UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 85th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

## VOLUME 103—PART 2

FEBRUARY 4, 1957, TO MARCH 1, 1957
(PAGES 1421 TO 2848)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1957

J
11
.R
v.103
pt. 2

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA


# Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 85th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION


## SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1957

Rev. Robert B. Appleyard, D. D., rector, Christ Church, Greenwich, Conn., offered the following prayer:

O Almighty God, judge of all nations, in honest self-searching we know our ways have not been Thy ways. Through the centuries, we have oft cloaked national gain in the garb of honor; confused greatness with political power; ignored injustice and poverty within our own gates; made terms of conquest which precluded a lasting peace.

Merciful God, we have forsaken Thy ways of blessedness. In Thy love forgive us.

And may we stand for Thy truth and restore life. Where the sacredness of the sealed word has been broken; where wanton cruelty has held sway; where liberty and free choice have been denied; where the sanctity of Thy spirit has been scorned; help us to stand, and, having done all, to stand. Strengthen us to make no compromise with oppression, nor to our seeming advantage come to terms with evil. Give us an abiding hatred of the wrong which we oppose, and a generous forgiveness of the doer, lest our own trespasses be unforgiven in Thy sight.

And let Thy living cross illumine all our calvaries, as we join hands across the borders and the seas to clear the air of lies; to enlist our common hopes against our separate fears; and, with all our skills combined, to rebuild a new home for Thy life in all the corners of the earth.

We ask it through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 1, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 637), an act to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available thereunder for business loans, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Olin Hatfield Chilson, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior; and

Richard Barrett Lowe, of South Dakota, to be Governor of Guam.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

### POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Arthur E. Summerfield, of Michigan, to be Postmaster General.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I merely wish to say a word of commendation regarding the willingness of Mr. Summerfield to continue to serve as Postmaster General. I know how hard he has worked during the past 4 years to make the Post Office Department an efficient agency for all the people of the United States, and at the same time to be fair to the great number of Post Office employees, both in Washington, D. C. and elsewhere throughout the country. I am glad that Mr. Summerfield is willing to continue to serve as Postmaster General.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am happy to join my colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], in saying a word in commendation of Arthur Summerfield.

Long before Mr. Summerfield became Postmaster General, I knew him rather intimately; and since he has come to Washington, I have watched with great interest the effectiveness with which he has carried on the work of the Post Office Department.

I wish to express my full approval of the nomination and its confirmation, because I believe Arthur Summerfield to be one of the outstanding men not only in the Post Office Department, but in the employ of the entire Federal Government.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, for 15 years I have been a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. During that time I have become intimately acquainted with the work of the committee and of the Post Office Department.

I cannot speak too highly of the services of Postmaster General Summerfield. In my opinion he has done an outstanding job. He has the confidence of the members of the committee, Democrats and Republicans alike. In my opinion the people of the country are to be congratulated upon having in the office of Postmaster General a man of Mr. Summerfield's business experience and eminence.

Under the law passed in 1872, no other member of the Cabinet has to be confirmed by the Senate; the Postmaster General is the only one.

I am satisfied that the Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle agree with me that Mr. Summerfield has done an outstanding job.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, formerly I was privileged to serve for 3 years on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. During my service on the committee I became somewhat acquainted with the functioning of the Post Office Department. Over the years I have closely watched the activities of the Postmasters General under both Democratic and Republican administrations.

Mr. President, it has been a source of pleasure and a great satisfaction to me to see the Reorganization Act take effect in connection with the functioning of the Post Office Department, under the able leadership of the Postmaster General, Arthur Summerfield. Today, there are the regional offices which are dispersing the activities of the Post Office Department and the postal service throughout the Nation; and that reorganization is reducing the cost of the service, and is bringing about greater administrative efficiency.

Mr. President, the Postmaster General, Arthur Summerfield, has brought business management ideas into the

postal service. Although the reorganization is in its infancy, yet we can see the promise of a more efficient postal service, both in the local post offices, and in the nationwide functioning of the Department.

So it is with a great deal of pleasure, Mr. President, that I have the privilege, as a Member of the Senate, of supporting confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Summerfield, for reappointment as Postmaster General.

One of the more obvious changes and improvements in the postal service is the painting of the mailboxes and the mail trucks red, white, and blue. That, in itself, gives evidence of a new day in the postal service. I know that the Postmaster General, Arthur Summerfield, has taken a keen interest in developing new methods which will be beneficial both to the postal employees and to the mail service of the Nation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that in our experience on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, we have discovered that the Post Office Department conducts the biggest business in the United States—bigger than that of any corporation?

Mr. THYE. Undoubtedly that is true. Furthermore, the postal service involves more people in everyday life than does any other governmental function.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I wish to add my words to those of my colleagues who have spoken in commendation of confirmation of the nomination of Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield.

It was my pleasure to know Arthur Summerfield a number of years before he actively entered into the great responsibilities which he is discharging at the moment. He is a businessman. He is a conscientious public servant. In the position of Postmaster General he has performed excellently in connection with the reorganization plans, which have been applied rather uniformly throughout the country.

As a result of Arthur Summerfield's business approach, we have a far better postal system and postal organization. I think he has made magnificent strides in tying together all the elements of the postal service into the greatest cooperative effort we have seen for many years.

Mr. President, today we have an efficient and a progressive Post Office Department.

Of course, I am delighted that the President has renominated Arthur Summerfield to be Postmaster General; and I shall be happy to vote for the confirmation of his nomination, just as I have been happy to make this statement regarding it.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, it is a great pleasure to stand on the floor of this deliberative body and speak in behalf of so great an American as Arthur Summerfield.

Today, when we must practice economy in Government, because of the great demands made on our Government for reasons very well understood by the people of the Nation, the time has come when every possible economy must be exercised in the postal service. The Postmaster General has done that exceptionally well, and I think has even added to the efficiency of that important department of our Government. It is a real pleasure to support the renomination of Arthur Summerfield as Postmaster General.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I wish to be associated with my colleagues in the very fine remarks which have been made about the renomination of the distinguished Postmaster General for another 4 years, plus 30 days. I think our country is to be congratulated that it has as its Postmaster General a man of the integrity, caliber, and character of Arthur E. Summerfield. He has rendered great service to the country. In my book, he is one of the outstanding Postmasters General in the history of America. I hope the nomination will be confirmed unanimously.

Mr. President, I am pleased that associated with Arthur E. Summerfield is an old friend of mine, Abe McGregor Goff, who has served as solicitor in the Post Office Department. His nomination to be General Counsel of the Department is before the Senate today.

I am delighted that he has been appointed to the responsible position of General Counsel of the Post Office Department. I hope the nomination will be confirmed unanimously.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, at a meeting of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee last Thursday, the committee unanimously approved and recommended to the Senate for confirmation the nominations of Arthur E. Summerfield to be Postmaster General, and of Abe Goff to be General Counsel of the Post Office Department.

As I understand, the Postmaster General is the only Cabinet officer whose nomination is required by statute to come to the Senate for confirmation at the beginning of a second term of a President's administration.

Abe Goff has been Solicitor in the Department, and now assumes the new position of General Counsel, which was created at the last session of Congress.

I shall not go into the background of the Postmaster General's business experience before he accepted the appointment as Postmaster General in the present administration. His background was made a part of the record on the occasion of the confirmation of his first nomination.

During the past 4 years there have been many improvements in the postal service, especially as it dealt with the personnel of the Department.

The Postmaster General made several recommendations in regard to the improvement of personnel policies in the Department, and Congress, by legislative action, approved these changes.

I think it is well to keep in mind that the Post Office Department is the second largest employer in the Government, employing 520,000 persons.

I think one of the important achievements during the past 4 years has been the installation of a modern pay structure, which became effective on December 3, 1955. This new compensation structure fully ascribed and allocated to their proper level 520,000 field positions. This represented probably the largest installation of a completely new compensation system ever successfully completed anywhere.

One of the programs in which I have been particularly interested, and which I sponsored, was the incentive awards program. During the first 6 months of the program, 240 awards were granted. During the fiscal year 1956, the adoption rate of employee suggestions increased by more than 100 percent, and substantial savings were estimated from their adoption.

I think I should mention the progress which has been made in the safety program in the Post Office Department. There has been continuous improvement in motor-vehicle safety and a reduced number of accidents for the second consecutive year.

For the second consecutive year the National Safety Council recognized the Department's contribution to motor-vehicle safety with a special award.

These and many other achievements have been carried out during the administration of Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield, and I urge the Senate to confirm his nomination.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I shall not attempt to add anything to the very fine statements which have been made about the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Summerfield to be Postmaster General for a second term, except to say that I approve of and join other Senators in their tributes to his work during the past 4 years.

I have known Art Summerfield for a number of years. I think the record shows he has established some innovations in the operations of a most difficult department, the great Post Office Department of the United States. He has increased the efficiency of the delivery of the mails and of the postal service generally to the people. On the basis of the costs incident to the operation of the Department, I think he has saved for the people and cut down expenses by hundreds of millions of dollars. Additional costs for the operation of the Department have been added from time to time by the Congress, but the increased efficiency of the service which he has brought about has resulted in a saving to the United States and to the American people of vast amounts of money.

I am glad to join with my colleagues in their tributes to Art Summerfield today.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, it is an honor to add my voice in support of the appointment of Arthur E. Summerfield to be Postmaster General of the United States.

Before he was called to Washington in 1953 to serve in President Eisenhower's Cabinet, Mr. Summerfield demonstrated great ability to organize and lead in the field of business. Those qualities were recognized in World War II, when he was selected as Michigan chairman of the

automobile committee of the National Automobile Dealers Association. In that capacity he was in charge of recruitment for the Ordnance Department of the United States Army for his State. He made an admirable record in that capacity. He also served as regional vice president of this association and headed up the organization's postwar planning committee. Again he did an excellent job.

The fine work of Arthur Summerfield first came to my attention when he served as chairman of the Republican National Committee during the very successful campaign of 1952. He completed the duties of this demanding office with dispatch and dignity, and added another page to his book of outstanding achievements.

During the past 4 years, Mr. Summerfield has served as Postmaster General of the United States. Again, the record he has compiled is an inspiring one. He has served with the efficiency that marks the successful businessman, the dignity that should always characterize a member of the President's Cabinet, and the energy and zeal that should always be the hallmark of a public servant.

The 4-year record of the Postal Department under the leadership of Mr. Summerfield reflects the type of administration he has engineered. New methods of operation, a revitalized organization within the Department, new and better equipment—these, and many other developments, have taken place. The result of this administration is reflected in one significant set of facts. In the past 4 fiscal years there has been an 11 percent increase in the volume of mail handled by the Post Office Department. In the face of that great increase, however, there has been an increase in employment in the Department of only slightly more than 3 percent. Many public servants, in many positions, pay verbal tribute to the goal of increased efficiency in Government. Mr. Summerfield has translated the pledge of increased efficiency into concrete and effective action.

I have had the honor of representing the people of Iowa in the Congress for 18 years—16 of them as the Representative from the First District of Iowa, and the last two as the junior Senator from Iowa. During that entire period, I have never seen a Cabinet official more dedicated to serving the people of America and their Government, or more devoted to the well-being of the personnel under his direction, than Arthur Summerfield. He has walked the narrow path of service and leadership with great honor and with becoming modesty.

I am proud and privileged to support without reservation the nomination of Arthur E. Summerfield to be Postmaster General of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am very pleased to join with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in paying tribute to one whom I consider to be a loyal public servant. I have known General Summerfield only since he came to Washington as a member of the Cabinet. He has been diligent in his work. He has been pleasant in his relationships. He has been fair in his dealings. It has been my observation that he has lived up to his responsibilities as a public servant.

I think I should observe that he is not a man of the best judgment in all respects, because he belongs to the Republican Party. [Laughter.] But if we are going to have Republicans—and it seems there were a lot of them last November—I want them to be like Arthur Summerfield. He never takes advantage of anyone. He does not play his cards under the table. He tries to reason with people, he tries to persuade people, he tries to lead people; but he never tries to drive one.

I am glad the Democratic majority, under the leadership of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has reported this nomination promptly and favorably.

It has been my observation, so far as my personal knowledge is concerned relating to my State, that General Summerfield has done an excellent administrative job; and I am glad, if we must have a Republican Postmaster General, that the President has renominated him.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in paying my respects to the Postmaster General, Arthur Summerfield, who has completed 4 years in this very important task, and whose nomination is before the Senate today for reconfirmation. I think he has done an outstanding job in the Post Office Department. I believe that when the history of the Post Office Department is ultimately written, Arthur Summerfield will stand high among the outstanding Postmasters General of the United States.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, it is unnecessary for me to add my word to the good things that have been said about Postmaster General Summerfield. I most heartily agree with them.

My purpose in rising is to say a word about Abe McGregor Goff, who has been renominated as General Counsel for the Post Office Department.

I entered the House of Representatives in 1947 with Abe McGregor Goff, and served with him in the House of Representatives. Among the 76 freshmen Members that year he was outstanding. He was selected by his party to represent the freshmen Members on the policy committee in the House of Representatives.

His service was conspicuously able. I have followed his activities and career through the years, and I should like to have the RECORD show, from one who has served with him and known him so well, that in confirming his nomination to this responsible position, we are fortunate in selecting a very able public servant of the highest degree of competency and integrity.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the excellent remarks made by my colleague from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], and other colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Summerfield has been an outstanding Postmaster General. He has brought about many much needed reforms in the Post Office Department. Above all, I think Mr. Summerfield has made the people of America conscious of the job of Postmaster General, and in doing so he has in some ways glamorized the Post Office Department—most notably by the beautiful decorative paint now appearing on mailboxes and mail trucks.

Postmaster General Summerfield has been a fine administrator. As I have said, he has brought about many needed reforms. I am very happy to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in complimenting him and wishing him great success in the years which lie ahead.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a great Michigander. Those of us from Michigan are extremely proud of the leadership which General Summerfield has given, not only to our State, but to our country.

General Summerfield's life story is a typical Horatio Alger story. He has achieved great success through his own hard work and ability.

Since January 1953 the postal administration of Arthur E. Summerfield has effected many short-term improvements and savings throughout the Post Office Department and has also developed long-range programs to modernize thoroughly our obsolete postal plant and to establish a sound fiscal policy.

In the past 4 years the Post Office Department has made more than 80 major improvements and simplifications for the users of the mails, making it easier and more economical for them to use the Department's services.

The shifting patterns of population and the growth of suburban communities have been served by adding the equivalent of 15,000 new letter carriers to serve 5 million more American homes and 500,000 more business concerns.

A complete regionalization program of the Post Office Department's operations has been effected, and the management is now decentralized into 15 region and 91 district offices, each equipped and staffed to handle its own problems quickly at a local level, on a home-rule basis.

An experimental airlift of regular 3-cent mail on a space-available basis with the airlines is a great success, and more than a billion such letters a year are now arriving at their destinations as much as 48 hours earlier than before and at no increase in cost to the Government or to the mailers.

Later collections of mail are now being made, so that millions of letters a day are now being sent on their way overnight instead of lying in mailboxes until the next morning.

Window hour service in post offices in large cities has been extended for the convenience of people who work during the day. Hundreds of thousands of rural dwellers are now receiving efficient rural delivery service.

More than 1,500 new postal buildings have been built to the Department's specifications by private capital, to meet our expanding postal needs, and 3,500 more new post offices are programed for completion in the next 5 years.

An industrial engineering program has been established and an organized program of research and development started.

In the larger post offices modern equipment, including conveyors, lift trucks, label-printing machines, strong tying machines, and so forth, has been installed.

The Department is actively designing and inventing electronic and mechanical equipment to do a large part of the tedious handwork in post offices.

Despite the great progress in improving the postal service during the past 4 years, the thing I like best about Arthur E. Summerfield is his frankness in admitting that the postal service is still far from satisfactory.

He has said on a number of occasions:

Our goal for the future seems to me to be an obvious one; namely, that we cannot, we must not, ever be satisfied until the mail service is as good as it possibly can be.

We cannot, we must not, be complacent or satisfied until the postal service matches in efficiency the best of American industry in techniques, in equipment, and in buildings.

I predict that in the next 4 years our Post Office Department, under Arthur E. Summerfield's dynamic leadership, will constantly improve the mail service to the American people; will make vast strides in modernizing its old-fashioned physical plant to keep pace with this growing Nation; and will contribute its share to balancing the Federal budget so essential to the economic well-being and security of the American people.

I wish once again to extend my congratulations to the President of the United States for nominating Arthur E. Summerfield to be Postmaster General.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to endorse and embrace all the commendatory statements we have heard on the floor of the Senate today concerning Arthur E. Summerfield.

Arthur Summerfield is a great American. He is a self-made man, in the tradition of our American concepts. He has brought to the Post Office Department some refreshingly new ideas. He has brought to the Post Office Department the Summerfield philosophy that no problem is too big to be tackled, and that any problem appropriately tackled is a problem to which a solution can be found.

He has had the courage and farsightedness to make suggestions and proposals which have gone far toward improving the postal service and making it the type of service to which the American people are entitled.

It is refreshing to realize that we have had this morning a very fine and very sincere tribute paid to Mr. Summerfield by a great Democrat from Texas, the majority leader of the Senate [Mr. JOHNSON], a man who has an affinity for the Democratic Party which no one has ever challenged. When he rises, as he did, and, in true Texan style, speaks straight from the shoulder in tribute to a man who was formerly the national chairman of the Republican Party, it is an occasion which I believe should make headlines in Europe and to make the people of the world realize that in America we have a political system with a capacity for accommodation to each other's point of view. That of itself should be of great assistance in other areas of the world and should constitute an example which other peoples might well emulate.

I know that Art Summerfield was not only the national Republican chairman, but that he was a very fine one. It was my pleasure to serve under him in 1952, as director of the speakers bureau of the Eisenhower-Nixon campaign. I watched him in action then, as I have observed him in operation in the Post Office Department. He has the tenacity, the enthusiasm, and the adventuresome spirit which keep our Government young and moving forward. It is a great thing for America that we can bring into the Government service, and have in the Cabinet, in charge of an important function of government, a man with the ability of Art Summerfield. I congratulate him, as I congratulate ourselves, on the job he is doing and will continue to do so admirably.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I join very happily with my colleagues in voting for the confirmation of the nomination of Arthur Summerfield, whose work I have watched very closely during the past 4 years. I believe he has done one thing which needed to be done very much indeed, and that is the improvement of the working conditions in our post offices, in plants which are old and outmoded and inadequate by modern standards, both with respect to the traffic handled in the post offices and the traffic handled on the streets.

We need a tremendous renovation program in the Post Office Department. I recall that last year General Summerfield proposed such a plan. Perhaps it is not big enough; but, certainly it shows that he has an understanding of one of the most crying needs of the postal service; namely, the improvement of the plant and the improvement of the working conditions for the postal employees. I hope that in his second administration he will have an opportunity to bring into force the ideas and the plans which he has conceived for the improvement of the service along the lines I have indicated.

I am very happy to vote for the confirmation of his nomination. I join my colleagues in wishing him great success in his second administration.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice to the voices of my colleagues in praise of the Postmaster General. I congratulate him on his renomination, and I join my colleagues in praising his qualities as an able leader and good administrator, and as one who has used a great deal of good judgment and fine management in conducting the affairs of his department. It is to be hoped he will receive the same measure of cooperation in the future that he has received heretofore in improving the working conditions of the employees of his Department, so as to increase the efficiency of the Post Office Department and the service it extends to the public.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say something about the nomination. I shall not vote against it, of course, because I believe Mr. Summerfield has done an excellent job in many of his Department's activities. The distinguished occupant of the chair, I believe, can understand what I have in mind, because we deal with the appropriations for the Post Office Department.

However, I did not wish this occasion to pass without putting into the RECORD one thought. We need a great many post offices throughout the country. About 2 years ago Congress enacted a law which allowed the Postmaster General—the law is called the lease-purchase law—to let contracts for the construction of post office buildings, and to contract with individuals for the rental of such buildings for a period of 20 years. At the end of the 20-year period the Government has the right to take possession of the buildings, if it wishes to do so. However, in many cases, when we add up the cost of such an operation, we find the cost to be almost twice what it would be if the Government appropriated the money in the first instance and built the post offices.

In a great many instances rentals and lease-purchases in connection with post offices are justified; but it seems to me that when it is contemplated to erect a large building which will be used solely for a Federal function, such as a post office, for example, the Post Office Department might well consider coming to Congress and asking for an appropriation with which to construct the building for its exclusive use, so as to save the taxpayers at least 40 or 50, and in some cases 90 percent, of the cost which would be incurred if the building were constructed under the lease-purchase plan.

Of course what I have related is not Mr. Summerfield's fault, because Congress enacted the lease-purchase law. I believe he has done a good job in many instances. However, I feel that under the circumstances I have outlined he might well come to Congress and, without being afraid of the size of his budget, ask Congress to appropriate the money for the building of post offices, instead of letting an outsider make a profit.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in recent years—and perhaps for the past 8 or 10 or 12 years—the Post Office Department has bought land for post-office sites, and that later it was authorized to sell that land. As a result, although the Government made millions of dollars in profit from the sale of such properties, the Post Office Department did not get any credit for that profit.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I had not quite finished my statement. I wish to add that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], has announced that hearings will be held on the lease-purchase program on February 19. As the Senator from Michigan has stated in his announcement of the hearings, the purpose of the hearings will be to determine the progress under the program and to develop recommendations for the future. That lease-purchase program provides for the acquisition of title to real property and the construction of public buildings by the Administrator of

General Services. The question of local taxes is also involved. The whole subject matter will be taken up at the hearings, which, as I said, will begin on the 19th of this month.

I know that the Senate will vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Summerfield to be Postmaster General. However, this is one part of the program we had better take another look at so as to find out what it is costing the taxpayers of the United States. I wish to say to the Senator from Michigan that he will find the reason the Post Office Department does not want to construct the necessary buildings is that it does not like to ask for the amount in its budget.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Arthur E. Summerfield to be Postmaster General?

The nomination was confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Abe McGregor Goff, of Idaho, to be General Counsel of the Post Office Department.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## VISIT TO THE SENATE BY LORD LOTHIAN, MEMBER OF THE BRITISH HOUSE OF LORDS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am pleased to state that today we have as our guest in the Senate Lord Lothian, of the British House of Lords, who has been a member of that body for 12 years. At the present time, he is a member of the British delegation to the United Nations, meeting in New York. He happened to be in Washington over this weekend, and I extended an invitation to him to be on the floor of the Senate. I am sure all Members of both parties are happy to have him with us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished minority leader. I regret that it will not be possible for me to enjoy a longer visit with Lord Lothian, but I am glad that he is present in the Senate, and that we are able to extend to him the warm hand of welcome and to express to him the hope that his visit to this country will be both pleasant and helpful in strengthening the mutual ties between our nations.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EASTER RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain data relating to the Easter recess in 1956 and the Easter recess in 1955.

There being no objection, the data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

| Year | Easter date | Number of days recessed | House | Senate | Resolution No. | CONGRESSIONAL RECORD page |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1956 | Apr. 1 | 10 | Mar. 29–Apr. 9 | Mar. 29–Apr. 9 | H. Con. Res. 226 | 5871 (House). 5857 (Senate). |
| 1955 | Apr. 10 | 8 | Apr. 4–Apr. 13 | Apr. 4–Apr. 13 | H. Con. Res. 103 | 3955 (House). 4026 (Senate). |

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to state to the Senate that it is my hope, since Easter comes on Sunday, April 21, this year, that we may be able to recess or adjourn on Thursday, the 18th, and return the following Monday, the 22d, with the understanding that there will be no votes on Monday, and that then the Senate will go over until the following Wednesday.

I am not able at this time to confirm that date, because I am still negotiating with the distinguished minority leader, and it is impossible to estimate what will be before the Senate during that time. But I wish to give as much advance notice as may be possible, and it is my hope that we may leave here on Thursday, April 18, and return on the following Monday, the 22d, and proceed as I have suggested, coming back for regular business on the following Wednesday.

## PROPOSED ELECTION REFORM LEGISLATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have 2 or 3 announcements I desire to make at this time, because I must leave the floor to attend a meeting.

First, I wish to invite attention to the very splendid report that has been issued over the weekend by the subcommittee under the very able chairmanship of the very able junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

This report highlights the need for an election reform bill. I am hopeful that we shall be able to pass one before the end of this session of the Congress.

I hope every Member of the Senate will study the report and ponder its implications.

## INVESTIGATION OF RACKETEERING IN THE FIELD OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief comment today on an action of the Senate which I believe will meet a long-awaited need.

It was the resolution to establish a select committee to investigate racketeers in the field of labor-management relations.

This inquiry will be conducted by a carefully selected committee under the able leadership of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. The caliber of the membership is sufficient guaranty that the inquiry will be thorough, painstaking, and objective.

There is something about the question of racketeering in the field of labor-management relations that fills most of us with a deep sense of disgust. The source of the racketeering does not matter.

The thought that organizations designed to protect the rights of workingmen can be infiltrated by underworld characters is obnoxious. The thought that such people may receive some cooperation from a few businessmen or a few labor leaders is even worse.

I know the Senator from Arkansas intimately and have a deep appreciation of his extraordinary abilities. I know this is one investigation which need be feared neither by labor nor management.

The only people who have to fear this inquiry are those who have sought to pervert honorable relations between labor and management. And this is the kind of fear which will meet with widespread approval throughout the Nation.

## WORK OF THE SENATE DURING MONTH OF JANUARY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senate has completed a very productive month, and I want to extend my congratulations to all my colleagues. It is seldom that so much has been done during the first month of a session.

The record—which has been modest in terms of headlines but substantial in terms of accomplishment—could not have been possible without the cooperation of Members on both sides of the aisle.

The organization of the Senate proceeded smoothly on the very first day. There were no unnecessary conflicts, no flaming disputes—just a reasonable agreement on the problems that were before us.

The organization of the committees followed—and again it was a well-working operation which I believe strengthened all of our groups. That task will be completed today when we fill two vacancies on the Senate Select Committee on Small Business.

The session opened with a discussion of rule XXII—a subject generally considered to be loaded with emotional controversy. The discussion was completed in 7 hours—and every Senator made his

points forcefully, ably, and on the highest plane.

I believe that out of that discussion will come a reasonable solution to a perplexing problem.

In the period since those first days, we have completed action on a bill to increase by $80 million the loan authorizations of the Small Business Administration; we have approved a major investigation into racketeering in the field of labor-management relations; we have held hearings on the President's Middle East doctrine. I hope the resolution dealing with that question will be reported to the Senate in the form the committees may recommend, in the very near future, probably in the early part of next week.

The Senate Banking Committee has started hearings on the Financial Institutions Act of 1957—the result of studies it has made already. The Joint Economic Committee has started hearings on the President's economic report.

More than 1,100 measures have been introduced and the Senate has acted upon 61 of them. We have approved 24 money resolutions providing funds for various studies and inquiries, and we have confirmed 1,307 Presidential nominations.

This is a promising start for a constructive session.

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until next Thursday at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## BRIEF ABSENCE OF SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS FROM THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to inform my colleagues that I shall be absent from the Senate for the remainder of this week. I plan to take a little rest during that period. During my absence the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] will take my place as acting majority leader. I ask only that Senators be as kindly and generous to him as they have always been to me.

As I told the Senate last year, it is my intention to take a number of brief holidays from time to time—a privilege which I hope will be copied by all my colleagues.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am sincerely happy that the majority leader will take a necessary rest, because, frankly—and I say this in all sincerity—good men are scarce, and the Senator from Texas is one of the good men, and I should like to see him take care of his health. If we must have a majority leader on the other side of the aisle, I want him to be LYNDON JOHNSON.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind remarks of the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is now in order.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF CERTAIN BOATS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Department of the Navy proposes to loan to the Navy League of the United States, a 104-foot aircraft rescue boat, and a 24-foot plane personnel boat, to the Danvers Veterans 130 Club, Inc., of Danvers, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON STUDY OF SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF NICKEL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, requesting an extension of time in which to file a supplemental report on the study of supply and distribution of nickel; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON IRON AND STEEL SCRAP

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on iron and steel scrap, dated January 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY—AMENDMENT OF ANTIDUMPING ACT OF 1921

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the operation and effectiveness of the Antidumping Act, 1921, together with a draft of proposed legislation to amend certain provisions of the Antidumping Act, 1921, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in the enforcement thereof, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF DISPOSAL OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on sales and transfers of foreign excess property by that Administration for the period January 1, 1956, through December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, for the period January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956 (with accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Leonora Levon Yanovkian from a report transmitted to the Senate on January 16, 1956, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON POSITIONS FILLED IN CERTAIN GRADES OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions filled under the Classification Act of 1949, in grades GS–16, 17, and 18 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 2

"Relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States in relation to repealing the transportation excise taxes

"Whereas for the purpose of meeting wartime emergency necessity, the Congress of the United States enacted as excise taxes a levy upon the transportation of persons and property; and

"Whereas one of the principal purposes of levying such tax upon the transportation of persons was to discourage unnecessary wartime travel; and

"Whereas today, 12 years after the cessation of hostilities, there continues a 10 percent levy on the transportation of persons and a 3 percent levy on the transportation of property; and

"Whereas it is the opinion of the Legislature of the State of California that excise taxes should not impose an unfair burden on the long-distance shipper and the long-distance traveler as does the present tax on the transportation of property and persons; and

"Whereas it should be a principle of Federal taxation to levy taxes in such a manner as to prevent them from falling as an unequal burden on citizens residing in different areas of the country; and

"Whereas the distances to, from, and within the West impose an unfair burden on the western traveler and shipper; and

"Whereas the present transportation tax on property is unfairly burdensome upon the State of California as it adds what is in effect an additional tariff on the goods shipped from California to the eastern markets; and

"Whereas the development and preservation of open markets leads to the efficient development and stimulation of the agricultural resources of the Nation; and

"Whereas the State of California is particularly interested in preserving the eastern market as an open market in which the agricultural products of California may compete freely without hindrance of artificial barriers such as the present transportation tax; and

"Whereas the State of California is particularly interested in protecting and developing its vacation and tourist travel on an equal basis with other vacation travel areas; and

"Whereas the transportation of both persons and property plays such a vital role in the economic life of this country to the extent that the costs of transportation should always be kept at the lowest possible level; and

"Whereas transportation is in no sense a luxury but is a vital necessity and there is,

therefore, sound reason for distinguishing between the transportation taxes and other excise taxes that are imposed upon luxury items; and

"Whereas it is the opinion of the Legislature of the State of California that the best interest of the country and particularly the Western States, who are now discriminated against by the present transportation taxes, would be served by a repeal of those taxes; and

"Whereas there is presently pending before the Congress of the United States legislation which would repeal the tax on transportation of property and which would repeal the tax on transportation of persons: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact into law such legislation or any other bill or bills which would accomplish the same purpose; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 6

"Relative to prohibiting juveniles, unaccompanied by a parent or guardian, from crossing the United States-Mexico border without a permit for such purposes

"Whereas a bill (H. R. 5108) was introduced in the 84th Congress of the United States by Representative ROBERT C. WILSON of California, which would have required that a juvenile either have a proper permit issued by the United States Attorney General or be accompanied by a parent or guardian before he could cross the border into Mexico; and

"Whereas Representative WILSON intends to introduce a similar measure in the 85th Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas many juveniles are entering Mexico for the sole purpose of gaining easy access to illicit drugs, including heroin and marihuana; and

"Whereas the suppression of narcotic addiction in the United States is of no avail if our youth can obtain an unending supply of such nefarious drugs by merely crossing the border; and

"Whereas, the alarming extent of narcotic addiction among young Americans is without doubt a paramount cause of increased juvenile delinquency and crime in this Nation and many of our youngsters who could otherwise develop into useful and worthy citizens are doomed by this evil to the horror of a living death; and

"Whereas legislation to eliminate this unhealthy situation would be a major step in the protection of our country's greatest resource—its youth—and is deserving of full congressional support: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation initiated by Congressman WILSON of California that would prohibit unescorted juveniles from crossing the United States-Mexico border; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 9

"Relative to restoration of the San Diego Veterans' Administration regional office

"Whereas prior to September 1955, a regional office of the Veterans' Administration was maintained in San Diego, Calif., and adequately served an area which has a heavier veteran population than any other area in the United States; and

"Whereas in September 1955, this office was consolidated with the Los Angeles regional office in an endeavor to effect economies by reducing personnel and rental costs; and

"Whereas it was not intended, nor was it to be expected by officials of the Veterans' Administration and others concerned, that the consolidation would result in any interruption, deterioration, or diminution in the services authorized by law for the veterans and their dependents in the San Diego area; and

"Whereas the consolidation has, because of difficulties inherent in any attempt to provide veterans' services in the San Diego area without a regional office in that city, failed to effect any such economies and has resulted in a serious curtailment of services with the inevitably attendant hardships; and

"Whereas with respect to the economies that it was hoped would result from the consolidation, experience has demonstrated that costs of providing necessary services have increased rather than decreased; as examples, the cost of administering a case under the fee basis medical program has increased more than $4 as a result of the consolidation and, while consolidation has permited the elimination of 77 positions in the San Diego office, more than 200 positions have been required to be added to the Los Angeles office; and

"Whereas the deterioration in service, which has resulted notwithstanding all efforts of the officials and employees of the Veterans' Administration and the explicit cooperation of the veterans, is evidenced by the fact that subsistence checks for student veterans for the fall semester had not been received by December, by the fact that veterans with service-connected disabilities have been required to travel great distances to Los Angeles for examinations, and by the fact that a backlog of over 6,000 cases in the Los Angeles office prevents any hope for the prompt processing of any case and thereby deprives the service of its very essence in many instances; and

"Whereas the consolidation has been given a fair trial and has, through difficulties inherent in the situation rather than through the fault or dereliction of anyone concerned, utterly failed in its objects; and

"Whereas it now appears that it would be far more feasible to return the San Diego office to its regional status and embrace the Counties of Orange, Riverside, and Imperial within that regional area: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States to take appropriate measures to insure that the possibility, desirability, and urgency of restoring the San Diego office to its original status be investigated and that necessary action be taken on facts the investigation will disclose: And be it further

*"Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Resolution 31

"Joint resolution relative to Federal relief to poultry producers

"Whereas the poultry producers of this State annually provide a great amount of the meat consumed in this State; and

"Whereas this vital factor in our economy and well being is most gravely threatened with economic chaos due in large part to the fact that the raisers of poultry are required under present law to actually pay twice for the grain and other feed they purchase; first by way of taxes to maintain price supports on these commodities and second by paying the artificially raised prices for the products; and

"Whereas this is particularly harmful to the small family-type poultry producer as evidenced by the almost catastrophic increase in the number of bankruptcies and other failures of these producers; and

"Whereas the small family-type operation is traditionally the very basis for our American economy: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California*, That the President and Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States are respectfully memorialized to take immediate action to afford relief to the depressed poultry producers of California; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from California."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

*"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 34th session thereof, do respectfully represent that—

"Whereas the State of Idaho is approximately 550 miles in length from north to south and there are only 2 interstate highways across the State in an easterly and westerly direction, namely, No. 10 in the north and United States Highway No. 30 in the south, the 2 highways mentioned being at least 400 miles apart at the points where they cross the mountainous easterly borders of the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas in the event of hostilities involving the Pacific Northwest, highway facilities through the State of Idaho in an easterly direction would be of paramount and vital importance both from the standpoint of military defense and for the evacuation of civilians; and

"Whereas the Lewis and Clark Highway, when completed, will connect Lewiston, Idaho, and Missoula, Mont., by a direct, water-grade route, and thus provide another means of east-west travel between the Pacific Northwest and the Middle West; and

"Whereas the unconstructed portion of the Lewis and Clark Highway is only 25 miles in length and lies entirely within the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas the Lewis and Clark Highway, when completed, will traverse or closely parallel the route of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, which opened up the Pacific Northwest over 150 years ago and would be a fitting memorial to those explorers: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, concurring, now in its 34th session, do respectfully and earnestly request the Congress of the United States to authorize and appropriate sufficient moneys to provide for the construction and completion of said unfinished link in said Lewis and Clark Highway at the earliest practicable date; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized, and he is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"*To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Fred Seaton, Secretary of the Interior; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate; the Committee on Interior Affairs, United States House of Representatives; the Congress of the United States:*

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, 23d session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas statehood in the American union on a basis of full equality has long been an aspiration of the people of Alaska, believing in government of, by and for the people; and

"Whereas the people of Alaska have, for a long time past, demonstrated their ability and fitness to assume the full rights, obligations and duties of citizens of the United States, and now desire to form themselves into a state, as the people of all other territories have done before them; and

"Whereas the people of the United States, committees of the Congress of the United States, and the National platforms of both our major political parties have called for the early admission of Alaska to statehood; and

"Whereas the Territory of Alaska has now written and adopted a constitution for the proposed State of Alaska, by overwhelming majority, and has elected a Representative and Senators to the Congress of the United States, as provided by the constitution: Now, therefore,

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska respectfully prays that the Congress of the United States, at its present session, adopt legislation admitting Alaska as a State of the Union and seating is duly elected representatives. And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house January 28, 1957.

"RICHARD GREUE,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Attest:

"DOLORES D. GOAD,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*

"Passed by the Senate January 31, 1957.

"VICTOR C. RIVERS,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A resolution of the City Council of the City of Philadelphia, Pa., relating to the restoration of the U. S. S. *Olympia;* to the Committee on Armed Services.

Three resolutions adopted by the Immigration and Naturalization Committee of the Supreme Lodge, Orders of the Sons of Italy in America, New York, N. Y., relating to immigration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the American Veterans of World War II and Korea, Department of Ohio, favoring an investigation relating to the cost of living and the danger of inflation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## TRAINING FOR THE NATIONAL GUARD—LETTER AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, Senate Concurrent Resolution 3, adopted by the Legislature of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States to take action for the purpose of changing and overriding a directive of the Department of Defense requiring 6 months' national training for all National Guard enlistees, and a letter from L. R. Houck, Lieutenant Governor, and president of the Senate of South Dakota, transmitting to me the above concurrent resolution. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and concurrent resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and concurrent resolution were referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and the letter and concurrent resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
*Pierre, February 1, 1957.*

Hon. KARL E. MUNDT,
*United States Senator,*
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

YOUR HONORABLE SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 3 which was adopted by the Senate of the State of South Dakota and concurred in by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota on this date.

Your favorable consideration of this expression of the legislative bodies of the State of South Dakota will indeed be appreciated by the citizens of our great State.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Respectfully,

L. R. HOUCK,
*Lieutenant Governor,*
*President of the Senate.*

Attest:

NIELS P. JENSEN,
*Secretary of the Senate.*

Senate Concurrent Resolution 3

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States, His Excellency the President of the United States, to take action for the purpose of changing and overruling a directive of the Secretary of Defense requiring 6 months active military training for all National Guard enlistees who have had no previous basic military training

*Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein):*

Whereas the Secretary of Defense of the United States has issued a directive requiring 6 months of active duty in the United States Army for all enlistees in the National Guard, who have not had any previous basic training; and

Whereas the requirement of 6 months active duty will seriously reduce enlistments in the National Guard as many of the enlistees are young men in high school and college or are engaged in business and who would not enlist if required to take an initial period of six months basic training; and

Whereas said requirement for 6 months basic training could well reduce the National Guerd to a mere skeleton unit and defeat the purpose and aims of the National Guard as a part of the Ready Reserve of the Nation; and

Whereas it is believed that the objectives of having a Ready Reserve could be accomplished by a much shorter initial period of basic training which, with the periodic instruction and drills now being given in the National Guard would be sufficient to qualify the individuals concerned as basically trained for any duties that may be assigned and, at the same time, will not reduce the enlistments in the National Guard to any great extent: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate of the 35th session of the South Dakota Legislature, the House of Representatives concurring therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States and His Excellency, the President of the United States, to require that the directive issued by the Secretary of Defense requiring an initial period of 6 months basic training for enlistees in the National Guard be abrogated and set aside and that a much shorter and realistic period of basic training be required which will fulfill the concept of Ready Reserves and, at the same time, will not reduce enlistments in the National Guard, and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress, to the chairman of the appropriate military committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, to United States Senators Karl Mundt and Francis Case, Congressman E. Y. Berry, Congressman George McGovern, and to C. E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense of the United States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

## TRAINING OF THE NATIONAL GUARD—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on January 27, 1957, the Minnesota Legislature unanimously passed a concurrent resolution memorializing the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Army to reconsider a recently announced policy requiring 6 months of active duty training of members of the National Guard, to the end that more realistic and workable requirements agreeable to the State be prescribed.

I feel that my colleagues should know of the very definite opinions of the members of the Minnesota State Legislature on the current controversy aroused by the recent directive of the Secretary of Defense requiring a 6-months consecutive training period for all National Guard recruits, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD and appropriately referred, the concurrent resolution passed by the Minnesota Legislature on January 27.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and, under

the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army to reconsider a recently announced policy requiring 6 months of active duty training of members of the National Guard, to the end that more realistic and workable requirements, agreeable to the State, be prescribed

Whereas the Minnesota National Guard, in Minnesota's 100 years of statehood, has a distinguished record of service to the State and Nation in war and peace and its continued existence in strength and effectiveness, and, its status as both a Federal and State force is vital to the State and the Nation, and

Whereas the qualifications for membership therein is, under the United States Constitution, the exclusive responsibility of the State; and

Whereas no changes in the qualifications of National Guard membership should be effected by the Federal Government without the consent of the State; and

Whereas a directive has recently been issued by the departments of defense and the Secretary of the Army, establishing, to become effective April 1, 1957, which will require all nonprior service enlistees in the National Guard to perform 6 months of active military training as a condition of enlistment; and

Whereas the purported intent of this change in policy is to improve the training and the combat readiness of the National Guard, with which purpose the State and the military authorities thereof are in accord and are constantly striving to improve; and

Whereas it is believed a compulsory 6 months active training program for all members of the Natioal Guard will not gain the desired objectives as to training and readiness for the reasons that such a program is difficult to reconcile in the educational and employment planning of our young men and will so greatly reduce the rate of enlistments as to make it impossible for the National Guard to fulfill its responsibilities to the State and Nation and under such a program there is serious question that it can long survive; and

Whereas it would appear that there should be a common ground for the establishment of a practical and workable solution to the enlistment and requirements of the National Guard which will be acceptable to both the State and the Federal Government: Now, therefore be it

*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army, reconsider the action which has been taken in prescribing a compulsory 6 months training program for all non-prior service members of the National Guard and in collaboration with the governor and the adjutant general of Minnesota, and those of other States, establish realistic and workable policies relative to the enlistment and training of the National Guard, which will assure it continued maintenance of strength and effectiveness in the State and Nation's plan of National Defense; be it further

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota, be instructed to transmit copies of this joint resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army, and to each Member of Congress of the United States from the State of Minnesota.

## RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF VIRGINIA, MINN.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Virginia, Minn., relating to inflation.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 6444

Resolution requesting Federal action to curb the present inflation prevalent in all phases of our national economy

*Resolved by the City Council of the City of Virginia*—

Whereas the present effect of inflation has caused serious damage to many branches of our economy and has directly cast great hardships on large groups of our citizens, depriving many of their properties and means of proper sustenance because of poorly conceived or poorly executed controls; and

Whereas the upward spiral of inflation has continued so long in this country that the ever-deflating value of the dollar has reached such proportions that continued inflation will inevitably reach a chaotic state: Now, therefore, be it hereby

*Resolved*, That the City Council of the City of Virginia place itself on record in opposition to the continuance of unbridled inflation and place itself in favor of any proper legislation which will correct this dangerous situation and direct that copies of this resolution be sent to all Senators and Representatives representing this district and all other interested persons.

## RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL RETAIL DRY GOODS ASSOCIATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have before me resolutions adopted by the National Retail Dry Goods Association, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. We believe the imposition of actual or standby regulation of consumer credit is unnecessary.

2. To the extent that retailers are required to be collectors of sales taxes, we propose that they be reimbursed for the cost thereby incurred.

3. Because of the present trend of rising Government costs, we urge that the Hoover Commission recommendations should be further implemented without delay.

4. Convinced that a healthy and expanding trade among the free nations is a prerequisite to a sound world economy, good will, and mutual understanding, we urge—

(a) A continual effort toward the development of a vigorous foreign trade program; and

(b) An examination of current tariff rates, trade policies, and customs procedures to minimize trade barriers, with due regard to the national interest.

5. The National Retail Dry Goods Association is opposed to the encroachment of Federal legislative authority in areas which historically and properly rest with the various States.

We are convinced that the need for establishment of minimum wages for localized businesses such as retailing is properly a matter for State and local determination.

The association reaffirms its position for the retention of the retail exemption in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1949 as amended.

6. The right to belong or not to belong to a trade union should reside in the individual employee.

We believe that the requirement of union membership as a condition of employment is a denial of this right for those employees who of their own free choice prefer to remain nonunion or to become nonunion.

We reendorse the principle of right-to-work laws as set forth in section 14 (b) of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 as amended.

7. Though recognizing the right of properly certified labor unions to represent employees, we believe that organizational picketing to gain representation is an unjustifiable economic pressure. Its purpose is to force upon an employer a labor organization regardless of his employees' wishes. We therefore strongly urge enactment of Federal and State legislation to prohibit picketing to force an employer to recognize a labor organization which has not been legally certified as the bargaining agent for his employees.

8. Reaffirming our position that the present statute regulating the sizes and weights of parcel post packages as incorporated in Public Law 199 is arbitrary, discriminatory, and contrary to the public interest, we strongly urge its immediate repeal.

9. We urge the removal of all excise taxes which were initially imposed as a wartime emergency measure.

## LIMITATION OF POWER OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a copy has just reached me of a resolution passed by the City Council of Minneapolis on January 25, enclosing a passage of legislation to limit the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission in regulating the price of natural gas in interstate commerce. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE PASSAGE OF LEGISLATION DESIGNED TO LIMIT THE POWER OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION IN REGULATING THE PRICE OF PRODUCED GAS MOVING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Whereas the City Council of the City of Minneapolis on March 11, 1955 adopted a resolution opposing the provisions of the so-called Harris bill, then pending in the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas under the provisions of the said Harris bill it was proposed to take away from regulation by the Federal Power Commission producers of natural gas selling such gas in interstate commerce; and

Whereas at the present session of Congress certain bills have already been introduced seeking to accomplish the same results; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the city council that the passage of such legislation will nullify the effect of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Phillips Petroleum Co.* v. *State of Wisconsin* (347 U. S. 672, 74 S. Ct. 794 (1954)); and

Whereas the consumption of natural gas by domestic consumers in the city of Minneapolis is proportionately greater than most other large urban centers because of the long and intensely cold winter season, and, therefore, the city of Minneapolis is vitally interested in any legislation which might tend to increase the price of gas to consumers; and

Whereas the removal from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission of independent producers who sell gas in interstate commerce may well result in increased cost burdens to the consumers of gas in the city of Minneapolis; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the city council that such legislation is not in the public interest: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis*, That it opposes passage of any legislation having a similar effect of the so-called Harris bill; be it further

*Resolved*, That the City Council of the City of Minneapolis requests the Members in Congress from Minnesota to exert their utmost efforts to defeat any such proposed leigslation; be it further

*Resolved*, That the city clerk be directed to submit forthwith a copy of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Member of the United States Congress from the State of Minnesota.

Passed January 25, 1957.

Approved January 25, 1957.

EUGENE E. STOKOWSKI,
*President of the Council.*
ERIC G. HOYER,
*Mayor.*

Attest:

LEONARD A. JOHNSON,
*City Clerk.*

## THE NATIONAL FARM POLICY—RESOLUTION OF TAYLOR COUNTY (MINN.) FARMERS UNION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have just received a resolution adopted by the Taylor County Farmers Union concerning our national farm policy.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed at this point in my remarks and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 25, 1957.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: We are enclosing resolutions as unanimously adopted by the Taylor County Farmers Union at our recent meeting. We believe this to be the thinking of a large majority of the farmers in our community, regardless of organizational affiliations.

Resolutions are:

"That 100 percent of parity price supports of all farm products is a must if our economy is to be restored.

"That corn-acreage allotments be increased to 51 million acres which is the same as submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture under the recent corn referendum as a base acreage.

"That soil-bank payments be materially increased if participation is desired.

"That Government crop insurance for all agricultural products be made available to all producers.

"That the farmer is not asking for a handout but for a balanced economy with industry and other segments of our economy.

"That the Secretary of Agriculture be instructed to use all the powers vested in him to the limit, to balance our agricultural economy until a better plan has been worked out. With many billions of dollars being spent for armaments and foreign aid and allowing our agricultural economy to crumble most certainly is unrealistic.

"That we vigorously protest the recent advance in prices of gasoline and fuel oils. We feel further price advances should be discouraged or denied."

We would appreciate any effort you can put forth to carry out the above resolutions.

Yours sincerely,

DELBERT ROGERS,
*President.*
MRS. FARRIS GRAY,
*Secretary-Treasurer.*

## RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF NORTHERN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, VIRGINIA, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on January 7, 1957, I directed the attention of the Senate to the fraudulent advertising campaign which private power companies apparently are conducting in our national magazines in an effort to portray a completely false picture of cooperatives and taxation.

I have just received a resolution from the Board of Directors of the Northern Electric Cooperative Association, of Virginia, Minn., asking that a congressional investigation be conducted to determine whether or not there is an organized effort by private power companies to influence tax legislation, using tax deductible funds for advertising for this purpose.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas America's light and power companies are carrying on a propaganda advertising program designed to convey a completely false picture and for lobbying purposes against rural electric cooperatives, municipalities, public power districts, and the Federal power program; and

Whereas since the cost of such advertising is a deductible expense for tax purposes part of the cost of this program actually comes out of the Federal Treasury; and

Whereas electric cooperatives purchase less federally generated power than do the private power companies: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That Congress launch a full-scale joint investigation to determine whether or not there is an organized effort on the part of the private power companies to influence the Federal administration, the Congress, the governments of the States and the political life of the Nation and further that copies of this resolution be sent to the United States Senators from Minnesota and the Representative from the Minnesota Eighth Congressional District.

## THE TANKER SHORTAGE; RESOLUTION OF PROPELLER CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the world's desperate need of tankships to carry petroleum products, resulting from the closing of the Suez Canal, has aggravated greatly a steel-shortage problem that has plagued the country's shipbuilding industry for some months.

I have been in touch with the responsible authorities of our Government to the end that provisions be made to assure the necessary amounts of steel plate required for the replacement of our merchant fleet, and for constructing the many new tankers now under construction and on order.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted October 12, 1956, at a joint session of the Propeller Club of the United States, and the American Merchant Marine Conference, pointing up the necessity of prompt action to prevent a bog-down of shipbuilding activities.

This resolution was adopted last year, but in view of the Suez situation, it states exactly what I wish to say today in relation to our tanker shortage.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE 30TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE PROPELLER CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES AND AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE CONFERENCE, NEW YORK, N. Y., OCTOBER 12, 1956

It is the sense of this convention that, because of the critical shortage of ship steel, the shipbuilding and ship-repairing industry is in imminent danger of a severe curtailment, not only of its present activities but of any future commitments which may become available in connection with the several ship-replacement programs now underway. In view of the fact that the demands for heavy shapes and plates, constituting the bulk of the requirements for shipbuilding and ship repairing is far in excess of existing steel-mill capacity now devoted to that type of production, it is imperative that action be taken in Washington at the highest level to assure sufficient steel to carry out existing and future commitments for shipbuilding and ship repair. Failure to make such provision will result in a definite curtailment of the defense potential of both the shipping and shipbuilding and ship-repair industries, impairing the fourth arm of the national defense, without which the three military arms cannot function effectively. Curtailment of the modernization of the American Merchant Marine, due to inability to produce modern and efficient replacement vessels inevitably will have an adverse effect on our economic welfare, and in our foreign trade, both export and import, by diverting still more of it to foreign-flag vessels as a result of inadequate competition by obsolete American-flag vessels.

## THE MERCHANT MARINE—RESOLUTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as I am sure most of my colleagues are aware, the American Legion has from its very inception been one of the stanchest supporters of our national policy for a merchant marine adequate to the needs of war as well as of peace.

At its 38th National Convention in Los Angeles in September the Legion membership reaffirmed their faith in this time-proven national policy, in a resolution whose sound principles reflect in emphatic fashion a thorough understanding of and devotion to the maritime needs of the Nation.

In presenting this resolution for printing in the RECORD with my remarks, I wish to pay tribute to the Legion's National Security Commission and its Merchant Marine Committee, whose devoted chairman, Mr. Henry C. Parke, has for some years given unsparingly of his time and his efforts to the cause of alerting our citizens to the importance of, and the necessity for, a merchant marine worthy of this great country of ours.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MERCHANT MARINE RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE 38TH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION AT LOS ANGELES, CALIF., SEPTEMBER 3–6, 1956

Whereas the Suez Canal dispute, threatening for a time to flame into a shooting war, has again demonstrated even in this

atomic age, the world's dependence on freedom of the seas; and that a modernized American Merchant Marine of improved design, planned for peace but geared to the speed and needs of our Navy to maintain control of the seas is still essential to the welfare and security of the United States and all free nations: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the American Legion reaffirm its 37-year support of a strong, privately owned and operated American Merchant Marine as our fourth arm of defense, and urges the adoption of such policies and procedures as will—

1. Implement as fully as possible the sound national maritime policy established in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

2. Provide adequate shipbuilding and ship repair mobilization bases for wartime requirements along all of our three seacoasts; and that Government and military officials allocate and distribute peacetime new-ship construction and repairs equitably among all Atlantic, Gulf and Pacific facilities, in the interest of national security.

3. Encourage the construction, experimentation, and perfection of the nuclear-powered merchant vessel, authorized by Congress, so that the word's first commercial nuclear-powered ship will fly the American flag.

4. Reinstate offering of United States Naval Reserve commissions to graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy and the maritime colleges of New York, Maine, Massachusetts and California.

5. Reactivate the Merchant Marine Naval Reserve as an effective component of the United States Naval Reserve.

6. Provide for the mobility of our naval and merchant seapower by modernizing the Panama Canal to permit larger vessels now and in the future to transit the canal.

7. Urge that the Office of Defense Mobilization review the shortage of steel for the construction of new merchant ships and establish a high rating, in the interest of national security.

8. Assure that operating and construction differential payments to American-flag steamship lines will continue to be based upon the concept of parity with foreign-flag competitors.

9. Attract sufficient private capital to finance an orderly and evenly scheduled ship-replacement program so as to avoid block obsolescence of the merchant fleet and to provide a steady workload for all American shipyards.

10. Maintain and effectively administer the Cargo Preference Act of 1954 and thereby assure that a strong privately owned and operated merchant marine will carry its fair share of surplus farm commodities and foreign-aid cargoes.

11. Encourage United States exporters and importers to use American-flag ships wherever possible, in the interest of dependable and reliable service, in the interest of a dynamic and expanding United States foreign commerce, and in the interest of national defense.

12. Provide that low-speed, inefficient, and overage vessels now in laid-up status be scrapped, and that ships traded in from the commercial fleet at fair market values be progressively replaced by new construction.

13. Develop constructive steps to insure strong intercoastal and coastwise steamship service and to expand and improve the Nation's fleet of oceangoing tankers and ore carriers.

14. Encourage the Maritime Administration, in cooperation with the Department of Defense and private industry, to continue its vigorous policy to insure that the United States maintain its position in the field of vessel design and propulsion as well as improved cargo-handling techniques.

15. Increase the efforts of the Government to work with other nations toward eliminating discriminatory practices harmful to United States-flag shipping.

16. Foster free enterprise in shipping and avoid unnecessary expenditures of public funds by withdrawing ships operated by Government agencies from routes or services where privately owned and operated vessels are available.

17. Continue to encourage and support the United States Merchant Marine Academy and the maritime colleges in Maine, Massachusetts, California, and New York.

Whereas the American Legion has adopted and intends to continue a program of direct action for a strong American merchant marine; and

Whereas in order to implement the broad and extensive information and educational campaign by the American Legion on behalf of a strong American merchant marine for our national security: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the chairman of the merchant marine committee and the director of the national security commission of the American Legion be, and they hereby are, directed to continue to seek and obtain from all possible sources such information and assistance as will insure the effectiveness of the mandates of this convention concerning the American merchant marine, and, further, that the chairman and the director be, and they hereby are, authorized to participate in all public hearings affecting the said program; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the American Legion, at its 38th annual national convention, assembled in Los Angeles, Calif., September 3–6, 1956, instructs the national headquarters of the American Legion to continue to prepare and to carry out an extensive information and educational program about the American merchant marine as your fourth arm" of national security.

## RESOLUTION OF PANAMA CANAL SOCIETY OF FLORIDA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Panama Canal Society of Florida, at its annual reunion at St. Petersburg, on January 15–16, 1957, urging the creation of an independent Interoceanic Canals Commission to study and review all the problems involved in the matter of increased capacity for the canal and make such recommendations as the situation may warrant.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Panama Canal situation has been dangerously simmering for over 2 years without constructive results; and

Whereas the inadequacy of the Panama Canal to meet increasing traffic requirements has become more and more acute and the absolute need for a speedy determination of the overall subject is of the most vital importance; and

Whereas there is developing a determined movement to force the Congress into authorizing a sea-level canal and to which radical change practically all engineers familiar with local Canal Zone conditions are unalterably opposed as a dangerous and costly experiment not warranted or supported by experience gained over 42 years of Panama Canal operations and maintenance: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Panama Canal Society of Florida at its annual reunion at St. Petersburg, January 15–16, 1957*, That (1) the society respectfully and most earnestly urges the Congress of the United States to enact, without further delay, legislation providing for the creation of an independent Interoceanic Canals Commission to study and review all the problems involved in the matter of increased capacity for the canal, with recommendations in the premises.

(2) That copies of this resolution be furnished the press and the Members of Congress.

(3) That copies of this resolution also be furnished each of the 2,400 former members of the original canal construction force now comprising the membership of the Panama Canal Societies located throughout the United States, with the request that these members utilize every opportunity to support in the public press and through their congressional representatives the action recommended in this resolution.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 63. A bill for the relief of Joan Yung-en Chao (Rept. No. 49);

S. 75. A bill for the relief of Vincent Lee Lao (Rept. No. 51);

S. 158. A bill for the relief of Hewey Malachi Mackey (Rept. No. 52);

S. 162. A bill for the relief of Jew Gim Gee (Rept. No. 53);

S. 225. A bill for the relief of Kew Chan (Chan Kew), Nancy Tsui Mei (Leung) Chan, and Cecilia (Oi Fan) Chan (Rept. No. 54);

S. 446. A bill for the relief of Ki Young Kwan (Rept. No. 55);

S. 458. A bill for the relief of Athanasios Nicholas Prittes (also known as Thomas Prites, or Tom N. Phillips) (Rept. No. 56); and

S. 461. A bill for the relief of Paul Yen-Hsiung Feng and his wife, Mary Stella Pao-Ching Feng, and their minor child, Joseph Shao-Ying Feng (Rept. No. 57).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 394. A bill to authorize the award of a Medal of Honor to Comdr. Hugh Barr Miller, Jr., United States Navy (Rept. No. 58); and

S. 674. A bill for the relief of Cale P. Haun and Julia Fay Haun (Rept. No. 59).

## SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 48) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A–9716766, Alfonso, Jose Fortich.
A–6949986, Alter, Chaim.
A–10135642, Alter, Paula.
A–6821652, Chao, Chi-Hsien.
A–7174725, Chillemi, Agatino.
A–5225158, Chor, Lin Yet.
A–9769273, Choy, Yen Chu.
A–9635428, Constantinides, Michael.
A–7485232, Crisci, Chung May Fong.
T–2672020, Cuevas-Fausto, Marciso.
A–2545910, Goumas, Costas Theodore.
A–6662794, Halberstam, Hersch.
A–6463603, Halberstam, Brucha.

A-7858110, Halbrecht, Miriam Baraks.
A-7821864, Huerta, Juana Villanueva De.
A-7821806, Huerta-Villanueva, Elena.
A-7457147, Iniguez-Gomez, Martin.
0900-55633, Iniguez, Petra Martinez De.
A-6760550, Klein, Leon.
0300-403947, Lam, Bee.
A-2976235, Lam, Tit Hong.
T-2671987, Lopez-Martinez, Fidencio.
A-5319344, Minami, Tom Miyoshi.
A-4802395, Miyashita, Hisano.
0900-63110, Ortiz-Soto, Efrain.
A-5977278, Santos, Marcolino.
A-1985208, Veronis, Gerasimos Nicholaou.
A-4956624, Wallace, Empson Clarkston.
T-1496984, Uyeyama, Miyasumi.
A-4095935, Aguirre-Ruiz, Jose.
A-7354329, Arbutman, Lejb Bernardo.
A-6612013, Arzrouni, Achoude.
A-4784317, Bakker, Harry Paul Marinus.
1600-97772, Barra-Duarte, Aureliano.
A-2938135, Beker, Leon.
0900-64192, Camarena-Arias, Juan.
A-9669215, Dedo, Styepo.
A-9737095, De Moura, Julio.
A-7898941, Douskos, Carmen Maria.
A-6507735, Douskos, George.
A-9518412, Foo, Nee Ah.
E-89750, Gee, Chin Jun Kim.
0900-64550, Hernandez-Castro, Juan.
A-6048903, Huerta-Santellan, Angel Magdaleno.
E-056666, Joe, Kwok Liang.
E-056667, Joe, Paylan Liang.
E-056668, Joe, Lee San.
A-6597759, Legister, Albert John.
T-2760961, Levy, Rene Cisneros.
A-7250484, Lockhart, Baleeka.
V-319235, Long, Haydee Rueda.
A-4954329, Lumas, Joseph.
A-6726819, Madrazo, Elisa Amparo.
A-8876988, O'Donnell, William John.
A-7270220, Palombella, Francesco.
A-9707191, Ramos, Pedro.
A-6711481, Rizk, Alfred Alexander.
T-2760421, Rodriguez-Garcia, Rafael.
A-3822477, Sanchez-Alejandro, Esteban.
A-3038125, Sanchez-Alejandro, Filomeno.
A-4010160, Sanchez-Alejandro, Gregorio.
A-4209497, Sanchez-de, Natividad Bazan.
T-1499169, Si, Wang.
A-5904796, Su'a, Kipeni.
A-4219656, Temita, Tamio.
A-5338975, Traynor, Janet Jessie.
A-9581816, Trojanovic, Pedro.
A-5423889, Tsien Wei Hwa.
A-923872, Tsien, Wei Nan.
E-44755, Vega, Maria.
A-3610417, Ying, Teresa.
A-10086556, Ying, Yuen.
0966-263, Zamarripa-Barrera, Petra.
0966-264, Zamarripa-Barrera, Enrique.
A-2821296, Cnapich, Joseph.
A-7225061, Di Mambro, Edoardo.
V-1240687, Okana, Takeko.
A-7469332, Nevarez-Meraz, Alberto.
A-7044290, Ramirez-Mata, Carles.
T-2672016, Ramirez, Petra Aida Montes De.
A-7188173, Roden, Adolf.
A-5528068, Todeschini, Isidoro Oreste.
A-6346278, Valkana, Constantinos.
A-6357988, Valkana, Panagiota.
A-6079538, Browne, Candelaria S. M.
A-6078003, Browne, Cynthia.
A-6079549, Browne, Rudolph.
A-8938372, Browne, Albert.
A-6079545, Browne, Leslie.
A-6078002, Browne, Vernon.
A-6870027, Fong, Way Chong.
A-7367898, Chu, Lau Hing.
A-5978605, Engelmann, August Max.
A-5763362, Fong, Liu.
A-4030307, Hee, Yep.
A-5967408, Ikari, Manuel Enrique.
A-5982007, Katsuro, Shuhei.
A-6886810, Lawrence, Genoveva Adelina.
A-5815895, Marshall, John Neil.
A-4080362, Maya-Ybarra, Francisco.
A-4334530, Miki, Tomizo.
A-10416353, Orozco-Estrada, Pedro.
0300-387312, Quintero-Toscano, Candido.
A-5248778, Singh, Channan.
A-6352536, Soltero, Silverio.
A-8039899, Stumbaugh, Giovanna Fiammini Di Loreto.
A-8901479, Tang, Lily Cheng-Li.
1600-101488, Toro-Moreno, Manuel Del.
A-10504578, Valles, Luz Gasca De.
1500-42507, Velez, Esteban.
1500-42508, Velez, Eduviges.
1500-42509, Velez, Elvira.
A-7283659, Wah, Leung.
T-1892615, Foo, Wong Ah.
A-9747459, Henderson, Cecil Ashton.
A-6097780, Honda, Katsuki.
A-2573276, Li, I-Ying.
A-4829259, Mischler, Richard Robert.
A-6063644, Nielson, Lindsay Franklin.
A-6930858, Paradissis, Philip John.
A-8883007, Petrizzo, Maria Rosaria.
A-7751743, Pigulewski, Nicholas De Lorence.
A-1657086, Redko, Isay Ivanovich.
A-10086222, Scurvin, Lancelot Seymore.
A-2994820, Alfaro, Lydia Molina De.
A-8021752, Alfaro-Molina, Samuel.
A-6160109, Davis, Guy Henry.
A-7391996, Herrera-Ruiz, Juan.
A-3972563, Kogano, Takashi.
A-9708088, Naum, Lee.
0300-415842, Ong, Min.
A-5186985, Perez-Perez, Ruben.
A-10492500, Perez, Socorro Luna De.
A-10492499, Luna, Maria de Jesus.
A-8082062, Sing, Au.
E-118899, Wong, Ah Liang.
A-2185719, Alie, Alex.
A-5672581, Havlasa, Jan Klecanda.
A-4967880, Korogiannos, Eponinodas.
A-9645741, Lee, De She.
0300-398983, Leong, Mock Fook.
A-8014953, Nardo, Albert Di.
A-6161490, Ozawa, Atsumi Angelica.
A-6354359, Periaki, Thomas.
A-7764289, Plaushak, Pamela Lysa.
A-7930337, Poy, Ngai Kai.
T-1892169, San, Chin You.
A-9513946, Sze, To King.
A-6161489, Yoshimura, Suzuko.
A-7284855, Benn, Hajara Singh.
A-6226075, Carlson, Susan.
A-3497151, Cosgrove, James.
A-8258649, Dominguez, Beatrice Rodriguez De.
A-10474407, Guerra, Maria Tovares De.
A-4352288, Hurtado, Lucia Espinosa De.
A-8832503, Mazer, Carmen Enriqueta De.
A-9501884, Michalakis, George.
A-7772769, Pinedo-Tamayo, Adolfo.
A-2706650, Sato, Kunishige.
A-7295956, Villapudua-Sanchez, Armando.
A-2319483, Zara, Thomas.
A-5997836, Gonzalez, Feliciano.
A-5882765, Gutierrez, Angelina Cuellar.
A-3653450, Lee, Hsin Chin.
A-9747187, Locke, George Frederick.
A-2008973, Maticzuk, Nicolaj.
A-6459301, Paneth, Lea.
A-8851449, Ulrych, Boruch.
A-8851450, Ulrych, Chaia Tauba.
A-3812648, Won, Tom Yon.
A-7439457, Aguirre, Rita Talavera De.
A-6484421, Fischer, Isidor.
T-303675, Garcia-Ramos, Eulalio.
A-9333333, Jit, Boh Tong.
A-3818721, Jung, Wood Dar.
A-8039673, Kenul, Joseph.
A-7290162, Lee, John.
A-5360726, Maldonado-Gonzalez, Fidel.
A-8258739, Padron-Lizana, Enrique.
A-1196312, Silverman, Ada.
A-5753515, Sutherland, William George.
A-7363001, Vernazza, Gina Letina.
A-8871495, Ybarra-Torres, Eugenio.
A-7276513, Wing, Jew.
A-9151185, Akerberg, Hjalmar Alfons.
A-9684304, Fat, Lam.
A-7361923, Jung, Guey.
A-9538393, Leetmaa, Kaarel.
A-8870247, Martinez-Gutierrez, Alvino.
A-3379867, Naito, Tomio.
A-4784332, Nelson, Minnie.
A-6496278, Oriel, Benjamin Joseph.
A-4234512, Paz, Alicia Hernandez De.
A-3096797, Tsichlis, Vasilios.
A-4381523, Cook, Anthony.
A-5944885, Crowther, Angela Knez
A-6899161, Dirks, Hendrik.
A-4820438, Frangos, Nicholas Kostantinos.
A-5154701, La Guardia, Francisco Marti.
A-9117178, Legac, George.
A-5966811, Miculinic, Joseph.
A-10499492, Mohamed, John.
A-4906873, Pizarro, Emilio Anastacio.
A-5997834, Prieto, Angel.
A-5997834, Prieto, Jr., Angel.
A-7201762, Scott, George Edward Wisdom.
A-10416355, Atilano, Berta Morales De.
A-9517004, Fong, Foh Hua.
A-10075140, Foo, Mah Hong.
A-5549548, Friedrich, Hans Max.
A-7984748, Gonzalez-Perez, Angel.
A-3573618, Green, Caroline Louise.
A-6549172, Lazaro, Pelagia Javier.
A-6614916, Livas, Gregory Panagiotou.
A-5785564, Merayo, Agustin.
A-74445700, Niewolkiewicz, Mary.
A-10416327, Ramirez, Luis Ortega.
A-7841671, Shew, Gee.
A-1305814, Diamond, Phillip.
A-6476840, Figueroa-Ayuso, Eulalio.
A-10256536, Hung Wong.
A-7140275, Lopez-Barragon, Nicolas.
A-5372469, Marcev, Samuel Anton.
A-5778460, Naess, Fred.
A-7115379, Scime, Marianne.
A-3747236, Tai, Mook Hoo.
A-8883649, Barbosa-Gomez, Luis Emilo.
A-7251809, Kehoe, Sophie.
A-8190275, Lai, William.
A-1945249, Rumenko, Frank.
A-7028911, Shavulsky, David.
A-5415136, Shavulsky, Goldie.
A-7028913, Shavulsky, Sylvia.
A-9582980, Syrigos, Antonios.
A-6849417, Tung, Ching Chen.
A-6967562, Tung, Lillian Liu.
A-9662775, Van Diepen, John.
A-9260398, Ward, Frank Joseph.
A-10255874, Chow, Fai King.

## WITHDRAWAL OF SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF A CERTAIN ALIEN—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution withdrawing suspension of deportation of Carlis Stender, and I submit a report (No. 50) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress, in accordance with section 246 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U. S. C. A. 1256 (a)), withdraws the suspension of deportation in the case of Carlis Stender (A-2180275) which was previously granted by the Attorney General and approved by the Congress.

## PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) to provide for the printing of additional copies of hearings held by the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of

the Committee on the Judiciary, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held by the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly on June 21, 26, 27, 29, 30, July 3 and 5, 1956, on bills to amend section 2 of the Clayton Act.

## REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of December 1956. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported regular civilian employment in the month of December totaling 2,389,792. This was a net decrease of 4,532, as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of November.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1957, which began July 1, 1956, follows:

| Month | Employment | Increase | Decrease |
|---|---|---|---|
| July | 2,398,673 | 14,250 | |
| August | 2,400,493 | 1,820 | |
| September | 2,388,854 | | 11,639 |
| October | 2,396,163 | 7,309 | |
| November | 2,394,324 | | 1,839 |
| December | 2,389,792 | | 4,532 |
| Net increase, first 6 months, fiscal year 1957. | | 5,369 | |

Total civilian employment in civilian agencies during the month of December was 1,213,796, a decrease of 1,113 as compared with the November total of 1,214,909. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in December was 1,175,996. This was a decrease of 3,419 as compared with 1,179,415 in November.

Civilian agencies reporting the major decreases were Department of Agriculture with 1,629, Department of the Interior with 1,018, Veterans Administration with 618, and the Panama Canal with 574. Major increases were reported by the Post Office Department with 2,018 and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare with 494.

In the Department of Defense decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Department of the Army with 1,809 and the Department of the Air Force with 1,803. Increases were reported by the Department of the Navy with 153 and the Office of the Secretary of Defense with 40.

Inside continental United States civilian employment decreased 2,892. Outside continental United States civilian employment decreased 1,640. Industrial employment by the Federal agencies in December totaled 659,607 a decrease of 1,591.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,389,792 civilian employees certified to the Committee by executive agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in United States Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 273,674 foreign nationals working for United States military agencies during December who were not counted in the usual personnel report. The number in November was 276,467. A breakdown of this employment for December follows:

| Country | Total | Army | Navy | Air Force |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| England | 7,945 | | 33 | 7,912 |
| France | 26,001 | 17,861 | | 8,140 |
| French Morocco | 6,069 | 159 | 994 | 4,916 |
| Germany | 98,814 | 82,691 | 590 | 15,533 |
| Japan | 129,311 | 67,495 | 19,327 | 42,489 |
| Korea | 4,817 | 4,817 | | |
| Malta | 85 | | 85 | |
| Netherlands | 45 | | | 45 |
| Norway | 21 | | | 21 |
| Trinidad | 566 | | 566 | |
| Total | 273,674 | 173,023 | 21,595 | 79,056 |

*Personnel and pay summary*

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for December 1956 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

| Total and major categories | Civilian personnel in executive branch | | | Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | In December numbered— | In November numbered— | Increase (+) or decrease (−) | In November was— | In October was— | Increase (+) or decrease (−) |
| Total [1] | 2,389,792 | 2,394,324 | −4,532 | $931,007 | $946,657 | −$15,650 |
| Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense | 1,213,796 | 1,214,909 | −1,113 | 472,547 | 479,278 | −6,731 |
| Department of Defense | 1,175,996 | 1,179,415 | −3,419 | 458,460 | 467,379 | −8,919 |
| Inside continental United States | 2,184,009 | 2,186,901 | −2,892 | | | |
| Outside continental United States | 205,783 | 207,423 | −1,640 | | | |
| Industrial employment | 659,607 | 661,198 | −1,591 | | | |
| Foreign nationals | 273,674 | 276,467 | −2,793 | [3] 30,405 | [3] 28,572 | +1,833 |

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.
[2] Subject to revision.
[3] Revised on basis of later information.

Table I, below, breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside continental United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside continental United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1956, and comparison with November 1956, and pay for November 1956, and comparison with October 1956*

| Department or agency | Personnel | | | | Pay (in thousands) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | December | November | Increase | Decrease | November | October | Increase | Decrease |
| Executive departments (except Department of Defense): | | | | | | | | |
| Agriculture | 82,449 | 84,078 | | 1,629 | $29,737 | $30,711 | | $974 |
| Commerce [1] | 47,219 | 46,928 | 291 | | 21,698 | 21,022 | $676 | |
| Health, Education, and Welfare | 49,981 | 49,487 | 494 | | 21,235 | 20,568 | 667 | |
| Interior | 48,610 | 49,628 | | 1,018 | 20,753 | 21,942 | | 1,189 |
| Justice | 30,520 | 30,548 | | 28 | 14,975 | 15,648 | | 673 |
| Labor | 5,932 | 5,929 | 3 | | 2,741 | 2,821 | | 80 |
| Post Office | 523,427 | 521,409 | 2,018 | | 196,159 | [3] 195,144 | 1,015 | |
| State [3] | 33,116 | [2] 33,072 | 44 | | 12,341 | 12,820 | | 479 |
| Treasury | 78,417 | 78,715 | | 298 | 34,315 | 36,386 | | 2,071 |
| Executive Office of the President: | | | | | | | | |
| White House Office | 398 | 395 | 3 | | 233 | 236 | | 3 |
| Bureau of the Budget | 443 | 438 | 5 | | 296 | 303 | | 7 |
| Council of Economic Advisers | 38 | 35 | 3 | | 27 | 28 | | 1 |
| Executive Mansion and Grounds | 69 | 70 | | 1 | 19 | 24 | | 5 |
| National Security Council [4] | 25 | 26 | | 1 | 18 | 19 | | 1 |
| Office of Defense Mobilization | 264 | 251 | 13 | | 157 | 170 | | 13 |
| President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization | 5 | 5 | | | 2 | 3 | | 1 |

[1] December figure includes 742 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.
[2] Revised on basis of later information.
[3] December figure includes 10,668 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 10,569 in November, and their pay. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The December figure includes 2,507 of these trust-fund employees, and the November figure includes 2,462.
[4] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1956, and comparison with November 1956, and pay for November 1956, and comparison with October 1956*—Continued

| Department or agency | Personnel | | | | Pay (in thousands) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | December | November | Increase | Decrease | November | October | Increase | Decrease |
| Independent agencies: | | | | | | | | |
| Advisory Committee on Weather Control | 11 | 8 | 3 | | $4 | $6 | | $2 |
| Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission | 12 | 12 | | | 6 | 6 | | |
| American Battle Monuments Commission | 611 | 620 | | 9 | 95 | 97 | | 2 |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 6,673 | 6,686 | | 13 | 3,534 | 3,694 | | 160 |
| Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System | 597 | 588 | 9 | | 312 | 319 | | 7 |
| Boston National Historic Sites Commission | 4 | 4 | | | 2 | 1 | $1 | |
| Civil Aeronautics Board | 603 | 602 | 1 | | 352 | 356 | | 4 |
| Civil Service Commission | 4,441 | 4,444 | | 3 | 2,136 | 2,261 | | 125 |
| Commission of Fine Arts | 11 | 11 | | | 2 | 2 | | |
| Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission | 3 | 3 | | | 1 | 2 | | 1 |
| District of Columbia Auditorium Commission | 18 | 18 | | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Export-Import Bank of Washington | 188 | 182 | 6 | | 112 | 118 | | 6 |
| Farm Credit Administration | 1,008 | 1,016 | | 8 | 527 | 536 | | 9 |
| Federal Civil Defense Administration | 1,122 | 1,146 | | 24 | 624 | 652 | | 28 |
| Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review | 8 | 8 | | | 4 | 4 | | |
| Federal Communications Commission | 1,147 | 1,145 | 2 | | 617 | 637 | | 20 |
| Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation | 1,144 | 1,152 | | 8 | 589 | 613 | | 24 |
| Federal Home Loan Bank Board | 698 | 693 | 5 | | 336 | 353 | | 17 |
| Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service | 335 | 338 | | 3 | 241 | 248 | | 7 |
| Federal Power Commission | 707 | 703 | 4 | | 386 | 402 | | 16 |
| Federal Trade Commission | 718 | 710 | 8 | | 409 | 425 | | 16 |
| Foreign Claims Settlement Commission | 114 | 115 | | 1 | 58 | 60 | | 2 |
| General Accounting Office | 5,386 | 5,433 | | 47 | 2,564 | 2,667 | | 103 |
| General Services Administration | 27,102 | 27,072 | 30 | | 9,728 | 10,032 | | 304 |
| Government Contract Committee | 20 | 17 | 3 | | 10 | 10 | | |
| Government Printing Office | 6,664 | 6,681 | | 17 | 2,874 | 3,049 | | 175 |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | 9,932 | 9,949 | | 17 | 4,845 | 5,089 | | 244 |
| Indian Claims Commission | 14 | 14 | | | 11 | 11 | | |
| Interstate Commerce Commission | 2,084 | 2,070 | 14 | | 1,101 | 1,091 | 10 | |
| Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission | 4 | 4 | | | 3 | 3 | | |
| National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics | 7,668 | 7,641 | 27 | | 3,881 | 4,020 | | 139 |
| National Capital Housing Authority | 254 | 250 | 4 | | 95 | 99 | | 4 |
| National Capital Planning Commission | 34 | 33 | 1 | | 18 | 19 | | 1 |
| National Gallery of Art | 333 | 335 | | 2 | 111 | 110 | 1 | |
| National Labor Relations Board | 1,115 | 1,118 | | 3 | 637 | 670 | | 33 |
| National Mediation Board | 104 | 105 | | 1 | 74 | 72 | 2 | |
| National Science Foundation | 262 | 301 | | 39 | 137 | 147 | | 10 |
| National Security Training Commission | 5 | 5 | | | 3 | 3 | | |
| Panama Canal | 14,401 | 14,975 | | 574 | 5,370 | 3,560 | 1,810 | |
| Railroad Retirement Board | 2,251 | 2,215 | 36 | | 909 | 924 | | 15 |
| Renegotiation Board | 443 | 445 | | 2 | 285 | 300 | | 15 |
| St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation | 36 | 34 | 2 | | 23 | 28 | | 5 |
| Securities and Exchange Commission | 788 | 786 | 2 | | 454 | 460 | | 6 |
| Selective Service System | 6,939 | 6,918 | 21 | | 1,752 | 1,817 | | 65 |
| Small Business Administration | 950 | 936 | 14 | | 504 | 518 | | 14 |
| Smithsonian Institution | 761 | 758 | 3 | | 296 | 306 | | 10 |
| Soldiers' Home | 1,024 | 1,030 | | 6 | 245 | 245 | | |
| Subversive Activities Control Board | 33 | 33 | | | 24 | 25 | | 1 |
| Tariff Commission | 207 | 205 | 2 | | 125 | 129 | | 4 |
| Tax Court of the United States | 148 | 146 | 2 | | 97 | 98 | | 1 |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 14,887 | 14,857 | 30 | | 6,721 | 7,102 | | 381 |
| Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | 3 | | |
| U. S. Information Agency | 11,473 | 11,319 | 154 | | 3,243 | 3,267 | | 24 |
| Veterans' Administration | 177,382 | 178,000 | | 618 | 61,349 | 64,765 | | 3,416 |
| Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission | 3 | 3 | | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Total, excluding Department of Defense | 1,213,796 | 1,214,909 | 3,257 | 4,370 | 472,547 | 479,278 | 4,182 | 10,913 |
| Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense | | | 1,113 | | | | 6,731 | |
| Department of Defense: | | | | | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary of Defense | 1,726 | 1,686 | 40 | | 1,040 | 1,082 | | 42 |
| Department of the Army | 430,231 | 432,040 | | 1,809 | 162,503 | 167,537 | | 5,034 |
| Department of the Navy | 393,339 | 393,186 | 153 | | 163,204 | 162,369 | 835 | |
| Department of the Air Force | 350,700 | 352,503 | | 1,803 | 131,713 | 136,391 | | 4,678 |
| Total, Department of Defense | 1,175,996 | 1,179,415 | 193 | 3,612 | 458,460 | 467,379 | 835 | 9,754 |
| Net decrease, Department of Defense | | | 3,419 | | | | 8,919 | |
| Grand total, including Department of Defense | 2,389,792 | 2,394,324 | 3,450 | 7,982 | 931,007 | 946,657 | 5,017 | 20,667 |
| Net decrease, including Department of Defense | | | 4,532 | | | | 15,650 | |

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1956, and comparison with November 1956*

| Department or agency | December | November | Increase | Decrease |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Executive departments (except Department of Defense): | | | | |
| Agriculture | 81,113 | 82,808 | | 1,695 |
| Commerce [1] | 43,537 | 43,211 | 326 | |
| Health, Education, and Welfare | 48,149 | 47,595 | 554 | |
| Interior | 44,965 | 45,556 | | 591 |
| Justice | 29,986 | 30,007 | | 21 |
| Labor | 5,807 | 5,788 | 19 | |
| Post Office | 520,949 | 518,926 | 2,023 | |
| State [2] | 8,272 | 8,259 | 13 | |
| Treasury | 77,435 | 77,733 | | 298 |
| Executive Office of the President: | | | | |
| White House Office | 398 | 395 | 3 | |
| Bureau of the Budget | 443 | 438 | 5 | |
| Council of Economic Advisers | 38 | 35 | 3 | |
| Executive Mansion and Grounds | 69 | 70 | | 1 |
| National Security Council [3] | 25 | 26 | | 1 |
| Office of Defense Mobilization | 264 | 251 | 13 | |
| President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization | 5 | 5 | | |
| Independent agencies: | | | | |
| Advisory Committee on Weather Control | 11 | 8 | 3 | |
| Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission | 12 | 12 | | |
| American Battle Monuments Commission | 15 | 15 | | |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 6,651 | 6,666 | | 15 |
| Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System | 597 | 588 | 9 | |
| Boston National Historic Sites Commission | 4 | 4 | | |
| Civil Aeronautics Board | 599 | 598 | 1 | |
| Civil Service Commission | 4,424 | 4,428 | | 4 |
| Commission of Fine Arts | 11 | 11 | | |
| Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission | 3 | 3 | | |
| District of Columbia Auditorium Commission | 18 | 18 | | |
| Export-Import Bank of Washington | 188 | 182 | 6 | |
| Farm Credit Administration | 996 | 1,004 | | 8 |
| Federal Civil Defense Administration | 1,122 | 1,146 | | 24 |

[1] December figure includes 782 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.

[2] December figure includes 1,692 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 1,674 in November.

[3] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1956, and comparison with November 1956*—Continued

| Department or agency | December | November | Increase | Decrease |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Independent agencies—Continued | | | | |
| Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review | 8 | 8 | | |
| Federal Communications Commission | 1,118 | 1,116 | 2 | |
| Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation | 1,142 | 1,150 | | 8 |
| Federal Home Loan Bank Board | 698 | 693 | 5 | |
| Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service | 335 | 338 | | 3 |
| Federal Power Commission | 707 | 703 | 4 | |
| Federal Trade Commission | 718 | 710 | 8 | |
| Foreign Claims Settlement Commission | 114 | 115 | | 1 |
| General Accounting Office | 5,309 | 5,359 | | 50 |
| General Services Administration | 26,996 | 26,968 | 28 | |
| Government Contract Committee | 20 | 17 | 3 | |
| Government Printing Office | 6,664 | 6,681 | | 17 |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | 9,773 | 9,794 | | 21 |
| Indian Claims Commission | 14 | 14 | | |
| Interstate Commerce Commission | 2,084 | 2,070 | 14 | |
| Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission | 4 | 4 | | |
| National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics | 7,668 | 7,641 | 27 | |
| National Capital Housing Authority | 254 | 250 | 4 | |
| National Capital Planning Commission | 34 | 33 | 1 | |
| National Gallery of Art | 333 | 335 | | 2 |
| National Labor Relations Board | 1,096 | 1,099 | | 3 |
| National Mediation Board | 104 | 105 | | 1 |
| National Science Foundation | 262 | 301 | | 39 |
| National Security Training Commission | 5 | 5 | | |
| Panama Canal | 533 | 545 | | 12 |
| Railroad Retirement Board | 2,251 | 2,215 | 36 | |
| Renegotiation Board | 443 | 445 | | 2 |
| St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation | 36 | 34 | 2 | |
| Securities and Exchange Commission | 788 | 786 | 2 | |
| Selective Service System | 6,742 | 6,722 | 20 | |
| Small Business Administration | 942 | 928 | 14 | |
| Smithsonian Institution | 759 | 756 | 3 | |
| Soldiers' Home | 1,024 | 1,030 | | 6 |
| Subversive Activities Control Board | 33 | 33 | | |
| Tariff Commission | 207 | 205 | 2 | |
| Tax Court of the United States | 148 | 146 | 2 | |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 14,887 | 14,857 | 30 | |
| Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission | 3 | 3 | | |
| United States Information Agency | 2,619 | 2,577 | 42 | |
| Veterans' Administration | 176,142 | 176,762 | | 620 |
| Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission | 3 | 3 | | |
| Total, excluding Department of Defense | 1,149,126 | 1,149,342 | 3,227 | 3,443 |
| Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense | | | 216 | |
| Department of Defense: | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary of Defense | 1,673 | 1,632 | 41 | |
| Department of the Army | 366,394 | 367,721 | | 1,327 |
| Department of the Navy | 360,434 | 360,233 | 201 | |
| Department of the Air Force | 306,382 | 307,973 | | 1,591 |
| Total, Department of Defense | 1,034,883 | 1,037,559 | 242 | 2,918 |
| Net decrease, Department of Defense | | | 2,676 | |
| Grand total, including Department of Defense | 2,184,009 | 2,186,901 | 3,469 | 6,361 |
| Net decrease, including Department of Defense | | | 2,892 | |

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1956, and comparison with November 1956*

| Department or agency | December | November | Increase | Decrease |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Executive departments (except Department of Defense): | | | | |
| Agriculture | 1,336 | 1,270 | 66 | |
| Commerce | 3,682 | 3,717 | | 35 |
| Health, Education, and Welfare | 1,832 | 1,892 | | 60 |
| Interior | 3,645 | 4,072 | | 427 |
| Justice | 534 | 541 | | 7 |
| Labor | 125 | 141 | | 16 |
| Post Office | 2,478 | 2,483 | | 5 |
| State [1] | 24,844 | [2] 24,813 | 31 | |
| Treasury | 982 | 982 | | |
| Independent agencies: | | | | |
| American Battle Monuments Commission | 596 | 605 | | 9 |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 22 | 20 | 2 | |
| Civil Aeronautics Board | 4 | 4 | | |
| Civil Service Commission | 17 | 16 | 1 | |
| Farm Credit Administration | 12 | 12 | | |
| Federal Communications Commission | 29 | 29 | | |
| Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation | 2 | 2 | | |
| General Accounting Office | 77 | 74 | 3 | |
| General Services Administration | 106 | 104 | 2 | |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | 159 | 155 | 4 | |
| National Labor Relations Board | 19 | 19 | | |
| Panama Canal | 13,868 | 14,430 | | 562 |
| Independent agencies—Continued | | | | |
| Selective Service System | 197 | 196 | 1 | |
| Small Business Administration | 8 | 8 | | |
| Smithsonian Institution | 2 | 2 | | |
| United States Information Agency | 8,854 | 8,742 | 112 | |
| Veterans' Administration | 1,240 | 1,238 | 2 | |
| Total, excluding Department of Defense | 64,670 | 65,567 | 224 | 1,121 |
| Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense | | | 897 | |
| Department of Defense: | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary of Defense | 53 | 54 | | 1 |
| Department of the Army | 63,837 | [2] 64,319 | | 482 |
| Department of the Navy | 32,905 | 32,953 | | 48 |
| Department of the Air Force | 44,318 | 44,530 | | 212 |
| Total, Department of Defense | 141,113 | 141,856 | | 743 |
| Net decrease, Department of Defense | | | 743 | |
| Grand total, including Department of Defense | 205,783 | 207,423 | 224 | 1,864 |
| Net decrease, including Department of Defense | | | 1,640 | |

[1] December figure includes 8,976 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 8,895 in November. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The December figure includes 2,507 of these trust fund employees and the November figure includes 2,462.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1956, and comparison with November 1956*

| Department or agency | December | November | Increase | Decrease |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Executive departments (except Department of Defense): | | | | |
| Agriculture | 2,995 | 2,961 | 34 | |
| Commerce | 2,662 | 2,590 | 72 | |
| Interior | 7,565 | 7,743 | | 178 |
| Treasury | 5,568 | 5,615 | | 47 |
| Independent agencies: | | | | |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 148 | 149 | | 1 |
| Federal Communications Commission | 14 | 14 | | |
| General Services Administration | 1,132 | 1,108 | 24 | |
| Government Printing Office | 6,664 | 6,681 | | 17 |
| National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics | 7,668 | 7,641 | 27 | |
| Panama Canal | 7,269 | 7,343 | | 74 |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 12,125 | 12,091 | 34 | |
| Total, excluding Department of Defense | 53,810 | 53,936 | 191 | 317 |
| Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense | | | 126 | |
| Department of Defense: | | | | |
| Department of the Army: | | | | |
| Inside continental United States | [1] 182,780 | [2] 183,473 | | 693 |
| Outside continental United States | [1] 21,900 | [2] 22,027 | | 127 |
| Department of the Navy: | | | | |
| Inside continental United States | 22,236 | 222,001 | 235 | |
| Outside continental United States | 6,008 | 6,008 | | |
| Department of the Air Force: | | | | |
| Inside continental United States | 165,829 | 166,750 | | 921 |
| Outside continental United States | 7,044 | 7,003 | 41 | |
| Total, Department of Defense | 605,797 | 607,262 | 276 | 1,741 |
| Net decrease, Department of Defense | | | 1,465 | |
| Grand total, including Department of Defense | 659,607 | 661,198 | 467 | 2,058 |
| Net decrease, including Department of Defense | | | 1,591 | |

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under United States agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of December 1956 and comparison with November 1956*

| Country | Total | | Army | | Navy | | Air Force | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | December | November | December | November | December | November | December | November |
| England | 7,945 | 7,841 | | | 33 | 35 | 7,912 | 7,806 |
| France | 26,001 | 25,623 | 17,861 | [1] 17,542 | | | 8,140 | 8,081 |
| French Morocco | 6,069 | 6,084 | 159 | [1] 171 | 994 | 975 | 4,916 | 4,938 |
| Germany | 98,814 | 98,599 | 82,691 | 82,423 | [2] 590 | 590 | 15,533 | 15,586 |
| Japan | 129,311 | 131,832 | 67,495 | [1] 69,721 | [2] 19,327 | 19,327 | 42,489 | 42,784 |
| Korea | 4,817 | 5,706 | 4,817 | 5,706 | | | | |
| Malta | 85 | 84 | | | 85 | 84 | | |
| Netherlands | 45 | 40 | | | | | 45 | 40 |
| Norway | 21 | 21 | | | | | 21 | 21 |
| Trinidad | 566 | 637 | | | 566 | 637 | | |
| Total | 273,674 | 276,467 | 173,023 | 175,563 | 21,595 | 21,648 | 79,056 | 79,256 |

[1] Revised on the basis of later information.
[2] Subject to revision.

NOTE.—The Germans are paid from funds provided by German Governments. The French and English reported by the Army and Air Force are paid from funds appropriated for personal services. All others are paid from funds appropriated for other contractual services.

*Foreign nationals*

Table 5 segregates and accounts for certain categories of personal services rendered to the United States Government overseas, which cannot be regarded as ordinary direct employment.

Generally, this personal service is rendered military agencies overseas under agreements with the foreign governments. In most cases the employment is indirect. The foreign governments hire the employees. The United States military agencies in most cases administer or direct the activity.

The source of the funds for the payment of these employees varies. The Germans are employed without direct reimbursement by the United States and by agreement, payment is made from the German economy. The Japanese are employed under a master labor contract between United States agencies and the Japanese Government. French and English are employed for the Army and Air Force under agreements with the respective governments. Funds originally appropriated for "Personal service" are used for this purpose. The Koreans and others are paid under varying contractual agreements with funds appropriated for "Other contractual services."

Personnel hired and used under such circumstances cannot be properly considered in the same category as regular employment, but they are used and should be counted for what they are.

The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is endeavoring to identify these groups of employees and to count them along with, but separate from, the regularly reported United States employment overseas.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1022. A bill for improvement of Salem Harbor, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BRICKER (by request):

S. 1023. A bill to clarify the powers granted to the Federal Trade Commission by section 9 of the Federal Trade Commission Act to compel the production of documentary evidence; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1024. A bill for the relief of Robert Naihsin Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1025. A bill to amend section 5 of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 to authorize the sale of goods and services by any department or independent establishment to the owner of an aircraft or his agent in an emergency, and for other purposes;

S. 1026. A bill to amend section 510 (a) (1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to accelerate the trade-in of old vessels with replacement by modern vessels;

S. 1027. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe seals for bureaus and offices of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 1028. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize expenditures for recreation and welfare of Coast Guard personnel and the schooling of their dependent children; and

S. 1029. A bill to provide for standby authority for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 1030. A bill to provide parking space for the automobiles of patrons and postal employees at postal installations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1031. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain seven units of the Greater Wenatchee division, Chief Joseph project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 1032. A bill to provide for amounts contributed by the Post Office Department to the civil service retirement and disability fund to be considered as costs of providing postal service for the purpose of establishing postal rates, and for other purposes; and

S. 1033. A bill to authorize and direct the Postmaster General to estimate for each fiscal year certain expenses incurred by, and losses in revenues to, the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1034. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the University of Missouri, for agricultural purposes, certain real property in Callaway County, Missouri; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1035. A bill for the relief of Alice Eirl Schaer (Mi On Lee); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1036. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 1037. A bill to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1038. A bill for the relief of Julio and Remedios Austria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 1039. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that all cabs for hire in the District of Columbia be compelled to carry insurance for the protection of passengers, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1938;

S. 1040. A bill to amend the acts known as the "Life Insurance Act," approved June 19, 1934, and the "Fire and Casualty Act," approved October 9, 1940;

S. 1041. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, and for other purposes," approved May 18, 1910; and

S. 1042. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two 4-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1043. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to compensate retail dealers of gasoline for taxes paid on gasoline which is lost due to spillage, evaporation, and other causes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. COTTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 1044. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1045. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by adding thereto new provisions relating to civil aviation medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1046. A bill for the relief of Myung Sook Lee;

S. 1047. A bill for the relief of Adelheid Pfeffer; and

S. 1048. A bill for the relief of Matilda Hajos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1049. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ahsapet Gamityan;

S. 1050. A bill for the relief of Hrygory (Harry) Mydlak; and

S. 1051. A bill for the relief of Stylianos P. Antippas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1052. A bill for the relief of Alice Eirl Schaer (Mi On Lee); and

S. 1053. A bill for the relief of Poppy Catherine Hayakawa Merritt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1054. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rainy River at or near Baudette, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 1055. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 1056. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1057. A bill to require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States, and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. THYE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 1058. A bill to direct the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization to conduct a particular survey in order to assist in promoting the production of concentrated iron ore and steel and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 1059. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. CARROLL):

S. 1060. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 1061. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 and part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to require certain private educational institutions and training establishments to file non-Communist affidavits with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and to require disapproval under such act, or such part, of any such institution or establishment which fails to file such an affidavit; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution providing loans for training of teachers in certain studies; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution to establish the Multiple Uses of Public Lands Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. J. Res. 50. Joint resolution to provide for the relocation of the Ferry County, State of Washington, highway by the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Public Works.

## CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions were reported and referred as indicated:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary; placed on the calendar:

S. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; and

S. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution withdrawing suspension of deportation of Carlis Stender.

(See the above concurrent resolutions printed in full which appear under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of hearings held by the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above resolution printed in full where it appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

## RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were submitted or reported and referred as indicated:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, considered and agreed to:

S. Res. 84. Resolution to extend the time for the filing of certain reports by the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See resolution printed in full which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE), submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. Res. 85. Resolution requesting the Interior Department to submit for consideration by Congress legislation providing for establishment of a so-called basin account in the valley of the Columbia River.

(See the above resolution printed in full where it appears under a separate heading.)

## AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO APPOINTMENT OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 86), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended by—

(1) striking out subparagraphs 10 through 13 in paragraph (h) of section (1);

(2) striking out subparagraphs 16 through 19 in paragraph (l) of section (1); and

(3) inserting in section (1) after paragraph (o) the following new paragraph:

"(p) Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of nine Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Veterans' measures, generally.

"2. Pensions of all wars of the United States, general and special.

"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"4. Compensation of veterans.

"5. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"6. Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

"7. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"8. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life."

SEC. 2. Effective for the remainder of the 85th Congress, section (4) of Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(4) (a) Each Senator shall serve on 2 standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed 21 Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed 9 Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may serve on 3 standing committees and no more.

"(b) In the event that during the 85th Congress members of one party in the Senate are replaced by members of the other party, the 30 third-committee assignments shall in such event be distributed in accordance with the following table:

"*Senate seats*

| *Majority* | *Minority* |
|---|---|
| 48 | 48 |
| 49 | 47 |
| 50 | 46 |
| 51 | 45 |

*Third-committee assignments*

| *Majority* | *Minority* |
|---|---|
| 23 | 7 |
| 21 | 9 |
| 19 | 11 |
| 17 | 13." |

SEC. 3. Effective at the beginning of the 86th Congress, section (4) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Each Senator shall serve on 2 standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed 19 Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed 7 Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may serve on 3 standing committees and no more."

SEC. 4. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed as promptly as feasible after its appointment and organization to confer with the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for the purpose of determining what disposition should be made of proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters theretofore referred to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the 85th Congress which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## REGULATION OF AIRCRAFT FLIGHTS OVER URBAN AREAS

Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. BLAKLEY, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. COTTON), submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 87) which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Civil Aeronautics Board and other

appropriate authorities exercise immediately and to the fullest practicable extent the authority which they now possess under existing law to regulate the flight of civilian, military, and private aircraft including experimental, test or other flight, over and in the vicinity of urban areas in order that the possibility of damage to persons and property resulting from airplane accidents be lessened and that greater safety be provided both in the air and on the ground.

Subsequently, Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported the above resolution, favorably, without amendment, and it was placed on the calendar.

## EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING REPORTS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 84.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 84) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the time for filing by the Committee on the Judiciary of any reports of the committee or its subcommittees now required by Senate resolution to be filed "not later than January 31, 1957," is hereby extended until March 4, 1957.

## PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, ETC.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, 5 bills, 3 at the request of the Secretary of Commerce, 1 at the request of the Department of Defense, and the other at the request of the Treasury Department. The bills are accompanied by letters of transmittal and I ask unanimous consent to include the letters in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

S. 1025. A bill to amend section 5 of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 to authorize the sale of goods and services by any department or independent establishment to the owner of an aircraft or his agent in an emergency, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1025 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
*Washington, D. C., January 7, 1957.*

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
*President of the Senate.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To amend section 5 of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 to authorize the sale of goods and services by any department or independent establishment to the owner of an aircraft or his agent in an emergency, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1957, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

Section 5 (d) of the Air Commerce Act of 1926, as amended (49 U. S. C. 175), authorizes the head of any Government agency having jurisdiction over an airport owned or operated by the Government to provide for the sale to any aircraft of fuel, oil, equipment, mechanical service, and shelter if such action is, by reason of an emergency, necessary to the continuance of such aircraft on its course to the nearest airport operated by private enterprise. There is a need for legislation which will provide authority for carefully regulated sales in certain circumstances where such sales would be definitely advantageous to the Government, yet a clear case of emergency, as required by the present law, does not exist. To fill this need, the proposed amendment would revise section 5 (d) of the act to authorize such sales in circumstances which would benefit the Government, as well as in emergencies. While the military services wish to restrict reimbursable supply transactions of this kind to a minimum, there are a number of situations in which they would be clearly advantageous to the Government. For example, some of our overseas airbases, particularly those in remote island and polar areas, are regular points or alternates for civil air routes important to our national defense. Others may become such points in the future as new routes are developed. Operations to those points would seldom qualify as "emergencies" within the meaning of that term in the present law; nor would operational considerations permit confining sales to amounts necessary to get to the nearest commercial source, as is likewise required under existing law. The proposed change would both clear up these points for present civil use of our bases and facilitate development of future routes of importance to our national defense.

The proposed legislation would also clarify the authority for sales to air carriers operating under contract with the United States Government. A substantial portion of the air transportation requirements of the Government are now met by contract operations. All their needs for logistical support from the Government, particularly at remote corners of the globe, frequently cannot be predicted at the time the contract is drafted.

Still another advantage of the proposed legislation would be simplification of authority and procedures for servicing aircraft from allied countries at USAF bases while on joint air exercises and training flights. Although section 106 of the Mutual Security Act authorizes such sales, the statutory requirements, procedures, and regulations controlling mutual-security transactions, while appropriate for occasional sales of costly equipment, are extremely inefficient and uneconomical if applied to recurring transactions such as routine fuel and related sales.

Reciprocal treatment for our own aircraft would be assured by amending the provisions of section 5 of the Air Commerce Act to make them applicable to aircraft owned by, or registered in any friendly foreign nation which authorizes comparable assistance to aircraft owned by, or registered in, the United States.

To insure that Government agencies do not compete with commercial enterprise with respect to sales of the kind discussed and to facilitate the establishment of commercial supply sources where the demand would support them, a new subsection "(f)" is proposed for section 5 of the act. The new subsection "(f)" would prohibit sales under section 5 (d) of the items listed therein, if they are reasonably available from commercial sources. Further, whenever the present or anticipated source would support such a source, the Department having jurisdiction over the facility would be directed to encourage the establishment of a commercial source, if the circumstances at the facility permit.

There are a number of foreign bases jointly occupied by the United States and host government agencies or airlines. This is particularly true in Japan, where most of the former Japanese airfields have been under United States jurisdiction and operations. With the growth of civil air operations at such bases, situations have arisen in which the supply function could not be assumed by commercial concerns unless certain United States-controlled pipelines and storage facilities could be utilized where space limitations and other considerations foreclose construction of duplicate facilities. In such circumstances the United States may relieve a burden on its own supplies by permitting, where feasible, joint use of certain facilities. Careful safeguards have been provided in the proposed legislation to prevent any additional cost to the United States Government or unwarranted profit to a commercial enterprise in such circumstances.

Occasions arise when it would be advantageous to the Government to allow commercial oil companies to operate Government petroleum storage and dispensing facilities and to supply Government-owned fuel through these facilities to their commercial accounts, repaying the Government either in cash or by reimbursement-in-kind. Such situations occur in locations where stores of Government-owned mobilization reserve fuel stocks must be maintained, but where normal consumption does not assure the required freshening of stocks. Rotation of such fuel for quality control purposes, normally required at considerable expense to the Government, could be accomplished in some instances at no cost to the Government under the proposed amendment. Further, there are cases in which it is economically preferable for the Government to accept commercially-owned fuel at one location and repay it by replacement-in-kind at another location, in order to save the Government transportation costs. Legislative authority to enter into such arrangements is included in the attached draft by the proposed new subsection (g) of section 5 of the act.

The provisions of existing section 5 (d) of the act, relative to terms of such sales of fuels, equipment and other services, and disposition of the proceeds therefrom, would be revised and incorporated into proposed new subsections (e) and (f) of section 5. Under the proposed amendments to section 5 of the act, present subsection (f) would be redesignated as (j).

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposed legislation would result in no increased cost to the Government and in fact should result in savings where the cost of rotating and transferring fuel can be eliminated as outlined above.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. DOUGLAS,
*Acting Secretary.*

S. 1026. A bill to amend section 510 (a) (1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to accelerate the trade-in of old vessels with replacement by modern vessels.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1026 is as follows:)

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
*Washington, January 3, 1957.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed herewith four copies of a proposed bill, together with a statement of purpose and

provisions, to amend section 510 (a) (1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to accelerate the trade-in of old vessels with replacement by modern vessels.

Section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, which would be amended by the bill, authorizes the Secretary of Commerce until June 30, 1958, to acquire in return for an allowance on a new vessel, vessels that are not less than 12 years old. After June 30, 1958, only vessels that are at least 17 years old may be traded in for an allowance on a new vessel.

The proposed legislation would extend from June 30, 1958, to June 30, 1962, the reduction of the age requirement from 17 to 12 years for vessels acquired as trade-ins.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
*Secretary of Commerce.*

S. 1027. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe seals for bureaus and offices of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1027 is as follows:)

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
*Washington, D. C., December 21, 1956.*

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
*President of the Senate,*
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are attached four copies of a proposed bill "to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe seals for bureaus and offices of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes."

There is also attached a statement of purpose and need for the proposed legislation.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that it would interpose no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE T. MOORE,
*Acting Secretary of Commerce.*

---

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED

The Department of Commerce, in performance of its diverse and widespread activities, functions through 13 primary organization units, each responsible to the Secretary for a defined area of Department jurisdiction.

In the normal conduct of operations the bureaus and offices of the Department are regularly called upon or required to certify certain documents for use as evidence in court proceedings or as official documents for purposes of recordation. Except in the case of the Patent Office and the Bureau of the Census, which have seals authorized by the Congress (66 Stat. 792 and 68 Stat. 1012, respectively), such papers are required to bear the seal of the Department of Commerce, which is in the custody of the Office of the Secretary in Washington, D. C.

Since many of these documents are located at installations of the primary organization units outside the District of Columbia, there is a constant exchange of documents between offices in the field and the Office of the Secretary for the purpose of affixation of the Department seal. The alternative is the use of original bureau documents for court use or official filing, which obviously precludes their availability to the bureaus and the public generally.

While many courts and States accept certification by the bureaus and offices without questioning the legal authority therefor, the question is raised for purely legalistic reasons or as delaying tactics in court proceedings in a sufficient number of instances to warrant enactment of legislation providing for seals of the individual units and judicial notice thereof.

The proposed legislation will not only result in considerable savings of time and money in the processing of certified papers and documents, but will also lend the proper dignity to documents of departmental bureaus such as the Weather Bureau and the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which operate more or less autonomously in substantive program areas.

S. 1028. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize expenditures for recreation and welfare of Coast Guard personnel and the schooling of their dependent children.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1028 is as follows:)

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
*Washington, January 7, 1957.*

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize expenditures for recreation and welfare of Coast Guard personnel and the schooling of their dependent children.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide basic legislative authority for two provisions relating to the Coast Guard which have appeared from year to year in the annual appropriation acts for the Treasury Department. The two provisions authorize expenditures for the recreation and welfare of Coast Guard personnel and the primary and secondary schooling of their dependents. It appears that points of order might be raised as to these provisions and basic legislative authority is considered desirable with respect to the items. The provisions are discussed in more detail in the attached memorandum.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

DAVID W. KENDALL,
*Acting Secretary of the Treasury.*

---

MEMORANDUM RE: TREASURY PROPOSED BILL "TO AMEND TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED 'COAST GUARD,' TO AUTHORIZE EXPENDITURES FOR RECREATION AND WELFARE OF COAST GUARD PERSONNEL AND THE SCHOOLING OF THEIR DEPENDENT CHILDREN"

One provision in the Treasury Department annual appropriations acts relating to Coast Guard has, for many years, made appropriations available for the expenses of primary and secondary schooling of dependents of Coast Guard personnel stationed outside the continental United States. This provision has been necessary to permit the Coast Guard to make expenditures in connection with the education of minor children of Coast Guard personnel where normal educational facilities are not available. At some units, the children attend schools administered by the other branches of the armed services and reimbursement is made to the armed service operating the school. In cases where courses in public schools outside the United States are taught in English, the children are sent to such schools and reimbursement is made for tuition. In other cases, no suitable schools are available and the children must be sent elsewhere to be educated. The new section 512 that would be added to title 14 of the United States Code by the proposed bill would provide basic authority for such expenses with respect to dependents of Coast Guard military personnel. No provision, such as has appeared in annual appropriation acts, placing a ceiling on the amount that can be expended for schooling per student has been included in the bill. It is felt that such a limitation should be provided in regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury or continued in the annual appropriations relating to such expenditures.

Another provision in the Treasury Department annual appropriation acts relating to the Coast Guard has, for many years, made appropriations available for recreation and welfare of enlisted personnel of the Coast Guard. To maintain the morale of service personnel is essential to efficiency. To that end expenditures are made for motion-picture equipment and rentals, magazines, baseball and football equipment, etc. The new section 513 that would be added to title 14 by the proposed bill would provide permanent basic authority for such expenditure.

S. 1029. A bill to provide for standby authority for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1029 is as follows:)

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
*Washington, January 24, 1957.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed herewith four copies of a proposed bill, together with a statement of purpose and need for legislation, to provide for standby authority for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes.

An identical bill (S. 2709) passed the Senate in the 84th Congress.

The proposed standby system of ship warrants is based upon previous experience in World War II under Public Law 173, 77th Congress, approved July 14, 1941 (55 Stat. 591), and repealed July 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 449). The bill is strengthened in the light of certain shortcomings of the World War II law, which were met by administrative action and which should be incorporated in the frame of the legislation.

The Department recommends early consideration and enactment of this legislation. In addition to being an important standby authority as part of the readiness program in the interest of security, the legislation is desirable to meet the commitments on the part of the United States for exercising this authority in coordination with authority already adopted by various member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in the event that coordinated efforts of these nations become necessary.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it would interpose no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
*Secretary of Commerce.*

---

## CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN NIAGARA RIVER FOR POWER PURPOSES

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the construction of a hydroelectric power project at Niagara Falls, N. Y., by the power authority of the State of New York.

An identical bill is being introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative WILLIAM E. MILLER, of New York.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement on the bill prepared by Senator

JAVITS, Representative MILLER, and myself be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, together with the text of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1037) to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes, introduced by Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. JAVITS) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.—*

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(a) that an emergency exists in the western part of the State of New York as a result of a rock slide which on June 7, 1956, destroyed most of the facilities employed by the licensee of Federal Power Commission project 16 for the generation of power by the use of waters of the Niagara River;

(b) that the power generated at such facilities was largely used by electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries vital to the defense of the United States and employing a large proportion of all workers resident in the vicinity;

(c) that these industries would be forced to curtail their operations drastically or abandon them at a cost of tens of thousands of jobs were it not that they are able to receive necessary power at high cost on a temporary basis from the generating facilities of the Hydroelectric Power Commission of Ontario which is using not only Canada's share of the water permitted under the treaty signed on February 27, 1950, between the United States and Canada, but also a large part of the United States share of such water;

(d) that the licensee of project 16 is entitled to use 19,725 cubic feet per second of the United States share of the waters until 1971 and to use a further 12,775 cubic feet per second until further order of the Commission;

(e) that by the use of this total of 32,500 cubic feet of water per second, the licensee of project 16 annually produced approximately 4 billion kilowatt-hours of energy;

(f) that a modern hydroelectric plant proposed to be constructed by the Power Authority of the State of New York to take advantage of the entire drop of the Niagara River can produce about the same amount of power by the use of 19,725 cubic feet of such water per second;

(g) that, by the use of this water and of the additional water permitted to be used under the 1950 treaty, approximately 13 billion kilowatt-hours annually of urgently needed power can be produced by the project; and

(h) that it is, therefore, imperative that the works to produce such power be constructed without further delay.

ISSUANCE OF LICENSE

SEC. 2. The Federal Power Commission is hereby expressly authorized and directed to issue a license pursuant to the Federal Power Act to the Power Authority of the State of New York for a power project with capacity to utilize all of the United States share of the waters of the Niagara River permitted by international agreement.

CONDITIONS OF LICENSE

SEC. 3. The Federal Power Commission shall include among the conditions of the license issued under section 2—

(a) a provision requiring the licensee to reimburse the United States for its share of the cost of construction of remedial works, including engineering and economic investigations, undertaken in accordance with article II of the 1950 treaty;

(b) a provision requiring the licensee, as a part of the cost of the project and in cooperation with the agency of the State of New York in charge of the development of parks, to protect the scenic values of the American side of the gorge in a manner similar to that in which they have been safeguarded on the Canadian side and to construct a scenic drive and park on the American side of the Niagara River near Niagara Falls pursuant to a plan, the general outlines of which shall be approved by the Federal Power Commission;

(c) a provision requiring the licensee to contract, with the approval of the Governor of the State of New York, pursuant to the procedure established by New York law, to sell to the licensee of project 16 for a period ending on the final maturity date of the bonds initially issued to finance the project works herein specifically authorized, 445,000 kilowatts of power, which is equivalent to the amount produced by project 16 prior to June 7, 1956, for the same general purposes for which power from project 16 was utilized and in order to restore as nearly as possible low power costs: provided the licensee of project 16 consents to the surrender of its license at the completion of the construction of such projects works upon terms agreed to by both licensees and approved by the Federal Power Commission which shall include the following: (1) the licensee of project 16 shall waive and release any claim for compensation or damages from the Power Authority of the State of New York or the State of New York except just compensation for tangible property and rights of way actually taken, (ii) without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the licensee of project 16 shall waive all claims to compensation or damages based upon loss of or damage to riparian rights, diversionary rights, or other rights relating to the diversion or use of water, whether founded on legislative grant or otherwise;

(d) a provision giving defense agencies of the United States a preference to purchase power;

(e) a provision requiring a reasonable amount of power to be made available within the project's economic market area in neighboring States to be distributed according to their laws;

(f) a provision requiring that a reasonable amount of the power available in the State of New York and of the power made available in neighboring States under paragraph (e) be allocated for the present and reasonably foreseeable future needs of rural electric cooperatives and municipalities in the project's economic market area.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 4. This act may be cited as the "Niagara Development Act of 1957."

The statement, presented by Mr. IVES, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATORS IVES AND JAVITS AND REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM E. MILLER

In order to achieve prompt construction of the Niagara power project, we are introducing today a bill to permit development of this $600 million undertaking by the New York State Power Authority in conformity with New York law.

The bill points out that an emergency exists in the Niagara frontier as a result of the rockfall last June which very nearly destroyed the Schoellkopf plant of the Niagara Mohawk Co., at Niagara Falls. As a result, the defense industries of the area "would be forced to curtail their operations drastically or abandon them at a cost of tens of thousands of jobs were it not that they are able to receive necessary power at high cost on a temporary basis from * * * the Hydroelectric Power Commission of Ontario," the bill declares.

According to the bill, a modern hydroelectric plant using all the water formerly used by Niagara Mohawk's Schoellkopf plant and the additional water made available to the United States under a 1950 treaty with Canada could produce 13 billion kilowatt-hours of power annually, compared to approximately 4 billion produced by the Schoellkopf plant.

Under the bill, Niagara Mohawk would surrender its license to use the water of the Niagara River. This license has 14 more years to run, and the use of the water under the license is essential to the Niagara project. In turn, the State power authority would agree to sell the company 445,000 kilowatts of power per annum from the new project. That is the amount of power the company was producing before the rockfall.

The bill also would require the State power authority "to protect the scenic values of the American side of the gorge in a manner similar to that in which they have been safeguarded on the Canadian side and to construct a scenic drive and park on the American side of the Niagara River near Niagara Falls."

The bill provides for allocating "a reasonable amount" of the power to other States "within the project's economic market area" for distribution according to their laws. It specifies that a reasonable amount of the power in New York and the other States shall be allocated "for the present and reasonably foreseeable needs of rural electric cooperatives and municipalities in the project's economic market area."

We shall press for immediate action on this measure.

## AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, RELATING TO COMPENSATION OF RETAIL DEALERS FOR CERTAIN LOSSES ON GASOLINE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to compensate retail dealers of gasoline for taxes paid on gasoline which is lost due to spillage, evaporation, and other causes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table until Wednesday night, to permit certain other Senators, now absent, to join in sponsoring the bill, if they so desire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The bill (S. 1043) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to compensate retail dealers of gasoline for taxes paid on gasoline which is lost due to spillage, evaporation, and other causes, introduced by Mr. COTTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by adding some new provisions relating to civilian aviation medicine. The bill would set up in the Civil Aero-

nautics Administration, under the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Board, an Office of Civil Aviation Medicine. Civil aviation medicine is rapidly assuming much more importance in the field of aviation. I suspect that the bill is today much more timely than it was last year, when I first introduced it, although Congress then adjourned before it was possible to have action taken on the bill.

In view of the number of aircraft accidents and the necessity of conducting research into civil aviation medicine, including physical examinations and many other aspects of safety in the air, it is clear that such functions could best be handled by the proposed Office of Civil Aviation Medicine.

For many years I have been a personal friend of, and have been associated with, some of the men who have done a great deal of research in this field. They include Dr. William Randolph Lovelace, formerly of the Mayo Clinic, who received the Collier award for his work on the stratosphere, particularly on the effect of oxygen upon human beings and other effects of the air upon the ability to fly.

Another one is Dr. Jan Tillisch, now one of the chief surgeons with the Mayo brothers, and one of the chief researchers who is now quite active in this field.

As a matter of fact, there is a national organization on the subject which meets quite often, the members of which give their time and freely advise and discuss matters that pertain to this rapidly approaching crowded air age.

I think the establishment of such a division in the Civil Aeronautics Board, to work with pilots, airlines, civil aviation, and with reports from the military forces, is going to be a greatly needed one.

So I introduce the bill at this time and ask for its appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1045) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by adding thereto new provisions relating to civil aviation medicine, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, so far as I know, all those interested in aviation—pilots' organizations, commercial airlines, and private flyers—are in support of this proposed legislation. They believe that it is necessary and that it will not be a hardship upon everyone, but will probably help make the air safer for air travel, whether it be by military or commercial airplanes.

## AMENDMENT OF SOIL BANK AND AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACTS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Soil Bank Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in order to give greatly needed help to those cotton-growing States that have lost considerable cotton acreage allotment since 1950.

According to statistics available through the cotton division, Agricultural Stabilization Service, the period during which the greatest number of acres were in cotton cultivation in States of the southeast, like Alabama, was the 5-year period of 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, and 1950. The average annual cultivation of cotton during the 5-year period of 1946–50 for Alabama was 1,583,800 acres. The cotton acreage allotment for Alabama for 1957 is 1,028,617 acres.

Comparing these cotton acreage figures, it can be seen that Alabama's cotton acreage for 1957 will be only 64.9 percent of what it was on an average annual basis during the 1946–50 period. Throughout the Nation, the 1957 cotton acreage allotment is 80.4 percent of what it was on an average annual basis during the 1946–50 period. Consequently, Alabama's loss of cotton acreage since the 1946–50 period is 15.5 percent greater than the national loss of cotton acreage.

What is true in the case of Alabama is true of 14 of the 21 cotton-producing States in the Union.

Mr. President, I have prepared a chart which shows the record for each of the 21 cotton-producing States. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Statistical table on acreage in cotton-producing States, 1946–57*

| State | Average annual acreage in cultivation, 1946–50 | 1957 acreage allotment | Percent 1957 allotment is of 1946–50 average |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | 1,583,800 | 1,028,617 | 64.9 |
| Arizona | 253,700 | 360,892 | 142.3 |
| Arkansas | 2,109,000 | 1,416,819 | 67.2 |
| California | 644,300 | 810,445 | 125.8 |
| Florida | 32,561 | 38,671 | 118.8 |
| Georgia | 1,285,000 | 904,813 | 70.4 |
| Illinois | 4,120 | 3,182 | 77.2 |
| Kansas | 113 | 30 | 26.5 |
| Kentucky | 12,480 | 7,966 | 63.8 |
| Louisiana | 823,000 | 609,540 | 74.1 |
| Maryland | | 25 | |
| Mississippi | 2,447,800 | 1,643,544 | 67.1 |
| Missouri | 492,000 | 376,103 | 76.4 |
| Nevada | 264 | 3,320 | 1,257.6 |
| New Mexico | 194,748 | 184,029 | 94.5 |
| North Carolina | 703,000 | 492,877 | 70.1 |
| Oklahoma | 1,121,400 | 841,990 | 75.1 |
| South Carolina | 1,055,600 | 727,837 | 69.0 |
| Tennessee | 749,400 | 569,335 | 76.0 |
| Texas | 8,341,170 | 7,547,503 | 90.5 |
| Virginia | 25,000 | 17,925 | 71.7 |
| United States | 21,878,454 | 17,585,463 | 80.4 |

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in view of the hardship conditions which have been caused by the loss of cotton acreage in the instance of Alabama producers and those of other States similarly situated, the intent of this bill is to make restitution to them through the soil-bank program for the losses sustained in cotton acreage since 1950.

Such a plan of restitution would accomplish a twofold objective. In the first instance, it would compensate through soil-bank payments cotton farmers in States like Alabama for the loss of cotton acreage since 1950; and, secondly, it would not add another bale of cotton to the already burdensome surplus of cotton now held in warehouses by the United States Department of Agriculture.

The first section of the bill would amend section 103 of the Soil Bank Act by adding at the end of it a new subsection (c), which would provide that in any State where the 1957, 1958, and 1959 cotton-acreage allotment is less than 80 percent of the average cotton acreage in cultivation during the years 1946 to 1950, inclusive, there shall be established for each old cotton farm in the State a farm base acreage, which shall be the farm cotton-acreage allotment—for 1957, 1958, and 1959—as increased by 20 percent, and producers will be compensated through the soil bank for reducing their acreages of cotton below their farm base acreages. Thus, this bill would increase the farm base cotton acreage in Alabama on which soil-bank payments could be computed from a statewide total of 1,028,617 acres to 1,233,340 acres.

The reason why the 20-percent increase factor is used in the bill is that this percentage of increase in the farm base cotton acreage on which to compute soil-bank payments can be handled within the appropriation currently available to the Department of Agriculture for soil-bank operations. A greater percentage of increase factor would require additional funds for the operation of the soil bank.

The following table will illustrate how the bill would compensate cotton farmers through the soil-bank program:

| Name of farm operator | 1957 farm cotton allotment | 1957 farm base acreage | 1957 acreage planted to cotton | 1957 acreage for soil-bank payment |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| John Doe | 6.0 | 7.2 | 3.0 | 4.2 |
| Richard Poe | 12.0 | 14.4 | 4.4 | 10.0 |
| John Smith | 30.0 | 36.0 | 25.2 | 10.8 |

Under the provisions of the bill, there is no need at this time to freeze the cotton-acreage allotment at the State or the county level, since the bill provides for the establishment on each old cotton farm in the State a farm base of acreage which will be equivalent to the farm cotton-acreage allotments for the years of 1957, 1958, and 1959, plus an increase of 20 percent, and producers will be compensated from the soil bank for reducing this acreage below their farm-base acreage.

Section 342 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, provides that in no case can a State's cotton-acreage allotment for 1957 and 1958 be less than 1 percent of its 1956 allotment. Thus, ample protection is provided in the case of each State for the next 2 years in the matter of keeping at least 99 percent of its present cotton-acreage allotment. The 20-percent increase factor, added to the guaranteed stable cotton-acreage allotment to the State through 1958, will make of the farm-base acreage provisions of this bill a guaranteed basis on which the cotton producer may make his plans through

1958 to plant acreage to cotton and/or draw compensation from the soil bank.

By testing out the provisions of this new cotton bill through 1958, the Congress will then be in a position to evaluate its effectiveness in terms of cotton-growers' needs.

Section 2 of the bill would provide for a more careful and accurate measurement of acreage planted to cotton each year. This section would eliminate inconsistent measurements that have been common in the past years. In many cases, farmers have planted plots of cotton that were approved by the county committee, and the following year, in the same plot planted to cotton, the county committee would measure a different acreage than the plot measured in former years. A measurement policy by metes and bounds, as set forth in this bill, would fix and make certain from year to year proper acreage measurements.

Mr. President, I ask that this bill be allowed to lie on the table through Tuesday, February 5, for any other Senators that may want to join in sponsoring it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

The bill (S. 1055) to amend the Soil Bank Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to cotton, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the National Housing Act. This bill is in the nature of a clarifying amendment relating to FHA insurance on dwellings constructed in urban renewal areas.

In the Housing Act of 1954, section 220 was added to the National Housing Act in order to encourage the construction of dwelling units in urban renewal areas. One of the provisions made it possible to increase the insurable mortgage amount by $1,000 per room in high-cost areas. This provision for high-cost areas was applicable, however, only to elevator-type structures.

In the Housing Act of 1956, a provision was included which was meant to treat nonelevator-type structures in the same manner as elevator-type structures; that is, the intent of Congress was to eliminate the distinction between elevator- and nonelevator-type structures in urban renewal areas, without changing any other provisions in section 220.

We are now advised that the congressional intent cannot be administered by the Federal Housing Administration without this clarifying amendment. I believe that this is a noncontroversial technical amendment which should be enacted without delay.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of Sunday, February 3, 1957, which explains the need and the urgency for this bill, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1056) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The editorial, presented by Mr. SPARKMAN, is as follows:

### SLEEPY FHA

It is highly disappointing that, despite several attempts, the Federal Housing Administration has not yet achieved a mortgage insurance program capable of getting residential redevelopment under way in Washington's southwest slum clearance project. It is even more discouraging that, despite many months of informal negotiations between FHA and the would-be developers, FHA officials did not even understand what the developers were seeking and at this late date are asking Congress for a further change in the Housing Act now that the requirements finally have been agreed upon.

There is no question of providing a new "windfall" program, which discredited the great FHA-sponsored boom in apartment construction a few years ago. The need is merely for a realistic FHA mortgage guaranty to supplement the minimum private cash outlay that prudent investors will make in these risky, pioneering redevelopment ventures. In high-cost areas like Washington, special inducements are needed to lure scarce funds away from the "sure bets" available in the uncomplicated, popular suburban building business.

Now of course the Government can conclude that it does not wish to take the risks of underwriting new construction in cleared, central city areas. But Congress has many times considered this risk and indicated that it should be taken. Moreover, FHA's parent body, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, has made available more than $100 million in loan and grant funds to finance public acquisition, clearance, improvement, and resale of southwest Washington slum areas for private redevelopment. This has been done on the assumption that FHA would proceed to insure mortgages for the residential redevelopment. FHA has made commitments to insure such mortgages for projects of this kind in New York. But it has taken FHA half a year to discover that when the Housing Act was amended last year, the legal basis for such commitments, probably inadvertently, was thrown in doubt.

Now, of course, the only thing to do is to seek congressional clarification of the law's intent. This FHA hoped to achieve, understandably, with a minimum of redtape and publicity. But although speed certainly is desirable at this point, further confusion and legislative misadventure must be avoided. Once and for all, Congress ought to make plain that it intends FHA to support the slum-clearance program. And for its part, FHA ought to stop regarding this aspect of its responsibilities as secondary and show some leadership in getting on with this important task—important not just in Washington's southwest but also in communities throughout the country that are trying to save their blighting central cores.

## SURVEY TO ASSIST IN PROMOTING PRODUCTION OF CONCENTRATED IRON ORE AND STEEL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators YOUNG, HUMPHREY, THYE, MANSFIELD, MURRAY, MUNDT, and CASE of South Dakota, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to direct the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization to conduct a particular survey in order to assist in promoting the production of concentrated iron ore and steel and for other purposes.

In a meeting held in my office which was attended by me, Senator YOUNG of North Dakota, Senator CASE of South Dakota, Senators HUMPHREY and THYE of Minnesota, Senators MURRAY and MANSFIELD of Montana, Senator POTTER of Michigan, Senator MUNDT of South Dakota, and Senator WILEY of Wisconsin; Representatives KREUGER and BURDICK of North Dakota, Representatives BLATNIK and KNUTSON of Minnesota, and Representative METCALF of Montana, Lester Barlow, an engineering consultant to several industries and the president of the Gimite Corp., pointed out the many tremendous business opportunities to the State of North Dakota and States contiguous to the Great Lakes area when this plan materializes. The Senators and Representatives at the conference agreed that the findings by the Greater North Dakota Association and the Resources Research Committee brought to light the new industries and products that would result from this plan of industrial complex and the coordination of various types of transportation.

My colleague from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and I agree that all interested officials in the State of North Dakota on the State level, as well as the congressional delegation in Washington, have been very much interested in finding ways and means of bringing industry into the State of North Dakota. This new proposed plan, which will utilize the vast lignite fields of North Dakota, is a major step in bringing industry to the State of North Dakota and greatly strengthen the economy of the entire State, as well as the States of Montana, South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan.

The vast low-grade iron deposits of the Mesabi Range in northern Minnesota, Montana, Wisconsin, and northern Michigan, and the billions upon billions of tons of lignite in the North Dakota, Montana, and South Dakota fields available for surface mining are certain to become of major importance to the future economy of the entire United States and at the same time meet the pressing needs of iron and steel for defense and security purposes and the huge Federal highway program, and other domestic purposes.

The search for an adequate source of suitable carbon for manufacture of gimite explosive which was proposed for use for blasting taconite rock on the iron range led to the conviction that production of char as fuel for the Minnesota, Wisconsin, northern Michigan, and Montana iron mining industries would

be feasible only if it was a part of a larger industrial picture. The reduction of aluminum in North Dakota using lignite as a power source had heretofore been competitively unpracticable because of higher transportation costs.

However, this factor will be overcome when industries are located in North Dakota and South Dakota and in the iron range sections of Minnesota, Wisconsin, northern Michigan, and Montana which will provide full loads for hopper railroad cars on both east and west hauls. It is proposed that bauxite be brought from the Caribbean, up the Atlantic Ocean through the St. Lawrence Seaway to the head of the Great Lakes; thence shipped by rail to North Dakota for reduction to aluminum at the fields of low-cost lignite coal.

The back haul could be both lignite char and/or aluminum pigs. The char would be utilized in producing explosives on the iron range, and for the general fuel for the iron-mining industries.

Joint utilization of railroad cars through employment of the same rolling stock (hopper ore cars) for the movement of the combination of fuels and iron and aluminum ores visualizes a complete round trip between North Dakota and Minnesota iron mines of loaded hopper cars of approximately 1,000 miles and points in the States of Montana, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and northern Michigan.

After unloading the bauxite, the ships then would be reloaded with iron ore for shipment to steel industries at Lake Erie ports, and then reloaded with cargoes of products produced from the Great Lakes area which constitutes 42 percent of manufacturing industry of the United States of America for discharge at south Atlantic United States ports and Caribbean ports. After discharge of such cargoes the ships would be in the vicinity of bauxite source in the Caribbean for reloading bauxite for the Great Lakes area.

The fact that there will always be full capacity cargo loads for returning aluminum ore ships to the Carribbean provides payloads in both directions and such cargoes will be immediately available for reloading when such ore ships are available for receiving same, means low rate shipping costs for each of the cargoes.

By establishing standard hopper car trains suitable for transportation of the three commodities, the Mesabi iron ore to the head of the Great Lakes, the transportation of bauxite ores to western North Dakota and South Dakota and transportation of lignite from North Dakota and South Dakota to the Mesabi range to Montana, and other iron ore fields in Wisconsin and northern Michigan makes possible a vast saving in the rail transportation costs of each of the three commodities.

It is further noted that the Mesabi range iron ore deposits of low grade will be available for production in our domestic steel industries, and that means that this Nation will have available domestic iron ores in unlimited volumes for 200 years ahead for the security of United States as well as for domestic use.

Also, the production of various chemical products and char fuel from lignite coals, when established in combination with aluminum production, iron and steel industry on the Mesabi Range, will be limited only by the market at the Mesabi for lignite char.

Lignite char has about the same BTU content as bituminous coal, and it is very conceivable that char for fuel at the Mesabi Range can be made available for less cost for the production of kilowatts and heat on the Mesabi than can be realized by the use of bituminous coal.

As a result of the conference, this bill has been drafted directing the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization to conduct a survey of national significance in the defense and economy of our country, to determine ways and means of affirming and encouraging the production of concentrated ore for steel and its related products from the sources of ore and lignite fuel from the States of North Dakota, Minnesota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and other areas contiguous to the Great Lakes. An appointment with the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization has already been made where the interested Senators and Representatives in Congress will meet with Mr. Arthur Flemming to discuss further this matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in full in the RECORD at this point, and that the bill lie on the desk, until the close of business today, in order that any Senator who so desires may add his name as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from North Dakota.

The bill (S. 1058) to direct the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization to conduct a particular survey in order to assist in promoting the production of concentrated iron ore and steel and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LANGER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the production of steel and relating products are and will be of vital need to the defense and the economy of our country; and

Whereas there is an abundance of iron ore in the Mesabi Range in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Montana; and

Whereas there are extensive deposits of lignite fuels in the State of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana which are essential for the future recovery and concentration of low grade iron ores and further direct production of iron and steel in the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Montana and for other purposes relating to the defense and economy of the country; and

Whereas the transportation facilities afforded by the Saint Lawrence Seaway, the Great Lakes, and the contiguous railways of the area will promote a tremendous expansion of the facilities for industries aiding economy and the national defense of this country; and

Whereas coordination of production and transportation facilities must be generated by effective surveys and studies tending to bring groups of various industries in the coordination of their common problems: Therefore

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization is hereby authorized and directed to conduct a survey of national significance in the defense and economy of our country to determine ways and means of affirmatively encouraging the production of concentrated iron ore for steel and its related products from the sources of ore and fuel contiguous to the Great Lakes areas. The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization is directed to report the result of such surveys to the Congress and to make such reports public not later than 90 days from the enactment of this bill.

---

## FILING OF NONCOMMUNIST AFFIDAVITS BY CERTAIN PRIVATE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, during the second session of the 84th Congress, on behalf of myself and all the then Members of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, I introduced a bill (S. 4078) to amend Public Law 346, 78th Congress, and Public Law 550, 82d Congress, which laws grant, among other things, educational benefits to World War II and Korean war veterans.

Because of time limitations, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to which the bill was referred, was unable to give it complete consideration in order to report it to the Senate and permit either House to act on it during the last session. I am, therefore, again introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend Public Laws 346 and 550.

In essence the bill would require private schools below the college level which are training veterans or seeking approval to train veterans to submit to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs affidavits signed by the owners and by the members of the governing body that he is not and never has been a member of the Communist Party or any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by illegal or unconstitutional methods. In the event a school fails to file an affidavit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs will not approve the enrollment of veterans in such school. An individual who has been a member of the Communist Party in the past can comply with provisions of the proposed legislation if he files an affidavit that he has terminated his membership and since such termination is opposed to the doctrines, program, principles, and ideology of such organizations.

This bill is being introduced with a view to correcting deficiencies in Public Laws 346 and 550. During hearings held by the subcommittee during January and February 1956 on Communist ownership of GI schools, it was developed that, under the existing provisions of these laws, the Veterans' Administration has been and is required to expend Federal funds for tuition of veterans attending schools which are Communist owned. Over $3 million was paid by the Veterans' Administration to four schools which were

the subject of the subcommittee hearings, and which, because of Communist connection, should be ineligible to participate in the veterans' training program.

Mr. President, last year when this bill was introduced, all members of the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee joined in sponsoring it. I ask, therefore, that the bill remain on the desk until the next day the Senate is in session, in order to give an opportunity to Senators who may desire to cosponsor the bill to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

The bill (S. 1061) to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 and part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to require certain private educational institutions and training establishments to file non-Communist affidavits with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and to require disapproval under such act, or such part, of any such institution or establishment which fails to file such an affidavit, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and Mr. ALLOTT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## PROPOSED COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN ACCOUNT FOR IRRIGATION PURPOSES—BASIN ACCOUNT NEEDED TO ADVANCE IRRIGATION IN COLUMBIA RIVER VALLEY

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution which formally requests the Interior Department to submit for consideration by Congress legislation providing for establishment of a so-called basin account in the valley of the Columbia River.

The objective of the basin account would be to pool power revenues from Federal hydroelectric projects to help underwrite irrigation and reclamation projects in areas of the Pacific Northwest.

The need for such legislation is fairly obvious. To begin with, the most feasible and lowest-cost irrigation projects have long since been completed. Future projects will be financially possible for farmers only if power revenues help to reduce the reimbursable acreage cost of development.

Secondly, there is no reason why a power project belonging to the United States should benefit only that area directly contiguous to the plant. After all, the drops of water accumulating throughout an entire river basin contribute to the power potential of a river. The site of a particular dam is merely an accident of bedrock, cliff walls, and a sudden rapid or waterfall. Thus, the revenues from the dam should be used to help an entire region and not just the special place which is right at the site of the project.

I realize that some Members of the Senate may be critical of any future irrigation projects. The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I encountered such criticism when we sponsored successfully the Crooked River irrigation project bill last year. To skeptics, I should like to cite the brilliant speech delivered by the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] on April 19, 1955, in which he pointed out that the world's expanding population will require more agricultural production in the United States and not less. In addition, the Senator from New Mexico, emphasized the need to improve and expand the diets of many people, especially children, right here in the United States. Irrigation undertaking like the Crooked River project, the Dalles project, and the Vale-Owyhee project, grow specialty crops, such as cherries, onions, carrots, and other commodities which are not presently in surplus and which are not being stored in Government warehouses like corn or cotton.

In my own State of Oregon, even in areas of the humid western slopes, there are numerous farms which require more water during critical growing periods. The majority of these are small farms on which single families are attempting to make their livelihoods. However, a shortage of water has placed severe limitations on productivity of the land. One of America's pressing social and economic problems is the preservation of the family-sized farm. One of the solutions offered is to turn the family-sized farm into a solvent economic unit—one which can support a family at an adequate standard of living. Increased irrigation for water-short farms is one means of boosting crop output so that small units will pay out.

To provide new farming opportunities, to increase the productivity of many existing farms, it will be necessary to develop a method of governmental financing to cover irrigation costs which are beyond the ability of water-users to pay.

The basin account program makes abundantly evident, Mr. President, the justification for further Federal hydroelectric-power projects in the Columbia Basin. When representatives of the National Reclamation Association appeared before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee last week, they admitted that the Hells Canyon low dams of Idaho Power Co. will not contribute one red cent toward helping to reduce acreage costs at any Federal reclamation project. Nor will funds for irrigation and reclamation come from so-called partnership with the private power companies, whether at John Day or Green Peter or Bruces Eddy, or any other site where the utility corporations seek to prevent Federal development.

A basin account, to be successful, can operate only if there are additional Federal dams like Bonneville, Grand Coulee, McNary, and others. That is one reason, and one only, why the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I are working so hard for Hells Canyon, John Day, Libby, Paradise, and others as Federal dams. Of course, there are excellent additional reasons, such as the urgent need for low-cost kilowatts to bring payrolls to industry-starved Oregon and Idaho, and to other Pacific Northwest States.

Mr. President, I believe this resolution for a basin account merits prompt and early attention by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. I am submitting it on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 85), submitted by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

Senate Resolution 85

Resolution to request the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to prepare and submit to the Congress legislation to establish a Columbia River Basin account for irrigation projects

Whereas the Congress, since 1906 (act of April 16, 1906, ch. 1631, 34 Stat. 116), has approved the application of surplus revenues accruing from disposition of electric energy generated at Federal projects as an aid in returning to the Treasury that part of the reimbursable construction costs allocated to irrigation that is beyond the ability of the water users to repay; and

Whereas the Congress provided, in the Columbia Basin Project Act of 1943 (act of March 3, 1943, 57 Stat. 14) that surplus revenues from disposition of energy generated at Grand Coulee Dam shall be applied as aid to irrigation on said Columbia Basin project; and

Whereas said principle of application of surplus-power revenues as aid to irrigation on a river-basin basis was approved by the Congress with respect to the Missouri River Basin project (including surplus revenues from disposition of the power generated at main stem dams that are constructed and operated by the Corps of Engineers) was approved by the Flood Control Act of 1944 (act of December 22, 1944, ch. 665, 58 Stat. 887); and

Whereas said principle of surplus revenues for disposition of power generated at main stem dams being applied as aid to irrigation of participating projects in the same river basin was again approved by the Congress in the Colorado River Storage Project Act (act of April 11, 1956, 70 Stat. 105); and

Whereas in the Columbia River Basin, the Congress has approved said principle of surplus revenues from power generated at main stem dams (including dams constructed and operated by the Corps of Engineers) being applied as aid to certain irrigation projects in the same river basin in the case of the Foster Creek project being aided by power revenues from Chief Joseph Dam (act of July 27, 1954, 68 Stat. 569), and in the case of the Crooked River project being aided by revenues from the Dalles Dam (act of August 6, 1956, 70 Stat. 1058); and

Whereas other irrigation projects in the Columbia River Basin are entitled to equal opportunity to participate in the aid to irrigation from surplus revenues from disposition of power generated at Federal projects within said Columbia River Basin: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget be, and are hereby requested to furnish to the Senate not later than March 1, 1957, for consideration and study, their recommendations for legislation to provide for deriving needed assistance for irrigation in the Columbia River Basin from the Federal power system in that area as a whole.

## AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on Friday, February 1, 1957, I introduced the bill S. 1020, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956, to provide donations of surplus food commodities to State and local penal institutions.

Last year, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] submitted to the Agricultural Act of 1956 an amendment which sought to accomplish essentially the same purpose. He has expressed a desire to have his name entered as a cosponsor of Senate bill 1020, because of his continuing interest in this matter. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of Senate bill 1020, the name of the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] be included as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## SELF-DETERMINATION FOR PEOPLE OF CYPRUS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 30, 1957, the names of Senators CLARK, PURTELL, BARRETT, BEALL, YOUNG, PAYNE, and HUMPHREY were added as additional cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 81) favoring the application of the principle of self-determination to the people of Cyprus, submitted by Mr. IVES on January 30, 1957.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MCNAMARA:

Address delivered by Senator CHAVEZ before 55th annual convention of American Road Builders Association, Chicago, Ill., January 28, 1957.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "A New Approach to Disarmament," written by himself, and published in the New Republic of December 24, 1956.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Address delivered by Representative VICTOR ANFUSO before Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York State, at Hotel Piccadilly, New York City, January 31, 1957.

## NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON PROPOSED CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION BY SENATE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, I wish to announce that public hearings will commence at 10 a. m. on Thursday, February 14, 1957, in the Senate Office Building—the room number to be announced later—on all pending civil rights legislation which has been referred to the subcommittee by the full committee.

This proposed legislation also includes a composite bill, in subcommittee print form, which I have had prepared, embodying the provisions of the four measures which have been introduced in this session by the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and myself, corresponding to the four bills reported favorably by the subcommittee to the full committee in the 84th Congress, together with provisions of S. 83, a bill sponsored by all the minority members of the Committee on the Judiciary and corresponding to the measure which passed the other house in the 84th Congress.

Any Members of the Senate knowing of persons who desire to file statements for the record or appear to testify in person are urged to communicate directly with the office of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights: Government code 151—Republic 7-7500—extension 2363.

## LIVING CONDITIONS OF AMERICAN INDIANS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received a copy of a letter from the Indian affairs committee of the Anadarko Chamber of Commerce of Anadarko, Okla., signed by Dave Nixon and Albert Connel, cochairmen. The letter is addressed to the Oklahoma delegation in Congress, consisting of Senators KERR and MONRONEY, and Representatives TOBY MORRIS, PAGE BELCHER, ED EDMONDSON, CARL ALBERT, TOM STEED and JOHN JARMAN.

Mr. President, I was very happy to receive a copy of this letter since it brought out what the non-Indian people of a given community feel about a constructive program to help their Indian neighbors. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 25, 1957.

The OKLAHOMA DELEGATION,
*Washington, D. C.*

(Senators ROBERT S. KERR and A. S. MIKE MONRONEY; Congressmen TOBY MORRIS, PAGE BELCHER, ED EDMONDSON, CARL ALBERT, TOM STEED and JOHN JARMAN)

OUR GOOD FRIENDS: We note from a news story—Daily Oklahoman, page 22, datelined Thursday, January 24, 1957, a bill introduced Wednesday by Senator LANGER and 18 other Senators asking for legislation to set up a $200 million program to induce industry to locate on or near Indian reservations to provide employment for Indians.

In our opinion legislation of this type should have been enacted many years ago. The Indian, as we know them, has been and is a mistreated race. We as citizens and our Government have failed through the years to provide proper ways to help the Indian to be the kind of citizen that he should be. It is through our errors that we have created in the Indian an attitude of irresponsibility. It is our fault that they have an attitude of dependence instead of independence.

Money could not be spent for a better use and service than to find a way to develop industry within the reach of Indian labor so that the Indian could have an opportunity to earn an independent living. By these methods he would ultimately become an independent citizen and be able to compete with his neighbors and find a proper place in society.

We recognize the unfortunate situation of the Indian here in Anadarko perhaps better than any other community in the country. There are thousands of Indians in this area that would make excellent workers or employees in most any kind of industry. Such a move would not only help the Indians individually but would assist immeasurably in improving the social and economic situation in the community where they live.

We plead with you to give this bill your very best attention, and we certainly do hope that this legislation as proposed will be authorized.

Thanking all of you for your usual prompt and sincere attention.

We are sincerely,

INDIAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
ANADARKO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
DAVE NIXON, *Cochairman.*
ALBERT L. CONNEL, *Cochairman.*

(Copy to Mr. Glen L. Emmons, Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D. C.; Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.; Gov. Raymond Gary, State Capitol Building, Oklahoma City, Okla; Senator Don Baldwin, president pro tempore, State Capitol Building, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Mr. Will J. Pitner, Indian area office, Anadarko, Okla.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I believe most of the Members of Congress read in the local newspapers within the past several days, of a family of 13 living in nearby Washington who had absolutely no heat in their home and little, if any, food to eat. When this matter was brought to the attention of the neighbors an immediate response was shown and calls were coming in on a 24-hour basis rendering help to this needy family. It is unfortunate that in this great country of ours, where good times are enjoyed by so many people, stories such as this reach the newspapers in various cities throughout the United States. But, Mr. President, the sad story I have just related which is an unusual occurrence in a city such as Washington, is a story which is told time and time again by Indian leaders to the various congressional committees that deal with Indian problems. They say that their people are starving and living in homes far worse than the home as described of that unfortunate family in the Washington area; that they are inflicted with high rates of certain illnesses, such as tuberculosis, pneumonia, and child diseases. I have received a letter from an Indian lady living in Los Angeles which quotes from the December issue of Talking Leaf, a mimeographed sheet published by the Indian center in Los Angeles, Calif., which reads as follows:

On Thanksgiving Day we heard many a radio and television broadcast about the turkey dinners being served to Hungarian refugees recently arrived in the good old United States of America from oppression in their homeland. The letter we read just 4 days later came from some very depressed Indian people in our own country. We quote a few words from it and let you be the judge—

"We try to find work around here but it is hard to find work on the reservation. All we get is cornmeal, cheese, and 20 pounds of flour. Do you think 20 pounds of flour will last for a month? There are eight of us in

the family. We sure could use a lot of things. For instance, food and clothing. About one-fourth of the people are starving. The only way we could make a living is by stealing wood and post, the other way is hunting rabbits and deer on the reservation. When we kill them we get picked up." Guess there isn't enough turkey to go around in this land of plenty.

The person writing me says:

Sir, isn't there some pressure you could bring to bear in certain quarters so that these Indian people in the United States could at least be kept from starving to death? They wouldn't need, or expect, any great lavish feasts I am sure, but just common decency of human beings.

Mr. President, I know that many times I have risen on the floor of the Senate and have spoken about the plight of the American Indian. But the above quoted letter pictures vividly the need for constructive action. It is for this reason that 20 Senators from States where there are Indian reservations have joined with me in sponsoring the 4-point plan for the improvement of the condition of American Indians in the United States. The passage of this bill is essential for the improvement of the economy of our Indian people and to return them to the status of a self-sustaining people—a status they which always had in years past, and in which they took great pride.

The following Senators joined in sponsoring S. 809: Senator ANDERSON, New Mexico; Senator BARRETT, Wyoming; Senator BIBLE, Nevada; Senator BRICKER, Ohio; Senator CASE, South Dakota; Senator CHAVEZ, New Mexico; Senator CHURCH, Idaho; Senator DWORSHAK, Idaho; Senator HUMPHREY, Minnesota; Senator JACKSON, Washington; Senator KEFAUVER, Tennessee; Senator KERR, Oklahoma; Senator MAGNUSON, Washington; Senator MANSFIELD, Montana; Senator MORSE, Oregon; Senator MUNDT, South Dakota; Senator MURRAY, Montana; Senator O'MAHONEY, Wyoming; Senator THYE, Minnesota, and Senator YOUNG, North Dakota.

## RECOMMENDATIONS OF 43D NATIONAL FOREIGN TRADE CONVENTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased the other day to receive from Mr. William S. Swingle, president of the National Foreign Trade Council, Inc., of 111 Broadway, New York, the text of a policy statement, as well as a series of recommendations which had been adopted at the 43d National Foreign Trade Convention, sponsored by the council.

I found both the final declaration and the series of specific suggestions most illuminating and helpful.

The convention was attended, I may say, by more than 2,000 United States business leaders engaged in international trade and investment or in related services.

The final declaration set forth certain principles on the importance of private investment and private trade—principles which I, for one, have expressed on many occasions on the floor of the Senate, where I have pointed out that the basic stimulus to world prosperity must come, not through United States governmental aid, but, basically, through free-enterprise channels.

While I have been and shall remain a strong supporter of mutual-security legislation, I do not want anyone to fail to understand that it is American industry which represents our great hope for increasingly raising world standards of living, rather than the more artificial type of aid which may have to be given under certain circumstances by Government.

We Americans want the free world to become economically stronger. We desire that there be a continued increase in the interchange of raw materials and finished products. We want sound investments to increase, and we want the sanctity of private contracts observed in letter and in spirit.

I send to the desk the text of the specific recommendations adopted at the National Foreign Trade Convention. These recommendations bear upon such important matters as foreign trade, technical assistance, Export-Import Bank policy, tax changes, foreign travel, and many other important subjects.

The convention's recommendations were made frankly. We may or may not agree with all the recommendations, because certainly there are few areas of greater controversy than the general subject of United States tariff policy. Nevertheless, I know that my colleagues will profit, as I did, from reading the candid views of these business leaders in this significant area.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the recommendations be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, and that they be preceded by a list of the distinguished membership of the board of directors of the council and a list of the executive officers and staff.

There being no objection, the list of names and recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FOREIGN TRADE COUNCIL, INC.

Board of directors: Chairman, George W. Wolf, United States Steel Export Co.; past chairman, Robert F. Loree; H. D. Arneson, Abbott Laboratories International Co.; Sam G. Baggett, United Fruit Co.; Henry W. Balgooyen, American & Foreign Power Co., Inc.; Erwin Balluder, Pan American World Airways System; J. M. Barr, United Aircraft Export Corp.; S. M. Bash, Bethlehem Steel Export Corp.; D. H. Bellamore, Republic Steel Corp.; L. C. Boos, United States Rubber Co. (international division); Willis H. Booth, Intertype Corp.; Samuel Broers, Firestone International Co.; Meade Brunet, Radio Corporation of America; Charles Cain, Jr., Chase Manhattan Bank; Percy Chubb II, Chubb & Son; Edward P. Curtis, Eastman Kodak Co.; Paul Dietz, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.; R. Stanley Dollar, Robert Dollar Co.; E. A. Emerson, Armco International Corp.; James A. Farley, Coca-Cola Export Corp.; James A. Farrell, Jr., Farrell Lines, Inc.; Berent Friele, International Basic Economy Corp.; Carl J. Gilbert, Gillette Co.; W. Latimer Gray, First National Bank of Boston; Willard C. Gulick, International B. F. Goodrich Co.; W. R. Herod, International General Electric Co.; R. A. Hummel, Lone Star Cement Corp.; Leonard Jacob II, International Telephone & Telegraph Corp.; George F. James, Standard-Vacuum Oil Co.; John K. Jenney, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.; Clinton C. Johnson, Chemical Corn Exchange Bank; A. Donald Kelso, Norton Behr-Manning Overseas, Inc.; H. Donn Keresey, Anaconda Wire & Cable Co.; Paul V. Keyser, Jr., Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc.; William E. Knox, Westinghouse Electric International Co.; Peter T. Lamont, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey); A. N. Lilley, Texas Co.; Walter L. Lingle, Jr., Procter & Gamble Co.; Frank T. Magennis, Goodyear Foreign Operations, Inc.; E. I. McClintock, Sterling Drug, Inc.; J. Q. McDonald, Caterpillar Tractor Co.; William T. Moore, Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc.; Frederick M. Neall, Atlantic Refining Co.; John J. O'Connor, Armour & Co.; Sydnor Oden, Anderson, Clayton & Co.; F. C. W. Paton, Gulf Oil Corp.; Stanley Powell, California Packing Corp.; W. J. W. Reid, Otis Elevator Co.; Edward Riley, General Motors Corp.; Edward M. Ryan, International Harvester Co.; James H. Sharp, Merck & Co., Inc.; Leo N. Shaw, First National City Bank of New York; Frank P. Shepard, Bankers Trust Co.; Warren Simonson, American Home Products Corp.; A. D. Simpson, National Bank of Commerce; William L. Sims II, Colgate-Palmolive Co.; Russell G. Smith, Bank of America N. T. & S. A.; A. B. Sparboe, Pillsbury Mills, Inc.; James H. Stebbins, W. R. Grace & Co.; William R. Strelow, Guaranty Trust Company of New York; William S. Swingle, National Foreign Trade Council, Inc.; A. E. Thayer, California Texas Oil Co., Ltd.; Merle D. Thompson, Insular Lumber Co.; Eugene P. Warner, McGraw-Hill International Corp.; Arthur K. Watson, IBM World Trade Corp.; George C. Wells, Union Carbide International Co.; Arthur J. Weiland, Ford Motor Co.; Brayton Wilbur, Wilbur-Ellis Co.; Marshall E. Young, Monsanto Chemical Co.; Charles R. Carroll, counsel to the board.

Executive officers and staff: George W. Wolf, chairman; William S. Swingle, president; John Quirk, vice president and treasurer; John Akin, secretary; P. T. Hitchens, research; Fred D. Fremd, public relations; Eleanor Tremel, assistant treasurer; Helene L. Bienzle, assistant secretary; J. B. Brady, foreign property; Fredrik deCoste, trade relations; John Akin, Western Hemisphere; D. F. Heatherington, Europe; Melville H. Walker, Far East; John Quirk, Africa-Middle East.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The 43d National Foreign Trade Convention offers the following specific recommendations looking toward the formulation and execution of a United States foreign economic policy which will better enable American private enterprise to demonstrate the reality of its premise that foreign trade and investment promote security and prosperity. It calls upon the National Foreign Trade Council to exert every effort, in the year ahead, to secure the acceptance and implementation of the recommendations advanced, to the end that the individual enterpriser may make the contribution of which he is capable toward the goal of America's strength and well-being.

I

Promotion of International Trade: The convention emphasizes that a great and expanding volume of international trade is essential both to the strength and security of the free nations and to the economic well-being of their peoples.

From the standpoint of the United States and other industralized nations, a higher level of international trade will enable them to acquire, in adequate quantities, the raw materials and other products they need or desire from abroad, and will bring them the benefits of an enlarged market for the products which they themselves produce.

From the standpoint of countries seeking to advance their economic development, a higher level of international trade will increase their opportunities for the disposal abroad of the raw materials and other products they can make available for export, and

will thereby enable them to obtain in other countries the finished goods, the services, and the productive facilities they require for industrialization or other economic development.

In order that the free world may move boldly toward the goal of a great and expanding volume of international trade, the convention calls for vigorous and continuing efforts on the part of our Government to secure the attainment and maintenance of an international trading system, multilateral in character and free of discriminations and burdensome restrictions, which will afford access on substantially equal terms to materials and markets. It calls too, as essential to the achievement of this goal, for the adoption and effective application everywhere of governmental policies and practices which will tend to encourage trade within and among nations.

II

Stimulation of Private Investment Abroad: The convention believes that private enterprise constitutes the best source from which nations seeking capital for economic development can obtain the facilities they need. Private enterprise has access to abundant reserves of capital for productive investment when conditions favorable to such investment exist. When the investment is made it carries with it, uniquely, the managerial and technical skills essential to its effective application, including the training and experience necessary for determining what kinds of economic projects are capable of development and successful operation. Private enterprise thus provides the greatest measure of assurance that the development projects which it undertakes will be economically feasible.

The potential contribution which private enterprise can make to economic development can be realized only if conditions exist or are established which will encourage private investment. The creation of climates favorable to private investment is the responsibility of all countries, but especially of those countries in need of capital for economic development purposes. It is essential that countries seeking investment capital demonstrate, both by attitude and action, that they welcome the investment of private capital and that they will deal with it in a fair and nondiscriminatory manner. Our own Government can and should aid in the creation abroad of climates conducive to private investment by the conclusion of Treaties of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation, tax conventions and other appropriate agreements with countries with which such agreements do not now exist, and by the revision and modernization, where necessary, of existing agreements.

In addition to the creation of more favorable climates for private investment abroad, there is need also for constant and continuing cooperation between the United States Government and American private enterprisers in anticipating and meeting the problems which arise in the normal course of the conduct of America's foreign trade and investment.

III

Sanctity of contract: The convention holds that maintenance of the principle of sanctity of contract is fundamental to the whole process of international trade and investment. Without sanctity of contract there can be no respect for private property rights, and no reliance upon agreements made between nation and nation, or between nations and private parties, or between the private parties themselves.

The deterioration of respect for solemnly undertaken obligations has spread dangerously since the Second World War. As each lapse is condoned on grounds of expediency, others will occur. It is our responsibility as a member of the world community not to condone any deviation from the principles of integrity which are inherent in the concept of property rights, and which are, in consequence, essential to the achievement of world security and world economic advancement. The convention holds that no country in which a proper recognition of the sanctity of contract is lacking can be a healthy or useful part of a free world.

IV

Financing of economic development: The convention reemphasizes its belief that the financing of economic development is primarily the function of private enterprise.

In line with the stand taken by previous conventions, this convention is opposed to participation by the United States Government in the proposed Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED). It is opposed to our having a part in any nation or international mechanism, by whatever name it may be called, which is designed deliberately to provide governmental funds for the financing, on a grant or long-term nominal-interest basis, of development projects which lack sufficient economic merit to attract private capital or to meet the standards of such existing lending institutions as the World Bank and the Export-Import Bank.

The convention believes that, when essential development projects cannot for any reason be financed through private channels, financing should be sought through national or international public lending agencies on a loan basis. It holds that, if the projects are justifiable economically, they should add to the wealth of the country concerned, and should enable that country in time to repay the loan.

In these exceptional cases where the United States Government considers it in the national interest to make United States public funds available for the financing of development projects abroad, the convention holds that such funds should be provided directly by our Government, and not through any international agency. This is essential in order to assure that the funds provided will be used, at all times, for purposes which are consistent with our foreign policy objectives.

V

Foreign aid: The convention is gratified to note that the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and a special committee appointed by the President headed by Benjamin F. Fairless, are making comprehensive studies with a view to determining what the future policy of the United States should be with respect to the provision of foreign aid. The convention deems it essential and urgent that a national policy be developed in this regard which will deserve the approval and support of the American people as a whole.

The convention considers it vitally important that the policy as determined be so convincingly demonstrated to be in the national interest as to ensure the willing acceptance of the tax burden imposed.

The convention further urges that foreign aid, whether for defense, defense-support, or general economic purposes, be extended only under conditions which our own people and the people of all the world will accept as valid and constructively beneficial to the cause of human freedom.

VI

Technical assistance: The convention reiterates the view of previous conventions that technical assistance provided by the United States Government to other countries, either directly or through United Nations or other international agencies, should be limited to the field of the public services, embracing broadly such areas as health, education, sanitation, public administration, and agricultural techniques.

The convention holds that technical assistance in all other fields of economic development—particularly in the field of industry—should be provided by private enterprise. Private capital carries with it the integrated managerial and technical skills, and the continuing responsibility, which are essential to its effective application. Moreover, most technical knowledge in the industrial field is private property, and government agencies should not attempt to dispense it in competition with the private concerns which brought it into being. This invaluable asset can, in fact, be utilized with maximum efficiency only as an adjunct to private capital.

VII

Export-Import Bank: The convention welcomes the acceleration of the Export-Import Bank's activities during the past year and commends that institution for its efforts to improve the services rendered in support of the foreign trade of the United States. The bank has demonstrated that it can be a vital and cooperative adjunct to the financial facilities provided by private enterprise for the promotion of trade on a sound economic basis. The convention believes that flexibility in approach and adaptability to changing conditions will continue to produce the most effective results.

The convention urges that the bank be ever alert to new opportunities to serve the needs and interests of American foreign trade, while steadfastly maintaining its traditional standards and requirements.

The convention recommends tnat prompt action be taken by the new Congress to extend for a period of 5 years the operating authority of the Export-Import Bank.

VIII

Taxation: The convention regards revision of the United States tax on income derived from business operations abroad as one of the most important steps our Government could take to promote and encourage American foreign trade and investment.

Both the statutes and the tax conventions of the United States generally apply our full domestic tax rate to corporate income derived from foreign operations, alleviated only by the foreign tax credit. The result is a burden on American foreign investment in three respects. First, this extension of the law of the United States to foreign operations applies a tax rate appropriate to conditions in a highly developed economy to profits derived in many cases from countries with a lower stage of economic development. Second, the American investor operates at a competitive disadvantage as against investors from the majority of foreign nations which grant outright exemption or substantial concessions in their tax rates to profits earned by their nationals in foreign business operations. Third, our existing tax regime nullifies the benefit of tax rate reductions, exemptions, and other special incentives which many countries grant to encourage and attract foreign investment.

The Western Hemisphere Trade Corporation Act was a step in the right direction, and, since substantial investments have been made on the faith of that act, it should be retained. The convention deplores, however, the continuing failure of Congress to take favorable action on the proposal of the President for a 14-percentage-point reduction in the tax rate to be generally applied to income derived from foreign branches and subsidiaries of United States business corporations or to develop any alternative treatment of foreign-source business income which would place the American foreign trader and investor in a more equitable position. It deplores specifically the continuance of a regime which denies to American investors the benefit of incentives granted by foreign governments to stimulate expansion of production within their own countries by inducing an increased flow of private investment from abroad.

The United States Government's tax treaty program, with its objective of the avoidance of international double taxation, should be extended at the earliest possible date to embrace American business income earned everywhere abroad, in order further to stimulate investment and trade within and among the free nations of the world.

IX

Currency Convertibility and Monetary Policy: The Convention is encouraged by the further progress made in the elimination or reduction of bilateral and discriminatory exchange practices, in the liberalization of restrictions on international payments, and in the widening of the area of currency transferability and convertibility. Despite localized difficulties and setbacks resulting in some instances from an unfavorable turn of events and in others from adherence to unsound policies, there has been a general improvement in the world financial situation during the past year. This has been both a result and a cause of the greater willingness on the part of most countries to take the steps necessary to the eventual establishment of a fully multilateral trade and payments system.

In the efforts made to create a keener awareness of the value of constructive and flexible monetary and fiscal policies, the convention notes especially the leadership provided by the International Monetary Fund, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, and the Bank for International Settlements. By reason of the insistent emphasis these bodies have put upon the need to curb the forces making for inflationary pressures, the prospect for monetary stability, hand-in-hand with economic growth and development, has been measurably strengthened. Realizing that the crisis in the Middle East must adversely affect the foreign exchange reserves of many countries and bring new strains on their economies, the convention nevertheless most earnestly hopes that there will be no abandonment of those financial policies which have proved so effective.

X

Food and Raw Materials Reserves, Intergovernmental Commodity Agreements, Etc.: The Convention is opposed to participation by the United States Government in any scheme for a world food reserve or a world food and raw materials reserve, or in any international organization, whether separate or within the framework of the United Nations, which would seek to set up and maintain such reserves. It supports the stand taken by previous conventions in opposition to participation by our Government in intergovernmental commodity agreements, in the United Nations Commission on International Commodity Trade, or in any other international mechanism designed ostensibly to stabilize the production, distribution or prices of commodities moving in international trade.

The Convention believes that the solution of the problem of overproduction or underproduction, in a private enterprise economy, is to be found in the operation of the law of supply and demand, and that action in contravention of the principles implicit in that law would serve, as they have in the past, to aggravate, rather than to solve, the very problem with which it seeks to deal. It believes, further, that international arrangements designed to regulate the production or prices of commodities moving in international trade would not only prove extremely costly, particularly for the American taxpayer, but would result inevitably in extensive regimentation of the economies of the countries participating in such arrangements. In the view of the convention, the consequences would be a stifling of individual initiative, a reduction in productive efficiency, and a lowering of standards of living throughout the world.

XI

Disposal of American Agricultural Surpluses Abroad: The Convention urges that, in the formulation and administration of programs for the disposal of American agricultural surpluses abroad, careful consideration be given to the possible effects of such programs on the overall trade relations of the United States with other friendly countries.

The Convention also urges that, in triangular foreign-aid transactions involving the use of foreign currency funds produced by the sale of these surpluses abroad, adequate steps be taken to safeguard the normal commercial marketings of American nonagricultural products in third countries.

The Convention recommends that, with respect to the use of these foreign-currency funds for loans to promote multilateral trade and economic development, action be taken to assure opportunity, on a fair and nondiscriminatory basis, for American private enterprises or their local subsidiaries to have access to such funds for the purpose of financing their operations in the countries where the funds are generated.

The convention holds that, when loaned for trade and development purposes, these foreign-currency funds—which belong to the people of the United States—should be used to the maximum extent for the financing of private-enterprise undertakings. In no event should the funds be so used as to place the United States Government in the anomalous position of fostering and subsidizing socialism in the form of state enterprise.

XII

Merchant marine: The convention believes that the Suez crisis and the tense situation elsewhere in the world combine to highlight the importance of ocean transport to international trade and to emphasize the vital necessity of American-flag shipping to our national defense. These considerations prompt the convention to affirm its support of the national maritime policy as expressed in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

The convention holds that the existence of a privately owned and operated American merchant marine and the maintenance of regular steamship service on the essential trade routes as provided for in the 1936 act are necessary to maintain access to foreign markets and to assure a continuing flow of the imports essential to national defense and to our economy. The commendable progress in long-range ship-construction programs by the lines operating on essential trade routes demonstrates the effectiveness of the act in maintaining a modern merchant fleet capable of providing efficient service to our foreign trade.

The convention supports the national policy calling for a fair and reasonable participation by American-flag ships in the carriage of cargoes owned or financed by the Government. It urges vigorous action by the Government to secure the elimination of discriminatory practices by foreign nations which tend to divert cargoes from American-flag ships.

The convention recommends greater reliance upon private steamship services and the elimination, wherever practicable, of Government-operated steamship services which compete with private industry.

The convention urges that Congress enact legislation making quarantine inspection at United States ports available on a 24-hour basis to American and foreign maritime interests at their own expense for service after the hours presently covered by existing regulations. Such legislation would minimize the undue delays and heavy expense now incurred while waiting in anchorage for quarantine inspection.

The convention urges that steps be taken by our Government to limit the functions of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization to technical matters relating to safety at sea.

XIII

Commercial aviation: The convention holds that United States air-transport policy should be designed to assure the maintenance, with necessary Government regulation and support, of privately owned and operated American-flag air services which meet the requirements of our national defense, our postal service, and our domestic and foreign commerce.

In negotiations with foreign governments concerning air-traffic rights, it is essential that our Government keep always in view the importance in the national interest of a strong American-flag system of international air transportation and the predominant contribution the United States is making to the world air-traffic market. The convention holds that the United States should not grant to air carriers of foreign countries traffic routes which cannot be economically operated under the Bermuda Agreement of 1946, and it urges that full recognition be given to the value of traffic between the United States and third countries, both in considering the granting of routes to foreign air carriers, and in the enforcement of the Bermuda principles on routes already operated by such carriers.

The convention recommends that close cooperation be maintained between our Government and the American airline industry in the development of the United States position in all air-transport negotiations, and that an industry representative be appointed to serve as a member of all United States delegations in such negotiations. It urges that our State Department maintain a specially trained and adequate staff, with personnel of rank and responsibility commensurate with those of foreign governments, in order that the desired policies may be implemented in bilateral air-transport negotiations.

XIV

Foreign travel: Expenditures by Americans for foreign travel in 1955 established a new record of more than $1.6 billion, of which $1.35 billion was received by foreign nations through expenditures within their borders and as earnings for transportation. This United States import constituted, in dollar terms, the most important single item in our purchases abroad. The indications are that the rising trend in evidence will continue and that, with the impetus given by the introduction of jet aircraft and other new air and surface transport capacity, it will bring a doubling of foreign-travel expenditures by 1960. The tourist industry is, obviously, of great present and potential importance, and should be given every encouragement.

The convention notes with gratification the establishment of an International Travel Division in the Department of Commerce, and urges that this Division be supported on a continuing basis with manpower and funds commensurate with the important contribution which foreign travel makes to foreign trade. It welcomes the removal of the 10-percent excise tax on overseas travel and the ratification by our Government of the United Nations conventions on facilitation of customs procedures relating to tourists' personal effects and automobiles. Further action can be taken, the convention believes, to simplify visa and other requirements for travelers from friendly countries.

The convention urges that foreign governments in need of dollar exchange encourage travel from the United States to their countries by eliminating burdensome visa requirements and by promoting the construction of new hotels of the type which appeal to the American businessman and tourist.

XV

Commercial treaties: Relatively few treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation have been concluded by this country in recent years. The convention urges that negotiations looking toward the conclusion of commercial treaties between the United States and countries with which such treaties do not now exist be accelerated, with a view to placing our international commercial relations on a sounder basis. It further urges that existing treaties which do not meet present-day requirements be revised or replaced by modern treaties.

Recent events serve to dramatize the real need for extending to American enterprises in foreign countries the protection which treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation afford.

XVI

Proprietary rights: The convention holds that the international trade and investment essential to the economic development of nations demands respect for and effective protection of proprietary rights.

Private industry has, in general, been responsible for the development and compilation of the technical industrial information required for the successful application of modern manufacturing processes. The dissemination of such information is usually based on contractual relationships, and the benefits derived from such dissemination are dependent upon the faithful observance of the terms of the contracts.

The convention holds that technical industrial information is entitled to protection as effective as that accorded to any other property right, and it believes that economic development will be enhanced in those nations which provide the necessary protection.

XVII

Customs simplification and procedures: The convention notes with approval the progress made, through enactment of the Customs Simplification Act of 1956, toward simplification of the customs procedures of this country and the establishment of a more workable system for the conversion of foreign currencies into dollars for customs assessment purposes. It commends the Treasury Department and customs officials in Washington and at ports of entry for their continued efforts to simplify and expedite customs procedures by administrative action. It urges further legislative and administrative action designed to minimize the barriers that still remain and to speed up the clearance of foreign goods through the customs portals of this country.

XVIII

Commercial insurance: The convention reaffirms the position of previous conventions that the expansion of international trade and investment through private enterprise requires the ready availability of commercial insurance functioning on a freely competitive basis in the world markets. The removal of discriminations, nationalistic restrictions, and other barriers in the field of commercial insurance has been distressingly slow, but the convention welcomes the evidence of continued efforts to secure their removal by those branches and agencies of the United States Government and those private and public organizations which have concerned themselves with the problem.

The convention urges that our Government intensify its efforts, particularly when negotiating treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation, to safeguard adequately and specifically the interests of American commercial insurance enterprises operating overseas.

XIX

International trade and financial statistics: The convention believes that the Federal Government should collect, process, and disseminate the statistical information necessary to the conduct of international business. The provision of adequate and timely data on America's international transactions is an essential public function and responsibility, and beneficial to the whole economy. The cost of maintaining comprehensive statistical programs geared to the growth of foreign commerce and investment is slight when compared with the value of the data derived and the importance of foreign trade to the Nation.

The convention is gratified by the action taken by Congress to make possible the rescinding of the cutback in Census Bureau coverage and the restoration of the schedule B commodity-classification system. The convention holds, however, that both the executive branch and Congress should give attention and support to the removal of other existing deficiencies and to a further strengthening and improvement of the entire statistical program. It urges, therefore, renewed consideration of those findings and recommendations relating to foreign trade statistics which were submitted by the official intensive review committee to the Secretary of Commerce in February 1954. It also urges that the scientific revision and modernization of schedule B commodity classifications be hastened to bring them more nearly into line with current conditions.

The convention takes special note of the historic activities of the Department of Commerce in connection with United States balance of payments and foreign investment statistics, and the deservedly high international reputation which this work has acquired. There should be no slackening in the effort to develop and improve these statistics. The convention recommends that sufficient funds be provided to maintain the traditional standards of coverage, and to enable more information on our international financial transactions to be made available as needed by business.

XX

International trade fairs: The convention emphasizes the important role which international trade fairs can play in promoting trade between the United States and other countries and in furthering understanding abroad of our unique system of free enterprise and of the American way of life. It believes that participation by our Government and by American business in these trade fairs can help to bring to the people of other nations an appreciation of the dynamic factors in our economic system which stimulate the initiatives and the energies essential to a maximum productive output of useful goods and services.

The convention commends our Government for the facilities and services it has provided to assist American industrial enterprises in planning and conducting product exhibits at trade fairs abroad, for the exhibits it has itself staged, and for other assistance given in assuring the success of American participation in these fairs. It recommends that American business firms cooperate in making products available for use in the central displays of our Government, as well as in providing the industrial exhibits which play such an important part in the foreign marketing of American products.

XXI

Foreign trade education: The convention notes with satisfaction the wider recognition being given to the long-term benefits of foreign trade education. It is gratified by the increased importance which leading colleges and universities are attaching to social and cultural studies of world areas and to the intensive emphasis being given to the teaching of foreign languages. It commends individual business enterprises for the programs they have instituted to supplement the academic background of their executives with further specialized training designed to correlate their technical capacities with the cultural attainments essential to success in their work abroad.

The convention believes that foreign trade education must be concerned with the nature and spirit of the peoples of other lands, and that it must emphasize the importance of establishing and maintaining friendly relations based on mutual trust and confidence. It believes that a better understanding of languages and social customs different from our own will serve greatly in promoting American business and investment opportunities abroad and will extend and strengthen the foundation upon which a continued expansion of our international trade can be built.

## CURE FOR "FOOT-IN-MOUTH" DISEASE

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of a newspaper report of a statement by the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], whom we are all glad to see in the Senate Chamber this morning, looking so much improved in health.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator MATTHEW M. NEELY, referring to the Nation's most recent official outburst of malapropism, today offered a suggestion for the curing of Secretary of Defense Wilson's chronic "foot-in-mouth" disease. Drawing upon his knowledge of the classics, Senator NEELY quoted from Demosthenes' speech "Against Timocrates," in which it is stated that it was the custom among the ancient Locrians that if a man wished to propose a new law, he must legislate with a halter round his neck. If the law proved good, the proposer lived; if bad he was hanged by the neck until dead.

"If there were a similar rule applicable to members of the President's Cabinet with reference to their public remarks," Senator NEELY said, "then assuredly Engine Charlie Wilson would now be swinging for his slanderous remarks about the National Guard, one of the Nation's oldest, most patriotic, and useful agencies of national defense. We would not now advocate capital punishment in such a case. Nevertheless it might prove helpful for the President to have Secretary Wilson wear a coat lapel reminder of what happened once in Locri to those who, through either malice or ignorance, attempted to change for the worse a landmark of either custom or law. Long life and a green old age to the National Guard and banishment for all its foes."

## COURAGEOUS LOYALTY OF WIFE OF SECRETARY WILSON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a tribute from the New York Times of February 3, 1957, to a woman whom I admire—Mrs. Charles E. Wilson. The article is entitled "Charlie Wilson's Secret Weapon—Jessie Ann," and was written by the chief Washington correspondent of the Times, Mr. James Reston.

I do not agree with Secretary Wilson in many of his inflammatory outbursts. He often flies in the face of facts. Yet there must be a lot of good in a man who will receive the kind of courageous loyalty from his wife that Mr. Wilson has received in this episode.

There is so much insincerity, hypocrisy and double-talk in Washington that Mrs. Wilson's candid defense of her husband—and her rebuke to the President for allegedly letting her husband down—must be encouraging to a lot of Americans, particularly American women.

My own wife stumped the entire State of Oregon urging my election to the Senate in 1954, so I think I have some knowledge and appreciation of what it means to enjoy the kind of support which Secretary Wilson is receiving from Mrs. Wilson in this instance.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 3, 1957]

CHARLIE WILSON'S SECRET WEAPON—JESSIE ANN

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 2. The chief charm of women in official Washington—aside, of course, from their reckless beauty—is that they are essentially more honest than their men folk.

The men who come down here into lofty executive jobs invariably lose their individuality to the organization. The demands of the big Government machine, the pressures for conformity with the official "line" and the dictates of ambition squeeze all the spunk and personal distinction out of most of them.

But their women are different. Except in rare instances they are not surrounded by droves of bureaucratic drones and press agents. They are not protected and puffed up by official aides and are therefore not so likely to confuse themselves with the vast powers they merely represent.

They stay in their homes during most of the day. They remember more vividly who they really are and where they came from. They have "the humble job" of raising the children, who are not impressed by all the trappings of official life, and therefore they remain more human, more direct and more honest.

MRS. WILSON SPEAKS UP

Once in a while, however, some courageous female rebel gets thoroughly fed up with all the sham and hypocrisy of the big Government hive and shakes creation with some lovely back-fence commentary.

This is what the wife of Secretary of Defense Wilson did this week and it is the nicest thing that has happened in this town since Bess Truman told Harry to watch his language.

Not since the invention and official recognition of "togetherness" has anybody on the Eisenhower "team" dared to whisper a word of criticism of the President of the United States. Mrs. Harold Talbott did say that it was "a dirty, low-down, sneaking group" that was trying to "get" her husband, the former Secretary of the Air Force, but even she subsided into wifely silence once the President decided that Mr. Talbott should go away.

Mrs. Wilson, however, said for publication—and she wasn't kidding—that the President was unfair in criticizing her husband's remarks about draft-dodging in the National Guard; she implied that she thought her husband had done as good a job as Mr. Dulles, whom the President praised in the same news conference, and that she wished that Mr. Wilson would quit.

"I've stood back and listened to criticism until I'm tired of it," she said. "I've been very, very careful not to make any criticism of any kind. But you reach a point sometimes—and this was it."

Whereupon Charlie issued an official communiqué saying he was "very proud" of his wife, told a committee of the Congress that he wouldn't be around to be badgered any more next week and took his Jessie Ann off to Florida for a vacation.

This is a reminder of a very important point in life; namely, that a man's first and last line of defense, even if he is the Secretary of Defense, is his wife. And it is a reminder of some other things.

Among these is the fact that these famous officials, who are supposed to do no wrong in a world where it is almost impossible to be right, are men who pull on their pants one leg at a time just like other men, and have wives with feelings, even as you and I.

The pity is that they don't speak up more often, for while the pleasures of official life are many, the ordeals are at least as great.

NOT ALL WINE AND CREPES SUZETTE

Save for the butterflies, who love the parties and the ridiculous social pretenses of this expense-account town, the Government officials' wives are not as a rule at ease in the big official limousines, the endless receiving lines, and the big crystal chandelier dining rooms.

They come to these things, most of them, late in life from simpler backgrounds. They worry about their children growing up in what seems to many of them as unreal and bogus atmosphere. They are properly impressed by the majesty and tradition of this beautiful community, but they see their husbands working too hard and gradually being more impressed than they should by the endless flattery that goes with power.

Men, such as Dulles and Nixon and Stassen, get inured to criticism, for they dish it out; they love the struggle and they get the satisfactions of pride and position. But what of their wives?

This is one of the endless perils of official life in Washington. The men learn to say a lot of things without disclosing anything. Indeed, saying nothing at great length eventually becomes a rather pleasant official game. But their women are accustomed before they come here to saying what they think, and it is only later that they discover that outgoing spontaneity is a menace to themselves and their husbands.

"I've been very, very careful," said Mrs. Wilson. "But you reach a point sometimes—and this was it."

---

## RESPONSIBILITY FOR REDUCING THE BUDGET

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, a few days ago, when the President submitted his annual budget, press reports indicated that it was his desire that the Congress trim the budget. How unrealistic and unfair is such a statement. It should be apparent not only to the members of the press but to every Member of Congress that the Budget Bureau has hundreds and hundreds of employees. There are hundreds and hundreds of employees in every department and agency of the Government. If all these employees who are completely under the direction of the President and other executive officers are unable to cut the budget, I wonder how in the name of high heaven the American people can believe that the Members of Congress, with their limited staffs and investigating committees, are capable of doing so. I saw figures the other day which tended to show that this administration has spent in its first 4 years $65 billion more than was spent under President Truman's administration. We had a war to finance, too, the Keorean war, during the period covered by President Truman's figures.

It is just another buck-passing game. We will be compelled to pass the budget in substantially the form in which it is submitted, because we do not have the facilities to analyze adequately the give-away programs and the spending sprees engaged in by every branch of the Government.

I, as one Senator, intend to vote for reductions in the appropriation bills as they come to the floor of the Senate.

The cure for this situation may be to make the Budget Bureau an independent arm of the Government answerable to the Congress only. We get the blame for high spending and our failure to reduce taxes, yet we are asked to rubberstamp every program the executive sends to Congress. In most cases the emergency is so imminent there is no alternative. Let us consider making the Budget Bureau an arm of the Congress, as is the General Accounting Office.

I wish to alert the Congress to the fact that if we do not stop our wild spending we will spend ourselves into bankruptcy. We cannot remain economically strong unless we reduce taxes, reduce our budget, and retire our large national debt. In my opinion, the first step to be taken should be reducing the Government's indebtedness.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "The Budget That's Too High," written by David Lawrence, and published in the U. S. News & World Report of February 8, 1957.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BUDGET THAT'S TOO HIGH

(By David Lawrence)

Seventy-two billions of dollars is a big sum of money for a Federal budget. It is an amount difficult, even for Members of Congress, to evaluate. They cannot possibly familiarize themselves with the wide variety of items in a budget.

Someday the American people will demand that the system of budgetmaking be reformed. Today's methods are obsolete and inadequate. The Government is too big to be run as it was 36 years ago when the present budget law was passed.

For the truth is Congress created a Bureau of the Budget but made it a subdivision of the Office of the President. It gave no power to the Budget Director himself to change the estimates furnished by heads of departments and other governmental agencies. It made the Budget Director only a sort of information gatherer for the President. It did not even require the Budget Director to be confirmed by the Senate.

No member of the Cabinet—not even the Secretary of the Treasury—has the official duty of reviewing the whole budget to determine what items should be included or eliminated.

The President receives estimates from each department or agency and depends on the Director of the Budget for explanatory data. But the decision in the last analysis as to how much shall be included must, by law, be made by the President himself.

Does anybody believe for a moment that any President can make a detailed examination or review of a present-day budget of the Government of the United States and do anything else?

There are, of course, items that do not change from year to year—obligations that grow out of existing laws or previous commitments. The President cannot, for instance, assume that certain laws will be repealed even though he may dislike them, yet they involve recurrent expenditures of many billions every year.

A President, to be sure, is the head of the Government and represents the national interest. He cannot be biased in favor of this or that special interest or locality. He must weigh judicially the demands of pressure groups. He must be sensitive to public opinion—for the continuance of his party in power depends on whether he has in general satisfied the wishes of the electorate.

When the budget law was passed in 1921, it was recognized that officials of the various departments might not be satisfied with the sums allotted to them in the budget and might complain to Congress. Strict regulations—which are still in force—were, therefore, issued by the President forbidding executive department employees from going to Congress to obtain higher appropriations than those set forth in the budget. This has been ingeniously circumvented by Congress itself. Officials are usually invited to testify at congressional hearings, and from them is elicited the information on which champions of particular causes base their demands for enlarged appropriations.

The voting of about a billion dollars more than the President and the armed services themselves asked for at the last session of Congress was so transparently the result of political demagoguery and collusion with overzealous advocates of larger spending within the executive departments that the incident makes one wonder whether strong laws rather than mere regulations should not hereafter govern the behavior of executive employees who connive with Members of Congress to lobby for increases in the budget.

In all fairness, however, it must be said that the armament-spending group doubtless felt it was as much entitled to the taxpayers' money as the groups pressing for some of the so-called "welfare" items in the budget.

But who is to weigh all the facts and say for what the taxpayers' money shall be spent? The budget recently presented by the President was, according to his own admission, very high. He said he hoped it could be cut.

Congress has the sole duty of deciding what the final budget shall be. Under the British and Canadian system, the budget is submitted by the Prime Minister and then the Parliament must accept or reject it as it is, for both the executive and the legislative branch are controlled by the same political party. In America, where divided government prevails today, the people pay a high price for their failure to fix responsibility in a single party.

Someday Congress should set up large enough committees with proper staffs—perhaps a joint committee of both Houses—to study continuously throughout each year the workings of the budget system and gather the necessary information to guide Congress.

Nobody likes the size of the new budget—neither the President nor the Congress. Certainly the taxpayers don't like it. For they see the Federal budget going higher and higher, with no relief in sight from heavy taxes on the incomes of individuals and businesses.

How much longer will taxpayers tolerate such a haphazard system of budget making as we have today?

## DROUGHT RELIEF IN MISSOURI

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on Friday, February 1, in Jefferson City, the Governor of Missouri held a meeting of the Missouri State Drought Committee, at which time the committee presented their problems to Mr. Harry Thomas, latest of the investigators representing the Department of Agriculture, who have come to our State. Governor Blair was kind enough to ask me to this meeting. Because of what this problem means to Missouri, I was very glad to attend.

Mr. President, as a result of what was presented to Mr. Thomas in Jefferson City, on last Friday, I am confident something will be done for Missouri, unless again the recommendations of the Department of Agriculture representative are reversed in Washington.

As mentioned, last week we did obtain for some counties the right to have some emergency credit, but neither this nor hay can be of much help at this time. Farmers who have suffered 5 years from problems caused by drought cannot do much with credit alone.

What our farmers need badly, and need now, is the right to participate in the grain program on a basis comparable with that right already extended to 12 other States, in many of which the drought problem does not even compare in severity with that in Missouri.

This situation has now dragged for so long, that hundreds of our farmers have already been forced to the wall. Urgent action is needed; else hundreds more will go bankrupt at the same time that they see the great grain stocks held by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, on January 28, a January 23d release from the Department of Agriculture, having to do with the current critical drought problem in Missouri, was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It had not been my purpose to dwell further on this release; but inasmuch as it has been placed in the RECORD, I now ask unanimous consent that my reply to it, which I presented to Secretary Benson last week at a meeting of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST MISSOURI ON FEDERAL DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

This statement is in reply to a statement issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, on Wednesday, January 23, with respect to my continued protests about the way the drought-aid situation is being handled in Missouri by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Secretary Benson's latest effort to justify discrimination against Missouri farmers in his administration of the drought program, as released by one of his men on January 23, is most misleading.

This statement says in part:

"Missouri farmers have already received Federal emergency assistance totaling over $32 million from Department of Agriculture disaster programs in the fiscal years 1954, 1955, 1956, and 1957 up to November 30. This has been aid in the form of emergency credit, feed, and hay assistance, and free food distribution."

What he did not say was that, since July 1, 1955, little or no new emergency credit, and not one cent of assistance for a pound of hay, or grain, has been allowed a Missouri farmer; and we are talking about drought conditions today—not in 1954.

The "free food" distribution comment referred to in this drought-release statement has nothing to do with the drought program; and I am told amounts to but some $30,000.

At the same time Mr. Benson refused Missouri farmers such aid as provided by the Congress; he has been pouring it into other States, including some which border on Missouri.

Drought doesn't end at a State boundary.

The Department of Agriculture has described Missouri as a State having "extreme drought," the worst category listed for any State.

In his January 23 press release, Mr. Benson says: "As a result of a recent survey, the Secretary of Agriculture has declared 28 counties in Missouri eligible for emergency loans through the facilities of the Farmers' Home Administration under Public Law 38."

What he does not say, however, is that the emergency loan approval came only last week, after many months effort on the part of some of us to obtain that approval.

As Greene County Agent Clyde Clubb recently emphasized, no hay program "could get rolling in less than 5 or 6 weeks, but by that time it would be too late."

Steadily worsening drought conditions in Missouri were first called to the attention of Mr. Benson personally when he met with the Missouri State Drought Committee on October 10, but inspectors were not sent to the State until the latter part of November; and then only following a personal trip to Washington by Missouri Commissioner of Agriculture Clelle Carpenter.

Secretary Benson continues in the press release of January 23, "It would be very timely for the State officials to demonstrate their expressed concern about the plight of the farm people by taking some positive steps to provide some State aid programs.

"Throughout the past several months, when spokesmen for the State have been vigorous in their efforts to get large Federal-aid programs into operation, we have not been informed that the State officials have taken any steps to have State funds appropriated to aid their farm people in meeting drought problems."

This statement is misleading and Mr. Benson should know it, because he also knows that on Tuesday of last week, the day before he announced this emergency credit for 28 counties, Missouri Gov. James T. Blair, Jr., personally called on Mr. Benson in Washington. At that time Governor Blair asked for specific suggestions as to what more the State could do.

Mr. Benson knows, and the record so shows, that for many months former Governor Donnelly and the Missouri congressional delegation have been sending continuous pleas to him, to his aides, and even to President Eisenhower, himself, urging that something be done in this tragic matter.

In fact, in Governor Donnelly's wire of October 23 to President Eisenhower, the Governor stated, "My staff members and I will be available to meet with your representatives at any time and I urge immediate action * * *."

In his inaugural address in Jefferson City, January 14, Governor Blair stated that he intended to ask for an emergency drought fund so Missouri could continue to meet its fair responsibility. A bill to cover this recommendation is already in the Missouri State Senate, S. 49; and is due for hearing this week.

The implications from Mr. Benson therefore that the officials of Missouri have not "taken any steps" or "expressed concern" is not correct—and the record so proves.

We Missourians are very proud of our record on State drought aid. We challenge Mr. Benson, or anyone else, to show any State that has done better, or even as much, in percentage of cash drought appropriation as against assistance from the Federal Government.

Although we are not sure, we are told that the appropriations of Missouri for drought aid are more than that of all other States combined.

This press release of Mr. Benson then uses figures showing good production of grain in Missouri last year as an excuse for the Department of Agriculture not designating Missouri counties for grain assistance.

The 1954 Census of Agriculture shows that the 28 counties most seriously affected by the drought have an average of only 1.4 percent of their land in corn; and this production is almost entirely for silage.

Because of the terrain in these counties, other grains are similarly light.

The emergency drought program is supposedly designed to aid beef and dairy farmers, so that they can carry their foundation herds through to normal seasons. The fact that a grain farmer in another area of the State had a good crop does not help the dairy farmer who depends upon pasture to carry him through to December 15.

When the drought came this year, the latter had to start buying and feeding grain and hay in July and August.

The figures of the Department of Agriculture show that Missouri pastures were in as bad condition as any of the 12 States which were designated for hay and grain assistance; in fact, only 2 of these 12 States—Texas and Oklahoma—were ranked as low as Missouri in percentage of normal pasture.

Mr. Benson's release then says, "Senator Symington can hardly be serious in his talk of feed shortages" and then he gives figures for feed production in all Missouri.

Again this is misleading, because as Mr. Benson should know, the drought-stricken parts of Missouri are largely pasture land, with very little grain production—and pasture land and hay production in this area were practically nil during the latter half of 1956.

In addition, the percentages which Mr. Benson gives in this release are estimated; and in the interest of accuracy the release should have so stated.

Mr. Benson's release then questions my statement that cattlemen have been forced to sacrifice their herds and gives as the reason the fact there were just as many cattle and calves in Missouri on January 1, 1957, as there were a year earlier.

Again, he uses figures for the whole State, not just the drought area. Mr. Benson's approach to the problem would appear to be like that of a man who, because of his fondness for hoarding wealth, refuses to let a doctor operate on his sick child, on the grounds his other children are abnormally healthy.

Now as to the facts:

The Producers' Creamery Co. with plants in Springfield, Monett, Cabool, Eldorado Springs, and Lebanon in the drought-stricken southwest section of Missouri have already lost 6 percent of their patrons—660 to be exact—in 1956.

These farmers, in the main operating family size farms, were forced to sell their herds.

The same loss in milk patrons is reported by the other creameries in this area.

Mr. Benson's own Department, in figures released on January 11 and 17 of this month, shows that the above statements he released on Missouri milk production tell only part of the story, and are therefore misleading.

According to USDA reports, in December 1956, Missouri milk production was 6 million pounds below the same month in 1955, this at the same time that 5 of the States receiving drought assistance showed an increase in milk production.

It is welcome news that under the growing pressure of officials and citizens of Missouri, Mr. Benson is now sending another inspector to the drought-stricken counties of our State.

Mr. Benson can have the dubious satisfaction, however, of knowing that in recent months his policies have removed hundreds of small Missouri farmers from their land.

We trust that the recommendations of any additional inspectors who come to Missouri will be followed in Washington—and not be overruled by centralized Agriculture there, as we understand were the recommendations of the previous inspectors who visited Missouri.

What worries me, at least as much as anything, about Mr. Benson's statement is his doubt I was serious in the matter.

How can any representative of the people in a State not be serious, when conditions in that State are as follows:

(1) Farmers in large areas of Missouri are being forced to sell their foundation herds because they have no feed.

(2) These farmers see large quantities of this feed in Government storage. They know also that Mr. Benson is constantly bemoaning the size of these surplus stocks.

(3) These Missouri farmers look across State boundaries into Kansas and Oklahoma and see farmers in those States feed grain supplied them by their Government, help which has been repeatedly denied to our farmers in Missouri, over these tragic months.

I want to assure Mr. Benson that I am very serious about this matter.

## COMMENDATION OF SENATOR CLARK

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many of us had high expectations for outstanding leadership from the new junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and we have not been disappointed. The vigor, courage, and liberalism with which he confronts major public issues are characteristic of a man of integrity and intelligence.

I ask that a splendid tribute to Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, which was published in the issue of Labor for February 2, 1957, be printed in the body of the RECORD, so that other Senators may benefit by reading the views and ideas of our distinguished new colleague from the Keystone State.

Incidentally, I should like to add that the Senator from Pennsylvania and his attractive family made a most appealing and winning appearance on the CBS television program, Meet Your New Senators, several weeks ago.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SQUARES OFF FOR BATTLES—CLARK TO FIGHT GAS GOUGE; WOULD PLUG UP LOOPHOLES

Predictions that Pennsylvania's new Democratic Senator—JOSEPH S. CLARK—would quickly make an outstanding name for himself were already coming to pass this week.

In the short time since Congress assembled, CLARK has won appointment as chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee of the Senate Banking Committee and has got a bill reported out to hike the Federal loan money available for small business.

He has drafted, together with Senator PAT MCNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan, a series of much-needed amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act. He has helped revise and liberalize a bill to aid the Nation's depressed areas.

He has led 15 other Senators in sponsoring a measure for public development of the power from Niagara Falls, to insure low-cost electricity for New York and Pennsylvania consumers rather than high power trust rates.

HUMAN DYNAMO

Currently he's working with other Senators on drafting a new aid-to-education bill to relieve what he calls the "tragic situation" of our schools.

All this activity suggests that Senator CLARK is not only a strong progressive but something of a human dynamo. Those impressions were confirmed this week when a representative of Labor called on the new Senator.

CLARK speaks quickly, incisively and with the keen expressiveness of the able trial lawyer that he used to be. At 55, his face is creased with many "thought lines."

The new Senator comes from a well-to-do Philadelphia family. But what's more impressive about him is the clear evidence that he seeks to put the public interest first.

One personal incident illustrates this better than a hundred generalities. Some years ago oil and gas were discovered on a small island off the Louisiana coast owned by Clark's family.

Despite this personal interest in higher oil and gas prices, CLARK last year—when he was mayor of Philadelphia—led the Nation's mayors in fighting the natural gas "gouge" bill. That bill would have raised gas prices to consumers by up to $600 million a year.

"I don't see why I should want to hog everything," said the new Senator this week when asked about that fight against his own pocketbook interest. "That was a very vicious bill. I'll fight it again this year when it comes up.

"Also," CLARK continued, "I'd like to knock the spots out of that depletion allowance." The depletion allowance is the tax loophole that enables many oil and gas producers to pay virtually no income taxes.

SOURCE OF NEEDED FUNDS

"If we could cut down the depletion allowance and cancel the special exemptions on stockholders' dividends, I believe we could raise $2 or $3 billion more in taxes without any rise in rates," CLARK pointed out. That money is gravely needed, he said, for social welfare improvements and also probably for national defense.

CLARK's election last November was an extraordinary personal triumph. He carried the State despite an Eisenhower sweep in Pennsylvania by over 600,000 votes. Harking back, CLARK said this week that organized labor's support proved an enormous help in his campaign.

Between 1952 and 1956 CLARK was an extremely popular and effective reform mayor of Philadelphia. But last fall, he noted, "I was known primarily only in the southeastern part of the State."

"However," he said, "in my campaign the sponsorship of the AFL, CIO, Mine Workers and Railroad Brotherhoods got me in the door with local people all over the State. That's what labor did for me, and it was a great advantage."

## INCREASED DUTY ON IMPORTS OF WATCH MOVEMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the administration has repeatedly stated that it believes in freer trade and that it wishes to promote a greater volume of exchange of goods among nations. However, when it has come down to specific decisions relating to free trade, the action has not always been consistent with the promise.

Most recently the Treasury Department, over the very sharp protests of Members of Congress, including Senators, key members of the House Ways and Means Committee, and the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, issued a ruling which in effect increases the duty on imports on many watch movements. This action was taken despite efforts on the part of Members of

Congress to persuade the administration to submit the question to Congress, on the ground that it amounted to legislation by the executive.

The leading editorial of the January 30, 1957, issue of the Journal of Commerce discusses, in a very informative manner the administration's promises and performance in the field of trade cooperation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial, entitled "Still a Question Mark," printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Journal of Commerce and Commercial of January 30, 1957]

STILL A QUESTION MARK

During most of the years since the war Congress has been the biggest question mark hanging over the foreign economic policy horizon. Would it extend the Trade Agreements Act? Would it approve customs simplification? Would it give the President authority to cut tariffs? And so on.

It is still a question mark. Congress has yet to approve United States participation in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, a very necessary administrative arm of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. It can still damage the machinery greatly by coming up suddenly with some specific import quota, as it has too often done in the past.

But right now another large question mark looms on the same horizon. How is the executive branch going to handle its foreign trade decisions this year? This may not be the larger of the two prime uncertainties, but it has been growing in size.

Three factors are tending to concentrate more and more of the crucial decisions affecting foreign trade in the hands of the White House.

First is the familiar requirement that the President weigh against the broader national interest each Tariff Commission recommendation for a duty increase or a quota on a specific import as a result of an escape clause proceeding.

The second is the effect of a section in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 which, in effect, directed the Office of Defense Mobilization and the White House to handle all pleas for greater tariff protection brought on grounds of defense essentiality.

The third, the most recent and the most difficult to assess is the administration's recent disposition to seek voluntary limitations on imports through persuasion rather than through compulsion. In one instance, involving oil, the American importers were asked to hold down incoming volume voluntarily. In another, involving Japanese textile goods, agreement was sought and obtained from the supplying country.

In view of this growing concentration of foreign trade policymaking in the executive branch, it is not surprising that those sensitive to policy decisions in this field should be watching this concentration with growing attention. The results, so far, have been mixed.

During the period 1953–56 the President was called to act on 15 escape clause cases. In only four instances did he modify or withdraw tariff concessions previously negotiated. In 2 instances he deferred action, and in 9 he declined to raise the tariff rate or otherwise restrict imports of the item in question. In this sense, the President's performance parallels closely his general goal of a more liberal trade policy.

On the other hand, Swiss watch imports have been continually harassed by the executive branch. They have been hit by a stiff tariff increase granted to preserve the essential defense skills of the domestic industry, by antitrust proceedings launched by the Department of Justice and by several investigations launched by the Treasury.

The Treasury's activities resulted in a ruling last week which reversed a 15-year policy on treating watch "adjustments." This, in effect, amounts to another duty increase on imports of many watch movements. In the case of watches, the administration's actions have been difficult to reconcile with its stated policies.

The uneven record compiled by the administration's actions on escape clause and defense essentiality cases is now raising considerable uncertainty as to the direction in which the "voluntary" or gentlemen's agreements to restrict imports are likely to take us.

We have no quarrel with the voluntary approach. In matters of trade—as in many other matters—it is always better to negotiate than to act unilaterally. An agreement of the type to which Japan will adhere in exporting cotton goods to this country is certainly to be preferred over a stiff tariff increase or a sudden import quota.

Yet, as we have pointed out previously, there are dangers in this approach to trade problems. What may on the surface appear to be a voluntary agreement may be something less than voluntary if its negotiation is accompanied by implicit warnings of unilateral action in the event that such an agreement is not reached.

The danger is that through such a system an administration could pursue one policy publicly, but quite another privately. We have no reason to believe the Eisenhower administration has any such purpose. But the existence of this danger is something to be kept in mind—especially in view of recent reports that some major foreign exporters to this country have heard "intimations" that they would do well to limit voluntarily their shipments to the American market.

On two occasions of late, President Eisenhower has made it plain that he wants to staff key posts in the executive branch with men who fully understand the importance of foreign trade to our national development and who fully share his own views as to its development.

Like Gov. Christian Herter, of Massachusetts, who will soon succeed Herbert Hoover, Jr., at the State Department, Gordon Gray is such a man. His appointment as Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization should go some distance in quieting the fears raised by ODM's handling of the watch import case—namely, that this organization might prove an easy way of securing higher tariffs by claiming defense essentiality.

In this sense, at least, the President is getting off to a good start on his second term in office.

## NEED OF MORE AID FACTS ON THE EISENHOWER MIDDLE EAST DOCTRINE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on last Saturday, January 26, 1957, the Minneapolis Morning Tribune published an editorial entitled "More Aid Facts Needed." The editorial states with precision the complaint which many of us have about the administration's presentation of the Eisenhower doctrine—not that we oppose the doctrine so much, as that we do not know what it is.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE AID FACTS NEEDED

Approval of President Eisenhower's Middle East doctrine by a 24 to 2 vote of the House Foreign Affairs Committee probably foreshadows its acceptance by Congress.

Yet Congress remains unhappy over the doctrine, and especially over the administration's request to spend $200 million in foreign aid funds in the area in the year ending next June 30.

The President properly puts a high priority on the need for foreign aid money. He told his news conference Wednesday that he needs the authority for both parts of his package—to send American troops on request to any nation threatened by the Communists and to provide military and economic aid—if the program is to succeed.

However, the administration has not advanced any specific plans for the use of the aid funds. With only 5 months left in the fiscal year, Congress is understandably concerned about the nature of the help the administration expects to provide in this area of the world. There has not even been a breakdown on the proposed division of the aid between military and economic assistance.

The President and Secretary of State Dulles both insist they cannot spell out the program they have in mind until after Congress authorizes the expenditure. The President says the "only way" he can find out exactly how to spend the $200 million is through the work of the mission headed by former Representative James Richards, of South Carolina, the former chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. And, Mr. Eisenhower says, the mission cannot leave until the congressional resolution has been passed.

Yet the administration's reluctance to outline any specific program, if it has one, probably will result in limitations on aid expendtures. The House Foreign Relations Committee already has stipulated that no more than $30 million in economic aid can go to any one country during the current fiscal year. Yet the House committee presumably had no more information—and probably had less—than the administration about the needs of the Middle East when it imposed this important—and perhaps even crippling—limitation.

There usually is conflict between the administration and Congress over plans for spending foreign aid funds. But the administration could have made a better case now for the needs of the area if it had not decided to rely entirely on the forthcoming Richards mission survey. After all, it must have had some specific plans in mind when it decided to ask Congress for authority to spend the $200 million by June 30.

Congress and the American people are entitled to know more about the general outlines of the foreign aid spending, even if the specific projects cannot yet be described.

## INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGED RACKETEERING IN THE LABOR MOVEMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, all of us will watch with interest the progress of the forthcoming investigation on alleged racketeering in the labor movement.

As a friend of organized labor, I wish to see the American labor movement clean, strong, and responsible. The few who abuse their power or are guilty of corruption, misuse of funds, or any other form of unethical conduct serve only to bring discredit upon the good name and

reputation of organized labor. Free unions are a part of the American political, social, and economic structure. It has taken courage, steadfastness of purpose, sacrifice, and great leadership to build the American labor movement. There is no room within its organization for those who would violate their trust.

It is to the everlasting credit and honor of organized labor in America that it has, at all times, been a vigorous opponent of all forms of totalitarianism at home and abroad. It has made significant contributions to the welfare of the American people and to the strength and progress of our political and economic institutions.

Mr. President, a year ago on the Senate floor I had occasion to refer to the remarkable labor-management relationship which has existed between local 1145, the Honeywell union, and the Honeywell Regulator Co., of Minneapolis, Minn. Mr. Robert I. Wishart, the secretary-treasurer of local 1145, is one of the Nation's most able and dedicated labor leaders. He and his union have gained the respect and confidence of the entire State of Minnesota. An article about labor-management cooperation in this company has just appeared in the latest issue of the Reader's Digest. The article is entitled "This Union Found the Best Way To Raise Wages," and is written by Karl Detzer. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS UNION FOUND THE BEST WAY TO RAISE WAGES—LABOR AND INDUSTRY EVERYWHERE CAN PROFIT FROM THE EXAMPLE OF THESE MINNEAPOLIS TEAMSTERS WHO JOINED WITH COMPANY MANAGEMENT TO CUT PRODUCTION COSTS

(By Karl Detzer)

Some 8,000 members of local 1145, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, work for the Minneapolis-Honeywell Co. in its huge Minneapolis shops. The union and the firm's management are in the midst of an all-out drive to make the company more prosperous than it already is.

This powerful local is no company stooge. It fights hard for its rights. Nor is the company a soft touch at any bargaining table. It stands up and demands its own rights. But both company and employees are convinced that they are in the same economic boat, and that they must pull together if there are going to be enough profits to give each a worthwhile share. Both know that a picket line is never a substitute for a humming production line when it comes to take-home pay or dividends. One result of this realistic viewpoint is that there has not been a strike since 1942, when local 1145 became the bargaining agent for the workers in the plant. Arguments, to be sure; grievances, complaints; but never a strike.

In the early autumn of 1954, after 12 years of industrial peace, labor and management concluded that an increase in sales of Honeywell products would benefit both, and that a joint effort in that direction should be planned.

More sales, the union recognized, depended in part on keeping the price of Honeywell products competitive and the quality high; therefore, union and management—everyone from executives, engineers, and foremen to truck drivers and clerks—should together declare war on waste, an expensive factor in every industry, waste of materials, motions and minutes, waste of brawn and brains, waste of talent and experience, of personnel.

"Many a man down there in the shop," the union pointed out, "is performing jobs that experience and commonsense tell him could be done more easily. The fellow on the floor could show us how to take short cuts that have not occurred to some of the best engineers."

Men and women from both sides of the bargaining table went to work together on their mutual problem. They drew up a plan they called "POP"—"Planning Our Progress." The plan had hardly passed the blueprint stage, however, when one department began to lay men off.

"I was worried," says Robert Wishart, the energetic and determined secretary-treasurer of the local and its spokesman ever since it was formed. "Every layoff worries everyone in both management and labor. But here was a chance to prove that our POP idea would work."

So that the new scheme should be clearly understood by everyone, POP leaders hired the immense civic auditorium, and some 10,000 Minneapolis-Honeywell plant and office employees and their husbands and wives crowded into the building. They ranged from the company president, Paul Wishart—no relation to the union leader—through department heads and foremen, mechanics and clerks, to the sweepers. The two Wisharts outlined the "Planning Our Progress" scheme. Standing together on the platform, they stressed the necessity of teamwork up and down the line.

Next day 500 union stewards and committeemen joined management representatives in the campaign. They began by studying each section of each shop, and each individual job.

Union members and management soon were devising schemes to prevent useless effort and wasted materials. They saw to it that no one loafed. They cut carelessness. There was no speedup but simpler ways were found to do many jobs. Within a few weeks production costs began to show a slow, steady decline. A penny here, a penny there, added up to substantial totals.

After scores of small changes the department that had laid off so many men had cut production costs to a figure low enough to stimulate sales. At the same time, quality improved. Within a few months every one of the idle employees who wanted work was back on the payroll, and the company was putting on extra help.

In another shop it had taken Honeywell 42 different operations to machine a part of an Army ordnance instrument. This not only made production expensive but with so many opportunities for error the percentage of rejections was extremely high. After careful study the union-management team found ways to eliminate half a dozen of the operations.

Then one of the union men made a simple suggestion. "Why don't we transfer the operation on which we are having the most trouble to a different machine?" he asked. "See that fellow over there? He's the best machinist in this shop, never satisfied with anything that's not 100 percent accurate. Yet he turns out a lot of work. Right now he's on a job that doesn't call for such skill." That suggestion really paid off.

Honeywell makes many instruments which, by reacting to heat and cold, turn electric current on and off. Several of these contain a liquid that vaporizes at a certain temperature. The liquid used was expensive. The labor-management team in this shop suggested a new, cheaper liquid. Company chemists began immediate tests, found that the proposed substitute was exactly as efficient as the old liquid. The change was made at a monthly saving of $1,000.

"We're cutting costs and the company is raising wages," Union Leader Bob Wishart points out. "Here at Honeywell the workers simply give full, intelligent value for what they get."

A shop employee puts it this way: "We used to talk about a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. Now we talk about a good day's work for a good day's pay."

Employee grievances reaching the arbitration table have dropped 25 percent. There are as many grievances as before, but today when an employee feels he has been wronged he and his union steward and his department foreman often settle the matter quickly on the shop floor. Molehills remain molehills.

The workers have cause for satisfaction. For while they help the company increase its profits, they also cash in handsomely on those same profits. In the 2 years of POP, wages and annual benefits combined rose $2 million. In individual pay envelopes this means raises of from 14 to 26 cents on hour. The least-skilled production worker now receives $1.51½ an hour, skilled workers as much as $2.91½.

But this is only part of the story. Last winter local 1145 printed a broadside listing some of the results of its—and the management's—unusual policies. "Through good management relations," the union reported, "members of local 1145 enjoy the following: arbitration of all disputes; double time for Sundays and holidays; a pension plan; vacations with pay; job protection; fair seniority rules; free paid insurance and free death gratuity to all members; bonuses for night work; good wages; excellent working conditions; guaranties of no racial or religious discrimination." Remember, that's the union—not the company—speaking.

In these days of much talk of "labor bosses," it is refreshing to find local 1145 completely unbossed. It makes all its important decisions by secret ballot that actually is secret. No one in this union ever tries to push anyone around.

Bob Wishart, asked if he believes in the guaranteed annual wage, replies: "It can best be achieved through full employment, which management and our union have achieved at Honeywell."

Does he advocate the closed shop?

"It is not necessary when labor and management work together."

He does feel that labor unions should take an active part in worthwhile community projects. No corporation in Minnesota is more deeply involved in public matters than the union he represents. So impressive has been its contribution to good government, to public health and welfare under his leadership, that 3 years ago the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce and Time magazine named him one of the city's 100 most outstanding young men.

Last St. Patrick's Day 500 foremen representing the management and 500 shop stewards and committeemen representing the union sat down together at dinner to plan improvements in the "POP" program. "From now on," they decided, "we will try to eliminate all waste. We will not be satisfied so long as there is any wasted effort, any wasted time."

Honeywell's employees have raised their sights and are out to make this year the best in the history of the company—best for management, for stockholders, and for every person in the immense plant.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is constructive records like that of local 1145, in Minneapolis, which are a part of the honorable history and tradition of the labor-union movement. These things must not be forgotten when charges of racketeering and corruption hit the headlines and attract public notice.

During the 82d Congress, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations, I served as chairman of subcommittee hearings aimed at exposing and eliminating Communist influence or domination in labor unions. In that inquiry I had the wholehearted cooperation of organized labor and its leadership. That the same kind of cooperation will be forthcoming in the prospective investigation of racketeering is clear from the position just adopted by the AFL–CIO executive council.

In recent years, I, too, have had a deep concern about the protection and care of union welfare funds. Literally millions of dollars of the funds belonging to employees and union members have been entrusted to union officials for safekeeping and proper investment. Fortunately, most of the funds—indeed, the vast majority—have been guarded with zeal, honor, and integrity. There have been charges, however, of some abuses and misuse of such funds. Therefore, in 1954 I introduced proposed legislation aimed at trying to eliminate abuses and misuse of such funds, and I have been pressing for congressional action in this important area of labor-management relations.

Racketeering, corruption, abuse of power, or subversion are wrong wherever they are found, be it in labor, business, government, or any other institution of our society. I am pleased to see the friendly response of the responsible national leaders of organized labor concerning the plans of the Senate to make a thorough investigation of the charges of racketeering and corruption. It is our joint responsibility to keep this inquiry objective, and not to permit it to become an antilabor sounding board. The inquiry should be centered upon the real abuses and the few persons who may be guilty of violating their trust.

## PROPOSED INCREASE IN TRADE-IN ALLOWANCES FOR TANKERS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, an editorial entitled "Santa on the Seas" appeared in the Washington Post under date of December 22, 1956. In the editorial there is discussed a proposed new policy of the Maritime Administration, by which it would allow greater trade-in allowances for tankers than that presently authorized by Congress. Mr. Morse, the Administrator, is quoted as recognizing that this change will necessitate action by Congress. However, he is also quoted as saying, "I will leave open the trade-in value of tankers for later determination," thereby indicating that he will ask Congress for additional legislative authority.

I think notice should be served at this point that any effort on the part of the Maritime Administration to commit the United States Government to greater trade-in allowances than those presently authorized by existing law will be resisted.

It should be noted that the suggested change in the trade-in allowance, as recommended by the Maritime Administration, would have the net effect of allowing the shipowners substantially greater trade-in allowances than the original cost of the ships, when purchased from the United States Government. Congress has defeated this proposal before, and I am confident Congress will do so again.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, as published in the Washington Post on December 22, 1956, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of December 22, 1956]

SANTA ON THE SEAS

There seems to be no limit to what Maritime Administrator Clarence G. Morse hopes to do for the subsidized American merchant marine. Not content with proposing to give unauthorized and unjustified world market trade-in allowances to the subsidized operators on all their old dry cargo vessels, he is now seeking a way to bestow the same kind of largess in connection with tanker trade-ins.

A Maritime Administration committee on ship valuations finally yielded to Mr. Morse and went along with his dry cargo ship trade-in policy in spite of the restrictions in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The committee refused, however, to recommend more than the law allows on tanker trade-ins, since the law's requirements on this point are even clearer. This latter advice Mr. Morse rejected, saying, as though he were Congress itself, "I will leave open the trade-in value of tankers for later determination." Now he is trying to figure a way to get Congress to change the tanker law, eliminating the wise proviso that the Government can pay no more for these used vessels than the depreciated cost to the operator.

Fortunately, none of this monkey business yet has been sanctioned by the Comptroller General or the Budget Bureau. The matter deserves a full airing in the new Congress, in any case, since the Morse policies, if pursued in the growing merchant marine replacement program, could mean a drain on the Treasury running into the hundreds of millions. Even more important, the congressional and public ire this ill-conceived policy is bound to provoke might seriously delay if not wreck the important program to modernize the merchant fleet.

This program is so important, in fact, that if Mr. Morse will undertake to demonstrate that new or bigger subsidies are required to accomplish it—either in the long run, or to sustain the supertanker program undertaken in connection with the Suez closure—he will command broad support. So far, however, there has been no suggestion of public need of either a permanent or crisis nature in the Morse maneuvers. The American Merchant Marine Institute has not seen fit to petition for liberalized tanker trade-ins. Perhaps the responsible segments of the maritime industry recognize that the future of their subsidized business is closely linked to continuing public approval and do not wish to jeopardize what they have by an unwarranted grab for more.

## ADOPT-A-SHIP PROGRAM

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, one of the major obstacles that has always faced the maritime industry of our country has been the lack of understanding of its problems and its important part in our economy by our people generally, and particularly those in the noncoastal areas.

To help overcome this situation, the Propeller Club of the United States initiated, in 1936, an adopt-a-ship program for use in the schools. Under this program the children of a particular school would adopt a particular vessel of our merchant fleet, correspond with its officers and crew, and study the operation of that vessel as a part of the foreign commerce of the Nation.

In 1937 sponsorship of the adopt-a-ship program was transferred to the women's organization for the American Merchant Marine, Inc., and that splendid group has carried on the work with a great deal of success and, I am sure, a great deal of benefit to the merchant marine and to the many children involved.

I was favored to receive a letter concerning the workings of the program from Mrs. Fred N. Hansen, director of the plan, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD, so that all Members of the Congress may have opportunity to acquaint themselves with this forward-looking program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WOMEN'S ORGANIZATION FOR THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE, INC.,
*New York, N. Y., January 14, 1957.*

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
*Chairman, Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: Congratulations on your stand against the transfer of American merchant ships to foreign registry, and good luck as you present your bill this week which will necessitate approval of the board.

Because of your extreme interest in American-flag shipping, may we call your attention to the adopt-a-ship plan sponsored by the Women's Organization for the American Merchant Marine, Inc. As perhaps you know, this plan was originally introduced by the Propeller Club of the United States in 1936 and was turned over to the women's organization in 1937. Because of the war years, much of its activity, of necessity, was curtailed. The plan was reactivated in earnest and put into effect in 1954–55 with 60 American-flag ships adopted, and the present school year finds 252 American-flag ships receiving and answering correspondence from children in schools covering 35 States.

Of particular interest to you might be the fact that 8 ship adoptions have been assigned to schools in your own State of Washington. Two have proved outstanding—one, the Ahtanum Valley School in Yakima, who adopted the S. S. *Expeditor*, and another, the Burton Elementary School, Burton, who adopted the S. S. *Excellency*. These happen to be both export ships, but we also have represented in the State of Washington adoptions from the United States Lines Co., the American President Lines, Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., and the Isthmian Steamship Co., all of which is bringing vital information by direct contact with American-flag shipping.

The adopt-a-ship plan has grown greatly through the voluntary efforts of the Women's Organization of the American Merchant Marine, Inc., but we still need more support from the shiping operators to fulfill the additional requests from teachers for ship adoptions, for we lack sufficient ships.

Your support of this plan would be greatly appreciated. For your further interest and information, we are enclosing brochure which outlines the general procedure of the

plan; also reprints covering some of last year's activities, which includes a teacher's report from the Burton, Wash., school.

Sincerely yours,

Amelia H. Hansen,
Mrs. FRED N. HANSEN,
*Director, Adopt-a-Ship Plan.*

## EXPORT MARKETING OF GRAIN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last July 3, in an address in this chamber, I called upon the Secretary of Agriculture to quit socializing the grain trade by taking over more and more of the export markets from private channels.

My remarks were made only after I had privately urged the Department for several weeks to act favorably on recommendations originating with the Minneapolis Grain Exchange.

In my remarks here I declared that an administrative decision along the lines I advocated would firm up wheat and other grain prices in the market place and reduce the flow of commodities into government hands.

Mr. President, perhaps my colleagues will be interested in subsequent developments.

At the time of my presentation in the Senate in July of last year, I indicated to my colleagues I would give them information, as time went on, relating to the success of the program, or at least the developments of the export program.

Eventually, the Department of Agriculture concurred in the course I had outlined in the Senate, and put into effect changes in its export program.

Mr. President, I have in my hand an article from the January, 1957, issue of Greater Minneapolis, published by the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce, entitled "Grain Marketing and the Government". It was written by Robert L. Searles, Minneapolis futures broker, and is a report on what happened under the changed policies which I had been advocating for months.

The article reads, in part:

> The first and most dramatic result was a swiftly rising wheat market. During the first two weeks of July, 1956, Chicago December wheat traded between $2.09 and $2.15 per bushel. When the new export program was announced on July 13th, the market immediately advanced to a trading range of $2.19 to $2.23. By the time the export plan went into effect on September 4, the market had reached $2.27. Since that time the added demand for export wheat has pushed the Chicago December wheat as high as $2.47 per bushel.

I think those statistics within themselves point up the effectiveness of this type of program. If the unit price a bushel were multiplied by the number of bushels of wheat produced in the United States, the tremendous economic impact of a program such as I have been discussing soon would be understandable to all.

The article further shows that more farmers are redeeming their wheat loans; in other words, selling on the open market and repaying their loans, instead of letting the wheat go into Government hands.

Mr. President, I am convinced the evidence substantiates the argument I voiced throughout the last year that much more could be done, through administrative policies of the Department of Agriculture, to improve the price position of farm commodities, and that much of it could be done by encouraging more movement through private trade.

I repeat what I said a year ago, that we do have a splendid marketing establishment in private trade channels. There is no need for its being supplanted by the Government. The job of the Government is to supplement, not supplant.

When Government decisions depress the market, it merely drives more commodities into Government hands. When Government decisions help stir activity and bidding in the open market, the result is fewer commodities falling into Government hands.

I recommend consideration of the results of this experiment in wheat to those concerned about similar problems involving the export of cotton.

Mr. President, I know the Department of Agriculture has been concerned again as to whether or not it should try to sell some of its surplus cotton through the normal cotton-trade facilities, such as the cotton exchanges, or whether it should be done entirely by Government. I call upon the Department of Agriculture to utilize, in the handling of cotton, the experience it has had in the case of wheat. I lay no claim at all to being an expert on the marketing of cotton, but I do know if there is any doubt as to what to do, the Department ought to resolve that doubt in line with the experience it has had in the handling of wheat.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of a press summary of my remarks on this subject last year, as well as the complete article from Greater Minneapolis to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the summary and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### EXPORT WHEAT FROM FREE MARKET INSTEAD OF CCC, SENATOR HUMPHREY URGES

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, yesterday called upon the Secretary of Agriculture to quit socializing the grain trade by taking over more and more of the export markets from private channels.

Urging the Department of Agriculture to accept proposals submitted by the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives and the National Grain Trade Council to export wheat from the free market instead of out of CCC stocks, Senator HUMPHREY said in a Senate speech that such a course would "firm up wheat and other grain prices in the market place, and reduce the flow of commodities into Government hands."

"For weeks the Department has had before it recommendations of the private grain trade for halting the drift toward State trading," Senator HUMPHREY said. "They are good, sound recommendations—from experienced people who know what they are talking about. Yet the Department appears reluctant to accept them * * * Secretary Benson has been so frightened by the bugaboo of surplus created by Republican propagandists that he lacks either the vision or understanding to deal boldly with the problem of firming up farm prices, apparently being willing to drift with the tide.

"It seems strange indeed that some of us who have worked long and vigorously for an effective farm program—and been often wrongly accused of seeking to socialize agriculture—should now have to speak out in defense of our country's private grain marketing system.

"It seems even more strange that an administration supposedly dedicated to furtherance of free enterprise and preservation of free markets should be the most reluctant to serve those very purposes. Yet that is now the situation that confronts us," Senator HUMPHREY said.

Senator HUMPHREY added that in recent weeks "many experienced men from within the grain trade have sadly confessed that this administration has done more to socialize the marketing of grain than happened under all the previous years of farm programs.

"I have heard that similar admissions have been made by Republican-appointed officials within the Department of Agriculture, in their frustration over inability to get top officials to recognize the reality of what they are doing," he added.

Senator HUMPHREY said there was nothing inconsistent about "efforts to protect producers through effective farm programs being coupled with just as strong a desire to protect our private marketing system.

"Our farm price support loan programs to bolster producer prices were intended to work within the framework of normal trade practices and facilities, not supplant them entirely with Government sales," he declared.

Instead of actually disposing of surplus, he warned, the Department of Agriculture "is following administrative and sales policies which just mean more and more of the total production must run through Government hands, taking over more and more of the normal markets formerly served by private traders and exporters."

Returning export markets to the private trade by providing subsidies covering the difference between domestic and world market prices, Senator HUMPHREY said "would restore active bidding for the farmers' grain in the market place, boost wheat prices by 12 to 16 cents a bushel right now, and cut down on the amount of grain going into Government hands." Senator HUMPHREY called attention to previous efforts during the farm-bill debate to convince the Department of Agriculture it was inviting more surplus problems, rather than less, by its sales policies of displacing private sales and competing with the farmer himself.

---

[From Greater Minneapolis of January 1957]

### GRAIN MARKETING AND THE GOVERNMENT

(By Robert L. Searles)

Several months have passed since the new export payment-in-kind program went into effect for United States wheat moving to foreign markets. An examination of the results of this program shows that a great step has been taken to divorce the Government from some of its entanglements in grain marketing.

When this export plan was proposed last spring by James F. Mullin, then president of the Minneapolis Grain Exchange, the grain trade in the United States was frustrated by a fast-growing monopoly of grain marketing functions by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Simply stated, the Government's price-support program attracted a large percentage of each crop, the CCC was filling virtually all export demand out of its own stocks, and the grain trade was struggling to keep its head above water in competition with a $14 billion Government corporation.

Probably the worst aspect of this situation (which still exists in many farm products other than wheat) is that the farmer produces to turn his crop over to the United States Government instead of looking to the marketplace and consumer demand.

This fact alone has worried Government men, as well as others, for years. The specific mechanics of the CCC operation do not have to be outlined here. Suffice it to say, that Government wheat operations were

mammoth. Under price-support operations the CCC acquired large quantities of wheat in recent years.

| Year beginning July: | *Millions of bushels acquired* |
|---|---|
| 1952 | 397,000,000 |
| 1953 | 486,100,000 |
| 1954 | 391,400,000 |
| 1955 | 264,600,000 |

At the same time exports (principally out of Government stocks) ran as follows:

| Year beginning July: | *Millions of bushels exported* |
|---|---|
| 1952 | 317,700,000 |
| 1953 | 217,000,000 |
| 1954 | 274,200,000 |
| 1955 | 344,900,000 |

It is easy to see that the CCC was acting as a market, taking in wheat with one hand and paying it out with the other.

Under the new payment-in-kind program, wheat is exported by the competitive grain trade. The wheat shipped out of the United States must be bought in the open market, thus adding commercial demand in United States markets for millions of bushels of wheat each year.

Since the price support program raises domestic wheat prices well above world price levels, all wheat exports are subsidized in one form or another. When the CCC stocks were used for export the grain was acquired at the high price support level and then exported at the lower world price. The difference was reflected as the national cost of price support operations and shows up as a loss on the CCC annual statement. Congressional appropriations make up the deficit.

Under the payment-in-kind program, the exporter buys the wheat in the market place and is then paid a subsidy in the form of CCC wheat. The combination of high priced "free" wheat and the CCC subsidy wheat bring the value of the total to the world market price. The cost of this operation still must be paid by the taxpayer.

The purposes of the change from the CCC type of exportation to the competitive market type of exportation are many. Primary among these aims was to raise domestic wheat prices to a level whereby United States farmers would sell more wheat in the open market and put less under CCC loan. It has restored to firms in grain marketing their traditional functions. Cutting down CCC grain manipulation and increasing exports by drawing upon competitive marketing skills were also ends sought under this program.

Just how well have these ends been achieved since the program was announced July 13, and since it was put into effect on September 4? The first and most dramatic result was a swiftly rising wheat market. An example of this advancing market is seen in Chicago future prices. During the first 2 weeks of July 1956, Chicago December wheat traded between $2.09 and $2.15 per bushel. When the new export program was announced on July 13 the market immediately advanced to a trading range of $2.19 to $2.23. By the time the export plan went into effect on September 4 the market had reached $2.27. Since that time the added demand for export wheat has pushed Chicago December wheat as high as $2.47 per bushel.

The price effect noted here is duplicated in the other wheat markets, but to a lesser degree. Kansas City December wheat has been up as much as 21 cents per bushel since July 13, and Minneapolis wheat has risen as much as 14 cents per bushel.

The principal price rise has occurred where the least supplies of wheat exist; the soft red winter wheat area served by the Chicago market. In the Southwest, where hard red winter wheat is in the greatest surplus position, a lesser advance has taken place. In the spring wheat area served by the Minneapolis market, the least price rise took place. This was due to a higher price level to begin with in this area, and also somewhat due to the fact that the valuable protein in spring wheat is running from ½ to 1 percent lower than last year. In addition the spring wheat harvest was under way when the program began.

Many factors influence grain prices, and it can't be said that the new export program is the sole cause of the higher prices. While total wheat exports under the new program (as of year's end) are 138 million bushels since September 4, it must be remembered that world political unrest and actual fighting in Egypt and Hungary have stimulated foreign wheat buying and stockpiling. Crop conditions in foreign lands also figure in a large way in United States wheat exports. Our own soil-bank program is another factor in wheat prices. Therefore, a healthy flow of export wheat stems from many causes, not just the new export program. However, it is reasonable to say that the program is a strong contributing factor in wheat export since free market incentives and competition are used to advantage.

How is it with the United States wheat farmer? Is he using Federal price support loans more or less than before? Paradoxically, he has more wheat under loan so far this year than last. The agricultural marketing service of the Department of Agriculture reports that through November 15, 1956, farmers placed 219,207,588 bushels of 1956 wheat under price support loans and purchase agreements. A year ago the figure was 208,553,480 bushels. However, the farmer has withdrawn 15.8 million bushels as of November 15 versus less than two million a year ago.

Evidently, the wheat farmer is trying to hold title to more wheat this year because he is looking for higher wheat prices later in the year. The farmer is traditionally a speculator in the commodities he produces, and this year he has even greater reason to use the price support loan to help him delay wheat sales in the hope that the market will be higher later in the year. Actually, the major wheat markets in the country have been consistently above loan levels for several months, in some cases as much as 20 cents per bushel higher. The farmer with wheat under loan is apparently looking for even higher prices. In any event the loan protects him from severe losses.

The true test of this phase of the export program will be seen when the CCC finally takes over wheat and defaulted price-support loans. The amount of wheat so acquired in recent years is listed earlier in this article. The figure which we will see in the spring of 1957 (annual takeover of defaulted wheat usually takes place in March or April), will give the answer to this part of the program. Surely if market prices continue firm, farmers will choose to redeem their wheat loans, sell the wheat in the open market, and relieve the CCC of the burden of handling vast new quantities of 1956 crop wheat. But time alone will tell.

As far as the free markets are concerned the new export program has been a welcome turnabout from years of socialization of grain marketing. No other industry in the United States has been so afflicted with the virus of statism in recent years. The ebb and flow of trade in the country's wheat markets has returned to a more healthy condition. Competition, initiative, and service to customers have replaced the heavy hand of State marketing. The grain trade itself is earnestly hoping that this revival can spread out to cover other price-supported grains. Far-sighted leaders in the grain marketing industry can see in this type of program a chance to blend farm-aid programs with free competitive markets to the advantage of farmers, processor, and consumer alike.

A strong appeal to the highest political and economic principles has been the keynote of this export plan. The Department of Agriculture and the competitive marketing system have already seen that commonsense principles have very practical benefits. Certainly people in agriculture, both in and out of Government, can see in this example a hope for changing farm-aid programs in the future so that free markets are used to the fullest extent.

---

## RETIREMENT AND OTHER PRIVILEGES FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I understand that Calendar No. 43, Senate bill 607, is the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will not be automatically laid before the Senate until 2 o'clock, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 43, Senate bill 607.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 607) to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement from the report of the committee relative to the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement from the report (No. 47) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The principal purpose of this bill is to make provisions for meeting the living expenses and office expenses of former Presidents of the United States. The bill also provides for pensions of $10,000 a year for widows of former Presidents. The bill would be applicable with respect to Presidents whose terms of office are already ended and also with respect to Presidents whose terms of office end in the future.

There are many reasons why legislation of this character is desirable and should be enacted. The Presidency is the greatest office within the gift of the American people. The words and deeds of the man who holds it are of vast significance not only to Americans but to the people of all the world. We expect—and rightly so—that he who holds that office should dedicate himself with a consuming and singleminded purpose to discharging the duties of his office to the best of his ability. In return, we should do all we can to relieve his mind of concern over his personal affairs. This is not only a matter of equity, it is a matter of good business for the American people. The financial cost

of maintaining the Presidential office is infinitesimal in relation to the critical importance—even the life-and-death importance—which its decisions have in the lives of all of us.

The interest of the American people in the President does not cease when his term of office has ended. Neither does his obligation to maintain the dignity of that great office, nor his opportunity to be of service to the public good. There has been wide recognition of the fact that a man who serves as President gains a unique and invaluable experience thereby, and that somehow the benefit of this experience should be made available for public service. There have been a number of proposals as to how this might best be done. We do not at this time propose any definitive solution of this matter. We agree that the way should be open to utilize the services of former Presidents when that is appropriate. We are inclined to the view that no attempt should be made to establish a fixed pattern for doing this, but rather that it should be left to be determined in the circumstances of each particular case. However, this is perfectly clear to us: the matter ought not to be determined on the basis of financial stringency in any case. In other words, when and if any former President can be called upon for public service, there ought to be no financial bars standing in the way.

Moreover, any man who serves as President by that very fact becomes an important public figure for the rest of his life. Whether or not he is thereafter called on for any official service, there are many demands upon him in the form of public appearances, correspondence, and otherwise. These are legitimate demands and they should be met; but they can entail substantial expenditures.

With all of this, we expect a former President to engage in no business or occupation which would demean the office he has held or capitalize upon it in any improper way. There are many ways in which a former President can earn a large income, but ought not to. Paradoxically, while his earning power is greatly increased by the fact of his having been President, the field in which it is right and proper for him to use his earning power may well be narrowed far beyond that which is available to other men. We believe that a former President should take very seriously his obligation to maintain the dignity of that office insofar as it appertains to him for the remainder of his life. It follows that there is an obligation upon the Government to see that it is financially possible for him to do so without hardship to himself and his family.

Some men who find themselves in this position may be wealthy enough individually to meet all the demands upon them without financial difficulty. But we do not want to depend on this. With the Presidency, as with other political offices, the opportunity of holding office and meeting its demands should not be confined to the wealthy. In short, the Government should provide adequate compensation and other facilities for former Presidents to enable them without financial hardship to maintain the dignity of the great office they have held, to meet the public demands upon them, and to make themselves available for further public service whenever they are called upon in appropriate cases.

In the judgment of the committee, this bill (S. 307) makes reasonable provisions for this purpose.

The first subsection of the bill, as reported, provides that each former President of the United States shall be entitled, as long as he shall live, to receive a monetary allowance at the rate of $25,000 a year, payable monthly by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Subsection (b) provides that the Administrator of General Services shall provide for each former President an administrative assistant, a secretary, and other secretarial and clerical assistants. All these staff assistants are to be selected and their respective rates of compensation fixed by the former President; but their aggregate compensation is not to exceed the aggregate authorized for the staff of a Senator from the least populous State of the Union.

Subsection (c) provides that the Administrator of General Services shall furnish suitable office space for each former President, located in a Federal building at such place within the United States as the former President shall specify.

Subsection (d) provides the franking privilege for mail sent by each former President. The postal revenues are to be reimbursed out of the general funds of the Treasury in an amount equal to the postage which would otherwise be payable on such mail. This is in line with the policy established by the Congress last year for the reimbursement of the Post Office Department for penalty or franked mails.

Subsection (e) provides that the widow of any former President shall receive a pension at the rate of $10,000 a year. The Congress has from time to time in the past provided pensions at the rate of $5,000 a year for some of the widows of former Presidents by special legislation applicable to particular cases. This bill would establish a provision of general applicability for widows of former Presidents and would fix the rate at $10,000 for those who are already receiving pensions as well as any additional ones not now receiving pensions.

Subsection (f) contains a definition of the term "former President."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the talk is rather loud and broad throughout the country concerning the excessiveness of the cost of government. In reading this bill I discover that it involves an expenditure of only $25,000 a year, to provide certain clerical help and mailing service for retired Presidents.

My respect for former President Hoover and former President Truman is deep. When the bill is approached from the standpoint of the $25,000 a year cost, as against a $70 billion budget, the amount is akin to a drop of rain falling into the ocean.

To me, however, there is a principle involved, and that principle deals with the constant increase in the cost of government. If we urge economy in government, the practice of economy ought to begin at the highest level. We cannot expect economy in the lower echelons unless we who are in charge practice it in those quarters where we set the example and have control. I cannot help thinking of the proverbial camel, the back of which was broken by placing upon it one lone straw. The accumulation of many straws finally broke the camel's back. In my judgment it is the accumulation of these small weights and their addition to the burden which, in finality, is making the cost of government so great.

Based upon the reasoning which I have just expounded, and having respect for the purposes of the bill, realizing that it involves only $25,000, so far as I am concerned, it involves a principle, and I wish to go on record as opposing the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this bill represents in my opinion belated recognition of an important fact of American political life.

It is that the President of the United States remains a public figure after he retires from office.

The measure that is before the Senate does not represent a pension or a recognition of past services and past performances. It is based upon the reality that the American people still look to an ex-President for advice, for counsel, and for inspiration in their moments of trial.

The Office of President is one that is unique in this world. Upon the shoulders of the President fall all the burdens of speaking for the Nation; of uniting the people in times of stress and peril; and of making basic decisions of war and peace.

He conducts the foreign policy of the United States; he is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces; he is the administrative head of our Government with all its branches and agencies. No man who fills these functions can ever again be a private citizen.

Only 33 men in our history have occupied this exalted but lonely position. Of the 32 former Presidents, only 2 are still living—and those 2 illustrate to perfection the point I am making.

One is former President Herbert Hoover. The other is former President Harry S Truman.

These are men who served their country in trying times. They discharged their obligations to their office with patriotism, with selflessness and with a determination to do what they thought was right.

They had their trials and their tribulations. They were misunderstood by some people, and praised extravagantly by others. They saw things differently, and they acted according to their convictions.

But they were united in their determination to preserve their country. I believe that one of the events of the past decade that truly warmed the hearts of many people was when President Truman called upon former President Hoover to serve the country—and former President Hoover responded enthusiastically.

Mr. President, this is one of the great examples in our history that men can put patriotism above partisanship—country above party.

This bill represents a modest recognition of the public character of a former President. It merely provides:

A $25,000 a year allowance.

An office staff paid on the basis of a sum which shall not exceed the allotment to a Senator from the least populous State of the Union.

Suitable office space.

The franking privilege—with the costs reimbursed by the Treasury.

A pension for the widow of any former President. I am informed that this bill would apply to only three widows.

Personally, I wish that we could find ways and means of making greater use of the services of former Presidents. They have a type of experience and knowledge that can be gained by no other men.

But for the moment, we can content ourselves with taking this one step—a step which rises above partisanship and recognizes the true nature of the greatest office in the world.

A bill identical with this one was considered most carefully during the 84th Congress. It was studied by Democrats and Republicans in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and it was unanimously reported by that committee.

It was considered by the entire membership of the Senate. It was passed by the Senate without a dissenting vote. Today we find on our calendar, as a result of a favorable report by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the identical bill we passed in the 84th Congress, but which died in the House.

I am hopeful that the Senate will take the same action today that it took in the 84th Congress, because such action is merited and deserved.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it might be well to note at this time, following the explanation given by the distinguished Senator from Texas, that former President Herbert Hoover is in the city today and will receive—and probably has already received at a noon luncheon—a high civilian award for the kind of outstanding work the distinguished majority leader has referred to.

Also, I should like to say that I know of no man in the United States who gets more mail than Harry Truman, and I know of no one who likes to answer mail more than Harry Truman does [laughter]; and that mail is more or less of a public nature.

Of course, I am in favor of the bill. However, I should like to offer one thought. I have several times introduced bills and resolutions providing for a constitutional amendment which would make it possible for us to make more use of the abilities of our ex-Presidents by having them appointed Senators-at-large of the United States.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], who has made a very forceful presentation of his reasons for voting against the bill. I am opposed to the bill, and I desire the RECORD to show my opposition to it.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with what the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] have said on the pending bill. I should like the RECORD to show my opposition to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 607) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That each former President of the United States shall be entitled, as long as he shall live, to receive a monetary allowance at the rate of $25,000 per annum, payable monthly by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(b) The Administrator of General Services shall, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, provide for each former President a staff consisting of an administrative assistant, a secretary, and other secretarial and clerical assistants. Persons employed under this subsection shall be selected by the former President and shall be responsible only to him for the performance of their duties. Each former President shall fix basic rates of compensation for persons employed for him under this paragraph which in the aggregate shall not exceed the aggregate amount provided by law for the basic compensation of the administrative assistant, secretary, and other secretarial and clerical assistants authorized for a Senator from the least populous State of the Union; and the persons so employed shall also receive additional compensation at the rates provided by law for employees in the offices of Senators.

(c) The Administrator of General Services shall furnish for each former President suitable office space appropriately furnished and equipped, as determined by the Administrator, located in a Federal building at such place within the United States as the former President shall specify.

(d) Each former President shall be entitled to conveyance within the United States and its Territories and possessions free of postage of all mail matter sent by him under his written autograph signature. The postal revenues shall be reimbursed each fiscal year out of the general funds of the Treasury in an amount equivalent to the postage which would otherwise be payable on such mail matter.

(e) The widow of any former President of the United States shall be entitled to receive a pension at the rate of $10,000 per annum, payable monthly by the Secretary of the Treasury, if such widow shall waive the right to any annuity or pension under any other act of Congress.

(f) As used in this section, the term "former President" means an individual who shall have held the office of President of the United States, and whose service in such office shall have been terminated other than by removal pursuant to section 4, article II, of the Constitution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill (S. 607) was passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

---

## NATIONAL CONSERVATION ANNIVERSARY COMMISSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 42, Senate Joint Resolution 35.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 35) to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the first conference of State governors for the protection, in the public interest, of the natural resources of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, nothing could be more important to the people of the United States than the conservation and protection of the great natural resources of our country.

Near the end of the last session of Congress the Senate passed without objection Senate Joint Resolution 139 to establish a Commission to arrange a 50th anniversary celebration of the beginning of the conservation movement on a national basis. A conference of State governors, called in 1908 by President Theodore Roosevelt, is regarded in the resolution as the beginning of the national conservation movement. The fact that there were many prior conservation efforts, but not nationally organized, is fully recognized.

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported the measure favorably last year after a day of hearings at which Mrs. Gifford Pinchot, Mr. James Cagney, a representative of more than 30 of the big conservation organizations, two farm organizations and others appeared in behalf of the proposal. Statements were filed by Mr. Morris L. Cooke, head of President Truman's National Water Policy Commission; Mr. William S. Paley, head of one of our great broadcasting systems and chairman of the Materials Policy Commission of 1950–51, the National Reclamation Association, and many others.

I have reintroduced the resolution in this Congress for myself and 64 cosponsors. It is identical to the resolution the Senate passed only a few months ago.

In order to give such a Commission time to organize, plan and prepare for an anniversary year in 1958, it is urgent that the Congress enact the joint resolution promptly. I know of no controversy or opposition to it.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] for having this joint resolution brought before the Senate for action today. It is very timely, not only because 1958 marks the fiftieth anniversary of the first conference of State governors in the United States, but also because that conference was called to deal with problems connected with the conservation of the Nation's natural resources.

As one who has had the privilege of serving not only as governor of my State, but also as chairman of the governors' conference in 1950, at the meeting held at White Sulphur Springs, I wish to state that the Senator from Montana is to be commended for securing early action on the joint resolution.

While I am on that point I desire to invite the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that last Friday I introduced Senate bill 1019, which establishes a commission on the conservation, development, and use of renewable natural resources. That bill has been referred to the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Montana is chairman. I should like to urge him to hold early hearings on this bill with the hope that we may get favorable action on it at this session. We need to look into the problems connected with our land and water and other natural resources, which, after all, are the basic strength of the future of our country. I believe it is a worthy suggestion, and I sincerely hope that action will be taken soon, because at the present time we have

many agencies which deal with these problems and I believe there might well be established a commission which would tie all these groups together.

The President has asked the States and local communities to take action along with the Federal Government in joint endeavor to deal with the problems of drought, decreasing water supply, and the wind erosion of our soil. The creating of a committee as proposed in my bill would work toward the solution of those problems. It is my contention that this is not merely a short-range program, but must be a program looking to the future.

It is especially important in the great areas of the Middle West which have suffered from drought and general lack of water. I believe that the future growth and development of the Midwest and especially Kansas—agriculturally and industrially—will be largely determined by the amount of water we can conserve and use for beneficial purposes. I urge favorable consideration of that program by the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to assure the distinguished Senator that our committee will give early and prompt consideration to that measure and that we will be able to report it shortly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise in support of the joint resolution which was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. I wish to join the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] in his commendation of the Senator from Montana. Not only is he the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but he is also the unquestioned leader in the field of conservation and development of our natural resources and the protection of the heritage of future generations and of their rights to those resources.

The Senator from Montana, in my judgment, has made such a fine and noble record in the Senate in this particular legislative field that anyone who comes here 50 years from now will probably find pending in the Senate a resolution memorializing the Senator from Montana on the great record he made during his service in the Senate for the benefit of future generations of Americans in protecting God's gift to them, the Nation's natural resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 35) was ordered to be engrossed for the third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That (a) there is hereby established a commission to be known as the National Conservation Anniversary Commission (hereinafter referred to in this joint resolution as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of the following members: The President of the United States, who shall be honorary chairman, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Interior, ex officio; the President of the Senate and four Members of the Senate appointed by him; the Speaker of the House of Representatives and four Members of the House of Representatives appointed by him. The Commission members shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number. The Chairman shall, with the advice of the Commission, expand its membership to include 15 representatives of national nonprofit organizations dedicated to conservation of various natural resources and 10 citizens at large from private life.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Commission to prepare and carry out a comprehensive plan for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the first conference of State governors on conservation in the United States and generally promote among all citizens a realization of the importance of protecting the natural resources of the United States. In the preparation of such plan, the Commission shall have the cooperation and assistance of all departments and agencies of the Federal Government. It shall also cooperate with the governors of the individual States in order that there may be proper coordination and correlation of plans for such observance. The Commission is authorized to appoint such volunteer special project committees, task forces, and advisory groups as will advance its work, and it shall seek the cooperation of all citizens, and of groups and associations with activities in the conservation field, in bringing conservation's importance to public attention during the year 1958.

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission is authorized to appoint and prescribe the duties and fix the compensation of such employees as are necessary in the execution of its duties and functions.

(b) There is hereby authorized the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution, including all necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by the members and employees of the Commission. All expenditures of the Commission shall be allowed and paid upon presentation of itemized vouchers therefor, approved by the Chairman of the Commission.

(c) The Commission shall cease to exist not later than 1 year after the date of the observance of the golden anniversary.

The preamble was agreed to.

## STUDY OF MATTERS RELATING TO THE ELECTION, SUCCESSION, AND DUTIES OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 11, Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

Mr. CARLSON. As I understand, the distinguished Senator from Washington is asking that the Senate formally resume the consideration of the concurrent resolution, but that it will not be debated at this time. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct. It is the intention to take it up later.

Mr. CARLSON. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to create a joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, inasmuch as it is the intention of the leadership to have the Senate adjourn until Thursday, I suggest the absence of a quorum so that notice may be given to any Senators who wish to address the Senate at this time.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for the time being?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall be very happy to do so.

## NAVAL RESERVE DADS' CLUB

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently, in Phoenix, Ariz., there was organized the Phoenix Naval Reserve Dads' Club, which is the first organization of its kind in the United States. It is a very interesting organization, because it concerns itself with maintaining the strength of the Navy and the furtherance of interest in the Navy.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks the following material:

Article entitled "First Naval Reserve Dads' Club in Nation Formed Here," published in the Arizona Republic of October 18, 1956; letter of the Navy League of the United States, dated January 31, 1957; National Bylaws of the Navy Dads' Clubs of America, Inc.; and articles of incorporation of the Navy Dads' Clubs of America, Inc.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST NAVAL RESERVE DADS' CLUB IN NATION FORMED HERE

The Phoenix Naval Reserve Dads' Club the first such organization in the United States, will meet at 7:30 p. m. today in the Rons Club, 3355 North 17th Avenue, to elect officers and welcome new members.

Comdr. Robert Feddern, USN, commanding officer, Naval Air Facility, Goodyear; Lt. Comdr. Herman A. Graven, USN, commanding officer, Phoenix Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, and Chief Petty Officer William Bovee, recruiter-in-charge, Phoenix Navy Recruiting Station, will speak at the meeting to explain Navy opportunities, obligations, and policies.

The Dads' Club was organized to provide the fathers of naval reservists with information concerning the Navy and Naval Reserve.

All dads whose sons are members of the Naval Reserve are invited to attend.

NAVY LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES,
*Washington, D. C., January 31, 1957.*

Mr. GLENN A. BAGWELL, Sr.,
*Vice President, Navy Dad's Clubs of America, Inc.; Chairman of Charter Committee, Phoenix, Ariz.*

DEAR MR. BAGWELL: Through Comdr. H. A. Graven, United States Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, commanding officer, Phoenix, Ariz., as well as through Mrs. Florence Ewalt, commander, Navy Mother's Club, Phoenix, Ariz., I have learned of your activities in organizing the Navy Dad's Clubs of America.

Anything that will further the interest of the Navy, I heartily endorse. For many years the Navy Mothers' Clubs have successfully carried on splendid work for the active personnel of the Navy and for the veterans of the Navy. I believe that anything that will capture the interest of the fathers of these boys and girls will materially assist in the work done by the Mothers' Clubs as well as in the interests of stepping up enlistments.

If you will contact my friends in Washington, I feel sure that they will assist you in any way possible in order to obtain recog-

nition of your efforts to have granted to you all powers and rights to charter local organizations throughout the United States and her possessions, of the Navy Dads' Clubs of America.

I mention particularly the Honorable Carl Hayden, United States Senator; the Honorable Barry Goldwater, United States Senator; the Honorable John J. Rhodes, United States Representative; the Honorable Stuart Udall, United States Representative; the Honorable Howard Pyle, Administrative Assistant to the President; the Honorable Charles Thomas, Secretary of the Navy.

Yours sincerely,

H. R. ASKINS,
*President, Arizona Council,*
*Navy League of the United States.*

PHOENIX, ARIZ.

---

NAVY DADS' CLUBS OF AMERICA, INC., NATIONAL BYLAWS

ARTICLE I—MEMBERSHIP

Section 1: Any organized local club composed principally of fathers of sons or daughters who are serving in naval service personnel, which shall consist of United States Navy, United States Marine Corps, United States Coast Guard, Seabees, active and organized Naval Reserve, having been granted a charter by Navy Dads' Clubs of America, and will adhere to the purposes and principles of the charter and will obey and follow the bylaws, rules, and regulations of the Navy Dads' Clubs of America is eligible for membership.

Section 2: Active membership in a local club holding charter of membership in Navy Dads' Clubs of America, with yearly per capita dues paid, shall constitute membership in the national organization.

Section 3: Active membership in local club shall be composed of, and limited to, fathers of naval service personnel; be he a natural father or father established by law, having sons or daughters now serving or who have died while in service, or have been honorably discharged from naval service personnel shall be eligible to active membership in the Navy Dads' Clubs of America.

Section 4: Any member club may be dismissed from the organization and its charter canceled if it fails to give adherence to the purposes, principles, and policies named in the charter, and fails to comply with the bylaws, rules, and regulations of the Navy Dads' Clubs of America.

Section 5: Failure to pay annual per capita dues within 60 days after the end of fiscal year shall suspend membership of the club in the organization, and failure to pay annual per capita dues for 6 months after the end of fiscal year ipso facto cancels membership in the Navy Dads' Clubs of America.

Section 6: Chaplains of any naval service personnel and any other worthy person recommended by the board of directors and delegates in convention assembled may be given honorary membership in the Navy Dads' Clubs of America.

ARTICLE II—ANNUAL DUES

Section 1: Each club shall pay annual dues to the Navy Dads' Clubs of America the sum of $1 per member, for all active members on membership list, and the sum of $5 per member, for all associate members so listed. There shall be no dues for honorary members. Fiscal year ends September 30, dues must be paid before installation of officers.

Section 2: A member club to be in good standing must keep its dues paid and comply with the bylaws, rules, and regulations of the Navy Dads' Clubs of America.

ARTICLE III—LOCAL CHARTER: REQUIREMENTS, FEES

Section 1: Not less than 15 dads naval service personnel, having organized a club and adopted a name, containing, with the permission of the national organization, the phrase Navy Dads' Clubs of America, may apply for a charter in the organization, provided, they agree to adhere to the purposes and principles of the charter, and be governed by the bylaws, rules, and regulations of the Navy Dads' Clubs of America. Such a group may operate under a special dispensation not to exceed 90 days, at which time application for charter must be made. If application be not made within the time specified, said group shall immediately cease using the phrase Navy Dads' Clubs of America.

Section 2: Application for charter in Navy Dads' Clubs of America shall be accompanied by a fee of $50, plus per capita dues of $1, for each name on charter, and not to exceed 50 members on original charter.

Section 3: Only active members as defined in article I, are eligible to be named charter members and have their names inscribed on the charter. The given name of applicant must appear on charter.

Section 4: Application for reinstatement of local club in good standing at time of withdrawal must be accompanied by a fee of $25, plus per capita dues and have a minimum of 15 members.

Section 5: A duplicate charter may be secured for a fee of $25 upon certified statement from club that the original charter has been lost, destroyed, damaged, or a name misspelled on the part of the applicant.

ARTICLE IV—NATIONAL CONVENTION

Section 1: A national convention shall be held annually at such place and time as is selected by the preceding convention. Should an emergency arise and a change of date or meeting place become necessary for best interest said change shall be made by majority vote of the board of directors and the national secretary shall notify the clubs in good standing at least 30 days before convention date.

Section 2: Duly elected and qualified delegates of the member clubs present in convention duly assembled shall elect the national board of directors, which shall be composed of 14 members, of which 13 members shall be elected, and the immediate past president shall be the 14th member, who shall transact any and all business which may come before the convention.

Section 3: Delegates representing 10 percent of the local clubs in good standing and whose per capita annual dues have been paid in accordance with article II, section 1, shall constitute a quorum at a national convention of the Navy Dads' Clubs of America.

Section 4: A club with 25 members or less is entitled to 1 delegate and for each additional 25 members or majority portion thereof is entitled to 1 additional delegate. One delegate may have the full voting power of his own club. The number of votes of each club is to be determined by the national secretary's per capita annual dues report on members in good standing on the 30th of September.

Section 5: Delegates and alternates to the national convention shall be elected by local clubs not later than 90 days prior to national convention date. Names and credentials of delegates and alternate to the national convention shall be filed with the national secretary not later than 30 days before convention date.

Section 6: No delegate shall be eligible to vote at any convention meeting unless and until he shall have registered with the national secretary, nor shall any acting delegate be entitled to vote until he shows evidence of his appointment as acting delegate and shall have registered with the national secretary.

Section 7: Each authorized delegate to the national convention and national officers and directors and past presidents shall have at least one vote and as many more as committee chairmanships held by such delegate in the national organization.

Section 8: If any national officer, except national president, fail to answer rollcall at opening session of national convention, or if a vacancy occurs in any office during the convention, the national president shall appoint any regularly elected delegate to serve in such office only during the convention in which he was appointed.

Section 9: A delegate and alternate must be active members of and must have held office in local club and attended two-thirds of the current local club meetings with dues paid 90 days in advance.

Section 10: Past National, State, and local past presidents shall be given a vote and voice in national conventions, provided they have met the qualifications for delegates as set forth in section 9 of article IV. His two-thirds attendance in local club meetings to be certified by his club. National officers, national committee chairman and State organizers must be active members and must have attended two-thirds of current local club meetings with dues paid ninety (90) days in advance to have a vote or voice in national convention. This status to be maintained during the term of office.

ARTICLE V—OFFICERS, ELECTIVE AND APPOINTIVE

Section 1: The elective officers of the national organization shall be president, first vice president, second vice president, secretary, treasurer, chaplain, judge advocate, and organizer.

Section 2: Only duly elected national board of directors shall be eligible for nomination or election to a national office. There shall be only one national officer from any one club. The secretary and treasurer in addition to the above, must meet the requirements named in article VI, sections 4 and 5.

Section 3: All members of the national board of directors shall be nominated by the nominating committee and duly elected as set forth by article IV, section 2, section 6, and section 9; and all candidates for directors shall file their credentials with the national secretary and nominating committee one (1) week prior to convention date.

Section 4: All board members and officers shall be elected by ballot at each national convention, and shall serve until their successors are duly elected and qualified. He may succeed himself for only one additional term, after which he shall not be eligible to be elected to the same office. When there is but one candidate for the office to be filled, the ballot may be dispensed with and the election by voice vote.

Section 5: The sergeant at arms and two color bearers shall be appointed by the national president 90 days prior to the national convention. They shall be selected from the membership of the convention host club.

ARTICLE VI—DUTIES OF OFFICERS

Section 1: The national president shall be presiding officer over all annual conventions and meetings of the national board of directors and shall have such other powers as may be delegated to him by the board of directors.

Section 2: The first vice president shall assist the national president and in his absence preside over meetings of the national convention and perform such other duties as delegated to him by the board of directors.

Section 3: The second vice president shall assist the president and first vice president and be prepared to preside over meetings during their absence.

Section 4: The secretary shall perform such duties as are usual to a recording secretary and shall keep accurate records of the proceedings of the national convention and meetings, both regular and special. He shall receive all moneys due the club, record it and deliver promptly to the national treasurer, taking his receipt for same. He shall announce the time and place of the national convention and meetings, answer all communications as directed by the president in

accordance with action taken by the national board or during regular or special sessions, and perform such other duties as may be required of him by the charter and the bylaws of the Navy Dads' Clubs of America, Inc. At the close of each convention, he shall send a list of the names and addresses of the new officers to each club in good standing. He shall have charge of all supplies of the Navy Dads' Clubs of America, Inc., mailing same upon receipt of order and payment to cover same from all local clubs, check or money order made payable to the Navy Dads' Clubs of America, Inc., also sending a receipt of moneys received. He must be a qualified secretary and file his application with credential at the time of his registration at convention.

Section 5: The treasurer shall perform all duties of treasurer, receiving all funds of the national organization, depositing same in a bank or depository designated by the board of directors. He shall pay all authorized expenditures which must be approved by the finance committee, consisting of the national president, national secretary, and national treasurer. At the close of each convention, he shall send a copy of the treasurer's report given at convention to each local club in good standing. He must be exact in all transactions by giving and requesting and keeping an itemized record of all receipts and expenditures. He shall perform such other duties as designated by the board of directors. He shall be a qualified bookkeeper and file his application with credential at the time of registration at convention. The application must be approved by a certified public accountant.

Section 6: The judge advocate shall perform all duties usual to that of parliamentarian. He shall inform himself in parliamentary law governing clubs, study the constitution and bylaws of the national organization and the local clubs and maintain a working knowledge of same at all times, that he may advise the members when requested to do so and pass upon questions that may arise concerning both national and local units of the Navy Dads' Clubs of America.

Section 7: The chaplain shall conduct the devotional exercises in national meetings, lend moral and spiritual advice to those in distress or in need of aid and sympathy.

Section 8: The organizer shall promote and supervise the organizing of new clubs of Navy Dads' Clubs of America. He shall appoint a State organizer or organizers in each State, appointment approved by the national president. The appointee shall be an active member, holding or having held office in a local club. He shall inform the State organizers to the recruiting offices in their State and shall keep in contact with the organizers by correspondence at least once a month, and act in conjunction, with the national president and in accordance with the national constitution and bylaws of the Navy Dads' Clubs of America; and shall prepare and distribute charters to all newly organized local clubs.

Section 9: The Sergent-at-Arms must attend every session, see that the assembly room is in order, that the Bible is in the room and act as host at all national conventions.

Section 10: The color bearer shall have custody of the American Flag and Navy Dads' Clubs of America Banner during the national convention. It is his duty to present these colors at the opening session and to furl and safely care for them at the close of the national convention.

ARTICLE VII—BOARD OF DIRECTORS: DUTIES AND POWERS

Section 1: The property and business of the corporation shall be managed and directed by its Board of Directors, 14 in number, of which the national president shall act as chairman. They shall be elected by the delegates at the annual national convention as provided in article V, section 3, and each director shall be elected to serve until his successor shall be elected and qualified. In addition to the power and authority by these bylaws expressly conferred upon them, the Board may exercise all such powers of the corporation and do all such lawful acts and things as are not by statute or by the certificate of incorporation or by these bylaws directed or required to be done by the delegates in convention assembled. They shall have full power and authority to delegate to one or more of its members, or any committee the duties and powers they have as directors.

Section 2: (a) Board of directors shall meet during the week preceding the national convention in the convention city to review and pass upon the reports of the president, executive committee, treasurer, board of trustees, and other officers appointed by it, and transact any other business that may come before it.

(b) The newly elected board of directors shall meet immediately after the adjournment of the national convention, for the purpose of organizing and transacting any and all business that may come before the meeting. The national president shall notify the newly elected board of directors in order to legally constitute the meeting; majority of the board shall be present.

(c) Special meetings of the board of directors may be called by the president, who is chairman of the board of directors on 10 days' notice to each director, either personally or by mail or telegram; special meetings shall be called by the president or secretary in like manner and on like notice on the written request of eight directors.

(d) At all meetings of the board of directors, the presence of a majority shall be necessary and sufficient to constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

(e) The board of directors may hold their meetings at such places as they may agree upon except that the first meeting after the election of directors by the national convention shall be held in the convention city immediately after the national convention adjourns.

Section 3: The board of directors shall appoint such other officers, agents, and committees as shall be deemed necessary, with such authority as from time to time shall be prescribed by the board.

Section 4: There shall be a board of trustees which shall consist of the national president, national secretary, and national treasurer. There shall be an executive committee which shall consist of the national president, first vice president, secretary, treasurer, and immediate past national president, which shall have power and authority to hear and adjudge all complaints filed against any member club or national officer, and exercise any and all authority granted to it by the board of directors.

Section 5: (a) If the office of any director becomes vacant, by reason of death, resignation, retirement, disqualification, removal from office or otherwise, the directors then in office, although less than a quorum, by a majority vote, may choose a successor or successors who shall hold office for the unexpired term.

(b) If the office of any officer or appointee becomes vacant, by reason of death, resignation, retirement, disqualifications, removal from office or otherwise, the board of directors or committee or person appointed by it, may choose a successor, who shall hold office for the unexpired term.

Section 6: The salaries of the officers and employees of the corporation shall be fixed by the board of directors. The board of trustees and employees handling funds shall furnish bond.

ARTICLE VIII—COMMITTEES: DUTIES

Section 1: There shall be the following standing committees: Nominating, credentials, finance, constitution and bylaws, welfare, memorial, Americanism, veterans' administration, exhibits, history, membership, publicity, convention, organizer, and charter.

Section 2: Such other committees may be created as recommended by the national president and by the vote of the board of directors. Chairmen of committees shall be selected by president with approval of the board of directors. The national president may have the privilege of selecting all committee members. The president shall be an ex-officio member of all committees.

Section 3: The nominating committee shall be composed of 4 board of directors and 4 delegates at large, making 8 members of the committee, whose selection shall be made by the national president. The board member who so selected should be an officer of the board shall be chairman of the committee; whose duties and powers are to select such candidates for directors and officers; and hold such election as provided for in article V, section 4.

Section 4: The credentials committee shall examine the credentials of delegates to the annual meeting or national convention and shall recommend acceptance or rejection for registration by the national secretary and national treasurer. Any delegate whose credentials are rejected shall have recourse to the national executive committee for a review of his case if he so desires.

Section 5: The finance committee shall be composed of the national president, national secretary, and national treasurer, who shall approve all authorized expenditures before payment is made by the treasurer.

Section 6: The constitution and bylaws committee shall make such recommendations for change and addition to said constitution and bylaws from time to time as may be deemed advisable.

Section 7: The welfare chairman shall be elected by the national board of directors at the first meeting after close of convention. He shall secure a welfare committee in each club to act in conjunction with the national president for assisting those in need.

Section 8: The memorial committee shall keep a record of the deceased members, mothers, naval service personnel sons and daughters.

Section 9: The Americanism committee shall continually carry on the work of research into history, organization, and personnel and environment of the naval service personnel and to sponsor a program of education for the association relating to the naval service personnel and its work for the members through the local clubs.

Section 10: The national veterans administration committee duties shall consist of certifying all Navy Dads' Clubs of America representatives at various veterans' hospitals and keep the representative and clubs informed on all matters pertaining to the VA national advisory committee.

Section 11: The exhibit committee shall supervise the display of clubs at national convention.

Section 12: The history committee shall keep a historical record of the club and its activities and shall preserve such records for the benefit of the present and future members of the clubs.

Section 13: The membership committee shall be custodian of the membership rolls to be furnished to it by the Secretary of all local clubs.

Section 14: The publicity committee shall handle all publicity for convention and must be approved by the board of directors.

Section 15: The convention committee shall receive all bids for convention city and screen and recommend for approval of national board of directors and to present for majority vote by delegates at large for naming next convention city by ballot vote.

ARTICLE IX—DISCIPLINE: REINSTATEMENT

Section 1: The board of directors or committee appointed by it shall have power to suspend, cancel charter and dismiss any member club of the Navy Dads' Clubs of America, provided, specific charges made in writing have been served upon the accused club.

If after diligent effort has been made to settle and adjust the matter in controversy, it should be found necessary to have a trial, the accused club shall be notified of time and place of trial by registered mail addressed to the president of said club. This notice shall be sent to the accused club at least 10 days before trial. The accused club shall be entitled to be represented and present evidence in its defense. Failure to appear and defend on date set for trial, does not prevent committee from hearing evidence and rendering judgment. A two-thirds vote shall be necessary to suspend, cancel charter and dismiss accused club, and the decision rendered shall be final.

Section 2: Appeal taken by aggrieved party as provided for in article XVIII of uniform code of local bylaws shall be tried de novo by the board of directors or the executive committee appointed by the board of directors.

Board of directors or executive committee shall set a date and place for hearing which shall not be more than 60 days from date of receipt of appeal.

The accused and accuser shall be notified of date of hearing and both shall be entitled to be present and present evidence. Failure of either party to appear and defend or prosecute on date set for trial does not prevent the board or committee from hearing evidence and rendering judgment.

A two-thirds vote of the board of directors or committee appointed by it present and voting shall be necessary for decision, which shall be final.

Section 3: Any elective officer who fails or neglects to perform the duties of his office, or is found to be incompetent, or fails to obey the bylaws, rules, and regulations, and orders of the board of directors or committee appointed by it, may be removed from office provided specific charges made in writing have been served upon him.

Should trial be necessary, said officer shall be notified of the time and place by registered mail at least 10 days before trial.

Said officer shall be entitled to be present and present evidence in his behalf. Failure to appear and defend on date set for trial does not prevent committee from hearing evidence and rendering judgment.

A two-thirds vote of the committee appointed by the board of directors shall be necessary to remove said officer, and the decision rendered shall be final.

ARTICLE X—LIMITATION, LIABILITIES, AND FUNDS

Section 1: No member club, national officer or appointee shall incur any obligation against the national organization without the consent of the board of directors or committee appointed by it.

Section 2: All checks and money orders must be made payable to the order of the Navy Dads' Clubs of America, Inc.

Section 3: Contributions made for entertainment, welfare or other purposes shall be promptly disbursed by the national treasurer as directed by the contributor.

ARTICLE XI—PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY

The rules contained in Roberts' Rules of Order, Revised, shall govern the Navy Dads' Clubs of America in all cases in which they are applicable, and in which they are not inconsistent with the bylaws or special rules of the Navy Dads' Clubs of America, Inc.

---

ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION OF NAVY DADS' CLUBS OF AMERICA, INC.

Know all men by these presents that we, the undersigned, have associated and do hereby associate ourselves together for the purpose of forming a nonprofit corporation without capital stock, pursuant to the laws of the State of Arizona and for that purpose to make, adopt, and certify the following as our articles of incorporation:

ARTICLE I

The names, residences, and post office addresses of the incorporators of this corporation are as follows: Ernest Ludwig, 2539 West Vista; Robert E. Tweedy, 356 East Alvarado Road; Frank E. Glemba, 1313 North Second Street; Francis D. Foley, 2124 East Weldon; LCDR Frank R. Williams, 7102 North Third Street; Glenn A. Bagwell, Sr., 406 North 18th Avenue; Orlan P. Glisan, 1828 East Colter Street; Stanley Rogalski, 1918 North 48th Place; Browning Z. Bailey, 2514 North Mitchell; Harold N. Kissel, 940 West Sahuaro Drive; Paul R. Hunt, 1911 West Holly; Elmer H. McClellan, route 5, box 1400; Ralph Stout, 6629 South Central Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz.

ARTICLE II

The name of this corporation shall be "Navy Dads' Clubs of America, Inc."

ARTICLE III

The principal place of business of this corporation shall be in Maricopa County, Ariz., but the corporation may have such other offices, branches or places of conducting business, and its board of directors may meet and transact business at such other places within or without the State of Arizona as may be established by the board of directors.

ARTICLE IV

On the 19th day of October 1956, a meeting was held in Phoenix, Ariz., by the Naval Reserve Dads' Club, an unincorporated association, at which meeting the membership thereof decided to incorporate said association and the said incorporators were elected to serve as incorporators and as the first board of directors of this corporation, all in accordance with the rules of said association.

ARTICLE V

(a) The general nature of the business proposed to be transacted by the corporation is as follows:

(1) To promote the civic, economic, and social welfare of fathers, sons, and daughters serving in the United States naval service within or without the United States, its possessions, or Territories.

(2) To promote a program of educational welfare and social interest between the parents of Navy men and women and to extend benevolent relief to needy members, those dependent upon or related to them, or to such other persons as to the club may seem desirable.

(3) To provide a cooperative working organization to assist and aid the United States naval service in whichever manner to the club would seem beneficial.

(b) The corporation shall have the following powers to carry out the purposes expressed in paragraph (a) hereof:

(1) To charter chapters throughout the United States and its possessions or Territories.

(2) To promote membership throughout the United States, its possessions, or Territories.

(3) To initiate and control all types of insignias, badges, and trademarks.

(4) To provide bylaws, constitutions, and rituals for all membership and clubs in the United States, its possessions, or Territories.

(5) To execute policy for all members; to promote conventions and meetings as directed in the bylaws or constitutions.

(6) To provide guidance and direction for all chartered clubs throughout the United States, its possessions, or Territories.

(7) To purchase, acquire, own, sell, borrow, assign, construct, and invest all forms of property including, but not limited to, real property, within and without the State of Arizona, together with buildings, fixtures, and equipment.

(8) To acquire, hold, own, sell, or otherwise dispose of, and to have the right to vote, any shares of stock, bonds, and obligations of other corporations.

(9) To purchase, hold, acquire, and dispose of bills, notes, and commercial paper of every kind, and to endorse, sell, discount, rediscount, and guarantee payment of the same.

(10) To borrow money, with or without security, for its corporate business and to issue the corporation's notes therefor and to mortgage, hypothecate, or pledge any or all of the corporation's property.

(11) To receive gifts, devises, and bequests of real or personal property; and to receive contributions of real or personal property in trust, or the income of any trust, and to execute such trusts.

(12) To enter into agreements, to perform any act or thing, or to do, transact or conduct any and all businesses or enterprises in any way connected with or related to the aforesaid purposes or to the powers expressly or by implication granted herein as fully and to the same extent as an individual.

ARTICLE VI

This corporation shall have no capital stock. No dividends or pecuniary profit shall be declared or paid to, nor shall any part of the earnings or assets of the corporation inure to the benefit of, any member, director, officer, or individual.

In the event of the dissolution or liquidation of the corporation all surplus, capital, and assets remaining after the payment of the debts of the corporation shall become the property of and be distributed to the Navy Relief Society or its successor.

ARTICLE VII

This corporation is organized by Fathers of Naval Service Personnel. Its active membership shall be composed of, and limited to, fathers of naval service personnel. The active members of this corporation shall be those listed as the incorporators hereof, and all members who shall be accepted in accordance with the bylaws as being fathers of naval service personnel as prescribed in the bylaws. Any individual may become an honorary or associate member as provided in the bylaws. Members shall hold their membership in accordance with the bylaws.

ARTICLE VII–A

Any organized local club composed principally of fathers of naval service personnel and having the above purposes and adopting a name containing the phrase "Navy Dads' Clubs of America, Inc." and holding a charter under the Navy Dads' Clubs of America, Inc., and which shall not be in arrears in the payment of its annual national dues may be entitled to membership in this corporation. Each new club, upon payment of 1 year's dues, and such charter fees as may be required by the board of directors and when approved by the board of directors, shall be entitled to a charter of membership and copies of all literature issued by the Navy Dads' Clubs of America, Inc. for 1 year. Each club becoming a member shall pay at least $1 per local member per year toward the support of the national office of Navy Dads' Clubs of America, Inc.

ARTICLE VIII

The highest amount of indebtedness or liability, direct or contingent, to which this corporation may be subject at any one time is $500,000, provided that any such indebtedness shall be incurred only as authorized by the board of directors and officers of this corporation in conformity with and in the manner prescribed in the bylaws.

ARTICLE IX

The members and officers of the corporation shall not be individually liable for the

debts or liabilities of the corporation; and their private property shall be exempt from all corporate debts and liabilities.

ARTICLE IX–A

The board of trustees shall consist of three members and shall be composed of national president, national secretary, and national treasurer, and the title to all property of the corporation shall vest in such board of trustees as well as State and local officers or employees of national, State, or local clubs handling funds shall furnish fidelity bonds.

ARTICLE X

The time of commencement of this corporation shall be the date that these articles are filed with the Arizona Corporation Commission and a certified copy of the same recorded in the recorder's office of Maricopa County in accordance with the law. The corporation shall endure for 25 years after the aforesaid filing with privilege of renewal as prescribed by law.

ARTICLE XI

The control and management of the affairs of this corporation shall be vested in the board of directors, which shall be composed of four or more active members, who shall be elected from the active membership. The officers shall be a president, a vice president, a secretary, and a treasurer; additional officers may be provided for in the bylaws. Officers shall be elected in the manner prescribed in the bylaws from the newly elected board of directors. The board of directors and officers shall have powers and duties, and be governed by those rules and policies, set forth in the bylaws. The first board of directors shall be composed of the incorporators named in article I, hereof. The first officers shall be: Francis D. Foley, president; Glenn A. Bagwell, Sr., vice president; Robert E. Tweedy, secretary; Stanley Rogalski, treasurer.

The first members of the board of directors and officers shall serve until the first annual meeting. Thereafter, the members of the board of directors and the officers shall be elected at an annual meeting to be held on the third Thursday in October 1957, and annually thereafter.

ARTICLE XII

Bylaws and amendments thereto, and amendments to the articles of incorporation shall be adopted by a two-thirds majority of the board of directors and, thereafter, by a majority vote of the active members of the club.

ARTICLE XII–A

Frank R. Williams who has been a bona fide resident of Phoenix, Maricopa County, Ariz., for more than 3 years last past, is hereby appointed and made statutory agent of said corporation, in and for the State of Arizona, and without the State if necessary to accept and acknowledge service, and upon whom may be served all necessary process in any action, suit or proceeding that may be had or brought against the corporation in any of the courts of the said State of Arizona or any of the courts outside the State of Arizona, which service or process or notice, or the acceptance thereof by said agent endorsed thereon, shall have the same force and effect as if served upon the president and secretary of the corporation. The appointment may be revoked at any time by filing the appointment of another agent.

In witness whereof, we have hereunto set our hands this 19th day of October 1956.

Ernest Ludwig, Robert E. Tweedy, Frank E. Glemba, Francis D. Foley, Lt. Comdr. Frank R. Williams, Glenn A. Bagwell, Sr., Orland P. Gilsan, Stanley Rogalski, Browning Z. Bailey, Harold N. Kissel, Paul R. Hunt, Elmer H. McClellan, Ralph Stout.

STATE OF ARIZONA,
*County of Maricopa.*

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 19th day of October 1956 by, Ernest Ludwig, Robert E. Tweedy, Frank E. Glemba, Francis D. Foley, Lt. Comdr. Frank R. Williams, Glenn A. Bagwell, Sr., Orlan P. Glisan, Stanley Rogalski, Browning Z. Bailey, Harold N. Kissel, Paul R. Hunt, Elmer H. McClellan, and Ralph Stout.

[SEAL] BONNIE E. MCNEELY,
*Notary Public.*

My commission expires May 2, 1960.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I suggested the absence of a quorum because it was the desire of the minority leader to name two members of the Small Business Committee before the Senate adjourned. I understand, however, that the senior Senator from California will not be ready until Monday.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

## RECENT AIRPLANE TRAGEDY IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last Friday I had occasion to comment on the tragic air disaster in California, and late in that afternoon I received and placed in the RECORD a directive from the Civil Aeronautics Administration which was issued on Friday. I wish to read the first sentence of that directive:

Request you take immediate action to establish voluntary local flying areas for all test flights where such areas are not already effective.

Mr. President, this directive, as I have said, was sent to the regional administrators of the Civil Aeronautics Authority across the country.

I wish to emphasize the word "voluntary."

Mr. President, that is not enough. I have spoken with my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I do not know whether the Civil Aeronautics Authority has the right, effectively and unquestionably, to prescribe airspace patterns in America where test flights will be prohibited, but I point to the directive which is couched in voluntary and cooperative terms rather than in the form of an enforcible regulation. What the Civil Aeronautics Board can do, legally, I do not know.

I intend to have a bill prepared with teeth in it, as I stated on Friday, to give to the Civil Aeronautics Board the responsibility and the duty to enforce such regulations as are necessary to prevent a recurrence of the type of accident which apparently resulted from test-flight activities in California last week.

In connection with that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two editorials from Los Angeles newspapers—one, the Los Angeles Times, and the other, the Los Angeles Examiner—be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times of February 2, 1957]

AIR TRAGEDY CALLS FOR MORE SAFETY

Two planes collide in midair; 7 are killed, including 2 schoolchildren, and 74 injured.

The tragedy of San Fernando Valley is permanently written into the records of aviation. The remedy remains to be found so as to assure the people this sort of thing will not become a part of their life and death.

It is not a time for hysteria but for sober examination of existing air regulations with ultimate adoption of effective rules to police the air and protect populous areas.

Progress dictates that air travel cannot be abolished over centers of population, but commonsense cries out for a stern examination of test flights. They should be shunted into open country where the planes could be "shaken down" with the least possible danger to human life.

Major Poulson and Los Angeles County Congressmen are calling for a searching Federal investigation. It should be immediately forthcoming and have a dual purpose: to determine the cause of the crash and to make certain a central agency has the responsibility of knowing what planes are where and why.

This does not mean there are now no air regulations. There are and it is possible they may be sufficient if properly integrated and administered.

The one survivor of the six crewmen aboard the planes said there was no indication of the close proximity of the craft until an instant before the crash. Headquarters of the jet and the passenger liner knew where their own ships were but had no knowledge of the other's presence.

Aviation has grown fast, probably faster than regulation of airlanes. If controls have lagged behind, then it is time to modernize them.

The tragedy of San Fernando Valley cannot be eased, but something will be accomplished if it becomes a milestone in looking ahead toward safer airlanes.

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of February 1, 1957]

PLANE TRAGEDY

Yesterday's tragedy at Pacoima Junior High School is exactly what has long been feared and expected.

Two test planes collided above the school. Two children were killed and 44 others grievously injured. These were in addition to the five airmen also killed.

Why in the name of common sense are pilots permitted to test planes above densely populated areas?

Why are they not ordered to make their tests over the thousands of square miles of desert nearby where there is no human habitation, or over the limitless space above the ocean at hand?

As long as this is not done, there is no home, school, place of business, or factory in the San Fernando Valley and elsewhere, that is not in danger of sudden death from the skies—as none is free now of the constant and often destructive annoyance of sonic booms.

Mayor Poulson has very properly directed his personal protest to President Eisenhower himself.

It is evident that only an order from the highest authority can compel all forces to comply with a rule of simple common sense.

We hope the order is issued, and if ever disobeyed, penalties of the utmost severity imposed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator discussed this matter with me immediately after the tragedy occurred, and I proceeded over the weekend to make inquiry as to just what authority the CAA or CAB would have in this matter. I looked it up myself in the act and also had some of the legal members of the staff look it up. I had proposed, with

the help of the Senator from California, to submit a resolution which would give authority to regulate the airspace over so-called populated urban areas. It is my opinion that the CAB does have that authority, but has not laid out airspace patterns except for some of the regular air roads which commercial lines use. Beyond that, there is no airspace pattern.

I also find that the military have taken up and restricted a great portion of the airspace of the United States to such an extent that some of the commercial traffic has to operate through a very narrow lane, even though the space on either side may never be used.

The conflict which exists as to whether the CAB has authority to regulate all the airspace as against the military regulating it, is a question we shall have to explore.

I will say to the Senator from California because he has been very zealous and prompt in this matter, that the committee is meeting at 2:30 this afternoon in an effort to go over the question. I have a resolution prepared in which I hope the Senator from California will join. It always seems to require a tragedy to force action in matters of this kind.

In this instance, both the planes were in private hands. There were civilian crews in both cases. It seems to be almost inexcusable on a clear day for two planes to collide. The jet made a normal turn to test its radar. It did not make any sharp turn, only a normal turn to test its radar, and the other test plane was going along in its usual test flight. But even though they were private planes and did not involve military or commercial operations, the responsibility of the CAB for airspace still exists under the basic act. Certainly, Mr. President, something must be done about the urban centers. This is not the first one of such tragedies. Airliners have to come in and land at airports in urban centers, but the idea of testing planes over populated areas is inconceivable.

We must have some cooperation from the military. I am aware they have rules and regulations, but the Senator and I know that in the crowded California area the jets are constantly violating the rules. The Senator has seen them on many occasions flying over populous areas.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, conceding that what the Senator from Washington has said is true, and that he has supplied an abundance of reasons why such a hearing before his committee is necessary, let me say that I, too, have researched the statutes which have been passed by Congress in prior years relative to the authority of the CAB and the CAA, and I have talked with members of the legal staff of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. There does not seem to be any uniformity of opinion as to whether a clear-cut authority or responsibility exists today with respect to areas where flight tests may be conducted.

Again I say, Mr. President, that in the regulation which was issued last Friday, the word "voluntary" is used. Apparently, there still remains some question, which perhaps a committee hearing could resolve, whether a regulation could be adopted which could be enforced to prevent, or assist in preventing, a recurrence of such a tragedy. What I wish to do, with the help of the able Senator from Washington and his committee, is to provide legislation that will clear up any doubt as to the authority and the responsibility of the Civil Aeronautics Board to act in such a situation, if a hearing demonstrated there is a doubt. If there is any possibility of a doubt, I think it is necessary to remove it and have a law with teeth in it, so that it can be enforced. Then the possibility of a recurrence will be eliminated to the extent that laws or regulations can eliminate such recurrence.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I assure the Senator from California—and I think I speak for all members of the committee—that if there is any doubt in our minds that the authority may be vague or cloudy we will immediately report a bill to provide such authority, because the problem of airspace is becoming one of very vital importance. Not only does it relate to test flights, but also to the airports themselves. The Civil Aeronautics Authority should have whatever authority it needs to control the airspace.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is completely right.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It even comes down to the fight about the airport in Washington. There will be an accident there some day, if some action is not taken to correct the dangerous conditions which now exist. Congress has been arguing 5 years about a second airport for Washington.

I suggested the other day—and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] himself has gone through this—that if we wait another 6 months, the airport will become totally obsolete anyway, and something else will have to be done.

The question of airspace also, as it concerns safety, is one which confronts us. A thorough study should be made with a view to keeping planes away from urban areas, and permitting them to come into such areas only when it is necessary for them to land.

Mr. KUCHEL. I could not agree more completely with my friend from Washington. While I was motivated in the comments I made last week and again today by the primary consideration of enacting legislation to require test flights to be conducted in areas below which there is no population, I must say that the larger question of laws which will provide for authority over air travel generally is certainly one which needs to be looked into by Congress, and as to which I am certain Congress is prepared to act. On both those counts I hope Congress will take such effective remedial action as a hearing may indicate is necessary.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I first wish to state that I am wholeheartedly in accord with the desires of the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and other Senators who are interested in the very difficult and intricate problem of controlling aircraft over the continental United States. I know that the junior Senator from California will accept what I am saying in the vein in which it is offered.

There are many things which take place in the air which are necessary to the future safety of air travel. I think that, in determining what future course should be taken in legislation or regulations, we must remember these things in all fairness to the aviation industry.

I was just as much appalled as was the Senator from California at the accident last Friday which was caused by a collision of a DC–7 and an F–89. We can consider that occurrence and, at first blush, say that it was entirely uncalled for, but probably we shall never know whether it was or not. I wish to remind my friend from California that many times the personnel in an air-and-ground control station, such as the radar station at Los Angeles International Airport, or the ground-control-approach station at the same airport, will request a pilot to make a test run, so that he may test his own equipment. Certainly such an operation can be regulated. I think it can be done safely. But for us to imagine that we can abolish altogether that type of test flying would be, I think, the wrong approach.

As the junior Senator from California probably will agree, the busiest air pattern in the United States for an entire metropolitan area is in Los Angeles and the vicinity. With Northrop, Lockheed, Douglas, and the other big airports, Los Angeles has a problem of establishing channels for takeoff, return, and landing.

Also in the Senator's area there is one National Guard unit, at Van Nuys, which is constantly called upon, as a part of its duties, to provide air defense aircraft for "scrambles," as they are called. As many as 300 or 400 times a month planes may be called into the air to try to intercept "enemy" aircraft in the form of our own aircraft, or even to intercept themselves. The Senator knows that that is an important part of defense.

In the discussions as to the regulation of air traffic, I think we have to make up our minds whether the fighter installations will be near cities, or whether they will be away from cities. If they are to be away, will they be so far away that the protection of vital areas will become a problem?

Turning to another phase of the question, which the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] mentioned, namely, the control of air space, I can tell the Senator that the airspace above the United States is pretty well taken up by the Air Force, by the Navy, and by ground forces.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is true.

Mr. GOLDWATER. For example, to the north of airway red 2, which runs across southern Arizona, is a range which covers thousands of square miles and extends to infinity, as it is now called—it used to be 40,000 feet—in which missiles are occasionally discharged from the ground to determine their ballistic characteristics.

I think as Senators begin to consider the question of airspace above the United

States, they might well review the air space requirements of the Armed Forces, to determine if they are really needed or not. I can assure the junior Senator from California that much of the air space over southern California, as also in my own State of Arizona and in the State of the distinguished senior Senator from Washington, is an area in which it is not easy to fly. A plane is confined to an airway of some 10 miles in width with deviation from this narrow route virtually impossible because of air space reservations of the various services.

I bring these matters to the attention of the Senator from California and the Senator from Washington because of my interest in aviation. I want to make certain that every single facet of the problem is explored thoroughly, and not be allowed to become the subject of legislation until we have satisfied ourselves that the ground has been covered completely.

One thing must be kept in mind. All kinds of regulations can be written. Safety can be urged upon pilots. But remember that 40,000 persons were killed on the highways of the Nation last year. We are constantly talking to our children about safety. We are constantly exhorting the drivers of the country to drive safely. Those of us who fly are constantly concerned with safety, because the first collision "up there" will be the last one. But it has not been possible to prevent 40,000 motor vehicle accidents a year on the ground. I do not think we should be too hopeful of slowing down or stopping completely accidents in the air until we have educated people not to commit errors on the ground. So long as there are persons who are driving something, there will be errors.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Arizona. So that the record may be kept straight, last week I said, in part:

> My attention was called some time ago to a statement by one who is presumed to know—

And he is presumed to know—

> that the air traffic control situation in America is one horrible mess and is going to get worse before it gets better.

I said subsequently—and I commend this to the junior Senator from Arizona:

> I wish to suggest to the Senate, and to others who may care to listen, that the time is now long past for the American Government to take appropriate steps to protect the American people in their cities and towns and centers of population, where protection can, by law or by regulation, be given. I am sure the Congress of the United States overwhelmingly would approve legislation with teeth in it providing, for example, that in the field of testing operations the tests be confined to remote areas where a repetition of yesterday's tragedy in California could not take place.

Listen to this comment from the Los Angeles Examiner:

> Why in the name of commonsense are pilots permitted to test planes above densely populated areas?
>
> Why are they not ordered to make their tests over the thousands of square miles of desert nearby where there is no human habitation, or over the limitless space above the ocean at hand?

Those are reasonable, relevant, and important questions which the people of California, and the Nation, have a right to have answered.

Listen to this comment from the Los Angeles Times:

> Mayor Poulson and Los Angeles County Congressmen are calling for a searching Federal investigation. It should be immediately forthcoming and have a dual purpose: To determine the cause of the crash and to make certain a central agency has the responsibility of knowing what planes are where and why.
>
> This does not mean that there are now no air regulations. There are, and it is possible they may be sufficient if properly integrated and administered.

With this comment I agree. I suggest that a hearing can quickly demonstrate whether present regulations, properly administered will fill the bill. All of us recognize that many hazards are involved in living in this air age. One of them is the increasing use of the air by all types of planes—those privately owned, as well as commercial aircraft and military aircraft. But in answer to the comments of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], I say, with respect to planes in the air for purposes of testing, that it is completely unreasonable to permit such testing operations to be conducted directly over large centers of population. To that extent, if there is the slightest question about the availability today of legal authority to prevent it, then, as I say, speaking for myself, and I believe, for the entire Congress, I am ready to do all I can to have the necessary legislation enacted.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am glad to yield to my friend, the Senator from Maine.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I wish to commend my colleague, the Senator from California, for his observations and for the concern he has expressed on the floor, not only today, but last week, following the tragic air accident in California.

I think it is to the credit of the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Mr. Pyle, that he moved with great dispatch at least to set into motion activity in line with the concern of the American people, the Members of this body, and the Members of the House of Representatives, regarding matters related to the accident which occurred in California. Mr. Pyle did move with dispatch. Whether he has legal authority to back up his wish in the matter, is something which I am sure will be thoroughly studied by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, under the able leadership of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

As a member of its subcommittee dealing with those matters, let me say that for the past 2 years we have been working constantly in this field, and we have been trying to focus greater attention on these problems.

Certainly it was revealing that last year, for the first time in many years, the Congress took the bull by the horns—something it had previously failed to do—and appropriated sufficient funds to enable the Civil Aeronautics Administration to develop the type of air-safety traffic controls which are required by, and are in keeping with, the conditions existing today. Furthermore, let me say, for the first time the administration recognized the problems presented by the airspace and air-traffic safety factors involve; and the President appointed Gen. Ted Curtis a special assistant to work actively in this field. General Curtis is eminently qualified to go into this matter from top to bottom, and he is doing so at the present time. I am confident that he will develop a constructive and forthright approach to the problems—both those related to military tactical and non-tactical use of the air and those related to commercial and private operations.

So, Mr. President, as a result of the work of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the work already being undertaken by the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the work of General Curtis and his staff, it is my feeling that at last we are on the right course, one we should have undertaken long, long ago. However, today this matter is more important than ever before, because of the tremendous advances made in the use of jet planes. After all, in a short time jet transport planes will be in use, following the present use of jet aircraft by the military.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Maine.

Mr. President, I do not have the pleasure of knowing Mr. Pyle personally. I do know him by his very fine reputation.

If I may venture a guess, let me say that I believe Mr. Pyle would have preferred to have the Civil Aeronautics Administration issue, on last Friday, a regulation which would not have been voluntary, but which would have been as a result of unquestioned Federal statutory power and duty.

My only purpose at this point, in placing in the RECORD various newspaper editorials, and in stating as concisely as I can to the Senate my conception of the facts, is to lay a foundation to assist other Members of the Senate who are interested in joining the chairman of the committee, the able Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], having an appropriate hearing and then, if need be, in introducing a clear, understandable bill dealing with this specific problem.

I would also wish to assist in the passage of a bill—if that is necessary; and I believe it is—providing broad authority in regard to the problem of air-traffic control generally.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently there have been published the results of an investigation into the airpower of the United States. In the report I find much of a constructive nature concerning the airpower of the entire country, in general, and of the Air Force, in particular. I am sorry the report does not, in my opinion, deal sufficiently with quality, but spends too much attention on quantity.

In trying to analyze the differences between the Russian potential in the air and ours, we must remember that today we have a great retaliatory force in

our Strategic Air Command. We must also remember that Russia's attempts to become strong in this field deserve our attention. However, before we say the United States Air Force is not strong or that it has been weakened in the past 5 years, we must remember that qualitatively we have long been ahead of the Russians, and that we shall continue to remain ahead of the Russians, so long as we pay sufficient attention to the factors which bear on that situation.

We must keep in mind the quite simple facts involved. For instance, during World War II the Russians flew a total of 4 or 5 strategic missions. I believe the longest one of those was 400 miles. On the other hand, the United States Air Force flew tens of thousands of strategic air missions, and dropped hundreds of millions of tons of bombs, and flew millions of miles. Out of that experience there can come a very great knowledge of when, where, and how to bomb.

After listening to some of the testimony given before the committee last year, I am not convinced that Russia has even begun to keep up with us in the production of bombsights, for instance, or the use of them if she has them. Neither am I completely impressed with the idea that guided missiles will be in use tomorrow. After having studied the wars of the past, it is my personal opinion that such things as guided missiles are good to dream about and to work toward; and I hope we will increase, instead of decrease, our activities in connection with research in that field.

So long as we have wars, we will necessarily have men fighting. I do not want to put my money on the guided missile alone. Today I should like to confine my remarks to what I feel are steps necessary to be taken in the field of personnel in order to maintain the qualitative advantage we have over the Russians and to increase it as the years go by.

In flying recently to Germany as a member of a military aircraft service crew, it fell to my lot to act as copilot on the ship from midnight to 6 in the morning. Cruising along at 17,000 feet, the dark Atlantic obscured by clouds and the stars bright above, I engaged the flight engineer in conversation.

We talked of many things: home, family, and the inevitable, the Air Force—not about the mission of the Air Force, nor its place in our military scheme, but what were the intentions of this young man, with not too many years in the service, regarding his future.

The discussion brought out the old, old pattern. Here was a man, dedicated to his work, highly trained and wonderfully skilled, proud of the Air Force. But he has a family and, like all Americans, he is possessed of ambition. He said he did not know if he would continue in the service too long, because he felt that in his field there were better opportunities on the outside. He was right in this assumption, because a flight engineer on any of our airlines, working far fewer hours and performing the same task, receives much greater pay.

We cannot blame that man in the Air Force—we can blame ourselves.

What Americans seem reluctant to face up to is that the military is with us forever, and until that happy day arrives when the Russian threat no longer exists more accent will be put on the military than has been the case at any other time in our history.

We must realize that large forces and large expenditures are required, and we must recognize, too, that a full-time job is involved and that a highly trained personnel is required.

As I finished my time as copilot, I took my turn in the bunk, but sleep would not come. My mind furnished me with memories to go with the intelligent discussion I had concluded with this young enlisted man.

I remembered another night, many thousands of feet over the Gulf of Mexico, as I flew in a B–47. Neither the brightness of a full moon nor the beauty of a shimmering gulf below could provide sufficient interest to overcome the urge to talk to the copilot over the intercom.

The conversation inevitably got to the Air Force career stage. Through the strange combination of talking into a rubber oxygen mask and hearing from the shell of a helmet, I learned that the man behind me loved his work, was dedicated, as all SAC men are. He did a job and he did it perfectly, but he was a family man, and he wondered if his patriotic application to his job could make up for what might be better opportunities for his family if he yielded to the higher pay offered by industry for exactly his skills.

Then there was a day last fall when I flew to one of our most important Air Force bases to speak with the pilots on the subject I am discussing today. This base is charged with teaching our young fighter pilots not only to fly the new hundred series, but to do with that airplane what all weapons are designed to do—kill the enemy.

These new supersonic aircraft are what an airman would call electronic nightmares.

Thousands of miles of wire, connecting hundreds of black boxes that work out problems of navigation and gunnery at speeds above that of sound, are encased in the sleekness of those aircraft, along with an engine that gives power in ever-increasing units of thrust.

The crew chief of old, marvelous as he was, with his wrenches and knowledge, has given way to the crew chief, the engineer of today, with his slide rule, and his understanding of the intricate subject of electronics and thermal physics—the same know-how which every electronics firm in the United States wants and is getting from the Air Force.

I wondered about the new F series I saw, not flying, but standing on the ramp, and I was told that the base was short of experienced men in the fields necessary to maintain these craft—trained men, trained with thousands of taxpayers' dollars, who have not re-enlisted, but who have yielded, usually reluctantly, to the siren call of industry—the song of proper pay for the job.

Then, finally, before I dropped off to sleep, I recalled the hundreds, maybe even the thousands, of times I have flown Air Force aircraft, making mental notes of malfunctions, either real or imagined, and then noting them in the form 1, which is the squawk sheet of the Air Force. Now, keep in mind that any of these squawks are of a nature that require engineering and technological knowledge above that required by, let us say, the airlines. That is true because Air Force aircraft are generally far more complex than those flown by industry or by the airlines. For example, the fuel consumption becomes too high. The pilot does not know why, but the crew chief finds out and remedies the defect. The slave compass is slow. Why? The pilot does not know. The instrument man finds out and fixes it. At 100 percent, the tailpipe temperature is too high, but still within limits. Who fixes that? Not the pilot. The engineer expert does it.

The airlines will get jets soon, and there will be the same general malfunctions in them that we find in Air Force equipment, and who will be fixing these squawks? I will bet some engineer, some electronics man, some instrument man, or some radio man trained by the Air Force, will be doing it.

Television and modern radio, the coming of atomic power, the Buck Rogers dream of yesterday, are becoming the life of today and tomorrow, and call for men of exactly the abilities and training I have been discussing.

Our major defense problem, in all the services, rests not with equipment, but with the training and retention of men who can use and maintain that with which our scientists and designers and our industry constantly provide our military.

The most important problem within the Air Force today is that of retention of skilled personnel. This concern was expressed by Secretary Quarles before the Senate Appropriations Committee, when he said: "I am convinced that the most important single item in the program today is experienced, qualified manpower."

The complex weapons of today and those programed for the future cannot be properly operated and maintained by inexperienced personnel on relatively short tours of duty. The capability of the Air Force to carry out its mission depends on our ability to attract and retain skilled personnel on a voluntary basis. Officers and airmen must be procured, trained, and employed within realistic dollar and manpower limitations. The best machines in the world are ineffective unless qualified men maintain and operate them. An adequate solution to the problem of personnel retention is vital to the Air Force and our national security. It must be given highest priority.

This problem has been given special consideration during the past few years. In 1953 the Womble committee, an ad hoc committee on the future of military service as a career that will attract and retain capable career personnel, made a number of recommendations to improve career retention. Many of the recommendations were implemented; others await legislative action. More recently an interservice task force on military career incentives was established with responsibilities in the area

of career retention, giving special consideration to the Womble committee-type programs such as the survivor benefits bill and the dependent medical care bill. The special attention given to the retention problem has been effective and can be demonstrated.

During the last session of the 83d Congress and in the course of the 84th Congress the reenlistment bonus bill, and the Career Incentive Act of 1955, respectively, were enacted, as well as other items designed to make a service career more attractive. All of these had, as their central purpose, the retention of qualified personnel. The beneficial effect of these enactments has been felt.

The Career Incentive Act of 1955 marked a departure from the historical method of awarding military pay. Special consideration was given to areas in the grade structure in which retention was especially desired and compensation in those areas was augmented in a greater degree than in other areas. The result was that retention was improved in the areas desired beyond what would have been affected by an average payment.

An inherent weakness, however, in both the reenlistment bonus, 1954, and the military-pay increases, 1955, is that they apply across the board. In this respect, every officer or staff sergeant with a stated amount of service receives the same benefit without regard to the degree of skill, the amount of supervision he provides or is supplied, the Government's investment in time and money for training, mission essentiality, competition with industry for the skill, and other factors. With changes in the nature of basic employment in the service, and with military skills which formerly were largely unidentifiable with civilian skills, becoming more and more closely related to civilian skills, the old concept that one sergeant is as valuable or is entitled to as much pay as the next one is becoming just as impracticable in the military service as it is for personnel in private industry. Our efforts to make the service more attractive to particular individuals by raising the pay of all persons is not the best answer from the standpoint of the Air Force or the taxpayer. There would simply not be enough money to make the payroll if everyone were paid what an electronics engineer should be paid. Since there is not enough money to solve the problem by that method, the specialist is unhappy on two counts: first, he is not getting as much money as he feels he deserves and, secondly, the less skilled member is making as much as he is. The philosophy that one man is worth as much money as another is no longer acceptable, and some refinements must be made.

The objectives of such refinements must be to—

First, reduce the high loss rate in critical skills.

Second, increase the operational effectiveness of the Air Force.

Third, give recognition for demonstrated ability in skills of particular value to the service and encourage continued proficiency in these skills.

Fourth, reduce the cost of training recruits as replacements for those who do not reenlist.

Fifth, provide a greater return on the training investment by utilization of the services of personnel over a longer period and at a time when the people are fully productive.

Sixth, permit release of personnel primarily assigned to the training function to more effective employment.

Seventh, revaluate current practices wherein length of service has as much if not more bearing on military compensation rates than does the skill of the individual concerned. For example, the armed services today have many personnel who, because of their length of service, are receiving more pay than their supervisors. Under such a system all a man has to do is to keep out of trouble and he can eventually be assured of an income equal to or greater than his supervisor. The program envisoned by the Cordiner Committee calls for an improved system for maintaining in the Armed Forces a work force balanced by skills and one which will attain optimum performance levels. To provide such a balanced force, careful consideration must be given to drastic changes in current military pay concepts. The importance and capabilities of highly skilled personnel as well as supervisory military members must be recognized if the services are to retain a hard core organization.

Slowly but surely the lessons of World War II are being explained to the American people and as the impact of air power is told, Americans are realizing that the pivotal strength of our military force is in the air. America's military planning is based on that premise and as a nation we have come to believe that this is a sound and the only course to take.

The many problems which are generated in achieving a strong deterrent Air Force are problems all America must consider.

It is a fact that today the most serious difficulty facing the Air Force is that of retaining skilled technicians, both airmen and officers. It certainly is also true that material and equipment aspects of the Air Force bear constant surveillance. The fact remains, however, that human beings are still the basic substance and most vital element of our Air Force. The skill of these people, more so than the speed of modern aircraft or other supporting equipment, will be the ultimate determiner of how much "power" there is in American airpower. The complex weapons of today and those programed for the future cannot be properly operated or maintained by inexperienced or short-term personnel.

The problem, therefore, boils down simply to the fact that the capability of the Air Force to carry out its mission of deterring possible aggression depends upon its ability to attract and retain skilled personnel on a voluntary basis. The highest priority effort must be directed to the immediate solution of this problem area.

Each year Congress has appropriated billions of dollars to support the Air Force toward its eventual buildup goal of 137 wings. At the same time Congress, and particularly the 84th Congress, has given careful consideration to the personnel aspects. For instance, legislation was enacted which now provides expanded medical care to the dependents of military personnel, equalized, and expanded benefits for the survivors of military personnel, a broad program of military housing based on amendments to the National Housing Act. There have been other items of legislation which have been passed to provide increased military career incentives. Despite this we must frankly admit that still greater improvements are mandatory, and it has become increasingly obvious, particularly within the past several years, that a military pay revision must be effected.

It will be recalled that in 1955 a straight across-the-board pay increase was granted to all military personnel, without regard to the degree of skill, the amount of supervision the individual provides or is supplied, the Government's investment in time and money for training, and the individual's essentiality to the Air Force mission. But what is more important, the pay increase of 1955 failed to recognize the serious competition the Air Force is receiving from industry for people possessing high technical skills. One has but to read the want ads in any newspaper in any part of the country to see how critical is the need for people possessing specialized skills. Today a high percentage of Air Force personnel possess the very skills for which our expanding industry is clamoring.

I might relate a story which I heard at lunch the other day with some of my old Air Force friends. They brought out the point that a lieutenant colonel, one of the lead pilots of the Strategic Air Command crews, making about $900 a month, with all the benefits he might receive, had resigned from the Air Force in order to take a job which would pay him $12,000 a year.

Why did he do this? He liked the Air Force. He would have liked to remain in it, but he has a family, with which he must be concerned.

What do Senators think it cost to train this man? How much money was invested in this lieutenant colonel, a man we were depending upon to fly one of our B-47's in the event the bell should ring, as we say? There was invested in this man's training $645,000; and yet, because of our desire to make an increase across the board, because of our failure to recognize that particular skill requires particular pay, we have lost this individual.

Because of the technical nature of Air Force equipment, Air Force needs have become more and more closely related to civilian needs. Some refinement is necessary, therefore, to our thinking that one airman or one officer is as valuable or is entitled to as much pay as the next one. This philosophy is becoming just as impractical within the military service as it has become in industry.

When it is considered that the training of an Air Force technician costs countless thousands of dollars and extends over a

period, in some instances up to 3 years, it behooves us to create conditions which will insure a greater return on such training investments. It is necessary that we supply the proper motivation to our airmen and officers if we are to have use of these people over a longer period of time and at a time when they are fully productive.

A review of the experiences of the past several years points out how critical the problem is. In 1949 the Air Force had a reenlistment rate of 60 percent. From 1950 through 1953 it exceeded 50 percent; in 1954, however, following the Korean conflict, it declined to 31 percent, and in 1955 it fell off to a low of 23 percent. The legislation to promote career benefits that I have mentioned earlier has somewhat reversed the trend and in this coming year the Air Force expects to reenlist slightly more than 30 percent of those eligible for reenlistment.

Some believe that this is a good sign, but when we consider past, present, and projected reenlistment rates in terms of skill categories, we get an entirely different picture. The overall reenlistment rate in technical skills lies somewhere between 10 percent and 15 percent. While in the nontechnical areas such as Food Services, it lies between 60 percent and 93 percent. Among people who have served but one tour of duty in the Air Force the reenlistment rate of technically qualified personnel is far less. During the fiscal year which ended on June 30, 1956, the Air Force lost almost 120,000 airmen who completed their first 4-year enlistment and who did not reenlist. Many of these people were electronics technicans who spent up to 2½ years of their first enlistment in formal training costing in excess of $20,000. If these same ones could have been induced to reenlist and their training cost amortized over a 5½-year period instead of 1½-year productive period of their first enlistment, the cost to the Air Force would have been greatly reduced.

This lack of skilled airmen has a serious effect on Air Force operations. Today it takes 7 days to inspect a B–47 aircraft; 3 days should be maximum. To change a jet engine on many of our modern aircraft is taking as much as 120 man-hours. On hand, trained technicians could do the job in less than 60 hours. Preventive maintenance within the Air Force is becoming increasingly difficult; it is experiencing a greater incidence of equipment breakdowns and malfunctions. Air Force combat readiness suffers because of all of these.

What of the future? In the fiscal year ending next June the Air Force expects to lose more than 80,000 first-term enlisted personnel. In terms of dollars this represents a loss of trained manpower in excess of $1¼ billion.

Mr. President, that is a fantastic sum. We are not talking about a small amount of money; we are talking about an amount which is in excess of $1¼ billion.

If these people could be persuaded to stay with the Air Force over a period of from 8 to 12 years the resultant savings would reduce the training cost of the Air Force. I suggest that an increase in pay would reduce the expected attrition rate and the cost of such an increase would be but a very small percentage of existing and proposed Air Force training costs. We must not expect that a pay increase will result in any large immediate reduction in defense dollar requirements, but it certainly can be expected to result in an increase in the quality of the Air Force, followed by an eventual saving as training costs will ultimately be reduced.

Mr. President, let me remark at this point that no Member of the Senate is more dedicated to reducing the proposed Federal budget than is the junior Senator from Arizona. I believe, as do many of my colleagues, that we cannot continue deficit spending indefinitely. When I suggest that we take a look at the pay schedules of our armed services I do so knowing full well that it will probably cost more money immediately, but also that in the long run—and by that I mean within as short a time as 1 year—we will get benefits from such a program in a monetary way which will far exceed the small outlay involved at the present time.

The problems with regard to officers are similar to that dealing with airmen. There is an increasing requirement within the Air Force for personnel possessing a high level of education capable of being leaders, managers, and specialists. This affects very junior officers whose obligated tour of duty is also consumed by expensive training before they are ready to produce, and senior officers who, on the basis of cost of living indexes are paid about one-half as much as they received 40 years ago. Industry counterparts of Air Force senior officers have kept better pace with the economic progress of the country.

Industry has openings for practically all college graduates, particularly those with technical degrees, and is actively recruiting our technically skilled enlisted personnel. These men are being offered high wages, job security, and increasingly attractive fringe benefits. The Air Force is not now able to meet the competition of a thriving economy and the attractiveness of civilian life.

Consideration must also be given to conditions of service for military members assigned to remote and isolated locations. Civilian industry has long recognized the necessity of additional compensation for personnel assigned to undesirable areas where normal living conditions are lacking. If we are to be realistic we must offer relatively comparable compensation and opportunity to our professional service personnel.

Mr. President, at this point I might inject another thought. We will very shortly be considering the Eisenhower Middle East doctrine. It occurs to me that, instead of giving from $200 million to $400 million in the form of economic assistance to nations in the Middle East, it might be wiser to invest that money in well-equipped bases, and to provide for the health and security and happiness of our personnel who will be stationed in that very remote area of the world.

I speak feelingly on that point because I served in that area during the Second World War; I have flown over it many times, and I visited it only a year ago. It is not a part of the world where Americans will enjoy life. I would much prefer to see the sum of from $200 million to $400 milion spent on the personnel and bases than dropped into the usual rat hole of economic assistance to countries which I believe have enough economic income at the present time to handle their own problems.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER). Demonstrations in the galleries are not permitted.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Furthermore, we must recognize that in the present-day military structure, compensation should have more relation to degree of skill, education, and mission essentiality. Across the board rates based on present military grade structures are no longer appropriate.

We have acknowledged this need in the case of physicians and dentists, now we must recognize this requirement throughout our structure. Only in this way can we hope to retain the people we need to provide a combat-ready Air Force—and I say this with all due respect to the other armed services—for the defense of the United States and our American way of life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point some tables which depict in detail the information I have tried to bring out during my short presentation to the Senate.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Out of every 4 officers in all services completing obligated service during fiscal year 1955, 3 elected to return to civil life: 43,800 completed their obligated service, 11,800 stayed, 32,000 left the service. Of those who left 3,975 were Air Force pilots!

*Reenlistment rate of first term airmen, fiscal year 1956*

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| Atomic weapons | 5 |
| Intricate equipment | [1] 20 |
| Air police | [2] 40 |
| Food service | 46 |

[1] Average training time, 24 to 36 months.
[2] Average training time, 8 months.

*Air Force gains and losses*

| | Fiscal year 1955 | |
|---|---|---|
| | Losses | Gains |
| Basic airmen | 12,800 | 161,961 |
| Sergeants | 58,100 | 3,000 |
| Master sergeants | 2,000 | 450 |
| Officers | 13,260 | 20,600 |

| | Fiscal year 1956 | |
|---|---|---|
| | Losses | Gains |
| Basic airmen | 11,987 | 129,200 |
| Sergeants | 40,900 | 2,350 |
| Master sergeants | 3,000 | 350 |
| Officers | 14,900 | 22,500 |

| | Fiscal year 1957 | |
|---|---|---|
| | Losses | Gains |
| Basic airmen | 11,500 | 128,750 |
| Sergeants | 19,400 | 2,000 |
| Master sergeants | 1,700 | 200 |
| Officers | 16,600 | 14,400 |

*Reenlistment trend by Air Force career fields (cumulative fiscal year 1955 and 1st quarter fiscal year 1956)*

| Career | 1st term | Career |
|---|---|---|
| | *Percent* | *Percent* |
| Air control and warning | 15 | 65 |
| Communications | 18 | 75 |
| Radio-radar | 10 | 63 |
| Armament | 12 | 64 |
| Aircraft and engines | 20 | 75 |
| Food service | 40 | 87 |
| Supply | 30 | 83 |

*Cumulative reenlistment by career field*

| | Fiscal year 1955 | Fiscal year 1956 (July 1955 through November 1955) |
|---|---|---|
| Cumulative | 23.5 | 45 |
| 1st term | 14.5 | 31 |
| Career | 70.2 | 88 |
| Intelligence (20) | 12.7 | 32 |
| 1st term | 6.1 | 16 |
| Career | 51.7 | 87 |
| Photomapping (22) | 15.7 | 23 |
| 1st term | 8.1 | 12 |
| Career | 54.8 | 71 |
| Photographic (23) | 22.9 | 46 |
| 1st term | 12.0 | 26 |
| Career | 60.0 | 87 |
| Weather (25) | 18.8 | 35 |
| 1st term | 9.5 | 18 |
| Career | 50.4 | 84 |
| Air traffic control and warning (27) | 16.6 | 31 |
| 1st term | 10.7 | 20 |
| Career | 57.6 | 81 |
| Communication operations (29) | 21.1 | 38 |
| 1st term | 13.0 | 26 |
| Career | 63.0 | 85 |
| Radio radar system (30) | 12.4 | 32 |
| 1st term | 7.0 | 17 |
| Career | 50.5 | 83 |
| Pilotless aircraft guidance and control system (31) | 7.4 | 28 |
| 1st term | 5.1 | 13 |
| Career | 35.3 | 91 |
| Armament system maintenance (32) | 11.5 | 32 |
| 1st term | 7.1 | 24 |
| Career | 57.7 | 83 |
| Atomic weapons (33) | 13.4 | 16 |
| 1st term | 4.7 | 8 |
| Career | 60.3 | 71 |
| Training devices (34) | 22.5 | 46 |
| 1st term | 13.5 | 28 |
| Career | 65.5 | 92 |
| Wire maintenance (36) | 19.0 | 43 |
| 1st term | 12.4 | 26 |
| Career | 56.8 | 87 |
| Intricate equipment maintenance (40) | 14.6 | 31 |
| 1st term | 9.1 | 16 |
| Career | 62.6 | 85 |
| Aircraft accessories maintenance (42) | 18.5 | 29 |
| 1st term | 12.7 | 20 |
| Career | 69.0 | 80 |

*Cumulative reenlistment by career field—Continued*

| | Fiscal year 1955 | Fiscal year 1956 (July 1955 through November 1955) |
|---|---|---|
| Aircraft and engine maintenance (43) | 27.0 | 49 |
| 1st term | 14.1 | 32 |
| Career | 75.9 | 90 |
| Rocket propulsion (44) | 36.7 | 73 |
| 1st term | 17.8 | |
| Career | 93.3 | 100 |
| Production control (45) | 46.7 | 70 |
| 1st term | 27.3 | 36 |
| Career | 100.0 | 93 |
| Munitions and weapons maintenance (46) | 23.2 | 46 |
| 1st term | 13.2 | 32 |
| Career | 72.0 | 88 |
| Vehicle maintenance (47) | 21.0 | 45 |
| 1st term | 13.5 | 31 |
| Career | 70.4 | 87 |
| Metalworking (53) | 22.1 | 43 |
| 1st term | 13.1 | 31 |
| Career | 73.4 | 84 |
| Construction (55) | 27.7 | 50 |
| 1st term | 18.2 | 35 |
| Career | 70.3 | 87 |
| Utilities (56) | 20.7 | 44 |
| 1st term | 13.3 | 33 |
| Career | 66.2 | 81 |
| Fire fighting (57) | 28.2 | 55 |
| 1st term | 19.9 | 44 |
| Career | 67.9 | 90 |
| Fabric, leather, rubber (58) | 29.3 | 55 |
| 1st term | 18.8 | 42 |
| Career | 78.2 | 92 |
| Marine (59) | 41.7 | 75 |
| 1st term | 24.2 | 53 |
| Career | 86.3 | 90 |
| Transportation (60) | 28.8 | 56 |
| 1st term | 19.1 | 41 |
| Career | 72.0 | 89 |
| Food service (62) | 32.5 | 55 |
| 1st term | 23.8 | 44 |
| Career | 84.1 | 92 |
| Supply (64) | 30.3 | 56 |
| 1st term | 18.7 | 41 |
| Career | 75.9 | 92 |
| Procurement (65) | 26.2 | 32 |
| 1st term | 17.9 | 20 |
| Career | 67.6 | 73 |
| Finance, accounting, and auditing (67) | 18.4 | 32 |
| 1st term | 9.1 | 16 |
| Career | 68.3 | 84 |
| Machine accounting (68) | 17.4 | 26 |
| 1st term | 9.5 | 16 |
| Career | 66.9 | 79 |
| Administrative (70) | 23.9 | 41 |
| 1st term | 15.1 | 28 |
| Career | 73.0 | 88 |
| Printing (71) | 22.2 | 30 |
| 1st term | 6.2 | 23 |
| Career | 65.6 | 78 |
| Information (72) | 15.6 | 26 |
| 1st term | 6.2 | 11 |
| Career | 65.6 | 87 |

*Cumulative reenlistment by career field—Continued*

| | Fiscal year 1955 | Fiscal year 1956 (July 1955 through November 1955) |
|---|---|---|
| Personnel (73) | 26.8 | 51 |
| 1st term | 14.4 | 29 |
| Career | 78.2 | 90 |
| Special services (74) | 24.6 | 46 |
| 1st term | 11.6 | 26 |
| Career | 73.5 | 86 |
| Education and training (75) | 19.9 | 44 |
| 1st term | 11.9 | 25 |
| Career | 70.6 | 57 |
| Band (76) | 11.3 | 28 |
| 1st term | 4.9 | 13 |
| Career | 69.4 | 80 |
| Air police (77) and (82) | 25.0 | 50 |
| 1st term | 18.0 | 38 |
| Career | 65.4 | 80 |
| Medical (90) | 21.0 | 45 |
| 1st term | 15.3 | 32 |
| Career | 66.2 | 88 |
| Aircrew protection (92) | 35.8 | 51 |
| 1st term | 20.0 | 40 |
| Career | 77.9 | 89 |
| Dental (93) | 33.3 | 33 |
| 1st term | 25.3 | 25 |
| Career | 91.7 | 85 |
| Unclassified (99 and 100) | 30.8 | 32 |
| 1st term | 20.2 | 22 |
| Career | 70.2 | 97 |

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the junior Senator from Arizona on the very excellent and well-thought-out address he has made upon the salary situation in the Armed Forces.

All of us know, of course, that we are facing a demand by the Armed Forces for increased appropriations. It has been my experience in life that when we give overall increases to people we usually end up by giving the most money to those who need it the least, and give the least money to those who need it the most, who in this instance are the airmen and noncommissioned officers in the Air Force. Throughout the armed services of our country it is privates and the noncommissioned officers who need assistance the most.

Much as they need it, as the Senator from Arizona has very well pointed out, merely increasing the money which we allocate to those services may by itself increase the problem with which we are confronted.

Therefore, I particularly wish to compliment the Senator from Arizona on having the courage and foresight to bring before the Senate a subject whose presentation, while perhaps a little daring and perhaps a little audacious, shows some real thought, which will make a real contribution toward diminishing the amount which we must expend for defense, and which will at the same time assure us of a better and firmer and more solid defense system and plant than we now have. Therefore, I am very

proud and very happy to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Arizona, and to thank him for making them at this time.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado for his very generous remarks in my behalf. I failed to mention during the course of my discussion, that the Cordiner Committee report is now available to the Members of the Senate. I believe most Members of the Senate have received it. In that report Senators will find much to support the conviction I have expressed today.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, informed the Senate that the chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee had appointed Mr. MILLER of California; Mr. LENNON, of North Carolina, and Mr. MAILLIARD, of California, as members, on the part of the House, of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

The message also informed the Senate that the chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee had appointed Mrs. SULLIVAN, of Missouri; Mr. T. A. THOMPSON, of Louisiana, and Mr. RAY, of New York, as members, on the part of the House, of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

## FOREIGN AID REPORT ON THURSDAY BY SENATOR ELLENDER

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, following the morning hour, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] be recognized to give his report on foreign aid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## MAJORITY MEMBERSHIP OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk an order listing the Members of the Senate who are to be assigned to the Select Committee on Small Business on the part of the majority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order will be stated.

The order was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Ordered*, That the Select Committee on Small Business consist of the following Members on the part of the majority: Mr. SPARKMAN (chairman), Mr. LONG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MONRONEY, and Mr. BIBLE.

## HOW ONE MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL GUARD "DODGED THE DRAFT"

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in view of recent unfortunate remarks implying that members of the National Guard are "draft dodgers," I should like to read for the RECORD the confession of one guardsman, as published in the San Angelo (Tex.) Standard-Times:

ROBERT LEE, January 30.—Frank Dickey, attorney here and World War I soldier out of the National Guard, provides the deft touch for the controversy stirred up by Secretary of Defense Wilson's remarks.

Dickey, a ground observer overseas during World War I, speaks his piece as follows:

"The jig's up * * * Secretary Wilson has let the cat out of the bag. I want it off my conscience, so I'll tell the world:

"Back in June or July 1917 while I was punchin' cows on the Double Circle in Arizona, I got scared that I was going to be drafted—I became horrified—since I was 6 feet up and pretty well stacked, I couldn't claim to be an 'ambulatory.' Besides, I'd been muggin' steers and skinnin' broncs as they come. I tried acting funny; but, that didn't seem to take. I sure didn't want any part of that drafting.

"I thought about going into the ministry, but I had tooted 'em up so much here and there, that I couldn't get away with that. Going to college was out—I couldn't spell 'come to breakfast.' I might have got by on a marrying deal, but, when I thought of it there wasn't 'a widow with three' left.

Politics seemed like the 'spot.' When I hit on that idea I thought I had it made. I boned up on beliringin' and got to be pretty good. I could 'view with alarm' and 'point with pride' to a fair-you-well. I had 'background'—I had herded sheep, punched cows, busted broncs, dug postholes and I had 'pioneer' ancestors to spare.

I might add: Perhaps he was born in a log cabin.

"In fact, my background was so durn hot I got scared and decided against politics.

"Well, to make a long story short, I done it—I jined the 6th Texas Infantry (National Guard).

"In April 1918, disguised as a soldier, 'Pvt. Frank C. Dickey,' I slipped aboard the 'Ausonia' with about 1,700 other draft-dodgers and left the draft board without even one of my whiskers.

"I am not going to tell you where we went nor what we did—I don't want to reflect on men like General MacArthur who rode herd on us. I will say on my own that the wine was good and the women was up to par.

"But, may the Lord have pity on my poor soul, I done it: I dodged the draft."

Dickey came out of the service as he went in with the rank of private. He was attached to Headquarters Company, 6th Texas Infantry.

## COMPLETION OF DEMOCRATIC ORGANIZATION OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, today there was a meeting of the Senate Democratic campaign committee. The meeting was called to complete the Democratic organization of the Senate.

We have the Senate Democratic policy committee, which handles our legislative program.

We have the Senate Democratic steering committee which handles the appointments of members to standing legislative committees.

Now we have completed the organization of the Senate Democratic campaign committee, which handles election problems.

The committee has been set up this year with Earle C. Clements as executive director. He will work closely with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], who has agreed to remain as chairman, and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who will remain as vice chairman.

The Senate Democratic campaign committee has a heavy responsibility. It works closely with the Democratic National Committee. It helps individual candidates for the United States Senate—either for election or reelection.

And it must work in harmony with the House Democratic campaign committee, which has somewhat different—but still similar—problems.

The next election will be important to the Democratic Party. We recognize its importance already. A few more Democratic seats would do wonders for the country in terms of passing the kind of bills the people want.

The leadership of the Senate Democratic campaign committee in the past has been excellent. It worked wonders in helping to elect a Democratic Senate in 1954 and in reelecting a Democratic Senate in 1956 in the face of a Republican Presidential sweep.

We are going to retain that leadership and strengthen it by the addition of a topnotch staff under the direction of Earle Clements. It will be active right from the beginning, working closely not only with the National Committee, but with State organizations.

We Democrats feel that we can do the kind of job that will serve the country, and the campaign committee can operate actively in bringing that fact home to the people of the country. We will be ready for 1958 before it gets here.

## ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 4, 1957, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 637), an act to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available thereunder for business loans.

## ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, to Thursday, February 7, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 4, 1957:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Randolph H. Weber, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the eastern

district of Missouri vice Rubey M. Hulen, deceased.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Thomas James Donegan, of New York, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the remainder of the term expiring April 9, 1957, vice Thomas J. Herbert, resigned.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

James A. Boatwright, Abbeville, Ala., in place of J. R. Solomon, transferred.

Henry L. Mullins, Andalusia, Ala., in place of L. E. Brown, retired.

Prince W. Cofield, Bexar, Ala., in place of Pearce Goggans, retired.

Robert L. Cockrell, Double Springs, Ala., in place of B. L. Butler, retired.

Lewis L. Buttram, Goodwater, Ala., in place of Daisy Buice, retired.

Luther W. Bowen, Horton, Ala., in place of J. L. Stephens, resigned.

Jonas Jackson Nance, Mount Hope, Ala., in place of J. W. Smith, retired.

Earl Barley, Normal, Ala., in place of M. L. Gill, removed.

Carolyn S. Brown, Northport, Ala., in place of W. T. Collins, retired.

Eugene Williamson, Orrville, Ala., in place of H. E. Marshall, retired.

Fred Clardy, Roanoke, Ala., in place of C. W. Jordan, retired.

Roy Wesley Rhodes, Tuscaloosa, Ala., in place of H. M. McLeod, removed.

ALASKA

Paul G. Swanson, Chugiak, Alaska, in place of M. L. McDowell, resigned.

ARIZONA

Irvan W. Fleming, Ajo, Ariz., in place of R. B. Anderson, retired.

Robert L. Honea, Marana, Ariz., in place of J. E. Collins, retired.

Jimmie L. Matheson, Sierra Vista, Ariz., in place of V. J. Schrader, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Curtis F. Mason, Alma, Ark., in place of W. D. Patton, retired.

Smiley F. Buck, Altus, Ark., in place of C. C. Pitts, deceased.

Ted M. Anderson, Batesville, Ark., in place of E. F. Crutchfield, transferred.

Herschel A. Webb, Beebe, Ark., in place of Sarah Abington, retired.

Alma K. May, Booneville, Ark., in place of B. B. Bevens, retired.

Ashley N. Park, De Valls Bluff, Ark., in place of James Thweatt, retired.

Mack Hopper, Glenwood, Ark., in place of Edbert Jessup, removed.

Sam D. Lieblong, Greenbrier, Ark., in place of H. E. Mayhew, retired.

Leland T. Lewis, Huntsville, Ark., in place of O. E. Faubus, resigned.

Harry Craig, Jonesboro, Ark., in place of F. R. Parr, retired.

Kermit C. Sparks, Lamar, Ark., in place of M. E. Nation, resigned.

Ralph A. Morrison, Nettleton, Ark., in place of M. R. Hughes, retired.

Naomi Oleta Hixson, Paris, Ark., in place of R. C. Hixson, deceased.

Dillard H. Collins, Salem, Ark., in place of H. J. Humphries, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Lillian M. Burrow, Betteravia, Calif., in place of P. M. Pittori, retired.

Agnes C. Richmond, Beverly Hills, Calif., in place of M. J. O'Rourke, retired.

Loudon F. Hillhouse, Bijou, Calif., in place of G. J. Hickey, resigned.

Stanley A. Powell, Downey, Calif., in place of J. A. Bryson, resigned.

Noma Joyce Marshall, Five Points, Calif., in place of O. L. Smith, resigned.

Irene F. Tallis, Hilts, Calif., in place of R. E. Baumgartner, retired.

Delpha P. Furgeson, Indio, Calif., in place of R. J. King, transferred.

Marion M. Davis, La Habra, Calif., in place of Bertha Hilbert, retired.

Marion S. Karrh, La Jolla, Calif., in place of N. L. Rannells, retired.

Llewellyn D. Crandall, Larkspur, Calif., in place of F. G. Kirby, resigned.

Vera A. Largent, Leucadia, Calif., in place of G. E. Thrailkill, retired.

John R. Hann, Merced, Calif., in place of J. T. McInerny, retired.

Henry Payne Thayer, Newport Beach, Calif., in place of J. T. Boyd, Jr., resigned.

Everett T. Carpenter, North Hollywood, Calif., in place of B. W. Harris, removed.

Walter A. Page, Redlands, Calif., in place of J. B. Stone, resigned.

James T. Walter, St. Helena, Calif., in place of F. B. Rossi, resigned.

Herman J. Johnson, San Carlos, Calif., in place of M. K. Davis, retired.

Walter Lewin, Westminster, Calif., in place of L. N. Strawbridge, removed.

Frank B. Johnson, Westmoreland, Calif., in place of E. H. Cain, resigned.

Wynn K. Giles, West Point, Calif., in place of H. A. Eckert, retired.

Walter J. Fitzpatrick, Yosemite National Park, Calif., in place of F. C. Alexander, retired.

COLORADO

Hazel L. Weston, Bristol, Colo., in place of B. E. Osborn, resigned.

Max T. Robb, Central City, Colo., in place of C. I. Parsons, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Robert M. Gates, Niantic, Conn., in place of C. A. O'Connell, removed.

Theodore D. Lindemark, Rockfall, Conn., in place of F. E. Collins, retired.

FLORIDA

Troy K. Smith, Bowling Green, Fla., in place of H. H. Bryan, retired.

Harlow John Schutt, Boynton Beach, Fla., in place of E. S. Pierce, retired.

John Lester Dicus, Clearwater, Fla., in place of Sue Barco, retired.

Lewis M. Gallaway, Eustis, Fla., in place of A. O. Jefferis, deceased.

Joel L. Adams, Laurel Hill, Fla., in place of J. W. Harrison, transferred.

Wilmer K. Sadler, Lutz, Fla., in place of W. R. Bosburg, retired.

Harry Beckner, Jr., Mango, Fla., in place of W. A. Lehmann, retired.

Catherine W. McCormick, Nocatee, Fla., in place of J. D. Carlton, retired.

David W. Gormican, St. Leo, Fla., in place of J. D. Carlton, retired.

John R. Higgins, Samoset, Fla., in place of W. D. Thomas, retired.

Fred Wagner, Tice, Fla., in place of B. L. Ward, resigned.

GEORGIA

Burl F. Sanders, Atlanta, Ga., in place of L. F. Livingston, retired.

Ed. J. Ehrensperger, Blackshear, Ga., in place of W. R. Allen, removed.

Homer Coy Anderson, Cusseta, Ga., in place of N. K. Rogers, deceased.

Willard E. Thomas, Lafayette, Ga., in place of W. A. Enloe, Jr., resigned.

Clara Jean S. Bentley, Palmetto, Ga., in place of E. B. Cotton, retired.

William A. Garner, Ray City, Ga., in place of G. L. Webb, removed.

Clara W. Smith, Sargent, Ga., in place of E. W. Scroggin, retired.

William Madison Dewberry, Tifton, Ga., in place of O. V. Barkuloo, resigned.

Robert M. Ellis, Villa Rica, Ga., in place of U. W. Busby, removed.

IDAHO

Robert L. Bulen, Culesac, Idaho, in place of C. A. Rohrman, resigned.

Jesse O. Hiatt, Marsing, Idaho, in place of W. W. Volkmer, retired.

Robert J. Krouse, Priest River, Idaho, in place of Mercedes Tremblay, deceased.

ILLINOIS

Arlynn M. Price, Abingdon, Ill., in place of J. W. Lucas, resigned.

William S. Totten, Alexis, Ill., in place of G. A. Porter, removed.

Carl E. Heideman, Algonquin, Ill., in place of M. W. Struming, removed.

Frank Keistler, Jr., Anna, Ill., in place of R. C. Gurley, transferred.

Gordon L. Smedley, Ashland, Ill., in place of Pearl Caswell, removed.

George L. Wall, Bridgeport, Ill., in place of F. H. Stoltz, deceased.

Robert V. Loft, Capron, Ill., in place of M. M. Boyd, removed.

Walter B. Tregoning, Carterville, Ill., in place of F. J. Rudloff, removed.

Harlow D. Smoke, Cerro Gordo, Ill., in place of J. E. Pollard, resigned.

Marjorie M. Herringer, Channahon, Ill., in place of M. S. Bordeaux, removed.

Kenneth B. Westray, Clinton, Ill., in place of T. W. Cramer, resigned.

Colette C. Hynes, Crete, Ill., in place of G. S. Allen, resigned.

Francis J. Aydt, Dahlgren, Ill., in place of C. W. Karcher, deceased.

Raymond D. Manis, Ewing, Ill., in place of W. H. King, deceased.

Ernie R. Rightmyer, Fairfield, Ill., in place of J. C. Stanley, removed.

Milton H. Lacey, Farina, Ill., in place of M. W. Irish, removed.

Thomas M. Balk, Franklin Park, Ill., in place of W. J. Dolamore, retired.

Herbert O. E. Baltz, Freeburg, Ill., in place of E. J. Heiligenstein, deceased.

Theron C. Tavenner, Freeport, Ill., in place of J. C. McKinstra, deceased.

Charles A. McDonald, Galesburg, Ill., in place of D. C. Beatty, retired.

Kenneth L. Pflaum, Genoa, Ill., in place of J. R. Sester, removed.

William M. Johnson, Granite City, Ill., in place of C. T. Heaton, removed.

Marjorie C. Mossman, Hamburg, Ill., in place of E. F. Day, retired.

August Todd, Joppa, Ill., in place of V. M. Lauderdale, resigned.

John Paul Smothers, Marion, Ill., in place of A. O. Ledbetter, removed.

William I. Anderson, Metropolis, Ill., in place of L. L. Taylor, transferred.

Justus A. Gibson, Mount Carmel, Ill., in place of Fay Moyer, removed.

Joseph Knuth, Mount Prospect, Ill., in place of D. L. Besander, resigned.

Merlyn H. Reatherford, Moweaqua, Ill., in place of H. R. Richardson, removed.

Warren S. Plant, National Stock Yards, Ill., in place of G. F. Bennett, retired.

Alfred E. Leininger, Nauvoo, Ill., in place of P. H. Schenk, removed.

Earl J. Thompson, O'Fallon, Ill., in place of J. L. Anheuser, retired.

Gilbert H. Abraham, Orangeville, Ill., in place of E. M. Reeser, retired.

Elmer P. Hitter, Ottawa, Ill., in place of F. J. Mulholland, resigned.

Charles E. Turvey, Pana, Ill., in place of C. V. Fellers, deceased.

Joseph E. Myers, Ramsey, Ill., in place of O. W. Hinton, removed.

Frank G. Brown, Salem, Ill., in place of C. H. Roberts, transferred.

Josephine C. Hanfelder, South Roxanna, Ill., in place of D. M. Magee, resigned.

Bertha P. Glenn, Verona, Ill., in place of J. G. Finch, retired.

James Ruzicka, Warrenville, Ill., in place of H. G. Sleep, retired.

Horace Roscoe Bradbury, West Point, Ill., in place of S. B. Gordon, retired.

Harry L. Crawford, Yorkville, Ill., in place of M. N. Beecher, removed.

INDIANA

Wilfred M. Bedel, Batesville, Ind., in place of C. H. Andres, deceased.

Richard W. Garvin, Battle Ground, Ind., in place of A. C. Whiteside, retired.

Mary Ann Massa, Blanford, Ind., in place of James Perona, retired.
Anne Lee Cooper, Clarksburg, Ind., in place of N. C. Tucker, removed.
Robert L. Sieber, Delphi, Ind., in place of W. B. Popejoy, transferred.
Guy E. Edds, Dugger, Ind., in place of H. M. Collins, resigned.
Maurice F. Keilman, Dyer, Ind., in place of L. E. Hoffman, deceased.
James R. Williams, Elizabethtown, Ind., in place of B. L. Shepard, retired.
Alvin J. Vaal, Ferdinand, Ind., in place of Albert Seufert, removed.
James L. Conwell, Greensburg, Ind., in place of C. D. Samuels, resigned.
Madeline L. Freeman, Griffin, Ind., in place of C. C. Gilmore, removed.
Walter A. Smith, Indianapolis, Ind., in place of G. J. Ress, retired.
James H. Nelson, Ladoga, Ind., in place of O. H. Scott, deceased.
George M. Smith, Medora, Ind., in place of H. H. Zollman, resigned.
William F. Reineke, Mount Vernon, Ind., in place of M. W. Smith, deceased.
Frances L. Autrey, Newberry, Ind., in place of C. V. Wolford, retired.
William W. Bishop, Newport, Ind., in place of R. H. Adams, removed.
Paul Burns, Oakland City, Ind., in place of T. J. Lemasters, retired.
Ray E. Melick, Oaktown, Ind., in place of E. P. Donnar, retired.
Bill R. Davidson, Princeton, Ind., in place of E. M. Miller, retired.
Wendell R. Martin, Rensselaer, Ind., in place of H. E. McMahan, resigned.
Arthur R. Bietry, Richmond, Ind., in place of F. B. Pickett, deceased.
Alfred L. Howe, Star City, Ind., in place of H. L. Korner, retired.
Glendel D. Marshall, Swayzee, Ind., in place of E. C. McLain, retired.
Ernest E. Bushong, Syracuse, Ind., in place of L. B. Whitehead, retired.
John D. Gaston, Urbana, Ind., in place of A. O. Hipskind, resigned.
Charles David Keller, Valparaiso, Ind., in place of R. B. Wise, retired.
Merrill R. Dorrell, West Newton, Ind., in place of M. L. Plummer, resigned.
Eura Annita Dillon, Williamsburg, Ind., in place of M. J. Frazer, retired.
Philip L. Laurien, Winona Lake, Ind., in place of R. G. Nusbaum, retired.
Donald Eugene Greenburg, Wolcott, Ind., in place of M. A. Dismore, retired.

IOWA

Darwin L. Hascall, Emerson, Iowa, in place of G. L. Johnson, transferred.
Thomas J. Hamilton, Epworth, Iowa, in place of S. J. Callahan, retired.
Jerry J. Snoble, Hazleton, Iowa, in place of G. E. Sherrer, retired.
Martin O. Knapp, Lohrville, Iowa, in place of W. G. Strabala, deceased.
Kenneth B. Fairall, Muscatine, Iowa, in place of A. S. Barry, retired.
Wayne A. Stein, Newhall, Iowa, in place of E. S. Wheeler, retired.
Charles E. Boyles, Woodward, Iowa, in place of H. C. Calonkey, retired.

KANSAS

Ralyn M. Hill, Abilene, Kans., in place of J. B. Robson, removed.
Jacob C. Gaeddert, Inman, Kans., in place of J. F. Lambert, transferred.
Joseph W. Rush, Longford, Kans., in place of A. I. Marty, retired.
Lloyd William Barker, Valley Falls, Kans., in place of Clayton Wyatt, retired.

KENTUCKY

Guy Samuels, Baxter, Ky., in place of E. P. Leger, resigned.
Escar O. Coe, Burkesville, Ky., in place of J. G. Talbot, resigned.
Rufus D. Higgins, Gray, Ky., in place of R. A. Brafford, removed.
Rees H. Dickson, Jeffersontown, Ky., in place of B. H. Dean, removed.
Arnel C. Taylor, Livingston, Ky., in place of D. E. Pike, resigned.
Wilmer L. Boggs, London, Ky., in place of H. O. House, transferred.
Mattie F. Cole, Louellen, Ky., in place of M. B. Vaughn, retired.
Clarence B. Howard, Loyall, Ky., in place of H. F. Saulinas, resigned.
Pauline M. Collins, Lynch, Ky., in place of O. A. Brannon, resigned.
Ralph P. Chaney, Pine Knot, Ky., in place of J. C. Ryan, retired.
John D. Miller, Valley Station, Ky., in place of Murray Swindler, retired.

LOUISIANA

Roy E. Boyd, Converse, La., in place of T. S. Heard, retired.
Marlin M. Ryder, Deville, La., in place of J. M. Wilbanks, retired.
Alex M. McCabe, Jones, La., in place of W. R. Boone, deceased.
William Caldwell Fisher, Morrow, La., in place of J. E. Hicks, resigned.
James H. Smith, Newllano, La., in place of E. O. Joynes, removed.

MAINE

Willis J. Gates, Millinocket, Maine, in place of G. J. Jones, retired.

MARYLAND

Beatrice P. Brittingham, Fishing Creek, Md., in place of L. W. Tyler, declined.
Elwood J. Greenhalgh, Royal Oak, Md., in place of P. M. Pastorfield, Jr., retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Thomas J. Mason, Clinton, Mass., in place of W. F. McNamara, removed.
James E. Elphinstone, Ludlow, Mass., in place of Hormisdas Boucher, retired.
Carroll A. Strysko, Montague, Mass., in place of D. J. Newton, retired.
Raymond H. Allen, North Grafton, Mass., in place of James Connaughton, retired.
Normar V. Joyal, North Oxford, Mass., in place of William Bacon, deceased.
Nathaniel A. Nash, Oakdale, Mass., in place of Laura Boulais, retired.
Robert S. Caves, Wenham, Mass., in place of F. J. Lucey, retired.
Cecil H. Evans, West Hanover, Mass., in place of P. J. Hanberry, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Joseph B. Woodrow, Jr., Augusta, Mich., in place of C. E. Richardson, removed.
Alton C. Britton, Battle Creek, Mich., in place of J. O. Curry, retired.
Marie Norris, Casnovia, Mich., in place of R. G. Hayward, retired.
Frederick M. Davenport, Constantine, Mich., in place of E. L. Wittenberg, transferred.
Theodore H. Lyon, Eaton Rapids, Mich., in place of W. V. Clegg, retired.
Charles H. Hinman, Hastings, Mich., in place of R. G. Hubbard, retired.
Harold Stecker, Hermansville, Mich., in place of W. C. Radue, retired.
Lyle H. Van Etten, Jasper, Mich., in place of C. A. Van Dusen, retired.
John W. Van Eck, Kalamazoo, Mich., in place of Walter Schanz, removed.
Justice A. Mitchell, Leonidas, Mich., in place of Diana Wardwell, removed.
Myron L. Newman, Martin, Mich., in place of S. A. Snyden, resigned.
Jean F. Richards, Perrinton, Mich., in place of M. M. Miller, deceased.
Clark E. Nogle, Plainwell, Mich., in place of S. J. Doster, retired.
Donald D. French, Portland, Mich., in place of P. J. Trierweiler, removed.
Nellie J. Morrison, Rapid City, Mich., in place of C. K. Guy, removed.
George J. Ruff, Rockwood, Mich., in place of A. J. LaBo, deceased.
Chester J. Orr, Standish, Mich., in place of A. M. Rokosz, removed.
Harold J. Hawkins, Wayland, Mich, in place of M. R. Ehle, removed.
Milton E. Fairbank, Wheeler, Mich., in place of J. C. Haynor, retired.
Clarence A. Broemer, White Pine, Mich., office established February 1, 1954.
Albert A. Hebda, Wyandotte, Mich., in place of Przybylski, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Emmet H. Beckman, Bird Island, Minn., in place of J. D. Fehlhaber, resigned.
Robert P. Clark, Cromwell, Minn., in place of Elizabeth Wright, retired.
Milton J. Moxness, Montevideo, Minn., in place of A. E. Anderson, retired.
Earl W. Axeen, Sartell, Minn., in place of P. A. Weis, retired.
Manfred C. Folstad, Shelly, Minn., in place of H. C. Megrund, retired.
Agnes M. Quam, Watson, Minn., in place of R. M. Odegard, removed.

MISSISSIPPI

Harvey C. Mitchell, Jr., Plantersville, Miss., in place of W. T. Grant, transferred.
Edgar I. Adcock, Ridgeland, Miss., in place of B. D. Battley, resigned.
Rufus A. Ware, Stringer, Miss., in place of J. G. Ishee, retired.

MISSOURI

William E. Wise, Aurora, Mo., in place of M. L. Coleman, removed.
Colin A. Labruyere, Bloomsdale, Mo., in place of A. P. Drury, retired.
Ralph Gravely, Bolivar, Mo., in place of J. E. Thomasson, removed.
Gordon A. Rollins, Carthage, Mo., in place of C. O. Smith, removed.
Curtis M. Cook, Festus, Mo., in place of R. F. Irvin, removed.
James E. Lysinger, Lowry City, Mo., in place of B. F. Eversole, transferred.
Alfred W. McKenzie, Parma, Mo., in place of R. M. Hall, retired.
Lawrence L. Poleski, St. Ann, Mo. Office established June 1, 1954.
George R. Arnold, Smithville, Mo., in place of E. E. Eberts, resigned.
Clyde R. Muller, Sweet Springs, Mo., in place of H. F. Nelson, retired.
Eugene W. Waite, Wheeling, Mo., in place of S. H. Biggerstaff, deceased.

MONTANA

Mark M. Fuller, Great Falls, Mont., in place of E. W. Toole, resigned.
Robert Julian, Sheridan, Mont., in place of F. A. Marsh, retired.
William B. McCracken, Wolf Point, Mont., in place of L. R. Johnson, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Arthur Floyd Gowin, Hemingford, Nebr., in place of Clyde Yardley, removed.
Layton E. Baker, Neligh, Nebr., in place of K. A. Scofield, removed.
ElRoy Bartels, Tobias, Nebr., in place of A. E. Pratt, retired.
Harry F. Falke, Wahoo, Nebr., in place of C. E. Henrickson, resigned.

NEVADA

James Donald Morrison, Eureka, Nev., in place of J. V. Hooper, removed.
Minnie Kennedy Tuxill, Glenbrook, Nev., in place of Frank Schneider, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Ives Atherton, Hanover, N. H., in place of J. S. Gould, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Frank E. Gersie, Clifton, N. J., in place of G. A. Keenan, deceased.
George W. Schuyler, Clinton, N. J., in place of Nelson Pickel, deceased.
Gertrude N. Bailey, Dividing Creek, N. J., in place of J. R. Hendricks, removed.
Joseph Kain, Kenvil, N. J., in place of J. F. Bird, resigned.
John V. Zoppel, North Bergen, N. J., in place of F. A. Hynes, deceased.

Michael Yurcisin, Roebling, N. J., in place of George Majoros, Jr., removed.

John J. Picknally, Jr., Sea Bright, N. J., in place of J. L. Garland, resigned.

NEW MEXICO

Louise V. Maestas, Fairview, N. Mex. Office established January 1, 1952.

NEW YORK

John W. Ginther, Adams Basin, N. Y., in place of J. J. Ginther, retired.

Peter Hillen, Jr., Amityville, N. Y., in place of T. L. Wardle, deceased.

Patrick L. Agnano, Ardsley, N. Y., in place of M. T. Goehren, retired.

Gaetano Pavone, Bear Mountain, N. Y., in place of T. F. Reilly, retired.

Alta P. Johnson, Blue Mountain Lake, N. Y., in place of W. L. Smith, resigned.

Bernard J. Davis, Bouckville, N. Y., in place of F. G. Shattuck, retired.

Herbert Improte, Centereach, N. Y., in place of A. V. Herron, resigned.

John Wesley Sinnickson, Center Moriches, N. Y., in place of T. E. Havens, resigned.

John Hobert Stear, Churchville, N. Y., in place of P. C. Hopson, resigned.

Marta E. Hoffmann, Commack, N. Y., in place of M. S. Otten, retired.

Amelia L. Donovan, Forestport, N. Y., in place of M. A. Murphy, retired.

August J. Oliver, Frankfort, N. Y., in place of B. J. Vincent, removed.

Anthony B. Nicastri, Franklin Square, N. Y., in place of J. J. Loughnane, deceased.

Catherin V. Whalen, Hopewell Junction, N. Y., in place of W. T. Storm, retired.

Walter J. Beattie, Lake Luzern, N. Y., in place of E. F. Sebald, retired.

James H. Graham, Levittown, N. Y. Office established July 1, 1952.

Fotius Stelianou, Lyndonville, N. Y., in place of L. B. Wright, retired.

Lawrence Leo Shade, Merrick, N. Y., in place of J. G. Funch, retired.

Louis I. Katz, Mountain Dale, N. Y., place of Isidore Smith, retired.

Archie C. Davidson, New City, N. Y., in place of J. A. Lynch, removed.

Vincent E. Trunk, Niagara University, N. Y., in place of W. J. Glavin, resigned.

Horace E. Wadsworth, Nyack, N. Y., in place of M. F. McNichol, retired.

Russell A. Southard, Otego, N. Y., in place of D. L. Palmer, retired.

Phyllis N. Cooley, Richburg, N. Y., in place of H. C. Conneely, retired.

Kenneth D. Woods, Setauket, N. Y., in place of Anna Fallon, retired.

Helen S. Record, Sherburne, N. Y., in place of E. H. O'Connor, retired.

Richard C. Dedell, Sherrill, N. Y., in place of J. A. Egan, removed.

Robert J. Johnson, Staten Island, N. Y., in place of B. J. Sheeran, deceased.

Edmon L. Sowers, Thiells, N. Y., in place of Walter Stanhope, retired.

Sylvia C. Semel, Thompsonville, N. Y., in place of D. M. Loeb, retired.

Frederick J. Weigel, Tribes Hill, N. Y., in place of William Holdorf, deceased.

Stanley L. Evans, Utica, N. Y., in place of C. S. Donnelley, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Edward Leroy Hobby, Apex, N. C., in place of T. B. Miller, retired.

Guy E. Snyder, Bakersville, N. C., in place of J. F. Greene, resigned.

Judson G. Burrell, Barnardsville, N. C. in place of S. M. Brigmon, retired.

Lyle B. Cook, Boone, N. C., in place of J. E. Brown, Jr., removed.

Vernon P. Fullbright, Brevard, N. C., in place of T. C. Galloway, retired.

Nelwyn F. Carawan, Bridgeton, N. C., in place of R. J. Weisiger, retired.

Ruth A. Farrior, Calypso, N. C., in place of Russell Best, retired.

Clarence W. Burrell, Canton, N. C., in place of W. C. Hill, retired.

James F. Lampley, Cordova, N. C., in place of E. W. Ratliff, resigned.

Clifford O. Scott, Dobson, N. C., in place of R. L. Folger, removed.

Charles A. Brown, Efland, N. C., in place of M. E. Harris, retired.

Lala C. Shell, Elk Park, N. C., in place of B. H. Winters, retired.

Charles Michael Crawford, Erwin, N. C., in place of J. F. Lynch, retired.

Leonard R. Odham, Fair Bluff, N. C., in place of A. E. Waller, retired.

Burl L. Orr, Fontana Dam, N. C., in place of B. Q. Cable, transferred.

Annie P. Wolfe, Jamesville, N. C., in place of E. H. Ange, retired.

John F. Mewborne, Kinston, N. C., in place of E. R. Wooten, resigned.

William Oliver Keller, Lake Lure, N. C., in place of E. S. Holliman, resigned.

Dexter G. Oakley, Lawsonville, N. C., in place of J. T. Tucker, transferred.

Mary R. Titman, Lowell, N. C., in place of C. H. Hand, retired.

John B. McLaughlin, Newell, N. C., in place of S. B. Wilson, retired.

Vernon W. Taylor, Oxford, N. C., in place of J. A. Williams, retired.

LeRoy A. Self, Pittsboro, N. C., in place of W. L. Farrell, removed.

Coy S. Lewis, Jr., Robbins, N. C., in place of G. E. Walker, deceased.

Alice H. Graves, Seagrove, N. C., in place of J. L. Kearns, deceased.

Martin T. Southard, Stokesdale, N. C., in place of H. G. Cook, retired.

John H. Norton, Stony Point, N. C., in place of D. F. Cockrell, removed.

James H. Parks, Swannanoa, N. C., in place of W. B. Stone, retired.

Jasper M. Brown, Troy, N. C., in place of G. A. Holt, transferred.

Nancy C. Harris, Wake Forest, N. C., in place of J. R. Wiggins, retired.

Enos R. Boyd, Waynesville, N. C., in place of J. H. Howell, retired.

Howell W. Ratcliff, Weaverville, N. C., in place of Kate Reagan, retired.

Josiah A. Maultsby, Jr., Whiteville, N. C., in place of A. E. Powell, retired.

Julius C. Vogt, Wilson, N. C., in place of G. T. Fulghum, retired.

Jackson T. Potter, Winnabow, N. C., in place of J. J. Henry, resigned.

Harry R. Sams, Woodland, N. C., in place of M. G. Blanchard, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Edward A. Herrick, Abercrombie, N. Dak., in place of E. G. Ottis, retired.

Otto W. Chapek, Anamoose, N. Dak., in place of H. R. Wold, transferred.

Raymond F. Pfeifer, Buffalo, N. Dak., in place of J. U. Pavlik, deceased.

Anna E. Schlabach, Driscoll, N. Dak., in place of A. M. Bruschwein, retired.

Charles S. Moores, Finley, N. Dak., in place of N. A. Anderson, retired.

Dora H. Loeppke, Heaton, N. Dak., in place of J. C. Stuart, resigned.

Norman J. Dahl, Hillsboro, N. Dak., in place of F. O. Johnson, retired.

Mildred L. Knudsen, Marion, N. Dak., in place of Cleo Flugga, transferred.

Leo E. Tibbs, Minot, N. Dak., in place of Nellie Dougherty, retired.

Gerald D. Davis, Mooreton, N. Dak., in place of F. L. Gerou, resigned.

Fyold I. Ferguson, Oakes, N. Dak., in place of F. A. Gallagher, deceased.

Mons K. Ohnstad, Jr., Sharon, N. Dak., in place of M. K. Ohnstad, retired.

Brownell H. Cole, Valley City, N. Dak., in place of C. K. Otto, retired.

Norman R. Fuchs, Zap, N. Dak., in place of M. T. Rogers, retired.

OHIO

Dorothy S. Hagelberger, Anna, Ohio, in place of W. D. Day, transferred.

Raymond C. Mote, Austinburg, Ohio, in place of Harold Montgomery, Jr., transferred.

Smith B. Applegarth, Barton, Ohio, in place of M. I. Timko, resigned.

Gay W. Smyth, Bergholz, Ohio, in place of M. M. Morrow, retired.

Ray W. Coler, Chesterhill, Ohio, in place of Hettie Woodward, retired.

William R. Davis, Creston, Ohio, in place of W. F. Hookway, retired.

John E. LaPage, Cumberland, Ohio, in place of W. E. Waller, removed.

Wilson S. Geisler, Dalton, Ohio, in place of L. D. Poorman, retired.

John Benson Davis, Ironton, Ohio, in place of C. L. Collett, removed.

Virginia C. Carter, Magnetic Springs, Ohio, in place of O. M. Force, removed.

Ralph M. Hardy, Mansfield, Ohio, in place of C. L. Ford, removed.

Harry E. Bricker, Negley, Ohio, in place of V. M. Murphy, deceased.

John H. Scott, Newcomerstown, Ohio, in place of K. H. Baxter, retired.

Martha R. Maerkisch, North Fairfield, Ohio, in place of H. W. Keiser, resigned.

Clarence J. Loch, Salineville, Ohio, in place of M. F. Mulheran, retired.

Robert C. Detwiler, Seville, Ohio, in place of D. P. Auxter, resigned.

Fern Pittenger, Shiloh, Ohio, in place of D. E. Bushey, deceased.

Victor Ferrari, Sr., Smithfield, Ohio, in place of C. A. Flenniken, removed.

Nolen E. Stuckey, Van Wert, Ohio, in place of J. I. Miller, retired.

Lell A. Smith, Wheelersburg, Ohio, in place of H. W. Staker, retired.

Elvin B. McKay, Wilmington, Ohio, in place of J. F. Smith, removed.

OKLAHOMA

Hobart F. R. Higdon, Avant, Okla., in place of E. V. Hamrick, deceased.

Ernest H. Armstrong, Baker, Okla., in place of R. W. Sellers, deceased.

Thornton J. Lucado, Jr., Blanchard, Okla., in place of T. C. Anthony, deceased.

Marguerite L. McDonald, Bokoshe, Okla., in place of O. C. Broking, retired.

Buster E. Barker, Boswell, Okla., in place of H. F. Craig, deceased.

Grady V. Duncan, Durant, Okla., in place of B. W. Johnson, deceased.

Richard W. Lilly, Fletcher, Okla., in place of M. A. Peacock, deceased.

Julius R. Griffith, Kinta, Okla., in place of R. L. Cummings, resigned.

Archie A. Godfrey, Lone Wolf, Okla., in place of S. M. Alexander, retired.

Fred W. Loula, Lookeba, Okla., in place of S. M. Scholl, retired.

Jack H. Justice, Maysville, Okla., in place of B. C. Sparks, transferred.

William A. Craig, Miami, Okla., in place of Roy McGhee, removed.

Edward E. Easton, Muskogee, Okla., in place of Harold Cartwright, resigned.

Carson Scott, Okmulgee, Okla., in place of H. B. Torbett, removed.

Randolph H. Grinstead, Pawhuska, Okla., in place of R. J. Morrow, retired.

Guy W. Willibey, Sapulpa, Okla., in place of G. B. Grigsby, resigned.

James B. Cox, Tahlequah, Okla., in place of W. H. Balentine, retired.

Isaac L. Thomson, Valliant, Okla., in place of A. M. Mills, resigned.

Phillip J. McGee, Wetumka, Okla., in place of J. W. Nicks, resigned.

OREGON

Madalene M. Hutchison, Bates, Oreg., in place of R. M. Haskell, resigned.

Joseph P. Kelly, Coos Bay, Oreg., in place of W. P. McKenna, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Margaret F. Doering, Bethayres, Pa., in place of Harold Doering, deceased.

Alvin J. Oldham, California, Pa., in place of E. W. Sulek, resigned.

Walter F. Rhine, Canonsburg, Pa., in place of S. J. Bondi, removed.

Mark D. Reber, Centerport, Pa., in place of R. P. Rentschler, retired.
Lyle T. Streeter, Easton, Pa., in place of H. C. Schultz, retired.
Harold Raymond Mitchell, East Smithfield, Pa., in place of E. S. Blakeslee, retired.
Hugh H. Hart, East Waterford, Pa., in place of M. G. Kirk, retired.
James W. Hutchison, Elizabeth, Pa., in place of E. E. Hall, retired.
Florence M. Leyerzapf, Glenfield, Pa., in place of C. A. Zahner, resigned.
Robert A. Krieger, Greentown, Pa., in place of C. J. Daly, removed.
Leo A. Patterson, Homestead, Pa., in place of E. P. Lawlor, deceased.
Mary C. Pratt, Hopwood, Pa., in place of F. W. Coughanour, Jr., resigned.
Blaine E. Moyer, Kreamer, Pa., in place of C. G. Hummel, removed.
George E. Palko, Loyalhanna, Pa., in place of T. S. Walter, resigned.
Steve Olen, Lyndora, Pa., in place of M. S. Karlitsky, removed.
Bruce B. DeLong, Mertztown, Pa., in place of E. F. Fox, retired.
Robert W. Stahl, Mount Pleasant, Pa., in place of Clark Queer, resigned.
Leo J. English, Oil City, Pa., in place of G. W. McElhatten, removed.
Howard A. Miller, Richfield, Pa., in place of J. H. Snyder, resigned.
Lester I. Heist, Robesonia, Pa., in place of B. M. Kintzer, retired.
Ralph A. Pensyl, Shamokin, Pa., in place of J. E. Staniszewski, retired.
Fred G. Haddon, Shamokin Dam, Pa., in place of M. K. Ritter, retired.
Miriam T. Hornberger, Talmage, Pa., in place of F. P. Dixon, retired.
Harry H. Powell, Sr., Tamaqua, Pa., in place of M. E. Devlin, deceased.
John D. Marshall, Wampum, Pa., in place of C. R. Aiken, deceased.
Marcellus J. Heppe, Wayne, Pa., in place of M. B. Rickabaugh, deceased.
Mary E. Reagle, Wheatland, Pa., in place of R. E. Haney, retired.
Howard J. Short, Willow Grove, Pa., in place of H. T. McEvoy, removed.

PUERTO RICO

Euclides Pagan Irizarry, Aguadilla, P. R., in place of Antonio Esteves, retired.
Pablo Rivera, Jr., Salinas, P. R., in place of Jose Monserrate, retired.
Manuel F. Varela, San Juan, P. R., in place of G. P. DePass.

RHODE ISLAND

Ralph E. Olney, Coventry, R. I., in place of J. V. O'Connell, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

William E. Barmore, Donalds, S. C., in place of P. M. Davis, retired.
Wesley D. Banks, Saint Matthews, S. C., in place of J. B. Taylor, deceased.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Leo W. Lingemann, Ethan, S. Dak., in place of L. A. Turner, retired.
Theodore Mehlhaf, Menno, S. Dak., in place of A. W. L. Trottnow, retired.
Winfield T. Wilt, Mitchell, S. Dak., in place of T. E. Callan, removed.
Morris F. Broe, Mobridge, S. Dak., in place of J. E. Meyer, removed.
Helen Olvia Putnam, Quinn, S. Dak., in place of Knute Tennyson, removed.

TENNESSEE

Jim N. Bone, Cumberland Furnace, Tenn., in place of E. L. Smith, deceased.
William C. Ashworth, Franklin, Tenn., in place of J. A. Jordan, deceased.
Louis W. Oliver, Jr., Hendersonville, Tenn., in place of E. B. Weisiger, retired.
Ernest Neil Muzzall, Henry, Tenn., in place of M. B. Curry, transferred.
George L. Bowman, Lenoir City, Tenn., in place of H. M. Calloway, retired.
Lewis C. Drinnon, Morristown, Tenn., in place of H. H. Horner, deceased.
Molly L. Casteel, Mosheim, Tenn., in place of L. F. Robinette, resigned.
Paul R. Ledbetter, Obion, Tenn., in place of H. B. Fox, deceased.
Carl A. Thompson, Pleasant Hill, Tenn., in place of L. C. Treadway, resigned.
Irlene A. Robin, Pressmen's Home, Tenn., in place of B. L. Day, removed.
Mable F. Harlow, Pulaski, Tenn., in place of Ross Bass, resigned.
Luther L. Martin, Silver Point, Tenn., in place of A. H. Gill, transferred.
Ross C. Hopkins, Sneedville, Tenn., in place of C. M. Seal, resigned.
William Raymon Kea, Waynesboro, Tenn., in place of C. A. Galloway, retired.

TEXAS

Aubrey A. Dunwody, Anson, Tex., in place of G. O. Harrell, transferred.
Ethel T. Bledsoe, Archer City, Tex., in place of Z. T. Burkett, retired.
Elmer E. Cryer, Bartlett, Tex., in place of H. O. Lindeman, deceased.
Marion Lee Neal, Baytown, Tex., in place of N. B. Ballard, transferred.
Ray W. Mulhollan, Belton, Tex., in place of E. L. Upshaw, removed.
Mauricio Gonzalez, Benavides, Tex., in place of R. R. Gonzalez, removed.
James Q. Pennington, Bluegrove, Tex., in place of R. O. Childs, removed.
Homer B. Adams, College Station, Tex., in place of T. O. Walton, retired.
Joseph A. Campbell, Covington, Tex., in place of B. O. Sanford, retired.
Glenn R. Prater, Dayton, Tex., in place of E. F. Gaston, retired.
Hargrove Smith, Eagle Lake, Tex., in place of W. E. McRee, retired.
Marene J. Johnson, Eastland, Tex., in place of E. E. Layton, retired.
Buster Fleming, Emory, Tex., in place of J. B. Christian, transferred.
Ernest A. Mullen, Florence, Tex., in place of W. H. Taylor, deceased.
Richard Thomas Cowan, Fort Worth, Tex., in place of D. C. Jernigin, deceased.
Billy G. Williams, Freer, Tex., in place of E. C. Kelly, removed.
Howard W. Curtis, Galena Park, Tex., in place of E. P. Minnock, removed.
Argus D. Smith, Godley, Tex., in place of N. C. McNally, retired.
Tom Y. Stephens, Grapevine, Tex., in place of S. B. Mullins, retired.
Thelma O. Houtchens, Harrold, Tex., in place of J. A. Nesbitt, transferred.
Vernon J. Burns, Ingram, Tex., in place of J. A. Leinweber, retired.
Mixon C. Stampler, Jacksboro, Tex., in place of W. A. Ham, retired.
Ronald A. Helfenstine, Kennedale, Tex., in place of Sallie Helm, resigned.
Samuel J. Morse, Jr., Linden, Tex., in place of N. L. Stanley, transferred.
Jeffie M. Griffith, Lockney, Tex., in place of H. B. Machen, resigned.
Clinton E. Spragins, Martindale, Tex., in place of F. F. Spragins, retired.
Annie E. Kain, Matagorda, Tex., in place of M. E. Pennington, retired.
William M. Turnbough, Meadow, Tex., in place of H. M. Welch, resigned.
Hugh Spinks, Menard, Tex., in place of H. P. Armstrong, removed.
Harry L. Muenzler, New Ulm, Tex., in place of L. O. Muenzler, retired.
Herbert W. Havemann, Orange Grove, Tex., in place of D. P. Seidel, declined.
Arthur R. Main, Petersburg, Tex., in place of L. M. Brashear, resigned.
Annie M. Ramsey, Point Comfort, Tex., office established January 1, 1955.
Neda C. Holt, Pyote, Tex., in place of A. J. Sitton, Jr., resigned.
Ocie K. Milner, Jr., Quitman, Tex., in place of J. T. Morse, transferred.
Elton J. Mueller, Richmond, Tex., in place of L. C. Davis, retired.
Joy S. Morris, Rosenberg, Tex., in place of L. O. Senkel, transferred.
Alda R. McDougal, Smyer, Tex., in place of S. W. Arnett, deceased.
Joseph C. Hammond, Terrell, Tex., in place of F. I. Massengill, retired.
Frederick H. Pearce, Sr., Thorndale, Tex., in place of V. F. Norris, resigned.
Raymond J. Hruska, West, Tex., in place of J. D. Wilkinson, removed.
R. T. Savage, Wellington, Tex, in place of R. F. Curry, retired.
John W. Word, Whiteface, Tex., in place of D. K. Bowden, removed

UTAH

Charles Norman Baxter, Milford, Utah, in place of Rudolph Nielson, retired
Howard D. Knight, Parowan, Utah, in place of Ivan Decker, removed.
Clark E. Blake, St. George, Utah, in place of M. C. Crandall, transferred.

VERMONT

John William Laramie, North Springfield, Vt., in place of E. J. Chapman, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Sarah C. Lowry, Beaverdam, Va., in place of L. J. Taylor, removed.
Inez P. Richardson, Fentress, Va., in place of A. L. Humphries, resigned.
Harry G. Penley, Gate City, Va., in place of H. B. Quillen, Jr, resigned.
Louis W. Blankenship, Glen Lyn, Va., in place of E. B. Shumate, retired.
Virginia G. Kiser, Grundry, Va., in place of P. V. Dennis, Jr., resigned.
Tecumseh S. Dalton, Pulaski, Va., in place of E. P. Whitman, retired.
Joseph E. Bell, Smithfield, Va., in place of V. W. Joyner, deceased.

WASHINGTON

Howard W. Grending, Benton City, Wash., in place of O. B. Gwin, retired.
John C. Nowadnick, Chehalis, Wash., in place of L. K. Sullivan, deceased.
Mabel P. Rayback, Des Moines, Wash., in place of E. L. Baker, retired.
Otis K. Hill, Goldendale, Wash., in place of C. W. Allbritton, resigned.
Walter E. Soehl, La Center, Wash., in place of Edna Smith, retired.
Mary Elizabeth Morrow, Lacey, Wash., in place of A. I. Foy, retired.
Genevieve K. Simm, Metaline Falls, Wash., in place of F. P. LaSota, retired.
Arthur J. Freeborg, Moses Lake, Wash., in place of L. E. Harris, retired.
Lawrence G. Luzader, Pe Ell, Wash., in place of H. M. Walker, deceased.
Paul E. McMahan, Randle, Wash., in place of F. L. Magill, deceased.
James T. Likes, Rosalia, Wash., in place of H. C. Roberts, retired.
Chauncey F. Arnold, Silverdale, Wash., in place of Elizabeth Clogston, retired.
Chesla D. Williams, Tonasket, Wash., in place of D. M. Richardson, removed.
Calvin M. Langfield, Trout Lake, Wash., in place of M. M. Aldahl, resigned.
Wanda G. Wyatt, Union, Wash., in place of H. G. Andersen, retired.
Josiah F. Lester, Wenatchee, Wash., in place of R. H. Maus, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Loren A. Hoffman, Grafton, W. Va., in place of H. F. Courtney, deceased.
John Samuel Stewart, Hundred, W. Va., in place of A. F. Cole, retired.
Clarence R. Roberts, Mannington, W. Va., in place of H. V. Burt, deceased.
Ernest A. Grim, Paden City, W. Va., in place of O. E. McKay, Jr., resigned.

WISCONSIN

Inez Myrtle Rautio, Amberg, Wis., in place of A. S. Port, retired.
Arnold C. Works, Augusta, Wis., in place of T. F. Boehrer, retired.
Robert J. Beese, Butternut, Wis., in place of George Heiderer, removed.

Paul R. Dyer, Crivitz, Wis., in place of S. V. Wolf, retired.

Matilda J. Loden, Granville, Wis., in place of H. M. Pfeil, resigned.

George C. Drews, Hortonville, Wis., in place of A. M. Olk, removed.

John C. Pribnow, Loyal, Wis., in place of L. M. Meyer, deceased.

Myles Clark, Mauston, Wis., in place of J. J. Steiner, retired.

Julius C. Sarafolean, Portage, Wis., in place of C. J. Rubin, deceased.

Patrick H. Peterson, Valders, Wis., in place of T. E. Brennan, resigned.

Felix F. Neider, Wabeno, Wis., in place of M. E. Lang, resigned.

WYOMING

Iduma Slagowski, Mountain View, Wyo., in place of R. C. Taylor, resigned.

Ruth Newbrough, Pavillion, Wyo., in place of E. G. Kirschbaum, retired.

Harold C. Jones, Saratoga, Wyo., in place of E. K. Peck, retired.

Joseph H. Whitmore, Wheatland, Wyo., in place of J. C. Clark, deceased.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 4, 1957:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Arthur E. Summerfield, of Michigan, to be Postmaster General.

Abe McGregor Goff, of Idaho, to be General Counsel of the Post Office Department.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. David Reginald Thomas, First Presbyterian Church, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast in the wondrous ways of Thy providence brought this Nation to plenty and to power, we pray for these who are commissioned to the task of directing its policies.

Grant, we beseech Thee, that they may be possessed of a real sense of the stewardship of Thy gifts, that in the administration of its abundance this people may not be unmindful of the needs of others.

Grant that they may so exercise its power that this land may be as an instrument in Thy hands for the healing of the nations.

Give to these men the fearlessness that allows no compromise of principle and the wisdom of that restraint which gives no unnecessary offense.

O Lord, who dost mark out men to do Thy will in high places of authority, we pray for the President; so endow him with Thy grace that he may uplift the moral and spiritual tone of this seat of government and that thus it may know and do Thy will to the end that it may increasingly gain and maintain the esteem and confidence of all the freedom-loving peoples.

Grant that under his leadership these men may learn to be right without being self-righteous and that their ability to lead in human affairs may be in their pliability in Thy hands.

This we pray in the name and for the sake of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 31, 1957, was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 637. An act to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available thereunder for business loans.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 72

*Resolved*, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Hayden, of Arizona; Mr. Hennings, of Missouri; and Mr. Javits, of New York.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. Green, of Rhode Island; Mr. Hennings, of Missouri; Mr. Talmadge, of Georgia; Mr. Curtis, of Nebraska; and Mr. Cooper, of Kentucky.

The message further announced that the Vice President had appointed the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], as a member on the part of the Senate to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

## APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 31, 1957.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for the year 1957:

Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER.
Hon. ALTON LENNON.
Hon. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

HERBERT C. BONNER,
*Chairman.*

## APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 31, 1957.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1957:

Hon. LEONOR K. (Mrs. John B.) SULLIVAN.
Hon. T. A. THOMPSON.
Hon. JOHN H. RAY.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

HERBERT C. BONNER,
*Chairman.*

## COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary, which is considering, as I understand, holding hearings on the civil-rights bill, may have permission to sit during general debate for the remainder of the week. I make this request at the request of the chairman of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. COLMER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

## THE LATE EDGAR T. WOLFE

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise with sorrow to announce the death last Saturday of Edgar T. Wolfe, Sr., of Columbus, Ohio. Publisher, banker, and civil leader, Edgar Wolfe was a powerful, energetic, farsighted, and selfless driver for the long-range development of Columbus and central Ohio. Typical of his devotion was his great work for a hospital-building campaign last fall when he was suffering from cancer, the affliction that finally struck him down. His passing has brought tributes from leaders in all walks of life, including Vice President Nixon, former President Hoover, both Ohio Senators, Governor O'Neill, Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, and many others. Typical of these are the words of Mr. Hoover:

By the passing of Edgar Wolfe the American people lose a great and dedicated American citizen devoted to his country and community.

Edgar Wolfe was my longtime, personal friend. My heart goes out in sympathy to his wife, his family, and many friends. I feel his life and work are best summed up in an editorial in last Sunday's Columbus Dispatch, of which he was copublisher. It was written by sorrowing close associates and I ask to give this editorial to the House at this point:

EDGAR T. WOLFE, SR.

The dominant motivation in the life of Edgar Thurston Wolfe was the civic improvement of this community.

At his death Saturday that motivation could be held largely responsible for such achievements here as the establishment of the city's airport, Port Columbus, larger and improved hospital service, more and better school buildings, a burgeoning program of slum clearance, the developing expressway traffic systems, and many more of the physical betterments which have made Columbus

and central Ohio a more convenient and a more progressive place in which to live.

The genius of this tremendous success, in forwarding the thousands of details and of overcoming the many difficulties necessary for achieving these civic ends, did not, of course, lie wholly within one man's limited capabilities. But they did lie within the ability of one man to assert the leadership necessary for bringing together those community forces and influences which could make those achievements possible.

That leadership, natural in part in so vigorous a personality and so decisive a mind, was cultivated to the high degree it finally attained by young Edgar's close association with his father, R. F. Wolfe, and his uncle, H. P. Wolfe, who established the family tradition of constructive interest in civic affairs here and saw within their own generation the development of Columbus' nationally known civic center.

Edgar T. Wolfe exercised this leadership modestly but with a vision and boldness so daring at times as to cause many of his associates to believe it was rash. Inevitably, however, it was vindicated, not only because he was able to perceive what might be accomplished in a given situation but also because of his ability to bring others with leadership qualities to see the possibilities of his proposals.

Edgar Wolfe will be remembered for a great many activities and accomplishments, but most widely, in view of the record, will be those which grew out of his tireless and influential devotion to the great public interests of this community.

Practically every institution of public importance—including those contained within government, our schools, transportation, communications, health, welfare—benefited from Mr. Wolfe's intense interest in advancing their capacities for meeting the needs of a growing and thriving community.

With all these many activities and close association with his many business as well as civic interests the personality of Mr. Wolfe was elusive to many. Those who were most closely associated with him knew him as a man of moods and inspirations. Although reticent to inject himself into the limelight in any manner he was never hesitant to assert his convictions once he formed them.

These convictions generally were reflected most openly perhaps in the conduct of the newspapers with which he was so closely associated, the Ohio State Journal and the Columbus Dispatch. These were rooted in his belief that these newspapers be published and edited for family reading, that they be alert to the need of the public to know public business and that they support and advance the best interests of the community.

His personality was best reflected perhaps in the wide variety of subsidiary interests in which he indulged himself. These spanned such varied activities as mathematics and music, airplanes and ships, travel and entertainment. And it was pointed up by the fact that whatever activity he entered into he did so enthusiastically and completely.

As a youth he served in the United States Navy during World War I. It was typical that he enlisted only a few days following our entry into that war and that he remained in service until the end.

It was no accident, either, that he was graduated from Princeton with a degree in science rather than in one of the more general courses. His natural intensity of feeling about anything with which he concerned himself led him not only to enjoy airplane travel, for instance, as a means of expressing his liking for airplanes. He also saw to it that he rode in the new jet planes and also helicopters.

His friendships were extraordinarily wide and ranged from those normally expected of an active businessman to such individuals as Charles Lindbergh, Eddie Rickenbacker, and others beyond the provincial confines of his own area.

Despite the liveliness of his imagination and the universality of his interests, Edgar Wolfe prided himself upon a basic hardheaded practicality, and with good reason. His visions were not those of castles in the air, but of concrete accomplishments. His business philosophy was based in an old-fashioned concept of the need for business to know and discharge its responsibilities so that it might continue to function in the interests for which it was established.

It was undoubtedly this rare combination of being able to see ahead clearly what may have been dim to others and being able to know the practical problems by which the future might be realized which enabled him to contribute so much to the life around him during his amazingly active years.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, Congressman VORYS, for yielding to me that I might join in paying respects to one of the great leaders of, not only Ohio, but of the Nation. The passing of Edgar T. Wolfe, Sr., will be a loss, not only to me, but to our State and to the Nation.

Edgar T. Wolfe was outstanding in his accomplishments. He had widespread interests and he devoted many, many hours to civic affairs that would advance principles of a great American and would make living a little more pleasant for all of us. It is fortunate that his worthy sons, Edgar T. Wolfe, Jr., and John Walton Wolfe, and his cousins Robert H. Wolfe and Preston Wolfe, have been adequately trained so they are familiar with his activities, and they can now carry on his fine work.

Mrs. McGregor joins me in extending to the widow and to the children our sincere sympathy. Our prayers are with them in this their hour of bereavement.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the gentleman representing the 12th District of Ohio [Mr. VORYS] in the tribute he has paid to the life and work of an old friend, Edgar T. Wolfe, whom I have had the pleasure of knowing for more than 40 years. Certainly, there has been no man who has rendered a greater service to the people of Ohio during the last half century than has Edgar T. Wolfe. He was not only one of the great newspaper publishers of our State, but he was also the head of a great banking institution, and also of a great industry. He has contributed much to the welfare, not only of Ohio, but of the entire Nation as well. We shall miss his leadership.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman for bringing this matter up today in this place and in this way. The man about whom he talks and about whom I talk now was really a distinguished gentleman, a man worthy of the acquaintance and friendship of everybody who knew him. He was a wonderful gentleman, and I am glad to testify to these fine virtues of this great man.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, while I do not come from Ohio, I knew Mr. Wolfe. He was one of our finest citizens. He was not only a leader in business, religious, and civic affairs, but in every activity looking toward good government and good citizenship. His death is a loss not only to Ohio but to the country.

---

## CAB RULES FOR PUBLIC AND CIVIL AIRCRAFT

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include a copy of a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday just before noon a new deluxe airliner and an F–89 jet fighter plane, both on test runs, collided high above Pacoima, Calif., in the district which I represent. Most of the airliner crashed on an open schoolyard where several hundred teen-age boys were gathered for physical education. Only a miracle saved most of them. Deaths, including the crews of the planes, were limited to 8, but 60 or more were injured, some of whom underwent amputations.

Of course, our first reaction is a most profound sympathy for the families of the innocent victims.

This was not simply a San Fernando Valley or California tragedy. It is of national importance in that this seemingly preventable accident could have occurred over any congested area here represented. It was the first of a series of airplane accidents that shocked the Nation over this weekend.

The air traffic rules of civil air regulations charge the Civil Aeronautics Board with prescribing rules governing the flight of aircraft.

Civil Aeronautics Board rules for test flying are not clearly restrictive for military aircraft.

Apparently neither pilot was in violation of existing rules.

I propose by resolution introduced today to charge the CAB more aggressively to use the authority presently granted them to draft rules without distinction between public and civil aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, I ask as early consideration of this resolution as possible.

The resolution is as follows:

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the establishment of certain restricted airspace areas in the United States for the purpose of conducting test flights of aircraft

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That it is the sense

of the Congress that in order to further promote safety of flight in air commerce and provide for greater safety to persons and property in congested areas of cities, towns, and settlements, the Civil Aeronautics Board should, under its authority to prescribe air traffic rules governing the flight of aircraft (including rules as to safe altitudes of flight and rules for the prevention of collisions between aircraft, and between aircraft and land or water vehicles), prescribe air traffic rules (1) providing for the designation of certain airspace areas, located in sparsely populated geographical areas of the United States in which there is light air traffic, as restricted areas reserved for test flights of aircraft, and (2) prohibiting or restricting air traffic within such restricted areas without special authorization from the appropriate authorities controlling such restricted areas. Any such restricted area should be shown on aeronautical maps and charts and in publications of aids to navigation, indicating the prohibitions and restrictions on flight and the name of appropriate authority from which prior permission must be obtained before operating an aircraft within any such restricted area.

No airspace area over any congested area of a city, town, or settlement, should be reserved for test flights of aircraft.

It is also the sense of the Congress that, if the Civil Aeronautics Board determines that it does not have adequate authority under existing law to prescribe air traffic rules reserving certain airspace areas for test flights of aircraft, such Board should submit to the Congress its recommendations for appropriate legislation granting such authority.

As used in this concurrent resolution, the term "test flights of aircraft" means flights of aircraft conducted for the purpose of observing or measuring the performance of such aircraft or their components following their manufacture, alteration, or repair.

---

## TIGHT MONEY POLICY FORCING VETERANS TO RENT HOUSES THEY ARE BUYING

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Miami Herald of Miami, Fla., on Sunday, January 20, 1957, carried an article written by Frederic Sherman their real estate editor.

The article pointedly focuses attention on the serious effects the administration's tight money policy is having on one of our Nation's most important industries as well as the drastic effect it has had on the veteran in his attempt to obtain a home.

It is important that each of us realize that this situation is not exclusive of the greater Miami, Fla. area, but rather it is similarly affecting every other area in the entire United States. It also must be realized that the inability of the veteran to purchase a home under the terms of the Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1944 has had many other serious effects on our national economy. Not only is the builder affected, but likewise the lenders, the real estate agents, the furniture, electrical appliances, manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers, and every individual employed in the building trades profession.

Millions of these builders, lenders, suppliers, and tradesmen are veterans and have derived a goodly portion of their income from the profits brought about by this Veterans' Administration building program. With the curtailment of the VA home building program, these veterans and the non-veterans alike have suffered a severe reduction in income. It appears that tight money is forcing the veteran and non-veteran alike to lose in more ways than one.

It behooves each and every one of us to actively interest ourselves in finding a solution to this problem. The article by Mr. Frederic Sherman follows:

VETERANS FORCED TO RENT HOUSES THEY'RE BUYING

(By Frederic Sherman)

Hundreds of veterans in Dade County are getting a personal lesson in tight money. They are paying rent for houses they thought they would be buying. It's impossible to get an accurate figure, but it is estimated that something like 400 VA home loans are hanging fire and not being closed because the bottom has fallen out of the 4½ percent mortgage market.

Certainly well over 100 veterans have moved into homes on a rental basis, paying anywhere from $2 to $3 a day. A lot of them feel they are getting the runaround.

Who's to blame for the fact closings are being put off? You can put some of the blame on the builder. You can put some of the blame on the mortgage company.

But the big accusing finger points at the dunderheads in Washington who allowed FHA to raise the interest rate to 5 percent early in December. Somebody in the administration must be bright enough to have realized what was going to happen to VA mortgages which are frozen by Congress at 4½ percent. Only Congress can change that rate of interest.

There was some pie-in-the-sky talk that Congress would take care of that little matter the same day the session was called to order. What a pipedream.

THE MONEY JUNGLE

There's a lot of money involved here. If a VA mortgage loan is closed today, the builder will get about 92½ cents on the dollar. If the closing is put off until Congress raises the interest rate a half point, chances are the mortgage will be marketed at 96 or 97 cents on the dollar. On a $14,000 mortgage, that's a real piece of change.

You can't blame the builder for trying to protect himself in the monetary jungle. And keep in mind that it's poor business to rent a house to the man who's going to buy it.

It breaks every rule in the home builder's manual. He's not making any money because $2.50 a day just about covers taxes, insurance and the interest on the construction money.

There are builders who claim their mortgage company refuses to close. This is true in some cases. Northern investors are turning up their noses at that 4½ percent paper, except at a discount that even today is ridiculous.

VA DOESN'T LIKE IT

How about the VA? What's its position? Asa Groves, VA's loan guaranty officer for the south Florida region, calls this renting business a regrettable situation, but one the VA has no control over. When you check up, you find that the veteran has signed a sales contract that says the loan can be closed at the highest prevailing interest rate and that the buyer acknowledges the fact there is no firm commitment for a mortgage at any rate of interest.

"We dislike the practice of temporary lease agreement, but we recognize the fact the veteran wants to move into the house. There's usually a factor of urgency on the buyer's part. He has sold his old house. Or his old lease is up. His furniture is on the way down from the North by van and he wants to save storage charges."

The buyer is losing, however, on the interest payments that he could be deducting from his income tax. As for homestead exemption, everybody seems agreed the veteran will be allowed it if he was living in the house January 1. Some builders using the lease system have filed the exemption for the veterans. Chances are the assessor will accept a notarized sales contract.

BUILDER ON THE SPOT

Before you heap hot coals on the builder's head, you have to realize he's in a tough spot. He had figured on taking about a 4-percent discount. Now he is faced with an extra 3 or 4 cents on every dollar.

As weeks stretch into months, the builder is faced with the possibility that the buyer's financial condition can change. Suppose the veteran loses his job? Suppose his car is wrecked and he has to take out a bank loan to buy a new one?

The mortgage company is certainly going to ask for a fresh credit report when closing time finally rolls around. And if Congress raises the VA rate to 5 percent, it means a veteran is going to need a little net income to meet the higher payments.

What if the buyer doesn't qualify with the mortgage firm? The builder has a used house on his hands.

One builder is solving the problem by charging $125 a month rent. If and when the mortgage closing takes place, the buyer gets back everything above $2 a day. If the deal falls through, the builder will use the excess amount to refurbish the place.

OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES

It's not always the mortgage market that holds up a closing. Sometimes the VA's final inspection reveals items that must be taken care of before the closing is allowed.

There have been some hot calls from veterans who bought the Westchester homes out in the southwest section. Some of them put down deposits last summer. Their houses were completed in November.

Harold N. Moss, the developer, says he has allowed 10 or 12 veterans to move in because they told him they had to get in off the street. He is charging them about $2.75 a day.

Some of the buyers say they moved in during November and were told the middle of December there would be no closings until Congress raised the interest rate on VA loans.

Moss says closings have been delayed because some of the streets have been slightly below approved grade, but that these are being fixed up and that the closings will take place within 10 days.

"I had been figuring on a 3-percent discount on the mortgage, and now it's about 7 percent," Moss said. "In view of the market conditions, I don't like the idea of taking that beating but I am going to do it. I don't want a stigma attached to my homes."

A TIME OF DECISION

It's a sad story all around. In his budget message last week, President Eisenhower recommended raising the VA interest rate to 5 percent. But the administration isn't acting like its mind is really made up. There's an International News Service story on page 10–F that gives you an idea how much confusion does exist.

The builders are hanging over a cliff. Last quote one Miamian got on future mortgage discount on 4½-percent VA money was 11 cents on the dollar.

This month's House & Home magazine says the administration has decided to support Representative OLIN TEAGUE who wants to reduce FHA downpayments.

The Texas Democrat, chairman of the powerful House Veterans' Committee, is firmly opposed to raising the VA interest rate.

He wants to cut FHA downpayments to 2 percent on houses up to $10,000. It would be 3 percent up to $12,000, 4 percent up to $14,000, 5 percent up to $16,000. Top downpayment would be 15 percent on house costing more than $30,000.

That would certainly kill off the VA program. But there are Congressmen who feel they are being stampeded into a quick shuffle that will take the Government out of the housing business. There's talk of making direct loans to veterans if the mortgage companies aren't going to do the job.

The future is uncertain, but the current situation is certainly one big mess.

The International News Service story which appeared in the Miami Herald, page 10F, and referred to by Mr. Sherman, follows:

FOG HASN'T CLEARED IN MORTGAGE MARKET

(By Hugh L. Morris)

WASHINGTON. — President Eisenhower's budget message and legislative proposals on housing are more revealing in what they imply than in their recommendations for congressional action.

The administration endorses, without elaboration, the program advanced by Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, Texas Democrat, to liberalize Government mortgage insurance for former GI's and nonveterans alike.

Clarification of the administration position apparently will have to await the testimony of spokesmen before congressional committees.

Meanwhile, Federal Housing Chief Albert M. Cole reportedly is preparing a bill which would authorize FHA administration of the enlarged program upon expiration of the GI home loan benefits.

The chief difference between the two programs is one of Government philosophy and cost to the home buyer.

The mortgage insurance is provided as a benefit, without cost, to veterans. They pay only the 4½ percent interest charged by the lender, and the Government pays the service costs.

Mortgage insurance for nonveterans is considered a service. Those who use it pay 5 percent interest to the lender and one-half of 1 percent to cover the service costs. The program is self-supporting and does not cost the Government a penny.

The President's budget message says:

"The Government is taking steps to aid buyers of homes to obtain a reasonable share of the savings which help to supply the credit necessary to maintain a satisfactory level of private housing construction."

Specifically, his major proposals call for an increase to 5 percent in interest on GI home loans to match the FHA rate, and for more money to buy Government-insured mortgages in the secondary market.

The GI program has almost collapsed since the FHA rate was boosted 6 weeks ago to permit better competition for investment capital.

With money at a premium, the Government has invested more than $2½ billion in its insured mortgages to sustain the flow of credit for additional construction. Its funds, about $3 billion, will be depleted by March 1.

Eisenhower is asking Congress to authorize nearly $2 billion more in the next 18 months for the secondary market operations carried out by the Federal National Mortgage Association.

Other housing aids being sought by the administration include $250 million for slum clearance, elimination of the workable program to prevent slums before small communities can get public housing, $175 million for college dormitory loans, 3-year extension of the voluntary home mortgage credit program, and $250 million to insure mortgages on cooperative, military, and elderly housing.

An article appearing in the January 28, 1957, edition of the National Association of Real Estate Boards' weekly news letter further points to the severity of the situation.

GI LOAN ACTIVITY DOWN

Another drop in GI home loan activity took place in December 1956, the Veterans' Administration reported last week.

The volume of appraisal requests—generally regarded as a measure of future loan activity—dropped in December with respect to both proposed and existing units. Last month there were 19,029 requests for the appraisal of proposed units, compared to 21,941 in November and 24,892 in December 1955. Appraisal requests for existing units totaled 11,637 in December 1956, compared to 15,465 in November and 18,565 in December 1956.

VA received 33,118 home loan applications in December, a decrease of 12 percent from November 1956, and a drop of more than 27 percent from December 1955.

Another decline was registered during the month in the housing start field. The number of new homes started under VA inspection in December 1956 was 14,987, compared with 17,824 for the previous month, and 21,611 in December 1955.

Mr. Kenneth S. Keyes, of Miami, Fla., an extremely able and well-liked realtor, was recently elected national president of this great organization. Speaking before the annual convention of the National Association of Home Builders in Chicago, Mr. Keyes urged realtors and builders to join forces in "doing everything within our power to convince those who control the fiscal policies of our Government that our goal of more and better homes for the people of America is not a purely selfish desire to make more profit for our industry. It fills a widely felt and deeply rooted desire on the part of the people of America to continue to improve their standards of living—and that any policy which deprives our citizens of the opportunity to achieve this desire is unsound and unwise."

There was a time when steel, agriculture, and coal were considered to be the major controlling factors in our economy. However, today home building and its many allied industries and vocations cannot be excluded, for they are the backbone of our economy.

If any single thing can be contributed to being the major cause of America's greatness, it would certainly be the fact that in no other part of the world do so many individuals own their own homes.

It is a known fact that a homeowner has more civic pride and has a greater interest in the affairs of his government. To lessen an American's chances of owning his own home would seriously weaken us. Let's keep America great.

---

## DEFENSE CONTRACTS AND UTILIZATION OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of Defense Contracts and Utilization of Scientists and Engineers and to include a letter by the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, during the 84th Congress the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization and Departmental Personnel Management, of which I was chairman, stressed the need for good manpower management in the Federal service. Our hearings and investigations brought out the fact that activities under defense contracts have helped make it difficult to recruit and hold competent engineers and scientists in the Federal service. The salaries allowed as costs have also led to demands for increasing the Federal pay scale for engineers at a rate faster than would normally be the case. This has created a competitive cycle that has added to the inflationary pressures we are now facing.

Our subcommittee urged the Secretary of Defense to take three steps that will help correct the existing situation. First, it was suggested that concerns with defense contracts be encouraged to improve the utilization of their scientists and engineers. Next, we urged that specific quantitative standards be set to govern allowances for salaries and recruiting costs including advertising. Finally, we requested a renewed effort to achieve better use of the engineers and scientists in military uniform. I might add that, despite improvements to date, numerous complaints are still received from holders of degrees in science and engineering that they are losing their acquired skills because they seldom use them during their military service. I have read and heard of the complaints from the services of their reenlistment losses in higher skills. Poor utilization may be the key to their problems.

It was interesting to note, in the report recently submitted by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Albert Pratt, the several marked differences between defense industries and those largely commercial in nature. The defense industries, for example, had about 35,000 engineers and the commercial about 9,000; yet the commercial industries did a quarter billion dollars more business. This lends strong support to the validity of our request to Mr. Wilson that he encourage the defense industries to initiate manpower-utilization programs.

I wish to insert in the RECORD a letter in reply to one I sent the Secretary of Defense. This letter outlines the steps that the Secretary of Defense has personally directed in respect to two of our suggestions. The cooperative spirit indicated by this letter reflects the fact that ours has been a cooperative endeavor from the first.

There has been no reply to date on our third suggestion. I feel sure, however, from the record, that progress can be expected in this regard. Our subcommittee has commended Secretary Wilson

in the past for his forthright approach to manpower problems. I wish again to commend him on his latest steps.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 25, 1957.*

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization and Departmental Personnel Management, House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of December 14, addressed to Secretary Wilson, in connection with advertising and other costs incidental to the recruitment of engineering and scientific personnel, has been forwarded to me for reply.

Secretary Wilson has personally acted in the matters raised in your letter and has directed that an objective study leading to prompt corrective action be immediately undertaken and vigorously progressed. This study is currently underway.

The Department of Defense will, as a result of this study, attempt to develop quantitative standards or practical criteria to govern those costs which may be allowable in defense contracts of the reimbursement type. A report of results attained will be furnished you at the earliest practicable date.

Additionally, the Department of Defense is establishing a Technical Manpower Utilization Committee. It will be the function of this Committee to conduct an investigation of the extent departmental technical administrative procedures affect efficient utilization of industry technical personnel working on military contracts. This study will also consider how best to encourage industry to take active steps to make improvements in the present situation.

Your interest in this matter is greatly appreciated by the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

R. C. LANPHIER, Jr.,
*Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics).*

## HON. NOAH M. MASON, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, during the 10 years I have served in this body I have learned that there are Members on both sides of the aisle who rise above personal and sectional interest and devote themselves courageously and wholeheartedly to the task of keeping America a land of freedom, opportunity, and constitutional government.

One of such Members is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]. Although we sit on different sides of the aisle, I have come to know him well and in my acquaintance with him have developed a wholesome respect for his ability, his courage, and his statesmanship.

I heard him deliver to this House on January 14 an able and timely message in which he warned us that the Supreme Court is usurping functions which do not belong to the judicial branch of the government and is undermining our Constitution.

His able address has received favorable editorial comment from many of the newspapers of our country and has received recognition far and wide as a timely and able address.

The general assembly of my home State of Georgia is now in session, and on January 21 the house of representatives there adopted House Resolution No. 18 by Messrs. Helms, of Atkinson County, and Love, of Catoosa County, commending our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, for his great political courage and personal integrity.

I am glad that the house of representatives of my home State has thus honored our distinguished colleague from Illinois, and I take pleasure in inserting the resolution referred to herewith.

Whereas the Honorable NOAH M. MASON, representative of the State of Illinois, in the United States Congress, did on the 14th day of January 1957 in an address to the House of Representatives in Washington transcend the lines of conventional politics and did accurately and honestly censure the United States Supreme Court for its infamous decision of usurpation in May 1954 and whereas the Honorable NOAH M. MASON did condemn the Supreme Court for attempting to amend the United States Constitution by evasion and subterfuge by its decision against segregation in schools and on buses; and whereas such conduct reflects not only great judgment but political courage and personal integrity on the part of the said NOAH M. MASON; now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia that the said NOAH M. MASON be congratulated for this feat of statesmanship; and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Members of the Georgia delegation in Congress and to the aforesaid NOAH M. MASON.

In house, read and adopted January 21, 1957:

MARVIN E. MOATE,
*Speaker of House.*
JOE BOONE,
*Clerk of House.*

## "CITY OF BETHLEHEM" DESERVES RECOGNITION

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, when America's new atomic-powered cruiser puts forth to sea, it will be a symbol of two significant things: the tremendous industrial technical preeminance that underlines this country's strength, and the vast force of free labor and management that have made this preeminence possible.

The new cruiser is being built by the Bethlehem Steel Co., one of the most important armories of American defense. It is fitting that the Bethelehem Steel Co.—and the people of Bethlehem, who are the company, should lead the country in the new era of nuclear power.

From the earliest days of the revolution they have provided the basic ingredients of our defense—ammunition for Washington's Army; steel and iron ships and guns ever since. During World War II, Bethlehem Steel produced a total of 1,127 vessels, among them 6 aircraft carriers, a battleship, 50 light and heavy cruisers, over 100 destroyers, over 500 cargo transports.

In the light of these accomplishments, many suggestions have been made that the new atomic cruiser bear the name of the *City of Bethlehem.* Certainly there can be no more appropriate expressions of our recognition of the *City of Bethlehem's* role in preserving our liberty and security. It is a name that will serve as an impressive calling card of America's continuing and growing prowess.

## IMPORTATION OF JAPANESE PLYWOOD

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I enclose herewith a letter written to Mr. R. M. Cooper, director, South Carolina Development Board, Columbia, S. C., by Mr. L. W. Anderson, president, Standard Plywoods, Inc., Clinton, S. C., concerning the effect of the importation of Japanese plywood into the United States on this important phase of our industry.

Since I have strongly felt for some time that more attention and certainly more relief should be given to our own textile, plywood, and other interests I wanted others in the Congress and elsewhere to know how some of our industries are floundering under the effect of too much importation and lack of quota restrictions.

STANDARD PLYWOODS, INC.,
*Clinton, S. C., January 24, 1957.*

Mr. R. M. COOPER,
*Director, South Carolina Development Board, Columbia, S. C.*

DEAR MR. COOPER: Some time ago the Charlotte Observer carried a lengthy article on the merits of South Carolina for industry location. They gave due recognition to you and your board as being responsible for the recent increased expansion throughout the State. We were quite interested in this article because we have always found that when some hardship problem confronts us, we can usually get some quick relief by calling on your office for assistance.

We were especially interested in your quoted statement that you are more interested in the industry you have than in getting new ones. Also that once an industry is established here they are not forgotten.

Along with the article was a picture of the U. S. Plywood plant at Orangeburg. This is perhaps the largest plywood plant in the State, however there are a great many others of various sizes (so called small plants) in operation throughout the State. We mention this, not because South Carolina has forgotten our industry, but rather because the Federal Government, which of course includes the Tariff Commission, has given us the runaround. We are prompted to put our story before you since your office is in the habit of getting things done and not just talked about. Our problem is nonpolitical and is of major importance to all people.

Much has been written and argued in various channels about the plight of the textile industry because of unwarranted imports from Japan. Because of the pressure they have exerted the Japanese have themselves now come through with a compromise self-imposed quota. The textile industry is much larger than the forest products industry yet we are second in the State as employers of labor.

We would welcome some quota from the Japanese on plywoods, however we are told by powers in Washington that we are not large enough nationally to get proper consideration. That we are being badly hurt is evidenced by the fact that while about 10 percent of the cotton goods capacity of the country was being imported from Japan, over 45 percent of the hardwood plywood capacity is being imported and 73 percent of the 567 million square feet brought in during the first 10 months of 1956 came from Japan. These imports continue to grow by the month and will do so until curbed. With the help of starvation wages in Japan, low duties, a deaf ear on the part of the Tariff Commission and the State Department more and more plants are being forced to close down. The resultant impact on the labor force is being keenly felt.

Further, immediately following the attack on Pearl Harbor our Government put out inquiries for millions of feet of hardwood plywood for all branches of the Armed Forces. With Europe blocked off and Japan at war with us, where would all this plywood have come from, had the same stupid attitude been taken prior to 1941? As it was, all requirements were taken care of by our own plants, so why does our Government now figure we are expendable just because the conquered nations want to take the business? As long as they can pay 10 cents an hour for labor, ship in here at little or no duty, and not be restricted in any way by quotas, they can undersell our plants who are regulated by minimum wages and maximum hours. What we want to determine, and quickly, is whether or not we are considered by our Government as being expendable.

So intent is the State Department on taking from our Congressmen all power to control foreign trade and tariffs that the administration is going to press for the quick passage of OTC. The Organization of Trade Cooperation is that superinternational body in which the United States would have one vote. OTC will control tariffs and trade through GATT. If allowed to pass, it will take from our elected representatives in Congress all control and so tie their hands that no law on tariffs can be passed without it being contended by the State Department that the law will violate an agreement with foreign countries. In other words, they would fix it so Congress loses its constitutional powers. This is of vital interest to every American who likes the way we live and do things in this country, and they should let their Congressman know that we want him to keep the power that we gave him through our vote.

We are just one of the many small businesses adversely affected by the desire of Washington to pull all of the world up by its bootstraps. To enjoy prosperity you must first aspire to it, and few, if any, of the nations which would flood our markets have evidenced any intention of bringing themselves up to our standards. When they meet our standards, then and then only would we favor unrestricted imports. Otherwise the efforts of the State Department to ruin small business in this country can only have the effect of destroying the initiative and aspirations of the people who have been the backbone of our country.

We can hardly believe the statement of David Lawrence in one of his recent Washington columns about Small Business Stands All Alone. He writes, and we quote in part: "No greater piece of demagoguery emerges in politics nowadays than the alleged concern for the fate of small business, as the term is used by Congressmen. For the truth is, "small business," as it should be defined, has more enemies than friends in Congress, and the trend is toward more strangulation of such businesses in America through the power of monopoly."

We are not so concerned about big business in America, about taxes, or wage rates, high as they may be, so long as we are protected from foreign intrigue posing as friendship. What do you think we can do?

Thanks for your indulgence, and before it's too late we hope for a solution.

Yours very truly,

L. W. ANDERSON,
*President.*

## STRATEGIC METALS

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat disturbed at the action and report of the subcommitee on Appropriations which is before us on Tuesday. It would require hours of my time here to go into the background and development that have taken place over the past 20 years in the field of materials that are required to meet our ever-increasing defense requirements and also the requirements of our economic structure as well. Progress or nonprogress will be measured by the development of those materials needed to meet the steadily increasing demand for more horsepower—not in our airplane industry alone, which is probably increasing faster in demand than any other industry since the days of Kitty Hawk, with the test flight of the 4-cylinder reciprocating engine which developed 12 horsepower and weighed about 13 pounds for each horsepower developed. Driving 2 wooden propellers, the Kitty Hawk was able to sustain a speed of about 25 miles per hour.

In comparison, let us think of what has happened since Kitty Hawk and the present time. More than 3,000 different models of airplanes have been developed and tested during this period. Today we have the B–52, with a turbine engine, the J–57, which develops 30,000 horsepower, and in each B–57, 8 of these turbines together are over 240,000 horsepower. This gives us some idea of what has taken place in airplane development in just a short span of time. The 10 turbines driving the large generator in Bonneville Dam develop about 600,000 horsepower, and if this country develops an atomic-powered supersonic bomber, its power will probably be close to this figure.

This progress could not have taken place without the materials. You could have provided all the men and all the know-how, but it was necessary that we have materials to meet the ever-increasing requirements associated with high temperatures. This simply had to take place.

And the whole development and continued progress and performance in the field of heat control, not only in our defense needs but in our whole economic life, will be primarily dependent on the availability of new metals and alloys that are to do the job. Although it is true that all the industries in our country, the aircraft industry is by far the largest user of high temperature resisting metal, our constant effort to secure increasing reliability and performance is behind the never-ending search for improved materials and alloys for the continuance of our whole economic development. The whole road to progress will be in the constant effort to obtain more and more power from the lightest weight engine possible, whether it be in automobiles, lawn mowers, or whatever type of propulsion you may have to use.

The life of an engine of whatever type it may be is limited by the high temperature strength in the cylinder head and valve materials that are available. During the past 15 years we have been developing the turbo-jet engine, and I will never forget the day we stood at Nordhausen in Germany, when Dr. Harriman, the great English scientist, made the statement, after seeing the first turbojets, that it was the greatest achievement in propulsion that came out of World War II, which has proven to be true.

As speed increases, and certainly it will, the components of the airplane, including the engine, must be comprised of materials that are safe. It follows that a great deal of progress is still ahead of us if we can develop high temperature materials that are needed to meet these severe requirements. In analyzing the problem, it appears that there is only one course available to us and that is to develop alloys based on the refractory metals which have melting points considerably higher than those of the iron, nickel, and cobalt base alloys that we have been working with. From experience we know that we can raise the effective recrystallization temperatures of some of the metals we have by proper alloys. Although we have done quite well in this effort, today we are working too close to the melting point to expect significant improvement over what has already been done with metals like nickel, cobalt, iron, and several others. Of the 18 metals which have higher melting points than those of nickel, cobalt, and iron, there are only 4 which have significantly higher melting points that are available in sufficient quantities to be considered. These four refractories are columbium, molybdenum, tantalum, and tungsten.

Although there is much research already done, much remains to be done today in alloying these materials with each other which would have engineering properties toward temperatures probably above 3,000° F. Columbium has a melting point of 4,380° F., and is limited in supply. Molybdenum has a melting point of 4,750° F. and is available in rather large quantities in our domestic mines. Tantalum is a metal that appears usually along with molybdenum and it is a very heavy metal. It is relatively scarce and is the least attractive of the four high resisting materials, although it has excellent alloying quantities. Of the 4 high melting point refractory metals, the one that offers the greatest promise for extremely high temperature is tungsten, which has the highest melting point of all the metals—6,152° F. It also has a high density. Per cubic inch, tungsten is twice as heavy as nickel, cobalt, or columbium. Also, of the four metals, tungsten has the best resistance to oxidation at elevated temperatures. And tungsten gives great

promise that it can be sufficiently improved by alloying. Another advantage it offers is that it is now available in large quantities both from domestic and foreign sources. Its high melting point makes it very attractive.

My main reason in discussing this subject somewhat technically is to call your attention to what I believe to be one of the primary metals that will be used in the future, not measured in the few tons that exist today in the stockpile, but by practically every industry in our whole economic life. I know there are few people who are not familiar with what was done in 1939, when we did not have a single tungsten mine operating in this country. In desperation, a few of us appealed to the President for emergency funds to open up what is known as the Yellow Pines Mine in Idaho. This was the only source of the armor-piercing material, when the tanks of Hitler had rolled across Europe.

Today we have developed a domestic mining operation and are faced with off-shore foreign competition, with low wages and low production costs. We all are familiar with the pattern who have spent many years here in Congress. We have seen it happen many times before. It was thus that our manganese mines closed in the '30s and again in the '40s—because of the competition from Russia, and many other materials had the same fate.

We simply cannot, in my opinion, again afford to let what I believe to be one of the most essential materials—and one known to be essential to our whole industrial structure and to our national security—close its doors.

Much more can be said as to why it is important that this country adopt a permanent, long-range policy, especially on its high temperature resisting materials that come from the earth. Mining operations cannot close down and open up again like the corner grocery store. There must be a degree of permanency in the operation. Congress should provide funds to support Public Law 733 until we can provide something of a permanent nature for this important minerals supply.

---

## HEARINGS TO BE HELD ON NEW CIVIL DEFENSE BILL

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the Committee on Government Operations Subcommittee on Military Operations, of which I am chairman, will hold hearings on proposed new civil defense legislation commencing Tuesday, February 5, 1957, at 10 a. m. in room 1501 of the New House Office Building.

The new civil defense bill, referred to my subcommittee by Chairman DAWSON of the Committee on Government Operations, was introduced in the House on January 7 of this year by seven members of the subcommittee—H. R. 2125 and identical bills. Its purpose is to reorganize and make possible a more efficient operation of the civil defense functions of the Federal Government.

### ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES

Under the terms of this bill, the Federal Civil Defense Administration would be replaced by a Department of Civil Defense, to which the President would be authorized to transfer additional civil defense functions now being performed by the Office of Defense Mobilization. To link the new civilian departments to related functions in the Department of Defense, and in other ways provide for its more effective operation, this bill would also create a Military Liaison Committee, a Scientific Advisory Board, and a broadly representative Civil Defense Advisory Council.

This, in general, is what the bill is designed to accomplish organizationally, and in my opinion it makes sense from an organizational standpoint. But the true value of the proposed legislation extends far beyond these organizational changes. It puts forth a new concept of civil defense which this Nation desperately needs.

### A CHANGED STRATEGIC CONCEPT

Since the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 was signed into law, revolutionary changes in weapon technology have profoundly influenced our thinking with respect to military strategy and the entire question of the roles and missions of our armed services. At least until recently, we have narrowly channeled our attention to dramatic new developments in offensive weapons—the hydrogen bomb, guided missiles, supersonic aircraft, tactical atomic weapons. We have been so fascinated by and obsessed with the need for striking power that we have sadly neglected the bedrock on which the deterrent value of this striking power must inevitably stand. We have largely ignored the implications of technological advances which demand that we assign a strategic value to civil defense. Civil defense must take its rightful part in the total national defense, or else the Nation will remain dangerously exposed to the enormous destructive power of enemy weapons.

The new civil-defense bill is designed to overcome this great gap in our national defense. It would project civil defense into our total national-defense structure, for the first time, as a coherent and realistic national plan, tailored to meet the essential survival requirements of our people in the event of a nationwide disaster such as would result from an enemy attack on the United States.

Today Khrushchev is still boasting that his threat to bomb, or shower rockets on, England and France caused those nations to withdraw their troops from Egypt. Our State Department officials are reported to be inclined to share this view. Without commenting further on the recent unhappy experience in the Middle East, we can surmise that the Soviet threat would never have been made had Great Britain and France been in a position to resist a direct attack.

Even today Soviet leaders are warning our allies as well as the United States that any attempt to defend the Middle East from Communist aggression will lead to devastating retaliation against our homelands. I say this is a type of blackmail that can be successful only if we are not prepared to withstand the effects of an enemy attack.

In other words, being prepared for the worst eventuality would add immeasurably to our total military posture. This applies equally to our offensive and defensive strength, because offensive power is virtually useless to a peace-minded nation if it is incapable of first surviving a surprise attack and then fighting back. The very fact that a nation can survive constitutes a warning to a potential aggressor that an attack would mean retaliation to the full extent of available offensive power.

### A CIVIL DEFENSE MASTER PLAN

The new civil-defense bill which the Military Operations Subcommittee is about to consider offers not only a new strategic concept but a workable means to put it into operation. For the first time it will require the development and execution of a nationwide master plan for civil defense encompassing the basic minimum requirements for survival in the event of a nuclear attack. It will not saddle State and local levels of government with responsibilities they are not capable of carrying out. It will not require each level and unit of government to make its own appraisal of weapons effects, enemy strength, and necessary countermeasures.

The existing civil-defense legislation, now 6 years old, is obsolete—in fact, it was outdated upon its enactment after a decade of atomic-bomb technology. There is virtually unanimous agreement that civil defense can no longer be left to the States and local communities as a primary responsibility. The responsibility is a Federal one. The Constitution clearly implies it. The brute facts of the nuclear age compel it.

At the same time, I should point out, this bill does provide for a maximum supporting role by every level of government.

### BACKGROUND OF NEW CIVIL-DEFENSE BILL

The concept of civil defense embraced by this proposed legislation was not hastily arrived at. Nor, may I add, is this bill in any way a subject of partisan political controversy. Instead, this concept of civil defense is the end product of nearly 2 years of intensive research and study by the Military Operations Subcommittee, and during the past year both of our major political parties, for the first time in history, adopted civil-defense planks in their national platforms.

Our subcommittee believes that in the course of our long investigation of civil defense we secured some of the best thinking available from the science, business, medical, engineering, and military professions. Testimony was received from over 200 witnesses in 7 of our major target cities. We were fortunate in receiving expert testimony from the chairman and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which was supplemented by on-the-spot briefings at the National Civil Defense Headquarters at Battle Creek,

Mich.; at the Continental Air Defense Command Headquarters, Colorado Springs, Colorado; and at the Strategic Air Command Headquarters, Omaha, Nebr., as well as a briefing on missile developments by top military personnel in the Pentagon.

In addition, we have examined many of the practical problems of civil defense at the Federal, regional, State, and local levels of operation.

Based on the 7 volumes of hearings, comprising over 3,000 pages of printed testimony, which was produced by this investigation, the subcommittee presented to the Congress a report entitled "Civil Defense for National Survival"—House Report No. 2946, 84th Congress, 2d session, July 27, 1956. This report analyzed the major problems affecting the national civil defense program and presented 13 specific recommendations for the improvement of this program.

SUPPORT FOR CIVIL DEFENSE

During the 6 months since that report was presented to Congress, our subcommittee has witnessed an encouraging response on the part of the American people. We have found that the public is not apathetic to civil defense needs when a realistic, down-to-earth approach is made and when constructive action is taken to improve our chance of survival.

Altogether, more than 5,000 copies of the printed hearings and report have been distributed, on request, to every part of the country as well as to some friendly foreign countries.

Many letters commending the subcommittee report have been received and authoritative sources have characterized the report as "the first clear and unvarnished analysis of the Nation's civil defense preparedness" and as "the outstanding authority on the national civil defense problem."

A professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has cited our civil defense hearings as "splendid examples of the American democratic system in operation" and has praised the superb treatment of technical material in the report itself.

In a similar fashion, the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists praises the skillful analysis of technical material in the subcommittee report and states that "anyone concerned about the Nation's capacity to survive atomic war should take time to read the whole report."

A governor of one of our great States, writing in a national magazine, refers to our civil defense investigation and states:

> Chairman CHET HOLIFIELD and his committee have performed a service to the Nation and I recommend the complete study as required reading.

Assistant Secretary Burgess, of the Department of Defense, in transmitting the official views of the Department of Defense on the report, has expressed his sentiment in this respect by stating:

> I feel that your report is ample evidence of a sincere and searching inquiry into national civil defense by the Military Operations Subcommittee. The people of the United States should be grateful to you and the members of your subcommittee for its painstaking and thorough investigation.

I wish to note also, in this connection, that many national organizations and patriotic associations have expressed their concurrence with and support of the recommendations contained in our subcommittee report.

The American Legion National Convention, assembled in Los Angeles, Calif., this past September, among other things, adopted a resolution supporting the idea of Cabinet status for the Federal civil defense function.

The Fifth Annual Conference of the United States Civil Defense Council, meeting at Atlanta, Ga., this past October, requested Federal legislation to: Vest basic civil-defense responsibility in the Federal Government; create a Department of Civil Defense; formulate a civil-defense master plan; provide federally financed mass shelters for target cities; and to authorize the Secretary of Civil Defense to carry out preattack, or peacetime plans.

These are all specific recommendations put forth in our subcommittee report and provided for in the new civil-defense bill.

The National Association of State and Territorial Civil Defense Directors in April 1956 specifically resolved that its organization "pledges its full support and cooperation to the Holifield Committee and urges that Congress by proper legislation redefine and establish the basic policy for civil defense so that all levels of government may be guided accordingly in building for their jurisdictions and for the Nation a unified and effective system of civil defense."

I cite these facts, not to justify or in any way attach praise to the work of my subcommittee, but to indicate in some measure the authoritative background of our report and the importance of bringing before the Congress a sensible and workable civil-defense bill. The people of America, and particularly those in a position to understand the basic problems confronting civil defense, are looking to Congress for the enactment of legislation which will make possible an effective civil-defense program in the United States.

The new civil-defense bill on which our subcommittee will hold hearings is, I believe, sensible and realistic. It is patterned after our civil-defense report and is designed to put into effect the basic recommendations of that report.

PENDING AMENDATORY PROPOSALS

At the present time the Bureau of the Budget is circulating for comments several proposed amendments to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950. It is my understanding that these amendments, which are due to be submitted to Congress in the next few days, represent only modest changes in the act, being primarily concerned with a modification to permit Federal contributions to the States for administrative expenses.

While I would not want to prejudge these proposed amendments—and indeed they may be most worthwhile as far as they go—I am compelled to state that they are symptomatic of the chief malady now afflicting the Federal civil-defense program. They represent the same patchwork approach to civil defense that our subcommittee has been witnessing since the inception of our study and investigation almost 2 years ago.

What we need today is not a continuation of a patched-up, antiquated World War II system of civil defense, but a new concept embracing the total civil-defense task to be accomplished.

Evidence compiled by our subcommittee has led us to the conclusion that no civil-defense program can reasonably expect to cope with the hazards of modern warfare unless it, first, is capable of providing mass-shelter protection for our target-area population; second, is not dependent upon more than a few minutes warning; and, third, is capable of producing a simultaneous response on a nationwide scale in the event of an enemy attack.

Unless we face up to these realities, this Nation will never achieve an effective civil-defense program. Interstate compacts, mutual-aid agreements, regional and national conferences, exhortations to the States and other similar actions and programs may have a legitimate and worthwhile function in our Federal scheme of government. But such things alone do not constitute an integrated national plan for civil defense.

To achieve the desired integrated national plan we must first achieve a unity of direction and planning at the national level. I am convinced that at the present time our civil-defense planning is the victim of an institutional inability to grasp the nature of the job to be done. Once we provide a single, Cabinet-level agency for civil-defense planning at the national level, we will have taken the first step toward a truly national plan for civil defense in the United States.

In closing, I wish to call attention to a printing of the new civil defense bill—H. R. 2125—together with a brief explanation which accompanies it, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 7, 1957, at pages 296 to 301. This is the bill which our Subcommittee on Military Operations will consider at the hearings beginning next Tuesday, February 5, 1957. We think that this bill, although subject to changes as our consideration progresses, provides the basic framework for an effective civil defense, which we deem essential to assure our survival as a nation.

May I also take this opportunity to invite testimony from Members of the House? We would be most grateful for your contribution to our subcommittee deliberations on this important legislation. To my mind it is one of the most pressing legislative problems facing this session of Congress.

## GI EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 31, 1957, I introduced a bill to restore GI educational benefits to a limited number of inductees. My

bill would grant educational benefits only to those students of junior colleges, colleges and universities whose education is interrupted by selective service action.

Many young men attend college at a great sacrifice, and when they return from service, far too many of them, for one reason or another, simply do not have the means to complete their education.

The Middle East policy of the President extends our commitments. Greater emphasis on manpower may be expected, which lessens the possibility of the end of the draft. Young men shall continue to be threatened with an interrupted educational career.

The young man who is in the top third of his class is able to escape the interruption, but we should not overlook those below that level who frequently fail to reach their full development as a student until reaching older ages.

We know that all of our leadership of today has not been recruited from the top third of an earlier college generation, and unless we assure that these young Americans shall continue their education, we may be losing top leadership for tomorrow.

## BOY SCOUT WEEK

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the Boy Scouts of America chartered by the Congress is celebrating its 47th anniversary this week. Since its establishment it has had in excess of 26 million boys and leaders enrolled, and all have committed themselves to live up to the principles of the Scout oath and law. At the end of 1956 there were 4½ million Scouts and leaders enrolled, the highest record for membership in the Boy Scouts of America.

Through numerous training courses in all parts of the Nation, volunteer leaders are receiving training in unit administration and programing so that our boys will enjoy the best possible scouting experience.

In July of 1957 the Boy Scouts of America will conduct its 4th National Jamboree at Valley Forge when 50,000 Scouts, explorers and leaders will assemble for a week's encampment. This great patriotic gathering is part of the Scout's program "Onward for God and My Country." Another history making assembly of Scouts will take place in England when the 100th anniversary of the birth of Lord Baden-Powell, founder of the Boy Scout movement, and the 50th anniversary of the establishment of scouting in the world will be observed at a jubilee jamboree. Sixteen hundred American boys will attend.

The Boy Scouts of America has also engaged in an international exchange of nearly 300 young men with 11 nations of Europe, Asia, and Latin America thus strengthening the World Brotherhood of Scouting.

I am happy to call attention to the patriotic service of this great organization on the occasion of its anniversary. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following message from the President congratulating the Scouts upon their progress and achievements.

*To the Boy Scouts of America:*

As the American people observe Boy Scout Week, they are—I am confident—proud of the more than 4½ million boys and leaders now carrying on the Scout program of character development, citizenship training, and physical fitness. Since 1910, when this program was inaugurated, 26 million young Americans and their leaders have been active in it, constituting a tremendous force for wholesome living in our national life. Certainly the Boy Scout program is a distinctive contribution to a better and stronger America.

In July, during the National Jamboree at Valley Forge, Pa., the Nation will witness a tremendous rallying of the boys and men of the Scout movement. There, they will demonstrate the skills, the capacity for cooperative work, the ability to do things as a united team that they have learned in scouting. My best wishes go to the 50,000 who will attend. I am sure that once again they will be inspired by their encampment on that hallowed ground, and that in their conduct there and at home when they return they will prove themselves worthy heirs to their heroic forebears.

As all of you go forward with your 4-year program, "Onward For God and My Country," I extend to each and every one of you my warmest regards and best wishes for another year of accomplishment.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

## DROUGHT RELIEF

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to call up today the bill H. R. 2367 and ask for its passage under suspension of the rules. This bill was introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] on January 10. On January 12 and 13 the idea was proposed to the President on the drought trip. On January 17 a report was requested by telephone from the Department. On January 23 and 25 hearings were held by the subcommittee. On January 29, the executive session of the committee was held and the bill was unanimously reported after the one section, which became controversial, was deleted. The bill was unanimously reported by the committee, and we had every reason to believe it would have the support of the officials of the Department of Agriculture. But, it developed at our committee meeting this morning, that the Department of Agriculture does object to the consideration of this bill, as reported, at this time. In view of this opposition, which I think is very, very unfortunate, I shall not ask for its consideration under suspension of the rules at this time, but will probably ask for it to be consideration under suspension at a later date, or we will obtain a rule and ask for its consideration under a rule. The bill deals with what we consider to be a very severe and grave problem. The drought areas of the country were visited by President Eisenhower in person. The Department of Agriculture has certainly been aware of the distressing situation for many, many long weeks and it is unfortunate, after the bill had been considered and public hearings had been held, that Mr. True Morse of the Department of Agriculture came before the committee this morning and objected to the consideration of this bill. I just want to report to the House why I am not calling up the bill for consideration at this time, and fix the responsibility for the delay in the consideration of this very important and meritorious measure.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it perfectly clear that the House Committee on Agriculture is unanimously in favor of immediate passage of this bill. It is now apparent that relief will be delayed if not denied to those who are suffering in the drought areas of our Nation, and the Secretary of Agriculture is entirely responsible for this delay. When asked why officials of the Department of Agriculture were opposed to the bill, we received the usual answer—a committee has been studying the problems involved and have not yet reported. In other words, officials of the Department of Agriculture are fiddling while the farm lands of America are burning and parching and farmers are in great distress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

## DROUGHT LEGISLATION

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, my chairman [Mr. COOLEY] has explained the reason for the failure to carry out the ordinary legislative processes in connection with the drought bill. It seems to me this is one of the most tragic things to come before this House. The committee held extensive hearings and the Department's own witness, the head of the drought division, Mr. Kenneth L. Scott, appeared before the committee. Every page of this extensive record is his testimony. He did not tell us that the Department opposed the bill. He did not tell us that they wanted extra time for any studies of anything else. He said, "We need something." Although he would not approve of all of the details of the bill.

The committee made its own decision and brought out what is believed to be a fine and fair bill. I want to say for all of my colleagues, Republican and Democrat alike, everyone voted for it—everyone. There was no objection to this bill after it was finally brought out, and I do not think there is any objection to it now. I do not think there is any man on this floor who will stand up and tell us why we should not consider it except that the Department does not want to consider drought relief unless it is their drought relief.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Can the gentleman tell us how the committee first learned about the Department's attitude on this drought legislation?

Mr. POAGE. We read it in the newspapers, and that is where we usually find out about the Department's attitude.

Had the Department been as interested in helping drought sufferers as they said they were down at San Angelo, we could have already had one bill passed.

The minority leader did not think that the House was acting with too much haste when we passed the administration's bill to aid drought sufferers in the Middle East last week. Why should he be disturbed now when the committee finally acts after 3 weeks of study? Are we to understand that the trouble with our ranchmen is that they live in the valleys of the Cimarron, the Canadian, and the Red, rather than in the valleys of the Tigris, the Euphrates, and the Nile? Or could it be that only those bills which bear the name of a modern Republican could be expected to save the soil?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

## IRAN

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a statement by Deputy Under Secretary Murphy on Iran.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced into the RECORD a letter which, as a former member of the International Operations Subcommittee, I had addressed to the chairman of the subcommittee, the honorable gentleman from Virginia. This letter, dated December 29, 1956, set forth some of my serious reservations regarding the factual accuracy and interpretations of the subcommittee's report on United States aid operations in Iran. Regretting that my letter was not appended to the report as I had hoped it would be, I felt it should be made a matter of record before this House.

I now bring to the attention of the House, an additional document, which apparently through inadvertence, was omitted from the printed transcript of hearings before the subcommittee. This document consists of a summary of a statement given to the subcommittee in executive session by the Deputy Undersecretary of State, the Honorable Robert G. Murphy. This summary was prepared and provided to the subcommittee's staff last summer, after being cleared by the Department of State, in order to enable the transcript to include a public statement of the relevant facts surrounding this aid program.

I attach some importance to this since it provides what is nowhere else so succinctly presented, either in the report or in the transcript, that is, a description of the conditions which existed in Iran during the years 1951–54. To analyze the Iranian program without constant reference to these conditions is to analyze it in a vacuum. It was these conditions and the clear threat which they posed for Iran and the free world in general that set the tone of urgency and emergency which governed the conduct of United States aid operations in Iran during this fateful period. Our aid programs were deliberately planned to support the United States policy to assist Iran in regaining its stability, reestablishing security, protecting its independence and providing a basis for economic improvement. The immediate urgent problem in those years was to assist Iran in avoiding a Communist takeover by a subversive movement supported from abroad. Once this objective had been achieved, it was necessary to seek a solution to the long-deadlocked oil problem. Operating under such conditions, when time was perpetually of the essence and when American officials were frequently unable to move about the country or even from their homes to offices in safety, it was sometimes not possible to give the same leisurely, deliberate time to careful advance planning which is expected in more normal times. Furthermore, the overall success of the program is crystal clear. The measure of this success is that the objectives have been achieved.

The statement by Mr. Murphy sets forth the above facts and since this summary of his statement was prepared in order to make it available to the public, I believe it should be entered into the record of this House.

Along the same line, I might refer briefly to an article which appeared in the February issue of the Reader's Digest. This article, entitled, "How Not To Handle Foreign Aid," written by a former ECA employee, appeared in print, by a curious coincidence, almost simultaneously with the publication of the subcommittee's report on the aid program in Iran. By the careful selection of certain information, most of which was provided to the subcommittee, this article manages to cast a cloud of suspicion over the objectives and management of the program in Iran. As my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], pointed out to the House on January 28, this article deals in personalities and for this reason should not be compared with the subcommittee's report. Nevertheless, there are a few points worth noting. The article describes the proposed Iranian Karaj Dam project solely as being a hydroelectric project and criticizes it on that ground, omitting any mention of the fact that it would actually be a multipurpose project which would provide power, drinking water to Tehran and irrigation water to the vicinity. The article indicates that the Iranians were bitterly opposed to the project and that it was forced on the country as the result of the alleged prejudices of one man, but neglects to mention that since before World War II, this project has been the dream of many Iranians desirous of raising their country's standard of living. The article quotes selectively from certain engineering reports and purports to demonstrate that all competent technical opinion is opposed to the project. No mention is made of the most recent engineering report by a well-known American firm retained by the Iranian 7-year plan organization. This report, on the basis of which Iran is proceeding to get the project underway, finds that the dam will satisfy a great human need, provide additional annual revenues to the Government of Iran, increase irrigation and provide urgently needed water to Tehran as well as electric energy. While the article's author clearly favors thermal power over hydroelectric power, the most recent engineering studies state that in this case, an economic evaluation provides no clear-cut advantage to either thermal or hydroelectric power.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot provide the answers to these technical questions but I wanted to introduce this information solely with a view to introducing an element of moderate, calm perspective into what seems to me to have become a rather dangerously unbalanced and unobjective presentation of highly complex matters.

I feel that great credit should be given the representatives of the State Department and the Foreign Operations Administration for the splendid manner in which our relationship with the Government of Iran was handled during this very difficult but tremendously important period. Any serious mistake or ineffectiveness on the part of our officials might have been disastrous, not only to us but to the free world, and I want to take advantage of this opportunity to compliment all of them in the performance of a highly satisfactory service, the long-range benefits of which we are unable to estimate.

SUMMARY OF STATEMENT OF DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY ROBERT MURPHY ON MAY 29, 1956

The Second World War made a terrific impact upon the political and economic life of Iran. Following the occupation of the country in 1941, Reza Shah, who had been ruling Iran with a firm hand for many years, abdicated and went into exile where he died. His son, Mohammed Shah, the present King, succeeded him. The Government of Iran was, for several years, in the difficult position of governing alongside allied military leaders who in performing their tasks were constantly making decisions which affected political and economic conditions in the country.

The departure of allied troops left the country in an unstable situation. Furthermore, the Russians left behind two puppet Communist regimes occupying most of northwestern Iran. They were driven out only in the winter of 1946. The central government was weak; the army was in a deplorable condition; Communists were active and at one time even succeeded in holding three cabinet posts in the government.

Eventually, early in 1950, a stronger central government under General Razamara was established and it looked at though more stable conditions were returning. In the spring of 1951, however, General Razamara was assassinated and a group of extreme nationalists, supported by a treacherous but energetic Communist element, came into power. One of the first actions of the new nationalist government under Dr. Mossadegh was to nationalize the oil industry and take control of the oil fields and the great Abadan

refinery which had been operated by the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. As a result, the export of Iranian oil came to a halt. Since the government was dependent to a large extent upon oil revenues to pay government salaries and meet other expenses, the absence of oil revenues had an immediate serious effect upon the financial and economic conditions of the country.

Unless some way could be found to revive the oil industry or unless the oil revenues could be replaced by funds from other sources, the Iranian Government was bound for bankruptcy, the national economy would become increasingly chaotic, and Iran would encounter increasing difficulties in maintaining its independence in the face of increased Communist pressures from her gigantic neighbor to the north.

Although Dr. Mossadegh, the Prime Minister, had no desire to see Iran fall under Soviet domination, he nevertheless took the position that in the circumstances he could not afford to complicate his situation by adopting a strong stand against international communism. A historic and bitter struggle gradually developed between the forces of freedom and international communism in Iran. It would have been contrary to the interests of Iran and of the free world for the country to fall under Communist domination and for the Persian Gulf to become a Communist lake. An Iran dominated by international communism would have been like a chunk of radio-active matter thrust into the heart of the Middle East. Strategically, the downfall of Iran would have split the world, leaving the Communists free to push either west or east. The struggle which took place in Iran from 1951 to 1954 was sometimes of a most critical character. Cunningly, international communism remained in the background at first, pushing forward the more extreme leftwing which proceeded, step-by-step, to eliminate the influence of constructive Iranian nationalists.

In this struggle, the international communism had the advantage of proximity. For more than 1,200 miles, the borders of Iran touched on the Soviet Union. Along these borders were massed troops which from time to time would make demonstrations for the purpose of encouraging the relatively small but disciplined indigenous Communists and discouraging those who desired to maintain Iran's territorial and political integrity. International communism maintained well-organized and highly disciplined fifth columns in various parts of Iran. These fifth columns were trained for street fighting, and on occasion after occasion they were marshaled in the streets to demonstrate their strength and terrorize the population. Communists had penetrated most segments of Iranian life, official and nonofficial. The Soviet radio was used to blanket the country. International communism exerted every effort to exploit and mislead sincere Iranian nationalists.

By the spring of 1951 it had become clear that if Iran was to be saved from foreign domination, urgent assistance would have to be given. For a number of years there had been operating in Iran a military mission and a gendarmeric mission. Consideration was given to strengthening these missions and to sending more supplies to the Iranian defense and gendarmerie forces. Similarly, efforts were made to strengthening the MAAG mission which was devoted to the task of supplying weapons to the Iranian armed forces and training them in their use.

However, in view of the Iranian situation which was daily becoming more critical, more was needed than the mere furnishing of military support. Consideration, therefore, was given to sending to Iran a substantial Technical Cooperation Administration mission, the personnel of which would be distributed throughout various parts of the country and would render various types of technical assistance. With the passage of the MSA Act in October 1951, it was possible to bring these plans to fruition. Some $23 million was allocated under the act for TCA assistance to Iran, and Mr. William C. Warne, who was at that time Assistant Secretary of the Interior, resigned and was appointed by President Truman to head the TCA mission. Mr. Warne consulted with Dr. Mossadegh while the latter was in the United States in November 1951 and the Iranian Prime Minister agreed, during the course of these conversations, to some of Mr. Warne's plans.

The means of strengthening Iran were not limited to military and technical assistance. Diplomatic and educational means also were used.

International communism did not fail to understand the dangers presented to their plans for Iran by strengthened and expanded American assistance. It made efforts to frustrate these activities. Pressure was put on Dr. Mossadegh to prevent him from coming to the agreements necessary for the extension of new aid programs. The Communist ridiculed and endeavored to undermine the TCA programs, claiming that no tangible aid was really planned and that these programs were being dangled before Iranian eyes merely to divert the Iranian Government from the path of nationalism. A distinction should be drawn between the real Iranian nationalists and the Communists. The real Iranian nationalists had no sympathy with Communist imperialism. They realized that the latter represented a mortal danger to their country. But, as has happened elsewhere, the Communists cynically donned the cloak of nationalism to deceive the people and then proceeded with all haste to try to confuse and take over the nationalist movement.

The Communists used numerous devices in order to discredit American diplomacy and make it look like mere expressions of imperialism. They countered our public-relations work by increasing the number of anti-American programs on the radio and by heavy-handed pressure on important sections of the Iranian press. They belittled the Shah, who they knew would never acquiesce in their designs. They effected the removal from key military, police, and civilian positions of officials known to be strongly anti-Communist. They took energetic measures to make living in Iran hazardous for Americans. Communist-led gangs stoned American automobiles, terrorized Iranian citizens working for Americans, mud-plastered "Yankee, go home" slogans over countless walls. In Shiraz, Communist-inspired mobs actually attacked and destroyed TCA headquarters. During one period of violence, all Americans in Tehran were confined to their homes for 6 days. The successes of the Communist front were tempered by the fact that, despite these pressures, many Iranians who had had experience with Americans and who had seen the work being done by our military and technical-assistance personnel knew that the United States had no intention other than helping Iran to improve its conditions and preserve its independence.

The treatment accorded to American citizens during one period became so unbearable that it was necessary to stop recruitment for TCA (or FOA, as it later became). This halt in recruitment was extremely unfortunate, since it came about at a time when more personnel were needed to take care of the material and equipment coming into the country for use in certain assistance programs throughout Iran. In the summer of 1953 the situation had deteriorated so far that some American dependents found it necessary to depart. In one province adjacent to the U. S. S. R. it became necessary to remove all Americans. At the same time, it became increasingly difficult to recruit new TCA personnel for Iran. Such personnel as TCA was able to recruit preferred, as a rule, to go to areas where there would be greater security for their families.

In the field of diplomacy, the United States did its utmost to assist the parties to the oil dispute to come to some agreement which would permit a solution of the problem. Nevertheless, the Iranian Government broke relations with Great Britain, and the British Embassy was closed in the fall of 1952. This seriously complicated the problem, making it practically impossible to find any possible solution.

In March 1953, after a series of arduous and complicated negotiations between the Iranian Government and our Embassy, the purpose of which was to find a solution to the oil problem, the Mossadegh Government, under pressure from forces anxious to prevent a settlement, rejected proposals which were of a most reasonable nature. It began to become clear in the spring of that year that there did not exist conditions for an oil agreement of a kind which would result in a revival of the Iranian oil industry. It also became quite clear to Dr. Mossadegh that unless he could receive budgetary aid from the United States or some other foreign source, Iran, in the absence of an oil settlement, would quickly become bankrupt. He, therefore, endeavored to persuade the American Government to substitute budgetary aid for technical assistance. In June 1953 he sent a letter to President Eisenhower in which he intimated that if the United States could not give Iran budgetary aid at once Iran might be compelled to turn elsewhere. This letter was correctly interpreted as a threat that Iran might turn toward the Soviet Union.

The President, in his reply, indicated that so long as Iran was not prepared to do its utmost to exploit its own natural resources, it could not expect budgetary aid from the United States. When this exchange of letters became public, a most serious crisis began to develop in Iran. It now became clear to the Shah, the Iranian military and civilian officials, and to the public that Iran was at a crossroads. If it was not to become an economic swamp it must either find a solution to the oil problem or resign itself to capitulating to the increasing pressures of international Communism.

In August 1953, the Shah issued a decree dismissing Dr. Mossadegh and appointing General Zahedi as Prime Minister in his stead. Mossadegh arrested two emissaries of the Shah who had requested his resignation. During the succeeding week, Iran began to slide rapidly in the direction of international communism. Communist-led mobs dominated the streets. They carried Communist slogans and sang Communist songs. Americans and other foreigners who ventured from their homes were attacked. Not only in Tehran, but in other prominent cities, slogans were displayed condemning the United States, praising the Soviet Union, and threatening the lives of American citizens.

Just at the moment when it seemed Iran might lose its independence, an uprising took place in Tehran and spread rapidly to other parts of the country. This spontaneous upsurge was in favor of the Shah and a free Iran, and against the forces which had brought Iran into such a perilous state. Within a period of 12 hours after this rioting had started, the tide had turned; General Zahedi took over as Prime Minister with the support of the Army, gendarmerie, police, most civilian officials and the overwhelming majority of the people. There is every reason to believe that the aid given by the United States and the encouragement afforded by the steadfast friendship of the United States played an important role in helping Iran to survive during this dangerous period—1951–53. Fortunately for the Free World, international Communism had overplayed its hand. The Iranian people again

demonstrated their determination to maintain the independence of their country.

General Zahedi, the new Prime Minister, established a Government which immediately indicated its desire to establish close friendly relations with the United States. This Government found itself in a difficult position. There were absolutely no funds left in the treasury. Mossadegh had for months been financing his government by the secret issuance of inflation-producing currency. One of the first acts of the new Prime Minister was to address a letter to President Eisenhower indicating that his Government was prepared to exploit the natural resources of Iran but that if it was to survive it must immediately have financial assistance. It was clear that if the United States failed to give budgetary aid at this critical time, the new Government could not survive. Therefore, financial assistance to the extent of $45 million was granted as a first emergency measure to tide the Iranian Government over its immediate difficulties.

It was not easy for the new government to find an immediate solution of the oil problem. In spite of its goodwill and serious efforts, a little over a year elapsed before protracted and complicated negotiations culminated in the signing of an oil agreement in the late summer of 1954. Nearly 2 months more passed before the new agreement was ratified by both Houses of the Iranian Parliament. There was widespread concern in Iran lest the revenues from the revived oil industry would be drained away uneconomically as had been the case in the past. The government, to dispel this uneasiness, indicated that in making use of oil revenues, priority would be given to economic development. It was the hope of the government at that time that these revenues, when plowed into the economy of the country, would produce a prosperity which in turn would result in increased tax receipts sufficient to enable the government to balance its budget. It will still take time for this hope to materialize.

The ratification of the oil agreement did not of itself solve Iran's financial problems. Several months of preparation were necessary before substantial quantities of oil could flow from the fields and the refinery at Abadan could begin to turn out oil products in large amounts. In the meantime, it was necessary for the Iranian Government to receive from some source, financial assistance to take care of its current budgetary deficit. The United States, therefore, has continued up to this time to give Iran budgetary aid.

In October 1951 there were probably not more than a score of Americans in Iran on the TCA payroll. In spite of the difficulties experienced in operating in the atmosphere prevailing in Iran prior to August 1953, the number of American personnel of TCA multiplied rapidly. In 1953, the Americans numbered more than 200 persons in addition to perhaps 1,500 Iranians.

In the fall of 1951, a table of organization was drawn up which provided for a well-staffed joint administrative service, serving both the Embassy and TCA. For various reasons, the personnel provided for in this table, failed to arrive in Iran. As a result, the enormous task of furnishing administrative support to the Embassy and TCA in all 10 provinces fell for a time on a handful of Americans and several hundred Iranians. Supplies came pouring in as also did American technical experts. It was impossible for the joint administrative service adequately to deal with the situation. Efforts were made to set up procedures for maintaining an inventory of property and a careful accounting of funds expended. These procedures too frequently broke down, however, under the stress and strain of the volume of work developed. In spite of administrative shortcoming, there was no abatement in the work of developing and carrying out technical assistance and economic programs. Slowing down of these programs would have tended to give credence to the charges which the enemies of the United States were making to the effect that it did not intend to give technical assistance and development aid to Iran. Furthermore, in view of the steadily worsening situation, it was considered imperative that as many American technicians as possible go to work throughout the country to demonstrate American interest in, and friendship for Iran and the American determination to help Iran during this trying period.

In view of this situation there unfortunately was some wastage of supplies and at times a certain amount of disorder in the handling and utilization of American equipment. Furthermore, some of the programs were undoubtedly not as carefully prepared as they would have been in a more normal situation. Partly, as a result of the chaotic conditions under which the work was being carried on, it was not until the summer of 1954 that it was possible to put into effect the kind of effective inventory and accounting procedures which the situation seemed to require. These procedures at the present time are fairly satisfactory although they are constantly being improved.

We believe that it was wise for TCA to push ahead rapidly with the programs even though there might be administrative shortcomings with regard to them. Events in Iran during the period 1951 to 1954 are evidence of the correctness of this policy.

## AFL–CIO POLICY REGARDING FIFTH AMENDMENT

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, last week the other body authorized—within 24 hours of the time it was proposed—a full-scale investigation of labor racketeering. I am sure that we here in this body wish them well. Although no Members of this body are to be included in this investigation, many of us have a keen interest in its field of inquiry. Mr. Meany and the leadership of the AFL–CIO are to be congratulated for their statesmanship in deciding to cooperate fully with Congress in this effort.

As one who has repeatedly called for a concerted attack on racketeering, I trust that what I have to say now will not be misunderstood. However, I feel compelled to comment on a particular part of the AFL–CIO's recent statement concerning racketeering investigations. I do so only because it concerns a fundamental constitutional right, the fifth amendment's protection of the privilege against self-incrimination.

As it appears in the New York Times of Tuesday, January 24, 1957, the AFL–CIO statement announces the following policy:

> If a trade union official decides to invoke the fifth amendment for his personal protection and to avoid scrutiny by proper legislative committees, law enforcement agencies, or other public bodies into corruption on his part, he has no right to continue to hold office in his union.

If this statement means what it seems to mean; namely, that any union official who avails himself of his constitutional privilege against self-incrimination will be, ipso facto, automatically dismissed without a hearing, then we should all be disturbed. For this would not be due process of law. And in a great organization such as the AFL–CIO, which is in a sense clothed with the public interest, it seems to me especially important that due process be followed.

Less than a year ago the United States Supreme Court, in the Slochower case, passed on this same basic issue. Slochower had been dropped from his teaching position at Brooklyn College solely because he had invoked the fifth amendment under questioning by a congressional committee. The Supreme Court held that his summary dismissal violated due process of law.

In its decision the Court said:

> At the outset we must condemn the practice of imputing a sinister meaning to the exercise of a person's constitutional right under the fifth amendment. The right of an accused person to refuse to testify, which had been in England merely a rule of evidence, was so important to our forefathers that they raised it to the dignity of a constitutional enactment, and it has been recognized as one of the most valuable prerogatives of the citizen. *Brown* v. *Walker* (161 U. S. 591, 610). We have reaffirmed our faith in this principle recently in *Quinn* v. *United States* (349 U. S. 155). In *Ullmann* v. *United States*, decided last month, we scored the assumption that those who claim this privilege are either criminals or perjurers. The privilege against self-incrimination would be reduced to a hollow mockery if its exercise could be taken as equivalent either to a confession of guilt or a conclusive presumption of perjury. As we pointed out in Ullmann, a witness may have a reasonable fear of prosecution and yet be innocent of any wrongdoing. The privilege serves to protect the innocent who otherwise might be ensnared by ambiguous circumstances. (See Griswold, The Fifth Amendment Today (1955).)

If, as James P. Carey has suggested, the AFL–CIO were to make its own investigation of a case following a union official's use of the fifth amendment, it might then properly decide that legitimate grounds existed for expelling the official in question. However, this is a very different thing from automatically expelling every official who avails himself of his constitutional privilege against self-incrimination.

The AFL–CIO deserves the fullest praise for its determination to cooperate with Congress in a joint effort to attack labor racketeering. But need we undermine, in pursuing this laudable objective, what is, and should remain, a cherished constitutional right?

## DROUGHT LEGISLATION

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was terribly saddened by the announcement made by Mr. COOLEY that

we could not vote on the drought legislation today; sad, not only because we will not consider this legislation today, but saddened further because it looks like the Congress of the United States has now abdicated to the executive branch of the Government. Many of us who are familiar with the drought problems in this great Southwest country worked on this legislation, yet we come here and get ready to decide on the legislation, as representatives of the people, and one man walks in from the executive branch of the Government and says, "No, representatives of the people, you do not have any right to consider this because I am opposed to it and I want to study it."

I want to say to Mr. Benson that this is no time for delay. The people who would be helped by this bill, need the assistance now, and cannot wait for the Secretary to study it at his leisure.

There is one other thing I want to say. Many people in this Congress studied this bill, people who knew and understood the drought situation and the farm problem a great deal better than Mr. Benson does. I do not think his experts down there are qualified to veto what the people, who are sent to Congress, decide upon. It is indeed a sad day when one man can control the destinies of so many in this country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a little difficult to understand all this cry about postponing legislation on this drought situation. It has been only 4 or 5 days since gentlemen gave the President authority to declare war, use our men wherever he wanted to, put them under the command of the United Nations—not under the Stars and Stripes, but under the United Nations.

Now, why squawk about this slight delay? Now they are crying about it. But just a few days ago absolute authority was given the President to make and carry on war. Is the present situation more important than the Nation's future?

The President went out of his way to kill a good news story, when he said the Secretary of Defense made an unwise remark, and then when Mrs. Wilson took him to task, and rightly I think, invited Wilson and Mrs. Wilson to hitchhike with him down to Florida. What becomes of that nice little difference of opinion which the press might have used for 2 or 3 days on the front page? It is all gone into thin air. Just another example of the way people in a free country operate.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I share the concern expressed by my colleagues in regard to the postponement of action on the bill that has been discussed this morning.

This bill relates to the terrible drought situation which the Weather Bureau and all authorities on this subject say is the worst in more than 300 years in a considerable area of the United States. It covers more than 600 counties, about one-fifth of all the counties in the United States.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I just want to say to the gentleman and to the House that this is merely a postponement of this important matter. I wanted to fix the responsibility for the postponement, and it is fixed now on Mr. Ezra Benson and Mr. True D. Morse of the Department of Agriculture.

Our committee acted expeditiously on this bill. The bill was well and thoroughly considered and again I repeat was unanimously reported. Officials of the Department of Agriculture had an opportunity to be heard at the time hearings were being held. The passage of the bill should not be delayed, and I assure you that its presentation to the House will not long be delayed.

Mr. FISHER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I think we all recognize that it is not an objection to the bill but a request for a postponement. I feel confident it will be taken up and passed in a reasonable time. Secretary Benson was in Texas and other drought-stricken States with President Eisenhower. He showed his solicitude for the plight of the drought victims. He has been most understanding of our problems in the past and I am confident that upon study of this treatment of the land as a relief and restoration measure, he will approve this very sound and helpful proposal. I have talked with people in the Soil Conservation Service, and I think I know their attitude. We have a most desperate problem to deal with and I am certain Secretary Benson recognizes that to be true. This deferred grazing proposal is sound, practicable, and badly needed. It will more than pay for itself in restoring the land to productive capacity much more rapidly than would otherwise be the case. It will pay the Government dividends because it will speed up the restoration of the economy of a vast area. That will mean more taxes, more income, more stability.

## OFFICIAL OBJECTORS ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the House the appointment on the Democratic side of the official objectors committee on the Consent Calendar: The gentleman from Colorado, Mr. ASPINALL; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. BOLAND; and the gentleman from California, Mr. MCFALL.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. I desire to announce the appointment on the Republican side of members on the official objectors committee on the Consent Calendar: The gentleman from Iowa, Mr. CUNNINGHAM; the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. BYRNES; the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. FORD; and the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. WEAVER.

## OFFICIAL OBJECTORS ON THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. I also wish to announce that the following Members have been appointed to the objectors committee on the Private Calendar: The gentleman from Alabama, Mr. ROBERTS; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. BOLAND; and the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. HEMPHILL.

Mr. MARTIN. I desire to announce the appointment on the Republican side of members on the objectors committee on the Private Calendar: The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. SHEEHAN; the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. VAN PELT; and the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. AVERY.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as we know, service on these committees is very important. They render exceedingly valuable service to the House and to the people of the country, and it is done by these Members at great sacrifice. I want to express my sincere thanks to the Members who served during the last Congress for serving again this Congress, and to the new Members, the gentleman from California [Mr. MCFALL] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] my thanks for being willing to serve on these committees which require so much extra work.

## AVIATION MEDICAL RESEARCH

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for aviation medical research and to broaden the medical responsibility of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The bill would set up the Office of Civil Aviation Medicine within the CAA to develop essential technical information in the field of aviation medicine and medical fitness standards for pilots and other airmen.

The legislation calls for the creation and equipment of a Civil Aeronautics medical research laboratory to provide a counterpart in medicine to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. In the field of civil aviation this would provide the equivalent of the medical research and development facilities of the Armed Forces for the development of technical medical information essential to aviation safety.

The Office of Civil Aviation Medicine in the CAA would be headed by a civil-air surgeon. The civil-air surgeon would establish minimum human requirements in aircraft design, minimum standards of mental and physical fitness for civil airmen, promulgate regulations for inspection of aircraft with respect to hu-

man requirements, conduct and encourage research and investigation in aviation medicine, be required to investigate medical causes of accidents and where needed require physical examination of passengers and crew members involved in accidents.

The civil-air surgeon also would be authorized to make grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals and to other public and private institutions and to individuals for research projects recommended by a Federal Advisory Council on Civil Aviation Medicine also set up under the terms of the bill. The bill appropriates $2,500,000 for the Civil Aeronautics Medical Research Laboratory to carry out the provisions of the measure.

## THE DROUGHT SITUATION

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the people in the drought area is very bad and I am very sympathetic to them; I really think something should be done about it, but I assumed that after the President and the Secretary flew over the drought area that everything was taken care of.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. As I remember, about 2 years ago, Mr. Benson was out in this same area. In one town he blamed the drought on the Democrats, but at another stop he urged the people to pray for rain. I suppose it would be expecting too much to ask some consistency from the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman; but he is asking too much when he asks Mr. Benson to be consistent except consistently against the farmer.

## IMPORTATION OF TEXTILES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution requesting the House Committee on Ways and Means to investigate and study the arrangement recently negotiated with Japan by the State Department and others under which Japan will limit her exports of cotton textiles to this country over a 5-year period.

Mr. Speaker, in asking this investigation and study I wish to make it clear that I do not oppose the limitation of imports of cotton textiles. I believe that such limitation was and is necessary. I approve of the limitation but not of the method of securing it. The cotton textile industry was being seriously injured in several lines of cotton goods by imports from Japan.

Strenuous efforts were made by the industry through their representatives in the Congress for a period of more than a year to obtain relief. Every effort was strongly opposed by the executive branch of the Government. Not only that, but in a trade agreement with Japan the duty on textiles was sharply reduced. Announcement of this reduction was not made until after the bill continuing the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was passed.

It became clear in a short time that the duty should not have been reduced in the first place. Such reductions were opposed before the Committee for Reciprocity Information no less than before the Tariff Commission in hearings held for the guidance of the State Department prior to the actual negotiations. It now appears that such hearings are little better than a matter of form. Once in Geneva the United States delegates seem to pay not the least attention to the statements made before the Committee for Reciprocity Information by representatives of the industry and their workers.

Mr. Speaker, that is a super-duper committee set up to permit the Executive to get some alleged facts on which to override findings of the Tariff Commission. Of course, you know that the Tariff Commission is an arm of the Congress. Yet they have set up this committee to override the findings of the Tariff Commission and give the President some alleged ground at least for so doing. The textile industry made a showing before that super-duper committee.

What would happen if the duty were to be reduced was clear enough. There could be no question about the advantage held by Japan in competition with our own mills. Already imports were coming in at an alarming rate. But, of course, the State Department had its policy to carry out. The policy of freer trade through more liberal imports must be served. Nothing else mattered. Hold hearings, yes; but pay no attention to them.

Well, we know what happened. The American textile industry was like a row of sitting ducks under the guns of Japanese competition. The low Japanese wages, combined with modern textile machinery in Japanese plants, gave Japan a cost advantage that was a sure key to our market for the cheaper varieties of goods. The cost advantage was made wider by the cotton disposal program of the Department of Agriculture which enables Japanese mills to purchase raw cotton at a price lower than domestic mills had to pay.

When the tide of imports rolled in there was no stopping them. In a short time the imports succeeded in taking large and growing slices of the whole market for velveteens, ginghams, damasks, blouses, and other lines.

The industry undertook to invoke the existing administrative remedies such as section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the Escape Clause of the Trade Agreements Act. The action under section 22 was strenuously opposed by the administration, and it came to naught.

I recall that more than 100 representatives from the textile area, both from the Senate and the House, made appointments with President Eisenhower personally and urged him to take some action to protect the industry under this section 22. But he failed and refused to do it on the objection of the State Department. Action under the Escape Clause was delayed by an overall approach that failed to distinguish between different classes of cotton goods. The Tariff Commission pointed to the need of examining the imports of particular items.

Several applications were then filed by the industry, covering individual items such as velveteens, ginghams, pillow cases, blouses, and so forth.

It was at this point that the devious strategy that culminated in the recently announced self-limitation of exports by Japan began to take shape.

Now I call your attention to the fact that the President and the Department of State urged the textile industry to do this very thing, to pursue its remedies before the Tariff Commission. They did that. They accepted the recommendation of the President and the Department of State, and they did everything they could to make those remedies available.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Is the gentleman aware of any report as yet made by the textile industry, a report on the recent agreement reached between the Japanese Government and our Government on this very question?

Mr. LANHAM. No; I do not know of any report, and I know of no report from the State Department. It is sort of a secret matter. That is what we want to find out by this resolution.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I agree with the gentleman, but here is what I am getting at. Has the gentleman as yet had a report from the textile industry as to what the real effect of that decision will be on our textile industry?

Mr. LANHAM. No; I have not.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. We are both looking for that report, I am sure.

Mr. LANHAM. Yes. We would like to have that report, and one from the State Department.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. We do have information, however, that the Japanese may or may not go through with the agreement recently set up. They seem to be, if I understand the situation correctly, insisting that if they go through with this agreement, that the United States Government bring pressure upon—what States are they—South Carolina and Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. Georgia and several others, to withdraw their laws or to repeal their laws on the labeling of textiles imported from Japan.

Mr. GROSS. That seems to be entering into the picture now; that the United States bring pressure to bear upon them.

Mr. LANHAM. I have introduced this resolution, and I want to know if the State Department promised to nullify these laws if they were passed. Now, I

do not say that I think this will do much good, but we want to know the facts.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I have been unofficially informed that the State Department has not only agreed to set aside most of the regulations that apply to other nations, but they have agreed with the Japanese that they will not enforce the sections of the escape clause; in other words, they would prohibit the textile industry from going before the Tariff Commission for a period.

Mr. LANHAM. And after they go, the President ignores the recommendations of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. BAILEY. I know, but they are going so far as to try to bind the Congress and the Tariff Commission in not conducting any hearings to determine injury within the industry.

Mr. LANHAM. Do you not think, then, that the Committee on Ways and Means should find out for us just exactly what they did promise?

Mr. BAILEY. Just what is in the agreement.

Mr. LANHAM. And whether there is an agreement or not, I think it is an arrangement. I do not think it is even an an agreement.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. With respect to these Japanese agreements, it was quite generous of the Japanese Government to agree to permit our textile industry to continue, because the State Department had become determined not to let them continue. That was true in my State. So, the only thing we had left to do was to pass laws in our own defense. Of course, it was not an agreement in accordance with the philosophy of the State Department. Let me tell you this: I do not care what the Japanese say or what the State Department says, we in South Carolina are going to run our business, whether it is Japan, the State Department, or the Supreme Court. We have been doing that for a long time.

Mr. LANHAM. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I want to make the flat statement that the State Department for at least 8 or 10 years has been deliberately using its powers over the tariff, and these agreements under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, for international political effect. It is simply a part of our State Department's policy to curry favor with all of these nations at the expense of our own industries.

Mr. LANHAM. And to ignore the Congress as they do it.

Mr. MASON. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman gladly.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratluate the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] on the splendid speech he is making. I shall support his resolution relative to the so-called voluntary agreement with Japan to limit exports of textiles to this country.

If textile imports from Japan and other countries where cheap labor is available continue to increase, this will put our textile mills practically out of business sooner or later and create much unemployment.

The mills of this country are the only dependable markets we have for cotton.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, in line with the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] with reference to Japan, I was very interested to read the following editorial from one of the leading newspapers in Japan, which was sent to me, the Asahi Evening News of January 19, 1957, which I think shows something of the attitude of the people of Japan on this matter. The editorial is entitled, "United States and Cotton Exports," and it says this, among other things:

> Much as we should like to welcome the settlement, the attitude taken by the United States during the negotiations and the results which were finally reached make this impossible even as a polite gesture. Nothing can hide the fact that for the most part the United States forced her proposal on Japan and paid little attention to the latter's urgent demands that she be allowed to expand her exports. United States is most powerful country in the world. She is constantly advocating the need for freer trade. It is now this same country that has now shown insufficient awareness of her responsibilities and overeagerness for immediate profit by demanding of Japan whose position is so much weaker, that she impose crushing restrictions on her exports.

Now listen to this:

> Japan can scarcely be expected to take this with a smile. Japan has not the slightest intention of engaging in any ill-considered export competition. This being so, America's attitude of regarding Japanese textiles as a major threat is difficult to understand.

It goes on with other matters and finally says:

> The attitude taken by the United States in the recent negotiations is deplorable in the extreme.

I say to the Members of the House that if that editorial is indicative of the thinking of the people of Japan, or of the industrialists of Japan, then the gentleman from Iowa is certainly correct in which I understood to be his intimation that this so-called arrangement has little value to the industry in this country.

Mr. LANHAM. Because I knew the Japanese attitude after this arrangement was forced upon them, as I said a few moments ago, I doubted that there was any agreement at all. It was merely an arrangement that was forced on the Japanese people by the State Department without any authority of law whatsoever. They did it to prevent the President from having to grant the relief that the Tariff Commission had recommended. They did it deliberately to bypass the Congress and to bypass the arm of Congress, the Tariff Commission, and act itself wholly without the law. They have made our relations with Japan much worse than if the President had followed the law and the findings of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. As I understand, there has been a 40-percent mortality rate in the knitwear industry in the last few years because of imports of Japanese-knit gloves and mittens. There has been a 560-percent increase in the numbers of knit gloves and mittens that have been coming into this country. I have a knitting mill in my district, the only one in the State of Iowa. The question I should like to ask the gentleman is, whether his resolution is broad enough to cover an inquiry as to what is happening in the knitwear industry in the United States.

Mr. LANHAM. This resolution simply calls for a report on this alleged agreement with Japan relative to textiles. I think it would of course apply also to the imports of gloves and mittens. I do not know whether or not this agreement included those, but that is what I would like to find out. Yes, it would call for a report on what items were covered in this arrangement.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that I certainly support his resolution and hope it is broad enough to give us some information on what is happening.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I commend my colleague from Georgia on introducing this resolution and for the able speech he has made in support of it. I concur in what he has said and concur in the remarks that have been made here during his address by my colleagues from Illinois, Iowa, Georgia, North Carolina, and other States. This is one of the most serious questions that affects our State and many of the other States of this Union. In Georgia the textile industry is one of the outstanding industries. It means a great deal to the market for our farmers for cotton. It means a great deal to those who work in the cotton mills in the State of Georgia. I think the textile industry employs probably more people than any other one industry in that State. Does the gentleman know if that is correct?

Mr. LANHAM. I think that is correct.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is my understanding. I am wholeheartedly in support of the gentleman's resolution and feel that he has done a great service in introducing it and in pushing it as he is doing.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the resolution the gentleman has introduced should be welcomed by the Congress. I am sure I would be very happy to join in any such legislation. I think an inquiry into this particular field is essential because I believe the gentleman in introducing his resolution has seen a beginning, an inroad, not only in arrangements of this sort with regard to textiles but the importation of other materials. I speak particularly of the field of pottery. Domestic pottery has suffered greatly from the inroads of imports in the past decade. I hope the inquiry the gentleman is making through the Committee on Ways and Means can also shed light on the problem which the pottery industries of southeastern Ohio and elsewhere are having from the wholesale importation of pottery goods into this country.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that I, and others, have introduced a general bill permitting and calling upon the Tariff Commission to impose import quotas and tariff quotas on every product of American manufacture where the imported portion represents a certain percentage of the entire American market. I think if we can ever get back to the Congress the right to regulate our foreign commerce, which the Constitution gives us, if we can get it out of the State Department and out of the hands of the Executive and get it back into the hands of the Tariff Commission and the Congress, then we can do something. But, as it is now, and watch what I tell you, they are going to try to put this OTC over again this year. That was one of the greatest things we did in the last session of the Congress in this respect, to prevent the passage of that bill which would still further take from the Congress the right to regulate our foreign trade and turn it over to an international organization. I simply am not going to agree to that and I do not believe the Congress will do it when it realizes what it means.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am aware of the gentleman's bill which has been introduced. I have studied it with considerable interest. I hope it can receive early and a very considerate hearing.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for his timely remarks on this particular question. In my section of the country, this textile industry is a key industry. In investigating this particular phase of it, I found the following things to be true: In the first place, there is no written agreement between the United States or any department of the United States and the Japanese Government. Since there is no agreement, there is absolutely no provision for enforcement insofar as this country is concerned. Upon inquiry being made to the Department of Commerce, I find that their theory is that because of the census report or statistical control, they will be able to determine whether or not the Japanese will abide by this agreement—and this is not an agreement actually, but it is a statement which was published on January 16, 1957. However, this fact remains: If Japan, or any other government or any other segment of industry wishing to come in, in violation of this self-imposed quota, ships through either Hong Kong, China, the Canadian sources, or some industry in Canada or Mexico or some other place where the material has been processed in any way, then it is impossible to determine the origin of the goods which would result in their being allowed to come into this country without the quota being imposed. I have gone into it rather fully because of the people who have suffered. I am mindful of what a distinguished gentleman said here the other day about the velveteen industry and the woolen industry. We all know what has happened in those particular industries. I am also concerned with the plywood industry. I want to read, if the gentleman will indulge me for just a moment, from a letter from one of my friends in the plywood business.

Mr. LANHAM. Certainly, the gentleman may go right ahead.

Mr. HEMPHILL. A part of the letter is as follows:

> Eight years ago when I went into this business, imports of plywood were a negligible source of trouble and accounted for less than 10 percent of the plywood used in the United States.
>
> Today, if you will note from this letter, 46 percent of the plywood used in the United States is imported. We have lost customer after customer on account of price for imports. It is impossible for us or any other plywood manufacturer to meet this competition with the prices we have had to pay for labor.

I think we all want to maintain our high living standards, as well as our high wage standards, and if we are to compete with the world, these people who are paying these great American wages to the great American people, and the wage earners themselves, certainly deserve some protection from the Government that is spending their tax money. I thank the gentleman for his indulgence.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution and agree with what he has said. I want to emphasize the fact that all of us believe in expanded trade, but we do not want it to go to the point where it destroys our own industries. I am sure that the proper solution is either to enact legislation such as the bill I and others have introduced or to strengthen the escape clause and the peril-point provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act so that the President cannot override the findings of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Am I wrong in assuming that as a result of some of the dollars and the technical assistance we have given to other countries, they are now in a better position to compete with us?

Mr. LANHAM. That is a part of the result; yes. We have given them new machinery.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We have built them up so that they know better how to do the things we are doing?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes; at least they can do it cheaper.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does it not follow that we ought to cut down on this foreign aid?

Mr. LANHAM. I do not think you can draw that conclusion. Personally, I want to cut it as much as we can, consistent with American security. But we must take into consideration its effect toward protecting our industry, without doing away with our foreign-trade policy.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. I am glad to see that there is some interest in the gentleman's section of the country in the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the strengthening of the escape clause provision under that particular act. For a long time some of us in the North have been very much interested in that. Sometimes we do not have support from the southern areas of the country. I am glad to see there is some interest today, particularly as far as the plywood industry is concerned.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. When the matter was under consideration in the last Congress, I did not notice anybody from the gentleman's section of the country carrying the burden of the battle as much as we did from our section. I am glad to see the gentleman, and others from his part of the country, showing an interest in it now.

Mr. LANHAM. We came within 6 votes of strengthening the escape clause and the peril point provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. MASON. As one Member of this House who has consistently for 20 years voted against extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act every time it came up, knowing in my own mind that when the Congress passed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act it gave away to the executive department—and that means the State Department under the present condition—delegated powers that the Constitution placed in the Congress to regulate international trade—gave it away, and we have always been in hot water ever since. The gentleman talks about the plywood and the increase in the shipments of plywood from 10 percent of our needs to 40 percent. That is true of clocks and watches. The same thing is true of sewing machines. The same thing is true of bicycles. The same thing is true of pottery, and many other articles. That is what is going on. We are giving away our markets to cheap labor in foreign lands; but we still, thank

heaven, insist that we will not allow too many of the cheap laborers from other countries to come in to take jobs away from our own American workers. We do let the products of these cheap laborers in Japan and other nations come in and thereby take away the jobs of our own American workers.

Mr. LANHAM. How right the gentleman is.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentlemen from Georgia, both the gentleman who has the floor and Mr. DAVIS, should not be too greatly discouraged because their cause is finding support, and as time goes on and the procedure hits the home folks the support will be greater. Our friends from the Northeast—I am sorry indeed that our colleague the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is not on the floor, but Massachusetts is ably represented here—I recall that it was only last spring tears were being shed in the well of the House about fish being imported from other countries. How about that, I ask my colleague from Massachusetts, if the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. BATES. I would like to ask in what respect he intends to change and strengthen the escape clause? Because the gentleman recalls the President denied relief to the fish industry last autumn even though the Tariff Commission had recommended for the second time that relief be granted to the ground fish filet industry.

Mr. LANHAM. As the gentleman recalls, 2 years ago we attempted to amend the escape clause and the peril-point provisions by making the action of the Tariff Commission final and preventing the President from overriding, and the State Department really, from overriding the action of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. BATES. That is the gentleman's position today?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes; I think that we are going to have to do it if we are going to continue renewing the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. BATES. It certainly seems to the gentleman from Massachusetts that when the President or the State Department, or a combination of both, turn down relief on a six to nothing unanimous decision of the Tariff Commission in the national interest, it seems to me that the effects of a national policy of that nature must be borne by the Nation as a whole and not by a single industry as is the case of the fishing industry.

Mr. LANHAM. That is exactly what happened in this so-called agreement, this arrangement with Japan. What happened was that the Tariff Commission unanimously recommended the imposition of quotas. The President did not act within 60 days, as he is supposed to do but kept stringing along until he got this so-called agreement through and then refused to act. So you see they are by-passing the Congress and the Tariff Commission, and they are willing to impose these conditions upon Japan without any authority of law at all simply to override the Congress and the agency of the Congress, the Tariff Commission.

Mr. BATES. You did get some concession; that is more than the fishing industry got.

Mr. LANHAM. You got none.

Mr. BATES. But I do hope that the Ways and Means Committee will review this problem. There has only been relief given to five industries in the entire history of this legislation.

Mr. LANHAM. I must make the same plea that my friend from Illinois made. Unfortunately, I voted for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, but I did it believing that the escape clause and the peril point provisions would protect our industry. However, since I find that they do not and that we could not amend it so as to protect them, then more of us here voted against the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. That does not mean that I do not realize that we cannot shut ourselves off from the balance of the world and that we must trade with them, but we must have provision in our law to protect our own industry when it comes to the point where they are being destroyed as is the case with our gingham industry and our velveteen industry.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. LANHAM. Gladly.

Mr. MASON. From the encouragement of those who now are feeling the pressure and the damage from these reciprocal trade agreements, I want to say that 20 years ago this month was the first extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. My first vote in this House was 1 of 13 against the extension. But we have grown up to the point where now there are 120 or 130 who vote against extensions of the reciprocal trade agreements. So we are gradually awakening to the damage that has been done to our people.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LANHAM. Gladly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A thought has just occurred to me that might possibly, just possibly, mind you, be helpful and that is if the gentleman would get the group that is now being heard, including Wisconsin, to get Walter Reuther to sponsor legislation that would give the automobile industry abroad a little help with larger factories and the technical know-how, and then pay a little bounty on each car that came in, the gentleman would find Reuther and all of those who go along with him will go along with the gentleman.

Mr. LANHAM. They do not do it now because they want to sell their cars abroad. They are not hurt by these reciprocity agreements.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The letters I get are crying about these cars that run 35 to 40 miles on a gallon. The pocketbooks of Americans are getting thinner and they are losing some of that business abroad.

Mr. LANHAM. Do the oil people oppose those cars?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know about oil. I have no oil stock or no oil wells, so I do not know about that. I do understand that the President intends through the State Department to do something. As a matter of fact, the gentleman will agree with me that the State Department does run the Government?

Mr. LANHAM. Oh, yes; its foreign affairs at least.

As it became clear that either Congress would legislate the imposition of import quotas or that restrictions on imports would come from the Escape Clause actions, the executive departments, in order to avoid at all odds the successful exercise by Congress itself or its agency, the Tariff Commission, of its function to regulate foreign commerce, opened semisecret negotiations with Japan.

It looks very much as if the State Department could not bear to see Congress regain its constitutional authority. The Department had become so accustomed to acting in the place of Congress that it grew panicky at the very thought of Congress performing its responsibility.

So panicked was the Department or, if not panicked, then so determined not to see a reversion to constitutional government that it was willing to see, one, the flow of cotton textiles from Japan to the United States restricted by quotas so long as Japan but not the United States imposed the restrictions; two, GATT circumvented and downgraded; and three, the antitrust laws of the United States bypassed and flouted by a methodology representing actual contempt for law.

There is much more at stake here than meets the eye at first glance.

To be sure imports of Japanese textiles have been restricted by a nameless arrangement outside the law. But two questions arise: One, at what cost was the arrangement bought; and two, how good is it in any case?

It is my belief that the State Department was wholly wrong in taking the path it did. It not only set a bad example in its attitude toward the law; it accepted the very thing—trade restriction by quota limitation—that it professes to abhor. If import quotas are to be outlawed, as the State Department has sought to do under GATT, export quotas that produce the same result should not be acceptable to that Department.

The only conclusion that comes to me is that what weighs most with the State Department is retention of control by itself over our foreign commerce. To hold on to the power that it has taken to itself in the past 10 years from a restricted delegation of power by Congress, the Department is apparently willing to sacrifice almost anything.

It is because of my deep concern over this situation that I have introduced the resolution. The Ways and Means Committee is the committee of this body that is most directly concerned with this question and I hope that it will be given the necessary authorization by this resolution to bring to light for the Congress to see just what has happened in the so-called arrangement with Japan.

The time is here when we either assert our proper authority or lose it forever. I believe that we will insist that the regulation of foreign commerce be carried

out under the control of Congress. I believe that it is Congress that should set our national policy on import quotas, not the State Department. In the Japanese arrangement we witness the exact opposite. It is a case where the State Department has run interference against Congress.

Let us get at the bottom of this through a thorough inquiry.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. LANHAM, in calling for an investigation of the so-called arrangement with Japan for the limitation of cotton textile exports to this country. This agreement which the State Department says is not an agreement marks a departure from lawful procedure that if recognized would put Congress on the shelf so far as regulation of foreign commerce is concerned.

I have on numerous occasions pointed out to the House the ambitions of the State Department to replace Congress in this function that is so vital to many of our industries facing foreign competition. I shall not take time to go into the details that exemplify this ambition.

We have had the example of the charter for an International Trade Organization—ITO—under which the State Department sought to pass authority over the tariff and trade to an international body sitting in Geneva. The House turned its back on this scheme in 1950 when the House Committee on Foreign Affairs held public hearings on the scheme and then refused to report it out of committee.

We have sought repeatedly in the Congress by adopting the escape clause amendment to the Trade Agreements Act and by subsequent amendments to regain for Congress the power that has been usurped by the executive only to find that the administration of the clause by the executive has nullified the intent of Congress.

More recently the State Department has come forward with another proposal designed to seal the surrender by Congress of its constitutional authority and responsibility in this important field. I refer to the plan to make the United States a member of the Organization for Trade Cooperation, known as the OTC, which would be headquartered in Geneva, far out of the reach of the people who elect the Congress and to whom they look not only for policy determination but for laying down final rules for the execution of policies adopted.

There has been a long series of acts by the State Department that can no longer leave the least doubt of its ambition. The Department steadfastly refuses to be bound by what we do in Congress toward the regulation of foreign commerce.

The latest act has been one of negotiation with Japan for the regulation of the flow of commerce in cotton textiles to this country. I agree that limitations on the imports of cotton textiles were desirable and urgent; but that is not the question. There are other products than cotton goods that require import regulation.

We have laws on the subject. Congress passed these laws. The executive is supposed to carry out the laws of Congress, not circumvent them or set them aside.

We have legislated specifically on this subject. The intent of Congress has been made clear.

Yet here we find extensive negotiations by executive departments, including the Department of Commerce, with a foreign country for the purpose of avoiding the use of the laws passed by Congress. The executive departments would have us believe that the limitation on cotton textile exports announced both by Japan and this Government was a voluntary undertaking of Japan, involving no agreement and no reciprocal obligations. This pose of nonimplication by the executive departments is an insult to the intelligence of every member of this body and to the American people.

If this so-called arrangement is not an agreement it is a worthless sham, a deceptive stratagem to fool the American textile producers and in the final analysis an act of monumental stupidity. I believe that it is an agreement, an executive agreement, fully negotiated with Japan over a period of many months. Insistence that it is not an agreement is fully in agreement with the type of action we have come to expect from the State Department in this field, if not in others. I believe that it is a deceptive pose unworthy of the executive branch of the Government.

To call the arrangement by its name, i. e., an agreement, would show it up for what it is, namely a maneuver to bypass Congress and to avoid execution of its laws.

The gentleman from Georgia has told you how during the past year the State Department strenuously opposed every effort made by the domestic textile industry to bring about quota regulation of imports under the law or by legislation on the subject. He has made it clear that in resorting to negotiation outside the law the State Department accepted limitations of a sort that it has long opposed and that it has sought for ten years to eliminate. As he has stated, it is therefore also clear that what really interests the State Department is clinging to its own control and the ousting of Congress from its constitutional function.

The Department evidently does not mind having quota limitations on trade—for that is what the Japanese limitations on exports come to—so long, one, as the control is exercised in the State Department; and two, so long as the State Department is in a position to determine what products may be treated in this manner.

I do not seek, in supporting this resolution for an investigation and study of this so-called arrangement with Japan, to pick a bone with the textile industry. I know all too well from my own experience with State Department domination in the case of other products the point of desperation to which the textile industry was driven. All other doors were closed on order of the State Department, so to speak. The Department has so entrenched itself in the swollen power that it has built from a scrap of delegated authority under the Trade Agreements Act that it presumes to tell Congress what it can and cannot do by legislation in its own lawful field.

It also saw in this instance the possibility of deftly dividing those who seek to restore the Congress to its rightful role in the regulation of foreign commerce. By accommodating, no matter how, a large element opposed to its ambitions to dominate it hopes to consolidate its position to a point of invincibility. Once achieved, once solidly entrenched, it can then take care of its opponents, not one by one, but altogether, including any that it once found it convenient to accommodate.

I cannot believe that the scheme, this stratagem to beggar the Congress and to put it in short pants, can succeed. Once thoroughly looked into it will not stand the light of day. The Ways and Means Committee is the appropriate body to make the investigation and I hope that the resolution calling upon it to institute an inquiry will be adopted. The time is now; not next year. The State Department has been forging these handcuffs for ten years. If we do not strike them off now they will paralyze our wrists for a long time to come.

Prior to 1950 Japanese imports of cotton cloth amounted to approximately 15 million yards annually. Today Japanese imports of cotton cloth total 270 million yards. What this agreement was worked out to be a bilateral arrangement with Japan—I will not call it an arrangement; it was an understanding of some kind—that Japan was voluntarily agreeing to cut its imports from 270 million yards to 235 million yards, a reduction of approximately 25 or 30 million yards. It was to be a voluntary action on the part of Japan, but there is proof that it was forced on them by the State Department.

Now, in this connection I would like to call your attention that some months ago I read and put in the RECORD here a situation of the importation by the Japanese of 140,000 Confederate flags, something like this flag I am showing you. But, they are telling you now that they will cut that from 140,000 and only ship them in 26,000 lots. Too bad that the State Department did not at the same time they were working out this limitation on Japanese imports also put Japanese bands on the free list so that they could come in and play Dixie for your enjoyment.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so have permission to extend their remarks following the remarks I made today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy the gentleman from Georgia has seen fit to discuss the important question of tariffs and to whom the power to levy tariffs belongs. The Congress is given specific authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations, which is just as specific as

the authority given to it in the same Constitution to levy taxes. It seems to me that Congress has no more right to delegate the authority to levy tariffs to the State Department than it would have to delegate to the Secretary of the Treasury the power to levy taxes.

I also wish to commend the gentleman for the position he has taken in opposition to OTC, and I sincerely hope that this Congress will not pass any measure authorizing our participation in that organization.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] for providing me an opportunity to speak on the tariff versus free trade issue.

It is, of course, a many sided issue. All of us desire to encourage exports, but at the same time none of us want to destroy established industry. The gentleman from Georgia acts wisely in proposing an investigation of the subject of foreign trade by the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

I agree with the gentleman from Georgia that imports of textiles from Japan are increasing at such an alarming rate as to imperil our domestic industry. Likewise, our crabbing, oyster, and fishing industries of the Pacific coast and our plywood industry is under serious threat from too heavy imports of the products these low-wage foreign industries produce and ship in increasing quantities into the United States. I agree with him that existing laws do not meet the urgent present need of halting the damage to domestic industries.

The wage rate in the Japanese fisheries industries and in the Japanese forest-product industries on the average is only about 11 cents an hour. There is no extra pay for overtime. Our American worker is paid as much for an hour of work as the Japanese workman receives for a 10- or 12-hour day of labor.

American workers cannot and should not be expected to live on the 11-cent-an-hour wage rate that prevails in Japan. Our American workmen must have protection from 11-cent-an-hour wages.

A way must be found to accomplish this. Otherwise some great and well-established American industries in which millions have been invested in plants and equipment will be undermined and destroyed.

Some callously say that if our American fishermen, textile, plywood, and other workers cannot produce as cheaply as can the low-paid Japanese workers that American workers in such competitive industries should get into some other business or employment. These people argue we must buy crab, textiles, plywood from Japan so that she will build up her economy.

We want to build up Japan and other nations overseas, but when we destroy any one or a few of our own domestic industries in order to do so we are placing the burden of the cost of helping build up Japan and other foreign nations upon only the few people who will be ruined financially by the flooding of American markets with specialized foreign goods.

If building up foreign nations is a matter of national defense policy, the cost of supporting that policy should be borne by all the people, not just that segment of the American population that makes textiles, plywood, or fisheries that produce fish products.

The whole subject of free trade versus protection demands a speedy and thorough investigation by Congress. Haste in this investigation is important for every week or month of delay in finding a solution to existing foreign trade problems means losses of jobs for Americans and loss of jobs gradually undermines national prosperity.

We must remain prosperous to remain strong. Without strength there can be no foreign policy that will keep us free.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for the excellent presentation which he has made here today.

His keen awareness of the problems which the present status of our foreign trade presents to this Nation is evident from the splendid utterances which we have just heard.

The question of importation of products from foreign lands is a many-sided proposition. It appears to me, however, that entirely too few of our leaders have taken "our side" of the question as it has been outlined to us today and on previous occasions by our distinguished colleague from Georgia.

My immediate concern in this entire picture is the plight of the textile industry as a result of the importing of vast quantities of textile products from the Japanese mills. As I have indicated in my brief remarks earlier today, I do not believe that the so-called arrangement which the State Department recently announced is of much value to the people in our textile industry. From my personal investigation of the matter through sources which I deem to be entirely reliable, it seems to me that the Japanese people themselves are not happy about the arrangement. When the situation of two parties to an arrangement develops to the point at which neither of the parties is satisfied with what they have done, the next step is to see one of the parties commence circumventing his side of the agreement.

Comments made in the public press of Japan and by other spokesmen of that nation, cause me to express the opinion that the arrangement will be short lived.

Mr. Speaker, the people of my particular Congressional District, and in North Carolina generally, are vitally concerned about the attitude which the State Department is taking toward the textile industry of this Nation. Their apparent attitude that this great industry is expendable is not shared by the farmer, workingman, or industrialist in my State.

When we realize that in 1955, a total of 1,065,000 persons were employed in textile plants of this Nation and that this represented 1 out of every 15.5 employees engaged in manufacturing in the United States, we begin to see the impact which a crippled textile industry would have upon our Nation.

When we go further and realize that in North Carolina alone there are 227,800 textile employees, constituting approximately 52 percent of the manufacturing employment in North Carolina, and that these textile production workers in North Carolina received approximately $600 million dollars in pay during 1955, we immediately see that every citizen of North Carolina has a vital interest in the proper handling of our textile import problem.

When we go further and look into the situation of the farmers in North Carolina, we find that our average cotton production will range from 400,000 to 500,000 bales of cotton per year. We readily understand the concern which the farm people of our State and other States have in this important matter. Of course, the textile mills of North Carolina normally consume from 2½ million to 3 million bales of cotton each year; so the impact of a crippled textile industry in North Carolina would have its effect in many other cottonproducing States. To be sure, the farmers of those States are interested and concerned about our situation.

But, Mr. Speaker, the threat of destruction of the great textile industry in this country is not confined to the farmers, the textile worker, or the owners of the capital stock of textile plants. It touches chemical, transportation, fuel, power, paper, paint, electrical, hardware, and many other types of business.

This is graphically pointed out by a study of the United States Department of Labor, which reveals that in 1947 the textile industry of this Nation spent $1,642,000,000 with the other industries for material and services alone. The items already mentioned constituted only a portion of the economic factors involved in this problem which now weighs heavily upon people in the textile-producing areas.

I express the thought, Mr. Speaker, that while we must all be vitally concerned about the plight of our brothers in other lands, we must, at the same time, keep in our line of vision our own people. A destruction or further impairment of the textile industry would result in chaos to the people of North Carolina and many other States of this Nation.

I, therefore, join the distinguished gentleman from Georgia in expressing the hope that his resolution will be adopted and that there will be a full investigation of the handling of the textile situation by our State Department for the purpose of letting our people know just what has happened to them and to prevent further inroads in the economic welfare of the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a partisan political problem. It is a problem which must be met by those of us who serve in this House on each side of the aisle. That this sort of nonpartisan approach will be made has been evidenced by the remarks of some of the distinguished Members across the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia yielding his time in order that I might express my individual opinion upon this important question.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] for a wonderful presentation of the facts with respect to the great in-

crease of imports of cotton textiles. Other commodities including veneer and plywoods have felt and are now experiencing great losses of domestic business because of foreign competition.

The gentleman from Georgia has consistently brought this matter to the attention of the House. The situation is a most serious one and should be so considered by this Congress.

In the 84th Congress, 2d session, H. R. 8658 and H. R. 8659 were introduced by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] and myself, which, among other things, had for their purpose limiting the quantity of manufactured cotton products within any tariff schedule which may be imported annually into the United States to a figure not to exceed 150 percent of the average annual quantitly of such manufactured cotton products imported during the 2-year period 1953–1954. Hearings were held on this legislation on February 6, 7, and 8, 1956. From the testimony that was adduced, it was shown that during the year 1950 after textile industries had expanded their production following World War II, our imports of cotton cloth—as a percentage of our exports of such cloth—amounted to 8.6 percent. This percentage figure moved up to where, in October 1955, the imports were 31.5 percent of exports. These figures showed unmistakably that our textile industry was made to suffer, as well as the cotton producer himself, since domestic textile manufacturers are the best customers the cotton farmer has for his product.

From the inception of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, it was the theory advanced by Secretary of State Cordell Hull that the plan had for its purpose and objective to move goods freely into world channels so that those countries that had a surplus of a commodity could sell such surplus freely in exchange for those items that such country was deficient in. Our textile manufacturing establishments have an excess capacity to produce a finished product. We, as a matter of fact, do not need textiles from Japan; and the textiles that come into this country from Japan are taken in in an effort to assist with economic development problems in that country. The only reason they are being brought in is because they are lower priced, and the reason they are lower priced is because the labor that produces such items is much lower-priced labor. It is not the purpose and intention of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to operate in any such manner.

The cotton textile industry in the United States sent several missions to Japan in an effort to assist that country in getting its industry back on its feet. One of the best men in the textile field in this country was sent to Japan for a year and a half for the purpose of helping them increase their markets so that they could in turn use United States cotton. The Japanese themselves have shown a great deal of appreciation of the problem in which our mills find themselves at this time. In the fall of 1955, Japan sent a delegation of some 70 or 80 people here to discuss textile matters with representatives of the United States textile industry and with governmental agencies. After these discussions they realized that definite steps ought to be taken in order to alleviate the situation which was faced by our mills. They realized that some type of controls were in order. They were anxious to find some suitable and reasonable solution to the problem. Since then, they have tendered invitations to our people to visit Japan so that an agreement could be reached on these issues.

Let us look at the effect of increased imports on the plywood industry.

Recently, I received a letter from McKnight Veneer & Plywoods Manufacturers of Helena, Ark., which stated in part as follows:

> The total imports of plywood for 10 months in 1956 was 567 million square feet with a dutiable value of $45 million, 73 percent of the plywood came from Japan, and imports have captured 46 percent of the domestic market. These are facts that startle those who are dependent on hardwood plywood for a livelihood, both labor and management. We think foreign imports should be limited.

These figures are amazing indeed, when practically half of the domestic markets for plywood is imported into this country. This situation demands definite action. These industries are asking for help. They employ American labor. These laboring men want and need employment.

I am glad to join with the gentleman from Georgia and others who have spoken on this subject today in an effort to solve these most serious, difficult, and far-reaching problems.

---

## IS THE PRESIDENT'S TASK A LITTLE TOUGHER THAN HE THOUGHT?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the highest compliment ever paid to me was to see a Member of the House about to leave return to hear what was about to be said, and I am referring to my good colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]. But I know that the gentleman joins me in my desire—the desire of all of us—to help the President remake the Republican Party.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MASON. I will join the gentleman and anyone else if they propose to remake the Republican Party in the likeness that the Republican Party had when it was organized by President Lincoln.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the gentleman not expecting altogether too much in this day and age?

Mr. MASON. I said I would join the gentleman in that effort.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think the gentleman will be glad to help remake the Republican Party.

Mr. MASON. Not in the likeness of the New Deal.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The President and his left-wing, free-spending, international one-world advisers propose to disinfect, fumigate, purify, renovate, unify, and remake the Republican Party. The avowed purpose is to, in the most approved, dictatorial, military fashion, purge the party of all those who do not enthusiastically accept a political philosophy heretofore demonstrated in many a land to be fallacious.

The pronouncements of its advocates seem to be to establish political unity by political liquidation—not, of course, accompanied by physical liquidation—of all those who do not accept the new doctrine, though, in fact, it is as old as civilization itself. Nor has one-man rule ever demonstrated its permanency—even though invoked by great military leaders like Napoleon, Alexander, etc., and, more recently, Stalin, Hitler, and Mussolini. Rulers of old sometimes obtained and held power over their subjects by lavish public expenditures, but none ever secured or gave to the people the freedom or the prosperity under which under our form of government our people have always enjoyed.

While our present internationalists, Socialists, and one-worlders are shedding tears over the oppressed people in other lands, here in free America all those who, in the exercise of their right to speak freely—presumably protected by the first amendment—venture to disagree with the self-anointed leaders are to be kicked out of the Republican Party.

That some of the President's pals have an itch to be dictators is evidenced by Paul G. Hoffman's decree in Collier's, October 26, 1956, issue.

Presuming to speak for the President and, so far, without public rebuke, Hoffman, who, so far as we know never won elective office in his own right, calls for the banishment of men like JENNER, WELKER, MALONE, MCCARTHY, and a host of Representatives, who have repeatedly been reelected by their constituents. Others like DWORSHAK, SCHOEPPEL, GOLDWATER, Hoffman thinks there is a possibility of converting to what the President calls "modern Republicanism."

Just the other day the President publicly expressed displeasure because Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson, who sometimes generalizes, made a remark about the National Guard. Mrs. Wilson quickly, and in a characteristically wifely fashion, advised the President that he was talking out of turn. Apparently the shaft went home, for a day or two later the President gave Secretary Wilson and Mrs. Wilson a lift in his private plane on their way to Florida. Thus demonstrating once more that here in America the pathway of even a President is not always rosy.

The incident is another illustration of how the press, and especially the Washington Post and Times Herald, which seems to hate every individual who does not unquestioningly accept its views, attempts to build into a mountain an incident which ordinarily, in the so-called sticks attracts little or no attention.

Ike's tremendous personal popularity, aided by an unprecedented publicity buildup, as evidenced by the election returns, is heady wine to his political cronies. Some even seem to think that the stone tablets brought down from Mount Sinai were rather inferior pronouncements.

Sure, Ike won a tremendous victory. That, however, is no reason why hero worship should make us dizzy. He is the glamorous Commander in Chief of the Army which won World War II, conquered the world, out-performed the general who mourned because there were no more worlds to conquer.

Naturally, millions of Americans preferred an experienced military man as Commander in Chief of our armed services, if we were to have a war, especially as by implication he promised peace.

Some one-worlders and New Dealers, both Republican and Democrat, enthusiastically supported Ike.

Conservatives of both parties preferred Ike to the only alternative choice.

But it may be that the liquidation and the permanent burial of conservatives, that is, of those who believe in economy, in the principles laid down by the Constitution, is something more of a job than the President and some of his advisers apparently realized.

In Thursday's Star, Albright has a story which makes reference to the unsuccessful political liquidation of conservatives in years gone by.

Unfortunately those who believe in deficit spending, who think that our people can raise to their own standard of living and opportunity all the peoples of the world, whatever may be their religious and political belief, their economical methods and practices, are, if the lessons of history teach us anything, ultimately in for what might be characterized as a bad time.

As has been demonstrated by history time and again, false, unsound doctrines cannot, in the end, prevail. There probably will always be some in this country who believe in the fundamental principles of the Constitution, who do not see any way of evading nature's laws, who object to caring for and making happy those who are too indolent to support themselves.

Conservatives, both Republican and Democrat, may see future generations, because of bitter experience, again drift back to the straight and narrow path.

The President's modern republicanism undoubtedly has an appeal to those in office who desire to remain in office. To those who are candidates for office. To those in every pressure group, who, through promise of gain, hope to retain lucrative office. Likewise to others, who through no fault of their own, find difficulty in meeting the ever-increasing cost of food, clothing, and shelter.

The program appeals to all who want something for nothing. To all who, having comparatively little, insist that those who have more should divide with them though they, in turn, are unwilling to divide what they have with those who have less. Like Roosevelt's New Deal spending, it is and will continue to be politically attractive until national and individual bankruptcy brings the tax and spend program to an end.

The President had some difficulty in selecting the political banner under which he would campaign for the Presidency. Subsequent events indicated that international financial and politically minded groups were active in the attempts to influence his decision. Perhaps at that time the President had no definite political philosophy.

That thought is strengthened by the fact that he now announced that the party under whose banner he chose to seek office must be completely remade. The old, well-established principles of that party repudiated. This, though adherence to those principles has given us all so much. So much, indeed, that now looking down from our mountain top of extreme prosperity and liberty—our Nation's productive ability and military might—we can say to all other nations—even the once world-dominating Britain—"We will give whatever you desire—economic, technical, or military aid—and if need be, we will take it to you, if you do not care to come and get it."

The one-worlders apparently think we are so powerful that we can now guarantee the territorial integrity, the political independence of any threatened nation which may appeal to us for aid. So wealthy do they believe us to be that we can, year after year, wring billions of dollars out of our taxpayers, broadcast them throughout the world.

That the President has underestimated the task of permanently purging conservatives, establishing Republican modernism, is shown by recent press articles.

My suggestion to the President's supporters, the purgers, and of course I am one of his loyal supporters—if without offense I might make one—it would seem that the easy way would be for the President to run on the Democratic ticket in 1960. As my friend from Georgia Mr. DAVIS will understand, we have a constitutional amendment saying that a man should not run for a third term. But perhaps a complaisant Supreme Court might be induced to hold that that meant that a candidate could not run for a third term on the same ticket. That if the President would switch over and run on the Democratic ticket in 1960 that would be constitutional and legal.

I hope if that does come about my good friend in the Speaker's chair will go along and support the President. Unfortunately, at least from my standpoint, there will be a purging then of some of the members of the Democratic Party, some of those old-fashioned back numbers who still believe in the Ten Commandments.

Pardon a second reference to the Wilson episode. No views are expressed by many as to the present controversy—largely speculative—as to the effectiveness of the National Guard.

The record shows almost unparalleled examples of courage, determination, initiative on the part of the Guard units. Let us forget the whole matter by acknowledging that in every organization—religious, fraternal, military, or civilian—there are different degrees of good and bad qualities.

The thing that intrigues me is that the personal opinions of a frank, free-speaking American—even though he be a Cabinet officer—should be publicly criticized by his boss. While the demand of the President's self-designated pal, Paul Hoffman, that a substantial number of individuals selected by their constituents to represent them be liquidated, goes unrebuked.

Does Hoffman think that the title "Commander in Chief" authorizes him as second in command to banish from public life those selected by the people to represent them? Perhaps the easier way to establish Hoffman and Stassen as directors of a successful political party would be to persuade Ike to run in 1960 on the Democratic ticket.

True, there is the small matter of a constitutional amendment barring a third term. But perhaps a complacent Supreme Court might construe that amendment as inapplicable if Ike was nominated as a Democratic candidate. Such a move, if successful, might give the people a choice between what has become to be known as the liberal and the conservative viewpoints.

Conservatives, I am sure, would not mind, though long it has been asserted they are in the minority. For the past 25 years they have not been able to elect both a President and a majority of the Congress, but the people would at least, and at long last, be able to, as are the people of England, register their choice of a political philosophy.

The military-minded men finally succeeded in getting the daughters, wives, and mothers into the armed services—the unquestioned goal of which is to toughen and brutalize its personnel, even though that tendency has seldom prevailed. It is doubtful if, in this or in the next generation, either a Wave, a Spar, or a Wac will ever become an efficient, tobacco-chewing legendary top sergeant. Nor will they silence the wives.

There is another phase of the situation where it is difficult to reconcile actions with words. As a conservative, the President seeks to get the Government out of competition with private enterprise. As a conservative, he would fire all dishonest or unethical public servants. On the other hand, Ike apparently goes all out in support of the theory that the Federal or the State government should come to the aid of the individual, even though he has not exhausted his own resources, his own efforts to attain his objectives. In short, we are in an era of deficit spending. Commonsense and experience tell us that it will never succeed.

The strange part of the situation here in Washington is that while the President apparently is going all out for the New Deal, international, free-spending political philosophy, he calls to his aid—as members of his Cabinet—Secretary of Defense Wilson, Secretary of Commerce Weeks, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey.

Other Presidential advisers, calling themselves liberals and progressives, have adopted spending as a national policy. Oh, it will get votes all right, but, if innately good and sound, why not call upon dyed-in-the-wool disciples of that philosophy for its implementation? Why call upon political conservatives whose philosophy is anathema to the one world, New Deal spenders?

It would be more consistent if the President would fire from his Cabinet and, where possible, from Government, all conservative Republicans. Select the

do-gooders and the one-worlders, the free spenders, to implement his program. So doing would bring to an end our present nightmare—comparatively quickly demonstrate whether a liquidation of conservatives was, over the long pull, good or bad, acceptable to the people.

## THE FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, recently I listened with interest to the reading of the President's budget message to Congress. Since that time I have studied his recommendations, and with certain limitations I have gone thoroughly into the many-sided aspects of the proposed budget for fiscal 1958.

The size of the proposed budget is not short of astounding; its figures approach the astronomical; its scope is as broad or broader than that of any other heretofore presented before the Congress of the United States. It is the largest proposed peacetime budget in history.

It is one which must be cut, and cut substantially by the Congress.

We are now in a period of reasonable economic prosperity, and at the same time the national debt is rapidly approaching not only a danger point but a disaster point. The interest on the national debt is, of course, one of the major items in our budget today.

It is not only possible, but I consider it necessary that the proposed budget for fiscal 1958 be cut by at least $6 billion. If the revenue estimate is correct and if this $6 billion cut in estimated expenditures can be effected, it will mean that approximately $7 billion can be applied toward the reduction of the national debt.

I am quite willing to vote for and provide whatever sum is necessary for the national defense, but I believe that between $2 billion and $3 billion can be cut off the proposed budgetary expenditure for the Department of Defense without in any way impairing our national defense and national security.

I am further of the opinion that at least $3 billion can be cut from that portion of the budget estimate which pertains to the mutual security program foreign aid.

I believe that nearly $1 billion can be saved annually by adopting at least some of the recommendations of the House Subcommittee on Utilization of Manpower.

I am confident that if these three cuts can be effected that the budget for fiscal 1958 can be reduced by at least $6 billion, and I shall do my part to see that this is accomplished.

If there is no inclination on the part of those with whom this responsibility primarily rests to effect these or similar cuts, then if necessary I shall vote against many of the appropriations bills to emphasize my desire to effect needed economies and to force a realistic reduction in our national budget.

## FLOOD DISASTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include some newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, today I speak for the many thousands of homeless families in eastern Kentucky who are the victims of the tragic and disastrous flood which has swept through eastern and southeastern Kentucky, West Virginia, southwestern Virginia, and a portion of east Tennessee.

It is inadequate to merely express our deep sympathy at their plight and the plight of those who have lost members of their family. It is also inadequate to express our concern for the destruction of places of business, schools, hospitals, personal property, homes by the thousands. Damage in eastern and southeastern Kentucky alone, in all probability, will be in excess of a billion dollars.

Mr. Speaker, in a period of 72 hours, 6 inches of rainfall was recorded in much of this area. In order that my colleagues may better understand the effect of these unprecedented floods, I include in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the following stories and editorials appearing in the Louisville Courier-Journal:

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of February 1, 1957]

CARS SEEKING TO ENTER CITY TURNED BACK—GUARDS ARRIVE BY TRUCK, BRING WATER SUPPLY

(By Gerald Griffin)

PIKEVILLE, KY., January 31.—Armed men in uniform are patrolling Pikeville streets. They are standing guard on bridges and on all roads leading to this floodstricken eastern Kentucky town.

They turn back every car that approaches the Pike County seat. Too many people here now, they say.

The soldiers are 100 men from the 242d Tank Battalion, Kentucky National Guard, at Ashland, commanded by Maj. R. B. Allen, and 15 reservists from Pikesville's 3d Battalion, 397th Infantry Regiment, Lt. Col. James Wine commanding.

The National Guard contingent arrived by truck shortly after midnight. It took that outfit 12 hours to make the trip, part of it over seldom-used mountain roads.

HOSPITAL GETS WATER

The guardsmen brought their own supplies, which they are sharing with hungry townspeople. They brought 1,200 gallons of water. They gave 400 gallons to the Methodist Hospital, which is overflowing with patients. Only three available doctors are in town.

All patients from the new United Mine Workers Memorial Hospital, which was flooded out, have been transferred to the Methodist Hospital, which is located on a high hill in Pikeville.

Governor Chandler, accompanied by Lt. Gov. Harry Lee Waterfield and Harry Davis and John DeMoisey, aides to the Governor, reached Pikeville this afternoon on an inspection tour. They spent most of yesterday and last night in Hazard, which they say is even harder hit than Pikeville.

The Governor said he has made all State agencies available to help the stricken mountain areas in the Big Sandy, Kentucky, and Cumberland River Valleys. The Governor and his party made the trip by automobile through Whitesburg from Hazard.

MANY RUMORS ARE RIFE

The Regular Army and the Red Cross have come to Pikeville's aid, bringing cots, blankets, food, and medical supplies.

Several truckloads of milk and bread arrived today from Fort Knox, but one truck, carrying cots, slipped over an embankment between here and Prestonsburg. Other trucks carrying blankets and cots got through.

All kinds of rumors are floating around and it is impossible to check them. However, one that's probably correct, is that a considerable stretch of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway's tracks, about 18 miles north of here, was washed away. At any rate, there are no trains. And the mines are shut down because there's no way to ship out the coal.

A food-distributing station has been set up in the Methodist Church here with volunteer workers, including the pastor's wife, Mrs. A. R. Perkins, handing out 1 quart of milk and 1 loaf of bread to each family that sends after them. A huge Red Cross banner hangs above the entrance to the church.

TYPHOID VACCINE ARRIVES

A limited quantity of typhoid vaccine has arrived. A "shot" station is being set up in the Pike County health building.

Reports of damage are beginning to trickle in from the outlying districts. Six frame houses, clustered near a motel a few miles south of here, were washed away. There is nothing left but the concrete foundations.

The gas company reported that 20 or 30 homes on its lines have been destroyed. Gas-transmission pipes crossing the river have gone downstream with the greatest tide of water in the county's history.

There still are no drugstores operating here. Most of them are a total loss. The only restaurant still attempting to operate is Loui's Cafe, which served its last hamburger at noon and had little left in the place except pancake mix and coffee.

PENNILESS DON'T HAVE TO PAY

People without money didn't have to pay.

This dreary, mud-coated town still is without water. That's the most critical problem right now. However, the water company hoped to have some water flowing by midnight. Even so, it will have to be boiled before it is safe to use.

The State Department of Highways reports that the bridge at the upper end of town has been knocked 18 inches out of line. Damage to the highways in the area will reach into the millions.

Consensus among Pikeville's businessmen is that the total property damage in this town alone will reach $30 million and it will take something like $3 million, which must be raised quickly, to relieve the situation even temporarily.

The few doctors here are doing a heroic job. They don't get time to rest or sleep. Babies continue to be born and sick people have to be attended to. Fortunately, the electric lights still work, but many places have no heat.

A tour of Pikeville today revealed that many big plate-glass store windows were shattered by the raging torrents when the Levisa Fork of the Big Sandy went berserk night before last. Many businessmen lost everything they had. And none of them were insured against flood damage. The same is true of people whose homes were inundated.

There are still no telegraph lines out of here, but a mail truck got through from Virginia today. And a bus left here at 11

a. m. heading for Ashland. There is no train service.

People here are sharing their homes and food supplies with less-fortunate families. Some unkempt children are collecting cans of food stuffs discarded by stores when it was rendered unfit for consumption. These cans of food were termed dangerous because they had been covered with filthy river water.

It has been a somber, dreary day with no hint of sunshine. It has been drizzling rain since dawn. Frightened people keep looking at the river.

There was a steady rain at 6 p. m. The Weather Bureau predicted an inch would fall between 7 a. m. today and 7 a. m. tomorrow.

This new rainfall is expected to raise the Levisa Fork again, but only slightly. It would take another 2 inches of rain to cause the river to reach flood stage.

COURIER-JOURNAL ARRIVES

Crowds of men, with nothing else to do, are standing around in the mud just looking.

The Courier-Journal managed to get its newspapers into Pikeville this morning. It is the first outside newspaper to get in. The newspaper in Williamson, W. Va., 33 miles from here, has been flooded out.

---

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of January 30, 1957]

HUNDREDS FLEEING; GUARD CALLED OUT—DISASTER COULD BE REGION'S WORST ON RECORD; MANY TOWNS SUFFER

Hazard's business district has been wiped out by yesterday's flood in the Kentucky River, Dewey Daniel told the Courier-Journal in a radio message last night.

From Pikeville, Gerald Griffin of the Courier-Journal's East Kentucky Bureau, reported water in the lobby of Hotel Hatcher as floods hit many mountain towns.

The Army Corps of Engineers said the floods could be the worest on record in eastern Kentucky.

Hundreds of persons have been forced from their homes at Pikeville. Basements of business houses on Main street, highest street in the downtown area, are flooded by waters from Levisa Fork of the Big Sandy River.

SEVEN HUNDRED FORCED FROM HOMES AT BARBOURVILLE

Barbourville reported about 700 persons forced from their homes by the rampaging Cumberland River. The floodwall started there was not far enough along to protect the community.

Harlan, flooded earlier in the day by the Cumberland, reported the river had crested after many had been routed from their homes. The river started receding there early in the night.

Paintsville, downstream from Pikesville, braced itself for a crest of 45 feet, 5 feet above flood stage, about midnight tonight. This would be a foot above the record set there in 1918.

Louisa, on the Big Sandy, is to have a crest of 46 to 47 feet early tomorrow, but no flooding is expected. Flood stage is 48 feet.

Catlettsburg was getting only a slight rise in the Big Sandy.

Other hard-hit communities in eastern Kentucky included Neon and Whitesburg in Letcher County.

Many other communities have been cut off from communications with the outside world.

The mountain floods resulted from 3 days of heavy rains that sent rivers and streams swirling far out of their banks.

Down the Kentucky River from Hazard, officials at Jackson said the situation there was not serious, but they expressed alarm at high water headed their way.

Highways throughout the flooded areas were blocked in many places by high water.

The Federal Government promised food for distribution in the area and Red Cross and other agencies were asked for aid.

Adj. Gen. J. J. B. Williams told Governor Chandler National Guard units have been assigned duty in several areas.

He said the London unit was sent to Corbin and that the Barbourville and Williamsburg units were assigned to duty at home. The Middlesboro unit was ordered to Hazard and the Jackson unit was assigned to work at home.

Daniel, who is a Hazard banker and a State Republican leader, said in his message to the Courier-Journal:

"Hazard's business district completely wiped out. Four feet of water in Peoples Bank. Damage $5 million. Will be several days before communications are restored by other means than Civil Air Patrol. Several hundred people out of homes."

The message was relayed to the Courier-Journal by the Civil Air Patrol. The patrol said Hazard was without power and lights and appeals have been issued by Hazard hospitals for auxiliary power units for emergency use.

Chandler said State highway department equipment is being pressed into service to aid flood sufferers where possible and that State foresters and conservation department equipment will be available.

Here was the situation last night:

Barbourville: Fast-rising Cumberland River forced evacuation of an estimated 700 persons from their homes here during the day.

Flood stage is 36 feet and the Weather Bureau forecast the river would crest about noon today near 41 feet, about 3 feet above the present level, the Associated Press said.

SIXTY PERCENT UNDER WATER

The refugees were taken to the homes of friends, churches, or the courthouse, where emergency sleeping quarters were set up. Many were given a meal at First Baptist Church before moving on to other quarters. The Baptist Church is expected to be isolated by water today and the Methodist Church will take over as the feeding center.

At 5 p. m. yesterday, about 60 percent of the community, including most of the business section, was under water. At the crest, about 75 percent of the town is expected to be inundated with the rest of the community, largely residential sections, safe on higher ground.

Corbin: Workers in rowboats helped remove 150 to 200 families from Corbin, Laurel County, after waters from Lynn Camp Creek spread through the east, south, and central portions of the community.

Harlan: The Cumberland River crested there at 5 p. m. after reaching 22.2 feet, 6.2 feet above flood stage, killing at least 1 person and causing evacuation of nearly 200 persons.

Homer Nolan, official observer of the United States Weather Bureau, said the river began falling after 4.58 inches of rainfall had been dumped into the stream and its tributaries since Sunday.

Evacuation centers had been set up at the Harlan County Courthouse, Kelly Street Baptist Church in Harlan, National Guard Armory in the Sunshine addition, and the Wallins Town Hall.

MAN SWEPT AWAY

Bedding and food were supplied by the city of Harlan, the county, town of Wallins, Red Cross, and Salvation Army.

Harlan city police said an unidentified elderly man was swept away in the swirling stream at nearby Kosspoint when his house crumpled into the water.

All highway traffic to Cumberland was blocked by sliding rock from the mountainside at Putney. A slide at Shields blocked traffic there and telephone service was out of order.

Practically all schools in Harlan County were dismissed early in the afternoon, when the river had reached 19 feet. No classes are scheduled today.

London: Col. Howard Clark of the 160th Engineering Group at Fort Knox arrived in London last night in advance of a 200-man unit for flood relief work. The colonel said the unit's equipment included 5 assault crafts, 10 rafts, and a 27-foot powerboat that could tow several rafts.

He said the unit carried mobile kitchens, bedding and rations ready to distribute to flood victims.

The Fort Knox troops also took along tents, medical supplies, and medical personnel.

Pineville: This city was warned by the Weather Bureau to expect the Cumberland River to rise there to a crest of 4 to 5 feet above flood stage during the night.

Total rainfall at Pineville in the past 3 days has been 5.24 inches, while Williamsburg has had 5.87 inches, 4 inches of it in the past 24 hours, the Weather Bureau said.

Neon: Gasoline escaping from filling-station tanks created a fire hazard at Neon. Police said the gasoline floated on 7 feet of water dumped into the Letcher County town by the rampaging Kentucky River.

About 100 families were evacuated from Neon. Mrs. Elsie Tucker, operator of a restaurant there, called the town "a solid mess of water." She said many employees of a steel company who reported for work last night found their cars covered by water this morning.

Whitesburg: Two homes were washed away at Whitesburg, the Letcher county seat, while rescuers were evacuating 25 families. All roads into Whitesburg were closed. Two other county mining settlements, Fleming and Seco, reported water in the streets.

Jackson: The situation there and in Breathitt County late yesterday was reported not serious yet, but one city official voiced alarm over predictions as to what might be expected.

He was David Collier, city clerk and publisher of the Jackson Times, who noted that the rising Kentucky River might provide the first big test of the recently completed $250,000 Jackson Cutoff project.

Pikeville: Three days and nights of almost unceasing rain has isolated virtually all the upper reaches of the Big Sandy and the Kentucky River Valleys.

Police Chief Bob May estimated 400 automobiles were under water in the main business section. Water was waist hight in some places, shoulder high in others.

The telephone switchboard at the United Mine Workers Hospital was out of operation. Apparently there was some water in the hospital, the Associated Press said.

Cumberland Publishing Co., publisher of the Pike County News, was flooded.

PRISONERS ARE FREED

All prisoners were turned out of the city jail when water entered the one-story building.

Streams are out of their banks in many places and highway travel is at a standstill.

Roads still passable are perilous because of falling rock from overhanging cliffs. As darkness fell it was still raining in many places throughout the area. As a result, many streams are expected to continue rising.

M. F. Johnson, district engineer for the State Department of Highways with headquarters here, issued a warning for motorists to stay off the highways in the upper Kentucky and Big Sandy areas unless the travel is essential.

Levisa Fork of the Big Sandy, which flows through Pikeville, Prestonsburg, and Paintsville, is on a rampage as is the Tug Fork which it joins at Louisa.

THIRTY-YEAR RECORD BROKEN

Already the stream is higher at Pikeville than it has been in 30 years.

---

EVERY BUSINESS HIT; FIVE PERSONS DEAD—HOMELESS WANDER IN MUD, MUCK; HILL FAMILIES GO ALL OUT TO HELP

(By S. C. Van Curon, managing editor of the Harlan Daily Enterprise)

HAZARD, KY., January 30.—Hundreds of homeless residents of this southeastern Kentucky mountain town stood in the mud and muck today, bewildered as they viewed the ruins left by receding floodwaters.

Every business establishment in this town of nearly 7,000 residents had felt the tremendous surge of thousands of tons of water from the rampaging Kentucky River.

Automobiles were tossed like matchsticks; store windows were crushed; merchandise was scattered through the streets and stores; mud-soaked clothing and bedding waved from utility wires and trees.

As I arrived from Harlan, about 65 miles away, I tried to remember the attractive mountain city as it once was. But the destruction that greeted me blanked out my memory.

Homeless lined the streets, standing in mud up to their knees, gazing at what had once been their priceless belongings. They wandered aimlessly, no place to go, nothing to eat, no purified water to drink.

SCENE LOOKS LIKE ONE DREAMED UP FOR MOVIES

Their only clothing was on their backs. They borrowed essentials from friends or neighbors who lived on the hills surrounding the town.

The community counted at least five dead.

Three were drowned. One of them, Mack Hill, a 34-year-old Negro miner, died trying to rescue two white women stranded in an office building. They were saved by others.

Also drowned were Raymond Ward, son of Mr. and Mrs. George Dewey Ward, Portsmouth, Ohio, and an unidentified person whose body was not recovered.

Elderly Mr. and Mrs. Bill Sizemore burned to death when fire destroyed a house in which they and others had taken refuge.

It is impossible to make an accurate dollar estimate of damage. However, Dewey Daniel, president of the People's Bank, grabbed at a figure and placed damage from Neon to Irvine at $250 million. But he said "it might run more."

The scene looked as though it had been dreamed up by a Hollywood movieset designer. I have seen the effects on towns of tornadoes out West, but nothing could ever compare to this.

This city is without outside communication, save a couple of ham radio operators. There is no gas to prepare a meal on what few stoves exist in the houses on the hill.

There is no electricity to afford a warm light.

The Rev. C. Lynn White and I drove to a hilltop where he relayed reports of the scene along the ham network asking for food, clothing, and medical aid.

What food was available for breakfast and the noon meal was supplied by the people on the hill, who emptied their pantries to share with their less fortunate neighbors.

Little children were crying and pleading for food and drink. Tired, weary mothers and fathers found it difficult to explain nature's mighty blast.

WORK CREWS ORGANIZED

Businessmen quickly organized work crews to set up emergency housing and kitchens in three churches not touched by high water and in the city's high school.

All up and down the valley for a distance of 20 miles household furnishings were lodged in trees. Along the roads and river banks hundreds of cars were smashed as though they had been in headon collision.

The coal mines, which furnish work for the bulk of this city's population, will be unworkable for several days and perhaps for weeks.

Angry streams of water flow from the mine mouths. Before work can begin in the pits safety props and track will have to be replaced.

Equipment worth thousands of dollars will have to be replaced.

Along the hillsides, household pets and domestic animals roam in compatibility. Cats and dogs, once bitter enemies, are friendly. Hogs, cows, and horses share the meager forage from the scrub trees and grass.

Jim Cannon and his wife were watching yesterday when a 33,000-volt power line exploded. They described it as "looking like an atomic flash."

In the Lothair section of Hazard, a community of 1,000, not a home could be seen standing.

Splintered, grotesquely twisted lumber leered at the spectator.

Red Cross aid had not arrived because many roads were still impassable. Other help was on the way from Williamson, W. Va., and Roanoke, Va.

The city's two hospitals, both on high ground, felt the effects. Their basements were flooded, knocking out emergency generators. About the most needed item is electricity.

Fred Bullard, vice chairman of the Perry County Red Cross, said the worst danger facing the community was a typoid epidemic.

Mr. White radioed for serum and asked for quantities of penicillin and for water trucks to transport fresh water.

However, as elsewhere in the stricken areas in Kentucky, there is hope.

Daniel standing in ankle-deep mud in his bank's lobby and looking out along Main Street said, "Hazard is destroyed. But we'll build it back and it will still be the best town in Kentucky."

And under the grief-stricken faces of the ravaged one could see sparks of hope, and I got the feeling that Hazard would come back.

---

DAMAGE AT PIKEVILLE RUNS INTO MILLIONS—ALL OF CITY COVERED FOR FIRST TIME SINCE 1862; DRINKING WATER AND FOOD ARE NEEDED

(By Gerald Griffin)

PIKEVILLE, KY., January 30.—This is a stunned and stricken town, beaten to its knees by disaster.

It couldn't happen. But it did. The docile Big Sandy went crazy last night after a murderous rain. It inflicted millions of dollars worth of damage and claimed at least one life, perhaps more, in Pike County alone.

There is no telling what that river did farther downstream today after cresting here at more than 53 feet sometime during the night. Flood stage is 37 feet. It was the worst flood in Pikeville's history and the first time since 1862 that the whole town had been under water.

WANDER AROUND IN THE MUD

Today, people are wandering around in the mud. It's everywhere. The town is without drinking water. There is no milk to be had; nor bread. No gas. But electric power is still available. A few isolated instances of minor looting have been reported. But no arrests.

Stores in the business section are a mess, but at least the filthy water from the Big Sandy's Levisa Fork has gone down in most places. Here and there are lakes in the streets. Boats are beached on the curbs. Last night they were cruising all over town; even motorboats.

Water stood at 3 feet or more in the Main Street hotels and business houses. It reached a depth of 9 feet in some of the stores on other streets. It got so high in the city jail that prisoners were turned loose.

RESTAURANTS OUT OF FOOD

When the water receded it left a thick coating of mud, even on table tops in restaurants, which served free coffee this morning and continued to serve meals until the food ran out. That didn't take long.

Yesterday, the people were warned to boil their drinking water. Such warning was not necessary today. There was no water to boil. Many people here haven't had a drink of water since yesterday.

People living in hotels were hard hit. They are living on cold canned food and fruit purchased at grocery stores and many are beginning to feel the pinch of cold, unless they happen to have coal stoves or furnaces.

SANITATION IS PROBLEM

Pikeville remains isolated. Communication is limited. State police cars are able to talk with Frankfort headquarters by radio. There is no telegraph service, no mail. Telephone service is limited to emergency calls.

Sanitation is a serious problem, as Louisville found out in 1937. Commodes can't be flushed. Louisville people could evacuate their city. People here can't go anywhere.

Pikeville is in dire need of help. It has been promised, but the problem is how to get it here.

ASKS FOR 1,000 COTS

Mayor W. E. Blackburn today phoned the commanding general of Fort Knox and Governor Chandler, both of whom were eager to help relieve the situation.

The mayor requested 1,000 cots, 2,500 blankets, a huge supply of typhoid antitoxin, an Army field kitchen, and a quartermaster water-purification unit. He asked for bread and milk.

Dr. M. D. Flanary talked with Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, explaining the situation and urging immediate Federal aid. In Washington Senator COOPER said he would go at once to confer with President Eisenhower to find out what could be done.

MUST HAVE HELP

There was talk of using helicopters to fly essentials to Pikeville. It also was reported that 100 National Guard members were on their way from Ashland.

If there ever was a distressed area, it is Pike County, and the people must have help. Perhaps the best way to bring in supplies is by rail, although washed-out roadbeds will have to be repaired first.

Even the drugstores are closed, most of their stocks ruined.

MOTEL BURNS

Pike, the largest Kentucky county, has a population of 85,000. Pikeville, the county seat, has a population of about 5,500, most of whom have suffered losses either to their businesses or their homes. The town has no floodwall.

None was deemed necessary before last night. And there is no flood-control system of impoundment dams in the streams pouring into the Big Sandy to the south, or upstream from here.

Fortunately, there have been few fires since the water supply was cut off. However, the Down Town Motel and a nearby service station burned during the night.

There was no way for the city's fire-fighting equipment to reach them. And, despite the flood, no water.

DOCTOR TURNS UP SAFE

With no water and insufficient drugs available, public health poses a critical problem.

State highway officials expect that Pikeville might be reached sometime tomorrow by highway. But the trip is bound to be hazardous because of earth slides and fallen rocks, even if the water goes down.

Dr. Ralph W. Allen, Pikeville physician, reported missing yesterday, returned to Pikeville today. He had been in a boat rescuing

flood victims and his boat got hung up in a tree. After some time, the boat was freed.

---

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of January 31, 1957]

RIVER REACHES RECORD LEVEL AT WHITESBURG—GREAT DAMAGE DONE IN MUCH OF LETCHER

WHITESBURG, KY., January 30.—The Kentucky River retreated back into its banks today after reaching its highest level in memory here.

It left untold damage to homes, businesses, roads, and bridges, through much of Letcher County. Food and clothing were being sought from outside sources for the area, still cut off from the outside except through shaky communications. All water supplies were feared contaminated and most families were boiling drinking water.

Thomas E. Gish, editor and publisher of the Mountain Eagle here, told the Associated Press in a telephone conversation no fatalities had been reported in the county.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY FAMILIES LEAVE HOMES

He estimated 250 families had to leave their homes. Most were taken into other private homes.

Gish said County Judge James M. Caudill was seeking State and Federal aid for flood victims but had been unable to reach officials because of communications difficulties.

Caudill estimated about 15 highway and foot bridges in the county were washed out and many miles of county roads destroyed, Gish said.

Forty to fifty homes in Whitesburg's residential area were damaged extensively by the water. Most of the business section escaped damage, although two bottling plants and an automobile firm were hard hit, Gish said.

UMW HOSPITAL ESCAPES

The United Mine Workers Hospital here was not hit by the flood.

Gish reported that about 15 businesses in nearby Neon were damaged extensively.

The flood's crest here was termed the highest on record by all sources, Gish said.

Electric power went off in sections of the county last night, but all service apparently was restored today. Some telephone circuits were open, but most lines into Whitesburg were jammed with calls.

---

HOW LONG CAN EASTERN KENTUCKY ENDURE THE RAVAGES OF FLOODS?

It was just 20 years ago this week that Louisville was fighting for its life against the waters of the Ohio. No one who lived through those days can fail now to feel a deep sympathy for the people of eastern Kentucky as the flood waters of the Cumberland, Kentucky, and Big Sandy Rivers tear at their towns and homes. There is a special quality of terror about a flood. It is a relentless thing against which man has little means of defense. He can only flee, and hope, and return to rebuild again after the skies relent and the waters recede.

This is especially true of the valley towns of eastern Kentucky. The valleys, like the river beds, are narrow. The river banks and the hillsides above them are steep. When hard rains come, there is not room enough between the narrow banks for the torrents that cascade down from the hills and ridges and swell the creeks that flow into the river. And the towns, which must be built in the flats along the river because they cannot cling to the steep hillsides, quake as the river boils from its banks and roars through the streets.

It is hard to prepare for such a flood, for mountain rivers rise so fast. In a time of hard rains, the placid stream that last night flowed so quietly along the edge of town becomes by daybreak a swirling, foaming torrent, brown with the soil of the hills, heavy with debris. Merchants can only put things on higher shelves and hope, while those homeowners who can move furniture to higher ground. Less lucky families wake to find brown water at their feet and horror outside the door.

Nor does the heartbreak stop with the rain's end and the retreat of the water. A mud-choked swamp where flowers once grew, stained, soggy plaster, ruined wallpaper, floors warped and buckled and thick with silt, the wrecked garage, the toppled trees, the slimy, gullied place that was a garden, driftwood hanging from a smashed window—this sight of his home is not a thing a man forgets real soon. Yet is there a town along the Cumberland or Kentucky without those sandy marks along buildings or trees that tell where once the waters stood, reminders of a people's anguish?

There is an irony, too, in this devastation by water. For eastern Kentucky suffers a greater part of the time from too little water to support the industrial plants that the region needs and seeks. During summer months, a boy can wade the Kentucky at Hazard, the Big Sandy below Pikeville, or the Cumberland at Barbourville, where now the flood curls above the tops of houses and rips at sites on which factories might stand. Many things have been proposed to aid the troubled economy of the mountains. But of all its needs, none is as pressing as the region's need for a stable water supply, a river flow that would be ample to people's needs in dry months and controllable during the rainy season.

But only by the most tremendous effort could this be achieved. Much blame has been attached to overcutting of the hills and to mining activities that strip or destroy soil cover that might slow the runoff of rain water. But floods were occurring here before a tree was cut or a lump of coal was taken from the hills. And not even the most ambitious replanting and reforestation program could enable these rocky ridges to hold back heavy rainfall. To do this would require an extensive system of reservoirs along the headwaters and tributaries of each of these rivers, a great program of channel-straightening and deepening, together with a systematic replanting of the hill slopes above the towns.

Floodwalls can help. But without these additional measures, the floodwalls can at best be only incomplete protection against floods which seem yearly to grow in violence. It will take money to save eastern Kentucky from the ravages of its rivers, and to turn those rivers to the service of their region. But it would be worth the money, for without it the economy of an area must wither.

We who have known the trial of floods should be the first to ask that these needed improvements be made. In the meantime, we can only extend our sympathy and our offers of help.

---

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of February 1, 1957]

FOLK AT HAZARD WORK TO RETURN CITY TO NORMAL—WATER SERVICE PARTLY BACK; DAMAGE IN 5-MILE RADIUS ESTIMATED AT $20 MILLION

(By Joe Reister)

HAZARD, KY., January 31.—Hazard folk today began the Herculean task of restoring the city to a normal way of life after the worst flood in the history of the city.

Water service was restored on a restricted basis early this afternoon. City Manager Hobert Wooton requested citizens to use water sparingly and only for essential purposes such as sanitation and cooking.

Wooton said 2 million gallons of pure water were now in storage tanks on a hill near Hazard. This amount is sufficient to take care of normal usage for 2 days, he said.

NEW PLANT TO OPERATE

The new Hazard water plant will be placed in operation tomorrow for the first time, he said, adding:

"If we do succeed in putting the big plant in operation, our water problem is licked."

Mayor Doug Combs said the new plant, completed recently, was not affected by the flood.

Meanwhile, the mud, debris, and silt left behind by the receding floodwaters of the North Fork of the Kentucky River were being removed from the streets here.

MUD 18 INCHES DEEP

This phase of the cleanup job was being done with hydraulically operated scoops furnished by the Kentucky Highway Department and private contractors. Mud is 18 inches deep on some streets here.

Scores of residents of Perry County and adjacent territory drove about Hazard's streets in automobiles today to look at the damage caused by the flood.

What they saw wasn't pleasant.

For example, a carport attached to the home of Mayor Combs on East Main Street near the downtown section was torn away by the floodwater and came to rest atop an automobile that had washed down in front of the mayor's home.

TYPICAL OF HAVOC

Combs' home and all its furnishings were destroyed. The damage to the city official's home was typical of the havoc wrought by the floodwaters on hundreds of homes in Hazard and surrounding territory.

An estimate of the overall damage within a 5-mile radius of Hazard has been unofficially set at $20 million.

Meanwhile, the Red Cross set up headquarters in Memorial Auditorium to dispense food and blankets to flood victims. The original supply of about 800 blankets was exhausted early this afternoon. Additional blankets will be brought here tomorrow, Mayor Combs said.

SOLDIERS DISTRIBUTE FOOD

Flood victims were given supplies of fresh meats, rice, beans, bread, cornmeal, and milk. A detachment of 2d Army soldiers from Fort Knox distributed the food and blankets to the refugees.

Citizens received typhoid-immunization shots at a medical center set up in the auditorium. All persons exposed in any way to the floodwater were urged to take the shots by City Manager Wooton.

Throughout the day Hazard residents continued to talk about the suddenness with which the flood struck.

Remarks made by Ralph Bingham, president of a construction firm here, were typical of statements by townspeople.

ABSOLUTELY UNBELIEVABLE

"The lightninglike way the flood struck was absolutely unbelievable," Bingham said. "It is just hard to describe. I am still walking around in a daze to figure out just what made the water come down on us so fast Tuesday."

Bingham's firm's offices and heavy equipment stored in an adjacent building were heavily damaged.

Fred Combs, official of a wholesale automotive-parts firm here, said the floodwaters "rose so fast we didn't have time to move any of our stock." Combs, a cousin of the mayor, formerly was Perry County judge.

Hazard will be "back to halfway normalcy within a week," Wooton said tonight. "We plan to work night and day to restore the situation to a near state of normalcy as rapidly as possible."

RELIEF WORK PRAISED

Wooton praised the relief work being done "by hundreds of people here."

"There are no words to describe how much they have done during these trying days,"

he said. "We hope to thank them publicly after we get this town cleaned up."

The intrepid spirit of Hazard folk during major disasters was exemplified by Roy Sizemore, superintendent of public works here.

Sizemore's father and mother were burned to death Tuesday night when a home housing 40 flood refugees caught fire. All the occupants escaped except the elderly couple. Efforts to remove them proved futile.

However, "their grief-stricken son did not stop working at his important post to restore public-utility services to Hazard," Wooton said.

WE ALL HAVE TO PITCH IN

The city manager quoted Sizemore as saying:

"I figure we all have to pitch in now to do whatever we can, regardless of what happened to our loved ones."

Dr. Maurice Kamp, director of the Louisville-Jefferson County Health Department, and a team of six sanitarians arrived here tonight to offer their services. Dr. Kamp also was accompanied by A. P. Bell, director of engineering for the department.

Four nurses from the department staff will arrive here tomorrow, Dr. Kamp said.

---

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of February 2, 1957]

FLOOD-RAVAGED HAZARD WATCHES SKIES WARILY—TWO MORE INCHES OF RAIN EXPECTED; RELIEF FROM UNITED STATES, RED CROSS PROMISED THE VICTIMS

(By Joe Reister)

HAZARD, KY., February 1.—The people of Hazard, starting to clean up this flood-drenched city, kept anxious eyes on the low clouds that were dropping rain on the area today.

Fred Bullard, vice chairman of the Perry County Red Cross said, however, that "there is no cause for alarm now," but suggested that people living in low-lying sections along the Kentucky River should check its height frequently.

EXPECT 2 INCHES OF RAIN

In an announcement broadcast over radio station WKIC here, Bullard told the community 2 inches of rain was expected over the north, middle, and south forks of the Kentucky River in the next 24 hours.

The message also stated that "more rain is expected south of Hazard, Buckhorn, and Oneida on the three forks of the river. It is anticipated that the river will rise to some extent during the next 24 hours."

Meanwhile, Perry County folk were cheered by news stories in today's edition of The Courier Journal stating that Federal funds will be used for flood relief in Kentucky. Announcement of the Federal aid was also contained in a delayed telegram received here today from Senators JOHN SHERMAN COOPER and THRUSTON B. MORTON and Congressman EUGENE SILER.

UNITED STATES LOANS TO BE AVAILABLE

Dewey Daniel, Hazard banker and civic leader, said the Small Business Administration would open an office here within the next few days to make a survey of the needs of firms here to reopen their businesses destroyed by the flood. The S. B. A. makes low interest rate loans to replace flood-damaged property.

Virtually all of Hazard's police, firefighting and garbage disposal equipment was destroyed by the flood, City Manager Hobart Wooton and Mayor Doug Combs said. Equipment that has to be replaced includes two police cruisers, two 750-gallon pumpers for the fire department, seven dump and pickup trucks, two garbage disposal trucks, and a grader, they said.

INOCULATIONS STARTED

Teams of physicians and nurses attached to the Perry County Health Department and the Louisville-Jefferson County Health Department today established outpost clinics to give typhoid shots to all residents of this area. Sanitarians and engineers from the Louisville department accompanied the doctors and nurses.

The clinics were under the general supervision of Dr. Maurice Kemp, director of the Louisville-Jefferson County Health Department, and Rollie Johnson, administrator of the Perry County Health Department.

After the series of three typhoid shots a week apart are given, inoculations against diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus will be started.

LONG LINES FORM

The clinics were set up in city and county school buildings. Reponse by the citizens was unusually good, Johnson said. Long lines of men, women, and children awaited their turn for the shots.

A special local Red Cross appeal was made today for funds to aid flood victims. The request came from Alva Hollon, chairman of the Perry County Red Cross Chapter.

The Red Cross, Hollon said, will finance a disaster relief program, including emergency aid of shelter, food, clothing, and medical care for flood victims unable to provide themselves with those necessities. After the emergency period is over, Hollon said, the Red Cross will accept applications for recovery assistance.

AID FROM WHOLE NATION

The National Red Cross is making funds available for relief in Perry County from contributions made by people throughout the Nation, Hollon said.

"However, we have local people who want to contribute now to shoulder part of the load. Perry County will welcome their participation in the support of this relief for our neighbors. You may send your contributions to Mrs. Irene Hancock, our chapter treasurer."

FOOD CENTERS SET UP

One of the immediate needs is for addition supplies of staple food, Hollon said. "We face no shortage of foodstuff in the near future, but more supplies will have to come in to help us out in the days ahead," he said.

Food centers were set up in churches here Wednesday.

The staple foods needed most are beans and potatoes, Hollon said.

"We have an ample supply of bread and fresh milk," the Red Cross official said.

The National Red Cross set up headquarters here Wednesday under the direction of Edward Brandhorst, St. Louis, assistant director of disaster relief for the Midwest. He is being assisted by Miss Mary Ginnan, Bloomington, Ind., a Red Cross field representative.

HEATING UNITS DUE

The American Air Filter Co., Louisville, plans to send 10 large mobile heating units to Hazard tomorrow, Joe Pat Gorman, member of the emergency-relief committee, announced here late today.

One of the gasoline-powered units is capable of heating a large building, Gorman said. The heaters will be shipped to Louisville from Chicago and brought here by truck, he said.

HELICOPTERS ARRIVE

Moderate weather conditions in this area within the past 2 days have prevented any real suffering from lack of adequate heating facilities, Bullard said. Many citizens were using open-grate fires to heat their homes. Fuel ranged from coal to surveyor's stakes.

Two Army helicopters from Fort Belvoir, Va., landed here late today on a reconnaissance flight over the flood areas, Sgt. Lloyd Gross, member of the crew in one of the helicopters, said the planes "would be used to bring in supplies or for any other duty that may be requested. Right now we are trying to find out if such need exists."

The helicopter landed on Hazard High School's Collins Field.

---

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of February 3, 1957]

PRESTONSBURG SCENE UNBELIEVABLE, MAYOR OF SALYERSVILLE ASSERTS—HE CALLS TOWN A TOTAL WRECK

SALYERSVILLE, KY., February 2.—Prestonsburg was a total wreck and unbelievable to look at after the flooding Levisa Fork went back into its banks, the mayor of neighboring Salyersville said today.

Mayor J. O. Arnett visited Prestonsburg yesterday. He said the people were stunned but cheerful. Prestonsburg is 22 miles east of here.

The prevailing mood of the hundreds of homeless citizens and financially ruined businessmen was that "we're broke together," Arnett said.

CLEARING OUT MUD

They were going about the dirty and heartbreaking business of cleaning 5 to 6 inches of mud from their homes, stores, and offices.

There were no plans being made for the future, however. "When you've lost that much," Arnett said, "you don't make many plans right away."

The skies were sunny today, but fairly heavy new rains fell yesterday. The mayor said, "That scared all of us." Salyersville lies on low ground, but was not flooded by this week's high waters. "We usually get it first," the mayor said.

THREE HUNDRED FEET OF ROAD OUT

He commented that Prestonsburg citizens had not had time to save much of anything when the waters hit. "They had been warned, but didn't believe it would be this bad," he said. "I guess they had heard 'wolf' before when nothing happened."

Water, gas, and electric service have been restored, and the roads opened into Prestonsburg, but telephone lines were still out today.

The town was under martial law, and Red Cross and other relief and charitable agencies were on the job. Prestonsburg was still in need of milk, sugar, and shortening, but had other food.

Arnett said about 200 pieces of State machinery had moved through his town on the way to clean and repair roads. About 300 feet of highway between Prestonsburg and Pikeville had been washed out by the flood.

The 1,100-population town of Martin, south of Prestonsburg on Beaver Creek, was destroyed, Arnett said, when water went over the tops of most of the business establishments.

Salyersville sent 4 or 5 trucks loaded with clothing and other supplies to Prestonsburg.

Total damage at Prestonsburg was estimated at $3 million, and to the First National Bank alone at $100,000. Water stood 8 or 9 feet deep in the bank, covering the vault and soaking the money and papers in it.

The Federal Housing Administration has outlined procedures for obtaining FHA disaster loans up to $12,000 at a 5 percent interest. But that won't be enough to save many of Prestonsburg's businesses, according to the Salyersville mayor.

Mr. Speaker, both in the 81st and 82d Congresses we undertook to give agencies of the executive branch of the Federal Government additional authority in order that those agencies could give greater assistance to the States and local governments from the standpoint of alleviating suffering and damages resulting from major disasters, such as repairing essential public facilities, and so forth—title 42, United States Code, 1952 edition, section 1855 and the following.

Notwithstanding all the existing emergency powers of the President to deal with disasters, it could be that additional legislation is needed and I am sure that this Congress will respond as it has always responded in the past with adequate legislation to meet disasters. All Federal and State agencies are cooperating. Yet this is a catastrophe where we all must redouble our efforts. I have requested Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Agriculture, and Small Business Administration to step up their measures of assistance in working with Civil Defense.

Sanitation and treatment of water, as well as additional supplies of surplus food and medicine, will be needed in the area for weeks. These are emergency measures only. At present all coal mines are down in an area where coal mining is the principal industry. Business places by the thousands completely destroyed. The National Red Cross is doing everything possible to cope with the situation.

The people of eastern Kentucky, a grateful people, are appreciative and thankful for all assistance rendered to them from every source. In a catastrophe of this type where our governmental agencies have been expressly authorized by law to give all-out assistance, it is not enough to go part of the way, but it is the duty of all governmental agencies to carry out the true intent of the law and to go all the way to rescue its citizenry. More can yet be done and it must be done.

Mr. Speaker, in this area of Kentucky we have had more than our share of floods in the past, but this one has broken all records. For example, on the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy at Kermit, W. Va., the stage read 44.8 feet. This was 6 feet higher than the previous record of 38.8 in 1918. The stage of the Levisa Fork at Pikeville, Ky., was in excess of 52 feet, equal to or breaking the record set 95 years ago. Record-breaking floods were recorded all through the Hazard, Ky., area, and in Letcher County on both the north fork and the middle fork of the Kentucky River.

It was 20 years ago this January past that this country was shocked by the disastrous floods in the Ohio River valley. The Flood Control Act following approved a general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Ohio River Basin. This plan recommended construction of 3 reservoirs in the Big Sandy Basin and 3 in the Kentucky River Basin. Of the authorized reservoirs, only one—Dewey—on the Levisa fork of the Big Sandy, has been constructed and is effective in the control of floods. In the meantime, the need for these reservoirs has greatly increased.

In spite of the disappointment due to construction delays, I feel there is hope in the studies now being made by the Corps of Engineers. The Big Sandy survey report is due by June 30 of this year, and the Kentucky River by June 30, 1958. A comprehensive survey on the Big Sandy and Kentucky Rivers will reappraise the need for upstream reservoirs as well as needed navigation, as well as the need for floodwalls or other local protection works that might be desirable, in view of the unprecedented floods.

It is my information from the Corps of Engineers that reservoirs on both the Kentucky and Big Sandy may retain water for domestic and industrial uses, with pollution measures to be considered.

These factors all merit restudy in the light of present-day conditions. Located close to large coal reserves and a surplus of labor, full employment of the potentialities of the region could be realized.

But, getting back to today's disaster, I know there is some difficulty in preparing for floods such as these. The only remedy to prevent their recurrence is the construction of reservoirs under the national flood-control program.

Mr. Speaker, upon receipt of word from the Courier-Journal's Ben Reeves about the Neon flood last Tuesday morning, January 29, and in view of subsequent developments, this date is of especial significance. Immediately, I realized that a far-reaching disaster was on hand. I talked to Neon, Ky., promptly. Immediately, my office alerted the National Civil Defense at Battle Creek, Mich., and the regional Director of Civil Defense at Olney, Md. Immediately, I personally alerted the State civil defense at Louisville, Ky., and immediately, the National Red Cross was alerted by my office and they promptly contacted their local offices in eastern Kentucky and dispatched trained disaster workers to the area. None of these agencies had received prior notice of this disaster, and all have worked effectively, but much remains to be done. However, flood-prevention measures to prevent the recurrence of such disasters can be initiated by Congress only. That is our task and our duty.

## RELIEF FOR DROUGHT AREAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I was very much disappointed today when I learned that an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture had, to use the phrase that we sometimes hear, thrown a monkey wrench into the works as far as drought relief is concerned at the present time.

I happen to live out in that area myself, and I know what things are like. We have had five consecutive droughts in the area, and it has now extended into western Illinois and southern Iowa, and, of course, extends from the gulf coast of Texas almost to the Canadian border. There may be a little of North Dakota that has had rain. I think perhaps in the northwest corner of the State they have had normal rainfall. Most of that territory has had in 5 years only 3 normal years of rainfall. But the exodus from the farm is not due to the drought, because it is going on all over the United States. In the years 1953, 1954, and 1955, 600,000 farm families left the farms in the United States. My home State of Missouri contributed 28,431 farm families to that exodus. There are 8 counties in my congressional district, and the farm families that gave up their farms in those 8 counties ran from 106 in Lafayette County to 616 in Jackson County. So I know what the drought, coupled with one Ezra Taft Benson, is doing to the farmers in my home State. That is happening all over the United States.

I have a little article here that I would like to read to my colleagues. It was written by N. F. O., reporter.

[From the Henry County Democrat of January 11, 1957]

COMMENT AND OPINION

(By the Editor)

AS I AM LEAVING THE FARM

Now the crowd has gone and you have loaded the last reluctant cow and stubborn hog out to their various destinations. As the last truckload pulls out of the strangely silent barn, you stand and smoke thoughtfully.

Bill, your neighbor and best friend, comes and leans up beside you. Bill has helped with the sale all day and now he stands hunched against the raw wind cold of the December evening.

You stand there together, awkwardly trying to make conversation but soon each of you quit trying to put your thoughts into words and just stand. After a bit, he pulls his coat collar up a little higher, bids a gruff "So long" and strides off into the dark.

You turn the yard light on. You feel that somehow it will make the silent barn and empty lots less lonely. You make the rounds closing the open doors and widely flung gates. Why? Nothing left to get out, but habit is strong.

Somehow, you dread going into the house; the kids, not too long home from school, will be noisily asking questions about the sale; questions you don't care to answer.

The whole family will be discussing the move to town; a step you hate to think about. You pull your collar a little higher around your ears and hunker down on the lee side of the barn, out of the gusty wind—to think.

A confused jumble of thoughts run through your head. "Where did I fail? Surely not from lack of hard work." You think of the backbreaking years of toil you and your wife have spent. Lack of management? Maybe you could have managed better, but you were always counted a good farmer.

You loved the soil and tended it carefully, your terraced fields and neat farmstead will vouch for that. Your mouth twists bitterly as you contemplate the fate of those fields. The man farming your land next year has merely added your little 160 to his already extensive holdings and a vision of your farmstead, deserted and weedgrown, flits through your mind.

The new operator is also a firm believer in straight rows; you sadly contemplate the fate of your terraced fields and grassed waterways. Oh well, maybe all small farms have to go; that seems to be the trend now, anyway.

On that move to town? What in the devil are you going to do in town? You can slop hogs and milk cows but folks in town don't seem to have any demand for those skills. Also you have come to realize that you are a heck of a lot older than you thought you were. Seems like 45 is 10 years too old to be worth a darn for anything as far as getting a job is concerned.

You think of the future with a deep aching fear. You can't help it. "What if I can't find a job? What will my wife and family do if I can't? How will the kids adjust themselves to town life?"

As you sit there pondering, old Shep comes up, sits down by you and lays his head on your knee. Poor old dog. This has been a day of bewildering events as far as he's concerned.

Now he whines softly and thumps his tail on the ground, seeking the reassurance that his upside-down world will be righted again. You absently pat his head and there you sit together—in a way, two of a kind, for you have a feeling that old Shep, more than anyone else in the world, really knows how you feel.

Now the question that you have postponed answering several times in the last few weeks demands a final answer. "What's to become of old Shep?" You've had Shep since puppyhood but now he's old, lame and half blind. None of the neighbors want him and there is no place for dogs where you are going, so your question has but one answer. You know that answer—and a sudden moisture stings your eyes that you can't blame on the bitter wind.

You look across the driveway to the crib. In the glare of the yard light, the different-colored sale bills tacked up there today, stand out strangely.

There they hang an even dozen of them, stuck up there by fellow farmers, each one bearing that pathetic heading "As I Am Leaving the Farm." You gaze at those brightly colored scraps of cardboard. Some of the names on them are men you know, men like yourself, being torn from the soil they loved and have cherished, to be thrown into a strange and unfriendly environment.

Men whose dreams and hopes withered with their crops the last two drought-stricken years and now, like you, will be walking city pavements when the bluegrass greens the hills next spring.

You can't help but wonder about the bright boys; those boys' heads are full of statistics rather than brains; whose answer to the farm problem is "Get rid of the small inefficient farmer." You wonder how they'd feel if they were in your shoes.

You're getting cold so you start slowly toward the house. Under the yard light pole lays one of your sale bills. Your own name in big letters at the bottom looks strange. You walk up to it and idly turn it with your foot. A gust of wind catches it and away it goes, across the driveway into the road, to disappear in a cloud of dust—into the cold windy dark.—The N. F. O. Reporter.

## SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 56, 85th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee To Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business the following Members of the House: Mr. PATMAN, of Texas, chairman; Mr. EVINS, of Tennessee; Mr. MULTER, of New York; Mr. YATES, of Illinois; Mr. STEED, of Oklahoma; Mr. ROOSEVELT, of California; Mr. BROWN, of Missouri; Mr. HILL, of Colorado; Mr. RIEHLMAN, of New York; Mr. SEELY-BROWN, of Connecticut; Mr. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio; Mr. SHEEHAN, of Illinois; and Mr. HOSMER, of California.

## WONDERFUL SPEECH BY MAJORITY LEADER IN SENATE, HON. LYNDON JOHNSON, ON DEVASTATING EFFECTS OF HIGH INTEREST

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimouse consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a short speech made by the majority leader of the Senate, the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON, on the floor of the Senate last Friday on the devastating effects of high interest and, particularly, its effect on small business. It is as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the cause of this disturbing trend in failures is not altogether clear. But certain things are readily apparent.

The tight money policy hits the small-business man much harder than it hits the big fellow.

The continual trend toward mergers of big companies leave a smaller share of the market for the average businessman.

Rising costs all along the line add to the difficulties of a small firm in meeting expenses.

And, of those increasing costs, one of the most important is the increasing cost of money. This is something that is felt all along the line—by business, by government, and by the average citizen.

Mr. President, I am told that if the interest rates applicable to the Federal debt in 1952 had held at those lower levels, and been applicable to the 1956 debt, our taxpayers would have been saved approximately $717 million.

We must also realize that the problems of financing are complicated in every field as the cost of money constantly rises. Because of the constant rise in interest rates, municipalities are assuming excessively heavy interest obligations in order to sell their bonds.

Mr. President, this is a situation that can change our whole economy. The rising cost of money and other necessities represents a constant squeeze on small business—and the squeeze will eliminate many as time goes on.

I have never been opposed to big business as such, as it plays a vital role in our whole economy. But we face the problem of maintaining the free-enterprise system, and that is something we cannot do unless we help small business remain vital and flourishing.

This is a problem which must be tackled from many standpoints. The Congress has the committees. They are ably led and I think ably manned with most efficient staffs. I believe they can, and I hope they will, during this session face up to this challenge and do the job as it ought to be done.

Although I agree with everything Senator JOHNSON said, I will comment on the statement he made to the effect that the increasing cost of money is felt all along the line. Before doing so, I would like to state:

First. In any fight against inflation, if it is necessary to increase interest rates, and there is not a better alternative, I will favor such an increase to stop inflation; however, I am not willing to concede that a normal, necessary expansion in our economy is inflation. Neither am I willing to say that there is ruinous inflation facing us when small business, the farmer, and the home-building industry are suffering as they are today.

Second. To increase interest rates, which increases the cost of doing business all along the line, is itself inflationary and is, for all practical purposes, like trying to put out a fire by pouring gasoline on it. Interest rates have been going up rapidly the past 2 years, so have prices. If higher interest will stop price increases why has it not worked the last 2 years?

Third. For approximately 14 years, Government bonds did not sell below par, being protected by the open market committee of the Federal Reserve System. This gave stability to the bond market and assured every person, who bought bonds, that he could always get his money back. In recent years, the bond market has been permitted to drop as low as 87 cents on the dollar, which is a national disgrace and a great reflection on the Congress, Congress having entrusted the matter to an agency that has allowed such an awful thing to happen. The Government bond market could have been supported without cost to the Government or to the Federal Reserve banks.

Fourth. The total debts of the country aggregate over seven hundred billion dollars, including the national debt. A 1 percent increase on our debt means a rate of increase equivalent to a $40-a-year increase on every man, woman, and child in America, or at the rate of an extra cost of $200 a year for a family of five. If this is not paid directly, it is paid indirectly because increasing interest is a hidden tax.

INCREASED INTEREST UNBALANCES ALL BUDGETS

Now more about what Senator JOHNSON said.

A small increase in the Federal Reserve discount rate unbalances every budget in America from the national budget down to the smallest budget in the home of one of the lowest income.

The discount rate has increased 200 percent the last 2 years. It sets the pace for the price of money; is the lowest wholesale interest rate. An increase of one-fourth of 1 percent in the discount rate means an increase of many times that amount in the money market—effective immediately.

The discount rate is almost wholly psychological. It is intended to be the rate charged a member bank for money the member bank gets from the Federal Reserve bank. If banks do not borrow any funds, the rate is still applicable in the money market. The rate is used very little because the amount of funds obtained by member banks from the Federal Reserve banks is surprisingly small; banks have other ways of obtaining this reserve money—the powerful dollars, upon which they can expand an average of 6 to 1; in other words, lend $6 to every $1 the banks have in reserve. So a raise in the discount rate is a deliberate act to unbalance all budgets in America by giving a great advantage and special privilege to lenders of money and credit.

Let us see how an increase in interest rates affects the entire country and every living person.

The Federal Government must pay more money on its debts. By reason of increases the past 4 years in interest, the Federal Government is required to pay almost a billion dollars a year more for interest on the national debt. This must be paid in taxes and becomes an increased burden on all taxpaying citizens.

All States, counties, cities, and political subdivisions, such as road districts, school districts, levee districts, and many other districts of all kinds of purposes to serve and accommodate the people must pay more for new funds.

The people in each State and in each city will feel the increase in interest rates

by having to pay more in taxes very soon after such an increase and the other subdivisions when they borrow more funds.

Every public service corporation, including gas, water, telephone, electricity, transportation, and sewer, will have to pay more interest, which will require higher rates to the public and which will be paid by the users of the service; it will show up on their bills.

Every manufacturing concern will have to pay more interest, which will be added to the cost of the goods produced; each handler and transporter of the goods will not only add an additional amount to the extra interest added by the manufacturer, but will add the increased interest that they are also compelled to pay.

These interest increases are added on everything that is bought by the consumers—and that includes us all.

FARMER HIT HARDEST

The farmer is hit the hardest on what he buys on increased interest because all of the increase is passed right on to him. For instance, the farmer buys a tractor. From the time the iron ore is taken from the earth and transported on the barge and the railroad to the blast furnace and made into pig iron, to the steel mill, the fabricator, the manufacturer of tractors, and through the distributing agencies, including the agent who sells it to the farmer, the increased interest is added by each and every one of them. The farmer pays it all.

When the Federal Reserve Open Market Committee, on March 4, 1951, violated their promise to President Truman to continue to keep Government bonds at par and permitted interest rates to commence their first real increase in 14 years, the farmer commenced to feel it immediately and has felt it ever since. If you will look at any chart that discloses the prices paid by farmers and received by farmers since March 4, 1951, you will find that the farmer has paid more for what he bought and received less for what he sold. It has been increasingly bad for the farmer the last 4 years because the pattern set for hard money and high interest in March 1951 did not become really effective until January 20, 1953.

The Open Market Committee at the time the long-term rate was broken March 4, 1951, had as its chairman a very fine, able man from Philadelphia, but who made a colossal blunder in this matter, Mr. McCabe, a Republican. He was one of the seven public members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; the other members of the Open Market Committee were the other 6 members of the Board of Governors and 5 presidents of Federal Reserve banks, all of whom had been chosen by the representatives of the commercial banks. These 12 men have more power over our economic affairs than the Congress of the United States. The power has been delegated to them by Congress.

WHAT IS BEHIND THIS HIGH INTEREST POLICY AND WHAT ARE THE ULTIMATE GOALS?

The country was getting along remarkably well under the policy of 2½ percent interest on long-term Government bonds and the prices of the bonds maintained at par. There was no real reason for breaking the line and allowing interest rates to go up except to permit lenders to make more money. I believe in the commercial banking system, the Federal Reserve System, an the capitalistic system, but I do not believe it was necessary to increase the earnings of moneylenders in this way in order to make the commercial banking system profitable. It has other ways of being profitable, and it is a profitable system. That is the way it should be, because we need the commercial banks and they perform a great service, both in time of peace and war, and they can only render that service if they are profitable institutions. But I repeat it was not necessary to give them higher interest rates in order to make their profits adequate. The 2½ percent interest rate was the wholesale rate for money, the lowest rate, which the Government should be allowed to received, since, after all, the money that is borrowed is money that is created on the credit of the Nation.

We must conclude that the present hard money, high interest policy will do the following:

First. Permit big business to get all the money it wants to expand its facilities, plant, and equipment, as much as it desires, and the high interest rate will not affect big business, since the Government will, in effect, pay 52 percent of the interest paid, and the remainder can very easily be passed on to the consumer in higher prices.

Second. Since big business can secure so much of its capital for plant and equipment expansion through higher prices, which really amounts to costless capital, and the interest rate is no burden to big business, the effect will be to absolutely destroy small business. The House Small Business Committee has just reported that if the trend of the past 5 years continues another 18 years, all manufacturing and distributing businesses will be in the hands of corporations of $100 million or more in size.

Third. Obviously, farmers cannot exist under the present hard money, high interest system as family type farms. So the policy will destroy our system of family type farms and force factory type farms or big corporation farming.

I wonder if it is the determined goal of the advocates and sponsors of this hard money, high interest policy to destroy small business, small farmers, and encourage monopoly, both in business and farming? Whether it is or not, that is actually happening.

PERCENTAGE INCREASES IN INTEREST RATES AND PRICES

I am inserting herewith some information about percentage increases from 1947 to 1956:

*Farm wage rates, railroad freight rate index, and total transportation bill for farm food products, 1947, 1955, and 1956*

| | 1947 | 1955 | 1956 | Percentage increase to— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 1955 | 1956 |
| | | | | *Percent* | *Percent* |
| Transportation bill for farm food products (billions of dollars) [1] | $2.05 | $3.59 | (2) | 75.1 | (2) |
| Railroad freight rate index (index No. 1947–49=100) [3] | 88 | 124 | P 130 | 40.9 | 47.7 |
| Farm wage rates, composite (dollars per hour) [4] | $0.571 | ---------- | $0.736 | ---------- | 28.9 |

[1] Estimates of total expenditures by shippers for transportation (except local hauling) of farm products for civilian consumption by rail and truck, including private trucks. Principal causes for increase are change in rates, volume shipped, and length of haul.
[2] Not available.
[3] Combined index for railroad freight rates on livestock, meats, vegetables and fruits, wheat and cotton.
[4] For October 1947 and October 1956.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture.

*Bond yields and money market rates, 1947, and week ending Dec. 1, 1956*

| | Week ending Dec. 1, 1956 (percent) | 1947 | 1947–56 percentage increase |
|---|---|---|---|
| U. S. Government securities (taxable): | | | |
| 3-month bills [1] | 3.174 | 0.594 | 434.3 |
| 9- to 12-month issues [2] | 3.23 | .88 | 267.0 |
| 3- to 5-year issues [3] | 3.60 | 1.32 | 172.7 |
| Bonds: | | | |
| Due or callable from 10 to 20 years | 3.36 | [4] 2.25 | 49.3 |
| Due or callable at 20 years or after | 3.33 | | 48.0 |
| Local housing authority temporary notes (tax exempt) [5] | 2.355 | .845 | 178.7 |
| High-grade municipal bonds [6] | [7] 3.45 | 2.01 | 71.6 |
| Corporate bonds: [8] | | | |
| Aaa | [9] 3.71 | 2.61 | 42.1 |
| Baa | [9] 4.26 | 3.24 | 31.5 |
| Prime commercial paper, 4 to 6 months | 3.68 | 1.03 | 232.4 |
| Prime bankers' acceptances, 90 days | 3.19 | .87 | 266.7 |
| Federal Reserve discount rate [10] | 3.00 | 1.00 | 200.0 |

[1] Rate on new issues within period.
[2] Includes certificates of indebtedness and selected note and bond issues.
[3] Includes selected note and bond issues.
[4] 15 years or more.
[5] Last sale of notes in 1947 and sale of Dec. 4, 1956.
[6] Standard & Poor's Corp.
[7] Week ending Nov. 28.
[8] Moody's Investors Service.
[9] Week ending Nov. 23.
[10] Advances of member banks secured by Government obligations and discounts of and advances secured by eligible paper.

Source: Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System.

*Average prices paid by farmers at independent stores Sept. 15, 1956, compared to Sept. 15, 1947*

| Commodity and unit | Sept. 15, 1956 | Sept. 15, 1947 | Percentage increase (+) or decrease (−) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Food: Coffee—pound | $1.05 | $0.484 | +116.9 |
| Clothing: | | | |
| Men's overalls—pair | 3.58 | 3.29 | +8.8 |
| Women's shoes—do | 5.65 | 4.99 | +13.2 |
| Household operation: | | | |
| Soapflakes—pound | .275 | | −5.5 |
| Detergent—do | | .291 | |
| Household furnishings: Living-room suites—each | 194.00 | 163.00 | +19.0 |
| Building materials: Framing lumber (2 by 4 by 16)—thousand board-feet | 143.00 | 115.00 | +24.3 |
| Motor supplies: Gasoline—gallon | 0.306 | 0.256 | +19.5 |
| Motor vehicles: | | | |
| Automobile: Ford, 6-cylinder, Mainline [1]—each | 2,040.00 | 1,310.00 | +55.7 |
| Tractor: 20–29 belt horsepower—do | 2,090.00 | 1,490.00 | +40.0 |
| Farm machinery: Combine, 5- to 6-foot cut, power takeoff—do | 1,590.00 | 1,010.00 | +57.4 |
| Fertilizer: 3–12–6—ton | 40.80 | 38.10 | +7.1 |
| Livestock: Feeder cattle—100 pounds | 16.70 | 20.10 | −16.9 |
| Feed: Mixed dairy, 16-percent protein—do | 3.66 | 4.23 | −13.5 |
| Iron and steel items: | | | |
| Milk can, 10-gallon—each | 12.60 | 7.43 | +69.6 |
| Nails, 8-penny, common—pound | .154 | .0966 | +59.4 |
| Barbed wire: | | | |
| 2-point—spool of 80 rods | 9.39 | 6.47 | +45.1 |
| 4-point—do | 10.50 | 6.95 | +51.1 |
| Poultry netting (5 x 150 feet)—roll | 10.10 | 6.55 | +54.2 |
| Fence posts, steel—each | 1.08 | .729 | +48.1 |
| Gates, farm, galvanized, 14 feet—do | 26.60 | 18.50 | +43.8 |
| Iron pipe, galvanized, 1¼-inch diameter—foot | .420 | .249 | +68.7 |

[1] For July 1947 and 1956. This model was a 2-door sedan in 1947 and a 4-door sedan in 1956.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture.

*Average prices received by farmers for farm products in United States, Nov. 15, 1956, compared to Nov. 15, 1947*

| Commodity and unit | Nov. 15, 1956 | Nov. 15, 1947 | Percentage increase (+) or decrease (−) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Wheat—bushel | $2.05 | $2.74 | −25.2 |
| Corn—do | 1.21 | 2.19 | −44.7 |
| Cotton, American Upland—pound | .3188 | .3186 | +.1 |
| Tobacco, all—do | .10 | .40 | −75.0 |
| Potatoes—hundredweight | 1.53 | 2.60 | −41.2 |
| Hogs—do | 14.20 | 24.30 | −41.6 |
| Beef cattle—do | 14.60 | 18.20 | −19.8 |
| All milk, wholesale—do | 4.59 | 5.02 | −8.6 |
| Eggs—per dozen | .372 | .534 | −30.3 |

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KRUEGER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) for several days on account of medical attention.

To Mr. DOYLE for balance of this week on account of Subcommittee of Un-American Activities Committee hearings in New York.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered was granted to:

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) for 30 minutes on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER for 15 minutes today.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER for 1 hour on Thursday to discuss the agricultural situation in the United States.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. FASCELL) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALTER and to include a statement.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FRIEDEL (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. SILER.

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PROUTY and include extraneous matter.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

Mr. MACK of Washington.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD and include extraneous material.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RABAUT and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BONNER and to include an address.

Mr. PATMAN and to include extraneous material.

## SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 637. An act to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available thereunder for business loans.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 5, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speakers' table and referred as follows:

409. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on a study of possible methods of improving the parity formula, pursuant to section 602 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 213); to the Committee on Agriculture.

410. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on the operations of Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-45 upon departments, agencies, and corporations of the Government, pursuant to section 208 of the General Government Matters Appropriation Act, 1957; to the Committee on Appropriations.

411. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy relative to the proposed transfer by the Department of the Navy of certain boats as follows: (1) a 104-foot aircraft rescue boat, hull No. *C–13550* (without engines) to the Navy League of the United States; (2) a 24-foot plane personnel boat, hull No. *C–102613*, with engines, to the Danvers Veterans 130 Club, Inc., of Danvers, Mass., pursuant to section 6 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 898; 10 U. S. C. 7308); to the Committee on Armed Services.

412. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Personnel and Reserve Forces), transmitting a report on the progress in the Department of the Navy of the flight-training program, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 879, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

413. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report relative to what has been accomplished in the plating material industry to achieve a fair and equitable distribution of plating materials, pursuant to Public Law 632, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

414. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report on iron and steel scrap, dated January 31, 1957, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 631, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

415. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, and for other purposes," approved May 18, 1910; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

416. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing 14th Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

417. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the acts known as the 'Life Insurance Act,' approved June 19, 1934, and the 'Fire and Casualty Act,' approved October 9, 1940"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

418. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, the Ninth Annual Report of the District of Columbia Armory Board, pursuant to Public Law 605, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

419. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend Public Law 843, 80th Congress, as amended, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Labor Organization and authorizing appropriations therefor"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

420. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report on its activities in the disposal of foreign excess property for the period January 1, 1956 through December 31, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

421. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Government of the Virgin Islands for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956; to the Committee on Government Operations.

422. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the first report on progress and accomplishments of the anthracite mine drainage program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

423. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of all tort claims paid by this Department for the period January 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, pursuant to section 2673 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

424. A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a statement indicating the general situation as to the movement of positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to section 503 of title V of Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

425. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the operation and effectiveness of the Antidumping Act, 1921, together with a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend certain provisions of the Antidumping Act, 1921, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in the enforcement thereof, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

426. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

427. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

428. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting additional information relative to the case of Leonora Levon Yenovkian, A–10044761, and requesting that it be returned to this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

429. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII pursuant to the order of the House of January 30, 1957, the following bill was reported February 1, 1957:

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4249. A bill making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 24). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted February 4, 1957*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2146. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; with amendment (Rept. No. 25). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: From the Delegation of the United States House of Representatives to the Second NATO Parliamentary Conference. Report of the United States delegation to the Paris conference of the NATO Parliamentarians November 19–23, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 689. (84th Cong.); without amendment (Rept. No. 26). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of January 30, 1957, the following bill was introduced on February 1, 1957:

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 4249. A bill making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

[*Introduced and referred February 4, 1957*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4250. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 4251. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 4252. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to formulate a plan and make recommendations for consolidation in a single executive agency of the responsibility for, and supervision of, activities involving Antarctica; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. AVERY:

H. R. 4253. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide more flexibility in refinancing loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 4254. A bill to direct the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization to conduct a particular survey in order to assist in promoting the production of concentrated iron ore and steel and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 4255. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4256. A bill to direct the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization to conduct a particular survey in order to assist in promoting the production of concentrated iron ore and steel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H. R. 4257. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to permit retroactive payments to farmers who have voluntarily carried out certain emergency conservation measures; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4258. A bill to provide a more equitable method for computing the self-employment income of farmers under the Social Security Act for taxable years ending during the period commencing January 1, 1955, and ending December 31, 1958; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4259. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as part of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 4260. A bill to authorize the Chief of Engineers to publish information pamphlets, maps, brochures, and other material; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4261. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 4262. A bill to make the calendar fixed and perpetual; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 4263. A bill to provide for the construction of a fish and wildlife marine laboratory and experiment station in the central gulf coast area of Florida; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 4264. A bill to provide that the highway running from Tampa, Fla., through Bradenton, Fla., Punta Gorda, Fla., Fort Myers, Fla., Naples, Fla., and Miami, Fla., to Homestead, Fla., shall be a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 4265. A bill to provide tax equity through the taxation of cooperative corporations and to provide tax credits for recipients of dividends from genuine cooperatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4266. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4267. A bill to provide supplementary benefits for recipients of public assistance and benefits for others who are in need through the issuance of certificates to be used in the acquisition of surplus agricultural food products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4268. A bill to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H. R. 4269. A bill to provide for an additional Assistant Attorney General; to establish a bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to provide means of further securing and protecting the right to vote; to strengthen the civil rights statutes; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 4270. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to formulate a plan and make recommendations for consolidation in a single executive agency of the responsibility for, and supervision of, activities involving Antarctica; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4271. A bill to provide that the Delegate from Alaska in the House of Representatives of the United States shall be a member of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 4272. A bill to provide increases in service-connected disability compensation and to increase dependency allowances; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 4273. A bill to provide that any child of a quota immigrant, if such immigrant is entitled to a fourth preference quota, shall also be entitled to a fourth preference quota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 4274. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 4275. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by adding thereto new provisions relating to civil aviation medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 4276. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 4277. A bill to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed services who suffer disability or death incident to active duty, active duty for training, or inactive-duty training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 4278. A bill to provide for the inclusion of employees of the Memorial Hospital, Cumberland, Md., as participants in the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHANSEN (by request):

H. R. 4279. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 4280. A bill to provide for carry-back and carry-over of foreign tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 4281. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include California among the States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts so as to obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for only those State and local employees who desire such coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNOX:

H. R. 4282. A bill to direct the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization to conduct a particular survey in order to assist in promoting the production of concentrated iron ore and steel and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 4283. A bill to direct the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization to conduct a particular survey in order to assist in promoting the production of concentrated iron ore and steel and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H. R. 4284. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Buford Dam and Reservoir, Ga., by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to former owners thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 4285. A bill to authorize the sale of degaussing equipment by the Department of the Navy to the owners or operators of privately owned merchant ships of United States registry; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 4286. A bill to appropriate money for the continued construction of the Calumet-Sag Channel, Ill., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 4287. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 4288. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 4289. A bill to direct the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization to conduct a particular survey in order to assist in promoting the production of concentrated iron ore and steel and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 4290. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in the further development of their programs of general university extension education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4291. A bill to provide for cooperative unit programs of research, education, and demonstration between the Federal Government of the United States, colleges, and universities, the several States and Territories, and private organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 4292. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for carrying out provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain timber access roads, to permit maximum economy in harvesting national forest timber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 4293. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to formulate a plan and make recommendations for consolidation in a single executive agency of the responsibility for, and supervision of, activities involving Antarctica; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 4294. A bill to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H. R. 4295. A bill to reorganize the civil-defense functions of the Federal Government, to establish a Federal Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 4296. A bill relating to the establishment of national mutual savings banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 4297. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to formulate a plan and make recommendations for consolidation in a single executive agency, of the responsibility for, and supervision of, activities involving Antarctica; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 4298. A bill for the establishment of a Department of Peace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 4299. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 4300. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to formulate a plan and make recommendations for consolidation in a single executive agency of the responsibility for, and supervision of, activities involving Antarctica; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 4301. A bill to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 4302. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to impose a graduated tax on the taxable income of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4303. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Kansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 4304. A bill to provide an additional rule with respect to the rendering of the national anthem of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H. R. 4305. A bill to recognize the Ryan-Hemet Airport as a public airport for the purposes of the Federal Airport Act, and to provide for reimbursement for damage to such airport in accordance with such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4306. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to include additional works of improvement; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H. R. 4307. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Pawnee State Park as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4308. A bill to amend section 4121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on certain appliances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 4309. A bill to amend section 8256 of title 10 of the United States Code to authorize certain reenlistments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H. R. 4310. A bill to authorize the sale for feeding purposes of limited quantities of wheat of less desirable milling quality; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 4311. A bill to provide for the payment of the unpaid balance of joint stock land-bank bonds declared by Congress to be instrumentalities of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 4312. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 4313. A bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4314. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 4315. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin compact and for related purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 4316. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 4317. A bill to provide for the erection in Arlington National Cemetery of an equestrian statue of General of the Armies of the United States John J. Pershing; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. J. Res. 218. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for limitation of taxation powers of Congress unless concurred in by two-thirds of the Members elected to each House; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. J. Res. 219. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating January 22 of each year as Ukrainian Independence Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. J. Res. 220. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army to confer with certain municipal officials and others to work out a method of preventing certain lake levels from dropping excessively because of the use of hydroelectric generators; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. Con. Res. 102. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the United States policy of opposition to colonialism, restating the United States policy of expanding freedom throughout the world, and sending greetings to those suffering under the colonialism of the Communists; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to the return of 450 American prisoners of war who have not been accounted for by the Communists; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on excise taxes held by the Committee on Ways and Means during the 84th Congress, 2d session; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the establishment of certain restricted airspace areas in the United States for the purpose of conducting test flights of aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to the return of 450 American prisoners of war who have not been accounted for by the Communists; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Res. 144. Resolution authorizing the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives to insure the funds of his office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. Res. 145. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the Japanese program for the control of exports of cotton textiles to the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 146. Resolution providing for expenses of investigations authorized by House Resolution 56; to the Committee on House Administration.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ULLMAN: Memorial of the house of representatives, State of Oregon, urging stopgap legislation extending the period of time in which Public Law 587 is to become effective; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to take immediate action to afford relief to the depressed poultry producers of California; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to prohibiting juveniles, unaccompanied by a parent or guardian, from crossing the United States-Mexico border without a permit for such purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize and appropriate sufficient moneys to provide for the construction and completion of the unfinished link in the Lewis and Clark Highway at the earliest practicable date; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to providing stopgap legislation extending the period of time in which Public Law 587, 83d Congress, is to become effective; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take action for the purpose of changing and overruling a directive of the Secretary of Defense requiring 6 months' active military training for all National Guard enlistees, who have had no previous basic military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to praying that legislation be adopted admitting Alaska as a State of the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 4318. A bill for the relief of Aurelio Perillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 4319. A bill for the relief of Anna Rossetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 4320. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theresia Licata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 4321. A bill for the relief of Adolf Klossek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4322. A bill for the relief of Alice Sislian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 4323. A bill to authorize the award of a Medal of Honor to Comdr. Hugh Barr Miller, Jr., United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 4324. A bill for the relief of Irene Montoya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4325. A bill for the relief of Aristides Samoilis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 4326. A bill for the relief of Theodore Triantafillopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 4327. A bill for the relief of Bianca G. Hidalgo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 4328. A bill for the relief of Evelyne Marie Madeleine Frederick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4329. A bill for the relief of Jung Sang Jine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 4330. A bill for the relief of Lucia (Castaneda) Sayaan, Gloria (Castaneda) Sayaan, Erlinda (Castaneda) Sayaan, and Pascual (Castaneda) Sayaan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4331. A bill for the relief of Harold William Abbott and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HARDEN:

H. R. 4332. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kathleen A. Higginbotham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H. R. 4333. A bill for the relief of Victor Toplisky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4334. A bill for the relief of Nicola Barrea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4335. A bill for the relief of Ramon Tavarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 4336. A bill for the relief of the First National Bank of Birmingham, Ala.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4337. A bill for the relief of Ettore Renucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 4338. A bill for the relief of Anton Stanak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 4339. A bill for the relief of Tatjana Prosek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 4340. A bill for the relief of Luciano F. and Elda Rossi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4341. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Frank Grande; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4342. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Thomas L. Davidson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 4343. A bill for the relief of Theodore M. (also known as Ted M.) Cote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H. R. 4344. A bill for the relief of Malone Hsia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4345. A bill for the relief of Dr. Leonardo Garcia-Bunuel and his wife, Maria-Rosa Garcia-Bunuel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H. R. 4346. A bill for the relief of Carmel C. McDonald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 4347. A bill for the relief of Elfriede R. Harper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4348. A bill for the relief of Stefica Mundar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4349. A bill for the relief of Evelin Minton, nee Hegeler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 4350. A bill for the relief of Vasilios A. Xerikos, his wife Eleni, and three minor children, Nicoleta, Constantinos, and Andreas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4351. A bill for the relief of G. H. Litts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 4352. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lavinia Brancato Spoto, her husband Vincenzo Spoto, and their two minor children, Domenico and Ignazio Spoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

68. By Mr. BURDICK: Resolution of the Fargo, N. Dak., Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, urging that the first Sunday in February each year be set aside as Chaplains' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

69. Also, resolution of the Jamestown, N. Dak., Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, urging that the first Sunday in February each year be set aside as Chaplains' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

70. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution to set aside the first Sunday in February each year as Chaplains' Day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

71. Also, resolution of the 85th annual session of the Wisconsin State Grange, October 16–18, 1956, that the Wisconsin State Grange petition the Congress of the United States to retain the present transportation law and policy, to preserve the inherent advantages of each form of transportation, and to defeat in the next session of Congress the legislation proposed by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Transport Policy and Organization; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

72. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chief clerk, City Council, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging legislation for the preservation of the U. S. S. *Olympia* as a national memorial and maritime museum in Philadelphia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

73. Also petition of the secretary, American Nurses' Association, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the memory of Hon. James Percy Priest; to the Committee on House Administration.

74. Also, petition of the chairman, immigration and naturalization committee, Supreme Lodge, Order Sons of Italy in America, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to revising and amending the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

75. Also, petition of the department adjutant, Amvets, Department of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to being placed on record as requesting a congressional investigation of the high cost of living, etc.; to the Committee on Rules.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## A Statement Concerning the President's Recommendations on Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 4, 1957*

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, if the President's recommendations were enacted into law, this country would admit over 200,000 people annually in excess of the number of immigrants which we receive at this time. Here is the breakdown of this figure:

The President wishes to admit escapees selected by the Secretary of State, the number of whom "should not exceed in any one year the average number of aliens who over the past 8 years have been permitted to enter the United States by special acts of Congress outside the basic immigration system."

Under 3 such laws, enacted in 1948, 1950, and 1953, respectively, this country has admitted outside the basic immigration quotas approximately 400,000 displaced persons and 200,000 refugees. This total of 600,000 represents an annual average of 75,000, which, under the President's recommendations, could be admitted each year as escapees over and above the present quota system.

Under another of the President's recommendations, an additional 65,000 quota immigrants would be admitted and, under still another of his recommendations, unused quota numbers would be available to countries which consistently fill their immigration quotas. Based on official statistical figures for fiscal years from 1952 to 1956, inclusive, this recommendation will produce an additional 60,000 immigrants annually.

Further, the canceling of the so-called "mortgage" on quotas would have the effect of admitting 8,000 immigrants annually. Thus, the total effect of the President's recommendations would be to increase the number of quota immigrants—75,000 plus 65,000 plus 60,000 plus 8,000—by 208,000 each year.

It is necessary to remember that our regular annual intake of immigrants now exceeds 200,000. Should the President's recommendations be enacted into law, our annual intake of immigrants would undoubtedly average well in excess of 500,000.

In view of the fact that 4 million Americans are brought into the world each year, I do not believe that this country's housing and educational facilities, institutions of health and welfare, and employment opportunities are sufficient to accommodate the additional number of those that would have to be integrated into our economy.

It is also important to remember that the President does not recommend any change in the system of our nonquota admission of immigrants. This means that the continuous influx of immigrants from Mexico—60,000 last year and 80,000 in the current year, approximately—would not be curtailed.

Regarding the President's recommendation under which the Attorney General, and not the Congress, would provide relief in immigration cases where the law does not offer solution in individual cases, my personal opinion is that the Congress should exercise its constitutional prerogative to redress grievances and that it is much more equitable to have the Congress weigh the merits involved in each individual case on a completely impartial basis than to have a politically appointed officer of the administration exercise the authority to grant or deny relief to individuals.

Many of the technical amendments to our immigration laws that the President recommends are already embodied in the bill, H. R. 4008, which I have introduced earlier this week.

As to the problem of Hungarian refugees, I do not wish to make any comment at this time, since my subcommittee is right now engaged in an extensive investigation of this matter. I expect it will be terminated shortly, permitting us to explore the matter fully in public hearings.

## The Back to God Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. EMMET F. BYRNE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 4, 1957*

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like the RECORD to reflect the activities of the Mount Greenwood Legion post and the Mount Greenwood auxiliary in Chicago. Recently the commander of the post, Richard Ast, 11006 South Fairfield Avenue, and Mrs. Michael Cozzi, 11122 South Trumbull, president of the auxiliary, reported that their organizations will participate in the back-to-God crusade under the leadership

of the American Legion, department of Illinois.

Such action is to be commended. A pamphlet announcing this back-to-God crusade has been prepared and will be made available to residents of the Mount Greenwood area on February 1 and 2 at the Mount Greenwood State bank, 3052 West 111th Street, Chicago.

This date is in memory of the four chaplains who gave up their lives so others might be saved when the U. S. S. *Dorchester* was sunk February 3, 1943. One was a rabbbi, one a Catholic priest, and two were Protestant ministers. The chaplains, with arms locked and kneeling together, sank under the waves, each saying a prayer in his own faith.

Many other communities in Illinois are participating in this crusade.

## Orman W. Ketcham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 4, 1957*

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to express my keen pleasure in the appointment of Orman W. Ketcham to the juvenile court bench in the District of Columbia. I know Mr. Ketcham through his father-in-law, Mr. Harold Phelps Stokes, who was an old classmate of mine at school and college, and I can testify that his training and abilities well qualify him for this responsible position. May I review briefly his career.

Mr. Ketcham was born in Brooklyn, N. Y., and was educated in the James Madison High School there; graduated cum laude from the Poly Prep Country Day School in Brooklyn; graduated from Princeton University in 1940, and was the recipient of the School of Public and International Affairs fellowship for study in Great Britain in the year 1939. He then went to the Yale Law School where he graduated in 1947, and while there was book review editor of the Yale Law Journal and was one of the founders and chairman of the Yale Law School Student Association. He graduated 10th in the class of 86 members.

Mr. Ketcham served his country in the Navy during World War II, being commissioned an ensign in September 1941 and later was assigned to the District Intelligence Office in New York City. From there he went to Washington in the Office of Naval Intelligence, and from April 1942 to August 1944, Mr. Ketcham was assistant navigator, radar division, on the U. S. S. *Cleveland* on both Atlantic and Pacific duty. After that he was in the Tactical Radar Training School, Hollywood Beach, Fla., where he was successively instructor, head of the combat information center department, and a training officer. In February 1946 Mr. Ketcham was released to inactive duty with the permanent rank of lieutenant commander, and he wears the Navy Unit Commendation Medal, American Defense Medal, Pacific theater ribbon with five battle stars. North African theater ribbon with one battle star, and the Western Hemisphere theater ribbon.

Mr. Ketcham was associated with the legal firm of Covington and Burling here in Washington from 1947 to 1952, taking part in the organization as trial defense counsel for various large antitrust cases. He was legislative and litigation attorney for the Foreign Operations Administration from 1953 to 1955 and assistant general counsel to Christian A. Herter, Jr., in Foreign Operations Administration. He was active in the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice in 1955.

Mr. Ketcham has always been interested in juvenile affairs. From 1930 to 1947 he was active in the promotion and operation of Boy Scouts camps, YMCA boys camps, and acted as leader at Camp Dudley, a YMCA camp on Lake Champlain. He organized in 1948 at Christ Episcopal Church in Georgetown, a voluntary discussion group on public problems for young men from 13 to 18 years of age and from 1952 through 1955 he acted in the counseling service for college applicants in the Princeton Club of Washington, D. C.

Mr. Ketcham is an earnest, straightforward, and loyal American citizen who will bring to the problems of the Juvenile Court a refreshing new look which I am sure will commend itself to the citizens of this community and to all people who are interested in solving the problems besetting the youth of America.

## Both Editor of Detroit Times and President of Detroit NAACP Receive Amity Award From Jewish Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 4, 1957*

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to call attention to the awards presented recently to two of Detroit's outstanding leaders, Mr. John C. Manning, editor of the Detroit Times, and Edward M. Turner, president of the Detroit chapter of the NAACP, the largest chapter in the Nation.

The Jewish Congress for the last decade has paid recognition to certain outstanding citizens who, in addition to their normal duties, have contributed particularly to the enhancement of their fellow man. The plaque presented to Mr. Turner in acknowledgment of his years of public service states:

> In recognition of a life dedicated to a meaningful interpretation of the concept of the brotherhood of man.
>
> Through his tireless efforts for integrated public housing and fair employment practices, he has demonstrated that the proposition that man is equal in the sight of God can be interpreted through equal opportunity under law.

Mr. Manning, in receiving his award from Lieutenant Governor Hart, was lauded for his concise and comprehensive analysis of the troubled Middle East situation and for his dedication through the years to the belief that only through a properly informed public can democracy be made to work for the benefit of all elements of our society.

The American Jewish Congress is to be highly commended for the interest it has stimulated in service to our fellow men. The awards presented in the recent ceremony are highly coveted and I join the city of Detroit in saying, "Well done."

## Consumer Protection Against Diseased Poultry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 4, 1957*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in June 1956, toward the close of the 84th Congress, I introduced a bill to provide for compulsory Federal inspection of poultry so as to give consumers, workers, and farmers full protection against diseased and filthy poultry. Hearings were held on my bill by the House Agriculture Committee, but because the session was approaching adjournment no action was taken.

I am now reintroducing my bill. I feel more than ever that Federal poultry inspection would fill an important health need for our population. It is urgent that steps be taken as soon as possible to safeguard the health of the American people. The consumer must be protected against diseased poultry coming from rodent-infested plants. The poultry worker and the farmer must be safeguarded against illness or infection resulting from diseased poultry.

United States Public Health Service statistics show that one-third of the food-poisoning cases each year are attributed to filthy and diseased poultry and poultry products. No less than 26 diseases are transmissible from poultry to man. During an outbreak of psittacosis—caused by turkeys—in Portland, Oreg., last year, 2 persons died and 62 others became extremely ill.

Federal inspection of poultry is at the present time available through the Agricultural Marketing Service only on a voluntary but not compulsory basis. This is a very limited form of inspection, which covers only about one-fifth of the poultry marketed, while the other four-fifths are marketed without inspection. There is almost complete unanimity that poultry-inspection legislation is badly needed, and the sooner such a law is passed the better for everyone concerned. We should not wait for next month or next year and risk the danger of needless loss of human lives.

My bill calls for a mandatory inspection law which would provide adequate inspection for wholesomeness, including

ante-mortem and post-mortem examination. The details of this type of inspection would be worked out by the Secretary of Agriculture in the rules and regulations to be set up pursuant to the adoption of the law. It is suggested, however, that ante-mortem inspection be by flock, coop, or batch, rather than bird by bird, unless there is reason for suspicion of disease. It is my understanding that health authorities claim that both ante-mortem and post-mortem examination are necessary because respiratory diseases can only be recognized while the bird is still alive.

Furthermore, my bill provides for inspection of plant and facilities sanitation, as well as sanitary processing practices. Effective inspection of this kind, including the product, the plant, and the processing practices, is absolutely vital. This three-way inspection would provide maximum protection to the consuming public, to the poultry workers, and to the farmers.

Inspection would be entrusted to the Meat Inspection Branch of the Department of Agriculture, rather than the Agricultural Marketing Service, because of the ineffectiveness of the latter's voluntary inspection program. A program of poultry inspection, if it is to be effective, should be administered by a Federal agency which concerns itself solely and seriously with consumer and health protection in the best interests of the American public. Unfortunately, the voluntary program of the AMS appears to be geared only to the wishes of the industry, but disregards the problems of the consumer and labor.

Numerous groups and organizations throughout the country have come out in support of this legislation. Among them, to list only a few, are the AFL–CIO, General Federation of Women's Clubs, American Association of University Women, Housewives United, National Board of YWCA, National Farmers Union, Association of Food and Drug Officials of the United States, Conference of State and Territorial Health Officers, Conference of State Public Health Veterinarians, American Veterinary Medical Association, and many others.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress to adopt this legislation as soon as possible to safeguard the health of the American people.

## In Defense of the National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 4, 1957*

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Defense has deeply disturbed the American public with his charge that the National Guard was a haven for draft dodgers during the Korean war.

If the Secretary does not know, it is time he was told that 150,000 Army and Air National Guard men were called to active duty between 1950 and 1952 and the record of the guard during the dark days of the Korean conflict is a source of great pride to a grateful Nation. Many guardsmen gave their lives in this crisis and it is ironic, indeed, that the memory of their sacrifices should be stained by the irresponsible charges of a high Government official.

The late Secretary of War, Robert Patterson, characterized perhaps better than anyone else the magnificent contribution of the National Guard during World War II when he stated:

> The National Guard took into the field 18 infantry divisions; 9 of those divisions crossed the Atlantic to Europe and Africa, and 9 went to the far reaches of the Pacific. The soldiers of the guard fought in every action from Bataan to Okinawa. They made a brilliant record on every fighting front. They proved once more the value of the trained citizen soldier.

We have about half a million men today in our Air and Army National Guard—some of whom were fighting to preserve our liberties before many Members of this House were born and others who bear the scars of three wars. But whether fresh recruits or experienced veterans, they all stand ready to answer a call to duty if this Nation is imperiled.

Mr. Speaker, although Secretary Wilson may be a capable administrator, without question his usefulness has diminished to a serious degree as a result of the aspersions he has cast upon the National Guard.

## School Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 4, 1957*

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the President in a special message again has appealed to Congress for speedy enactment of legislation to relieve the nationwide existing shortage in school classrooms.

The schools of the Nation, today, are 600,000 classrooms short of the number required to house adequately the Nation's school pupils. The President's appeal for this school construction legislation should be heeded promptly.

The classroom shortage emergency exists partly because all kinds of construction, including that of schools, was curtailed during the war and partly because of the tremendous increase in the birth rate.

As President Eisenhower, in his message to Congress points out, the number of pupils in the Nation's public schools increased by 5.5 million during the past 5 years and is expected to increase by 6 million during the next five. The States and local communities are unable to keep pace with the growing need for more classrooms and at the same time catch up with the backlog of 600,000 classrooms already needed. This situation makes it urgently necessary that the Federal Government temporarily aid the local communities in helping solve the crisis in education caused by the existing classroom shortage.

The President figures this can be done by Federal aid for school construction for a 4-year period. Under his plan the Federal Government would grant this aid without any strings attached. The President wants no Federal control over schools. With that sentiment I am in full agreement.

Under the plan Washington State would receive $4,298,000 a year for each of the next 4 years in Federal aid for school construction or about $17 million altogether during the next 4 years. This aid will be of great help in relieving our State's classroom shortage.

I support the President's position on aid for school construction. Education, in my opinion, has ceased to be a luxury. It is the right of every American child to receive an education. More importantly, the education of American youth, has become a national necessity, for we are entering into an age of experts and specialists, without whose skilled hands and trained brains our complicated civilization will not run.

The school construction bill was defeated in the House of Representatives last year because of the Powell amendment which got the school issue involved with the civil rights issue of segregation. This move did no good to the cause of civil rights but did do much harm to the good cause of school construction.

We hope the school construction bill will pass early in the present session of Congress so that the building of the school classrooms so urgently needed may be started soon.

## Forget Not the Vets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 4, 1957*

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, the best people in our land are undoubtedly included in that segment called the veterans. While consideration is being given to helping Hungarians, Arabians, Israelis, and various other groups on both side of the intervening oceans, let us now do some timely pondering on those surviving citizens we once or twice put in uniforms and sent away amid the serenading of local bands for a disruption of all local ties, for a life of severe hardship or ofttimes unto broken bodies or death itself. Among other considerations for us to ponder in dealing with this subject are the following:

First. Retail prices of food have risen by 15 percent since the 1947–49 period;

Second. Retail prices of clothing have risen by 7 percent since the 1947–49 period.

Because of my own personal knowledge that many of our veterans have, in trying to meet their expenses, been caught between a rock on one side of the road and a hard place on the other side, a situation sometimes referred to

as a Scylla and Charybdis, I am today introducing a bill to increase Veterans' Administration compensation from the present monthly payment of $17 up to $20 for a 10-percent rating and from the present monthly payment of $33 up to $40 monthly for a 20-percent rating and so on through the other classifications of our compensable veterans. My bill is identical with that of our worthy colleague and distinguished Veterans' Affairs Committee chairman, Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE of Texas. I feel this proposed legislation will be approved by that conscientious committee and I trust it will finally be passed by the House.

My other bill dealing with this same general problem is one that would increase Veterans' Administration pensions from the present monthly payment of $66.15 up to $85 monthly for veterans under 65 years of age and would increase the present monthly payment of $78.75 up to $105 monthly for veterans of 65 years of age and over and would give automatic total and permanent disability status to our 65-year-old veterans, all subject to the income limitations provided by present law. My bill is identical with the so-called American Legion bill as it was finally passed by the House, but not by the Senate, in the closing weeks of the 84th Congress. I believe it is a proposal for constructive legislation that should be given the utmost consideration by our Veterans' Affairs Committee and then by the House itself if it comes to the floor for final disposition. I hope it will become part of the law of our land, which should always be a most grateful and unforgetting land toward all those who carried its arms in time of war.

## Discounts From Suppliers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 4, 1957*

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving many telegrams and letters expressing opposition to H. R. 11. I do not believe many of them have been spontaneously inspired because so many follow a pattern and appear to be based upon misinformation relative to provisions dealing with discounts.

I understand many of my colleagues have been receiving similar telegrams and letters. For this reason my reply to these letters may be of interest.

The text of my letter follows:

I have received several hundred letters and telegrams similar to yours with respect to H. R. 11, S. 11, and/or H. R. 398. In order to get you a reply within a reasonable time, I have prepared this letter in this form. I particularly want to be sure that you know that I have given careful consideration to your views.

So many of your letters and telegrams are almost exactly similar that I am wondering whether or not some outside influence did not request you to write me and whether or not they have given you only their prejudiced views instead of giving you the full bill so that you can read it and know the exact truth. If you care to have a copy of it, I shall be glad to send it to you.

I do, however, want to stress that, if you have been informed that H. R. 11 would in any way prevent your supplier from giving you a discount to meet competition, you are absolutely misinformed. H. R. 11 merely says that your supplier shall not give to you, as against others who are in a similar position to yours, a special and unfairly discriminatory discount. Obviously, without special protection, while today you might be the specially favored one, next time you might be the one left out and made to suffer. The important point is that, if the discount or adjustment is given equally to all who need it, the proposed law allows the discount to be made.

If you have any other questions concerning the proposed law, I shall be more than happy to answer them.

With all good wishes.

Very sincerely,

JAMES ROOSEVELT.

## Safety First Club of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 4, 1957*

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, since the Members of the Congress are as interested in highway traffic safety as I am, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives some of the activities in this field. The traffic toll in the United States has become so large and tragic, in the great numbers of accidents on the roads and highways, that attention is merited by any organization, whether volunteer or official, that has as its aim the promotion of all means of combating this great menace.

In this category belongs the Safety First Club of Maryland, headed by J. O. Shuger, of Baltimore, president. The major objectives of that very fine club are: First, help reduce traffic fatalities and accidents; second, stress the importance of traffic safety among our youth; third, work for the passage and enforcement of statutes aiming to reduce the tragic traffic toll; and, fourth, give proper recognition to the deserving for attainments in the field of safety.

The Baltimore Beacon, whose gifted editor is the well-known Maurice R. Shochatt, reports in its February issue that the Safety First Club of Maryland will sponsor its first annual Wheelmaster banquet on March 14, 1957 at the Sheraton-Belvedere Hotel in Baltimore. On that occasion, Traffic Director Henry A. Barnes and the renowned inventor, Charles Adler, Jr., will receive Wheelmaster safety awards in recognition of their contributions in the field of safety. At the same time, Frederick W. Rohrs will be given a special safety award for having operated automobiles since 1901 without a single accident marring his spotless driving record.

In addition to J. O. Shuger, president, the other officers of the club are: Harry Waller and J. J. Leidy, vice presidents; Maurice R. Shochatt, secretary; and Samuel T. Abrams, treasurer.

It is worthy of note that the President's Committee for Traffic Safety has awarded a certificate of service to the Baltimore Beacon in recognition of its service in furthering the cause of safety on the streets and highways.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include herein the thought-provoking poem written by the brilliant managing editor of the Baltimore Beacon, Julia Yohn Pickett. It is as follows:

HIGHWAY HORROR

More cars and trucks on the highway roll,
And accidents take their terrible toll;
A shameful record to unfold,
And countless heartaches go untold.

Lengthy lists of death and destruction
Might be shortened by speed reduction;
What we need is the endorsement
Of a stricter law enforcement.

The speeders rush to meet their fate,
Indifferent to the accident rate;
Those who purposely flout the law,
Heavy penalties should draw.

High-powered cars go all the faster,
Heedlessly heading for disaster,
Never counting the tragic cost,
And needlessly many lives are lost.

## The Estonian People Still Long for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 4, 1957*

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, when Estonia declared her independence on February 24, 1918, a proud and historic people gave the world renewed evidence that the true spirit of freedom can never be quenched. Even though Estonia had lain for more than two centuries under Russian domination, she was determined to build her own destiny.

It is important to recall this anniversary of Estonian independence because it reminds us of our own high resolve that the right of all nations—small or large—to self-determination shall remain one of the goals which our country must always seek. Our Nation was itself conceived on the principle that it is the inalienable right of a people to govern themselves. That principle must guide us in the future as in the past.

Despite the oppression of the Soviet tyrants today, the Estonian people still long for freedom. Those of Estonian descent who have come to this Nation to mingle with their fellow Americans from many lands have brought that spirit of liberty with them. America must open its door in hospitality to all those who seek refuge from dictatorship.

We sense today a new spirit of dedication to freedom's cause behind the Iron Curtain. I believe that this rising ferment makes it imperative that the United States take the lead in calling on

the United Nations to expose for all to see the shame of Soviet tyranny over Estonia and her neighbors of Baltic and Eastern Europe. On February 24, 1957, let us be as true to democratic ideals as the Estonian patriots were true to them 39 years ago.

## Mexico Celebrates Its Adoption of the Constitution of 1857

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 4, 1957*

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, today, February 5, Mexico celebrates the first centennial of the Constitution of 1857.

It is particularly appropriate that this Nation with a Constitution of our own based upon the principles of liberty and freedom should join our sister Republic of Mexico in celebrating the adoption of its Constitution based upon principles so similar to those that are fundamental to our own Constitution.

The Constitution of 1857 marks an outstanding chapter in the political and juridical history of Mexico. It established the permanent basis for Mexico as a nation and crystallized the aspiration of freedom of the Mexican people.

The Constitution of 1857 was the forerunner of the Constitution of 1917 which embodies the ideals of the revolution of 1910, and which is now the Magna Carta of Mexico.

This historical date will be commemorated throughout Mexico by civic ceremonies presided over by the political authorities of every city, village, and hamlet in Mexico.

President Adolfo Ruiz Cortines has written letters to the governors of each of the Mexican States commenting on the historical importance of the date of February 5, 1857, and asking their cooperation in the observance of the centennial.

Thus, the centenary of the Constitution of 1857 will be celebrated in Mexico on the 5th of February, 1957. The congress of the union has, therefore, declared 1957 Year of the Constitution.

The fundamental rights of man, as recognized in our Declaration of Independence and set forth in our Constitution, are just as clearly and emphatically expressed in the several articles of the Mexican Constitution, the adoption of which is celebrated today.

An examination of the articles of the Constitution make plain that it was not only the purpose of the Mexican Constitution to recognize the rights of man, but also to protect those rights in every detail that would promote the welfare of the individual citizen, as will be readily seen from the following:

Article I: The Mexican people recognize that the rights of men are the foundation and the purpose of social institutions. In consequence they proclaim that all the laws and authorities of the country must respect and sustain the warranties stipulated by this Constitution.

Article II: In the Republic every one is born free. The slaves who step into the national territory recover their liberty by this mere fact, and have the right of the protection of the law.

This article takes on special significance when it is realized that at the time of its adoption slavery had not yet been abolished in our country. Thus, fugitive slaves were not only given full right of asylum, but declared that from the moment he entered Mexico he "received his freedom," thus recognizing in no uncertain way the principle that every man is born free. In later articles of the Constitution will be seen further recognition of this principle, its extension and elaboration.

Article III: All education is free. The law will determine which profession needs a diploma for its exercise, and what requisites are to be fulfilled.

This fundamental principle was later amplified to make education not only free but also universal, free, nonsectarian, and compulsory.

Article IV: Every man is free to adopt the profession, trade, or work that suits him, it being useful and honest; and to enjoy the product thereof.

Article V: No man shall be compelled to work without his plain consent and without just compensation. The state will not permit to become effective any contract, pact, or agreement with the purpose of the curtailment, the loss, or the irrevocable sacrifice of the liberty of any man.

Thus, these provisions leave no doubt that the framers of the Constitution for Mexico intended to make, and, did make, the rights of man to be absolute.

Article VI: The expression of ideas shall not be subjected to any judicial or governmental prosecution except in cases of attack upon the public morality, the rights of a third party, or the prevention of a crime or a disturbance of public order.

Article VII: The liberty of writing and publishing writings upon any matter is inviolable. No previous censorship nor imposition of bonds upon the writers nor the publishers for the purpose of curtailing the freedom of the press can be established by any law or authority, such freedom being restricted to respect of private life, morals, and public business.

In these articles is firmly established the right of free speech and the right of free press, as constituting the basic foundation of a pure democracy.

Article VIII: This deals with the right of petition to the government.

Article IX: This gives the right of assembly.

Article X: This establishes the right of every man to possess and carry arms for his safety and legitimate defense.

Article XI: This deals with immigration to the country and other travelling both from the country and into the same.

Article XII: This establishes the invalidity of all titles of nobility, prerogatives, and hereditary honors.

Article XIII: In the Mexican Republic no one shall be subjected to private laws nor special courts. No man or corporation shall enjoy fueros nor receive emoluments unless they be a compensation for public services and already fixed by law.

Article XIV: This establishes the principle that no one shall be tried by retroactive laws.

Article XV: No treaties can be made for the extradition of political offenders; neither for those criminals whose crime was committed in a country where they had been slaves; neither can a treaty or agreement be made by which the warranties or rights that this Constitution gives to man or citizen be altered.

Thus, it will be seen that the framers of the Constitution of Mexico intended to provide for the establishment of the full and unrestricted freedom of person, of labor, of speech, and of the press in Mexico, and, in addition thereto recognized similar rights in the individuals of all nations and refused to permit any act upon the part of Mexico in violation of these rights in its relationship with any foreign power. By these provisions the full right of asylum was established.

Article XVI: This article establishes the principle that the family and domicile are inviolable, except for the purposes of arrest under a warrant from a proper court expressing the charge.

Article XVII: No one shall be arrested or imprisoned for debts of a purely civil character. No one shall exercise violence to claim his rights. The courts will always be ready for the administration of justice. This will be free, the costs being abolished.

It is easily to be seen that the framers of this Constitution were men of the people, and, as such were fully cognizant of the wrongs that had brought distress to their fellow men by the usages of the past, and did not intend that such wrongful practices should be perpetrated thereafter.

Article XXVII: Private property shall not be taken without the consent of the owner, except in case of public utility, and by just payment therefor, and so forth.

Article XXVIII: State and church are independent. Congress cannot make any law establishing or forbidding any religion.

The foregoing constitute the fundamental principles of the Constitution, the adoption of which the people of Mexico celebrate today. Other articles were included that established the form of government as republican, federal, representative, democratic, and popular. It adopted the system of the division of the functions of government into executive, legislative, and judicial; defined the rights of and duties of citizenship, and formulated the methods of election in accordance with methods generally adopted in other federal republics.

On January 14, 1957, the President of Mexico, in a letter addressed to the governors of the States, enjoined them to strive for the greatest solemnity in the civic acts commemorating the centenary of the Constitution of 1857.

The text of the letter addressed by President Adolpho Ruiz Cortines to the

governors of the States on the observance of the first centennial of the Constitution of 1857, reads as follows:

On February 5 we shall commemorate the first centennial of the political Constitution of 1857, and for this reason Congress has given its approval in declaring 1957 as the Year of the Constitution of 1857 and of the Mexican Liberal Thought.

The Federal Constitution of 1857 has an extraordinary historical, political, and juridical importance, having emanated from the revolution of Ayutla, and for having embodied in its precepts the aspirations of the Mexican people, and for having given expression within it to the permanent features of our nationality. Sixty years later, on the same symbolic date of February 5, the Constitution of 1917 was ratified. Its origin was the Mexican Revolution, which governs the public life of the country and which embodies the aspirations of the people of our country.

Therefore, I am writing to you in your capacity as the head of the executive power in your State, to request that you organize the most solemn commemorative ceremonies that will express the homage of the people to both Constitutions. I believe that, considering the civic importance of these ceremonies, the leading political authorities throughout the country should preside at the respective rites; the governors in the capitals of their States, and the mayors in the municipalities.

The nation is striving to reach its optimum moral, civic, social, and material development, united in its common aims of general improvement and with tenacious dedication to work, seeking the betterment and growth of the nation.

All the foregoing requires that the commemorative acts be distinguished by their high civic spirit, the elevation of our national assets, and the decision to strive so that Mexico may gain day by day, greater benefits for each and every one of its citizens and for the entire collectivity.

Very truly yours,

ADOLFO RUIZ CORTINES,
*The President of the Republic.*

These celebrations called for by President Cortines will include acts in honor of the illustrious patriot Don Benito Juárez, to whom fell the responsibility, upon assuming the Presidency of the Republic in December 1857, to be the defender of the Constitution against the formidable attacks of the Conservatives.

In the years that have intervened since the adoption of the Constitution of 1857, the Republic of Mexico has had its trials and tribulations, but the people of Mexico have met with courage and fortitude each difficulty. They have surmounted them. Their vision of a great nation has never been dimmed. Progress with honor has ever been their watchword. With the same unconquerable spirit that has characterized them in the past, they press on with renewed vigor and determination to achieve even greater glories in the future. The progress made in industrial achievement, financial stability, advanced education, and improved living conditions for the people may well be a source of pride.

On this day of celebration in the Republic of Mexico, it is fitting that we, as representatives of the people of the United States of America, should join with the people of that great Republic, in celebrating the adoption of their Constitution, which, in the truest sense of the word, is a document that insures to the people of Mexico a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

And it is our hope and prayer that the Republic of Mexico may continue to progress in its domestic affairs, continue to increase in influence in foreign affairs, and that our relationship with each other may continue to strengthen the bonds that bind us together in friendship, and strengthen our hands in the cause of peace.

---

## The Surplus Food Certificate Act of 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 4, 1957*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing in this Congress the Surplus Food Certificate Act of 1957, a bill similar to one which I sponsored last year. This proposal attracted widespread support in hearings conducted during the 84th Congress. I look forward to its enactment in the present session.

This bill would help our Nation to escape from a distressing dilemma—a situation in which huge stocks of surplus foods are held in warehouses throughout the land while millions of Americans are without adequate means to obtain the foods they should have for a healthy, well-balanced, and reasonably varied diet. Under my bill, foods would be drawn out of these inventories into the customary channels of distribution. Even more important, there should be less need of diverting future production into Government storehouses. Instead, a larger quantity of food would find its way through ordinary retail grocery stores onto the tables of millions of people who can make good use of it.

The plan would operate by providing food certificates worth $10 a month for each individual in each family dependent on public assistance or receiving unemployment insurance benefits. Food retailers would be authorized to accept these certificates in payment for those foods which are determined and publicly listed each month by the Secretary of Agriculture as agricultural commodities for which supplies exceed domestic demand to such an extent that the market price is depressed below the parity price. The certificates would be distributed by State and local public assistance agencies and unemployment insurance offices in conjunction with their issuance of other benefits, and the amounts represented by food certificates would be additional to any other benefit payments. Retailers redeeming the certificates would receive either cash or deposit credit for them at their banks, and the banks would be repaid, in turn, with funds derived from the statutory appropriations to encourage exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural products, under section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935.

This is a simple, straightforward plan of action. A food-stamp plan was tried out successfully during 1939–43 in nearly half of the counties of the United States. The plan incorporated in my bill is simpler than the earlier plan, but it draws upon the experience which was gained in that operation and also on the experience derived from the direct distribution program which is presently being conducted. The direct distribution system could continue alongside my food certificate plan, insofar as direct distribution is considered preferable for school lunch programs and persons in public institutions. The food certificate plan would specifically encourage families and individuals at the lower end of the income scale to increase their consumption of foods in excess supply, and it would avoid the cumbersome distribution arrangements which at present are required where surplus commodities are made available to families and individuals outside institutions.

The Department of Agriculture has estimated that the supplemental purchasing power provided under the earlier food-stamp plan amounted to an average of 4 percent of total food sales in some of the cities where the plan operated. The Department says:

There is no doubt but what the plan did increase food consumption levels among participating groups.

That was the experience during 1939–43. The simplified plan which I am proposing will be even more widely effective, since it will operate on a nationwide basis.

Members will recall that the Agricultural Act of 1956 laid down a policy of disposal of all stocks of commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation as rapidly as possible consistent with its existing authority, the operation of the price-support program, and orderly liquidation. In this connection, the Secretary of Agriculture was required to submit, within 90 days of the enactment of the act, certain detailed programs with recommendations for any additional legislation needed to carry out these programs. One of the specified programs to be studied was "a food-stamp plan or similar program for distribution through States—including the District of Columbia, the Territories, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands—and local units of government of future surplus production to needy persons in the United States, its Territories and possessions, so as to prevent the accumulation of commodities in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation"—Public Law 540, 84th Congress, section 201 (b).

My bill meets exactly the specifications laid down in the Agricultural Act of 1956. It meets the administrative and other problems referred to in the Department of Agriculture's report, transmitted to the Speaker on January 3, 1957, in response to the statutory mandate. It is somewhat more inclusive than the limited-scope program for reaching potentially about 6 million persons, which is described in the Department's report, but it is not so extensive as the Department's medium-scope program for 16 million persons or its maximum-scope program for 25 million. Under my bill, between 7.5 and 8 million persons would currently be eligible for food certificates, and the amount distributed would be

something less than $1 billion in a full year of operation. I believe this would constitute an adequate and feasible beginning.

All the families and individuals becoming eligible under my bill would qualify by virtue of their eligibility for some other public benefit or on the basis of case reviews made by State or local agencies in ascertaining eligibility for other benefits. Consequently, no special and separate examination of their entitlement to food certificates would be required. The groups I recommend for eligibility are those who are receiving old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanent and totally disabled; persons receiving unemployment-compensation benefits; those receiving financial aid under the public-assistance program of any State or subdivision; and those persons certified by State or local welfare or public-assistance agencies as being in need of public assistance but not eligible for food certificates under any of the preceding categories. These number, as I have said, between 7.5 and 8 million persons. Extension of eligibility to other groups would entail a special review of pertinent facts for each family and individual; this kind of extension should be deferred until the need is evident and the methods can be worked out. My bill carries a time limit—June 30, 1958—which will insure early congressional review of the whole program.

Through the food certificate plan, we will under present conditions be raising to more nearly acceptable levels the food consumption of some 8 million people in the lowest income brackets. This, is, of course, the most important purpose of my proposal. At the same time, we would increase purchasing power used for food by nearly $1 billion a year, increasing the sales volume of grocery and other food and retail stores by approximately the same extent, and raising the income of farm operations—and especially those farmers whose produce is now selling at prices below parity. Finally, this food certificate plan would provide another built-in stabilizer, similar to unemployment insurance, which would buttress purchasing power further when the need increases and would diminish automatically when relief rolls decline.

This proposal richly deserves the wide support it has received from farm groups, labor groups, State and local welfare officials, retail food distributors, and the American people generally. The President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations recommended action along the lines of this plan, for it proposed nearly 2 years ago that the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare "jointly explore the possibility of distributing surplus agricultural commodities through commercial instead of governmental channels." The Commission expressed the opinion "that intergovernmental relationships in this area would be greatly simplified through some such device as a locally operated certificate plan."

Now that the plan has been studied by the Department of Agriculture, in response to the mandate in the Agricultural Act of 1956, the opposition which the Eisenhower administration had previously expressed toward a food stamp plan seems to be fading away. This is not surprising, since the use of normal trade channels, as provided in my bill, is precisely what the administration has called for in other fields, and it would be strange indeed if the Department of Agriculture were to continue to oppose the food certificate plan on the ground that this plan relies on normal trade channels in preference to a Government-operated food distribution system. Yet that is the argument which the Department advanced last year.

In closing this statement, I should like to repeat what was said by the Reverened James L. Vizzard, of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, when he endorsed this proposal:

> We have the food. Our brethren are hungry. The demands of justice and charity we believe are clear and urgent. On very few issues do the dictates of our conscience and of our self-interest coincide as strongly as here.

The time is ripe for enactment of the food certificate plan. Surely the Congress will act speedily to this end.

## Excise Tax on Furs Should Be Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 4, 1957*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, excise taxes imposed on some of our industries are having anything but a beneficial effect on these industries. In numerous instances business firms are operating at a loss or have been taxed out of business because of the exorbitant excise taxes.

One of these is the heavily taxed fur industry which has been severely hit in recent years. Much of this situation is a result of the 10 percent excise tax on furs which has proven to be very burdensome on the industry. This has increased the cost of furs to a considerable extent, thus taking them out of reach of the masses of American women for whom this article of clothing is no longer a luxury but a necessity.

Until a few years ago fur coats were widely popular and sufficiently low priced that women in all income groups could afford them. The excise tax and the rising trend of inflation have now made these fur garments beyond reach for the low-income group. When we consider the fact that the lower and middle-income groups purchase about 80 percent of all fur garments, it can be readily understood how this affects both the industry and the consumer.

The average consumer is deprived of purchasing a fur coat, even an inexpensive one, which in the colder sections of the country are an absolute necessity, because the excise tax has placed the low-priced fur garment out of her reach. It is significant to note that the Department of Labor includes fur coats in its cost-of-living index because it regards them as a cost-of-living item and, therefore, a necessity.

The fact that this item is no longer considered a luxury only emphasizes the need for revision and reconsideration of the excise tax imposed on furs, which under the circumstances seems like a punitive measure on an article that has become a part and parcel of our way of life. Fur garments are today the only items of wearing apparel upon which such a tax burden is levied. This is nothing short of discrimination against a whole industry, which is placed in an unfair competitive position with other sections of the garment industry.

The result is that in the postwar years since 1946 there has been a declining volume of retail fur sales, which is having a ruinous effect on the entire fur industry. This is evidenced by the fact that the number of business failures in this industry has been extremely high in this period, despite the high level of prosperity in the country.

A logical way to aid this industry would be to repeal the excise tax on furs. This tax violates the principles of sound economy and equity. Repeal of this tax would be reflected in lower prices of fur garments and would serve as a much-needed shot in the arm for the whole fur industry from the trapper all the way to the retail merchant. There is no justification for continuing this burdensome tax any longer. I strongly urge the Congress to repeal it as soon as possible.

## Small and Independent Manufacturers Complain About Price Discrimination and Call for a Strong Robinson-Patman Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 4, 1957*

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the 84th Congress extensive hearings were held by the House Small Business Committee on the subject of price discrimination and by the Committee on the Judiciary regarding legislative proposals to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act against price discriminations which substantially lessen competition and tend to create a monopoly. Small and independent businessmen and their representatives who testified during the course of those hearings were unanimous on the point that the price of price discrimination is destroying small business and our free and competitive enterprise system. They strongly supported H. R. 11, the equality of opportunity bill, which was designed to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act as a safeguard against

the monopolistic practice of price discrimination. Therefore, the reports which have been made to the House of Representatives including House Report No. 2966 by the House Select Committee on Small Business entitled "Price Discrimination, the Robinson-Patman Act, and the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws" reflect the testimony to which I have referred.

Despite the clear showing made in the reports on the hearings dealing with the practice of price discrimination and the pleas of small-business men for amendments to the laws to strengthen prohibitions against that monopolistic practice, we are now hearing and reading statements made by the opponents to the Robinson-Patman Act and to the proposals to help small business that the reports dealing with the practice of price discrimination which have been made to the House of Representatives "lack objectivity" and that they were based upon the testimony of selected witnesses. In that connection the following statement was made:

> For example, on that question of price discrimination, no food manufacturers or processors were called to give their views.

That statement is not only erroneous, it suggests that food manufacturers and processors would have been opposed to a strengthening of the anti-price-discrimination law. The truth is that the committee heard six witnesses from firms that manufacture bread and sell it at wholesale. Mr. Roosevelt's subcommittee heard 3 witnesses from this industry and, in addition, we received a petition signed by 48 other wholesale bakers calling for a strengthening of the Robinson-Patman Act. This petition is in our record.

The secretary of the Illinois Bakers Association told our committee that there had been a net reduction of independent wholesale bakers in his State of 50 percent from 10 years ago.

You cannot read anywhere either stronger or more intelligent and understanding pleas for a strengthening of the Robinson-Patman Act than were given by these wholesale bakers before our committee.

Now what is the reason for thinking that food processors are opposed to the act?

The report of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws made recommendations for weakening all subsections of the Robinson-Patman Act. As it happens, however, when our committee began hearings it was the recommendations in subsection 2 (c) that received publicity. A local lawyer-lobbyist who has carried on a campaign against one such section of the act after another, was then carrying on a campaign against subsection 2 (c). He appeared before our committee with prepared press releases which charged that this section is responsible for the growing spread between consumer prices and the prices farmers receive. This charge received terrific press notices all over the United States.

Consequently, I sent out a form letter to all food manufacturers and all fruit and vegetable canners listed in their directories. I asked them to tell me frankly, and off the record, what they thought of the act. I have never read such vigorous statements of support as these replies contained. The replies were vigorous in support of the act and for a strengthening of the act by a margin of more than 15 to 1.

Let me read a few sentences from some of the extracts.

One large food processor wrote:

> I am writing to state this company's strong opposition to the position of the Attorney General's Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws regarding the brokerage section of the Robinson-Patman Act.
>
> * * * * * *
>
> Please forgive the length of this letter. This company well remembers the brokerage practices that existed before the adoption of section 2 (c) of the Robinson-Patman Act. They were costly and unfair and should never be permitted again.

A vegetable canner wrote:

> We have vigorously defended the Robinson-Patman Act from its original enactment in 1936 for the reason that prior to that date we experienced some of the worst conditions from price cutting and freezing out of small manufacturers from several different angles, viz., secret rebates, fictitious retailers, and numerous other ways in which big distributors named the price of the processor regardless as to whether they were able to deliver merchandise at the price. We, therefore, think that instead of the Robinson-Patman Act being weakened that it should be strengthened as big business certainly is trying to get around and have been getting around the Robinson-Patman Act now for the past 2 years due to negligence on the part of the Federal Trade Commission that had a chairman who was in sympathy with big business.

An organization of food distributors wrote:

> We consider that the Robinson-Patman Act was one of the best pieces of legislation that ever happened in this country in the last 100 years.
>
> * * * * * *
>
> It may be, Congressman PATMAN, that some canners in this country are intimidated and afraid that anything they say might be held against them by large buyers, but if the truth was known the canning industry is 100 percent for the Robinson-Patman bill. Without it I honestly believe the economy of the whole country would be undermined. You have always had my keen admiration.

Another canner wrote:

> We think by all means the Robinson-Patman Act should be strengthened and a stop put to trying to wreck it.

A packer wrote:

> So far as our company is concerned, we certainly are in favor of retaining the present legislation and, as a matter of fact, strengthening this legislation, if such might be possible.

Another food processor wrote:

> We would be most interested in seeing this law strengthened manyfold, rather than weakened as big business is apparently trying to do.

Another canner wrote:

> We are certain that the majority of the membership of the National Canners Association is definitely opposed to the weakening.
>
> The writer and his company will be glad to go on record at any time in saying that we favor strengthening of the act rather than any weakening.

Another food processor wrote:

> As a small-business man, I would like to see the Robinson-Patman Act strengthened wherever necessary, especially the clause which entitles a manufacturer to meet competitive prices.

Let me read you a letter which came to me just the other day from the president of a small canning company. This is a small but a substantial company. The letter is dated January 23, 1957.

This gentleman has been doing some research on the canning companies in his industry. Beginning with the directory of the National Canners Association in 1954, there were 1,911 canning firms listed. By the close of 1955, 581 of these, or 30 percent had gone out of business. These are not merely canning plants but canning firms. Some firms had more than one plant. More than that, it does not include new firms which started up and then went out of business in this 10-year period.

His letter reads as follows:

> SALTER CANNING CO., INC.,
> *North Rose, N. Y., January 23, 1957.*
>
> Representative WRIGHT PATMAN,
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR MR. PATMAN: I am grateful to have your letter of the 8th, January, in reply to mine of December 17 and 20. In the past I have remarked upon the mortality rate within our industry, and recently I decided to bring together some talking statistics. The findings, enclosed, even startle me.
>
> Forty-five States are listed. Three States had no fruit or vegetable canneries. Earlier we sent questionnaires to the several regional associations. Some replied, some did not. The extreme right column gives their reports for 1956 to 1957. The 13 for Virginia and 12 for Wisconsin—we understand these are old operators. Of interest is that the failure rate is now at a quickening pace. This, at a time of an expanding economy and boom. What would it be in a depression?
>
> Of course, here is the truth: Small business is not participating in the expansion or in the boom. It is clearly demonstrated here. There is no reason to believe that the canning industry is the only one so on the decline. I dare say this is the picture of all small businesses.
>
> Two years ago this March the Attorney General's committee issued its study of the antitrust laws. I predicted it was a signal the bars were down, that the Robinson-Patman Act was dead. This extremely high mortality rate in our industry can only imply that as tin-can prices to us are hiked (three time during 1956), our large competitors are enjoying the old rebates. I am watching the situation closely; we are in strong position financially; and if the storm drifts our way, we are closing up tighter than a drum.
>
> From past history and in light of current events, it seems to me the committee should be devoting its attention to paving the way for one giant corporation and one giant bank. I am serious. The will of the people through Congress is consistently ignored by our Federal administrative agencies—here I have in mind the FTC and antitrust—and our high courts have furnished tremendous momentum toward that end.
>
> Most sincerely,
>
> L. J. SALTER,
> *Salter Canning Co.*

*Decline in the number of names of independent canners of basic fruits and vegetables, in the continental United States, from the close of 1945 to the close of 1955—taken from the National Canners Association's Canners Directory of 1946 and 1956*

Total number of firms:

| | |
|---|---|
| Close of 1945 | 1,911 |
| Close of 1955 | 1,330 |
| Decline in 10-year period | 581 |
| Percent of decline | 30.4 |

(This decline is in the number of firms. Some firms that closed had two or more plants. Also, to this decline can be added many new canners that started up but quit within the designated 10-year period. Reckoning with these two aspects, the closure of individual plants would exceed the decline here recorded by another 7 to 10 percent.)

| State | Number of firms in NCA directory of 1946 | Number of firms in NCA directory of 1956 | Individual plants closed during 1956–57 as reported to date (incomplete) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | 3 | 2 | |
| Arizona | 3 | 5 | |
| Arkansas | 124 | 36 | |
| California | 184 | 143 | |
| Colorado | 15 | 12 | |
| Connecticut | 4 | 2 | |
| Delaware | 21 | 23 | |
| District of Columbia | 1 | 1 | |
| Florida | 63 | 40 | |
| Georgia | 25 | 25 | |
| Idaho | 5 | 7 | |
| Illinois | 55 | 44 | 0 |
| Indiana | 134 | 73 | |
| Iowa | 20 | 14 | 0 |
| Kansas | 4 | 1 | |
| Kentucky | 17 | 9 | |
| Louisiana | 27 | 21 | |
| Maine | 33 | 25 | |
| Maryland | 168 | 128 | |
| Massachusetts | 11 | 7 | |
| Michigan | 49 | 50 | 0 |
| Minnesota | 18 | 17 | |
| Mississippi | 7 | 5 | |
| Missouri | 64 | 21 | |
| Montana | 3 | 4 | |
| Nebraska | 6 | 4 | |
| New Jersey | 51 | 32 | 0 |
| New Mexico | 4 | 3 | |
| New York | 107 | 98 | |
| North Carolina | 10 | 14 | |
| Ohio | 83 | 63 | |
| Oklahoma | 11 | 9 | |
| Oregon | 39 | 38 | |
| Pennsylvania | 70 | 64 | |
| Rhode Island | 1 | 1 | |
| South Carolina | 13 | 13 | |
| Tennessee | 26 | 11 | 5 |
| Texas | 77 | 45 | 3 |
| Utah | 22 | 18 | |
| Vermont | 2 | 1 | |
| Virginia | 150 | 70 | [1] 13 |
| Washington | 48 | 35 | |
| West Virginia | 9 | 7 | |
| Wisconsin | 113 | 88 | 12 |
| Wyoming | 1 | 1 | |
| Total | 1,911 | 1,330 | [2] |

[1] Eastern Virginia.
[2] Incomplete.

## Growing Problems of Recreational Boating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 4, 1957*

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, last July the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, at the suggestion of the manufacturers of small boats and engines, initiated a comprehensive study of the growing problems of recreational boating throughout the country. Some 20 full days of hearings were held in Washington, the Great Lakes area, the west coast, major centers in the North and Middle Atlantic areas, the western rivers area, the gulf coast, and Florida. More than 300 witnesses, from all walks of life and representing every phase of boating activity, were heard.

Out of this mass of testimony the committee members learned at first hand of the recent explosive development of America's fastest growing sport.

Since the hearings were not concluded until early December of 1956, time did not permit the adoption of a report and recommendations in the last Congress. This important subject, however, is high on the committee's agenda for action early in this session, on the basis of the comprehensive record which has been made.

During the course of the hearings much testimony was presented showing that recent developments in the field of recreational boating are creating problems in many areas, and that some State and local regulatory action is being initiated to meet these problems. At the same time, however, the consensus was that the Federal Government should lead the way with basic legislation and regulation to which the States could conform, and thus avoid the chaos that would result from a hodge-podge of conflicting State and local laws and regulations.

Almost every member of the committee took part in the hearings in Washington and one or more of the hearings held at boating centers throughout the country. Probably none was as faithful in attendance upon the many days of hearings as my good friend and colleague, JOHN J. ALLEN, JR., of California. Therefore, even though the committee has not yet taken action on the problems of recreational boating, and consequently no position has been established, I feel that his views on the subject will be of great interest to all concerned. I am therefore offering for insertion in the RECORD the text of Congressman ALLEN'S excellent talk before the annual meeting of the American Boat and Yacht Council, Inc., at the New York Coliseum on January 24, 1957.

The text follows:

TALK OF JOHN J. ALLEN, JR., MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN BOAT AND YACHT COUNCIL, INC., AT THE NEW YORK COLISEUM ON JANUARY 24, 1957

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I appreciate very much the opportunity to be here with you today and discuss the hearings which the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has held throughout the United States on the questions of recreational boating safety.

The problem as to whether there should be Federal legislation in addition to that already enacted to accomplish greater safety in the use of small boats was brought to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House of Representatives before any critical problem came into existence. There has been, therefore, no evidence of any distress that requires hurried legislative action. The committee would proceed very slowly except for the desire to establish a pattern of legislation in the interest of having uniform laws throughout the Nation.

The committee has a very positive desire not to hamper or interfere with the enjoyment of the sport of boating. It does not want to enact any legislation which will be a burden upon anyone, either because of the size of his vessel or his investment, his age, or the nature of the opportunity he has to enjoy this family sport.

The committee has taken no action as yet. Necessarily, therefore, what I may say about future actions is just one Member's opinion.

Basically the most general problem is whether or not any legislation at all is required on a Federal level. I believe that most of the committee would agree that some early action in some fields would be a step forward.

A second very general problem concerns the matter of jurisdiction. There are areas in which the Federal Government is charged with legislative responsibility and others in which it has no authority to act and the State governments are in a similar position. There are areas in the legislative field in which there may be concurrent jurisdiction and the problem is whether the Federal Government or the more local governments should enact and enforce the necessary laws. The Merchant Marine Committee has no desire to increase the scope of activities of the Federal Government in fields in which the States may act. On the other hand, the Federal Government is probably the agency best able to bring about uniformity of laws throughout the Nation by taking actions which will establish a pattern for the several States. Uniformity is highly desirable, rather than have 48 different State laws and a 49th Federal law.

There must also be a decision as to whether enforcement of boating laws should be continued by an extension of the use of civil penalties under the procedures which the Coast Guard has followed in the past or whether some simplified procedure in the courts should be developed similar to the procedure used in the handling of automobile traffic cases.

SPECIFIC PROBLEMS

1. Registration and numbering: There is general agreement with some exceptions that all motor-driven boats should be registered and numbered for purposes of identification. Those who observe the illegal or negligent operation of vessels find it difficult or impossible to identify the vessel in order to locate the person responsible. Where boats are stolen or lost the police and others have difficulty in identifying the property involved and in returning it to its proper owner. On occasions, boats are washed ashore and authorities have no way of knowing the circumstances under which they became adrift or whether the occupants have been lost. The collection of taxes requires some method of identifying the vessels taxed.

My opinion is that some system for the numbering of all motor-propelled vessels will be required by law and that the committee will so recommend.

There is a probem as to what agency should be responsible for the numbering of vessels. The Coast Guard has customarily carried Federal law into execution in this regard. Several States have laws requiring the numbering of vessels, either for tax purposes or for other reasons. In my opinion, the number of small vessels is so great that it is not realistic to expect that the Coast Guard will be expanded to a degree which would enable it to undertake a national numbering system as an exclusive Federal activity. Rather, I would expect that a system of numbers would be worked out and that the Federal and States agencies would take appropriate shares of responsibility under which full coverage of the problem would be had and in which the numbers awarded by one agency would be honored by the other.

Under the present numbering system, an award of number once made need never be renewed and the penalty for not complying with the numbering law is so small that noncompliance is not a serious matter.

It would seem to be desirable that legislation should provide for a renewal of the award at some fixed interval, such as 3 or 4 years, and that the failure to have an awarded number currently valid would invoke a higher penalty.

There have been some proposals that a certificate awarding a number might be revokable for cause. In effect, such a rule would make the owner of the vessel responsible for its proper operation to some degree. I personally have great doubt that it would be good law to punish an owner for the act of another operator.

It has also been suggested that some simple test might be given to each applicant for a certificate awarding a number. If such a test were sufficiently simple as to not to deter the enjoyment of the sport as might be the case, if such an applicant were required to answer some nontechnical questions concerning the laws under which he would probably operate and certify as to his own physical abilities to see and hear, etc., I would see no objection to it.

2. Operators' licenses: There is a great deal of controversy as to whether or not the operators of powerboats should be licensed and if so, what qualifications should be required before a license was issued. Most of those now operating boats who might be required to obtain a license contend that licensing of operators is unnecessary. I doubt that our committee is ready to recommend any general requirement that operators of pleasure craft should be licensed.

On the other hand, I think some form of licensing will come. There are already proposals in specific fields. There is the suggestion that professional boatmen employed to operate small pleasure craft should be licensed. Another suggestion would require a license for the amateur operators of the larger pleasure boats. There have been suggestions that no license should be issued to minors under some fixed age.

It would seem to me to be well for the industry and the sportsmen to recognize that attempts will be made to license operators, in limited fields at first, but ultimately rather generally and that the proposals will be better if they come from the industry and sportsmen rather than from other sources.

3. Inspections by the United States Coast Guard or similar agencies: Some questions have been raised which might indicate that the Coast Guard should have greater powers with regard to the inspection of boats. A recent action of Congress increased these powers with regard to boats carrying more than six passengers for hire. The powers of inspection with regard to small boats' safety equipment are limited to vessels under way. There is some sense to the suggestions that such an inspection might be made before the vessel leaves the dock and the potential deficiencies be listed before any violation of law occurs or any operation in an unsafe condition is started. However, we do not generally give enforcement officers the power to act in anticipation that persons will violate a law.

There is also the suggestion that there should be an inspection of boats available for hire and possibly that the operators of boat liveries should be licensed, either to carry on the business or to provide a license for each boat or boats. The reason is somewhat similar to that which brought about the law requiring the inspection of boats carrying passengers for hire.

However, the Commandant of the Coast Guard indicated to us that he did not believe that any further authority to inspect should be given to the Coast Guard at this time, and I have great respect for his opinion and am inclined to follow it.

4. Legislation to govern the operation of boats: The great increase in the number of small pleasure craft, the congestion that is produced in many areas and the new capabilities of small craft with regard to speed and mobility have brought suggestions that there should be a specification of additional offenses in connection with operations which produce unsafe conditions or that there should be a redefinition or expansion with regard to actions which are considered reckless or negligent.

At the outset of our hearings it seemed to me that there were a variety of situations which might be governed by specific regulations. Specific speed limits might be fixed. Specific prohibitions against operations in certain waters might be ordered. It soon became apparent, however, that local conditions are so varied and the vessels themselves vary so greatly that a more general statement of standards of conduct might serve better with regard to recklessness or negligence. A rule requiring operation in a careful and prudent manner and at a rate of speed which would not endanger life, limb, or property is probably better than fixing a rate of speed. The inclusion, within the definition of recklessness or negligence, of all operations which are unsafe, whether it be operating at an unreasonable rate of speed, overloading a boat, endangering the lives of others by knowingly taking them into dangerous waters, or damaging other vessels or property by the creation of an unreasonable wake, or operating unsafely through areas reserved for swimmers or dangerous skiing practices with easily enforceable penalties will probably take care of most of the requirements in the type of law that our committee should recommend.

LEGISLATIVE POSSIBILITIES

This brings me to a consideration of what legislation may be recommended by our committee during the present session of Congress:

1. Some additional Federal law should be passed. It should be developed conservatively to the end that at the outset a simple basic law will result that will control in Federal waters and furnish a pattern for a uniform set of State laws.

2. The Federal law should authorize concurrent jurisdiction with the States over small-boat operations, particularly in waters not usually used by vessels engaged in interstate or foreign commerce. Under such circumstances, the State laws should be reasonably compatible with Federal law.

3. The Coast Guard should be the executive agency for the enforcement of any Federal law. The agency should be enlarged with regard to its operations in connection with the programs having to do with small boats. Possibly, a special division of the Coast Guard should devote its full time to such problems. In all probability no new legislation would be required to accomplish these changes. The recommendations of the Merchant Marine Committee might have some bearing in having additional funds appropriated to accomplish the desired results.

4. The definition of "reckless and negligent operation" should be made sufficiently certain as to make sure that all of the offenses which we wish to have included are actually included in the interpretation of the law with regard to this phrase. Whether more legislation is required or whether a statement in a committee report will serve, I do not know. Some penalties should be changed. The penalty for failure to have a currently valid certificate of award of number should be raised so as to impel compliance. Some of the penalties for present misdemeanors are probably so severe that the executive agencies overlook many minor offenses.

5. The manner of enforcement of law in connection with minor offenses and particularly the proposal to expand the scope of Coast Guard activity in enforcing civil penalties may require legislation. I am personally inclined to maintain a separation of the powers of government even in minor matters, and this belief indicates to me that the Congress should make the Federal laws, the executive branch through the Coast Guard in this field should enforce them, and the courts should administer justice and fix the penalties for violations which are technically criminal in nature. A simplified procedure under which the Coast Guard enforce the laws is undoubtedly necessary. In national parks the rangers bring traffic violators and other minor offenders before the United States commissioners, who act as magistrates. A similar procedure might be authorized in connection with minor offenses in the operation of small boats. It is also possible that State officials and the courts might be authorized to have concurrent jurisdiction in the enforcement of such penalties. In any event, the present cumbersome procedure under which the Coast Guard brings minor offenders before the Federal courts needs to be changed.

6. Standards for construction and equipment: There was not much indication that any legislation would be required at this time concerning standards or construction or equipment. We were not informed of any statement of standards in which there was common agreement nor was it indicated to us that the Coast Guard would like to endeavor to develop such standards. Desirable standards can probably be developed better through industry cooperation than by law.

My own opinion is that a code of good practice with regard to construction and equipment can and should be developed and that the certificate of compliance with the code from some well respected industry organization, such as the American Boat and Yacht Council, might be placed on the product and give the public the assurance that the product is satisfactory for the purpose intended. In other fields, such industry organizations have risen to positions of such reliability that they are recognized in law as the agency which fixes the standards satisfactory to the Government. The progress which your organization has already made indicates to me that it might soon receive such recognition.

7. Some legislation may be desirable to implement the gathering of statistics. A requirement that operators involved in accidents should report the nature thereof to some governmental agency as is done in many States with regard to automobile accidents will undoubtedly be considered by the committee. However, legislation with regard to most statistics is probably not required if the various departments of government in the Federal and State Governments will set about to organize the systematic compilation of statistics that can be voluntarily made available.

8. In order to bring about uniformity in the Federal law and the laws of the several States, the committee will consider some incentives designed to bring earlier action in this direction. I believe that the State governments are highly cooperative and recognize the desirability of fairly uniform laws. Such has been the experience with regard to the operation of automobiles. However, if functions of registration and enforcement are delegated by the Federal Government to the States, provisions that any fees that are collected should remain with the States for appropriate expenditure might be desirable. The suggestion that the portion of the gas tax collected on fuel for

marine use might be similarly returned to States will also be considered and some recommendations to the appropriate committees of the House may be made.

SAFETY IN OPERATION

The members of the committee recognize that complete safety cannot be legislated. Punishment of the negligent and reckless touches only a small fraction of those engaged in boating. We recognize also that, commendable as it has been, the efforts of the organizations which have voluntarily carried on educational programs have been able to reach only a minute fraction of the vast numbers of those who have come into this rapidly developing sport. As the rate of growth decreases and the proportion of experienced sportsmen to newcomers in the field becomes greater with passage of time, the situation will improve. I believe that the services of the usual institutions of public education can be enlisted to augment the efforts of the volunteer organizations which have carried the program on so well in the past. In all probability, however, no additional legislation is needed or desirable at this time.

OTHER MATTERS FOR STUDY

The committee heard testimony concerning the various pilot rules. I believe that it is not ready to act with regard to any changes. However, having in mind the many changes that have occurred since the rules were originally formulated, both in the nature of the vessels which are governed and the use of the water in which they operate, it would seem to me that a study of the various rules and an effort to restate them should be considered. In some instances, the rules can be made more uniform. Undoubtedly, the varying situations in many local areas have required rules different from those required in other areas. I am somewhat of the opinion that a single set of rules for all waters could take the place of the four sets of rules we now have with some of the needless variations eliminated and the traditional needs of individual areas still provided for.

It might be desirable at this time to state generally in the rules that they were formulated with the thought in mind that they were rules to govern between vessels of equal maneuverability and that a rule of prudence would still require that the smaller vessels able to operate in less restricted waters and with greater maneuverability should give way to the larger vessels in many instances where a strict compliance with the rules might give the smaller vessel a right to consider itself as the privileged vessel. However, I would not expect the committee to make any changes in the rules of the road without further hearings which might develop with great precision what changes, if any, might be desirable.

CONCLUSION

In summary, as I review in my own mind the hearings which have been held by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in the various parts of the country during the past 6 months and the testimony given by the several hundred witnesses, I think the following conclusions can be reasonably based upon them:

(a) There will be early Federal legislation recommended of a rather simple basic nature suitable to govern operations in the Federal waters and to serve as a pattern for uniform laws throughout the States.

(b) Enforcement procedures will be streamlined and simplified so that minor offenses may be treated in a manner comparable to that in which minor offenses under automobile traffic laws are now treated.

(c) Uniformity between State and Federal laws will be fostered and States will be encouraged to carry much of the responsibility, both for legislation of a general nature, legislation suited to local areas, and enforcement of law generally.

(d) A need for more legislation will follow and it will be forthcoming as the need is demonstrated from time to time.

(e) Congress will look to the industry to develop and police its own standards of construction and equipment. It will legislate in this field if it feels that the industry is not carrying its responsibility or when an industry organization recognized for its reliability brings recommendations to it.

Thank you very much.

---

## Address by Hon. Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico, Before 55th Annual Convention, American Road Builders Association

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, February 4, 1957*

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] before the 55th Annual Convention of the American Road Builders Association, at Chicago, Ill., on Monday, January 28, 1957.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ, UNITED STATES SENATE, CHAIRMAN, SENATE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, AT 55TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF AMERICAN ROAD BUILDERS ASSOCIATION, CHICAGO, ILL., JANUARY 28, 1957

I have been attending your annual meetings for many years and I want you to know that I always look forward to them. It is a great pleasure for me to speak to an eminent group of people such as you have here today.

I notice that this is your 55th annual convention and want to congratulate you on this long record of effort to improve services and facilities which mean so much to our national economy. You represent an important element of our national industrial and economic structure. I cannot refrain from using the word "structure" since the connotation fits the name of your association. The word "builders" is synonomous with the development of our own great country.

Last year at your convention in Miami Beach, I spoke to you on the subject of "Major Aspects of the Senate Highway Bill." I am very happy that the character of the legislation has changed and that it is now Federal law.

One year ago we had many questions to resolve on legislation and had much ground to cover. On June 29, 1956, about five months after I spoke to you at Miami Beach, the many problems of authorizing of and financing the highway program were resolved and enacted into law. This law provides for a total Federal expenditure of $27,350,000,000 and participation by States, in the amount of $5,150,000,000. I feel justified in bragging just a little bit about such a major accomplishment. I might add that the law provides for the greatest single program for improving our national economy ever known. I am extremely happy and grateful to the people of my State of New Mexico for giving me the opportunity to represent them and in turn become chairman of the committee of the Senate which handled the legislation for the highway program.

Our committee does not cease to be interested in legislation upon its enactment into law. As a matter of fact, under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, our committees of Congress are called upon to exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the Congress by the executive agencies.

Our committee must supply the leadership which is required in advancing the program of improving not only our great system of highways but also our vast network of inland waterways and harbors on our seacoasts and on the Great Lakes, the flood control program which has provided protection for lives and property and the development of hydroelectric power which is an important by-product of a multipurpose water development program.

Our committee is responsible for legislation dealing with the extremely important water and air pollution control needs of our Nation. We also handled the legislation concerning the protection of upstream areas which is known as the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.

Another extremely important piece of legislation which our committee handled authorized funds to complete the Inter-American Highway through Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Panama. Your Inter-American Division has done a very good job of working with the people of those countries and in turn actually made the "good neighbor" policy work.

Our committee approved projects for the construction of 150 post office and Federal office buildings during the 84th Congress. In addition, there were many other legislative matters which were handled by our committee.

I review the activities of our committee primarily to point out to you many representatives of manufacturers, processors, contractors, and engineers, that we have an extremely widespread interest in public works improvement in our country—all of which requires materials and services which you are showing and discussing during this week in Chicago.

This great city of Chicago has a vital interest in every bit of the legislation mentioned. The excellent Chicago Harbor has received and is continuing to receive attention from our committee. The 29,000 miles of inland waterways of our country, many miles of which serve Chicago, have and will also continue to receive the attention of our committee. The Great Lakes connecting channels which will provide a 27-foot depth between Lake Erie and Lakes Superior and Michigan, was handled by our committee. The water and air pollution control legislation is of extreme importance to this fine area.

We also reported out and passed a bill which would authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, to test on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway. Testimony was presented by Senator DOUGLAS, and other competent witnesses, that even though Chicago does have essentially complete treatment of its sewage, additional flows of fresh water are required to dilute the treated sewage effluent. However, President Eisenhower vetoed the bill because of the fear that such a diversion would affect lake levels along the Canadian border and thus cause international complications. He also said that the interests of other States might be affected.

As chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, it is my plan to continue to search for ways and means of accelerating the completion of work now authorized and to perfect legislation which will allow for a consistent and orderly program of highways, navigation, harbor, beach erosion, flood control, hydroelectric power, and pollution control works and public building construction throughout our Nation.

We in Congress, in passing the highway bill, recognized that a start needed to be made in the actual laying of concrete and asphalt over which vehicles may travel. We also recognized that the 40,000 miles of the Interstate System may not be the ultimate mileage which should be included in that system. We did increase the authorization by 1,000 miles.

States have recently reviewed their additional needs for the Interstate System and have estimated that an additional 12,500 miles are desirable. This raises the question as to the adequacy of the presently authorized 41,000 miles of interstate routes to interconnect the principal cities of our Nation.

I do not suggest that there should be an immediate authorization for additional miles on the Interstate System, but in my capacity as chairman of the Public Works Committee, I must look to the future, not only for 13 to 15 or 20 years, but beyond that period. We must obtain the best estimates possible of the needs for this system and plan legislative action. As you all know, proper planning on any project, whether it be for roads, flood control, navigation, irrigation, power, or pollution control, must be done so that we can get the most return for each dollar invested.

In the 1956 Highway Act we call for several major studies. These studies are: (1) Cost of completing the Interstate System, (2) maximum desirable dimensions and weights, (3) reimbursement for certain highways, (4) safety study, and (5) study of the cost and benefits of highways to highway users.

The study on the cost of completing the designated portion of the Interstate System is scheduled for submission to Congress by January 12, 1958. In my opinion, this study will need to be followed by other studies which will determine the additions which should be made to the Interstate System so that we in Congress may be able to explore the need for legislative action dealing with future requirements. We must plan for the future. We should now have plans for a much longer range highway program as it relates not only to the Interstate System but also to the primary, secondary, and urban program. The systems are all interrelated. We need to know about the entire system needs so that the program of highway construction can be properly balanced. In many cases it is just as important to have well improved primary, secondary, and urban routes as it is to have a highly developed interstate route. Actually many are interstate, in that they provide needed interconnection between important parts of States.

The study of maximum desirable dimensions and weights is extremely important to enable you manufacturers of highway transportation equipment to properly design such vehicles. The highways need to be designed on the basis of the economic factors involved. As you probably know, there is a point at which overloading results in extremely rapid deterioration of the road. I understand that the tests to be conducted in the State of Illinois will provide much data. The information obtained can be used to correlate between maximum weights and dimensions of vehicles and strength and thickness of road subgrades and pavement. We must be certain that our highways do not become obsolete because of improper design or because excessive loads are imposed on them. We in Congress want to see the taxpayer's dollar properly spent and also to see that each taxpayer using the roads is given fair treatment in his use of the road. After the results of studies are available, we can then determine to what extent, if any, the present law will require amending with respect to maximum weights and dimensions of vehicles allowable on Federal-aid highways.

The study of reimbursement for certain highways will be completed before July 1, 1957, which should allow the Bureau of Public Roads sufficient time to report to Congress by January 12, 1958.

Some States have already constructed to required Interstate standards, toll or free highways which have been or may be selected for the final location of the Interstate System, and other States are proceeding along similar lines. It is our view in Congress that those States which have provided adequate facilities which may be selected for final location of the Interstate System should, as a matter of equity, be reimbursed or given credit for such construction expenditures. We must look forward to the time when legislative consideration must be given to this problem.

The safety study called for in the 1956 Highway Act is far reaching and must be made objectively and thoroughly. The study must furnish us with sufficient information so that we can determine the place the Federal Government might properly take in preventing or at least reducing the injuries and fatalities resulting from highway traffic.

Dr. Paul D. White, the eminent heart specialist of Boston has written to me concerning the problem of highway accidents. Dr. White points out that speed causes at least half of the highway accidents and that most drivers do not appreciate the power which they have at their command in the modern automobile. He suggests that Federal legislation would probably be needed to control the making of automobiles so that their speed would be limited. I am sure that many suggestions will be made by other people on ways by which safety will be improved. I am also sure that this subject will be controversial insofar as control measures are concerned. We in Congress will need to have much wisdom and exercise great care when we deal with legislation on safety.

Another study called for in the 1956 Highway Act deals with the costs and benefits of highways to highway users and others. The purpose of this study is to make available to Congress, information so that we may determine what Federal taxes should be imposed, and in what amounts among the various classes of vehicles using the Federal-aid highways or otherwise deriving benefits from the highways.

In conclusion, I would like to summarize for you the legislative program relating to highways which I envision within the next few years.

1. Consideration of needs for additions to interstate mileage.

2. Consideration of needs for accelerating primary, secondary, and urban projects.

3. Possible rescheduling of priorities for construction of total system of highways to provide most economic and useful arterial highways. This should be done only after a complete evaluation is made by Federal and State highway officials.

4. Review and approval of reports dealing with apportionment of funds among States on the "needs" basis.

5. Review of present law on maximum weights and dimensions with possible amendment depending on what studies now completed and under way will show.

6. Determination of the manner and degree to which States will be reimbursed for roads now constructed.

7. Study results of safety research program and determine whether Federal legislation is required or not.

8. Determine the advisability of assessing Federal taxes among persons using the Federal-aid highways in proportion to benefits derived or uses made thereof.

During our recent hearings on the progress of the highway program, I was quite interested in observations made by General Prentiss. He referred to the fact that many county engineers and administrators feel that the emphasis on the interstate system may result in overlooking some of the problems of the counties and the secondary system. He suggests an advisory committee of county officials to the Bureau of Public Roads to facilitate coordination of State and county systems. I believe that his suggestion has considerable merit. I do not want to see the secondary system neglected and I assure you that our committee will make it our business to accelerate work on this very important system.

General Prentiss recommended that committees be set up for the purpose of determining desirable extensions to the interstate system and to recommend coordinating controls and priority of construction for the interstate system and to try and work out a method whereby the improvements of highways will be made in a continuing and orderly fashion.

I might add that I have always worked for a program of development for our navigation, harbors, and water resources on a sustained and consistent basis so that we may put these resources to beneficial use at an early date and at the least cost to the tax-paying public.

I hope that everyone will work aggressively in carrying out the immense program of highway construction and that there will be no bottlenecks created by shortages of steel, cement, and other materials required. I also hope that engineers and other technical help will see fit to enter this field and push the program to completion. We in Congress shall be on the alert to help in any way possible in eliminating causes of delay. We shall assume our responsibility in reviewing the program from time to time to determine causes of delay. We shall also look forward to other legislative actions which will accelerate all public-works programs.

It has been a great pleasure to be here and I want to thank you for your many courtesies.

---

## A New Approach to Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, February 4, 1957*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my colleagues well know of my long interest in the problem of disarmament. During the past year that interest has taken a concrete and, I hope, useful form in the work of the Senate Special Subcommittee on Disarmament, on which I have been privileged to serve as chairman. As a delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations, I have also recently had an opportunity to consider this problem from the vantage point of international opinion and from a practical negotiation point of view.

As a result of these various interests and experiences, I have tried to formulate some constructive suggestions in an article entitled "A New Approach to Disarmament," which appeared in the New Republic on December 24, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW APPROACH TO DISARMAMENT

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

After 10 years of negotiations, all efforts to achieve a reduction and control of the world's armaments have ended in failure. Why? The most common explanation is the lack of agreement on the admittedly critical substantive issues. Clearly the major powers have not been able to agree on what weapons should be reduced or eliminated, how the agreed reduction should be enforced, what kind of an inspection system should be devised to guard against surprise attack, and what should be done if violations of the agreement should occur.

No items on our foreign-policy agenda merit a higher priority than do solutions to these substantive issues. They are ones which have for the past year absorbed the attention of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Disarmament of which I am the chairman. It is my hope that recommendations resulting from the study will contribute to a solution.

There exists, however, another aspect of the questions which, although seldom discussed in hearings or articles, is of great importance. That is the method used in disarmament negotiations by the major powers. Methods can prevent or encourage agreement. Failure to appreciate this point can also jeopardize the world's chances of finding real security against the threat of a third world war waged with deadly nuclear weapons.

Disarmament negotiations have ignored fundamental principles used successfully in other types of negotiations not too dissimilar from disarmament talks. Although the proposals of the major powers have changed or shifted in recent years, the methods have remained basically unchanged. In short, they have become obsolete. New approaches are needed which may offer brighter prospects for reaching agreement than the methods in the past.

METHODS OF THE PAST

Disarmament negotiations until 1952 were carried on almost exclusively through two Commissions of the United Nations. One was called the Commission on Conventional Armaments and the other the Atomic Energy Commission. Each Commission considered the problems of disarmament relegated to it independently of the other. Little attempt was made to coordinate the work of the two. Both Commissions had a relatively large membership: one 11 nations, the other 12. Both conducted all their work in public session. Neither had the benefit of permanent staff assistance except the assistance which each individual country brought to the meetings. Neither could discuss world political and security problems which were related to disarmament.

In 1950, President Truman proposed that the two Commissions be merged into a single disarmament Commission. This suggestion was adopted by the United Nations and a new United Nations Disarmament Commission was created. Although the change had the advantage of joining discussion on all types of weapons, it retained the other features of the earlier Commission's methods. That is, all sessions were conducted in public, the membership remained at 12, and political questions continued to be excluded from the agenda.

The United Nations General Assembly, in 1953, made another modification in the method of disarmament negotiations. This change was aimed at the size of the Commission and at the public nature of the talks. It was argued at that time that with the talks conducted in public the negotiators appeared to be more concerned with the public-relations value of what they said than whether the substance of their proposals would help achieve disarmament.

The size of the Commission membership was criticized on the ground that it was too large for effective consultation. Many of the members of the United Nations also felt that the negotiations should more properly be limited to the major powers. The result of these criticisms was the decision by the General Assembly to create a subcommittee of the Disarmament Commission. The subcommittee would be composed of the five major atomic powers—the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, France, and Canada. These nations were to make a renewed effort to reach agreement and they were to follow semisecret procedures. In other words, the subcommittee would meet in private and release only periodic information on how the talks were progressing. At the end of a session of negotiations the verbatim records were to be made public.

This procedure has been followed by the subcommittee from 1954 to the present. The function of the Disarmament Commission has been limited primarily to receiving the reports of its subcommittee and forwarding them to the General Assembly.

In 1955, two other techniques were injected into disarmament discussions. One was the meeting of the heads of Government—the summit conference in July and the Foreign Ministers' Conference in October. The second has been the exchange of letters between President Eisenhower and Premier Bulganin. Both of these efforts have been primarily a public exchange of views. They cannot be called negotiations. As such they undoubtedly focused world opinion on the disarmament problem, helped to build up public pressure on the major powers to reach agreement, and possibly reduced international tension in some areas. As a means of resolving the issues of disarmament, however, these methods are ineffectual. The solution of the issues ultimately can come about only through negotiation. This principle underlies many of the following comments, criticisms, and suggestions regarding the methods of achieving arms control. My suggestions on new methods which might be tried are divided into seven categories. The suggestions in each might be tried without reference to the others; but all seven areas could be worked into a total plan for a new or modified approach.

AGENDA AND PROCEDURES

The United Nations Subcommittee on Disarmament in its 3 years of deliberations has followed no particular agenda and has adopted a minimum of procedures. Such procedures as are followed were set forth by a member of the United Nations Secretariat at the subcommittee's 22d meeting:

"That the chairmanship should be rotated in English alphabetical order; that there should be no specific rules of procedure but that all decisions of the subcommittee should be taken by general and unanimous agreement; that the record should be verbatim in three languages * * * ; that the interpretations should be simultaneous * * *; that the meetings should be strictly closed and private, with the possibility that occasionally the representatives of the subcommittee might meet even without a record being made by the Secretariat, if that were desired."

This very loose arrangement of no agenda and a minimum of rules has had the advantage to date of allowing the nations represented on the subcommittee to cover a wide range of the issues of disarmament. The principal technique pursued in the negotiations has consisted of the presentation of the views of the governments represented, followed by the exchange of questions and and answers on particular points made. One meeting might, and did, cover several separate topics. The next meeting might cover some of the same topics, omit some, and include new ones. There was no attempt to restrict the discussion or to deal with one topic solely until all facets had been explored by all the parties present. This procedure, although resulting in no definite agreement, did move the Western nations and the Soviet Union closer together on a number of issues. It has served a useful purpose. Future negotiations, however, ought to be more orderly.

One of the main reasons why they ought to be more orderly is that neither side wishes to commit itself to any area of arms control without knowing what position will be taken on other areas. The United States, for example, has maintained that it cannot agree to a ban on nuclear weapons tests without knowing what the Russians will agree to on conventional weapons and an inspection system to guard against surprise attack. The Russians say they do not propose to agree on an inspection system until they know what will be the agreed upon reductions of armaments and armed forces. Thus the negotiations go around and around, not having any one place to start and certainly no place to end.

A way out of this dilemma is to adopt an agenda which permits each major issue of disarmament to be discussed separately until a tentative agreement has been reached. For example, the negotiators might first delineate the broad major issues of disarmament, such as the control of nuclear weapons, reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces, inspection systems, enforcement, and the stages of disarmament. Another issue which might be included is the relationship of disarmament and political settlements. The negotiators would then agree to discuss each issue in a specified order. Each issue would be broken down into its component parts. To illustrate, under inspection systems the negotiators would need to decide on the extent to which aerial surveys, ground inspection, and budgetary controls would be used, how each system would operate, and what would be the objects of inspection, that is, factories, airfields, military installations, and so on. Agreement on each issue would be tentative in the sense that it would not require formal ratification until the other issues had been defined and discussed and agreement reached.

This approach was used to conclude an armistice in Korea. At that time the position of the United Nations Command was that the proper order of business was to establish first the general topics which both sides agreed to discuss and in an agreed upon and specified order. In the armistice negotiations it was difficult at first, according to Admiral Joy, one of the chief negotiators for the United Nations, to adopt an agenda which did not state conclusions. After several sessions, however, the Communists finally acquiesced. If this approach were followed, disarmament negotiations could be far more specific and detailed and much more to the point than they have been in the past. It would not be possible to skip from inspection to weapons control to stages and back to inspection without ever having the discussion concluded at a point of agreement. The time has come to have an agenda in precise form. The cause of disarmament would be enhanced if this course could be adopted.

PRIVACY OF NEGOTIATIONS

World diplomacy, until the end of World War I, was conducted in such a shroud of secrecy that the public, particularly in the United States, reacted violently. We resolved that the motto should be "open covenants openly arrived at." Recently, however, many of those skilled in international affairs believe the motto requires modification on the order of "open covenants privately arrived at."

Almost all negotiations in our public life are conducted on this basis. Labor and management meet behind closed doors, but when agreement is reached that agreement is made available to the public. If the negotiations were conducted in public, it would be infinitely more difficult to conclude a contract. The Congress of the United States conducts most of its business in public; but when a committee meets to mark up a bill, approve a report, or resolve differences between bills passed by the Senate and the House, it goes into executive session.

The United Nations Subcommittee on Disarmament, therefore, should consider conducting its business in somewhat less public view than it has. True, its meetings are closed but after each day's discussion a release is made to the press; the verbatim records become public upon the adjournment of each round of meetings; and there is a strong tendency, particularly on the part of the Soviet Union, to leak to the press on the progress of the meetings. In recent negotiations, however, the Soviet Union has been less inclined to indulge in such leaks. There is hope, therefore, that more private and responsible negotiations may be held.

The present rules already provide that private meetings without a verbatim record could be held. They have been used seldom. It does seem, however, that if the major powers did not have to worry constantly about the public-relations value of every sentence uttered, every question asked and every answer given in disarament negotiations, that agreement might be promoted.

NEED FOR NEUTRAL CHAIRMAN

A third proposal which might improve the chances for success in disarament negotiations would be to have a neutral middleman or conciliator appointed to preside over the negotiations. Again there is a parallel in labor-management relations. Occasionally when the representatives of labor and management reach an impasse they have a neutral person present. Sometimes the presence of such a person facilitates reaching successful agreement; sometimes it doesn't. What it does do and might do in disarmament negotiations is to keep the two sides on the point, and to keep the propaganda factor down to a minimum. A neutral chairman in disarament talks should have no authority except to preside at the meetings and to exhibit an impartial attitude. He would have to be acceptable to both sides. He certainly could not be from any of the nations represented on the subcommittee. He might come from a so-called neutral country in Asia, such as India or Burma, or he might be appointed by the United Nations Secretary General.

The British and the French have often tried to produce a synthesis of the views of the United States and the Soviet Union. Generally the Soviet Union has found this effort at impartiality to be totally unacceptable. The conciliator, if one is tried, must be that in every sense of the word.

Closely related to the need for a conciliator is the matter of staff assistance for the Disarmament Subcommittee. It was pointed out earlier that the subcommittee does not have a professional disarmament staff of its own. The reports and technical studies are prepared by representatives of the nations on the subcommittee.

Just as the cause of disarmament may be furthered by the appointment of a neutral chairman so might it be furthered by the creation of an impartial and objective United Nations technical staff. The reports prepared—and they should deal with legal, scientific and military questions—should be as objective as possible. A United Nations staff should be able to consider the problems of the various nations more impartially than the staff assigned to the member delegations. It would, hopefully, help to create mutual trust and confidence among the five powers. Finally, such a staff would to a limited extent gain experience to function as an international secretariat soon after a disarmament agreement was reached. Disarmament involves highly complex and technical problems and it is important to have skilled men and women with an impartial attitude to assist in their solution.

After each session of the subcommittee, a report is drafted and submitted to the United Nations Disarmament Commission. These reports have emphasized the areas of disagreement between the Western powers and the Soviet Union. A report has yet to be issued which contains areas of agreement, yet representatives of the United States have often mentioned that the views of the two sides have come closer together.

If the major powers could spend as much time drafting reports to the Commission on areas of agreement as they spend in stating their remaining differences, the chances for a successful outcome of the negotiations might be increased.

A rule requiring the Disarmament Subcommittee members to state areas of agreement as well as disagreement would also help to prevent one side from shifting its position radically between sessions when it appears a reconciliation of views is imminent.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The present membership of the Disarmament Subcommittee makes sense in that the 5 nations on it are 5 atomic powers in the world. It is they which must find a way to control nuclear weapons to eliminate the menacing threat of a nuclear war. In other respects, however, the membership does not make so much sense.

Some of the nations which would be greatly affected by a disarmament agreement are not members of the United Nations and thus not in a position to be involved directly in disarmament negotiations. West Germany is included among them. Communist China, for very good reasons, does not belong to the United Nations; yet, that country has the largest standing army in the world. The United Nations is composed of many countries in Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America but not one of these is represented on the Disarmament Subcommittee.

It is assumed that if the five powers ever reached agreement on the control and reduction of armaments the rest of the nations would be so relieved that they would accept the terms of the agreement with little difficulty. This is a big assumption and one, which if not valid, could jeopardize seriously the success of disarmament negotiations. In addition, in a few years or months, the number of nations with atomic weapons is likely to increase. It seems necessary, therefore, that a way should be devised to increase the participation of other nations in disarmament negotiations and to heighten their responsibility for success or failure of an agreement.

The State Department ought to explore the various possibilities of how this participation might be obtained. Individual nations might be encouraged to submit proposals to the subcommittee for its consideration. Groups of nations might meet together, perhaps on a regional basis and under the auspices of the United Nations, to confer on ways of bringing the world closer to effective arms control. Recommendations from such conferences could then be forwarded to the Disarmament Subcommittee. They could have the advantage of increasing participation and responsibility for disarmament among all nations without causing the negotiations among the major powers to become unwieldy through enlargement of the membership on the subcommittee itself.

SCOPE OF DISARMAMENT TALKS

Everyone agree- that disarmament problems have a definite relationship to outstanding unresolved political disputes among nations. Yet the meeting at the summit and the 1955 Foreign Ministers Conference, both extremely brief conferences in view of the problems on the agenda, constituted the only recent attempts to resolve political and disarmament problems simultaneously. (Political questions are excluded from the U. N. Disarmament Subcommittee).

The executive branch has maintained in the past that substantial disarmament cannot come until political settlements occur. But we make no systematized effort to resolve the political issues, nor has there been much attempt to define what these issues are. Some doubt exists as to whether political settlements must be a prerequisite to the achievement of a disarmament agreement. To the extent, however, that the executors of our foreign policy insist on the prerequisite, negotiations on disarmament and political issues should bear more of a direct relationship to each other. This might mean greater use of regular diplomatic channels to proceed with the political questions. Consideration might also be given to enlarging the jurisdictional scope of the United Nations Disarmament Subcommittee so long as this would not cause duplication and confusion in the conduct of our foreign policy.

The above suggestions are not earth shaking. They are not offered as a panacea for the world's problem on disarmament. On the other hand, the methods used thus far to achieve disarmament leave much to be desired. They have not produced results. They are not relied on in other types of negotiations which are carried on in public life. The stakes of a continued arms race versus a controlled reduction of armaments are such that every proposal and every approach must be studied carefully and tried by those who are responsible for the negotiations. Present methods, if continued, while not necessarily doomed to failure, do not show prospects of producing or facilitating agreement. Other methods must be found.

## Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, February 4, 1957*

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the text of an address on Foreign Policy which was delivered by Representative VICTOR ANFUSO, before the Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York State, Thursday evening, January 31, 1957, at the Hotel Piccadilly in New York City. The Honorable Harold Moskovit, State chairman of the organization, presided.

In this address Representative ANFUSO proposed an outline for a United States foreign policy which emphasizes and delineates our relations with friendly countries, with undecided and neutral nations, with the Communist satellites, and with unfriendly countries. The address is well worth our consideration.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members, and friends, it is always a great delight for me to accept your invitation and to have the opportunity to discuss problems of the day with you. In my reply to my good friend and your esteemed president, Harold Moskovit, I told

him that I would like to devote my address to a discussion of foreign policy in this crucial period in our history.

Our Nation has long ago reached full maturity and has assumed international leadership and responsibility which, to be successful, challenges the best that is in us. I am not so sure that we are doing all that we can to meet this responsibility. My own opinion is that overabundance and overconfidence have made us neglect our own past mistakes and the history of other great powers which were reduced to minor states. This overconfidence has also been manifested by politicians, as well as leaders in business, in their lack of planning for the future.

This much I am sure: That we are a great nation, able to meet any emergency, either in peacetime or in war. What I see wrong is that after the emergency we go back to old habits and fail to properly plan to prevent the emergency from arising again.

The recent suffering of our people in the drought areas of the United States is a perfect example. This is what one New Mexico resident told the visiting President:

"When a crisis such as flood, fire, or tornado strikes a community, our Government is the first to respond with help."

My friends, but what happens after the emergency is over? The Government forgets all about these people and leaves them to struggle with the future alone. No wonder this farmer in New Mexico concludes:

"Maybe this is the best 'next year' country in the world, but we have got to stay with the land at all times."

And so it is with our foreign policy. What will happen next week or next month is anyone's guess. But no matter what happens, we must have a clear idea of our aims and goals. Only when we know clearly what our foreign policy is, and on what principles it is based, can we hope to solve successfully the problems we are facing today and those we are to face tomorrow. Old Teddy Roosevelt once said, "let us keep our eyes on the stars and our feet on the ground." This is still excellent advice in our day and times.

What is needed at this time is a careful review and reorientation of our foreign policy on a global basis and in the light of current developments in Eastern Europe and the Middle East. Mind you, I am not suggesting merely a review of our foreign aid program, which is done by Congress each year to some extent, but on a much larger scale to include the security of the free world, our relationship with the various nations, our bilateral and multilateral defense pacts, and our position and role as leader of the free world. In the years between 1946 and 1955 we built up alliances with 42 nations as a means of defense against the spread of communism. During those years we spent $266 billion for defense and an additional $52 billion for foreign aid to these 42 nations.

What do we have to show for all this expenditure? How strong are these alliances today? What about the future? Will these alliances continue to exist or will they fall apart? Will NATO develop into the strong deterrent to communism in Europe for which it was set up, or will it lose its vigor gradually and disintegrate in the next few years?

Were we wise in reacting sternly toward our two leading NATO allies, Britain and France, when they recently tried to protect their national interests and economic well-being in the Suez Canal? I ask in all earnestness: Are we that strong that we no longer need any help from our stanchest and most faithful allies? Have we acquired so many other friends elsewhere in the world that we can cast off old friends? The American people will want an answer to these questions.

As it is presently constituted, our foreign policy appears to be quite unrealistic, unsystematic, and a hodge-podge of unrelated thoughts about moral missions and ethical standards which the rest of the world neither appreciates nor understands. Our foreign policy is originated and developed on a day-to-day basis, and this is not said to be critical of any single administration. Whether this is the proper way for a Nation such as ours, with all the leadership which has been foisted upon it and with all the responsibilities it has, is something I shall ask you to judge for yourselves.

One thing is certain: We cannot and should not continue in such a haphazard manner. You could not run your business nor your home in that manner and survive. By our actions, we have antagonized a number of friendly nations and we have driven some to become neutral. At the same time, we have not succeeded in getting some of the neutrals to come off the fence and joint with us. Likewise, our policy in dealing with satellite countries struggling to become free has been a failure.

Take, for example, our reaction in the Hungarian situation. The revolt in Hungary caught us completely by surprise, and as a result we were totally unprepared to cope with the situation. Secretary Dulles was hospitalized at the time. The country's attention was concentrated on the national election. Our diplomatic representative in Budapest was not at his post at this crucial moment. We were not aware of what was going on, and we did not know what to do when it was discovered that an uprising was in full force. We hesitated to recognize or contact the Imre Nagy government, which made the Russians realize that they could undertake their brutal action with no fear or outside reprisal. Because of our unpreparedness, we missed a grant opportunity—one which may not come again for a long time.

My friends, foreign policy is something that cannot be formulated over night, nor by one man. It requires time. It requires the thinking of many men. It must be flexible, and yet specific enough to deal with various circumstances and emergencies.

At this point, I should like to suggest the possibility of an outline of a foreign policy consisting of five major points. I emphasize that this is merely an outline, and not a definitive policy. As such, it would require further study and no doubt some changes and additions. Nevertheless, it might serve as a good starting point toward a national foreign policy. This outline of an open foreign policy should be made clear to the world so that no nation shall ever make a miscalculation as a result of not knowing how we stand on a particular situation.

Our foreign policy, it would seem to me, should start with a sort of preamble about the aims and purposes of the United States in its international relations with all countries. The two primary aims, of course, would be the prevention of war and the establishment of universal peace. Other purposes might possibly be the following: to support the efforts of all nations to be free and independent; to disavow aggression against any nation; to offer all possible aid to countries in time of national emergencies, such as famine, floods, earthquakes, etc., and to help them improve their standard of living.

Following the preamble it is suggested that our foreign policy be delineated along five major points:

I. UNITED STATES RELATIONS WITH FRIENDLY COUNTRIES

1. The fullest possible economic and military aid should be extended to all countries maintaining friendly relations with the United States, in order to enable them to develop their full strength and to preserve their freedom in the face of Communist threats, so that they could be dependable allies of the United States.

2. The cultural and moral ties between the American people and the people of friendly countries should be strengthened, such as through large-scale exchange of persons in every field of human endeavor, education, literature and the arts, industrial, agricultural and other expositions, etc.

3. Bring to the attention of these countries the achievements of the 4–H clubs in the United States and encourage them to set up similar clubs to aid their agriculture and their youth. Many countries are dependent upon the land for survival and clubs like the 4–H will encourage freedom and independence.

4. Utilize some of our surpluses of foodstuffs in this country for stockpiling in various parts of the world to aid these friendly countries in times of national disaster (famine or other catastrophe) or in the event of war. This will help them in a concrete manner so that the nation would not starve in time of need, and it would help us dispose of some of our surpluses in a most effective way. And let me say in this connection that the best way I know of winning friends is not with money, but with food. I offered this suggestion at the last NATO conference and it was very well received.

II. UNITED STATES RELATIONS WITH UNDECIDED PEOPLES AND NEUTRAL COUNTRIES

1. To countries and peoples who prefer to remain on the fence, instead of throwing in their lot with the free world, we should offer only a certain degree of limited economic assistance, including some technical aid to help them improve the standard of living of their people. Under no circumstances are we to offer them any military aid, and we should make it clear to them that they cannot expect such aid from us as long as they refuse to assume their share of the responsibility of keeping the world at peace and free.

2. The United States is to undertake a well-organized program of public relations to bring to the peoples of the undecided countries the advantages of freedom and democracy over communism and servitude. Because of the high illiteracy rate in these nations they are not familiar with Russia's ruthless action in Hungary and other satellite countries. It is my opinion that the peoples in these countries would be receptive to information giving them the truth about life in the United States and other free countries, as compared with life under the yoke of Communist domination.

3. The United States has been traditionally opposed to colonialism. It has always supported subjugated peoples to seek their independence, and it has given them economic aid after they achieved their independence so that they could remain free nations. We must reemphasize our position against colonialism as part of the United States foreign policy, and we must do so by giving reassurance to all the peoples of Asia, Africa, and other areas of the globe that we remain loyal to our heritage and to the doctrine of freedom for all. Anticolonialism is to be made a basic tenet of our foreign policy, and this applies to Communist colonialism as well.

4. I think we do not utilize religion sufficiently in the struggle of the free world. It might be advisable to set up organized religious programs, aimed specifically toward the undecided countries, to point up to them the lack of religion in the Communist countries and the godless philosophy of communism. A philosophy and a way of life which are not based on the principles of religion ignore the rights of the individual human being and the concept of justice.

5. The achievements of the 4–H clubs can be utilized in these countries, as it is suggested above for the friendly countries.

6. The United States should establish a mission for peace comprised of high-level elder statesmen who are to work independently outside the United Nations. They are to be men and women of renown and prestige, dedicated to the task of achieving peace. They are to conduct private talks with the leaders and statesmen of other nations in

order to explore all possible avenues leading toward peace. Their chief task would be to help bring about a better understanding among the nations of the world and to help make it possible for all nations to live securely. I am thinking of people like Harry Truman, who could perform a great service now in neutral India. Or Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Bernard Baruch, Former President Herbert Hoover, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and others of similar stature who could serve on such a mission for peace.

III. UNITED STATES RELATIONS WITH COMMUNIST SATELLITE COUNTRIES

1. These people contain within them the seed that will eventually destroy communism and help sweep this diabolical tyranny from the face of the earth. We must give all moral and material support to them, short of war, to achieve that destruction. Had they been assured of such support from us in the past, there would have been by now several attempts to throw off Communist enslavement. Each such attempt weakens communism and exposes it for what it is—a state of slavery for all. Our mistakes and inaction in Hungary should teach us a lesson.

2. To the satellite nations we could offer a certain limited amount of economic aid on a people-to-people basis. (Explain.) This aid, however, is to be not so much in the form of American dollars as in food commodities from our surplus stocks; also clothing and medical supplies. It is to be more in the nature of humanitarian aid to help these people obtain the essentials of life which they cannot obtain under communism.

3. Formation of the 4–H club idea in these countries.

4. We should also maintain a steady stream of propaganda directed at these countries, stressing the advantages of freedom and independence, the democratic way of life, the friendship of the United States, which they could gain, and the dangers of communism.

IV. UNITED STATES RELATIONS WITH UNFRIENDLY COUNTRIES

1. By unfriendly countries I mean specifically Soviet Russia and Communist China, which constitute the major menace to the free world because of their arrogance and tactics, and because of the tremendous existing and potential power which they possess. The primary objective is to secure America and her allies against attack from these two countries, instigated directly or indirectly by them. Our defenses and the defenses of our allies must be fully maintained, constantly strengthened, and always be on the alert.

2. The United States must strive to keep ahead in the development of atomic weapons and the power to retaliate quickly and decisively in the event of an attack by either or both of these countries or countries instigated by them. Spending for security is something that the American taxpayer will never frown upon.

3. It is advisable to take periodic inventory of our military and economic strength in the various regions of the world. We should also serve clear notice to Soviet Russia, Red China, and their satellites in those regions that we will not tolerate invasion or infiltration, by whatever means, of countries desiring to be free and independent, and that we stand ready to meet force with force when necessary. (In substance, you might say that this is the Eisenhower doctrine proclaimed for the Middle East.)

4. Here, too, we should direct a steady stream of propaganda emphasizing the advantages of freedom, the lack of religion under communism, the advantages to be gained by establishing friendly relations with the United States and other free countries, etc.

5. We should offer them some economic assistance, but with specific strings attached, such as stop subversive intrigues, renounce their ideas of world domination, cooperate in the United Nations, and show an earnest desire to help solve outstanding world problems.

6. In dealing with unfriendly countries let me make this final point: People are people no matter from what country they come. We should always try to develop understanding on a people-to-people basis with any country. The door should always be left open to persecuted and dominated people who are willing to make the dash for freedom.

V. QUASI-PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENTS TO BE SET UP IN THE UNITED STATES

It is suggested that quasi-provisional governments of the various nations now under Communist control be established in the United States just as soon as the people of these countries show an inclination to be liberated from Communist domination. These quasi-provisional governments are to be recognized as spokesmen for their countrymen and to be aided by every means short of war in their plans to help or liberate their countrymen. If we had had such a quasi-provisional government for Hungary during the time of the October uprising, faster action would have been made possible and aid to the Hungarian people would have gone forward in time. The specific purposes or duties of such quasi-provisional governments would be the following:

1. To set up committees to cooperate with the United States NATO, and the United Nations in fostering freedom for their country.

2. To develop methods of rendering economic aid to their country.

3. To establish volunteer brigades which are to serve under or in conjunction with NATO for use in the event of an uprising or military action.

Thus, in broad terms, is my outline of a foreign policy, not for just a day, a month, or a year, but for all times. The free nations and the undecided peoples of the world are anxiously waiting and watching our actions, waiting for guidance and leadership and watching for us to show the way. Will we let them down or will we give them the opportunity to develop their strength and to build together with us the common defense and a world at peace.

---

## New Jersey Republican Labor Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 4, 1957*

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party in New Jersey in the years that have passed has made a record of forward-looking and progressive legislation that would be helpful to labor in the State of New Jersey. It may not have always done all that in the opinion of some should have been done, yet, it has been of a character that establishes it as worth while.

In this connection, I now wish to set forth a résumé of the accomplishments of the Republican legislature of New Jersey in the field of labor during the past 3 years. I realize that this will only give a part of the splendid record that has been made by the Republican Party in the State of New Jersey, in the years that have passed, but, it is sufficient to show that the Republican Party in New Jersey continues to be helpful and desirous of serving the best interests of the working men and working women of the State of New Jersey.

In presenting the New Jersey Republican labor story, it is a pleasure to record that through Republican efforts in the legislature and by a number of its Republican governors, New Jersey ranks among the foremost States in the Nation in modern, progressive labor legislation. The most recent improvement in the beneficial, forward-looking New Jersey labor laws was enacted in 1956 by the Republican legislature. In direct cooperation with leaders of labor and business a committee of Republicans completely revised the Workmen's Compensation Act. A new wage and compensation schedule was adopted. Maximums for temporary total disability were increased to $40 per week.

Under this new law the maximum for permanent total disability was raised from $30 to $40 per week while the maximum for permanent partial disability was raised to $35.

The maximum compensation awarded to widows with or without children on the death of a husband was raised to $40 per week. In Pennsylvania, the maximum for a widow with 3 children is $37.50 and for the widow alone is $33.75. In New York for a widow alone, a maximum of $24 per week is allowed. If she has 3 children it rises to the New Jersey maximum of $40 per week.

The Republican legislators also provided for increases in the duration of benefits for the loss of vision. Funeral allowances were increased to $400. A lump-sum payment of up to $1,000 was made available to a widow who remarries before her benefit period is up. Another new feature of the act is the provision that an innocent employee injured through the horseplay of another is entitled to compensation. Further, employees must now repair or replace prosthetic devices broken or destroyed as a result of a compensable accident.

The entire liberalization of the workmen's compensation law took a constructive group of Republican legislators 4 months of steady work. It was originated, studied, and adopted as a Republican measure.

During the previous year, in 1955, the Republican legislature in New Jersey adopted one of the country's most liberal formulas for unemployment and temporary disability benefits by raising maximum benefits to $35 per week.

In order to qualify for the present maximum, a New Jersey worker need have earned an average pay of $55.01 per week. In Pennsylvania, a worker can qualify for $35 unemployment compensation only if he has earned $66.38, and in New York $67. Put another way, for a weekly gross wage of $55.01 in New Jersey, a worker may receive up to $35 per week as compensation but could only receive $29 in Pennsylvania and $30 in New York. Under Michigan's benefit formula, a worker would have to earn $75.51 a week in order to qualify for that State's maximum which is $30 per week.

Another advantage to the workingman in this Republican-sponsored program is the financing of the fund out of which

payments are made. This fund is raised by a dual tax on employer and employee alike. However, the employee's tax remains stable, at ¼ of 1 percent of his first $3,000 of salary. Should an employer experience extensive personnel unemployment at his plant or should the general level of the State fund go down, the employers' rate of contribution automatically goes up to a maximum of 3.6 percent of payroll. Thus, it is the employer, not the employee, who bears the brunt of fluctuating unemployment in the State. The covered employment payroll in New Jersey for 1956 amounted to $6,700,000,000.

Again, the Republican legislature did this splendid and worthwhile job of liberalizing unemployment and temporary disability benefits.

Perhaps the most significant achievement for the workers of New Jersey within the past 2 years, in the unemployment compensation field, was the passage of a Republican bill decentralizing payment of unemployment checks. Prior to the enactment of this law, a claimant reported to his local employment office, certified to his eligibility for unemployment benefits and left the office empty-handed. Their certification was then mailed to the Trenton office, and after a prolonged wait of several weeks, a check signed by the State treasurer was forwarded to them. Under the new law, when a claimant reports to his or her local unemployment office, they receive a check that day, before they leave, for their past week of unemployment.

This law, enabling unemployed persons to receive their checks after a short waiting period—when the unemployed worker most needs the money—was passed by a straight Republican vote—two-thirds of the assembly and the senate—over a Democratic governor's veto and strong objections.

Over the years, Republican legislators have provided for most eventualities. They created a cushion on which the unemployed worker could rest when his or her job was not there. This cushion is unemployment compensation, and a worker need only apply and fulfill certain minimal requirements to obtain it. At the same time, while they are receiving their unemployment compensation checks, their State employment service will help them find a new job.

New Jersey's working men and women have other cushions. If a worker is injured during the course of his or her work, he or she is entitled to workmen's compensation. Their medical expenses will be paid; they will be compensated for their loss of wages; and, after being back on the job, they will continue to receive payments for their injury and disability.

Another remarkable achievement for the workingman and workingwoman in New Jersey is the existence of the temporary disability benefits law. Only four States in the United States have such a law. Initiated by Republican Governor Driscoll and introduced by a Republican State senator in 1948, this law set up a system of weekly benefits payable to workers suffering off-the-job illness or accident and hence not covered by the Workmen's Compensation Act. Total benefits paid under this program in 1955 amounted to $35,500,000.

New Jersey's accident or disability coverage goes even further. If a worker is going home at night and is injured, for example, while getting off the bus and cannot report for work, he or she may qualify for the temporary disability benefits—and this quite apart from their private, civil right to sue the bus company.

When a New Jersey worker is ready and able to go to work, he or she knows they have protection on the job. Their State government has passed compulsory laws requiring businesses to operate under conditions of health, safety, and sanitation. They know that, under the law, they have a right to time off to eat a meal. The worker knows there are special laws protecting his womenfolk and his children while on the job. He can rest assured they will not work under substandard conditions at the whim of an unscrupulous employer. He knows, too, if his wife or anyone else in the family, including himself, does any work at home for an employer that this homework comes under strict regulation. And he knows, above all, that this State backs up these laws with inspection and penalties for violation.

In addition, New Jersey's workingman and workingwoman has the protection of their State in the regulation of wages. When they are paid by check, the State requires some guaranty. It also aids in their collection and makes provision for such things as frequency of payment when a worker is deceased.

Republican legislators take particular credit for guaranteeing to a worker the right to join a union. This is a constitutional right, not just a privilege which may be modified with a shift in the legislature, but a fundamental right which stands or falls with the supreme power of the State of New Jersey. This right, the worker knows, is further buttressed by an anti-injunction act preventing abuse in the issuing of court injunctions in a labor dispute. And finally, the worker knows that where their union and their company cannot reach agreement, the State lends a helping hand through its mediation board.

During the years since the enactment of the labor legislation, Republicans have consistently supported and fought for liberalization of benefits, to their present maximums of $40 and $35 per week, and a lowering of qualifying conditions for such benefits.

From morning to night, New Jersey's workingman and workingwoman has protection on the job, in their work conditions or when there is unavoidable accident; off the job when he or she suffers accident or illness; and when he or she lose their job. The worker in New Jersey is guaranteed the constitutional right to fight for better conditions for their job, and the agency he or she has chosen to achieve this—their union—is protected against paralyzing court injunctions. New Jersey goes even further and demonstrates its interest, as an impartial mediator, in the promotion of labor-management harmony, by affording the services of a State board of mediation.

These are all beneficial gains for the workingman and workingwoman and they have all come about through the leadership and high-caliber performance of the Republican Party. Thus, it will be seen that New Jersey's 2½ million working men and women have good reason to look favorably upon the Republican Party because of its numerous achievements in promoting the welfare of labor.

## The Modern Republican Battleground

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 4, 1957*

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks before the Women's National Republican Club, Inc., Waldorf-Astoria Hotel ballroom, New York City:

THE MODERN REPUBLICAN BATTLEGROUND

We gather today in this the first year of the second century of the Republican Party—proud of its accomplishments and determined that our generation shall lay the foundation of another 100 years of dedicated service.

At the start of a new Congress and a reelected administration, it is a fitting time to take our bearings and chart our course. So let's study some of the lessons of recent events and discuss frankly a few controversial topics, which Al Smith used to call hot potatoes.

I shall try to do so without reflecting narrow partisanship and by giving full credit to those Democrats in Congress and the Nation, who believe in sound principles and support the President.

THE NEW DEALISM CHARGE

Now let's tackle the first controversial hot potato—New Dealism.

Right here I should like to say a word to those old friends we sometimes hear complaining that the Eisenhower program is "just like the New Deal."

Obviously, this just isn't so, period.

How short are some memories. How blind are some eyes. If the Eisenhower program really is a repeat performance of the New Deal, why is it that old line New Dealers and a new crop of leftwingers are fighting that program tooth and nail?

If it is a New Deal carbon copy, why did the last Republican National Convention—representing rock-ribbed Republicans from every State in the Union—endorse that program?

This administration's actions are different in spirit from the New Deal practices of its predecessors, who tried to pack the Supreme Court, seize the steel mills, and draft strikers into the Army.

The record clearly proves the sharp contrast between our middle-of-the-road administration and the New Deal which fostered socialized medicine and socialized agriculture, filled regulatory agencies with members hostile to private enterprise, tried to make electric power a Federal monopoly, used the tax system to change the social order, encouraged the squandering of tax funds, harassed honest business, retarded the sound recovery of agriculture, set class against class, played politics with civil rights, treated spy hunts as "red herrings," and some of whose leaders even condoned corruption.

Let those who grumble that we are New Dealish point out in what way the following great popular accomplishments of the Eisenhower administration are a second edition of the New Deal.

We rejected the despairing philosophy that prosperity must be based on a war boom. We stopped the agony and slaughter in Korea and thereby freed a peacetime economy to produce the greatest prosperity in all history.

We rejected the alien theory of nursemaid government which claims that distant bureaucrats know better how to run business and meet a payroll than businessmen.

In sharp contrast and often with the help of members of both parties in the Congress we created a climate favorable to private competitive enterprise and free labor—we removed straitjacket controls; we reduced Government competition with private industry; we checked fast-rising inflation; we kept Government's hand off the scales in collective bargaining; we checked monopoly and helped small business by enforcing antitrust laws; we established new programs to promote world trade. We made the greatest tax cut in history, paid installments on the public debt, balanced the budget twice, and plan to do it again this time. And we are making progress with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

The disposal of the Government's smelter in Texas, its synthetic rubber plants, and the liquidation of the RFC and its former activities, plus the release of cash previously held for working capital for these programs, have resulted in a return to the United States Treasury of more than $1 billion. That's the kind of benefit the public receives when this administration gets Government out of business—and I have cited only a part of this particular program.

Yes, my friends, when President Eisenhower was inaugurated in 1953, the New Deal went out and a new day dawned.

A wave of confidence lifted this Nation to unprecedented heights of prosperity because of his inspired leadership.

That which this administration is doing today is a projection of the Republican record of the past 4 years and is in keeping with the 1956 Republican campaign promises.

THE 1958 BUDGET

Now let's tackle a second hot potato—the budget. It provides for the expenditures of $71.8 billion between next July 1 and June 30, 1958, to finance national security and other services. It was designed to carry out the Republican program of peace, prosperity, and progress.

In order to present the whole truth about the budget, let us tell the public some of the facts which some critics fail to mention.

It is a fact, based on the latest comparative figures, that while Federal expenditures went down 13.2 percent, State and local spending went up 22.8 percent.

It is a fact that our population has grown more than 11 million in the last 4 years—that in the same period our gross national product rose more than $49 billion and that our national income increased $40 billion. Obviously, the Federal Government must expand some functions to keep pace with this tremendous growth.

It is a fact, nevertheless, that whereas in 1953 the budget, measured against the gross national product, was 20 percent, it has now gone down to about 16 or 17 percent.

It is a fact that the chief reason for the current size of the budget is national security—payment of former wars and spending to keep us out of future wars. The price of security and peace is not cheap.

This problem can be readily appreciated by showing where the budget dollar goes: 62.6 percent of expenditures are earmarked directly for national security, including defense and aid to our free-nation partners; 27.7 percent are earmarked for interest on the national debt, veterans' benefits, agricultural supports, and grants to States; 9.7 percent are earmarked for all the rest of Government—executive, legislative, and judicial, actually less than a dime in every dollar appropriated.

I repeat with grim emphasis that Americans, living under the awful shadow of the hydrogen bomb, must pay a lot of money to remain free and stay alive.

A disturbing paradox of modern times is that while science, technology, and invention have enriched modern civilian life, these innovations also have increased the heavy burden of national defense.

Every year it takes more money to buy the absolutely essential new weapons in the field of guided missiles, atomic forces and other ultra-modern war material.

One example will suffice:

The old B–29 bomber plane cost $693,000; our current B–52 bomber costs $8 million. Suppose a necessary household expense jumped from $6.93 to $80, can you imagine what a problem that would create in a family budget? Yet that is the comparative increase in just one type of modern airplane.

If we are ever to escape from the increasing burden of military expense, we must concentrate our utmost efforts in easing world tensions, in making friends among the nations, in spreading international good will and in bringing a just and lasting peace to this war-cursed generation.

I say—what I believe is the response of every woman at this gathering—that no man on earth is working harder and doing more to bring this era of peace than our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Because the price of survival is so high, we dare not waste our substance. If we are to provide the private savings to produce the new plant and equipment that create jobs for the growing number of young people, we must do a better job in reducing the drain of taxes.

I should like here to enlarge on my reference to that portion of the budget (27.7 percent) which goes for interest, veterans' benefits, agricultural supports, grants to States, etc.

The almost insatiable demand of different groups and different people for new Government services and the continuing expansion of the old is one of the most difficult aspects of the budget problem. In turn, the temptation on their representatives in Congress to vote for money to be spent in their district is almost irresistible. And, just so no one will think I'm trying to let the executive branch off too lightly, let me admit that in my opinion we in the executive branch can improve upon our record in this regard.

If we ever are going to be able to tighten the tap on public spending, all of us must throw our weight against the mounting pressure, year after year, to swell special favors, subsidies, pet projects, grants to States and pork barrel expenditures. By all of us, I mean the executive branch, the Congress, and the public.

Ask most anyone today if he favors reducing the cost of Government and the reply is "yes." Then suggest stopping some Federal service which he wants and the reply is a loud "no." We'll not get very far in reversing the trend in Government spending if everyone says, "Cut the other fellow's benefit, but don't touch mine."

If every section, every segment, every pressure group succeeds in grabbing more and more, the future economy could crumple under the increasing weight of taxes. But if, on the other hand, the aroused people of the United States rise up and demand greater economy in Federal, as well as local and State appropriations, then they will get greater economy.

Let me ask every woman in this room to reflect a minute: Are you a member of any group which is pressing for projects that will expand the Federal budget? Is your husband? If you are, consider well whether your activity in this respect is right or wrong.

MEETING MODERN NEEDS

Still another "live wire" subject is meeting modern needs.

Complicated life in an urban industrial society and the rapid progress of science create many serious problems—undreamed of a few years back—which must be solved soon or we and the coming generation could face stagnation in our economy and other critical conditions.

Progress in an electronic-atomic age is one of the cornerstones of the Eisenhower Republican program.

To meet modern needs, programs have been designed for highways, peaceful uses of atomic energy, water resources, power development, St. Lawrence Seaway, flood control, soil bank, widened opportunities for small business, a transport policy aimed at cheaper transportation, and a 4-year emergency program of Federal cooperation with States in overcoming the critical shortage of schoolrooms.

Although there may be some differences of opinion about some of these items, they are aimed at helping to create valuable private and public assets and at meeting the requirements of a growing population and a growing economy.

For example, in my own Department is lodged the duty of protecting the safety of those who fly—now and in the jet age.

Already the highways of the sky face congestion. The situation is being handled now. But it could grow more dangerous in the years ahead as slow-moving vertical-flight helicopters cross the slanted path of commercial and military jets, traveling at breathless speed.

If we do not get ready now to safeguard the airways of the future, the toll of tomorrow's crackups and collisions could be appalling.

To forestall such a hazard, the President appointed Edward P. Curtis, an outstanding expert, to recommend a long-range solution. In the interim the Civil Aeronautics Administration of the Commerce Department is embarked on the greatest air-safety program in history and is providing air-navigational aids such as radars, electronic devices, and other safe air-traffic controls. But this is costing money—nearly three times the bill in 1953.

One of the great current and future needs which we are trying to meet at the Bureau of Public Roads of the Commerce Department is modern highways. Had public demands not been neglected so long, we might not have had such traffic bottlenecks and road accident slaughter as now.

Although the President's highway program is by far the greatest public-works program in all history, its cost does not appear in the budget. Instead of passing along debts for our children to carry we have undertaken—thanks to sound legislation—the first major project of its kind that is entirely self-liquidating. Pay-as-you-build taxes on the gasoline and oils of highway users are footing the bill. Not a mile of road is laid until the money to pay for it is in the Treasury.

MODERN REPUBLICANISM

In conclusion, let us size up modern Republicanism—about which there is so much interesting talk today.

Modern Republicanism is not something brandnew, dreamed up recently—as some folks think—by maverick stargazers. It is as old as the principles of the first successful Republican candidate for the Presidency, Abraham Lincoln.

The Republican Party, in its finest hours, has been concerned with human freedom and

human welfare. In fact, it was born to fight for freedom—and still does.

The Republican record of a century clearly proves that all through our history our party has provided sound Government services to foster the well-being of farmers, workers, businessmen, children, and others and to meet future national needs.

The Lincoln administration founded the Department of Agriculture and initiated the first Homestead Act, which gave land to farm families who would work it. Republicans passed the Sherman Antitrust Act to protect small business against monopoly. To insure workers' rights Republicans started the Bureau of Labor which later became the Department of Labor. Republicans established the merit system through the Civil Service Act of 1883.

Republicans protected family health through the passage of the Pure Food and Drug Act and the Meat Inspection Act. Republicans in 1912 established the Children's Bureau after the passage of child labor laws in many Republican States.

The Panama Canal was built to meet future needs. Under President Theodore Roosevelt, programs also were launched to conserve the Nation's forests, minerals, and water resources. One of the conservation measures to preserve water and timber resources was the Weeks' Act of 1911—introduced in Congress by my father, when he was a Representative.

Later the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was established; the Federal Land Banks were strengthened; a new system of agricultural credit banks was organized and the Home Loan Bank System was created to assist individual farm and individual homeowners. These latter protections against adversity were initiated in the administration of your honored guest, that lifelong humanitarian—President Herbert Hoover.

Republican policies today are the expression of our party's great century-old principles, dressed in the clothing of this current age.

So we are in keeping with a century of Republican accomplishments for the American people, when Republicans insist that Government must have a heart as well as a head.

We also are in harmony with our 1956 platform, in step with our Republican President and in line with the overwhelming majority of American citizens, when we support programs reflecting a hard head, a warm heart, and a far-seeing eye.

Let us go home with renewed faith that Republican policies are helping to encourage a healthy and growing economy with prosperity widely shared and are helping to advance peace, justice, and freedom. Let us, by our attitude on public issues, prove worthy of the trust the American people have placed in our party and in our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, Thou art always waiting and willing to dwell in and with us and to pervade and possess our minds and hearts with Thy divine spirit.

Grant that we may be men and women whose life and character are inspired by the highest ideals and the most sacred traditions.

Hear us in our prayer of intercession as we beseech Thee to bless all who are having such a tremendous struggle with the hard facts of life.

Lift from their troubled souls those strange feelings of loneliness and anxiety when their faith is in danger of becoming eclipsed by doubt and despair.

We pray that they may have the glad assurance that Thou art great and good enough to care for them and that where Thou dost guide Thou wilt provide.

In Christ's name we bring our petition. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 607. An act to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes.

## "DUTY TO COUNTRY" THEME OF BOY SCOUT WEEK

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 6, is the first day of Boy Scout Week, observing the 47th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America. The theme of this anniversary is "duty to country."

Over 200 boys in Cub Scout blue and gold are visiting Members of Congress, Cabinet officers, and other high Government officials to present them with Scouter pins emblematic of the occasion. These boys have been selected to represent over 38,000 Cubs, Scouts, explorers, and leaders in this area. Many are sons of people from our own States. They are ambassadors of good will, inviting us to join over 3 million Scouts and Cubs in recognition of Congress chartering the Boy Scouts of America in 1916.

The theme this year is in the highest Scout tradition. Scouting is a program of character development, citizenship training, and mental, moral, and physical fitness. Scout ideals are inspirations to these youngsters, preparing them in body, skill, spirit, and will to be good citizens.

The great principles of Scouting are heartening and helpful to all of us. There is no finer exposition of the spirit of our Nation than the 12 parts of the Scout law. None is more timely than duty to country. I believe the last two parts of the Scout law also are timely and valuable to the boys themselves, in view of conditions in today's troubled world. I commend them particularly to your attention. They are:

A Scout is clean. He keeps clean in thought and body, stands for clean speech, clean habits, clean sport, and travels with a clean crowd.

A Scout is reverent. He is reverent toward God. He is faithful in his religious duties and respects others in matters of religion and custom.

Today the young people of America are subject to many influences. No endeavor is more deserving of universal support than Scouting, which leads them in the path of good citizenship. Scouting is doing its part. We should all do ours.

In my own State of Kansas all seven Scout councils have shown a healthy increase in numbers of Boy Scouts and Scout activities. We have received immeasurable benefits from Scouting. Twenty-five million boys and young men have gone on, through Scouting, to become useful citizens.

It is a real privilege to wear the Scouter pin presented by my Cub Scout visitor this week.

## COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

## URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4249), making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate not exceed 4 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, could we not get along with less than 4 hours of general debate? I have no requests for time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this is the first appropriation bill and there are some requests for time for general discussion, I have asked for this time. In view of what the gentleman from New York says, I ask unanimous consent that debate not exceed 3 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]

said that he had had no requests for time. Some of us did not know it was coming up. I, for one, would like a little time to get some explanation of how I can go along with the administration on foreign aid and still cut down here and make things come out all right.

The SPEAKER. The question may be bothering a great many Members of the House.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4249, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is the first appropriation measure to be reported by the committee and considered by the 85th Congress.

Its components will be explained by the chairmen of the respective subcommittees having jurisdiction.

This measure is separate and apart from the budget for the fiscal year 1958. It deals with money need arising prior to the commencement of the fiscal year beginning next July 1.

However it is not separate and apart from the warning sounded by the Secretary of the Treasury simultaneously with the presentation of the new budget that it is of transcendent importance that expenditures be kept at a minimum consistent with essential disbursements in order to avoid dire consequences. That warning did not apply alone to expenditures after July 1. It encompasses the present as well as the future.

The committee has had Secretary Humphrey before it in connection with his emphatic statements to the prers in criticism of the budget. Our inquiry cannot be described as fruitful in any way with reference to counsel and advice as to where the reductions he discussed with the press might be applied. The Secretary blows both hot and cold. He expresses one opinion to the press and the opposite opinion to the committee. He is for the budget as written one day and cannot find a dollar that can be cut and he is against the budget the next day as a work of iniquity leading directly to hirsute cocklebur entanglements.

It may also be said that the estimates of appropriations on which this bill is based do not evidence particular care and watchfulness on the part of the executive branch in holding its requests for funds to actual requirements for the remainder of this fiscal year. They do tend to support and emphasize Secretary Humphrey's view that the 1958 budget is excessive—and makes clearer the necessity for finding and eliminating excesses.

As judged by its budgets this is an ever-broadening and continually expanding Government. Each year and each session Congress initiates new activities requiring more money and the executive departments reach out for more power, more employees, wider jurisdiction, and more money.

But, unfortunately, the budget does not tell the full story. When all the extras are added up the Government will collect from taxes and other revenue $98.9 billion and will pay out the incredible amount of $95.6 billion.

This includes payments from a growing number of trust funds, the latest of which include highways and welfare, all of which will be larger every year.

But as high and unwieldy as this budget is—$3 billion above last year—and that was a record peacetime budget up to that time—and $8 billion increase over the 1955 budget—the Director of the Budget expresses no hope that it will ever be smaller. I personally think we ought to be able to hold the overall total pretty close to what it now is—at least another year or so. That means no tax cuts.

The budget and its architects seem to involve us in a vicious circle of tax and spend and inflation and depreciation of currency and increased cost of living. They are all interrelated and interdependent and the administration, speaking through its Budget Director seems to add the last paralyzing element of hopelessness:

Mr. BRUNDAGE. * * * I would certainly hope we would be able to reduce taxes. If we can hold our expenditures for a couple of years at even this level, I think the expanding economy will enable it.

Question. You think it is doubtful whether we can hold them at this level or not? You think if there is any change in this budget, it will be up instead of down?

Mr. BRUNDAGE. I am fearful of it; yes.

And that means no tax cuts. If we are to continue to spend this vast amount of money, we must continue the Korean war taxes to pay the bills—to balance the budget. And the present surplus of only $1.8 billion is a very narrow and tenuous margin. If even a mild recession drops on us—as Secretary Humphrey intimates—what will be the reaction in the value of the dollar and the quotation of United States bonds over the counter?

Already the interest on our national debt exceeds all Government expenditures in the fiscal year of 1938.

Let us take a realistic look at the rate at which ruinous inflation is already eroding our economies. Let me quote from the book Personal Estate Planning in a Changing World, by Rene A. Wormser. The first edition of this book was published in 1942. The eighth edition came off the press about a year ago. So authoritative is this work that the entire book was reprinted verbatim by the U. S. News & World Report a week or two ago.

I quote a paragraph from page 3:

In the first edition of this book I warned against the imminence of inflation; my prediction was all too correct; we have had it, several doses of it. Will it continue? That is a matter of debate. I think it will. It could be stopped if the American people should insist on it; it will not be stopped if the trend toward the welfare state continues. At any rate, in the face of the very severe degree of inflation which we have had to date, it would be stupid to plan without taking its possible continuance into account. Here and there, throughout the text, you will see references to the inflation problem. It merits most serious concern. Inflation is partially confiscatory in the very operation of our tax system—why legislators do not realize this, I do not understand. The capital-gain tax is confiscatory when it taxes those profits which are a mere reflection of the loss of purchasing power of the dollar and not true profits at all. The income tax, the gift tax, and the estate tax are all on a sliding scale. Therefore, they also are confiscatory during inflation. Let me give you an example under income tax. You have an income of $10,000 per year and there is a 50 percent inflation. So you manage to raise your income to $15,000 and think you are level with the inflationary rise. You are not. For you reach higher tax percentages with your new income and thus pay disproportionately more taxes. This principle operates similarly under gift tax and estate tax. To compensate for inflation, tax rates should be reduced, but the tendency is always to raise the percentages instead of to lower them.

Ever since this book was published inflation has continued. If you build a house the cost is obsolescent from the time you lay the foundation. If you take out life insurance, your family are robbed before the premiums are due. Every computation the dollar buys less and the cost of living is higher. Why? Because this administration has not kept its pledge to economize. Because this Congress passes larger appropriation bills every session. Even the record-breaking revenues pouring into the United States Treasury cannot keep up with the spenders.

The source and compilation of this budget is one of the inscrutible mysteries of all time. The men always consulted and whose ideas are traditionally reflected in the budget are the Secretary of the Treasury, former President Herbert Hoover, and JOHN TABER, ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations which formulates the appropriations bills to carry it into effect. All of them have, in effect, repudiated this budget. All three of them have said it is too large, that expenditures contemplated by the budget are too high. The President himself has said in practically every speech and statement made on the subject, that we should economize and he proposed to retrench expenditure. And yet, I repeat, this budget is $3 billion higher than last year and $8 billion higher than the 1955 budget. Somewhere along the line, somewhere after Secretary Humphrey and ex-President Hoover and Meatax JOHN TABER advised the President, a more potent force, an overriding influence has upped this budget beyond anything some of us here in the House ever dreamed of. JOHN has been called down to the White House repeatedly and had breakfast with the President just before he left for the South.

Someone says the country is for it; that the people want larger budgets. In the last 2 weeks I have received personal letters from nearly every State in the Union—every one of them urging a reduction in the budget. And every responsible metropolitan newspaper in the Nation has emphasized the unwieldiness of the budget; its contribution to infla-

tion, to the decline in the purchasing power of the dollar, and to its foreclosure of any hope of tax reduction during the fiscal year—during the next 18 months; to its inevitable acceleration of the coming depression. "If this country does not reduce the tax take"—and the tax take, national, State, and local, is now 29 percent of the national income—"if this country does not reduce the tax take you will have a depression that will curl your hair." And in this morning's paper President Hoover says: "Mine has already been curled once—and I think I can detect the signs." There you have the voice of experience. Herbert says he thinks a depresssion is on the way.

A day or 2 ago Secretary Humphrey was asked if the Government should speed up public works when private capital drops? The Secretary answered, "No." Yesterday when asked the same question he said, "I think you would." But he qualified it. He said, "outlays should be handled in such a way as not to shake confidence"—implying increased Federal outlays ran the risk of impairing business confidence to such an extent that private spending might be cut back further. So you are between the devil and the deep blue sea. You can spend and curl your hair—or you can throw in public works and destroy the confidence of private capital.

But still you have not told us who wrote the budget.

The Secretary of the Treasury has been incendiary in his reference to the budget and in his comments upon the phenomenonal and unprecedented size of it; and President Hoover in calm and deliberate, but a concise, statement says in this morning's paper that it is beyond all reason, or words to that effect. My friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], whose denouncement of high budgets is traditional, is no longer risking high blood pressure in his comments on Government spending. How often have we been edified by his old battle cry: "Why, it's ridiculous." He has been overlooking that time honored expletive this session; I have not heard him say this budget is ridiculous yet, although in days gone by he has employed that expressive phrase when budgets were many, many times smaller.

Apologists for this budget insist that it is in response to popular demand. And that would seem to be a logical conclusion. But when we look into the matter a little more closely it does not seem to be borne out by the opinion of the average taxpayer. I have had letters in the last 3 weeks from practically every State in the Union and without exception they said the budget ought to be reduced.

I said in a statement to the press that we were increasing expenditures instead of decreasing expenditures and that nobody seemed to care; that the most alarming thing about this alarming budget was that nobody was alarmed.

Many wrote, "You are wrong about that, we are concerned, but what can we do about it?"

In response to those letters never have I presumed to tell anybody what he should do. I have never said he should write to the President or take it up with his Congressman or bring pressure to bear on his Senator, although at this late date there seems to be no alternative if this budget is to be reduced. It must be reduced by the executive department or by the legislative branch of the Government.

In connection with these statements by our senior statesman, former President Hoover, for whom I have the highest regard, whom I quote always with respect, I would like to make a brief reference to the Hoover Commission. One of the greatest pieces of propaganda that was ever circulated—and not by the Commission itself—in the history of the United States was to the effect that the Commission had recommended measures which, if adopted, would save $4 billion a year.

That statement has had the widest circulation. Every metropolitan paper in the United States has copied it, and I think every Member of Congress must have received letters asking "If you can save $4 billion merely by adopting that recommendation of the report of the Commission, dealing largely with bookkeeping, why do you not do it? Why not save $4 billion a year?" The Committee on Appropriations, naturally, received many inquiries about it and I asked the Director of the budget to come up and see us. He came up, and JOHN TABER and I talked to him, and we said, "We have considered the report of the Commission very carefully, and we do not see anything in any recommendation of the Commission that would save $4 billion," and the Director of the budget said, "I do not, either." He said, "As a matter of fact, I do not see anything in the recommendations that would save $4 million much less $4 billion." We had him up again on the 24th of this month, January 1957, and again I asked him about it, and you will find it in the hearings where he said "It is absolutely impossible to prove these savings." He went on to say he thought we had saved money, of course, but he could not prove that the adoption of any recommendation by the Commission had saved or would save a single dollar.

It does not seem to be generally known that the Congress has adopted many of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. At this point I will include a list of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission adopted.

*Actions of 84th Cong. on Hoover Commission reports*

| Public Law No. | Date approved | Subject |
|---|---|---|
| Public Law 16 | Mar. 25, 1955 | Extended the Reorganization Act of 1949 to June 1, 1957. |
| Public Law 41 | May 23, 1955 | Extended the Hoover Commission to June 30, 1955. |
| Public Law 55 | June 1, 1955 | Facilitated liquidation of Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. |
| Public Law 61 | June 3, 1955 | Improved program for donation of surplus property for educational and public health purposes. |
| Public Law 68 | June 10, 1955 | Provided for reclassification of postal employees. |
| Public Law 83 | June 16, 1955 | Limited veterans' dental care to service-connected disabilities or conditions. |
| Public Law 88 | June 21, 1955 | Extended program of direct loans to veterans for housing until July 25, 1957. |
| Public Law 101 | July 26, 1955 | Authorized headquarters for the Central Intelligence Agency. |
| Public Law 182 | July 28, 1955 | Authorized Federal grants for program of research on mental illness. |
| Public Law 232 | Aug. 4, 1955 | Authorized President to lease the Alaska Railroad to private interests. |
| Public Law 245 | Aug. 5, 1955 | Amended Career Compensation Act to permit nontemporary storage of certain personal property. |
| Public Law 268 | Aug. 9, 1955 | Continued Small Business Administration for 2 years. (Included in Public Law 268.) |
| Public Law 304 | ——do—— | Established the Commission on Government Security. |
| Public Law 334 | ——do—— | Authorized the Comptroller General to relieve accountable officers of financial liability in certain instances. |
| Public Law 345 | Aug. 11, 1955 | Separated the Home Loan Bank System from Housing and Home Finance Agency. |
| Public Law 347 | ——do—— | Increased rate of retirement of Government capital in certain institutions operating under supervision of Federal Farm Credit System. (Included in Public Law 347.) |
| Public Law 365 | ——do—— | Partially implemented recommendation incorporated in Public Law 334 above. |
| Public Law 497 | Apr. 30, 1956 | Increased pay of Air Force medical officers. |
| Public Law 538 | May 28, 1956 | Authorized armed services to utilize commercial shipping in transporting military cargoes. |
| Public Law 569 | June 7, 1956 | Provided for medical care of Armed Forces dependents through insurance. |
| Public Law 608 | June 22, 1956 | Provided for the disposal of the Texas City Tin Smelter. |
| Public Law 655 | July 3, 1956 | Authorized donation of surplus property for Civil Defense purposes. |
| Public Law 666 | July 9, 1956 | Vested primary responsibility for water pollution projects in States. |
| Public Law 705 | July 14, 1956 | Simplified computing of fees charged executive agencies for use of the United States mail. |
| Public Law 786 | July 25, 1956 | Extended the Commission on Government Security to June 30, 1957. |
| Public Law 798 | ——do—— | Expedited payments of certified claims where appropriations have lapsed. |
| Public Law 809 | July 26, 1956 | Merged Production Credit Corporation in Federal Intermediate Credit Banks. |
| Public Law 852 | July 31, 1956 | Included the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in sec. 158 of the Revised Statutes. |
| Public Law 854 [1] | ——do—— | Provided for pay increases for certain executive officers. |
| Public Law 863 | Aug. 1, 1956 | Revised budgeting, accounting, and allotment procedures in the Federal Government. |
| Public Law 941 | Aug. 3, 1956 | Established a National Library of Medicine. |
| Public Law 971 | ——do—— | Extended authority to negotiate the disposal of surplus property. |
| S. Res. 285 | July 11, 1956 | Provided for a study of the foreign-aid program by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. |
| H. Res. 118 | Feb. 2, 1955 | Authorized the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to investigate the necessity for continuing the Panama Railroad. |
| H. Res. 262 | July 5, 1955 | Authorized an investigation into unnecessary Government paperwork. |

[1] Public Law 854 also incorporated a Hoover Commission recommendation authorizing the President to appoint the chief legal officers of certain executive agencies.

A supporting list is attached. The staff report comments that this reflects substantial progress when it is considered that the final report of the Commission was not received until near the end of the 1st session of the 84th Congress. It also states that 5 years were required to effectuate some 70 to 75 percent of the recommendations of the first Commission.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATION

On October 15, 1956, the President stated:

A number of the most important recommendations require congressional action. With bipartisan support, a modest start was made at the last session of the Congress. I propose to transmit further specific legislative proposals to the next session of the Congress, and I am hopeful that these will receive the wholehearted bipartisan support which they merit.

As with all legislation, any Presidential proposals along these lines will be subject to recommendation by the legislative committees having jurisdiction. As to these, perhaps this paragraph from the statement of general dissent by one of the Commissioners sums up the situation:

With their sensitivity to public issues, their varied experience in legislation, their party obligations, and their public responsibilities as elected officials, the Members of Congress are better qualified to make policy judgments and to legislate for the national welfare than any 12-man commission.

As a matter of fact, we have adopted everything that is practical and consistent in the Hoover Commission recommendations, approaching it from a bipartisan point of view. But, we have not yet been able to show a saving of $4 billion; we have not been able to show a saving of $4. For example, I am enclosing a table here which shows that while we have been adopting these recommendations of the Commission, the expenses of the Government, instead of being retarded, have gone steadily upward. Never once could it be said definitely that the adoption of any recommendation by the Hoover Commission resulted in reduced expenditure.

Beginning back in 1950, when the total budget was $29.6 billion, and coming down to this budget, when it has increased from $29.6 billion to $71.8 billion, it shows that all recommendations by the Hoover Commission have, up to this point, so far as we can judicially determine, been without effect in holding down the budget.

Federal budgetary spending since the first Commission reported follows:

| | *Billions* |
|---|---|
| 1950 | $39.6 |
| 1951 (war year) | 44.1 |
| 1952 (war year) | 65.4 |
| 1953 (war year) | 74.3 |
| 1954 | 67.8 |
| 1955 | 64.6 |
| 1956 | 66.5 |
| 1957 estimate ($70.1, including highways) | 68.9 |
| 1958 estimate ($73.6, including highways) | 71.8 |

I mention this because the fallacy persists, and it is still circulated. For example, I have received, and I take for granted every other Member of the Congress has received, in the last week a questionnaire sent out by the junior chambers of commerce embodying this repudiated and exploded fallacy.

In the bill before us we have taken the current situation much to heart. We have made material savings. We have reduced the estimates far below the total of the requests of the departments and of the Budget Bureau. If in every appropriation bill submitted to the House this session we are able to make the same percentage of savings we are making in this bill, we shall achieve a situation which will greatly relieve the fears and apprehenaions expressed by the Secretary of the Treasury and by ex-President Hoover.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. A while ago the gentleman spoke of numerous letters that he received, I believe he said, from all of the States, by people asking what they could do to cut the budget. The gentleman says he did not refer them to the President or any of the Members of the other body or to any of the other Members of the House. Just what did the gentleman tell them they should do in order to hold down the budget? I am interested. I would like to draw from the gentleman's wisdom on that subject.

Mr. CANNON. I wrote to them and told them I was in hearty accord with their sentiments and that so far as I was concerned I would make every effort to reduce the budget. I did not feel it devolved upon me to ask them to write to my colleagues. I assured them that so far as I was concerned I would be glad to cooperate in bringing the country back to solvency.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations has before you a bill for certain deficiency or supplementary items. Those relating to agriculture relate to loans to farmers and to some of this drought-relief proposition. The one of the Department of Commerce relates to the Small Business Administration and is entirely for loans and the additional expense of operations which the loans entail.

The Health, Education, and Welfare Department has $275 million to carry out the provisions of the increase in the old-age assistance items that were adopted a year ago after the regular bill and such supplemental bills as it could be applied to and disposed of.

An item in the Interior Department portion relates to the procurement of strategic and critical materials. The Director of Defense Mobilization is on record with a statement that they have procured all of their requirements for the stockpile and have sufficient stocks of the type of things it was proposed to purchase to carry them for at least 5 years even in time of war.

The other items relate to legislative housekeeping.

Frankly, the reduction which has been made in these items below the budget estimates total in the aggregate $46,977,000. That is 12.5 percent of the amount of the budget estimates, $382 million.

The items represent a very careful screening by the Committee on Appropriations of the items that were submitted to them. Frankly, for my own part, I am interested in operating on the day-to-day budgets that are submitted to us and I am not so much interested in what people say about it as I am about approaching it with a sense of responsibility.

Let me say to the Congress that the budget is in our lap regardless of what the budget is as submitted. It is in our lap now and it is up to us to find out what it is for and how badly it is needed, and to find out just what is needed and to bring out what is necessary to carry on the functions of the Government, and nothing more.

For my own part, I have today called attention to the savings that have been made in the estimates and I propose from day to day and from week to week as the other bills come before the House to call attention to any bill where I believe the adjustments and the cuts that are justified have not been made. I do not care what they are. I shall follow that through clear to the end of the session. Frankly, I believe there are spots where money can be saved, and I propose to do what I can to save funds wherever it is possible. It would not do any good for me to get up here and to tell where I believe those spots are. That would just put the demanding service on notice of where their weaknesses are and I do not propose to advertise that for their benefit. I hope, and I am just going to say this much and then I am going to quit, I just hope that the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress will go down the line and cut every dollar that they can cut out of this budget which is before us, and that we will meet our responsibilities to the people of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has consumed 7 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, as I understand it the Appropriations Committee struck out President Eisenhower's supplementary budget request of $67,500 to reestablish immediately 24-hour quarantine service for the shipping industry.

Three years ago the Congress passed H. R. 6253, a bill I introduced to allow health officers to receive overtime pay—the same as customs and immigration officials. At that time the President was instituting a general study of overtime rates of pay of Federal employees, so, although he stated the bill had merit, he vetoed it.

Under existing operations, any ship arriving from a foreign port after 5 p. m. has had to anchor and wait until the next morning before it could clear quarantine and dock.

Since our American-flag ships on foreign routes are subsidized by the Federal Government, the cost of holding up docking of these vessels to a large extent is paid by Uncle Sam. The pay of the crew and the cost of feeding all persons on board runs into thousands of dollars

per night per ship and in turn this situation increases greatly the cost of Government subsidy. I understand this amounts to approximately $10 million per year.

So it seems clear that the action of the Appropriations Committee in disallowing this small amount is false economy.

Personally, since I heard of the committe's action I have felt inclined to offer an amendment to restore the amount. But unless the distinguished chairman of the committee and ranking members and all members on both sides of the aisle will accept such an amendment, I will limit myself to the earnest request that if the other body allows the funds, then our House conferees will consider the merit and net economy and accept the amount.

I am sure what I have said is true, and there will be a substantial net saving to the taxpayers if President Eisenhower's request is allowed.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to say to the gentleman in this regard that I have prepared an amendment which, I understand, is agreeable to all the members of the committee, which will remedy the situation without a nickel of cost to the Government and the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. PELLY. I am very glad to hear that. I am sure that it will result in substantial savings to the taxpayers by reducing the amount of Government subsidies to the shipping lines that go to foreign ports. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, included in this urgent deficiency appropriation bill for 1957 are three items—agricultural conservation measures for the agricultural conservation program which the committee reduced from the budget estimate of $25 million to $15 million. The $15 million provides for funds to assist farmers in carrying out emergency measures to control wind erosion on farmlands and to rehabilitate farmlands already damaged; two, to reimburse the President's Disaster Relief Fund for funds advanced to the Secretary of Agriculture; and three, loan authorizations for the Farmers Home Administration.

Last year there was a severe flood on the west coast and a grant of $800,000 was obtained from the President's Disaster Fund to deal with the land restoration measures in California and Oregon. In addition, a hurricane struck Puerto Rico doing a great deal of damage to the coffee plantations. An advance of $1,100,000 was made to help with restoring that land by clearing it of debris and getting it into productive use. Because of the accumulation of balances, the Department assures us they will be able to meet these advances with the million dollars of extra funds which is restored to the President's Disaster Fund. The committee is pleased to note that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico expended approximately two-thirds of the total requirements.

Language was submitted to the committee which would have appropriated $25 million of unused 1956 agricultural conservation program funds to assist farmers in carrying out emergency measures to control wind erosion and to rehabilitate lands already damaged. The committee felt that an emergency program of this nature should be financed by direct appropriation rather than from funds previously appropriated for the regular agricultural conservation program. Agricultural conservation program payments are distributed to the States by an established formula assuring each State its share of these funds. The committee is desirous to maintain equality in the distribution of these funds and desires to resist any temptation to divert these funds for other uses even though these uses may be necessary and constructive.

It is felt that each State should be given ample opportunity to make use of these funds and that the proper consideration of any unexpended balance ought to be made when the regular appropriation bill is under consideration. It should be pointed out either way this item is handled, it would not, in my estimation, result in a saving of taxpayers' money, inasmuch as any unused balance of funds for the ACP program will be taken into consideration by the committee in considering the regular appropriation bill. Requests were made for $10 million to be used for practices which would not be put into use until late summer and fall of 1957. The committee felt that it would be undesirable for the Congress to make commitments for the next fiscal year in the urgent deficiency bill feeling that it would be more desirable to consider these items in the regular appropriation bill which would be in ample time to meet the requirements of this program. Furthermore, uncertain climatic conditions may alter the need for these conservation measures to a considerable extent.

The committee believes that full use of the funds for proper practices within the agricultural conservation program and other conservation programs of the Department would do much to prevent emergency conditions of this kind from developing. It recommends, therefore, that the funds included in the accompanying bill be used only after the Secretary is convinced that the regular conservation programs have been directed as fully as possible to practices needed in these areas.

A question has been raised as to whether or not authority for payments under this program should be made on a retroactive basis. It has been pointed out that payments for future work to be done gives farmers who have not yet done the necessary work an advantage over farmers in the same area who have already protected their land with such practices at their own expense.

The committee can fully appreciate and is sympathetic to this point of view. In view of the precedents established on this point, however, it does not believe that authority exists for it to reach back and repay farmers or others for work already done or expenses already incurred.

The basic legislation supporting this type of activity makes no provision for such retroactive payments. Further, Congress has consistently resisted efforts to enter into retroactive assistance of this kind. Also, such action would raise numerous policy questions such as: how far back should such feature go; who should be included; and what area of the country should be included?

In considering the deficiency request for the Farmers' Home Administration the committee reported: The act of April 6, 1949, provides for emergency assistance in furnishing feed and seed to farmers, ranchers and stockmen in disaster areas designated by the President under Public Law 875. The Third Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1954 established a ceiling of $50 million on the amount of the disaster loan revolving fund which could be used for this purpose. As of January 3, 1957, only $210,000 remained available for this purpose. The President has proposed language to increase this limitation by an additional $25 million in view of the serious feed problem still existing in the drought areas.

The committee recommends an increase of $15 million in the limitation, a decrease of $10 million in the budget proposal. Information presented during the hearings indicates that only $10 million will be required during the balance of the current fiscal year. The amount recommended will provide a reserve of $5 million for assistance in 1958 and subsequent years, and will permit reimbursement of the $8 million secured from the President's disaster relief fund to supplement funds available within the disaster loan revolving fund.

At the time this emergency program was adopted by Congress, it was intended that the States would participate substantially in a financial way. It appears, however, that amounts advanced by the States to date have been very small—hardly enough to cover the cost of handling their contributions. The committee feels that steps should be taken to correct this situation. Accordingly, it recommends that, as soon as present contracts have been honored, the Secretary require that the governor or appropriate authority in each State participating in the program should commit the State to assume at least 25 percent of the cost.

Inasmuch as all of these items are consistently related to items which will appear in the regular appropriation bill, I wish to assure the Congress that our committee, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman JAMIE WHITTEN, will go into these items in our usual conscientious manner as we consider each one of them.

These are troublesome times particularly for the people who suffer from disastrous climatic conditions. Our committee is most sympathetic to those people in the drought areas. We appreciate the consideration that the Congress is giving to these items which have been gone over very carefully by members of the committee. We have agreed to those items which our committee feels can be

fully justified as emergency measures at this time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee on the Department of the Interior has disallowed the supplemental budget request for $30 million for purchase of four domestic minerals. They have disallowed it on the basis of the testimony of the head of the Office of Defense Mobilization, Dr. Flemming. He testified last year that tungsten and the other three minerals are not needed for defense purposes. He said we have enough tungsten in stockpile to last for 5 years. So there is no defense justification for this program. That was his testimony before the Senate in June 1956.

Senator DWORSHAK asked the president of the Tungsten Institute if the people who mine tungsten in this country sell any to domestic industry? And he was informed that the industry using tungsten does not buy one pound of the tungsten that is mined in this country. They buy tungsten that comes from foreign mines. Yet the United States Government is paying $55 a unit for tungsten to several large producers and small producers, when you can buy a trainload of it on the market for $35 a unit.

In my youth on a Friday afternoon some little child would get up and talk about the ride of Paul Revere. But the taxpayers should realize the ride they are being taken for now. One on the list of domestic producers receiving money under this program also has a large tungsten mine located in a foreign country. He has signed a contract to sell tungsten from this foreign mine to the United States Government at $55 a unit. This contract does not expire until 1959. By that time he will have sold about $39 million worth of tungsten to the Government.

Now somebody will come along and say: "Oh, it is an emergency." They will say: "If we shut down the mine we will never be able to open it up again." One of the leaders in the tungsten industry has admitted it is an up and down business. He has been in it since before the First World War and he has seen four periods like this. They shut down after the First World War, when the national debt was only $23 billion, but now it is around $270 billion, and we are paying $55 a ton for this tungsten while the market price is $35. We even went so far as to amortize taxes for some of these purchasers so that they could write off their investment for tax purposes in 5 years, under the stockpile program they got $63 a ton, which was $20 a ton more than it was selling for in the open market.

I do not want to take up the time reading things, but I want to read to you from the committee report about one producer under the new program:

> The largest purchase during this period was from a group of 3 affiliated companies and totaled $2,875,730, representing 19 percent of the total. A top executive of these companies testified previously that the authorizing legislation was needed in order that the domestic mines "can survive foreign competition." The committee was astounded to discover through its own investigation that a dominant company in this group has the largest contract to supply tungsten to the Government from foreign mines. The committee is advised that this contract, for the purchase of over $39,000,000 of tungsten at $55 a unit, will not terminate until December 1959.

While the United States Government was paying $63 a unit from 1951 until 1956, and the open market price dropped from $64.63 in 1952 to $35 in 1956, anybody could buy it. Yet the United States Government was paying, up until last year, $63 a unit. Under this new program the Government pays $55 and the market price is $35.

I do not know how many such cards are in the deck, but just how long do you think we can survive if we continue to pay $55 a unit when we could get all the tungsten we want for $35.

The head of the Office of Defense Mobilization said there is no scarcity and no defense connected with this whatsoever. We have enough now in the stockpile for 5 years. Anybody who listens to the military will hear them come in and ask for billions of dollars for guided missiles and bombs and everything. They say the next war will only last a few months. The one that gets there first will win. If they are right, what are they going to do with this 5 years' stockpile of tungsten that we now have? They come in and tell you how swift and terrible will be the first blows in the next war, a flight of planes and then it will be almost all over. I say we are sufficiently stocked up with tungsten now that the supply would last us for 5 years even during all-out war. That is why the committee thought it was about time to eliminate something like this and I hope the Members today in their wisdom and judgment will back up the committee and vote down any attempt to put the item back.

When this program was authorized it came to the House under a suspension of the rules. Nobody spoke on the bill or for the bill until after it was passed, and then two Members who had a tungsten mine in their areas spoke about the necessity for tungsten. But there was not anybody outside of the man who sponsored the bill, who, incidentally, is a fine gentleman and a great Congressman, who spoke on the bill or for the bill. They held hearings in the committee, but the hearings were never published.

Again I ask you to support the committee should any attempt be made to restore this item to the bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Who is responsible for executing the contract?

Mr. KIRWAN. The United States Government.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What department?

Mr. KIRWAN. The Department that is responsible for the stockpiling program. They are the ones that have been charged with the contract.

We sent our own investigators to look into the situation and we found one fellow selling foreign tungsten to the United States Government, the one with the largest foreign order which will amount to about $39 million before the contract expires—selling foreign tungsten to the Government at $55 a unit when the market price is $35 a ton, and at the same time is selling tungsten from his domestic mines to the Government at $55 under this program.

Mr. REES of Kansas. You mean we have to carry out that contract?

Mr. KIRWAN. I do not know whether we will have to carry it out or not, but we have decided to meet the issue by not providing any funds in this bill for purchases from his domestic mines, and I hope the House will back up its committee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], a member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, some years ago the Secretary of Agriculture saw fit to ask certain Members of the Congress to serve on what was known as an advisory group, or as consultants to the special drought committee of the Department of Agriculture. I happen to have been named as one of the members along with one of our colleagues and 2 members from the other body.

For a time we had a few meetings with representatives of the Department. Those meetings never seemed to accomplish anything because our advice, as far as I could see, was never taken. It is true that those meetings did allow the Department to suggest from time to time: "Well, we have discussed this policy with representatives of the Congress, so our policy must be their policy."

For approximately 18 months no meetings have been held, but as late as last week the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and made substantially this statement: "I may say also that there are 4 Members of Congress who have been named as consultants to the committee, and they have on occasion met with us, Senator ANDERSON, Senator SCHOEPPEL, from your own body, and 2 Members of the House of Representatives. We try to consult with them even when they do not meet with the committee."

I want to make it plain that there has been no effort brought to my attention on the part of the Department of Agriculture to consult with at least this 1 of the 4 consultants for 18 long months. For that reason I have felt that these consultants could serve no possible purpose other than as a means to allow the Department to place blame on the consultants rather than to accept blame for an erroneous decision itself.

Therefore on yesterday I wrote a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture which I think I should read to the Members of

the House because it bears upon the action of this House. The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., February 4, 1957.*

Hon. EZRA T. BENSON,
*Secretary of Agriculture,*
*Department of Agriculture,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. BENSON: Some 2 or 3 years ago I was advised that I had been named as 1 of 4 congressional advisers to your departmental drought advisory committee. Shortly after our appointment the advisers had several meetings with representatives of your Department. These meetings gradually became fewer. I believe the last was held about 18 months ago. Nobody in the Department has asked for my advice since then. My advice was not taken even when the meetings were held. I had supposed that you had considered that our tenure as advisers had ceased to exist. I was, therefore, somewhat surprised to learn that in your appearance before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last week you are reported to have stated:

"May I say also that there are four Members of the Congress that had been named as consultants to the committee, and they have, on occasion, met with us: Senator ANDERSON, Senator SCHOEPPEL from your own body, and two Members of the House of Representatives. We try to consult with them even when they do not meet with the committee."

Apparently you made the positive statement that you try to consult with these congressional advisers, although no such consultation has taken place with me for approximately a year and a half. I think that your statements are calculated to give the impression that the named Members of Congress exercised some influence in shaping the drought policy.

The Agriculture Committee of the House has made a serious and conscientious effort to deal with at least a phase of the drought program. A large number of bills were introduced something like 4 weeks ago on this subject. The committee on January 17 requested that your Department give it the benefit of the Department's views. Up until this morning we had not received any such memorandum of views. In the meantime, we held rather extended hearings. We invited the Department to send any individual they felt best qualified to speak on this program. Mr. Kenneth Scott appeared before the committee some 10 days ago and gave us 75 pages of testimony. He raised all of the questions that you have raised.

The committee felt that we had given the Department a fair and generous hearing and had not the slightest idea that the Department wanted to make any further presentation. The members of the committee voted to make certain changes in the bills as introduced and struck out one complete section, but then gave a unanimously favorable recommendation to the remainder of the bill. That legislation which had the support of both sides was scheduled to come before the House this afternoon. On Saturday, I first learned that you had sent a request, not to the committee and not to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, but rather to the minority leader asking that he use every possible means to defeat the passage of this legislation.

In the meantime, you had accompanied the President of the United States to several of the drought-stricken areas. You and the President have given out a number of statements asserting your desire to be of prompt assistance to the drought sufferers, but you have proposed no concrete program other than to ask for additional money, a large part of which has already been authorized by the House. Your action is now preventing the passage of legislation which every member of the Agriculture Committee seemed to believe was desirable and helpful to the drought-stricken people.

I must, therefore, come to the regretful conclusion that the congressional advisors have no functions other than to share the criticism of the Department's actions. Since I have never exercised any influence, since my advice has never been taken and is no longer even asked, it seems to me that my continued membership on this advisory group serves no useful purpose. If I could see where my continuation on this group could be of any possible help to the suffering farmers and ranches of the drought area, I would certainly continue to serve regardless of any embarrassment that it might be to me, but inasmuch as it seems clear that I am helping no one except the Department—and that only in the matter of sharing blame—I believe that it would be in the interest of a clear understanding for me to remove myself. I am, therefore, resigning from this advisory or consultive group effective today.

Yours sincerely,

W. R. POAGE,
*Congressman.*

I feel, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, that the Members of this House should not be made the fall guys for the Department of Agriculture, and for one I do not propose to continue in such a position. I hope that the membership of the House will bear this attitude of the Department in mind when we take up the drought relief bill, which was reported by an unanimous vote of the House Committee on Agriculture. It is my hope that a rule may be granted this afternoon and that this bill may come before the membership of this House on tomorrow, in which event I hope all of those who believe in the integrity of this House, and the right of the Congress to determine legislation rather than merely to accept that which is forced upon us by the Department, will be here ready to record themselves in favor of a congressional determination of policy. I hope that we may adopt and that you will be here ready to implement a prompt program of relief for the drought-stricken areas rather than simply a newspaper program of expressions of regret about a drought situation that is affecting a very vast area of our country.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

TIRED OF BEING A GOAT

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, during the past 22 years, the Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan has probably cast as many if not more "No" votes than any other Member of the House.

He was forcefully reminded of this fact during the last campaign by his Democratic opponents.

In truth and in fact, the "No" votes, while negative in form, were affirmative in effect, because they were against wasteful, unnecessary spending, against the surrender of any part of our national sovereignty, in favor of the efficient expenditure of the taxpayers' dollars and adherence to our constitutional form of government.

No apology is now made for any of those votes.

Just a few days ago, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey suggested that, if we continued to tax and spend at our present rate, we might experience a depression that would make your hair curl.

The morning's press indicates that Mr. Humphrey has, to a certain extent, hinted that it might be necessary, in case of such a depression, to authorize a series of public works to take up the shock of unemployment.

That is nothing new. We did that back in the Roosevelt days. And it may be necessary and helpful as a temporary remedy.

Today's press carries the statement that, last night, 83-year-old former President Herbert Hoover, referring to Humphrey's hair-curling statement, said, "Mine has already been curled once—and I think I can detect the signs."

Since his inauguration, President Eisenhower has twice pointed out the necessity of lessened Federal spending if we were to avoid financial disaster—a depression.

Nevertheless, the President called upon the House to give him, and it overwhelmingly did give him, a blank check for the use of the military forces to defend the territorial integrity, the political independence, not of the United States of America, but of Middle East nations. That authority if exercised means the spending of additional billions of dollars—a further trend toward inflation.

During the last election, the officials of practically every pressure group in this country were on my political back, because I had not, over the years, gone along with their every demand.

Compliance with 95, or even 99 percent of their proposed legislative program was not enough. Failure to bow the head and bend the knee on every occasion was sufficient to justify a decree of political liquidation.

While many—no doubt a majority—of the Members of the House realize that deficit spending must end, the record shows that a majority continue to vote for increasing governmental expenditures. Many of them demanded by the administration.

While I may or I may not be a candidate for Congress in 1958, Members of the House will understand what I mean—at least I hope they will—when I here and now state that I am weary of refusing to go along with pressure groups demanding ever increasing Federal expenditures, of consistently voting against legislation calling for the expenditure of billions of dollars for foreign aid while others avoid criticism, political opposition, by consistently supporting the wasting of billions of our dollars abroad.

I was the only Member of Congress from Michigan who voted against giving the President authority to spend $200 million abroad, authority to use the Armed Forces to protect other countries.

It all boils down to this. If a majority of the Congress is determined, as it seems to be, to continue increasing the taxpayer's burden by voting for every appropriation which is necessary to comply

with the demands of the one-worlders, the internationalists, the rulers of other countries—the spending of billions of dollars abroad for the benefit of other peoples—I have about reached the conclusion that it might be well, if we are determined to spend those dollars, to spend them here in America for the benefit of our own people—especially for the benefit of those who now, through no fault of their own, find it difficult to obtain food, shelter, and clothing.

Why should I attempt to force economy on the Federal Government if, at the same time, an equal or far greater sum is being wasted abroad?

If continued inflation is to ruin us, if a depression is inevitable, why not, while it is on its way, spend our money here at home?

Why should I make the people of my district mad at me if the administration and the Congress are to pour their dollars down rat holes across the seas?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I obtained a copy, which I have in hand, of the United Nations telephone directory. I do not know how many of you have seen it, but it is an interesting publication.

In view of the fact that this is the first appropriation bill of the session, I thought I ought to take a minute or two to call the attention of the Committee on Appropriations to a place where savings might be made. You understand, of course, that the Congress appropriates at least one-third of the running expenses of this modern Tower of Babel, known as United Nations headquarters.

Let me read you some of the clubs that are listed in this U. N. telephone directory:

The Art Club, the Badminton Club, the Ballet Club, the Ballroom Dancing Club, the Bowling Club, the Bridge Club, the Chess Club, the Cricket Club, the Drama Club, the Golf Club, the Gym Club, the Motion Picture Club, the Music Club, and the Press Club. Then there is the Recreation Council, the Singers Club, the Skating Club, the Ski Club, the Softball League, the Stamp Club, the Table Tennis Club, the Tennis Club, the Volley Ball Club, and the World-Wide Club.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], being the good angler that he is, might be disappointed in that they have no fishing club.

Then they have in addition to the above listed clubs, the granddaddy of all clubs. It is listed as "Clubs—general information." Evidently if you cannot get the information you want from these various clubs you can call "Clubs—general information"—and get what you want.

I have looked this list over pretty carefully. Each of these clubs has an office and each has a telephone. None of them is duplicated, that is, no two of these clubs are in the same office, so that each has an office and a telephone. I assume, and I think it is logical to assume, that the United Nations, using American tax dollars, provides a secretary at each of these offices and telephones. I suggest that when they come before you looking for an appropriation this year you of the committee investigate what they have been spending.

I might call your attention to the fact that there is a "Delegates' Bar—North," and a "Delegates' Bar—South." I do not know why there is no "Delegates' Bar—East" or "Delegates' Bar—West," unless the delegates, the Russians in particular, would rather drink their vodka in the north or the south.

There is also the London School of Economics Society, and it also has its own office and telephone number. I do not know what the London School of Economics Society might be, but I assume that is the place where people are taught to value and devalue money at will, how to escape interest payments to the United States on the money that they owe, and how to influence this country to issue 95-day paper to the tune of nearly a billion dollars so that we pay the British for their invasion of and aggression upon Egypt.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am most happy to yield to my friend the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. One of my colleagues advises me that while I was called out to the phone, not by the White House, the gentleman mentioned the Member from the Fourth District of Michigan. Now, do not worry about it. I will go along with you on any economy program that you would like to sponsor.

Mr. GROSS. I thought, perhaps, that being the good fisherman that you are, the U. N. ought to have a fishing club to go along with a ski club, a soccer club, a ballet club, and a ballroom-dancing club.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, wait a minute, I do not know about the last two. So far as this fishing business is concerned, I buy my own tackle and I dig my own bait, and when I catch them, I clean my own fish. But, if you have noticed here, the Committee on the Interior has found plenty of land where there are many lakes and streams on which they hunt and fish. Have you noticed that? And the facilities to get to them in the armed services. So if I can get on the Committee on the Interior, I can get to go on some of those trips.

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased to know that the gentleman from Michigan digs his own bait, but I suspect most of the U. N. club members spend most of their time cutting bait with which to catch American suckers.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I never cut any bait for them. I will admit they catch plenty of suckers.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I dare predict that when the history of this era is written, this administration will be referred to as the great buck-passing administration. The President has passed the buck to us on domestic policy. He has passed it to us on foreign policy. He has passed it to us on monetary policy. He has passed it to us for budget-making.

I do hope, in fact I am almost certain, that this great Committee on Appropriations and the leadership of the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is going to do a good job in cutting that budget.

I have a suggestion to make, and I do hope the Appropriations Committee will not think that one who is not a member of that committee is presumptuous in indicating a course of action. I suggest that the head of every Department seeking an appropriation be advised that unless that Department comes in and shows to the committee how it can cut the proposed budget by at least 10 percent, that you will cut their request 10 percent straight across the board. If they cannot come in and justify the figures submitted, warn them that the first 10 percent is going to come out of the salaries of the exempt jobs. Tell them that you are going to cut 10 percent off their salaries if they cannot show you how they can cut their own budget.

Everybody in the administration says the budget is too high and that it can be cut and it should be cut. Then, the administration leaves it to the Congress to find the ways and means of doing it.

I suggest that you take seriously what I have just said, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, and warn the heads of the departments that if they cannot find a way of cutting their appropriations, you are going to do it for them and that they may not like the way that you will do it for them.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York yields back 3 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I might start my remarks by saying I think the Constitution places the buck on spending with the Congress. So it is very difficult to see how the Executive can pass the buck where the Constitution places it. I was quite interested in listening to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations talking about the budget and the height of the budget and the dangerousness of it. I believe he must believe that it is too high and yet throughout all of his speech I did not hear him offer one constructive suggestion of what he, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, was going to do about it.

I would like to make some suggestions of what he might have done about it.

No. 1 is the suggestion that Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey presented to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and to the Committee on Appropriations also when he appeared before them a couple of weeks ago on the budget.

He had previously recommended to the Committee on Appropriations various ways and means whereby we might handle these tremendous budgets that are generated in this great Government in Washington; and a subcommittee was appointed, as I understand it, to go into these matters. Apparently that subcommittee is not operating, because Secretary Humphrey again mentioned it to

the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in these hearings. The chairman of the committee then said, "Would you be willing to appear before this committee to further those recommendations?" And he said, "Yes, I would." At that point the conversation is terminated. At least, as it is reported in these hearings.

I would like to know is the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations going to do something about this and go ahead with this subcommittee and let us go into these suggested procedures as to how we can handle these budgets?

Secondly, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee referred to the Hoover Commission recommendations, and said that could be done just by accounting procedures. Why do we not do it? If we analyze those recommendations, the gentleman will find that a great deal must be done by the Congress and certainly a great deal must not be done by the Congress. I refer to one specific recommendation, which was to get the Government out of business, particularly the Military Establishment out of civilian type business. Yet we all witnessed last year and the year before this effort to throw a roadblock in the way of that orderly process, preventing the Military Establishment from getting out of those areas which would have saved considerable money.

Secondly, we have the requirement, by law, of the unification of the military services, particularly in the area of common-use supply items and the distribution of them. A subcommittee in the 82d Congress, of which I was a member, did a great deal of work in that area, and the Hoover Commission picked up a lot of their findings. Yet we find that to this date the Military Establishment has moved hardly at all in the unification of common-use supplies—I am not talking about airplanes and guided missiles and such things. A figure that everyone ought to be aware of is the fact that we are generating in our Military Establishment three to four billion dollars annually in surpluses that are sold at an average of about 8 cents on the dollar. The fact that annually you generate three or four billion extra property indicates how poor the procurement procedures must be. It is in this area that the Appropriations Committee could do a great deal of work.

Furthermore, we should look into the executive department's practice of obligation and deobligation of funds, the use of letters of intent, and the fact that these contracts are written as they are to avoid that magic date of June 30.

Furthermore, I might call attention to another procedure that has grown up and could be corrected in the executive department, but perhaps the Appropriations Committee might do something about it. The fact that the Bureau of the Budget now meets jointly with the Defense Department in going over the Military Establishment budget, instead of having the Military Establishment coming down to the Bureau of the Budget. The very fact that they have to go to the Pentagon and operate on this budget over there, sitting with the very people who are trying to keep the budget up, is the wrong technique. Perhaps a little pressure by the Appropriations Committee might change that.

One matter was suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], a member of the Appropriations Committee, in these hearings, to which I was referring, where he said that for years he has been advocating a permanent investigatory staff. Why does not the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations implement some of these beneficial suggestions? Then we could get on top of this budget. I submit that Congress has a real job to do and a job that the executive department cannot do. The Government Accounting Office is an arm of the Congress; not an arm of the executive. Why do we not utilize the Government Accounting Office more? Why do we not create better liaison between the old Expenditures Committee, now called the Committee on Government Operations, with the Appropriations Committee. The material that committee gets on extravagant and foolish expenditures would be of inestimable benefit to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman has stated that I have advocated the establishment of a permanent investigatory staff. I would like to explain that more fully. We do now have a permanent committee staff, a very well-qualified staff. Their time, however, is taken up with the regular committee work. What I had in mind was the staffing by the committee with additional men who could act as investigators to go into every detail of expenditure and really give our Appropriations Committees tools with which to do the job. That particular investigative staff should be on a permanent basis attached to the Committee on Appropriations. I repeat that our present very splendid staff does not have the time in which to do the job. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is making a very fine statement.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I appreciate the gentleman's further explanation. It is pointed out very clearly in the gentleman's remarks in these hearings, and it is important that they be emphasized.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. As the gentleman knows, when our party was in power in 1953, the Committee on Appropriations employed about 10 very expert accountants. Many of them right out of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. And then we brought into Washington a number of public accountants from large business institutions. Ultimately we had a staff of about 50. They divided into small groups and went into every department of government and brought to us the facts as to where we could cut expenditures. As the gentleman knows that year we cut the President's budget by a sum of over $10 billion.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I appreciate the gentleman from Iowa's remarks which were made at a point just preceding the remarks that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has herein inserted. Referring to the gentleman from Iowa's [Mr. JENSEN] remarks, I have had no opportunity of knowing what the remarks inserted by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] are. It is a point that should be made, and I suggest to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, if he is sincere, and I am sure he is, in his efforts to cut the budget, that he might well employ similar techniques that were used by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] at the time he was chairman of the committee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I cannot yield; I wish to finish my statement.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], of course, is too wise a man and too experienced in appropriation matters not to know that no Chief Executive can completely handle the budget. He does the best he can with it and presents it to Congress.

Every President knows, every executive knows, that his budget is going to be worked over. He knows also that the Congress has additional techniques that the executive department does not have in coping with these budgets. For instance, we can call in witnesses, we can use the facilities of the General Accounting Office, we can utilize the experience of the Committee on Expenditures in running down some of these things. There are so many techniques that the Congress has that are not available to the President.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not yield; no. I want to finish my statement.

That is the reason the Constitution very properly vests the authority on appropriations in the Congress.

Now I yield.

Mr. CANNON. The Congress has no spending authority. That is vested in the President.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Congress has the basic authority. Now I want to present some figures I have obtained pertaining to this particular budget, and I might say I disagree with the $71.8 billion proposal if we are going to avert inflation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would like to ask just one question. Is there any authority that the President does not now have? Is not the President of the United States as Commander in Chief the person who should be best qualified and in the best position to bring about this unification and do away with this duplication of buying than any other individual?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, there is authority that the President does not have, but basically, I cannot agree with the gentleman more. I take exception to the criticism offered by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, when at the same time he is not assuming his

responsibilities in this area in not adopting the techniques available to Congress. I am critical of his statement when this budget is being presented and nothing is being done by the Congress about the failure to bring about unification of the armed services. In these areas there is a great deal to be done. If the Hoover Commission recommendations were implemented we would have saved 3 or 4 billion dollars a year. On the other hand, I might say, under the leadership of that side of the aisle, although there was help from this side, too, stones were thrown in the way of one of the recommendations and that was taking the Military Establishment out of business.

Now, I would like to get some figures in because much has been said about the actual budget itself. It is important to realize that at the end of fiscal year 1953, a grand total of balance available of unspent appropriations—that is, the authority to go ahead and spend this money from previous appropriations—was $103 billion, $60 billion of which was for defense. At the end of fiscal year 1957, and this is partly an estimate, the total for carryover of unspent items is $70 billion of which $40 billion is for defense. You will notice that is an overall cut of $33 billion. At the end of fiscal year 1958, it is estimated the carryover of unspent appropriations will be $70.5 billion.

Here is another set of figures. Twenty-two billion dollars has been cut off of these unspent appropriations. This is money that Congress said could be spent, but the executive branch did not spend. That shows a good course of action on the part of the executive department.

When Mr. Humphrey and the President stated they are going to continue to ride herd on these expenditures, I think we can take them at their word because they cut out $22 billion they could have spent but did not spend. I think we have to view the picture as a whole. In other words, we have to consider the proposed budget in conjunction with the carryover unspent appropriations from previous budgets. By cutting down on the size of the carryover figures, both the Executive and the Congress gain a better control over expenditures and future appropriations. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee could assist in this endeavor, and probably right in this area the proposed budget could be reduced in size by a considerable amount.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself time to say that the Congress has no techniques which the President does not possess. So far as the General Accounting Office is concerned, it is open to him and his Budget Director as well as to us. As a matter of fact the Director of the Budget is himself a professional accountant.

Any suggestion that we have access to service denied the President is on the face of it without foundation.

The gentleman also refers to a recommendation made by Secretary Humphrey last year that all appropriation bills be completed in the House down to the final vote on passage and then held over until the end of the session and after all have been brought to this stage they be again passed as one bill. The suggestion was so absurd and so impracticable that the committee refused to give it serious consideration.

Then the gentleman asks why we have not adopted the recommendations of the Hoover Commission when I have just shown we adopted all that were practical and identified them in tabular form, and included a table showing that the appropriation bills continued to increase under this administration, the Hoover Commission recommendations to the contrary notwithstanding.

On the motion to eliminate the roadblock against taking the Government out of business I call attention to the fact that this motion was by Chairman Vinson of the Armed Services Committee and that I voted with him to take the Government out of business.

The charge that the Military Establishment "generates 3 or 4 billion annually in surpluses which are sold for an average of 8 cents on the dollar," is made without concrete support but if it has any basis of fact it is an administrative function and the administration should remedy it.

He also complains that the Bureau of the Budget meets jointly with the Defense Department down at the Pentagon. That again is an administrative matter over which the Committee on Appropriations has no jurisdiction. And he should address his complaint to the executive department.

The reference to large, unspent, carryover appropriation balances at the end of fiscal 1953 and the subsequent reduction of such balances in no way alters the essential fact, which is that expenditures under this administration have been increasing steadily during the past 3 years. Large unspent balances in 1953 are the natural consequence of appropriations, supported by both sides of the aisle, made during the Korean war. As indicated by the gentleman from Missouri, these balances are now on the increase, and, moreover, new appropriations requested are increasing each year. It is absurd to suggest that there is any achievement, or credit due, for reducing carryover balances by saying they could have been spent but were not spent. On the contrary, they were reduced only because they were spent—that is the way they were reduced. If the gentleman wants to claim a $22 billion credit in this manner as an accomplishment, that is his privilege.

But the consummation of the gentleman's argument is that if the budget which the President sends down is not reduced Congress must assume responsibility. When the President's resolution on foreign policy came up in the House the other day it was the contention on that side that we should follow the President's recommendation. But when the President signs the budget and sends it down with the recommendation that it be passed as written—and when his Secretary of the Treasury and Budget Director appear before the committee and tell us that it should be passed without dotting an "i" or crossing a "t"—that they cannot recommend even the minutest change in it, then the gentleman from Missouri contends that we should not follow the President. Let me ask the gentleman when we should follow the President and when we should not follow him. If the President thought the budget should be cut why didn't he cut it himself. If the gentleman's idea is correct this is the first President in the history of the Nation who has sent down a budget and asked that it be cut.

Now the gentleman from Missouri says we "can take the President and Mr. Humphrey at their word." That is just what past experience teaches us we cannot do.

The budget for 1956 contained a lump-sum unallocated reduction of $1,750,000,000 in the Defense section which was precisely labeled as an anticipatory savings which the Defense Secretary could not pinpoint and allocate but which he felt could be accomplished during the period covered by that budget. Of course, this unusual item served to discount budget totals by $1¾ billion. But what were the results? In that budget, defense spending was shown at $35,750,000,000, discounted by the unallocated reduction to arrive at an even $34 billion. Actual defense spending in 1956 turned out to be $35,791,000,000—the $1,750,000,000 unallocated reduction vanished along with $41 million additional. And this happened in a budget area consuming more than half of the budget and almost universally recognized as a source of tremendous waste and extravagance.

And now, Mr. Chairman, let me take time to answer these gentlemen who are always coming in here and excusing themselves by saying they did not have the necessary data—that they had no means of investigation—that they needed investigators.

Mr. Chairman, under our system of investigation which has been in effect for many years and which was devised in collaboration with Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, and which uses many General Accounting Office FBI men—no member of the Committee on Appropriations has ever asked for an investigation which he did not get and which was made by the most experienced and best trained men in the world. I make that statement advisedly. No member has ever asked for information which was not submitted in detail and in written form.

None of our investigators have permanent places on the payroll of the Committee or the House. Two of them remain for 2 years, the first year as Assistant Director and the second year as Director. The remainder are taken from Federal agencies long enough to participate in one investigation, are transferred to the Committee payroll at the same salary received in the Department and as soon as the investigation is completed are removed from the Committee payroll and returned to their own office.

The advantages of the system are:

First. It is economical. The employees are on the House payroll only as long as needed. If a permanent staff were employed the entire force would be drawing salaries whether the committee was conducting an investigation or not. But under this system a man is called from the Department and placed on the House roll, at the same salary he is drawing in his present position. As soon as the assignment is completed he is returned to

the Department and goes off the House roll and back to his original roll. His salary cannot be raised by the committee and he is not paid a day longer than required for the assignment.

Second. Men especially qualified for the particular investigation involved are secured. In some investigations an auditor is needed, in some a lawyer, in some a chemist, in some an efficiency expert, in some a detective, and so forth. Accordingly, the man best fitted for the assignment is requisitioned. If an auditor is needed the General Accounting Office may be asked to supply the man. If a chemist, the Bureau of Standards; if a lawyer, the Department of Justice; if a civil-service expert, the Civil Service Commission; if a detective, the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the Secret Service of the Treasury Department. By way of rotation auditors are also available from the Army, Navy, SEC, RFC, WPB, OPA, and Tariff Commission, chemists from Agriculture, Treasury, and others, and lawyers from the legal staffs of all departments, and so forth. No other system yet suggested will so promptly and so exactly supply just the precise character of qualification needed for any specific investigation.

Third. The system is elastic. It supplies 1 man or 10 men on short notice. There are 10 subcommittees. If only 2 order an investigation, a half dozen men will suffice. But if all 10, or any considerable number of the 10, simultaneously request investigations, the requisition jumps to 50 or 60 men. Then during vacation, when only 1 or 2 subcommittees are investigating, the number drop again. But for any investigation or number of investigations, this system meets the emergency. It supplies just the number needed and no more—and for the time required—and no longer.

Fourth. The system supplies men of rare qualification. For such investigations the departments assign their best operators. These men are experienced. They are trained. They are tried and tested. They have come up through the ranks. They have demonstrated their fidelity and capacity. There are among them no tyros or amateurs. They are the ablest and most dependable men that are to be secured and incomparably superior to the men to be had by political selection of a permanent House staff. Furthermore, they are active and alert. Men on permanent staffs grow old and inert with the passage of the years, but the departments are a never-failing fountain of youth and energy.

Fifth. The constant change in operatives sends into the departments men unknown and unacquainted in the bureaus which they investigate. They have had no opportunities to establish cordial relations. They are new faces and new brooms—and they sweep clean.

Sixth. The only interest of the operator is to secure the facts as quickly and as economically as possible and get back to his own office. Under the average committee of investigation the employee is likely to swayed by two dominant interests: First, he wishes to prolong and perpetuate his job. He is drawing a better salary than he can get anywhere else and he wants to make it last as long as conditions permit. Second, he feels that he must justify his employment by "making his case" and "getting his man."

There is no such incentive under this system. Congressional committees of investigation now operating have expended vast sums—as high as half a million dollars—with little visible results. The Committee on Appropriations conducting investigations in many departments for the larger part of the year has spent less than $20,000 and secured invaluable results.

Seventh. The system cannot be used for the publicizing or aggrandizement of the chairman or any member of the committee. Requests submitted by the subcommittees are for facts. Opinions are not admitted. The investigators receive written assignments and make written reports, and from those facts reported the members of the committee deduce their own opinions, although the committee may request, through the staff, an analysis of the data by an expert not connected with the original investigation. Results of the investigations are not released to the newspapers. The department which has been investigated does not itself know what the investigator has reported and as a result must be on its toes ready for any development when its representatives appear before the committee in the hearings on the budget estimates.

Eighth. On the other hand, the system cannot be used as an instrument of persecution. The fact that a department is investigated is in no way to its discredit. Investigations are routine and are expected and as a rule welcomed by the departments. While many instances have been reported which justified heavy retrenchments, there have been occasions when on the basis of the reports submitted by the investigator the appropriation was increased over the budget estimate. The system makes for efficient administration as well as economical administration. And it is effective even when not in use. It is like the shotgun behind the door. The very knowledge that it is there is a deterrent—even though not in use. The mere fact that Congress can investigate, and is supplied with effective machinery for investigation, exerts a salutary influence.

On the whole, the system has proven remarkably successful. It has met every requirement. In fact, it is difficult to imagine a system which would be more responsive to our needs and more economical and effective in its operation and results.

The surprising feature of the system is that it has met with no criticism from any source. Every member of the committee, both of the majority and minority, approves of it without reservation. Even the departments which have been investigated uniformly express appreciation of the tact and courtesy with which the investigations have been handled, and have cooperated with the committee. It has not only been comparatively inexpensive but through the information deduced the subcommittees have been able to make material retrenchments.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree more with the gentleman who just preceded me in regard to the need for cutting the budget, but I do believe there is one program we should scrutinize very carefully before accepting the Appropriation Committee's recommendation. I refer particularly to the failure of the committee to include strategic metals in the budget in order to continue a program which was voted last year.

Mr. Chairman, we are confronted here with a simple choice. Should we support, for an interim period, a new industry that our Government called into being to meet a strategic metal shortage during the Korean war? Or should we, once again, allow this industry to go out of business leaving us dependent upon the foreign sources which proved so undependable in the recent past?

Prior to the Korean conflict, we had no tungsten industry. When the Korean war broke out, this Nation had to shop all over the world, paying up to $65 per ton, plus costs of transporting this material to the United States. During this period, the Government encouraged a domestic tungsten industry by guaranteeing a purchase price of $63 per ton. The encouragement paid off. We are now producing 42 percent of the Nation's tungsten supply.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is only wise to keep this industry going until the President's long range metal program can be considered by Congress. If we abandon this domestic industry now and permit our mines to fill with water, what guaranty have we that in the case of new emergency we will not have to again shop on the world market and be gouged by foreign producers who will charge all the traffic will bear.

It has been said that we now have a stockpile sufficient to meet defense needs.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt that anyone in this Government can make such a statement with any assurance that it is accurate. Tungsten is a metal that we are going to consume in ever-increasing quantities as we become more and more dependent upon high-heat energy. Our technology is advancing with such rapidity that we may need and be able to use twice as much tungsten as we now have on hand.

An adequate, healthy domestic tungsten mining industry is the best insurance this Nation has against being victimized on world metal markets by other nations, who, knowing we must have this metal, will boost the price sky high if we become dependent upon their production. The continuation of this program and its relatively minor cost is a small premium to pay for this type of insurance.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss that portion of the report relating to the acquisition of domestic minerals.

In the beginning, I would like to say that I am very unhappy to find myself

in disagreement with my respected friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] the chairman of that subcommittee, and I believe that when the Committee on Appropriations gets the facts before it with respect to this program these funds will be restored. As a matter of fact, the unanimity of the support in the executive branch for this program when it was voted by the Congress last year and the unanimous action of this House and of the Senate in passing this legislation, subsequently signed by the President, leaves me in some mystification as to why now, after the Committee on Appropriations itself appropriated $21 million last August for this program, it should be peremptorily cut off.

The committee report dealing with this subject matter is on page 11 of the report, and if you have it before you, I would like to call your attention to the second paragraph, which reads as follows:

The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization assured the Congress in June 1956 that there was no defense justification for further domestic purchase of any of these four minerals, pointing out—

And so forth.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I wish the gentleman would complete the paragraph.

Mr. ENGLE. I will be glad to complete it if the gentleman considers it relevant.

Mr. JENSEN. Please.

Mr. ENGLE. "Pointing out that in each instance the amount on hand and on order met both the minimum and long-term stockpile objectives."

And then he cites the example of tungsten.

Now, the members of this committee might assume from that quotation by Dr. Flemming that he opposed this program, and they might assume, also, except for a careful reading of the statement, that Dr. Flemming's statement is a current one made before the Committee on Appropriations. As a matter of fact, the exact opposite is the truth. Dr. Flemming did not oppose this program, but he supported it. Not only that, but the testimony quoted is not testimony given before the Committee on Appropriations this session but given before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in June of 1956.

The measure, which was reported by the House Committee on Interior and which became Public Law 733 was the subject of House Report 2596 to accompany S. 3982 which is available to the Members. I want to read from page 5 of that report. This is a quotation from the report itself as distinguished from Mr. Flemming's testimony, which I will also read:

The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming in recommending that the Congress provide the interim assistance which would be authorized by S. 3982, as amended, cited the recommendations of the President's Cabinet Committee on Minerals Policy and presented a summary of his position, as follows.

And following is a discussion of the recommendations of the President's Cabinet Committee on Minerals Policy by Dr. Flemming; and point 4 is as follows:

The Cabinet Committee on Minerals Policy also recognized that the development of mineral resources may involve factors beyond the national security.

And Dr. Flemming goes on to say:

As I have already indicated, however, we believe that where a domestic purchase program is about to terminate and where all defense needs have been met, the Congress should make provision beyond the scope of defense legislation to assist the industry by providing for the purchase of specified amounts from nondefense funds until the Congress has had time to consider recommendations from the appropriate nondefense agency for a long-range program.

The long-range program is promised and will be here. He went on to say that

Based on this approach—

This is Dr. Flemming speaking who is quoted on page 11 in the subcommittee report:

Based on this approach, I have taken action necessary to insure the continuance of domestic purchase programs for six minerals under the authority of the Stock Piling Act or the Defense Production Act.

And he names all 6 of them. And they were continued by Executive order. Then he goes on, and I quote him again:

I also recommend that in the case of four minerals: chrysotile asbestos, acid grade fluorspar, tungsten, and columbite-tantalite—for which all defense needs have been met, the Congress provide interim assistance pending consideration by the Congress of a long-range nondefense program.

In other words, Dr. Flemming not only did not oppose this program, he vigorously supported it and recommended it and Assistant Secretary Felix Wormser who is also quoted in this report appeared before our committee and testified as follows:

Failure to provide this readjustment assistance might cause destruction of domestic production capacity necessary to our anticipated future peacetime industrial requirements. Furthermore, failure to enact such a program might well negate the gains that have accrued from the defense-related programs. For these reasons we believe some form of interim Government support during this transitional phase would be proper.

That, of course, was the function of the bill then before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that passed the House and that is here repudiated in this report from the Committee on Appropriations. But that is not all. Along came the Bureau of the Budget, that tightfisted Bureau, and what did it say? And I am quoting now from page 7 of the same report, the statement made by Robert E. Merriam, Assistant to the Director. He says, and this is his language:

Quite quickly, I can say this: That from the standpoint of the Bureau of the Budget, the testimony submitted here this morning by Mr. Wormser and Mr. Flemming does represent our position in these matters. We feel that it is wise to develop an interim program, and we want to emphasize that word "interim," which would tide us over a very difficult situation in those metals where the defense needs have now been met. And we would endorse and subscribe to the amendments to S. 3982 that were suggested here this morning by Mr. Wormser.

We adopted all of those amendments, and that is the program referred to which was enacted by our committee. The statement in the Appropriations Committee report does not contain new information. This matter was all before the House of Representatives in July of last year.

The fact of the matter is that every executive agency that has had anything to do with this program has supported it. Dr. Flemming supported it notwithstanding the quotation you see in the report. The Interior Department supported it. The Office of Minerals Mobilization supported it. The Bureau of the Budget supported it. The President of the United States supported it by signing the bill.

That is not all. This legislation had such unanimity of support in the Congress that it passed the Senate without a rollcall vote with no opposition whatever from anybody. It came over here to the House of Representatives. We brought it on the floor under suspension of the rules, that requires a two-thirds vote, and no one even raised his voice. There was nothing to say because no one was opposing this legislation.

Following that, the Appropriations Committee appropriated over $21 million to effectuate this program, to put it into operation. The miners went into production in reliance on the continuance of a program for 18 months that had been voted by Congress after unanimous support from every executive agency involved. Now we find ourselves cut off without a plugged nickel in this urgency appropriation bill, although it was clearly understood when the $21 million was voted last year that it would not be sufficient. This is a very unusual situation.

Let me deal with one other aspect of the statements made in this report.

The Appropriations Committee report quotes the veto message of August 14, 1955, when the President vetoed H. R. 6373, which would have directed the continuation of existing domestic minerals purchase program. This veto message is presumably quoted in support of the proposition that the present program should be stopped. The fact is that the President favored this legislation and signed the bill S. 3982 which put it into operation. S. 3982, which became Public Law 733, met on an interim basis the objections which the President made in his veto message of August 14, 1955. That is demonstrated by the testimony of Dr. Flemming which appears on page 6 of House Report No. 2596. Dr. Flemming points out that the action taken is not a piecemeal approach to which the President objected. He states in his testimony, which I have previously quoted, that he had taken executive action to continue the domestic purchase program with reference to six minerals—mica, chromite, beryl, manganese, fluorspar, and antimony. And, in order to round out the program, he recommended the enactment of Public Law 733 adding the 4 minerals which had been deprived of funds in this appropriation bill. Our

committee, on page 13 of the same report, points out that it was our purpose to "round out the package program for interim assistance to a number of the important segments of the domestic mining industry."

The Appropriations Committee has now made a piecemeal program out of the situation by striking down 4 of the 10 minerals recommended for continuation in the overall approach to the problem which the President had requested.

The Appropriations Committee's report calls attention to the fact that one of the largest producers got over $2 million of the money and, according to their information, 9 producers received 87 percent of the funds. If the Members of the House interested in this legislation had been given an opportunity to testify prior to the action taken by the Appropriations Committee, we would have pointed out two facts with reference to this situation.

The first is that most of the small miners do not have processing facilities and, therefore, must process their materials through the bigger operators. Most of the larger operators mentioned in the tabulation, which appears in the Appropriations Committee hearings, actually represented the production also of a large number of small producers. A correct statement of the number of producers participating in this program which I have secured from the General Services Administration, the administering agency for the purchasing of these materials, is as follows:

*Public Law 733—As of Jan. 31, 1957*

| | Number of producers | Short-ton units purchased |
|---|---|---|
| Arizona | 10 | 3,958 |
| California | 89 | 53,236 |
| Colorado | 17 | 36,441 |
| Idaho | 5 | 17,602 |
| Montana | 7 | 31,464 |
| Nevada | 73 | 115,399 |
| New Mexico | 1 | 22 |
| North Carolina | 1 | 24,999 |
| Utah | 4 | 155 |
| Washington | 1 | 774 |
| Wyoming | 1 | 20 |
| Total | 209 | 283,424 |

The above tabulation shows that the number of producers was admittedly less than under the old program, which was in excess of 700, and that brings up the second matter.

The price has been cut from $63 to $55, and since the small producers are the highest-cost producers they go out of business first. Additionally, the on-again-off-again way this matter has been handled works great hardship on the small producers, who do not have the financial resources to shut down and start up. But, all of the production of the small producers goes into this program whereas only a portion of the production of the large producers goes into it since there is a limitation of 5,000 units per month. In fact, only 25 percent of the domestic production of tungsten is now handled under the Government purchase program, the balance going into regular channels of trade.

The criticism of the Wha Chang Corporation, which is the largest purchaser referred to in the last two paragraphs in the Appropriations Committee report, is not only unwarranted but unfair. Wha Chang has two mines in this country in which it has invested over 6 million dollars. This capital investment will not be recaptured even if this program runs the entire period for which it was initiated. Moreover, the Appropriations Committee did not have the facts on the contract of this corporation for foreign tungsten. The contract is for tungsten in Brazil and was entered into during the Korean war. Wha Chang offered to drop the contract but the Government insisted that the contract be completed. At the time the contract was entered into the Government was begging for tungsten, and now Wha Chang finds itself criticized for having a contract entered into during the Korean war which it offered to relinquish but which it was told to perform.

The question before the Congress when this program was authorized last summer was whether or not we wanted to continue the domestic mining program on an interim basis until such time as the executive agencies presented their long-range nondefense domestic mining program to the Congress. As I have previously said, every executive agency involved unanimously supported the continuation of the domestic mining program on an interim basis for that purpose and the bill to do so passed the Congress without any opposition. Additionally, the Appropriations Committee and the Congress approved $21 million to put the purchase program underway. In other words, the executive agencies and Congress decided that the domestic mining industry should be continued on an interim basis and provided a portion of the funds.

Now the Appropriations Committee has redecided the matter and intends to veto the action taken by Congress last August by refusing to provide any further funds. We feel that this is manifestly unfair to the mining industry which made its investments, reopened its mines and proceeded to continue to produce in reliance upon Public Law 733 and the initial appropriation which was made.

The long-range domestic mining program is presently being prepared in the executive branch. Secretary Seaton promised to bring up such a program when he was confirmed as Secretary of the Interior, and, as recently as last fall in his speech in Los Angeles, agreed to present a long-range domestic, nondefense mining program to Congress in this session. I am in hopes that with full understanding of this matter the Appropriations Committee will restore these funds thus keeping the commitment which Congress made when Public Law 733 was passed, and continue the domestic mining industry on an interim basis until such time—certainly not longer than the period for which this program was set up—as Congress will need to enact, if it thinks wise, the long-range domestic mining program which is finally submitted.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations I want to explain a few things about this item.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KIRWAN. May I say this to the ranking member of the subcommittee? We did not give them the $20 million last year. On the evidence that was given us last year we kicked it out. We did not give them a quarter.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. KIRWAN. It went over to the Senate where they put it in. We took it out in conference. When it went back on the Senate floor, the Senate would not accept it. We did not give them the $20 million at all, as the gentleman said we did.

Mr. JENSEN. I am happy that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations has spoken on this matter. The justification before the committee was very weak and unconvincing. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] agree?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; they did not have the proper justifications. Then, referring to the other body again—the gentleman said there was no opposition on the floor there. Senator WILLIAMS and Senator DWORSHAK pounded on this right along. The testimony shows in the hearings that it was Senator DWORSHAK. In fact, some people called me yesterday and made this statement. They are the largest outfit in the country. They said, "You are putting us out of business." I said, "How? Why I thought you were one of the largest steel corporations." But it is their tungsten mines. I said, "Do you buy your own tungsten?" They said, "Oh, no, we sell it to the Government." In other words, for their own use, they buy tungsten at $33 a short ton anywhere in the country, but in mining it they sell it to the United States Government for $55 a ton.

Mr. JENSEN. The American taxpayer pays those companies a neat profit of $22 a ton.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; around $20 a ton.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, to clinch this argument and to answer the gentleman from California, for whom I have the highest regard, he simply just does not have the information that he should have had to make the speech which he just made. Mr. Wormser, Assistant Secretary for Mineral Resources for the Department of the Interior, said before the other body on May 25, 1956, that "some continued assistance is needed in the case of tungsten and asbestos to minimize economic dislocations and permit adjustment to competitive markets."

He testified further:

> In my opinion, continuing Government subsidization of the mining of submarginal ores in peacetime will weaken rather than strengthen the domestic mining industry.

In conclusion, he said:

> It is my Department's recommendation that the Government not embark upon a program to subsidize in peacetime the mining of submarginal ores. Such action would not only be in conflict with our free-enter-

prise economy, but over the long term cannot be expected to yield the benefits to be derived from a more basic approach to the development of our natural resources as recommended by the Cabinet Committee and being put into effect in the manner I have indicated. We therefore recommend that each purchase program be brought to an orderly close when the material involved is no longer needed for defense.

The facts are that the Department of Defense has 5 years' supply of most of these strategic materials on hand and in stockpile at the present time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to the action of the Appropriations Committee in recommending to the House in this urgent deficiency appropriation bill of 1957 that no funds be permitted to implement the provisions of the domestic tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum production and purchase bill of 1956 for the last months of fiscal 1957. I hesitate—momentarily—to voice my opposition, not because I have doubts as to the validity of this program thus cut to nothing, but rather because I do not wish to dull the zealous desire of the committee to reduce Federal expenditures wherever it can be done without materially and permanently injuring some necessary segment of our national economy.

We have information from many sources, including both the President and his Secretary of the Treasury, that Federal expenditures are too high—this notwithstanding the fact that the budget recommendations of the President are consistently cut by the House. I have never been one to urge spending just for the sake of spending. It is now quite obvious that spending is a habit of political administrations not confined to any one political party, as was so often alleged not too long ago.

However, I would be derelict in my duty of representation to our people and to my colleagues if I did not oppose the termination of a sound legislative program by appropriation action alone. Just last July 13, this House gave its approval, under suspension of the rules, to S. 3982, as amended. This bill, the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956, had been approved by the Senate, was reapproved as amended and was then signed into law by the President on July 19, 1956, as Public Law 733. That was July of last year, just 7 months ago. Funds to implement this newly enacted program were requested and provided for in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act for 1957. Let me again repeat, the program and the funds for the program were approved by both Houses of Congress and by the President.

With the funds so allowed, the General Services Administration, as the designated purchasing agency of the Department of the Interior, established the necessary purchase programs. The appropriation of 21 millions was known at that time to be less than required for the operation of the program throughout fiscal 1957. It was expected and admitted that a request for additional funds would be included in the first deficiency bill this year. All parties, both governmental and private, had every reason to assume that a program approved by the Congress and the President in July and supported by the administrative agencies, would have a life equal to its authorized time. Such now appears to be impossible because this program has been struck down—wiped out—finished—by the Appropriations Committee.

I realize that the Appropriations Committee can and should stand on its merit and that it is not, and should not be, the mere rubber stamp of either the legally constituted authorizing or jurisdictional committees, or of administrative agencies. Still, legislative enactment, with its attendant expression of policy, must be more than a passing whim. Laws must be more than mere ruffles to decorate the labors of the standing committees of the House, or of the Congress itself. Honest and enterprising citizens, operating under legislative enactment, must have something more than mere hope that a law enacted in July to run for 18 months will, at least, outlast the first chill blast of the following January.

The respective Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the two Houses of Congress are able and conscientious committees; their membership is equal in dedication to our economic well-being to that of any other committee in Congress. They do not promote grab-bag legislation which must be struck down before it has run its planned course.

What actually is this legislation that has here been cut down? It has a long history, but apparently is still not well understood even by the experienced and learned members of the most powerful committee of the House. When the Korean emergency hit this Nation in its economic solar plexus it found us, as usual, unprepared on the mineral front. Long and valiant battles by the mining industry had improved somewhat the boom and bust, feast and famine policy which we have had so long for minerals, but we were still unprepared for the dangers confronting us, so far as minerals were concerned. Hostilities in Korea did more than create the drain. The tide of battle itself cost us an important source of tungsten, a vital and strategic mineral. South Korea was an important source of supply of tungsten. Yet the battle cut it off. Above the ground campaign roared the first jets in air combat, and with the need for jets came a zooming demand for high temperature materials—and that meant, and still means, tungsten.

In the usual and ordinary course, the Government set out to do by yesterday what the mining industry had urged as wise and necessary procedure on a long-term peacetime basis—that is, secure both a stockpile and a sure domestic source for an emergency. They did not succeed by yesterday, but success did come. Overseas suppliers of these vital materials, including tungsten, again charged all that the traffic would bear for ever shorter supplies of needed goods. Our Government again entered into most generous contracts with overseas suppliers, both for development and for purchase of material from existing concerns. The Government also saw fit to provide a domestic program for many materials, less generous to be sure, but at least something for the home folks. At that time, I might add, all expert opinion ran to the conclusion that it was quite impossible to develop a domestic tungsten industry in the continental United States since our surveys indicated that we did not have commercial tungsten deposits. As it always happens, success brought disaster for domestic producers, or at least disaster was waiting at the door until the Congress extended the domestic purchase program with the Domestic Minerals Extension Act of 1953, which extended these purchases for 2 years.

It is true that the President vetoed H. R. 6373 of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, a bill which would have provided funds to carry these programs to their stated termination dates. This is indicated in the hearings of the bill before us. These hearings also indicate that certain objections to this program were once voiced by the Office of Defense Mobilization. However, equally important, and perhaps more important, are subsequent events which were not brought out in the hearings had this year by the Appropriations Committee on this bill.

These events are well covered in House Report No. 2596, filed by the House Interior Committee in reporting S. 3982 last year. Statements of such positions are found on pages 5 and 6 of the report, that is, House Report No. 2596. The Director of ODM, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, in testifying before the Senate Interior Committee on S. 3982, brought out the facts alluded to in the hearings on the bill before us. However, he went on from there to state that additional developments in the administration, including a study by a policy committee and the Cabinet Committee on Minerals Policy, had forced the conclusion that interim action was needed until a long-term program could be adopted. This interim program is the one now cut out and it was this program which was to sustain certain minerals programs even where defense and stockpile needs had been met. It was upon this recommendation, approved by the Bureau of the Budget, that the Congress passed S. 3982 last July, a program to sustain operations in tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum until a long-term, nondefense industry could be established.

Events since that time, last July, have advanced this schedule. Mr. Felix Wormser, Assistant Secretary, Mineral Resources of the Department of the Interior, in his testimony before the Appropriations Committee this year, stated that the long-awaited, long-term minerals program is about to be born. Having approved an interim program for a vital industry in prospect of this development, we should not now kill it just when the purpose it was to serve is so close to reality.

Concern is expressed in the hearings before the Appropriations Committee that some larger producers seem to be obtaining the most benefit from this purchase program. This is not a valid criti-

cism; rather it is a compliment. Recall, we were supposed to be a "have not" Nation in tungsten. These enterprising men have merely established the fact that we are not. They have gone out and developed these resources—which is precisely what was desired in the Defense Production Act of 1950, the extension in 1953, and the interim program passed just last July. That desire was to find and establish a domestic source of this vital metal. Are we to penalize them for success?

It should also be noted that in these operations, the large and small live and die together. The larger operator furnishes the milling and refining facility to which the small operator sends his ore. Without the larger producer and his mill, the small operator would have nothing. Thus, I know for a fact that some of the larger operators reported in the hearings as receiving substantial sums under this program are obligated to pass much of this on to small operators with whom they have marketing arrangements. They receive, process, and market the ore under lease or contract and must make payment for such supply to the producer. Additionally, it can be shown that the availability of a processing facility and the market furnished by this program has brought into production mines which can and will stand on their own just as soon as heavy development costs have been written off and when the now large supply of overseas ores, largely the result of action by this Government, resumes its more normal size. It was expected that many small producers would fall by the wayside in this stabilizing program.

I cannot believe that the Congress will one day encourage men to begin a mining operation, encourage them to risk their capital, hire workers, and establish processing facilities, and then turn the next day and say, "Boys, we are sorry, but we did not mean what we said. You just take your losses, close down your mines, fire your workers, and let this whole thing go to rack and ruin." Yet this is what is happening already in this program since funds ran out in December. If we do not approve the requested funds for this program for the balance of fiscal 1957, the months from December through July, we will be abrogating a legislative promise upon which men have risked much. We cannot do this in good conscience. The Government has no special option to play fast and loose with either its promises or its citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my remarks have been constructive. I realize that many do not believe in spending funds to sustain domestic mineral industries, yet the record of yesterday clearly shows the great cost to our Nation of our inaction in this field. We have, by these emergency programs, now established the rudiments of a domestic tungsten industry, and this in the face of the fact that we were supposed to be a have not Nation in this vital material. Given something like an even break, these hardy minerals enterprisers, who somehow sustain hope in spite of governmental policies which one day encourage, the next day discourage, will establish a sound tungsten program. They will establish an industry that will provide employment for many workers, provide a sure source of this vital mineral with its irreplaceable heat resistant qualities, prevent price gouging in future emergency, and prove a wise investment to the Nation.

It follows that what I have said applies equally to many other metals and minerals. What we have that is our own, we can depend on in emergency or normalcy. What we develop and build in our own Nation, we get the return from. We do not live in a world so settled and peaceful that we can ignore the wise and efficient development and use of our sources of tungsten, of asbestos, of fluorspar or of many other vital strategic materials.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Idaho.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my colleague for the fine, factual, and constructive statement he is making this afternoon. I would like to associate myself with his remarks and those of my chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply worried as I contemplate here today the complete thwarting of this Nation's domestic minerals program.

It was only last June that Congress enacted Public Law 733. Today the urgent deficiency appropriation bill has been presented to us without the funds necessary to carry out the law we enacted last session. Everything that Congress last year promised thousands upon thousands of miners and their families has gone down the drain.

How in the world, Mr. Chairman, do you go about explaining to mine owners, miners and their hungry families that the word Congress gave them last June can be so blithely broken the following February.

In my State of Idaho there are two principal producers and five smaller producers of tungsten. Their 1955 production totalled 38,520 short ton units of tungsten trioxide, which was sold to the Government for more than $2 million. Presumably because of interruptions in the Government purchasing programs the production went down approximately 15 percent in 1956. By the end of last November there was only one producer still operating in Idaho.

You can see why I am disturbed today. I am also fearful that if the philosophy expounded in this report is allowed to stand the farm price program or the agricultural barter program will be its next victim.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will have the vision, the courage, and the sense of rightness and justice, to correct this wrong by restoring the domestic minerals purchase program item in this urgency deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I simply wanted to make the statement at this point that we find ourselves today committed to a long-term contract at approximately $65 per unit from foreign sources. This tungsten is being supplied under contracts that we entered into back at a time when we had to have this metal. Now it is costing $35 a ton as a result of the Government's program in supporting production of this metal. If we curtail the program then the price will go back up and we will be forced to go into foreign markets again to augment our own supply.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct; and, of course, if it had not been that we were able to get business entrepreneurs to come in to keep the domestic program going we would not have had the supply of domestic tungsten that we have at the present time, as the gentleman recognizes.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. GRAY. I compliment the gentleman on his excellent statement. The gentleman, however, has failed to mention the great unemployment that is going to result if this program is curtailed. This means it will cost the Government more because of the added expenditures the Government will have to make by way of relief payments. I know what would happen in my own district where we produce 50 percent of domestic fluorspar. Five hundred men are employed in that operation. That is something Congress should take into consideration in this connection.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman's statement of course, is correct.

It is not to the credit of the United States to close such a program as this and cause unemployment when the authorizing legislation has led them to believe it would be continued for an 18-month period.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

This is an excellent example of just what happens when we attempt to reduce Government expenditures.

Here is a program with which most of us in the Congress agree. The purpose of the law which was reported out by the House Committee on the Interior last year is excellent, but the question now is, Does the record of administration in its application justify the continuation of the expenditures as they have been made? If we cannot cut the expenditures in a field such as this, if we cannot reduce the President's budget in this instance, then certainly our overall picture for reductions in this session of Congress is almost nil.

This is what happened: The purpose of this legislation—and the purpose was excellent—was to encourage the development of tungsten mines by small miners throughout the United States. The testimony was that some 700 small miners would participate in such program if the Congress would institute it. It is a laudable purpose, but what happened?

From the Department records 43 producers participated in the program, and 9 of those got 87 percent of the amount appropriated. In every instance each of those nine producers was one of the big mining corporations of this country. For example, I note in the figures that were furnished the committee by the Department that Union Carbide received approximately $2 million from the $21 million which has already been spent on this program. I also notice in this morning's paper that the Union Carbide Co. announced in New York this morning its plans to build a building to house its offices on Park Avenue between 47th and 48th Streets in the city of New York at a cost of $47 million. If these funds had been used for the intended purpose, or if the legislation will be corrected by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs so that the funds can be expended for the very laudable purpose which he intended, then I am sure the Appropriations Committee will be very sympathetic toward his cause.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Let me say to the gentleman that that is the trouble with this kind of procedure. You do not get a chance to talk enough to get the facts before the House. The report before the Committee is not correct. The total number of producers is 209. In 1957 the total units of production were 283,424 as compared with 793 producers and 2,996,451 units under the previous law. Admittedly the program has been cut about a third. We expected that when we cut the price. But the small producers have since been squeezed out.

We would like a chance, when a program so vital to the West is before the Appropriations Committee, to have the opportunity to get our two-bits worth in before the Committee acts, but we were not afforded that opportunity.

Mr. BUDGE. The gentleman stated a few minutes ago that the Appropriations Committee approved this appropriation item in the last session. The fact of the matter is the budget item came too late and was sent directly to the Senate. The House Appropriations Committee had no opportunity to act on it in the last session of the Congress. The item was inserted in the Senate; it was taken out in the first conference. A compromise sum was agreed on in the second conference between the two bodies.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I wish to congratulate the gentleman on his statement to begin with, then may I say I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] that there must be some confusion because he alleges that the program should be based on helping a peacetime industry. I understood the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] to say it was based on wartime needs. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON] stated we were being gouged by the foreigners at $65 a ton, yet the purchases under this program amount to $63 a ton. I think the committee is right when it suggests that this program be set aside and perhaps over a long period of time be reconsidered.

Mr. BUDGE. I thank the gentleman. That is what I am suggesting to the chairman and the membership of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; that is, that the legislation be corrected to accomplish its original purpose.

Let me cite another instance. A corporation named Wah Chang has headquarters in the Woolworth Building, New York City. Wah Chang received $2,800,000 out of this program. At the same time it is producing tungsten in other areas of the world and also selling it to the United States Government. Wah Chang also has the beneficiation plant located near New York City for the processing of tungsten. The figures which our staff was able to get in the short time available to them showed that Wah Chang processes the major portion of all the tungsten produced in the free world. I would like to reiterate that the purpose of this legislation is excellent. No one wants more than I to assure ourselves of a proper and adequate production of the minerals and metals in this country so that when they are needed we will have them at our finger tips. On the other hand, I see absolutely no justification for the Government of the United States collecting from the taxpayers of the United States money with which to subsidize the Union Carbide Co., Wah Chang Corp., and the other 7 producers who received 87 percent of the tungsten allocation of the $21 million appropriated and who would get 87 percent of the additional $30 million if the Congress saw fit to appropriate it at this time.

The remedy lies with the legislative committee. It should correct the legislation which it wrote, then the Appropriations Committee would be very happy to implement it with appropriations which can be used for the purpose originally intended. If we are to request assistance from the Federal Government for the preservation and development of our domestic mines, and particularly our small miners, we must be able to present a better record of accomplishment than has been presented in this instance.

I repeat that the intent of the legislation is excellent and if what I consider to have been abuses can be eliminated, then funds should be requested.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to speak on this important subject matter of stockpiling domestic minerals, but it has been so completely covered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] that I will ask unanimous consent at this point to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, a very grave and serious matter is before this House. I refer to the proposed appropriation which would have permitted the continued operation of our acid-grade fluorspar, our tungsten, columbium-tantalum, and asbestos mines. Why do I say this is a grave matter? These are producers of strategic and critical defense minerals—they are essential to our defense needs and vital to our domestic economy. Yet today we propose to destroy them; that will be the direct result of our refusal to continue the program approved by the last session of Congress, and in so doing, we propose to become wholly dependent upon foreign sources for our supply of these critical raw materials.

In my district over 50 percent of our national supply of acid-grade fluorspar is produced. That industry, already terribly depressed, will cease to exist on April 15, the termination date of the present contracts, under Public Law 733, unless we provide additional funds. These then unemployed miners will be added to the 35,000 already unemployed miners in my district.

Consider for a moment the current experiments being conducted in the field of rocket propulsion by our Armed Forces. One of the propellants being tested is liquid fluorine—obtained wholly from acid-grade fluorspar.

We have been advised by the experts in our atomic energy program that an adequate source of supply of acid-grade fluorspar is as essential for our atomic energy program as a supply of uranium. Yet today we propose to destroy our domestic source of supply.

Without an adequate and constant supply of acid-grade fluorspar, our aluminum industry would cease operation immediately. Acid-grade fluorspar is indispensable to the production of aluminum.

Hydrofluoric acid cannot be produced without acid-grade fluorspar. This chemical ingredient is the base on which our entire chemical industry rests.

Research in fluorine chemistry, being pursued by the industry with more vigor and showing more promise than any other research promise in the chemical field, is wholly dependent upon a supply of acid-grade fluorspar. This research indicates that by the substitution or exchange of the fluorine element in the hydrocarbon compounds we will have paints and plastics as well as lubricating oils that cannot burn or be destroyed by heat. In the vital field of national health, acid-grade fluorspar is being used in our drinking water and in our toothpaste as the most effective ingredient ever devised to prevent tooth decay.

I would like to refer to the report which has been filed on this bill. In that report it is indicated that our defense requirements for these minerals have been met. I would first like to point out that the statement concerning our defense requirements was made by Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. I do not need to remind this body that those requirements are based on last year's estimates; in view of the new uses visualized for these materials who among us can say that last year's requirements are sufficient for today or will be adequate for tomorrow. Even the Office of Defense Mobilization revises these requirements

estimates annually. The risk involved in assuming that we are safe and protected by having met yesterday's requirements is so fraught with danger that I shudder to think of the possible consequences of proceeding on such a dangerous promise. And, in the case of acid-grade fluorspar almost 90 percent, so I am advised of the stockpile requirements have been filled by foreign producers at prices up to $65 per ton—while our own domestic mines were closed, our miners unemployed. The present program calls for a payment of $53 per ton for domestic producers, far below what we have paid our foreign suppliers. With our domestic producers destroyed by our failure to continue the present program what will be the price we will pay our foreign producers to meet the inevitable expanded stockpile requirements? It has been my observation that foreign producers, once they have obtained domination of our domestic market, seldom show any consideration in exacting their toll from the domestic consumer, be he a private or Government purchaser. And who can say that foreign supplies will be available, regardless of the cost, when we are confronted with a dire emergency or even to meet expanded stockpile requirements.

My second observation on the committee report is this: Again referring to the statement of Dr. Flemming of ODM on the fact that our stockpile requirements have been met and that there is no present defense justification for this program. I was sufficiently interested in the statement to obtain a complete copy of it. I believe it will be of interest to you to learn that there is considerably more to Dr. Flemmings' statement. In the very same statement Dr. Flemming recommended that the Congress enact Public Law 733. The report neglects to furnish this illuminating bit of information. But I want this body to be fully informed and to know that even though Dr. Flemming testified as shown in the report, he further stated that and I quote from the record:

The Cabinet Committee on Minerals Policy also recognized that the development of mineral resources may involve factors beyond the national security. It stated that—

> In addition to security considerations, the Committee believes that an orderly development and wise use of the Nation's resources is an essential element in a strong and sound economy.
>
> A major objective of mineral policy is a full and orderly program for the development and conservation of the country's mineral resources.
>
> The Committee believes that the Government has an obligation to assure that the mineral resources of the Nation be developed, conserved, and utilized in the best possible manner over the longest possible period in order to enhance its security and commerce. Development of mineral resources is, of course, primarily a function of private enterprise. The Government must, however, continue to assist in many ways.

Thus the Minerals Policy Committee recognized that there may be nondefense problems in the minerals industries and, therefore, that, as is evident later in the report, these problems are beyond the scope of the Office of Defense Mobilization as a defense agency. I suggest, however, that where a domestic purchase program is about to terminate and where all defense needs have been met, the Congress should make provision beyond the scope of defense legislation to assist the industry by providing for the purchase of specified amounts from nondefense funds until the Congress has had time to consider recommendations from the appropriate nondefense agency, namely, the Department of Interior, for a long-range program.

I also recommend that in the case of three minerals: chrysotile asbestos, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten—for which all defense needs have been met, the Congress pass such legislation and appropriate such funds as it deems necessary to provide interim assistance pending consideration by the Congress of a long-range nondefense program.

Thus, gentlemen, Dr. Flemming did not, as the report indicates, oppose this measure but rather he strongly urged its enactment. I am unable to accept any philosophy other than that proposed by Dr. Flemming. I have the utmost confidence in his judgment; and I am equally confident in his unswerving devotion to the cause of the strongest possible American defense; one that rests squarely on an adequate supply of raw materials and particularly critical and strategic minerals from United States sources. That is a policy on which we can never go wrong.

Consider the significance of the few illustrations given above, gentlemen, and ones which could be enlarged. Are we prepared to say that these vital defense industries as well as our health program are to become wholly dependent upon foreign sources of supply for their fluorine? Where do our imports, upon which we will be forced to rely, originate? Italy, Sardinia, Spain, France, Germany, Newfoundland and Mexico; thousands of miles away, and in every case except one, across the wide, and as history has repeatedly shown, nearly defenseless sea lanes; in the case of Mexico the productive capacity of that nation is approximately one-fourth of our present domestic consumptive requirements. Our domestic sources of supply all within the United States are in some cases within 50 miles of the consumption point. Which would be easier to defend and certain of access, supplies thousands of miles overseas or those in our own country on the doorsteps of our consuming industries? Who can guarantee us that all of the foreign sources of supply will remain available to us and be in friendly hands when we most urgently need them? No one. Have we not just recently witnessed the near collapse of the economy of Britain and France, in peacetime, due to their dependence upon foreign sources for a fuel supply? Is this lesson to be so completely overlooked in such a short time? Are we not now embarking upon a similar course?

Or, should we, as decided by the last Congress, permit these vital and strategic mining industries to continue to operate until a long-range minerals policy shall have been developed? That, gentlemen, seems to me to be a far wiser and certainly the only safe course for us to follow.

This present program is but an interim one. If a long-range program were enacted tomorrow, the present program would cease to operate. But, think of the benefits we will have obtained by its operation and its assurance of a continuity of availability of these minerals. These domestic mines so vital to our national security and economy would have been in operation and their products available if needed. The products produced by them would be safely held in the storehouse of our Government; refined and ready for use yesterday, today, tomorrow, or hundreds of years from now—whenever needed, for they are not subject to decay, erosion, or deterioration.

Do we dare to deliberately destroy our domestic sources of supply for strategic and critical minerals? Do we propose to become wholly dependent upon foreign sources for the supply of our strategic and critical minerals when there is no reason to do so. Are we ready to give to foreign nations absolute control of the vital raw materials for our atomic energy program, our rocket fuels, our aluminum and chemical industries? Yet such is the inevitable result of the course we embarked upon today. I for one refuse to follow this course which surely and inevitably will imperil our national security and our national economy, and I urge you to join with me to protect and preserve our domestic, strategic, and critical mines, and in turn provide for our national security and protect our national economy.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an observation, if I may, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], on the floor a few minutes ago, made the statement that he thought the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was derelict in his duty in not trying to cut down expenditures.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not think the gentleman heard what I said. I did not say he was derelict. I asked him what he was going to do about it.

Mr. GRAY. I think if you check the record, the gentleman said he had not done his duty.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I said he had not, and I asked him what he was going to do.

Mr. GRAY. Well, "derelict" and "not doing his duty" are the same thing. I do not want to argue with the gentleman, but in this one appropriation bill I want to tell him how it affects my district. We have 50 percent of the domestic fluorspar production in my congressional district. By cutting out all of the $30 million allowed in this request, you are going to close every fluorspar mine in my district, throwing out of work about 500 workers, which means that the unemployment roll in southern Illinois will be about 30,500 instead of 30,000.

In addition to that, in this bill they are putting a limitation on the administrative cost of administering public aid

in Illinois and the other States, which means that public-aid recipients are going to suffer. So, I say in answer to the gentleman from Missouri that in just two items you are going to affect the welfare of hundreds of people in southern Illinois, particularly those who need help the most, the laboring man and the unemployed man. So, I say in defense of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations: if he had done any more cutting, we would all be out of work in southern Illinois.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Where does the gentleman figure any money goes to Illinois? I was looking at page 14 of the hearings, and I see no item there that would go to anyone in the gentleman's district or in Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. Is the gentleman referring to the domestic stockpiling program?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. That shows that the report is not conclusive, for the simple reason that there is nothing stated in that report that has to do with fluorspar and so forth, unless you look at the bottom, and you find there the payments made to fluorspar, one-half of which in the United States is produced in Mr. GRAY's district, as he stated.

Mr. GRAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is under the heading "Colorado."

Mr. ASPINALL. Colorado produces the other 50 percent.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It has Colorado listed. That is why I am asking where Illinois comes into the picture.

Mr. GRAY. I might state to the gentleman that the report is very incomplete; that we have been selling to the Government from our mines in southern Illinois, and if we do not get more money on April 15 all mines will be forced to close in southern Illinois.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. ANDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The Chairman. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

DOMESTIC MINERAL PROGRAM

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Chairman, during the past 2 days I have received a number of wires and letters from Montana concerning the domestic minerals program, and more particularly the plight of the people of Montana who mine tungsten.

In my State, employment can make or break a community where mining is the principal industry. That now is the unhappy prospect for around 100 men, whose labor has made Montana the third principal producer of tungsten.

Domestic mining development of strategic minerals must be protected against distant foreign production.

I believe we must give every consideration to completion of a projected program of domestic minerals purchase promised by the 84th Congress as outlined in Public Law 733.

I thank you.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARING. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I asked the gentleman to yield so that I could respond to the statement made by my friend from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE], that 87 percent of the appropriation spent out of the $21 million appropriated last August went to 9 producers. The fact is that these larger producers, such as Union Carbide, process material for the smaller fellows and as a consequence they do not show in the receipt of the checks. That is why, when I presented the actual number of participants, it was 202 producers rather than the 47 shown in the committee report.

Mr. BARING. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in defense of the arguments presented by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and others here today who have defended the minerals program so excellently. I, too, hate to take argument with my good friend from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], but he made the remark, as I heard it, that nobody came before the committee to present the case of the stockpiling program. Mr. ENGLE has already told the Congress that we from the Rocky Mountain mineral area were expecting to be called before the Appropriations Committee. I called the Committee on Appropriations a week before this action came up for information and a clerk of that committee—not a Congressman but a clerk, told me that they were not allowed to give information out until the full committee met. Consequently our whole western group was meeting last Friday afternoon, the 1st of February, in preparation for our meeting with the Committee on Appropriations Monday afternoon when we heard that this bill was already printed and the committee report completed. We all felt aghast for we had not been informed that such action would take place before we had a chance to appear before the Appropriations Committee. In fact, Congresman CARL DURHAM, of the Armed Services Committee and Congressman ENGLE, chairman of the Interior Committee were scheduled to talk before that body at that time. We considered this quite a piece of railroading and rough shodding.

I want to inform the Congress that tungsten is one of the most important minerals in America today. The gentleman from Ohio made the remark that we have a 5-year supply on hand. Now, think back a month ago, when the President of the United States stood before this body and told us of the very pressing world conditions existing today and how earnest he was that the Congress should grant him powers unheard of before this, due to the crisis at hand. Now, how can anybody say "how much" is "too much" or that any supply is too much. This is more than I can understand. When you put a jet motor up into the air it lasts about 100 hours under present conditions. Tests show now that with a little more tungsten it will last that much longer. It will make the metal that much harder, it can resist that much more heat, and can go that much faster because the tungsten increases the tensile strength of the alloy.

We do not know what is ahead of us. The Committee on Armed Services and the various testing laboratories has proven that tungsten is one of the most important minerals in America today. If our sealanes are ever cut we will not be able to get these cheap foreign-mined minerals which it appears this country has always relied on. We in the West know that we have these metals there, and that our mines should be developed, a stockpile made, and the mines kept in good condition, because mines are not made over night, and take at least 3 or 4 years in the making. We have to have a healthy domestic mine program going. That is our first line of defense. I come from the West, where I have seen mines fill with water, and you can never get them opened up again after that. It is the time now for Congress to take action and reinstate this appropriation to complete this program so that we may have a domestic production. I, for one, am sick of the point 4, under which we are legislating not just a mere $30 million, as we are asking for now, but billions into the development of mines in foreign countries. This might be a popular program with some people, but it is not right. We should protect our own first.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARING. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. Of course, all we can do on the Committee on Appropriations or any other committee in most instances is to rely upon the figures which are furnished the committee by the Government agency responsible for the program. On page 14 we have set forth, in answer to the comments of the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. ENGLE] the information which was given us by the Department. And I submit that the Department also told us that in order to police the restrictions which are in the bill, no single producer shall contract for more than 5,000 units per month, of necessity the Department must check into each individual company, and this is the list as furnished us.

Mr. BARING. That is just the point I wanted to bring out, Mr. BUDGE, that the committee in their report has used figures erroneously given them and information that is not pertinent at this time. I call your attention to page 12 of the committee report in which it states that it was contended that about 700 domestic producers might benefit from this program—only 49 producers have participated. I also want to call your attention to the real figures in the case which show that just 4 States, Arizona, California, Idaho, and Nevada, with 675 producers in all, participated in and produced 808,501 short-ton units previous to the recent shutdown in No-

vember. In comparison to this figure, since the shutdown in the 4 States only 170 produced a total of only 160,367 short-ton units. This shows that the intent of Congress to stimulate the small producers was not accomplished, and bear in mind, that this is just for 4 States. The fact that only 49 producers as named by the committee, participated, is attributed to the fact that these are large custom mills to which the small man sends his mineral ore. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a grave mistake on the part of the Appropriations Committee to take this appropriation out when it actually affects our national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nevada has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, before we pass from general debate into a reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule, I am going to take you out of the field of minerals for a moment, because I have a little problem on my hands, at least in my State and I think the same problem exists in other States.

I should like to make an inquiry of my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and his subcommittee regarding an item I find on page 10 of the report dealing with grants to States for public assistance. I have a telegram here and before the day is over I should like to learn just what happened in connection with the cut that was made in this item. This telegram I think has been sent to most of the members of the delegation and it reads as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *February 4, 1957.*

Hon. ROY W. WIER,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Have just learned House Appropriations Committee approve placing ceiling on public assistance administrative costs. This would sharply reduce our administrative funds at a time when we are trying to assist Minnesota counties in meeting their rising administrative costs. This bill is known as urgent deficiency appropriation bill, 1957. Chapter 3 of this bill headed grants to States carries this ceiling.

We strongly oppose closed end appropriations and hope that you and your colleagues will not act to reduce administrative funds available to Minnesota and other States.

MORRIS HURSH,
*Commissioner.*

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to the gentleman that we attempted to and did cut $2 million from a total of $101 million now being spent for administrative costs. Since 1950 administrative costs have risen from $57,281,000 to $104,500,000. During that time the average monthly caseload has risen from only 3,405,000 to 3,485,000.

Something has to be done to stop this rising cost of administration, and I do not know any way to do it other than simply not to appropriate the money. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] showed at the time we were holding these hearings that the administrative cost were about 8 percent. Naturally, the folks back home that are getting this money for administering this service do not complain about it because they are not so concerned about administrative costs as we must be if we do our duty. But unless we do something about it, what are we going to do about this budget?

The recipients are not going to suffer at all. This does not take away a penny from the money that goes to the recipients.

Mr. WIER. I understand that.

Mr. LANHAM. However, this does make an effort to cut down on the administrative costs. I do not know how else we are ever going to cut this budget.

Mr. WIER. Let me reply to my good friend from Georgia that I am sure he is well aware that throughout our deliberations of the many items of the President's $71 billion budget we must remember and recognize that every year there is a continually increasing cost of government, whether it is on the township, county, State, or Federal Government level.

Mr. LANHAM. Unless we just quit furnishing the money, how are we going to cut it?

Mr. WIER. I am just saying the application ought to be made in a general way rather than to single out the funds that are used for the administration of old-age assistance. If you apply that same formula to the foreign-aid program, to the military program, and to some more, I will go along with you, but I must resist this cut because of our longtime obligations under this program to the States and possessions of the Nation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, may I say in reply to the gentleman from Minnesota that I am also a member of that subcommittee—Foreign Aid—and I can assure him we will attempt to cut the administrative costs there. We cut the total foreign aid last year a total of about half a billion dollars, and we made it stick over in the Senate. So we just have to take this thing piecemeal. When these problems are before us we have to try to cut here, and let the others take care of themselves.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOLLAND. This cut in the cost in Pennsylvania is going to jeopardize the operations. I think you are making an error. You are trying to save $2 million but stand to lose many millions because you will not be able to investigate the cases. You will be giving money to people who should not get money. I think it is false economy.

Mr. LANHAM. Any time you try to cut the budget somebody says it is false economy.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. With the number on old-age assistance declining, the cost of administration has been mounting and mounting and mounting. It is about time we began to look at it and stop it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include two telegrams.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, with regard to grants to States for public assistance, social-security administration, I am very much afraid of the consequences of the limitation upon the amount to be available for State and local administration as set forth on page 5 of the pending bill.

In this connection, I received the following telegrams yesterday from Gov. Averell Harriman and Commissioner Raymond W. Houston, of New York State:

ALBANY, N. Y., *February 4, 1957.*

JOHN J. ROONEY,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Hope you will join in effort to strike from deficiency appropriation bill limitation on assistance for welfare administration which would cost New York State and local welfare departments $400,000 and establish bad precedent of closed-end appropriations in this field. Telegram to you from Welfare Commissioner Raymond Houston contains details. Regards.

AVERELL HARRIMAN.

---

ALBANY, N. Y., *February 4, 1957.*

Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Urgency deficiency appropriation bill, 1957, chapter 3, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, grants to States for public assistance, contains a ceiling on expenditures for State and local administrative costs. Our State and local departments would lose about $400,000 in Federal funds already anticipated in current budgets which have been reviewed and adopted by local appropriating bodies and fiscal authorities and the State legislature. Seek your opposition because of loss of revenue and because it changes present legal provisions for open-end appropriations.

RAYMOND W. HOUSTON,
*Commissioner, New York State*
*Department of Social Welfare.*

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, you have heard Mr. ENGLE's discussion about the history of this legislation—Public Law 733, 84th Congress—and the reasons why Congress at its last session passed this legislation as being vital to the best interests of the United States. I should like to supplement those statements with some views of my own relative to the defense connotations of the strategic minerals industries.

It is true that ODM has said that based upon its present requirements' data it has accumulated a sufficient supply of some of these minerals. Every year ODM reviews its position as requirements' data change with new and different military demands and weapons. We all know that the kinds of weapons and material shift drastically in a very short

period of time. How much of a guided-missile program was there 5 years, 3 years, 2 years ago? As the weapons change so must the kinds and amounts of materials which must be available for their production change.

We are living today in a time of extremely rapid change in technology. It is impossible to sit here today and project how much of all minerals we are going to need for our minimum civilian needs and for our defense a few years from today. Four years ago we never heard about titanium. Yet, because of technological developments brought about by the Department of Defense and the aircraft industries to make faster aircraft to keep up with Russia we now have a several-hundred-million-dollar industry going in this very strategic metal. Five years ago we never thought about long-range continental rockets and the strategic minerals that would be necessary to make the high-temperature alloys to make such a development possible. Yet we all sit here, gentlemen, and hear testimony from the Department of Defense and from our own Appropriations Committee on the necessity for providing hundreds of millions of dollars in the direction of these new developments. I say to you that none of these are possible without the raw materials to make the alloys and to develop the fuels which can bring these new weapons of defense into existence. Our first line of defense is an adequate supply of everything we need on a continuing basis to keep our production lines as close to technological developments as possible.

Our military people have during the last few years deliberately designed out of weapons strategic and critical minerals like columbium, tantalum, tungsten, beryllium, cobalt, and others, not because these minerals and metals do not make superior weapons but because they do not have the materials available to mass-produce these superior weapons. As availability of dependable sources of supply of these materials increases this policy can and is being reversed.

Since the passage of Public Law 733 by the Congress last year the military have given instructions to their technological people to design more of these strategic minerals and metals, such as tungsten and nickel, into their defense weapons based upon the availability of these materials. This is a matter of necessity, not just whim. By way of illustration let me say that I am now reliably informed, as we all understand, that the Russians have made as great strides as we have in the development of jet engines. I am reliably informed that the Russians are using enormous quantities of these very strategic metals in their superior jet engines. Are we to say that we are satisfied with what we have by cutting off our ability to produce and use them even should we be able to design them?

About the projected uses for fluorspar let me say this: Since Public Law 733 was enacted last year the special assistant to the Secretary of Defense, in charge of guided missiles, stated to the American Chemical Society in New York that one of the new rocket fuels being tested was liquid fluorine. This can be obtained only from fluorspar. All of the finest rockets in the world are of little use to us if we do not have the propellant for them. I ask, should we rely exclusively on foreign sources to provide us with the propellant for this defensive weapon? We are today living in an age of rapid technological developments. We cannot afford to overlook the fact that what might appear today to be a sufficiency in supply might tomorrow be wholly inadequate for all purposes.

In the first report of the atomic-energy program presented to the Congress it was stated that an adequate supply of fluorspar was as essential to the atomic-energy program as an adequate supply of uranium.

Yet, although the administration recommends it, our Appropriations Committee tells us that we no longer need to concern ourselves with domestic supplies of this material, although it takes but a short look at the facts to know that as atomic-power development takes place ever-increasing quantities of fluorspar are needed to make this hope a reality. I say to you today, gentlemen, that the domestic production in terms of tons of fluorspar in the United States now is less than it was 15 years ago. How can we ever hope to achieve the ultimate in technological developments for defense and industry if we deny ourselves the very tools to make them possible or put ourselves in the position of being totally dependent on these very materials from areas that are politically unstable in many cases or inaccessible under certain circumstances.

Let us consider for a moment the new technological developments which point to the necessity for enormously larger supply of tungsten. During the past few years there has been developed within the continental boundaries of the United States a tungsten mining industry which I am reliably informed by the Department of the Interior officials and others knowledgeable in this area is on the threshold of tremendous increases in utilization both for industry and defense. Yet we have a roomful in the stockpile. Are we to destroy this industry and destroy our ability to advance in technology in this area because we insist that this industry is no longer necessary to the welfare?

A little more than a year ago this small group of domestic tungsten producers sponsored a research program designed to develop the best heat-resistant alloy possible in the high-temperature field. This research project is supervised by the developer of the X–40 alloy which came into being in 1942 and is still used in the vanes and blades of the jet engine, and contains only 7½ percent of tungsten. As of a few weeks ago it was the best alloy available for those particular uses. But, thanks to this research program, a better alloy has been developed, However, it is still not adequate. During the last year there have been improvements as a result of this research that the Air Research and Development Command of the United States Air Force has requested the Tungsten Institute to make available the results of its findings and to engage in a cooperative arrangement for an exchange of reports, program objectives, and requirements that will be mutually beneficial so that a tungsten-base alloy may be developed in the shortest possible period of time. In furtherance of this cooperative effort, the Wright Air Development Center has invited the Tungsten Institute to send a group of their engineers to Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, to cooperate in an effort to determine the structural properties and behavior of tungsten as a base metal. Such solicitation of cooperation directed to this small segment of the domestic mining industry is a testimonial of their splendid achievement and an admission of the great need for the development of superior materials for our jet engine parts, guided missiles, and nuclear and other high-temperature applications. These domestic tungsten miners deserve our highest praise for the pioneer work they have initiated and for the confidence manifested by the Air Force in the outcome of their joint effort in this important field of metallurgical research.

Are we to deny to these enterprising tungsten miners the small appropriation requested by the Budget Bureau and lose their production of this valuable resource? If so, they would be compelled to shut down, thus terminating their research program and depriving the Air Force of their valuable cooperation in an effort to improve the performance, durability, and safety as well as to extend the life of our military aircraft.

Consider for a moment, gentlemen, that without acid grade fluorspar no aluminum can be produced, and no hydrofluoric acid—the base for our chemical industry—could be produced. Fluoridation of water and the fluorine in our toothpaste, the best method known of preventing tooth decay, are wholly dependent upon acid grade fluorspar. Our atomic energy program, as I have said, is wholly dependent upon an adequate supply of acid grade fluorspar. Research in fluorine chemistry offers the greatest possibility for advancement of any of our chemical fields. Our Armed Forces today are testing lubricating oils which will last for the life of the engine, this being made possible by the use of one element derived solely from acid grade fluorspar. In this same field we have noninflammable paints and indestructible plasters made possible only through the use of acid grade fluorspar. Are we, gentlemen, wise in permitting these vital industries to become wholly dependent upon foreign sources for their supply of acid grade fluorspar? Who can say that tomorrow those foreign sources will not be in enemy hands and unavailable to us? Are we prepared to take that risk?

When the Stockpile Act was passed—Public Law 520—several years ago the Congress wisely provided that maximum effort should be expended in the direction of reducing our dependency, where possible, on foreign sources for strategic minerals and metals. We said to the executive agencies of the Government, "Go out and find new mineral deposits and bring them into production as a continuing and most dependable source of sup-

ply." This was done. In addition, we have put away large quantities in the warehouse. What we have in the warehouse is the difference between our present available supply during time of use and the total amount presently anticipated for use. If we cut off our dependable sources of domestic supply, then we have only what can be gleaned from foreign sources in an emergency or what we have stored up. Is this a risk we can afford to take—in the light of constant and continuing changes in requirements?

The President's Materials Policy Commission, known commonly as the Paley Commission, submitted in 1952 a projection to guide the materials policy of the United States in terms of their then best information on supply and requirements. Gentlemen, today those projections are as antiquated 5 years later in terms of strategic and critical materials as the military's estimate of rockets was 5 years ago. You could not today recognize either one of these projections in terms of our current needs, and who is to say that what we know today is all that is to be known, and all the development that is to take place in these areas?

When the United States Government decided a few years ago to spend some money developing the atom bomb we believed that this would probably be the ultimate in the utilization of uranium. We were told that there was little in the United States and that future uses of this mineral for power was in the long, long range. Because of an aggressive program in this direction we now talk about the development of power from uranium in the foreseeable future with all of its manifold benefits. Where would we be today if we had refused to spend any more money on uranium after we had developed and stored away 100 atom bombs?

Gentlemen, the philosophy of Public Law 520 is just as sound today as it was when it was written. We need to develop and keep alive our strategic minerals mines that have been built over the past few years at forced draft and tremendous energy. The Public Law 733 is nothing more than a method to carry out the purpose of the Stockpile Act and keep us as independent as possible in an area where dependence is courting disaster.

The testimony before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of both Houses last year made it unmistakably clear that if Public Law 733 were not made effective, these strategic minerals industries would be lost; some of the mines irretrievably. These are new industries that have not yet found their place in the competitive markets. If they are strangled in their infancy it will take many years to replace them. Public Law 733 was a program to keep them alive until they had sufficient virility to survive in open competition or until other programs promised this Congress could be devised to assist them.

We cannot afford to scrap these vital industries any more than we can afford to scrap our research programs in guided missiles and atomic energy.



Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back to chapter 3 of the bill, having to do with public assistance. I think it is important to point out that this increase of 70 percent from 1950 to 1956, roughly from $57,300,000 to $97,600,000, was not just squandering money. It was spent for very definite reasons. I am indebted for these figures to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], who made inquiry of the Department concerning these facts. Twenty-six and six-tenths percent of the 70 percent came because of new programs added to the permanent disability program by the Congress. Fifty-seven and one-tenth percent, or $23 million, came from salary increases which corresponded with increases given to other State employees.

Seven and four-tenths came from salaries for added personnel in order to take care of the program voted by the Congress. Eight and nine-tenths percent came from increased cost due to travel, which items were beyond the control of the States themselves.

I point out that I think the way this is worded it is subject to a point of order. I think it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and a point of order will be raised against it. But if we really want to cut down on the cost of administration, the proper place to do it is in the executive branch, because it is the executive branch that has to O. K. the various administrative costs which are assumed by the States. Therefore, obviously this is not the right time or place to take $2 million out of this bill for administration of old-age assistance programs.

We are making every effort in the various States, particularly in California, and at this point I would like to put in the RECORD a telegram received from the Governor of the State of California.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *February 2, 1957.*

JAMES ROOSEVELT,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Important you review chapter 3 urgent deficiency appropriation bill for 1957 to delete language establishing ceilings on Federal reimbursement for public assistance administrative costs. States have responsibility under Federal Social Security Act for proper and efficient administration of aid programs. Limitation on Federal funds will hamper California program; also administrative moneys needed for 1956 amendments to act which place emphasis on self-support and self-care for aid recipients. Request you join others in California delegation to delete ceilings when bill reaches House floor Monday.

GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,
*Governor of California.*

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I want to point out that in the various States every effort is being made to spend costs wisely, as I think is shown in the testimony of the committee at about page 88. It is an effort to make sure that people are rehabilitated and do not have to stay on these old-age assistance programs, in order that we may make a permanent saving. Far more than $2 million is saved over and over again by these State programs. We should recognize that and recognize that this is certainly not only inhuman as the testimony shows, but a very unfortunate way to try to improve the budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, that concludes all the requests for time on this side.

Mr. TABER. I have no further requests.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

*Agricultural conservation program service*

Emergency Conservation Measures

For an additional amount to enable the Secretary to make payments to farmers who carry out emergency measures to control wind erosion on farmlands or to rehabilitate farmlands damaged by wind erosion, floods, hurricanes, or other natural disasters when, as a result of the foregoing, new conservation problems have been created which, (1) if not treated, will impair or endanger the land, (2) materially affect the productive capacity of the land, (3) represent damage which is unusual in character and, except for wind erosion, is not the type which would recur frequently in the same area, and (4) will be so costly to rehabilitate that Federal assistance is or will be required to return the land to productive agricultural use, and for reimbursement to the appropriation to the President for "Disaster relief," for allocations to the Secretary of Agriculture for such purposes, $15 million: *Provided*, That this appropriation may be expended without regard to the adjustments required under section 8 (e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h), and may be distributed among States and individual farmers without regard to other provisions of law.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in this legislation, as I represent a district which has suffered heavy damages on account of the prolonged drought.

I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that he funds provided for these emergency conservation measures are not made retroactive. This question was discussed by the subcommittee and the committee made some comments in the report as to whether or not payments under this program should be on a retroactive basis.

I personally feel that the program should be made retroactive so that we can protect those who have taken care of their land. I am disappointed that the committee did not include such a provision in this section. In some cases farmers have had to borrow the money to enable them to do this work. Naturally they would expect the Federal Government to reimburse them if a soil erosion program is adopted. I feel that the committee should have made these funds retroactive, and thereby protected those farmers who went ahead and did the necessary work to protect their land.

Along with my colleague from Kansas, [Mr. SMITH], and my colleague from Colorado [Mr. HILL], I signed a statement which was filed with the Appropriations Committee after the hearings

were closed. This statement reads as follows:

Inasmuch as we, the undersigned, desire to have our views made a part of the record or hearings on the item of $25 million contained in House Document No. 48, 85th Congress, 1st session, on page 5 thereof under heading "Emergency Conservation Measures," we submit the following statement and ask that it be made a part of the hearings:

We, the undersigned, cannot stress too greatly the importance of making these cost-sharing payments to farmers for emergency wind erosion control work, retroactive to the 1st day of October 1956.

Soil blowing over a large area of the Great Plains had reached such proportions on or before Octiber 1, 1956, that a great number of farmers were compelled to engage in emergency control measures in order to protect their land and that of their neighbors.

Those who engaged in such practices both before and since October 1, 1956, have spent large sums for this work. Others neglected their land and widespread damage both to their own land and that of their neighbors resulted.

It is our feeling that those who recognized the need for this work and performed it at the proper time should be permitted to participate in the distribution of these funds for such work performed after October 1, 1956, and the effective date of this grant as now proposed.

It would seem that this legislation should not prejudice the thrifty farmers who performed this service to the land when the need became apparent. To adequately control soil blowing, the work should be done before the soil actually commences to blow.

WINT SMITH,
*Sixth District, Kansas.*
J. EDGAR CHENOWETH,
*Third District, Colorado.*
WILLIAM S. HILL,
*Second District, Colorado.*

This statement appears on page 148 of the hearings. We call attention to the fact that this money should be made retroactive; that we should not penalize those farmers who had the vision and foresight to protect their land, and in performing these emergency practices not only protected their own land from wind erosion but also protected the adjacent lands. I remind the committee that in previous years when we have had similar emergency wind erosion programs we have provided for retroactive payments. We think these funds should be made retroactive to October 1, 1956. This would be the fair and reasonable thing to do. In my opinion, we are doing this group a grave injustice by not making these payments retroactive to reimburse them for these emergency practices.

I am hoping that when this bill is considered in the other body a provision can be inserted in this section which will protect these farmers who have already performed the work for which these funds are being made available. I am not going to offer an amendment at this time, but I trust that the bill will contain such a provision before it is finally passed.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good program and this money is badly needed in the drought areas. I am anxious that Congress do everything possible to assist those who are in distress because of drought conditions. This is why I feel so strongly that we should extend this assistance to all of those who are deserving. Those who have had the initiative to do this emergency work in recent months should not be penalized for doing so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Chapter III. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: Page 5, line 3, insert the following:

"PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

*"Foreign Quarantine Service*

"The provisions of law that govern the financing (including rates of pay for personnel) of overtime activities of the Bureau of Customs, Department of the Treasury, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, shall, effective 60 days after the enactment hereof, also govern the financing (including rates of pay for personnel) of overtime activities of the Foreign Quarantine Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: *Provided,* That in the case of difference between provisions of said law, the provisions governing the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall govern the Foreign Quarantine Service: *Provided further,* That whatever title of Government official or employee, name of an organization or unit, designation of an appropriation account, or similar nomenclature appears in any law, the most nearly comparable title, name, designation, or descriptive term in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shall be substituted for the purpose of this paragraph."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment just read by the Clerk has to do with an item for the Public Health Service, Foreign Quarantine Service, which was presented to the committee in the amount of $67,500 to enable the Public Health Service to provide quarantine inspection of vessels on a 24-hour basis. At the present time, with a few special exceptions, inspections are made only during daylight hours. This has resulted in tying up shipping with losses estimated at between ten and twelve million dollars a year to the maritime business. The subcommittee as well as the full Committee on Appropriations saw fit to deny the requested $67,500 in public money and has not included any appropriation therefor in the pending bill.

For many years past the steamship companies have been pleased to pay for the overtime services of customs and immigrant inspectors in inspecting their ships. None of these overtime costs have been borne by the Federal Treasury. For a number of years now, these companies have also sought permission to pay overtime pay on the same basis to the Foreign Quarantine Service so as to have 24-hour inspection service.

The adoption of the pending amendment would permit the companies to pay the overtime and would result in no cost whatever to the taxpayers. It would thus place the Foreign Quarantine Service inspection on the same basis as has been the basis for overtime in Customs and the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

In his testimony before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare on January 28, 1957, Dr. Calvin B. Spencer, Chief, Division of Foreign Quarantine, presented the following statement:

At present, inspections are made only during daylight hours at most ports, except for emergencies, resulting in forced layovers of vessels to await inspection. Because of the increased demand for shipping space in both tankers and dry-cargo vessels resulting from the Middle East situation, various measures have been undertaken to provide additional ships. Performing quarantine inspections on arrival should provide more effective utilization of existing vessels by decreasing time lost in port and make an immediate impact on the shipping shortage.

Dr. Spencer also had this to say:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the supplemental budget estimate under consideration involves a request for funds in the amount of $67,500 for the fiscal year 1957. This sum is needed to pay for extended maritime inspectional services beyond the present regularly established 12-hour day.

The situation in the Middle East, with the resulting pressures on shipping to move cargoes of food, oil and other supplies into the European countries, has made it essential that turnaround time for ships be kept to a minimum in order that they can reload and be on their way. This shipping emergency has reemphasized the past requests of the shippers that hours of boarding service be extended, because of the economic losses to the industry through forced layovers while awaiting quarantine inspection. These losses greatly exceed the cost to the Government of providing this service and it has been stated that they amount to 10 to 12 millions of dollars per year. In some instances the loss on a single vessel will approximate $5,000 for 1 night's delay.

Rather than to staff for full 24-hour coverage, it is proposed to use the present staff, on an overtime basis, to do the inspections as they are requested for each individual vessel.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, permit me to say that adoption of the pending amendment, which I am sure is acceptable to all members of the committee, will solve the distressing situation presented by Dr. Spencer by providing 20-hour quarantine inspection service of vessels without any cost whatever to the taxpayer.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Committee will adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. It will not cost the Government anything, but, in fact, will save the Government many times more than the $67,500 involved.

The Bureau of the Budget requested $67,500 for the remainder of this fiscal year to institute 24-hour quarantine service for all ships entering United States ports. Heretofore, quarantine service has been available only during daytime hours, and if a vessel entered port in the evening after quarantine offices were closed, it was compelled to wait until the following day before discharging cargo. It is estimated that this loss of time costs American and foreign shipping companies about $10 million per year.

The current shortage of ships has emphasized the need for additional shipping space. Ships are being "broken out" of the United States Reserve Fleet. A faster "turnaround" time for ships already in operation could help relieve the shortage. The "turnaround" time could be shortened by extending the hours of quarantine service by the Public Health Service agencies.

While the shortage of shipping space presents the emergency factor—which factor will exist throughout 1957—there are other factors which should be of interest to the Committee on Appropriations.

First. Most of the United States shipping lines which are subsidized are in a "recapture" bracket. That is, their earnings are presently in excess of 10 percent of their capital necessarily employed. Fifty percent of their profits in excess of 10 percent are paid to the United States Government. As an example then, if the cost to the subsidized lines through loss of time occasioned by lack of 24-hour quarantine service should amount to $1 million annually—a conservative figure—then the cost to the Government would approach the $500,000 figure.

Second. Even were the lines not in the "recapture" position the Government would still be out of pocket. Most of the Government's operating subsidy payments consist of wage differentials, i. e., the difference in wages paid to American seamen and foreign seamen. These run as high as 75 percent. Therefore, the loss of time to American shipping lines through lack of quarantine service results in higher operating subsidy payments. These would exceed the $67,500 requested by the budget.

Third. The Military Sea Transport Service, a United States Government agency, operates over 250 ships. About 100 of these are subject to quarantine inspection the same as commercial vessels. Any loss of time to them resulting in increased costs is a cost borne by the Government. This cost could greatly exceed the $67,500 requested by the budget.

For the above reasons a deletion of the $67,500 figure from the appropriations bill would result in a loss to the Government which could reach several times that amount.

The Clerk read as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

*Grants to States for public assistance*

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for public assistance," $275,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $99,000,000 of the funds available under this head for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, shall be expended for State and local administration.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that part of the chapter following the colon in line 7 and reading: "*Provided*, That not to exceed $99,000,000 of the funds available under this head for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, shall be expended for State and local administration," on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has examined the language and feels that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: Page 5, line 7, after "$275,000,000," strike out the colon and insert: "*Provided*, That not more than $15,728,000 of this amount may be used for State and local administration."

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the same ground; that is, it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, of course, this is a limitation on an appropriation and it is in no sense legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has had an opportunity to examine the language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] and is of the opinion that the language constitutes a proper limitation on the appropriation contained in the paragraph; therefore, the language is in order and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RILEY. Does not the amendment that the gentleman has offered cut the limitation on funds available to the States back to the $99 million instead of the $101 million which they feel is necessary to match the funds they have appropriated for this purpose?

Mr. LANHAM. The estimated administrative expenses for the year are $101 million. On a pro rata basis there is $83,272,000 in the total appropriation of $1,300,000,000 already made and there is $17,728,000 in the supplemental request of $277 million. This cuts the $17,728,000 back to $15,728,000 and has nothing to do with the funds that have already been appropriated.

Mr. RILEY. It limits the States for the fiscal year 1957 to matching funds of $99 million instead of the $101 million which they state is required to match the money which the States are spending for this purpose?

Mr. LANHAM. Of course, it would reduce the total.

Mr. RILEY. To $99 million?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. RILEY. Just as the bill provides here?

Mr. LANHAM. That is right.

Mr. Chairman, as I tried to explain a little while ago, this committee has simply tried to save money where money could be saved and to stop the rising cost of the administration of this program. In one of my letters recently sent to my constituents I used a little couplet which I think sums up what we are headed for unless somebody does attempt to put the brakes on to reduce these appropriations. I said something like the following:

Hush little budget, don't you cry.
You'll be a trillion bye and bye.

That is exactly what is going to happen unless we put the brakes on somewhere. This committee is trying to do that here.

The gentleman from California, and I have great respect for him, said something about this being a heartless way to try to cut the budget. He referred to disability training. This has nothing to do with that. This simply puts the people back home on notice that we cannot go on permitting the cost of administration of this program to rise. It does not affect the recipients at all. We always cut the amount that they ask for here in Washington for administration purposes. The folks back home have to learn that they must administer this program as efficiently as possible.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Can the committee advise us with reference to the increase in the cost of administration as to whether it has occurred at the State, the county, or at the Federal level?

Mr. LANHAM. The figures I gave a while ago were the total for State and local.

Mr. COOLEY. I understand the committee has indicated that the cost of administration has increased 75 percent since 1950 while the caseload has increased only 3 percent.

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. I am, of course, disturbed about that.

Mr. LANHAM. We all ought to be.

Mr. COOLEY. In my own county I am advised that the cost of administration has not increased, that, on the contrary, the caseload has increased. Because my people have been thrifty in administrative costs it seems to me they are going to be penalized and it seems to me also that this is an unwise and an unfair way to administer the program. I have telegrams from the Governor of my State and also from the State commissioner of welfare and one from the welfare officer of my own home county and they are all very much disturbed about the reduction.

Mr. LANHAM. They are disturbed all over the country. You will get letters about this and I think everybody has. We are going to hear about every effort we make to cut appropriations.

Mr. COOLEY. Did the committee try to determine where this cost has increased?

Mr. LANHAM. We did not go into the details as to whether it had increased here or someplace else.

Mr. COOLEY. It may be loaded down with a bunch of bureaucrats here in Washington.

Mr. LANHAM. We almost always cut the requests they make.

Mr. COOLEY. They may still be well paid at the Washington level while the caseloads at the State level have increased and the staff at county and State level is underpaid.

Mr. LANHAM. That is not probable.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that I am a member of this committee and that we have not cut this appropriation for administration for welfare. As a matter of fact, we have increased it about $15 million. One Member after another has spoken here and said that we should cut this budget; that we should cut this appropriation. Now, this Department requested $277 million; $260 million of that was to pay the recipients of welfare. The remainder was for administration. The only place we could cut was in administration. Now, that fund has gone up over 75 percent for administration since 1950. The workload has only gone up 3 percent. Now, if it is going to be cut, that is the only place we can cut it. If this amendment is not adopted, we are going to take $2 million away from the recipients and you give that same $2 million to these people who go out and investigate these claims. Now, this committee was trying to carry out the will of this Congress that we hear over and over again that we should make cuts. Of course, we cannot make appropriations to any one county, as somebody suggested. The only thing we can do is make an overall cut. It is a small amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RILEY to the amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: Strike out "$15,728,000" and insert "$17,728,000."

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, this does not raise the appropriation which this fine committee has brought to the House. It simply increases the limitation from $99 million to $101 million to match the funds which the States are providing for the administration of this program. Under the social security law, as we all know, the Federal Government is pledged to match these administration funds with the States. Now, the States have submitted their estimates for this last quarter to administer this program, and in my opinion we would not be fulfilling our contract unless we gave them the $101 million which they say they need to carry out the program.

If there is any waste in this program, I am satisfied it is not in the States. Their accounts and procedures are very closely scrutinized, and I think the fact that they match the Federal appropriation dollar for dollar means that they are going to be very careful, because they are spending their own money just as they are spending the money which is appropriated by the Federal Government. So, I hope that the committee will at least put this fund back to the $101 million which the States say they need to carry out this program for the old, aged people, the blind, the orphans, the disabled, and people of that nature.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RILEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. And the same thing can be said about the several counties of the country. They have fixed their 1957 budgets in contemplation of this amount of money being made available.

Mr. RILEY. The point of the gentleman is well taken. This cutting down of this fund comes in the midst of the fiscal year, and the counties and the States will have no means to raise the difference in the money it will take to carry out this program, and the Federal Government will not be meeting its obligation.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment to the Riley amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. McDONOUGH: On page 5, line 7, strike out all after the semicolon on line 7 to the period on line 10.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a substitute amendment, because that language has been stricken out on the point of order raised by the gentlewoman from Oregon and sustained by the Chair. That language is not in the bill at the moment.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I withdraw the amendment and rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, like many of the other States that have heavy social security administration loads, California is in the same category. I have here a wire from the Governor of the State; from the Supervisors Association of the State of California and from many other sources we have heard that any limitation on the administration of these funds is going to work a hardship on the caseload and the administration of social security. I propose an amendment here to remove any limitation. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY] is recommending a limitation which is equal to the practice that we have had in the past.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RILEY. I offered an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] providing for a limitation.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is right.

Mr. RILEY. My amendment to his amendment simply provides the amount of money which the States themselves say that they will need to carry on the program.

Mr. McDONOUGH. However, the gentleman's amendment is a limitation. The basic Social Security Act provides matching funds, 50–50, between the States and the Federal Government. The situation so far as the gentleman's amendment is concerned is that it is a limitation similar to the one offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] except it adds $2 million. But it still is a limitation of only $101 million.

I am not asking for any reduction in the proposal made by the committee, nor am I asking for any increase in the amount the committee recommends. The estimate, as I read the report, is $277 million for this purpose. The committee reports to the House $275 million. That is perfectly all right. But when you come to administer the funds in a State which has a heavy caseload and where the problem is to find by investigation what people who are entitled to social security should be on the rolls and whether any who are asking should not be on the rolls and you do not permit administrative funds to do that job, it is not fair. This will mean that the State of California will get $400,000 less money for administrative purposes.

I definitely think that we should not put a limitation in here, even the one submitted by the gentleman from South Carolina, nor the one offered by the gentleman from Georgia. I think we should allow them to operate under the formula in the basic law, and if we are going to change that it should be done at some other time and not in an appropriation bill.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I suggest to my colleague that this would be the proper way to do it—to defeat the amendment to the amendment and then to defeat the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia, leaving the language of the bill providing a total amount of $275 million which would not raise the budget but which would, however, eliminate the objections which the gentleman is now offering?

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is exactly what I am saying.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Therefore, we should vote down both amendments.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is right.

The House Committee on Appropriations in reporting out the Urgent Deficiency Appropriations Act, 1957, recommended, first, to reduce the amount of the appropriation request for grants to States for public assistance from $277 million to $275 million, and, second, to insert language in the bill that would limit the Federal funds available for administrative expenses incurred by the States for fiscal year 1957 to $99 million as compared with estimated requirements of $101 million. The adoption of the limitation under consideration would have serious implications for the programs of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

The committee report, in commenting on this item, indicates that the basic legislation establishes mathematical formula for granting these funds to the States and that the costs of the program are beyond administrative control except

for the relatively small amount for the administration of the program. As I understand it, the formula which provides for Federal matching of administrative costs on a 50–50 basis is no less an obligation under the basic statute than is the Federal responsibility for matching assistance payments; consequently, the bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations abrogates without prior notice and appropriate hearings, an arrangement which has been in effect since 1946 whereby the Federal Government meets by law one-half of State expenditures for administration.

Special problems are presented by the proposed application of such a limitation provision in relation to a supplemental appropriation. The States have made their fiscal plans for these Federal-State programs based upon the expectation of receiving 50 percent of the costs of administration for the year. The limitation would cause a great deal of hardship on States in that the total reduction of $2 million would have to be applied against the fourth quarter Federal grants to States. The effect would be an 8-percent reduction in that quarter. This would mean, for example, that the State of California would receive about $400,000 less in Federal funds than they would be entitled to under the 50–50 matching formula in the Social Security Act. The reduction in Federal funds would mean that many States would have to furlough some of their State and local personnel. Such actions would result in inadequate investigation of applicants for assistance and delay action on applications for assistance from the aged, the blind, the disabled, and dependent children.

I do not believe that an appropriation bill is the appropriate vehicle for amending the fiscal provisions of a program which involves more than 5 million people and the Federal expenditure of over $1.5 billion a year.

The wire from Governor Knight, of California, which I referred to is as follows:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *February 2, 1957.*
GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Important you review chapter 3 urgent deficiency appropriation bill for 1957 to delete language establishing ceilings on Federal reimbursement for public assistance administrative costs States have responsibility under Federal Social Security Act for proper and efficient administration of aid programs limitation on Federal funds will hamper California program also administrative monies needed for 1956 amendments to act which place emphasis on self support and self care for aid recipients request you join others in California delegation to delete ceilings when bill reaches House floor Monday.

GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,
*Governor of California.*

The wire from the California Supervisors Association is as follows:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *February 2, 1957.*
Congressman GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
*United States House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Chapter 3 of urgent deficiency appropriation bill for 1957 providing funds for public assistance grants and administration is of grave concern to California counties because it sets ceiling on such Federal appropriations for the first time. California counties must expect the Federal Government to appropriate, without ceilings, necessary funds for full one-half of administrative costs. Urge you join other California Congressmen in seeking amendments to delete ceilings in chapter 3. Understand bill set for floor action Monday or Tuesday.

BILL MACDOUGALL,
*General Manager, County Supervisors Association of California.*

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RILEY. Would my amendment to the amendment be considered before the amendment is considered?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's amendment to the amendment would be voted on first.

Mr. RILEY. Then the vote on the amendment would follow after the House had worked its will on my amendment, is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RILEY. I thank the Chair.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in opposing this amendment I do not argue over the $99 million or the $101 million. It seems to me if we adopt this proposal we would basically change the nature and scope of this very important program from what is set forth in the Social Security Act.

Titles I, IV, and X of that act have been in operation since 1935. Title XIV, relating to the permanently and totally disabled, has been in operation since 1950. The pattern of operation has been proven over the years. This proposed amendment is an attempt to bypass the regularly constituted legislative processes of this body and to change basic legislation by appropriation language without adequate consideration of these changes by the proper committees of the Congress after full hearings.

This is not a question of whether $101 million or $99 million will be appropriated for the remainder of the current fiscal year. Much more than that is at stake.

Under these titles of the Social Security Act, open-end appropriation programs are established. The concept is quite simple. Because the number of potential recipients could not be determined accurately in advance, the Congress did not state in the act the maximum amount of Federal funds which would be available to match State expenditures. Instead, the Congress made a promise to the States that it would match certain percentages of State expenditures both for welfare payments to recipients and for the costs of administering the programs. The only limitations were the maxima on payments to individual recipients and that matching would be available only for such administrative expenditures as are found by the Secretary to be necessary.

The pattern adopted by the Congress for this program was a deliberate pattern. It was designed to preserve and protect to the maximum extent possible State control over these programs.

With respect to Federal matching for administrative expenses, which is the point involved in this particular proposal, the basic statutes provide that the Secretary shall pay to each State "an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan."

The act does not state that the determination by the Secretary of the amounts necessary to administer any one State plan is to be limited by the amounts appropriated by the Congress. An expenditure by a State agency does not become less necessary or even unnecessary dependent on whether Federal funds are or are not appropriated.

The proposed change would be particularly disruptive of the orderly administration of these programs. If this proviso were enacted, no State agency administering these public-assistance programs would be able to plan intelligently and according to sound fiscal practices. No longer would the criteria used in determining whether Federal funds would be available be whether or not the State expenditures were necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the programs. The amount of Federal funds made available to each State would depend not on its own expenditures but on the expenditures of all the other States. The proviso makes no provision for pro rata distribution of the amounts available. Are they to be distributed on the basis of the ratio of each State's population to the total population of all the States? But that would not be fair and equitable in the old-age assistance program, for example. Should those be distributed on the basis of the aged population?

The basic act provides also for adjustments in the State's accounts from time to time as it is determined that more or less than what was due to State had been paid to it. Such adjustments come about most frequently after Federal audit of the State's accounts, which can take place during subsequent fiscal years. If then a State is to be denied reimbursement in a later fiscal year for proper expenditures previously made only because Federal funds appropriated had all been paid out, then we would be opening up the greatest grab bag this Nation has ever seen. The premium would be upon overestimating needed Federal funds, rather than in estimating State expenditures accurately. Such procedures would do more than disrupt State fiscal planning—they would also disrupt the orderly budget practices of the Federal Government.

If this proposal is enacted we would be creating a hydra-headed monster. We would be changing basically the method of operation of these programs without adequate direction to the Secretary as to how these changes are to be administered. We cannot legislate by delegation to uncontrolled and undirected administrative descretion.

We cannot disrupt the orderly processes of the administration of programs which have been functioning under

clearly defined limits for over 20 years by hasty, ill-conceived proposals tacked onto appropriation acts.

The welfare of our aged, our blind, our dependent children, and our handicapped should be of more concern to us than to permit the passage of crippling legislation. If those who propose such amendments sincerely desire to bring them about, then I would suggest that the regular procedures of the Congress be employed—that bills for these purposes be introduced and referred to the proper committees, there to be considered after full public hearings and then reported to both bodies for deliberate and considered action.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I do this, Mr. Chairman, so that we may obtain the program for tomorrow and the rest of the week, and for next week, if that is possible. May I also request the majority leader, if he can at this time, to inform the House of the agreement the two leaderships have reached with respect to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very happy to do so. After the disposition of this bill, the next order of business will be the resolutions reported by the Committee on Rules. Then, there is a bill that has been reported by the Committee on Armed Services. If, as I assume, they will be disposed of today, and, if not, they will continue until tomorrow, tomorrow there will be the drought bill up. A rule has been reported out of the Committee on Rules. I am informed by the chairman of the committee, and I concur, that there will be a rollcall on the passage of that bill. With the passage of that bill, I am hopeful that all legislative business for this week will have been completed tomorrow. I am not in a position to announce any program for next week, but I will do so on Thursday. But, in the event of any program for next week for Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday, and if there should be any rollcalls to be taken, it is the understanding of the leadership on both sides, in view of the fact that the anniversary of Lincoln's birthday will be celebrated on Tuesday, and because many of our Republican colleagues have speaking engagements in connection with Lincoln's birthday, any rollcalls will not take place before Thursday of next week.

Mr. MARTIN. May I say to the gentleman that it would be agreeable to me, and I am sure to all on this side, if it is desired to meet tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock in order to assure the completion of the program I will not object.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is very fine, but I think we will be better able to decide that when we see what transpires during the remainder of the day.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose both the amendment and the amendment to the amendment. The amount of money at the moment, the $2 million which would be cut by the adoption of the recommendation of the committee is not nearly so important as the principle involved in this matter, which is a departure from an agreement of 21 years' duration, an agreement with the States and the counties to underwrite one-half of the administrative costs of these aid programs. At a time when the county governments are diligently seeking means to reduce costs and to control the strong pressures for increases, when the State legislatures are grappling with the problems just as we are here, we propose to say that we are going to put a ceiling on our part of this package. We are going to say, "We have spent years encouraging you to expand your staff and to undertake a better supervision of these programs; we impose upon you standards as to the type of personnel that you will employ in your local welfare departments—we have you effectively over the barrel." And now we are going to say, "We are going to back away and this is all of the kitty that we are going to ante up." Mr. Chairman, that is not responsible government. It is not the proper means for cutting the cost. If we want to reduce costs in administering these programs, let us then examine into the regulations which have been adopted under the laws passed by this Congress which impose upon local governments requirements as to the standards of staff, as to the qualifications of the personnel working in these departments.

There is where we will effect savings, if savings can be effected. But, let us maintain the integrity of this House and recognize that agreement which has existed for years. Regardless of how strong the desire is in each of us to see some reduction in the cost of Government, a great part of the cost of increased administrative overhead has arisen because the Congress has broadened the categories of aid. They have done that in recent years. There has been in State government and county government just as there has been in the Federal Government, increased costs of salaries of personnel. I believe that approximately 7 percent covers the cost of new personnel to the program. Three percent of that represents the increased caseload. Some of it I sincerely hope represents sounder supervision of these programs because it does not save money if you reduce the cost of supervision and thereby permit widespread abuses to develop where people who are not properly qualified receive aid under the various laws enacted by the Congress and shared in by the States and local governments. This is not the proper place to effect sound and lasting economies. All we are doing here is welsh on an agreement and back away from a commitment which has been honored for some 21 years. We can do the job properly by voting down both amendments, and by permitting the proper legislative committee to examine into the entire program. But at the moment, let us keep away from the amendments, and meet our obligations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], and in favor of the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we ought to look at this thing according to the history of it. This is the history: Last spring when the bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was before the Congress, it provided for a certain proportion and a certain item for expenditure for administration. The Congress subsequently passed an amendment to the statute which governed the amount that the different States might use. They increased the amount. They did not increase the number of people involved. So, here we have a picture of administration which was satisfactory to the States when that bill was passed last spring, and we have a proposal to increase the administrative expenses that quick. I was much disturbed when I began to see this situation and when I began to see that they were spending 8 percent of the total for administrative expenses. If the amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] is agreed to, $2 million of that increase that is proposed to be added in this bill would be cut out, but the rest of it would be there.

I do not know how greedy these people can get, but it does seem to me that we ought to be a little particular about how we handle these things, and that we ought to approach the thing from an honest basis and that we ought to expect the States to be honest with us. It is not a question of welfare with me. It is a question of being honest with the people of the United States, and the different States that we between us represent in this Congress. I do not see how we can fail to meet our responsibility and vote "No" on the substitute and vote "Aye" on the amendment which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] has offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. RILEY) there were—ayes 17, noes 90.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROOSEVELT) there were—ayes 89, noes 42.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the telegram which I have received from Mrs. Mary Evelyn Parker, commissioner of public welfare, State of Louisiana, regarding the urgent deficiency appropriation bill before us for consideration today.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *February 4, 1957.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

We oppose action of House Appropriations Committee placing ceiling on administration costs in public assistance in urgent deficiency appropriation bill, 1957, which would reduce Federal participation in State costs. This seems inconsistent with 1956 social-security amendments placing greater emphasis on services to reduce dependency. Our program is expanding to carry out intent of 1956 amendments. We believe Congress should make it possible for the Federal agency to finance its share of expenditures. We will appreciate your working to this end.

MARY EVELYN PARKER,
*Commissioner of Public Welfare.*

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4249) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment to chapter III adopted in the Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: Page 5, line 7, after "$275,000,000", strike out the colon and insert *"Provided*, That not more than $15,728,000 of this amount may be used for State and local administration."

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" had it.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order and ask for a division.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. GREEN of Oregon) there were—ayes 118, noes 46.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The point of order is that that request has already been made in reference to this vote, and the gentlewoman withdrew it.

The SPEAKER. The objection to the voice vote on the grounds that a quorum was not present was withdrawn. The objection to the vote by division, on the grounds that a quorum is not present, is in order.

Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 206, nays 167, answered "present" 1, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—206

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Fenton | Miller, Nebr. |
| Abernethy | Fisher | Miller, N. Y. |
| Adair | Fogarty | Mills |
| Alexander | Ford | Minshall |
| Alger | Forrester | Mumma |
| Allen, Calif. | Fountain | Murray |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Frelinghuysen | Nicholson |
| | Gary | Nimtz |
| Andrews | Gathings | Norrell |
| Auchincloss | Gavin | O'Hara, Minn. |
| Avery | George | Osmers |
| Ayres | Gregory | Ostertag |
| Baker | Griffin | Passman |
| Barden | Gross | Pelly |
| Bass, N. H. | Gubser | Pillion |
| Bates | Hale | Poff |
| Baumhart | Harden | Preston |
| Beamer | Hardy | Prouty |
| Becker | Harris | Ray |
| Beckworth | Harrison, Nebr. | Rees, Kans. |
| Bentley | Harrison, Va. | Robeson, Va. |
| Berry | Harvey | Robsion, Ky. |
| Betts | Haskell | Rogers, Mass. |
| Bolton | Henderson | St. George |
| Bonner | Heselton | Schenck |
| Bosch | Hess | Scherer |
| Bow | Hiestand | Schwengel |
| Bray | Hill | Scott, N. C. |
| Broomfield | Hoeven | Scott, Pa. |
| Brown, Ga. | Hoffman | Scrivner |
| Brown, Mo. | Holt | Scudder |
| Brown, Ohio | Horan | Sheehan |
| Broyhill | Hull | Shuford |
| Budge | Jackson | Siler |
| Bush | James | Simpson, Pa. |
| Byrne, Ill. | Jenkins | Smith, Calif. |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Jensen | Smith, Kans. |
| Cannon | Johansen | Smith, Va. |
| Carrigg | Johnson | Springer |
| Cederberg | Jonas | Stauffer |
| Chamberlain | Judd | Steed |
| Chenoweth | Kean | Taber |
| Chiperfield | Kearns | Talle |
| Church | Keating | Taylor |
| Clevenger | Keeney | Teague, Calif. |
| Cole | Kilburn | Teague, Tex. |
| Collier | Kitchin | Tewes |
| Colmer | Knox | Thomas |
| Corbett | Laird | Thompson, Tex. |
| Coudert | Landrum | Thomson, Wyo. |
| Cretella | Lanham | Tollefson |
| Cunningham, Iowa | Latham | Tuck |
| | LeCompte | Utt |
| Cunningham, Nebr. | Lipscomb | Van Pelt |
| | McConnell | Van Zandt |
| Curtin | McCulloch | Vinson |
| Curtis, Mass. | McGregor | Vorys |
| Curtis, Mo. | McIntire | Vursell |
| Dague | McIntosh | Walter |
| Davis, Ga. | McMillan | Weaver |
| Dawson, Utah | McVey | Westland |
| Dennison | Mack, Wash. | Wharton |
| Denton | Mahon | Whitener |
| Derounian | Mailliard | Widnall |
| Devereux | Marshall | Wigglesworth |
| Dixon | Martin | Williams, Miss. |
| Dooley | Mason | Wilson, Calif. |
| Durham | May | Winstead |
| Dwyer | Michel | Younger |
| Evins | Miller, Md. | |

NAYS—167

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Addonizio | Garmatz | O'Brien, N. Y. |
| Albert | Gordon | O'Hara, Ill. |
| Anderson, Mont. | Granahan | O'Konski |
| | Grant | O'Neill |
| Anfuso | Gray | Patman |
| Ashley | Green, Oreg. | Patterson |
| Ashmore | Griffiths | Pfost |
| Aspinall | Hagen | Poage |
| Baldwin | Hébert | Polk |
| Baring | Hemphill | Porter |
| Barrett | Herlong | Powell |
| Bass, Tenn. | Hillings | Price |
| Bennett, Fla. | Holifield | Rabaut |
| Bennett, Mich. | Holland | Rains |
| Blatnik | Holmes | Reuss |
| Blitch | Holtzman | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| Boggs | Hosmer | Rhodes, Pa. |
| Boland | Huddleston | Riley |
| Bolling | Ikard | Rivers |
| Boyle | Jennings | Roberts |
| Breeding | Jones, Ala. | Rodino |
| Brooks, La. | Jones, Mo. | Rogers, Colo. |
| Brooks, Tex. | Karsten | Rogers, Fla. |
| Burleson | Kee | Rogers, Tex. |
| Byrd | Kilday | Rooney |
| Byrne, Pa. | Kilgore | Roosevelt |
| Canfield | King | Rutherford |
| Carnahan | Kirwan | Sadlak |
| Celler | Kluczynski | Santangelo |
| Chelf | Knutson | Saund |
| Christopher | Lane | Seely-Brown |
| Chudoff | Lankford | Selden |
| Clark | Lennon | Shelley |
| Coad | Loser | Sheppard |
| Coffin | McCarthy | Sieminski |
| Cooley | McCormack | Sikes |
| Cooper | McDonough | Simpson, Ill. |
| Davis, Tenn. | McFall | Sisk |
| Dawson, Ill. | Macdonald | Smith, Miss. |
| Delaney | Machrowicz | Spence |
| Diggs | Mack, Ill. | Staggers |
| Dollinger | Madden | Sullivan |
| Dorn, S. C. | Magnuson | Thompson, La. |
| Dowdy | Matthews | Thompson, N. J. |
| Eberharter | Merrow | Trimble |
| Edmondson | Metcalf | Udall |
| Elliott | Miller, Calif. | Ullman |
| Engle | Moore | Wainwright |
| Fallon | Morgan | Watts |
| Fascell | Morris | Wier |
| Feighan | Moss | Willis |
| Fino | Multer | Withrow |
| Flood | Natcher | Wright |
| Forand | Neal | Yates |
| Frazier | Norblad | Young |
| Friedel | O'Brien, Ill. | Zablocki |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Saylor

NOT VOTING—58

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, Ill. | Flynt | Morano |
| Andresen, August H. | Fulton | Morrison |
| | Green, Pa. | Moulder |
| Arends | Gwinn | Perkins |
| Bailey | Haley | Philbin |
| Belcher | Halleck | Pilcher |
| Bowler | Hays, Ark. | Radwan |
| Boykin | Hays, Ohio | Reece, Tenn. |
| Brownson | Healey | Reed |
| Buckley | Hyde | Riehlman |
| Burdick | Jarman | Smith, Wis. |
| Cramer | Kearney | Teller |
| Dellay | Kelley, Pa. | Thornberry |
| Dempsey | Kelly, N. Y. | Vanik |
| Dies | Keogh | Whitten |
| Dingell | Krueger | Williams, N. Y. |
| Donohue | Lesinski | Wilson, Ind. |
| Dorn, N. Y. | Long | Wolverton |
| Doyle | McGovern | Zelenko |
| Farbstein | Meader | |

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Pilcher for, with Mr. Keogh against.
Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Saylor against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Dies with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Long with Mr. Dellay.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Cramer.
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Teller with Mr. Morano.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Vanik with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Dorn of New York.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Brownson.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. August H. Andresen.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Hyde.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Williams of New York.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Krueger.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Bowler with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. If he were present he would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote of "nay" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON THE BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING HOUSE SESSION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary for the rest of the week may be privileged to sit on various bills while the House is in session engaged in general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration may sit while the House is in session today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

## INSPECTION OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 64 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the following programs of benefits for veterans and their dependents and survivors:

(1) The programs of compensation and pension;

(2) The programs of hospitalization, domiciliary care, medical and dental care and treatment, and furnishing of prosthetic appliances;

(3) The insurance and indemnity programs;

(4) The housing and business loan programs, and the program of furnishing assistance for the acquisition of specially adapted housing;

(5) The programs of education and training (including vocational rehabilitation);

(6) The furnishing of burial allowances; and

(7) The furnishing of unemployment compensation under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952; with a view to determining whether or not such programs are being conducted economically, efficiently, in the best interests of the Government and the beneficiaries of such programs, and in such a manner as to avoid the misuse of Government funds; whether or not such programs adequately serve the needs and protect the welfare of the beneficiaries of such programs; and whether changes in the law or in the administration and operation of the programs either will lead to greater efficiency and economy or will make such programs more adequately serve the needs of the beneficiaries of such programs. The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any matter which is under investigation by another committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, it Territories, and possessions, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such records, documents, and papers, to administer oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, after "That," insert: "effective from January 4, 1957."

Page 1, line 3, strike out "and directed."

Page 3, line 7, after the word "House" strike out the words "is in session."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I offer an additional committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 2, line 19, after the word "programs", strike out the balance of the line and all of lines 20 and 21.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is the customary resolution authorizing the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to conduct investigations concerning matters within the jurisdiction of that committee. I have no request for time on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this is one of a number of authorizing resolutions for committees to conduct investigations and is in the usual form. I am hoping that we may be able to consider them all today. I have no request for time on this particular resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 104 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct through studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorize to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, within or without the continental United States, its Territories, and possessions, as the committee may determine, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or of any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

SEC. 3. The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any studies or investigations made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 1, following the word "That" insert the following: ", effective from January 4, 1957."

Page 1, line 3, strike out "and directed."

Page 1, line 4, change "through" to read "thorough."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, change the period to a colon, and insert the following: *"Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject matter which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House."

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I with-

draw the amendment just read by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 12, strike out "or without."
Page 2, line 2, strike out "is in session."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 99 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That effective from January 3, 1957, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may make investigations and studies into matters within its jurisdiction, including the following:

(1) Policies with respect to competition among the various modes of transportation, whether rail, air, motor, water, or pipeline; measures for increased safety; and adequacy of the national transportation system for defense and the needs of an expanding economy;

(2) Policies with respect to the promotion of the development of civil aviation; measures for increased safety; restrictions on American air carriers which impede the free flow of commerce; rates, accounts, and continuance of subsidy payments; airport construction, hazards of adjacency to airports, and condemnation of airspace; aircraft and airline liability; aircraft research and development, and market for American aircraft; and air navigational aids and traffic control;

(3) Availability of channels for allocation for radio and television; and divestment of international radio and cable facilities;

(4) Adequacy of the protection to investors afforded by the disclosure and regulatory provisions of the various Securities Acts;

(5) Adequacy of petroleum, natural gas, and electric energy resources for defense and the needs of an expanding economy; adequacy, promotion, regulation, and safety of the facilities for extraction or generation, transmission and distribution of such resources; development of synthetic liquid fuel processes; and regulation of security issues of and control of natural gas pipeline companies;

(6) Advertising, fair competition, and labeling;

(7) Research in weather, including air pollution and smog, and artificially induced weather; research into the basic sciences; and standards and weights and measures;

(8) Effects of inflation upon benefits provided under railroad retirement and railroad unemployment programs; and inequities in provisions of statutes relating thereto, with comparison of benefits under the social system;

(9) Adequacy of medical facilities, medical personnel, and medical teaching and training facilities; research into human diseases; provisions for medical care; efficient and effective quarantine; protection to users against incorrectly labeled and deleterious foods, drugs, cosmetics, and devices; and other matters relating to public health;

(10) Disposition of funds arising from the operation of the Trading With the Enemy Act;

(11) Current and prospective consumption of newsprint and other papers used in the printing of newspapers, magazines, or such other publications as are admitted to second-class mailing privileges; current and prospective production and supply of such papers, factors affecting such supply, and possibilities of additional production through the use of alternative source materials;

(12) Increase in traffic accidents on the streets and highways of the United States during recent years; factors responsible for such increase; the resulting deaths, personal injuries, and economic losses; and measures for eliminating such accidents or reducing their frequency and severity; and

(13) The administration and enforcement by departments and agencies of the Government of provisions of law relating to subjects which are within the jurisdiction of such committee: *Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House.

For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any investigation or study made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report shall be filed with the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 1, strike out "3" and insert "4."
Page 4, line 11, strike out "or outside" and "is in session."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOLLING: Page 4, line 5, after the word "committee", strike out the remainder of line 5 and lines 6 and 7 and insert a period.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Why is that language being stricken out of the resolution here and in the case of House Resolution 104 the amendment was withdrawn?

Mr. BOLLING. The language is being stricken out because it was determined in consultation with the chairmen of the various committees that rather than serving the purpose for which it was intended it would increase competition between committees and cause confusion. The action taken today in the various resolutions is designed to eliminate uniformly that particular language from all the investigative resolutions.

Mr. GROSS. The committee has determined that it is in the best interest not to have that language in any of these resolutions.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the gentleman from Ohio called the fact to the attention of the committee that this wording would actually permit other committees to raid the standing legislative committees simply by announcing an investigation was going to be made, barring the regular committee named for that particular purpose and having jurisdiction over certain legislation from investigating the very field for which they were created. So the amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and pending that I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I would not take the time of the House were it not for the fact that what I am about to say I know is of much interest to many Members of this House. Of course, I am in wholehearted support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, many Members have asked me and other members of our committee about the tragic air accidents which occurred in the last few days.

### AVIATION STUDY AND ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION

In support of this resolution, I wish to announce that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce Wednesday morning will begin an investigation of the recent aircraft tragedies which have shocked the Nation.

Although our attention will be focused on the collision of a DC-7 and AF-89 jet fighter Thursday over a suburb of Los Angeles and the crash of an airliner in a snowstorm in New York Friday evening, the investigation actually will be a continuation of a study of airspace use and navigation aids undertaken by the committee during the last Congress, as well as the overall subject of aviation under our committee jurisdiction.

On Wednesday morning, representatives of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Civil Aeronautics Administration will give the committee preliminary reports on their investigations of the two accidents mentioned. We will want to know what steps have and can be taken to prevent a recurrence of such tragedies.

Later, the committee will hear other Government officials, including representatives of the Air Force, company officials and employees, and CAA traffic-control personnel. In addition to getting the facts regarding the recent tragedies, a multitude of problems must be studied. The public is entitled to the maximum possible protection against a recurrence of similar disasters.

The committee is anxious to get all of the facts as soon as possible. If additional legislation is needed, we want to know it. If there is anything more we can do to help get the equipment and

skilled personnel needed to get the job done, we want to do it.

We are not about to enter the jet age. We are already there, as the accident over Pacoima so graphically made clear.

The committee outlined the problem in its report entitled "Airspace Use Study," House Report No. 2972, which I filed January 3.

The committee will continue its study of air safety as rapidly as possible to get at the full facts in the public interest.

PETROLEUM INVESTIGATION

Also, Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that on Thursday morning the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will have before it the Oil and Gas Division of the Department of Interior for a public presentation of current petroleum matters.

This is the second in the series of hearings which the committee currently is holding with the departments, commissions, and agencies over which the committee has legislative jurisdiction.

It has been the custom of this committee at the beginning of each new Congress to hold such meetings for the purpose of being briefed on the organization and jurisdiction of each such agency, policies, and issues underlying the legislation they administer, and problems they are encountering in their operating experience.

Of our committee's long standing and continuing interest in the subject of petroleum, I do not need here to comment at length. It has been a field which we have had under constant study, not only in connection with the maintenance of a sound domestic industry ready to meet the needs of our country both in periods of emergency and in periods of peacetime economic expansion, but also with respect to the effect upon the adequacy of our supplies, of the worldwide demand for this commodity. In so doing, we have had occasion continually to cover the matter of supplies from the Western Hemisphere, the Middle East, and elsewhere, the demand for petroleum from Europe and the rest of the world, and their collateral effect on our own situation.

In view of the ramifications which have arisen from the closing of the Suez Canal, we have felt we should take up the petroleum subject at the earliest opportunity. We initially will view the picture in broad scope, the domestic supply and demand outlook, the present European demand and deficiencies in supply, the steps being taken to meet such deficiencies and the effect of such steps, and we then shall be in position to determine what further detailed study is appropriate consistent with our legislative duties and our responsibilities to the Members of the House.

NEWSPRINT INVESTIGATION

Now many people have become interested in the question of newsprint, which is one of real and continuous importance. We will have the Department of Commerce and all those who are interested in any phase of the newsprint problems before us, and we intend to continue to investigate and to go into the problem and all facets of the newsprint industry, starting next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. In connection with the newsprint, I assume that the committee will also seek the opinion of the publishers and editors of the country with particular emphasis upon their specific recommendations.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. I have personally been in touch with Mr. Williams of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, whom the gentleman knows very well, and he has offered to cooperate with the committee on the problems of the newspapers throughout the country, large and small.

Mr. McCORMACK. While they justifiably complain, they pass the buck to Congress and will not come forward with any specific recommendations of their own.

Mr. HARRIS. It is going to be our purpose to go into it thoroughly and request them to give us whatever recommendations they have.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say in reply to the majority leader that this morning I received a letter from Mr. Williams inclosing a copy of a resume for the year 1956 down to the 25th of January of this year of what the opinion of the American Newspaper Association is on this point. I have put in the RECORD both the letter and the report, which will appear in tomorrow morning's RECORD.

A year ago I made a statement on the floor of this House, and as far as I know I am the only one who did so, about what the situation was with reference to newsprint. It was far more critical at that time than it is now. However, I think the subcommittee on Finance and Commerce, of which the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] is the chairman, will make a complete and authoritative investigation of the entire newsprint situation that I am sure will satisfy every Member of this House.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I have asked the gentleman to yield for a purpose. During the time I have been a Member of Congress, every board and commission of this Government except the Interstate Commerce Commission has been set up, many of them from the committee of which I was a member, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission, and the three laws administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Securities Act of 1933, the Stock Exchange Regulation Act of 1934, and the Utilities Holding Company Act of 1935.

I trust that the gentleman will set up a subcommittee, and I think under the broad authority of this resolution he has that authority, to go into the administration of each and every one of these laws to see whether or not the law as we intended it is being carried out or whether a great many of these laws are being repealed or revamped by those who administer them.

Mr. HARRIS. May I say to our distinguished Speaker, in our committee session this morning in the discussion of the establishment of subcommittees and special subcommittees, this particular subject was discussed on the basis that the reorganization act of 1946 directs each committee to keep watch over the agencies of the Government as to the administration of the law. We discussed this problem of setting up a committee for such purpose.

It is my intention as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to set up a special subcommittee to investigate the administration of the laws as intended by Congress which comes under our jurisdiction. As this resolution indicates, many of these agencies come under our jurisdiction. They are established as arms of the Congress and appropriately report to the Congress. We will endeavor to be objective, and I intend to announce the committee in the next few days.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say that the Speaker has talked at least on one occasion with me and he expressed some of the doubts mentioned here on the floor this afternoon. I think the committee ought to go back through the years from the time that the law was first put into effect to determine what the trend has been over that period of time. That is perfectly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I think the House would like to know because the agencies which are under the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce cover almost every facet of business in America today. If that is done, and done properly, you could have such a study and it would have a good effect not only so far as this particular committee is concerned, but upon business generally. This is information to which the Congress and the public are entitled.

Mr. HARRIS. I am sure the historical background would be very helpful to the committee in discharging its tremendous responsibility.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. I hope the distinguished chairman of this distinguished committee will go into that widespread belief and supposed allegation that many of these air carriers are loading planes beyond their announced capabilities and capacities, and hence they are bound to smash when you put 100 people on a plane announced to carry 70 people.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank my distinguished friend for the fine compliment. It is the intention of the committee to do just what he suggests, and we will begin in the morning at 10 o'clock.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the distinguished chairman, when he has the representa-

tives of the petroleum industry before him next week, will inquire into the reason for the increase in gasoline prices a few weeks ago.

Mr. HARRIS. It is the intention of the committee to do that, too, I can assure the gentleman.

AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT, RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT, AND RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1957, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I, as chairman of the committee, introduced identical bills, H. R. 4101 and H. R. 4102, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. As I stated on the floor of the House on January 30, 1957—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1326—these bills provide for a 10-percent increase in retirement and survivor benefits, an increase in the contribution rate and tax base, and an increase in unemployment insurance benefits. They also contain a provision that employee retirement taxes be excluded from gross income and from wages for Federal income-tax purposes.

This latter provision is a subject matter appropriately within the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. In fact, a bill, H. R. 3665, has already been introduced on this subject by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Under the circumstances, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] and I are introducing today new bills—H. R. 4353 and H. R. 4354—which contain the same provisions as H. R. 4101 and H. R. 4102, except that the income tax-deduction provision has been deleted from the new bills.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual investigative resolution. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the minority has no requests for time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 94) to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may make investigations and studies into the following matters within its jurisdiction: In Alaska—the aboriginal and possessory rights of the Eskimos, Aleuts, and Indians in and to the public lands; in Hawaii—the operation of the Hawaiian Homes Commission under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, and the return of federally held lands to local authority and/or private ownership; in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and Pacific-flag areas—the provisions and local conditions for an organic act for the trust territory; legislation concerning American Samoa; operation and administration of the Organic Act of Guam; and legislation affecting the civilian population of the Ryukyu Islands; in Puerto Rico—the return of federally held lands to local authority; in the Virgin Islands—the operation and administration of the Revised Organic Act of 1954 and the Virgin Islands Corporation; in the continental United States, Hawaii, Alaska, and the Virgin Islands—the operation and administration of the units of the national park system; in the continental United States and Alaska—the mineral resources of the public lands and mining interests generally, including but not limited to the condition, problems, and needs of the mining and minerals industries; the proposed long-range domestic minerals programs to be submitted by the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the President, during the first session of the 85th Congress; mineral resources surveys, exploration, development, production, and conservation minerals research, including coal research, required to improve the position of domestic minerals industries; the administration and operation of Public Law 633 (84th Cong., 2d sess.) with a view to determining the extent to which the intent of Congress to provide interim assistance to those mining industries producing tungsten, fluorspar, asbestos, and columbium-tantalum bearing ores, has been carried out; the administration and operation of Public Law 167 (84th Cong., 1st sess) known as the Multiple Surface Use Act, and Public Law 359 (84th Cong., 1st sess.), known as the Mining Claims Restoration Act; proposed changes in the general mining laws, and the mineral leasing laws, including the laws which govern the development, utilization, and conservation of the oil, gas, and associated petroleum resources of the public lands and outer Continental Shelf of the United States and Alaska; in the continental United States—irrigation and reclamation projects proposed for authorization, including but not limited to the San Luis project in California, the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado, the San Angelo project in Texas, the Norman project in Oklahoma, the Garrison Dam diversion project in North Dakota, the Mid-State project in Nebraska, developments in the Middle and Upper Snake River Basin in Idaho, developments in the Columbia Basin in the vicinity of Wenatchee and Spokane in Washington, and developments in the Rio Grande River Basin in New Mexico, projects proposed for construction under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; disposal of Federal interests in the towns of Boulder City, Nev., and Coulee Dam, Wash., and policies relating to the establishment of such Federal cities at future damsites; applicability to Federal agencies and activities of State and Territorial laws governing the control, appropriation and use of water; in the United States and Alaska—the administration and operation of the laws governing the development, utilization, and conservation of the surface and subsurface resources of the public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management and the forest reserves created out of the public domain; on various Indian and native lands and reservations in the United States and Alaska—for the purpose of improving the management of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; the administration and operation of the Indian health program; and for the purpose of planning the ultimate release of the Indians from Federal wardship.

For the purpose of making such investigations the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, possessions, Puerto Rico, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 1, strike out "That" and insert "That, effective from January 4, 1957."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 11, strike out the period and insert a colon and *"Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject matter which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House."

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Rules to withdraw that committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 19, strike out "is in session."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS AND TO MAKE INQUIRIES RELATING TO HOUSING

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 86) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to any matter or matters in the field of housing coming within the jurisdiction of such committee, including, but not limited to, (1) the status and adequacy of mortgage credit in the United States, (2) the current rate of construction of residential dwelling units in relation to housing requirements and demands, and the role of Government-assisted mortgage programs with respect thereto, (3) the operation of the privately financed military housing program, (4) the requirement of and demand for Federal assistance in the development of community facilities, (5) the operation of the slum-clearance and urban renewal programs, and (6) farm housing and the adequacy of farm housing credit. The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any matter which is under investigation by another committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its

investigations and studies, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 1, after "that" insert "effective from January 4, 1957."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 18, strike out the words "is in session."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 2, line 5, strike out lines 5, 6, and 7.

The amendment was ageed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is the resolution continuing the investigation by the Banking and Currency Committee of the housing situation. It is merely a continuation of the investigation that was carried on by the gentleman from Alabama last year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is reported unanimously by the Rules Committee and has the support of the minority of the committee.

I yield such time as he may need to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time to inquire of the author of the resolution the general scope of this investigation. May I clarify that by saying that the housing industry is an important industry in the entire national economy. If there are, for example, a million housing units built in a year, that means there will be not only the labor required for the building of these houses but also the labor that is represented in the building of everything that goes into the housing, all the equipment and manufacture of all material; so it is an important part of the entire national economy. This being true, I ask the gentleman as to the scope of his inquiry.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me the time necessary to answer his inquiry?

Mr. SCHENCK. Certainly.

Mr. RAINS. As a member of the subcommittee I am thoroughly aware of the very problem of which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK], speaks and on which he is an authority. It will be the purpose of this committee to look into the possibility of increased mortgage credit which today, as the gentleman knows, is extremely tight all across the country. It will be necessary in the very near future to consider new and different legislation perhaps affecting the Federal National Mortgage Association.

It is also going to become necessary to look further into certain clarifications of the law which it is claimed are needed to carry out the Federal Insurance Act.

This resolution proposes a study of the great field of housing with special emphasis on mortgage credit in order to try to make available to the mortgage credit field funds necessary to build the houses which the gentleman stated form such a large part of our economic effort, and also to help give the opportunity to people who want homes.

Mr. SCHENCK. May I point out to the gentleman further that the discounts on mortgage loans particularly those for veterans' loans are running terrifically high. They are now in some areas discounted as much as 12 percent where the mortgagee is disbursing only 88 percent of the commitment. Other districts are running a little better than that. Recently the FNMA has still further lowered the discount rate on veterans' loans. I assume from what the gentleman has said that that is a part of this inquiry.

Mr. RAINS. We are going to look into that too, I can assure the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. One further question, Mr. Speaker; there seems to be extremely little coordination between the several agencies in the housing field. Public Housing does not seem to know what the FHA is doing and vice versa. Slum clearance and urban redevelopment do not seem to know what the other group is doing, and I am wondering if the gentleman's committee is going to inquire into the administration of those several laws.

Mr. RAINS. We intend to do what the Speaker suggested with reference to another committee, we intend to check to see if the agencies are carrying out the functions of the laws passed by Congress.

I might say to the gentleman also that there are overlapping functions here, that part of this comes under the jurisdiction of the gentleman's Committee on House Administration.

Mr. SCHENCK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I favor the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly in accord with the objectives of House Resolution 86. The Committee on Banking and Currency is charged with the physical responsibility of recommending legislation affecting the financial affairs of the economy of the United States. The First Congressional District of California is one of the largest lumber-producing areas in the United States. Thousands of people are engaged in this industry. The economy of the area is dependent upon an active building program. With the tightening money market and the lack of adequate and reasonable financing, the building industry slows down and adversely affects the lumber industry, as well as many of its various related industries.

I trust that this committee will forthwith make its investigations and come back to the Congress with a recommendation to speed up this phase of our economy. I thoroughly and wholeheartedly support this resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 67.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That effective from January 3, 1957, the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters—

(1) relating to the procurement, use, and disposition of materiel, equipment, supplies, and services, and the acquisition, use, and disposition of real property, by or within the Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics;

(2) relating to the military and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics;

(3) involving the laws, regulations, and directives administered by or within the Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics;

(4) involving the use of appropriated and nonappropriated funds by or within the Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; and

(5) relating to scientific research and development in support of the armed services.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned,

to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 1, strike out "3" and insert "4."

Page 1, line 3, strike out "and directed."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Civil Defense Administration and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Civil Defense Administration and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Civil Defense Administration and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics."

Page 2, line 12, strike out "the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Civil Defense Administration and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; and."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 16, after the word "services", insert *"Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject matter which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I would like to withdraw the committee amendment on page 2, line 16.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: Page 3, line 2, strike out "or outside."

Page 3, line 3, strike out "is in session."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is the customary resolution for the Armed Services Committee to investigate matters within its jurisdiction. That committee has made very successful investigations in past years. It has also saved us a lot of money.

I have no request for time and I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this is one of the most important of the several resolutions that we have before us today giving authority to various legislative standing committees of the House. The Committee on Armed Services authorizes the expenditure of more money than any other committee in the House. Of course, the Appropriations Committee handles all appropriations, but the authorizations for all defense matters come from the Committee on Armed Services.

It has been the position of many of us on the Rules Committee that it is the duty and the responsibility of the Committee on Armed Services to see to it just how the money authorized for our national defense is actually being spent. One of the subcommittees set up under the authority of this resolution has been the Hébert or the Hess committee, as the case might be, which has done a great deal to save the taxpayers of the country untold millions upon millions of dollars. I am hoping that this resolution will not only be voted unanimously but that the chairman of the committee and the full committee will be more zealous than ever in keeping check on the huge funds that we have to vote for defense almost blindly, without complete information as to the need for such appropriations. We favor the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters relating to procurement by the Department of Defense, personnel of such Department, laws administered by such Department, use of funds by such Department, and scientific research in support of the armed services."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 107 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct full and complete investigations and studies relating to the following matters coming within the jurisdiction of the committee, namely—

(1) relating to the administration and operation of general immigration and nationality laws and the resettlement of refugees, including such activities of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration which affect immigration in the United States; or involving violation of the immigration laws of the United States through abuse of private relief legislation;

(2) involving claims, both public and private, against the United States;

(3) involving the operation and administration of national penal institutions, including personnel and inmates therein;

(4) relating to judicial proceedings and the administration of Federal courts and personnel thereof, including local courts in Territories and possessions;

(5) relating to the operation and administration of the antitrust laws, including the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act;

(6) involving the operation and administration of Federal statutes, rules, and regulations relating to crime and criminal procedure; and

(7) involving the operation and administration of the Submerged Lands Act and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act: *Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or without the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 1, following the word "That" insert ", effective from January 4, 1957."

Page 1, line 2, strike out "and directed."

Page 3, beginning on line 5 and ending with the first word on line 6, strike out "or without."

Page 3, line 6, strike out "is in session."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further amendment on behalf of the committee:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Page 2, line 19, after "act", change the colon to a period and strike out the remainder of line 19 down to and including the word "House" on line 22.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual investigatory resolution on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary. I know of no objection to it. It was unanimously adopted in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the minority is in support and in favor of this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SALE OF ALCOHOL BUTADIENE FACILITY AT LOUISVILLE, KY.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 138 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2528) to authorize the sale of the Government-owned alcohol butadiene facility at Louisville, Ky., known as Plancor 1207. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage

without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is self-explanatory. It makes in order H. R. 2528 for the sale of the Government-owned alcohol butadiene facility at Louisville, Ky. I have no request for time, and I know of no opposition to the resolution.

I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Arkansas has so ably explained, House Resolution 138 makes in order the bill H. R. 2528 to authorize the sale of the Government-owned alcohol butadiene facility at Louisville, Ky., the last, I believe, of the Government-owned rubber plants. This legislation is in line with the policy that has been adopted by the Government. The other plants have all been sold, and I think this cleans up the operation, as I understand it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct. This is an effort to dispose of the butadiene plant at Louisville, Ky., on the same basis and with the same scrutiny that applied to the other synthetic rubber plants. I am going to ask that this bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole, and for that reason I want to make a brief statement in regard to this bill.

This bill was unanimously recommended by the committee. We tried to sell this plant, but we were unable to sell it, and then we tried to lease it and we could not get a satisfactory lease price.

So, therefore, we had to bring in a new bill to broaden the base and permit other chemicals to be manufactured but nevertheless with a national security clause. In this way we hope to be able to get a better offer than the ones we have received heretofore. The Corporation must make its report back to the committee; it must have the opinion from the Attorney General; and any Member of the House has 30 days in which to file any objection to it. And if there is objection, it goes to the committee and has to be reported by us just as in the case of the other rubber plant disposals.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As I understand it, and as the gentleman has explained, the interests of the Government and the taxpayers of this Nation are fully protected in this proposed legislation just as they were protected in previous legislation of the same type.

Mr. VINSON. I can assure the gentleman of that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If my memory serves me correctly a profit was made on the sale of the other plants; the taxpayers actually gained on the sale of those plants.

Mr. VINSON. I think it was one of the best laws ever enacted in connection with the disposal of Government-owned property. We sold the synthetic-rubber plants for more than $280 million, undoubtedly the highest price ever received for Government-constructed property of this nature—some $25 million more than the net value of the plants.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Far above the value carried on the books of the Government.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 2528) be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That this act shall be known as the "Plancor 1207 Disposal Act of 1957."

SEC. 2. The Federal Facilities Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation"), successor to the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission pursuant to Executive Order 10678 of September 20, 1956, is hereby authorized and directed, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, to take steps immediately to sell, as soon as practicable and in accordance with the provisions of this act, the Government-owned alcohol butadiene facility at Louisville, Ky., known as Plancor No. 1207 and hereinafter referred to as the "Louisville plant," subject to the existing lease which expires April 4, 1958. The sale thereof shall not limit the use of the plant to the manufacture of alcohol butadiene.

SEC. 3. In carrying out the provisions of this act, the Corporation shall (1) invite and receive proposals for the purchase of the Louisville plant; negotiate for its sale and make a recommendation therefor to the Congress; enter into an appropriate contract of sale, which contract shall be binding upon the Government and the prospective purchaser upon execution subject only to the further provisions of this act, and, in the performance of such contract, execute and deliver such deed and other instruments appropriate to transfer title to the purchaser effectively, and (2) take such action and exercise such powers as may be necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this act, including specifically the authority to accept a proposal which may not represent the highest price offered.

SEC. 4. (a) The Corporation shall invite, upon adequate notice and advertisement, proposals for the purchase of the Louisville plant. The period for the receipt of proposals shall be determined and publicly announced by the Corporation, and shall terminate not less than 30 days after the first day on which proposals may be received pursuant to the advertisement.

(b) Proposals shall be in writing, and shall contain, among other things—

(1) identification of the person in whose behalf the proposal is submitted, including the business affiliation of such person;

(2) the arrangement or plans, if any, formal or informal, for the supply of feedstock to, and the disposition of the end products of, the Louisville plant;

(3) the amount proposed to be paid, and, if such amount is not to be paid in cash, then the principal terms of the financing arrangement proposed;

(4) such other information as the Corporation in its notice and advertisement for proposals shall require be set forth in proposals including the prospective purchaser's acceptance of the terms, conditions, restrictions and reservations contained in section 7 of this act, and the interest rate to be charged on the purchase-money mortgage referred to in subsection (e) of this section.

(c) Should it become necessary to the effective prosecution of its duties under this act, the Corporation may, after the termination of the period for the submission of proposals provided for in subsection (a) of this section, disclose the contents of the proposals at such time, in such manner, and to such extent as it deems appropriate.

(d) Proposals shall be accompanied by a deposit of cash or United States Government bonds of face amount equal to 2½ percent of the gross amount proposed to be paid. Except in the case of the purchaser, deposits made hereinunder shall be refunded without interest and not later than upon the termination of the period for congressional review as provided in section 5 of this act. In the case of the purchaser, the deposit made hereunder shall be applied without interest to the purchase price: *Provided, however,* That upon the closing of the contract of sale the purchaser shall be required to substitute cash equal to the face amount of any Government bonds then held in connection with such purchaser's proposal.

(e) Payment of the purchase price may be made in part by a first lien purchase-money mortgage, in an amount not to exceed 75 percent of the purchase price. The terms of any such mortgage obligation, to be determined by negotiation, shall provide among other things for a maturity of not more than 10 years, periodic amortization, and a uniform interest rate of not less than 4 percent per annum.

(f) Promptly after the termination of the period for the receipt of proposals, pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, and for such period thereafter, which shall be not less than 30 days, as may be determined and publicly announced by the Corporation, it shall negotiate with those submitting proposals for the purpose of entering into a definitive contract of sale.

(g) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to prevent the Corporation from securing such additional information from those submitting proposals at any time as the Corporation may deem necessary or appropriate to fulfill its responsibilities under this act.

SEC. 5. Within 40 days after the termination of the actual negotiating period referred to in subsection (f) of section 4 of this act, the Corporation shall prepare and submit to the Congress a report containing, with respect to the disposal under this act of the Louisville plant, the information described in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, and 8 of section 9 (a) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the "Disposal Act"), together with a statement from the Attorney General approving the proposed disposal as not tending to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws. The report to the Congress shall be submitted in accordance with section 9 (b) of the Disposal Act, and unless the contract is disapproved by either House of the Congress by a resolution, as defined in section 23 of the Disposal Act, prior to the expiration of 30 days of continuous session (as defined in section 9 (c) of the Disposal Act) of the Congress following the date upon which the report is submitted to it, upon the expiration of such 30-day period the contract shall become fully effective and the Corporation shall proceed to carry it out, and transfer of title to the Louisville plant shall be made as soon as practicable, but in any event within 30 days after the expiration or termination of the existing lease on the Louisville plant. The failure to complete transfer of title within

30 days after the expiration or termination of the existing lease shall not give rise to or be the basis of rescission of the contract of sale.

SEC. 6. The Corporation, before submission to the Congress of its report relative to the Louisville plant, shall submit it to the Attorney General, who shall, within 30 days after receiving the report, advise the Corporation whether the proposed sale would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws. Throughout the course of disposal proceedings on the Louisville plant, the Corporation shall consult with the Attorney General in order (1) that the Corporation may secure guidance as to the application of the standard set forth in this section, and (2) that the Corporation may supply the Attorney General with such information as he may deem requisite to enable him to provide the advice contemplated by this section.

SEC. 7. The contract of sale for the Louisville plant and instruments in execution thereof shall contain a national security clause having terms, conditions, restrictions, and reservations which will assure the prompt availability of the Louisville plant, or facilities of equivalent capacity, for the production of one or more chemical products important to the national security, for a period of 10 years from the date of transfer of title of the Louisville plant. As used in this act, the term "chemical products important to the national security" shall mean (1) chemicals for which expansion goals have been established under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, during the calendar years 1951–55, inclusive, or (2) chemicals for the production of which a material has been determined to be strategic and critical under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act of 1947, or (3) any other chemical which the President may, upon request from the Corporation, or, during the period of the national security clause, upon request from the purchaser, approve as important to the national defense.

SEC. 8. Such sums as may be required to finance the Corporation's activities hereunder shall be provided out of the proceeds heretofore realized from disposal of the Government-owned synthetic rubber facilities, and all final net proceeds from sale of the Louisville plant shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 9. The provisions of section 6 of the Disposal Act are hereby made fully applicable to the activities of the Corporation and its employees in the sale of the Louisville plant under this act.

SEC. 10. Public Law 433, 84th Congress, with the exception of section 6 (a), (b) and (c) thereof, is hereby repealed; and Federal Facilities Corporation shall be substituted for the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission therein.

SEC. 11. In the event of dissolution of the Federal Facilities Corporation, the powers hereby conferred by this act shall be exercised by such successor agency of the Government as may be designated by the President.

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD in its entirety and open at this point to any amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the following committee amendments:

On page 4, lines 22 and 23, strike out the words "a uniform" and insert in lieu thereof the word "an."

On page 5, line 21, strike out "approving the proposed disposal as not tending" and insert in lieu thereof "advising whether the proposed disposal would tend."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2528 is a bill to authorize the sale of the Government-owned alcohol butadiene facility located at Louisville, Ky. This is the last of the Government-built rubber plants which will require legislative action and I am hopeful that it will be passed so that we may complete the disposal program which began in 1953.

You will recall that in the last Congress we passed Public Law 433, which permitted the Rubber Disposal Commission to sell or lease this facility located at Louisville, Ky.

Thereafter, the Commission entered into a sales contract with Union Carbide and Carbon Corp. However, this proposed sale was rejected by our committee and the House based upon the fact that the Attorney General could not approve the sale since in his opinion it did not meet all of the criteria of the Disposal Act.

Union Carbide had agreed to pay $3,500,000 for the facility including inventory and spare parts, but they could not enter into a contract which would assure the production of alcohol butadiene. The reason they could not do this was because alcohol butadiene is more expensive to produce and therefore must sell for a higher price than petroleum butadiene.

Then the Commission went out of business and the Federal Facilities Corporation, as the successor to the Commission, took bids for a long-term lease of the facility. But in January of this year, the Corporation reported to the Congress that they could not recommend awarding a lease because only two bidders offered to lease the plant and in both instances the Corporation felt that the return to the Government did not represent anything like the value of the facility.

One of the bidders offered a guaranteed rental of $2,000 a month, with the Government continuing to pay all maintenance costs and taxes. These amount to $342,000 a year. So you can understand why this bid was rejected. The other bidder offered more, but still not enough to satisfy the Corporation.

Now alcohol butadiene was important during World War II because there was not an adequate supply of petroleum butadiene. As you know, butadiene is a major feedstock in the production of synthetic rubber. But today the situation is entirely different. By 1959 we will have more petroleum butadiene available from privately owned sources in this country than the anticipated demand.

As a matter of fact, by 1959 the Office of Defense Mobilization estimates that the production of petroleum butadiene will exceed the demand by 146,000 tons. And on top of this, the Koppers Co. purchased an alcohol-butadiene plant from the Government in 1955 with a national security clause which does not expire until 1965, which requires the Koppers Co. to keep that plant available for the emergency production of alcohol butadiene in the amount of 80,000 tons annually. And in addition to this, we know that large quantities of butadiene can be obtained from butane, which can be obtained from natural gas.

For that reason, we propose in this legislation, to offer the plant for sale without the requirement that it be kept available for the production of alcohol butadiene. However, we do require a 10-year national security clause which will keep the facility available for the production of a chemical or chemicals important to the national security.

Now, by eliminating the restriction that the plant be kept available for the production of alcohol butadiene it is our opinion that the Government will receive a much better price for this facility than anything heretofore offered.

The sale of this plant will be similar to the sales of the other rubber plants. Bids will be received for not less than 30 days after they have been advertised; negotiations will be conducted for not less than 30 days; the Attorney General will have 30 days in which to submit his advice to the Corporation on the proposed sale, and the Congress will have 30 days to reject any proposed sale by the Corporation.

You will note that we amended one portion of the bill dealing with the Attorney General's position in this matter.

The bill as originally introduced required the approval of the Attorney General with respect to whether or not any proposed sale would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws. The Attorney General felt that this was a determination that should be made by the Congress and he in effect suggested that he submit his advice as to whether or not any proposed sale would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws, but not require his approval for the submission of the proposed sale to the Congress. We concurred in his views and amended the bill accordingly.

Now, I cannot tell you how much we are going to get from this plant, but I am satisfied that the price will be in excess of $3,500,000, not only because we have eliminated some of the restrictive language, but also because, under the proposed law, we will attract more bidders. Several, so I am told, have already indicated an interest in this facility.

There is some urgency in connection with the legislation because the plant is presently under a lease which will expire in April of 1958. Because of the necessity for engineering estimates, setting up an organization, preparing for feedstocks and getting set for modifications, repairs, and so forth, we would expect to get a much better price for the facility if the sale can be completed before this session of the Congress adjourns. If we wait until next year, we may lose a lot of bidder interest, and as a result may get less for the facility than the amount we can now reasonably expect.

To summarize briefly: this is the last plant in the rubber program; it will be

offered for sale subject to a national security clause; the Attorney General's advice must be contained in the report to the Congress, and the Congress will retain the right to disapprove the sale by action in either House.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## THE LATE HONORABLE THURMOND CHATHAM

Mr. SCOTT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow and regret that I inform the House of the death of the Honorable Thurmond Chatham. Mr. Chatham was a former Member of this body who rendered his country as well as his State and district long and valuable service. His passing is a great shock to his many friends and a serious loss to his State and the Nation.

I join his family and a host of friends in mourning his loss.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, it is with a sense of deep sorrow that I address you. A great man—a good man—has this day fallen. He was my friend and for many long years I enjoyed his friendship. Thurmond Chatham has passed into the great realm of silence and to his great reward. Thurmond Chatham was indeed a great and a good man. His life was a blessing and a benediction. To his State, his Nation, and to all humanity Thurmond Chatham was a patriot and above all an American in the truest and noblest sense of the word. In two great world wars he offered himself upon the altars of liberty and he died believing in the great cause of freedom. He was not only a gallant soldier in the cause of freedom, but he was a stateman—honest and courageous and fearless—and for 8 long years he served right here with us.

I have never known a man with whom I have had the privilege of serving who had a greater capacity for making friends than did our beloved former Congressman. Thurmond Chatham was a devoted and dedicated public servant and he enjoyed serving his country in times of war as in times of peace because he knew that he was at all times engaged in a noble pursuit. He was not only a very kind man, a very friendly person, but he was one of the most generous men I have ever known. His real joy came from making other people happy. I have known him for many long years and as I now recall our many friendly hours and days together, and as I now realize that he will never move among us again I am reminded of a few words of a poem which was written by Thomas Moore:

Let Fate do her worst, there are relics of joy,
Sweet dreams of the past which she cannot destroy;
Dreams that come in the nighttime of sorrow and care,
And bring back the features that joy used to wear.

Long, long be my heart with such memories filled,
Like the vase in which roses have once been distilled.
You may break, you may shatter, the vase if you will,
But the scent of the roses will hang round it still.

Wherever Thurmond Chatham went he made a broad thoroughfare for friendship. People everywhere loved him, respected and admired him. During his very useful life he visited many parts of the world and wherever he went he made friends. So around the world tonight friends will share the sorrow which has been caused by his passing. By his great generosity he contributed to the happiness of little orphan children in far distant lands and no man was ever too lowly to be called his friend. He had a very dynamic personality and yet he was one of the friendliest men I have ever known. Fate may take him from us but the joy of having known him will always remain with us.

Thurmond Chatham was a member of a great family. Thousands of friends will share the sorrow of his lovely wife, his devoted sons and all of the members of his family. I want to express my very deep, profound and heartfelt sympathy to Pat, his wife, to his three fine sons, to all of the loved ones he left behind. Our world is better because Thurmond Chatham lived and moved and worked among us.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my distinguished colleagues from North Carolina in taking note of the sudden and untimely passing of my late good friend, the Honorable Thurmond Chatham. Thurmond Chatham was a leader in his local community. He was a leader in the State of North Carolina, and he was a leader in the Nation. His interests were many.

I am sure all of you are as familiar as I was with his miltiary record and his patriotic interest in the military life of this country.

He was a business leader in its finest sense.

I know of my own knowledge of the excellent relations between management and labor at the plants which he operated in the State of North Carolina.

His name will long be remembered by the people of our State and by the people of other States of this great Union.

I, therefore, say with a heart full of sadness that I feel a great personal loss in his passing. Even keener than the loss that we now feel is the feeling of loss which is experienced and will be experienced in the future by the splendid family now making its mark in North Carolina and in this Nation in many worthy and worthwhile activities.

In conclusion, I would like to say a personal word. I, like many others who have been blessed with the friendship of this great and good man, can ill afford to lose such friends.

The words of one of our poets has well typified Thurmond Chatham when he wrote:

Here was a man whose heart was good,
Who walked with men and understood.
His was a voice that spoke to cheer,
And fell like music to the ear.
His was a smile men loved to see,
His was a hand that asked no fee
For friendliness or kindness done.
And now that he has journeyed on,
His is a fame that never ends
And leaves behind uncounted friends.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of Thurmond Chatham is a sad one. It leaves a void in the minds and hearts of those who knew him. Thurmond Chatham was not only a great son of North Carolina, he was one of the great Americans of his day and age. He served in this body with outstanding distinction. He served with great ability and unusual courage. He served on the important committee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which has played such a vital part in the trying period through which America and the rest of the world are now going through. Thurmond Chatham has left his imprint on the pages of the legislative history of our country. He has brought great credit to his district, to his family, and to his friends. During my period of service with him in this body we became close personal friends. His was a friendship that I value greatly. It will leave a memory that I shall always treasure. His personality was outstanding. His gentle charm was inspiring. As one of our colleagues well said, Thurmond Chatham was not only a great man—he was a good man. I am deeply grieved in the passing of this dear and beloved friend of mine. North Carolina has lost a great son, but the country has equally lost a great citizen. To his loved ones left behind I extend my profound sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in this tribute to our friend, Thurmond Chatham. He was a graduate of Yale. I knew him in those days and then served with him in this body and on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Thurmond Chatham had a remarkable intellect and a wonderfully quick grasp of the broad fundamentals. He was fearless in fighting for the principles in which he believed, but he had an enormous capacity for friendship which encircled all who knew him. I, together with my colleagues, join in my expression of sympathy for his fine wife and his loved ones that he leaves behind.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I should like at this point to join with those who have paid tribute to our former colleague. Like those who have spoken before and who have served in this House with Thurmond Chatham, I learned not only to respect him but to love him. Those of us who have observed, as we have run our race through life, I am sure have noted that nature never yields to any one person all of the talents. She is a great believer in disbursing those talents among her many creatures. One is given the talent of a particularly bright mind; one of a splendid physical prowess; another of a great capacity for love and passionate friendship of his fellow man. And it is fortunate, that nature does not endow any one of us with all of the virtues; otherwise we would all be subservient to the one. But of the many talents that our friend Thurmond Chatham did possess, it seems to me the most outstanding one was his capacity for love of his fellow man. A man possessed of more than the average of this world's material things, yet he was as democratic as any man I ever knew in his dealings with his fellow man. It was my high privilege and my distinct pleasure to have served with and to have known—yes, to have been a houseguest of this splendid friend of man. I like to think of him in the terms of the poet who wrote the beautiful little poem of "The man who lived by the side of the road and was a friend of man."

I join with all of my colleagues in extending my deepest sympathy to the loved ones he has left behind to mourn his untimely passing.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I want to express a feeling of personal loss, as I know is felt by so many of our colleagues, who had the privilege of associating with Thurmond Chatham. His was a warmth of friendship that is rare, and my life has been enriched by that association.

I extend my sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I join in the beautiful tributes which have been made to our former colleague, Thurmond Chatham. I think the characterization of his love for his fellowman, as made by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], so ably describes his character and his capacity to genuinely love his fellowman. He had a vivaciousness about him which makes it so difficult for all of us who sat with him to believe that he has gone to his great reward.

As has been so ably said, he was a man of many beautiful characteristics, but I think all of us will remember him as a friend and as a man who loved life.

To his lovely wife and his family I, too, join in expressions of deepest sympathy.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND TRIBUTES TO MR. CHATHAM

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point on the life, character, and public service of the late Thurmond Chatham.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me deep pain to learn of the passing of my dear friend, Thurmond Chatham. His fine personality and his gracious goodwill will be missed by all of us. To his family to whom he was so deeply devoted, I send my deepest sympathy.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, Thurmond Chatham personified to me the highest type of southern gentleman. He was kind and genial and made friends without trying. I have in these last few years felt real close to Thurmond even though my association with him was not extensive. He was that kind of man. He possessed that high type of attraction whereby those who hardly knew him would classify him as a close friend.

Only in recent weeks he invited me to visit his home and it was an invitation I intended to accept so elevating was his presence.

To his lovely wife and family, I offer my deepest sympathy and trust that the many who share his loss will serve to lift some of the heavy load that has been placed upon them.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn today of the passing of our former distinguished colleague and my good friend, Hon. Thurmond Chatham. I served with him in this body for 8 years. He was always a most affable and courteous gentleman and was held in high esteem by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Thurmond Chatham was a fine statesman, of unsullied and unquestioned patriotism and integrity, and rendered great service to his district, his State of North Carolina, and the country. We shall all miss him. I extend to his widow and family my sincere sympathy upon their great loss.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply moved by the news of the passing of my dear and loyal friend, Thurmond Chatham, who for 8 years represented his great district and the fine people of North Carolina. His untimely passing is a decided loss to North Carolina and to the Nation.

"Thurm," as most of us loved to call him, was one of the nicest guys that ever graced Capitol Hill from any State. He was kind, considerate, and generous. He was always interested in the problems and the heartaches of the other fellow. One would never suspect that he was a man of great wealth, due to his sympathetic understanding and his down-to-earth feeling with respect to the problems of others. Because of this and his many other fine traits, "Thurm" had the admiration and the affection of every Member of this House on both sides of this aisle. He was a man of honor, integrity, ability, and one of the most courageous persons that it has ever been my good fortune to meet and know. During World Wars I and II he served his country under fire, displaying great physical courage. Later, as a Member of this great body, he personally demonstrated the actual and exact meaning of political courage. Truly this good man had real class and rare judgment.

He was a God-fearing, God-loving man.

In my humble opinion, Thurmond Chatham was a laborer in the vineyard of the Master, where the laborers are few and the harvest abundant.

Surely the good Lord has set aside for him in that great mansion of rest special quarters. His acts of kindness, consideration, and respect for his less fortunate brothers were the password for him to enter that great lodge above.

To his splendid family—each and every one—I extend my deep and sincere sympathy.

May God rest his sweet soul in peace.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to know the Honorable Thurmond Chatham for the past 10 years. He served with great distinction as a member of the Board of Conservation and Development of North Carolina and, of course, as we all know, had a long and honorable service in this great body. He served with great distinction in the United States Navy in two World Wars.

Thurmond Chatham was undoubtedly one of North Carolina's leading industrialists and a man who always practiced his belief of human kindness and consideration in his dealings with his hundreds of employees and countless friends. North Carolina, as well as our Nation, has lost an outstanding and able public servant, and I join with my many distinguished colleagues in expressing deepest sympathy to his fine wife and sons.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad occasion for the friends of Thurmond Chatham here today in this body, but also it is a pleasure for us to be here honoring the memory of the man who is so worthy of honor. It is always a pleasure to me to read and hear the praise of a man who so richly deserves it, but because we have lost a friend there is deep sadness mingled with the pleasure of praise.

We know that many others have appreciated what we also appreciate in Thurmond Chatham—an individual whose overflow of human kindness to all beings of whatever race, creed, or color was well known.

I first met Thurmond Chatham when he entered the University of North Carolina as a freshman, more than 40 years ago. During all these years our relations were most pleasant and intimate and they were enriched by my later association with him here in the Halls of Congress.

Thurmond was a man who did not change his mind to suit men and circumstances. He relied upon the rewards given to men who do not flinch before the cries of the multitude and who do not seek their political fortune in the success of the moment. He always walked straight in what he thought was the right path as a patriotic citizen and a truly responsible legislator. His was a high standard of probity, political honesty, and abhorrence of political corruption. He comprehended the full scope of every undertaking and he had the courage to carry it on to a legitimate end. With a

kindly heart and a sympathy so comprehensive, he gained and retained the friendship of many men associated with him, not only here in the Congress but throughout his whole life. Our friend was true to every institution of liberty, true to the whole trust which reposed in him, vigilant of the Constitution, and he has left a very worthy record, with complete consistency, in an era that has exacted the best of men's brain and heart.

We may hope that these qualities of our honorable friend and colleague will create forces that will produce a better and purer citizenship and give us a renewed faith in the American people as custodians of a free government.

Thurmond Chatham was a dedicated believer in the House of Representatives, where he served effectively for four terms, and he believed that the House of Representatives is the heart and soul of this Republic of America, and that as long as American people keep it that way, freedom is safe. He was true to his friends and they were true to him. I feel a deep personal loss and my sincere sympathy is extended to his wife and family.

Mr. SCOTT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Thurmond Chatham was born in Elkin, N. C., August 16, 1896; educated in the public schools and attended the University of North Carolina and Yale University; during the First World War enlisted in the United States Navy as seaman second class, and served from May 1917 to June 1919; in World War II again served in the Navy from February 14, 1942, to November 25, 1945, with combat duty in the southwest Pacific; decorated with the Bronze Star Medal, the Secretary of the Navy's Commendation Medal, and the Royal Order of Nassau with Swords from the Dutch Government, American theater ribbon, European theater ribbon, Asiatic theater ribbon with three battle stars, World War I ribbon, and the Victory ribbon; went to work in the mills of the Chatham Manufacturing Co. in July 1919 and rose through various positions to the presidency of the company and chairman of the board of directors; married to Mrs. Patricia Firestone Coyner, November 16, 1950; one son, Walter Firestone Chatham, and two sons by former marriage, Hugh Gwyn Chatham and Richard Thurmond Chatham, Jr.; engaged in agricultural pursuits as owner and operator of Klondike Farm at Elkin, N. C.; former president of North Carolina Dairymen's Association, member of State Board of Conservation and Development, and county commissioner of Forsyth County; a member of the National Grange, the Farm Bureau, the visiting committee of Woman's College at Greensboro, and director of Hugh Chatham Memorial Hospital at Elkin; member, Society of Cincinnati; elected to 81st Congress on November 2, 1948; reelected to the 82d, 83d, and 84th Congresses.

I succeeded Thurmond Chatham in Congress and feel that I knew him better than many of you. I knew him personally as a friend and also as a political opponent. In the light of that knowledge, I can sincerely say to you that he possessed the grace of friendship, had the sense of oneness with our kind, and his mind and heart were linked with his fellow heart and mind. He was one of that select number who might sincerely join in that prayerful petition:

> Teach me to feel another's woe,
> To hide the fault I see;
> The mercy I to others show,
> That mercy show to me.

He did not seek the faults of his fellow men, but he did seek their woes and shared them with understanding, tolerance, and unselfish helpfulness. In the poet's language, he could have said, and probably did say, "I pray thee, then, write me as one that loves his fellow men."

I have never known a more sportsmanlike man than Thurmond Chatham. He could dish it out, but he could also take it. He was gracious and humble in victory. He was gracious and graceful in defeat—and I do not refer to political campaigns alone, but to all of the vicissitudes of life. His follies, if any, were so far overshadowed by his contributions to the sum total of human happiness and welfare that they must be considered negligible. He was a splendid and loveable gentleman, a fine friend, a courageous and conscientious public servant, one who never looked back and who continuously thought that this mid-20th century should be a period of progress.

I join with you in mourning his loss and in perpetuating in memory his fine qualities of character. For myself and on behalf of the people of my district, I salute the memory of Thurmond Chatham, who devoted the best efforts of his life to the cause of better relations among his own people and among those of the world. He was a man whose example in tolerance, compassion, and charity were his eloquent answer to the centuries-old query: "Am I my brother's keeper?"

Surely "he loved the stars too fondly to be fearful of the night."

From his widow, his fine sons, his family and host of friends, I bring you thanks and gratitude for your kindness, understanding, and friendship for Thurmond Chatham, who understood well that to have a friend one must be a friend.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the qualities of mind and heart that so firmly established Thurmond Chatham in our esteem and affection have been aptly described by his colleagues from his beloved State of North Carolina. I join them in the expressions of deep sorrow over his passing. North Carolina and the Nation have suffered a great loss. His life was one of usefulness and devotion. He was courageous, conscientious, kind and generous. He was a man of vision, with confidence in his country's future and faith in our capacity for sound progress. The Foreign Affairs Committee, on which he served during his entire membership in the House, benefitted greatly by his wise counsel, and the legislative history of the period bears the impress of his splendid contribution. His memory will be cherished.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the passing of our former friend and colleague, Hon. Thurmond Chatham, of North Carolina.

He had great ability and qualities which endeared him to all. He had a fine military record, serving in the United States Navy for 2 years in World War I and for 3 years in World War II, being awarded the Bronze Star Medal and the Secretary of the Navy's Commendation Medal. He was entitled to the American and European Theater Ribbons; the Asiatic Theater Ribbon with three battle stars; and the World War I and Victory Ribbons. He was also decorated by the Netherlands Government with the Royal Order of Nassau With Swords.

A highly successful businessman, formerly president of the Chatham Manufacturing Co. in Elkin, N. C., with many interests in his community and elsewhere, he was elected to the 81st Congress, serving in this body for 8 years and making a further and very fine contribution to his country and to the free world as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

We were old friends, our friendship dating back to the period before World War II. I shall miss him greatly, as will his wide circle of friends, both those who served with him here in the Congress and those who knew him in his other activities.

I join in heartfelt sympathy to his wife and all his family.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and untimely death of my good friend Thurmond Chatham was a great shock. I personally feel that I have lost one of my best friends.

I have known Thurmond Chatham since I was a young man and through all these years he has meant a great to me. He served with distinction in both of the Great Wars and I have worked with him in the American Legion in a very intimate way.

Thurmond Chatham was a great American. He was loyal to his community and to his people. I have never known of any worthy cause that Thurmond Chatham did not respond to. He loved people; he loved good government; he radiated friendliness; was always cheerful and a good companion.

While I was serving as a freshman in this great body he was most helpful to me. He was generous not only with his time but with his substance for any worthy cause.

As few men have been able to do, he lived out his life without taking advantage of his fellowman; he succeeded in business and retained the friendship, goodwill, and love of his benefactors and those he befriended. His active interest in civic matters was always a topic of pride and appreciation in his native North Carolina.

His passing has brought much sorrow to all who knew him and to the thousands who benefited from the many years of his fruitful and unselfish public service.

If there was any characteristic which particularly stood out to mark Thurmond Chatham I would say it was his ability to make and hold friends. He had a personal charm all his own, a friendly smile, and a genial handshake.

The State of North Carolina and the Nation has lost a true patriot in his passing. I join with a multitude of friends in paying a final tribute to my friend,

Thurmond Chatham. His memory will remain as a choice possession of all who knew and loved him.

To his lovely wife and three sons I express my deepest sympathy.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep sense of personal loss that I learned earlier today of the sudden and untimely passing of our distinguished former colleague, the Honorable Thurmond Chatham, of Elkin, N. C.

Congressman Chatham was elected to the 81st Congress and served from that time until his retirement as one of the most active, able, and conscientious members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He served as chairman of the important Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations and during his service undertook a number of highly important study missions abroad for the committee.

Congressman Chatham endeared himself to all who had the pleasure and privilege of working and serving with him. He was known to us for his outstanding and heroic record of naval service in both World Wars. Before coming to Congress he had achieved outstanding success as a businessman and served for many years as president and chairman of the board of the Chatham Manufacturing Co.

He leaves behind a host of friends who will share with his widow and other members of his family a deep personal sense of loss. Our most heartfelt condolences and sympathy go out to the dear ones of his family.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the body of today's RECORD in two instances:

First at a point during general debate on the bill H. R. 4249, following the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM], and immediately before the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], and to include two telegrams.

Mr. Speaker, second, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD at a point immediately following the Clerk's reading of the so-called Rooney amendment to line 3, page 5, of the bill H. R. 4249.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

## IRAN

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, at page 1485 of the RECORD for yesterday appears a statement by our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE]. I shall not concern myself with all of Mr. REECE's comments, but I do want to call attention to the statement attributed to Mr. Murphy, Deputy Under Secretary of State, and purporting to be a summary of his testimony before our subcommittee on May 29, 1956. From a personal standpoint, I certainly have no objections to the publication of Mr. Murphy's statement, but because all testimony at the hearing in question was taken in executive session it would be improper to release any part of it without authority by the committee itself.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] is in error if he supposes that this document was omitted from the printed transcript through inadvertence. Obviously, he is not too well informed on this point—which is understandable—since he was not present at the hearing held on May 29. To the best of my knowledge, he did not request for study a transcript of that hearing, and consequently any information which he has about it must have been supplied by someone in the Department of State.

I think the House ought to note that the May 29 hearing of the Subcommittee on International Operations, of which I was chairman, was strictly an executive session to permit the subcommittee freedom of discussion of certain classified information in connection with its comprehensive examination of the extensive foreign-aid program in Iran. This hearing immediately preceded the open hearings and at this session the subcommittee discussed in considerable detail the manner in which it would proceed in open hearings in order to avoid any possibility of improper public disclosures. At the opening of this session I explained this purpose to Mr. Murphy and to others who accompanied him, which included Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration Loy W. Henderson; Director of the International Cooperation Administration John Hollister; Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations Robert C. Hill; Director of the United States Operations Mission in Iran Clark Gregory; and others.

Mr. Murphy's testimony at this session was substantially confined to a statement he had prepared for the occasion setting forth certain operating difficulties experienced in the Iran aid program and their relation to the foreign policy aspects of the Iran aid allocations.

There was so much confidential information discussed at this executive session that the subcommittee could not have it included in the printed hearings. Any attempt to delete classified material would have destroyed all continuity. As a consequence, and in keeping with committee rules, none of the testimony taken in that hearing was released. There was never any official transmission to me or to the committee of the statement inserted by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE], although I was advised that the Iranian desk officer of the Department of State submitted to a member of the subcommittee staff a single copy of a mimeographed document which was represented to be a paraphrase of Mr. Murphy's statement in executive session, and which was presumed to have had classified or sensitive information deleted.

Since none of the remaining testimony taken at this session had been cleared, or indeed could be coherently cleared for public printing, the separate release of Mr. Murphy's statement, which is not the statement delivered before the subcommittee, does not seem to be in order.

I think I should point out also that in the preparation of this report the subcommittee took into account all of the information gathered at the executive sessions as well as that presented in the open sessions. Indeed, considerable reliance for the language of the report itself was placed upon Mr. Murphy's statement given at that time. The subcommittee is of the opinion that its report takes into account substantially all of the pertinent material which was presented by Mr. Murphy at this hearing and at other times when the subcommittee had the benefit of his advice and counsel.

The statement attributed to Mr. Murphy and inserted by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] should not be identified as a statement submitted by Mr. Murphy to the subcommittee. It must have been received by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] from other sources because he certainly did not receive it from the subcommittee. If it were an excerpt from the testimony taken on May 29, it would be improper for him to have released it because that testimony was taken in executive session.

## THE LATE HONORABLE GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on August 28, 1956, during the adjournment of Congress, former Representative George Holden Tinkham died suddenly at Cramerton, N. C., where for part of each year he has made his home with his sister.

For 28 years, from 1915 to 1943, in the 64th through the 77th Congress, our departed colleague ably served as the Republican representative of what was originally the 11th District of Massachusetts, but during his tenure became the 10th District.

It is interesting to note that only 2 Members of the present Congress were Members of the first Congress in which Mr. Tinkham served, the 64th, and they both were Members of the 63d Congress,

namely our distinguished Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, and the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, CARL VINSON of Georgia. But many present Members served in the House with Mr. Tinkham—all those who are now in their 9th or succeeding terms.

George Holden Tinkham was born in Boston on October 29, 1870, the son of George Henry and Frances Ann (Holden) Tinkham. He graduated from Harvard College in 1894 and subsequently attended Harvard Law School, and was admitted to the Massachusetts bar.

He soon became interested in politics, and in 1897 was elected to the Boston Common Council. He later served on the board of aldermen, in the Massachusetts Senate, and was elected to Congress in 1915. The district included nine wards of Boston, and although it was undoubtedly Democratic on the whole, Representative Tinkham's popularity was such that he was reelected again and again by large majorities, and during his later years in Congress, did no campaigning in person. During campaigns he could usually be found shooting big game in Africa, or traveling elsewhere abroad.

Representative Tinkham was an outspoken and colorful figure in the House. Coming from a long line of American ancestors, he once claimed to stand "with one foot on Bunker Hill and the other on Plymouth Rock." He was an outstanding foe of prohibition, and a champion of immigrants and others whom he felt were being discriminated against.

While campaigning in the district formerly represented by Mr. Tinkham, I have seen striking evidence of the esteem and affection in which he was held. Older voters especially, many of them Democrats, would tell me with extreme pride and pleasure that they "always used to vote for Mr. Tinkham." The highest compliment which they could pay me would be to say that they felt I was carrying on in his manner. I shall ever be personally grateful to Mr. Tinkham for having publicly endorsed me in my campaigns in his old district.

From first to last George Holden Tinkham was a man of honor and integrity, and of gay gallantry. His was a personality which forever enriches our American tradition.

I include as part of my remarks the article about Mr. Tinkham published in the New York Times of August 29, 1956. It is dated Cramerton, N. C., August 28, 1956.

George Holden Tinkham, lawyer, big-game hunter, and globetrotter who had served 14 terms in the United States House of Representatives, died here in his sleep today at the home of a sister, Mrs. Stuart W. Cramer, Sr. His age was 85.

A descendant of a family that came to America on the Mayflower, he represented the 10th Massachusetts District—including Boston's Back Bay and fashionable Newton—from 1915 to 1943, when he retired from political life. He was not married.

Another sister, Mrs. Madeleine P. Miller, of Boston, also survives.

LEADER OF WET BLOC

An unyielding isolationist, Mr. Tinkham was a leader of the wet bloc in prerepeal days, a defender of Negro rights and a foe of all restrictions on personal liberty. One of his proudest distinctions was that of having fired the first American shot against Austria in World War I. At the time, April 1917, he was touring Italy when the United States declared war.

His campaign methods brought him almost as much attention as his congressional activities. His usual procedure in an election year was to embark on a big-game hunt or a long trip abroad after Congress had adjourned. Either just before or just after election he would return.

Without having made a single campaign speech, he would be reelected as a Republican from the Tenth District, a section normally Democratic. In 1928, 1932, and 1936 his district gave heavy pluralities to Democratic presidential and senatorial candidates, but returned him to the House by an even heavier vote.

When, in April 1942, Mr. Tinkham announced he would retire from public life the next year, he declared that "younger shoulders" should carry the burden. He aded that "redistricting" had made him "a comparative stranger" to a large part of his new constituency.

Last March Mr. Tinkham made available to the New York Times a prediction by Commodore Matthew Calbraith Perry, the American naval officer who opened Japan to the West, that war "must sooner or later inevitably be fought" between this country and Russia. Mr. Tinkham said he could not recall how he had acquired this portion of an address delivered by Commodore Perry in 1856.

One of the richest men in the Congress, Mr. Tinkham was also one of the most picturesque. His was the last bearded face there. Until the death of Senator J. Hamilton Lewis, of Illinois, they shared this distinction.

NAMED TROPHIES FOR FOES

He was one of the most traveled men in the country. Even before he entered Harvard College in 1890 he had journeyed from Spitsbergen to New Zealand, usually in quest of big game. On some of his trips he covered as much as 40,000 miles. Big game and other trophies were brought back from these expeditions and preserved.

One of his whims was naming the more grotesque items in his collection for political opponents. In this category were many notable figures, including Bishop James Cannon, Jr., of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, whom Mr. Tinkham had assailed mercilessly during prohibition days; President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Secretary of State Cordell Hull and Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson.

His later years in Congress were devoted chiefly to fighting the foreign policy of the Roosevelt administration. In 1938 he charged that the President and the State Department were under the control of the British Foreign Office. He frequently mentioned the existence of international plots against the peace of the United States, and was one of the leaders in the fights against lifting the arms embargo and against the lease-lend bill to aid Great Britain in the war against Germany.

His isolationist record dated from the end of World War I. He opposed United States participation in the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague, the Netherlands; the Washington Naval Treaties, the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact and recognition of Soviet Russia.

Mr. Tinkham was born in Boston, on October 29, 1870, the son of George Henry and Frances Ann Holden Tinkham. He received a Bachelor of Arts degree from Harvard in 1894, and later attended Harvard Law School. He was admitted to the Massachusetts bar in 1899. Two years previously he had won his first political office, membership on Boston's common council.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD during the course of the tribute being paid to the late Honorable George Holden Tinkham, or, if they so desire, at any other time in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and that all Members who speak during the course of this tribute may have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, when George Holden Tinkham died last August there passed from this scene one of the most colorful and picturesque figures of our national life. For 28 years he served with great ability and distinction in the Congress of the United States. Previousy he had served in the city government in Boston and in the Massachusetts State Senate.

George Tinkham was a positive character, a man of strong views and with the courage to fight for them. He was a foe of prohibition and took a very prominent part in the fight.

Tinkham won fame as a hunter and traveler. The trophies he brought back from his many hunts afforded his friends vast information concerning animal life. His travels brought him to all parts of the world. Two years ago I recall running across him when he was leaving to make an air trip over the Arctic, the last place for him to visit; and he made that trip at the age of 84. Nearly every year he visited South Africa where he had an interest in a gold mine.

Mr. Tinkham was a student of economics. He visited Washington, New York, London, and other great cities every year to gather his information data.

He prided himself upon calling far in advance of the 1929 collapse as well as an advance prediction of the coming of the First World War.

Tinkham could well be clasified as an isolationist. From his Pilgrim ancestry he inherited a rugged independence that won for him the respect of friend and foe alike. His colorful beard gave him a ferocious appearance, but in reality he had a heart of sentiment and good will. He was devoutly loyal to his friends.

His popularity at home was such that regularly year after year a Democratic district in Boston returned him to Congress with hardly the semblance of a contest.

With the death of George Holden Tinkham passed a rugged and patriotic American who had but one purpose in his national service and that was to serve his beloved Boston, the State of Massachusetts, and the United States to the best of his ability. The country can ill afford to lose men of the character of George Holden Tinkham.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I knew George Tinkham during all the years he was a Member of the Congress. He was popular with all the Members of the House. He served well. His relatives have my deep sympathy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the late George Holden Tinkham who served

in this body for 28 years was one of the most colorful men who ever served in the Congress of the United States. He represented the old 10th District of Massachusetts. His district and my district joined each other.

George Tinkham was truly loved by the people of his district. The best evidence of this is the fact that he was elected as a Republican term after term in what was for any other Republican a fairly safe Democratic district.

While I differed with George Tinkham on some matters, I never for a moment, no matter how strong the point of contention, lost one iota of the respect in which I always regarded him, nor any part of the affection which deep down I had for this most unusual and individualistic American. For it was in his individualism that he was outstanding and fulfilled one of the great legends of the American character. There was in George Holden Tinkham an independence, a spirited American sense of individuality, which set him apart. It made him a superb ambassador of good will for America in his numerous travels to practically every part of the earth. Wherever he went he took with him and radiated a joy in life, a sense of well-being, a quality of fight and of victory, that were contagious and charged a room, a hotel lobby, an auditorium, this House, with the zest of a good and a sincere man interested in the problems of his time.

When he fought, which was often, he fought hard, but without malice. His vigorous contempt for hypocrisy might stir rancor in others. He never returned rancor though his language was often penetrating. His individualism and the orthodox consistency of his views persuaded him to a philosophy that revealed the rugged drive for self-reliance and freedom that invested his thinking. George Holden Tinkham was born, we must remember, in the Boston of 1870, only 5 years after the Civil War and won his first election to this House in 1915. He supported magnificently the background from which he sprang and the climate of opinion in which he was bred and to which he belonged. He gave himself fully to the heart of the era in which he served in this House from 1915 until 1943—28 years. When he died at the age of 85 on August 25, 1956, full of years and honor, he left a void in the hearts of the people who had known and respected him. They loved him and, like myself, shall forever miss the voice and the vigor, the amiability and the wit and intelligence of this rare gentleman.

A far greater tribute than I could pay him here was accorded Congressman Tinkham by his own fiercely devoted constituency in the old 10th Massachusetts Congressional District. It is the sort of tribute that makes his political career the envy of his colleagues. For George Holden Tinkham had been tested by the people who elected him. Consequently they did not require him to go through the arduous mills of campaigning once he had established himself in their hearts. They loved and respected George Holden Tinkham as a friend, a legislator, a big-game hunter, a world traveler, and as an individualist, as well as for his charitable heart. It was not George Holden Tinkham's constituency that retired him from public life, it was Congressman Tinkham who retired on his own accord, and he was succeeded by Christian A. Herter, now Under Secretary of State.

A Mayflower descendant and graduate of Harvard and Harvard Law School, the Tinkham personality explained, if anything can, the indomitable spirit and the passion for freedom that brought to such eventful fruition the extraordinary voyage of a small group of men, women, and children seeking—as Pilgrims—the right in 1620 to worship God in their own way. Consider what that has meant down through the centuries for mankind. He served in the old Boston Common Council even before he was admitted to the Massachusetts bar in 1899. Later, in 1901 and 1902, he served as a member of the board of aldermen and was a Massachusetts State senator from 1910 to 1912. He served in this House from the 64th Congress through the 77th.

George Tinkham was a symbol of democracy. Above all, he was, as an American, as a Representative of his district and as a man, one whom it was an honor to know and to associate with in the affairs of government.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the late George Holden Tinkham, who represented the 10th Massachusetts District from 1915 until 1943, was a man to remember.

His talents were many, and his independence of judgment was admired by friend and foe alike.

This hardy New England characteristic stood him in good stead through all the changing conditions of his long and constructive career as a Member of this House.

By his painstaking attention to the needs of his constituents, and by his numberless personal philanthropies, he won the affection of Republicans and Democrats alike. His seat was assured as long as he wanted it.

His political philosophy was Republican, but the regard in which he was held dissolved all petty partisan differences.

George Holden Tinkham was an original. There will never be a carbon copy of his unique personality, as fresh and clean as the sea breeze that comes off the Atlantic into his beloved Boston, whispering to men of freedom, adventure, and new horizons to be discovered.

Sure of himself, and the affectionate support of his cosmopolitan district, he could go big-game hunting in Africa during congressional elections.

This, unprecedented in itself, sums up his character and his popularity.

Massachusetts is proud of the contributions made by him to our national life.

We pay tribute to his memory today in the confident hope that his example, and those of courageous men like him, will nourish the traditions that future generations will emulate.

As long as our Nation continues to produce men of his quality, the United States will lead the way toward greater fulfillment in freedom for all mankind.

To the memory of George Holden Tinkham, our everlasting respect and admiration.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the passing of an old friend and former colleague in this House who died last autumn at just about the 86th milestone.

George Holden Tinkham had an extraordinary career. He devoted the useful years of his entire life to public service. For many years he was an institution in the public life of Massachusetts.

Having trained himself, as he told me on several occasions, in the hope of a career as a professor, he was destined to serve for 2 years on the Common Council of Boston, for 3 years on the Board of Aldermen in Boston, for 2 years in the Massachusetts Senate, and for 28 years as a Member of Congress—a total of 35 years. He was never defeated.

A Republican in a strong Democratic district, he nevertheless was elected to Congress again and again with large majorities. So strongly did he establish himself in the minds and hearts of his people that for many years he was reelected without even appearing in his district during the campaign.

I well remember the campaign of 1928 during which for the most part he was in Africa while Governor Smith was running for the Presidency as the "Happy Warrior." A postal card was distributed by his office with his photograph and the caption, "Don't Forget That Other Happy Warrior, George Holden Tinkham." Both "Happy Warriors" carried the district by over 15,000 votes.

George Tinkham was one of the most well read Members of the Congress. He had always been a student of history, of government, of economics, of finance.

He was one of the most traveled Members of the Congress. For many years, and almost to the date of his death, he visited the principal countries of the world and was known to their leaders in both public and private life.

The record in Who's Who indicates that he was the first American to fire a shot against the Austrians after America's declaration of war in World War I, at Carpo d'Arbine, on the Piave River, and that he was offered and declined a decoration—the Chevalier Della Corona d'Italia—by the Italian Government.

His apartment in Washington at the Arlington Hotel, where he lived for 28 years, even after the hotel was converted into an office building by reason of a clause in his lease permitting him to remain as long as he was a Member of Congress, was filled with trophies of his hunting expeditions and objects of art gathered in far corners of the world, some of which are today in the Boston Art Museum.

During his service in the Congress he devoted himself at first to the work of the Appropriations Committee and in later years to that of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He always had convictions and the courage of his convictions. He always stood and fought for what he believed to be the fundamentals of Americanism.

Retiring at the age of 72, he left thousands in his district who would always be grateful to him for the counsel and advice, for the helping hand which he had been able to give them as their Congressman.

Those who served with him here will always remember him.

He was a close friend. I served with him in this House for 15 years. I saw him often after his retirement.

I valued his friendship. I shall always recall him with affection, remembering his fearless service to his district, State, and Nation.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in tribute to George Holden Tinkham. I served with him years ago on the Foreign Affairs Committee. He was a deep student of world affairs and always a courtly gentleman. He was fearless in his advocacy of the principles he held. He will long be remembered for his service in Congress.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened to learn sometime ago of the passing of a former very distinguished Member of this body, Congressman George Holden Tinkham, who represented the 10th Massachusetts District for many years.

George Tinkham was a close friend of mine. He was one of the first men I met when I came to Washington years ago, when I was in college, to work on the other side of the Capitol during my summer vacations.

Throughout the years, I kept in touch with him, and saw him from time to time up to the time of his death. Of course, I held him in highest regard and esteem as everyone did who knew him. I had a real affection for him.

He was an able, devoted, and faithful public servant. More than that, he was a Bunker Hill American, and he had the courage to express and stand by his convictions for America.

George Tinkham was a keen student of government and economics and many other subjects. Possessed of splendid training and an alert, inquiring mind, he spent a great deal of time studying governmental and financial reports. His forecast of financial and economic trends were always most interesting and accurate.

His political success was sensational; his personality and makeup unique. For years, he was returned to Congress from a district that time and time again gave him overwhelming majorities on some occasions when he was in remote parts of the world following his hobby of big-game hunting.

As a result of his exploits in Africa, Asia, and other parts of the world he collected a large and very interesting exhibit of animals and reptiles, which were mounted in his apartment in the old Arlington Hotel in the Capital. The rare exhibits were set up against a dark background with real theatrical, dramatic skill.

When showing these exhibits to his friends he seldom turned on the apartment lights, but would personally escort his guests from one room and one exhibit to another, guiding the way with a large flashlight. There were many striking exhibits in his collection, but I always thought that the most impressive, to me at least, was the one that he had brought from India of the cobra and the mongoose. The Congressman captured the deadly cobra and the mongoose by himself in the Indian hinterlands and had them mounted in one piece in a simulated death battle.

He might seem to some to be extraordinary in appearance. He affected a Vandyke beard of the kind that General Grant wore. His black hats were invariably jauntily worn. In the winter, he wore an old-fashioned reefer, or pea coat, rather than a full-length overcoat, which came to a point just below his hips. This costume accentuated his rather short, robust stature.

He was a world traveler, linguist, and keen student of foreign policy and problems of other nations. In his own philosophy, he was a strong nationalist, rather surprising for a Harvard-bred scion of an aristocratic Boston family.

In his creed, America was predominant and paramount. He had no time for internationalism or other isms and was an implacable foe of communism. His great success in politics was attributable to his forthright, courageous attitude on foreign policy and current domestic issues and his faithful service to his entire constituency.

He was an able statesman, given to meticulous study of governmental problems and well versed in many fields of learning. He enjoyed a long, useful life and lived to a ripe old age.

George Tinkham will be mourned and missed by a great many people who knew and admired him. His outstanding service in the Congress will long be remembered. His sparkling, unusual, engaging personality, his ready wit, his good company, and his friendly spirit have left an indelible imprint upon his friends and upon the Congress and the time in which he lived.

He will be long remembered as a man of character and intestinal fortitude and devotion to his country. In the company of other Massachusetts colleagues, I attended the most impressive funeral services which were conducted for him in a historic church in his home city of Boston.

Like the many present, I was anxious to pay my last tribute to a good friend whom I had known for many years and who during his lifetime had given me so many reasons to marvel at his alert, informed, and penetrating mind, versatility, his patriotism and his loyalty to those things which are essential to uphold the Nation and its free institutions.

Few, if any, more unusual men have ever trod the Halls of Congress than George Tinkham. His valuable service will have a place in our history; his kindly, generous nature a place in our memory.

To his family, I tender again my most heartfelt sympathy in their sorrowful bereavement. May he find in his eternal reward peace and rest.

---

## MANPOWER UTILIZATION AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recommend strongly the approval of House Resolution 139 authorizing continuance of studies and investigations to improve manpower utilization and personnel management. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has from its inception had the responsibility for reviewing manpower utilization in the Federal Government. Until the 83d Congress the effort consisted mainly of special studies. At that time a more extensive program was launched. It was largely confined to the military departments.

With the experience thus gained, we undertook in the 84th Congress a full-fledged drive to improve manpower management throughout the executive branch. Our approach was based on several proven fundamentals. First, this was to be a cooperative effort between the executive and legislative branches. Second, we wanted every department and agency to establish an active manpower program. Third, we needed top-level support and recognition of the need for manpower planning, and fourth, the results were to be a general reduction in manpower to be achieved through the use of attrition instead of firings.

We have accomplished some of our objectives. We have been receiving some cooperation from the executive branch. Manpower programs have been established throughout the Government and the President has expressed his interest in the need for economical use of manpower. We have not achieved a general reduction. We have, however, had many reports on economies and the expansion in employment has definitely been slowed. Today we are in an excellent position to produce further substantial savings and other beneficial results.

The results to date were not achieved by just sitting back and asking for cooperation. We requested each department and agency to appoint a liaison officer. We held meetings with them and seminars on manpower utilization to acquaint the departments with our objectives.

Every department was requested to select a function for special study. The Canal Zone Government reported that through its functional surveys it was able to eliminate over 1,000 positions despite an increase in workload. The Veterans' Administration surveyed its vocational rehabilitation and training function. They were able to eliminate 450 jobs—14 percent—in the face of an increase of veterans being trained.

We had departments and agencies ask each supervisor down the line to see if he could do with one less employee. The Commerce Department, through this single step, saved 133 positions involving salaries of over $500,000.

Each department and agency was requested to review every vacant job for essentiality. In Washington alone over 400 jobs were abolished in 2 months. That does not sound like much but the

annual payroll of those jobs was $2 million. The Air Force completed a similar review and reported 5,711 jobs abolished at a saving to the taxpayer of $25 million annually. When you add all the results, big and little, it means that 35,000 fewer persons were hired than had been planned. When you couple this with similar reductions in overhead type military positions the total annual savings exceed half a billion dollars.

Our drive to reduce the pressures that are inflating the demands for engineers and scientists is also producing results. The Secretary of Defense has ordered the establishment of quantitative standards for allowable costs under defense contracts. These will not only help cut contract costs but also will eliminate undue competition by placing all contract holders on a footing based on normal business practices. We have already had expressions of appreciation from sources in and out of Government for our work in this regard.

At the same time we have encouraged a drive to improve the use of engineers and to reduce hoarding. This was based on the numerous complaints about hoarding of engineers by holders of defense contracts. We have no proof of this hoarding but reports submitted by the Navy Department showed defense contractors employed 11,700 engineers per billion dollars of total business, whereas the firms with essentially commercial business employed only 3,600 engineers per billion dollars. These figures certainly point to the need for thorough investigation. Hoarding not only means a waste of tax dollars but also of manpower reportedly in critically short supply. I am pleased to be able to report that action has also been initiated by Secretary Wilson to correct this situation.

We held 3 sets of hearings on manpower with 22 appearances by the departments and agencies.

Three special studies and 11 staff visits to field offices and installations were made. Each of these involved recommendations and changes that produced economies.

In addition to the 3 transcripts of hearings, 2 committee reports on manpower utilization and a special survey report were printed. All have received wide distribution based on demands from both Government and industry.

The signing of Public Law 801, which I introduced in the 84th Congress, marked a further step in the drive for good manpower utilization. For the first time the estimated dollars and manpower costs must accompany a new proposal involving expenditures of over a million dollars. This law will give each committee an opportunity to review costs prior to the passage of enabling legislation. This will help relieve some of the burden of achieving economies now borne by the Appropriations Committees.

From the above it can be seen that good manpower utilization is not something that merely happens. It has to be encouraged and when necessary demanded by the Congress. It takes the continuing cooperative support of both the executive and legislative branches. The end result is of benefit to the taxpayer and to the Federal service. A recent newspaper article pointed out that realization is spreading that our program is resulting in more job security for the Federal civil servant. This is true because it is based on manpower planning that considers the long-range welfare of the individual and the agency instead of indiscriminate hirings and firings to meet the immediate needs of the employer alone.

Again, I wish to add my strong support for favorable consideration of House Resolution 139. I am sure that the results obtained will be a sound basis for future accomplishments.

## HON. ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD, POSTMASTER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, by statute, the Postmaster General is the only Cabinet officer whose reappointment requires Senate confirmation. Yesterday, the Senate formally confirmed the nomination of Arthur E. Summerfield, of Flint, Mich., for a second 4-year term as Postmaster General.

Because Mr. Summerfield is a resident of my district, this action was a great satisfaction to me. I know him to be the finest kind of gentleman and a devoted public servant. The high praise which Mr. Summerfield received, from members of both political parties in the Senate yesterday, is a tribute to his administrative achievements in this office.

Mr. Summerfield brought to the Office of Postmaster General essentially the same talent and methods by which he achieved success in the business world: a constant effort to give efficient service to the public; an unending search for new and better methods; and the creation of a flexible, responsive organization.

I am proud to salute and congratulate Mr. Summerfield on this occasion.

## THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on page 49 of the President's Economic Report the President recommends an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code designed to improve the ability of local and State governments to finance their projects. I know most Congressmen are aware of the difficulties local school boards, sewer districts, and other taxing authorities are faced in going ahead with their various construction projects for which bonds have already been voted. Everything is ready except the money is not there.

I quote the pertinent excerpt from the President's Economic Report:

> Some improvement in the ability of these governmental units to finance their projects would result from an amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to extend the "conduit principle" to regulated investment companies that hold their assets in State and local securities. The amendment, which would involve no loss of revenue, would permit regulated investment companies of this type to pass through to their stockholders the tax-exempt status of the income received on State and local securities. The Congress is requested to enact legislation to accomplish this result.

The reason this would involve no loss of revenue is because presently the investment trusts will not invest in municipal bonds because they do not get the benefit of the tax exemption for their shareholders. To those interested in the little investor, it might be well to point out that it is through the device of the investment trust that the small investor can gain the spread in portfolio that the big investor has. So, in effect, this proposed amendment would be giving the small investor the same advantage that the large investor presently has.

Our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], has anticipated the President's request for legislation in this area by introducing on January 3, 1957, H. R. 1222, which will accomplish this purpose. I have introduced an identical bill today to indicate my personal support of this recommendation and to emphasize the importance of it.

## STANDARD OIL OF CALIFORNIA ADMITS INFLUENCING ITS DEALERS TO OPPOSE H. R. 11

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, I described the organization and the workings of a new lobby of the major oil companies, the purpose of which is to have the oil jobbers and retail gasoline dealers wire and write Members of Congress in opposition to H. R. 11.

On January 31, Standard of California released a statement from its San Francisco office, in answer to my statement of the 28th. This statement contains an unmistakable admission that the company has in fact been inspiring its customers to wire Members of Congress to oppose H. R. 11.

Having been caught redhanded, as it were, the company now becomes indignant and declares that:

> We believe our company has acted entirely within its rights in carrying to our dealers a program of information to point out to them the damaging effects this bad piece of legislation would have on their business and the oil business in general.

And this company further says:

> We believe we not only have a right to express this opinion, but a duty to do so.

On February 1, the Washington representative of Standard of California sent me a copy of this statement, requesting that I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Standard requests this,

its letter says, "in the interest of fair play."

IS IT FAIR PLAY TO MISLEAD MEMBERS OF CONGRESS?

Now let us examine the basis for this demand for fair play.

First, Standard argues that it has a right to express its opinion. With this I would agree. The question is, however, why has this company not come out in the open before now and expressed its opposition to H. R. 11, instead of working behind the scenes to have its customers do this. Certainly this silence on its own behalf could not be because Standard is unable to get top-level attention paid to its views. As I have said before, the major oil companies have been able to win great favors from the Federal Government, and they have been able to get consideration of their interests, both at home and abroad.

Where, during the past month, has a major oil company sent wires or letters to Members of Congress opposing the bill in its own name? Why, in short, have they preferred to give us the "false-front" lobby?

The answer is to be found, not in the oil companies' spirit of fair play, but in the very point of H. R. 11. This bill says certain things about how a supplier may and may not treat its customers. Therefore, if the bill does anything it must either help the supplier or help the supplier's customers. Standard of California has preferred to have Members of Congress believe that the bill would hurt its customers, and it has tried to make its customers believe that. What kind of "fair play" is this?

The new statement which Standard of California wishes me to place in the RECORD also says that its representatives have not pressured dealers to send wires opposing H. R. 11. Admittedly, however, this company has not hesitated to try to pressure and mislead Members of Congress, by inspiring a flood of wires which would have the Members think that H. R. 11 would hurt the jobbers and retail gasoline dealers. What kind of fair play shall we call that?

IS IT FAIR PLAY TO MISLEAD CUSTOMERS?

Finally, this new statement of Standard of California continues the same old propaganda line that the company has been giving its dealers. It claims that H. R. 11 would prevent the company from "assisting our dealers to meet competition." Since this is obviously not true, by what standards of fair play can the company demand that we lend our limited and feeble means of publicity to such a statement?

The simple fact is that H. R. 11 will not prevent Standard from meeting the price of an off-brand seller, or from meeting the price of any competitor's gasoline. Nor will the bill prevent Standard from discriminating in price to assist its dealers in meeting any competition that may be generated by a competing brand of gasoline. What the bill would do, however, is to require Standard to assist its dealers to meet the competition that is generated by Standard itself.

During the past 2 years the House Small Business Committee has heard testimony from a great number of retail gasoline dealers from all parts of the country. Many of these were still in business when they testified. Many others had already been put out of business by their supplier's practice of discriminating in prices as between its dealers. These people have uniformly complained about one major oil company or another, complaining that the company discriminates by charging some of its dealers high prices while granting other competing dealers low prices. These dealers and ex-dealers have, furthermore, uniformly asked for passage of H. R. 11. The bill is designed specifically to eliminate the kind of discriminations they are complaining about.

IS IT FAIR PLAY TO DESTROY CUSTOMERS?

Now what is this conflict about and what will H. R. 11 do? Let us say that there are 4 filling stations at a given intersection. Three of these are Standard dealers and one is a dealer who sells an off-brand gasoline at 2 cents less than Standard's regular retail price.

Now the discrimination is made when Standard reduces its price to one of its dealers at the intersection, but not to its other two dealers. The understanding is of course that the dealer who receives the lower price will reduce his price to consumers—or there need not be a spoken understanding, the dealer will do it anyway. The result is of course that the low consumer price offered by this favored dealer will divert trade from the off-brand dealer. But an equal result will be that Standard's favored dealer will also divert trade from the other two Standard dealers who are not given a price by which they can meet the competition.

True, the eventual result is likely to be that the off-brand dealer will go out of business, as will the small refiner who supplies him, and then Standard's price to the favored dealer will be raised again. But in the meantime, Standard's other two dealers will most likely go out of business too. Sample studies which have been submitted to the Small Business Committee indicate that about one-third of the retail gasoline dealers go out of business each year, only to be replaced by other young men who hopefuly scrape together a few thousand dollars to invest in this business.

Standard of California now professes great concern and tenderness for its jobbers and dealers. Reading the company's statement one would gain the impression that its greatest wish is to assist its jobbers and dealers in meeting competition. But if this were true, why, then, when Standard assists one dealer to meet competition does it not assist all of its other dealers who are in actual competition with that dealer? The oil companies are free to do that now. And if they did it, there would perhaps be no need for H. R. 11, insofar as the gasoline business is concerned. There would be no need for a law to require the oil companies to do what they say they wish to do. But there is a need, and this is what H. R. 11 does: It tells the supplier to give equal treatment to all of its dealers who are in competition in and among themselves. Or, more precisely, it tells the supplier not to give his dealers such unequal treatment that he causes a "substantial lessening of competition or a tendency to create monopoly." There are exceptions of course. For example, if the supplier has cost differences in serving the different dealers, these differences may be reflected in his prices.

If we judge by the actions of most of the major oil companies, rather than by their words, I think we would have to say that the company does not wish to assist its dealers to meet their competition, but to crush its own competition in a way which involves the smallest possible reduction in the corporation's profits. Indeed, we would have to say that these great oil corporations even discriminate among their dealers when there is no competition to be crushed, merely to squeeze their dealers' margins, so that the oil companies will themselves take a maximum portion of the profit contained in the price they prescribe for consumers.

Do these practices constitute fair play?

WHAT ARE THE POWER RELATIONSHIPS?

Let us consider briefly how the economic power of the top oil companies compares with that of the independent jobbers and dealers, and then ask the question again.

Standard Oil of California has assets of about $2 billion. Its profits in the year 1955, came to $231 million, after taxes. No doubt they were much higher last year. It is one of the 6 largest oil companies, which together have assets of more than $18 billion and had profits last year of about $2 billion, after paying taxes and paying all advertising and lobbying expenses.

Each of these six companies owns industrial empires which far exceed the wealth of most of the individual nations of the world. They have had tremendous financial and other assistance from the Federal Government, in not only maintaining but extending their holdings of both production fields and markets on all the continents of the globe. Directly or indirectly they have had the assistance of the Federal Government, not only in maintaining but in extending the cartel by which their prices are fixed and their markets are protected.

These and other major oil companies have long since bought up most of the jobber-distributor plants, most of the filling stations, and most of the good filling station sites in the United States.

As for the independent jobbers who once distributed gasoline, these have been largely replaced by the oil companies' own distributing systems, and are becoming more so. In some instances a substantial jobber is allowed to duplicate, to an extent, the services of the oil company's distribution system, but only where the gasoline of some small refiner remains accessible to such a jobber. For the most part, the independent jobber still exists only in areas where markets are thin and he must send his trucks over back roads to make small deliveries, or in urban markets where there is fringe business of a type which the oil companies do not care to handle. As an in-

dependent jobber in New York wrote me on January 22:

I have the undesired business that the major oil companies do not care for * * * I pick up my oil from the major oil companies and deliver it to my bulk plant and sell these many peddlers in their 300 gallon, 500 gallon and larger tank trucks. They in turn sell this oil to people in the underprivileged slums who cannot buy more than 5 gallons at a time.

Incidentially, this jobber adds:

Unfortunately I do not have much respect for the major companies as they treat most jobbers worse than a sharecropper.

As for the retail filling stations however, the trend has been somewhat different. The oil companies lease these stations, for the most part, to independent operators, for the simple reason that it is cheaper than paying wages. Young men, always hopeful that they can establish a small business of their own, save or borrow a few thousand dollars to invest in one of these leased stations, and then work 12, 14, or perhaps 16 hours a day trying to hang onto their investment. Here, then, is the important question: Are these young men being accorded fair play when the supplier with whom they have teamed up in good faith, and with whom they have made an investment, squeezes them out by discriminating in prices among them?

IS ABUSE OF POWER THE BASIC PRINCIPLE OF THE AMERICAN BUSINESS SYSTEM?

Standard Oil of California now says in its statement to me that H. R. 11 is "wholly contrary to the basic principles of the American business system." If this be true—if the American business system allows wanton abuse of power to crush a small competitor and allows the great corporate combines to destroy willy-nilly the customers who have tied their economic destinies to these combines in good faith—then the system is immoral and should be modified.

In asking for H. R. 11, small-business people are asking only for something approaching the golden rule, in business. What they ask for is modest and reasonable. They should have it and have it without delay.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT GASOLINE DEALERS SUPPORTS H. R. 11

I received yesterday a telegram from the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers which reads in part as follows:

In order to correct any false impression that may have been gained we wish to advise that the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers is the only national association representing the retail segment of the petroleum industry and has membership in 36 States from coast to coast. NCPR, speaking for approximately 200,000 independent service station operators across the Nation, strongly supports the equality of opportunity bill and strongly urges its prompt adoption by the Congress.

No practice has done so much to destroy free enterprise in the retail petroleum industry as price discrimination.

* * * * *

The injury to small business in general and to the Nation's service station operators in particular caused by the Supreme Court decision in the Standard Oil-Detroit case will continue to deepen and worsen until Congress acts to remedy this situation. We earnestly request the help of Congress to secure the adoption of this desperately-needed legislation as early as possible in the present session.

JOHN W. NERLINGER, Jr.,
*Executive Secretary.*

TEXAS ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT DEALERS SUPPORTS H. R. 11

I also have a letter dated January 30, from Texas Service Stations, Associated, which reads in part as follows:

Events of the past few months have confirmed our need for adoption of this bill in the present session where it has been reintroduced with the same number, H. R. 11 and S. 11. Destructive price discrimination has been on the rise in our industry and it is one of the principal factors causing an estimated 60,000 service station operators to fail in business, quit or be forced out of business each year.

* * * * *

We make this request in our members' behalf because service station operators are victims of price discrimination which destroys our businesses and savings, and we also make this request in the interest of preserving small business' opportunity in America and in the interest of consumers who are gouged by monopoly price fixing after small business is destroyed.

I insert in the RECORD the letter to me from the representative of Standard Oil of California, together with this company's statement of January 31.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 1, 1957.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: We are attaching a copy of a statement made on January 31 by Standard Oil Company of California concerning allegations and statements made by you to the Congress on January 28, 1957, with regard to H. R. 11.

In the interest of fair play, we request that you have this statement inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yours very truly,

WOOLLEN H. WALSHE,
*Washington Representative, Standard Oil Company of California.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., January 31, 1957.—The Standard Oil Company of California today made the following statement concerning certain allegations and statements made in Congress with regard to H. R. 11:

"We believe our company has acted entirely within its rights in carrying to our dealers a program of information to point out to them the damaging effects this bad piece of legislation would have on their business and the oil business in general.

"It is completely against this company's policies to make any attempt at all to 'pressure' its dealers and all our representatives in the field have long-standing instructions to this effect.

"Our inquiry indicates that the initial communication against the bill, made by the dealer mentioned in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, was entirely voluntary and that the pressure on this dealer, if any, was from the other side. Of the hundreds who sent communications in opposition, it is not strange that a few could have been induced to change their minds.

"We have no intention of accepting without a word of protest legislative proposals that will harm our business and harm the dealers who sell our products. We have talked in opposition to H. R. 11 not only to our service station dealers, but to every other group that might be interested.

"Passage of this legislation would prohibit us as a supplier from meeting local competition and from assisting our dealers in doing so. We do not believe that either we or our dealers can operate unless allowed to be freely competitive. This bill would artificially restrict competition and it is wholly contrary to the basic principles of the American business system. We believe we not only have a right to express this opinion, but a duty to do so."

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GARY for the balance of the day (Tuesday) and Wednesday on account of official business.

To Mr. KITCHIN for Wednesday and Thursday, February 6 and 7, 1957, on account of the necessity of being out of the District of Columbia on official business.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. BOLLING) today for 30 minutes, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri for 10 minutes today.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HULL and to include an address by Senator SYMINGTON.

Mr. HERLONG.

Mr. JENSEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUDGE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BALDWIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BERRY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BEAMER.

Mr. WRIGHT.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT to include a telegram in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOYLE.

## SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 607. An act to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.), the

House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 6, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

430. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

431. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to transfer to the Government of the District of Columbia the Public Employment Service for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

432. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the report (pt. I) of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction over Federal Areas Within the States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

433. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to include certain officers and employees of the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the General Services Administration, and Federal probation officers within the provisions of sections 111 and 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to assaults and homicides"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

434. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal year 1956, pursuant to the act approved June 23, 1934, (18 U. S. C. 4127); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

435. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

436. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

437. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 3, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Baltimore Harbor and channels, Maryland, requested by resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted August 17, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 86); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with three illustrations.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 27. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 147. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2367, a bill to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 28). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 4353. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 4354. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 4355. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall make certain payments to the counties of Mecklenburg, Halifax, and Charlotte, State of Virginia, from the proceeds of sales of timber located on that portion of the land within the John H. Kerr Reservoir, Va., and N. C., situated in the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4356. A bill to amend section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to provide that policies of insurance issued under that section on the 5-year level premium term plan may be exchanged for or converted to insurance on any other plan; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4357. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection of poultry and poultry products so as to prohibit the movement in interstate or foreign commerce of unsound, unhealthful, diseased, unwholesome, or adulterated poultry or poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4358. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 so as to authorize sales on credit; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 4359. A bill to make permanent certain temporary judgeships; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4360. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of March 12, 1914, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 4361. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 4362. A bill to amend section 334 (e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to increased allotments for durum wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 4363. A bill to provide for carryback and carryover of foreign tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 4364. A bill to create a United States Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 4365. A bill to provide free barber services to all Armed Forces personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 4366. A bill to amend the act of August 30, 1954, entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4367. A bill to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4368. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide travel and transportation allowances to enlisted members of the uniformed services for their first leave; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4369. A bill to amend the act of May 17, 1910, with respect to the composition and activities of the Commission of Fine Arts; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 4370. A bill to amend section 645 of title 14, United States Code, relative to the settlement of claims incident to activities of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 4371. A bill to create the office of Guest Member in the Senate and in the House of Representatives of the United States for former Presidents of the United States of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 4372. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped; to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4373. A bill to authorize the preservation of the United States ship *Olympia* and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4374. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and reenact the Wagner Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4375. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 4376. A bill to establish the United States Domestic Public Works Bank, which shall purchase obligations of certain local governmental bodies where such obligations cannot be sold on the open market except at an interest rate in excess of 3 percent per annum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COAD:

H. R. 4377. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that payments received by an individual in any taxable year under the Soil Bank Act may, at the election of such individual, be included in his gross income for the following taxable year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 4378. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the active duty obligation of certain officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:

H. R. 4379. A bill to authorize construction of Saylorville Reservoir on the Des Moines River, Iowa, for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 4380. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income-tax treatment of dividends paid by regulated investment companies which hold the bulk of their assets in State and local securities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 4381. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to furnish memorial markers commemorating certain deceased members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 4382. A bill to authorize the performance of active duty for training of 11 weeks in each of 2 consecutive years for certain persons enlisted under the provisions of section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H. R. 4383. A bill to amend the act of July 27, 1956, relating to detention of mail for temporary periods in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 4384. A bill to provide overtime pay for substitute postal employees and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4385. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 4386. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4387. A bill to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 4388. A bill to exempt regular and classified substitute employees in post offices of the first, second, and third classes from residence requirements governing appointment and service of postmasters at post offices to which such employees are assigned; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4389. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide certain retirement benefits for certain employees connected with the operation and testing of aircraft; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 4390. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of documents evidencing the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of motor vehicles sold to or owned by certain carriers subject to such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4391. A bill to amend section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to require freight forwarders to obtain certificates of public convenience and necessity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4392. A bill to amend section 402 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide more definite standards for determining who is entitled to exemption from part IV of that act as an association of shippers or a shipper's agent; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4393. A bill to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 4394. A bill to amend the joint resolution entitled "A joint resolution consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas," approved August 28, 1951; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4395. A bill to reduce the percentage depletion for oil and gas wells; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 4396. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a partial tax credit for certain payments made to a public private educational institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4397. A bill to provide a more equitable method for computing the self-employment income of farmers under the Social Security Act for taxable years ending during the period commencing January 1, 1955, and ending December 31, 1958; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 4398. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 4399. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 4400. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the taxes imposed on the transportation of persons and property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 4401. A bill to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4402. A bill to provide parking space for the automobiles of patrons and postal employees at postal installations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4403. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 4404. A bill to amend section 15 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, so as to make loans insured by the Secretary of Agriculture eligible for investment by national banks as "investment securities" rather than loan obligations, and to include such loans in the excepted class of investments listed in section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, relating to national banking associations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 4405. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide that all cabs for hire in the District of Columbia be compelled to carry insurance for the protection of passengers, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4406. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H. R. 4407. A bill to amend the law relating to residence of assistant assessors for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 4408. A bill to provide five longevity increases for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force who have completed 28 years of service, without regard to the grade in which such service was rendered; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. R. 4409. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF (by request):

H. R. 4410. A bill to suspend and to modify the application of the excess land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws to lands in the East Bench unit of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 4411. A bill to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4412. A bill to incorporate the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 4413. A bill to further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat or other grain producers from liability under the act where all the wheat or other grain crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LeCOMPTE:

H. R. 4414. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1948, to authorize the erection of appropriate Government headstones or markers in cemetery plots in memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died while serving in the overseas theaters of operations and whose bodies have not been recovered or identified or have been buried at sea; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 4415. A bill to reorganize the civil defense functions of the Federal Government, to establish a Federal Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 4416. A bill to provide funds to pay nationals of the United States who have war damage claims against Germany and Japan, without additional direct appropriations therefor, and to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act and the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 4417. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4418. A bill to reorganize the civil defense functions of the Federal Government, to establish a Federal Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 4419. A bill to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by a taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4420. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H. R. 4421. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a contract with the Bard Irrigation District of California with respect to operation and maintenance of works on the reservation division, Yuma reclamation project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4422. A bill to restrict the right of minors to cross the border into Mexico in the vicinity of Mexicali where not done for a bona fide purpose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4423. A bill to create additional district judges for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 4424. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to amounts paid for admission to certain classical ballet

performances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4425. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4426. A bill to amend the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 to provide insurance against earthquake damage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 4427. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 4428. A bill to provide increases in monthly rates of compensation for service-connected disability payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration and to liberalize the requirements for awarding additional disability compensation to veterans who have dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4429. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4430. A bill to authorize the improvement of Hull Creek, Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 4431. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to provide for the safety of chemicals in cosmetics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4432. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to provide for the safety of chemical additives in food; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 4433. A bill to provide benefits established by the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to persons who graduated from Air Force ROTC training in 1954 and served on active duty for training in the Air National Guard before February 1, 1955; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 4434. A bill to provide a 1 year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4435. A bill to increase the rate of pension of certain widows of World War I veterans and the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to widows and children of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4436. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide that certain additional categories of loans to veterans may be automatically guaranteed; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 4437. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 4438. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 4439. A bill to establish a program of financial aid to students in higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 4440. A bill to allow individuals to deduct for Federal income-tax purposes not to exceed $100 each year of political contributions made to candidates for elective Federal offices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 4441. A bill to give the Small Business Administration permanent status; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 4442. A bill to facilitate the transfer of storage facilities between the military departments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4443. A bill to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 4444. A bill to amend section 602 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 with respect to the utilization and disposal of excess and surplus property under the control of executive agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the several States to negotiate and enter into compacts for the purpose of promoting highway traffic safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. J. Res. 222. Joint resolution to provide that members of the National Guard shall not be called or ordered to perform active duty for training without their consent for periods in excess of 15 days, except for an initial period of active duty for training of not more than 8 weeks; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. J. Res. 223. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of an annual United States Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. J. Res. 224. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the official founding and launching of the conservation movement for the protection, in the public interest, of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution extending the best wishes of the Government and people of the United States to Blackburn College, in Carlinville, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Res. 148. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of existing and potential defense coordination of the inland water transport facilities and resources of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. Res. 149. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Res. 150. Resolution to provide funds for necessary expenses of the Committee on House Administration; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 151. Resolution granting 1 year's salary to the estate of Edward Joseph Marshall, late an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 152. Resolution providing for expenses of investigations authorized pursuant to House Resolution 99; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. Res. 153. Resolution concerning payment of claims by the United States for damage resulting from sonic blasts and aircraft accidents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. Res. 154. Resolution authorizing the creation of a Select Committee on Problems of the Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. Res. 155. Resolution to provide for the unity of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging the Congress of the United States to repeal and abolish the tax on interstate transportation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging the Congress to use its influence to abrogate the present political division of Ireland, and to protest the presence of British troops in Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging the Congress to provide legislation giving grants-in-aid for school building purposes to school districts in the various States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial by the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to offering congratulations to the Honorable Dwight David Eisenhower and the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON as they embark on their second terms and continue to assume their positions of responsibility and leadership and praying that this administration may be characterized by world peace and security; to the Committee on House Administration.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging the Congress to provide a stopgap legislation extending the period of time in which Public Law 587, 83d Congress is to become effective, relative to the termination of the Klamath Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 4445. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mr. Shirley B. Stebbins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 4446. A bill for the relief of Curtis W. Strong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 4447. A bill for the relief of W. R. Zanes & Co., of La., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 4448. A bill to renew and extend the term of patent No. 600,890 for an additional term of 17 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4449. A bill to renew and extend the term of patent No. 887,848 for an additional term of 17 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 4450. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hans Zimmerman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:
H. R. 4451. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret W. Morgan McCracken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. CHUDOFF:
H. R. 4452. A bill for the relief of Matteo Petrillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. COLLIER:
H. R. 4453. A bill for the relief of Robert Cyril Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. COUDERT:
H. R. 4454. A bill for the relief of Eleftherios Loukas Moschos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. CRAMER:
H. R. 4455. A bill for the relief of Maurice Marcel Chavigny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. CRETELLA:
H. R. 4456. A bill for the relief of Denise Curkan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:
H. R. 4457. A bill for the relief of Peter M. Shikany; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. DELANEY:
H. R. 4458. A bill for the relief of Bruno Cos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4459. A bill for the relief of Anton Revak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4460. A bill for the relief of Joyce Cook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:
H. R. 4461. A bill for the relief of Johnnie P. Saylors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. FALLON:
H. R. 4462. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jacinto Gochoco, Jr., his wife, Felicidad Gochoco, and their minor son, Jacinto Gochoco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4463. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sarolta S. Neubauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. FEIGHAN:
H. R. 4464. A bill for the relief of John M. Dean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. FINO:
H. R. 4465. A bill for the relief of Linda Bollella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. JAMES:
H. R. 4466. A bill for the relief of Angela Insana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. JONES of Missouri:
H. R. 4467. A bill for the relief of Diego Moncado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. McFALL:
H. R. 4468. A bill for the relief of Florencio Doriman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. McGREGOR:
H. R. 4469. A bill for the relief of A. W. Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MAHON:
H. R. 4470. A bill for the relief of Willie H. Tennison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MICHEL:
H. R. 4471. A bill for the relief of Willi Walther; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MILLER of California:
H. R. 4472. A bill for the relief of Paulita H. Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MOSS:
H. R. 4473. A bill for the relief of Carolina M. Gomes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:
H. R. 4474. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Aryeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. POWELL:
H. R. 4475. A bill for the relief of Emilio Poglianich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. ROBERTS:
H. R. 4476. A bill for the relief of Miss Florence V. Cook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4477. A bill for the relief of Michael Tony Fenfene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:
H. R. 4478. A bill for the relief of Angelika Veresse Eskildsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. SANTANGELO:
H. R. 4479. A bill for the relief of Oldrich Bartasek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4480. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Dweck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 4481. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Leonila E. V. Pretel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. SAUND:
H. R. 4482. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Riccardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. SPENCE:
H. R. 4483. A bill for the relief of Menelaos Spyridon Coulouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. TELLER:
H. R. 4484. A bill for the relief of Albert Charles Jolly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

76. By Mr. BARING: Petition of Las Vegas Aerie No. 1213, Fraternal Order of Eagles, that the Congress of the United States set aside the first Sunday in February each year, as Chaplain's Day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

77. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Farmington Hill Grange No. 841, Tioga, Pa., urging the passage of legislation that will make available to the people of Pennsylvania the utmost benefits of the proposed development of electric production facilities at Niagara Falls, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Governor of California Proclaims February 3 Through 9, 1957, as Chamber of Commerce Week—Huntington Park Chamber in Great 23d District Issues Special "Kit" in Recognition of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 5, 1957*

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of California proclaims the week of February 3 through 9 as Chamber of Commerce Week in California. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present to you and all the other distinguished Members of this great representative body the following text of a proclamation recently issued by Hon. Goodwin J. Knight, Governor of my native State of California, and attested to by Frank W. Jordan, secretary of state, proclaiming the week of February 3 through 9, 1957, as Chamber of Commerce Week throughout my native State of California:

The first chamber of commerce was established in California in 1851 and was responsible for the initiation of a great service to industry, commerce, and the communities of our State. Today there are 621 independent city chambers throughout the Golden State that are playing an exemplary part in the progress of the communities. Were these chambers to operate individually, there would exist a bottleneck in the duties that they perform. With the organization of the State chamber of commerce, the efforts of all chambers are being steered into a common project.

It is this type of cooperation between the cities that has given California the reputation of being the most progressive State. National industries are recognizing the potentialities of placing their operations in the State; problems between these industries and the communities in which they settle are being ably handled through the local chambers of commerce; local civic leaders are continually called on to aid in guiding the growth of their areas. These civic duties that are being absorbed by the chambers are worthy of our continual recognition.

Therefore, I, Goodwin J. Knight, Governor of California, do hereby proclaim the week of February 3 through 9 as Chamber of Commerce Week, and I urge my fellow Californians to become acquainted with the operation of their local chambers and to take an active part in the noteworthy work that they are doing.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of California to be affixed this 19th day of December A. D. 1956.

GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,
*Governor of California.*

Attest:

FRANK W. JORDAN,
*Secretary of State.*

Mr. Speaker, the proclamation text not only recites some of the early history of the establishment of the chamber of commerce in 1851, but indicates some of the very important work which is accomplished by this important community organization.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to inform you that the chamber of commerce in the important city of Huntington Park, Los Angeles County, in the great 23d Congressional District, wherein my district congressional office is located has, in connection with the activities throughout the State of California, during the week, within its own splendid organization promulgated a strong, local campaign, in which campaign it strongly urges the objectives of the chamber of commerce in the community. In connection with this emphasized effort by the Huntington Park Chamber of Commerce, I have received from Roger B. McGinnis, the very able chairman of

public relations committee of the California Chamber of Commerce, he also being the valued secretary-manager of the Huntington Park Chamber of Commerce, a "kit of materials, ideas, and suggestions for possible guides and use during Chamber of Commerce Week." The very ably prepared kit includes among other comments and suggestions the following: Names of Huntington Park Chamber of Commerce public relations committee; exhibits, judging, and awards; how to organize and mobilize committee for effective activity during Chamber of Commerce Week; proposed assignments for committee; suggestions for school activities during Chamber of Commerce Week; service-club programs, public forums, membership orientation, open house, and so forth; how can you help your newspaper editor help you during California Chamber of Commerce week; suggested news story; suggested editorial; getting radio coverage; suggested radio spot announcements.

My gracious friend, Roger B. McGinnis, writes me and says:

As you will have noticed, this is the first time in the 106-year history of chamber of commerce in California that we have been honored by this type of recognition.

Mr. Speaker, the kit which I received from the Huntington Park Chamber of Commerce secretary also included copy of their splendid monthly Reporter, published monthly by way of reporting to the hundreds of members and including items of general interest. It lists their standing committees such as advertising and publicity, civic affairs, education, industrial, legislation and taxation, merchants' division, Fetchers Club—membership—and parking, and give the name of each chairman and the regular meeting day and place. It is a pleasure for me, Mr. Speaker, to note that the majority of these committee chairmen are the very busy, successful men of Huntington Park who are taking time to materially aid in constructive citizenship and prosperous, happy communities.

## Let the U. N. Be Strong and Forthright in Its Action Toward All Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 5, 1957*

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations once again finds itself in a predicament largely because of its own making.

It has asked Israel to withdraw from the Gaza strip. Israel has refused without firm guaranties.

While we all regret that Israel hasn't seen fit to cooperate with the U. N.—can we really blame them?

They see Russia ignoring U. N. requests and resolutions every time it suits their fancy—the latest in Hungary. They see that the U. N. has not done anything about Russia—so cannot they logically expect that nothing will be done about the failure of Israel to cooperate.

Of course, sometimes the U. N. takes a firm hand when dealing with weaker nations—but it fails to show any intestinal fortitude when dealing with Russia.

It seems to me that if the U. N. is going to justify its existence it must be firm and treat everyone alike. If it is going to be strong against the weak and weak against the strong then it can serve no useful purpose. It has become as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal.

Over the weekend two resolutions with regard to Israel getting out of Egypt were adopted in the U. N. Even their sponsors cannot agree as to what these resolutions mean. They are just so many words—falling far short of the clear-cut decisions called for.

Let the U. N. be strong and forthright in its action toward all nations and it will not be misunderstood.

## Statement of John F. Baldwin Before Judiciary Committee in Favor of Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 5, 1957*

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following statement which I made before the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives on Monday, February 4, 1957, in support of H. R. 542, of which I am the author, and other similar civil rights bills which have been introduced in the House of Representatives:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Judiciary Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before your committee to speak on behalf of H. R. 542 and other similar bills which have been introduced in the House of Representatives. These bills would establish a Federal Commission on Civil Rights, would create an additional Assistant Attorney General's position in the Department of Justice, and would authorize the Attorney General to institute civil actions or applications for a permanent or temporary injunction, or restraining order, in cases involving a violation of civil rights, including the right to vote.

It seems to me that perhaps the most important single right of a citizen of the United States is the right to vote in a Federal election for the offices of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or a Member of the House of Representatives. I believe that this right to vote in a Federal election should be given every protection by the Federal Government. It is deeply disturbing to hear reports that there have been incidents where citizens of the United States have been intimidated or threatened in an effort to prevent them from registering or from voting in a Federal election. If these reports are true, the passage of this civil rights bill is most essential in order to provide proper protection to such citizens.

Many constituents in my congressional district are very much interested in the passage of this civil rights measure. They feel that it is completely proper and just for the Federal Government to establish more clearly its position in this field of voting rights in Federal elections. I share their views on this subject and would like to urge that this important Judiciary Committee approve this civil rights measure and bring it before the House of Representatives at an early date in the 85th Congress.

## Hoover Commission Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 5, 1957*

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced three bills aimed at saving an estimated $2 billion in unnecessary Government spending.

These bills would put into effect several of the major recommendations of the Hoover Commission. This is an attempt to permit a substantial reduction in expenditures without injuring necessary or desirable activities of the Government.

The Government of the United States is the biggest business enterprise on earth, and Congress has a responsibility to operate it in the most efficient and businesslike manner possible.

These three bills would call for the following action:

First. Warehouse space would be pooled between the armed services. At present, the Army, Navy, and Air Force have maintained separate storage facilities, often partly vacant and sometimes in the same city. My proposal would unify warehousing, making it possible for the various services to interchange excess space.

Surprising as it may seem, the Government maintains depots with a total storage area, which, if spread out in one place, would cover 31,000 acres, or about 50 square miles. According to the Hoover Commission report, it costs the Defense Department almost $3 billions annually to operate these depots. By making these facilities interchangeable, the Commission believes that much wasted area could be dispensed with.

The Hoover group has estimated that this action could eliminate 172 million square feet of warehousing and result in an annual saving of some $250 million.

Second. Surplus disposal policies would be tightened. Specifically, my second bill would require an agency of the Government to offer any surplus item first to other services or Government agencies before dumping it on the open market at a sacrifice price.

In addition to this, it would give the General Services Administration wider authority to coordinate surplus disposal and buying operations throughout the Government. There is reason to believe that such centralized direction can result in smaller inventories and tighter inventory controls. As one vivid illustration of overstocking, the Commission has cited the instance of the Army Signal Corps, with an 8½ year supply on hand of dry-cell flashlight batteries, an obviously perishable commodity.

On a given date 2 years ago the Commission found that there was a total value of $66 billion in property on hand in Government warehouses throughout the country. Much of this property deteriorates or becomes obsolete before it can be issued. Some $2 billion worth must be disposed of each year to private dealers, at an estimated 5 percent to 7 percent of the original cost.

Sometimes one agency will sell for surplus a commodity which is currently in demand by another agency. The Hoover Commission disclosed one situation in which the Army Transportation Corps had offered to sell $200,000 worth of marine engines on the open market until the GSA discovered that the Army engineers needed the identical engines and arranged a transfer.

Thus, a saving was twice effected: Once, when the Transportation Corps avoided selling at a sacrifice and again when the engineers avoided the necessity of buying new engines at higher prices.

The Hoover report avers that this type of tightening throughout the Government's surplus program could save close to $1 billion a year.

Third. Government budgeting and accounting procedures would be reformed. Budgeting would be done on an annual-cost basis, with a big cut in carryover funds.

During the present fiscal year, some $74 billions in funds were carried over unspent from previous appropriations. This figure, we might note, is more than the total budget being requested for the current year. All of this money was appropriated in earlier years to various arms of the Government. Unspent, it has accumulated to the credit of the various departments. Congress, for all practical purposes, has lost control over this money.

My third bill would establish an annual accrued expenditure basis for appropriations. As of the end of a fiscal year, the excess above the amount actually required and spent during that year by any agency would lapse unless otherwise specifically provided for in the appropriation act.

It seems to me that the reforms embodied in these bills are among the more valuable recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Of course we cannot surrender the legislative prerogative and adopt changes just because some commission recommends them, but these particular proposals, with their attendant benefits in tax savings, certainly seem to merit our most serious consideration.

In the introduction of this legislation, I have had the pleasure of working with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS]. As a member of the Committee on Government Operations, Congressman REUSS has devoted much care and considerable study to the recommendations for more efficient management and operation in all the agencies of our Federal Government.

He has introduced similar legislation, including a proposal not unlike mine of last year to enhance efficiency by removing several thousand Federal job-holders from the patronage rolls and placing them under the competitive merit system of civil service.

To date, Congress has enacted 31 public laws pursuant to the report of the second Commission on Governmental Organization. Some tax savings have surely resulted.

While recognizing that certain other of the latest Hoover recommendations are difficult, if not impossible, of enactment since they involve much deeper policy than mere streamlining and efficiency, I think it behooves us to take a very close look at such avenues as are available to us to bring about a much-needed reduction in the costs of operating the Government whenever this can be done without causing legitimate functions of the Government to suffer.

---

## United States Attorney J. Julius Levy Resigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 5, 1957*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials: one from the Scranton Times and the other from the Scranton Tribune and a news story from the Scranton Times on the resignation of Attorney J. Julius Levy, of Scranton, as United States attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania:

[From the Scranton Times of January 25, 1957]

LEVY QUITS FEDERAL POST

The resignation of Attorney J. Julius Levy as United States attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania was not entirely unexpected. For the past few months there had been reports that he was preparing to step down from the job which he had filled since August 1953.

It is no secret that Mr. Levy gave up a lucrative private practice to take on the post of Federal prosecutor with its strict ban on all outside professional activity. When he accepted the Government job, it was the hope of many of his friends that the office would prove the steppingstone to an appointment as a Federal judge. No judicial vacancy ever developed in the district during his tenure as Federal attorney, however, and Attorney Levy, in submitting his resignation, now feels that he "cannot continue further in this public service without serious injury to my personal estate and the welfare of my family."

Attorney Levy had achieved a reputation as an outstanding lawyer prior to his acceptance of the Federal post. In the latter position, he has been a diligent, conscientious Government officer. A major assignment which he has carried out has been the direction of the grand jury probe into charges of fraud and corruption in connection with the construction of the Tobyhanna Signal Corps Depot. That inquiry is nearing its end, and Attorney Levy has indicated his willingness to stay on, should his superiors so desire, until it is completed. He will take with him in his return to private practice the best wishes not only of his fellow members of the bar but of his many friends throughout the middle district and the State at large.

[From the Scranton Tribune of January 26 1957]

A SPLENDID PUBLIC SERVANT WITHDRAWS

The resignation of J. Julius Levy as United States attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania while not coming as a complete surprise nonetheless adds up to a major loss in public service to the Department of Justice.

Mr. Levy has served in the post for about 3½ years and over that period demonstrated a fidelity to duty, a loyalty to his oath, a capacity for earnest endeavor, and untiring effort which has distinguished him throughout his career in the law. In leaving public office to return to private practice, Attorney Levy may do so with the assurance of a task well performed and the sincere appreciation of the public and the Government which he served.

Mr. Levy, like many another able Government servant, is the victim of a penuriousness on the part of our Government in recompensing the men who volunteer to serve it. As he pointed out, he could continue in his post only with serious injury to his personal estate and his family's welfare. The monetary compensation of the office was inadequate for his needs with the result that the position became too expensive for him to retain.

Those familiar with the situation know very well that he continued in office at a major sacrifice in income and under circumstances which placed an enormous demand on his time.

So while it is most regrettable to contemplate his departure from the United States attorney's office, it is quite understandable.

Mr. Levy was especially well qualified for the office he held. In earlier years he was an assistant district attorney for Lackawanna County and was a specially appointed prosecutor in the probe of slot-machine rackets in Scranton some years back. In addition his civil and criminal law practice furnished him with a complete background of jurisprudence.

While regretting his departure we readily extend our commendations for the splendid record he achieved and express the hope that he continue his success in private practice.

---

[From the Scranton Times of January 25, 1957]

IKE COMMENDS UNITED STATES ATTORNEY—SPLENDID RECORD OF LEVY IS CITED

President Dwight D. Eisenhower has commended United States Attorney J. Julius Levy, whose resignation becomes effective Friday, for the excellent manner in which he performed his duties.

The President also extended his personal thanks to Attorney Levy for his "outstanding contribution to the splendid record established by the United States attorneys' offices during the past 4 years."

President Eisenhower's personal letter to Attorney Levy, dated January 24, 1957, was authorized for publication by Murray Snyder, assistant to Presidential Secretary James Hagerty who is currently away from the White House. Mr. Levy leaves office February 1.

The letter bearing the President's signature follows:

JANUARY 24, 1957.

DEAR MR. LEVY: Your recent letter, tendering your resignation as United States attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania, effective February 1, 1957, has just come to me.

I am familiar with the excellent manner in which you have performed the duties of this office, and in accepting your resignation I want to thank you personally for your outstanding contribution to the splendid record established by the United States attorneys' offices during the past 4 years. I also want

to express my very best wishes for success and happiness in your future endeavors.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

## Traffic Safety State Compact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 5, 1957*

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a House joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the several States to negotiate and enter into compacts for the purpose of promoting highway traffic safety.

The consideration of an interstate compact resulted from the hearings and studies made by a Traffic Safety Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of which I am a member.

Statistics show that there are 76 million licensed automobile drivers at the present time. The average number of deaths resulting from automobile accidents is 115 per day. At the present rate of population increase and of automobile output, it will be only a comparatively short time until 100 million licensed drivers will be operating high-powered cars on our Nation's highways. If accidents continue to increase at the present rate, it can be estimated that in the near future there will be 150 fatal automobile accidents per day.

Our Traffic Safety Subcommittee has started the study of various phases of this problem—automotive engineering, highway construction, law enforcement, education, and uniform highway markings and traffic signals.

Numerous governmental agencies at various levels as well as many private organizations have been working valiantly to reduce the frightful loss of life and property. It is evident that many of these efforts, worthy as they are, do not always work in the same direction.

Furthermore, by the United States Constitution, the Federal Government dare not overstep the authority of the several States. In fact, the States have established their own traffic laws and regulations. Thus, there is no uniform legal code for enforcement, no uniform highway marking system, and no uniform educational program. Certain private organizations have attempted to urge a coordination of these efforts, but no specific authority or program exists to permit the several States to join in a mutual effort.

For this reason, this House joint resolution would grant the consent of the Congress to the several States to join in the formation of a body that would have authority to legally prepare and promulgate regulations and legislation, if needed, to attempt to meet this serious problem.

This idea is not new. It is being used successfully in the interstate oil compact and the interstate compact for crime prevention.

I hope that the Congress will study this proposal carefully and that it can be brought to the attention of all of the States in this manner. It further is hoped that the Traffic Safety Subcommittee will be both continued and encouraged in pursuing the work that it has started so ably under the chairmanship of the Honorable KENNETH ROBERTS, of Alabama.

I feel confident that the States will welcome such authority to coordinate their efforts. My own State of Indiana is keenly interested in this work. It has accomplished much in this field and will be happy to pass on to others the results of its experience. At the same time, our State realizes that there is much to do and more to learn. This mutual exchange of ideas and cooperation in this never-ending battle will be a worthy program for all of the States.

## Analysis of the Anderson-Jensen Bill Introduced January 30, 1957 (H. R. 4108) Amending the Soil Bank Act of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 5, 1957*

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4108 provides the following five important features:

FIFTY-ONE MILLION ACRES MINIMUM CORN ALLOTMENT

First, it meets the problem of an unrealistic acreage allotment for corn. Unless we take immediate action, I am told that only a small percentage of farmers in the commercial corn area are expected to comply with the present allotment of 37 million acres. The result will be wide open production of corn, the glutting of the market if we have reasonably good crops, and a possibly disastrous effect on the feed and livestock economy.

By providing a minimum acreage allotment for corn of 51 million acres we can hope to accomplish many things. Foremost among these, of course, will be widespread compliance with the allotment program and a material reduction in corn production. Additionally, we will be giving to corn a fair minimum acreage allotment as we have done for certain other basic commodities.

CORN ALLOTMENT APPORTIONED ON BASIS OF TILLABLE ACREAGE

Under the present program basing corn acreage allotments on previous planting histories, inequities are perpetuated and many good farmers are penalized. Corn production in the commercial area is unique in this regard. I am convinced and I believe the vast majority of farmers agree with me that tillable acreage is the only fair, equitable, and sensible basis for apportioning corn acreage allotments. Since this is a detail of administration and has no material bearing on any other aspect of the legislation, there should certainly be no objection to the provision directing that corn acreage allotments be apportioned solely on the basis of tillable acreage. This change is in the best interests of the program, the farmers involved, and the land itself.

NINETY PERCENT OF PARITY SUPPORTS FOR FAMILY-SIZE FARMS

Critics of the price support program almost invariably point to the very large operators as the beneficiaries of such programs. They cite the extremely large CCC loans as horrible examples. Then they claim that price supports actually are not for the benefit of the small farmers anyway so we might as well do away with them. While this provision of our bill will benefit the small farmer first and most, it will in a very short time also benefit the larger farmer by increasing the price of corn and in turn other feed grains will rise in price comparable to the feed value of corn; and generally speaking the price of feed determines the price of livestock over any 12-month period.

This third, and very important, provision is to the effect that 90 percent of parity price supports shall be made available on the first 4,000 bushels of corn produced on each farm eligible for such supports. That will take care of most of the family-size operations. At the same time, the big operators will also have the protective benefits of this umbrella over the smaller operations. First, they will have the 90 percent of parity protection on their first 4,000 bushels of production; second, they will have the general protection of the market-strengthening effects of this price level plus the stabilizing effects of the surplus-reducing results of this and other sections of the bill.

Take Iowa for instance, and say the average corn allotment is 50 acres per farm. With an average yield of 60 bushels to the acre, a total of 3,000 bushels, the average farmer in Iowa would have his corn protected at a minimum of 90 percent of parity or at a price between $1.50 and $1.55.

CROPLAND EQUAL TO 20 PERCENT OF ALLOTMENT MUST GO INTO SOIL BANK PROGRAM

The fourth provision is to the effect that a farmer must cut cropland equal to 20 percent of his corn acreage allotment into the soil bank or conservation reserve in order to be eligible for the price supports provided in the previous section. Farmers recognize that they must make a major contribution to the solution of their own problems and the best way they can do that is to help reduce the surplus. They will do that by putting land into the soil bank or conservation reserve as a condition of eligibility for the price support. They are asking for something, and they are willing to give something in return. Farmers throughout America are willing to make justified sacrifices providing equivalent protection is given their economy. This is a most equitable provision of the bill and it is deserving of unanimous approval along with the other provisions.

ALL FARMERS MADE ELIGIBLE FOR CONSERVATION RESERVE

The cross-compliance section of the Soil Bank Act provides that any farmer in the commercial area who was not in compliance with the corn base or allotment could not participate in either section of the soil bank program. Now to me that simply does not make sense, as it tends to defeat the fundamental objectives of the program, namely, to get surplus-producing land out of production. Corn is not our only surplus commodity. We have a similar and companion problem in all of the other feed grains.

There is no justifiable reason for keeping this provision in the present law. Experience has shown that it is no inducement whatsoever to farmers to obtain their compliance with corn acreage allotments. At the same time, it has kept untold acreages out of the low-cost conservation reserve and in the production of surplus feed grains like barley and oats. By eliminating this restriction, we will open up the conservation reserve to thousands of farmers who may then put surplus-producing lands into the soil bank program. For example, a farmer who has a 50-acre corn allotment now could put 10 acres of his other than corn allotted acres in conservation reserve, and be in full compliance.

In order to make the soil-bank program effective we must do two things. First, we must make it possible for more farmers to participate. H. R. 4108 does just that. Second, we must set the payment rates high enough to attract participation. Last year some of the payment rates were too low. They must be adjusted in this year's program.

The gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN, a farm owner and operator, who has rendered outstanding service to the farm people and American agriculture in the Congress for many years, has joined me in the introduction of this bill.

Farm legislation is, of course, intended to have its primary impact upon agriculture and farm people. However, I again urge my colleagues and others from nonfarm districts to keep in mind the effect of slumps in purchasing power of rural areas on their business and industry. The businessmen in my district know that their economic status is tied directly to the level of the farm economy in their trade areas. It is well to occasionally remind businessmen in other areas that they, too, have a real stake in the farm economy. The annual Federal spending of $35 billion for national defense has created the artificial prosperity now enjoyed by nonfarmers with its huge payrolls and profits. But after that, then what?

It is noteworthy than when the farmer's dollar buys 100 cents worth of goods at the counter, records show that he buys 2⅕ times more goods on an average per capita than other average Americans, because he purchases such costly goods as tractors, pickers, combines, implements of every nature, trucks, lumber, posts, wire, commercial feeds, seeds, and so forth, that other Americans do not require; hence, with reduced farmer purchasing, it is immediately felt by many, and in time by all.

In conclusion let us not forget that all new wealth springs from mother earth and that every American is employed in producing, transporting, processing, and marketing the raw products which spring from mother earth, is pumped or mined out of the earth, or is fished out of the waters; and that the quantity of these raw products, coupled with the price paid per unit, determines our national income in normal times. Also, history records that when a farmer's cash crop, such as corn, for example, is too low in price, the corn farmer must, of necessity, plant more acres of corn, in order to have sufficient income to meet the high costs of operation, machinery, and so forth, which he must have for the economical operation of his farm; hence, in order to reduce corn production the first requirement is to support corn at not less than 90 percent of parity as provided in our bill.

The duty of Congress is to pass a good farm law. The duty of the Department of Agriculture is to administer that law as Congress, in plain words, directs. We must act very soon, as seeding and planting time will soon be here.

## Boy Scouts Stand for Character and Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 5, 1957*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on this 47th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America, we salute the 26 million boys—and men—who have lived up to the Scout oath and law since 1910.

The spiritual ideals and the healthy out-of-doors training of this organization have helped immeasurably to strengthen American manhood in body and mind and soul.

"Onward for God and my country."

There is no finer objective for American boys, and the results over 47 years have earned the genuine gratitude of the Nation.

At the rededication ceremonies to be held on February 8, we are sure that the impressive accomplishments of this youth movement that is always first to volunteer its services to community programs and to assist in time of emergency, will open the eyes of many boys to the honor and the responsibility of being a Boy Scout.

A good Scout learns the joy that comes from helping other people.

He builds radiant health through his participation in planned outdoor activities.

He gains knowledge about the natural wonders of field and stream and forest, and the self-reliance that comes with camping out.

He knows the pioneering meaning of freedom and the obligations that go with it.

He gains the recognition and respect of his elders, in preparation for becoming a man.

Happy birthday to the Boy Scouts of America, and our thanks to them for the training that will make them the leaders of tomorrow.

## Education and the Liberal Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 5, 1957*

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1957, Park College, one of the fine colleges in my district, held its annual midsemester convocation and conferred a well merited honorary doctor of laws degree upon one of Missouri's most distinguished citizens, Senator STUART SYMINGTON.

Upon that occasion, Senator SYMINGTON delivered an address which is so germane to the times that I feel it should be made available to the public.

In this timely presentation, Senator SYMINGTON points out that the increasing emphasis on physical science and vocational training programs should not be permitted to crowd out basic educational work in the liberal arts.

Because of the scientific demands of this nuclear age, we are in danger of losing our moral and cultural equilibrium, which is so necessary to the proper evaluation of human relationships. In this address, given in my district, Senator SYMINGTON clearly points out that a balance is not only possible but necessary:

EDUCATION AND THE LIBERAL ARTS

The honor you have just extended me makes this one of the most memorable days of my life. It is a great privilege to be included in your distinguished group of graduates.

For many years the people of Missouri and of America have watched with interest and admiration the educational achievements of Park College.

Your school, with its unique approach to the training and development of human personality, richly deserves its high-ranking position among our universities and colleges.

Your efforts are more vital than ever before, because the United States is in urgent need of moral leadership commensurate with its industrial, scientific, and military strength.

The mental genius of such men as the Comptons and Einstein, coupled with the practical applications of Edison and Ford, have formed our Nation into a complex network of science, technology, and industrial development.

As a result, each year our expanding economy demands more and more highly trained people.

We also need scientific personnel in order to keep America abreast of the startling technological advances made by the possible enemy.

Amidst our concern about maintaining national prosperity and relative technical competence, however, is growing awareness that something else is also required—moral and cultural development.

History shows that moral and cultural development are dependent upon man's success in his efforts to wrest a livelihood from nature. But it is also true that while such development is possible it is not inevitable, and in the past it has always been limited to a comparatively small portion of the populace.

The early Greeks achieved high standards of living and culture—but only for the few, because Grecian society of the fifth and sixth centuries B. C. was based on slavery.

Elizabethan England had a comparatively high standard of culture for the few, the ruling class. Here, too, culture was based on the conquest and exploitation of other peoples.

Now, for the first time in history, we can have high standards of morality and culture, based, not on exploitation of human beings but rather on use of machines, with the consequent elevation of human dignity.

However, in our world of jet airplanes, atomic reactors, and mechanical brains, and even after two great wars, man is still unable to find the road that leads to the ultimate goal of world peace.

It is easier to obtain money for H-bombs than for hospitals.

We build up our highways, but neglect our teachers.

We work long hours on our jobs, but take little time to develop cultural interests.

I do not wish to belittle in any way the importance of combat weapons, transportation facilities, or business activity, and the need is obvious for national security, technical skills, and specialized aptitudes.

Along with our faith in the importance of our new inventions, however, lies the hidden danger that by constantly giving priority to the know-how we may obscure the know-why. If that happens, like Alice in Wonderland, we will be rushing ahead without knowing where we are going.

Dr. Peter Viereck, professor of history and Pulitzer prize winner described this possibility when he said:

"The Atomic Age puts a new premium on the technician and on practical applications of inner theory.

"Yet, without the understanding of man's inner nature which art and literature give us, and without the inner ethical restraint which religion gives us, our outer mechanical progress is paving our road to hell with good inventions."

A wise statement, justifying the belief of many of us that we must maintain our moral and cultural equilibrium.

But the record shows we are losing that equilibrium.

A recent survey states that of all the discharges from some 76 American corporations, 10 percent were for lack of know-how, 90 percent because of character defects.

According to a leading industrialist, an inventory of 100 members of his management personnel showed that only 4 lacked job know-how, and only 8 did poor quality work. On the other side of the scale, 21 percent failed in initiative, 20 percent in leadership, and 19 percent failed in management ability.

As a result of such surveys as these, in an effort to teach them the broader phases of business responsibility, more and more industries are sending their junior executives to colleges and universities.

The basic reason for the need to reeducate these men may well be that they were the product of a shift in American educational values.

From the time of the Declaration of Independence until about the beginning of the 20th century, college students almost universally exposed to such subjects as history, literature, metaphysics, logic, and ethics.

As noted by Dr. H. W. Stoke, dean of the University of Washington Graduate School:

"Yesterday the educated man knew much of history—ancient, medieval and modern; he knew something of the lives of great men; he could identify the 13 decisive battles of the world; he studied foreign languages, and moral philosophy. He studded his conversation with literary allusions."

While such knowledge may still be admired, it is now relegated to second place, because it is no longer considered practical.

Today, it takes considerable time and effort to become proficient in any field. Therefore, our college students have tended more and more to specialize. Their former goal of a broad liberal arts education has been replaced by the goal of becoming competent, because for many years the most sought after man has been the competent man.

Under strong economic pressures, it is not surprising that many of our educational institutions revamped their curriculum, substituting physics for art, electronics for literature, and engineering for philosophy.

As stated in a recent Saturday Evening Post article:

"For many years the technical schools—particularly the engineering schools—prided themselves on the practicality of their curriculums. There was no time for cultural falderal and classical nonsense. Faculty and students alike took grim satisfaction in a policy of all work and no play."

Thus, the scientific revolution touched off a chain reaction. It created economic pressures which in turn influenced our educational institutions.

The tragic results of this latter change are now becoming apparent.

A generation of competent specialists has graduated; and with their entrance into the stream of human activity the previously mentioned chain reaction has spread into the social and political spheres.

In these areas the effects are most disturbing.

The Ben Franklins and Thomas Jeffersons have been replaced by men in gray flannel suits, most of whom prefer Univac to Plato.

As pointed out by Dr. Ernest O. Melby, dean of the School of Education of New York University, in many cases:

"Our education has failed to equip men to think and to discriminate between that which builds our freedom and that which destroys it."

A tragic recent example of this statement might be the famous physicist, J Robert Oppenheimer, one of the world's most brilliant living scientists.

In an eloquent and moving public statement, Dr. Oppenheimer told the Atomic Energy Commission that he knew nothing of history, economics, or political science until approaching middle age.

This case is significant. Perhaps it brings into sharp focus the meaning of the poet who said, "No man is an island entire of itself."

Because of our fascination with the miraculous achievements of science perhaps we are creating a generation of technically competent human islands.

And they are important, not only to further our prosperity, but also to aid in the preservation of our freedom against the growing Communist aggression.

But no company or country can survive on competence alone. Human beings cannot be measured with a slide rule. Human problems cannot be solved with the charts and graphs and equipment of a laboratory.

President Ellis of the University of Missouri recently pointed out to me the following able quotation from the president of the Carnegie Corp.:

"We are beginning to understand that one of the marks of a modern complex society is an insatiable appetite for educated talent. It is not just technologists and scientists that we need. We desperately need gifted teachers, professional men, scholars, critics, and seers.

"The tremendous rewards for specialization encourage narrow training; and for certain purposes of science, business, and government this is useful. But a world of ever-ramifying specialties soon cries out for generalists.

"The most forward-looking of our colleges and universities are making active efforts to insure that every specialist will build his specialty on a base of general education."

In short, says this authority, we must have more thinking men; men who can judge values, because we have now become so efficient in the means of mass destruction that one wrong decision might result in oblivion.

It was H. G. Wells who wrote, "Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe."

To be sure of winning that race we must reexamine our educational ideals and adopt standards to insure the development of well-rounded individuals—men and women as capable of coming to grips with moral and spiritual problems as with those of the atom.

The hard-working, rough-talking, highly competent engineering and business ramrods of 20 or 30 years ago are now outmoded.

Some of our more forward-looking technical schools have become aware of this fact and are revising their curriculum accordingly.

As Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., president of MIT, puts it:

"The specialist must shun the view that lopsidedness is laudable; he must be politically and morally responsible; he must test his actions by their human impact."

It is not only our technical schools, however, who need to take a long look at their present educational programs.

While it is true that the liberal arts have been relegated to a position of secondary importance at some of our universities and colleges, perhaps part of the reason was the unwillingness of liberal arts exponents to adapt themselves to the changing needs of their students.

As noted by one liberal arts advocate:

"The scientist has come to be the poet of modernity and we students of the ages—especially of the Middle Ages—had better realize it."

My point here is that liberal arts studies can and should be adapted to the special needs of students majoring in other fields. I feel sure this can be accomplished without compromising any of the basic values of the arts.

After all, should we not keep in mind that if Shakespeare were alive today, he would probably be the world's greatest television and moving picture playwright.

We must also strengthen and improve the liberal arts curriculum in our high schools.

During this period of their education, the minds of our youth are eager for general knowledge—often they are still seeking a field for later concentration.

By instructing them in the liberal arts, we will not only help them make that choice but also plant in their minds an inquisitive spirit, which we hope would continue to grow in later years.

As pointed out recently by one of our leading industrialists:

"The role of leadership in tomorrow's world will be assumed neither by those who know a great deal about a very little or a very little about a great deal. It will be discharged only by those whose thinking is broad and uninhibited, those with grasp and understanding—leaders, in short, whose horizons are wide enough to comprehend the world in which we live."

In summary, the goal we seek for all students, regardless of field or educational level, is the development of individual perspective—the ability to see things in proper relationship, so they can do their part in moving the world onward and upward.

Achievement of this goal will mean more than a better life. It will mean our continued progress as a free people.

Leadership of the free world in this nuclear age is a challenge which we must now

face, with care and courage, if some day we are to attain the glory of that ultimate world described many years ago by Rabindranath Tagore.

"Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high;
Where knowledge is free;
Where the world has not been broken up into fragments by narrow domestic walls;
Where words come out from the depth of truth;
Where tireless striving stretches its arms towards perfection;
Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way into the dreary desert sand of dead habit;
Where the mind is led forward by thee into ever-widening thought and action—
Into that heaven of freedom, my Father, let my country awake."

## The National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 5, 1957*

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to register two protests against recent rulings and statements coming out of the Defense Department, which I feel deserve special consideration by the Congress.

SIX MONTHS' TRAINING

My first protest is to the recent order of the Department of Defense requiring 6 months of active duty in the United States Army for enlistees of the National Guard.

This is entirely unrealistic and arbitrary, and I feel the order was made with a view of weakening the National Guard organization. The Department of Defense has arbitrarily established the 6 months' training period only because it is the maximum period authorized by Congress.

The Army's basic individual training consists of a period of 8 weeks. This is followed by another 8 weeks of advanced individual training. There is no established training program for the remaining part of the 6 months' program of the Defense Department. According to the Department's regulation, the remaining 8 weeks are to be spent in unit training.

I feel that the 8-week individual basic training could probably be accomplished to the best advantage in the Army; however, I definitely feel that it would be more advantageous to the entire program if the individual were then returned to the unit in the National Guard to which he was originally assigned where he will continue to serve for the remainder of his enlisted period.

In the Middle Western States, and this is especially true in my State of South Dakota, a large percentage of the youth live on farms and are either engaged in farming individually or possibly with their parents. These young men are the foundation upon which the defense of America rests. They comprise a large percentage of the South Dakota National Guard personnel, and to require them to take more than the regular 8 weeks of basic training is purely a waste of agricultural manpower.

During the war, when basic training was of utmost importance, the American youth were given 8 weeks basic and then a large percentage of them were sent directly into combat. If 8 weeks of basic training were sufficient for these young men during times of war, certainly 8 weeks of basic training, coupled with the regular and intensive training as a part of the National Guard units, is sufficient for the defense of this country. The longer we keep them on active duty in the Army after the 8 weeks of basic training, the greater is the cost of the training, both to the individual, his profession, and the Government, without adequate return.

South Dakota has one of the outstanding National Guard units in the country. It has always been among the first to be called in every conflict, and it has always served with distinction. Early mobilization of the South Dakota National Guard in times of need has been motivated because of the advanced trained readiness of these units.

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY WILSON

The second great injustice is the unfortunate and uninformed statement of the very capable but unpredictable Secretary of Defense, Charles E. Wilson, when he said the National Guard was sort of a scandal during the Korean war, which he said was used as a draft-dodging business to escape fighting in Korea.

Mr. Wilson apparently had failed to inform himself that South Dakota had approximately 4,000 National Guard men and that approximately 1,900 of these men and officers were ordered to active duty shortly after Korea started, and that the remainder of the trained volunteers were prepared to leave at a moment's notice.

There may be some State guard units that are not up to military standards, but this does not include the South Dakota National Guard, and I feel that those State guards, such as South Dakota's, that are up to standard, are entitled to an apology.

SOUTH DAKOTA GUARD

Mr. Speaker, I feel that Secretary of Defense Wilson would do well to check the history and record of the South Dakota National Guard. It inherits from an illustrious past the continuous record of patriotic volunteer service of many of its pioneer sons—those who grouped together to meet the hostile Indians—those who followed General Custer in his last stand at the fatal Little Big Horn in 1876—all of them heroes who deserve mention with the valiant forerunners who helped to subjugate and civilize the vast western plains and mountains now comprising the State of South Dakota.

Under the stress of the Indian outbreak of 1862, the first territorial governor organized a territorial militia. Practically every able-bodied man who was not already in the United States volunteer service became a member of it. Six companies organized during the Indian troubles were the first to serve in the organized militia of Dakota. Historical accounts of the service and security given by these early fighters have found deserving places in many libraries. A reorganization of the territorial militia was ordered by the Governor in August 1864. In his biennial report dated September 30, 1888, the adjutant general of the Territory reported with pardonable pride that "Dakota alone of all the Territories maintains a military force that in numbers and efficiency outranks that of many of the Commonwealths of the Nation."

Following the admission of South Dakota to the Union as a State in 1889, the organized militia maintained its organization and standards of efficiency until the Spanish-American War, when components of the first regiment, South Dakota National Guard, were mustered into Federal service and participated in a number of battles and engagements in the Philippine Islands.

The regiment was mustered out in 1899 and President McKinley was present at Aberdeen, S. Dak., to welcome the returning regiment and convey the appreciation of the Nation to the South Dakota soldiers for their gallant service.

Units of the South Dakota National Guard fought with distinction as front-line combat units during World War II in both the Pacific and European theaters. During the Korean war the South Dakota National Guard was also activated for 2 years and units served in Alaska and Europe.

HISTORY OF SERVICE

The 109th Engineers has a history going back to the 1800's as the unit served valiantly at the Battle of Manila in the Philippines during the Spanish-American War as the 1st Regiment, South Dakota National Guard. It was reorganized into the 4th Infantry and served under "Black Jack" Pershing in the Pancho Villa campaign during the Mexican Border incident in 1916. Mustered out of Federal service at Fort Crock, Nebr., on March 3, 1917, it was drafted back into Federal service on August 5, 1917, for duty during World War I. The unit participated in 6 campaigns in France and was commended by the Allied commander in chief. On February 10, 1941, the 109th Engineers were inducted into Federal service as part of the 34th Division. On June 14, 1942, the 109th Engineers were among the first American troop units to land in the European Theater of Operations. In 1942 the unit participated in the assault landing in Algeria.

As a combat battalion, the South Dakota guardsmen distinguished themselves in many ways during the remainder of World War II. They served over 500 days of actual combat, one of the longest of any American unit in the ETO. They served in 7 campaigns, winning the French Croix-de-Guerre. During the Korean war the unit was recalled to Federal service and was stationed overseas in Europe most of their 2 years of active duty.

THE 196TH RCT

The 196th Regimental Combat Team of South Dakota is descendant from the 6 companies of Territorial militia. The 1st South Dakota Infantry, which is the parent organization of both the 109th

Engineers and the 196th RCT, served actively in the Philippine Insurrection. South Dakota guardsmen served on the Mexican border in 1916 and worked hard for maintenance and expansion of the 196th RCT in future years. Units of the 196th served with the 41st Division in World War I. In World War II South Dakota guardsmen served with the 34th Division from north Africa through Italy. During the Korean war the 196th Regimental Combat Team was called to active duty for 2 years, taking extensive winter combat training in Colorado and then were stationed in Alaska for the remainder of their active-duty tour.

THE 147TH FIELD ARTILLERY

The 147th Field Artillery Battalion also has a history tracing back to the First South Dakota Infantry Regiment that later served in the Philippines and on the Mexican border. During World War I units of the 196th and the 147th Field Artillery had battle honors for campaigns at Lorraine, Alsace, Aisne-Marne, Champagne, Oise-Aisne, and Meuse-Argonne. On November 25, 1940, the 147th was again activated for Federal service in World War II, and they have battle honors for the East Indies, New Guinea, Bismarck Archipelago, and Luzon in the Philippines.

OTHER UNITS

The 179th Field Artillery Battalion served in World War I beginning July 1917 and has the same campaign streamers as the 147th Field Artillery. In World War II they were activated in January 1941 and fought with distinction through north Africa and Italy with campaign streamers for Tunisia, Sicily, Naples-Foggia, Rome-Arno, North Apennines, and Po Valley.

THE GUARD NATIONALLY

Older than the Nation it serves, the National Guard has the longest continuous history of any military organization in the United States. As the outgrowth of the early militia concept which provided for the common defense, its origin can be traced back to the first years of the 17th century when the early settlers, in order to protect their lives and property, banded together to form militia companies. These companies were equipped and trained according to the needs of the times. As the Nation grew, the militia grew, and as towns sprang up and States were admitted into the Union, additional units were formed for local and national protection. The distinction of being the oldest National Guard unit in the United States is shared by the 101st Engineer Battalion and the 182d Infantry Regiment, Massachusetts, which trace their history back to October 1636 when the General Court at Boston ordered that all military men in the area were to be formed into militia regiments. Two of those regiments, the North and East, later became the 182d Infantry and the 101st Engineer Regiment.

In 1775 the Committee of Safety of the Second Continental Congress organized the militia units throughout the Colonies into an overall defense force, from which came approximately 165,000 of the 396,000 troops raised for Gen. George Washington's Continental Army.

During the period 1776–90, specific military laws were passed by the States, generally causing the enrollment of all free males between certain ages as a proper, natural, and safe defense of a free State. The substance of these laws was based upon the Declaration of Independence and the Articles of Confederation to the extent that it was realized a well-regulated militia was necessary which should not be superior to civil power or assume the role of a standing army in time of peace—the concept of the National Guard as a State-supported organization of local volunteers.

The principles of the citizen-soldier were written into the Constitution of the United States. Section 8, article I, of the Constitution empowered the Congress to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrection and repel invasion, and for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, reserving to the States the appointment of officers and the training of the militia according to discipline prescribed by the Congress. The second amendment to the Constitution—article II of the Bill of Rights—recognized the right of the citizen-soldier, in the interests of "a well-regulated militia" to keep and bear arms. Ultimately, this basic authority was to result in the establishment of the National Guard in its present form.

The National Guard has played an important part in providing well-trained troops and units for the several wars in which the United States has engaged during its history, including wars with the Indians; the War of 1812; Mexican War; Civil War; Spanish-American War; Mexican border incident, 151,000 men; World War I, 382,000 men; World War II, 300,000 men; and the Korean conflict, 183,000 men.

SUMMARY

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this is a poor time to cut the spirit out of the National Guard by referring to them as a draft-dodging unit, and likewise a poor time to cut the heart out of the National Guard by summarily ordering a 6 months' training period. I hope that if the Defense Department does not take action to correct this injustice, the Congress will.

## Anniversary of Birth of Gen. Tadeusz Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 5, 1957*

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is significant that February 12 is the birthday of Abraham Lincoln and Gen. Tadeusz Kosciusko. Separated though they were by time and space, they were kindred souls, dedicated to the cause of human freedom.

We are all familiar with the part played by General Kosciusko in our own fight for freedom. To reiterate would be repetitious.

Today it is ironical that a country whose sons fought for American independence, a country whose roots strike deep in American soil going back to colonial Virginia and the stirring story of the pioneers in the Ohio and Mississippi Valley, that a country from which has come the spirit as well as the blood, bone, and sinew of our independence and industrial strength, that that country is still a captive suffering Communist oppression.

Like Lincoln, General Kosciusko wrote his devotion to the cause of human freedom in deeds. Today the Polish people behind the Iron Curtain are struggling for the freedom, political and economic, which is their birthright. Our tribute to General Kosciusko, the engineer of our fortifications at West Point, should be in deeds.

Poland needs economic assistance to gain economic independence from the Soviet. Polish displaced persons need liberation of our immigration laws so that they may find a haven here. Poland and the other captive nations are waiting to hear the Voice of America raised in the United Nations in protest against Soviet aggression and crimes against these captives. That voice, like the voice of Lincoln, must be raised in the United Nations so that "government of, by, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

## A Constitutional Vacuum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 5, 1957*

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert a speech entitled "A Constitutional Vacuum" which was given by Congressman FRANK T. BOW before the Women's Patriotic Conference, and I also include resolution No. 8 which was adopted by the conference in regard to the NATO Status of Forces Treaty.

A CONSTITUTIONAL VACUUM

(By FRANK T. BOW)

Madam Chairman, delegates, and patriots all, it is a comfort and inspiration to me to see this evidence of the interest which the women of our country, particularly the members of the organizations represented here, have in the welfare of our country. The best patriots we have are the women who are alert to the dangers confronting us, the threats to our Constitution, and the enemies both without and within our country. I am sure this conference will give new vitality to your efforts.

I have been asked to tell you this morning what happens when our servicemen are surrendered to foreign courts. Two words will describe their status. They are thrown into a constitutional vacuum. The net effect is to deprive them of United States citizenship, at least during their trial, and after conviction, as long as it may take to comply with the sentence of the foreign court. This is the result of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement, which is a treaty, or the Administration Agreement with Japan, which is not

a treaty, or the 50-odd agreements with other nations of the world, which are so-called executive agreements, all of which concern the status of our troops serving in such foreign countries.

Most of these agreements give to the foreign nations concerned the right to exercise criminal jurisdiction over the members of our Armed Forces for offenses committed when off duty.

This right can be waived by the foreign authority and there are many trivial charges made in which this jurisdiction is waived. But if the foreign authority insists on prosecution, the unfortunate serviceman is turned over to the foreign court for trial. He may be left in the custody of American forces until called up for trial, but, if so, foreign authorities can demand his appearance at any time. From then on he has lost any and all guaranties or rights given to every citizen of the United States by our Constitution. That is our constitutional vacuum. It is the creation of those in the executive department who negotiated these agreements with forein powers. They were individuals who enjoyed immunity from foreign laws.

Now remember that most of our servicemen who have been accused of some offense when off duty are stationed in countries where the language, customs, and laws are strange to them. The atmosphere is frightening, if not hostile. An accused serviceman can only guess what is going on for interpreters are lacking or inexperienced. This unfortunately has been true of the interpreting done in many trials as well as in the preliminary proceedings.

RIGHTS ARE LOST

There is no grand jury as we know it in most foreign countries. The preliminary investigation is by an officer or magistrate who has considerable power with respect to accumulating evidence and preparing charges. The written statements secured by him from complainants and other witnesses play an important part in the trial. Furnished to the judge before trial he has an opportunity to reach a verdict of guilt before the trial starts. In fact, the written statements are frequently accepted as evidence without calling the witnesses in person. Obviously then the accused is not confronted by the witnesses against him. Even when a witness is called, the right of cross-examination, which is the principal value of confrontation, is lost through procedure. All questions must be funneled through the chief judge, who may decide whether or not to ask them, and he may rephrase to suit himself.

The accused is presumed to be guilty from the start. The presumption of innocence is practically unknown in foreign courts. There is no burden of proof on the prosecution to prove the accused guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. He does not have the privilege of remaining silent. Confessions secured by threats or force or other involuntary means can be used against him.

There are other rights he would have under our Constitution which he may lose but the ones I have mentioned are certain to be lost. This has been confirmed by a study of laws of foreign countries made by the Judge Advocate General of the Army, on orders of the Senate. Defenders of the status agreements are prone to deny that constitutional rights are lost, but the conclusion of the Judge Advocate General in this instance brooks no denial.

DISGRACEFUL COMPROMISE

The NATO Status of Forces Agreement and similar agreements are deceptive in that they provide certain so-called safeguards for the accused. Our Attorney General has called these "civilized standards of justice." That is a disgraceful compromise with principle. The provisions bear no resemblance to the rights granted by our Constitution. And foreign courts sometimes ignore these safeguards.

The right of appeal in foreign courts amounts to double jeopardy. The reviewing court has the right to receive additional evidence and to impose a different sentence. The fact that a sentence may be increased by appeal frequently discourages this step. Records of appeals show that frequently the prosecutor has perfected an appeal after a conviction solely for the purpose of securing a greater sentence.

One of the safeguards in the agreements usually is that the accused may communicate with a representative of his government and have such representative present at the trial, if the rules of court permit. This representative is the only link the accused has with his government, and the function of this representative is merely to observe and report to the commander in the area. He cannot take part in the trial.

During the last session of Congress the Secretary of Defense was authorized to employ counsel for accused servicemen when he deemed necessary. It was hoped this would remedy the indifference of counsel appointed by the courts. It has probably been of some benefit to various accused. It seems, however, that even such counsel feel more of an obligation to the court, and their colleague who may be prosecuting, than to the accused.

COURT-MARTIAL SYSTEM

Some supporters of the status agreements have claimed that anyone joining the Armed Forces automatically loses his constitutional rights. This is not true. His rights are still set forth in the Constitution and insured by law. Congress under its power to make laws for the Government of the land and naval forces has enacted the Uniform Code of Military Justice which was intended to govern our forces at home and abroad. This code specifically gives to the accused serviceman all those rights under our Constitution which the Judge Advocate General has said he would lose in a foreign court.

These defenders of the agreements make a point of saying there is no trial by jury in a court-martial, this supposedly excusing the lack of a jury in foreign trials. Actually the court-martial procedure amounts to a jury trial. There is a trial board consisting of both officers and enlisted men, if the accused desires, and he enjoys the right to challenge for cause and a peremptory challenge, just as in a civil court. Then there is an elaborate system of review and appeal provided for servicemen, ending with the Court of Military Appeals, composed of three civilians. Finally, there is an appeal to the President. No American intervention, not even the President, can stop the processes of foreign justice, once started.

Our serviceman on trial in a foreign court remains in a vacuum of expatriation until he has been convicted and has paid the penalty imposed. When the wife of Private Keefe sought to secure his release by habeus corpus proceeding, the court said Keefe was beyond the jurisdiction of the United States.

After a convicted serviceman has paid his fine or served his sentence he is returned by the foreign authorities to the jurisdiction of the United States commander in the area. Perhaps he did not have a fair trial. Reports of observers have shown some failures of justice. Perhaps he would not have been convicted under our system of jurisprudence. Yet his conviction by a foreign court is the measure of his discharge. He will be classed as undesirable, his discharge only a degree above dishonorable.

I consider it an outrage that we enlist or induct men into the service of our country, or assign reservists to active duty, to protect and defend our country and its institutions, and then deprive them of the guaranties of our Constitution when they are sent abroad on duty which is not of their choosing.

INTERNATIONAL LAW

Every enlisted man takes an oath that he will obey the orders of the President of the United States and the orders of the officers appointed over him according to regulations and the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The United States Manual for Courts-Martial provided by Executive order in 1951, by authority of the Uniform Code, contains this paragraph:

"Under international law, jurisdiction over members of the Armed Forces of the United States or other sovereign who commit offenses in the territory of a friendly foreign state in which the visting armed force is by consent quartered or in passage remains in the visiting sovereign."

Now this rule of international law has been flouted and superseded by the Status of Forces Treaty and similar agreements.

Those who negotiated the agreements would have us believe there never was such a rule. This in spite of the fact that it was stated clearly by Chief Justice Marshall in 1811, followed several times since by our Supreme Court, and asserted by the United States in the Supreme Court of Canada in 1943.

As recently as last May, a court in Japan recognized this rule of international law, but claimed that we had waived our rights through administrative agreement with Japan. He also mentioned we had lost face as well. The Japanese court said:

"An armed force constitutes the fighting power of a country and is a symbol of its dignity. Consequently, it is a well-established rule of international law that an armed force stationed in a foreign country in accordance with a treaty, is not subject to civil or criminal jurisdiction of the receiving state."

It is obvious that our forces are no longer a symbol of dignity in Japan. We have lost face there by the surrender of our rights through the administrative agreement. The same Japanese court made this plain by the orders which it tried to enforce in the case where it made its pronouncement. It is also evident from the fact that two-thirds of our servicemen imprisoned in foreign countries are in Japan.

CANADA PROTECTS ITS MEN

The Canadian Government is also very conscious of this rule of international law. Canadian troops are now a part of the international police force now on duty in Egypt. The Minister of Defense was asked in the House of Commons if the Canadians would be governed by the Canadian Code of Military Discipline or when punishment had to be dealt out would they be tried by an Egyptian court or by some international court-martial. The Minister of Defense was emphatic in his answer. I quote this colloquy from House of Commons debates of November 29, 1956, page 171:

"Mr. PEARKES. Would the Minister of National Defense advise us concerning the code of discipline under which these troops will be serving? Will the Canadians be governed by the Canadian Code of Military Discipline? When punishment has to be dealt out, will the men involved be tried by their own commanding officers or a Canadian court, or will they have to be tried by an Egyptian court or by some international court-martial? We would like to have some information as to the exercise of discipline and the protection of any of our men who may through some misfortune fall afoul of some commander from some other unit, or the laws of Egypt or elsewhere.

"Mr. CAMPNEY. This matter is now under discussion in the United Nations. But it is our contention and we are acting on this contention for the present and will continue to do so until there is any change, that our

forces will be governed by Canadian law and discipline will be administered under our own Canadian system. As I say, the question is being reviewed now in the United Nations.

"Mr. PEARKES. Would that apply to any civil offense which might be alleged against a Canadian soldier?

"Mr. CAMPNEY. Yes. We have taken the view that that should obtain. Whether or not we will maintain that, whether other courts of an international nature will be set up or what the final disposition will be I do not know, but as for now that is our contention.

"Mr. PEARKES. I should like to express the opinion that it is very desirable that we remain firm in that stand.

"Mr. CAMPNEY. We feel quite strongly about it."

There is not sufficient time this morning to go into the circumstances surrounding the making of these agreements, the motives of the negotiators, the pressure put upon the Senate to consent to the only treaty presented to it, and what now appears downright misrepresentation of facts and law to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. We have had almost 4 years of experience with the agreements and need not theorize. We should face the facts.

ACTION NEEDED

In May 1955, I presented to the House of Representatives a resolution which would have directed the President to seek a modification of all such agreements so that the right to exercise criminal jurisdiction over our servicemen abroad for off-duty offenses would be restored to the United States. Failing such modification being secured, the President would have been directed to terminate such agreements in accordance with the terms of each. Although extensive hearings were held by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the committee voted 19 to 10 not to report the resolution to the House. I think the testimony and evidence offered in the hearings clearly showed the necessity for its adoption. Accordingly, I have again offered an identical resolution to the House which is designated House Joint Resolution 16. I might add that some of my colleagues have joined with me in offering identical resolutions, just as they did in the previous session.

I have found that there is another vacuum of information or knowledge about this matter among the American people. This is not surprising, when I know that we have had inquiries from other congressional offices as to what the Status of Forces Agreement is, or what my resolution is about. So there is much work to be done to inform our citizens of the dangers inherent in foreign service in our Armed Forces.

That is where you patriotic women can be of great help.

Inform your friends, particularly any who may have sons, husbands, or other relatives now in service or about to enter service. Generate a demand on the Congress for action. Find out where your Representative stands on this subject. Tell him your views, particularly if he is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I feel confident that if my resolution is presented to the full body for action that it will be adopted. It is necessary that we have such an expression of the will of the people in order to recover the rights of our servicemen on duty abroad.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE 31ST WOMEN'S PATRIOTIC CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL DEFENSE, INC.

RESOLUTION NO. 8—NATO STATUS OF FORCES TREATY

Whereas until July 15, 1953, American service personnel on duty in foreign countries were under United States military courts, thus retaining their rights as United States citizens while serving our country abroad; and

Whereas the ratification on July 15, 1953, of the Status of Forces Treaty of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has deprived our servicemen of the traditional protection extended by our Constitution and enjoyed by United States servicemen on foreign soil, and now subjects our men to trial, imprisonment, and even the death penalty under foreign laws in foreign civil courts and prisons: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the 31st Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., petitions the Congress of the United States to support legislation which would nullify that part of the NATO treaty referring to the status of forces which deprives American servicemen of the protection of the United States Constitution when serving in more than 50 countries of the world.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, who art here and everywhere, we thank Thee for the wise and bountiful provision which Thou art daily making for our spiritual and material welfare.

We penitently confess that we frequently demand and try to gain so much from life for ourselves and are little concerned about giving help and happiness and hope unto others.

Grant that each to the extent of his ability and all with equal fidelity may be coworkers with Thee in the glorious adventure of supplying every human need and of establishing on earth the kingdom of brotherhood.

Hear us in the name of the Christ who was the world's greatest servant and its only savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the first conference of State governors for the protection, in the public interest, of the natural resources of the United States.

### JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency:

FEBRUARY 5, 1957.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 712 (a) (2) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, I have appointed the following members of the Banking and Currency Committee as members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production: Hon. PAUL BROWN, of Georgia; Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas; Hon. ALBERT RAINS, of Alabama; Hon. HENRY O. TALLE, of Iowa; Hon. GORDON MCDONOUGH, of California.

Sincerely,

BRENT SPENCE.

### DO NOT WEAKEN THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the National Guard represents the development of our citizen-soldier tradition.

One of its major functions is to meet emergencies in the several States.

It is also a first line of reserve for the regular or professional Military Establishment.

The proposal, by the Defense Department, that all enlistees in the guard shall be required to complete 6 months of active-duty training with the Army, although understandable in its attempt to create a large, trained, and immediately available reserve, is not the only solution nor the desirable one.

The whole concept of National Guard training is that it will permit and attract men for military training without disrupting their jobs or homelife.

It is designed to provide "a well-regulated militia," as specified in the Constitution. It is separate and distinct from the Regular Army.

To my mind the only question is how to increase its technical proficiency, without destroying the base upon which it relies for its existence. The proposed requirement for 6 months' active duty would dry up enlistments and regulate it out of existence. This could be a thinly disguised maneuver to eliminate the National Guard and to completely federalize all military components.

Like most Americans, I have a high regard for our professional soldiers, but I have also observed how much of a trainee's time is wasted under the "hurry up and wait" programing.

Instead, I believe it is the responsibility of the regulars to streamline their training methods and provide an accelerated course.

The National Guard Association has recommended a fair compromise especially regarding men who have had no previous military experience. Otherwise active-duty training should be on a voluntary basis, consistent with the organization and the function of the National Guard.

We, in Massachusetts, are proud of the combat records of our National Guard units.

We resent and oppose any plan, however devious, to discredit the guard or to destroy its identity.

The arbitrary and coercive action of the Defense Department must be repudiated.

Let the guard, with its professional advisers, develop methods for realistic training close to home, that will approximate Army standards without destroying the base upon which the guard relies for its personnel and its very existence.

Pentagon politics must not be permitted to obscure the place and the value of our citizen-soldier reserve.

## POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill which would allow individuals to deduct for Federal income-tax purposes political contributions to candidates for elective Federal offices in amounts up to $100 annually.

This is essentially the same as a bill I sponsored in the House in 1955 and which was sponsored in the Senate by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. He has reintroduced the measure this year.

This bill would enlarge the base of political participation by encouraging modest political contributions from the average voter, thus reducing the dependence of candidates and parties on the large contributors.

Need for such a measure has been reemphasized by the detailed study of campaign contributions and expenditures announced this week by the Senate subcommittee headed by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Others needs illuminated by that report would be taken care of in a bill I have already introduced in the House—H. R. 4146—and which the senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] has introduced in the Senate—S. 426. This bill, little changed from one which was reported favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee 2 years ago, would set realistic limits on campaign expenditures by candidates and committees set up to help them. At the same time, it would effectively limit the total amount of contributions which any person could make.

Enactment of both the $100 exemption and the improved Corrupt Practices Act bills would go far toward removing many of the present faults in our elections processes.

## ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 88)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of Public Law 358, 83d Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation covering its activities for the year ended December 31, 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 6, 1957.*

## HEALTH RESEARCH FACILITIES PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 21)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the provisions of the Health Research Facilities Act of 1956, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the annual report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service summarizing the activities of the health research facilities program.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 6, 1957.*

## COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

## INDIAN HOSPITALS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2021) to provide for the construction of Indian hospitals and to provide for grants to assist in the construction of community hospitals which will serve Indians and non-Indians jointly, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## DEFERRED GRAZING PROGRAM

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 147 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2367) to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2367, which is the bill concerning the drought situation in the Southwest. It provides a program for deferred grazing and soil conservation in the area that has been afflicted for a number of years by a very severe drought.

The Committee on Agriculture has reported the bill unanimously and has asked for the type of rule which has just been read to you. There was no objection to the consideration of the bill in the Rules Committee. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture and the rule unanimously by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time and yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2367) to establish a deferred-grazing program and a protein-feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2367, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable that this bill is before us this afternoon. It should have been passed the day before yesterday. I am sure, but for some kind of misunderstanding, it would have been passed at that time. I cannot believe

that the minority leader would have delayed the action which was scheduled last Monday had he understood the problem.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does that make any difference—any particular difference?

Mr. POAGE. I do not know that it makes a bit of difference in the world to the gentleman from Michigan, but probably it makes a difference to some others.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does it make any difference to anybody. I was not asking just about myself.

Mr. POAGE. I can only answer for myself. I think that it makes considerable difference.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is fine.

Mr. POAGE. I am glad the gentleman is satisfied.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, wait a minute now, just a minute.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not satisfied. Do not put words in my mouth.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further to the gentleman. The gentleman can get time on the other side.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that the death of our former colleague, the Honorable Thurmond Chatham, has made it impossible for the chairman of our committee to present this legislation to the House.

I shall, therefore, attempt to explain the measure. This bill is but an attempt to give some slight degree of protection to the soils in the vast drought-stricken area of the United States. This is not a relief bill. This bill does not solve the drought-distress problem. This bill is not a bill that will take care of the immediate needs of the farmers and ranchmen who have suffered so severely from the drought. It is to be hoped that we will have legislation that will extend a far larger measure of relief to these people. The President and the Secretary of Agriculture made a visit in the drought-stricken area something more than 3 weeks ago. They stated at that time that such action as could be taken would be taken in behalf of the drought area. They did not pass upon this legislation. This legislation is not an outgrowth of that visit. This legislation is not even connected with that visit. It was introduced sometime before that visit was made. The situation was so serious that 22 Members introduced identical bills. This bill bears my name, but Mr. ALBERT, of Oklahoma; Mr. BROOKS of Texas; Mr. BURLESON, of Texas; Mr. DEMPSEY, of New Mexico; Mr. DIES, of Texas; Mr. DOWDY, of Texas; Mr. FISHER, of Texas; Mr. IKARD, of Texas; Mr. KILGORE, of Texas; Mr. MAHON, of Texas; Mr. ROGERS of Texas; Mr. RUTHERFORD, of Texas; Mr. THORNBERRY, of Texas; Mr. WRIGHT, of Texas; Mr. YOUNG, of Texas; Mr. THOMPSON of Texas; Mr. ASPINALL, of Colorado; Mr. EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma; Mr. TEAGUE of Texas; Mr. DIXON, of Utah; and Mr. CHRISTOPHER, of Missouri, all introduced identical bills. This action surely attests to the seriousness of the situation. This bill is not an attempt to evaluate the things that the President and the Secretary of Agriculture saw, nor is it an attempt to suggest that at some future day the President or the Secretary or both may not very properly come up here and make suggestions as to further legislation. As one member of the Committee on Agriculture, and I am sure I speak for all, we will welcome any such suggestions at any time they are presented. But, up until this good moment, no suggestions whatsoever for the relief of the drought-stricken area have been presented to the Committee on Agriculture by either the President or the Secretary of Agriculture, and our committee knows that action is needed now. The drought does not wait, and we should not be asked to wait further. The President can still come—the Secretary can still come to Congress at any time either decides he wants to suggest any further aid for the drought sufferers. We will still be glad to have their suggestions, but we should not refuse to do what we can do at this time, just because the President and the Secretary do not have any thoughts to offer. This bill will not end the drought; it will not bring rain—but every member of our committee thought it would help. It is not a Democratic measure. It is not a partisan measure. It is a bill which comes to you with the unanimous recommendation of all of the members of our committee.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is it not correct to say that the substance and the principle embodied in this legislation already has been acted upon favorably by this House in the previous session when we had the soil-bank legislation before us?

Mr. POAGE. I think the gentleman correctly expresses it, although this House in the Albert amendment went much farther than this bill goes. The far-reaching Albert amendment was adopted by a majority vote of this House. We proposed at that time to extend the principle of deferred grazing all over the Nation, whether there was any emergency, drought, or disaster, or not. It was in a sincere effort to meet the objection of the Secretary of Agriculture to that amendment, that this bill was introduced. The Secretary stated at the time that amendment was adopted that he felt it was not a proper part of the soil bank. He felt it was improper to include grazing provisions in the soil bank. No objection was raised to the idea of encouraging deferred use of pasture land. So we introduced these bills, carefully amending only the disaster relief program and not touching the soil-bank program at all, in the sincere belief that by so doing we were meeting the objection of the Secretary of Agriculture. We confined this bill and its operation to those counties that have been declared by the Secretary of Agriculture to be disaster areas. This bill is not of universal application, but deals only with those counties that have been found to be suffering from serious disaster.

The bill provides that the Secretary of Agriculture, when he finds that it would be desirable for the protection of the soil to encourage deferred grazing shall promulgate a program of deferred grazing, in which he is authorized to pay to the landowner not less than the normal rental value of the land for not less than 12 months, but not to exceed more than 3 years after the termination of the disaster. Frankly, that is all that is left in the bill, because section 5 has been removed by the committee, and there will be a committee to take section 5 out of the bill.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. WIER. I think I heard you say this took care of so-called distressed drought areas.

Mr. POAGE. That is all.

Mr. WIER. The meat of your bill is for the Southwest drought areas. How about the drought area that has been placed under distress conditions in South Dakota?

Mr. POAGE. This bill covers every area that has been declared a disaster area. Unfortunately the larger part of those disaster areas are in 6 or 7 Southwestern States, but these disaster areas do extend over nearly half of the United States.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Would the gentleman inform the House if this was not done, or similar action taken, that had the same effect in the case of drought areas on certain crops under the soil bank last year—in the case of corn for instance? I think where the drought had hit those areas they were allowed to put these crops under the soil bank at that time, were they not?

Mr. POAGE. Of course our committee has heard a great deal of testimony as to the effect of the soil bank in the corn areas last year. It seems to me that the result was to pay some $179,000,000 of money to those people but not to do what the soil bank was expected to do—that is this payment did not reduce the corn crop. But this is not a bill that is going to enrich a group of people as those payments did but it is a bill that is going to encourage a group of people to keep from further abusing the soil that is about to lose its turf. I do not think the soil bank payments to corn farmers last year had that result. They simply put money in the people's pockets. This bill is to protect the Nation's soil. It offers the only practicable method of doing so in this area.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Further, with reference to the question asked by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER], the provisions of this bill are flexible, are they not, and a county not now in a drought area, should it become designated a drought area, can be included under the provisions of the bill?

Mr. POAGE. That is correct. Any area that becomes a drought disaster area can be placed under the provisions of this bill by the Secretary.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is not that circumscribed somewhat in that grazing must be the chief source of income in that area?

Mr. POAGE. That is correct. The bill relates only to grazing land.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In other words, the drought county that has some farming and some grazing might not come under the provisions of the bill even though it is a total drought area.

Mr. POAGE. The Secretary would have the discretion to determine whether there was enough grazing involved to justify the imposition of the program.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does the Secretary also determine when the deferred grazing period shall end?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, with this one exception: The bill provides that he cannot make the period for less than 12 months, and the reason was that the committee felt it was so plain it would be an utter waste of money to make payments for a period less than 12 months. Where grazing is deferred for less than a full year there would not be a chance of letting the grass reseed. We provided that the minimum must be 12 months.

Mr. GROSS. And it is left to someone's discretion to open it again after it recovers?

Mr. POAGE. I think we are faced with this situation in all the eastern edges of the drought area, let us say on the perimeter of the drought area, but I am more familiar with the eastern edge of that perimeter than any other. In that area you will find that the Secretary will probably need only 1-year contracts because probably 1 year's deferment is all that land will need for recovery. Where it is a little more severely damaged he will probably give 2-year contracts, feeling that 1 year will not cure the situation; and in the most severe portions he undoubtedly will give 3-year contracts, and that is as far as he can go under the terms of this bill. There are undoubtedly areas in which he will give 3-year contracts. The bill gives him discretion between 1, 2, and 3-year periods.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I wonder if the gentleman can tell me whether the bill as worded would help our Missouri counties.

Mr. POAGE. Not unless the Secretary of Agriculture decides that the Missouri counties are a disaster area. I know there is much discussion about that matter. From all I have heard, conditions particularly in the western and southwestern counties of Missouri are desperate, but to date the Department of Agriculture has not declared those counties to be a portion of the disaster area.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. But this would be an enabling act which should benefit the situation in those counties.

Mr. POAGE. The minute the Secretary decides that they are disaster counties the terms of this bill are as applicable there as anywhere else in the United States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I just suggest from reading page 2 of the bill that that again is circumscribed by the language in which grazing is decided to be a substantial factor in agricultural production.

Mr. POAGE. Right.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. And if the gentleman will yield for 1 further question, I refer to lines 22 to 24:

> Payment to any person for deferred grazing of land in any one county shall not exceed $5,000 in any one year.

There are large landowners who own land in 2, 3, or 4 counties. Would that language mean that he could get up to $5,000 in each county where he happened to have land located?

Mr. POAGE. It does, because there are probably not more than three dozen such owners in the whole United States. In discussing the administration of the act we felt that it would be extremely complex to require every contract to be sent back to Washington to have it checked against every other county in the United States. The administration of this thing would increase in cost far more than the amount you could save by not making those few payments than if we had taken the other approach and tried to say that if you had more than $5,000 anywhere in the United States you are ineligible. This program is to be operated on a county basis, as the gentleman knows.

It is handled through the county offices. Smith County does not know what the record is in Jones County. There is no way of knowing it for the 3,000 counties of the United States except to send every contract to Washington and have every contract audited here. The cost of that would be out of proportion to the savings.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It would be possible for an individual owning land in several counties to get $5,000 for each county.

Mr. POAGE. I do not think there is any doubt about that.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. Is this an outright grant or loan?

Mr. POAGE. It is neither a grant or a loan. It is a direct payment for performing a service to the United States.

Mr. O'NEILL. It is like burying the potatoes in the ground?

Mr. POAGE. No, I do not think it is like burying potatoes in the ground for this reason. When you bury potatoes, you destroy them. This bill prevents the destruction of the grass. I do not think the gentleman understands the situation in the Southwest.

Mr. O'NEILL. We have had tornadoes up in the northeast section, we have had hurricanes in the northeast section, we have had floods up in the northeast section. The people in our section of the country have suffered as much in the past 2 years as you have in Texas, and we feel sorry for you. But we do not come in here and ask for handouts. We had a bill up here last year but you people from Texas put a crippling amendment on that bill so that it would not work. We of Massachusetts, we in the northeast section, had to work out our own problems. You people down there with your oil wells, why not work out your own problems without coming to the Congress and saddling the expense on the people of the entire United States.

Mr. POAGE. Unfortunately, it is not the same people who have the oil wells that have these little ranches. They are entirely different people. It is for the very reason the gentleman has discussed that we have put a $5,000 limitation in here. That was placed there, in part at least, so that the benefits of this bill will not go to the people who do not need it. We understand that there are people in Texas who do not need any help to defer their pastures, just as there are people in Boston who do not need the hundred-million-dollar subsidy contained in the insurance bill we gave New England a year or two ago, but I do not recall that the gentlemen offered to make them ineligible for those benefits. Where there is one man in Texas who has made money out of oil, there are about 3,500 who have never made a thin dime on oil. Those people are in just as dire circumstances as they would be if there were not somebody from Dallas or Houston who had made a bunch of money out of oil.

Mr. O'NEILL. It is a local problem and it should be handled on a local basis by the State.

Mr. POAGE. It is not a local problem. This is involving the life of America itself, and all of America.

Mr. O'NEILL. Oklahoma is also a great wealthy oil State. You were in here last year or the year before for your tidelands and things of that nature. But whenever you have a problem like this you come to the people of the entire Nation and ask them to save you.

Mr. POAGE. This is a problem that relates to the preservation of the soil of America. In every State, in every county, where the Secretary of Agriculture, whether he be the present Secretary or some other man, finds that there is a danger of losing your soil, this applies. History teaches us that vast areas of this world have been overgrazed and have passed from productive pastures into barren deserts which today support no one.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. I am wondering, Does this bill cover only emergencies of a drought nature or does it cover any kind of emergency situation?

Mr. POAGE. It is only applicable to drought cases. We had a tornado in my hometown which killed 113 people but that did not mean we had to keep cattle off the pastures next year. It is only applicable to drought because drought is

the only kind of disaster that makes it necessary to lighten your livestock load on your pastures.

Mr. McGOVERN. What about provision for a drought in a county where the entire county is not declared eligible for drought relief, where you have spotty damage covering one or more farms in that county?

Mr. POAGE. If the Secretary of Agriculture declares it to be a disaster area the bill applies whether he declares a large or small area. But that discretion is with the Secretary under existing law and it is not changed by this bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture. Hearings were held on the bill. I would like to have heard more witnesses or more definite statements from the department as to their attitude on the bill, but those were not forthcoming at that time. However, the committee felt that this was an emergency matter that should be dealt with very promptly so that a beginning could be made in the consideration of this important bill.

I will not go into the merits of the bill. One section dealing with protein feeds was stricken out of the bill, so all that remains in the legislation is the matter dealing with deferred grazing. If the bill works out in actual practice in accordance with the intent of the author of the bill, it should be a good measure and do some good in creating better pasturage in the southwest area wherever there is need for this kind of a policy.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. Was Secretary Benson called in on this piece of legislation?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Secretary Benson did not appear.

Mr. O'NEILL. Did he send any communications?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not have it, but I understand there was an exchange of letters. Undoubtedly his objections will be placed in the RECORD.

Mr. O'NEILL. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that legislation like this would come before the Congress without a recommendation or nonrecommendation from the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I will say in answer to the inquiry of my friend from Massachusetts that Secretary Benson has sent a letter up here, and he is opposed to the measure as it now stands.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. I would like to ask two questions. First, as to the application of this bill, does it apply to Government-owned lands?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is my understanding that it does not apply to Government-owned lands.

Mr. BATES. Is that the situation?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. BATES. The next question I had was this: If the fishermen up in my area decide not to fish any more because the fish are becoming depleted, is that not the same situation that you have here? The farmers are stopping farming so that they can restore the land; therefore, do you believe the fishing industry should get a subsidy along the same lines as are the farmers in this particular bill?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In reply to that question, I find that several years ago in your area the fishermen reduced the size of the catch in order to raise the price; that is, on codfish.

Mr. BATES. The gentleman does not understand the situation at all, because that is not the case.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I like to fish, just like my colleague from Michigan does, but I do recall one instance, and I talked with some of the fishermen and they told me that they were going to reduce the size of the catch in order to raise the price.

Mr. BATES. I enjoy the comments of the gentleman, but I would like to get an answer to my question. Would the gentleman tell me specifically what is the difference between a fisherman stopping fishing and a farmer stopping farming? Why should not the fisherman get a subsidy as well as the farmer in this particular case? What is the difference?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is a lot of difference, but we will not have time to go into that argument now.

Mr. BATES. The point is, we never do.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, we have argued that a great many times here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. To answer the question of my very, very dear friend from Massachusetts, it was only a few years ago that we did make an appropriation to teach them how to be experts to catch more fish. Do you remember that one?

Mr. BATES. The gentleman recalls the authorization.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did you not get the money?

Mr. BATES. We never got the money.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, that was a dirty trick.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I could not be in the Hall when the debate first started. First of all, this is no laughing or funny matter.

If you lived on the eastern plains of Colorado, in my own district, or in the district of Mr. CHENOWETH; or if you lived in the Panhandle of Texas or on the plains of Oklahoma, you would realize what it means to see your cows without sufficient feed so that they are not even strong enough to get up without the help of the farmer, and you would then begin to realize that what we are trying to do in this bill is not funny business in any sense.

Really and truly, I was completely surprised when I found that the Department was opposed to this bill. I had no idea that they were going to oppose it and only knew about it after seeing a news item in the paper.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, this morning there was mentioned the attitude of the Department of Agriculture toward this measure. But in the final analysis is it not the Congress which should legislate? I believe the gentleman certainly would answer "Yes" to that. Furthermore, I would much rather have the opinion of the membership of the great legislative Committee on Agriculture than I would that of the top echelon of the Department of Agriculture today.

Mr. HILL. Of course, I am glad to get the gentleman's opinion. But we must work together on agriculture. That is why we have a Department of Agriculture. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call your attention to some of the provisions in the bill that I think take care of many objections that might be made. First of all it refers to pasture land that has been used as pasture. Would you tell me how anyone can get into the program that has 10,000 or 15,000 acres that have not been used as pasture? He cannot.

The second thing is that this land—and I hope someone will correct me if I am wrong—if a cattle producer or a livestock grower has not been using this land, he cannot get in under this program. There is no way for him to get in under the program.

Also, if he does get into the program, $5,000 is the most that he can receive at any one time or in any one year. Furthermore, he must agree to follow out the program for a full year. It is only a 3-year program. There is no reason why the House should not pass this bill and send it over into the other body where changes can be made and, of course, will be offered. Then the House can agree or disagree at its pleasure. If there are any provisions in the bill anyone does not like, it is certainly his privilege to raise objections to it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I am in perfect sympathy with the objectives of the bill, but I am wondering how we are going to police it. Most of this land in the southwest counties, in the various States are not pasture. There would have to be some policing. There would be some farmers who would not go into the program. They would have a right to run their cattle out. There are no fences there. I hope we are not going to have to have a Government bureaucrat on every section of land to make sure that the cattle are not getting off onto the wrong section.

I am sure the gentleman can see the problem of policing this. I am wondering if we are not opening up a Pandora's box here, or whether there is no bottom to the pit.

There was a question raised here concerning the State of South Dakota and Idaho having no counties that would come under this program; also there are counties in my State that apparently would be precluded from being in the program. Perhaps some of those counties do not use the land for grazing all the time; that is, not all of the counties, but grazing is the main activity. As I understand it, South Dakota, North Dakota, Nebraska, and other States where they do have grazing would not even come under the program.

Mr. HILL. Of course, No. 1: This is the same old jinx that follows every bill concerning the farmer. When a farmer wants some assistance they always say you cannot police it. Let me say a word about that. I should like to see you police the traffic in the city of Washington, but you do not remove your traffic officers and repeal your traffic laws because you cannot police the traffic.

As far as policing is concerned, most of our agricultural programs are policed at home in the localities, in the counties where the projects originate. You have the same thing in various types of cultivation of certain crops that are planted to increase the quality of your soil. They are all policed at home at the local level.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. I see nothing in the report about the ultimate cost of this program. That certainly must have come up before the committee. What would be the anticipated final cost?

Mr. HILL. I think the author of the bill has an idea of how much money it will cost, but it is a little hard to tell how many acres will be participating. I do not assume there are going to be millions and millions of acres. I think if you want to help the small farmer, you will get the small farmer with the small herd in the small area where he runs the cattle, in on this program.

Mr. O'NEILL. We all have sympathy for the farmers to whom the gentleman refers, but how much is this program going to cost?

Mr. POAGE. No one can tell what the participation will be, but I think we can all agree that it certainly would be not as much as 18 or 20 million in this program. I think it would be very remarkable if you got that much. The program will probably cost an average of $1.25 an acre. Nobody knows how much you can get, but I think if you can get 20 million acres you will be exceeding everybody's wildest expectations.

Mr. O'NEILL. You certainly must have come up with some idea of what would have to be appropriated.

Mr. POAGE. Certainly I came up with the thought that we would have at the outside 18 or 20 million acres. That is the thought. It may not be correct.

Mr. O'NEILL. Then the gentleman figures it will cost around $20 or $25 million?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. HILL. In the committee it was discussed as being between $15 and $25 million, but in my opinion you will not get that much participation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If no one seems able to tell us approximately how much it will cost, can you do it some way by comparison? Will it cost as much as the foreign-aid program would cost?

Mr. HILL. I cannot compare it with foreign aid.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman mean it is not as much, or is it more?

Mr. HILL. Let us say not as much. The gentleman can answer his own question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would not have asked it if I could have answered it.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. The question was raised about the fairness of this program to the farmers who do not graze. Were they not put into the soil-bank program last year? Both in and out of drought areas are farmers not eligible to receive not only the rental but the profits they would have received if they had raised a successful crop on land that they put into the soil bank?

Mr. HILL. That is exactly correct. Our entire soil-bank program is in the formative stage. There is no reason in the world why you should not take pasture and submarginal land and put it in the conservation part of the soil-bank program.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DIXON. Is it not a fact that the bill gives the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to prescribe the terms and conditions on which this is granted, and that would mean the authority to require the States to match this money if he so desired?

Mr. HILL. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that, because I neglected to read this section. I am reading from section 3, which is the key to the whole bill:

> The program authorized herein may include such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate its purposes and to facilitate practical administration.

Under that clause the Secretary can set up local committees, and the farmers or stockmen that came into the program would be absolutely bound voluntarily to follow the rules and regulations adopted by the Department of Agriculture. I say under that section the cities and the municipalities and the counties and the States could all cooperate. I do not think there is any question about that.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thought that this bill had been pretty thoroughly argued out and that everyone understood it. I am a little regretful that there has been some play of words here about one part of the country getting more than some other part of the country. I think I have about as good a sense of humor as anyone in the House of Representatives, but I want you to know it is a pretty serious situation, so serious that it is something that cannot be played with either with words or with lack of action. In regard to the Secretary of Agriculture, I remarked here on the floor the other day, I do not think the democratic form of Government, under which we are conducting the affairs of this country, sets up any provision where the Secretary of Agriculture can veto something that the representatives of the people who are sent here to legislate provide to be included among our laws. This law is nothing in the world but good, sound commonsense in regard to soil conservation. I had hoped that the provisions similar to those contained in this bill would have been included in the soil-bank provisions. And they would have been had Mr. ALBERT's amendment been adopted when the soil-bank program was before the House. But, although the House did see fit to adopt it, the other body struck it. One of the reasons, let me say, I think, was because the Secretary of Agriculture at that time said he did not want to mix up the soil-bank program with anything in the world that might help out drought relief, for the simple reason that he wanted the soil bank devoted solely to the reduction of surpluses, and not to help anybody out who was affected by the drought. All right, well and good. The Congress did just exactly what the Secretary of Agriculture said he wanted on that; although I voted for the Albert amendment then, and I am going to vote for this bill today.

What we have done is to come back to the Congress with a soil conservation measure that is designed to provide drought relief that will protect the soil of this Nation. It has been remarked here on the floor today that this is not a national problem. I appreciate the concern of my friends from the Northeast. I want to say I have helped them out many times on these measures and I will continue to do so in the future. But, this is definitely a national problem because if I could take you today to my district, which is in the geographical center of this drought area, and show you how the land has deteriorated, many of you would not believe it. In one section, our grass has been eaten off by the cattle and the top soil has been removed by the winds clear down to the hardpan. It is going to take 5 years to reseed that and to grow that back. And that is a minimum estimate of the time that it will take. In addition to that plague, in one section of my district we were hit by a plague that I am sure some of you have never heard of, a plague of grass termites. They came in under the

grass and ate the roots of the grass. When the cattle eat that grass, they lift out the whole tuft of grass and nothing in the world but the hardpan is left. It looks just exactly like the bare spots on a baseball diamond between bases where the runner runs. If we do not do something to relieve that situation and afford some temporary relief to these people who are making a living off that land, there is nothing in the world for them to do but to move to the metropolitan areas. I think we, in all fairness to everyone concerned, should give at least fair consideration to this matter and understand what this bill does. My friend, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] has explained to you exactly what it is intended to do. It is not intended to grant anybody anything. It is intended to provide a means to let these people keep their heads above the waters of the economic sea. That is what it is designed to do. Unless something is provided, the 6 years of the drought that we have already had, and we got another one this year, is going to engulf a lot of them and you are going to have a lot of the little ranchers move off the land and then you will be in a worse situation than you have ever dreamed of.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to commend the gentleman for the splendid statement he has made as to the real and grave necessity behind this legislation and for calling attention to the national implications involved in this Dust Bowl problem if something is not done to check it. The folks who live in the metropolitan areas or in areas far removed from the Dust Bowl may be a year or two later than the folks who live in the dust bowl in feeling the implications of what happens down there. But they will feel them as certainly as the sun rises in the morning, if we do not do something to check it. I think the gentleman has made a strong point in calling the attention of the Members to the national implications of this Dust Bowl problem.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. There is one other thing I want to say about the national situation. You remember back in the depression days this Government in many instances, because people had overgrazed land and overplanted land, had to buy up submarginal land. That land the Government has been restoring all along, and much of it has been brought back to production. If we pass legislation of this kind we will afford an opportunity to the landowner, the person living on the land, to restore that land. Otherwise, you let it go into worse condition, and then the next thing we will be back in submarginal land-buying program by the Government.

Mr. O'NEILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. O'NEILL. I was going to say to the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Oklahoma that if we could get rid of this tax-depletion exemption on oil those States will be able to handle the situation very easily.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Surely, the gentleman must be joking.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] has again expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the questions that have been asked, I think it is proper that the position of the Department of Agriculture should be known.

First, I want to say that they are opposed to the passage of this legislation in its present form. They think it would create as many problems as it would solve.

I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read the statement of the Department.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement, as follows:

DEFERRED GRAZING BILL, H. R. 2367

The Department of Agriculture vigorously opposes the passage of H. R. 2367. Administration of the bill as it is written would be nearly impossible, and at best, would create more problems than the bill could solve. These problems include:

1. Much of the rangeland involved is not fenced and it would be difficult, if not impossible, to enforce regulations setting aside a given number of acres out of an unfenced range.

2. The withdrawing of a substantial acreage of rangeland would bring about additional hardships, since there is not enough grazing land now with all the available range being grazed.

3. If an actual reduction of grazing lands could be accomplished it would be followed by a liquidation of cattle and sheep which would be disastrous to market prices.

4. The Department recognizes the critical problem faced by some livestock men, but H. R. 2367 is so written as to provide payments indiscriminately and without regard to need. The result would be that much of the funds provided would go into the pockets of wealthy cattlemen and absentee landowners, instead of helping the cattleman who is in real trouble.

5. The language of the bill leaves serious question as to whether payments under the deferred grazing program would be authorized for ranchers and farmers on federally owned grazing land as well as to those on privately owned grazing land. Neither is it clear whether the bill is intended to apply to land which is not now used for grazing, but which may have been so used in the past.

6. The bill does not provide for any State participation and the Department feels that abuses of such programs using the taxpayers' money can largely be avoided if the State will contribute a reasonable share of the cost of the program.

7. The bill would not only be difficult to administer because of the reasons noted above, but it does not provide authority of a regulatory nature other than the withholding of payment or the recovery of payment already made in the event the program provisions are violated. This would tend to encourage violations, the Department believes, under the reasoning that even if the claimant is found in violation the worst the Government can do is to take the payment away from him without any additional penalty.

8. Such a program as this bill provides moves in the direction of Government regulation and control of the livestock industry.

9. The scope of the program is so large that 40 to 50 million acres may be involved with a cost of $40 million estimated. In view of the magnitude of the program, it seems unreasonable that the sponsors of the bill did not ask for a formal report from the Department of Agriculture, did not invite representatives of national farm organizations to testify, nor did representatives of national livestock associations present their views. Some of these associations have already gone on record with resolutions opposing the principles embodied in H. R. 2367.

10. The President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Interior have recently made a survey of the drought area and a conference was held in Wichita to hear the recommendations of those closest to the problem. These recommendations have been further refined by the 190 representatives from 15 drought States who took part in the Wichita meeting, and their suggestions are now being received by the Department of Agriculture. It does not seem reasonable that these men who gave their time and energies in an effort to secure good drought legislation should be denied a voice in this matter, or that legislation should be hastily adopted before their recommendations can be heard.

11. The establishment of equitable payment rates will present serious problems because of the lack of completely adequate data. State averages cannot be assumed to be the same as the true rental value in every case, but due to selective participation, might be considerably more or less.

In brief, the Department has serious doubts that this bill, as written, could be administered even if enacted. We do not believe that it will do what it purports to do, and we believe that it would produce more problems than it solves in the drought-stricken areas.

We are deeply sympathetic to the problem facing our farmers and ranchers, and we expect to have complete and workable drought recommendations ready soon which will embody the recommendations made by those in drought areas. It would be hasty and ill-considered, however, to take action without hearing the livestock groups who will be most affected, the conferees at Wichita and major farm organizations.

The argument that the House can enact this bill and then leave it to the Senate or a conference committee to clean it up is hardly a sound legislative proposal.

Furthermore, the present broad drought program is working effectively.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, the Department is not opposing this bill here today, because it hopes a satisfactory bill can be secured in the Senate.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, there you have heard the situation with that letter. If anybody was ever looking for an out that is certainly it. A lot of us from the great industrial States probably want to take it, but I am not going to. I have been voting for farm legislation since 1944, and so have many of my colleagues from the great industrial States.

There is before this body and there is before the Committee on Banking and Currency my bill to aid distressed economic areas in this Nation. It affects 25 or 35 entire congressional districts in more than a dozen States. Similar legislation was recommended by the Presi-

dent 2 years in a row; it is in the platform of both great political parties.

Many of the Members on both sides of the aisle from these farming and rural States if given half a chance have indicated they will be against that kind of law. Now, Mr. Chairman, if ever there was special pleading the farm legislation is it. I voted for subsidies; I voted for a library of law for the farming districts, and for my colleagues from farming sections at their request for years. We have given you subsidies for everything but the squeal of your hogs, and I suppose you will soon get that; you are entitled to most of this because in the rest of the States we have got to eat and if you do not produce we do not eat.

But there are other national problems that go beyond the farm problem. While your cause is a sacred cow to the politicians of both parties, I speak, Mr. Chairman, of other serious economic problems that are equally serious affecting dozens of millions of people throughout this Nation, and when my bill is before the Committee and the House I plead for your support. Remember today.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the statement was made that the Secretary of Agriculture is now opposed to this bill. I am sure that that correctly reflects the Secretary's position as of 1:45 this afternoon. But the Secretary of Agriculture did not express this opposition to the Agriculture Committee of this House. On the 17th day of last month the committee called upon the Department of Agriculture for its sugegstions and advice on this matter. The Department of Agriculture sent the head of the drought division, Mr. Kenneth Scott, to testify before our committee. Every bit of this record of 75 pages is Mr. Kenneth Scott's testimony and it does not say that the Department is opposed to the bill. He was asked if the Department opposed the bill, but he did not answer either yea or nay.

Most of the objections that were just read to the House today were never presented to the Committee on Agriculture. Three or four of them were presented, were considered, and were answered. The letter which was just read did not state to whom these questions were addressed. They were not addressed to the Committee on Agriculture of the House nor have they ever been presented. They were not addressed to the Speaker of the House.

In addition to Mr. Scott's testimony, Under Secretary True D. Morse was before the committee and every page of this record is Mr. Morse's testimony about this bill. He did not present the objections that have been raised this afternoon.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think the Secretary probably was going to give that information through the Washington Post as he has done in connection with some of the other matters or messages. It seems that he prefers to do that rather than to give them direct to our committees.

Mr. POAGE. I think so. The Secretary raised certain questions here today through the minority leader. He asks, How are you going to take care of land if it is not fenced? Well, most of this is fenced. The day of the free range is gone except in connection with Government land and this program does not involve Government land. Surely the Government can and will protect its own land from abuse. As to individuals, they can do their own fencing or leave it undone. If a rancher has but one pasture he would have to put all his land in the program. If he wanted to put in only a part of his land he would have to build cross fences.

The Secretary fears that we are going to reduce the cattle population. Could there be a finer thing happen to the livestock industry than to reduce the cattle population of America? I think that everybody except the packers will agree that we have several million too many cattle.

In other words, he feels that the program is not going to be too effective. I do not think it is going to be very effective so far as reducing the cattle population is concerned. But to the extent it does reduce the cattle population it will be a double blessing. For every head it does reduce our cattle population that is to the advantage of every livestock grower in the country, whether he produces cattle, sheep, or hogs. It is certainly to the advantage of America to strengthen our livestock market.

The Secretary suggests that certain wealthy cattlemen would get most of this money. Obviously he has not read the provisions of the bill that limits payment to $5,000. This denies many middle-sized-ranch men an opportunity to participate. Surely no one would want to make the bill any more restrictive.

The Secretary objects because the States are not required to participate in this program. I want to make it plain that I think one of my colleagues was in error when he said that the States do participate in the cost of this program. The Secretary is correct in saying that it does not provide for State participation any more than the present deferred-grazing program that we have had for the last 16 years so provides. Why should we require the desperately hurt States to pay part of a program to save the soil when the Federal Government pays all of the cost in other States, as it now does?

This leads me to the last important criticism. For 20 years the Department of Agriculture has administered grazing programs and it has had a very substantial participation. It has had as high as 35,000 farms some years and that program was, and is, applicable all over the United States. The Secretary has found no difficulty in administering it. This program is no more difficult to administer than the present deferred-grazing phase of the soil-conservation program that has been administered for 20 long years.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is it not also true that the final objection of the Secretary that it would not work was exactly the same objection he made to the soil-bank proposition when it was first proposed to him, at which time he said the soil bank would not work?

Mr. POAGE. Yes. The Secretary will embrace this program just as he has heretofore embraced that program; the Secretary will support this; the Secretary will go to the other body and suggest that there are certain little amendments which he considers vital. It will then become the Benson program, and he will tell the country that it is a good program. I do not care whose name is to it. I simply want to see us save the soil of America.

No one has come here and made any practical suggestion as to how this soil could be saved other than by a program of deferred grazing. As far as I know, the soil-conservation people of this and of no other nation have found no other program to protect the turf. It must be done, else we will be spending many times this amount to reseed that selfsame land. It costs $20 to $50 an acre to reseed it. It may cost us as much as $3 an acre over a period of time to save it under this program. I think we would be most unwise to refuse to take this needed step, just because the Department did not think about it.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. It appears to me, even though there be some subsidy in the bill, that subsidies have been established since George Washington's time and that subsidies are fundamentally American.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, very few Members of this body are so young that they do not recall the days of the Dust Bowl. It was caused by failure to keep some degree of cover on drought-parched lands in the Middle West and Southwest.

What the Members may not realize is that we are now facing another Dust Bowl, some of it in the same area as that which occurred some 20 years ago.

Granting that we are now to have somewhere near adequate rainfall in the drought areas, we still face the necessity for reseeding and resodding the drought-parched areas. Even though the grass may start to grow back, when the summer sun begins to parch it again this coming summer the roots will have difficulty finding any moisture in the subsoil; and the sod poorly established, at best, will have a hard time sustaining itself through even a normal summer.

If cattle have been permitted to graze the new grass as fast as it appears, there will be no reseeding process and the resodding will not take place. Therefore, the cattle must be kept off until there has been sufficient rainfall and until sufficient time has passed, even though it

be 2 or 3 years, for the sod to be thoroughly reestablished.

In the meantime, the cattlemen who would normally put their stock on these pastures remain in the precarious economic condition they now find themselves. The modest rental payments proposed in this bill provide the best means which the committee has been able to find for keeping the cattlemen and their creditors in a reasonably solvent condition. We face a disaster which could seriously impair the Nation's economy, not alone that in the affected areas.

Let me stress to you that the cautious, almost fearful attitude of the Department of Agriculture will not get this job done. It will take bold and determined steps and it will take immediate action and not reluctant and hesitant measures after long delays. This legislation may not be perfect, but at least it is an effort and one which the drought victims certainly deserve at the hands of the Congress.

I urge the passage of the bill as reported out by the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire about the program for tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Committee on Rules has reported out several resolutions granting investigative authority to several committees of the House. They will be brought up tomorrow, and are as follows:

House Resolution 139, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service;

House Resolution 29, Committee on Foreign Affairs;

House Resolution 113, Committee on Public Works;

House Resolution 65, Committee on Veterans' Affairs;

House Resolution 128, authorizing the Committee on House Administration to continue investigation of Government printing; and

H. R. 1056, the military substandard housing bill.

I understand there is no controversy over them, and with the conclusion of these matters tomorrow, then the understanding between the gentleman from Massachusetts and myself with reference to next week will be applicable.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connection with any major disaster due to drought determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended, the President is authorized and directed as part of the assistance provided pursuant to such act to formulate and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of Agriculture, a deferred grazing program in any county affected by such disaster in which grazing is determined to be a substantial factor in agricultural production. Such program shall be applicable only to land which is normally used for grazing and with respect to which it is determined that deferment of grazing is desirable for the protection of the land. Such program in any county shall be made available to farmers and ranchers immediately and shall remain available for a period of not less than 3 years after the termination of such county as a major disaster area.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of this bill in committee we were advised that the President was going to send to the Congress his recommendations for dealing with the drought situation. Now, everyone is aware that some 3 or 4 weeks ago the President went to the drought area along with the Secretary of Agriculture and others. Since that time more than 3 weeks have passed and yet we have not received any recommendations from either the Department or the President dealing with this proposition. Meanwhile the drought continues on the Great Plains of this country with increasing severity. Today the Department still complains that we should await the recommendations of the administration.

This reminds me of an incident that took place in my community when I was a small boy in southeastern Oklahoma—when a Government survey team was surveying that part of the country. One of the young engineers had a team of Government mules, one of which was severely injured when the tongue of a wagon pierced its stomach. The engineer's first reaction was to shoot the suffering mule, but after thinking it over, he thought to himself, "This is a Government animal. If I shoot the mule, I will probably have to pay for it." So he wired his superintendent for authority to kill the mule. The superintendent wired back and said that he had sent his request to the regional office with the recommendation that it be approved. Within a few days the mule died. A couple of weeks later the answer came back from the Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C., saying: "Dear sir, your request, forwarded to the superintendent and by him forwarded to the regional office, who in turn referred it to this Department, has been considered by the appropriate agency, and after due consideration you are directed to proceed immediately and shoot the mule." If we delay this matter until we have heard from the administration it may be too late to do any good.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is not comparing the people of Texas to a mule, is he?

Mr. ALBERT. No; I am not comparing the people of Texas to a mule, but I am comparing the suffering in the drought-stricken area to the suffering that the mule experienced.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know why the gentlemen on the Democratic side should object to giving a little time for consideration of this situation by the President. He made a special trip to the area. Just a few days ago they told him to go ahead and use the Army at his discretion over there across the ocean, did they not? What is so fussy about this? Why not wait until the President comes up with his considered solution?

I can understand why this bill is important. It gives these Texas gentlemen—but before I go into that, I would like to ask the gentleman who is in charge of the debate here today if there are any oil wells on this grazing land? That question is asked in all seriousness. As to this land which is to be subsidized, are there any oil wells on it?

Great silence over there. No answer. Texas is one of the richest States in the Union. There is more money down there apparently than in most other States. They have had a rapid growth in population and in wealth and they are making improvements all the time all along the way. They have shown they are amply able to handle their own State problems. This year they made a wonderful advance when they voted for Eisenhower. They are really going somewhere.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. I am wondering if some of those oil wells might not be shut down, because I understand the price of gas is going up, that some of the production is being held down so that they may increase the price to the consumer.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is due to this situation over around Suez, the canal being clogged up and the line of supply shut off, so that you and I and the rest of the people who use gasoline and oil are to pay a little more for it. So they will profit that way. Less oil, perhaps, but a higher price. There will not be any net loss to them down there.

This bill is important because it affords an opportunity to some to show the interested parties they are on the job.

Some of us have had Dust Bowl legislation brought before us in others years. Do you remember that? I have been reading some of these Westerns and apparently the situation has always revolved around a contest between the grazing boys, the people who want to raise cattle, and the fellows who want to farm, between the ranchers and the sod busters. Unless I am very much mistaken, what happened in the years gone by has been this. A breaking up by plowing or grazing of sod which has been followed by a blowing away of good soil. We are told now that the grazing was so close that the cattle ate all the top off the grass and the roots became so loose that now we must pay subsidies to reseed because the roots were blown away when that land was plowed or grazed.

Well, you cannot have it both ways unless periodically the land is reseeded at Government expense. Now, I suppose we are to blame, we in other sections of the country, if we do not remedy their error.

When the water in Lake Michigan and Lake Erie and Lake Huron got high, water let out by Canada which should have gone into Hudson Bay, but was dumped down into Lake Superior, came down through the St. Marys River and finally got into other of the Great Lakes, and washed out the improvements, the homes, docks, and harbors we had in Wisconsin and both sides of Lake Michigan and in some of the other States. Members will remember that we were not given relief even though the fault was not ours. Did they give us any help then? No, no; they would not do that. Now, when you want water over there for your Sanitary Canal, or a little drinking water in Chicago—although I do not know why you would want to drink that stuff—the gentlemen from Chicago are asking for more water from Lake Michigan—but when you want that, the State Department says, "No, you have got to see Canada first; that is an international problem."

Now, with reference to this Dust Bowl. Does the fault not lie with the people who lived there and misused the land? Is that not the reason for the present trouble?

Now they want us to come along and help pay them a subsidy to those who are being injured by a lack of rain and their own way of land use.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Does the gentleman regard it as a misuse of the land to continue to try to make a living if it is the only land a man has and there is no alternative to it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is just a silly interpretation of my statement. The gentleman is assuming there is no alternative. In my county we have poor, cold sand. We gave up trying to grow crops on it. I consider the misuse of the land is where a fellow goes along and insists on using grazing land for the growing of grain. There is some land that you cannot plow up and have it stay put. When rain fails, the wind blows, it just leaves that area. My Dutch grandfather from Pennsylvania used to rotate his crops. He never kept on plowing it and seeding it year after year. He let sod grow on it once in a while. He sowed wheat one year, had clover the next, and either planted corn or let it lie fallow the next. You plow up land that is not suitable for the growing of grain. You plow it up and seed it, harvest, and sell a crop year after year when the only sensible use is to use it for grazing?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Does the gentleman realize that the land that has been plowed is not eligible for this particular program? What the gentleman is saying may be true, but it does not relate to the matter in issue.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That would not be the first time a Congressman has talked about something that was not relevant, now, would it? However, from what information I have, knowing that we have rainless seasons or years, folks are using the land just as though they were certain rain would fall as and when needed.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let us just be fair about this situation. Our country has experienced subsidies since George Washington's time. They are just as American as George Washington was. We started out with the tariff under George Washington, and we have continued it. The American public has spent billions upon billions of dollars supporting the large manufacturers in the East. Believe it or not, I am not opposed to a tariff. I am not opposed to a reasonable tariff at all. I think they are entitled to some protection. I think it gives good security to our whole economy.

In addition, the slick magazines come through the mails and pay almost nothing for that privilege. That is based on the need to disseminate information in this great democracy. We give them practically a free ride, and I am for that, too, as long as it is proper.

Some of you, I think, may be in opposition to this measure. I hope you will not be, but perhaps you just do not understand our problem out there. It is a terrible situation there, by reason of this devastating drought we are going through. The author of this bill is the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], one of the soundest and best Members of this Congress, in my judgment, and he has given a lot of thought to it. The great Committee on Agriculture has brought it out.

This is not just a gimmick to give money away, it is a matter to give new life to the soil and the grass that grows on it and to give justice to our people. If you want us to go along with you and support the tariff and other things you may be interested in, we ask your indulgence, for this is a serious situation with us, and we would like for you to help us. When you do, we do not think you are doing any more for us than we are doing for you or are willing to do for you. Let us just be fair. Come on and help us.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would be glad to go along with you in preference to going along with these appropriations for other nations, sure, but is there going to be money enough to go around? As I understand, you are bound, or rather, not bound, but you are determined to continue these foreign-aid programs.

Mr. MORRIS. The gentleman knows that he and I pretty well have agreed on this foreign-aid proposition, as far as I am personally concerned. Some of the other gentlemen do disagree with me on that, and some on the gentleman's side disagree as to that. But that is beside the question here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no.

Mr. MORRIS. This is for our own people at home.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is only so much money. If you keep on giving it abroad you cannot give it to the Texas boys.

Mr. MORRIS. The gentleman may have a point there, but let us stay with the bill here. Let us give the people out there an opportunity to live, an opportunity to exist. Let us protect our soil and grass by passing this bill. It is a good bill, I think.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to add a few words here from a group of people who have no oil wells—they do not have any fish in any ocean—they cannot benefit directly from this bill at the present time—but we are for this legislation. You see, we cannot yet benefit from this legislation in south Missouri because we have a strange kind of drought. It is an unofficial, off-the-record drought without the benefit of Mr. Benson's official blessings. For some strange reason, we have not been declared a disaster area in spite of the fact that of all the States of the Union, we alone match Texas and Oklahoma for the dubious honor of having the worst pasture conditions in America, 26 percent of normal. We rank fourth worst in the Nation in the matter of hay supplies. Our hay production this year was 72 percent to 80 percent of normal at the outset and it is now almost totally exhausted by an unusually long feeding period that started as early as July and August of this year. Other States with pasture conditions 60 percent of normal and hay supplies 151 percent of normal are receiving disaster aid from the Federal Government. But the Secretary of Agriculture steadfastly refuses to declare southwest Missouri a disaster area. Nevertheless we will not be dogs in the manger. We are for good legislation which is good for America, and we are neither surprised nor impressed to hear that the Secretary of Agriculture is opposed to this bill. It is not the first time that he has tried to thwart the will of the Congress, and I suspect it will not be the last. For instance, it might have escaped your notice, but here is an excellent example. Public Law 875, which was passed by the 81st Congress, specifically states that "the President through the Secretary of Agriculture shall furnish to established farmers, ranchers, and stockmen feed for livestock"—and get this—"and seed for planting."

The sad truth is that in spite of the fact that the language is clear, the Secretary of Agriculture has never provided any seed to any drought disaster areas. Not one dime of additional money has ever been allocated through the ACP to counties suffering from drought so that farmers might reseed their ravaged pastures. The excuse is that the Government has no stockpile of surplus seed. But, I submit that excuse is too thin to pour. The Government owns no Commodity Credit Corporation surplus of hay either, but it has and is providing hay in many drought-stricken States. The mere fact that the Government has no surplus seed should not preclude the benefit that was intended by the Congress. One of the most important needs in any disaster area is to get some grass or permanent pasture back on the fields.

That was the intent of Congress or it would never have so stated in Public Law 875. But, because Mr. Benson has no surplus seed, the will of the Congress is thwarted. I quote from a conversation that I had just this morning with one Mr. Fred G. Ritchie of the Agricultural Conservation Service Program who said:

> The only additional funds that have been allocated over and above the regular conservation program has been for wind erosion and flood damage area. The department has not allocated additional funds under ACSP for drought practices.

So you see while it is on the books, while it is definitely the will of Congress, we apparently have not spelled it out sufficiently for the Secretary of Agriculture. Congress has tried. We have told them they should provide seed for reseeding. In fact, just yesterday we voted the money for it.

May I quote from page 3 under the "Disaster-loan revolving fund," which we voted yesterday as a deficiency appropriation, "$15 million that may be used for emergency feed and seed assistance." Note the word "seed" appears again in our drought legislation.

We want it done. We have appropriated the money, but the Department of Agriculture refuses to do it.

I had hoped to present an amendment to this legislation today which will direct the Secretary of Agriculture to provide Federal aid for the reseeding of permanent pasture. But after talking with the Committee on Agriculture I believe it would be better to present a special bill—which I will do at an early date—a bill which will spell out in no uncertain terms that the will of Congress is that the Government is to provide specific aid in the reseeding of permanent pasture and other vegetation in drought-stricken areas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. McCormack, the time of Mr. Brown of Missouri was extended 5 minutes.)

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Thank you very much.

I will present that bill, and I hope the Committee on Agriculture will give it prompt action, because it is already the specific will of Congress and has been so stated many times.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas whom we respect as a learned friend of agriculture.

Mr. POAGE. The committee will be glad to have the gentleman's bill.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Thank you very much.

I want to say a word about deferred grazing. Every person in this room is vitally concerned with the goal that will be accomplished by this measure and subsequent measures of drought assistance.

There can be pros and cons on whether a government has certain responsibilities in time of emergency to aid in the development of the sands of Arabia or Pakistan. There can be pros and cons on government's right to assume other responsibilities now taken for granted by governments all over the world.

But here we are talking about a time-honored government responsibility that is as old as government itself. Historically, even among the least civilized tribes, governments have come to the aid of their unfortunate citizens who suffer an act-of-God disaster.

And I do not care how modern we have become, or how much our concepts have changed. If this Government has so many commitments that it cannot extend a helping hand to those who are stricken by disaster, this Government has too many commitments.

But even more important than the good-neighbor principle involved in this legislation, let me point out to you that everyone in this Hall can vote for this bill out of sheer selfishness, if need be.

Everyone—in every congressional district—eats food; and every housewife I have ever seen is vitally interested in the lowest possible grocery bill every month. Now, this legislation deals with the vital source of both.

We are talking about the heart of the modern diet and the heart of economical grocery bills; because we are talking about protecting the most economical source of meat and milk. That is what we are eating in the 20th century. Not homemade bread or biscuits or lard anymore. We are eating meat, milk, and eggs.

And if we are to assure ourselves ever-increasing supplies of beef and milk; if the housewife is to continue to buy these supplies at the most economical price—we must protect nature's own way of producing meat and milk. We must keep grass on the grass farms of America. For to replace nature's grass with man-grown and harvested roughage is to increase every grocery bill in America.

The blue-stem plains of Oklahoma, Texas, and the West—and the woodland pastures of southwest Missouri—have been ravaged by an undramatic but horrible disaster. Not just one drought. Not just two. But 4 and 5 in a row.

America cannot afford to lose the meat and milk production of this area. For this is the source of economical production.

The bottom farms of the creek valleys and the deltas—the irrigated farms of the great reclamation areas—can produce crops more economically than the plains or upland farms. But no one, and Mr. Chairman, I mean no one, can produce meat and milk more economically than our grass farmers, who farm the low-priced thin land of America.

You cannot graze cattle or milk cows on $300 an acre land, unless you want to pay $3 a pound for a porterhouse steak and 50 cents a quart for milk. We must protect nature's grass.

After continuous droughts, our grass-farms are going. Some are as bare as this tabletop. Our farmers have seeded and reseeded, straining their pocketbooks and their credit, hoping against hope that next year the rains will come. But the rains have not come; and our farmers cannot dig into their jeans for another gamble.

The only way that we, as Americans, can keep grass on the grass farms is for all of us, through our Government, to make it economically feasible for the owner or renter to defer grazing and reseed his parched fields. That is what this legislation is designed to do.

Now this bill as it stands is directed primarily toward ranching; and this is just the first of many drought measures. Other will be brought forth which will mean more specific benefits for the small farmer who produces meat and milk.

But the principle of deferred grazing is sound. It is no money-making gimmick. By the time the Department of Agriculture carves this thing up to fit the money, the deferred-grazing payments will scarcely be enough to replace the income the ranchers could have gained by keeping cattle on even the ravaged acres.

But it will offer the farmer who looks toward the future some economic justification for sacrificing today's "bird in the hand" for tomorrow's "two in the bush." He will not make any money out of the deal. But if it is properly administered, maybe he will not lose too much; and the Nation will gain the replenishment of land at the very time the land needs it most—immediately after a serious drought.

This one piece of grass-farming legislation is small, indeed, compared to the Government programs for crop farming, especially when you consider that livestock products contribute 55 percent of our total gross agricultural product of the Nation.

The money involved is mere pocket change compared to the costly soil bank.

And few, if any, grass farmers can qualify for soil bank payments. You have to have a base acreage allotment to qualify for soil-bank acreage reserve program. And, even in the conservation reserve, only those acres that have been devoted to soil-depleting crops can be included.

All the grass farmers are asking here is deferred grazing for a minimum of 1 year and a maximum of 3 years and only for those areas that have suffered a major disaster.

This legislation is sound. It is sorely needed to insure the continuing supply of vital portions of our daily diet both in the immediate and long-range future. It strives to protect the most economical source of that production: Nature's way, the grass.

The people of south Missouri who have suffered 5 long years of drought and its accompanying disasters—who are even now in the midst of a major disaster, albeit an off-the-record one without benefit of Benson recognition—are proud to join in urging the passage of this bill.

Even if we never get to participate in the program, deferred grazing is good for America.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall take only 1 minute, simply to clarify the record on 2 or 3 points that have been raised. First: This drought is no respecter of State lines or of county lines. Some 600 counties in the United States are now officially identified by the Secretary of Agriculture as being of disaster propor-

tions. That is one-fifth of all the counties in the United States. It goes all the way from the Mexican border almost to the Canadian border; so it is a nationwide problem to which this bill would apply. The United States Weather Bureau and the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey have described the drought conditions as the worst that has beset this country in more than 300 years. It is so serious in its extent that it has been played up in front-page feature stories in practically every national magazine in the country during the last 6 months. Not only that, it was so serious it caused the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior in their solicitude for the plight of the people in this area and the land that is going to ruin, to go there recently and spend 3 days studying the problem and inspecting the actual area involved. I was present when the President came to my home county in San Angelo, Tex. There he was told by the best authorities in America—not some local man but by the best authorities in America—speaking from the scientific standpoint, from what has been learned in colleges and in connection with the soil-conservation program generally, in a very well-prepared brief that one of the best remedies to apply to this situation is the very provision set up and authorized in this legislation. So I think it is a sound program. This is not a relief measure for any individual or for any particular group. It is a relief measure for the soil of America in order to get it back to normal productive capacity so that some people, among the most stable people in the whole country, will be able to pay their taxes and get back to a normal life once it starts raining again. That is what this bill is for. It was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture, after careful study and consideration. Every practical soil conservationist in the country is for it.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BREEDING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, the seriousness of the drought situation as it affects my district and the entire drought area and Nation cannot be overemphasized.

As I have stated before, the people in southwest Kansas are not in a state of panic about the future of their farm communities, because they know that their area is subject to weather cycles of several years of dry weather, followed by several years of adequate rainfall. They know that things will get better. However, the severity and length of the present shortage of moisture at a time when farmers have faced rising costs and sliding-scale prices has created an immediate situation that concerns the whole Nation and which I would term a national emergency. Of course, we are concerned as a Nation when those who provide the major portions of our bread and meat are not rewarded in income for their lifegiving services because of a catastrophe of nature and lower parity prices. But we are also deeply concerned about what may happen to that great natural resource—our native pastureland—in a time of unparalleled drought. Already much grass has been overpastured and is in danger of being lost. Reseeding in these areas is expensive and often impractical. The bill to establish a deferred grazing program is aimed at making it possible for ranchers to rest these now marginal pastures. Such a practice would help to sustain the present stands of grass and allow it to seed and thicken while farmer-ranchers receive a nominal fee from the Government equal to prevailing rental rates as a temporary measure. If the pastures need to be rested some will wonder why the farmer or rancher does not do this on his own initiative. Many are doing this already. Others, destitute for immediate income, are continuing to pasture, with the hope that rain will be immediately forthcoming and the knowledge that this is their only possibility for any sort of income. This program will be the farthest thing from a plum for its recipients. The payments will be nominal, and the maximum to any one operator is set at $5,000.

To summarize, this bill, if passed, will serve three purposes. First, it will furnish some some of temporary monetary assistance to the drought-stricken areas. Second, it will encourage the kind of protection for one of our great natural resources that individuals in many cases will be unable to provide. Third, deferred grazing practices will make possible increased cover on pasturelands which may avert tremendous wind erosion problems that may otherwise result if the drought continues another year.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The program shall provide for payment for deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates not less than the average annual rental value of grazing land in the county as will induce sufficient participation in the program to accomplish its objective, taking into consideration the grazing capacity of the land, the funds available for carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors. No payment shall be made under the program if the deferred grazing is for a period of less than 12 consecutive months, or if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the deferred areas to other parts of the farm or ranch results in overgrazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any person for deferred grazing on land in any one county shall not exceed $5,000 for any 1 year.

SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The program authorized herein for any county shall be in addition to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such county authorized by any other law, except that no payment shall be made on the same land for deferred grazing under this and any other program concurrently.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of Public Law 875, 81st Congress, such funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized herein.

SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, 81st Congress (act of April 6, 1949), is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Secretary is authorized in connection with any major disaster determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, 81st Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended, to furnish to established farmers, ranchers, or stockmen feed for livestock or seeds for planting for such period or periods of time and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may determine to be required by the nature and effect of the disaster. Feed for livestock shall include the types of roughage, grain, or protein feed concentrates, or any combination thereof, and in the amount recommended by the State extension service which, with other feed available will provide the minimum subsistence ration for the basic herd of livestock. The Secretary may utilize the personnel, facilities, property, and funds of any agency of the United States Department of Agriculture, including Commodity Credit Corporation, for carrying out these functions and shall reimburse the agencies so utilized for the value of any commodities furnished which are not paid for by the farmers or ranchmen, and for costs and administrative expenses necessary in performing such functions."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 14, strike out all of section 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2367) to establish a deferred grazing program and a protein-feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 147, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 269, nays 110, answered "present" 2, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—269

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Anderson, Mont. | Ayres |
| Abernethy | Andresen, August H. | Bailey |
| Adair | Andrews | Baldwin |
| Addonizio | Anfuso | Barden |
| Albert | Ashley | Baring |
| Alexander | Ashmore | Bass, Tenn. |
| Alger | Aspinall | Beamer |
| Allen, Ill. | Avery | Beckworth |
| Andersen, H. Carl | | Belcher |
| | | Bennett, Fla. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Berry | Hale | O'Hara, Minn. |
| Blatnik | Harden | Osmers |
| Blitch | Hardy | Passman |
| Boggs | Harris | Patman |
| Bolling | Harrison, Nebr. | Patterson |
| Bonner | Harrison, Va. | Pfost |
| Boykin | Harvey | Pillion |
| Boyle | Hays, Ohio | Poage |
| Bray | Healey | Polk |
| Breeding | Hébert | Powell |
| Brooks, La. | Hemphill | Preston |
| Brooks, Tex. | Herlong | Price |
| Brown, Ga. | Hill | Rabaut |
| Brown, Mo. | Hoeven | Rains |
| Burdick | Holifield | Reece, Tenn. |
| Burleson | Holmes | Rees, Kans. |
| Byrd | Holtzman | Reuss |
| Byrne, Pa. | Horan | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| Cannon | Huddleston | Rhodes, Pa. |
| Carnahan | Hull | Riley |
| Carrigg | Ikard | Rivers |
| Celler | Jenkins | Roberts |
| Chelf | Jennings | Robeson, Va. |
| Chenoweth | Jensen | Robsion, Ky. |
| Chiperfield | Johnson | Rodino |
| Christopher | Jones, Ala. | Rogers, Colo. |
| Chudoff | Jones, Mo. | Rogers, Fla. |
| Clark | Judd | Rogers, Mass. |
| Coad | Karsten | Rogers, Tex. |
| Coffin | Kearns | Rooney |
| Colmer | Kee | Roosevelt |
| Cooper | Kelley, Pa. | Rutherford |
| Corbett | Keogh | Santangelo |
| Cunningham, Iowa | Kilday | Saund |
| | Kilgore | Saylor |
| Cunningham, Nebr. | King | Schwengel |
| | Kirwan | Scrivner |
| Curtis, Mo. | Kitchin | Selden |
| Dague | Knutson | Shelley |
| Davis, Ga. | Landrum | Sheppard |
| Davis, Tenn. | Lane | Shuford |
| Dawson, Ill. | Lanham | Sieminski |
| Dawson, Utah | Lankford | Sikes |
| Delaney | LeCompte | Siler |
| Dempsey | Lennon | Simpson, Ill. |
| Denton | Long | Simpson, Pa. |
| Diggs | Loser | Sisk |
| Dingell | McCarthy | Smith, Kans. |
| Dixon | McCormack | Smith, Miss. |
| Dollinger | McFall | Smith, Va. |
| Dooley | McGovern | Spence |
| Dorn, S. C. | McIntire | Springer |
| Dowdy | McIntosh | Staggers |
| Durham | McMillan | Sullivan |
| Edmondson | McVey | Talle |
| Elliott | Macdonald | Teague, Tex. |
| Engle | Mack, Ill. | Thomas |
| Evins | Mack, Wash. | Thompson, La. |
| Fallon | Madden | Thompson, N. J. |
| Farbstein | Magnuson | Thompson, Tex. |
| Fascell | Mahon | Thomson, Wyo. |
| Feighan | Matthews | Trimble |
| Fenton | Merrow | Tuck |
| Fisher | Metcalf | Udall |
| Flood | Michel | Ullman |
| Forand | Miller, Calif. | Van Zandt |
| Forrester | Miller, Md. | Vinson |
| Fountain | Miller, Nebr. | Walter |
| Frazier | Miller, N. Y. | Watts |
| Frelinghuysen | Mills | Weaver |
| Friedel | Morgan | Whitener |
| Garmatz | Morris | Widnall |
| Gathings | Moss | Williams, Miss. |
| Gavin | Multer | Willis |
| George | Murray | Winstead |
| Granahan | Natcher | Withrow |
| Grant | Nimtz | Wolverton |
| Gray | Norblad | Wright |
| Green, Oreg. | Norrell | Young |
| Gregory | O'Brien, Ill. | Zelenko |
| Griffiths | O'Brien, N. Y. | |
| Gross | O'Hara, Ill. | |

NAYS—110

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, Calif. | Church | Hillings |
| Auchincloss | Clevenger | Hoffman |
| Bass, N. H. | Collier | Holt |
| Bates | Coudert | Hosmer |
| Baumhart | Cretella | James |
| Becker | Curtin | Johansen |
| Bennett, Mich. | Curtis, Mass. | Kean |
| Bentley | Dellay | Kearney |
| Betts | Dennison | Keeney |
| Boland | Derounian | Kilburn |
| Bolton | Devereux | Kluczynski |
| Bosch | Dorn, N. Y. | Knox |
| Bow | Dwyer | Laird |
| Broomfield | Fino | Latham |
| Brown, Ohio | Fogarty | Lipscomb |
| Broyhill | Ford | McConnell |
| Budge | Griffin | McCulloch |
| Bush | Gubser | McDonough |
| Byrne, Ill. | Haskell | McGregor |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Henderson | Mailliard |
| Canfield | Heselton | Marshall |
| Cederberg | Hess | Martin |
| Chamberlain | Hiestand | Mason |
| May | St. George | Utt |
| Minshall | Schenck | Vanik |
| Moore | Scherer | Van Pelt |
| Mumma | Scott, Pa. | Vursell |
| Neal | Scudder | Westland |
| Nicholson | Seely-Brown | Wharton |
| O'Konski | Sheehan | Whitten |
| Ostertag | Smith, Calif. | Wier |
| Pelly | Smith, Wis. | Wigglesworth |
| Poff | Stauffer | Wilson, Calif. |
| Prouty | Taylor | Yates |
| Ray | Teague, Calif. | Younger |
| Reed | Tewes | Zablocki |
| Sadlak | Tollefson | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Machrowicz O'Neill

NOT VOTING—51

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Arends | Green, Pa. | Morrison |
| Baker | Gwinn | Moulder |
| Barrett | Hagen | Perkins |
| Bowler | Haley | Philbin |
| Brownson | Halleck | Pilcher |
| Buckley | Hays, Ark. | Porter |
| Cole | Holland | Radwin |
| Cooley | Hyde | Riehlman |
| Cramer | Jackson | Scott, N. C. |
| Dies | Jarman | Steed |
| Donohue | Jonas | Taber |
| Doyle | Keating | Teller |
| Eberharter | Kelly, N. Y. | Thornberry |
| Flynt | Krueger | Vorys |
| Fulton | Lesinski | Wainwright |
| Gary | Meader | Williams, N. Y. |
| Gordon | Morano | Wilson, Ind. |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Jarman for, with Mr. O'Neill against.

Mr. Steed for, with Mr. Machrowicz against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Gwinn against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Gordon with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Morano.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Cole.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Vorys.

Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Taber.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Riehlman.

Mr. Haley with Mr. Brownson.

Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Keating.

Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Doyle with Mr. Fulton.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Radwan.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Moulder with Mr. Meader.

Mr. Teller with Mr. Hyde.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Krueger.

Mr. Bowler with Mr. Wainwright.

Mr. Hagen with Mr. Williams of New York.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, on this bill I voted "No." I have a live pair with the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. JARMAN. Were he present he would have voted "Aye." I withdraw my vote and answer "Present."

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. STEED. I voted "No." If present Mr. STEED would have voted "Aye." I withdraw my vote and answer "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to establish a deferred grazing program as part of the relief available to drought stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes."

## BOSTON NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES COMMISSION

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3845) extending for 1 year the time in which the Boston National Historic Sites Commission shall complete its work.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted etc.,* That section 4 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area," approved June 16, 1955 (69 Stat. 136), is amended by striking out "2 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "3 years."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## DEWEY SHORT

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it was recently my honor—and I use the word advisedly—to be mentioned briefly in the most widely syndicated and most widely read column in the country, in connection with remarks made in introducing my colleague Hon. CHARLES H. BROWN to the Democratic caucus.

It is the custom in the caucus at the beginning of a new Congress to call the roll of States and the dean of each delegation presents any new Members from their respective States. In conformity with this happy custom I made a few well-chosen remarks in introducing Congressman BROWN which were reported in this particular column. Now I would positively not presume to question any statement made in this column. Far from it. It is an American institution—an integral part of the unwritten constitution of the Nation and it keeps more people in order than the FBI and all the United States marshals combined.

But in hearsay reports there inevitably creep in elisions, substitutions, and interpolations which sometimes leave a confused impression.

On that basis, may I say—and I call my colleagues of the caucus to witness—that neither on that occasion nor any other occasion of my life have I ever said anything that in any way reflected on my friend Dewey Short. I alluded to the hard fought campaign waged on the issues in every precinct, at every schoolhouse, and every crossroads in the congressional district but never in any way did I reflect on the high character and distinguished service of the man who has represented that district so many years in this House. I did pay tribute to the extraordinary man who, against impossible handicaps and incredible odds, defeated him in a district which went 30,000 for Eisenhower, but nothing was said

derogatory to the man who has served in this House with such honor to himself and his party, my friend, and your friend, Dewey Short.

## THE U. S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, an article published in the U. S. News & World Report under date of August 3, 1956, should compel all Members of the House to do some real thinking. This article lists how people have prospered in 17 boom years after allowing for taxes and changes in the value of the dollar. Thirty-five groups of people are listed, the highest percentage increase in real income was 107 percent. I was shocked to see how little prosperity our Federal Government workers have secured. Out of 35 groups they were 34th with a percentage of only 14 percent. We have been mighty slow in voting pay increases for postal and Federal workers, and when the legislation is finally passed the amount is greatly watered down. Postal and Federal employees have lagged behind in the improved American standard of living. Their increases are much less than the increases secured by practically everyone else in the American economic scene. The postal employee job because of its low wage scale has become most unattractive. Local postal officials are hard put in securing competent help and are complaining of the difficulties that they meet with in getting people to work at the low entrance salary of $3,660 per year. The service is suffering. The turnover in large offices such as Detroit, Mich., is as high as 33⅓ percent. The low-pay policy of the Post Office Department is costly to the Government of the United States. The better people are trained and leave as rapidly as they are trained. The result—a most costly operation and poor service.

Sixty percent of all American families today own their own homes, yet there are many instances on record where letter carriers have been turned down for G. I. loans because their earning power was not sufficient to assure repayment. Are we going to condemn our postal employees to a state of peonage? Are we going to keep them at a submerged economic level, where they have no hope of becoming homeowners? What are we going to do about it?

According to the public press, the Honorable Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, suggests a study. By the time such a study would be concluded, we would have no postal employees left. I know of no way of making a bad situation worse. I suggest to our colleagues on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee that they start immediate hearings, keep the hearings short, and report out one of the pay bills now before the committee so that we can speed its enactment into law.

## THE TRAGEDY IN SOUTHWEST VIRGINIA AND WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak of a tragedy that has come to the coal-producing area of southwest Virginia and neighboring West Virginia.

At approximately 1:55 a. m. on Monday of this week, shortly after the midnight shift had started work in the Bishop, Va., coal mine of the Pocahontas Fuel Co., an explosion occurred that killed 37 of the men working in that section of the mine. The remainder of the some 180 workers on the midnight shift escaped, and, displaying the courage that is typical of the men who face daily dangers in producing our coal, many returned to the mine to assist in the rescue and recovery operation that was launched.

The effects of this explosion, apparently caused by gas in the mine, will undoubtedly be long felt and long remembered in the coalfields surrounding the Bishop mine. The explosion has been etched in the faces and the minds of the surviving workers; the dependents of those who died have encountered a great personal loss in the deaths of their husbands, fathers, and sons. Approximately 154 dependents will experience the need that comes from such tragedy. Fortunately, they will receive assistance from the United Mine Workers' health and welfare fund and from the social-security program. And, in the highest traditions of the people who reside and work in our coalfields, aid and comfort will come from friends and neighbors.

I have expressed my deep sympathy to the families of the 37 who died in the early hours of Monday. I know that each Member of this body, Mr. Speaker, is interested and concerned over this tragedy.

Soon after the news of the Bishop explosion became known, I was in contact with the Director of the Bureau of Mines, expressing interest in the rescue operation and the investigation of the cause. The Director and his assistant for health and safety flew to Bishop to join field representatives on the scene and to take charge of the investigation.

Mr. Speaker, so that my colleagues will be fully apprised of the explosion, I include as part of my remarks a newspaper account from the Washington Post and Times Herald, an editorial from the Bristol (Va.) Herald-Courier, an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald, and a newspaper listing of the mine disasters in the State of Virginia since 1839.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has often expressed concern over the need for safety practices and programs in our coal industry. The various legislative actions over the years were culminated by the passage of the Federal Mine Safety Act of 1952; a health and safety program is an integral and important part of the Bureau of Mines; the United Mine Workers and the coal industry in general are encouraging and conducting safety programs; the various States have their individual agencies for coal-mine inspection and enforcement of safety regulations. However, the explosion of Monday—the worst mine disaster since 1951—and the deaths of 443 workers in the mines in 1956, clearly illustrate the need to improve and expand safety regulations and programs.

I would like to mention here the contribution of our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, Jr., who authored the changes in the mine safety law in 1952. These changes put real teeth in this law, which was passed with bipartisan support in the Congress. It has served to improve safety conditions in our mines and has undoubtedly been responsible for the decline in deaths and injuries.

However, there is room for improvement in the Mine Safety Act. I am issuing invitations to the interested parties, especially the coal associations, the United Mine Workers, the Bureau of Mines, and the Coal Research Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to advise me of their recommendations for changes. I intend to give study to possible additional legislative action to improve this law.

The February 1 issue of the United Mine Workers Journal devoted a portion of its issue to a summary of the mining deaths and injuries in 1956. I include as part of my remarks a table from the Journal, showing the fatality cause for 1956 and 1955:

*Fatality causes—1956 and 1955 compared*

| | Bituminous fatalities | | Pennsylvania anthracite fatalities | | Total fatalities | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1956 | 1955 | 1956 | 1955 | 1956 | 1955 |
| Underground: | | | | | | |
| Falls of roof or face | 213 | 194 | 31 | 34 | 244 | 228 |
| Haulage | 71 | 60 | 6 | 6 | 77 | 66 |
| Gas or dust explosions: | | | | | | |
| Local | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 4 |
| Major | | | | | | |
| Explosives | 8 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 12 |
| Electricity | 13 | 15 | 2 | | 15 | 15 |
| Machinery | 17 | 14 | | | 17 | 14 |
| Mine fires | 2 | | | | 2 | |
| All other | 11 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 15 | 10 |
| Total underground | 340 | 300 | 48 | 49 | 388 | 349 |
| Surface: | | | | | | |
| Haulage | 11 | 17 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 19 |
| Electricity | 4 | 5 | | 1 | 4 | 6 |
| Machinery | 5 | 5 | 1 | | 6 | 5 |
| All other | 3 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 11 |
| Total surface | 23 | 33 | 4 | 8 | 27 | 14 |
| Strip mines: | | | | | | |
| Haulage | 9 | 7 | 1 | | 10 | 7 |
| Electricity | 2 | | | | 2 | |
| Machinery | 2 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 11 |
| All other | 12 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 9 |
| Total strip | 25 | 24 | 3 | 3 | 28 | 27 |
| Grand total | 388 | 357 | 55 | 60 | 443 | 417 |

The Director of the Bureau of Mines, Mr. Marling J. Ankeny, as quoted by the

Mine Workers Journal, stated a few days ago:

Increasing activity in the coal industry has brought increased danger and all persons interested in mine safety must work hard in 1957 to better last year's record.

This statement should be a guide for this year, the need being emphasized by the Bishop explosion of Monday.

The Bureau of Mines this year has requested an appropriation of $5,900,000 for its health and saftey work. I urge that this sum be appropriated and that a review be made of the existing program to determine its adequacy. The director of the safety division of the United Mine Workers, Charles Ferguson, said in his statement on the summary of 1956 deaths and injuries in our mines that "coal mining can be made just as safe as any other major industry." The Bureau of Mines health and safety program is one of the main roads toward this goal.

Research into safety in coal mining is needed just as much as research in other work connected with the coal industry. I intend to bring this need for additional safety to the attention of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Bishop, Tazewell County, and the entire Nation have been stunned by the tragedy of 37 men being killed in a mine explosion. It is appropriate that we take note here today of this disaster and to extend the sympathy of the Congress to the affected families.

It should also be made a part of our deliberation in future weeks and months to take any necessary legislative action to insure that everything possible is being done to prevent a recurrence of the Bishop explosion, and to generally improve our safety programs and regulations.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 5, 1957]

THIRTY-SEVEN VIRGINIANS PERISH IN COAL-MINE EXPLOSION—ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY OTHERS FLEE BLAST—VICTIMS ARE BELIEVED SUFFOCATED WHEN DETONATION DRIVES OXYGEN OUT OF TUNNEL AREA AT BISHOP; BODIES BROUGHT OUT ON 12-CAR TRAIN

BISHOP, VA., February 4.—Thirty-seven miners died today in a rumbling gas explosion deep in the giant Bishop coal mine that burrows under the mountains of the Virginia-West Virginia line.

It was the Nation's worst mine disaster since 119 died in a blast at West Frankfort, Ill., on December 21, 1951.

There was no immediate official word about what touched off the blast that sent acrid, dust-laden fumes whistling through the mine 337 feet below the surface. A fireboss had reported the area free of hazard prior to the time the midnight shift went to work. Time of the explosion was set at 1: 55 a. m. (e. s. t.).

At a distance downslope from the disaster site the explosion seemed almost gentle. Charles Vaughan, of Bluefield, Va., a survivor, said he heard it, "but it wasn't loud at all."

LIKE PUFF OF WIND

One of Vaughan's companions said it was more like "a big puff of wind."

It appeared to many of the rescue workers that the lives of the 37 were snuffed out by the resulting lack of oxygen rather than the force of the blast.

About 180 men were underground at the time, but the 37 victims apparently were the only ones in the immediate blast area. First intimation something was wrong down in the cavernous 2-million-ton-a-year producer of the Pocahontas Fuel Co. came in a phone call to the tipple.

Rufus Trail, a mine motorman who was outside after carrying two hauls of men to the diggings, said a miner below reported things don't look right—there was a heavy accumulation of dust. This call was believed to have come some distance from the explosion area.

The elevator on the Virginia side was jammed at the top and miners began to file out on the West Virginia side from a mountain tunnel which is a normal coal exit.

Relatives and friends gathered at mine entrances on both sides of the line—an area hit less than a week ago by disastrous floods. They held to a waning hope that the trapped men somehow had managed to throw up a barricade against the smoke and fumes. And the Bishop community of 900 began its vigil while rescue teams moved into the mine from the West Virginia side 2½ miles away.

BODIES BROUGHT OUT

At 5:50 p. m., 12 mine cars rolled slowly from the drift entrance across the West Virginia line, carrying the bodies of the victims. Rescue workers, their faces and clothing grimy, rode on the cars, miners' lamps on their hats casting a weird glow in the dusk. Flashbulbs from photographers' cameras flared from all sides.

The bodies were unloaded from the cars, and 20 minutes later all were laid in a mine company building, where physicians began the grim task of establishing positive identification and making preliminary examinations.

Among the rescue workers were some men who had worked on the shift and had escaped.

Rescue workers said the last bodies were discovered buried under piles of slate brought down by the explosion.

The workers said there was no evidence any of the doomed men had attempted to build a barricade. No notes were found.

William A. Fullarton, special assistant to the president of Pocahontas Fuel, said it was believed an accumulation of gas in the mine had caused the explosion. What touched off the gas, he said, was unknown, but could have been any one of a number of things.

The victims were the only ones of the shift working in the vicinity of the blast.

The last word officials of the company received from below came by phone from Raymond Owensby. He said his section was all right if the smoke and fumes would abate. But Owensby was among the trapped men and perished in a spot described as a 5-minute walk from the foot of the elevator shaft.

Finally, masked rescue groups reached the area. They first reported finding 3 or 4 bodies, then 9.

At 9:30 a. m., while the crowds pressed near the entrances during a chill, drizzling rain, the company and the West Virginia Mines Department issued a joint statement that forecast the dismal climax.

"Less than 40 of the men were involved in the explosion, and of this number there are no survivors," said the statement.

Families already notified that their men were lost in the mine sat quietly in automobiles near the drift mouth, waiting for the bodies to be brought up.

Many of the town's 700 miners milled about the streets. All operations were suspended at the round-the-clock mine which has an output of 10,000 tons of soft coal a day, the United Press said.

Virginia and West Virginia mine-safety officials were joined by United States Director of Mines Marling J. Ankeny and an assistant in their check on the possible cause of the worst life loss in United States mining in the past 5 years.

---

[From the Bristol (Va.) Herald-Courier of February 5, 1957]

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SEVEN MAY BECOME YEAR OF DISASTER

If the year 1957 continues in the tragic manner in which it has begun, this will be known as the year of disaster in southwest Virginia and neighboring States. Hardly had we begun to recover from the relentless swirl of the floods when we were shocked by the mine disaster at Bishop, Va.

The lives of 37 men were lost. Our deepest sympathy goes out to the wives and families of these men who died in one of the most tragic manners possible.

Elsewhere in this issue there is a list of other mining disasters in our area. Many were larger in casualty list—but the size of a disaster does not have any effect on the numbing tragedy of individual loss on the part of families concerned.

It is a matter of minor concern now that the current mine-labor relationship provides survivors with adequate compensation for the future. In months to come, when the shock of grief has given place to the reality of necessity, this will figure much larger.

Meanwhile, our hearts must turn, in part, from the grief we have felt for the homeless in the Virginia coalfields to those who have their homes, but have lost those who animated them and made them homes instead of mere houses.

---

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 6, 1957]

DEATH BELOW GROUND

The Bishop, Va., mining disaster comes as a grim reminder that safety codes, no matter how stringent, cannot remove altogether the hazards of mining. The Bishop tragedy—this country's worst disaster in 5 years—resulted from an apparently unavoidable gas explosion which took 37 lives. There is so far no evidence of negligence. According to the United Mine Workers, the Pocahontas Fuel Co., which operates the mine, has a good safety record. Just before the midnight shift began work, a fire inspector found no evidence of hazard in the explosion area.

If any meager comfort can be drawn, it is the escape of 150 workers in the same mine. This contrasts with the West Frankfort, Ill., disaster in which 119 persons were killed in 1951, and with the infamous Centralia, Ill., tragedy whose toll in 1947 was 111. Partly as a result of those catastrophes, a long-needed Federal mine safety law was enacted in 1952. There is some reason to believe that enforcement of this code may have diminished the Bishop death toll. The mine was thoroughly rock dusted to neutralize coal-dust danger, as required by the Federal law. The absence of coal dust, miners feel, probably contained the explosion to only a portion of the mine. The investigation now in progress should determine the validity of this important point. Whatever the cause, the Bishop calamity emphasizes the importance of exacting safety standards for one of society's most dangerous jobs.

---

[From the Bristol (Va.) Herald-Courier of February 5, 1957]

MINE DISASTERS IN STATE DATE BACK TO 1839

Here is a list of major mine disasters which have occurred in Virginia:

March 18, 1839, Black Heath Mine, Chesterfield County, Va., 40 killed; 1850, Cox's Pit, Clover Hill, Chesterfield County, 7 killed; May 15, 1854, Chesterfield Mine, Chesterfield County, 20 killed; April 13, 1859, Bright Hope Mine, Chesterfield County, 9

killed; 1863, Raccoon Mine, Chesterfield County, 17 killed; April 3, 1867, Bright Hope Mine, 69 killed; 1875, Raccoon Pit, Chesterfield County, 3 killed; May 20, 1876, Midlothian Mine, Chesterfield County, 8 killed.

February 3, 1882, Midlothian Mine, Coalfield, Va., 32 killed; March 13, 1884, Laurel Mine, Pocahontas, Va., 112 killed; May 10, 1900, Lee Mine, Wise County, 7 killed; Nov. 22, 1901, Pocahontas Mine, Tazewell, 17 killed; October 3, 1906, Pocahontas Mine, Tazewell County, 36 killed; March 16, 1907, Greene Mine, Wise County, 6 killed; January 1909, Carbon Hill Mine, Chesterfield County, 6 killed; December 14, 1910, Greene Mine, Wise County, 8 killed; January 20, 1911, Carbon Hill Mine, Carbon Hill, Va., 7 killed.

January 21, 1911, Carbon Hill Mine, Chesterfield County, 7 killed; July 16, 1912, Carbon Hill, Chesterfield County, 10 killed; July 16, 1912, Old Dominion Mine, No. 1 Carbon Hill, Va., 8 killed; February 27, 1932, Boissevain Mine, Boissevain, Va., 38 killed; June 13, 1932, Splashdam No. Six Mine, Splashdam, Va., 10 killed; August 6, 1934, Derby No. Three, Big Stone Gap, Va., 17 killed; April 22, 1938, Keene Mountain Mine, Keene Mountain, Va., 45 killed; April 18, 1946, Great Valley Mine, McCoy, Va., 12 killed.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill H. R. 2367 may have permission to revise and extend their remarks, and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H. R. 2367.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the announcement I made heretofore with reference to the legislative program for tomorrow, may I say that there are 8 or 10 resolutions reported by the Committee on House Administration providing money that has been requested by various committees which have a relationship to certain investigatory resolutions heretofore adopted by the House. Those will be brought up tomorrow.

After consideration of these matters I see no program in sight for next week so I can therefore announce that there will be no program for next week, which means that all Members may act accordingly.

## BOY SCOUT WEEK, FEBRUARY 6–12

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I had a very important visitor in my office. His arrival was not unannounced, for he had scheduled his call days in advance. He had obviously used the intervening time for the preparation of his message and his attire.

My visitor arrived smartly dressed in a natty blue uniform, adorned with medals, awards, and decorations for the world to see and admire. This important personage, in a week in which Washington is receiving kings and crown princes from other lands, was Cub Scout Jack Zsakany from Den No. 21, Pack No. 718, of Suitland, Md. Jack had been commissioned to call at my office as well as the offices of several other Members because of his excellent achievements in Scouting. He informed me that February 6–12 is Boy Scout Week, to be celebrated throughout the Nation in commemoration of the 47th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America. The climax of the visit was his presentation of a Scout pin to me.

The presence of Cub Scout Jack Zsakany, the presentation of the Scout pin, and the speech of presentation which he recited so flawlessly, impressed and reminded me again of the genuine importance of the Boy Scout movement in America and throughout the free world.

The constructive principles and teachings of Scouting are manifold and the lessons learned are retained for they are absorbed in an atmosphere of wholesome, happy activity. "Duty to country" is the theme of the current anniversary week, a lesson of obligation to firm and worthy ideals.

Youth movements in totalitarian dictatorships have as their object the subjugation of the individual to the state. There boys are indoctrinated with the necessity to deny individual aspirations and to fling themselves into the pattern of unthinking and unequivocal obedience of thought and action demanded by the all-powerful and master state.

In its differences from such organizations, the Boy Scout movement symbolizes the epic and terrible struggle in which our generation is involved—the contest of the mechanisms of slavery and its denial of all individual rights with the principles of freedom, honesty, and truth in the conduct of relations among individuals and the affairs of nations.

I am convinced that no individual who has known a youthful association with scouting can avoid carrying the lessons learned in such experiences with him throughout his life. Our most dedicated leaders today are yesterday's Scouts. I am equally certain that Jack Zsakany and those fellow Scouts whom he represented in this ceremony are receiving rich and lasting benefits from their membership in the Cub and Boy Scout organizations. If all the boys in America could receive these same benefits and experiences, the immediate juvenile problems with which we are concerned would be dealt a severe blow and many of our jails and correctional institutions could be torn down. Even more, the patterns of usefulness and devotion to our Nation's finest ideals taught to each Boy Scout might be translated into that better and more secure world which every parent hopes will be the lot, if not the legacy, of his children.

## THE CIGAR INDUSTRY

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the bill which I introduced today—H. R. 4485—to amend section 5701 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to adjust the rate of tax on cigars, and to add a new definition to section 5702, is designed to correct a long-standing injustice which has been done to one of America's oldest and most tax-burdened industries—the cigar industry.

Ever since 1942 the cigar industry has been paying World War II emergency excise taxes. Hampered by the high tax rates, cigar consumption has fallen drastically, and many cigar factories have gone out of business. The decline in cigar consumption has resulted in an equivalent loss of markets for one of the Connecticut Valley's most important products—cigar tobaccos.

The bill which I have introduced will not only enable the cigar industry and cigar tobacco growers to prosper once again, but it will correct many of the inequities that arose because of the present method of levying cigar taxes, by means of price brackets. The cigar industry is the only American industry which pays its excise taxes on a price bracket basis. The brackets have been a straitjacket to cigar manufacturers, who have been prevented from adjusting their prices in response to changing economic conditions, without moving their cigars into a higher tax bracket, at the expense of the manufacturer and the ultimate consumer. The result has been economic strangulation for the manufacturer, insufficient funds with which to promote the sale of cigars, and a declining market for the tobacco farmer.

The bracket system has also perpetrated inequities on the low-income cigar smoker. The bracket system is regressive taxation at its worst, because the low-priced cigar, in most instances, pays a far heavier tax than the high-priced cigar. For example, the 3 for 25 cents cigar pays a tax that is one of the highest under the bracket system: over 21 percent of the manufacturer's net price, while the 15-cent cigar pays at half the rate or 11 percent of the manufacturer's price.

The popular 10-cent cigar pays the second highest tax rate under the bracket system, about 18 percent of the manufacturer's net price, while the higher-priced 3 for $1 cigar pays less than 10 percent.

There are scores of other instances that could be cited of discriminatory tax rates on cigars at various prices. They all stem from the antiquated method of levying cigar taxes by means of a tax-bracket system.

My bill is designed to eliminate these inequities by providing for a uniform tax rate of 8 percent of the manufacturer's net selling price, up to the present maximum tax of $20 per thousand cigars. It provides tax relief for all cigar prices except the very highest priced cigars, those retailing at 40 cents or more, which will continue to be taxed at the present rates.

The ad valorem method of taxation represented by my bill is a method of cigar taxation long advocated by the Treasury Department as the fairest and most desirable method of cigar taxation. As long ago as 1948 the Treasury Department stated that "inequities would continue to exist within price brackets. These problems could largely be avoided by adopting an ad valorem tax for cigars."

My bill is designed to give tax relief to the cigar industry and, at the same time, to correct the inequities of the present system of cigar taxation, by the method recommended by the Treasury. It is supported by the cigar industry and the tobacco growers of the Connecticut Valley and I hope will be favorably received by the Congress.

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, when the deficiency appropriation bill was voted on yesterday, I was unavoidably absent. One amendment placed a $15 million limitation on the amount to be spent for State and local administration of public-assistance grants. If I had been present, I would have voted "no."

## PROHIBIT CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES ABOARD COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to provide that the Civil Aeronautics Board shall have authority to issue rules and regulations to prohibit the consumption of alcoholic beverages aboard commercial aircraft.

I believe it is of the utmost importance that every conceivable precaution be taken to insure complete air safety, and for this reason I feel that the Civil Aeronautics Board should have the authority to issue the necessary rules or regulations to eliminate the presence of alcoholic beverages on commercial airlines.

My bill includes beer and wine within the meaning of alcoholic beverages. To interpret the term "alcoholic beverages" to exclude therefrom beer and wine would only amount to a distinction without a difference. Plainly, the purpose underlying this bill can only be accomplished when our airlines proscribe the serving of all intoxicating beverages.

Certainly our airlines have not been unmindful of the essentiality of such a prohibition. In this connection, it should be noted that on June 27, 1956, the commercial airlines entered into an agreement to establish a standard practice with reference to the serving of alcoholic beverages—not including beer and wine. The signatories to that instrument agreed, in part, as follows:

Each party hereto will continue its policy of not encouraging the consumption of alcoholic beverages by its customers.

None of the parties hereto will serve more than two drinks, each of which shall contain no more than 1.6 ounces (the standard miniature bottle) of any alcoholic beverage, to any one customer.

Each party hereto will continue to refuse to serve alcoholic beverages to any person when it has reason to believe that such service will result in such person's becoming objectionable to other passengers.

Is there any logic to a situation which inflicts upon airlines' personnel the responsibility for determining that alcoholic beverages should or should not be served to an individual? The serving of alcoholic beverages is not a necessity to the enjoyment of air travel. Neither do the people of our country harbor the notion that alcoholic beverages are conducive to the comfort of their air travel.

I am confident that no occupant of an airplane, whether passenger or crew member, will object to any measure that will serve to assure the safety of air traffic against the risk that some occupant might endanger the lives and property of others.

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, during the rollcall on the drought bill I was in conference with a constituent from my district. I arrived here too late to qualify. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

## GHANA, AFRICA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, 1 month from today, on March 6, a new nation will be born, the nation of Ghana, now the territory of Gold Coast, on the west coast of Africa. The administration has very wisely appointed the Vice President of the United States, Mr. NIXON, accompanied by his wife, Mrs. Nixon, to represent us there. I also propose to go personally, because Prime Minister Nkrumah is an old friend of mine. We went to Columbia University together.

The following comes from the Pittsburgh Courier and by Dr. Horace Cayton:

GHANESE AWAIT DAY OF INDEPENDENCE ON MARCH 6 AND THEY LIKE AMERICANS

Within the short span of 24 hours March 6, history will not only reverse itself, but millions of people throughout the world will pause to wonder if what they have been taught is true and decide that they must change their ideas about Africa to fit reality.

On the day that the new country of Ghana is born in the storied Gold Coast of west Africa, a new light will beam from what has been known as the Dark Continent and the rays of this sunlight of independence will illuminate the continent and presage the dawn of a new era of modern history.

The new citizens of Ghana, proud of a tradition which reaches back into the centuries when there was no England or France or Germany and confident that they can reassert the political acumen which enabled them to maintain a stable empire for a thousand years, will march fearlessly into the atomic age of the 20th century.

In addition to Liberia, Ghana will become an open door to Africa for America and American citizens.

The residents of the present Gold Coast like America. There are reasons.

One of the reasons, of course, is that the ancestors of most American Negroes came from the Gold Coast. There exists a feeling of blood relationship. The Ghanians have the same burning desire to show their mettle that possesses American Negroes.

Ghanians, however, also like the way America does things. They appreciate American hustle and know-how.

They know that Americans do the job yesterday and that they only put off the impossible until tomorrow.

This tempo and dauntless approach to problems appeals to the Ghanians' sense of inner genius.

As March approaches, the Ghanians are busy doing things the American way.

There is building and construction going on in all the principal cities at what is called the feverish pace.

New hospitals are going up. New libraries. Schools by the hundreds. Magnificent hotels. New paved roads. New bridges.

Everywhere you turn in Accra, the capital, Kumasi, or Takoradi, the mad rush is on to put the best foot forward for independence day.

The United States Government appreciates the friendly attitude of the Ghanians toward the United States and the American way.

Uncle Sam will be on hand May 6 to shake hands with the brilliant Premier of Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah, the man, educated at Lincoln University in the United States, who is scheduled to become the first President of Ghana.

Uncle Sam may take gifts to Ghana. The country is rich in natural resources, many undeveloped.

If Uncle Sam lends a hand, Ghana will become a pivotal demonstration of friendship and cooperation between the United States and Africa.

American Negroes who make the trip to Ghana are going to be amazed. Accra is no jungle city. With a population of 150,000, it has modern, tree-lined streets, large and beautiful banks, department stores, and public buildings, gardens, and parks.

Artisans are now rushing to completion the Arch of Independence, patterned somewhat after the famous Arc de Triomphe in Paris. This arch with a light that will never go out will be the birthmark of the new nation.

When the African Gold Coast region (over 100,000 square miles in area) assumes the ancient historical name of Ghana on March 6, the occasion will mark one of the most significant events of the second half of the 20th century.

It'll be more than the creation of a new nation. It'll be the beginning of a surge which in a few years, will likely see other segments of this great continent follow suit.

And when it happens, it will mark the dawn of a new freedom for untold millions of black peoples throughout that continent.

It'll have a profound impact on world conditions and world events. It will give non-

white peoples throughout the world a resurgence of the pride which has flamed fiercely down through the centuries.

Ghana, the new African nation, is no primitive country, without dignity and culture.

It has big, teeming cities, fine ports and harbors, modern schools, colleges, and universities, paved streets, big industries, luxury homes, up-to-date hotels.

It has its own black cabinet; with a black man as Chief Justice. Women are active in government, in radio, in civic and political life.

Ghana will have its own navy, army, air force • • • has its own modern system of communications, including telephones and radio.

It is the world's largest producer of cocoa. It also exports bauxite, manganese ore, rubber, diamonds, gold, mahogany. It is one of the wealthiest countries in the world, with many of its natural resources undeveloped.

---

### What Problems Face the New Nation, Ghana?

On March 6 a new nation will receive its independence.

Ghana, now the Gold Coast, will be granted the right of self-government. This is an event of fateful importance to Ghana, to Africa, to the British Commonwealth of Nations, and to the world.

To Ghana, independence day is the culmination of a long struggle for national independence—a movement which burst into flame with the return of Dr. Kwame Nkrumah from London in 1947 to become secretary of the United Gold Coast Convention, the chief nationalist party of that day.

Previously the Danes, the Portuguese, then again the Danes and finally the English had dominated the country.

Now Nkrumah and his small body of ardent followers are achieving an almost bloodless revolution. Gold Coast leaders are proud of the fact that in 3 years their country has reached a goal that Ceylon took 20 years to achieve and India a generation.

The spirit of nationalism which has inflamed the subjected peoples of the world has found fruition in Ghana.

But the leaders of Ghana, proud of their success, are modest in the face of the responsibilities it brings them as an independent nation in a troubled world.

The independence of Ghana is important to all of Africa. What the people of Ghana are doing is being watched by all subject African peoples.

Their achievement in getting self-government will be an inspiration to other African countries to redouble their efforts for freedom. Ghana will lead the way to political freedom for her neighbors: Nigeria, French and English Togoland, the Cameroons, French West Africa, and the Belgian Congo.

The impact of her success will be felt in Kenya, the home of the Mau Mau movement; it will be felt in Tanganyika, which is taking a few fumbling steps toward a multiracial state, and in South Africa, where a handful of white Dutch settlers are trying to maintain control in an overwhelmingly black population.

Throughout the continent of Africa, with its 200 million population, the fires of nationalism will be replenished by the achievements of the black state of Ghana.

Ghana's successful struggle for freedom will have its impact on the British Commonwealth of Nations. This Commonwealth has steadily become darker with the addition of India, Pakistan, Ceylon, and Burma. Now it will receive a member from black Africa.

How the Commonwealth will deal with this new dark member, undoubtedly a forerunner for other dark nations, will determine whether the Commonwealth itself can survive; whether this once proud and powerful empire now crumbling under the impact of farflung national movements among the darker peoples will be able to adapt itself to a system that will fully satisfy the aspirations of those who have for so long been subjects of its colonial policy.

Finally, Ghana's emergency as a free and independent black nation will have tremendous implications in a world which is two-thirds nonwhite and in which the Communist bloc is using the color consciousness of the nonwhite peoples to turn them against European colonials and imperialist nations.

Contrast the worldwide importance of two small nations—Israel and Ghana. Both have small populations; Israel has less than 2 million, Ghana has less than 5 million. But Israel operates from a backlog of 14 million Jews in the world's population.

Ghana is the forerunner of a freedom movement of an entire continent, the 200 million black and brown peoples of Africa. Further, in the growing self-consciousness of the nonwhite peoples—those of the Middle East, Africa, India, and Asia—Ghana will make history.

The extent to which Ghana lines up with the anticolonial countries—especially the nonwhite ones—will be important, in that it might set a precedent for other subjected peoples yet to be liberated.

Whether Ghana joins the Arab-Asian-African bloc which has been growing with such speed and has become such a vital factor in United Nations affairs, is important.

The significance of Ghana to the Continent of Africa is vital in the growing crisis of color and communism, a significance which exceeds its numbers in population, its size in square miles.

To compare it with other African states that have received liberation is enlightening and illustrates the relatively greater importance of this new nation. It is not an impoverished and barren state with little culture and no world connections, as is Libya.

It is not a truncated area dependent upon another country such as the Sudan and Eritrea.

Ghana is wealthy, it is located in Black Africa, the Africa below the Sahara where Negro nationalism is strong. Ghana has a small but enlightened educated class, a strong political party system, a relatively stable government and economy, and connections with the outside world.

What will be the problems of this new state when it receives independence?

The important ones will be internal politics, industrial expansion, and cultural and social development. Ghana has arrived at a measure of political unanimity which is in striking contrast to Nigeria.

The British laid down stringent rules as to the development of a stable party system which would express the will of the people of the country before they entertained ideas about political independence.

Even when, in 1954, Nkrumah's party received 72 out of 104 of the seats in the legislative assembly, the Colonial Office questioned whether the Convention People's Party (the government party in control) had sufficient backing in the population to go forward with plans for independence.

But the opposition to the CPP still exists. According to K. A. Gbedemah, Minister of Finance, in a recent speech in New York, the opposition employs political tactics which, to use his words, "leave much to be desired." During the question period of this meeting, Minister Gbedemah was asked whether or not the opposition would refuse to take the oath of allegiance to the new state—after independence officeholders will be required to swear allegiance first to Ghana rather than to the Queen of England—he expressed hope but some doubt.

In an interview at the United Nations with this reporter, Gbedemah explained that at the time of independence if the opposition did not take the oath they would not be seated in the legislature and their seats would be filled by a loyal group at a by-election.

Again he stated his belief that the opposition would not go that far.

In explaining the situation the Minister said: "The most important problems facing the new nation are political. It is how to get the people to accept a democratic way of life. The opposition does not want to accept the principle of democracy, the rule of the majority after there has been a debate on a question and the issue voted."

There seems to be no question but that the Convention Peoples Party, and Nkrumah as its leader, have the majority of voters.

But the opposition parties—the National Liberation Movement, the Northern Peoples Party, and the Togoland Congress—have so far failed to realize their position under national sovereignty. That this will be achieved in time there is no doubt.

At the present the fears of the leaders of the Convention Peoples Party seem a little exaggerated.

However, there is some evidence that Mr. Gbedemah has cause to worry. Recently the Chief's Council representing Ashanti, one of the four regions of the Gold Coast, has said it would boycott all celebrations when the territory became independent in March. The council further adopted a resolution to ask the British Colonial Secretary to declare Ashanti an independent state.

Nkrumah's constitution, the main feature of which is a centralized government, is and will continue to find opposition from those who wish a federal constitution with local governments for each of the country's four regions.

The second most important problem for the new nation will be economic. The economy of Ghana is agricultural and extractive. It is the largest producer of cocoa in the world, supplying more than one-third of the total world crop, and the largest exporter of manganese.

The country also has substantial wealth in timber, gold, and diamonds.

There is the desperate need to develop these and other manufacturing industries to balance the economy. A project, still in the planning stage, is the ambitious one of harnessing the Volta River which flows steeply down to the sea through an area in the country that contains the richest bauxite deposits in the world.

Such a development would be capable of generating 564,000 kilowatts of electrical power and smelt 210,000 tons of aluminum per year. It would cost £144 million. Both English and Canadian aluminum companies are interested in the possibilities.

In speaking of this the Minister of Finance said that even the combined resources of English, Canadian, and Ghana capital were insufficient to finance the project and that it in all probability would necessitate a loan from the World Bank.

If the project is completed, it will prove profitable and work a profound change in the economy of the country and will lessen its critical dependence on cocoa.

---

### The New Nation: Ghana—The Commonwealth Changes Complexion

Within a few years the complexion of the British Commonwealth has turned darker and darker. The proud Nordics of the commonwealth nations—the rulers of the world—have found their ranks invaded by yellow, brown, and now by black peoples. Pakistan, India, Burma, and Ceylon have relieved the dead white monotony of that family of nations. The new applicant is Nkrumah of Ghana. This development was dictated by logic and history.

Ghana is, after Malaya, the richest of all British dependencies. Why, one might ask,

were the British willing, some say even anxious, to let the country go? In 1948 the British Governor of the Gold Coast issued an order sending into exile Nkrumah and other nationalist leaders on the grounds that his removal was expedient for securing the public safety and the maintenance of order.

Even after he was released, Nkrumah set up the machinery for a civil disobedience campaign which he called positive action. In spite of friendly negotiations with Sir Charles Arden-Clarke, then the British Governor, Nkrumah called a general strike. For this he was again arrested and sentenced to 2 years in jail on the charge of having fomented an illegal strike.

During his imprisonment he ran for office and received the overwhelming support of the Province of Accra. Knowing that Nkrumah's party would receive a majority in the legislative assembly, the British were in a quandary about keeping its leader in jail. They solved it by releasing him to head the new Government.

Why were the British so gentle with this insurgent native leader when throughout its history that country often had employed force and violence to maintain its rule?

The answer is to be found in the new realization on the part of the British that their day of controlling and ruling peoples through force was done. They had learned a powerful lesson in India and realized that their shaky economy would not allow the maintenance of huge armed forces to subdue dependent peoples in view of the growing spirit of nationalism among the oppressed. The Empire was dissolving; subjected people could not be held down indefinitely. Shrewd Britishers looked around desperately for some way of saving something out of the liquidation of their colonial empire.

The phrase "creative abdication" was coined to describe this new policy. The British are pulling out because they must, but they intend to hold on to something even after they go. It is because of this policy that 1,500 British civil servants in the Gold Coast for the past few years have been working themselves to death to give the country away.

John Gunther in his monumental book, Inside Africa, written in 1953, describes it this way:

"The policy to 'give—and keep' only works if you give before you have to give. The secret of successful British policy, as we have mentioned before is pace—to judge the timing right. The British do not consider the advance of the nationalist movement to be a defeat, but—if things turn out well—almost as a victory. In 1949 Nkrumah stood for immediate and complete independence outside the Commonwealth. Today he is fully prepared to accept dominion status within the Commonwealth, and does not even say when he wants it. The British have given up a lot. But so has Nkrumah."

This policy has dismayed other colonial countries, especially the French. But its wisdom can be seen when we compare England's relationship with her former colonies—India, Burma, Ceylon, Pakistan—with the disastrous results which the French have achieved in Indochina which are apparently to be repeated in North Africa.

The idea of pace, which Gunther stresses, must be kept in mind, however, to understand England's contradictory behavior in other parts of the continent. The Gold Coast, and to an extent Nigeria and English Togoland, had reached a point in their fight for liberation where to keep them from self-government meant subjecting the area by military force. Furthermore, on the west coast of Africa there were few white settlers—Ghana is 99.8 percent black—and white people did not own the land.

On the east coast of Africa—where there is a larger white population; where large tracts of the most fertile land are owned by whites; and where the black population is not as well trained or as insistent on independence—the English, feeling more secure, do not employ the idea of creative abdication. There they will hold on and exploit. One cynical Englishman explained, "There are many mansions in our kingdom."

The statement that Ghana was given her freedom, however, should not be interpreted to belittle the valiant struggle of Nkrumah and his group. Their activities forced the English to realize that their thrust for freedom was powerful; that the retention of that country in the Commonwealth was preferable to an embittered country that had to fight for political freedom.

Although the Commonwealth gradually has become accustomed to the presence of nonwhite Prime Ministers at their deliberations, some of the dominions—South Africa especially—have not been overjoyed at their presence. Now they are faced with a black man from Africa, who will have equal status.

On this point South Africa has made her feeling abundantly clear. Dr. Malan, former head of that state, talked of the Gold Coast with contempt and loathing. His successors view with alarm, as a threat to white dominance in Africa, the admittance of a black Prime Minister to Commonwealth circles. South Africa has made veiled threats that she might withdraw from the Commonwealth if Nkrumah joins the meetings of the British dominions.

Although lukewarm to membership at first, Nkrumah and his followers are now anxious for membership in the Commonwealth. The military protection which this association gives, as well as the economic advantages of trade relations within the Commonwealth, have much to offer a new and undeveloped nation.

So, as the possibility of independence came closer, Nkrumah with characteristic political wisdom, subjected his emotions—emotions which must have arisen out of his imprisonment—to the welfare of the state. At the present time, Ghana is anxious to be a member of the Commonwealth, indeed, just a trifle afraid that she will not be accepted or rather than there might be some difficulty accompanying her acceptance.

Mr. Gbedemah, the Minister of Finance, seemed a little sensitive in his talk with this reporter when this subject was introduced. He said he expected that admittance to the Commonwealth would be automatic but then hastily added that if South Africa caused any fuss Ghana would rather not become a member.

When pressed as to what England would do if she had to make a choice between Ghana and South Africa, Gbedemah was positive in his feeling that England would choose his country. "Ghana will set the pattern for other African states which will soon get their freedom," he stated. "Those combined states are more formidable than South Africa."

There is every indication that the Commonwealth will receive Ghana with open arms. At this period of history—when British prestige is at a new low ebb; when England has incurred the wrath of colored peoples throughout the world; when she has antagonized the United States by her invasion of Egypt—the inclusion of Ghana in the Commonwealth is not only fortuitous but perhaps essential to her well-being as a great power.

Other countries of the world would react unfavorably and consider such an exclusion a major diplomatic error. England can make just so many more blunders and continue as a powerful nation.

For Ghana, the advantages of membership in the Commonwealth are obvious. The country has no Army but is of great military importance. If the Mediterranean should be cut off in a new world war, Accra would reassume the position it had in World War II as an indispensable base for communication across Africa. But Ghana would be helpless if an attack was launched against this strategic port and needs the assistance of England and the Commonwealth.

There are also many economic advantages in being in the Commonwealth. One striking illustration of this is the Volta River project. The money for this gigantic development is, in part, to be underwritten by England and Canada. The entire development and exploitation of her natural resources will be aided by membership in the Commonwealth.

Politically, too, Ghana will gain by membership in this exclusive fraternity of nations. She will be brought into closer contact with such white nations as Canada which is progressive and sympathetic to her problems. Furthermore, she will immediately be associated within the intimate framework of the Commonwealth with the non-white nations such as India, Burma, and Ceylon. Membership will thrust the new nation into the mainstream of world politics rather than leave her a small isolated, unprotected and undeveloped state to work out her many problems alone.

The importance of Ghana to England should be stressed. The freedom of Ghana and its inclusion in the Commonwealth is the fulfillment of a promise, perhaps made with little thought of fulfillment, to hundreds of millions of Africans. It is partial insurance that the continent of Africa will not swing into the Soviet sphere of influence.

It is some little assurance that the world will not be divided into racial camps. England has long seen these possibilities and the necessity of receiving Ghana into her exclusive club of nations. The Suez affair which threatened to take on the aspect of a war between whites and non-whites made this necessity an imperative. England needs Ghana in the Commonwealth as much, if not more, than Ghana needs the advantages she will receive from such membership.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

---

## THE QUARTERMASTER RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY AT NATICK, MASS.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a little more than 2 years ago, in October 1954 at Natick, Mass., the Quartermaster Corps consolidated its research and development command post and its central laboratories in a new, comparatively small facility, bringing together most of its widely scattered research activities from all over the country.

The great need for this consolidation of scientists and technicians, to work together in close intimacy, was one of the hard lessons learned from World War II and confirmed by our later military experience in Korea.

Many of you will remember the prolonged discussions and consideration that was given this proposal, and the selection of Natick, Mass., in the Boston area, as the best possible site for this concentration.

Today I want to report to you what has happened since the new consolidated research center commenced operations and briefly describe some of the accomplishments and the definite improvements that have been made by the Quartermaster in the field of providing better clothing, equipment, and facilities for our soldiers. This has come about as the direct result of your approval of this project and the united support you gave to the leaders of both parties in advocating this undertaking.

I can report that this bringing together of the scientific and technical personnel at Natick has been completely successful. The scientists and technicians and their families have settled down in that beautiful town and the surrounding suburbs of Boston, and they are very happy, not alone because of the excellent working environment, but because of the wealth of scientific knowledge and experience that surrounds them and is available to them.

The cost of erecting this laboratory was less than $10 million, on land partly donated by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. At the time it was erected, more than $1 million was held back from the original appropriation by the Department of Defense. The withholding of this construction money is now proving to be a severe handicap to the work that is underway or should be undertaken. Personnel are badly crowded together, so this year I hope that the Department of Defense, the Army, and the administration will approve at least this expenditure of the original appropriation so that the work can be expanded. It is badly needed.

Recently the statement was publicly made that the laboratory was hoarding scientists. This is not so. As a matter of fact, this consolidated laboratory, like other military laboratories, has great difficulty holding on to its qualified men for badly needed projects, and trying to obtain other qualified men for other important projects.

This research is most important for national defense, the workload is so heavy that every qualified man is working to full capacity. To their great credit, they are staying with the job, inspired by the knowledge that they are making great contributions to keeping our American soldiers the best equipped in the world.

If the Members of this body, particularly veterans of the Army, should visit distant outposts of our Army, either in the Arctic, the desert, the jungle, or this laboratory, they will be very much impressed with the great improvements that have been made in clothing, protecting, feeding and housing our soldiers, and the very many improvements that have been provided for making them more comfortable and efficient in every climatic environment and readiness for any emergency.

Outstanding accomplishments have been achieved in Natick during the past 2 years. This success has excited the close interest and praise of the countries allied with us. Representatives of these foreign nations visit the laboratory frequently to learn what is being done, so that their armies may profit from our discoveries and improvements.

When you have the opportunity you should come to New England and by all means see this laboratory at work. You also will be greatly impressed with the displays, the ingenious equipment that is on display, and the great progress that is being made. You can be sure that you will be welcomed by the commanding general, his staff, and the scientists who are responsible for these advances.

I am very much impressed with a growing conviction, that logistic superiority, particularly in this field will not alone be a most powerful factor in the event of enemy attack but may be the decisive element in achieving victory.

It is probable that we cannot select the climatic battleground, and by the very nature of any modern conflict it may be fought in the bitter cold of the Arctic, the burning sands of the desert or the sweltering heat of the jungle. The morale and protection of our American soldier will always be the best, to a considerable degree because of intense efforts and accomplishments of the Quartermaster Corps in foreseeing and preparing for every combat condition. If our troops are sustained and protected to maintain top fighting condition, it will have a profound effect on the outcome.

When the first field tests were made in the Arctic several years ago, one of the findings publicly announced was that under conditions of 40 to 50 degrees below zero, 90 percent of the energy and time of a combat soldier was consumed in survival and only 10 percent of his efforts were available for combat.

This problem has received long and deep study by the Quartermaster Research experts and it can now be stated that substantial improvements have been made and are being made to provide greater combat power to the American soldier under these climatic handicaps.

This has been accomplished in numerous ways. Better clothing, lighter and more efficient equipment, more effective protection, more acceptable food that can always be served hot. These are only some of the ways this problem has been solved.

We all know that the character of war has radically changed as the result of our experience, that of other modern armies, and the possibility of atomic warfare. No longer do our military leaders anticipate a static type of warfare, or congested fighting in small areas. The new concept anticipates fast moving, hard-hitting independent units striking at unexpected places. Such units will probably be supplied by air drops, and as the strategic and tactical concepts are now changed, so the obligations of the Quartermaster Corps have radically changed. It is in this new field of logistics that the Quartermaster has made its most striking advances and improvements.

No longer is the American soldier bundled up in felt-like clothing when he lives under Arctic conditions. The layer principle, discovered by the Quartermaster Research Laboratories, provides successive, relatively thin, layers of clothing which can be put on or taken off to meet conditions. The soldier is warmer and more comfortable, but has much greater freedom of movement.

Formerly arctic foot protection for the soldier was the shoe-pac and the felt arctic boot. These required the wearing of 8 wool socks and 4 felt inner soles. The new rubber insulated boot, developed by the Quartermaster, with built-in insulation, is now standard equipment, with only one pair of socks needed.

Recently, I am told, one of our Quartermaster generals, in the 50-degree below Arctic, put on a pair of these new insulated boots without any socks, just his bare feet, and moved around in the snow and frozen ground for quite a while and was perfectly comfortable.

When the first of these crude insulated boots were sent to Korea in the last days of that conflict, the old soldiers quickly found out their usefulness and value.

An unexpected advantage of these boots was discovered by the Surgeon General's Office at the end of the Korean conflict. Not alone had the use of these boots reduced the incidence of trench foot and gangrene more than 50 percent, but there was a marked reduction in the number of soldiers losing feet from buried antipersonnel mines. The soldier might be blown over, might even suffer from a broken leg, but not so often did his feet suffer injuries requiring amputation. Since then the boot has been perfected as the result of exhaustive field tests.

The soldier of today under extremely cold conditions carries his own stove, and cooks or heats his own meals, on a stove half the weight of his World War equivalent. Soon he will be carrying one meal rations instead of a full-day ration, with whatever variety he wishes. This is possible because of new Quartermaster developments in freeze-drying, radiation preservation, precooking, and new types of packaging, working closely with the food industry.

The soldier's pack is a problem still receiving constant research. Fifty pounds is still the standard weight, but marked improvement has been made by the stress physiologists at Natick, involving extensive field testing of the soldier's ability to carry this pack for long distances without tiring. Now by scientifically placing the pack on the soldier's back it is much more comfortable and acceptable.

Lightness in weight is especially important because of the constantly growing use of aircraft to supply the troops. A nylon helmet liner which gives 30 percent more protection against penetration, body armor that saves lives and reduces danger from wounds, rubber that will remain flexible even under the

coldest conditions, the cold-bar suit that protects against immersion in icy waters, new air-drop containers for gas and fuel oil and a host of other new types of equipment were developed by the Quartermaster scientists and are constantly being improved, tested, and accepted. New sleeping bags, canteens that will not freeze at 40 below, new survival packs, new desert uniforms have come from the Natick laboratory.

Recently studies have been completed which prove that by the use of new clothing and equipment, our troops can be quickly moved from a hot climate to which they are acclimatized, to a cold climate without loss of fighting efficiency, time for climatic adjustment or hardship.

The center of all of these operations is at Natick. From there the cooperation of hundreds of manufacturing concerns, industrial laboratories, and universities in 32 States is enlisted, and they are working on contracts with the Quartermaster Research Command.

While the scientific staff at Natick is of high caliber, the number is relatively small. When, through this teamwork, new discoveries or developments are achieved, the improvements are tried out in climatic chambers at Natick, where a complement of regularly enlisted soldiers who have volunteered, test the clothing or equipment under conditions of climate and exposure that might be met in the field.

If a new development is approved, it is then issued to a limited number of troops in the field, either at the top of Mount Washington, Arizona, Alaska, Panama, or other places. This provides thorough field testing and acceptance. Only after this thorough tryout does the improvement become standard for the Army.

In this field testing there has recently been adopted a radio system by which each soldier used in a test automatically sends physiological data back from the field to a central recording point. This system of telemetering is most valuable in exactly determining the protection against heat, sun and cold, wind resistance, water repellency, the burden imposed upon the soldier, and other physiological reactions provided by the garment or equipment.

It is only through this scientific, thorough and constant study that we can be sure that our soldiers' clothing and equipment is the best. The expenditure by the Quartermaster Department in this work is so relatively small that it represents a very small price to pay for superiority.

What is not generally recognized, however, is that while these improvements in clothing and equipment can be seen, the hidden values from this work are probably even more important. Of equal, and possibly more importance is the soldiers acceptance of new or improved equipment, so that he will not discard it when going into battle or under combat conditions. Every old soldier will remember the piles of discarded equipment along the roadside. This will not be so, if we ever have to fight again, because soldiers acceptance and willingness to carry the equipment to his destination must be positive before providing it to the troops.

Great economies are being made in all fields by quartermaster research, by the adoption of better storage methods, and the substitution of less costly items without loss of efficiency and usefulness. A soldier's clothing and equipment, today and tomorrow, will represent great savings of money as well as greater efficiency, and the amounts saved each year are so large and the cost of the scientific and technical research that made these economies possible, is so small, that it is a mere pittance by comparison.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BREEDING (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) for 10 days on account of death in the family.

To Mr. COFFIN for the remainder of the week on account of official business in district.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. IKARD, for 1 hour, on Thursday, February 7.

Mr. BRAY for 10 minutes on tomorrow.

Mr. HENDERSON on tomorrow for 10 minutes.

Mr. MCCORMACK for 20 minutes today.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. MULTER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VANIK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DIXON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania.

Mrs. PFOST.

Mr. WILLIS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. CANFIELD and to include a letter.

Mr. WALTER.

## SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the first conference of State governors for the protection, in the public interest, of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 7, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

438. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy, Air Force, and Armed Services Petroleum Purchasing Agency prime contract procurement actions with small and large concerns for work in the United States, pursuant to Public Law 268, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

439. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to, the Lignite Research Laboratory, Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the calendar year 1956, pursuant to the act of March 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 85); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

440. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting an interim report in respect of the administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, which expired on December 31, 1956, etc., pursuant to section 19 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

441. A letter from the vice chairman, Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, transmitting an interim report of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, pursuant to Public Law 601, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

442. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide that appointments to the position of Deputy Maritime Administrator shall be made by the Secretary of Commerce under civil service laws, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

443. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens who have been found admissable into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 29. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct a full and complete investigation of matters relating to the laws, regulations, directives, and policies, including personnel, pertaining to the Department of State and such other departments and agencies engaged primarily in the implementation of United States foreign policy and the overseas

operations, personnel, and facilities of departments and agencies of the United States which participate in the development and execution of such policy; with amendment (Rept. No. 29). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 65. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to investigate and study appeals for charitable contributions made in the name of the American veteran; with amendment (Rept. No. 30). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 113. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Works to conduct studies and investigations within the jurisdiction of such committee; with amendment (Rept. No. 31). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 128. Resolution to authorize the Committee on House Administration to continue the study and investigation begun under House Resolution 262 of the 84th Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 32). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 139. Resoution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct investigations and studies with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 33). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 156. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1056, a bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents, to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters; without amendment (Rept. No. 34). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 4485. A bill to amend section 5701 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to adjust the rates of tax on cigars, and to add a new definition to section 5702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 4486. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4487. A bill to recognize the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., a national nonprofit nonpolitical war veterans' organization, for purposes of bestowing upon it certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4488. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4489. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4490. A bill to provide for loans to enable needy and scholastically qualified students to continue post-high-school education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4491. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in operation of industries affecting commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4492. A bill to provide a deduction for income-tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income-tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4493. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an individual to deduct, for income-tax purposes, the expenses incurred by him for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4494. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4495. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to establish corporate tax rates of 22 percent normal tax and 32 percent surtax, and to increase the amount of the exemption from such surtax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4496. A bill to promote further respect for an observance of civil rights within the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 4497. A bill to amend sections 1331 and 1332 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the amount in controversy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H. R. 4498. A bill to provide for assisting States and local communities to devise means of solving the financial problems arising out of their obligation to construct and to maintain an adequate system of public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 4499. A bill to provide for the issuance of checks and continuation of accounts when there is a vacancy in the office of the disbursing officer for the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 4500. A bill to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 4501. A bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 4502. A bill to amend section 601 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the consumption of alcoholic beverages aboard aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 4503. A bill to provide that all interests of the United States in a certain tract of land formerly conveyed to it by the Commonwealth of Kentucky shall be quitclaimed and returned to the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 4504. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 4505. A bill to grant the status of permanent residence to parole aliens fleeing persecution and tyranny of totalitarian governments, and to Korean orphans, adopted children, and other aliens on parole status; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 4506. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Weber Basin, Utah, for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 4507. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 4508. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 4509. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the establishment of special quotas, and preferences within quotas, for aliens immigrating directly to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 4510. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Services.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 4511. A bill to declare a certain portion of Back Cove at Portland, Maine, to be nonnavigable water of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 4512. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to formulate a plan and make recommendations for consolidation in a single executive agency of the responsibility for, and supervision of, activities involving Antarctica; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 4513. A bill to provide a plan for greater opportunities of employment, for distribution to owners, management, and to all other employees certain amounts of corporate income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4514. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4515. A bill to provide for the coinage of gold $10 pieces and gold $5 pieces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 4516. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 to grant officers and employees of the Federal Government with service-connected disabilities of 10 percent or more, sick leave with pay at the rate of 26 days per year; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 4517. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 4518. A bill relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4519. A bill to continue the exemption from the Classification Act of 1949 of

certain employees whose compensation is fixed and adjusted in accordance with prevailing rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 4520. A bill to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to authorize permanent certification for certain air carriers operating between the United States and Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 4521. A bill to extend to fishermen the same treatment accorded farmers in relation to estimated income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 4522. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the refund of taxes and duties paid on certain distilled spirits, wines, and beer lost or destroyed as a result of a major disaster; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 4523. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit an annuitant to receive his annuity even though he renders compensated service for the outside employer by whom he was last employed before his annuity began to accrue; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 4524. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 4525. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to contributions and gifts by corporations to or for the use of schools of engineering and related technical subjects; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 4526. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the Knights of Columbus; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 4527. A bill to assist recipients of public assistance and other needy persons in improving their nutritional standards; to assist in maintaining fair prices and incomes to farmers by providing additional outlets for surplus agricultural commodities; to prevent burdening and obstructing channels of interstate commerce; to promote the full use of agricultural resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 4528. A bill to authorize construction of a Federal building in Santa Rosa, Calif., to be used for a Federal post office, and for other Federal purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 4529. A bill to establish a Federal Agency for Handicapped; to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 4530. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4531. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 4532. A bill relating to the quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 4533. A bill to amend sections 4081 and 4082 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include wholesale distributors within the definition of "producers" of gasoline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution requesting the President, through the United States delegation to the United Nations, to bring about the establishment of a United Nations military force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 113. Concurrent resolution to conduct a full and complete investigation and study into the price-profit-wage relationships in the automobile, steel, meatpacking, and other basic industries whose policies exert a decisive influence on the American economy; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, urging the President and the Congress of the United States to use its influence to abrogate the present political division of Ireland, and to protest the presence of British troops in Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, protesting the present political division of Ireland, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. PFOST: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho to authorize and appropriate sufficient moneys to provide for construction and completion of the unfinished link in the Lewis and Clark Highway at the earliest practicable date; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, to repeal and abolish the tax on interstate transportation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide legislation giving grants-in-aid for school-building purposes to school districts in various States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 4534. A bill for the relief of Kenneth H. Strader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 4535. A bill for the relief of Ernest C. St. Onge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOWLER:

H. R. 4536. A bill for the relief of Lin, Tsung-min (T. M. Lin); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

H. R. 4537. A bill for the relief of H. T. Parker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4538. A bill for the relief of Martin A. McGrory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. R. 4539. A bill for the relief of Thomas Esposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4540. A bill for the relief of Jean Jacques Gaston Moreau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 4541. A bill for the relief of Leslie A. Batdorf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 4542. A bill for the relief of Mato Sabo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 4543. A bill for the relief of Arthur J. Dettmers, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4544. A bill for the relief of Louis S. Levenson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 4545. A bill for the relief of Sono Hoshi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 4546. A bill for the relief of Edgars Pedraudze and his wife, Alma Pedraudze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 4547. A bill to authorize Rear Adm. Daniel W. Ryan, Dental Corps, United States Navy, to accept the Order De Vasco Nunez De Balboa awarded him by the Republic of Panama; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 4548. A bill for the relief of Mon Wai Lau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4549. A bill for the relief of Pedro Flores-Carrillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4550. A bill for the relief of Rosario Zuniga de Lara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 4551. A bill for the relief of Kay Harding; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4552. A bill for the relief of Dwejra Shaffer and daughter, Haya Shaffer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4553. A bill for the relief of Maria Gounaris Stephenson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 4554. A bill for the relief of Michael Lo Monaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

78. By Mr. BENTLEY: Petition of the Fraternal Order of Eagles in respect to the setting aside of the first Sunday in February each year, as Chaplains' day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

79. By Mr. WAINWRIGHT: Petition of James F. McManus, manager of the Levittown Travel Agency, Levittown, N. Y., asking for the right to earn his livelihood or any part thereof in the sale of air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

80. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, American Newspaper Publishers Association, New York, N. Y., relative to the right of newspapers to gather and disseminate information in all areas of the world in which the United States is not engaged in war, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Free Marketing of Domestic Newly Mined Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. GRACIE PFOST**
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 6, 1957*

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of this session I introduced a bill to permit the free marketing of domestic newly mined gold. For the benefit of other Members, and the many people from all over the United States who are writing me to express interest in this legislation, I would like to explain briefly why I have introduced the bill and what it would do.

As you know, innumerable bills have been introduced in the House or the Senate during the past decade to increase the value of gold, to permit the free coinage of gold, to restore convertibility, to allow our gold to circulate freely in world markets and for other purposes. Without exception these bills have been adversely received by the Treasury Department and each one has been protested to the Banking and Currency Committees by the Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget, and has died in committee.

My bill was drawn after a careful study of the objections which the Treasury Department has registered to the previous gold bills. While it does not go all the way in doing what the hard-money people and the free-gold people eventually want to do, it opens the whole subject up for discussion.

It is hard to see what material objections the Government can have to this measure, as it only affects gold newly mined in the United States after the act becomes law, and there will be no effect whatever on the monetary stocks of gold at Fort Knox. No price is named in the bill and the relationship of gold to the United States currency therefore is not affected. There are no provisions for export so the Government does not have to worry about this gold traveling out of the country where it might disturb the international monetary situation, unless it were smuggled out and no one would take that risk unless there were a very considerable difference between the free gold market price here and that abroad. Various blocs and embargoes imposed by other countries would not be violated. Jewelers and other fabricators or processors of gold in this country would have the option of buying through their present channels or on the free domestic market, whichever they might prefer.

Newly mined, untreated, domestic placer gold may be sold freely on the domestic market at the present time—why then not newly mined gold from other sources? Canada has recently eliminated restrictions on the transaction of gold, why should we not do the same? Several countries, notably South Africa, have brought great pressure upon the International Monetary Fund to break away from the $35 per ounce price.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members that gold is grossly underpriced. Should the domestic free market price of newly mined gold rise above the Treasury price it would provide additional revenue for those many mines which produce gold as a byproduct of mining base metals and would thus help to defray the rising costs of operation.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that the Banking and Currency Committee will hold a hearing and give the gold miners and others a chance to testify and tell us their problems. There is an appalling situation in the gold mining industry today, and steps must be taken to revive the industry and place it on a business-like basis. If this bill is not considered feasible, perhaps a new one satisfactory to the Treasury Department can be written around it in committee after industry and Government witnesses have thrashed the matter out. I have pointed out the way by introducing the bill.

## Thaddeus Kosciusko: Hero of the American Revolution (1746–1817)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD**
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 6, 1957*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Thaddeus Kosciusko was one of those brave and restless Polish fighters for freedom who was so strongly motivated by a love of liberty that he would go anywhere and take part in any battle provided it was for a righteous cause. It was this feeling which brought him to America not long after our Revolutionary War had begun. He arrived in Philadelphia in August of 1776 and immediately applied for military service. He was admitted and charged with the drawing up of plans for fortifying the Delaware River. The success of this work earned him a commission as colonel of engineers in the Continental Army.

In the spring of the following year, he joined the Northern Army at Ticonderoga. Later the fortifications he erected at Saratoga contributed greatly to the brilliant victory of our forces there. During the next 2 years he was placed in charge of the building of fortifications at West Point. Subsequently, he took part in the battle of Charleston, and was among the first of the Continentals to enter that city after its evacuation by the British. On October 13, 1783, Congress made him a brigadier general.

Having served this country and its cause successfully and brilliantly, in July of 1784 he returned to his native land, hoping to carry on the fight for her freedom. For more than 20 years he continued his brave but unfortunately futile efforts for Poland's freedom and died in exile in Switzerland in 1817.

On the 211th anniversary of his birthday, we solemnly honor his noble memory. We do this not only because he fought for our independence, but also because he was a vigorous champion of the universal cause of human freedom as long as he lived.

## The Eisenhower Middle East Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. CHARLES A. VANIK**
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 6, 1957*

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, there are a few Members of the House of Representatives who may feel that they have had something to do in formulating this Nation's foreign policy by a vote for or against the Eisenhower Middle East Doctrine. During the next several weeks, several Members of the other body may sense their great participation.

The cruel fact is that Congress has had very little indeed to say about the implications and far-reaching effects of the commitments being made right now.

Last Wednesday evening, at the White House, the King of Saudi Arabia and 16 members of his family and royal entourage dined at a state dinner for men only, oil men, to be exact. Among the out-of-town guests were Stephen D. Bechtel, president and chairman of Bechtel Co., of San Francisco; Fred A. Davies, president and board chairman of the Arabian-American Oil Co., of New York; William T. Faricy, president of the American Railroad Association; Ralph G. Follis, president and board chairman of Standard Oil, California, and Brewster Jennings, president and board chairman of Socony Mobil Oil of New York.

Also among those present was William L. Kleitz, president of Guaranty Trust Co. of New York; Augustus C. Long, chairman of the board of Texas Co., New York, John J. McCloy, chairman of the board, Chase Manhattan Bank; Harry W. Morrison, president of Morrison-Knudsen of Boise, Idaho; Warren L. Pierson, board chairman, Trans World Airways of New York; Monroe J. Rathbone, president Standard Oil of New Jersey, of New York; Howard C. Sheperd, board chairman, First National City Bank, New York.

In between niblets of beef tenderloin and savarin, the boys probably discussed ways and means of keeping the King solid on his throne, to insure that a renegotiation of his oil royalty contracts with American financial interests need not occur.

One very likely commitment being entered into by our Government is a commitment to both King Saud and to the American-Arabian Oil Co., and/or their associates that our Government will preserve the integrity of the oil contracts between Saudi Arabia and American investment interests. Never has the word "integrity" received such blasphemous use.

## Foreign Aid at No Government Expense—The Boy Scouts Did It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 6, 1957*

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, with the observance of National Boy Scout Week, it seems appropriate for the House to recognize the work of the Boy Scouts in a field in which we seldom recognize their activity but one which demands much attention. I refer to the World Friendship Fund, the Boy Scouts' version of the United States Mutual Security Act. Without disparaging the mutual security program, I daresay the World Friendship Fund has gained more affection and brotherhood for America over the years than some official foreign-aid projects.

The World Friendship Fund is foreign relations on a person-to-person level. It is actually a program of human relations, for scouting recognizes its brotherhood in all nations, climes, and regions.

Through the World Friendship Fund, American Boy Scouts are afforded the opportunity to help brother Scouts in lands "a thousand leagues away."

The World Friendship Fund began 11 years ago as a continuing effort to help less fortunate Scouts in other lands. These boys and their leaders across the seas have desperately needed things with which to carry on their scouting activities, and the Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, and Explorer Scouts of the United States—through the World Friendship Fund—have supplied them.

The World Friendship Fund works through the nickels, dimes, quarters, and dollars contributed by our Scouts. These contributions in warmhearted torrents have sent thousands of handbooks and badges to war-torn islands, completely outfitted a troop on a lonely island in the Bering Sea, shipped hundreds of uniforms to the struggling young Scout movement in Korea, sent tons of needed camping equipment to South America, to Hong Kong, to Liberia—and much, much more.

The World Friendship Fund is a sterling example of the Scout belief in the good turn—in this instance, a good turn with a long arm. It is an honor to salute the Boy Scouts of America for their unselfish participation in United States foreign aid—at no Government expense.

## Flood-Control Measures for Weber Basin, Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 6, 1957*

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing in this Congress a measure which I had introduced in the previous Congress in the House. This former measure was H. R. 4262. Recently, in the Senate, Mr. BENNETT introduced, for himself and Mr. WATKINS, an identical measure, known as S. 3.

The Weber Basin drainage area contains each spring the seeds of disaster for many Utah families. The Corps of Engineers estimate that each year an average of $264,000 in damages is wrought in residential and agricultural lands along the path of the Weber River.

This is their estimate for an average year, but I well remember the year 1952, when considerably more than $264,000 in damages and havoc resulted from a flood. I would place a conservative estimate of destruction at more than $1,600,000, for it was in that year that 1,200 acres of key residential, business, and industrial acres were flooded in Ogden, Utah's second largest city. That year more than 20,000 acres of improved agricultural land were damaged and 100 acres of residential and business land in Morgan City were inundated. One transcontinental highway was completely washed out in several places and another highway was flooded. Parts of the strategic Ogden railway yards were flooded.

If enacted in time, this measure may mean that 1952 will be the last year that water, mud, rock, and sand will do their fearful damage in this strategic area.

This measure passed the House and Senate in 1956, but had the misfortune to be included in the omnibus public-works bill, H. R. 12080. This measure in particular had been approved by all the executive departments, including the Bureau of the Budget, but many other projects which had not been investigated and approved were included in the omnibus bill, which, after passage by the Congress, was vetoed by the President.

In general terms, the bill authorizes the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers for flood control in this area. It will provide for channel improvements, low levees, rock revetments to prevent channel erosion, and the use of certain dams new in being as flood-control checks, as well as other improvements recommended by the Engineers.

The estimated first cost of the channel improvements is $635,000, of which $500,000 would be provided by the Federal Government and $115,000 by the local interests. The estimated charges after completion will be $40,000, of which $15,800 is Federal and $24,200 will be locally provided.

This cost is more than justified when compared to the estimated annual benefits from the project, $264,000, particularly when it is realized that the 1952 flood caused more than $1,600,000.

## Social Security for the Disabled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 6, 1957*

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has authorized several giant forward steps in the last few years in behalf of the disabled worker under the social-security law, but from what I have seen of the operation of the new program, it appears as if this administration is determined to stretch every possible point to apply the benefits as narrowly as possible.

In the 83d Congress, we wrote into the social-security law the principle of a disability freeze so that if a worker became disabled before reaching retirement age his future benefits would be figured as if he had continued to work at the same wage right up to the time of retirement.

This was intended to prevent a disabled worker from having his retirement benefits reduced practically to nothing by a long period of unemployment before reaching retirement age.

In the 84th Congress, we took an even more important forward step by writing into the law—over the vigorous opposition of the Eisenhower Administration, I might say—the provision for inauguration of a new program this coming July of paying full retirement benefits under social security beginning at age 50 to workers who are covered by social security but who are, or become, permanently disabled.

Social-security taxes were increased January 1, for both employer and employee to cover the cost of this added new disability benefits program scheduled to go into operation in July.

But from what I have seen of the operation of the disability freeze provision of the 1954 law, I am very much afraid that very few deserving workers are going to benefit from the disability program unless Congress launches an investigation of present administrative policies and cracks down hard.

For instance, it has been my understanding that when a disabled worker who loses his job because of disability, applies for a "freeze" of his work record in order to protect his future benefits, the social security administration almost invariably turns down the application on the ground that the worker involved does not appear to be completely unable to do any work. It then suggests that the

applicant can file an appeal, but this suggestion is usually made in a form letter which seems to hold out little hope of qualifying.

DOES IT MEAN COMPLETELY PARALYZED ONLY?

I have looked into this matter at the request of some of the disabled people who have gotten in touch with me either because they are from Westmoreland County or because they know of my interest in the disabled as the former chairman of the House committee on the physically handicapped and as the author of vocational rehabilitation legislation.

As I have gone over the standards which the Eisenhower administration has set up for determining permanent disability, it strikes me that the only type of person who might seem to qualify is one who is completely paralyzed. Otherwise, the bureaucrats seem to think the person can do some work even if he cannot qualify for employment anywhere, because of his health.

It reminds me of the early days of unemployment compensation when the Republican administration in Pennsylvania held that a person was not to receive the benefits if he turned down any job at all, even though it was a case of a highly skilled industrial worker being offered a job at 25 cents an hour or less.

A skilled worker who, through accident or illness, is no longer able to work at the job at which he spent his lifetime, and in which he is highly skilled, and who cannot be retrained through vocational rehabilitation into some other skilled employment is, I should think, disabled under any fair interpretation of the law. To deny him disability benefits because he could, say, cut out paper dolls at home, is hardly realistic or reasonable.

## Dow H. Drukker, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 6, 1957*

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Dow H. Drukker, Sr., "Dad" to those he employs at the Herald-News, Passaic, and the granddaddy of New Jersey publishers, is celebrating his 85th birthday.

Mr. Drukker, one of the oldest active publishers in the United States, was born 6 months before the old Passaic Daily Herald—which merged with the Passaic Herald in 1932—was established by Orrin Vanderhoven.

The silver-haired former Congressman is chairman of the board of the Passaic Daily News, the company which publishes the Herald-News of Passaic.

Mr. Drukker, who is spending the winter months at his home in Daytona Beach, Fla., is observing his birthday in a quiet manner surrounded by members of his family.

This will be a year of anniversaries and innovations for Mr. Drukker. It was 60 years ago that Mr. Drukker arrived in Passaic from Grand Rapids, Mich., where as a young man he had ventured into the contracting business on his own.

August will mark the 60th anniversary of the organization of the Union Building & Construction Corp., of which he was president for 42 years. February 8 marks the 39th anniversary of Mr. Drukker and his associates' assumption of ownership and management of the Passaic Daily Herald. In 1928 they purchased control of the Passaic Daily News, and 4 years later merged the two as the Herald-News.

And now, "Dad" Drukker is looking forward to the later part of 1957 when the Herald-News will move into a new building now under construction at Main Avenue, Passaic-Clifton.

Mr. Drukker was born in Holland and taken to Grand Rapids in infancy. His grandfather had previously lived in Michigan many years.

For 8 years Mr. Drukker served as a member of the Passaic County Board of Freeholders, serving as director for the last 4 years of that period. In 1914 he filled the unexpired term of office caused by the death of Robert G. Bremner in the House of Representatives. He served full terms in the 64th and 65th Congresses and retired from active politics in 1919.

Two years ago Drukker was invested as an officer in the Order of Orange-Nassau, the highest award the Netherlands can grant an American. The investiture was by royal decree of Queen Juliana, of the Netherlands.

In making the presentation for the Queen, Baron J. A. de Vos van Steenwijk, then consul general of the Netherlands in New York, said in part:

It is a pleasure to honor someone whose cradle stood in the Netherlands.

We salute you as a former Congressman of the United States. We salute you as an immigrant from Holland who has made a great success in business and with your family * * * and are very proud of you and your achievements.

Mr. Drukker has frequently been honored by the Boy Scouts of America for his great interest in the scout movement; particularly in relation to the acquisition and development of the Drukker Scout Reservation at Camp Aheka, in Morris County above Towaco.

The following letter has been sent to Mr. Drukker by members of the New Jersey congressional delegation:

JANUARY 30, 1957.

Hon. DOW H. DRUKKER,
*Daytona Beach, Fla.*

DEAR MR. DRUKKER: We, of the New Jersey congressional delegation, have just learned that you will be observing your 85th birthday on Thursday, February 7, and we join in sending you our felicitations and best wishes.

We are mindful of your many distinguished services both in private and public life, the latter including your service in the 64th and 65th Congresses, and we feel it quite proper to salute you as "New Jersey's Senior Congressman."

While your career has been attended with many successes, we feel certain that your greatest pride is in your wonderful family, members of which are carrying out so honorably the fine traditions of the Drukker name.

It would please us no end to have you visit us in the House and Senate when you come our way.

May you have many happy years ahead.

Very sincerely,

H. ALEXANDER SMITH; CLIFFORD P. CASE; CHARLES A. WOLVERTON; ROBERT W. KEAN; GORDON CANFIELD; JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS; FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.; HUGH J. ADDONIZIO; PETER W. RODINO, JR.; WILLIAM B. WIDNALL; ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI; PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.; FRANK THOMPSON, JR.; VINCENT J. DELLAY; FLORENCE P. DWYER.

## No Tax on Interest Earned on United States Savings Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 6, 1957*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that interest received by individuals from United States savings bonds shall be excluded from gross income and therefore not be taxable.

For some time now the United States Treasury Department has been telling us that the American people have been redeeming more Government defense and savings bonds than are being purchased. On February 4 of this year, for example, Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey reported that since August 1956 the American public has cashed $108 million more series E and H bonds than they had bought during the same period.

I do not pretend to know the causes for this situation, as each family undoubtedly has valid reasons for redeeming these bonds. In some instances it is probably due to the steadily rising cost of living which necessitates using family savings to meet essential needs. In other instances it may be due to the fact that the interest accruing on these bonds is regarded as gross income and is taxable, which actually reduces the net value of the bond. In addition, the interest is smaller than the current rates paid by commercial banks on savings.

As is well known, E bonds still pay only 3 percent interest, but only after they are held by the purchaser for about 10 years. If redeemed earlier the interest is lower. For example, a bond held for 5 years will yield only 2½ percent interest, while the same deposit in a commercial bank would yield at least 3 percent and savings and loan associations offer 4 percent.

Millions of Americans are holding all types of savings bonds valued at around $57 billion, of which about $41 billion are in E and H bonds. This is not only an important part of the Government's financial structure, but is an extremely important savings nest for millions of families. Many of these people are now wondering what to do with the bonds they hold. Inflation has wiped out most of the value of the interest earned on the

bonds, while taxes on the interest takes the rest. Up to about 1952 these bonds were maintained at fairly fixed prices, but since then their value has gone down.

The result has been a growing rate of bond redemptions or cash-ins in recent years. In the last 6 months of 1955 redemptions of savings bonds of all types exceeded the sales of such bonds by $95 million. During the first 6 months of 1956, redemptions exceeded sales by $691 million. In the last 6 months of 1956, $839 million more of savings bonds were cashed in than were sold. Unless something is done soon to correct this situation, the rate of redemptions over sales may go over the $1 billion mark in the first 6 months of 1957.

If this trend continues, it will mean that the United States Treasury will be forced to make huge outlays of funds to finance the growing number of redemptions—and that may have its effects on our financial structure and our economy. Ways must be found to convince the American public to hold on to these bonds and to purchase new ones. The public must be convinced that they are profitable as an investment, that they are economically sound, in addition to the patriotic duty to purchase such bonds. Perhaps another reason is the value of these bonds in helping to curb inflation. By holding on to them and by purchasing new bonds excess consumer spending is drawn off and thus the impact of inflation on our economy is much smaller.

The purchase of savings bonds must be made more attractive to the public at large in various ways. One way is to encourage greater participation in the payroll savings plan through the purchase of savings bonds at regular intervals in factories and shops, through trade unions and other organizations, and so forth. It is estimated that some 7 or 8 million wage and salary workers are at present participating in this plan at their places of work, but with a good incentive and better returns this could be considerably increased.

Perhaps the best way to accomplish this is to make the interest earnings on savings bonds tax-exempt. I would suggest we designate the lower or E series as wage earners' bonds and that we make them nontaxable, in order to provide such an incentive. It is for this reason that I am introducing my bill to exempt from income taxation the interest received on United States savings bonds. I believe this may help to reverse the current trend and stimulate greater sales of savings bonds in the future.

## Time To Write Your Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS**
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 6, 1957*

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. M. A. Wolcott, editor and publisher of the Daily Iberian, published in my Congressional District, wrote a very challenging editorial on February 2, 1957, entitled "Time To Write Your Congressman." The editorial deals with the subject of high budgets and prospects for reducing taxes. Mr. Wolcott always writes with logic and clarity. He does not comment very often on problems of this kind, but when he speaks it makes sense. I commend the editorial to the thoughtful consideration of the entire membership of the House.

The article follows:

TIME TO WRITE YOUR CONGRESSMAN

There seems to be a feeling that broadens every day that big Government spending is getting out of hand, and that the man who pays the bills ought to speak his mind.

The enormous size of the new Eisenhower budget is the principal subject of conversation, not only among Members of Congress, but gradually the little fellow at the grassroots level is getting sick and tired of having Uncle Sam take off the cream without the taxpayer getting a chance to look at it.

Dismayed conservatives in Congress say it looks as if Ike may be going the way of F. D. R.—who in 1932 promised a 25-percent reduction in expenses and instead—after a few months of economy—turned to spending as the secret of political popularity and the remedy for all social ills.

During his 1952 campaign for the Presidency General Eisenhower promised that his fourth budget—the one now on the table—would bring Federal expenses down to $60 billion. Instead, it has climbed to $71.8 billion, only 3 percent less than Truman's last budget—sent to Congress at the peak of expenditures for the Korean war.

If expenditures for highways, social security, and other items for which special taxes are levied are included, the Ike budget goes to $85 billion plus.

Fiscal experts in Washington point out that if Eisenhower's 1952 campaign promises were fulfilled, the $12 billion difference would be equal to an across-the-board personal income-tax cut of just under 30 percent. (Estimated revenue in fiscal 1958 from the individual income taxes, $41 billion.)

Taxmen say a reduction of $12 billion would not be difficult if there was the urge to make it.

Ike's foreign-aid proposals would cost nearly $5 billion. Many Congressmen would like that sum cut by at least $3½ billion, which would still leave ample provision for Nationalist China, South Korea, South Vietnam, and a few other special situations.

The cost of maintaining ground troops in Western Europe is estimated at 3 or 4 billion dollars. Western Europe has a larger population than the United States and should provide its own ground defenses, say those Congressmen who would like our overseas commitments limited to token battalions plus retaliatory Air Force units.

If you believe the people's earnings should be spent by them rather than by bureaucracy; if you believe an across-the-board, 30-percent cut in all personal income taxes is a desirable goal, why not do some writing? Write your Congressman, Representative EDWIN E. WILLIS, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C., and tell him what you think.

In the absence of any word from you, the taxpaying voter, he is right in assuming you agree with all the spending that is going on.

You can start a revolt against big spending.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the broad problem of fiscal policy should be made the subject of intense study and public debate, and for my part I thought that the Daily Iberian's editorial was so timely that it deserved an open reply, which follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., February 6, 1957.*

Mr. M. A. WOLCOTT,
*Editor, the Daily Iberian,*
*New Iberia, La.*

DEAR RED: I thought so well of your editorial of February 2, entitled "Time To Write Your Congressman," that I mentioned it on the floor of the House, as you will see from the enclosed CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In submitting the administration's budget to the Congress this year, the President indicated that we might want to trim it down. This reminded me of the story of Sitting Bull, which is a modified form of the Who Shall Bell the Cat legend. As a condition of his release Sitting Bull had to promise to conform to the ways of the white man. He grunted begrudged approval to everything but when it came to his marital status he was inclined to pass the buck. Informed of the fact that the white man was entitled to only one wife and reminded that he had two, he was told that he would have to tell one of them to go. To which he replied, "You tell her."

I think the majority of the people would agree that it would be fiscal irresponsibility to reduce taxes by going into the red every year in the same amount of the tax reduction. You are eminently correct in saying that the only solution is lowering of Federal expenditures followed by tax reductions.

In view of the heavy demands made upon Congress by different groups in different areas throughout the United States for good causes and deserving projects, I would be less than frank if I did not say that the problem of lowering the budget and reduction of taxes is not an easy one. I think that in commenting on foreign aid in your editorial, however, you put your finger on at least one item that can be considered with real hope for savings by the Federal Government. As you know, the Marshall plan was instituted in 1946 to restore the economy of certain European countries that had been wrecked by the ravages of war. The program was intended to last for 4 years and when I came to Congress I voted for the program for the years 1949 and 1950, which was supposed to be the terminal date. From all the information I was able to obtain, I came to the conclusion that by 1950 the economy of most if not all of the European countries had improved to the point where it was at least as good if not better than before World War II. Accordingly, when the same program was renewed under a different name, about 1951 (it is now called the Mutual Security Administration), I voted against the foreign economic aid, and I have voted against it every year ever since. Our opposition forces have increased every year, and I am hopeful that real reduction, if not total elimination of foreign economic aid, will be accomplished this year.

I think it was a mistake for the President to tack on an economic feature to his Mid-west policy, and the fact that it was presented on the House side in a single package and on a take-it-or-leave-it basis made our task doubly difficult. As it turned out, we were not asked to appropriate new funds but to transfer unexpended foreign aid funds which were provided without my vote last year. Accordingly, desiring very much to express confidence in the President in the conduct of our foreign policy, I voted for the single package resolution. I hope, however, that the Senate will separate the two issues, and in that case I will vote against the economic aid feature even though new funds are not involved, and I will vote against direct appropriations later on.

I feel that your editorial has made a real contribution to the debates that will un-

doubtedly ensue in the field of fiscal affairs and I congratulate you.

With best wishes, I am

Very sincerely,

EDWIN E. WILLIS,
*Member of Congress.*

## Dulles' Reply Raises Serious Doubts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 6, 1957*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a statement relative to the Secretary of State's reply to 75 Members of the House who had communicated with him on January 23, 1957, relative to the crisis in the Middle East:

I am today making public a letter which the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, addressed to 75 Democratic Members of Congress in reply to a communication sent to him on January 23. In that original letter we stated that the Congress should insist on guaranties for free passage of all shipping through the Suez Canal and the Straits of Tiran before the area is prematurely abandoned.

Certain passages are highly debatable. Mr. Dulles reaffirms the views that there shall be free and open transit through the canal without discrimination and that we have made clear to the Government of Egypt the importance we attach to an early conclusion of a settlement. I, for one, have seen no evidence that we are exerting any influence on Egypt to persuade that Government to resume negotiations. On the other hand, Mr. Dulles' hint yesterday that the United States might join in United Nations sanctions against Israel shows that we are exerting the most reprehensible pressure against that country.

Moreover, I am greatly alarmed by the weakness of the Secretary's position on the Straits of Tiran. While this Government supports the positioning of units of the United Nations emergency force in this area, as Mr. Dulles states in his letter, the vague and meaningless resolution sponsored by Ambassador Lodge at the U. N. has already been watered away by Egypt's veto. But more significant, why does Mr. Dulles make the suggestion that the problem of free passage through the Straits of Tiran could be determined by the International Court of Justice, since that Court has already ruled in the Corfu case upon the preeminence of international shipping in similar circumstances? Moreover, since freedom of passage through the straits is so vital to all the free world, it is amazing that the Secretary of State has made this new and dangerous concession to Cairo. In his press conference yesterday, he has made disclosure that the United States would have to give very serious consideration to any proposed United Nations sanctions against Israel to force the withdrawal of her troops.

That statement is another monumental blunder. It will surely encourage the Soviet and Arab blocs to pressure for economic sanctions against Israel to force her to retreat from Sinai and permit Egypt to reinstate the blockade of Tiran. It is now likely that Egypt will resume that blockade if Israel withdraws and that resumption will be justified by citing Mr. Dulles' suggestion that the issue be determined by the International Court of Justice.

Here is a glaring example of the double standard. Sanctions are threatened against Israel to force her to abandon her struggle against illegal blockade, but no such threat is advanced against Egypt, who continues her blockade in violation of the United Nations Charter and the armistice agreements, and while she openly continues in her state of war with Israel.

For Nasser, our Government offers free legal advice. For Israel, the Secretary offers the threat of sanctions.

Nasser continues to be treated by Mr. Dulles with all the tender solicitude a veteran international lawyer offers to a wayward and incorrigible client.

The text of Mr. Dulles' reply follows:

"DEAR MR. CELLER: I have received the letter of January 23, 1957, in which you and a group of your colleagues in the Congress discuss some of the current problems in the Middle East.

"I am in complete agreement with you and your colleagues on the importance of the Suez Canal. Since I have been Secretary of State there has been no single issue to which I have devoted more time and effort than this one. The record of the steps taken by the United States Government to reach a peaceful, just, and equitable Suez settlement reveals the strong defense which the United States has made of the rights and interests of the international community in this waterway, as established in the Constantinople Convention of 1888. One of these is, of course, the right of free and unfettered transit.

"The Secretary General of the United Nations is now endeavoring to bring about resumption of the negotiations on a Suez Canal regime on the basis of the 6 principles endorsed by the Security Council on October 13, 1956. One of these principles is that there shall be free and open transit through the canal without discrimination. We are giving full support to the Secretary General in this task, and have made clear to the Government of Egypt the importance we attach to the early conclusion of a settlement consonant with the six principles. We shall continue to press for the resumption of negotiations on this basis.

"The matter of the Straits of Tiran is also important. It seems to us that the positioning of units of the United Nations emergency force in this area, as suggested by Mr. Hammarskjold in his report of January 25, 1957, would be of a constructive step. The problem of whether the straits are international or territorial waters is one which perhaps could be determined by the International Court of Justice. The important thing at the present is to take measures to insure that developments in this area do not lead to the resumption of hostilities. Here I would observe that the continued presence of Israeli forces on Egyptian soil, in contravention of the terms of the General Assembly's resolution of November 2, 1956, and of the Assembly's reiterated calls for withdrawal since then, is making it much more difficult for the United Nations and the states which are genuinely interested in the peace and well-being of the Middle East to work for the lessening of tensions in the area and the solution of such problems as that of the Straits of Tiran.

"It seems to me that the implementation by all parties of the pertinent recommendations in Mr. Hammarskjold's report of January 25, 1957, would be a means of insuring against a return to the conditions which obtained on October 29, 1956. We hope that the substance of the report will be approved by the General Assembly.

"I was gratified to note in your comments on the need for the United States Government to take effective measures to strengthen the Middle East against the threat of Communist aggression. Congressional approval of the President's proposal to accomplish this purpose would serve as convincing evidence of United States determination to offer positive cooperation to the states in this vital area desiring to preserve their independence against the Communist menace. The vote of the House of Representatives on January 30, 1957, was an important and most welcome step forward. An improved atmosphere in the Middle East should, I think, make solutions to regional political problems more readily attainable.

"Sincerely yours,

"JOHN FOSTER DULLES."

## The Penn-Texas Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 6, 1957*

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, American industry and the American way of life must be protected from unscrupulous practices such as two individuals, namely Alfons Landa, a Washington attorney, and David Karr, alias David Katz, a man who was a writer for the Daily Worker, engage in. These two men, with the help of moneyed Chicago interests, namely, Robert H. Morse, Jr., of Fairbanks, Morse, and his father, have conspired to wreck the reputation and progress of a flourishing Pennsylvania company. This is the same Fairbanks, Morse whose questionable activities were the subject of remarks made by Senator STYLES BRIDGES of New Hampshire. This should be no concern, ordinarily, of a Congressman, except, of course, from the improper activities aspect of it which may injure job opportunities of workers. However, these men have willfully set out to use Government agencies and other public bureaus and the courts to further their scheme. The scheme is to parade falsely as a so-called committee representing the stockholders of one company while actually serving interests diametrically opposed. In short it is the practice of a shocking fraud on the public.

Landa, as a lawyer, should know better. But as you look at his past history you will see that he has already established a record of activity in seeking to disrupt companies. Now he has attempted to do this by posing as chairman and counsel of a so-called stockholders protective committee for the Penn-Texas Corp. Karr erstwhile has pulled the strings, but has no doubt remained hidden behind the scenes. The record of Karr's activities shows that when he was not working for the Communists, he was busy working for the Nazis.

This time the Landa activities have been more brazen. He first publicly announced his sole unselfish interest in the welfare of the Penn-Texas stockholders. When he organized the so-called Penn-Texas protective committee, neither he nor Karr owned any stock in the company. They did get hold of one little disgruntled ex-Penn-Texas employee who did own shares of stock, of a grand total of exactly two shares. Then Landa

bought some shares and he published in the newspaper that the stockholders' protective committee was formed, never saying a word about Karr, who was the moving spirit behind it. No mention was made that Robert H. Morse, Jr., president of Fairbanks, Morse & Co., was the financial angel backing the committee. Landa kept him hidden behind the scenes, so as to conceal the real purpose of the plot.

What a threat this is to American industry to have Karr, a writer for the Communist organ, the Daily Worker, and Landa, attempting to stir up dissension among the stockholders of a prosperous Pennsylvania company. And backed by the pursestrings of the Morses. This company, Penn-Texas, is engaged in serious defense business. It employs 12,000 good Americans. It has over 30,000 stockholders. Landa, himself as a plaintiff, goes into the courts of Pennsylvania to sue. He bought the stock in order that he could sue. He financed the suit with the help of Fairbanks, Morse money. He brought his co-plaintiff in with him. And all for what purpose? To seek to have the courts of Pennsylvania stop the Penn-Texas Corp. from increasing its capital, when only by such means it has been able to grow from a small struggling company less than 6 years ago to a company which today is one of the 400 largest industrial corporations in the Nation.

Leopold D. Silberstein, the head of Penn-Texas, is a great humanitarian. Most recently he aided in the resettlement of Hungarian refugees and offered job opportunities to 1,000 of these Hungarian fighters for freedom who fled Soviet oppression in their own land. This has been made possible with the cooperation of the International Rescue Committee and the President's Committee. Now the strange counterpart of this activity is that Karr, masquerading mercenaries of the Robert Morses, have attempted to discredit him by slanders and libels carried to Silberstein's fellow workers and officers of the International Rescue Committee.

Again I must state, as a Congressman, why I touch on this subject, and this is another important reason. Landa and Karr, in their conspiracy, have gone to the New York Stock Exchange and attempted to have delisted and removed from trading on that exchange the stock of Fairbanks, Morse in which Penn-Texas has a stake in excess of $21 million. Frustrated there, they now have descended upon the Government agencies and have maliciously inspired investigation by Senate and congressional committees.

This so-called stockholders' protective committee of Karr and Landa, backed by Morse, must now have the immediate attention of the SEC. It should concern itself with the fraud and illegal conspiracy in which its principals, disclosed and undisclosed, are involved. Such a committee must qualify by filing a true account of its makeup, personnel, and other factors. Such filings must be carefully scrutinized by the SEC. Has such scrutiny been made here, and if it has, why has that agency not brought to light the character of Landa and Karr posing as defenders of Penn-Texas stockholders, whereas they are actually and in fact paid mercenaries of Robert H. Morse, Jr., thereby deceiving the public as to their true interests and purpose?

Why have not Landa's activities and Karr's activities in their field of slander and libel been exposed? Why has not the SEC held Landa as a lawyer to the standard of conduct that all practitioners at the bar should observe and which its own rules require? Perhaps it is because the Commission has not been alerted to the situation. But there is no excuse now. The full and complete history of the real facts are available to them. A full public hearing of the matter should be ordered at once.

It is my sincere belief that Karr long since should have been eliminated from any consideration as a public relations man to be trusted. Long since he has shown a record of serving both sides. He can little qualify as the sponsor and creator of any sort of protective committee, much less for such a successful and progressive company as Penn-Texas.

As to Landa, the SEC should see that he is barred from practice before them or participation in committees of any sort dealing with publicly held securities altogether. Robert H. Morse, Jr., also has much to answer. He used these two persons as tools. Silently he has furnished them money. America cannot grow strong on this type of domestic subversion. This is un-American in the real sense of the word. Any committee for the protection of American stockholders must be straightforward and honest. It cannot masquerade and sail under false colors. I believe something must be done immediately to see that this present fraud is stopped and that it shall not occur again. A company like Penn-Texas Corp., which we are mighty proud of in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, must be protected and safeguarded against Communist infiltration and brigand plots of this type.

---

# SENATE

## THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1957

Rev. James P. Wesberry, D. D., pastor, Morningside Baptist Church, Atlanta, Ga., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and most merciful God, our Father, whose wise and loving providence hast made us citizens of a great land, we give Thee humble thanks for the multitude of tender and gracious blessings which Thou hast lavished upon us. Thou hast truly favored us and given us a large and strategic place of leadership among the galaxy of nations. Grateful as we are for our blessings, we are not unmindful of our responsibilities. We confess that we are not all that we could be. We humbly ask Thee to forgive both our individual and national sins, and make us worthy of our reputation as a Christian nation.

Look, we beseech Thee, with special favor upon our greatly beloved and esteemed President. Surely Thou hast brought him to the kingdom for such a time as this. Grant him an abundance of Thy grace, wisdom, and guidance. As he has led our Nation to mighty conquests on fields of battle in times past, use him now, O God, to bring us to even more glorious conquests, yea, even to the establishment of a permanent and everlasting peace among the nations. Bless the distinguished Vice President, the Cabinet, this illustrious body of Senators, and all others who work for the good of our Nation. Fill each of them with Thy holy spirit, that they may walk humbly before Thee, seeking ever to know and do Thy will and to govern our Nation according to the laws of Thy kingdom. And in the words of our great leader, "May the light of freedom, coming to all darkened lands, flame brightly until at last the darkness is no more."

Give to us the able mind, the large heart, the magnanimous spirit, the far vision, the strong hand, and true wisdom to follow Thy counsel. May all that we are, all that we have, and all that we ever hope to be, be dedicated to Thee as instruments of blessing for all mankind. Grant to all who bear the burdens and responsibilities of government, patience in tribulation, fervency in spirit, joy in hope, steadfastness of purpose, persistence in righteousness, loyalty in justice, love in mercy, and efficacy in prayer. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 4, 1957, was approved and its reading was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### REPORT OF SURGEON GENERAL OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 21)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the provisions of the Health Research Facilities Act of 1956, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the annual report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service summarizing the activities of the health research facilities program.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 6, 1957.*

### REPORT OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 88)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the

President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Public Works:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of Public Law 358, 83d Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation covering its activities for the year ended December 31, 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 7, 1957.*

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, informed the Senate that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives had appointed Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN of Texas, Mr. RAINS of Alabama, Mr. TALLE of Iowa, and Mr. MCDONOUGH of California, as members, on the part of the House, of the Joint Committee on Defense Production.

The message also informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. RABAUT of Michigan, Mr. FORD of Michigan, and Mr. BETTS of Ohio, as members, on the part of the House, of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

The message announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2367. An act to establish a deferred grazing program as part of the relief available to drought stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2528. An act to authorize the sale of the Government-owned alcohol butadiene facility at Louisville, Ky., known as Plancor 1207;

H. R. 3845. An act extending for 1 year the time in which the Boston National Historic Sites Commission shall complete its work; and

H. R. 4249. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

## HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 2367. An act to establish a deferred grazing program as part of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 2528. An act to authorize the sale of the Government-owned alcohol butadiene facilities at Louisville, Ky., known as Plancor 1207; to the Committee on Banking and Currency; and

H. R. 4249. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Banking of the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet on next Monday and Tuesday, during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. O'MAHONEY, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs were authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have been informed that it is the intention of the leadership to have the Senate meet next on Monday, and thereafter on Thursday of next week.

I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until Monday, February 11, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

Elliot Lee Richardson, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

Parke Monroe Banta, of Missouri, to be General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

Alma Chamberlain McGuinness, of Pennsylvania, to be Special Assistant on Health and Medical Affairs to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

Arthur R. Campbell, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board; and

Leslie A. Blake, of Maine, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 1, with headquarters at Portland, Maine.

By Mr. POTTER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Frederick C. Nash, of Michigan, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

James Tolman Pyle, of Maryland, to be Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

John Hay Whitney, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Great Britain;

C. Burke Elbrick, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of State; and

William B. Kelly, of Ohio, and sundry other persons, for promotion in the Foreign Service.

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Robert L. Farrington, of Oklahoma, to be General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture.

By Mr. SMATHERS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Laurence Walrath, of Florida, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Stephen Hadley Evans, Edward H. Thiele, and Allen Winbeck, for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the United States Coast Guard;

Ross L. Leffler, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, Department of the Interior;

Edward T. Tait, of Pennsylvania, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner;

Richard F. Mitchell, of Iowa, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner; and

John R. Plaggmier, and sundry other persons, for permanent appointments in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Olin Hatfield Chilson, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## GOVERNOR OF GUAM

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Richard Barrett Lowe, of South Dakota, to be Governor of Guam.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BOSTON NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES COMMISSION TO COMPLETE ITS WORK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 3845 be laid before the Senate for immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The bill (H. R. 3845) extending for 1 year the time in which the Boston National Historic Sites Commission shall complete its work, was read twice by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I may say that this bill has been cleared with the leadership on the Republican side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is now in order.

---

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE, GOVERNMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, Government of the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Office of Civil Defense of the District of Columbia (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON MILITARY PRIME CONTRACTS WITH BUSINESS FIRMS IN THE UNITED STATES FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, AND RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military prime contracts with business firms in the United States for experimental, developmental, and research work (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON JURISDICTION OVER FEDERAL AREAS WITHIN THE STATES

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report (pt. I) of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROHIBITION OF TRANSPORTATION OF GAMBLING DEVICES IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3 of the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission, as of December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON LIGNITE RESEARCH LABORATORY, GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by and donations to, the Lignite Research Laboratory, operated by the Bureau of Mines, at Grand Forks, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an interim report in respect of the administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIEN DEFECTORS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain alien defectors (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONDEMNATION OF SOVIET REPRESSION IN HUNGARY—RESOLUTION OF REPUBLIC OF CUBA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a resolution of the Senate of the Republic of Cuba condemning Soviet repression in Hungary (with an accompanying resolution); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the Secretary, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO FEES OF UNITED STATES MARSHALS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to fees of United States marshals (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 544 OF TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO BONDS OF UNITED STATES MARSHALS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 544 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the bonds of United States marshals (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MAIL DELIVERY SERVICE TO RURAL AREAS

A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Postmaster General to provide mail delivery service to rural patrons by the most efficient and economical means possible, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

APPOINTMENTS TO POSITION OF DEPUTY MARITIME ADMINISTRATOR

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that appointments to the position of Deputy Maritime Administrator shall be made by the Secretary of Commerce under Civil Service laws, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

INTERIM REPORT OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION (S. Doc. No. 20)

A letter from the Chairman, Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an interim report of that Commission, dated February 1, 1957 (with an accompanying paper); ordered to be printed.

---

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Resolution 4

"Relative to requesting the Commodity Credit Corporation to avail themselves of storage facilities in California

"Whereas the United States Government has established the Commodity Credit Corporation as an instrument of the United States Department of Agriculture to administer the farm crop price support program including storage of farm crops and produce such as cheese, butter, powdered milk, other dairy products and beans, soya beans, rice, wheat, corn, and feed grains; and

"Whereas there is a shortage of storage facilities in many areas where farm crops and products are produced and held in surplus storage by CCC; and

"Whereas the shortage of storage facilities in some areas and the great quantity of commodities to be stored have caused the CCC to purchase and operate millions of dollars worth of storage facilities and will force the purchase of still more millions of dollars worth unless maximum use is made of privately owned facilities; and

"Whereas these commodities can be stored, handled and distributed more advantageously through privately owned storage facilities; and

"Whereas California is deficient in corn, livestock and dairy products, wheat, foodstuffs and many other commodities held in surplus storage by CCC; and

"Whereas many CCC commodities in storage are susceptible to damage from high humidity and other climatic factors and California climatic and weather conditions are most favorable for successful handling, storage, and distribution of these commodities; and

"Whereas there is available in California an abundance of the most modern storage and port facilities suitable for the storage, handling and shipping of CCC commodities; and

"Whereas CCC has offered inducements to California warehousemen and elevator operators to build storage facilities including occupancy agreement; and

"Whereas CCC is now and has been shipping many thousands of tons of these commodities to Japan and other eastern countries; and

"Whereas the storage, distribution and shipping of CCC commodities through and in California improve her economy and increase her export trade; and

"Whereas California ports, both inland river and ocean shore, are equipped with the most modern and efficient terminal storage, loading and unloading facilities for terminal to ship and ship to terminal handling of cargoes; and

"Whereas California based steamship and other transportation companies and port authorities need and solicit added stimulus to their economy; and

"Whereas shipments destined for Pakistan, Japan and other adjacent countries enjoy a lesser ocean going freight rate from California ports than from eastern or gulf ports and this rate advantage is a much as ten dollars ($10) per ton; and

"Whereas further economic aid to the Middle East as proposed by President Eisenhower will greatly stimulate the movement of CCC commodities to that area; and

"Whereas California is a target area in case of attack by foreign enemy which entitles her to and indicates the wisdom of having abundant amounts of all foodstuffs under control of CCC stored at strategic points within the State for the convenience, protection and preservation of her citizens; and

"Whereas vast quantities of rice, dairy products, corn, wheat and other commodities held in surplus by CCC are being used in the school-lunch program in California: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the senate and the assembly (jointly)*, That the Members of Congress in the California delegation are memorialized to urge the Secretary of Agriculture, Honorable Ezra Taft Benson and his administrative assistants in Commodity Credit Corporation to avail themselves of all storage facilities in California which meet their health and sanitation standards and which can be used in accordance with economic feasibility practices of the CCC; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this joint resolution be sent to each member of the California delegation in Congress and to United States Senators Knowland and Kuchel and to Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson; Jack Anderson, Agricultural Assistant to President Eisenhower; Walter Burger, Administrator of CSS; Marvin L. McLain, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Agriculture; Clarence Palmby, Director of the Division of Grain of CSS; and to Francis S. Daniels, General Sales Manager of CSS."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

*"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its 34th session, respectfully represent that—

"Whereas the exise tax on interstate transportation was adopted during World War II as an emergency revenue measure; and

"Whereas, Idaho, like most Western States imports the majority of what it consumes and exports the majority of what it produces; and

"Whereas the cost of transportation on goods consumed in Idaho is passed to the consumer, while the cost of transportation of goods produced in Idaho is paid by the producer, thereby resulting in Idahoans paying substantially the full freight bill on all goods shipped both in and out of the State; and

"Whereas Idaho and other Western States shippers who sell in eastern, Atlantic, and Gulf coast markets are at an enormous disadvantage, for example, the excise tax amounts to more than $600,000 annually in the case of Idaho potato shipments alone, and is correspondingly heavy on shipments of timber and timber-products, livestock, and ores and mining products; and

"Whereas our Western States are large in area but relatively small in population and therefore more dependent upon transportation than other areas; and

"Whereas said tax on interstate transportation has increased in amount with each rate raise granted the transportation industry, and is burdensome to the people of this State; and

"Whereas, to an impartial observer it would seem indisputable that the emergency for which said tax was imposed has ceased: Now, therefore be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the 34th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America to repeal and abolish the Tax on Interstate Transportation; be it further

*"Resolved,* That the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho, be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to send copies of this Joint Memorial to the President of the United States, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to the United States Senators and Representatives of the State of Idaho, and to the Senate and the House of Representatives in each of the other eleven Western States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

*"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

"Whereas proposal has been made that the waters of the interstate streams of Wyoming and Idaho, and particularly the headwaters and headwater tributaries of the Snake River, be diverted into the Colorado River watershed for use in the State of Colorado; and

"Whereas the waters of such streams are vital to the prosperity and well-being of the States of Idaho and Wyoming and the citizenry of each such State and the flow of such streams has been dedicated, and as a matter of right should be dedicated, to the use of the peoples of Idaho and Wyoming, and are necessary to fill the appropriations in each such State and the uses and projects under development in each such State, and the rights to use of the flow of such streams should be confined to Idaho and Wyoming, and the use thereof be determined by the States of Idaho and Wyoming, and governed by the laws of each such State and the compacts of such States for the adjustment of conflicting interests; and

"Whereas the States of Idaho and Wyoming have the exclusive interest in such streams and there is no controversy over the rights to the use of such streams between such States and any diversion or attempted diversion or use of the flow of such streams in any other State will create great and extended controversy: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the 34th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and the same hereby is, memorialized to fairly consider in any proposed legislation which may come before it, the rights of the peoples of Idaho and Wyoming to the flow of the interstate streams constituting the headwaters and the headwater tributaries of the Snake River, all to the end that there shall be no legislation enacted which will authorize or result, directly or indirectly, in the diversion, or attempted or threatened diversion, of the waters of such interstate streams of the States of Idaho and Wyoming from the Snake River watershed into the Colorado River watershed for use in the State of Colorado or any other State; be it further

*"Resolved,* That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; ordered to lie on the table:

"House Joint Resolution 2

"Whereas the Honorable Dwight David Eisenhower and the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON are soon to be inaugurated as President and Vice President of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the President and Vice President of the United States of America, in their positions of responsibility and leadership, are, in the eyes of the American people and the peoples of the world, the symbol of America's desire for peace and opposition to forces of tyranny and oppression; and

"Whereas the President and Vice President of the United States of America are the elected leaders of all the people of this Nation regardless of their party affiliation: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring)*, That we offer our congratulations to the Honorable Dwight David Eisenhower and the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON as they embark on their second terms and continue to assume their positions of responsibility and leadership; be it further

*"Resolved,* That we wish the Honorable Dwight David Eisenhower and the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON success, achievement and the best of health during their terms of office; be it further

*"Resolved,* That we pray that this administration may be characterized by world peace and security; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate to the Honorable Dwight David Eisenhower, the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON, to the Secretary of State of the United States and to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by House January 18, 1957.

"Adopted by Senate January 28, 1957.

"EDITH BYRON LOW,
*"Chief Clerk.*

"PAT DOOLEY,
*"Speaker of House.*

"BOYD R. OVERHULAE,
*"President of Senate."*

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Memorial 2

*"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, and to the Oregon Members of these legislative bodies:*

"We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas increasing school costs are imposing a steadily increasing burden upon the real property owners of our State; and

"Whereas the present tax collection policies of the Federal Government fall heavily upon State sources, with no corresponding return to the State for the assistance of education; and

"Whereas under such taxation policies the Federal Government should assume its rightful obligation to the preservation of our way of life by assisting the cause of education; and

"Whereas it is the announced policy of both major political parties that the Federal Government should provide assistance in meeting building needs of various school districts: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon,* That the Congress of the United States hereby is urged to provide legislation giving grants-in-aid for school building purposes to school districts in the various States; be it further

*"Resolved,* That the Oregon Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives promote and support such legislation; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That the Secretary of State of the State of Oregon be and hereby is directed to send a copy of this memorial to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, Vice President of the United States, to the Honorable Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare of the United States, to the President and Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to all Members of the Oregon congressional delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by house January 28, 1957.

"EDITH EYRON LAW,
*"Chief Clerk.*

"PAT DOOLEY,
*"Speaker of House."*

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Resolution 9

"Resolution of condemnation and protest against oppressive usurpation of power by the Supreme Court of the United States, calling upon the several States of the Union and the Congress of the United States to bring to an end this tyrannical usurpation of power

"Whereas the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of Tennessee acknowledges and reaffirms its allegiance to the Constitution and Government of the United States and is ever mindful of its responsibility to defend the Constitution of the United States against every attempt, foreign or domestic, to undermine the dual structure of this Union or to destroy those fundamental principles embodied in the written Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas the founders of this great Nation, fearful of the tyranny that naturally and always follows the unrestricted concentration of governmental power, secured the passage of the Bill of Rights, consisting of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution; and

"Whereas the 9th and 10th amendments to the Constitution expressly and explicitly limit the Federal Government to specific powers delegated to it by the terms of the compact and reserved to the States and their people and all other powers, unless specifically prohibited by it to the States; and

"Whereas the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of Tennessee is ever mindful of the admonition that 'frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty'; and

"Whereas 'eternal vigilance is the price of liberty' and also the price of constitutional government which is the sole guardian of our liberties; and

"Whereas the Constitution is a solemn compact between the States, and the Federal Government is the creature born of that compact from sovereign powers inherently residing in the States and their people but delegated solely for the purposes clearly and manifestly set forth in the Constitution, and only those powers specifically enumerated; and that all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people; and

"Whereas the methods and procedures for amending the Constitution of the United States are distinctly and plainly stated in article V of that instrument in these words: 'The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress'; and

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States may be validly amended only in the manner prescribed by the Constitution itself, and the United States Supreme Court has never had, does not now have, and should never possess, the power and authority to amend the Constitution; and

"Whereas neither the judicial power granted the United States Supreme Court in article III of the Federal Constitution nor such appellate jurisdiction as Congress has conferred, or may confer, can constitute that Court the dominant and ultimate authority with the power of determining without regard for the Constitution what is and is not in the best interest of the Nation; and

"Whereas by its decision of May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States, in seeking to establish itself as the dominant and ultimate policy-setting agency of the Nation, in effect amended the Constitution by interpreting the 14th amendment in a manner clearly contrary to the well-settled construction of that amendment; and

"Whereas the State of Tennessee in ratifying the 14th amendment did not intend to delegate to the Federal Government the power to deny to the States the inherent right to operate racially separate schools; and when the 14th amendment was ratified, there were 36 States in the Union, and 23 of those States had segregated schools and others had no public schools at all; and the Congress which proposed the 14th amendment established segregated schools in the District of Columbia; and both State and Federal courts, without exception, beginning with a decision of the Massachusetts Supreme Court in 1848, and subsequently followed by the courts of Connecticut, New York, Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, Minnesota, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and others, recognized the power of the States to operate a system of separate public schools; and

"Whereas the General Assembly of Tennessee relying upon the United States Supreme Court's own interpretation of the 14th amendment and the numerous and uncontradicted decisions of other Federal and State courts established and developed a segregated public-school system; and Tennessee properly assumed that it could rely upon congressional action and earlier Court decisions as is demonstrated by the language of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Myers* v. *United States* (1927) * * * 'when Congress, after full consideration and with the acquiescence and long practice of all branches of the Government, has established the construction of the Constitution, it may not by its mere subsequent legislation reverse such construction. It is not given powers by itself thus to amend the Constitution'; and

"Whereas the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of Tennessee, mindful that powers assumed by the Supreme Court in one field and for one purpose today will become precedents for further assumption of power in other fields and for other purposes tomorrow and recognizing, as did the founders of this great Nation, that tyranny naturally and always follows naked power; and the Supreme Court of the United States has recently denied to the States the right to have laws of their own to deal with subversion or espionage against the Nation; and the States have been denied the right to dismiss individuals from their employment who refuse to answer questions concerning their connections with communism by invoking the fifth amendment; and power delegated to the Congress to regulate commerce among the several States has been exploited and twisted into a power to control local enterprises remote from interstate commerce; and the power to levy taxes for the general welfare has been used relentlessly as a power to confiscate the earnings of our people for purposes totally unrelated to the general welfare as we conceive it; and judicial prerogative has finally permitted private property to be taken for uses that plainly are not public uses; and now the power to provide for the common defense is being distorted into a power to meddle in the school-building program of the several States; and the fears of Thomas Jefferson are rapidly becoming realities: 'The great object of my fear is the Federal judiciary. That body, like gravity, ever acting, with noiseless foot, and unalarming advance, * * * is engulfing insidiously the special governments into the jaws of that which feeds them'; and

"Whereas there is implicit in these recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court a most grievous and deplorable disrespect for declared and established law; and

"Whereas, by reason of this disrespect for declared and established law on the part of the United States Supreme Court, the people's faith and confidence in the judicial ability and temperament and judicial self-restraint of our highest Federal judges has been most severely shaken; and

"Whereas the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of Tennessee recognize its solemn duty to help alert the Nation to the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States, by interpretations and constructions of the Constitution, encroaches upon the reserved powers of the States; and our failure to discharge the solemn duty to alert our people and the Nation would constitute passive acquiescence in dangerous precedents aimed at undermining our democratic form of government: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives*—

"SECTION 1. That the States have never granted to the United States Supreme Court, or any other court, the power to amend the Federal Constitution, nor does the Federal Government possess any powers not delegated to it by the Constitution of the United States.

"SEC. 2. That the grievous and deplorable disrespect for the declared and established law of the land on the part of the United States Supreme Court constitutes a most dangerous and oppressive usurpation of the power of the Congress and the rights of the States and the people and a grave threat to constitutional government in these United States.

"SEC. 3. That the State of Tennessee does condemn and protest the oppressive usurpation of power by the Supreme Court of the United States.

"SEC. 4. That the State of Tennessee does call upon all States and the Congress of the United States to bring to an end this tyrannical usurpation of power by the United States Supreme Court and to prevent now and in the future other and further encroachment upon the reserved powers of the States and the rights of the people, to the end that constitutional government shall ever be preserved.

"SEC. 5. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the governor and legislature of each

of the States, to the presiding officers of each of the Houses of the Congress of the United States, to Tennessee's Representatives and Senators in the Congress, to the President of the United States, and to the several judges of the Supreme Court of the United States.

"SEC. 6. This resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its adoption.

"Adopted: January 22, 1957.

"JAMES L. BOMAR,
*"Speaker of the House of Representatives."*

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 4

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States and urging the repeal of that section of the Federal laws governing old-age assistance, to enable the recipients of awards to accept partial employment and to retain the remuneration received therefrom without penalty or reduction of old-age assistance payments

"Whereas the people of Colorado, having adopted a constitutional amendment by the will of the majority as expressed by the vote of the people on November 6, 1956; and

"Whereas said amendment, in part, provides for a means of adapting Colorado statutes to such modifications as may be desirable, in conformity with alterations of Federal laws relating to old-age assistance; and

"Whereas there have been expressed strong sentiments favoring the affirmation of the rights of all citizens to engage in work of their choice; and

"Whereas it is a well-established fact that the therapy of work, and the psychological benefits derived therefrom, are of great value to our aged; and

"Whereas such employment would not materially alter the average income of our elder citizens who are recipients of old-age assistance: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 41st General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the senate concurring herein),* That the general assembly hereby petitions the Members of the Congress of the United States to consider such modification of existing old-age assistance laws as would enable recipients to accept employment and retain the compensation derived therefrom up to the statutory limit of Federal income-tax exemption, establish savings, make contributions to charities, and other similar morale-building forces of participation in their community life without loss of, or deductions from, their awards; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and Members of Congress from the State of Colorado.

"FRANK L. HAYS,
*"President of the Senate.*
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
*"Secretary of the Senate.*
"CHARLES R. CONKLIN,
*"Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"LEE MATTIES,
*"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."*

Resolutions of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolutions on remarks by the Secretary of Defense with reference to the National Guard

"Whereas the Secretary of Defense has unfortunately and ineptly seen fit to state that the National Guard was used to dodge the draft and escape fighting in Korea; and

"Whereas the importance and prestige of the Secretary's office have given to his incorrect and scurrilous remark a national and perhaps international circulation; and

"Whereas the Secretary's remark has been widely interpreted as a slur upon the officers and men, the honor, traditions, and history of the National Guard and citizen soldiers of the United States: Therefore, be it

*"Resolved,* as follows:

"1. That the Massachusetts Senate condemns the allegation of the Secretary of Defense that young men voluntarily enlisted in the National Guard before induction into the Regular services with the motive and for the purpose of escaping dangerous duty in Korea;

"2. That the Massachusetts Senate affirms the obvious proposition that one who voluntarily enlisted in the National Guard during the Korean emergency made himself instantly and unconditionally available for unlimited military service in that conflict;

"3. That the Massachusetts Senate avers that those accused by the Secretary of Defense as draft dodgers enlisted in the National Guard and made themselves available for unlimited military service long before they would have been inducted in due course;

"4. That the adjutant general of Massachusetts be instructed to enlighten the Secretary of Defense by advising him of the units of the Massachusetts National Guard both Army and Air which were called into Federal service during the Korean emergency;

"5. That the Massachusetts Senate reaffirms its confidence in the honor of the officers and men of the National Guard and its consciousness and pride in the citizen soldiers who have fought and died for the safety and integrity of America in every conflict from the Indian wars through and including the action in Korea;

"6. That the Massachusetts Senate condemns the apparent purpose of the Secretary of Defense to destroy the National Guard, and condemns his remarks noted above, which are part and parcel of his policy;

"7. That the secretary of this Commonwealth be instructed to forward copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense and all Massachusetts Members of the Congress of the United States.

"Senate, January 31, 1957.

"Adopted:

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
*"Clerk.*

"A true copy.

"Attest:

"EDWARD J. CRONIN,
*"Secretary of the Commonwealth."*

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Memorial 2

*"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, and to the Oregon Members of these legislative bodies:*

"We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas increasing school costs are imposing a steadily increasing burden upon the real property owners of our State; and

"Whereas the present tax collection policies of the Federal Government fall heavily upon State sources, with no corresponding return to the State for the assistance of education; and

"Whereas under such taxation policies the Federal Government should assume its rightful obligation to the preservation of our way of life by assisting the cause of education; and

"Whereas it is the announced policy of both major political parties that the Federal Government should provide assistance in meeting building needs of various school districts: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon,* That the Congress of the United States hereby is urged to provide legislation giving grants-in-aid for school building purposes to school districts in the various States; be it further

*"Resolved,* That the Oregon Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives promote and support such legislation; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That the Secretary of State of the State of Oregon be and hereby is directed to send a copy of this memorial to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, Vice President of the United States, to the Honorable Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare of the United States, to the President and Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by house January 28, 1957.

"EDITH BYNON LAW,
*"Chief Clerk.*

"PAT DOOLEY,
*"Speaker of House."*

Resolutions adopted by the Utility Co-Workers' Association, Newark, N. J., relating to social security, and so forth; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, New York, N. Y., relating to the right of newspapers to gather and disseminate information in all areas of the world in which the United States is not engaged in war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the executive committee of the National Association of Attorneys General, Washington, D. C., favoring the enactment of legislation to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to passing legislation granting to the State of Wyoming all of the land and minerals within the confines of its borders, with the exception of the national parks and national monuments, national forests, and lands for natural defense and promotion of aviation and agriculture. The people of the sovereign State of Wyoming recognizing that the United States of America owns over 51 percent of all the lands within the borders of the State of Wyoming, and over 73 percent of the minerals on, in, or under the lands of the State of Wyoming

"Whereas the people of the State of Wyoming have long been aware of the inequitable lack of sovereignty and loss of revenue from the lands and minerals aforesaid; and

"Whereas the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, in its preamble, states that its purpose is to 'promote the highest use of the public lands pending its final disposal'; and

"Whereas the right of coastal States to ownership of tidelands oil has been recognized by act of Congress with presidential affirmation; and

"Whereas by act of admission of 1890, 'The State of Wyoming is hereby declared admitted to the Union on an equal footing with the Original States in all respects whatever,' which is not the case in fact when the Federal Government owns the majority of Wyoming's surface lands and minerals rights; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States has attempted to take more of the

land and minerals in addition to those already owned by it, and thus deprive the State of Wyoming and its citizens further from the benefits of such lands and minerals: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 34th Legislature of the State of Wyoming* (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, memorialized to promptly, diligently, and fairly consider and act upon at this session, legislation designed to grant to the State of Wyoming and its citizens title to all of the lands and minerals presently owned by the Government of the United States of America within the borders of the State of Wyoming, with the exception of national parks and national monuments, national forests, and lands for national defense, and promotion of aviation and agriculture; be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, United States Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, and Represenative in Congress E. KEITH THOMPSON, and to the governors and legislatures of the following States: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Washington.

"LEE E. KEITH,
*"Speaker of the House.*
"EARL T. BOWER,
*"President of the Senate.*

"Approved January 23, 1957.
"MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
*"Governor."*

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Wyoming, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

"Joint Memorial 4

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to passing legislation to modernize the 160-acre limitation now imposed upon farm units in federally financed reclamation projects

"Whereas the 160-acre limitation upon farm units involving federally financed reclamation projects is based upon an outworn concept and has become a serious hindrance to the development of the West through reclamation; and

"Whereas in the case of presently irrigated private lands which need supplemental irrigation, the proper economic size of farm units has already been determined, as a result of decades of trial and error, and

"Whereas there exist in the West many areas which are naturally less favored than others, by reason of short growing seasons due to high elevation, northern latitude, or otherwise, and

"Whereas, such less favored areas cannot be reclaimed under the present land limitation provisions because they can be made productive only by the use of machinery, the cost of which is not warranted if the farm is limited to 160 acres or less, now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of the 34th Legislature of the State of Wyoming* (*the Senate of such legislature concurring*), That the Congress of the United States of America, be and it is hereby memorialized to promptly, diligently, and fairly consider and act upon at this session, legislation designed to modernize the acreage limitation in the following manner:

"1. Removal of the limitation in the case of lands to which supplemental water is to be supplied; and

"2. Determination of the economic size of farm units in a new land project by the appropriate State official or agency; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, United States Senator J. C. O'MAHONEY, and Representative in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Reclamation, and to the governors and legislatures of the following States: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Washington.

"LEE E. KEITH,
*"Speaker of the House.*
"EARL T. BOWER,
*"President of the Senate.*

"Approved January 23, 1957.
"MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
*"Governor."*

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

"Joint Memorial No. 3

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to nonreimbursable costs in water development

"Whereas the costs allocated to flood control, navigation, and fish and wildlife benefits are now authorized by law as nonreimbursables, and

"Whereas many water development and reclamation projects provide recreational, salinity control, sediment control, public transportation, protection of public health, promotion of national defense and fulfillment of international obligation benefits which are of more value to a river basin and the Nation as a whole, than they are to the irrigation-water users under the projects, and

"Whereas it is no more logical to make the local irrigation water users pay for these benefits to the region and the Nation than it would be to make them pay for flood control, navigation, and fish and wildlife benefits which are now nonreimbursables: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved,* That the house of the 34th legislature of the State of Wyoming and the senate of such legislature concurring that the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to promptly, diligently, and fairly consider and act upon at this session, legislation designed to include: (1) Recreation, (2) salinity control, (3) sediment control, (4) public transportation, (5) protection of public health, (6) promotion of national defense, (7) fulfillment of international obligation benefits as nonreimbursables to the full extent of the national interest: Be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, United States Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, and Representative in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON, to the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation.

"LEE E. KEITH,
*"Speaker of the House.*
"EARL T. BOWER,
*"President of the Senate.*

"Approved January 23, 1957.
"MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
*"Governor."*

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

By Mr. BARRETT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to making adequate appropriations for stream measurement, ground water investigations and mapping

"Whereas the future agricultural and industrial progress of Wyoming is dependent in large measure on the wise conservation and proper utilization of her limited water resources, both surface and underground; and

"Whereas the determination of the water resources of the State requires continuous and expanding scientific study of the variations in water supply from year to year and of the areal distribution of available water supplies: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of the 34th Legislature of the State of Wyoming* (*the Senate of such legislature concurring*), That the Congress of the United States of America, be and it is hereby memorialized to appropriate funds adequate to carry on a direct program of stream measurement, ground water investigations and mapping; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, United States Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, and Representative in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON, Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the Geological Survey.

"LEE E. KEITH,
*"Speaker of the House.*
"EARL T. BOWER,
*"President of the Senate.*

"Approved January 23, 1957.
"MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
*"Governor."*

By Mr. THYE:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Joint Resolution 472

"Joint resolution memoralizing the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to secure a removal of all military facilities and activities from Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport—Wold-Chamberlain Field, located in Hennepin County, Minn.

"Whereas the Minneapolis-St. Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission is a public corporation created, organized, and operating under the laws of the State of Minnesota, Minnesota Statutes 1953, sections 360.101–360.125;

"Whereas such commission acting under and as required by the act creating it did on August 14, 1944, take possession of Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport—Wold-Chamberlain Field and did on that date take over the operation, management, maintenance and development of such field, and has at all times since and is now in possession of such field and operating, managing, maintaining, and developing the same;

"Whereas such field was established as a civil airport and at all times since such establishment has been operated as a civil airport, to which commercial airlines have been and are carrying on very extensive passenger, mail, and cargo operations;

"Whereas the military—Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, and Minnesota National Guard, have facilities in the vicinity of such field and are engaged in military aviation activities to, from, and in the vicinity of such field, including as a part thereof the operation of jet military aircraft;

"Whereas the operation of jet military aircraft by the military resulted in several crashes during the spring of 1956 resulting in loss of life and destruction of property;

"Whereas military aviation operations at such field are deemed by the commission as detrimental to the safe and efficient operation of the airport as a civil airport, and constitute a constant hazard to residents living in the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul and the village of Richfield and to all others living in the general vicinity of the airport;

"Whereas the commission has gone on record from time to time as opposed to the continuance of said military aviation activities at such field and in connection therewith has suggested to the military that their facilities and activities be removed to another site well away from the populated areas of the cities and village aforesaid;

"Whereas a removal of the military from such airport will necessitate action by the Congress of the United States with the approval of the President of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota,* That the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States be requested to do all in their power to bring about the removal of all military facilities and activities from Wold-Chamberlain Field and from the vicinity thereof to a site to be acquired and facilities to be constructed by the Government well away from the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul and populated areas in the vicinity thereof; be it further

*"Resolved,* That the Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota."

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolutions protesting the present political division of Ireland and the presence of British troops therein

"Whereas the present political division of Ireland, whereby a part thereof is subject to British rule, is not in keeping with the principles of self-determination and is not based on the racial, economic or historical background of the people of Ireland; therefore be it

*"Resolved,* That the General Court of Massachusetts recommends that the Congress of the United States be urged to use its influence to abrogate the present political division of Ireland, and to protest the presence of British troops in that country; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the members thereof from this commonwealth.

"House of representatives, January 24, 1957.

"Adopted.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
*"Clerk.*

"Senate, January 29, 1957.

"Adopted, in concurrence.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
*"Clerk.*

"A true copy.

"Attest:

"EDWARD J. CRONIN,
*"Secretary of the Commonwealth."*

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

A resolution adopted by Oneota Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, Oneota, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to designate the first Sunday in February of each year as Chaplain's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of James F. McManus, of New York, N. Y., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## CITATION OF NUGENT LAPOMA FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 61)

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 89) citing Nugent LaPoma (alias George Cavano) for contempt of the Senate, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on Government Operations of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Nugent LaPoma, also known as George Cavano, to answer questions before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations; to produce certain papers consisting of described books and records of Local 174 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers, said refusal to answer and to produce the aforementioned papers being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Nugent LaPoma may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

## CITATION OF HARRY REISS FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 63)

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 90) citing Harry Reiss for contempt of the Senate, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on Government Operations of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Harry Reiss to answer questions before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Harry Reiss may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

## CITATION OF EINAR O. MOHN FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 62)

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 91) citing Einar O. Mohn for contempt of the Senate, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on Government Operations of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Einar O. Mohn, to answer questions before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Einar O. Mohn may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

## CITATION OF FRANK W. BREWSTER FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 60)

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 92) citing Frank W. Brewster for contempt of the Senate, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on Government Operations of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Frank W. Brewster—

(1) to answer questions before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Invesigations of the Committee on Government Operations;

(2) to produce certain papers consisting of described books and records of the Western Conference of Teamsters before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, and

(3) to produce certain papers consisting of described books and records of Joint Council 28, of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers,

said refusal to answer and to produce the aforementioned papers being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Frank W. Brewster may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1062. A bill for the relief of Maud Claer Wahl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1063. A bill vesting in the American Monuments Commission the care and maintenance of the Surrender Tree Site in Santiago, Cuba; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 1064. A bill relating to the management of the Red Lake Indian forest and sawmill; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1065. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1066. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretaries of the military departments to settle claims against the United States for damages caused by aircraft and guided missiles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HOLLAND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 1067. A bill to extend the Unemployment Compensation Program to Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 1068. A bill for the relief of Gladys Arbutus Joel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1069. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Page; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 1070. A bill for the relief of Lucia Samano Tingleaf; and

S. 1071. A bill for the relief of David Mark Sterling and Judith Kobudeh Sterling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1072. A bill to provide for the establishment of townsites and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. MORTON):

S. 1073. A bill to prohibit unjust discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 1074. A bill to authorize the establishment of an Inventive Contributions Awards Board within the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. THYE):

S. 1075. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 to exclude from coverage under such act certain corporations the entire net income of which is turned over to an exempt organization; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1076. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to provide a base acreage for corn of 52 million acres, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1077. A bill to provide that Inauguration Day shall be a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1078. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in Middlesex County, Mass.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 1079. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of stamps to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the arrival in Springfield, Mo., of the first westbound stage of the Overland Butterfield Stage Co.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HENNINGS (for himself, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1080. A bill to provide for approval under title X of the Social Security Act of State plans for aid to the blind without regard to the existence in any State of other programs of assistance to blind persons financed entirely by the State; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Mr. MARTIN of Iowa):

S. 1081. A bill to amend the act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill., in order to make certain changes in the authority of such commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1082. A bill for the relief of Katina Apostolou; and

S. 1083. A bill for the relief of Maria Maniates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1084. A bill to provide an adequate basis for administration of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Arizona and Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 1085. A bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. CHURCH):

S. 1086. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to a Bear River Compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. WATKINS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S. 1087. A bill to authorize the construction of a shellfish research laboratory and experiment station in the Chesapeake Bay area; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONG (for himself, Mr. BLAKLEY, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1088. A bill to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1089. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Pantano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 1090. A bill to extend the time for disposal of a certain war housing project to the housing authority of the town of Wethersfield, Conn.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1091. A bill to stimulate industrial development near Indian reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1092. A bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1093. A bill to amend title 10, United States, Code, to provide for the rank of certain officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; and

S. 1094. A bill to provide an extension of time for making application for terminal-leave pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1095. A bill to amend title II of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to provide educational benefits to persons who perform active service in the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955, while compulsory military service is required under existing laws of the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 1096. A bill to amend section 2 (c) of the Act of April 6, 1949, as amended, relating to special livestock loans; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MCNAMARA:

S. 1097. A bill for the relief of Francoise Beyronneau;

S. 1098. A bill for the relief of Stephen Kuang-Tao Hsu;

S. 1099. A bill for the relief of Jalileh A. Mansour;

S. 1100. A bill for the relief of Tadeusz Gasowski;

S. 1101. A bill for the relief of Elia Zelich; and

S. 1102. A bill for the relief of Adolfo Camillo Scopone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 1103. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the special school milk program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1104. A bill providing for the making of payments to the States and their political subdivisions in lieu of taxes with respect to certain real property owned by the United States or its agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1105. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; and

S. 1106. A bill for the relief of Margaret Nelson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1107. A bill to establish a Missouri Basin Commission and Compact Board to provide coherent and unified direction for the development of the Missouri Basin's natural resources, to give responsible direction to the resource development activities of the Federal Government in the Missouri Basin, and for coordinating those activities with resource development activities of the States; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he introduced Senate bills 1103, 1104, and 1107, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1108. A bill to amend paragraph 1629 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide for

the free importation of tourist literature; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1109. A bill to provide for the preservation of historical and archeological data (including relics and specimens) which might otherwise be lost as the result of the construction of a dam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1110. A bill for the relief of Sono Hoshi;

S. 1111. A bill to incorporate the Sea Cadet Corps of America; and

S. 1112. A bill for the relief of Matsue Harada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1113. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the city of Gloucester, Mass.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1114. A bill for the relief of Nazzarena Mancini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 1115. A bill for the relief of the city of Newport, R. I.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1116. A bill for the relief of the Salvatorian Mission House, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1117. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 1118. A bill to facilitate the administration and development of the Whitman National Monument, in the State of Washington, by authorizing the acquisition of additional land for the monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1119. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Giannini; and

S. 1120. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Miltiades Xenos, also known as John M. Xenos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1121. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to permit the States to disregard certain income in determining need for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. IVES):

S. 1122. A bill to provide for registration, reporting, and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefit plans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 1123. A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 1124. A bill to transfer to the Government of the District of Columbia the Public Employment Service for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 1125. A bill to enable corn producers to participate in the 1957 soil-bank and price-support programs and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HICKENLOOPER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1126. A bill for the relief of David Cingel; his wife, Dora Cingel; and their two children, Chawa Cingel and Laja Cingel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1127. A bill to extend and enlarge the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 1128. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1129. A bill to increase the education and training allowances under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1130. A bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands, including Indian tribal lands, acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam project of mineral interests in such lands; and

S. 1131. A bill granting certain grazing, fishing and hunting rights to the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1132. A bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the continental United States and Alaska and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. IVES):

S. 1133. A bill to provide for the installation of a public address system in the Senate Chamber; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1134. A bill to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 1135. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large retail establishments whose activities affect interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 1136. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for carrying out provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain timber access roads, to permit maximum economy in harvesting national-forest timber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. LONG):

S. 1137. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement that an individual attain 50 years of age in order to be eligible for disability benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period from May 12, 1957, to May 18, 1957, as National Transportation Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution designating the 7th day of December in each year as "Preparedness Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

---

## ADMISSION OF SPAIN AS A MEMBER OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. BRIDGES (for himself, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. IVES, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. LONG, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. BEALL) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the United States, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, and the United Kingdom are parties to the North Atlantic Treaty; and

Whereas the primary objective of the treaty is to contribute to the maintenance of peace by making clear the determination of the parties collectively to resist armed attack upon any of them; and

Whereas the parties have joined, pursuant to the treaty, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a collective defense arrangement for the North Atlantic area established within the framework of the United Nations Charter and based upon the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the charter; and

Whereas the United States and Spain, on September 26, 1953, signed bilateral agreements for the furtherance of their mutual security; and

Whereas Portugal, a member of NATO, is already joined with Spain in a treaty of mutual friendship; and

Whereas the membership of Spain would strengthen the strategic position of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the Department of State should continue to use its good offices toward the end of achieving the earliest possible participation by Spain in the North Atlantic Treaty and as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

## RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were submitted or reported, and referred or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. Res. 88. Resolution amending S. Res. 74, 85th Congress, establishing a select committee to investigate certain problems pertaining to labor-management relations; considered and agreed to.

The following resolutions were reported by Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, and placed on the calendar:

S. Res. 89. Citing Nugent LaPoma (alias George Cavano) for contempt of the Senate;

S. Res. 90. Citing Harry Reiss for contempt of the Senate;

S. Res. 91. Citing Einar O. Mohn for contempt of the Senate; and

S. Res. 92. Citing Frank W. Brewster for contempt of the Senate.

(See the above resolutions printed in full which appear under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

## PRINTING OF REPORT ON INVESTIGATION OF AIRPOWER AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on January 30, 1957, the airpower report of the Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Senate Committee on Armed Services was made public.

The demand for copies of this report has far exceeded the limited supply obtained as a committee print. In fact, requests for copies by Members of both Houses of the Congress cannot now be met. I submit a resolution to have this report printed as a Senate document and to have 5,000 additional copies printed.

The staff of the Joint Committee on Printing has estimated the cost at about $660.

I ask that this resolution be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 93) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there be printed as a Senate document the report of an investigation of airpower by the Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate; and that 5,000 additional copies be printed for use of the Committee on Armed Services.

## SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES CAUSED BY AIRCRAFT AND GUIDED MISSILES

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill which would expedite payment by the Federal Government of claims for damages suffered by private citizens in military aircraft crashes. I feel that the enactment of general legislation on this subject is necessary if the Federal Government is to fulfill its moral obligations to those unfortunate citizens who suffer substantial injuries and damages, through no fault of their own, as a result of the operation of a governmental function, operating in the interest of all of the people of the United States and in the defense of this Nation. Certainly this burden should be shared by the entire populace of the United States, and reasonably quick relief should be granted in order to alleviate, as soon as possible, the suffering of victims of such crashes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a copy of the bill and a statement I have prepared with reference to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1066) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretaries of the military departments to settle claims against the United States for damages caused by aircraft and guided missiles, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That chapter 163 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) By redesignating section 2735 thereof as section 2736 thereof.

(2) By inserting, immediately after section 2734 thereof, the following new section:

"§ 2735. Property loss; personal injury or death: caused by aircraft or guided missiles.

"(a) Under such regulations as the Secretary of a military department may prescribe, he may settle, or compromise, and pay (or partially pay pending a final determination of the validity of the total amount of the claim) any claim against the United States, not exceeding a total amount of $50,000, for—

"(1) damage to, or loss of, real property, including damage or loss incident to use and occupancy;

"(2) damage to, or loss of, personal property; or

"(3) personal injury or death;

caused by an aircraft, or an aerial missile having a guidance system or a portion of a guidance system which is an integral part of the missile, if that aircraft or missile was owned or controlled by his department and was operated or launched in the course of activities other than combat activities by military or civilian personnel of such department. For the purpose of determining the extent of any damage to real property which is the subject of any claim under this section, the Secretary is authorized to retain the services of one or more qualified impartial appraisers, and to compensate such appraiser or appraisers for such service in an amount not in excess of that customarily charged for like service at the place at which such property is situated.

"(b) In any case in which the amount to be paid is not more than $1,000, the Secretary of the military department concerned may delegate his authority under subsection (a).

"(c) A claim may be paid under subsection (a) only if—

"(1) it is based upon damage, loss, injury, or death occurring within the continental United States, any Territory or possession of the United States, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and

"(2) it is presented in writing within 2 years after the accrual of such claim, except that if the claim accrues in time of war or a war intervenes within 2 years after it accrues, and if good cause is shown, the claim may be presented not later than 2 years after the war is terminated.

"(d) No payment shall be made under this section on account of any damage to or loss of the property, or the death or injury, of any member of any armed force of the United States or any civilian officer or employee of the United States, or any department or agency thereof, if compensation for or on account of such damage, loss, injury or death is provided under any other provision of law.

"(e) The availability to a claimant under this act of any remedy under chapter 171 of title 28 of the United States Code shall not bar payment of the claim made by him under this act. No claim may be paid under both this act and such chapter. No payment made under this section shall give rise to any right of subrogation to any claim for reimbursement in whole or in part under any contract of insurance providing for the making of any payment for or on account of the damage, loss, injury, or death for or on account of which such payment was made under this section, and no payment made hereunder shall absolve any insurer, in whole or in part, of any obligation under any such contract. The acceptance by any claimant of any payment in full satisfaction of his claim under this section shall render final and conclusive the settlement or compromise upon which such payment was made.

"(f) Notwithstanding any contract to the contrary, no part of any amount awarded upon any claim made under this section in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim. Whoever violates any provision of this subsection shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be fined not more than $1,000.

"(g) The Secretary of each military department shall report to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives within 20 days after an amount over $3,000 is paid by him under this section. The report shall include a description of the claim, the name of each person to whom any part of such payment was made, the amount paid to each such person, the basis of the determination, and other pertinent information. Each such Secretary shall transmit to the Congress, within 30 days after the beginning of each regular session, a report containing a full and complete description of all claims which have been paid under this section since the submission of the preceding session report. During any war any Secretary may omit from any report made under this subsection any information the disclosure of which would, in his opinion, prejudice the national security."

(3) By striking out the word "or" in section 2736, as redesignated by the first paragraph of this act, and inserting a comma and the words "or 2735" after the figure "2734" therein.

(4) By inserting in the analysis, immediately after the item thereof relating to section 2734, the following new item:

"2735. Property loss; personal injury or death: caused by aircraft or guided missiles."

SEC. 2. Chapter 17 of title 14, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting, immediately after section 646 thereof, the following new section:

"§ 646A. Claims for damages occasioned by aircraft or guided missiles

"(a) Under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, he may

settle, or compromise, and pay (or partially pay pending a final determination of the validity of the total amount of the claim) any claim against the United States, not exceeding a total amount of $50,000, for—

"(1) damage to, or loss of, real property, including damage or loss incident to use and occupancy;

"(2) damage to, or loss of, personal property; or

"(3) personal injury or death;

caused by an aircraft, or an aerial missile having a guidance system or a portion of a guidance system which is an integral part of the missile, if that aircraft or missile was owned or controlled by the Coast Guard and was operated or launched in the course of activities other than combat activities by military or civilian personnel of the Coast Guard at any time when the Coast Guard is not serving as a part of the Navy. For the purpose of determining the extent of any damage to real property which is the subject of any claim under this section, the Secretary is authorized to retain the services of one or more qualified impartial appraisers, and to compensate such appraiser or appraisers for such service in an amount not in excess of that customarily charged for like service at the place at which such property is situated.

"(b) In any case in which the amount to be paid is not more than $1,000, the Secretary may delegate his authority under subsection (a) to any officer of the Treasury Department or Coast Guard designated by the Secretary.

"(c) A claim may be paid under subsection (a) only if—

"(1) it is based upon damage, loss, injury, or death occurring within the continental United States, any Territory or possession of the United States, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and

"(2) it is presented in writing within 2 years after the accrual of such claim, except that if the claim accrues in time of war or a war intervenes within 2 years after it accrues, and if good cause is shown, the claim may be presented not later than 2 years after the war is terminated.

"(d) No payment shall be made under this section on account of any damage to or loss of the property, or the death or injury, of any member of any Armed Force of the United States or any civilian officer or employee of the United States, or any department or agency thereof, if compensation for or on account of such damage, loss, injury, or death is provided under any other provision of law.

"(e) The availability to a claimant under this act of any remedy under chapter 171 of title 28 of the United States Code shall not bar payment of the claim made by him under this act. No claim may be paid under both this act and such chapter. No payment made under this section shall give rise to any right of subrogation to any claim for reimbursement in whole or in part under any contract of insurance providing for the making of any payment for or on account of the damage, loss, injury, or death for or on account of which such payment was made under this section, and no payment made hereunder shall absolve any insurer, in whole or in part, of any obligation under any such contract. The acceptance by any claimant of any payment in full satisfaction of his claim under this section shall render final and conclusive the settlement or compromise upon which such payment was made.

"(f) Notwithstanding any contract to the contrary, no part of any amount awarded upon any claim made under this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim. Whoever violates any provision of this subsection shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be fined not more than $1,000.

"(g) The Secretary shall report to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives within 20 days after an amount over $3,000 is paid by him under this section. The report shall include a description of the claim, the name of each person to whom any part of such payment was made, the amount paid to each such person, the basis of the determination, and other pertinent information. The Secretary shall transmit to the Congress, within 30 days after the beginning of each regular session, a report containing a full and complete description of all claims which have been paid under this section since the submission of the preceding session report. During any war, the Secretary may omit from any report made under this subsection any information the disclosure of which would in his opinion prejudice the national security."

(2) By inserting in the analysis, immediately after the item thereof relating to section 646, the following new item:

"646A. Claims for damages occasioned by aircraft or guided missiles."

The statement presented by Mr. HOLLAND is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOLLAND

I have introduced today a bill which, if enacted, would permit more expeditious handling of claims of private citizens arising out of military aircraft crashes within the continental United States, any Territory or possessions of the United States, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Under existing law, a claim resulting from such a crash may be administratively settled by the Secretary of the military department concerned if it does not exceed $1,000, as an incident to noncombat activities of that department (10 U. S. C. 2733, as amended by Public Law 446, 84th Congress). Thus, small claims of this nature may be expeditiously adjudicated and paid.

However, a meritorious claim which exceeds $1,000 must be first reviewed by the service Secretary and if the claimant agrees to accept the decision of the Secretary, as to damages suffered, it must then be referred to the Congress for action. Even if Congress is in session at the time, the funds with which to make the payment must be provided in an appropriations bill, the claim then processed by the General Accounting Office, and thereafter a check issued by the Treasurer of the United States. Accordingly, the claimant usually must wait many months from the time his claim was reviewed by the service Secretary until he receives compensation for his loss. This delay can and does, in many cases, place undue hardship upon the person who has suffered personal injury or property damage, and, in the final analysis, the Congress, almost without exception, goes along with the amounts recommended by the military departments.

In many cases claimants resort to suit under the Federal Tort Claims Act in an effort to obtain compensation for property damages or personal injuries. Under that statute, in order to impose liability upon the Government, the plaintiff is required to prove that the proximate cause of the crash and resultant damage was the negligence of an officer or employee of the United States while acting within the scope of his employment. Under the bill this avenue for relief is still available to those who are not satisfied with the decision of a service Secretary, but it is generally recognized that proof of negligence under the circumstances surrounding an aircrash is extremely difficult and is often impossible, particularly in those cases where the aircraft is totally destroyed and there are no survivors.

The task is made more difficult in some cases by the fact that the agency in possession of the facts necessary to prove negligence, that is the service department concerned, is not permitted for security reasons to allow such evidence to come before the courts. This situation usually results in useless expenditures of time and money and finally in private relief legislation being enacted by the Congress. Such was the case in *Williams* v. *United States* (115 Fed. Supp. 386; confirmed in 218 F. (2d) 473), which finally led to enactment of Private Law 675 in the 84th Congress. On July 22, 1952, a B–47 bomber disintegrated in flight and fell in Marianna, Fla. killing two children at play in their own backyard and causing personal injuries and property damage to others. Finally, on May 28, 1956, we were able to get a private relief bill enacted making possible some compensation for the tragic loss approximately 4 years after the accident. I am sure Senators will recall other similar cases.

The bill I have introduced today provides that under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Secretary of a military department, and the Secretary of the Treasury in behalf of the Coast Guard, (1) may settle, or compromise, and pay (or partially pay where extreme hardship exists, pending determination of the validity of the amount of the claim) any claim against the United States not exceeding $50,000 for damages to real property, personal property, or death caused by an aircraft or an aerial missile having a guidance system or a portion of a guidance system which is an integral part of the missile, if that aircraft or missile was owned or controlled by his Department and was operated or launched in the course of activities other than combat activities by military or civilian personnel of such Department; and (2) may delegate his authority on claims in which the amount to be paid is not more than $1,000.

Also, the bill—

1. limits claims payable to damages suffered in the continental United States, a Territory or possession of the United States, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

2. authorizes the Secretary to retain the services of qualified impartial appraisers;

3. requires claims to be filed within 2 years after they accrue, except in time of war (or when war intervenes) if good cause shown, claim may be filed within 2 years after the war is terminated.

4. provides that the act does not apply to employees of the Government if compensation is provided under other provisions of law;

5. makes available remedy under this act notwithstanding availability of the Tort Claims Act, but no claim is payable under both acts;

6. provides that the acceptance of payment under the act shall render final and conclusive the settlement or compromise upon which such payment was made;

7. provides that no payment made under the act shall give rise to right of subrogation to any claim for reimbursement under any contract of insurance, and that payment under the act shall not absolve any insurer;

8. contains 10 percent attorney fee provision; and

9. requires the Secretary of each military department to report to the Committee on the Judiciary in the Senate and the House of Representatives within 20 days after an amount over $3,000 is paid under the act. Also, a general report of all claims paid under the act since the preceding report, must be filed within 30 days after the beginning of each regular session of Congress.

A few weeks ago I asked the Air Force to make for me a compilation of claims above $1,000, resulting from military aircraft crashes, which have been paid in recent years by the Government, and I was surprised to learn that in the period 1951–1955, the Air Force alone had a total of 256 such claims, of which only 20 were ultimately decided by our courts. One hundred and forty-six claims were reported to the Congress for

payment through the appropriation procedure mentioned above, and in 27 cases the time of Congress was taken up with passage of private relief bills. The other claims were paid as settlements in lawsuits. Of course, because of its very nature, the Air Force has the largest number of such accidents, but the Navy reported many such actions and even the Army, with its limited flying, reported two such claims.

In claims involving Air Force, Army and Navy aircraft, including those of $1,000 or less, the Government expended more than $4,400,000 during the period of fiscal year 1951 through fiscal year 1955.

As a result of recent accidents in Florida, there are now pending, or soon will be, claims of considerable size arising out of 7 accidents, which killed 7 civilians and inflicted personal injury and property damage on others. The crash of a Navy plane killed 3 persons in 1 family in Sanford, Fla., on August 27, 1956, and the crash of an Air Force plane in Tallahassee in September of last year killed an expectant mother and 3 children. I am anxious that a procedure be set up to permit the expeditious settlement of such claims now pending and the many others which inevitably will follow as we strive to insure our national security by increased activities in developing, testing, and operating large numbers of aircraft and aerial missiles. The very nature of these weapons is such that a certain amount of hazard is involved in their operation, and since these operations are carried on for the protection of all of us, we should all bear at least the financial losses suffered by those unfortunate enough to have terrible tragedy visited upon them from such operations. To those who lose loved ones in such accidents, monetary reimbursement is a very small consolation. We can never fully repay them for their loss, and the very least we can do, it seems to me, is to expedite settlement of their claims in order to provide, as soon as possible, a near-normal life for remaining members of the family, particularly if the breadwinner is a victim of the accident.

In many instances immediate and severe cases of hardship are caused, and some money should be made available at once to alleviate this hardship and keep members of the family from having to rely on such charity as may be available to them. For this reason, under this bill a partial payment for damages may be made by the Secretary to give some immediate relief in extreme cases.

I have carefully studied the data prepared for me by the Air Force, and based on this information it is reasonable to assume that the limitation of $50,000, which is included in the bill, would permit the administrative and expeditious settlement of between 90 percent and 95 percent of all claims arising from military air crashes, and the provision in the bill permitting delegation of authority by the Secretary for the payment of claims not exceeding $1,000 would further expedite the payment of the small claims.

It is my strong feeling that Congress should maintain control over the larger claims but that an administrative procedure should be available to allow for the early settlement of the vast majority of meritorious claims of this nature, based upon causation rather than proof of negligence, in order for the Government to meet its moral responsibility.

Authority for settlement of claims against the Government by the military Secretaries is nothing new. As already stated, claims under $1,000 may be settled under 10 United States Code, 2733. Section 4802, title 10, United States Code, permits payment of admiralty claims against the United States Government of $500,000 or less by the Secretary of the Army, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense; section 9802, title 10, United States Code, permits the Secretary of the Air Force, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, to settle admiralty claims of $500,000 or less; and section 7622, title 10, United States Code, permits the Secretary of the Navy to settle such claims up to $1 million.

Also, in a law enacted last year, the $1,000 limitation which this bill would increase to $50,000, was completely waived in order that the Secretary of the Navy in one case, and the Secretary of the Air Force in another, might settle claims arising out of two military aircraft crashes in the vicinity of Minneapolis, Minn., in June of 1956. If such a procedure was desirable in these two cases, and I think it was, some general and reasonable method of settlement should be provided for the majority of the meritorious claims, with Congress being fully informed of the action taken in each case and maintaining jurisdiction over claims above $50,000.

I am sure that the military services would welcome the opportunity to settle as many claims as possible arising out of military aircraft crashes, because they realize the hardships these accidents cause and the great value prompt payment would be to good public relations, which, incidentally, with the noisier jets coming into use, is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain in some areas.

Enactment of this proposal would not increase the overall cost to the Government to satisfy such claims. In some instances it would save the cost of litigation and in others a financial saving from reduced redtape might be expected. Since the military departments would adjudicate and pay most of the claims, there would be an increase in the annual Department of Defense appropriations for claims, with a corresponding decrease in the funds now obtained from other sources for that purpose.

I strongly urge early and favorable consideration of this measure by the Congress.

---

## UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM FOR PUERTO RICO

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in the 84th Congress, I introduced a bill to extend the Federal-State unemployment insurance program to Puerto Rico. That bill was referred to the Committee on Finance, which solicited comment from the interested Federal agencies. Without exception, those agencies approved the proposed legislation.

Unemployment insurance is one of the few social security programs not yet extended to Puerto Rico. The Puerto Rican Legislative Assembly has asked that the program be extended to the Commonwealth, and has enacted the measures necessary to implement it.

Puerto Rico is plagued by labor surpulses. The long-range solution to this problem is the establishment of more industry in the island—a solution which the government of the Commonwealth is working assiduously to achieve. But a more immediate way of alleviating the problem would be a full-scale unemployment insurance program such as is in effect in other parts of the United States.

I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate a remark made by the Secretary of Labor in his comment on my bill last year.

The lack of sufficient industrial activity in Puerto Rico—

He said—

has led to a large-scale migration of workers from the island to the mainland in search of employment. This influx has produced serious economic consequences in some sections of the United States. I believe a full employment compensation program for Puerto Rico, as authorized by this bill, would do much to alleviate these problems.

This proposed legislation appears to me to be necessary and desirable. Therefore, I am reintroducing herewith the bill which I sponsored in the 84th Congress. My colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is joining me in sponsoring this bill. I send the bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred. I ask unanimous consent that a statement in explanation of the bill may be printed at this point in my remarks, together with the text of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1067) to extend the unemployment compensation program to Puerto Rico, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1067

A bill to extend the unemployment compensation program to Puerto Rico, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That paragraph (2) of section 901 (b) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) the amount estimated by the Secretary of Labor as equal to the necessary expenses incurred during the fiscal year for the performance by the Department of Labor of its functions under (i) this title and titles III and XII of this act, (ii) the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, (iii) the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, (iv) title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and (v) title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1952; and."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (1) of section 1101 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The term 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and when used in titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV includes the Virgin Islands."

SEC. 3. Paragraph 2 of section 1101 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The term 'United States' when used in a geographical sense means the States, Alaska, Hawaii, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

SEC. 4. Section 3306 (j) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(j) State, United States, and citizen: For purposes of this chapter—

"(1) State: The term 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(2) United States: The term 'United States' when used in a geographical sense includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"An individual who is a citizen of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (but not otherwise a citizen of the United States) shall be considered, for purposes of this section, as a citizen of the United States."

SEC. 5. Effective date—

(a) The effective date of sections 1, 2, and 3 of these amendments shall be January 1, 1958.

(b) Section 4 of these amendments shall be effective with respect to remuneration paid after 1957 for services performed after 1957.

The statement presented by Mr. IVES is as follows:

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF A BILL TO EXTEND THE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM TO PUERTO RICO

This draft bill is designed to extend the present Federal-State unemployment compensation program to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The proposal is part of the legislative program of the Department of Labor.

Under the present Federal-State system, unemployment insurance benefits are paid in accordance with State laws to workers, who, while able to work and available for work, are unemployed through no fault of their own. The benefits are paid from the proceeds of State payroll taxes which are deposited in the Unemployment Trust Fund in the United States Treasury.

NEED FOR A FEDERAL-STATE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM IN PUERTO RICO

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is plagued by unemployment and lacks sufficient industrial activity to absorb its labor surpluses. As a result, all three of its major industrial areas had substantial labor surpluses in September of this year, according to figures compiled by the Department of Labor. Two of these areas were classified as "group F," with 12 percent or more of the total labor force unemployed. The third area was classified as "group D," with 3 to 5.9 percent of the total labor force unemployed. This lack of balance between employment supply and demand has produced serious economic problems in Puerto Rico and led to a large-scale migration of workers from the island to the mainland in search of employment. The basic solution to this problem, of course, requires more industry to provide jobs for those now unemployed and great strides toward this goal are being made through Puerto Rico's dynamic program for bringing in new industry.

The Puerto Rican Legislature has also passed legislation establishing an unemployment insurance program for Puerto Rico. This legislation, which was enacted into law on June 21, 1956 and took effect on January 1, 1957, is such that minor changes would enable its approval for incorporation into the existing Federal-State system. Thus, the Federal-State unemployment insurance program could come into operation without delay upon the enactment of this proposal and Puerto Rico would be afforded the advantages of the Federal-State system, which are provided for the United States, Alaska and Hawaii.

Also, since the Wagner-Peyser Act was amended in 1950 to extend the Federal-State employment service program to Puerto Rico, enactment of this proposal would make the entire employment security program in Puerto Rico a part of the Federal-State system.

Unemployment insurance protection is presently provided in Puerto Rico under other Federal programs, of course, for employees of the Federal Government and veterans. A full Federal-State unemployment compensation program, however, is needed.

EXTENSION WILL ROUND OUT THE SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM

The desirability and feasibility of meeting serious social problems in Puerto Rico has long been recognized by Congress and is reflected in its inclusion in a number of remedial statutes. All of the provisions of the Social Security Act except the unemployment compensation program have already been extended to Puerto Rico. The maternal and child welfare program was extended to the Commonwealth as early as January 1, 1940; the program for old age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently disabled was extended on October 1, 1950; and the old age and survivors' insurance programs were made effective to Puerto Rico on January 1, 1951. Including Puerto Rico in the unemployment compensation program will round out the social security program for the Commonwealth.

PUERTO RICO WANTS TO BE INCLUDED

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is anxious to be brought under the Federal-State unemployment insurance program. Officials of the Commonwealth have had frequent conferences with staff members of the Department of Labor in their efforts to develop a financially sound and acceptable plan. The Puerto Rican Legislative Assembly passed a concurrent resolution on February 18, 1955, expressing its desire that the program be extended to the Commonwealth. This resolution was presented to the United States House of Representatives on February 28, 1955, and to the United States Senate on March 2, 1955.

## DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT BECAUSE OF AGE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make it an unlawful employment practice to discriminate in employment because of age.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1073) to prohibit unjust discrimination in employment because of age, introduced by Mr. JAVITS for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the bill would make it an unlawful employment practice to discharge, refuse to hire, or otherwise discriminate against an individual with relation to employment because of age, where the position does not require such age distinction. It makes the same provision with regard to employment agencies.

The bill makes it an unlawful employment practice to:

First. Discharge, refuse to hire, or otherwise discriminate against any individual with respect to his employment because of age, when the reasonable demands of the position do not require such an age distinction.

Second. Use the services of any employment agency or other hiring service that does discriminate against individuals because of age.

The Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor is given the necessary authority to issue cease and desist orders and to bring about reinstatement or rehiring with or without back pay. Judicial review is provided for, as well as processes of mediation, conciliation, technical advice and other aids to employer and employee with which we have had such good experience in New York.

Joint statement:

Hiring bias generally against workers 45 and older deprives the Nation of its most important resource of experienced employees, adds to the number of persons receiving public assistance and deprives older people of the dignity and status of self support. The right to employment without discrimination because of age, where the reasonable demands of the position do not require such an age distinction, is a right of all the people of the United States and should be protected.

While the whole problem of employment for those 45 or over cannot be solved by law, a suitable basis for solution can be brought about by law, since age discrimination in employment has unfortunately become widely prevalent in modern times.

For example, highlighting the employment difficulties of those 45 and older, Department of Labor statistics show that men over 45, collecting unemployment compensation, take substantially longer to find new jobs than those under 45. By the 15th week of unemployment, 1½ times as many workers over 45, as compared to those under, are still unemployed. The Labor Department figures also show that in addition to a longer duration of unemployment, more frequent periods of unemployment can be expected by the older men. Again many over 45 are out of work nearly 1½ times as often as those under 45.

Furthermore, in an analysis of hiring practices throughout the country, Labor Department statistics disclose that more than half the openings listed with employment offices in 70 percent of the cities surveyed contained maximum hiring ages.

Discrimination in hiring because of age is as unrealistic in view of our need for skilled labor as it is unfair. The President's recent economic report states that "shortages of trained manpower exist in virtually every field." To meet the demands of production, expanding as it must to enable us to fulfill our defense obligations as well as provide for a full and prosperous peacetime economy, we will need a labor force of 74 million by 1965, an increase of 7 million over the 1956 figure of 67 million. To meet present needs and prepare to meet our skilled labor requirements for the future, we must begin now to tap more fully the 45-and-over age group, who have the skill, the training, and the desire to continue as useful, productive, and self-reliant members of society.

The cosponsors consider this the most desirable bill along the lines sought to be covered, in the national interest.

## AMENDMENT OF SOIL BANK ACT, RELATING TO BASE ACREAGE FOR CORN

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill proposing an amendment to the Soil Bank Act, to provide a base acreage for corn of 52 million acres. The reason for suggesting 52 million acres is that since the crop in 1956, 52 new commercial counties have been added to the commercial acreage of this country. The Department of Agriculture advises me that that will expand by about a million acres the corn productive capacity of this country in the commercial area. For that reason, I propose a new base. My bill also proposes that there be a 75 percent minimum price support.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1067) to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to provide a base acreage for corn of 52 million acres, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## DESIGNATION OF INAUGURATION DAY AS A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing that Inauguration Day shall be a national holiday.

In past years we have provided that Inauguration Day shall be a legal holiday in the District of Columbia. Throughout the country generally there are millions of people who, were it not for the fact that they are fastened to their desks in their offices, or are employed in shops, or otherwise, once every 4 years would certainly grasp the opportunity, now that television is with us, to witness from their homes, or from cafes, or other public places, the tremendously significant ceremonies incident to the inauguration of the President of the United States.

In that connection I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the text of the very short bill I am introducing, together with an editorial supporting it, published in the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader of January 28, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1077) to provide that Inauguration Day shall be a national holiday, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the 20th day of January of each year in which the terms of President and Vice President begin is hereby made a legal public holiday to all intents and purposes and in the same manner as the 1st day of January, the 22d day of February, the 30th day of May, the 4th day of July, the 1st Monday of September, the 11th day of November, the 4th Thursday of November, and Christmas Day are now made by law public holidays.

The editorial presented by Mr. MUNDT is as follows:

[From the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader of January 28, 1957]

MAKE INAUGURAL DAY A HOLIDAY

Frank Harrington, of the Argus-Leader's news staff, comes up with an idea that contains a lot of merit. It is that the Presidential Inaugural Day be made a national holiday.

The reason for his suggestion is that such a holiday would permit everyone who wanted to do so to see the inauguration in view of the fact that the event is now so widely televised.

Many persons did see it last week over television and found the entire event of tremendous interest. Countless others wanted to see it but couldn't because they were at work.

A broader interest in the actual inauguration of a President would do much to promote understanding of Government and an appreciation of just what it means to all of us.

That's why there's a significant appeal in this suggestion.

It may be said we already have too many holidays. And we do have many holidays whose significance and purpose are lost in their observance.

But the proposed inaugural holiday would come only once in a four-year period and the event itself would command the attention of many millions who do not now have the privilege of seeing it.

Furthermore the holiday comes at a time of the year when there would be extremely limited objection from retail merchants and others because of the relatively low ebb of business.

More important, though, is the realization that it would help in educating all of us in respect to a subject—our Government—concerning which we should know much more than we do.

With that type of a holiday established, there might eventually develop some community associations. For example, communities themselves could hold in the evenings inaugural balls patterned after those in Washington.

The holiday could be developed into a notable occasion in American life. Certainly the idea deserves thorough consideration.

## NATIONAL CEMETERY IN MIDDLESEX COUNTY, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in Middlesex County, Mass. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a release prepared by me relating to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the release will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1078) to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in Middlesex County, Mass., introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The release presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL is as follows:

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL (Republican, of Massachusetts), introduced in today's session of Congress a bill providing for the establishment of a national cemetery in Middlesex County. The bill is a companion to H. R. 925, introduced on the first day of Congress by Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

Under the provisions of the bill the Secretary of the Army is directed to acquire the necessary lands for the establishment of a national cemetery. The cemetery will be maintained by the Department of the Army.

The Senator has been in correspondence with representatives of the American Legion, Middlesex County Council. The resolution requesting the Massachusetts Senator to introduce this proposed legislation originated in the American Legion Post, Marlboro, Mass.

"In view of the many Massachusetts citizens who have given their lives to our country, I believe that a national cemetery is a very fitting and proper recognition of their great sacrifice," said Senator SALTONSTALL.

## ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL STAMPS TO COMMEMORATE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST WEST-BOUND STAGE COACH AT SPRINGFIELD, MO.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of stamps, to commemorate the 100th aniversary of the arrival in Springfield, Mo., of the first west-bound stage of the Overland Butterfield Stage Co. The bill provides that the stamps shall be first offered for sale to the public at Springfield, Mo., on September 17, 1958, the date of the anniversary.

Springfield, in Greene County, Mo., was the first important stop on the Butterfield trail of coaches between St. Louis and San Francisco. The Greene County Historical Society is planning to celebrate the anniversary in Springfield, in 1958, and expects other cities along the route will take interest in the event.

Springfield has never had a first-day issue of commemorative stamps. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement concerning the historical significance of this event, and I trust that the Senate will give favorable consideration to the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The establishment of the stage coach route from St. Louis to San Francisco in the autumn of 1858 did much toward keeping the Far West in the Federal Union. Settlers in California were then becoming restless because of the long haul of mail by water, and were threatening to set up a separate republic. The arrival of the first Butterfield stage at San Francisco, October 10, 1858, caused much rejoicing and a general feeling among California settlers of closer ties with the East.

Springfield, in Greene County, Mo., was the first important stop on the westward trail of Butterfield coaches between St. Louis and San Francisco, and the arrival of the first west-bound coach, Friday, September 17, 1858, was accompanied by much revolver firing, and other manifestations of public approval.

Former Governor John S. Phelps, of Missouri, who was a Member of Congress in 1858, and a resident of Greene County, helped get an act through Congress authorizing a contract between the United States Government and John Butterfield, proprietor of the State company, for carrying the mail. It was generally considered that Governor Phelps was the father of the postage stamp.

The first coach left St. Louis September 16, 1858, at 8 a. m. It arrived at Tipton, Mo., which was then the end of the rail line, at 6 p. m., the same day. There the mail was loaded on the Butterfield stage, which headed west via Springfield, Mo., and Fort Smith, Ark. It arrived at Springfield at 3:15 p. m., Friday, September 17, and arrived in San Francisco on October 10, 23 days and 23½ hours after its departure. The first eastbound stage left San Francisco at 12:10 a. m., September 14, 1858, and arrived at St. Louis, October 9 at 8:45 p. m., 24 days, 18 hours and 26 minutes after departure. The two stages passed each other about 100 miles east of El Paso, Tex.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1079) to provide for the issuance of a special series of stamps to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the arrival in Springfield, Mo., of the first westbound stage of the Overland Butterfield Stage Co., introduced by Mr. HENNINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT RELATING TO ASSISTANCE TO THE BLIND

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly on a proposed amendment to the Social Security Act. My comments are directed to subsections

A and B of section 734, which relate to the various aid-to-the-blind programs. The bill I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself, my colleague from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN and Mr. CLARK], will permit the States of Missouri and Pennsylvania, whose plans do not meet the restrictive $600 Federal limitation on annual income, to be able to participate permanently in a Federal-State matching program. A similar bill—H. R. 48—has already been introduced in the House by Representative CURTIS of Missouri. I should also like to say that there is considerable urgency attached to this bill, as the expiration date for the current program will occur in June of this year.

Prior to 1950 Missouri and Pennsylvania alone had been held ineligible for Federal assistance in meeting the financial requirements of their "peculiarly"—and I use the word designedly—humane and liberal aid-to-the-blind programs because, whereas the Federal law sanctioned earnings by recipients up to a maximum of $600, Missouri allowed an income of $2,100 annually.

However, in 1950 the law was amended—section 344 (b)—so as to exempt Missouri and Pennsylvania from the restriction imposed under the Federal law, thus qualifying them for Federal assistance in meeting the payments to those blind individuals who met the income limitation; that is, up until June 30, 1955. In the meantime Missouri continued to bear the entire cost of the payments to blind recipients whose income exceeded the $50 per month Federal income restriction.

This partial exemption operated so efficiently and to the mutual advantage of the State and the Federal Government that it was subsequently extended to June 30, 1957. Now that this date is so near at hand we must make every effort to see that this program is not curtailed.

Merely to postpone the termination date for a year or two, as has been done in the past, would only mean that Congress would be required to reintroduce, consider in committee, debate on the floor, and enact parallel legislation in another year or two, which, to my mind, would constitute a needless waste of time and energy, particularly when the legislative docket is already one of such tremendous proportions.

In my judgment and in the judgment of the people of my State, it is only just and proper that we should be permitted to retain this standard permanently, provided that State funds only are used for payments to those who do not qualify under the more restrictive Federal requirement for assistance.

At the present time the Federal Government shares in the payments to three-fourths of the blind recipients in Missouri. Missouri bears the entire cost of assisting the remaining 25 percent who are not eligible under the Federal program. Of the total expenditure for aid to the blind, Missouri paid considerably more than half; and, I might add, that not one Federal dollar was used to pay any individual who did not meet the $50 restriction of the Federal law.

I sincerely believe that the amendment which we propose is humanitarian in principle and sound both from the standpoint of good administration and simple justice. It accords the States of Missouri and Pennsylvania no more than equal treatment with other States, conceivably less. I hope the Finance Committee will give the bill prompt and favorable consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1080) to provide for approval under title X of the Social Security Act of State plans for aid to the blind without regard to the existence in any State of other programs of assistance to blind persons financed entirely by the State, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## ADMINISTRATION OF LAKE MEAD NATIONAL RECREATION AREA, ARIZONA AND NEVADA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I reintroduce, for appropriate reference, a bill "to provide an adequate basis for administration of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Arizona and Nevada, and for other purposes."

One of the country's largest and most scenic recreation areas is that surrounding Lake Mead and Lake Mohave, formed by Hoover and Davis Dams on the Colorado River. More than 2,600,000 persons visit this area annually, attesting to its national significance.

Administrative problems of control over this nearly two million acre area have arisen down through the years since its withdrawal by Executive order in 1930 for reclamation purposes. It has been administered by the National Park Service under an inter-bureau agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation.

Principal effect of my bill would be the area's recognition and designation as a recreation area of national significance. It is of extraordinary scenic and scientific interest, with the plateau section including nearly 100 miles of the Grand Canyon, the mouth of the canyon, 155-mile long Lake Mead, the world's largest man-made body of water, and Lake Mohave, not to mention numerous sites of geological, biological, and archeological interest.

My bill would redescribe the boundaries of the National Recreation Area, with the new boundaries eliminating some 139,800 acres from the present gross area of 1,951,928 acres. It is recognized this is a large acreage, but it includes a region of almost indescribable ruggedness, whose principal values, apart from the storage of water, are those arising from its use by the National Recreation Area and collateral uses such as mining and grazing

The bill will fully protect purposes of the water-control projects, and at the same time will allow for greater development of the tremendous recreation advantages. As I have told the Senate before, facilities supplied by the National Park Service on Lake Mead have been pitifully inadequate in the past 20 years compared with the demands and the potential available.

Present regulations governing hunting, grazing, and vacation cabin sites will be continued substantially the same.

Recognition is given to the canyon portion of the Hualapai Indian reservation within the National Recreation Area. This Arizona tribe has indicated its willingness to have certain of its lands included, allowing the tribe to participate and benefit from establishment of the area.

In effect, my bill will provide a suitable and harmonious adjustment of various activities within the recreation area. At the same time, it will permit greater development of this area's recreational potential, which growing populations in Nevada, Arizona, and other western States are quite properly demanding.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1084) to provide an adequate basis for administration of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Arizona and Nevada, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## PROPOSED BEAR RIVER COMPACT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to give congressional consent to the three-State Bear River compact. Joining me as sponsors of this proposed legislation are colleagues from States included in the Bear River drainage basin, namely, Senators BARRETT, BENNETT, O'MAHONEY, DWORSHAK, and CHURCH. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table until the close of the day so that colleagues who may wish to join as cosponsors may have an opportunity to see the bill as drafted.

Legislatures of the basin States of Idaho, Utah, and Wyoming have now all ratified this compact, which was formally signed by representatives of the three States 2 years ago, February 4, 1955. Prior to the acceptance of the draft introduced today, some 13 years of negotiations went into the preparation of the compact. Hence, this request for congressional approval represents the culmination of some 15 years of negotiation and legislative consideration by the States affected.

Bear River, the largest tributary of Great Salt Lake, is probably the largest stream in the Western Hemisphere which does not reach the ocean. The river starts and ends in the State of Utah, but during the first 100 miles of its 300-mile course, it crosses the border of Wyoming four times, and then makes a large loop through southeastern Idaho before reentering Utah and discharging into Great Salt Lake.

Prior to settlement of that area, the river probably discharged an average of 1½ million acre-feet of water annually into Great Salt Lake. Today, at least one-half of that original volume still wastes into Great Salt Lake, where it becomes salty and eventually evaporates.

This compact, which allocates the available water among the respective

States, will make possible development of that vital water for beneficial uses in a semi-arid area where water is the most valuable natural resource.

This compact is one of the most complicated of any compact which the States involved have had to deal with. The fact that the problems associated with the five State-line crossings and the early, disassociated irrigation and power developments have been resolved to the satisfaction of the States involved is a credit to our engineering and water resource personnel and to the water users and utilities who participated in the 13 years of study and negotiations.

Furthermore, I am assured that this compact is based on perhaps the most complete hydrologic data of any stream in our area. Water officials in each of the States have advised their legislatures that the compact is fair and that it equitably provides for the future development of the tri-State stream.

Bureau of Reclamation representatives participated in the studies and negotiations, and E. O. Larson, Regional Director for the Bureau, served as chairman of the compact commission and signed for the Federal Government.

On behalf of my colleagues who are cosponsoring this measure, I request that action upon it be expedited so that the available water can be utilized in the communities and farming areas of the three-State Bear River Basin which have been waiting for a compact for 15 long, dry years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1086) granting the consent and approval of Congress to a Bear River compact, and for related purposes, introduced by Mr. WATKINS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am again introducing a bill to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may purchase national service life insurance. Senators will recall the wide support this bill had last year, when 52 of my colleagues in the 84th Congress saw fit to cosponsor it with me.

This bill was included in the military survivor benefit bill (H. R. 7089, 84th Cong.) by the Finance Committee, and it was passed by the Senate. As most of my colleagues will probably recall, when H. R. 7089 went to conference, the terms of our bill were deleted and a provision was substituted which limited reinstatement of NSLI term policies to those which lapsed during the last 2 months of the term of the policy. It is estimated that only about 10,000 policies would fall in that category, compared with about 14 million which would have been included under my proposal.

After contacting my fellow Senators, I again found wide support for this measure, which includes many of the new Members of the Senate. Fifty of my colleagues have agreed to cosponsor the bill with me this year. I ask unanimous consent that their names be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. BLAKLEY, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. YOUNG.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, since the initial introduction of this bill as S. 3067 in the last session of Congress, the major veterans organizations have expressed enthusiastic approval of the proposal. Mr. Miles D. Kennedy, director, national legislative commission, the American Legion, has written me as follows:

Our national rehabilitation commission and its insurance advisory board expressed agreement that there is a positive need for restoring the right of insurable veterans to obtain this insurance within the limited period proposed in S. 3067 which you presented to the United States Senate, with 52 cosponsors on January 27, 1956. Our 38th annual national convention, assembled September 3–6, 1956 in Los Angeles, Calif., approved Resolution No. 463 which requires that the national organization strongly support enactment of such legislation in the 85th Congress.

The 57th National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, held in Dallas Tex., August 12–17, 1956, endorsed S. 3067, 84th Congress, when it unanimously approved resolution 231, which reads as follows:

Whereas Senate bill 3067 provides a 1-year period during which certain veterans be granted the right to obtain National Service Life Insurance: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the 57th National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States,* That we urge the passage of Senate bill 3067, or similar legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from Mr. John Holden, national legislative director of AMVETS, which indicates the vigorous support of AMVETS for the bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMVETS NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
*Washington, D. C., February 4, 1957.*

The Honorable RUSSELL B. LONG,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR LONG: At the most recent National Convention of AMVETS held in Milwaukee, Wis., August 29 through September 2, 1956, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Whereas World War II and Korean veterans regard their service insurance as one of the most valuable benefits made available to them by the Congress of the United States, and

Whereas under existing legislation the privilege of purchasing Government insurance or reinstating lapsed insurance is permanently lost to millions of these veterans, and

Whereas this action has unjustly deprived many veterans of the right to invaluable insurance benefits and has resultingly caused a serious and widespread hardship upon the families of untold numbers of veterans who today are without vital insurance protection because their low-cost service insurance is forever lost to them and because they are unable to afford the costlier coverage of commercial insurance policies: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That AMVETS go on record as favoring a bill similar to Senate bill 3067, 84th Congress, which if enacted will allow World War II and Korean veterans 1 year from the date of enactment of such legislation to purchase or reinstate their service insurance.

We, of course, are aware of your efforts during the last Congress to have S. 3067 enacted into law. We of AMVETS would be most appreciative if you will renew your efforts during the present session of Congress by introducing a measure with provisions similar to S. 3067. I can assure you of the unqualified support of AMVETS should you introduce such a measure.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. HOLDEN,
*National Legislative Director.*

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, Col. Edwin S. Bettelheim, Jr., the Adjutant General of the Military Order of the World Wars, has indicated the desire of that organization to cooperate with the other veterans organizations in support of this bill.

In addition, I have received hundreds of letters from veterans' posts and from individual veterans throughout the United States, expressing strong approval of this proposed legislation. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point several letters from individual veterans and veterans' posts in my own State of Louisiana, which are representative of the many letters which I have received.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF LOUISIANA,
*March 12, 1956.*

Hon. RUSSELL LONG,
*United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR LONG: Let me take this opportunity, though it is somewhat belated, of expressing to you the sincere thanks and appreciation of the legionnaires of Louisiana for your interest and work in their behalf.

We in Louisiana are wholeheartedly in support of Senate bill 3067. If there is any way that we in Louisiana can be of service in helping your campaign to secure favorable action on the bill, please do not hesitate to call on us.

It is indeed gratifying to know that our Representatives in the Congress of the United States have the interest of the veteran uppermost in their minds.

We congratulate you on your initiative and ingenuity in furthering this bill and feel that we are indebted to you for your very fine cooperation and work in behalf of the veteran.

We in Louisiana are looking forward to a very prosperous and progressive administration in the next 4 years under the guidance of the Honorable Earl K. Long. Governor Long was a fine administrator in his previous

terms of office, and we believe he will do even better in the current one.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

A. R. CHOPPIN,
*National Executive Committeeman.*

---

AUXILIARY TO V. F. W. POST, No. 2483,
*Opelousas, La., September 7, 1956.*

DEAR SENATOR LONG: The Ladies Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Post 2483 Opelousas, wants to thank you for your help in passing the bill to allow GI insurance to be reinstated. However we want to see your original bill passed and not the recently watered down version.

Please continue to do all in your power to see that it is brought up again and passed as originally written.

Thanking you for your conscientious efforts in behalf of all your constituents, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. A. K. SMITH, Jr.,
*President.*

---

TREMONT LUMBER CO.,
*Joyce, La., May 24, 1956.*

The Honorable RUSSELL B. LONG,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR LONG: I have information that you have a bill before Congress to reinstate the National Servicemen's Life Insurance Act.

For one, I would certainly like to see this bill go through since I, like many others, did not continue my insurance due to lack of proper information upon my discharge.

There are many others who feel the same as I do and will appreciate your special efforts in this direction.

Sincerely yours,

A. G. STEWART,
*Assistant Sales Manager.*

---

MAY 1, 1956.

Senator RUSSELL B. LONG,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR LONG: At our recent monthly meeting a resolution was adopted to unanimously support bill No. S. 3067—N. S. L. I. World War II and Korean Veterans.

Speaking in behalf of our 155 members we deeply appreciate your support and interest in the above-mentioned bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. DAVIS,
*Commander.*
E. A. BACHEMIN,
*Adjutant.*

---

FIRST DISTRICT AMVETS,
*New Orleans, La., April 19, 1956.*

Hon. RUSSELL B. LONG,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR LONG: At a recent meeting of First District Amvets a motion was made to write you our views on your proposed bill No. S. 3067.

The first district feels that the bill will give the veterans of World War II and the Korean veterans an opportunity to get insurance at reasonable rates.

We find that a large number of World War II and Korean veterans have let their national service life insurance lapse, because of some misunderstanding, and would feel grateful for the opportunity to renew their insurance.

The First District Amvets appreciate the efforts you have given by introducing the above bill and feel you will be successful in having your bill passed.

Best wishes for your continued success.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH F. KIHNEMANN, *Commander.*

RACELAND MEMORIAL POST, No. 349,
AMERICAN LEGION,
*Raceland, La., April 26, 1956.*

Hon. RUSSELL B. LONG,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. LONG: The Raceland Memorial Post, No. 349, American Legion, would appreciate anything you are able to do regarding the reviving of national service life insurance. We feel sure that as you have stated in your letter to this post, that a large majority of veterans at the time of their discharge did not realize the importance of this insurance and have since wanted to either increase or take out this insurance.

This American Legion post would like to go on record as fully approving your proposed bill, S. 3067.

Thanking you.

IRA J. UZEE, *Commander.*

---

EVANGELINE LOAN CO., INC.,
*Ville Platte, La., June 18, 1956.*

Hon. RUSSELL LONG,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR LONG: Just wondering what are the chances for your bill to permit myself and thousands of veterans throughout the country to reinstate our N. S. L. I. policies which we were forced to drop while attending college, or what have you, immediately after the war. I'm sure there must be worlds of us that weren't able to continue carrying the policy then that would be most grateful if we were permitted another chance to pick it up. In closing I would also like to thank you for introducing the bill.

With warmest personal regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

E. W. WARD.

---

REMINGTON RAND,
*Shreveport, La., January 30, 1956.*

Senator RUSSELL B. LONG,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: I have been requested by many veterans of this area, to express to you our appreciation for the veterans insurance bill which you have introduced, that would permit them to renew their G. I. insurance.

We hope that this bill will become law, and we are confident it will, with your push behind it. If we can be of any help please let me know.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

*Murphy J. Roden.*

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have prepared a brief statement explaining in some detail just what is involved in the proposed legislation. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT REGARDING THE BILL TO PROVIDE A 1-YEAR PERIOD DURING WHICH CERTAIN VETERANS MAY TAKE OUT NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

The proposed bill provides a further opportunity for our veterans to have the protection afforded by a national service life insurance. It provides a period of 1 year from the date of enactment during which veterans can apply for this insurance protection. It requires that they be able to make a showing of good health to the Veterans' Administration.

What is intended by this bill is to permit veterans of World War II and the Korean war to obtain this insurance if they have either not previously applied for the insurance or have permitted their policies to lapse.

In the case of those whose policies have been permitted to lapse, the veterans concerned would not be able to have reinstated the original policies but would have to pay premiums on the basis of their attained age at the time of this new application.

Inasmuch as the premiums to be paid are based on actuarial tables, practically the only Federal cost involved would be the cost of administration, which under the law is borne by the Government. The Veterans' Administration estimates that administrative costs would average only $3.6 million annually. No new problems would be created. The Veterans' Administration would only have a higher volume of business.

Many of our young men regret very much that they did not take advantage of the opportunity of continuing in effect or converting their insurance coverage which was made available during World War II. At that time they were war weary and did not give as serious thought to their future as they might have done. Now they have very considerable family responsibilities and need additional protection very badly.

It should be emphasized that this bill does not make additional persons eligible beond those who were made eligible by the basic laws concerned. This will only provide a limited opportunity for those who were originally eligible to submit their applications for coverage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1088) to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance by Mr. LONG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

---

## STIMULATION OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT NEAR INDIAN RESERVATIONS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to stimulate industrial development near Indian reservations. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me explaining the purposes and reasons for the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1091) to stimulate industrial development near Indian reservations, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. NEUBERGER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER—USE OF McNARY DAM TOWNSITE FOR INDIAN EMPLOYMENT IN OREGON

Early in December a call was taken by one of my assistants and the memorandum of the call informed me that Carl Beck, assistant to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, was going to Pendleton and Portland to discuss the possibility of the Bureau's obtaining McNary townsite from General Services Administration for use as a site to locate an industry which would commit itself to employ qualified Indians from the Umatilla, Yakima, and Warm Springs tribes. The memo explained further that this would be

under a Bureau program for finding employment opportunities for Indians near their home locations.

Having to be in Pendleton for meetings with constituent groups gave me an opportunity to confer on the spot with Mr. Beck. We met at Hermiston, Oreg., only a few minutes drive from McNary townsite.

We discussed the possibility of adapting the McNary village to a privately operated industrial project offering employment opportunities to as many as 200 or 300 Indians. Although employment would also be open to other persons, job preference would be given to Indians under contracts protecting their interests with regard to prevailing wage rates and working conditions.

What such a project might mean for the economically lagging Northwest was emphasized by the Portland area office of the Indian Bureau which estimated at least 1,300 Indians of both sexes were available in the Pacific Northwest as a labor supply for a McNary plant.

In a breakdown on the surplus-labor supply available, I was given the following figures for the 3 agencies near the site: Umatilla Agency, 64 male, 16 female; Warm Springs Agency, 62 male, 44 female; Yakima Agency, 400 male, 150 female.

It is my hope that some industry of substantial size will make use of the McNary townsite so that the wealth of the area can be increased, and so the Indians may find productive and rewarding employment. This also could contribute toward a reduction in welfare costs at the local level.

Buildings at the townsite contain 60,000 square feet of space in structure suitable for assembly plants and there are 315 comfortable and adequate dwellings. The village, built during early construction phases of the Federal McNary Dam, cost about $3 million. Indian Service representatives in Portland believe that the plant might be appropriate either for manufacturing in connection with the electronics industry or for a furniture factory. The site is close to abundant supplies of water and power and is served by rail, highway, and river transportation facilities.

Following my conferences with Mr. Beck, Umatilla County civic leaders, and spokesmen of the Indians in the vicinity, I promised, at their request, that I would offer legislation in this session to provide for transfer of the Army engineers' village at McNary Dam to the Umatilla Indian agency for industrial development. At the conclusion of my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to have included two supporting statements from the Pendleton Chamber of Commerce and the Common Council of the City of Umatilla.

In keeping with my commitment, I have conferred with the Bureau in recent weeks and I have had their valuable cooperation in the drafting of needed legislation. Representative ULLMAN, in whose district McNary townsite is located, has ready a companion bill for introduction in the House.

---

CITY OF UMATILLA,
"HOME OF MCNARY DAM,"
*Umatilla, Oreg., January 15, 1956.*

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: The Common Council of the City of Umatilla would like to express their unanimous approval of the bill presented by you, proposing to turn McNary City over to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This to be done for the purpose of establishing an industry for the Indians there.

We feel that this would be of great benefit in training the Indians for useful and gainful employment and having an industry there would be beneficial to the whole of Umatilla County. This site is ideal for industry due to the McNary Dam power, the Columbia River transportation and plenty of space in which to expand.

Very truly yours,
ARCHIE W. EASTON,
*Mayor, City of Umatilla.*

---

PENDLETON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
*Pendleton, Oreg., December 18, 1956.*

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Our chamber urges that you sponsor legislation to transfer the McNary Village and site to the Umatilla Indian Agency for a planned industrial development tract to attract industry to provide employment for the Indians of this area.

We appreciated your statement while you were in Pendleton that you would do this and urge you to carry through. We want you to know that it is a project that all of us in Umatilla County and the entire surrounding area are keenly interested in.

Sincerely,
VERNE H. TINNERSTET, *Manager.*

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I am pleased to be the cosponsor of the bill, S. 1091, introduced earlier today by my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER]. His introduction of the bill to transfer McNary townsite to the Bureau of Indian Affairs will enable the site to be used for industrial purposes and will make possible the employment of many of our Oregon Indian citizens under desirable working conditions and at prevailing wage rates.

Once again, my colleague, by sponsoring this proposed legislation, has demonstrated his desire to improve the status of our Indian citizens in furtherance of the general public interest.

During the preparation of this bill, I discussed with my colleague the status of individuals presently residing in dwelling units at the McNary townsite. We concluded that these people will be most sympathetic with the purposes of S. 1091 and we appreciate the fact that many of the present occupants of these rental units will desire to continue their occupancies. We urge upon the committee to which this bill is referred, a very thorough consideration of the status of those now renting McNary townsite units to the end that they may be put to an absolute minimum of inconvenience.

---

## EXPANSION OF TEACHING AND RESEARCH IN EDUCATION OF MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State education agencies.

Today there are an estimated 1 million school-age children in the United States who suffer from mental retardation. This number increases annually by approximately 80,000 cases. Until the turn of the century these children were regarded with shame, and the cause of their subnormal development was shrouded in superstition and ignorance. During the past 30 or 40 years advances in medical science have brought new hope to these long-forgotten children.

We know now that even severely retarded children can be rehabilitated or aided through proper instruction. We have initiated programs at Federal and State levels for the care and education of the mentally retarded. However, only a beginning has been made in the vast job of fitting these children for a useful place in society.

The bill which I introduce today in the Senate is similar to H. R. 3830, introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative FOGARTY of Rhode Island, long a leader in this field. It would supplement an existing program of cooperative research in the Office of Education of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. If all our mentally retarded children are to receive the opportunity they require to develop their full capabilities, an estimated 40,000 specially trained teachers are needed. Less than half that number are now available.

This bill provides for Federal assistance in the training of professional personnel in fields related to education of mentally retarded children through grants to public or non-profit institutions of higher learning. Until our researchers have discovered methods of preventing mental retardation, we must fulfill our responsibility to these unfortunate children to help them toward a more self-sufficient existence.

Let me add that my special interest in this field stems in part from the active role of Mrs. Neuberger in sponsoring successfully bills in the Oregon State Legislature to provide pilot courses for retarded children at the State level. She was the Oregon pioneer in this program.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, introduced by me for myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1092) to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Commissioner of Education is authorized to make grants to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning to assist them in providing training of professional personnel to conduct research in, or conduct training of teachers in, fields related to education of mentally retarded children. Such grants may be used by such institutions to assist in covering the cost of courses of training or study for such personnel and for establishing and maintaining fellowships, with such stipends as may be determined by the Commissioner of Education.

SEC. 2. The Commissioner of Education is also authorized to make grants to State educational agencies to assist them in establishing and maintaining, directly or through grants to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning, fellowships or

traineeships for training personnel engaged or preparing to engage in employment as teachers of mentally retarded children or as supervisors of such teachers.

SEC. 3. Payments of grants pursuant to this act may be made by the Commissioner of Education from time to time, in advance or by way of reimbursement, on such conditions as the Commissioner may determine.

SEC. 4. For purposes of this act—

(a) The term "nonprofit institution" means an institution owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(b) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for State supervision of education of mentally retarded children and youths in public elementary and secondary schools in the State.

SEC. 5. The Commissioner of Education is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

## AMENDMENTS OF VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT, RELATING TO EXTENSION OF EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title II of the Veterans' Assistance Act, which would provide for extension of the educational benefits in return for compulsory military service. The effect of the bill would be to provide about one and a half days of educational benefit for each day of compulsory military service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1095) to amend title II of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to provide educational benefits to persons who perform active service in the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955, while compulsory military service is required under existing laws of the United States, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## SPECIAL LIVESTOCK LOANS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 2 (c) of the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, relating to special livestock loans. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me relating to the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1096) to amend section 2 (c) of the Act of April 6, 1949, as amended, relating to special livestock loans, introduced by Mr. SCHOEPPEL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. SCHOEPPEL is as follows:

A great deal has been said, and written, concerning the effects of one of the worst droughts in our history which presently plagues many of the States. Very little has been done to be of any real assistance to the many fine farm and ranch families suffering untold hardship and privation which was thrust upon them by the vagaries of climatic conditions.

The President has determined that a major disaster, occasioned by drought, exists in many of the States. Following this determination the Department of Agriculture is furnishing surplus feed grain at reduced prices to eligible farmers and livestockmen, also the Department of Agriculture is providing a cash subsidy on hay purchased by these eligible farmers and livestockmen. These items of assistance are designed to assist livestockmen in maintaining their basic herds during these periods of emergency. I shall have more to say, at a future date, concerning the actual benefits received by the livestockmen from these programs.

At this time I want to pay tribute to the American Association of Railroads, and especially to the carriers comprising the Western Traffic Association, for having voluntarily reduced their rates by 50 percent for the movement of hay, from areas where hay is plentiful, to those areas designated by the President as major disaster areas.

The 1st session of the 83d Congress in its enactment of Public Law 115 provided, in part, for "Special livestock loans." Under the authority of this act "loans of $2,500 or more" were authorized to be made to established producers and feeders, who had a good record but were unable to get their necessary credit requirements from private lending sources at reasonable rates of interest. This lending provision of the act was very helpful, especially at that time. Today, however, because of the long duration and extreme severity of the drought, and because of the inevitable higher cost of livestock feed, all owners of livestock in the drought-plagued areas have culled their herds down to a minimum number. To hold on to, and to buy feed for, these reduced numbers of livestock, the owners thereof have gone deeper and deeper into debt, and many deprive themselves and their families of the essential necessities of life, in order to buy feed for their animals.

In order to be of greater assistance to these small farmers and livestockmen, the people I have in mind own from 10 to 25 head of livestock, I have introduced an amendment to this Special Livestock Loan Act to reduce the minimum amount of these loans from $2,500 to $500. The small livestockman, and he is the one in greatest need of financial assistance for he had the least reserve for such an emergency, does not appreciate being told by his benevolent Government that he is not eligible for a special livestock loan unless he borrows, and has security for, a $2,500 loan. A $500 loan probably would enable this small livestockman to carry his reduced herd until grass grows once again on his presently barren pastures and fields.

Also, in the special livestock loan provisions of Public Law 115, the Congress fixed the interest rate for such loans at 5 percent per annum. In my amendment to this act it is provided that the interest rates shall not exceed 3 percent per annum on such loans which are made in an area, after it has been determined by the President to be a major disaster area, and on such loans made therein for a period of 12 months following the termination of such designation. This interest provision is in keeping with the interest rates on other types of Federal emergency loans made in such designated areas.

The prompt consideration and enactment of these two amendments to the aforesaid Special Livestock Loan Act will do much to assist the small livestockman in his present difficulties. These are the people who seek to retain their way of life by remaining on their lands. Such financial assistance will enable them to hold on to a few of their best livestock until such time as the good Lord above sends them rain. Then, and then only, will feed grow for their livestock and they will be able to work out of their present financial difficulties.

I urge your earnest and prompt consideration of these amendments.

## THE SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about a bill I introduce, for appropriate reference, to extend until 1960, the school-milk program, whereby $75 million of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation are to be authorized to provide milk for nonprofit schools, nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps and other similar nonprofit institutions. This bill is similar to one already introduced in the House by Representative MELVIN LAIRD, of Wisconsin.

All too frequently in the past we have made inadequate provisions for the school milk program. We have not granted sufficient funds, nor have we had any kind of a long-range program. By extending the current provisions until 1960, the program will be able to function a great deal more effectively, and adequate planning and distribution will be assured. The sum has been settled upon after extensive hearings held in the House last year. I am introducing this measure in the Senate to facilitate its passage in both Houses as soon as possible.

I should also like to observe that this bill is closely related to my recently introduced food-stamp bill. They will both help the farmer because of the assured and broadened markets for their products, and they also are in keeping with the general concept that since America is a land of plenty, our surplus national products should be made available to the most needy here in this country, as well as the needy abroad.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1103) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the special school milk program, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the making of payments to the States and their political subdivisions in lieu of taxes with respect to certain real property owned by the United States or its agencies.

Under this bill, Federal payments would be the same as the real property taxes which would have been levied on the property if it were privately owned. Additional Federal payments would cover school taxes in those jurisdictions where Federal property exists, on which officers, agents, and employees of the Federal Government reside.

The Federal Government now owns about one-fourth of the land in the Nation, and this ownership cuts down the potential tax revenue of many localities by large amounts. In Missouri, for example, the Federal Government owns 1,641,502 acres of land, or 3.7 percent of the land area of the State. Although Missouri does not suffer loss of tax revenues from this source as much as do some other States in similar situations, I believe legislation of this type is needed to help the States and many municipalities meet their financial obligations.

This bill would not cover Federal office buildings, or land in the public domain such as national parks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1104) providing for the making of payments to the States and their political subdivisions in lieu of taxes with respect to certain real property owned by the United States or its agencies, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

---

## PROPOSED MISSOURI BASIN COMMISSION AND COMPACT BOARD

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Missouri Basin Commission and Compact Board to provide coherent and unified direction for the development of the Missouri Basin's natural resources, to give responsible direction to the resource development activities of the Federal Government in the Missouri Basin, and for coordinating those activities with resource development activities of the States.

Mr. President, as far back as August 1951, I introduced a joint resolution to establish a Missouri Basin Survey Commission to be charged with the responsibility of formulating an integrated program based on the total land and water use of the area, and to make positive and specific recommendations for the carrying out of such a program. Although my resolution was never acted upon, President Truman, recognizing the need for an overall program for the basin instead of a piecemeal approach, established a Missouri Basin Survey Commission by Executive order.

It was my privilege to serve as Vice Chairman of this Commission, which was made up of Members of the Senate, the House of Representatives, and public members. Our Commission held extensive public hearings in every part of the 10 basin States. As a result of these hearings and detailed study by the Commission, we submitted findings and recommendations which were contained in a 300-page report entitled "Missouri: Land and Water." The report was submitted to President Eisenhower in February 1953 in the hope that our recommendations would form the basis for some legislative proposals in this field.

Mr. President, I regret to say that the President has made no legislative recommendations to date based on this report. I might add here that not only was nothing done with the report and recommendations of the Missouri Basin Survey Commission, but to date nothing has been done to implement the recommendations made as a result of three additional studies on water resources policy undertaken by the administration itself. These were the recommendations of the Cabinet Committee on Water Resources Policy which was later known as the Presidential Advisory Committee, the Hoover Commission and the Intergovernmental Relations Commission.

Mr. President, I think we have had enough studies and investigations; we have had enough task forces and committees and conferences and commissions. What we need is a long-range, comprehensive, well-thought-out policy for the solution of water resources problems.

The bill I am reintroducing today would provide just such a unified, overall, multipurpose program for the Missouri Basin—a vast section of our country comprising one-sixth of our Nation's land area. I might add, Mr. President, that although my bill deals with the Missouri Basin, I can see no reason why the policies proposed in this measure could not serve as a pattern for land and water development in other parts of the country. Right at this moment, there is more than ample evidence of the importance of an overall plan to solve the problems of water resources. Six States are now suffering the effects of devastating floods, and 15 Midwestern and Southwestern States including my own State of Missouri have had 5 prolonged years of ruinous and disastrous drought.

Mr. President, my bill would not only deal with the problems of flood control and drought, but the Missouri Basin Commission which would be established under this bill would have the authority to coordinate the overall activities of the Federal Government within the Missouri Basin relating to resource development.

Mr. President, I think it is clear that piecemeal, stop-gap, and emergency measures in dealing with water resource problems have been woefully inadequate. It is my hope that in spite of the President's failure to make recommendations in this area, the Congress will see fit to take action in this session.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a further statement in connection with it may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and further statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1107) to establish a Missouri Basin Commission and Compact Board to provide coherent and unified direction for the development of the Missouri Basin's natural resources, to give responsible direction to the resource development activities of the Federal Government in the Missouri Basin, and for coordinating those activities with resource development activities of the States, introduced by Mr. Hennings, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the "Missouri Basin Commission and Compact Board Act."

DECLARATION OF POLICY AND OBJECTIVES

SEC. 2. (a) In order to provide for the control and prevention of floods in the Missouri Basin, the reclamation of public lands, the development of electric power, and for the application and use of the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries on the public and private lands of the area for irrigation and other useful purposes, to safeguard the navigable waters, to promote navigation, to promote watershed management and land conservation, to encourage a sound agriculture and the development, protection, and improvement of municipal and industrial water supply, to encourage industrial development, to preserve and develop the recreational advantages, and to foster the fuller utilization of the resources of the region, all for the purpose of fostering and protecting commerce among the several States, strengthening the national defense, conserving the water, soil, and forest resources of the Nation, and promoting the general welfare of the United States, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States—

(1) that the Federal Government shall establish and maintain a broad program of unified water control and resource development for the Missouri Basin, consisting of the entire Missouri River, its tributaries and watershed, as located within the following States: Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Colorado, Minnesota, and Iowa; and including for the purposes of this act the drainage basin of the Souris River in North Dakota and the drainage basin of the Red River in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota;

(2) that the supervision of such a multipurpose program shall be entrusted to a Commission having its principal headquarters in the basin, which shall be directly responsible to the President and Congress, with full authority and responsibility for directing the carrying out of the program herein authorized, subject to review by the Missouri River Compact Board as provided in subsequent sections; and

(3) that the interest and rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders and likewise their interests and rights in water utilization and control, as well as the preservation and protection of established and potential uses for all purposes, of the waters of the basin's rivers, shall be recognized by such a Commission and that accordingly such a Commission shall utilize to the fullest possible extent the advice, assistance, and cooperation of the people of the region and their public and private organizations, local and State, as well as the advice, assistance, and cooperation of the existing operating agencies of the Federal Government.

(b) The following principles shall provide the general framework for establishing resource goals and directing basin development in furtherance of the above-declared policy and objectives:

First: The program should be comprehensive—for the basin as a whole and for all its land and water resources.

Second: The people who will be affected by the program should have ample and continuing opportunity to participate in the formulation and to influence the operation of the program.

Third: The combined efforts of the State and Federal Governments should be employed in carrying out the program.

Fourth: Goals should assure a proper balance among all the various phases of the resource program.

Fifth: Each project in the program should offer total benefits in excess of all costs.

Sixth: Costs should be borne in relation to the sharing of the benefits.

Seventh: The program should encourage the diversified development of the basin's resources for both progressive growth and stability.

Eighth: Each part of the program should be flexible enough to respond to changing needs, yet specific enough to direct program and project plans forward in a consistent course.

Ninth: The program should be planned and managed to achieve widespread benefits to the residents of the basin.

Tenth: The program should recognize the basin's limited supply of water and should be based upon a sound preference in the use of this vital asset.

MISSOURI BASIN COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a Missouri Basin Commission (herein called the "Commission"), which shall be composed of 5 members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from a list of 30 names submitted by the States. The Governors in consultation with members of the congressional delegation of each of the 10 Missouri Basin States will each submit 3 names, not more than 2 from the same political party. After the term of a member has expired, or as vacancies occur, the President shall make a like selection from names submitted as above by those States not having a member remaining on the Commission. The term of office of each member of the Commission shall be 9 years, except that the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire as designated by the President at the time of nomination, 1 at the end of 3 years, 2 at the end of 6 years, and 2 at the end of 9 years, after the effective date of this act, and any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Not more than 3 of the 5 members of the Commission shall be members of any one political party. Each member of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $ per annum. No member of the Commission shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as a member of the Commission, or have a financial interest in any corporation or other enterprise which will be enhanced or adversely affected by the activities of the Commission in the basin development program.

(b) Each appointee to the Commission shall be a legal resident of one of the States that fall wholly or partly within the Missouri Basin, for a continuous period of not less than 5 years immediately prior to his appointment. Not more than 1 member shall be from a single State.

(c) Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum to do business.

(d) The President shall designate one of the members as Chairman of the Commission.

(e) The permanent office of the Commission shall be located within the Missouri Basin.

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws, employ such officers, employees, attorneys, agents, and consultants as are necessary for the transaction of its business, fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, define their duties, require bonds of such of them as the Commission may designate, and provide a system of organization to fix responsibility and promote efficiency. The Commission may also produce, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(b) In the employment, selection, classification, and promotion of officers and employees of the Commission, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such employments and promotions shall be given and made only on the basis of merit and efficiency. Any officer or employee of the Commission who is found by the Commission to be guilty of a violation of this section shall be removed from office by the Commission. It shall be unlawful for a member of the Commission to make or assist in the making of or cause to be made any employment, selection, classification, or promotion of any officer or employee of the Commission on the basis of or because of any political qualification or test, and any member of the Commission who violates this provision shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisonment not more than 1 year, or both.

(c) The Commission is authorized to request the assistance and advice of any officer, agent, or employee of any executive department or any independent establishment or agency of the United States, to enable the Commission to better carry out its functions, and as far as practicable shall utilize the services of such officers, agents, and employees. The President shall, if in his opinion the public interest, service, or economy so requires, direct that such assistnace, advice, and service be rendered to the Commission, and any individual that may be by the President directed to render such assistance, advice, and service shall thereafter be subject to the orders, rules, and regulations of the Commission, and the Commission shall reimburse such department, establishement, or agency for the compensation of such individuals while serving pursuant to such direction.

MISSOURI BASIN COMPACT BOARD

SEC. 5. (a) The Missouri Basin States are granted consent to negotiate an interstate compact which will become effective when ratified by the legislatures of the 7 States of the 10 basin States.

(b) The Compact Board created by the interstate compact is authorized to:

(1) Review, suggest revisions, and approve or disapprove the comprehensive program for the Missouri Basin and any subsequent revisions which may be submitted by the Missouri Basin Commission together with any recommended policies relating thereto.

(2) Promote supplemental agreements for the use of water and the division of water between States and for other purposes.

(3) Promote a program of State legislation to direct and regulate resource use and to protect investment in resource development.

(4) To promote joint Federal-State programs.

(5) Perform such additional functions as may be provided in the compact.

(c) Pending the negotiation and ratification of the interstate compact, the Governors of the Missouri Basin States shall constitute an advisory committee to consult with the Commission regarding resource development policy, to review Commission programs, and to develop related State programs. The Missouri Basin Commission will submit its program for review and approval by the advisory committee as would be provided when the Compact Board is established.

GENERAL AUTHORITY OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission shall have authority, for the direction, coordination, and control of overall activities of the Federal Government within the Missouri Basin relating to the development of the resource potential of such basin in general, and, in particular, to activities relating to watershed management and land conservation, flood control, forestry, irrigation, electric power, domestic and industrial water supply, navigation, stream-bank stabilization, pollution abatement, mosquito control, drainage, fish and wildlife, recreation, industrial development and related development of land and water resources and shall exercise general supervision, direction, and control with respect to any other activity of any Federal agency involving functions under the authority and control of the Commission (including but not limited to the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Interior, Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce, Public Health Service, and Federal Power Commission).

(b) Any Federal agency engaged in any activity under the authority and control of the Commission shall, upon request therefor, submit to the Commission for examination and review, any data, plan, survey, or other information relating to any such activity.

FORMULATION OF A MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission shall proceed at once to direct the preparation of a comprehensive long-range program for the unified development of the land and water resources of the Missouri Basin in accordance with the purposes and policy of this act and shall submit such a program to the President, the Congress, and the governors of the States within the Missouri Basin.

(b) In the preparation of the program, the Commission shall establish the general goals and objectives toward which future basin development is to be directed and develop a program of specific proposals designed to attain such objectives.

(c) The Commission shall establish uniform standards and procedures for the formulation, evaluation, and cost allocation of proposals to be included in the program, review, and appraise project plans on a systematic basis and recommend priorities for project development, and shall have the power to review, approve, or modify such evaluations, allocations, and appraisals as it may deem necessary.

(d) The Commission shall incorporate into the basin program the present plans and programs of Federal agencies to the extent that they are compatible with the full development of the basin resources. The Commission shall examine and review all uncompleted Federal investigations, plans, and programs with respect to activities over which it has authority and which were initiated prior to the establishment of the Commission and shall recommend to the Congress the completion, reauthorization, modification, scheduling, or rescheduling or reappraisal of the same. Any request for authorization of completed project plans shall be submitted to the Commission for analysis and review with respect to engineering and economic feasibility and its relation to the basin program before transmittal to Congress. Each Federal agency shall submit such data and information on projects completed or under investigation as the Commission may require.

(e) In the preparation of the program, the Commission shall take into account projects, programs, and plans of State and local governments, as well as those of private groups, associations, and individuals, with respect to land and water resource development within the Missouri Basin.

(f) The basin program shall be kept current, may be modified, altered, and added to from time to time and the Commission shall periodically review all Federal projects and activities and report to the President, the Congress, and the governors of the States in

the Missouri Basin on the advisability of changes and modifications.

(g) Future resource investigations, examinations, and surveys in the basin by Federal agencies shall be under the general supervision of the Commission and the Commission may direct agencies to undertake specified investigations jointly or singly. The Commission may initiate studies of resource problems by any agency and may submit budget requirements for funds to carry on such studies. The Commision shall coordinate the procurement of basic data necessary to sound basin planning and project formulation and promote adequate research and surveys.

(h) The Federal Power Commision shall submit all applications and licenses filed with it to the Commission for examination and review, and the Commission shall, if it finds the issuance of any such license to be consistent with the overall Missouri Basin program, approve issuance of same. No license shall be issued by the Federal Power Commission without approval of the Commission.

(i) The Commission shall, in carying out the policies and objectives of this act with respect to the development of water resources, observe the following order of priority in the use of water:

(1) Water supply for domestic and municipal use, and pollution control.

(2) Irrigation and ground water recharge and industrial consumption.

(3) Hydroelectric power.

(4) Fish, wildlife, and recreation.

(5) Navigation.

The use for navigation of waters arising in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian shall be only such use as does not conflict with any beneficial consumptive use, present or future, in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian of such waters for domestic, municipal stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes.

(j) Before adoption of a comprehensive basin program and any proposed modifications, alterations, or extensions therein, the Commission shall hold formal public hearings at designated points, within the basin or the area affected by a modification, alteration or extension; submit its findings and recommendations to the Compact Board for review and approval or disapproval; and the Commission's report to the President and the Congress of the United States shall include the recommendations of the Compact Board, other State and local groups, and a record of the hearings: *Provided*, That if the Board takes no action within 90 days following submission, the Commission recommendations shall be considered as approved: *And provided further*, That in case the Board disapproves a program recommended by the Commission, the Board may propose revisions or a substitute program. If agreement between the Commission and the Board cannot be reached on a mutaully acceptable program within two years from the submission of the initial Commission recommendations, the Commission may submit its proposal to the President and the Congress along with the specific recommendations of the Compact Board, accompanied by a full statement of the issues in dispute.

PROGRAM INSTALLATION, MANAGEMENT, AND OPERATION

SEC. 8. (a) In order that the comprehensive long-range programs for the unified development of the land and water resources of the Missouri Basin be systematically installed and maintained, with appropriate cost-sharing arrangements, the Commission shall have general authority and responsibility for management of the resource development budget, costs and accounts, and the operation of projects and programs involving land and water development in the basin.

(b) In carrying out the overall basin plan, the Commission shall, in consultation with the operating agencies, prepare annually a consolidated basin resource budget for land and water resource development. The budget shall consist of four parts: (1) A basic data budget, (2) a planning budget, (3) a construction budget, and (4) an operation budget. The budget shall be prepared on at least three levels of expenditure for the guidance of Congress in appropriating funds for resource development and shall contain recommendations showing the features to be added or dropped as the level changes.

(c) The Commission shall have general responsibility for the development and application of equitable cost-sharing arrangements and reimbursement requirements, including:

(1) Establishing uniform and consistent procedures for the allocation of project costs among purposes included in multiple-purpose programs.

(2) Establishing uniform and consistent procedures for cost-sharing and reimbursement requirements for various programs and purposes, to the extent such is in accordance with national policy.

(3) Negotiating agreements and contracts for sharing financial responsibility with States, districts, agencies, groups, and enterprises and supervision of their execution.

(4) Establishment and supervision of a system of accounts for reimbursable purposes and directing the payments and charges to be made from such accounts.

(5) Establishing bases and apportioning amounts of reimbursable revenues to be paid States and counties as payments in lieu of taxes.

(d) The Commission shall be responsible for carrying out legislative policy regarding land and water use and control and shall establish operational guides and standards. It shall exercise central control over water releases and river operations, direct operating plans for facilities utilizing water, and prepare coordinating plans in consultation with the national flood-control agency for emergency operation of water structures. It shall plan programs, recommend budgets for operation and maintenance, and coordinate related water use and control projects. The Commission shall establish a program of research and technical service to assist local districts with maintenance work and prepare long-range maintenance plans for projects under Federal control.

(e) The adoption of policies and procedures relating to the allocation of cost, and assessment and assignment of charges shall be made only after formal public hearings held within the area affected by the decisions. The Commission shall submit its findings and decisions to the Compact Board for review and approval or disapproval. If approved by the Compact Board, the Commission shall report its findings and decisions together with the recommendations of the Compact Board, of other State and local groups, and the record of the hearings to the President of the United States, and if such findings and decisions are not disapproved by the President within 90 days from date of submission of the report containing such findings, they shall become effective. If the Compact Board does not approve the findings and revised findings cannot be agreed on by the Compact Board and the Commission, then the Commission may submit the disputed findings to the President along with the recommendations of the Compact Board and a full record of the issues in dispute.

FLOOD CONTROL MEASURES

SEC. 9. (a) In the formulation of plans for any flood-control program or project, and in examining and reviewing any such plans made by any Federal agency engaged in activities under its authority and control, the Commission shall give consideration to all methods of preventing or reducing flood damage in each particular instance and shall choose the method or combinations of methods it deems to be the most effective and most economical, including:

(1) Flood plain development and redevelopment, relocation, and zoning.

(2) Sedimentation and runoff control.

(3) Storage of floodwaters on cultivated fields, other watershed lands, or underground through appropriate measures.

(4) Levee and flood wall construction.

(5) Reservoir storage.

(6) Channel improvement and rectification, bank stabilization, and floodways and diversions.

(7) Flood forecasting.

(8) Such other measures as will result in effective flood damage prevention or control.

(b) If the Commission finds that flood damage can be prevented or controlled most effectively and economically through adoption by States, local governments, or districts of programs for flood plain development and redevelopment, relocation, and zoning, or other similar measures, either in substitution for, or as a supplement to, construction of flood-control works, it shall, when feasible, enter into arrangements or agreements with such States, local governments, or districts providing for Federal assistance to them in carrying out such measures, but in any such arrangement or agreement the share of the cost to be borne by the Federal Government shall not be greater than the share of costs which the Federal Government would bear in prosecuting the most economic alternative method of obtaining similar reductions in flood damage.

RIVER STABILIZATION

SEC. 10. The Commission shall make a separate intensive study and investigation of bank stabilization and navigation on the Missouri River in order to ascertain (1) whether feasible methods may be employed in stabilizing and the effect of such stabilization on the various levees constructed along the river, and (2) the benefits and costs, and cost-sharing considerations, involved in any such stabilization of the Missouri River. Within 2 years from the date of its establishment, the Commission shall report to the Congress the results of such study and investigation together with its views and recommendations concerning a stabilization program for the Missouri River.

IRRIGATION PRACTICES AND POLICIES

SEC. 11. The Commission shall make a separate intensive study and investigation of the problems arising from the application of existing irrigation practices and policies of the Federal agencies operating in the Missouri Basin, including but not limited to (1) appropriate size of a farm limitation to allow efficient operations and wide distribution of benefits, (2) the enforcement of acreage limitations where reclaimed areas include large tracts of established farmlands that are privately owned, (3) means of assuring the acquisition of lands by settlers at reasonable prices through curbing undue windfall gains, (4) the conditions under which utility-type contracts might be used, and (5) means of assessing an appropriate share of irrigation costs against secondary beneficiaries. Within 2 years from the date of its establishment, the Commission shall report to the Congress the results of such study and investigation and shall recommend to the Congress any changes or revisions which would, in its opinion, improve such irrigation practices and policies.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES AND DISTRICTS

SEC. 12. The Commission shall establish, through the Compact Board, a program of research and technical service to assist States and local districts with investigations and planning of resource-development programs and shall have the authority to make funds available to States or local governments to

encourage their participation in the program of the Missouri Basin.

ATOMIC ENERGY AND DEFENSE PROJECTS

SEC. 13. Nothing in this act shall be construed to affect any provision of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended; and the Commission shall not have any jurisdiction of any project of the Atomic Energy Commission or any defense project which in the judgment of the President should be carried out without regard to the provisions of this act.

DISPOSITION OF ELECTRIC POWER

SEC. 14. (a) The Commission is authorized to carry out the policies of Congress governing power-marketing and power-system operation with respect to projects in the Missouri Basin and require the execution of these policies; make cost allocations and approve or modify power-rate schedules applicable to the Missouri Basin; approve contracts for the sale of electric power; and, in conjunction with control of river operations, direct power dispatching operations.

(b) The transmission and disposition of electric power and energy generated at projects in the Missouri Basin shall be carried out in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof with the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Commission.

(c) Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives, subject to prior requirements of the Government for direct use, such as in national defense or in irrigation pumping. After the demands of preference customers have been assured, power shall be made available to nonpreference customers, giving consideration to operating efficiency, the extension of benefits, and the development of economic and desirable resource enterprises.

EXISTING RIGHTS

SEC. 15. (a) Nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or in any way to interfere with any vested right acquired under the laws of any State or Territory relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation, and nothing herein shall in any way affect any right of any State or of the Federal Government or of any landowner, appropriator, or user of water in, to, or from any interstate stream, or the waters thereof.

(b) The Commission may propose, through the Compact Board, types of State water laws suitable for basin conditions and may recommend that each basin State take legislative action providing for an appraisal of its present water laws and a study of improvements needed to insure a firm basis for the orderly development of its water resources.

(c) The Commission shall, through the Compact Board, offer its services and facilities to the States in carrying out such program of law revision and shall from time to time call to the attention of the Board specific impediments which the laws of the States present to particular projects or to development in general.

SEPARABILITY PROVISIONS

SEC. 16. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

The statement, presented by Mr. HENNINGS, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS—NEED FOR UNIFIED MULTIPURPOSE PROGRAM

The situation in the Missouri Basin combines all the aspects of our natural resources problem. We find ourselves repeatedly in a state of emergency growing out of water—too much of it, or lack of it. I have spoken in the Senate and elsewhere in great detail about the land and water problems in the Missouri Basin, so I shall not again go into all of the details at this time. Suffice it to say that repeatedly, over many years, we have had recurring and terrible floods; we have had extended and disastrous droughts; and we have been severely handicapped by the lack of any adequate organization of all the diverse agencies and groups concerned with the problem.

My own State of Missouri, as well as 14 other Midwestern and Southwestern States, are now suffering the ravages of 5 long years of devastating drought. In this connection, I would like to call the attention of the Senate to an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 16, 1957, concerning the President's drought plan which stated that a long-range solution to the drought problem needs the President's assurance, and I quote "that he recognizes, as Senator HENNINGS, of Missouri, has said, that truly unified development of the Missouri Valley and all other great regions of the United States can reduce to a minimum the destructive effects of drought on our human and natural resources."

The Commission on which it was my privilege to serve as Vice Chairman had been given a tremendous task. Our assignment was to prepare recommendations for the better protection, development, and use of the land and water resources of the Missouri Basin. The scope of our study was to be far broader than flood control and drought. It included irrigation, navigation and hydroelectric power development, pollution control, recreation, fish and wildlife conservation, as well as the highly controversial question of the allocation of costs for each of the aspects of resource development. As I said, this was a big assignment. In the first place, the Missouri Basin includes all or parts of 10 States. It embraces 529,000 square miles in the heart of our Nation.

Our Commission heard more than 400 witnesses at 17 separate hearings. In addition, we studied reports from Federal and State resource agencies and the activities which they regulated. We met in a great many executive sessions to hear spokesmen from these agencies. As a result of our hearings and our further detailed study over many months, it was apparent that there had to be some agency with authority (1) to determine the scope of operations of the various Federal bureaus and departments and (2) to bring these agencies together in a cooperative working relationship with the several States for the development of the resources in the basin. It was, moreover, our conclusion—and it is my own strong belief—that there should be as much State and local responsibility and control as could be achieved on a workable basis.

In the report of the Missouri Basin Survey Commission, we pinpointed certain deficiencies that have hamstrung the entire resources-development program. In particular, we discussed the delay and confusion in the basin program as a result of the inability or the unwillingness of the various Federal agencies to work together, to cooperate in the use of the most effective techniques and to find any solid basis of agreement on financial fundamentals. We discussed in considerable detail the weaknesses in Federal-State relationships and, in particular, the extremely limited participation presently accorded to the States and local communities. We pointed out that, under present arrangements, while it is true that the States and local communities may be permitted to review a specific project, this chance actually comes so late in the planning stage that a particular project has already become a firm part of the program of the sponsoring agency. In effect, the State's participation actually becomes, in many instances, merely a choice of being for or against a particular project. In our recommendations I believe that we made a conscientious effort to deal with and to ease the many conflicts of interest and of jurisdiction which have hindered good resource development.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MISSOURI BASIN COMMISSION

The bill I am introducing today would, I believe, provide such a program and it would offer a sound basis for the orderly development of the great land and water resources in the Missouri Basin.

The bill recommends the establishment of a Missouri Basin Commission with authority to coordinate the activities of the various agencies operating in the basin—beginning at the planning stage and carrying through beyond the installation of the projects. It also includes a provision that would grant consent to the Missouri Basin States for the establishment of an interstate compact board. This provision assures a method whereby the various States would formally participate in the program, share in planning, review proposals of the Commission, and exercise a distinct function in approving or disapproving the programs and budgets for resources development which the Commission would submit to the Congress.

My bill is substantially in accord with the recommendations of the Missouri Basin Survey Commission. On the issue of State sovereignty this bill combines certain features of both the majority report and the dissent. I would like to explain that because it is a very important provision—perhaps the key provision of this bill.

One important and unique recommendation in our report was that each State, by formally refusing consent, could prevent the operation within its boundaries of the new commission. In addition to this extraordinary proviso, the survey commission suggested that the governors should constitute a permanent advisory board and that States would have a voice in selecting members of the new commission.

These several recommendations demonstrated that our Commission wanted to do everythnig possible to assure State participation. In fact, the minority proposal for an interstate compact, the sole dissent from the formal Commission recommendation (the only other dissent was from a finding), was aimed in the same direction. The Survey Commission, in effect was unanimous in recognizing the need for according the States a greater role than they now have in the task of resource development. The bill which I am introducing today, therefore, is designed, as I said, in an effort to insure that the full advantages and benefits of both the majority and minority proposals would be combined in the basin program.

The proposed basin Commission would have the same source of authority and same duties as the majority of the survey Commission has recommended. As a federally created body, the new Commission would not replace or supersede the resource functions of existing Federal agencies but would have authority for the coordination of overall activities of the Federal Government within the Missouri Basin relating to resource development. Coordination would begin at the planning stage and carry through beyond the installation of the projects. In particular, the Commission would be responsible for activities relating to watershed management, land conservation, flood control, forestry, irrigation, electric power, domestic and industrial water supply, navigation, streambank stabilization, pollution control, mosquito control, drainage, fish and wildlife, and recreation.

In addition, by the proposed interstate compact, the States could set up a board which would have a clearly defined scope of

operations. As the instrumentality of the several States in the basin, it would be invested with State sovereignty. Under the authorization of the compact, the States would formally participate in the program, sharing in the planning, reviewing proposals, and approving or disapproving the formal programs and the budgets which the Commission would present to the Congress in behalf of the Federal resource agencies, the States, and the basin as an entity.

Under its charter sanctioned by Congress, as proposed in my bill, the Interstate Compact Board would actually exercise a limited veto over the recommendations of the Commission. It would operate in this way. If the Interstate Board disapproved a Commission would be required, at the time of making its recommendations to Congress, to set forth the Board's disapproval and the basis thereof. Disapproval of the Board, furthermore, could be the basis for automatically restraining the Federal body temporarily from taking further action. In the interim, the Board and the Commission would have both the opportunity and the responsibility to work out a mutually satisfactory recommendation.

Machinery of this kind would assure realistic participation by the States without trespassing upon the responsibilities of the agencies authorized and directed by Congress—and accountable to the Congress—to carry out specific tasks. Moreover, the interstate board would open the way for the States to accept and carry out successfully an ever larger share of the resource-development work. The States could cooperate in programs of research and education aimed toward pollution control, recreation improvements, and zoning programs. The board likewise could become the vehicle by which, in the future, the States could participate in sharing the costs for resource developments.

I believe there are a number of advantages in the plan for the joint administration of a basin resource program, especially in the Missouri Valley, under the cooperative direction of a Federal commission and an interstate compact board. Only by pooling Federal and State authorities can the Missouri Basin have a resource program that would be sufficiently comprehensive to meet the many and diverse needs of the area.

## CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO CITY OF GLOUCESTER, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the city of Gloucester, Mass. I ask unanimous consent that a release prepared by me relating to the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the release will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1113) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the city of Gloucester, Mass., introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The release presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL is as follows:

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts, introduced in today's session of the Senate a bill providing for the conveyance of Ten Pound Island to the city of Gloucester.

Ten Pound Island is in Gloucester Harbor. The total area which the bill directs be conveyed to the city is approximately 3.5 acres. The Senator's bill is a companion to H. R. 3748, introduced last week by Representative BATES. This land, which was at one time owned by the city of Gloucester, is to be transferred to the city for park and recreational purposes.

## AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Social Security Act. My amendment would amend title I of the act, to permit States to disregard certain income in determining need for old-age assistance. To be specific, recipients of old-age assistance would be permitted to earn up to $50 per month without having that amount deducted from their subsistence grants.

I offered this amendment to the Social Security bill when it was before the Senate in the last session of Congress. The Senate adopted my amendment by a vote of 56 to 34, and it securied bipartisan support. Unfortunately, the amendment was deleted in conference.

Under the present system those who receive old-age assistance are discouraged from working. As their average age was given as 75 years in the 1953 study published by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, they are not a threat to the labor market or to the jobs of other people, and they should be encouraged to do those small tasks for which they are physically capable. Under the present system any money they earn as babysitters or for casual labor must be deducted from their assistance.

This provision is a holdover from the depression years when, with great unemployment, the system was designed to discourage older people from competing for jobs. Now the need is the other way around. The services of elderly people are needed. It is to the best interests of the community and to elderly people themselves for them to have some work which they can perform, and to encourage them in that endeavor. Therefore it is wise to allow them to work at some tasks without endangering their old-age assistance as a consequence.

A number of States, including my own, already have legislation which would disregard the first $50 of earnings by people on old-age assistance if the Federal Government will allow that to be done. Therefore, some of the States, at least, believe this would be wise policy. Although I am not a fervent supporter of "states rights", as those rights are sometimes interpreted, I should think that the supporters of "states rights" might find in this amendment a principle which was close to their hearts.

I hope, therefore, Mr. President, that the clear sense of the Senate as it was reflected in the 56-to-34 vote in the last session for my amendment, may have an opportunity to be reflected in another vote in this session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1121) to amend title I of the Social Security Act to permit the States to disregard certain income in determining need for old-age assistance, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## REGISTRATION, REPORTING, AND DISCLOSURE OF EMPLOYEE WELFARE AND PENSION BENEFIT PLANS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 3 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the registration, reporting and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefit plans.

This bill is substantially the same as S. 3873, which the same sponsors introduced last year but which came too late in the session for it to be acted upon by this body.

This bill is the outgrowth of the investigation and studies carried on for nearly 2 years by a special subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which was first headed by the Senator from New York and later by me.

It was also influenced by investigations in the State of New York and elsewhere, including investigations by the House of Representatives, and by facts disclosed in public trials and in the press.

We believe that a conclusive showing has been made of the importance of the subject, the need for Federal action and the solid merit of our proposals.

### BROAD SCOPE OF WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS

Briefly stated, the report of our subcommittee pointed out last year that over 75 million persons, including members of families, are now covered in some measure by employee welfare and pension programs.

We furthermore pointed out that the annual contributions to these funds amounted to over $6.8 billion, or, in round terms, approximately $7 billion. The welfare plans are almost universally financed on an annual or current basis, but the pension plans have built up funded reserves which now total between $20 and $25 billion. Their impact on the securities and investments markets can best be gaged in the light of the Securities and Exchange Commission report that pension funds reserves alone are currently the largest single source of equality capital.

Our committee therefore concluded that the private employee welfare and pension programs had grown to such proportions and involved the use of such large amounts of tax-exempt funds as to place a grave responsibility upon the Government for their sound operation and for the elimination of abuses.

### MANY ABUSES REVEALED

We stated in the report that—

While the great majority of welfare and pension programs are being responsibly and

honestly administered, the rights and equities of the beneficiaries in many instances are being dangerously ignored. In other cases, the funds of the programs are being dissipated and at times become the hunting ground of the unscrupulous.

We also observed that—

The lack of standards and the inadequacies of State and Federal laws have permitted employee welfare and pension programs to operate in such manner as to give rise to many abuses, problems, weaknesses, and unsound practices which could jeopardize the operation of this system and give insufficient protection to the rights and equities of the employee-beneficiaries.

* * * there have been shocking abuses, such as embezzlement, collusion, kickbacks, exorbitant insurance charges, and various other forms of malfeasance. Mismanagement, lack of know-how, waste, extravagance, indifference, nepotism, and a lack of criteria for sound operation have contributed to the unnecessary drain on such funds with a consequent serious loss to the employee beneficiaries.

A major problem, we therefore stated, is one "of assuring the immediate and long-range stability of private pension and welfare programs * * * in order that they may better withstand the contingencies against which they were established. The breakdown of any significant part of either the pension or the welfare programs could, and undoubtedly would, amount to a major setback to our economy." As set forth in the report, we were "convinced that without some legislative direction, the abuses, problems, and weaknesses which do exist will not be self-correcting."

NO GROUP—UNIONS, MANAGEMENT, INSURANCE COMPANIES OR BANKS—EXEMPT FROM CRITICISM

Our report took note of the fact that labor had "condemned dishonesty, created committees on ethical practices, established codes of ethics for the operation of employee welfare and pension plans, and recommended legislation toward that end." We expressed the belief that such efforts would have a salutary effect but did not feel that the objectives would be quickly achieved by voluntary methods alone. Our report further pointed out that representatives of labor had been involved in some of the worst abuses found to exist and, in some cases, had been found unprepared for the responsibilities of trusteeship under these programs.

It is highly gratifying that the AFL–CIO has itself taken action to discipline those whom our hearings revealed to have engaged in some of the most flagrant abuses. It is also encouraging that the leaders of the AFL–CIO have endorsed the main principles of our proposal as a helpful step toward the elimination of such practices in the future.

We also pointed out in our report that the insurance industry, while opposing Federal control or supervision, had not set up a code of ethical practices to condemn the unscrupulous. Our report concluded that—

Many of the worst abuses found in welfare plan operations involve certain insurance practices. These abuses include high commissions, excessive administrative fees, high insurance-company retentions, unequal treatment of the policyholders, activities of unscrupulous brokers and agents, including embezzlement of premiums, sometimes in collusion with union officials or management—mostly the result of inadequate control and nondisclosure to the interested parties.

Management, too, came in for its share of criticism, the report pointing out that it—management—"shares the responsibility for many of the serious problems and abuses" found, and that "management, as well as labor, has at times been unreasonable and unsound in positions taken with respect to benefit programs." Employers, it was stated, "in too many cases have abdicated their responsibilities under jointly managed plans."

With reference to the banking industry, our report observed that banks, while recognized as competently managing pension investments under corporate trusts, do not have the responsibility for actuarial soundness, often have too little control over proper investments, but still sell the features of this type of pension plan without assuming all of the responsibilities necessarily inherent in a complete pension plan.

BROAD COVERAGE ESSENTIAL TO PROTECT MAIN GROUP OF BENEFICIARIES

According to our report, by far the largest percentage—about 90 percent—of employees included in health and welfare programs are covered in unilateral employer-administered plans. In including this type of plan in those which should register, report and disclose detailed information, the report stated "Since Congress has stated and the courts have held that employer contributions toward welfare and pension benefits are in the nature of compensation to employees, it must be concluded that whether the funds for such programs are contributed by the employers, the employees, or both, the employees have a right to know the financial details of such plans as well as to have their interest in such plans protected."

On the basis of the whole record, therefore, legislation requiring registration, reporting and disclosure of information to beneficiaries seemed to us a minimum protection that the Federal Government should provide for the millions of beneficiaries and their employers.

Our bill was, accordingly, drafted along those lines—I should also note that Senator ALLOTT, of Colorado, filed supplemental views to the report, and Senator NEELY, of West Virginia, who, because of other duties was unable to take an active part in preparation of the report, reserved judgment on the recommendations.

BILL PROVIDES FOR DISCLOSURE, NOT REGULATION

We feel it to be a moderate, but helpful, approach, still leaving much room for action by the respective States. The power to regulate would still remain with the States. The only Federal action proposed is for adequate disclosure.

We repeat, this is not a regulatory bill. It is only a disclosure bill. We who sponsor it hope that the healing qualities of sunlight on these plans will eliminate the abuses and make it unnecessary to go further.

I should like to emphasize, however, that these requirements of registration, reporting and disclosure will serve not only as a deterrent to the kinds of abuses and questionable practices uncovered by the committee, but also as an almost indispensable aid and encouragement to the self-policing of the kind initiated by the labor movement. This self-policing and the voluntary restraint of unions, management, banks and insurance companies are, in the long run, the only alternative to the more stringent Federal regulation of welfare and pension plans which the public is bound to demand in the absence of some remedial action now.

Surely, the added work which these reporting and disclosure provisions will admittedly require is a small price to pay for the added protections to beneficiaries and businesses alike, which this legislation would afford.

SUMMARY OF BILL'S PROVISIONS

Mr. President, I wish to summarize now the specific protections which the bill introduced today would provide.

REGISTRATION

The bill requires, in the first place, registration by all types of employee welfare and pension benefit plans covering 25 or more employees. This registration would provide basic, minimum data concerning each plan to permit its identification and classification.

REPORTING

For every plan which, with closely related plans, covers 100 or more employees, the bill, in the second place, requires the filing of annual reports. These reporting provisions are the real heart of the measure.

These annual reports would include full legal and financial data, as specifically provided in section 6 of the bill, and would be based upon an audit by an independent accountant. The bill requires, among other things, information concerning contributions, benefits paid, expenses, salaries and fees, reserves, and so forth.

If benefits are provided by an insurance carrier, the required data includes premiums paid, claims incurred and paid, dividends, commissions, fees, retentions, and so forth.

In the case of pension plans, or welfare plans which have a reserve fund, the report would include summary data concerning these reserves and their investment, and detailed information on (a) all investments in properties of any party in interest, (b) any investment in one security which exceeds 5 percent of the fund, and (c) any investment in one security which exceeds 10 percent of the outstanding securities of that issue.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION TO ADMINISTER

The agency charged with administration of the act under this bill would be the Securities and Exchange Commission, although the subcommittee found this allocation of responsibility its most difficult decision. This agency would be given discretion to require reporting by plans covering from 25 to 100 employees, if necessary, to accomplish the objectives of the bill.

DISCLOSURE

Disclosure of the information in the annual report, in the third place, would

be required by making copies available to beneficiaries and other interested parties at the office of the plan, and to the public generally, in the public documents room of the agency. In addition, summary data from the report as prescribed by the agency would have to be furnished to the beneficiaries.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

The bill sets up an advisory council drawn from insurance, banking, management, labor, related Government agencies, and the general public.

ENFORCEMENT

The administrative agency is empowered to make investigations and apply for court orders to secure compliance with the law. Criminal penalties are provided for those who willfully violate the law, who knowingly make false statements, and who embezzle moneys from any fund. Thus, while the provisions of the bill are moderate and do not impose any new standards of operation, commissions, fees, investments, benefit levels, reserves, and so forth, real teeth are put into the enforcement of these moderate provisions. And embezzlement, as well as perjury, are made subject to criminal penalties under Federal law.

THREE-YEAR TERM

The bill provides that the act shall be effective for 3 years. The administering agency would be required to file, on or before January 1, 1959, a report giving its recommendations as to the continuance, simplification, or modification of the law.

Congress would thus necessarily have a further opportunity, on the basis of 2½ years' experience to determine whether, and in what form, to make the protections of this bill a permanent part of our legal structure.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION NOW IS ESSENTIAL

Mr. President, I hope the proposals in this bill may have early and favorable consideration in the Senate. Here is a specific affirmative program to help root out one of the newest and most clearly-evidenced sources of racketeering and abuse of trust affecting the welfare of millions of beneficiaries and thousands of businesses.

Further investigations could disclose further abuses. Our studies began with union and jointly administered plans, and only in their later stages did they begin to dig more deeply into the practices of insurance companies and employer-administered plans in this field. But the abuses and opportunities for abuse already revealed justify—indeed, they require—prompt remedial action of the broad character we are proposing.

To do nothing or to delay in the face of the proven needs would jeopardize the interests of many who are looking to Congress to follow up its investigation with appropriate legislation.

The endorsement of the general outline of the proposal by many union leaders is most encouraging. I hope that the management leaders, from whom I have been hearing about the evils of racketeering, and the banking and insurance representatives will also put their effective support behind this necessary, protective legislation, and not some poor, watered-down substitute that does not cover the situation.

The beneficiaries and businesses so vitally affected by this problem have a right to look to Congress now for action to match its findings and for protections adequate to meet the danger. I hope we shall not disappoint them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1122) to provide for registration, reporting, and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefit plans, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. IVES), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, recently at its meeting in Miami Beach, Fla., the AFL–CIO executive council adopted a most constructive and forward-looking code of ethical practices on the administration of health and welfare funds. This code recommends to the affiliated unions of the AFL–CIO not only practices of accounting and reporting to all beneficiaries of such funds, but also standards of conduct for individual officers and members of unions to avoid conflicts of interest, breaches of trust, improper fees and kickbacks, questionable investments, and other weaknesses that have characterized the administration of a few such plans.

The wholehearted application of such a code will be a great protection to the beneficiaries of such plans, as well as to the good name of the labor movement. I believe it may serve as a model to other branches of industry and finance which are involved in the administration of such funds.

The requirements of this code obviously go far beyond the legal requirements that would be set up in the bill I have just introduced, and I have been glad to note that the leaders of the AFL–CIO also endorse the basic registration, reporting, and disclosure requirements of that bill as a legal minimum applicable to all, regardless of their acceptance of some such code.

Because of its constructive contribution to the meeting of the problems in this field, and for the information of Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of that code printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection the report and recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE AFL–CIO COMMITTEE ON ETHICAL PRACTICES, APPROVED BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., JANUARY 31, 1957

AS TO A CODE OF ETHICAL PRACTICES REGARDING HEALTH AND WELFARE PLAN ADMINISTRATION

*Code II: Health and welfare funds*

At its June, 1956, meeting the executive council directed the committee on ethical practices "to develop a set of principles and guides for adoption by the AFL–CIO in order to implement the constitutional determination that the AFL–CIO shall be and remain free from all corrupt influences" and directed that such recommended guides and principles be submitted to the council. In accordance with this direction, and its constitutional responsibilities, the committee on ethical practices submitted to the executive council at its August, 1956, meeting the first of a proposed series of recommended codes. This code covering the issuance of local union charters was unanimously adopted by the council.

This report, and the recommended code contained in it, is the second in the series which the committee, in accordance with the council's direction, is developing to implement the constitutional mandate that the AFL–CIO shall be and remain free from any and all corrupt influences and the determination of the first constitutional convention of the AFL–CIO that the reputations of the vast majority of labor union officials, who accept their responsibilities and trust, are "imperiled by the dishonest, corrupt, unethical practices of the few who betray their trust and who look upon the trade union movement not as a brotherhood to serve the general welfare, but as a means to advance their own selfish purposes * * *."

Both the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations prior to the merger of these two organizations into the AFL–CIO gave thorough consideration to the subject of health and welfare funds. This subject was also considered by and dealt with by the first constitutional convention of the AFL–CIO and a resolution dealing with this subject matter was adopted by that convention.

As stated in the resolution adopted by the first constitutional convention of the AFL–CIO, the task of administering and operating health and welfare programs which have been developed through collective bargaining has placed heavy new responsibilities upon the shoulders of trade union officials. The funds involved are paid for through the labor of the workers covered by the plans. They must be administered, therefore, as a high trust for the benefit only of those workers.

Most trade union officials have been faithful to the high trust which has been imposed upon them because of the development of health and welfare funds. The malfeasances of a few, however, have served to bring into disrepute not only the officials of the particular unions involved, but also the good name of the entire American labor movement. For this reason, it is imperative that the AFL–CIO and each of the national and international unions affiliated with it rigorously adhere to the highest ethical standards in dealing with the subject of health and welfare funds.

For these reasons, the ethical practices committee, under the authority vested in it by the constitution of the AFL–CIO and pursuant to the mandate of the first constitutional convention of the AFL–CIO, recommends that the executive council of the AFL–CIO adopt the following policies to safeguard the good name of the AFL–CIO and its affiliated unions:

1. No union official who already receives full-time pay from his union should receive fees or salaries of any kind from a fund established for the provision of a health, welfare or retirement program. Where a salaried union official serves as employee representative or trustee in the administration of such programs, such service should be regarded as one of the functions expected to be performed by him in the normal course of his duties and not as an extra function requiring further compensation from the welfare fund.

2. No union official, employee, or other person acting as agent or representative of a union, who exercises responsibilities or influence in the administration of welfare

programs or the placement of insurance contracts, should have any compromising personal ties, direct or indirect, with outside agencies such as insurance carriers, brokers, or consultants doing business with the welfare plan. Such ties cannot be reconciled with the duty of a union official to be guided solely by the best interests of the membership in any transactions with such agencies. Any union official found to have such ties to his own personal advantage or to have accepted fees, inducements, benefits, or favors of any kind from any such outside agency, should be removed. This principle, of course, does not prevent the existence of a relationship between a union officer or employee and an outside agency where—

(a) no substantial personal advantage is derived from the relationship, and

(b) the outside agency is one in the management of which the union participates, as a union, for the benefit of its members.

3. Complete records of the financial operations of all welfare funds and programs should be maintained in accordance with the best accounting practice. Each such fund should be audited regularly by internal auditors. In addition, each such fund should be audited at least once each year, and preferably semi-annually, by certified public or other independent accountants of unquestioned professional integrity, who should certify that the audits fully and comprehensively show the financial condition of the fund and the results of the operation of the fund.

4. All audit reports should be available to the membership of the union and the affected employees.

5. The trustees or administrators of welfare funds should make a full disclosure and report to the beneficiaries at least once each year. Such report should set forth, in detail, the receipts and expenses of the fund; all salaries and fees paid by the fund, with a statement of the persons to whom paid; the amount paid, and the service or purpose for which paid; a breakdown of insurance premium paid, if a commercial insurance carrier is involved, showing, insofar as possible, the premiums paid, dividends, commissions, claims paid, retentions and service charges; a statement of the person to whom any commissions or fees of any kind were paid, a financial statement on the part of the insuring or service agency, if an agency other than a commercial insurance carrier is employed; and a detailed account of the manner in which the reserves held by the fund are invested.

6. Where health and welfare benefits are provided through the use of a commercial insurance carrier, the carrier should be selected through competitive bids solicited from a substantial number of reliable companies, on the basis of the lowest net cost for the given benefits submitted by a responsible carrier, taking into consideration such factors as comparative retention rates, financial responsibility, facilities for and promptness in servicing claims, and the past record of the carrier, including its record in dealing with trade unions representing its employees.

The trustees of the fund should be required to include in reporting to the membership the specific reasons for the selection of the carrier finally chosen. The carrier should be required to warrant that no fee or other remuneration of any kind has been paid directly or indirectly to any representative of the parties in connection with the business of the fund.

7. Where a union or union trustees participate in the administration of the investment of welfare fund reserves, the union or its trustees should make every effort to prohibit the investment of welfare fund reserves in the business of any contributing employer, insurance carrier or agency doing business with the fund, or in any enterprise in which any trustee, officer or employee of the fund has a personal financial interest of such a nature as to be affected by the fund's investment or disinvestment.

(This is not to be construed as preventing investment in an enterprise in which a union official is engaged by virture to his office, provided (i) no substantial personal advantage is derived from the relationship, and (ii) the concern or enterprise is one in the management of which the union participates for the benefit of its members.)

8. Where any trustee, agent, fiduciary or employee of a health or welfare program is found to have received an unethical payment, the union should insist upon his removal and should take appropriate legal steps against both the party receiving and the party making the payment. Where health and welfare funds are negotiated or administered by local unions or by other organizations subordinate to or affiliated with a national or international union, provision should be made to give the national or international union the authority to audit such funds and to apply remedies where there is evidence of a violation of ethical standards.

9. Every welfare program should provide redress against the arbitrary or unjust denial of claims so as to afford the individual member prompt and effective relief where his claim for benefits has been improperly rejected. Every program should provide for the keeping of complete records of the claims experience so that a constant check can be maintained on the relationship between claims and premiums and dividends, and on the utilization of the various benefits.

10. The duty of policing and enforcing these standards is shared by every union member, as well as by local, national and international officials. The best safeguard against abuses lies in the hands of a vigilant, informed and active membership, jealous of their rights and interests in the operation of health and welfare programs, as well as any other trade union program. As a fundamental part of any approach to the problem of policing health and welfare funds, affiliated unions, through education, publicity and discussion programs, should seek to develop the widest possible degree of active and informed interest in all phases of these programs on the part of the membership at large. International unions should, wherever possible, have expert advice available for the negotiation, establishment and administration of health and welfare plans, and should provide training for union representatives in the techniques and standards of proper administration of welfare plans.

11. Where constitutional amendments or changes in internal administrative procedure are necessary to comply with the standards herein set forth, such amendments and changes should be undertaken at the earliest practicable time.

---

## LAKE MICHIGAN WATER DIVERSION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago to test, on a 3-year basis, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway. The bill would authorize a desperately needed additional diversion at a rate providing a total annual average of not more than 2,500 cubic feet per second, which is an increase of an annual average rate of 1,000 cubic feet per second over existing diversion.

There is a real need for the benefits provided by this bill. The health and welfare of an expanding 5½ million people residing within the service area of the Chicago Sanitary District must be seriously considered. The increased demands of an expanding population require an equal expansion of facilities of this type, including the expanded need for water. The Chicago Sanitary District has spent over $300 million in an effort to solve this problem. The history of their accomplishments is an example of the finest in sanitary engineering skills. There is possible only 90 percent purification and the irreducible residue of effluvia has a bad effect upon the flow of the Illinois Waterway unless diluted with additional oxygen. The Illinois Waterway, a vital transportation link, connecting the Mississippi Valley with the Great Lakes, is carrying an ever-increasing volume of commercial water traffic. Development of the St. Lawrence Seaway will greatly increase the traffic demands on this Illinois water route. Additional water is needed to provide the Illinois River with the means of meeting this demand.

During the 84th Congress a similar bill—H. R. 3210—was considered by both the House and the Senate, and was the subject of extensive hearings before the House Public Works Committee and the Senate Public Works Committee. Each committee favorably reported the bill. Testimony and documents produced before each of the committees and on the floor of the Senate during debate, I believe, conclusively demonstrated the need for the bill, and the authority of Congress to enact the bill. The bill passed both the House and Senate with large majorities and support by both parties. The subsequent veto by the President expressed the need for additional reports on control of lake levels and discussion with Canada prior to enactment. The President has since requested the State Department to begin discussion with Canada to solve these differences, and that the Department of Defense expedite completion of their report. I hope those requests will be honored in time to permit early consideration and enactment of the bill.

Adequate safeguards have been retained in the bill. They are, first, a limitation of not more than 5,000 cubic feet per second at any time; second, the Secretary of the Army shall at all times have direct control and supervision of the amount of water directly diverted from Lake Michigan; and, third, prohibition of the diversion of water into the Illinois Waterway during times of flood in the Illinois, Des Plaines, Chicago, and Calumet Rivers. Downstate Illinois communities urge passage of the bill because of their need for increased water for navigation, a cleaner river, and the enhancement of their underground water supply.

I sincerely hope the Senate will carefully consider the bill and give the necessary approval.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1123) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

## TRANSFER OF PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT SERVICE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 established a nationwide system of public employment offices. These offices, which are located in all 48 States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, are operated as a State function in cooperation with the United States Employment Service. In addition, the operation of these offices is coordinated with the administration of unemployment insurance, another State operation.

The District of Columbia is in an unusual situation with respect to these functions. On the one hand, the statutes presently require that the United States Department of Labor operate the public employment service for the District, a practice which does not conform with the pattern throughout the rest of the country. At the same time, unemployment insurance for workers in the District of Columbia is administered, as it should be, by the District government. Thus two different jurisdictions presently administer functions whose administration should be in conjunction with each other to assure maximum benefit from both.

I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would transfer the public employment service for the District to the District government and thereby place responsibility for the operation of the program, together with the means of carrying it out, in the hands of local rather than Federal authority. The economy and efficiency of both employment service and unemployment insurance programs should increase as a result of administration by the same authority.

The proposal authorizes and directs the District Commissioners to furnish the public employment services required by the Wagner-Peyser Act. To accomplish this purpose, the Commissioners are directed to establish a new agency with at least two coordinate divisions, one to administer the employment service and the other to administer the unemployment insurance functions. As at present, all employees administering these functions are to be included in the Federal civil service.

No change in the cost to the Federal Government of operating this service should result from enactment of this proposal since the District will be reimbursed by the Federal Government, as are all States, of the costs of the operation.

This bill, if enacted, would constitute legislation separate from the Wagner-Peyser Act, but would contain certain necessary amendments of that act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1124) to transfer to the government of the District of Columbia the Public Employment Service for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## PARTICIPATION BY CORN PRODUCERS IN 1957 SOIL-BANK AND PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAMS

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the corn program for the year 1956. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in full at this point in my remarks, and that I may be permitted to have printed in the RECORD, following the printing of the bill, a statement I have prepared in connection therewith.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1125) to enable corn producers to participate in the 1957 soil-bank and price-support programs and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. MARTIN of Iowa), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, section 103 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (Public Law 540, 84th Cong.) is amended by adding a new subsection (c) as follows: (c) For the 1957 crop year, corn producers in the commercial corn area may qualify for price support on corn and participate in the soil bank program by complying, in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture, with either of the alternatives presented to producers in the corn referendum dated December 11, 1956, pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (Public Law 540, 84th Cong.) and price support in the noncommercial corn area shall be 82½ percent of the average of the price support in the commercial corn area as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The statement, presented by Mr. HICKENLOOPER, is as follows:

By introducing the accompanying bill, to enable corn producers to participate in the 1957 soil bank on a basis of the farmers' choice between the propositions submitted in the corn referendum of last December, I hope that it may provide a formula for a satisfactory compromise on this program as between a number of theories that have been advanced. Time is short; it is essential that farmers know very soon what the program is to be. By way of a short explanation at this time, I make the following statement:

(1) The Agricultural Act of 1956 authorized and directed the Secretary of Agriculture to offer corn farmers in the commercial area an opportunity to decide whether they preferred (1) a corn acre allotment of 37,289,000 with price support at $1.36 for bushels or (2) a corn base acreage of 51 million acres with price support at a level which will assist farmers in marketing corn but not encourage uneconomic production (set by the Secretary at $1.31 per bushel for 1957) provided that an acreage equal to 15 percent of the farm corn base acreage is put into the soil bank. Such acreage could be put into either the acreage reserve or the conservative reserve or a combination of the two programs.

(2) 61.5 percent of the 437,490 votes cast in the referendum on December 11, 1956 were for the lower price support and higher acreage with the requirement that an acreage equal to 15 percent of the farm corn base acreage must be put in the soil bank.

(3) Prior to the referendum, farmers were given a written notice of the acreages allotted to their farm under both the 51 million corn base acreage and the 37.3 million acre corn allotment, the level of price support under both programs, and what would be required for participation in the soil bank under both programs.

(4) The amendment here proposed would permit a corn farmer in the commercial corn area to plant within either the farm base acreage for his farm or the farm acreage allotment. Those farmers choosing to plant within the farm base acreage would be eligible for price support at a national average of $1.31 per bushel if an acreage equal to 15 percent of the farm base acreage was put into the soil bank. Those farmers planting within the farm corn allotment would be eligible for price support at $1.36 per bushel. They would not be required to put any acreage in the soil bank.

(5) The amendment is a temporary measure to deal with the corn problem in 1957 only.

(6) It permits farmers immediately upon passage of the act to know what they may do without further administrative work on the part of the USDA since farmers may use the same notice for planting purposes that they used to participate in the referendum.

(7) Noncommercial area price support would be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture on the basis of 82½ percent of the average of the price support in the commercial corn area.

## EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 3 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend for 2 years the basic authority for disposal of surplus farm commodities for foreign currencies, under

title I of Public Law 480, enacted by the 83d Congress. The bill authorizes export commitments of an additional $3 billion worth of farm commodities during that extended period.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that this constructive program is far more than just a farm-surplus disposal program. It is another arm of our foreign policy, a vital part of our efforts to maintain trade relations with countries lacking dollars to trade with us.

In considering an extension and increase in authorization for sales of our farm commodities for foreign currencies, it should be understood that the foreign currencies obtained are used by the United States for constructive purposes which otherwise might require direct appropriations. In other words, in many instances the program permits us to make use of our abundance of American food, instead of just using American dollars in carrying forward programs abroad.

For example, foreign currencies obtained from Public Law 480 sales are being used for payment of United States obligations abroad, for military procurement, for purchase of strategic materials, for purchase of goods for other countries under military or economic-aid programs, loans for multilateral trade and economic development, financing of the international educational exchange program, and last, but far from least, new market development for American farm products.

It can easily be seen that the amount authorized for Public Law 480 is far from a loss in the economic sense, and far from being solely a charge against agriculture for surplus disposal. It is much broader; it is an interlocking program making wiser use of our abundance to carry forward objectives of our foreign policy, and our entire Nation's self-interest.

Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks I shall place in the RECORD tables indicating the amounts of farm commodities moved under this program, and the uses for which foreign currencies have been designated under agreements to date.

Mr. President, the budget message recognized the need for continuation of this program, but proposed an extension of the program to only June 30, 1958, and asked only an additional $1 billion for that purpose.

Mr. President, I wish to explain why, after a careful study of the program, I am asking that it be extended instead to June 30, 1959, with an authorization of an additional $3 billion.

Officials of the Department of Agriculture concede that they already have pending requests from countries seeking to conclude agreements amounting to more than $1 billion.

Furthermore, as a practical matter the increase we are talking about is not an extension covering the period from June 30, 1957, when the present authorization expires, to June 30, 1958, as the administration proposes. Actually, it must be enough to cover carrying on this program from the end of the current month, if we are to avoid a sharp curtailment in this export program.

In a letter to me, dated January 29, 1957, signed by Assistant Secretary Earl Butz, the Department of Agriculture confirms that its current funds for this program are virtually exhausted and will not be sufficient to complete this fiscal year.

Assistant Secretary Butz says, in part:

> The $3 billion authorization for foreign currency sales under title I of Public Law 480 is nearly exhausted; only about $200 million remains to be programed. On the basis of title I negotiations now in progress and current program planning, it is expected that the remaining $200 million will be committed by the end of February or soon thereafter.

It can be readily seen that the Department expects to be at the end of its present dollar authority by the end of this month—4 months before the end of the fiscal year during which its authority for the program continues.

Furthermore, the same letter makes it apparent that the Department expects to continue its program during those 4 months out of the additional authorization voted by Congress for the period ahead—whether that be the 1 year asked by the administration, or the 2 years I have proposed.

Mr. Butz continues:

> The President in his budget message requested an additional $1 billion for these sales and an extension of 1 year to the authority to June 30, 1958. It is hoped that this increase will be granted soon so that we can continue to enter into new agreements. Additional authority would also facilitate the orderly programing of commodities for fiscal year 1958.

Mr. President, it should be obvious that if the Department of Agriculture has pending requests for $1 billion worth of American farm commodities, and if it intends to proceed with new sales agreements between now and the start of the new fiscal year under the extension we are being asked to provide, new authority of $1 billion certainly is not going to carry on the program through another entire fiscal year. In fact, the possibility exists that the entire amount might be committed before the beginning of the fiscal year for which we are supposedly voting an extension.

For that reason I am asking us to be realistic: to consider the fact the Department has already used up available funds, and to provide realistically for carrying on the program between the present time and June 30, 1959.

Mr. President, the 2-year extension is more realistic in developing the kind of constructive programs we hope to achieve under this program, and in providing the time necessary for working out participation by some countries. It will also give us a better opportunity to appraise the effectiveness of the program and to consider transitional means of shifting more toward direct dollar trade.

Mr. President, if we do not provide the 2-year extension now, we can accept as a certainty that requests will be made of us a year from now for another 1-year extension. Even Secretary Benson indicated that possibility in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

For the purpose of more efficient operations, planning and programing, I believe it would be far wiser to grant the 2-year authority now, rather than to proceed in piecemeal, year-at-a-time fashion.

Mr. President, I have tried to emphasize the importance of Public Law 480 to our general trade and foreign policy. However, I do not want to minimize its vital importance to American agriculture at a time when it is the weakest link in our economy.

Let me quote further from Mr. Butz' letter of January 29, in response to my inquiry about this program:

> We agree that operations under Public Law 480 have stimulated agricultural marketing. Title I sales have contributed substantially to increases in United States agricultural exports that have taken place; for some commodities, these sales have been the primary factor in maintaining exports at high levels. Well over 400 million bushels of wheat will be exported under agreements signed to date, including the 3-year programs with Brazil and India; about 1.2 billion pounds of soybean oil and cottonseed oil, 65 million bushels of feed grains, 130 million pounds of dairy products, and 150 million pounds of meat and meat products have also been programed.
>
> Title I sales are making important reductions in Commodity Credit Corporation inventories, particularly wheat, rice, and cotton. In addition, these sales are moving other commodities in surplus supply directly into consumption channels.

Mr. President, it seems good business to me to keep going a program that reduces our surpluses, cuts domestic storage costs, and at the same time provides foreign currency for making military purchases and granting economic development loans.

Mr. President, I wish to make one further point. As a United States Delegate to the United Nations, it was my privilege recently to present to that body on behalf of our Government a United States proposal to encourage international assistance toward establishment of national food reserves in various parts of the world. Our Government extended an offer to cooperate in providing commodities for such stockpiles, as well as commodities to aid in financing construction of storage facilities for such reserves.

From all indications, our proposal was favorably received. My reason for mentioning it here, however, is to emphasize that our Government will need as a minimum the extension and expansion I have proposed under Public Law 480 if it is to carry forward in good faith the public commitment it has made through the United Nations to other countries of the world.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full text of the letter from Assistant Secretary Butz, to which I have referred, as well as three tables prepared by the Department of Agriculture covering the operations of Public Law 480 to date. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD

a press release summarizing my presentation of the World Food Reserve program to the United Nations, to which I have also referred. Let me add that my presentation on the World Food Reserve program, which I submitted to the United Nations, was accepted unanimously by 80 nations in the United Nations General Assembly, and therefore commits our Government to long-term programs for the use of our agricultural abundance.

There being no objection, the letter, tables, and release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
*Washington, D. C., January 29, 1957.*

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
*United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: This is in response to your letter of January 7, 1957, concerning the amount of funds available for programing under Public Law 480.

The $3 billion authorization for foreign currency sales under title I of Public Law 480 is nearly exhausted; only about $200 million remains to be programed. On the basis of title I negotiations now in progress and current program planning it is expected that the remaining $200 million will be committed by the end of February or soon thereafter.

The President in his budget message requested an additional $1 billion for these sales and an extension of 1 year to the authority to June 30, 1958. It is hoped that this increase will be granted soon so that we can continue to enter into new agreements. Additional authority would also facilitate the orderly programing of commodities for fiscal year 1958.

We agree that operations under Public Law 480 have stimulated agricultural marketing. Title I sales have contributed substantially to increases in United States agricultural exports that have taken place; for some commodities, these sales have been the primary factor in maintaining exports at high levels. Well over 400 million bushels of wheat will be exported under agreements signed to date, including the 3-year programs with Brazil and India; about 1.2 billion pounds of soybean oil and cottonseeed oil, 65 million bushels of feed grains, 130 million pounds of dairy products, and 150 million pounds of meat and meat products have also been programed.

Title I sales are making important reductions in Commodity Credit Corporation inventories, particularly wheat, rice, and cotton. In addition, these sales are moving other commodities in surplus supply directly into consumption channels.

We appreciate your interest in Public Law 480 activities and welcome your support for an extension of these programs.

Sincerely yours,

EARL L. BUTZ,
*Assistant Secretary.*

EXHIBIT I.—*Approximate quantities of commodities under title I, Public Law 480 agreements signed from beginning of program through Dec. 31, 1956*

| Country | Wheat and flour | Feed grains [1] | Rice | Cotton [2] | Tobacco | Dairy products [3] | Fats and oils [4] | Poultry | Dry edible beans | Fruit and vegetables | Meat | Hay and pasture seeds |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Thousand bushels* | *Thousand bushels* | *Thousand hundredweight* | *Thousand bales* | *Thousand pounds* | *Thousand pounds* | *Thousand pounds* | *Thousand pounds* | *Thousand hundredweight* | *Thousand pounds* | *Thousand pounds* | *Thousand hundredweight* |
| Argentina | | | | | | | 220,000 | | | | | |
| Austria | 2,025 | 7,091 | | 42.5 | 5,900 | | [6] 16,552 | | | [6] 1,974 | | |
| Brazil | [7] 85,211 | 688 | | | 125 | 10,190 | [5] 55,092 | | | | | |
| Burma | | | | 125.2 | 1,467 | 9,682 | | | | [6] 1,579 | | |
| Chile | 7,316 | | | 37.6 | 360 | 9,900 | [5] 94,019 | | | | | 55 |
| China (Taiwan) | | | | 35.6 | 2,000 | 4,740 | 10,811 | | | | | |
| Colombia | 2,612 | | | 48.3 | | 3,307 | 14,141 | | | | | |
| Ecuador | 597 | | | 6.0 | 323 | | 13,629 | | | | | |
| Egypt | 10,329 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Finland | 3,724 | 1,581 | | 36.1 | 9,990 | 1,163 | | | | [6] 10,720 | | |
| France | | | | | 3,216 | | | | | | | |
| Germany | | | | | | | | 3,000 | | | | |
| Greece | 6,378 | 5,073 | | | | 34,761 | [5] 83,288 | | | | | |
| India [8] | 128,600 | | 4,409 | 500.0 | 6,000 | 14,770 | | | | | | |
| Indonesia | 2,894 | | 5,629 | 250.2 | 23,000 | | | | | | | |
| Iran | 2,120 | | | | | 11,708 | 5,773 | | | | | |
| Israel | 9,251 | 7,356 | 7 | 15.5 | 550 | 18,556 | 19,450 | | 37 | | [9] 40,000 | |
| Italy | 948 | 5,860 | | 453.8 | 9,798 | | 196,815 | | | | | |
| Japan | 30,866 | 11,450 | 2,111 | 305.0 | 9,462 | | | | | | | |
| Korea | 4,122 | 10,000 | | 102.7 | 12,667 | 2,751 | [5] 24,004 | | | | [9] 19,842 | |
| Netherlands | | | | 1.8 | | | | | | | | |
| Pakistan | 15,357 | | 6,636 | 189.5 | 5,317 | 5,105 | 21,159 | | | | | |
| Paraguay | 994 | | | | | 933 | [9] 3,126 | | | | | |
| Peru | 5,014 | | | | | 621 | 22,000 | | | | | |
| Portugal | 3,751 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Spain | [10] 2,446 | 5,916 | | [2] 221.9 | 11,388 | | 515,001 | | | [6] 66,667 | [9] 71,256 | |
| Thailand | | | | | 2,700 | 1,857 | | | | | | |
| Turkey | 26,890 | 10,902 | 220 | | | | 92,551 | | | | [9] 17,637 | |
| United Kingdom | | | | | 38,625 | | | | | | | |
| Yugoslavia | 80,460 | | | 199.7 | 0 | 0 | [5] 190,566 | | | | | |
| Total | 431,905 | 65,917 | 19,012 | 2,571.4 | 142,828 | 130,044 | 1,597,977 | 3,000 | 37 | 80,040 | 148,734 | 55 |

[1] Feed grains:

| | *Thousand bushels* |
|---|---|
| Feed wheat | 2,234 |
| Corn | 27,095 |
| Oats | 5,843 |
| Barley | 24,950 |
| Grain sorghums | 5,795 |
| Total | 65,917 |

[2] Includes 15,400 bales cotton linters for Spain.

[3] Dairy products:

| | *Thousand pounds* |
|---|---|
| Condensed milk | 6,229 |
| Dry whole milk | 3,831 |
| Nonfat dry milk | 55,602 |
| Evaporated milk | 14,680 |
| Butter | 17,057 |
| Cheese | 8,258 |
| Butter oil | 2,861 |
| Butter oil and/or ghee | 15,276 |
| Ghee | 4,249 |
| Whey | 2,001 |
| Total | 130,044 |

[4] Fats and oils:

| | *Thousand pounds* |
|---|---|
| Cottonseed oil | 121,500 |
| Cottonseed oil and/or soybean oil | 776,715 |
| Cottonseed oil, soybean oil, and/or lard | 320,151 |
| Linseed oil | 11,945 |
| Lard | 241,572 |
| Tallow and/or grease | 126,004 |
| Total | 1,597,977 |

[5] Entire quantity shown for country is lard except Brazil, Chile, Greece, Korea, Paraguay, and Yugoslavia which includes lard as follows:

| | *Thousand pounds* |
|---|---|
| Brazil | 44,069 |
| Chile | 3,241 |
| Greece | 3,571 |
| Korea | 14,327 |
| Paraguay | 1,300 |
| Yugoslavia | 158,512 |

[6] Fruits and vegetables:

| | *Thousand pounds* |
|---|---|
| Austria: | |
| Canned fruit and fruit juices | 47 |
| Dried fruit | 1,927 |
| Burma: | |
| Canned fruit and fruit juices | 769 |
| Dried fruit | 810 |
| Finland: | |
| Dried fruit | 9,809 |
| Fresh pears | 920 |
| Spain, potatoes. | |

[7] Includes 65,055,000 bushels under fiscal year 1957 program to be shipped over a 3-year period.

[8] 3-year program except rice which is a 1-year program.

[9] Meat:

| | *Thousand pounds* |
|---|---|
| Israel and Turkey, frozen beef. | |
| Korea, canned pork. | |
| Spain: | |
| Canned hams | 2,571 |
| Salt pork | 4,267 |
| Frozen beef | 64,417 |

[10] Wheat to be sold to Spain for resale to Switzerland for financing procurement of Swiss goods by Spain.

EXHIBIT II.—*Commodity composition of programs under title I, Public Law 480, agreements signed from beginning of program through Dec. 31, 1956*

[In millions of dollars]

| Country | Wheat | Feed grains | Rice | Cotton [1] | Tobacco | Dairy products | Fats and oils | Other | Market value | Ocean transportation | Market value including ocean transportation [2] | Estimated CCC cost including ocean transportation [3] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Argentina | | | | | | | 30.4 | | 30.4 | 0.7 | 31.1 | 34.0 |
| Austria | 3.4 | 10.6 | | 6.1 | 3.5 | | 2.4 | [4] 0.3 | 26.3 | 2.3 | 28.6 | 41.8 |
| Brazil | [4] 145.2 | .9 | | | .2 | 2.2 | 8.3 | | 156.8 | 23.9 | 180.7 | 301.0 |
| Burma | | | | 17.5 | 1.1 | 2.0 | | [5] .2 | 20.8 | .9 | 21.7 | 31.2 |
| Chile | 12.1 | | | 5.3 | .2 | 1.0 | 16.0 | [6] 2.5 | 37.1 | 3.0 | 40.1 | 56.0 |
| China (Taiwan) | | | | 5.0 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 1.0 | | 9.2 | .6 | 9.8 | 12.5 |
| Colombia | 5.0 | | | 7.6 | | .7 | 2.5 | | 15.8 | 1.1 | 16.9 | 24.1 |
| Ecuador | 1.2 | | | .8 | .2 | | 1.5 | | 3.7 | .3 | 4.0 | 5.3 |
| Egypt | 17.1 | | | | | | | | 17.1 | 2.5 | 19.6 | 38.7 |
| Finland | 6.3 | 2.3 | | 5.8 | 6.0 | .5 | | [7] 1.2 | 22.1 | 1.9 | 24.0 | 34.3 |
| France | | | | | 2.1 | | | | 2.1 | | 2.1 | 2.1 |
| Germany | | | | | | | | [8] 1.2 | 1.2 | | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Greece | 11.0 | 5.4 | | | | 3.6 | 14.3 | | 34.3 | 3.4 | 37.7 | 51.2 |
| India | 200.0 | | 26.4 | 70.0 | 6.0 | 3.5 | | | 305.9 | [9] 60.2 | 366.1 | 553.4 |
| Indonesia | 5.0 | | 35.8 | 36.0 | 15.0 | | | | 91.8 | 6.1 | 97.9 | 153.5 |
| Iran | 3.9 | | | | | 6.0 | 1.4 | | 11.3 | 1.2 | 12.5 | 20.0 |
| Israel | 15.8 | 8.4 | .1 | 2.6 | .4 | 5.8 | 3.0 | [6] 10.3 | 46.4 | 5.2 | 51.6 | 76.5 |
| Italy | 1.6 | 10.0 | | 65.3 | 7.4 | | 30.9 | | 114.3 | 4.5 | 118.8 | 187.3 |
| Japan | 49.7 | 14.3 | 14.4 | 52.8 | 7.7 | | | | 138.9 | 11.9 | 150.8 | 210.1 |
| Korea | 6.4 | 11.5 | | 17.2 | 6.6 | 1.0 | 3.0 | [10] 8.0 | 53.7 | 5.3 | 59.0 | 74.6 |
| Netherlands | | | | .27 | | | | | .27 | .01 | .28 | .4 |
| Pakistan | 25.5 | | 41.9 | 29.0 | 4.8 | 2.5 | 3.3 | | 107.0 | 13.7 | 120.7 | 194.9 |
| Paraguay | 1.7 | | | | | .4 | .5 | | 2.6 | .4 | 3.0 | 4.3 |
| Peru | 8.9 | | | | | .2 | 3.0 | | 12.1 | 1.4 | 13.5 | 20.3 |
| Portugal | 6.3 | | | | | | | | 6.3 | .8 | 7.1 | 13.7 |
| Spain [11] | 4.6 | 9.1 | | [4] 32.9 | 6.2 | | 89.6 | [12] 19.3 | 161.7 | 15.0 | 176.7 | 199.2 |
| Thailand | | | | | 1.9 | .5 | | | 2.4 | .1 | 2.5 | 2.8 |
| Turkey | 45.4 | 13.3 | 1.4 | | | | 12.3 | [13] 4.4 | 76.8 | 13.9 | 90.7 | 136.2 |
| United Kingdom | | | | | 27.0 | | | | 27.0 | .4 | 27.4 | 27.4 |
| Yugoslavia | 137.2 | | | 30.9 | | | 26.0 | | 194.1 | 28.0 | 222.1 | 348.1 |
| Total agreements | 713.3 | 85.8 | 120.0 | 385.07 | 98.0 | 31.4 | 248.5 | 47.4 | 1,729.47 | 208.71 | 1,938.18 | 2,826.1 |

[1] Spanish program includes $0.3 million cotton linters.
[2] Includes only ocean transportation to be financed by CCC except as noted in footnote 8.
[3] Fruit.
[4] Includes $111 million under fiscal year 1957 agreement to be shipped over a 3-year period.
[5] Hay and pasture seeds, $2.5 million.
[6] Poultry.
[7] 3-year program except rice, which is a 1-year program.
[8] Includes $C million estimated for ocean freight differential for which no rupee deposits are required. The balance, $54.2 million, only, is reflected in the currency use table III.
[9] Dry edible beans, $0.3 million; chilled or frozen beef, $10 million.
[10] Canned pork.
[11] Wheat to be sold to Spain for resale to Switzerland for financing procurement of Swiss goods by Spain.
[12] Hams, $1.6 million; salt pork, $0.8 million; potatoes, $1.4 million; frozen beef $13.5 million.
[13] Frozen beef.

EXHIBIT III.—*Planned uses of foreign currency under title I, Public Law 480 agreements signed from beginning of program through Dec. 31, 1956* [1]

[In million dollars]

| Country | Total amount programed (market value including ocean transportation) | Market development (sec. 104 (a)) | Purchase of strategic material (sec. 104 (b)) | Military procurement (sec. 104 (c)) | Purchase of goods for other countries [2] (sec. 104 (d)) | Grants for multilateral trade and economic development (sec. 104 (e)) | Payment of United States obligations [3] (sec. 104 (f)) | Loans for multilateral trade and economic development (sec. 104 (g)) | International education exchange (sec. 104 (h)) | Translation and publication (sec. 104 (i)) | Information and education (sec. 104 (j)) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Argentina | 31.1 | 0.6 | | | (*) | | 9.8 | 20.0 | 0.7 | | |
| Austria | 28.6 | .7 | | | 2.0 | | 9.7 | 16.0 | .2 | | |
| Brazil | 180.7 | 2.7 | 3.2 | 2.0 | | | 20.1 | 149.2 | 2.1 | 0.5 | 0.9 |
| Burma | 21.7 | .5 | | | (*) | | 3.9 | 17.3 | | | |
| Chile | 40.1 | .8 | | | | | 7.0 | 31.7 | .6 | | |
| China (Taiwan) | 9.8 | .7 | | 4.9 | | | 4.2 | | | | |
| Colombia | 16.9 | .8 | | | (*) | | 5.5 | 10.0 | .6 | | |
| Ecuador | 4.0 | .2 | | | | | .4 | 3.1 | .3 | | |
| Egypt | 19.6 | .5 | | | | | 4.7 | 13.6 | .8 | | |
| Finland | 24.0 | .5 | | | (*) | | 23.2 | | .3 | .05 | |
| France | 2.1 | 1.2 | | | .6 | | .3 | | | | |
| Germany | 1.2 | 1.1 | | | | | .1 | | | | |
| Greece | 37.7 | .8 | | | | 7.5 | 8.9 | 20.5 | | | |
| India (3-year program) | [4] 360.1 | 4.0 | | | (*) | 54.0 | 68.0 | 234.1 | | | |
| Indonesia | 97.9 | 1.0 | 2.0 | | | | 17.2 | 77.4 | .3 | | |
| Iran | 12.5 | .2 | | 5.9 | | | 3.2 | 2.5 | .7 | | |
| Israel | 51.6 | .4 | | | (*) | | 14.0 | 36.8 | .4 | | |
| Italy | 118.8 | 2.7 | 1.0 | | [5] 10.0 | | 22.9 | 81.2 | | | 1.0 |
| Japan | 150.8 | 3.3 | | (*) | 10.9 | | [6] 25.6 | 108.9 | 2.1 | | |
| Korea | 59.0 | .5 | | 45.4 | | | 12.2 | | .9 | | |
| Netherlands | .28 | .25 | | | | | .03 | | | | |
| Pakistan | 120.7 | 1.7 | | 74.3 | | | 18.8 | 23.6 | 1.0 | .3 | 1.0 |
| Paraguay | 3.0 | .2 | | | | | .5 | 2.2 | .1 | | |
| Peru | 13.5 | .7 | | | | | .26 | 9.7 | .5 | | |

[1] Amounts shown on this table are subject to adjustment when actual purchases and allocations have been made.
[2] Amounts shown in this column indicate a specified amount in the agreement for this use. Footnote 2 only shows an unspecified amount for possible procurement for third countries. A footnote and an amount indicate more than 1 agreement including both specified and unspecified amounts.
[3] In order to provide flexibility in the use of funds, many agreements provide that a specified amount of local currency proceeds may be used under subsecs. 104 (a), (b), (f), (h), and (i). In some instances, possible uses under subsec. 104 (d) are also included in this category. Therefore, estimates based on the best information now available are indicated above under subsecs. (a), (b), (h) and (f). Balances not otherwise distributed are included under subsec. (f). This distribution is subject to revision when allocations have been completed.
[4] Total market value in table VI differs from total in table II by the $6 million estimated for ocean-freight differential in the Indian agreement for which no rupee deposits will be required.
[5] The Japanese agreement for the July–June year 1955–56 provides for the use of $8.1 million and the United Kingdom agreements provide for the entire currency use under subsec. 104 (e). However, since in return for this currency use, these countries will construct and make available to the U. S. Armed Forces an equivalent value of dependent housing, the amounts are shown under subsec. 104 (f).

EXHIBIT III.—*Planned uses of foreign currency under title I, Public Law 480 agreements signed from beginning of program through Dec. 31, 1956* —Continued

[In million dollars]

| Country | Total amount programed (market value including ocean transportation) | Market development (sec. 104 (a)) | Purchase of strategic material (sec. 104 (b)) | Military procurement (sec. 104 (c)) | Purchase of goods for other countries (sec. 104 (d)) | Grants for multilateral trade and economic development (sec. 104 (e)) | Payment of United States obligations (sec. 104 (f)) | Loans for multilateral trade and economic development (sec. 104 (g)) | International education exchange (sec. 104 (h)) | Translation and publication (sec. 104 (i)) | Information and education (sec. 104 (j)) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Portugal | 7.1 | .3 | | | | | 3.1 | 3.4 | .3 | | |
| Spain | 176.7 | 3.0 | 1.0 | | | | 62.9 | 107.7 | 1.1 | .5 | .5 |
| Thailand | 2.5 | .4 | | | | | .65 | 1.0 | .45 | | |
| Turkey | 90.7 | .7 | | | | | 41.9 | 45.3 | 1.5 | .1 | 1.2 |
| United Kingdom | 27.4 | | | [5] | | | [4] 27.4 | | | | |
| Yugoslavia | 222.1 | 1.0 | | 88.8 | | | 49.3 | 82.7 | | .3 | |
| Total agreements [4] | [4] 1,932.18 | 31.45 | 7.2 | 221.3 | 23.5 | 61.5 | 468.08 | 1,097.9 | 14.95 | 1.75 | 4.6 |
| Use as percent of total | 100.0 | 1.6 | .4 | 11.5 | 1.2 | 3.2 | 24.2 | 56.8 | .8 | .1 | .2 |

[4] In some instances column totals do not add to total amount programed because of slight differences in rounding.

SENATOR HUMPHREY OUTLINES NEW WORLD FOOD AID OFFER TO UNITED NATIONS

A proposal for international cooperation toward establishment of more adequate national food reserves was outlined to the United Nations in New York today by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY (Democrat, Minnesota), member of the United States delegation to the United Nations General Assembly.

As spokesman for the United States on the world food reserves item on the U. N. agenda, Senator HUMPHREY's address explained a draft resolution submitted by the United States delegation calling for exploring possibilities of international assistance for national food reserves.

Calling attention to the fact that "the negative attitude of the United States in the past toward establishment of world food reserves has been concerned with means, rather than end," Senator HUMPHREY said he was offering the specific new proposal "in order to draw attention to approaches that might add realism to the further studies and evaluations now in progress."

"Feeling as we do about these matters of practical approach to a purpose on which there is no disagreement, it is only natural that we would want to explore a number of avenues that might, in our view, contribute to a speedier and more adequate attainment of our common objectives," Senator HUMPHREY explained.

"The establishment and maintenance of more adequate national food reserves, especially in crop-cycle and famine areas, would go a long way toward accomplishing most, if not all, of the purposes that some of us had hoped a world food reserve or a world food capital fund could meet.

"The construction of storage facilities and the accumulation of reserve stocks in 'crop-cycle' or 'famine' areas would seem to be an essential step toward general economic development. Surplus foods from abroad not only could in part finance the cost of the construction of strategically situated storage space but could also make an important direct contribution to providing the stocks that should be held as an emergency reserve. Moreover, if storage space were available, the local government's task of dealing with domestic surpluses in years of good crops would be vastly facilitated, and years of abundance would become the blessing they should be, instead of the embarrassment they now are sometimes even in countries normally plagued by shortages.

"Somehow it would seem only logical if some of the world's surplus holdings were used to bolster stocks in areas where the failure of a crop means famine and where people live on the brink of disaster from one harvest to the next.

"FAO's report eloquently describes the desirability of adequate national reserves in countries living near the margin of subsistence. Such reserves could be brought into action at an early stage of an emergency, before panic and hoarding aggravate the plight. They would also afford some 'elbow room' for projects of economic development; they could be drawn upon to help finance such projects—mitigating inflationary pressures of increased consumer demand resulting from intensified economic development.

"Unfortunately, the need for such reserves is greatest in the countries least able to afford diversion of output from current consumption to the building of stocks."

It is in the light of considerations such as these, Senator HUMPHREY told the U. N., that "my Government has authorized me to say that, in accordance with our traditions, the United States stands ready to make grants of agricultural commodities to countries facing famine or other emergencies."

"Furthermore, the United States is prepared to make available to needy countries, under existing legislation and subject to further congressional authorizations, surplus agricultural commodities for the establishment of reserve stocks to meet extraordinary needs due to crop failures or other emergencies, or to mitigate excessive price effects of increased demand due to economic development programs.

"Assistance of this kind is predicated on the development by the countries concerned of reasonable and realistic programs, and of safeguards that ensure the observance of the FAO principle of avoiding 'harmful interferences with the normal pattern of production and international trade.' United States assistance in the above sense would be fashioned after previous arrangements entered into with several individual countries under which large parts of the local currencies received in payment for agricultural commodities supplied for building up national reserves were made available for financing economic development.

"The United States will cooperate with other countries in the further development of programs for the establishment of national food reserves * * * it is in order to stimulate a more rapid exploration of such possibilities for national action, with international assistance * * * that we are submitting the draft resolution. * * * We should be happy if it would contribute to uncover additional realistic possibilities for action that serves the noble purpose of improving the lot of the common man."

Senator HUMPHREY said he was convinced "that our first task here in the United Nations is to be realistic."

"If we aim at the possible, we will advance further than if we get stuck halfway toward the best of all worlds. It is not enough to be wanting to do a good thing; it is equally important to do it well so that the highmindedness that we cherish does not fall into disrepute with consequent damage to the very purpose that we wish to advance," Senator HUMPHREY told the U. N.

It was in that spirit, he declared, that he presented what he regarded as a practical and constructive suggestion, going beyond past United States position on the subject of world food reserves.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1127) to extend and enlarge the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## COMPULSORY POULTRY INSPECTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for compulsory poultry inspection legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on the bill in excess of the 3 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many of us in the Senate have for several years sought the enactment of compulsory poultry inspection legislation. We have asked congressional approval for a poultry program which would give Americans the same protection as meat inspection has provided during the last half century.

A nation as health- and public-relations conscious as ours needs a meaningful and truly consumer-protective sys-

tem of compulsory poultry inspection. It would assure the housewife that she is getting a clean and wholesome product when she puts her money on the counter.

Compulsory poultry inspection is vital for the protection of poultry consumers, poultry farmers, poultry processors, and poultry workers.

Three congressional hearings last year revealed some dangerous statistics. There are 26 diseases transmissible from poultry to humans.

Some of them are of only academic importance; some bring terrible illnesses and death. For example, three psittacosis epidemics, in Portland, Oreg.; Houston, Tex., and Virginia, hit 136 persons during 1956, killing 3 men. The United States Public Health Service blames poultry and poultry products for the unusually high average rate of one-third of the food poisoning cases reported each year.

I want to emphasize, Mr. President—and it cannot be emphasized too strongly—that most of the poultry processing industry is working hard to bring clean and wholesome poultry to the consumer. But there are many shady operators who are a thorn in the side of the industry—as they are a danger to consumers and poultry workers.

In an industry as highly competitive, and sometimes economically marginal, as the poultry industry, the shady operators put great pressure upon the reputable processors.

The lack of inspection also hurts the poultry farmer, who already suffers great economic distress. Although inspection will be carried out at the processing level, not at the farm, the poultry farmer will benefit from the consumer goodwill which inspection will bring. His market will expand, just as meat inspection helped to multiply the rancher's market many times over.

I am happy to see that there is now virtually unanimous acceptance of the need for and desirability of compulsory poultry inspection. I hope and believe that the Senate and the House of Representatives can enact a compulsory poultry inspection law in this session. When we do, we shall have made one of the greatest strides forward in health, consumer and agricultural legislation in many years.

But to enact legislation which will provide compulsory poultry inspection in name only, will help no one. We must be certain that the legislation actually protects the consumer, farmer, and worker and processor. It must be effective, meaningful, and practical. If it contains glaring loopholes, it harms all groups. Our consideration and time will have been spent for nothing. The clamor for consumer protection will have to, and will, continue.

Two compulsory poultry inspection bills have already been introduced in the Senate. One was sponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and one by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE].

I know that these two colleagues of mine on the Agriculture Committee seek a good poultry-inspection program and I honor them for their initiative. I regret that in studying their measures, I have found serious shortcomings. Unfortunately, S. 313 and S. 645 contain dangerous loopholes.

For example, they would be virtually impossible to enforce. They would not provide the much-needed ante-mortem inspection, which would, among other benefits, minimize psittacosis epidemics. They would permit a plan employee to inspect his employer's products. They would not require the placing of inspection in a consumer-protective agency within the Department of Agriculture. They could wipe out State and local jurisdiction in intrastate poultry commerce against the wishes of the States and municipalities involved.

Because of these and other shortcomings in S. 313 and S. 645, I today offer another compulsory poultry inspection bill. My measure is an amended version of a bill which the Department of Agriculture supported last year. I believe it would bring about an effective poultry-inspection system.

The bill I introduce is in many ways similar to S. 313 and S. 645. It uses the same legislative form, yet it does plug the dangerous loopholes which would make a mockery out of a compulsory inspection system.

This bill incorporates many of the principles demanded and supported during congressional hearings and in resolutions by more than a dozen consumer, public health, farm, women's labor, and professional groups. These organizations include General Federation of Women's Clubs, American Public Health Association, National Farmers' Union, American Nurses Association, Young Women's Christian Association—national board, Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, Conference of Public Health Veterinarians, AFL–CIO, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, American Veterinary Medical Association, Association of Food and Drug Officials of the United States, Association of State Public Health Veterinarians, United States Livestock Sanitary Association, American Association of University Women, Housewives United, and the National Consumers League.

Briefly, my bill provides mandatory ante-mortem inspection, to be carried out in such a manner as the Secretary of Agriculture determines necessary. It calls for a mandatory post-mortem inspection on the carcass of each bird. I want to emphasize that this is not double inspection, since the ante-mortem inspection may be fulfilled by the examination of a flock, coop or batch, if the Secretary so orders.

Plant sanitation and sanitary processing rules would be established by the Secretary of Agriculture. A processor who fails to meet the standards would not have his poultry inspected. Uninspected poultry would be banned from shipment or sale in interstate commerce and in designated areas.

Areas of intrastate commerce in which poultry is handled or consumed in so great volume as to affect interstate commerce could be designated and brought into the Federal program. But the designation could be achieved only with the consent of the governing body of the area or locality affected.

The inspection would be handled by Federal employees under the direction of the Agricultural Research Service of the United States Department of Agriculture. One of this Service's units has handled meat inspection for over 50 years. Cost of inspection—except for overtime—would be paid by the United States Government.

A farmer who slaughters his own poultry or a retailer who only cuts up poultry products would be specifically exempt from the provisions of the bill. The measure would establish sound labeling practices.

In short, Mr. President, I believe my bill would effectively protect consumers and poultry workers. It would benefit poultry processors and poultry farmers. It would establish an inspection system which is both effective and practical.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of my bill and the memorandum I have prepared comparing the bills previously introduced be printed at this point in the RECORD; and I also ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk until the close of the Senate day, Friday, February 15, so that additional Senators may cosponsor if they wish.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bill (S. 1128) to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the "Poultry Products Inspection Act."

LEGISLATIVE FINDING

SEC. 2. Wholesome poultry products are an important source of the Nation's total supply of food. Such products are consumed throughout the Nation and substantial quantities thereof move in interstate and foreign commerce. Unwholesome poultry products in the channels of interstate or foreign commerce are injurious to the public welfare, adversely affect the marketing of wholesome poultry products, result in sundry losses to producers, and destroy markets for wholesome poultry products. The marketing of wholesome poultry products is affected with the public interest and directly affects the welfare of the people. All poultry and poultry products which have or are required to have inspection under this act are either in the current of interstate or foreign commerce or directly affect such commerce. That part that enters directly into the current of interstate or foreign commerce cannot be effectively inspected and regulated without also inspecting and regulating all poultry and poultry products processed or handled in the same establishment.

The great volume of poultry products required as an article of food for the inhabitants of large centers of population directly affects the movement of poultry and poultry products in interstate commerce. To protect interstate commerce in poultry and poultry products inspected for wholesomeness, from being adversely burdened, obstructed, or affected by uninspected poultry or poultry products, the Secretary of Agriculture should hold public hearing to ascertain from time to time and to designate cities or areas where poultry or poultry products are handled or consumed in such volume as to affect the movement of inspected poultry or poultry products in interstate commerce.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 3. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to provide for the inspection of poultry and poultry products by the inspection service as herein provided to prevent the movement in interstate or foreign commerce or in a designated city or area of poultry products which are unwholesome, adulterated, or otherwise unfit for human food.

DESIGNATION

SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized to ascertain from time to time the cities or areas where poultry or poultry products are handled or consumed in such volume as to affect, burden, or obstruct the movement of inspected poultry products in commerce. Whenever, after public hearings he finds that the designation of such a city or area will tend to effectuate the purposes of this act, he shall by order designated such city or area: *Provided*, That the governing body of such a city or area has consented to such designation. Such designation shall not become effective until 6 months after the notice thereof is published in the Federal Register. On and after the effective date of such designation, all poultry and poultry products processed, sold, received, or delivered in any such designated city or area shall be subject to the provisions of this act.

INSPECTION

SEC. 5. (a) For the purpose of preventing the entry into or flow or movement in commerce or in a designated city or area of any poultry product which is unwholesome or adulterated, the Secretary shall, whenever processing operations are being conducted, cause to be made by inspectors ante-mortem inspection in such manner as he determines necessary; post-mortem inspection of the carcass of each bird processed, and such quarantine, segregation, and reinspection as he determines necessary of poultry and poultry products in each official establishment processing such poultry or poultry products for commerce or in, or for marketing in, a designated city or area. All poultry, carcasses, and parts thereof, and poultry products found to be unwholesome or adulterated shall be condemned and shall, if no appeal be taken from such determination of condemnation, be destroyed for human food purposes under the supervision of an inspector. If an appeal be taken from such determination, the product shall be appropriately marked and segregated pending completion of an appeal inspection, which appeal shall be at the cost of the appellant if the Secretary determines that the appeal is frivolous. If the determination of condemnation is sustained, the product shall be destroyed for human food purposes under the supervision of an inspector.

(b) The Secretary shall refuse to render inspection to any establishment whose premises, facilities, or equipment, or the operation thereof, fail to meet the requirements of section 6 of this act.

SANITATION, FACILITIES, AND PRACTICES

SEC. 6. Each official establishment slaughtering poultry or processing poultry products for commerce or in or for marketing in a designated city or area shall have such premises, facilities, and equipment, and be operated in accordance with such sanitary practices as are required and approved by the Secretary for the purpose of preventing the entry into or flow of movement in commerce or in a designated city or area, of poultry products which are unwholesome or adulterated.

LABELING

SEC. 7. (a) Each shipping container of any poultry product inspected under the authority of this act and found to be wholesome shall at the time such product leaves the official establishment bear, in distinctly legible form, the official inspection mark, the name of the product, an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count, and the name and address or an approved plant number of the official establishment in which the contents were processed. Each individual consumer package, if any, of any poultry product inspected under the authority of this act and found to be wholesome shall bear, in addition to the official inspection mark, in distinctly legible form, the name of the product, a statement of ingredients if fabricated from two or more ingredients, the net weight or other appropriate measure of the contents, and the name and address or approved plant number of the official establishment in which the contents were processed: *Provided*, That the name and address of the distributor may be used if the approved plant number is used to identify the official establishment in which the poultry product was prepared and packed.

(b) The use of any written, printed, or graphic matter upon or accompanying any poultry product inspected or required to be inspected pursuant to the provisions of this act or the container thereof which is false or misleading in any particular is prohibited. No poultry products inspected or required to be inspected pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be sold or offered for sale by any person, firm, or corporation under any false or deceptive name; but established trade name or names which are usual to such products and which are not false and deceptive and which shall be approved by the Secretary are permitted. If the Secretary has reason to believe that any label in use or prepared for use is false or misleading in any particular, he may direct that the use of the label be withheld unless it is modified in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe so that it will not be false or misleading. If the person using or proposing to use the label does not accept the determination of the Secretary, he may request a hearing, but the use of the label shall, if the Secretary so directs, be withheld pending hearing and final determination by the Secretary. Any such determination by the Secretary, shall be conclusive unless within 30 days after the receipt of notice of such final determination the person adversely affected thereby appeals to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which he has his principal place of business or to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. The provisions of section 204 of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended, shall be applicable to appeals taken under this section.

PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 8. The following acts or the causing thereof are hereby prohibited:

(a) The processing, sale, or offering for sale, transportation, or delivery or receiving for transportation, in commerce or in a designated city or area of any poultry products, unless such poultry product has been inspected for wholesomeness and unless the shipping container and the individual consumer package, if any, are marked in accordance with the provisions of this act.

(b) The sale or other disposition for human food of any poultry or poultry product which has been inspected and declared to be unwholesome or adulterated under this act.

(c) Falsely making or issuing, altering, forging, simulating, or counterfeiting any official inspection certificate, memorandum, mark, or other identification, or device for making such mark or identification, used in connection with the inspection of poultry or poultry products under this act, or causing, procuring, aiding, assisting in, or being a party to, such false making, issuing, altering, forging, simulating, or counterfeiting, or processing, without promptly notifying the Secretary of Agriculture or his representative, uttering, publishing, or using as true, or causing to be uttered, published, or used as true, any such falsely made or issued, altered, forged, simulated, or counterfeited official inspection certificate, memorandum, mark, or other identification, or device for making such mark or identification, or representing that any poultry or poultry product has been officially inspected under the authority of this act when such poultry or poultry product has in fact not been so inspected.

(d) Using in commerce, or in a designated city or area, a false or misleading label on any poultry product.

(e) The use of any container bearing an official inspection mark except for the poultry product in the original form in which it was inspected and covered by said mark unless the mark is removed, obliterated, or otherwise destroyed.

(f) The refusal to permit access by any duly authorized representative of the Secretary, at all reasonable times, to the premises of an establishment engaged in processing poultry or poultry products for commerce, or in or for marketing in a designated city or area, upon presentation of appropriate credentials.

(g) The refusal to permit access to and the copying of any record as authorized by section 10 of this act.

(h) The using by any person to his own advantage, or revealing, other than to the authorized representatives of the Government in their official capacity, or to the courts when relevant in any judicial proceeding under this act, any information acquired under the authority of this act, concerning any matter which as a trade secret is entitled to protection.

(i) Delivering, receiving, transporting, selling, or offering for sale or transport any poultry slaughtered for human food or any part thereof, separately or in combination with other ingredients, other than poultry products as defined in this act, in commerce or in a designated city or area, except that such poultry may be transported to foreign countries pursuant to rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

SEC. 9. No establishment processing poultry or poultry products for commerce or in or for marketing in a designated city or area shall process any poultry or poultry product except in compliance with the requirements of this act.

RECORDS OF INTERSTATE SHIPMENT

SEC. 10. For the purpose of enforcing the provisions of this act, persons engaged in the business of processing, transporting, shipping, or receiving poultry slaughtered for human consumption or poultry products in commerce or in a designated city or area, or holding such products so received shall maintain records for a period of 2 years following each transaction showing, to the extent that they are concerned therewith, the receipt, delivery, sale, movement, or disposition of poultry and poultry products and shall, upon the request of a duly authorized representative of the Secretary, permit him at reasonable times to have access to and to copy all such records.

INJUNCTION PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 11. The district courts of the United States are vested with jurisdiction specifically to enforce, and to prevent and restrain violations of this act. The remedies provided for in this section shall be in addition to, and not exclusive of, any of the remedies or penalties provided for elsewhere in this act or now or hereafter existing at law or in equity.

PENALTIES

SEC. 12. Any person who violates the provisions of sections 8, 9, 10, or 17, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall on conviction thereof be subject to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or a fine of not more than $5,000, or both such imprisonment and fine; but if such violation is committed after a conviction of such person under this section has become final such person shall be subject to imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or a fine of not more than $10,000, or both such imprisonment and fine. When construing or enforcing the provisions of said sections, the act, omission, or failure of any person acting for or employed by any individual, partnership, corporation, or association within the scope of his employment or office shall in every case be deemed the act, omission, or failure of such individual, partnership, corporation, or association, as well as of such person.

SEC. 13. Before any violation of this act is reported by the Secretary to any United States attorney for institution of a criminal proceeding, the person against whom such proceeding is contemplated shall be given reasonable notice of the alleged violation and opportunity to present his views orally or in writing with regard to such contemplated proceeding. Nothing in this act shall be construed as requiring the Secretary to report for criminal prosecution or for the institution of injunction proceedings violations of this act whenever he believes that the public interest will be adequately served and compliance with the act obtained by a suitable written notice or warning.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 14. The Secretary shall promulgate such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 15. (a) The Secretary is authorized, by regulation and under such conditions as to sanitary standards, practices, and procedures as he may prescribe, to exempt from specific provisions of this act—

(1) poultry producers with respect to poultry of their own raising on their own farms which they sell directly to household consumers only, provided that such poultry producers do not engage in buying or selling poultry products other than those produced from poultry raised on their own farms;

(2) retail dealers with respect to poultry products sold directly to consumers in individual retail stores provided that the only processing operation performed by such retail dealers is the cutting up of poultry products on the premises in which such sales to consumers are made.

(b) The Secretary may by order suspend or terminate any exemption under this section with respect to any person whenever he finds that such action will aid in effectuating the purposes of this act.

VIOLATIONS BY EXEMPTED PERSONS

SEC. 16. Any person who sells, delivers, transports, or offers for sale or transportation in commerce or in a designated city or area any poultry products which are exempt under section 15, and which are unwholesome and adulterated and are intended for human consumption, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall on conviction thereof be subject to the penalties set forth in section 12.

IMPORTS

SEC. 17. (a) No slaughtered poultry or parts or products thereof, of any kind shall be imported into the United States unless they are healthful, wholesome, and fit for human food and contain no dye, chemical, preservative, or ingredient which renders them unhealthy, unwholesome, or unfit for human food and unless they also comply with the rules and regulations made by the Secretary of Agriculture. All imported slaughtered poultry, or parts or products thereof, shall after entry into the United States in compliance with such rules and regulations be deemed and treated as domestic slaughtered poultry, or parts or products thereof, within the meaning and subject to the provisions of this act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and acts amendatory of, supplemental to, or in substitution for such acts.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this section and in such rules and regulations the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe the terms and conditions for the destruction of all slaughtered poultry, or parts or products thereof, offered for entry and refused admission into the United States unless such slaughtered poultry, or parts or products thereof, be exported by the consignee within the time fixed therefor in such rules and regulations.

(c) All charges for storage, cartage, and labor with respect to any product which is refused admission pursuant to this section shall be paid by the owner or consignee, and in default of such payment shall constitute a lien against any other products imported thereafter by or for such owner or consignee.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 18. (a) Poultry and poultry products shall be exempt from the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, to the extent of the application or the extension thereto of the provisions of this act.

(b) In carrying out the provisions of this act, the Secretary may cooperate with other branches of Government and with State agencies.

COST OF INSPECTION

SEC. 19. The cost of inspection rendered under the requirements of this act shall be borne by the United States except the cost of overtime. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized in his discretion to pay employees employed in establishments subject to the provisions of this act for all overtime work performed at such establishments at such rates as he may determine and to accept from such establishments wherein such overtime work is performed reimbursement for any sums paid out by him for such overtime work.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 20. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 21. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 22. For purposes of this act—

(a) The term "commerce" means commerce between any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State or the District of Columbia, but through any place outside thereof; or within the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(c) The term "person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or any other business unit.

(d) The term "poultry" means any live or slaughtered domesticated or commercially produced game bird.

(e) The term "poultry product" means any poultry which has been slaughtered for human food from which the blood, feathers, feet, head and viscera have been removed in accordance with rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary, any edible part of poultry, or, unless exempted by the Secretary, any human food product consisting of any edible part of poultry separately or in combination with other ingredients.

(f) The term "wholesome" means sound, healthful, wholesome and otherwise fit for human food.

(g) The term "unwholesome" means:

(1) Unsound, injurious to health or otherwise rendered unfit for human food.

(2) Consisting in whole or in part of any filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance.

(3) Processed, prepared, packed, or held under unsanitary conditions whereby a poultry carcass or parts thereof or any poultry product may have become contaminated with filth or whereby a poultry product may have been rendered injurious to health.

(4) Produced in whole or in part from diseased poultry or from poultry which has died otherwise than by slaughter.

(5) Packaged in a container composed of any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render the contents injurious to health.

(h) The term "adulterated" shall apply to poultry and poultry products under one or more of the following circumstances:

(1) If they bear or contain any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render them injurious to health; but, in case the substance is not an added substance, such poultry and poultry products shall not be considered adulterated under this clause if the quantity of such substance in such poultry and poultry products does not ordinarily render them injurious to health.

(2) If they bear or contain any added poisonous or added deleterious substance, unless such substance is permitted in their production or unavoidable under good manufacturing practices as may be determined by rules and regulations hereunder prescribed by the Secretary or other provisions of Federal law limiting or tolerating the quantity of such added substance on or in such poultry and poultry products: *Provided*, That any quantity of such added substance exceeding the limits so fixed shall also be deemed to constitute adulteration.

(3) If any substance has been substituted, wholly or in part, therefor.

(4) If damage or inferiority has been concealed in any manner.

(i) The term "inspector" means any employee of the Federal Government authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture to inspect poultry and poultry products under the authority of this act.

(j) The term "official inspection mark" means the symbol, formulated pursuant to rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary, stating that the product was inspected.

(k) The term "inspection service" means the official Government service within the Agricultural Research Service, Department of Agriculture, having the responsibility for the inspection for wholesomeness of poultry and poultry products, and for carrying out the provisions of this act.

(l) The terms "container" or "package" include any box, can, tin, cloth, plastic, or any other receptacle, wrapper, or cover.

(m) The term "official establishment" means any establishment as determined by the Secretary at which inspection of the slaughter of poultry, or the processing of poultry products, is maintained under the authority of this act.

(n) The term "label" means any written, printed, or graphic material upon the shipping container or upon the individual consumer package, if any, of the poultry product, or accompanying such product.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 23. This act shall take effect upon enactment: *Provided*, That no person shall be subject to the provisions of this act prior to July 1, 1958, unless such person applies for and receives inspection for poultry or poultry products in accordance with the provisions of this act and pursuant to regulations promulgated by the Secretary hereunder, in any establishment processing poultry or poultry products in commerce or in a designated city or area. Any person who voluntarily applies for and receives such inspection prior to July 1, 1958, shall be subject, on and after the date he commences to receive such inspection, to all of the provisions and penalties provided for in this act with respect to all poultry or poultry products handled in the establishment for which said application for inspection is made.

The memorandum presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

MEMORANDUM BY SENATOR HUMPHREY COMPARING POULTRY INSPECTION BILLS BEFORE THE SENATE

Three major mandatory poultry-inspection bills have been introduced in the United States Senate. These are S. 313, S. 645, and the Humphrey bill.

S. 313 and S. 645 are inadequate, however praiseworthy their purposes. The Humphrey bill is a measure which will truly protect the poultry consumer, poultry worker, poultry-processing industry, and poultry farmers. It helps all of these four groups and is no way harmful to any of them.

It is doubtful whether S. 645 actually provides mandatory poultry inspection. Both it and S. 313 contain loopholes which would rob a poultry-inspection program of effectiveness and integrity. Any comparison of them with the inspection programs carried out under the Meat Inspection Act finds them sadly lacking. In fact, some of their sections could be used in the future as precedents to weaken the Meat Inspection Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Under S. 313 and S. 645 the inspection could be carried out by plant employees in their employers' processing establishments. Antemortem inspection, which health authorities, including the Food and Drug Administration, have testified is essential for the protection of consumers and poultry workers is not required. Prosecutions for violations of the act would be extremely difficult—if not impossible—to secure.

The Humphrey bill is on a superficial level similar to these two bills. Many sections of the three bills are the same, word for word. But the Humphrey bill plugs the loopholes in the other two bills. It provides for an effective system of mandatory poultry inspection in practice as well as in name. It is an amended form of a bill supported by the Department of Agriculture last year.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE BILLS

Here are the major differences between S. 313 and S. 645, on the one hand, and the Humphrey bill, on the other:

1. Ante-mortem inspection: S. 313 and S. 645 do not require ante-mortem or before slaughter inspection. The Humphrey bill does require it. The manner of ante-mortem inspection is left by the Humphrey bill to the discretion of the Secretary. In other words, slaughter inspection is mandatory under the Humphrey bill, but it need not be bird-by-bird inspection; it can be an examination by flock, coop, batch, or in any way the Secretary of Agriculture will later prescribe.

Public health experts believe ante-mortem inspection is essential to protect consumer interests. Respiratory diseases which are difficult to detect after slaughter may be easily identified in the live bird.

Mandatory ante-mortem inspection is also a major protection for poultry workers against industrial hazards. Any diseased birds which are prevented from coming on the processing line obviously cannot infect the workers. The dread danger of psittacosis, which hit 136 persons, killing 3, in 3 epidemics during 1956 alone, could be minimized through the use of ante-mortem inspection.

2. Post-mortem inspection: S. 645 does not specify the type of post-mortem or after-slaughter inspection. The Humphrey bill and S. 313 agree in providing for carcass-by-carcass inspection.

A post-mortem inspection of the carcass of every bird is an absolute essential protection for consumers. Although the voluntary poultry-inspection program now carried on by the Department of Agriculture is lacking in many respects, it does require a post-mortem inspection which is carcass by carcass.

3. Prohibited acts: S. 313 and S. 645 Prohibited Acts and Penalties sections would make these measures extremely difficult—if not impossible—to enforce. These sections repeatedly state that a violator must knowingly commit illegal acts before he can be punished. This means that an extreme degree of intent of violation, as well as the violation itself, must be proved.

The Humphrey bill closes this loophole, which would allow violators to either ignore or flaunt the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. The Humphrey bill still prevents any unfair or unwise indictments. Like S. 313 and S. 645 it gives the Secretary of Agriculture the discretion not to report for criminal prosecution or for institution of injunction proceedings any minor violations when the Secretary believes the public interest will be so served, and compliance may be obtained by other means.

Congress previously wrote the word "knowingly" in other bills pertaining to agriculture and was forced to initiate new legislation because the laws were thereby made unenforceable. The word is not contained in either the Meat Inspection Act or in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. In fact, if it is incorporated in a poultry-inspection law, it would set a very dangerous precedent for possible weakening of these two laws.

4. Inspectors: S. 313 and S. 645 identify inspectors simply as "any person authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture to inspect poultry or poultry products under the authority of this act." This seriously endangers the integrity of the program since it would permit, for example, the use of a company's employees to inspect the firm's poultry.

The Humphrey bill would avoid such dangers by stating that all inspectors must be employees of the Federal Government. Thus, the inspector would be responsible to the Secretary of Agriculture. There would be no chance for conflicts of interest.

The Humphrey bill thereby provides an extremely essential safeguard for the integrity of the inspection program. Further, it assures that if the Federal Government's seal, which is to signal clean and wholesome poultry to the consumer, is to be put on the bird, a man responsible to the Federal Government and having no conflicting interests would do it.

5. Designated areas: All three bills, S. 313, S. 645, and the Humphrey bill contain a provision that the Secretary of Agriculture may, after hearings, designate certain cities and areas of intrastate commerce which have such a large volume of poultry business as to affect interstate commerce. After designation, these cities and areas are brought under the scope of the act. This extends the protection of the poultry inspection law to many more consumers, poultry workers, poultry farmers, and poultry processors.

However, care must be taken that the jurisdiction of State and local governing bodies will be protected. Inspection programs by States and local governments for intrastate commerce within their areas should be encouraged and not wiped out. The Humphrey bill therefore provides that the governing bodies of the city or area affected must consent to the designation before the Secretary can authorize it.

6. Inspecting agency: S. 313 and S. 645 do not specify which agency in the Department of Agriculture would be responsible for the inspection work. Under such circumstances, it is most likely that the work will be performed by the Agricultural Marketing Service. Under the Humphrey bill, the Agricultural Research Service would specifically be delegated with the poultry inspection work.

The Meat Inspection Branch of the Agricultural Research Service has done an excellent job in protecting the public against undesirable meat during the past 50 years. It has done the type of work on red meat which is now sought for poultry. The Agricultural Marketing Service, although having done admirable work in promoting the sale of agricultural products, has often done an unsatisfactory job in protecting consumers with its voluntary poultry inspection program.

The Meat Inspection Branch has only one function: making certain that meats are wholesome and clean. The Agricultural Marketing Service's main task is to promote the sale of farm products—a duty which conflicts with consumer protection.

7. Shipment of uneviscerated poultry: Some of the practices used in holding dressed, but uneviscerated poultry carcasses, for later evisceration are among the most unsanitary and most objectionable practices existing in the poultry industry today. S. 313 and S. 645 would allow these practices to continue. The Humphrey bill, however, would prohibit the shipment of uneviscerated carcasses in domestic commerce.

8. Insanitary processing: In the definition of "unwholesome" S. 313 and S. 645 can be interpreted to excuse any filthy conditions during the processing through the point of evisceration. The Humphrey bill plugs this loophole or possible oversight.

9. Records of interstate shipments: S. 313 and S. 645 are indefinite concerning the length of time processors, wholesalers, retailers, and shippers must keep records. S. 313 would put the unnecessary hardship upon them of permanent retention. S. 645 says that they must maintain records for a period of 2 years, but does not state when the 2-year period begins. The Humphrey bill very specifically provides that they must maintain the record of each transaction only for 2 years after the transaction has taken place.

10. Labeling: Both S. 313 and S. 645 would allow the Secretary to grant any exemption from the labeling requirements. The Humphrey bill contains no such loophole. The public depends upon factual and informative labeling of food products. Exemptions from basic labeling requirements would confuse the housewife and would make the task of State and local regulatory officials very difficult.

11. Parts of diseased birds: S. 313 would permit, because of its definition of "unwholesome," the sale of parts of diseased birds. The horrible practice, used by some processors, of cutting off the unmarked wings and legs of tubercular birds would be allowed to continue. The Humphrey bill and S. 645 provide that poultry which is "produced in whole or in part from diseased poultry or poultry which has died otherwise than by slaughter" is unwholesome and therefore, to be condemned.

With the exception of the above points, which are vital to the effectiveness and integrity of an inspection program, the three bills contain only minor differences.

In short, the Humphrey bill contains all of the constructive provisions of S. 313 and S. 645. In addition, it closes the loopholes which would prove detrimental to all whose best interests depend upon an effective poultry-inspection program, that is, poultry consumers, poultry workers, poultry processors, and poultry farmers.

## AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, RELATING TO DISABILITY BENEFITS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last year the Congress adopted a series of changes in the Social Security Act, among them a provision for payment of benefits to persons who become totally and permanently disabled, upon reaching the age of 50. That was a bare beginning; now we should move forward to do an adequate job.

Provision for disability in the Social Security law by the 84th Congress was the most notable and desirable extension since the basic law was instituted 20 years ago. It recognized the desperate plight of working people and of their families when the provider is stricken with an illness or suffers an injury which robs him of his earning power. Until last year, many families in such circumstances were compelled to apply for public assistance and became wards of their communities.

We have removed this injustice for persons with social security coverage who are 50 years old or over. I am pleased that we have made that much progress. However, I am disturbed by the remaining thousands of individuals under 50 who are not able to work for a living because of disability. I am disturbed by the many hundreds of thousands of disabled men and women, not to mention their dependents, who continue to rely upon meager public relief for their subsistence.

If a man or woman who has worked enough to gain social security coverage becomes disabled at the age of 28, or 30, or 35, or 45 the children of such a person are so much the more dependent upon public welfare. The younger the age at which the disability is incurred, the longer the dependents must live on charitable donations or public aid, without the assurance of a steady income.

I think every Member of Congress knows many such families; we know of the despair and grief that parents face when a father becomes disabled; of the difficulty that an untrained or unskilled mother will have in trying to earn an income for the family; of the dependence of such families upon the charity and good will of relatives and neighbors to provide them with the essentials of living.

Testimony to the Senate Finance Committee last year in support of the disability section of H. R. 7225 shows that the State public welfare agencies are particularly emphatic in urging disability payments. Many of them noted that the families of disabled workers make up the greatest single share of public-assistance recipients, and that the financial burden on these families involves more than living costs alone, since medical care is usually necessary.

In some countries, social insurance began with disability and was expanded later to include old-age insurance. In the United States, insurance against loss of earning power through permanent disability at any age remains the greatest shortcoming in our social-security program. It was estimated in the Senate hearings that about 2.2 million persons are prevented from seeking work because of a disability that has lasted 6 months or more. Yet the amendment of last year extends benefits to not more than about 250,000. So the job of Congress has only begun, insofar as the disabled are concerned. We have provided this form of insurance for the employees of the Federal Government, and for railroad workers covered under the Railroad Retirement Act; but we have not provided it for the great bulk of wage earners who are employed in private industry and are covered by social security.

The bill I am introducing for myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], would repeal the age requirement and make social-security benefits available to the disabled without regard to age. In all other respects the requirements of length of coverage and the like are not changed.

The evidence is that this change in the law would be of comparatively slight cost. Failure to provide this minimum insurance against complete disability already costs the Nation far too much in public assistance and the many charges that inadequate income lead to.

Let us give working people what they earn by their social-security payments—security against disabling illness and injury.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1137) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement that an individual attain 50 years of age in order to be eligible for disability benefits, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. LONG), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## DESIGNATION OF DECEMBER 7 OF EACH YEAR AS PREPAREDNESS DAY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, we all remember only too well December 7, 1941, as "the day that will live long in infamy." That day was indeed a dark one in the epochal history of the United States. It was a day that impressed upon all freedom-loving Americans the importance of the strongest possible national defense to the preservation of our democracy. I think it fitting and proper that this day be set aside and declared to be National Preparedness Day to serve as a constant reminder that we must be forever vigilant in keeping our defenses strong if we are to preserve for ourselves and posterity our American way of life, and maintain leadership for world peace.

In behalf of my able and distinguished colleague [Mr. HOLLAND] and myself, I now introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution which would designate December 7 of each year as Preparedness Day and which would authorize the President to issue an annual proclamation calling on the officials of the Government to display the American flag on all Government buildings, and invite the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies in schools, churches, and other suitable places.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD, together with an editorial which appeared in the Miami Daily News under date of January 30 entitled "Let Congress Act Now To Set December 7 as Preparedness Day." I trust that the committee to which this joint resolution is referred will act promptly and favorably on it, and that it will be adopted by the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) designating the 7th day of December in each year as Preparedness Day, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 52

Joint resolution designating the 7th day of December in each year as Preparedness Day

*Resolved, etc.*, that the 7th day of December in each year is hereby designated as "Preparedness Day." The memory of a day that will long live in infamy, December 7, 1941, should be a constant reminder of America's need for preparedness. Today America should look to the future to assure our country's preparedness for our own protection and to maintain our leadership for world peace; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a state of preparedness is not merely material but is one of moral strength and will. It is determined, wise, and resolute. It must start in the minds and hearts of the people. The President is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on such day and inviting the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies in schools, churches, and other suitable places.

The editorial presented by Mr. SMATHERS is as follows:

[From the Miami Daily News of January 30, 1957]

LET CONGRESS ACT NOW TO SET DECEMBER 7 AS PREPAREDNESS DAY

The Miami News suggested last December 2 that December 7 be set by act of Congress as Preparedness Day. Yesterday Representative PAUL ROGERS, Democrat, of Florida, introduced a resolution into the House of Representatives proposing a national Preparedness Day in accordance with the suggestion.

The entire Florida House delegation is prepared to support this proposal. Across the Capitol in the Senate both Florida Senators' offices have expressed interest and one or both Senators may introduce a companion bill.

The significance of Pearl Harbor Day is in danger of being lost in barebone versions of "the day that will live long in infamy."

The bombing of an American naval base in 1941 could well be remembered as a symbol of all that was lacking in our national defense on that day 15 years ago—and beyond that, all that is lacking every year on that day. It could be an annual Preparedness Day.

Last December 2, this newspaper concluded to bring the matter to the attention of the 85th Congress, and pointed out:

"December 7 is a good day for Preparedness Day. It will come always after the heat of political elections and every 4 years after the election of a President and the promise of peace for 4 more years. The 85th Congress would do well to consider Preparedness Day because preparedness starts in the minds and hearts of the people."

This newspaper has received favorable comments from all eight Florida Congressmen and both Florida Senators. Most of them were enthusiastic.

Senator GEORGE SMATHERS inserted the above editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as has Representative ROGERS.

This newspaper believes strongly in the idea of Preparedness Day on the day that the first treacherous air attack on America occurred.

In retrospect, no nation was ever absolutely secure from attack from a foreign power. America, so long isolated from the warring continents by the oceans, is doing much better by contrast to prepare itself for world war III—in the hope and assurance that that is the best way to avoid it. But many Americans are disturbed because of conflicting reports, disagreements among the experts, and partisan clamor for less, rather than more spending.

What does America need to be prepared? There is no one answer. But the question is a challenge to all Americans to be about the seeking of the answer.

Preparedness Day is a good day for dedication to that purpose.

---

## APPOINTMENT OF DOCTORS OF CHIROPRACTIC IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 968) to authorize the appointment of doctors of chiropractic in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed.

---

## CIVILIAN ATOMIC POWER ACCELERATION PROGRAM—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JACKSON] may be added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 151) providing for a civilian atomic power acceleration program, introduced by me on January 7, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937, AS AMENDED—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 945) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, introduced by me on January 29, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

## FILING OF NON-COMMUNIST AFFIDAVITS BY CERTAIN PRIVATE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 4, 1957,

The names of Mr. MUNDT, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MCCARTHY and Mr. ERVIN were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1061) to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 and part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to require certain private educational institutions and training establishments to file non-Communist affidavits with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and to require disapproval under such act, or such part, of any such institution or establishment which fails to file such affidavit, introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself and Mr. ALLOTT) on February 4, 1957.

---

## RECOGNITION OF THE ALTAR OF THE NATION AS A NATIONAL SHRINE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 30, 1957,

The names of Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. BUSH, Mr. GREEN, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. BEALL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BARRETT, and Mr. THURMOND were added as additional cosponsors of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9) favoring the recognition of the Altar of the Nation as a national shrine, submitted by Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. COTTON) on January 30, 1957.

---

## SELF-DETERMINATION FOR PEOPLE OF CYPRUS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] may be added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 81, favoring the application of the principle of self-determination to the people of Cyprus, submitted by me on January 30, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 932) to establish an Office of Federal Administrative Practice; to provide for the appointment and administration of a corps of hearing commissioners; to provide for admission to and control of practice; to establish a Legal Career Service for improvement of legal services in Government; and for other purposes, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. This bill, known as the Federal Administration Practices Act of 1957, was originally referred to the Committee on Government Operations. I have consulted with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and he is agreeable to having the bill referred to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Committee on Government Operations has no objection to the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

---

## PRINTING OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "PROPOSALS FOR IMPROVING THE PATENT SYSTEM" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT (S. DOC. NO. 21)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Patents of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent that a document entitled "Proposals for Improving the Patent System," written by Dr. Vannevar Bush, may be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

## PRINTING OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "THE PATENT SYSTEM AND THE MODERN ECONOMY" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT (S. DOC. NO. 22)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Patents of the Committee on the Judiciary, that a document entitled "The Patent System and the Modern Economy," prepared by Mr. George E. Frost, a patent lawyer of Chicago, Ill., may be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

## PRINTING OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "DISTRIBUTION OF PATENTS ISSUED TO CORPORATIONS (1939–1955)" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT (S. DOC. NO. 23)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Patents of the Committee on the Judiciary, that a document entitled "Distribution of Patents Issued to Corporations (1939–1955)," prepared by the Patent Office, may be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## PRINTING OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "OPPOSITION AND REVOCATION PROCEEDINGS IN PATENT CASES" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT (S. DOC. NO. 24)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Patents of the Committee on the Judiciary, that a document entitled "Opposition and Revocation Proceedings in Patent Cases," prepared by Mr. P. J. Federico, Examiner in Chief of the Patent Office, may be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I may say that all these documents are available for purchase from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office. It is my understanding that all of them sell for 15 cents a copy. There has been a tremendous demand for them throughout the country, especially by the various industries affected by the patents.

I felt it desirable that through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD all persons who may desire copies of the documents should know that they are obtainable directly from the Superintendent of Documents at 15 cents a copy. On orders of 100 or more copies, delivered to the same address, a discount of 25 percent is given.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. THURMOND:

Address delivered by Senator ROBERTSON before Senate breakfast group on February 6, 1957.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

Statement made by him on December 27, 1956, relative to the shortage in college facilities.

By Mr. WILEY:

Article entitled "World Teamwork," written by Senator MUNDT, and published in the February 1957 issue of the magazine Childhood Education.

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF RANDOLPH H. WEBER TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, February 18, 1957, at 2:30 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Randolph H. Weber, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri, vice Rubey M. Hulen, deceased.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], Chairman, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

## NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Leon H. A. Pierson, of Maryland, to be United States Attorney for the District of Maryland for a term of 4 years;

Antonio C. Baza, of Guam, to be United States Marshal for the District of Guam for a term of 4 years; and

Thomas James Donegan, of New York, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the remainder of the term expiring April 9, 1957.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, February 15, 1957, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM JOSEPH BRENNAN, JR., TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 19, 1957, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of William Joseph Brennan, Jr., of New Jersey, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent.

## NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATION OF C. FREDERICK REINHARDT TO BE COUNSELOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today the nomination of C. Frederick Reinhardt, of California, to be counselor of the Department of State, vice Douglas MacArthur 2d.

Notice is given that the nomination will be eligible for consideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiraiton of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

## NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 420, THE OMNIBUS JUDGESHIP BILL, AND OTHER RELATED BILLS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of the Standing Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled to commence on Wednesday, February 20, 1957, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424 Senate Office Building, on S. 420, to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, and other related bills. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]; the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]; the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]; the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, chairman.

## THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain other letters and communications dealing with the same subject be printed at this point in the RECORD and then referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

There being no objection, the matters were referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

COMPANY A,
1022D ENGINEER BATTALION (COMBAT),
*Afton, Wyo., February 1, 1957.*

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. O'MAHONEY: Strongly oppose the mandatory 6 months' active duty for training requirement for all enlistees without prior service, who join the National Guard after April 1, 1957.

As a counter-proposal highly recommend adoption of proposal No. 3 as set forth by the Adjutants General Association and other General Officers of the Army National Guard. In that all men ages 17 to 18½ years who are enlisted on or after April 1, 1957 be required to take 11 weeks of active duty for training as a mandatory condition to their enlistment. These men may volunteeer for 6 months' active duty training.

Sincerely yours,

BOYD W. BARRUS,
*Captain, Corps of Engineers,*
*Wyoming National Guard,*
*Commanding.*

POWELL, WYO., *February 1, 1957.*

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*United States Senator for Wyoming,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I have been following the recent arguments on the National Guard controversy in newspapers and the radio. I feel that the proposed Department of the Army program of 6 months active duty training for National Guard personnel without prior service would be detrimental to the guard program.

In addition to other arguments which have been presented I feel that this program would interrupt the educational programs of many of the present guardsmen not to mention future enlistees. I feel that these active duty periods could be better accomplished during the summer vacations. This would also create job vacancies for other workers because of guard personnel attending active duty training camps.

The members of my National Guard company and myself would appreciate your support of the National Guard program in Congress.

Sincerely yours,

DWAIN H. EHRLICH,
*Company Commander,*
*Co. B, 1022d Engr. Bn. (C),*
*Powell, Wyo.*

BATTERY "B,"
300TH ARMORED FIELD
ARTILLERY BATTALION,
WYOMING NATIONAL GUARD,
*Cody, Wyo., January 29, 1957.*

Hon. JOSEPH O'MAHONEY,
*United States Senator,*
*State of Wyoming,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I think the recent action taken by the Department of the Army will do a great deal to tear down the best Reserve program the United States has—the National Guard. I have been a part of this program for a number of years and have seen the success it has had compared to the near failure of all others. The unit I belong to went to Korea and made a good record for itself as did many other National Guard units.

The many things said by Secretary Wilson are very unfair and are not based on fact. There may be isolated cases where he gets his information but on the whole anyone who would use a little reason could not say the things he has. Many National Guard units were called so how could a man join one of them to dodge the draft. He would not have any way of knowing that it wouldn't be taken in.

If the present program passes it will deeply cut into our enlistments as a good portion of them come from high school or college students. None of them would want to join as it would interfere with their schooling.

I recommend if the powers that be are going to insist extra training be given National Guardsmen that the 11-week program be put into effect so they can work it in between school years.

The whole Reserve program is not as effective as it should be now, without someone throwing another monkey wrench in the very heart of it for some selfish or political reason.

DAVID G. NELSON III,
*Captain, Artillery,*
*Battery B, 300th AFA Bn.,*
*Commanding.*

---

CODY, WYO., *January 31, 1957.*

The Honorable JOSEPH O'MAHONEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

SIR: This is to express my thoughts and reaction to the charges made against the National Guard. We all know they need service training to be prepared in the armed services.

I am in favor of the 11 weeks' training program in the summer for the high school boys in the National Guard. This would give them a basic knowledge and training in military service. Then their training could be continued while they get an education. In turn their education would make their training more valuable when they are needed in combat service.

Sincerely yours,

SCOTT HALL.

---

CHEYENNE, WYO., *February 3, 1957.*

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*United States Senator,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

To preserve the greatest military establishment in the history of United States; request you support the 11 weeks' training program for National Guard, and oppose 6 months as recommended by Defense Department. Six months' training hampers National Guard's objective to properly train men, and at the same time secure proper education.

Capt. DONALD R. COON,
*Headquarters Battery,*
*115th Field Artillery Group.*

C BATTERY 351 AFA BATTALION,
*Evanston, Wyo., January 30, 1957.*

To: Hon. JOSEPH O'MAHONEY.

Subject: Active duty training for National Guard.

I am taking this opportunity to write you in regards to the hearing on February 4. It appears to me that if this bill to require National Guards to take 6 months' active duty training, it will mean certain death to the National Guard. I am asking as a ground level battery commander, that if any way possible we might have this training period reduced. I understand this could be cut to 11 weeks. I would appreciate it if you could help us out in this matter.

RAYMOND A. TANNER,
*Second Lieutenant, Artillery, C Battery, 315 AFA Battalion, Evanston, Wyo.*

---

LUSK, WYO., *January 31, 1957.*

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: Current pending legislative hearings concerning the military defense of the United States and affecting the National Guard component prompts the undersigned to direct this communication. I seek consideration of my views as a citizen, as a World War II veteran; and because of my personal interest manifested by over 26 years as an active National Guard man of which 5 years were Federal service during World War II with 2½ years overseas duty.

As a company-size National Guard unit commander continuously prior to and since World War II I feel that I am somewhat qualified to speak. I have observed, particularly since World War II, the lack of unity and cooperation between the various components of the Military Establishment; and the National Guard coming under unjustifiable and unfair criticism. As a result the National Guard is confronted with a multitude of problems, one being that of maintaining manpower with our recruiting field limited basically to only 17 to 18½ year old youths with the situation of parental consent necessary to enlist a 17-year-old.

Apparently, fault is being found with the National Guard in order to advance universal military training which is only a nicer way of saying universal military conscription. Except during times of national emergency or imminent danger, every effort should be made to maintain national defense on a voluntary basis. As the people of the greatest nation on earth our daily prayer and effort must be to bring about peace; to live and let live. Permit me to present several reasons why we must exercise great care in this matter:

1. If the advocates of universal military conscription acquire 6-months compulsory training for every American youth, how soon will the demand be for 1 year, year and a half, 2 or 3 years of such training?

2. Is the answer to all our military defense problems conscription? This Nation under God has lived through wars and hardships, and our military forces have won every war. Our men have always responded to the call to arms. The spirit to defend and the will to fight are first requisites for a soldier.

3. Conscription with the involvement of maintaining training centers presents a huge financial burden for each American taxpayer.

4. Calling all our young men to military posts involves the problem (especially for the homesick and weak lad) of their falling into habits not moral, drunkenness, and the like; which the authorities find difficult to control.

5. The fact that the 6-months training program has not succeeded according to expectations should be sufficient evidence that parents and young men are skeptical as to its merits, and it does not have the support of our citizenry.

6. A 6-months training program interferes and places too much interruption for the young man who expects to continue education above high school.

Let us place the National Guard and support it as the line of defense originally intended next below the Regular Army. Give the National Guard adequate armories, rifle ranges, garages, and other necessary facilities to conduct training. Authorize and carry on training (in addition to the regular 48 armory drills and 15 days field training) as demanded for national defense from time to time as the need or emergencies occur. Present world conditions would indicate a need for the Army National Guard basic training program as unanimously was recommended by the Adjutants General and other general officers of the Army National Guard in Washington, D. C. on January 23, 1957; namely:

1. That all men age 18½ to 25 years now in (as members before April 1, 1957) be permitted to take 6 months' active duty for training on a voluntary basis, provided they have not already had active duty for training.

2. All men age 18½ to 25 years who are enlisted on or after April 1, 1957, be required to take 6 months' active duty for training as a mandatory condition to their enlistment.

3. All men age 17 to 18½ years who are enlisted on or after April 1, 1957, be required to take 11 weeks of active duty for training as a mandatory condition to their enlistment. These men may volunteer for 6 months' active duty training.

4. All men age 17 to 18½ years now in (as members before April 1, 1957) be permitted to choose either 11 weeks' active duty training or 6 months' active duty training, on a voluntary basis.

5. That there would be no ratio imposed upon the component to the number of men to participate in either the 11-week program or the 6-month program.

Respectfully,

JOHNNIE A. THON.

---

RIVERTON, WYO., *January 30, 1957.*

Senator O'MAHONEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: In regard to the slanderous statement about the National Guard, made by Defense Secretary Wilson, I believe he should have looked into the records of the guard and then made a public statement. I'm sure it would have been a reversal of the draft-dodging theme.

To show this more fully, the National Guard at this very time is fighting a series of floods in Kentucky. During hurricanes the guard is right there to help.

On the national scene Wyoming had three-fifths of its total military strength in the Korean police action. And in World War II, where would America have been if the National Guard had not been ready with what training they had received while they were on their voluntary training program.

I joined the National Guard after 2 years of Regular Army because it does not interfere with my civilian job, and also keeps me fit for future service to my country.

Sincerely yours,

FLOYD LOGHRY.

---

DOUGLAS, WYO., *February 2, 1957.*

Senator O'MAHONEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. O'MAHONEY: We feel Secretary of Defense Mr. Wilson's remark about the National Guard was not at all necessary and

wish you would do all in your power to make things right.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sfc. CLARENCE C. DUGAN
and Mrs. CLARENCE C. DUGAN.

---

KINNEAR, WYO., *January 30, 1957.*

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: In reference to Defense Secretary Wilson's statement and politics concerning the National Guard. The past record of the National Guard should have been examined before making any statements that insults and slanders a large percentage of the people, direct or indirect.

If appointed members of the public office can overrule laws, affecting the majority of people, passed by elected Members, then it's time for a change in politics somewhere along the line.

I request that you do all in your power as an elected Member of the people of Wyoming to correct the politics, and a public withdrawal of Defense Secretary Wilson's statement.

I do not feel that joining the National Guard would be trying to dodge the draft board as we, the National Guard, were the first ones to be in Korea when war broke out.

Most respectfully,

WAYNE JOSEPH YOURICK.

---

RIVERTON, WYO., *January 30, 1957.*

DEAR SIR: I am an ex-serviceman and have fulfilled my military obligation by serving in the Korean war.

However, I am now a member of the Wyoming National Guard and I feel that Mr. Wilson's comment of early this week is an insult to me, to all other veterans who are in the position and to more than 1 million National Guard men.

I feel that a fellow who joints the National Guard for a period of 8 years is doing every bit as much as one who goes on actual duty for 6 months or equal to one who puts in 24 months.

If we have a so-called draft-dodging group it is in college—I am a college graduate.

A person who is deferred for a semester to finish school, then is married and expecting a family at the end of this deferment, so he is reclassified.

I feel the National Guard has an apology coming from Mr. Wilson or I feel you should use your power to strive for his resignation.

Thank you.

J. E. SALLARS.

---

351ST ARMORED FIELD
ARTILLERY BATTALION,
WYOMING NATIONAL GUARD,
*Laramie, Wyo., January 30, 1957.*

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: As a battery commander in the Wyoming National Guard, and very much concerned with the recruiting problems of the National Guard, I strongly urge your support of the 11-week basic training course in lieu of the 6-month program for National Guard men.

As the main strength of the National Guard consists of prior servicemen and young men of school age, my opinion is that through the 11-week program you will receive a basically trained man and still not interrupt his plans for schooling or entering the business world.

I further wish to state that I and a large percentage of my "Draft Dodgers" served during the so-called Korean police action with the 141st Tank Battalion, Wyoming National Guard.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT K. RASMUSSEN,
*First Lieutenant, Artillery, Commanding.*

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask unanimous consent that a citation received by the Wyoming National Guard for its services at the front during the war in Korea be made a part of the RECORD and then referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
*Washington, D. C., June 30, 1953.*

(General Orders No. 55.)

Meritorious Unit Commendation: By direction of the Secretary of the Army, under AR 220–315, the Meritorious Unit Commendation is awarded to the following units of the United States Army for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service during the periods indicated. The citations read as follows:

* * * * *

7. The 300th Armored Field Artillery Battalion is cited for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services in support of combat operations in Korea during the period April 1, 1952, to April 27, 1953. Operating first in support of Task Force Paik, a Republic of Korea Army tactical maneuver designed to free large areas in Southern Korea from the grip of powerful guerrilla forces, this battalion participated in a series of vigorous, decisive actions which completely neutralized the collective fighting effectiveness of these groups. The artillery support of the 300th Armored Field Artillery Battalion was of vital importance to the success of the operation. Subsequently, the members of this battalion exhibited determination of purpose and singular technical skill in supporting the II Republic of Korea Army Corps in bitter engagements against the foe. Despite the seemingly impossible problems resulting from language and custom differences, the battalion carried out its mission with a degree of proficiency which instilled great confidence in every unit of the Republic of Korea Army with which it worked. Not only did this battalion provide direct artillery support, but its personnel gave intensive technical training to their Korean counterparts who were striving to organize their artillery battalions. Highly practical training methods were employed, numerous effective visual teaching aids were utilized, and the monumental task of translating field manuals and training directives from English to Korean was completed quickly and thoroughly. The allied fields of vehicle operation and maintenance, photo interpretation, observation methods, and signal communication were not neglected. Specialists in these subjects successfully imparted their knowledge while, at the same time, fully impressing upon their students the distinct value of the techniques they advocated. The superior support rendered by the battalion's members enabled the Republic of Korea Army to organize its organic artillery units with maximum effectiveness, while the battalion provided direct supporting fire. The 300th Armored Field Artillery Battalion displayed such outstanding devotion to duty in the performance of exceptionally difficult tasks as to set it apart from and above other units having similar missions. The technical skill, esprit de corps, and high standards of excellence exhibited by the personnel of this battalion reflect great credit on themselves and the military service of the United States.

* * * * *

By order of the Secretary of the Army:

J. LAWTON COLLINS,
*Chief of Staff, United States Army.*

Official:

WM. E. BERGIN,
*Major General, USA,*
*The Adjutant General.*

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
*Washington 25, D. C., March 26, 1953.*

(General Orders No. 31.)

Republic of Korea Presidential Unit Citation: The Republic of Korea Presidential Unit Citation which was awarded by the Republic of Korea to the following units of the United States Army is confirmed in accordance with AR 220–315:

Headquarters and Headquarters Battery, 5th Field Artillery Group, and attached units as follows: 176th Armored Field Artillery Battalion; 300th Armored Field Artillery Battalion; 987th Armored Field Artillery Battalion.

Republic of Korea Presidential Unit Citation awarded by citation dated October 31, 1952, by Syngman Rhee, President of the Republic of Korea, for outstanding and superior performance of duty during the period from February 7, 1952, to September 15, 1952, inclusive, with citation as follows:

Headquarters and Headquarters Battery, 5th Field Artillery Group, has rendered superlative artillery support for Republic of Korea units exclusively. While providing artillery support for II Republic of Korea Corps in active combat against an aggressor Communist enemy, the 5th Field Artillery Group and attached United States units have contributed materially to the successful development and expansion of the Republic of Korea Army. Overcoming barriers of language and customs with tact and diplomacy, they imparted sound, comprehensive knowledge of artillery techniques to all Republic of Korea units which were initially attached and to all field artillery groups and light artillery battalions subsequently activated. Continually evidencing exceptional ingenuity and resourcefulness, and overcoming myriad difficulties which confronted an undertaking of unprecedented magnitude, 5th Field Artillery Group planned and established an extensive program of training for Republic of Korea artillery units. In order to accomplish the monumental task, numerous schools were established to facilitate and expedite training and a wealth of artillery reference material were published, employing interlinear translation into the Korean language. This invaluable technical-training material was later published in volume for distribution to all Republic of Korea artillery units and to the Artillery School. This alone was a herculean undertaking. The proficiency and highly developed skill demonstrated by Republic of Korea artillery units in active combat operations is a tribute to the mastery of the training techniques employed by the 5th Field Artillery Group. The personnel of the 5th Field Artillery Group and attached United States units have repeatedly demonstrated their devotion to the principle of democracy and freedom by standing side by side with our own gallant soldiers during combat operations. It is with extreme gratitude that the people of Korea will remember the valiant and meritorious service rendered by the 5th Field Artillery Group. Their exemplary performance and devotion to duty has been an outstanding example reflecting great credit upon the personnel of these units, and is in the highest tradition of the military service.

By order of the Secretary of the Army:

J. LAWTON COLLINS,
*Chief of Staff, United States Army.*

Official:

WM. E. BERGIN,
*Major General, USA,*
*The Adjutant General.*

---

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
*Washington, D. C., January 7, 1954.*

(General Order No. 1.)

I. Distinguished Unit Citation: As authorized by Executive Order 9396 (sec. I, WD Bul. 22, 1943), superseding Executive Order 9075

(sec. III, WD Bul. 11, 1942), citation of the following units in the general orders indicated is confirmed in accordance with AR 220–315 in the name of the President of the United States as public evidence of deserved honor and distinction. The citations read as follows:

"* * * * *

"8. The 300th Armored Field Artillery Battalion (second award), (Battery B, first award), distinguished itself by extraordinary heroism in the performance of exceptionally difficult tasks in the vicinity of Kumsong, Korea. On July 10, 1953, the battalion was providing artillery support to the 6th Republic of Korea Division and other units when the area was subjected to a series of attacks by enemy troops of overwhelming numbers. Although hampered by the mountainous terrain, poor supply routes, and a lack of communications, the members of the unit remained with their guns. They inflicted heavy casualties on the enemy which enabled the United Nations infantry to hold the critical position. When the enemy finally succeeded in penetrating the main line of resistance and the Republic of Korea units were forced to evacuate, the battalion remained in position and enabled the supported organizations to withdraw with a minimum of casualties. Disregarding the intense mortar and artillery barrage and the increasing small arms fire, the battalion continued to direct effective fire on the enemy until July 15, when the infantry units had established blocking position and all field artillery battalions had displaced to new areas of operation. The magnificent fighting spirit exhibited by the members of the 300th Armored Field Artillery Battalion reflects great credit on themselves and the military service. (General Orders 1018, Headquarters Eighth United States Army, November 17, 1953.)"

* * * * *

By order of the Secretary of the Army:

M. B. RIDGWAY,
*General, United States Army,*
*Chief of Staff.*

Official:

WM. E. BERGIN,
*Major General, United States Army,*
*The Adjutant General.*

---

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
*Washington 25, D. C., August 9, 1956.*
(General Orders No. 72.)

I. Distinguished Unit Citation: As authorized by Executive Order 9396 (sec. I, WD Bul. 22, 1943), superseding Executive Order 9075 (sec. III, WD Bull. 11, 1942), the following units are cited under AR 260–15 in the name of the President of the United States as public evidence of deserved honor and distinction. The citations read as follows:

* * * * *

"2. The 2d Infantry Division and the following attached units: * * * 300th Armored Field Artillery Battalion (less Battery B); * * * are cited for extraordinary heroism and outstanding performance of duty in action against the armed enemy in the vicinity of Hongchon, Korea, during the period May 16 to 22, 1951. Defending the critical sector of the Eighth Army battlefront, the Second Infantry Division and attached units faced a hostile force of 12 Chinese Communist divisions with an estimated strength of 120,000 troops. The Third Chinese Communist Army Group drove the full force of its savage assault against the 2d Infantry Division with the specific mission of annihilation of the unit. The right flank of the unit was completely exposed when enemy pressure broke through adjacent United Nations elements. Pressure increased and each night enemy forces bypassed the stanch defenders and occupied positions to their rear areas. Tactical units of the 2d Infantry Division launched fierce counterattacks which destroyed enemy penetrations, successfully extricated themselves, and through readjustment of positions, stopped the onslaught of the Chinese Communist forces. Executing planned withdrawals and extending their flank eastward over extremely rugged, mountainous terrain, the 2d Infantry Division contained and held all enemy attempts to envelop and destroy the Eighth Army. The heroic and determined stand by the 2d Infantry Division and attached units provided critically required time for other Eighth Army units to regroup and block the attempted enemy envelopment. Without thought of defeat, this heroic unit demonstrated superb battlefield courage, knowledge, and discipline and displayed such gallantry, determination, and esprit de corps in accomplishing this extremely difficult and hazardous mission as to set it apart and above other units participating in similar operations. Its sustained brilliance in battle, resolution, and extraordinary heroism reflect unsurpassed credit on those courageous soldiers who participated and are in keeping with the finest traditions of the United States Army, the United Nations Forces, and their own homelands. * * *"

* * * * *

By order of the Secretary of the Army:

J. LAWTON COLLINS,
*Chief of Staff, United States Army.*

Official:

WM. E. BERGIN,
*Major General, USA,*
*The Adjutant General.*

---

## THE DOUBLE STANDARD OF INTERNATIONAL MORALITY AT THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it is time that we review the double standard of international morality growing like a cancer at the United Nations.

Nations which urged speed to stop aggression in the Middle East abstained from voting on resolutions aimed at stopping Soviet aggression in Hungary.

Nations which failed to show the slightest interest in applying either moral or economic sanctions against the Soviet Union, which has failed to respect any of the 10 resolutions passed on the Hungarian issue, now urge sanctions against Israel, which at least has partially conformed to the United Nations resolutions relative to the Middle East.

Mr. President, on the day before yesterday, I issued the following statement:

I do not believe the United States should support United Nations sanctions against Israel unless the United Nations is prepared to apply sanctions against the Soviet Union for its noncompliance with 10 General Assembly resolutions relative to Soviet aggression against Hungary.

A double standard by the United Nations that would apply sanctions to a small country that has at least partially complied with the resolutions of the General Assembly on the Suez-Near East conflict, while sidestepping the question of sanctions on a larger aggressor which has totally ignored all the resolutions on the crime against Hungary, is both immoral and in good conscience insupportable.

Mr. President, not only do we have the ludicrous situation of a failure even to suggest sanctions against the Soviet Union; but in the case of India, which at times has taken a high moral position at the United Nations, we find that in the Kashmir situation, India has failed to respect the resolutions of the General Assembly, and India has unilaterally incorporated Kashmir into the Indian state, in defiance of previous resolutions and actions of the United Nations and the recent unanimous action of the Security Council.

I ask unanimous consent that two editorials from the New York Times, and editorial comment from the Washington Star, and the Washington Post and Times Herald be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of January 28, 1957]

THE PAKISTAN RIOTS

The Pakistan riots, in protest against India's attempt to attach Kashmir by force and decree and in violation of repeated United Nations resolutions, are the wrong way to go at the problem. We congratulate the Government of Pakistan on its firm efforts to curb this sort of demonstration. Nothing will be solved by burning anyone in effigy. No basis for agreement is reached by throwing stones.

This does not mean that we are insensible to the grave provocation under which the Pakistanis now feel themselves to be. The Indian statements in the United Nations on this disputed case were more than provocative. They were defiant, not merely of Pakistan, not merely of the will of the Kashmiri people, but of the United Nations itself. There was on the part of the Indian spokesman no attempt to reach agreement or settlement. There was no disposition to allow the representatives of other nations to make a dispassionate judgment. There was no indication of allowing the people of Kashmir to make their own decisions.

Under those conditions we are obliged to reach the conclusion that the Indian case must be woefully weak or it would not be presented with such a maximum of arrogant words, such a minimum of goodwill and such meager search for a rightful solution. Pakistan, in agreeing to 11 different decisions of the United Nations—all of which were rejected by India—has shown a more constructive approach to the problem.

It is for this reason that we feel impelled to urge the Pakistanis to be patient once more. Their case is so strong that it should not be weakened by any thoughtless show of violence. The situation is so sensitive, in both India and Pakistan, that any breakdown of public order may have grave consequences. Pakistan's Government obviously knows this.

The United Nations is not absolved from responsibility. Its Security Council has once more indicated the proper course of action. The United Nations cannot afford to let one member, India, flout that collective will. Rioting in Pakistan will not do any good. Firmness of purpose in the United Nations may help.

---

[From the New York Times of January 25, 1957]

KASHMIR FOR THE KASHMIRIS

India's approach in the United Nations to the Kashmir question has gone far to justify some of the fears and charges of Pakistan. What V. K. Krishna Menon's long speech boils down to is simply that India considers the case closed. Kashmir is part of India, in this view, and will remain so.

It will be remembered that it was India's Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, who originally suggested that the political disposition of Kashmir ought to be determined by a free vote of the Kashmiris themselves.

This position was reasonable and liberal. The United Nations concurred. A plebiscite was authorized and a plebiscite administrator was named. The United Nations reiterated this position subsequently and has not repudiated it. The repudiation, however, has come from India and from India's spokesman here. Kashmir's accession to India has been made constitutional and India seems prepared to stand upon that ground.

The ultimate political place of the Kashmiris ought not to be decided in New Delhi. It ought not to be decided in Karachi. It ought to be decided in Kashmir, by Kashmiris who have the opportunity freely to express their will. Pakistan's suggestion that an international police force, under the United Nations might well supervise such a plebiscite is constructive. It would solve, at the outset, this troublesome question of foreign troops in Kashmir. It should make it possible for Indian as well as Pakistani soldiers to be withdrawn. It should make a truly free vote possible. It should give substance to the resolutions of the United Nations, which India has now disregarded.

Mr. Nehru was right in the first place. He should not allow himself to be put in the wrong now.

---

[From the Washington Star of January 28, 1957]

INDIA'S CONTEMPT

India's contemptuous disregard of United Nations opinion on the Kashmir question is shocking and discouraging. Equally so is its disregard for whatever may be the wishes of the Kashmiri people—promised nearly a decade ago that they would have the same rights to political self-determination given to all Indian states when the subcontinent was partitioned. Indeed, India's offense in this matter is compounded by the fact that it was Prime Minister Nehru himself who first proposed after partition that Kashmiri sentiment—on whether the state wished to join India or Pakistan, or become independent—should be established through a free vote of the people. It was largely on the basis of that proposal that the United Nations in 1948, 1950, and 1951 called for "a free and impartial plebiscite" in the territory, to be conducted under the neutral auspices of the world agency. By a vote of 10 to 0, the Security Council now has reaffirmed that position. The answer of Mr. Nehru's government is that Kashmir has been an "inseparable" part of India since 1947, and that the formality of its accession is now irrevocable."

Preceding this latest flaunting of world judgment is the long and consistent record of India's refusal to withdraw its troops from Kashmir or to allow the plebiscite to be held. At the same time, it has systematically crushed political freedom within the territory—ousting opposition leaders from office and even jailing some who dared express their disagreement with Indian policies. Its arbitrary position today is "justified" on the grounds that a Kashmiri Constituent Assembly—purged of opposition leaders and completely subservient to Indian wishes—has adopted a constitution authorizing accession of the state to the Republic of India. Without qualification, the Security Council's latest resolution declares that this action does not "constitute a disposition of the state."

It is not surprising that India's defiant action has prompted protest violence in Pakistan. But violence does not offer a solution, and indeed it is the danger that violence might become war that is causing gravest concern today. The Security Council resolved "to continue its consideration" of the Kashmir dispute. Pakistan should continue to press its cause before the U. N. And Mr. Nehru should think again about his own course and the indictment brought against it by such an important body of world opinion.

---

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 21, 1957]

FESTERING KASHMIR

Pakistan's urgent appeal to the United Nations Security Council for preventive action in Kashmir points to new trouble with an old and unhealed wound. India reportedly is about to absorb Kashmir on the basis of a vote by the Indian-sponsored Kashmiri Constituent Assembly. The Pakistani Foreign Minister, Malik Firoz Khan Noon, has given a veiled warning that if the U. N. allows this to happen irate refugees and tribesmen may move across the border into Kashmir.

This faces the U. N. with an excruciating test. The rights and wrongs of the military occupation (and division) of Kashmir by both countries after partition of the subcontinent in 1947 are obscure. A charge of aggression might be sustained against Pakistan as well as India. In recent years, however, pretty clearly it has been India that has frustrated the free plebiscite among the people of Kashmir and Jammu recommended by the Security Council and accepted by the Indo-Pakistani agreement at the end of 1948.

India has controlled most of Kashmir, and all mediation efforts and direct negotiations over the status of the province, which has a heavy Moslem majority, have failed. Sheikh Abdullah, the Moslem ruler, was jailed by India without trial in 1953. Subsequently Prime Minister Nehru, who is of Kashmiri ancestry, has made it clear that he considers Kashmir to be part of India.

There can be little doubt that India's attitude on many questions of world affairs—for example, her refusal to endorse the sending of observers to Hungary—is bound up with the question of Kashmir. Here, as on other issues, there is no easy cure for defiance of United Nations resolutions. It is difficult for any country to bow to international rulings that seem to go against its self-interest. Yet this is really the test of belief in the U. N.; and certainly India's influence on world affairs would be sadly undercut by any move in direct contradiction of the U. N. request.

The hope is, after India's rebuttal is heard this week, that the Security Council will be able to devise some new basis for settlement that will save face on both sides. This will require, first of all, a standstill against any unilateral change in the status of Kashmir. Even this possibility will be complicated by the attitude of Russia, since Mr. Khrushchev on his visit to India in 1955 proclaimed baldly that Kashmir belongs to India.

No doubt it would be possible to settle for a division of Kashmir along the present de facto line. But that would sanction a rebuff to the U. N., and it would give the people of Kashmir no free voice in their future. The U. N. cannot afford to consent to anything less than a fair plebiscite, however it is clothed. The issue will be a touchy one, however, and it will be interesting to see whether it will arouse the same concern as the clash in Egypt produced.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I close by saying that if we are to have sanctions at the United Nations, they should apply to all nations which defy the resolutions and the mandates of that organization. Otherwise the moral foundation of the United Nations is destroyed and a doctrine of "might makes right" condoned. This issue of principle cannot be brushed aside or avoided.

---

## INFLATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, at his press conference on yesterday, the President called attention to the current danger of price inflation, and asked the cooperation of both labor and industry. The President said:

I am asking them merely to act as enlightened Americans. Now, unless this happens, the United States then has to move in more firmly with so-called controls of some kind, and when we begin to control prices and allocations and wages, and all the rest, then it is not the America we know.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize two phases of the President's statement about inflation. First, the inflationary trend was clearly apparent in the spring of last year. Second, the President warns that if the inflationary trend is not checked, he will ask Congress not only for price controls and allocations, but for wage controls, as well.

In addressing the Colorado Bankers Association at Colorado Springs on May 21 of last year I said:

What happens in 1957 will depend largely on developments involving potentially inflationary factors which we should not ignore.

The purchasing power of the dollar has been stable for the last 3 years but it may not remain so much longer. Food accounts for 40 percent of the cost-of-living index and if the food consumed had advanced in proportion to all other products, that index already would have moved up enough to touch off wage increases of serious proportions which would have been followed inevitably by price increases.

It appears now that the steelworkers will get an increase and all other workers will demand equal treatment. Steel prices were advanced last year $7.50 a ton and if there is a similar increase this year that will be inflationary. Wage increases already given to garment workers indicate that clothing prices will be up next fall about 5 percent.

Considering the influence of Government spending on inflationary prospects we must recognize that about half of the Federal budget is allocated directly to defense and a major portion of the remainder is for the cost of previous wars, including interest on the national debt. There can be no major reduction in that spending until there is some trustworthy plan for world disarmament and no such plan is now in sight. There also may be increased spending if Congress passes a major highway bill.

All of these things suggest to me that we have less reason to fear a major depression in the near future than to fear the kind of inflation which will cause trouble later on.

I am concerned because, while our economy is more depression-resistant than it used to be, we cannot eliminate the business cycle completely and keeping the economy balanced on a high level will depend very largely on human factors.

Mr. President, since so many people like just a little bit of inflation—call it creeping, burning, or what you please—it is only human that during the campaign last fall the political leaders of both parties refrained from any serious discussion of the inflation problem. But, as the President said on yesterday, the issue can no longer be ignored. It has been emphasized by the Secretary of the Treasury, by former President Hoover, and by many of the leading economists of the Nation. The general impression is that current prices do not yet fully reflect recent wage increases, and that further wage increases are scheduled for the current year.

It is encouraging to me to know that the President intends to use the tremendous influence of his office to prevent a

boom from eventually turning into a bust. I have been through the nerve-racking strain of trying to draft a fair price law. I have lived through a period of bitter complaint concerning the failure of impartial administration; and I have observed, of course, how impotent price controls are in the absence of wage controls. Therefore, I share the hope of the President that we shall not live to see a peacetime program of a freeze across the board of wages and prices simply because labor and management have not been willing to cooperate in behalf of a stable economy.

## FARMERS AT THE CROSSROADS—BOOK BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE BENSON

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections recently issued a splendid report on election campaign financing. Among other important matters, the subcommittee reported specifically on the nationwide distribution by a tax-free organization, during the 1956 election campaign, of Secretary of Agriculture Benson's book, Farmers at the Crossroads. The subcommittee has referred its material on this matter to the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

The subcommittee has pointed out that, while the distributors hail the work as a nonpolitical solution to the farm problem, it contains chapters headed:

Controls Versus Initiative.
Why Price and Acreage Controls Don't Work.
Should Efficiency Be Outlawed?
The Paternalistic Road to Disaster.

Few books contain the quantity of sheer political bunkum that is contained in Mr. Benson's volume, as written for him by Carlyle Bargeron. The work will probably become known as the last defense ever made of the theory that lower prices result in lower production on the farm—the basis of the most expensive blunder ever made by a Cabinet officer of the United States of America.

Benson's multi-billion-dollar boner—the theory that low prices bring low production—is costing the farmers of the United States about $5 billion a year in net income. Instead of resulting in lowered production, it resulted in alltime record production in 1956, and skyrocketed Government costs.

Our 1956 farm production was an alltime record of 113 percent of the 1947–49 average. The record up to that time was the 1952 crop, which was only 107 percent of the 1947–49 average.

Significantly, the Benson theory that low feed prices would advantage livestock producers also resulted in a major fiasco in that branch of agriculture during the year. Livestock production went to 123 percent of that of the 1947–49 base period. We all know of the ruinous prices which prevailed.

In addition to the billions of dollars Benson's blunders have cost the farmers, they are costing the taxpayers additional billions. The budget requests for agriculture and agricultural resources this year exceed $5 billion—up more than five times since 1952.

It is in the face of these Benson multi-billion-dollar blunders that the taxpayers are asked to swallow, not only the mass circulation of his book on a tax-free basis during the political campaign, but also its continuing circulation at this time on a tax-free basis with a subsidy from the Post Office Department.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Thursday, January 31. On page A672 there is an insertion of materials showing that the Constitution and Free Enterprise Foundation is continuing the promotion of this book, soliciting wealthy interests to give the farmers' programs which were so successful in the thirties and forties in adjusting production to market requirement a tax-free kick in the face by Ezra Taft Benson as told to Carlyle Bargeron.

I wish to advise the Senate that I have turned over to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee a set of circulars promoting this book, which was mailed out by the Constitution and Free Enterprise Foundation this year at a subsidized 1-cent rate, with a rubber stamp endorsement under the postage reading "Nonprofit organization."

Inquiry reveals that the Postmaster General has given a certificate to the organization extending this special postal privilege to them, so that in addition to the tax exemption provided wealthy backers of this propaganda job, the taxpayers are providing a special postal subsidy for the promotion of this tax-dodging scheme.

Mr. President, I submit that the farmers and the taxpayers of the Nation have been burdened enough by the billions of dollars Benson's blunders have cost them without adding to that burden a large share of the costs of this propaganda job, whether it be done before or after election.

In my opinion, a very thorough investigation should be made of all the circumstances surrounding this operation by the Constitution and Free Enterprise Foundation on behalf of the Eisenhower-Benson farm policies.

## MILITARY STATUS OF STUDENTS AND GRADUATES OF THE MARITIME ACADEMY

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, during the 2d session of the 84th Congress I made a series of three statements in the Senate—March 15, 1956; March 29, 1956; and May 10, 1956—concerning the policies and attitude of the Department of Defense toward students and graduates of the State and Federal maritime academies. Very briefly stated, the problem was that the Department of Defense took the position that under the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 federally subsidized students at these maritime schools should be required to serve on active duty in the Navy upon graduation. These students had military status while attending school and were deferred from the draft.

A bill—S. 1748—introduced by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], was passed by the Senate in the 1st session of the 84th Congress which would have restored the midshipmen merchant marine reserve program that was terminated by the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952. At hearings before a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee last spring the Department of Defense vigorously opposed S. 1748.

The controversy over whether maritime academy graduates should be called to active military service developed to major proportions, and at times there was rather heated feeling on both sides. In retrospect, I am confident that both sides acted in complete good conscience, though at the time each side felt the other was being utterly unreasonable, and each to some extent was suspicious of the other's motives.

At any rate, the House Armed Services Committee refused to report S. 1748, and the 84th Congress adjourned without a solution being found for this very critical problem.

During the summer and fall of 1956 the Department of Defense, the Department of the Navy, the Selective Service System, and the Maritime Administration, held a series of conferences in an effort to reach a satisfactory solution regarding the military status and obligations of students at the maritime academies. A working plan to resolve the difficulty by administrative action emerged from these discussions. This plan was approved by the responsible officials, and has now been placed in effect. In brief, students entering the maritime academies after the fall of 1956 will have only civilian status, but will be deferred by the Selective Service System.

The details of the plan are set forth clearly in a directive issued by Vice Adm. J. L. Holloway, Jr., Chief of Naval Personnel, on December 21, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Admiral Holloway's directive may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to commend all the departments and agencies of the Government that were concerned with this problem. The final solution is one that clearly defines the military status and obligation of maritime academy students, fully recognizing the vital need for a strong and effective merchant marine whose officer requirements are carefully related to those of the rest of the National Defense Establishment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Maine?

There being no objection, the directive was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF A LETTER OF DECEMBER 21, 1956, FROM ADMIRAL HOLLOWAY, CHIEF OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

1. Purpose: The purpose of this letter is to outline recent developments, and clearly establish the future relationship of the Navy with students and graduates of the Merchant Marine Academies. Specifically, it is intended to disseminate information with respect to students enrolled as officer candidates (merchant marine), USNR, and students scheduled to be graduated who have not participated in the officer candidate (merchant marine), USNR, or Midshipmen Merchant Marine Reserve, USNR, programs.

2. Background: (a) The Navy's interest in the maritime academies stems from the national defense requirement for an adequate merchant marine manned by well-trained officers possessing an understanding of naval procedures and capable of operating with the Navy in time of war. The Secretary of the Navy is continuing his unswerving support, maintenance, and assistance wherever possible in areas, particularly with respect to future officers of the merchant marine, that will promote a strong merchant marine, fully recognizing the importance of the merchant marine to our great maritime Nation. It follows that the primary responsibility for the merchant marine properly remains fixed with the Secretary of Commerce.

To the extent that budgetary limitations permit, the Navy will continue to participate in training maritime academy students by conducting naval science courses, wherever practicable, in these institutions in order that the officers of our merchant marine may have some knowledge of naval procedure and further enhance their usefulness in the merchant marine in time of war. In addition, the Navy will continue to commission those eligible officers in the merchant marine serving on ships on which an operating differential subsidy is paid pursuant to law.

The Navy does not, under any circumstances, desire to be obligated to consider the merchant marine academies as basic sources of Naval Reserve officers, nor be obligated to call graduates of these institutions to active duty. To assume any other position would vitiate our concept that the maritime academies are for the purpose of supporting a strong merchant marine.

The Navy conceives of these schools as primarily required for the manning of our merchant marine.

(b) The Secretary of the Navy has approved a plan developed in concert with the Secretary of Commerce for students who entered in the fall of 1956 and for future students who will attend the Merchant Marine Academies. The Secretary of Defense has fully concurred with this mutual agreement. Pertinent points of the program thus established are as follows:

(1) The Navy will perform the screening and physical examinations of students who enter merchant marine academies.

(2) Students will retain civilian status.

(3) The Director of Selective Service has provided for the deferment of these students.

(4) Navy will continue to offer naval science courses.

(5) After graduation, those who obtain employment at sea in the merchant marine and who so request shall be tendered Naval Reserve commissions, if eligible.

(6) After graduation, those who through no fault of their own are unable to obtain employment at sea in the merchant marine and who volunteer for active Navy duty, may be commissioned, if eligible, and placed on active duty if there is an actual need for their services.

3. Information: Under present instruction, students who are officer candidates (merchant marine), United States Naval Reserve, are required to report to active duty in accordance with their agreements executed upon enrollment into the program. This is recognized as undesirable since the primary purpose of merchant marine academies is to produce officers for the merchant marine. Furthermore, there is an actual need for such trained officers in the merchant marine. In order to alleviate the situation insofar as practicable, the Secretary of the Navy, again in concert with the Secretary of Commerce and full concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, has approved the following plan:

(a) Those students who entered the officer candidate (merchant marine), United States Naval Reserve, program prior to August 10, 1955, effective date of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, and who were enlisted under section 227 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended, may have the designation of officer candidate (merchant marine), United States Naval Reserve, revoked, provided such individuals request such revocation. The Reserve enlistment will remain in effect and they will no longer be afforded a deferment under section 6 (d) (1), Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended. Commissioning of these individuals would be handled in the same manner as for students entering this last fall as outlined below:

(1) After graduation, those who obtain employment at sea in the merchant marine and who so request shall be tendered Naval Reserve commissions, if eligible.

(2) After graduation those who, through no fault of their own, are unable to obtain employment at sea in the merchant marine and who volunteer for active naval duty may be commissioned, if eligible, and placed on active duty if there is an actual need for their services.

(b) Those students under the officer candidate (merchant marine), USNR program who entered on and subsequent to August 10, 1955, will retain their designation officer candidate (merchant marine), USNR, including their deferment and 2 or 3 years' active duty obligation incurred under section 6 (d) (1), Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended. This active duty obligation and that in the plan outlined below are for service on active duty as distinguished from the 6 months' active duty for training plan as outlined in section 6 (d) (1), Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended. Salient features of the plan for this group are as follows:

(1) Commission all qualified Maritime Academy graduates and order them to active duty in accordance with their agreements under section 6 (d) (1), of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended.

(2) Those who find employment in the merchant marine may be prereleased from active duty in accordance with the provisions of section 4 (d) (3) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, but not earlier than the completion of 6 months of such duty. Such individuals would be subject to pertinent Department of Defense directives and instructions relating to the Ready Reserve and Standby Reserve.

4. Action: The heads of the Department of Naval Science at Merchant Marine Academies, both State and Federal, are requested to bring the contents of this letter to the attention of all students.

OFFICER CANDIDATE (MERCHANT MARINE), USNR, WHO ENTERED PRIOR TO AUGUST 10, 1955

(a) The heads, Department of Naval Science are requested to ascertain the desires of the individuals affected by virtue of their entering the officer candidate (merchant marine), USNR program prior to August 10, 1955, as described in paragraph 3 (a).

(b) Individuals entering the program prior to August 10, 1955, must indicate their desire with respect to the option offered no later than 6 months from the date of this letter.

(c) Students desiring the revocation of their designation of officer candidate (merchant marine), USNR, will forward their request to the Chief of Naval Personnel (Pers-B6262) via the Head, Department of Naval Science and the Superintendent of the Academy. The letter shall state that he has read and understands the provisions contained in this letter. A sample letter is contained in enclosure (1).

(d) Since there are certain officer candidates (merchant marine), USNR, who are scheduled to be graduated in February 1957 and who are already in process for commissioning, it is imperative that the desires of these students be known as soon as possible. In this connection, a copy of evidence of prospective employment, if appropriate, will be forwarded with the request for revocation of the designation "officer candidate (merchant marine), USNR," in order that active-duty orders will not be issued.

(e) When directed by the Chief of Naval Personnel, the Commandant of the Naval District maintaining the officer candidate's (merchant marine), USNR, record shall revoke the officer candidate's (merchant marine), USNR, designation. The heads of the Department of Naval Science will notify the officer candidate's (merchant marine), USNR, local selective-service board of his change of military status, using form DD 44.

OFFICER CANDIDATE (MERCHANT MARINE), USNR, WHO ENTERED ON AND AFTER AUGUST 10, 1955

(a) Heads of the Department of Naval Science shall bring the attention of such students to the plan outlined in subparagraph 3.b. Special amplifying instructions will be issued concerning such students at a later date.

MIDSHIPMEN, MERCHANT MARINE RESERVE, USNR

(b) There are no changes with respect to such midshipmen. They will be commissioned, if qualified, but active duty will not be required.

CIVILIANS AND STATE NAUTICAL STUDENTS

(c) Students who have not participated in the midshipmen merchant marine or the the officer candidate (merchant marine), USNR, programs will be commissioned, if qualified, under the principles outlined in subparagraphs 2.b (5) and (6).

6. Information contained in this letter will be incorporated in the recruiting service manual.

## ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF CREATION OF UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, 150 years ago this Sunday on February 10, 1807, President Thomas Jefferson signed into law the measure which established the Federal Bureau which is today known as the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey. The original authorization was intended to provide a survey of the shoreline of the new Republic in order to assist marine commerce, which was then, and still is, the lifeblood of our Nation. In all probability, the sponsors of this early legislation were completely unaware that they had in effect founded the first technical bureau of the Federal Government, a bureau which was destined to grow in size, scope, and importance of function until its activities in 1957 would vitally affect millions of people throughout the world.

The United States Coast and Geodetic Survey cannot be praised too highly for the manner in which it has fulfilled its responsibilities throughout its first 150 years. Few of us today truly appreciate the importance of the work performed by the Survey. Most of us are aware of the fact that it charts the coastal waters of the United States and is, therefore, of value to fishermen, mariners, and others who use the sea for commercial or recreational purposes. But how many of us realize that the Survey also charts the land area of the United States. In fact, the Survey has established the reference points which local surveyors use in laying out areas of land. The

Survey has completely mapped the United States and located the imaginary lines on which the determination of all American boundaries is based. Every citizen's back fence depends for its accurate location on the work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The round bronze markers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey are familiar to mountain climbers from the White Mountains to the Sierra Nevada, and dot the desert areas of the Great Basin. The Survey has installed nearly 400,000 benchmarks for distances above sea level, and more than 150,000 triangulation stations for which exact longitude and latitude have been calculated.

The Survey helps avert not only shipwrecks, but air crashes. Since 1926 it has supplied the country's aeronautical charts, which show airlanes, beacons, airports, and the obstructions that bother pilots on landing and takeoff. More than 43 million copies of its aeronautical charts were issued in the fiscal year 1956, besides 750,000 nautical charts.

Since 1952, in addition to improving its charts and maps, the Coast and Geodetic Survey has completed a survey of the strategic Arctic coast of Alaska; has intensified its charting work in the Bering Sea and its search for sunken wrecks along the Atlantic coast; and has broadened its contributions to science. For 1957 it is planning extended charting of the Georges Banks area off New England. One modern survey ship is on the drawing boards and another is projected under authorizing legislation sponsored by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and myself in the 84th Congress.

Mr. President, the 150th anniversary of the Coast and Geodetic Survey is a fitting time to pay tribute to the men who have manned the Survey over the years, to recognize the many valuable contributions which the Survey has made, and to look forward with confidence to another 150 years of service marked by the same caliber of work, with increasing contributions to science and mankind.

It is a privilege today to salute the men and ships of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey—surveyors extraordinary of both land and sea.

## REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AND BY FORMER PRESIDENT HOOVER ON THE OCCASION OF THE PRESENTATION OF A CITATION TO HIM

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on Monday last President Eisenhower presented a citation to former President Hoover.

In his remarks he made statements which should be carefully considered by every American. If we are to lessen the cost of government, all of us must assist in this effort.

President Hoover, on the same date, spoke on inflation, spending, taxes, and some reforms. This address should be carefully read by all Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the President and those of former President Hoover be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT, IN CONJUNCTION WITH HIS PRESENTATION OF A CITATION TO FORMER PRESIDENT HERBERT HOOVER FOR DISTINGUISHED CIVILIAN SERVICE TO THE CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE LUNCHEON GIVEN BY THE CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE HOOVER REPORT AT THE SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 4, 1957

President Hoover, Mr. Chairman, and my friends, you see, there was some excuse for my question addressed to the chairman because I had been assigned a very specific and succinct part of this program. But I did feel I wanted to express a few personal sentiments with which I hope most of you can agree.

First, my purpose was to pay a great tribute—as great a tribute as I am capable of delivering—to the youthfulness of our guest of honor, Mr. Hoover.

Someone said that any man is young who retains his optimism. And optimism, I believe, is a capacity for looking toward the future with hope and enthusiasm.

Now our guest of honor has shown his optimism twice. He has headed great commissions determined to deliver to us better service in the Government that we must maintain, and at less cost to ourselves. He remains optimistic, or he would not have devoted so many years of his life to this work.

And in his case, I think, there would be a great deal of excuse—at least at times I feel so—for an opposite conclusion.

He spent many years in public service, and I know something of some of the frustrations and difficulties he had during at least 4 years of that service.

He knows what it means to attempt to install new methods, new procedures, in a great hierarchy, in a great bureaucracy.

Now, I would not have any of you think that your public servants in the civil service and in other areas are not good people. Indeed they are. Some of them are extraordinarily intelligent and capable. But they are a very large group that has been accustomed to operate according to certain procedures—certain methods. We do it ourselves, in our daily lives. We become creatures of habit.

I won't venture to remark about the ladies. But I would bet any man here puts the same foot into his trousers first every morning.

In all our daily lives you can find that we fall into habits. Take the one of eating. How many people are in this room, I wonder, whose doctors have not asked them to keep their weight down, but who go on indulging themselves?

The same way in Government. We become used to these procedures and practices, and they involve these millions of people. I declare, if you could provide for the Government, through the Bureau of the Budget, a new accounting system, with the utmost expedition and efficiency, it would certainly take you many months before you could reach the last echelon of government. And why not? They will plead: Why, we have blank forms printed for the next 3 years. We will have to retrain our clerks. They have every good reason in the world for not doing this hastily.

Our guest of honor has never lost his enthusiasm for better government through all this kind of thing.

I merely wanted to point out, this is an unusual kind of enthusiasm and leadership, from which all of us benefit.

And may I say that every one of the recommendations submitted by the people—by the leaders of the Hoover Commission, have been the subject of earnest study. They have been monitored within the Government by one of our noted businessmen, Mr. Meyer Kestnbaum, in order to get every one of them implemented as rapidly as possible. I am very sorry to admit that that speed has not been sufficient and all we could ask. But it is progress, and it will continue. That I promise this body, which has worked so hard to bring it about.

And now after that comes the real purpose of my coming to this platform to speak: I have been privileged to prepare—to get ready for Mr. Hoover a short citation which I shall now read.

Mr. HOOVER. Mr. President, fellow members of this citizens committee: I have only to express my deep emotion and appreciation for the extraordinary honor which the President has just conferred upon me. And I also want to express to him the appreciation which you have for the constant support that he has given to the work of this body of citizens.

And I have the idea that when he has finished this term, he will certainly merit even a greater tribute than that which has come to me.

For he will have, I hope, a successor of an appreciation of a great national man.

Thank you.

### INFLATION, SPENDING, TAXES, AND SOME REFORMS

(By the Honorable Herbert Hoover)[1]

The purpose of these meetings is to stimulate interest in reducing waste, increasing efficiency, decreasing expenses and taxes in the Government, and thereby also contributing to curbing inflation.

I hope you will be patient with my approach to these questions. The modern connotation of liberalism having taken on one of its dictionary definitions as free spending, I hope I may be regarded as a constructive conservative.

#### THE INFLATION MOVEMENT

No one here needs to be told that we are in the midst of an inflation movement. Both President Eisenhower and Secretary Humphrey as well as a host of nonofficial persons have called full warning of it.

You do not need to be told that unless inflation is stopped, the end is a bump.

While Secretary of Commerce I witnessed a growing inflation movement. I protested vigorously at its promotion by Federal activities. Then I had to live through the agony of its inevitable consequences. Secretary Humphrey says that unless we change some of our ways, we will see "a depression that will curl your hair." Mine has already been curled once—and I think I can detect the signs.

The obvious gain of inflation is the advance of prices, wages, and the cost of living. But another sign is the temperament of some of our economists. Again you hear the same expressions as in the inflation period of 30 years ago, that "we are in a new economic era"; that "the old economic laws are outmoded." I just suggest to you that even in a partially free economy, unless we curb inflation on its way up, Old Man Economic Law will return with a full equipment of hair curlers.

#### THE AMERICAN PEOPLE NEED TO BE MORE AWAKE

There are several things as to Government financial operations of which our people should be more fully awake.

First. The Federal Government spending is much larger than the figures in the annual Federal budget. There is spending on various governmentally conducted pensions and on some trust funds. And there is indirect

[1] Thirty-first President of the United States; chairman of the 1947–49 and the 1953–55 Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

spending on projects financed by guaranties and loans. And there is the spending of our State and local governments which we must take within our vision. Various responsible institutions have estimated the total of these expenditures during the last calendar year at over $103 billion.

Second. The American people should realize that this spending has to be met with some kind of levies on the people, whether they appear as taxes or under some other guise, and these levies are also estimated at about $103 billion.

Third. They need to realize that this enormous Federal and local spending and the levies which it requires has some part in this inflation movement.

Fourth. They should also realize that these total levies are taking so much from the people that their savings are insufficient to finance the needs of growing private enterprise to provide 1,500,000 new jobs each year, and to provide homes for the new couples. This is thwarting progress itself. Incidentally the rise in interest rates is an indication of inflation.

Fifth. They should realize that with combined Federal, State, and local taxes, we are a long way on the road to socializing the income of the people. Moreover, the form of these taxes is making new individual enterprise most difficult and is driving small businesses to sell out to big business. And the Government is engaged in a host of businesses in competition with private enterprise.

The spirit of Karl Marx no doubt rejoices at these phenomena. He recommended some such action as the road to socialism.

But lest I be misunderstood as to expenditures, let me repeat what I have said many times over the years. The Federal Government should undertake and only undertake, competitive business and public improvements which cannot be otherwise attained by the people or their local governments. There are less of them than some pressure groups would have you think.

Sixth. The American people must realize that they cannot have every social and public works improvement of their dreams all at once, especially in a world where we have to defend ourselves from a monstrous international danger.

At least we should only undertake such ventures in order of their urgency.

OUR PROPOSALS

Our Commission has made a multitude of proposals for reducing the cost of Government. We have not proposed to abolish or injure any necessary functions of the Government. With the support of President Eisenhower and the Congress a good deal of progress has been made.

Out of scores of further such opportunities to save expenditures I will mention at this time only four.

BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING

Our Federal budgeting and accounting is not adapted to these enormous expenditures. Two things have resulted. No one today can tell what the actual annual expenditures of the Government really are. And for this reason, and the continuing appropriations, the Congress has lost control of the purse—the very foundation of free men.

The remedy we proposed has been supported by President Eisenhower, the Comptroller General and the Director of the Budget. Under the leadership of Senator JOHN KENNEDY, a bill providing these reforms was passed unanimously by the Senate in the last session. The act was divided into three parts. Two parts were passed by the House and are now law. The key part, however, was deleted in the House. Again under Senator KENNEDY's leadership, this legislation has been introduced into the Senate with 48 Senators as sponsors.

Here is a spot for the citizens committee and the other agencies of reform in Government to express themselves vigorously, for there are savings estimated at over $3 billions to be had. And further, the country and the Congress could then know what the Government really spends each year and the Congress could really control it.

DEFENSE

In the face of the Communist threat, we must maintain our military strength. But we need a soul-searching look into the abandonment of obsolete methods and weapons of defense. Beyond that we proposed the effective unification of the common-use business service of the four military departments with a saving of over $2 billions a year. Some admirable steps have been taken by the Defense Department—but there is still a long way to go. I might remind you that unification of these common-use activities was one of the great hopes of the Congress when it enacted the unification of the defense services.

THE CIVIL SERVICE

There is another area in which there are billions of dollars to be saved. The turnover in our civil service is about 500,000 employees annually; that is 25 percent per annum, three or four times the normal of a well-conducted business. It costs about $3,000 to process and to give a year's training to a new employee. If this turnover could be reduced by 200,000, that alone would produce a saving of over $5 billion a year.

Another cause of this turnover comes from the failure of Government service to attract and hold men and women who have developed unusual administrative abilities. With inadequate pay for top executive skill and the uncertainty of promotions our best employees become the easy recruits of private business. In consequence many services are left to be administered by deadwood. President Eisenhower has approved our proposals.

GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS

The Federal Government is engaged in a multitude of business enterprises in competition with private business. As a whole they pay microscopic taxes—either Federal, State, or local; few of them pay interest on Government capital and still fewer amortize this capital. Any strict accounting would show, as a whole, that they are a burden on the taxpayer and that they deprive the Government of taxes that would be paid on the same service by private enterprise. Some headway is being made on getting rid of them, but there is still a long way to go.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS SPENDING AND TAXES?

And now I will disclose to you who is mostly responsible in these unnecessary and wasteful expenditures. They are opposed by some Government employees. But the most important opposition is the pressure groups who operate among our people. Many of their names are on the Federal register of lobbyists as required by law. Others of them operate strenuously on Senators and Congressmen and the public in the field. There are probably more than a thousand of these pressure groups, working day and night, to get what they call theirs. So far as I know, there is not a name among the registered lobbyists whose purpose is to decrease public expenditures. I know of only two private organizations in Washington working to reduce expenses and taxes.

I suggest to you, the American people, that each of you examine yourself as to whether you belong to any pressure group asking for Federal spending. If you value your own safety and future peace of mind, just resign from it, and do it loudly.

However, despite the pressure groups we are making progress on the Commission's recommendations.

And may I add that, so far as our internal economic forces are concerned, I have no fear of a serious depression if we can stop the march of inflation.

## INVESTIGATION OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—AMENDMENT OF SENATE RESOLUTION 74

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 88), as follows:

*Resolved,* That section 2 of Senate Resolution 74, 85th Congress, 1st session, agreed to January 30, 1957 (establishing a select committee to investigate certain matters pertaining to labor-management relations), is amended by—

(1) striking out the period at the end of subsection (a) thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "governing standing committees of the Senate."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I might make this observation. Since the adoption of Senate Resolution 74, the select committee that was established has been organized, and in examining the resolution, it was found there may be a technical defect in section 2, to which the present resolution refers. Section 2 reads:

The select committee shall consist of 8 members, to be appointed by the Vice President, 4 each from the majority and minority Members of the Senate, and shall at the first meeting called by the Vice President select a chairman and vice chairman, and adopt rules of procedure not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate.

All this resolution does is add to what was in the original resolution the following words: "governing standing committees of the Senate."

The rules of the Senate require a majority to constitute a quorum. The resolution enables us to conform with the established procedures regarding standing committees, and I hope there will be no objection to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 88) was agreed to.

## ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF MEXICAN FEDERAL CONSTITUTION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on February 5 of this year the Mexican people celebrated the 100th anniversary of the establishment of their federal constitution. I would be remiss in my duties to my respect for these fine people if I failed to comment briefly on this very important event.

It has been my pleasure to have lived my life close to Mexico and the people who claim that country as their home

and also those of Mexican ancestry who as proudly call the United States their home. To know these people is to respect them. To respect them for their unswerving allegiance to the principles of freedom; to respect them for their recognition of the spiritual values of life; to respect them as honest, decent, forthright people. To visit their country affords one the opportunity of seeing the vigorous progress they are making in developing the natural resources that abound within Mexico's farflung borders.

These people are our neighbors and they are good ones whom we should visit more often. Their way of life is woven closely into the pattern of the Southwest. Our streets bear names as familiar in Mexico as in the United States, and many of our cities have taken their names from the language spoken in Mexico. The majority of the Southwest itself came from Mexico as a result of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo which was signed in 1848, and our present borders were rounded out by the Gadsden Purchase of 1853.

So, Mr. President, it is proper that this country should pay tribute this day to the Republic of Mexico, recognizing as we do that she is a friend of ours, and a strong and understanding ally.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entiled "Mexican Milestone," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 6, 1957.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEXICAN MILESTONE

Yesterday Mexico began the celebration of the 100th anniversary of its liberal federal constitution. The observance has importance for the United States as well as Mexico because of the maturity it signifies in the growing democracy south of the border. The ideas of individual freedom and justice in the Mexican constitution of 1857 were carried over and amplified in the constitution of 1917 which remains in force today. Mexico's course has not been easy, and relations with the United States have sometimes been sorely troubled. But Mexico has mastered its revolution, and the constitution has practical and lasting meaning in vigorous popular institutions. The country has made enormous progress in industrialization, in diversification of agriculture, in education, in health, and in broadening participation in public affairs. Today, as large numbers of American tourists have had occasion to see for themselves, Mexico enjoys a stable elected government and a rapidly increasing standard of living. All of this is the more reason to commemorate the friendship between good neighbors, which never ought to be taken for granted, by joining in the applause for Mexico's achievements.

## PROPOSED NATIONAL TAX COMMISSION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on January 30, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 1256, I indicated additional cosponsorship of my bill, S. 769, for the establishment of a National Tax Commission.

I should like to present at this time the names of Senators who have agreed to be cosponsors.

I ask unanimous consent that the names of the following Senators be so listed:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

One of my brother Senators, when writing to me to ask that he be listed as a cosponsor, sent along a letter as evidence of the need for this bill. The Senator had received the letter from one of his constituents in a small town of less than 2,500 population.

This man, a merchant, sent to his Senator a letter which affords a real insight into the terrific problem faced by the average small-business man these days.

The letter included a long sheet—several feet long—of individual taxes at Federal, State, and local levels paid by this businessman. The merchant wrote:

The business or individual just simply cannot stand any more (taxes). Our business now needs, and has for several years, new fixtures and equipment. We are buying part of it at this time, hoping that we may be able in some way to make the payments.

His experiences could, I know, be duplicated manyfold.

As an indication of the wide approval which my suggestion has received, I send to the desk the text of an editorial which was carried in the February 2, 1957, issue of the Janesville Gazette. This editorial entitled "For a New Tax Law" uniformly praises the Wiley tax-commission bill.

I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR A NEW TAX LAW

Citizens often wonder why Congress occasionally does not repeal a whole section of the law and start over with a clean slate.

Many of the laws under which we are operating date back decades but are amended at every session. Often the result is a totally new system with a background more or less in direct conflict with present provisions. To find out what the law really is, it is often necessary to trace back through the amendments to the amendments of the amendments.

The tax laws are particularly bad in this respect. We practically never have a new Federal tax law. Changes are made from session to session, but never a whole new start.

Something of this kind is proposed, however, by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY in his proposal for a Hoover-type Commission on Federal Taxation. The group he proposes would be comprised of Presidential appointees and Members of the House and Senate, a portion of them private citizens. Its function would be to "take a comprehensive look at the Nation's tax structure," in the words of the Senator.

In his statement accompanying the introduction of his proposal, Senator WILEY points out that "the American tax structure has become a complex spider's web of levies—we have taxes of 1 percent, 3 percent, 5 percent, 10 percent, 15 percent, 20 percent and more—all the way up to 91 percent. We have individual income taxes, partnership, corporation, excise, gift, inheritance, capital gains, and a vast variety of other, hidden and direct."

He adds:

"We all recognize that the entire tendency of Congress has been to add piecemeal or subtract piecemeal to our tax structure. The result, while unintended, has often been to cause still more confusion."

Senator WILEY calls attention to the fact that the adoption of his proposal and the appointment of the Commission in themselves would solve nothing. It will be the attitude of Congress toward any suggestions which may come from it and as Senator WILEY says, "basically upon the attitude of the American people."

"Let it not be thought that the commission will come up with all sorts of pleasant suggestions simply to reduce taxes," he said. "On the contrary, we may expect realistically that tax increases in numerous categories may be suggested."

There are about three things in the Wiley proposal which will receive almost universal approval. One of these is the possibility of some sort of division of tax revenues among local, State and Federal Governments, so that the same taxpayers will not be called upon to pay the same kind of taxes to 2 or 3 different tax collectors. One of the thoughts is that some areas of taxation should be left by the Federal Government so that State and local governments can carry on their functions without bankrupting their citizens.

A second is that new and clear-cut tax laws would encourage cooperation by taxpayers. The Wiley statement says on this point:

"I do not believe that our tax statutes and regulations should have the effect of encouraging all sorts of dubious subterfuges by taxpayers. I do not believe that a condition should be developed in which the line between legitimate tax avoidance and illegal tax evasion becomes more and more blurred and indistinct and almost impossible to determine.

"The mass of American people are honest, law-abiding citizens. If and when people come to feel that they are the victims of complete injustice, if they feel that there is rank discrimination, complete inequities, then almost inevitably there is a tendency for moral scruples to decline."

His third point is that there are "new industries, new products, new services, new forms of organizations" which may be taxed. By bringing into the tax structure some of these things which may not be carrying their fair share of the taxload, the burden may be lessened for the rest of the taxpayers.

The proposed commission study, if followed up by a newly written, fair and unified tax law, should command support everywhere.

## THE 1957 CORN PROGRAM

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, farmers in my State are now making their plans for planting the 1957 corn crop. But until the Congress acts, either one way or another on the corn program, they will be at a loss to know what to do in this coming year. I am, therefore, rising to urge immediate and speedy action on a corn program for 1957.

In 1956 the Secretary of Agriculture set 43 million acres as the allotment in the commercial Corn Belt which would bring normal production. During the farm debate last year, Congress accepted

an amendment making 51 million the base acreage. This made it possible for corn farmers to take part in the soil bank and to devote at least 15 percent of their base acreage to the soil bank. If they complied with the program they received an average support price for corn of $1.50 per bushel. If they were not in compliance in the commercial corn area and planted all the corn they wanted, they could receive either $1.25 per bushel under a support program or the market price, whichever was higher.

On December 11, 1956, corn farmers voted in a referendum on the 1957 program. They were given two choices, neither of which, in my opinion, was satisfactory. If two-thirds of those voting, or more, voted to give the Secretary of Agriculture discretion to set the support price from 0 to 90 percent of parity, they were to be allowed a base acreage of 51 million acres.

If two-thirds failed to vote for this provision, the alternative was to accept a 37.3 million acreage allotment for the commercial corn belt with price supports at $1.36 or 77 percent of parity as of October 15, 1956.

Farmers in Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, and North and South Dakota generally favored the acreage allotment program because it guaranteed price supports of 77 percent of parity. They did not trust Secretary Benson enough to give him discretion to set price supports from 0 to 90 percent because they knew from past experience that when he has had discretion price supports have always declined. This was true even though he announced on December 6 that he would set price supports at $1.31 or 74 percent of parity as of October 15, 1956.

Farmers in other States, and particularly in my own State of Illinois, supported the base acreage program even though it gave Mr. Benson a certain discretion because they knew that the 37.3 million acreage allotment would not allow them to participate in the soil bank.

The result of the referendum was that only 61.5 percent of the corn farmers voted for the 51 million acre provision. Because two-thirds was needed this vote was inadequate. Furthermore, only a very small proportion of eligible voters even made an effort to vote. There were only 437,480 votes cast and it has been estimated by the Department of Agriculture that about 2.5 million were eligible. Therefore, only 17.5 percent of those eligible actually voted.

My view is that the Secretary of Agriculture should have been prepared with a new program to put forward immediately upon the defeat of the 51 million acre provision. It is not unfair to suggest that he knew it would be very difficult to get a two-thirds majority at the referendum. That would not have taken great foresight. However, he did not have a program ready, and although the referendum was held on December 11 and Congress convened on January 3, it was not until January 29 that the Secretary came forward with his proposals for this year. Then, like the Secretary of the Treasury in approving a budget but urging the Congress to cut it, he passed the buck to us and insisted that we have a bill approved and ready for Presidential signature by March 1.

Now, Mr. President, I urge the Congress, and particularly the Senate, to move heaven and earth to meet that March 1 date. However, I do not think the Secretary has been overly helpful in delaying 49 days following the referendum to make even the most meager proposals. I hope he does not fall back on the defense that the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare used over the polio vaccine shortage, namely, that no one could have foreseen the demand.

I hope Mr. Benson will not blame the Congress and the Democratic majority if his March 1 date is not met. For the facts of life are that his proposal came very late and that the Republicans in Congress always insist on a fairly lengthy recess each February over Lincoln's birthday when very little legislative action can take place. He is an intelligent man, and he must have known this when he came here on January 29.

Further, although I am here to urge that we do our best to meet the March 1 date—which is vital if corn farmers are to make their 1957 plans—I am not here to urge complete acceptance of his new proposal.

His proposal—made 49 days after the referendum—is that we adopt a base acreage of 51 million acres for the commercial Corn Belt and require the farmers to place at least 15 percent, or about 7.5 million acres overall, in the soil bank in order to become eligible for price supports. So far so good. But at what price is corn to be supported? Apparently the proposed new legislation would place a floor of 70 percent of parity for price supports. However, is this minimum also to be the maximum? That would appear to be true from some of the press reports I have seen. This would mean an average price of about $1.25 a bushel. Mr. Benson is, in effect, proposing something which is even less than the farmers turned down.

While I believe that the 51 million acre provision is appropriate—for such an acreage will yield the approximate amount of corn which is actually used in the commercial Corn Belt—and that the 15-percent figure for soil-bank participation is adequate, for it will reduce productive acres by about 7.5 million and can, therefore, help to reduce the surpluses—a provision for 70 percent of parity would be too low, in my opinion, to induce corn farmers to comply with the program. We will have, once again, a situation in which it appears that the Secretary's proposals seem to be designed to do away with the corn program altogether.

Therefore, Mr. President, I should think that at least 75 percent of parity should be set as a minimum if farmers are to be induced to comply with the program. So I urge that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry consider that figure, or a higher one, in its action on this measure. Although that is not 90 percent of parity, when one considers that a soil-bank payment would be made as well, it might give some rough equity to corn farmers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement issued by the Department of Agriculture under date of January 18, 1957, be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINAL CORN REFERENDUM TALLY CONFIRMS FAILURE TO APPROVE BASE ACREAGES

Final returns from the growers' referendum held December 11 in the 894 commercial corn counties confirm the early returns, which indicated that farmers approved an acreage allotment program for 1957 and subsequent corn crops instead of the alternate base acreage program.

The final tabulation of referendum results shows that 61.5 percent of the 437,480 farmers voting approved the corn base acreage program. This differs only slightly from the preliminary results reported December 12, which showed approval of base acreages by 61.2 percent of the farmers voting.

Since less than the necessary two-thirds of the total votes approved the base acreage program, the allotment program will be in effect for the 1957 and subsequent corn crops. Growers in the commercial corn area will have available a total allotment of 37,288,889 acres for the 1957 corn crop, and price support at a national average of $1.36 per bushel will be available to producers who comply with their allotments. In noncommercial areas price support for corn will be available at 75 percent of the commercial rate.

Following is the final report on votes cast in the corn referendum, by States:

| State | For corn base acreage program | For corn acreage allotment program | Total votes cast | Percent favoring base acreage program | Percent favoring acreage allotment program |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | 3,223 | 633 | 3,856 | 83.6 | 16.4 |
| Arkansas | 1,123 | 761 | 1,884 | 59.6 | 40.4 |
| Delaware | 336 | 44 | 380 | 88.4 | 11.6 |
| Georgia | 3,808 | 625 | 4,433 | 85.9 | 14.1 |
| Illinois | 58,592 | 13,949 | 72,541 | 80.8 | 19.2 |
| Indiana | 29,147 | 9,917 | 39,064 | 74.6 | 25.4 |
| Iowa | 51,724 | 35,177 | 86,901 | 59.5 | 40.5 |
| Kansas | 3,793 | 3,545 | 7,338 | 51.7 | 48.3 |
| Kentucky | 11,014 | 1,620 | 12,634 | 87.2 | 12.8 |
| Maryland | 817 | 399 | 1,216 | 67.2 | 32.8 |
| Michigan | 8,032 | 2,678 | 10,710 | 75.0 | 25.0 |
| Minnesota | 10,939 | 35,495 | 46,434 | 23.6 | 76.4 |
| Missouri | 10,987 | 12,488 | 23,475 | 47.8 | 53.2 |
| Nebraska | 16,656 | 16,655 | 33,311 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| New Jersey | 364 | 87 | 451 | 80.7 | 19.3 |
| North Carolina | 16,042 | 4,317 | 20,359 | 78.8 | 21.2 |
| North Dakota | 235 | 591 | 826 | 28.5 | 71.5 |
| Ohio | 17,236 | 6,943 | 24,179 | 71.3 | 28.7 |
| Pennsylvania | 2,555 | 904 | 3,459 | 73.9 | 26.1 |
| South Dakota | 4,851 | 13,126 | 17,977 | 27.0 | 73.0 |
| Tennessee | 9,158 | 1,377 | 10,535 | 86.9 | 13.1 |
| Virginia | 1,009 | 972 | 1,981 | 50.9 | 49.1 |
| West Virginia | 229 | 13 | 242 | 94.6 | 5.4 |
| Wisconsin | 7,315 | 5,979 | 13,294 | 55.0 | 45.0 |
| Total | 269,185 | 168,295 | 437,480 | 61.5 | 38.5 |

## C. WAYLAND BROOKS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, many of us in the Senate who had the privilege to know him and to work with him were saddened recently to learn of the sudden passing of a distinguished former colleague, the Honorable C. Wayland Brooks, of Illinois. He was affectionately known in the Senate and to many thousands of his friends in his home State and across the country as "Curly" Brooks.

I was especially privileged to have been considered a close friend, and Mrs. Bridges and I enjoyed every minute of

our association with Curly and his loving wife and helpmate, Mary. He was a trusted friend in every respect and a keen student of law and government.

Elected in 1940 for a short term and reelected in 1942 for a full term, Curly Brooks devoted himself without reservation to the welfare of this country and to the interests of his constituency. He gave the people of Illinois able representation in the United States Senate. His intelligence, his fairness to all his colleagues, and his friendliness made him a much sought individual. He rose rapidly in the Senate, and became chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. He became third ranking Republican on the Senate Committee on Appropriations, which is as important and powerful a committee as the Senate has. It was my good fortune to have had Curly Brooks as a member of the Appropriations Committee when I served as chairman during the 80th Congress. His cooperation was most valuable.

Curly's service to the American people began many years ago when he donned a Marine Corps uniform and waged a hero's fight during World War I. Wounded seven times in battle and invalided for a long time, he was decorated on several occasions by the American and the French Governments.

The American people have lost a distinguished leader and I have lost a friend. I want to take this opportunity to express my sincere sympathy to Mary Brooks, his devoted and gracious wife. My sympathy also goes to all members of his family.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks several newspaper articles and editorials regarding former Senator Brooks.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune of January 14, 1957]

EX-SENATOR BROOKS DIES—ILL 5 DAYS—TEAR IN ARTERY NEAR HEART

C. Wayland Brooks, 59, former United States Senator from Illinois and currently Republican national committeeman from the State, died at 12:40 a. m. today in Passavant Hospital.

Dr. Gerry Smyth said the former Senator's death came unexpectedly after he had spent an excellent day and apparently was progressing satisfactorily. However, when he awakened from a peaceful sleep, he complained of a pain in his chest. He died shortly afterward.

IN HOSPITAL 5 DAYS

The former Senator was removed to the hospital late Tuesday from his home at 3240 Lake Shore Drive. Thereafter, physicians reported he was suffering from a tear in the artery leading from the left ventricle of the heart, an ailment medically known as dissecting aneurysm.

Brooks' widow, the former Mary Thomas Peavy, was at his side. Later, Brooks' son, Russell A., a veterinary surgeon, of Meridian, Idaho, and Mrs. Peavey's son, John, Chicago, arrived.

LAWYER AND GOP LEADER

Charles Wayland Brooks was a lawyer and Republican leader who by his flaming oratory became a rallying point for Americans opposed to global meddling and socialism.

The offspring of three generations of preachers, he was born in a farming community in Bureau County, March 8, 1897. He was working his way through the University of Illinois in the spring of 1917 when this country entered World War I. He and his older brother, Russell, left school to enlist in the Marine Corps.

Young Brooks was decorated by General Pershing with the Distinguished Service Cross and commissioned a second lieutenant in the field for his bravery at Belleau Wood. Before that engagement ended he won the American Navy Medal, the Croix de Guerre, and had been promoted to first lieutenant.

WOUNDED NEAR SOISSONS

Near Soissons an explosive shell tore away part of his left foot and inflicted other injuries. He was returned to the United States for extensive surgery which restored use of his foot.

---

[From the Chicago Tribune of January 15, 1957]

C. WAYLAND BROOKS

C. Wayland Brooks—"Curly" to his countless friends—was a fighter of flaming courage who always managed to smile when the going was toughest.

In the last few years Wayland Brooks was slowed but never stopped by a failing heart. When death came to him yesterday he met it with the serene acknowledgment that he always reserved for opponents he respected but did not dread.

A poor boy in a Congregational minister's home, he worked his way through college and law school to win one of the highest honors this country bestows—a seat among the 96 in the United States Senate. He won that place originally against the tide of Franklin Roosevelt's third term vote, in a contest to fill a vacancy. Two years later he was elected to a full term of 6 years by the great margin of 203,000 votes.

Before he entered national politics, he made his name as a fiery and eloquent prosecutor in the State's attorney's office. He was assigned to many of the major criminal cases in the heyday of Chicago's organized crime in the thirties. His great abilities later insured success in private practice.

He was a clean fighter in politics and one of the most eloquent orators of the day. He always put his country first. When he was retired in the Democratic sweep of 1948, he continued to work toward the upbuilding of the Republican Party as national committeeman from Illinois. He contributed to its triumph in two presidential elections.

His patriotism came from the heart and the spirit. He left the University of Illinois to enlist as a private in the Marine Corps in World War I. He was among the great heroes in the annals of the corps, winning a battlefield promotion to first lieutenant at Belleau Wood, the Navy Cross, the Army's Distinguished Service Cross, and the French Croix de Guerre. He was wounded in action seven times.

The country owes him much. He was not only one of its greatest heroes in battle but in a day when dedication to political principle so frequently yields to crowd clamor or social pressure, Wayland Brooks was unswerving. His was one of the most eloquent voices in the Senate against the internationalist folly that entangled the Nation in World War II and led to the disastrous consequences with which we live. His contributions to debate in the early forties were phrased in prophecy.

Wayland Brooks will be greatly missed not only as a leading figure in public life but as our friend. He was unselfish and warm hearted in his associations, stimulating, and always kind. His thoughtfulness in doing for others will long be remembered. Our sympathy goes to his family, and especially to his devoted wife, Mary, herself a Senator's daughter, who shared his interests so closely and sustained him in his moments of greatest trial.

---

[From the Chicago Daily News of January 15, 1957]

C. WAYLAND BROOKS

In his many years of prominent public life, C. Wayland Brooks generated no neutralism concerning himself and his positions. Those of conservative views regarded him highly as a stalwart and effective champion; those of New Deal persuasion were bitter in their opposition.

Mr. Brooks' 8 years in the United States Senate, beginning in 1940, coincided with preparations for war, the long conflict, and the postwar rise of Soviet Russia as a threat to our national safety. Those who believe that our course in those years was right and inevitable will still hold that Senator Brooks' objections were mistaken, but even they would have to note the clarity of his foresight.

The essential nature of the man who generated so much emotionalism was probably unknown to most of the partisans. It was a pity. His personal scruples were unbending, his courtesy unfailing, his loyalty constant, and his high abilities applied with an unflagging humor that kept him secure against stuffiness.

As a war hero, lawyer, Senator, and civic servant, he was an illustrious citizen. His untimely death is saddening.

---

[From the Chicago Tribune of January 19, 1957]

POLITICAL LOOKOUT

(By George Tagge)

No one is now around who can fill the vacuum caused by the death of C. Wayland Brooks. It was not his title as Senator, nor his position as Republican national committeeman from Illinois, which made him invaluable.

Party spirit, persuasiveness, and patience were coupled with deep wisdom and his famous courage, when he rode into action on countless occasions to prevent head-on clashes in the GOP. Mostly he won for the GOP. Not always was there gratitude.

It was Curly Brooks who got the late Senator Taft to persuade top followers here to give a clear track in the 1950 primary to EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN. And it turned out that DIRKSEN was just the man to topple Scott W. Lucas, Senate Democratic majority leader.

And Curly had the boldness and perceptiveness to encourage the GOP slating of a prominent independent Democrat, Benjamin S. Adamowski, to end the 28 years of failure to elect a State's attorney.

In so doing, he helped mightily to forge the narrow reelection of Governor Stratton. For many years Curly was a fatherly adviser to Stratton, 17 years his junior.

But in 1944 Curly found a tartar in young Bill. After hours of importunities in Brooks' Palmer House suite, Stratton was still obdurate. He went ahead and ran for secretary of state nomination against Gov. Dwight H. Green's man, Arnold P. Benson, and lost. The costly primary had an almost inevitable sequel. Benson was routed in the election while other GOP State candidates won.

Stratton's was among the many grief stricken faces at the funeral. We have seldom seen so much evidence of sorrow at the final rites for a political leader. Bowed with sadness at the funeral was Charles L. Allison, administrative assistant when Brooks' was Senator. Allison, who became assistant to Lt. Gov. John William Chapman, died in his sleep hours after returning to Springfield.

[From the Chicago Tribune of January 19, 1957]

MEMORIAL CITING BROOKS' SERVICE VOTED BY COUNCIL

A resolution lauding the public service of former Senator C. Wayland Brooks, who died Monday, was passed yesterday by the city council. It was signed by all aldermen.

Alderman Bohling, who introduced the resolution, said a copy of the resolution on a scroll with printing that glows will be presented to Mr. Brooks' widow, Mary.

The resolution also offers the condolences of the city council to the family. At the time of his death, Mr. Brooks was Republican national committeeman for Illinois. Burial services were held Thursday in Kewanee, Henry County.

## LET US BUILD SCHOOLS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, so far in the 85th Congress there have been introduced in both Houses at least 24 bills to provide Federal aid for school construction.

I am proud that my school-construction bill was the first bill of any kind to be introduced in the Senate in the 85th Congress—although by some sleight-of-hand it is known as S. 197.

The point, however, is not one of authorship. The only issue involved is the adoption of an equitable program for building schools.

The speed with which the Senate acts on this matter is important. Waiting for someone else to do it first is to shirk our responsibilities.

The fact that at least 24 school-aid bills have been introduced in Congress is an encouraging one.

It shows that congressional interest in this matter is mounting steadily. The President also has put a priority tag on school-construction legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled, "The School Crisis," written by Mr. Walter Lippmann, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald on February 5, 1957, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)

THE SCHOOL CRISIS

In our home affairs the President has given top priority to the proposal that Congress grant Federal aid to States in order to build public schools. The case for this Federal aid rests on the hard fact that since the war the number of children ready for schools has grown much faster than has the construction of schoolrooms in which to teach them.

This year the enrollment in our schools exceeds their normal capacity by more than 2 million children. This means overcrowding in the classrooms to the point where great numbers of children are being denied a decent education.

This denial is in the true sense of the term an emergency. For when a child misses an education, the loss cannot be repaired easily later on. Children who do not receive a decent education when they are of school age are almost certain to go through life without having had a decent education.

The critical shortage in classrooms cannot fairly be attributed to a failure of the States and localities to meet their responsibilities. Here and there, no doubt, there are such failures. But the total effort made by the States and localities is impressive. During the past year they have built 63,000 new classrooms. This is a record, particularly when compared with 10 years ago when the rate of construction was 9,000 annually. Yet this large number will not be enough even to replace classrooms that have become obsolete and unusable and to provide for the new enrollments, which are increasing each year. Just to stand still where we are, there are needed all the new classrooms that have been built this year. In the meantime, against the total efforts of the local authorities, there is a backlog deficit of 150,000 classrooms.

In a recent publication of the Department of Commerce, it was estimated that for school construction $4 billion would be needed annually for the next 10 years. This would mean that the rate of expenditure would have to rise 60 percent over the current level, which is $2.6 billion. This increase would be a rise of $1.4 billion a year. The President is asking the Federal Government to contribute less than one quarter of this amount annually, hoping that by compelling the States to match the Federal grants, the whole need can be met. The administration offer to set up a fund of $750 million to purchase school bonds does not relieve the States and local communities from raising most of the money to pay for the new schools. It is only a loan designed to protect them against having to pay very high interest rates.

"The need," said the President in his message last week, "for Federal assistance in eliminating this shortage is not theory, but demonstrated fact. It cannot now be said—realistically—that the States and communities will meet the need. The classroom shortage has been apparent for a number of years, and the States and communities have notably increased their school building efforts. Each year, for several years, they have set a new record in school construction. And yet in the face of a vast expansion in enrollments each year, many areas are making inadequate progress in reducing the shortage."

Yet the President's proposals face formidable obstacles in Congress. There are those who on the principle of States rights object to any Federal action in relation to the public schools. There are Catholic taxpayers who feel that the parochial schools should not be excluded from Federal aid. There are the Negro politicians, led by Congressman POWELL, of New York, who wish to have Federal aid used as a means of coercing the Southern States to eliminate segregation. And last, but by no means least, there will be all those who, looking for ways to carry out Secretary Humphrey's injunction to cut expenditures, will be tempted to begin with Federal aid for the schools.

It is often asserted that all the subsidies and grants which appear in the Federal budget are there because of the special interests of pressure groups. There is, of course, some truth in this. But as a generalized rule it is untrue and grossly unfair. In the case of Federal aid for schools, it is truer and fairer to say that the opposition comes from pressure groups, whereas the support is truly national and public spirited. There is no special interest which is going to be favored specially by the adoption of these proposals. The demand for them comes from teachers and school superintendents, from parents and from civic leaders who are worrying about our failure to provide a large part of the coming generation with adequate schooling.

Indeed the support of education—by the localities, the States, and the Federal Government—is like the support of the national defense. It is a public and patriotic duty which this generation owes to the next. Can we afford to support American education? The answer is that we cannot afford not to support it. Do we have the money to support it? Well, in the past 25 years the national income has risen $300 billion while the amount we spend on education has increased by a little more than $7 billion or $8 billion.

The truth is that it is absurd to say that the richest country in the history of mankind cannot afford both to defend itself and to educate its children.

## OUR FOREIGN POLICY PREDICAMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the distinguished columnist and international affairs analyst, Mr. Walter Lippmann, delivered the annual Gideon D. Seymour memorial lecture at the University of Minnesota on Sunday, January 27.

This is as comprehensive an analysis of our whole foreign policy predicament as any I have seen in recent months. In a sweeping review of the position of the United States in the Western World, and of the Western World in the total world order, Mr. Lippmann illuminates the historic changes which have occurred in our own generation—changes which have been climaxed by the dramatic events in Hungary and the Middle East in the past few months.

Mr. Lippmann's address speaks for itself, and I shall not presume to comment upon it except in one particular. Near the conclusion of his remarks Mr. Lippmann says:

> The supreme question is whether we can, by a great effort of statesmanship, negotiate a settlement which averts these dangers. I am not saying that we can. But at least one can imagine such a settlement. It will have to be a settlement negotiated by the Western Powers with the Soviet Union and ratified by the two Germanies.
>
> It will have to provide for the reunification of the two Germanies. It will have to provide for the gradual but nevertheless definite evacuation of the European Continent up to the Soviet frontier by the Red army in the east, and by the British and American Armies in the west. Only in this way can Poland, Hungary, and the other satellites be liberated.
>
> But that will not be enough. The withdrawal of the armies, the unification of Germany, the liberation of the satellites will be possible, will be conceivable—only if we can construct by negotiation an all-European security system which is underwritten by the Soviet Union and the United States.

Mr. President, I should like to take this occasion to mention on the floor of the Senate that I have in recent months ventured suggestions similar to those which I have just quoted from Mr. Lippmann's address. No one doubts that this is a serious, complicated, and delicate matter. But it is clear to me that our policy in Europe is in danger of becoming rigid and inflexible.

Alternatives for our present policies must be considered and evaluated well in advance of their possible application.

It was with this in mind last December that the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament released staff study No. 5 on Control and Reduction of Armaments—Disarmament and Security in Europe.

In my personal preface to that staff study I asked the question:

> Can the reunification of Germany be brought to fruition and under what conditions? * * * New developments call for modified if not new approaches. * * * I am

not referring to total and comprehensive plans. I am thinking of specific proposals for Europe that could be a beginning in the endeavor to evolve a new European security system based on a limitation of armaments and armed forces in the area. Such a beginning could help to reduce tensions between the Western Nations and the Soviet bloc. It could help set patterns which might be applied on a wider scale.

One proposal which ought to be explored more fully in future negotiations is that of creating a geographical zone in which military equipment and manpower would be kept at a prescribed limit. Such a zone would act as a buffer between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers. An inspection system should be instituted to insure that armaments and armed forces permitted within the zone would not be exceeded. The United States, Great Britain, France, and the Federal Republic of Germany have each discussed the possibility of a demilitarized zone in Europe. The U. S. S. R. has also made general statements about such a geographical zone. The negotiations among the major powers on this point, however, have not reached the stage of implementing the proposal. More detailed discussions on the establishment of a demilitarized zone should be undertaken.

At the same time I issued a press release with an elaboration of my views on the advisability of exploring mutual troop withdrawals in Central Europe. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this press release be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"The United States and its allies in Western Europe should show more imagination and initiative in pressing for new ways and means of bringing about the reunification of Germany and the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Eastern Europe," Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said today.

"So long as Germany remains divided, it is a potential battlefield for the beginning of world war III," he declared.

HUMPHREY made his statement releasing a subcommittee staff study entitled "Disarmament and Security in Europe." The study deals with the development of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Western Europe and of the Warsaw pact in Eastern Europe. It also considers the problems involved in the reduction of armed forces, the control of nuclear weapons, and the creation of neutral zones or demilitarized belts. Finally, it discusses the overriding question involved in the continued division of Germany.

"It is clear," HUMPHREY said, "that Germany is the key to the kind of European political settlement which might lead to real progress toward disarmament. A decade of fruitless negotiations with the Soviet Union has demonstrated, however, that our policy toward Germany has not attained one of its major objectives—the reunification of that country based on free, honest elections. The time has come, therefore, to consider other means which may be more effective in achieving this objective.

"If Germany poses the sort of political question whose settlement might result in real progress toward disarmament, then equally the settlement of the security problem in Europe, particularly as it comes to a focus in the central and eastern regions of that Continent, is a key to the German problem.

"Consequently, I suggest," the Senator went on, "that in future negotiations there ought to be fuller exploration of the proposal, referred to in this study, for creating a geographical zone in Europe in which military equipment and manpower would be kept at a prescribed limitation. Such a zone would act as a buffer between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers. However, the negotiations on the creation of such a zone that have already taken place between the Western Powers and the Soviet Union have not reached the stage of implementing the proposal with details.

"In further negotiations relating either to demilitarization or to troop withdrawals," the Senator said, "the United States would need to be alert to several factors: (1) Any redeployment of troops in the zone must not weaken the overall relative military strength of NATO powers in Europe, and in no case should American troops be withdrawn from the European area; (2) the security of all European states from armed aggression from any source must be assured; (3) the agreement on setting up the zone of limited armaments and forces must include provision for the reunification of Germany in freedom; and (4) a balance of armed forces and armaments between the sides within the zone must be maintained.

"It is always difficult to anticipate what the Soviet reaction to any proposal will be, but something along the lines I have suggested could provide the basis for negotiations," the Senator declared. "In any event, the fundamental changes which have obviously been taking place in Eastern Europe make the present a particularly good time to reassess our position in Europe and to seek new solutions. And I want to emphasize strongly that this process should take place in the closest consultation with the other members of NATO, and particularly with the German Federal Republic. This is no issue on which the United States can, or should, proceed unilaterally."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a week later, in a speech at the Overseas Press Club in New York, I expressed the same views.

Mr. President, I am delighted that so wise an astute and observer of the contemporary scene as Mr. Walter Lippmann seems to have reached generally the same conclusions that I have on the importance of exploring these new alternatives in Europe. His proposals in the context of his brilliant analysis of world affairs are particularly striking. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Lippmann's address at the University of Minnesota be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of January 28, 1957]

LIPPMANN SAYS UNITED STATES IS MAPPING NEW WORLD POLICY

We have met here today to do honor to the memory of Gideon D. Seymour, a newspaperman, who, until his untimely death in 1954, served with so much distinction as the executive editor of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune. Although I never worked with him personally, he was a close and beloved friend of many of my own close friends.

And I have always been aware of the high place he occupied in the newspaper world and in this community. Gideon Seymour was a great credit to the profession of journalism and his name is honored throughout the profession. I am proud to belong to the newspaper family to which he belonged and to be able to say that as a result I am, in a small way, at home among you here in Minnesota.

It is now some months since I first heard from my friend, John Cowles, that the university authorities were thinking of asking me to be the speaker on this occasion.

I have given much thought to the choice of a subject, and in the end, I concluded that as one newspaperman speaking in honor of another newspaperman, I should talk about current events. More exactly, I made up my mind to try to talk to you about the American position in the world as it is now.

I can tell you in a word where we are now. We are in the midst of making up our minds. We are in the midst of the business of finding out where we actually are, of trying to understand a world situation which is very new and is in large part hidden by censorship or obscured by propaganda.

No one, I think, not even at the top of affairs and therefore on the inside of all of the available information, can as yet see clearly, can as yet see as a whole, where we really are and where we ought to go.

I was speaking about this the other day to a friend of mine who works in the Government on the making of foreign policy. "We are rewriting the book," he said, "but we are still somewhere about chapter 3, and we don't know yet what is going to happen to the hero, to the girl, or to his rival. We know that he and the girl are going to have many ups and downs, and we have no guaranty that they will be married and live happily ever after."

WORLD CHANGED NOW

Everyone knows, of course, that we are in a time of rapid, radical and complicated change. Now, in itself, change is far from being a new experience for the generation to which I belong. We have lived amidst great events for which we were unprepared. We have become involved in wars which we expected to stay out of. We have hoped great things from victory and we have never seen a good peace. But now, if I may put it that way, the world is changed for Americans, not only in the degree of our involvement with the outer world, but in the very kind of our involvement with the rest of the world.

Throughout the 19th century, and during the two World Wars of this century, we have thought that we were living in one world. We have thought that this world had its political center in the Western society, the society which consists of Europe and the Americas, the society to which we belong.

Even the most anti-imperialistic among us has assumed this. We have supposed that all the nations—the old ones who were breaking with the past, the new ones who were emerging from colonial status—that all the nations would have the same fundamental political ideals which we have, not because they are our ideals but because these ideals are universal.

We have believed all mankind would move toward the same rules of law that we believe in, that they would arrive at essentially the same conception of the rights of man that we have, and that all the new nations would eventually develop the same democratic and parliamentary institutions as we have.

The greatest and most fundamental change of our time is that this picture of ourselves and of our place in the world and of our role in the history of mankind is no longer valid. The culture, the ideology, of the Western society is no longer recognized as universal. It is challenged, as it has not been challenged since Christendom was challenged by the expansion of Islam.

WEST ONLY PLANET

The one world which we always have taken for granted in our thinking has been succeeded by many worlds. We now live amidst these many worlds. They compete with one another, they coexist with one another. They trade with one another and, in varying degrees, they cooperate with one another.

This change from one world to several worlds is a deep change. It is a change not only in what we think about for foreign policy but in the very way that we have to think about it.

In our political thinking, that is to say in the thinking of the Western World, it is a change comparable with the change from the Ptolemaic to the Copernican astronomy, from the view that this earth is the center of the universe to the view that this earth is only a planet in its solar system. The Western society which was once the center of the political universe is now only a planet, a big planet no doubt, but still a planet in a much larger solar system.

It is this new situation which we are trying to understand. It is in this new situation that we are trying to get our bearings and to feel our way forward.

But in order to do this, we must first look back and see how United States foreign policy was, until very recently, controlled by the underlying conception of the 19th century—the conception of one world whose political center was in the North Atlantic region of the globe. This conception has underlain our thinking in foreign affairs not only throughout the 19th century but down through both of the World Wars of this century.

In the First World War we were drawn in when Britain and her ally, France, were threatened with defeat. We were no longer able to remain isolated from Europe and unentangled with the wars of Europe, as we had been during the 19th century. But how were we drawn in the First World War? We were drawn in to reinforce Great Britain. We were the auxiliaries and the reserves. We called ourselves an associated power, and our troops fought in Europe under a supreme commander who was a French general and our Navy was under the overall command of the British admiralty.

BRILLIANT ILLUSION

When the war ended in 1918, we hoped and believed that we had won a victory for the idea that the principles and ideals of the Western society are universal. Woodrow Wilson proclaimed a world order. But it was a world order based on our Western principles and ideals. Moreover, it was to be an order in which the nations of the North Atlantic region would continue to be the political leaders of mankind.

On the surface, there was in 1918 much to justify this optimistic view. The North Atlantic community had won a smashing military victory, and the United States had emerged as a new and powerful member of the Western society. Russia was still a primitive country in the throes of a deep social revolution. China was a feeble and backward country, divided up among fo.. gn powers. India was still under British rule. North Africa, the Middle East, and Southeast Asia were under British or French imperial dominion. On the surface, in Woodrow Wilson's time it looked as if Britain and France, reinforced by the United States and Canada, could prolong indefinitely the world order that had existed in the 19th century.

We now know that this was a brilliant illusion. Both France and Britain were profoundly weakened by their fearful losses in the First World War. As representatives of the Western philosophy, they were challenged as imperialists over all Asia and Africa. We did not know this in 1918. We took it for granted that with American military and financial help the worldwide predominance of the Atlantic community would continue.

In the Second World War, the role played by the United States was no longer that of an associated power bringing up the reinforcements and the reserves. But before Pearl Harbor, and before we actually entered the Second World War, we still thought of ourselves in terms of World War I. We used to talk, you may remember, about aiding the Allies to defend America. In fact, however, it was soon plain that we must take up the whole burden of the war in the Pacific, including the defense of Australia and of New Zealand. In Europe, the French Army had been defeated and Great Britain was under violent assault and strained to the limit. We had not only to supply the weapons and other economic necessities, but that we had to raise a great army ourselves.

The difference between the two World Wars is marked by the fact that in the second, as distinguished from the first, the supreme commanders on sea and on land were Americans. Nevertheless, until World War II ended, we could still believe—perhaps I should say that we tried still to believe—that as when Britain and France and Western Europe recovered from the damages of the war, the North Atlantic community would still be the political center of the world.

I venture to believe that in the last analysis this was the underlying assumption in the minds of both Churchill and Roosevelt at the close of the war. They believed that with Britain and America acting as partners, they could handle Russia and have the deciding voice in the postwar settlement. They were mistaken.

The fact of the matter is that Churchill himself was so big that he made the British power look bigger than it was. It soon appeared that Britain, though it was a great power by the old standards, was not like the United States and the U. S. S. R., a superpower. It was soon evident that in the postwar world the Atlantic community, with the British-American partnership at its core, was no longer the paramount power in the world.

POWER CENTER SHIFTS

Since the war we have found ourselves in a position different from any in our whole political experience. We are no longer members of a world order which is accepted by mankind as universal. There are other world orders which challenge ours and compete with it.

What is more, throughout our history as a nation the center of world power has been in the North Atlantic region of the globe, and the fundamental decisions of our foreign policy have had to do with our relations in the North Atlantic, particularly our relations with Great Britain.

We achieved our independence amidst the rivalry of the North Atlantic powers. We developed this continent in security behind the supremacy of the British powers. We fought the First World War as the auxiliary of the Atlantic powers. We fought the Second World War as the leading power of the Atlantic community. Now this is fundamentally altered.

The greatest powers with which we have to concern ourselves are no longer in the North Atlantic region. They are in Eastern Europe and in Asia. While the welfare of the Atlantic community is a close and vital interest of the United States, the Atlantic community is no longer the political center of the world. We are living amidst the decline of Britain as one of the leading powers of the world, and we find ourselves without a powerful ally in face of the new powers of Eastern Europe and of Asia and of Africa.

To dramatize the rapid changes in the past 100 years, we might say that through most of the 19th century the world capital was London. After the First World War, the world capitals were London and Washington. After the Second World War, the world capitals were Washington, Moscow, and London. Now the world capitals are Washington, Moscow, London, Peiping, Delhi, and, who knows, perhaps eventually, also Cairo.

I said earlier, and I must say again, that we are in a wholly new situation. It is not a clearly visible situation with all its landmarks and features well defined. There are no reliable maps. This is, in part, because so much of the world is hidden by censorship and obscured by propaganda.

But another reason, and perhaps a more compelling reason, why there are no reliable maps is that so much of the world is in the midst of revolutionary changes of which we cannot foresee the outcome.

Nevertheless, we must try to find our bearings, to find out where we are and what is around us. And one way to do this is to look back and to remind ourselves where we came from and how we got where we are.

We must, I think, go back about 12 years to the winter of 1945 when Roosevelt and Churchill were on their way to Yalta in the Russian Crimea. The end of the world war was in sight. They were on their way to Yalta in order to negotiate with Stalin about the armistices which would end the fighting.

As we all know, they did not reach an agreement on what should be the terms of the peace treaties with the two powerful enemies they expected soon to defeat. But they did agree on the general terms of the armistices they expected to make with Germany and Japan.

WHAT STARTED BREAKUP?

I hope I can say what I have to say here about Yalta without entering into and stirring up again the furious controversy which has raged about it ever since. The point about which there cannot be serious dispute is that Yalta was followed in May by the German armistice and in August by the Japanese armistice.

Now an armistice is essentially an agreement, first to stop shooting, and then it is an agreement as to where the armed forces are to stand still. In substance, the armistices of 1945 reflected and registered the military situation as the Big Three at Yalta expected it would be when the fighting ended.

The lines of the armistices of the Second World War are what we have since come to know as the line of the Iron Curtain. The Iron Curtain is where the Red Army settled down when the fighting stopped. This line still divides Germany. It still divides Europe. And in Asia the lines which now divides the Communist from the non-Communist powers is essentially the line of the American occupation at the time of the ceasefire.

This, then, was the situation of the postwar world as it took shape from the armistice lines. Today we are living amidst the breakup and the disintegration of the postwar world.

The question I should now like to discuss is how this disintegration started, and what caused this breakup.

As a result of the Yalta conference the world was divided into two great spheres of influence. In the one sphere, where the Soviet Union was supreme, Stalin tried to create a new Russian Empire. This empire was founded primarily on the power of the Red army. In fact, the empire was the territory occupied by the Red army. Stalin's purposes was to make the people of Eastern Europe docile satellites or colonies of the new Russian Empire.

The other sphere comprised the rest of the world. It was an unorganized collection of old and new states. It consisted not only of Western Europe, Latin America, and the United States, but also of the old European empires, which then extended across north Africa, Egypt, and the Middle East through India and Southeast Asia to the Dutch Empire in Indonesia. In this sphere, the United States took the initiative in trying to make sure that the Soviet Union did not extend its empire.

As the principal military arm of the Communist sphere was the Red army, so the principal military aim of the non-Communist sphere was the United States Strategic Air Force equipped with atomic bombs.

This situation lasted until about 1950, as long as only the Soviets had an effective

army and only the United States had the atomic bomb. In this uneasy balance of power, the Red army was supreme on the ground in all of Europe and Asia; the United States Strategic Air Force was supreme in the air over Europe and Asia.

Each acted as a deterrent on the other. As against an invasion by the Red army, Western Europe was wholly defenseless. Yet the Red army did not and could not overrun Western Europe. It was contained because the Kremlin knew what the United States Air Force could do to the Russian cities.

POSTWAR STALEMATE

On the other hand, one might say vice versa, the United States was held in check by the Red army. Let me say a word about how we were held in check. The very highest American military authorities knew that if we struck at the Russian cities, the Red army, which was already in Eastern Europe, would overrun Western Europe.

It would occupy the countries of Western Europe against which we could not use the atomic bomb, countries such as Western Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium and France. When the Red army did that it would destroy the existing governments. It would liquidate the existing leaders in all classes and, before it could be forced to retire, it would probably destroy the big cities and the industrial plants of Western Europe.

This was the postwar stalemate, the Red army as against the atomic bomb.

The breakup of the postwar world was fairly foreseeable as soon as this original postwar stalemate was broken. In September 1949, the Soviet Union set off an atomic bomb of its own. This event announced to the world that the American monopoly was over and that a situation, which was radically different from that of the postwar years, would not develop.

The breaking of the American monopoly meant the beginning of a race in nuclear armaments. This was a terrifying prospect. It set in motion a strong tendency towards disintegration inside both the Stalinist empire and inside the Western coalition.

Once it was evident that there were going to be two rival superpowers, each armed with nuclear weapons, the nations which had no nuclear weapons began to feel desperately insecure. They were in danger of being destroyed in a war that would be fought with weapons they themselves did not possess.

They could not defend themselves against those weapons. They could not strike back. They were bound, therefore, to make it their central national purpose to stay out of a big war if, because of acts of criminal folly, a big war could not be prevented. It was under these conditions that what we call neutralism was born and soon began rapidly to spread.

If we say that at Yalta the postwar world was divided into two great spheres of influence, then I would say that when the race of nuclear armaments got under way—beginning in 1949 but rising to a climax with the hydrogen bomb—the two great spheres of influence began to disintegrate. No doubt there were other reasons. But the trigger which set the forces of disintegration in rapid motion in both spheres was the race of nuclear armaments.

On both sides of the Iron Curtain the pent-up forces of nationalism were released. On our side of the Iron Curtain these forces invoked the slogan of anticolonialism and anti-imperialism. On the other side of the Iron Curtain, they have been invoking the slogan of anti-Stalinism.

ALLIANCES CRUMBLE

These upheavals have, of course, a long history. The liquidation of the Western empires is one of the great historical phenomena of the 20th century, and the national opposition by Hungarians and Poles to Russian domination began long ago in the past. But when the atomic race began in 1949, nationalism and neutralism became urgent and passionate because they offered a means of staying out of war, a means of self-defense, and indeed a means of survival.

The terrifying destructiveness of the hydrogen bomb was demonstrated between November 1952, when we exploded ours, and August 1953, when the Soviets exploded theirs. Politically and psychologically, these gigantic explosions have jarred loose, they have dislocated and pulled apart, much of the political structure of the postwar world. The disintegration of the old European empires in Asia and Africa has been accelerated. The disintegration of the new Russian empire in Europe has been started. The structure of alliances on both sides of the Iron Curtain has begun to crumble.

It was when he realized this, that President Eisenhower made his historic declaration that there is now no alternative to peace. The Russians had also realized what the revolution in military weapons meant. This common realization in Moscow and Washington led to the famous meeting at the summit, which took place in Geneva a year and a half ago, in July of 1955.

At that meeting, Russia and the United States acknowledged publicly to each other and before the world that with the advent of the new weapons they could not, they would not, they dared not contemplate war.

At the time of the Geneva meeting, we were all aware that, beyond these mutual declarations against war, there were no serious agreements reached, or even brought any nearer, on any of the great practical issues of the time—on, for example, the reunification of the two Germanies, on the problem of the status of the satellites in Eastern Europe, on the future of the Middle East.

There is no way of telling whether or not the opportunity existed to go on from Geneva to settlements of some of these problems. If the opportunity existed, it was missed. On our side, the President fell ill and was unable for some time to take the initiative in foreign affairs.

On the other side, the Russians stood pat and were unyielding. We do not know what might have been. But what has actually happened, is that while we have come no nearer to settlements in Europe, in the Middle East and in the Far East, there has been a rapid disintegration of empires and of alliances.

We can see what has happened to the French in North Africa and to the British in the Middle East. We know from what has happened in Poland and in Hungary that the Soviet empire in eastern Europe is undermined, and that the Soviet military system, which is known as the Warsaw pact, is profoundly affected. We know that if NATO is going to survive, it is going to have a very different future from what we expected.

WHAT LIES AHEAD?

A few months ago, at the end of October, the course of events, which I have been describing, burst into violence. It is a remarkable fact, which historians will long be studying and trying to explain, that the explosion in Hungary and the explosion in Egypt took place at approximately the same time.

The fact that the two explosions came so very close together may not have been a mere accident. It may well be that the Israeli Government decided to strike when it saw that the Soviet Union was deeply entangled by the rebellion in Hungary. But the two explosions would not have happened if both in Eastern Europe and in the Middle East the situation had not become explosive.

These two explosions marked the disintegration of the postwar world.

You will want me to say before I conclude what I see emerging from all this. This is not so easy, and no doubt I am foolish to try. But here at least are some of the things I see coming out of it.

There will remain the fundamental stalemate between the Soviet Union and the United States, the stalemate which was recognized by the President and the Soviet leaders at Geneva in 1955.

In all probability, neither of the superpowers will decide deliberately to make war against the other. On the other hand, both in Europe and in the Middle East, there are very grave issues which, if they cannot be settled by negotiation, may burst into violence. They may become uncontrollable, and they could involve Russia and America in a war they are both trying to avoid.

In Europe the question is whether the Soviet empire can be liquidated in a peaceable and orderly way. If it is not, we must be prepared to see the kind of thing that has happened in Hungary spread to Eastern Germany. If there is armed rebellion in Eastern Germany and the Red army is used to suppress it, there is little likelihood that the West Germans will sit quietly on the sidelines.

They will almost certainly join in, perhaps not officially at first, but as volunteers, and this will put the American and the British Armies in Western Germany in a very dangerous predicament. For one could hardly expect the Russians to leave West Germany alone if it becomes the base of a rebellion in Eastern Germany. All of this could readily enough lead to a world war.

The supreme question is whether we can, by a great effort of statesmanship, negotiate a settlement which averts these dangers. I am not saying that we can. But at least one can imagine such a settlement. It will have to be a settlement negotiated by the Western Powers with the Soviet Union and ratified by the two Germanies.

It will have to provide for the reunification of the two Germanies. It will have to provide for the gradual but nevertheless definite evacuation of the European Continent up to the Soviet frontier by the Red army in the east, and by the British and American Armies in the west. Only in this way can Poland, Hungary, and the other satellites be liberated.

But that will not be enough. The withdrawal of the armies, the unification of Germany, the liberation of the satellites will be possible, will be conceivable—only if we can construct by negotiation an all-European security system which is underwritten by the Soviet Union and the United States.

It will have to be a system which guarantees the European nations among themselves, and particularly against a revived and reunited Germany. It will have to be a system which guarantees all of Europe against Russia, and it will have to be one which guarantees Russia against Europe. Within such a European system there ought to develop an all-European economy, and beyond that—on the far horizons of hope—the prospect of a European political confederation.

In my view the issue of war and peace will be decided primarily in Europe, and, so to speak, along the line of the Iron Curtain. The greatest question in the world is whether Europe can cease to be divided and can become united by negotiation and peaceable means.

I would go so far as to say that if we could engage the Russians in a serious negotiation which looked to a general European settlement, the problem of the Middle East would become—I won't say soluble—but manageable. I say this because Russia is not vitally interested in the Middle East.

She does not need the oil, and she cannot be invaded from the Middle East. Russia is, however, vitally interested in Europe, particularly in Germany and in Poland, and it is there in Europe that we must make a settlement or live in continual danger of a gigantic war.

TWO GREAT MISSIONS

When I look into the future I think of this country as having two great missions to perform. The one is to bring about the European settlement I have just been describing. On this, as I have just said, depends the issue of peace or war. From such a settlement would come a new Europe, a Europe which had lost its empires overseas but had found a new strength, security, and prosperity in its own unity.

Our other mission is, I firmly believe, to work out a new relationship between the Western nations and the newly emancipated peoples of Africa and Asia. The imperial and colonial age is over. The age which is to follow is only in its dim beginnings, and it is our mission to play a leading part in working out the terms on which the peoples of the East and the peoples of the West can live side by side in confidence, in security, and in mutual respect.

This is about as far as I can see into the future, and about all I can say is that in the years that lie ahead of us it will take good nerves to live and to find our way, and to act honorably and to preserve the peace. We have great problems at home, which arise from the enormous growth of our population and the deep changes caused by applied science. We shall be under severe pressure from abroad and we shall need constant vigilance and alertness and resourcefulness.

It will not be good enough to have good nerves though we shall need them. We shall have to have knowledge of what is going on around us. We shall have to understand what we know. For that we shall need more than we have ever needed them before, wise and devoted reporters and editors, like Gideon Seymour whom we salute today.

"There are other world orders which challange ours and compete with it."

"The greatest powers with which we have to concern ourselves are no longer in the North Atlantic region. They are in Eastern Europe and in Asia," Lippmann said.

And, with the decline of Britain, he pointed out, we find ourselves without a powerful ally.

Because no agreement was reached with Stalin on adjusting world problems at the end of the war, "the line we have since come to know as the Iron Curtain" crystallized where Communist armies settled down after the shooting stopped, Lippmann explained.

At first, the situation was stabilized by the stalemate between the American atom bomb, which could destroy Russian cities, and the Red army, which could overrun and destroy Western Europe, Lippmann declared.

This statement was replaced by another when Russia broke America's monopoly on nuclear weapons, he went on. Forces were set in motion that have eroded postwar empires and alliances.

Nationalism and neutralism grew in nations that lacked nuclear weapons and did not want to get involved in a war between the two superpowers, he declared.

Behind the Iron Curtain, Russia's satellite empire began to crumble. On this side, military alliances and old spheres of influence became badly disjointed.

Lippmann cited the recent explosions in Hungary and Egypt as the most dramatic and significant symptoms of the disintegration of the postwar world.

Admitting that it is possibly foolish to try to see what will emerge from this, Lippmann ventured these forecasts:

The stalemate will continue between Russia and the United States.

There will be no deliberately started war, but grave issues in Europe and the Middle East may burst into uncontainable violence unless settlements are negotiated.

We must expect satellite unrest to spread to East Germany unless the Soviet Empire can be liquidated in a peaceable and orderly way.

If the Red army intervenes in East Germany, West Germany surely will become involved and Americans and British forces there will be in a very dangerous predicament. This could readily enough lead to war.

"The supreme question is whether we can, by a great effort of statesmanship, negotiate a settlement which averts these dangers," Lippmann observed. "I am not saying we can. But, at least, one can imagine such a settlement."

It would have to be ratified by East and West Germany and reunify them. It must provide for the withdrawal of the Red army to the Soviet frontier and of American and British forces from the Continent.

This still will not be enough, he warned.

We will have to construct an all-European security system, underwritten by the Soviet Union and the United States. It will have to guarantee European nations against each other, against a rebuilt Germany and safeguard all of Europe from Russia and Russia from all of Europe.

Within such a system, there should develop an all-European economy and "on the far horizon of hope" prospects of a European political confederation.

The issue of war or peace can only be settled in central Europe, after which problems such as the Middle East will become manageable, Lippmann believes.

America has "two great missions to perform," he said. One is to bring about the above European settlement; the other to work out new relationships between Western nations and the newly emancipated peoples of Africa and Asia.

"The years ahead will take good nerves to live and to find our way and to act honorably and to preserve the peace," Lippmann warned.

"We shall have to have knowledge of what is going on around us. We shall have to understand what we know. For that we shall need, more than ever we have needed them before, wise and devoted reporters and editors like Gideon Seymour, whom we salute today."

## THE EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY BILL—LETTER FROM NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PETROLEUM RETAILERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, under the date of January 25th I received a communication from the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers calling to my attention important legislation introduced in this Congress, H. R. 11 and S. 11, the equality of opportunity bill.

I am a cosponsor of S. 11, and intend to actively support its passage in this Congress. Because of the information that Mr. Cash B. Hawley, president of the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, has presented in his letter of January 25th, I wish to bring it to the attention of the entire Senate. I encourage each Member of Congress to study it carefully. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PETROLEUM RETAILERS,
*Detroit, Mich., January 25, 1957.*

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: No practice has done so much to destroy free enterprise in the retail petroleum industry as price discrimination. Over the years it has put service-station operators at the economic mercy of their major oil-company suppliers who all too often have been able to crush independent brand competition, move surplus gasoline and reduce their own retailers' margins—by giving a discriminatory discount to one or a few dealers, and making others sell the product at a loss in order to compete.

As shown by the record, Congress intended to prevent such destructive price-discrimination practices when it adopted the Robinson-Patman Act—but the Supreme Court decision in the Standard Oil-Detroit case in 1951, which opened up the good-faith loophole, has destroyed the effectiveness of this protection by letting the good-faith defense prevail even where competition is substantially lessened and monopoly fostered by the discrimination involved. As a result, price-discrimination practices permitted by this decision are weakening and destroying small business across the country and fostering the growth of monopoly in industry after industry.

As the national trade association of service-station operators, we believe the injury to small business in general and to the Nation's service-station operators in particular caused by the Supreme Court decision in the Standard Oil-Detroit case will continue to deepen and worsen until Congress acts to remedy this situation.

We were deeply hopeful of congressional action to correct this problem in the last session when the Equality of Opportunity bill passed the House by vote of 393 to 3 and was unanimously approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee. While this bill failed of adoption at the last minute through lack of time, it has been reintroduced as H. R. 11 and S. 11, the Equality of Opportunity bill, and every single reason which supported its adoption in the last session applies with even greater force at the present time.

In behalf of the Nation's 200,000 service station operators, we earnestly request your help to secure the adoption of this desperately needed legislation as early as possible in the present session. The mounting rate of small business failures, the injury to consumers as (in industry after industry) they are forced to pay higher monopoly prices, the increasing injury to small business economic freedom and opportunity which we are witnessing—all cry out for congressional action against monopolistic price discrimination practices. Those who profit from these monopolistic practices have a right to be heard in their defense, but we ask you to weigh the interests of small business, consumers and the American system of opportunity against such promonopolistic interests—and to vigorously support our cause.

We also ask you to be alert to pro-monopoly propaganda in the guise of small business' communications. We are receiving reports that various major oil companies are propagandizing and pressuring their short-term lessee operators to wire Congress in opposition to this bill which is and has been strongly supported by service station operators through the years. Since these lessee retailers can be forced out of their stations on a few days notice, it is not surprising that some are yielding to company influence and pressure. This is occurring in spite of the fact that service station operators across the country are substantially unanimous in supporting the Equality of Opportunity bill and in spite of the fact that there are probably more complaints of price discrimination from service station operators than from any other business group in the country.

You have undoubtedly heard from members of one or more of our affiliated associations in 36 States in support of the Equality of Opportunity bill and asking your help in securing its adoption. In closing, we assure you of the united support of service station

operators across America for this legislation and of the desperate need for its adoption at the earliest date.

We will appreciate hearing from you as to the progress of this vitally important measure.

Sincerely yours,

CASH B. HAWLEY, *President.*

## PRICE INCREASE BY UNION OIL & GAS COMPANY OF LOUISIANA

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I was shocked by the recent action of the Federal Power Commission in permitting a 108 percent increase in the prices charged by the Union Oil & Gas Company of Louisiana without first investigating and scheduling a public hearing.

The Union company, which delivers natural gas to the Texas Gas Transmission Co., which in turn serves large portions of west Tennessee and other areas, filed its proposed increase with the Federal Power Commission on October 2 of last year. The date of the proposed increase was January 1. Under the National Gas Act, however, the Federal Power Commission has authority to suspend the effective date of any increase for a period of 5 months, during which time an investigation can be made and the affected areas can be heard from.

Therefore, the Federal Power Commission could have suspended the increase until May 1.

In this case, the Federal Power Commission, has now authorized the increase to become effective on February 15. No hearing has yet been scheduled. Eventually there will be a hearing, I am told, and the company will have to file assurances guaranteeing repayment if the increase is not sustained.

Nevertheless, I have never seen more highhanded action from a Federal bureau presumably constituted to protect the public interest.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It occurs to me to ask the Senator from Tennessee whether it is his belief that if the members of the Federal Power Commission pay attention to the statements made by President Eisenhower yesterday, at his press conference, about the importance of stopping inflation, they may hold the hearing before February 15 arrives.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I certainly thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for that contribution.

After the President in his state of the Union message and otherwise has asked that the line be held against inflation, it is strange to find that the Federal Power Commission, some members of which President Eisenhower has appointed—and it is an executive agency—is granting an increase of 108 percent, without holding a hearing. It seems that the members of the Commission do not pay any attention to the President's statements.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield again to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that the Federal Power Commission has the authority to investigate this matter, and that through the Federal Power Commission the Government has the power to do so, and it is not necessary to wait upon voluntary compliance in response to exhortations from the White House, of industries which wish to raise prices?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from Wyoming is entirely correct. The purpose of the Federal Power Commission is to protect the interests of the users of products coming under its jurisdiction, so as to see that they are treated fairly. But in this case the Commission certainly is not doing so.

I think it is also interesting, in connection with the inquiry of the Senator from Wyoming, to note that in the case of the hearing over which he is presiding, whereas the President asked that the line against inflation be held, Mr. Wormser, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, and other Government agents sitting on the Middle East Emergency Committee have not even raised their voices to ask the giant oil companies to stop gouging American consumers, growing out of a situation resulting from the blocking of the Suez Canal.

Mr. President, I cannot conceive of any set of circumstances which would cause any company to be justified in suddenly increasing its prices 108 percent. Surely any increase in costs justifying such an increase would have been building up over a long period of time. A 25-percent increase would be shocking to me. A 108-percent increase is absolutely overwhelming.

It is hard to see why President Eisenhower thinks the natural gas bill, relaxing Federal controls, is necessary, as he recommended in his state of the Union message.

It would seem that if this is an example of Federal Power Commission control, there are now no Federal regulations, for all practical purposes. If the natural gas producers can start charging 108 percent more, without even so much as giving the affected parties a right to be heard, then it is a farce to say that the Federal Power Commission is a regulatory body.

The Federal Power Commission is a quasi-judicial body and is a creature of Congress. It is high time that Congress began to exercise responsibility for the behavior of its creature. I am studying possible amendments to the statute, but I do not think that is the seat of the problem.

The problem, I believe, is not in the law, but is in the people who administer the law. Despite the fact that they are executive appointees, Congress has a responsibility to call the present action to the attention of the appropriate Congressional committees exercising jurisdiction over the Federal Power Commission. The President constantly pleads for holding the line against inflation. Yet this price increase is an inflationary move of the worst kind. Mr. President, it is high time that the Federal Power Commission and other regulatory agencies of the Federal Government start to follow the advice of the President.

Mr. President, the Railway and Public Service Commission of Tennessee has shown foresight and has acted properly in asking for a hearing on this order, which was issued before a hearing was allowed. My colleague, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and I and several members of the Tennessee delegation in the House of Representatives have joined in expressing the hope that the Federal Power Commission will reconsider this increase. Certainly the Commission should do so.

## UNWISDOM OF BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SMALLER APPROPRIATION FOR NATIONAL CANCER RESEARCH

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to indicate my disappointment over the fact that administration budget recommendations in the vital realm of cancer research call for less funds than were appropriated by Congress during the current fiscal year.

The proposal of the Eisenhower administration in this field is for the expenditure of $46,902,000. This is approximately a million and a half dollars less than the present allotment for the National Cancer Institute of $48,432,000.

Furthermore, the current cancer-research appropriation was achieved only after a valiant and prolonged effort by many of us in the Senate under the able leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. After all, the present sum of $48,432,000 virtually doubles the fiscal 1956 sum of $24,978,000—and it again represents a vast increase over earlier administration requests.

Mr. President, the head of the Eisenhower administration often tells the Nation that he is liberal in human matters but conservative in financial matters. If there is any one zone of Government where liberalism in human matters is vital to human beings of every age and stratum of life, it is in funds and support for the National Cancer Institute. What could be more crucial and important than constant and ever-expanding research into the causes and possible cure of the sinister disease which threatens all mankind from the cradle to the tomb? Yet it was only through the most persistent and tireless work that we were able to secure the $48 million investment for the onslaught against cancer—an investment 50 percent greater than that proposed by the administration for fiscal year 1957.

In my opinion, the present appropriation for Government support of cancer research, far from being reduced by 3 percent, should have been increased by at least 100 percent—perhaps even more. The administration recommendation represents a falling back in our progress along one of the most vital of all avenues in the domain of health. It is regrettable that a budget of $72 billion includes fewer funds for cancer research, instead of additional funds for an undertaking so important to every man, woman, and child on the face of the globe.

This one recommendation tends to refute much of the talk from the White House and from the administration's many fountainheads of propaganda about the burning concern of this regime for human matters and for human beings. Actions always speak louder than words.

Mr. President, the administration is still thinking in pygmy terms with respect to the war against disease. Unhesitatingly, billions are budgeted for tanks or battleships or bombing planes. By contrast we are stingy with mere millions when sickness is the enemy, rather than a foreign foe. We spend less attempting to solve the terrible riddle of cancer than we do, for example, on the fittings for one aircraft carrier of the *Forrestal* class.

The former head of our Public Service, Dr. Leonard Scheele, once informed me that the National Cancer Institute could ultimately utilize $500 million in a single year in an all-out crash program of medical research into the ominous roots of cancer. This sum sounds fantastic; yet Americans spend over $15 billion a year on liquor and tobacco, $280 million for chewing gum, and $116 million for shampoos. Why not twice as much for cancer research as for gum? Every dollar invested in cancer research can be amortized in longer, happier, and healthier lives. Victory on this crucial battlefield would not only reduce immeasurably the tragic toll of human suffering, but would bolster our manpower resources and increase our productive strength.

## ADMINISTRATION OF THE DROUGHT PROGRAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last week when I came before the Senate presenting some more of the record in regard to the administration of the drought program, and the failure of the Department of Agriculture to give the much-needed assistance to my State, I commented that this refusal had resulted in bankruptcy of many of our family sized farms.

Typical of many such letters I have received is one telling how a Missouri farmer in Caldwell County was forced to sell his farm because his pastures were dried up and he could not afford to buy feed for his dairy cows. To save unnecessary embarrassment, I have removed the sender's name, and ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I notice that my county of Caldwell is not included in the list of counties to receive relief and for your information there is a comparatively small area along the southern border of Caldwell County that has had three successive droughts. I know, for I am one of the victims. I was operating a grade "A" dairy, having accumulated one of the finest dairy herds in this area, but I was compelled, because of the severe drought during 1956, to disperse my fine dairy herd and quit. I was not able to grow enough hay and other feed to carry one cow through the winter and until spring; and I had a herd of 50 head. Because almost every one else was in the same shape as I, my large Holstein cows that cost me $300 per head went through the sale ring at from $140 to $200 per head causing me a loss of about $5,000. Two previous drought years had put me behind at my bank together with an accumulation of accounts for farm operation with the result that after applying all of the money received for my dairy cows; I still owe my bank about $7,000. I am compelled to hold a sale this spring and dispose of all of my machinery to pay my bank, leaving me with a $13,000 debt on my 340-acre farm which I am also having to sell in order to "clean up." This is typical of this immediate vicinity. I tried every known means in my attempt to get my whole situation refinanced in order that I might save my dairy herd, my machinery and my farm, but without avail. My situation and others like it around here are the ones who are badly in need of assistance but are not getting it; and certainly no one is more deserving. This for your information. Copy of this letter is being forwarded to Mr. Harry M. Thomas at the Department of Agriculture who is to be sent to Missouri to look the situation over.

## MILITARY FUNERALS AT ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, last Saturday, after reading that there was no room in our $38 billion military budget for a continuation of certain time-honored customs connected with military funerals at Arlington National Cemetery, I wrote to the President, suggesting that perhaps we were becoming so budget-conscious that we were beginning to stifle all our emotions.

I referred specifically to recent reports that financial considerations have prompted the elimination of the horse-drawn caissons from the military funerals at Arlington National Cemetery.

As I noted then, there is obviously some point at which we must check our sentiments before they overrun our sense of financial responsibility. On the other hand, I sincerely feel that we must guard against the day when, to use an extreme example, we might be considering the advisability of maintaining the honor guard at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

News accounts have said that the motorizing of military funerals will save about $77.90 a ceremony. I feel that such an amount can be more than justified when spent in honor of our warrior dead, but I realize that such sentiments cannot help balance a ledger.

Perhaps, then, we might consider the continuation of these expenditures as a practical investment in the traditions which have kept us strong, and without which we cannot survive.

Many persons have written to me expressing agreement with my ideas, and I should like to comment at this time that the letters were as sincere as any that have ever been brought to my attention.

As my record will show, I have always been interested in sincere efforts to achieve economies. I believe, however, that the efforts in this particular instance are somewhat out of place.

Therefore, I hope that those of my esteemed colleagues who share my sentiments will join with me in my personal request that action be taken within the Defense Department to preserve the traditional ceremonies connected with the burial of our warrior dead in Arlington National Cemetery.

## NATIONAL FOOD ALLOTMENT PROGRAM

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement, prepared by me, regarding Senate bill 43, which was introduced to establish a national food allotment program. I felt that I had some reservations with respect to this particular bill, and I have prepared the statement, which explains my point of view on the measure.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS ON S. 43 TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL FOOD-ALLOTMENT PROGRAM

On Monday, January 7, 1957, Senator AIKEN introduced S. 43 on behalf of himself and several others, including myself. This bill, if enacted, would establish a national food allotment program for the purpose among other things, of maintaining fair prices and incomes to farmers by providing adequate outlets for agricultural products.

In cosponsoring S. 43, I was motivated by the conviction I hold that we owe it to the American farmer to examine in detail every proposal which preliminary investigation indicates may significantly increase the demand for agricultural products. Closer examination may indicate that the disadvantages outweigh the seeming advantages at this point, but since it is evident that the kit of tools we are now relying upon to help farmers achieve parity is not capable of achieving that objective, it would seem desirable that the merits of the food stamp proposal ought to be thoroughly examined.

That farm prices have been as good as they have the past 5 or 6 years is a reflection of the general prosperity we have enjoyed. Why do I say this? Because the best guaranty of satisfactory farm prices is the maintenance of maximum employment, and a correspondingly high level of consumptive expenditures for food. During the past 6 years, total employment increased by 5 million persons. In only one of these years—1954, did unemployment represent as much as 5 percent of the total civilian labor force, so, relatively speaking, it can be said that conditions of full employment prevailed. Personal consumption expenditures for food increased by $19.5 billion, during the same period, with $3.5 billion of the increase coming between 1955 and 1956.

During these same years, 1951–56, the farm output index increased from 103 in 1951 to 114 in 1956, the base period being 1947–49. Noteworthy, in particular, were the increases in production of some of the perishable commodities during this period, which concern us here. Meat animals increased 22 percent over the base period; poultry and eggs 15 percent; and dairy products 11 percent. On the other hand, the parity ratio declined from 107 in 1951 to 83 in 1956, and net farm income (excluding inventory changes) declined from $14.8 billion in 1951 to $11.9 billion in 1956. The simple fact remains, therefore, that our present high levels of food consumption, the resultants of the highest levels of employment and personal disposable incomes in history, have not been sufficient to remove our agricultural production from the market at satisfactory prices to farmers. Especially

has this been true with respect to the perishable commodities, which concern us here—vegetables, meats, including poultry, eggs, and dairy products, and for which no effective means of price support has been available.

Although farmers can look forward to some increase in "hard dollar" agricultural exports, the facts seem to indicate that this consumptive channel also cannot be depended upon to bring supplies in line with demand. In a Foreign Agricultural Service publication entitled "Competitive Position of United States Farm Products Abroad in 1957," appears the statement:

"The expansion of agricultural production continues as a primary objective of many foreign countries. * * * Many governmental measures promote and foster this objective. The expansion is designed to (1) lessen the need for imports, or (2) to provide larger quantities for export.

"Whatever the purpose, all these measures tend to increase the competition which United States farm products face in foreign markets. They either lessen the need for United States products or make foreign markets less accessible even though an apparent need exists.

"Volumewise, the 1955–56 level of United States agricultural exports was the highest in 30 years. The prospects for 1956–57 are indicated to be 25 percent greater than last year. * * * But the short-run outlook, based on a number of circumstances now favoring this country, is no guaranty that present high levels will be maintained."

Especially would this latter statement appear true when it is realized that although United States farm exports increased during each of the fiscal years 1954 through 1956, the percentage of such exports which constituted sales for dollars through private commercial channels declined, and the percent exported under Government subsidy programs of various kinds increased. For the 1956 calendar year, foreign sales through private channels may well represent less than 60 percent of total sales.

Very clearly then, since much of the increase in foreign sales of agricultural products depends upon Government export subsidies, barter, or sales for local currencies, and because of increasing foreign production, the present high level of exports, not enough by itself to give farmers reasonable prices, cannot be expected to continue, let alone improve the demand for agricultural commodities so as to appreciably improve farm prices.

We have developed elaborate price-support programs for the so-called basic commodities, which are providing their producers better prices than those received by producers of nonbasic commodities, especially the perishables. As of December 15, 1956, cotton was bringing 87 percent of parity, wheat 84, rice 82, and peanuts 82. Several types of tobacco were bringing growers over 100 percent of parity. On the other hand, beef-cattle producers were getting 65 percent of parity, calves were bringing 64, eggs and lambs 72, potatoes 64, oranges 57, chickens 55, and grapefruit 62 percent of parity.

Of course, we cannot apply these programs to perishable commodities for several reasons. First, it is doubtful that marketing quotas could be applied to milk production, eggs, or other poultry products. Second, since they are not storable for any great length of time, the marketing period of most perishable commodities cannot be extended by means of commodity loans to give producers the advantage of probable price increases after seasonal marketing peaks have been reached.

By the same token, it is evident that the use of surplus disposal or direct purchase programs to remove market gluts, especially where purchases are made from processors, do not really afford producers of perishable commodities much market-price protection. For example, beginning last September and continuing until mid-November the USDA purchased 25.3 million pounds of turkey at a cost of $9.6 million. As of September 15, turkeys were bringing 74 percent of parity; as of mid-December the price received had advanced only 1 percent of parity to 75. From mid-September to late November, the USDA purchased 72 million pounds of hamburger at a cost of $24.5 million. As of mid-September, beef cattle were bringing 75 percent of parity; yet as of December 15, they were bringing only 65 percent. In mid-September, the USDA began buying eggs when prices received stood at 75 percent of parity. During the period ending December 6, 17.5 million dozen were purchased at a cost of $6.6 million, yet as of December 15, the market price had dropped to 72 percent of parity. Obviously, surplus disposal programs of this type are of little value in supporting prices of these commodities during their heavy marketing periods.

But the question remains, Have we exhausted the examination of other means which seem to offer some hope of reasonable assistance to producers of nonstorable and highly perishable agricultural products? What about food stamps or national food allotment programs such as provided in S. 43? Perhaps such programs as that provided for in S. 43 offer a real means of increasing the demand for those agricultural commodities most in need of price-support assistance. This might be accomplished by providing an indirect form of price support by use of Government transfer payments to low-income families. In other words, we could support increased food purchases on the consumer side of the market structure. The Congress thought so much of the idea that it incorporated a provision in the Agricultural Act of 1956, directing the USDA to submit to Congress within 90 days detailed programs with recommendations for any additional legislation needed to carry out such programs for a food-stamp plan or similar program for distribution of future surplus production to needy persons. (Sec. 201 (b).)

In August 1956, the USDA transmitted a report containing an analysis of food-stamp plans. While it seemingly was not as comprehensive as that asked for by the Congress, nevertheless, it contained much valuable information which led me to believe that such legislation should be introduced in the 85th Congress, in hopes that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would hold hearings upon the proposal. The first item of significance which caught my attention was the observation made on page 1, part B of the report to the effect that: "A review of the food-stamp plan, operated by the Department of Agriculture between 1939–43, indicates that it was effective in obtaining a net increase in food consumption levels among participating families."

But an increase in what kind of foods can be expected? Are they to be cereal crops made from wheat and rice, both of which are basic commodities for which elaborate price-support programs already have been developed? Or can increased consumption be expected primarily of perishables such as poultry, eggs, beef, vegetables, fruits, etc., commodities for which we do not have effective price-support programs? Answers to these questions were given as follows in the report.

"An analysis has been undertaken * * * to determine the probable impact of a stamp plan on the consumption pattern of participants. This has been done by estimating the probable consumption changes that would have occurred if families with annual incomes of less than $2,000 in 1948 had been consuming food at the rate of those families with annual incomes of between $2,000 and $3,000. (Such families represented 18 percent of all urban families of 2 or more persons in 1948.)

"Among the food groups where consumption would have increased, the estimated percentage increase ranged from 1 percent for bakery products, 14 percent for meats, to 27 percent for processed fruits and vegetables.

"The results of this preliminary analysis indicate that a stamp plan would be more effective in increasing the consumption of some foods than of others. The food group that might be expected to benefit most would be fruits and vegetables. * * * Livestock products would be in an intermediate position. Of the commodities now in Commodity Credit Corporation inventories, dairy products would be the major item to benefit."

In light of these findings, further detailed study may well indicate that a food-stamp plan such as that provided for in S. 43 may be the best means of extending price support to producers of beef cattle and calves, which provide United States farmers with 16.7 percent of their incomes; dairy products which provide 14.2 percent; poultry products which provide 11.6 percent; truck crops which provide 4.1 percent; and fruits and nuts which provide 4.3 percent.

Farmers and ranchers in such States as Utah, Nevada, Wyoming, Colorado, Montana, where beef cattle production predominates, for the first time might find expanding markets for their animals. Farmers in California, Florida, New Jersey, New York, Delaware, and Rhode Island where truck crops are important agriculturally, may find new consumptive outlets. The same results might be enjoyed by poultry producers in such States as Maryland, New Jersey, Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah, Virginia, and West Virginia, where a large proportion of farm income is derived from such products.

The economics behind the food-stamp plan, as a means of increasing the demand for farm products, is based upon the rather certain knowledge that although no two families spend their incomes in exactly the same way, there is a rather predictable regularity in the way people in various income groups allocate their expenditures for such items as food and clothing. Poorer families must necessarily spend most of their incomes on the necessities of life—food, clothing, and shelter. Economists have demonstrated that as incomes increase so do expenditures for food. Such families eat more and they eat better. Consumption shifts from cereals to the more expensive foods such as meat, milk, eggs, fruit, and vegetables. These, incidentally, are the perishables for which no effective price-support program has been developed.

Food stamp plans are not designed or intended, therefore, to be a means of eliminating the inventories of wheat, cotton, corn, and the other so-called basic commodities. They are proposed rather as a means of supporting the prices of perishable commodities by making possible increased consumption of such commodities by low-income families who would consume more of such food if they had the purchasing power.

Significantly, the food-stamp program may be a device whereby we can "kill two birds with one stone." At the same time, it operates to raise the prices of perishable farm commodities by increasing their consumption, it operates to raise the dietary standards of low income families. Oddly enough, this latter observation has additional significance for agriculture and the success of the rural-development program, which is especially designed to assist low-income farm families, since nearly one-half of those families with incomes below $2,000 are farm-operator families. Secretary Benson observed, in this respect, in his talk before the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives a year ago that:

"About 1.5 million farm families in this Nation have incomes of less than $1,000.

Think of what an income like this means to an individual family. How much food and clothing, medical care, recreation, and household equipment can a family buy in these days with such a small amount of money?"

Under Secretary Morse, head of the rural-development program, has stated on occasion that health and nutritional needs must be met more adequately, as a first step toward helping low-income farm families. Additional study may reveal that most of the owners and operators of two-thirds of our farms, which produce only 15 percent of our crop value, could benefit by enactment of S. 43.

I think it can go without saying that few families go hungry in this country today. Dietary standards also are much higher than they were before the war. However, based upon what is called the basic food allotment," a low-cost adequate-diet food plan developed by the USDA, the report which I have referred to conservatively estimates that 15 million urban persons, in addition, could be provided assistance as families for whom the cost of such a basic food allotment would represent 40 percent or more of their money income. This is the standard provided for in S. 43.

By making payments at the rate of 40 percent of its income, each participating family would receive sufficient coupons to cover the cost of this basic food allotment and other coupons as well which are good for perishable commodities in surplus. It is believed that such a program would afford producers of nonbasic commodities an increased demand for their products. Significantly, such an increased demand would largely be independent of fluctuations in nonagricultural employment and national income and would be in addition to high consumer expenditures during peak years of economic activity such as we are now experiencing.

It should be noted also, however, that the report calls attention to certain administrative problems which appear to be connected with such proposals as that embodied in S. 43. For example, it is important that substitution of supplemental food money for normal food expenditures be kept at a minimum. Certification of eligible participants also must be handled very carefully, with due precautions being taken to prevent abuse. Whether these and similar problems are so formidable as to preclude the effective use of a national food allotment plan as an indirect method of supporting prices of nonbasic commodities ought to be studied and examined very carefully.

In concluding my remarks on why I cosponsored S. 43 I merely want to state that any proposal which seems to have the merits that the national food allotment program proposed in this bill does ought to be given serious study and consideration by the Congress.

## THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, we are proud of the valiant and loyal service of the Oregon National Guard during World War II. Oregon's 41st Infantry Division has an enviable history of combat; it was the first major Army unit to enter the South Pacific area after the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Members of the Oregon Guard are entirely volunteers, and more than 8,200 members voluntarily give their time to participate in our State and National defense in 25 active Air and Army units.

The Secretary of Defense has accused members of the National Guard of being draft dodgers during the Korean war. This statement is untrue, for it attacks the loyalty and patriotism of all guard members.

Mr. President, I ask unaimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, on behalf of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself, a petition signed by 36 members of the Oregon State Legislature, 34 Democrats and 2 Republicans, which expresses their vigorous protest of the remarks by the Secretary of Defense. This petition was sent to me by the State senator for Baker, Wallowa, and Union Counties, young and able Dwight H. Hopkins, of Imbler, Oreg.

Mr. President, I also seek unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Oregonian of January 27, 1957, which describes the National Guard as a Good Way To Serve.

There being no objection, the petition and editorial were orderd to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAYNE L. MORSE,
RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
*United States Senators for Oregon:*

We, the undersigned members of the 49th Oregon State Senate and House of Representatives, express our shock at and sharp disagreement with the violent and slanderous attack made this week upon the National Guard units of the States by the Secretary of Defense, Charles E. Wilson.

This type of irresponsible utterance cannot be tolerated from the topmost official of the Defense Establishment. It undermines confidence in our Armed Forces, destroys morale among the men and women in the forces, gives aid and comfort to the enemies of the Nation, and is completely false upon the record of high valor and selfless accomplishment made by the National Guard units of Oregon and other States in every period of crisis and war.

Please transmit to the President and the appropriate committee of Congress our vigorous protest and contradiction of the charges of incompetence and draft dodging which were hurled this week, and do all in your power to offset the damage which has been done.

Dwight H. Hopkins, Monroe Sweetland, Dan A. Thiel, Alfred H. Corbett, Dan Dimick, Ben Musa, R. F. Chapman, Phil Brady, G. D. Gleason, Walter J. Pearson, Boyd R. Overhulse, Ward H. Cook, Jean R. Lewis, Jess W. Savage, Leon S. Davis, Roy Fitzwater, Clarence Barton, Carl Yancey, O. W. Grubb, Ray Dooley, Al Flegel, Robert Steward, Richard E. Groener, Ed Benedict, R. E. Goad, Don Willner, Harry L. Wells, Robert R. Klemson, Richard Eymann, Guy Jonas, Vernon Cook, R. E. Schedeen, Joe Rogers, Norman R. Howard, Verne N. Cady, Ben Evick.

[From the Sunday Oregonian of January 27, 1957]

GOOD WAY TO SERVE

Of the several ways a young American may fulfill his military obligation to his country, one of the most attractive programs is that offered by the National Guard.

Although for practical purposes in peacetime and fully in wartime a part of the United States Army's Reserve Establishment, the guard because of its origin as a State militia organization still retains considerable local identity and control. Local National Guard units are made up of officers and men who are friends and neighbors when in civilian clothing. They attend weekly drills in State-managed armories. They go to summer training camp as complete units, and if called for active duty either by the Governor or the President, they go as a unit, not simply as individual soldiers to be absorbed by other Army groups.

Best of all, the National Guard recruit, by enlisting before he is 18½ years of age to exempt himself from selective service, also escapes the 6 months' basic training which members of the organized Army Reserve must take. All that is required of him is attendance at weekly drills and the annual 2 weeks' summer encampment.

After April 1, however, by order of the Defense Department, National Guard recruits, too, will be required to take 6 months' training. This order has been protested, unsuccessfully so far, by National Guard leaders who see in it an effort to weaken State control of the guard, and put it more under the Army thumb. They say the 6 months' training requirement discourages guard recruitment because parents are unwilling to permit their sons' college training to be interrupted this long. They have urged the division of the training period into two 11-week halves, so it can be accomplished in successive summer vacations between classes.

Countering this, it is argued that a minimum of 6 months' training is needed to make any recruit a qualified member of any Army Reserve component, and that dividing the period in two halves would lessen its effectiveness.

Regardless of the outcome of this dispute, it would seem the National Guard still will retain features that should make service in it desirable for potential enlistees. Certainly every young man approaching the age of 18½, beyond which he cannot escape the draft by this route, should study thoroughly the guard program between now and April 1, when the new and more stringent regulations are to become effective.

## EXPENDITURE OF COUNTERPART FUNDS BY CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND THEIR STAFFS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, recently there appeared in the press rather severe criticism of the reckless manner in which two staff members of a senatorial committee were squandering counterpart funds on a European tour under the guise of an official inspection trip.

Counterpart funds are those funds generated in foreign countries as a result of nonmilitary dollar grant aid extended by the ICA and its predecessor agencies. These funds are deposited in a special account from which a percentage thereof up to 10 percent is transferred to the United States Treasury for ownership and use by the United States to cover expenditures made in the country involved.

The use of these counterpart funds by congressional committees and their staffs is legal and serves a constructive purpose when used in a constructive manner. The visiting of foreign countries by Members of Congress or committees directly dealing with appropriations in the areas being checked is valuable not only to the committees doing the work but also to the Congress when considering appropriations and future authorizations. However, instances such as recently described on the part of the two staff members, as well as incidents which have been reported at times in connection with the conduct of some of the Members of Congress, have not been of constructive benefit but only served to discredit our country.

I have checked with the Comptroller General as to the extent to which any

audit is made of funds expended by officials of Government agencies or by congressional committees and have been advised that the expenditures of officials of the agencies of the Government during their foreign travel are subject to the routine audit of the agency. However, the Comptroller General advises that under section 502 (b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 congressional committees are authorized to use these counterpart funds in the payment of the expenses incurred by Members of Congress or their authorized committees traveling abroad, and that his office is not authorized to make any audit of these expenditures but that they are merely reported back to the congressional committee involved.

I am not suggesting that these reports have not been made nor that they have not been properly examined by the appropriate committees, but it is a fact that no report on these expenditures is available to the public, and since these are public funds I feel that the congressional committees should amend their rules and release information outlining the extent of the expenditures and the manner and purpose for which they were used.

As Members of Congress we have on many occasions criticized the cloak of secrecy surrounding the activities of certain operations of the executive branch. I have joined in that criticism; however, I feel that we would be in a better position to demand full disclosure on the part of the executive branch of their activities by setting the example and disclosing information governing our own expenditures.

I have discussed this problem with many Members of Congress who have traveled abroad and used counterpart funds and who have said they would be glad to see the cloak of secrecy removed in order to prevent suspicion of those who have made these trips for constructive purposes and spent the money in a conscientious manner.

In commenting on this same subject recently at a press conference the President of the United States is quoted as saying:

> There is no expenditure of public money, except only involving that where public security itself is involved, that should not face the light of day any time any citizen inquires for it.

The fact that any expenditure, either by Congress or by the executive branch, is going to be subjected to public scrutiny will in itself be a deterrent to misuse. I urge that whatever steps are necessary to correct this situation be promptly taken.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a letter dated December 5, 1956, signed by the Comptroller General discussing the legal aspects of these expenditures, followed by the insertion of two editorials, one appearing in the Washington Daily News under date of February 1, 1957, and the second appearing in the Albuquerque Journal of Albuquerque, N. Mex., under the same date.

There being no objection, the letter and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
*Washington, December 5, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
*United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in further response to your letter of November 14, 1956, requesting information relative to the audit of expenditures of counterpart funds accumulated in the various foreign countries.

Counterpart funds are generated in foreign countries as a result of nonmilitary dollar grant aid extended by the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) and its predecessor agencies. These funds are deposited in a special account from which a percentage thereof up to 10 percent as required by section 142 (b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 840 and 69 Stat. 285) is transferred to the United States Treasury for ownership and use by the United States. The funds remaining in the special account belong to and are disbursed by the respective foreign countries for such purposes consistent with the objectives of the mutual security program as may be agreed upon between the foreign governments and ICA; the withdrawal of specific amounts for approved purposes is generally authorized by ICA.

Except in Spain, this Office does not audit the expenditure of the foreign country portions of counterpart funds; however, at such times as field audits are made at overseas missions of ICA, we review the procedures and controls of the missions relative to the deposit and withdrawal of these funds and their use for approved purposes. In Spain, 60 percent of the generated counterpart funds are earmarked for payment of local costs of construction of military bases. The expenditures of these funds are accounted for by Navy disbursing officers and are audited by personnel of the General Accounting Office stationed in Madrid.

The United States owned counterpart is held by the United States Treasury in accounts maintained in the respective countries and as provided in section 1415, Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953 (66 Stat. 662) is available to Federal agencies in exchange for appropriated dollar funds. These counterpart funds are used principally to defray administrative costs of the mutual security program in the respective countries and in some cases for other purposes depending generally on the conditions for the use of counterpart funds contained in agreements between the United States and the individual countries. Expenditures by these agencies are recorded in their accounts in dollars by conversion at prevailing exchange rates and are accounted for by the disbursing officers in dollars and local currencies. The expenditures so reported and the related documentation are audited as expenditures of dollar appropriated funds since they are paid from allotments of dollar appropriations. Any expenditures deemed upon audit to be improper are the subject of exceptions against the certifying or disbursing officers; certificates of settlement are issued annually for each account for which certifying and disbursing officers are accountable, at which time any outstanding exceptions are charged against them and in due course demand is made upon them for payment. We generally do not issue formal reports on our continuing examinations of the accounts of accountable officers. We do, however, if our examination discloses conditions which we feel should be brought to the attention of the Congress or of top levels in the administrative agency.

Public officials other than those who may use local currencies pursuant to section 502 (b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 850), may acquire United States owned counterpart by payment therefor with dollar funds, which presumably are paid by the agencies which they represent and accordingly are accounted for by these agencies as dollar expenditures. Such expenditures are audited in the same manner as other expenditures from appropriated funds.

Section 502 (b) referred to above provides that:

"Notwithstanding section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to appropriate committees of the Congress engaged in carrying out their duties under section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, for their local currency expenses: *Provided*, That any such committee of the Congress which uses local currency shall make a full report thereof to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives (if the committee using such currency is a committee of the House of Representatives) or to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate (if the committee using such currency is a committee of the Senate), showing the total amount of such currency so used in each country and the purposes for which it was expended."

We do not audit the use made of the local currencies by the recipients under section 502 (b). The full reports required to be submitted to the congressional committees are not subject to audit by this Office.

We are pleased to have received your request and trust that the above meets your requirements.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
*Comptroller General of the United States.*

---

[From the Washington Daily News of February 1, 1957]

FUNNY MONEY

Few subjects have caused more disgraceful controversies over the past 10 years than the use of counterpart funds abroad. They are foreign currencies which recipients of foreign aid make available to the United States Government. We give country "X" $1 million in aid and they credit us with the equivalent of $1 million in their currencies.

American foreign missions used to be allowed to spend this money without any accounting at home. The funds became known as "funny money." That has been stopped. But congressional committees on study trips or junkets still don't have to account publicly.

The latest incident involves not Senators or Congressmen—but two women staff members of the Senate Appropriations Committee. They, too, were furnished counterpart funds to use during a 'round-the-world junket and were not required to make any public accounting. The comment of one of these travelers is, as a minimum, condemnatory of a system which allows such practices.

"Members of Congress who go on trips," she said, "get plenty of counterpart funds. They buy what they want and get the embassies to ship the stuff home. I don't see why committee staffs shouldn't be allowed to do likewise when they are on official business."

Government officials have been passing the buck on this problem. Congress itself, which properly heckled executive departments for riding a foreign "gravy train," will stand guilty of hypocrisy so long as it allows its Members to do the same with impunity.

President Eisenhower has stated a principle which Congress would be wise to incorporate in its procedures if it is to remove itself from suspicion. He said:

"There is no expenditure of public money, except only involving that where public se-

curity itself is involved, that should not face the light of day any time any citizen inquires for it."

---

[From the Albuquerque Journal of February 1, 1957]

OPEN THE RECORDS

The subject of travel expenses came up again in President Eisenhower's press conference on Wednesday. Again the President expressed himself in favor of making all such expenses public.

This newspaper and others have made a campaign against the secrecy of such expenses, which under present practices cannot be disclosed except by the chairmen of the committees handling them. Thus far no complete accountings have been made public.

The President's comment on the subject was apt and sound. He said he believes any expenditures of public funds should be able to withstand the light of day anytime any citizen inquires about them.

Congress should meet the issue and adopt legislation requiring that all travel expenses of congressional committees be made public.

## THE BUDGET

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on Monday of this week I called attention to the President's tremendous budget, the largest in peacetime that has ever been submitted to the Congress. The obvious fact remains that if it is to be reduced the primary responsibility for a reduction belongs to the executive branch of the Government and to the President himself rather than the Congress.

Mr. Henry Hazlitt, in an article which appears in the February 11 issue of Newsweek, pinpoints this prime responsibility. His article relates this responsibility directly to the President. Under the law he is charged with the duty of preparing the budget estimates.

Mr. President, I have had some experience in the field of budgets. When I was the chief executive of the State of South Carolina and ascertained that we were going to have a surplus, I did not permit its expenditure at the last moment. I knew that the State had outstanding interest-bearing bonds. I knew that if the affairs of South Carolina were to be administered on an economically sound basis our State debt had to be retired. What surpluses were created we used to retire a part of our State debt.

I wish to call the attention of the Congress again to the fact that the budget-making processes of our National Government should be coordinated with legislative responsibilities for proper appropriations. The Bureau of the Budget should be an arm of our Government answerable directly to the Congress and not to the Executive. In this way those who must appropriate by law share the responsibility in making up the budget.

Under our system in South Carolina, so far as budget making is concerned, the responsibility is shared with the appropriate legislative committees and the Governor's office. Some such arrangement should be enacted into law for our National Government.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hazlitt's article be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek of February 11, 1957]

ECONOMIC DOUBLETHINK

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The late George Orwell coined the word "doublethink" to mean "the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously and accepting both of them." Has this power been acquired by the Eisenhower administration? It might explain the budget, the Middle East policy, and the economic report.

Let's begin with the budget. We are told by administration officials that it is the tightest budget that could be presented to Congress, but that it should be cut. The President even told his press conference that "there are literally thousands and thousands" of individual items in the budget, and "anybody that is examining that seriously ought to find some place where they might save another dollar." It did not seem to occur to him that it was the prior and primary duty of himself, the Budget Bureau, and others who actually put those thousands of items together to search out the possible savings that anybody ought to find.

SPEND AND SPEND

When some Congressmen did suggest that it might be unnecessary just now to tie an authorization for a special discretionary foreign-aid fund of $200 million for the Middle East on to the proposal for unrestricted military authority, Mr. Eisenhower quickly intervened to say that separation or postponement of the foreign-aid authorization "would destroy what we are really trying to do." But when he was asked at a press conference how the proposed $200 million would be spent, he replied that he didn't know, "because the only way I can find out exactly how to spend the $200 million would be through the medium of the Richards mission * * * which cannot leave until the resolution has been passed." He insists on the $200 million, in short, before the need for it has even been determined.

His new philosophy of spending is also puzzling. Though he is presenting the largest peacetime budget on record, with unparalleled nondefense spending, Mr. Eisenhower is not troubled, because the country is enjoying the greatest prosperity on record, and a growing country can afford to and must spend more to meet its growing needs. But suppose the growth were suddenly to stop? Suppose signs of a depression set in? Then the Government must spend more. Asked about deficit spending as a cure for recession, the President replied: "You begin then to apply moderate means, and then more, and if it kept going, finally you would go into every single thing, and very quickly * * *. And there would be no limit, I think, to what should be attempted as long as it was constitutional." There is, alas, no constitutional limit on deficit spending.

THE ECONOMIC REPORT

The economic report is another example of doublethink. It repeatedly praises "our free economy"—and then goes on to advocate the extension of Government controls in a score of new directions. It insists on "strengthening competition"—and then proposes a score of measures to protect small business, labor, and agriculture against the effects of competition. It insists that Government "must exercise a strict discipline over its expenditures"—then advocates an expansion of most existing categories of spending, and adds entirely new ones for local school and highway building.

"As long as the American people demand and, in my opinion, deserve the kind of services that this budegt provides," the President declares, "we have got to spend this kind of money." This implies the existence of a sort of economic fourth dimension. Mr. Eisenhower forgets that the Government has nothing to give the American people that it does not take from the American people. It has nothing to give the States and cities that it does not take from the residents of the States and cities. It has nothing to give Paul that it does not take from Peter.

Five years ago—January 28, 1952—with Mr. Truman in office, I remarked here that the economic report was an unnecessary document, whose chief recommendations are or ought to be found in the state of the Union message or in the budget. "The rest consists mainly of giving scientific and economic reasons for what the President has done or wants to do for political reasons."

Has the situation changed?

---

## STUDY OF MATTERS RELATING TO THE ELECTION, SUCCESSION, AND DUTIES OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded; and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to create a joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President.

---

## REPORT BY SENATOR ELLENDER RESPECTING FOREIGN AID, EMBASSIES ABROAD, MUTUAL-SECURITY PROGRAM, ETC.

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that our distinguished friend the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is about to make a report on his extensive investigation and inspection of our foreign facilities at our diplomatic bases in many countries throughout the world. I think it is important that every Senator have the opportunity to be present to hear his narrative, which I know, from some personal discussion with the Senator, is of interest and importance.

I therefore ask that I may suggest the absence of a quorum. I understand that the Senator from Louisiana is agreeable to my doing so.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, for the past 6 years I have made it my practice, as a Member of the Senate and of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, to make an annual inspection of United States operations abroad. In an effort to familiarize myself with the

grassroots operations of our various installations overseas, I initially limited my inspection to embassies and legations. Later I added the foreign-aid program; during the last 3 years I have also studied our country's information service, and, since 1955, the military-aid program.

Last year it was my privilege to make an inspection which was more thorough than any previously undertaken. I visited almost every country I had visited in 1955. Therefore, because of my background acquired in prior years, I was in a position to make quick progress in a comparatively short time. Last year I had the privilege of visiting 33 countries, and I am today reporting on 28 of those countries.

The work was very interesting and,, as many of my colleagues who have made similar trips abroad know, quite arduous. However, I wish to say that I enjoyed the work very much.

In 1955 I visited various parts of Russia. Last year I again visited Russia, and it is my purpose this afternoon to devote a good deal of my time discussing my findings and impressions resulting from that visit. I do so primarily because of the interest in that country evidenced by Senators and our people generally.

After each of my trips abroad I have reported my findings in detail to the department of Government affected, and, of course, to the Committee on Appropriations. I have not attempted to make headlines with respect to what I found in many of the countries abroad; I have tried to do an objective job in calling to the attention of the departments of Government involved certain things which I thought should be scrutinized, and other matters which, in my opinion, required corrective action.

I do not speak boastfully when I say that it has been my privilege to make five complete circuits of the world by air. I have visited every country in the world except two, Bulgaria and Albania. Because the United States has no representation in those countries I was unable to visit them.

My reports were made, as I indicated, to the various departments affected, particularly the State Department. I am glad to say that many of the suggestions I made were put into effect; many of the complaints I filed were acted upon; and the conditions complained of were corrected.

Mr. President, the amount of time I could spend on the floor in relating my experiences during the almost 3½ months I spent abroad could probably consume not only all of the afternoon and evening, but could even run into the wee hours of the morning. However, it is certainly not my purpose to do that. What I propose to do is to comment on the various countries I visited.

I shall cheerfully attempt to answer any questions presented by my colleagues as I proceed with my remarks.

Mr. President, I am not going to read all of my notes on all the countries I visited, but I ask unanimous consent that, as I proceed with my statement, my entire narrative report on the respective countries be printed in the RECORD in the order in which I address myself to those countries. In this connection, due to security regulations it has been necessary for me to delete certain information which the International Cooperation Administration, the United States Information Agency, the Department of State, and the Department of Defense felt should be kept confidential. Those deletions have been indicated in my report. In addition, because of security regulations, I am not able to include various exhibits to which I refer in the body of my report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FINLAND

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the first country in which I inspected United States operations was Finland. We are not spending much money in Finland except that which has been generated by sales of surplus agricultural commodities to the Finns under Public Law 480. As I recall, the amount of the sales made to the Finns aggregated $30 million through 1956. The Finns are a good, sturdy people, and they are in need of such assistance. They do not ask for gifts. They are in need of credit. Because of the Battle Act, Finland is prohibited from borrowing money from the Export-Import Bank. It is my belief that we should reevaluate the Battle Act, with the idea in mind of making it possible for countries such as Finland to borrow much needed funds.

In Finland, as in some other countries, I found that programs started on a small scale have been expanded far above the level we originally anticipated.

It will be recalled that Finland—I believe I am correct in this—was the only country which owed us money as a result of World War I which consistently met its debt payments on time. The Finns made a noble effort in that direction and were able to make their yearly payments regularly.

Two or 3 years ago some Members of Congress felt that since the Finns were such good people, since they were willing to pay, and since they had made every effort to pay us, a law should be enacted, and it was enacted, providing that the money which the Finns paid to America each year would be used to educate Finns in America or in other areas. It strikes me that with such a law as that on the statute books, providing for the utilization in that manner of money which was actually due the United States Government, no further education programs financed in whole or in part by our Government should be necessary. The yearly payment made by the Finns to the United States aggregates over $325,000, including both principal and interest. That sum in itself should be sufficient to provide for a large enough exchange program.

But our world planners were not satisfied with that. They added to that program substantial sums under the so-called Fulbright and Smith-Mundt programs. So today, although every dollar which is paid to us each year by the Finns is used or can be used to educate Finns, funds have been added under the Smith-Mundt and the Fulbright programs. It seems to me that we are going very far afield when we spend so much money, and so much money unnecessarily, to finance an exchange program for the Finns. It would be much more beneficial for us to use every means at our command to make certain that the Finns get the finances they need, on a loan basis, in order to develop their own country.

The Finns are an enterprising people, and Finland has many natural resources.

I learned that the interest rate in Finland is about 8 percent. I asked some bankers why the rate of interest was so high, and was told that money was so scarce that the bankers could even get 10 percent, if they desired.

In order to aid the development of that great area, I recommend that the United States make reasonable amounts of development funds available on a loan basis. I am certain that such loans would be well secured and would be repaid.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. As I recall, Finland was one of the very few nations which made a special effort to aid the United States some time ago when there was a very great shortage of newsprint in this country, and supplied us with substantial quantities of newsprint. Did the Senator find that to be correct, and that the newsprint industry is a substantial industry in Finland?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. As a matter of fact, it is their bread and butter. Without their great forest industry, Finland could not make a go of it. It occurs to me that it would be advantageous to our country and its newspapers to encourage the production of more newsprint and other products made from the forests.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. POTTER. How much effect does the domination or influence of the Soviet Union in Finland have on the value of our aiding Finland as a nation?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sorry to say that the Finns cannot show the affection they might have for the United States because of their physical proximity to Soviet Russia. But when one travels through Finland and talks to the people, one finds that their love for America is great; there can be no question about that. They realize that they must deal with Russia, because, as the Senator may remember, the Finns were more or less compelled to enter into trade agreements with the Russians, and those trade agreements are now in effect.

I would not say that the Finns like to trade with Russia, but I did find that they are fond of America and Americans.

I think every effort should be made to provide the Finns with an opportunity to develop their great resources. I am certain that from such an effort, we would benefit greatly.

Mr. POTTER. Is there any climate in Finland for American investments or capital to be used in the Finnish economy?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, I should say there is, without question; but the investors would like to know if they will be repaid. Furthermore, the proximity

of Finland to Russia, is, I believe, a deterrent to American private capital being invested heavily in that area.

I return to the proposition that the Export-Import Bank could be used as an instrumentality by which the United States could make loans to Finland, and thereby help Finland develop the great resources of which the world and the United States are in so much need at present, and about which my good friend from Michigan spoke so eloquently last week.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. If the Battle Act prohibits the Export-Import Bank from making such loans, I think certainly that is a situation which Congress should explore.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am advocating that Congress do so. I think we should take a new look, not only into that matter, but, as I shall demonstrate after a while, also into many other phases of our foreign policy.

The statement concerning Finland which was ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

FINLAND

We have no economic aid program in Finland. No grants have been made since World War II, with the exception that the Congress remitted a part of Finland's World War I debt. There have been no American loans since immediately after the war when credits were extended to Finland by the Export-Import Bank and also by our Government in connection with the sales of United States surplus properties to Finland. This latter transaction took place in 1946 and 1947.

In recent years, Finland has obtained loans from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and has been the beneficiary of certain credits extended by the Soviet Union.

While the bare statements I have outlined thus far would indicate that the Finns have not benefited from any of the American postwar assistance programs, it should be noted that from January 1954 through the end of 1956, a total of nearly $30 million in surplus agricultural commodities has been programed for Finland. More than one-half of this amount is represented by Public Law 480 sales for 1956 alone.

From 1954 to date the United States has received in Finnish currency the equivalent of about $15 million, with the remaining $15 million to be received during the latter part of 1956.

Of the $15 million received thus far, only $4 million has actually been spent but contracts are about to be entered into involving approximately $3 million more. The remainder of the proceeds of the $30 million worth of surplus agricultural commodities sold to Finland through 1956 has already been earmarked by our zealous planners for other purchases and projects. As outlined to me, the surplus agricultural commodity transactions with Finland may be broken down approximately as follows:

1. In January 1954 the Foreign Operations Administration arranged for the sale of approximately $3 million in surplus cotton and roughly $2.2 million in surplus tobacco with funds appropriated under section 550 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951. In other words, the Foreign Operations Administration used appropriated dollars—dollars appropriated under the foreign aid program—to purchase surplus commodities, which commodities were subsequently sold to Finland. The Finnish currency derived from these sales has been used according to my information, as follows: Roughly $2 million of equivalent Finnish currency was used to purchase for the Army prefabricated wooden buildings (warehouses and barracks) for shipment to Iran and Pakistan in connection with our military assistance program in those two countries. Another $1 million was spent by FOA in 1954 to buy building materials, such as doors and window frames for shipment to Greece as a part of the relief effort in that country immediately following the earthquake which struck the Ionian Islands. In addition, prefabricated houses in the value of $1.8 million are to be purchased for the refugee housing program in Berlin, but at the time of my visit to Helsinki, actual contracts for these prefabricated dwellings had not yet been placed.

2. In March of 1955 the Foreign Operations Administration authorized the sale of roughly $2 million worth of coal to Finland, again with payment by Finland in its local currency. It is interesting to note that this coal was purchased with dollars from a revolving fund, which the Foreign Operations Administration had set up as part of its "coal sales" program to various European countries. It is my understanding that the Finnish currency received for this coal has been used in such a way as to permit replacement in the revolving fund of the actual amount of dollars expended. In this connection, Finnish lumber products are currently being shipped to Greece under contracts totaling $680,000; the remainder (about $1.3 million in Finmarks) will soon be spent under contracts which are to be placed for the sale of lumber and woodpulp to Spain. It is my understanding that these various items, which we procured with the Finnish currency received for the coal, are being sold to the foreign aid administrators in the two countries concerned for dollars, with dollar vouchers being drawn against the appropriations for those two nations.

3. In early May of 1955 our Government entered into a basic agreement with Finland concerning the sale of surplus agricultural commodities under Public Law 480. This agreement provided for sales approximating $3 million worth of cotton and $2,250,000 worth of tobacco. According to my information these commodities have all been shipped and the local currency has been paid to the United States Government but as yet it has not been spent. However, it would be too much to expect of our anxious planners to expect that this little "kitty" has not already been programed. As a matter of fact it has, with some $250,000 in local currency equivalent to be used to help support the educational exchange program between Finland and the United States, and an additional $200,000 to be used to promote the development of markets for American agricultural commodities in Finland. The remainder (about $4.8 million) has been allocated to the Department of the Air Force, which intends to purchase prefabricated houses for use in military housing projects in the Mediterranean area.

4. During 1956 our basic Public Law 480 agreement with Finland (consummated on May 6, 1955) has been supplemented three times. At the time of my visit it provided for shipments of nearly $17 million worth of surplus agricultural commodities, including wheat, tobacco, cotton, corn, prunes and raisins, butter, and fresh fruits. With respect to the butter sales (totaling $550,000) this butter was specially requested by Finland in January 1956 when domestic supplies were very low. But, before this butter could be shipped, the supply position in Finland has improved so that Finland has actually been exporting butter this summer and our planners indicated to me that it may not be feasible for Finland to import the butter which was envisioned under Public Law 480 agreement.

Of the $17 million which this fourth transaction will provide our Government in Finnish currency equivalent, a total of about $2.2 million has been added to the $4.8 million already allocated to the Air Force for the prefabricated military housing projects in the Mediterranean area. Some $12 million additional has been allocated to six South Asian countries to purchase small coastal and fishing vessels in Finland. Under this scheme, which fortunately has not yet progressed beyond the planning stage, the countries purchasing these vessels would repay the United States in dollars, or perhaps in their own local currency, under a long-term loan agreement.

The remaining funds from the 1956 sales of agricultural commodities under Public Law 480 (approximately $2.7 million) may be used for the purchase of Finnish machinery for the paper industry, for delivery to Turkey as a part of the ICA aid program in that country.

Time did not permit me to delve into the detailed operations of the various programs. I most earnestly recommend, however, that the Senate Appropriations Committee staff endeavor to ascertain whether the amounts derived from our sales to Finland of surplus agricultural commodities and coal and which have been used by the Department of Defense and the Foreign Operations Administration (now ICA) have been in addition to the regularly appropriated amounts for these agencies, or whether proper reimbursement has been made to the Department of Agriculture, the Treasury, or other affected Federal agencies.

I feel relatively sure that reimbursement has taken place; however, I am particularly anxious to obtain details with respect to the loan program of Finnmark proceeds for the purchase of vessels in Finland by a number of South Asian nations. If these Finnmarks were purchased from the United States Treasury with dollars appropriated for use in these various South Asian countries, the entire transaction appears to be aboveboard. However, if these amounts are over and above the appropriated dollars for these areas, then the entire transaction should be brought to the attention of the committee for appropriate action in connection with the fiscal year 1958 Mutual Security appropriations bill.

Earlier in this report I refer to the fact that the United States maintains in Helsinki a rather sizable information program.

Exhibit A, attached hereto, indicates that during the 1956 fiscal year a total of $157,105 was spent by USIA/Helsinki for information activities. This amount will increase to $215,980 in the 1957 fiscal year, and according to information obtained by me in Helsinki, our ambitious USIA planners will probably request a further increase in 1958, with the aggregate total for that fiscal year approximating $222,310.

Needless to say it would appear that a large part of the USIA expenditures here are unnecessary. I visited the information offices, our library in Helsinki, and the USIA auditorium. The officer in charge there (Mr. Chapman) is a most sincere official and appeared to be most interested in his work. He was emphatic in his recommendation that a great deal of good can be accomplished if the information service is maintained in Finland at its present level. (See exhibit A for details of budgetary items.)

Be that as it may, there are a number of facets of the information program in Helsinki which certainly bear investigating. For example, I was informed that a 10-year contract has been consummated with a Finnish concern for space for the information service in a newly constructed office building. According to my information the yearly rental on this office space is in the neighborhood of $26,000, computed at the current rate of 325 Finmarks to the dollar. In it are located the library, the auditorium, and offices for the USIA staff. The entire facility

is very spacious, yet I saw only a few persons using it. I was told that in the summer the majority of the Finnish people go to the country and few use the library. Nevertheless, I was unable to obtain any information on the scene as to what authority in the information agency's enabling act or subsequent legislative enactments authorized our Government to contract for this space on a 10-year basis. At first blush, it would seem that at least some of our information officials are well on the way to making a permanent institution of this program—a program which Congress originated as a temporary stopgap.

Since the entire population of Finland numbers only some four million people I recommend that under no circumstances should the information program be further expanded, as is now contemplated for fiscal year 1958. I further recommend that the library be turned over to local authorities for operation. It was my information that many American books are handled by local libraries in other areas of Finland, and there is no reason why the same situation should not prevail in Helsinki. The people of Finland are most intelligent; they are well educated, and their literacy rate is extremely high. They are capable, and are overwhelmingly anti-Communist. They should be able to take over the operation of the library facility with no difficulty. It might be well for our planners to consider the establishment of a United States section in one of the main libraries in Helsinki proper, with the library itself providing the space and the maintenance, but with our Government contributing books and similar items.

With respect to the student exchange program, reference to exhibit A, attached hereto, discloses that only token amounts were earmarked under the country budget for this type of program. However, under Public Law 265, enacted August 24, 1949, an educational program is financed out of payments to the United States on Finland's debt.

Exhibit B, attached hereto, shows the amounts available for this purpose through 1984, the year Finland's indebtedness to our country will be retired.

In addition to these amounts, however, the United States is also making foreign currency funds available for the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Act programs. In other words, the United States is operating a three-pronged exchange effort in Finland: first, under the debt retirement program referred to earlier; second, the Fulbright program and third, the Smith-Mundt program.

Using the 1956 fiscal year exchange expenditures, it becomes evident that the exchange effort with respect to Finland is excessive. The Fulbright program referred to earlier requires that the sum of $250,000 annually over a 5-year period be spent for exchange and related activities. (See exhibit C.)

Thus, with reference to 1956 fiscal year, here is the way the exchange program operated. Out of the Finnish World War I debt retirement fund a total of $275,958 (in local currency equivalent) was spent for the exchange program. This compares with a total of $398,454 available in both principal and interest payments from the Finnish debt retirement program. In addition to the $275,958 spent for exchange purposes from this source, the exchange program here also spent the requisite $250,000 under the Fulbright Act during the 1956 fiscal year. Thus, total expenditures for exchange activities in Finland aggregated $525,958 compared with $398,454 (in equivalent Finnish funds) available from the debt retirement payments. The net result was that our country spent $127,504 over and above the amount available from the Finnish debt payments.

I recommend most heartily that if the Fulbright, Smith-Mundt, and related exchange programs are to continue, they all be financed from payments available under Public Law 265 enacted in 1949, which authorizes the use of Finland's debt payments for such programs. Under no circumstances should we supplement these amounts for exchange of persons by further appropriations of dollars or allocations of local currency proceeds held by the United States Government.

It should be also noted that during fiscal year 1956 100 persons were involved in the exchange program utilizing debt payment funds. Over and above this number, 30 Americans were sent to Finland under the Fulbright Act with 82 Finns coming to the United States under related programs. It would seem most wasteful to provide appropriated dollars to send 212 exchangees back and forth between Finland and the United States, when at least the major part of the present effort could be maintained by using debt payments alone. I therefore recommend that the dollar expenditures and foreign currency funds made available to the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt programs, over and above the Finnish debt payments, be halted.

With respect to our operations in Finland as a whole, I would recommend a review of our present policy which precludes Finland's borrowing from the United States because of the Battle Act's provisions. Finland, which is rich in forest resources, is suffering from an acute shortage of capital. If the potentialities of this tiny nation are to be developed to the utmost, a reasonable and realistic program of loans to assist the Finns in rectifying their capital deficiencies would be most beneficial. Loans made on a fair and reasonable basis might so improve the economy of Finland that she would not need help of any kind.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the next country I visited was Russia. I wish to say at the outset that during my visit to Russia I went where I wished to go. I did not ask to visit their atomic plants or large airbases or armament factories, but I was free to travel where I liked. I, myself, arranged my own itinerary.

When I was in Russia in 1955, I had occasion to talk to Mr. Mikoyan, who at that time was the third ranking member of the Politburo. Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Bulganin were not then in the country. Although I was told that I would be able to speak with Mr. Mikoyan for only 15 minutes, I talked with him for an hour and 45 minutes. During the course of our conversation, Mr. Mikoyan asked me if I desired to visit other parts of Russia, other than Moscow, Kiev, and Odessa, which I had planned to visit at that time. I told him I could not do so because I had a fixed itinerary, which limited the time I could spend in Russia, and that I desired to follow it as closely as possible. I explained this was due to long-standing arrangements I had made to visit various other countries, and because I had a specified time in which to make the visits. But I told him I would take a raincheck on his offer and that I would try to visit Russia the next year.

In April 1956 I communicated with Mr. Mikoyan by letter and suggested to him that I felt I would be able to visit Russia in 1956. Within a few weeks after I wrote to Mr. Mikoyan, Mr. Zarubin, who is the Ambassador from Russia to the United States, called me and suggested that it would be all right for me to visit Russia, if I still desired to do so. He suggested that if I would call the offices of the Intourist Bureau, which is a Government-owned travel agency maintained by Soviet Russia in New York, I could plan a schedule to visit Russia. I told Mr. Zarubin that if I had to go to Russia as a tourist, he could forget about it. I told him that I realized that all such trips were planned, and would permit one to visit only certain places.

Two weeks after I told the Ambassador that I would not go to Russia unless I could visit the places I desired to visit, he called me again and stated that everything had been arranged, and that all I had to do was go to Moscow, and there I could arrange my own itinerary. Mr. President, I wish to say that is exactly what I did.

On the map which is displayed in the rear of the Chamber I shall point out the various places I had occasion to visit in Russia, and then I shall comment from my notes about my visit there.

In the previous year, I entered Russia through West Germany, and traveled to Moscow. While in Moscow I traveled in the vicinity of that city for a radius of probably 150 kilometers. I saw many farms and factories in that locality.

After leaving Moscow I went to the Ukraine, to Kiev, and then to Odessa, on the Black Sea. I visited all the area in the vicinity of Kiev. I traveled from Odessa to Romania, and then to Budapest, and Czechoslovakia, and then to Vienna.

In my trip last year, I entered from Helsinki; I crossed the Gulf of Finland to Leningrad. While in Leningrad I inspected a number of large factories in that area.

I wish to say that when I arrived there, I was met by a member of our embassy staff at Moscow. My baggage was not checked in any manner; but as soon as I arrived, I was taken to a hotel. After 2 days in Leningrad, I proceeded by air to Moscow. While in Moscow, I visited a few factories and quite a great deal of the area around Moscow.

By the way, Mr. President, I happened to be in Moscow when the contests took place for the selection of the Russian athletes to participate in the Olympic games in Australia. I visited their huge stadium in Moscow. After looking over their setup, I concluded that the Russians have more trainers or coaches than the United States has athletes. My on-the-ground notes show that I took a very dim view of the chance of the United States athletes to lead in the Olympic games. As a recall, I predicted that this time Russia would probably win more points than our athletes. Of course that actually occurred at Melbourne.

I spent several days in Moscow, arranging my itinerary. I had decided to travel as much as I could by automobile. Mr. President, it was my privilege to travel 2,500 miles by automobile in Russia. The places visited by me were as follows: We started from Moscow and traveled to Tula, to Orel, to Kursk, to Kharkov, to Zaporoshje, and then down to the Crimea, to Yalta. Of course, on the way we visited many places.

From Yalta I traveled to Rostov-on-the-Don, a distance of about 250 miles. In order to reach Rostov-on-the-Don, it was necessary—because of a lack of roads—to return to Kharkov. Thus, we

had to travel about three times the direct-line distance to Rostov.

The roads in Russia are only fairly good. There are only two main roads from north to south. One begins at Leningrad and passes through Minsk and Kiev; then there is one from Leningrad to Moscow and on down to Yalta, as I have just indicated. At each city visited I found quite a number of good roads on the outskirts, but they were just a few miles in length.

From Kharkov, I drove on by car to Rostov-on-the-Don; and from Rostov-on-the-Don I traveled by plane to Stalingrad, and from Stalingrad I flew to Moscow. Within a few hours after landing in Moscow I was in an airplane en route to Siberia. We landed at Kasan, which is on the western slope of the Ural Mountains. Then we flew over the Ural Mountains to Chelyabinsk, which, by the way, is the Pittsburgh of Russia. I was very much surprised at the large number of steel plants that I saw from the airplane while we were flying over the airfield there.

From Chelyabinsk, I visited various cities, many of them not shown on the map. One was Kuctanai, which happens to be in almost the center of the so-called new lands area. It will be recalled that in the last 3 years an effort has been made by the Russian leadership to develop that area; in the last 3 years in excess of 60 million acres of new lands have been put to the plow and have been planted almost exclusively in grain. In that area the climate is very dry. I was informed that a good crop can be expected there only once in every 5 years. The texture of the soil is such, however, that after that land has been in cultivation for as long as 5 years, it will hardly be possible to harvest a crop every 5 years in the future. I predict that this entire new land area in Siberia will soon become more drought-stricken than our own Dust Bowl in Colorado, Oklahoma, and other States. The black topsoil is very thin—only about 3 inches thick—and the land is held together or anchored by grasses which have been growing there from time immemorial. In that area the surface of the soil has now been broken. I saw with my own eyes much of the land which had been plowed so deep that already the sand and gravel, which lies beneath the thin topsoil, are showing. It is my judgment that in little or no time this section of Russia will become, as I have said, a dust bowl.

From Kuctanai we went to Atbasar, and then to Karaganda, and then to Alma-Ata, which is located at the base of the Caucasus Mountains and within 150 kilometers of China.

Mr. President, the entire area from Alma-Ata to Tashkent, along the mountain slopes, reminds me of California. The climate is very dry. Much of the land is desert, but from the streams which find their source in the melting snows in the mountains, the entire area, for a distance of probably 200 miles or so east of Alma-Ata and then west as far as the Oxus River, which separates Russia from Afghanistan, a distance of probably 850 miles, forms a very fertile place where much cotton is grown, and also much fruit—including watermelons and cantaloups—as well as vegetables of all kinds.

I was very much surprised to find these crops produced on a large scale in Russia, considering the fact that the southernmost part of Russia is on the same parallel as the southern part of Canada. It is much farther north than any part of our own country except, of course, Alaska.

Then, from Tashkent I proceeded to visit various farms there, and came to Tazeman, which is quite a large city, located near the Oxus River.

From Tazeman I flew over the Hindu Kush Mountains, shown on the map, to Kabul, in Afghanistan.

At this point, Mr. President, I should like to read, from my prepared statement, my impressions of what I saw in Russia.

Russia, in both people and resources, is a slumbering giant, now in the throes of complete awakening. I was astounded by both the progress this country is making, and its lack of progress in very basic areas.

For example, in agriculture, Russia has reached a point comparable to that attained by our country 20 or 30 years ago. Plagued by a shortage in the varieties of crops which she can produce, and hampered by adverse growing and harvesting conditions, Russian agriculture is making relatively slow progress. Furthermore, Russian agricultural methods, when compared to ours, are almost primitive; there is much waste, both of foodstuffs and manpower.

I may state at this point it is my considered judgment that today 1 American farmer produces more food than 5 Russian farmers.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. Did the Senator receive the impression that the collective farming system has been a failure in the Soviet Union?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I point out in my prepared statement, in Russia it is everybody's business in general and nobody's business in particular; they all work for the state. In many areas, there seems to be no real leadership. As the Senator knows, the farmers are grouped into squads on the farm. There is a squad leader who, for instance, heads the melon pickers or the cotton pickers. A lot of their work is done on a task basis. It is entirely possible for a worker to complete as many as 3 tasks in 1 day in comparison with another worker completing only 1 task. That is their method of providing individual incentive, by the way.

The profits, if any, made on a farm are divided as follows: First, all of the expenses are deducted; that is, the unit has to pay to have the land plowed and the crops harvested. Whatever is left over is divided on the basis of the number of tasks all the workers on the farm perform. If a task is worth 4 or 5 or 10 rubles, and a farmer on a cooperative unit performs 1,000 tasks, he gets 1,000 times whatever the value of the particular task is. Another farmer may perform only 500 tasks. He gets 500 times the value of the task. That is their method of encouraging initiative and providing incentive among the workers.

I may say that there is a great difference in production among the various farms. For instance, in southern Russia, at the place I just mentioned, Alma-Ata, the farmers depend largely on irrigation. The water comes from the mountains, and there crops are produced every year. There is very seldom a crop failure. I saw some apple orchards almost as large as those operated by my friend the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. POTTER. I would bet the apples were not so good, though.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. There is also produced in that area quite a variety of melons and vegetables, but they cannot be shipped too far. They do not have the transportation with which to convey those products over the Urals into Moscow, the central point and the largest city in Russia. The markets for the products of that area are rather limited.

As I said, considerable cotton is grown there. Indeed, I was surprised to learn that from 7.5 to 8 million bales of cotton a year were produced there. The cotton is long-staple cotton, ranging from 1⅛ to 1⅜ inches, which is almost, but perhaps not quite, as long as cotton grown on the irrigated farms of California and other Western States.

Mr. POTTER. Did the Senator have an opportunity to discuss with individual farmers the question whether they were satisfied with collective farming as opposed to individual ownership of their land?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Of course, I did not discuss individual ownership as such, because in Russia there is no such thing as individual ownership of anything, except perhaps an automobile, if a person can afford to buy one—which is very rarely the case. Everything is owned and operated by the Government. Even the barber shops, taxicabs, the stores—everything is operated by the Government. Russians work for the Government, buy from the Government, bank with the Government, and there is no individual or free enterprise.

While in Russia, I visited quite a number of the large farms. There are two classes of farms, those that are collective and those that are state owned. The state-owned farm is usually the larger. All the machinery used on that type of farm is owned by the Government, and operated by the Government. The people who work on that kind of farm are paid daily wages. In addition to their daily wages, they are given a home to live in, with a fair-sized garden around it, or at least enough land to make a garden.

The incentive varies. If the goal established for the various crops grown on such a farm are exceeded, then the workers get a certain percentage of whatever is over and above those goals.

Mr. POTTER. That means if they reach their quotas?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, and they receive their share over and above their daily or weekly wages.

The other kind of farm in Russia is the collective farm. The distinguishing feature of this type farm is that it is worked by the families themselves, under mutual consent working agreement, so to speak. For instance, I visited a collective farm around Tashkent, where a variety of crops was grown. They engaged in dairying and grew cotton and various kinds of farm products. There were 1,500 families on that 1 farm. It was quite well equipped, and the people seemed fairly prosperous and happy, primarily because they apparently had all they wanted to eat. This particular farm was quite productive. I asked one man how much they expected to be paid for each task in 1956. He said he did not know, but he gave me the results of the year before. As I recall, each task in 1955 was worth, in our money, about $3.75. In addition to that, they grew quite a number of products in small gardens which they worked and controlled themselves. From their small gardens they were permitted to retain all the fruits and vegetables, also the milk and meat produced on their home premises. In addition to the money stipend I have just stated they also received some of the produce raised on the farm. If they had more than they needed at home they sold the overage to anyone who chose to buy.

But I found the collective farm near Tashkent to be an exception. In the dry land area the situation is different. Apparently the only thing that can be produced well there is grain. Living is much more difficult than in the vicinity of Tashkent or Alma-Ata. The land is dry, the weather very hot during the summer and very cold during the winter. Because of the climate, it is not possible to raise many cows, pigs, chickens, and other animals. In many places in this dry land area goals are set for production of wheat, cattle, and so forth. I doubt if any of those goals will ever be reached, because the land is so dry, making farming a very hazardous occupation.

Coming back to the description of the farms to which I have just adverted, in the case of a collective farm, none of the farmers own the equipment with which the land is worked. That fact is the source of great dissatisfaction among the people who work these collective farms. For example, in an area of 10 square miles there may be as many as six collective farms. In the center of that area there is a machine-tool center.

Mr. POTTER. Is that owned by the state?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is owned by the state. Tractors, plows, cultivators, harvesters, and other machinery are kept there—in fact, all tools and implements necessary to operate a farm in that locality are maintained in the pool. Those tools are owned by the Government.

Before the cooperatives start their crop, they enter into a contract with the management of the implement pool, which is, of course, the Government. They pay, in kind, for plowing the land, for preparing it, for harvesting, and for transporting the product to centers where it is processed and either stored or shipped. Every form of implement, except, perhaps, small hand tools, is owned by the Government.

Between my 1955 and 1956 visits to Russia I found there had been so much pressure, brought about by the desire of the people to own their own tractors, that in many instances the Government now permits some of the cooperatives to own from 2 to as many as 4 tractors, so that the farmers can have such tools whenever they need them.

There is much dissatisfaction on the collective farms because some farmers would like to plow their land today, but some other collective wants the equipment too, and there is not enough to go around. That necessitates a great deal of waiting. In my judgment, that accounts for a great deal of the land being in poor shape.

For example, consider the Ukraine. As a boy, I remember being taught that the Ukraine was one of the most fertile spots in Russia. Today the land has been overworked. Only 20 percent of the land in the Ukraine is allowed to lie fallow. It is nothing unusual to ride along the road and see a large field of corn, sunflowers, wheat, or oats, with as many weeds as there are crops. I was very much surprised. If this land were worked in the same manner as we work our lands over here, in time half the land could produce more than is now being produced by the entire area.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the distinguished Senator for his comments. I look forward to hearing the remainder of his statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. During my visit, I was able to travel freely, to see the things I wished to see, and to have with me, in addition to a Russian interpreter, my own interpreter, a member of the United States Embassy staff in Moscow. As a matter of fact, I arranged my own itinerary after I reached Moscow, as I have stated. My only difficulty was in obtaining accommodations where I desired to visit. As a result of a lack of accommodations, I had to travel long hours.

I found that the people of Russia, particularly some of the leaders—I do not mean the heads of the Politburo, but the heads of various travel agencies—are very sensitive about the lack of accommodations in Russia. It is my belief that that is the reason why so few visitors are able to obtain permission to go wherever they desire in Russia.

For example, when I visited the Kuban area, out of Rostov-on-the-Don, I had to be in a car for almost 20 hours, due to the fact that I had to travel from Rostov to my destination, see what I desired to see, and travel back to Rostov, all in 1 day. I could not get overnight accommodations in the Kuban area. There were no hotels, and few places to eat.

On the day to which I refer, I was on the road for 20 hours. I remember that I had on a black suit, and when I came back, it was almost white from the dust. That is where I learned about the Russian roads. They have no road system such as we have. The two roads which I described, running north and south, are about the only good ones they have. With respect to side roads, there will be perhaps 2 or 3 kilometers that are paved; then there will be a few kilometers of cobblestones, a few kilometers of gravel, and the remainder dirt. Their dirt roads are even worse and more dusty than the roads we had in Louisiana 50 years ago.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. While I completely agree with respect to the conditions of the highways in the Soviet Union, I venture to say that the Senator did notice that the Soviets have a way of getting the job done with the limited facilities they have. My understanding is that their railroad mileage is about a third less than ours, yet they haul about twice as much freight as we haul on our railroads. In spite of the terrible condition of the roads and the fact that in many cases they are impassable in time of rain, nevertheless, they seem to get the job done. Perhaps they lose many of their crops by reason of poor transportation.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is why their railroads are doing such a big business. In most areas they offer practically the only method of transportation for a long haul. So far as hauling by truck is concerned, as we know the method, it is almost unknown, except between nearby cities.

In order to save time as well as expenses, we hired a Russian car and chauffeur. We traversed a wide area of Russian farmlands. In fact, we visited the heart of Russian agriculture. I motored over 2,500 miles and flew 5,000 miles over Russian territory, as I previously stated.

I saw much waste, particularly with respect to food grains. For example, huge piles of grain lay in the open, on the roadways and the farms, without covering of any kind. Russian workers turned this grain frequently by hand, in order to facilitate drying. Buckets, trowels, shovels, dishpans, in fact, all sorts of utensils were used in the operation. Because of the short growing season, and the lack of equipment, much grain must be cut before maturity. It is windrowed in the field when the kernels are milky and thereafter thrashed after the kernels harden. South of Moscow, one half of the hard-surfaced roadway we traveled over was covered with grain for a distance of about 500 kilometers to permit it to dry. It was raining and I know there was much loss sustained. Much human power was in use to save the grain.

Russia relies, to a large extent, upon mechanical devices to facilitate farming, but almost all the tractors, combines, harrows, and other equipment I saw appeared antiquated by our standards. I saw only a few more or less modern pieces of equipment at the fairground in Moscow. They were on exhibition. Where equipment was not available, manpower was used, with women performing what we in America would regard as the work of men.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator visited at least one tractor plant, and perhaps more.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am coming to that.

Mr. LONG. I am curious to have the Senator's judgment and estimate of the quality of the Russian tractors.

Mr. ELLENDER. When I visited various factories, I noticed that there were not too many models of tractors. The Senator may have noticed that in Russia there are only five different models of automobiles. There is the Zis, which is all hand tooled and made for the members of the Politburo, or the people in the higher ranks of Government. Then there is the Zim, the kind I used, which is a sort of Buick super. Then there is one that looks like a Chevrolet, another one that looks like a Ford, and still another one, a very small car, which one can almost carry on his back.

The latter is the kind that some Russians are able to own.

With respect to tractors, there are only one or two models. They are all about the same, except as to size. I was informed that many of the tractors were poorly constructed, that the steel used, particularly for the engine, was of an inferior quality, and that there was much breakage, and a great deal of other trouble. As a matter of fact when I was in Afghanistan I learned that the Russians had contracted with Afghanistans to sell them some trucks. I was told that at the end of about 90 days those trucks were not usable. That caused quite a bit of dissatisfaction. The same thing is true with respect to various farm tools such as tractors, which the Senator has mentioned.

However, I understand that the Russians are improving their equipment, and they are learning fast.

Mr. LONG. The tractor which they were manufacturing last year appeared to be the kind that we had in America perhaps 8 or 9 years ago.

Mr. ELLENDER. Even more ancient than that. When I was a boy, working my way through college, in 1911 and 1912, I pitched wheat in Nebraska and Kansas—I see on the floor the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]—and some of the tractors I saw in Russia last year were of the kind in use in Nebraska and Kansas in 1911 and 1912. Once the Russians get a type or style, they seem to keep on manufacturing it. They may improve it a bit, of course, but usually there is very little change made from year to year.

Mr. LONG. With respect to automobiles, as I understand, the Zis was largely copied from the——

Mr. ELLENDER. The Cadillac.

Mr. LONG. It seems to me it was copied from the 1947 Packard.

Mr. ELLENDER. It looked to me more like a Cadillac.

Mr. LONG. There is one large car, which may be the Zim. As someone pointed out, Russia is the only country in the world in which a man can buy a brand new 1947 Packard.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator for his observations.

Despite the recent boasts of Russian leaders, the Soviet Union is having extreme difficulty in producing sufficient foodstuffs to properly feed its people; Russian dietary standards are far below our own. The majority of Russian people with whom I spoke—and this includes Russian men on the street—were plump and heavy-set and apparently relied almost entirely upon starchy foods for nourishment. Grain, potatoes, root crops, such as turnips, beets and radishes, form the bulk of their diet. Fats and oils come principally from sunflower seed and cottonseed. Meat is scarce and very expensive.

For the past 2 or 3 years, Russian leadership has been engaged in opening new lands in the south central part of the U. S. S. R. to agriculture. Settlers are encouraged to go there and farm. The area is semiarid and the soil is held together by a layer of virgin grasses. About 60 million acres have been put to the plow and more is being plowed. One grain crop of consequence can be grown every 4 or 5 years. This year a banner crop was produced. I predict that after the land is plowed for 3 or 4 successive years, it will blow away and create a dust bowl that will make our own look insignificant.

There is quite a stretch of land at the base of the Caucasus Mountains that is irrigated by water that comes down mountain streams which are fed from melting snows. Cotton, fruit, some vegetables, watermelons, and cantaloups are grown in abundance. Between seven and eight million bales of cotton are produced annually.

The Kuban area—comparatively new lands, located between the Caspian and Black Seas—is very fertile. The rainfall is about 25 to 28 inches. One is reminded of Iowa, Illinois, and Indiana lands. It is my belief that much corn and livestock could be produced here under proper guidance. It could be made to rival some of our own areas.

These developments, coupled with a more efficient use of the manpower available to the Soviet Union, plus an increased availability of modern farming equipment, could result in vast increases in Russian agricultural production. The Soviet, however, will continue to be plagued by a relatively short growing season, and climatic conditions which preclude the large-scale production of what we have come to regard as basic agricultural staples. I was disappointed not to find a wider variety of crops grown in the Ukraine. That once-fertile area is deteriorating. Only one-fifth of the land lies fallow each year. I saw many fields with weeds as thick as the planted grain.

Russian agriculture suffers tremendously from the concentration of production in either collective or state farms. Many of the Russian farmers have no desire to increase production or become more efficient, since they have lost their identity as individual entrepreneurs. The old saying, "What's everybody's business is nobody's business" can be successfully applied to the collective farms.

As to Russian industry, I saw some modern processes, such as a most unique shoe production line, along with great evidence of expansion, but for the most part, Russian industry seems to be crude and backward when compared with our own. I saw only five different models of passenger cars, two models of passenger buses, one for short and the other long haul, two models of refrigerators, one standard model of trucks. I do not desire to leave the impression that this status may long remain, for great efforts are being made to modernize Russian industry, and to expand production, particularly in the area of heavy industry. Dams, both for navigation and power generation, are being constructed. More factories are rising. The industrial base is being widened, and within the next 5 to 10 years, Russia will undoubtedly become a mighty industrial power. That will come about by the increasing demand for more and more consumer goods.

I was much impressed with hydroelectric power development in Russia, particularly on the Volga River. At Stalingrad, 21 turbines will be constructed to produce 2,350,000 kilowatt-hours per hour. Eight power facilities will be built on that great river which will produce, I was told, 65 billion kilowatt-hours per year. Two rivers that now flow into the Arctic Ocean will be directed to the Volga so as to increase its capacity.

I visited a huge electrical manufacturing plant in Kharkov. I saw under construction a turbine that was larger in diameter than any I have ever seen in the United States. I doubt that we have sufficient water capacity to engage such a huge turbine economically.

I was not in Russia during the school months. However, I did have occasion to talk to Russians in almost all walks of life. The Soviets are placing great emphasis upon educational training. A modified form of merit system is in effect, with students selected for certain training on the basis of ability and aptitude; they attend college at Government expense; subsidies are paid to scholars, particularly in the technological fields and in both theoretical and applied sciences, I was informed.

Too, Russian children are being exposed to a universal educational system. In cities of 10,000 and more, from the 1st to the 10th grades is a must and in all other areas, from the 1st to the 7th is compulsory. While the Russian school curriculum is spiced heavily with Communist doctrine, the Soviet leadership has not yet found a way to communize such basic principles as the chemical composition of water or the Pythagorean theorum in geometery. I am firmly convinced that it is the Russian educational system that offers the greatest hope for ultimate Russian freedom. The people are beginning to think for themselves, and as time goes on, it will be more and more difficult for the leaders to keep them in line.

I found that, as a whole, the educated Russians I spoke with were extremely curious about our mode of life in the United States, and—even more important—demonstrated a desire if not a compelling urge to go behind catchy Red slogans, and to do their own thinking. I have no doubt that the Russians of today are better off than they have ever been. Most of them seem satisfied for

the reason that they know no better way of life than that which they are now enjoying.

Joseph Stalin grew to power in the midst of ignorance and poverty. I am convinced that because of the changed conditions in Russia the people will not permit another despot to assume such powers as those exercised by Stalin.

As more Russians become educated, they will become less and less prone to accept at face value the propaganda-loaded description of life in the United States which the Red propaganda system dins insistently into their ears. The Russian people are curious by nature; they are becoming increasingly more curious about Americans, about life in America, and about the freedoms we enjoy.

During my stay in Russia, I visited the Crimea, where former royal palaces have been turned into worker hotels and resorts. People gathered around me in the street, at the hotels, and on the boardwalks, eager to feel the quality of my clothing, to see the kind of leather from which my shoes were made, and to hear me speak—through our interpreter—of life in America. They were astounded to learn that American workers are not starving in the streets of New York, and that Negroes are not lynched by the hundreds in the deep South. A good many of the questions which were propounded to me were along the propaganda line and came from newspapers such as Izvestia and Pravda.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Was the Senator able to have those interviews with the common people in Russia?

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, yes; indeed. When I visited the great palace in Yalta, which was built for the use of the czars and which is now a workers' hotel, I visited at least half a dozen of the large rooms. For instance, the room which formerly was the czar's bedroom was large enough to accommodate 40 beds. The workers who visited the palace came from all parts of Russia. They included doctors and lawyers; some were the heads of cooperatives; others were coal miners or factory workers. At each place I visited in the great palace, I spoke with the people through my own interpreter. They asked all kinds of questions about America.

Evidently it became known that I was in the palace, because when I went outside, more than 250 Russians were waiting at the entrance to talk with me. I spoke with them freely for more than an hour and a half through my own interpreter, answering the questions they asked me. I had never before seen such great interest.

I may say to the Senator that, in my humble judgment, the people of Russia are now beginning to think for themselves. They are becoming bolder. All of that is due, in my humble opinion, to the increased opportunities for education which are being offered in Russia. When Stalin came into power, the people of Russia were in poor circumstances. They had little or no clothing, and food was extremely scarce.

I learned of the living conditions which then prevailed in Russia by speaking with older people, ranging from 75 to 90 years of age. I asked about the living conditions in present-day Russia as compared with the living conditions under the czars. The people were almost unanimous in saying to me—and these statements were substantially the same at various places—that under the czars there was even less freedom than the Russian people now have; the people did not own much in the way of farms, or other property of that kind. They said they worked longer hours, harder, and for less pay for the nobility, that they were poorly clad and had very little food. They also said that under the present regime there was one outstanding difference: There is much more food and much more clothing, and in general they are receiving better medical attention, better educational opportunities—in general a better way of life—than was the case under the czars.

For example, in practically all of Russia, especially around some of the large manufacturing facilities, such as cotton mills and other large factories, hospitals and day nurseries for the care of the children of working mothers are provided.

The Russian people asked all kinds of questions of me and I asked questions of them. They freely answered my questions.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BLAKLEY. I wish to refer to the Senator's discussion awhile ago concerning farming. I wonder if the Senator would make some observation with respect to the amount of freedom the farmers have to use the products which they themselves produce.

Mr. ELLENDER. The collective farmer has no right, although he produces the goods, to take what he desires, except that which he produces in his own garden. Each collective-farming family is given a house in which to live, about a third of an acre of land for garden purposes, and another small parcel of land on which to keep a cow and a calf, perhaps 4 or 5 hogs, and all the chickens which are necessary for home consumption. All the produce grown in the garden, together with the cows, hogs, and chickens needed for food, belong to the collective family. They can sell these products on the so-called free market, which is in essence in competition with the state, because the state sells produce similar to that grown by the average collective-farm family. I found that although there is some competition, the food, because of its scarcity, is sold by the collective farmer on many occasions for a pretty fair price.

There is also this liberty afforded workers on the collective farms: If a collective farmer is allotted more wheat or corn than he and his family can consume, he can dispose of it in the markets which are usually operated by a group of collective farmers in competition with the Government. But aside from that, the collective farmers have no say, except in a collective way, as to what becomes of their produce.

Much of the crops are contracted for in advance. The Government takes out of the crop so much for plowing the land, so much for harvesting and handling the crop; not more than 25 percent of the crops can be taken for those purposes. The cooperatives are forced to sell, after these levies, to the State from 30 to as much as 50 percent of the crop at a price fixed by the Government. This price may be 10 times less than the collective farmer could get on the open market. These low prices are fixed to compensate the Government for the use of the land. In other words, this is done in lieu of collecting taxes.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will permit me to do so, I should like to ask him to discuss further the matter of education, especially as it relates to his observations concerning the rural areas of Russia. The Senator made some observation with reference to how the schools were arranged and what courses of education were given.

Mr. ELLENDER. I had intended to speak about that later, but I will be happy to do so at this time.

There has been a steady evolution in the educational system in Russia during the past 30 years. Today education is a must for all city children between the ages of 6 and 18. They must attend preparatory schools, where grades from the 1st to the 10th are taught. In the country districts and in cities of less than 10,000 population, it is compulsory for children to attend school from the first to the seventh grade.

When a student graduates from one of these schools, he has a profession selected for him according to his aptitude. Engineering, medicine, chemistry, and similar professions are stressed.

Although on the surface it may appear that the Government forces students to study particular courses, nevertheless the Government makes it attractive for the students to do so. If a student desires to study engineering, the Government makes it more encouraging for him to follow that course by providing him with more financial assistance than would be the case if he studied languages, for example. Great emphasis is placed on preparation for the technical professions. Very little encouragement is given to the studying of elementary subjects or the study of the arts. Of course, students are able to take such courses, if they wish to, but they are not encouraged to pursue those courses. The real incentives are provided for the study of the scientific courses.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Would the Senator go a little further into the question of students being paid to go to school? Are the students paid an allowance?

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, yes. They get cash and lodging.

For example, Moscow University boasts of having more dormitory space than any other university in the world. I visited the University of Moscow. It has 6,000 single rooms for students. Each student has his own room. Of course the room is more or less a cubbyhole; it is very small. But it is a private room. Anyone studying at the university is paid a cer-

tain amount per day to cover his board and lodging and also his clothing and other expenses while he is studying. Those who study must contract to work a certain number of years in the field of endeavor to which their studies relate. For instance, one who studies medicine must agree to work a certain number of years in hospitals. While he is working there he will receive only his board or perhaps a small stipend, until he becomes proficient. After this initial training such persons continue to work for the Government, but they are paid in proportion to their efficiency. At the medical schools, some study surgery; others study internal medicine; and so forth. In most cases I found that the students are prone to specialize. Of course the teachers select the branch of medicine which is to be studied by the individual students. Some leeway is allowed the students, but the teachers and professors encourage them to study what they feel the student can do best.

I also found that once a student completes his course and is given employment—whether in engineering or in other fields—he is unable to change his job at will. That is, of course, unlike the situation which prevails in the United States. Instead, the Russian student must give notice to his present employer—which is the Government—that he wishes to obtain a job somewhere else which is also controlled by the Government. It usually takes from 2 to 3 weeks for a determination to be made as to whether he should be permitted to change jobs. Often, the applicant is unable to make such a move, because of a lack of a place for him at the factory at which he has applied, or sometimes the factory at which he has been working takes steps to prevent his leaving. There is very little freedom of movement, as I gathered from talking to quite a number of the Russian people; there is very little freedom to change employment from one place to another.

Of course changes often occur within a given factory. I noticed one peculiarity in most of the plants in Russia. For instance, a huge dam is being built approximately 21 kilometers north of Stalingrad. At that site the Russians propose to construct a dam with 21 turbines, from which they hope to produce 2,350,000 kilowatts of electricity an hour. In connection with that project, the first thing done was to construct a large city. The city is 2 kilometers from the dam. It has broad avenues lined with trees, theaters, stores, and so forth, all owned and controlled by the Government. In addition, there are hospitals for the workers at the dam, and for their families; there are cultural centers where all who work at the dam can exhibit their skills or talents.

The Russians are very proud of the huge stadiums constructed near all these installations; they are the first things they show to visitors. At the stadiums the boys and girls, and men and women who work at the nearby facilities have access to soccer fields, football fields, tennis courts, swimming pools, tracks, and so forth. The athletes from each facility compete with those from other facilities. In that way they become very proficient in various sports.

When I visited other places, such as Tashkent, Alma-Ata, and Chelyabinsk, which is to Russia what Pittsburgh is to America, I noticed that the same practice prevailed, that is, around each large facility the Russians were constructing schools and hospitals similar to the ones I have just described.

Any factory built in Russia also has, in connection with it, a technical school, so that the children of the workers at the factory can become qualified to work in the factory if they so desire. The Russians make it very attractive to their young people, to learn various trades. As they become more and more proficient, they are allowed to advance somewhat in grade, or in the type of work they perform. Of course, the pay they receive is in proportion to their ability to produce.

I talked to many men and women who were engaged in work at the factories. Some of them earn as much as $500 a month in United States money. Of course, they are unable to buy with that amount of money as much as it is possible to buy in the United States. However, the men and women who are able to work well with their hands are paid a premium for doing so.

The Russian people to whom I talked thought it unbelievable that almost every American family has its own automobile, and that the people of the United States do not want war with the people of Russia.

They were extremely curious about the prices of food and goods in the United States. They displayed doubt when I told them my shoes cost $17.50, compared with a price of $65 or $75 in the Soviet Union. The cheapness in price and the abundant availability of goods in America created amazement and disbelief among these people, who are charged $220 for an 8-inch television set and $500 for a small electric refrigerator, and to whom owning an automobile is an almost unheard of luxury for the average worker.

This curiosity, it strikes me, offers the free world a fertile area in which can be planted the seeds of freedom for Russia. I therefore recommend that, subject to reasonable security regulations, we broaden our exchange of persons program with the Soviet Union, and that we bring more of the Russian people into the United States, to see at firsthand how our people live. I recommend, too, that our Information Service increase its efforts to reach behind the Iron Curtain with the message of freedom. In this connection, it is of vital importance that our magazines, broadcasts, and so forth, to the people of Russia contain no criticism of their way of life. Although we abhor communism, instead of disparaging it we must stress the positive aspects of our own system. We should say, in effect: "We give you credit for believing in communism as an economic system; that is your right. But here is what a free people, living under a democratic system of government, have—both in physical and spiritual things." A better plan would be to extol the virtues of democracy, and completely ignore their system.

I do not pretend to be a psychologist, but I do know that the surest way to shut the ears of the Russian people to the story of our way of life is to criticize their existing form of government. As the old saying goes, "You can catch more flies with honey than with vinegar."

I am sincere in my belief that by bringing more Russian farmers, more Russian industrial workers, doctors, teachers, more Russian housewives and children and others, to our country, and permitting them to see at firsthand how we live and the benefits available to us under a free system, we can demonstrate that communism cannot hold a candle to democracy in furthering the cause of individual freedom or bringing about a better way of life. This exchange of persons, coupled with objective reporting of our American way of life, will, I believe, create a mighty force for peace with its genesis among the Russian people—a force which the leaders of Russia could ignore only at their personal peril.

As a matter of fact, the Russian leadership has done much to make any effort on its part to generate a warlike spirit extremely difficult. Throughout the countryside were posters bearing the legend: "Peace." The Russian radio repeated the message that Russia desires only peace. The Russian people have been conditioned to expect peace, and I feel that it will be extremely difficult for Soviet leaders to plunge them into a major conflict without creating within the U. S. S. R. fearsome conditions which perhaps could result in a violent reaction among the Russian people.

The Russian people with whom I spoke believe that the United States fears Russia, and that present American policy is designed with one ultimate objective—the forcible destruction of the Soviet Union. Therefore, they fear us. The Russian people love their land, if not the present Government, and as patriots—the people of Russia would be willing to fight for their existence. Soviet leadership has capitalized upon the fear to which I have alluded; through this medium, they have been able to keep living standards low in order to forge a military machine. If it were possible to dispel this fear, as I think it is, to eliminate the distrust of American motives among the Russian people, then relations between our two countries would improve overnight. We must make every effort to convince them that our preparations are not for war or aggression, but for defense.

To illustrate what I am driving at, I may state that while visiting the great dam at Stalingrad, I asked the engineer in charge if it were not true that the dam was started in 1950 or 1951 and that suddenly orders came from Russian leaders to stop building the dam. I asked why that was done. He said because the money was needed for other purposes. And what were those purposes, I asked? He said it was political, and he did not care to answer. I chided him and said: "I suppose you spent the money to make weapons of war to fight us." He smiled, but insisted that the question was political and he would not discuss it further. I then asked: "When

did you resume work?" He said, "After the Geneva Conference, when your President indicated to the world that America wanted peace and not war."

As I said, the dam had been started in 1950, and the work continued into 1951. No work was done during 1952, 1953, and 1954; construction was again begun in 1955, after the Geneva Conference took place.

The older Russian citizens with whom I spoke, people who had lived under and could recall the rule of the Czars, were unanimous in their belief that "things are better now than then." They have more food, more clothing, and a greater sense of their individual worth, as I indicated earlier in my remarks. However, there is much discontent within Russia—discontent which, nourished by exposure to America and Americans, could blossom into such a powerful force that communism could receive a telling blow.

These factors—increased education, natural curiosity, and a desire for self-improvement—are available to the United States for intelligent use as the foundation for an ultimate rejection by the Russian people of communism as both a way of life and an economic system.

I therefore regard as most unwise our Government's recent shutdown of exchange of persons between Russia and the United States. I think it was stupid. The reaction of the Russian people, fostered by the Communist propaganda machine, will be: "America fears us—she fears that we will see her poverty and her ignorance—she does not want us to see how weak she is and how her people are oppressed." In addition, this action will lend credence to the oft-repeated pronouncements of Moscow propaganda mediums that the United States wants war, while Russia wants peace. This, of course, will create an atmosphere which could ignite like tinder should even a tiny spark fall.

Since my return to the United States I have been referred to by some mediums as having been brainwashed by Khrushchev. This I most vehemently deny. I believe I have noted basic factors which, if only capitalized upon by our country, can result in the destruction of dictatorial rule in Russia. The people of Russia bear within their great masses the seed of American victory in the cold war—a victory which can result not only in benefiting the free world but in rekindling the light of freedom behind the Iron Curtain. It is now time for us to begin nourishing this seed, to the end that fear will be replaced with trust, ignorance with knowledge, and, ultimately, cold war with warm friendship between the people of Russia and the people of the United States.

Mr. President, as I stated at the opening of my remarks, I could recite many more experiences I had in Russia. I was about to reach down to obtain two volumes of my diary. What I hold in my hand is the result of much work. My diary consists of 276 legal-size pages; and, as has been my custom, I will file it—along with my country reports, contained in 21 volumes—with the Committee on Appropriations. I invite each Senator to read both of these. I believe they will find both my diary and my report informing and interesting.

I shall also file these documents with the State Department, the International Cooperation Administration, the United States Information Agency, and the Department of Defense.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CURTIS. I am sure the entire Senate is appreciative of the work the Senator from Louisiana has done, and about which he is giving us the benefit of his observations and conclusions.

I should like to ask a question concerning some of the industrial developments in Russia. The Senator from Louisiana referred particularly to the lack of progress in the type of farm machinery used. Is that a correct picture all through Russia's industrial development, or is that an exception rather than the rule?

Mr. ELLENDER. Generally speaking, there is little progress in evidence in the field of tools, automobiles, farm machinery, and other mechanical equipment. The one exception that came to my attention was the up-to-date electrical equipment—dynamos, generators, turbines, and other types of electrical machinery. In this latter field, they have been most progressive. As for automobiles, farm machinery and the like, the Russians do not change models every year or so, as we do over here.

Mr. CURTIS. How about armaments?

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not see any armaments. I felt it would be futile to ask to see their airplane factories, for instance, or their atomic plants.

I wish to say that the industrial factories I visited wherein there was evidence of some progress, were those dealing with the electrical phases of Russia's industrial development. I saw steam turbines which are now being used and others which will be installed to generate electricity in the thickly populated sections throughout Russia, or, at least, so I was told. I was told that in some areas more than 65 percent of the farms are electrified.

Of course, there are not many such areas, but I predict that when all the dams which the Russians plan to build on the Dnieper and Volga Rivers are constructed, there will be much electricity available, sufficient to supply practically all the thickly populated farming sections of Russia.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator.

### AFGHANISTAN

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, when I left the USSR, I flew over the Hindu Kush Mountains to Kabul, Afghanistan. In Afghanistan we have undertaken quite a large air-transport program. We are building airports, equipping an Afghan airline with planes, training pilots, and installing navigation aids.

Yet, Afghanistan, like many other countries in Asia, does not have any trained technicians. As they so often do, our representatives in Afghanistan have gone overboard in their effort to provide facilities which the country has no technicians to operate; for instance, the airport at Kandahar, the airport at Kabul, and airports in other places, and of course the navigation aids. Afghanistan does not have technicians to operate such facilities. As a result, we are paying quite a large sum of money to Pan American for the purpose of sending instructors to that area to teach some of the local citizens how to operate those facilities.

We are in a bad way in Afghanistan, because of the building there of the Helmand Valley project. When I was there 3 years ago, I told the manager of Morrison-Knutson, the California firm, who has the construction contract, that the Helmand Valley project had not been thoroughly planned. This project was begun by the Afghans themselves. They employed engineers to draft plans without studying the flow of the river and without determining how much land would be covered by backwaters, and so forth. As I pointed out, the area covered by one of the lakes to be created will be almost as large as the land they expect to irrigate. This area to be irrigated is covered by thin soil. It will not produce nearly as much as the river bottoms, which are to be covered by water from the dam. I fear that this project will never meet the Afghan hopes. As a matter of fact many basic weaknesses are already showing up, and we are being blamed for that situation, although we had no more to do with it than any one of the pages sitting before me. The Afghans say, "Since an American engineer built it, and since you loaned us the money to complete the project after we exhausted our own funds, you should have known that the project was plausible, or else you should not have loaned us the money."

There may be something to that argument. However, as I have said, we had absolutely nothing to do with the construction of the dam, or with the plans. Yet, as I have said, we are being blamed for its possible failure.

While I was in Afghanistan, a large delegation from the United States, headed by the former Governor of Idaho, came there to study the project, in the hope that some way could be found to make it successful and thus satisfy the Afghans. But it is my judgment, from the two visits I made to the project that there is very little hope of making the project as profitable as was intended by the Afghans.

There is one other bad situation which faces us in connection with the project. The "farmers" who are to take over much of the land to be made available by the project are nomads, not dirt farmers. They are people who roam about, sleeping in tents, going from one place to another without having a permanent home. They do not know farming—they are shepherds and goatherders—yet our mission there has a program under way to try to teach those people how to farm.

It is my judgment that the money earmarked for this project is wasted. If the project turns out to be good, the

Afghans will get the credit because they started it. But if it is bad, we shall be blamed—heads we lose, tails we lose.

Before any money is made available by way of gifts, grants, or even loans, this project should be thoroughly studied, in the hope that there may be some way by which it can be made workable.

(The statement concerning Afghanistan, which was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:)

AFGHANISTAN

There are three major programs either contemplated or underway in this isolated and undeveloped country. They are: (1) Development of air transportation; (2) technical and economic cooperation with the Helmand Valley Authority; (3) technical cooperation with the Afghan Bureau of Public Roads.

A number of other technical assistance projects are already in existence, which I shall hereafter discuss, but the three items I have referred to are receiving the greatest emphasis and deserve the most comprehensive scrutiny.

Development of air transportation is a joint United States-Afghan project under which the United States Government will assist the Afghanistan Government in developing a balanced, efficient, and financially stable air transport system.

Afghanistan is a land-locked country with an estimated area of 260,000 square miles. It is characterized by mountain and desert country interspersed with small valleys which are made to produce by irrigation from snow-fed mountain streams. It is the feeling of our planners in Afghanistan that due to this little nation's geographical position, which is astride trade and invasion routes leading from the Middle East into Central Asia and the Indian subcontinent, Afghanistan should be modernized, and to the maximum extent possible, made to feel that its most stable and realistic future lies in alinement with the West.

Consequently, our efforts in Afghanistan have been directed toward providing a foundation, both economic and political, upon which the Afghans can build a secure national existence.

Communication facilities in Afghanistan are particularly primitive. There is no railway in existence. The primary road system consists of a comparatively crude highway which connects the principal cities of the country; these roads are unpaved, with bridges frequently washed out. Many of the highways are little more than camel trails. One of the objectives of our ambitious planners in Afghanistan is to increase communication between the various areas of this backward land.

The air transportation development program will stress five major objectives. These are: first, the development of an international airport at Kandahar; second, the development of an Afghan national airline (Aryana Airlines Co., Ltd.); third, the development of small domestic airports; fourth, the development of an airway system in accord with international air-traffic requirements; and fifth, development of the organization and skills of what is now the Afghan Department of Civil Aviation.

The development of Kandahar International Airport will include the construction of runways, taxiways, aprons, hangars, control tower, high intensity lighting system, aviation fuel storage and fueling systems, water supply system and essential buildings and facilities for operational purposes. In connection with the development of the airlines company proper, it is proposed to extend technical and economic assistance to the end that this organization will be managed and operated in accordance with what our planners regard as sound commercial practices. It is proposed that the United States Government train pilots, mechanics, traffic control personnel, among others, and procure additional airplanes.

In developing smaller domestic airports and emergency landing strips, the proposed program will concentrate on three airports located at Herat, Baghlan, and Jalalabad, with emergency landing strips at other sites.

With respect to the development of an airway system, it is proposed that proper communications and navigational equipment be installed at all airports and other selected sites which our Government and the Government of Afghanistan may mutually agree upon. Of course, it will require technically trained personnel to operate this ambitious program, and we are presently undertaking to train Afghans for not only maintenance and communication chores but also in the regulation of civil aviation, that is, to equip the citizens of this extremely backward land with sufficient know-how to control the economic aspects of a commercial aviation program. It is my assumption that the end result of this latter phase will be the establishment of an Afghan equivalent of our Civil Aeronautics Board.

At the present time, a grand total of * * * in appropriated United States funds has been allocated to the aviation program. Of this amount, * * * is a loan; the remaining * * * is a grant. The loan funds will be used to provide aircraft for the airline company, for engineering and construction, and to import equipment, materials, supplies, etc., for the international airport at Kandahar.

Grant funds will be used in the following amounts for the following purposes:

Airline management and technical operations assistance and training, including training abroad, * * * communications-navigational aids, * * * with half of this amount to be used at Kandahar and the remaining one-half at Kabul, Herat, Baghlan, Jalalabad, and other sites agreed upon; engineering and construction services and imported commodities for the construction and operation of domestic airports, * * *

In addition to the $1,800,000 which we have loaned to the Government of Afghanistan to be used in connection with the air-transportation program for engineering and related services, * * * in grant funds will be made available for similar purposes, with an additional grant of * * * to be used for training equipment and facilities for technical schools. An additional * * * be used for the Department of Civil Aviation functional operating and training-assistance program.

While the United States proposes contributing * * * at this time for the air transportation development program, approximately 100 million afghanis (local currency of Afghanistan) will be contributed by the Government of Afghanistan. It is to be noted, however, that the great bulk of this amount is in the form of professional, skilled, and unskilled labor.

I recommend that an earnest effort be made to ascertain whether or not this program is too ambitious and not in keeping with the financial capabilities of the Government of Afghanistan. As I indicated earlier in this report, this is an extremely underdeveloped land. I fear that once these amounts are expended in order to provide a foundation for a commercial aircraft and transportation system in Afghanistan, a continued effort will be required by our Government to see that the installations constructed, the aircraft provided, the navigational aids installed, and so forth, are properly serviced and maintained. In addition, the Government of Afghanistan may feel that the United States is at least morally bound to continue a pilot-training program, and to exercise general supervisory functions over the entire program. If this is true, then I fear that our initial effort in this tiny land will lead to a long-continued program, which, under the circumstances, could lead to an increased feeling among the Afghan people themselves that their country is falling under the political domination of the United States.

As a matter of fact, there were indications that this feeling is growing at this time, stimulated no doubt by the intensive propaganda efforts of the Russians. To counter this program, we have had to undertake a rather comprehensive information effort here. Thus, we enter the vicious circle. Our aid, which contemplates projects beyond the inherent capabilities of the people, creates ill will amongst the people. This necessitates greater expenditures for the information program. The more spent for information results in the need for more aid. Thus, around and around we go and where we will stop nobody knows.

Perhaps an even better illustration of my remarks can be found with respect to the Helmand Valley program.

According to information provided me while in Afghanistan, the purpose of our cooperation with the Afghan Helmand Valley Authority is to provide basic assistance essential for the ultimate success of this ambitious program.

The Helmand Valley program goes back to 1946, when the royal government of Afghanistan entered into a contract with the International Engineering Company and Morrison-Knudsen Afghanistan, Inc., a construction company, for building this combination reclamation, power development, and navigation project. No studies were made of the projects, except that plans for two dams were perfected at the request of the Afghan Government. The Government had on hand a little over $23 million and expected to complete the projects with that sum. The dams were started and well advanced when the Afghan Government ran out of funds. Applications for loans were made with the Export-Import Bank in 1950 and in 1954, and after only cursory engineering studies the bank loaned $21 million and $18,500,000, respectively, to the Government of Afghanistan to continue and complete the dams, canals, irrigation, and other works. This total of nearly $40 million made available by the United States Export-Import Bank had its implications. In making the loan we were supposed to know that the project was feasible; in fact, the prestige of the United States was at stake in the success or failure of this project. In fact, since American engineers were employed, the project was destined to be a great success, according to its promoters.

We find ourselves, according to our planners, in the unhappy position of being blamed if the ill-planned project is not successfully completed, and actually receiving but scant credit should it be a success, since a successful effort will result in the government of Afghanistan (which conceived the scheme in the first place) receiving the credit.

Because of this "heads you win, tails we lose" position of the United States, high priority has been given to the Helmand Valley Project in our assistance effort. Prior to fiscal year 1956, we extended technical assistance to Afghanistan and the Helmand Valley Authority on a more or less piecemeal basis. As the committee will recall, I pointed out in my report last year that the project appeared to be ill-planned and in many respects ill-conceived. Unfortunately, as I indicated before, this project was started on engineering studies which were essentially incomplete and which had not been thoroughly worked out. From the information I was able to obtain concerning our earlier efforts, it would seem that it would be correct to state that prior to fiscal year 1956 our money invested in this project was essentially wasted.

Prior to the 1956 fiscal year, our funds were used primarily to keep canals and minor irrigation facilities in operating condition;

to accumulate hydrological data essential to the management of the flow of water from the reservoirs (which certainly should have been done prior to the undertaking of the project), to formulate and implement an agricultural program for the entire valley, to establish agricultural research, forestry, and horticultural nurseries, to undertake rural development including environmental sanitation, health and educational programs, and to establish a sound administrative program for the Helmand Valley Authority.

In other words, prior to the 1956 fiscal year, technical assistance rendered to the Government of Afghanistan in connection with this project amounted to performing functions which certainly should have been completed in advance of undertaking the project and, certainly, in advance of the granting of loans in 1950 and 1954 by the Export-Import Bank.

Since 1956, spurred by what our planners describe as "unexpected problems which have been encountered in the land-reclamation phase of the Helmand Valley development," the entire project has been resurveyed at the request of the royal Government of Afghanistan. While there I met members of the commission making the study.

At the time of my visit, I was informed that the Helmand Valley fiscal year 1957 works are being formulated only tentatively and will later be modified to conform with the recommendations of this survey mission. So far I have not been informed of its findings.

• • • • •

Just a brief rundown of the various subprojects involved in the overall valley program will indicate the present scope and the projected scope of what could become a monumental American effort here. As stated earlier, prior to fiscal 1957, ICA provided only technical assistance for the implementation of the Helmand Valley project. In June of 1956, $500,000 in economic assistance, to be spent over a 3-year period, was allotted for the proposed works. Up to the present time the Helmand Valley development program has been basically an operation designed to make increased water resources available for established agricultural areas and to reclaim additional agricultural lands. Two dams for water storage have been completed as well as approximately 200 miles of main canals and necessary laterals and drainage works. An additional 100 miles of main canals together with the necessary laterals and drainage works are under construction. When completed, it is proposed that the irrigation system will supply water for approximately 750,000 acres of land already under cultivation and for approximately 200,000 acres of reclaimed lands. The maintenance of this phase of the authority requires considerable know-how, and, unfortunately, the local personnel experienced in this work is extremely limited. Therefore, the primary purpose of our effort with respect to the canal operation and maintenance work has been to provide assistance in the nature of technical personnel to operate and maintain the canal system and to train local personnel for the efficient discharge of their responsibilities.

The second phase of the authority program is a surface-water investigation project, the primary purpose of which is to accumulate hydrological data essential to the management of the flow of water from the two reservoirs already constructed. To further this work, we have established, operated, and maintained stream-flow stations on rivers and canals and compiled records for present and future use. We have also established and presently operate a network of weather stations to study and analyze stream-flow records and to prepare rainfall-runoff computations and runoff forecasts. We have also begun ground-water investigations which appeared essential to the solution of rather serious drainage problems. Three technicians are presently engaged in this work.

The third subproject in this authority program is a community-development program which has stressed assistance to settlers in the reclaimed lands and the training of village workers and extension specialists in agriculture, health and sanitation, and social education. In other words, now that additional land has been made available, we are embarking upon a program to teach the settlers in these areas how best to use this land.

The fourth phase of the authority involves technical assistance and training in introducing and establishing principles and techniques of general administration, organization, and management in order to provide the local administrators of the authority with sufficient training to properly administer its various phases. (During fiscal year 1957, funds to undertake this work on a 2-year basis under contract with an American Administrative Services Organization are proposed to be allocated.)

The fifth and final phase of the authority program involves a public health and sanitation effort in the Helmand Valley. It will be tied in with the village-development project, which I referred to earlier, and will stress assistance in sanitation, including the construction of latrines, compound planning, sewage-disposal and similar programs. This will involve three technicians during the 1957 fiscal year.

While in Afghanistan I visited a considerable portion of the Helmand Valley project, and I quote now from my on-the-spot notes:

"The Helmand Valley project was not properly planned in the first place, as I first noted 2 years ago. The firm hired to construct the two existing dams by the Afghans several years ago and which firm was partly paid out of funds advanced by the Export-Import Bank, evidently failed to live up to the original expectations of the Afghan Government. Consequently the Afghans have spent not only the bulk of the money they had planned to make available themselves for this work but the amounts loaned by the Export-Import Bank as well. Since the project has still not met local government expectations, the United States is being blamed by virtue of the fact that it was our Export-Import Bank that made the original loans in the first place."

I visited both of the existing dams in the Helmand Valley area. The first (Arghandab) has formed a lake 2½ miles wide and about 24 miles long. The second (Kajakai) has formed a lake of similar size. Both of these structures are quite impressive and both have been built so that generating equipment can be installed if and when money is made available.

I consulted with the local representative of the Morrison-Knudsen Co., and he admitted to me that he was hired to build dams, but that he was not fully acquainted with the project or how it would operate. It was his view that his company had been employed before the Afghanistan Government had fully completed the necessary preconstruction planning.

A ride through the country with the technical advisor to the Helmand Valley Authority resulted in my being able to inspect canal and lateral works. We also visited the first major reclamation and resettlement area undertaken under the valley authority. This particular section consisted of 21,000 acres; the soil appeared to be extremely shallow. By visiting subsequent areas I learned that there are now approximately 385,000 acres of land under development. However, I would recommend that before any further money is spent the survey mission should be permitted to conduct extensive soil surveys since it appeared to me that the soil, once the rich river bottoms proper are left, is extremely thin. I noticed stones and rocks scattered over most of the acres and the land is as hard as cement. It appears to me that much will have to be done at considerable expense to develop this area and condition the land for cultivation.

According to my information, the primary purpose behind the program is to settle the many nomads which roam Afghanistan. These tribes own thousands of sheep, goats, and camels and, basically, they are not farmers. Nevertheless our technicians are hard at work trying to make dirt farmers out of people who have wandered throughout this ancient land almost since time immemorial. Since the older folks are extremely set in their ways and actually have no interest in agriculture, our technicians have concentrated their efforts on young and inexperienced boys. Frankly, I fear that even should the proposed and expected areas be reclaimed, it will not be possible to convince a sufficient number of these nomadic tribal members to farm these areas efficiently. After revisiting this project, I have found that not only was the entire scheme ill planned and insufficiently developed before vast sums of money were poured into it, but also that even with comprehensive and extensive planning, it will not meet the expectations of the Afghan Government. If more money be spent I sincerely hope that it will not come from the United States Treasury. Our experts in Afghanistan are advocating the expenditure of substantial amounts of money in order to make the project a success. They fear that unless we do so, we shall incur the displeasure of the Afghanistan people and that they will turn to Russia for aid. As a matter of fact, a considerable amount of Russian money has already been spent in this country. (See classified attachment with respect to ure of Soviet loans thus far.) The general nature of work undertaken with Russian aid has involved paving streets in Kabul, building a grain silo, bakery, and oil storage tanks, and performing highway rehabilitation.

Not to be outdone, the United States is also proposing a highway construction program. According to my data, we are presently extending technical assistance to the Ministry of Public Works of Afghanistan, with primary efforts directed at planning a national road network. As noted by our mission here, the improvement of roads in Afghanistan necessarily has a high priority because it is basic to the nation's general economic development. They add: "The present high per-ton-mile cost of transport constitutes an obstacle to internal and external trade and consequently is a brake on agricultural, industrial, and mineral development. The (road) project will contribute to the success of ministry efforts to improve Afghanistan's roads and to the establishment of an effective maintenance organization."

• • • • •

Besides these three programs which I have discussed in detail, reference to exhibit A will indicate the following additional projects.

A national agricultural development project (technical cooperation with the Ministry of Agriculture) to modernize the production of livestock and crops, which presently involve century-old practices. Ultimately, our technical cooperation is designed to—

(1) Strengthen the organization and functioning of the technical and administrative departments of the Ministry;

(2) Establish a central research and experiment station in Kabul and substations in the provincial areas;

(3) Develop a national forestry policy and program;

(4) Develop a program for controlling locusts and other destructive insects;

(5) Introduce improved varieties of crops and breeds of livestock;

(6) Improve agricultural techniques and practices throughout the country; and

(7) Provide in-service training and training abroad for Ministry of Agricultural personnel.

We are also involved in a program of technical cooperation with the Ministry of Mines and Industry which involves a mineral resources and coal production project. We have given assistance to the Ministry of Mines and Industry concerning coal production since 1952. The best that can be said as a result of this aid is that production at these mines has been maintained, with a planned increase and output at one of them to materialize with the installation of an electric power plant in 1957. The assistance planned through fiscal year 1957 will emphasize the development of additional coal deposits in Afghanistan. Our planners feel that this is necessary since they foresee an increase in Afghan industrial activity with a consequent increase in fuel and power requirements.

We are also extending technical assistance to the Ministry of Education to get more students to go to school. At the present time only about 5 percent of the young men of this country and only a fraction of 1 percent of the girls of school age attend school. Thus, we have established an institute of education, under contract with Columbia University—the Afghan Institute of Technology—a technical high school to supply trained workers for projects and industries of Afghanistan; a vocational agricultural educational project, under contract with the University of Wyoming, to bring up to date the agricultural training program of the Afghan people; to train agricultural and engineering technicians, to provide administrative training and techniques to the University of Kabul, and to generally modernize the entire educational program of Afghanistan—a program which, for all practical purposes, had never before been in existence.

We are also dabbling in Afghanistan's finances in that we have established a technical assistance project to provide consultative and technical aid to the Ministry of Finance of the Royal Government of Afghanistan in developing a more realistic organization of the Ministry, to set up budgetary preparation techniques, to organize a banking system, to teach administration with respect to fiscal matters to those underdeveloped people, and to generally educate the Afghans in what we consider to be the proper use of public funds and budgetary processes.

Perhaps it would be more appropriate for us to improve our own budgetary processes and obtain a truly balanced budget before we attempt to teach our techniques to any so-called backward country. If they followed our practices of budgeting they would bankrupt themselves.

We are also undertaking a national rural development project, which involves assistance to the Afghan Rural Development Commission in inaugurating and carrying on a community development type project in 75 villages of the valley areas of Afghanistan.

In general, it is my fear that we are so closely involved with the most intimate functions of the Afghanistan Government, its programs and its governmental processes, that we are laying ourselves open to not only severe criticism, but dire injury to our prestige and objectives in this area should our efforts fail. Thus, it would appear that we must make these programs work or find ourselves rejected as friends of the Afghans. By all means, our planners should be instructed that no projects be undertaken unless surveys have been made and projects found feasible. Furthermore, we should be satisfied that the Government of Afghanistan can and will be able to maintain and carry on without further assistance from us. The technical assistance we are rendering to Afghanistan is in many areas badly needed. However, I fear that our technicians are forcing the Afghanistan Government to seek development of projects which it cannot possibly finance. I fear we will soon embark on a vast, long-range, high cost economic aid program here.

It is my hope that the survey mission will indicate who is to blame for the apparent failure of the Helmand projects. We came into the picture long after the project was conceived and started. The mere fact that American engineers built the dams and that the Export-Import Bank furnished some of the money to continue the work, does not brand the project as one undertaken by our Government.

INDIA

Mr. ELLENDER. From Afghanistan I went to India. I flew through the Khyber Pass, to Amritsar, which is in the extreme northern part of India. From there I proceeded south to Delhi.

I have visited India 10 times.

India is such a large country, and there are so many people there that whatever we do is so little in proportion to the size of the country and the population, the effect of our work—if any—is not discernible. Yet we have appropriated quite a good deal of money—in the neighborhood of from $350 million to $360 million—for aid to India. Much of this, incidentally, remains unspent.

It is my hope that we can continue to aid India in a small way. It strikes me that what we ought to do, because of the low educational level of most of the people of that area, is to start at the bottom rung of the ladder and teach them things in keeping with their ability to learn and to carry on for themselves. Further, it should be aid that will truly stimulate the economy of the country.

I found that at Bhopal we have supplied a school; we spent $100,000 to supply farm machinery for the students. We have there large tractors, and large plows, which farmers in that area can never hope to use. They cannot even use the tractors we have there now; and yet $100,000 has been spent in order to buy heavy machinery, including huge plows, to train about 120 students a year.

If we are to help the people of India, teaching ought to be limited to the things which the generally illiterate masses can use. We are now doing things almost solely for the benefit of the owners of large holdings, who, in the case of the tractors, would be the only farmers able to use them. We should show the masses how to better use the tools they have.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my report on India be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIA

This is a vast country and thickly populated. It is extremely backward when measured by our standards, and the aid program undertaken here may result in some good over a period of many, many years but the process is bound to be slow. It is my frank judgment that with so many people in this ancient land, the vast majority of whom are illiterate, any effort to modernize India overnight is doomed to failure. The farms are small, the people are poor, and labor is cheap. There is little industry and industrial expansion is still very slow. Because of the magnitude of the effort required I fear that much of the money we have spent has been in vain and that it will require generations of steady work to bring the Indian industrial and agricultural economies into any semblance of modern order.

Since 1952, the United States has been committed to a variety of projects in India aggregating in cost approximately $334,430,154, with $81,062,592 of this total committed during the fiscal year 1956. The subtotals by function are: agriculture and natural resources, $81,427,404 since 1952 with $6,986,917 committed in the 1956 fiscal year; industry and mining, cumulative total $62,675,383 with $3,051,800 committed during fiscal 1956; transportation, $40,959,200 cumulative with a 1956 commitment of $941,700; labor, cumulative, $1,010,590 with $260,590 committed during the 1956 fiscal year; health and sanitation, cumulative $23,062,344, with $2,418,847 committed during fiscal year 1956; education, cumulative $4,131,700, with a fiscal year 1956 commitment of $1,863,700; community development, cumulative, $13,233,240, with $182,380 of this amount committed in fiscal 1956.

In addition to these programs, we have committed $16,430 for public administration, all of which was allocated during the fiscal year 1956. Total project assistance to India, cumulative, amounts to $243,233,619 with $18,746,919 committed in fiscal year 1956.

In addition to these amounts for project assistance, we have expended a total of $85,672,940 since 1952 in development assistance; $61,427,000 of this amount was committed during fiscal year 1956.

Through fiscal year 1956 total expenditures in India of United States funds (none of which generated counterpart) totaled $167,526,992. As of June 30, 1956, balances were as follows: unobligated, $1,017,227; unexpended, $134,534,522. Of the $134.5 million in unexpended balances, the funds will be used as follows:

| O. A. No. | Project | Unexpended balance |
|---|---|---|
| | | *Million* |
| 6 | Ground-water irrigation | $2.2 |
| 8 | Community development | 5.2 |
| 12 | Ground-water exploration | 2.0 |
| 17 | Railway rehabilitation | [1] 11.0 |
| 18 | Industrial steel | [2] 13.2 |
| 20 | Rihand Valley development | 4.1 |
| 24 | Expansion, aviation ground facilities | 2.4 |
| 25 | National water supply | 4.2 |
| 26 | Industrial research | 2.2 |
| 27 | Educational institutions | 2.0 |
| 28 | Agricultural education and research | [3] 5.0 |
| 31 | Modern storage of food grains | [4] 4.4 |
| | Subtotal | 58.0 |
| | Other (balances less than $2,000,000) | 20.1 |
| | Technicians, Trng. Prog. Dir. Tech. Sup. and other projects | 3.3 |
| | Total (TCM/I allotment) | 81.4 |
| | Run 13 (Washington allotments): | |
| | Bread grains (ISM) | [5] 13.8 |
| | Fertilizer (GSA) | [6] 3.6 |
| | Steel (ISM) | [7] 34.3 |
| | DDT (GSA) | [8] 1.4 |
| | Total (Washington allotment) | 53.1 |
| | Grand total | 134.5 |

[1] 10 percent, or 3.9 million, withheld for 18 months guaranty period. Deliveries up to December 1956.
[2] Delivery period, December 1956.
[3] Current university contract.
[4] Delivery period, December 1956.
[5] Contracting July 1956.
[6] Contracting October 1956.
[7] Contracting December 1956.
[8] Delivery August 1956.

For the fiscal year 1957, a program level of * * * is expected, but at the time of my visit the precise amount was still doubtful. With reference to a letter to me dated September 28, 1956, from New Delhi and attachments thereto, which material is included as exhibit A of this report, it is amply

demonstrated that even as of that date, appropriations made by the Congress during the latter part of July had still not been allocated to India as of the first of October. Note 3 to attachment No. 1 of exhibit A indicates that the * * * amount for fiscal year 1957 includes a maximum development assistance level of * * * million, plus a tentative program of * * * for technical cooperation. The * * * in development assistance is the maximum permitted under the fiscal year 1957 Mutual Security Appropriation Act. The important words to be noted are: "Actual level not yet determined," which indicates that some 8 weeks after the Congress passed the fiscal year 1957 Mutual Security Appropriation Act, the final allocation to India had still not been made. Certainly an effort should be made to reduce this time lag, for it is doubtless a large contributing factor to the haphazard planning and large accumulation of unexpended and unobligated balances which have characterized many of our assistance programs.

Exhibit B attached hereto, defines the scope and volume of our assistance effort to India during the fiscal years 1952 through 1956.

It should be emphasized that the unexpended and unobligated balances presently in the hands of the Indian-USOM aggregate * * * (See attachment No. 1, exhibit A.) This amount compares with a total expenditure over the past three fiscal year (that is, fiscal year 1954, fiscal year 1955, and fiscal year 1956) of $167,526,992. In other words, the combined unobligated and unexpended balances which were in USOM/India coffers as of the beginning of the 1957 fiscal year would provide sufficient funds to carry the Indian program for over 3½ years based on expenditures during the prior 3 fiscal years.

Recently, the American people and the Congress have heard much about the prospect of a "long range" foreign aid program. However, despite the discussion in the Nation's press and evidently among the executive departments charged with administering this program all authority for the aid program has been confined to a 1-year basis. It is apparent though, that the accumulations of large unexpended and unobligated balances, such as those presently found in India, make possible what is in effect a long range foreign aid program. For example, reference to attached exhibit "C," dealing with the 1956 fiscal year India program, discloses that our program of assistance to the extension training program for secondary school leaders in India will cover a 4-year period, that is, fiscal years 1956 through fiscal year 1959. The rural electrification program, toward which the United States is to contribute some $3 million will not be completed until 1957 at the earliest. Since this program was begun in fiscal year 1956, it demonstrates that we are, indeed, engaged in a long range foreign aid program. Other examples along this line include: Tubewell casing, estimated completion date 1961; educational administration program, estimated completion date 1958; construction of a steel casting foundry, estimated completion date 1959.

Other programs which will not be completed until fiscal year 1959 include small industry development, assistance to the Indian Statistical Institute, development of Indian telecommunications, technical assistance for the Indian Civil Air Transportation network, foundry training, a program for moving 40,000 cattle from Calcutta to Haringhata, the construction of a milk pasteurizing and processing plant at Calcutta and emphasizing the value of milk in the Indian diet. Thus, it appears, that despite the assurances of our administrators, the backlog of appropriated funds combined with what is obviously an intent to commit the United States in this area to a 3 to 5 year effort (at least in some fields) adequately indicate that our country is, indeed, involved in a long range foreign aid effort.

It should be noted that at the present time India has embarked upon a comprehensive economic development program, designated as "the great 5-year plan." It requires no stretch of the imagination to arrive at the conclusion that our Government is certainly involved in the success of this effort, and that funds already appropriated and new money which will doubtless be requested to be appropriated in future years, will require us to carry a large portion of the burden that should more properly be assumed by India if the plan is to meet with success.

During the short period of time I was in India, it was obviously impossible for me to visit each and every project to which we have contributed. However I was able to inspect some of the so-called grassroots operations and the information I gathered bears out my previous comments.

The first of these installations which I visited was at Budni, some 65 miles from Bhopal in south central India. This agricultural center is located in an old army camp. We have set up a tractor and machinery school. The United States provided $100,000 for the purchase of tractors, bulldozers, plows, and similar farm equipment to be used in demonstration seminars for the youth of this area. I was impressed with the objective of the program here, and particularly with the desire among the students to learn. They study 2 hours per day and do practical work on a nearby farm for 6 hours per day. They are clearing land and it is planned to ultimately operate a farm in conjunction with the agricultural center, thus giving students opportunities to put into practice the principles they are taught.

Each student is paid 30 rupees (about $7 in American currency) for his board per month. The barracks are neatly kept, and there is apparently a great eagerness among the students to learn new ways.

It seems to me that $100,000 was quite a large sum to spend for demonstration machinery. I would suggest that less emphasis be placed upon the purchase of heavy, highly technical equipment, and that small tractors, simple plows, and similar agricultural devices be emphasized—that is, we should provide the kind of equipment which is best suited to existing Indian agriculture, and which the farmers of India can put to best use. Few Indian farmers are able to purchase the type of equipment we have furnished for demonstration purposes.

I also visited several areas in the vicinity of Madras. Several community projects are now in progress in this area, at least two of which are maintained on a contract basis with the Universities of Tennessee and Wisconsin. I noted that emphasis was placed upon demonstration work. But our only direct contact with those programs is in guidance and demonstration with contract payments comprising the bulk of our expenditures. I discussed the progress of these programs with one engineer present, a technician whose work it was to teach better methods of packing and manufacturing goods. He pointed out that large savings had been realized by Indian distributors and manufacturers as a result of the technical know-how made available under this program. I inquired if these savings were passed on to the consumers and the engineer with whom I spoke answered in the negative. He said that as a rule, supply is short, and the manufacturers and distributors feel that there is no point in cutting prices.

It strikes me that this situation certainly should be corrected, for if our program here is to result in benefits to the few with no relief for the masses, our money is certainly being spent for naught. Unfortunately, this seems to be the case as I pointed out in reference to our agricultural demonstration program for the use of tractors and farm machinery.

In discussing the overall community projects with the representatives of the college groups present here, I inquired whether or not they believed their effort were bearing fruit. The reply was unanimously negative with the reason cited that the programs were only about 1 year old and that much time would be required for them to take hold. Be that as it may, I believe that generally speaking these programs are extremely worth while and that the work should be followed through in order to achieve the utmost success.

My primary fear in this connection is that only a few of the people are being reached. I indeed hope that it will be possible for the Indians to soon carry the load; that is, the persons we train should subsequently train others and thus make the benefits of progress available to the great masses of India.

Also, in the Madras area, I inspected the extension work we are doing in cooperation with the Government of India. Our only expense is the salaries of technicians.

Unlike the project in Bhopal, we are not providing machinery and tractors, but it is felt that some demonstration material will be necessary. I expressed the hope then, and I express the hope now, that extreme care be taken not to follow the example at Bhopal where $100,000 was used to purchase tractors and complicated machinery in an effort to impose American farming methods on the people of India. It is my judgment that such a program, utilizing such complicated pieces of equipment, is not in keeping with existing conditions here. Our program should emphasize assistance for the small farmers, such as better yielding seeds, increased use of fertilizers, and modern basic devices, such as more efficient plows, hoes, etc. Under no circumstances should we engage in a program of training in order to provide skilled workers for the benefit of large landowners.

Following my inspection of these projects, I chatted with the former Governor General of India, Sir C. Rajagopalachari (Rajaji). He is a most intelligent gentleman, and he expressed views which I believe to be essentially sound. For example, he emphasized that he believed our program of foreign assistance should not be thrust on people. Even as to loans, he recommended that they be carefully regulated and not permitted to overload the budget of a country. Perhaps, we here should take cognizance of this wise man's advice and not overload our own budget.

During my visit in Delhi, I had occasion to discuss in some detail our information program in India with director of the USIA program. He indicated to me that there is a strong undercurrent of anti-American feeling in India founded principally on three issues. First, their misunderstanding of our racial relationships here in the United States; second, anger at our support of Portugal and its claim to Goa; and third, our attitude toward the arming of Pakistan and its membership in the Baghdad Pact. We are also criticized for not giving Prime Minister Nehru sufficient credit for attempting to make peace between the United States and Russia.

Last year—that is—during fiscal year 1956, the USIA country budget here totaled $1,200,000. This year—that is—fiscal year 1957, it was increased to $1,738,000 with an increase in American employees from 57 to 68 persons. The bulk of the extra appropriation available for fiscal year 1957 will be used to expand existing programs and to further the circulation of American Reporter, a bimonthly newspaper. The circulation of this publication is now 185,000 and it is proposed to increase this to 210,000.

The primary objectives of our information effort here in India are to convince the people of India that the United States champions peace and progress through peaceful means; to publicize the United States technical- and economic-aid program to India and the results thereof; to counter Commu-

nist propaganda and distorted information about the United States; and to promote a better understanding of the American way of life such as our historical background, our culture, our democratic processes, and our free-enterprise system, among other things. Achievement of these objectives is presently being sought through magazines, Voice of America broadcasts, and translation and publication of books from the United States into the various languages and dialects of India. Our administrators here also feel that exhibits, such as that of the Family of Man, play an important part in the program.

There are many obstacles in the path of our information program. For example, India is extremely sensitive to anything she may regard as an infringement of her sovereignty, although the attitude seems to be that India needs assistance from the United States and other areas. * * *

In this connection, I have received a letter from the acting director of the information program in Washington dated August 9, 1956, which letter contains comments on the country report I submitted to the Information Agency last year.

I have attached this letter to this report, but I feel it pertinent that I include in the body of this report the following extracts:

"It must be remembered, however, that the kind of program we are able to put on in a particular country depends to a large degree upon the attitude of the government. For example, in India the motion picture program has not been expanded to the proportions we would desire, in large measure because of procedural redtape of the Indian Government which has the effect of restricting the film program.

"The Indian Government censorship program normally requires from 3 to 4 weeks for approval of a film. Films with an anti-Communist theme are generally not approved. Other films with a decided message may take up to 9 months for approval, by which time the film is out of date.

"In addition to censorship by the Indian Government, film showings are licensed by the local governments. In the Bombay area all mobile unit showings are prohibited. In other areas licensing requirements are such that showings by mobile units are not practicable. Finally, mobile units are now permitted to operate only out of four major posts, making it impossible to cover the more remote areas. * * *

"There are roughly 80 million literates in India. Seven and a half million read English. These 80 million persons control most of the opinion-molding and policy-deciding positions in the country. The Communists are very aware of this fact and Communist publications are to be found in most bookstores. A November 1955 advertisement in the magazine New Age listed 90 different Soviet publications, ranging from illustrated children's books to works by Marx and Engel. Vigorous sales campaigns are undertaken including door-to-door solicitations and the setting up of stalls by the local chapters of the Communist Party. * * *"

The information service maintains posts in India at New Delhi, Lucknow, Bombay, Hyderabad, Calcutta, Madras, Bangalore, and Trivandrum. A total of 69 Americans were on duty at these posts during the 1956 fiscal year with an additional 494 locals employed there.

We maintain information centers at these cities with reading rooms also at Guntur and Patna.

I wish to reemphasize my prior year recommendations that a greater effort be made to reach the masses of the Indian people. The magazines we publish, the books we print and, to a very large extent, the library and related facilities we maintain, are used almost exclusively by the literate of India, which constitute only a relatively small percentage of the Indian population. As noted in the letter cited above, only approximately 80 million of some 384 million Indian citizens are able to read and write. In the past, our information program has been directed almost exclusively at this literate element since it was felt that they are the opinion-molding and policy-deciding positions in the country. Unless we are able to reach the masses of the people, unless we are able to convince them of our peaceful intentions and our good offices inherent in the assistance we are rendering them, we shall never achieve any success in India. I also recommend that in bringing our information program to the grassroots of India that we be strictly objective. We should eliminate all criticism in any of the publications, pamphlets, movies, etc., prepared by us on India, and in fact as to any nation. We should extol the virtues of our own way of life and not criticize others.

In addition I recommend that this country use its good offices with Portugal to the end that the Portuguese cede Goa to India and that Portugal and other nations claiming or holding areas in India relinquish these to the Indian Government. By so doing, they would lose at best only small parcels of land and the West would gain much in stature in the eyes of the people of India. I can well understand that perhaps in former days it might have been necessary for the Portuguese and other maritime nations to control small parcels of land here and there in order to provide bases for their commerce. However, the time for such things as this is past, and each day the Portuguese retain their claim to Goa, they do themselves and the cause of freedom irreparable harm.

Mr. ELLENDER. My next stop was Ceylon, which is quite a fine little island, located at the southern tip of India. We have just started a program there. It will be recalled that some time ago efforts were made to extend aid to Ceylon, but because the then existing government was not willing, the proposal went unaccepted. This was the case until recently, when former Prime Minister Kotelawala was defeated at the polls. He was succeeded by the present Prime Minister.

Although the projects outlined to be done in Ceylon had been in the talking stage for almost 6 months, it was not until 48 hours before the end of the 1956 fiscal year that $5 million was obligated. This is a grade A example of the reason why there are so many unexpended funds on hand in many countries. In this case, $5 million was set aside 2 days before the end of the fiscal year. If that money had not been allocated to Ceylon, it might have come back to the Treasury. I am not permitted to say how much will be available for expenditure in Ceylon from the 1957 budget, because that amount is still secret, up to this time, but there will be available what was allocated in the closing hours of the 1956 fiscal year, and what will be allocated from the fiscal 1957 budget.

When a program starts with so much money, it starts in a big way, and is likely to grow bigger and bigger—and contain much waste.

I believe that Congress should deny new funds, under such circumstances as these, where a country has enough on hand to carry on. Providing new funds while unexpended balances are so large accounts for the huge surpluses of unspent funds which remain available at the end of each fiscal year.

Things are very promising in Ceylon, and I really believe that this money can be well spent and great progress made. But care must be taken to see that these funds are spent for the benefit of the mass of the people, rather than the few large landowners.

That seems to be one of the troubles in Ceylon. Nearly all the fertile land is owned by large families. Of course the Government is attempting to acquire and distribute some of that land. I am not advocating confiscation; on the contrary, my belief is that when land is taken by the Government the owners should be properly compensated for it. However, in providing irrigation projects, it strikes me that care should be exercised to see that funds will be used to irrigate the lands of the many small landowners rather than the large landowners.

I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my report on Ceylon be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CEYLON

Ceylon is a small island located near the southern tip of India. It has a total land area of 25,332 square miles, which is roughly equal to that of the State of West Virginia. The last census, taken in 1955, shows a population of 8,700,000—with the highest concentration of inhabitants located in the southwestern quarter of the island where agricultural conditions are exceptionally favorable.

There is much poverty on Ceylon. It is plagued by a shortage of good cultivatable land, and a burgeoning population which is estimated to double itself every 25 years.

Much of the good arable land is presently owned by well-to-do Ceylonese, who—until recently—have maintained the workers in the status of medieval serfs. However, the Government of Ceylon is doing a great deal to bring new land into cultivation, and there is increasing pressure being applied against the large landowners to have them sell some of their holdings or liberalize their rentals and thereby give the small farmers a break. A great deal of the state-owned land located in the northern part of the island, where the rainfall is scant and where irrigation is practiced, will be distributed among the Ceylonese farmers. It is expected that such a land redistribution program may discourage continued large holdings among the wealthy landlords. It is to be hoped that this can be done in an orderly way with just compensation to the landlords.

Our assistance effort in Ceylon consists primarily of technical and development assistance. The aid effort was initiated in fiscal 1956, with an agreement signed with Ceylon on April 28, 1956. However, on June 29, 2 days before the close of the 1956 fiscal year, ICA allotted $5 million for fiscal 1956, for economic and technical assistance funds to Ceylon. The money was tentatively earmarked for improvement of railroads, development of power and irrigation projects, the expansion of the University of Ceylon, and agricultural extension services. No plans had been previously made for any of these projects.

This $5 million was drawn from the President's fund for Asian development, and it is interesting to note that while the allocation actually took place in fiscal year 1956 it occurred only 48 hours before the close of that fiscal year with no hope of spending, nor even contracting for it, during fiscal

1956. Only token amounts have been firmly obligated. * * *

The circumstances surrounding the last-minute allocation of funds to Ceylon out of fiscal 1956 appropriations is compelling evidence tending to prove that the present system of presentation, review, and appropriation by the Congress of mutual-security funds requires extensive revision. It appears absolutely senseless for some $5 million in tax money to be allocated during the closing hours of a fiscal year, and then for our ambitious planners to insist upon, and by the way, actually receive an additional * * * for the succeeding fiscal year. Certainly this opens the way to waste and inefficiency.

During my visit to Ceylon, it was my judgment that since the Government of Ceylon has fixed 1962 as its target date for a number of economic reforms, our planners doubtlessly have in mind building up a large "kitty" for Ceylon in order to assure that nation of continued assistance even if the Congress should reduce aid here in some future year.

Of the $5 million allotted to Ceylon during the last 48 hours of the 1956 fiscal year, project assistance will be distributed as follows:

Some $1,875,000 to purchase 15 diesel locomotives as part of a program to modernize Ceylon's railway services.

Roughly $1,824,000 to purchase construction equipment supplies and technical assistance for the construction of irrigation projects and related maintenance facilities.

Over $581,000 to expand the University of Ceylon.

Roughly $75,000 to be used for supplies and equipment for government agricultural research and extension centers.

Exhibit A attached hereto indicates the scope of the program we have undertaken in this area.

Exhibit B, proposed fiscal year 1957 Ceylon American development assistance and technical cooperation program as of August 27, 1957, is a tentative outline of what can be expected in the way of further aid to this country should ICA, Washington, allocate * * * in development-assistance funds, plus * * * in technical-assistance funds, during the 1957 fiscal year.

It is interesting to note that this exhibit indicates that instead of USOM-Ceylon formulating a program of technical assistance consistent with local requirements, ICA allocated the * * * in technical-assistance funds to the Ceylon Mission and directed USOM-Ceylon to find ways and means of spending it.

(See also exhibit C.)

In this connection, it should also be noted that during the 1957 fiscal year, USOM-Ceylon will have available for expenditure not the * * * in technical assistance which ICA witnesses went to such pains to justify as absolutely necessary, but, actually, nearly * * * in technical-assistance funds, since to the * * * 1957 fiscal year allocation must be added the $975,000 allocation which took place during fiscal year 1956, and which was not obligated, and, of course, not spent during that fiscal year.

Since present circumstances have made possible the accumulation of roughly * * * in development assistance funds plus some * * * in technical-assistance funds for use in Ceylon, I recommend that the committee should not appropriate additional funds for this country in fiscal 1958. The addition of more money to the huge unobligated amount presently on hand would constitute an engraved invitation by the Congress for the continuation of wasteful practices. On the other hand, if all the money available is spent and/or obligated it might be used in the future as a gage to determine the size of the yearly program for the future.

I also direct the committee's attention to the fact that some $491,000 in development assistance funds allocated to the Government of Ceylon out of 1956 fiscal-year appropriations was used to defray the ocean freight costs of transporting powdered milk to Ceylon for distribution by CARE. Since funds for ocean freight for relief shipments have been appropriated under separate authority in the mutual-security bill, I find it most strange that our foreign-aid planners have gone out of their way to use development assistance funds—money for which they pleaded and which they emphasized as necessary down to the last penny if our aid program was to succeed—to pay ocean freight. I question the authority of ICA to use development assistance funds to pay freight on commodities for relief. Those responsible should be questioned and dealt with properly. I recommend that appropriate language be incorporated in the fiscal year 1958 bill, precluding further diversion of such funds for purposes other than appropriated, should there be a loophole in the present law to permit such a diversion of funds. In this connection, the committee will recall that when the subject of a Presidential fund for Asia was first broached to the Congress last year the overriding necessity for a separate appropriation for this purpose was justified on the basis that the money would be used for regional projects.

During hearings before the House Committee on Appropriations on the fiscal year 1957 appropriations bill, Mr. John B. Hollister, Administrator of the International Cooperation Administration, again testified that the purpose of the President's fund for Asian economic development was to further the establishment of a number of regional projects, but he added: "While under the statute preference is to be given to projects of a regional character, the possibility of a need to use this fund for assistance to individual countries was also foreseen. We have kept such situations to an absolute minimum but have found it necessary to fund a modest development program for Indonesia and a small part of one for Ceylon from the Asian fund. These activities, which account for less than 5 percent of the outstanding appropriation, were deemed to be of major importance to the accomplishment of our foreign policy objectives in Asia, at a time when there was no other readily available source of funds with which to carry them out." (P. 62, hearings, mutual security appropriations for 1957, House Committee on Appropriations.)

While it is perhaps understandable that some individual country projects should be financed from money appropriated for primarily regional development, it is particularly difficult for me to understand in the case of Ceylon just why it was of such major importance that $5 million of these regional funds should be withdrawn from their primary purpose and allocated to Ceylon when, by waiting only 48 hours, fiscal year 1957 funds, request for which was then pending before the Congress, could have been used. Activities such as this on the part of our foreign aid administrators are responsible in no small measure for an increasing lack of confidence in and appreciation of our foreign assistance efforts among both rank and file American citizens and of course Members of the Congress. At the time of my visit to Ceylon, which was more than 60 days since the allocation of fiscal 1956 funds, no actual work had yet been undertaken.

It is my considered judgment that a reasonable and realistic program of assistance to Ceylon could achieve much good. However, extreme care will have to be used in both the manner and method by which the funds are applied.

Reference to the attached exhibits will demonstrate that it is proposed to spend some * * * during the next fiscal year on irrigation and land reclamation in Ceylon. By all means, programs upon which these funds are to be applied should be carefully scrutinized, and every effort should be made to see that the money we spend for this development will not inure to the benefit of the large landowners. The overriding purpose of our expenditures should be to better the way of life of the masses of the people. I would also recommend that consideration be given to suggesting that an increased tax rate be made applicable to the large landowners by the Government of Ceylon, on the theory that those who have created the conditions of unrest with reference to land shortages, should assist in defraying the cost of rectifying their errors. If a tax is not feasible, some other method should be studied and applied.

* * * * *

It is my impression that the changed government owes its existence primarily to the activities of religious leaders of the Buddhist faith. The Buddhist priests were very active in the election. It was their position that the former premier was too favorably inclined toward Christianity and that his reelection would injure the Buddhist cause. Apparently such was not the case. The people have learned better since the election and there is a growing dissatisfaction in Ceylon with the ruling regime, I was informed by people I talked to in various parts of the island.

It was my privilege while in Ceylon to confer with Sir Oliver Goonetilleke, Governor General of Ceylon, who has held his post since July 17, 1954. He is the first Ceylonese to ever hold this position in the local government. Before his appointment he served as Minister of Finance in the government formerly headed by Sir John Kotelawala.

During our discussions, Sir Oliver emphasized the need for assistance to Ceylon, and was most interested in conditions in the United States. I stressed to him our present economic position, with particular reference to our large debt and the fact that we are bogged down in deficit financing; I hope that my remarks had some effect. It has been my impression that too many foreign leaders feel that the United States has an inexhaustible source of funds—an impression which, unfortunately, is fostered by some of our representatives abroad. All of the budgets for foreign aid are made up and suggested by our own representatives and they seem unwilling to consider the impact that such spending will have on our own economy. A large bureaucracy has been established on both the Washington and the foreign level that has become most powerful. It dictates the amounts to be spent and the terms and conditions under which the spending is to be made.

It is my hope that the program in Ceylon will be administered in keeping with this small country's financial ability to carry on after we leave. We should start at the bottom rung of the ladder and go up progressively as the people show a tendency to help themselves.

### INDONESIA

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the next country I visited was Indonesia. We have spent a great deal of money in that country for technical assistance. We have loaned Indonesia some money with which to build cement plants, and we are now in the process of lending money to Indonesia for the erection of additional cement plants and also for the erection of fertilizer plants. We plan to use some of the money we are making available to Indonesia for technical assistance to educate technicians, so that they will be able to operate those plants after they are erected.

One of the great difficulties in Indonesia is that it has a population of al-

most 90 million, of which two-thirds live on Java.

Other islands are the Celebes and Sumatra and Bali, for example. The other islands are very thinly populated.

It strikes me that a program to be of most benefit to those people should be started at the bottom rung of the ladder. We should educate the people there in keeping with their ability to carry on.

Moreover, as I stated before, no projects should be promoted in that area of the world unless the host country—in this case Indonesia—is in a position to carry them financially. Unless that course is followed we will be trying to educate men and women to operate many of the projects to which I have referred for a long time. Unless the host government itself has the money to keep the operation under way, the United States will have to carry the burden for a long time, for if we failed to do so, we would probably end up making more enemies than friends.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my report on Indonesia be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDONESIA

Indonesia is essentially an island republic, with a population of some 80 million. The land area of the country, which is about twice the size of Texas, consists of over 2,500 islands stretching from the equator in a southeasterly direction for a distance of some 3,000 miles. Included are the islands of Sumatra, Java, Celebes, the Moluccas and Borneo. Java, incidentally, is the most densely populated area in the world. Living within its confines, an area approximately the size of New York State, are 50 million people.

Prior to the establishment of an independent government in Indonesia, the area was under Dutch influence. Known as the Dutch East Indies, the islands were developed into one of the world's richest colonial possessions. It is an unfortunate fact that the Dutch made no concerted effort to improve the living conditions of the people who inhabit what is now the Republic of Indonesia. On the contrary, the Dutch exploited the Indies—draining them of their rich tin and rubber resources, leaching their soils with the concentrated production of sugarcane and other crops, and gave little or no thought to bettering the welfare of the people.

The net result at this time is a tremendous distrust of white men, particularly those who inhabit the nations allied with the West.

It is against this background that present events in Indonesia must be studied. In extending assistance to the Republic of Indonesia, the United States is treading on extremely dangerous grounds, for while the island republic is rich in natural resources and ripe for development, there is an outward hesitancy to accept aid from the United States lest the impression be left that the country is falling under the domination of another Western power. Thus, at least outwardly, Indonesia must maintain a position of being unwilling to accept American aid even while its present circumstances cry out for development.

American assistance to Indonesia began in 1950, although approximately $60 million in American assistance was extended to Indonesia in 1945 to 1948 through the Netherlands. In 1948, our aid program was suspended, but in 1949, when sovereignty was transferred from the Netherlands to the government of the new republic, an additional $40 million of assistance—largely in food and consumer goods—was authorized by the United States in order to help the new nation through its difficult infancy.

In 1950, our Government signed an agreement for economic and technical cooperation with the Government of Indonesia. Aid rendered since that time has been primarily technical assistance, with some economic aid.

In addition to American assistance, the United Nations technical assistance program has also been operating in Indonesia. As a matter of fact, as of July 1956, the following U. N. agencies were active in this area:

1. United Nations Technical Assistance Administration.
2. International Labor Organization.
3. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
4. United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).
5. International Civil Aviation Organization.
6. World Health Organization.

During 1957, the United Nations will spend a total of $13.3 million in technical assistance in Indonesia for projects of a varied nature.

Attached to this report is a 21-page summary of proposed programs for the United Nations fiscal year 1957.

I was not able to obtain the total of expenditures by the United States since its program of assistance to Indonesia began. However, since the 1951 fiscal year through fiscal year 1956, United States dollar contributions to Indonesia have totaled $41.7 million. This amount comprises 41.73 percent of a total program cost of $99 million. The remaining 58.27 percent is made up of $38.5 million from the Indonesia country budget plus $19.6 million in counterpart funds.

Total of actual expenditures in Indonesia by the United States during the 1956 fiscal year aggregated $6.3 million, including $2 million generating counterpart funds, and $4.3 million which generate no counterpart. In this connection, unexpended balances in United States funds as of June 30, 1956, totaled $17.2 million, with an additional $847,624 unobligated.

Unexpended counterpart funds (in equivalent United States dollars) aggregated $41.4 million as of June 30, 1956, with $38.2 million in counterpart equivalent unobligated.

To these amounts must be added the * * * appropriation voted by Congress in the fiscal year 1957 mutual security appropriation bill, thus raising the total of unexpended funds to * * * million with some * * * million of this amount unobligated. In addition, however, $47.3 million in counterpart funds (in equivalent United States dollars) will also be available for expenditure, with $44.2 million of this amount unobligated.

Over and above this amount, we presently have programed for Indonesia under Public Law 480 (title 1) $96.7 million worth of agricultural commodities. Of this sum, $77.4 million of the total currency proceeds are to be loaned back to the Government of Indonesia for economic development. (See p. 24, H. Doc. 447, 84th Cong., 2d sess., fourth semiannual report on activities under Public Law 480, 83d Cong., as amended, dated June 30, 1956.)

Thus there is available for expenditure in Indonesia during the 1957 fiscal year a total of * * * million composed of * * * million in unexpended dollar funds under the Mutual Security Act, $47.3 million in counterpart funds, and $77.4 million in local currency loan funds under title I of Public Law 480.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that there is an apparent discrepancy between the figures I obtained in Indonesia and those cited to the House Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Mutual Security Appropriations during hearings on the fiscal year 1957 appropriations bill.

At that time (June 14, 1956) Dr. R. T. Moyer, director, Office of Far Eastern Operations, International Cooperation Administration, testified that ICA expected to terminate the fiscal year 1956 with only some $10.4 million in unexpended funds in the Indonesian account. J. E. Murphy, Controller, International Cooperation Administration, testified on that same date that the unexpended balance for both technical and development assistance in Indonesia was expected to aggregate $10.4 million, based on an expectancy of spending $7.9 million during the 1956 fiscal year.

According to my figures, actual expenditures in dollars during the 1956 fiscal year totaled $6.3 million, with an unexpended balance as of June 30, 1956, of $17.2 million. In other words, taken together, testimony before the House Appropriations Committee subcommittee and information given me during my visit to Indonesia are irreconcilable. According to the latter, the Indonesian account contains approximately $6.8 million more than either Mr. Murphy or Mr. Moyer expected, despite the fact that expenditures totaled $1.6 million less than expected. I have not been able to determine precisely what happened to the difference—approximately $5.2 million. Nevertheless, this point should be cleared up by ICA, for it is strong evidence of an almost total lack of accounting procedures and/or sloppy management in the aid program here.

Of the * * * tentatively earmarked for the fiscal 1957 program, approximately * * * will be spent for agriculture and natural resources, * * * for industry and mining, * * * for transportation, * * * for labor, * * * for health and sanitation, * * * for education, * * * for public administration, * * * for community development, social welfare, and housing, and * * * for general and miscellaneous purposes such as radio, film, and general audio visual advisory services, etc. This last item would be more properly chargeable against information program activities, but since it represents visual aids and similar items for the furtherance of the technical and development assistance program here, it is charged as an expense against the ICA program.

During my stay in Indonesia, I had an opportunity to visit several of the aid projects. My first visit was to the office of the Medical Control Center, part of a project involving the modernization of medical services in this republic. The offices I visited are quite modern.

The proposed medical program is a 5-year effort. It involves assisting the medical faculty of the University of Indonesia in strengthening its teaching facilities to a point where some 300 physicians, as opposed to 30, at present, can be graduated annually. This goal is supposed to be reached by 1965.

Under a contract with the University of California Medical School consummated in July 1954, an affiliation has been established between that institution and the medical faculty of the University of Indonesia. The University of California is providing 10 to 12 man-years of teaching services to the medical faculty annually. California personnel are in practical charge of operations of the various departments of the Indonesia Medical School. Graduates of the local facility are sent to the United States for specialized training, and upon their return may join the Indonesian faculty as members thereof. By the time the contract activities are concluded, which is presently proposed as 1960, it is hoped that sufficient new personnel will have been trained not only to replace the contract personnel but also to expand the teaching capacity of the medical faculty in order to provide the requisite graduates per year by 1965.

I was informed that the malaria health program, which actually began in 1951 was

undertaken on such a small basis that over $2.5 million was spent with little or no results. The local authorities evidently tried to cover too much ground with the small amount of money they had available. Under present plans, equipment and services which are acquired will be provided over a 5-year period with the total United States contribution required fixed at about $10 million. An equivalent amount will be contributed by the local government in labor, fuel, and administration. This would appear to be just one more example of a long-term obligation, moral if not precisely legal, entered into by our planners without adequate congressional authority. Nevertheless, a glance at the total unexpended balances available for expenditure in this area indicate that while congressional authority for this long-term obligation is not available per se, the accumulation of funds presently in ICA-Indonesia coffers will permit the program to be carried to completion. If this were the only long-range program I discovered on my journey, I would not feel that there is presently a deliberate and apparently successful effort being made to circumvent if not negate the intent of Congress in not authorizing mutual-aid programs on a long-term basis. However, in Indonesia alone, a number of projects have been undertaken which will not be completed for a number of years. These include:

1. Agriculture and extension and the creation of an agricultural experiment station. Reference to the attached data will show that "It is expected that United States assistance will be withdrawn from this project by the end of calendar year 1961 and that, by that time, Indonesia will be able to carry on the necessary activities in this field with only a minimum of consultation with ICA headquarters personnel."

2. Land development and conservation. This is described as "A companion project to the agriculture extension and agricultural experiment station * * *." It would appear that this program will continue for the same length of time as its conjunctive effort.

3. Expansion and modernization of marine and inland fisheries. This project is tailored to increase the use of fish as a source of animal protein which is essential for an adequate diet, by providing demonstrations of the possibilities inherent in production methods of fishing, of handling, and of processing, assisting in providing sources of fish flour, canned fish and quality dried fish and shrimp to establish and stimulate their acceptance in domestic trade channels, provide training for the development of skills necessary in expanding operations throughout Indonesia, fostering improved culture techniques in existing inland ponds, stimulating stocking of rice paddies for inland fish varieties, and assisting to halt production declines by preventing the silting of brackish water feeder canals. According to attached data, "It is planned to withdraw ICA assistance to this project by the end of 1961, by which time Indonesian personnel should be in a position to effectively carry on the activities of the project to its natural conclusion."

4. Consumer industry development techniques, which involves providing American technicians to help plan increased manufacturing of consumer items from raw materials which are indigenous to Indonesia. According to the data supplied to me, "United States withdrawal for the entire project is tentatively scheduled for early 1958."

5. Cement plant training. This project provides 22 training grants in cement plant management and operation for the technical and managerial staff of the government-owned cement plant here. A contract for the operation of this plant is presently in effect with the Morrison-Knudsen Co., and this contract will expire in 1959. In the attached information ICA indicates: "It is not expected that ICA assistance will continue past the termination of that contract which is planned for late 1959."

I visited the cement plant referred to, which is state-owned and which was financed by an Import-Export Bank loan of approximately $14 million. Capacity of the plant is approximately 275,000 tons per year, compared with present production of some 15,000 tons per year now resulting from the old plant on Sumatra. It was indicated that Indonesia's present cement requirements aggregate some 500,000 tons annually, and this will probably increase in the near future to some 900,000 tons annually. According to my notes, we have entered into a contract that will cost the United States some $600,000 to operate the cement plant for 18 months to 2 years (this is the Morrison-Knudsen contract) and in addition we are sending 22 Indonesians at a cost of $7,000 each to the United States for on-the-job training.

6. Vocational education teacher training. This project was originally scheduled for completion in late 1957 but the Indonesian Government has requested that the Tuskegee University contract be extended until the end of 1958. It is my understanding that this contract has been so extended.

7. Police administration. This involves assistance in improving the operations of the Indonesian police force, including the provision of small weapons, laboratory equipment, and similar items along with technical training. ICA indicates: "It is believed that by the end of fiscal year 1961, the time at which withdrawal of ICA assistance is planned, the State police will have been strengthened and improved to the point that the department will be able to carry out the proper functions of a modern police organization without any difficulty whatsoever.

All of these projects point to a plan by our local administrators—coupled with at least a moral obligation—to maintain an aid program in Indonesia for a period ranging from three to five years from the present date.

In addition to my visit to the cement plant, I also proceeded to other projects in Indonesia. I visited an agricultural station. This center trains tractor operators and repairmen for the various tractors located throughout Indonesia. Groups of 16 to 20 students spend approximately six months in this type of training and then return to their respective areas as tractor operators or repairmen. We provided six or eight tractors and repair parts as well as machine tools for training. This work is carried on at the expense of the local government except for our contribution of technical help, tractors, etc. for demonstration.

I also visited the demonstration farm of 27 acres, designed to demonstrate the value of soil conservation. Some 10 acres have been restored to fertility. The land was nicely worked and legumes were planted. There is not much erosion in some parts of Indonesia, but it is my understanding that in West Java much land has been worn out. It is hoped that more demonstration farms will be undertaken, and I agree that they would serve a useful purpose. However, we should confine our assistance to providing technicians and perhaps a little fertilizer for demonstration purposes.

I was informed that it is proposed to construct a fertilizer plant in Indonesia, to cost approximately $20 million. Public Law 480 proceeds will be used to some extent to pay for labor and local materials, but the United States, I understand, is to contribute some $12 million for machinery and contract services by an American firm. I have requested details on this and other proposed projects, for I fear that coupled with the examples I have cited above, they indicate a continuing obligation being forced upon our country by our field administrators to continue the aid program for many, many years to come.

I visited one of the public technical schools in Djakarta to see some of the work being done by Tuskegee University under its contract with ICA. It was my impression that our effort will meet rough going. The country is almost completely devoid of trained workers, because of the failure on the part of the Dutch to properly teach the Indonesian people various trades. I was informed that students are apt and willing to learn. All of them that I saw appeared very young and not too strong. The blacksmith shop and carpenter shop were well attended, and the equipment was being put to good use. In the school grounds I saw a few heavy pieces of steel being buried to get them out of the way so as to have more space. It impressed me that it is extremely wasteful for the Indonesians, aided and abetted by our administrators, to bury such valuable material. It was claimed that there were no large torches available to cut up the material and no foundry of sufficient size available to melt the iron. I feel that there is no excuse for such waste.

I also visited the diesel engine and auto mechanic school, the electricity school, and the woodworking shop. We have furnished quite a number of lathes, anvils, and other equipment such as engines, and parts of all kinds, for those engines. Each student is given a tool kit, and at the end of his term he is responsible for its return. Progress in such work as this is very slow. It will require many years to recruit a sufficient force.

In addition to the American operations, I have already referred to the fact that the United Nations carries on a rather large program also. It is my considered judgment that despite assurances given me by the local program administrators, there is a considerable amount of duplication between United Nation and United States technical aid. Perhaps a primary example of this is the malaria control program.

During fiscal 1957, the United Nations has programed a total of some $52,600 for malaria demonstration and training and for assistance to the malaria section. In addition to this amount, the United States has programed some * * * for malaria control technical services and * * * for equipment for malaria control. This equipment consists primarily of chemicals for spraying purposes and equipment to conduct the spraying operations. It strikes me that this work should be left to the United Nations. As it is now operated, the United States contributes 100 percent of its own program work for malaria control, plus a considerable portion of the United Nations effort. While there is no doubt that it would be beneficial to rid the island of malaria as quickly as possible, it would seem that the local government, operating with the United Nations, could assume some of the burden without the United States having to undertake additional expenditures.

Reference to the attached summary of United States technical assistance through 1956 fiscal year and the proposed fiscal 1957 program, along with the United Nations proposed program for fiscal 1957 will demonstrate that in almost every field, the United Nations and the United States are attacking the same problems. This is bound to result in duplication. As a matter of fact, before leaving Djkarta, I discussed the possibility of duplication with the chief of the UN mission in Indonesia, Mr. J. B. Rose. He admitted that at one time there was considerable duplication of effort between the United States and United Nations, but he insisted that the situation had been corrected to a large extent. I told him of my criticism with respect to duplication 2 years ago and he said that I was absolutely right. I am convinced that at least some duplica-

tion has been removed, but it is my fervent belief that a considerable amount still exists. It is my suggestion as it was several years ago that before any program is undertaken or pursued further by either the United Nations or the United States, consultation should take place and all possibility of duplication eliminated.

The information program here has an authorized contingent of 23 Americans and 126 locals. At the time of my visit only 18 were actually employed and 126 locals were on the job. For fiscal year 1957, the number authorized will be raised to 24, but it is expected that only 19 will be actually at work. As I just indicated, during fiscal 1956, 126 locals were employed, with 136 to be employed during fiscal 1957.

The USIA budget here shows a tremendous increase from 1956 to fiscal 1957. In the former year, the budget was $345,900; for fiscal 1957 this amount will be raised to $655,400.

I refer the committee to USIS/Indonesia material attached hereto, a portion of which is classified. This exhibit outlines in detail the activities carried on and the scope thereof.

It seems to me that the huge increase in funds approved for this post for fiscal 1957 is unnecessary. Surely, the needed work could be done here without the expenditure of nearly $700,000 per year.

It was my privilege while in Djkarta to confer with the Indonesian Minister for State Planning, and his assistant. He requested more aid from the United States and pointed out that Indonesia was in need of it. I suggested to him that increased economic assistance was really not necessary. I emphasized that if his government created a better economic climate in order to attract private investment, it could certainly earn for itself the dollar exchange necessary to further Indonesian development. I told him of how our country was developed but I could not convince him that it would be more beneficial to Indonesia if the United States did not step in.

Frankly, I do not feel that the United States should become too deeply involved here. A number of years will be required to educate a sufficient number of the Indonesian people in the technical complexities which they seem to want to acquire almost overnight. Progress is very slow, and we are in the unhappy position of having to attempt to force progress beyond its normal bounds in order to satisfy the claims of our planners and to beat down attacks on the aid program from pro-Communist elements in Indonesia, particularly those found in labor unions.

It should be noted that Indonesia is extremely rich in natural resources, particularly oil, tin, and rubber. If the people of Indonesia and their leadership would only create the proper climate for private capital to assist them in their development, I feel sure that an abundance of progress could be made without the United States spending one thin dime. This course is partly blocked by what is perhaps a not unreasonable fear that, based on the experience of Indonesia under the Dutch, foreign investment is synonymous with exploitation. As a matter of fact, it is this same fear that has made Indonesia reluctant to accept United States assistance. At this point, it would appear that unless the attitude of the Government of Indonesia changes, the present leadership may decide that, in order to satisfy public clamor, asking increased grant assistance from the United States would be a better way to achieve economic development than permitting private enterprise to assist the Government of Indonesia obtain that objective.

If such a request is made, I most heartily recommend that it be denied, that the Government of Indonesia be advised to seek to establish cooperative arrangements with private firms, using private capital, for development purposes. Certainly, the example of some Latin American nations, which have required as a condition precedent that foreign firms operating there plow a specified portion of profit from their operations back into the local economy, should be cited as a laudable course which Indonesia could well afford to follow. Our Government and our people cannot afford to spend huge sums to develop Indonesia merely because the Indonesian people and the Indonesian leadership do not desire to do it in the same manner our own people did a century ago.

If private capital cannot be encouraged to develop the country, then a loan program should be proposed, rather than outright grants.

AUSTRALIA

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, from Indonesia I went to Australia. I had the good fortune to visit every State capital in Australia except one, Adelaide. In Australia, of all places, I again found that we have an Information Service. When I was there 3 years ago, the then Ambassador, Mr. Peasley, was new to the country. He was succeeded by Mr. Moffatt, who has since died.

I do not know of any people in the world who are more pro-American than the Australians. Yet, it is evidently felt that because we have an information program in other places where perhaps we should have one, such as in countries on the perimeter of Russia, we should also have one in Australia.

I have been trying to find out for the past 3 years what authority the State Department had to erect an office building there, or to contribute to its erection, and then turn it over to the information agency. What happened was this: An American insurance company decided to build an office building in Sidney, Australia. The understanding was that the United States would rent two floors of the building, and move our consulate from a bank building, in which it was then established, to the new office building. But, what happened? We paid 2 years rent in advance, in order to help the insurance company erect the office building. Then we did not move the consulate into that office building at all; instead, the Information Service—and I point all this out in my report—spent several thousand dollars in putting partitions in the new building to suit its purposes, and moved in. The Information Service is now paying a rent, and we are stuck, with a 10-year lease, obligating us to pay rent for that building.

This may have been a good idea as first conceived, but where is the authority for the State Department to enter into that kind of long-term agreement? That is not peculiar to Australia, Mr. President, for, as I point out in my report, similar situations have occurred in other places. With respect to many of the new buildings we are constructing abroad, to house our workers, there seems to be an effort made to provide permanent quarters for the information program. In other words, for the past 4 or 5 years it has been my observation that the Information Service has left nothing undone in that direction, in the hope, apparently, that it can make itself into a permanent organization.

So far as I am concerned, I am against it. I really believe that a system by which someone in the Ambassador's office or in the consul's office could disseminate information about our country would be a much better way of handling the matter than creating a permanent, global network of high-powered, high-cost press agents. We could let the great press services of the world, United Press, Associated Press, and International News Service, for example, perform the job of feeding world news to the newspapers in those areas, instead of our having to maintain a separate federally financed agency to give information to the local newspapers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my report on Australia be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUSTRALIA

Australia is a thriving, growing country, almost entirely free of Communist influence. Some of the labor unions are still infested with a few Communists, however. Its people appear to be pro-American to the bone, and the memory of the Australian-American alliance in their battle against the Japanese in World War II is still vivid in their minds. I visited two great monuments, one at Brisbane and the other at Canberra, erected by the Australian people honoring Americans for their valiant fight against the Japanese. Communist influence is almost nonexistent here.

Organized labor and the Labor Party still exert considerable influence in this country. Unions control at least 90 percent of the labor force and it is my impression that they are most independent and effective. As a matter of fact, productivity per laborer in Australia is almost entirely controlled by union leadership. There has been some improvement in this situation recently, for a worker is today allowed a little more leeway in increasing his individual productivity in many trades than was the case during my visit in 1953. At that time, union members who exceeded a daily work average were punished.

I was told that no one ever works here more than 40 hours per week except in cases of extreme emergency. In addition, because of union influence in the Australian Parliament, immigration policies have been tailored so as to keep the labor force free from foreign influx. The immigration laws are flexible and the number of immigrants per year may be raised or lowered, depending on the labor supply situation. Unions have much influence in the determination of the number of immigrants to be permitted each year.

While Australia is growing—growing much as the American frontier grew in the earlier part of this century—it is in need of capital for investment. It has borrowed quite a sum of money from the World Bank and some effort is being made to borrow more to improve rail transportation. The primary roadblock in the way of this objective is that each Australian State has its own rail system; each State frequently has a different gage, with the result that goods must be transferred from one train to another at the State border. It is the desire of business leaders to rebuild and reorganize the railway system. Because of long distances with sparsely inhabited country, the cost will be high and in many cases, uneconomical.

My first stop was at Perth, where I was met by Stephen Winship, our consul here. He said there are 700 Americans residing in the State of western Australia, and the chief export is wool, with wheat a close second. He is the only American officer here and is assisted by three Australian girls. The office

takes in $5,000 per year, principally from visas.

My next stop in Australia was Sydney, where I conferred with the executive officer, Mr. Orray Taft, in the absence of Mr. Donald D. Kennedy, consul general, and the head of the information service, Mr. Robert J. Boylan, who came in from Canberra to meet me.

The total cost of maintaining our State Department missions here alone aggregated $469,562 in 1953, the time of my last visit to Australia, compared with $489,389, which is the estimated expenditure for fiscal year 1957. It should be noted that although the total cost of operating the State Department missions here has increased during the current period, there has been a substantial reduction in the amount of money required to pay United States employees. This was accomplished despite the fact that wages for American employees have increased considerably since 1953. It appears that my recommendations, submitted at the termination of my 1953 inspection, to the effect that more local employees could be hired at a smaller cost to our Government thus reducing the number of American employees, has been followed, and followed profitably.

With respect to the other operating costs of our State Department missions here, they appear to be normal, except that much savings could be effected if certain consolidations which I shall propose subsequently are carried out. Exhibit A attached hereto indicates the various purposes for which the total $489,389, fiscal year 1957 budget, will be used.

As the committee will recall, during my last visit to Australia, I commented on the contract which our State Department had entered into for the construction of an office building in Sydney. Under this contract, the building was constructed and the United States Government had obligated itself to pay a stipulated rent over a period of 10 years, some of which was paid in advance.

At that time, the objective was to move the consulate from the quarters it then occupied to the new building. I discovered upon my arrival in Australia that such did not occur. Instead, the Information Service has occupied the entire space contracted for our consulate, and is paying rent. As I visited the USIS offices here I discovered that many alterations were necessary in order to accommodate the structure to Information Service use. The Information Service paid for all alterations. USIS occupies the second and third floors, while the owner of the structure, the Hartford Insurance Company of America, occupies the first floor.

USIS is obligated to pay $9,200 per year rental for its space. The second floor, containing a library and film section, is most spacious. The third floor is occupied by offices and the press service.

Following my visit to Sydney, I inspected our activities in Melbourne. The staff here consists of 4 foreign-service officers and 1 clerk, all Americans, and 12 locals.

In addition to the consulate, we also have here the beginning of a new branch of the Information Service, which is presently staffed by 1 officer and 1 local clerk. Rental is $720 a year for office space for these two persons. I was informed that it was an absolute necessity that an office for the Information Service be established here in order to properly cover the Olympic games, which are scheduled for late 1956. I frankly saw no necessity for moving in a new staff in order to cover the Olympic games, when personnel assigned to either Sydney or Canberra could be temporarily assigned to Melbourne for that purpose. Further, I feel sure that an effort will be made to continue the office in Melbourne even after the Olympic games have ended. I most emphatically recommend that any such request be denied.

From Melbourne I proceeded to Canberra, where I was met by the United States Charge D'Affairs, Avery F. Peterson. The operation at Canberra seems to be progressing very well, in spite of the death of former Ambassador Moffat. I have no specific recommendations to make in regard to our operations there, except in respect to a consolidation of facilities which I will discuss later in this report.

After inspecting the State Department program in Canberra, I proceeded to Brisbane, where the high point of my visit was a conference with the lord mayor of that city, and Governor of Queensland, Sir John Laverick.

I believe Brisbane deserves and needs some form of consular service. I recommend that personnel now stationed at Canberra, Sydney, or Melbourne be assigned to this area; if that should not prove feasible, I would recommend that some American citizen presently residing in Brisbane be permitted to perform consular duties on an as-needed basis, with remuneration based on actual working time.

It is apparent that there is considerable duplication of effort involved in our State Department activities in Australia. Although Canberra is the capital, we maintain a full-fledged staff in Sydney, that handles practically all the business of the embassy. By all means, the Department of State should consolidate and concentrate its activities in Canberra, where we have built a fine home for the Ambassador, a spacious chancery, and where the Australian seat of government is located. There is no reason nor a good excuse for having all the administrative work for the embassy performed in Sydney. It should be transferred to Canberra. The same goes for all political and economic reporting. Consulates only should be maintained at Melbourne and Sydney, and a consular office in Brisbane. At the time of my visit it was my understanding that it is proposed to raise Melbourne to the status of a consulate general, so as to place it on a par with Sydney. These two cities vie with each other to the point where we must treat them similarly in all respects, no matter the cost. Whereas this increasing status will require no additional appropriation, my recommendation would be quite the converse—that both Melbourne and Sydney be reduced to consular posts, and the administrative, political, and economic staffs be assigned to our Embassy at Canberra. A considerable reduction of the force should be possible by the consolidation. We are spending entirely too much money in Australia when we consider its population.

As to the Information Service, the entire program in Australia should be dispensed with.

Exhibit B attached hereto indicates the scope of the information program in Australia; a total of $137,900 in tax funds is required for its maintenance. The justification urged by our representatives for maintaining such a large operation here is an almost stereotyped one, similar to the justification which one would hear in Vietnam or Korea. I emphasize once again that Australia is pro-American to the bone, and our Information Service should be withdrawn from this area at once. The books presently in the USIS libraries should be turned over to local Australian libraries, on condition perhaps that they be placed together in an American section.

An example of some of the unnecessary expenditures which are presently taking place under the information effort in Australia is the exchange program. In Australia we have a fund of some $5 million which is used to finance exchanges on a revolving basis. Persons selected to travel to the United States are selected by a local board. At the time of my visit, our planners urged that this program be accelerated rather than reduced.

In addition to this exchange program, we are also spending a considerable amount of money on the Smith-Mundt exchange program. Exhibit C attached hereto indicates that 113 persons are scheduled to be exchanged under Public Law 534, with an additional 29 persons receiving dollar grants on a joint basis, and 5 additional persons receiving full dollar grants. These exchanges, including journalists, lawyers, recreation experts, labor experts, etc., will require the expenditure of $51,465 during fiscal year 1957 in addition to exchanges financed out of the revolving fund referred to previously.

It is obvious with respect to Australia that our so-called information experts are determined to maintain a staff in each and every country where the American flag flies, whether it is needed or not. It is true that the sum involved here is comparatively small, but when measured against the need, which is practically nonexistent, it is obvious that information expenditures can and should be reduced considerably, and even eliminated entirely as I have recommended.

During my conversation with Sir Dallas Brooks, the Governor General of the State of Victoria, he remarked that the United States has spent considerable amounts of money all over the world, and that many of these expenditures were made possible by our own advisers. He commented that many of our representatives at home and abroad have the attitude that the United States' financial resources are inexhaustible, and that our eager-beaver emissaries do their utmost to convey this same impression to foreign officials and to the foreign man in the street. He noted that except for American encouragement—that is, encouragement and help from Americans on the scene—many countries would not have received as much financial assistance as they actually obtained. He agreed with me that the destiny of the free world depends upon the United States remaining financially strong, and that should America fall economically, the light of freedom will soon be extinguished throughout the world.

I repeat, we should do away with our Information Service here and consolidate all of our activities at Canberra, with the exception of maintaining consulates at Sydney, Melbourne, Perth and Brisbane. Much business is handled at Perth, one of the large cities of this country, and yet the business there is handled by 1 American officer and 3 locals. It is my sincere belief that expenditures could be cut here by one-third and still a good job could be done.

### THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, from Australia I went to the Philippine Islands and spent several days traveling around that country. I should like to reiterate what I stated after my 1955 visit, namely, that I do not know of a program being carried on in any part of the world, which is more in keeping with what Congress intended than the program underway in the Philippine Islands. It is heart warming to visit the various small villages and see people engaged with their own hands trying to carry on various programs for their own benefit. They build wells and otherwise improve their living conditions. All of it is under our direction, of course.

My hope is that the work can continue; but I also think it should be curtailed to some extent; that is, that we should not try to do too much too fast. I noticed that in the Philippines, as in many other countries, we have some long-term programs underway. If we continue along that way, it will invite

other countries to demand more, and those programs will be carried on more or less indefinitely.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my report on the Philippines be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILIPPINES

This new nation, which received its independence from the United States on July 4, 1946, has shown a continued development since my first visit there 10 years ago.

After the Japanese occupation, it was quite a task to repair the tremendous damage necessarily sustained in the allied effort to liberate this archipelago.

Most of our aid in the last few years has been designed to support President Magsaysay's economic development program. The Philippine government has budgeted $79.5 million for the 1956 fiscal year for this program, which is designed to improve government services, expand transportation and communications, and, first and foremost, to improve the living conditions and earning capacity of the rural population, who make up 70 percent of the Philippines' total population of 22 million.

Our aid program began here on an organized basis in July of 1950. Through fiscal year 1956 a total of $137.1 million has been obligate or programed. In addition, the Philippine contribution, expressed in dollar equivalent, has aggregated $217.5 million.

During fiscal 1957 a budget request of * * * was submitted by the local mission. This amount compared with $19.7 million actually spent during fiscal 1956.

At the time of my visit no firm allocation for the 1957 fiscal year had yet been made, although almost 3 months in the 1957 fiscal year had passed. Should the entire * * * requested by the mission be allocated, there would be available for expenditure in fiscal 1957 a total of some * * *. This total is composed of the * * * requested by the mission for fiscal 1957 and $30.9 million in unexpended funds from appropriations allocated during prior fiscal years. Incidentally, this latter figure ($30.9 million) includes $19.2 million of unobligated funds, an amount approximately equal to the amount of money spent by the United States during fiscal 1956, exclusive of dollars which generated no counterpart funds.

Reference to the documents which I have attached to this report, and in particular to exhibit "A" of the booklet entitled "The ICA Program in the Philippines," will show that during fiscal 1956 from $2 million to $5 million have been requested for a regional training program plus $20 million to $30 million for Asian nuclear training. These amounts are to be funded from the President's Asian economic development fund. In this connection, I note that the $2 million to $5 million proposed for regional training under the requested withdrawals from the Asian economic development fund will be converted to pesos through the import and sale of United States agricultural commodities. Although I was not able to delve into this proposal in great detail, I would recommend that, instead of utilizing appropriated dollars for subsequent conversion to local currencies, consideration be given to using local currency funds which have accrued to the credit of our Government. These funds might be drawn from Public Law 480 proceeds, or from the reserved counterpart amounts generated under assistance programs here or in other areas.

There is indicated in section 1 of the attached exhibit A the types of programs we are operating in the Philippine Islands. For the most part, these programs consist of technical assistance, and are worthwhile. However, I wish to call to the attention of the committee the fact that a number of these programs have completion dates ranging from 1957 to 1960, and into the indefinite future. I fear that unless we make it clear to the Government of the Philippines that our mutual security program is not a long-range effort, we may find ourselves placed in the position of being compelled to maintain the program in order to fulfill at least moral commitments made by our officials in the field.

Also, I wish to warn the committee that it is my judgment that present negotiations concerning title to United States military installations in the Philippines may lead to our exchanging a promise of expanded assistance to the local government in exchange for the relinquishment of certain claims by the Government of the Philippines. Detailed information as to this controversy is, by its very nature confidential, and I suggest that all possible ramifications be developed in connection with the committee's hearings on the 1958 mutual security appropriations bill, and also, before the Committee on Foreign relations in connection with authorizing legislation. I was very much disappointed at the attitude of the press, generally, about the United States. They are advocating Philippine sovereignty over all bases with our putting up all funds necessary to erect all installations and the maintenance by us of all facilities at our expense. When I suggest that these bases were for our mutual protection and that those who advocated sovereignty should also be willing for the local government to share in construction and maintenance costs; I was castigated, called ignorant and brash. I was accorded most unfavorable publicity, to say the least, when I gave my views.

With reference to our effort to increase agricultural production and the status of small landowners in the Philippines, I visited a number of the projects where grassroots technical assistance is being extended. Again this year, I was impressed by the willingness of the local population to help themselves. In one village I inspected, I saw residents building roads while the United States was supplying the technicians and a truck. I saw poultry and swine projects where farmers were learning by seeing and doing, under the direction of their own people, who had been trained by our technicians under prior year efforts.

It is heartwarming to see men and women of this generation striving to better themselves by producing better livestock, using local products so as to provide a balanced diet for their families, and learning rudimentary techniques in food preservation.

Villages were kept clean. The inhabitants worked together and seemed proud of their accomplishments. Demonstrations in how to dig new wells and how to eliminate pollution were being extended. Projects showing how better homes could be built from local materials appeared worthwhile. Quoting from my "on the scene notes" which were jotted down during my visit to one of these villages:

"Fences and hedges surrounded the homes and there seemed to be an air of joy and contentment. It was very impressive and I hope that interest and progress can be maintained. Actually, very little money is being spent by us on such programs. We start them, create interest, and the rest of the program is carried on by the people through mutual help. All join hands in improving streets, building better homes, increasing their food supply, and generally raising their living standards."

These programs of self-help will certainly pay dividends—this will occur because we are attempting to assist the people of this generation. Certainly, programs of this nature are to be preferred to the outright grant aid, which if given lavishly, will result in the loss of self respect by the donees. Another thing, these programs are simple, in fact, rudimentary and are in keeping with the mental ability of the local people to absorb and they are also carried on within the financial capability of the local people.

While in the Philippines, I had breakfast with President Magsaysay and some of the members of the Senate of the Philippines. The conversation with them was most interesting. I was impressed by the sincerity and good intentions of these officials. I also conferred with Major General Joseph Harper, who is in charge of our military assistance mission here. He said that exclusive of the military hardware left here after World War II, goods valued at $178 million had been provided to the Philippine defense forces since 1950. He was unable to estimate what the future might bring, since developments will depend on the willingness of the government of the Philippines to pay its fair share of its defense burden. As I understand the situation, the local government reduced its appropriations for defense, considerably, actually to a point when it could not meet its obligations. As a result, we have held back delivery of further military hardware. It is my understanding that this policy will be continued until the local government meets its fair share of the cost. A similar attitude should be taken by our representatives in many other areas.

The information program here is a sizable operation. Posts are maintained at Manila, Cebu, Davao and Iloilo. I shall refer subsequently to this last post.

We also maintain information centers including libraries at Manila, Cebu, Davao and Iloilo.

As of July 1, 1956, a total of 15 American positions were authorized for the information service here, with a total of 109 local employees authorized as well.

Total costs approximate $721,300 per year, including $352,000 in funds allotted to the country, $124,500 in American salaries including the differential, and $244,800 for reimbursement to the State Department for shared administrative costs. At first blush it would seem to me that the reimbursement to the State Department is rather large, over one-third of the whole spent here by USIS.

In Manila, our Government also maintains a press production center. Costs approximate $2,586,600, including $1,519,900 in purchases consummated in the United States, $144,000 in American salaries, $162,200 for reimbursement to the State Department for shared administrative costs, and $760,500 in local program expenses. In this connection, the local program expenses in connection with the production center would bear examination in order to ascertain if they should not more properly be charged against the country budget of the information service.

Also maintained here are three radio-broadcasting services. The Philippines relay base, located 155 miles north of Manila, consists of a receiving station with general offices located at Baguio and transmitter station and offices at San Fernando. The transmitter plant consists of one 1,000-kilowatt medium-wave transmitter, two 35-kilowatt shortwave transmitters, and several low-power shortwave transmitters. Primary target of this relay base is south China, southeast Asia, and Indonesia, with broadcasts transmitted in Amoi, Burmese, Cantonese, English, Indonesian, Mandarin, Thai, Vietnamese, and Cambodian. Total costs for this facility aggregate approximately $325,000, including $185,800 in funds allotted to the base, $77,900 in salaries, $28,300 in purchases in the United States, and $33,100 for reimbursement to the State Department for shared administrative costs.

The facility at Baguio required the expenditure of approximately $694,500 during fiscal year 1956 which amount includes $382,000 allotted to the base, $137,700 in American salaries, $135,700 for purchases in the

United States, and $39,100 for reimbursement to the State Department for shared administrative costs.

Under the jurisdiction of this general area is the relay base for Voice of America broadcasts located on Okinawa. This establishment consists of a transmitting plant with a 1,000-kilowatt medium-wave transmitter and two 35-kilowatt shortwave transmitters plus a receiving station. The station is on the air 12 hours per day, with broadcasts directed principally at northeast Asia in Mandarin, Korean, Cantonese, Amoi, English, and Russian. Total costs for this facility during fiscal 1956 were approximately $668,200, including $358,700 funds allotted to the base, $160,200 for American salaries, $130,700 for purchases in the United States, and $18,600 for reimbursement to the State Department for shared administrative expenses.

Previously in this report, I referred to the USIA facilities at Iloilo. Before leaving Washington, I was requested by the information agency to look into the situation at Iloilo. At that time, it was proposed to close the facility entirely as of September 30 of this year. This proposal met a great deal of local opposition by the people residing in the immediate area, who desired the information center to remain open. As a matter of fact, the local residents formed a committee to study the proposed closing and after completing this study, recommended that the United States retain the facility. They promised to bear the cost of the space, together with the cost of utilities and janitorial services.

I recommend that this proposal be accepted. Certainly, the institution of a truly cooperative information center—based on cost of sharing between local citizens and the United States—would establish a precedent which could well be followed in other areas of the world. At the time of my visit, it was my impression that by accepting the local offer, we would be able to reduce our fiscal 1957 expenditures here by some $11 to $12 thousand. However, I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. George M. Hellyer, Assistant Director (Far East) for the United States Information Agency, wherein he states in part: "Unfortunately there appears to be a misunderstanding as to the effect of the decision to eliminate the branch public affairs officer position. The savings thus realized cannot be returned to the treasury as you suggest for the following reasons:

The decision to operate the Iloilo center without direct American supervision was made last year as indicated in Mr. Streibert's testimony before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations on February 22. When allocations were made to the overseas post in the following July, reduced costs of operations at Iloilo had already been taken into consideration. Thus, the allocation to the Philippines was determined on the basis that American salaries and other costs at Iloilo would be approximately $11 to $12 thousand less than they would have been if the branch post had been funded for the fiscal year. Hence, in arriving at the allocation of $354,000 (including $5,000 for local motion picture production) for fiscal year 1957 for the Philippine program, we were aware of the availability of this saving and anticipated its use in the post's other activities."

I attach to this report a record of correspondence between Mr. William W. Copeland, Chief Public Affairs Officer, USIS, Manila, and the Information Agency's Washington office concerning the Iloilo matter.

I would suggest, as I have before, that steps be taken now to close many of these facilities unless the local people carry a part of the load. There is no longer any reason why we should bear the whole load. The people are beginning to reap benefits from our library centers and they should be willing to contribute to their maintenance.

I respectfully refer to my report of last year where I discussed the cooperative movement here in the purchase and sale of Agricultural commodities. Much progress is still being made and the rates of interest charged to farmer borrowers are still being reduced.

KOREA

Mr. ELLENDER. From the Philippines I went to Korea. I wish merely to remark here that of all the countries I had the privilege of visiting, I do not know of one in which I had a more unfavorable press than in Korea. The bad publicity came about because I had been advocating reducing our assistance abroad. I was accused of calling the Koreans bloodsuckers, which I never did. I did not say that about Korea or about any other country.

However, I have since concluded, after all this bad publicity, that if the word were to be used at all, it could well have been said about our own people; that is, of those who are suggesting that we spend more and more money abroad.

The Senate may be surprised to know that all the aid budgets which are made in Korea, in Formosa, and, in fact, in every other part of the world, are not made by the people of those countries. It is our own representatives in those countries who go about figuring out how much money should be spent in order to carry on what they may regard as necessary programs.

For example, let me refer to Korea and Formosa—particularly Formosa. The ICA Administrators in Formosa and Korea were told to build an economy to take care of X number of soldiers. That was what they were told to do. There was nothing reasonable or realistic about the program—it was just conceived, as I see it. Thus, with little or nothing to work with, our administrators in Formosa and Korea proceeded to try to balance industry with agriculture. We now have in Formosa as well as in Korea, as the record will show, several hundred technicians who are trying to balance industry with agriculture.

The agriculture of Korea has never been better than it now is. In fact, in the raising of livestock of all kinds, there is no comparison with the condition which existed when the Japanese were in control of Korea before the Second World War, and there today. Korea's livestock industry—in fact, her entire agriculture—is producing at an alltime high. Yet the United States has technicians employed in that area who are trying to teach the Koreans how to grow more rice, for example, when the Koreans could teach some of our own people, because more rice per acre is grown in Korea and in Formosa, than is grown in any part of our country. Nevertheless, many Americans are employed there to teach the Korean people how to grow more rice.

In the case of industrial expansion, the same conditions exist in Korea as exist in Formosa. In those countries there are only a few technically-trained native personnel, if any. Yet, the United States has built manufacturing plant after manufacturing plant in those areas, and there is no personnel capable of operating them except our own people. The operation of the plants has to be done under our direction.

We have built, or are in the process of building, in Korea several flour mills, for example. Yet, not a pound of wheat is grown in Korea. Why was this done? Because our planners decided they could teach the Koreans how to use flour, and that by increasing the use of flour, the Koreans could export some of their rice. That was fine—except for one thing. Where will the Koreans get the wheat to grind into flour in these mills? Where do you think this wheat is coming from, Mr. President? Well, from gifts made under Public Law 480, of course.

In both Korea and Formosa the United States is spending millions of dollars to develop industrial plants. Most of the plants are to be operated by electricity. One would imagine that the governments of those respective countries would make every effort to have the individuals and the corporations which use the electricity pay realistic rates, so that the electric powerplants could pay their own way. But such is not the case. Instead, we—the United States—subsidize these plants and keep the power bills low. The same is true with respect to transportation and communications. What is particularly bad is that not only do we subsidize these utilities because the local governments will not charge realistic rates, but we built most of the powerplants, the railroads, the telephone and telegraph systems in the first place.

As might be expected, most of these utilities are publicly owned. In Formosa over 90 percent of the electric system is in the hands of the government.

Efforts are now being made, especially in Formosa, to double the present electrical generating capacity, although we have already been instrumental in trebling Formosa's prewar production of power. At whose cost has this expansion been? Almost exclusively at our own cost. Why? Because the fixing of rates, I was told, must be done by the Legislature of Formosa and the General Assembly of Korea. Because rate making is a hot political issue, neither the assembly of Korea nor the Legislature of Formosa has seen fit to increase rates to a point where they will pay current costs plus amortization.

I told our representatives in those two countries in no uncertain terms that I would report this fact to the Senate. I think we should ascertain how much we subsidized all those facilities, and deduct such amounts from any future appropriations.

I was advised by the American in charge of the railroads in Korea that the taxpayers of the United States pay an extremely large subsidy each year in order to operate those railroads—railroads built almost entirely by us. Again, because the General Assembly of South Korea will not charge reasonable transportation rates, the good taxpayers of the United States, including those who are our guests in the galleries, are subsidizing the Korean transportation system to the extent of several million dollars a year.

It is my hope that the General Assembly of Korea and the Legislative Yuan of Formosa, will proceed to im-

pose rates which will at least pay the maintenance and administrative costs of these facilities.

Though I have no proof of this, I have been advised, since my visit that in both Korea and Formosa the respective governing bodies have raised these rates to some extent. I hope that information is correct.

I think our next step should be to determine the size of the fiscal 1957 subsidies and to eliminate them from the fiscal 1958 appropriations. The people of those two countries should be required to carry that burden themselves. There is no excuse for the taxpayers of the good old United States of America to subsidize railroads, electric power, and communications in either of those countries simply because the legislatures fail to do their full duty.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD my statements relative to Formosa and Korea.

There being no objection, the statements relating to Formosa and Korea were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORMOSA

I regret very much that the entire membership of the committee was not able to be with me on my inspection of this island fortress. Truly our program on Formosa—past, and present, and proposed—must be seen to be believed.

During the period fiscal year 1954 through fiscal year 1956 expenditures have totaled $247.4 million in United States funds, plus $237.9 million in counterpart funds. Against this amount local contributions have aggregated $146.5 million. During the 1957 fiscal year it is proposed to spend * * * in United States funds plus * * * in counterpart funds. Against this amount the Government of China will contribute * * * in its own currency. Thus, assuming the implementation of the fiscal year 1957 program as proposed at the time of my visit, expenditures during the period fiscal year 1954 through fiscal year 1957 will aggregate * * * in United States funds plus * * * million in counterpart equivalent. Against this amount the Government of China will have contributed * * * in its own currency.

"Unliquidated" balances (i. e., "unexpended") as of June 30, 1956, aggregated $97.1 million in United States funds, $3.6 million in unobligated balances is included in this total. In addition, there was on hand as of June 30, 1956, $23.4 million of unexpended counterpart funds, of which amount $8.6 million was unobligated.

These amounts plus the funds proposed for fiscal year 1957, enabled our mission on Formosa to open the 1957 fiscal year with a total of * * * in United States funds available for expenditure plus * * * in counterpart equivalent. The figure of * * * million in United States currencies is the equivalent of a 2-year program, based upon expenditures proposed during the fiscal year 1957. In other words, if expenditures in fiscal year 1957 reach the projected goal of * * *, our planners will have on hand something like * * * at the beginning of the 1958 fiscal year without the appropriation by Congress of another nickel.

On Formosa our economic assistance program is divided into two phases—technical assistance and defense support. Technical assistance during fiscal year 1957 will probably require the expenditure of * * * in United States funds while defense support will aggregate * * * in United States funds. This total of * * * in combined United States defense support and technical assistance expenditures during 1957 fiscal year compares with a total expenditure projected of * * *. (It is assumed that the difference between these two totals represents what is, in essence, budgetary support to the Nationalist Chinese Government.)

I have attached to this report for the committee's attention a 34-page summary of project descriptions for the defense support program plus a 12-page summary of projects to be implemented under the technical-assistance program. Reference to this data will show that the United States Government, through the mutual-security program, is presently engaged and has, for some time been engaged, in a comprehensive program designed to balance industry with agriculture on Taiwan. We are building new manufacturing plants, expanding power generation and transmission facilities, rehabilitating and expanding the Nationalist fishing fleet, undertaking a long-range program of coal, petroleum, and copper development along with a comprehensive program for exploration of minerals, expanding steel production, and surveying the possible necessity for expanding the production of steel and pig iron even further. In addition, we are maintaining a number of miscellaneous programs such as employment placement, job training, industrial administration, and a number of others. Altogether a total of 113 projects are included within the illustrative fiscal year 1957 defense support program. Listed marginal headings of these are as follows:

Agriculture and natural resources: Fifteen, total United States dollar cost * * *. Included in this total are the following items: * * * to procure logging equipment, etc.; * * * to procure engines and material for the local construction of four 350-ton tuna-fishing boats; * * * for the rehabilitation of cold storage and ice-making facilities to be used in connection with the fishing industry; and * * * to procure 75 tractors to increase mechanization for sugarcane growing and harvesting.

Industry and mining: This is the largest single phase of our defense support program here. Included are 62 projects, at a total United States dollar cost of * * *. The following are some of the more ambitious projects:

Coal-mining improvement: * * * For the development of workings in several coal mines.

Copper and pyrite development: * * * To defray the cost of the purchase of mining, drilling, and transportation equipment under the third phase expansion of the Chinqua-shih mine-development program.

Wusheh Dam: * * * To be used to defray the cost of contract services by the United States Bureau of Reclamation and to procure equipment necessary for the dam and power generating facility. The completion of this dam will add approximately 35,300 kilowatts of firm power to this system through the additional storage capacity available to the Sun-Moon Lake generating facilities.

Telecommunications exansion: * * * For financial support to the Taiwan telecommunications administration and to purchase equipment from worldwide sources to increase the capacity of urban telephone systems, the very-high-frequency system on the east coast of Taiwan, and the toll-carrier system on the west coast in order to meet the domestic demand for telephone services.

Lung Chien hydroproject: * * * To continue construction of this facility which will ultimately have a capacity of 48,600 kilowatts.

Ku Kwan hydrofacility: * * * To start procurement of equipment and to defray first construction costs of this project which will be developed initially as a 90,000-kilowatt run-of-river station with peaking pondage. ICA indicates that this project must be started in fiscal year 1957 in order to assist in relieving the acute power shortage projected for 1959 and 1960.

Fiscal year 1957 power transmission and distribution: * * * For dollar financing of equipment and materials to be procured on a worldwide basis for this project which is a portion of the Taiwan Power Co. program for the expansion and improvement of the transmission and distribution facilities under its control. (I shall comment on the Taiwan Power Co. later in this report.)

Fiscal year 1957 primary system improvements: * * * To defray the costs of procuring 100,000-kilovolt-ampere transformers and equipment and materials necessary to the construction of a new trunk transmission line paralleling an existing 154 kilovolt line along the west coast of Taiwan.

Shen Ao 1st unit thermal: * * * For planning and initial design of a hydroelectric plant and the training of two Taiwan Power Co. engineers in the United States on hydropower project planning and construction. The project, which it is proposed will be supported through the United States aid program in subsequent years, contemplates the establishment of a hydropower station having an ultimate capacity of 120,000 kilowatts.

Urea plant: * * * To continue procurement of equipment and materials, plant construction, and installations of equipment in a urea plant owned by the Taiwan Fertilizer Corp., designed to produce 85,800 metric tons of urea. This plant is expected to be in operations by the end of 1957.

Sulfuric-acid plant: * * * For continued financing of United States dollar costs of procuring equipment and machinery for the establishment of a sulfuric-acid plant with a designed capacity of 275 metric tons per day of 98 percent sulfuric acid, initial procurement of which was financed under the fiscal year 1956 program.

Electric motor and switch manufacturing: * * * To procure machine tools for manufacturing and testing equipment supplementing the equipment presently installed in the plant of the Ta Tung Engineering Corp. which produces small electrical motors, switches, switchgears, and other electrical accessories.

Incandescent lamp manufacturing: * * * To procure automatic bulbmaking machinery, auxiliary equipment, and testing apparatus for the manufacture of uniform glass bulbs. When complete, this plant will produce approximately 4.8 million light bulbs per year.

Modernization of mills: * * * To procure modern machinery and equipment to replace obsolete equipment in the sugar mills of the Government-owned Taiwan Sugar Corporation. In addition, an instrument control and repair team of 3 training participants will be sent to the United States for 6 months requiring * * * in United States currency and a counterpart grant of * * * Nationalist Chinese dollars plus * * * Nationalist Chinese dollars to be provided by the Taiwan Sugar Corporation.

Bagasse shaving board: * * * For a shaving-board plant having a capacity of 55 metric tons daily of bagasse board utilizing bagasse as a raw material. This plant is being established under the direction of the Taiwan Sugar Corporation. United States dollar financing is being provided under this project for the procurement of necessary equipment from the United States.

Dynamite manufacturing: * * * For the procurement on a worldwide basis of equipment for the establishment of a plant manufacturing 1,000 metric tons annually of industrial dynamite.

Acetic acid plant: * * * To procure equipment needed in the establishment of an acetic-acid plant having a capacity of 5 metric tons per year.

Rubber tire manufacturing: * * * This is an initial United States dollar grant to

provide equipment for the establishment of a rubber-tire manufacturing plant with a capacity of 30,000 automobile, truck, and bus tires annually. Additional financing will be required in fiscal year 1958.

Aluminum plant modernization: * * * For the procurement of equipment to improve the efficiency and reduce costs for the Kaohsiung plant of the Taiwan Aluminum Co.

Lithograph printing and platemaking: * * * To establish a modern printing plant in Taiwan to supply photoengraving and photolithographic plates to the printing trade and to provide high-grade printing facilities. The Government will sponsor this project but the plant will be turned over to private finance and operation after completion and after a training program has been carried out.

* * * * *

Shop improvement of the Taiwan Machinery Manufacturing Corporation: * * * To procure modern machine tools and equipment for plant improvement and expansion for this industry which produces the major portion of heavy machinery manufacturing on Formosa.

Tang Eng Iron Works: * * * To procure equipment for this privately owned facility to provide two new substations to meet the additional load requirements directly from its powerline.

Jute mill rehabilitation: * * * To rehabilitate two jute mills which were transferred to private ownership in 1955. This money will be used to procure replacements for wornout machinery.

Small industry fund: * * * This project, begun in 1954, was designed to make available industrial development loans to a great number and wide variety of small privately owned industries. Delayed payments for United States dollar-aid equipment and machinery and local currency loans for plant expansion are extended through three privately owned and managed commercial banks with branches situated in all major cities of Taiwan. In this connection, during my visit I was informed that these loans are being repaid at a rapid rate. However, I was informed that borrowers are required to pay 6 to 7 percent interest rate on 80 percent of the amount borrowed and 15 percent interest on the remaining 20 percent which is advanced by the banks referred to above. In addition, I was told that the banks charged 1 percent on the total amount borrowed for merely collecting the installments as they come due. I think such a system is unconscionable. It is a bonanza to the banks and I recommend most emphatically that our mission take steps to see that more reasonable rates are promulgated.

Water resources survey: * * * To finance a comprehensive survey of the water resources of Taiwan.

Steel industry survey: * * * To complete a project begun in the 1956 fiscal year. The * * * will be used as a contingency fund for services of a group of six consultant engineers whose expenses were financed in fiscal year 1956. This survey team will work with the Industrial Development Commission on general overall planning, blast-furnace installations, byproduct coke oven, steelmaking processes, and rolling mill installations.

General construction corps: * * * This is a new project which provides as a counterpart fund grant, local currency for financing the training, equipping, and housing of several thousand combat ineffectives retired from the Chinese Armed Forces who have joined together to form a construction working corps. This construction corps has been working on various water-conservation projects throughout Taiwan and is now employed on the East-West Highway. This project will enable the construction corps to be permanently resettled in self-supporting productive employment on Taiwan. United States dollar-aid financing is tentatively budgeted for importing construction machinery for use of the construction corps. This is another phase of the "GI bill of rights" program which the United States has undertaken to help finance in large part for the Government of Nationalist China. This program involves the resettlement of overage members of Chiang Kai-shek's army. I shall refer to this program later on in my discussion of public administration projects.

Transportation: Under this phase, 13 projects are to be undertaken at a total United States dollar cost of * * *.

East-West Highway construction: * * * This is part of a continuing project which provides for United States dollars and counterpart funds to continue and expand construction of a major highway connecting the east and west coast of Taiwan. It was originally begun in the 1956 fiscal year. The highway involved crosses Taiwan's high central mountain range and opens up vast areas of the island for exploitation as resettlement activities for combat ineffectives in the fields of forestry, farming, livestock raising, mining, etc. The dollars provided will be used to obtain construction machinery and materials for the highway which cannot be obtained locally or in Japan. The counterpart funds will provide financing for resettlement projects for combat ineffectives. In other words, this is another phase of the "GI bill of rights" program being extended with the United States assistance to overage soldiers of the Nationalist armies.

Expansion of railroad facilities: * * * To finance the dollar cost of the first year of a 4-year development plan embarked upon by the Taiwan Railway Administration to meet the needs of their growing economy. Dollars provided during fiscal year 1957 will finance the procurement of 5 steam locomotives, 1 wrecking crane, and materials for construction of 6,000 tons of freight cars. The 4-year plan aimed at adding 25 steam freight locomotives, 6 switching locomotives, 25,000 tons of freight cars, and 146 passenger cars. Also under the fiscal year 1957 program will come a railway shop expansion including the procurement of machinery and equipment and extension of shop buildings for the expansion of the Taiwan Railway Administration workshops at Taipei and Kaohsiung. In subsequent years we shall also contribute to the building of a railway double track over 3 sections totaling 21 kilometers which are regarded as bottlenecks.

Keelung harbor improvement: * * * To continue improvement of Keelung Harbor's facilities. Dollars will be used to expand the grain elevator from 10,000- to 15,000-ton capacity and to construct three new small tugboats.

Coastal ships construction: * * * On a loan basis to construct one 25,000-ton general cargo ship for banana export to Japan, one 350-ton ferry boat to run between Kaohsiung and Makung, and two 50-ton ferries to operate between Taitung-Orchid Island and Green Island.

Civil airways improvement: * * * To continue the improvement of navigational aids, landing and communication facilities of Taipei International Airport and Tainan and Hengchun NDB and VOR stations, as well as maintenance and overhaul facilities.

Shipyard expansion: * * * For the procurement of one 35-ton crane for the building berth of Taiwan Shipbuilding Corp. as well as additional arc welding machines, acetylene generating and piping systems and electric apparatus. The underwater section of the No. 2 berth will be extended to permit simultaneous construction of fishing boats and coastal vessels leaving drydock No. 1 available full time for ocean ships repair. The Government of Nationalist China will provide * * * Nationalist Chinese dollars to pay customs duties, installation cost, etc.

Education: In the field of education one project is contemplated as follows:

Expansion of educational facilities for overseas Chinese: * * * For physical facilities and improvements on the various college and high school campuses which have been made available for the training of overseas Chinese students.

During the fiscal year 1957 it is also proposed to spend * * * United States dollars in the area of health and sanitation including, among the larger expenses, * * * for further work toward the completion of permanent hospital and domiciliary facilities for 19,837 disabled and sick combat ineffectives discharged from the Chinese armed forces in June 1955. In addition, there is involved a counterpart fund grant of local currency in the amount of * * * equivalent United States dollars for financing the interim medical care and living expenses for these 19,837 persons. This, as is obvious, is another phase of the so-called "GI Bill of Rights" program for over-age Nationalist Chinese soldiers. Besides this facility, there is also programed * * * for the importation of construction materials for building construction and its support facilities such as staff housing as well as for importing medical supplies and equipment for equipping and operating a 1,000-bed general hospital for these soldiers; * * * for materials, etc. for a 1,500-bed tuberculosis hospital; and * * * for constructing and equiping three clinics being built to provide adequate medical facilities for 10,000 combat ineffectives. All of these programs, as I indicated previously, are part of the so-called "Chinese Nationalist GI Bill of Rights."

In the field of public administration, it is proposed to spend a total of * * * in United States dollars. * * * of this amount will be used to provide dollar aid to assist the Chinese Government in carrying out its retirement program for discharging combat ineffectives from the Chinese armed forces and to defray the cost of a contract with George Fry and Associates. This latter firm is to advise the Chinese Government on all phases if its retired servicemen's program which aims at permanently settling as far as possible in productive, self-supporting employment, the combat ineffectives in the Taiwan civilian economy. This, too, is part and parcel of this "GI Bill of Rights" for the Nationalist Chinese.

In the area of community development * * * is proposed to be spend during fiscal year 1957 including * * * to build 9,500 low-cost dwellings for low-income workers during fiscal year 1957 by making construction loans. About 40 percent of the capital required is supplied by counterpart funds. An additional * * * will be spent in the continuation of a project which provides as a counterpart fund grant local currency for constructing, equipping, and operating six domiciliary-type homes for 6,000 disabled combat ineffectives retired from the Chinese Armed Forces.

Listed as general miscellaneous projects are the following aggregating a total proposed expenditure during fiscal year 1957 at * * *. Motion picture producing facilities * * * in connection with the continuation of assistance to the Chinese Government in developing its program for improvements in motion picture production facilities for filming documentary subjects including the fields of agriculture, industry and related areas. Overseas Chinese information * * * to finance invitational travel for overseas Chinese leaders and journalists and other groups from southeastern Asia; increased travel of Chinese press, civic, technical and cultural leaders to and in the countries of Asia and assistance in providing United States dollar equipment and reading room material to Chinese Government information offices throughout Southeast Asia. In other words, besides maintaining our own information

service, we are also subsidizing and helping to maintain the propaganda outlet for the Government of Nationalist China. This becomes obvious when it is noted that * * * will also be spent for overseas broadcast facilities—a project designed to assist the Broadcasting Corporation of China in stepping up and improving broadcasts to overseas Chinese in southeast Asia, through the procuring of shortwave transmitting equipment, and supplying necessary funds for cost of construction and installation.

The last project listed under the heading "General and Miscellaneous" is a * * * local currency item earmarked for government budgetary support. However, it should be noted, that we are also proposing to expend during fiscal year 1957 * * * in United States currency on the Shihmen Dam. This is a multipurpose project for irrigation, hydroelectric power, flood control and domestic water supply. This amount is only a start toward an expenditure which will probably total in excess $12.5 million United States dollars for the project. The total cost of the project will be about $42 million of which we will contribute in cash an excess of $12.5 million and much by way of counterpart dollar funds. There is attached to this report a document entitled Shihmen Dam, which outlines the proposal in detail. It will be noted that the cost estimates vary in direct proportion to the scope of the facility, that is, whether it will contain 1 or 2 power units. Further, annual fund requirements—which were begun in fiscal year 1956—are proposed to extend through fiscal year 1961.

I shall not deal with the technical cooperation program in detail except to note that the various projects which we have scheduled for fiscal year 1957 indicate future years will bring increases in our expenditures in the transportation, industrial, mining, and related fields along with a large labor productivity program in future years.

At this point, I quote from my on-the-spot notes:

"We first visited the modernized railway shops where locomotives and cars were being repaired. This is quite an extensive facility toward the construction and maintenance of which we have contributed quite a large sum. I noted that hundreds of people were employed. Much repair work is done here. If parts are not on hand, they are made. However the facility is now self-sustaining and I was told that revenues more than pay for all operations as well as repairs.

"We then proceeded to the Sung I Textile Plant. This plant produces cotton cloth. As I recall, there are 13 such plants on the island. All the cotton required is obtained through ICA and except for our Government making it available the plants would immediately close. We donate the cotton to the Government and it in turn sells it to the textile mills. The proceeds of these sales are added to the counterpart fund and are used for rehabilitation of the island.

"The same situation obtains with practically all the flour mills erected here so far. I saw two of these mills. I also visited the Urea Plant and, while it is not completed, I understand it will be ready for operation early next year. I was informed that the United States provided all the money—either cash for the purchase of machinery—or counterpart funds required for the construction of this facility. It is quite a large plant and will supply much needed nitrogen. Of course, our aid planners claim that it will save the Government of Nationalist China many dollars. However, I was told the same story as to the other plants, but our contributions to the foreign aid program here continue to increase each year and there is apparently no serious effort made to reduce the amount. In connection with these fertilizer plants in particular, we furnish all phosphates and other ingredients that cannot be obtained locally. Of course, this is an expensive process for the United States and we do not obtain any reimbursement.

"Next we visited various plants which are owned by the Taiwan Power Company, an organization formed in 1946 to take over all former Japanese facilities. It is owned 90 percent by the Government and controlled by it in all respects."

Before the war, the powerplant we visited (Pei Pu Power Plant) produced a peak load of 177,000 kilowatts but this production dwindled to 33,000 when the present government took over. On its own resources and initiative, Taiwan Power Company restored the level of production which existed in 1948. Since that time, 190,000 kilowatts were added and by 1953, over 320,000 additional kilowatts were being produced.

It should be noted that this total is not produced from this one plant, it is produced from the entire network of generating facilities towards which I understand the United States is contributing $48 million in cash and $20 million in counterpart funds as against only $16 million by the local government—most of which comes from the profits made from the sale of power.

Yet, there is in contemplation a huge expansion program in which we are again to participate heavily (see above). During my discussion with the manager of the Taiwan Power Company System, he provided me with many details as to how all of Taiwan is now being supplied by electricity. He said that the east coast was connected with the west coast, and that the power produced was generated at a cost which was even less than the cost of power in the United States. His boast was that power can be generated in the Taiwan Power Company System at 1.2 mills per kilowatt. Of course, I lost no time telling him that if the United States were supplied the necessary money by a rich relative as is the case with Formosa, we could probably cut the cost of power even lower.

Then we visited the Taiwan Ship Company Yard. It is entirely owned by the government and operated by it. Ships are repaired here and boat owners are charged for services in just the same manner as if the yard were privately owned and operated. Incidentally, I noticed that there is a splendid harbor here which needs little or no upkeep.

We crossed the harbor to inspect the grain elevator. At the time of our visit a cargo of wheat from the United States was being unloaded. The elevator is most modern and I was told that the United States provided most of the funds for its construction.

We also visited cotton mills and a factory where chinaware is produced. I also inspected the installation which produces electrical equipment such as fans, meters, switches, etc. (see above). I regretted very much that due to inclement weather I was not able to visit the sugar mills and other facilities on the south end of Formosa. Reference to the above data will indicate that the United States has contributed generously to rehabilitation and now to the expansion of these installations. Much sugar is exported from Formosa to Japan.

During my trip over the island I was very much impressed with the work we are doing in the area of forestry. I was told that we spend about $100,000 per year for pine seedlings, fire-fighting equipment and similar materials. I saw quite a number of seedlings in open nurseries. They are balled and then planted. The process of growing new trees seems slow and appears to be expensive; I question the advisibility of expanding this program. Now that we have shown the way the local government should do more on its own.

At the time of my visit there were 810 employees attached to the ICA Mission here. This number includes 680 locals and 130 Americans. Of the locals, 492 are technicians employed by the United States, 67 are contract technicians, and 121 are assigned to administrative duties. With respect to the Americans, 57 are United States employed technicians, 51 are contract technicians and 22 are administrative employees. I was astounded to discover that the mission still employs such a large number of persons. I suspect that a great number of these are keeping busy trying to conceive new projects and otherwise seeking ways and means to increase United States expenditures in Formosa.

Before leaving the economic assistance phase of our mutual security program on Formosa, I believe it is important to call to the committee's attention the fact that there is extreme reluctance—reluctance which at times approximates full neglect—on the part of local government officials to see that operations in the nature of public utilities here fix their rates in such a manner as to properly amortize investments and meet current expenses. When I mentioned this situation, which is extremely flagrant in connection with the Taiwan Power Co., local officials indicated to me that rate making was a legislative matter completely within the hands of the legislative assembly. Further, it is difficult if not impossible to impress upon the legislature the necessity for charging a fair rate on utilities. We are here confronted with the same situation which prevails in Korea. Because of political reasons the legislative assembly will not raise utility rates in order to insure a return which will permit the Government of China to properly participate in the expansion of existing utility facilities. It should be made clear to the Government of China that unless it exercises its proper responsibilities in this, as well as in other areas, appropriate action by the United States must be taken. This action would certainly take the form of withholding further United States dollar and/or counterpart contributions until fair and adequate rates are fixed.

The Committee will be interested in the fact that United States assistance funds, appropriated under authority of the Mutual Assistance Act for purposes other than support of the United Nations, are nevertheless being used to bring UN experts into Nationalist China. While in Formosa, I inquired into this program. The following statement was provided me. I believe it is self-explanatory; it indicates that under "fellowships" the United States is indirectly financing under our mutual security program the bringing of United Nations experts to Formosa:

"With respect to the UN Technical Assistance Administration we have included below an extract statement from the Treaty Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, outlining the technical assistance program for China in 1956, which differs in some degree from the statements made in this section of the notes. The primary differences are that 41 fellowships will be awarded (these are for technical training) and 18 experts will be in China assisting in various fields, economic development, and public administrations. The statement by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs follows: 'For the year of 1956, the Technical Assistance Committee (TAC) of the Economic and Social Council, upon the recommendation of the Technical Assistance Board (TAB), approved for China the amount of US$280,667 to finance technical assistance projects in Taiwan Province. Under the program, 41 fellowships will be awarded by UNTAA, ILO, UNESCO, ICAO, and WHO, and 18 experts will be sent by these organizations to China to provide technical assistance in various fields of economic development and public administration.'

"(1) The personnel being provided by the United Nations in no way overlap activities carried out by ICA mission personnel. Similarly all fellowships (technical training assignments) to be carried out by the UN organization are screened against the technical assistance training projects established

under the ICA program. Wherever it is found that the UN is providing training in a specific field in which an ICA technical assistance training project has been established, there is eliminated from the ICA program that particular project.

"(2) Upon review of the technicians proposed it was found that one position differs from those outlined in the notes. No technician from the International Civil Aeronautics Organization is scheduled to be in Taiwan under the new or modified program; one International Civil Aeronautics Organization training fellowship has been provided in the field of aviation meteorology.

"With respect to comment on the budget deficit of the Chinese Government the primary scurce of this is, and will continue to be, the military assistance program impact, which is becoming greater as additional material arrives and more installations are constructed under the United States military assistance program. As long as the military program continues at the present level, little improvement in the situation can be foreseen."

Turning now to the United States Information Agency, fiscal year 1957 will bring an increase of $37,000 over funds spent during fiscal year 1956. The staffing pattern will remain the same with respect to Americans, yet the number of locals will increase from 56 to 65. * * * I was informed that the Nationalist Chinese Information Service, despite large-scale United States help (see above) has not been effective in its effort to counter Chinese Communist propaganda. Reference to the attached exhibit C headed United States Information Agency will provide the basic background as to our information operations here.

As with other countries, military assistance to Formosa is treated in a separate section of this report. However, it should be noted that during calendar years 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954 and the fiscal years 1955, 1956, and 1957, the Chinese Government's contributions toward its own defense, expressed as a percentage of the national budget, were, respectively, as follows: 1951, 75.1 percent; 1952, 42.8 percent; 1953, 40.1 percent; 1954, 45.1 percent; 1955, 45.5 percent; 1956, 51.2 percent; and 1957, 49 percent (estimated).

---

KOREA

The magnitude of the United States assistance effort, both past and present, in this tiny land must be seen by one in order to properly evaluate it. South Korea, which is about the size of the State of Minnesota, suffered heavy damages at the hands of Red invaders during the period of the Korean war. The American people have paid dearly in their efforts to drive off the invaders and in reconstructing and rehabilitating the economy of the country. Yet I doubt that the economy of South Korea has ever been in a more healthy state than at present.

During the fiscal years 1954, 1955, and 1956, a total of $780.3 million in United States dollar assistance was actually spent here. During this same period, this aid generated a total of $144.5 million in counterpart funds, which funds were spent during the same period.

As of June 30, 1956, unobligated balances in the Korean accounts totaled $697,000 plus over $86 million in counterpart funds. Unexpended balance as of June 30, 1956, in dollars was $344,229,000, with a total of an additional $86 million in counterpart equivalent.

Allocations from the fiscal year 1957 mutual-security appropriation aggregate * * * which amount will generate an exact equivalent in local currency funds.

In other words, during fiscal 1957, there will be available for expenditure in this tiny land a total of * * * in dollars alone. At the time of my visit, our planners propose to spend * * * during fiscal 1957. If this program is actually implemented as proposed, the end of the 1957 fiscal year will find an unexpended balance of * * * on hand in Korea.

Assuming that the full * * * proposed to be spent is actually spent during fiscal year 1957, United States direct dollar assistance to the Republic of Korea from the beginning of fiscal year 1954 through fiscal year 1957 will have aggregated something over a * * * to be exact. In addition to this amount in dollars, counterpart funds generated and spent will aggregate * * * in dollar equivalent.

At the time of my visit, a host of technicians were employed in this country. It might be truthfully said that between the United States civilian employees and our troops, the countryside was alive with Americans. ICA employees in Korea totaled 988 technicians plus 1,944 contract employees, a total of nearly 3,000 civilian employees. Of this number, 399 are Americans, the remaining 2,533 are locals.

Reference to the attached exhibits will demonstrate that the United States is in almost complete charge of the Korean economy. I would not hesitate to say that * * * except that while our country continues to "pick up the tab," it is my considered judgment that the Government of the Republic of Korea has frequently shown an extremely uncooperative attitude toward our efforts to be of help. I shall refer to this specifically later in this report.

I desire to particularly direct the attention of the committee to the documents entitled ICA/FOA Capital Investment Programs in Korea—fiscal year 1954—fiscal year 1955—fiscal year 1956, which I have attached.

Reference to this exhibit demonstrates that since 1954 our country has actually spent a grand total of $214,554,690 in dollar expenditures plus $152,889,632 in counterpart equivalent on a variety of capital improvement programs in this country. Compared with this amount, the Government of Korea has spent only $84,620,826 for the same purposes.

With reference to grand totals, it will be seen that our total contributions in the various fields of endeavor embraced within the report referred to have totaled (including counterpart funds):

Transportation, $96,174,000 or 92.5 percent of the total.

Communications, $22,999,530 or 97.5 percent of the total.

Public works, $50,439,095 or 86.8 percent of the total.

Power development, $55,041,749 or 97.5 percent of the total.

Agriculture, $58,181,250 or 56.2 percent of the total.

Public health, $4,491,000 or 100 percent of the total.

Public safety, $1,355,000 or 100 percent of the total.

Social affairs, $4,488,000 or 36.9 percent of the total.

Manufacturing and processing, $63,353,900 or 94.4 percent of the total.

Mining, $1,150,000 or 100 percent of the total.

Fisheries, $1,200,000 or 85 percent of the total.

Education, $8,580,798 or 97.2 percent of the total.

Under these various headings, our planners have undertaken programs involving every conceivable project. The following are illustrative:

Transportation: $1.2 million to partially restore 4 engine houses and 2 back shops of the Korean National Railroad; $190,000 to restore 26 war damaged locomotive watering installations along the Korean National Railroad; roughly $100,000 for engine replacement and restoration; $549,632 to construct a prestressed concrete plant in order to permit the Korean National Railroad to manufacture concrete railway ties; $210,000 to improve the streetcar systems in Seoul and Pusan; $18 million to construct a railway to link the largest coal-mining area in Korea with the central system of the Korean National Railroad; $1 million to rebuild railroad warehouse buildings; $1.4 million to procure coal, tar, pitch, etc., to provide a basic material for the Korean National Railroad to manufacture coal briquettes for use in their locomotives; $2.4 million to purchase used passenger coaches; $3.7 million to repair 554 steam locomotives and 8,908 pieces of rolling stock; $1.9 million to purchase 9 to 12 new passenger coaches; $11.4 million to purchase 825 boxcars, 565 gondolas, and 50 coal hopper cars; $389,000 to purchase creosote to treat crossties; $4 million to finish the railroad line from the coal field referred to earlier; $2.3 million to rebuild the Han River bridge; $410,000 to purchase 15 used steam locomotives; $1.7 million to purchase cargo handling equipment; $8.6 million to purchase 8 cargo vessels in order to replace uneconomical units of the Korean maritime fleet; $235,000 to modernize a shipyard near Inchon; another $364,000 to modernize another shipyard near Pango-jin, T'chang; $2.3 million to procure 42 prefabricated steel warehouses to be erected in 9 Korean ports; $1.6 million to repair and modernize marine navigational aids along the coast of Korea; $20.7 million to rehabilitate 52 Korean ports; $1.3 million to purchase 89 streetcars and to rehabilitate 56 others; $7.3 million to provide machine tools and other equipment for the expansion of the Pusan Iron Works and $7.3 million to procure fishing vessels.

Further details concerning projects will not be enumerated here; however, they may be obtained from the attached data.

Communications: In this area, we have underway, among other things, programs involving $780,000 to purchase telephone poles; $4.7 million to rehabilitate and expand telephone facilities in Seoul; $4 million to rehabilitate a telephone cable plant in Seoul; $1.2 million to rehabilitate the National Police communication system; and, among other things, replacement of the telephone central office in Masan, rehabilitation of the manual switchboard at Taejon, and the rehabilitation of the Korean Ministry of Communications school for training communications technicians and specialists.

Also proposed and underway are projects to rehabilitate and restore the domestic radio telegram system within Korea, to rehabilitate major telephone toll centers; to reactivate 6 coastal radio stations for the marine radio service; to connect vital industrial cities and ports to the coal centers referred to earlier; to rehabilitate various secondary toll centers now that the major telephone central offices have been rehabilitated and connected; and to create a weather, press broadcast, and monitoring network in Seoul in order to "reestablish radio facilities for dissemination of weather and press information and for monitoring Korean radio stations which are controlled and regulated by the Ministry of Communications."

Public works: In this area we have undertaken to reconstruct and rehabilitate city water plants throughout Korea (estimated total cost something over $16 million); pave streets and highways throughout major cities and provinces; rehabilitate drainage structures throughout 32 major cities in Korea; rehabilitate and reconstruct highway bridges throughout the country; rebuild the Korean National Prison; reconstruct the Government buildings of the Republic of Korea in Seoul to provide more space for offices, industrial exhibits, the national police, library, post offices, and telephone central facilities (total cost $1.1 million with United States contributing 100 percent); construct a maintenance and repair shop in order to properly maintain and repair some $2.5 million worth of heavy equipment and vehicles which will be utilized in the recon-

struction of roads and bridges throughout South Korea (needless to say we also provided the heavy equipment and vehicles); rehabilitation of Korean city and provincial buildings in order to provide offices for city and provincial officials (total cost $750,500 with Korea contributing $150,000 in labor); rehabilitated a number of thermal and electrical power stations and transmitters including $4.5 million to rehabilitate the overall electrical power transmission system in Korea, $2.1 million to rehabilitate 2 thermal powerplants substations; $3.1 million for rehabilitation of the Chongpoing Dam; and a complete reconstruction and new construction of numerous thermal power, transmission, and similar facilities in Korea at a total cost of $34.9 million, with the United States contributions averaging out something over 90 percent.

One of the facilities which we undertook to rehabilitate was the Hwachon Dam, at a total cost of something over $8 million. This represented approximately 97 percent of the total construction cost. I visited this facility, and the engineer in charge (an employee of an American contracting firm) indicated that he felt sure that the project could be self-liquidating if only adequate charges for the use of electricity were levied by the Government. However, since the Korean National Assembly has reserved to itself all ratemaking functions, the entire rate structure has become involved in local politics. The net effect is that instead of levying adequate charges—charges which would permit the amortization of the cost of these facilities over a reasonable period of time—the Government of Korea continues to look to the United States for continued economic support. As a matter of fact, at the time of my visit, it appeared that the Government of Korea was attempting to shift the blame for delay to our shoulders, since they are claiming that our armed services—which are stationed here in order to protect the Republic of Korea from another attack from the north—were not paying their electric bills on time. In other words, although we have for all practical purposes built for the Government of Korea its entire electrical generating and transmission system, the Government is now raising as a barrier to adequate rate charges, the fact that the United States has not paid for consumption of electricity by its military forces. It is my considered judgment that this situation will never be completely rectified unless our officials in Korea make it known to the local government that unless and until they decide to charge adequate rates for the power, we shall refuse to provide one thin dime further in assistance. The same should be true as to transportation which we subsidized to the tune of $27,210,000 during the last fiscal year.

The attached exhibits will demonstrate that in the fields of power development and transmission, the United States has borne and continues to bear not only the burden of extending technical assistance to the Government of Korea but also constructing, maintaining, and training techniciains for the operation of these facilities.

Agriculture: In this area, we have built farm-soil testing service stations, complete agricultural research facilities, dams and levees in order to protect rice paddies and villages, irrigation systems in order to increase the Korean production of rice; veterinary and livestock facilities throughout the country; 70 seed fumigation plants; approximately 900 rural warehouses in order to store farm produce and equipment; and have undertaken a complete forestry development program including reforestation, forest erosion control work, stream improvement work, forest protection and forest management in designated forest areas in all provinces of Korea. This last project alone has cost something over $9 million.

Public health: In this area, we have constructed wells and sanitary facilities in all provinces and in Seoul; we have rebuilt and remodeled hospital facilities throughout Korea; in doing this, while the costs are small, it should be noted that we have contributed 100 percent of the total of hospital rehabilitation and construction and 100 percent of the total of constructing wells and sanitary facilities.

Social affairs: We have undertaken a $12 million resettlement project under which we propose to reestablish and resettle refugees and persons displaced as a result of war.

Manufacturing and processing: I do not intend to outline in detail the scope of this program. The number and types of plants constructed and/or rehabilitated are outlined in the attached exhibits. Suffice it to say, that they include fertilizer plants, sulfuric acid and aluminum sulphate plants, rubber tire and tube plants, rubber reclamation plants, insecticide and pesticide plants, pharmaceutical plants, flour mills, starch plants, plastic plants (in order to produce toothbrushes, rice bowls, glasses, combs, etc.) aluminum sheeting plants, a paint plant, clothing factories, asbestos plants, a leather plant, and leather processing and shoe manufacturing plant, a book printing plant, a three-wheeled-truck plant, a glass container plant, a plant to manufacture the material which provides hardness for rubber, a ball-bearing plant, silk textile plants, auto spare parts plant, a marble plant, iron stone-crushing plant, agar-agar plants, paper mills, small industrial processing plants, and others.

My report last year noted that the great majority of manufacturing enterprises constructed under our aid program were being operated by the Government of Korea. At that time, I commented that it was unfortunate that while preaching democracy and free enterprise, we were, in fact, fostering socialism in Korea. I was particularly pleased to note that at the time of my visit in 1956, the vast majority of the manufacturing enterprises which formerly were Japanese property and which had been rehabilitated under the aid program had been turned over to private industry. In this connection, I expressed an interest in obtaining the terms under which these transfers took place. I have requested this information from both the International Cooperation Administration, Seoul, and the General Accounting Office through its representatives in South Korea. As soon as it is made available, I shall file it with the committee.

During my stay in Korea, I visited the Hung Ah Tire Co., Ltd., in Pusan. This is a facility which was originally built by the Japanese but which was rehabilitated under the American aid program. The president of this firm indicated to me that his problem is to win customers. In addition, he fears that a shortage of operating funds and a lack of technical knowledge may hamper his success.

I also visited one of the chemical plants we constructed here and a number of port facilities. I noted that the port was crammed with goods obtained from the United States, and I was not able to find one item which originated in a foreign country other than a few purchased with American aid funds. Goods are flowing in to bolster the economy of Korea. It would appear, from the materials I saw on the docks, that our planners contemplate United States assistance for the Republic of Korea for many more years.

As I stated last year, none of our allies are helping Korea. We have undertaken and are doing the whole job.

In addition, the United States is in complete supervisory control of the port facilities since there are no Koreans who are competent to operate it. True, we are in the process of training a host of local employees in order to fulfill these tasks, but the process is a long and tedious one.

I was particularly alarmed to note that while we are building a number of manufacturing facilities in the Republic of Korea, there is very little in the way of natural resources available to supply raw materials for these plants. For example, we are building flour mills in order to convince the people of Korea that bread is a suitable substitute for rice in their diet. It is hoped that by so doing, the consumption of rice in Korea can be reduced, thus making rice available for export. Ignoring the fact that Korea is thus being placed in the position to compete in Far Eastern markets which our own rice industry would desire to obtain, it must be realized that Korea produces no wheat. Thus, after constructing the flour mills we shall be obligated to either subsidize the importation of wheat into this country or give it to the Republic of Korea. Consequently, it will be necessary for our aid to continue ad infinitum.

The same is true with respect to cotton textiles, for we are rebuilding, in fact have built, a number of textile mills here without a thought of the fact that no cotton is produced in Korea. Of course, it is the view of our officials that Korea will be able to purchase these basic raw materials under the Surplus Disposal Act (Public Law 480). This ignores the fact that there is no assurance that Public Law 480 will remain on the statute books for any definite period of time.

Many phases of our effort here boil down to placing the United States in a position where once the capital improvement program in Korea is completed, we will be compelled to provide enough raw materials in order to permit these facilities to operate. Since Japan is fast coming back into the manufacturing picture in the Far East, it is not far-fetched to assume that the day will soon come when the United States may be obligated to not only provide raw materials in order to operate the plants which we have constructed, but to also provide markets for the goods which are made there.

In this connection, during my interview with President Rhee, I stressed to him the necessity for his government to undertake a "buy at home program"—in other words, a program designed to convince the people of his country that the goods manufactured there are deserving of their patronage. I cited the tire plant as a case in point. Unless Koreans buy Korean made goods, many of the factories will have to close or else foreign markets will have to be tapped.

I also suggested to President Rhee that he intervene and undertake to have the legislature increase public utility rates—telephone, telegraph, electric, and transportation—in order to amortize the cost of and pay for operating investments which we have undertaken in this country. I said to him that public utilities involved one area where Korea could certainly afford to carry a bigger portion of the burden. His only answer was that the United States Army did not settle its bills promptly.

Since our military effort in Korea is of such tremendous magnitude, I was not able to delve deeply into its operation. However, it should be noted that we have constructed fine barracks for practically all armed services, both American and Korean, and these are more or less permanent facilities. I was not able to obtain an estimate of the cost but I feel sure that it was substantial. I was informed however that during the 1956 fiscal year, the Republic of Korea allocated 51 percent of its entire budget for support of its military forces. On this amount however, roughly 25.6 percent consisted of counterpart funds generated under our aid program. For the last 6 months of 1956, 54 percent of the Korean budget was devoted to the military with some 22 percent of this amount consisting of counterpart funds generated under our aid program and the remainder from the Republic of Korea treasury. This latter figure, compared with the prior one,

offers some encouragement and I hope it continues. I have not attempted to show our expenditures in the military field before and after the armistice. I can assure the committee that the figures stagger the imagination.

The information service in Korea received $310,118 for fiscal year 1956. This amount was increased to $420,600 for 1957. (See attached exhibit.) This increase appears to be completely unwarranted, if, as our officials have maintained, the people of Korea are truly stanch and loyal allies. Certainly, if the Koreans are stanch and unwavering friends of the free world, it is inconsistent that there be increased budgets for propaganda purposes. Therefore, I urge that the amount provided for fiscal year 1958 be considerably reduced.

JAPAN

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I now turn to a discussion of my visit to Japan. I shall not spend much time in discussing Japan except to say that 3 years ago I did all I could to prevent our planners from establishing a technical aid program in Japan. The Japanese need no such aid. They have good technicians.

When the technical aid program here was first conceived, the Ambassador at that time was opposed to it—but he was prevailed upon by Governor Stassen, who then headed our aid program, to establish such a program in Japan. The cost for the first 6 months was $450,000. For the next year the cost was $980,000. This year it will be $3 million. Needless to say, the amount is rising and probably will continue its climb.

I say there is absolutely no need for any technical assistance program in Japan. My hope is that such a program will be dispensed with as quickly as possible.

Advice is being given as to how to cultivate land in Hokkaido, the northern island. I visited the place. I was surprised to learn that there were several million acres of land in that area—beautiful land—which is not cultivated because the weather is too cold. The American who was sent to guide the Japanese in doing the Hokkaido land reclamation job went with me on my visit.

As we looked around, he said, "What a change has taken place since I was here last! Look at all they have done."

I asked, "When were you here last?"

He said, "18 months ago."

Mr. President, why should we have there a man ostensibly guiding the Japanese, showing them what to do, when he had not been there in 18 months to see what they already had done?

I say that the Japanese people are able, and have good technicians. To my way of thinking, it is a pure waste of money for us to do such things. I believe it borders on an insult to the Japanese, for us to establish such a technical assistance mission agency there.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my memorandum on Japan printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAPAN

The program in Japan is primarily technical assistance. However, our efforts will bear close attention. Although the funds appropriated directly for assistance to Japan are comparatively small, the increases which have taken place from fiscal year 1956 through fiscal year 1957 are large. For 6 months in 1955, when the program started, $450,000 were made available. For fiscal 1956 the annual total was $948,000 and at the time of my visit it was expected that fiscal 1957 would be increased to * * *. It will be recalled that I objected to this program when I visited Japan in 1955. I contended then and I repeat now, that the program was started against the advice of our Ambassador. It was upon the insistence of Harold Stassen that this program was ever started here.

Basically the American effort is to increase productivity. We are attempting to spur the efficient production of goods and commodities in industry, in agriculture, and in labor. In addition the United States is attempting to bring Japan's transportation system, principally by air, up to date.

It should be noted that the United States technical assistance program in Japan is geared to operate in conjunction with our assistance program under Public Law 480, sales of surplus agricultural commodities. To date two sales have been consummated, both under Title 1 of Public Law 480; the first took place on May 31, 1955, and involved the sale of $85 million of surplus commodities to Japan. About 30 percent of the total or $25½ million, accrued to the credit of the United States and was used by the United States for Armed Forces dependent housing, and the purchase of goods and services in Japan for other friendly countries; also sales promotion and market research, to defray the expenses related to the international exchange activities between the United States and Japan, and to finance USIA activities in Japan. The remainder (70 percent of the total proceeds or $59½ million) was loaned to the Japanese Government. This amount is to be repaid by Japan over a 40-year period with a 3-year moratorium on interest and principal at the outset. Payment may be made in either dollars or in Japanese currency. If the payment should be in Japanese currency the interest rates rise from 3 percent to 4 percent.

The second Public Law 480 agreement consummated on February 15, 1956, is very similar to the first although smaller in amount. Under it, $65.8 million of surplus commodities were financed with the United States retaining 25 percent or $16.4 million, and the Government of Japan being loaned 75 percent or $49.4 million over a 40-year period with repayment rates similar to those outlined under the first program. Of the United States share of this sale, $8 million will be used to procure military equipment, materials, facilities, and services for the common defense. Under this heading the great bulk of the amount will be used for dependent housing. Five and a half million dollars will be used to finance the purchase of goods or services for other countries, $1.3 million to help develop new markets for United States agricultural commodities, $1.3 million to finance international education exchange activities, and $300,000 to pay United States obligations in Japan.

The total sum loaned to Japan, amounting to $108.9 million, will be spent for the following purposes:

| | |
|---|---|
| Electric power development project | $50,700,000 |
| Land reclamation and irrigation | 8,400,000 |
| Increase of productivity in Japan | 400,000 |
| Aichi Irrigation Public Corporation | 11,700,000 |
| Agricultural Land Development Machinery Corporation | 4,600,000 |
| Mechanical land reclamation | 500,000 |
| Development of forestry, livestock products, port and storage facilities, fertilizer for domestic use and the domestic sugar beet industry | $11,500,000 |
| Japan Productivity Center | 2,800,000 |
| Electric Power Development Company | 21,900,000 |
| Total | 108,900,000 |

(Figures may not add to exact total due to rounding.)

A third surplus commodity arrangement has been entered into between the United States and Japan on a 4-year basis. It involves the United States providing a declining amount of foodstuffs for use in the Japanese school-lunch program. During the first year the United States has agreed to furnish 100,000 tons of wheat and 7.5 million tons of dried milk. The total value of both is $15 million. At the same time, the Japanese Government will furnish 85,000 tons of wheat and 12,000 tons of dried milk. The United States and Japanese contributions combined are expected to permit the extension of a school-lunch program to nearly 7.5 million children or about 80 percent more than were receiving the benefit of this program prior to this new arrangement. Through the 4-year period, the United States contribution will decline and the Japanese contribution will rise so that a constant level will be maintained. By the fifth year of the program it is expected that the United States contribution will be entirely discontinued. At the time of my visit to Japan shipments under this program were expected to begin very soon.

It is the position of our mission here that the government of Japan needs advice and counsel as to how to spend the $108.9 million in local currency heretofore mentioned. It is my view that the Japanese are well able to spend these borrowed funds without help from us, except that it might be advisable to have some one here to see to it that the money is spent for the purposes indicated. After all, that is the procedure followed by the World Bank and the Export-Import Bank.

According to our experts here, the primary difficulty with the Japanese economy is its low productivity. They feel that if industrial, agricultural, and labor productivity could be increased, the Japanese competitive situation with respect to world trade would be strengthened.

To achieve this end our Government has formulated, in cooperation with the Japanese Government, a productivity program which went into effect in April of 1955. It is allegedly supported by the Japanese Government and Japanese industry. These two segments of the Japanese economy have joined with the United States in establishing a Japan Productivity Center which is more or less a private agency through which all technical assistance to the Japanese economy is channeled.

This effort relies very heavily on exchange of persons. The fiscal 1957 program will expand this exchange, and will endeavor to place more emphasis upon the program hitting the grass roots of Japanese industry. It is my understanding that prior year programs, that is those conducted during the last half of 1955 and fiscal 1956, were directed primarily at big industries in Japan, and were based more or less on the trickle down theory. The net result was, in view of this activity, a tremendous barrage of criticism, particularly from Japanese small business (which received no benefit under prior-year programs) and Japanese labor which regarded the American effort as a means of increasing the power of big Japanese business, and strangling Japanese labor.

Thus, the net result of the pre-1957 fiscal-year programs was to develop among the great masses of Japanese people what

amounts to an increasing distrust of the United States and its motives.

Recognizing this situation, our planners in the current fiscal year have placed particular emphasis on extending the benefits of higher productivity to Japanese small business and labor groups. My impression of the situation was, especially with respect to labor, that the United States is doing its utmost to convince Japanese organized labor that our technical assistance and productivity programs are in their best interest. However, it was not my impression that this effort is making any great headway. In the data which I am attaching to this country report, the committee will note a number of project proposals and approval forms. These forms provide a good indication of some of the specific productivity efforts now underway in Japan.

It is with great reluctance that I have reached the conclusion that the United States assistance effort in Japan seems to be predicated on the notion that we must maintain a staff of advisers and technicians in that country in order to save the Japanese from themselves. That is to say, after American planners have noted what they consider to be ways and means of bettering the Japanese economy, they feel dutybound to force these views upon the Government of Japan, whether that Government desires them or not. I was particularly impressed by what seems to be a prevailing attitude among our aid planners there that even though the Japanese Legislature, for example, may not desire such programs as these planners have recommended, it is the duty of our Government to undertake them at all costs. A striking example of this is found in the field of agriculture, where, due to American efforts, the Japanese are being exposed to a great land reclamation and land-use program. For many years the Japanese have concentrated their agriculture on the production of rice. However, American planners take the view that the Japanese diet is insufficient under present conditions in that the intake of protein is too low. Therefore, they have undertaken a program to not only expand the area of arable Japanese land, but to take some of this land out of rice production and place it in the production of cattle, poultry, etc. In particular, efforts have been concentrated on the uplands of Japan, areas which presently produce rice on a marginal basis but which American planners feel could be used to great advantage to produce protein foods. During the 1957 fiscal year I was told * * * will be spent to set up some 8,000 demonstration grassland projects. This, in itself, would perhaps be salutary; however, it should be noted that according to information given me in Japan, this proposal was first submitted to the Japanese Diet and was promptly turned down. Thereafter, the unit which corresponds to our Department of Agriculture in Japan approached our planners, asking if the United States would undertake the demonstration. Needless to say, we complied, all at our expense.

It may be true that agricultural efficiency would be promoted by devoting these areas to the production of protein foods instead of rice; however, the fact is that the Japanese Parliament has on several occasions turned down such proposals. Since the Japanese themselves refuse to undertake the projects, it would appear to me to be an infringement by the United States upon Japanese sovereignty for us to now come in and undertake the project for them. It is evidently the view of the Japanese Diet that domestic Japanese agricultural policy would be best served by the continuation of the existing agricultural set-up with its accompanying emphasis upon the production of rice. Until the Japanese themselves change this attitude, I am forced to conclude that it ill behooves the United States Government to step in and undertake to change it for them, no matter how misguided we may believe them to be.

I am also concerned about our present efforts in industry and labor to make the Japanese economy over into a mirror of our own. It is no doubt true that Japense productivity both in factories and per laborer is considerably below ours. However, the Japanese themselves are technically advanced people. They are well able to undertake the modernization of their industrial and labor techniques on their own without an overly generous United States having to step in and do that for them. It should be noted and it was my distinct impression during my visit in Japan that the United States is committed, at least morally, to a 5-year program designed to raise the productivity of the Japanese economy. In other words, should the Congress decide tomorrow to eliminate the technical assistance program, we would place our government in the position of having to breach what the Japanese seem to regard as a moral obligation for the United States to continue its assistance to the Japanese through 1960 or 1961.

I discovered much the same situation with respect to Japanese agriculture. As I mentioned earlier, the United States has undertaken ambitious reclamation schemes in Japan, projects designed to increase the area of arable land available to Japan and place it under cultivation. The objective of this, of course, is to make Japan more self-sufficient in foodstuffs.

The Japanese themselves have known for many years that they must increase their domestic agricultural production if they are to survive as a nation. At least one reclamation project was begun some time ago, and was proceeding satisfactorily although perhaps slowly until Uncle Sam came in. Now there are two such programs in effect on Hokkaido Island alone. The gist of the logic which our planners say necessitates our assistance is that (a) Japan needs more food production; (b) They need that food production immediately; (c) If the Japanese undertake the job themselves it may take them 10 or 15 years; (d) But if the United States pours technical aid and money by way of Public Law 480 sales into the Japanese effort, the objective can be reached in a much shorter time.

This may no doubt be true if it were predicated upon a sound basis; however, what it ignores is that the Public Law 480 program may not be in existence for a sufficient length of time to permit the expenditure by Japan of the huge amounts which our planners propose. If Public Law 480 should cease to exist, and the necessary funds required for these projects were not forthcoming from that source, the United States would be at least morally bound to come in and supply the deficit.

I quote now from my field notes which I jotted down after visiting one of the reclamation schemes on Hokkaido Island:

"This project as well as others is being helped by us by way of Public Law 480 funds, derived from the purchase by Japan of agricultural commodities from the United States and then the lending back of the end proceeds for the development of the Japanese economy. After flying over the two pilot projects on Hokkaido Island we landed for an inspection of the works in progress. One of these is located in the Kosen Plains. The Government of Japan uses the money or at least part of it which we loaned to the government to help build a home and equip a farm for a family. The settling family obtains about 50 acres which costs the government about $8,500 when equipped. In return the settler agrees to pay for his farm on the installment plan with the government actually realizing about $4,000 and absorbing the rest. The land I saw appears to be very fertile. The project I visited will, it is hoped, take care of 450 families. There were 58 on the land at the time of my visit; the others were to come in gradually. It is the objective to have all the land occupied at the end of 5 years.

"My impression is that our presence here is more or less useless. To begin with the Japanese are competent people. They are able to hire experts to help them, without our assistance. Certainly the Japanese have competent scientists and competent technicians. But perhaps the greatest danger in this entire effort is the fact that should the Public Law 480 program end, Japan would find itself without sufficient funds to complete the work which it has undertaken."

One of our agricultural experts in Japan accompanied us on the visit I referred to in my notes. He was amazed at the progress made. He admitted he had not been here in 18 months, which goes to show that the Japanese can do the job themselves.

Earlier in this section of my report I referred to the Japan Productivity Center. This center, which at least in theory is supported by Japanese private industry and Japanese Government contributions, is designed to act as a clearinghouse for American technical assistance to Japanese industry. However, I was informed that it was difficult to obtain sufficient contributions from the Japanese Government to support the size center which our planners deem advisable. Therefore, in order to close the gap the United States has stepped in and is contributing Japanese local currency to do so. It is evidently hoped that once the Japanese legislature has become educated to the necessity for this project, it will become more liberal. This may or may not be true; however, even if the Japanese legislature should become more amenable to the program, I can well understand its attitude that instead of increasing contributions the reply could be: "Well, the United States has done it so far, why not let them continue."

In this connection I urge special attention to the data which I attach to this report. It outlines our program here and its background in detail, and I believe amply demonstrates that we are attempting to undertake a program with respect to the Japanese economy which the Japanese themselves are well able to handle on their own, without continued, long-term, large-scale American aid. Of course, should the Japanese do this work alone, it is the view of our planners that they might not do it in the same manner and to the same degree which these planners presently deem desirable. This means in effect that the United States is pushing the Japanese in order to force them to achieve certain goals which we may believe to be desirable but which the Japanese themselves may not be convinced are desirable at all.

I particularly urge the committee to carefully examine the United States technical assistance program in transportation, under which we are extending technical assistance to Japanese airlines, in order to Americanize this air carrier. In addition, we are undertaking to supervise the construction of United States-type commercial airfields in Japan. As a matter of fact, despite the fact that only 2 of the 11 commercial airlines which presently use Japanese facilities are American, we are at the helm, showing the way, and incidentally—picking up the tab.

As to the necessity for any technical assistance program whatsoever in Japan I reiterate my comment of last year that this effort was forced upon the Japanese Government by our planners in Washington. It was not endorsed by our Ambassador to Japan contrary to the impression given the committee last year. As a matter of fact, I discussed with Ambassador Allison the Department of State's position that I was incorrect in my comment of last year that he had opposed the extension of a technical assistance program to Japan. I quote now from my verbatim

notes, which I wrote immediately after my conversation with the Ambassador:

"I reminded him of his statement to me last year and his subsequent denial of having said in effect that I had misunderstood him and in fact misquoted him when I said he opposed the creation of a technical aid program here. He insisted that he is and always has been opposed to a technical aid program. He reiterated to me that the program was started without his approval and over his objection. He said that he favored a program of assistance through the sale of Public Law 480 surpluses. That, I have no objection to, but we agreed that there was no need for 26 Americans to administer such a program. He agreed with me that one or two persons connected with the Embassy could check on the end use of the borrowed funds. I expressed the hope that the Federal-aid program offices would be closed out as of June 30, 1956, and he agreed that they should."

I therefore recommend to the committee that no further funds be appropriated for technical assistance to Japan; that if the Japanese Government or the Japanese people desire to improve their industry, their agriculture, their transportation, and their labor, that they do so with their own funds. In the meantime, the present USOM Japan should be closed out. As it now stands, the aid program here is a self-perpetuating, empire-building scheme. Our planners advise the Japanese on what surplus commodities they need. Our planners assist the Japanese to arrange for the purchase of these commodities. Once the purchase is consummated, our planners assist the Japanese in allocating the loan proceeds among Japanese economic areas. This is not the way any program of aid should work.

Instead of waiting for the Japanese themselves to see if they need a program, we attempt to go in and convince them that a program is necessary. In order to convince them, we institute a program and then have to spend vast additional sums to educate the people that our motives are not ulterior. Much expense, much possible loss of face, much waste could be eliminated if only we waited for local people themselves to realize their needs instead of insisting that the need is there and volunteering to satisfy it.

As to our information program in Japan, we have been forced to undertake a huge program here in order to counteract some of the bad impressions created by our eagerness to make the Japanese economy over into a picture of our own. At the time of my visit an estimated budget of $1,794,700 was in prospect for the fiscal year 1957, compared with $1,074,429 for fiscal year 1956, an increase of $720,271. Of this increased amount, $65,668 will be used to defray the cost of clerk hire and other administrative expenses. As a matter of fact, during 1957 fiscal year, our Government will pay out roughly $270,600 in rent and administrative expenses alone for the information program in Japan. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that the Japanese USIA budget for the 1957 fiscal year is precisely what the local people requested of Washington. Data is attached which demonstrates the use to which these funds are to be put, including a new radio TV program series entitled "Science for Peace and Peoples Capitalism." In particular, I call the committee's attention to the fact that during the 1957 fiscal year the United States plans to spend $22,000 to establish an * * *, $10,000 to establish a * * *, and $58,000 for * * *. Needless to say, much of this expense is unnecessary. I recommend therefore that the entire USIA budget in Japan be reevaluated and reduced. I think we could safely do so if only our ambitious planners did not try to cram programs down the throats of the Japanese Government and the Japanese people, thus generating distrust and, in many cases, outright hatred of the United States.

HONG KONG

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in Hong Kong we are not doing very much except by way of a refugee program. In that connection, we are spending considerable amounts of money, however. As the buildings are erected, we turn them over to the British, who are allowed to rent them. I am told that the rents are merely sufficient to pay for the upkeep of the buildings, which have been constructed by us. The project is a worthy one, and I am not criticizing it; but at the same time it seems to me that since we have obtained nothing from the buildings, and since we have not been repaid for them, they should be rented for amounts at least sufficient to repay the cost. I hope that is being done.

I ask unanimous consent to have my memorandum on Hong Kong printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HONG KONG

The pressing problem facing the British in Hong Kong is the resettlement of refugees fleeing the Red rule in Communist China. Estimates of how many displaced persons are presently residing within the restrictive confines of Hong Kong vary, but it can be safely estimated that between 500,000 and 800,000 refugee Chinese are presently crammed into this small area.

Both the United States Government, under the Far East refugee program, and the British are endeavoring to provide housing and employment for as many of these refugees as possible. The British have constructed a number of apartment buildings. They charge sufficient rental to amortize the cost of the structures and to pay for current expenses. Initially, two-story buildings were erected, but because of the high cost and shortage of land, subsequent construction has consisted of buildings of 5 to 7 stories. Even so, the accommodations are rather crowded. Nevertheless the contrast between the old, rickety, ramshackle, tenement-type structures and the spanking new multi-story dwellings is astounding.

The United States has also undertaken a construction program here. This program, administered under the Far East refugee program * * * has built a number of one-story buildings. These structures are located on the side of mountains and are by comparison with the older dwellings quite attractive. The mountain is first terraced and the stone thus obtained is used for building materials. According to my information, each unit costs about $200. I visited several of these projects and it was my impression that much good work is being done. A small rental is charged by the British, who take over after we have constructed these dwellings, to defray maintenance costs and the cost of building streets up the mountain. We are not repaid for expenditures in building as is the case with British-built facilities.

The most commendable feature of this program is the opportunity given the refugees to help themselves. Actually, they furnish the labor for the building operation. Some hew stone slabs, while others make brick out of crushed stone. Thus, the program not only provides housing, but it is also a means of keeping the refugees occupied.

According to my information, the Far East refugee program spent approximately $1 million in fiscal year 1956, with about $700,000 of this spent in Hong Kong and Macao and the remainder on Taiwan. This grand total of $1,062,168 was spent in the following manner:

| | |
|---|---|
| Transportation | $290,862 |
| Documentation and counseling | 46,796 |
| Medical and dental | 184,510 |
| Economic aid | 57,124 |
| Vocational training | 202,887 |
| Permanent houses | 206,823 |
| Supplementary food and clothing | 41,761 |
| Temporary shelter | 23,299 |
| Amenities | 7,625 |
| Others | 477 |

Assistance is also rendered by accredited nonprofit international volunteer agencies, such as the Aid Refugee Chinese Intellectuals, Inc., the Catholic Foreign Mission Society of America, the Church World Service, the Free China Relief Association (which is the welfare arm of the Nationalist Party Republic of China), the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, Lutheran World Federation, National Catholic Welfare Conference of America, and the World Council of Churches. An attached summary, which is marked "Not for publication," indicates the various contributions made by these organizations.

While in Hong Kong, I also visited the Pope Pius XIII Handicraft School. This school is conducted by the Maryknoll Fathers and is housed in a granite-block building 100 feet long and 25 feet wide. I was told that the granite blocks for the building came from surrounding hills and that they were cut by resettled refugees. I was also told that 70 percent of the labor used in the erection of the school was supplied by the refugees. Actual cost of the building was about $9,000.

The primary purpose of this facility is to train refugee Chinese in handicrafts to qualify them for employment. For example, 150 candidates were selected for the first weaving course. Each one of these candidates represented a family. They were paid 5 Hong Kong dollars per day as an allowance in order to help them live while they learned weaving. Upon graduation, each student is presented with a loom, a table, and a chair on a loan basis. From the school they obtain the yarn which is woven into cloth at their cottages. The finished goods are then returned to the school and marketed by a specially trained clerical staff, through local Hong Kong stores.

While there is no doubt that assistance such as construction of new housing and the creation of employment opportunities for the displaced Chinese refugees is of great importance, I did not learn why the British Government is not able to bear this expense without our assistance. Certainly Hong Kong is first and foremost a British responsibility. Therefore, I recommend that consideration be given to shifting the resettlement and rehabilitation program entirely to the British, with the specific understanding that they cooperate with the various international volunteer groups now doing work in Hong Kong. As I pointed out before we receive no aid from the British in any part of Asia, except a small 700-soldier contingent in Korea. Here in Hong Kong, a rich British colony, where the British could undertake the whole job, good old Uncle Sam steps in and gives aid. No one must be blamed except ourselves. Our big-hearted representatives see to it that we chip in.

The Information Service here is a mushrooming endeavor. However, there is considerable merit in the contention that Hong Kong offers the best point to channel the Voice of Freedom through the Bamboo Curtain. Certainly, information emanating from Hong Kong will have a more profound effect upon the people of Communist China than that created in Formosa.

The Information Service budget here for fiscal 1956 was approximately $427,000. Dur-

ing 1957 fiscal year, expenditures will probably aggregate $590,000, an increase of $163,000. In addition to this amount, $28,500 will be used to make an emergency purchase of paper for the magazine World Today, to produce some extra broadcasts for the Voice of America, and to do some motion picture work on behalf of the USIS mission in Saigon.

* * * * *

For the committee's information, a complete and detailed picture of proposed expenditures during fiscal year 1957 by the United States Information Service is attached.

SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I come now to South Vietnam. I shall not spend any great length of time in discussing our programs there. I do wish to say they are huge. The amount of money being spent there is enormous, as will be seen by a review of my report.

It is my considered judgment that at this time we are doing in South Vietnam things the host government will not be able to maintain after our representatives leave. Our "eager beavers" are simply trying to do too much in too short a time. Our representatives are trying to construct various factories, although few or no local technicians are available. In other words, there we see the same scheme that now is being carried on in Formosa and South Korea.

In South Vietnam we are simply doing so much, that the people of the host country cannot possibly maintain the projects by means of taxation. Unless our representatives stay there and maintain the facilities, I assume that we shall have more enemies by the time our representatives leave than we had friends there when our representatives began their work.

When I was in South Vietnam 2 years ago, in 1955, it was my privilege to talk to President Diem, a very intelligent and able man. After visiting the refugee camps—and, as I remember, approximately 800,000 refugees had come there from the northern part of Indochina—I suggested to President Diem that he cooperate with our representatives to the fullest extent, in the hope that it would be possible to provide work for the refugees, and keep them contented. I was glad to note on my trip that the suggestions I made in 1955 had been followed. It was my privilege to travel for many miles along canals which had been dug by hand by the refugees, with our financial help. In that effort we spent approximately $40 million. I am glad to be able to say that most of the refugees are now at work, and have houses in which to live. All that has come about as a result of our assistance.

Last December, 1 year after the canals and houses were built, our representatives brought tractors, bulldozers, and plows to prepare the new land for planting. Much of the rice which was harvested this season was planted as a result of our efforts. In December 1956, the people were plowing the rest of the area. It made me feel good to see the excellent work done in rehabilitating the refugees and in making it possible for them to earn their own way.

Mr. President, inasmuch as we had provided $40 million with which to complete the work, one would assume that in the next budget that amount would be deducted. We now find, instead, that even more is asked for—and for what purpose? Our planners say we must provide the money to build roads there. I do not mean it is intended to build new farm roads for the refugees whom we have rehabilitated and established on farms. Good stone roads have been available from time immemorial, but now our dreamers say that those roads must be macadamized. Our eager beavers in Vietnam do not know where to stop, Mr. President.

Since we have spent the vast sums that were required to rehabilitate those people—$40 million—I say this is a good time to reduce next year's foreign-aid allocation to this country by at least the $40 million. But no, Mr. President—they want even more money now; they say we must put up enough to build roads in Vietnam. It is my hope, Mr. President, that Congress will tell them to raise their own road-building funds by taxing the local people, just as we do in my own State of Louisiana, and in the other 47 States.

Mr. President, I could speak on and on about the situation in South Vietnam and the projects we have undertaken there. I do not want to detain the Senate too long. I ask unanimous consent to have my report on South Vietnam printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM

It is unfortunate, to say the least, that the International Cooperation Administration has seen fit to classify the tabulation of fiscal data provided me in connection with our operations in this infant Republic. Vietnam, which has a total area of 127,000 square miles and a population of approximately 25 million, has been allocated appropriations aggregating over * * * during the fiscal years 1954, 1955, 1956, and 1957.

Of the total appropriations of * * * allocated to Vietnam since the beginning of 1954 fiscal year, approximately $585.9 million have actually been spent. Available for expenditure as of July 1, 1956 (the beginning of the 1957 fiscal year), were * * * made up of $209.5 million in unexpended carryover from prior fiscal years and * * * available under the mutual-security appropriation for 1957 fiscal year.

I wish to emphasize that these dollar amounts are over and above counterpart funds which American assistance has generated. As a matter of fact, during the period 1954–57, it is expected that these generated funds will aggregate * * * with an additional * * * in local currency available for expenditure in fiscal year 1957. During this same period, the Vietnam Government has made available * * * composed of * * * in local currency and * * * in services.

Although a vast amount of aid has been extended to this beleaguered Republic, the accomplishments are far from heartening.

* * * * *

Thus, it appears obvious that our aid effort here, instead of being directed to activities designed to raise living standards, is being used to fill the coffers of the Vietnamese Government.

I landed at Saigon on September 28, 1956, in a drenching rain. One of my first inspections was at a school center maintained by the military where soldiers are taught basic fundamentals of mechanics, such as repairing engines for trucks, jeeps, and tanks. This is one of three such centers which were built by the French but which are now maintained by us.

From these centers search parties go out into the jungle wilderness to search for the military hardware which was sent to the French during its fight against the Communist Viet Minh here. As the committee knows, during the last year of active fighting alone, the United States gave to France some $785 million in American currency to support its armies and to assist the new military forces of the Associated States of Indochina. It is my understanding that to date over $100 million in abandoned war equipment has been found in Vietnam. This equipment was not credited against future demands of our Southeastern Asia allies, but instead, was sent to various countries in Southeast Asia, including Formosa, as "Lagniappe." During my visit I was told that enough usable war material had been located in Vietnam to take care of all present requirements of this area. Some of the material, particularly ammunition, had considerably deteriorated. Nevertheless, much of the war equipment has been rehabilitated and has been supplied to the army of Vietnam—all of which is over and above the military assistance authorizations provided by specific legislation.

My next stop was the Hung Loc Livestock Station, one of three to be developed by the United States and Vietnam. It is hoped that these facilities will help implement an efficient long-range policy to attain self-sufficiency for Vietnam and to renovate the agricultural economy of this country which our planners feel is endowed with real possibilities for large livestock development. Reference to the attached material will outline in more detail the size of this proposed facility and its two companion stations.

It is my view that the country has not sufficient technicians to properly man three full-fledged stations, nor the finances. Perhaps the one station will suffice. After all, only fundamentals are taught and climatic conditions will determine the advisability of growing cattle in the lowlands. I fear that cattle and/or animal husbandry cannot be made to thrive throughout the country, but there might be some possibility of success in the mountainous areas where this one station is now located. It would be a waste of money to establish a station in the lowlands and another in a trifle higher land and the third in still higher land than the one I visited is located.

During my stay in Vietnam, I visited several villages including the resettlement projects built to house thousands of refugees from North Vietnam. With respect to the resettlement of these refugees a splendid job has been done. Of course, mistakes have been made in some areas. As an instance, in one area, 30,000 were established and 10,000 of them became dissatisfied and moved away. I repeat, a good job was done and it was heart warming to see these displaced people pitch in and work with their own hands to better themselves. The funds used for resettling refugees have been well spent, in my judgment.

Another settlement which I had occasion to vist was the Cai Son refugee settlement. The refugees in this settlement have dug 14 canals without the aid of machinery. These are located 2 kilometers apart and are about 2 kilometers in length. Along each bank of the canals, a strip of land 100 feet wide by 1 kilometer deep has been assigned to each family. The earth removed in the course of digging the canals was placed on the bank so as to provide a high dry spot on which the homes are built. In December of 1955, much of the land was plowed and disked so that when the rains came in early

1956 rice was planted. It is my understanding that in December of 1956, during the dry season, a similar course will be followed, with the result that all of the remaining land will be plowed and then planted.

In this connection, the United States donated over 100 tractors plus a similar number of plows and disk harrows to perform this work. This equipment has become the property of the Government of Vietnam.

As I indicated earlier, I feel that a good job has been done in connection with the resettlement of these refugees and I sincerely hope that the money already set aside will be sufficient to finish the project. From here on out, settlers should be basically left on their own, and by all means, the equipment which we have provided for the disking and plowing operations should be placed in local machine pools to be used by the settlers in the maintenance of their new land.

I am compelled to inform the committee that while the resettlement project appears to be substantially complete, our eager planners are not undertaking to reduce expenditures as the work is completed. For example, although we spent from $38 to $40 million out of last year's budget for resettlement purposes, and although the project is completed, the budget for 1957 has not been reduced by that amount. On the contrary, the amount available was replenished. I was told that this was necessary because roads had to be repaired and others built. Some of the people are insisting upon macadam roadways although they presently have adequate stone roads. They insist that the United States do their road building for them, and of course our mission is complying. To me that is incredible and yet it is true. I can see no end to this program if we pursue such a course.

During my stay I visited the National College of Agriculture at Blao, located some 3,000 feet up in the southern highlands. This project, which was opened in December of 1955, is a joint project of the Government of Vietnam and the United States Operations Mission. But, of course, the entire tab is borne by the United States. It is designed to ease the country's urgent need for skilled agricultural technicians. It is hoped that by 1958 the college will be able to accommodate some 500 students.

Two dormitories for a total of 192 students are being built, in addition to 3 masonry buildings, each holding 4 classrooms, 2 laboratories, and 2 offices. A small playing field has been cleared and some $850 in sports equipment has been ordered from the United States. About $70,000 worth of material to equip the new classrooms and dormitories are being shipped from the United States, while from Saigon we are obtaining about $30,000 of goods which are available on the local market. In addition to the erecting and equipping, the United States will also supply the teachers to staff this college of agriculture.

Frankly, I feel that this facility is unnecessary at the present. It is beyond the capacity of the Vietnam Government to maintain and its cost is, by comparison, much too high. For example, according to my information, the total cost of the project will approximate * * * Of this amount, the United States will put up * * * in cash and an additional * * * will be obtained from counterpart. Our planners are trying to do a job overnight. The schools should expand as the economy of the country improves. It would be better to stress elementary and high schools and then start on colleges, if and when the country's economy can provide them.

I also visited a rural hospital for which the United States had provided some of the equipment and built three quonset huts. It is my understanding that this installation, which is headed by Dr. Bienbenido P. Caro, from the Philippines, is allegedly maintained and conducted under the auspices of the Junior Chamber of Commerce International Operation Brotherhood. The United States gets no credit for the assistance supplied. As a matter of fact, this project is in line to receive more equipment and additional quarters for doctors and nurses from us, although it has been fostered by the Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Although the objectives sought by this work are doubtlessly laudable, I feel that if it is to be conducted under the auspices of a private organization, the private organization should provide the financial support. On the other hand, if the United States is going to supply assistance, then the people of the United States should receive credit.

The committee will note that among the data attached to this country summary is a volume entitled "Special Activities Report, United States Operation Mission to Vietnam, September 1956." This volume outlines in detail the various projects undertaken in agriculture, industry, and mining, transportation, labor, health and sanitation, education, public administration, resettlement and rehabilitation, and program support. It also provides an outline of ICA personnel here—personnel which aggregated at the time of my visit a total of 893 persons, of which 225 were Americans and 668 locals.

I also wish to inform the committee that the United States has undertaken a rather large information and propaganda program on behalf of the Government of Vietnam. Quoting from the volume previously referred to in the preceding paragraph, it is found that:

"Training is conducted in the techniques of audiovisual presentation and equipment provided to meet the national needs. Vietnamese Government photo lab has been established in Saigon and three branch labs are under installation. Seventy-three audiovisual mobile units are in operation throughout the country and 646 community listening centers have been established and are functioning. A national radio chain is being erected to take advantage of the geography and population concentrations of Vietnam. Provincial information headquarters is functioning in each of the 39 provinces as well as in the 212 districts of free Vietnam. More than 1,500 information specialists have been trained. Six potential technicians have been qualified and sent to the United States for training and five more are scheduled to leave shortly."

The total cost of this project is estimated at $9,216,630, of which the United States will contribute $1,545,227 in direct dollar aid with the remainder coming from counterpart funds and local government contributions. Of this remainder, counterpart funds in the equivalent of $1,489,418 will be provided. Completion date is estimated at June 1958.

It should further be noted that this program is over and above our own information program, which I shall discuss subsequently. Here we have another indication of the scope of our activities and the extent to which we have shouldered the burden of purely local governmental functions.

For the latest on this program of support to the Vietnamese propaganda effort, I refer the committee to page 6 of the January 4, 1957, issue of News From Vietnam, published by the Embassy of the Republic of Vietnam, Sheridan Circle, Washington 8, D. C., an article entitled, "Former Opium Factory To Be Converted Into Motion Picture Laboratory for Vietnamese Government."

This article reads in part:

"A former opium manufacturing establishment in Saigon will soon be transformed into a motion picture laboratory for the Vietnamese Government. Plans for remodeling the interior of the building have already been approved by the Government as well as the budget for financing the project. The studio will be modern in all respects, completely air conditioned, and have its own automatic auxiliary powerplant, machine shop, snack bar, and comfortable rest areas. The United States operations mission has allocated $280,000 for film equipment, supplies, and professional services.

"It is estimated that remodeling work will require at least 4 months time. When completed, this Government will have the largest and most modern motion picture production studio in Southeast Asia with a staff of 60 employees."

From the attached data headed "Changes in the USIS Program in Vietnam," the committee will note that proposed obligations for fiscal year 1957 will be $140,100 less than in 1956. However, this decrease in expenditures results from a change in the exchange rate and is not really a reduction in the budget. At this point I quote from the report supplied me:

"Throughout fiscal year 1956, USIS paid for all local expenditures in piasters purchased with dollars at the official rate of 35 piasters to $1. Beginning July 2 all United States and other foreign government agencies in Vietnam were granted use of a limited access free market—which in practice has meant approximately 74 piasters to the dollar depending on slight daily fluctuations. The 'limited access' means that this accommodation is restricted to the legitimate expenses of diplomatic establishments, tourists, and a few other small categories. All imports and exports, capital transfers, and American and other aid goods are still reckoned at the official 35 to 1 rate."

It is obvious, then, that because of this exchange rate concession, those phases of our Information Service which are supported by local currencies can be expanded despite the fact that the actual dollar expenditures may show a slight reduction. However, as to capital goods and other assistance generating local currencies other than the information program, the United States continues to be bound to what is obviously an artificial exchange rate pegged at less than one-half the true rate.

This factor takes on added importance when viewed in connection with the manner in which our aid dollars have been utilized in Vietnam.

It is obvious then that in exchanging our aid dollars for piasters at the central bank of Vietnam, the United States was compelled to accept an artificially fixed rate of 35 piasters to $1 instead of the realistic rate of 74 piasters to the dollar. Thus it is clear that for value received (that is the local currencies purchased) the United States actually obtained less than one-half the true value of its dollars when measured by actual market standards. Thus again we are denied full credit for the aid we have extended.

I recommend that a new look be taken at the information service program which seeks to increase the size of its library. In the alternative, I would favor and recommend opening a number of smaller branch libraries. I would extend this further to provide small library facilities throughout the rural areas of Vietnam in order to permit the local people to obtain a better picture of what the United States of America is doing for them. As the situation now stands, I fear that the Vietnamese "man in the street" has no comprehension of the support—fiscal, political, and economic, as well as military—which the United States has extended to his country in its quest for true independence. Space for these branch libraries should be provided by the Vietnamese Government. Only in this way will we be able to effectively combat Communist propaganda.

LAOS, CAMBODIA, AND THAILAND

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, from South Vietnam I traveled to Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand. Again I could speak at great length about the situation in those three countries. Our programs are being carried out there along much the same lines as in South Vietnam, except not quite as extravagantly. In Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand, we are undertaking projects which undoubtedly are worthy, but they are not in keeping with the ability of those countries to proceed with them in future years. Many undertakings are far beyond the present capabilities of the people of those countries. If only we would spread over a period of several years the money we are now spending there in 1 year, far better and more lasting results would be obtained.

Furthermore—and this is not peculiar to Laos, Cambodia, or Thailand—a considerable number of long-range projects are underway or in the planning stage. The objective is to bring about improvements 10 years from now; for instance, to construct buildings and make expenditures for colleges and other projects to which I refer specifically in my reports. In my humble judgment, we should be taking care of the present-day generation. If trouble comes in the near future, today's and not tomorrow's population will be affected. Yet, in these countries very little is being done to improve the lot of the people of this generation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my reports on Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memoranda were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAMBODIA

Once again we are confronted with unnecessarily large amounts of unexpended funds. Reference to the attached data as pertains to Cambodia will show that during fiscal years 1955 and 1956, a total of $61.3 million was actually spent in Cambodia under our non-military-assistance program. At the termination of the 1956 fiscal year, our unexpended balances approximated $42.8 million, of which amount $279,000 were unobligated. Appropriations for fiscal year 1957 for Cambodia aggregate * * * which, when added to the unexpended carryover of $42.8 million indicates that something like * * * will be available for expenditure during fiscal year 1957. However, against this amount, the mission has programed for expenditure only * * *. If Congress did not appropriate another penny for expenditure in Cambodia during the 1958 fiscal year, the mission here will have available for expenditure approximately * * *.

I also call the committee's attention to the fact that during the 1955 and 1956 fiscal years, approximately $12 million were expended by way of cash grants to the Government of Cambodia to generate local currency. In general, this process involves our exchanging appropriated dollars through the local banking system for local currencies and then using these local currencies for aid purposes. This procedure has serious drawbacks. Because of an unrealistic exchange rate, it leads to what, in my opinion, is nothing less than the misuse of appropriated aid dollars. Actually the United States is not receiving full value for its aid dollars when this procedure is followed. Doubtless much of our cash finds its way into the hands of the few in exchange for inflated local currency.

There will be no discussion in this report on our military-assistance program. As indicated in the introduction to these country reports, a separate section of this overall report will deal with military-assistance programs in the various areas insofar as dollar amounts are concerned. This is necessary because the information provided at the grassroots level was very sketchy. The scant amount of specific information obtained originated at the Washington level and I hope to obtain a full picture there.

In Cambodia there exists a situation similar to that prevailing in South Viet Nam. It is beyond the scope of this report to discuss 1956 programs in detail. However, for the committee's use, attachment 1C consists of project proposals and approval summaries for each and every project undertaken for prior fiscal years.

Concerning technical cooperation, attachment 2A explains in some detail the purposes for which technical assistance funds are to be spent during fiscal year 1957. I specifically direct the committee's attention to proposals to expend considerable funds for development of irrigation and drainage systems, aid in establishing a bureau of reclamation * * * including both dollar currency and counterpart), power site survey * * * and * * * in counterpart equivalent), development of credit for small industry * * * in counterpart equivalent), * * *.

It is apparent that the technical assistance program here is not being used to extend grassroots enlightenment to the people, but rather to find ways and means of maintaining a large economic assistance program for the future. For example, reference to page 21 of the attachment indicates that the total resources survey is to be undertaken, for which * * * in counterpart equivalent will be spent during the 1957 fiscal year. The purpose of this program is to survey all of Cambodia's resources to determine by research, census, or physical inspection the total resources of Cambodia available for economic development. In this same category, there can be found on pages 23 and 24, under the general heading "Improvement of Mass Communications," proposals involving the expenditure of * * * in counterpart equivalent during the 1957 fiscal year. Reference to the details of this program reveal that among the so-called "technical assistance commodities" to be procured are 12 audio visual mobile units, 4 marine engines, and 4 sets of basic mobile audio visual equipment. This equipment is to be installed in Government-procured halls to reach otherwise inaccessible masses of people. Obviously the purpose of this "technical assistance" program is to expand the propaganda organs of the Government of Cambodia. I doubt seriously that either Congress or the American people had such enterprises in mind when the program of technical aid—point 4—was conceived. In addition, the explanatory material provided in connection with this project indicates that it is being undertaken despite opposition from the Cambodian Ministry of Information. I quote from page 26:

"Before all else in the field of mass communications and information assistance in Cambodia, the first problem to overcome is a lack of recognition—within the Ministry of Information itself—of the nature and role of audio visual production to support the economic development efforts of the Government as a whole. On the highest levels knowledge in the field of information did not go beyond direct political and personal propaganda. Coupled with this, of course, is a lack of technicians and an inadequate national budget.

"Concrete beginnings have been made in this extra job of educating personnel of the ministry. As a result of this—and of the failure to recruit the total of four United States technicians requested for fiscal year 1956—the following year looms as the crucial year in implementing a direct-aid commodity picture that now totals nearly half a million dollars."

If this were not enough, information outlined on page 27 indicates what other propagandizing activities have been undertaken under the guise of technical assistance. These include—

(1) An ICA financed printing plant.

(2) Two hundred and fifty radio receivers plus 150 generators have been distributed throughout Cambodia.

(3) One 1,000-watt transmitter has been installed.

(4) Five audio visual mobile units have been delivered, with two of these not in operation for lack of technically trained personnel.

(5) A Government photographic laboratory has been constructed, equipped, and put into operation.

On page 28 of attachment 2A it is indicated that * * * American dollars plus * * * in counterpart equivalent will be spent to provide the services of 14 American experts and secretarial personnel to the missions program office and finance and trade division. Thus it appears that, despite the fact that we have presently employed in Cambodia 63 Americans plus 102 locals, it is proposed to further increase the number of Americans by 14 plus secretarial personnel. Again I remind the committee that this project is not carried as an administrative expense, but rather, apparently, is listed as technical assistance.

Turning now to defense support for fiscal year 1957 (see attachment 2B) a similar situation presents itself.

A number of projects in this area require close scrutiny and should be reevaluated, particularly the development of irrigation and drainage systems, rural power development, river navigation improvement, the repair and rehabilitation of airfields, and others. Specifically, I direct the committee's attention to the following:

The construction of a new highway from Phnom Penh to Kompong Som which will probably cost some * * * of which * * * is scheduled for expenditure during 1957. This highway, which will be built to American standards, will involve the shipment of 500 tons of equipment to Cambodia, plus large quantities of asphalt, cement, bridge iron, and so forth. The highway is proposed to be completed in fiscal year 1958. In addition, we have undertaken and will no doubt complete, a program of highway and bridge repair, rehabilitation and construction, on which will be spent * * * United States dollars in fiscal year 1957 plus * * * in counterpart equivalent. Needless to say, both of these projects will involve continued maintenance. As a matter of fact, in the briefing material supplied me, our officials state: "The mission feels that it should withdraw from the field of maintenance of highways and bridges, but realizes this change must be gradual." How gradual it is not said, but it is obvious that a considerable amount of money will be required for maintenance for an indefinite time.

Attached, as an exhibit, is a letter dated October 10, 1956, which has as its subject the status of the dredge program in Cambodia. This letter explains in full the genesis of this operation and prospects for ordering an American withdrawal. Suffice to say at this time, these prospects are dim indeed. I quote from my field notes:

"I again asked about the dredging operations about which I complained last year. At that time there were three dredges on the job involved in filling privately owned land at our expense. I was informed that the situation with respect to this dredging had been changed. However, upon investigation, I discovered that the United States is still picking

up the tab. The government has assessed riparian land owners, and it is proposed that they will pay for the benefits to their land over a period of 5 or 6 years. In the meantime, we continue to advance the money through counterpart funds. In other words, the United States still pays and the Government of Cambodia will later attempt to collect and, where successful, money so obtained will be used to replenish the counterpart account.

"I feel that this is unconscionable, to say the least."

The situation is such that a new Cambodian Government agency called "Office of Dredges" has been created and has taken over the responsibility for continuing the dredging program. However, the 1957 operating budget totals * * * of which only * * * are guaranteed by the Royal Government of Cambodia and * * * will be loaned to the Office of Dredges from counterpart accounts. The remaining * * * will be made up of an equivalent amount of American dollars which will be used to procure spare parts, fuel, and to continue training.

Reference to the last paragraph of this letter indicates that "We made a strenuous effort to reduce our aid to technical assistance only. We found the dredge authority unfamiliar with the nature of their responsibility and actually frightened with the political ramifications of tax assessment and collection. They have never heard of an assessment roll and it seems that there is actually no word in the Cambodian language for the English word "assess." We have convinced them that this is a part of the Democratic process and they should try it. Consequently we are continuing aid and hope for results."

* * * * *

The Government of Cambodia has recently embraced the so-called five principles of peaceful coexistence, and has consummated trade and economic assistance agreements with Communist China. Our planners in Cambodia apparently feel that the United States must engage in all-out competition with the Government of the so-called Peoples Chinese Republic. If this is so, then it becomes obvious that our program in Cambodia will not even maintain a semblance of supplying the basic needs of the people. On the contrary, it will evolve into a propaganda effort designed to see which government can spend the most and achieve, at least superficially, the most progress.

For a review of information service activities, I direct the committee's attention to the attached memorandum from John M. Anspacher, public affairs officer, USIS, Cambodia. This memorandum indicates that the fiscal year 1957 program for Cambodia has been increased by $107,000—that is, to $407,000 from $300,000 in fiscal year 1956. The increase will be used to provide staff housing rentals, rental and maintenance of a new library, expanded Chinese programs through various mediums, budgetary support for 14 provincial Cambodian-American cultural centers, a book translation program, and 1 new position.

With reference to the film and library programs, I recommend that they both be immediately reevaluated. For example, I visited the USOM/USIS film center at Phnom Penh. This facility is housed in a residence which is owned by a rich banker. We pay $1,000 in American currency per month for rental on this facility. Actually, USOM pays the rent, and USIS in return makes 12 films for USOM.

With respect to the library, we again rent a residence at approximately $1,000 in American currency per month. While the facility appears to be well organized and is used by a number of Cambodians, it would appear that an expenditure of something like $24,000 per year in rentals for these two magnificent pieces of property is wasteful, to say the least. I therefore recommend that the library and film center be housed in one building which should be supplied by the Government of Cambodia.

It should also be noted that the United States has rented an office building which houses the Embassy, USIS, USOM, and military attachés. The rents are out of all proportion. * * * I recommend that the Government of Cambodia be prevailed upon to provide suitable facilities for these units at cost. This should not be difficult to achieve inasmuch as the Government of the United States is dealing on quite generous terms with the Government of Cambodia.

### Laos

Laos, once a part of French Indochina, is now an independent kingdom, covering an area just a little larger than the State of Idaho. Our aid program has been here for some time, but prior to the 1955 fiscal year, funds appropriated were allocated to Indochina as a whole and only a small sum reached Laos. There is no breakdown as to what proportion of the total Indochina funds prior to fiscal year 1955 had been allocated to the area which is now the Kingdom of Laos.

Expenditures during the 1955 and 1956 fiscal years totaled roughly $71 million. As of June 30, 1956, the end of the 1956 fiscal year, unexpended balances totaled $25.7 million with $70,000 of this amount unobligated. In addition, we have on hand in the Laos accounts, over $2 million in unobligated counterpart equivalent with a total counterpart balance unexpended of $2.7 million in local currencies.

As of September 26, 1956, the date when the attached "Summary of Operations of ICA: Laos" was prepared, no firm allocation had yet been received with respect to expenditures during the 1957 fiscal year. However, based upon the International Cooperation Administration's budget as approved by Congress, roughly * * * will be available for expenditure during the 1957 fiscal year. This amount, added to the aggregate unexpended balance on hand as of June 30, 1956, will make available a total of * * * for expenditure during the 1957 fiscal year. Based upon the record of expenditures during the 1956 fiscal year, this amount would be sufficient to carry the program through fiscal 1957 and fiscal 1958 without the necessity for an additional appropriation. We are spending quite a sum here when one considers the size of the country with a population of only 1½ million people. This program should develop slowly and in keeping with the economic ability of the country to carry on.

I received a thorough briefing on the economic situation in Laos during my visit, and was informed that the little nation is presently experiencing the greatest building boom that the country has seen since the war. Construction of public and commercial buildings, offices, and homes has been going on during the last 6 months at an unprecedented rate. I was told that two fairly modern hotels are nearing completion in Vientiane, and that they will be ready for occupancy in the near future. However, there has been no investment in new manufacturing enterprises.

Highway construction is also being emphasized, as I shall point out later, with a network of roads linking Laos with Thailand receiving high priority. In addition, as the committee will note in connection with my report on Thailand, emphasis is also being placed on expanding rail links between Thailand and Laos, in order to move into commerce the rather large Laotian production of rice.

Reference to the attached exhibit headed "Current Economic Situation in Laos" will provide the committee with a rather thorough picture of the economic situation in Laos as of the fall of 1956.

At the time of my visit, the fiscal year 1957 allocation of funds had not as yet been made. Thus, the information provided me concerning the fiscal year 1957 program in Laos has been classified "For official use only." However, reference to the 1956 program will provide a comprehensive picture of our aid-program operation.

Attachment 1 to this report contains a number of project proposal and approval forms indicating the use of fiscal year 1956 funds. It is obviously impossible for me to direct the committee's attention to each and every one of these forms, but I believe that there are certain undertakings which should be specifically called to the committee's attention for its use in studying the budget for 1958.

Under the general heading of "General and Miscellaneous," approximately $124,000 had been programed for support of the Laotian Propaganda Ministry for fiscal year 1956. This money was allocated on May 28, 1956, some 33 days prior to the expiration of fiscal year 1956. The committee should take note of the fact that while allocation had been made in May of 1956, the funds were not to be used until January 1, 1957. This particular program involves the publication of a weekly photo newspaper, in the Laotian language, to be operated under the auspices of the country's Ministry of Information. At present, it is planned to publish approximately 30,000 copies weekly.

This project will also involve the construction, equipping, staffing, and operation of a modern printing plant. The newspaper will be distributed free of charge for the first year with the hope that during that period it will be possible to build the public interest to a point where newsstands will have a market for these papers.

I recommend the reevaluation of this proposal, and suggest that if it is carried out, a commensurate reduction in the USIA program be made. Otherwise, I fear that there will be rank duplication of effort by this facility and our regularly established information program.

Also programed during the 1956 fiscal year are $65,000 for the organization and establishment of a Government procurement system for the Government of Laos. This proposed unit will coordinate and control all Government procurement. It will establish and provide policy direction and issue regulations, manuals, and instructions. It is proposed that it will review and analyze all procurement actions, train procurement specialists and technicians, provide a central purchasing office, and will generally promote the efficiency of the Government's procurement program. Under this program it is also proposed (since there is no space available in any of the existing Government buildings) to erect two warehouses which will house both office and warehousing facilities. The construction of these two buildings will cost approximately $45,000.

At this point, I quote from the project proposal and approval summary:

"This function of government cannot be financed within the Government budget as present revenues plus nonrecurring items make up less than 75 percent of the cost of operating and maintaining the Government on a minimum level without taking into account any of the cost of the military services and the new public works which are financed entirely from the United States and other foreign aid sources. The Government purchasing office will delegate operating authority, under its policies and procedures, and subject to its review and analysis, to the Ministries of Defense, Public Works, and other Government departments as they become qualified."

This project is justified because of the extreme shortage of competent procurement

personnel in the Government procurement processes. Purchasing has in some instances developed into a personal prerogative of senior officials with the usual problems attending such a situation. In other words, the project is necessary to eliminate corruption.

The 1956 project proposal and approval schedule also indicates a proposal to spend some $900,000 to provide aid in the reorganization, training, and reequipping of the civil police in this country. It should be noted that during the fiscal year 1955, $257,000 for equipment and $2,150 for a technical-assistance contract was paid from defense support funds. Financing of participant training and cost of United States technicians was deferred until fiscal year 1956. This project proposal and approval schedule provides $642,156 for equipment, $200,000 for participant training, and $57,844 for technicians. One million three hundred and thirty thousand dollars equivalent in counterpart is provided for salaries and equipment and supplies to be purchased in Laos.

It is presently estimated that expenditures for plant equipment will be completed by July 1, 1958. However, ICA notes, "It cannot be determined at this time whether it will be possible to phase out the requirement for technical assistance by that date." Further, under another project proposal and approval summary, the same project also involves the installation of a radio network under contract between the Government of Laos and Barrow Brown & Co., of Bangkok, Thailand.

Because of the crippling scarcity of skilled and semiskilled mechanical technicians in Laos, it is planned to establish 3 training centers consisting of 2 apprentice training schools and a technical training school. This last school differs from the two former in that the theoretical aspects of technical training will be included in the curriculum for a 5-year course. The apprentice schools will offer a 3-year course and will turn out much needed but less highly skilled mechanics, stenographers, and clerks. It is believed that the technical schools will eventually become the source of nearly all skilled and semiskilled labor for the country of Laos. The estimated completion date for this work is June 1959.

We have also become involved in a rather ambitious transportation program, based upon a survey authorized in fiscal year 1955. I particularly want to direct the committee's attention to what is described as "Operation Mekong." This program, instituted in fiscal year 1956, consists of an attempt to establish a reliable transportation network between Thailand and Laos. It will involve a ferry or ferries to provide suitable river crossings; a properly constructed ramp on the Laos side to insure mooring of the river-crossing vessels at all times of the year; storage and customs facilities immediately adjacent to the ramp site; and improvements to the road into Vientiane to insure all-season all-weather heavy traffic usage.

We are also involved in a fisheries project here, in order to expand the production of tilopie, a kind of rapidly developing fish. We are also undertaking a rather large program of forestry development, and the development of the lumber industry. In the field of agriculture, we are undertaking to expand the production of major cash crops, principally rice and coffee. In 1955, we began the Xieng Khouang development project, which was to be the first model agricultural project in Laos. It is described as essentially a self-help project, and I was able to visit the site during my inspection of our program in Laos.

I quote now from my on-the-spot notes:

"Some 1,000 acres have been set aside by the Government. We are building fences around the land to keep the cattle out. A large plot is devoted to the planting of soybeans, potatoes, vegetables, etc. Grasses are being fertilized to see if pastures can be improved, since grasses appear to grow well here.

"The plan is to start a cattle industry if possible. I saw some of the local cattle and they appear to be small and lean. I would judge that there is something wrong with the grass since native cattle do not get fat. About the only exception to this are water buffalo which apparently thrive on the forage. It may be that heat has an adverse effect upon the particular breed of cattle presently being raised here.

"I also visited rice plots where fertilizer was being applied. A great difference could be seen. However, I fear that this entire project may turn sour. It is a long range program whereas something should be done for the generation which now tills the land if our program is to be effective. We are apparently to begin a cattle industry here with no way to market the meat which will be produced. Of course, this will lead to another road program.

"I return to the proposition that I have frequently expressed, i. e., that what is now being done may pay dividends in the long run but our most pressing need is for immediate results."

The following information is classified:

* * * * *

The staff planned for the mission for fiscal year 1957 will aggregate 150 persons compared to 88 during the fiscal year 1956. This would include 111 United States employees of which 80 will be employed by the United States Government and 31 under contract plus 39 locals, including 37 United States employed and 2 contract. The increased staff for fiscal year 1957 "reflects the number of personnel needed to achieve reasonable effect for the expenditures planned.

The committee will recall that last year at the time of my visit I noted that bulldozers were at work leveling the ground in the Embassy compound to erect houses for the Embassy staff. During my visit this year, I revisited the compound. We erected 18 houses for the Embassy staff and also servants' quarters. I was informed that the houses cost about $6,000 apiece. They are prefabricated houses purchased in Japan and shipped to Laos. Corrugated aluminum was used for the sides and the roofs. In addition to the $6,000 original cost per unit, an approximate $3,166 additional was necessary for extras including the drilling of a well, pumps, piping, air conditioning, etc. I feel in this instance we received our money's worth.

However, in addition to the houses built for our Embassy personnel, approximately 18 houses are now being built over and above the 14 which were constructed last year for personnel of the United States Operations Mission. These houses are built with counterpart funds plus some United States dollars, and are located on Laos Government property. If and when we leave this country, title to the land and of course the houses upon it, will revert to the Government of Laos. It would appear to me that an arrangement more advantageous to the Government of the United States could have been consummated with respect to these USOM houses.

Before moving into my discussion of the information service, I want once again to place on record the fact that the bulk of the work we are undertaking or will undertake in the future in this tiny kingdom will require a long time to show effects, and that, if our programs are to succeed, it is necessary that we provide immediate relief to the people of this generation.

I also fear that with the expansion of the USOM staff here, more ambitious schemes will be conceived involving principally the industrial development of Laos. At present, Laos is primarily an agricultural country. However, during my stay, I noticed an increase in sentiment among the people and among the Government officials to the effect that Laos will never feel secure until it has created a rather large industrial program. It is my distinct impression that the bulk of the people do not seem to want to continue to farm—they are more interested in industry.

If and when we do undertake an industrial development program here, it will be necessary to build a complete transportation system—land, rail, and water, along with development of what mineral resources Laos may have, plus the construction of industrial plants. Under no circumstances should we become embarked upon such an ambitious program. Yet, the proposed surveys of minerals, ways and means of improving transportation, and similar projects, indicate that the views of local leaders have been heeded and that the United States of America is about to become embroiled in a long-term, long-range, high-cost program of remaking the landscape and economy of Laos.

Perhaps the main thing our planners lose sight of is that some time in the future the United States Government will have to halt financial aid, not only to this country, but to all beneficiaries of our bounty. Nevertheless, if our planners conceive and implement projects which are overly ambitious, the Government of Laos will not be able to sustain the effort if and when we leave. Then instead of having the gratitude and friendship of these peoples we will be the object of contempt and hatred for generations.

At the time of my visit, it was proposed to increase the information service budget here from $157,000 actually spent in fiscal year 1956 to $285,000 in 1957. The justification for this rather large increase was "the greater need for USIS effective action in Laos resulting from the changed political situation and the increase of Americans on the job in Laos from 4 to 8." We are also going to institute a radio program here for the first time. Estimated cost for this will be $5,000 a year. Press and publications will increase from $14,400 to $22,000. Motion pictures will rise from $18,160 to $33,000. It is proposed to purchase three river boats to operate out of Vientiane, Pakse and Luang Prabang for use as floating mobile units. Costs of information centers will also rise, from $6,600 in fiscal year 1956 to $20,600 in 1957 fiscal year. It is expected to inaugurate for the first time a book translation program plus repairs and improvements to the USIS libraries. Special exhibits will also be shown.

USIS further proposes to spend $20,400 during the 1957 fiscal year as against no money during 1956 for the teaching of the English language. Besides paying the hire of teachers, it will be necessary for the United States to pay the cost of transporting teachers to the classes. Since there is no public transportation and since no Government vehicles are available for this purpose it is further proposed to purchase a small bus to provide this transportation.

Reference to the attached exhibits dealing with USIS will demonstrate that among the programs presently maintained are:

(1) Yearly publication of a mimeograph news bulletin.

* * * * *

(4) Free World Magazine, which is a feature magazine emphasizing cultural, historical, and economic development in Laos.

* * * * *

(6) Production of photographs for display purposes.

(7) The preparation and publication of posters, booklets, and circulars.

(8) The sponsoring of exhibits.

* * * * *

(10) Distribution and showing of films produced in Laos as well as films received from Washington showing the American way of life, etc., and of course the educational

exchange program under which 10 Laos citizens have been sent to the United States.

THAILAND

The fiscal accounts of this country with respect to the nonmilitary mutual assistance program are, in my opinion, in a most unenviable position. According to information provided, our assistance during the period fiscal year 1951 through fiscal year 1956, inclusive, totaled $99.9 million. During the period, fiscal year 1954 through fiscal year 1956, actual expenditures aggregated some $37.5 million. Unexpended balances as of the end of the 1956 fiscal year totaled $62.3 million with $1.6 million of this amount unobligated. In other words, out of a grand total of approximately $99.8 million appropriated during this 3-year period less than one-third was actually spent. Despite the fact that on June 30 the unexpended balances amounted to $62.3 million, our foreign-aid planners prevailed upon Congress to appropriate an additional * * * in new funds. This raised the amount available for obligation and expenditure in fiscal year 1957 to * * * in United States funds and approximately * * * in counterpart funds equivalent.

Information provided in response to my questionnaire indicates that during the 1957 fiscal year approximately * * * in American funds are proposed for expenditure. If this amount is deducted from the total amount of * * * available for obligation and expenditure in fiscal year 1957, it is obvious that the 1958 fiscal year will begin with approximately * * * in funds available for expenditure in Thailand without the appropriation of another dime by Congress.

It was also interesting to note that as of August 31, 1956, a total of 475 persons were on the ICA payroll here. Of this number, 271 were Americans and 204 locals. Of the 271 Americans, 88 were United States-employed technicians, 165 were contract employees, and 20 were in other categories, presumably administrative.

Why is there necessity for so many employees in this comparatively small nation? Perhaps it is due to the fact that the United States is footing the bill for practically every conceivable kind of endeavor. They range from road construction to education, and include development of manufacturing resources through labor union formation, fish-hatching projects, and public administration programs.

Our program of aid had its inception in the fiscal year 1951, and until fiscal year 1955, it consisted primarily of technical assistance. In 1955, our planners began to pour economic assistance funds into this country, in an effort to raise the standard of living and remake the entire economy. Our planners hold that the economic aid funds make possible the undertaking of larger scale assistance projects and in addition provide needed budgetary support to the Thai Government.

The attached document entitled "United States of America Operations Mission to Thailand," amply illustrates the range of our program here.

It is not my purpose to outline in great detail each and every program undertaken but the committee and the Senate should know that few fields of endeavor have been neglected by ICA in its attempt to remake this tiny nation overnight.

The first category is agriculture and natural resources. Our projects in this area are many and varied. To mention a few, here is what we have done so far. We have become involved in a huge program of upland crop improvement, of plant protection, and a comprehensive effort of soil fertility and management. We have established a soil laboratory and conducted innumerable demonstration projects. We have a thorough extension program, including a youth organization similar to the 4–H Clubs in the United States. We have undertaken to enlighten the citizens of Thailand in agricultural engineering. We have created a 200-acre completely mechanized rice farm. We have assisted in planning the northeast Thailand land-clearing and leveling project in order to make available more land. We have erected 10 Butler steel storage bins for the storage of rice and corn, and many others too numerous to itemize.

The United States, in cooperation with the Government of Thailand, has also embarked upon a program of livestock improvement and disease control, including the implementation of a regional eradication program of rinderpest.

In earlier reports, attention was directed to the so-called fisheries project, under which the United States had built 4,000 additional private fishponds, to say nothing of fish hatcheries. One of our fishery experts has been in Thailand for 5 years. The bulk of his time is spent in attempting to increase the production of a certain species of fish which matures in 4 months. During my discussion with him, he admitted that Thailand has enough fish and shrimp in the southern part to supply its needs but that he is attempting to increase fish production in the northern areas where fish have never been produced heretofore, because of a lack of water. Since the United States has, to some extent, remedied the water deficiency, it must now develop the fish. This program should be ended immediately.

Our efforts in the public-works and industrial areas have included the following projects:

(1) The expenditure of * * * for construction equipment and spare parts, * * * for the repair- and maintenance-shop machinery, and * * * for laboratory and testing equipment in connection with the Thai highway programs. In this connection, the Northeast Highway project alone involves three major services contracts. The first of these covers the purchase of $2,500,000 of construction machinery, title to which goes to the Thai Government upon completion of the project. The second covers a contract for $1 million in engineering services for the first 63 kilometers of a 172-kilometer highway. The third involves a contract amounting to $4 million for construction services and the 63-kilometer link just mentioned.

According to my information, negotiations for extensions to the above contracts are presently underway. These will include an additional $2 million in construction equipment which also will become the property of the Thai Government. Thus, a total of $4.5 million in construction equipment will become the property of the Government of Thailand upon completion of the highway.

Information in my files also indicates that under the expanded aid highways project USOM and the Thai Highway Department have formulated a program for undertaking additional construction aggregating approximately $6 million. This will be done under a contract which will provide for complete construction of another highway located in some other portion of the country. This project contemplates the purchase of $1,600,000 in construction equipment which will become Thai Government property.

We have not aided the Thailand highway system, at the expense of the railroads. The following commodities and equipment have been purchased and furnished to the State railways: (1) two diesel-electric generating sets at a total cost of $108,000; (2) $1 million of railway materials and supplies such as wheels, couplers, air brakes, castings, etc.; (3) $350,000 of equipment and machinery; and (4) $34,000 of test equipment and laboratory equipment for installation at various locations throughout the system.

Reference to my files also discloses the following:

"Construction of the Udorn-Nong-Khai line was performed largely by State railway forces utilizing United States furnished equipment. Services of a local contractor were used to some extent in this work. The line is presently 95 percent complete and consists of 54 kilometers of single-track line with all necessary sidings, bridges, and yards. The total cost of this new line, including construction costs, materials, and equipment is $4 million. In addition, $1,100,000 of rolling stock and communications equipment have been procured and are in the pipeline.

"A ferry landing and railway spur which will form the extreme terminus of the northeast system have been planned and approved. Foundation investigations are under way and construction will begin shortly. This will provide facilities to accommodate the movement of traffic and goods across the Mekong (River) to Laos."

In the area of air transport, the United States has participated in projects pertaining to three major fields—traffic control, meteorological services, and technical assistance to the Thai Airways Co. In addition approximately $9.2 million of economic aid funds including counterpart funds have been provided for airfield construction. The International Airport at Bangkok is one of the finest in all of Asia. It does much business and is more than self-sustaining, I was informed.

I was advised that on March 8, 1956, a contract was signed providing for Pan American Airways to furnish technical assistance to the Thai Airways Co. for developing a program to improve and expand its air transport service. This 3-year contract has a total value of $2,800,000. It is my view that the Thai Government is well able to provide such technicians.

Our aid program has placed considerable emphasis on water resources. USOM has assisted in projects for tank and pump irrigation and ground water research. Under the tank irrigation project, 73 irrigation tanks and dams have been completed and 56 are presently under construction. Those completed provide a volume capacity of 118 million cubic meters and cover an irrigable area of 60,000 acres. We have furnished 28 truck-mounted and 2 barge-mounted pumps. We have begun the water research program by drilling 5 wells of an estimated total of 150 to 250 to be ultimately drilled. We have also furnished a number of other items of supplies and equipment, warehouses, repair shops, laboratories, rainfall gaging apparatus, motor vehicles, and testing equipment.

In the area of power and communications, USOM has provided assistance in three specific areas. These are power facilities improvement, power exploratory survey, and telecommunications engineering.

In the field of mining and geology, we have also undertaken three projects—geological survey, experimental metal mining, and minerals experimental center. The minerals experimental center at Bangkok was recently dedicated. It consists of a modern laboratory where studies of minerals, ore dressing methods, and other research projects are performed.

We have also established mining centers for instruction throughout the three mining areas of the country. Instruction and training courses are conducted in modern mechanized mining methods and in the location of ore-bearing bodies. Approximately $160,000 in equipment has been furnished for this program.

Other ventures into the public works and industrial areas include the following: (1) Provided training facilities in the United States for Thai technicians in the small industries field. Services of an industrial adviser have been made available to examine overall industrial development needs and possibilities in Thailand, and to advise on methods to stimulate the growth of industrial enterprises.

(2) Established an automotive maintenance training center. This year a contract is proposed which will provide for a technical survey by American engineers to determine requirements and establish procedures for properly maintaining and repairing the 10,000 vehicles owned by the Thai Government exclusive of those which are the property of the various defense agencies.

(3) The hydrographic study, which was begun in 1951, continues unabated. Thirteen participants have received training in the United States in fields of hydrography, port operations, and allied subjects. Four more were scheduled for training in fiscal year 1956. The Committee will recall that, in my previous reports, I noted that not only would the United States provide the dredge *Manhattan* for work on the Chao Phraya River, but that it would be necessary to do maintenance dredging with United States technicians until such time as we had trained a sufficient number of Thais for this operation.

(4) Thailand, through the American aid program, has also participated in a project described as the Mekong River reconnaissance. This is a regional effort and involves the four countries of Thailand, Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia. In December 1955, and January and February 1956, the team of United States experts aided by local USOM and Thai Government consultants reconnoitered the Mekong River from upper Laos to its mouth on the South China Sea. On February 8, a final regional conference was held at Saigon, following which the team members returned to the United States, where they are now preparing a final report. This report will contain recommendations for specific surveys to accomplish long-range development of the river for irrigation, flood control, navigation, and hydroelectric power generation.

The committee will recall that in 1955 when the President first requested funds to implement his so-called Asian aid program, the Mekong River project was cited as a possible project. Now nearly 2 years later, the project has at last reached the point where, if everything goes well, a preconstruction survey will be undertaken. As yet there is no hint what projects will be undertaken, where they will be located, what they will comprise or what they will cost. Thus again, we have a concrete example of Congress being forced to legislate in the dark.

Earlier in this report I referred to our labor and welfare program. It was indicated in the data provided me during my visit in Thailand, that within a few months significant developments would occur, namely, the passage of basic labor legislation. It is my understanding that our mission's labor adviser, upon request of the Government of Thailand has analyzed 5 bills, submitted opinions on their applicability to Thailand, suggested and discussed proposed revisions, and actually assisted in formulation of policy for (1) settlement of labor disputes including the right to organize labor unions and to bargain collectively and the establishment of an advisory labor board; (2) a regulation of labor unions including registration; (3) limiting daily and weekly hours of work, and establishing rules for paying wages; (4) protection of women and child labor including prescribing conditions of work, forbidding work in specified occupations, and setting up age and health standards for hiring; and (5) weekly holidays.

In addition to this USOM is helping to train personnel to administer these labor laws and to provide sound trade union training to labor officials and workers. Also there are plans for improving the economic and social welfare of the people of Thailand which includes a survey of workers' housing, recommendation of a program for future development, and a so-called self-help program. This self-help program is built around active cooperation in the field of community development and is described as a way of building democracy from the bottom up. It is my understanding that future work will be integrated with the self-help settlement work initiated by the Prime Minister and with other experiments in operation in several places in Thailand.

In the field of education, we have endeavored to provide more teachers. We have also expanded our program of vocational education, and have built a new technical institute, comprising 38 new buildings and offering instructions to Thai students in 15 vocational areas. The lands and buildings of the institute were purchased with local funds generated for the most part under our aid program, while approximately 95 percent of the equipment was supplied directly by the United States. Assistance has also been extended to secondary education.

We have provided some $11 million in United States assistance to 16 health projects. Under this program, we have accomplished much good and it is interesting to note that the USOM assistance project aims toward phasing out its dollar assistance in 1957 and its counterpart fund assistance in 1959. By that time malaria should largely be eliminated and health protection can be maintained out of the local government's budget.

The public health effort was well worth the money it involved. It has produced concrete results in a comparatively short time. It has done what our mutual-security aid should do, that is, improve the way of life of present citizens, not future generations.

We have done much to assist in the area of medical education. Twenty-eight United States technical advisers have been here for periods of time up to 2 years.

Hospitals have been built in all but 1 of the 71 provinces by the Thai Government from its own funds and funds contributed by us by way of counterpart funds and direct United States dollar aid for hospital equipment and to train Thai doctors and nurses.

In the field of environmental sanitation, major accomplishments include the construction of 6 municipal water systems in the northeast area, the establishment of a regional headquarters, the provision of $400,000 worth of commodities for the program, construction and/or rehabilitation of 364 wells and small reservoirs, plus the construction and installation of privies with the aid of mobile sanitation teams.

Our aid program has also embraced the actual administrative operations of the Government of Thailand. In May of 1955, a contract was signed with Indiana University under which it is cooperating with Thammasat University in a program to strengthen training facilities in the area of public administration. It is my understanding that in March of 1956, another agreement was concluded under which the public administration service, a nonprofit United States organization, is to assist the Government of Thailand in modernizing its budgetary procedures and its accounting programs. Our aid program is making available some $400,000 to cover the dollar cost of this contract and the Government of Thailand has agreed to provide the equivalent of $210,000 in its local currency. Under this latter contract, a resident staff of 6 advisers will be sent to Thailand for a 26-month period with other advisers coming in for consultation for shorter periods of time. These experts are to work with the government officials as consulters and advisers. They will collaborate with and use the training facilities of the Public Administration Institute at Thammasat University. As I noted in my report last, it is interesting, to say the least, that the United States of America, with its huge debt and almost chronic deficit, has now undertaken to advise foreign governments on budgetary practices and procedures.

The above outline, lengthy though it may be, is submitted as indicative of the programs presently operating, and what can be expected for the future. The huge amounts of funds on hand, plus the budget request for additional appropriations in fiscal year 1957, make it obvious that our aid planners contemplate remaining in Thailand for many more years. The multitudes of programs begun by us will require our continued support for a long time because the local government will not possibly be able to raise funds necessary to maintain and operate these programs once the United States terminates the existence of the mission. Our eager beavers are still most active and always try to overdo the job. These many programs point up the second weakness in our programs that I have complained about, namely, "That our planners promote programs far beyond the financial capacity of a host country to maintain out of its own economy."

I also want to call the committee's attention to the fact that the yardstick for measuring the magnitude of programs is apparently no longer need, but, rather, how much Thailand demands as its rightful share of our aid as compared with that extended to neighboring states. There appeared to be dissatisfaction with the amount of assistance we have provided. Apparently, host government officials take the stand that, if they were not as cooperative as they have been, the United States would be more liberal with its aid. They cite India and other neutrals as examples of those who obtain more money by extending less cooperation. I noted that some of the newspapers were editorializing along this line.

Unfortunately, the military assistance program, since it is classified, cannot be opened for public scrutiny. However, at this time I wish to inform the committee that some of the Thai military officials appear to be dissatisfied with the secondhand hardware and materials of war which have been furnished by us. In a nutshell, they expect the United States to provide for the soldiers of Thailand the same kind and variety of equipment that we provide for our forces. This attitude is unreasonable to say the least. Perhaps our entire military assistance program should be reviewed and reevaluated. For further information on this phase of aid, I refer you to the attached classified material on the military assistance program. Complaints are now being made that the local government will not be able to carry its share of the military program, that it is too costly and beyond the capability of the host government to support. That means that the forces may be reduced or else we may have to carry some of the load.

Exhibit B appended indicates the use of funds for information services during the 1957 fiscal year as compared with fiscal year 1956. As indicated there is an increase of $81,070 for 1957 over 1956. Here, as in other countries, I found a determined effort to make the information service a permanent institution. It appears that the information service label is automatically regarded as propaganda in Thailand as in many other countries of Southeast Asia. Needless to say, the information program needs an increase in direction, but not in funds.

I visited our library in Bangkok. It is ornate and spacious, indeed a beautiful showplace. However, it is not visited by the Thailand ordinary citizen, for two reasons. First, most of them do not know it exists and second, those who know of its existence are frightened away by the swank look.

Of this $81,000 increase for fiscal year 1957 over fiscal year 1956, $37,800 will be used to increase local salaries and to hire three additional local employees; $11,587 will go to

increase USIS American employees' allowances; $12,571 will be used to increase the radio and TV programs; $22,036 will expand the press and publications branch, with additional funds to finance the cost of increasing the circulation of Free World to 50,000 copies per month and for increasing the circulation of a weekly newspaper from 15,000 to 20,000 copies. It is also proposed to print some pamphlets in Chinese for distribution among the some 3 million Chinese now residing in Thailand.

Ten thousand five hundred and twenty-six dollars has been cut from the motion-picture budget, however, along with $200 from the funds available for representation allowances.

Twenty-eight thousand one hundred and seven dollars additional will be devoted to the information center and cultural activities, including $22,000 to translate American books into the Thai language.

Among other reductions which will be effective during fiscal year 1957 is a $22,513 cut in program direction and $18,837 cut in administrative expenses resulting from more efficient management.

Equipment available for USIA here along with an outline of the publications, press, and film programs is included in exhibit B.

Here as in other countries I visited no new elements have been added to the programs. We are simply expanding the existing program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very sorry that I was called out of the chamber when the Senator from Louisiana discussed Thailand, and as a result I did not hear his remarks about it. I am interested in two activities about which I wish to inquire. I am not sure whether they came under the Senator's observation, because, of course, he could not see everything our representatives were doing there.

Did the Senator from Louisiana have occasion to attend the Trade Fair in Thailand?

Mr. ELLENDER. It was not operating when I visited there. I did attend a trade fair at Kabul.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Louisiana will recall that in the Appropriations Committee last year, he and I and various other Senators were of the feeling that the participation of the United States in such trade fairs had been particularly helpful in previous years, and we urged continued participation along certain lines.

From the observations the Senator from Louisiana made at Kabul, would he be able to give us information as to the worthwhileness of our participation, in his opinion?

Mr. ELLENDER. I would say it is most worthwhile. I think that money is well spent. As I pointed out in committee, I thought it was better to spend the money for trade fairs than to send to those countries jazz artists, as we have done. I had a colloquy with the Senator on the subject. I think it is inexcusable to spend our taxpayers' money on some of the useless programs that our planners have engaged in. On the other hand, I was very much impressed with the trade fair that was being conducted in Kabul. Our country had quite a nice exhibit there, and it brought about much favorable comment. The Russians had an exhibit, too. In that connection, I talked to Mr. Khrushchev while I was in Moscow, and he told me that, insofar as his government was concerned, he had the hope that more and more fairs could be held in Russia. That is one thing I should like to see our Government encourage also, not only in Afghanistan and in Thailand, but even more so in countries behind the Iron Curtain to whose people we are trying to sell our way of life.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator mean he believes Russia will welcome our exhibiting at trade fairs?

Mr. ELLENDER. I received that understanding from Mr. Khrushchev, yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Exhibiting behind the Iron Curtain?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I certainly join with the distinguished Senator in saying I think we should participate, because I believe we have nothing to fear by contrasting our production with Russian production.

I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana another question. There are in my State branches of a dairy concern which maintains in Bangkok, Thailand, an agency for the reconstituting of dried milk so as to sell it in liquid form for native currency or for money we take for native currency, so that the people there will participate in the use of milk, butter, and similar products, much more fully than they have heretofore. Can the Senator give us any information as to the operation of that activity?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, sir. I visited several of them. I do not recall at the moment the specific cities, but I can assure the Senator they were very popular. These programs were more or less handled not by our Government, but by those interested in the disposition of their products. Dairy interests, for instance, had a lot to do with their administration, in trying to popularize milk drinking, the eating of ice cream, and so forth. They are very good programs. I believe the money spent on such programs is well spent.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator then feels, as I do, does he not, that instead of giving technical assistance to those who may know more about a particular subject than we do, and who could dispense with things that have been mentioned, we could do more in the line of practical things, by the use, for example, of products of which we have an ample supply, and by such things as bringing the production of our wonderful industries to the attention of the world, as we do in the trade fairs. Those are two distinctly worthwhile activities, are they not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Such activities are something the people in those areas can see and enjoy and from which they can learn. That was the burden of my remarks a while ago, I may say to my good friend from Florida. These programs ought to be developed to fit present conditions, and geared to the ability of the people we are working with to absorb the benefits. Secondly, our efforts ought to be in keeping with the ability of the country to carry on after we leave.

That was the burden of my earlier remarks, with reference to Indochina and Thailand, as well as Formosa and Korea.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from Louisiana will yield long enough to let me say so, I think, by his series of travels year after year, at very great physical expense and at an expenditure of great energy, he has done magnificent work for the United States and for the Senate. I want to have that statement appear in the RECORD because that is the way I feel about it, as I am sure many other persons do. The Senator brings back firsthand information of activities in which we participate that are worth while, and of other activities which he thinks are not worth while, but are extravagant and wasteful. Such information is of inestimable importance to us in the United States in the reshaping of our program so as to do more good and to be less offensive in meddling with other people's business. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to thank the Senator from Florida. Let me say that I discovered an interesting situation in Thailand, which is on the Gulf of Siam. Fish, shrimp, and oysters are in abundance there.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Louisiana could be highly appreciative of that kind of production, could he not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Notwithstanding the fact that the natural supplies of fish and other seafood in Thailand are sufficient to meet the population's needs our planners have had built in northern Thailand some 4,000 fishponds. We have had a fish expert in that area for 5 years, whose job has been to teach the people in northern Thailand what they have plenty of in the southern part of the same country. If, instead of spending money to build fishponds, we had spent it on things which the people in that country could see and enjoy and which would enable them to aid themselves, I think they would respect us more. It is true that some of the water in the fishponds was used to irrigate, but most of it was used for the purpose of growing a small fish called the tilopie, which grows in about 4 months to about 7 or 8 inches in length. I' is undertakings of that kind, and there are many of them, which have caused me to question the good judgment of some of our foreign aid administrators.

BURMA

Mr. President, I shall not dwell at any length on my findings in Burma, a country that has not received very much help from us. The Burmese leaders are most anxious to develop their country, not with handouts from the United States, but from borrowed funds, and I hope that attitude remains with them.

(The statement concerning Burma, which was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:)

BURMA

The United States has had no technical or economic programs here since 1953. The

Burmese Government on its own initiative requested that the program originally instituted in 1950 be terminated. That was done in order to show strict neutrality by Burma, as between the East and the West, I was informed.

In 1956, the United States commenced to aid Burma through a loan arrangement rather than by outright grants. Under this arrangement, the United States agreed to sell to Burma $21.7 million of United States agricultural products, principally cotton, under Public Law 480. Burma agreed to pay the United States in Burmese currency. $17.3 million of this currency will be loaned, through the Export-Import Bank, to the Government of Burma for economic development (or "mutually agreeable projects in accordance with standard International Cooperation Administration procedures". Why that procedure was followed, I could not learn at the local level.

In addition, at the request of Burma, we are offering a $25 million line of credit through the Export-Import Bank. These funds are provided from International Cooperation Administration appropriations and they will be required to be utilized in Burma in accordance with standard ICA procedures. Why the ICA is in the picture I could not learn at the local level. Burma can draw upon this credit only for those projects and purposes which are included in an agreement consummated between the United States and the Government of Burma. This dollar loan, as well as the loan of proceeds derived from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities herein referred to are repayable in 40 years. Interest will be charged at the rate of 3 percent per annum on dollar repayments and at 4 percent per annum on repayments made in Burmese currency.

I discussed these two financial arrangements with various Burmese Government officials and was deeply impressed by their thinking on the matter of aid. They want no gifts, but merely want credits to permit the Government of Burma to help itself. In the light of this circumstance, I express the hope that the United States will not force aid upon Burma. I might also express the hope that other countries presently receiving aid make an endeavor to follow the example of the Burmese.

Burma is giving widespread publicity to the fact that it is desirous of developing its natural resources through the cooperation of private enterprise, and it is inviting American investments. The officials with whom I spoke seemed to realize the difficulties and to understand the problems facing Burma in this endeavor. The people of Burma are genuinely independent and desire above all other things to remain that way. They do not condone the policies followed by Russia. If there is one predominant fear here, it is the fear that Burma may fall under foreign domination in its effort to develop its natural resources. There is a stronge sense of nationalism in Burma and I am certain that if treated fairly Burmese development can proceed rapidly. Basically, I would say that Burma is pro-western in its philosophy and its beliefs. However, because of local political considerations, Burma desires no firm ties to either the East or the West.

During my visit I had an opportunity to call upon and discuss Burmese problems with a number of high officials in the Government of Burma.

My first call was upon the Honorable U Ba Swe, Prime Minister of Burma and Minister for Defense and Minister for National Planning. This official, a member of the Socialist Party, succeeded U Nu as Premier. Our discussion dealt with the many problems facing Burma. He believes that the assistance which will soon be forthcoming from the United States will be of great benefit to Burma. He took pains to express pleasure that the assistance being rendered was on a loan basis.

I also conferred with the Honorable Sao Khum Hkio, foreign minister. This official seems most able. At this point I quote from my verbatim notes:

"It is officials such as the foreign minister who spark a feeling of confidence in the ability of most of the officials of the present Burmese Government. During our conversation I stressed private enterprise and it was my impression that there is a widespread feeling in Burma that cooperative arrangements between private enterprise and the government of Burma will result in the most rapid development of the Burmese economy. This is true despite the fact that at least two basic Burmese industries—lumber and oil—have been nationalized. It was my understanding that the Burma Oil Company and the present Government had entered into a partnership agreement for the construction of a large refinery in Rangoon. This refinery, which is about to be completed, will be owned in the ratio of 60 percent company that is British and 40 percent Government of Burma.

"The Foreign Minister, who is also head of the Shan State, is of the belief that the boundary dispute between Burma and China will be settled amicably. As a matter of fact his feeling seems to be the general feeling throughout the country.

"The Foreign Minister was very enthusiastic about progress made in his country since I was here last year. The rice crop is good and a better market is in the offing."

My next visit was to the Minister of Agriculture, the Honorable Thakin Tin Maung. Our discussion revolved primarily around the Minister's claim that the United States should not invade the Burmese rice market. I assured him most emphatically that we were not doing so. I emphasized that the sale of rice in the Far East, in what he regards as principally Burmese marketing areas, were made by the United States to relieve distress in areas where people were unable to buy from their regular sources.

In this connection, as the committee knows, on June 30, 1956, an agreement was reached to provide Burma with $1.1 million in technical services in return for 10,000 tons of Burmese rice to be used to meet a critical food shortage in East Pakistan. It is my impression that this sale created much good will in Burma for the United States Government.

Our information program in Burma has a budget for fiscal year 1957 of $446,050, compared with $304,294 in fiscal year 1956, or an increase of $141,756.

This increase is made up of the following:

(1) Salaries of $29,796, which includes $9,000 for nine additional local employees; $15,286 for a 15-percent across-the-board increase to implement a new wage scale for local employees based on higher costs of living in Rangoon; and $5,510 for annual ingrade promotions.

(2) Foreign service allowances, an increase of $8,863, resulting primarily from the reclassification of Rangoon by the Department of State from a class 3 post to a class 5 post, causing a higher cost-of-living allowance of $7,200 per year.

(3) Radio activities of $2,823.

(4) For a stepped-up program of press activities, an increase of $1,975.

(5) Publications activities, an increase of $8,673, due to increased handling cost for wider circulation of Free World, the Burmese edition, from 27,500 copies to 40,000 copies per issue, the local production of 4 additional pamphlets, and a 35-percent increase in the number of pamphlets produced by the Far Eastern Reproduction Center.

(6) Motion picture activities, an increase of $9,840, due to increased mobile unit tours inland and the initiation of a monthly 16-millimeter 400-foot newsreel for distribution through mass educational teams and Burmese Government Public Relations Office in the interior.

(7) Cultural affairs and related operations, an increase of $79,266 due to the following:

(a) Four thousand dollars for additional library shelving, desks, and equipment for the new information center in Moulmein;

(b) Twenty-one thousand dollars for an increased book translation program, including books by indigenous authors;

(c) One thousand six hundred dollars for three English-teaching seminars in Moulmein, Mandalay, and Rangoon;

(d) Fifty-two thousand seven hundred and sixty-six dollars for the nonrecurring costs of initiating an exhibits unit in Rangoon, affording materials and workshop space for setting up large agency exhibits, and including the cost of construction and materials of a book pavilion exhibit on the campus of Rangoon University.

These increases may be justified. However, in view of the strong sense of nationalism in Burma, we should use our information program in such a manner as not to offend the Burmese people.

There has been no increase in the staffing of our Embassy during the past year.

It is my understanding that there will be no separate ICA mission in connection with the administration of the Burmese loan and similar funds, but that a very small ICA staff will be added to the Embassy to service these programs. The United States should not undertake a large-scale, bureaucrat-dominated aid program in this land.

### PAKISTAN

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, from Burma I went to Pakistan. I shall not burden the Senate with any lengthy remarks about that country. I merely wish to say I did notice there a great change for the better from what I saw on my visit 3 years ago. Pakistan has been very fortunate in that gas was found within her borders. I think Pakistan will make good use of it in producing electricity and thereby overcome its fuel shortage. I think the people of Pakistan will be able to use this wonderful resource to great advantage.

We have several programs in operation which will inure to the benefit of the farmers of Pakistan; one of these is providing facilities for testing waters for irrigation purposes.

We also have built in that country grain-storage facilities in abundance. I was quite happy to learn that the storage facilities were built by the people of Pakistan mostly from materials they themselves had on hand. It may be recalled that 2 or 3 years ago there was some criticism on the Senate floor about a contract for steel bins, because there was some chicanery attached to it, or so the story went. The persons who opposed the construction of the storage facility felt it was foolish to use steel or corrugated iron because the bins would rust quickly and would not last any time. I personally inspected the facilities that were finally constructed and can vouch for their stability and utility. The changeover from steel bins to concrete bins was most beneficial.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I recall that in one of his earlier reports the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, commenting about the Pakistani, stated it was his

feeling that they were very sturdy, dependable allies of ours, who were quite prepared to stand and fight if they had to, and proposed to do so, along with us, in defending freedom, in the event there was occasion for them to take a stand. Is that still the Senator's opinion?

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, yes. I would say that is one area in the world in which Americans are well liked. I was happy to note their strong pro-American sentiment.

Of course, a great deal of work remains to be done, as the Senator knows. Many refugees are there who came from India. When the partition was made, most of the Moslems from India moved to Pakistan, and some Hindus moved from Pakistan to India. The same holds true for East as well as West Pakistan. The biggest problem in Pakistan seems to be that of producing enough food to sustain life.

(The statement concerning Pakistan, which was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:)

PAKISTAN

United States assistance to Pakistan began in fiscal year 1952. During the period 1952–56, projects costing $221,800,000 have been undertaken, with United States contributions fixed at $110,100,000 or 49 percent of the total. The Government of Pakistan contributed the remainder.

During the last 3 fiscal years, that is fiscal year 1954 through fiscal year 1956, expenditures by the United States in dollars in Pakistan have totaled $166,400,000. The proposed program, as outlined at the time of my visit, for fiscal year 1957, will approximate, in dollars, * * *. This figure compares with $57,900,000 actually spent in fiscal year 1956, $67,500,000 in fiscal 1955, and $41 million in fiscal 1954.

Unexpended balances as of June 30, 1956, aggregated $130,300,000, with roughly $2 million of this amount unobligated. If the proposed allocation of * * * for fiscal year 1957 is added to this amount, there will be available for expenditure in Pakistan during the 1957 fiscal year a total of * * * an amount roughly four times the expenditures listed for fiscal 1956.

The ICA staff in Pakistan consists of 1,064 persons, including 226 Americans. Of this 226, 110 are government employed and 116 are contract employees. Local employees number 838, all of whom are employed by the United States Government.

It appeared to me that Pakistan's primary problem is a shortage of food. As a matter of fact, a large proportion of our assistance actually rendered to date has been in the form of foodstuffs. During the 1956 fiscal year, project aid aggregated $39 million. An additional $58.7 million was used for the purchase of commodities, $3.7 million for the purchase of sugar, and an additional $2.4 million was made available under Public Law 480. Under the heading of relief and emergency, an additional $42 million was spent. Of this amount $1.6 million was for flood relief, $1.2 million was for the purchase of Burmese rice (see report on Burma) and $39.2 million consisted of foodstuffs sent under title II of Public Law 480, including the cost of transportation.

Many refugees are temporarily housed in Karachi and the vast majority of them must struggle to merely exist. The market places here were filthy. It was a common sight to see poor people picking over garbage for food and fighting off crows and vultures for whatever tidbits might be present. The refugee problem is caused by displaced Moslems moving into Pakistan from India. Unfortunately, the converse is true since many Hindus are leaving Pakistan for India.

The situation reemphasizes, in my opinion, that the partitioning of India was a tragic mistake. The partition has disrupted the economy of both Pakistan and India and caused almost insurmountable problems with respect to displaced persons. The United States is suffering directly from the results of the partition, since our aid program is attempting to restore the economies of both India and Pakistan.

Unfortunately, too, the upper classes appear unwilling to help Pakistan pull itself up by the boot straps. Wages are so low that I do not see how people can hope to exist, much less live. It is my feeling that much of the assistance we are giving in almost all forms tends to make the rich richer and the poor poorer. I noted that hundreds of people live and sleep on the streets and in the open. This, of course, is tragic, and I fear that unless the program here is reviewed, we shall find that our assistance effort has created ill will instead of gratitude and friendship, no matter how worthy many of the projects may be.

During my stay in Pakistan I had occasion to visit a number of our projects. My first inspection was of a fish harbor project near Karachi. Much dredging has been done in the harbor and more is planned. According to my information, expenditures so far have totaled $250,000. I was told that the United States has obligated itself to spend a total of $1.25 million as its share of completing this project. I am pleased to report to the committee that the project seems to be progressing nicely. Already more fish are being caught and this of course will result in an increase in the amount of protein available in the local diet. I saw several small refrigerating plants and discovered that one of the Pakistan firms freezes a great deal of fish and shrimp for export to the United States. I was not able to ascertain the exact amount, but the export of seafood is apparently on the increase.

Besides deepening the harbor, this project includes construction of levees. Further, the spoil obtained from the harbor dredging will be used to raise riparian lands. We are also teaching the local fishermen how to build better and more efficient fishing boats.

My next visit was to the grain storage facilities. I was told that existing storage facilities aggregate less than 450,000 tons. A capacity of at least two million tons is needed.

The committee will recall that an attempt was made in the Congress recently to obtain full details about proposals to build steel grain storage bins here. The advisability of constructing such bins was questioned since steel bins would perhaps corrode quickly. In the meantime, a number of concrete bins have been built here to store sacked grain. It was my understanding that the United States did not furnish any funds for this purpose except proceeds derived from the sale in the local economy of wheat which the United States donated to Pakistan in 1953 and 1954. A total of 750,000 tons of wheat were donated to Pakistan, of which 613,000 tons were actually used. The grain was sold in Pakistan for local currencies and the proceeds were set aside for use in developing Pakistan's economy, including the construction of some of the grain bins.

It was interesting to note that in constructing these bins only local products were used, with one exception, reinforcing steel. These bins are built along railroad tracks and are accessible to motor vehicles as well as trains. The entire programs seems to be well planned. It is my belief that we did well to discontinue the steel bin program. It would have cost much more in dollars. The present program utilizes local material, as I previously stated, and gives work to local people.

A problem still to be solved is the construction of two grain elevators, one at the Karachi seaport and another at Chittagong on the Bay of Bengal, in East Pakistan. It was originally proposed to build steel bins there but I understand now that since attention has been directed to the corrosion factor the construction is being restudied with a view toward using reinforced steel and concrete. It is my recommendation that any such facility be constructed of concrete. I repeat again, this type of construction will cost much less and will provide employment for Pakistan citizens by making possible the use of local materials. Of course, it will be necessary to furnish some reinforcing steel; however, the cost of this material should be comparatively small. I would, of course, insist that the Government make contribution to the extent of its ability.

A proposal is now under review by which bulk grains may be stored in bins designed for sack grain. According to my information, sacked grain would be placed around these bins, 16 sacks high, with bulk grain stored in the middle. I strongly urge that the proposed new plan be adopted. It will be in keeping with the country's need, and can be effected for the most part by the effort of the local people.

While in this area, I flew to Lahore to visit some of the projects in progress. One of the large efforts is a dam built across the Indus River a few miles outside of Hyderabad. This project has been under construction for 8 years. It will provide water to irrigate 2.5 million acres of land. According to my information, the United States did not contribute to this project. The government of Pakistan is undertaking to construct this facility without United States aid.

Not far from the dam, an agricultural college is being established. The campus consists of about 800 acres of land. The bricks for this construction were made and fired on the school grounds. Construction is being financed by the local government, but the United States has furnished some equipment—principally for laboratories, etc. The United States has also furnished technical advice on construction and curriculum. A technical assistance contract with the University of New Mexico involving the placing of seven education experts to exercise general supervisory duties over the college has been negotiated. It is also proposed to send from 8 to 10 Pakistani educators from various schools in Pakistan to the United States to study American educational methods.

The committee will recall that at one time there was a proposal advanced to build a second plant for fertilizer production here. I was told that this program has been abandoned. The local government has been planning to build two new plants and to utilize natural gas recently discovered in this area.

One most worthwhile project is designed to teach the local people how to get the best use out of available raw materials. It provides the establishment of an industrial research development center in Lahore which will carry on research in the use of raw materials, develop processes best suited to the production of consumer goods of common use, and establish a nucleus for a tool and die industry. The project is aimed at encouraging and assisting private enterprise in the improvement of existing small industry and the sound development of additional small industry. The total cost of this project will aggregate approximately $1.3 million, with the United States contribution fixed at the sum of $876,000.

Another worthwhile project established here is a laboratory for testing soil and water. It will make it possible to test in the Punjab area about half of a total of 13 million acres of land. The United Nations, I understand, began a similar project and after spending about $150,000 terminated its work. I was informed that the project—which is now being pushed to completion

by the United States and the Government of Pakistan on a cooperative basis—will cost about $10 million—with the United States contribution aggregating about $3 million. I was told that expenditures to date have totaled roughly $2.5 million.

We are also extending technical assistance and defense support assistance to Pakistan railroads. One technician advises the local government in the operation of the roads and how to obtain the best service from existing equipment. Also in this area is a car depot where several thousand people are employed. A diesel project is to be erected in East Pakistan, similar to one in Karachi, where local employees are schooled in diesel mechanics. An assembly line has been built to manufacture boxcars and to repair existing rolling stock. It is my understanding that rolling stock can be built in Pakistan at approximately two-thirds the cost of purchase abroad.

Besides the agricultural college to which I referred earlier, our program involves assistance to five other colleges. There are five separate contracts for this assistance, and in addition, some money is being spent for laboratories.

One of the most encouraging projects here is the village training program. The United States proposes to contribute 10 percent of the cost, the Ford Foundation 10 percent and the local government 80 percent. Two years ago I was told our contribution amounted to approximately $2.7 million. As of the time of my visit it was $1.2 million.

Our aid consists primarily of technical assistance plus the provision of some basic equipment. I was not able to visit this project but from the information I obtained its purpose is to establish and operate village training centers in order to train local people in basic self-help programs, such as simple health remedies, sanitation, etc.

We are also involved in a project of plant protection here under which we have provided insecticides, etc. I was informed that many acres of rice were saved from destruction by the use of insecticides. This work has been of great benefit not only to the farmers, but also to the great masses of Pakistani who depend to a large extent upon rice in their diet.

I did not have an opportunity to visit the fertilizer plant which is being constructed by a Belgian contractor at Wanwali. According to my information, the United States has contributed approximately $12 million for machinery, much of which was purchased from sources other than the United States. This plant, when completed, will produce fertilizer at the rate of 50 million tons annually. At the time of my visit the plant was due to begin operations in January of 1957.

Besides the economic and emergency relief assistance now being rendered to Pakistan, millions of dollars per year are required in order to support the armed forces of this country.

We must clothe, quarter, and equip soldiers necessary to man * * * divisions.

In this connection, I requested a briefing from our military mission and conferred for some time with Col. Scott M. Case. Frankly, he was of little help. He could only tell me that * * * divisions had to be maintained, but he was unable to tell me what the military budget was or what had been requested for military assistance during the 1957 fiscal year. He told me he understood I would be furnished the full details by Washington. I did my utmost to obtain from him information about the method used to compute the local country's mutual military budget. He stated that he personally did not know. Later, Mr. Arthur Gardiner, Chargé d'Affaires in the absence of the Ambassador, attempted to assist me in this regard but he was also unable to give the details.

With respect to our information program, I conferred at length with Allan L. Swim, country public-affairs officer. He provided me with the attached information headed "Cumulative Obligations Fiscal Year 1957–58." Cumulative obligations in the period 1956–57 fiscal years aggregated $588,954 as against estimated obligations for fiscal year 1956–57 of $1,159,431. He told me that USIS Pakistan had requested $1,288,000 for fiscal year 1957 and were offered $1,680,000, predicated upon the approval of a total USIA budget of $135 million. In other words, as at other posts, it seems Washington calls the shots and simply fixes arbitrarily the amounts to be used in each post. The country Director here said he could not effectively use the full sum he was offered by Washington.

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize to the committee that it was impossible for me to study in great detail the program now underway in this country. However, I recommend to the committee staff a careful scrutiny of the attached list of nonmilitary projects in Pakistan covering the period 1952–56. Some discrepancies will be noted between the figures provided me in conferences with USOM/Pakistan officials and estimates indicated on the attachment. It is my understanding that these apparent discrepancies are attributable to consolidation under one heading in my report of several related projects, and with recent revisions in program costs. However, the most important thing to be noted, is that despite the expenditure of over $100 million to date, the plight of the masses of the people has not been noticeably improved. Therefore, I most emphatically recommend that the Pakistan program be restudied with a view toward extending assistance which will result in the immediate betterment of living conditions. I further recommend that adjustment be made in the program's operational aspects to eliminate the frequent complaint I found among local citizens that American aid makes the rich richer and the poor poorer.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, from Pakistan I went on to the Middle East. I wish now to read in full my report on the countries of the Middle East:

MIDDLE EAST

This section of my report, for convenience and ready reference, will embrace our Government's operation in Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and Israel. I have grouped these four nations together primarily because of the current Israeli-Arab controversy and the impact of attitudes and political positions in this area upon the destinies of the free world.

LEBANON

In this tiny land, as in the other Arab States I visited, I found an increasing volume of resentment directed against the United States because of our initial recognition of and subsequent assistance to Israel. Almost every Arab leader with whom I spoke blamed the United States for much if not all of the trouble that now exists in this area.

We have maintained a technical cooperation program here for 6 years. Primary achievement of this effort has been the completion of a detailed survey of the Litani River Basin. In August 1955, the Government of Lebanon signed a $27 million loan agreement with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, to implement the first phase of this major water-resources project.

In June of 1954, an economic-aid agreement was signed with Lebanon, under which projects have been undertaken in the fields of agricultural production, village water supply, and road construction. The United States contributed $6 million to these projects. In April of 1956 the United States granted Lebanon $2 million to assist in repairing damage caused by the March 16, 1956 earthquakes.

In 1955, Lebanon and the United States signed an agreement for cooperation and research in the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Assuming the expenditure of * * * during fiscal year 1957, total United States expenditure during the period fiscal year 1954–fiscal year 1957 will have aggregated * * *. As of June 30, 1956, unexpended balances totaled $10.3 million, with $56,000 of this amount unobligated. Allocations to Lebanon from the budget for fiscal 1957 mutual security totaled * * *. When this amount is added to the unexpended balances, there will be available in Lebanon for expenditure in fiscal 1957 roughly * * * with * * * of this amount available for obligation.

Attached to this report is a summary of operations of the International Cooperation Administration in Lebanon, which lists the various nonmilitary foreign-aid projects including technical assistance which we have undertaken or are presently pursuing in Lebanon. Unfortunately, my schedule did not permit me to visit these projects. I visited most of them in 1954 and again in 1955. The list, however, is self-explanatory. It indicates that of the programs presently in effect, the majority deal with the development of educational facilities, and the provision of an adequate transportation network. I traveled over many miles of improved highways along the west coast of the country through its capital, Beirut.

We maintain a sizable information program here. In fiscal year 1956, the USIS budget totaled $115,452. For fiscal year 1957, a $44,184 increase was approved, raising the total operating budget to $159,636.

Also attached is a classified discussion of the mission of the Information Service in Lebanon, the methods used, and some of the problems faced.

SYRIA

The United States has no economic assistance, technical assistance, or military agreements with Syria. However, we do maintain an information program here. Our activities are centered in Damascus, the principal post, where we maintain libraries. Last year, the budget for this country was $372,912. Of this amount $255,692 consists of operating costs, $66,272 American salaries, and $50,948 represents reimbursement to the State Department for shared administrative costs.

Primary objective of the information program here is to expose Soviet strategy and the dangers of Communist subversion and to create confidence in United States policies and programs with respect to Syria and the Near East. It should be noted, however, that the Syrian Government is most unsympathetic to our information program, and I fear that the Soviet Union and Red China are making great headway in their propaganda activities in this country. For example, a group of Syrian lawyers recently visited Red China, and the Syrian exchange of persons program with both Russia and Red China is on the increase. Again here, the Syrian "man on the street" displays an intensive distrust of Americans. Perhaps the only country in greater disrepute than the United States is the United Kingdom. It was my impression that the people of Syria are extremely aroused and dislike the British to the point where they would not hesitate to stone them. Unfortunately, the United States is gradually falling into that same position. We are being blamed first and foremost for our assistance to Israel.

I am attaching a verbatim transcript of my conversation with the President of Syria, the Honorable Shukri Quwwatli, on October 11, 1956. He did not offer any plan by which the Arab-Israeli problem could be settled. To the contrary, there seems no hope of settlement if I am to judge from from what he stated to me.

Of course, Mr. President, our standing in the Arab countries is somewhat improved over that which prevailed when I was there last October. During the Suez Canal crisis, the fact that the United States Government sided in the United Nations against England and France caused our stock to rise in all the Arab countries to which I am now referring.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of my report relating to Jordan be included in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the portion of the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JORDAN

It was in Jordan that I had the most free and open discussion of prevailing Arab attitudes toward the United States. It was my privilege to be present at a dinner given by the Honorable Lester D. Mallory, our Ambassador, at which, were also present former high officials of the Government of Jordan. I quote now from my verbatim notes:

"I suggested that the persons meet with me in an adjoining room where we could confer in private. I was most anxious to obtain a full picture of the situation here and find out if there were perhaps a way by which the Israeli-Arab dispute could be resolved. I had been hopeful that I would be able to confer with King Hussein whom I met 2 years ago but unfortunately he was at the front where activity was taking place due to a recent raid by Israel guerrillas. I was informed that the attack was made in retaliation by the Israelis after they found two of their people dead in fields located near the boundary between Israel and Syria.

"Our discussion revolved around the solution of this dispute. Unfortunately, the prevailing view among Jordanian leadership seems to be that there will be no settlement since the Israeli will probably not accept the proposal to confine their territory to boundaries outlined in the United Nations Resolution of 1947. The Arabs feel that they are bound to the 1947 resolution, particularly that portion which calls for repatriation of Arab refugees. The contention advanced was there could not and would not be any immediate settlement and that even if Israel accepted the terms of the 1947 resolution, that acceptance would not be satisfactory to the Arab world and would not mean peace.

"We pressed as to why not, it was indicated that the only solution was to restore the entire area which is now Israel to Arab control, permitting the Jewish population to remain there but denying them their independence. My impression was that here, as in other portions of the Arab world, the objective is to advance a settlement which the Israeli will refuse in order to place the Arab world in a position of having offered to settle differences but being blocked by Israel.

"If such a proposal is advanced, then I feel that the Arab leadership will probably seek to force the Government of Israel to accept it. Should Israel still refuse, then an effort will be made to deny Israel further aid. This, of course, would mean a complete collapse of the State of Israel. It was my impression that the Arab leadership is determined to bide their time until assistance to Israel tapers off, in which case the time would be ripe to completely destroy the Israeli state.

"Again the argument was advanced that it was legally and morally wrong for the United States to recognize Israel as an independent state in the first place and that by extending economic and similar assistance subsequent to this recognition, the United States merely compounded its felony in the eyes of the Arab world."

During my stay in Jordan I visited hospitals to which I referred in my report of last year. I noted that a maternity clinic was complete as was a tubercular clinic. A third building, designed as a nurses' training school, was also complete and in actual operation. Yet, as I indicated would be the case, there is already a cry for more buildings. We are being told that space is available for greater expansion, and a great need exists.

I also visited the vocational training school where young men are being trained in auto mechanics, etc. This facility was undertaken under the former technical-assistance program. As the committee will recall, prior to the introduction of restrictions on technical-assistance legislation technical aid was frequently used for capital developments. It appears that the school is now making progress, since at the time of my visit only 1 of the 8 rooms was not in use.

In the economic-assistance field our emphasis is upon the construction of highways, particularly roads linking important sectors in the country.

The committee will note from the attached data (exhibit E) that, assuming an expenditure in dollars of * * * in fiscal year 1957, total United States dollar expenditures in Jordan during the period fiscal year 1954 to fiscal year 1957 will have aggregated * * *. Unexpended balances on hand as of June 30, 1956, aggregated $9.4 million, of which amount $223,221 was unobligated. There will be available for expenditure during fiscal year 1957 a total of * * *, of which * * * will be available for obligation.

As of the time of my visit, there were 155 International Cooperation Administration (ICA) employees on the job here. Of this number, 80 were Americans—57 employed by the Government, 9 under contract, and 14 others. In addition, there were 75 local technicians in our employ.

The United States maintains no military-assistance programs in Jordan.

The information program here during fiscal year 1957 has received a total allotment of $83,213, compared with $43,592 in 1956. The big reason for the increase can be attributed to high rentals. Late in 1956 information centers in Amman and Jerusalem were moved to new locations. Prior to that time the information center in Jerusalem had occupied space rent free at the consulate. After rather severe riots in January, it was the Department of State's decision that this arrangement could not be continued and new quarters were acquired. In Amman the center had been temporarily located in the Embassy building following the burning and looting in 1954. These two moves account for about $6,000 of the increase.

It is also planned to expand the information program in a number of ways. These will include exhibits, book centers, film production, cultural activities, a wireless file, and book translations. Prior to the 1957 fiscal year these programs were either nonexistent or were maintained at a very low level of activity.

Book centers are planned near the refugee camps, with one now located at Nablus. Establishment of the others depends upon the political climate.

For further details I refer the committee to the attached exhibit E, entitled "USIS/Amman." It will be noted that while there are no new programs, the existing programs have been broadened.

As an indication of the prevailing attitude toward Americans, the following excerpt from my diary, made while in Amman, Jordan, may prove enlightening:

"We are not well liked here; for example, I was prevented from taking pictures. The local police had to intervene. It was suggested by the officer with whom I spoke that I proceed to his office for a picture-taking permit. I told him that if there were the least objections to my taking pictures, I would certainly stop.

"The people are definitely on edge. All the men seem to be trigger minded, even the younger generation. The English are hated and we are beginning to be despised. The United States is blamed for all the evils that have befallen these people—first and foremost because of our assistance to Israel."

Mr. ELLENDER. It was my privilege, while in Syria, to confer with the President of Syria for some time, and in my visit to Jordan I conferred with most of the Cabinet members of King Hussein—the King was then at the front. While in Israel it was my privilege to talk to Mrs. Golda Meir, the Israeli Foreign Minister. I also had the pleasure of conferring with Mr. David Ben-Gurion, the Israeli Prime Minister.

I ask unanimous consent that the portion of my report dealing with Israel be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the portion of the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL

A considerable amount of the data that I obtained while in Israel is classified. I regret that, because of the confidential nature of this material, I am not at liberty to go into much detail in this report. However, it should be noted that during the period fiscal years 1954–57, assuming an estimated expenditure in the latter year of $37 million, a total of * * * will have been spent in connection with our aid to Israel. This is exclusive of Public Law 480 sales, which totaled $38.5 million in fiscal year 1956 alone.

Balances as of June 30, 1956, aggregated $20.4 million in unexpended funds, of which amount $53,000 was unobligated. A tentative allocation of * * * from the fiscal year 1957 appropriation will make a total of * * * available for expenditure here in the 1957 fiscal year, of which some * * * million will be available for obligation.

During fiscal year 1957 it is proposed to spend * * * on a grant basis. This includes * * * for petroleum and other lubricants, * * * for tin plate, * * * for skins and hides,* * * for chemicals, * * * for kraft liner for exports, and * * * for deep drawing iron sheets. In addition, * * * will be used to import foodstuffs—* * * for wheat, * * * for fodder, and * * * for cotton.

An additional * * * will be used in so-called triangular trade, specifically. * * * to finance the import of ferrous metals (round bars, iron bars for construction, flat iron, etc.) from Germany, and * * * to import logs for plywood, artificial yarns, and cold rolled iron sheets from France.

An additional * * * will be used to finance the fiscal year 1957 technical assistance program.

I had a most enlightening visit in Israel. My initial act was to confer with the Honorable Theodore Kalleck, Director General of the Prime Minister's office. According to Mr. Kalleck, Israel is faced with three serious problems.

The first is immigration. Mr. Kalleck still is of the opinion that Israel can maintain a population of at least 2½ million, and perhaps up to 4 million. He does not believe, however, that the 4 million figure will be reached, because many of the nations which formerly engaged in activities which more or less forced the Jewish populations to migrate are now displaying conciliatory attitudes.

The next problem facing Israel is the tight economic situation. Israel is finding it increasingly difficult to make both ends meet. Her trade deficit last year was about $250

million, and in 1957 it may reach $285 million. The reason cited for the additional deficit is that more and more capital investments are underway. It should be noted that the dollar gap was somewhat reduced last year due to contributions by the United States of $53 million, plus $85 million in German reparations, with the balance of the dollar deficit derived through loans and donations from world Jewry. It is hoped that in 1957 * * * will be contributed by the United States, and $90 million derived from German reparations, with whatever balance required being supplied from loans and by contributions from world Jewry.

In connection with this assistance to Israel from Jewish people throughout the world, I was surprised to learn that funds from the United Jewish Appeal, an American institution which is tax exempt, and to which contributions by American taxpayers are deductible, spends much if not all of its funds to rehabilitate Jews who settle in Israel. Money is advanced to immigrants to provide day-to-day living expenses, and then grants are made to permit them to build homes and prepare the land for tilling. Actually, the United Jewish Appeal makes a part of its funds available to the United Israel Appeal, an American Jewish agency, which finances the immigration of refugees to Palestine.

It should be noted that this money is not used as the Red Cross uses its funds—for disaster purposes—or as other tax-exempt organizations operate. On the contrary, United Jewish Appeal funds are used to rehabilitate and settle foreign Jews who immigrate to Israel.

It should also be noted that the land on which the Jewish immigrants settle is owned by the State, and settlers hold under a lease arrangement only.

I recommend that the question of tax exemption for these organizations be thoroughly studied in order to determine if such exemptions are legal. On several occasions in the past 3 years while traveling in Arab countries I heard much complaint from Arab leaders as to our efforts to assist Israelis to the Arabs' detriment. They pointed up to the abuses of the tax-exemption provision.

In addition to these contributions by the United Jewish Appeal and similar agencies, the local government contributes about two-thirds of the sum required to rehabilitate immigrants.

The third major problem facing Israel is its relationship with neighboring Arab States. This relationship seems to be deteriorating rapidly, and no one knows what will be required to settle this dispute or how long it may require to reach a settlement, if at all.

While in Israel I conferrred with Mrs. Golda Meir, Foreign Minister. Mrs. Meir appears to be a very capable person, but she does not seem to be disposed to give an inch in her views. She expressed the hope that the United States would furnish the necessary weapons to properly arm Israel so that, in her words, war can be averted. She is of the belief that unless Israel is adequately armed, preferably by the United States, war is bound to result because she feels that Israeli weakness invites armed aggression from the neighboring states. This was the gist of her viewpoint, and it is a viewpoint which is not only apparently unchangeable but which is diametrically opposed to the views expressed by representatives of the Arab States.

I also had occasion to confer with the Israeli Prime Minister, The Honorable David Ben-Gurion. He also feels that if war is to be averted, Israel must receive arms in large quantities from America. Mr. Ben-Gurion declared most emphatically that under no conditions would Israel return to the boundaries established in the 1947 United Nations resolution.

With such a divergency in views between the Israelis and Arabs, I frankly can see no hope for an immediate settlement of this pressing problem. The Arab world seems to be united in not desiring to give an inch in an effort to settle any of the questions involved. The same situation obtains with respect to the Israeli leadership. As a matter of fact, the Arabs are not willing to meet with Israel to merely discuss the problems involved. On the other hand, I am certain that Israel does not have the same attitude.

Tension is high on both sides, but there is apparently no fear on the part of Israel. All of the Israeli leaders with whom I spoke seem to think that the question will settle itself if only given enough time. I also noted much more enthusiasm on the part of the people of Israel than among the Arabs. The people of Israel and their leaders feel that they have powerful friends in the world and that assistance will continue to flow their way. They also feel that the United States will not let them down.

Following my conferences in Israel with Israeli leaders, I left for the field to inspect some of the technical and economic aid projects which are presently underway in Israel. One of the most interesting, and incidentally one of the most expensive, consists of piping water from springs located in an area which was once an almost impenetrable bog, to new land developments. At this point I quote from my verbatim notes:

"What we planned and did was to locate all the springs and box them in with concrete pipes so as to control their flow. A fairly large pool was created into which all the spring water was channeled. Part of that water now flows into a nearby river but much of it is piped over a distance of 66 miles to the south in a pipeline measuring 66 inches in diameter. At the far end, the pipe is reduced to 48 inches in diameter for a few kilometers. There are several pumps located along the way that lifts the water to its ultimate destination. The rise in terrain is gradual until it reaches almost 400 feet. I followed the course of the pipeline. At points all along the way, this huge pipe is tapped and the water it carries is combined with water obtained from springs at nearby points and fed into smaller pipelines and thence into a sprinkler system. This sprinkler system is similar to systems frequently seen in private gardens. One can get a good understanding of this operation by picturing the lands now irrigated as a huge garden with pipes running underground through which water is fed and subsequently sprinkled by overhead systems."

I was told that the total cost of this installation, including the pumps, was $40 million. Of this amount the United States provided one-half.

Frankly, it appeared to me that this method of irrigation is most uneconomical. There is, however, another program already underway to build a second pipeline of roughly the same dimensions running in almost the same general direction. This project, too, will cost about $40 million, with the United States contributing about one-half.

Adjoining the existing pipeline are a number of farming projects. Located about 48 miles south of the main source of water and 10 kilometers from the main pipeline is the development which I visited. Villages are being established in order to take care of the immigrants. These people are taught to farm, they are paid to work, and homes are built for them through a government agency which is supported by the Israeli Treasury and the Israeli charitable institution referred to earlier. Some of the land has been in cultivation with only a scant supply of water available. The supplemental water will help considerably but I was not told how much this water will cost. I did learn that of the total expenditure, including additions proposed to be made, only 25,000 new acres of land will be brought into cultivation.

A city will be built at this development, with its surrounding villages, and a cotton textile mill is now under construction, using capital from private sources in the United States. Water for this city will be supplied by the pipeline. In addition to the textile mill, a cotton gin will also be constructed. There were 2 other cotton gins already in operation at the development, 1 of which is privately owned and another established cooperatively by 6 local agencies. A fourth cotton gin is scheduled to be built in the immediate future.

At present there are 15,000 acres planted to cotton where only 3 years ago no cotton at all was being produced. In 3 years cotton production has increased from an initial yield of 5,000 bales to 60,000 bales, and it is contemplated that this expansion will increase even further. It was my understanding that an American cotton producer residing in California was the first to finance cotton production here and that he is deeply interested in increasing this production.

In addition to cotton, some of the new land will be planted to peanuts and sugar beets.

It should be noted that the money to erect the cotton gins and some other proposed industrial plants is provided by six different groups, all of which are in existence here. These are as follows: (1) Kibbutzim (plural) (one of the lowest forms of collectivism where the married workers live in boarding houses, their children being raised in nurseries and educated by the organization with little or no family life). In a Kibbutz (singular) all work for their board, lodging, and clothes, and should the family leave it gets nothing but the clothing on the backs of the husband and wife. (2) Moshavinn (plural), Moshav (singular), another form of collectivism where people lease land from the government or own it and work it on a collective basis, with the exception of a small part retained by a cooperator for his own use for gardening and a homesite. The Moshavinn are somewhat similar to the Russian type of collectivism, except, of course, they have more say as to the disposal of the commodities produced. Unlike in Russia, they sell on a competitive market. (3) Private owners. (Some farms are privately owned and operated.) (4) Communities, that is, people living in communities that will benefit from the agricultural development. (5) The Jewish Agency referred to above that obtains its money from loans or tax-exempt money from the United States; and (6) Histadrut, a huge marketing and labor control organization that owns transportation facilities, cement plants, etc., and controls about 75 to 85 percent of the labor force of the country. In addition, a substantial proportion of the overall cost of the whole project is being financed with American dollars provided under the Mutual Security Program. I question the advisability of fostering in Israel the production of crops which are already in surplus the world over and particularly in the United States. The program director indicated to me that he did all he could to discourage the production of sugar, peanuts, and cotton, but to no avail. It appears that the local government is determined to plant and produce crops at a price which will permit their exportation and thus earn dollars in world markets.

Although this development is small, others are underway and when their productions are totaled together, I fear that the impact on our own world markets may be substantial. Especially is that true when we total the production of other countries that have increased production of surplus crops with funds furnished by us. It is neither right nor just; in fact, it is immoral for American dollars to be used to produce crops abroad

that are already in surplus in the United States. I wish that every producer of cotton, peanuts, and sugar could have been with me when I visited this area. I can well understand how they would feel to learn that their hard-earned money, much of which goes to the United States Government in taxes, is used at least in part to foster competition for them here and in other parts of the world. In particular, the cotton producers of our country would be interested to learn that cotton production here averages about 4 bales per acre.

In considering these development programs, it should be borne in mind that they are not short-term endeavors. In the one I visited, I noted specific areas marked off where from 80 to 100 families, each assigned 10 acres of land, will live. As I indicated earlier in this report, this land is leased from the government for 49 years with an option in the lessee to extend the lease for another 50 years. In each of these areas, a village will be established where hospitals, stores, and other facilities for the nearby residents will be available.

Farming is conducted in much the same manner as I saw collective farms in operation in Russia. A machinery pool is established, and the land is worked collectively. The members of the working group are paid daily wages, and the proceeds of the sale of commodities produced are used to pay operating expenses. If profits are made over and above operating expenses, they are divided among the cooperators. The commodities are sold on a free market here instead of to the State as in Russia.

A number of these developments are proposed, but no one could give me the exact area that will ultimately produce crops under irrigation or dry-land farming. The only answer I received was "it will all depend on the water." I fear that an attempt will be made to reclaim too much land, with the result that the available water supply will be insufficient to irrigate these areas properly. Accent seems to be on rehabilitating people and not more production on less acres with the water available.

It should not be difficult to limit the land area to be placed under cultivation since the supply of water is controlled by a Government agency. It is estimated that the cost of this water is $60 per acre per year in rural areas and $72 per acre per year in urban areas. Much of the cost is subsidized by the Government, but I was unable to determine the precise percentage.

On my inspection of the interior of Israel I also visited a vocational school, built under our foreign-aid program, to teach trades to immigrant youths.

I also visited a flourishing ceramic factory. This factory produces bathroom fixtures, such as wash basins, toilets, etc., for export trade. I was told that many of its products are shipped to Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and Africa.

Turning now to the United States information program in Israel, the fiscal year 1956 budget, including both operating and administrative costs, totalled $76,181. This amount will be increased to $114,743 in fiscal year 1957, and it is proposed to further raise the amount to $141,847 in fiscal year 1958. There is attached to this report a comprehensive breakdown of the purposes for which this money is to be spent. The committee will note that the greatest increase is found in the field of press publications and administrative expenses. In the press field, the monthly Hebrew language publication "The Worker in America" is to be further developed. Circulation is to be expanded from 10,000 to 50,000.

There was also a substantial increase in the representation allowances although the gross sum is smaller. Expenditures for this in fiscal year 1956 was $271. The figure will rise to $800 in fiscal year 1957, and $1,000 in fiscal year 1958. I was informed that a large proportion of this increase is due to rising prices.

A bookmobile is also proposed to be placed into operation in fiscal year 1957 in order to "enable USIS to make more effective its work in rural areas." In particular, it is felt that this vehicle will "enable USIS to form and maintain a wider range of contacts in the labor-agrarian segment of the population." I recommend that this proposal be restudied.

The committee will recall that last year during our committee hearings, we sought out some of the details of the International Media Guarantee Fund balance which has built up in Israel. Under this program as operated here, the United States publishers may sell books to Israeli distributors and be guaranteed payment in United States dollars at the rate of approximately one American dollar to one Israeli pound. When the Israeli agent deposits a pound in an Israeli bank to the credit of the United States Government, the United States Government then pays the publisher one American dollar. As of the time of my visit, our Government had accumulated to its credit approximately $8,350,000 Israeli pounds—worth at today's exchange rate about $4 million in United States dollars. In other words, it seems that the official exchange rate under the International Media Guarantee program in Israel is 1 to 1, whereas the actual exchange rate is somewhat less than 1 to one-half.

As to this $4 million (United States equivalent) in Israeli currency on deposit to the United States Government, it will be used for "educational, scientific and cultural projects" in Israeli. I feel that this is unconscionable. This money should never have been earmarked for these projects; it should, instead, have remained credited to the account of the United States Government in order to assist in defraying some of the local currency expenses which our normal Government operations incur.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I left this troubled area convinced of one thing and that is, that it will be impossible to establish a self-sustaining State of Israel. Particularly is that true, if the minimum goal of not less than 2.5 million inhabitants is to be reached. Should the population remain at 1.5 million to 1.6 million as is now the case, then this tiny little land might eventually become self-supporting. Even with that alternative, however, it would require an investment of many, many millions of dollars to build a sound economic base. As for sustaining a population of 2.5 to 4 million without foreign subsidies, this is seeking the impossible. If Israel's population ever reaches that point, world Jewry must be made to understand that it must continue to subsidize Israel heavily and indefinitely.

It is heartwarming to note the progress being made in Israel, although at high costs. Because of an inadequate background in technology, the populations in the neighboring Arab countries are not as well developed for survival in today's atomic age as are the Israeli. What the Middle East needs is the promotion of a political climate under which the Arab and Jewish population could cooperate to raise living standards and develop the economy of the area. If, as I contend, Israel cannot become a self-sustaining state to take care of displaced Jews, it might be well to explore the possibility of reducing the area of the present State to the size proposed in the 1947 United Nations Resolution. To this end, fixed boundaries should be promulgated, and any additional Jewish immigration should be channeled into Arab lands, conditioned, of course, upon their being permitted to live in peace there. I feel that if only this could be achieved, the Arab and Jewish populations by working together could achieve an unprecedented economic development. In other words, the technological training of the Jewish immigrants should be used as a nucleus around which to build a highly developed Jewish-Arab economic sphere of influence.

I cannot overemphasize the necessity for some early solution to the present difficulties in the Middle East. As I warned in 1954, the Middle East is the most volatile place on earth—it and it alone offers the greatest likelihood as the source of world war III.

There is no possibility of lessening the dissension by extending assistance to both the Arabs and Israelis. We are beginning to be hated by the Arabs, and will undoubtedly be despised by the Jews if we refuse to further help them economically and militarily. It is time for the Jewish people of America and of the world to realize the complexities of the problems involved and the difficulties inherent in achieving a solution. It must be borne in mind, too, that comparatively few people of Jewish faith are involved in contrast to the vast numbers of Arab people. A solution built around the continued existence of the State of Israel—but a state required to remain in fixed boundaries—and designed to promote cooperation between the Jews and peoples of the neighboring Arab countries, must be achieved. What the Arab leaders fear most of all is that Israel will expand and eventually take them over.

TURKEY

Mr. President, the next country I visited was Turkey. I shall not take the time of the Senate to speak in detail of that country. Instead, I ask unanimous consent that my report on Turkey be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TURKEY

My visit to Turkey was an eye opening experience. While most of my time was spent at Ankara, since information with respect to our operations in this country was more readily available there, I entered Turkey through Istanbul. This latter city appears most prosperous. Many of its streets are being widened, and everywhere there is an air of confidence and good will.

The magnitude of our assistance to Turkey has been substantial. Since the inception of the aid program in 1948, through June 30, 1956, dollar expenditures for economic aid have totaled $470 million, of which $324 million were represented by outright grants, and the remainder by loans. Of the dollars spent, about 30 percent was used to improve agriculture, 25 percent for public works, 30 percent for industry and capital investments, and the remaining 15 percent for consumer goods and ocean freight.

Agricultural production has increased to 160 percent of prewar and industrial production to roughly 200 percent of prewar.

Of the counterpart funds generated to date under the mutual security program, 85 percent has been used to support the Turkish defense budget, an additional 5 percent

was channeled into agriculture, and the remaining 10 percent into the area of public works. In this connection, it might be noted that the Government of Turkey has devoted the following percentages of its total budget for defense purposes during the indicated periods:

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| 1948 | 35.5 |
| 1949 | 37.3 |
| 1950 | 29.3 |
| 1951 | 28.4 |
| 1952 | 27.4 |
| 1953 | 26.6 |
| 1954 | 27.7 |
| 1955 | 23.9 |
| 1956 | 22.8 |

These percentages compare with between 60 and 65 percent of the United States budget which is earmarked for defense.

In addition to the $470 million expenditure for economic aid, the United States has advanced $82 million to Turkey for direct forces support, of which $19 million was spent under the direction of the joint military mission here during the 1956 fiscal year. That entire sum was used to purchase oil, gasoline, food, clothing and similar items for the Turkish military forces.

During the fiscal years 1954, 1955 and 1956, dollar expenditures totaled $183.6 million. Proposed expenditures for fiscal year 1957 will aggregate * * * with * * * of this amount earmarked for defense support and * * * for technical assistance.

Unexpended dollar balances as of June 30, 1956 totaled $142.8 million. Tentative allocations from the fiscal year 1957 mutual security budget total * * *. Thus, there will be available for expenditure here during the 1957 fiscal year a total of * * *.

The Committee will note, by reference to exhibit A, that note 4 indicates an economic technical aid pipeline of only $93.8 million as of June 30, 1956. However, this figure is obtained by subtracting from the actual unexpended balance of $142.8 million as of that date, the following amounts:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. First slice fiscal year 1957 aid obligated June 29, 1956 | $25,000,000 |
| 2. Ocean freight for Public Law 480 | 892,000 |
| 3. Emergency relief | 635,000 |
| 4. Direct forces support reallotments | 567,000 |
| 5. Direct forces support fiscal year 1955 and prior years | 18,293 |
| 6. Technical cooperation fiscal year 1956 | 3,549,000 |

Thus, the total pipeline as of June 30, 1956, our planners insist, is really $93.8 million instead of $142.8 million. I frankly think the position taken by ICA in this matter is misleading, since $142.8 million represents the actual amount carried over from prior fiscal years which is available for expenditure, without taking into account allocations from the fiscal year 1957 mutual-security budget.

I also want to point out to the committee that in addition to the * * * available for obligation from the fiscal year 1957 budget, the ICA mission here would have had an additional $25 million available for obligation during the fiscal year 1957, if it had not obligated on June 29, 1956, that amount as the first slice of the fiscal year 1957 program. Practices such as this are unconscionable, and the committee should take pains to warn ICA that it will not continue to tolerate last minute obligations such as this, which are apparently directed at keeping unobligated balances as low as possible. Practices such as these lend themselves to waste and are certainly not consistent with good management or fiscal procedures.

At the time of my visit, there were 202 technicians employed by the United States in Turkey. Of this number 135 were directly employed by the Federal Government, and the remainder were contract employees. I fear that if the staff is kept as large as it was at the time of my visit, this factor coupled with huge unexpended and unobligated balances will result in the undertaking of constantly expanding programs for this country. I realize full well that Turkey is a large country, and that it is willing to fight, and will fight well for its freedom. It is deserving of United States assistance. However, Turkey is endowed with abundant natural resources and, its leaders have a genuine, progressive, and constructive desire to raise the population's living standards. I recommend that increasing attention be given to fostering Turkish economic development by private enterprises and foreign investments, and a consequent reduction in our economic aid program. An early switch to a program of this kind would make possible the return of considerable amounts of unobligated and unexpended funds to our Treasury.

In the section of this report dealing with military assistance, I will refer in detail to the Turkish program. I conferred with Maj. Gen. Lawrence R. Dewey, Chief of the Joint American Military Mission for military aid to Turkey. I was not able to obtain specific information from him since he had been ordered by Washington not to provide me with any data. He did give me a briefing on the assistance provided over the last few years and it was his judgment that much progress had been made. However, he indicated that there is still much to be done, particularly for the Air Force and the Army. He said that more modern equipment is an urgent necessity, particularly in the field of airpower.

Under our military aid program, shops are maintained to repair damaged equipment. These shops were equipped by the United States. I was unable to visit them due to lack of time, but I understand that much is being done to train Turkish military personnel in the repair and maintenance of advanced-type military equipment. I am sorry I am unable to give figures on our military assistance program. They are quite large. With all the assistance made available by us to Turkey and her great advance in industrial and agricultural expansion, I am surprised to note that her defense budget has been steadily declining to the point where it is now 22.8 percent of her expenditures. It will keep on decreasing if we continue to pile in United States borrowed dollars.

The information program here is large and growing larger. The budget for the 1956 fiscal year was $180,197; for fiscal year 1957 this amount was increased to $354,762. It should be noted by the committee that the USIS mission here originally requested only $307,199 for fiscal year 1957. This request was prepared July 8, 1955, prior to the raising of the priority of the USIS Turkish program. It is indicated to me that "the raising of the priority undoubtedly induced USIA Washington to increase that figure in its submission to the Congress."

This is a grade A example of how the information budget is determined—that is, it is not based upon recommendations sent from the field, but, rather, is promulgated in Washington, submitted to Congress, approved in almost rubber-stamp manner, and then the increased funds are sent down to the field for whatever use the missions can find for them. Of course, it is needless to point out that this is a most wasteful procedure. Steps should be taken to eliminate this type of budgetary programing.

I referred to the fact that higher priority has been given to the USIS program in Turkey. It was indicated to me that the reason for this increase is that during fiscal year 1956 Turkish-American relations were considered to be free of serious psychological problems. * * *

I doubt that, in view of the traditional Turkish hatred of things Russian and, more recently, things both Russian and communistic, that a doubling of the information program here is either necessary or desirable.

For the information of the committee I attach hereto a detailed outline of the proposed fiscal year 1957 technical cooperation program for Turkey and a similar outline of the proposed fiscal year 1957 defense support program.

Also attached is a list of all nonmilitary projects undertaken from the beginning of the program here through fiscal year 1956, indicating the total cost of the various projects, United States contributions, local government contributions (both from country budgets and counterpart funds), and the percent the United States contribution represents of the whole. As an annex to this, I am including a mimeograph list of all nonmilitary aid projects, which supplements the fiscal data referred to previously, and which describes in general terms the scope and purpose of these expenditures.

Both the military and economic aid programs should be reevaluated in the light of the great progress made here, both industrially and agriculturally. Business seems to be flourishing, with taxes at a very low rate. I was surprised to learn that no taxpayer, no matter his size, pays more than one-third of his income for all manner and form of taxes.

Mr. ELLENDER. From Turkey I proceeded to Italy. Then I went to France, Belgium, Holland, England, and then home. I ask unanimous consent that my report on those countries be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTERN EUROPE

ITALY

This is a most prosperous country. Nevertheless, the United States still grants a considerable amount of aid. Assistance continues to flow from direct military aid, offshore procurement balances remaining in foreign-aid accounts of appropriations for prior years, and from funds derived from the proceeds of Public Law 480 sales.

Despite the fact that Italy is a wealthy country, the great bulk of the wealth is concentrated in the hands of the few. The poor, and there are many, appear to either grow poorer, or at best, maintain their status quo, while the rich appear to get richer. The working classes in their endeavor to find a better way of life move into the Communist camp. It appears that selfish big-business interests dominate the government and have little regard for the laboring class. This attitude prevails notwithstanding it is in the interest of big business to maintain a stable government.

An example of this selfishness may be found in the prevailing tax structure. Much property is not subject to tax. The property belongs for the most part to the wealthy class. On the other hand, the poor pay high excise taxes despite their low wages.

With respect to assistance, I conferred with James Fry, head of our Military Assistance Advisory Group, and Charles Rogers, our Ambassador's representative on military matters. Unfortunately, the great bulk of information given me is classified. However, the situation in Italy as well as in Western Europe involves the promulgation of force goals by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. These are then submitted to the ministers of the various NATO countries. Following this submission, the participating countries determine what proportion of the forced goals they can attain. * * *

There is apparently no effort made to force the other NATO countries to make a few sacrifices in order to contribute more to their own defense. As a matter of fact, instead of

reducing local expenditures or increasing taxes to raise more revenue, any future increase in NATO strength will find the United States being obligated to furnish the additional support. I expressed the hope that at perhaps some future time our own officials will become as solicitous of the American economy as they apparently are for the economies of some of our allies.

* * * * *

With respect to economic assistance, we still maintain here a mission of 27 persons. There is absolutely no necessity for this size staff in Italy in connection with what remains of an economic program which, until its flow was curtailed, poured approximately $1.6 billion into the Italian economy.

Some counterpart funds are still being collected from various investments made here, and some triangular transactions are being engineered through the purchase of surplus food under Public Law 480,. Additional moneys are being generated on this basis for loans to Italy. It strikes me that there is no need for an American ICA staff to administer these funds. Certainly, the Public Law 480 transactions could be supervised by our agricultural attaché or at least through his office. The other programs could be administered adequately by two or three persons since mere supervision is all that is required.

Attached to this report are two comprehensive exhibits. The first of these, Exhibit A, deals with current programs in Italy for which the United States Operations Mission is wholly or partially responsible. The committee will note that these programs fall within five basic categories. These are: (1) Local currency loan programs; (2) Productivity and technical assistance programs; (3) Triangular trade programs; (4) Public Law 480 programs, and (5) The civil aeronautics mission, which is presently winding up a technical-aid project concerning aviation safety and traffic controls.

The Information Service mission received a healthy increase in funds for fiscal year 1957 over and above fiscal year 1956. The fiscal year 1956 budget was $1,908,284. Of this amount, $1,906,311 was actually spent. Yet, an increase in funds is proposed for fiscal year 1957. At this point I quote from memorandums prepared for me by Charles F. Blackman, Acting Public Affairs Officer for Italy:

"Prior to the submission of our budget plan for fiscal year 1957 and fiscal year 1958 we were advised by telegram from the United States Information Agency that our annual allotment for fiscal year 1957 would be $2,121,170. Our budget for fiscal year 1957 was therefore prepared using this figure of $2,121,170. This amount represented an increase of $214,858.06 over the amount actually obligated by USIS, Italy, in fiscal year 1956. It is expected that this increased allotment will be spent as follows: Salaries, $72,317; local film production, $111,330; direct administrative expenses, $29,517."

The committee will also be interested in an attached memorandum dealing with the Information Service. Part of this memorandum consists of a telegram from Theodore Streibert, Director of the United States Information Agency, which indicates far better than any words I could use that budgets for grassroots information activities are not programed by the local missions but are determined on the Washington level, with the local missions, in effect, told to find ways and means to spend considerable increases allotted by USIA. I also attach to this report a comprehensive summary of balances in counterpart productivity funds. This exhibit is marked exhibit "B".

FRANCE

I was shocked by the fiscal situation which prevails in this country. Almost all of French revenues are derived from excise taxes, which bear the same rate for poor as well as the rich. This generates much resentment among the people of France, since a system of this type works a severe hardship upon the poor, while having no comparative effect on the wealthy.

With respect to military assistance, I shall deal with this in the attached portion of this report concerned with this subject, since the information I obtained was classified. I conferred at length with General Norstad with respect to forces actually available for the defense of Western Europe and the extent to which the United States supports the total NATO defense effort. It should be noted that the French withdrew practically all of their troops after notification to the North Atlantic Council for use in North Africa and subsequently in the Suez area.

I also had a most informative conference with Mr. Frederick Payne, American representative to the Organization for European Economic Cooperation. The United States is merely an observer with respect to this agency, although we contribute $1,500,000 out of a total OEEC budget of $4 million. At this point I quote from a letter written me subsequent to my visit by Mr. Payne:

"You may remember that I told you that the United States is contributing $1,500,000 to the European Productivity Agency of the OEEC. Formerly, EPA projects, when they were of considerable size, had been handled by the United States. This is the first year that a lump sum has been siphoned through the Secretariat of the OEEC who, in consultation with us and other member countries, plans to direct its activities. Your question was: 'What are the other countries contributing?' The answer is that there is approximately $4 million being contributed in all, of which $1,500,000 is from the United States. The other $2,500,000 is contributed by each member country of the OEEC in relationship to its respective size. We, as associate member, do not make any other contribution to the OEEC, such as any contribution to the administration of the OEEC. This incidently is a considerable item inasmuch as the Secretariat of the OEEC numbers over 700 people of which I believe only 1 or 2 are Americans, for whom, as I said above, we make no monetary contribution."

Although we may not contribute to the cost of administering the office of OEEC, we spend a considerable sum to pay those representing us.

The EPA referred to in Mr. Payne's letter is the European Productivity Administration, which is attempting to show these highly advanced Western European countries how to make more and better use of the productive facilities which they have on hand.

I was told that one of the main problems regarding the economic development of Western Europe is the problem of convertibility. This problem however is well on the road to solution and Mr. Payne indicated to me that if the participating countries could only increase productivity, eliminate trade and tariff barriers, and otherwise form an integrated economy, they would be much better off.

With respect to economic assistance, the material available is classified and is attached to this report. At this time the great proportion consists of offshore procurement and related programs. However, there is one small program—$150,000 in scope—which is used to finance the transportation of French labor leaders to the United States in order to acquaint them with the business operations of American labor organizations. This program should certainly be discontinued for obvious reasons.

At the time of my visit there were only 9 Americans and 10 locals in the ICA Mission. The budget of $126,000 is expected to be completely exhausted by March 31, 1957.

While in France I conferred with Mr. Morrill Cody, Public Affairs Officer for the United States Information Service in France. As of the time of my visit there were 52 authorized American positions and a local employee ceiling of 233. We maintain information centers including libraries at Paris, Lille, Lyon, Strasbourg, Marseille, Bordeaux, Tours, and Algiers.

The USIS budget for fiscal year 1957 shows a startling increase over fiscal 1956—$511,800 to be exact. Part of this increase ($121,000) resulted from an 11-percent wage increase granted by the Embassy to local employees of the United States Government, higher cost of living and increased wages outside, and increases and allowances. The budget for fiscal 1956 was $1,610,500. For fiscal 1957, a total of $2,368,723 was requested. An allocation of $2,122,300 was approved.

The remaining $390,800 provided in the fiscal year 1957 budget over the fiscal year 1956 budget will be used as follows:

1. Increase in circulation of biweekly publication "Informations et Documents" from 30,000 to 100,000, $50,000.

2. Production of three locally made documentary films on American musicians performing abroad, on European integration and on Lafayette, $75,000.

3. More prints of documentary films for wider distribution and more adaptations of films now available from Washington, $21,800.

4. Increased rent for new central downtown offices for USIS, Algiers, Bordeaux, Lyon, and Strasbourg, $90,000.

(It should be noted that USIS, France, informed me that the initial cost for these new offices is high because the United States is being required in most cases to pay 2 years' rent in advance. Before leaving this particular topic, it is my fervent recommendation that the scope of these programs be reduced. Certainly, it is unreasonable for France—supposedly an ally of our—to require the United States to carry the whole burden alone.)

5. Establishment of a new office in the Saar, $18,000.

6. New information center, 2 years' rent in Saar, $18,000.

(This center will be used for lectures and motion pictures. This would appear to be a highly unnecessary expense.)

7. Increase in subsidy for translations of American books into French, $30,000.

8. Increase in materials (books principally) to be presented to institutions and influential persons, $13,000.

9. Television and radio programs increase, $25,000.

The entire information program here should be drastically reduced. I find that our information agency planners are using the Suez crisis as an excuse for increasing the information efforts in countries such as France and Britain. On the contrary, this crisis points out the fact that our information program must have been an abysmal failure, since it has obviously produced no increase in respect or understanding for America or its policies in these two countries. I therefore recommend that unless the French Government is willing to assist the United States in its effort to inform the people of France of the necessity for free world strength, the program be reduced in scope and size. Under no circumstances, even if reductions are not imposed, should fiscal year 1958 bring any increase in the information agency budget for this country or, for that matter, any other Western European nation.

BELGIUM

The ICA office was closed here as of June 30, 1956. At the time of my visit there was only one employee connected with the mutual-security program still on the job. He was checking on the delivery of goods, amounting to $200,000, made quite some time ago. This employee is under the immediate supervision of the Paris office.

I was well pleased with the development, but I was astounded to note that the Eco-

nomic Counselor of the Embassy, Mr. Charles Adair, is of the opinion that the United States should undertake further work in Belgium by way of increasing the productivity of Belgian industry. In view of the existence of the European Production Administration (EPA—see my report on France) I recommend that any increase in productivity techniques be undertaken through the EPA, without any additional American assistance. I fear, despite the existence of EPA, that ICA, Washington, will no doubt send an additional expert or experts here in order to perform similar tasks.

I was informed that there are no commodity programs presently under study for Belgium, either under section 402 or Public Law 480. By no means should any such programs be considered, for Belgium is most prosperous. As a matter of fact, Belgium should be contributing to the worldwide mutual security program instead of being considered for further United States assistance.

I do wish to call to the committee's attention that the facilities-assistance program, under which the United States furnished dollar assistance for the tooling of new plants, could well be terminated. Here, as in other countries of Western Europe, the local economies are well able to undertake these programs without any United States assistance. It is my distinct impression that our own people, stimulated by self-seeking local officials, see these programs as a means of continuing economic aid to countries which are essentially healthy.

I am attaching to this report an exhibit indicating the status of counterpart funds in Belgium and Luxembourg. The amounts remaining in counterpart accounts are considerable, but it is my understanding that they are all programed and there should be no further necessity for ICA's supervision except through present existing missions in other lands whose personnel are well able to scrutinize the expenditure of these funds.

With respect to the Information Service, the budget request for 1956 was $123,650 and $149,343 was actually allotted. The funds over and above the original request were used for an atomic energy exhibit and related exhibit materials. For fiscal year 1957, a budget request of $184,820 was submitted; the allotment was $162,000 an increase of almost $40,000 over the regular 1956 budget. The staffing pattern for 1957 fiscal year remains the same as during fiscal 1956—5 Americans and 32 locals.

Despite the growing reasons cited for the necessity of an information program here, I am far from convinced the need exists. Everyone with whom I spoke declared most emphatically that the Belgians are definitely pro-American. Nevertheless, they are of the opinion that there are areas of misunderstanding on such matters as tariffs, colonialism, and east-west trade, which irritate our relationship and the information program is necessary in order to minimize these differences. Whether or not this be true, there is certainly no need for a program of $162,000 for this country. Certainly one man, or at least one section, in the Embassy would be sufficient to do the job.

I recommend a complete reevaluation of the USIA program not only here but in all Western European countries. There is a basic inconsistency in the continuous proclamations emanating from the Department of State that the Western European countries are firm and stanch allies of the United States and the continued appropriation and expenditure of huge sums of money in order to win friends and influence people in these lands. The two cannot be reconciled.

### UNITED KINGDOM

Since April 3, 1948, a total of nearly $5 billion has been obligated for economic and military, along with quasi-military aid, to the United Kingdom. This amount is broken down as follows:

Economic recovery program, 1948–49 through 1950–51, $2.714 billion.

Mutual defense assistance, $2,172,000,000. This amount was spent as follows:

Defense support: $874 million.

* * * * *

Direct forces support (special aircraft), $120 million.

Military assistance, $1,178,000,000.

* * * * *

Agricultural trade development and assistance under Public Law 480, $27 million.

* * * * *

It should also be noted that under the mutual-weapons-development program, the United States of America finances at least a part of British research and development designed to produce advanced weapons of useful design. It should be recalled that in addition to this program, the United States through the Department of Defense spends * * * dollars for research and development here in this country.

At the time of my visit, there was no separate ICA mission as such here, but the chief assistant to the head of the economic section in the Embassy was charged with overseeing the expenditure of ICA funds. in addition to this officer, there were 5 additional officers, 3 secretaries and 5 local employees engaged in this same work. Their necessity was sought to be justified on the basis that there remain about $2 million in funds to be allocated under prior year programs and about $33 million of Public Law 480 funds. I recommend that this mission be closed out promptly. I understand that it is proposed to be terminated as of June 30, 1957, but there appears to be no valid reason why the ICA section should not be terminated immediately.

While in Britain, I visited the so-called "tobacco houses"—housing for military dependents financed from the proceeds of tobacco sold under Public Law 480. Each unit has its own heating system which is gas fired. All utilities are being installed, and the United States will pay for water, gas and/or other fuel. There were 110 of these houses under construction at the time of my visit. The cost is $20,000 per building, which contains two dwelling units. These structures are of course built upon British soil and title to them will vest in the British Government if and when the United States forces housed in them are no longer needed here. In the meantime, military personnel housed in these dwellings do not receive housing allowances but instead receive housing rent free. The allowances which would usually be paid to these personnel will be used to liquidate the cost as long as our Armed Forces remain here. The unpaid balance will, in effect, be our loss.

Construction of the "tobacco houses" is being performed by a British contractor. It is specified that British material must be exclusively used. The outside walls of these buildings are constructed of cement blocks, oblong in shape and of various colors. The roofs are tile. The entire subdivision is located in a flat area complete with paved streets, a sewer system, and storm cellars. In other words, the general policy of providing nothing but the best for our servicemen is being followed. Unfortunately, there is little consideration given to the expense of these structures, particularly in view of the fact that they will eventually belong to the Government of the United Kingdom, not the Government of the United States.

I was informed that additional housing programs such as this are contemplated, using proceeds from surplus sales under Public Law 480. It should be noted that the British are apparently not over anxious to purchase surplus American agricultural commodities under this authority of law, but our planners are using every device known in order to persuade the British that more and better use should be made of this program. I recommend most emphatically that our transactions with the United Kingdom with respect to military preparedness, sale of surplus agricultural commodities, and housing of military personnel be placed upon a strictly businesslike basis and that the authority of Title I of Public Law 480 not be used to subsidize the British economy.

I regret very much that I am not able to discuss in detail at this point the various aspects of our military assistance program here. I do want the American people to know however that many unnecessary and purely punitive road blocks are being placed in our path. For example, under an agreement consummated between the United States of America and the Government of Great Britain concerning the construction of air bases here, a sharing of the construction expenses was provided. I am not at liberty to say in what respect this agreement has been breached by the British, but it was breached. In addition, the British are still holding 250,000 pounds of funds which they originally agreed to contribute to the construction of these bases. It is the British claim that this amount is necessary to reimburse the Government of the United Kingdom for damages to British highways which the British maintain were caused by American construction and other vehicles. In view of the assistance which we have rendered and are still rendering to the United Kingdom, the withholding of this amount of money is a gesture which calls for stern censure on the part of our Government. The United Kingdom should be forced to live up to its agreements, or be notified that further assistance from the United States of America will be withheld.

I had a most informative conversation with Mr. W. Bradley Connors concerning our information program here. The information program for the United Kingdom shows an increase of $250,000 for 1957 over fiscal year 1956. I understand, however, that no increase is proposed for fiscal year 1958. Of this additional $250,000, $50,000 will be used to produce and distribute pamphlets, leaflets, and posters to explain President Eisenhower's so-called open sky disarmament proposal. In addition, a large school poster campaign is being undertaken to highlight American history, geography, and government for the major secondary schools in Britain.

An additional expenditure of $120,000 is proposed to be spent for two major exhibits to be shown in a dozen or more cities throughout the United Kingdom dealing with (1) the open sky disarmament program and (2) the American economy.

The balance—approximately $80,000—will be devoted to increasing the study of American history, government, institutions, and geography in the British schools. As a matter of fact, the Information Service here has launched a long-range program designed to get American textbooks on the United States introduced into British schools, but this program has shown little effect. Now, it is proposed to subsidize the publication of American textbooks in order to make them more readily available to the schools of Great Britain.

I recommend most emphatically that this increase be rescinded and that it be returned to the Treasury. The programs upon which it is proposed to be spent demonstrate a bankruptcy of imagination and a complete disregard for the purpose of the information program. Certainly, it was not the intent of Congress to authorize under the United States information program an expenditure of considerable sums of money to propagandize a so-called friendly country.

I found in the United Kingdom, that because the British insist on being a full partner with America, our information agency

planners feel it necessary to maintain a program of ridiculous size. It is obvious, that while the British desire full partnership in free world planning, they are not willing to accept the burdens which this full partnership brings. If, after the expenditure of nearly $5 billion in American aid since the initiation of the Marshall plan, the British Government and the British people have no basic understanding or appreciation of American policies and efforts, the expenditure of further large sums for propaganda will serve no useful purpose.

According to a memorandum I received from Mr. Connors' office, "Our most difficult task in the United Kingdom is to convince the British that we have an identity of interest and feeling in the political, economic, social, and cultural spheres. Whether Britain accepts the lead of the United States in international affairs and retains the United States as a permanent partner in world affairs must depend greatly on the depth of the British people's understanding and approval of what may be called the American way of life."

In other words, a gigantic information effort is necessary in the United Kingdom to convince the people of Great Britain that the Government which has so generously lavished its treasure upon them in years past and which has spent its blood in a combined effort to rid the world of totalitarian rule, contains sufficient cultural and social depth in order to be regarded as a worthwhile British associate. I believe this argument answers itself. As indicated above, if our past assistance has not convinced the British of our capacity for leadership and the necessity for a strong United States-British alliance, then the expenditure of further sums under the information program will certainly prove abortive.

NETHERLANDS

I visited missions at The Hague and at Amsterdam. At the time of my visit, there was a considerable amount of money still in the counterpart fund; if fact, more than can be spent. 372,464,904 guilders ($97,503,902) remain to be released. 115 million guilders ($30,104,712) programed in 1950–51 must be reprogramed. In other words, based upon a guilder value of 3.82 guilders equals 1 American dollar, the total of $127,608,613—American dollars—is available in local currencies for expenditure here.

Notwithstanding these facts, intensive efforts were being made to negotiate Public Law 480 sales. The claim advanced is that these sales will produce needed additional local currencies. As a matter of fact, I understand that an agreement was recently completed under which $275,000 worth of surplus cotton would be sold to the Government of the Netherlands under Public Law 480. Of the local currency generated under that sale, 10 percent, or the equivalent of $27,500, will be made available to the United States Government for whatever use it may desire in the Netherlands. The equivalent of $200,000 in local currency will be used to finance market research and sales promotion projects in the Netherlands designed to further stimulate the consumption of cotton. This research and promotion will be undertaken by the National Cotton Council of America and its Netherlands counterpart. The equivalent of a maximum of $47,500 will be used to pay the local expenses of the Cotton Council of America. In addition, the agreement provides that $25,000 in equivalent will be converted into other currencies by the Government of Netherlands as required.

I am in full accord with any program designed to dispose of our surpluses, however, I feel confident that it was never the intent of Congress to use title I of Public Law 480 purely as a means of generating local currencies in areas where for one reason or another it might be felt that the local currencies would be beneficial to have on hand. If there is indeed a necessity for market research and promotion with respect to cotton in the Netherlands, it would seem to me that the remaining local currency in the counterpart fund could be well spent for that purpose instead of further increasing the local currency accounts by generating the same under the Surplus Disposal Act. There should be actually no necessity for promoting this sale if, as indicated to me, its sole purpose is the generation of additional local currency funds.

Of course, the Government of the Netherlands, which has a major voice in the use to which unspent counterpart funds may be put, no doubt would object to the expenditure of these funds for purposes such as those proposed under the Public Law 480 sale because in effect it would enable us to reduce our economic assistance. I recommend most emphatically that the Department of State undertake to overcome these objections to the end that the interest of the American taxpayer will be better served. The day is long past when the fiscal welfare of our country is to be subservient to purely local desires of those receiving aid.

Turning now to the information program, I discussed The Hague installation with Mr. Robert Donhauser, chief of the information program there. As usual, fiscal year 1957 will show an increase in expenditures for information over fiscal year 1956. It should be further noted that whereas in fiscal year 1956 the budget request was for $141,842, the actual allotment was $142,000. The budget request for fiscal year 1957 was $199,055 and the actual allotment was $171,350.

The increase in the fiscal year 1957 allotment over fiscal year 1956 will be spent as follows: $5,000 additional television work; $1,000 employment of qualified journalists to write human interest stories regarding life in the United States and, the largest item, $17,000 for increases in local salaries. In this connection this increase is made necessary by virtue of a Dutch Government decree, which was expected, at the time of my visit, to be issued January 1, raising wages by 10 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, during the course of my remarks I have advocated a new look, a new approach with respect to our foreign policy. Here is one of the reasons why I feel this new look is necessary:

Since 1945 the record shows we have spent in excess of $36 billion in Western Europe alone. In that period, in other areas of the world, we have spent an additional $11 billion or $12 billion for both economic and military aid.

When I voted for the Marshall plan, in 1948, it was with the conviction that by spending reasonable amounts of money in the war-torn countries of Western Europe we could raise the living standards of their people, rehabilitate them, and, by so doing, those countries would be placed in a position to be of assistance to us and could help us carry the load, not only in Europe, but also in Asia and Africa and other parts of the world.

When Mr. Hoffman was testifying before the Committee on Appropriations in 1950 he was asked how long the program would have to be continued, how much money would be spent, and what the goal was. Mr. Hoffman said that if we could increase the industrial production of the countries of Western Europe to 125 percent of prewar we could cease our aid. With respect to agriculture, he put the goal at 110 percent of prewar.

We reached those goals before the end of the third year.

Today the average of industrial output of Western Europe is 165 percent of prewar. In other words, it is 40 percent over the goal set by Mr. Hoffman in 1950. Nevertheless, we are still there, still spending money by the billions of dollars in that area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 3 extracts from Mr. Hoffman's testimony in 1950 on this subject be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECA PRODUCTION OBJECTIVE IN EUROPE

Senator CORDON. Now, Mr. Hoffman, let us assume success at the end of 1952. Let us assume that your target, which I believe is 130 percent of prewar production, has been achieved at that time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think it goes a little less than that; I think it is about 125 percent, Senator.

* * * * *

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would hope that we could wind this program up for $13 billion as against the $17 billion that was discussed originally as the cost of the program. I would be disappointed if that could not be cut by at least $4 billion.

Senator FERGUSON. So, it would be $3 billion the last year?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. I think we could go down to $3 billion in 1951, and I think you could go down substantially under that for the last year.

Senator RUSSELL. That is a material reduction from the $17 billion that was discussed when we started. That does not include the Greek and Turkish items; nor the German items?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Senator RUSSELL. It does include Germany?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It does not include the German GARIOA.

* * * * *

Mr. HOFFMAN.* * *

The Second World War cost us $341 billion. There are still deadly dangers in the world which could result in a third world war and which would destroy the fabric of our civilization. If we are able through our aid under the European recovery program to make a substantial contribution to the building of peace and prosperity in the world, then the European recovery program is the best bargain the American people ever bought.

I would like to make one final point. It may at first glance seem paradoxical, but I look upon the European recovery program as our best hope for bringing Government spending down to a point where taxes will not be so oppressive—to a level at which our free economy is not in danger.

I say this because I see no way in which our tax burden can be reduced substantially unless the threat of war and the consequent necessity for maintaining an abnormal Military Establishment is reduced. This economy cannot go on indefinitely spending $15 billion or more a year for military defense. The surest way I know of to reduce the danger of war so that we may reduce our Military Establishment is to carry on the recovery program, to the point where a free and self-sustaining and unified Europe is able to pay its full role in cooperation with the United States and other free countries in maintaining the peace and prosperity of the world.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, first it was ECA; then came the MSA; now it is ICA—but the money keeps going to Europe. Since 1952, we have spent al-

most $3 billion in that area for offshore procurement.

In other words, we have been giving economic aid under the guise of offshore procurement right along—and we are still giving it. Offshore procurement contracts under the mutual assistance program have totaled in value $2.6 billion since 1952. These contracts go to Western European companies which, under the contracts, produce materials of war for European armies. In addition to this amount, our own forces have purchased $1.2 billion in goods from the European economy during that same period. This, too, is economic aid.

Under other programs, we are building new plants to produce arms for Western European countries; this is called facilities assistance—but it is economic aid, nevertheless. Over and above this, we are spending large sums to help Western European countries finance programs of research and development designed to produce new weapons—this, of course, is over and above our own multi-billion-dollar expenditures at home for research.

Yet, Mr. Hoffman said when industrial production in Western Europe reached 125 percent of prewar, we could end our aid; today, it is 165 percent of prewar and the aid goes on. It has changed its name, but it is there nevertheless.

All of that is done, notwithstanding the fact that in Asia, Formosa, Korea, South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand we are carrying the whole load. No one is helping us on Formosa. All the people whom we have assisted so nobly in Western Europe are not in any way assisting us in that area. We are carrying the whole load there. Even worse, we are having to carry a huge share of Western Europe's own defense budget.

Let us take, for example, the NATO obligations of our friends in Western Europe. Recently I read an article dealing with an interview with General Norstad, the supreme commander of NATO. He said when NATO first began, the number of divisions initially agreed upon was from 65 to 90. Now, NATO is down to 30 divisions. He said, in effect, he does not know what will happen if the British carry out their threat to remove the few divisions still assigned to NATO in Europe. Under the NATO agreement, a nation need not ask permission to remove its divisions; it may simply say, "Well, we will pull them out." That is what France did, when it sent its divisions to north Africa.

Notwithstanding all the money we have spent in those areas, we are still being called upon to help sustain the economies of those countries.

As I pointed out a while ago, this is being done with the full backing and frequent instigation of our own representatives in those countries.

I was very much disappointed when I visited England, for example, to find that England is not as cooperative as she should be. Several years ago we had agreements to build a certain number of airbases in England. They were to be built on a 50–50 basis. Later the plans were changed somewhat, and we asked for a continuation of the contribution on a 50–50 basis. What did the British do? They said, "No, we won't do that. We cannot do it. Our economy cannot sustain it. If you want to go ahead on your own, do so." So we did. Since 1953, out of our own pocket, we have spent more than $320 million on such airbases without one copper cent being put up by the British.

I am not saying that in derogation of our allies. The English are one of the finest people on earth; they are good people; but we cannot keep sustaining them and hope to remain solvent. The same is true of France, Belgium, Holland and other European countries who look to us first and their own resources last, or not at all.

Ten years ago I was ridiculed by the press of the United States and of the United Kingdom for taking the position that the United Kingdom, as such, was on the road down. It will be recalled that a request was made for us to lend the United Kingdom some three and three-quarter billion dollars. I took the position that it would be impossible to revive the British economy with dollars alone.

Years ago the British could go to their colonies and get all the raw materials they desired. They could even prevent their colonies from establishing manufacturing facilities which would compete with the mother country. The mother country had markets all over the world for its finished products. However, during the last two cruel wars those markets have dried up, as it were, insofar as the British are concerned. Most of the colonies are now wearing long pants. They are looking out for themselves. As a matter of fact, Canada today has perhaps as much business in South America as has the United Kingdom. Australia has almost as much business in the Far East as the British have in that area. Ten years ago, as I recall at the moment, the population of the United Kingdom was about 42 or 43 million. Now, ten years later, it is 50 or 51 million.

The United Kingdom has absolutely no natural resources, except some coal, which is very expensive to mine. It produces only a small part of its iron ore requirements. It can produce less than half of the food it consumes. The rest of what the British need must be imported. They must obtain these vital products in other countries; they must bring them to the United Kingdom. These raw products must then be sent to the factories, to be manufactured into finished products, and then sent into world markets for sale.

The profits which are made from the sale of finished products are the only source of Britain's funds. The British no longer have the investments they formerly had in large corporations in America and in other countries of the world. They must, more or less, depend on the profits which they themselves make from the sale of finished products and from their maritime fleet.

It saddens me to do so, but I will repeat what I said 10 years ago, and what I said again in 1951. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the statements I made in those 2 years, namely, that there is no more chance of reviving the United Kingdom with United States dollars than there is of reviving a dead horse.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, it is my considered judgment that in normal times, the sooner we stop this aid, the better it will be for Britain. I say "normal times"; I do not mean during a war. In passing, I may say that in the last several months the British treasury has benefited because of the Korean war. A great deal of tin, rubber, and other products which are obtained from British-controlled Malaya have been needed. This war-produced demand brought income to the British. However, I say now, as I said in 1946, that in the long pull there is no more chance of revitalizing the economy of the United Kingdom than there would be of reviving a dead horse. When I made that statement in 1946—and it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—I was ridiculed. Many sarcastic editorials were written about that statement. However, if the speech I made at that time and the conclusions I reached then, were read again today it would be seen that I was not far wrong. That speech was made in connection with $3,750 million loan for which Britain applied in 1946. At that time it was stated on the floor of the Senate that this loan, if made, would revive the British, and that they could revitalize themselves in 3 years. Yet in less than 18 months, all that money was gone, and the British were in as bad shape as they had been before we made the money available to them.

Mr. President, I repeat that I think we are doing the British a grave injustice from a long-range viewpoint. We should not encourage them to believe that our "shots in the arm" now and then may be able to revive and to develop their industry to a point where they can again compete with the rest of the world.

No, Mr. President, the plight of the present British economy is hopeless, I am sorry to say; and the prescription I gave in 1946 holds true today. I said then, and I repeat now: If Britain would depopulate the British Isles and send her know-how and some of her factories to the places where the raw products are located, she could be of assistance to all of us; if she needs financial assistance in order to do that, then such assistance would be justified.

---

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 21, 1951]

Mr. President, I do not believe that Great Britain will be able to carry on the trade which she maintained in the old days. It is going to take many more billions of dollars to keep her up. As I shall point out in a few moments, this $3,750,000,000 is but a shot in the arm, and if it does not suffice, Britain will be coming back here for more funds. Then what will we do? (79th Cong., 2d sess., vol. 92, pt. 4, p. 4186–4187, April 29, 1946.)

* * * * *

We are trying to revive a dead horse, which is impossible. I am very sympathetic to the British. In days gone by, as I shall point out, the British were able almost to force their colonies to buy manufactured goods from Great Britain. They prevented the development of manufactures in many of their colonies. But today the picture has changed. Her colonies are freeing themselves from the apron strings of the mother country and they are out for themselves.

I say to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that with the loss which I know now exists and will exist to an even greater extent as time passes, the British Government cannot force its colonies to trade

with England. So, in order to give the British the dominant position which they occupied in the past, as was described by the distinguished Senator from Utah, it will be necessary to keep on pouring money into London, just like pouring water into a rat hole, and expecting it to reach the rats. I simply cannot see it otherwise. (79th Cong., 2d sess., vol. 92, pt. 4, p. 4187, April 29, 1946.)

* * * * *

One of the suggestions which I propose to make during the course of my remarks is that the United Kingdom should remove a great volume of her population from the islands and send some of it to Canada, some to Australia, and some to New Zealand for the purpose of developing natural resources in those countries, and carrying on manufacture within close range of raw materials. (79th Cong., 2d sess., vol. 92, pt. 4, p. 4188, April 29, 1946.)

* * * * *

I will say, Mr. President, that the only solution I can see is for Britain, that is, England, Scotland, and Wales, to have a population just of sufficient size to maintain her economy, and move out many of the industrial plants which are there and locate them nearer the raw products. (79th Cong., 2d sess., vol. 92, pt. 4, p. 4190, April 29, 1946.)

* * * * *

Mr. ELLENDER. I will not say that the proposed loan will not be of any help whatsoever to the United Kingdom, but it is going to be a mere shot in the arm. In other words, I can visualize that in the near future this money will be absorbed by the British in order to maintain her population in the British Isles. In other words, the money will be used to replace revenues which she formerly received from shipping and from the profits she derived from various ventures throughout the world. I cannot foresee that those ventures, from which she derived so much in the way of funds with which to maintain herself in the past, will be sufficiently great in the future to maintain her. I really do not see any hope for her to maintain her economy. (79th Cong., 2d sess., vol. 92, pt. 4, p. 4194, April 29, 1946.)

The following is in answer to a question propounded by Senator LUCAS: "I take it the Senator from Louisiana is tremendously interested in seeing England go on rather than fall; is he not?

"Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, yes; certainly; but I do not want England to drag us down with her. That is one thing I am against, and I am offering suggestions, during the course of my remarks, which I believe, if followed, will help. But I want to be frank in saying to the Senator that I do not really think that Great Britain can maintain her present economy and successfully take care of the population now in the British Isles. There is bound to be a migration, as it were, of quite a few British subjects, let us say to South Africa, to Canada, to Australia. In that way the British Empire can be maintained." (79th Cong., 2d sess., vol. 92, pt. 4, p. 419, April 29, 1946.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I was ridiculed when I first made that statement, but today, 10 years later, the conditions in that great country are even worse in some respects than they were 10 years ago. It is high time for us to take steps whereby we shall not continue to sustain an area which, if we continue to sustain it, may reduce us to the same level as itself. Frankly, Mr. President, I would prefer to forego both principle and interest on the money now owed us by the United Kingdom; provided this money were used by Britain to send her excess population to underdeveloped areas—to Australia, Canada, South Africa or others—where this stalwart people might have a chance to use their great skills and great talents to bring greater benefits to themselves and to the world.

Mr. President, if the time ever comes when our great country fails economically, then the whole world may be in darkness. Today we owe more money than we can ever expect to repay. I say most sincerely that rather than burden ourselves and unborn generations with a rising debt and weakened economy we should, in all good faith, take that new look I discussed during my remarks on Russia.

We now have a golden opportunity to foster an exchange between our people and the people of Russia. I say this: Let us learn about each other—let us make every effort to dispel the fears on both sides of the Iron Curtain, fears which now cause us to continue to arm ourselves to the teeth—fears which compel us to burden our economy and pile debt upon staggering debt.

Let there be no misunderstanding, Mr. President. Until we are certain that the Russian people intend to make the exchange of which I speak, until we are convinced that they are acting in good faith, until it is possible for us, without ulterior motives, to learn about each other and to meet each other on equal terms, so that fears can be dispelled, we should never let our guard down.

But the time shall surely come—if, indeed, it has not already—when we cannot afford to continue spending as we are and still hope to survive economically.

I have been in Congress 20 years. The amount of the first appropriation bill for which I voted, to operate every department of Government, was about what is now required merely to pay the interest on our debt. We cannot continue that rate of spending and hope to survive.

Destroy initiative in our country, make the tax burden so great that industry cannot continue, strangle the free enterprise system by draining away capital and overtaxing labor, and the end is only a matter of time. We must act now. Unless our representatives abroad and our officials at home take note today, tomorrow may be too late.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I had the unusual opportunity of traveling for 3 weeks last fall with the senior Senator from Louisiana. Consequently, I should give voice to the fact that he displays exceptional zeal, sincerity, and thoroughness in undertaking his inspection trips abroad.

I recall that in one of the areas we visited in the far Pacific, because of the misinterpretation by newsmen of some remarks which the Senator from Louisiana had made, the Senator was subjected to considerable criticism and, in one case, to a public demonstration of protest.

I commend my colleague for his devotion, and his extracurricular efforts, I might say, to undertake some of these thankless tasks of compiling the data and information which are so essential not only to the Committee on Foreign Relations, but especially to the Committee on Appropriations, of which committee the Senator and I are both members.

I feel certain that when the history of the activities and extensive travels abroad of the Senator from Louisiana is written, he will receive the profound thanks of the taxpayers of this country for his efforts to preserve the security and safeguard the financial structure of this great Republic.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank my good friend from Idaho.

---

## MEETINGS HELD BY STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIALS WITH BIPARTISAN CONGRESSIONAL GROUPS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a letter I have received from the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Robert C. Hill, in response to a request from me. With his letter Mr. Hill transmits material relative to bipartisan meetings held by the Secretary of State and other principal officers of the State Department with Members of both the House of Representatives and the Senate during the period of time this administration has been in office.

There being no objection, the letter and enclosures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 6, 1957.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
*United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: In response to your request I am transmitting a compilation showing the number of times the Secretary of State and principal officers of the Department have met with committees of Congress, or with bipartisan groups, either in consultation or on pending legislation.

This compilation is presented in four parts:

1. Meeting and appearances of the Secretary with bipartisan congressional groups, which lists accurately as our records permit all of the group meetings in which the Secretary has participated. The term "congressional leadership" is used here in a broad sense, referring to high-ranking committee members as well as to the majority and minority officers of the Senate and House.

2. Meetings held by the Secretary or the Under Secretary with congressional leaders and other Members of both Houses of Congress to consult in foreign-policy matters.

3. Meetings held by the Secretary or other principal officers of the Department with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or subcommittees to consult on foreign-policy matters.

4. Meetings held by the Secretary or other principal officers of the Department with the House Foreign Affairs Committee or subcommittees an consult on foreign-policy matters.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HILL.

---

MEETINGS AND APPEARANCES OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE WITH BIPARTISAN CONGRESSIONAL GROUPS, 1953 THROUGH FEBRUARY 1, 1957

1953: 40 MEETINGS AND APPEARANCES

January 22, 1953: House Foreign Affairs.
January 29, 1953: Congressional leadership.
February 10, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations.
February 13, 1953: Senate Far East Subcommittee.
February 17, 1953: House Foreign Affairs.
February 18, 1953: Senate Appropriations.
February 24, 1953: Senate Banking and Currency.
February 26, 1953: House Foreign Affairs.
February 26, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations.

March 18, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations.
March 18, 1953: House Appropriations.
March 24, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee.
March 25, 1953: Congressional leadership.
April 6, 1953: Senate Judiciary.
April 7, 1953: Senate Far East Subcommittee.
April 17, 1953: House Foreign Affairs.
April 17, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations.
April 28, 1953: House Foreign Affairs.
April 29, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations.
April 30, 1953: Senate Appropriations.
May 2, 1953: Senate Far East Subcommittee.
May 4, 1953: House Ways and Means.
May 5, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs (joint meeting).
May 6, 1953: House Foreign Affairs.
May 6, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations.
May 9, 1953: House Foreign Affairs and Senate Foreign Relations members.
June 2, 1953: House Foreign Affairs.
June 3, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations.
June 8, 1953: Senate Far East Subcommittee.
June 12, 1953: Senate Agriculture.
June 15, 1953: House Agriculture.
June 19, 1953: Congressional leadership.
June 29, 1953: Senate leadership.
June 30, 1953: House Foreign Affairs and Senate Foreign Relations (Far East Subcommittee).
July 7, 1953: Senate Far East Subcommittee.
July 7, 1953: House Appropriations.
July 9, 1953: Congressional leadership.
July 9, 1953: Senate Appropriations.
July 25, 1953: House Foreign Affairs and Senate Foreign Relations (Far East Subcommittee).
October 14, 1953: House Foreign Affairs and Senate Foreign Relations.

1954: 43 MEETINGS AND APPEARANCES

January 5, 1954: Congressional leadership.
January 7, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
January 13, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
January 18, 1954: Senate U. N. Subcommittee.
January 19, 1954: House Foreign Affairs.
February 22, 1954: Congressional leadership.
February 23, 1954: House Foreign Affairs.
February 24, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
March 19, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
March 23, 1954: House Foreign Affairs.
April 3, 1954: Congressional leadership.
April 5, 1954: House Foreign Affairs.
April 6, 1954: Senate Minerals Subcommittee.
April 20, 1954: Congressional leadership.
May 5, 1954: Congressional leadership.
May 11, 1954: House Foreign Affairs.
May 12, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
May 17, 1954: Senate Appropriations.
May 21, 1954: Senate Appropriations.
May 21, 1954: House judiciary leadership.
May 24, 1954: House leadership.
May 25, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
June 3, 1954: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.
June 4, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
June 17, 1954: Senate Far East Subcommittee.
June 23, 1954: Congressional leadership.
June 24, 1954: House Appropriations Subcommittee.
July 2, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
July 2, 1954: Senate Judiciary.
July 12, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
July 16, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
July 17, 1954: House Appropriations.
July 19, 1954: Senate Appropriations.
July 21, 1954: House Appropriations.
July 21, 1954: House Foreign Affairs.
July 22, 1954: Senate Appropriations.
July 22, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
July 27, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
August 20, 1954: Congressional leadership.
November 10, 1954: Senate Far East Subcommittee.
November 11, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
November 17, 1954: Congressional leadership.
December 14, 1954: Congressional leadership.

1955: 33 MEETINGS AND APPEARANCES

January 13, 1955: Senate Foreign Relations.
January 17, 1955: House Ways and Means.
January 20, 1955: Congressional leadership.
January 24, 1955: Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services (joint meeting).
January 24, 1955: House Foreign Affairs.
February 7, 1955: Senate Foreign Relations.
February 8, 1955: House Appropriations.
March 8, 1955: Senate Foreign Relations.
March 8, 1955: House Foreign Affairs.
March 14, 1955: Senate Finance.
March 23, 1955: Senate Finance.
March 29, 1955: Senate Foreign Relations.
March 29, 1955: 82d and 83d Clubs.
March 30, 1955: House leadership.
March 31, 1955: Senate leadership.
April 18, 1955: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.
April 19, 1955: Senate Foreign Relations.
April 26, 1955: Senate Appropriations.
May 2, 1955: Senate Judiciary.
May 3, 1955: Congressional leadership.
May 5, 1955: Senate Foreign Relations.
May 16, 1955: House Foreign Affairs.
May 17, 1955: Senate Foreign Relations.
May 25, 1955: House Foreign Affairs.
June 10, 1955: Senate Foreign Relations.
June 10, 1955: House Appropriations.
July 12, 1955: Senate Appropriations.
July 12, 1955: Congressional leadership.
July 25, 1955: Congressional leadership.
July 25, 1955: House Foreign Affairs.
July 25, 1955: Senate Foreign Relations.
October 20, 1955: Congressional leadership.
December 13, 1955: Congressional leadership.

1956: 30 MEETINGS AND APPEARANCES

January 5, 1956: House Foreign Affairs.
January 6, 1956: Senate Foreign Relations.
January 10, 1956: House Appropriations.
January 23, 1956: Senate Foreign Relations (Technical Assistance Subcommittee).
February 24, 1956: Senate Foreign Relations.
February 29, 1956: Senate Foreign Relations.
March 1, 1956: House Ways and Means.
March 22, 1956: House Foreign Affairs.
March 22, 1956: Congressional leadership.
March 23, 1956: Senate Foreign Relations.
April 10, 1956: Congressional leadership.
April 25, 1956: Senate Judiciary Committee.
April 30, 1956: Senate Foreign Relations.
April 30, 1956: Ranking members, Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs.
May 10, 1956: House Foreign Affairs.
May 15, 1956: Senate Appropriations.
May 24, 1956: House Appropriations.
June 5, 1956: Congressional leadership.
June 7, 1956: House Agriculture.
June 12, 1956: Congressional leadership.
June 13, 1956: House Appropriations.
June 19, 1956: Senate Appropriations.
June 20, 1956: Senate leadership.
June 26, 1956: Senate Foreign Relations.
July 12, 1956: Senate Appropriations.
August 12, 1956: Congressional leadership.
September 6, 1956: Members, Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs.
September 27, 1956: Members, Senate Foreign Relations.
October 15, 1956: Members, Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs.
October 29, 1956: Members, Senate Foreign Relations.

1957 (AS OF FEBRUARY 1): 14 MEETINGS AND APPEARANCES

January 1, 1957: Congressional leadership.
January 1, 1957: Congressional leadership.
January 2, 1957: Congressional leadership.
January 2, 1957: Members, Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees.
January 7, 1957: House Foreign Affairs.
January 8, 1957: House Foreign Affairs.
January 9, 1957: House Foreign Affairs.
January 14, 1957: Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees (joint meeting).
January 15, 1957: Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees (joint meeting).
January 24, 1957: Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees (joint meeting).
January 25, 1957: Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees (joint meeting).
January 28, 1957: Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees (joint meeting).
January 29, 1957: House Appropriations Subcommittee.
February 1, 1957: Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees (joint meeting).

| | |
|---|---|
| 1953 | 40 |
| 1954 | 43 |
| 1955 | 33 |
| 1956 | 30 |
| 1957 (Feb. 1) | 14 |
| Total as of Feb. 1, 1957 | 160 |

*Meetings held by the Secretary or the Under Secretary of State with congressional leaders and other Members of both Houses of Congress to consult on current foreign policy matters*

| Date | Subject | Members | Department |
|---|---|---|---|
| *1953* | | | |
| Jan. 29 | Ambassadorial nomination | Senators Sparkman and Taft | The Secretary. |
| Mar. 25 | Foreign policy discussion | Senators Green, Hickenlooper, H. A. Smith, Sparkman, Wiley; Representatives Chiperfield, Lanham, Richards, Vorys. | Do. |
| May 9 (at Department of State) | Communist proposal on prisoners of war not desiring repatriation. | Senators George, Hickenlooper, Knowland, H. A. Smith, Sparkman; Representatives Chiperfield, Richards. | Do. |
| May 22 (at Department of State). | Far East | Senators Ferguson, George, Hickenlooper, Knowland, H. A. Smith, Sparkman, Wiley; Representatives Chiperfield, Judd, Lanham, Richards, Vorys. | The Under Secretary. |
| June 19 (at Department of State). | Korea | Senators George, L. B. Johnson, Knowland, H. A. Smith, Sparkman; Representatives Chiperfield, Judd, Lanham, J. W. Martin, Richards, Vorys. | The Secretary. |
| June 20 (at Department of State). | Proposed constitutional amendment on treaties. | Senators Cooper, George, Millikin | Do. |

*Meetings held by the Secretary or the Under Secretary of State with congressional leaders and other Members of both Houses of Congress to consult on current foreign policy matters*—Continued

| Date | Subject | Members | Department |
|---|---|---|---|
| *1953*—Continued | | | |
| June 30 (at Department of State) | Korea | Senators Hickenlooper, Knowland, H. A. Smith, Sparkman, Wiley; Representatives Chiperfield, Judd, Lanham, Vorys. | The Secretary |
| July 9 (at Department of State) | Proposed Foreign Ministers meeting | Senators Bridges, George, L. B. Johnson, Knowland, Millikin, Russell, Saltonstall, Wiley; Representatives Chiperfield, Halleck, McCormack, J. W. Martin. | Do. |
| July 25 (at Department of State) | Korea | Senators Knowland, H. A. Smith, Sparkman, Wiley; Representatives Chiperfield, Judd, Lanham, Richards, Vorys. | Do. |
| Oct. 14 (at Department of State) | London trip; special problems | Senators Ferguson, Green, Sparkman, Wiley; Representatives Burleson, Judd, Vorys, Zablocki. | Do. |
| *1954* | | | |
| Jan. 5 (at White House) | Congressional leadership meeting | Senators Bridges, Clements, Ferguson, George, L. B. Johnson, Millikin, Russell, Saltonstall, Wiley; Representatives Leo Allen, Arends, Chiperfield, Halleck, McCormack, J. W. Martin, Rayburn, Richards, Short, Vinson. | Do. |
| Jan. 22 (at Department of State) | Iran | Senators George, L. B. Johnson, Knowland, Saltonstall, Wiley; Representatives Halleck, J. W. Martin, Priest, Rayburn, Short. | The Under Secretary. |
| Feb. 8 (at Department of State) | Hoover Commission recommendations on Foreign Service. | Senators Ferguson, George, Mansfield, Wiley; Representatives Bentley, Chatham, Richards, Vorys. | Do. |
| Feb. 22 (at Department of State) | Berlin Conference | Senators Clements, Ferguson, George, L. B. Johnson, Knowland, Russell, Saltonstall, Wiley; Representatives Arends, Chiperfield, McCormack, J. W. Martin, Rayburn, Richards. | The Secretary. |
| Apr. 3 (at Department of State) | International security problems; Indochina. | Senators Clements, L. B. Johnson, Knowland, Millikin, Russell; Representatives McCormack, J. W. Martin, Priest. | The Secretary, Deputy Secretary of Defense Kyes, Secretary Anderson, Admiral Radford. |
| Apr. 20 (at Department of State) | Recent discussions in Europe and plans for Geneva Conference. | Senators Bridges, Clements, Ferguson, Fulbright, Green, Hickenlooper, L. B. Johnson, Knowland, Millikin, Russell, Saltonstall, Wiley; Representatives Arends, Chiperfield, Fisher, Brooks Hays. | The Secretary. |
| Apr. 26 (at Department of State) | Indochina | Senators Fulbright, Gillette, Hickenlooper, Langer, Mansfield, H. A. Smith; Representatives Carnahan, Chiperfield, Fulton, L. H. Smith, Zablocki. | The Acting Secretary. |
| May 5 (at Department of State) | Report on Geneva Conference | Senators Bridges, Clements, Ferguson, George, Green, L. B. Johnson, Knowland, Millikin, Russell, Saltonstall, H. A. Smith, Wiley; Representatives Arends, Chiperfield, Gordon, Halleck, Judd, Lanham, McCormack, J. W. Martin, Rayburn, Short, Vinson, Vorys. | The Secretary. |
| May 21 | Refugees | House judiciary leadership | Do. |
| May 24 | Foreign policy discussion | Representatives Arends, Cannon, Carnahan, Gordon, Judd, Lanham, McCormack, Martin, Rayburn, Taber, Vorys, Wigglesworth. | Do. |
| June 23 (at White House) | Congressional leadership meeting | Senators Bridges, Byrd, Clements, Ferguson, George, Green, Hayden, L. B. Johnson, Knowland, Russell, Saltonstall, H. A. Smith, Wiley; Representatives Leo Allen, O. Brooks, Cannon, Chiperfield, Halleck, Judd, McCormack, Mahon, J. W. Martin, Rayburn, Richards, Short, Taber, Vinson, Vorys, Wigglesworth. | Do. |
| Aug. 20 (at Department of State) | Egypt | Senators Ives, Lehman, Saltonstall; Representatives Bray, Celler, Javits. | Do. |
| Nov. 17 (at White House) | Congressional leadership meeting | Senators Bridges, Clements, Ferugson, George, Hayden, L. B. Johnson, Knowland, Millikin, Russell, Saltonstall, Wiley; Representatives Leo Allen, Arends, Cannon, Chiperfield, Halleck, McCormack, J. W. Martin, Rayburn, Richards, Short, Taber, Vinson. | Do. |
| Dec. 14 (at White House) | do | Senators Clements, George, Hayden, L. B. Johnson, Russell, Wiley; Representatives Cannon, Chiperfield, McCormack, Priest, Rayburn, Richards, Short, Taber, Vinson. | Do. |
| *1955* | | | |
| Jan. 20 | Far East | Senators Byrd, Clements, George, Knowland, Saltonstall, Wiley; Representatives Arends, Chiperfield, McCormack, J. W. Martin, Richards, Vinson. | The Secretary, Under Secretary, Assistant Secretary Robertson; Admiral Radford. |
| Mar. 29 | Foreign policy discussion | 82d and 83d Clubs | The Secretary. |
| Mar. 30 (at White House) | House leadership meeting | Representatives Albert, Arends, Cannon, Chiperfield, Gordon, J. W. Martin, McCormack, Rayburn, Richards, Short, Taber, Vinson, Vorys. | Do. |
| Mar. 31 (at White House) | Senate leadership meeting | Senators Bridges, Clements, George, Green, Hayden, Hennings, L. B. Johnson, Knowland, Millikin, Russell, Saltonstall, H. A. Smith, Wiley. | Do. |
| Apr. 15 | Foreign policy discussion | Members of Senate Appropriations Committee | The Under Secretary. |
| May 3 (at White House) | Mutual security program | Senators Bridges, George, Green, Hayden, L. B. Johnson, Knowland, Millikin, Russell, Saltonstall, H. A. Smith, Wiley; Representatives Albert, Leo Allen, Arends, Cannon, Chiperfield, McCormack, J. W. Martin, Rayburn, Richards, Short, Taber, Vinson, Vorys. | The Secretary. |
| July 12 (at White House) | Geneva summit meeting | Senators Bridges, Clements, George, Green, Hayden, Hennings, Knowland, Millikin, Russell, Saltonstall, H. A. Smith, Wiley; Representatives Albert, Leo Allen, Arends, Cannon, Chiperfield, Gordon, Halleck, McCormack, Martin, Rayburn, Richards, Taber, Vinson, Vorys. | The Secretary and Under Secretary. |
| July 25 (at White House) | Report on Geneva summit meeting | Senators Bridges, Clements, George, Green, Hayden, Hennings, Knowland, Millikin, Russell, Saltonstall, H. A. Smith, Wiley; Representatives Leo Allen, Arends, Albert, Cannon, Halleck, McCormack, Rayburn, Richards, Taber, Vinson, Vorys. | The Secretary. |
| Oct. 20 (at Department of State) | Forthcoming Geneva meeting of foreign ministers. | Senators Bridges, Clements, George, Hennings, Mansfield, H. A. Smith; Representatives Cannon, Chiperfield, Halleck, J. W. Martin, Short, Taber, Vinson, Vorys. | The Secretary, Under Secretary, Counselor, Assistant Secretaries Merchant and Wilcox. |
| Dec. 13 (at White House) | Congressional leadership meeting | Senators Bridges, Byrd, George, Hayden, Hennings, L. B. Johnson, Knowland, Russell, Saltonstall, Wiley; Representatives Albert, Leo Allen, Arends, Cannon, Chiperfield, Halleck, McCormack, J. W. Martin, Rayburn, Daniel Reed, Richards, Short, Taber, Vinson, Cooper. | The Secretary, Under Secretary. |
| *1956* | | | |
| Mar. 22 (at White House) | do | Senators Bridges, George, Green, Hayden, L. B. Johnson, Knowland, Russell, Saltonstall, H. A. Smith, Wiley; Representatives Albert, Leo Allen, Arends, Halleck, McCormack, Martin, Rayburn, Richards, Short, Taber, Vinson, Vorys. | Do. |
| Apr. 10 | Middle East | Senators Bridges, George, Johnson, Knowland, Saltonstall, H. A. Smith; Representatives Albert, Arends, Halleck, McCormack, J. W. Martin, Rayburn, Richards, Vorys. | The Secretary, Counselor, Assistant Secretaries Allen and Rountree. |
| Apr. 30 (at White House) | Foreign policy discussion | Senators George, H. A. Smith; Representatives Chiperfield, Richards. | The Secretary. |
| June 5 (at White House) | Mutual-security program | Representatives Albert, Arends, Chiperfield, Gordon, Halleck, McCormack, J. W. Martin, Rayburn, Richards, Vorys. | Do. |
| June 12 (at White House) | do | Senators Bridges, Byrd, George, Green, L. B. Johnson, Knowland, Russell, Saltonstall, H. A. Smith. | Do. |

*Meetings held by the Secretary or the Under Secretary of State with congressional leaders and other Members of both Houses of Congress to consult on current foreign policy matters*—Continued

| Date | Subject | Members | Department |
|---|---|---|---|
| *1956*—Continued | | | |
| June 20 (at Department of State) | Foreign policy discussion | Senators L. B. Johnson and Knowland | The Secretary |
| Aug. 12 (at White House) | Suez Canal | Senators Bridges, Clements, George, Green, Johnson, Knowland, Millikin, Russell, Saltonstall, H. A. Smith, Wiley; Representatives Albert, Leo Allen, Arends, Carnahan, Chiperfield, Halleck, J. W. Martin, Morgan, Rayburn, Short, Vorys. | Do. |
| Sept. 6 (at Department of State) | do | Senators Humphrey, Langer, Mansfield; Representatives Carnahan, Richards. | Do. |
| Sept. 27 (at Department of State) | do | Senators Fulbright, Langer, Mansfield, H. A. Smith | Do. |
| Oct. 15 (at Department of State) | United Nations Security Council | Senators Langer, Mansfield, H. A. Smith; Representative Richards | Do. |
| Oct. 29 (at Department of State) | Middle East and eastern European developments. | Senators Fulbright, George, Langer | Do. |
| Nov. 9 (at White House) | do | Senators Bridges, Byrd, Clements, George, Green, Johnson, Knowland, Saltonstall, H. A. Smith, Wiley; Representatives Albert, Leo Allen, Cannon, Chiperfield, Halleck, McCormack, Martin, Rayburn, Richards, Short, Taber, Vinson, Vorys. | Acting Secretary. |
| *1957* | | | |
| Jan. 1 (at White House) | Middle East proposal | Senators Bridges, Byrd, George, Green, Hayden, Hennings, Hill, Knowland, L. B. Johnson, Edward Martin, Russell, Saltonstall, H. A. Smith, Wiley; Representatives Albert, Leo Allen, Arends, Cannon, Chiperfield, Cooper, Gordon, Halleck, McCormack, J. W. Martin, Rayburn, Short, Taber, Vinson, Vorys. | The Secretary. |
| Jan. 1 | Congressional leadership meeting | Senators Johnson, Knowland; Representatives Martin, Rayburn | Do. |
| Jan. 2 | Middle East | Members of Foreign Affairs Committee and Representatives Albert, Arends, Cannon, Halleck, McCormack, J. W. Martin, Taber, Vinson. | Do. |
| Do | do | Members of Foreign Relations Committee and Senators Bridges, Russell, Saltonstall. | Do. |

*Meetings held by the Secretary or other principal officers of the Department with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or subcommittees of that committee to consult on current foreign policy matters*

| Date | Subject | Committee | Department |
|---|---|---|---|
| *1953* | | | |
| Feb. 10 | Recent European trip with Mr. Stassen | Foreign Relations Committee | The Secretary; Mr. Stassen. |
| 13 | Far Eastern policy | Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs | The Secretary. |
| 18 | Near East | Subcommittee, Near Eastern and African Affairs | Assistant Secretary Byroade. |
| 26 | German debt settlement agreements | Subcommittee, Economic and Social Policy Affairs | The Secretary; Legal Adviser Phleger; Mr. Riddleberger. |
| Mar. 5 | World review | Foreign Relations Committee | Under Secretary Smith. |
| 13 | Latin America | Subcommittee, American Republics Affairs | Assistant Secretary Cabot. |
| 24 | Korea | Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs | The Secretary. |
| Apr. 2 | Proposed German cultural convention and revival of Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Consular Rights of 1923 with Germany. | Subcommittee, European Affairs | Mr. Riddleberger. |
| 7 | Soviet proposals | Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs | The Secretary. |
| 10 | Palestine refugees | Subcommittee, Near Eastern and African Affairs | Assistant Secretary Byroade. |
| 13 | Problems before United Nations; Korea; security, United States employees. | Subcommittee, United Nations Affairs | Assistant Secretary Hickerson. |
| 17 | Forthcoming North Atlantic Council meeting, Paris. | Foreign Relations Committee | The Secretary. |
| 24 | Reactivation of Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Consular Rights of 1923 with Germany. | Subcommittee, European Affairs | Mr. Riddleberger. |
| 29 | Recent North Atlantic Council meeting, Paris. | Foreign Relations Committee | The Secretary. |
| May 2 | Far East | Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs | Do. |
| 20 | Arab refugees | Subcommittee, Near East and African Affairs | Acting Secretary Smith. |
| 26 | North Atlantic Council | Subcommittee, State Department Organization | Assistant Secretary Merchant. |
| 27 | Latin America | Subcommittee, American Republics Affairs | Assistant Secretary Cabot. |
| June 3 | Recent trip in Middle East and South Asia. | Foreign Relations Committee | The Secretary. |
| 4 | European Coal and Steel Community | Subcommittee, Economic and Social Policy Affairs | Mr. Moore with Mr. Jean Monnet, President, High Authority of the European Coal and Steel Community. |
| 5 | do | Foreign Relations Committee | Miss Camp with Mr. Monnet. |
| 8 | Korea | Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs | The Secretary. |
| 9 | Spanish base agreement | Subcommittee, European Affairs | Assistant Secretary Merchant. |
| July 7 | Korea | Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs | The Secretary. |
| 16 | Recent trip to Korea | Foreign Relations Committee | Assistant Secretary Robertson. |
| 23 | United Nations | do | Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr. |
| 28 | International Tin Conference | Subcommittee, Economic and Social Policy Affairs | Assistant Secretary Waugh. |
| *1954* | | | |
| Jan. 7 | Review of world developments | Foreign Relations Committee | The Secretary. |
| Feb. 3 | Guatemala | do | Mr. Fisher. |
| 16 | Indochina | do | Acting Secretary Smith. |
| 18 | Pakistan | Subcommittee, Near Eastern and African Affairs | Assistant Secretary Byroade. |
| 19 | Panama | Subcommittee, American Republics Affairs | Mr. Muccio. |
| 24 | Recent Berlin Conference | Foreign Relations Committee | The Secretary. |
| Mar. 19 | Foreign policy review | do | Do. |
| 26 | The Saar | Subcommittee, European Affairs | Assistant Secretary Merchant. |
| Apr. 28 | Germany | Foreign Relations Committee | Ambassador Conant, United States High Commissioner for Germany. |
| May 7 | Latin America | Subcommittee, American Republics Affairs | Assistant Secretary Holland. |
| 12 | Indochina | Foreign Relations Committee | The Secretary. |
| 12 | India | do | Assistant Secretary Allen. |
| 17 | Latin America | Subcommittee, Latin American Affairs | Assistant Secretary Holland. |
| 21 | do | do | Do. |
| 25 | Far East | Foreign Relations Committee | The Secretary. |
| June 11 | Near East | Subcommittee, Near Eastern and African Affairs | Assistant Secretary Byroade. |
| 11 | Guatemala | Subcommittee, American Republics Affairs | Assistant Secretary Holland. |
| 17 | Indochina | Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs | The Secretary. |
| 22 | Germany | Subcommittee, European Affairs | Assistant Secretary Merchant. |
| 25 | Guatemala | Subcommittee, American Republics Affairs | Assistant Secretary Holland. |
| July 12 | Foreign policy discussion | Foreign Relations Committee | The Secretary. |
| 16 | Recent Paris meeting; Geneva Conference | do | Do. |
| 22 | Restoration of German sovereignty | do | Do. |
| 27 | do | do | Do. |
| 28 | Panama Treaty | Subcommittee, American Republics Affairs | Assistant Secretary Holland. |

*Meetings held by the Secretary or other principal officers of the Department with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or subcommittees of that committee to consult on current foreign policy matters*—Continued

| Date | Subject | Committee | Department |
|---|---|---|---|
| *1954* | | | |
| Nov. 10 | Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty | Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs | The Secretary; Assistant Secretary Robertson; counselor. |
| 11 | do | Foreign Relations Committee | The Secretary. |
| *1955* | | | |
| Jan. 13 | World review; Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. | do | Do. |
| 19 | France | do | Ambassador Dillon. |
| Feb. 17 | Germany | do | Ambassador Conant, United States High Commissioner for Germany. |
| Mar. 8 | Recent trip to Far East, including Southeast Asia treaty meeting. | do | The Secretary. |
| Apr. 14 | Ecuador | Subcommittee, American Republics Affairs | Ambassador Mills. |
| 15 | Implementation of Wriston report | Subcommittee, State Department—Public Affairs | Deputy Under Secretary Henderson. |
| May 2 | Latin America | Subcommittee, American Republics Affairs | Assistant Secretary Holland. |
| 3 | Europe | Subcommittee, European Affairs | Assistant Secretary Merchant. |
| 17 | NATO Ministers' meeting; Vienna meeting on Austrian Treaty. | Foreign Relations Committee | The Secretary. |
| 19 | Guatemala | Subcommittee, American Republics Affairs | Assistant Secretary Holland. |
| June 21 | Geneva Conference | Foreign Relations Committee | Under Secretary Hoover. |
| July 12 | Tangier | Subcommittee, Near Eastern, and African Affairs | Assistant Secretary Allen. |
| 25 | Recent Geneva summit meeting | Foreign Relations Committee | The Secretary. |
| *1956* | | | |
| Jan. 6 | World review | do | Do. |
| 11 | Middle East | Subcommittee, Near Eastern, and African Affairs | Assistant Secretary Allen, Ambassador Byroade. |
| 17 | Aswan Dam; mutual security program | Foreign Relations Committee | Under Secretary Hoover. |
| 18 | Indonesia; the Far East | Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs | Assistant Secretary Robertson, Ambassador Cumming. |
| 31 | India | Foreign Relations Committee | Ambassador Cooper. |
| Feb. 1 | State Department organization | Subcommittee, State Department—Public Affairs | Deputy Under Secretary Henderson, Assistant Secretary Carpenter. |
| 24 | Middle East | Foreign Relations Committee | The Secretary; Under Secretary Hoover. |
| 27 | do | do | Under Secretary Hoover. |
| Mar. 6 | Territorial waters | do | Assistant Secretary Holland, Ambassador Dreier. |
| 13 | United Nations | do | Assistant Secretary Wilcox. |
| 23 | Recent trip to South Asia and the Far East, including 2d Annual Ministerial Council of SEATO. | do | The Secretary. |
| Apr. 10 | Morocco | do | Assistant Secretary Allen. |
| Nov. 12 | Middle East | do | Acting Secretary Hoover; Deputy Under Secretaries Murphy and Henderson; Assistant Secretaries Rountree and Wilcox; Legal Adviser Phleger. |

*Meetings held by the Secretary or other principal officers of the Department with the House Foreign Affairs Committee or subcommittees of that committee to consult on current foreign policy matters*

| Date | Subject | Committee | Department |
|---|---|---|---|
| *1953* | | | |
| Jan. 22 | World review | Foreign Affairs Committee | The Secretary. |
| Feb. 17 | Recent trip to Europe; Far Eastern matters | do | Do. |
| 24 | Inter-American treaties | Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs | Acting Assistant Secretary Mann. |
| 25 | Europe | Subcommittee, Europe | Acting Assistant Secretary Bonbright. |
| Mar. 2 | Inter-American affairs | Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs | Acting Assistant Secretary Mann. |
| 5 | Near East | Subcommittee, Near East and Africa | Mr. Gardiner. |
| 10 | do | do | Assistant Secretary Byroade. |
| 11 | Germany | Subcommittee, Europe | Mr. Riddleberger, Director of Office of German Affairs. |
| 12 | Foreign economic policy | Subcommittee, Foreign Economic Policy | Assistant Secretary Linder. |
| 18 | United Nations | Subcommittee, International Organizations and Movements | Assistant Secretary Hickerson. |
| 19 | International security matters | do | Under Secretary Smith. |
| 25 | European organization | Foreign Affairs Committee | Assistant Secretary Merchant. |
| 25 | Forthcoming rubber study meeting, Copenhagen. | Subcommittee, Foreign Economic Policy | Mr. Armstrong. |
| 27 | International organizations | Subcommittee, International Organizations and Movements | Ambassador Dreier, Assistant Secretary Hickerson. |
| Apr. 17 | Forthcoming NATO meeting with foreign ministers, Paris. | Foreign Affairs Committee | The Secretary. |
| 24 | Indochina | Subcommittee, Far East and the Pacific | Mr. Bonsal. |
| 28 | Recent NATO Paris meeting | Foreign Affairs Committee | The Secretary. |
| May 7 | Spain | Subcommittee, Europe | Ambassador Dunn. |
| 20 | International organizations; Palestine refugees. | Subcommittee, International Organizations and Movements | Ambassador Dreier, Mr. Ingram. |
| 22 | Recent Latin American trip | Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs | Assistant Secretary Cabot. |
| 26 | North Atlantic Council | Subcommittee, State Department Organization and Personnel | Assistant Secretary Merchant. |
| June 2 | Recent trip to Middle East and South Asia. | Foreign Affairs Committee | The Secretary. |
| 4 | Spanish Base Agreement | Subcommittee, Europe | Assistant Secretary Merchant. |
| July 2 | Panama | Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs | Ambassador Wiley. |
| 8 | United Nations; Korea | Subcommittee, International Organizations and Movements | Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr. |
| 16 | Korea | Foreign Affairs Committee | Assistant Secretary Robertson. |
| 16 | Foreign economic policy | Subcommittees, Foreign Economic Policy and Inter-American Affairs. | Assistant Secretaries Waugh and Woodward. |
| 28 | International Tin Conference | Subcommittee, Foreign Economic Policy | Assistant Secretary Waugh. |
| 30 | East Germany | Subcommittee, Europe | Mr. Lewis. |
| *1954* | | | |
| Jan. 19 | World review | Foreign Affairs Committee | The Secretary. |
| 19 | GATT meeting, east-west trade | Subcommittee, Foreign Economic Policy | Assistant Secretary Waugh. |
| 26 | Guatemala | Foreign Affairs Committee | Ambassadors Peurifoy and Hill; Assistant Secretary Cabot. |
| 27 | Lima Conference | do | Mr. Nolting. |
| 28 | Italy | Subcommittee, Europe | Deputy Assistant Secretary Elbrick. |

*Meetings held by the Secretary or other principal officers of the Department with the House Foreign Affairs Committee or subcommittees of that committee to consult on current foreign policy matters*—Continued

| Date | Subject | Committee | Department |
|---|---|---|---|
| *1954* | | | |
| Feb. 2 | Security of American employees of the United Nations. | Subcommittee, International Organizations and Movements | Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr. |
| 5 | Near East | Subcommittee, Near East and Africa | Assistant Secretary Byroade. |
| 8 | International travel and exchange of persons. | Subcommittee, Foreign Economic Policy | Deputy Assistant Secretary Kalijarvi. |
| 16 | Foreign economic policy | do | Do. |
| 17 | Japan | Subcommittee, Far East and the Pacific | Ambassador Allison. |
| 18 | Indochina | Foreign Affairs Committee | Acting Secretary Smith. |
| 19 | Panama | Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs | Mr. Muccio. |
| 23 | Berlin Conference | Foreign Affairs Committee | The Secretary. |
| Mar. 11 | Claims against U. S. S. R. | Subcommittee, Europe | Deputy Assistant Secretary Brown. |
| 23 | Recent Inter-American meeting, Caracas. | Foreign Affairs Committee | The Secretary. |
| 24 | Near East | Subcommittee, Near East and Africa | Mr. Gardiner. |
| 25 | Europe Defense Community | Subcommittee, Europe | Assistant Secretary Merchant. |
| Apr. 1 | Near East | Subcommittee, Near East and Africa | Mr. Gardiner. |
| 9 | Recent Caracas Conference | Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs | Assistant Secretary Holland. |
| May 11 | Geneva Conference | Foreign Affairs Committee | The Secretary. |
| 19 | Latin America | Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs | Assistant Secretary Holland. |
| 19 | Guatemala | Foreign Affairs Committee | Do. |
| June 9 | do | Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs | Do. |
| 20 | Rio Economic Conference | Subcommittees, Inter-American Affairs and Foreign Economic Policy. | Assistant Secretaries Holland and Waugh. |
| July 21 | Geneva Conference | Foreign Affairs Committee | The Secretary. |
| *1955* | | | |
| Feb. 18 | Germany | Subcommittee, Europe | Ambassador Conant. |
| Mar. 1 | Agricultural surpluses | Subcommittee, Foreign Economic Policy | Assistant Secretary Waugh, Deputy Assistant Secretary Kalijarvi. |
| 3 | Far East | Subcommittee, Far East and the Pacific | Deputy Assistant Secretary Sebald. |
| 8 | Recent Southeast Asia Treaty Conference. | Foreign Affairs Committee | The Secretary. |
| 17 | Far East | Subcommittee, Far East and the Pacific | Deputy Assistant Secretary Sebald. |
| 21 | Mutual security program | Subcommittee, Europe | Assistant Secretary Merchant. |
| 25 | Geneva negotiations on General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; International Finance Corporation. | Subcommittee, Foreign Economic Policy | Deputy Assistant Secretary Kalijarvi. |
| Apr. 14 | Ecuador | Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs | Ambassador Mills. |
| May 16 | NATO ministers' meeting; Vienna meeting on Austrian Treaty. | Foreign Affairs Committee | The Secretary. |
| June 21 | Argentina | Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs | Assistant Secretary Holland. |
| July 25 | Geneva summit meeting | Foreign Affairs Committee | The Secretary. |
| *1956* | | | |
| Jan. 5 | World review | do | Do. |
| 10 | Spain | do | Ambassador John Davis Lodge. |
| 19 | Aswan Dam; mutual security program | do | Under Secretary Hoover. |
| 26 | Middle East | do | Ambassador Byroade. |
| Feb. 1 | Indonesia; Far East | do | Ambassador Cumming. |
| 9 | Latin America | Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs | Assistant Secretary Holland. |
| 20 | International organizations | Subcommittee, International Organizations and Movements | Assistant Secretary Wilcox. |
| 21 | do | do | Do. |
| 22 | Middle East | Foreign Affairs Committee | Assistant Secretary Allen. |
| 29 | Indochina | Subcommittee, Far East and the Pacific | Lt. Gen. John O'Daniel, former Chief, Saigon. |
| 29 | Latin America | Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs | Assistant Secretary Holland, Ambassador Dreier. |
| Mar. 1 | Middle East | Foreign Affairs Committee | Assistant Secretary Morton. |
| 9 | Burma | Subcommittee, Far East and the Pacific | Deputy Assistant Secretary Sebald. |
| 14 | United Nations | Foreign Affairs Committee | Assistant Secretary Wilcox. |
| 22 | Recent SEATO trip | do | The Secretary. |
| June 25 | International organizations | Subcommittee, International Organizations and Movements | Assistant Secretary Wilcox. |
| Nov. 26 | Middle East | Foreign Affairs Committee | Acting Secretary Hoover, Deputy Under Secretary Murphy, the Counselor, Assistant Secretaries Wilcox and Rountree, the Legal Adviser. |

## 1956 CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I rise to discuss a publication which I hold in my hand, but before proceeding to do so, I ask unanimous consent that without losing the floor I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I invite attention to what appears to be a committee print which is entitled "1956 General Election Campaign Report of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, Together With Minority Views, Submitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration."

This publication is not officially before the Senate. To my knowledge, it has not been presented to any meeting of the Committee on Rules and Administration. Whether it will be so presented and transmitted to the Senate is something I cannot predict. I do know that the investigations to which it relates had as their authority Senate Resolution 176. Section 3 of that resolution provides:

> The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practical date, but not later than January 31, 1957.

It is not my purpose to raise a technical point about this publication. I rise rather to disclaim any part in the majority report. It purports to give a picture of the spending to elect the candidates of the two major parties in the election last fall.

I cannot accept the report, because it is neither complete, nor in accord with the known facts, and it attempts to make a showing that one political party—the Republican Party—obtained funds from corporate sources and outspent the Democrat Party many times.

The report fails to make a full and complete tabulation of the expenditures made to elect the Democrat candidates, it ignores vast areas of expenditures entirely, and it can be given no credence as a tabulation to inform either the Senate or the country.

Early in the hearings in September, Chairman Paul Butler, of the Democratic National Committee, appeared before our committee. Among other things, he said:

> It has been reported in the press that the Republican Party plans to spend $50 million throughout the country in the coming campaign. If so, it will be the largest expenditure ever made in a political campaign, and many times what the Democratic Party will have available.
>
> I believe that analysis would show that the bulk of the money for the Republican campaign has been coming from representatives of one interest group; by large corporations. Corporations themselves, of course, cannot lawfully make political contributions. The prohibition, however, is often circumvented.

It was after the Democratic chairman set the pattern that these figures were tabulated and given to the public, totally

disregarding the one big major item in the Democratic expenditures, namely, a full tabulation of the expenditures by the unions. Only a partial tabulation of that is given.

Mr. President, the majority report uses the term "net expenditures by the major political parties." It points out that that is a more realistic figure than the receipts, because receipts are passed from one organization to another, and thus there is some duplication.

In referring to the "net expenditures," on page 2 of the committee print, we find the following:

> The subcommittee found that the net expenditures by major political parties or political action committees, based upon information received, were as follows:
> Republican, $20,685,387.
> Democratic, $10,977,790.
> Labor, $941,271.
> Miscellaneous, $581,277.

The figure I wish to challenge at this particular time is the labor figure of $941,271, nationwide.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, at this point, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Before the Senator from Nebraska discusses the lack of information in regard to labor expenditures, I wonder whether he will answer a question for me. During the course of the hearings before the committee, was the Committee for an Effective Congress called before it, to the Senator's memory?

Mr. CURTIS. To the best of my recollection, it was not.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That emphasizes a fact that I rather dislike to bring out, namely, the general disappointment at the report. In my opinion, the committee was faced with a real challenge. I think the challenge was one which the American people wanted it to face. But I must agree with my colleague, the Senator from Nebraska, that the report leaves much to be desired. In fact, to be perfectly honest about it, I think the report could well have been written by Paul Butler in the Democratic national headquarters. For instance, whether we like to admit it or not, the Committee for an Effective Congress is a most effective tool in the hands of a small number of persons who are attempting to elect to this body a so-called liberal Congress. I do not dispute their right to do so. I only warn the conservative element that that group is attempting to elect a so-called liberal Congress of the United States. That group does not back conservatives. Again, that is a prerogative of the group. However, I would hate to think that had anything to do with the failure to call representatives of the group before the committee; I would hate to assume that it was for that reason that representatives of the group were not called before it.

Mr. President, in connection with this matter, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of contributions to the Committee for an Effective Congress from January 1, 1956, through the period of the election.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Contributions to Committee for an Effective Congress*

REPORT FOR PERIOD JAN. 1 THROUGH MARCH 9, 1956

The following is a list of contributors of $100 or more during this period:

| | |
|---|---|
| Jan. 13, 1956, Mrs. Ellen Holtgman, NYC | $100 |
| Jan. 13, 1956, Charles Rose, NYC | 500 |
| Jan. 13, 1956, James P. Warburg, NYC | 100 |
| Feb. 2, 1956, Moses D. Blitzer, NYC | 100 |
| Feb. 2, 1956, Herbert Rothschild, NYC | 500 |
| Feb. 7, 1956, Susan M. Lee, NYC | 1,000 |
| Feb. 8, 1956, Harry L. Seldon, NYC | 350 |
| Feb. 17, 1956, Mrs. Aline Weiss, NYC | 100 |
| Feb. 29, 1956, Dr. Viola W. Bernard, NYC | 300 |
| Mar. 8, 1956, John Wolf, NYC | 250 |

REPORT FOR PERIOD MARCH 10, 1956, THROUGH JUNE 7, 1956

(Report submitted by Sidney H. Scheuer, Agent, suite 1001–E, 30 East 48th Street, New York 17, N. Y.)

Contributions in amounts of less than $100, $3,604.05.

Total contributions, $10,904.05.

Total expenditures, $9,449.39.

One political contribution was made during this period, as follows:

April 19, 1956, to William D. MacMillan, treasurer, Tydings campaign committee, Baltimore, Md., $500.

The following is a list of contributors of $1,000 or more during this period:

March 13, 1956, Sidney H. Scheuer, NYC, $1,000.

April 2, 1956, Geo. D. Pratt, Jr., Bridgeport, $1,000.

April 13, 1956, the Mayer Family, NYC, $1,000.

April 26, 1956, Charles Gutwirth and Isidore Lipschultz, NYC, $1,000.

REPORT FOR PERIOD JUNE 8, 1956, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 6, 1956

(Report submitted by George E. Agree, agent, Suite 1001–E, 30 E. 48th Street, New York 17, N. Y.)

Contributions in amounts of less than $100, $3,823.00.

Total contributions, $22,003.39.

Total expenditures, $16,093.43.

Included in the expenditures for this period were the following individuals in addition to those already mentioned as salaried employees: Rosalind Salant, Rye, N. Y.; Doris R. Williams, Mary D. Grimes, Erni S. Berkley, New York City; Ralph Busch, W. Kerr Scott, Washington, D. C.; Jill B. Jakes, New York City.

The following is a list of contributors of $500 or more during this period:

| | |
|---|---|
| June 12, 1956, Isidore Lipschutz, New York City | $500 |
| June 14, 1956, Marshall Field, New York City | 1,000 |
| June 15, 1956, Sidney H. Scheuer, New York City | 500 |
| June 19, 1956, Richard Salomon, New York City | 500 |
| June 27, 1956, The Mayer Family, New York City | 1,000 |
| August 1, 1956, The Mayer Family, New York City | 1,000 |
| August 9, 1956, Laird Bell, Chicago | 500 |
| August 13, 1956, Joseph D. Shane, Beverly Hills | 1,000 |
| August 24, 1956, John Stahl, Los Angeles | 500 |
| August 31, 1956, Yoland D. Markson, Los Angeles | 1,000 |
| August 31, 1956, Ben Zukor, Beverly Hills | 500 |
| September 6, 1956, Geo. D. Pratt, Jr., Bridgeport | 4,000 |
| | 12,000 |

Under expenditures, the following campaign contributions were noted:

June 12, 1956, Stengel for Senator committee, Chicago, $500.

June 19, 1956, Iowans for Evans committee, Washington, D. C., $500.

June 19, 1956, Indianans for Wickard committee, Washington, D. C., $500.

August 31, 1956, Morse campaign fund, Portland, $1,550.

REPORT FOR PERIOD JUNE 25, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 6, 1956, FILED BY A CLEAN POLITICS APPEAL (NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR AN EFFECTIVE CONGRESS)

(Report submitted by George E. Agree, agent suite 101–E, 30 East 48th Street, New York 17, N. Y.)

Contributions in amounts of less than $100, $22,439.02.

Total contributions, $26,109.02.

Total expenditures, $19,614.16.

A review of the attachment to this report known as supplement A, listed the names of 25 individuals who contributed $100 or more. The largest amount noted was $300 contributed by Mrs. Thomas Fleming of Pasadena, Calif., on July 2, 1956.

Campaign contributions made during this period:

June 30, 1956, Stengel for Senate Committee, Chicago, $500.

June 30, 1956, Morse campaign fund, Portland, $500.

June 30, 1956, Wm. D. MacMillan, treasurer, (Tydings Campaign Committee), Baltimore, $500.

July 16, 1956, Stengel for Senate Committee, Chicago, $1,000.

July 16, 1956, Morse campaign fund, Portland, $1,000.

July 24, 1956, Stengel for Senate Committee, Chicago, $500.

August 13, 1956, Morse campaign fund, Portland, $1,733.

August 13, 1956, Stengel for Senate Committee, Chicago, $758.40.

August 15, 1956, Stengel for Senate Committee, Chicago, $1,000.

August 21, 1956, Morse campaign fund, Portland, $1,750.

August 21, 1956, Stengel for Senator Committee, Chicago, $1,750.

August 22, 1956, Stengel for Senator Committee, Chicago, $1,000.

August 28, 1956, Morse campaign fund, Portland, $2,000.

August 30, 1956, Stengel for Senator Committee, Chicago, $1,000.

August 30, 1956, Morse campaign fund, Portland, $1,000.

REPORT FOR PERIOD SEPTEMBER 7 THROUGH OCTOBER 22, 1956

(Report submitted by George E. Agree, agent, suite 1001–E, 30 East 48th Street, New York 17, N. Y.

Contributions in amounts of less than $100, $1,120.60.

Total contributions, $10,065.35.

Total expenditures, $14,082.14.

The following individuals were listed as having contributed $500 or more:

September 10, 1956, Dr. and Mrs. Francis North, Menlo Park, Calif., $500.

September 12, 1956, Gifford Phillips, Beverly Hills, $1,000.

September 13, 1956, Louis H. Boar, Beverly Hills, $1,000.

September 14, 1956, Isadore Lipschutz, New York City, $500.

October 15, 1956, Herbert H. Lehman, New York City, $1,000.

October 15, 1956, Michael W. Straight, Washington, D. C., $500.

October 19, 1956, J. M. Kaplan, New York City, $1,000.

October 19, 1956, The Mayer Family, New York City, $1,000.

The following campaign contributions were made:

September 7, 1956, Iowans for Evans Committee, Washington, D. C., $2,000.

September 7, 1956, Indianians for Wickard Committee, Washington, D. C., $2,000.

September 13, 1956, Church for Senator Committee, Boise, $500.

September 14, 1956, Iowans for Evans Committee, Washington, D. C., $500.

September 14, 1956, Indianians for Wickard Committee, Washington, D. C., $500.

October 19, 1956, Indianians for Wickard Committee, Washington, D. C., $500.

REPORT FOR PERIOD SEPTEMBER 7, THROUGH OCTOBER 22, 1956, BY A CLEAN POLITICS APPEAL (NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR AN EFFECTIVE CONGRESS)

(Report submitted by: George E. Agree, Agent, suite 1001–E, 30 East 48th Street, New York 17, N. Y.)

Contributions in amounts of less than $100, $31,634.28.

Total contributions, $38,481.08.

Total expenditures, $41,717.65.

The following individuals contributed $500 or more for this period:

September 14, 1956, Ed. V. Peterson, Alta, Iowa, $696.80.

September 28, 1956, Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Vanderbilt, Englewood, Fla., $1,000.

REPORT FOR PERIOD OCTOBER 23 THROUGH OCTOBER 31, 1956

Total contributions, $18,050.90.

The following individuals contributed $500 or more for this period:

October 23, 1956, Duncan Phillips, Washington, D. C., $500.

October 23, 1956, Lou Boyar, Beverly Hills, $2,500.

October 23, 1956, Seniel Ostrow, West Los Angeles, $3,051.30.

October 23, 1956, Joseph D. Shane, Beverly Hills, $2,500.

October 29, 1956, Susan Lee, New York City, $500.

October 29, 1956, Harry Louis Seldon, New York City, $500.

October 29, 1956, Will Clayton, Lexington, Ky., $500.

The following campaign contributions were made:

October 25, 1956, Church for Senator Committee, Boise, $1,500.

October 25, 1956, Indianians for Wickard Committee, Washington, D. C., $500.

October 25, 1956, Iowans for Evans Committee, Washington, D. C., $500.

October 26, 1956, Treasurer, Wiley for Senator Club, Washington, D. C., $1,500.

October 29, 1956, Marland for Senator Committee, Charleston, $1,000.

October 30, 1956, Ayres Campaign Committee, Akron, Ohio, $300.

October 30, 1956, Fulton Campaign Committee, Pittsburgh, Pa., $300.

October 30, 1956, Heselton Campaign Committee, Deerfield, Mass., $300.

October 30, 1956, Scott Campaign Committtee, Philadelphia, Pa., $300.

October 30, 1956, McCarthy Campaign Committee, St. Paul, Minn., $300.

REPORT FOR PERIOD OCTOBER 23 THROUGH OCTOBER 31, 1956, BY A CLEAN POLITICS APPEAL (NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR AN EFFECTIVE CONGRESS)

(Report submitted by George R. Donahue, agent, 1001–E, 30 East 48th Street, New York 17, N. Y.)

Contributions in amounts of less than $100, $6,005.08.

Total contributions, $6,305.08.

Total expenditures, $5,701.64.

On supplement A attached to this report, there were only 3 individuals listed as contributing $100 each.

The following campaign contributions were made:

October 24, 1956, Stengel for Senator Committee, Chicago, $1,000.

October 24, 1956, Morse campaign fund, Washington, D. C., $1,000.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I call the attention of Senators to the fact that on looking at this table there will be found many contributions in excess of $1,000, contributions which I feel should have been listed, inasmuch as the committee felt it necessary to make a detailed tabulation of everybody in this country who felt urged to give money to a political candidate or campaign—none of them in violation of the law, but made to appear, as this list might appear, as if it were a criminal list.

I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska one more question, if he cares to answer. Were the Americans for Democratic Action called before the committee for questioning as to their possible contributions to campaigns?

Mr. CURTIS. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Arizona that when he first raised that question today, I was not sure. I do not recall that they were, and I have been unable to locate any reference to it in the report.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I was not able to do so, either.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator will turn to Exhibit 29, on page 17, he will find reference to the Committee for an Effective Congress, including receipts and direct expenditures.

Mr. GOLDWATER. On page 17?

Mr. GORE. Exhibit 29, page 17. If the Senator from Nebraska will yield further, a more detailed report of the contributions received by that political committee is available in the report filed by the subcommittee, on which the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska served. I am glad to say the Committee for an Effective Congress was sent questionnaires, that it responded, and that the facts as reported by it have been fairly and accurately reported by the subcommittee.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield for one further question?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator from Nebraska recall the appearance before the committee of the Clean Politics Appeal, which I understand raised a considerable amount of money in the last campaign, and is already at work raising money for the next campaign?

Mr. CURTIS. I cannot say it did, but, as I say, I have not had any opportunity to look into it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator. I should like to interrupt him again when he begins his discussion of the union entity.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Very briefly; yes.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator will refer to the same exhibit he will find listed the Clean Politics Appeal, with receipts of $45,598. He will also find the direct expenditures.

I should like to say to the Senator that the report is nearly 1,000 pages long. I realize it is somewhat difficult to plow through it to find each of the facts in which Senators are interested, but the staff of the subcommittee is thoroughly familiar with it, and the special counsel is present at my elbow. He has aided me in finding this material, and I am sure he will be able to supply such information as the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska desires.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator.

Referring again to the expenditure figure of $941,271 spent by labor throughout the United States, that figure is so shockingly low that it should be a challenge to everyone. I inquired of the staff of the subcommittee as to how much of that figure was allocated to Michigan, that great industrial State, and I received the reply that $79,939 was spent by labor in the State of Michigan in the last campaign.

It is conceded that practically all of those expenditures were for Democrat candidates. The report so states. It is a matter of common knowledge.

Along with the suggestion that only $79,000 was spent in Michigan, I desire to call attention to a story written by Asher Lauren, in the Detroit (Mich.) News of October 7, in which he reports that $1.20 a year was assessed against the 700,000 Michigan union members as citizenship funds, and made available for political activities, in addition to the funds raised by voluntary contributions.

That might be more like the fact. If it were only 10 cents a month, it would be $1 million, not $79,000. The junior Senator from Nebraska laid before the committee certain facts about one local union at Flint, Mich. It is mentioned in the report. It was Local 599, UAW, at Flint, Mich.

The minutes of that union, as well as their various councils of government within the union, showed that they voted to assess each of their members 47½ cents as a contribution for political activities to influence the election.

In this one union, in one city in Michigan, that amounted to $25,000. It was so estimated. The minutes of the union show that they voted to call out their political committees and have them work for 1 month before election. Just how many were involved, I do not know. A further motion provided that they would hire 100 political workers for 3 days before election. What I am saying applies in this one political union. Were they volunteers? No. The minutes of their own meetings show that they were to be paid $20 a day, and $5 for expenses. The individuals were to go forth and win the election. Yet that is not tabulated as a part of the cost of the recent election.

On the other hand, in the document to which I have made reference, individuals are held up to ridicule, scorn, and censorship because they made a contribution that was reported, and which is not in violation of law. I think everybody who runs for office would welcome a situation where more people contributed to the campaign funds, because that would make more people interested in the elections. But if the limit as to how much an individual can give is too high, it is the responsibility of the Congress to change it, and not to let the law remain as it is and then hold a

citizen up to censorship for having made a political contribution within the law.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on October 9 it was my privilege and pleasure to appear before the committee to interrogate Mr. McDevitt and Mr. Kroll, of the Committee on Political Education, on these exact points. I am sure the Senator from Nebraska remembers it, because he was there with me. I was prompted to ask these questions by the growing realization that political planning by unions has taken an entirely different tack from what it has been in years gone by. I think that through the efforts of a number of people in this country we have been able to smoke out the fact that in the past political candidates were supported by compulsory dues or money. I doubt whether or not that continues today. In all fairness to the unions, I think there is evidence to show that they have stopped direct contributions from the general fund. However, we now have the unions—and when I say the unions I do not include all the unions of America, but those most actively engaged in politics at the national level—embarking on an entirely different route. They are now educating their people; and, mind you, Mr. President, the working people of this country know more about what is going on in the country than does any other group. In this attempted education, television, radio, and other news media are used.

Along with that, the unions are also engaged in activities which, were a corporation to indulge in them, would certainly result in the corporation's being called before the courts, because the law prohibits a labor union or a corporation from making a contribution or contributing in any way to a campaign.

I came to that conclusion from the conviction that the law was being circumvented in several ways. For instance, I read in Businessweek of November 3, a little squib which reads:

> Labor is concentrating on getting out the vote. As in most other industrial centers, it will provide car pools, baby sitters, and telephone reminder squads working on the outside. Just for Democrats? "Oh, no," a Toledo United Labor committee spokesman said. "We will pick anyone up on election day, Democrats, Independents, nonpartisans, everybody except Republicans."

The Senator will recall that during the course of that questioning, I asked the committee chairman, and the staff through the committee chairman, if an interrogation could not be made along those lines to determine just how many people from union ranks were used on election day, whereby the same people would be paid by the writeoff funds, or whatever they may want to call it.

The Senator will recall that Mr. McDevitt disclaimed any knowledge of the existence of such a fund, yet during the course of an investigation of a similar nature by another committee, of which I am a member, we found that in Local 65, United Steel Workers of America, $3,900 was spent in the last general election, $3,000 from dues, or general fund, sometimes referred to as lost-time reimbursement fund.

I was further prompted to ask these questions because of a letter which came to my attention, from the Greater Detroit-Wayne County Industrial Union Council, which called attention to an important meeting of the 17th district CIO–PAC workers, where there would be a discussion of the primary of August 7:

> If you are interested in working on election day for expenses, it is particularly important that you attend the meeting.

I asked the committee to get information from various unions involved, as to whether or not the layoff fund was being used to pay men to work at the polls, or to work on election day. I read from the report an interesting comment. It is stated that this investigation was made at the request of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska:

> Thus, it appears, the Greater Flint Industrial Union Council requested its locals to furnish to the council the sum of 47½ cents per member for use in the election campaign and to call out from their plants their political action committees and political candidates from October 8 to November 8, 1956. The executive board of local 599, at a meeting help September 7, 1956, voted to concur in the request of the council, and to recommend to the local that anyone called out of the shop be paid $20 per day, but not more than $100 per week. At the regular membership meeting of local 599 held, pursuant to the usual notice, on September 9, 1956, it was voted to concur in the request of the council and to adopt the recommendation of the executive board. It was not possible to establish in the course of the investigation whether this request was for a voluntary contribution from the members or whether an assessment was actually made.

I compliment the staff for having made what I consider to be a rather efficient investigation. I think they could have gone a little further. However, I am amazed, as a result of the staff's finding, as a result of newspaper and magazine articles from all over the country citing the intention of certain unions which are bound and determined to become strong politically to use their manpower from shops in layoffs on election day, that the committee was unable to arrive at some monetary value to attach to the labor of many thousands of people working on election day.

The Senator is a practical politician. He does not care particularly whether a donation is made to him of $1,000 or whether he receives a thousand dollars' worth of manpower help in the course of an election. One of the disturbing things about the report—and, frankly, one of the disappointing things, because I feel that the committee missed a real challenge and an opportunity to give the legislative body something to go on when we are in process of formulating laws to cover this general area—is the failure to include in the expenditure of the Democratic Party any sums of money for the vast pool of men, automobiles, and telephone calls.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator.

It is not only a question of manpower—and there is a great deal of paid manpower for 3 or 4 or 5 weeks before the election, and greater numbers of men and women just before the election; but in addition, out of their regular organization funds, radio programs, shop publications, and even voting records are paid for.

It might be contended that if an organization gets out a voting record as to how Senators or Representatives voted, it must be purely educational, designed to give the people information. But it is rather interesting to note that these voting records are not in that category. The one we had before us when Mr. Reuther appeared before the committee did not show how Senators and Representatives voted on major issues. It merely used the letters "R" and "W"—right or wrong. If an educational institution, a library, or any other group wished to compile such a record for informational purposes, certainly it would state that a Senator voted for or against certain legislation.

The ADA list used a "plus" or "minus" sign to indicate whether, in their opinion, and under their definition, the vote was a liberal vote or not. That is not an educational matter. That is a campaign publication.

Coming back to the State of Michigan, I wonder how they did so much with $79,000. They have a radio and television commentator by the name of Guy Nunn. The undisputed testimony before our committee was that in the election of 1954 his program was so political that the local station issued a disclaimer with respect to it—the usual disclaimer used in connection with political broadcasts. Yet there is no tabulation of that item.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. In a moment. I wish to follow through with this broadcast.

I secured one of Guy Nunn's broadcasts, which was paid for out of union funds.

After the opening, the voice of Adlai Stevenson was brought in. Mr. Stevenson's voice was carried for some time, in a favorable light. Among other things Mr. Stevenson said on this Guy Nunn program:

> Responsible union leaders have proposed programs for industrial rehabilitation and aid to the distressed areas.
>
> The Democratic platform endorses these proposals. Senator Paul Douglas of my State, and other Democrats, have already introduced bills in Congress to establish such programs.
>
> I know that when Congress reconvenes they can, with the White House endorsement that they have lacked so far, be enacted into law.

Later in the same program Guy Nunn said this:

> You know, there is one big issue in this presidential campaign that the Republican are not talking about, openly at any rate. As a matter of fact, the Democrats are pretty quiet about it, too. But the people, voters all over America, are talking about it and thinking about it plenty. That issue is the state of health of President Eisenhower.
>
> Last year the President had a very serious heart attack. Early in June of this year he underwent emergency surgery for a severe illness.
>
> The Republican medicine men, Leonard Hall and others, insist that the President is now in better shape than he was before his

heart attack and before the ileitis operation—

And so on.

I do not question their right to campaign. There is no issue here of free speech. But I say that when money is spent for programs like that, it should be included in a tabulation showing how much was spent to elect Democrats and how much was spent to elect Republicans. It was not even listed as institutional advertising, which is given some attention in this publication.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Referring to the hearings before the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, part 2, on page 311, during the course of my interrogation of Mr. McDevitt, Mr. Kroll, and Mr. Woll, I asked questions directed specifically to the point which the Senator has been making. I quote in part:

> Now, it is my feeling that when these broadcasts which are completely slanted against one party and against candidates of that party, and by that effect are political, that to be in keeping with what you just said and with what Mr. McDevitt—and Mr. Kroll has not committed himself—but Mr. McDevitt claims that you should take that out of the political fund and not the general fund.
>
> Mr. WOLL. We don't take the position that we should take it out of the political fund.

In other words, they take the attitude that these broadcasts and television shows, which were completely slanted toward the Democratic Party, and paid for out of union funds, should not come out of the voluntary contribution fund which they maintain for political activities.

If the Senator will yield a moment further, while he points out that they are within their legal rights in doing this, I have maintained all along that there is a moral issue involved, as to whether or not it is morally correct to take the money of a Republican, in the form of compulsory dues, and spend it for a Democrat, especially when the Republican will go to the polls and vote against the Democratic candidate, and the philosophies he represents, at election time.

I am sure the Senator from Nebraska shares my view, because we have discussed the question many times. I am glad the Senator brought out the fact that these broadcasts went on during the campaign, and are still going on. They went on before the campaign. They are completely political, in my mind, and if anyone cares to hear them, I have a rather extensive collection of transcriptions and television films emanating from Detroit, which I shall be glad to allow Senators to listen to. I shall be glad to show them the films. Anyone who, after seeing or hearing these statements, believes that they are nonpolitical, in my judgment, should make another venture into the wonderland of politics.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator from Arizona. In my minority view I made the statement that, if a full tabulation were made, it would probably appear that the expenditures which were made to elect the candidates of both political parties had been about the same. That would be shown if a complete tabulation were made. I stand on that statement. The easiest expenditure to measure, perhaps, is the amount of money spent for radio and television. That information is public. The station is required to keep a record. The station is a licensee. All stations must respond and give that kind of information.

Mr. President, on the basis of the committee's tabulations, the total amount spent for radio and television is about 2.9 to 4 in favor of the Republicans. However, that does not include any tabulations of programs such as the Guy Nunn program, which was referred to.

In other words, in an area campaign, where we can get an objective view of how much is spent, there is no such spread as indicated on page 2 of the report.

In all fairness I must say that, while I have strong feelings about this, I certainly do not challenge anyone's motives. We are dealing with a difficult problem, namely, the question of what constitutes a political expenditure and what constitutes a contribution and what is purely educational and what is citizenship.

Congress will never get an accurate accounting on how much money is spent in a campaign until we redefine the terms and make them more exact.

Therefore I agree that the majority and the staff and everyone involved were wrestling with a difficult problem, and I do not challenge their motives in the least. The point I do object to is the holding out of incomplete and inaccurate tabulations to the world as the full picture of the expenditures involved. I very respectfully make that criticism. I believe it is a valid criticism.

For example, let us take one item, which is one of the most expensive items in campaigning. It is the providing of personnel to help voters register. The individuals who want a certain side to win in the election are the ones who provide the money for that expenditure. Great sums of money were spent for registration of voters. What for? The money was spent to win the election. That was the reason for it. However, those expenditures are not tabulated in the report. In one Northwestern State some Republicans—perhaps they were a bit ill advised—went to a little effort to test some of the registrations, to determine whether the registrations were accurately made.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In that Northwestern State, which happens to be the State I have the honor, in part, to represent in the United States Senate, did those people try to determine if any Republicans were registered inaccurately, or only whether Democrats were registered inaccurately?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not know. I presume it was done in an effort to win the election.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Why does the Senator bring up that point if he does not know about it?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not know whom they were trying to check. My point is that registration is a political activity and a political expense, and both sides should report it as such.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The point I am making is this: Did those people attempt to determine whether Republicans and Democrats were registered inaccurately or allegedly illegally, or whether only Democrats were registered inaccurately or illegally?

Mr. CURTIS. I believe this was an endeavor undertaken by Republicans to find holes in Democratic registrations.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am glad the Senator regards it as such.

Mr. CURTIS. I regard registration as I do all other expenses along that line, namely, as an expenditure to win an election.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CURTIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Let us presume that a crucial election is taking place within a State and that one of the vital issues in that election, and perhaps even the most vital issue in that crucial election, involves the so-called partnership power program. Suppose a combination of private utility companies mails throughout the State thousands and thousands of copies of an elaborate brochure, and that those brochures are printed and published and distributed at great cost. Let us suppose, further, that the brochures take the side of one particular faction in the controversy and criticizes the other side. Is that an election expenditure, or is it not?

Mr. CURTIS. I cannot set myself up as a judge in a hypothetical case. However, I contend that any activity, the purpose of which is to influence votes, is a political expenditure.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator believe that an expenditure for such a brochure, namely, for printing it and publishing it and distributing it, should be charged to the rate payers of that private power company?

Mr. CURTIS. I have not seen the brochure, I cannot answer the Senator's question.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator know that following the 1952 election a great newspaper, the New York Times, which had supported the Republican nominees for President and for Vice President in that election, assigned a very extensive staff of its correspondents in an attempt to determine the visible sums of money which had been spent in behalf of each major party? I wonder whether I could read into the RECORD at this point, if the Senator does not object, the sums of money which the New York Times correspondents discovered had been spent on behalf of each major party?

Mr. CURTIS. What election is that?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The 1952 election.

Mr. CURTIS. I have no objection, even though it does not relate to this discussion.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Oh, it does, indeed. I beg to differ with the distinguished Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. What does it say with reference to paid manpower working before the election?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I do not know whether it includes paid manpower either by trade unions or by corporations.

Mr. CURTIS. What is meant by visible evidence?

Mr. NEUBERGER. If the Senator does not mind I should like to read the New York Times description of it into the RECORD.

Mr. CURTIS. May I ask what is meant by visible?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to point out to the distinguished Senator the reason I believe it has a bearing on the report under consideration is that the discovery made by the staff correspondents of the New York Times, that distinguished American newspaper, which supported the Republican nominees for the highest offices in the land, shows almost the same division of expenditures as that contained in the report just made by the subcommittee under the able chairmanship of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. That is why I believe it is pertinent.

Mr. CURTIS. What is the Senator's request?

Mr. NEUBERGER. May I have the figures included in the RECORD at this point, or does the Senator prefer that I wait?

Mr. CURTIS. No; if it will not take too long, I have no objection.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The figures discovered with respect to election expenditures by States, by the correspondents of the New York Times, reveal that the Republicans spent, in the States where these figures were analyzed, $18,769,848; and that the Democrats spent $6,847,725. If the Senator does not object, I shall be glad to read the brief description in the Times.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to know what they spent that money for.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I shall read this description:

> The following table was compiled from reports submitted by correspondents of the New York Times on campaign expenditures in 1952. The total figure for the States does not purport to be the total amount actually spent, but wherever possible it represents the total according to official reports from the statements of competent party officials.
>
> Where outlays of labor groups went to the Democratic candidates, they have been added to the column of Democratic spending.

I could go on further, but I do not wish to presume too much on the Senator's time. However, that was discovered by the correspondents of the New York Times.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think what the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon has brought out strengthens the argument the Senator from Nebraska and the junior Senator from Arizona have been trying to make; namely, there is nothing illegal about donations that are listed. The donations, so far as they go, are probably as accurate as any list can be accurate.

What the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and I are discussing are the hidden amounts, namely, the amounts which are not reported, by virtue of the fact that the Democrat Party is blessed daily by broadcasts and television shows in their favor, paid for from the general funds of the UAW–CIO; and by the fact that on election day people are available to make hundreds of thousands of telephone calls and to drive cars which are supplied with gasoline. In other words, they are doing what the Democrat Party and the Republican Party should be doing as political parties. I do not wish to stand here and argue the rightness or the wrongness of it. I maintain it is morally wrong. However, that is not to be argued at this time. I do believe such money should be included in the total. In other words, if a man comes to me and says, "Senator, you are running for reelection. I will give you a hundred men to work for you on election day." If I did not report that fact, I would be in error, and I could be held in contempt of the law. That is what we are trying to say.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Would the able Senator from Arizona not agree that it might be a very wise step in American life to outlaw all campaign contributions by private individuals, by corporations, and by trade unions, and to have the United States Treasury underwrite them, so that no one would be elected with the help of private sources of campaign contributions? Let me say that this idea was first proposed exactly 50 years ago this year by a very illustrious Republican President of the United States in a special message to Congress.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I decline to yield further.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska allow me to answer the Senator from Oregon, inasmuch as I was asked the question?

Mr. CURTIS. Very well.

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; I cannot agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that that would be a solution to these problems. I may say to the Senator from Oregon, because he is interested in this, that I serve on a committee which has been investigating lobbying and campaign expenses. While I cannot speak for the entire committee, because I have no knowledge that we will have unanimous concurrence concerning the testimony which has been offered, it has become more and more clear in our minds that spending during political campaigns cannot be controlled.

So long as money is printed and can be passed around, the issue remains a moral issue—is it right or is it wrong? I think it is up to the individual candidate to decide for himself; I think it is up to the individual donor to decide for himself.

There are many pitfalls in the proposal which Theodore Roosevelt made. I see similar pitfalls in the same proposal which the Senator from Oregon made, I believe, 2 years ago.

I, myself, speaking as the junior Senator from Arizona, am scared stiff about having the Federal Government do anything that the people can do better.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I should like to yield further, but the hour is late. I wish to make a comment on this point; then I will yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

If there is a feeling that there is something intrinsically evil about contributing to a political campaign or about receiving a political contribution, Congress should outlaw it. But I do not believe that as to the contributions listed very much evidence of impropriety was adduced, either in giving a contribution or in receiving one.

There are always those who have reservoirs of help, and who come forward and say, "Let us pass a law that a contribution of more than so much cannot be made."

Mr. Walter Reuther came before our committee and advocated a $5 limit on political giving. Later that same day I asked him:

> Are you acquainted with one Roy L. Reuther?

He answered:

> I am. He happens to be my brother.

I then asked Mr. Walter Reuther:

> Did he in 1954 hold any position in a union?

The answer was:

> He did. He was on the staff of the UAW.

Then I said:

> According to the Congressional Quarterly in reference to the 1954 election, Roy Reuther * * * is reported to have contributed $5,000 to the campaign of Senator Barkley, of Kentucky.
>
> Is that a correct report?

I could go on with the reply, but the point was in effect, Yes, he was a conduit for it, but the funds were UAW funds.

That was the testimony of a witness who advocated a limitation of $5.

In the cause of good government—and Democrats believe in it just as do Republicans—both sides have their economic and political philosophies, which they believe are best for the Nation. I happen to believe that that clash of ideologies and the taking of the questions to the people is a mighty good thing. But to get the story over is an important function in the operation of self-government. It costs money to show a candidate to the public. It costs money to give him a chance to express his ideas.

The providing of that money is just like any other good cause. If a hospital, a school, or a church is to be built, many little gifts are needed, but also it is necessary to call on those who can give more to do so.

Our attitude should be that if someone gives for an improper motive, or if someone receives for an improper motive, that situation should be dealt with. But are we, by such conduct, going to prohibit people from participating in elec-

tions by giving of their money, or to cause them to violate the law, and then hold them up to scorn and censorship? Shall we say that the Halls of Congress are closed to everyone except the wealthy?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have listened with great interest to my distinguished colleague from Nebraska. I point out that in this report, which is factual, no one is held up to scorn or ridicule. I think our chairman, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], has made a notable achievement. He did not claim that we have all the facts. But certainly the Senator from Nebraska well knows, he being a member of that committee, having participated in all the hearings, and having given his assent to the action taken by the subcommittee, that the Senator from Tennessee has done everything he possibly could do to try to get a full, fair, and factual report, without fear or favor. I think he is entitled to a vote of thanks from the Senate and the people of the country for having, for the first time, put into a book, so far as it is possible to do so, the amount of money spent, where it came from, and by whom it was contributed. The book marks a milestone in the election history of the United States of America.

My good friend, the distinguished Senator from Arizona, asked if we had any information pertaining to the Americans for Democratic Action. Yes, that organization is listed, together with the contributions it received and the names of the contributors.

The same is true of an organization known as The Clean Politics Appeal. The contributions and the names of the donors are given.

The National Committee for an Effective Congress is listed, and the contributions and the names of the contributors are given.

We have, to the best of our knowledge, exempted no particular group, but have tried to bring them all into the picture, so that the compilation would be as fair, as factual, and as complete as possible.

The Senator from Nebraska mentioned something about the Greater Flint Industrial Union Council, at page 18. He will remember that he himself made the motion that this particular question be referred to the Department of Justice. It was.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the Senator yield briefly for a question at this point?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Surely.

Mr. CURTIS. Was the amount of money raised by local 599, UAW, in Flint, included in the tabulation of $79,000 for the State of Michigan, which made up the total figure for union spending?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall have to ask counsel for the committee for the information, if the Senator will excuse me.

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that if these were voluntary funds, they are included. If they were not, the matter will have to be determined by the Department of Justice, because it is stated, at the bottom of page 18:

> It was not possible to establish in the course of the investigation whether this request was for a voluntary contribution from the members or whether an assessment was actually made.

Continuing, I read:

> The information and material obtained by the investigator was transmitted to the Department of Justice for such action as it should deem indicated.

So I think we have tried to do the right thing. I think we have done everything aboveboard, so far as this particular subcommittee is concerned. I repeat: We have made a distinct effort not to hold anyone up to scorn or ridicule.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I will yield briefly.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think the Senator from Montana has missed entirely the criticism of this report which the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Arizona have been making.

On October 9, as I said earlier, I appeared before that committee and asked a number of pointed questions of the witness. I had hoped that the committee staff would be able to get the answers. If the committee staff has good reason for not having been able to get those answers, well and good. The reason was not explained.

For instance, I wanted to know the size of the layoff fund, or whatever the particular union called that fund at certain times during the campaign, to ascertain how much the use of that fund increased, if any, immediately prior to the campaign, from September 1 until election day.

I wanted to know the number of men—not the names of the men, but the number of men—who were included in the use of the layoff fund prior to election day.

I think there are other questions which would immediately come to mind in trying to ascertain the total amount which was spent by each side in the past election. One of them would be, for instance, along this line: We understand that in each local of the UAW 10 men were available for work on election day or prior to election day. At what value should they be assessed? What was the value of their services? Certainly there was a value.

If the Senator from Montana feels that no value can be attached to them, then I suggest that a day may come when there will be no reported election expenses. Rather, both sides will resort to the easy way out, by charging off the use of men in large numbers and by passing around money in large amounts. Honest people, who report their exact amounts, will wonder, and their wonderment will increase, about television shows and radio broadcasts and about the large number of automobiles which will appear suddenly on election day. They will wonder who is paying for all of that. I think the Senator from Montana would like to know about that, just as much as does the Senator from Arizona. Who is paying for them? I think the Senator from Montana would like to know that, just as much as the Senator from Arizona would. Mr. President, that is the entire point of my criticism of this document.

Insofar as the document goes, it is rather interesting. I said earlier today that I thought it had been compiled in the headquarters of the Democratic Party. Possibly I am wrong in some instances, but certainly the report does not contain anything which could not have been gathered by any group dedicated to this task and desiring to go through the records. The report fails to include much that it should include; and that is what I have been criticizing.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to say that we tried to contact all labor organizations, even down to the county level.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I wish to say that the report contains a provision recommending that a further investigation be undertaken of both corporate and labor spending in campaigns. We want to have as full a picture as can possibly be obtained. We know the report is not complete as to all facts, but it is complete in reporting all the facts obtained by the subcommittee.

I wish to say that I think both the chairman and the Senator from Nebraska did a remarkably fine job, in the time at their disposal, in trying to present for the first time to the American people at least a partial picture.

I thank the Senator from Nebraska for yielding.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in conclusion, I repeat that I certainly do not question the integrity or motives of anyone.

However, I believe that so much in the way of tabulation of the expenditures made on one side is lacking from the report that it would have been far better to have reported that until we get a better system of accounting and a better definition of what constitutes a political expenditure, no tabulation could be made—rather than to make one which gives the public the impression this one gives, because obviously the report is defective, in that it does not tabulate one very important source of expenditures, manpower, publications, radio time, automobiles, voting lists, and all other means used to elect or to defeat candidates for office.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for his generous references to me with respect to the work which I and others have done in the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections.

I wish to compliment, in turn, the work done by the junior Senator from Montana and also by the junior Senator from Nebraska. Every action of the subcommittee, Mr. President, up to the point of the final report, was taken unanimously. We worked through the investigation and the hearing as a team. Every motion made by the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska was assented to. Every request made by him was agreed to. Every suggestion made by him as

to a desirable field of inquiry was adopted. In fact, as I have said, all actions and decisions of the subcommittee, except the final report, were taken unanimously.

We know, and the report shows, that the subcommittee is well aware of the fact that every single bit of information involved in a national election has not been obtained, nor was it possible to obtain it, but the report has repressed no facts that were obtained. Such facts, whether pertaining to a political committee, a candidate, a political action committee, a corporation, or a labor union, have been reported fairly and impartially.

I wonder if it is the incompleteness or the completeness of the report that some persons find disturbing. I hope that the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, or some other committee, will proceed further with the inquiry. The American people are entitled to know the facts. Disclosure of current practices in election campaigns is a necessary foundation for remedial legislation. The fullest possible disclosure has been made by this report, and I genuinely hope, and I think I can say I expect, that it will be helpful in bringing about the enactment of a clean elections bill during this session of the Congress.

---

## THE PRICE AND SUPPLY OF SUGAR

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, during the 2d session of the 84th Congress, it was my privilege to take an active interest in the enactment of legislation amending the Sugar Act of 1948 in such fashion as to bring our national sugar program into harmony with current conditions.

As I rise to speak again today of sugar, we are witnessing an extraordinary demonstration of the ability of the United States sugar program, under extreme pressure, to assure the American consumer an ample supply of sugar at all times and at fair and reasonable prices.

In reaction to recent international events, the price of raw sugar in the so-called world free market in a brief period of 60 days—roughly from mid-November to mid-January—increased 100 percent above the level of prices prevailing in this market for the last 3 years, and today raw-sugar prices in the world market are still at about this high level. In contrast, United States raw-sugar prices, at the highest point reached during this 60-day period, were only 4 percent above prices at the beginning of this 2-month period, and are today even lower than they were at the start of this period.

It appears to me to be singularly appropriate to examine at this time the influences which have been responsible for the recent precipitous advance in the world market prices.

The upward swing started with the outbreak of the anti-Soviet revolt in Hungary, and was accelerated when it became certain that the 1956 European sugar-beet crop was to be below normal expectations. The heightened demand for sugar was further accentuated by the seizure and closure of the Suez Canal. As a result of this situation, many people throughout the world began augmenting their sugar purchases as a measure of protection against the uncertainties of the future.

While the United States domestic sugar market is only indirectly influenced by developments on the world market, the United States sugar quota program cannot entirely insulate our market against world sugar price gyrations of this character. Consequently, considerable pressure has been exerted on our domestic market as world prices have climbed.

This pressure, together with unusual influences already operating on the United States market—principally the threat of a longshoremen's strike along our east coast—resulted in increased inventories and slightly higher domestic prices.

Best estimates available are that some extra amount of sugar has gone into invisible inventories by the end of 1956, which is a manner of saying that this extra amount of sugar has gone into standby storage in the pantries of the Nation and the warehouses of industrial firms.

The important thing to note is that, despite the sudden increase in demand in our market above normal expectations, plenty of sugar was available in this country at all times.

The amendments to the Sugar Act passed by the Congress in 1956 enabled the Secretary of Agriculture to make available to the United States market additional sugar supplies needed to meet this extra demand in a much more effective manner than would have been possible had the law not been amended. Under the Sugar Act before the 1956 amendments, all increases in sugar quotas were supplied by foreign areas, principally Cuba.

Under the amended Sugar Act, when the Secretary finds it necessary to make additional sugar supplies available, 55 percent of these added supplies come from domestic producing sugar supplies not subject to foreign influence. And in the case of the supplies drawn from the mainland sugar-beet and sugar-cane areas, the increased supply becomes available for consumption the very minute the Secretary decides it is needed.

Had not the Sugar Act amendments of 1956 been enacted, domestic sugar could not have been made available to meet the unusual demands of recent weeks. It would have remained dammed up behind quota walls, while making it necessary to bring in all additional sugar supplies from foreign areas.

As I have indicated, events have already shown the validity of assurances given by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and Under Secretary of Agriculture True D. Morse, at the time when the 1956 amendments were under consideration, that these changes in the law would not result in increased domestic sugar prices. As I have already pointed out, these amendments made it possible for the Secretary of Agriculture to move domestic sugar supplies quickly into the market when needed to meet the emergency, thereby actually contributing to price stability.

Some persons apparently have interpreted the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the able Under Secretary of Agriculture as constituting assurances that there would be no future increases in the price of sugar, come what may.

I am sure that neither the Senator from Virginia nor Under Secretary Morse, both being businessmen in their private capacities, ever intended that sugar prices should not be expected to respond to normal market influences and to change in the cost of production. As I understand their statements, all that the Senator from Virginia and Under Secretary Morse said was that it was not intended that anything in the bill would cause any increase in the price of sugar.

Our economy is not static. It is not possible or desirable to freeze the price of any commodity or to attempt to legislate out of existence factors which are basic to the movement of prices up or down.

Domestic raw sugar prices averaged 6.09 cents a pound for the year 1956—practically identical with the 1954 price. They were somewhat above the extremely low prices which prevailed in 1955, but were well below 1952 and 1953 prices.

Taking the 1947–49 price as a base—which is the base period used for general price comparisons, and which is now used in the Sugar Act—1956 prices were only 4 percent above those in the base period.

As we know, the prices of most commodities and wage rates have gone up much more than this in this interval. For example, the latest Bureau of Labor Statistics cost-of-living index—that for December of 1956—shows that the general price level has advanced 18 percent since 1947–49. The wholesale price of all commodities has advanced 14 percent, and the prices of wholesale commodities other than foods and farm products—which includes the items purchased by sugar producers—have gone up 22 percent. Weekly factory earnings are now about 60 percent higher than in 1947–49.

Since 1947–49, farm wage rates have gone up 28 percent, and the cost of farm machinery is up 41 percent.

There is no published Government data relative to changes in the costs of processing sugar, but the beet sugar industry recently surveyed what has happened to costs since 1947–49.

This survey shows that 1956 wage rates were from 35 percent to 50 percent more than those prevailing in 1947–49. Prices of the major items of machinery which beet processors buy have gone up an average of about 80 percent since 1947–49. Metal-containing items used in beet sugar processing, such as slicer knives and copper tubes, have gone up an average of about 70 percent.

The costs of coal and gas, the major sources of fuel used in beet-sugar processing, have gone up 11 and 52 percent, respectively, since 1947–49. Costs of other important items, such as coke, limerock, and freight charges, have gone up 5 or 6 times as much as sugar prices have advanced.

I think all Senators will agree that in view of these increases in costs, the mod-

est increase which has taken place recently in domestic sugar prices is long overdue, and has lagged far behind the increases in the cost of production of sugar.

It is only because of increased efficiency resulting from steady advancement in better farming techniques and general production efficiency that sugar farmers and processors have been able to survive the squeeze of increasing costs and stable or often actually declining sugar prices.

The yield of beet sugar per harvested acre in 1956 is estimated to be more than 20 percent over that in 1948, or 2.42 tons as against 1.96 tons. Measured in terms of reduction in the number of man-days of fieldworkers required to produce a ton of beets, the increase in efficiency is even more dramatic, having dropped about 30 percent since 1948. Less dramatic but substantial advances have been made in the processing segment of the industry.

Not only have the 1956 amendments to the Sugar Act been an effective protection for domestic consumers, but they also have enabled domestic sugar beet and sugarcane production to be increased, and domestic sugar marketings to be stepped up. At the same time, foreign producers' marketings in this country have continued to increase.

Cuba, the largest exporter of sugar in the United States market, enjoyed an increase in her United States quota for 1956 of 230,000 tons over the 1955 figure. Under provisions of the amendments enacted last year, Cuba's quota will continue to enlarge at a rate equal to 29.6 percent of the growth of the United States sugar market. It is worthy to note in passing what this has already meant to our good friends in Cuba. Official reports state that economic activity in Cuba recently is at the highest and most prosperous level on record.

My esteemed colleagues from Florida and Louisiana can state much more ably than I the beneficial effects of the 1956 Sugar Act amendments in enabling mainland cane-sugar producers to eliminate burdensome overquota stocks of sugars, a problem which also had afflicted some sugar-beet farmers and processors.

Not only were the overquota surpluses expensive to carry, but their presence resulted in enforced acreage cuts in sugar crops in 23 States, thus penalizing our farmers and processors for their outstanding technological advances and steadily improving production efficiency.

Today, the marketing quota for mainland cane sugar producers is 100,000 tons greater than that which prevailed throughout the period when the area's quota was rigidly fixed, and the drastic acreage cut imposed on the sugarcane farmers in 1955 has been discontinued.

I shall not take time to detail the advantages which have accrued to the other domestic production areas of the Territory of Hawaii and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, but I can assure the Senate that significant benefits have been realized in these areas.

As for my own part of the country, it is my earnest wish that this Congress may be able to devise solutions to the other agricultural problems which will result in as great benefits as those stemming from the 1956 Sugar Act revisions.

For the first time since 1947 domestic sugar producers have been permitted by law to participate in supplying the rising domestic sugar demand.

The beet sugar quota for 1957, under terms of the new law, is 150,000 tons higher than the 1,800,000-ton fixed quota with which the industry was saddled for the period 1947–55.

To our sugar-beet farmers, the increased marketing quotas gives relief from the pinch of acreage restrictions—including serious cutbacks—forced on this important nonsurplus farm commodity.

The Secretary of Agriculture has announced that 950,000 acres may be planted to sugar beets in this country this year, as compared with only 850,000 acres permitted in 1955 and 1956. In 1954, plantings amounted to about 944,000 acres. Thus, the cuts made in 1955 and 1956 have now been restored. These acreage increases will also take cropland that is now being planted to surplus or less needed crops.

In my own State of Utah, this means that our farmers may plant some 3,500 more acres of sugar beets, a 12 percent increase. Translated into terms of cash farm income, those 3,500 additional acres of beets can mean upward of $750,000 to our Utah farmers alone.

Events of recent months have demonstrated that our national sugar program is achieving the major purposes assigned to it—namely, the maintenance of a healthy and competitive domestic sugar industry, assurance of adequate supplies of sugar at reasonable prices, and promotion of desirable trade relationships with our foreign friends.

In this comparatively brief progress report, it has been my desire to bring before the Senate a timely appraisal of the noteworthy success of the Sugar Act, as amended during the last session of the Congress. I appreciate this opportunity to report.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. At the outset, let me commend the distinguished Senator from Utah for his splendid statement on the operation of the Sugar Act in these critical days. It seems to me that the Sugar Act is demonstrating quite clearly that it is an effective instrument for the benefit of both the producers and the consumers in this country. It operates for the benefit of the producers by insulating against competition occasioned by very low world prices; and at the same time it operates, for the benefit of the consumers, against high world market prices.

The price of wholesale refined sugar in New York has increased from $8.65 per hundredweight in January of last year to $9.10 per hundredweight at the present time. The records show that the price increased 10 cents on April 26, 10 cents on October 9, 10 cents on October 30, and 15 cents on December 1 of last year.

On the other hand, the world market price increased from $3.25 on January 1, 1956, to $5 on November 28 last; and thereafter it was well over $6. Even now, the world price is $5.60 per hundredweight. In other words, Mr. President, during the past year the price of refined sugar in this country has increased by 45 cents per hundredweight; which is about 5 percent, whereas the world price of sugar has nearly doubled in the same period of time. Let me ask the distinguished Senator from Utah whether that is approximately correct.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes. It actually reached a high of $6.70. It has decreased a little from that price.

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct, as I understand.

Mr. BENNETT. Today, the price is approximately 6 cents a pound.

Mr. BARRETT. Let me call attention to the fact, Mr. President, that the world price of sugar has remained fairly stable during the past three-fourths of a century. It is the cheapest commodity on the market today. The wholesale refined price in New York, over a 10-year period, has fluctuated very little, except during World War I. The figures are as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1880 | 9.6 |
| 1890 | 7.6 |
| 1900 | 5.3 |
| 1910 | 5.0 |
| 1920 | 15.5 |
| 1930 | 4.6 |
| 1940 | 4.3 |
| 1950 | 7.8 |
| 1957 | 9.10 |

I believe that the Sugar Act has worked in an admirable fashion for the benefit of the people of this country. Is that not correct?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, Mr. President; that is correct.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the quota at the beginning of last year was 8,800,000 tons, and it was increased on January 11 to a total of 9 million tons. During the past year 1,953,000 tons of beet sugar was marketed, which represents an increase of 153,000 tons over the amount in the previous year. The acreage in sugar beets has been increased to 950,000 acres, and the acreage in Wyoming has been increased to 38,787 acres. While we have been able to obtain an increase of about 4,000 acres for sugar beets in Wyoming, nevertheless, the total acreage in my State is considerably less today than it was some years ago. On the whole, Mr. President, I think it is fair and proper to say that the amendments to the Sugar Act of last year are completely justified in every way.

Again I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Utah for his splendid statement.

## THREAT TO CALIFORNIA'S WATER SUPPLY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, all of California owes a never-ending debt of gratitude to the Federal Government for its great assistance over the years, in our growing and continuing problem of water. Water is vital to our semiarid

commonwealth. Her whole future depends on an adequate supply. In recent years, our State government has commendably undertaken a responsibility in this field. And it has taken important preliminary steps in developing a State water plan.

Meanwhile, let all Californians clearly understand this fact: Water projects have been undertaken and constructed in our State through the efforts of local citizens, in the formation of local irrigation districts, and in many instances with the cooperation of the Federal Government.

Ever since President Theodore Roosevelt signed the Federal reclamation law in 1902, California has been a substantial beneficiary of that farsighted enactment. The development of adequate water supplies for our rapidly expanding population has required, and inevitably will require, the best efforts and the greatest level of cooperation of our State, our local communities and districts, and our National Government. Our State has seen the construction of reclamation projects, great and small, many under Federal reclamation law and built with money from the Federal Treasury.

In southern California, Hoover Dam, Parker Dam, and Davis Dam—all Federal projects with congressional approval—represent quite possibly the difference between a prosperous and contented area for many million Americans we know and a water-short desert region which might otherwise have been.

In northern California, through the valleys of the Sacramento and the San Joaquin, the great central valleys project is the elemental reason for that great area's expanding population and productivity. The Trinity project, upon which construction is now under way, is designed to underwrite more of our future development.

I am greatly concerned over the stark possibility that the Federal Government might be compelled to shut off a water supply to those local irrigation districts in our State which have not entered into confirmed water-supply contracts. This possibility arises by reason of the recent split decision of the California State Supreme Court in the so-called Ivanhoe Irrigation District case and cases related to it.

The Congress of the United States under the Constitution must lay down the rules by which States may receive Federal assistance in the development of reclamation projects. One of those rules, in effect, limits the purchase of supplemental water to 160 acres for each landowner—man, woman, or child—or 320 acres for a husband and wife in a community-property State such as our own. This limitation is not a new rule. It has been in the Federal law since 1902.

In the Ivanhoe case, by a 4–3 vote, the State Supreme Court interpreted not alone the State Constitution and the State law, but the Federal Constitution and Federal law, as well. The majority of four Justices held that the Federal land limitation provisions are not applicable to privately-owned lands in California. They hold that any effort to apply these Federal laws in our State would be a deprivation of property without due process of law, so far as private landowners are concerned. Three Justices, including the Chief Justice, dissented on all grounds.

Thus, the California decision raises the most serious problem with respect to the operation of many Federal reclamation projects in our State. What should be the position of the Department of the Interior? What should be the position of the people of California, and of their State government?

At the present time, I understand that the office of the Attorney General of the State is preparing to file a motion for reconsideration by the State Court. If that fails, I hope that proper appeal will be taken to the Supreme Court of the United States. The basic questions are of such great importance, not only to California but to other States in the West, that it seems to me that the Supreme Court of the United States must be asked to render the final decision in these important matters.

While it is useless to speculate on what the United States Supreme Court might decide when and if the Ivanhoe case is before it on appeal, I do wish to refer specifically to one decision of our highest court which was of great interest to California, particularly to southern California, and which, it seems to me, has a bearing on the pending question.

Years ago, the late United States Senator Hiram W. Johnson, and former Representative Phil D. Swing obtained congressional approval of a bill to provide for Federal construction of Hoover Dam on the Colorado River. The State of Arizona vigorously opposed this legislation, and then brought suit in the United States Supreme Court against California, the Secretary of the Interior, and others. Arizona asked that the Secretary of the Interior be restrained from building Hoover Dam, on the grounds, among others, that such a Federal structure would be in violation of Arizona's laws of water. Happily for southern California, and happily, indeed for all the States, the Supreme Court held that the United States, in exercising its powers under the Boulder Canyon Project Act, was not prevented from building Hoover Dam by reason of Arizona law.

Under the Constitution we live in a system of dual sovereignty. The Federal Government is one of delegated powers. In the States and in the people rests the balance of constitutional power. I believe in the constitutional rights of States, but I cite the above Arizona against California decision to indicate that our sister State's allegation of absolute power would have prevented the construction of Hoover Dam and of the great benefits it has brought to our State.

Mr. President, contrast the Hoover Dam dispute with the situation in our State, where, in every instance, Federal reclamation projects within our boundaries have been undertaken only after our State government had urged such Federal construction. Thus, it is not a case of invasion by the Federal Government, over the years, of California.

I earnestly hope that the Department will not find it necessary to refuse to deliver water to individual water users in California while these legal actions are being continued.

My own view is that the Department must proceed in accordance with Federal reclamation law.

If the Ivanhoe decision were ultimately to become final and binding, it would have a far-reaching impact on our State's future reclamation plans. That would be particularly true so far as Federal assistance is concerned. Speaking for myself, I want—as a Californian—to see a maximum of Federal assistance in this field to the people of my State.

I do not believe Congress will repeal the acreage-limitation laws. Thus, only through final judicial decision will the scope of their application in our State and elsewhere be determined. From a legislative standpoint, those laws are under an almost continuous study. Occasionally, Congress has seen fit to change their application in specific projects. Last year Congress approved the Washoe project, of interest to both Nevada and California. It authorized water to excess lands within the project, provided a proportionate interest charge were levied against those lands. No Member of Congress, of whatever political stripe or ideology, opposed this bill. It is now the law. But even if, which I decline to prophesy, a similar formula were approved by Congress for general application, the Ivanhoe decision, in my judgment, would still pose a very real problem.

This is a period of legal hiatus. Until the Ivanhoe case is finally disposed of, there remains the specific problem of what the Department of the Interior can do and should do and what the State of California can do and should do for California farmers in irrigation districts which need water.

The spigot must not be turned off. To remove the confusion brought on by the decision, positive and immediate action is required.

First, the Ivanhoe decision must, as rapidly as possible, be brought to final judgment in the United States Supreme Court.

Second, if legislation in Congress is necessary, I shall immediately introduce it. Federal legislation, during the interim, may be required in order to permit the Department, on a temporary basis, to continue supplying water. This is a problem I shall immediately explore with the Department. As a result of my discussions with members of the Senate Interior Committee, I believe such legislation would be sympathetically treated.

Third, State legislation may be necessary, too. It may well be that our State should enact at once a suitable type of State enabling act to avoid the tragic consequences of a possible termination of water supply in parts of our State at the beginning of our irrigation season. This is an urgent problem for consideration by our State government.

The threat of disruption to California's water supply poses a challenge to Government here and in Sacramento.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a news article appearing in the San Francisco Examiner of January

31 be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the news article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECISION HITS WATER PACTS

The first impact of the State supreme court's decision of last week which outlawed the 160-acre irrigation limit hit two irrigation districts yesterday.

The five-man State districts' securities commission declined to take any action on contracts pending between the Federal Bureau of Reclamation and the Corning Water District of Tehama County and the Solano Irrigation District of Solano County.

Both proposed contracts contain the 160-acre limitation which is required by Federal law but which the State high tribunal held to be in violation of the California constitution.

Before the supreme court's ruling, such contracts to obtain water were routine. However, the commission's chairman, Michael J. O'Dowd, of El Centro, said:

"Personally, I don't see how the commission can act until this matter is clarified."

NEXT MOVE BY UNITED STATES

Assistant State Attorney General Wallace Howland, the commission counsel, said he thought the next move to end the impasse between the California Supreme Court and the Federal Bureau of Reclamation is up to Interior Secretary Fred Seaton.

The Corning district, which covers 14,000 acres, sought approval of its contract to buy Sacramento River water at $2.75 an acre-foot. Its ranchers now get irrigation water from the ground.

The district attorney, C. A. Stromsness, urged the commission to seek clarification because, he said, "development of the whole Sacramento Valley depends upon what happens to this pilot plan."

Stromsness said the district's distribution system is ready for use but there is no way for it to receive water until the contract is approved.

SOLANO DEAL DELAYED

The commission also declined to act on the Solano district's application for a $12,300,000 Federal loan to finance a distribution system pending solution of the legal hassle.

Some 70,000 acres of Solano County land in the vicinity of Fairfield, Suisun, Dixon, and Vacaville would receive water from Putah Creek. The Federal Government now is building the Monticello Dam across the Putah near Winters.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I might say that article goes on to indicate that the State Districts' Securities Commission, which by law in my State is required to pass first judgment on water contracts, declined to approve two contracts before it by reason of the decision.

Mr. President, I desire to address myself briefly to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has the floor.

## FLIGHT TEST REGULATION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it was just a few days ago that the people of my State were shocked by the tragedy of an air collision between a DC–7 and a Northrop jet plane, as a result of which several school children were killed and many more were injured. I think the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce commendably took immediate action. It met together. It drafted a resolution asking the Civil Aeronautics Board to adopt suitable regulations with respect to air flight testing, and particularly that air flight testing be confined to areas under which there was no population. In essence, so far as the area from which I come is concerned, that would mean flight testing would be confined to the air either over the desert or over the ocean.

I was delighted to see the Civil Aeronautics Board, Mr. President, just a couple of days ago, adopt regulations designed to do that which many of us sought.

I ask unanimous consent that the comments which the Civil Aeronautics Board made in connection with the announcement of the rule, and the rule itself, be incorporated in my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the comments and rule were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR TRAFFIC RULES—PILOT VIGILANCE AND RESTRICTIONS ON FLIGHT TESTING

Part 60 of the Civil Air Regulations sets forth the air traffic rules which are applicable to all aircraft. These rules contain provisions prohibiting both civil and military aircraft from being flown in any unusual maneuvers over congested areas or on civil airways and prescribe certain minimum altitudes for the protection of persons or property on the ground. Although there are no specific provisions in part 60 dealing with flight testing, all civil aircraft for which an airworthiness certificate has not yet been issued are prohibited from flying over thickly populated areas or large gatherings of people by limitations set forth in special test-flight authorizations issued by the Administrator. Military aircraft, however, are not subject to these specific limitations.

The problems arising from the flight testing of production and experimental aircraft have long been the subject of considerable attention on the part of the Government. In 1947 an extensive study was undertaken by the civil and military agencies concerned, with a view toward determining the safeguards which should be applied to prevent the creating of a public hazard. At that time it was agreed that it would be impracticable to relocate aircraft manufacturing establishments outside highly populated areas but that the flight testing of production and experimental aircraft should be accomplished in sparsely settled areas and in airspace of relatively light traffic density. Although considerable effort has been made to insure that flight-testing activity is in fact conducted under circumstances in which hazard to persons on the ground or to other aircraft in flight will not result, the recent collision of aircraft undergoing certain tests in flight necessitates the immediate promulgation of amendments to part 60 which will reduce the possibility of midair collision and further enhance the safety of persons or property on the ground.

These amendments herein adopted prohibit the flight testing of aircraft unless such flight test is conducted (1) over open water or sparsely populated areas having light air traffic and approved by the Administrator, or (2) within a flight-test area designated by the Administrator. This regulation also provides that all flight tests are to be conducted in accordance with such traffic rules which the Administrator may from time to time prescribe.

In order to achieve the above-mentioned objectives, we are including within the term "flight tests," the operation of all aircraft in flight for the purpose of testing, observing, or measuring the performance of an aircraft, airframe, powerplant, or propeller after its manufacture or major alteration, except for takeoff, landing, and operation to and from the area authorized for such flight tests.

In addition to the regulatory change dealing with flight testing, the Board is also concerned with the problems relating to flight operations requiring more than normal preoccupation with cockpit duties. In order to stress the importance of vigilance on the part of the pilot to observe and avoid other air traffic, the regulation amends section 60.12 (c) by calling attention to the fact that lack of vigilance due to more than normal preoccupation with cockpit duties may constitute careless or reckless operation of aircraft.

For the reasons stated above, it is the opinion of the Board that a situation exists requiring immediate action in respect to safety in air commerce and that notice and public procedure hereon are impracticable and contrary to the public interest, and the Board finds that good cause exists for making this amendment effective on less than 30 days' notice.

Interested persons desiring to present written data setting forth their views with respect to the rules herein adopted are requested to submit such matter to the Board on or before March 22, 1957. All communications so received will be considered by the Board and the rules herein adopted will be reconsidered fully in the light of the comments submitted.

In consideration of the foregoing, the Civil Aeronautics Board hereby amends part 60 of the Civil Air Regulations (14 CFR, pt. 60, as amended) effective February 20, 1957.

1. By amending paragraph (c) of the note under section 60.12 to read as follows:

"60.12. Careless or reckless operation. * * *

"NOTE.—* * *.

"(c) Lack of vigilance by the pilot to observe and avoid other air traffic. In this respect, the pilot must clear his position prior to starting any maneuver, either on the ground or in flight. Furthermore, flight activities requiring such crew preoccupation with cockpit duties as to prevent adequate vigilance outside the cockpit for the purpose of collision avoidance shall be evidence of careless or reckless operation unless some provision is made which adequately compensates for such reduced degree of vigilance such as use of a competent observer in the aircraft, a chase aircraft, or other appropriate arrangements."

2. By adding a new section 60.24 and a note to read as follows:

"60.24. Flight test: No person shall flight test an aircraft unless such flight test is conducted (1) over open water or sparsely populated areas having light-air traffic and approved by the Administrator, or (2) within a flight-test area designated by the Administrator. All flight tests shall be conducted in accordance with such traffic rules as the Administrator may from time to time prescribe.

"NOTE.—It should be recognized that any flight operation that requires more than normal preoccupation with cockpit duties may result in careless or reckless operation of aircraft. See example (c) under section 60.12 of the Civil Air Regulations."

3. By adding a new definition to section 60.60 to read as follows:

"60.60. Definitions: * * *.

"Fight test: 'Flight test' means the operation of aircraft in flight for the purpose of testing, observing, or measuring the performance of an aircraft, airframe, powerplant, or propeller after its manufacture or major alteration (as defined in part 18), except for takeoff, landing and operation to and from the area authorized for such flight tests."

(Sec. 205 (a), 52 Stat. 984; 49 U. S. C. 425 (a). Interpret or apply secs. 601, 1005, 52 Stat. 1007, 1023, as amended; 49 U. S. C. 551,

645, and sec. 4 (a), 60 Stat. 238; 5 U. S. C. 10003 (a).)

By the Civil Aeronautics Board,

M. C. MULLIGAN,
*Secretary.*

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to make only one point. In the comments relative to the new regulation which has been adopted, the Civil Aeronautics Board went on to say, with respect to the air-test regulation, "Military aircraft, however, are not subject to these specific limitations."

Mr. President, I object to that qualification. If that qualification results in an inability presently on the part of the Civil Aeronautics Board to remedy the situation, then I suggest that the Congress has the responsibility to fasten on somebody—and I think it should be the Civil Aeronautics Board—the responsibility to control the air above the American continent with respect to all types of aircraft, military and civilian.

## REPORT BY TVA ON THREAT OF DISASTROUS FLOOD IN TENNESSEE VALLEY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report which I have obtained from the Tennessee Valley Authority with respect to the handling of the threat of a disastrous flood in the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. President, such a flood did not occur because the great Tennessee River is a controlled river. Its rushing waters are made to serve man rather than to destroy the fruits of his labors.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A flood crest of about 52 feet with damages in the order of $50 million would now be occurring at Chattanooga as a result of the storms which have swept across the Tennessee Valley since January 21, without the regulation which has been provided by the TVA flood-control system. Much of the main business section of Chattanooga would be under several feet of water.

Independent preliminary evaluations by the local United States Weather Bureau River Forecasting Unit and the TVA water-control engineers reveal that the Tennessee River would have exceeded the 30-foot flood stage at Chattanooga by about 22 feet without the control accomplished by the TVA system. Saturday the actual river stage at Chattanooga was 32.2 feet.

Reed A. Elliot, TVA's chief water-control engineer, pointed out that current estimates on both the maximum natural flood stage and damage averted are preliminary and that final computations cannot be made until more complete flood data has been collected and analyzed.

He also warned that all current figures are based on precipitation received through noon Saturday, and that additional heavy rainfall could result in marked revision of both the present estimates and existing flood conditions.

A flood crest of 52 feet at Chattanooga, which the city would now be experiencing if the river were uncontrolled, would have been the highest at that point on the Tennessee since 1933, and the fourth highest of record. The flood of record at Chattanooga occurred in 1867, when the river crested at 57.9 feet. In 1875 it reached 53.8 and in 1933, 52.2 feet, about the same height the present flood would have reached had it not been controlled.

The estimate of $50 million damages averted at Chattanooga is based on the 1953 property values, and includes only those areas which would have been inundated within the city limits. In all past floods in the 20 years since the TVA system has been in operation, property damage averted at Chattanooga has totaled $53.5 million.

In addition to the protection provided Chattanooga, considerable damage and dislocation is being averted elsewhere in the valley by the operation of the TVA system during the current flood period.

Without the flood storage provided by Norris Dam, the Clinch River at and below Clinton would have exceeded the flood stage by about 10 feet, with resulting damage of approximately a quarter of a million dollars in and around the Anderson County seat.

Reduction of the flood stage on the Clinch also kept water from reaching the AEC's K-25 operations area at Oak Ridge and from topping the floor of the main pumping station there.

Tributary storage also averted some damage at Kingsport. Although no great damage would have resulted from an uncontrolled flow at that city, it would have inundated practically all of Long Island below the old highway crossing.

Mr. Elliot pointed out that under natural conditions the calculated 52-foot crest at Chattanooga would not have been experienced until Sunday or Monday. Instead, the floodwaters are now being moved downstream past Chattanooga at a rather steady controlled rate which, barring further rainfall, can be expected to decline gradually as the water which has been impounded is released to provide storage space for possible subsequent floods.

TVA's flood control machinery went into action immediately when the early stages of the storm struck the northern and western sections of the valley on January 21. The rains at that time and in the succeeding days caused some headwater flooding in the upper reaches of the valley. The same storms were responsible for the flood conditions which developed on the upper Cumberland tributaries in Kentucky and on streams in West Virginia and Virginia.

In its later stages the storm struck in the southern and central portions of the valley, dropping water on and around the upper mainstream of the Tennessee, and in this way adding to the threat to Chattanooga. TVA's tributary reservoirs, at scheduled low levels for flood storage purposes, immediately started impounding the runoff from the tributaries, and except for some releases for the generation of power have stored all the runoff from rainfall in their drainage throughout the storm.

As a result the levels of the tributary reservoirs have gone up rapidly, and many of them are at the present time above the level desired at this time of year in order to have maximum storage available to control floods from future rainfall.

Levels of the major tributaries as of January 20 and February 2 are:

| Reservoir | Elevation, Jan. 20 | Elevation, Feb. 2 |
|---|---|---|
| South Holston | 1,679.3 | 1,708.9 |
| Watauga | 1,910.2 | 1,925.4 |
| Boone | 1,353.4 | 1,370.6 |
| Cherokee | 996.4 | 1,033.9 |
| Douglas | 921.8 | 967.6 |
| Fontana | 1,575.6 | 1,622.5 |
| Norris | 965.6 | 997.2 |
| Chatuge | 1,899.8 | 1,905.8 |
| Nottely | 1,725.2 | 1,740.0 |
| Hiwassee | 1,431.3 | 1,479.1 |

While the tributary reservoirs were storing water from their drainage basins, TVA water control engineers were scheduling the discharge of water through the mainstream dams in such a way as to move the maximum amount of water on downstream before a crest reached Chattanooga, and, at the same time retain whatever storage capacity could be kept in the mainstream reservoirs above Chattanooga for the purpose of holding back water and reducing the crest.

Because this storm developed early in the flood season there is still danger until late March or early April of additional flood-producing storms. The danger to Chattanooga will not be past until the reservoir system is restored to its seasonal balance in accord with planned operations, Elliot stated. The restoration of this balance will involve continuation of the movement of water from the recent storm through the mainstream dams, and the lowering of the tributaries, on a scheduled basis, to the desired levels for this time of year.

The schedule for this operation will depend, to a large extent, upon any rainfall which may develop in the near future.

## 1956 CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] leaves the floor, I want to commend him for the monumental work he has done as chairman of the subcommittee that has presented to the Senate the voluminous report on campaign financing in the 1956 campaign. At a later date I intend to discuss that matter on the floor of the Senate, because I think the report is of such significance to the welfare of good government that it is deserving of considerable discussion.

I was very much interested in some of the comments made in the Senate this afternoon to the effect that if a man or woman belongs to a labor union and devotes some of his time to good citizenship in getting out the vote, and getting people registered, he thereby engages in some form of conduct which would subject him to criticism, or engages in improper conduct.

Mr. President, the League of Women Voters does the same thing. Church groups do the same thing. The junior chambers of commerce do the same thing. The senior chambers of commerce do the same thing. Members of the business fraternity do it. And all to the good.

I certainly hope the time will never come when in the minds of some people, those who wear overalls should be disfranchised, and I hope we have not reached such a point that, because some reactionary political machines do not relish the idea that they have lost the labor vote, they must do what they can to hamper the exercise of good citizenship on the part of the workers of this country.

I wish to say I think the Senator from Tennessee has submitted a report which, as he has indicated, will serve us in good stead when the time comes to write legislation to bring about cleaner elections.

The Senator from Tennessee, and my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER] who is now in the chair, knows I have said the Corrupt Practices Act is one of the causes for corruption in American politics. It does not prevent corruption, but, in my judgment, in a variety of ways, it encourages corruption in American politics. The act needs to be redrafted in line with amendments I have offered

from time to time during my 12 years in the Senate. I make no further comment on the question tonight other than to say I think the Senator from Tennessee is deserving of the highest commendation for the great service he has rendered to the Senate and the American people in his report to the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield briefly.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator very sincerely. I assure him that it has been a diligent job. I wish also to call to his attention the fact that it has been far from a pleasant job.

## AMENDMENTS TO FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a series of bills to introduce and comments to place in the RECORD, and I shall do it in a very few moments. I have waited all afternoon to make this presentation. I would not take the time now except that the material has been in the press gallery all afternoon, and I certainly have an obligation to the press, some of whose members may have already sent out stories on some phases of this material, to see to it that it is officially introduced into the RECORD.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] I introduce a bill calling for certain amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act in relation to large retail establishments whose activities affect interstate commerce, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1135) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large retail establishments whose activities affect interstate commerce, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE, for himself and Mr. MURRAY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1135

A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large retail establishments whose activities affect interstate commerce, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the "Retail Establishment Amendments of 1957 to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended."

FINDING AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the 'act"), is amended by adding the following new subsection 2 (c) at the end thereof:

"(c) The findings and declaration of policy as set forth above in this section shall also be applicable to the retailing industry whose establishments engage in any activity affecting commerce."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. Section 3 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(p) 'Activity affecting commerce' includes any activity in commerce necessary to commerce or competing with any activity in commerce or where the payment of wages at rates below those prescribed by this act would burden or obstruct or tend to burden or obstruct commerce or the free flow of commerce."

SPECIAL INDUSTRY COMMITTEES FOR PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

SEC. 4. Section 5 (a) of such act is amended by adding, after the words ", or in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce," and after the words "or in the production of goods for commerce in particular industries", the following: "or employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise where an employer, having one or more retail establishments with a total annual volume of sales of more than $500,000 from all such establishments combined is engaged in any activity affecting commerce."

MINIMUM WAGES

SEC. 5. (a) That part of section 6 of such act, which immediately precedes subparagraph (1) of such section, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. (a) Every employer shall pay to each of his employees who is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and every employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce and who has one or more retail establishments with a total annual volume of sales of more than $500,000 from all such establishments combined shall pay to each of his employees employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise where he is so engaged, wages at the following rates:".

(b) Section 6 (a) (3) of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof, the following sentence:

"The provisions of the Retail Establishment Amendments of 1957 to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, shall be applicable to American Samoa."

(c) Section 6 (c) of such act is amended by adding after the words "in the production of goods for commerce" the following: ", or employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise where an employer, having one or more retail establishments with a total annual volume of sales of more than $500,000 from all such establishments combined, is engaged in any activity affecting commerce,".

MAXIMUM HOURS

SEC. 6. Section 7 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, and in section 13 (e) of this act, no employer shall employ any of his employees who is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and no employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce and who has one or more establishments with a total annual volume of sales of more than $500,000 from all such establishments combined shall employ any of his employees employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise where he is so hours, or in a workweek longer than 40 hours, or in a workday longer than 8 hours, unless such employee receives compensation for his employment in excess of the hours above specified at a rate not less than 1½ times the regular rate at which he is so employed."

WAGE ORDERS IN PUERTO RICO, THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, AND AMERICAN SAMOA

SEC. 7. Section 8 (a) is amended as follows:

Add after the words "in each such industry." at the end of the first sentence thereof, the following:

"The policy as expressed herein shall also be applicable to the retailing industry in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, whose establishments engage in any activity affecting commerce."; and by adding after the words "each fiscal year." at the end of said section 8 (a), the following:

"The provisions of this section shall also be applicable to any employer in Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands, or in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, or in American Samoa, engaged in any activity affecting commerce and having one or more retail establishments with a total annual volume of sales of more than $500,000 from all such establishments combined."

CHILD LABOR

SEC. 8. Section 12 (c) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) No employer shall employ any oppressive child labor in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and no employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce and who has one or more retail establishments with a total annual volume of sales of more than $500,000 from all such establishments combined shall employ any oppressive child labor in or about any establishment where he is so engaged."

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 9. Sections 13 (a) (1) and 14 (a) (2) and 13 (a) (4) of such act are amended and section 13 (a) (3) is re-enacted to read as follows:

"SEC. 13. (a) The provisions of sections 6 and 7 shall not apply with respect to (1) any employee employed in a bona fide executive, administrative, or professional capacity, or in the capacity of outside salesman (as such terms are defined and delimited by regulations of the Administrator); or (2) any employee employed in any retail establishment by an employer with one or more retail establishments and having from all such establishments combined a total annual volume of sales of not more than $500,000, or any employee employed by any service establishment, more than 50 percent of which service establishment's annual dollar volume of sales is made within the State in which the service establishment is located. An 'employer with one or more retail establishments' or a 'service establishment' shall mean respectively an employer or establishment 75 percent of whose annual dollar volume of sales of goods or services (or of both) is not for resale and is recognized as retail sales or services in the particular industry; or (3) any employee employed by an establishment engaged in laundering, cleaning or repairing clothing, or fabrics, more than 50 percent of which establishment's annual dollar volume of sales of such services is made within the State in which the establishment is located: *Provided*, that 75 percent of such establishment's annual dollar volume of sales of such services is made to customers who are not engaged in a mining, manufacturing, transportation, or communications business; or (4) any employee employed by a retail establishment of an employer which qualifies as an exempt employer with one or more retail establishments under clause (2) of this subsection and is recognized as a retail establishment in the particular industry not withstanding that such establishment makes or processes at the retail establishment the goods that it sells: *Provided*, that more than 85 percent of such establishment's annual dollar volume of sales of goods so made or processed is made within the State in which the establishment is located; or"

PROHIBITED ACTS: PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE

SEC. 10. Section 15 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (c), as follows:

"(c). The provisions of this section shall be applicable to the retailing industry whose establishments engage in any activity affecting commerce."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 11. The amendments made by this act shall take effect upon the expiration of 120 days from the date of its enactment.

## TIMBER ACCESS ROADS—THE KEY TO WISE FOREST MANAGEMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now turn to the introduction of one of the most important major pieces of legislation I shall introduce in this session of the Congress, a bill dealing with timber access roads. In my judgment, timber access roads are the key to wise forest management. Were I to give a title to the speech which I am about to make a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD it would be "Timber Access Roads—the Key to Wise Forest Management."

On behalf of myself, my junior colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], I introduce a bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for carrying out provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain timber access roads, to permit maximum economy in harvesting national forest timber, and for other purposes, and I ask to have the bill itself printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The bill (S. 1136) to authorize the appropriation of funds for carrying out provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain timber access roads, to permit maximum economy in harvesting national forest timber, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for forest development roads and trails, including timber access roads to and on the national forests in locations and according to specifications which will permit maximum economy in harvesting timber from national forest lands tributary to such roads, the following sums: $32 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958; $36 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959; $42 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960; $50 million for each of the subsequent 9 fiscal years; and such sums as may be needed for each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Secretary) is authorized to provide for the construction of timber access roads to and on the national forests in locations and according to specifications which will permit maximum economy in harvesting timber from national forest lands tributary to such roads, either (1) directly with appropriated funds, and in such case such roads shall be designed to meet the requirements for development and management of other national forest resources in addition to timber; (2) where desirable, by requirements of purchasers in contracts for the sale of timber from such lands and with reasonable allowance therefor in determining the fair market value of such timber; or (3) where desirable, by cooperation with public or private agencies or persons. In fixing the allowance under clause (2) above, an amount which shall not exceed the estimated cost of the construction shall be stated in the advertisement of the timber and shall be set forth in the timber sale contract.

(b) An advisory public hearing shall be held with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber-access road at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction.

(c) The Secretary is authorized in the construction of timber-access roads to cooperate with owners of or persons hauling timber from other lands and if the cooperator contributes an equitable share of the cost of construction and maintenance of such roads, as determined by the Secretary, he may be permitted to haul timber over such roads under conditions the Secretary may prescribe. Any moneys deposited under any such agreement shall be covered into the Treasury and shall constitute a special fund which is hereby made available until expended for the construction and maintenance of such roads: *Provided*, That any portion of such deposits in excess of the amount found due shall be refunded to the depositor.

(d) Except as authorized in section 2 (c), products from nonfederally owned lands may be hauled over access roads only if (1) the quantity of products hauled is minor and the Secretary has determined that the interests of the United States require no payment or deposit; or (2) the payment is made of an equitable fee to be determined by the Secretary, after consideration of the amount necessary to amortize the portion of construction costs allocable to the non-Federal timber tributary to the particular road, which fee will be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt, and a deposit is made to cover the estimated cost of that part of the maintenance of the road occasioned by such hauling. Such deposits shall be covered into the Treasury and shall constitute a special fund which is hereby made available until expended to cover the cost to the United States of performing the work specified. Any portion of such deposits found to be in excess of the cost of doing the work specified shall, upon determination that it is so in excess, be transferred to miscellaneous receipts.

(e) Deposits received for a number of similar types of work on adjacent or overlapping areas, or on areas which in the aggregate are determined to cover a single work unit, may be expended on such combined areas for the purposes for which deposited and if refunds to depositors of excess deposits are provided for such refunds shall be made on a proportionate basis. Where the only practicable and efficient manner of performing such specified work involves an intermingling of other work making it impracticable to keep separate costs on the work herein described an estimate based on a cost analysis of the particular type of work may be used to determine the cost to the United States of performing such work.

(f) In order to provide access to and across private lands and exchange of hauling rights, the Secretary is authorized to grant easements to, or enter into leases or permit agreements for definite periods of years with, owners of private property in the vicinity of national forests for rights-of-way for roads and bridges across the national forests; but such rights-of-way shall not include any more land than is reasonably necessary for the purpose thereof, and all or any part of such rights-of-way may be terminated by the Secretary for failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the easement, lease, or permit or for nonuse or abandonment.

(g) No agreement under section 2 (f) in connection with which purchasers of national forest timber will be required to pay to private landowners a fee for the use, or contribute to the maintenance, of the road shall be entered into until an advisory public hearing has been held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of the road, with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the necessity and reasonableness of such fees or contributions.

SEC. 3. Timber access roads are defined for purposes of the preceding sections as roads and bridges primarily for use in utilizing timber from national forests but which may be made available for utilizing other timber or for other purposes.

SEC. 4. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, sums not in excess of $3,000,000 for the purpose of establishing a revolving fund which may be utilized by the Secretary of the Interior, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, for constructing, improving, and maintaining roads and bridges to provide access to timber situated on Indian reservations; if Government aid for such purposes is not otherwise available under the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented. Such revolving fund shall be reimbursed for amounts expended therefrom for the construction, improvement, or maintenance of any such road or bridge on any Indian reservation from the proceeds from the sale of timber from such reservation, and no moneys shall be expended from such fund for such purposes unless such reimbursement has been consented to by the affected Indian tribes and/or individuals on such terms and over such period of time as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and such tribes or individuals.

(b) A report shall be made annually by the Secretary of the Interior to the Congress setting forth operations under this section and the status of the fund established pursuant thereto.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, timber is one of the most important resources of the Pacific Northwest. It constitutes a crop that should be developed and harvested wisely for the people of our generation and for those who follow us.

The United States Government owns great forests, not only in my own State of Oregon, but throughout the Nation. The access roads within these forests serve to protect, develop, and harvest magnificent stands of timber, some of which have never been logged.

In order that these access roads may be constructed and improved and the forests thereby developed as a good businessman would manage a going concern, I am today introducing an access-roads bill which will pay handsome dividends to the people of the United States for years to come.

The financial provisions of this bill implement a sound rate of construction for timber-access roads. The substantive provisions give the Secretary of Agriculture adequate authority to enter into the many types of agreements needed to develop sound access to both public and private timber.

In the 84th Congress I introduced a somewhat similar bill, S. 3420. Inasmuch as the remarks I made when I introduced S. 3420 are applicable to the bill I am now introducing, I consider it unnecessary to repeat my earlier remarks.

I do, however, wish to call attention to some matters of interest which occurred near the close of the last session.

THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET—THE ROADBLOCK TO FOREST ACCESS

First, it will be enlightening to have in the RECORD a letter from the Bureau of the Budget to Senator CHAVEZ, chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, which demonstrates how little the Bureau understood last year's counterpart of this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in my remarks a letter dated July 23, 1956, addressed to Senator CHAVEZ, by Robert E. Merriam, Assistant to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
*Washington, D. C., July 23, 1956.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
*Chairman, Committee on Public Works,*
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for the views of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to S. 3420, "To authorize the appropriation of funds for carrying out provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain timber access roads, to permit maximum economy in harvesting national forest timber, and for other purposes."

S. 3420 would authorize appropriations for forest-development roads and trails to and on national forests for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218). The bill would also authorize the establishment of a revolving fund to be utilized by the Secretary of the Interior to provide access to timber on Indian lands if Government aid is not otherwise available under the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented. This fund would be reimbursed from sale of timber from Indian lands.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, Public Law 627, authorizes the appropriation of $27 million annually for forest-development roads and trails and $12 million annually for roads and bridges on and to provide access to Indian reservations for the fiscal years 1958 and 1959. These amounts are larger than those authorized for fiscal years 1956 and 1957 by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954. The $12 million authorization for Indian reservations may be used for access to timber on Indian lands.

The Bureau of the Budget believes that recent enactment of Public Law 627 has made unnecessary the enactment of S. 3420.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. MERRIAM,
*Assistant to the Director.*

Mr. MORSE. The Budget Office said that the purposes of the bill had been met by the Highway Bill of the 84th Congress. The reply Senator GORE sent to the Budget Director effectively disposed of that suggestion. I ask unanimous consent that Senator GORE's letter of September 11, 1956, be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. PERCIVAL F. BRUNDAGE,
*Director, Bureau of the Budget,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. BRUNDAGE: Your letter of July 23, 1956 to the Chairman of the Public Works Committee on S. 3420 has been referred to me as Chairman of the Public Roads Subcommittee.

This bill had two objectives, only one of which was partially met by Public Law 627. First, the bill proposed an amendment to Section 23 of the Federal Highway Act as it related to the level of authorization. Of equal importance are the substantive legislative provisions which are designed to provide the Forest Service with the tools it needs for modern intensive forest management, making extensive use of cooperative efforts.

I am informed that a bill in substantially the same form as S. 3420 will be reintroduced in the 85th Congress, and it is my desire that early hearings be held to develop both a substantive legislative approach and a level of authorization adequate to meet the challenge of forest management goals.

Public Law 627 was designed to meet broad highway objectives. These were so significant and time-consuming that it was not possible to fit into the work of the Committee adequate time to review thoroughly the forest road program envisaged by S. 3420. Such an opportunity will be afforded next year.

I am delighted to have your opinion that portions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs' authorization can be used on Indian Reservations for timber access roads. It was my previous understanding that Bureau of Indian Affairs officials did not understand this to be the case.

I should like to request that you have an appropriate review made of road needs in our National Forests, and that a thorough study be made of substantive provisions of S. 3420, so that a prompt report may be received when a similar bill is introduced in the 85th Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT GORE,
*Chairman, Public Roads Subcommittee.*

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Tennessee is to be complimented for the awareness demonstrated by this letter. He has again shown that this administration cannot fool him. It would seem to me that the administration would be extremely careful in making statements that are apt to be scrutinized by one of the leaders of the memorable fight against the amazing Dixon-Yates proposal and the administration's atomic energy giveaway.

When I introduced the timber access road bill last year, the administration delayed in supplying comments on the bill. When the comments finally arrived, they demonstrated an alarming lack of understanding of the purposes of the access road bill.

What surprises me most is that the adminstration failed to recognize that the derstanding of the purposes of the access roads bill were drawn from H. R. 7118, a bill introduced in the House on June 30, 1955, by former Congressman Hope. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 7, page 9683, shows that the Hope bill was introduced after the Comptroller General had reported to the Congress on problems of national forest administration.

A NETWORK OF ACCESS ROADS IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST

The bill I am introducing here today will provide for a modern network of vitally needed access roads into our national forests—a network that will bring about maximum use and conservation of this priceless national asset.

The Chief of the Forest Service has told the Congress that millions of board-feet of timber lack full management and stand rotting on the stump because of insufficient roads. This is an appalling disclosure.

Western communities dependent on timber are adversely affected because these roads are not in. Their maximum economic development awaits the coming of the roads.

Wood—essential to national defense if we must again protect our Democracy from aggression—will be in short supply unless these roads are available for use. Our western national forests contain the greatest part of the high quality old growth timber—and this timber is a vital part of our defense stockpile.

CONGRESS TAKES THE INITIATIVE ON ROAD AUTHORIZATION

For 1953 and 1954 the Congress of its own accord raised the authorization for timber access roads in our national forests to $22.5 million. For 1955–56 the Congress raised the authorization to $24 million. Just last year the administration testified that the authorization should not be raised, but the Congress raised the authorization to $27 million for 1957 and 1958. These increases have enabled the program to move ahead, but at a rate that is not abreast of the times. Unfortunately, a large part of the money has been needed just to keep pace with the higher cost of roads. The present program level is totally inadequate.

It should be thoroughly appreciated by all that the funds the Forest Service receives for roads are spread among many programs. These funds are used to maintain the important roads needed for fire protection and public use, to replace the badly worn bridges and culverts (and I might say that this is a problem of increasing cost), to provide engineering services for roads constructed by timber purchasers and finally for new construction. In addition, this new construction involves roads for protection and general public use as well as timber access roads. When we think of a level of authorization we must remember the way these funds must be spread.

The timber access road program has moved ahead, but by too great reliance on roads built under timber contracts. This is costing the taxpayers money. This is decreasing revenues and it is reducing the ability of all firms to secure Federal timber on a true competitive basis.

Our cut of national forest timber is climbing. At present it is 7 billion board-feet a year. The present goal is 10 billion board-feet. The Chief of the Forest Service says, in his most recent annual report, that one-third—imagine—one-third—of the allowable cut cannot be made due to inaccessibility, lack of personnel, and other factors. His report shows that in 1955 only 529 miles of timber access roads were built by appropriated funds while 1,632 miles were completed under timber sale contracts. Seventy percent of our access roads are built by timber sale purchases. I feel that the proportion should not exceed 50 percent. The Chief of the Forest Service estimates that at least 30,000 miles of new roads are needed for timber access.

Our forests must be developed and it takes 500 miles of road a year to open up

each billion board-feet of timber harvested. This rate will be necessary until we open up and place under management the vast areas of untapped timber. My bill proposes to do this in 10 years. If we continue with the administration's program it will take over 20 years, and we will continue to lose potential wood for use and revenue for the Treasury.

A 10 billion board-foot annual cut will require 5,000 miles of new road a year. Current estimates show that these roads cost from $7,500 to $75,000 a mile with the average at $20,000 a mile. This bill would step up the cut to 10 billion board-feet in 4 years. It would raise the authorization by reasonable steps to $50 million a year. At a road cost of $20,000 a mile this bill would provide that one-half of the 5,000 miles needed annually for the next 10 years be constructed by appropriated funds. Construction with appropriated funds would increase these roads by 2,000 miles a year and construction by timber purchasers would add another 1,000 miles a year. These roads would not induce overcutting. Rather, they would enable us to step up the cut under sound principles of forest development. We are not getting such development today. We will not get it unless we greatly expand our access road program.

The program outlined in my bill would enable the national forests to reach their full allowable cut in a manner so as to bring in the maximum return to the Treasury.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION AND USE AGREEMENTS

Section 2 of the bill sets forth authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to construct roads by entering into road construction and use agreements, by charging the necessary fees, and by granting easement leases and permits and further it provides for adequate public hearings on projects where this is desirable. My bill does not in any way disturb the right of actual settlers to get to and from their farms and ranches as provided by the 1897 act.

This bill provides for more than sound management. It insures that all segments of the lumber industry dependent upon national forest timber will not starve in the midst of plenty. These roads can provide the means for better fire protection and disease control. They can make possible more opportunities for hunters, the fishermen, and the campers to enjoy our forests.

This bill also gives the people another chance to decide who leads in conservation, who merely follows, and who obstructs the wise use and development of the Nation's natural resources.

IMPROVING THE INDIAN TIMBER PROGRAM

Section 4 of my bill deserves a few brief remarks. Its language proposes setting up a revolving fund to finance roads to Indian timber. The administration says that the Federal Highway Act suffices. I disagree. We have not always appropriated enough money for the Indian programs. When an access road is built to the Indians' timber, it should insofar as possible be paid for by the Indians who own the timber. In the case of the national forest, Federal money appropriated for timber access roads comes back to the taxpayers many fold. In the case of Indians, they are the beneficiaries. I believe our Indians are entitled to fair treatment in the sale of their timber. It is only right that Indian timber should ultimately finance the roads that develop timber revenue. However, where the road is a multiple-use road with broad public benefits, Federal Highway Act funds should be used. That is what my bill calls for on this subject. It is a sound businesslike approach.

Section 4 of this bill provides for loans to the Indians so that they can develop their timber and get the best possible price instead of being forced to make large sales at reduced prices.

URGES BUDGET DIRECTOR TO STUDY PROBLEM

I close with the fervent hope that this year the Budget Director will really analyze the bill before he reports on it. I also hope that he looks at the fiscal aspects and takes cognizance of the principle that has made our Nation so great, namely, we must invest some capital before we can earn dividends.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I made before the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies of the House Appropriations Committee on February 4, 1957, together with the exhibits which I introduced at that hearing.

There being no objection, the testimony and exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES OF THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

BUDGET FOR FOREST SERVICE AND BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Chairman KIRWAN and members of the subcommittee, I wish to thank you for extending me the courtesy of testifying before the subcommittee on the budget of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

I had hoped to be able to introduce to you two new colleagues from Oregon—Congressman CHARLES PORTER of Eugene, representing the Fourth District, and AL ULLMAN, representing the Second District. These men bring to Congress a very broad knowledge of Oregon's resource problems and a great fund of local experience. We were unable to get our schedules together, and I just want to take this opportunity to mention that they plan to testify later today.

With one exception, which I shall discuss with respect to the Forest Service budget, it is my opinion these are far better budgets than last year's. For the first time they give reasonably proper recognition to the real contribution our public forests make to the Nation's economy.

The Congress has shown a fine understanding of our conservation problems by its action in increasing executive budgets for forestry and this has been of great help. I don't look upon this year's budget as containing increases. Rather, it is an effort to make up for past deficiencies.

Before I came over here, I looked over the recommendations I made last year and I am greatly pleased to find that all but one is recognized by this budget.

*The Forest Service*

In particular, I want to endorse "Operation Outdoors" under which the Forest Service plans to rehabilitate and expand its recreational facilities which serve 45 million Americans each year. We have pressing problems in the bad conditions of recreational areas in my State. Mount Hood Lodge and Lost Lake Camp on the Mount Hood Forest need special consideration just to name two situations that the folks back home have discussed in some detail with me.

In fiscal year 1956 Oregon's 18 national forests brought almost $38 million into the Treasury. I do not have the fiscal 1956 expenditure figures, but I do have the 1957 estimates which are comparable. The Forest Service spent about $12 million to develop this $38 million in revenue. Of the gross profit of $26 million, about $1 million is put into research and State and private forestry programs and $9.4 million goes toward payments in lieu of taxes, leaving a net of $15.6 million in the Treasury. Of course, you appreciate that all of the income goes into the Treasury and the above figures are merely used to demonstrate that Oregon's national forests are on a paying basis. In fact, no other State matches Oregon's national forests record for profitable operation. Oregon's return of $15.6 million over and above all expenses to the Treasury is a real accomplishment, and I want to say our foresters can do even better if they are given the tools.

Last year the Congress authorized $27 million for timber access roads under the Federal Highway Act. This, with the 10 percent fund, provides a total of $38,848,000 for roads and trail construction and maintenance. The Forest Service budget only calls for $36,184,000, which is $2,664,000 less than could be made available under the existing authorization. Through the lack of funds to construct timber access roads, the Government is losing millions of dollars. Let me just give you a few figures which demonstrate this. The BLM specializes in sales under 10 million board-feet and the Senate Interior Committee in its report on Federal timber sales policies notes on page 247 that 89 percent of its sales attracted more than one bidder and sold at an average price 76 percent above the appraisal price. For their few sales over 10 million board-feet, competition was less and they get only 56 percent more than their appraisal price.

On page 251, this report shows that Forest Service sales in the Willamette National Forest over 10 million board-feet in size commanded only 13 percent above the appraisal price. On page 258 the committee summarized large sales on a regionwide basis and again showed that as sales size went up the percentage of volume selling in one-bid sales rose to 100 percent, while bidding increases fell off from 53 percent above appraisal price for sales between 10 and 25 million board-feet then to 39 percent for sales up to 50 million board-feet, and finally to absolutely no increase, for sales over 50 million board-feet. The bigger the sale the less competition, and these big sales occur mainly when there are high cost roads to construct. If we furnish funds for roads this picture will change.

At this point I would like to insert in the record the annual report of the Willamette National Forest which is headquartered in my home town. Look at this fine financial record. Operating expenses were $852,524 and payments to local government were $2,309,257 for total annual expenses of $3,161,781. Receipts were $13,287,139 and the net income before expenses for investment purposes was $10,125,358. An additional $4,436,340 was invested, mainly in roads built

by timber purchasers, and there is a real net profit to the Treasury of $5,689,018. This 1,645,000-acre forest sold 377 million board-feet of timber last year and it could do better if it had more access roads.

Your attention is directed particularly to the statements on page 2 of this annual report under "Timber management." In the Lowell district mortality losses average 15 percent in the last 10-year period. The supervisor says: "If we had our road system in, such losses could be largely recovered; but without roads, a major part of this loss will rot away." He goes on to say: "At present we have no access road projects for the forest, although one is planned up Quartzville Creek in 1957." Gentlemen, I think the record on this forest is proof of the need for access roads.

"NINETEEN-FIFTY-SIX ANNUAL REPORT

"Every year the Willamette faces greater demands for its raw materials and services, such as timber to supply the industry that provides most of our jobs here in Oregon, campgrounds and forest recreation areas that go so far toward making Oregon a good place in which to live, pure and ample water supplies needed for recreation, domestic, industrial and power purposes. We expect these demands to keep right on increasing, and we want to do everything possible to meet them. We are sending you this report to tell you a little about what we are doing, what we plan to do, and what we think needs to be done to have the Williamette National Forest make the maximum contribution to the welfare and well-being of you, its stockholders.

"On behalf of my coworkers and myself, I want to express our appreciation again for your wonderful cooperation and support during the past year. We hope that you will visit the forest often, and if we can be of any assistance, please feel free to call on us.

"Best wishes for 1957 from the Willamette personnel.

"ROBERT AUFDERHEIDE,
*"Forest Supervisor."*

---

*"General administration*

"In addition to the normal management activities discussed in more detail in other sections of this report, the year 1956 brought us our share of special projects and problems.

"A good start was made in clearing for the flood control dams at Cougar and Hills Creek.

"After much debate and discussion, the voters of Eugene turned down the bond issue for construction of the Beaver Marsh project. In view of the power versus recreation values involved here, we undertook the preparation of a land management study of the upper McKenzie River area. This study will be completed this winter; and when finished, will be discussed with interested groups.

"A new contract was let by the Bureau of Public Roads for the Belknap Springs forest highway. The contract covers 4.5 miles from the South Santiam highway to Clear Lake. The grading contract from the McKenzie highway side was finished by the Halvorsen Construction Co., and the Bureau completed the location for the middle section.

"To get more on-the-ground supervision and to give the public better service, the McKenzie district was divided into two districts. An office and three new residences are under construction at Blue River for the new district. We are also constructing a new ranger office along the Willamette highway in Oakridge, just west of the Pope and Talbot mill.

"A land exchange was completed with the Bureau of Land Management to block up the intermingled O. and C. lands.

"Under mining legislation passed by Congress in 1955, the forest initiated action in the Little North Fork of the Santiam, Quartzville and Blue River areas to determine surface rights on mining claims. Under the procedure established by this legislation people who wish to retain surface rights on their claims must so certify. Those who do not so certify lose their surface rights. This procedure will clear up the status of abandoned claims, and will enable the forest to identify and locate those claims on which the claimant desires to retain surface rights.

*"Timber management*

"The forest has maintained its allowable cut permitted under present inventories since 1952.

"The Middle Fork Willamette, Hills Creek, Salt Creek, Salmon Creek, North Fork Willamette and McKenzie River drainages were reinventoried in 1956 in cooperation with the timber resource survey of Lane County by the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station. Fieldwork was also completed on the North Santiam drainage. Management plans will be revised as quickly as possible.

"The South Santiam drainage is the only drainage remaining in which the forest does not have a current inventory, and this job will be initiated in 1957.

"The reinventory and revision of timber management plan for the Lowell district (Fall Creek drainage) showed mortality losses averaging 15 percent during the last 10-year period. We think that we will find similar heavy volume losses in the working circles inventoried this year.

"If we had our road system in, such losses could largely be recovered; but without roads, a major part of this loss will rot away. As logging pushes back into the headwaters of the drainages, mature timber stands become more spotty because of past fire history, and here access road construction will be needed. At present we have no access road projects on the forest, although one is planned up Quartzville Creek in 1957.

"Here is the past year's timber business in brief: 390 million board-feet sold; 398 million board-feet cut; 490 million board-feet prepared for sale; $9,527,000, value of timber cut; 386, number of sales made; 1,200,000 board-feet, average size of sale; 973,300 acres reinventoried; 95 miles of road surveyed; 2 million trees planted; 4,000 acres planted; 102 miles of timber access road constructed through timber sale contracts; 3 miles of timber access road constructed with appropriated funds; 10 new bridges built, $2,800,000, value of roads and bridges built to develop timber resources; 4,000 acres of slash burned; 1,100 miles of existing road maintained.

*"Recreation and wildlife*

"The lakes, streams, mountains, trails, and campgrounds of the Willamette Forest this year were used by more than 95,000 campers, 95,000 fishermen, 5,500 hunters, 30,000 skiers, and 1,500,000 other visitors.

"This represents an increase in use of over 100 percent since the years immediately preceding World War II. We expect somewhere near this same rate of increase over the next 10-year period. Congressional appropriations have been inadequate for even annual maintenance of the existing campground facilities, and our increases in facilities to meet this expanding use have been negligible. However, there are encouraging indications that Congress will again increase appropriations for recreational use, and if they do we may gradually be able to rehabilitate existing facilities and develop badly needed new ones.

"Assistant Secretary of Agriculture E. L. Peterson visited the forest in August to look at the Three Sisters Wilderness area. No decision has been announced.

"On the basis of our limited experience with the land management study we have made on the upper McKenzie River, it appears highly desirable to extend similar land management studies over the entire forest. Such studies will give us rather accurate acreages for the various areas that are earmarked for preferential use—such as stream and roadside reservations. Correlation of such information with our timber management plans will improve their accuracy.

*"Watershed management*

"How much is it worth to the people of Oregon to have clean, clear water in their streams and to be free from disastrous floods in the wet season and water shortages in the dry season. No one knows in dollars and cents but we all know the value is tremendous. The Corps of Army Engineers are building flood control dams in the Willamette River Basin to control the major streams, but these alone aren't the final answer. We can't afford to build a dam on every stream, and we can't afford to reduce the useful life of the dams we can build through unnecessary siltation of the reservoirs. Overall watershed management must begin in the headwaters of each stream with good logging and road construction practices designed to keep dirt out of the streams and streamflow as near normal as possible throughout the year. Research is being carried on constantly at various places, including the H. J. Andrews Experimental Forest here on the Willamette, to determine how best to protect our water resources. Increasing care and attention is being paid road construction and logging to avoid and minimize siltation.

*"Fire protection*

"We could have headed this paragraph 'protection' alone, because the forest needs protection from insects, disease, floods, and other dangers, as well as from fire. These other threats we try to meet in the day-to-day work of timber management, and when occasionally something attacks, like the spruce budworm did several years ago, we have to make an all-out effort to defeat it. But the fire danger we have every year and the potential for damage is so terrific we have to be organized and prepared to cope with it on an annual basis. Since 1951, fire has pretty well been held in check, but no one can relax or become complacent because any summer day may give us the combination of circumstances that spell disaster.

"The 1956 fire record looks like this:

| | |
|---|---|
| "Total acres burned | 112 |
| Number of fires | 136 |
| Man-caused | 37 |
| Lightning fires | 99 |
| Cost of fire fighting | $51,000 |

*"Engineering and construction*

"This year we have taken on the job of complete road survey and designing for most of the roads to be constructed by timber-sale purchasers. We do this to provide a firmer base for appraisals and to remove some of the bidder's uncertainty as to costs. It has the further advantage of allowing the timber-sale purchaser to start road construction almost immediately after he buys the timber, since the survey is complete. Finally, we believe we can do a better job of protecting watershed values.

"The year's engineering accomplishments are, 95 miles of road surveyed for design by us; 15 miles of road located for design by timber purchasers; 3 miles of road constructed by contract; 10 bridges built through contract; 7 buildings constructed; 102 miles of road construction by timber purchasers supervised; 15 major culvert installations supervised (culverts furnished by the Forest Service); 400 miles of road maintenance by purchasers supervised; 700 miles of road maintained by the Forest Service; 2,370 miles of trail maintained; 680 miles of telephone line maintained; 125 radios maintained.

"The value of all the roads and bridges added to the forest system was $2,630,000.

*"Forest statistics*

| "Area: | *Acres* |
|---|---|
| Detroit ranger district | 273,400 |
| Cascadia ranger district | 246,200 |
| McKenzie ranger district | 265,700 |
| Blue River ranger district | 181,800 |
| Lowell ranger district | 152,100 |
| Oakridge ranger district | 244,900 |
| Rigdon ranger district | 280,900 |
| Forest total | 1,645,000 |

"Of this forest total, over one-third (620,300 acres) is in areas either reserved from timber cutting or not suited to timber production.

| | *Board-feet* |
|---|---|
| "Total timber volume | 34,700,400,000 |
| Allowable annual cut | 377,000,000 |

"(Both of the above figures will probably be raised when the results are in from our current reinventory project.)"

*"Willamette National Forest financial statement, fiscal year 1956*

| | Receipts | Expenditures | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Operating | Investments |
| Congressional appropriations: | | | |
| Timber management | | $181,196 | |
| Other resource management | | 76,641 | |
| Forest fire protection | | 259,126 | |
| Maintenance of improvements | | 48,974 | |
| Construction of new improvements | | | $46,216 |
| Tree planting and stand improvement | | | 5,565 |
| Road and trail maintenance | | 30,852 | |
| Road and trail construction (including bridges) | | | 335,175 |
| 10 percent road funds: | | | |
| Road and trail maintenance | | 75,798 | |
| Road and trail construction (including bridges) | | | 197,910 |
| Work deposits by forest users: | | | |
| Tree planting and stand improvement | $81,960 | | 67,050 |
| Brush disposal and extra fire protection | 103,483 | 114,426 | 5,204 |
| Road maintenance | 69,115 | 50,428 | |
| Scaling (extra services) | 16,245 | 13,320 | |
| Miscellaneous other | 841 | 1,763 | 754 |
| Timber operator built roads | 3,778,466 | | 3,778,466 |
| National forest receipts: | | | |
| Timber sales | 9,228,250 | | |
| Grazing fees | 312 | | |
| Special use fees | 8,467 | | |
| Totals | 13,287,139 | 852,524 | 4,436,340 |

"Twenty-five percent of national forest receipts is distributed to the counties in which national forest land is located. Distribution from the Willamette is as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| "Clackamas | $1,307 |
| "Douglas | 72,377 |
| "Jefferson | 1,189 |
| "Lane | 1,373,867 |
| "Linn | 664,199 |
| "Marion | 196,318 |
| "Total | 2,309,257" |

In addition, I would like to put in the RECORD a letter from Regional Forester Stone dated January 11, 1957, discussing some problems raised by a constituent regarding roads on the Siskiyou National Forest. I do not want to present the problem raised by this constituent which is in the process of solution, but I do want you to see first hand the immense road development job the Forest Service has in our State. This forest is cutting less than one-half of its allowable cut and this is because of the lack of funds for access roads.

Gentlemen, I did not come over here to recite reams of statistics but I would like to say this about the Forest Service access road program: The Forest Service made an estimate in 1952 that indicated that proper development required the expenditure in a 5-year period of $113 million by the Government for access roads. For the 5-year period ending this year only $74 million has been allotted for construction of roads. This deficit occurred because the authorization is neither big enough nor is it restricted solely to construction. These funds covered by the authorization are used for maintenance, reconstruction, and engineering.

At the same time the Service estimated that timber purchases should build $143 million worth of roads through allowances in timber sale contracts. In this 5-year period they have accomplished only about $107 million worth of this type of construction. There has not been enough money for road construction and as a result the percentage of road constructed by the Government in relation to those constructed by timber purchasers has dropped from a healthy 50–50 ratio to an unhealthy 30–70 ratio.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
PACIFIC NORTHWEST REGION,
*Portland, Oreg., January 11, 1957.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are pleased to acknowledge your letter of January 4.

We wrote to you on March 8 last year concerning our plans for development of the Rogue River Working Circle. You ask that we advise you on the current situation. Last year we completed construction under contract of 13.4 miles of the Elk River Road. See road reference No. 4 on the attached map. We plan to make 3 sales this year in this drainage totaling 25 million feet. In the next 5 years some 31 miles of permanent road will be constructed in the Elk River drainage by timber purchasers. Nine miles of the Hunter Creek Road (map reference No. 5) was completed last year by a timber purchaser. The mining-claim problems that were holding up the Evans Products Co. sale of 33 million feet have been cleared and the company has logged over 20 million feet. A second sale of 15 million feet will be made in fiscal year 1958, which sale will extend the Hunter Creek Road some 6 miles. If rights-of-way can be obtained we hope to make a 15-million-foot sale in Euchre Creek which sale will provide for construction of 10 miles of permanent road. The Bureau of Public Roads completed the survey of the Powers-Agness Road (map reference No. 3) last year. We made a reconnaissance of the Lobster Creek-Agness segment of the Gold Beach-Agness Road (map reference No. 2) last season.

From the reconnaissance it was determined that a road on the south bank of the Rogue River was feasible, and we immediately had the Bureau of Public Roads commence a road survey of this route. They will complete this survey in the next few months. When this survey is completed we will make an economic analysis to determine the priority of construction of these two routes (roads Nos. 2 and 3). We will plan to program construction of the most favorable route as promptly as availability of appropriated funds will permit considering other high priority road projects in the region. We believe that eventually construction of both the road from Lobster Creek to Agness and the Powers-Agness Road will need to be financed with appropriated funds. However, we are currently exploring with Curry County Timber Operators' Association the possibility of constructing the Lobster Creek-Agness Road under a cooperative arrangement.

We have shown on the attached map by broken black lines other proposed major access roads. We have not attempted to show all roads that will be necessary to fully develop the area. If you wish, we can send you a map showing our permanent transportation plan. Such a map is available for inspection in the Chief's office in Washington. At the present time we do not have specific plans as to how the other roads will be developed. A majority of the remaining roads will be constructed by timber purchasers. However, as development of the working circle progresses, we may find it necessary or desirable to use appropriated funds for the construction of the more costly roads.

A Cooperative Road Construction Agreement is now being executed by United States Plywood Corp. and the Forest Service for the construction of the Lobster Creek Road (map reference No. 1). This road will extend from the end of the county road near Gold Beach easterly up the south bank of the Rogue River to the mouth of Lobster Creek thence bridge the Rogue River and continue along the east bank of Lobster Creek to the national-forest boundary. The company started construction of the road last summer and they now have several miles of road completed. The total cost of the road will be shared equally between the two parties. The company will build all of the road and the Forest Service plans to build the bridge across the Rogue River. We have allocated $250,000 of appropriated funds for the construction of this bridge. The difference between the $250,000 that the Forest Service invests in the bridge and the Government's 50-percent share of the total project costs will be paid to the company by purchasers of national-forest timber who use the road. The agreement provides that the Forest Service will acquire the necessary road rights-of-way across the Thom property and rights-of-way for the bridge site. The company will secure all other rights-of-way. When the road is completed and prior to the time that purchasers of national-forest timber make payment for using the road, the company is required to furnish the Forest Service rights-of-way for the entire road. Pending, delivery of such rights-of-way, the agreement provides (1) the Government can use the road for official purposes, (2) the general public may use the road upon mutual agreement of the company and the Forest Service, (3) haulers of other private timber may use the road subject to paying a reasonable amortization charge. Such payments as are made by haulers of other private timber will be divided 50–50 between the company and the Forest Service. (4) Owners of private property bordering the road may use the road for purposes of ingress and egress to their property.

Full and complete title to the road will rest with the Government at the time easements are delivered, subject only to the provision of the cooperative agreement. On December 31, 1967, the cooperative agreement will expire with the Government having full control of the road, subject to United States Plywood Corp.'s reservation in easement deeds to use the road.

With respect to Mr. Thom's letter, we wish to comment as follows. Initially the company negotiated with Mr. Thom and they offered him $5,000 for a right of way, which figure Mr. Thom refused to accept. We understand that the company then offered to purchase Mr. Thom's property at a price of $52,000 and to furnish him another building site along the Rogue River on which he

could relocate. Mr. Thom made a written counter offer to furnish a right of way on the condition that a toll would be paid by all users of the road for each thousand board-feet of timber hauled over the road for a long period of years. He also offered to sell his property for a sum sufficient to give him $300,000, tax free. The two parties were so far apart that the company dropped negotiations with Mr. Thom. The company was prepared, in event negotiations with the Forest Service failed to consummate a satisfactory cooperative agreement, to bridge the Rogue River below Mr. Thom's property. The lower bridge site is less desirable and would be more costly than the bridge site above the Thom property, but if the company were to construct a private road for their own purposes it would have been cheaper for them to use the lower bridge crossing than to pay Mr. Thom an exorbitant amount for a right-of-way. Since the Forest Service would eventually need a road right-of-way across the Thom property in order to extend the road in the future up the south bank of the Rogue River to Agness, we determined that the best route for the proposed Lobster Creek road was to cross the Thom property and make use of the more favorable bridge site upstream from his property. In order to avoid the Thom property in constructing the proposed Gold Beach-Agness road in the future it would require bridging the Rogue River below the Thom property, then bridging Lobster Creek, and thence bridging back across the Rogue River to the south bank above the Thom property. The excess cost of such 3 bridges in comparison to the 1 bridge needed under the present plan is conservatively estimated to be about $500,000. Since, in any event, it was essential for our future needs to have a right-of-way across the Thom property and considering that United States Plywood Corp. was unsuccessful in negotiating with Mr. Thom, the Forest Service agreed to obtain the necessary right-of-way from him.

In reply to your question (4), the cooperative agreement provides that the cost of acquiring rights-of-way by either or both parties will be included in determining the total cost of the project. If Mr. Thom had accepted the United States Plywood offer the company would have reimbursed him directly and such cost would have been credited as part of the company's share of the total cost of the project. If condemnation action is taken, the Forest Service will deposit the required funds with the court and such cost will be a credit to the Government's share of the project cost.

Recognizing the probable difficulty in negotiating with Mr. Thom for a right-of-way, we are currently having a thorough appraisal of the fair value of the right-of-way made by qualified appraisers. The county court has furnished a report of a local board of viewers who have recommended a fair value of approximately $5,500 for the right-of-way. We have obtained the assistance of the Corps of Engineers and Bonneville Power Administration in furnishing us two experienced real-estate appraisers to make a report on the fair value of the right-of-way.

Mr. Thom's allegation that "big business" has brought pressure to bear upon the Government is not correct. The Forest Service took the initiative in proposing a cooperative road construction project. We have had plans for a Lobster Creek road for several years. A road survey was made by the Bureau of Public Roads a few years ago before U. S. Plywood had any interests in the area. That segment of the proposed road paralleling Lobster Creek will be constructed on the Bureau of Public Roads survey. The taxpayers will benefit under the agreement in that a road to serve the public need will be obtained for half price. If we were to construct the proposed road alone it would require in excess of $1 million of appropriated funds. Under the agreement, only $250,000 of appropriated funds will be required and the balance of the Government's share of road cost will be financed from stumpage through appraisal allowance.

As pointed out previously, the road will not be under direct control and supervision of the plywood corporation. During the initial 10-year period, the road will be under joint administration. Purchasers of national-forest timber have the right to use the road and the company cannot prevent anyone from bidding on national-forest timber. Until the Government's share of the road is amortized purchasers will have to make amortization payments for use of the road. However, if the company is a purchaser of national-forest timber, the amount that would have been paid by any other purchaser will be credited to reduce the Government's share of amortization.

Mr. Thom states that the Forest Service does not now have funds for extending the road from Lobster Creek to Agness and if such funds are not made available in the future, the current section of road will be of little or no use. This, of course, is not true. The proposed road when completed will furnish primary access to 2 townships of national forest timber in the Lobster Creek area and 1 township in the Quosatana area. We have had preliminary negotiations with Curry County Timber Operators' Association with respect to a possible cooperative construction agreement for extension of the road from Lobster Creek upstream toward Agness. If such a cooperative construction agreement does not materialize for extension of the Rogue River road, we will plan to build a road sometime in the future using appropriated funds, if available. If necessary the road from Lobster Creek to Agness could be constructed by progressive construction under timber sale procedure; however, this method is the least desirable because of the high cost of construction and the length of time that it would take to complete the road by this procedure.

Mr. Thom states that there is an excellent public road along the north bank of the Rogue River that overrules any argument that a south side road is needed. The north side road is a county road and is narrow and crooked and it would be dangerous to impose log hauling traffic upon the already existing public use. It would be necessary to widen and realine this road to make it an economic and safe timber-haul road. A few years ago we had the Bureau of Public Roads make a survey of the north side to determine what improvements would be needed. It was determined that the cost of improving the north side road would be considerably more than constructing a new road on the south side. There are numerous residents along the north side road. If the north side road was realined and widened it would damage many property owners in contrast to the south side route where only Mr. Thom is affected. It is estimated that the cost of securing needed rights-of-way for realinement on the north side road would equal or exceed the cost of constructing the south side road. The south bank route is without question the best and only feasible route for constructing a timber access road.

One reason Mr. Thom has not developed his property as a resort is probably the fact that since he has lived there there have been at least three floods that inundated all of the bottom land that he owns. The frequency and severity of the floods were of such magnitude that Mr. Thom found it necessary to dismantle and move his home from the bottom land and rebuild it on a steep mountainside above the toe of the slope. Because of the frequency of flooding it is questionable if the Thom property could be economically developed as resort property.

From an engineering standpoint the logical place for the proposed road across the Thom property is at the toe of the mountainside which location would take Mr. Thom's house. We have located the road in the only other possible location to avoid his house, which location will place the road between the main house and the river. The location places a segment of the road on land subject to occasional flooding and will cost approximately $5,000 more to build than if the road was constructed along the toe of the slope.

To our knowledge the majority of Curry County people favor our proposed road location and project. We have not received any other protest to the project. We wish to quote the following from a letter we received from the Curry County court of January 3, 1956:

"As I understand it, the Forest Service and the United States Plywood Corp. are presently working out the terms of an agreement whereby United States Plywood will extend Jerry's Flat Road on the south bank of the Rogue River to Lobster Creek where they will bridge the river. Terms of this agreement do not concern us at this time. However, we do wish you to know that we consider this road of vital importance to the welfare of the county as a whole. You have our assurance that we will do everything in our power to assist you and the plywood company in getting it built and getting it built soon. The whole county is behind us in this. We consider construction of the road to Lobster Creek as a first step in getting our road through to Agness. With the right-of-way bottleneck eliminated as far as Lobster Creek, the road to Agness could proceed without any further delay."

It is our plan to undertake negotiations with Mr. Thom as soon as we receive the appraisal reports from the appraisers. We wish and sincerely hope to be able to obtain the right-of-way through friendly negotiations. If we fail in our negotiations, we plan to recommend condemnation as we feel that the acquisition of this right-of-way is necessary and clearly in the public interest.

As requested, we are returning Mr. Thom's letter herewith.

If we can furnish you any additional information on this project, we will be happy to do so.

Very truly yours,

J. HERBERT STONE,
*Regional Forester.*

The Forest Service will have available to it in Oregon about the same amount of money for timber access roads as the Bureau of Land Management has ($6,032,000 as compared to $6,075,000). However, the Forest Service manages about 13 million acres of rugged commercial forest land, including one-half million acres of BLM timberlands while the BLM manages about 2¾ million acres. The Forest Service provides 2½ times as much timber for industry as the BLM does in Oregon but the national forests could provide 4 times as much as the BLM lands. Gentlemen, the major reason the Forest Service isn't providing more timber is the lack of access roads. I'd like to emphasize here that in my judgment the current record has been attained only by stepping up the cut in already developed areas when we should be concentrating our efforts on opening up all of the forest areas and getting them under complete management.

I do not want to belabor this subject unduly, but I cannot overemphasize that sound management must be our guiding criterion. Timber-access roads are the very heart and soul of sound timber management. Without roads we can't protect the forest fully from fire, insects, or disease, nor can

we profitably thin so as to promote maximum timber growth. Also of great importance is the indisputable fact that we should promote a situation which permits the large and small firms alike to bid in this timber.

Gentlemen, this road program is a basic and integral part of every multiple-use management operation the Forest Service performs. "Operation Outdoors" is largely dependent on it because our people use these roads to get to campgrounds for hunting and fishing. Fire protection and all of the other activities need roads. This road money is used for construction of all these various roads, as well as maintenance, replacement of bridges, and engineering services. You can see that when the total authorization plus the 10 percent road money is spread over the entire road program, it is a mighty small amount for the job that must be done. I would like to insert a letter I received from the Forest Service on January 22, which shows the lack of funds for the improvement of recreational roads.

We in the Congress can help correct this situation if we will appropriate the full $27 million authorization for access roads to the Forest Service. I urge you to support the unanimous action on the Highway Act by the House and Senate in the 84th Congress by adding $2,664,000 for access road construction. This will bring in handsome revenue to the Government. The Forest Service has asked for more money to sell timber. Let us add the money that will bring the Treasury the top dollar for the timber.

At this point I want to insert a statement furnished me by the Regional Forester in the Pacific Northwest covering Forest Service operations. I think this analysis modestly states accomplishments and fully describes problems facing the Forest Service. I believe that you will find this report a source of inspiration.

THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Turning to the Bureau of Land Management may I point out that something over 90 percent of their timber business is concentrated in Oregon. The BLM also conducts a sizable grazing business in my State.

An excellent working relationship exists in Oregon between local government units and the Federal Government. Our Oregon and California counties have been financing the BLM access-road program out of their share of receipts and now they want to aid in reforestation. This is an excellent example of local public bodies doing more than recognizing their responsibility. This is a clear case of local public officials showing by deeds how they can help in the sound management of these Federal lands. What our Oregon and California counties are doing supports the proposition that there is a special history surrounding these lands. They are entitled to the shared revenues they receive and the counties have shown their willingness to shoulder their responsibilities by making adequate funds available for access roads.

I think you will find that the BLM ratio of revenues to receipts compares favorably with the Forest Service program although BLM does not presently carry on the variety of activities that the Forest Service does, nor are all of their programs of the same intensity. The BLM anticipates that it will take in $21 million from the Oregon and California lands and $1 million on the public-domain lands in 1957. Against this $22 million after expenses, including in-lieu payments, there will be a substantial profit accrue to the Treasury.

I would like to insert at this point a statement prepared for my information by the area Administrator for western operations of the BLM. This excellent analysis shows how well this vital work is proceeding in Oregon.

You will note that the paper mentions an attachment listing timber access-road projects. I would like to avoid burdening the RECORD and I have omitted this.

CAREER PEOPLE DESERVE COMMENDATION

There is just one other subject I'd like to discuss which affects both agencies. We have a fine group of people in these agencies who have made careers out of conservation. Many of them have served under several administrations. For example, the Chief of the Forest Service started his Federal service over 33 years ago and worked his way up. These people have dedicated their lives to conservation in order to make certain that the Nation will always be abundant in these God-given natural resources. They manage these lands for the benefit of future generations. Their record of stewardship is a credit to conservation.

We in the Congress have played a part in this, too, and it should be a source of satisfaction to us to know that these agencies are manned by people who not only are building for future generations but also give us such a fine return on the money we appropriate for conservation. The soil and the water, if properly managed, will give us trees, grass, and recreation in abundance forever. This budget is a step in that direction and I urge it receive full support.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
*Washington, D. C., January 22, 1957.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is in reply to your letter of January 3 with which you sent us a letter from Mr. Wendell Halseth, of Breitenbush Hot Springs, Inc., urging improvement of the section of road now extending from Detroit to Breitenbush Hot Springs within the Willamette National Forest.

No forest road funds have been programed for improvement of the Breitenbush road in fiscal year 1957. This does not necessarily indicate the regional forester determined that no improvement was needed but rather that forest road funds available for this year were more needed elsewhere. Program details for fiscal year 1958 are not submitted by the regional foresters until later. We are, therefore, forwarding your inquiry to Regional Forester Stone, at Portland, with a request that he advise you of future prospects for improvement of this road.

Mr. Halseth's letter is returned.

Very truly yours,
RICHARD E. MCARDLE, *Chief.*
By EDWARD P. CLIFF.

---

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE, FOREST SERVICE,
PACIFIC NORTHWEST REGION,
*Portland, Oreg., January 16, 1957.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This letter is in reply to your request for information under date of December 14. I am not able to answer all of your questions, but am submitting information on the major portion of them. This letter will attempt to answer them in the order in your letter of the 14th. Copies of forest and regional annual reports will be sent as they are prepared.

Table 1 attached to this letter presents the allotments to the Pacific Northwest for 1956 and 1957 fiscal years. These allotments are shown for national-forest administration, cooperative work, and research. The research activities are conducted by the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station under the directorship of Bob Cowlin.

As a basis for the 1958 budget, we submit information on volumes of business anticipated in all activities that year. We do not translate these into dollar values, and the business reports from all regions are used in the chief's office to develop a monetary budget. Therefore, I am unable to advise you of amounts requested for region 6 for the 1958 budget. However, the attached table shows the amounts for the State of Oregon which are contained in the President's budget for 1958, along with amounts currently available for 1957.

Problems faced in the management of the national forests in the Northwest are those which have been widely discussed in the last several years. Recent budgets have permitted us to make progress on most of these problems and continued steady progress is important. We need to continue our access road development to open up the few working circles still underdeveloped, and this program must be carried forward on all working circles at a steady rate in order to maintain the allowable cuts in the future. We are close to cutting the allowable cut for the national forests, having attained this goal on most of our working circles. However, with reinventories our allowable cuts are bound to increase, and we will then need to forge ahead in our actual cutting program.

Our cut from the national forests in Oregon was 1,531,000,000 feet in fiscal year 1954; 1,767,000,000 feet in 1955, and 1,812,000,000 board-feet in 1956. The regional cut for fiscal year 1956 was 2,633,000,000, or 90.3 percent of the allowable cut for the region for that year. With increases in our timber funds in the last several years, we have been able to step up the reinventory of our timber resource, and have completed this on 32 of the 68 working circles in the region. This has raised the allowable annual cut from 2.4 billion feet in 1950 to 3.02 billion feet in 1956. We are reinventorying this year an additional 20 working circles, and we hope we can complete this job of reinventory and recalculation of cut in fiscal year 1959.

In addition to the harvesting of our calculated allowable cuts, there is also the opportunity, as our road systems are pushed into the forests, to salvage the normal losses from insects, disease, and fire which take place in any forest area. This type of sale business is more costly than the usual type sale, but will permit us to make many more small sales. There is considerable opportunity to expand our timber sale activity in this field, with increasing allotments for the purpose.

To take care of this increased timber business and other increased uses of our national forests will require more people, and since many of our ranger headquarters are out of communities or in very small communities where housing is not available, we have to carry out a building construction program. We have made a good start on housing this year with the additional funds made available by the last Congress, and we hope that this program may continue or be stepped up in the future.

In the field of forage production for domestic livestock and wildlife, we are carrying on what we call range allotment analyses. In a sense these are the inventory of the forage supplies available, and this information is very important to enable us to plan the management of our ranges and to administer effectively the use. We have made some progress on this in the last year, and we hope for an expansion of this type of activity in the years ahead in order to be able to meet fully our responsibilities in range and wildlife habitat management.

With the increasing pressures for the use of all of the resources on the forests, it has become especially important to systematize and develop formal land management analyses and plans. This is a managerial job of the first importance. We have made a start on this, but need to make considerably

more progress to insure the planwise development of all of the resources under a coordinated multiple-use program. The development of this program is one of the tasks of primary importance for our district rangers. Many of our district rangers have areas that are too large, and I believe that we must look forward to increasing our staff of rangers and limiting the areas under their jurisdiction to those on which they can give the managerial attention which is necessary to insure good, integrated land management.

There is a very active program of reservoir development for power and reclamation in and adjacent to the national forests of this region. These projects, carried on by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Army engineers, and under license from the Federal Power Commission, have important impacts on land management. Prior to authorization or licensing, studies by land managing agencies are needed of the impact of these projects on the land management, and further studies are essential by such agencies after projects are authorized to make plans to minimize the impacts and to harmonize the various uses so far as practicable. This planning job is imposed by these projects, but up to the present time no project funds are authorized for this planning activity.

The access road picture is shown in table 2 for the last 4 fiscal years. The effect on receipts of this road development and increased appropriations for timber activity are shown in table 3 for the last 3 fiscal years. I have previously stated that access road development had permitted us to open up a good many of our working circles, but there were a few still to be developed. Perhaps an example of the outstanding results of the development of a working circle is that of the Clackamas-Sandy working circle on the Mount Hood National Forest. This working circle now has a main stem access system built in the last 10 years, and we are now harvesting about 200 million feet a year from this area.

The Rogue River working circle on the Siskiyou National Forest and the Lewis River working circle on the Gifford Pinchot are two of the major areas still to be developed with access. Problems of rights-of-way over mining claims and other ownerships have lengthened our efforts in both areas to accomplish access. The Lewis River access is complicated by the development of a power dam which has necessitated making a new location and working out problems of responsibility with all of the parties involved. In the last 5 years most of the money available for road construction has been earmarked by Congress for the development of timber access roads. These were particularly needed in connection with harvesting insect-killed timber and blowdown material. Funds available for roads required for recreational use have been limited, and we are now considering the needs for construction of roads to permit optimum utilization of recreational resources by the increasing number of people seeking to use these resources. We anticipate that some progress will be made on this from total road funds available to us in fiscal year 1958.

Table 4 shows the recreational improvements which we are able to add with the money available in fiscal year 1956 and the planned construction for this current fiscal year. With these funds we have also been able to do a much more satisfactory job of maintenance. We have also submitted a 5-year program for recreational developments, and this is receiving special recognition in the 1958 budget submission which provides a nationwide total of $11,500,000 for recreation public use. We have made a good start in getting our unit recreation plans up to date and developing plans for new areas so that we will be in a position to go ahead at an accelerated pace in 1958. Rehabilitation, current maintenance, and a program of improvement for Timberline Lodge to make its operation more economical for the Government are needed. We plan to give this problem further study.

I should also emphasize that one of the big needs not only for the management of our national forests but for the management of all private forest lands in the Northwest is for additional information on plant-soil-water relationships and, in fact, for further knowledge in all fields of forest management including timber utilization and protection against insects, diseases, and fire. From studies in other parts of the country we know that the location and design of cutting units in forest areas can reduce the interception of snow by the timber and increase the snow pack. It is quite probable that under our climatic conditions and on our soils, proper manipulation of the cover can contribute to increased waterflows in the dry period of the year. A great deal of study of this point is needed to be sure that it is valid for our circumstances and to know the extent to which management may contribute to increased flows.

In the field of forest management we are rapidly moving into the management of second-growth forest. We will of course for many years have the problem of harvesting the old-growth forest, including salvage logging, but we must quickly learn more about such things as thinnings of young stands and problems of nurseries and plantations. For example, we need research to know the number of stems per acre which we should seek in different forest types and sites at different age classes. Thinnings and proper stocking and spacing of the crop trees will have quite an influence on increasing the amount of cut which will be available for the industry dependent on the forest resource.

In summarizing, I think that we have made steady progress in the management of the national forests and some progress in the field of research on the basis of the increases in allotments during the last 2 years. The budget submitted to Congress for fiscal year 1958 provides substantial increases which will help us materially in meeting our responsibilities for making these forests contribute as they can and should to the expanding economic life of Oregon and Washington.

In accordance with your request, I am sending copies of this letter to Senator NEUBERGER, Congressmen ULLMAN and PORTER, and Congresswoman GREEN.

Sincerely yours,

J. HERBERT STONE,
*Regional Forester.*

*President's budget for 1958—Tentative distribution to State of Oregon for Forest Service appropriations*

| Appropriation | Budget estimate, 1958 | Appropriation, 1957 |
|---|---|---|
| Forest protection and utilization: | | |
| 1. Forest land management: | | |
| (a) National forest protection and management (including advance from "Cooperative range improvements") | $6,623,000 | $4,606,000 |
| (b) Fighting forest fires [1] | 389,300 | 389,300 |
| (c) Insect and disease control | 199,000 | 198,400 |
| 2. Forest research | 540,000 | 451,009 |
| 3. State and private forestry | 692,000 | 637,000 |
| Total, forest protection and utilization | 8,443,300 | 6,371,700 |
| Forest roads and trails (includes transfer from "Roads and trails for States") | 6,032,000 | 5,801,000 |
| Expenses, brush disposal | 1,106,000 | 995,211 |
| Payments due counties, submarginal land | 2,000 | 1,700 |
| Payments to States and Territories | 9,958,000 | 9,422,817 |

[1] Amount will vary depending upon fire emergency. Figures shown for comparability.

*Total allotments for fiscal years 1956 and 1957, region 6*

| Appropriation | Fiscal year 1956 | Fiscal year 1957 |
|---|---|---|
| National forest administration: | | |
| Protection and management | [1]$6,052,514 | [2]$7,188,031 |
| Forest roads and trails | 7,617,977 | 7,963,564 |
| White pine blister rust control | 75,200 | 76,000 |
| Insect control | 44,200 | 17,550 |
| Cooperative range improvements | 48,549 | 49,368 |
| Total | 13,838,440 | 15,294,513 |
| State and private forestry cooperation | 1,279,363 | 1,260,708 |
| Soil bank conservation reserve program | | 493,467 |
| Small watershed protection | 90,173 | 68,900 |
| Research (Pacific Northwest Station): | | |
| Research | 540,442 | 647,724 |
| Pest control (detection and appraisal) | 57,070 | 91,604 |
| Total | 597,512 | 739,328 |

[1] Does not include $26,035 transferred from California for Smokejumper project.
[2] Same for $21,933.

*Value of timber access roads by fiscal years—Region 6*

| | 1953 | 1954 | 1955 | 1956 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Value of roads built by timber purchasers | $6,784,514 | $10,463,427 | $11,810,356 | $17,937,475 |
| Percentage of roads constructed by purchasers [1] | 92 | 91 | 92 | 90 |
| Cost of Forest Service engineering work on purchaser built roads | $361,517 | $450,386 | $804,946 | $1,304,487 |
| Amounts obligated by Forest Service from appropriated funds for access roads and bridges | $4,009,053 | $2,906,203 | [2] $7,698,371 | $3,306,934 |
| Percentage of roads constructed by Forest Service | 8 | 9 | 8 | 10 |
| Costs of engineering, Forest Service constructed roads | $247,153 | $250,364 | $451,181 | $154,708 |
| Estimate of temporary road costs by purchasers of Government timber by calendar years | $997,580 | $930,000 | $847,500 | $900,000 |

[1] Percentages somewhat misleading since Government-financed roads usually are the more difficult and in most cases too expensive to be included in timber-sale appraisal.
[2] Fiscal year 1955 was year of special funds to salvage beetle-killed timber.

NOTE.—Costs of engineering work for purchaser and Forest Service built roads not exactly comparable since those for purchaser include resident engineering costs whereas in the case of Government-constructed roads the resident engineering cost is included in the road-construction cost. Also there is chance for some overlap in these costs since our records do not ordinarily show a breakdown of survey and design costs between Government- and purchaser-constructed roads.

Roads in the temporary category are tending to decrease as more and more of them are added to the permanent road system.

*Fiscal year income (forest reserve fund), region 6*

| Forest | 1954 | | 1955 | | 1956 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Oregon | Washington | Oregon | Washington | Oregon | Washington |
| Deschutes | $1,838,064.01 | | $2,110,781.71 | | $2,607,499.51 | |
| Fremont | 1,719,791.65 | | 2,070,736.87 | | 2,544,899.13 | |
| Gifford Pinchot | | $3,086,909.24 | | $3,426,321.25 | | $5,784,658.31 |
| Malheur | 692,436.86 | | 1,328,393.62 | | 1,606,543.82 | |
| Mount Baker | | 2,244,480.38 | | 2,619,204.85 | | 2,485,535.92 |
| Mount Hood | 2,406,482.75 | | 3,005,107.74 | | 4,952,663.54 | |
| Ochoco | 1,309,132.93 | | 1,565,263.39 | | 2,453,507.69 | |
| Okanogan | | 664,593.43 | | 579,787.82 | | 766,787.84 |
| Olympic | | 3,526,996.36 | | 4,815,690.90 | | 5,110,727.77 |
| Rogue River | 1,436,995.27 | | 1,626,484.08 | | 1,753,273.75 | |
| Siskiyou | 790,441.78 | | 910,144.44 | | 2,144,403.48 | |
| Siuslaw | 1,105,373.65 | | 2,735,136.76 | | 4,194,422.79 | |
| Snoqualmie | | 889,665.07 | | 1,390,644.83 | | 1,903,626.05 |
| Umatilla | 113,696.64 | 33,147.76 | 447,668.84 | 130,515.98 | 386,465.48 | 112,672.38 |
| Umpqua | 2,202,776.38 | | 2,538,190.27 | | 4,526,526.67 | |
| Wallowa | 187,724.19 | | 393,055.80 | | 387,922.14 | |
| Wenatchee | | 552,335.43 | | 683,761.15 | | 673,168.35 |
| Whitman | 714,193.28 | | 918,333.15 | | 1,003,306.96 | |
| Willamette | 5,527,886.50 | | 4,884,554.03 | | 9,237,929.39 | |
| Total, Washington | | 10,998,127.67 | | 13,645,926.78 | | 16,837,176.62 |
| Total, Oregon | 20,044,995.89 | | 24,533,850.70 | | 37,798,464.35 | |
| Total, region | 31,043,123.56 | | 38,179,777.48 | | 54,635,640.97 | |

*Recreation accomplishments with increased funds for this purpose during fiscal year 1956, region 6*

| Recreation facilities | Number maintained satisfactorily | Number constructed replacement | Number new additions | Planned reconstruction and new facilities, fiscal year 1957 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Toilets | 1,408 | 74 | 121 | 260 |
| Garbage | 2,301 | 209 | 292 | 680 |
| Tables | 4,002 | 309 | 443 | 850 |
| Fireplaces | 2,159 | 240 | 244 | 1,070 |
| Water systems | 154 | 8 | 24 | 70 |
| Barrier, car (feet) | [1] 9,415 | [1] 2,920 | [1] 2,341 | |
| Other | 36 | 8 | 10 | |

[1] Feet.

Number of areas where cleanup was considered satisfactory, 404.

A considerable portion of the 1957 funds were held over until the fall and winter so we could extend employment of some of our key summer employees in those areas where fall and winter work is limited. In this way we also receive the benefit of more experienced and efficient help. Tables, toilets, and other portable facilities will be constructed at central locations this winter and then moved to camping areas by next camping season.

The above tabulation reflects the fact that 1956 fiscal year funds allowed us to improve maintenance, do some rehabilitation work and start some new construction. 1957 funds will enable us to maintain nearly all our present facilities to standard, continue reconstruction, and get started on a larger construction program.

Previous to fiscal year 1956 our funds did not allow us to maintain existing facilities to desired standard.

---

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,
*Portland, Oreg., January 16, 1957.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In reply to your letter of December 14, 1956, a report is enclosed which outlines the scope of the operations of the Bureau of Land Management in Oregon, its accomplishments, and the expected goals for fiscal year 1958. The latter figures are dependent upon the action taken by the Appropriation Committees.

The delay in replying is regretted but you understand, I am sure, that budget data for the ensuing fiscal year are considered confidential until released by the President in his budget message.

There is little legislation required solely for Oregon as practically any legislation would affect the entire Bureau and will be considered in the overall Bureau program.

Your interest in the Bureau is appreciated as is the opportunity to furnish the information.

Copies of these data have been furnished the Oregon delegation.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. DOYLE,
*Area Administrator.*

"BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES IN OREGON

"The Bureau of Land Management administers nearly 16 million acres of public land in Oregon containing a wide variety of natural resources of great value. The Bureau's responsibility is to provide management, protection, and proper use of these resources. The basic operations include range and forest management, administration of the land and mining laws, cadastral surveying, and fire control.

"A résumé of each of these functions is shown below:

*"Range management*

"There are somewhat less than 13 million acres in grazing districts and another 800,000 acres of vacant public lands, which are used by some 2,300 grazing permittees and lessees grazing over 420,000 head of stock. In addition, over 100,000 big game animals use the ranges.

"Management of the range includes not only supervision to prevent over-grazing, but protection of the area from fire, soil and moisture conservation practices designed to rehabilitate critically eroded areas, a weed control program directed to keeping Halogeton off the range, and cooperation with State and Federal wildlife management agencies to provide forage for wildlife, and determination of areas for special hunts, and so forth.

"In addition to the funds directly appropriated for these purposes, 25 percent of the annual grazing fees is made available in a separate appropriation. This has been used largely for the maintenance of existing projects in cooperation with advisory boards, ranchers, and others on water development and fencing projects.

"The increased funds during 1956 and 1957 have permitted an accelerated program of conservation, and the 1958 budget request provides for intensified range management as well as further expansion of the soil and moisture conservation program.

*"Forest management*

"There are some 2.75 million acres of so-called commercial forest lands and 1.75 million which would be classified as woodlands although these will have great commercial value in the future.

"During fiscal year 1956 timber sales on the forest lands administered by the Bureau exceeded 717 million board-feet. Assuming the current slump is only seasonal, it is expected that this volume will be increased slightly during fiscal year 1957 and in fiscal year 1958 will amount to about 750 million board-feet.

"As a result of increases in appropriations, the Bureau has been enabled to accelerate its inventory and reforestation programs, both of which received secondary consideration in efforts to place on the market the greatest possible amount of wind-blown and bug-killed timber and to meet the needs of the lumber industry. As a result, it is expected that the inventory will be completed by fiscal year 1960, at which time the regular reinventory cycle will begin.

"As a result of the inventory completed to date, the allowable cut for the O. and C. lands has been increased by 80 million board-feet and now is 661 million board-feet.

"The Associations of O. and C. Counties adopted a resolution requesting the Congress to appropriate up to $1 million of the funds due them to aid in the reforestation program. Provision for this total is included in the 1958 budget, of which amount $900,000 is to be reimbursed to the Treasury; and the Bureau will provide the planning and supervision from its funds. Provision also has been made for initiating the reforestation program on public domain lands.

"The forested lands in Oregon are protected by contracts with the United States Forest Service and the State, and the grazing districts generally are protected by force account. Actual costs of fire suppression are allotted when the costs have been determined.

*"Administration of land and mineral laws*

"This work involves action on the applications for use or title to lands or mineral resources.

"Increases in appropriations, principally due to the enactment of Public Law 167, have permitted the Bureau to accelerate its field investigations and to take preliminary steps to bringing proper administration to 150,000 acres of land covered by mining claims. It also was possible to reduce the caseload in the Portland Land Office by some 500 cases since the beginning of fiscal year 1956. These activities will proceed at about the same pace in 1958.

*"Cadastral surveying*

"During fiscal year 1956 a total of 21,760 acres was covered, largely by resurveys. Much of this was done in aid of clearing up suspected timber trespasses. The program will proceed at about the same rate during the current fiscal year, and is expected to be accelerated in fiscal year 1958.

*"Receipts*

"During fiscal year 1956 receipts from the State of Oregon amounted to approximately $24 million, including $19.5 million collected by this Bureau from the O. and C. lands and $3.5 million deposited by the Forest Service from receipts on these lands. During the current fiscal year total receipts are expected to amount to approximately $26 million, including $21 million collected by this Bureau on O. and C. lands and $3.5 million by the Forest Service. During fiscal year 1958 it is expected that receipts will amount to $29.5 million, including collections by this Bureau of $24 million on the O. and C. lands and $4 million by the Forest Service.

*"Access Roads Program*

"Management in a businesslike manner, orderly development, and full utilization of the resources of the O. and C. and other Bureau lands in Oregon are dependent upon the adequacy of the access to these lands. Measurement of the adequacy of access must take into account not only existing roads and their availability for use but also the economic feasibility of their use. A primary Bureau objective is to assure access for all timber purchasers to the timber which they have purchased. The availability of access to these lands is restricted in many instances by a lack of agreement to cross intermingled private lands or by the absence of a road or by a combination of both. The problem may be one of obtaining rights to use existing roads on private land, of obtaining rights to construct roads across private lands, or of constructing a major road system to open up inaccessible areas.

"The Bureau may obtain access by agreement with the road owner, usually under the O. and C. right-of-way regulations, by purchase of existing roads, by construction of its own roads, or by various combinations of these methods.

"The O. and C. access road program was initiated in 1951. Through the current fiscal year appropriations have totaled $17,256,000 of which $15,956,000 were reimbursed through a voluntary agreement by the O. and C. counties that the road appropriations would be taken from their share of income.

"It is anticipated that the system will total 1,614 miles, of which 766 miles will be built by the Bureau and 848 miles by timber sale operators. Construction has been completed on 34.3 miles and another 171 miles are under construction. It is anticipated that 78 miles of the roads now under construction will be completed by the end of the fiscal year. The average cost of the tributary timber will approximate $1 per thousand board-feet.

"The policy lines which we are following in programing access road projects are as follows:

"(1) Build new roads where there is a large percentage of Bureau of Land Management land and timber, generally more than any other single ownership; where an area is not now served by an economically usable mainline road; where construction costs would be so high that to build the road under a single timber sale contract or a series of such contracts would effectively restrict competition; and where local industries are in urgent need of timber from the Bureau of Land Management lands involved;

"(2) Purchase private roads, as indicated above, where there is a large percentage of Bureau of Land Management timber and where a favorable reciprocal road use agreement cannot be developed within a reasonable period or where part of the area has already been developed by a private road, but additional mainline road is needed.

"The attached access road program presents in detail the proposed construction projects for each fiscal year through 1963 and that now foreseeable after 1963. This represents a full program based on an expected return to the O and C counties from the harvesting of the total allowable O and C timber cut. Changes in economic conditions may result in some variation from the plan but it is sufficiently flexible so that these adjustments may readily be made, based on the priorities assigned to the various projects.

"Your attention is called to the projects listed under the headings, "Fiscal Years 1951 to 1957, Inclusive, Under Construction." Of these, the roads let for construction during the current fiscal year are: Galice section B, Yellowbottom section B, Yellowstone, Boulder Creek, Cantan Creek, Middle Creek; North Fork Middle Creek, Kelsey-Mule, the Cow Creek Bridge and surfacing of the Twin Sisters. Contracts for the remainder of the projects under construction were let prior to this fiscal year but still await completion. The next column presents the remaining projects that are to be started during the current year and are budgetary items. In the following columns are listed the road projects for 1958 and successive years planned for construction, subject of course to budget limitations and to adjustments in the program that may be made from time to time.

"Please note that the last column heading "After Fiscal Year 1963" lists additional expense. This does not represent all the remaining program after the 5-year period terminating at the end of fiscal year 1963, but rather those foreseeable at the present time that could not be included in the 5-year program. In the course of preparation of detailed management plans the need of additional projects will become apparent and will be added to the old plan.

*"Bureau of Land Management, allotments in State of Oregon*

| | 1956 | 1957 | Anticipated 1958 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lands and minerals | $124,800 | $236,000 | $242,000 |
| Range management | 417,500 | 502,700 | 633,600 |
| Range improvements | 39,900 | 37,100 | 39,500 |
| Forest management | 1,671,300 | 2,403,300 | 3,384,500 |
| Cadastral surveying | 303,750 | 320,000 | 350,000 |
| Construction and maintenance of buildings | 5,000 | 6,000 | 106,000 |
| Construction and maintenance of access roads | 4,295,000 | 4,495,000 | 6,075,000 |
| General administration | 149,200 | 188,500 | 210,000 |

"The above figures include the cost of operating the area office, though the work of that office is for the benefit of the States of California and Washington, both of which are administered from the Portland area office."

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement before the Interior Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, by Mr. Forrest E. Cooper, of Lakeview, Oreg., counsel of the Interstate Association of Public Land Counties, in support of maximum appropriations for certain activities of the United States Forest Service for the fiscal year 1958. This is an exceedingly able statement by Mr. Cooper, of my State, in which he points out that it is only sound business that the Government should proceed without delay to build the access roads necessary to bring the largest possible return from the Federal forests into the Treasury of the United States, consistent with a sound conservation program.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT TO HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, INTERIOR SUBCOMMITTEE, OF FORREST E. COOPER, LAKEVIEW, OREG., COUNSEL, INTERSTATE ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC LAND COUNTIES, IN SUPPORT OF MAXIMUM APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE, FOR FISCAL YEAR 1958, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 6, 1957

Gentlemen, I reside at Lakeview, Oreg. I am an attorney, and, as such, I serve as legal adviser and consultant on Federal land problems to the State Association of County Officials in several of the States of the West. I had the pleasure of appearing before this committee a year ago. We take this opportunity to thank you for your past interest in national forest management problems and financial support thereto and we hope that you will be able to find the funds to carry through the program you have embarked upon.

We of the back country realize the impact that the defense budget has made on the overall budget but, if Congress expects the Western States to contribute their share of the cost of operating our Government, Uncle Sam, as the owner of 1 acre in 2 in the 11 Western States must put an ample sum in the pot for administration before we of the West can take out renewable natural resources of sufficient value from which our share of the annual tax bill is to be paid. The ownership of this vast acreage carries with it heavy responsibilities. The national forest reserves, a type of acreage we value in common with upwards of 40 States, represents in many areas of the West the most valuable real estate of all, regardless of ownership, because of the vast stands of prime timber which we obtained by treaty or by right of conquest more than 100 years ago.

It is to the national forests in the Western States that this committee and the Forest Service look for the annual cash income with which to keep the nationwide Forest Service budget in balance. At the State level we have one Western State where the timber resources represent 50 percent of the annual industrial payroll. As the population of our country increases and as the finger-like access roads this committee is constructing keep reaching further back into our forest storehouse the lumber processing industry continues to be of greater importance over a constantly expanding area. Western Montana is on the threshhold of a vast wood fiber utilization program in which the national forests will play an important part. And so the panorama continues to unfold throughout the country and ripe Federal timber is removed to make room for a fast-growing new crop in an area where the annual growth would otherwise remain stationary.

We of the West also inventory the other values that stem from our national forest acreage, economic and spiritual. Range revegetation must continue to go forward, for "all flesh is grass," says the Bible, and, as the population pressure increases and as the standard of living, which includes paid holidays for the working class, goes up, the spiritual values of the rural West become known to, and are explored by, all.

The immense national forest administrative job falls into the following categories:

1. Timber resource management and sales.
2. Reforestation and stand improvement.
3. Recreation.
4. Range management.
5. Forest roads and trails.

The Congress appropriated $35,397,000 for these activities for fiscal year 1957. The Bureau of the Budget has recommended $36,184,000 for fiscal 1958. We citizens can only evaluate such sums in terms of what we personally consider to be the job that needs to be done. We think it is too early in the

game to expect net returns to the Federal Treasury of $2 per year for $1 invested, or better. There is a tremendous initial investment that is first required. Since this acreage cost us little or nothing, we can afford this outlay. As of today, fire and insects are harvesting as much Federal timber as the saw. To us from the West it seems too early to attempt to skim off profits, for in the strict sense of the word, there can be no profits until we first stop the waste by first investing the sums required to bring every acre of our national-forest inventory up to maximum efficiency. Thereafter, the profits will not only carry the required management program and expanded recreational program but should give us better than 10 to 1 return on invested capital.

In closing, it is submitted that there is too large a gap, as of today, between the total annual gross revenues of the country's national forest reserves and the amount that is annually plowed back into management and capital betterment and improvements. Our every motive, including self-interest, urges us to plow back the current proceeds. Then, when the profits start to come, they will be much larger than any of us can calculate at the present time.

Respectfully submitted.

FORREST E. COOPER,
*Attorney at Law.*

## FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION CANNOT BE DELAYED

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I turn to a major bill on Federal aid to education. I introduce the bill, which is a comprehensive bill—it might be called an omnibus education bill—on behalf of myself and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. President, our country is experiencing a drought in education. It is so serious and so chronic that we are losing through the erosion of crowded classrooms, inadequate facilities, too few, underpaid, and undertrained teachers our most precious national resource—the potentialities of the boys and girls of America.

Inadequate education is a national disease. Every day it is left untended, it grows worse and more difficult to cure. It is now 9 years since the Senate of the United States first passed an aid-to-education bill. In 1948 we adopted the first Taft bill, giving Federal financial help to the States for educational expenses. As a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare at that time, I participated in the drafting and in the passage of that bill in the Senate. Again in 1949, the Senate passed Senator Taft's aid-to-education bill, but as it had before, it again died in the House of Representatives.

Since 1948, the school problem has worsened rapidly. Although overcrowding of facilities is perhaps the most critical part of the Nation's education problem, teachers' salaries, the high cost of maintenance, of books and supplies, of special equipment, and the many other outlays for school operation are pushing school budgets to new highs and crowding tax sources to the very limit of their capacity to produce revenue.

I should like to call to the attention of the White House and of my colleagues in Congress the four conclusions of the National Education Association in its recent publication called Advance Estimates of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools for the School Year 1956–57.

Before doing so, I wish to describe the bill which I am introducing today as a bill which would bring up to date the Taft proposals of 1947 and 1949. They are omnibus proposals. They do not seek to deal merely with one segment of the problem, as does the administration's school construction bill, in my judgment. We can build the first school buildings imaginable, but we cannot have education within their walls unless we have teachers who are well paid and well trained, and unless we have the curricula and the facilities within those walls which are necessary to turn out educated boys and girls. We need facilities to give the best possible education to retarded children, and facilities to give the best possible education to superior children, as well as to the great mass of children whom we call average children.

That was what it was sought to do by the Taft bills in 1947 and 1949, and it is what I seek to do in the Morse-Clark bill of 1957.

I have had the assistance of a great many experts in the field of education in the drafting and preparation of the bill. In my judgment, we have arrived at what we think is a very fair and just formula. The statement which I shall present speaks for itself on that point.

I wish to stress the statement that if I am offered only one choice, I shall vote this year for a school construction bill. However, the Eisenhower administration is not even scratching the surface of America's educational problems by a mere school construction bill and a very inadequate one at that. We need the comprehensive type of bill for which Bob Taft fought on the floor of the Senate when many of us supported him shoulder to shoulder in the historic debates which then occurred.

This administration has been guilty of a great deal of backsliding when it comes to the matter of Federal responsibility in the field of education. I sincerely hope that the bill which the Senator from Pennsylvania and I are introducing, and the arguments I am presenting in support of it this afternoon, will have some beneficial effect on the thinking of the administration, and that the White House will not continue—and I speak respectfully—to look at only one segment of the problem, when the entire problem of education ought to be attacked, in my judgment, in its totality. Therefore I present these arguments in support of my bill, and I am perfectly willing to stand on the case which the Senator from Pennsylvania and I make in this argument.

### TEACHER SHORTAGE GROWS

The first finding of the National Education Association is that "The enrollment in teacher-education institutions is not gaining rapidly enough to fill the need for qualified teachers." The fact is that there has been some increase in the number of young men and women entering normal schools and teachers' colleges in each of the last 3 years, but the increase has not been great enough to keep up with rising enrollments. When the NEA surveyed the States to find out the expected demand for teachers, it found that over the next 2 years nearly all States expect the shortage to continue and, while it will be somewhat less at the elementary level, it will be worse at the secondary level.

Responsibility for the shortage lies with the economics of the teaching profession. There has been some improvement in overall salaries—with an increase of 4.7 percent this year over last year's average—but not enough to make the profession attractive for men and women to enter it and stay in it in the numbers needed. For the school year 1956–57, the average salary was $4,330. But it is clear that it is not high enough because it is not attracting enough teachers. And that figure is for all the instructional staff; for classroom teachers alone the average salary was only $4,220.

### TRAGIC LAG IN SCIENCE

Keeping in mind the years of education that are required before a young man or woman receives a teaching certificate, it is not hard to see why the profession is not keeping pace with the school-age population. In discussing the teacher shortage last year, I pointed out that it is most severe in mathematics and the sciences at the high-school level. The number of individuals seeking teacher education in these fields has declined steadily since 1950, with 50 percent fewer people graduated last year than in 1950. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who has given special study to the shortage of scientists and engineers and its meaning to the Nation, quoted recently a statement by Admiral Strauss of the Atomic Energy Commission on the matter. Admiral Strauss gave the number of students graduated last year to teach high-school physics as 125. The reaction of the Senator from Minnesota was to call this an almost unbelievable statement. I agree with him, but what is most unbelievable about it is that a Nation of our wealth and of our pride in our system of free education, of our pride in the technological adeptness of our people, and in our world leadership in science and industry, has so shamefully neglected to maintain the foundation of that leadership—the basic education we give to our boys and girls in high school. Last school year, the number of new high-school physics teachers was just about half the number of vacancies in our high-school physics departments. We had better start doing something about that now, because we will have 50 percent more high-school students 10 years from now.

### EIGHTY THOUSAND TEACHERS NOT FULLY QUALIFIED

One consequence of this condition is the use of teaching personnel who are not fully qualified under the regulations of their States for teaching certificates. As its second conclusion, the NEA estimates that 80,000 such people are employed this year, about the same number as for the previous school year. I commend these men and women for rising to meet an emergency, but their continued employment means that our boys

and girls are not receiving the benefits of fully qualified instructors.

EIGHT HUNDRED AND FORTY THOUSAND PUPILS MISS FULL-TIME SCHOOLING

A third alarming conclusion of the NEA's annual survey is that the shortage of classrooms and qualified teachers continues to deprive 840,000 pupils of full-time schooling. Here we get to one specific measure of the effect of the teacher and classroom shortages. And even where they are attending full time, the inadequacy of facilities is indicated by the 22.2 percent of all elementary pupils in urban schools who were in classes containing 35 or more youngsters at the start of the current school year. Education experts believe that classes of 25 to 28 are as large as can be handled properly at the elementary level.

These children are being shortchanged. They are not getting the full measure of one of their greatest birthrights as Americans—a free basic education. It can never be made up to them, and so that the significance of this figure may not be lost, let me point out that the number of part-time students is a per-year figure. Eight hundred thousand and more children have been receiving a part-time education for several years, and the prospect is that the same condition will continue for many more years.

SHORTAGES WORSENING AT SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVEL

The fourth conclusion the NEA points out in this year's summary of school statistics is that the shortages of buildings and qualified teachers, especially critical in the elementary schools in recent years, are now producing serious problems at the secondary level, especially in urban school districts.

This point is, I believe, the most pertinent of all. I have pointed out previously that we are not facing up to this outstanding fact about our education system: That the most expensive period in our 12 years of compulsory schooling is the high-school level, and that it is those secondary grades that have yet to be expanded to take care of the post-World War II population increase. Secondary education requires more teachers with more specialized training—which makes them more expensive—and more teachers are needed because more courses are offered. Likewise, the construction and equipment needs in high schools are vastly more extensive than what is needed for elementary schools.

Despite cheaper construction methods and materials, today's high schools are more expensive than ever because we include in them cafeterias, gymnasiums, auditoriums, and other facilities which were not considered an essential part of the teaching program a generation ago. High schools also offer such courses as music, manual arts, practical training in skilled trades, and various other skills that require special equipment and special teachers.

The heaviest impact on our schools in the next 10 to 15 years will come here at the high-school level. By 1965, there will be an increase of at least 54 percent in the number of youngsters of 12 and 13 and an increase of 58 percent in the number of young people 14 to 17. We must accommodate half again as many junior and senior high-school students as we are handling now in overcrowded conditions.

The great boom in our birthrate which came toward the end of World War II and which has continued at the same high level ever since, put a severe strain on elementary schools first—a strain which we have not yet been able to cope with. But the big increase in the school-age population is only now making itself felt at the junior and senior high-school levels. In 10 more years we will have an overcrowding problem in our high schools that will far outstrip the one we had at the elementary level in terms of cost and in terms of the revenue it will take to meet it.

The NEA material I have been quoting from shows that the shortage of teachers is critical at almost every point, but this year there is a slight easing of the shortage at the elementary level and an increase in the shortage at the secondary level. We can expect this trend to become greatly accentuated. The NEA states it this way:

> All States expect the shortage of elementary school teachers to continue into the next 3 years. With regard to secondary-school teachers, 43 States expect a shortage in the next 3 years. In 1953–54, the number in the "oversupply" column was 6; for 1954–55, the number is 2; for 1955–56 and 1956–57, zero. In other words, the increasing enrollments, which struck the elementary schools in greater numbers about 1947, show an increasing effect in secondary schools.

This condition will be equally true in the case of classrooms and for all school costs. The classroom shortage remains high throughout the school system, but as in the case of teachers, a worsening situation is showing up at the secondary level. And this impact comes at a time when we still have not alleviated conditions in the grade schools.

EDUCATION CRISIS WILL CONTINUE

At the risk of belaboring facts with which Senators may be familiar, I have reviewed the extent of our crisis in education because its significance to the American people is so far-reaching. What we call our present emergency actually extends into future decades because every year we delay means another class of boys and girls who are not educated as we know they should be, and who are not prepared to the degree that it is within our means to provide, have been sent into the world. We have the means, we have the wealth, to give them what they deserve. We have the financial resources not just to meet emergencies in the education system, but to raise the educational standards of the country.

GENERAL AID METHOD BEST—NATION NEEDS MORE THAN CLASSROOMS

That is what I believe we should do. Had the Taft program been adopted 10 years ago we would be doing it. I have tried to keep the Taft approach of general aid—which I regard as the best—alive and before the public by reintroducing it in the 84th Congress, with some revisions. I am going to do that again today, because I do not want the principle of a general aid program to be lost. Emergency legislation that seeks only to plug the holes and fill the worst cracks is needed, but it is not all that is needed. The school construction bills that have been introduced are designed only to construct a definite number of classrooms and then terminate. I am for that, and I shall work for and vote for a bill of that nature; but that is only part of the job.

FORMULA BALANCES POPULATION AND NEED

Under the terms of my bill, a billion dollars a year would be authorized for all educational expenses at the elementary and secondary levels. There are no limitations on how the money is to be spent, nor on the term of the authorization. Under the distribution formula in the bill, about half the money would be distributed according to school-age population; the other half would be distributed in proportion to per capita income, with the State having the least wealth per capita receiving four times as much money per child as the wealthiest State.

Under the two parts of the formula together, the poorest State would receive, in total, twice as much Federal money per student as the wealthiest State. It would equalize educational expenditures to some degree, but it does not go so far in that direction as to lose sight of the higher cost of educating a child in the wealthy States.

LOCAL CONTROL MAINTAINED

I want to emphasize that I regard as the great strength of this bill—and of the Taft bill—the absence of restrictions on how the money is to be spent. If we believe in the conscientiousness of our States, as I do, Congress has no need to direct them on how to use this money. That is the way to avoid dictation to the States, and to guarantee that there will be no Federal controls on education.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR RETARDED, HANDICAPPED AND GIFTED

Another important feature of the bill I am about to introduce is a provision I have added to the Taft bill. It sets aside 2 percent of the funds appropriated for special purposes. It is my intention that the money be used for special programs outside the normal curriculum for the mentally retarded, and for the gifted boys and girls who could make faster progress outside the regular classroom. I wonder how many Senators are aware of the meagerness of public facilities for training mentally retarded children.

Yet we are just as responsible for them as we are for the development of the abilities of normal boys and girls. We also have a responsibility to those with superior intelligence. They are our great reservoir for the future. From them will come the scientific, intellectual, and social leadership we need more than ever in an age when the world is threatened by organized evil.

The funds set aside under this provision could be applied for by State school authorities, and could be used not only for these special programs but for replacement of school facilities when natural disaster strikes.

It will be seen that my proposal is not a substitute for a school construction bill. The latter is emergency legislation, whereas mine is long-term; a school construction bill would give us a specific number of additional classrooms; my bill would improve the basic education of the American people. I am in favor of both, and intend to work for both. And I regret that so fundamental an element in American life as free education has been the object of so much political opportunism and hypocrisy.

AID-TO-EDUCATION HAS MARKED TIME

Since 1948, when a general education bill was first drafted and passed by the Senate, more has been promised with less performance than in any other area of public activity. When this administration first took office, it tried to ignore entirely the condition of the schools, only to find that it could not be ignored. In his first state of the Union message, the President said that "our school system demands some prompt, effective help." But the most he had in way of a recommendation was the statement that "this whole situation calls for careful congressional study and action." A year later he told Congress:

> The Federal Government should stand ready to assist States which demonstrably cannot provide sufficient school buildings. In order to appraise the needs, I hope that this year a conference on education will be held in each State, culminating in a national conference. From these conferences on education, every level of government—from the Federal Government to each local school board—should gain the information from which to attack this serious problem.

While I think the resulting conference was a worthwhile one, its findings merely confirmed what most of us had known and deplored for years—that a serious shortage of classrooms characterizes the school systems of every State in the Union, and it recommended only what the Senate had concluded 7 years earlier—that the Federal Government had an obligation to do something about it.

ADMINISTRATION DELAYS

It was not until 2 years after taking office that the President recommended any specific legislation to deal with this most glaring of our domestic problems of the last decade. In February 1955, when the White House finally did call for Federal aid for school construction, most of the money was earmarked for purchase of school bond issues. This program would not have helped the average district, which has its biggest problem in raising money for repayment of bond issues, not in finding a market for them.

BANKERS BENEFIT MORE THAN STUDENTS

Furthermore, a disproportionate share of the money needed to educate American boys and girls would have gone to banking institutions in the form of interest. It is questionable, in fact, as to who would have been the major beneficiaries of the administration plan; our students or our bankers. It called for purchase of school bonds in cases where a market could not be found by the school district at a reasonable rate of interest. It turned out to be an offer to buy bonds only if they could not be sold at interest rates of 3.12 percent or less. At the time that proposition was made, the average interest rate on municipal bonds was 2.42 percent. Under the Eisenhower plan, a school district had to offer its bonds for 3.12 percent—which was defined by the administration to be the reasonable rate of interest—before it could apply to the Federal Government for help. That meant a wide range of profiteering by lending institutions and a heavier financial burden for school districts before any Federal help could even be requested. The cost of interest would be driven up for every school district, not just those forced finally to sell their bonds to the Government.

ADMINISTRATION BOND PROVISIONS WOULD GOUGE SCHOOL DISTRICTS

I regret that this type of aid remains a major part of the President's idea of aid to education. This year he proposes to put $750 million over a 4-year period to that purpose. A hundred and eighty-five million a year would thus be devoted to bond purchases, and $325 million a year for grants. Under that part of his program, instead of offering a helping hand to districts needing it most desperately, the Government would purchase their bonds only because as a last resort, the district was paying an immoderately high rate of interest. And I note that the new administration bill has revised its definition of a reasonable rate of interest upward to bring the operation of the proposal more in line with current bond-market conditions.

The President would have the Federal Government charge all the traffic will bear as the price for help and call it Federal assistance for school construction. It is more than likely that the increased cost of interest that would have to be paid by the school districts would result in the sacrificing of other essential education activities, including teacher salaries.

ADMINISTRATION LEASE PURCHASE PROPOSAL OFFERS SMALL AID

The third form of aid under the President's program, in addition to purchase of bonds and a totally inadequate amount for grants, is the authorization of Federal advances to support bonds issued by State school financing agencies. This is the lease-purchase part of the administration program. The State agencies would finance schools with proceeds from the sale of bonds and the school districts would lease or rent them until after a period of years when they would become the property of the school district. An initial appropriation of $150 million is authorized as an advance to the reserve funds of the State agencies.

Right on the face of it, this section of the bill affords little help. State constitutions would have to be changed in many instances to permit the creation of agencies of that kind. And the school districts would once again foot the bill. The rental fee would include not only interest, insurance, and cost of replacement and repair, but an additional charge of one-fourth of 1 percent of the amount of the rental, to go to a supplemental reserve fund. Once again other outlays for education would very likely be reduced, since the rent would be an operating cost to be added to the already heavy load for current expenses. Since teachers' salaries are now around 75 percent of operating budgets, it is not hard to foresee that salary boosts would be out of the question where a rental fee for schools would be a new drain on scarce income.

ADMINISTRATION OPPOSITION TO KELLEY BILL

Last year, Congress was closer to adoption of a good school-construction bill than we have been since 1949. The Kelley bill, drafted by the House Committee on Education and Labor, reached the floor of the House of Representatives. It was a sound bill, one that gave the States the money for construction, without any cut for the bankers. But it was opposed by the administration and cynically defeated by Republican votes on the ground that its provisions for distribution were defective.

In a news conference on August 8 of last year, the President had this to say about what happened in the House to the school-construction bill:

> Well, we will have to get one thing straight. I recommended a particular bill, of which two of the primary features were these: (A) That money, school money, be allocated on the basis of need; and (B) that all of the Federal school construction be in addition to the current State programs and would not merely supplant, because our object was to get more schools and not merely to substitute Federal money for State money already appropriated or authorized.
>
> Now, when that bill was placed before the House in the form of a recommittal motion, the Republicans voted for it—three-quarters of them—I forget the exact thing, something like 147 to 49, something of that order * * * Now, when the bill, when those features were taken out, then is when the Republicans did vote against the bill.

As for his first objection, does the President really believe that the Kelley bill, or any measure which distributes the money for construction by population, is not based on need? Does he not know that there is no State and no section of the country that does not need more money for its schools? The Kelley bill would have provided it. I recall that when in 1953 the Hill oil-for-education amendment was before the Senate, most Republicans took the position that what was wrong with the Hill amendment was that it was not a per capita measure. Now the President tells us he cannot accept a per capita distribution of the money.

DRAWBACKS OF ADMINISTRATION MATCHING REQUIREMENT

The second demand of the President has been that Federal money be matched by the States in equal amount, a requirement I regard as unnecessary and undesirable. This means that a State already raising as much as it can for education would not receive any Federal money. This is the reverse of putting the oil where the squeak is. This is the doctrine of "to them that hath, it shall be given."

We are warned that without a matching requirement, Federal money would tend to replace State and local money and would not result in a net increase in expenditure. I have more confidence in the States than that. I believe they are making a determined effort to give their children the best education within their means to provide and that they will continue to do so whether they get Federal help or not. I do not want to say to them, "You'll have to do better than that.

Show your good faith by putting up as much money as you are getting, or you won't get any at all."

I am satisfied with the good faith of the States. Experience with grants from the States themselves to their local subdivisions has been that where grants are made, local effort increases voluntarily without any requirement for matching needed. This has been true in New York, for example, where the data are available.

OREGON CALLS ON CONGRESS FOR FEDERAL FINANCIAL HELP

My own State of Oregon spends an exceptionally high proportion of its income for its schools. Its expenditure of $350 per pupil in the 1955–56 school year was exceeded by only three States. Yet Federal aid for schools was a major issue in the political campaign in Oregon last fall, and a major influence on its outcome. Although Oregon has maintained this high level of expenditure and has a correspondingly high standard of education, the result of the election expresses the conviction in my State that Federal help is needed to do the job as our children deserve to have it done.

A new Democratic Governor, who had campaigned all over the State in support of Federal financial aid for the schools, was inaugurated in the State capital last month. In his inauguration address, Governor Holmes called upon the State legislature to memorialize Congress on this subject. It happens that the voters of Oregon also elected a new Democratic State house of representatives in that same election—again, the education issue was a decisive one—and on January 28, the State House of Representatives of Oregon adopted House Memorial No. 2, urging Congress to pass legislation giving the States grants-in-aid for school-building purposes. Here is a graphic example, if one is needed, that States are already spending a large amount of money per student, need and want help from the Federal Government, and Oregon has now called upon the Federal Government to take the necessary action.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorial, House Memorial No. 2 of the State of Oregon, appear at the conclusion of these remarks.

In addition to this objection to the matching requirement, I would also like to point out that if States are required to put this additional money into school construction, other educational outlays, including teachers' salaries, are going to suffer. It will mean that any revenue a State raises beyond current income for school purposes will be devoted to construction, as a means of assuring itself of receiving all the Federal aid possible.

ADEQUATE TEACHERS' SALARIES BADLY NEEDED

I suggest that teachers' salaries need raising as badly as new classrooms need to be built. Why should we concentrate on the one at the expense of the other? States and school districts need more money for all educational expenses. If the Federal Government does not give it to them for all expenses now, then it ought to take over part of the burden—in this case construction—and enable the States to channel more of their own money into other areas. Then there might be some hope that teachers' salaries will be raised and better equipment and instructional aids provided. Education needs must all be met. We will not beat the problem by raising new money for construction alone.

This year there will be a new drive for a school-construction bill—and I hope the administration will take an active part in it—and I expect to join in the drive and work for adoption of a construction bill. But I shall seek to eliminate the requirement that the States put an equal amount of their own money into construction in order to get Federal grants.

ADMINISTRATION'S PERFORMANCE POOR

Its sorry performance on school aid and its opposition to any bill not of its own design is in sharp contrast with the effort the administration put forth to defeat the Hells Canyon development bill—an effort reported by the New York Times as the greatest pressure applied by the White House on any issue in the last 3 years. I mention this only to show what the administration can do when it puts its mind to it, and really goes to work on a piece of legislation.

But it has not done that on behalf of our school children. It has not done it for the furtherance of educational opportunities, and for the training of the minds and development of the capacities of our boys and girls. It has organized itself to deprive them of one of their great natural heritages—that at Hells Canyon—but it has not done it to help them develop the greatest of all natural gifts—their minds and their ability to think.

In the face of this record, the President still came out to Portland, Oreg., last October and said: "What matters now is not the argument in terms of partisan politics as to why Congress failed to enact this legislation. What does matter to every American citizen is this fact: I shall call upon the next Congress to enact a school program to make up for the lost year, by doing the job of school building, not in 5 years but in 4."

I respectfully ask the President "What was the matter with 1953 and 1954, when your administration failed to make any proposal for school construction at all, and when you brought about the defeat of the Hill oil-for-education amendment in the House-Senate conference?" We could have had aid for education 3 years ago had not the White House strenuously objected to inclusion of the Hill amendment in the Outer Continental Shelf bill. I say to the President that thanks to him we have at least 3 years to make up; and had he shown any interest in the schools when he first took office, we might be as much as 4 years ahead of where we are now. He missed a third opportunity last year when a school construction bill could have been passed had he joined us in supporting the Kelley bill. He and his entire administration have been entirely "too little and too late" on the school issue.

ADMINISTRATION CANNOT REMAIN INFLEXIBLE

The President's attempt to shift the responsibility for the absence of Federal aid is partisanship. It ignores the central fact with which he should be concerned—the help is needed now, and his attitude of "Do it my way or not at all" is the surest way to defeat all legislation on the subject. Moreover, his way of doing it is a poor one to begin with.

I ask the administration to drop its inflexible position on the terms whereby Federal aid may be extended to relieve the school crisis. The emergency exists and we are not meeting it. It will continue to worsen unless we act now. During the last campaign, the administration and some of its supporters were required by public demand and the pace set by the Democratic standard bearers and congressional candidates to take a firm stand on Federal aid to education. These Republican pledges were urgently required to cancel out the sorry record of the administration in the field of education.

Now that they are on the record it is the duty of the Democrats in Congress and of the press to insure that the Republican deed matches the Republican word.

Every year since 1948, hundreds of thousands of American children have paid the price for political bickering and legislative haggling and delay on Federal aid to education or for school construction. They have paid for it in loss of the training and development of their minds that might have elevated their communities and their Nation, as well as their own lives. The opportunities lost by these children throughout life cannot be measured, and will never be known. The least we can do now is act promptly to make certain that the boys and girls now in school or about to enter school do not suffer from the same handicap.

Passage of an adequate school aid bill must be the foremost domestic goal of this Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a summary of the bill.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF MORSE-CLARK BILL, EDUCATION ACT OF 1957

Section 1 is the enacting clause and short title of the bill "the Education Act of 1957."

Section 2 of the bill makes clear that no direction or control over the States or local school jurisdictions of any kind shall be authorized. I believe the language it contains does explain that clearly; it is taken from the Taft education bill of 1949; but if there is other or additional language that can make this intention more specific or more complete, I shall welcome its inclusion in my bill.

AUTHORIZATION

Section 3 provides for an authorization of $1 billion a year to raise the level of educational standards nationwide and to equalize in part educational opportunities among the States. There is no limitation on the appropriations made under the bill. Neither is there a limitation on the term of the authorization. It shall be up to Congress to determine that this financial assistance is no longer needed.

DISTRIBUTION

Section 4 is the formula for distribution among the States. There is a great variety of possible methods of distribution, and I do not offer this one as the last word, but as a reasonable basis for further refinement. With the exception of 5 percent of the total appropriation which is reserved for other situations the funds would be divided in this way: Half would be distributed among

the States on the basis of school-age population. We know that the cost of education is rising everywhere, in the wealthy States as well as in the poorer States. A wealthy State, in terms of its per capita income, must spend relatively much more per child to give the child the same level of education that a smaller expenditure will provide in a State with lower cost and income indexes. We know, for example, that school construction in States with severe winters is considerably more costly than in States with mild winters, and that construction costs are also raised by higher wage levels and higher cost levels that prevail in some regions. Teachers' salaries that are high in one State as compared with other States, may be low in terms of other wages and salaries within that State. Therefore, I have felt that at least half the funds should be distributed on the basis of school-age population.

But it is also my purpose to equalize to some extent the educational opportunities among the States. That low per child outlay for education result in lower educational standards is evidenced by the high rejection rate of draftees in States with low per capita expenditures for education, and by many similar measures of relative performance. In order to provide additional help to the States having less financial resources on which to draw for educational expenses, I have provided that half the available funds shall be distributed in inverse proportion to the income per school-age child in each State. The outright ratio in per school child income was just about 4 to 1 in 1955, with New York having the highest and Mississippi the lowest; thus, this allotment per child in Mississippi would be four times that of New York. The overall per child gradation from the poorest to the richest State would be just a fraction more than 2 to 1.

SPECIAL PURPOSES

The section also sets aside 3 percent of the funds to be distributed by the Commissioner of Education to Alaska, Hawaii, the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands and Guam, and the District of Columbia under terms agreed to with their local educational authorities. The remaining 2 percent would also be distributed by the Commissioner of Education to meet special needs that may arise. There is an alarming lack, for example, of programs to train and educate retarded youngsters at least to their full capacities, and our exceptionally bright children, as well. There is too little provision for educating our blind children and those with other types of physical handicap. Too often the boy or girl that varies in any way from the norm and needs or deserves special instruction, goes without because all available money is devoted entirely to the general educational program. It would be my expectation that the Commissioner of Education would receive application for funds for programs aimed at meeting these special needs and would allot them at his discretion. They would also be available for allotment in event of natural disasters—floods, storms, and the like—that so often wipe out school buildings and property at a total loss to the community. With appropriation of the full amount authorized, $20 million would be available for this purpose.

AVAILABILITY

Section 5 sets forth the availability of the funds. I have tried to eliminate all restriction on the States, requiring only that the Federal grant be used for education at the primary and secondary levels. However, some minimum technical requirements for handling the money are included. The State may disburse the money only through its State educational authority, to be designated by the State, and must make arrangements for acceptance of the funds, for reports to the Commissioner of Education and to Congress on how it is spent, and must provide for an annual audit. These State arrangements are listed in sections 6 and 7. I believe that Congress must require an accounting from the States as to how they have used the funds provided them and assure their expenditure in accord with proper legal procedures. But there is no test or penalty in terms of State expenditures from its own sources, no matching requirement, no directive that funds be used for public education, no requirement that funds be used for this or that part of the cost of education, and no requirement that funds be channeled to the poorest districts within the States. I have confidence in the efforts made in every State to improve its educational system. I think every State is conscientiously trying to give its children a good education and is capable of deciding how additional funds could be used most effectively within its borders. Every State knows what its problems are and where money is most needed. What they need from Congress for education is money, not advice or directives on how to spend it.

Section 8 makes provision for the challenging of allotments as made by the Commissioner of Education by a State and for court determination of disputes that may arise.

Sections 9 and 10 define the terms used herein and provide for separability.

*Allocation of $500 million on basis of per-child population and $500 million in inverse proportion to average income per school-age child*

| State | Population aged 5–17, July 1954 (in thousands) | Apportionment of $500 million on basis of col. 2 | Personal income per school-age child | Apportionment of $500 million on basis of col. 4 | Total allocation per State | Allotment per child age 5–17 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| Alabama | 827 | $11,515,540 | $3,950 | $20,403,267 | $32,008,807 | $38.70 |
| Arizona | 234 | 3,258,327 | 6,274 | 3,659,003 | 6,917,330 | 29.56 |
| Arkansas | 490 | 6,822,992 | 3,592 | 13,382,925 | 20,205,917 | 41.23 |
| California | 2,540 | 35,368,163 | 10,640 | 23,419,802 | 58,787,965 | 23.14 |
| Colorado | 333 | 4,636,850 | 7,592 | 4,303,079 | 8,939,929 | 26.84 |
| Connecticut | 441 | 6,140,693 | 11,698 | 3,698,435 | 9,839,128 | 22.31 |
| Delaware | 77 | 1,072,184 | 11,429 | 660,961 | 1,733,145 | 22.50 |
| District of Columbia | 148 | 2,060,822 | 12,736 | 1,140,040 | 3,200,862 | 21.62 |
| Florida | 703 | 9,788,905 | 7,558 | 9,125,147 | 18,914,052 | 26.90 |
| Georgia | 944 | 13,144,703 | 4,725 | 19,600,246 | 32,744,949 | 34.68 |
| Idaho | 156 | 2,172,218 | 5,494 | 2,785,656 | 4,957,874 | 31.78 |
| Illinois | 1,867 | 25,996,992 | 10,612 | 17,259,907 | 43,256,899 | 23.16 |
| Indiana | 943 | 13,130,779 | 8,239 | 11,228,674 | 24,359,453 | 25.83 |
| Iowa | 592 | 8,243,288 | 7,505 | 7,738,596 | 15,981,884 | 26.99 |
| Kansas | 438 | 6,098,919 | 7,801 | 5,508,271 | 11,607,190 | 26.50 |
| Kentucky | 767 | 10,680,071 | 4,720 | 15,942,067 | 26,622,138 | 34.70 |
| Lousiana | 746 | 10,387,657 | 5,028 | 14,555,756 | 24,943,413 | 33.43 |
| Maine | 207 | 2,882,366 | 6,415 | 3,165,667 | 6,048,033 | 29.21 |
| Maryland | 572 | 7,964,790 | 8,820 | 6,362,368 | 14,327,167 | 25.04 |
| Massachusetts | 975 | 13,576,362 | 9,709 | 9,851,937 | 23,428,299 | 24.02 |
| Michigan | 1,573 | 21,903,197 | 9,010 | 17,127,554 | 39,030,751 | 24.81 |
| Minnesota | 710 | 9,886,376 | 7,251 | 9,606,197 | 19,492,573 | 27.45 |
| Mississippi | 600 | 8,354,684 | 3,093 | 19,031,043 | 27,385,727 | 45.64 |
| Missouri | 846 | 11,780,105 | 8,418 | 9,859,447 | 21,639,552 | 25.57 |
| Montana | 147 | 2,046,898 | 7,279 | 1,981,242 | 4,028,140 | 27.40 |
| Nebraska | 297 | 4,135,369 | 7,522 | 3,873,600 | 8,009,169 | 26.96 |
| Nevada | 43 | 598,752 | 11,791 | 357,772 | 956,524 | 22.24 |
| New Hampshire | 118 | 1,643,088 | 7,483 | 1,547,026 | 3,190,114 | 27.03 |
| New Jersey | 1,046 | 14,565,000 | 11,251 | 9,120,771 | 23,685,771 | 22.64 |
| New Mexico | 214 | 2,979,837 | 5,042 | 4,163,918 | 7,143,755 | 33.38 |
| New York | 3,024 | 42,107,608 | 11,319 | 25,209,887 | 68,317,495 | 22.59 |
| North Carolina | 1,123 | 15,637,184 | 4,477 | 24,608,432 | 40,245,616 | 35.83 |
| North Dakota | 159 | 2,213,991 | 4,736 | 3,293,644 | 5,507,635 | 34.63 |
| Ohio | 1,866 | 25,983,068 | 9,267 | 19,754,398 | 45,737,466 | 24.51 |
| Oklahoma | 527 | 7,338,198 | 6,047 | 8,549,919 | 15,888,117 | 30.14 |
| Oregon | 359 | 4,998,886 | 8,025 | 4,388,744 | 9,387,630 | 26.14 |
| Pennsylvania | 2,315 | 32,235,157 | 8,468 | 26,820,163 | 59,055,320 | 25.50 |
| Rhode Island | 164 | 2,283,614 | 9,305 | 1,729,094 | 4,012,708 | 24.46 |
| South Carolina | 646 | 8,995,210 | 3,737 | 16,959,013 | 25,954,223 | 40.17 |
| South Dakota | 159 | 2,213,991 | 5,629 | 2,771,128 | 4,985,119 | 31.35 |
| Tennessee | 846 | 11,780,105 | 4,816 | 17,233,562 | 29,013,667 | 34.29 |
| Texas | 2,027 | 28,224,908 | 6,586 | 30,194,187 | 58,419,095 | 28.82 |
| Utah | 200 | 2,784,895 | 5,650 | 3,472,745 | 6,257,640 | 31.28 |
| Vermont | 89 | 1,239,278 | 5,966 | 1,463,518 | 2,702,796 | 30.36 |
| Virginia | 849 | 11,821,878 | 6,206 | 13,421,077 | 25,242,955 | 29.73 |
| Washington | 553 | 7,700,234 | 8,922 | 6,080,709 | 13,780,943 | 24.92 |
| West Virginia | 530 | 7,379,971 | 4,626 | 11,239,874 | 18,619,845 | 35.13 |
| Wisconsin | 806 | 11,223,126 | 7,677 | 10,299,942 | 21,523,068 | 26.70 |
| Wyoming | 72 | 1,002,562 | 7,361 | 959,590 | 1,962,152 | 27.25 |
| Total | 35,908 | 500,000,000 | 7,947 | 500,000,000 | 1,000,000,000 | 27.84 |

NOTE.—Col. 3 constitutes a flat grant of $13.92 plus per child.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce the bill and I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed in my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1134) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. CLARK), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the "Education Act of 1957."

SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or to prescribe any requirements with respect to any school, or any State or local educational institution or agency, with respect to which any funds have been or may be made available or expended pursuant to this act, nor shall any term or condition of any agreement or any other action taken under this act, whether by agreement or otherwise, relating to any contribution made under this act to or on behalf of any school, or any State or local educational institution or agency, or any limitation or provision in any appropriation made pursuant to this act, seek to control in any manner, or prescribe requirements with respect to, or authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to direct, supervise, or control in any manner, or prescribe any requirements with respect to, the administration, the curriculum, the instruction, the methods of instruction, or the materials of instruction.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of more nearly equalizing elementary and secondary school opportunities among and within the States, and raising educational standards throughout all the States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without any limitation of such appropriations or condition inconsistent with or contrary to the terms or purposes of this act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the sum of $1 billion to be distributed among the States as hereinafter provided until the Congress determines that assistance is no longer needed for this purpose.

SEC. 4. (a) Ninety-five percent of the funds appropriated in accordance with section 3 of this act for each fiscal year shall be distributed among the States in the following manner:

(1) From 50 percent of such funds the Commissioner shall allot and authorize the payment to each State of an amount which bears the same ratio to the total of such 50 percent of such funds as the school-age population of such State bears to the total of the school-age populations of all the States. For the purposes of this act the term "school-age population" means with respect to any State that part of the population of such State which is between the ages of 5 and 17, both inclusive, according to the most recent estimates certified by the Secretary of Commerce.

(2) From the remaining 50 percent of such funds the Commissioner shall allot and authorize the payment to each State of an amount which bears the same ratio to the total of such 50 percent of such funds as the weighted school-age population of such State bears to the total of the weighted school-age populations of all the States. For the purposes of this act the term "weighted school-age population" means with respect to any State the school-age population of such State multiplied by the quotient obtained by dividing the personal income per school-age child of such State into the personal income per school-age child of the State having the highest personal income per school-age child. For the purposes of this act the term "personal income per school-age child" means with respect to any State the total personal income of such State, according to the most recent estimates certified by the Secretary of Commerce, divided by the school-age population of such State.

(b) From 3 percent of the funds appropriated for each fiscal year pursuant to section 3 of this act, such additional sums as may be necessary shall be apportioned by the Commissioner and paid to the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, according to their respective needs for additional funds for elementary and secondary schools, upon the basis of joint agreements made with their respective State educational authorities.

(c) From 2 percent of the funds appropriated for each fiscal year pursuant to section 3 of this act, such additional sums as may be necessary shall be apportioned by the Commissioner and paid to the States for urgent and special educational needs and programs, including but not limited to programs for mentally retarded children and specially gifted children, upon application of the State educational authority, except that no State shall be allotted more than 10 percent of the funds apportioned under this subsection.

SEC. 5. In order to improve and more nearly equalize educational opportunities, the funds paid to a State from the funds appropriated in accordance with section 3 and apportioned under subsections (a) and (b) of section 4 of this act shall be available for disbursement by the State educational authority, either directly or through payments to local school jurisdictions or other education agencies, exclusively for primary and secondary education expenses and activities. Funds appropriated in accordance with section 3 and apportioned under subsection (c) of section 4 of this act shall be available for disbursement by the Commissioner, upon application of the State educational authority, for urgent and special educational needs and programs within the discretion of the Commissioner.

SEC. 6. The Commissioner shall certify for each fiscal year the amounts to be paid under this act to each State that has qualified under section 7 of this act to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall, through the fiscal service of the Treasury Department and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the treasurer or corresponding official of such State the amount certified for such fiscal year in four equal installments, as soon after the first day of each quarter as may be feasible, beginning with the first quarter of the fiscal year for which appropriations made under the authorization of this act are available. Such treasurer or corresponding official shall pay out such funds only on the requisition of the State educational authority.

SEC. 7. In order to qualify for receiving funds appropriated under this act a State shall, by appropriate State action—

(1) accept the provisions of this act and provide for the administration of funds to be received;

(2) provide that the State treasurer or corresponding official in the State shall receive the funds paid to that State under this act and shall be required to submit to the Commissioner, on or before the first day of November of each year, for transmission to the Congress, a detailed statement of the amount so received for the preceding fiscal year and its disbursement;

(3) provide that its State educational authority shall represent the State in the administration of funds received;

(4) provide for an annual audit, and for the submission of a copy thereof to the Commissioner, of the expenditure of funds received under this act, and for a system of reports from local school jurisdictions and other educational agencies to the State educational authority;

(5) provide that the State educational authority shall make reports to the Commissioner with respect to the progress of education, on forms to be provided by the Commissioner, which reports the Commissioner shall transmit to the Congress with recommendations for such revisions of this act as in his judgment the Congress should consider, with particular reference to recommendations arising from changing conditions in our national economy; and

(6) transmit through its State educational authority to the Commissioner notice of acceptance and certified copies of the legislative enactments and the administrative regulations that may be issued by the State educational authority in connection with such funds, and any amendment of such enactments and revisions of regulations shall, in like manner, be transmitted to the Commissioner.

SEC. 8. In the event a State educational authority is dissatisfied with any action by the Commissioner taken with respect to such State pursuant to this act, or with his failure to take any action with respect to such State pursuant to this act, such authority shall have the right to appeal to the Commissioner to change the action he has taken or to take the action he has failed to take, and to present to him in support of such appeal such statement and other evidence as such authority may deem appropriate. If the action taken by the Commissioner on such appeal is not satisfactory to the State educational authority, or if he fails to act thereon within 90 days after he receives such appeal, such authority shall have the right to appeal to the United States district court for any district in which any part of such State is located. The court shall receive in evidence a copy of the statements and other evidence presented by the State educational authority to the Commissioner, and such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper; and shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgments as the facts and the law may require.

SEC. 9. As used in this act—

(1) The term "State" shall include the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam;

(2) The term "State educational authority" means, as the State legislature may determine, (a) the chief State school officer (such as the State superintendent of public education, commissioner of education, or similar officer), or (b) a board of education controlling the State department of education; except that in the District of Columbia it shall mean the Board of Education, and in the Canal Zone, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, it shall mean the Governor; and

(3) The term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education.

SEC. 10. If any provisions of this act or the application thereof to any State, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to other States, persons, or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks House Memorial No. 2 of the Oregon

Legislature, dealing with the question of educational grants-in-aid.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Memorial 2

*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, and to the Oregon Members of these legislative bodies:*

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas increasing school costs are imposing a steadily increasing burden upon the real property owners of our State; and

Whereas the present tax collection policies of the Federal Government fall heavily upon State sources, with no corresponding return to the State for the assistance of education; and

Whereas under such taxation policies the Federal Government should assume its rightful obligation to the preservation of our way of life by assisting the cause of education; and

Whereas it is the announced policy of both major political parties that the Federal Government should provide assistance in meeting building needs of various school districts: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon,* That the Congress of the United States hereby is urged to provide legislation giving grants-in-aid for school building purposes to school districts in the various States; be it further

*Resolved,* That the Oregon Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives promote and support such legislation; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and hereby is directed to send a copy of this memorial to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, to the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON, Vice President of the United States, to the Honorable Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of the United States, to the President and Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to all Members of the Oregon congresisonal delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by house January 28, 1957.

RURAL LIBRARY SERVICE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in RECORD at this point a letter from the Oregon Library Association, signed by Cora M. Miller, president, dealing with the problems of the library service.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,
*Portland, Oreg., January 31, 1957.*

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. MORSE: The Oregon Library Association is proud of the commendable forward step taken by the 84th Congress in the passage of the Library Services Act and sees it as an opportunity to promote library development needed to equalize or offer library opportunities to residents of rural areas too long denied adequate library services.

The act was planned as terminal legislation, for a period of 5 years only. We were alarmed when such a small appropriation was given for the implementation of this act last year but assumed it was due to a lag in initiating the new project. We fully expected that the amount would be enlarged this year. Now, the President's budget recommends only $3 million for this year instead of the full amount of the expected yearly appropriation of $7,500,000 as legislated. This is, indeed, a blow to Oregon, especially when so much planning for improved library services has been done.

If this were not a terminal act, we would hope for a gradual increase in appropriation each year, but, since it was only for 5 years and the first one has passed, and the amount asked for, when divided into 48 States with Territories additional, is a relatively small sum geared to minimum realistic needs, we hope that Oregon legislators will ask for the full amount of the appropriation this year. You know Oregon, know how much of its area is rural, how much industrial expansion is taking place, how rapid the population is growing and you know how inadequate library services are in areas of small population. Is it asking too much to ask that the people of Oregon be granted adequate libraries that will offer both children and adults the opportunity to be better informed and educated individuals and thus be better citizens of Oregon and the Nation? As a Senator, representing Oregon, will you not ask for the full appropriation allowed for the Library Services Act for this year? Oregon librarians have carefully planned for the best use of Oregon's share of this money and we are hard at work to make library development in Oregon a reality. Won't you be a leader in working for the full appropriation of the Library Services Act? Such action would benefit libraries, not only in Oregon, but all States as well.

Sincerely,

CORA M. MILLER, *President.*

THE FACTS ABOUT EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. I believe it is very important that we in Congress be educators on the need of Federal aid to education. It is important that we get the facts to American mothers and fathers as to what is happening to their children in the field of education.

The fact is that thousands of American boys and girls today are being denied a college education because our elementary schools and high schools in many parts of the land are so low in their standards that their graduates cannot qualify for college. They are either denied admission in the first instance, or, if admitted, they soon flunk out.

That is a terrific waste of a human resource. After all, the greatest resource we have in America, and the greatest wealth we have in America, is human talent. I have been heard to say many times on the floor that, although we cannot keep ahead of Russia in manpower, we had better keep ahead of her in brain power. We will not keep ahead of her in brain power when we look at such a statistic as this, namely, that 23 percent of the high schools of this country do not even offer a course in either physics or chemistry, and a large percentage of them offer only one of those courses. In this scientific age we had better take a hard look at the educational needs of our grade schools and our high schools and make sure that such deficiencies are corrected at once.

In the bill just introduced, we have sought to come to grips with the problem of a full development of the educational facilities of our country, not merely a development which is limited to a school-construction program. Interestingly enough the Eisenhower school-construction program will result in very little real aid to States, but rather great aid to the floaters of bonds and the interest collectors. They would be substantial benefactors from that kind of program. When I talk about Federal aid to education, I mean aid; I mean seeing to it that the money flows into the States, to be spent by the States for developing better support for the schools, including support for teachers' salaries, for the setting up of better curricula, for aid to retarded and superior children, and also for aid to the great mass of the so-called average children.

TAFT ANSWER TO FEDERAL-AID CRITICS

I close these remarks by referring again to the classic answer that Bob Taft used to give on the floor of the Senate, when the charge was made that favoring Federal aid to education would somehow, in some way, according to the critics, lead to Federal domination of the local school districts. Bob Taft used to stand on the floor of the Senate and shake his finger at us and say, "If any Member of the Senate can write language into the bill which will, in his opinion, give greater guaranties to the local school districts or greater assurance that the States will control education, let him give it to me, and I will put it in the bill." Nobody could. He said, "Nobody can, because the bill contains every guaranty that can be written into it."

Mr. President, Senators will find such guaranties in the Morse-Clark bill. It is in the provision which sets forth, in effect, that any Federal money which is given to a State shall be commingled with State money and spent by the State authorities in accordance with the State's educational policies. That is protection. That is my answer, as it was Bob Taft's answer, to those who raise the scarecrow argument and the highly fallacious argument that any program of Federal aid to education is bound to lead to the Federal Government's domination of education. There is no basis in fact to that argument. The argument has no merit. However, I am glad to introduce a bill this afternoon which reiterates the protection that Bob Taft always wrote into bills for aid to education which he and a group of us cosponsored.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF OREGON LEGISLATURE

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER], House Joint Resolution No. 2, passed by the Oregon Legislature.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 2

Whereas the Honorable Dwight David Eisenhower and the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON are soon to be inaugurated as President and Vice President of the United States of America; and

Whereas the President and Vice President of the United States of America, in their positions of responsibility and leadership, are, in the eyes of the American people and the peoples of the world, the symbol of America's desire for peace and opposition to forces of tyranny and oppression; and

Whereas the President and Vice President of the United States of America are the elected leaders of all the people of this Nation regardless of their party affiliation: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring)*, That we offer our congratulations to the Honorable Dwight David Eisenhower and the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON as they embark on their second terms and continue to assume their positions of responsibility and leadership; be it further

*Resolved*, That we wish the Honorable Dwight David Eisenhower and the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON success, achievement and the best of health during their terms of office; be it further

*Resolved*, That we pray that this administration may be characterized by world peace and security; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate to the Honorable Dwight David Eisenhower, the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON, to the Secretary of State of the United States and to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by house January 18, 1957.

Adopted by senate January 28, 1957.

## PORT OF SIUSLAW, OREG., REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT AND EXPANSION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Oregon's coastal seaports are assuming increasing importance in the economic life of surrounding areas. This is especially true in major lumber-producing sections of the State, where competitive market conditions have made shipping costs a critical factor in continued operation of many mills. Since the maintenance of harbor facilities is under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, it is essential that the Congress give the fullest consideration to developing maximum efficiency of navigation installations.

The Port of Siuslaw, Oreg., is the seaport for one of the Nation's major forest-products producing areas. Yet the existing jetties which make the port channel navigable have been allowed to fall into a state of disrepair. Details of this condition have been brought to my attention in a pointed resolution adopted by the Lane County delegation to the 49th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon. I ask consent to have the resolution inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks so that Members of the Senate may be apprised of the need for immediate improvement of the Siuslaw River jetties.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Lane County's seaport, the port of Siuslaw, is seeking rehabilitation of the existing jetties at the mouth of the Siuslaw River; and

Whereas the existing jetty at the mouth of the Siuslaw River, have since 1917, deteriorated to such an extent that they are no longer effective in maintaining a controlled depth at the mouth of the Siuslaw River; and

Whereas existing fishing and navigation interests have been operating in and out of the port of Siuslaw under most adverse and hazardous conditions, much of which is caused by lack of jetty protection at the mouth of the Siuslaw River; and

Whereas the rehabilitation of the jetties at the mouth of the Siuslaw River would substantially aid in controlling depths, thereby offering relief to existing navigation and encouraging additional use; and

Whereas the rehabilitation is necessary to maintain the present traffic and develop the full use of this resource, and must be done prior to the proposed modification of the project by extension of the present jetties; and

Whereas this modification is now pending in the United States Congress; and

Whereas the great economic value and necessity of this project has been recognized by such organized groups as the Northwest Rivers and Harbors Congress, Inland Empire Waterways Association, Lane County Chamber of Commerce, Eugene Chamber of Commerce, Springfield Chamber of Commerce, Cottage Grove Chamber of Commerce, Junction City Chamber of Commerce, Oakridge Chamber of Commerce, McKenzie River Chamber of Commerce, Florence Chamber of Commerce, Lane County Commissioners, Lane County Parks and Recreation Commission, port of Siuslaw, and generally by the people of the State of Oregon; and

Whereas the rehabilitation of the existing jetties at the mouth of the Siuslaw River must be financed from Federal Rivers and Harbors maintenance money; and

Whereas the Lane County delegation to the 49th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, does hereby recognize the immediate need and urgency of the situation: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Lane County delegates to the 49th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, do hereby urgently request that the rehabilitation of the existing jetties at the mouth of the Siuslaw River be given priority and the necessary funds allocated from Federal rivers and harbors funds for said rehabilitation; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Gov. Robert D. Holmes, Senator Wayne L. Morse, Senator Richard L. Neuberger, and Congressman Charles O. Porter, urging their concentrated support of this project.

Unanimously adopted by the Lane County delegation to the 49th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, this 2d day of February 1957.

TRUMAN A. CHASE,
*Oregon State Senator.*
DONALD R. HUSBAND,
*Oregon State Senator.*
EDWIN E. CONE,
*Oregon State Representative.*
V. E. JOHNSON,
*Oregon State Representative.*
KEITH SKELTON,
*Oregon State Representative.*
RICHARD EYMANN,
*Oregon State Representative.*
GLEN M. STADLER,
*Oregon State Representative.*

## NATIONAL ATTENTION HAS COME TO WILLIAM S. WHITE FOR HIS BOOK ABOUT THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, national recognition has come again to William S. White, chief congressional correspondent for the New York Times. This time the occasion is publication of his outstanding new book about the United States Senate. Its title is "Citadel." Its publication has been a major event in the realm of books.

This book has been reviewed with scholarship and ability in the current issue of the Saturday Review by Sidney Hyman, of the staff of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

I believe that all Senators interested in Mr. White's splendid book—and their number is legion—will value an opportunity to read the interesting review by Mr. Hyman. Here let me add that, as something of a minor author myself, I can only admire the great talent and skill with which William S. White has demonstrated true literary craftsmanship in the writing of Citadel. His choice of words is masterful.

I ask that Sidney Hyman's review of Citadel, a review entitled "Inside the Senate," appear in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSIDE THE SENATE

(By Sidney Hyman)

William S. White, of the New York Times, has long served his readers with a daily epiphany, making plain what is hidden behind changing Senate surfaces. Now, in a book called Citadel, his aim is to state and judge the timeless forces active in the Senate—an "institution that lives in an unending yesterday where the past is never gone, the present never quite decisive, and the future rarely visible."

In the concepts it puts forward Citadel is the most revealing single book ever written about the Senate. In its esthetic aspects also, the form and movement of Mr. White's story is everywhere luminous; it glows with a special light whenever he touches—with affectionate irony—the figure of the southerner in the Senate.

But to place a full value on the book one should add that Mr. White's command of his material is not confined to the image of the Senate he reconstructs. The Senate, rather, is his metaphor for an inspired essay about American constitutional morality—the condition of its strength, how it is affected by time itself, the nature of its paradoxes, its built-in risks, and the dangers now facing it. Indeed, to miss this moral-constitutional concern is to miss the cogent reason why Mr. White calls the Senate a Citadel, and why he expects it to be worthy of the title.

In Mr. White's outlook the institutional form of the Senate both explains and comments on the actors who embody it in any hour. There is, for example, the normal fact of Senate equality of State representation regardless of size, and the Senate seniority system regardless of merit. There is the right of unlimited debate regardless of subject matter, and the right of a committee chairman regardless of his virtue. There is the fierce trust in precedent because it is a precedent, the love of small things because of their smallness, and the Senate's general readiness to respect the absolute minority of one man—provided the one man has character.

These details of Senate form produce a general Senate type, which subdivides in many ways, but most importantly, into Senate types that do or don't belong to the Inner Club, formed of men who give the Senate its real direction. Still, for all Senate Members, the very form of the Senate opens the road to gross abuses of personal power, to disorder, to arrogance toward the House and the Executive. This Mr. White states and documents, sometimes with restrained contempt and sometimes by a comic representation that purifies the truly serious and somehow draws the reader closer to its solemnity.

But he does not stop with an indictment. Mr. White goes on to observe, with powerful documentary support, that the same Senate

forms which invite abuse, can also be enlisted in the service of the highest of moral-constitutional causes. What is it? It is to uphold Calhoun's doctrine of the concurrent majority (cleansed of its original identity with the defense of slavery). For it is this doctrine which represents true constitutionalism, based not on the unchecked rule of numbers, but on a concurrence of majority and minority interests.

In Mr. White's interpretation of that doctrine, and it is one with which this reviewer is in full accord, it is the Senate's duty to see to it that policies and laws that are quite literally intolerable (and not merely repugnant) shall not be pressed on any minority by any majority, however great. It is the Senate's duty to uphold the rights even of the absolute minority of one man—to keep all pressure points on minorities within constitutional bounds, and to search constantly for ways in which a workable modus vivendi between majority and minority interests can be achieved. When it does this moral-constitutional work, it becomes the citadel of the American idea of fair play.

There are many individual heroes in Mr. White's demonstration of constitutional morality working at its best. But the figure who draws his special attention is Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia—"incomparably the truest current Senate type, and incomparably the most influential man on the inner life of the Senate." Known to northern liberals as the field marshal of the southern Senators, and suspected by some on that account, Senator RUSSELL nevertheless has a clear and everlasting title to the gratitude of the Nation. For it was he who quietly yet heroically summoned the Senate to the defense of the Constitution in the inflamed hour following General MacArthur's removal from his Far Eastern command. It was Senator RUSSELL, above all other men, who broke the back of public hysteria and reaffirmed the authority of the constitutional idea that the civil order is supreme over the military order.

The very great danger to our constitutional morality, as Mr. White sees it, is the danger the Senate puts itself in when it abuses the right of immunity from slander and libel action, and when it abuses the 12th amendment in the conduct of its investigations. This last abuse, he reminds us, is one of which liberals and conservatives are equally guilty; the first, for example, in the course of the Kefauver crime investigations; the second, in the case of the McCarthy and McCarran investigations into communism. Both investigations violated the rights of individuals. Whether good or bad individuals were abused is beside the point. The point is that the liberals were silent when Senator KEFAUVER ignored the constitutional rights of criminals; the conservatives were silent when Senators MCCARTHY and MCCARRAN ignored the rights of individuals suspected of communism. And, worst of all, there was the shame of the Senate itself, as a guardian of the great constitutional tradition, in condoning what it [knew] was not right. "Stick to your knitting," Mr. White says to the Senate, "and the Republic will be well served in ways no other arm of the Government except the Senate can serve it. Wander from your knitting, and the great, greasy sea of conformity, of soulless bigness, of anti-individualism—indeed, of antipolitics—will be upon us."

The next best thing to having a man like William S. White in the Senate, is to have him writing about it.

## ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the order previously entered, to Monday, February 11, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 7, 1957:

### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

G. Frederick Reinhardt, of California, to be Counselor of the Department of State, vice Douglas MacArthur 2d.

### CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Louis J. Hector, of Florida, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1962, vice Joseph P. Adams, term expired.

### NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Jerome D. Fenton, of Connecticut, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 4 years.

### OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Gordon Gray, of North Carolina, to be Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, vice Arthur S. Flemming.

### AIR FORCE

Brig. Gen. Marvin Edward Kennebeck, 18819A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), United States Air Force, for temporary appointment as major general in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10, of the United States Code.

### POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

#### ALABAMA

Henry L. Ware, Aliceville, Ala., in place of R. H. Kirksey, resigned.

James G. Stone, Ashland, Ala., in place of K. J. White, transferred.

Jesse B. McCollum, Dawson, Ala., in place of C. T. Driskill, resigned.

Quinton A. Williams, Gulf Shores, Ala., in place of Frank Wenzel, removed.

L. Gertrude McConnell, St. Elmo, Ala., in place of J. H. Henley, removed.

#### ARKANSAS

Henry L. Clark, Black Rock, Ark., in place of J. N. Moore, removed.

Fred C. Seaton, Forrest City, Ark., in place of S. L. Kirkpatrick, deceased.

Don C. Jones, Jasper, Ark., in place of C. B. Casey, deceased.

Lola Mae Eppes, Madison, Ark., in place of J. R. Eppes, deceased.

Willie J. White, Mount Ida, Ark., in place of R. M. Harris, deceased.

#### CALIFORNIA

Lucille Peyton, Aromas, Calif., in place of L. M. Williamson, retired.

Wilda B. Keller, Boulevard, Calif., in place of W. B. Keller, resigned.

Helen M. Robertson, Cobb, Calif., in place of A. H. Robinson, resigned.

Raymond A. Hunter, Colton, Calif., in place of C. A. Ham, resigned.

Barbara P. O'Neill, Crannell, Calif, in place of H. M. Heitman, resigned.

Gladys L. Ralph, Eagle Mountain, Calif. Office established November 1, 1951.

Edward F. Fuselli, Fairfax, Calif., in place of M. L. Jordan, retired.

Thomas G. Moore, Folsom, Calif., in place of R. F. Keefe, resigned.

Frank B. Branson, Fort Jones, Calif., in place of R. B. Reynolds, Sr., resigned.

Lewis B. Miller, Moorpark, Calif., in place of E. T. Whitaker, retired.

Dorothy P. Faust, Newberry, Calif., in place of G. T. Lomker, resigned.

Albert W. Oxsen, Pleasanton, Calif., in place of R. M. Mollin, resigned.

John Redstreake, Quincy, Calif., in place of R. A. Bar, retired.

Beryl E. Carroll, Rancho Cordova, Calif. Office established May 16, 1955.

Flora R. Sproul, Redway, Calif. Office established April 1, 1953.

Lawrence Kenneth Fee, Sr., San Miguel, Calif., in place of R. E. Cruess, retired.

Mervin H. Sheppard, Sutter Creek, Calif., in place of Bess Morabe, retired.

Mary G. Hutchinson, Tecate, Calif., in place of R. C. Marks, resigned.

Orion K. Beeson, Venice, Calif., in place of L. D. Winn, resigned.

Raymond J. Schulze, Yountville, Calif., in place of G. E. Beard, transferred.

#### COLORADO

Sidney E. Koon, Arvada, Colo., in place of Roy Staley, retired.

Glenn A. Daniels, Castle Rock, Colo., in place of F. G. Hier, retired.

Theodore G. Hefner, Denver, Colo., in place of F. A. Pomponio, resigned.

Wilbur A. Snyder, Fountain, Colo., in place of N. M. King, retired.

Louise J. Caddell, Grand Lake, Colo., in place of R. C. Caddell, deceased.

Eva G. Woolley, Louviers, Colo., in place of Lucille Stewart, retired.

Alex J. Campbell, Norwood, Colo., in place of G. E. McCall, transferred.

Joseph P. Davis, Peyton, Colo., in place of I. G. Duncan, transferred.

#### CONNECTICUT

Violet A. Grape, Cobalt, Conn., in place of R. H. Clark, not commissioned.

Vincent S. Iovieno, North Branford, Conn., in place of E. J. Surprenant, transferred.

#### DELAWARE

Elizabeth M. Clendaniel, Lincoln, Del., in in place of M. J. Greenly, retired.

#### FLORIDA

Stewart H. Hawkins, Anna Maria, Fla., in place of F. I. Warttig, retired.

Lillian S. Rodgers, Bascom, Fla., in place of M. E. R. Etheridge, resigned.

Harry E. Kesler, Fellsmere, Fla., in place of V. M. Sanborn, resigned.

Huber C. Hurst, Jacksonville, Fla., in place of G. C. Blume, deceased.

Charles Wyland, Fort Myers Beach, Fla. Office established September 1, 1955.

Marshall I. Richards, Grant, Fla., in place of C. M. Gutermuth, retired.

Emmet W. Doak, Neptune Beach, Fla., in place of E. C. Hunter, deceased.

Essie M. Cogdill, Saint Marks, Fla., in place of O. P. Shields, retired.

Wayne Searcy, Tallahassee, Fla., in place of J. F. Cochran, deceased.

#### GEORGIA

Alex B. Greenway, Alma, Ga., in place of Howard Thompson, removed.

Guy D. McKinney, Ball Ground, Ga., in place of H. R. Cobb, retired.

Luther A. Adams, Elberton, Ga., in place of N. W. Hawes, retired.

Joseph E. Turner, Jr., Hephzibah, Ga., in place of A. D. Lindsey, retired.

Henrietta B. Dopson, Jacksonville, Ga., in place of D. T. Wilcox, retired.

Emory H. Camp, Monroe, Ga., in place of I. W. Field, retired.

Walter T. Brown, Mountain View, Ga., in place of M. B. Arman, resigned.

Thomas E. Wynne, Warm Springs, Ga., in place of W. B. Persons, retired.

#### ILLINOIS

John E. Parker, Deer Creek, Ill., in place of H. R. Foster, retired.

Charles H. Harker, Sr., Dunlap, Ill., in place of F. F. Colgan, deceased.

Edward J. Kleen, Elmwood, Ill., in place of C. R. Bowers, retired.

Bayard M. Wright, Lacon, Ill., in place of M. W. Dunn, removed.

Louis D. Hobaker, Mackinaw, Ill., in place of G. H. Kinsey, retired.

INDIANA

Ernest Wayne Mattox, Culver, Ind., in place of F. T. Strang, retired.

Herman Funkhouser, Hymera, Ind., in place of E. G. Moreland, retired.

Ruth Quillen, Mooresville, Ind., in place of C. H. Wilson, transferred.

Charles L. Lemonds, Otisco, Ind., in place of F. D. Sutton, retired.

William S. Hutchison, Paoli, Ind., in place of O. F. Wilson, deceased.

Anna Lee Mory, South Milford, Ind., in place of I. B. Shroyer, retired.

IOWA

Alexander Thomas Carlisle, Atalissa, Iowa, in place of W. J. Hohnke, removed.

George A. Brooks, Bagley, Iowa, in place of D. E. Wagner, resigned.

Billy M. McClanahan, Bloomfield, Iowa, in place of K. F. Baldridge, retired.

John N. Malmquist, Boxholm, Iowa, in place of M. B. Stark, retired.

Leo E. Dunbar, Brighton, Iowa, in place of O. T. Lamansky, deceased.

Charles Donald Finch, Bussey, Iowa, in place of V. M. Zylstra, transferred.

Elmer E. Brumm, Curlew, Iowa, in place of N. M. Easton, retired.

Lawrence E. Myers, Dallas Center, Iowa, in place of O. F. Ward, deceased.

Donald C. Ogden, Fonda, Iowa, in place of D. V. Farrell, retired.

Harry F. Olhausen, Hartley, Iowa, in place of R. D. McCarty, transferred.

Carl H. Kuhnle, Hiawatha, Iowa. Office established February 16, 1955.

Elmer J. Galloway, Jr., Lone Tree, Iowa, in place of M. R. Griebel, retired.

Duane A. Yeakel, Kanawha, Iowa, in place of H. J. Johnson, resigned.

Howard W. Cruise, Olin, Iowa, in place of R. M. White, retired.

Howard L. Pritchard, Pilot Mound, Iowa, in place of D. E. Peterson, deceased.

Esther B. Hass, Preston, Iowa, in place of A. H. Mohr, deceased.

Harvey Norman Wilberg, Ringsted, Iowa, in place of T. A. Helgason, resigned.

Edward H. Brandt, Sibley, Iowa, in place of A. J. Salland, retired.

Russell E. Mullins, Westgate, Iowa, in place of V. L. Coleman, resigned.

KANSAS

Orville W. Hopkins, Augusta, Kans., in place of J. C. Cox, retired.

KENTUCKY

Jessie R. Hodges, Alva, Ky., in place of H. H. Snodgrass, resigned.

LOUISIANA

Alva L. Coon, Arcadia, La., in place of W. L. Galloway, removed.

Dalton J. Richard, Creole, La., in place of Edras Nunez, Jr., retired.

Robert D. Comeaux, Duson, La., in place of L. F. Sladous, retired.

America Hahn Falgout, Meraux, La., in place of C. A. Meraux, retired.

Hannah J. Cunningham, Metairie, La. Office established January 1, 1955.

Pauline B. Cambre, Paulina, La., in place of Celia Reilly, retired.

Katherine M. Boucher, Springhill, La., in place of D. W. Payne, resigned.

Myra H. Doughty, Tioga, La., in place of M. M. Clark, retired.

MAINE

Leonora H. Good, Hampden, Maine, in place of E. L. Davis, removed.

Augustus Sylvester, Orrs Island, Maine, in place of C. F. Huff, retired.

Albert Ellsworth, Oxford, Maine, in place of I. P. Teague, retired.

MARYLAND

Olie K. Teeter, Flintstone, Md., in place of N. R. Wigfield, retired.

Dudley I. Windsor, Hurlock, Md., in place of G. V. Thompson, retired.

John R. Byers, Westminster, Md., in place of F. P. Myers, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Kenneth E. Keith, Bridgewater, Mass., in place of J. J. O'Brien, deceased.

Alfred K. Wilde, Edgartown, Mass., in place of A. A. Averill, retired.

Berton E. Hobart, Holbrook, Mass., in place of J. F. Megley, retired.

Charles M. Thrasher, Natick, Mass., in place of P. V. Casavant, removed.

Adelbert M. Eldredge, Northboro, Mass., in place of P. H. Sheehan, deceased.

Clifford A. E. Norrman, Plympton, Mass., in place of M. F. McDonagh, retired.

Richard H. Crittendon, Otis, Mass., in place of J. T. McManus, resigned.

Marian F. Church, Rochester, Mass., in place of E. O. Phillips, removed.

Essie H. Reynolds, South Acton, Mass., in place of J. T. Enneguess, removed.

Hazel B. Hiltz, South Ashburnham, Mass., in place of J. E. Dempsey, retired.

Albert R. Lacroix, Spencer, Mass., in place of G. A. Morin, removed.

Roger D. Scudder, Sunderland, Mass., in place of H. K. Hoxie, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Mabel E. Burford, Coldwater, Miss., in place of T. A. Elder, removed.

Jack T. Holleman, Houston, Miss., in place of F. L. Lowry, retired.

Charles P. Gunter, Marks, Miss., in place of W. J. Pettyjohn, retired.

William R. Lea, Minter City, Miss., in place of J. N. Truitt, retired.

James William Jones, Newhebron, Miss., in place of J. C. Garner, transferred.

Rufina F. W. Gully, Preston, Miss., in place of L. D. Henderson, Jr., resigned.

Philip L. May, Silver Creek, Miss., in place of G. M. Williams, retired.

MONTANA

John C. Emerson, Stevensville, Mont., in place of P. W. Poindexter, retired.

NEBRASKA

Osyth M. Stradley, Greenwood, Nebr., in place of Elsie Kelly, retired.

Verl A. Brunkow, Murdock, Nebr., in place of L. B. Gorthey, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Edna R. Perry, Center Barnstead, N. H., in place of M. L. McAllister, retired.

Orimer Bugbee, Newport, N. H., in place of R. E. Gould, retired.

Gordon A. Cheney, Newton Junction, N. H., in place of H. E. Cheney, deceased.

Helen R. Quimby, Northwood Narrows, N. H., in place of B. A. Trickey, retired.

Lavinia Y. Ladd, West Stewartstown, N. H., in place of C. N. Young, deceased.

NEW JERSEY

John A. Beetle, Blackwood, N. J., in place of D. T. Hagans, deceased.

William H. Rule, Dover, N. J., in place of G. T. Albrecht, deceased.

Francis E. Bruce, Eatontown, N. J., in place of H. S. Price, resigned.

Edith L. Brown, Mantua, N. J., in place of J. B. Graham, retired.

NEW YORK

John C. Newkerk, DeLancey, N. Y., in place of R. C. Newkerk, retired.

Gardner A. Cross, Felts Mills, N. Y., in place of P. S. Wood, removed.

Rudolph M. Jabbonsky, Holbrook, N. Y., in place of R. F. Jones, resigned.

Loren Grace, Jr., Lodi, N. Y., in place of N. E. Harding, transferred.

Harold B. Lauster, Lyons, N. Y., in place of J. M. Collins, deceased.

Robert P. Siersma, Marcellus, N. Y., in place of J. E. Conley, resigned.

Margaret M. Fitzgerald, Maryknoll, N. Y., in place of M. V. Schrempp, retired.

William Adolph Roese, Mineola, N. Y., in place of O. L. Sause, deceased.

Clifford S. Van Valkenburgh, Jr., New Paltz, N. Y., in place of Jay Zimmerman, resigned.

Laura E. Ebmeyer, Palisades, N. Y., in place of C. T. Cahill, retired.

Donald W. Floyd, Port Jefferson, N. Y., in place of W. E. Davis, retired.

Francis M. Landau, Shirley, N. Y. Office established June 1, 1952.

Mary Eva Loomis, Smithville Flats, N. Y., in place of L. L. Fish, retired.

Harry F. Erickson, Stottville, N. Y., in place of J. C. Kopperger, deceased.

John J. Blake, Taberg, N. Y., in place of F. M. Simon, retired.

William A. Todd, Valley Stream, N. Y., in place of R. J. Buckley, retired.

Robert K. La Londe, Wantagh, N. Y., in place of C. A. Pickard, resigned.

William J. Brown, Jr., Waterford, N. Y., in place of S. H. Keating, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Wren Hunter Freeman, Alexander, N. C., in place of F. E. Sluder, removed.

Raymond L. Long, Biscoe, N. C., in place of A. W. Burt, retired.

David C. Keller, Jr., Chimney Rock, N. C., in place of J. J. Meliski, resigned.

George O. Petree, Danbury, N. C., in place of M. J. Pepper, retired.

Sion Chester Rogers, Elizabethtown, N. C., in place of J. K. Clark, retired.

William T. Stokes, III, Graham, N. C., in place of A. R. Henderson, retired.

Vera N. Scarborough, Grifton, N. C., in place of J. S. Chapman, removed.

Annie B. Smith, Guilford, N. C., in place of Treva Wakefield, retired.

John Perry, Jr., Hendersonville, N. C., in place of Columbus Few, retired.

Cleveland C. Hines, Jr., Holly Ridge, N. C., in place of C. C. Hines, Sr., deceased.

Dennis G. Clifton, Lumber Bridge, N. C., in place of W. E. McGoogan, retired.

Steven Andrew Gaydek, Maury, N. C., in place of Mae Barber, removed.

Harveleigh M. White, Method, N. C., in place of A. T. White, deceased.

Ada S. Solomon, Montreat, N. C., in place of J. C. Rice, retired.

John C. Hammond, Rockingham, N. C., in place of C. R. McNair, retired.

Lola A. Woody, Saxapahaw, N. C., in place of H. M. Cates, retired.

Robert W. Loflin, Trinity, N. C., in place of C. C. Craven, retired.

Joseph W. Heath, Wade, N. C., in place of A L. McNeill, deceased.

OHIO

Robert J. Reese, Belpre, Ohio, in place of F. S. Trautman, deceased.

Ralph E. Kienzle, Bolivar, Ohio, in place of E. C. Marburger, resigned.

Winifred F. Brown, Casstown, Ohio, in place of E. L. Kinder, retired.

John Jay Gold, Dennison, Ohio, in place of Ludwig Ries, Jr., retired.

John M. Frazier, Frazeyburg, Ohio, in place of C. W. Somerville, deceased.

Karl H. Haberecht, Gates Mills, Ohio, in place of R. A. Pouttu, removed.

Elizabeth C. Watts, Highland, Ohio, in place of M. E. Allen, transferred.

Vincent J. Marcarello, Girard, Ohio, in place of T. H. Mulvey, resigned.

Donald L. Meyer, Houston, Ohio, in place of E. W. Kindle, retired.

Craig F. Barnett, Mineral City, Ohio, in place of Charles Fishley, deceased.

Paul E. Neal, Mogadore, Ohio, in place of E. C. Merkle, retired.

Otto E. Lankenau, Napoleon, Ohio, in place of Albert Daman, retired.

Eric Lester Finney, New Philadelphia, Ohio, in place of C. W. Kaiser, deceased.

Clarence C. Sanders, Port William, Ohio, in place of M. M. Knisley, removed.

Harry D. Anderson, Republic, Ohio, in place of N. U. Hawk, transferred.

Arthur C. Larimer, Sandusky, Ohio, in place of R. L. Lorenzen, deceased.

Salvatore D. Zavarella, Solon, Ohio, in place of M. A. Patterson, removed.

PENNSYLVANIA

Edgar R. Baker, Blairsville, Pa., in place of H. M. Smith, resigned.

William M. Crouse, Denver, Pa., in place of S. M. Shirk, removed.

Lloyd J. Burket, East Freedom, Pa., in place of M. C. Decker, resigned.

George L. Mosebarger, Johnsonburg, Pa., in place of E. P. McCarthy, deceased.

Anna F. Rorer, Johnsville, Pa., in place of H. L. Rorer, deceased.

George Costello, Jr., LaBelle, Pa., in place of G. B. Wellington, retired.

Arthur Z. Emery, New Berlinville, Pa., in place of F. S. Rush, deceased.

Gladys E. Ackelson, Prospect, Pa., in place of R. P. Ritchie, resigned.

Richard B. Nealer, Robinson, Pa., in place of E. M. Huston, retired.

Ralph B. Derry, Schellsburg, Pa., in place of Harper Triplett, retired.

Romert E. Doebler, Sunbury, Pa., in place of Charles Kline, retired.

Lawson Stinson, Thornton, Pa., in place of George Hunter, retired.

George Gaylord Barton, Tunkhannock, Pa., in place of S. A. DeWitt, deceased.

Kenneth C. Beener, Valley Forge, Pa., in place of Roy Wilkinson, deceased.

Wilson D. Catherman, Warriors Mark, Pa., in place of C. E. Houck, retired.

Leo W. Burr, Washington Crossing, Pa., in place of E. S. Whitesell, resigned.

Harry E. Gohn, Wrightsville, Pa., in place of M. E. Reisinger, retired.

Evelyn Mae Ray, Wyano, Pa., in place of J. V. Vanderscott, deceased.

RHODE ISLAND

Harold J. Pepler, Mapleville, R. I., in place of Frederick Baldwin, retired.

Raymond C. Holland, Tiverton, R. I., in place of C. S. Holding, removed.

TENNESSEE

Vance T. Tankersley, Cornersville, Tenn., in place of L. B. Fox, retired.

Ralph B. Gilliland, Harriman, Tenn., in place of W. R. Massey, retired.

Charles R. Sanford, New Tazewell, Tenn., in place of R. L. Oakes, retired.

Della G. Henard, Russellville, Tenn., in place of W. J. Dougherty, resigned.

VERMONT

William George Bushey, Charlotte, Vt., in place of M. M. O'Brien, retired.

VIRGINIA

Zeb Jerome Barbee, Jr., Altavista, Va., in place of F. L. Davis, retired.

Thomas M. Strickland, Chester, Va., in place of W. L. Pickhardt, resigned.

Toney S. Reynolds, Jr., Collinsville, Va., in place of M. L. Ramsey, transferred.

Allen F. Maxey, Dillwyn, Va., in place of R. B. Spencer, retired.

Drunette N. Holland, Eastville, Va., in place of E. C. Killman, removed.

John W. Leslie, Glasgow, Va., in place of L. B. Peak, retired.

Wilton E. Dunton, Hudgins, Va., in place of A. P. Stuteville, resigned.

George F. Walls, Isle of Wight, Va., in place of R. J. Atkins, deceased.

Joseph F. Downing, Jr., Keller, Va., in place of C. W. Bradford, deceased.

Paul S. Richmond, Lanexa, Va., in place of E. S. Hockaday, retired.

Doris B. Duncan, Skippers, Va., in place of A. W. Somner, retired.

Roy L. Reeve, Sperryville, Va., in place of Z. H. Sealock, retired.

Stephen K. Burns, Jr., Swoope, Va., in place of W. W. Trimble, Jr., resigned.

Samuel J. Rees, Weirton, W. Va., in place of W. S. Bambrick, deceased.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 7, 1957:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Olin Hatfield Chilson, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

GOVERNOR OF GUAM

Richard Barrett Lowe, of South Dakota, to be Governor of Guam.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, as we daily face the duties and responsibilities of our high calling, inspire us with that wisdom which is beyond the power of man to give.

Thou alone art able to satisfy our temporal needs and our immortal longings.

Help us to cultivate those finer attitudes toward one another which will make for mutual regard and understanding.

Expand our minds and hearts with the deepest concern for the blessedness of all mankind.

Thou knowest that again and again it seems that our hearts must be wrung with sorrow and our eyes be washed with tears before we can feel and see clearly that we ought to manifest a wider sympathy and stretch forth a helping hand to stricken and struggling humanity.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 10, sections 1055 and 1056, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. TEAGUE, of Texas; Mr. RABAUT, of Michigan; Mr. FORD, of Michigan; and Mr. BETTS, of Ohio.

## THE LATE HONORABLE THURMOND CHATHAM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial from the Winston-Salem Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House who knew and loved our late colleague, Thurmond Chatham, as I did, will appreciate an editorial from the Winston-Salem Journal which follows. The author of this editorial has perfectly expressed those qualities of mind and heart which endeared our colleague to us. It is given to few to win and hold the affectionate regard of so many men and women in all stations of life. The memory of Thurmond Chatham's thousandfold unselfish kindnesses, his boundless good fellowship, and his elevation of principle above political preferment are the qualities he has bequeathed to his family and host of friends.

The editorial follows:

[From the Winston-Salem Journal of February 6, 1957]

THURMOND CHATHAM

Thurmond Chatham genuinely liked people. He liked them for what they were, not because of what they had or the places they occupied.

Because of that trait, Mr. Chatham's death has been felt in a manner which, of itself, is the finest final tribute any man can earn.

It is not, perhaps, surprising that this death has caused sadness in those places where the high and the mighty sit.

In the high places of industry Thurmond Chatham earned respect both by his accomplishments (the Chatham Manufacturing Co. grew large sized under his leadership) and by his decent honesty in dealing with his people. It is the same in the high places of government; in the Congress (where he served ably), in the Navy (where he saw active service, really distinguished service, in two world wars), in the State Department (where he fought for improvement at a time when the Department was under general attack) and in the high echelons of politics (where he was courted both because of his wealth and because of his wise counsel).

But that sadness is to be expected of any man who has served ably in important posts over a period of many years.

Yet, the impact of the death of this man reaches far beyond these places. It is felt among a range of people whom you ordinarily would not expect to share an intimate relationship with such a man.

There are cattlemen like Tom Cooley of Surry and dirt farmers like John Wright of Currituck who feel a sickness in their hearts because of Mr. Chatham's death. Old-time hunters in our coastal sounds—men like Harrison Midgette, Uncle Daniel Wright and many others—share that feeling. So do unknown men like John Seri and Magner Nausti who fished the Norwegian salmon streams and walked the dusty roads of the Eira Valley each summer with Thurmond Chatham and, in their time together, came to love him as he loved them and their simple, honest way of life.

That touch—some call it the common touch but it truly is most uncommon—is, perhaps, the best measure of Thurmond Chatham. It explains, for example, why Mr. Chatham did not hesitate to speak out for the human rights of the Negro people in a time when merely opening his mouth invited political defeat.

His belief in the dignity of human beings also explains his deep seated feeling for tradition and for family. People, he felt, must have roots to have meaning. Out of that conviction came his feeling for his own people and their traditions and for the land which produced his people and to which, in their time, they returned.

These are fundamental things. The long list of accomplishments in industry, conservation, politics, foreign service, agriculture, local, State, and regional development and all the rest merely reflect what Thurmond Chatham was and believed.

Men will come along to serve in these areas as well as Thurmond Chatham has served. They always do. But there will not be many men who will come along who possess the same essentially simple but precious traits of character. Such men are rare.

## CORN ACREAGE REFERENDUM

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Agricultural Act of 1956 authorized and directed the Secretary of Agriculture to offer corn farmers in the commercial area an opportunity to decide whether they preferred, one, a corn acreage allotment of 37,289,000 with price support at $1.36 per bushel; or two, a corn base acreage of 51 million acres with price support at a level which will assist farmers in marketing corn but not encourage uneconomic production—set by the Secretary at $1.31 per bushel for 1957—provided that an acreage equal to 15 percent of the farm corn base acreage is put into the soil bank. Such acreage could be put into either the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve or a combination of the two programs.

Sixty-one and five-tenths percent of the 437,480 votes cast in the referendum on December 11, 1956, were for the lower price support and higher acreage with the requirement that an acreage equal to 15 percent of the farm corn base acreage must be put in the soil bank.

Prior to the referendum, farmers were given a written notice of the acreages allotted to their farm under both the 51 million corn base acreage and the 37.3 million acre corn allotment, the level of price support under both programs, and what would be required for participation in the soil bank under both programs.

The amendment to the act that I have today introduced would permit a corn farmer in the commercial corn area to plant within either the farm base acreage for his farm or the farm acreage allotment. Those farmers choosing to plant within the farm base acreage would be eligible for price support at a national average of $1.31 per bushel if an acreage equal to 15 percent of the farm base acreage was put into the soil bank. Those farmers planting within the farm corn allotment would be eligible for price support at $1.36 per bushel. They would not be required to put any acreage in the soil bank.

The amendment is a temporary measure to deal with the corn problem in 1957 only.

It permits farmers immediately upon passage of the act to know what they may do without further administrative work on the part of the USDA since farmers may use the same notice for planting purposes that they used to participate in the referendum.

---

## REPEAL OF THE 20-PERCENT CABARET TAX

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to discharge a duty which I have felt for some time to be of vital importance.

During World War I the Congress passed an emergency tax measure designed expressly "to provide revenue to defray war expenses." This tax came to be known, perhaps unfortunately, as the cabaret tax. Remaining in constant use between the two great wars, it again came into special prominence as a source of emergency revenue during World War II.

With the war over, the tax has remained, actually providing only $40 million annually to the Federal Treasury while depressing business where musicians are concerned to a point where a crisis exists in this industry today. The American Federation of Musicians feels that 200,000 jobs have been lost because of this unfair and unnecessary tax. Over 1,000 musicians have been affected in my own district of Hartford County.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the 20-percent cabaret tax should be repealed. I am introducing a bill at this time designed to accomplish this fact. The revenue raised from this tax is not sufficient to justify its basic effect. With its repeal, many thousands of jobs would be opened up for deserving musicians. In fact, I submit that the Federal Government would in the very near future derive a greater measure of revenue from increased cabaret business and the taxes that working musicians would be able to pay.

I have often been somewhat chagrined by my Democratic colleagues' assertion that only they represent the views of organized labor. Since the Democrats have a majority in committee, a favorable report should certainly be forthcoming on this bill to repeal the 20-percent cabaret tax.

The American Federation of Musicians have long sought passage of this legislation. They deserve it now more than ever.

---

## FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, there is now pending before Congress a request by the Federal National Mortgage Association that directs the Secretary of the Treasury to buy another $50 million in FNMA stock to increase the power of FNMA to buy Government-guaranteed mortgages such as the GI and FHA mortgages, which would bring some relief in the current tight-money situation.

The question I want to raise is, Are we giving proper consideration to the development of adequate debt reduction incentives? Thousands of GI loans contracted in the years immediately after World War II could be paid off today if it were good business for the debtor. But why should a GI debtor pay off a 4-percent mortgage loan when he can invest his money at 5 or 6 percent in conservative and secure investments?

If the Federal National Mortgage Association can discount mortgages at the 6- or 7-percent rate at which it purchases them, why should it not provide a debtor's discount for accelerated repayment? A discount for accelerated repayment of 5 percent would raise the needed $50 million of increased capital which it requires within 60 days.

If we provide adequate incentive for debt reduction, much of the current shortages of mortgage money would be made up by debt repayment. Four-percent mortgages would be paid up and the money could be reloaned at current rates of interest to help fill money needs in the currently expanding economy.

---

## PROPOSED VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES OF MARSHAL TITO

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, Franklin D. Roosevelt once called the Nazis and Communists and their submarines the rattlesnakes of the sea, and I for one believe this. With that being true, how can we, a free and God-loving people, coddle a rattlesnake like Tito to our bosom and expect him not to strike when it suits him. It has been said by some, that the Democrats were soft on communism. If the Democrats were soft on communism, just what kind of a thing is this that the heads of our Government seem to want to invite every Communist murderer, and godless ruler to sit with us. We are not about to win them. To my way of thinking they seem to be about to win us. To my mind the most dangerous thing this country faces today is dictatorship.

In recent weeks there has been considerable speculation over the propriety of a visit to the United States of Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia. While Mr. Tito has apparently given up his idea of being an official visitor to the United States, I nevertheless wish to voice my sentiments as opposed to such a visit. There is no need for me to list again the record of Tito's activities since he came into power. That record is known to all of us and clearly speaks out against his role as a welcomed guest in our homeland.

My conscience impels me to speak out against such a visit for the same basic reasons an upright law-abiding citizen would not invite an outspoken Communist with a public record of vicious communistic activities to visit as a welcome guest in his home. Why fight communism with all our resources and at the same time extend a royal welcome to a leading exponent of communism? While at this time no official invitation has

been extended to Tito, we must not forget that it is our custom to entertain royally official visitors from foreign countries. The courtesy, the entertainment, the considerable fanfare which customarily are accorded a visiting official would be vastly amiss if bestowed upon this outspoken enemy to our democratic way of life. It would be a grievous error to dignify this Communist despot by rewarding him with an official invitation and the special treatment which would accompany an official invitation to visit the United States.

## MEDICAL CORPS OF THE ARMY

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, it is very seldom that I ever either speak or write to criticize the action of any agency of the executive department of the United States Government. This is the first time that I have ever done so on the floor of the House.

I have just witnessed what I consider to be a flagrant breach of good faith between the Department of the Army and a citizen of the United States. I have inquired thoroughly into this matter, and I have been assured that there is nothing in the professional record or personal background of the citizen concerned that is not excellent.

The Department of the Army, through the Secretary and the Surgeon General, has almost constantly stated that there is a great demand, indeed a crying need, for medical officers, both in the Regular Army and under the provisions of the so-called doctor draft law.

A reputable, qualified doctor of medicine, Dr. J. Watts Lipscomb, who resides in Forest Park, Ga., in the fall of 1956 applied for a commission in the Medical Corps of the United States Army. I am not a doctor and do not profess to be able to pass upon his medical and professional qualifications, but I asked the specific question of an officer in the Surgeon General's Office and was assured that this man was qualified from both a professional standpoint and the standpoint of training, background, and character.

Dr. Lipscomb received a letter from the Office of the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, Washington, D. C., dated November 15, 1956, a copy of which is inserted below. Relying upon that letter, he closed up his office; he sold his home and made his plans to enter the Medical Corps of the Regular Army early in 1957, and expected that the Department of the Army would keep its word.

The language in this letter is clear and contains no ambiguity, and I believe that any reasonable person reading this letter would construe it as preliminary tender of an appointment in the Medical Corps of the Regular Army.

Since the time of that letter, the Office of the Surgeon General and someone acting in the name of the Surgeon General has repudiated both the content and the intent of the letter that Dr. Lipscomb received, and they have apparently rejected him because some 6 or 8 years ago, Dr. Lipscomb had a minor ulcer condition in his stomach while he was on active duty as an enlisted man in the United States Army.

Subsequent to that time he completed his medical college training, and from the date of his hospitalization from 6 or 8 years ago until now, he has not missed a day from school or a day from work because of any residuals or sequelae of that condition which existed approximately 6 or 8 years ago.

Last January, Dr. Lipscomb telephoned me and asked me to inquire what had happened to his promised appointment. I made such an inquiry as courteously and respectfully as I could and was given about as thorough a runaround and evasive answer as I have ever seen.

A few days ago, the Surgeon General's Office repudiated, without cause, the previous tender of an appointment in the Medical Corps of the Regular Army to Dr. Lipscomb.

To my way of thinking, it is one of the worst and most flagrant cases of a breach of faith and repudiation of the written word that I have ever seen or known about from an agency of the executive branch of our Government in its dealings with an honorable American citizen.

The Surgeon General may have some explanation as to why he continually voices an urgent need for doctors out of one side of his mouth and almost in the same breath repudiates the tender of an appointment to the professionally qualified physician of excellent character who has closed his private office and sold his home relying on the written statement from the Surgeon General's Office that he had been approved.

The letter from the Surgeon General follows:

NOVEMBER 15, 1956.

J. W. LIPSCOMB, M. D.,
*The Forest Park Clinic,*
*Forest Park, Ga.*

DEAR DR. LIPSCOMB: It is a pleasure to inform you that your application for appointment in the Regular Army Medical Corps has been approved by the Surgeon General and your application for residency training in internal medicine has been approved to begin July 1, 1957, at the University of Virginia Hospital, Charlottesville, Va.

Prior to beginning of residency training, you will, of course, be required to attend the Army Medical Service company officer course at Brooke Army Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, Tex., which is of 22 weeks' duration. This course is scheduled to begin January 1957 and to end July 1957.

There are certain regulatory processes which will require an additional amount of time prior to appointment in the Regular Army, such as a favorable national agency check, and Presidential and congressional action; upon the completion of which you will be contacted by The Adjutant General. From now on, all official correspondence pertaining to your application for the Regular Army will be from The Adjutant General. However, please feel free to contact me if you should have any further questions concerning your Regular Army appointment or residency training.

It will be sincerely appreciated if you will note on the attached carbon copy of this letter your intention to accept or decline a Regular Army appointment when tendered. Please understand that this is not a commitment on your part, but is necessary for planning purposes, since you may decline to accept a Regular Army commission at any time prior to the actual execution of oath of office.

Sincerely yours,

WILMOT L. GIBSON,
*Major, MSC, Personnel Division.*

## CHECKING TUBERCULOSIS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, one of the major concerns of the Appropriations Committee on Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare is the health of our Nation. Each year funds are appropriated to the Public Health Service for the grant-in-aid program to the States. A substantial portion of these funds are used to further the control of tuberculosis, which still remains our major communicable disease.

Tuberculosis continues to be a serious public health problem because, among other reasons, there are few early symptoms. A person may appear, and feel, healthy, yet have active tuberculosis. The best single diagnostic procedure, in the early stages of tuberculosis, is the chest X-ray. In a city where tuberculosis is especially prevalent, as it is in Washington, it is important that every person over 15 years of age have a chest X-ray at least once a year.

Free chest X-ray will be available to Members of the House of Representatives, to their staff members, and to their families, beginning at 11 a. m. on Monday, February 11, and continuing through Thursday, February 21. During the week of February 11 the X-ray unit will be located in room 150 of the Old House Office Building. From February 18 through February 21, the unit will be located in the conference room of the Ways and Means Committee, in the New House Office Building.

This service is provided as a cooperative undertaking of the Public Health Service, the District of Columbia Department of Public Health, and the District of Columbia Tuberculosis Association. It will be under the supervision and guidance of Dr. George W. Calver, our director of medical services.

May I urge that you not only avail yourself of this health service, but that you ensure that all members of your staff have a chest X-ray during the period of the survey.

Last year, there were found on the Hill three far-advanced tuberculosis cases, 68 heart abnormalities, 3 suspected carcinomas and 52 TB and other chest abnormalities which for further study were referred to their local physicians. I think it is a worthwhile service, and I urge every Member of Congress to take advantage of it.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] stressing the importance to all of us and our staff members of having chest X-rays taken when that service is available to us here in our office buildings next week.

Probably more progress has been made in the last half century in the control of tuberculosis through public health measures than any other similar disease. In our childhood, it was called the great white plague. In my State, almost half of the counties had tuberculosis sanitariums. Today, only eight remain in all of Minnesota. Eight have been closed in just the last 4 or 5 years for lack of patients. This is the splendid result of the last 20 or 30 years of teaching people to have X-rays, isolation of infectious cases, surgical measures, and so forth.

But there are many difficulties still remaining. No. 1 is that as yet we have not found a drug that is a specific cure. There is still a high mortality rate among patients who have an extensive or advanced infection.

We have some drugs that will help fight the disease process. Surgical procedures, too, will put the lung at rest to encourage healing. But there is no specific remedy for the disease in the sense that penicillin will miraculously cure most venereal diseases, lobar pneumonia, and certain other infections by killing the causative organisms.

A second difficulty is that individuals may have and spread tuberculosis without themselves knowing they have it.

Therefore, both from the standpoint of curing people who have tuberculosis, and from the standpoint of preventing their transmission of it to others unwittingly, the essential thing is early diagnosis and treatment.

There are two main ways to make such early diagnosis. One is the X-ray; and the other is the tuberculin test in children.

Mr. Speaker, we owe it to ourselves and to our families and fellow workers and to the health and well-being of our country to make sure that we ourselves do not have the disease; and we should do everything we can by our own example to assist in the programs designed ultimately to eliminate this great killer. It can be done.

## INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 29) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That effective from January 3, 1957, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters—

(1) relating to the laws, regulations, directives, and policies including personnel pertaining to the Department of State and such other departments and agencies engaged primarily in the implementation of United States foreign policy and the overseas operations, personnel, and facilities of departments and agencies of the United States which participate in the development and execution of such policy;

(2) relating to the carrying out of programs and operations authorized by the Mutual Security Act and to other laws and measures to promote the foreign policy of the United States;

(3) relating to activities and programs of international organizations in which the United States participates;

(4) relating to the effectiveness of United States programs of assistance and information; and

(5) relating to legislation within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs pursuant to provisions of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives:

*Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject matter which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 1, strike out "3" and insert "4."

Page 1, line 3, strike out the words "and directed."

Page 2, line 15, strike out the colon and insert a period; and strike out all of lines 16, 17, and 18.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 2, strike out "or outside."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, with respect to that amendment, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I desire to offer a substitute amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 3, line 1, after the word "places", strike out the words "within or outside the United States."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 2, after the word House, strike out the words "is in session."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

At this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House resolution 29 is the usual resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to hold investigations of matters within their jurisdiction. There are certain amendments which have been adopted, which were adopted by the committee.

I might say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], that I did not speak to him about the substitute amendment. I spoke to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and he said he would clear it with the gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. I understand there is no objection to the substitute amendment, and there is no objection to the resolution.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, is there an amendment to the resolution, and is it subject to discussion?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Any amendment is subject to discussion, if the gentleman gets time. I would be happy to yield the gentleman any time he desires.

The SPEAKER. The committee amendments have been adopted.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I desire to speak out of order. However, I do not want to delay the gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Then, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I have not had the opportunity to carefully look over this resolution, but I do not see anything in it referring to the United Nations. Is it true that the United Nations is not referred to in this resolution?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. There is no occasion to refer to the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. I am surprised to find a resolution coming from the Foreign Affairs Committee that does not refer in some way to the United Nations; and I am happy to see that it is omitted in at least this instance.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad the gentleman is pleased.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN APPEALS FOR CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS FOR VETERANS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 65 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Whereas the American people annually contribute millions of dollars to assist veterans and their dependents and survivors,

Whereas the size of such contributions testifies to the deep sense of indebtedness felt by the American people toward the veteran,

Whereas this sense of indebtedness makes a fertile field for solicitors of charitable contributions who are unwise or unscrupulous to obtain contributions for uses not contemplated by the donor,

Whereas the Congress has a responsibility to the veterans to prevent abuses which would discourage the making of charitable contributions on their behalf: Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study to determine—

(1) the extent to which appeals for charitable contributions are made to the American people, or segments thereof, in the name of American veterans by appealing to the desire of the American people to assist such veterans and their survivors or dependents;

(2) whether an undue proportion of such charitable contribution is used to meet the expenses of conducting such appeals and for other administrative expenses rather than for providing services for or benefits to veterans;

(3) whether any of such appeals are fraudulent in nature;

(4) whether additional supervision of the fund-raising activities conducted by organizations chartered by act of Congress in the name of veterans are necessary or desirable; and

(5) the existence of any other abuses connected with charitable appeals made in the name of veterans. The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such records, documents, and papers, to administer oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out the word "shall" and insert "is authorized to."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 7, strike out the words "is in session."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. This committee desires to look into a matter that has been the subject of a great deal of criticism within the last year or so because of the number of organizations that have promoted drives to raise funds presumably on behalf of the veterans.

The complaint has come to the committee in many instances that these drives turned out to be more for the benefit of the promoter than for the veteran. It is a very worthwhile subject of investigation and I hope there will be no objection to the passage of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight on Saturday to file a report on House Joint Resolution 209.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, after we have listened to the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Ohio whose remarks are not always seriously uttered or to be accepted with excessive gravity, I would like to return to the purpose of this bill.

As the gentleman from Virginia has said, the purpose of this resolution is to protect both the public and the veterans organizations from fraud or imposition by groups which attempt or purport to be acting on behalf of charitable activities concerned with veterans and who, in fact, are acting for themselves or for their backers, and the funds which they collect are not accounted for or are not turned in for the use of these veterans. This resolution would authorize the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to look into this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time with the comment that there is no objection that I know of on this side to this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 113 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Public Works, or any subcommittee thereof designated by the chairman, may make investigations into the following matters within its jurisdiction: In the continental United States, its Territories, and possessions, public works projects either authorized or proposed to be authorized relating to flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors, water power, navigation, water pollution control, public buildings and grounds, as well as roads and highways; in Mexico, and in Central American countries, the Inter-American Highway and the Rama Road; and, in the Dominion of Canada, the St. Lawrence seaway project.

For the purpose of making such investigations the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House has recessed or adjourned, and to hold such hearings and require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may attend conferences and meetings on matters within its jurisdiction wherever held within the continental United States, its Territories, and possessions, but no more than five members of such committee may attend any meeting outside of the continental United States except trips in connection with the investigation of the Inter-American Highway and the Rama Road and matters relating to the St. Lawrence seaway project in the Dominion of Canada.

The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject matter which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 1, strike out "That" and insert "That, effective from January 4, 1957."

Page 2, line 22, strike out lines 22, 23, and 24.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the word "Sain" page 1, line 12, will be corrected to read "Saint."

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this is the customary resolution authorizing the standing Committee on Public Works to conduct investigations on matters within its jurisdiction. It was unanimously reported by the Committee on Rules and I know of no objection to it.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to this resolution on this side and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## GOVERNMENT PRINTING, BINDING, ET CETERA

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 128 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on House Administration is authorized, as a committee, by subcommittee or otherwise, to continue during the 85th Congress, effective as of January 3, 1957, the study and investigation, begun under H. Res. 262 of the 84th Congress, of the operations of federally operated printing services with particular reference to the administration, by rule, regulation, or otherwise of the provisions of law to Government printing, binding, reproduction, and distribution services, the sale and distribution of Government publications, and Government paperwork in general. For the purpose of carrying out this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the pres-

ent Congress at such times and places in the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "3" and insert "4."
Page 2, line 6, strike out "is in session."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution providing for the continuation of a select committee that operated last year in connection with the public printing. I know of no objection to the resolution.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the resolution and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 139 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That effective from January 4, 1957, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete investigations and studies with respect to the following matters within the jurisdiction of the committee:

(1) the transportation and distribution of mail matter;

(2) general administration and management in the Post Office Department and the postal field service;

(3) fiscal administration and management in the Post Office Department and the postal field service;

(4) the mailability of articles and printed matter generally, including, among other things, the mailing of unsolicited articles and matter with requests for payments or contributions;

(5) the application, operation, and effect of the laws, rules, and regulations relating to the management of civilian personnel of the Federal Government, including matters relating to (A) compensation, (B) position classification, (C) examination, (D) appointment, (E) assignment of positions excepted from the competitive service to schedules A, B, and C under rule VI of the Civil Service Rules, (F) allocation of positions to, and distribution of positions in, grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, (G) reduction in force, and (H) separation from the service by action other than reduction in force;

(6) the recommendations contained in House Report No. 1844, 84th Congress, and administrative actions taken pursuant to such recommendations;

(7) the desirability and effect of the limitations imposed by law on the performance of personal services within the Federal Government and the extent to which such limitations have caused the Federal Government to enter into contracts, agreements, or arrangements for the performance, by and through sources outside the Federal Government, of administrative and management services;

(8) the effect of the contracting practices of the Federal Government on the availability and utilization of personnel qualified for the performance of essential functions of the Federal Government;

(9) the organization, management, and operations of the United States Civil Service Commission, including the delegation of authority to the department and agency Boards of Civil Service Examiners, and the audit and control thereof;

(10) operations under the Classification Act of 1949;

(11) actions taken and directives issued as a result of the investigations and studies, conducted by the committee under authority of House Resolution 32, 83d Congress, and House Resolution 304, 84th Congress, with respect to the utilization and dual supervision of civilian employees in or under the Department of Defense;

(12) dual supervision of civilian employees, creation of civilian positions, number of civilian positions, and other matters relating to conservation of manpower, in such departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Federal Government as the chairman of the committee may designate;

(13) the organization, management, and operations of the Bureau of the Census in the Department of Commerce; and

(14) insurance plans and programs of the Government for Government employees and related matters.

No such investigation or study by the committee under authority of this resolution shall duplicate any investigation or study which is being conducted by any other standing committee of the House of Representatives.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), at such time or times during the present Congress as it deems appropriate, the results of its investigations and studies, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized to do so by the chairman of the committee, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia (during the reading of the resolution). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in full in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 11, strike out all of lines 11, 12, 13, and 14.
Page 4, line 24, strike out "is in session."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK].

## ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understand that this is with the agreement of the minority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. There is no program for next week, as I indicated yesterday, and Members of the House may act accordingly. This is done particularly in light of the annual Lincoln Day celebrations and speeches that are made usually by Members on the Republican side.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand the House will meet for a short time on Monday in order that Members may get permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that for the next 2 weeks the business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman tell me his best judgment as to when the first rollcall will come next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. There will be no rollcall next week. No business is scheduled for next week.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I withdraw the reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may meet this afternoon while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

## INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from

Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and yield myself now such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, House Resolution 139, is the customary resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct needed investigations on matters in connection with the Civil Service and the Post Office Department coming within the jurisdiction of that committee. The resolution is unanimously reported and I know of no objection to it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the minority, of course, supports this resolution which the gentleman from Virginia has explained so cogently. We feel that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House has handled a great deal of important legislation in the last few years and has been very zealous in safeguarding the money that has been appropriated for its use. In fact, the testimony before the Committee on Rules shows that the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service turned back more than they spent in the appropriations to conduct these investigations. However, because of the important legislation which is scheduled to come before the committee, the committee must conduct certain investigations and it is here authorized through this resolution to do so.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SAVINGS THROUGH POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I strongly recommend, and I am sure the taxpayers of our Nation approve, the intent and purpose of House Resolution No. 139. This resolution authorizes the continuance of studies and investigations that would eliminate waste and inefficiency in Government. This authorization continues for the fifth consecutive year the studies that began under House Resolution 32 I introduced in the 83d Congress. This resolution, in my opinion, is one of the most important to come before the 85th Congress. It extends a total of 6 years in three consecutive Congresses a committee program that produced real results in savings for the taxpayers, as well as strengthening our Government.

The committee studies under my resolution in the 83d Congress resulted in paring nearly $1 billion from the annual cost of running the Federal Government, by striking at the roots of waste and inefficiency—duplication and overlapping, dual authority and responsibility, and other management weaknesses that swell the payroll. When we think of this saving in relation to a balanced budget its full value is clear.

The Committee program in the 83d Congress was based on analysis of the causes of rising Government costs and possible corrective measures. For a long time I have been convinced that what the Government needs is a bureau or commission of efficiency—a top-level agency, independent of pressures and special interests, responsible for a systematic, informed, and effective weeding out of wasteful and inefficient practices and the adoption of modern and effective management policies.

The way our Government is set up—the vast resources at its command and the almost unlimited demands placed on it—has become a natural breeding ground for empire building at public expense. To control this tendency requires constant surveillance by an authority completely without any self-interest—an authority that recognizes and is responsive to the interests of the taxpayers who in the final analysis pay the freight.

I introduced legislation in the 82d Congress to create a Commission on Government Efficiency, but could get no support from the administration at that time. This left no alternative but that the Congress exercise its full responsibility for legislative review. My resolution in the 83d Congress was introduced to carry out this essential legislative responsibility.

This resolution in effect was a charter for a new and militant approach to economy and greater efficiency at all levels in Government. It gave our committee broad authority to conduct studies and investigations of our 500,000-man postal operation, the Federal civil service system, and the utilization of Government civilian manpower.

We did not make the mistake of aiming for the stratosphere, which often winds up by missing the target. We dug deep into Government down through the operating levels where the expenses actually are incurred and the money spent, but kept a weather eye on the entire picture with the national interest in mind at all times.

We knew, for example, that dual supervision—that is, the same activity supervised by both military and civilian personnel—existed in the military departments. They would take no action, or even recognize the condition, until we demonstrated by a pilot study that these departments were honeycombed with dual supervision, overlapping responsibility and authority, and duplicate staffing. We presented the evidence to them with the request that they extend our study by self-appraisals throughout their operations.

Once they got started they did a commendable job of carrying out our recommendations which resulted in direct and indirect savings estimated at nearly $900 million annually. This is a continuing saving. Our committee is following up to prevent any backsliding.

The Department of the Air Force, for example, reported it had been able to increase the number of combat air wings from 106 to 110 and still continue within a reduced budget—an achievement that would not have been possible but for elimination of dual supervision and staffing.

I do not mean to imply that waste of manpower was confined exclusively to the military departments. Major improvements were made in other agencies as well. I cite these examples primarily because nearly half of all Federal civilian employees are working in the military departments.

In the final summing-up, during the period of our studies in the 83d Congress Federal employment was reduced by 230,244 positions at a yearly saving of $950 million.

Equally important, though less spectacular, economies and management improvements were made in our vast postal operation. The first committee report on postal operations, issued within 5 months after the Congress was organized and printed as House Report No. 366, 83d Congress, contained detailed recommendations as to where and how specific economies and management improvements could be made in the postal service.

It is a tribute to the management genius of Postmaster General Summerfield, and to the high caliber of the then new team in the Post Office Department, that they placed a majority of our committee recommendations in effect. The Postmaster General on July 15, 1954, reported annual savings of $70 million from these changes—a highly important economy in view of the postal deficit which at that time approached $500 million annually—and later reported still further savings of $7.5 million.

In the civil service field we directed our efforts to strengthening the merit system, promoting modern personnel programs and techniques, and bringing all employees into more active participation in the operation of their Government. Our study disclosed, for instance, that the Government lagged far behind private industry in encouraging employees' suggestions. It was not getting the benefit of the thinking of the men and women who perform the actual tasks that turn the wheels of Government.

As a result of this study a modern incentive awards program, with a single point of executive responsibility, was placed in effect by Public Law 763, 83d Congress. Frankly, the resultant savings have exceeded even my own estimate.

The first full year of operations under this law saved the Government over $102 million. The Department of the Air Force alone saved $35 million. Employees making the suggestions had their paychecks sweetened by $2.4 million. These also are recurring savings and important items in keeping the budget in balance—essential if we are to look forward to tax reductions in the future.

The second 2 years of these studies, under House Resolution 304 of the 84th Congress, brought further economies. Late in 1954 I had written the Personnel Advisor to the President, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Acting Comptroller General suggesting a periodic review, or "census," of employment by each supervisor at every operating level. The purpose was to determine what positions could be eliminated and to make certain that manpower was being utilized effectively.

In the 84th Congress each department and agency was asked to review every vacant job to see if it really needed to be filled. In just 2 months over 400 jobs were eliminated in Washington alone. This may not sound like much, but it means $2 million less in payroll expense each year. The Air Force later com-

pleted a review of 68,000 jobs and eliminated 5,711 of them which would have cost the taxpayers $25 million a year had they been filled.

We also had them ask each supervisor, all down the line, to see if he could not do with one less employee. The Commerce Department saved 133 spaces by this single step—again, not a great deal, but still over $500,000 saved each year.

Each department and agency was asked to make a manpower survey of at least one major function. Right now there is a manpower team in every department and agency making functional surveys to eliminate nonessential jobs. The Canal Zone Government, a comparatively small agency, has eliminated over 1,000 positions. The survey of the Veterans' Administration vocational rehabilitation and training program eliminated 450 jobs—14 percent of the total—despite an increase in veterans being trained. These two examples alone will save over $6 million a year. In the entire picture, 35,000 fewer employees have been hired than had been planned.

As our committee starts its 5th year of this program it is a source of considerable satisfaction that I have been privileged to take part in its inception and in making it a going concern. I have kept in very close personal touch with all phases of the studies and their implementation, and intend to continue this policy in the present Congress.

Our studies fully recognize the need to maintain a strong national defense capable of meeting the threat of any potential enemy. In fact, they have contributed immeasurably to strengthening our defense, and other essential Government programs, through better use of money and manpower and facilities.

When the committee first undertook these studies 4 years ago it was my firm conviction that a vital point of attack on waste and efficiency should be the swollen Federal payroll that had reached $2,600,000 when President Eisenhower first took office. I fully agreed with the President that the payroll exceeded any actual need. This conviction has been confirmed by our studies. I believe that all essential Government functions could be performed, and perhaps more effectively, with a payroll much closer to $2 million—without sacrificing the public interest, while saving a large part of the Federal payroll cost.

Excessive numbers of Government officials and employees do not merely inflate direct payroll cost—in itself a matter of serious concern as it approaches $11 billion a year. Many of these people spend time dreaming up new activities and fancy presentations to enlarge their share of the budget and obtain more money from the public treasury for their own pet ideas and programs. This indirect drain on the Treasury is even greater than the payroll cost.

I do not favor a "meat ax" approach, indiscriminate firings, or massive reductions in force. I am opposed to such methods. Most, if not all, reductions can be made through attrition, that is, simply by not filling needless positions when they become vacant. That has been my policy throughout the committee studies. The result has been both savings to the Government and greater job security for its employees. Today 91 percent of Federal positions in the United States are in the competitive civil service—an alltime high. The merit system has been strengthened immeasurably under this sound and equitable personnel policy.

Although substantial savings have been realized from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee studies in the past 4 years, the field by no means is exhausted. We intend to press forward even more vigorously to hold the gains we have made and to find other means of economy. House Resolution 139 is an effective and necessary instrument for the Congress to maintain a careful watch over the public purse. With this resolution our committee can continue its economy drive, do its part in helping to keep the budget balanced, and help ease the burden of the taxpayers in this country.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my strong endorsement of House Resolution 139 and to urge its passage.

During the 83d Congress I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization. At that time we initiated several phases of manpower activities now under way. We concentrated our efforts largely on the Department of Defense since they employ half the civilian manpower in the Government.

We urged that Department to study dual military-civilian supervision in order to eliminate duplication. At first, they were reluctant to take action. They did not feel that any problem existed. The General Accounting Office, at our request, visited various military installations and developed information that showed the existence of duplication.

When the Department of Defense was presented with this evidence they were quick to cooperate. Each of the services swung into action and through this and other studies savings totaling nearly a billion dollars were reported. I was pleased to note that in recent hearings Assistant Secretary of the Army Milton testified and I quote, "I think you have the most powerful Army you have ever had." He clearly felt the action had been beneficial.

The services did the work and they should receive full credit for the results. The important point is that our subcommittee energized them into taking action. This illustrates the need for congressional interest and support in these matters.

During the 84th Congress I was ranking member of the subcommittee of which my colleague, JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia, was chairman. Under his leadership the cooperative bipartisan program has been continued and expanded. This continuity of effort has permitted the activities which were initiated in the 83d Congress to gain momentum and to instill confidence in those who have worked with us.

Particularly pleasing to me is the recognition by employee groups and others that our efforts are directed, not only at economy, but also at obtaining a stronger Federal service that offers greater security to the individual. We advocated eliminating duplication and inefficiencies, yes, but not at the expense of the individual employee. We have urged the use of attrition; transfers to fill vacancies; planning ahead; and a constant review to see that waste is eliminated; all designed to avoid unnecessary hirings and firings.

We know, because it has been demonstrated, that what we advocate has benefited the Government, the employee, and the taxpayer. The section on manpower in the President's message on the budget was significant. With the added impetus of his expressed support much more can be accomplished. Everyone will know that ours is not only a bipartisan effort toward better Government but it is also a cooperative one between the legislative and executive branches. I also know from personal experience that congressional support and interest are necessary if the good work now started is to produce even greater benefits. For that reason, I urge adoption of House Resolution 139.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 30) providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 29, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That effective January 4, 1957, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations, authorized by House Resolution 29, 85th Congress, incurred by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $75,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 1, following the word "That" insert "effective January 4, 1957."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 68), to provide for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 67, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved*, That effective from January 4, 1957, the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 67, by the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $150,000, including expenditures for the employment of a special counsel, investigators, attorneys, experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 1, following the word "That" insert "effective January 4, 1957."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield to me for just 2 or 3 minutes?

Mr. BURLESON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the House, a few minutes ago, unanimously adopted several resolutions for investigations by several of the standing committees of the House. It now, of course, becomes incumbent upon the Committee on House Administration to present resolutions providing the money for these investigations inasmuch as the resolutions for the authorizing investigations have passed the House today and on previous days by unanimous vote. Since these authorizations were unanimously passed, I assume that the entire House membership is in favor of the investigations. The Committee on House Administration has very carefully gone into the budgets that have been presented by the chairmen and ranking members of the several committees. The Subcommittee on Accounts, of which the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] is chairman, scrutinized all of the requests very carefully, and in some cases have reported a slight reduction in the amount that has been sought. I think it can truthfully be said that every committee has been asked to justify the amount of money sought for these investigations. While the amount will run into a considerable sum of money, the investigations have been ordered by the House and I see no position that we can take except to vote to furnish the money to have the investigations made. The membership may feel assured that the House administration has examined the requests very carefully.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It is my understanding that all of these resolutions were not only cleared with the minority members of your committee but with the minority Members of the House.

Mr. BURLESON. Yes. In response to what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE] has just said, in all instances the subcommittee, in examining the budget before them, the chairman and the ranking minority members in all instances have agreed to the amounts requested, and the work to be covered and the matters to be investigated.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is it the gentleman's understanding that it has also been cleared with the minority leadership of the House?

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## AUTHORIZING FUNDS FOR INVESTIGATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 87) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved*, That, effective January 3, 1957, the expenses of conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 86, 85th Congress, incurred by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $100,000, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of accountants, experts, investigators, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 1, strike out "January 3, 1957" and insert "January 4, 1957."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## AUTHORIZING FUNDS FOR INVESTIGATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 105) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved*, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 104, 85th Congress, incurred by the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $250,000 including expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, effective January 4, 1957, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## AUTHORIZING FUNDS FOR INVESTIGATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 114) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved*, That, effective January 3, 1957, the expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 113 by the Committee on Public Works, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $125,000 including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, as the chairman deems necessary, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The chairman, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, is authorized and empowered to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other departments or agencies of the Government.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 1, strike out "January 3, 1957" and insert "January 4, 1957."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## AUTHORIZING FUNDS FOR INVESTIGATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 125) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved*, That, effective January 4, 1957, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 107 of the 85th Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $200,000 including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$200,000" and insert "$190,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PROVIDING FOR CERTAIN ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 126) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Committee on Ways and Means is authorized, until otherwise provided by law, to employ 2 additional professional staff employees and 2 additional clerical employees to be paid from the contingent fund of the House at rate of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 5, strike out the word "rate" and insert the word "rates."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## FUNDS FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 94

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 127) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved,* That, effective January 4, 1957, the expenses of the investigations to be made pursuant to House Resolution 94 by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (now comprised of the six former Committees on Insular Affairs, Territories, Public Lands, Irrigation and Reclamation, Mines and Mining, and Indian Affairs), acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $60,000, including expenditures for the employment of stenographic and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 7, strike out "$60,000" and insert "$57,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 136) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved,* That in carrying out its duties during the 85th Congress, the Committee on the District of Columbia is authorized to incur such expenses (not in excess of $10,000) as it deems advisable. Such expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 4, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$7,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 140) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved,* That effective from January 4, 1957, the expenses of conducting the investigations and studies pursuant to House Resolution 139, by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia if not otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 143) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved,* That the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 64 of the 85th Congress incurred by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 1, after the word "that", insert: "effective January 4, 1957."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 144) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to protect the funds of his office by purchasing insurance, in the amount necessary to protect against loss with respect to such funds. Until otherwise provided by law, premiums on such insurance shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers signed by the Sergeant at Arms and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 146) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved,* That effective January 4, 1957, the expenses of the study and investigation to be conducted by the select committee created by House Resolution 56, not to exceed $250,000 including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 3, strike out "$250,000" and insert "$225,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, certainly I support the chairman of our committee, Mr. PATMAN, and the members of the House Administration Committee who have recommended and approved an allocation of $225,000 for continuing the work of the House Select Committee on Small Business. This sum is a modest amount considering the importance of the work to be done.

The committee, during the last session of the Congress, conducted a number of important investigations and prepared reports to various legislative committees in which detailed and specific recommendations were made for assisting the small-business economy of the Nation.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the chairman, members of the committee and the staff handled more than 700 requests for Members of this House in the area of personal problems confronting constituents of individual Members in matters of assisting the small-business men of the Nation.

I am sure that we are all aware that with the tight money policy prevailing and high interest rates that the squeeze on small business is being felt and that there is a need for a continuous investigation and assistance.

Department of Commerce figures indicate that small business failures last year were 16 percent higher than in 1955. According to Dun & Bradstreet reports, more than 12,700 businesses failed last year. This was even greater than the number that failed during the World War II period when the draft and material shortages resulted in killing off thousands of small business concerns of the Nation.

So, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this fund is needed for continuing studies and investigations and to keep a check upon the activities of the Small Business Administration, the Federal Trade Commission in its administration of the antitrust laws, the Department of Defense in its procurement programs and policies, and other agencies of Government as they relate to and affect the small business economy of the Nation.

I trust that there will be no dissent and the full amount of the appropriation approved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR NECESSARY EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 150) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That, in carrying out its duties during the 85th Congress, the Committee on House Administration is authorized to incur such expenses (not in excess of $5,000) as it deems advisable. Such expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and approved by such committee, and signed by the chairman thereof.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GRANTING 1 YEAR'S SALARY TO THE ESTATE OF EDWARD JOSEPH MARSHALL, LATE AN EMPLOYEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 151) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Helen V. Scott, daughter; Alfred Stanley Marshall, son; and George E. Marshall, Jr., grandson; one-third share each, as relatives of Edward Joseph Marshall, late employee of the House, an amount equal to 1 year's salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AUTHORIZED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 99

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 152) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That effective from January 4, 1957, the expenses of the investigations and studies conducted pursuant to House Resolution 99, by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $100,000, including expenditures for employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SHIPPING OF OIL TO EUROPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks there has been a great deal of criticism directed against our domestic oil industry.

This has been occasioned by two developments. First, the commitment of our Government to supply oil to Europe, now short of fuel because it has become dependent upon Middle East oil as a source to heat her homes and power her factories and automobiles. The second development is the recent increase in the price of crude oil.

As to the first development, by some process of imagination, the Texas Railroad Commission and the independent producers have been blamed for the oil shortages in Europe. This simply is not true.

The administration assumed the responsibility of furnishing oil to Europe and then immediately delegated that responsibility to 15 major oil companies along with immunity from antitrust action. To this very moment the administration, or these 15 major oil companies, have not requested the Railroad Commission of Texas in person, by letter, phone, or telegraph any particular form of action. This is really amazing in view of the fact the high administration officials have been so quick to criticize the commission, yet they have not seen fit to discuss their plans or commitments with the commission. Do these high officials of the administration expect the members of the Texas Railroad Commission to be psychic, or do they prefer for the commissioners to find out the plans of the administration from the press?

The members of the Texas Railroad Commission are three dedicated public servants who have pioneered the field of petroleum conservation and, without their efforts, this Nation could very well today be short of this vital fuel. The commissioners are just as honest and just as conscious of their responsibilities to the national security as any Federal employee. Their responsibility transcends Texas and encompasses the entire Nation.

There have been charges in the press and by administration officials that the railroad commission has held down production of crude oil in Texas at a time when Europe was cut off from its main source of oil supply and depending upon United States production to see it through the crisis.

Some of the distortions of fact which have been made with respect to this situation are difficult to comprehend. There have appeared in the press editorial charges that Texas, and other oil-producing States, are reducing oil output in the face of the European shortage. Contrary to this, Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana, the three major producing States in the Southwest, have increased production for the last 3 months and have ordered a fourth increase in production for the month of February.

In regard to Texas, with which I am more familiar, the railroad commission has increased the allowable 230,000 barrels daily since November 1956. The increases are reflected in the following allowables, in thousands of barrels daily:

| | |
|---|---|
| November | 3,314 |
| December | 3,443 |
| January 1957 | 3,421 |
| February | 3,544 |

Since October, when the Suez crisis began, domestic production of crude oil has increased by 449,000 barrels daily—a substantial portion of which you can see is from Texas. In February, regulatory officials in both Texas and Louisiana have ordered additional increases, resulting in total production this month of almost 600,000 barrels daily more crude oil than in October 1956.

The Texas Railroad Commission was given authority in the petroleum field by law which was predicated on a need for the conservation of a vital natural resource, and it must act in conformity with that law. It is not a freewheeling, irresponsible organization accountable only unto itself.

The Texas Railroad Commission has one chief concern, and that concern is conservation. Based on engineering and technical data as to maximum efficient rates of production, and taking into account the market demand for oil, the railroad commission determines the allowable production on a basis of nondiscrimination as between fields and between producers. This determination is made in public hearings each month.

Conservation, as applied to oil and gas production, does not mean the locking up or hoarding of these natural resources. On the contrary, conservation of oil and gas means wise use of the reservoir energy which drives the oil through the sands and rocks to the well and on up to the surface and the prevention of waste of petroleum itself.

Texas statutes, no matter what may be said to the contrary, forbid the waste of crude oil and define waste as production in excess of market demand and transportation facilities. Thus, under present conditions, the railroad commission could not, without violating Texas law, have increased Texas allowables any more than has been done.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman prefer to conclude his speech now or yield for a question at this point?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman discuss later, in his very able and very analytical speech, the difficulty the independent oil operator is having, particularly in the western part of the State of Texas, in pipeline connections which are largely, if not all, controlled by these 15 major oil companies? Will he point out the transportation difficulties long experienced by the independents and the penalties they suffer in having to get their oil to tidewater in some way other than by pipeline connection?

Mr. IKARD. I mention that matter a little later on in my remarks. I thank the gentleman for calling it to my attention.

Mr. BURLESON. I certainly shall be listening with the greatest of interest.

Mr. IKARD. In addition, Texas law requires the commission to allocate the demand for Texas crude fairly among the various fields and wells of the State and all purchasers must take equitably from the fields wherever they buy or produce petroleum.

As an example of how the conservation laws may work to the advantage, not only of the oil producer and to Texas but to the security of the Nation, let me cite what has been done in the east Texas field.

That field was discovered in 1930 and at that time the experts estimated one to one and a half billion barrels of crude oil ultimately recoverable. The fact is that by carefully preserving and conserving the reservoir energy, 3,225,000,000 barrels of oil had been produced from that field through 1956. Not only that, but now it is estimated that, providing the same care is taken in conserving the pressure, there are nearly two billion barrels more of crude oil recoverable in the field.

That, my friends, is conservation.

By these methods by this conservation pioneered by the orders of the railroad commission oil was saved to propel the tanks that swept from the beaches of Normandy to ultimate victory in Berlin. Oil was saved to power ships and planes that were to sweep the Japanese from the sea and air in the South Pacific. Oil was saved for our use in Korea to stem the surge of the Communist imperialism, and oil will be saved for our own great industrial development.

I cite one other example of how conservation works to increase the available oil supply and thus benefit the entire American economy.

Prior to studies by the Texas Railroad Commission, two billion cubic feet of gas was wasted each day in Texas through flaring, a process of burning off the gas that pushed the oil to the surface. By 1954, the commission had stopped 98 percent of the flaring in the State. Thus, much of this gas that previously had been wasted is now being used to repressure or maintain the pressure in the oil reservoir. In other words, it is put back into the reservoir to help lift more oil and increase the availability of the oil in the well.

The past substantial increases in oil production have been made in consonance with sound conservation practices. I know that Texas and the 29 other oil-producing States stand ready, willing and able to supply additional oil for any real and true need.

Mr. Felix Wormser of the Department of the Interior has publicly blamed the oil-producing industry in the United States for the administration's failure to meet the commitments which apparently have been made to European nations. We know such commitments have been made, but I have nowhere heard them spelled out in a manner which would indicate a necessity to open up Texas oil production when we now have in a record amount of total petroleum and petroleum products in storage for this time of year.

If this need exists, then it is the responsibility of the administration, not 15 major American oil companies whose interests lie both in the development of Middle East crude oil reserves and in the pipelines which carry domestic production to market to point out that need to the Texas Railroad Commission which they have not yet done.

Before such action can be taken, however, it should be established that there is a need that transcends good conservation practices and the orderly progress and growth of the domestic industry. It should be ascertained whether or not crude and residual stocks in Europe are at such a level as to require immediate supplementation. If it is found that those stocks are at such a level, then it should be ascertained where the most readily available supply can be found from the point of quickest transportation.

It is known that the tanker route from the Caribbean to Europe is much shorter than the route from the United States gulf coast to Europe. It seems to me that the Government, being disturbed as it is about oil shortages in Europe, should turn its attention to the 15 foreign major operating oil companies to which it has delegated the responsibility for meeting those shortages.

These 15 companies filed a schedule of action to provide Europe with the oil it says it sorely needs. This schedule was approved by the administration. It provides, among other things, for the diversion to Europe of Latin American oil which normally is shipped to the United States.

Yet, in spite of this schedule, Caribbean imports of crude oil into the East and gulf coasts of the United States continue to increase. For instance, as the table below will show, Venezuelan imports of crude oil into this country in November and December—after the Suez crisis—exceeded the imports from that source during the third quarter of 1956 and in October of that year. Thus it was that even before the present grumblings were heard complaining about the lack of consideration for the problem by the Texas Railroad Commission, Venezuelan crude oil was pouring into ports of the United States at an increasing rate.

*Venezuela (crude imports)*

[All figures in barrels daily]

| | |
|---|---|
| Pre-Suez: | |
| October | 462,500 |
| November | 476,400 |
| Post-Suez: | |
| December | 502,100 |

Obviously the only diversion to the European shortage area has been Middle East oil formerly imported into the United States, a diversion which has been quickly and fully replaced by domestic oil. The administration's Middle East Emergency Committee could supply Europe with all the oil it needs by simply diverting the crude which is now being imported to the United States there instead of bringing it into this country where it goes into storage. Such a diversion of Caribbean oil would also be quickly and fully replaced by domestic production.

It is also interesting to note that those same members of the Middle East Emergency Committee who are so interested in imports also control a substantial portion of the refinery capacity and pipeline facilities of the United States.

There have been violent complaints that the Texas Railroad Commission has failed in its duty by not abandoning its policy of retable taking, a policy which in effect means that producers and buyers shall take their oil equitably from all fields.

There are several reasons in the interest of conservation why this should not be done. For instance: If this policy were abandoned and the wells and fields closest to tidewater were allowed to produce unlimited quantities of oil, they would soon be exceeding their maximum rates of efficiency, that rate which dictates the optimum amount of oil that can be produced from a well and still gain the most oil from that well. In other words, they would be gutted and of no further use to the industry and the Nation. This would be returning to a practice that experience has taught us is the most inefficient and wasteful method of producing oil. The Texas oil producers learned this lesson well during the boom days of Spindletop, in the early days of the industry when the wells were produced to their limits in order to get to market the quickest with the mostest.

Another reason for not opening the chocks full wide in the areas closest to tidewater is that this practice would discourage any development of areas remote from this transportation facility. Who would risk capital in a venture in which there was little chance of getting his product to market? Would you? Even now, there are more than 8,000 wells in Texas without pipeline connections. If this policy of ratable taking were abandoned, this number would grow to tenfold in a very short time. Thus, not only would the domestic industry suffer from lack of wells drilled and eventually lack of production, but the entire Nation

would find itself without the necessary petroleum to face a national emergency.

This issue of pipeline connections is a serious one. It affects not only the supply but also the price the producer receives for his oil. There are many producers in Texas who own unconnected wells on one section while the wells on the next section are connected to pipelines. Thus, although producers of oil from both wells receive the same price for their oil, the producer with the unconnected well must give up anywhere from 25 to sometimes 45 and 50 cents a barrel to have his oil trucked to a transportation facility. In other words, the producer with the unconnected wells is deprived of that much of the revenue from his wells.

Since they control most United States pipelines, one must assume that if the companies in the Middle East Emergency Committee wanted the domestic oil industry to supply Europe with the oil it needs, they would first see to it that as many unconnected wells as could be economically connected to pipelines were so connected, thus assuring an adequate supply of domestic production.

There is another responsibility the companies on the Middle East Emergency Committee have. These companies own and operate most of the refining capacity in the United States. Today, in the third month of the European oil shortage, these companies are refining too much gasoline. They could immediately reduce their gasoline output and thereby make large volumes of unneeded crude oil available to Western Europe.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the administration has assumed the responsibility for oil shipment to Europe and has delegated that responsibility to 15 big companies who operate worldwide, and who incidentally, have an economic interest in these movements of oil.

As you know, prior to the Suez crisis the administration threatened these same companies with a limitation on imports into the United States. The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization indicated he intended to follow through on his efforts to limit imports once the Suez crisis is over.

Now, adding 2 and 2, it would seem if imports are limited down the road, which they should be, they may be limited at the then existing rate. The purpose being served in present excessive and unneeded oil imports, therefore, is to hold the import level at a high base in the event of such Government action.

I have been disturbed by newspaper reports saying a committee of the House was going to investigate the failure of domestic oil producers to move sufficient oil to Europe.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if an investigation is made along this line, it should be directed at the Government's own proxy, the Middle East Emergency Committee. That is where the responsibility lies. That is where the facts can be made known. That is where we can find out why oil imports to the United States continue to increase while our European friends are burning kindling wood and walking instead of riding.

It is this same Middle East Committee which has, in effect, told the Texas Railroad Commission and the independent domestic producer that he should grab his hat full of oil and run with it to Europe while the members of the same Middle East Committee pour imported oil into the United States by the barrelful.

When this whole question is explored—and it should be fully explored—I am certain the domestic petroleum industry will be vindicated. I am not so sure that the administration and its Middle East Emergency Committee of international oil companies will not be embarrassed.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield.

Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman agree that the main reason the major importers of crude oil refrain and/or refuse to supplement the shortage in Europe is in order to hold the death grip they now have on the United States markets, to the detriment of independent oil producers? Will the gentleman agree that that is a logical conclusion?

Mr. IKARD. That is right. They want to keep the level high here, as the gentleman has pointed out. I agree with him wholeheartedly.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield.

Mr. HALE. The gentleman is perhaps aware that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is holding hearings on this very subject today?

Mr. IKARD. Yes, sir; I think it is a subject that should be heard, I will say to the gentleman.

The recent long-overdue increase in crude-oil price is a result, not a cause, of inflation. The oil industry has been a casualty of—not a contributor to—inflation.

Now, I would like to give you some specifics.

The search for and production of oil for our expanding economy and the Nation's security is no small job. It is conducted by more than 12,000 individuals and companies engaged in the oil- and gas-producing activities in 36 States, according to an October 1956 Bureau of the Census report on oil and gas companies.

These 12,000 oil and gas producers employ more than 300,000 persons in the production phase of the industry alone. These are industrious, responsible citizens who are just as conscious of the inflationary pressures on their pocketbooks as are any Congressmen here today.

It is deplorable that some people take it upon themselves to make this industry and those who strive so diligently in it the whipping boy for every abuse, imagined or real, which is perpetrated in this country. I know of no industry that has given more of itself in times of emergency than the domestic oil industry. It was, during times of war, able to provide this country with the most vital ammunition with which to throw back a stab-in-the-back attack and go on to ultimate victory.

I know of no other industry which provided the United States with the power to avert a possible third world war. It was not necessary for this country to throw its troops into the powder keg of the Middle East because its domestic fuel supply was more than adequate. Without this industry, the United States would have, in all probability, had no choice but to join Britain and France in their attack on Egypt following seizure of the Suez Canal and the shutting down of the vast supply source of fuel.

And yet, this industry, when it follows, not leads, the inflationary trend, is lampooned and pilloried across the country as gougers.

The domestic petroleum industry utilizes millions of tons of heavy industrial machines and additional millions of tons of steel pipe in the drilling for and production of oil. Steel, labor, and machinery are, therefore, primary items in the exploration, drilling, development, and production activities of the petroleum industry.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, there were two developments which had occasioned this great flood of unwarranted criticism against the domestic petroleum industry. The second development, the recent increase in the price of crude oil, I would like to discuss for a few moments.

On January 3, the price of crude petroleum in the United States was advanced for the first time in 3½ years. This increase averaged about 25 cents a barrel, or less than 10 percent.

However, as a result of this price change, necessitated and justified by spiraling costs, the oil producing industry has been subjected to an uproar of emotional criticism and has been charged with price gouging. In reality, if the critics could but put down the red flags for a minute and take a look at the record, they would see that this industry which they so roundly criticize has contributed nothing to the inflationary pressures of the past 3½ years.

There have been demands for investigations and even suggestions that the Federal Government take command of the oil business. Those who make such suggestions seem to think the oil business operates in an economic vacuum, completely immune from the influences of our general economy.

I think all of you know me well enough to know also that I am as concerned about inflationary tendencies as any Member of Congress. However, I fail to understand how the petroleum industry can be expected to exist outside these pressures. The oil producer is no more insulated against rising costs than any other American businessman, and he has been absorbing increasing costs for a number of years.

I share the concern of the administration, and of many in the Congress, over inflationary pressures; however, I do not concur in the singling out of one industry which, out of necessity, had to finally succumb to these pressures and raise its prices to stay in business.

If there are to be investigations here in this Body, they should get to the root of the problem. It can solve nothing by investigating only oil prices. Any fair investigation will show, I am confident, that crude oil prices are not only fair but insufficient to cover the cost of find-

ing and producing oil in an economy where a dollar is worth but 40 cents.

Since some here are proposing investigations, let us investigate the causes and not merely the effects. Whenever there has been a tragic airline crash or mine disaster, the safety inspectors do not investigate the background of the casualties. They go to the plane or the mine itself to find out the reasons behind the crash or the disaster.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. Yes, I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. At that point I want to say that the gentleman knows, from his great knowledge of the oil industry, that in the latter part of 1950 a paper was prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, which indicated that by 1960 we would be using about 8 million barrels of oil a day. If that point was reached, we could not possibly find sufficient reserves to meet that demand. We have passed that point in 1956—not in 1960—but the oil and gas industry in this country went out and found reserves and now has reserves to back it up, where we are not dependent on foreign oil.

Mr. IKARD. We have not only reached that point as the gentleman so ably pointed out, but we have reserves on hand that are at a near all-time high.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. IKARD. I yield.

Mr. BURLESON. If the gentleman will permit me to add, more than 80 percent of new oil discoveries are made by some little operator who is comparable to the small-business man, but these little operators who have gone bankrupt in the process of discovering these new reserves. I can point out to you in my area some of the men the magazines talk about as being rich oilmen who cannot pay their debts or their taxes today; they are broke, and plenty of them have gone completely broke in the process of trying to find new reserves. They are not numbered among these 4 or 5 fabulously rich men the newspapers and magazines tell about. People overlook that fact when talking generally about the oil business.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, in keeping with what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], has said, only this morning in our committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce it was pointed out by Mr. Stewart of the Interior Department that this increase of drilling that has been necessary in order for the oil industry to find these reserves so badly needed not only for our own consumption but for the security of this Nation, there has been a tremendous increase in the number of dry holes that have had to be drilled in order to find those reserves; and those dry holes cost money.

Mr. IKARD. I thank the gentleman very much.

Now I want to get to some figures that show what has happened in the matter of costs.

According to the latest figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, these major items of cost have increased as follows, as compared with oil prices including the latest crude-price adjustment:

*Item and percent increase since December 1947*

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| Average hourly wages paid | 66.3 |
| Oilfield-machinery prices | 55.6 |
| Oil-well casing (carbon) | 77.8 |
| Oil-well casing (alloy) | 87.5 |
| Line pipe (carbon) | 117.8 |
| Finished-steel products | 80.7 |
| Automobiles | 45.9 |

Crude-oil prices in the same period including this last raise have gone up only 31 percent.

Since the last previous crude-oil price adjustment in June 1953, the oil-producing industry has absorbed 5 rounds of increases in basic steel prices, and 4 rounds of wage increases. I do not intend to infer that these increases were unnecessary. I do intend to infer and again emphasize that the oil-producing industry has been slow in passing these increased costs along to the American consumer and, if anything, deserves the applause and appreciation of Government for an obviously burdensome job of resisting the onslaught of inflation.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I would like to see if I am correct in analyzing the gentleman's figures to this extent: The gentleman has just pointed out that the oil industry has been slow to pass on its increased cost by increasing the cost of oil. Do I understand that even though there has been only one increase since June 1953, that increase was in the amount of only something less than 10 percent?

Mr. IKARD. On the average a little below 10 percent. As the gentleman knows, of course, we have different grades of oil, and everything considered it spells out to about 25 cents a barrel.

Mr. KILGORE. As a matter of fact the items which the gentleman just read in the matter of increased costs of production and costs of exploration to the oil industry, those increases to the industry range anywhere from 21 to 117 percent.

Mr. IKARD. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. But the price increase on the part of the industry since 1953 is something less than 10 percent.

Mr. IKARD. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. In other words the industry has been slow to pass on its costs and lags behind other industries in this regard.

Mr. IKARD. It is behind almost all the other industries.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another comment on that particular point?

Mr. IKARD. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. In the gentleman's statement thus far he has not mentioned another very important item of cost to the oil industry, and that is the cost of money, vast sums of which must be borrowed to conduct these exploratory drilling operations. The cost of money has increased almost 100 percent because of higher interest rates, and this is certainly an appreciable item.

Mr. IKARD. I thank the gentleman for bringing out that point. I mention it a little later on in my manuscript. That, of course, is a very vital and important cost to any oil operator and in any oil operation; and, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], pointed out, contrary to the comments of most slick magazines, most of the oil industry operators in my district are either broke or fast getting into that shape, and what they pay for their borrowed money is a very important item in their cost—the interest they pay.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. YOUNG. I would like to say at the outset that I, like 99.9 percent of other Texans, own only the oil in the crankcase of my automobile and the last time I checked that was a quart low. I want to concur with the speaker in his fine, studious remarks concerning the condition of the domestic oil industry. It should be apparent to everybody that this cost-price squeeze that we see here in the Nation today affecting so many other factors of our economy has not let the domestic oil out. I wonder how many of us realize that our domestic companies frequently have as much as $1.10 per barrel cost of that oil in the ground as compared, for instance, with the Mid East, which is in competition, of something like 2 cents per barrel cost in the ground? The gentleman has certainly put his finger on it when he points out that the surplus products today in this Nation are at an alltime high when, as a matter of fact, they should be expected to be at a low. It is anticipated that in April the needs of this Nation will be something like 176 million barrels of refined products whereas in January of this year the industry already had on hand 191 million barrels and could look forward to many more millions of barrels before April comes.

It is simply this in a nutshell, and I thank the gentleman for this time: The Europeans do not want our finished products to use, they want our oil to run through their refineries for their profit. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. IKARD. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. May I clarify one point. In response to the question by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE], you referred to certain recent price increases on crude oil. Is it not true that the recent increase includes a 7-cent per barrel decrease which occurred several weeks ago. In other words this slight increase should have a 7-cent per barrel deducted from it. No logical or reasonable condition existed to justify the earlier decrease.

Mr. IKARD. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. As the gentleman knows, I happen to be the only Democratic Representative from Texas who lives in a district that does not produce oil in substantial quantities. Every other Democrat from Texas represents a district which produces a substantial amount of oil. As the gentleman from Corpus Christi suggested, I am not personally a producer of oil and my people do not produce oil, nor does the district I have the honor of representing. We are all purchasers of oil.

However, we believe that a sound program of conservation is in our interest just as well as it is in the interest of those who are actually producing and selling oil. We have felt over the years that the policy of the Texas Railroad Commission in prohibiting the production of oil which would result in waste has contributed mightily to the maintenance of a stable, fair price structure, not only for Texas but for the whole of the United States. I think that the figures are perfectly conclusive in that respect. I think it is clear that those that did not have the vision to establish programs of conservation in years gone by have seen their resources lost and are now insignificant factors in the oil production of America, whereas the State of Texas which more than 23 years ago established a policy of conservation of oil has been able to maintain production in fields which under wild and unlimited production would not be producing a barrel today.

Is it not true that the only way Texas could comply with the request that certain people have been making, the request they have made that we come to the rescue of the folks who do not want to buy gasoline but want to buy the crude and make the profits from refining, is to open our wells and imperil production for years to come?

Mr. IKARD. I think that is right. And, it is also an interesting thing, I will say to my friend, from what information I have, other than the official formal notices that they get once a month in the Department of the Interior and other than having asked the chairman of the commission to come to Washington at the beginning of this crisis for a brief meeting, at which no fundamental final decisions were made, that the requests that you speak about were made entirely through the press and over the radio, and I know as of about 8 o'clock last night that the Railroad Commission of Texas had not received any request, any petition, or anything from anybody in a position of responsibility about what they would like for the Railroad Commission or the oil producers of Texas to do, how much oil they wanted to produce or anything else. As I say, I think this whole thing has been handed over to this committee composed of the 15 big international oil companies who also, by the oddest coincidence, control the world market, the world transportation facilities, and maybe this did not fit into their scheme to let the Railroad Commission in on what the plans are. I do not know.

Mr. POAGE. Might it not very well be that there are people stationed somewhere around who would like to see the Texas oil fields drained and who would like to see the day come when we could not supply the United States with the oil that we need in case of an emergency?

Mr. IKARD. I hate to think that is true, but I am afraid it is.

Mr. POAGE. I mean across the water—as well as a few at home.

Mr. IKARD. Yes. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. Is that not quite probable?

Mr. IKARD. I think it would be very probable, unless we practice the methods that history has taught us are sound conservation. Now, it is of great importance to this country that we maintain great reserves of oil and gas. If we ever get to the point where we are dependent on oil out of the Western Hemisphere, I am afraid that whoever our enemies in the world might be at the time, whether the Communists or otherwise, they will pull the string on us in 30 days, and we will be out of business.

Mr. POAGE. It seems to me it is so true that some of these people who know nothing about the methods of producing oil are telling us that we ought to open those wells without regard to the effect it will have on our ultimate recovery, a thing that we will do in case the United States of America is involved in a war; but a thing which could be most costly to our country. They are asking us to do that today, asking us to open those wells and jeopardize the Texas fields at the very time when we are importing a very substantial amount of oil.

Mr. IKARD. Yes; not only a substantial amount, but the imports are going up.

Mr. POAGE. Exactly. And, if, in fact, they are only concerned with the welfare of the people in Europe, why do they not concentrate their criticism upon those major oil companies that are bringing that oil into this country and urge them to divert that oil to Europe instead of taking the oil from Texas to Europe?

Mr. IKARD. I could not agree with the gentleman more, and I also think that there is an analogy in this, and that is the gentleman's fine work through the years and his efforts to conserve the soil in this country and soil conservation. I think he will agree with me when I say that one of the reasons we find ourselves where we are today is that good conservation just is not very sensational and does not make very good headlines, either in the conservation of oil or the conservation of soil.

Mr. POAGE. I think the gentleman is so right. They are both essential to the maintenance of the prosperity of this country.

Mr. IKARD. I think the gentleman is absolutely right.

I would like to examine for a moment the result of the petroleum industry's resistance to inflation. It could and would be costly to the Nation, if the rapidly closing gap between costs and prices of crude oil is not materially widened.

Most of these 12,000 companies are small, independent producers. According to the latest edition of the Oil and Gas Journal, these small companies drilled more than 82 percent of the wildcat, or exploratory wells, in the search for new oil reserves in the United States in 1956. The so-called major companies drilled the rest.

If we are to maintain our security to which oil is so vital, Mr. Speaker, it is important that these thousands of independent producers stay in business. The only way we can meet our expanding oil needs is through the drilling of increasing numbers of wells, year after year. The amount of oil found in America has been in direct proportion to the expenditures for exploration, drilling, and development.

Oil producers have two sources for investment capital. These are market and price. Because of the unusual risk involved in oil exploration, the industry can obtain financing from outside money markets only to a limited, and sometimes dwindling degree.

For more than a year now, oil country bankers have been advising their independent domestic oil producer customers: "If you have a good solid bank connection, do not go shopping around for a better loan position."

As far back as last August, bankers from Denver to Houston to Chicago were advising independents that the future did not look very bright for them. One banker reported:

> The price of crude is wholly inadequate in general and one company has reported to me that it's cheaper to buy production than to drill it.

Another oil-country banker reported:

> You can't have foreign crude at 30 to 40 cents a barrel below domestic price and maintain a healthy domestic situation.

As the ratio of loans to deposits began to widen, the money problem of the small producer increased, and more and more independents were told by their bankers not to make any long-term commitments. Even the supply of money for wildcatting ventures outside the usual financial families has begun to dwindle. One southwestern banker has reported that the money sources for wildcatting were completely dry and that the only money available to him was coming from secondary sources.

As you can understand, Mr. Speaker, all the factors that affect the domestic producer's income, such as increasing costs, less net operating income, any wavering in the market, and increasing imports all affect his ability to increase his loan structure.

For almost 2 years, there has been evidence of an increasing inadequacy of capital as a result of depressed crude-oil prices. During 1956, for example, the domestic industry was unable to maintain a volume of drilling in keeping with either the demand for, or production of, oil. Total drilling of domestic wells increased 2.2 percent. Production and consumption both increased on the order of 5½ percent.

This is a shocking and disturbing trend. At a time when a sound domestic

petroleum industry has been proven vital to our own national security and to that of the free world, we cannot afford a slackening in the drilling for, and development of, increased petroleum reserves. To do so is to invite America into the situation now faced by Europeans—where denial of Middle East oil suddenly thrusts millions into the prospect of shivering out the winter in unheated homes and of being immobilized for lack of gasoline.

Fortunately, the United States had not only enough oil for itself, but some to spare for its allies.

If we are to maintain this position in future emergencies, we cannot deny the oil-producing industry a price which compensates for the cost of finding and developing oil.

Americans are not only assured adequate oil—but only because of an abundance of oil—they also pay low prices for petroleum products. Gasoline today sells for an average of 22 cents a gallon at United States service stations. Added to this price is 9 cents in State and Federal taxes.

Gasoline prices, except for increased taxes, had held unchanged for 3 years prior to the nominal increase this year.

And here let me put the record straight. If those who had screamed in anguish had but waited a few weeks, they would have had nothing to scream about. Already in many areas of the country that small increase, which was fully justified from all cost standpoints, is being wiped from the books.

In contrast to what the United States consumer pays, gasoline in Great Britain is 84 cents a gallon, and in many areas of Europe it is $1 a gallon. These are some of the prices which result from being dependent upon foreign oil for survival.

The charge has been made, Mr. Speaker, that in advancing the price of crude oil the domestic oil industry was taking advantage of our allies.

This statement is made ridiculous by the fact that Middle East oil from Saudi Arabia on which Europe was dependent, was increased twice during 1956 for a total of 33 cents a barrel, at the eastern Mediterranean port of Sidon.

Also, during 1956, Venezuelan crude oil was increased on numerous occasions by up to as much as 28 cents a barrel.

These increases took place months ahead of the adjustment in domestic crude oil prices in the United States. I do not recall any howls of protest, in behalf of our European allies, when these price increases for foreign crude oil were effectuated.

Mr. Speaker, I have other detailed information with which I will not now burden you. I do wish to say that by any and every standard which could be applied, the recent small adjustment in crude oil prices was both necessary and justified.

If it assists in generating additional expansion of our oil producing capabilities in these critical times, then it will be small investment indeed.

I again say that any investigation that we should make which singles out the petroleum industry will serve no useful purpose unless it also delves into the underlying causes and effects of these inflationary pressures to which the oil industry has fallen victim.

We cannot hold back the flood by slapping at the waves; we must build the dam from the bottom.

---

## CREATING OFFICE OF GUEST MEMBER IN SENATE AND HOUSE

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I appear before you today in the interest of my bill (H. R. 4371) which seeks to create the office of guest Member in the Senate and in the House of Representatives of the United States for former Presidents. In the future, under this legislation, there will always be the possibility of one or more ex-Presidents in the House and Senate, no matter what his political beliefs may be.

Gentlemen, if there ever was a time during the history of our Nation that the combined talents, know-how, experience, and training of our two living former Presidents are needed to help us solve the many complex problems with which we are presently confronted—this is that time. Let us make no mistake about it or lull ourselves to sleep over the international situation because, quite frankly, our relationship, at the present time, with the various countries of the world is most precarious.

At this time our country is particularly blessed in having two splendid gentlemen who have served as Presidents of the United States of America. One of these distinguished gentlemen is a Republican, a conservative, and truly an elder statesman; while the other outstanding gentleman is a Democrat, inclined to be liberal, and is a real American.

The Honorable Herbert Hoover has had long and varied experience as a public servant. In addition to his having served as the President of the United States, he has served in various capacities throughout the years both prior to his term as President and since that time as chairman of various boards and commissions which have added luster to his good name. You will recall that during World War I, President Wilson designated Mr. Hoover to distribute adequately, efficiently, and humanely food, clothing, medical supplies, and other aid to stricken peoples, scarred and marked by the ravages of war.

Mr. Hoover recently served as active Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, and, as usual, made a most valuable contribution to his country.

No doubt, at this juncture, you are asking yourself the question: well this all may be very true, but what does Mr. Hoover think of this legislation? This is a good question. Although I wrote Mr. Hoover a letter asking for his comments, I must confess he replied that while he appreciated my sentiments and remarks, he asked that I do him the "kindness of leaving him out of the discussion." In other words, Mr. Hoover quite clearly takes the attitude that since he is involved in the legislation, he ought not to be embarrassed by being requested to make a statement. While I am unable to give you Mr. Hoover's reaction, I am informed that a similar plan, such as I propose, received the weighty endorsement of former President Hoover in 1949. Mr. Truman has stated publicly several times that he is not adverse to my plan.

The Honorable Harry S. Truman served as United States Senator from the great State of Missouri for approximately 10 years. He gained national stature and prominence by serving as chairman of the Truman Investigating Committee. In 1944, he was nominated and elected by the people of this country to serve as Vice President under President Roosevelt. He had hardly settled down into his office as Vice President when President Roosevelt was summoned to his reward by the Master of all nations, lodges, and men and suddenly and without warning, Mr. Truman found himself being sworn in as President of the United States.

Whether we agreed with Mr. Truman's politics, his policies, his methods or his achievements, there is one thing that I feel that all of us will be bound to admit, he served our Nation fearlessly and honorably and at a most crucial time in our history.

In my opinion, no man ever was confronted with the decisions that he had to make as Commander in Chief of approximately 12 million men to conclude successfully World War II and to help lead our country and the world, for that matter, which was tottering on the brink of destruction and despair, back to a sound, sane post-war status.

My colleagues, it was President Harry S Truman who had to make the decision as to whether or not the atom bomb would be dropped on Hiroshima and on Nagasaki. I know and you know that this good man had to take decisions of such magnitude to the Good Lord in prayer. Frankly, I do not think that any person could make such a momentous decision without calling on Almighty God for help and guidance.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very deeply about this particular situation. In my heart, I know full well that there are tens of thousands of our young men who are living in happiness today due to the decision made by President Truman to drop these bombs, each then carrying death and destruction equivalent to 50,000 tons of TNT.

It took real courage to issue that order that acted as a certain death warrant to thousands of civilians. Nevertheless, we were at war, a horrible bloody war and it was either the Japanese or our soldiers who had to die. Had not Mr. Truman made the decision at the time, place and manner in which he did, World War II would have continued longer and the million casualties in blood and the billions in gold and treasure that we lost might conceivably have been doubled.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken to several of my colleagues about this legislation. I have urged their support of this bill. I am happy to report that 4 out of 5

favor it overwhelmingly because they agree with me that unless this legislation is enacted now during the time in which both former Presidents are active and alive, it will never be done.

The small amount of opposition that I have encountered to the legislation is, unfortunately, due to prejudice against one or the other of the two former Presidents. Such an attitude is strictly unfair because you and I know that we cannot legislate by prejudice.

Any man who has served his country in as many capacities as these two distinguished men and, in addition, has served as President of the United States is entitled to have the floor privileges of the House and the Senate. Their advice, counsel, views and ideas on domestic and foreign policies ought on request be made readily available to all of us on Capitol Hill. As guest members of the House and Senate, without a vote, our two former Presidents would be not only easily available to us for assistance but in addition thereto this legislation would give to them an honorable, working, active retirement. I do not know of anything that could be either more cruel, shortsighted or tragic than to place our former Presidents on an inactive dole that firmly but yet so gently relegates them and their talents into oblivion.

At the present time, our former Presidents are somewhat reluctant to visit Washington, or to speak out on matters of foreign and domestic interest. I am sure that they would be happy to say what was on their minds and in their hearts—if only asked.

As a guest member in the House and Senate, the country would have the full benefit of their services, and their vast experience without any embarrassment to themselves. If we allow this chance to tap this storehouse of knowledge and experience to go "over the hill" shame on us for we will have truly missed the gangplank and with it the boat. I think it would be a healthy thing for the country to have at least 1 or 2 persons who upon invitation could sound off on an issue without having to worry about his reelection or any voter repercussions. Truly it would be refreshing and beneficial to have these elder statesmen sitting amongst us. It would be America at her best and in her finest tradition. As a democracy we either come up with new ideas occasionally or we wither down and die on the vine of progress.

On April 15, 1955, the Louisville Courier-Journal printed an editorial entitled "A Senate Seat for Hoover and Truman." Later, on April 25, 1955, that splendid newspaper printed another editorial entitled "A Forum Is Needed, Not Just a Pension."

The editorial dated April 15, 1955, among other things, had the following to say:

> But they (Truman and Hoover) would hold positions of recognized distinction instead of being relegated to relative oblivion. They would be, in every case, men inclined by training and circumstances to think in national rather than in more local or regional terms. Freed of all thought of elective harassment, and representing the people at large, they could at their best provide the country with a continuous wealth of experienced statesmanship. It is an asset that should not go begging. Congress could make this a memorable session indeed by reintroducing us all to Senator Hoover and Senator Truman, and preparing us, in time, to meet Senator Eisenhower.

From the editorial dated April 25, 1955, I quote the following excerpt:

> It is politically improbable that Congress ever would pass a bill affecting former Presidents of the United States except at a time when ex-Presidents of the two political parties were alive. The 84th Congress has such an opportunity now while Herbert Hoover and Harry Truman are active and alert. * * * Bills introduced by West Virginia's Harley Kilgore and Kentucky's Representative FRANK CHELF, would make all ex-Presidents nonvoting Members of the Senate for life terms. * * * It seems to this newspaper that making our former President's experience and wisdom officially useful in the United States is more important than method. * * * But of the two plans (the civil-service pension plan) the Kilgore-Chelf proposal appeals to us more. It imposes no inflexibility on the pattern of service. It gives official and active status to those former Presidents who desire to use it. It removes any suggestion that the old gentlemen have been pensioned off to pasture—which is quite the opposite of what is intended.

There is a great deal more that I could say with respect to the qualifications of these outstanding Americans and why they ought to be permitted to sit along beside us with floor privileges—but since I realize I am speaking to men who understand and appreciate the accomplishments of our former Presidents it would, therefore, waste your valuable time to go into further detail. Let us give to our former Presidents an honorable, active, useful, retirement and not sentence them to an inactive, useless, unproductive handout or dole.

The Bible says:

> * * * A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid.
>
> Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house.

I urge you to support H. R. 4371.

---

## A NEW APPROACH TO IMMIGRATION

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, some 30 Members of Congress, meeting together, I, among them, have hammered out an omnibus, overall revision of our immigration law. It has not been an easy matter to arrive at changes that not only would remove discriminations in the law, but work out solutions that would not only be just, but be workable. A good-looking blueprint may be fine on paper, but we have to be sure that out of these plans a livable house can be built. So it is with the new immigration bill I have introduced. Just doing away with the national origins theory upon which our present entry laws are based was not enough. We had to seek for and find a new formula which would guarantee not only that one country would not be given preference over another, but that immigration into this country would not fall into conditions of chaos and confusions, once the national origins theory was discarded.

Here, then, is the formula which took a bit of imagination, much research, much soul searching, and many, many forms until we found what we were looking for—a bill that would do justice to American humanity and conscience, and yet would neither confound nor confuse.

The overall annual quota for all peoples, everywhere, seeking entrance into the United States would be 250,000 each year. The figure, of course, is larger since spouses and minor children of American citizens would be permitted in addition to the 250,000. A further addition to the 250,000 will be parents of United States citizens and professors of academic schools. Now, then, these 250,000 will be distributed among 5 classes of people without regard to any census count in the United States, without regard to where the immigrant was born or to his citizenry. The one limitation with reference to country is that no more than 15 percent of the annual allocation could be issued to inhabitants of any one single country. As to the five classes, they are as follows:

First: Family unification.
Second: Occupational.
Third: Refugee asylum.
Fourth: National interest.
Fifth: Resettlement.

By the resettlement class, we mean those who have no ties in this country who fall into neither of the four other classes, but who seek to emigrate for economic reasons or because they seek to begin again in a new country.

Who will make this distribution? Each year, the President of the United States, after consulting with the Departments of State, Commerce, Labor, and with the Attorney General will submit to the Congress a detailed plan setting forth how each of the 5 categories will be filled; that is, how many of the 250,000 shall go into the first class, or the third class or the second. The plan will then also set forward how many will be permitted entry from each country. After this plan is submitted each year to the Congress, the Congress will have 60 days in which to act; that is, the plan goes through if in 60 days the Congress has not vetoed it. If the Congress does not agree with the allocations, the plan submitted the year before goes into effect.

Now, let us see how this formula actually works with a country, say, like Italy. Under the present law, Italy is allotted an annual quota of 5,645. In keeping that number in mind, we must also keep in mind that the entire 5,645 must be of Italian origin, so that if a thousand Italians emigrate to Australia, for example, and then wish to emigrate further to the United States, that thousand is subtracted from the total. Under the new proposal, Italy could be allotted, if all the 5 categories were filled, as high as 37,500 per year—and certainly Italy's population composition is such that her peoples could fill each of these categories within the 15 percent limitation. That would, of course, de-

pend upon the President and the concurrence of the Congress. Moreover, we must remember that if Italians emigrated to another country and then these desired to come to the United States, they would not be chargeable to the Italian quota, but to the quota of the country or countries of which they are inhabitants. Of all the countries in the world, I believe that Italy's population, native, citizen, or resident can more fully reach into all of the five classes than any other national unit.

The chart which follows gives a graphic picture of how the formula can work:

*Examples of maximum proposed quota, sec. 201 (b)*

| | Present quota | 1st preference | 2d preference | 3d preference | 4th preference | Resettlement |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Australia | 100 | 18,750 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 3,750 |
| Chinese racial | 105 | 18,750 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 3,750 |
| China [1] | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,750 |
| Germany | 25,814 | 18,750 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 3,750 |
| Great Britain | 65,361 | 18,750 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 3,750 |
| Greece | 308 | 18,750 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 3,750 |
| Israel | 100 | 18,750 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 3,750 |
| Italy | 5,645 | 18,750 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 3,750 |
| Poland [1] | 6,488 | [1] 18,750 | (?) | (?) | (?) | (?) |
| Spain | 250 | 18,750 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 3,750 |

*Examples of maximum proposed quota, alternative plan, sec. 201 (c)*

| | Present quota | 1st preference | 2d preference | 3d preference | 4th preference | Resettlement |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Australia | 100 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 |
| Chinese racial | 105 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 |
| China [1] | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Germany | 25,814 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 |
| Great Britain | 65,361 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 |
| Greece | 308 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 |
| Israel | 100 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 |
| Italy | 5,645 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 |
| Poland [1] | 6,488 | 7,500 | 7,500 | (?) | 7,500 | (?) |
| Spain | 250 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 |

[1] At the present time, it is possible that certain relatives within 1st preference classification might be permitted to depart from Poland or some of the other Iron Curtain countries—occupational preference groups, refugees, etc., would not probably seek visas in Iron Curtain countries. China would have no visas allotted to inhabitants of her territory until diplomatic relations are set up and visa issuance in American consulates there would be resumed. (Note also that the maximum quota of 37,500 would be available to no more than 6 countries.)

These figures are, of course, maximum figures giving an indication of how the formula could work in these selected countries. I wish to emphasize that these are the maximum figures subject, of course, to the built-in flexibility of the formula itself and to the President's appraisal of domestic and external needs.

Under this formula, there will be a net gain for all countries of low quota numbers because no longer will there be a quota of some sixty-five-odd thousand to Great Britain alone. Great Britain would have to take her place along with all the other countries of the world. No longer would some 80,000 precious visas be lost to mankind because Great Britain did not use her huge slice of the immigration pie. Great Britain could not stand with folded hands while so many other hands stretched out in vain. It was not Great Britain's doing that so precious a gift was handed to her, a gift she could not take nor use. Our law said it was hers and belonged in that measure to nobody else. It was a gift she could not take nor give to anyone else.

Today the allocation of quota is fixed and rigidly fixed. Year after year, since 1924, it has stayed that way and allotments could not be moved though wars, floods, and famine drenched the world. Our own needs and the needs of other countries could not break through the barrier of the quota bonds. Emergency refugee legislation there was, but a price was exacted both in the nature of the legislation enacted and in the administration of that legislation. Each time emergency legislation was called for, the Congress acted painfully and reluctantly, under the new proposals, the allocations are flexible, capable of being moved around within the orbit of American needs and the needs of other peoples. Each year the President may take into account what is happening in the corners of the world, adjust the allotments as justice and conscience dictate. Where in the world are the worst population pressures? Where are the largest influx of refugees? What labor do we need—construction workers, tailors, mathematicians, scientists, diamond cutters? He can ask, "Isn't it human and right and decent to reunite families?" All these questions may be asked and answered with the knowledge that we can do something about them without the agonizing frustration of the fixed number—the fixed 308 for Greece, the 865 for Hungary, the thousand or so for Denmark. Into the immigration picture, if we can get this legislation passed, will be added the one ingredient that is most conspicuously absent, that of humanity.

Let me pass on to other features of the bill we propose.

Under the present law, we have a two-headed system where officials of the Department of State issue visas to both immigrants and nonimmigrants abroad, while officers of the Department of Justice determine at ports of entry whether the holders of visas are admissible to the United States. This is an antiquated, cumbersome, and expensive system. It creates anxiety and uncertainty in the minds of the immigrants and nonimmigrants alike, and it causes friction between two governmental agencies operating independently in the same field and stepping on each other's toes.

Under my proposal, the entire administration of our immigration and nationality laws will be placed in the hands of a Director of Bureau of Immigration and Citizenship, who will be an Assistant Attorney General, subject to confirmation by the Senate. His officers, acting as immigration attachés, will be stationed at our consulates abroad and will issue immigrant and nonimmigrant visas after a finding is made that the recipient of a visa is found to be eligible actually to enter the United States.

In addition to simplification of procedures and elimination of dual standards, as well as uncertainty in the minds of immigrants or foreign visitors, my proposal will automatically open visa issuance to administrative review in the Department of Justice by the well-qualified and trusted Board of Immigration Appeals. The issuance of diplomatic visas will, of course, remain a function of diplomatic officers of the Department of State.

I believe that the administrative system which is proposed will not only provide a more efficient and more equitable issuance of visas abroad, but that it will also bring a great saving to the American taxpayer.

Note we have taken away the life and death power of some consul whose final word on the fate of an applicant cannot be challenged. No longer will the fate of a prospective immigrant be dependent upon the personal whims, caprice or prejudice of a consul who, knowing his judgment cannot be questioned, succumbs almost inevitably to the dehumanizing temptations of absolute power. This is wrong, all wrong, and must be changed.

I want to note a few of the other changes we made—changes, while not as dramatic as the elimination of all traces of the national origins system yet which are just as necessary if we are to feel any pride in a just and workable immigration law. Where statutes of limitation have been rubbed out in the present law, we replaced them so that nobody could be deported for an act done 20, 30, or even 50 years ago. We have reworded the law, too, so that there will be no additional grounds for loss of United States citizenship by naturalized citizens which could not apply to native-born citizens as well. We have eased the restrictions on adoption. We have liberalized the administration of deportations so that nobody need prove, as he does today, that his deportation would cause exceptionally and extremely unusual hardship, a curious set of words that brought much needless tragedy to some people facing deportation. We have revised the sections of the law that led to useless separation of families. We have given the courts the power to review not only deportation cases but exclusion cases as well.

It has taken many years, many beginnings, many false turns to arrive at a proposal which does justice to all, but we believe we have found the right one now. This is the first proposal made—and there have been others seeking a

good law—that completely, but completely, wipes away all traces of the national origins system. Even the proposal that our quota be based on the 1950 instead of the 1920 census has its roots in the national origins theory, even though there would, under such a count, have been an increase for low-quota countries. The 15 percent limitation we have placed on each country is the assurance that no one country can overshadow another by the mere edict of law. If there are miscalculations in one year's allotment, they can be corrected the following year. Once this law is enacted, the watchful eyes of Congress having given its consent to a just law, will not permit unbalanced or unjustified allocations of quotas anywhere.

We have a goal to reach—an immigration policy that bespeaks the generosity and the warmth of the American people and which, withal, is mindful of America's own interest. That goal we must reach, each of us, in his way, pulling together to reach it.

## RESOLUTIONS OF UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN REGARD TO HUNGARY

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter and a memorandum.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to include the text of a memorandum dated January 9, 1957, from the Assembly of Captive European Nations and concerning the necessity of effective measures to enforce the resolutions adopted by the United Nation General Assembly in regard to Hungary.

I also wish to include the text of a letter dated February 5, 1957, from the Department of State in specific comment on the forementioned memorandum. It will be noted that the Department admits that the great majority of U. N. members at present would not be likely to support enforcement measures against the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, it seems indeed farcical that there is at the present time talk of U. N. sanctions against the State of Israel because of that Government's failure to surrender certain territory in the Middle East without adequate guaranties as to its own national security. On the other hand, to judge from the contents of the Department's letter, there is not even the slightest thought of sanctions against the Soviet Union. It only proves, Mr. Speaker, what I have all along contended: If you are a little country, the U. N. will discipline you, if you are a great power, the U. N. will lecture you, nothing more.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
*Washington, February 5, 1957.*

The Honorable ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. BENTLEY: I have received your letter of January 23 requesting the comments of the Department on the memorandum prepared by the Assembly of Captive European Nations with respect to the enforcement of the resolutions on the situation in Hungary adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

From the very outset of the crisis in Hungary this Government has sought, in the United Nations and through other means, to take every practicable action in relation to the situation. In our judgment the various General Assembly resolutions, adopted in each case by an overwhelming majority, constitute an important expression of judgment by the international community with respect to the intervention of the Soviet Union in Hungary. The actions of the Assembly have left no doubt as to where the responsibility lies for the tragic course of Hungarian events. The present five-member Assembly committee on Hungary, currently at work in New York taking testimony and collecting documentary evidence, should supply in its anticipated reports to the Organization an indisputable factual record that can be used to refute Soviet propaganda regarding the origin of the situation in Hungary. Incidentally, that Committee has already begun hearings at which the escaped leaders of the Hungarian revolutionary movement are scheduled to be, or have already been heard, as proposed in the memorandum accompanying your letter.

Naturally it continues to be a source of regret and concern that more tangible results have not been produced as a result of United Nations actions with respect to Hungary, and particularly that the Soviet and Hungarian authorities have continued to defy the Assembly's recommendations. Suggestions such as those made by the Assembly of Captive European Nations are being given careful study both here and in New York.

However, certain practical considerations must be borne in mind with respect to the possibility of enforcement action in a case such as that of Hungary. One fundamental point relates to the authority of the General Assembly which, under the charter, has recommendatory power and not the power to order. While this does not mean that the Assembly cannot recommend enforcement measures under certain circumstances, it does make essential that any such recommendation receive overwhelming support from the great majority of members in order to insure its effectiveness. In the Hungarian situation such support for enforcement measures seems unlikely in present circumstances. Another equally crucial point is whether limited enforcement measures would produce the desired results or whether they would seriously risk the precipitation of general hostilities. Regardless of one's individual estimate on this point the fact is that here, too, the requisite majority of United Nations members is not prepared to support such action. Nevertheless this Government is continuing to study the question whether there may not be available additional measures that the General Assembly could undertake with a view to bringing about the achievement of United Nations objectives in Hungary.

The suspension or expulsion of Hungary from membership in the United Nations would be subject to the veto in the Security Council, which means that the Soviet Union could block action on such a move. In these circumstances the general feeling has been that no useful purpose would be served by such a proposal. Moreover, there is at least some practical advantage in Hungary's continued membership in the Organization because it means that Hungary remains bound by its charter obligations, thereby maintaining grounds upon which the United Nations can base its efforts to bring the full force of world public opinion to bear upon the situation in Hungary. Incidentally, you may be interested to know that the General Assembly has taken no action to approve the credentials of the present Hungarian delegation whose status consequently remains strictly provisional.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HILL,
*Assistant Secretary*
(For the Secretary of State).

MEMORANDUM CONCERNING THE NECESSITY OF EFFECTIVE MEASURES TO ENFORCE THE RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE U. N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN REGARD TO HUNGARY

1. Eleven weeks have passed since the United Nations was first seized with the Hungarian question. During this period the General Assembly has adopted not less than 10 resolutions providing, among others, for the dispatch of United Nations observers to Hungary, for the cessation of Soviet intervention, the withdrawal of Soviet armed forces and the holding of free elections.

2. Both the Soviet Union and the authorities in Hungary have completely ignored the resolutions of the General Assembly. The conspicuous lack of resolve on the part of the United Nations to take measures for the enforcement of [illegible] decisions has certainly encouraged the Soviet Union in this defiant attitude.

3. Among the measures ordered by the General Assembly there was one which could have been implemented independently of any cooperation from the Soviet and Hungarian authorities. We refer to the action provided for in point 4 of the operative part of Resolution 1004 (ES-II), of November 4, 1956, in which the Secretary General was asked (a) "to investigate the situation caused by foreign intervention in Hungary, to observe the situation directly through representatives named by him, and to report thereon to the General Assembly at the earliest moment," and (b) "as soon as possible suggest methods to bring an end to the foreign intervention in Hungary in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations."

4. In discharging the first of these tasks, the Secretary General addressed on November 8, 1956, an aide-memoire to the Kadar government asking the latter whether it was willing to permit observers designated by the Secretary General of the United Nations to enter Hungary and report to him on their findings.

The procedure followed by the Secretary General raises two questions. Was it necessary to request permission or would a mere notice to the Hungarian authorities of the arrival of the United Nations observers have sufficed? In choosing the first way did not the Secretary General suggest that the question of whether to comply or not with a decision of the U. N. General Assembly was left to the discretion of the foreign-imposed and controlled Kadar government?

5. It should be noted that despite proddings from the General Assembly (resolutions of November 9, November 22, December 4), the Secretary General confined his action to interventions with the Hungarian and Soviet Governments to permit the Secretary General or his observers to enter Hungary. Other existing factfinding possibilities were not used. For instance, although the resolution adopted on December 4 authorized the Secretary General to dispatch observers to other countries than Hungary, this authority has never been made use of notwithstanding the fact that the Austrian Government had given its consent to the entry of U. N. observers to investigate on Austrian territory, through hearings of refugees, the situation in Hungary, and the deportations of Hungarian nationals by the Soviet authorities.

6. As regards the second task conferred upon the Secretary General by the resolution of the General Assembly of November 4, 1956, no suggestion has come so far from the highest official of the U. N. concerning meth-

ods to bring an end to foreign intervention in Hungary.

In the view of the ACEN, the fact that no investigation was held does not seem to justify inaction. To hold the contrary view would be to condemn the United Nations to ineffectiveness. It would indeed be tantamount to acknowledging that an organ of the United Nations is in all events barred from making proposals for action before it is able to investigate the pertinent facts. This would mean that no such proposals can be presented even when the essential facts have already been established by the General Assembly and when it is within the power of the guilty party to prevent investigation and thereby foil action.

7. In asking the Secretary General to suggest methods to bring an end to foreign intervention in Hungary, the resolution of November 4 mentions that it was to be done in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. This can only mean that the Secretary General was invited to present proposals concerning the most appropriate measures that could be taken under the U. N. Charter to bring an end to foreign intervention in Hungary. Such measures range from negotiations and conciliation to military measures against disturbers of the peace.

8. It would be hard to deny that all measures short of sanctions have already been taken and have failed to "bring an end to foreign intervention in Hungary." It would be equally hard to deny that the Soviet and Hungarian authorities have shown themselves determined to defy the General Assembly and to refuse any cooperation with the Secretary General in his attempts to discharge the task conferred upon him by the charter. Therefore, under the specific terms of the November 4 resolution, no alternative seems to be left to the Secretary General but to propose enforcement measures under articles 5, 6, 41, and 42 of the charter. This duty of the Secretary General, it must be stressed, in no way diminishes the responsibility of the General Assembly under the terms of the charter and of the uniting-for-peace resolution.

9. In his report of January 5, 1957 (A/3485), the Secretary General suggested the establishment by the General Assembly of "a special ad hoc committee which would take over the activities of the group of investigators established by the Secretary General and follow them up under somewhat broader terms of reference." The Assembly of Captive European Nations welcomes any step designed to establish an authoritative, detailed record of events in Hungary. But it feels dutybound to warn against any attempt to use such investigation as a substitute for effective action or an excuse to further defer long-overdue enforcement efforts.

10. The essential facts of Soviet aggression against Hungary, of Soviet intervention in the internal affairs of Hungary, and of deportations of Hungarian nationals to the Soviet Union have already been established by the General Assembly. Therefore, the Secretary General is not only entitled but also obligated to carry out without delay the second task entrusted to him by the November 4 resolution.

11. Independently of the action the Secretary General may undertake, it is to be hoped that the United Nations will take the initiative of enforcement action. The most urgent and longest overdue, such action is a decision to suspend Hungary (as represented by the Kadar regime) from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership under article 5 of the charter.

12. Recent developments in Hungary prove that the failure of the United Nations to enforce its resolutions has given the Soviet Union and its puppets the assurance that they have no disagreeable consequences to fear whatever they may do in Hungary. We refer to the fact that following a conference held in Budapest, from January 1 to 4, 1956, high-ranking representatives of the Communist parties and governments of the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Romania, and Hungary announced in a public communique, a new line of policy in Hungary. This policy can be best described as a full return to unrestricted Stalinist dictatorship by terror. It constitutes without any doubt a further instance of political aggression against Hungary and foreign intervention in the internal affairs of the Hungarian people.

13. The very substance of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly indicates that the Hungarian question is no longer at the fact-finding, but rather at the enforcement stage. Nevertheless, if the General Assembly were to order a detailed investigation of Soviet intervention and other Soviet crimes in Hungary, it may derive useful information from escaped leaders of the Hungarian revolutionary movement. According to the Hungarian National Council, a member of our Assembly, Miss Anna Kethly, member of the Imre Nagy government, General Bela Kirely, military leader of the Hungarian revolution, and Jozsef Kovago, former mayor of Budapest, would be the most appropriate witnesses. We respectfully suggest that they be given a hearing either in the General Assembly or in a public meeting of one of the Assembly's committees.

14. In conclusion the Assembly of Captive European Nations trust that, independently of any investigation the General Assembly may order and of any action the Secretary General may initiate pursuant to point 4 of Resolution 1004–ES II, the General Assembly will (a) forthwith suspend, on the basis of article 5 of the Charter, Hungary (as represented by the so-called Kadar government) from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership; (b) urgently consider collective measures under articles 42 and 43 and sanctions, under article 6, with the view of exhausting all the means provided by the Charter to bring about compliance with the resolutions of the United Nations.

---

## PREVENTION OF URBAN BLIGHT ON A BUSINESS BASIS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to bring immediately to the attention of my colleagues the contents of a letter that I received today from E. G. Shinner, chairman of the Shinner Foundation. In his letter Mr. Shinner reviews the various phases of the question of urban blight and city slums and makes suggestions that I am sure will receive the careful and the thoughtful attention of the Members of this body, especially those charged with the responsibility of the study of housing and the drafting of legislation in that field.

Mr. Shinner will be remembered by the Members of the House because of his authorship of the Shinner small farm plan. He was a most successful businessman, and having acquired a large fortune by reason of his industry and his ability, and being still in his prime, he retired to devote unselfishly his fortune and his time to serving the public. Coming from such a source his communication on the present subject of the rehabilitation of our metropolitan areas will prove, I am sure, of informative and stimulating value to us in the Congress.

Mr. Shinner's letter follows:

MY DEAR MR. O'HARA: The question of urban blight and city slums is a matter in which I know you are deeply interested. I have a new thought on the subject which I herewith submit for your consideration.

It is my observation that it is an easily demonstrable fact that the numerous redevelopment projects (tear down and rebuild) and/or public housing—even when coupled with the best available city planning—fall far short of meeting the national need.

The Hyde Park-Kenwood redevelopment project, involving an area of 900 acres surrounding the University of Chicago, is a case in point. This project, designed to meet the specific needs of the university area, is both well conceived and ably administered. It will be a great credit to the university, as well as to the city of Chicago, if and when it is finally completed; however, impartial observers, local business and professional men in the area, and even some of those who most actively interested in this development, admit that the pattern which is being followed cannot be successfully used or accepted for city or nationwide adoption.

First, the cost is prohibitive; secondly, the problems encountered are endless; and in many cases, are insurmountable.

This project does provide, however, an object lesson as to what is really needed. I list below, two fundamental lessons learned from this noble experiment:

1. City slums must be made unprofitable through rigid code enforcement. This is presently not being done; slums, as a result, are still profitable.

2. To arrest blight, it must be made economically feasible for individual private owners to improve their property. Under existing conditions, rehabilitation can be undertaken only at a known financial loss.

Now, the question arises: How can this second situation be reversed? The answer, it appears, can best be stated in two parts:

First, the prime need is to develop a program which would enlist the active support and cooperation of millions of property owners—a program in which they might participate, with the prospect of at least a nominal profit. In short, the prevention of blight should be undertaken on a straight out-and-out business basis, rather than by a piecemeal process involving continuous Government grants.

One positive way to develop incentive would be through Federal income tax relief.

The Federal Government, as you know, has been granting a rapid writeoff to corporations engaged wholly or partly in Government work, to encourage the construction of new factories. The economic or practical value of this rapid writeoff program need not be debated; suffice to say that here we have established a precedent.

I would reverse this whole procedure. I would allow the owners of all residential property—property beyond a certain age (possibly 10 to 15 years or older), a rapid writeoff of, say, 3 to 5 years as they may elect, for money spent on repairs and rehabilitation. Such writeoff would be a deductible item on Federal income tax returns.

Appropriate regulations governing the rehabilitation of residential property could be established by and made to function through the Federal Housing Administration.

I have talked to many businessmen and contractors about this idea and they have unanimously voiced their approval. The plan which I am proposing would be available to millions of property owners throughout the Nation, whereas the present scheme of allowing a 5-year writeoff on new buildings benefits only a few corporations, at best.

Such a change in the income tax law would be of great assistance to property owners in raising money for improvements through strictly conventional mortgages and other presently available sources.

While the easing of conventional forms of obtaining money for rehabilitation would admittedly be of tremendous help, it is my belief that it would still be inadequate to fully cope with the problem involved.

In addition to tax relief, long-term capital must be made available. As a means of supplying this financing, I propose an organization which, for the purpose of description, I shall call the Urban Redevelopment Finance Corporation; a detailed outline of the scope, source of funds, and so forth, is described in chapter VII of my pamphlet, Arresting Slums Through Private Enterprise.

As previously stated, the problems encountered in a redevelopment project, such as Hyde Park-Kenwood, are endless. I list herewith just a few which are among the most baffling:

1. In the redevelopment area, there is presently marked for demolition in excess of 1 million square feet of commercial floor space—space devoted largely to retailing. Under the redevelopment plan, it is contemplated to reduce this space to 125,000 square feet; hence, at best, 80 percent of the merchants will be permanently displaced. As a matter of practical fact, they will all be displaced. In view of the cost of erecting new stores ($17 to $20 per square foot), it will be found necessary to consider only major corporations as tenants for the newly created shopping area. Only by leasing to financially strong national institutions can this new project (the shopping center) be financed. Such leases become part of the collateral back of the loan which provides the necessary funds. Thus the old merchants will be almost completely eliminated. This phase alone tends to discredit the whole scheme when applied to the vast areas of slums and blighted properties of the Nation; it is about on a par with the principle of abandoning the family farm in favor of corporate farming.

2. The Hyde Park-Kenwood project and all similar undertakings involve a period of planning of from 3 to 10 years, and another indefinite period while the program is being carried out. This means a period of complete stagnation—no improvement in stores, shops, streets, etc., no new leases and no sale or resale of property—a penalty on property owners and businessmen which it is extremely difficult to justify.

3. This, and all similar projects, involve the moving of all residents—both tenants and homeowners—housing in the properties marked for demolition. In the Hyde Park-Kenwood project, 3,800 dwelling units are involved. These people are being left to shift for themselves, with the result that since their economic status is impaired through this process they, to a large extent, contribute to further downgrading their new locations; in other words, they become a factor in creating additional slums elsewhere.

4. The Hyde Park-Kenwood project involves the redevelopment of only 20 percent of the total buildings in the area. When it is finally completed, the other 80 percent will be left to its fate. I submit that no epidemic can be cured (blight and slums are epidemic in all big cities) by treating only 20 percent of those afflicted, and leaving the other 80 percent untreated and neglected. This fact again points to the need for a complete new approach.

5. At a recent panel discussion sponsored by the National Association of Home Builders, on the subject of redevelopment, it was disclosed that the resale of cleared land to private builders has proven so difficult that in many cases it has been abandoned. The South East Chicago Commission (the Hyde Park-Kenwood project) is presently confronted with such a difficulty. The University of Chicago has under consideration a plan whereby it hopes to interest public-spirited citizens to take an equity position in land which has been cleared—land unsalable in the open market.

6. The cost, if a similar approach were applied to the entire blighted areas of the city of Chicago, would run upward of $6 billion—obviously a financial impossibility.

This review of the difficulties encountered in the Hyde Park-Kenwood project is in no way intended to disparge the undertaking. The intent is to point out that its usefulness is largely confined to local communities spearheaded by a major institution, such as the University of Chicago, rather than as an answer to city or nationwide problems of slums and blighted areas.

So, we find the problems involved in such a redevelopment are not only big and unending, they baffle all presently known means of solution.

The building and maintenance of residential property is and must ever be of utmost importance—important from an economic, financial, cultural, and social standpoint. The Nation's total investment in residential property is estimated to be in excess of $500 billion. The need for protection of this huge national asset through proper care and maintenance is obvious. Furthermore, it is the one and only available means whereby the constant creation of additional slums can be arrested. To deny or ignore the need of a national policy directed toward these ends is simply to admit that there is no solution.

There is ample precedent for Federal action of a conservational nature. Federal laws and funds provide for the conservation of wildlife, forests, soil under cultivation, water resources, oil and mineral deposits, etc. I submit the prevention and arresting of slums and blight are of equal, if not greater, importance.

In the final analysis, the most important aspect in the control and eradication of urban blight and city slums is one of prevention. In the city of Chicago, slums are being created at the rate of 7 to 8 blocks per month. I repeat, to stop this rapid deterioration, certain positive measures are indicated—rigid code enforcement, a permanent source of mortgage money, a rapid writeoff of the expense involved, plus the active cooperation of all landlord and homeowners.

Your earnest consideration of the foregoing is respectfully urged.

Sincerely,

E. G. SHINNER,
*Chairman, the Shinner Foundation.*

Mr. Speaker, I give back the remainder of my time.

## FACTORS AFFECTING PRICE OF STANDARD FOOD PRODUCTS

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a resolution which, if passed, would authorize the Joint Economic Committee to conduct a full, complete, and impartial investigation into the various factors affecting the prices of standard food products sold to consumers.

I rather imagine, Mr. Speaker, that should a poll be taken of the Members of Congress, it would be discovered that every single Member had received numerous complaints from constituents about the continuing advance in the cost of living. In addition, I know that those Members who have farm constituents have likewise received a host of communications about the drop that has occurred in farm income.

The existence of considerable discontent among the citizens of our Nation reflects a need with which all of us here must be concerned. The Consumer Price Index continues its steady march upward. In 1952, to go no further back, the index stood at 113.5. According to the most recent figures released by the Department of Labor, it is now at 117.8—the highest point it has reached since the index was first established. In the last 10 months alone the index has soared 3 points—and each point has cost the American people $2½ billion.

Of the items on which the Consumer Price Index is based, food is certainly one of the most important—and, of course, insofar as the consumer is concerned, it is very nearly the most important item. It is true that the food index fell slightly at the time the last figures were released, but it is still at almost record heights. In 1950, the food index stood at 101.2. Today, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, it has reached 112.9. But people must still eat, and for those groups and individuals in our Nation whose income is fixed or has otherwise failed to keep pace with this phenomenal rise in the cost of living, the inevitable result has been a sharp decline in their standard of living—and this at a time when the Nation is supposed to be experiencing the greatest prosperity in its history.

Anyone looking at the figures I have just quoted would suppose that if food prices have risen in such spectacular fashion, then obviously the farmers' income must also have gone up. But what are the facts? Precisely the opposite is true. In terms of current prices and again using the figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, net farm income reached a high in 1948 of $3,049 per farm. During the third quarter of 1956 it had dropped to $2,370.

Mr. Speaker, there simply has to be some reason, some explanation, for the fact that American consumers are today paying the highest food prices in history, while farm income—the prices received by American farmers—is $700 below the 1948 level. Each year American taxpayers are called upon to spend billions of dollars in direct and indirect support of our farm economy, yet they receive no plausible explanation for the ever-widening gap between the prices they pay and the prices received by food producers.

Mr. Speaker, both the American people and Congress are entitled to the facts. On last January 29th I introduced a resolution calling for a complete investigation into the wage-price-profit relationships in our basic industries. Now I am introducing what is, in essence, a companion measure designed to bring to light the facts related to the rise in the cost of the food we eat. I cannot urge the passage of these two resolutions too strongly.

## MIDDLE EAST RESOLUTION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, recently, I voted for the Middle East resolution sponsored by the administration. I did so with great reluctance because I felt that this resolution impaired the basic constitutional relationship between the President and Congress. Moreover, the Congress was compelled to act on the resolution because of Mr. Dulles' previous ineptness. The resolution conferred on the President powers which everyone, including the committee reporting the matter, conceded were already his. Mr. Dulles conceded it did not attack the real problems in the area. At the time the matter was voted upon in the House, the resolution appeared to be both hasty, ill timed, and ill conceived. It mixed foreign policy with foreign aid authorizations, a thing which should never be done. Nevertheless I voted for the proposition on the premise that failure to do so would make America appear weak and indecisive on policy in this vital area.

In the time since this matter was brought before the House, we are learning how the administration proposed to use this power. The administration, it is reported, is already preparing to expend funds authorized in countries which have a substantial oil income. For example, Saudi Arabia, whose oil resources are about $360 million a year; and Iran, which has an oil revenue of about $150 million a year. There is strong evidence that Mr. Dulles' creature, Nasser, is to receive substantial aid under this program. Thus we witness a situation where the United States is about to aid the real trouble makers in the area.

Consideration of the matter has disclosed that the threat of Soviet armed intervention used to rush this matter through Congress was nonexistent and probably will not materialize in the foreseeable future. Indeed, according to recent statements of the President, Mr. Dulles and Admiral Radford, this danger now appears nonexistent.

It further appears that Mr. Dulles is now considering application of economic sanctions on Israel because that nation seeks guaranties that her right to peaceful existence and access to international waterways will be respected.

It is unnecessary to point out that real aggressors with blood-soiled hands like Russia in the Hungarian affair, or India in its seizure of Kashmir are not threatened with sanctions by our braggadocio Mr. Dulles. Only little Israel, which is virtually friendless, in this world of oil and power politics, receives this unwelcome attention. A strange scale of value for a virtuous, sanctimonious, and hypocritical administration to apply. If the Secretary continues to show his present attitude in his anti-Israel declarations, many of us will probably be compelled to vote against any conference report on this resolution.

---

## THE AGRICULTURAL SITUATION IN THE UNITED STATES TODAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I sought this time to discuss the agricultural situation in the United States today and compare it with what it has been in the past several years and in the very recent past.

The number of farmers in the United States is getting less all the time. The farmer is entrusted with one of the most vital services being performed in this country. It is his duty to feed and clothe this Nation and to produce an exportable surplus to care for our friends and, incidentally, perhaps, some of our enemies abroad. I maintain that he has been discharging this duty well.

He is entrusted with another thing that too many of us overlook. In his hands and keeping is the little film of topsoil that overlies the clay and rock and shale in this Nation. That soil is in his care and in his keeping. It has been estimated by some of our professors of soils in our agricultural colleges, including Dr. Albrecht of the agricultural college in my home State at Columbia, Mo., that already 50 percent of the topsoil of the United States has been lost through wind and water erosion. That loss is what is building the delta of the Mississippi out into the Gulf of Mexico. This Nation and the future food supply of this Nation are bleeding away from Vancouver all the way around to the mouth of the St. Lawrence.

The farmer has learned in rather recent years how to tie his soil down with grass, how to build terraces, grass waterways, concrete structures, galvanized steel down pipes, to try to keep this soil at home.

He has made strides in that direction. But all these things take money, they take labor, and they take time. Unless the farmer can sell the food and fiber that he produces for more than the cost of production, in order to stay on his farm he is going to mine the fertility out of that land. He is going to fail to build those terraces, he is going to fail to rotate his crops, and sod down his fields as he should.

If you think that because your office is on the 33d floor of a New York skyscraper you are not interested in soil conservation, you are just making one of the greatest mistakes any man or woman in the United States ever made.

All life in this country, from the birds in the air to man himself, depends on that little thin film of topsoil for his existence, and that little film of topsoil will nurture our great-grandchildren and their great-grandchildren in this country or they will not be nourished. That is why I take the position that soil conservation is a problem not only of the farmer but of every American who loves his country and loves that country's future.

Two hundred years ago the great city of Pittsburgh, that great steel city in western Pennsylvania, was an outpost in the wilderness. The Revolutionary War was still 20 years in the future. It was almost 100 years after that that gold was discovered in California. But in the geological history of nations and continents what does 200 years mean? It is only a watch tick in the age of the earth.

Two hundred years ago from here to the Rocky Mountains there was river valley after river valley where the streams ran deep and clear and were bordered by some of the finest hardwood forests that ever grew in the world. Grass grew over the plains where now the dust flies, bluestem short grass, grama and bunch grass, had the soil tied down, and the Lord had placed there the deer, the buffalo, and the antelope to graze this grass. It was a hunter's paradise. It was a land where man could grow and expand with his children and his grandchildren.

But I say to you today, Mr. Speaker, that the last river valley has been taken. The sod of that last prairie, like Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, and the Dakotas, has been turned to produce wheat. We have been to the Pacific coast and come back across our country looking closely to see if perhaps we missed something worth having as we went across the first time.

The die is cast and the edict has gone forth. So far as we, the American people, are concerned, for food and fiber, we will live or die, survive or perish, right where we are. There is no longer a frontier. There is no longer in these United States a place where the Government will bet you 160 acres of land that you cannot stay on it for 5 years. There is no such place any more. I can remember back past the turn of the century when I was plowing Missouri soil before 1900 with a 16-inch walking plow and a pair of old draft horses. I have lived my life on and with the soil. I speak to you this evening, my colleagues, from almost a lifetime of experience. I remember very vividly the things that have happened to agriculture in the last half century because I was a part of it. Because the bread I ate and the clothes I wore and the house that sheltered me from the elements depended on what I could dig out of that land and my very existence depended on the price which the products of that land had to be sold for. I remember the so-called good old days that were neither good nor old—year after year of them. Back in 1907 when I was trying to go to college on nothing, when there were 4-cent hogs and 26-cent to 30-cent corn and 60-cent wheat and a dollar a day for a man to pitch hay from the time the dew dried off of it in the morning until as late as you could see that night, in harvest weather. I lived through it. I am not talking to you about things that I have lived and experienced. I want to say to you today that the first time I ever saw the farmers of the United States get a price that was comparable to the labor that they had to put into it to produce this food and fiber was when Woodrow Wilson was President of the United States in 1913 to 1920. That was the first time I ever saw the farmers of the United States get anything that compared to decent wages for the work that we were doing.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CHRISTOPHER) is making one of the most effective

and one of the most constructive speeches I have ever heard in my 29 years as a Member of this body. The gentleman is not only making a powerful and a convincing speech from the historical angle, but it is doubly powerful and convincing because it is based on his own personal experience. The gentleman is bringing out very forcefully the vital importance of agriculture in the life of the Nation. I represent a district that does not have a farm in it, but from my experience and from my contacts with my colleagues in my efforts to try to learn a little, I have one firm conviction in my mind and that is that many a great nation has come and gone in the past as a result of the destruction of the topsoil to which the gentleman has so eloquently referred. Fortunately, we are a great nation both because of our industry and manufacture and because God has blessed our country. It is incumbent upon us to see that the blessings that we have received are preserved and that we not only continue to have a strong industrial and manufacturing life, but that we have a virile, dynamic, and strong agricultural life. Even from the selfish point of view, a man who works in the city ought to recognize, and I can state that they do recognize that the lot of the worker in the factory and of those who toil on the soil are not independent of each other, but are in fact interdependent and directly related one to the other. In fact, they are one. When the farmer has his days of depression and when he has to curtail his purchases, it is only a matter of time that the worker in the city feels the effect and manufacturing has to be curtailed to meet the law of supply and demand. Unemployment comes and reduces the purchasing power of the farmers very quickly under our economic system and transmits itself to the worker in the city and to industry. It affects not only the worker, but it affects management as well. The gentleman from Missouri as a Member of the House of Representatives has brought to me one of my pleasant associations as a result of his sound, progressive, and forward-looking outlook. The speech he is making today should be heard by everyone without regard to whether they toil on the soil or not. But, particularly those who toil on the soil—the farmers whether they own a farm or just work on it, whether the farm is large or small, they should read the speech made by the gentleman from Missouri.

May I say further the people of the gentleman's district are justified—if I might compliment the gentleman and not flatter him because flattery to me is a form of insult—but, as I was saying, the people of the gentleman's district are justified in the confidence they have placed in their Representative, and I say this so that they might know for whatever it might be worth to them, the profound respect in which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] is held by his colleagues in the House of Representatives. The people of his district are justified in being profoundly grateful to him for the character of service that he renders, because he attracts me, who comes from a district that has no farms, to study the problems of agriculture. He attracts those of us in the city to view the problems of agriculture and the farmer from a national angle. The people of the gentleman's district are justified in feeling proud of him. The best evidence of it is the eloquent, practical speech, not only historical but from the angle of experience, that the gentleman is giving the House today on one of the most fundamental subjects that concerns our country.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to express my deep appreciation of the gentleman's speech. I have a great many city dwellers and a great many farmers in my district. What the gentleman says about protecting the farmers is very true. Studies are being made about flood control, soil erosion, and other things affecting the farmers. I would like to thank the gentleman for that part of his speech, and to thank him for his great work in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. He is a tower of strength wherever he moves.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I thank the lady for her kind remarks.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I would like to add my congratulations and associate myself with all the words of appreciation of my colleagues for bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I thank the gentleman.

Now, if I may return to the matter I came here to discuss, most of the things that I have said are more or less in the nature of generalities, but I do have some cold, hard facts to present to you today.

When the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] asked me to yield, I was discussing the fact that the first time in my memory the farmer ever had anything approaching a fair price for the labor and the thought and the capital that he used in feeding and clothing this country was in 1914, 1915, 1916, and on through to 1920. That is absolutely true. But after 1918 and 1919 that was changed. That change began in 1920. In June 1921, corn was selling for $1.80 a bushel in Missouri. In December of that same year, it was selling for 56 cents a bushel. The following August it was selling for 26 cents a bushel. That was deflation with a vengeance. The farmer was considered then, as he is considered in some quarters now, as a section of our population that was expendable. A bond salesman who was working in my district in the State of Missouri last summer said, "It does not make any difference about the farmers. They are only about 13.3 percent of our population anyway, and this country can remain prosperous with them or without them."

Many people had that idea in the 1920's. So farmers dragged along, borrowing more money from the banks, increasing their mortgage debt just as they are doing now.

The stock market went up and up and up and burst out through the ceiling. Interest rates went up and up and up and the price of beef, pork, milk, eggs, and wheat produced on the American farms did not go down gradually, it fell down in 1922 and 1923 and just went along at bankrupt prices until the farmer could no longer buy the products of labor and industry. Then factory chimneys ceased to smoke and 9,976 banks went broke with no deposits in them guaranteed. The railroads went into receivership, and our big life-insurance companies went on a moratorium; they could not lend you your cash or loan value of your life-insurance policy. Life-insurance companies in my home county in the State of Missouri scaled their mortgages down 20, 30, and some of them even 50 percent. Two life-insurance companies and one big English estate owned the most of my county in 1933.

Those things happened. Now, I have a listing sheet here that is very recent. It comes from the Production Economies Branch of the Department of Agriculture. It is a little cumbersome, but it is interesting.

Do you realize that in 1932 the net income of all the farmers in the United States was $2 billion? Two billion dollars only? This year it is $11.7 billion. That includes not only the income from the farms but all the income of the farmers who work off the farm. That is the entire farm income, whether it is earned on the farm or whether it is earned in the factory, that is all of it, $11.7 billion. But that is a tremendous difference from $2 billion.

There is another thing that stands out in this listing sheet. In 1952 the value of the livestock on American farms—and these are not my figures, these are from the Department of Agriculture, from the Production Economies Branch, presided over by Mr. Norman J. Wall.

The value of the livestock on American farms in 1952 was $19.5 billion; in 1956 it was $10.8 billion. That is a considerable inventory loss for the American farmer to take in 4 years, and that is one of the facts that I want you gentlemen to take out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and note. Whatever figures I give you here today will either be taken from the Agricultural Statistics published by the Department of Agriculture, or they will come from the Production Economies Branch under Mr. Wall, or they will be taken from the report of the President's Committee of Economic Advisers. If those figures are not available I do not know where we can find reliable figures in the United States.

Look what happens to our net income. Our net income for the 10 years, the average of the 10 years preceding 1952, was $14.2 billion, and preceding 1952 there were 11 years during which the average price of the food and fiber produced on the American farms was more than 100 percent of parity for 11 years without a break. In fact, for that 11 years it averaged 107 percent of parity.

What has happened to the net farm income since 1952? The average for the 10 years just preceding 1952 was $14.2 billion, but in 1953 it was $12.8 billion;

in 1954, $12.3 billion; in 1955, $11 billion. It got a little bit better this year, mostly with soil-bank payments. In 1956 it was $11.7 billion.

So if you will take the 10-year average previous to 1952 as base, the American farmer has lost $9 billion in net income in the last 4 years. While he was losing that $9 billion in net income he suffered also a loss in the value of his livestock of $3,700,000,000. That is something over $18 billion lost in the inventory value of his livestock and in his net income in 4 years, 1952–56, inclusive. Again let me stress these are not my figures.

We had a price-support program that worked. We tried to reenact it in the House, and we did reenact as far as the House was concerned last year. The Senate accepted it. But it went over to the White House and got vetoed. Mr. Benson was left in the Department of Agriculture to continue to deflate the American farmer and drive him into bankruptcy.

The only way I hold the President of the United States responsible for this is: it is my firm belief he is responsible for Mr. Benson, and Mr. Benson is responsible for the condition farmers are in today. That is not a direct responsibility, but it is still a responsibility.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Does the gentleman attach any importance to the fact that in this period of time the Korean war had ended and, therefore, a factor that might have had some artificial stimulus on the price of agricultural products is no longer with us and that that, perhaps, might be responsible for some reduction in farm prices?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Does the gentleman contend that in order for the farmers of the United States to have a fair price for their food and fiber, we have to have a war?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. No. I thought that is what the gentleman from Missouri was saying. I certainly did not say that.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Well, we had a program that worked, there is no question about that, and it did not cost a bankrupting amount of money to the Federal Government.

Here are some more figures that are very interesting. On December 31, 1952, the Commodity Credit Corporation had $1,399,000,000 in outstanding loans on food and fiber stored either on farms or in commercial warehouses, and an inventory of $1,053,000,000 a total of $2,452,000,000.

What has happened to the Commodity Credit Corporation in the last 4 years? On December 31, 1956—that is the 31st of December just past—that $1,399,000,000 had risen to $2,319,000,000, and an inventory that was $1,530,000,000 had risen to $5,892,000,000. In other words, the Commodity Credit Corporation had in storage food and fiber to the value of $2,452,000,000 4 years ago. Now it has $8,211,000,000 worth of it.

I do not think it was necessary for Ezra Taft Benson to keep all that food and fiber with the Commodity Credit Corporation if he had wanted to sell it. The Honorable JAMIE WHITTEN, of Mississippi, demonstrated beyond doubt that the Secretary of Agriculture had to be driven to sell cotton. He sold a lot of it in the last year. He could have been selling it for the previous 3 years. Ezra Taft Benson has indicated by every action he has taken that it was his intention to destroy the price-support program in the United States in its entirety: lock, stock, and barrel.

Now, the Department of Agriculture tells me, Mr. Speaker, that there were 14,609,000,000 man-hours of labor used in the United States in 1955 to produce food and fiber that was produced on the American farm during that period. Well, if the farmer had a net income of $11,100,000,000, he worked for 75 cents an hour and did not get a cent interest on his investment. And, we have a $1 minimum wage. All right. If he was paid 5 percent on his investment, he worked for 31 cents an hour. Mr. Benson says it is too much. If he does not say it with his lips, he says it with his actions, because he seeks by every action he takes to drive the price of farm products lower and lower. And, we already have a farm depression, and if we have it long enough, we will have a nationwide depression. Even our Secretary of the Treasury says that if we are not careful, we will have a depression that will curl our hair.

Now, while the farmer has been taking cuts like that in his income and in the inventory value of his livestock, what has happened to his debts? Well, instead of paying the banks anything in the last 4 years, he has borrowed $3.1 billion more from them. Instead of paying anything on his mortgage, he has gone to the loan companies for $3.8 billion more mortgage money. That is costing him $375 million a year more interest than he was already paying. One of these days you are going to say that the farmer has gone on a buyer's strike. Sure. He will soon be to the place where he will not have any money; he will not have any more unpledged collateral at the bank, and his mortgage will be as high as the loan company will take it, and at that time he will go on a buyer's strike. At that time your factory chimneys will not smoke any more and your laborers will not draw the more than $2 an hour that they are now drawing.

What has happened to the population in the United States? In 1952 there were 155.5 million of us in the United States. Now, these figures came from the Bureau of the Census yesterday. They are reliable and they are current. In 1952 there were 155.5 million of us and 24.1 million lived on the farm. In 1956 there were 169.9 million of us and only 22.5 million of us on the farm. While the overall population increased 14.4 million in 4 years, the farm population decreased 1.5 million in the same 4 years.

What does that mean? To me it means babies are being born on the farm just the same as they always were, but just as soon as they get big enough to get off the farm they go to the city where they will get that $2 an hour and let the old farm grow up in brush. I do not blame them. Do you know that less than 50 percent of the farm homes in the United States today have a telephone? That is what I was told yesterday by the Bureau of the Census—less than 50 percent of the farm homes have a telephone. I can remember when they had no electric refrigeration, no electric lights, no roads from town to the farm except a ditch between two fences that was mud when it rained and hard ruts when it did not. I have lived it.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am wondering why the farmers who do not have telephones did not get them during those lush years when the other agricultural program was in effect.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. The telephone companies in many instances said that it was not feasible to put lines in there, that there would not be enough subscribers. That is the reason we have REA telephone programs. When the telephone companies skimmed the cream off the crock of milk, they just left 60 to 70 percent of the farmers down in the skim milk because they did not figure it would pay them enough to build those lines out over the hills and over those roads.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I agree that is a very fine program, but I did not think it had too much to do with the support price for farm products.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I am glad to yield to the Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. One of the reasons why we did not have telephone lines out on the farm is that the people who controlled the telephones would not build them. And they will not build them now. The only reason we get any telephones out on the farms is because of legislation that we passed here in the House. Free enterprise had the opportunity for 50 years of electrifying the farm homes of this country. When we passed the rural electrification bill in 1934 less than 3 percent of the farm homes in the great Southwest had the comforts and the conveniences of rural electrification; because they would not build the lines. Then we loaned this money to these farm cooperatives and now, in my neighborhood, instead of fewer than 3 percent of the farm homes being electrified, more than 90 percent of them are electrified. The reason for that is the laws that we passed.

Let us get back to one more thing, and this is not about the Korean war. The facts stare us in the face that in the first 4 years of the Eisenhower Administration, farm income in the United States went down more than $4 billion.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, it is $9 billion according to the latest figures that I have. I thank the distinguished Speaker whom I love very much.

In passing I want to say that the farmers and the ranchers of the State of Texas have lost $1 billion since 1952; I have checked the figure and it is a little

over $1 billion in those 4 years. Still they voted for Eisenhower last fall, and if the Speaker knows why, he knows a lot more about his folks than I have been able to find out.

Mr. RAYBURN. Let me say this to the gentleman about my own experience in the cattle business. Nineteen hundred and fifty-three was the last year that I made a dollar raising and marketing cattle. I have taken substantial losses every year since.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I would like to say to the Speaker that in 1952 my farm sent 200,000 pounds of grade A milk to Kansas City, and it sold for $6 in Kansas City and retailed for 20 cents a quart. In 1955 I sent 170,000 pounds of the same kind of milk to Kansas City, which sold delivered for $4 a hundred and retailed for 21 to 23 cents a quart. Somebody put 1 to 3 cents a quart on the price of that milk to the people who drink it and took $2 a hundred off the price that they gave me.

I said in a speech in Kansas City that I like to sell my milk, not give it away, but if I must give it away I would like to have the privilege of giving it to the people who drink it, and I could not even do that.

We are traveling the same road we traveled in the twenties. Interest is going up. I cannot agree with the people that say that the way to control inflation is to raise interest rates and make money harder to get and make everything cost the people more. I can no more agree with that than I can agree with Secretary Benson when he says the lower you drive farm produce prices the less you will have as a surplus. That applies only when it takes the farmer completely out of business.

If 100 head of No. 1 butchers will pay my overhead I will raise 100 head of No. 1 butchers. If it takes 200 head in order to get that money that I must have, I will strain a point to raise that 200 head, if possible, rather than have the disgrace and the ruin of having my home sold at the east front door of the courthouse; and every other farmer will do the same. The lower you drive the prices the more the farmer will try to produce in order to exist. One of those theories is just as faulty as the other.

There is a school of thought in the United States that holds money is a commodity to be bought, sold, hoarded, cornered, or manipulated for the exclusive benefit of the 3 percent of our population that have it in abundance. There is another school of thought that believes that money is a medium of exchange, something to trade for goods and services. That is the philosophy I have of money. There ought to be enough money and enough credit to take care of the business of the country. Hard money will drive us into a depression quicker than permitting the goods and services of the United States to flow to the people so it can be used.

The trouble was in 1952 the American farmer had had 100 percent of parity so long that he had argued himself into the belief that he could vote the Republican ticket and still have it, but you cannot do it. We demonstrated it in the 1920's and we have demonstrated it again since 1952.

## COL. DEAN HESS, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HENDERSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, I wish to call to the attention of the House of Representatives the work of Col. Dean Hess of the United States Air Force whose activities and career symbolize the finest traditions and ideals of our Armed Forces. These principles combine a deep understanding of this Nation's dedication to the cause of freedom and humanity with the will to serve in the advancement of that cause.

Colonel Hess is a citizen-soldier who has dedicated his life to the opposition of tyranny and the assistance of his fellow men innocently involved in those actual battlefield areas where the continuing struggle has erupted into warfare and bloodshed. He is a minister of the Church of Christ-Disciples who has left his pulpit twice to fight the predatory advance of those nations whose avowed purposes would destroy all semblance of Christian doctrine. His return to the ministry awaits the removal of those perils which now threaten the enslavement of the world in a godless conspiracy.

This fine gentleman is a native and resident of Marietta in Ohio's 15th Congressional District and is a graduate of Marietta College, that excellent educational institution on the banks of the Ohio River which has produced so many leaders in all walks of life for more than a century. I am privileged to know Colonel Hess and to have had the opportunity to share with him in conversation some of his notable experiences.

Like millions of other young Americans, Colonel Hess entered military service following Pearl Harbor to become a combat pilot in the Air Force, flying 63 missions over Germany in World War II. In 1950, this "flying parson" began his assignment of developing the South Korean Air Force to defend that tragic nation in its fight for survival against Communist aggression.

In Korea, Colonel Hess saw the extreme suffering of the people of that valiant nation. He shared the anguish felt by all of our servicemen there over the destruction which was wrought as the conflict raged up and down that small peninsula. The most tragic aspect of that destruction was the homeless, starving children orphaned in the death and confusion of war. These were the hapless pawns left friendless to live or die by their wits. They knew only battlefield and the vague recollection of the security of a home and parents before this new environment had burst forth with such awful suddenness.

Even in the urgency of combat, Colonel Hess and his men in the Fifth Air worked to find some means to care for the Korean children who wandered in their makeshift orphanage. At last, more than 1,080 children had crowded into the crude facilities. Then, another peril endangered their survival. The following is Quentin Reynolds' report of these events in the current issue of the Reader's Digest:

> In December it became clear that Seoul would fall to the Communists. Hess was flying 8 hours a day and worrying about those helpless kids the other 16. Somehow they had to be evacuated. But where could they go? Suddenly Hess remembered hearing about an abandoned agricultural school on the island of Cheju. He phoned Korean Naval headquarters, blurted out the desperate need, and was promised an LST to transport the children to the island. It would arrive the next morning.
>
> At dawn, the children were taken to the dock. Between missions that day Hess watched for the LST. None came. Then in the late afternoon he got the bad news: the ship was needed to evacuate hard-pressed Marines from the Hungnam area.
>
> In desperation Hess appealed to the Fifth Air Force headquarters. The kids had been huddling on the dock in freezing weather now for 12 hours, and 7 had died of exposure. The Fifth Air Force couldn't promise anything, but told him to move the children to Kimpo airport and they'd do what they could. Hess rounded up some trucks and put the weakest ones in them; the others had to trudge the long 10 miles to the airstrip. There they waited, with no shelter, shivering in the icy blasts.
>
> Hess prayed that help would come before it was too late—and then he heard the sound of engines. Three big C–54's appeared in the sky. Before they had taxied to a stop, more C–54's appeared. There were 15 in all, and Hess could only stand and wonder at the miracle. The planes had been sent by Gen. Earl Partridge, commanding officer of the Fifth Air Force.
>
> Flight nurses, doctors, orderlies carrying blankets and medical supplies piled out and started the rescue mission that became known as "Operation Kiddie Car." Within an hour more than a thousand ragged little figures had been bundled into the planes and shipped off to Cheju.

This was one of the more dramatic events in the crusade of Colonel Hess. Even though the guns are stilled on those battlegrounds, the wounds of human misery in Korea are slow to heal and this Air Force officer continues to work for the orphan children.

His book, Battle Hymn, recounting these experiences, is an inspiring testimonial to Colonel Hess' deep dedication to humanity. It has now been made into a motion picture which I have been privileged to see. The proceeds from both the book and its movie version have been directed by Colonel Hess for the support of Korean orphans.

We in southeastern Ohio are honored that the first public showing of this film will occur in Marietta on February 14. It has been made the occasion of important civic events wherein the city of Marietta and Marietta College will combine in honoring Colonel Hess. Ohio's Gov. William O'Neill, himself a native of this city, Governor Underwood, of West Virginia, and the Ambassador of South Korea to the United States will join with many other dignitaries and well-known personalities to make this occasion a truly memorable one in tribute to this eminent and modest Ohioan.

## PRICE OF CRUDE OIL IN OHIO

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but remark after the speech

made earlier in the afternoon by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD] that the great State of Texas is not the only one which is producing oil—that Ohio, although not on as grand a scale as Texas, is also an important producer of oil. The daily production is approximately 12,960 barrels a day.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD] has mentioned that the production of oil and the price of oil are some of the questions of public interest. I am pleased to know that an investigation into some of these matters is going to be made in the near future, particularly on why the price of petroleum has gone up.

Mr. Speaker, I can point out a fact which is known not only to oil producers in Ohio, but also to farmers and landowners of southeastern Ohio who are receiving royalties from oil production which serve to supplement their incomes from the hilly farms. And that fact is this: that while the price of oil and petroleum products may be in some cases increasing, in Ohio the price of crude oil has decreased. In 1948 the price of Buckeye-Pennsylvania grade was $4.79 a barrel. Now it is $4.23 a barrel—a decrease of 12 percent. In 1948 Corning oil was $3.10. Now it averages $2.94—a decrease of 5 percent. These two grades of oil account for 11,000 of the State's 12,960 barrels of average daily production.

While the people of this country are wondering why the price of petroleum and petroleum products has increased, there are farmers in southeastern Ohio who are even more amazed at the increase in view of the fact that they are receiving less for oil today than they were in 1948.

The Marietta Daily Times in its editorial of February 5, 1957, presents this paradox in a very interesting manner and concludes as follows:

Investigators should have little difficulty uncovering these changes in operating costs. As for the motorist, whose consumption of crude oil is mostly in the form of highly refined gasoline, a big portion of the price he pays continues to be tax, State and Federal. In Ohio it is 8 cents on a gallon. The national average is a little higher. That amounts to more than a dollar on a tankful.

## COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 4090.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 15 minutes, today.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HAYS of Ohio and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ABBITT (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Virginia) and include extraneous matters.

Mr. RIVERS and to include a statement by Representative MASON before the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. BASS of New Hampshire) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KILGORE and to include a speech made by Mr. HOLIFIELD.

Mr. WILLIS (at the request of Mr. PRICE).

Mr. HILLINGS (at the request of Mr. BASS of New Hampshire) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ELLIOTT (at the request of Mr. COAD) and to include extraneous matter.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 11, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

## COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

### COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

JANUARY 14, 1957.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1956, to December 31, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| John J. Heimburger | Counsel | $7,399.98 |
| Francis M. LeMay | Staff consultant | 6,808.86 |
| Mabel C. Downey | Clerk | 7,399.98 |
| George L. Reid, Jr. | Assistant clerk | 7,399.98 |
| Lydia Vacin | Staff assistant | 3,843.54 |
| Pauline E. Graves | do | 3,483.90 |
| Betty M. Prezioso | do | 3,338.31 |
| Gladys Ondarcho | do | 3,074.30 |
| Diane Johnston | do | 604.68 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $50,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 28,951.98 |
| Amount expended from June 30, 1956, to Dec. 31, 1956 | 5,256.76 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1955, to Dec. 31, 1956 | 34,208.74 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956 | 15,791.26 |

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman.*

### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JANUARY 11, 1957.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Charles G. Haynes | Director of surveys and investigations. | $5,991.42 |
| Richard F. McIlwain | Assistant director of surveys and investigations. | 5,991.42 |
| Ralph W. Horton | Investigator | 5,805.66 |
| Rose Marie Borda | Stenographer | 2,587.90 |
| Ethel P. Powers | do | 2,310.72 |
| John J. Bachmann | Consultant | 3,240.00 |
| John J. Donnelly | do | 5,151.50 |
| Engelhardt, Engelhardt, Leggett and Cornell. | do | 4,000.00 |
| Marion N. Hardesty | do | 6,650.00 |
| Alvin C. Loewer, Jr. | do | 2,362.50 |
| John B. St. John | do | 400.00 |
| Daniel D. Whitcraft, Jr. | do | 5,550.00 |
| REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES | | |
| ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION | | |
| Albert P. Pollman | Investigator | $3,037.46 |
| FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION | | |
| Carl L. Bennett | do | 5,265.68 |
| Harold H. Hair | do | 4,352.40 |
| Thomas J. Jenkins | do | 3,577.45 |
| Hugh B. McGahey | do | 3,582.59 |
| Richard A. Miller | do | 5,265.68 |
| Robert M. Murphy | do | 5,157.35 |
| James E. Nugent | do | 6,383.56 |
| Robert E. Rightmyer | do | 5,719.06 |
| John A. Rubl | do | 4,180.39 |
| Andrew J Shannon | do | 3,346.37 |
| Glenn A. Trofast | do | 3,582.59 |
| Samuel E. Virden II | do | 3,936.91 |
| GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION | | |
| Howard K. Chapman, Jr. | do | 3,162.98 |
| John W. Flatley | do | 2,083.84 |
| John H. Holmead | do | 2,903.40 |
| W. Trigg Miller | do | 1,014.47 |
| Robert J. Rickey | do | 665.00 |
| Joseph E. Vaughan | do | 631.92 |
| HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, DEPARTMENT OF | | |
| Majorie C. Hymans | Stenographer | 847.12 |
| McGuire, James N | Investigator | 1,080.42 |
| Travel and miscellaneous expense. | | 18,112.59 |

EXPENDITURES IN PREVIOUS PERIOD NOT REPORTED AGAINST 1956 APPROPRIATION

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES | | |
| General Services Administration: | | |
| W. Trigg Miller | Investigator | $362.31 |
| Federal Bureau of Investigation: | | |
| Carl L. Bennett | do | 844.12 |
| Richard A. Miller | do | 844.12 |
| Robert M. Murphy | do | 826.75 |
| James E. Nugent | do | 1,003.63 |
| Robert E. Rightmyer. | do | 916.80 |
| Travel and miscellaneous expenses. | | 4,663.54 |
| Total | | 9,461.27 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $500,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1956, to Dec. 31, 1956 | 137,930.35 |
| Total amount expended from July 1, 1956, to Dec. 31, 1956 | 137,930.35 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956 | 362,069.65 |

CLARENCE CANNON,
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JANUARY 11, 1957.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Corhal D.Orescan | Clerk and staff director. | $7,399.98 |
| Kenneth Sprankle | do | 7,399.98 |
| Paul M. Wilson | do | 7,399.98 |
| Jay B. Howe | Staff assistant | 6,808.86 |
| Ross P. Pope | do | 6,808.86 |
| Robert M. Moyer | do | 6,808.86 |
| Carson W. Culp | do | 6,808.86 |
| Samuel W. Crosby | do | 6,808.86 |
| Harris H. Huston | do | 6,808.86 |
| Frank Sanders | do | 6,288.66 |
| Eugene B. Wilhelm | do | 6,288.66 |
| George S. Green | Clerk to minority | 6,325.80 |
| E. L. Eckloff | Clerk to majority | 6,325.80 |
| Robert P. Williams | Editor | 5,917.14 |
| Robert L. Michaels | Staff assistant | 5,322.60 |
| G. Homer Skarin | do | 4,727.94 |
| Earl C. Silsby | do | 4,564.44 |
| Lawrence C. Miller | Assistant editor | 3,723.66 |
| Francis G. Merrill | Staff assistant | 3,552.42 |
| Samuel R. Preston | Junior staff assistant | 3,124.26 |
| Donald R. Bridges | Clerical assistant | 2,353.50 |
| Donald F. Berens | do | 2,267.88 |
| John C. Pugh | Consultant | 1,461.00 |
| Randolph Thomas | Janitor-messenger | 1,601.52 |
| Delores Cropper | Clerk-stenographer to the chairman. | 2,610.42 |
| Julia M. Elliott | Clerk-stenographer | 2,610.42 |
| Rose Ann Nimitz | do | 2,610.42 |
| Mary A. Vaughan | do | 2,610.42 |
| Phyllis N. Troy | do | 2,610.42 |
| William J. Neary | do | 2,610.42 |
| Shirley Rae Colley | do | 2,610.42 |
| Catherine D. Norrell | do | 2,610.42 |
| Mildred Burnham | do | 2,175.35 |
| Ruth M. Young | do | 2,610.42 |
| Donald L. Bernard | do | 2,610.42 |
| Agnes Norton | do | 2,610.42 |
| Edwin A. Sheehan | do | 2,610.42 |
| Molly O'Day Saguto | do | 2,524.78 |
| Rose Marie Kline | do | 1,626.12 |
| Margie H. Trew | do | 2,610.42 |
| James W. Dudley | do | 2,610.42 |
| John G. Clevenger | do | 2,610.42 |
| Charles C. Andersen | do | 2,610.42 |
| Gladys Kofmehl | do | 2,610.42 |
| Frank B. Melchior | do | 2,507.64 |
| Monica Smith | Clerk-stenographer to the ranking minority member. | 2,524.80 |
| Frank Mentillo | Clerk-stenographer | 2,353.50 |
| Lenore Cummings | do | 1,961.25 |
| Baert Devos Brand | do | 1,968.18 |
| Margaret D. Lane | do | 2,032.65 |
| Roma E. Jaques | do | 1,396.68 |
| Jane Andrews | do | 1,176.75 |
| Luman H. Long | do | 1,740.28 |
| Barbara Grey | do | 870.14 |
| Elaine M. Hopkins | do | 392.25 |
| Barbara J. Groves | do | 392.25 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $435,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1956, to Dec. 31, 1956 | 196,918.14 |
| Total amount expended from July 1, 1956, to Dec. 31, 1956 | 196,918.14 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956 | 238,081.86 |

CLARENCE CANNON,
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

DECEMBER 31, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1956, to January 3, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Robert W. Smart | Chief counsel | $7,400.00 |
| John R. Blandford | Counsel | 7,366.00 |
| Charles F. Ducander | do | 7,310.45 |
| Philip W. Kelleher | do | 7,310.45 |
| Janice G. Angell | Clerical staff | 3,209.88 |
| Berniece Kalinowski | do | 3,209.88 |
| Oneta L. Stockstill | do | 2,811.67 |
| L. Louise Ellis | do | 2,811.67 |
| Marie M. Abbott | do | 2,262.89 |
| James A. Deakins | do | 2,610.43 |
| John J. Courtney | Special counsel | 7,823.31 |
| Edward T. Fogo | Staff assistant | 5,260.21 |
| Lloyd R. Kuhn | do | 4,081.75 |
| Dorothy Britton | Secretary | 2,828.08 |
| Katherine Staggs | do | 2,653.93 |
| Adeline Tolerton | Clerk | 2,653.93 |
| Ethel L. Mott | do | 2,653.93 |
| James Woolls | Staff assistant | 756.32 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $150,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 91,302.17 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1956, to Jan. 3, 1957 | 30,807.64 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1955, to Jan. 3, 1957 | 122,112.81 |
| Balance unexpended as of Jan. 3, 1957 | 27,887.19 |

CARL VINSON,
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

JANUARY 1, 1957.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1956, to January 1, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Robert L. Cardon | Clerk and counsel | $7,399.98 |
| Orman S. Fink | Professional staff | 7,399.98 |
| John E. Barriere | do | 7,399.98 |
| Elsie G. Whitney | Deputy clerk | 4,951.08 |
| Helen E. Long | Assistant clerk | 3,723.66 |
| Mary W. Layton | Secretary | 3,723.66 |
| Employees pursuant to H. Res. 203 Subcommittee on Housing: | | |
| Eleanor Hamilton | Research assistant | 4,100.46 |
| Alberta Masumiam | Secretary | 3,021.48 |
| John J. McEwan, Jr. | Housing economist | 6,500.46 |
| Robert R. Poston | Chief counsel | 7,399.98 |
| Betty B. Ridgell | Clerk | 3,329.76 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $150,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 63,248.41 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1956, to Dec. 31, 1956 | 31,328.54 |
| Total amount expended from July 1, 1955, to Dec. 31, 1956 | 94,576.95 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956 | 55,423.05 |

BRENT SPENCE,
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DECEMBER 31, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| W. N. McLeod, Jr. | Clerk | $7,400.00 |
| Wendell E. Cable | Minority clerk | 6,258.96 |
| George R. Stewart | Attorney | 6,808.86 |
| Ruth Butterworth | Assistant clerk | 4,031.94 |
| Margaret S. Rogers | do | 2,473.44 |
| Dixon D. Davis | do | 1,851.68 |
| William Gerber | Special attorney (appointed July 9, 1956). | 7,071.09 |
| George W. McCown | Research analyst (appointed July 1, 1956). | 2,439.13 |
| Leonard O. Hilder | Investigator (appointed July 9, to Oct. 31, 1956). | 3,126.89 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $2,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 74.08 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1956 | 1,801.09 |
| Total amount expended from Feb. 24, 1955, to Dec. 31, 1956 | 1,875.17 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956 | 124.83 |

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
*Chairman.*

EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE

JANUARY 11, 1957.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Fred G. Hussey | Chief clerk | $7,399.98 |
| Russell C. Derrickson | Chief investigator | 7,399.98 |
| James M. Brewbaker | General counsel | 7,399.98 |
| John O. Graham | Minority clerk | 7,399.98 |
| Kennedy W. Ward | Assistant general counsel. | 7,399.98 |
| Kathryn Kivett | Assistant clerk | 3,226.98 |
| Jeanne Thomson | Assistant clerk—minority. | 3,226.98 |
| Gloria Ann Gaysden | Assistant clerk | 3,226.98 |
| Marion O. Riddiford | do | 3,226.98 |
| Mary Lynn Venuto | do | 268.91 |
| Michael T. Taylor | Staff assistant | 1,675.80 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $125,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 36,025.13 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1956 | 13,934.91 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1955 to Dec. 31, 1956 | 49,960.04 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956 | 75,039.96 |

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

DECEMBER 31, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Boyd Crawford | Staff administrator and committee clerk. | $7,399.98 |
| Roy J. Bullock | Staff consultant | 7,106.10 |
| Albert C. F. Westphal. | do | 7,106.10 |
| Dumond Peck Hill | do | [1] 4,990.07 |
| Sheldon Z. Kaplan | do | 7,106.10 |
| June Nigh | Staff assistant | 3,723.66 |
| Winifred G. Osborne | do | 3,638.04 |
| Helen C. Mattas | do | 3,638.04 |
| Myrtle M. Melvin | do | 3,638.04 |
| Helen L. Hashagen | do | 3,638.04 |
| Mary L. O'Brien | do | 2,952.96 |
| Roosevelt Taylor | Messenger | [2] 839.01 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $75,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 10,583.29 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1956, to Dec. 31, 1956 | 12,150.81 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1955, to Dec. 31, 1956 | 22,734.10 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956 | 52,265.90 |

[1] For period Aug. 15 to Dec. 31, 1956, inclusive.
[2] For period July 1 to Sept. 30, 1956, inclusive.

JAMES P. RICHARDS,
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JANUARY 23, 1957.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1956, to January 3, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| | |
|---|---|
| Expenses, July 1, 1956 through Jan. 3, 1957: | |
| Full committee | $4,377.92 |
| Special Donable Property Subcommittee | 10,463.41 |
| Special Government Activities Subcommittee | 25,993.79 |
| Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee | 39,560.49 |
| International Operations Subcommittee | 22,641.54 |
| Public Works and Resources Subcommittee | 42,654.94 |
| Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee | 18,719.32 |
| Military Operations Subcommittee | 37,582.27 |
| Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee | 23,450.24 |
| Special Government Information Subcommittee | 30,044.75 |
| Special Water Resources and Power Subcommittee | 18,647.82 |
| Salaries, full committee, July 1-Dec. 31, 1956: | |
| Orville S. Poland, general counsel | 6,853.98 |
| Christine Ray Davis, staff director | 7,399.98 |
| William Pincus, associate general counsel | 7,180.38 |
| Martha C. Roland, staff member | 5,694.18 |
| J. Robert Brown, staff member July 1-31, 1956 | 887.10 |
| Dolores Fel'Dotto, clerk-stenographer | 3,937.80 |
| Ann E. McLachlan, clerk stenographer Sept. 1-Oct. 31, 1956 | 1,075.66 |
| Mona Keating, clerk-stenographer | 2,760.30 |
| Earle J. Wade, staff member | 3,496.74 |
| Helen M. Boyer, minority staff director | 6,437.28 |
| John Philip Carlson, minority counsel | 5,694.18 |

CIII——113

| | |
|---|---|
| Expenses, July, 1, 1956, through Jan. 3, 1957.—Continued | |
| Full committee | $4,377.92 |
| Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman: | |
| Elmer W. Henderson, counsel | 6,166.86 |
| William A. Young, professional staff member | 5,789.08 |
| Emmet V. Mittlebeeler, professional staff member, July 1-Aug. 31, 1956 | 1,338.28 |
| David Glick, investigator | 4,324.72 |
| Ann E. McLachlan, clerk-stenographer, July 1-Aug. 31, 1956; Nov. 1, 1956-Jan. 3, 1957 | 2,205.10 |
| Clara Armstrong, minority-clerical | 2,740.97 |
| Expenses | 885.23 |
| Total | 23,450.24 |
| Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman: | |
| Michael P. Balwan, staff director, July 1-Aug. 17, 1956 | 1,777.87 |
| Herbert Roback, director of investigations, July 1-Aug. 31, 1956; staff director, Sept. 1-Jan. 3, 1957 | 6,922.34 |
| James Eckhart, assistant counsel | 4,640.51 |
| Earl J. Morgan, investigator | 4,640.51 |
| Robert J. McElroy, investigator | 3,568.07 |
| Sylvia L. Swartzel, clerk-stenographer | 3,285.09 |
| Mollie Jo Hughes, clerk-stenographer | 3,285.09 |
| Arlene Roback, clerical (special project, months) | 839.30 |
| Library of Congress, reimbursement for salary of Carey Brewer, Aug. 1-Dec. 31, 1956 | 3,768.74 |
| Expenses | 4,854.75 |
| Total | 37,582.27 |
| Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN, chairman: | |
| James R. Naughton, professional staff member | 5,184.70 |
| Delphis C. Goldberg, professional staff member | 5,109.12 |
| Francis X. McLaughlin, investigator | 3,698.67 |
| Eileen M. Anderson, clerk-stenographer | 3,089.22 |
| Mary E. Davis, clerk-stenographer, July 16-Aug. 31, 1956 | 588.37 |
| Expenses | 1,049.24 |
| Total | 18,719.32 |
| Public Works and Resources Subcommittee, Hon. EARL CHUDOFF, chairman: | |
| Arthur Perlman, staff director | 6,922.34 |
| James A. Lanigan, counsel | 6,620.15 |
| John B. O'Brien, Jr., investigator | 5,033.60 |
| Miles Q. Romney, professional staff member | 4,577.09 |
| Clarence A. Winder, consultant | 1,002.74 |
| Irene Manning, clerk-stenographer | 3,010.90 |
| Joan Heinly, clerk-stenographer | 2,288.29 |
| Expenses | 13,199.83 |
| Total | 42,654.94 |
| International Operations Subcommittee, Hon. PORTER HARDY, Jr., chairman: | |
| Maurice J. Mountain, staff director | 6,620.15 |
| Walton Woods, investigator | 5,273.86 |
| Charles Rothenberg: | |
| Special counsel, July 1-Aug. 31, 1956 | 1,774.20 |
| Consultant, Sept. 1-Dec. 31, 1956 | 2,514.02 |
| Phyllis Seymour, clerk-stenographer | 3,285.09 |
| Angela Hall, clerk-stenographer, Aug. 1-Dec. 31, 1956 | 1,875.65 |
| Mary E. Davis, stenographer, July 1-15, 1956 | 196.13 |
| Expenses | 1,102.44 |
| Total | 22,641.54 |
| Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, chairman: | |
| Curtis E. Johnson, staff director | 6,922.34 |
| Jerome S. Plapinger, counsel | 6,922.34 |
| Stanley T. Fisher, accountant-investigator | 5,184.70 |
| Hal M. Christensen, associate counsel | 4,723.66 |
| John L. Anderson, investigator | 4,590.68 |
| A. Carl Carey, Jr., assistant counsel | 4,590.68 |
| Elizabeth D. Heater, clerk-stenographer | 3,010.89 |
| Barbara L. Tork, stenographer | 2,131.58 |
| Expenses | 1,483.62 |
| Total | 39,560.49 |
| Special Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. JACK BROOKS, chairman: | |
| Vernon McDaniel, staff director | 6,922.34 |
| William Huskey, investigator | 4,264.57 |
| John E. Moore, investigator | 3,694.34 |
| Irma Reel, clerk-stenographer | 2,740.97 |
| William Townsley, counsel | 5,139.37 |
| Expenses | 3,232.20 |
| Total | 25,993.79 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Expenses, July 1, 1956, through Jan. 3, 1957.—Continued | |
| Special Subcommittee on Donable Property, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, chairman: | |
| Ray Ward, staff director | $6,922.34 |
| Margaret O'Connor, clerk-stenographer | 2,786.66 |
| Expenses | 754.41 |
| | 10,463.41 |
| Special Subcommittee on Government Information, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman: | |
| Samuel J. Archibald, staff director | 6,922.34 |
| John J. Mitchell, chief counsel | 6,809.00 |
| J. Lacey Reynolds, senior consultant | 5,637.99 |
| William Fairfield, investigator, July 1 to Sept. 12, 1956 | 2,099.33 |
| Helen K. Beasley, clerk-stenographer | 3,010.90 |
| Catherine Hartke, clerk-stenographer | 3,010.90 |
| Expenses | 2,554.29 |
| Total | 30,044.75 |
| Special Subcommittee on Water Resources and Power, Hon. ROBERT E. JONES, chairman: | |
| William C. Wise, staff director | 6,922.34 |
| William A. Lang, Jr., investigator | 3,697.04 |
| Roy F. Bessey, consultant | 2,600.00 |
| Ann A. Dominek, clerk-stenographer | 2,810.64 |
| Sally Wise, stenographer | 907.02 |
| Expenses | 1,710.78 |
| Total | 18,647.82 |
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | 995,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 621,766.18 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1956 to Jan. 3, 1957 | 274,136.49 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1955 to Jan. 3, 1957 | 895,902.67 |
| Balance unexpended as of Jan. 3, 1957 | 99,097.33 |

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

JANUARY 15, 1957.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Langston, Julian P | Chief clerk | $6,808.86 |
| Savage, Marjorie | Assistant clerk | 6,437.29 |
| Watson, Jack W | do | 5,322.62 |
| Cannon, Lura | do | 4,564.46 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $10,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 751.48 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1956, to Dec. 31, 1956 | 710.15 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 30, 1956, to Dec. 31, 1956 | 1,461.63 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956 | 8,538.37 |

OMAR BURLESON,
*Chairman.*

SUBCOMMITTEE TO STUDY FEDERAL PRINTING AND PAPERWORK OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

JANUARY 7, 1957.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the

following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Billings, Philip B. | Legal counsel | $5,694.18 |
| Campaine, Olga Marie. | Research analyst | 1,734.53 |
| Fodor, Susan Agnes | do | 477.89 |
| Haley, John F. | Staff director | 6,065.76 |
| McWhorter, Julian H. | Technical adviser | 5,694.18 |
| Poore, Asselia S. | Research analyst | 3,295.50 |
| Prout, Marjorie A. | do | 2,439.18 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $75,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 33,076.33 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1956 to Dec. 31, 1956 | 27,344.95 |
| Total amount expended from Aug. 1, 1955 to Dec. 31, 1956 | 60,421.28 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956 | 14,578.72 |

OMAR BURLESON,
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

JANUARY 9, 1957.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| PROFESSIONAL STAFF | | |
| George W. Abbott | Counsel | $6,717.83 |
| Sidney L. McFarland | Engineering consultant | 6,262.68 |
| John L. Taylor | Territories consultant | 6,262.68 |
| George H. Soule, Jr. | Minerals and lands consultant | 6,262.68 |
| CLERICAL STAFF | | |
| Nancy J. Arnold | Chief clerk | 5,545.56 |
| Neida Boding | Clerk | 3,552.42 |
| Gertrude S. Harris | do | 3,552.42 |
| Laura Ann Moran | do | 3,209.88 |
| Eve Fatznick | do | 3,209.88 |
| Geraldine W. Eaker | Clerk (July 1, to Aug. 4, inclusive). | 541.61 |

| | |
|---|---|
| House Resolution 31 | $50,000.00 |
| H. Resolution 629 | 10,000.00 |
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | 60,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 38,278.11 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1956 to Dec. 31, 1956 | [1] 8,645.95 |
| Total amount expended from Feb. 24, 1955 to Dec. 31, 1956 | 46,924.06 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956 | 13,075.94 |

[1] Includes $3,653.23 paid to Eugene D. Eaton, research consultant, in salary for period July 16 to Oct. 31, 1956, inclusive.

CLAIR ENGLE,
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

JANUARY 2, 1957.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Clerical staff: | | |
| Elton J. Layton | Clerk | $7,400.00 |
| Kenneth J. Painter | First assistant clerk | 5,396.94 |
| Herman C. Beasley | Assistant clerk | 4,597.15 |
| Georgia G. Glassmann. | Assistant clerk-stenographer. | 3,295.50 |
| Helen A. Grickis | do | 3,295.50 |
| Roy P. Wilkinson | Assistant clerk | 2,781.70 |
| Margaret J. Beach | Clerk-typist (H. Res. 105, H. Res. 117). | 2,610.43 |
| Pauline Chaternuck | Assistant clerk-stenographer (to July 31, 1956, H. Res. 105, H. Res. 117). | 473.18 |
| Professional staff: | | |
| Andrew Stevenson | Expert | 7,400.00 |
| Kurt Borchardt | Legal counsel | 7,400.00 |
| Sam G. Spal | Research specialist | 7,400.00 |
| Martin W. Cunningham. | Aviation consultant | 7,400.00 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $60,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 19,995.36 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1956 | 12,983.71 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1955, to Dec. 31, 1956 | 32,979.07 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956 (approximate) | 27,020.93 |

OREN HARRIS,
*Acting Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JANUARY 15, 1957.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Bess E. Dick | Staff director | $7,399.98 |
| Bessie M. Orcutt | Administrative assistant. | 6,808.86 |
| William R. Foley | General counsel | 7,399.98 |
| Walter M. Besterman | Legislative assistant | 7,399.98 |
| Thomas F. Broden | Counsel | 6,065.76 |
| Walter R. Lee | Legislative assistant | 7,399.98 |
| Velma Smedley | Clerical staff | 4,564.44 |
| Violet Benn | do | 4,237.50 |
| Anne J. Berger | do | 4,237.50 |
| Lola Bikul | do | 3,723.66 |
| Frances Christy | do | 4,151.88 |
| Helen Goldsmith | do | 3,980.58 |
| Mary D. Weil | do | 3,295.50 |

SALARIES PAID JULY THROUGH DECEMBER, 1956 PURSUANT TO H. RES. 98 AND H. RES. 355, 84TH CONG.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Herbert N. Maletz | Counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee. | $6,437.28 |
| Kenneth R. Harkins | Cocounsel, Antitrust Subcommittee. | 6,065.76 |
| Samuel R. Pierce, Jr. | Associate Counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee. | 6,065.76 |
| Jerrold Walden | do | 1,850.66 |

SALARIES PAID JULY THROUGH DECEMBER, 1956 PURSUANT TO H. RES. 98 AND H. RES. 355, 84TH CONG.—continued

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Leonard Appel | Assistant Counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee. | $5,322.60 |
| Thomas H. McGrail | do | 2,890.81 |
| Julian H. Singman | do | 4,564.44 |
| Herbert Fuchs | do | 3,803.70 |
| Lucille Brooks | Clerical | 3,080.58 |
| Gertrude C. Burak | do | 3,552.42 |
| Roberta Eisenberg | do | 3,021.48 |
| Elizabeth Meekins | do | 2,867.34 |
| Michael Kelemonick | do | 2,696.04 |
| Marianne Higgs | do | 228.74 |
| Robert Bauman | Messenger | 1,678.02 |
| Shelia Warren White | Clerical, Antitrust Subcommittee. | 250.00 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds for preparation of United States Code, District of Columbia Code, and revision of the laws: | |
| A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year): | |
| Unexpended balance June 30, 1956 | $83,279.02 |
| Expended, July 1–Dec. 31, 1956 | 24,442.26 |
| Balance, Dec. 31, 1956 | 58,836.76 |
| B. Revision of the laws: | |
| Appropriated by Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957 | 16,500.00 |
| Expended July 1–Dec. 31, 1956 | 7,414.98 |
| Balance, Dec. 31, 1956 | 9,085.02 |
| C. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code (no year): | |
| Unexpended balance, June 30, 1956 | 2,764.01 |
| Expended | 0 |
| Balance, Dec. 31, 1956 | 2,764.01 |
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | 225,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 126,437.25 |
| Amount expended from July to Dec. 31, 1956 | 62,110.38 |
| Total amount expended from Mar. 30, 1955, to Dec. 12, 1956 | 188,547.63 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956 | 36,452.37 |

EMANUEL CELLER,
*Chairman.*

MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE

JANUARY 15, 1957.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| John M. Drewry | Chief counsel | $7,301.46 |
| Bernard J. Zincke | Counsel | 6,808.86 |
| Charles F. Warren | Assistant counsel | 4,564.44 |
| Frances Still | Clerk | 5,471.22 |
| William B. Winfield | Assistant clerk | 4,066.20 |
| Edith Gordon | Secretary | 3,226.98 |
| Ruth Brookshire | Assistant clerk | 3,226.98 |
| Vera Barker | Secretary | 3,226.98 |
| Shirley Schwartz | Minority clerk | 4,066.20 |

| | |
|---|---|
| H. Res. 89 | $50,000.00 |
| H. Res. 566 | 25,000.00 |
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | 75,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 40,154.39 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1956 | 20,683.16 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1956 | 60,837.55 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956 | $14,162.45 |
| Estimated additional obligations | 2,744.40 |
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 654) | 10,000.00 |
| Amount expended from July 27 to Dec. 31, 1956 | 5,090.55 |
| Balance as of Dec. 31, 1956 | 4,909.45 |

All vouchers have not been submitted.

HERBERT C. BONNER,
*Chairman.*

---

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

JANUARY 11, 1957.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Frederick C. Belen | Chief counsel | $7,399.98 |
| Charles E. Johnson | Counsel | 7,143.24 |
| Henry C. Cassell | Clerk | 6,455.88 |
| Weldon T. Ellis, Jr. | Professional staff member. | 6,455.88 |
| John B. Price | Assistant clerk | 3,809.34 |
| Lillian Hopkins | do | 3,723.66 |
| Lucy K. Daley | do | 3,552.42 |
| Elsie Thornton | Stenographer | 2,824.50 |
| Blanche Simons | do | 2,824.50 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $75,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 16,588.60 |
| Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1956 | 13,900.08 |
| Total amount expended from Aug. 1, 1955, to Dec. 31, 1956 | 30,548.68 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956 | 44,451.32 |

TOM MURRAY,
*Chairman.*

---

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

JANUARY 14, 1957.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Charles G. Tierney | Chief clerk and counsel. | $7,400.00 |
| Robert F. McConnell | Counsel | 7,400.00 |
| Joseph H. McGann, Sr. | Consultant | 6,808.86 |
| Margaret R. Beiter | Assistant chief clerk | 5,322.60 |
| S. Philip Cohen | Staff assistant | 3,809.34 |
| Helen Dooley | do | 4,564.44 |
| Helen A. Thompson | do | 3,766.50 |
| Louise B. Cullen | do | 3,766.50 |
| Herman J. Sloves | Staff assistant (July 1, through Aug. 7, 1956). | 765.42 |
| Estes Saunders | Clerk-messenger | 1,839.72 |
| Anna McHale | Staff assistant (from Aug. 8, 1956). | 1,196.38 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $50,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | $24,377.00 |
| Amount expended from June 30, to Dec. 31, 1956 | 4,420.42 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1955 to Dec. 31, 1956 | 28,797.42 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956 | 21,202.58 |

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
*Chairman.*

---

COMMITTEE ON RULES

JANUARY 10, 1957.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Thomas M. Carruthers. | Clerk | $5,322.60 |
| Barbara M. Thornton | Assistant clerk | 3,295.58 |
| Jane Snader | Minority clerk | 4,151.80 |

HOWARD W. SMITH,
*Chairman.*

---

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

JANUARY 29, 1957.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| STANDING COMMITTEE | | |
| Richard Arens | Director | $7,399.98 |
| Juliette P. Joray | Clerk | 4,802.46 |
| Isabel B. Nagel | Clerk-stenographer | 3,295.50 |
| Courtney E. Owens | Investigator | 5,694.18 |
| Rosella Purdy | Secretary to counsel | 3,963.48 |
| Carolyn Roberts | Assistant chief of reference section. | 3,723.66 |
| Thelma I. Scearce | Secretary to investigators. | 3,963.48 |
| Frank S. Tavenner, Jr. | Counsel | 7,399.98 |
| Anne D. Turner | Chief of reference section. | 4,727.94 |
| William A. Wheeler | Investigator | 5,991.42 |
| INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE | | |
| Alice W. Anderson | Information analyst | 3,124.26 |
| Donald T. Appell | Investigator | 6,140.04 |
| Margaret B. Attinello | Information specialist. | 2,610.42 |
| Karl Baarslag | Consultant | 6,140.04 |
| Kay Baird | Clerk-stenographer | 2,995.80 |
| Suanne Blair | Clerk-typist (terminated Aug. 31, 1956). | 613.24 |
| Frank T. Bonora | Investigator | 3,894.96 |
| Jeanne M. Cassebaum | Clerk-typist (appointed Aug. 13, 1956). | 1,390.76 |
| Raymond T. Collins | Investigator | 3,723.66 |
| Patricia R. Crovato | Clerk-typist | 1,873.98 |
| Anniel Cunningham | Information analyst | 3,038.58 |
| John Davies | Clerk-typist (terminated Aug. 11, 1956). | 419.05 |
| Barbara H. Edelschein | Editor | 2,696.04 |
| Elizabeth L. Edinger | Clerk-stenographer | 3,124.26 |
| Karl E. Ettinger | Special consultant (Aug. 15–Aug. 31, 1956). | $277.71 |
| Helen M. Gittings | Research analyst | 3,723.66 |
| Ann C. Goldsmith | Clerk-typist (terminated Sept. 8, 1956). | 625.10 |
| Joan Haletsky | Clerk-typist (terminated Aug. 15, 1956). | 459.93 |
| William F. Heimlich | Consultant (Aug. 15–Oct. 15, 1956). | 1,546.84 |
| Lillian E. Howard | Research analyst | 3,552.42 |
| Vada Hummel | Clerk-stenographer (July 11–Aug. 31, 1956). | 677.55 |
| William Jackson Jones. | Investigator | 4,951.08 |
| Olive M. King | Editor | 3,489.62 |
| Stephen V. Kopunek | Clerk-typist | 2,096.64 |
| Regina McCall | Clerk-typist (appointed Oct. 1, 1956). | 919.86 |
| Joseph P. Orsulak | Clerk-typist (appointed Nov. 19, 1956). | 391.54 |
| Katharine Phillips | Switchboard operator. | 2,053.80 |
| Maureen Roselle | Clerk-stenographer | 2,439.18 |
| Dolores F. Scotti | Investigator | 3,723.66 |
| Josephine Sheetz | Clerk-stenographer | 2,439.18 |
| Lela Mae Stiles | Clerk-typist | 2,439.18 |
| Cele Frey Sweeney | do | 2,267.88 |
| Ruth Tansill | Information analyst (terminated Aug. 31, 1956). | 1,041.42 |
| Max O. Truitt, Jr. | Clerk-typist (terminated Sept. 15, 1956). | 909.27 |
| D. Pauline Umberson | Clerk-typist (terminated Aug. 31, 1956). | 613.24 |
| Lorraine N. Veley | Clerk-stenographer | 3,124.26 |
| Vera L. Watts | Clerk-stenographer (appointed Aug. 1, 1956). | 2,418.00 |
| Richard S. Weil | Research analyst | 3,980.58 |
| Billie Wheeler | Clerk-stenographer (terminated Aug. 31, 1956). | 1,012.86 |
| George C. Williams | Investigator | 4,951.08 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $500,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 343,381.60 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1956 | 133,229.35 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1955 to Dec. 31, 1956 | 476,610.95 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956 | 23,389.05 |

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
*Chairman.*

---

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

DECEMBER 31, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| FULL COMMITTEE | | |
| Oliver E. Meadows | Staff director | $7,399.98 |
| Edwin B. Patterson | Counsel | 7,399.98 |
| Harold A. L. Lawrence. | Professional staff (minority). | 6,808.86 |
| J. Buford Jenkins | Housing consultant | 6,511.62 |
| George Fisher | Clerk | 6,808.86 |

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| FULL COMMITTEE—continued | | |
| Ida Rowan | Clerk (minority) | $6,808.86 |
| Paul K. Jones | Assistant clerk | 5,322.60 |
| Helen A. Biondi | do | 4,151.88 |
| Alice V. Matthews | Clerk-stenographer | 3,638.04 |
| George J. Turner | Assistant clerk | 3,509.58 |
| INVESTIGATING STAFF | | |
| Sam Hardy | Investigator | 787.99 |
| W. N. Furey | do | 3,031.70 |
| Adin M. Downer | Staff member | 6,114.16 |
| Joanne Doyle | Clerk-stenographer | 2,921.84 |
| Jean Johnson | do | 3,838.84 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (1st and 2d sess., 84th) | $85,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 40,199.53 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1956 | 25,625.79 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1955 to Dec. 31, 1956 | 65,825.32 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956 | 19,174.68 |

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
*Chairman.*

---

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

JANUARY 18, 1957.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

**The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Full committee: | |
| Leo H. Irwin, clerk (C) | $7,399.98 |
| Russell E. Train, minority adviser (P) to Nov. 9, 1956 | 5,262.21 |
| Thomas A. Martin, assistant clerk (P) | 7,106.10 |
| John M. Martin, Jr., professional assistant (P) | 6,258.96 |
| James W. Riddell, professional assistant (P) | 6,258.96 |
| Frances C. Russell, staff assistant (C) | 4,515.42 |
| Susan Alice Taylor, staff assistant (C) | 4,066.20 |
| Virginia M. Butler, staff assistant (C) | 3,338.34 |
| Anne Gordon, staff assistant (C) | 3,338.34 |
| Grace G. Kagan, staff assistant (C) | 3,338.34 |
| Irene Wade, staff assistant (C) | 3,338.34 |
| Virginia Brannock, staff assistant (C) | 3,021.48 |
| Frances E. Donovan, staff assistant (C) | 3,021.48 |
| Hughlon Greene, messenger | 2,048.09 |
| Walter B. Little, messenger | 2,048.09 |
| Expenses, full committee | 1,909.87 |
| Customs, Tariffs and Reciprocal Trade Agreements Subcommittee, Hon. HALE BOGGS, chairman: | |
| Edwin G. Martin, counsel from Aug. 27, 1956 | 5,097.76 |
| Loyle A. Morrison, chief economist from Aug. 27, 1956 | 5,097.76 |
| Charles Nutter, administrative officer from Aug. 27, 1956 | 5,097.76 |
| Myer Rashish, consultant from Sept. 22, 1956 | 3,908.36 |
| Robert L. Treanor, research economist, from Oct. 1, 1956 | 2,512.68 |
| Harriet I. Lane, staff assistant (C) from Aug. 19, 1956 | 2,416.70 |
| Gizella Huber, research economist from Sept. 20, 1956 | 2,252.77 |
| Mary G. Chapin, staff assistant (C) from Oct. 15, 1956 | 1,275.74 |
| Fannie Sue Vanes, staff assistant (C) from Dec. 1, 1956 | 503.58 |
| Expenses | 4,217.71 |
| Total | 32,380.82 |
| Excise Taxes Subcommittee, Hon. AIME J. FORAND, chairman: | |
| Milton J. Kolb, consultant from Oct. 9, 1956 | $4,375.00 |
| Charles W. Hester, consultant from Oct. 15, 1956 | 3,124.44 |
| Jack Poe, consultant from Oct. 21, 1956 | 2,877.77 |
| June A. Kendall, staff assistant (C) from Oct. 5, 1956 | 1,799.55 |
| Martha L. Lockwood, staff assistant (C) from Dec. 17, 1956 | 187.05 |
| Expenses | 2,370.95 |
| Total | 14,734.76 |
| Internal Revenue Taxation Subcommittee, Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman: | |
| Expenses | 20,680.89 |
| Total | 20,680.89 |
| Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditures | 325,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | −10,469.92 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1956, to Dec. 31, 1956 | −67,796.47 |
| Total amount expended July 1, 1956, to Dec. 31, 1956, and previously reported | 78,266.39 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956 | 246,733.61 |
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | 5,000.00 |
| Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditures | 325,000.00 |
| Total | 330,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 10,469.92 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1956, to Dec. 31, 1956 | −1,909.87 |
| Amount expended, subcommittees | −67,796.47 |
| Total amount expended from July 1, 1956, to Dec. 31, 1956 | 69,706.34 |
| | +10,469.92 |
| | −80,176.26 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956 | 249,823.74 |

JERE COOPER,
*Chairman.*

---

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

JANUARY 1, 1957.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

**The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:**

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Everette MacIntyre | Staff director and general counsel. | $7,399.98 |
| Wm. Summers Johnson. | Chief economist and assistant staff director. | 6,808.86 |
| Marie M. Stewart | Clerk | 3,552.42 |
| Jane M. Deem | Administrative assistant, clerk. | 3,552.42 |
| Harry S. Weidberg | Assistant counsel and investigator. | 5,173.98 |
| Irving Maness | do | 5,173.98 |
| Justinus Gould | do | 5,173.98 |
| Lois E. Allison | Economist | 3,616.62 |
| Eunice V. Hutton | Research analyst, secretary. | 3,552.42 |
| Katherine C. Blackburn. | Research analyst | 3,423.96 |
| Clarence D. Everett | Investigator | 3,552.42 |
| Milton S. Fairfax | Secretary | 3,552.42 |
| Ila D. Coe | Stenographer | 2,696.04 |
| Clara G. Romero | do | 2,696.04 |
| Alice Fay Ebert | do | 647.50 |
| Margaret Fallon Palmer. | Research analyst | 3,295.50 |
| Warren H. Biscalluz | Assistant counsel and investigator. | 606.34 |
| Wm. F. Vail | Stenographer, typist. | $449.34 |
| Victor P. Dalmas | Adviser to minority members. | 4,534.32 |
| Mildred C. Darrow | Secretary, stenographer to minority. | 2,867.34 |
| Harry Olsher | Assistant to the chairman. | 2,368.28 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $330,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 210,912.56 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1956, to Dec. 31, 1956 | 82,449.79 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1955, to Dec. 31, 1956 | 293,362.35 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956 | 36,637.65 |

WRIGHT PATMAN,
*Chairman.*

---

SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF THE FINANCIAL POSITION OF THE WHITE COUNTY BRIDGE COMMISSION

JANUARY 11, 1957.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

**The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:**

| | |
|---|---|
| No funds have been expended by the select committee for staff salaries. | |
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $10,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 4,334.91 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1956 | 79.42 |
| Total amount expended from July 21, 1955 to Dec. 31, 1956 | 4,414.33 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1956 | 5,585.67 |

WINFIELD K. DENTON,
*Chairman.*

---

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 1956

JANUARY 31, 1957.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

**The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 5-month-and-3-days' period from August 1, 1956, to January 3, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:**

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 5-month, 3-day period |
|---|---|---|
| Gillis W. Long | Chief counsel | $5,787.53 |
| Richard T. Allen | Chief investigator | 5,155.89 |
| C. P. J. Mooney | Associate chief counsel | 2,009.93 |
| Raymond D. Watts | Associate counsel | 1,560.39 |
| J. Russell Anders | do | 857.56 |
| Ruth Heritage | Clerk | 4,524.21 |
| Barbara Groves | Secretary | 418.92 |
| Total | | 20,314.43 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $30,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | None |
| Amount expended from Aug. 1, 1956 to Jan. 3, 1957 | 25,984.76 |
| Balance unexpended as of Jan. 3, 1957 (approximate) | 4,015.24 |

NOTE.—Bills outstanding, incurred prior to Jan. 3, 1957.

CLIFFORD DAVIS,
*Chairman.*

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

444. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Civil Defense of the District of Columbia, pursuant to Public Law 686, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

445. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of December 31, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

446. A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to provide mail delivery service to rural patrons by the most efficient and economical means possible, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

447. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to make the act approved March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1045, 1057, ch. 422), providing for the appointment of special policemen by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, applicable to Government departments and agencies"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

448. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the designation of holidays for the officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia for pay and leave purposes, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

449. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 3 of the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

450. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 544 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the bonds of United States marshals"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

451. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to fees of United States marshals"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

452. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

453. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize funds for the improvement by the Secretary of Commerce of the Pentagon road network and that portion of the Henry G. Shirley Memorial Highway in Arlington County, Va., and to provide for the transfer of such highways to the Commonwealth of Virginia"; to the Committee on Public Works.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 30. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 29; with amendment (Rept. No. 35). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 68. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 67; with amendment (Rept. No. 36). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 87. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 86; with amendment (Rept. No. 37). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 105. Resolution providing funds for the expenses of studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 104; without amendment (Rept. No. 38). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 114. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 113; with amendment (Rept. No. 39). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 125. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; with amendment (Rept. No. 40). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 126. Resolution providing for certain additional employees; with amendment (Rept. No. 41). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 127. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 94; with amendment (Rept. No. 42). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 136. Resolution to provide funds for necessary miscellaneous expenses of the Committee on the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 43). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 140. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 139; without amendment (Rept. No. 44). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 143. Resolution to provide funds for the investigations and studies made by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs pursuant to House Resolution 64; with amendment (Rept. No. 45). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 144. Resolution authorizing the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives to insure the funds of his office; without amendment (Rept. No. 46). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 146. Resolution providing for expenses of investigations authorized by House Resolution 56; with amendment (Rept. No. 47). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 150. Resolution to provide funds for necessary expenses of the Committee on House Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 48). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 151. Resolution granting 1 year's salary to the estate of Edward Joseph Marshall, late an employee of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 49). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 152. Resolution providing for expenses of investigations authorized pursuant to House Resolution 99; without amendment (Rept. No. 50). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. House Joint Resolution 209. Joint resolution to provide interim assistance, through the Federal National Mortgage Association, in relieving the shortage of funds for home loans pending further investigation of housing credit conditions; without amendment (Rept. No. 51). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4090. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates; without amendment (Rept. No. 52). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. R. 4555. A bill to enable corn producers to participate in the 1957 soil-bank and price-support program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 4556. A bill to encourage new residential construction for veterans' housing in rural areas and small cities and towns by raising the maximum amount in which direct loans may be made from $10,000 to $12,500, to authorize advance financing commitments, to extend the direct-loan program for veterans, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe a rate of interest on guaranteed and direct loans of not more than 5 percent per annum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 4557. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the district of Nevada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4558. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims for basic and overtime compensation of employees of the Alaska Road Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4559. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims for basic and overtime compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 4560. A bill providing for price reporting and research with respect to forest products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 4561. A bill to suspend for 2 years the duty on crude chicory and to amend the

Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to chicory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4562. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 4563. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from $1 to $1.35; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H. R. 4564. A bill to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to make regulations that certain railroad vehicles be equipped with reflectors or luminous material so that they can be readily seen at night; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:

H. R. 4565. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by an individual for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 4566. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide relief with respect to the tax treatment of damages in antitrust actions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 4567. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 4568. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4569. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 4570. A bill to reduce the rate of tax on transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 4571. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, to provide for regulation of the amount of radio and television program time which may be devoted to advertising; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 4572. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code (relating to copyrights) to provide that reception of radio or television programs or the playing of phonographic records in hotels shall not constitute public performances for profit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 4573. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 4574. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide that insured mortgages may be sold to and held by individuals if such mortgages are serviced by approved mortgagees while they are so held; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4575. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of employers who are engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce, to eliminate certain exemptions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4576. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped; to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 4577. A bill for the purpose of constructing at the Dunseith, N. Dak., port of entry Federal facilities for the Bureau of Customs and Immigration and Naturalization Service; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 4578. A bill to provide a method for computing parity prices for manufacturing milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LECOMPTE (by request):

H. R. 4579. A bill to regulate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, to regulate supply of crops and to thereby guard against famine and destitution in any part of the United States and its possessions and in other nations, to promote orderly marketing of crops, to insure against unduly depressive price levels, and to establish a board and corporations for such purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McFALL:

H. R. 4580. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Folsom south unit, American River Division, Central Valley project, in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McINTOSH:

H. R. 4581. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4582. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain seven units of the Greater Wenatchee division, Chief Joseph project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4583. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 4584. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project, in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4585. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the northern district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H. R. 4586. A bill to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System established by the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 814), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NIMTZ:

H. R. 4587. A bill to provide an exemption from participation in the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program for individuals who are opposed to participation in such program on grounds of conscience or religious belief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 4588. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 4589. A bill to enable corn producers to participate in the 1957 soil-bank and price-support programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 4590. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4591. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 4592. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 to provide 20 days of sick leave a year for employees with service-connected disabilities of 10 percent or more; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 4593. A bill to provide for the control of certain advertising on federally owned or controlled lands adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and to encourage such control on other lands adjacent to such National System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4594. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4595. A bill to amend the act of May 17, 1910, with respect to the composition and activities of the Commission of Fine Arts; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 4596. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to permit a Representative to the Congress to nominate as a candidate to the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, or the United States Air Force Academy, a person domiciled at any place in the State from which such Representative is elected; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 4597. A bill to provide a 30 percent credit against the Federal individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4598. A bill to establish a program of scholarship aid and long-term loans to students in higher education and to provide facilities assistance to institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4599. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, with respect to medical services and supplies; selection of physicians; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 4600. A bill to provide more adequate retirement benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed services who have served in World War I, World War II, and the Korean campaign; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 4601. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Navy or his designee to convey a two hundred forty and fifty-five one-hundredths-acre tract of land situated near the city of Grand Prairie, in Dallas County, Tex., to the State of Texas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4602. A bill to encourage new residential construction for veterans' housing in rural areas and small cities and towns by raising the maximum amount in which direct loans may be made from $10,000 to $12,500, to authorize advance financing commitments, to extend the direct loan program for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 4603. A bill relating to the construction of school facilities in areas affected by school integration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4604. A bill to amend the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act to encourage home mortgage financing in areas of investment capital shortage by providing that mortgage sellers in such areas shall not be required to make certain capital contributions in connection with the purchase of mortgages by the association; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4605. A bill to provide that 25 percentum of the national service life insurance fund may be invested in making direct home loans to veterans; to increase the maximum loan entitlement of veterans under section 512 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and to expedite action on certain applications of veterans for direct home loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H. R. 4606. A bill to encourage new residential construction for veterans' housing in rural areas and small cities and towns by raising the maximum amount in which direct loans may be made from $10,000 to $12,500, to authorize advance financing commitments, to extend the direct loan program for veterans, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe a rate of interest on guaranteed and direct loans of not more than 5 percent per annum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. R. 4607. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROWN of Missouri:

H. R. 4608. A bill to amend the provisions of law providing for an emergency feed and seed program to provide for an emergency pasture reseeding program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 4609. A bill to further amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes," approved September 5, 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4610. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an individual to deduct, for income tax purposes, the expenses incurred by him in traveling to and from work on public conveyances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4611. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 4612. A bill to provide a residence for pages of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, under the supervision of a Capitol Pages' Residence Board; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. HARDEN:

H. R. 4613. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 4614. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain seven units of the Greater Wenatchee division, Chief Joseph project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4615. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for carrying out provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain timber access roads, to permit maximum economy in harvesting national forest timber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 4616. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for carrying out provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain timber access roads, to permit maximum economy in harvesting national forest timber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 4617. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for carrying out provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain timber access roads, to permit maximum economy in harvesting national forest timber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 4618. A bill to study the use of conservation programs to provide healthful outdoor training for young men and to establish a pilot Youth Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 4619. A bill to amend section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, 81st Congress (act of April 6, 1949); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 4620. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ULLMAN.

H. R. 4621. A bill to stimulate industrial development near Indian reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4622. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for carrying out provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain timber access roads, to permit maximum economy in harvesting national forest timber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. J. Res. 225. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the third week in April of each year as National My Family Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution to authorize the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to investigate and report on the various factors affecting the prices of standard food products sold to consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 116. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to conduct a study and inquiry with respect to severance of diplomatic, economic, and other relations between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 157. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Agriculture to make investigations into certain matters within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. Res. 158. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 128; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 159. Resolution to amend clause 20, rule XI, of the Rules of the House of Pepresentatives; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred, as follows:

By Mr. HILL: Memorial of House of Representatives of the 41st General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the Senate therein concurring urging repeal of that section of the Federal laws governing old-age assistance, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging repeal of that section of the Federal laws governing old-age assistance, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting favorable consideration of any proposed legislation which deals with the rights of the peoples of Idaho and Wyoming concerning the flow of the interstate streams constituting the headwaters and the headwater tributaries of the Snake River, etc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to condemnation and protest against oppressive usurpation of power by the Supreme Court of the United States, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to passing legislation to modernize the 160-acre limitation now imposed upon farm units in federally financed reclamation projects; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to passing legislation granting to the State of Wyoming all of the land and minerals within the confines of its borders, etc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to nonreimbursable costs in water development; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 4623. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Madaline S. January; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 4624. A bill for the relief of William R. Fleetwood; to the Committee on the judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 4625. A bill for the relief of Ethel Winefred (Winifred) Crow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 4626. A bill for the relief of Tai Win Wong (also known as Wong Tai Win); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 4627. A bill for the relief of Enrique R. Godinez, Enriqueta P. Goodinez, and Lydia M. Godinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H. R. 4628. A bill for the relief of Carl R. Marten; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4629. A bill for the relief of Mirca Bruna Gesiotto Gordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4630. A bill for the relief of Lo Liang Sun Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4631. A bill for the relief of Kotikalapudi Kali Venkata Krishna Somayajulu Rao and his wife Charumati Rana Rao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 4632. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Maria Hines (nee Anna Maria Decker); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

81. By Mr. BEAMER: Petition of Anderson Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, of Anderson, Ind., relative to their Chaplain's Day resolution recognizing the four chaplains who lost their lives aboard the U. S. S. *Dorchester* which was sunk during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

82. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Bradford County (Pa.) Farmers' Association urging the Congress of the United States in enacting legislation for the development of electric power facilities on the Niagara River to include a provision requiring that electric cooperatives organized under the Rural Electrification Act be allowed to buy their fair share of this electric energy; to the Committee on Public Works.

83. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolutions adopted by the 14th Annual Convention of the Utility Co-Workers' Association concerning social security, income tax revision, revision of the Taft-Hartley Act, and the 7-hour day, 35-hour week; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Outstanding Progress of St. Martin Parish Library in Louisiana Cited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 7, 1957*

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in public-library matters, and particularly in a report showing the outstanding results achieved in the St. Martin Parish—County—Library program directed from St. Martinsville, my home town.

Only 2 years old, the St. Martin Parish Library has attracted widespread attention and has served as a model and inspiration to all who are connected with the public-library movement. The citizens of St. Martin Parish have shown great interest in the project for which the taxpayers approved funds to provide modern facilities, including four new buildings made ready for use this year.

The report shows that during 1956 the parish library circulated 54,226 books and magazines, borrowed by 4,692 persons, or an average of 2 books for every man, woman, and child in the parish. More than 110,000 books and magazines have been borrowed during the 2 years. Purchase of 2,954 new books brought the library collection to 13,000. Reading certificates were presented to 397 children during the summer reading program, and story hours were held at St. Martinville and Breaux Bridge. Forty-six films, loaned by the Louisiana State Library, were viewed by 4,318 persons.

Expansion of the library's bookmobile service was a prominent factor during 1956. A new book truck for white citizens was put into use in August, and the number of stops increased to give better and more complete service throughout the parish. Bookmobile service for Negro citizens was inaugurated in the fall, through use of a truck borrowed from the State library pending arrival of a new one for this purpose, expected this month.

In supervising this work, the parish librarian, Miss Hazel G. Sockrider, traveled 3,352 miles during the year, visiting the branch libraries, helping to start new bookmobile stops, addressing various groups, and looking after the other phases of the rapidly developing program.

Heading the St. Martin Parish Library Board of Control is the president, Miss Edith E. Steckler, of St. Martinville, who received the Modisette award for trustees, given for the second time by the Louisiana Library Association in March of 1956. Other members of the board are Mr. Paul Angelle, Jr., of Cecilia, who is president of the St. Martin Police Jury, governing body of the parish; Mrs. James Guirard, Cathoula; Mr. Grover Rees, Breaux Bridge; Mr. Mitchell Talley, St. Martinville; and Mrs. Claude Carriere, of Cecilia.

## Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 7, 1957*

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, as we pause to celebrate the anniversary of Lithuania's independence, we should take special cognizance of the continuing fight being waged by peoples behind the Iron Curtain against the Communists. The people of Lithuania have never accepted the rule of their Red masters and I predict the day will come when these fine people will be free again.

The recent uprisings in Hungary and Poland prove that America has millions of friends behind the Iron Curtain including the vast majority of the people of Lithuania. I join with my colleagues in sending special greetings to the Americans of Lithuanian descent and to their brothers who still live in the shadow of the Kremlin. We must do everything possible to keep their hopes alive and to encourage the early arrival of that great day when we will again have an independent and free Lithuania.

## Thanks for the Tip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 7, 1957*

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include some four paragraphs from the front page of the Washington Post of the date of February 6 which tells about King Saud tipping the waitresses at a luncheon $500 on a $750 check.

KING SAUD TIPS WITH WRIST WATCHES AND OTHER NOT-SO-TRINKETY TRINKETS

If you've been tipping your favorite waitresses with cheap little alarm clocks, be advised that King Saud has been beating your time all over town.

He leaves gold wrist watches and cash tips on a scale that figures out roughly to 66 percent of the tab.

Most spectacular demonstration of the royal visitor's largess occurred at Normandy Farms, a Potomac (Md.) restaurant to which Saud repaired for lunch Monday afternoon.

His bill for the rather elaborate menu indulged by his party of 50 ran to something like $750. By way of expressing his satisfaction with the meal they helped arrange for him, Saud presented his chief waitress, Irene Watts, and Manager Lucien Bedourat with wrist watches. Then he left about $500 in cash to be prorated among the establishment's fifty-odd employees.

This is the same King Saud to whom the Secretary of State proposes to give $60 million of the taxpayers' money to help tide him over since his annual income from oil royalties of $360 million, which he spends upon himself and his family, is insufficient to do it. Last Wednesday evening the President entertained the King and 16 members of his family at a state dinner.

Included among the out-of-town guests were the following: Stephen D. Bechtel, president and chairman of Bechtel Co., of San Francisco; Fred A. Davies, president and board chairman of the Arabian-American Oil Co., of New York; William T. Faricy, president of the American Railroad Association; Ralph G. Follis, president and board chairman of Standard Oil, California, and Brewster

Jennings, president and board chairman of Socony Mobil Oil of New York.

Also among those present were William L. Kleitz, president of Guaranty Trust Co., of New York; Augustus C. Long, chairman of the board of Texas Co., New York; John J. McCloy, chairman of the board, Chase Manhattan Bank; Harry W. Morrison, president of Morrison-Knudsen of Boise, Idaho; Warren L. Pierson, board chairman, Trans-World Airways of New York; Monroe J. Rathbone, president Standard Oil of New Jersey, of New York; Howard C. Sheperd, board chairman, First National City Bank, New York.

It looks like the main interest in Saudi-Arabia is to protect the investments of the oil companies. Under the terms of the resolution, Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer, not only will your $60 million go to King Saud, but if he gets in any trouble your boys may be sent there to fight to keep him on his throne. How do you like an administration which cannot reduce taxes but can spend your money like this?

## Sacrifice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, February 7, 1957*

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a fine address entitled "Sacrifice," which was delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] before the Senate breakfast group, on February 6, 1957.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SACRIFICE

(Remarks of A. WILLIS ROBERTSON before the Senate breakfast group, February 6, 1957)

It appears to be far easier for the average man to accept without question the laws of nature than to accept the fact that the author of our spiritual laws is the author of our natural laws, and there is no conflict between them. Since God, the creator of all life, saw fit to make man in His own image and to endow him, exclusively, with a conscience and an immortal soul, there are some provisions of spiritual laws that are applicable to mankind only.

But the Christian who seeks to bring his life into conformity with all the laws of God is surprised to see how closely the spiritual law of self-denial parallels the natural law of the survival of the fittest. In nature the life of the fish, birds, and animals that survive is a trained and disciplined one. For 6 years I headed the Virginia Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries. In our fish hatcheries we raised thousands of trout and planted them in flowing streams. Fishermen caught some. The rest just disappeared. We raised and released in good cover thousands of bobwhite quail. They did not survive either. Wildlife conservationists now are all agreed that there is no valid substitute for God's plan of training wild life for survival in the school of hard knocks.

But there are many men and perhaps some ministers who are unwilling to face up to the fact that the development of Christian character and the survival of a life worth while in God's sight are subject to the same fundamental law. A proper recognition of the spiritual law of sacrifice and self-denial is made more difficult for us in this country by an economic trend sometimes called the welfare state. We know our colonial ancestors carved an empire out of a wilderness through hard, courageous, self-sacrificing effort. As we read the history of our national heroes we applaud the personal effort and denial of self that went into their greatness. Yet the current economic trend is against our private enterprise system which has outproduced the world and by the same token against that type of Christian faith and training that produced the martyrs of the past.

In order to clarify the Christian viewpoint in character building we would do well to start with the oldest book in the Bible—the Book of Job—of that book the great English essayist Thomas Carlyle said:

"They had many prophets, these Arabs; teachers each to his tribe, each according to the light he had. But indeed, have we not from of old the noblest of proofs, still palpable to every one of us, of what devoutness and noblemindedness had dwelt in these rustic, thoughtful peoples? Biblical critics seem agreed that our own Book of Job was written in that region of the world. I call that, apart from all theories about it, one of the grandest things ever written with pen. One feels, indeed, as if it were not Hebrew; such a noble universality, different from noble patriotism or sectarianism, reigns in it. A noble book; all men's book. It is our first, oldest statement of the never-ending problem—man's destiny, and God's ways with him here in this earth. * * * There is nothing written, I think, in the Bible or out of it, of equal literary merit."

Never before in the history of our Nation have so many of our people been conscious of the area in which Job lived, commonly called the Middle East. We hear much of the conflict between the Jews and their neighbors. But that's an ageless conflict. More wars have been fought over the possession of Jerusalem than any other city of recorded history.

We have become very conscious of the oil resources of the Middle East. Our financial stake in that natural resource is great. Our political stake, namely, world freedom is so much greater, that our President has asked Congress to authorize him to issue to the Soviet Union, with respect to that area, a "Stop—Look and Listen" warning.

Such a warning is calculated to prevent the Russians from committing overt acts of aggression in the Middle East on a misapprehension of our attitude. But such a warning would not be worth a barbe unless backed up by atomic power.

I am sure we all recognize that we labor in vain to build a temple of peace that is not dedicated to the victory of moral force.

What is moral force? An American clergyman, Horace Bushnell, put it this way: "By moral power, we mean the power of a life and a character, the power of good and great purposes, the power which comes at length to reside in a man distinguished in some course of estimable or great conduct. No other power of man compares with this, and there is no individual who may not be measurably invested with it." In short, it is God's way of using demonstrated faith in the ethical teachings of the Bible to influence the minds and hearts of others.

And where did we get that Bible? From the Middle East of Job, of Abraham, of David, of Jesus of Nazareth. From Job, the earliest book of the Old Testament to Revelation, in the New Testament, the fundamental message is the same—God is our creator. He is supreme and in humility, through unwavering faith, we must seek to know and then to do His will.

And that brings me back to my original thesis: Unless we submit to God's training and discipline our chances to overcome evil with good will not rise above the survival rate of hatchery trout and pen-raised quail.

"Happy is the man," says Job "whom God correcteth: therefore despise not thou the chastening of the Almighty:

"For he maketh sore, and bindeth up: He woundeth, and His hands make whole.

"He shall deliver thee in six troubles: yea, in seven there shall no evil touch thee.

"In famine He shall redeem thee from death: and in war from the power of the sword.

"Thou shalt be hid from the scourge of the tongue: neither shalt thou be afraid of destruction when it cometh.

"At destruction and famine thou shalt laugh: neither shalt thou be afraid of the beasts of the earth.

"For thou shalt be in league with the stones of the field: and the beasts of the field shall be at peace with thee.

"And thou shalt know that thy tabernacle shall be in peace; and thou shalt visit thy habitation, and shalt not sin."

The same thought is carried forward into the new dispensation by the greatest of all expounders of Christian tenets when he says in Hebrews 12: 7–11:

"If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not?

"But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons.

"Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence; shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits and live?

"For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of His holiness.

"Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous; nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby."

I challenge any one, on the basis of experience or recorded history, to name any man who achieved true greatness in any field without sacrifice.

In the ultimate solution of the problems of the Middle East our best hope is for a day when all in that area will accept the Christian philosophy of life that originated in that area. In the meantime, we can't repeat too often the unanswered prayer of that great advocate of world peace—Woodrow Wilson—voiced in 1909, on the birthday of Robert E. Lee:

"I wish there were some great orator who could go about and make men drunk with this spirit of self-sacrifice. I wish there were some man whose tongue might every day carry abroad the golden accents of that creative age in which we were born a nation; accents which would ring like tones of reassurance around the whole circle of the globe, so that America might again have the distinction of showing men the way, the certain way, of achievement and of confident hope."

## Shortage in College Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, February 7, 1957*

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have received several inquiries

from other congressional offices about a proposal which I have made to help alleviate the shortage in college facilities. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I made on December 27, 1956.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, yesterday warned that the bumper crop of war and postwar babies now crowding elementary schools will soon be seeking admission to colleges and finding again that there is no room for them.

He urged consideration of an emergency program of Federal aid to provide classrooms at public community colleges for the more than half million qualified young men and women who will otherwise have no place to go in the next 5 years.

The Senator proposed establishing and expanding 2-year colleges through grants-in-aid to the States. Funds of up to one-third of the cost of building and equipping academic structures would be distributed to States choosing to take part in the national drive to catch up with educational needs.

Community colleges, which have received the strong endorsements of several national citizens' and educational groups, are designed to meet these two particular needs at the lowest cost per student:

1. Provide 2 years of college credit education at a low-cost college in preparation for the final 2 years at a 4-year college.

2. Provide a terminal program of 2 years of post-high-school general education with opportunities for vocational training for the subprofessions and occupations of a technical nature.

The community college, in effect, is the usual 2-year junior college expanded in functions to meet the educational and cultural needs of the whole community. It would provide many young men and women with a college education of at least 2 years by removing the heavy expense of living away from home and would bring colleges to many areas where such facilities are presently unavailable.

Senator CASE made the following statement:

"NEED

"A study completed earlier this month by President Eisenhower's Committee on Education Beyond the High School predicts that by 1970 at least 6 million youngsters will be college bound, roughly double the present total. By that time, according to present indications, the Association of American Colleges expects colleges will have space for only 4,350,000.

"In the next 5 years the situation is indeed gloomy. Public and private colleges in the liberal arts field together plan to expand by 20 percent in the next 5 years, the association reports. But enrollments are expected to increase more than 32 percent, the Office of Education reports. This means that some 368,800 qualified boys and girls now in junior and senior high school are doomed to disappointment unless we find some effective way to expand college facilities.

"Not only these 368,800 who would like to go to college but additional hundreds of thousands who have the mental and physical qualifications for college training would have to end their education at high-school graduation. It means that, despite their hopes and dreams, many of our finest youth will be denied equality of opportunity. They will have to miss out on adequate education for life, for a profession, and for citizenship. The Nation will lose the benefits of their talent and brainpower, and this can be counted in "discoveries unmade and in services unrendered."

"In the highly populated States such as my own, the shortage will result in particularly sharp denial of opportunity. The New Jersey State Board of Education reports that if nothing is done beyond expansions now planned, by 1963, one out of every three young people in New Jersey wanting to go to college will find no place. By 1973, the "no room" sign will be hung for one out of every two desiring college.

"Such figures as I have quoted here are minimal, based as they are largely on the present percentages of high school graduates who go to college. They contemplate about 30 percent of high school seniors will want college.

"But the number who qualify for education beyond high school is much larger. If we could reduce the cost of college education and locate colleges within reach of those young people who qualify, many more would go to college and the college-trained population of our country would be much larger. The President's Commission on Higher Education in 1947 reported that 'at least 49 percent of our population has the mental ability to complete 14 years of schooling with a curriculum of general and vocational studies that should lead either to gainful employment or to further study at a more advanced level.'

"In this country, we do not want only an educational elite. Our goal, as stated by President Eisenhower's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, is that 'every individual, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, shall have the opportunity to develop his or her best self, to continue appropriate education up to his or her personal point of optimum development.'

"The failure to expand facilities for higher education will take its toll as our population continues to grow and the number of doctors, scientists, teachers, and ministers does not grow apace. It will take its toll in industry and commerce as higher and higher skills are demanded and proportionately fewer and fewer young people can provide them. The Eisenhower Committee has predicted a need for a 75-percent increase in professional and technical personnel by 1975, along with a 25-percent decrease in laborers.

"In some nations, young people in great numbers are being led into science and industry to serve a selfish ideology. In the national interest alone we should make it possible—and attractive—for youngsters to enter these fields in far greater numbers.

"ADVANTAGES

"President Eisenhower's Committee on Education Beyond the High School in its report last month made this comment:

" 'The growth of community and junior colleges is a significant development of our educational system in this century and is probably the next logical step in filling in and rounding out our educational system. While the emphasis in many junior colleges is to prepare students for transfer to 4-year institutions, an important function and contribution of the 2-year college has been to offer a terminal program aimed at providing general education and training for the subprofessions and occupations of a highly technical nature.'

"President Truman's Committee on Higher Education recommended that 'the number of community colleges be increased and that their activities be multiplied.' This group included the presidents of several 4-year colleges, including Dr. Milton Eisenhower, now president of Johns Hopkins, and Dr. Lewis Webster Jones, now president of Rutgers University. (Senator CASE is both an alumnus and trustee of Rutgers.)

"President Eisenhower, a former college president, in a speech at Defiance, Ohio, declared, 'I firmly believe that more education than that obtained in high school must be brought to every community and locality in such a way that every young person regardless of his means or lack of means can go to school for a minimum of 2 additional years.'

"Other distinguished college presidents have given specific endorsement to the community college idea. James B. Conant, then president of Harvard University, wrote, 'To equalize collegiate education for all except the relatively few with professional ambitions, I advocate a wide extension of 2-year community colleges.'

"Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul, president of the University of California, has said, 'I would today urge high-school graduates to attend junior colleges unless there is a compelling reason for them to go to a 4-year college away from home.'

"Clearly, the community college plan produces the most for the tax dollar, it avoids the expensive costs of building dormitories and of long-distance transportation. It gives the student a chance to live at home, to find part-time work among his friends and neighbors and perhaps to combine education and work. From the viewpoint of business and industry, it permits planning of curriculum to meet local needs for technical and skilled manpower. It permits cooperative arrangements for use of technicians as instructors where faculty specialists are not available, as well as equipment on a similar basis. In some cases, it has been possible for community colleges to use certain high-school buildings and training equipment.

"The community college can serve as a screening device for the 4-year college, a badly needed service since fully half the freshman-sophomore classes in 4-year institutions drop out at the end of the second year. Since it is in the first 2 years of college that the greatest shortage exists, the community colleges complement, rather than compete with the 4-year colleges.

"By absorbing much of the freshman-sophomore load, the community college makes it possible for the 4-year colleges to do a more effective job on the remaining 2 years and in the professional schools.

"The president of the University of California, Dr. Sproul, has said, 'Certainly, without the excellent junior colleges that are characteristic of our State, the present policies of specialization, and high standards of admission and graduation, in the university would have been extremely difficult if not impossible to establish and maintain.' He has also reported on the quality of junior college training in these words, 'Junior college graduates who could have met the admission requirements of the university, when they were graduated from high school, do as well when they transfer to the university for their junior and senior years as do our so-called native students.

" 'The community college expansion would also ease the pressure on the many small, liberal arts colleges which do such an excellent job now and don't want to expand. Their continued existence in present form is essential and desirable.

" 'One important byproduct of the establishment of a community college is likely to be the creation of a continuing program of adult education for persons who are employed, but want to continue their studies. Experience shows that community colleges in small towns can become the local cultural, as well as educational centers. And this fills a major need. The President's Commission on Education Beyond the High School warns that "current trends leave no doubt that many million more adults of all ages will look to a growing variety of institutions and programs for the education and training they too will need to adjust to the changing world." '

"COST

"The program I have been considering, while not fixed in final detail, would contemplate the establishment of an emergency

program to accommodate at least the 300,000 to 600,000 qualified and eager boys and girls who are eligible.

"It is difficult to figure, even in rough terms, the cost of instructional and administrative buildings for such a program. An average figure of $3,000 to $4,000 per student has been estimated by the New Jersey State Board of Education. Obviously, such costs would vary from area to area and would change from year to year, depending on economic conditions prevailing at the time the program went into effect.

"It is difficult to estimate the total cost of such a program or even the third the Federal Government would supply. The actual amount would depend on what portion of the total problem Congress chose to attack and how much interest this approach stimulated among the States.

"Obviously, the program would require a large sum, but our Government is already spending millions and millions to assist our farmers, our airlines, and our shipping firms. Surely, our youth and their future are equally important.

"One possible way of apportioning funds to the States would be on a formula combining flat grants made on the basis of the number of youngsters of college age with some weight given to the per capita income of the State. States would be required to establish a program of junior colleges on a statewide basis to become eligible for funds. This would encourage an organized approach to the problem, rather than a piecemeal arrangement that would mean many colleges located in some parts of the State and none in others.

"Theodore A. Distler, then president of Franklin and Marshall College, and now executive director, Association of American Colleges, wrote in 1947 that we 'need education properly distributed to be available where demand is the greatest. Many cities in which a senior college might be almost a liability can readily support a junior college. The 2-year school requires less financial outlay, is more flexible and is less hampered by traditional ideas of curriculum.'

"Presently, 26 States have laws permitting the establishment of community or junior colleges and 16 States have a program of State aid for them. The proposed program should serve as a stimulus to encourage other States to do likewise, if they desire.

"Understandably, many of us are concerned to keep control over education in local and State hands. The program I have outlined will not disturb our traditional pattern in this field. Rather, it is designed to stimulate and assist the States in initiation of programs of their own devising. The heart of the program I have sketched here is the State plan; there would be no Federal control of curriculum. The Federal Government would seek only to help the States lick a nationwide shortage in college capacity.

"What I have suggested is only part of the answer to the need for college expansion. But as we work to ease the public-school shortage we should start thinking about the classroom deficit in higher education, too."

## World Teamwork

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, February 7, 1957*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to read in the February 1957 issue of the magazine Childhood Education, published by the Association for Childhood Education International, at 1200 15th Street here in Washington, a brief but exceedingly stimulating and constructive article by our good friend the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The article is entitled "World Teamwork." It points out the breathtaking opportunities which are now available to bring to the underdeveloped peoples of the world training toward literacy, opportunities to bring to them new ideas, new concepts, so that they can improve their own lot and thereby help improve the well-being of mankind.

I know there are few Members of this body more competent to write on this theme than is our colleague from South Dakota, for he has made a long series of invaluable contributions to world information and understanding, notably through the famous Smith-Mundt program, and through other means as well.

We of this country who rightly regard our educational system as so vitally important, who have invested so much of our national, State, and local resources in training our children, and who recognize that we must invest still more, are ready, willing, and eager to render additional technical assistance to educators throughout the world in the parallel task abroad.

In previous years I have pointed out, for example, how the miracle medium of international television can contribute significantly in this direction.

Through audio-visual methods, as well as through the more classic ways of teaching, we will be able to help widen the exchange of ideas between nations, increase understanding, acquaint peoples with each other's patterns of living and thinking, and help eliminate ignorance, superstition, disease, and poverty.

The opportunities are vast, the challenge is vast, the need is great.

No finer work can be performed in all this world than to plant wholesome seeds in the minds of the young.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator MUNDT's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD TEAMWORK

(By KARL E. MUNDT, United States Senator, South Dakota)

The hearts of the people of the world hunger for peace. Through their knowledge of contemporary weapons of war, people are convinced that mankind may stand on the brink of self-destruction. The threat to peace is gigantic. Can man make his desires for peace felt? Can he hold back forces of destruction? Can he devise positive forward steps to end international tensions?

To those who have been watching worldwide programs, the answer appears to become more and more affirmative. Through the exchange of ideas, the exchange of knowledge, the attempts to create common understanding of basic problems, we have seen tensions erased, strife diminished, good faith and fellowship reestablished.

For example, progressive steps taken through UNESCO projects have laid the groundwork for even more aggressive and forward-looking programs. I am certain there is a creative approach to teamwork, one which offers a serious challenge to educators.

More and more we must turn to educators to devise new ideas for making men in every country conscious of neighbors across borders, the wants and needs of other people, and the responsibility of each in living harmoniously with nationals and nations.

Educators who have gone into other countries to work on textbook projects have shown that the basic tenets of democracy can be brought to children. These new textbooks follow cultural patterns of those countries with basic beliefs of freedom interwoven. Similar demonstrations showing how men may live together in peace could be injected into schoolbooks of every country.

The opportunities for group education have not yet been fully explored. The potential of information media has not been exhausted. We should—and probably will—in the next few years be able to reach more and more people through international information programs. The full use of television on an international scale has yet to be discovered. Every form of the visual can be sent via TV to millions everywhere.

We are entering a new era of "show-how." In this era we can reach the two-thirds of the world that is illiterate. We can stimulate mental processes, communicate new ideas, attack poverty and disease, dispel the "glamour" of subversive doctrines and rout ignorance.

The face of the world will soon be covered with a new generation of people. That generation is now sitting in classrooms around the world. It is learning. The greatest lesson this new generation must learn is continuously seeking moral answers for meeting the world situation and for saving mankind. We must expect a response from every teacher in the world to see these lessons are taught.

The seed of brotherly love and understanding must be nurtured until, like the Biblical mustard seed, it becomes the tree that covers the world.

## America's Imperative Need for an Adequate Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOE M. KILGORE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 7, 1957*

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, the following speech was presented by my colleague and chairman of the Military Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations to the Women's Forum on National Security at the Statler Hotel today.

Mr. HOLIFIELD presents an interesting and challenging analysis of our Nation's civil defense. In the light of the fact that his subcommittee is currently holding hearings on new civil defense legislation, I recommend Mr. HOLIFIELD's speech for the consideration of all:

AMERICA'S IMPERATIVE NEED FOR AN ADEQUATE CIVIL DEFENSE

(Address by Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, to the Women's Forum on National Security, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., February 7, 1957)

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to be with the Ladies of the Women's Forum on National Security. The director of the national security division of the American Legion, Mr. James R. Wilson, Jr.,

invited me to discuss the vital subject of civil defense.

You can appreciate the fact that the life of a Congressman is a busy one, particularly at the opening of a new Congress. To respond to this invitation I had to readjust my committee hearing schedule to get a few hours off. Yet I believe sincerely that few matters of public policy have more urgency and demand more attention at this time than civil defense.

In taking this time to talk with you about our recent congressional work in this field, I am sure that the time is fully justified and will be well spent. You ladies who are participating in this forum on national security are not only close to civil defense in your training and educational activities but you will be able to carry home to your respective communities the highlights of my message.

I know of no greater challenge, to you as individuals, than the challenge of family survival in case of nuclear attack. I know of no greater crusade upon which your separate organizations could embark, than the crusade for an effective civil defense.

If I could put that message in a single sentence it would be this: Today the need for civil defense in the United States is greater, more urgent than it has been ever before. And yet the sad cruel fact is that we have not begun in any serious way to meet that need.

Our national leaders—and here I include those in all branches of the Federal Government—have not yet begun to grasp the central fact that the threat of nuclear warfare which we face today, and in the years ahead, is a new kind of threat. The leap forward in destructive energy which these new weapons represent is almost too much for the human mind to comprehend. The explosive force of a single high-yield nuclear bomb exceeds that of all the millions upon millions of tons of high explosives let loose in World War II.

And these new weapons, in addition to their enormous explosive power, spread deadly radioactive dust over thousands of square miles of territory. It is well within the realm of possibility that this new poison of radioactivity can contaminate the whole earth and all the peoples that live in it—killing many millions, maiming other millions, condemning those that survive to chronic illness and shortened lives. These harmful effects are transmitted by heredity, so that the curse of war is visited upon generations yet unborn.

This story of the horrors of nuclear warfare is not new. You have heard it before. Others have heard it too. It may be that those who strive honestly for world peace and international control of armaments have recited the awful facts of nuclear destruction so often and with such telling effect that attitudes of hopelessness and despair have been generated among our people. I believe that such attitudes are not natural to the American people.

If fully and properly informed, the people will act to protect their families and homes and their country. They will support their government and make the necessary sacrifices in time and treasure to help build an effective civil defense. They will do so if the Government has a sensible program, a program that makes headway, a program whose progress can be measured.

Today in the United States we do not have such a civil defense program. We have instead a great deal of local effort which is not coordinated, which is not well financed, which lacks central direction, which lacks full information on the latest developments in weapons technology and the means of counteraction.

In short, the present civil-defense program lacks the strong leadership which only the Federal Government can provide. Such leadership, I may add, is a direct responsibility of the Federal Government, in view of the constitutional responsibility of the Federal Government to provide for the defense of our people against enemy attack. Yet the existing national legislation providing for civil-defense functions in this country cites primary responsibility as residing with State and local governments.

For some years, as a charter member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I personally have been concerned over this shockingly inept system of civil defense in the face of a rapidly advancing nuclear weapons technology.

Nearly 2 years ago the Military Operations Subcommittee, of which I am privileged to be chairman, began a study of the major civil-defense problems confronting this country and undertook a long-term investigation into the operation of our present civil-defense program. I may note in passing that, as a unit of the House Committee on Government Operations, our duty is to investigate and study military and related matters in the interest of promoting efficiency in operations and economy in the use of the taxpayers' money.

Last year we began our public hearings on civil defense. This hearing program resulted in the most comprehensive investigation of civil defense ever undertaken by a congressional group. We received expert testimony from military officials, including the Chairman and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Chief of Engineers, from scientists, doctors, administrators, engineers, informed private citizens, civil-defense officials at all levels of government, and from other interested individuals and organizations.

Not least important among those who appeared at our hearings last year was the American Legion. Through the years this public-spirited organization has lifted its voice—sometimes a lone voice—to sound a warning against the threat of nuclear warfare, to urge that we build our defenses to overcome this threat. Mr. James Wilson, Mr. Bruce Henderson, and Gen. William Nicholson of the Legion, I may note, will appear before my subcommittee again tomorrow to give us the benefit of their judgment on civil-defense legislation.

At the conclusion of the subcommittee investigation into civil defense last summer, we presented a report to the Congress. This report, I am proud to say, has won acclaim throughout the land. The subcommittee files contain many letters of commendation for our work. Our report was comprehensive but concise and to the point. Without any partisan division, without mincing words, we criticized the national failure to build an adequate civil defense and we made constructive recommendations to achieve that objective.

Certainly the American Legion is in full accord with the objective we seek—to protect the people, to maintain the continuity of our governmental and industrial life, to make sure that American democratic institutions will not be destroyed by ruthless aggression.

Following through on the recommendations in our report, we drafted new civil-defense legislation, striving to write these objectives into the lawbooks. This legislation, as I indicated before, is the subject of hearings before our subcommittee. We are receiving strong support from many informed organizations and persons. But this bill is not yet law. We need to convince many more Members of Congress. We need to convince the administration. I hope that the American Legion Auxiliary can, if the legislation meets with its approval, help to convince the people back home.

Without going into technical details, I will outline the broad principles of the new civil-defense legislation sponsored unanimously by the eight members of my subcommittee.

First of all it would make clear the Federal responsibility for civil defense. The existing legislation is obsolete because it relegates this responsibility to States and localities. Civil defense is a vital part of the national defense and, therefore, a proper function of the Federal Government.

At the same time the bill recognizes the important supporting role that State and local governments must perform. We do not want to create an enormous Federal bureaucracy which dries up local initiative. Everyone must do his share in civil defense—from the highest levels of government down to the community and the home. But civil defense without Federal leadership and direction, without Federal funds and resources, is but a token civil defense—and that is all we have today.

Secondly, the new civil-defense bill would provide an organization adequate to discharge the Federal responsibility. It would create a new Department of Civil Defense, headed by a Secretary in place of the existing Federal Civil Defense Administration. Also it would transfer to the new Department civil-defense functions now carried on by the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Under the new bill a military liaison committee would provide a two-way channel of communications and cooperative working relationships with the Department of Defense. A scientific advisory board would bring high-level scientific talents to bear on the civil-defense effort. A Civil Defense Advisory Council would give broad representation in civil-defense affairs to industry, labor, State, and local government, and the public, generally.

Thirdly, the new civil-defense bill would provide the authority that goes with responsibility and organization. The Secretary of civil defense would be required to prepare and execute a national plan of civil defense. This seems to be an obvious and necessary requirement and yet there is no national plan of civil defense in the United States today.

A national plan of civil defense means many things—adequate warning devices, full information to the public, training—but above all, it means a nationwide shelter system to protect the people against the blast, burn and radioactive effects of nuclear explosions.

On the basis of testimony by experts, including those in the naval radiological defense laboratory, the subcommittee is firmly convinced that it is feasible, not only engineering-wise, but dollars-and-cents-wise, to build underground shelters for the protection of the American population. The cost estimates are only approximate at this time. But for something less than $20 billion—half the military budget for 1 year, we can do this vital civil defense job. Each billion dollars spent for shelters could mean 5 million persons saved.

Our Nation has the resources for a shelter-building program. The question is not, Can we afford to spend the money? We can. The question is, what will it cost in human life not to build shelters?

Let me emphasize one point as strongly as I can. Without a nationwide shelter system, civil defense remains a token effort. Shelter is the strong bulwark of an effective civil defense, the means to preserve life in the first few desperate hours and days of an enemy attack, the means to survive, to strike back against the enemy, to restore a working economy.

Unless we build a nationwide shelter system our other efforts, however energetic and well-meaning, will come to little. Stockpiling medical supplies, training people in rescue work—these are important civil-defense functions. Yet we can never store enough supplies or organize enough rescue teams to care for casualties numbered in the tens or scores of millions. Casualties will be minimized only if shelters are near at hand—near enough to permit entry in a

few minutes time and equipped for 1 or 2 weeks of occupancy.

In this connection, I may add that testimony from some of the foremost authorities in this country clearly indicates that the evacuation concept espoused by the Federal Civil Defense Administration is completely inadequate in the face of the rapidly decreasing warning time we may expect as guided missiles come into being. In addition, testimony received indicates that a nationwide shelter system would probably cost less than highway improvements required for evacuation purposes, and would offer protection against radioactive fallout.

Shelters, in other words, are the only means of making civil defense a manageable task. And because the Federal Civil Defense Administration has never quite come around to accepting this fact, the civil defense task, so far as FCDA efforts go, remains unmanageable. We propose through new legislation to bring the civil defense task under control, to make civil defense workable, to measure progress, and to achieve objectives.

Finally, but certainly not least in importance, the new civil defense bill looks upon civil defense as essentially a nonmilitary function. Not only do we propose that civil defense be kept in civilian hands now: we project our thinking forward to the conditions of an emergency and seek to minimize the need for martial law. This, I know, is a matter of great concern to the American Legion. Military rule, once established, is hard to displace. A strong, well-managed civil defense effort will avoid the tendency to let the military take over in an emergency.

The role of the military authorities in civil defense, as we see it, is one of assistance and cooperation, not one of direction and control. The military have their own missions to perform. They must be free to deploy their forces and resist an enemy attack. At the same time they must train their troops in civil defense tasks and organize their supply and logistic systems in readiness to aid the civilian authorites.

In a few weeks our hearings on the civil defense legislation will be finished. Our subcommittee will report out the bill with such changes as the testimony indicates should be made. Then it will be up to the Congress to act.

To get this bill enacted into law is not an easy task. The Congress will more readily respond if the American people make known their desire for positive action. I hope that your great organization will help in this regard. I know you want to see our great and wonderful country stay at peace, to see it prosperous and secure.

In a world beset by aggressive communism, security cannot be cheaply bought. No matter how hard we strive for peaceful coexistence, no matter how strong our deterrent weapons, we cannot be sure that the enemy will refrain from attacking. The civil defense for which I plead is one that will withstand the ravages of an enemy attack. Such a defense is possible: it can be built. Let's build it together.

## Making Service Life Attractive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 7, 1957*

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly difficult to persuade young men to voluntarily enter our Armed Forces, and being once there to remain and make the military their life work. This situation exists in spite of the fact that our armed services are by far the highest paid on earth.

This reluctance on the part of American youths to make the armed services their profession gives great concern to those of us who have a special responsibility in keeping America's defenses strong. We all look forward to the day when we can dispense with the draft, having only a voluntary Army, Navy, and Air Force.

There are many factors which go into making service life attractive, and we must remember that money alone cannot do everything. Servicemen's families have to live in circumstances much different than civilian families. They are denied many of the opportunities that those outside the service have to live a full and normal life. The men in service live lives of rather humdrum activities occasionally followed by brief periods of intense action.

Through the centuries customs have grown up that helped to break the tedium of military life; customs that instill in men the pride, the spirit, the love and devotion that enable them in time of great stress to go beyond the call of duty.

Who has not thrilled to hear the bugle sounding "To the Colors," to see the guard walking his post at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier? Who has not felt a heartthrob listening to the dying notes of "Taps," following the roar of the firing squad at the last rites of a departed veteran?

To those in the service, guard mount and the lowering of the flag at the close of the day adds an indefinable something to a way of life. So it is with the soft playing of an Army band at eventide. Perhaps no one can quite express in words what these colorful customs mean to the men in service. The memory of the caisson being pulled by the six gray horses, carrying the casket of a deceased exserviceman at Arlington Cemetery, lingers with us for years. While I do not intend to be buried in Arlington Cemetery, I cannot help but take a great pride in knowing that as one who has served in the Armed Forces of the United States I am entitled to such a service if I desired it.

Now in an economy move it is proposed to save the cost of the hay and oats that are eaten by the 16 horses used in the impressive funeral ceremonies at Arlington Cemetery. I believe I am as interested in stopping waste in the Armed Forces as any Member of Congress, but this does seem to be straining at a gnat. It reminds me of the young man who had been asked by his mother to give up his life of wine, women, and song. To comply with his mother's request he resigned from the glee club.

The first person that brought to my attention the move to do away with the horses and caissons at funeral ceremonies at Arlington was the wife of a famous Army general. The next person who mentioned it to me was a wounded veteran of World War I who was working in a restaurant. People in many walks of life have told me of their objections to this change. I cannot explain to you exactly what those gray horses and caissons pulling the flag-draped caskets mean. Neither can I quite make clear what the flag which our Government furnishes for the casket of every exserviceman means.

Yes; we can have an Army without having the caissons at Arlington. We could have an Army without guard mount, and Taps without bands and without retreat. We can abandon our customs of the past. Yes; we could even have an Army without a flag, but I do not think it would be much of an Army.

## A Statement Concerning H. R. 4202 Implementing the President's Recommendations on Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 7, 1957*

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some misunderstanding in regard to H. R. 4202, a bill which I have introduced to implement President Eisenhower's recommendations for revision of the immigration and nationality laws. I do not intend to offer a full explanation of the legislation at this time, but I do wish to correct certain statements made by its opponents in analyzing it.

It should be pointed out that my bill provides for only moderate revision in the quota system. It does not eliminate the national-origins theory. It would not open the floodgates to an influx of immigrants and it is not aimed to bring Communists or subversives of any kind into our country.

As a matter of fact, this legislation would provide for a more selective type of immigration than has been the case in the past.

It has been charged that H. R. 4202 calls for the immigration of more than 200,000 immigrants annually in excess of those now permitted to come to the United States. This figure is partially arrived at by the allegation that 75,000 Communist escapees would be allowed to enter the United States each year. The fact of the matter is that under the present provisions of the immigration and nationality act there is no numerical limitation on the number of aliens who may be paroled into the United States.

My bill would impose an actual limitation on the parole power inasmuch as it could be exercised in behalf of aliens fleeing from Communist persecution. It seems to me that the legislation recommended by the President is actually an improvement over the present law which contains no limitation upon the granting of immigrants entering under parole.

The limited parole section of my bill would allow a maximum of 67,890 persons to enter the United States annually. However, it is doubtful if the total

amount allowed would be utilized. It must be remembered that this number is a maximum and not a minimum. It is not a number to be used every year.

Refugees allowed to enter the United States under this provision do not come as immigrants or even as nonimmigrants. They would remain in our country at sufferance. My bill establishes a method whereby parolees could apply for adjustment of status to that of permanent residence after having been in the United States for a certain period of time.

However, Mr. Speaker, please note that this status can be adjusted only after congressional review. It is my desire to allow the Congress to maintain its traditional and rightful jurisdiction in this field. My legislation offers the Congress an opportunity to review the administrative action when the parolee seeks to acquire permanent residence.

It has also been charged that the President's recommendations for pooling unused quota numbers would produce an increase of 60,000 immigrants annually. This allegation is not necessarily correct. There is no guaranty that unused quota numbers would be exhausted. If, as now, the Congress has permitted the issuance of over 154,000 visas and perhaps 70,000 are unused each year, I submit that it is incorrect to suggest that the use of these unused quota numbers constitutes an increase in the quota. My bill merely provides a way by which unused quota numbers can be utilized, but it does not increase their number in this respect.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the President's recommendations as contained in my bill would increase the maximum limitation on the total annual quota by about 65,000 numbers. No one can correctly assert as a fact that a change in the limit means that the limit will be reached, however, and the actual restrictions and limitations in the use of the parole provision in my bill could prevent excessive use of such a provision as it now exists in the present law.

I believe that the modest increase proposed in the legislation is justified by the economic absorptive potential of the United States, whose population is increasing so rapidly that the effect of the arrival of a few extra immigrants per year will hardly be noticed.

At the proper time I will discuss the other proposals contained in the President's recommendations and the other provisions of my bill.

---

## Civil Rights Versus States Rights and God-Given Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 7, 1957*

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable NOAH M. MASON, on Wednesday, February 6, 1957, before the Judiciary Committee of the House on the so-called proposed civil rights legislation.

There has been no voice in the Congress who has spoken out against the tendency of the central Government to take over the State functions—all in violation of the Constitution—than has Mr. MASON. There has been no voice in the Congress who has spoken with more force of effect against the tendency of the Supreme Court to arrogate unto itself the legislative functions of this Congress than has Mr. MASON.

No man in Congress has less to gain by such a position than he. He speaks without hope of reward because he comes from neither the North or South where this issue seems uppermost in the minds of these two sections. He speaks as an American, concerned only with the pathetic and tragic trend of our National Legislature. He speaks with clarity on the dangerous threat which the Supreme Court poses both to the Congress and to the only bulwark left to our constitutional government, States rights. Mr. Speaker, I would to God there were more men in Congress like Mr. MASON. He has left his mark in these historic Halls. So long as he lives his voice will be a vital and clarion call for constitutional government—a government which treats all men of all colors, from all sections with impartiality:

CIVIL RIGHTS VERSUS STATES RIGHTS AND GOD-GIVEN HUMAN RIGHTS

(Testimony of the Honorable N. M. MASON, Representative, Illinois 15th District, on civil rights before the House Judiciary Committee, Wednesday, February 6, 1957)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in discussing the explosive subject of civil rights I approach it without bias, discussing it both impartially and impersonally—if that is possible—ignoring the controversial segregation issue almost entirely, placing the emphasis upon God-given human rights and States rights and the tendency of our leaders to sacrifice those rights in order to establish by law the mirage of civil rights.

We have all heard the old saying, "The cure can be worse than the disease." In connection with the proposed civil-rights legislation that saying may well apply. We might exchange States rights and our God-given human rights for a civil rights program and be much worse off after the exchange. Let us not exchange the real blessings we now enjoy for the fancied or fictitious blessings that may be a part of the mirage known as civil rights.

Habits, customs, obligations are much more effective than any civil rights program implemented by Federal laws. Laws are not particularly efficient. Custom is much more effective than any law because it polices itself. A law has little chance of being enforced if it does not have the approval and support of the majority of the people affected.

Prohibition was once the law of the land. It was a part of our written Constitution. However, because it did not reflect the conscience of the majority of our people, it was not enforceable from a practical standpoint and it had to be repealed.

Edmund Burke once said, "I know of no way to bring an indictment against a whole people." Of course, that statement applies in a democracy such as ours. It does not apply under a despot; it does not apply in Russia.

Any attempt to enforce a Federal law—or a so-called Supreme Court decision—upon 48 States that have different conditions, different customs, different social standards, and different personal consciences is simply an effort to indict, to arraign, to try a whole Nation, a whole section, a whole State. It just cannot be done in a democracy; it can only be done under a dictator. Is that what the civil rights program proposes to do? Must we lose our personal freedom? Must we surrender our precious guaranteed States rights in order to establish a program of civil rights? These are questions that bother me. They worry me. Isn't the cure much worse than the disease?

Laws reflect reform; they never induce reform. Laws that violate or go contrary to the mores of a community never bring about social peace and harmony. Our times call for patience, for moderation, for gradual evolution—not revolution by Federal law or by Supreme Court fiat.

Can the explosive Israeli-Arab controversy be settled properly and permanently by force, by law, by U. N. fiat? Can segregation advocates and integration advocates be brought into harmony by force, by Court fiat, by law? These are parallel controversies—one as explosive as the other.

Today the 85th Congress under President Eisenhower is facing the same civil rights proposal that the 81st Congress faced under President Truman. In 1948 President Truman gave the following as his civil rights objectives:

1. We believe that all men are created equal under law and that they have the right to equal justice under law.

2. We believe that all men have the right to freedom of thought and of expression and the right to worship as they please.

3. We believe that all men are entitled to equal opportunities for jobs, for homes, for good health, and for education.

4. We believe that all men should have a voice in their government, and that government should protect, not usurp, the rights of the people.

Mr. Truman further stated, "These are the basic civil rights which are the source and the support of our democracy."

I say these are all worthy objectives. No decent, law-abiding citizen would question these objectives nor oppose them. But—President Truman's methods for bringing about these objectives were questioned. His methods were opposed.

Now—President Eisenhower wants the 85th Congress to do through legislation almost exactly what President Truman wanted the 81st Congress to do, namely:

1. Establish a permanent Commission on Civil Rights, a joint congressional Committee on Civil Rights, and a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice.

2. Strengthen existing civil-rights statutes.

3. Provide Federal protection against lynching.

4. Protect more adequately the right to vote.

5. Establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission to prevent unfair discrimination in employment.

6. Prohibit discrimination in interstate transportation facilities.

Only one of these six methods for establishing civil rights—"Prohibit discrimination in interstate transportation facilities"—comes within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government as outlined in the Constitution. The other five are all State functions, State responsibilities, State obligations. They come within the police powers of the various States, and were definitely left to the States by the Constitution.

Why then should the Federal Government violate States rights by assuming functions that belong to the States? Wouldn't that be going contrary to the supreme law of the land—the Constitution?

When the Federal Constitution was before the States for ratification, four of the States demanded guaranties that "freedom of the press, of speech, and of religion," would be a part of the Constitution. Nine of the States insisted that "States rights" be guaranteed. And so the 10th amendment was made a part of the Bill of Rights so that the Federal Government would be restrained from ever interfering with human liberty and human dignity.

The first nine amendments in the Bill of Rights deal with the rights of the people, God-given rights; the 10th amendment deals with the powers of the Federal Government. It limits those powers. It says to the President, to the Supreme Court, and to the Congress: "You may do what the Constitution specifically says you may do, but you may do no more. Those powers that are not given you are either reserved to the States or they belong to the people." That is what the 10th amendment spells out, and we must not forget it in our desire to establish civil rights.

In 1952, speaking at Des Moines as a candidate for the Presidency, General Eisenhower said: "The Federal Government did not create the States of this Republic. The States created the Federal Government. The creation should not supersede the creator. For if the States lose their meaning our entire system of government loses its meaning and the next step is the rise of the centralized national state in which the seeds of autocracy can take root and grow."

At the conference of governors in Seattle early in 1953 President Eisenhower declared: "I am here because of my indestructible conviction that unless we preserve in this country the place of State government with the power of authority, the responsibilities, and the revenues necessary to discharge those responsibilities, then we are not going to have America as we have known it. We will have some other form of government."

In the words of President Eisenhower himself, therefore, the destruction of constitutional States rights will sow the seeds of autocracy, bring about some other form of government in America, and force us to establish a dictatorship.

Yet in the face of those words the President proceeded to ask Congress to create a new Cabinet office to supervise the Nation's health, education, and welfare. Under the 10th article of the Bill of Rights protection of the people's health, education, and welfare is reserved to the respective States of the Union. The President's actions, therefore, do not coincide with his words.

Not only that—but the President's own Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, after an exhaustive study by a carefully selected group of highway experts, recommended a complete set of practical plans for the adequate expansion of the Nation's highway systems under State responsibility with little or no financial aid from the Federal Government. Here was a practical official proposal for the restoration of States rights that the President ignored entirely when he submitted to the Congress his own system of highway expansion under Federal control and supervision.

And if that is not enough to convince anyone that the President's actions do not conform to his words, take the Report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations on Federal Aid for Schools. A 15-man study committee on education submitted a 200-page report on that subject which stated definitely: "We have been unable to find a State that cannot afford to make more money available to its schools or that is economically unable to support an adequate school system."

Yet the Secretary of the new Cabinet post, Mrs. Hobby—who was also a member of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations—and President Eisenhower both ignored that report and presented to the 84th Congress a Federal school aid program that would cost $2 billion. The question arises: Does the President—in the face of his own words—continue to ignore the recommendations of his own Commission on Intergovernmental Relations? I say his recommendations for Federal school aid are exactly opposite from the recommendations of his own Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

Mr. Chairman, I know these three examples: (1) a Cabinet officer to look after the health, education, and welfare of the people; (2) a Federal system of highway construction; and (3) Federal aid for public schools, are not examples of civil rights. But they are definitely examples of the violation of States rights. And—as such—have a direct bearing and relationship to civil rights, because the proposed civil rights program is also a direct violation of States rights as guaranteed by the Constitution.

I had the good fortune to serve on the Commission of Intergovernmental Relations under the chairmanship of Dean Manion, one of the greatest constitutional lawyers in America. The one great principle he emphasized was that the purpose of the American Government is to preserve and protect our God-given rights; that the American Government is a mechanism for the protection of human rights; that civil rights are rights provided by law that definitely come under the jurisdiction of the States, not under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government; that whenever the Federal Government undertakes to establish or set up a program of civil rights, it must of necessity encroach upon States rights and upon God-given human rights.

Can we afford to do that? Dare we violate the Constitution by ignoring the following clear and concise language?

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

---

## Reducing Government Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 7, 1957*

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 4, 1957, the Honorable BURR P. HARRISON, Representative of the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia, delivered, at the third national reorganization conference of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report meeting in Washington, D. C., a magnificent address which I hope every citizen of this great Nation of ours will read. It points up some of the vital issues facing our people.

Representative HARRISON is one of the outstanding Members of the Congress. He is a hard-working, conscientious, dedicated public servant who is determined to do his best to preserve for our people our republican form of government.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include therewith the splendid address made by Congressman HARRISON.

REDUCING GOVERNMENT COMPETITION

(Address by Hon. BURR P. HARRISON, of Virginia, delivered at the third national reorganization conference of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, Washington, D. C., on February 4, 1957)

In 1954 Budget Director Hughes said:

"The Federal Government * * * is * * * the largest electric power producer in the country, the largest insurer, the largest lender and the largest borrower, the largest landlord and the largest tenant, the largest holder of grazing land, the largest holder of timberland, the largest owner of grain, the largest warehouse operator, the largest shipowner, and the largest truck-fleet operator."

The report of the Second Hoover Commission on Business Enterprises, containing recommendations for 479 separate actions of reform, was submitted in May 1955. In a bulletin issued by the Citizens Committee in November, 1956, it is said, "Thirty-nine percent of the recommendations have been or are being implemented in full in principle, or as to objective."

In other words, after nearly 2 years, the Government either is doing something or thinking about doing something in regard to 39 percent of the recommendations.

What are some of the reasons for the development of counterpressures which stretch out adoption of the Commission's recommendations on a rack of economic, political, and psychological tensions.

First, there is the old bureaucratic argument that a commercial operation of the Federal Government, from ice-cream factories to Bluebeard's Castle, a hotel in the Virgin Islands, should be retained because it seems to be providing an article, or a service, at less cost than if the article or service were provided by private industry. In operation after operation, the Hoover Commission found that, if all expenditures for personnel and other overhead, such as depreciation, interest on investment, etc., were taken into consideration, the purchase could be made from private enterprise at the same or less cost.

It is refreshing, however, to note that the last argument has been rejected by Director of the Budget Brundage on a broader basis. The Director makes this flat statement:

"The decision whether to continue or discontinue a Government activity solely on an apparent cost basis runs counter to our concept that the Government has, ordinarily, no right to compete in a private-enterprise economy."

This forthright policy, if rigidly adhered to in the future, will mean the complete adoption of the Commission's recommendations in the civil government.

Let us turn to situations peculiar to the Department of Defense. Here we are told that a particular activity must be maintained under exclusive control of the military to protect our national defense because of security considerations or as a pilot operation to establish standards for a key item.

In other words, the Russians will get us unless the military continues its vital military and secret operations of moving picture studios, ice cream plants, tree and garden nurseries, dental repair shops, clothing factories, coffee roasting plants, and jewelry repair shops. It is heresy bordering on disloyalty to question any such 2,500 commercial and industrial-type facilities in which Government capital invested exceeds $15 billion. There is one activity of the military which I especially urge should not be disturbed: the manufacture of ophthalmic goods. Not only is this necessary to manufacture spectacles for the colonel's lady—and possibly Judy O'Grady—it is also obvious that some of our military leaders are in need of opticals—possibly a spyglass—to see when they are conducting a business they have no business conducting.

The Hoover Commission recommended the restriction and realistic limitation of the integrated Military Air Transport Service to persons and cargo necessary for military air transportation, and that transportation on service carriers be authorized only after commercial carriers had been utilized to maximum practicable extent. This recommendation follows the declaration by Congress, and the policy approved by the President, that private enterprise is to be encouraged in this field.

The Department of Defense insists it is essential the military have in being a substantial fleet of transport and cargo planes, with adequately trained crews, for immediate use in the event of a future D-day. Obviously, we cannot demand that the military get out of the airline business—flying scheduled trips all over the world on routes similar to those of commercial carriers—if to do so would endanger defense readiness.

There is reason to wonder, though, whether it really is essential, for force-in-being and training purposes, that the Military Air Transport Service maintain, as I am informed, more than 40,000 persons in its transport operations and operate in its global air ferry services almost as many aircraft as all the certificated American commercial airlines together use wholly or partly in their international service. Aircraft under control of MATS carried 617,000 passengers in fiscal year 1955, all of whom couldn't have been junketing Members of Congress. As I am informed MATS operates between 700 and 800 transport aircraft, and the Department of Defense controls approximately 4,000 transport types, this figure obviously does not include thousands of passengers carried by transports of the Armed Forces on training or other flights.

As I understand it, MATS schedules flights in accordance with prudent training requirements, but its quarterly operations summaries customarily list many extra flights as, "to move traffic backlog."

If MATS accumulates so much traffic backlog, would it not be consistent with our national civil aviation policy to encourage private enterprise participation in the job? Although air carriers have only recently been able to persuade the Department of Defense to contract for private carrier assistance as far as 6 months in advance, the Military Sea Transportation Service, relying heavily on private shipping, has been taking steps to insure a cargo and transport fleet in being for the future by contracting in advance for the use of ships, notably tankers, even before the keels are laid.

I do not presume to suggest a yardstick for participation of private transportation facilities—air, sea, and land—in the movement of military traffic, but the defense agencies should be giving it active and continuing consideration, inasmuch as heavy military passenger and cargo movements of a routine nature seem destined to remain part of the peacetime transportation picture for the indefinite future.

I should like to comment briefly on what seems to me to be the strongest force operating against the movement for reduction in Federal business-type activity—a growing acceptance of dependence on Government, even among citizens who are loud in their demands for economy in the gross.

It seems to me that many members of the business community who can see clearly the undesirability of the Government's running an ice cream factory have become increasingly resigned to letting the Government compete, or even take over, in larger spheres which we used to regard as reserved to private enterprise.

The growing tax burden, its expansion accelerated by inflation, has reduced many citizens to an outlook of fatalism:

"Sure, I know my taxes pay for public housing and public power and loans, but taxes keep going up anyway. If I get a loan, or some cheap electricity or subsidized housing, at least I'll get a little something back for my money. If I don't, some foreigner will get it—that's where most of it is going, anyway."

There is no purpose in our pausing to indict this viewpoint as specious or un-American. It exists, and it helps keep the Government active in public housing, public power, and other fields in which private enterprise should supply the need.

The ads in the national magazines, proclaiming the private enterprise can do it better, are not enough. The man in the street says, "Show me."

I realize there have been some instances in which the proof has been forthcoming in dramatic and incontrovertible form, but these cases are isolated, and their lessons have not gotten across to the public on a broad enough basis to alter the easy acceptance of Federal pap.

The most discouraging development, to my mind, has been the progressive abdication of private enterprise in the field of long-term credit. The increasing reliance on Government guaranties and other credit crutches presents us with paradoxical spectacles. The private housing industry, for example, which properly abhors the continuation of a Federal public-housing program, insists, year after year, that it cannot survive unless the Federal Government extends its activity in the mortgage-banking field, by an increase in Fannie May limits, or by other means.

We have come so far along this road that a major withdrawal by the Federal Government from the lending and loan-guaranty fields would create a dangerous vacuum if private enterprise did not demonstrate in advance a capacity and willingness to occupy the space. We must remember that the Federal Government moved in because of a vacuum which private sources created by their own failure to meet public demand for credit, notably in home financing and in small business.

In many communities, particularly the smaller ones, the banks and other private lending institutions simply have not come close to satisfying the credit demand.

Events have proved that deciding nothing can be done does not settle the matter. It merely heads the prospective homebuyer, the small-business man and those elements of the economy anxious to sell to them, toward Washington.

Clearly, private enterprise should not be bludgeoned into making or guaranteeing unsound loans. But neither can private enterprise rail against Government competition when it assists in the creation of a vacuum for the prompt occupancy of a willing bureaucracy.

We have prided ourselves on the development of an economic system in which private initiative has succeeded in providing, at increasing efficiency and, where inflation has not intervened, at declining cost, the goods and services for which private demand has developed. This ingenuity has achieved tremendous things. And yet, it apparently has not been equal to the task of supplying credit of the sort demanded.

I do not mean to minimize the problems inherent in trying to reestablish the dominance of private enterprise in the credit structure, but I do contend that business cannot counter the federalization of enterprise in this country merely by preaching in the abstract of the virtues and capacities of private initiative and the sinfulness of governmental competition. The time is long past when it was considered disgraceful to come to Washington with hat in hand. Some of the best people are doing it now.

Last week, as one of the first pieces of legislation ready for floor action in this session of Congress, we were asked in the House of Representatives to approve an increase of $80 million in the business loan authorization of the Small Business Administration. Leaving aside the disaster loan operations of this agency, we have here a renewed demand for normal commercial credit which private suppliers are not filling. This is not seizure by Government but an occupation by invitation.

If we are going to stem this dangerous tide toward an economic state of affairs in which the Government holds a mortgage interest in virtually every business in the Nation, private enterprise is going to have to concentrate its vaunted ingenuity and initiative on a means of supplying the credit demand of individual and business.

This is a stern challenge. If it can be met, we shall have moved a giant step toward the lean and frugal structure of Government which we insist we want. If it is not met, it will not seem so important, a few years from now, that we were able to get the Defense Department out of the ice cream business.

---

## Members of Congress Greet French Ambassador Herve M. Alphand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 7, 1957*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I herewith insert statements by the Ambassador and myself made at a luncheon I tendered in honor of the French Ambassador on January 29, 1957, in the Speaker's Dining Room, at which were present a number of our distinguished colleagues. In introducing His Excellency, the French Ambassador, I stated:

M. Herve Alphand, who is only 49 years old, seems on first acquaintance to be a career diplomat straight out of the pages of Somerset Maugham. He has had a brilliant academic career. He completed his "bacho," which is the French equivalent of the first 2 years of an American college, at the age of 16—and his knowledge of painting, music, and literature is fully equal to his grasp of international affairs.

M. Alphand comes from a long line of diplomats. His family began its government service under the Bourbons back in 1707.

In line with the family tradition, M. Alphand's grandfather entered the Ministry of Interior. His father, however, chose the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and after World War I he was Ambassador to Moscow.

Strangely enough, in view of the fact that he appears to be the very model of a career diplomat, M. Alphand never studied for a foreign service career. His formal education was concentrated on law and economics. After finishing his formal schooling, he spent a year in military service, after which in 1930 he entered the Ministry of Finance, and was the youngest man ever to attain the eminent post of Inspecteur des Finances.

During World War II he joined the Free French in London while his wife remained in the United States. He served in various posts with the Free French and attended the San Francisco Conference where the United Nations Charter was written. He also represented his country on the NATO Council of Foreign Minister Deputies, and afterward served as the permanent delegate before taking up his post as French representative at the United Nations, a post which he held until his appointment as Ambassador to Washington.

M. Alphand believes firmly that France must remain a strong Western democratic power, and that France and the United States must always be in the same camp. He has said: "I am certain that France and the United States can never differ fundamentally on vital international problems."

M. Alphand has always devoted himself to dissipating temporary misunderstandings which, according to him, are usually due to lack of information, a situation that often arises among the best of friends. His major aim is to bring about a better understanding of France, and to strengthen our alliance which has continued without interruption for nearly two centuries.

Among the major problems that face France today is that of Algeria. We must try to understand and see this problem whole. Carping criticism irritates—helps little.

France has been our friend for nearly 200 years. We shed our blood together in two world wars. We cannot forget her decisive aid to Washington in our struggle for independence. The years between should not dim our memories. We must not be blind to the efforts of France to work out a constructive solution anent Algeria.

We must remember that the development of Algeria since 1830, when France first set foot there—made up part of the French legend—not unlike the trailblazing of the American pioneers west of the Mississippi during the same decades, and which has become part of our national legend. Algeria then was a land of arid stretches not unlike our great western plains. France built up those wastelands until we can see plainly the progress made.

Algeria is French territory and under the French Constitution. Algeria is as much a part of France as Hawaii is of the United States.

Now, Egyptian money and arms (Russian made) pour into Algeria. Innocent minds in Algeria are inflamed daily by blasts from Cairo and Moscow radios. France has poured much treasure into Algeria and increased its economic levels. Mere prating of French colonialism is nonsense. France, at great sacrifice, set Tunisia and Morocco free. Algeria's problem is totally different. We cannot permit a vacuum to exist there, free for Russian domination.

There is a solution to the problem of Algeria, but that solution must be sensible, realistic, and afford protection to 9 million native Algerians and protection to 1,200,000 natives of French European origin. United States can and must help in such an effort at amity and justice. France needs our moral support.

The Ambassador followed with his remarks:

I am very grateful to Congressman CELLER for his kind words about me. I deem it a great honor to have been invited to meet with so distinguished a group of American legislators and to have this opportunity to say a few words to you.

In my many years of service to my Government in different parts of the world I have never felt so much at home away from home as I do when I am here in the United States.

Almost two centuries of close alliance and mutual assistance in times of need have welded a kind of friendship between our two countries which can never be destroyed by temporary differences of opinion on a particular issue. As in any closely knit association, whether in personal family life or in the family of nations, misunderstandings and differences are bound to arise, but they only serve to emphasize the more permanent state and trust and devotion.

Let us for a moment discuss some of the differences confronting us today and permit me to give you the French point of view.

In reply to the frequently voiced criticism of my country for its policies of so-called colonialism, I would like to mention the bold steps taken by France in the past 10 years to emancipate the peoples of Asia and Africa, to raise their standards of living, and to help them participate in the progress of the modern world.

Morocco and Tunisia are now independent. We believe that, in their own interests, these states should maintain with France, within the framework of an association freely consented to, relations of mutual confidence in military, financial, and administrative matters.

May I recall, also, what we are doing in dark Africa. There we have set up the autonomous Republic of Togoland, ratified by a free plebiscite. And all our policies are directed toward granting an ever greater autonomy to French territories everywhere.

As to the criticism of our policy in Algeria as one of "outdated colonialism," may I say that those who know Algeria, those who know what France has accomplished there understand only too well what our intentions are there. I wish to add only two remarks:

In the first place, I wish to recall that Premier Mollet has just proposed that free elections be held in Algeria in the presence of observers from countries which also live under the regime of freedom. I only wish that the masters in the Kremlin would grant to the Kadar government in Budapest the same permission to hold free elections in Hungary.

Secondly, at a time when the United States is trying to build up a defense against communism in the Middle East, it would be strange for its ally France to throw North Africa wide open to communism by giving up Algeria. I am certain that the so-called Algerian nationalists do not possess either the experience or the necessary leadership to establish and administer a state. The only well organized group among the Algerian rebels is the Communists. Are we willing, at this time, to accept the establishment, for the first time, of a so-called People's Republic on African soil? In such a case would not the whole of the African Continent be in danger of swinging to the East? What, then, would be the fate of Europe itself? What consequences would this have throughout the world, including this hemisphere?

Thus this question of Algeria, which seems to you so remote, and which is ignored by so many of your countrymen, is of essential importance to the future of the entire free world, of which France and the United States, together with Great Britain, are the main pillars.

## Speech of Senator Sparkman to Jaycees of Jasper, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 7, 1957*

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address made by Alabama's junior Senator, the Honorable JOHN J. SPARKMAN, before the junior chamber of commerce of my home town of Jasper, Ala., on Friday night, January 11, 1957:

SPEECH BY SENATOR JOHN SPARKMAN, OF ALABAMA, BEFORE THE JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE YOUNG-MAN-OF-THE-YEAR-AWARD BANQUET, JASPER, ALA., JANUARY 11, 1957

We are here tonight honoring a young man who has already achieved success. He has achieved that success right here in Alabama—right here in Walker County, where many of the necessary ingredients for success lie all about him.

A young man, either on the point of deciding on, or in the early stages of his career, often wonders if he should take Horace Greeley's advice and "Go west," or take someone else's advice and go north or east.

To many young men, the grass does look greener in distant pastures. But my hope is that young men and young women, born and reared in Alabama, may resolve that today their futures lie in Alabama. I hope that so far as it may be reasonably done young people of Walker County may cast their future lot in Walker County.

Alabama needs the ability, the initiative and the productiveness of her young men and young women. One of our greatest needs in Alabama is an industrial development that will make jobs available for our own people and thus put an end to this never-ending migration of our young people and the resulting terrific economic loss.

Of course, no young man can expect to sit here in Alabama or Walker County and wait for a glowing future to unfold before him. Any man who expects the future to glow must provide the flame to spark that glow. He must look about him. He must size up the opportunities that face him.

I am convinced that there are many opportunities in Walker County for a young man willing to apply himself. The young man who wishes to size up Walker County and its opportunities might well take a look at Walker County's history.

Like many good things American, Walker County's history started with the Indians. This county was originally a territory formed by the boundaries of the Creek, Chickasaw, and Cherokee Indian nations. Walker's history is steeped in the sweat of the common man's toil, for its first settlers were primarily farmers from the Carolinas, north Georgia, and eastern Tennessee. They were seeking just a little land on which to scratch out their simple wants from Walker County's fertile hills.

It was not until the 1820's that the mainstream of settlers found its way into the county. With this mainstream came a desire on the part of these new settlers to search deeper into the resources of the county. One of their first findings was coal.

There is some question as to whether the first coal mined in Alabama was mined in Walker County. It is known that the first flatboat of coal to reach Mobile was shipped from Walker County. And while people came first to farm, mining eventually achieved equal importance with agriculture.

Although today we see the county groping its way out of a serious economic plight, the combination of farming and mining was so strong by the time of the panic of 1837 that this depression produced only a slight effect on the economic picture here. The rest of the Nation, however, suffered shattering economic setbacks.

The county's population has grown from 2,200 in 1830 to around 65,000 today. The coal mines did much to help this growth, but the demand for coal has fallen off considerably in the last 5 years. The advent of the diesel engine was the prime factor in Walker's declining coal market.

While the hardships brought on by that falling market were severe, and the suffering of Walker County's people great, that falling market—in the view of some—has really been a blessing in disguise. It has caused Walker county to pause, to take stock of itself, and to come up with a sharp appraisal of its other resources.

This reappraisal has a parallel in the situation that faced the entire South many years ago. In the old days, people spoke of King Cotton, because that was the primary crop on most farms and and plantations. The boll weevil came north from Mexico and

temporarily conquered King Cotton. Then the whole South began to reappraise itself. That reappraisal resulted in the South finding and ferreting out its other resources. And for opening its eyes the South erected, in one place, at least, a monument to the boll weevil.

I am not necessarily suggesting that Walker Countians erect a monument to the declining coal market. I am, however, complimenting you on your foresight in making a sweeping and profitable reappraisal of the county's assets.

Those earlier settlers would be pleased to know that the opportunities they saw in farming are being carefully explored today. They would be proud to know that farming has returned to prominence as a vital factor in the county's economy.

The whole State has learned of Walker County's "Operation Drumstick." Under "Operation Drumstick," the forward-looking people of this county have established the poultry industry as the backbone of the county's industry. Walker County is coming back, mainly through the efforts of young men like you here, ably guided by the older leaders of the county. For it was through the leadership of business and civic groups that a program of diversified industry and farming was established here.

In 1955 the poultry business, alone, produced 3 million broilers. The 1956 figure is estimated to be in the neighborhood of 6 million.

Five years ago 6,000 Jasper workers depended on the mines for a livelihood. Today approximately 1,000 work in the mines. Other workers are finding employment in five furniture factories, a ladies' lingerie factory, a number of chicken-feed mills, and in the many small businesses that thrive here and in neighboring towns.

Today a substantial number of Walker Countians are finding that they can make about the same wages raising 7,500 broilers that they can make in the mines. The average broiler raiser finds that tending his chickens takes only a small part of the day. Some are farming. Some are hiring out on construction jobs. Others are finding full- or part-time work in local factories and businesses.

In this shift away from Old King Coal Walker Countians are not forgetting coal's value to the economy. Those tipples, standing now gaunt and still, those abandoned mines whose mouths stand open but dark will yet pour more wealth into the county. Old King Coal is sick, but organizations like the junior chamber of commerce have the brains and the drive to make him well again.

Walker Countians are not forgetting that—according to one of your parent organization's own publications—this Nation's known reserves of gas will last only 32 years and that the known reserves of oil will last only 15 years at present consumption rates. These are relatively short periods when you consider that the known reserves of coal in this Nation will last for 1,000 years.

Walker Countians are not forgetting either that many industries of this Nation must rely on derivatives of coal; that there are over one billion tons of recoverable coal in place in the county; and that live-wire groups like the Jaycees will be working to find markets for the black gold in your hills.

Walker Countians know the value of education in making use of the county's potentialities. Signs of Walker County's interest in education are obvious. Right here in Jasper, Walker College stands as a symbol of this county's desire that its children shall have the opportunity to begin a college education near home, where the expense is small.

College officials foresee a gymnasium, a library, a science building, and several dormitories on the Walker College campus. Enrollment in 1956 was more than double that of 1955. The 9-month secretarial course offered by the college is, no doubt, a considerable service to the many local businessmen.

A specialist in the relationship between economics and education recently challenged Alabamians to make use of its three main assets—climate, water, and space. He said education and skill in the use of these assets can bring the people of the South to new highs in income levels. The whole South is proving this statement to be true.

I want to discuss now some of the things that are going on in Washington—things that will affect you here in Jasper.

Of major interest to the 85th Congress is the Eisenhower administration's tight-money policy. Congress will take special note of this policy's effect on the small-business man. Small business made much news in 1956 because it was in trouble. I think it is vital that Congress do something to halt the rather alarming number of bankruptcies that small business suffered in 1956.

Something should be done about the lower profits to small business; the lack of credit available to small business; and the mounting interest rates both on small business operating loans and to consumer installment buyers.

That a large portion of the small-business community of our Nation, comprising more than 4 million firms and accounting for more than 95 percent of our total business enterprises, in the past few years has been pushed closer and closer to the brink of bankruptcy is a matter of common knowledge.

As recently as January 2, headlines in the New York Times proclaimed: "Failures Climb to 15-Year High—Small Business Has Big Troubles." Beneath this headline the facts were set forth, in part, as follows: "Heightened competition, particularly in the field of retail and wholesale distribution, took a higher toll in failures in 1956 than any year since 1941. From the standpoint of dollar liability of failures, the total last year was the highest since 1935. * * *"

The inescapable fact is that our free-enterprise system has become imperiled by the rapid deterioration in the position of small and independent business establishments.

The extent and gravity of this deterioration is frightening in its implications. We know that in the distributive trades, in wholesaling and retailing, there has been what almost amounts to an epidemic of failures.

I am convinced, as one must be convinced who has given the subject serious thought, that independent small business in this country will never regain its rightful and traditional share of the rich rewards of our economic system unless—to the degree that commonsense and national self-interest dictate—it is assured an opportunity to compete on equal terms with its larger rivals in the market place.

Of the many small-business problem areas susceptible of legislative relief, none should take precedence over those involving taxes, financial and credit assistance, and increased antitrust protection.

To bring much-needed relief to small business in the tax field, I introduced five bills last Monday. Each of these bills is designed to bring the maximum relief to those who need it most—the very smallest corporations, partnerships, and proprietorships, whether they be machine shops, farms, or the corner grocery store.

The first bill provides for a graduated corporate income tax. I first introduced this bill in the closing weeks of the 84th Congress. While the press of other major legislation prevented its consideration last year, the response to the bill was so encouraging that I decided to reintroduce it in this Congress.

This bill would substitute graduated rates for the present normal and surtax rates applicable to corporate income. The present law imposes a normal tax of 30 percent on the first $25,000 of corporate net income and a surtax of 22 percent, for a total statutory rate of 52 percent on all net income over $25,000. My bill would start with a tax rate of 5 percent on the first $5,000 of corporate net income and would result in a tax saving to all corporations having up to $375,000 of net income.

This would mean a tax saving to nearly 98 percent of all corporations. The top rate on my bill would be 55 percent and would apply to all net income over $100,000. Only some 2 percent of all corporations would pay increased taxes under this bill, and then only in relatively minor amounts.

I am informed by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation that this bill will not cause any loss in revenue. In fact it would bring about an increase in revenue in the neighborhood of ninety to one hundred million dollars. While this amount is significant, I am further informed that it would not be possible to reduce any of the rates in the bill as it stands without causing revenue loss.

The other four tax bills would benefit all forms of small business, unincorporated as well as incorporated.

One of these bills would extend the benefits of rapid depreciation to purchasers of used equipment. The 1954 Internal Revenue Code added a new provision to our tax law which enabled purchasers of new equipment to write off the cost of such equipment at accelerated rates.

This, of course, means a tax saving to such businessmen. It is a well-recognized fact, however, that many small concerns cannot afford the present-day high costs of certain equipment which they need to run their businesses. They must buy used equipment at the prices they can afford to pay.

I know of no good reason why the purchasers of such equipment should not be granted the same privilege of rapid depreciation now given to purchasers of new equipment. By virtue of the very fact that the equipment is used and possibly approaching obsolescence when purchased, it would appear to me to be only fair that the purchaser should be entitled to write off his cost over a relatively short period of time.

Another one of the bills which I introduced Monday would liberalize the requirements on the payment of estate taxes. Under the present law, the tax on the estate of the deceased is payable 1 year after the death of the decedent, except that on a showing of hardship, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may authorize payment over a 10-year period.

The bill which I have introduced on this subject will alleviate the problem to a great extent. It grants an estate the right to pay the estate tax over a period of 10 years without any showing of hardship. In addition, where hardship can be shown—and the term "hardship" is defined in the bill in terms of equities in a business—the tax may be paid over a period of 20 years.

One of the great benefits extended to businesses in the 1954 Internal Revenue Act was that contained in the provisions relating to approved profit-sharing plans and pension plans. By virtue of the language of the law, only "employees" could benefit from the plans. This means that a sole stockholder of a corporation who also serves as the president of the corporation may qualify as an "employee" of the corporation and thus be a beneficiary under its pension or profit-sharing plan. But a member of a partnership or a proprietor of an unincorporated business does not qualify as an "employee" under the law and thus cannot be a beneficiary under any of these tax-exempt plans.

Such plans have great and obvious advantages for the man who wants to save for his own future and for the future security of his family. One of the bills which I intro-

duced Monday would entitle the proprietors of unincorporated business to the benefits of the tax-exempt plans.

Lastly, I have introduced a bill which would grant an election to certain corporations to be taxed as partnerships. This would benefit some small corporations which are hit especially hard by double taxes—first on the corporation and then on its stockholders on receipt of dividends.

It would also be of some benefit to small corporations which might otherwise be vulnerable to the surtax on surplus accumulations. The election would be extended to all corporations having not more than 10 stockholders, all stockholders being active in the business.

Last year on the eve of the election the President's Cabinet Committee on Small Business recommended similar tax legislation for the relief of small business. The President endorsed the committee's proposals. I am asking Congress to take him at his word.

In addition to these tax bills, next week I will introduce two bills relating to credit availability for the small-business man.

One of the most difficult problems of small business is that of obtaining adequate credit—credit for working capital and credit for necessary expansion. This has been a long-standing problem but it is an especially acute one today in the face of the administration's tight-money policy.

It is for this reason that I believe that the need for a comprehensive credit program for small business is all the more compelling. My bills, if enacted, will (a) establish national investment companies authorized to make long-term capital loans to small concerns, and (b) make it possible for small-business men to get federally insured loans.

Through such a program small businesses will at long last have a dependable source of credit. Such a source of credit is necessary to insure equal competitive opportunity to small-business men.

I know that small-business men do not want a Federal handout. All they want is a chance to compete on an equal basis with the larger businesses.

The farmer, like the small-business man, is having economic trouble. I will support legislation which will bring farm income more in line with farm expenses. Alabama is basically a farming State despite the increasing number of people leaving the farms. Since 1953 farm costs have increased. Farm income has shrunk.

I intend to fight during this 85th Congress for higher price supports for Alabama's farm products. I will insist that Secretary of Agriculture Benson use the authority we have given him over the last several years to dispose, in a sensible manner, of our present farm surpluses. Specifically, I have joined with Senator HILL in sponsoring a bill to prevent further cotton acreage cuts.

School construction remains one of the desperate needs of Alabama and the Nation. I trust that vitally needed school construction legislation will not be blocked under the rather transparent effort to inject civil rights. The right to an adequate education is a right that transcends all so-called questions of civil rights. Those who inject the civil-rights issue each time that Federal aid to education is introduced in Congress are depriving both the Negro and the white child of his right to a worthwhile education.

Some rather drastic, but much-needed, cleaning up of this Nation's foreign policy is in order during the next few weeks. The day is long past when the United States can separate its domestic welfare from foreign affairs.

Perhaps the most crucial item in Congress' consideration of foreign affairs is the still-boiling Middle Eastern crisis. Terrible mistakes of the last 3 years have led to this crisis.

Fortunately, President Eisenhower has finally, but belatedly, recognized the seriousness of the Middle Eastern situation.

His proposals, while not new with but one exception, boil down essentially to this:

1. Providing economic cooperation to the Middle East.

2. Helping Middle East nations to build their defenses.

3. Making available our Armed Forces to any Middle East nation or nations who feel that the Communist threat is of such a nature that their independence is at stake; and, finally,

4. Freeing $200 million that Congress had previously appropriated for other purposes, for use in the Middle East.

His request will receive high priority during the next few weeks of Congress. And during the next few days all of us on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will spend much time studying his suggestions. Somehow, we must prevent world war III. We must prevent Communist leaders from gaining control of more and more areas vital to our own security.

In closing, let me congratulate you young men again on the community-building job you are doing here in Jasper. Let me congratulate you on the fact that you are publicly praising the work of young men in this area who are contributing to a better community.

Your efforts will not go unrewarded. The very process of giving this young-man-of-the-year award each year serves as a beacon to those young men who may sometimes wonder: What's the use?

You are providing the flame that is making Jasper into one of the more progressive and forward-looking cities of Alabama.

---

# SENATE

## MONDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1957

Rev. Harold M. Davis, pastor, Elkton Methodist Church, Elkton, Md., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we humbly thank Thee for the blessings which Thou hast given to our country; for the faith of our fathers who laid the foundation of freedom upon which we are still building; for the vast reservoir of natural resources which have resulted in our prosperity; for our faculties of mind and will which have given us the know-how to produce much goods for abundant living. For these we give Thee thanks.

We are mindful of those who have walked before us. Especially rich is our memory of one whose birthday we celebrate tomorrow. We pray that something of the spirit that was his may be ours today. In our hearts may there be malice toward none and charity for all.

God bless the Members of this body in whom the people of our Nation have placed great confidence. Help them in their offices, committees, and in other delegated responsibilities as they meet in legislative sessions. May their actions be so noble and honorable that we electors may be inspired and proud that we have exercised our right as American citizens.

May Thy presence be real to each one of the Members of this body, that they may be strengthened when weak, encouraged when downcast, and steady when wavering. May they labor together in an atmosphere of teamwork, with a freedom to be honest and frank in facing the issues of the hour. Imbue them with the spirit of wisdom, goodness, and truth; and so rule in their hearts that law and order, justice and peace will everywhere prevail.

We ask these things in the name of Christ, our Lord. Amen.

---

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 7, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

---

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

---

## REPORT ON OPERATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 93)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Finance:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

This is my first annual report on the operation of the trade agreements program. It is submitted to the Congress pursuant to section 350 (e) (1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended by section 3 (d) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955. The trade agreements program is carried out under the authority contained in the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 and its various amendments and extensions.

Our present trade-policy objectives, which I outlined in my special message on foreign economic policy of March 30, 1954, were established after study by the bipartisan Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, constituted in 1953 pursuant to Public Law 215, 83d Congress. Most of the Commission's recommendations have been adopted and put into effect. This report outlines the steps which have been taken to achieve these foreign-trade-policy goals.

The major efforts undertaken in recent years have been concentrated, first, upon improving the substance and administration of the existing trade agreement system. These activities are described in section I of this report. They were directed primarily to a basic review of the general agreement on tariffs and trade. This review resulted in proposals for the improvement of the substantive provisions of the general

agreement and in the drafting of an agreement to establish an organization for trade cooperation. I have requested the Congress to authorize United States membership in the proposed organization. Establishment of the organization for trade cooperation is essential to make our trade-agreements program more effective in the interest of American industry, agriculture, and labor.

The United States has also taken gradual steps under authority granted by the Congress to reduce barriers to trade through reciprocal tariff negotiations. The most recent of these negotiations was carried on under new authority set forth in Public Law 86, 84th Congress. Safeguards for domestic industry are contained both in the escape clause and peril point provisions of this law and in the administrative procedures established thereunder. A detailed account of these negotiations is given in section II.

The United States has also worked successfully through the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to obtain the reduction or elimination of quotas that have restricted United States export trade. These activities are described in section III.

Section IV of this report covers actions under special legislative provisions affecting the trade agreements program—the "escape clause" and the "national security" amendment.

The final portion of this report, section V, summarizes developments in our trading relations with those countries which are not parties to the General Agreement but with which the United States has bilateral trade agreements.

Since this is the first Presidential report on a program that has been in effect for a number of years, the report is not limited to the 1956 calendar year but includes such earlier developments as are necessary to replace recent events in perspective. Detailed accounts of individual actions taken under the trade agreements program are included in the Tariff Commission's annual report to the Congress.

Exports and imports are important to our economic strength and to the well-being of our people. International commerce is beneficial to the community of nations and conducive to the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the world. Our national trade policy, which seeks to promote the continued growth of mutually profitable world trade, is thus doubly in the self-interest of the United States; it furthers both our prosperity and our national security.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 11, 1957.*

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3845) extending for 1 year the time in which the Boston National Historic Sites Commission shall complete its work, and it was signed by the Vice President.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] has been invited to address the Georgia State Legislature today. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that he be officially excused from attendance at this session of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

## READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the Chair designates the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] to read Washington's Farewell Address to the Senate on February 22 next.

## ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar, under the rule, be dispensed with today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business for today, it stand in adjournment until Thursday, February 14.

The VICE PRESIDENT. without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## PROTOCOL WITH CANADA RELATING TO SOCKEYE SALMON FISHERIES IN FRASER RIVER SYSTEM, AND TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP, COMMERCE, AND NAVIGATION WITH KOREA—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive C, 85th Congress, 1st session, a protocol between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada to the Convention for the Protection, Preservation, and Extension of the Sockeye Salmon Fisheries in the Fraser River System signed at Washington on the 26th day of May 1930, which protocol was signed at Ottawa on December 28, 1956, and Executive D, 85th Congress, 1st session, a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Seoul on November 28, 1956, and that the protocol and treaty, together with the President's messages, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's messages be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed, and the protocol and treaty, together with the President's messages, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the messages from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The messages from the President are as follows:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the protocol between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada to the Convention for the Protection, Preservation, and Extension of the Sockeye Salmon Fisheries in the Fraser River System signed at Washington on the 26th day of May 1930, which protocol was signed at Ottawa on December 28, 1956.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the protocol.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 11, 1957.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Protocol to Convention for the Protection, Preservation, and Extension of the Sockeye Salmon Fisheries in the Fraser River System.)

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Seoul on November 28, 1956.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the treaty.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 11, 1957.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation, with protocol, signed at Seoul, November 28, 1956.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of C. Burke Elbrick, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John Hay Whitney, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Great Britain.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of Foreign Service officers for promotion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ross L. Leffler, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, Department of the Interior.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert L. Farrington, of Oklahoma, to be General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frederick C. Nash, of Michigan, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James Tolman Pyle, of Maryland, to be Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Richard F. Mitchell, of Iowa, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1963.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lawrence Walrath, of Florida, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1963.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward T. Tait, of Pennsylvania, to be Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years from September 26, 1956.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Arthur R. Campbell, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Leslie A. Blake, of Maine, to be collector of customs for district No. 1, with headquarters at Portland, Maine.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Coast Guard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

WATERSHED WORK PLAN, LITTLE YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER WATERSHED, MARYLAND

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a plan for works of improvement in the Little Youghiogheny River watershed, Garrett County, Md., dated March 1956 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPEAL OF SECTION 2 OF ACT OF AUGUST 2, 1956

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal section 2 of the act of August 2, 1956, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON RESERVE FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting pursuant to law, his report on the status of training of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and the progress made in strengthening of the Reserve components, during fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that administration reflecting estimated obligations by principal activities, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF D. C. TRANSIT SYSTEM, INC.

A letter from the president, D. C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering operations of that system, for the period August 15 through December 31, 1956, with balance sheet as of December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AUDIT REPORT ON ALASKA ROAD COMMISSION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Alaska Road

Commission, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1955 and 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committtee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 3238, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPRESENTATION OF CERTAIN DEFENDANTS IN CRIMINAL CASES

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 3731, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO APPEALS BY THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3731 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to appeals by the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF EMPLOYMENT OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL IN THE INTEREST OF NATIONAL SECURITY

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF BOARD OF ACTUARIES OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

A letter from the chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF CERTAIN HIGHWAYS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize funds for the improvement by the Secretary of Commerce of the Pentagon Road Network and that portion of the Henry G. Shirley Memorial Highway in Arlington County, Va., and to provide for the transfer of such highways to the Commonwealth of Virginia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Senate Joint Resolution 5

"Relative to a stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the first land survey in Death Valley

"Whereas matters of historic and national importance are fitting subjects for commemorative issues of United States postage stamps; and

"Whereas this year marks the 100th anniversary of one of the most difficult land surveys, that of the land survey of the great Death Valley; and

"Whereas this survey is now used to delineate the Death Valley National Monument, one of the most unique of all our national monuments; and

"Whereas not only has the proposal to issue such a commemorative stamp received the wholehearted support of citizens from all walks of life who have learned to love the unique and magnificent grandeur of Death Valley and who especially appreciate the tremendous undertaking of those original surveyors but is also supported by the honorable Governors of the State of California and the State of Nevada: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President, the Congress of the United States, and the Postmaster General to provide for a commemorative stamp honoring the 100th anniversary of the first land survey of Death Valley; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate shall transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Postmaster General, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile and fish imports from foreign countries

*"Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States pass no legislation granting concessions on textile and fish imports from foreign countries; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, January 31, 1957.

"Adopted.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
*"Clerk.*

"Senate, February 5, 1957.

"Adopted, in concurrence.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
*"Clerk.*

"A true copy.

"Attest:

"EDWARD J. CRONIN,
*"Secretary of the Commonwealth."*

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolutions to expel Russia from the United Nations

"Whereas the United Nations Organization was founded on clearly expressed principles binding peace-loving member nations; and

"Whereas those principles clearly seek to prevent the scourge of war, to protect human dignity, and secure liberty and justice for peoples of all nations; and

"Whereas this same distinguished Organization has stipulated in its Charter the definite qualifications of the member nations; and

"Whereas the United Nations Charter has further provided in chapter II, article 5, for the suspension of the exercise of the rights and privileges of any member nation against which the United Nations Organization has seen fit to take preventive or enforcement action; and

"Whereas in chapter II, article 6, it further provided that any member nation which has persistently violated the principles contained in the U. N. Charter may be expelled by the General Assembly upon recommendation of the Security Council; and

"Whereas such effective sanctions are necessary if the United Nations Organization is to retain its nature and purpose; and

"Whereas the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has by more than 80 vetoes constantly obstructed effective action of the Security Council; and

"Whereas the same Government has persistently violated the basic principles stipulated by the U. N. Charter, by massive maintenance of slave-labor camps, by aggression of neighboring peoples, by capture and domination of the Governments of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, depriving not only her own peoples but the peoples of these nations of elemental rights of freedom and justice and human dignity; and

"Whereas even now she threatens to defy again the U. N. decision by sending so-called volunteers in Egypt even as she battled against the U. N. in Korea; and

"Whereas even at this moment the great and noble people of Hungary lie prostrate under her heel of barbaric assault of massacre and torture, a tragic victim of cruelest aggression on the part of a cynical government, which, as our distinguished President remarked on Wednesday, November 14, "has violated every concept of human liberty and justice": Therefore be it

*"Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, representing a people that has been nurtured in the great traditions of human dignity, of freedom and justice for all men, does hereby go on record as vehemently condemning the inhuman actions of the Soviet Government of the Russian peoples, and now calls for the expulsion of Soviet Russia from the United Nations Organization; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That copies of the foregoing resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State for the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the Secretary General of the United Nations.

"House of representatives, adopted January 17, 1957.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
*"Clerk.*

"A true copy.

"Attest:

[SEAL] "EDWARD J. CRONIN,
*"Secretary of the Commonwealth."*

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 11

"Concurrent resolution commending the National Guard of the State of Idaho and the National Guard system, and recommending that all persons enlisting in the National Guard be given adequate training

"Whereas the National Guard of the State of Idaho is an organization subject to the call of the President of the United States and the Governor of the State of Idaho in the event of emergencies in time of war and in time of peace; and

"Whereas the National Guard of the State of Idaho has a proud and glorious history of responding to calls to active service in the service of the United States and in the service of the State of Idaho in times of emergency; and

"Whereas the National Guard of the State of Idaho has a proud and glorious history of ship is composed of civilians who devote their time and efforts to being part-time soldiers and providing the citizens of the United States and the State of Idaho with a trained military force available in the event of any emergencies; and

"Whereas, the National Guard system of utilizing civilians as part-time soldiers provides for a more adequate national defense and is organized and trained in the spirit of the militia system originating during the time of our fight for independence and making it possible for the State of Idaho and the United States of America to obviate the necessity for a large standing military force; and

"Whereas for the National Guard to fulfill its obligation as a part of the Ready Reserve of the Armed Forces of the United States, it is essential that all persons enlisting in the National Guard should have sufficient training consistent with their civilian status as recommended by the Defense Department to more adequately prepare them for their duties and responsibilities in the event of an emergency; Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho,* That the militia system as exemplified by the National Guard be endorsed and approved, and it is the sense of these houses that the National Guard system should be continued; be it further

*"Resolved,* That it is the sense of this legislature that all persons enlisting in the National Guard should be required to have sufficient military training so that they may better perform their duties and obligations as civilian soldiers in the event of an emergency; Be it further

*"Resolved,* That the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho be authorized, and he is hereby directed, to immediately forward certified copies of this concurrent resolution to the President of the United States, the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State."

Five joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to the compact commission approach to the solution to the need for greater coordination and integration of development of land and water resources of regional watersheds

"Whereas the people of the State of Wyoming recognize the need for greater coordination and integration of the water development program of various State and Federal agencies operating within regional watersheds than at present prevails; and

"Whereas a satisfactory precedent for accomplishing this goal has been established in the upper Colorado River Basin, wherein the 4 States involved have each 1 vote and the Federal Government 1 vote; and

"Whereas a planning and operating commission set up in this manner provides the necessary coordination and integration of the State and Federal agencies and at the same time assures the protection of the rights, laws, customs, powers, and sovereignty of the States involved; and

"Whereas the Council of State Governments and other groups of public spirited and practical westerners, after exhaustive study, have recommended variations of this solution to the need for greater coordination and integration in regional watershed development: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the 34th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such Legislature concurring),* That the President and Congress of the United States of America, be and they are hereby memorialized to diligently and fairly consider the sentiment of the people of the State of Wyoming who favor such planning and operating commissions in broad outline similar to the upper Colorado River Basin Commission, along the lines recommended by the Council of State Governments for other regional watersheds lying partly in the State of Wyoming, to be set up by compact between the States involved and the Federal Government; be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, United States Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, and Representative in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Reclamation, and to the governors and legislatures of the following States: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Washington.

"EARL T. BOWER,
*"President of the Senate.*
"WILLIAM F. SWANTON,
*"Speaker of the House pro tempore.*

"Approved February 1, 1957.

"MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
*"Governor."*

---

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to making adequate appropriations for authorized reclamation projects

"Whereas Wyoming has several water development projects which have been authorized for construction under the Federal reclamation laws; and

"Whereas the completion of these projects on a progressive and economical construction schedule is most desirable from the standpoint of the State and Nation: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the 34th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of such Legislature concurring),* That the Congress of the United States of America, be and it is hereby memorialized to appropriate adequate funds so that the authorized reclamation projects in Wyoming and the units of the Colorado River storage project can proceed on a progressive and economical construction schedules; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, United States Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Representative in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON, the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation.

"EARL T. BOWER,
*"President of the Senate.*
"WILLIAM F. SWANTON,
*"Speaker of the House.*

"Approved February 2, 1957.

"MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
*"Governor."*

---

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 4

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to the opposition of the people of the State of Wyoming to any form of Federal, regional, or watershed rules or regulations set up either by legislative act or Executive order, in which the States involved would have no real voice in administration thereof

"Whereas any form of Federal, regional, or watershed authority, however disguised, would supersede and nullify existing State laws under which water users have acquired water rights and by which these rights have been protected and administered; and

"Whereas existing water rights established under Wyoming State law would be subject to condemnation proceedings under provisions of acts creating such Federal authority; and

"Whereas the citizens of Wyoming would have no voice in the selection of the directors of the Federal authority, who would have unlimited control over the development of their land and water resources; and

"Whereas under a Federal authority, the only voice permitted the people of the State of Wyoming and their local and State officials would be of an advisory nature; and

"Whereas such Federal legislation would place exclusive jurisdiction over water litigation involving the Federal authority in the Federal courts; and

"Whereas such Federal authority would tend to create a Federal power monopoly; and

"Whereas such Federal legislation would to a large extent reduce the States to mere geographical entities, replacing the present powers of local and State governments with a superstate in which the final control is vested in the Federal Government; and

"Whereas such Federal legislation would add nothing to the program of development of land and water resources which is not already available through existing State and Federal agencies, except better coordination, which could be accomplished through more democratic means: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the 34 Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such Legislature concurring),* That the President and Congress of the United States of America, be and they are hereby memorialized to consider against any proposed legislation or Executive order setting up any form of Federal, regional, or watershed authority, however disguised, the strong, unequivocal, and unalterable opposition of the people of the State of Wyoming to any such proposition and their determination to resist by every device at their command any such usurpation of the rights, laws, customs, powers, and sovereignty of their local and State governments; be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, United States Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, and Representative in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Reclamation, and to the governors and legislatures of the

following States: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Washington.

"EARL T. BOWER,
*"President of the Senate.*
"WILLIAM F. SWANTON,
*"Speaker of the House.*

"Approved February 2, 1957.
"MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
*"Governor."*

---

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 5

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to passing legislation to modify the standard repayment period for irrigation features of water development projects to 60 years

"Whereas it is a basic principle of the Federal reclamation laws that all reimbursable projects costs are repayable to the United States by project beneficiaries over a reasonable repayment period; and

"Whereas the Federal reclamation laws now provide a general statutory repayment period of 40 years and

"Whereas Federal reclamation projects have a useful life of 100 years and more, and the development of land and water resources by means of such projects represents a long-time investment of the benefit of the entire Nation; and

"Whereas the repayment of the reimbursable costs of irrigation features of projects under the Federal reclamation laws is based on the ability of water users to repay; and

"Whereas based on the ability of water users to repay, the present general statutory repayment period is inadequate for the irrigation feature of many existing projects; and

"Whereas it is recognized that there are large areas of arid land throughout most of the West in need of reclamation development, and that new projects will inevitably require larger capital expenditures than similar projects built in the past under more favorable cost basis; and that as to most new projects the ability of irrigation water users to repay has not increased in proportion to the increase in the cost of project construction: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the 34th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of such Legislature concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America, be and it is hereby memorialized to promptly, diligently and fairly consider and act upon at this session, legislation designed to modify the standard repayment period for irrigation features of water development projects to 60 years; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, United States Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, and Representative in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Reclamation and to the governors and legislatures of the following States: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Washington.

"EARL T. BOWER,
*"President of the Senate.*
"WILLIAM F. SWANTON,
*"Speaker of the House.*

"Approved February 2, 1957.
"MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
*"Governor."*

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 6

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to passing legislation to control noxious weeds on federally owned or controlled lands

"Whereas noxious weeds on federally controlled lands are injurious to farmland; and

"Whereas at present no Federal funds are available for the control of noxious weeds on federally controlled land: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved,* That the Senate of the 34th Legislature of the State of Wyoming, the House of Representatives of such legislature concurring, that the Congress of the United States of America, be and it is hereby memorialized to appropriate funds for the control of noxious weeds on federally owned or controlled lands; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, United States Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Representatives in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture.

"EARL T. BOWER,
*"President of the Senate.*
"LEE E. KEITH,
*"Speaker of the House.*

"Approved: February 2, 1957.
"HILWARD L. SIMPSON,
*"Governor."*

A resolution adopted by the governing body of the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent, at New York, N. Y., relating to the liberation of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) District Dental Society, relating to tax benefits for self-employed persons; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Ohio Bell, of Chicago, Ill., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Mrs. W. O. Bielski, of Hesper, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

---

## NEW AIRFIELD AT MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL, MINN.—JOINT RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last week on Thursday, February 7, the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Navy announced jointly that the Defense Department would shortly request authority from Congress for the construction of a new military airfield in the vicinity of the Twin Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, to be built in conjunction with the State of Minnesota.

This new airbase would relieve the very heavy congestion at the present joint commercial-military field, Wold-Chamberlain Field, Minneapolis, and greatly increase the present narrow safety margin. It has been a goal of the entire Minnesota congressional delegation for many years.

Making possible the new plans for a separate military airfield to handle all military jet-propelled aircraft in the Twin Cities area has been a proposal by the Governor of Minnesota that the State of Minnesota provide the necessary land for the new field. The Governor has been strongly supported by the Minnesota State Legislature in his own efforts toward securing the new base. For example, on February 1, 1957, the legislature passed unanimously a joint resolution memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to secure a removal of all military facilities and activities from Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport—Wold-Chamberlain Field, located in Hennepin County, Minn.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of H. R. 472 of the 60th session of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, which is the joint resolution referring to the need for a new military field in the Twin Cities area.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to secure a removal of all military facilities and activities from Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport—Wold-Chamberlain Field, located in Hennepin County, Minn.

Whereas the Minneapolis-St. Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission is a public corporation created, organized and operating under the laws of the State of Minnesota, Minnesota statutes 1953, sections 360.101-360.125;

Whereas such commission acting under and as required by the act creating it did on August 14, 1944, take possession of Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport—Wold-Chamberlain Field and did on that date take over the operation, management, maintenance and development of such field, and has at all times since and is now in possession of such field and operating, managing, maintaining and developing the same;

Whereas such field was established as a civil airport and at all times since such establishment has been operated as a civil airport, to which commercial airlines have been and are carrying on very extensive passenger, mail and cargo operations;

Whereas the military—Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines and Minnesota National Guard, have facilities in the vicinity of such field and are engaged in military aviation activities to, from and in the vicinity of such field, including as a part thereof the operation of jet military aircraft;

Whereas the operation of jet military aircraft by the military resulted in several crashes during the spring of 1956 resulting in loss of life and destruction of property;

Whereas military aviation operations at such field are deemed by the commission as detrimental to the safe and efficient operation of the airport as a civil airport, and constitute a constant hazard to residents living in the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul and the village of Richfield and to all others living in the general vicinity of the airport;

Whereas the commission has gone on record from time to time as opposed to the continuance of said military aviation activities at such field and in connection therewith has suggested to the military that their facilities and activities be removed to another site well away from the populated areas of the cities and village aforesaid;

Whereas a removal of the military from such airport will necessitate action by the Congress of the United States with the ap-

proval of the President of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota*, That the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States be requested to do all in their power to bring about the removal of all military facilities and activities from Wold-Chamberlain Field and from the vicinity thereof to a site to be acquired and facilities to be constructed by the Government well away from the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul and populated areas in the vicinity thereof; be it further

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at this moment the Legislature of the State of Minnesota is considering further legislation to grant authority to the Governor of Minnesota to acquire the necessary land for the new airfield. The necessary steps are being taken in Minnesota, and I am hopeful that the Congress will also take prompt action to facilitate the establishment of this necessary new airfield.

In that regard, I have already urged upon the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services the necessity for the new airfield, and have requested that the committee recommend the necessary authority for Federal participation in the project.

## RESOLUTION OF MINNEAPOLIS (MINN.) BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have just received from the Board of Education of the City of Minneapolis a resolution endorsing the use for educational purposes of all funds accrued from the oil under the outer Continental Shelf.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Minneapolis public schools as well as the schools throughout the Nation have been and no doubt will be confronted with financial difficulties; and

Whereas the needs of education are great and no doubt the future needs will be even greater if we maintain the steady progress of the past by providing maximum educational opportunities to all children of school age; and

Whereas the White House Conference on Education has dramatized the financial plight of education throughout the Nation and endorsed and requested action of Federal aid to education; and

Whereas President Eisenhower and leaders in the Republican and Democratic Parties have also endorsed Federal aid to education; and

Whereas the Department of the Interior has reported that the United States Treasury is holding in escrow $150 million from the sale of rights to drill in the rich oilfields under the outer Continental Shelf; and

Whereas this $150 million plus the tremendous additional revenues that will be forthcoming should be used to meet the financial crisis in education to the relief of local taxpayers: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Minneapolis Board of Education endorse in principle the use of all funds already accrued and which will be accrued from the oil under the outer Continental Shelf for educational purposes.

## HIGH MILLING QUALITY WHEAT—RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF MONTANA

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, House Memorial No. 1 adopted by the Montana House of Representatives concerning high milling quality wheat.

The finest milling wheats in the world are grown in Montana. As the memorial points out, there is an overall surplus of wheat in the United States, but there is no surplus of the high-quality wheat which the farmers of my State produce.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that in applying wheat acreage allotments consideration must be given to supplies of individual types of wheat. Flat reductions in acreage regardless of type produced are unsatisfactory and unworkable.

The memorial of the Montana House of Representatives requests that revision of allotments be made to permit increased production in areas where wheat of high milling quality is produced. I request that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for a study of the problem which it presents.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Memorial to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Secretary Ezra Taft Benson, Montana's Congressional delegation, and members of the United States House and Senate Committees on Agriculture, seeking an adjustment in the Federal farm program as it relates to the grower of quality wheat.

*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

Whereas all wheat-acreage allotments and marketing quotas were meant to control surpluses, but there is no surplus of the kind of wheat raised in Montana; and

Whereas millers are again asking for more high-milling-quality wheat of which Montana is the principal producer; and

Whereas Montana growers are still subject to the same restrictions as are growers of soft low-quality wheats, which are said to be in surplus; and

Whereas huge drought areas have cut production levels and greater export demand for wheat appears certain; and

Whereas some higher acreage allotments for our small operators will tend to redress a balance which is badly needed, and the present pressure on all operators is curtailing too much production of high-protein wheat: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by Montana's House of Representatives in 1957 session assembled*, That all officials noted above be asked to see that revisions are made in the Federal farm program to permit increased production in areas which grow wheat of high milling quality: Now, therefore, be it further

*Resolved*, That this house memorial be read in full and spread on the minutes of the house journal.

EUGENE H. MAHONEY,
*Speaker of the House.*

## ASSISTANCE TO SMALL BUSINESS—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have received resolutions from the Sterling Chamber of Commerce, Sterling, Kans., and the Great Bend Chamber of Commerce, Great Bend, Kans., urging that the Federal Government consider means of assisting small business in these areas to participate in the national-defense program.

In practically every section of my State we have small industries operating under excellent management and we do have outstanding labor. Therefore, I urge the Defense Department, in making its contracts, to give special consideration to the use of these industries.

As farming becomes more mechanized and requires less hours of labor for the production of food needed by the Nation, I believe the future requires that we adopt a program which will assist the location of manufacturing in rural areas.

We need to look forward to a time when we can have a combination of agriculture and industry working together in the same communities if we are to have a secure and prosperous Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions may be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STERLING CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
*Sterling, Kans., February 4, 1957.*

Whereas the area comprising the Central Kansas Industrial Development Association is in the drought area of Kansas; and

Whereas this drought condition is of such a serious nature that regardless of favorable weather conditions in the immediate future this area will be affected for several years; and

Whereas the oil industry is on the decline in this area; and

Whereas the many small industries serving the agricultural area are finding it nearly impossible to stay in business: Now, therefore

We the members of the Sterling Chamber of Commerce in a regular assembled meeting on this the 4th day of February 1957, do hereby memoralize our Government to consider some means of assisting such small business as well as additional industries in financing, leasing, and otherwise securing necessary tools and equipment to participate in the many subcontracts which the national-defense program is creating. This is one positive way to help balance the economy of this area and will create employment for many small farmers who will otherwise be forced to leave their farms.

R. E. WYATT, Jr.,
*Secretary, Sterling Chamber of Commerce.*

GREAT BEND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
*Great Bend, Kans.*

Whereas the Great Bend Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors, representing some 600 business and professional members, is acutely aware of the drought situation in Kansas and its economic effects on our trade area, have at a regularly scheduled board meeting on Tuesday, February 5, 1957, voted the following:

That the Federal Government, in addition to assisting farmers in the drought area, consider a means of assisting small industries and businesses in the area, to participate in the various subcontracts which

are being created and financed by the national defense program.

It is believed that such assistance will help to balance the economy of this area and will assist in creating part-time employment for farmers in the drought area.

Copies of this resolution will be mailed to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, with copies going to Senators Carlson and Schoeppel, Congressman Breeding, and Secretary of Interior Fred Seaton.

LOYALL KOMAREK,
*President, Chamber of Commerce.*

## RESOLUTION OF POLISH CENTRAL COUNCIL, NIAGARA FALLS, N. Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Polish Central Council, Niagara Falls, New York, favoring the enactment of legislation to utilize World War II frozen assets of Germany, Japan and Italy, originally amounting to approximately $575 million, for science and engineering scholarships for American students. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas a bill has been introduced by Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS in the 85th session of the Congress of the United States to utilize World War II frozen assets of Germany, Japan, and Italy, originally amounting to approximately $575 million for science and engineering scholarships for American students; and

Whereas service in the Armed Forces in times of war or critical international affairs denies or delays the opportunity for our youth to finish their education; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has indicated that there are approximately 2,500,000 children of veterans in the college-age bracket, many of whom cannot afford the high cost of a college education; and

Whereas a critical shortage exists in many of the professional fields, including science and engineering; and

Whereas the demands for highly trained scientists and engineers is particularly important in this atomic age: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Polish Central Council, representing more than 4,000 members, urge the Congress of the United States to favorably consider the bill referred to above in this session of the Congress, which would make available scholarships in these critical fields to the deserving youth of our country; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Senators IRVING M. IVES, JACOB K. JAVITS, GEORGE A. SMATHERS; WILLIAM E. MILLER, Member of the House of Representatives, and to Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.

MARY L. BIALECKI, *Chairman.*
ANTHONY SNAGLEWSKI,
CHESTER G. TULINIS,
*Resolutions Committee.*

This is to certify that the above resolution was approved by the Niagara Falls, N. Y., Polish Central Council at a regular meeting held January 25, 1957.

HEDWIG GUHAZDOWSSKI, *Secretary.*

## RESOLUTION OF YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUB OF HENNEPIN COUNTY, MINN.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Young Republican Club of Hennepin County, Minn., relating to the establishment of a police force by the United Nations to preserve peace.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the recent events in the Middle East and Hungary have shown the necessity for having armed forces available and ready to act in response to the wishes of the majority of the United Nations; and

Whereas there are no armed forces of such type now in existence; and

Whereas it has been proposed that a police force be created from armed forces drawn from various of the united nations to preserve world peace: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Young Republican League of Hennepin County—*

(1) That an effective United Nations police force be created, composed of armed forces from the various member nations of the United Nations.

(2) That the armed forces of such a force be composed of contingents from the various member nations.

(3) That all such armed forces wear one common uniform indicative of the United Nations.

(4) That the said armed forces be quartered in various areas of the world in common barracks and that all of such groups be of at least five varying nations.

(5) That the armed forces move into any nation or take any other action on the affirmative vote of one-half of the General Assembly, votes abstaining not counted. That any attack on any garrison of the United Nations be considered an attack upon the United Nations and its various member nations.

## REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 601. A bill relating to the charging of interest on deposits to the credit of the civil-service retirement and disability fund (Rept. No. 64).

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1138. A bill to permit coverage under Social Security of service performed by an individual in the employ of his son, daughter, or spouse, and service performed by a child under the age of 21 in the employ of his father or mother; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1139. A bill for the relief of Linda Jean Rewinkel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1140. A bill to authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed to be disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1141. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to donate to the Philippine Republic certain records captured from insurrectos during 1899–1903; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1142. A bill for the relief of Mario Bellich; and

S. 1143. A bill for the relief of citizens of the State of Illinois and of the State of New Jersey, organizers and owners of First, Second, and Third National Steamship Companies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 1144. A bill to amend the Federal Highway Act to provide for the inclusion in the Federal-aid highway system of certain parkways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

S. 1145. A bill to provide for the registration and reporting of welfare and benefit plans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1146. A bill providing for a National Advisory Committee of County Officials to facilitate coordination of county highways in the Federal-Aid Highway System; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1147. A bill for the relief of Kiyoshi Takahashi, Kyoko Takahashi, and Nosomu Takahashi; and

S. 1148. A bill for the relief of Teofilo Medina, of Alcalde, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (by request):

S. 1149. A bill to amend section 502 of the General Bridge Act of 1946 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHAVEZ when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1150. A bill for the relief of Monick Cukier (also known as Zdzislaw Wasilewski);

S. 1151. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chu Suk Koh;

S. 1152. A bill for the relief of Peter Trbojevic;

S. 1153. A bill for the relief of Zdenka Sneler;

S. 1154. A bill for the relief of Therese Gloebl Clark; and

S. 1155. A bill for the relief of Eileen Teahan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1156. A bill to authorize the sale for feeding purposes of limited quantities of wheat of less desirable milling quality; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 1157. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1158. A bill to extend the educational provisions of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 until such time as existing laws authorizing compulsory military service cease to be effective; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1159. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large retail establishments whose activities affect interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 1160. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt homeworkers in rural areas from the minimum wage and maximum hours provision of that act in certain cases; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 1161. A bill for the relief of Gertrud K. Rupp; and

S. 1162. A bill for the relief of Maria Spada Browning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 1163. A bill to authorize the establishment, maintenance, and operation of auxiliary communication networks composed of licensed amateur radio operators for military radio communications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1164. A bill to make the evaluation of recreational benefits resulting from the construction of any flood control, navigation or reclamation project an integral part of project planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. KERR when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1165. A bill to provide for the procurement of judge advocates and law-specialist officers for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1166. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to require that prices of basic agricultural commodities be supported at 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. THURMOND when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 1167. A bill for the relief of John Nicholas Christodoulias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1168. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1169. A bill for the relief of Herbert C. Heller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 1170. A bill to provide a deduction from gross income for certain medical expenses of handicapped persons; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1171. A bill for the relief of Harry Siegbert Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. IVES):

S. 1172. A bill to further amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes," approved September 5, 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 1173. A bill for the incorporation of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. GREEN):

S. 1174. A bill to clarify the general powers, increase the borrowing authority, and authorize the deferment of interest payments on borrowings of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1175. A bill for the relief of Helene Cordery Hall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. MORSE, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1176. A bill to establish on public lands of the United States a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, to provide for the protection and administration of the areas within this System by existing Federal agencies and for the gathering and dissemination of information to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness for its appropriate use and enjoyment by the people, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1177. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to provide a more effective method of dealing with labor disputes in vital industries which affect the national security; and

S. 1178. A bill to amend section 213 (52 Stat. 1067, as amended by 53 Stat. 1266) of title 29 of the United States Code, the same being a section of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, so as to eliminate the exemption of small telephone exchanges from the overtime and minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1179. A bill for the relief of Harold George Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the first two above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 1180. A bill for the relief of Heber Lee Bond; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution to provide for the acquisition, preservation, maintenance, and administration of the home of John Jay as a national historical site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## MODIFICATION OF NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY REGARDING THE STATUS OF FORCES

Mr. McCARTHY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that (a) the President should take immediate action to procure at the earliest possible time the termination of those provisions of the agreement between the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty regarding the status of their forces, signed at London on June 19, 1951, and ratified by the United States Senate on July 15, 1953, and those provisions of any other protocol or international agreement to which the United States is a party, which confer or purport to confer upon any court of any foreign nation the power to exercise criminal jurisdiction over members of the Armed Forces of the United States or their dependents for acts committed within any foreign country, and (b) hereafter the United States Government should not enter into any treaty, executive agreement, protocol, or other international agreement containing any provision which confers or purports to confer upon any court of any foreign nation the power to exercise criminal jurisdiction over members of the Armed Forces of the United States or their dependents for acts committed within any foreign country.

Mr. WILEY (for himself, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. FREAR, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANGER, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. POTTER) submitted the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16), favoring the admission of Spain into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See Concurrent Resolution 16 printed in full when submitted by Mr. WILEY, which appears under a separate heading.)

## EMBARGO ON SHIPMENT OF GOODS TO RUSSIA UNTIL CERTAIN ACTION IS TAKEN WITH RESPECT TO HUNGARY

Mr. McCARTHY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 94), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States delegate to the United Nations should introduce in that organization at the earliest practicable time an appropriate resolution calling upon member Nations to embargo shipments of all goods to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics so long as Russian troops are stationed in Hungary and until the Communist Government of Russia returns to Hungary all the Hungarian patriots who have been deported from Hungary.

## ADDITIONAL SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to permit coverage under social security of service performed by an individual in the employ of his son, daughter, or spouse, and service performed by a child under the age of 21 in the employ of his father or mother.

As all of us know, benefit payments under the old-age and survivors provisions of the Social Security Act are based on wages from employment and net earning from self-employment covered under the act. However, the law has specifically excluded services performed by an individual in the employ of his son, daughter, or spouse.

I have received from constituents several inquiries along these lines, and it seems unfair to me that such persons

should be denied participation in the social-security program, although they are performing the duties of any employee.

The revision proposed in my bill may not be the best solution to the problem, but I feel that the attention of Congress should be directed to this situation in any new legislation which may be considered in reviewing the Social Security Act. It is most unfortunate that a parent must be denied these privileges while working for a member of his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1138) to permit coverage under social security of service performed by an individual in the employ of his son, daughter, or spouse, and service performed by a child under the age of 21 in the employ of his father or mother, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

---

## REGISTRATION AND REPORTING OF WELFARE AND BENEFIT PLANS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the registration and reporting of welfare and pension plans. Identical proposed legislation was introduced by us last year at the request of the Department of Labor.

President Eisenhower again has urged the Congress to enact legislation needed as a safeguard for our rapidly increasing private welfare and pensions funds, and he has stated that it would be desirable to require Federal registration of these plans and reports on their administration and finances.

Pursuant to the President's recommendation during the 83d Congress, the Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was created, and for approximately 2 years engaged in a thorough study of welfare and pension funds with a view to the enactment of needed legislation.

During the 83d Congress, I had the honor and privilege of acting as the chairman of the subcommittee. In the 84th Congress, under the able chairmanship of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the subcommittee completed its study and the legislative recommendations of the subcommittee were contained in a bill introduced by a majority of its members, including myself. Unfortunately, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was unable to consider these important bills prior to the adjournment of the 84th Congress.

The bill we are introducing today contains the legislative recommendations of the Department of Labor. I know that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will benefit from the excellent work of the Department of Labor in connection with welfare and pension plans.

I also have sponsored proposed legislation containing the recommendation of a majority of the former Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds, which I understand has been reintroduced by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Both of these bills are designed to provide for the full disclosure of the financial operations of welfare and pension funds established by employer or employee organizations, or by both. As a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I strongly urge that early hearings be scheduled on this proposed legislation, so that prompt congressional action may be taken in this field of vital importance to many millions of Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD, together with an explanation of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1145) to provide for the registration and reporting of welfare and benefit plans, introduced by Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1145

A bill to provide for registration and reporting of welfare and benefit plans

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the "Welfare and Benefit Plans Registration Act of 1957."

FINDINGS AND POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that in recent years there has been a phenomenal increase in the number of welfare and benefit plans for the wage earners of the United States, with a corresponding increase in the amount of money contributed to, involved in, and disbursed by such welfare and benefit plans; that these plans have served greatly to advance the health and well-being of millions of wage earners and their families; that these plans have become an important factor in present-day industrial relations and it is essential that their integrity be maintained; that much of the money involved in such plans is exempted by law from taxation by the United States, and that it is essential for the protection both of the revenue of the United States and of the interests of the beneficiaries that full disclosure be made of the financial details of the operation and administration of such plans.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act to afford protection to the revenue of the United States and to the beneficiaries of the welfare and benefit plans above referred to, and to promote the general welfare, by requiring the registration of welfare and benefit plans and the reporting of appropriate information respecting their receipts, disbursements, assets, liabilities, and financial activities.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. When used in this act—

(a) The term "welfare or benefit plan" means any plan, fund, or program established by employers or employee organizations, or by both, for the purpose of paying or providing, for the benefit of beneficiaries, for medical or hospital care, pensions or annuities on retirement or death of beneficiaries, compensation for injuries or illness, or insurance to provide any of the foregoing, or life insurance, disability and sickness insurance, or accident insurance; but shall not include any plan, fund, or program established by statute to provide benefits prescribed by such statute.

(b) The term "employee organization" means any labor union or any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee, association, group, or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, conditions of work, or other matters incidental to employment relationships.

(c) The term "employer" includes any person acting directly or indirectly in the interest of an employer in relation to an employee, or a group or association of employers, but shall not include a foreign government or the Government of the United States or of any State, Territory, or possession, or political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or any governmental instrumentality of such a government.

(d) The term "employee" means any individual employed by an employer.

(e) The term "beneficiary" means any employee of an employer or any member of an employee organization who is eligible to receive a benefit of any type from a welfare or benefit plan, or whose dependents or the members of whose family may be eligible to receive any such benefit.

(f) The term person means an individual, partnership, corporation, association, or employee organization.

(g) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor.

REGISTRATION

SEC. 4. The person or persons responsible for the control, disposition, or management, either directly or through an agent or trustees designated solely by such person or persons, of the money received by or contributed to any welfare or benefit plan for which—

(1) any exemption from taxation is claimed under the Internal Revenue Code by reason of the nature or activities of such plan; or

(2) any claim is made that money involved in such plan constitutes an allowable deduction in computing taxable income under the Internal Revenue Code; or

(3) contributions are received from any person who claims all or part of such contributions as an allowable deduction under the Internal Revenue Code in computing taxable income;

shall register such welfare or benefit plan with the Secretary and shall file a report with the Secretary within 3 months after the close of the fiscal year of such plan, and shall thereafter file with the Secretary an annual report. Every registration and all reports of every such plan shall be in such form as the Secretary may, by regulations, prescribe. Every report shall be sworn to by a person responsible for the registration of such plan, and shall include such information or documents relating to the receipts, disbursements, assets, liabilities, and financial activities of the plan as the Secretary may, by regulations, prescribe.

GOVERNMENT AGENCY COOPERATION

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary is authorized to request from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the Government any information he deems necessary to carry out his functions under this act; and each department, agency, and instrumentality is directed to cooperate with the Secretary and, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such information to the Secretary upon his request.

(b) The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare regarding the administration of this act by the Secretary, and the Secretary may utilize the facilities of the Department of the Treasury and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for such research and other purposes as the Secretary may deem appropriate.

Any such utilization of any such facilities shall be pursuant to proper agreement, and payment to cover the cost thereof shall be made either in advance or by way of reimbursement as may be provided in such agreement.

ACCESS TO INFORMATION FILED WITH THE SECRETARY

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary may provide that portions of the reports of welfare or benefit plans, in such form as the Secretary may prescribe by regulations, shall be mailed by the person or persons responsible for the registration of such plan to each beneficiary.

(b) When, in the judgment of the Secretary, the disclosure of any information contained in the reports or other documents filed by welfare or benefit plans pursuant to this act would be in the public interest or in the interest of the beneficiaries, such information as the Secretary deems appropriate to disclose may be made available to the public under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe.

(c) The Secretary may by regulations require the person or persons responsible for the registration of any welfare or benefit plan to file a copy of any report required by this act, or any portions thereof, with such State agency as the Secretary may designate.

(d) The Secretary shall by regulations provide for the making available of information furnished to him by welfare and benefit plans pursuant to this act to other departments and agencies of the Government to assist in the performance of the statutory functions of such departments and agencies.

POWERS OF THE SECRETARY

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) The Secretary may by regulations provide for the exemption from any provision of this act of any class or type of welfare or benefit plans if the Secretary finds that the application of such provision to such plans is not required in order to effectuate the purposes of this act.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to utilize any information submitted under this act for statistical and research purposes and to compile and publish such studies, analyses, reports, and surveys as he may deem appropriate.

(d) The Secretary is authorized to make such expenditures and, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel, including attorneys, as may be necessary to perform the functions imposed upon the Secretary by this act. Attorneys appointed under this section may appear for and represent the Secretary in any litigation, but such litigation shall be subject to the direction and control of the Attorney General.

REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS

SEC. 8. The Secretary shall submit annually a report to the Congress including such information and data, and such recommendations for further legislation in connection with the matters covered by this act, as the Secretary may find desirable.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 9 (a) Any person who willfully violates or fails to comply with any provision of this act or the rules and regulations thereunder shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

(b) The district courts of the United States, and the United States courts of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, to restrain violations of, to enforce any duty created by, or to compel disclosure of any information required to be submitted to the Secretary in accordance with this act or the rules and regulations thereunder. All actions under this subsection shall be brought on behalf of the Secretary.

EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS

SEC. 10. Neither the provisions of this act nor any action taken thereunder shall be held to exempt or relieve any person from any liability, duty, penalty, or punishment provided by any law of the United States or of any State or Territory relating to the operation or administration of welfare or benefit plans, or in any manner to authorize the operation or administration of such a plan contrary to any such law.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 11. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected.

The explanation presented by Mr. IVES is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF DRAFT BILL TO REQUIRE REGISTRATION AND REPORTING OF WELFARE AND BENEFIT PLANS

PURPOSE OF DRAFT BILL

The draft bill is designed to provide for full disclosure of the financial operations of welfare and benefit plans established by employers or employee organizations, or by both, to provide benefits such as medical or hospital care, pensions or retirement annuities, compensation for injuries or illness, or insurance to provide any of those benefits, for employees of employers, members of employee organizations, or the dependents of such employees or members. The bill would exclude any plan, fund, or program established by statute to provide benefits prescribed by such statute, such as the laws relating to unemployment compensation and workmen's compensation.

Most of the older craft unions for many years have made available medical services, hospitalization, and cash payments during disability, as well as group life insurance and pension plans. During the late 1920's plans providing such benefits were brought within the scope of collective bargaining in isolated instances.

The real growth in number of plans has occurred during the past 10 years. It is estimated that at least 12 million workers are now covered by plans under collective bargaining. From slightly more than one-half million in 1945, coverage increased to upward of 3 million by mid-1948, to more than 7½ million by early 1950, and since then to the estimated 12 million figure. The total number of employees covered by all private health, insurance, and pension plans is unknown, but the amount of money involved today is probably in excess of $20 million.

This rapid growth has led to many problems. President Eisenhower has recommended legislation to protect the beneficiaries of these plans by requiring adequate disclosure of their financial operations. There have been widespread expressions of opinion that such disclosure would undoubtedly be a deterrent to malpractice, mismanagement, and waste. These plans have become an important factor in present-day industrial relations and it is essential that their integrity be maintained. In addition, the availability of such information respecting other plans would lend material assistance to individual plans in devising means to improve their actuarial soundness. Moreover, much of the money involved in such plans is exempt from taxation under the Internal Revenue Code. The disclosure which the draft bill would provide would afford a substantial measure of protection both to the revenue of the United States and to the beneficiaries of those plans.

ADMINISTERING AGENCY

The Secretary of Labor would be charged with the function and responsibility of administering the draft bill, and he would be authorized to utilize any information obtained under the bill for statistical and research purposes. However, the Secretary would be directed to consult with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare respecting the administration of the measure.

COVERAGE

The draft bill would apply to all welfare or benefit plans for which (a) any exemption from taxation is claimed under the Internal Revenue Code, (b) any claim is made that money involved in such plan constitutes an allowable deduction for income tax purposes, or (c) contributions are received from any person claiming such contributions as a deduction under the Internal Revenue Code. However, the Secretary would be empowered to exempt from any provision of the bill, by regulations, any class or type of plans if the Secretary finds that the application of such provision to such plans is not required in order to effectuate the purposes of the bill. This procedure, analogous to one followed by the National Labor Relations Board, would facilitate the administration of the measure by the Secretary.

REGISTRATION

The registration and reporting requirements are the heart of the draft bill. The person or persons responsible for the control, disposition, or management of the money contributed to or received by any welfare or benefit plan covered by the measure would be required to register such plan with, and submit annual reports to, the Secretary in such form as the Secretary may prescribe by regulations. The reports would be sworn to by a responsible official of the particular plan and would contain such information relating to receipts, disbursements, assets, liabilities, and financial activities of the plan as the Secretary may prescribe by regulations.

UTILIZATION OF OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND OF INFORMATION SUBMITTED IN REPORTS

The draft bill would authorize the Secretary to request information from other Government agencies and utilize on a reimbursable basis the facilities of the Departments of the Treasury and Health, Education, and Welfare for such research and other purposes as the Secretary may deem appropriate. Information obtained by the Secretary from welfare and benefit plans would be made available, under regulations, to other Government agencies to assist in the performance of their statutory functions. The Secretary would also be authorized to require portions of the information contained in the reports of welfare and benefit plans to be furnished to the beneficiaries of the plans. The measure would further permit the Secretary to make public information in the reports, the disclosure of which he deems appropriate in the interest of the public or the beneficiaries. The Secretary would be empowered to require that copies of all or part of the reports be filed with an appropriate State agency.

OTHER PROVISIONS

An annual report would be submitted to the Congress by the Secretary including such information, data, and legislative recommendations in connection with the subject matter of the bill as he may find advisable.

The draft bill would make it a misdemeanor willfully to violate or fail to comply with any provision of the bill or the regulations. The provisions of 18 U. S. C. 1001 would apply criminal penalties to the willful making of false statements or the concealing of material facts in any material required to be submitted to the Secretary under this act. Civil litigation to restrain

violations of, to enforce any liability or duty created by, or to require disclosure of information in accordance with, the measure or the regulations issued thereunder could be brought on behalf of the Secretary.

Section 10 would make clear that neither the provisions of the bill nor any action taken thereunder would exempt or relieve any person from compliance with any Federal, State, or Territorial law relating to the operation or administration of welfare or benefit plans, or authorize the operation or administration of such a plan contrary to any such law.

Section 11 is the separability-of-provisions portion of the measure.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in the splendid work they have been doing in studying the administration of employee pension and welfare funds. I wish to be listed as a cosponsor of the bill on that subject which the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] has introduced today, on behalf of himself and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]; it is the administration's bill. The Senate owes a debt of gratitude to these Senators and other Senators who have worked on the special subcommittee created by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to study these pension and welfare funds. I believe we are moving toward the time when we shall get sound legislation in this field.

## AMENDMENT OF GENERAL BRIDGE ACT OF 1946

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, by request I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 502 of the General Bridge Act of 1946, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section analysis of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1149) to amend section 502 of the General Bridge Act of 1946 and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. CHAVEZ is as follows:

Section 1 would amend certain subsections of section 502 of the General Bridge Act of 1946, 60 Stat. 812 and add new subsections, as indicated below:

Subsection (a) involves no change from wording of present law.

Subsection (b) would change the wording of the present law, which requires the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army in approving bridge plans, to "protect the interests of public navigation." The changed wording would require those officials to base their decisions upon the "public interest." In considering what constitutes the public interest, they would be required (1) to recognize the equal rights of all forms of surface transportation (highway, railroad, waterway, and pipeline); (2) to consider how the navigational clearances to be required, and any conditions relating to bridge maintenance and operation, affect all forms of surface transportation; and (3) to take into account any special requirements for accommodation of federally owned defense watercraft, which are identified in a new subsection (f), discussed below. Subsection (b) also would require these officials to afford interested parties an appropriate opportunity to make known their views. This latter provision, though presently not statutory requirement, conforms with existing administrative procedures of the Corps of Engineers.

Subsection (c) would change the basic concept for determining navigational clearances for bridges from the present concept, as contained in section 502 b of the existing law, which requires protection of navigational interests only. The concept proposed in this bill is that bridge clearances would be established on the basis of the minimal total economic effect on all forms of surface transportation. Also, the proposed legislation would provide that wherever feasible fixed bridges would be constructed in preference to movable span bridges, thereby permitting free movement of overland and waterway traffic without disruption resulting from operation of movable span bridges.

Subsection (d) presents new language. It would require the Secretary of the Army, in conformity with the requirements of subsections (b) and (c) to designate from time to time reaches of waterways over which bridges are planned within which approval of plans of bridges would not be required.

This new subsection can be compared with the present law, which requires Corps of Engineers' approval of plans for bridges across some 60,000 miles of waterways presently deemed navigable, even though there may be no real or foreseeable navigation on certain reaches of such waterways.

Subsection (d) and the administrative action taken pursuant thereto would eliminate the present requirement for such approval in cases where special bridge clearances for accommodation of vessels are not economically justified. This subsection would tend to reduce the volume of paperwork, including issuances of notices, etc., presently required in such cases.

Subsection (e) presents new language. It would require the Secretary of the Army, in conformity with subsections (b) and (c) to determine general standards of navigational clearances for bridges over waterways where special provisions in bridges are needed for accommodation of vessels. These standards would serve as guides for establishing clearances for specific bridges, but the precise clearances for any specific structure could be based upon a special economic analysis relating to that structure. The subsection also would require any determination of general standards, or any findings of navigational clearances for a specific structure, to indicate the views of the affected transportation interest.

Subsection (e) would serve a twofold purpost. First, it would enable public and private waterway interests to standardize the design and construction of vessels (including floating construction equipment) intended for use on specific waterways. In this regard, an analysis of Corps of Engineers Transportation Series indicates that only 10 to 15 percent of the watercraft listed therein (including floating construction equipment) which navigate the inland streams and intracoastal waterways, have fixed projections which require excessive navigational clearances that greatly increase bridge costs. Secondly, it would enable overland transportation interests—in conjunction with highway program planning—to arrive at more realistic estimates of bridge costs than are now possible.

Subsection (f) presents new language. It would require the Secretary of the Army to request from the owner of a bridge information upon which to estimate the extent to which the cost of a bridge has been increased due to special requirements of federally owned defense vessels. Any Government-owned vessel having a mobilization assignment issued by the Department of Defense would be deemed a federally owned defense vessel for the purposes of the suggested bill. This subsection also would prohibit the establishment of a special navigational clearance solely for accommodation of Government-owned vessels that do not have a mobilization assignment. However, the effect of reduced bridge clearances upon the operations of the latter vessels would be taken into account with other economic factors that are considered in arriving at a bridge clearance decision.

This subsection is intended to ascertain how much the cost of bridges across navigable waterways is increased solely for accommodation of federally owned defense vessels. It also is intended to overcome a long standing undesirable condition under which fixed projections on other Government-owned vessels (including floating construction equipment) have influenced bridge clearances without having the added cost of such clearances offset by equal or greater savings in waterway transportation costs. As provided in this act such clearances would be based upon an overall economic study. That study would compare the relative cost of modifying Government-owned nondefense vessels and other vessels so they could be accommodated under bridge clearances with different navigational clearances, with possible savings in overland transportation costs that could be achieved through establishment of such bridge clearances.

The examples cited below illustrate the situation with respect to bridge clearances for accommodation of federally owned nondefense craft. On the Skagit River in the State of Washington the cost of constructing a highway bridge was reduced $425,000 because the Corps of Engineers agreed to absorb the cost of altering its own floating construction equipment (a snagboat and a dredge) at an expense of about $42,000 for initial alteration of the equipment, and an annual expense of about $4,000 to disassemble and reassemble the plant to pass under the fixed bridge during the remaining 12-year life of the equipment. The net saving of the public funds in this case is estimated at $335,000.

Such possible savings also are illustrated in connection with the proposed new Constitution Avenue Bridge and the replacement for the old Highway Bridge across the Potomac River in Washington, D. C. A fixed bridge at Constitution Avenue with 27.5-foot vertical clearance would cost about $1,900,000 less than a movable span bridge at the same location. Also in replacing old Highway Bridge, a similar fixed bridge would cost about $1,500,000 less than a movable span structure.

Such fixed bridges would eliminate the added annual cost of maintaining and operating movable spans, and the cost of maintaining and operating movable spans on Memorial Bridge and the new Highway Bridge. With full-time operation of the movable spans on the foregoing bridges this cost was estimated at $100,000 annually. Under the present operating regulations, with advance notice required for opening of these bridges to accommodate vessels, this annual cost has been substantially reduced.

These total savings can be compared with the added cost to the United States Coast Guard of about $1,000 annually in shifting its operations from types of vessels which it has been using on this reach of the Potomac River to types of vessels which can be accommodated under fixed bridges with a 27.5-foot vertical clearance.

Subsection (g). This provision is intended to require application of the concepts provided for in the legislation in cases where specific bridge clearances have been established but construction has not yet started.

Subsection (h) is consistent with the present law. Instead of referring to the Public

Roads Administration the suggested wording refers to the Secretary of Commerce.

Section 2 presents new language. It would require the Secretary of the Army, from time to time, to reexamine bridge regulations promulgated pursuant to section 5 of the River and Harbor Act of 1894 (28 Stat. 362), to determine whether modification of such regulations, as they relate to specific bridges, and to specific reaches of waterways, may result in net savings or other advantages to the overall transportation economy and would provide authority for him to issue appropriate modifications.

This section is intended to place a statutory responsibility upon the Secretary of the Army for such a review. No such statutory responsibility now exists. Recent experiences demonstrate that such reviews would result in having bridge-operating regulations keep abreast with other changes in the transportation economy, and that substantial sums can be saved through reduced operating requirements on movable span bridges that are opened for accommodation of watercraft at only infrequent intervals. Conversely, where increased navigational activities on previously unused waterways indicate that frequent bridge openings are economically justified, such reviews would indicate the need for regular attendants existing on movable bridges where there are no attendants or only part-time attendants.

Section 3 would authorize a study to be made of fixed projections on commercial watercraft of American registry navigating inland stream and intracoastal waterways. This section is intended to make possible the completion of a study within a reasonable time in order that the information thus obtained may serve as a guide for establishing bridge clearances under the expanded highway program. Failure to include such a provision in the proposed draft bill would result in a study extending over a period substantially longer than 2 years after the funds have been appropriated. Delay in obtaining adequate data upon which to base sound decisions on bridge clearances would greatly reduce the effectiveness of the legislation.

Section 4 presents new language. It is intended to permit the relatively few vessels having lights and day signals which extend vertically above the understructure of a bridge to depart from the rules of navigation that are ordinarily applicable on the particular waterway. In such cases the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating would be authorized to prescribe such special rules, to be observed by vessels navigating under or near such bridges, as in his judgment the public safety may require for the prevention of collisions.

This section and the special rules that would be issued pursuant thereto would provide official recognition for effective treatment of a rapidly growing problem in surface transportation relationships.

Section 5 presents new language. It would authorize appropriations of such funds as may be necessary to defray the cost of altering the construction and design of any existing federally owned watercraft and/or the construction of new federally owned watercraft where such measure is necessary to enable Government agencies operating federally owned vessels (other than federally owned defense vessels) to perform their statutory duties in those reaches of navigable waterways where reduced navigational clearances for bridges are established.

Recent experiences indicate that the Federal agencies operating vessels normally can expect only nominal costs resulting from alteration of their vessels so the vessels can pass under fixed bridges with navigational clearances established pursuant to this draft of bill, and that those costs readily can be absorbed without special appropriations. However, this section is intended to provide for a contingency that might develop and which the United States Coast Guard believes should be taken into account in this legislation. No estimate can be made as to the impact such a remote contingency might have upon the Federal Treasury. Nevertheless, if an appropriation of funds would be needed pursuant to this section the need would arise only because the amount of the funds involved—when taken into account with other economic costs resulting from reduced bridge clearances—would be less than the overall savings in overland transportation costs resulting from such reduced bridge clearances.

Section 6 presents new language. It is intended that enactment of this proposal should not in any way alter, modify, or amend the Truman-Hobbs Act, as amended.

Section 7. This section would incorporate into statutory language procedural steps now required by the appropriation committees of the Congress.

Section 8 presents new language. It is intended to recognize that the cost of administering the concepts set forth in the proposed bill would be greater than the cost of administering section 502 of the General Bridge Act as presently worded. Cost estimates are included in the letter of transmittal.

Section 9 presents new language suggested by the Tennessee Valley Authority. It would provide that nothing in this act should in any way affect the powers and responsibilities of the TVA under the provisions of certain laws identified in the draft bill. Since we cannot anticipate any situation under which the TVA might require other navigational clearances—either greater or less—than those determined by the Secretary of the Army, the Department of Commerce concurs in this language.

According to TVA the provisions of section 9 of the bill are needed to preserve their powers and responsibilities under section 26a of the TVA Act. TVA also pointed out that its responsibilities under section 26a, which would be preserved by section 9, differ from those conferred on the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army by the proposed bill. In this regard TVA stated that its responsibilities embrace flood-control operations and possible effects upon Federal properties in TVA's custody as well as the requirements of navigation.

In the light of the vast savings of public funds which can be achieved under this proposal without unduly affecting waterway transportation, it is the belief of the Department of Commerce that the cost of administering this proposal is well justified.

---

## SALE OF LIMITED QUANTITIES OF CERTAIN WHEAT FOR FEEDING PURPOSES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the sale for feeding purposes of limited quantities of wheat of less desirable milling quality.

The bill being introduced would provide that consideration be given the historical area use of wheat as feed. It would divert into feed channels wheat which has less desirable milling qualities. The bill also provides that consideration be given the value of wheat in relation to other feed grains and the effect such sales of wheat will have on the price of feed grains.

Mr. President, I call attention to the statement of President Eisenhower in his farm speech delivered January 9, 1956, in which he said:

Historically a significant proportion of the annual wheat crop has been used for livestock feed. The quality fed in pre-World War II years ranged from 100 million to 150 million bushels a year about twice the quantity fed in more recent years. This reduced consumption has aggravated the surplus burden.

I recommend that the Congress give consideration to authorizing the annual sale for feeding purposes, at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, of limited quantities of Commodity Credit Corporation wheat of less desirable milling quality. The authorized sale price should reflect the feeding value of the wheat, precautions being exercised as to the effect of such sales on prices of other feed grains. There are opportunities to use more wheat for feed in feed-deficit areas distant from the Corn Belt.

In a letter from James Hill, Jr., manager of the Pendleton Grain Growers, Pendleton, Oreg., discussing the need for such legislation, the following paragraphs which I will quote are, indeed, pertinent:

First of all, let me say that I think it is a good idea to try and get a definite bill through so that the Department of Agriculture can feel free to go ahead and actively use at least 100 million bushels of wheat every year for feed purposes in those areas that historically and economically should be using wheat for feed instead of some of the other situations.

* * * * *

As you know, our basic contention of fairness in any type of Government program for grains is the contention that our area should be entitled to have the use of our own feed grains at prices that are equally competitive with the prices of feed grains produced in other areas. This is very essential if our animal industry is going to develop in the Pacific Northwest. Our feeders cannot compete in the animal industry game if they have to pay a price higher for their basic feed grains than the feeders, say in the Midwest. We are getting along very well with our feeding program now on the basis of using our Pacific Northwest barley which, of course, is priced competitive with feed grains in other producing areas of the Nation. Barley works well on hogs, cattle, and recently turkeys. However, the poultry industry in the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific slope States is the one that is really taking the beating. For poultry, it is almost essential to have either corn or wheat to do a satisfactory job. Corn from the Midwest is priced high in this area and, of course, our wheat is even higher. This means that the poultry industry on their basic main cost ingredient, grain, are at a price disadvantage that they cannot hope to compete with the producers in other areas that are getting corn at a price low enough to raise the poultry and ship it into our consuming markets and undersell our own producers. This particular feed bill, if passed and if the Department would administer it properly and fairly, could very well help solve the poultry situation here in the Pacific Northwest and Pacific slope States. This industry, in itself, would use some 25 million bushels of wheat a year very easily. Actually, in our long-term program, we estimate that 50 million of wheat should be used every year for feed here in the Pacific slope States. However, under the present program as it now exists, considering our barley we could do a very commendable job if the Department gave us 25 million of wheat for feed in the coming year. As our feeding industry developed, we would need more than the 25, but it would get us by for a year or two.

Mr. Noel Bennion, who is secretary of the Oregon Turkey Improvement Association, and perhaps Oregon's outstanding authority on poultry questions, said in a recent letter to me discussing overall problems:

From the standpoint of national legislation the turkey industry is very much in favor of a feed wheat program for the Pacific Northwest.

A past president of the Oregon Turkey Growers Association offered the following cogent remarks:

I raise enough turkeys that I buy a carload of corn at a time through the Oregon Egg Producers, which is a cooperative for farmers, and charge $1.50 per ton to unload a car of corn and put it in my truck. Last January a car cost me $61 per ton put in my truck, then when Congress was talking of rigid price supports on the basic crops, corn went up approximately $1 per ton per week all the time Congress was discussing the farm program and stayed up to around $71 to a high of $73 per ton in August of this year.

Roughly you can see that corn cost about $10 per ton higher for the feeder than it did at the start of the talks. Now don't get me wrong, part of this is a seasonal advance, but normally probably wouldn't have been quite as rapid if it hadn't been in the national spotlight. When a basic feedstuff goes up it usually carries the lessor feedstuffs up also. Ten dollars per ton would hit a feeder like me this way. A turkey consumes approximately 100 pounds of feed to maturity and if feed costs $10 per ton more this would mean 50 cents per bird and reduce this to about 20 pounds per bird and you would have approximately .025 cent per pound the increase in cost of production. Most producers try to realize $1 per bird above the cash costs for their labor. You can see that nearly half of their proposed income was legislated out of their hands without any consideration of supply and demand of the turkey crop entering into their profit picture.

* * * * *

Corn production has made the wheat production burdensome here in Oregon, for wheat is supported at a higher rate than is corn, making those of us that are feeders go to corn to stay in business. We pay over $18 per ton freight for corn and still get it cheaper than local wheat. Most of the wheat that I have bought the last 2 years has been $63 per ton from the farmer, this would make corn worth $70 on its feed value basis. Poultry feedstuffs contain soybean meal; turkey starter mash runs nearly 30 percent; alfalfa meal (dehydrated) comes from California and has to compete with ground used to raise cotton under Government supports, of course. Our meat meal is gained from byproducts from rendering plants (from animals that had to be fed on grain supported by Government prices). Fish meal depends on the fishing fleet in the Northwest and has to compete pricewise with Government supported cotton and soybean crops. We used to feed peanut meal but it is too high to be used now. Dried whey is used to some extent and comes from the dairy industry which the Government was supporting. Then we use some distillers byproducts which means again the price of these are contingent on actions of Government on grain supports. You can see from the above examples that our fundamental farm problems are quite complex and cannot be answered by surface appearances only.

The president of the Oregon Feed and Seed Dealers Association, writing to me last month, emphasized certain factors that characterize the situation in the Pacific Coast States. His letter reads in part:

The major problem that seems to be facing us in the feed end of the industry, is that we are at the end of everything, highest freight rates, smaller but growing population, less poultry, turkey, broiler, and hog population, and so on. We have high labor and handling and construction costs, high taxes, all of which make it difficult to compete with outsiders, who take advantage of their better position to shove their products into our area. For instance, when our broiler market reaches a point of good return to our growers, outside States start shooting broilers into our market, usually oversupplying the market, and down go the prices. Usually these come from Southern States, such as Arkansas, where freight, labor, inspection costs are well under those in our State, and broilers can be produced for a much lower cost, enabling them to ship into our market at prices below that which gives our growers a fair return. In feed manufacturing also, we now pay with the new increase given to the railroads, $30.49 per ton for soybean oilmeal freight, and over $20 per ton on corn freight, Southern States pay about one-third this amount. In 1947 the rate on soybean meal was $13.63 per ton, so you can see what it has gone up. We have, as you know, tons and tons of wheat, which our feed manufacturers cannot afford to use in feed because of the high loan.

The able Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] in introducing a somewhat similar bill last month, called attention to the situation of livestock producers in deficit feed-producing areas such as the Intermountain and New England States. He, too, quoted the President's statement:

There are opportunities to use more wheat for feed in feed-deficit areas, distant from the Corn Belt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill I have introduced may be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1156) to authorize the sale for feeding purposes of limited quantities of wheat of less desirable milling quality, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "Notwithstanding the foregoing restrictions, the Corporation may (shall) sell annually not to exceed 100 million bushels of wheat for feeding purposes, *Provided*, That in selling such wheat due consideration shall be given to (a) the historical area use of wheat as feed, (b) the availability of wheat of less desirable milling qualities, (c) the feeding value of wheat in relation to other feed grains, and (d) the effect such sales of wheat will have on the price of feed grains."

## EXTENDING EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS FOR PEACETIME MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 3 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from California may proceed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in the 2d session of the 84th Congress I introduced a bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 and to extend its educational provisions to all persons who have entered the Armed Forces of the United States since January 31, 1955. This extension would continue until such time as the existing laws authorizing compulsory military service ceased to be effective.

Regrettably, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare did not give any consideration to the proposed legislation. Today I again introduce the same proposed legislation, with the hope it will receive early consideration by the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1158) to extend the educational provisions of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 until such time as existing laws authorizing compulsory military service cease to be effective, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may proceed as requested.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, educational benefits were provided for World War II veterans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 and for veterans of the Korean conflict under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. Under both of these acts, education and training were constituted as temporary programs, and use of the benefits offered were subject to statutory deadlines.

In the case of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, only a small number of veterans who were afforded special treatment, by virtue of an enlistment or reenlistment within 1 year of date of enactment of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945, are still eligible to train. Korean conflict veterans are required to initiate their program of education or training by a date not more than 3 years after they have been discharged or released from active service, and no education or training is afforded under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act beyond 8 years after veterans' discharge or release, or after January 31, 1965, whichever is the later date.

The Veterans' Administration advises me that approximately 7.8 million World War II veterans have trained under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. Only a handful of veterans are still entitled to the benefits under this law, and as of November 30, 1956, only 1,800 veterans are still in training.

As a result of the Korean conflict, the Veterans' Administration states that, to date, approximately 1.7 million have entered training under the Veterans' Readjustment Act. It is anticipated that nearly 1 million additional veterans will

enter training under that law prior to January 31, 1965, the general termination date for the program. Enrollments are currently at or near their peak and it is anticipated that unless the law is amended, the number of veterans in training will remain at a relatively high level for the next 4 or 5 years and then decline at a more rapid rate until the program terminates in 1965.

Under computations prepared for me by the Veterans' Administration, it is estimated that, in the event the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act is amended as proposed by my bill, there will be an average of approximately 600,000 veterans in training each month. The annual cost to the Federal Government will probably average about $800 million. This is the approximate cost of the program at the present time. I emphasize that the cost of the education or training for those presently eligible will commence to decline, whereas, the cost of educating or training veterans made eligible by my proposed legislation will be relatively small at its inception and will, after a period of approximately 10 years, finally equal the current amount being expended by the VA.

Since I first introduced this proposed legislation in the 84th Congress, I have received communications from servicemen and their parents from all parts of our country urging speedy congressional approval. Letters recommending adoption have come from servicemen stationed in some of our remote world outposts. These servicemen cannot understand the logic behind granting educational benefits to fellow servicemen up to but not after January 31, 1955, and denying to those entering the service after this date the same educational benefits. I find it difficult to answer. It is true that provisions granting the President authority to terminate certain benefits, including the educational entitlement was made in the Veterans' Readjustment Assistanct Act of 1952. The President terminated such benefits by proclamation No. 3080, dated January 5, 1955, effective January 31, 1955.

I am informed that the rationale behind the cutoff or termination date of veterans benefits was that this country was not in a state of war; or, that the services of young men inducted into the armed services after January 31, 1955, was not of wartime character. I cannot be too much impressed with this fine distinction. To the boy or his parents, his induction at the present time creates in his mind and the mind of his family many, if not all, of the same emotional disturbances experienced by American families in World War II and Korea. As a practical matter, many veterans of World War II and Korea saw little actual wartime service. These veterans were not denied any of the benefits that their fellow servicemen received for wartime service. Moreover, current world conditions find our young men stationed in almost every possible place throughout the world. With the possibility of surprise peripheral warfare, troops, ships, and aircraft would be mobilized and moved to faraway areas without notice. Since we have already witnessed these conditions during the Suez crisis, who is to say that service in the armed services today is without risks, sacrifices, and hardships? To me the reasons motivating my original introduction of this legislation are still persuasive. These reasons are:

First. As a matter of equity, so long as we continue to induct into our military services young Americans, thus denying to many an opportunity for a complete education, the least we, as citizens of a grateful nation, can do, is to offer these young America a quid pro quo—in return for the sacrifice of 2 or more years of their life at a most crucial time in their educational cycle, give to them partial educational assistance at Government expense.

Second. I fail to see a good reason to distinguish the service rendered subsequent to January 31, 1955, and the service rendered before that date. The inductee or volunteer, before that date, received all the benefits of Public Law 550. I am asking that the inductee or volunteer since that date receive solely the educational or training benefits of that law. This legislation will go a long way toward alleviating the strong feelings that must exist in the minds of those who have served and will serve since the cutoff date of January 31, 1955.

Third. We hear from all sides about the difficulties the Armed Forces have in maintaining the strength of the several volunteer services. It is my opinion that, with the reestablishment of the educational benefits, the Armed Forces will be rewarded by an increased number of volunteers and reenlistees. Many of our young citizens, who wish to receive additional education but do not have the financial resources to provide for themselves, would welcome the opportunity to receive such training as reward for serving their country for several years in the military service. This training would lift the general tone of the morale in the Armed Forces. We all are familiar with the many bills would we have been asked to consider to increase fringe benefits, such as hospitalization for dependents, increased pay, and so forth. Passage of this bill would have as much or more effect on the morale of the serviceman as any that I have seen to date.

Fourth. The need to increase our general educational level is of paramount importance. This need is dual in nature: It is not only of prime interest in increasing our general standard of living, but it is vital to our national security. Daily we read in the press, statements by people high in the military departments, educators, and men holding high office in the executive branch of the Government, that we are falling behind in output of trained scientists and engineers. Russia today is reported to far exceed us in the number of persons training in these fields. Obviously, this is of grave concern to us, for today our struggle to preserve our way of life is not limited by manpower but rather by the know-how in making further strides in the technical fields which have become so vital in the nuclear era. The cost in offering the opportunity to thousands of young men and women in uniform to further their education is nil compared to the enormous benefits to be derived by the Nation as a whole from such educational entitlements.

Let me refer to a letter I have received from the department of education of my own State, California. I believe these remarks are very germane to this legislation. This letter, in part, reads as follows:

> I know we are all most concerned about the reports emanating on the Russian training program for scientists, engineers, and mathematicians. We have always felt that our veterans' educational benefit programs under Public Law 346 and Public Law 550 have done a great deal to assist in a scholarship program for those persons who have served in the armed services, to attain training through the Federal Government without the many difficulties and problems of true Federal control. We hope and trust that the educational benefits can be extended to those who have served in the armed services after February 1, 1955. The National Association of State Approved Agencies is preparing such recommended legislation, which I am sure will be presented to Congress during this session.

The California State Scholarship Commission has expressed its interest in this proposed legislation.

With the termination of present educational entitlements many of our colleges and universities will feel the effect of reduced enrollments. Industry will feel a like effect. The already serious shortages of scientists, engineers, and other specialist personnel may well increase. I am informed that a great percentage of veterans participating in the present educational benefits program have enrolled in engineering and technical courses. There can be no question that, over the 10-year period that has elapsed since the end of World War II the educational benefits program has proved to be extremely rewarding to veterans, industry, and beyond that, to the country. The passage of this bill, in my judgment, will continue rewarding them in the days ahead.

---

## EVALUATION OF RECREATIONAL BENEFITS AS A PART OF PROJECT PLANNING

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, Federal water projects have become a major portion of the playgrounds for the Nation. I believe it is time that the Federal law recognize the great economic value of these recreation benefits, and increase the opportunity for their development.

Under present law, the value of the recreation benefits expected from water projects cannot be counted in computing the economic justification. Furthermore, there is insufficient provision for a full development of recreation opportunities to insure wider usage and more economic benefits to the areas.

My colleague, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and I are introducing proposed legislation to correct this situation. The only limitation will be that the recreation program shall not conflict with the major purposes of the project, such as flood control, power, and so forth. The general result will be to speed authorization and construction of projects with recreational opportunities, and to improve such facilities of those projects already in operation.

The basic provision of the bill is to improve the benefit-cost ratio by counting potential recreation benefits up to 15 percent of the total cost of the project. This portion would not be repaid to the Federal Government by users. Such benefits would be computed on the basis of $1 per person on the estimated number of visitors annually, a figure obviously much less than experience proves would be fed into the local economy by the booming tourist trade.

Our bill would allow and encourage full cooperation and coordination of all agencies, local, State, and Federal, to promote the maximum development and usage of recreation facilities. It covers the projects built both by the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

This proposal to recognize officially recreation benefits has been endorsed by the Chief of the Corps of Army Engineers. He recently cited the tremendous popularity of the lake projects, and indicated the need of new and clarifying legislation.

The proven value and popularity of these great projects demonstrate the logic and necessity of recognizing recreation as an important benefit.

For instance, in 1955 there was a total of 62 million visitors at the Army engineers' projects, which was more than the combined total at all national parks, and many, many more than the total visiting national forests.

Last summer 64,000 boats were licensed for operation on the Army engineer reservoirs, with the number growing at a rapid rate. Water skiing in the land-locked Middle West has become a booming fad.

In our State of Oklahoma, there were about 13.5 million visitors reported at our nine big lakes, including about 6.6 million at Lake Texoma. Already, the tourist business is feeding millions of dollars annually into our economy, and the increase of population, with the increase of leisure time, is calculated to multiply this total many times in the future.

The junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is cosponsoring this bill with me in the Senate, and a companion bill is being introduced in the House by Representatives CARL ALBERT and ED EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma.

We have spent many months in conference on this bill, working with representatives of State and local agencies, and the Federal agencies affected. We believe it is adequate and satisfactory. It will greatly strengthen our soil and water program, provide better recreation facilities for the people, and spur the economy where the projects are located.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1164) to make the evaluation of recreational benefits resulting from the construction of any flood control, navigation, or reclamation project an integral part of project planning, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

## AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO PRICE SUPPORTS FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide that price supports on the basic farm commodities shall be fixed at 90 percent of parity.

In the 84th Congress I introduced a bill to accomplish the same purpose. Unfortunately for the farmers, the omnibus farm bill which contained a 1-year provision for 90 percent of parity support levels was vetoed by the President, and the Congress later enacted the soil bank program without the 90-percent provision.

I am now prompted to introduced my bill again to provide for permanent 90 percent of parity on the basic farm crops, because I believe it essential to the welfare of the farmer and of the Nation itself.

More than a week ago, upon receiving a report that Mr. Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, was about to announce a reduction in the support level for cotton, I telegraphed him urging that he increase the support level instead of reducing it. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that telegram be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1957.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
*Secretary of Agriculture,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

I am informed that you may announce the price support level for cotton for the 1957 crop year within the next 2 weeks. I hope this will be possible so that our farmers may be given as much notice as possible on this important matter. I earnestly request that in exercising your discretionary authority on this matter of cotton price supports, you will increase the support price to 90 percent of parity and in no event decrease the support level below the 1956 price of 82½ percent of parity. Thank you for your attention to this matter of grave importance to our Nation's cotton growers.

STROM THURMOND,
*United States Senator.*

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, last Saturday, when I learned of the Secretary's action in reducing support levels, I telegraphed him again with specific reference to cotton, urging that he reconsider the reduction from 82½ percent to 77 percent of parity. I request that a copy of this telegram be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 9, 1957.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
*Secretary of Agriculture,*
*Department of Agriculture,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Regret to learn you have approved reduction in support price level of cotton. Please refer to my telegram to you on February 1. Urge that you reconsider your action in view of the importance of this matter to continuing welfare of our cotton farmers.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND,
*United States Senator.*

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, many groups in this country have received guaranteed increases in income during the past year. Those increases have also raised the cost of living generally for most of the people of this country. This increase in the cost of living applies to our farmers as well as to those who have received increased incomes. But our farmers have not received any increase in income. They have been the victims of a decreased income. Not only that, they now have been subjected to a lesser guarantee of the prices on the basic farm commodities.

These commodities are essential to our civilian population and to our Defense Establishments. In my opinion, fixed price supports are essential, not only to the farmer, but to all of us, because the production of these commodities is vital to the proper functioning of the civilian and military pursuits of this Nation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1166) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to require that prices of basic agricultural commodities be supported at 90 percent of parity, introduced by Mr. THURMOND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

---

## DEDUCTION FROM GROSS INCOME OF CERTAIN MEDICAL EXPENSES

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide a deduction from gross income for certain medical expenses of handicapped persons.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1170) to provide a deduction from gross income for certain medical expenses of handicapped persons, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. BUTLER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this bill proposes to amend the Internal Revenue Code by providing for a deduction for income-tax purposes of amounts paid for hearing aids, crutches, artificial limbs, artificial glass eyes, wheel chairs, and seeing-eye dogs.

Under existing law, expenses paid for the above-listed items are allowed as deductions under section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the deduction for medical and dental expenses. A taxpayer must itemize his nonbusiness deductions in order to claim the amounts paid for medical expenses, which are only allowable to the extent such expenses exceed 3 percent of the adjusted gross income unless the taxpayer or spouse is 65 years of age or over. For individuals not electing to list their nonbusiness deductions, allowance is provided for these deductions (which include medical expenses) by means of allowing a standard deduction of 10 percent based on the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer and limited to a maximum deduction of $1,000.

In order to provide a specific deduction for the cost of hearing aids, crutches, artificial limbs, artificial glass eyes, wheel chairs, and seeing-eye dogs to taxpayers regardless of whether they itemize their nonbusiness deductions or elect to use the standard deduction, the deduction should be in the form of a gross income deduction. This is accomplished by amending section 62 of the code.

There are no data available for the purpose of determining a basis for estimating the revenue loss with respect to the proposed deduction for crutches, artificial glass eyes, wheelchairs, and seeing-eye dogs. The loss of revenue under the proposed deduction for hearing aids and artificial limbs is estimated to amount to approximately $10 million.

## ADMISSION OF SPAIN INTO NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution favoring the admission of Spain into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

It is similar to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14) submitted on February 7 by the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], on behalf of himself and a number of other Senators.

I should like to note that in the 84th Congress my colleague and I had both submitted a concurrent resolution for this same purpose.

The House of Representatives had unanimously approved a concurrent resolution to this effect, but final action had not been taken in the Senate. I trust that such action will be taken at this session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the United States, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, and the United Kingdom and parties to the North Atlantic Treaty; and

Whereas the primary objective of the treaty is to contribute to the maintenance of peace by making clear the determination of the parties collectively to resist armed attack upon any of them; and

Whereas the parties have joined, pursuant to the treaty, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a collective defense arrangement for the North Atlantic area established within the framework of the United Nations Charter and based upon the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the charter; and

Whereas the United States and Spain, on September 26, 1953, signed bilateral agreements for the furtherance of their mutual security; and

Whereas Portugal, a member of NATO, is already joined with Spain in a treaty of mutual friendship; and

Whereas the membership of Spain would strengthen the strategic position of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the Department of State should continue to use its good offices toward the end of achieving the earliest possible participation by Spain in the North Atlantic Treaty and as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

## ENFORCEMENT OF STATE STATUTES PRESCRIBING CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] may be added as cosponsor to the bill (S. 654) to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities, introduced by me on behalf of myself and other Senators, on January 17, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## PRINTING OF REPORT ENTITLED "INVENTORY REPORT ON REAL PROPERTY OWNED BY THE UNITED STATES THROUGHOUT THE WORLD," AS A SENATE DOCUMENT (S. DOC. NO. 25)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, at a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations on February 7, it was recommended that a committee print of the inventory report on Real Property Owned by the United States Throughout the World as of June 30, 1956, compiled by the General Services Administration at the request of the committee be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

I present the committee print, and ask that it be so printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence relating to the report, together with a press release giving some of the facts on the inventory, be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the correspondence and press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
*Washington, D. C., February 6, 1957.*

Hon. F. G. FLOETE,
*Administrator,*
*General Services Administration,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. FLOETE: The committee is in receipt of the inventory report on real property owned by the United States throughout the world as of June 30, 1956, prepared by your Administration pursuant to the committee's request first made in 1953 and now continued annually. This report now contains in a single document the summaries of all real property owned by the United States, for which comparable inventory data was published last year in Senate Document No. 100 for property in the United States and in Senate Document No. 109 for property outside the United States.

The summary report of this current inventory, with supporting charts and tables, is being issued as a Senate document and made available to all Federal agencies as well as the public generally. We recommend that a set of the electric accounting machine detail data sheets be furnished to the Senate and House Appropriations Committees and Government Operations Committees, to the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office, and to the reporting agency for pertinent use, and that file and working copies of these sheets will be available also in your Administration for reference.

The purpose of the committee in requesting these inventory reports is well stated in your listing of the major objectives to be served, as follows:

"Facilitate disposal of surplus property and thereby increase revenue of the Government, as well as decrease maintenance and realty costs;

"Restore property to private ownership and thus increase the opportunity for its productive use, especially as a source of employment;

"Return such properties to the tax rolls of State and local governments;

"Effect economies in acquisitions, by purchase or lease, and in construction and operation;

"Facilitate the preparation of budgets by individual agencies;

"Assist in the intelligent evaluation and appraisal of budgetary requests; and

"Achieve maximum control over and utilization of Federal real property."

Whether used as a budgetary aid, as a management tool in property utilization or disposal, or as a source of information previously unavailable, the resulting economies are becoming increasingly apparent from year to year.

The committee commends you and your organization for a job well done.

Very sincerely yours,

CARL HAYDEN,
STYLES BRIDGES.

---

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
*Washington, D. C., February 1, 1957.*

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
*Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,*
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are pleased to submit the attached summary report covering the inventory of real property owned by the United States Government throughout the world as of June 30, 1956. This inventory report was prepared pursuant to the request of the Senate Committee on Appropriations in Senate Report No. 411 on the first independent offices appropriation bill for 1956, dated June 2, 1955.

This report summarizes in a single document all real property owned by the United States. Comparable inventory data was published in two separate reports last year. One report covered federally owned real property in the United States (S. Doc. No. 100, Feb. 14, 1956). The other report covered federally owned real property outside the United States (S. Doc. No. 109, March 27, 1956).

This report contains only certain summary data, as reported by the Department of Defense for its military installations in United States Territories and possessions and in foreign countries.

In addition to the attached summary inventory report, detailed supporting inventory listings are being submitted under separate cover.

The total cost of real property owned by the United States throughout the world amounts to $40.3 billion. This total is comprised of (a) $34.3 billion for property in the United States; (b) $3.6 billion for property in United States Territories and possessions; and (c) $2.4 billion for property in foreign countries.

This inventory report, in addition to including real property changes since June 30, 1955, also reflects refinements to the inventory data contained in previous reports. Considerable progress has been achieved in improving real property records throughout the Government, although in our opinion, additional work remains to be done.

The annual inventory is facilitating the efforts of the Bureau of the Budget, GSA, and the respective agencies in reviewing and evaluating the need for the retention or disposal of real properties. It has also made the agencies aware of the need for adequate real property records to achieve the most effective utilization of their properties.

In May 1956, the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in Report No. 2041, requested GSA to expand the annual inventory to cover real property leased to the United States Government throughout the world. Pursuant to this request, a separate report on leased properties is presently being compiled.

We again wish to express our appreciation for the cooperation received from Mr. Earl Cooper of the committee's staff, the participating agencies, and the Bureau of the Census.

Sincerely yours,

F. G. FLOETE, *Administrator.*

---

The United States has nearly three-quarters of a billion acres of land which, with the improvements thereon, cost $40.3 billion in its worldwide inventory of Government-owned real property.

These are the outstanding total figures in the current annual inventory of Federal property which General Services Administration prepares for the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The committee's inventory report, a 144-page summary, was made public today by Senator CARL HAYDEN, chairman.

The inventory, complete as of June 30, 1956, is the second worldwide tally of Government realty which GSA has compiled at the request of the committee. The first worldwide inventory was prepared a year ago. The initial inventory, which was prepared at the committee's request in 1953, covered only Federal properties in the United States. The committee has asked GSA to bring the report up to date annually.

Today's figures show that the cost of realty owned by the Government is $2.3 billion greater than last year's reported total of $38 billion.

This increase is due principally to two factors: An expansion in such programs as atomic energy, defense, and reclamation; and secondly, a refinement of inventory data.

The report released today, complete with graphs and charts, is a summary of the master inventory, which consists of 24 volumes with more than 5,000 pages of detailed entries. Part of the property is scattered in over 100 foreign countries and some of it, in the far reaches of Alaska, may not yet have ever been trod by man.

The inventory does not include lands owned by the sovereign governments of the various United States Territories and possessions, nor does it cover any lands which are administered by the United States under trusteeship by authority of the United Nations.

However, included separately are 53.1 million acres of Indian lands held in trust by the Government.

All other holdings are listed, except property owned by the District of Columbia government and residential and farm properties acquired through foreclosure incident to lending operations or other Federal-aid projects. Capital improvements are included in costs, but machinery, furniture, and demountable and movable structures are not.

Highlights of the inventory report:

"The $40.3 billion cost is based on the acquisition cost of all the real property, some of which goes back as far as 1789.

"$34.3 billion is located in the continental United States, $3.6 billion in the Territories and possessions, and $2.4 billion in foreign countries.

"409.5 million acres, representing 52.9 percent of the total owned, are in the United States, 364.2 million acres (47 percent) are in Alaska and the balance of .9 million acres (one-tenth of 1 percent) are in foreign countries.

"93.5 percent of all land owned by the Federal Government was acquired as a part of the public domain. The Government has a life interest in one-tenth of 1 percent of its holdings, a life interest being property which has been acquired by treaty or long-term lease. The Panama Canal is a good example of life-interest property.

"Of the total $34.3 billion cost of real property owned in the continental United States, the Department of Defense has $21.5 billion. The Department of the Interior has $3.6 billion, and the Atomic Energy Commission is next largest holder with $3 billion.

"Of the total 409.5 million acres owned in the United States, 182 million are used for grazing, 172 million acres for forests and wildlife preserves, 18.4 million acres by the military (except for airfields). Parks, reclamation and irrigation, flood control and navigation, industrial uses, airfields and power development and distribution comprise the remaining 37.1 million acres of land acreage.

"Of the 36.2 million square feet of floor area in buildings owned by the United States outside the continental limits, 17.1 million feet are used for housing. Office space takes up 6 million feet. Schools, hospitals, industrial areas, etc., take up the balance.

"The United States Government owns no property in the U. S. S. R. The American Embassy in Moscow is rented. However, property is owned in nations with which this Government does not have diplomatic relations, such as Albania, Bulgaria, and China. In such instances, custodial control is exercised through the cooperation of other countries."

The detailed inventory listings show the cost of several well-known national landmarks in Washington, D. C., as follows: Smithsonian Institution, $19,457,000; Washington Monument, $1,300,000; Thomas Jefferson Memorial, $3,375,000, and the Lincoln Memorial, $2,940,000.

---

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BYRD:

Address on the subject Financial Stability as a National Resource, delivered by him before the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, in Washington, D. C., on February 5, 1957.

Account of the third annual Rochambeau Commission Commemoration of the victory at Yorktown, Va.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Speech delivered by him at the annual meeting of the National Wheat Growers Association, at Lincoln, Nebr., on February 8, 1957.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

Statement by him made before American College of Public Relations Association and the American Alumni Council, in Atlantic City, N. J., on January 24, 1957.

By Mr. BUTLER:

Address delivered by Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., at the presentation of the American Way Award to Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Report No. 1 from the office of EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, a Representative in Congress from the Fourth District of Minnesota, to his constituents, dated February 1957.

---

## NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today the following nominations:

Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. (Reappointment.)

Laird Bell, of Illinois, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1960, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified. (Reappointment.)

Notice is given that these nominations will be eligible for consideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

---

## THIRTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the people of Lithuania and to make note of the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, which will be celebrated on February 16, 1957.

This historic anniversary will not be celebrated in the Lithuanian homeland, so it is all the more important that we take note of it here. It must be ignored in its homeland because of the godless tyranny of Soviet communism which now holds Lithuania in bondage.

The history of a free and sovereign Lithuanian nation goes back more than 700 years. Its citizens have developed and strengthened their love of freedom and their love of God throughout the centuries, despite the repeated conquest and intervention of more powerful neighbors.

After more than a century of domination by czarist Russia, a free Lithuania took its place among the nations of the

world at Vilna on February 16, 1918, and enjoyed 22 years of independence. In 1940, the Soviet Union began its systematic, ruthless efforts to destroy the nation, its people, language, religion, and culture. Despite this brutal pressure, I am confident that communism will fail in Lithuania, as it has elsewhere, to stamp out the burning desire for freedom and liberty in the hearts of the people.

I am proud to join many Americans of Lithuanian descent and friends of Lithuania in marking this occasion and pledging our efforts and our prayers to the task of restoring freedom to all captive people behind the Iron Curtain.

---

## INFLATION, SPENDING, TAXES, AND SOME REFORMS — ADDRESS BY FORMER PRESIDENT HOOVER

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Monday February 4, 1957, former President Hoover delivered a notable address before the Third National Reorganization Conference at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington. It was broadcast nationally.

The subject of the address was "Inflation, Spending, Taxes, and Some Reforms."

In his remarks Mr. Hoover stressed the critical danger in the present inflation trends, and called for reforms in reducing the cost of Government as recommended in the second Hoover Commission reports. He pointed out the progress made by emphasizing the imperative steps that still remain to be taken if we are to have real savings in our annual expenditures.

Because of the present inflationary dangers and the timeliness of Mr. Hoover's recommendations, I ask unanimous consent that this important address be published in full in the body of the RECORD, and I urge that it be read by every Member of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFLATION, SPENDING, TAXES, AND SOME REFORMS—ADDRESS BY HERBERT HOOVER BEFORE THE THIRD NATIONAL REORGANIZATION CONFERENCE, SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 4, 1957

The purpose of these meetings is to stimulate interest in reducing waste, increasing efficiency, decreasing expenses and taxes in the Government, and thereby also contributing to curbing inflation.

I hope you will be patient with my approach to these questions. The modern connotation of liberalism having taken on one of its dictionary definitions as free spending, I hope I may be regarded as a constructive conservative.

### THE INFLATION MOVEMENT

No one here needs to be told that we are in the midst of an inflation movement. Both President Eisenhower and Secretary Humphrey, as well as a host of nonofficial persons, have called full warning of it.

You do not need to be told that unless inflation is stopped the end is a bump.

While Secretary of Commerce I witnessed a growing inflation movement. I protested vigorously at its promotion by Federal activities. Then I had to live through the agony of its inevitable consequences. Secretary Humphrey says that unless we change some of our ways we will see "a depression that will curl your hair." Mine has already been curled once—and I think I can detect the signs.

The obvious sign of inflation is the advance of prices, wages, and the cost of living. But another sign is the temperament of some of our economists. Again you hear the same expressions as in the inflation period of 30 years ago—that "we are in a new economic era"; that "the old economic laws are outmoded." I just suggest to you that even in a partially free economy, unless we curb inflation on its way up, Old Man Economic Law will return with a full equipment of hair curlers.

### THE AMERICAN PEOPLE NEED TO BE MORE AWAKE

There are several things as to Government financial operations of which our people should be more fully awake.

First. The Federal Government spending is much larger than the figures in the annual Federal budget. There is spending on various governmentally conducted pensions and on some trust funds. And there is indirect spending on projects financed by guaranties and loans. And there is the spending of our State and local governments which we must take within our vision. Various responsible institutions have estimated the total of these expenditures during the last calendar year at over $103 billions.

Second. The American people should realize that this spending has to be met with some kind of levies on the people, whether they appear as taxes or under some other guise, and these levies are also estimated at about $103 billion.

Third. They need to realize that this enormous Federal and local spending and the levies which it requires has some part in this inflation movement.

Fourth. They should also realize that these total levies are taking so much from the people that their savings are insufficient to finance the needs of growing private enterprise to provide 1,500,000 new jobs each year, and to provide homes for the new couples. This is thwarting progress itself. Incidentally the rise in interest rates is an indication of inflation.

Fifth. They should realize that with combined Federal, State, and local taxes, we are a long way on the road to socializing the income of the people. Moreover, the form of these taxes is making new individual enterprise most difficult and is driving small businesses to sell out to big business. And the Government is engaged in a host of businesses in competition with private enterprise.

The spirit of Karl Marx no doubt rejoices at these phenomena. He recommended some such action as the road to socialism.

But lest I be misunderstood as to expenditures, let me repeat what I have said many times over the years. The Federal Government should undertake, and only undertake, competitive business and public improvements which cannot be otherwise attained by the people or their local governments. There are less of them than some pressure groups would have you think.

Sixth. The American people must realize that they cannot have every social and public works improvement of their dreams all at once, especially in a world where we have to defend ourselves from a monstrous international danger.

At least we should only undertake such ventures in order of their urgency.

### OUR PROPOSALS

Our Commission has made a multitude of proposals for reducing the cost of Government. We have not proposed to abolish or injure any necessary functions of the Government. With the support of President Eisenhower and the Congress a good deal of progress has been made.

Out of scores of further such opportunities to save expenditures I will mention at this time only four.

### BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING

Our Federal budgeting and accounting is not adapted to these enormous expenditures. Two things have resulted. No one today can tell what the actual annual expenditures of the Government really are. And for this reason, and the continuing appropriations, the Congress has lost control of the purse—the very foundation of freemen.

The remedy we proposed has been supported by President Eisenhower, the Comptroller General, and the Director of the Budget. Under the leadership of Senator JOHN KENNEDY, a bill providing these reforms was passed unanimously by the Senate in the last session. The act was divided into three parts. Two parts were passed by the House and are now law. The key part, however, was deleted in the House. Again, under Senator KENNEDY's leadership, this legislation has been introduced into the Senate with 48 Senators as sponsors.

Here is a spot for the Citizens Committee and the other agencies of reform in Government to express themselves vigorously, for there are savings estimated at over $3 billion to be had. And further, the country and the Congress could then know what the Government really spends each year and the Congress could really control it.

### DEFENSE

In the face of the Communist threat, we must maintain our military strength. But we need a soul-searching look into the abandonment of obsolete methods and weapons of defense. Beyond that we proposed the effective unification of the common-use business service of the four military departments with a saving of over $2 billion a year. Some admirable steps have been taken by the Defense Department—but there is still a long way to go. I might remind you that unification of these common-use activities was one of the great hopes of the Congress when it enacted the unification of the defense services.

### THE CIVIL SERVICE

There is another area in which there are billions of dollars to be saved. The turnover in our civil service is about 500,000 employees annually—that is 25 percent per annum, 3 or 4 times the normal of the well-conducted business. It costs about $3,000 to process and give a year's training to the new employee. If this turnover could be reduced by 200,000, that alone would produce a saving of over $5 billion a year.

Another cause of this turnover comes from the failure of Government service to attract and hold men and women who have developed unusual administrative abilities. With inadequate pay for top executive skill and the uncertainty of promotions, our best employees become the easy recruits of private business. In consequence, many services are left to be administered by deadwood. President Eisenhower has approved our proposals.

### GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS

The Federal Government is engaged in a multitude of business enterprises in competition with private business. As a whole, they pay microscopic taxes—either Federal, State, or local; few of them pay interest on Government capital and still fewer amortize this capital. Any strict accounting would show, as a whole, that they are a burden on the taxpayer and that they deprive the Government of taxes that would be paid on the same service by private enterprise. Some headway is being made on getting rid of them but there is still a long way to go.

### WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS SPENDING AND TAXES?

And now I will disclose to you who is mostly responsible in these unnecessary and wasteful expenditures. They are opposed by some Government employees. But the most important opposition is the pressure groups who operate among our people. Many of

their names are on the Federal register of lobbyists as required by law. Others of them operate strenuously on Senators and Congressmen and the public in the field. There are probably more than a thousand of these pressure groups, working day and night, to get what they call theirs. So far as I know there is not a name among the registered lobbyists whose purpose is to decrease public expenditures. I know of only two private organizations in Washington working to reduce expenses and taxes.

I suggest to you, the American people, that each of you examine yourself as to whether you belong to any pressure group asking for Federal spending. If you value your own safety and future peace of mind, just resign from it—and do it loudly.

However, despite the pressure groups we are making progress on the Commission's recommendations.

And may I add that so far as our internal economic forces are concerned, I have no fear of a serious depression if we can stop the march of inflation.

## STRENGTH OF VICE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE IN RECENT ELECTION

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, recently Mr. Harold Stassen, the President's Special Assistant on Disarmament Matters, appeared as a guest on a prominent national television program. While being interviewed, he made the statement that the nomination of Gov. Christian Herter for Vice President would have given majorities to the Republican Party in both Houses of Congress.

The magazine, U. S. News & World Report, asked 82 losing Republican congressional candidates in 37 States to comment on this controversial statement. Seventy-seven, or 94 percent, replied that RICHARD M. NIXON was the strongest vice-presidential candidate the Republican Party could have presented on their behalf. Three of those interviewed made no comment, and the remaining two said that Governor Herter would have strengthened their election chances. Significantly, both of these candidates for the House of Representatives from Massachusetts, Governor Herter's home State.

The comments of these candidates, as reported in the February 8 issue of U. S. News & World Report, are most interesting and significant. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANSWERS TO STASSEN: DID NIXON HURT THE TICKET?—REPUBLICAN LOSERS SAY "NO"

SENATE CANDIDATES

*Arizona*

ROSS F. JONES, defeated by Senator CARL HAYDEN: "Insofar as Arizona was concerned, I believe that Mr. Stassen's statement that Mr. Herter for Vice President would have resulted in a Republican Congress is erroneous. The very large majority given to the Eisenhower-Nixon ticket and the large majorities given in Arizona to reelect incumbents to Congress would refute such a claim. Mr. Herter's name on the ballot would not have changed results in my campaign."

*Colorado*

Dan Thornton, defeated for the Senate by JOHN A. CARROLL: "The nomination of Mr. Herter for Vice President would not have made any difference in my race in Colorado at all. As a matter of fact, it seemed to me that Vice President NIXON was a help to me. I was defeated by only 2,700 votes. A severe drought over the State and the fact that I would not agree wholeheartedly with the labor leaders on points regarding labor legislation were the causes of my defeat, and not Vice President NIXON on the ticket."

*Idaho*

Senator Herman Welker, defeated by FRANK CHURCH: "The statement made by Harold Stassen is below par for his statements. NIXON helped me more than any other person and, in my opinion, is far more popular than Governor Herter. When will Republicans muzzle the talkative Stassen?

"It seems he has done enough singing for the eastern seaboard leftwing press. If he would ever attempt to run for public office, he would find his unpopularity, as I did, at the polls. NIXON's candidacy had nothing to do with my defeat."

*Missouri*

Herbert Douglas, defeated by Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.: "In my case, it would not have made any difference. RICHARD NIXON was the strongest possible candidate the Republican Party could have presented for Vice President. He grew in stature as the campaign went on. Governor Herter is unknown in Missouri and would not have helped my situation.

"As a matter of fact, I think the Eisenhower ticket would have been weakened in the State by as much as 7 to 8 percent if someone else had been on the ticket instead of Mr. NIXON. I lost because of a peculiar situation in Missouri—from an organization standpoint, from the dry-weather standpoint and from running against a good Democrat Senator."

*Nevada*

Cliff Young, defeated by Senator ALAN BIBLE: No.

*Ohio*

Senator George H. Bender, defeated by FRANK J. LAUSCHE: "I believe that the Stassen statement is completely unfounded. Vice President NIXON made a tremendous effort on my behalf during the Ohio Senate campaign. He spoke throughout the State and waged a sincere, determined fight for my reelection. I believe that his work contributed to the closeness of the outcome. I attribute the loss of the Senate seat to the popularity of my opponent in normally Republican areas of the State."

*Oklahoma*

Douglas McKeever, defeated by Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY: "The substitution of Governor Herter for Mr. NIXON would not have made the slightest difference in my State. In this part of the country, the Vice President is stronger and more popular than Mr. Herter, and always has been. There isn't any question but that Mr. NIXON was a help to the ticket.

"Out here there is a strong conservative background and a strong conservative thought among the people, and Vice President NIXON somewhat represents that thought in the national scene, as far as they are concerned. That applies particularly to the Republican Party. Mr. Herter isn't very well known in this area as compared to the Vice President, anyway. The Vice President has a large following among Oklahoma voters. I think that Mr. Stassen has gaged the whole thing wrong, so far as Oklahoma is concerned, anyway."

*Oregon*

Douglas McKay, defeated by Senator WAYNE MORSE: "I do not believe that Christian Herter would have strengthened the Republican ticket for Congress. I believe that Vice President NIXON was the strongest possible candidate for the Vice Presidency. In my own case, I feel that Vice President NIXON did more than any other candidate for that office could have. My strongest opposition came from the leaders of organized labor, COPE (committee on political education, AFL–CIO)."

HOUSE CANDIDATES

*Arizona*

John G. Speiden in the Second District: "Mr. Herter on the ballot would not have resulted in my election, nor do I believe it would have gotten me any more votes. Both he and Mr. NIXON are very highly regarded throughout Arizona, but Mr. NIXON is much better known."

*California*

Noel C. Stevenson in the Third District: "If Christian Herter had been on the ticket instead of Mr. NIXON, I probably wouldn't have done as well in this district. What put the President over, throughout the district, was his personal popularity. I think Mr. NIXON was a help. I think he is generally popular here in California."

Robert B. Moore in the 12th District: "I will grant that RICHARD M. NIXON is controversial in this district, but I do not believe either Eisenhower or I would have carried the district with Mr. Herter on the ticket."

Myron D. Tisdel in the 14th District: "I disagree with Mr. Stassen. Neither Senator KUCHEL or President Eisenhower carried my district. I am a NIXON supporter and he was a great help to my campaign."

Roy E. Reynolds in the 19th District: "Christian Herter would have been of no help in any way to my campaign. NIXON could have been of more help if time had permitted. I'll cast my vote with RICHARD NIXON now and later."

E. Elgie Calvin in the 23d District: "The election proved Stassen wrong. Herter is a fine man and in some respects could have helped. NIXON was the whipping boy."

*Colorado*

Hugh L. Caldwell in the Fourth District: "I do not believe the nomination of Mr. Herter for Vice President would have made any difference with my election. If any one Republican was to blame for the election of a Democratic Congress, I think it was Harold Stassen."

*Idaho*

Louise Shadduck in the First District: "Vice President NIXON's appearance in Idaho's First Congressional District during the campaign was enthusiastically received by over 10,000. Excellent reports followed his talk. I do not feel that Christian Herter could have been of greater help."

*Illinois*

George B. McKibbin in the Second District: "My district is a strong Democratic one which Eisenhower failed to carry. With the help of NIXON, who came to my district, I made a better showing than if Herter, who was unknown in my district, had been a candidate. The district is one-third Negro and with the help of NIXON I doubled the Negro vote."

John S. Ackerman in the Ninth District: "Anti-NIXON sentiment in my district seemed to vanish after conventions and was a negligible factor in the result. Local scandals were the major adverse factors."

Edgar A. Jonas in the 12th District: "I do not agree with the conclusion of Harold Stassen. I believe the Herter nomination would not have been productive of different results than those obtained with NIXON on the ticket. In my opinion, the dominant and persuasive factors that produced the result in my district were issues closely related to racial and extreme liberal tendencies, plus local scandals."

*Indiana*

Donald K. Stimson, Jr., in the First District: "I do not feel that Mr. Herter on the

ticket would have affected the outcome of my race. To win, I would have needed personal help from Mr. Eisenhower in the form of personal appearances."

D. Bailey Merrill, in the Eighth District: "No."

*Iowa*

Representative James I. Dolliver, in the Sixth District: "Mr. Herter's candidacy for Vice President on the Republican ticket would have had no effect on the election results in my district."

*Kansas*

John W. Crutcher, in the Fifth District: "The Kansas farmer was not much disturbed about the relative merits of GOP Vice Presidential personalities. If Chris Herter could have delivered a drought-busting rain it would have carried the entire ticket. I suggest we put a rainmaker in second spot on the GOP ticket in 1960."

*Maine*

James L. Reid, in the Second District: "I am sure I would not have been elected if Mr. Herter rather than RICHARD NIXON had been on the ticket as Vice President. In Maine, the issues were largely local, with no emphasis on the Vice Presidential candidates. In September, Maine elected a Democrat Governor, but voted in November overwhelmingly for Eisenhower. I believe NIXON and Herter are highly respected by Maine people."

*Maryland*

Harry Kemper, in the Third District: "My defeat was due, at least in part, to the fact that I received no financial support from the Republican Party in Washington and Maryland. If Christian Herter had been the nominee for Vice President I would have been defeated anyway."

William B. Prendergast, in the Fifth District: "The Stassen statement is utter nonsense. I will buy his unused Herter buttons if he can produce five voters in Maryland's Fifth District who voted against me because of dislike for NIXON."

David A. Halley, in the Seventh District: "RICHARD NIXON was an asset to my campaign. In my opinion, Harold Stassen is just a misguided missile, with no place to light."

*Massachusetts*

Foster W. Doty, in the Second District: "The continued crystal gazing of Harold Stassen is most unfortunate for the Republican Party. I see no basis for assuming that the result would have been changed in the Second District if Mr. Herter had run as Vice President."

Robert A. Parker, in the Third District: "I think it would have made very little difference in this district. The incumbent is firmly entrenched in office. In my book, Mr. NIXON is a stronger man than Mr. Herter would have been on the ticket. On the State level, Mr. Herter did a good job, but I think he incurred enemies who might have hurt him even in Massachusetts."

Mary R. Wheeler in the Fourth District: "I found no evidence of an anti-Nixon feeling in my district."

Robert T. Breed in the Seventh District: "This is a gerrymandered district that had been sacrificed to the Democrats. Normally it is 4 to 1, or more, for Democratic candidates. In my district, the entire Republican State ticket took a pretty bad licking. The only Republican who made a good showing was Mr. Eisenhower himself. The last time a Massachusetts man—Calvin Coolidge—was nominated on the national ticket the Republicans carried all Massachusetts congressional districts. This could have happened again with Governor Herter. In my opinion, Mr. Herter is a much stronger man than Mr. NIXON, and he should be the Republican candidate for President in 1960."

C. Eugene Farnam in the Eighth District: "As the greatest Governor in the history of Massachusetts, it is unquestionable that Chris Herter would have helped me if he had been the vice-presidential nominee. I am not certain that his place on the ticket would have meant control of Congress for President Eisenhower."

Rudolph E. Mottola in the 11th District: "I don't think it would have made much difference in the congressional races in Massachusetts. The Eisenhower popularity was such that he would have carried the State, no matter who was the second man on the ticket. And we had a Democratic sweep running against us at the State levels."

James S. Tremblay in the 12th District: "I am unable to agree with Harold Stassen. Christian Herter was an able and popular Governor here, but he does not possess the experience, ability, popularity, and youth of RICHARD NIXON. The voters were interested only in electing Ike for President, not in electing members of Congress."

*Michigan*

Larry Middleton in the 15th District: "Mr. Stassen is entitled to his opinion, but I do not believe the identity of the vice-presidential nominee would have affected the outcome of the congressional race in my district."

George E. Smith in the 17th District: "The Herter name would not have helped me. The NIXON name did not hurt me that I know of—in this district, I feel that he helped me."

*Minnesota*

Edward C. Slettedahl in the Fourth District: "With the help of any candidate for Vice President who could have provided a more unified Republican Party, and with more positive support, I could have been elected to Congress. There is no way for me to judge the potential of positive help from Christian Herter in Minnesota, but it is a fact that Vice President NIXON's candidacy did not provide positive help for me. On the contrary, his candidacy increased disunity, so that he required help from me because of the opposition to his candidacy."

Alfred J. Weinberg in the Eighth District: "Herter's name on the ballot would not have changed the result. No Republican without a labor endorsement could have done so."

Harold C. Hagen in the Ninth District: "In my opinion RICHARD NIXON was the stronger candidate for Vice President. He helped tremendously in the campaign. He already is the front-running candidate for the Republican nomination for the Presidency in 1960. President Eisenhower and I both lost the Ninth District. We carried virtually all of the towns and villages but lost the rural areas, primarily because of the farm issue."

*Missouri*

Bill Bangert in the First District: "If Moses had been the candidate for Vice President, I still would not have had a chance for election to Congress in this district. This district has never elected a Republican."

Stanley I. Dale in the Sixth District: "Vice President NIXON was not an issue in my campaign. Four years of consistent drought and the feeling of farmers that the Department of Agriculture was unsympathetic to their problem were the principal causes of my defeat. Local issues also figured in the outcome."

Frank W. May in the Eighth District: "The shortcomings in this district on the Republican ticket were not those of RICHARD NIXON. I do not feel that Herter was as strong here as NIXON. Mr. Herter is no doubt a fine man, but few people here had ever heard of him. I do not feel that his substitution would have elected me."

*Montana*

W. D. McDonald in the first District: "I was politically unknown. My opponent has been in politics for many years. I do not believe a change in the Vice Presidency would have affected my race."

Representative Orvin B. Fjare in the second district: "The substitution of Mr. Herter for Mr. NIXON would not have helped in my district. I think that Mr. NIXON helped me a great deal. He came into the State to campaign and I think it was a tremendous boost. His popular appeal exceeds that of Mr. Herter."

*Nevada*

Richard W. Horton, candidate at large: "The public gave a vote of confidence to Eisenhower, and rejected candidates who they believed represented outmoded Republican theories. NIXON, being more closely identified than Herter with Eisenhower Republicanism, was certainly the strongest vice presidential candidate. I believe Herter's candidacy would have resulted in even fewer votes for Republican congressional candidates."

*New Jersey*

William H. Wells in the Fourth District: "NIXON's presence on the ticket was not a factor in my defeat. I doubt if Herter's presence on the ticket would have helped in this district."

Chester K. Ligham in the 11th District: "The question posed is highly speculative and cannot be answered."

*New York*

Joseph A. Bailey in the 16th District: "Mr. NIXON was a negligible factor in my district. It is my view that no vice presidential candidate could have turned the tide here. Mr. NIXON has grown considerably in the esteem gress if Christian Herter had been the vice President, and his views are much better known than are those of Governor Herter."

Maurice G. Henry, Jr., in the 19th District: "NIXON performed admirably during 1956, and I doubt that Herter could have surpassed or even equaled his energetic campaign."

Philip Myer in the 23d District: "I feel that I would not have been elected to Congress if Christian Herter had b-en the vice presidential nominee. In my judgment, it would have made no difference in the outcome. I ran in a traditionally Democratic stronghold."

*Ohio*

Albert L. Daniels in the Sixth District: "RICHARD NIXON addressed a meeting in the Sixth Ohio District on November 3. It was the most valuable meeting held in the district for the Republican ticket during the campaign. The answer to your question is 'No.' "

Joseph Miller in the 18th District: "I feel that the loss of the congressional race in our district was due, first, to the lack of adequate party organization within the district, and, second, to the lack of interest in Washington by the party to capture control of the House. If NIXON had entered the district, we could have won easily. The neighboring Democratic district across the river in West Virginia went Republican after his help. NIXON could have helped, but did not so choose after being requested."

Ralph E. Turner in the 19th District: "Harold is wrong again."

*Oklahoma*

Percy Butler in the Second District: "It would have made no difference in the results in this district, as voters are only interested in presidential nominees."

Harold H. Potter in the Fourth District: "Eisenhower and NIXON carried this district by a small majority and were the strongest possible Republican ticket."

Hobart H. Hobbs in the Fifth District: "It is not believed that my chances of election would have been better had another been the vice-presidential nominee. In my case, defeat was caused by lack of Republican State committee support."

*Oregon*

Phil J. Roth in the Third District: "Herter on the ticket would not have saved my race. Republican congressional and senatorial defeats in the Northwest country may be traced

primarily to identification with an overemphasis by leading Republican candidates of the partnership concept of hydro-electric-power development along with the Democrat campaign by innuendo and distortion of the administration's conservation policies, tied to an unfavorable relationship with organized labor."

Representative Harris Ellsworth in the Fourth District: "My answer is 'No.' NIXON is very popular in Oregon, as was clearly demonstrated by his amazing write-in vote in our 1956 primary election on both Republican and Democrat ballots."

*Pennsylvania*

A. J. Cammarota in the First District: "I attribute my failure to the lack of cooperation from the Republican congressional committee. I feel that the results would have been the same regardless of which candidate ran as Vice President."

Charles H. Sporkin in the Third District: "Lack of Federal patronage to workers in my district, plus failure to man the polls with watchers to prevent improper voting, is the direct cause of my defeat. RICHARD NIXON had much appeal to voters. The outpouring of the people from my district at a NIXON rally disproves the Stassen statement."

Enoch H. Thomas, Jr., in the 11th District: "With due respect to Governor Stassen, I cannot subscribe to his view at all. Vice President and Mrs. Nixon campaigned in Luzerne County, and their efforts aided me measurably. I am deeply indebted to them. Please dont' interpret this as a reflection on Governor Herter, for whom I have great respect."

Thomas K. Leinbach in the 14th District: "Had Christian Herter been the Republican nominee for Vice President, I would not have been elected to the Congress. The sentiment against NIXON was not very potent in Berks County."

George M. Berg of the 15th District: "I do not feel that I would have been elected if Herter had been on the ticket. I am firmly of the belief that NIXON was the strongest vice-presidential candidate in the country."

Herbert O. Morrison of the 21st District: "Harold Stassen's inference is certainly not borne out by the returns in our district. I considered NIXON's campaign appearance in my behalf an asset. He was, and is, well liked here. Christian Herter, while a fine man, would not have helped me win. It is my opinion that Mr. Stassen, once more at bat, has again struck out—and may be playing in the wrong league."

Sidney L. Lockley in the 25th District: "In my opinion, Vice President NIXON strengthened the ticket, and I do not feel that my defeat would have been altered by having Mr. Herter as candidate. I believe vocal opposition to NIXON stems mainly from those Democrats who view him as a logical and powerful presidential candidate in 1960 who must be reduced by some means."

Richard C. Witt in the 28th District: "Maybe if Franklin D. Roosevelt or Abraham Lincoln had been vice-presidential candidate, I would have been helped, but someone as little known as Mr. Herter would not have helped the ticket in western Pennsylvania as much as Mr. NIXON did. Mr. NIXON is very popular in Pennsylvania, and I personally feel that he helped me get more votes than anyone else who might have run in his place."

Ross V. Walker in the 30th District: "No I believe I did very well in a district with a 3-to-1 registration favoring the Democrats."

*Rhode Island*

Samuel H. Ramsay in the First District: "As a Republican candidate who lost to a good Democrat, I am convinced beyond a shadow of a doubt that former Governor Herter or any other American statesman could not have commanded more respect from the voters of Rhode Island than did RICHARD NIXON for the high office of Vice President."

Thomas H. Needham in the Second District: "The outcome of my election campaign would not have been affected by Mr. Herter's presence as vice-presidential candidate. Mr. NIXON is the strongest, most popular campaigner to visit Rhode Island. In cold and rain, at 8 a. m., he addressed a gathering of 8,000 people. He typified the new, young Republican Party."

*South Dakota*

Representative Harold O. Lovre in the First District: "NIXON added material strength to our ticket last November, Governor Stassen to the contrary notwithstanding. Republican losses in South Dakota, as well as my defeat, were the direct result of a protest vote by farmers and small-business men, coupled with a purely State issue."

*Virginia*

Horace E. Henderson in the First District: "As the Republican congressional candidate with the closest race in the South—49.2 percent of the vote—I consider NIXON's candidacy to have a definite asset. Herter was largely unknown in the South."

William R. Burns in the Second District: "In my opinion, the outcome in this district would have been the same no matter whose name appeared as the nominee for Vice President on the Republican ticket."

Royal E. Cabell, Jr., in the Third District: "The Eisenhower-Nixon ticket carried this district by a larger majority than in 1952. Although NIXON's statements on civil rights were used against me by my opponent, I do not believe the presence of Herter on the ticket would have affected the outcome. NIXON is generally popular in this conservative district."

Jackson L. Kiser in the Fifth District: "I feel the outcome of my race was unaffected by the vice-presidential candidate."

A. R. Dunning of the Seventh District: "I would not have been elected to Congress last fall if the Angel Gabriel had been the Republican candidate for Vice President."

Horace B. Clay of the Eighth District: "Herter-for-Nixon switch would have had a demoralizing effect on the GOP in this district. It would have cost votes in both presidential and congressional campaign. Harold Stassen, as usual, is all wet."

*Washington*

Philip Evans, candidate at large: "In the future, if more Republicans contribute less to division in the Republican Party, I am sure all candidates, including the well-deserving Christian Herter, will do better."

*West Virginia*

Daniel L. Louchery in the Third District: "President Eisenhower failed to carry this district in 1952. He carried it in 1956. I do not feel that I would have been elected if Herter had been on the ticket."

Williams H. Sanders in the Fifth District: "I disagree with Stassen. The real reason why the House of Representatives is an independent race, divorced from the presidential race, is to be found in vast social programs of Government, with Representatives dispensing countless favors from the governmental grab bag."

Cleo S. Jones in the Sixth District: "It is my opinion that Mr. NIXON added some strength to the ticket in this district. Mr. Herter would not have helped my candidacy."

*Wisconsin*

William J. Burke in the Fourth District: "The Eisenhower-Nixon ticket was the strongest available to hold the Republican Party together. A Nixon removal would have alienated additional conservative support, much of which sat out the recent election. Herter is unknown in Wisconsin."

Arthur L. Peterson in the Ninth District: "It would be my personal feeling that NIXON did not win or lose any votes for me and that Herter's effect would have been the same—neutral."

A QUESTION AND ANSWER THAT STIRRED A NEW ARGUMENT

Harold Stassen, a special assistant to the President, appeared as guest on the ABC television program, College News Conference, on January 27, 1957. The following is from the transcript of that program:

Question. Can you tell me if you think there is anyone better qualified within the Republican Party for the Presidency than Mr. NIXON is?

Mr. Stassen. "I would put it this way: I do believe sincerely that, if Governor Herter had been nominated, the Republican Party would have won the majority in both Houses of Congress. I mean, that was the judgment I gave at the time.

"I think that, when the election was over, we found we'd lost both Houses of Congress in the Republican Party even though the President carried so strongly. I do believe that Governor Herter would have strengthened the developments in the party so that we would have won not only both Houses of Congress, but more of the governorships and more of the courthouses."

A CONGRESSMAN ASKS IKE: "WHY IS STASSEN KEPT?"

On January 29, 1957, Representative PATRICK J. HILLINGS, Republican, of California, who succeeded RICHARD NIXON in the House, sent the following letter to President Eisenhower:

"Many of my constituents have asked me the question: "Why is Harold Stassen kept in our Republican administration when he has consistently belittled the President's choice of a Vice President and has attempted to create disunity in the official family?" The number of such inquiries has increased since Mr. Stassen's comments last Sunday on nationwide television.

"I do not know how to answer this question and would appreciate it if you would advise me what the proper reply should be."

TWO REPUBLICAN VIEWS ON THE STASSEN STATEMENT

In Washington, the question whether Mr. Herter would have helped more than Mr. NIXON to win Congress for the Republicans was raised at the President's January 30 press conference and in the Republican Congresional Campaign Committee. Mr. Eisenhower said in answer to a request for comment:

"It used to amuse me during the war: You would fight a battle and achieve something sometimes that no one had dreamed was possible, but then everybody came along and showed you if you had done it some other way you would have won twice as big a victory, and the war would have been shortened by months.

"Now, I will say this about such speculation as you just quoted to me: I believe it is more your job than mine to make such speculation, so I will leave it to you."

Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania, said this about the Stassen statement:

"This is a most absurd and ridiculous charge.

"As chairman of the Republican Congressional Committee, I can say that nobody in the party campaigned as vigorously or as effectively for the Republican ticket, for the congressional and local tickets than DICK NIXON.

"In connection with Mr. Stassen's assertions yesterday, I assume that Mr. Herter must have given his best for the Republican ticket in Massachusetts, and I note regret-

fully that Republicans lost the governorship in that State. This alone seems to belie Stassen's strange thesis."

## IMPORTS OF SWISS WATCHES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, During the last session I called the attention of Congress to the efforts of the Swiss watch cartel to mislead the Congress, the administrative agencies, the public, and the press, by a high-powered propaganda campaign. The campaign slacked off when Congress adjourned, but it has now started again.

A New York Times story on January 3 warned that there would be a strong resurgence of this effort. Swiss sources advise that at least $500,000 will be spent by the cartel during this session.

The latest ad is an appealing picture of a Swiss youth with two candy-coated apples and an American youth with two ice cream cones, and one is offering to trade a cone for an apple. The text under the ad, which I ask permission to have printed at the end of these remarks, likens the youthful freshness and simplicity of this big deal to the past trade relations of the United States and Switzerland, and asserts that this relationship has broken down.

This is a rather odd approach, since the Swiss watch cartel is itself the cause of any disturbance which has occurred in American-Swiss trade relations. The cartel has about 80 percent of the American jeweled-watch market, and wants to be left free to take over the other 20 percent by what it calls free competition.

This is the same cartel which is a principal defendant in an antitrust action brought by the Department of Justice, now pending in the Federal District Court in New York.

This ad is an example of how the cartel operates.

If one reads the text of the ad, he will see that it is certainly contrived to give the impression that the Swiss watch industry has suffered greatly from the President's action in 1954 to increase tariffs by an average of about $1 a watch. It says that "imports of certain jeweled lever Swiss watches and movements have already fallen some 25 percent." This implies that there has been a real drop in Swiss watch shipments to the United States, and that the drop continues.

Compare this claim with the news item which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on January 29, the very day the ad was published in the Washington Post. The Herald Tribune writer quoted 1956 official Swiss statistics to show that "Switzerland's watch industry broke all export records in 1956."

While the value of Swiss-watch exports increased by 15 percent over 1955, the number of watches and watch movements went up by 17.6 percent.

I ask that this Herald Tribune story be printed in full at the end of my remarks. It shows the disregard which the cartel and its American advertising agents have for their own official figures.

It is no excuse that they have carefully inserted the word "certain" in their attempt to make it appear that jeweled-lever watches are suffering badly from the President's action. The Bureau of the Census does not yet have the December 1956 figures for the United States jeweled-watch imports from Switzerland, but census figures for the first 11 months of 1956 show that all jeweled-watch imports were 9.3 percent above the corresponding period for 1955. Our imports of Swiss jeweled watches in 1955 were below 1953 and 1954, but, as the Tariff Commission found last summer, this drop could "in part only be attributed to the 1954 increase in duties, since there was a heavy carryover of stocks from 1953," when imports glutted the American market.

The text of the ad says that "if the door is eventually closed to the sale of jeweled-lever Swiss watches, movements, and parts to the United States, Switzerland loses a formidable share of her earning power" and, consequently, "a proportionate share of her buying power."

Following, as it does, the reference to present studies now being made by the Office of Defense Mobilization, this implies that our Government is considering "closing the door" on Swiss watches. But the cartel knows that the United States Government has no idea of any such move. In fact, the application of the American jeweled-watch manufacturers which ODM is studying only states a need for about 33 percent of the American market, as compared with its present 22 percent.

The ad claims that "at the peak" of the century-old Swiss-American trade relationship "the United States bought Swiss products at the rate of about $100 million per year." The ad implies that trade has fallen off from this "peak" by saying that the United States-Swiss trade relationship "used to be" a happy example. Bureau of Census figures show United States purchases from Switzerland never reached $100 million until 1948, and now are greatly in excess of that level, as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1951 | $133,891,000 |
| 1952 | 142,161,000 |
| 1953 | 161,369,000 |
| 1954 | 145,213,000 |
| 1955 | 146,939,000 |

And while figures are available for 1956 only through October, they show that in the first 10 months of 1956 our purchases from Switzerland were $140,102,000. Thus, 1956 purchases will certainly be substantially above 1955, and may even exceed the record year of 1953.

Now consider the claim that "in the same period Switzerland bought half again as much." Bureau of Census figures show that Swiss purchases of American products have not been as much as 50 percent more than United States purchases of Swiss products in any year since 1949. For the period since 1951 Swiss purchases from the United States have exceeded our purchases from Switzerland by an average of less than 1 percent. Here are the figures:

| | Swiss purchases of United States products | United States purchase of Swiss products | Percent difference |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1952 | 151,138 | 142,161 | 6.3 |
| 1953 | 134,391 | 161,369 | (20.0) |
| 1954 | 154,465 | 145,213 | 6.3 |
| 1955 | 163,594 | 146,939 | 11.3 |
| 1956 (10 months) | 168,967 | 140,102 | 20.6 |
| Total | 742,555 | 735,784 | .9 |

Even these figures do not give the true picture of the balance of trade between the United States and Switzerland. They leave the impression that the balance favors the United States. While that is what the cartel is trying to make Americans believe, it is not true. The balance favors Switzerland because of invisible dollar payments made to Switzerland on its American investments and from tourists. There are no published data on the balance of trade including these invisible exports. However, estimates based on information from the Office of Business Economics of the Department of Commerce and on figures published by the International Monetary Fund indicate that Switzerland has enjoyed a favorable balance of trade with the United States for some years.

In the New York Times for December 31, 1956, a staff writer estimated that the balance in favor of Switzerland in 1954 was $135 million. The article also reports that the surplus of dollars in Switzerland exerts a constant downward pressure on the dollar rate of exchange. I ask permission to have this article by George H. Morison reprinted at the end of my remarks.

Note, also, from the last table I have given, that, in 1953, the previous high for United States purchases of Swiss watches, the Swiss bought less American products than in any other year. Conversely, note that, while the Swiss watch cartel is telling America that the United States trade with Switzerland will suffer because of our Government's efforts to preserve our watch industry, Swiss purchases of American products nevertheless have been increasing each year since the President's tariff increase in 1954.

All this should make it perfectly clear that the Swiss trade with the United States has prospered, not diminished, and that it favors the Swiss; that the Swiss watch industry as a whole has reached an unparalleled prosperity—its exports having reached a record high in 1956.

It should be plain to all that in permitting the Swiss such a large proportion of our American watch market the United States has dealt more than fairly with the Swiss nation and with its watch industry.

We have no quarrel with the Swiss people or its government, but we are determined that our domestic watch industry be preserved in the interest of national defense, and we intend to leave no stone unturned to make certain that

a healthy watch industry exists in the United States. No amount of propaganda by the Swiss cartel or anyone else is going to deter this Government from making certain that an important segment of our defense posture will not go by the boards.

There being no objection, the articles referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 29, 1957]

BIG DEAL BREWING

If you know small fry, you will see a basic and happy example of reciprocal trade any moment now.

Reciprocal trade comes naturally to kids. And also nations. For the minute one nation produces what other nations need, the natural thing is to seek out that nation which desires to buy.

When the buyer nation, in turn, may sell its products to the first, reciprocal trade has its finest hour.

FINEST HOUR 106 YEARS LONG

One of the happiest instances of reciprocal trade on record used to be the more than century-old relationship between Switzerland and the United States. At its peak, the United States bought Swiss products at the rate of about $100 million per year. More than half of this in watches and watch parts.

In the same period, Switzerland bought half again as much—about $150 million annually of American products. And the list was as long as your arm: oils, minerals, $68 million worth of farm and food products; autos and parts, airplanes, farm equipment, and fabrics.

These were cash transactions. Switzerland became America's best cash customer in Europe.

STATISTICS VERSUS REALISTICS

Statistically, America came off the best in the deal by about 50 percent. Realistically, both our countries were better off. For we both enjoyed the fruits of the other's finest products. And thousands of our citizens on both sides of the Atlantic earned all—or a good portion—of their living through this happy reciprocal arrangement. Their individual prosperity filtered down to firm up the economy and general prosperity of both our countries.

NOW A PAINFUL REALISTIC

Just so long as both our countries can continue to earn—then both can continue to buy.

Two and one-half years ago, America upped her tariff on the import of jeweled-lever Swiss watches by a whopping 50 percent. Latest figures show that imports of certain jeweled-lever Swiss watches and movements have already fallen some 25 percent. Yet even more stringent regulations and restrictions are under consideration now.

If the door is eventually closed to the sale of jeweled-lever Swiss watches, movements, and parts to the United States, Switzerland loses a formidable share of her earning power. And primer economics will tell you, with the loss of her earning power goes a proportionate loss of her buying power. A matter of concern to the Swiss? Yes. But of equal concern to thousands of American farmers, workers, and businessmen, too.

It's a problem. One, we submit, that deserves the mature and immediate consideration of well-intentioned men in both our lands.

(Published in recognition of the 106th anniversary of the Treaty of Friendship and Commerce pledged between the people of America and the people of Switzerland.)

THE WATCHMAKERS OF SWITZERLAND.

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

SWISS WATCH EXPORTS SET RECORD AT $288 MILLION

ZURICH, SWITZERLAND, January 28.—Switzerland's watch industry broke all export records in 1956, official statistics showed today.

Exports of watches, watch parts and watch movements, the statistics reveal, increased by 15 percent over 1955 and totaled 1,234,525,765 francs ($288,385,219).

They were 127,800,000 francs ($29,854,080) above the previous record achieved in 1953 and assured the Swiss watch industry second place in the list of Swiss exporters in 1956.

First place went to the Swiss machinery industry with total exports valued at 1,338,600,000 francs ($312,696,960).

While the value of Swiss watch exports increased by 15 percent over 1955, the number of watches and watch movements exported went up by 17.6 percent, indicating a tendency toward cheaper watches. This is viewed with concern by producers of high quality watches.

Exports to the United States, the Swiss watch industry's best customer, increased by 17.1 percent and totaled 349,265,817 francs ($81,588,495).

---

[From the New York Times of December 31, 1956]

BANKER EXPLAINS SWISS FRANC RATE—GROUP IN ZURICH HEARS WHY EXCHANGE LEVEL IS BELOW THE OFFICIAL FIGURE

(By George H. Morison)

ZURICH, December 30.—To explain why the dollar rate of exchange has held at 4.28½ francs for years in Zurich while the official level is 4.37, Werner Strohmeier, foreign exchange manager of the Swiss Bank Corporation, answered questions asked by a group of bankers here last week.

One banker asked if there was any prospect that the rate would improve in the near future.

Mr. Strohmeier answered that the official level of the United States dollar in terms of the Swiss franc was based on the official price of gold in the United States of $35 an ounce. Hence the official value of the dollar is 4.37 francs. But, he added, this rate has not been reached since 1952, the rate in practice being about 4.28½. "I see no reason for expecting any improvement in this rate in the near future," said Mr. Strohmeier.

Although Switzerland always has a heavy deficit in her trade with the United States as far as the exchange of commodities is concerned, this is always more than covered by the so-called invisible exports to the United States, such as the earnings on tourist trade, payments for banking services, insurance premiums, transport charges and the yield on the investments of Swiss capital in the United States. In 1954 there was a net estimated surplus of $135 million in favor of Switzerland in her trade with the United States.

SWISS LAW CITED

Offered for sale on the Zurich foreign exchange market, this dollar surplus depresses the rate of exchange, which would fall still lower if the Swiss National Bank did not intervene, buying up any surplus at 4.28½.

This rate was chosen by the Swiss National Bank because, by Swiss law, the rate must not be permitted to rise or fall more than 1½ percent of the level corresponding to the gold content of the franc at the official price of 4,921 francs a kilogram (about 2.2 pounds).

At present, the Swiss National Bank buys bar gold at 4,870 francs a kilogram, or about 1 percent below the official level, but buys at this rate only from other central banks and only when the countervalue available in francs is not enough to settle accounts in current trade.

On the free gold market, the price fluctuates between 4,810 and 4,825 francs a kilogram. At the present official gold level, the dollar rate of exchange is 4.3728 francs, so that the point at which the Swiss National Bank intervenes is almost 2 percent lower. Of this 2 percent, 1 percent is the actual drop below the national bank's buying price of 4,870 francs and the remaining 1 percent represents costs, including freight, insurance, and interest on the shipment of gold from New York.

If the Swiss National Bank allowed the dollar rate in Zurich to sink to the lowest level permitted by Swiss law, 1½ percent below the official rate, the lower intervention point would be at about 4.26½ francs to the dollar.

---

## JOHN DAY DAM ON COLUMBIA RIVER

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, thousands of residents of the Pacific Northwest have wondered why the Eisenhower administration failed to include 1 cent in its budget for construction of the great John Day Dam on the Columbia River, for which all preliminary planning will have been completed by the Corps of Engineers on June 30.

The answer to this question is now revealed by a discussion which took place between myself and Robert E. Merriam, Assistant Director of the Budget, at a session of the Flood Control Subcommittee of the Senate Public Works Committee on February 7.

Mr. Merriam disclosed that the administration still adheres to the discredited partnership scheme at John Day, under which a syndicate of private utility corporations would acquire all the power production for a period of at least 50 years.

In view of election results in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho this may be difficult to believe, but I shall let the words of this leading and authoritative administration spokesman speak for themselves. This is what Mr. Merriam had to say after he had been asked by the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and by me why no construction funds for John Day Dam were included in the budget:

> The reason is that in terms of the total budgetary situation of the Government as we faced it, and in view of the possibility of alternate methods of constructing this dam, a partnership arrangement, it was deemed that this was not a project which the President would recommend for construction.

After the election of 1956 there were reports from this capital that the administration was commencing a so-called reappraisal of its policies in the realm of water-resource development. It was indicated that perhaps the partnership with the private utilities might be abandoned in favor of a return to the successful Federal Government program which had erected such mighty structures as Grand Coulee, Chief Joseph, Bonneville, Kungry Horse, McNary, the Dalles, and Lookout Point Dams.

The answer given by Assistant Budget Director Merriam to the inquiries put to him by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and myself is direct evidence that the administration stands by the so-called partnership.

In conclusion, I should like to answer briefly the argument implicit in Mr. Merriam's statement.

To begin with, additions to the Columbia River power system are not a drain on the budget. This system has put in the Treasury more than $450 million in power revenues, and it is approximately $70 million ahead of schedule in repaying to the Government, principal plus interest, every dime of taxpayers' funds which have been invested in power facilities, transmission lines, and similar equipment.

Secondly, while it starves the Columbia River Basin, the administration is allocating generously in its budget for the $421 million Glen Canyon Dam on the Colorado River. I am not complaining about Glen Canyon. This dam should be built, too, even though its kilowatt-hours will cost about 6 mills apiece as compared with 2.5 mills at John Day.

But I do complain about an administration which, with a straight face, tells Congress there are no funds in the budget for development of the greatest waterpower river in North America, while at the same time it can find many millions of dollars to build dams on streams which are far less suitable for power production than the Columbia.

We in the Pacific Northwest are being victimized by the administration simply because the Creator favored our region with mighty rivers, great mountains, and abundant sources of snow and rainfall.

## STRENGTHENING OF INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate a publication which is playing an important role in the strengthening of inter-American relations by creating an understanding of mutual problems throughout the Americas.

The publication, Latin American Report, which is a monthly magazine, continually contains excellent material concerned with the economic, cultural, and political relations between the United States, and our neighbors of Central and South America. Its attractive presentations are well known in many nations, and I wish to commend it highly to my colleagues in the Senate.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Brazil Comes Through," published in the Washington Post of February 8, 1957. This proves how well our friends in Central and South America stand with us when we need them.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### BRAZIL COMES THROUGH

President Kubitschek, of Brazil, was the decisive influence in pushing through the new agreement permitting the United States to establish a missile tracking station on the rocky island of Fernando de Noronha. For a time there was a disposition in the Brazilian Congress to condition the agreement on the granting of some $500 million in economic aid by the United States. No strings show in the final compact, although the United States no doubt will continue to pay attention to Brazilian economic needs. (Brazil has received some $350 million in American credits during the last year, and probably can look forward to more help when project requests are made specific.)

Sr. Kubitschek found, when he intervened with congress, that public opinion supported the concession. This is not surprising, for the Brazilian people have proved themselves firm allies. During World War II, in addition to military support, they granted the United States permission to maintain a string of bases along the rim of their vast country. Actually, Fernando de Noronha was a sort of auxiliary base at that time. This mountainous pile of rocks 175 miles out in the Atlantic served as the site of a rescue unit along the lifeline to Ascension Island and Africa. Used by Brazil as a penal colony in the past, it was the base of life-saving operations when a Brazilian battleship exploded and sank nearby at the end of the war.

In permitting the establishment of the tracking station, Brazil again is cooperating in a venture that is designed for hemisphere and free world defense. There is hope that a workable international agreement on missile testing may eventually transform such bases into check points for arms control, but in the meantime the agreement is a prudent one for Brazil as well as the United States.

Mr. SMATHERS. In connection with the same subject, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Where Communism Went Out and Good times Came In: 3 Years After a House Cleaning, Guatemala Begins To Boom." This article, which was published in the U. S. News & World Report of February 8, 1957, very vividly demonstrates how, with a little attention and effort on our part, we can drive communistic influences from South and Central America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### WHERE COMMUNISM WENT OUT AND GOOD TIMES CAME IN

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In neighboring Guatemala, you see what's happening to one country that threw out the Reds. Three years ago pro-Communists were in power and things were in a mess. But all that is changed now. Industry is prospering. So is agriculture. With United States help and advice, Guatemala is well on the way toward recovery.)

GUATEMALA CITY.—You don't have to be here long before you sense a feeling of new confidence and well-being in this country that threw out a pro-Communist Government less than 3 years ago.

Hotels that were virtually deserted when the Reds were riding high in Guatemala are bustling now with American tourists and businessmen. A large United States bank is opening a branch here. New capital is flowing into manufacturing, farming enterprises, and mining.

The biggest building boom in the country's history is underway. Two new hotels are being built. A third is on the drawing boards. A North American firm is in the process of buying a site for a fourth.

All this activity is in sharp contrast with the days when the pro-Communist government of President Jacobo Arbenz Guzmán was in control. He and his followers left Guatemala in what observers agreed was a mess. Business was sagging badly. Communist-led peasants were seizing private farmland at will. People who had money to invest were sending it to the United States for safety. Unemployment was high, the national treasury was nearly empty, and official corruption had taken on notorious proportions.

Getting the country reorganized and back in business was largely the job of President Carlos Castillo Armas, the little colonel who led the revolt against the Reds and took over after they were driven from the country.

Castillo Armas, himself, still has troubles. The reactionaries say he is too liberal, while the leftists charge he is too conservative. Communists still are working underground. The President sometimes is criticized for accepting United States advice and economic aid. Organized labor felt, until recently, that it was not getting a fair break. The President has had troubles with leftist-led university students, and he is accused of having been too prone to cry "Communist" at his enemies and send them into exile.

Yet, for all his troubles, President Castillo Armas has a lot of public support, and a quick look around the country shows that it isn't the same place it was in the days just before the revolution. Unemployment has been nearly wiped out. Stores are doing a big business. There's plenty of money in the banks, and reserves of gold and dollars are near an alltime high.

Here in the capital city, major oil companies have occupied most of the office space available and have leased many of the new houses for their officials. The oil companies wanted to come into Guatemala for years, for they believe there's oil in the northern and eastern sections of the country. The Arbenz oil code was so unfavorable, however, that nobody was willing to risk money under it. Now it has been replaced by one much like the oil law that has helped Venezuela to get rich on petroleum.

Road building on a large scale is another change that you notice. Arbenz, leader of the pro-Communist regime, had a chance to get United States aid in completing the Pan American Highway across this country, but he did not accept it. Instead, he started building a road from here to the Caribbean Sea, 187 miles away. Before long, however, he quit work on it and spent much of the road money on arms from Czechoslovakia.

Today, work is being rushed on the Pan American Highway and on the parallel Pacific Highway that is opening new lands to development. Construction of the highway to the Caribbean has been resumed, and other roads are being built. All told, the new program for highways is to cost about $130 million and is to give Guatemala 1,280 miles of new roads by 1960.

So many roads and buildings are being constructed that the demand for cement far exceeds the output of Guatemala's one cement plant. The owner now is doubling this plant's capacity, and a new company is building another one.

Driving through the interior of the country, you pass coffee plantations whose owners were afraid to spend money on improvements when Arbenz and his Communist friends were in power. This fear carried over into the first year and a half under Castillo Armas, when it sometimes was touch and go whether the Government would be overthrown. Today, a good many farm owners are setting out coffee trees and buying machinery and other equipment.

#### LAND REFORM

Most of the farms that you see are large. Nearly all of the privately owned land is in the hands of a few people, whose holdings run as high as 100,000 acres. Near the Pacific Highway, however, you find several communities where family-size farms of about 50 acres are being established. These new farms are on Government land that is being subdivided under a new agrarian law. The Communists, also, had an agrarian law, but the families that got land under it became tenants of the Government. Under the new law, the settlers become the owners.

United States advisers helped to draft this new law, and they are giving guidance on rural credits. Guatemalans are being trained by Americans to advise farmers on the best methods of farming, as county agricultural agents do in the United States.

At experiment stations, American agronomists are working with Guatemalans to develop improved varieties of crops.

Agriculture, in fact, has a high priority in the program of United States aid to Guatemala. It is believed that a man who owns his farm won't pay much attention to Communist propaganda, and that producing more food will raise the standard of living and increase the national income.

An education mission from the United States is helping to train teachers. Some of them will work in city schools. Others will go to rural districts. There they will work, for the most part, with the 1.5 million of Guatemala's 3.1 million people who are illiterate Indian peasants.

UNITED STATES HELP

American technicians are helping with programs of sanitation, public administration, tax reforms, and low-cost housing. Recently, when there was a critical shortage of the staple food—corn—because of poor crops, the United States gave Guatemala more than $7 million worth of surplus farm products.

All told, United States funds allocated for Guatemala's benefit during the 3-year period ending next June 30 amount to about $68 million. This compares with more than three quarters of a billion dollars in gifts that Yugoslavia has received from the United States since breaking with Moscow in 1947.

Even so, the relatively small amount of help from the United States is benefiting Guatemala. From many points of view, things in this country are looking up, although there's still a long way to go. The national income is only about $183 a year per capita. Many people still are hungry, and 70 percent of the population is illiterate. There are beggars in the streets and homeless people sleeping in parks and on railway-station platforms, as there have been for years. The President seems confident, however, that Guatemala's problems can be solved.

CLEARER GOALS

President Castillo Armas' confident attitude is another of the innovations noticed by a visiting American long familiar with Guatemalan affairs. In July of 1954, soon after the revolution, the President was uncertain. When asked at that time about his plans for getting the country on its feet, he vaguely stated some general objectives but seemed to have few ideas about practical ways of attaining them. Today, if you ask him about any public question, he discusses it in detail, giving facts and figures.

Both Guatemala and President Castillo Armas have come a long way since the pro-Communist administration was thrown out.

## VISIT TO THE SENATE BY FORMER SENATOR POPE, OF IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it is my privilege at this time to have as my guest a distinguished citizen, formerly from the State of Idaho, who once served in the United States Senate with great distinction. He has spend a lifetime in the public service, in addition to his service in the Senate.

Many years ago he was mayor of my city of Boise, and he served in that capacity with honor and great credit to himself and to the citizens of his State. Now with the Tennessee Valley Authority, he has come to Washington today on a visit. I take this opportunity to call attention to his presence among us. He is among old friends and acquaintances. I present the distinguished former Senator from Idaho, Jim Pope.

[Applause, Senators rising,]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair.) We are very glad indeed to welcome back the distinguished former Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As a Senator from Tennessee, I wish to join in welcoming Senator Pope back to the Senate.

Senator Pope is now a resident of Tennessee. We are very proud of the fine civic work he is doing in the Volunteer State, as a member of the Tennessee Valley Authority. He has contributed greatly to the outstanding success of that great organization.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I had the honor of being a Member of the Senate when Senator Pope served in this body. He was highly esteemed by his colleagues in the Senate, as one of its ablest, most devoted, and outstanding Members. I rejoice that I am present today to join in welcoming him back to the Senate.

## MAJ. GEN. VERNE D. MUDGE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, many of us in the Senate were saddened recently by the announcement of the death of one of our great field commanders, Maj. Gen. Verne D. Mudge, retired, United States Army, who in recent years served so ably the Senate Committee on Armed Services as staff consultant and adviser.

Mr. President, many years ago I had the privilege of working closely with General Mudge's father, who lived at that time in the little town of Fellsmere, Fla., and I later followed closely the military feats of General Mudge throughout the years of World War II. General Mudge was a student for 2 years at the University of Florida immediately prior to his appointment to the United States Military Academy at West Point in 1918 by the then Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of Florida, the Honorable W. J. Sears.

The brilliant military record of General Mudge was discussed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 10, pages 12282–12284. At that time, the Senator from Georgia placed in the RECORD a statement relating to General Mudge's military service, together with some of the citations awarded to the general, which included the Distinguished Service Medal, the Distinguished Service Cross, and the Silver Star.

In the last few days I was pleased to note in the contributors' section of the Washington Post and Times Herald two exceptionally fine tributes to the late Maj. Gen. Verne D. Mudge. The first letter, written by Lt. Gen. Floyd L. Parks, United States Army, retired, appeared in the February 2 issue, and the other, written by the former Chief of the Army Corps of Engineers, Lt. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis, Jr., United States Army, retired, appeared in the February 10 issue.

I do not desire to restate this morning the information which has previously been placed in the RECORD by other Senators, but I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD these two communications concerning the eminent soldier, Gen. Verne Mudge, which clearly show his stature as a great soldier, a great field commander, and a great American.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJ. GEN. VERNE D. MUDGE

The obituary notice for Maj. Gen. Verne D. Mudge, United States Army, retired, appeared in the Washington Post, January 30, 1957.

In the main, the Post editors hit the high spots of the distinguished military career of General Mudge. I am sure that most of your readers finished that little feature with the feeling, "Well, there goes a good soldier."

Somehow, I think there is a great deal more to say about this devoted American. There is no question that General Mudge was a good soldier. He was that, but he was something more important than that—he was a great and good American.

I have known this man since the days when we were both junior officers in the Army. We were classmates at Command and General Staff School, at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., in the depression-choked years of 1934–35. That was a bad era for everybody, but those were the starveling days for those of us in the military.

It was during that time that I came to know what a big American this cheerful man from Bangor, S. Dak., really was. His limitless faith in the essential soundness and the eventual greatness of America never wavered. Verne Mudge was one of those rare men who get bigger and bigger the more you look at them and the better you know them.

To those of us who knew Verne Mudge well, his legendary deeds in the Pacific area in World War II were hardly surprising. He was the kind of man who could lead the 1st Cavalry Division into New Guinea, the Admiralty Islands, into Leyte and Luzon, and then go slashing his way into Manila to liberate the pitiable American and Filipino captives there.

Soldiering was his trade. He knew it well. Whatever he did in the 58 years of his life he gave just "that extra something" that always marks the great American from the routine or run of the mill.

Most men who had been grieviously wounded as was General Mudge, in the taking of Manila, would have been content to retire to St. Petersburg, San Antonio, or Carmel and talk about the high days of their life with some old comrades.

When General Mudge was released from Walter Reed, after 12 operations, he became a member of the professional staff of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. There he devised the methods for the rapid release of all testimony pertaining to military service matters, and his painstaking research on selective service and universal military training are standard works in that field.

In his writings and in his daily conversations with civilian and military officials he impressed everyone as a man who wished to do only what would be of real and lasting good for all the people of the land to which he had devoted his life. He was notably successful in attaining his wish.

Obviously, I am saddened by the death of my friend and old comrade. The Army has lost one of its best officers. And America has lost one of her finest sons with the passing of Verne Mudge.

FLOYD L. PARKS,
*Lieutenant General United States Army (Retired), President, National Rifle Association.*

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 10, 1957]

MUDGE'S BOLD MISSION

As a fellow officer in the Sixth Army during its 22 major amphibious operations from Australia to Japan, 1943 to 1946. I would appreciate the privilege of supplementing Gen. Floyd Parks' eloquent tribute to Maj. Gen. Verne Mudge, that appeared in your columns of February 2.

The southwest Pacific campaign was conducted in a remote area of the world; it received, comparatively speaking, little attention at the time, and is almost forgotten today.

Even at the decade, there was no mention in magazines or the press of the momentous land, sea, and air battle of Leyte—the greatest such joint service battle that military history records. Yet nowhere were officers, men, and troop units bound more closely together from regiment to division, Army, and GHQ, than during the long trek through jungle, mountain, and coral coast in the southwest Pacific. Nowhere, either, was leadership in the face of ruthless elements as well as a desperate enemy more at a premium.

The 1st Cavalry Division, commanded by Maj. Gen. Verne Mudge, was one of the true storm divisions of Krueger's slashing, hammering, island-hopping, amphibious Sixth Army. It had gone all the way of 3,000 miles from Buna and Ora Bay, New Guinea, to Luzon. At this time, just 12 years ago, Gen. Walter Krueger had selected the 1st Cavalry Division, under Mudge, to cross two formidable lines and penetrate the Jap flank northeast of Manila, thus enveloping that part of the city north of the Pasig River. Such a maneuver was planned to outflank the enemy confronting the remainder of the Sixth Army and permitted it to negotiate with greater security the river obstacles barring the routes to Manila from the north.

Secondarily, but nevertheless important, missions assigned Mudge's division were the seizure and defense of Novaliches Reservoir, the sole source of water supply for the 400,000 battered inhabitants of Manila, with the "dry" season just beginning—an absolutely essential requirement for the development of the city with its port as the major base for the intended later assault on the Japanese mainland.

Last, but not least, was the mission of seizing Santo Tomas University in North Manila, and rescuing some 4,000 American men, women, and children internees held captive by the Japanese since 1941, who doubtless owe their lives today to the timely arrival of Brigadier General Chase's advance brigade (5th and 8th Cavalry Regiments) of the 1st Cavalry Division.

Isolated for 3 days in the midst of the enemy, and with powerful hostile forces on his left flank and rear, which took another 2 months to dislodge and destroy, General Mudge's exploit was certainly one of the boldest and most brilliant as well as successful operations of the war. Penetration of a flank and envelopment of the enemy line of communication leading to the destruction of his center is one of the oldest and boldest maneuvers of military history from Ney to Patton, requiring consummate courage and skill.

In supplementing General Parks' remarks, I bring to your attention that General Mudge was not only a great soldier and an admirable gentleman, but he exemplified the great traditions and skill of the cavalry and cavalry leaders so needed, and so applicable to the armor-airborne army of today.

SAMUEL D. STURGIS, Jr.,
*Lieutenant General,*
*United States Army, Retired.*

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mudge's Bold Mission," published in the Washington Post of February 10, 1957. This is another tribute to the fine character and courage of Maj. Gen. Verne Mudge.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUDGE'S BOLD MISSION

As a fellow officer in the Sixth Army during its 22 major amphibious operations from Australia to Japan, 1943 to 1946, I would appreciate the privilege of supplementing Gen. Floyd Parks' eloquent tribute to Maj. Gen. Verne Mudge, that appeared in your columns of February 2.

The southwest Pacific campaign was conducted in a remote area of the world; it received, comparatively speaking, little attention at the time, and is almost forgotten today.

Even at the decade, there was no mention in magazines or the press of the momentous land, sea, and air Battle of Leyte—the greatest such joint service battle that military history records. Yet nowhere were officers, men, and troop units bound more closely together from regiment to division, army, and GHQ, than during the long trek through jungle, mountain, and coral coast in the southwest Pacific. Nowhere, either, was leadership in the face of ruthless elements as well as a desperate enemy more at a premium.

The 1st Cavalry Division, commanded by Maj. Gen. Verne Mudge, was one of the true storm divisions of Krueger's slashing, hammering, island-hopping, amphibious Sixth Army. It had gone all the way of 3,000 miles from Buna and Ora Bay, New Guinea, to Luzon. At this time, just 12 years ago, Gen. Walter Krueger had selected the 1st Cavalry Division, under Mudge, to cross two formidable lines and penetrate the Jap flank northeast of Manila, thus enveloping that part of the city north of the Pasig River. Such a maneuver was planned to outflank the enemy confronting the remainder of the Sixth Army and permitted it to negotiate with greater security the river obstacles barring the routes to Manila from the north.

Secondary, but nevertheless important, missions assigned Mudge's division were the seizure and defense of Novaliches Reservoir, the sole source of water supply for the 400,000 battered inhabitants of Manila, with the dry season just beginning—an absolutely essential requirement for the development of the city with its port as the major base for the intended later assault on the Japanese mainland.

Last, but not least, was the mission of seizing Santo Tomas University in North Manila, and rescuing some 4,000 American men, women, and children internees held captive by the Japanese since 1941, who doubtless owe their lives today to the timely arrival of Brigadier General Chase's advance brigade (5th and 8th Cavalry Regiments) of the 1st Cavalry Division.

Isolated for 3 days in the midst of the enemy, and with powerful hostile forces on his left flank and rear, which took another 2 months to dislodge and destroy, General Mudge's exploit was certainly one of the boldest and most brilliant as well as successful operations of the war. Penetration of a flank and envelopment of the enemy line of communication leading to the destruction of his center is one of the oldest and boldest maneuvers of military history from Ney to Patton, requiring consummate courage and skill.

In supplementing General Parks' remarks, I bring to your attention that General Mudge was not only a great soldier and an admirable gentleman, but he exemplified the great traditions and skill of the cavalry and cavalry leaders so needed, and so applicable of the armor-airborne army of today.

SAMUEL D. STURGIS, Jr.,
*Lieutenant General, United States Army, Retired.*

## THE LATE HECTOR McLEAN

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, last week. I noted with great regret the notice of the death of Hector McLean, a distinguished reporter of the Washington Evening Star.

Mr. McLean specialized in coverage of the affairs of the District of Columbia government and the Senate District of Columbia Committee.

In my work as a member of the Senate committee, and particularly on the subcommittee to deal with the problem of mass transportation in Washington, I came to know Mr. McLean and to respect his great drive to obtain the facts and to give them to his readers in a clear and objective manner. His work was in the highest tradition of newspaper journalism.

I extend my sympathy to his wife and two children.

## SEEMING DIFFERENCES WITHIN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is becoming increasingly difficult to determine who is running the Government.

First, President Eisenhower says he will use any legal means at the disposal of the Government to combat a depression.

Then Secretary Humphrey says he will not tolerate deficit spending.

Next President Eisenhower says that unless business and labor hold down inflation voluntarily "the United States then has to move in more firmly with so-called controls of some kind."

And Secretary of Commerce Weeks answers:

> We got rid of controls when this administration first came in. The administration is against controls. There are no studies being made. There are no plans being made. There is no disposition in the administration to take that role.

President Eisenhower said that "business in its pricing policy should avoid unnecessary price increases," but Assistant Secretary of the Interior Felix E. Wormser said that they have let prices "severely alone" in dealing with the oil companies and would not complain if the gasoline prices were raised 5 cents a gallon.

Finally, President Eisenhower said that he will take Federal action if necessary to assure Western Europe of all the oil available tankers can carry, but Hugh A. Stewart, head of the Interior Department's Oil and Gas Division, answered that the Government has "no positive plans" to boost the shipments.

It occurs to me, Mr. President, that this running debate between the President and his cabinet may be an unfortunate thing. In these difficult times, with prices zigging and zagging and oil ebbing and flowing, the Cabinet ought to close ranks behind the President.

It is confusing to the people, and sooner or later may prove embarrassing to the President. Even if we pass the Middle East resolution, saying that Congress stands behind the President in whatever he might do in the Middle East, who is to assure that the Cabinet will stand behind him?

In my 18 years' experience in the national legislative branch of the Government, I have never, up to now, come face to face with a problem about which I did not think the Congress, in some manner or other, could do something.

But this one, I must admit, is beyond my previous experience.

Congress cannot pass a law requiring the Cabinet to get in step with the President. And it cannot adopt a resolution urging the President to change step so that he will be marching with the Cabinet.

And we in Congress, in our committees, cannot be sure when we are questioning an administration witness, which branch of the executive department we are hearing from—the President's or the Cabinet's.

Obviously, Alice has left Wonderland. Here she is in Washington.

## VISIT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE BENSON TO PIERRE, S. DAK.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, tomorrow the Secretary of Agriculture will speak in Pierre, the capital city of South Dakota. I am glad he is to be there. I urged him to accept a double invitation, one from the Lincoln Club and the other from Lt. Gov. Roy Houck, to address a joint session of the legislature.

Mr. Benson is an earnest man and an able speaker. Right now he has in his keeping the prosperity of the American farmer and, to a greater extent than most people realize, the prosperity of the Nation.

Saturday, on the eve of going west, Mr. Benson announced lower support rates for most farm commodities, lower than 1956 and lower than recent markets. Mr. Benson's theory is that support prices should always be below the market so that commodities will always move in the market.

Personally, I think that theory is wrong and, if continued, will bring the country into a depression that will not only "curl your hair," to borrow Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey's classic phrase, but will singe every segment of our national anatomy.

Placing price supports always below the market—whatever the market may be—means the gradual erosion of prices to successively lower levels. Under such a policy, a so-called farm program becomes only an anesthetic to lessen the pain of going broke.

Mr. Benson believes that if prices go down, farmers will produce less of a commodity and that will force prices to rise. Such a theory seems to ignore the simple fact that a farmer today has heavy investments in machinery, livestock, and land with fixed or mounting expenses. If prices go down he has to increase his volume to make ends meet. If he milks 20 cows and gets $4.25 for 100 pounds of milk, he has to milk 25 or 30 cows to keep up his income if the price goes down to $3.25.

Mr. Benson may have some answer for this. That is why I am glad he is to be in South Dakota. I want the farmers of my State to have his best advice on how to make ends meet when prices go down.

Mr. President, we cannot keep high prosperity in the industrial centers with agriculture on the ashcan.

## REFUSAL BY SECRETARY HUMPHREY TO APPROVE SMALL-BUSINESS TAX RELIEF

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, during the past several days, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. George Humphrey, has been extremely busy telling congressional committees why there can be no tax relief for small business this year. Furthermore, he intimates, no hope can be held out for many years, since he will approve small business assistance only after there is a budget surplus large enough to cover tax relief for every taxpayer.

This is, I submit, an irrational stand.

Let us take an example from recent developments in other fields. We all remember the scramble for available supplies of the Salk polio vaccine which resulted after it had been approved for public use. There was not enough of the serum for everyone, so priorities were established and those most susceptible to the dread disease were given the shot first. Now a sufficient supply is becoming available and everyone who wishes can be immunized. This was a sound method of operation—the available supplies were doled out to those who most needed the vaccine.

But what if some hair-splitting equalitarian had proposed that it was not fair to allow some to be vaccinated while others could not be; therefore, according to the Humphrey doctrine, the only equitable course would have been to hold up all immunizations until enough of the serum was available for everyone. Obviously, we would not have allowed this to happen—too many crippled and dead children would have testified to the abysmal ignorance of such a ruling.

Nonetheless, the Secretary of the Treasury, despite his admissions that small business is sorely pressed, demands that no tax relief be given until everyone can receive a share. Despite the fact that it is obvious that small business is peculiarly susceptible to the viruses of today's economy, it is denied vaccine, because there is not enough for everyone. I personally reject this position and I shall continue to work with like-minded colleagues for small-business tax relief, since I know all too well that too many of the smaller business firms will be fatally afflicted or permanently crippled long before that happy day comes when tax relief can be made available to all claimants.

## INDEPENDENT ACTION BY MEMBERS OF NATO

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in the not too distant future, the Congress will be considering the military budget for the fiscal year 1958.

An article entitled "NATO Allies Go It Alone on Army Plan" has been written by an able and experienced newspaperman, William H. Stoneman, of the Chicago Daily News.

This article bears examination.

As we continue to extend our commitments around the world, we should nevertheless remember that perhaps our important structure from the standpoint of our military position, is NATO, along with its functioning military arm, the Supreme Headquarters for Allied Powers in Europe—SHAPE—which was first commanded by the then General Eisenhower, later by General Gruenther, and now by General Norstad.

Mr. President, if this column is correct, its contents are most disturbing; therefore I am sending a copy of it to the Secretary of Defense, requesting information as to its accuracy.

If it is accurate, then it is also obvious that it contains a matter of serious import to the security of the United States, especially if our position in the Middle East has assumed that gravity recently emphasized by the President and the Secretary of State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Stoneman's column printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 27, 1957]

### NATO ALLIES GO IT ALONE ON ARMY PLAN

(By William H. Stoneman)

PARIS, January 26.—There was a time, not long ago, when Western military leaders plugged for standardization and uniformity in the armies of the NATO powers.

Now, in reorganizing their ground forces to cope with the atomic age the different members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization appear to be behaving like so many newborn kittens, wandering off in entirely different directions.

In the case of the United States, which has taken revolutionary steps to reorganize its ground forces, nobody has even taken the trouble to tell America's European allies what the plans are.

When information was last given other NATO powers in February 1956 the United States was still planning on an atomic division of about 18,000 to 19,000 men. In the meantime the powers that be have decided that the American infantry division of the future should be reduced to a strength of 13,700 men.

Result is that members of the North Atlantic Council—which is supposed to generate constant consultation between NATO's members—and the professional military leaders of the other NATO powers are getting their information out of American service journals.

Most of this information is now public property but the United States Army has not been allowed to distribute it officially. Even at SHAPE—Supreme Headquarters for Allied Powers in Europe—the only information on the American organizational changes is heavily restricted and unofficial.

Despite this halfway pushup it takes no Russian spy to discover that such countries as the United States and Britain are making entirely different plans for the future organization of their armies.

And since American and British infantry divisions are pretty sure to be fighting side by side in similar conditions, under the orders of the same supreme and intermediate commanders, under fire from similar atomic weapons, the difference in their plans appears to many here to be inexplicable and indefensible.

In the case of the infantry, the United States plans a drastic change in the old triangular division, which contained 3 regiments, each broken down into 3 battalions.

The new sentormic division, according to present plans will be organized into 5 combat groups instead of 3 regiments. It will also have a composite artillery battalion with 8-inch howitzers, capable of firing atomic shells and a battery of 762-millimeter Honest John rocket launchers. The new armored division will have the same kind of atomic artillery outfit.

The British have different plans.

Their infantry divisions will continue to have 19,000 men and their basic organization will remain roughly the same, with 3 brigades, each consisting of 3 infantry battalions and 1 armored regiment.

But they plan a drastic new look for their armored divisions. The new atomic armored division will have only 1 infantry battalion instead of the 4 battalions under the old system. Its strength will be cut to 9,500 men.

The only explanation for the failure of the United States and Britain to decide on a common form of organization is that we haven't decided anything definite yet and we are still experimenting.

Fact is that the experimenting has already gone so far that the main decisions are practically settled.

## AWARD OF MEDAL OF HONOR TO COMDR. HUGH BARR MILLER, JR., UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, out of order, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 55, S. 394.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 394) to authorize the award of a Medal of Honor to Comdr. Hugh Barr Miller, Jr., United States Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That notwithstanding the provisions of section 6248 of title 10 of the United States Code, which establishes limitations of time for certain naval awards, a Medal of Honor may be awarded, at any time not later than 1 year subsequent to the date of enactment of this act, to Lt. (now Comdr.) Hugh Barr Miller, Jr., United States Navy, for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in combat with the enemy at the risk of his life, above and beyond the call of duty, during World War II.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to waive the limitation on the time within which a Medal of Honor may be awarded to Comdr. Hugh Barr Miller, Jr., United States Navy."

## TABULATION OF ACTION TAKEN BY 84TH CONGRESS ON HOOVER COMMISSION REPORTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in response to many inquiries, I send to the desk a tabulation of the action taken by the 84th Congress on the Hoover Commission reports.

I am confident Senators will be glad to know that the 84th Congress passed 36 public laws and adopted 2 House resolutions and 1 Senate resolution, which implement 55, or approximately one-third of the 167 legislative recommendations that the Commission made.

When it is considered that the final Hoover Commission report was not filed with the Congress until June 1955, toward the close of the first session, this legislative record, in my opinion, reflects substantial progress on implementation, in a relatively short period of time, of the Commission's recommendations. Five years was required to effectuate some 70 to 75 percent of the recommendations of the first Hoover Commission, 1949–50.

I may add that a substantial proportion of this legislation upon the Hoover Commission reports was implemented under the direction of my distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], chairman of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who, during the 84th Congress, was chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization, of the Government Operations Committee, which was directly responsible for enactment of many of these Hoover Commission bills.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization, I should like to assure all Members of the Senate that it is my intention to carry forward without interruption the fine progress that has been made in the Senate on the Hoover Commission reports.

The subcommittee has scheduled for the first week of March hearings, about which a subsequent announcement will be made in the RECORD, on the Commission's all-important recommendation for stating appropriation estimates on an annual accrued expenditure basis, as called for by Senate bill 434, introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], along with 47 other distinguished Members of this body from both sides of the aisle. As time permits, we shall follow this action with hearings upon other worthwhile Hoover Commission recommendations which, in the judgment of the subcommittee, require attention at this session of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the tabulation prepared by the staff of the Subcommittee on Reorganization be incorporated in the RECORD as part of my remarks, for the convenience of Members in answering inquiries on the Hoover reports.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Bills implementing Hoover Commission reports which were enacted into law*

SENATE BILLS

| Bill No. | Public law | Title of bill | Commission report | Recommendation No. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| S. 654 | 88 | Extends program of direct loans to veterans for housing until July 25, 1957 | Lending Agencies | 9. |
| S. 890 | 660 | Vests primary responsibility for water pollution projects in States | Water Resources and Power | 1 (c) (in part). |
| S. 941 | 55 | Facilities liquidation of Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation | Lending Agencies | 28 (in part). |
| S. 1871 | 705 | Simplifies computing of fees charged executive agencies for use of the United States mail. | Paperwork Management, pt. I | 1 (task force 16). |
| S. 2061 | 68 | To increase the basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department. | Personnel and Civil Service | 8 (b). |
| S. 2126 | 345 | To extend and clarify laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, the conservation and development of urban communities, the financing of vitally needed public works, and for other purposes. (Sec. 109 makes the Home Loan Bank Board an independent agency.) | Lending Agencies | 2. |
| S. 2127 | 268 | To amend the Small Business Act of 1953. (Sec. 13 extends the Small Business Administration for 2 years.) | ....do | 39 (b). |
| S. 2286 | 538 | To amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 so as to provide for the utilization of privately owned shipping services in connection with transportation of privately owned vehicles. | Transportation | 7 (a) (b), 10. |
| S. 3430 | 941 | To promote the progress of medicine and to advance the national health and welfare by creating a National Library of Medicine (in the Public Health Service). | Federal Medical Services | 23 (in part). |
| S. 3481 | 828 | To amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes. | Personnel and Civil Service | Task force 3 (task-force report, p. 137). |
| S. 3768 | 852 | Includes the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in sec. 158 of the Revised Statutes. | Legal Services and Procedure | 31 and 32 (in part). |
| S. 3897 | 863 | To improve governmental budgeting and accounting methods and procedures, and for other purposes. | Budgeting and Accounting | 2, 4–7, 13, 14. |
| S. 3958 | 911 | To improve the health of the people by assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes. | Federal Medical Services | 25 (b), 27 (task force report, p. 75). |
| S. J. Res. 199 | 882 | To authorize an additional position of Assistant Director in the Bureau of the Budget. | Budget and Accounting | 10. |
| S. Res. 285 | ..... | Provided for a study of the foreign aid program by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. | Overseas Economic Operations | 1. |

*Bills implementing Hoover Commission reports which were enacted into law*—Continued

HOUSE BILLS

| Bill No. | Public law | Title of bill | Commission report | Recommendation No. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| H. R. 2576 | 16 | To further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1958. (Amended to read June 1, 1957.) | Progress Report | No specific number. (See p. 22 of Progress Report.) |
| H. R. 3322 | 61 | To amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public health purposes. | Surplus Property | 8 (a) (d), 9. |
| H. R. 3338 | 232 | Authorizes President to lease the Alaska Railroad to private interests for 55 years. | Business Enterprises | L13 (b). |
| H. R. 4941 | 22 | To amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes. (Task force recommended passage of "certain pending proposals to strengthen the Foreign Service.") | Personnel and Civil Service | Task force 3 (task force report, p. 137). |
| H. R. 5100 | 83 | Limits veterans' dental care to service-connected disabilities or conditions | Federal Medical Services | 7. |
| H. R. 5168 | 347 | Increases rate of retirement of Government capital in certain institutions operating under supervision of Federal Farm Credit System. | Lending Agencies | 22. |
| H. R. 6277 | 245 | To amend subsec. 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 relating to transportation and storage of household goods of military personnel on permanent change of station. | Transportation; Depot Utilization. | 2, special task force legislative recommendation (b). |
| H. R. 6829 | 161 | Authorizes headquarters for the Central Intelligence Agency | Intelligence Activities | 1. |
| H. R. 7034 | 365 | To provide permanent authority for the relief of certain disbursing officers, and for other purposes. | Budget and Accounting | 19 (in part). |
| H. R. 7035 | 334 | To amend sec. 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes", approved Aug. 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 720). | do | (19 (in part). |
| H. R. 7227 | 655 | Authorizes donation of Government-owned surplus property for civil defense purposes. | Surplus Property | 9. |
| H. R. 7619 | 854 | To adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government and for other purposes. | Personnel and Civil Service; Business Organization of the Department of Defense; Research and Development. | 4, 12, 1. |
| H. R. 8755 | 971 | Extended authority to negotiate the disposal of surplus property | Surplus Property | 17. |
| H. R. 9428 | 497 | To provide for procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes. | Federal Medical Services | 4 (in spirit). |
| H. R. 9429 | 569 | To provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes. | do | 21. |
| H. R. 9593 | 798 | To simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes. | Budget and Accounting | 17, 18. |
| H. R. 10285 | 809 | To merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; and for other purposes. | Lending Agencies | 24, 25. |
| H. R. 10368 | 801 | To amend the Civil Service Act of Jan. 16, 1883, so as to require that certain reports of the executive branch to Congress contain information pertaining to the number of civilian officers and employees required to carry out additional or expanded functions, and for other purposes. | Personnel and Civil Service | Task force report, p. 106. |
| H. R. 12138 | 814 | Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957. (Gives Bureau of Budget additional funds for salaries.) | Budget and Accounting | 1. |
| H. J. Res. 157 | 304 | Establishes the Commission on Government Security | Personnel and Civil Service | Task force report, p. 121. |
| H. J. Res. 256 | 182 | Authorizes Federal grants for program of research on mental illness | Federal Medical Services | 27 (in part). |
| H. J. Res. 607 | 608 | Provides for the disposal of the Texas City tin smelter | Business Enterprises | 17. |
| H. Res. 118 | | Authorizes the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to investigate the necessity for continuing the Panama Railroad. | Transportation | 18. |
| H. Res. 262 | | Resolution that the Committee on House Administration or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to conduct a full investigation and study of federally operated printing presses. | Paperwork Management, pt. I | General objectives. |

## OBJECTION TO IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS AGAINST THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of a letter, dated February 8, 1957, signed by my able colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and myself, and sent to the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State.

In the letter we express our strong objection to the imposition of sanctions against the State of Israel by the United Nations, and urge our Government to oppose any proposal of this nature under present circumstances.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 8, 1957.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
*Secretary of State,*
*Department of State,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is clear that the United States is this very weekend considering its position with respect to any resolution imposing sanctions on Israel which might be voted by the United Nations. Indeed, it is fair to say that the position of the United States is likely to determine whether any such resolution will be voted at all.

We believe that it would be a serious error of policy to vote sanctions against Israel, because it will run contrary to the basic principal of enforcing international law upon which we have been proceeding since hostilities first broke out on October 29, 1956.

We are agreed that Israel has basic responsibilities to the United Nations—which, indeed, was so important in bringing Israel into being—but so does Egypt, which is also a member of the United Nations and receiving its help.

It is a basic principle of international law that to be entitled to aid from international organs a nation must itself come in with clean hands. This is also a fundamental principle of the law in the United States. An especial beneficiary, if sanctions were voted against Israel, would be Egypt, and Egypt is and has been in violation of the letter and spirit of the United Nations' resolutions and of the United Nations Charter. Hence our country would be compromising the fundamental principle upon which it proceeded in backing the United Nations General Assembly's cease fire resolution of November 2, 1956; the second cease fire resolution of November 4, 1956; and the resolutions of November 7, 1956, November 24, 1956, January 19, 1957, and February 1, 1957, if it voted for sanctions against Israel while Egypt remained in violation of equally valid United Nations decisions.

Reports which have every indication of being authoritative state that arms shipments by the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc to Egypt have begun again. This is in direct contravention of the United Nations General Assembly resolution of November 2, 1956, which "recommends that all members refrain from introducing military goods in the area of hostility and, in general, refrain from any acts which would delay or prevent the implementation of this resolution"; indeed, the Soviet Union and the whole Communist bloc voted for the resolution. The second cease-fire resolution on November 4, 1956, authorized the Secretary General immediately to arrange with the parties concerned for "the halting of the movement of military forces and arms into the area," but the making to and the receipt of arms shipments by Egypt at this time would be clearly in direct violation of these provisions of the United Nations General Assembly resolution.

In addition, Egypt continues its often expressed refusal to comply with the United Nations Security Council's resolution of September 1, 1951, requiring it to cease interdiction of Israel's shipping through the Suez Canal. Reliable reports also make it clear that Egypt refuses to give necessary assurances guaranteeing transit through the Suez Canal to the shipping of France and the United Kingdom, when traffic movements are restored, thereby refusing to comply with the six principles for the operation of the Suez Canal which were adopted by the United Nations Security Council on October 13, 1956, with Egypt's concurrence.

Egypt, in contravention of the United Nations Charter and of the Arab-Israel Armistice Agreements of February 1949 arranged under United Nations auspices, insists upon the right to maintain a state of belligerency against Israel thereby refusing to give assurance of the passage of shipping of all nations, including Israel's, through the international waters of the Gulf of Aqaba.

The question right now in the Middle East is whether there shall be impartial justice in the enforcement of United Nations resolutions. In addition to the argument made by our colleague, Senator KNOWLAND, which certainly has considerable logic, that United Nations resolutions demanding that Soviet forces withdraw from Hungary should equally be enforced by sanctions, we believe that im-

partial justice dictates that our Government should not back sanctions against Israel so long as Egypt remains in default and defiance of United Nations resolutions.

We believe it clear that impartial justice in the situation of Israel and Egypt dictates that our Government should not back sanctions against Israel. Our Government should insist that there be appropriate and effective guaranties against the interdiction of shipping contrary to international law and against new guerrilla raids into Israel territory, striking at its very national survival as an essential condition precedent to enforcement of United Nations resolutions against Israel. After all, these were the very conditions so widely regarded as the serious provocations which brought on Israel's original action.

Indeed, there will be no occasion for sanctions if a reasonable plan of this kind is adopted.

The United States should not be pressing the issue of sanctions now. Rather, in the words of the President, we should expect that all parties will have a decent respect for the opinions of mankind and we should back to the hilt negotiations to accomplish the results of obtaining those guaranties which France, Britain and Israel should have as to Egypt's future course in Suez and Sinai and which seem generally proper to about everybody except a very few intransigent Arab States.

Respectfully,

IRVING M. IVES,
JACOB K. JAVITS,
*United States Senators.*

---

## DOUBLE STANDARD OF INTERNATIONAL MORALITY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, last December a national magazine published an article which I wrote, entitled the "Moral Crisis in Our Foreign Policy." In that article I pointed out that what truly divides this country from the Communists are human, moral, and spiritual questions; and that in our relations with the world, it is essential that we set an example of moral valor and spiritual dedication.

We have had a recent prime example of this moral valor, Mr. President, in the justified protest raised last week by the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who had the courage to condemn and to speak out forthrightly against a double standard of international morality wherein sanctions would be applied against Israel for aggression but not against Soviet Russia.

In all earnestness I commend him for this, and I also commend the other leaders of the Senate and the House who have expressed similar views. We must be guided in our political, as well as our personal actions, by moral concepts—by standing firmly for what we believe to be right and against what our conscience tells us is wrong. We have been telling our children that for generations. Our way of life and that of the whole civilized world is based upon these concepts.

In my judgment, it would be wrong for the United Nations to apply sanctions against Israel if it is going to do nothing about Russia for its defiance of the General Assembly on the tragic repression of Hungary, or about India for defying the Security Council on Kashmir, or about Egypt for defying the Security Council in respect of Israeli shipping in the Suez Canal.

If the United Nations is to live and function, it cannot discipline a small country and at the same time turn its back and close its eyes to the wrongs that it charges are being committed by larger nations. There must not be one standard for the weak and another for the strong. There is no middle ground between good and evil. As I stated in a speech before this body last June 27, this Nation cannot operate in gray areas. To do so is to retreat from moral standards, and I greatly fear that is what we have been doing in some of our international affairs. We must be moral, and we must be consistently moral.

In closing, I wish to pay my tribute to the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and to every other Member of this body and every Member of the House of Representatives who has stood up for this principle, because one cannot be both right and wrong. We cannot adopt one standard of morality for the strong and a different one for the weak. That is what the United Nations proposes in this instance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech delivered by me on June 27, 1956, be printed in the body of the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MORAL CRISIS IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY—SPEECH OF HON. STYLES BRIDGES, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, JUNE 27, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a short time ago in a nationwide television broadcast, Secretary of State Dulles talked to the American people. He invited full and fearless discussion on all questions concerning our foreign policy.

It is not often that a Cabinet officer of the party in power asks for advice, debate, or criticism of the policy he adopts and the Department he administers.

Secretary Dulles showed courage in this proposal, especially as we are about to enter a great presidential campaign. But the Secretary realizes that the campaign, dramatizing personalities and issues, captures the attention and interest of millions of Americans. It provides an excellent opportunity to discuss our foreign policy, appraise its successes and its failures, and reach the solid conclusions on which vigorous action can be based.

Of course, there must be self-restraint. Our discussion must be carried on with a sincere desire to arrive at the truth and at the best interest of our people. We must not seek small partisan advantage. Our criticism must not be carping and destructive, but rather clear and constructive.

In this discussion we must be free of party discipline and executive dictation. We must honestly, courageously face the issues—admitting past mistakes, whether they have been made by Republicans or Democrats. This is in the best American tradition of public service.

Our duty during the course of the campaign in the convention halls, meeting places and on the street corners throughout the Nation, is to discuss our international problems fully and frankly. Our allies and opponents must understand that we are dedicated to the task of preserving the free world.

How we conduct our foreign policy, and whether we successfully handle the issues confronting us, will determine not only the fate of Americans now living, but also the fate of generations to come—and perhaps the fate of the civilized world. It is because of these awesome pending decisions that I ask for a searching examination of our foreign policy—what it is and what it should be to serve our people best.

I think we might well spend a few moments reviewing the fundamentals and thereby clear the air. Let us see whether we can determine the essentials for a foreign policy that would truly and effectively advance our national interests.

So much has been written, so much has been said, and the confusion becomes so great, that we have lost sight of the simple and obvious fact. That fact is that the purpose of our foreign policy is to promote and protect the true interests of our people. No one will deny this simple statement of purpose, and yet we become involved in incredible confusions.

The real interests of our people: What are they? The ideals of the Republic: What are they?

Our real interests are the preservation of our freedoms—our way of life. As individuals, we want to realize our greatest possibilities—morally, spiritually, economically; to live in decency and to raise our families in the best traditions of our free society. As Americans, we want to be citizens of a Republic which provides a Government under a Constitution which guarantees those rights.

Because of war and circumstance, the United States has become the leader of the free world. The power of example is of overwhelmingly critical importance. To the extent that we are determined to maintain our own freedom, our friends and allies will be disposed to follow our example.

As Americans, we want to remain free to live according to our democratic traditions—to work, to hold property, to raise our families, to live in our town, city, State, and Nation, free from the danger of attack and foreign conquest.

By foreign conquest I do not merely mean military conquest. I also mean intellectual and spiritual conquest. The time has passed when only men's bodies are conquered. We now live in a world where the dictators are as much interested in the conquest of men's souls and minds as that of their bodies and their land.

Real security, which was once defined in only military terms as being freedom from the danger of armed invasion, has a wider meaning now. Security now means not only physical defense against our enemies. Security now also means defense against spiritual and intellectual demoralization.

I am as much concerned with our moral and spiritual security as I am with our military security. We are nearly all cognizant of our military security. Needless to say, our military security presents serious problems, but most of us are alert to these problems. Once aware and alerted, I have great confidence in American technological skill, American economic know-how, and American resourcefulness. These talents are a great asset in building a military defense.

It is with the moral and spiritual side of our problem that I am greatly concerned. I do not say Americans are morally weak. I do say we are morally confused. Nowhere is this moral confusion worse than among our so-called liberal intellectuals. This confusion tends to paralyze the mind and the will. The more extended the paralysis, the greater is the Communist victory.

There are moral questions on which we cannot be neutral. The recognition of physical torture as a deliberate instrument of government, the employment of secret police, the use of summary trials and executions behind closed doors, the dragooning of forced labor—these and other practices of tyrannical despotisms behind the Iron Curtain have been abhorrent to our people.

Yet these practices are commonplace in Communist states.

Right now we are being told that some mysterious and inexorable law of history and economics is remaking the conduct of the Russians. Things are going to be different.

How different? In what way?

The purported speech of Khrushchev before the 20th Communist Party congress was reported at length in the New York Times for June 5, 1956—just a few days ago.

Said Khrushchev, recounting the gruesome methods of the Stalin regime:

"When the cases of some the these so-called spies and saboteurs were examined, it was found that all their cases were fabricated. Confessions of guilt of many arrested and charged with enemy activity were gained with the help of cruel and inhuman tortures."

He continued with instance after instance of these horrors. He spoke repeatedly of trials in secret of what he calls illegality, and so forth.

What does he mean by the words "secret" and "illegality"?

This man, engaged in denouncing Stalin for these crimes, is the most prominent member of an oligarchy which, since it has come to power, has been doing the very things of which Stalin is now accused. Beria, the chief of the secret police, was not the only man the present regime sent to death. We do not know how many there were. We do know, however, that a few weeks ago the news was permitted to leak out that four lieutenants of Beria had been tried in secret and shot. Is this what is called legal? Is this what is called open trial?

I say we have no evidence whatever to prove that the leopard has changed his spots.

Only a short while ago Khrushchev and Marshal Bulganin paid a visit to Britain. While they were there, they were entertained at dinner by Labor members of Parliament. When the dinner was over the time came for questions. At length, one of those present addressed Khrushchev and said that there was worry and concern in Britain over the fate of a number of Social Democrats who had been imprisoned or had disappeared in Eastern Europe. Would Mr. Khrushchev be so good as to receive a list of names and furnish, at his convenience, information about these Social Democrats? According to the press dispatch descriptions of the dinner, Khrushchev turned livid with rage. He brushed aside the list of names and said:

"Why should I take a list of names when I have no idea whatever of paying any attention?"

Are we going to give way, here a little, there a little, to people of this stripe? There was once a British Minister who went to Munich to get what he called "peace in our time." You know what happened.

Are we to ignore and pass over and rationalize these things?

I say we cannot if we have any moral principle left. We cannot if we act on moral principle at all.

Whatever our faults, whatever grievous blunders our people have made in the past, the belief in freedom has been—and, I believe, remains—the spark of our national conscience. This belief in freedom is what shores up the demand for "Equal justice under law." In some of the darkest moments of our history, it was this belief that carried us through. Over and over again the declarations of this conscience have been given to the world and, what is more, have been made to stick.

Recall the phrases:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

There is no neutralism or indecision here.

Yet again:

"With a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

And once more:

"That government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

These are expressions of moral principle and I could quote a hundred more. Every last one an expression of honorable American tradition, down to the historic rejoinder of General McAuliffe at Bastogne. There is no neutralism about them. They are the enduring evidences of the determination of Americans to keep their freedom.

We can exercise self-restraint, I hope, in our international relations. We can respect the rights of other nations. We can understand the yearning of colonial peoples for their freedom, because we ourselves were a colonial people once upon a time. We can refrain from meddling with the traditions and religion and customs of others. We certainly do not want to say "Do it our way, or else."

But, by the same token, we cannot tolerate the systematic effort of Moscow to impose communism upon nations and peoples who do not want it. That is what the Kremlin has been doing for decades. Here a murderous coup d'etat as in Czechoslovakia. There a wrecking job done by infiltration as in Indochina. To suppose that the piecemeal absorption of other countries by the Communists is of no direct concern to us is insane.

Let us never forget that not a single one of the countries and half-countries now under Russian domination ever asked for it. Remember that even the Russians themselves have never had a chance. I said never. In their earliest times they lived in slavery. Then, they endured the bloodthirsty rule of the Mongols. In place of that, they became serfs under the absolute autocracy of the czars. Then, in 1917, the faint flickers of a democratic revolution were snuffed out when a handful of Bolsheviks hijacked control and set up the dictatorship of the proletariat.

We know that Russians have been brave. We know that their endurance seems inexhaustible. But no Russian now or ever in the past has known what freedom is.

From East Germany to North Korea and North Vietnam, the peoples of the Red empire were given no real choice. They were beaten down and trapped by methods ranging from propaganda, subversion, and infiltration, to military violence or the threat of military violence. And, once trapped, by whatever means, their captivity has been maintained by unlimited terror.

Those self-styled liberals who defend the right of the Russians or Czechs, the Chinese or North Vietnamese, to go Communist are talking nonsense. They might just as logically defend the right of inmates of concentration camps to be slaves. The captive peoples did not go Communist—they were driven into the Kremlin's prison of nations, hermetically sealed against escape.

Let us never forget, also, that the Red empire is not limited to the countries already behind its Iron and Bamboo Curtains. Every Communist Party in what remains of the free world, every false-front organization operating under Moscow discipline, every guerrilla warfare contingent under Communist direction, is an integral part of the Red empire. We are not dealing with a group of conventional nations, but with a worldwide conspiracy dedicated to making this one world—one Communist world.

The necessity of international political life makes it necessary for foreign offices, including our State Department, to treat Soviet Russia as if it were just another country, but we know it is nothing of the sort. In reality, Soviet Russia, its satellites, and its allies are the core of an apparatus of power and coercion which penetrates in varying degrees every nation on every continent of this earth.

On the one hand, the dictators in the Kremlin are the bosses of a great domain; on the other, they are the bandit leaders of a vast revolutionary conspiracy which seeks to destroy not only opponent states, but moral values, religion, freedom, all that we hold dear.

When Comrades Khrushchev, Bulganin, Malenkov, and Mikoyan, stage state visits beyond the Soviet frontiers, they pose as merely the heads of one country. The pose, unfortunately, is accepted at face value. Yet only the most befuddled can be unaware that these despots are at the same time the heads of a world revolutionary movement. Their every word and act is related to a firm and fixed strategy of world dominion. When they are abroad, no matter how plausible their pretext, they are reconnoitering enemy areas which they are determined to seduce or bludgeon into the Communist sphere.

Nothing that has happened since the death of Stalin has changed the overriding Communist commitment. The so-called return to Leninism, which is to say, to the original Bolshevik principles, is being foolishly interpreted in some quarters as a policy of moderation. Actually, it is a reffirmation of Lenin's militant dogmas of class war, civil upheaval, and unlimited deception, all directed to the achievement of a totalitarian, all-Communist world.

So why the new optimism? Why the disastrous letdown of our vigilance?

If only our optimists today could be induced to do their homework in Communist history they would realize that in the middle thirties, under cover of Stalin's pretenses of live-and-let-live united fronts, the Soviets forged the weapons of subversion and infiltration which they exploited to the full when the line was changed.

They would recall how generally it was then accepted that communism had "matured," that it had ceased to be interested in world revolution, that Stalin, the realist, was concerned only with improving conditions in his own country. Those who tried to warn the world that communism had not changed its nature, but was temporarily employing cunning instead of brute force, were denounced as "Red-baiters" and "alarmists."

Yet today we are neck-deep in the same confusions and illusions, as if the 1930's had never been. In order to soothe our nerves and our conscience, we are fed with fairy tales about "new looks" in the Communist world and the magic of collective leadership.

I am tired of this kind of talk, and I am especially tired of being told that I am an alarmist. I am no Johnny-come-lately in watching the Communist pitch curves at the so-called liberals.

How well do I recall that during World War II we were being swamped with stories about how completely the Communists had changed, and how we were all going to dwell in peace and unity after the war. We were going to remake the world and usher in the golden age.

I did not believe it. I could see no fundamental change in Communist tactics at all.

I said so in an interview with the Boston Herald on September 12, 1943. I said:

"It is time to use more spine and less servility on this subject (of dealing with the Soviets). Joseph Stalin needs to be dealt with toughly, frankly * * * and with self-interest plainly in mind."

Numerous persons told me that I just did not understand the Communists, that I had been deceived by Red-baiters.

Was I deceived? I notice that in the Daily Worker for June 12, 1956, a prominent American Communist, Howard Fast, now confesses that the Khrushchev revelations of Stalin's record constitute, and I quote, "a record of barbarism and paranoic blood lust that will be a lasting and shameful memory to civilized man."

In 1944, immediately after Tehran, I questioned the nature of the political com-

mitments made there. In a speech I made in the Senate on January 14, 1944, I said:

"Americans want to know whether the national life and independence of any people in Europe—or Western Europe—whether in the Baltic region, the Balkans, or Western Europe have been endangered by American commitments or the failure to make strong American representations. Americans want to know how Poland, which was the only full ally which England and France had at the beginning of the war and which has been so horribly ravaged, is to be rewarded for its loyalty and supreme sacrifices."

That speech was made a full year before the Yalta conferences. I was given to understand that my suspicions were groundless. I was told that Mr. Roosevelt would handle matters, and that, anyway, I utterly misinterpreted Communist intentions.

Did I misinterpret their intentions? We know now how the Poles were rewarded. Their territory was carved up, their people were handed over to a reign of terror, and a gang of Polish stooges for Moscow were put in power.

Ten months before Yalta, I returned to this subject in a Senate speech, on May 23, 1944. The speech was entitled "What Are Our Peace Aims?" I said:

"Because the matter which I am presenting is so urgent, from this point on I shall address myself directly to the President of the United States. President Roosevelt, the American people are not going to be content with a military victory only. We, as a people, are utterly in sympathy with your own sentiments which you expressed in a radio talk on May 27, 1941, wherein you said, 'We will accept only a world consecrated to freedom of speech and expression—freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—freedom from want, and freedom from terrorism'."

Well, how did we make out? Freedom to worship God? With Cardinal Mindszenty drugged, put through the third degree, flung into prison, let out again under the watch of the secret police, and now, as I understand it, in prison again? In Yugoslavia, Cardinal Stepinac under house guard and the constant surveillance of our friend Tito's goon squad. In Poland, the Archbishop of Warsaw shut up in a monastery and all but cut off from the outside world. As for China, you all have seen the photographs of those few missionaries who have been released. Although they went to China to spread the word of God, they have been shrunk to skin and bone, and are physical wrecks. There are the ways in which the Communists guarantee a person freedom to worship God in his own way.

Mr. President, let me point out that, despite those speeches which I made, I have heard Members of the Senate and other representatives of official Washington say, "Well, anyone can have hindsight." But, Mr. President, that was not hindsight; it was foresight. However, those in charge of our Government at that time closed their eyes and their ears to what was occurring. That was true not only of the executive branch of the Government but also of some of the leading Members of the Congress of the United States at that time.

Yet again in the same speech of May 23, 1944, I said:

"We know that [President Roosevelt] risking our whole future and the future of the postwar world on the good will of Mr. Stalin * * * will never be accepted by the American people as their only safeguard against war and the threat of war."

And, I went on to say:

"What are our peace aims, Mr. President, and do they bode good or ill? * * * Are they a patchwork of unprecedented necessities which will merely postpone the final issue of war itself to the not-too-distant future? Why do you not take us, your own people, into your confidence, Mr. President? Is it because you wish to overwhelm us with joy when you suddenly pull a patchwork peace settlement out of your hat, or is it because the monster which you have helped to breed has broken its leash and is now at large?"

Well, what happened? A year later, the Russians entered the Far Eastern war, just a few days before the Japanese surrender—just a few days, but with time enough to seize control of Manchuria and get their hands on North Korea, from which, in 1950, the Communists launched another bloody war.

We remember what happened. General MacArthur was forbidden victory; he was flung to the appeasers; and today, in North Korea, the arms buildup for a new Communist war goes on.

Now, we have the new look in Russia. Many of the intellectuals in this country are saying, "It is a new look." What is the reason for it? We can only speculate.

My own guess is that the reason is double. The first part of the reason is that their domestic political situation forced a new piece of window dressing. The rest of the reason is that those in charge of the Communist machine, never giving up for an instant their goal of world dominion, now believe that an exhibition of sweetness and light will soften up the West.

The present Communist rulers cannot wash the blood from their own hands. Their helpless subjects have as yet no alternative but to pretend to accept the alibis.

But there is no such compulsion upon the free world, Mr. President. Why then, do we go along with the idea that Stalin's heirs are any different from their late boss? It should be obvious that only the most ruthless and corrupt of Stalin's subordinates, only those capable of doing his bloody work without wincing, could have survived a quarter of a century of purges under his suspicious eye. The very fact that they were at the time of Stalin's death—or was it murder?—his most intimate collaborators is proof enough that they are made of the same moral stuff. Whatever the interpretation for this sudden repudiation of Stalin, it could only stem from weakness.

Why not take advantage of this weakness in our opponents? Certainly this is not the time to dignify the culprits of the Kremlin by accepting them and extending the courtesies of normal statesmen. In doing this, we are only building them up with their own people at this time when they are weakest. Such action can only confound and confuse our friends and give aid and comfort to our enemies. The terrorism to which those men admit having been a party should earn them the deserved disgust of the entire world.

We cannot be optimistic about our dealings with men to whom Stalin could be a deity for 25 years, and overnight become a demon. We will not grasp to our bosom those men who for 25 years as Stalin's lieutenants were responsible for the torture of millions of Russians and the condemning of hundreds of thousands of victims to death by starvation and the atrocities committed in far-off Siberian prisons.

I appreciate that there will be those who will ask that I be more diplomatic and temperate in my language. I shall answer that moderation and diplomacy are perhaps requirements of foreign-affairs officers; but it is good to clear the air.

If ever there was a moment when the revulsion of mankind should have found forthright expression, it is now. The most extreme of the charges against the Soviet regime, those which our muddled pro-Sovieteers once denounced as inventions and slanders, have now been confirmed by the culprits themselves.

But we see no such revulsion. It is as if freemen had lost their capacity for telling good and evil apart, their capacity for indignation at the spectable of millionfold crimes, even the crimes of which they themselves were the victims.

I am forced to conclude that many times in the past, in the conduct of our foreign relations, we have lost the compass of moral principle. More and more we operate in gray areas, somewhere between good and evil. The excuse, of course, is political realism. But history is our guaranty that such realism is a snare and a delusion.

It was a false expediency which produced Munich and Yalta and the chain of appeasements on which our Soviet enemy has been nourished to his present dimensions.

What have we got in exchange for the billion dollars we gave to Tito? We fed him, and bolstered him when Stalin tried to crush him; we supplied and equipped his army. And what do we get for our pains?

We get a Tito honeymoon staged in Moscow. We get a statement from Marshal Zhukov to Tito that in war the Kremlin and Tito will fight shoulder to shoulder. We get an official statement that Tito and the Kremlin will make stubborn efforts to see that Red China is admitted to the United Nations. Are we supposed to forget that the United Nations voted Red China an aggressor in the Korean war, and that the ban has never been revoked?

We get an official statement that East and West Germany must be reunited, not by plebiscite and popular vote, but by a negotiated deal. We get an official statement that Formosa must be handed over to Red China. Americans paid $1 billion for this.

If anyone can show me why we should provide more money to Tito, I should like to be shown. It was a disdain for moral values which maneuvered us into the folly of building up the dictator Tito of Yugoslavia. And it is the same retreat from moral standards which today creates the confusion over so-called neutralists.

"Neutrality," as I have said, made sense and still does where the opposing powers were primarily involved in a contest for territories, dynasties, frontiers, colonies, and economic advantages. We know—the whole world knows—that this is not the nature of the conquest at the present time. There is no quarrel between America and Russia on any such traditional grounds. If those were the issues, we would have no trouble coming to terms with the vast Soviet empire, just as we did with the British and other expanding empires in the past.

No. What divides us from the Communists are human, moral, and spiritual questions; the determination of a crusading totalitarianism to extend its pattern of life to the rest of the human race. Every time a spokesman for the free world speaks of "neutrality" in the old sense in relation to our present dilemma, he cheapens the issue and betrays the high purpose of the free world. He helps make it seem—as the Kremlin wants it to seem—simply an old style duel for power. On that false assumption, the contest loses its true significance, and other countries are fortified in their delusion that the whole thing concerns only the main antagonists, namely, the United States and Soviet Russia.

It is at this point that I lose patience with those nations which are not only neutralist in their military position, but insist on neutralism in their moral position. I know of no worse offender in this regard than Nehru, who proclaims himself the moralist of Asia.

I know of no instance of Nehru having openly and sincerely taken the side of freedom and democracy. I know only weasel words and idle pretensions. Nehru has yet to denounce slave labor, torture, trial without jury, political violence, and all the absolute ruthless dictatorship that goes with Soviet Russia. It is just possible that Nehru may yet come around and denounce Stalin. Everyone else is doing it. It is thoroughly fashionable and quite safe to do it today. Dead men cannot retaliate.

On a more specific level, I cannot feel justified in voting large sums of foreign aid to India. In my view, foreign aid, military,

economic, and technical, is an instrument of foreign policy. Our foreign aid should be employed to build and nurture those allies and alliances necessary to protect us and to assure our safety. We must match with bonds of friendship the enmities our opponents try to create. We want to help other nations to strengthen them spiritually and economically, so that if they are assaulted or if we are assaulted, we will all be much stronger to resist and to fight. I do not care about buying gratitude but we ought to be buying something. Surely we are not spending $5 billion a year on a huge giveaway charity program. We have no right to tax our people just to give largess all over the world. If nations tell us they want our economic help but that what side they are on is none of our business, or that they see some good in both sides, and some bad in both sides—then how does helping them aid our foreign policy?

Mr. President, what kind of global do-gooding is this? How can we respect ourselves for giving our money and substance all over the world and asking nothing in return? What has this to do with an effective policy which in this day and age ought to be pretty hard, and realistic? Our survival as a people and as a nation may depend on who our allies are and how firmly they stand with us. And if we do not have any allies, we ought to know that too, and act accordingly. This confusion, this softheadedness, must end. We must realistically reappraise the whole business or in the end we will waste our substance and perish.

In leaving this question of sharing our financial and material resources with other nations, I should like to make one thing very clear. I have long favored the basis for our foreign aid program. I was for foreign aid nearly two decades ago, at a time when that position was not entirely popular, because I believed that it was essential to the security of the United States and the protection of the free world. I am still for a truly mutual assistance program, with particular emphasis on aiding those countries who honestly intend to help themselves and the rest of the free world.

We do not lose sight of the fact that some countries and peoples are more exposed and more vulnerable to Soviet pressures than others. The temptation to forget moral values in their desire to live and stave off attack is understandably stronger upon them. But where are they to find a source of strength to resist if not in our America? We should be supplying the courage, the moral fiber, and the religious conviction to resist. Where are they to find a guaranty that all is not lost if America, too, begins to go neutralist, even if it evades the unpleasant word?

Let us bear in mind that every American compromise, however it may be explained, is multiplied in other countries into surrenders. Our job, to insure our own security and to secure the survival of freedom on this earth, is to galvanize the stragglers, the fearful, the intimidated, by examples of moral valor and spiritual dedication. Such is the rule of leadership which, though we never sought it, we can reject only to our own peril.

That is what I meant when I said that attitudes and basic principles are no less decisive than actions and policies. An attitude of compromise on essentials, phony friendships with gangsters at any price, leads to one set of decisions. An attitude related to deep-rooted moral values leads to an opposite set of decisions.

It is precisely these underlying considerations which must be examined in the debate on foreign policy which will develop in the forthcoming election campaign. We can excuse and make up for failures of particular policies. Those reflect the mistakes of fallible men in a complex situation.

We dare not excuse a failure of nerve and a failure of principle, for those witness a weakening and threaten a collapse of our whole moral structure. If the present drift to cynical grayness, where once we knew the difference between black and white, is not arrested and reversed, we shall lose our ability to defend ourselves. Indeed we shall have little left that is worth defending.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, first let me say that I commend the Senator from New Hampshire for what he has said about the United Nations sanctions. I was in favor of the League of Nations. I have been in favor of the United Nations. My own feeling is that it is highly desirable that the United Nations as a body should succeed. I want it to succeed; but I do not think it can attain the success we hope for it if its decisions are to be made without consideration of moral questions or questions of right and wrong, or without due regard of what it can accomplish as a practical matter. It seems to me in this instance what we must do is to realize that the United Nations cannot be successful if, when there has been aggression, it orders sanctions against one nation but not against another, as will be the result if sanctions are put into effect against Israel but not against Egypt or Russia.

So, for realistic and practical reasons, I feel much as does the Senator from New Hampshire, who bases his position on the higher plane of the difference between right and wrong. I want the United Nations to be a continuing body for a more peaceful world. It cannot be if it is asked to do something that cannot be supported as fair in conception and practical in operation.

## EQUAL TREATMENT UNDER LAW

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, when punitive measures are undertaken by the United Nations General Assembly to enforce Assembly resolutions, let them be taken with the same impact in all instances of noncompliance with those resolutions. Let the principle of equal treatment prevail in its deliberations regarding the Middle East conflict and in all other matters coming before that international organization.

The Israelis should, of course, withdraw from Gaza and the Sinai Peninsula as a necessary step toward what the General Assembly withdrawal resolution itself suggests would be "action which would assure progress toward creation of peaceful conditions." But simply to return to the status quo ante and to recreate the same evils of shipping blockades, of border raids, and reprisals which have so long and so unhappily plagued the Middle East, would not contribute to peace. Assurances by the General Assembly itself as to its future policy for peace in that area are, it seems to me, indispensable. And, to me, an Egyptian declaration of nonbelligerence ought now to be forthcoming. Egypt spurned the General Assembly resolution on the Suez Canal, something which certainly did not contribute to peace in the Middle East.

My colleague, the minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], spoke on this subject in the Senate the other day. He denounced what he termed "the double standard of international morality." As a member of the United States delegation to the Assembly, he spoke with first-hand knowledge. Let me repeat a statement which he made:

> I do not believe the United States should support United Nations sanctions against Israel unless the United Nations is prepared to apply sanctions against the Soviet Union for its noncompliance with 10 General Assembly resolutions relative to Soviet aggression against Hungary.
>
> A double standard by the United Nations that would apply sanctions to a small country that has at least partially complied with the resolutions of the General Assembly on the Suez-Near East conflict, while sidestepping the question of sanctions on a larger aggressor which has totally ignored all the resolutions on the crime against Hungary, is both immoral and in good conscience insupportable.

I endorse the position the senior Senator from California has taken. Should noncompliance of General Assembly resolutions by Russia, India, and Egypt result in exoneration while sanctions are invoked for noncompliance by Israel? Justice and equal treatment say "No."

The United States joined the United Nations because we hoped and believed that organization would help to bring a just peace to a war-weary world. We continue our membership today for the same reason. One of the basic tenets of American Government is equal treatment under law to all people. American laws, by constitutional guaranty, have the same impact on all people, rich or poor, big or little. Only on this same principle of equal treatment can the United Nations merit the respect of mankind and fulfill its charter responsibility to advance the cause of a just peace in the world.

## THE MIDDLE EAST QUESTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we have just heard distinguished Members of the Senate, including the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] strongly support the initiative taken by the minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] on the question of voting sanctions against Israel. My colleague from New York has asked to have printed in the RECORD a letter which he and I sent to the Secretary of State on that subject. We have just been informed on the news ticker that the Secretary General of the United Nations has asked the United Nations General Assembly for new instructions. This poses, therefore, the further query as to what those new instructions shall be. The question at issue is what shall be the assurances as to no right of belligerency being asserted by Egypt against Israel, and also as to whom they shall be given.

Mr. President, our thinking cannot be muddled now. The dangers are too great and the stakes too high. In determining what will happen with respect to the Sinai Peninsula we may well determine what will happen also with respect to the operation of the Suez Canal, because the very same Colonel Nasser and almost the same kind of principles are involved. The issue is whether or

not Colonel Nasser controls the actions of the United Nations emergency force and the U. N. agencies on what is Egyptian soil, despite their presence there as directed by the U. N. General Assembly to maintain international peace pursuant to the authority of the U. N. Charter. If he does—and this is the situation we are led to and allowed to believe to be the fact—then to compel Israel's withdrawal by sanctions is to be one-sided in our actions—I call this particularly to the attention of my colleagues—and to run the same risks we ran in getting just as angry and frustrated as we did about what ensued following British withdrawal from the Suez Canal base. The United States can get those assurances itself. If the United States can get them, and then states that it will help see that they are carried out, that would mean something, and we would not be lost in our own semantics.

The United States continues to be a party to the three party declaration of 1950, with the United Kingdom and France, guaranteeing armistice lines between the Arab States and Israel.

As it stands now, the best we can see is our Government's belief that if Israel withdraws there is a reasonable chance that the U. N. will be able to maintain freedom of navigation to Elath through the Gulf of Aqaba, and security along the Egyptian-Israeli border. This is too reminiscent of what followed the British withdrawal from its Suez base to be reassuring to anyone, let alone a small state, Israel, which is up against an issue involving the very life and death of its people and its survival as a state.

The connection between this situation and that of clearance of and transit through the Suez Canal—as vital to the survival of free Europe as is freedom from guerrilla raids and transit through the Gulf of Aqaba are to Israel—is also too clear. If Colonel Nasser can also turn on and off use of the canal, and, considering the way he is being manipulated by Communist influence, what is left for free Europe?

In his reference to this situation a few days ago, the President spoke of a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. That is a masterful statement and is quite in line with the President's philosophy. I am sure the President meant it to be as applicable to Colonel Nasser as to Prime Minister Ben-Gurion. The time has come to ask this same decent respect from Colonel Nasser. An air of injured innocence does not "take in" an experienced judge or lawyer, and should not "take in" the United States. It cannot conceal violations of resolutions of the Security Council since September 1, 1951, on the question of transit through Suez; opening up the Mid-East to communism by buying Moscow's arms; arbitrary denial to the world of the Suez Canal in the teeth of international guaranties half a century old; fomenting guerrilla raids and maintaining belligerency against a neighbor state in the teeth of solemn armistice agreements; and the medieval expulsion and persecution by Colonel Nasser of Egypt's Jewish community because of their religious faith.

Mr. President, I quote the last sentence of the editorial entitled "Israel, Egypt, and the U. N.," published in the New York Times of today:

The friendship of the Arab States, if that is what we are looking for, is not worthwhile if it has to be bought by subterfuges and injustice.

Attention is invited to Senate Resolution 77, in which the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], as well as my senior colleague from New York [Mr. IVES], and I have joined, stating it to be the sense of the Senate:

That our Government should support effective action both in and outside of the United Nations, which will guarantee that there will not be a resumption of border raids and blockades of vital international waterways and other activities which might erupt into new hostilities in the Middle East; and that, pending an effective guaranty that there will not be a restoration of the conditions out of which the hostilities in the Sinai Peninsula came about, our delegation at the United Nations urges measures to assure that the United Nations Emergency Force take up positions to separate the forces of Israel and Egypt and to prevent repossession of bases for the operation of guerrilla bands, and the interdiction of international shipping, including Israel's, through the Straits of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba.

A hearing upon this resolution could contribute to the understanding and resolution of the present situation.

In fact it is also too little understood that even now the United States aid to and normal relations with Israel have been seriously interfered with. At the present time, the United States is suspending certain previously indicated aid to Israel. The development assistance allocation of an estimated $25 million has not been programed. Technical assistance of several million dollars and negotiations for surplus food which had reached the final stages before completion have been deferred. The special mission to Israel, relative to the Import-Export Bank loan of $17 million has been suspended. The travel to Israel by American citizens, so vital to the Israeli dollar economy, has been barred. Incidentally, I am advised that the United States is the only country in the world, except the Arab States, which does not at this time permit travel to Israel .

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the complete editorial from which I have previously quoted and which appears in today's New York Times and also an editorial entitled "Suez Calls for Action," published in the New York Times of February 7, 1957.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 11, 1957]

ISRAEL, EGYPT, AND THE U. N.

The State of Israel, after enduring various ordeals during the 10 years of her existence, faces this week in the U. N. the possibility of punitive measures because she will not unconditionally obey resolutions of the General Assembly calling upon her to complete her withdrawal behind the armistice demarcation lines of 1949. The United States, in consequence, faces the choice of supporting such measures, opposing them or abstaining from voting on them. We can modify them or kill them, if we wish.

President Eisenhower has concededly urged the withdrawal. State Department spokesmen were described in a Washington dispatch to this newspaper yesterday as being both angry and frustrated over Israel's insistence upon guaranties before pulling out.

The desired guaranties are simple. They are in line with at least one interpretation of the General Assembly's second resolution of February 1, which this country sponsored. This is that when the General Assembly said that withdrawal by Israel must be followed by action which would assure progress toward the creation of peaceful conditions it meant conditions differing from those that preceded the Israeli invasion of the Gaza strip and Sinai on October 29.

The conditions then existing included an Egyptian blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba against Israeli ships and restrictions on the movements of Israeli ships and cargoes in the Suez Canal. They also included Fedayeen gangs, trained, and inspired by the Egyptians, raiding into Israel out of the Gaza strip and Sinai.

It is argued that the Israelis ought not to be rewarded for their own admittedly illegal invasion of Egyptian or Egyptian-controlled territory. Of course they should not be. But it is surely illogical to the point of nonsense to contend that the Egyptians should be rewarded for losing a war, and the Israelis punished for winning a war, in which neither side was blameless. Finally, in the interests of peace, it is neither wise nor just to remove some of the conditions making for war and leave others untouched.

We hope that when our spokesmen next express themselves, either in Washington or at the U. N., they will insist, for our own sake and for all nations' sake, not merely for the sake of Israel, that the Egyptians give guaranties to keep the peace before there is any further talks of sanctions against Israel.

The friendship of the Arab States, if that is what we are working for, is not worth while if it has to be bought by subterfuges and injustice.

---

[From the New York Times of February 7, 1957]

SUEZ CALLS FOR ACTION

While the deadlock between Israel and Egypt continues amid new confusion caused by the latest United Nations resolutions another Middle Eastern problem is racing toward a deadline. This is the problem of the Suez Canal, and the deadline is the end of February, when General Wheeler, now clearing away the wrecks scuttled by President Nasser, expects to have the canal open for ships up to 10,000 tons, with full operations due early in May.

If a solution could be found by that time, even for an interim period, much of the damage caused by Nasser's illegal seizure and blocking of the canal could be repaired. This would restore to the world a major artery of commerce and would relieve Western Europe of a growing oil shortage that is causing increasing economic hardships. But if no solution is found by that time, and since United Nations policies have ruled out the use of force in reaching it, the Western Nations will have to choose between two grim alternatives. One is to boycott the canal, at dangerous economic cost, until other transportation routes can be established. The other is Nasser's determination to keep the canal under his sole control as an instrument of his totalitarian and imperialistic ambitions.

Because of this situation the Western Powers have been pressing for new negotiations ever since the end of the recent hostilities.

But Nasser, aware of the tremendous advantage which reopening of the canal will give him, has been holding back and threatening to stop clearing operations, and in any case to bar British and French ships from the canal unless Israel completes its withdrawal without reciprocal Egyptian guaranties of Israel's national security. Some soundings toward new negotiations have been undertaken by Mr. Hammarskjold, the overburdened Secretary General, but if anything has come of them the public has not been informed.

The issue in the Suez Canal problem is not so much Nasser's seizure and "nationalization" of the canal company, however open to challenge on legal and moral grounds, but rather a restoration of the "definitive system" established by the Convention of 1888 to guarantee for all time and to all nations, in peace and war, the free use of the canal. To that end the Western Powers have insisted that the canal must not be operated for the political purposes of any single nation and that it must therefore be put under international operation and control. In this stand they have the backing of the Security Council resolution of last October 13, which established 6 principles, the most important of which is that the operation of the canal must be "insulated" from the politics of any country, including Egypt.

To carry out these aims and principles the main users of the canal, meeting in two conferences in London, adopted first an American proposal for an international Suez Canal Board, which was to operate the canal with due regard for Egypt's interests and sovereignty, and then another American proposal for a Suez Canal Users Association, whose prinicpal function was to be to act as agent for ships using the canal to prevent overt or covert discrimination and in particular to collect the tolls. It was to get hold of these tolls in order to finance his schemes that Nasser seized the canal in the first place, and control over the tolls remains the crucial issue in any settlement to assure both the safety and the development of the canal. For that reason British and French ships paid their tolls into blocked accounts from the beginning, and the United States has pledged itself to take measures to divert the tolls of its shipping to the Users' Association as soon as it became a going concern, which it will be when the canal reopens.

But for the same reasons Nasser has thus far rejected all such proposals and continues to insist in the name of Egyptian sovereignty that he must operate and control the canal and collect the tolls for his own treasury. At most, he offers to cooperate with the users and promises to observe the 1888 Convention, which he has already violated, or to negotiate a new convention guaranteeing free passage through the canal, unless—as in the case of Israel—it suits him to do otherwise. That is a proposition which the free world and Western Europe in particular cannot accept and it is high time to impress on Nasser that ruling out the use of force does not rule out other measures short of war, including political and economic pressures, to bring him to terms which the free world can accept.

## THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE FUTURE OF THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday I released a statement with regard to what I feel should be the correct position of our Government in meeting the present difficult problem in the United Nations as regards the future of the Middle East.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY INSISTS ON RESPECT FOR U. N. RESOLUTIONS BY ALL POWERS, LARGE AND SMALL: "STRONGLY" QUESTIONS WHETHER SANCTIONS SHOULD NOW BE INVOKED IN MIDEAST

I believe that the correct position of our Government with respect to helping to end the current deadlock on withdrawal of the forces of Israel from Egypt—should be as follows:

1. The United Nations must establish the firm precedent that its resolutions are uniformly respected, rather than frequently ignored. U. N. resolutions must come to be honored by all powers—large and small.

2. The most glaring, flagrant, and absolutely indefensible violations have come from the Soviet Union's "thumbing its nose" at the U. N. in Russia's brutal repression of the rights of the Hungarian people.

3. At other times, however, other nations have also violated U. N. resolutions, including India, in the annexation of Kashmir. None of these violations should be ignored.

4. I feel that the United Nations has rightfully insisted that Israeli forces withdraw promptly from Egypt.

I also feel, however, that any nation—Israel or anyone else—is definitely entitled to reasonable guaranties that (1) her citizens will not be attacked night after night, and (2) that an international waterway shall not be denied to her shipping—in violation of all international law.

5. I feel further that continued negotiation by the United Nations can and will find a means out of the present deadlock over Israeli withdrawal from the Gaza strip and the Gulf of Aqaba. I do not believe that proposed sanctions again Israel would constitute either a fair, justified, or an effective answer. There must be no U. N. "double standard" of punishing a small power's violation and ignoring a big power's infinitely worse violations. It would be a cruel irony if the U. N. were suddenly to "get tough," not against a great power—Russia, guilty of the most flagrant and repeated of all violations of the Charter—but against one of the smallest powers—Israel—which has been basically asking for guaranties against violations of international law.

The U. N. must, of course, not permit a record that a nation need respect a resolution only when it suits its own convenience.

We of the United States have been consistent in absolute respect of international law. We come to the United Nations with a record untarnished. Egypt does not. And certainly the arch-violator, the Soviet Union, does not, nor does India, nor does Israel.

All of them must learn to respect all U. N. resolutions. But every country, including Israel, has the basic right to seek its own national self-preservation, its own survival, and to defend itself against attacks.

I feel very strongly, as I'm sure the Congress does, against any double standard in applying international law conduct.

## OPPOSITION TO APPLYING SANCTIONS TO ISRAEL

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I agree with the statement of the minority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], when he said last Thursday:

If we are to have sanctions at the United Nations, they should apply to all nations which defy the resolutions and the mandates of that organization. Otherwise the moral foundation of the United Nations is destroyed and a doctrine of "might makes right" condoned.

One might add also, Why not apply sanctions to Egypt as well as Israel, especially in that for many years Egypt has refused to allow a single ship from Israel to pass through the Suez Canal.

I was glad to hear yesterday both the distinguished majority leader of the House, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] state that they believed it was unfair to apply sanctions to Israel, and not also to a country that has for so long violated international law.

Are we now adopting as a national program a policy of being strong against the weak and weak against the strong?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have recently received numerous telegrams opposing United Nations sanctions against Israel. In connection with the discussion today of sanctions against Israel, I should like to read into the RECORD the text of a telegram which I have sent in reply. My telegram reads as follows:

Sanctions cannot consistently be taken against Israel while U. N. has not followed up its resolutions against Russia in Hungary and against Nasser for closing canal to Israel shipping. However, we must bear in mind under Charter U. N. seeks rules of law and cannot condone use of aggression for any purpose. Therefore, it is my hope both compliance with U. N. recommendations and protection of the State of Israel through firm U. N. action can be brought about.

## THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the time of the presentations made by different Senators on the subject of the situation in the Middle East, I have hoped that some of us might engage in colloquy. I know that today speeches will be delivered on the entire Middle Eastern foreign policy. We shall hear one from the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]; and I, too, shall speak on this subject.

I rise now to say that although I have heard many comments about the failures of the United Nations and I have heard Senators and other speakers say that the United Nations must not impose sanctions upon Israel—in which I fully concur, and to which, by the way, I have lent my word from time to time—I wish to point out that the United Nations is not some kind of international Univac machine. The United Nations requires leadership. If the United States will just exert its leadership, instead of running around the flanks, hoping to be all things to all countries, we need not permit the imposition of sanctions upon Israel.

I repeat, it is time for the United States to exert its leadership, rather than try to make the people feel that the United Nations is a self-operating organization—which it is not. The United Nations is a mechanism for a policy, and it requires direction and leadership.

I think it is time that these obligations be placed right on the doorstep of Dwight Eisenhower, the President of the United States. He is the spokesman of this

Nation on foreign policy. It is time for us to hear from him whether we are only to restrain and reprimand our friends, or whether we are to apply with equal justice the same rule on those who have not been so kind to us. I think we have a right to ask whether the Eisenhower doctrine means the sending of tanks and planes to Saudi Arabia and the imposition of sanctions upon Israel, or whether it means justice to both parties.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks just made by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I think it is well to emphasize for the RECORD the fact that only in the past few days the press has pointed out that the President of the United States made an unprecedented journey to the Washington National Airport, to greet the King of Saudi Arabia when he arrived there. By the same token, it is my understanding that the present occupant of the White House never paid a similar honor either to Sir Winston Churchill or to former Prime Minister Anthony Eden, when those great leaders of our main ally in the free world arrived at the Washington National Airport. At this time of international crisis, I should like to have the RECORD call attention to that fact. The contrast is a striking symbol of our times and era.

## SECRETARY DULLES, A FREE PRESS, AND COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, our country's desperate need of all the facts possible regarding developments today in every nation of the world, whether it be friendly or unfriendly, law abiding or outlaw, moves me to ask what Secretary Dulles hopes to gain by refusing permission for representatives of American newspapers and magazines to enter Communist China.

Is our intelligence, military and otherwise, so complete, so full, that our experts do not want it beefed up with the additional events in Communist China?

What are we losing to obtain whatever gain the Secretary of State has in mind? Just the news which the very able reporters invited to China would send to us through their news media? Or are we also losing something more basic, such as a climate where publishers and broadcasters feel free to report the facts?

Have we lost something already when the climate becomes such that a major radio network does not allow one of our leading commentators even to discuss the subject on the air?

Therefore, Mr. President, I wish to ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a Washington Star report on the broadcast which Eric Sevareid, one of the world's most distinguished commentators, would have made had he not been cut off the air by the CBS news authorities on last Wednesday.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the summary of his remarks which, for some reason, were not allowed to go to the American people.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of February 9, 1957]

### WHY DID CBS FADE SEVAREID?

(By Bernie Harrison)

When the Columbia Broadcasting System took Eric Sevareid off the air last Wednesday for editorializing when he should have been analyzing, a wave of curiosity swept over much of the listening public—including this segment. What did he say?

Here (direct from Mr. Sevareid's office) is the portion of his prepared script that caused it to be kept off the air:

"Mr. Dulles' present argument—and this caught the President by surprise today at his news meeting—is that the Chinese are trying to do a deal—will release the 10 American prisoners they illegally hold if he lets the American reporters go in; that this is blackmail and that he won't submit to it. Now this statement was pursued by questions all right, but if time had permitted it might have been pursued much further. Among others, there would have been a few questions like these:

Is this not the third distinct argument used for withholding these passports? First, that the Government is unable to protect the reporters, which they did not expect, anyway; second, that the men could not go in until the prisoners were let out—this was the President's last argument; now, that the men cannot go in because then the prisoners will be let out and this smacks of Communist blackmail.

Since the Secretary admits the reporting from China would not necessarily be favorable to the Red regime, what quid would they be getting for their quo? If this would be paying a price as the Secretary puts it, how do you get the prisoners released without paying any price? Nowhere in all the discussion has the humanitarian aspect been mentioned; what is the prisoners' attitude as they rot in their cells? Do their families have any say in all this?

If this would be yielding to blackmail, what did the United States Government do when it paid a ransom to the Hungarian Reds for the release of the American businessman, Robert Vogeler? In that one, the prisoner was prominent and had powerful friends who kept fierce pressures on the State Department until a deal was arranged. While we're on the subject, when does a diplomatic agreement represent respectable bargaining and when does it represent an unsavory deal?

"The Secretary said that if the prisoners are released he would then review the question of letting the reporters go in; but later he indicated they still wouldn't be allowed to go in because we don't recognize Red China; so the next question would be, then why was this matter of the prisoners ever brought into the argument at all?

"There would be other questions; how does the Secretary answer private legal opinions that his prohibition violates the first amendment? Would the Government be willing to have a judicial finding on the constitutional question of the American people's right to be informed about other parts of the world by their fellow Americans?

"Well, there would be lots of questions, and, no doubt lots of answers; under present handicaps both are intermittent and incomplete."

An interview that should be interesting, in view of the above, will take place Sunday on Mr. Sevareid's News Roundup at 3:30 p. m., WTOP—9. He will talk to William Worthy, the Baltimore Afro-American correspondent who went into Red China.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a broader, and a very able, discussion of the whole matter of denying the American people the right to know what goes on in the world, written by Mr. James Reston, chief correspondent of the New York Times, and published in that newspaper last Sunday, also be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### MR. DULLES ON THE PRESS AND VICE VERSA

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 8.—Secretary of State Dulles has started telling the American newspapers how to run their business, which is fair enough, since we are always trying to tell him how to run his.

The trouble is that, of all the good and valid arguments he could properly bring against the press, he has chosen the worst.

He has decreed, with the backing of the President, that American newspapers and magazines cannot send reporters to Communist China because (a) the Chinese Communists are wicked people who hold 10 Americans in jail and otherwise violate acceptable rules of international conduct; (b) the United States does not recognize Communist China and therefore cannot provide protection for reporters there; (c) the Communists are trying to hand-pick American reporters who will spout Communist propaganda; and (d) finally, the Communists are trying to "blackmail" the United States by holding the 10 Americans in jail until the reporters are permitted to go to China.

All this raises some interesting points. It is precisely because the Chinese Communists are wicked, because they are violating acceptable rules of international conduct and are therefore a menace to the security of the United States that the newspapers want to send reporters there to tell as much as they can about what is going on.

From Eve down through Al Capone and Colonel Nasser it has been the outlaws of the world who have been the most newsworthy. The American newspapers have correspondents in Moscow, not because the Soviets abide by acceptable rules of international conduct and treat Americans nice but because they don't. It is not the good who have to be watched but the wicked, not the law-abiding nations we have to form judgments about but the international ruffians, not the people we like who have to be "covered" but the ones that give us the scunners.

#### THE TRADITION OF SKEPTICISM

This is why the Founding Fathers, whom Mr. Dulles is so fond of quoting on other subjects, forbade the Congress in the first article of the Bill of Rights to pass any laws abridging the freedom of the press. For they believed that a free press would report honestly on the abuses of power that affected the rights and judgments of the people, whether by a group of scoundrels in Peiping or a Secretary of State in Washington.

Linking the right to report the news to the Government's policy of recognition is equally foreign to the American tradition. The United States did not recognize the Soviet Union from 1917 to 1933, but American reporters were there without official protection throughout this period, and produced some of the most brilliant and useful newspaper correspondence ever written in the English language.

Also, the State Department's argument that it is worrying about not being able to "protect" reporters in China is at least inconsistent. The Government was not able to "protect" the correspondents of this newspaper it permitted to go last year to Outer Mongolia, which we do not "recognize,"

or to Communist East Germany, where we have no official representatives. The papers have waived any claims of official "protection." And besides, the Government has even threatened to take action against any United States paper sending a Canadian reporter to Communist China, though it has no obligation for the protection of foreign nationals.

As to Mr. Dulles' charge that the Chinese Communists were trying to hand-pick the American correspondents they invited to China, this is at best a piece of misinformation, and at worst an impertinence.

THE "GULLIBLE" INKY WRETCHES

The correspondents invited include Cyrus Sulzberger and four others on this newspaper; Edward R. Murrow of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Marquis Childs of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and A. T. Steele of the New York Herald Tribune, not one of whom has been fooled very often by any official, including Mr. Dulles.

This myth of the gullible American reporter is as bogus as the myth of the gullible American diplomatic innocent abroad. If there is any solid tradition of American reporting it is the tradition of skepticism toward government pronouncements. Nobody in the world has added so much to this tradition of skepticism as the Communists, for they have lied to reporters more than other officials.

Finally, the most disturbing thing about this whole debate is Mr. Dulles' flat statement that he cannot permit reporters to go to Communist China because the Peiping regime has tried to make a deal with him to release the American prisoners in China, if he will let the reporters into China.

If true, this is the best offer from the Communists since the invention of vodka. The State Department, however, refuses to say where and when the offer was made. The Pentagon knows nothing about it. The Central Intelligence Agency—which incidentally has been pressing for years to get American correspondents into Communist China—never heard of it.

Meanwhile, Mr. Dulles is diverted once more from primary to secondary issues. Which is a pity, for he has a lot of other things to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Is there further morning business?

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

---

## THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on Friday, February 1, I took the floor of the Senate to point out the great dangers which would occur if the Israeli troops were compelled to withdraw from the Gaza Strip and from the positions commanding the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba and if Egyptian troops moved in to reoccupy those places. I pointed out that prior to October 29 of last year Egyptian troops had mounted their gun batteries on islands and on shore positions commanding the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba and had fired upon ships going into and coming out from that gulf; that if Egyptian troops went back again to the positions which they had occupied, we might be certain that once again their batteries, which had been temporarily put out of commission, would be reestablished, and that once again the Gulf of Aqaba would be closed to shipping.

I furthermore pointed out if this occurred we would not have the possibility of finding an alternative route for oil to move from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean without going through the Suez Canal. The importance of the Gulf of Aqaba lies in the fact that at its head is the small Israeli port of Elath, and that Israel could build one or more pipelines from Elath to a port on the Mediterranean, such as Haifa. If those pipelines are completed, and if entrance to the port of Aqaba is assured, then oil from the Persian Gulf can move into the Gulf of Aqaba, be pumped into the pipelines at Elath, be transported across Israeli territory via the pipelines, and then put into tankers at some Mediterranean port in Israel itself. Therefore, we would have, at best, a supplement, and, at worst, an alternative to the Suez Canal and to the pipelines which terminate in Syria.

As we all know, two of the pipelines in Syria have been blown up, namely, those connecting the oil of Iraq with the ports of Lebanon. Only the Saudi Arabian pipeline is now operating. Syria has indeed more or less served notice that she does not intend to repair these pipelines until some solution satisfactory to herself is arrived at in the Near East.

As we also know, at the moment the Suez Canal is blocked, and even though the physical obstructions will be removed, it is not at all certain that General Nasser will then permit ships of Britain and France and other nations to pass through the canal. In other words, with Syria in control of the transit of the three existing pipelines and with Egypt in military possession of the Suez Canal, power is given to the two most intransigent members of the Arab bloc to shut off the supply of oil going to Western Europe. In Colonel Nasser's book, which he published in 1953, shortly after he took power in Egypt by deposing General Naguib, he made it very clear that he recognized the great importance that Egypt holds in the control of the Suez Canal. He also made it clear that Egypt, by controlling passage through the canal, could exercise world power and control over the other nations of the world.

It is therefore in the interest of the free world that a pipeline from Elath to a Mediterranean port in Israel should be completed, because it would give us a bargaining weapon to use against both Syria and Egypt and an alternative to the control which those two countries would otherwise have. Yet such a pipeline would be completely valueless unless the Straits of Tiran, namely, the straits at the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba, were so neutralized that tankers could move in and out.

Mr. President, this is one of the grave issues now before the world, and immediately before the United Nations, and I wish to repeat most seriously that if Israel is compelled to move out from this position at the Straits of Tiran and there is no provision for immediate and permanent occupation of these straits by a United Nations police force, we may be quite certain that Egypt will move its troops into those prepared military positions and once again blockade the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba.

Mr. President, there is also involved in this question the matter of the Gaza Strip. That Strip, as we all know, is a small area, 6 miles wide and about 25 miles long, which extends from the Sinai Desert up into what was once known as Palestine. It was occupied by Egypt from the time of the hostilities in 1948 until October 29 of last year. While the blame for the hostilities which occurred in that area is mixed, and while Israel upon occasion did things which were aggressive, still it is also true that from March 1955 until late in October 1956 Egypt maintained a group of irregular guerrillas in the Gaza Strip, some 600 in number, who were used for informal raids into the territory of Israel, who attacked isolated farmhouses and small villages, and who killed from ambush large numbers of Israelis.

We can be quite certain, if the Gaza Strip once again goes into the military hands of Egypt, that the irregular guerrillas will once again be sponsored by that country, that the border raids will continue, that there will be great bloodshed; and it is quite conceivable that another war, with all its disastrous possibilities, may soon break out.

It therefore seemed to me absolutely imperative that the Gaza Strip be occupied by a police force of the United Nations immediately upon the withdrawal of the Israeli troops, and that this occupation be permanent, or at least permanent for a considerable period of time.

Ideally, there should also be a border strip of from 25 to 50 miles in the unoccupied Sinai Desert, facing the Israeli border, which could be internationalized and patrolled by helicopter. In other words, it is necessary that we not repeat the great mistake which was made in the case of the Suez Canal. I think it was correct that the British and the French should have withdrawn from the positions which they occupied; but, unfortunately, all that was done as a substitute was that the United Nations police force was used as a shield, occupying positions between the Egyptians to the south and the British and the French to the north, and when the British and the French withdrew, the United Nations police force withdrew from the canal, so that the entire control of the canal has now passed into Egyptian hands.

It is very significant, in this connection, that Secretary General Hammarskjold has consistently taken the position that the United Nations police force could operate within Egypt only with the consent of the Egyptian Government, and that therefore, in effect, unless Secretary General Hammarskjold reverses his ruling, Egypt has a veto power on any disposition of a United Nations force which is not directly ordered by the General Assembly.

As I say, this speech of mine was delivered on Friday, February 1, and it was done to influence if possible the attitude which the American delegate to the United Nations would take on the following Saturday, February 2, when this question came up before the United Nations.

I delivered it on that day, before the United Nations vote, because the President of the United States had complained that criticism of his foreign policy had not been constructive and had

followed, rather than led, events. I believe my speech was constructive and that had its substance been followed we would not now be facing such a crisis in the Middle East over the withdrawal of Israel and the threat of sanctions.

As we all know, two resolutions were passed by the United Nations at the instance of the United States. The first resolution, in direct and clear language, called upon Israel "to complete its withdrawal behind the armistice demarcation line without further delay." This was a statement that Israel must withdraw and had no qualification.

Then a very cloudy second resolution was passed at our instance, the exact meaning of which defies analysis or description. Vague and misty language was used, stating that—

After full withdrawal of Israel from the Sharm El Sheikh—

Which is the area controlling the Straits of Tiran—

and Gaza areas, scrupulous maintenance of the armistice agreement requires the placing of the United Nations Emergency Force on the Egyptian-Israeli armistice demarcation line and the implementation of other measures, as proposed in the Secretary General's report, with due regard to the considerations set out therein, with a view to assist in achieving situations conducive to the maintenance of peaceful conditions in the area.

That language reminds me of Talleyrand's remarks that language is a device to conceal thought. It is impossible to tell from this resolution what the United Nations proposes, and, in effect everything is turned over to the Secretary General.

In the 9 days which have followed since the passage of these resolutions, the situation has become more serious. Israel has announced that it is willing to withdraw its troops, provided it can have clear, explicit, and binding assurances that United Nations troops will replace her troops at these two spots, and that there will be United Nations occupation of these areas.

The Arab-Asian bloc is insisting that Israel must carry out to the letter, and without qualification, the first resolution, and withdraw its troops. The Arab-Asian bloc is saying that if Israel does not do this, the United Nations should enforce economic and financial sanctions against Israel. Whether military sanctions are involved in the proposal is not yet certain.

We are therefore moving into another very crucial decision on this point, and it seems to me that the United States Senate should make clear what its own position is. I have been greatly heartened by the numerous statements made on the floor of the Senate today by Members from both sides of the aisle, opposing the use of sanctions against Israel by the United States Government.

In the press conference which the President held last week, and in the press conference of the Secretary of State, it was implied that if the United Nations invoked sanctions against Israel, there was, at least, some tendency for the United States to "go along," as it was said, with the United Nations, and enforce sanctions of its own.

The speeches which have already been made on the floor today have attacked this proposal from the point of view of asking why we should impose sanctions on Israel when we have not imposed similar sanctions against Egypt, against the Russians in Hungary, and against India, all of which have been in violation of the decisions of the United Nations.

There was published in the New York Herald Tribune of this morning a very amusing letter, reminding us of a fable by LaFontaine, The Animals Smitten by the Plague. The letter reads as follows:

TODAY'S DONKEY

*To the New York Herald Tribune:*

I am constantly reminded these days of a fable by LaFontaine: Les Animaux Malades de la Peste (The Animals Smitten by the Plague).

In trying to find out who in the animal world might be responsible for this catastrophe viewed as a punishment from heaven, every animal at a special meeting had to confess its sins. The lion, the wolf, the tiger, the fox recited their murders, their lootings, their thefts. Finally, a miserable looking donkey came along and admitted that it had eaten a small tuft of grass in a meadow along the road because it was so hungry. Immediately all the others cried out: "Here is the culprit." They knocked him down and killed him. And LaFontaine concludes: When you are powerful the sentence of the court will make you white, when you are small it will make you black.

I wonder whether anybody could tell me who is today's donkey amongst nations.

B. ABRAHAM.

NEW YORK, *February 7, 1957.*

That is one way to deal with the question of our invoking sanctions; but I think a more important point is the question as to whether the attitude of Israel is reasonable, and whether the attitude of the Arab-Asian bloc is unreasonable. Which is in conformity with our national interests, and which is in closer conformity with the interests of the free world? I should like to make it clear again that all that Israel is proposing is that if she withdraws, these areas should be internationalized in their military aspects. This would seem to me to be an essentially reasonable point of view.

But Israel wants the assurances to be clear, precise, and binding before she withdraws her troops. In a very able article in this morning's New York Tribune, which I think probably can be taken as the semiofficial organ of this administration, Margaret Higgins says that—

We have assured Israel that it—

Namely, the United States—

will take the lead in insuring the right of innocent passage in the Gulf of Aqaba after Israel withdraws.

But the assurance is not to be given—if we can get it—until after the withdrawal has taken place. Secretary Hammarskjold, in his report to the United Nations this morning, has said that Egypt has reaffirmed privately its intent to observe fully the provisions of the 1949 armistice agreement.

In other words, Secretary Hammarskjold is saying that Egypt has given private assurances that she will not close the Suez Canal to Israeli ships and that she will not bar passage to the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli ships or the ships of any other nation. But I think that in view of all the past history, the State of Israel may be pardoned of it does not take these private assurances at face value. I do not wish to condemn Colonel Nasser, but I think our experience with him during the past years has been such that if we make an arrangement, it will be well to have it ironclad, completely tight, covering all points, and one which cannot be later disavowed.

So I hope that in the days to come we may insist upon a clear and definite guaranty that the Gaza Strip will not be again used as a basis for guerrilla operations against Israel, and that the Gulf of Aqaba and the Suez Canal may be opened to all traffic. I submit that the only real guaranty we can have in such matters is permanent occupation by a United Nations police force. No matter how the pledge may be given by Colonel Nasser, no reliance can be placed upon it if his troops are once there, and if he is once again in physical possession of these strategic areas. In any event, I see no harm and a great deal of good to be gained by requiring Colonel Nasser and the Egyptian Government to make a public pledge in advance of the evacuation by the Israeli troops. If he is willing to give a private pledge, why is he not willing to give a public pledge? I do not know how much the pledge would be worth, but at least it would have the advantage of being more definite and more precise, even though it might not be binding.

In any event, I believe there is a general feeling that in our desire to get the support of the Arab countries, what we may be doing is building them up for a further attack against Israel, instead of increasing their strength for resistance against Soviet Russia, and that the Eisenhower Doctrine may become perverted into promoting Arab supremacy and weakening the existence of Israel.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. We talk about Israel versus Egypt in this current situation. Is there not a more important frame of reference, as we might term it? Is there not a situation facing the whole commercial world and the world family of nations in which the point of view of the family of nations supersedes the interests of either Israel or Egypt?

If we approach the situation from that standpoint, should we not say that the United Nations force, augmented, if necessary, and extended in time, if necessary, should move in on the area above the Gulf of Aqaba and in the Gaza Strip, and along the eastern shore of the canal, and stay there until Egypt and Israel have straightened out their relations, to insure continued operations of the canal and the continued access by the ships of Israel and of other nations to the Gulf of Aqaba and through the canal? It seems to me that those interests supersede the interests of the two countries that we have been discussing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; I quite agree with the remarks of the Senator from Vermont. It is a point which I tried to stress. If I did not stress it enough,

I am very glad for the emphasis the Senator has given to it. The point is that oil is essential to the economy of Western Europe and to the free world as a whole; that as long as that oil can be shut off by Egypt or Syria at any moment, the economic and political life of the free world is in danger; that some means are necessary, from the standpoint of the free world, to provide an alternative route for the oil to reach the Mediterranean from the Persian Gulf; that a pipeline from Elath at the head of the Gulf of Aqaba to a Mediterranean port in Israel is such a possibility; and that in order to move the oil through that pipeline, the neutralization of the Straits of Tiran is a necessity. Therefore, the Western World cannot afford to go back to the status quo ante in those areas, because to do so would be putting ourselves once again in the hands of Nasser and the Egyptian-Syrian group, with results which would be disastrous to the free world. I thank the Senator from Vermont for emphasizing that fact.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I might say that personally I do not feel—and I do not feel it is necessary to feel—that the relationships between Israel and the Arab World have all been onesided.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no.

Mr. FLANDERS. They have not been one sided, one way or the other.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I might say at this point that I tried to make that clear in my remarks. I think that on several occasions Israel has been provocative in the raids which it has made. The raid that was made in February 1955, on Gaza and also certain raids which were made by Israel prior to October 29, 1956, were improper. Prime Minister Ben-Gurion has apologized for one of them. I am not saying that the fault is on one side alone. I do say that from March 1955 on Egypt carried on systematic raids from the Gaza Strip into Israel. Therefore, if she once again gets military possession of that area, I feel that we can be perfectly certain that those raids will start again. In the interest of the peace of the world, that vantage point for hostilities should be neutralized.

Mr. FLANDERS. In the interests of the family of nations, I hope we can hold the balance even as between the two countries, and insist that arrangements be made and that those arrangements assure the flow of oil.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I like very much what the Senator from Illinois has said on this point. I believe it is true that the problem we face is a juridical one: Can the United Nations order its troops to stay on Egyptian soil against the insistence of Egypt that it leave? That is the danger. We must be either prepared to undertake it, in the way of leadership, as our colleague from Minnesota said this morning, and for the United States to lead in the determination that the United Nations will assert that kind of power, or we will have to fill the vacuum.

Hence, I respectfully submit to the Senator from Illinois that we must even face the possibility of a naval patrol through the Gulf of Aqaba to secure international navigation.

This is a policy which goes back to the early 19th century, so far as our country is concerned. In short, if we are to be powerless in this situation, and if we are lost in our own semantics and in a question of legalities then we are lost indeed. I submit that to the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator's suggestion of a naval patrol in the Straits of Tiran and in the Gulf of Aqaba is a very constructive one. It would involve less danger of involving us in a general war than would military action. However, I believe that we should first try to get the United Nations to act in a constructive way upon this matter. Personally I do not believe that there is much substance to the attitude of the administration and of Secretary Dulles that we will merely follow the lead of the United Nations. The question is, what will we do in the United Nations, and what is going to be our policy there? To be perfectly passive and to say that we will do everything the United Nations want us to do, without trying to influence the decisions of the United Nations, means, to my mind, an abject surrender.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I wonder whether the Senator from Illinois would yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from New York to clarify a certain point.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. FLANDERS. Would the Senator from New York extend his doubts as to the occupation of the Sinai Peninsula by the United Nations force to the action already taken? Does the Senator doubt the legality of that action already taken?

Mr. JAVITS. I believe that the idea that the United Nations will go into a country's territory, in order to maintain the peace of the world, will have to be established as a juridical fact. I was merely pointing out that we have to think of two alternatives if we are to be effective. I emphasize again that if we are going to be lost in juridical arguments, we will have to find other ways to do it. Otherwise we may lose the confidence of the free world, aside from being embroiled in this situation.

Mr. FLANDERS. Opening up the Gulf of Aqaba and keeping it open with naval action does not solve the canal problem, of course.

Mr. JAVITS. No; it does not.

Mr. FLANDERS. I do not know whether those two pipelines from the head of the Gulf of Aqaba to the coast have been completed.

Mr. JAVITS. I have physically seen the area. There is a small pipeline under construction from Elath to a Mediterranean port.

Mr. FLANDERS. As I understand, it is a small, 6-inch pipeline.

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct.

Mr. FLANDERS. Have the pumps been completed?

Mr. JAVITS. No; the construction is in its early stages. In fact, the port of Elath has been kept in a rather primitive state, because of the fact that it has been bottled up for so long. This whole area urgently needs this kind of constructive approach in order to be responsive to the kind of development that the Senator from Illinois is speaking about.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I believe this completes what I have to say on this subject. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, the text of the two resolutions adopted by the United Nations on February 2 and 3 of this year; an editorial published in the Philadelphia Inquirer, entitled "One Standard For All In the U. N."; an editorial published in this morning's Washington Post entitled "Israel's Defiance; Cause and Effect"; an editorial published in the Lynchburg News entitled "Israel's Position"; a letter to the editor of the New York Times under date of February 11, 1957, written by Frank Altschul; and the article written by Margaret Higgins and published in the New York Herald Tribune, which summarizes what she understands to be the administration's position.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y., February 1.—Following are the texts of two resolutions on the situation in the Middle East presented to the General Assembly today:

"RESOLUTION 1

"The General Assembly, recalling its Resolutions 997 (ES–I) of November 2, 1956, 998 (ES–I) and 999 (ES–I) of November 4, 1956, 1002 (ES–I) of November 7, 1956, A/RES/410 of November 24, 1956, and A/RES/453 of January 19, 1957—

"(1) Deplores the noncompliance of Israel to complete its withdrawal behind the demarcation line, despite the repeated requests of the General Assembly;

"(2) Calls upon Israel to complete its withdrawal behind the armistice demarcation line without further delay.

"RESOLUTION 2

"The General Assembly having received the report of the Secretary General of January 24, 1957 (A/3512), recognizing that withdrawal must be followed by action which would assure progress toward the creation of peaceful conditions—

"(1) Notes with appreciation the Secretary General's report and the measures therein to be carried out upon Israel's complete withdrawal;

"(2) Calls upon the Governments of Egypt and Israel scrupulously to observe the provisions of the 1949 armistice agreement;

"(3) Considers that, after full withdrawal of Israel from the Sharm el Sheikh and Gaza areas, the scrupulous maintenance of the armistice agreement requires the placing of the United Nations Emergency Force on the Egyptian-Israeli armistice demarcation line and the implementation of other measures as proposed in the Secretary General's report, with due regard to the considerations set out therein with a view to assist in achieving situations conducive to the maintenance of peaceful conditions in the area;

"(4) Requests the Secretary General, in consultation with the parties concerned, to take steps to carry out these measures and to report, as appropriate, to the General Assembly."

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 11, 1957]

ONE STANDARD FOR ALL IN U. N.

When it begins debate today on a proposed resolution calling for sanctions against Israel, the United Nations will have reached a critical point not only in the effort to restore peace to the Middle East, but in the development of the U. N. itself.

For the U. N. has to decide much more than whether voting sanctions against Israel is the best way to persuade Israel to withdraw from the Gaza Strip and the Sinai Peninsula territory of Sharm el Sheikh.

The nations pushing for sanctions against Israel have to decide whether the U. N. is to adopt a double standard of international morality—one for the weak, another for the strong. That question is behind the growing protest in Congress against any one-sided judgment of Israel.

There is backing—in theory—for the stand that Israel ought to withdraw her remaining troops from the disputed territory. That is what the U. N. General Assembly ordered, and if the U. N. is to mean anything, its orders ought to be obeyed.

But there is also abundant practical backing for Israel's refusal to withdraw unless there are U. N. guaranties that Egypt, as well as Israel, will be restrained from launching new aggression.

The Gaza Strip was the main base for the border raids from Egypt which brought on the combined Israel-British-French invasion of the Sinai Peninsula last fall. Sharm el Sheikh has been the base for Egypt's blockade of Israel's port of Elath.

If these small but vital pieces of territory are given to Egypt—without any U. N. guaranties—the situation in the Mid-East will return to what it was before the drive on Suez. And Egypt will be in a position to resume border raids, and to deny Israeli ships passage through the Suez Canal.

But what the U. N. ought not to forget, as it debates this crucial matter, is that Egypt has persistently violated U. N. resolutions—and nothing was done about it. Moreover, it was Egypt's breach of the 1949 armistice terms that touched off the latest conflict.

It would be bad enough now for the U. N. to apply one rigid standard to Israel, and another weak and yielding standard to Egypt. That might achieve the immediate purpose of penalizing Israel; the long-range results could easily include the resumption of war.

Far worse would be for the U. N. to forget other occasions when U. N. decisions have been ignored—by some of the very nations now pressing so vigorously for sanctions against Israel.

Only last month, the U. N. Security Council again ordered a plebiscite to determine the future of Kashmir. India has flouted that order—and there have been no sanctions.

Last fall, the U. N. General Assembly recommended that Soviet troops be withdrawn from Hungary. The troops stayed, crushing the Hungarian revolt in murderous fashion—and the U. N. ordered no sanctions.

Also last fall the Assembly tried to send neutral observers into Hungary. The Soviet-created puppet government refused to let them in—and no sanctions resulted.

Israel is a new, small, and relatively weak nation, surrounded by hostile ones. Economic sanctions would strike a heavy blow at her, since Israel is heavily dependent on foreign assistance. There's little chance that economic sanctions would fail to force Israel to withdraw.

But if the U. N. sinks into the immorality of a double standard—get tough with the weak, but let the strong flout international opinion—it will be a grievous, perhaps fatal, setback for justice. More than Israel is being judged in this debate on sanctions; the U. N. also will be rendering judgment on itself.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 11, 1957]

ISRAEL'S DEFIANCE: CAUSE AND EFFECT

Members of the United Nations have failed in their responsibility toward Israel. The General Assembly is rightly insisting that Israel withdraw her troops behind her borders, but the same Assembly has done nothing to deter Egypt from renewing the undeclared war that provoked the Israeli attack in the first place. That is the real explanation of Israel's defiance. In the circumstances a U. N. vote for sanctions against Israel would be hypocrisy. It is past time for the United States to assert itself so as to avoid such a travesty.

There is no need to condone Israel's defiance of the General Assembly. It is true that Russia has defied the Assembly on Hungary; India has defied the Security Council on Kashmir; and Egypt has defied the Security Council in respect of Israeli shipping in the Suez Canal. The U. N. has been either unwilling or powerless to force observance of its resolutions by larger nations, some of which are sanctimoniously demanding penalties against Israel. Nevertheless, even a collection of wrongs does not make a right, and the refusal of the Ben-Gurion government to comply with the troop withdrawal request should not be encouraged.

But if repeated defiance can destroy respect for the U. N., failure to grapple with realities also can debilitate the effectiveness of the international organization. The present defiance has been invited, indeed made inevitable, by the one-sided view which U. N. members collectively have taken of the Israeli-Egyptian conflict. There has been no security in this area, largely because of the indifference of U. N. members (including the United States), and a narrow and puristic attitude toward Israeli aggression now is decidedly out of place.

The plain fact is that the 1949 armistice between Egypt and Israel has been dishonored from the day it was signed. Egypt proclaimed her continued belligerency; she occupied Saudi Arabian islands in the Gulf of Aqaba so as to blockade Israeli shipping; she denied Israel access to the Suez Canal despite a Security Council resolution; and she unleashed countless raids into Israeli territory by fedayeen gangs. U. N. truce teams could do little to halt the incursions, and the General Assembly apparently was not interested. The 1950 tripartite declaration by Britain, France, and the United States proved weak and ineffective against these provocations. It would require extraordinary mental blinders to think that Israel began the crisis when she struck back last October, however mistaken her action was.

This does not mean that there have been no provocations on the Israeli side, or that the present course of the Ben-Gurion government is unassailable. Israel is wrong, in this newspaper's judgment, in demanding the right to administer the Gaza strip. She could do a great deal more to conciliate the Arab States by offering to absorb some of the Arab refugees. Israel cannot remain forever an island in a hostile sea; she herself has a responsibility to promote reconciliation with her neighbors. Moreover, she has a particular responsibility to respect the United Nations, to which she owes her existence.

Obviously Israeli troops must be withdrawn from Egyptian territory, and obviously Israel cannot expect to exact formal conditions for compliance with the U. N. resolution. But to say this without qualification is to beg the question. Israel knows that economic sanctions would injure her cruelly, especially if the United States should apply them. She is gambling that they will not be pressed, and her defiance is a measure of her desperation. Israel is the child of the United Nations, and she has a right to look to the U. N. to protect her basic security.

How then can this security be protected and an Israeli troop withdrawal accomplished without resort to sanctions? Moralizing from the administration is unlikely to prevail Israeli desperation. A statement from Colonel Nasser that Egypt would not renew her belligerency—which American sources are said to be seeking—unquestionably would help, but it scarcely would suffice. What is required is a clear statement from the United States that this country will undertake to guarantee the Israeli-Egyptian border and Israeli navigation rights through the U. N., if possible, but independently, if necessary. There need be nothing provocative in such a statement, and it can apply equally to both sides.

Simultaneously, it is necessary to avoid the imposition of sanctions—and the Arab-Asian resolution comes up for discussion today. The United States and like-minded countries have the power to stop any such resolution in the Assembly if they wish. To do so, however, the administration will have to avoid any spasm of self-righteousness and put aside any infatuation with its newly purchased popularity among the Arabs so as to provide realistic leadership.

The next task, in the assumption that Israel will comply, will be to move toward strict enforcement of the 1949 armistice. This would mean far more than a return to the status quo before the recent fighting; it would mean an end to Egypt's belligerency and a halt to fedayeen raids, as well as unimpeded Israeli transit in the Gulf of Aqaba and access to the Suez Canal. Vague as it is, the second U. N. resolution looks toward such a step, and that is Secretary General Hammarskjold's objective.

Under such a plan troops of the United Nations Emergency Force would be stationed along both sides of the border in the Aqaba area as well as in the Gaza Strip. Unquestionably there will be some difficulties because of conflicting interpretations of the resolution; moreover, some countries which have supplied troops to the U. N. force have limited their use. But U. N. members cannot legitimately object to enforcement of the 1949 armistice which the U. N. itself arranged. American leadership can help clarify the intent of the resolution so as to give Mr. Hammarskjold the leeway and guidance he needs.

Beyond this there remains the question of political settlement. That now seems far off, but in the interim the U. N. ought to concern itself with promoting the stability that may make a settlement possible. If the armistice can be enforced, then it may be possible to look toward the creation of a permanent buffer zone, perhaps by U. N. purchase, as well as the recruitment of a permanent U. N. police force.

In all of this a positive role on the part of the United States is paramount. So far the administration has been content to act very largely through and along with others; and its efforts at fairness toward both sides have been praiseworthy. But it would be a tragic blunder to think that in order to respect the principles of the United Nations the United States must always defer to the opinions of others in the Assembly without asserting its own leadership. That path leads to a dead end. The world is looking to the United States to have the courage of its convictions, and nothing could be more disappointing than for the administration to delude itself with the notion that all action in the U. N. must be reduced to the lowest common denominator.

---

[From The Lynchburg (Va.) News of February 11, 1957]

ISRAEL'S POSITION

Israel has a strong case in demanding assurances that Egypt will not renew attacks once the Israeli troops have pulled out. Her position is natural. Unfortunately, Israel

is in no position to make conditions before withdrawing. She was the aggressor and as such she is now being constrained to obey the resolution of the United Nations. Egypt, as the aggrieved party, is able to take refuge behind the United Nations as if she were entirely innocent, which is far from being the case. She was for years in contempt of the United Nations resolution to the effect that she should not interfere with Israeli shipping in the Suez Canal. Nothing could throw a clearer light on the paradoxical situation in which the United Nations and the parties to the present dispute find themselves. Why, if the resolutions of the United Nations are to be taken so seriously, have they not been so taken in the past? What has happened to lead us to attach such importance to them? How does anyone know, much less the Israelis, that after they have carried out the terms of the resolution and withdrawn their forces the Egyptians will not go on doing the same things they have always done?

The difference is that the United States has decided to work through the United Nations. Everything is now staked on our ability to make these resolutions mean something. So far we have been able to line up an overwhelming vote in favor of forcing the Israelis out. But the real test will come when that happens, if it does happen. When the Egyptians get back where they were and start their same old tricks again, what then? A United Nations resolution, no doubt, but hardly with such an overwhelming majority. And perhaps enforceable if they ignore it. There may be some hope in the negotiations going on between influential Arab personalities and our Government. The evident object is to reduce the importance of Nasser. But he has captured the imagination of the Arab masses, a fact which gives individual Arab rulers considerable pause. And the United Nations? Russia is in contempt, Hungary is in contempt, India is in contempt, Israel is in contempt, Egypt is in contempt. The position of Israel is understandable under the circumstances even if not wholly justifiable. She wants something more solid in the way of security than blind faith in action by the United Nations after she has withdrawn from the conquered territory.

---

[From the New York Times of February 11, 1957]

ISRAEL'S STAND ON GAZA—QUESTION RAISED AS TO WHETHER U. N. VOTES REPRESENT PUBLIC OPINION

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

At his last press conference, President Eisenhower, confirming a view previously voiced by Secretary Dulles, expressed the belief that Israel would withdraw her forces still remaining in Egypt because "Israel has what our declaration calls a decent respect to the opinions of mankind."

I would assume, as does the President, that the Government of the State of Israel would be profoundly influenced by this consideration. But the question left unanswered is whether even a practically unanimous vote of the General Assembly can reasonably be interpreted as a clear indication of the "opinions of mankind." May I suggest that this would be a totally unwarranted conclusion.

In the General Assembly the representatives of 80 nations cast their votes in accordance with instructions received from their governments. But the decisions of governments are arrived at in the light of a number of factors, the least important of which, in many instances, obviously is the opinion of the vast populations for which they presume to speak.

COMMUNIST VOTES

In the case of the Communist bloc, for example, where free and open debate as we know it is nonexistent, it could hardly be seriously argued that their votes in the General Assembly represent in any manner the reflection of a consensus of individual opinions. Similarly, though conditions vary widely from country to country, it could hardly be seriously argued that the votes of the Bandung powers are fully representative of such a consensus.

According to the latest estimates, the world population, excluding Communist China, is approximately 2,087 million. Of these, 300 million live under the domination of the Soviet Union and 900 million live within the Bandung powers. From this the conclusion seems inescapable that the so-called "opinions of mankind" remain unexpressed by not far from 60 percent of the world population represented in the United Nations.

And what of the free world? Here, too, the decisions of governments are affected by a number of considerations and can hardly be construed in each instance as reflecting the views of a constituency that has never been consulted on the specific issue involved.

In the case of our own country, where the Anglo-Saxon spirit of fair play exercises such a profound influence, I doubt very much whether public opinion, if consulted, would have supported the unqualified denunciation of the State of Israel as an aggressor if the intense provocation under which she had acted had been as graphically underscored in the presentation as the act of aggression itself.

EGYPT'S ACTS

For let us remember that Egypt has illegally denied the Suez Canal to the passage of Israeli shipping, that it has illegally blockaded the Gulf of Aqaba, that it has launched on innumerable occasions murderous attacks of the fedayeen on innocent men, women and children across the armistice lines, that it has stimulated similar attacks from the Jordanian and Syrian frontiers, that over the Cairo radio it has proclaimed day in and day out its dedication to the destruction of the State of Israel, and that it has made extensive purchases of military materiel from the Communist bloc in preparation for the accomplishment of this end.

The Government of Israel has taken the position that, in spite of the vote of the General Assembly, it is unwilling to withdraw its troops from the Gaza Strip and from the approaches to Elath on the Gulf of Aqaba until it has received satisfactory assurances that Egypt will not revert to the program of calculated aggressions which she has heretofore attempted to justify as the exercise of her "belligerent rights."

We must all hope that the negotiations in which the Secretary General is presently engaged may result in overcoming the existing impasse. But, failing this, should the State of Israel feel impelled to persist in its stand would it not under all the circumstances be unrealistic as well as unfair to suggest that she was in any way flying in the face of "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind?"

FRANK ALTSCHUL,
*Vice President,*
*Council on Foreign Relations.*

NEW YORK, *February 7, 1957.*

---

AFTER KING SAUD, THE DELUGE?

(By Marguerite Higgins)

Whirling dervishes of olden times were never busier than the top American officials coping these days with Mideast affairs. When the fabled King Saud, whose introduction to oil and the 20th century is less than a decade old, swept regally out of Washington Saturday, there was not even time for the hardworking officials to savour briefly the very real accomplishments of the Saudi-United States negotiations. For they were deeply embroiled in the new crisis boiling to a head this week concerning Israel's refusal to withdraw to the 1949 armistice lines until it has ironclad Egyptian guaranties of nonbelligerency in the Gulf of Aqaba.

Quite apart from the fact that the crisis could overshadow and party nullify some of the brand new gains in American-Arab friendship, the hard fact is being faced in Washington that if worst comes to worst the deadlock in the Gulf of Aqaba and the Gaza Strip could lead to another Mideast war and all the awful implications that more hostilities bespeak.

No matter what happens the crisis is going to be a whopper involving, if it comes to sanctions against Israel, possibly the greatest political storm this administration has ever faced. No wonder Mr. Dulles passed all weekend huddled in urgent conferences with his chief advisors.

Both President Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles have reason to be thankful to King Saud for leaving a legacy that will help the United States in grappling with the problem—and in this case any contribution will be most welcome.

This legacy consists, first, of King Saud's pledge in the joint communique with President Eisenhower to oppose the use of force "from any source" as a means of settling international disputes. This, in Washington eyes, is assurance against use of Saudi Arabian arms or resources to attack Israel. In turn this attitude on the part of Saudi Arabia should have, it is felt here, an important influence on King Saud's Mideast allies, including Egypt.

Secondly the King has pledged himself to try to improve general Arab-American relations—an event that would deprive the Communists of many opportunities for mischief making.

Fine as all this is, it is subsidiary to the immediate problem. What President Eisenhower and Secretary of Dulles were urgently seeking to avoid this weekend was a squeeze play whereby this country is forced to choose between Israel and the United Nations. If this choice is forced upon us at this time and in this issue the United States will most certainly have to choose the United Nations.

Quite apart from the fact that the United States wants to maintain—not tear down—Israel's economic prosperity, the administration believes that sanctions are a negative, frequently ineffective approach that do not contribute to any real solution. The United States recognizes that Israel has many just grievances against the Arab states. We would be happy if Israel could get ironclad guaranties of free shipping in the Gulf of Aqaba prior to getting her troops out of Egypt's Sinai Peninsula.

But it is also our official conviction that Israel under present world attitudes and conditions cannot obtain guaranties of nonbelligerency while she herself is exercising belligerency by keeping troops in Egypt.

A hard look at the alternatives to an Israeli withdrawal has convinced this country that they are not only against the best interests of the United States and Western Europe but above all of Israel herself.

The alarm in Washington over Israel's failure to withdraw stems from an appreciation of one central economic fact: That the Arab world by virtue of its oil has in the next few years at least more weapons to use against the West, particularly Britain and France, than vice versa. To illustrate: Syria, which sabotaged the important Iraq pipeline, broke off repair talks and has threatened to blow the remaining tap pipeline from Saudi Arabia if Israel stays in Egypt. We think she means it. King Saud has made plain that Israel's failure to withdraw could mean an extended oil boycott of Britain and France (because the Arabs accuse the British and particularly the French of having planned and executed the attack jointly with Israel).

Among the questions raised here are: Can Britain and France exist indefinitely with oil from the Mideast at a mere trickle? Can

they sustain indefinitely the dollar outlays necessary to obtain the oil from the Western Hemisphere (already far less than needed)? Is the United States prepared indefinitely to make available loans of about a billion a year to make possible West European importation of oil from this hemisphere?

What would happen to Israel's relations with Western Europe if they were compelled over a long period to suffer hardships on her account?

And, if it should come to sanctions in the United Nations, what if America stood aloof? King Saud, for one, bluntly told Mr. Eisenhower that if America stood aside from U. N. efforts to enforce Israel compliance the President might as well discard the Eisenhower doctrine because neither it nor all of America's dollars could thereafter buy Arab confidence. Such abstention, the King warned, would be taken as proof of a policy of discrimination.

The United States has assured Israel that it will take the lead in insuring the right of innocent passage in the Gulf of Aqaba after Israel withdraws. Additionally the U. N. Secretary General has indicated that the way will be open for United Nations action to enforce nonbelligenrency once the legal way is cleared by Israel's own adherence to the U. N. resolutions. Nearly everyone in authority at the U. N. has made plain that the aim is not a return to the status quo ante (in which the 1949 armistice was constantly violated) but to the legal status quo (in which the armistice is lived up to). The armistice itself provides expressions of nonbelligerency by land, sea, or air of either party and according to the Secretary General can be brought into being again as soon as Israel gets behind the armistice demarcation lines.

What the United States is doing is asking Israel to take as an act of faith this country's determination to use its full influence, that of its allies and new-found friends in the U. N. to guarantee Israel rights in Aqaba and along the armistice lines. Let us say that it is less than Israel wants or even deserves. But is it worse than the deluge of global troubles that otherwise threaten? Does anyone, including Israel, think Aqaba is worth the risk of another war?

---

## REFUSAL BY STATE DEPARTMENT OF PASSPORTS FOR TRAVEL TO COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday I announced that I was deeply concerned about the State Department's refusal to allow American reporters to obtain passports for travel to Communist China. I have been heartened by the protest which widely respected American newspaper and magazine publishers have made in the fact of the obstinacy of the State Department on this question. I ask unanimous consent that the text of a press release which I issued yesterday on this subject be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HUMPHREY ASKS PROBE OF DULLES PASSPORT DENIALS TO RED CHINA

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, today protested the continued refusal of the State Department to allow skilled, patriotic, American reporters to obtain passports for travel to Communist China. The Minnesota Senator complimented those well-known and respected American newspaper and magazine publishers who have stood up for freedom of inquiry by opposing this State Department edict.

Terming the State Department's ban on newsmen's passports for Communist China "an unwarranted abuse of the right to travel and an intolerable interference with the right to read," Senator HUMPHREY announced his intention to seek a public hearing on the matter before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee following completion of work on the Middle East resolution. HUMPHREY stated:

"On January 5 I said that I considered the State Department's action to be 'incredibly shortsighted' in barring American newsmen from Red China," Senator HUMPHREY stated. "In their press conference this week, President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles have confounded the confusion which previously existed. The Secretary of State has indeed added insult to injury by his gratuitous reflections on the seriousness and honesty of any American correspondent who would go to Communist China.

"The shoe ought really to be on the other foot, however," the Minnesota Senator continued. "On several critical counts the honesty of the State Department's own position has now been called into question.

"Contrary to what Mr. Dulles has said, it apparently is not true that the Communist regime has picked the correspondents it will permit to come to China. Contrary to what Mr. Dulles used to say, it apparently is not true that our reason for banning newsmen's passports for Red China is our policy of nonrecognition of the Peking regime. Contrary to what Mr. Dulles now says is our reason, the right to travel does not suddenly become dispensable, alienable, or an instrument of blackmail when Communist regimes suddenly reverse themselves and decide to welcome visitors.

"In 1949 the State Department condemned Peking for interfering with the free reporting of American reporters in China. The right to know, as best we can, what was going on in China was then considered in the national interest of the United States, just as it has been considered in our national interest for some time to have American newsmen in Moscow. I cannot believe that our national interest has somehow suddenly been reversed merely because the Chinese Communists have changed their own minds and now encourage reporters to come.

"The logical inconsistencies, the rigid determination not to admit mistakes, the reiterated irrelevancies, and the frustrating self-righteousness of Mr. Dulles' well-known positions on other foreign policy issues have been repeated on this passport question. If his sessions with the Foreign Relations Committee on the Eisenhower doctrine have helped to clarify his thinking, the Secretary might derive equal benefit from another hearing with the committee on the passport issue.

"The courage, resourcefulness, accuracy, and responsibility of American newsmen ought to be trusted by their own Government at least to the degree they are trusted by Mao Tse-tung.

"Unless it is afraid of the truth, even the State Department might benefit from the columns some of these correspondents send home."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the press conferences last week by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles were only the latest in a series of confused official statements on this issue. Already on January 5, 1957, I had called public attention to the inconsistencies of the State Department's position. I ask unanimous consent that a press release which I issued on that date be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HUMPHREY UPHOLDS FREEDOM OF INQUIRY RIGHT OF AMERICAN NEWSMEN

Freedom of the press requires freedom of inquiry, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, declared yesterday in upholding the right of American newsmen to "seek out the truth wherever they can find it."

Senator HUMPHREY criticized action of the State Department in barring American newsmen from Red China as "incredibly shortsighted."

"Qualified, recognized American newsmen should be encouraged rather than discouraged from going to any part of the world to bring us unbiased information," Senator HUMPHREY declared.

"If freedom of the press is to have any real meaning, there must be no barriers to freedom of inquiry.

"I fail to see any justification for a policy that permits American newsmen to be stationed in Moscow, but refuses to allow them to go into Red China. Why should we depend on Radio Peiping for our information on Red China? If our news correspondents for press, radio, or television have the courage and enterprise and resourcefulness to want to risk hardships to bring desperately needed unbiased information to the American people from behind shutout areas of the world, we ought to be helping smooth the way for them, not adding roadblocks. If the Chinese are willing to accept them, it seems incredibly shortsighted for our State Department to deny them the opportunity to crack the Bamboo Curtain."

Senator HUMPHREY revealed he had urged the Secretary of State to reconsider the State Department decision on visas for newspapermen wishing to go to Red China as "contrary to the best interests of an informed American people, which in turn is in the best interest of a sound foreign policy."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the light of this long-standing controversy, I think it is important that last week's developments be carefully reviewed by my colleagues. As an up-to-date summary of these developments, I ask unanimous consent that four articles which appeared last week in the New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, and the Washington Post and Times Herald be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 6, 1957]

DULLES SAYS PEIPING OFFERS CAPTIVE DEAL IF UNITED STATES NEWSMEN GO

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 5.—Communist China is trying to make a deal under which it would release the 10 Americans imprisoned there if the United States would allow news reporters to visit that country, Secretary of State Dulles said today.

"We have so far refused to make that deal," Mr. Dulles said at a news conference.

The Secretary of State said the administration's policy on this question was in no way dictated by a desire to withhold from the American people any information about Communist China. He implied that he could get the American civilians released if he would approve applications by United States publications to send their reporters to Communist China.

He declined to approve the arrangement, on the ground that it would be submission to Communist blackmail.

QUESTION AT ISSUE SOME TIME

This has been a matter of controversy not only between Washington and Peiping but between the administration and some United States newspapers and magazines for more than 2 years. The administration originally refused to permit United States reporters to go to Red China before the question was linked with the 10 imprisoned Americans on the ground that the United States had no officials in that country and could not protect American reporters if they went to mainland China.

Not until today, however, had the Secretary of State said—though he offered no evidence in support of his statement—that the Communists had made the release of the imprisoned United States civilians contingent on permitted American reporters to enter Communist China.

"The Chinese Government has for some time been trying to get reporters—preferably those it picked—to come into Communist China and it has repeatedly tried to use the illegal detention of Americans in Communist China as a means of pressure to accomplish its ends in that respect," Mr. Dulles said.

At another point in the conference the Secretary of State made clear that while the Peiping Government was trying to handpick the United States correspondents it wished to invite, he did not think that the reports sent back to the United States by these writers would be partial to Communistic China.

"We do not think that it is sound philosophy to permit other governments, other regimes, to feel that it is profitable business for them to withhold and detain illegally and throw into jail American citizens, so they can put a price on their release," the Secretary of State added.

"If we allow that to happen in one case, then I think the safety of all Americans throughout the world is lowered by several degrees for a long time in the future."

PROTESTS IN UNITED STATES RECALLED

Mr. Dulles said that if the Americans were released, the administration would then take a new look at the situation, but he added with considerable heat: "That kind of blackmail I don't propose to satisfy."

This is a new angle on an old controversy. Heretofore, the State Department has been criticized for withholding permission to reporters as an instrument of United States policy in Communist China.

Some publications have protested against this on the ground that it is the duty of the American press to report the news, regardless of personal danger to its reporters, if that news is important to the American people.

On this ground some United States newspapers and magazines have protested that the State Department was using this issue to try to get the Chinese Communists to do what the State Department wanted them to do.

Now Mr. Dulles is saying for the first time that the situation is precisely the opposite, namely, that the Chinese Communists—not the State Department—are trying to use the American correspondents as an instrument of Communist diplomacy.

In any event, regardless of who is using this issue for diplomatic purposes, Mr. Dulles made it clear that he would not even review the question until the Communists released the 10 civilians. And even if they did, he still raised the question of whether United States reporters would receive a passport to report the news in that country.

"I do not think under any circumstances that so long as the present state of semiwar prevails and we do not recognize that regime that we would issue a passport valid for Communist China," Mr. Dulles told one questioner.

"Now, then, you get into all sorts of refinements, however, as to whether or not a correspondent wishes to go without claiming the protection from the United States Government," he added. "The issuance of passports to a regime which is not recognized is something which is never done."

SOME OFFER TO WAIVE CLAIM

Some newspapers have offered to waive any claim for the protection of the Government for their reporters if they can get assurance that it would not be a legal offense to go to Red China to report the news.

Three reporters have gone to the Chinese mainland in spite of the present threats of legal action by the United States Government against them. They are William Worthy, of the Baltimore Afro-American, and Edmund Stevens and Phillip Harrington, of Look magazine. All three have now left China.

Mr. Dulles was asked whether the United States Government intended to take legal action against those who had gone to Communist China without a passport. He replied that this was now under study.

---

[From the Christian Science Monitor of February 6, 1957]

DULLES BARS BARTER DEAL FOR PRISONERS IN CHINA

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—American newsmen—some at least—want to visit Communist China. Should the United States help them to do so?

There are more angles to this seemingly simple issue than to the Pentagon; and some were partially clarified this week in a running exchange between Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and members of the press at his press conference—the first in nearly 2 months.

DULLES' VIEWS STAND

However, the next day when the President was thrown the same question he hedged, saying he would have to talk to Mr. Dulles first, but by his very hesitation suggesting that maybe there was something new in the picture—at least to him. His only guarded observation was that this "quid pro quo" thing was new, but the Chinese Communists still must carry out their promises first.

Thus Secretary Dulles' comments still stand as official American policy on this matter—until either he or the President amends them.

The Secretary asserted he never will make a deal with Peiping permitting United States newsmen to enter Communist China in return for the release of 10 Americans still imprisoned in that country. That is blackmail, the Secretary said, and "I don't propose to pay it." Yet that is what Peiping has proposed, he added.

THREE CASES CITED

But what if newsmen want to go and are prepared to waive United States protection while there? Will the United States give them passports permitting such travel? Here again the secretary was firm: "We don't issue passports to regimes we don't recognize," he said, so obviously, he continued, the United States could not provide passports while it continued to deny recognition of Red China.

What, then, about newsmen going without passports and without United States permission? Could they do that without fear of United States legal action against them after getting out? On this point the Secretary was not sure. We would have to study the matter, he suggested.

The last point is timely, for three United States newsmen have been in and out of Communist China in recent weeks without United States passports and without United States permission. They are William Worthy of the Baltimore Afro-American Press, and Edmund Stevens and Phillip Harrington of Look magazine. Mr. Dulles' reply on the last point did not close off the possibility that the United States might take legal action against these three when and if they return to the United States. (They are in other foreign countries at the moment.) At least there is no decision to date that the United States won't act, even though Mr. Dulles has not said definitely that it would.

PEIPING VIEW STATED

But Mr. Dulles' major objection to any present arrangement for getting United States newsmen into Communist China is that Peiping has made it part of a quid pro quo—and the United States will not touch it as such. It is the Red Chinese, Mr. Dulles says, who have tied the 10 United States prisoners in China to visits by United States newsmen, and, he continued, "I don't believe the bodies of American citizens ought to be made a subject for that kind of barter."

"So long as the Chinese Communists make the connection," Mr. Dulles declared, "we cannot escape the consequences of that connection or escape the fact that, if we give in to it, it puts a premium for all time and at all places upon seizing and imprisoning Americans illegally and then bargaining as to the terms upon which they will be allowed to get out."

But reports out of Peking do not confirm Mr. Dulles' analysis of the picture. Only last week the Chinese Communists said that they would be ready to free the 10 Americans if the more than 30 Chinese in United States jails were released and allowed to return to China. (Incidentally the State Department denies there are any such number in United States jails, and asserts that Chinese who want to go back to either Formosa or the Communist mainland are free to do so.)

SHIFT IN POLICY?

Then this week Communist China's Premier Chou En-lai said in Calcutta that release of the 10 Americans had nothing to do with any United States Government attitude, but depended entirely upon the good behavior of the prisoners. Communist China has released many prisoners to date—but these 10 still remain.

Also there was some interest and speculation on what appeared to be a shift of State Department policy on this matter of press visits to Communist Red China. A couple of years ago, when certain newsmen sought to go to Communist China professionally, they were told the United States could not permit it as it could not protect them there, because the United States had no relations with Communist China.

Today, however, they are told that they cannot go as long as the Communist Chinese hold United States citizens prisoners. Both the Secretary and President Eisenhower have been adamant on that: No deal with the Communist Chinese on prisoners for newsmen.

---

[From the New York Times of February 7, 1957]

PUBLISHERS SCORE UNITED STATES BAN ON CHINA—ASSOCIATION ASKS PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS TO PERMIT CORRESPONDENTS' VISITS

The American Newspaper Publishers Association protested to President Eisenhower and Congress yesterday against State Department opposition to visits by American newsmen to Communist China.

President William Dwight of the A. N. P. A. sent telegrams of protest to the White House, to Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, and to SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The messages called for removal of any official United States impediment to newsgathering activities of American correspondents in any country with which the United States was not at war.

The State Department has refused to give approval to trips of American reporters to Communist China. It has said that it will invalidate the passports of three American correspondents who recently visited Communist China.

Secretary of State Dulles, speaking at a news conference in Washington, Tuesday, insisted that the State Department would not change its policy.

Mr. Dulles charged that the Peiping regime, which is holding 10 Americans prisoner, hoped to trade them for the entry of American newsmen. They entered China from the Soviet Union, and have now returned to Moscow.

The State Department has said it will regard their passports valid only for return to the United States and has threatened to take other punitive steps against them.

THREE PRINCIPLES STRESSED

Mr. Dwight's telegram specified three principles that should be respected by the Government. They were:

1. Freedom for American reporters employed by American publications and news services to gather and write news or opinion in any country in the world with which the United States is not at war.

2. No restriction on the passports of American citizens engaged in news writing and gathering so far as travel to any country with which the United States is not at war is concerned.

3. No imposition of penalties by fine or imprisonment or revocation of right of travel upon American reporters who at their own risk choose to pursue their profession in any country in the world with which the United States is not at war.

Mr. Dwight asked President Eisenhower and Congress to accept these principles in connection with the visit of American writers to Communist China "for the purpose of gathering and reporting facts for the information of the American people."

The telegram was in conformity with a resolution of the Board of Directors of the A. N. P. A. approved at its regular meeting here Tuesday.

The three American newsmen who visited Communist China in defiance of the travel ban were William Worthy of the Baltimore Afro-American and Edmund Stevens and Phillip Harrington, of Look magazine.

---

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 8, 1957]

LOOK TO FIGHT PASSPORT BAN

NEW YORK, February 7.—Look magazine challenged today the State Department's move to revoke the passport of one of its correspondents who recently toured Red China despite the United States ban on visits to that Communist country.

Gardner Cowles, president and editor of Look, announced that the publication had asked the Department for an open hearing on the threatened invalidation of Edmund Stevens' passport because the action involves important aspects of freedom of the press.

Stevens, Moscow correspondent for Look, has been called to the American Embassy and told his passport would be invalidated for all travel other than returning to the United States. Officials told the Pulitzer prize-winning correspondent he would be entitled to a hearing before he turns in his passport.

Stevens visited Communist China last month with Look photographer Philip Harrington. Their trip was cut short by several weeks when the State Department informed the magazine that their presence was hindering negotiations for the release of the 10 Americans held in Chinese prisons.

No action has been taken yet against Harrington who returned to New York on January 29.

Cowles declared: "We have retained counsel in Washington to represent Stevens and hope that the State Department will grant an adequate hearing. The question of a reporter's right to travel involves important aspects of freedom of the press, and the sooner it is fully tested in open hearing the better."

The publisher said Stevens and Harrington entered Red China from Russia on December 23 to do a picture story about the Communist country. He added that the decision to assign them was taken by Look's editors—despite the ban on travel to China by American newsmen—because "the story was so important that American readers should have the chance to hear it from American reporters."

Cowles added that Look promptly ordered the two men to return to Moscow when the State Department claimed their visit was hindering the negotiations.

Although assured that instructions to leave had been sent to the two men, the publisher said, the Department on the same day announced that their passports would be revoked and threatened them with possible prosecution for violating the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Cowles said there was a seeming contradiction in the State Department's position on the ban. He declared the magazine did not issue any statement on the confused situation early because the State Department had not taken any punitive action against its reporters.

Cowles added that the threatened passport invalidation leaves Look "no choice but to challenge the right of the Department to dictate the movements of reporters on legitimate news-gathering assignments."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as a result of the State Department's renewed opposition to newspapermen's going to China, editorials across the Nation have been highly critical. Three of these editorials appeared in the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, and the Minneapolis Tribune. I ask unanimous consent that these three editorials be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 7, 1957]

AMERICANS IN CHINA

Secretary of State Dulles' arguments against American correspondents going to Communist China were no more valid or convincing in his press conference on Tuesday than they were before. Moreover, the Secretary put in some gratuitous remarks about American correspondents and their newspapers that were uncalled for.

It was not true that the Communist regime picked the correspondents it wanted to come to China. In the case of the New York Times four men were chosen by this newspaper solely on their qualifications as experts in the field, and the Chinese were willing to grant them visas. In other cases, too, some of the most distinguished names in American journalism were involved. It is also a reflection on the honesty and seriousness of any correspondent to say that if he were persona grata to the Chinese, or even if the Chinese suggested his name, that such a correspondent would write what the Chinese Reds wanted and would help the Communists. Any responsible and self-respecting correspondent will write what he sees and believes.

The American public is entitled to know from their own observers what is happening in Communist China. This is a question of freedom of the press and freedom of knowledge, and it is farfetched to say, as Mr. Dulles did, that it means yielding to Communist blackmail and would set a precedent dangerous to Americans in other countries in the future. The Peking Government may have linked the entry of American correspondents to the release of American prisoners, but if so the United States should have refused to recognize such a link. It should have been recognized from the beginning that it was right for American correspondents to go to China and report on that country and, whatever the Chinese said, this principle retained its validity—as it still does.

Mr. Dulles claimed that he was not aware that any correspondents tried to go to China before the recent group. This is extraordinary, because his Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, Carl McCardle, and his Under Secretary, Robert Murphy, among others at the State Department, have known for at least 2 years that American correspondents were trying to get to China and were being blocked by the State Department.

As a final argument (and something of a switch), Mr. Dulles asserted that passports are never issued to a regime that we do not recognize. Has he forgotten, among other things, that this newspaper and others kept correspondents in Moscow for years between the wars before we recognized the Soviet regime?

The sooner the State Department drops its present position on American correspondents going to Communist China the better. As Mr. Dulles must have realized at his conference, the American press feels strongly about this and is not going to let up on its pressure.

---

[From the Wall Street Journal of February 7, 1957]

PASSPORTS AND PRISONERS

Mr. Dulles remarked in his recent press conference that the Chinese Reds were willing to release 10 Americans they hold in prison if the State Department would grant passports to newsmen to visit Red China.

The Secretary of State said he refused the offer because "we don't like to have American citizens used as a means of coercion." It is, he said, not a "sound philosophy" to allow foreign countries to think it "a profitable business" to put a price on the release of imprisoned Americans.

To be sure, that is not a sound philosophy. But we doubt if Mr. Dulles' application of it in this case will seem impressive to the American prisoners, considering the price. Nor does it impress us very much.

For one thing, what the Chinese Communists ask as their "price" is something Mr. Dulles ought to do anyway. A policy of denying newsmen passports to Red China simply because we have not recognized Red China strikes us as downright silly. If Mr. Dulles fears that the newsmen, too, might be held as hostages, all he has to do is to tell them that they are on their own and that the United States will not be responsible for them if they decide to go. As a matter of fact, a handful went anyway, passport or no passport.

For another thing, there are still 10 Americans in Chinese jails. The day is long past when the State Department could suggest politely that Americans be released or that some cruisers would be sent to bring them home. Since the United States can no longer use such power, other ways to rescue jailed Americans must be found if they are not to be left to rot out their lives.

Mr. Dulles is, of course, not responsible for the fact that the Americans are in jail there, but the public does expect him to do what he can to get them out. On the other hand, Mr. Dulles is responsible for the policy of denying newsmen passports to Red China. These are two very uncomfortable hooks to be on, no matter how one looks at them.

Instead of seizing the opportunity of getting off both hooks, Mr. Dulles seems to us

to be in some danger of getting himself on still a third one. For he also said that "if the Americans were released, then we would, of course, give a new look at the situation" of allowing newsmen passports to Red China.

We suggest that this is a nuance of diplomatic relations the public may find extremely hard to follow. It has the look of a game of the chicken and the egg, and in it Mr. Dulles places himself open to the criticism of using these 10 jailed Americans as something of a diplomatic pawn himself.

We doubt very much if the public is overly concerned with who does what first when the freedom of the 10 Americans is in the balance. And we doubt if either the public or the prisoners will be much concerned whether the diplomatic "victory" is counted by one side, by the other, or by both.

---

[From the Minneapolis Tribune of February 7, 1957]

THAT CHINA TRAVEL BAN

Right from the beginning we have thought our Government wrong in ordering American news gatherers not to go into Red China. We have been unconvinced by the official defenses of this policy, whether expressed by the State Department or by President Eisenhower.

The Department first said it could not permit American travel in Red China because our country does not recognize the Chinese Communist regime. But it did nothing about a United States Senator who junketed to Bulgaria when this country had broken off relations with the Bulgarian Communist regime.

The Department said Americans must not go to Red China because, since Washington has no relations with Peiping, our Government could not guarantee the safety of newsmen on the Communist mainland. But newsmen asked for no such guarantees.

More recently, the President, in defense of the State Department ban, said that as long as the Communist regime refuses to free the 10 Americans it is holding in prison, the United States should have nothing to do with the Red Government. But allowing American newsmen to go to China—or, more accurately, refraining from threatening reprisals against those who do go there—does not require the United States Government to enter into any relations with Peiping.

Now the Chinese apparently have moved to take advantage of both the shortsighted rigidity of the State Department's position and the President's implication—for it could be read that way—that official consent for United States newsmen to go to China hinges on freeing the American prisoners.

Secretary Dulles indicated in his press conference Tuesday that Peiping is offering to free the Americans if Washington will lift its ban on correspondents' travel in China. Dulles said our Government has "refused to make that deal so far," suggesting that to do so would be submission to "Communist blackmail."

Perhaps so. But looked at in another way, Peiping's offer could appear to be a reasonable effort to meet our Government's stated objection to American travel in China.

At least, that's the way many, if not most, other people in the world who, by and large, consider United States policy toward China as ostrichlike and unrealistic are going to look at it.

It would have been much, much better if our Government had not adopted the China-travel ban in the first place, and thus been forced into trying to rationalize the policy with unrealistic arguments. All the policy has done, in effect, has been to make the American public dependent on either Red Chinese news (or propaganda) agencies or correspondents of other nations for information as to what is going on inside the biggest power in Asia.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Finally, Mr. President, two excellent analyses of the difficulties in the State Department's position were written by Mr. James Reston for publication in the New York Times of February 7 and 10, 1957. I ask unanimous consent that the text of these two articles be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 7, 1957]

VISAS TO RED CHINA—AN ANALYSIS OF PRESENT U. N. POSITION AS CONTRASTED WITH PREVIOUS STAND

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 6.—The State Department refused today to say where or when Communist China had offered to make a deal with the United States for the release of the 10 American civilians held in that country.

Secretary of State Dulles said at his news conference yesterday that "the Chinese Communist Government has for some time been trying to get [American] reporters—preferably those it picked—to come into Communist China and it has repeatedly tried to use the illegal detention of Americans in Communist China as a means of pressure to accomplish its ends in that respect."

President Eisenhower was asked about this at a news conference this morning. He described this reporters-prisoners deal as "a new thought" and asked to postpone his answer until he had had time to talk to the Secretary of State and see exactly what he is speaking of.

Since the President could not clarify an offer that might end the long incarceration of Americans in China, the State Department was asked for details about when the offer was made.

STATE DEPARTMENT SILENT

Lincoln White, State Department spokesman, said that the Government had many sources of information but would not go beyond that.

This blackout of information about the origins of the Communist offer, or blackmail, as Mr. Dulles called it, has revived a controversy here over the right of the United States Government to deny to United States publishers permission to send reporters to Communist China to report what they could on developments there.

Until yesterday's statement by Mr. Dulles, United States publishers had been told that reporters could not go to Red China because the United States did not recognize the Peiping regime and therefore did not have there official representatives who could protect United States citizens.

This policy was the subject of protest by some United States publishers on the ground that a free press had the obligation to report any news important to the American people and that denial of permission to go to Red China was an attempt by the Government of the United States to use the reporters as an instrument of its diplomacy.

PEIPING BLAMED BY DULLES

Mr. Dulles position yesterday, however, was that it was not the United States Government but the Chinese Communist Government that was attempting to use the correspondent issue as an instrument of Communist diplomacy. He added that, while he would look at the situation again if the Communists did release the 10 American civilians now imprisoned in Communist China, he did not see how the United States Government could grant a passport to anybody for travel in a country with which the United States did not maintain diplomatic relations.

This is a reversal of the position taken by the State Department more than 7 years ago when the Communists first banned reporters from countries that did not recognize the Chinese Communist regime. On October 6, 1949, the Aliens Affairs Bureau of Communist China handed foreign correspondents in Shanghai the following order:

"Effective from the date of issue of this order, all correspondents in Shanghai, irrespective of whether they are Chinese or foreign, of foreign newspapers and periodicals, news agencies and broadcasting agencies whose country has not established diplomatic relations with these Chinese People's [Communist] Republic, are to cease acting in their capacity as press men, including the filing of press telegrams and radiograms."

The State Department issued 2 days later a statement condemning this order as an attempt to put pressure on governments to recognize Communist China.

The official statement of the State Department said at that time:

"The effect of this order is to blot out completely objective reporting of developments in the Communist-occupied territory of China.

"It is evident that this order constitutes a crude effort on the part of the Chinese Communists to force recognition of their newly established regime by those countries which continue to have, on the basis of the Chinese Communists conduct to date wholly justifiable doubts regarding the responsible nature of the regime according to general accepted international standards."

Thus, the State Department condemned the Peiping regime in 1949 for denying to United States correspondents the opportunity for "objective reporting" in Communist China and charged that it was doing so to influence the Washington's recognition policy.

Now the State Department is saying that the offer of the Chinese Communists to permit United States correspondents to go to Red China is also a form of pressure that cannot be considered until the Chinese Reds release the American civilians.

Mr. Dulles' statement on this question yesterday also differed from at least two other procedures followed by the United States Government in the past. He said yesterday:

"We do not think that it is sound philosophy to permit other governments, other regimes, to feel that it is profitable business for them to withhold and detain illegally and throw into jail American citizens so they can put a price on their release."

His point was that the United States Government would not consider making concessions to win the release of Americans imprisoned in a Communist country.

RANSOM OF FLIERS RECALLED

On November 17, 1951, however, a United States C–47 transport plane, flying from West Germany to Yugoslavia was forced down in Hungary. Four United States fliers were interned in Hungary and fined $30,000 each. The United States Government eventually paid $120,000 and got the fliers released.

Similarly, in May of 1951, the United States Government agreed to lift its ban on travel by United States citizens in Hungary as a condition set by the Hungarian Government for the release of Robert A. Vogeler, a United States citizen incarcerated in Hungary.

Mr. Dulles also said yesterday that "there is a problem which would always exist about the issuance of a passport valid for Communist China and I do not think under any circumstances that so long as the present state of at least semiwar prevails and we do not recognize that regime, that we would issue a passport valid for Communist China."

He added that the Government was considering what legal action could be taken against three United States correspondents who recently went to Communist China without a passport.

Correspondents for the New York Times, however, have traveled through several countries normally forbidden to United States citizens. For example, Jack Raymond, former Moscow correspondent of the Times, traveled through East Germany in December of 1955 on an East German Government visa, though the United States does not recognize the Communist regime in that country.

He also traveled in August of 1956 through Outer Mongolia with the knowledge of United States authorities, although the United States does not recognize the Peoples Republic of Mongolia and has opposed its membership in the United Nations.

Past correspondence with the State Department indicates that the present Administration was opposing the entrance of United States reporters into Communist China before there was any question of the Communists' trying to make a deal to get United States reporters there.

For example, Walter Bedell Smith, former Undersecretary of State, wrote to the New York Times September 21, 1954, as follows:

"We have given this problem careful consideration since you first brought the matter up in August. While highly sympathetic to the ideals of freedom of information which motivate your request we consider that there should be no change at this time in the Department's policy of refusing to issue passports valid for travel to Communist China.

"As you know, that regime has demonstrated repeatedly its disregard for the normal decencies of international relations. Many Americans have been badly mistreated by the Communist Chinese authorities and twenty-seven Americans are still in jails there.

"In issuing a passport, this Government assumes certain obligations for the protection of the holder, and it would obviously be impossible for us to fulfill these obligations for an American in Communist China."

The former Under Secretary of State added a warning that the United States Government also had power to license money for anybody in certain areas of the world and he implied that it would use this power to prevent any United States newspaper representative, including a non-American, from receiving money in Communist China.

---

[From the New York Times of February 10, 1957]

MR. DULLES ON THE PRESS AND VICE VERSA

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 8.—Secretary of State Dulles has started telling the American newspapers how to run their business, which is fair enough, since we are always trying to tell him how to run his.

The trouble is that, of all the good and valid arguments he could properly bring against the press, he has chosen the worst.

He has decreed, with the backing of the President, that American newspapers and magazines cannot send reporters to Communist China because (a) the Chinese Communists are wicked people who hold 10 Americans in jail and otherwise violate acceptable rules of international conduct; (b) the United States does not recognize Communist China and therefore cannot provide protection for reporters there; (c) the Communists are trying to handpick American reporters who will spout Communist propaganda; and (d) finally, the Communists are trying to blackmail the United States by holding the 10 Americans in jail until the reporters are permitted to go to China.

All this raises some interesting points. It is precisely because the Chinese Communists are wicked, because they are violating acceptable rules of international conduct and are therefore a menace to the security of the United States that the newspapers want to send reporters there to tell as much as they can about what is going on.

From Eve down through Al Capone and Colonel Nasser it has been the outlaws of the world who have been the most newsworthy. The American newspapers have correspondents in Moscow, not because the Soviets abide by acceptable rules of international conduct and treat Americans nice but because they don't. It is not the good who have to be watched but the wicked, not the law-abiding nations we have to form judgments about but the international ruffians, not the people we like who have to be covered but the ones that give us the scunners.

THE TRANSITION OF SKEPTICISM

This is why the Founding Fathers, whom Mr. Dulles is so fond of quoting on other subjects, forbade the Congress in the first article of the Bill of Rights to pass any laws abridging the freedom of the press. For they believed that a free press would report honestly on the abuses of power that affected the rights and judgments of the people, whether by a group of scoundrels in Peiping or a Secretary of State in Washington.

Linking the right to report the news to the Government's policy of recognition is equally foreign to the American tradition. The United States did not recognize the Soviet Union from 1917 to 1933, but American reporters were there without official protection throughout this period, and produced some of the most brilliant and useful newspaper correspondence ever written in the English language.

Also, the State Department's argument that it is worrying about not being able to "protect" reporters in China is at least inconsistent. The Government was not able to "protect" the correspondents of this newspaper it permitted to go last year to Outer Mongolia, which we do not "recognize," or to Communist East Germany, where we have no official representatives. The papers have waved any claims of official "protection." And besides, the Government has even threatened to take action against any United States paper sending a Canadian reporter to Communist China, though it has no obligation for the protection of foreign nationals.

As to Mr. Dulles' charge that the Chinese Communists were trying to handpick the American correspondents they invited to China, this is at best a piece of misinformation, and at worst an impertinence.

THE GULLIBLE INKY WRETCHES

The correspondents invited include Cyrus Sulzberger and four others on this newspaper, Edward R. Murrow of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Marquis Childs of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and A. T. Steele of the New York Herald Tribune, not one of whom has been fooled very often by any official, including Mr. Dulles.

This myth of the gullible American reporter is as bogus as the myth of the gullible American diplomatic innocent abroad. If there is any solid tradition of American reporting, it is the tradition of skepticism toward Government pronouncements. Nobody in the world has added so much to this tradition of skepticism as the Communists, for they have lied to reporters more than other officials.

Finally, the most disturbing thing about this whole debate is Mr. Dulles' flat statement that he cannot permit reporters to go to Communist China because the Peiping regime has tried to make a "deal" with him to release the American prisoners in China if he will let the reporters into China.

If true, this is the best offer from the Communists since the invention of vodka. The State Department, however, refuses to say where and when the offer was made. The Pentagon knows nothing about it. The Central Intelligence Agency (which incidentally has been pressing for years to get American correspondents into Communist China) never heard of it.

Meanwhile, Mr. Dulles is diverted once more from primary to secondary issues. Which is a pity, for he has a lot of other things to do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this unwarranted abuse of the right to travel seems to me to be an appropriate area for congressional investigation. The inconsistencies in the State Department's position have become increasingly confounded as pressure mounts upon the Secretary for a reversal of his position. I think it is in the interest of a free press and of free travel that this pressure continue until the reversal occurs.

I might add that the Secretary can be a rather stubborn man at times, so I suggest that the justifiable pressure be maintained. Consequently, Mr. President, I am today asking the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to bring before the committee the possibility of holding a hearing on this matter at which Secretary Dulles might appear. I appreciate the fact that the committee is presently engaged in its work on the Middle East resolution, but I am hopeful that the committee will be able to interest itself in the passport situation as soon as its work on that resolution is completed.

---

## STUDY OF MATTERS RELATING TO THE ELECTION, SUCCESSION, AND DUTIES OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2), to create a joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President.

---

## THE TRUTH ABOUT FARM INCOME

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on Saturday, Secretary of Agriculture Benson further reduced the parity support prices on crops.

This was done against a background of his prepared statement—a long and detailed one—as presented to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last January 29.

In this presentation Mr. Benson gave some optimistic figures about the improved position of the American farmer in 1956 as against 1955.

I have investigated those optimistic figures, Mr. President, and it is with regret that I now report to the Senate they are incomplete and misleading.

Here are the facts which justify this assertion.

On the first page of the long prepared statement, Mr. Benson says:

Realized net farm income in 1956 was 5 percent above 1955.

It happened we had noticed that in his Economic Report to the Congress, transmitted on January 23, the President

made the same statement; but the President thereupon added immediately:

After adjustment for the change in farm inventories, net income was the same as in 1955.

Anyone with any business experience knows that no responsible business or banking executive would submit a balance sheet and earning statement to his stockholders without giving a true picture of the inventory expressed as part of his current assets.

Surely what is demanded in the way of ethics in business should also apply in government.

As mentioned, President Eisenhower previously gave the facts; namely, that after adjustment for inventory the farmers realized net income was $11.7 billion in 1955—and the same, $11.7 billion in 1956.

If President Eisenhower is right—and I believe he is—then the statement of Mr. Benson is misleading.

Actually there was a decrease in 1956 real farm income as against 1955, because the prices of things the farmer buys rose during the more recent 12-month period. As an example, wholesale prices rose almost 5 percent, and consumer prices rose about 3 percent.

This matter could not be more important, because apparently Mr. Benson is further reducing parity support with the premise that farm income is up.

In other words, Mr. Benson is taking this action with the premise that his polices have improved the farmers' position in the economy.

But that is not the case—and the above figures prove it.

We brought this matter up with Mr. Benson at a hearing in the Senate Agriculture Committee on February 6.

At that time we also referred to a Department of Agriculture study entitled "Possible Methods of Improving the Parity Formula, a study required by section 602 of the Agriculture Act of 1956."

This study was dated January 31. It shows that farmers' average per capita net income from farming has decreased from $702 in 1952 to $605 in 1956; whereas income for non-farm population had increased in the same period from $1833 to $2009 per capita.

But those are not the figures pertinent to this presentation this afternoon. The pertinent figures are that the same study shows there was a decrease in per capita net income from agriculture between 1955 and 1956—from $606 in 1955 to $605 in 1956.

Inasmuch as the President's economic report also says there were some 100,000 fewer farms at the end of 1956 as against 1955, again we see how wrong Mr. Benson was in his above assertion that 1956 was better than 1955.

When Secretary Benson was confronted with this discrepancy before the Senate committee, he turned to one of his assistants, Dr. Parlberg, and asked for an explanation.

Dr. Parlberg thereupon pointed to the fourth column on page 43 of the January 31 Department of Agriculture study in question. This column adds "income from nonfarm sources" to agriculture income; and as a result expresses a per capita increase in 1956 over 1955 of $12—$881 to $893.

Dr. Parlberg told the committee: "The third column includes income from all sources; the column you read was income from agriculture only."

But Mr. Benson's statement referred only to farm income.

Dr. Parlberg continued:

When you look at the column showing income from all sources you note a slight increase in 1956 over 1955 on a per capita basis.

Dr. Parlberg therefore was attempting to justify Mr. Benson's statement that there was a 5-percent increase in farm income in 1956 by adding as farm income wages, say, a farmer received for working in town in a garage at night, or teaching school in town at night.

Even if Dr. Parlberg's claim was correct, however, the $12 addition to farm income amounts to an increase of only 1½ percent—whereas Secretary Benson's detailed presentation to the Congress States stated there was an increase of 5 percent; despite President Eisenhower, only a few days previously, having said there was no real increase whatever in 1956 farm income over 1955.

This inaccuracy was pointed out to Mr. Benson in detail at a later hearing of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on February 6.

Nevertheless on the very next day, February 7, in my own State, at St. Louis, Mo., in an address before the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Mr. Benson repeated this misstatement in a formal address.

It is bad enough to have farm support prices drop again. It can only lead to lower prices for the farmers in Missouri and the Nation. But it is far worse for Mr. Benson first to assert, and then to reassert, that American farm income has actually risen—and then apparently to utilize that false premise for further reducing farm price supports.

Mr. President, we will never get anywhere in our effort to solve this complicated and ever more misty farm program unless and until Mr. Benson and his Department give the Congress and the people all the figures and all the facts; because partial truth is an evasion of truth.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I recall vividly the circumstances which the Senator from Missouri reports to the Senate today relating to the discussion of the agricultural income figures which Secretary Benson and his Chief Economist, Dr. Parlberg, presented.

Would the Senator agree with me that a Secretary of Agriculture, while pursuing his own economies, who can have losses of $3 billion in 4 years in Commodity Credit Corporation operations, is a Secretary whose policies have been anything but successful?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. More and more it becomes obvious that the person most anxious to see any price-support program fail is the Secretary of Agriculture himself.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that the Secretary of Agriculture has shown his real intent to keep lowering any farm commodity price support or protection by his latest move in cutting down price supports, contrary to the assurances which had been given to the farmers prior to the election?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That would seem to be true. This latest action should make us approach with more apprehension the entire question of future corn legislation. What may be really wanted is the right to eliminate any price support on corn of any kind whatever in the not-too-distant future?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield further to me?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say that the Secretary of Agriculture has made it crystal clear that the price protection relating to corn will be related directly to the price-support protection applying to other feed grains. The Secretary of Agriculture has lowered the price support on other feed grains at a time when the price support on feed grains has cost the Government little or nothing. He has lowered those price-support protections, and I predict that is but the opening wedge or the first step in lowering even further than had been contemplated or known by the public the price protection upon corn, which indeed is a basic commodity. Does the Senator from Missouri agree with that?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes, I agree this is a growing danger.

Mr. President, my main purpose this afternoon is to state that, regardless of what may be the policies of the Secretary of Agriculture, he should not give the Senate figures which do not properly present the true position of agriculture in the United States today. When it was pointed out to Mr. Benson why his figures were wrong, it was disturbing to see that the very next day Mr. Benson, in a prepared speech continued to use these misleading figures which figures were not and are not in agreement with those used by President Eisenhower in his economic report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say that later in the day I shall supplement the statement the Senator from Missouri has made, which was very conclusive and excellent, by a few remarks of my own. Of course, we are keenly interested in international problems, and they constitute a priority item. There is, indeed, trouble in the Middle East, but there is also plenty of trouble in the middle west; and I shall be interested in both areas of the world, both today and tomorrow and for the days to come.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I hope he will let me know when he will speak this afternoon, because he is a great authority on this subject. All farmers, in Missouri and elsewhere in the Nation, will be interested in what he has to say.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared covering many of the points raised in the debate be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Once again Secretary of Agriculture Benson has shown his real intent to keep lowering any farm income protection, contrary to the kind of assurances farmers are always given before elections.

Secretary Benson's latest move in reducing support levels offered for feed grains and some other commodities is hardly a surprise to those of us who have warned for years that it was his deliberate intention to keep lowering such floors until they might as well be eliminated entirely, so far as any practical effect is concerned. Is should be increasingly apparent that such is his purpose.

But what does disturb me is the false impression some taxpayers may get that Secretary Benson's action will mean a saving for them—an impression that some newspaper articles and some editorial comment have erroneously encouraged.

The truth is that every time Secretary Benson has lowered price-support levels on farm commodities under his sliding-scale discretionary authority, it has cost taxpayers more money rather than less—through greater losses resulting in Commodity Credit Corporation operations.

Ever since Secretary Benson started out on his policy of forcing down the levels at which crop loans would be offered to farmers, there have been staggering increases in the losses incurred under his farm program. By the Department's own reports, Government losses in supporting farm prices during the Eisenhower administration have been nearly three times greater than the total losses during the preceding 20 years of the farm program—and the losses have been increasing year by year, as Benson has further lowered support levels, step by step.

Before any taxpayer gets the idea Secretary Benson is saving money by his announcement that he is reducing support levels for the coming year, he had better look more carefully at the record of what Benson has done to the taxpayer since he has been in office. And that might also be a good idea for editorial writers on the Washington Post, as well—before they interpret his latest action as in the interests of taxpayers.

Secretary Benson has spent more money than any Secretary of Agriculture in history—with less results to show for it.

During the period while Secretary Benson was losing nearly $3 billion on his economy version of less effective price-support operations, farm income in this country dropped some $5 billion.

Both from the farmer's standpoint and the taxpayer's standpoint, it should be amply apparent by now that this administration's farm program has been and still is a complete failure.

Secretary Benson is just making more trouble for himself, as well as the farmers, every time he lowers these support levels. For when he lowers the level at which loans will be granted on a crop, he is, in effect, devaluating that commodity, whether it is in the farmers' hands or the Government's hands. As a result, the taxpayers' losses have been increasing as Benson has pulled farm income downward. As market prices have been depressed by administrative policies, more rather than less farm production has wound up in the Government's hands—just the opposite of what the administration says it is seeking to do.

And as a result of lower prices per unit, farmers have had to produce more to cover fixed overhead costs. Production of feed grains has expanded steadily as support prices have been lowered. Any review of the Department's own statistics will prove that to be true.

It is regrettable that the public gets such a distorted picture of some of these conditions through the American press.

Secretary Benson boasts of his tremendous disposal operations, of the huge sums spent in moving surplus commodities, and of the increases obtained in export shipments. Yet he does not say much about the fact that he has far more total holdings in Government hands today than when he took over the post which he has bungled so badly—and the press never seems concerned about pointing it out for him.

The fact that our surplus holdings are mounting despite all the stepped-up disposal operations is not due to that much of an increase in production. Instead, it is just evidence that Secretary Benson's own policies are driving more and more farm production through Government hands, instead of into the market he talks about.

I hope Secretary Benson's latest action will serve as a warning to corn producers whom the Secretary has been trying to woo since before the election. Corn producers were evidently right in deciding they could not risk giving the Secretary complete discretion on fixing future support levels, as he had asked. Repeatedly, Benson has said he wanted to handle corn just as he would other feed grains. He is now showing his intention on other feed grains—pulling supports lower and lower.

This administration has almost made a

Perhaps it would be well for Secretary Benson. His answer to most appeals from farm people for help has been for them to learn to be more efficient.

Let me say just this, that if Secretary Benson's record of constantly piling up bigger losses to the taxpayers while letting farm income fall unchecked is his idea of efficiency, farmers would do well to beware of his advice. It is not very efficient, in my opinion, to spend more money for less results than ever before in history.

Perhaps it would be well for Secretary Benson and others to give a little more thought to what efficiency could really mean in agriculture. For that purpose, I call attention to an address by Robert G. Lewis, editor of the Washington Newsletter of the National Farmers Union, at the annual meeting of the Inter-Organization Committee on Problems for Rural Youth held here last weekend. It was entitled "An Efficiency Judgment of the Family Farm." It contains some thoughtful reading.

I attach to this statement for printing in the RECORD an article from today's Washington Post headed "CCC Sets Loss at $4 Billion," an editorial from the Washington Post trying in vain to explain away the higher losses under the very policies the Post has long blindly advocated, and the address by Mr. Lewis to which I have referred.

---

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 11, 1957]

### CCC SETS LOSS AT $4 BILLION

(By Ovid A. Martin)

Government losses in supporting farm prices during the Eisenhower administration have been nearly three times greater than the total losses during the preceding 20 years of Federal farm-aid programs.

A Commodity Credit Corporation report yesterday placed the cumulative losses since 1933—the year the Roosevelt administration inaugurated the programs—at $4,005,000,000.

Losses reported during the 4 years of the present administration were put at $2,894 million. This composed with $1,111 million between 1933 and 1953.

Deficits have been particularly heavy during recent years, reflecting accumulation of large surplus supplies and vigorous Government efforts to dispose of them even at a loss. The administration has taken the position that there is little chance of agriculture regaining full prosperity as long as price-depressing surpluses exist.

#### SUBSIDIES NOT INCLUDED

The figures include only CCC operations in carrying out direct price-support programs for a wide variety of commodities through loans on surpluses and purchases of excess supplies. Losses were sustained when these products were sold or otherwise disposed of at less than the cost to the CCC.

The figures do not take into account subsidy payments made to farmers, cost of export subsidies under which some commodities were sold abroad at cut-rate prices, or funds other than those of CCC used to purchase surpluses for relief and other distribution. No cumulative figures were available on these programs.

As of December 31, CCC reported, it owned surplus commodities costing $5,892 million. It expects to take losses on these stocks before they are disposed of.

#### LOWER LEVELS ANNOUNCED

In addition, it had put out $2,319 million in loans to farmers on surpluses withheld from markets. It probably will have to take over the bulk of these products as payment for such loans. Additional losses undoubtedly will be incurred under this program.

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson announced Saturday a lowering of price support levels this year on a wide range of farm products. The action is expected to reduce by about $200 million the amount committed to the support program this year under average production.

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, said the lower supports "may cause a lot of squeaking but they are what most of us expected."

With the exception of dairy products, which remained the same, all the support levels were somewhat lower than similar price props in 1956 and the recent market averages.

The support level for cotton was cut about $6 a bale which amounts to more than $70 million for an average crop.

Support levels for oats, barley, rye, and other livestock feed grains also were reduced somewhat.

"The lower supports result in part from the compromise worked out to obtain passage last year of the soil bank farm legislation," AIKEN told a reporter.

Under that, he explained, slightly higher supports were continued on cotton, feed grains, and some other crops for 1 year only.

AIKEN, ranking Republican on the Senate Agriculture Committee, said the reduced levels are in line with the theory that Government supports should be lowered in periods of large surplus production to discourage overproduction.

#### MILK PRODUCTS TOP LIST

The CCC report had dairy products—fluid milk, butter, cheese, and dried milk—topping the list of products on which the Corporation suffered losses. The amount was reported at $1,283 million. It was more than double the losses incurred on any other product.

The bulk of the dairy losses were marked-up during the present administration.

Potatoes—which no longer are supported—were second with total losses of $479 million. Most of this setback occurred during and immediately after World War II.

Wheat was third at $468 million. This amount did not include, however, other funds used to subsidize wheat exports.

Corn was next with losses of $370 million, followed by cotton at $198 million, and eggs—which no longer are directly supported by CCC—at $190 million.

LOWER PRICE SUPPORTS

One reason for Secretary Benson's reduction of support prices for 8 farm commodities during 1957 became pointedly evident when the Commodity Credit Corporation announced its colossal losses. The CCC is the agency which, under the law, lends farmers money at specified rates on their crops and then, if market prices are below the loan rates, takes over the crops and sells them at a loss. During the last 4 years its losses have amounted to $2,994,000,000, compared to $1,111,000,000 during the previous 20 years.

It is especially ironic that losses should have soared during the Eisenhower administration despite the shift from fixed price supports to lower flexible supports at the insistence of the President and Secretary Benson. Losses would have been still higher if the rigid supports had been retained. Presumably also surpluses yet to be disposed of at a loss would also have been larger. Now that the soil bank is affording additional relief to farmers and pressure to hold Government spending in check has become acute the administration certainly ought to reduce this drain on its revenue whenever that can be done without serious consequences to agriculture.

The advocates of high, fixed supports are denouncing the reductions and threatening to take away the power of the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust price props in accord with supply and market conditions. But they are crying before the farmer is hurt. All the commodities on which supports were lowered—cotton, oats, barley, rye, grain sorghums, soybeans, flaxseed, and cottonseed—were selling above the new support price in mid-January and all but two above the old support level. In other words, it is an opportune moment for the Department of Agriculture to move toward its goal of farm production for consumption instead of storage in Government warehouses.

---

AN EFFICIENCY JUDGMENT OF THE FAMILY FARM—REMARKS BY ROBERT G. LEWIS, EDITOR, WASHINGTON NEWSLETTER, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION, AT ANNUAL MEETING OF THE INTER-ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE ON PROBLEMS FOR RURAL YOUTH, FEBRUARY 7–8, 1957, WASHINGTON, D. C.

I am not going to spend your time and my own in defining "the family farm." I think it is perfectly clear to everyone here, within permissible limits, just what is a family farm.

I will try instead to evaluate the family farm from the standpoint of what is probably a new concept of efficiency, or at least one which is not commonly applied.

As a product of a family farm, I am completely subject to all the sentimental and romantic notions and illusions about that institution that most such people are. I intend to avoid sentiment, however, and to make an appraisal of the family farm on the basis of what I consider a very important standard of efficiency. I submit that the standard which I will describe is nothing less than ultimate efficiency.

Man does not live by bread alone. As it looks to me, with bread alone he is in fact less than man. Yet there are those, actively engaged in the farm-policy debate today, who seem to choose their policy positions on the basis of standards of material efficiency. What is still worse, they apply their material judgments mechanically, instead of humanely. Their ideal for agriculture is expressed in terms of maximum production at minimum cost. Maximum output with minimum input.

This view, it seems to me, is terribly shortsighted. It seems to me that these partisans in the farm-policy debate are keeping their gaze fixed on the product, so that they neglect to see the producer. Which is really important, the farm output or the farm family that produces it? Certainly, in the last analysis, it is the human beings, and not the bread, that are important. The bread, by itself, is totally unimportant. The thing that is truly important is the human life that depends upon it. The bread is merely incidental to human life. The bread has importance only insofar as it sustains and enriches human lives.

Man does not live, therefore, to produce bread. He produces bread to live. The distinction is enormosuly important and relevant. Obviously, man must have food, and so far as our experience goes, he must work to produce it. But work is not the purpose of life. Production is not the purpose of life. Instead, human lives are the entire purpose and the reason for all work and for all production.

If this is true, then the most important thing about the family farm is the farm family. The most important and valuable product of the family farm is the human lives that it sustains. The ultimate judgment of the efficiency of the family farm, as an economic institution must be based upon its contribution to quality, beauty, nobility, dignity, and joy in human living.

I am perfectly aware, of course, that other families than the farm family also depend upon the farm's production. On the average, seven other families share with the farm family the food that it produces. This in no way alters my conclusion that it is the human lives, all of them, which are the primary consideration, and not the material products that are merely incidental to their living.

Now we get down to a policy question of current controversy: Who will say that any one of these eight families is more important than the other? Who will say that one of the eight is least important, and, therefore, entitled to a much smaller portion of the material output of our economy than the others?

As things now stand, it is the de facto judgment of our society that the farm family is less important, and, therefore, it receives less than half of the average economic return received by the other families that share the food it produces.

I should make it clear that the marketing system, through which this de facto judgment of our society is rendered, is nothing more and nothing less than a manmade institution. It is not an impartial agency of blind justice. The market is a human institution that is controlled by human beings, just as a government is. I will say frankly that I consider that our manmade marketing system is operating defectively, and that circumstances cry aloud for men to improve and repair it.

I reject the argument that farm families, or any others, unquestioningly must accept the dictates of any manmade marketing system or any other manmade institution. If people do not like the results they get from their various institutions, I consider that they are entitled to do their best to change them. I have fundamental faith in the fairness and decency of human beings. I think that in the long run the people concerned can be depended upon to tinker with their social machinery until it works more agreeably and more fairly for all.

My point of view, therefore, is that all of us, as citizens in a democratic society, share in the responsibility for the way our institutions perform their appointed functions. If it is unfair that the farm families of this Nation should receive incomes only half as large as are received by other families, then we all, in a degree, are being unfair. Responsibility falls heaviest, of course, upon those in positions of authority. Let me emphasize, at this point, that it is sheer nonsense to pretend, as some attempt, that the market place is properly beyond the control of the responsible leaders of our society. It seems to me that this is placing the integrity of the market place above the integrity of the human beings who created it to serve the needs and purposes of their lives, and by whose tolerance and consent alone it is entitled to exist at all. Those who consent to the decision of the market that farm families should receive returns less than half as great as those received by others, are fully as responsible for the justice or injustice of these decisions as if it were their own deliberate decree.

My first policy conclusion, therefore, is that farm families are not receiving a fair and equitable share of the Nation's income, and that those who are in positions of power in the marketing system and in the Government are responsible for this injustice.

Another policy question that is the subject of current controversy is whether the family farm is the most satisfactory kind of institution for carrying on our food and fiber production. The question is often put as to whether the family farm is efficient.

Even by the limited standards of material and mechanical efficiency, the family farm seems to have a pretty clear claim to the highest efficiency rating.

In a modern industrial factory process, workers can be literally chained to their machines, and get their work done. Workers do not need to move to the materials upon which they work; the assembly line carries the materials to them. When workers remain stationary, they can be supervised, disciplined, and even coerced, in fairly large groups, by a single foreman. A relatively small corps of supervisors can direct the work of huge collections of workers, doing relatively complicated jobs.

But the farming operation is fundamentally different. The worker must move to the materials upon which he works—over broad acres of land, among growing plants and animals. In most modern farming processes, it is impossible for a supervisor to give close attention to more than 1 or 2 or 3 workers at any given time. To do a really effective job of supervision and direction, the boss must be in immediate contact with the worker most of the time. Obviously, the only efficient way to meet this requirement is to combine the function of boss and worker in the same individual. This the family farming system does—it combines ownership motivations, management, professional skill, and labor all in the single personality of the farm operator, who does most of his own work. Members of his own family who help, of course share all or part of his own interests in the job. If and when the family farmer employs outside labor, he is generally able to function as the boss while working side-by-side with the hired man.

Because of its peculiar psychological and administrative advantages, the family farm in most fields is able to yield greater output per unit of input than any known or imaginable form of industrialized, factory-type operation. This has been demonstrated both in the case of the collective factory-farm systems in Communist countries, and in the structurally-similar industrialized factory-farm systems that exist in the United States.

Nevertheless, collective-type farms do exist and persist in the United States. It is my opinion that they are able to do so only because they enjoy advantages over family farms that are completely unrelated to efficiency.

In the first place, sheer bigness of the ownership unit is an enormous advantage in the rates and terms on which credit is available, bargaining power in the marketing of products and in the purchasing of supplies, and in access to certain specialized skills. In the interest of efficient production, the government or organizations of farmers, if they are able—should act promptly to redress the disadvantages imposed upon family farm operations by their relative weakness in the markets.

In the second place, the factory-type farms in this country enjoy enormous subsidies in the supply of labor. The Government subsidizes the recruitment of temporary migrants from foreign countries to work on the American factory farms at wage levels and under working conditions far, far below the standards that are acceptable to American workers, and far below what the American economy justifies. The greatest subsidy here, of course, comes out of the sweat of these exploited foreign migrants and native farm workers themselves. The factory farm owners are able to take advantage of their lack of organization, ignorance, transient status, and other weaknesses so as to pay them only a small part of the value that their labor produces. The result may be cheap farm commodities, but the cost is heavy in broken bodies, starved souls and minds, retarded children, and empty, sordid lives.

In the interest of efficiency, the Government should step in vigorously, like civilized communities did long ago to outlaw the flogging of the peddler's horse and the exploitation of children in the textile mills, to compel these factory-farm owners to pay wages fully commensurate with an American standard of living. The real measure of efficiency must take account of the homes, the schools, the churches and community functions, the standards of local self-government, that are provided to the people who perform the work.

Another policy question relates to whether the population engaged in agriculture is too large, and if so what means should be used to reduce it.

Few will dispute that there are more people engaged in agriculture than are needed if all were to be fully employed and furnished with sufficient capital to achieve reasonable productivity.

The de facto choice of our society is to subject the entire farm economy to severe economic depression, so as to force some of the farm families to abandon their way of life for employment in the cities. That is what is happening. The Nation as a whole, in effect, has given its consent by default to this cruel process. There are many who actively favor and encourage it.

In evaluating the wisdom and necessity for making a massive transfer of farm families to the cities, it is particularly important to keep in mind that the lives of all the people concerned are the major consideration. Consider some of the costs of such a movement:

The adjustment that people have made to their way of life is part of the Nation's social capital equipment. It is an enormously important factor in yielding those things beyond bread alone that man must have to be human. Rural life is a distinctive way of life. Farm people have become adjusted to it, usually over many generations. They help to govern their communities, to run their schools and churches; they are a meaningful part of their community and its social life. Adjustment to their way of life helps to produce in people's lives those most important products that human beings create—dignity, beauty, happiness.

The families who usually move to the city through the process of depression are those least able to make a wholesome readjustment to a new and alien way of life. In their rural home communities, they counted for something; in the crowded city slums where they wind up after leaving the farm, they seem to count for nothing. Parents do not know how to give their children wise and meaningful guidance in the new environment, which is probably hostile to wholesome development to start with. The result is all too often deep unhappiness and discontentment, children drifting at loose ends, often into crime. It is hard to transplant a family successfully when its roots are torn up callously, and it is dumped carelessly into the unwelcoming soil of the city slum. Certainly, we need to measure any gains that might be realized against all of the costs over several generations, including those costs in human spirit.

If we would only look, I think we could find much more rewarding uses to make of any "surplus" farm population we may have in this country than to starve it off the land and into the unskilled labor pool in industrial centers. Look no further back than to the recent past, when farm people enjoyed relative prosperity; there was then a remarkable volume of population movement out of agricultural employment.

Many of these people did not move beyond their home communities. Fairly decent farm incomes enabled farm families to start installing the household equipment that was long considered part of the American standard of living, for example. It was farm boys—and some ex-farmers—who connected most of the new electrical gadgets and wired the farm houses for REA, who piped in the running water, and dug the new well.

There is an enormous employment opportunity right at home in the rural communities all over America—if farm families were only given their fair share of the national income. These potential new jobs can employ farm people to serve farm families remaining on the land—and would do so without tearing off their social and cultural roots in flight to the cities.

I suppose that if American farm people were to enjoy full parity of income, we would immediately need a migration of people back into rural communities, to build and rehabilitate houses, to sell and install household gadgets, to service new farm equipment, to man new service trades in the small towns.

But even if we continue to accept subparity returns to our farm people, I think we can probably do better, from the standpoint of ultimate efficiency, to move jobs to where the people are, instead of demanding that people move to where jobs might be. There is a lot of tremendously valuable capital, including spiritual and social capital as well as material, invested in these rural schools and roads and governments, rural religious institutions, rural homes, rural community patterns, rural culture. In the most depressed farming areas, it is true, this capital is terribly inadequate and depleted. But at least the families have their roots planted firmly in that soil, ready to receive fertilization if we choose to supply it.

Certainly it makes better sense to redesign some of our plans for industrial production expansion so it can be diverted into rural areas than to strain the bursting seams of our giant cities farther and farther. Certainly it would be efficient—in the ultimate meaning of efficiency—to spend some money and concern on improving the rural schools and churches where children already are, than to deal with juvenile delinquency and crime after families have been uprooted and cast spiritually adrift in the urban sea.

## THE ADMINISTRATION'S MIDDLE EAST PROPOSAL

Mr. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, before I commence my prepared remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a memorandum developing more thoroughly the constitutional points to which I shall allude in the course of my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the President of the United States and his Secretary of State have solemnly asked the Senate for an unprecedented delegation of authority to make wars and to spend money without restriction. The administration prepared Senate Joint Resolution 19, which was introduced by request.

The significant provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 19 are as follows:

The President "is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any such nation or group of nations (in the general area of the Middle East) requesting such aid against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism," and to use "without regard to the provisions of any other law or regulation, not to exceed $200 million. The resolution shall expire as the President may determine.

Mr. President, the question Senate Joint Resolution 19 puts to this body is not whether America should help reinforce the independence of Middle East nations. It is not whether we should help check the expansion of international communism. It is not whether a President of the United States needs the backing of a united America when he acts as our agent in the search for world peace. It is not whether our constitutional system must make a due allowance for the use of discretionary Executive power in time of grave emergency.

On these broad points, there is wide agreement in this Chamber. We favor freedom for all peoples. We are opposed to international communism. We favor a vigorous American checkmate to international communism. We favor national unity in the search for world peace. Moreover, as Senators we know from experience that the opportunities and threats arising in the foreign field cannot always be foreseen and covered by law before they emerge. We know that some matters must be entrusted to the discretion of our chief officers of state. Above all, we know that they ought to be entrusted in greater or lesser measure, depending on whether these officers have shown themselves candid, wise, responsible, and respectful of constitutional tradition in the discharge of their powers and duties.

The real question Senate Joint Resolution 19 puts to us has two related parts:

First, shall we strike down the Senate's rights and duties in the conduct of foreign affairs, as defined by 168 years of constitutional practice?

Second, shall we say yes to a radical proposal whose adoption would mean that we are abandoning our constitutional system of checks and balances; that from now on, naked Executive power will rule the highest and most fateful interests of the Nation?

If I put the question this way, it is not from any personal taste for extravagant words. We have heard enough of them from a current Secretary of State, who greets the dawn with a boast about his triumphs, and meets the dusk with scare words of panic, saying that the Nation will be ruined unless it unites to ratify the mistakes he made during the day.

If I put the question as I have, it is because that is precisely the way Senate Joint Resolution 19 puts it. In form and substance, the resolution, as prepared by the administration, wants something from this Chamber, the mere asking of which would have led to a national outcry under any other administration back to Washington's. It asks for a blank grant of power over our funds and Armed Forces, to be used in a blank way, for a blank length of time, under blank conditions, with respect to blank nations, in a blank area. We are asked to sign this blank check in perpetuity or at the pleasure of the President—any President.

Who will fill in all these blanks?

The resolution says that the President, whoever he may be at the time, shall do it. And that is not all it says. It says that in filling in the blanks, the President need not consult, much less be accountable to any other constitutional organ of government. He shall be the counsel, the judge, and the jury of the national interest.

His judgment about world realities shall be the sole warrant for his deeds in committing our forces to battle, and our funds to who knows what purpose.

His office shall be the only archive holding the record of his transactions, except as he reports the results once a year to the Congress.

And finally, he shall decide autonomously when his autonomous powers shall expire.

To repeat, all things are placed within the exclusive province of the President. He is absolved in advance from consulting the Congress. If he alone deems it important to the security of the Nation, he can use $200 million in any way he wants. The only limitation on the use of these funds, or more importantly, on the use of American Armed Forces against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism, is not a limitation to be exercised by the Congress of the United States, or, indeed, by the United States itself. The limitation turns on whether or not a nation or a group of nations under Communist attack asks for American military help.

This is a dubious kind of limitation, because our own security may well depend on the use of American Armed Forces against overt armed aggression from international communism—regardless of whether the nation under attack asks for our help or not. Does it make sense, then, to serve advance notice that America's freedom of action in fighting for its own interest will be at the mercy of how some of the quite unstable Middle Eastern governments react to Communist aggression? Uncertainty and confusion as to who really governs some of these states is not uncommon. From whom must the request for aid come during a revolutionary period—the ousted prime minister or the usurper; or must we wait until the United Nations or the World Court determines the legitimacy of the applicant for assistance?

How are we as Senators to react to all this?

Is the form and substance of the resolution consistent with the kind of constitutional government all of us in this Chamber took an oath to uphold? In the name of defending liberty abroad, are we, as Senators, henceforth to be deaf, dumb, and blind in the way we discharge our constitutional rights and duties in the conduct of foreign affairs? Do my colleagues believe that the President, any President, and his Secretary of State will be wiser and more effective, or more foresighted, in protecting the interests of our people if they are relieved of the necessity of consulting with and of justifying their actions to the Congress? Do you, my colleagues, representing 48 sovereign States, really desire to be rid of your power to influence the conduct of our foreign affairs?

You may ask: "In what way does the resolution abridge the constitutional principles of the separation of legislative and executive powers and the power of the Congress to declare war?"

The answer is that it does this in two ways:

First, there is the fact that this is not a Senate resolution or a concurrent resolution having only the force of advice on policy. It is a joint resolution. This means that it has the force of law.

The second way is related to the first. Since the joint resolution has the force of law, it represents, in its substantive content, a blanket transfer to the Executive of the constitutional right vested in the Congress to declare war. This, indeed, is a startling innovation. The Constitution, as we inherited it from the past, provided in effect that the Congress would declare war on a case-to-case basis. Under the joint resolution, however, the Congress stockpiles a batch of hypothetical declarations of war, covering a variety of possible contingencies. Then it says to the President: "Here they are. Now that you have them, you can take us into war—if that is your pleasure—in the confident knowledge that whatever you do, you have a legal basis for it."

I put this analogy to the Senate: Under the Constitution, the President has the power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint Cabinet officers, Ambassadors, members of the Supreme Court, and the like. But would any one of us say that as Senators we were carrying out our constitutional responsibilities if we authorized the President to appoint the next 10 Ambassadors, Cabinet officers, and members of the Supreme Court without the Senate passing on each one? The implications here are so preposterous that the question answers itself.

How much more preposterous is it, then, to say to the President, to any President, in the life and death matter of peace or war: "Here are blanket forms you may need if you want to wage war. Fill them in at your own discretion."

Read in this light, the claim put forward by the administration that the aim of the resolution is to have the President share his powers with the Congress in matters related to peace or war, is an affront to commonsense, for under this resolution, there is no sharing of power at all. Exclusive powers are given to the President. All that can be said is that the Congress is dragged in by the heels to share, not the power, but the responsibility for the consequences of the Executive's use or misuse of the power blindly put in his hands by the Congress.

Superficially, and as a matter of form, it might appear to the uninitiated that this resolution is a vehicle for consulting the Congress. However, there was no real prior consultation with Congress, nor will there be any sharing of power. The whole manner of presentation of this resolution—leaks to the press, speeches to specially summoned Saturday joint sessions, and dramatic secret meetings of the Committee on Foreign Relations after dark one evening before the Congress was even organized, in an atmosphere of suspense and urgency—does not constitute consultation in any true sense. All of this was designed to manage the Congress, to coerce it into signing this blank check. The main argument now is, that regardless of whether or not this is a proper method to express the Nation's will, it has now gone too far to draw back or to delay.

I am not unaware that cases can arise, as they have arisen in the past, where Presidents have employed the Armed Forces of the Nation in military operations without the express consent of the Congress. I am not unaware that the actions of the Executive in these emergency cases have well served the defense of the Republic. Experience tells us that when the highest interests of the country are at stake, an Executive who is timid represents a far greater danger to the preservation of our constitutional system than does one who exceeds the letter of the law in a vigorous use of Executive power to defend the Government, the Nation, and the Constitution. Yet experience also tells us something else. It tells us that we do a disservice to ourselves and the Executive if we try to define in exact terms what emergency power is. Why so?

An official who is required to justify the exercise of a power which he does not legally possess is in a very different situation from an official who is charged with abusing a power which is legally his, and who pleads necessity as a legal defense. The former will be very careful to see that the necessity which he pleads to excuse his act is clear and beyond question; he will also take care that the necessity he pleads did not arise from a fault of his own, lest his excuse

be turned against him. The latter official can act with much less caution. An abuse of power, unlike the usurpation of power, is condoned by the nonaction of Congress. There is in this case no necessity for seeking the positive approval of the constitutional authority, that is, the Congress. And that is what this resolution would absolve the administration from doing.

Instead of coming to us after the fact, when all the circumstances are known, and asking for our approval, this administration, not being willing to trust the fairness and justice of this body, asks us for an acquittance in advance of the fact, when none of the circumstances justifying the acquittance can possibly be known. I, for one, am unwilling to accept such a drastic change in constitutional practice.

In the First Congress, in 1789, a distinguished Member from Virginia, Alexander White, stated the applicable principle clearly and succinctly, as follows:

> It would be better for the President to extend his powers on some extraordinary occasions, even where he is not strictly justified by the Constitution, than the Legislature should grant an improper power to be exercised at all times. * * * I say it would be better for the Executive to assume the exercise of such a power on extraordinary occasions, than for us to delegate to him authority to exercise an extraordinary power on all occasions.

A final question remains.

What would the effect be on world opinion if the Congress failed to pass the joint resolution? I am not sure that the effect would be very significant, for the resolution in no way offers a policy that gets at the root of the dangers in the Middle East.

Witness after witness before our joint committee has testified that peace between Israel and her neighbors is indispensable to stability and progress in this area. To promote this peace, the refugee problem must be solved, and this in turn appears to be dependent upon the provision of opportunities for the refugees to work through irrigation and other public works. The Suez Canal, of course, must be reopened to all nations or alternative means of transporting oil developed, and long-term basic improvements in the economic and social structures of the countries undertaken. This area has vast undeveloped resources, which could carry the major part of the cost of development, if efficiently organized. But none of these objectives are envisaged by this resolution. And yet, if adopted, our people will assume, and quite logically, that surely a significant step toward a solution to the problems of the area has been enacted. It will be difficult indeed to persuade our constituents that after all the fuss and fury involved in promoting and enacting this resolution, the real work remains to be done.

Nevertheless, in view of the presentation of this resolution, I believe it would be advisable to announce now that if the international Communist movement tries to expand its influence in the Middle East by force, the United States would regard such action as a threat to the security of the United States, and would take appropriate action to repel such force.

It is one thing to tell the Soviet Union that the United States is prepared to use force to counter aggression. It is a very different thing—an unwise and unnecessary thing—for the Congress to say that the President is unauthorized to use the Armed Forces as he deems necessary at some future time and under conditions which cannot now be foreseen.

I am willing to vote for an advisory resolution expressing the Senate's support of the President's policy of opposing the expansion of Communist influence in the Middle East.

Such a procedure is not without precedent. The resolutions preceding the formation of the United Nations and the Vandenberg resolution, preceding NATO, were adopted with overwhelming support. They did not have the force of law. They did not pretend, or purport, or attempt to delegate additional powers to the President or to merge the legislative and Executive powers, but they evidenced the will of a united and determined people in support of a definite and constructive policy.

In both instances their final culmination depended upon future ratification by the Senate, when the conditions and the limitations were spelled out. This resolution does not so depend; and, by its character it cannot.

During the hearings on the resolution, the Secretary of State urged the committee and the Senate to act quickly, and suggested that constitutional questions should not be raised at such a time as this. I do not believe that even for a short time the Congress should abdicate its constitutional powers. History will demonstrate that the periods of greatest danger to the rights of the people, in a democracy, are those periods when adulation for a popular idol diverts their attention momentarily from the implications of their actions.

Consider for a moment the effect of this resolution as a precedent for future grants of power or for future appropriations.

Here we are asked for only $200 million without restrictions or safeguards. If we grant this, how can we deny a similar request for 2 billion next year? If we are willing to delegate our power to declare war, how can we conscientiously deny a request for a delegation of less important powers?

The effective participation of this Senate and this Congress in the Government of our country under our constitutional system is not a fortuitous circumstance of our history. Our Founding Fathers recognized the inherent tendency of the Executive to absorb all governmental power, and they provided safeguards against such instincts. I, for one, will not lend my vote to further the erosion of the power of this Senate.

EXHIBIT A

One may reasonably entertain two different views about the nature of the President's power under the circumstances which obtain in the Middle East. One view may be called the doctrine of inherent or residual power of the President. This view holds that as the possessor of the executive power of our Government, the President has a legal authority, granted to him by the Constitution itself, in cases of compelling necessity, to do whatever needs to be done to protect the vital interests of the Republic. Under this view, the resolution is entirely superfluous and positively bad. It is superfluous because the President already has the power. It is bad because if the Congress establishes a practice of formally granting such powers, it may raise the presumption that the President may not or should not exercise such powers in the absence of a congressional resolution. This would tend to limit an important Executive power, especially in the hands of a timid President and might therefore jeopardize the life of the Republic in a true emergency. At the very least, an unnecessary resolution would add confusion to an area of government where we can ill afford it.

The other view one may reasonably hold is sometimes called the doctrine of emergency power. Under this doctrine, if there is a genuine crisis in the Middle East requiring emergency action, the President should take whatever action he deems necessary to protect the vital interests of this Nation and then if he has reason to believe his actions exceed his authority, as soon as possible he should seek the approval of Congress.

According to Mr. Lucius Wilmerding, one of the leading authorities on this subject, our Founding Fathers subscribed to this second view. (See his article The President and the Law in the Political Science Quarterly, September 1952.) They believed that those who accept great power and responsibility from the Nation should also accept risk to themselves on great occasions when the safety of the Nation or its very highest interests are at stake.

In the First Congress, a distinguished member from Virginia, Alexander White, stated the principle as follows:

"It would be better for the President to extend his powers on some extraordinary occasion, even where he is not strictly justified by the Constitution, than the Legislature should grant an improper power to be exercised at all times. * * * I say it would be better for the Executive to assume the exercise of such a power on extraordinary occasions, than for us to delegate to him authority to exercise an extraordinary power on all occasions."

Representative Brown (16 Annals, 570) said:

"That there may be circumstances under which it might be the duty of a public officer to depart from the laws and take the responsibility upon himself."

Thomas Jefferson, in a letter to John B. Colvin, in 1810, expounded at length upon the principle. Colvin, a clerk in the State Department, had asked him the following questions: "Are there not periods when, in free governments, it is necessary for officers in responsible stations to exercise an authority beyond the law—and was not the time of Burr's treason such a period?" Jefferson answered both of these questions affirmatively:

"The question you propose, whether circumstances do not sometimes occur, which make it a duty in officers of high trust, to assume authorities beyond the law, is easy of solution in principle, but sometimes embarrassing in practice. A strict observance of the written laws is doubtless one of the high duties of a good citizen, but it is not the highest. The laws of necessity, of self-preservation, of saving our country when in danger, are of higher obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to written law, would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property, and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus absurdly sacrificing the end to the means."

In the Ninth Congress, a similar view was expressed by Congressman Barnabas Bidwell, as follows:

"Our Constitution, our laws, our liberty, and property are more endangered by acts done silently, under color of law, by a constructive assumption or extension of powers, than by any which may be done openly, in the face of the Nation, under a known and acknowledged responsibility, subject to the approbation or disapprobation of the Government, after a deliberate examination of the whole case. The temptation to pass such an ordeal cannot be so strong as to be dangerous."

An official who is required to justify the exercise of a power which he does not legally possess is in a very difficult situation from an official who is charged with abusing a power which is legally his, and who pleads necessity as a legal defense. The former will be very careful to see that the necessity which he pleads to excuse his act is clear and beyond question; he will also take care that the necessity he pleads did not arise from a fault of his own lest his excuse be turned against him. The latter official can act with much less caution. An abuse of power—unlike the usurpation of power—is condoned by the nonaction of Congress. There is in this case no necessity for seeking the positive approval of the constitutional authority.

Fully aware of the urge to expand which afflicts the executive power in any government, our Founding Fathers carefully created a system of checks and balances to restrain the Executive. Recognizing that critical periods of danger create the need for extraordinary powers in the Executive, and further recognizing the difficulty in canceling the power once the crisis is past, they adhered to the doctrine of emergency power, which, in effect, automatically restrains the Executive when the crisis is over. To substitute for this self-correcting doctrine the affirmative grant of vague and undefined authority contained in this resolution is improvident and unwise.

I believe the Congress ought not to abdicate its constitutional functions even for a short time. It ought to give the President whatever specific legislation he desires and can justify. It ought not to grant him vague and unlimited powers.

Another aspect of the procedure followed in this case warranting attention is the use of the joint resolution as a means to formulate foreign policy. Proper constitutional practice requires that the Congress as a whole by joint action declare war. But the Secretary of State himself repeatedly has told us this is neither a declaration of war, nor is it a delegation of the power to declare war. He has at times called this a declaration of peace, I believe. The Constitution does not mention a declaration of peace, but it does provide that the appointment of Ambassadors to foreign lands shall be confirmed by the Senate alone and that treaties with foreign nations may be made by the President, "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate * * * provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

Under these provisions the Executive has in the past properly sought the "advice and consent of the Senate" on matters of foreign policy. The constitutional provisions just cited recognize that matters involving our relations with other sovereign states require especial attention and safeguards on the part of our Government. To use a joint resolution which requires only a simple majority of each House is in my opinion a serious departure from the principles of our Founding Fathers and from the practice of the past.

The advice and consent of the Senate in matters of the highest importance to our foreign policy is not an idle or fortuitous requirement of the Constitution. Mistakes in this area of government are more serious, and not as easily corrected, as are mistakes in domestic legislation; hence the requirement of special safeguards in the Constitution in matters concerning foreign nations. It will be an evil day when the Senate abandons its power and responsibilities in the field of foreign policy.

That this fear is not mere idle speculation, but on the contrary is precisely the situation we now have in our Government is demonstrated by comparing the responsible attitude Jefferson took toward an incident in 1806, with the attitude of the present administration toward its responsibility in the Middle East.

"In 1806, during the recess of Congress, the *Leopard* attacked the *Chesapeake*. War with England appeared a possibility. The magazines were ill-provided with some necessary articles, nor had any appropriations been made for their purchase. In these circumstances Jefferson did not hesitate to provide them and place the country in safety, even though in so doing he violated the appropriation laws. Then he made a full disclosure to Congress and asked for an acquittance: 'To have awaited a previous and special sanction by law would have lost occasions which might not be retrieved. * * * I trust that the legislature, feeling the same anxiety for the safety of our country, so materially advanced by this precaution, will approve, when done, what they would have seen so important to be done if then assembled.' In due course the retrospective sanction which he asked was given."

In contrast to this forthright and courageous action of Jefferson, the present administration takes the position that if an attack takes place in the Middle East upon a vital installation considered essential to our national security, the President would not be able to use the Armed Forces to resist this aggression even by the Soviet, unless and until Congress has been called into session.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Before I ask the first question, let me say that I highly commend the Senator from Arkansas for this truly great speech. During the past 12 years I have heard the Senator make many notable speeches, but in my opinion this is his greatest one. It will stand to his everlasting credit. It is the second remarkable pronouncement I have heard today on the constitutional shortcomings of the resolution.

During the Senator's absence this morning from the committee, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I may correct the Senator, I attended the meeting of the committee this morning and was present until a few minutes before noon when I came to the Senate floor.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator was not present during the examination which went into this constitutional question. There is such similarity between the point of view the Senator from Arkansas has taken and the point of view the Senator from Wyoming took, that I wish to commend both of them. I think they have gone to the vital weakness of this resolution.

I have a little pride in making that comment, because, as the Senator knows, I have objected to this resolution from the very beginning. In two major speeches I have already made on this subject I have gone even further than have the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Wyoming, in that I have said, as a lawyer, that if there were a procedure by which we could get this resolution before the Supreme Court, I am satisfied that it would rule that the President is asking for unconstitutional powers; and I do not propose to give to any President unconstitutional powers, nor do I propose to seek to delegate away from the Congress the constitutional duties which clearly devolve upon it.

Therefore I should like to ask the Senator 3 or 4 questions which focus attention on the very heart of the great speech he has just made.

Does the Senator agree with me that, under the Constitution, the President has all the inherent and emergency power he needs to protect American lives, property, and vital interests anywhere in the world if they should be subject to armed attack against us by any other power?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me say that the memorandum which I asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks is concerned specifically with that very point. The authorities I have examined make a distinction between inherent power and emergency power. My own view is that the theory of emergency powers is probably the superior theory to be applied to the office of the Presidency, and I believe that was Jefferson's point of view. He referred to it in a case or two. I used the quotation from Alexander White primarily because it was very brief and succinct, and fit very well into the context of my speech. Jefferson said the same thing on several occasions, in a more expansive way. I did not wish to burden my speech, but I did include in my memorandum Jefferson's words and the words of others in the Congress who functioned in the early days in founding the Republic. I agree that the President has ample powers to meet an emergency, under whichever theory he may choose to justify such action.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has discussed the 1951 State Department report on the powers of the President. The Senator agrees then, does he not, that this resolution is not necessary to protect American lives, property, and vital interests in the Middle East if they should be militarily attacked by any enemy?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with that statement. As a matter of fact, the Secretary of State, in presenting the resolution, scarcely made such an argument. His main argument was that the resolution would have a psychological impact. It would be a terrible thing, in my opinion, in order to achieve a psychological impact, to undertake a procedure which is clearly, in my view, contrary to the practices this country has followed in the constitutional relationships between the legislative and executive branches.

To achieve the psychological impact the Secretary had in mind, all that would be necessary would be a resolution similar in form, for example, to the Vandenberg resolution. But there have been other resolutions before this body achieving the same purpose. In other words, if the psychological effect of demonstrating that the Congress is behind

the Executive in our policy with respect to Communist expansion in the Middle East is all the Secretary really seeks to obtain, a simple advisory resolution would achieve that result.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator recall that when the Secretary of State was on the witness stand he admitted that the power of Congress to declare war cannot be delegated?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not recall that exactly; but, of course, that is a fact. I do not recall the precise statement of the Secretary of State.

Mr. MORSE. Let me refresh the Senator's memory. I put the question to him, and he agreed that it could not be delegated. Then, does the Senator recall that the Secretary of State went on to say that he did not think this resolution in any way involved article I, section 8, of the Constitution, which is the section which vests in the Congress the power to declare war?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do recall that. He went on to say that he did not regard this as a declaration of war, but as a declaration of peace.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I recall that discussion.

Mr. MORSE. If we should pass the resolution, and if some nation in the Middle East should be attacked, and, under the terms of the resolution, should call upon the President of the United States to send American boys to protect its territorial integrity, if the President should oblige would we not then be in a state of war?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I certainly think so.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me, then, that in fact this resolution, no matter how the Secretary of State tries to word around it, seeks to empower the President of the United States, by law—because the Senator is completely right in the statement he has made today, that this is a law which we are asked to pass—to put this country into a state of war without, at that point, a declaration of war first being passed by the Congress?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is clear.

Mr. MORSE. Therefore, does the Senator agree with me that we are engaged in a historic discussion as to whether or not, by law, we should give any President the blank check authority to commit acts which would lead us into war, without being required, in the first place, to bring the facts to the Congress and obtain in advance the action of the Congress on the facts set forth?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator. Or, going one step further, if circumstances should develop whereby it was impossible to come to Congress, and our vital interests were threatened, I believe a good President would proceed as Jefferson said he should proceed, and as Jefferson himself proceded in the Leopard-Chesapeake case.

Mr. MORSE. That relates to the Senator's comment about the emergency power of the President, which can be exercised until the President can come before Congress.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; I believe the Senator is quite right.

Mr. MORSE. Rhetorical as the question may be, for the purpose of the RECORD I should like to have the Senator answer it. Does the Senator agree with me that it takes not more than 20 minutes, with modern transportation, for anyone to get from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue to a joint session of Congress?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; and it would probably be less than that.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that with modern transportation, it takes not more than 24 hours to get a majority of Congress assembled under this dome for a special session of Congress, if necessary?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should say that that is a reasonable period.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator know of any time factor which would justify the Secretary of State, speaking for the President, to seek to rationalize this resolution on the ground that it is needed in advance in order to save time in an hour of emergency?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator. That argument was not very persuasive with me, as the Senator may know.

Mr. MORSE. Later in the afternoon I intend to speak at greater length on this constitutional question. I wish to say again that I believe the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], raising as they have today these constitutional questions, have forewarned the American people what this administration is proposing. The administration is proposing to have passed a joint resolution which would weaken the constitutional power of Congress. When I make this statement I am not charging any motivation, but speak only about the effect. I say that the effect, if Congress passes the joint resolution, is to adopt police-state tactics in America. I say that because, if we take away from Congress its constitutional powers and substitute Executive power, we start down the road of the police state. That will never be done by a vote of the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First I should like to compliment the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for pointing out so clearly and bringing to the attention of the Senate some of the matters which have arisen from time to time in the consideration of the joint resolution by the two committees sitting jointly.

I was particularly interested in the very last reference the Senator made, namely, to the erosion of the power of the Senate.

I wish to suggest another erosion. It seems to me that perhaps there is contained in the joint resolution, if put into effect, and if repeated time after time, the danger that it will constitute a precedent. I may say that perhaps we really started down that road with the Formosa Resolution. I do not mean that the joint resolution is on all fours with the Formosa Resolution, by any means, because I believe that some clear distinctions can be drawn between them. However, the Formosa Resolution has been referred to frequently in the hearings before the committee as a precedent. There is the danger that the pending joint resolution will become another precedent; and another similar resolution in the future will become still another precedent. In that way would we not be actually eroding the powers of the Executive to handle affairs with other nations of the world?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it could be subject to that interpretation, in the sense that if there develops a feeling that the Executive cannot act without having a prior resolution adopted by Congress, there will be a tendency to destroy the principle I mentioned a moment ago, that of emergency power.

I believe it only illustrates again what has been illustrated so often, that the Constitution as drafted and adopted is a pretty sound document, and that, while not specific in this respect, it does allow a certain discretion—by not tying the question down in detail thereby allowing some room for wisdom to be used when the question of what constitutes Executive power is raised. I believe either way we look at the joint resolution, the results are clearly bad and clearly indefensible.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is a matter of mixing and confusing the powers which have been defined.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Those powers have been defined both in the Constitution by express provision and by the interpretation that has been placed upon the Constitution down through the years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may say to the Senator that the traditional way for the Executive to obtain an expression by Congress, so as to show what the Secretary of State calls the solidarity and unity of the country, is by adoption of a resolution of an advisory nature.

The Constitution says in so many words "consent and advice of the Senate." A resolution which would be properly within the normal meaning of the language of the Constitution would not provide what the pending joint resolution sets forth. A resolution similar to the two advisory resolutions I have mentioned would be quite acceptable, and I would have no trouble voting for one or the other, if they expressed wisdom and broad policy in this area. In this connection, the question of a precedent is a very important consideration.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Both as it pertains to the legislative and the executive branches of the Government.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very clear lines now exist in that respect.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is true.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask one further question. There is not, is there, in the Constitution a clear statement with respect to these powers? Have they not been developed down through the years?

For instance, the Senator mentioned the action of President Jefferson in the

Leopard-Chesapeake case. That precedent has been developing over the years and is now very clearly accepted. Is that not correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As I said, that is the traditional way of interpreting those powers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have looked hastily through the Constitution again, and I cannot find any express power. However, we know that during the years the Constitution has been in effect—and many cases along that line have been decided by the Supreme Court—the powers of the legislative and the executive branches have been pretty well defined.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct. The theory of emergency powers to which I referred, in effect—and to put it boldly—is the theory a responsible Executive would follow; namely, that if he took action which was beyond the authority of the Constitution, he would come immediately to Congress at the earliest opportunity and present the facts and ask for acquittance from the Congress. If Congress did not give it, then of course he could be either subject to impeachment or reprimand. However, that is the theory of emergency powers, which is the one I believe has been built up over the years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator from Wyoming will permit me, I should like to ask 1 or 2 further questions along the same line.

The Senator knows that the argument has been made throughout the hearings that the proposed action in this instance was following very much the pattern of the Greek-Turkish program. That has been cited to us as a precedent. I believe the Senator will agree with me that the proposed procedure is entirely different.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Absolutely. That reminds me of another point that should be placed in this RECORD, as well as in the record of the committee hearings. It is this: I am confident that much of the approval of the so-called Eisenhower doctrine arises from approval of the speech the President made, which was widely publicized, and not from a consideration of the joint resolution. Some of the witnesses, as the Senator will recall, were very enthusiastic about the Eisenhower doctrine. I asked one of them, "Are you sure you are talking about the resolution, or the President's speech?"

It was quite clear that he was talking about the President's speech. That is very different from the Truman doctrine. The Truman doctrine was offered in President Truman's speech.

Mr. SPARKMAN. He announced the policy our Government was going to follow.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. It was a policy speech. He made the speech to a joint session of Congress. Subsequently a bill, which implemented the policy on all fours, was passed, in order to provide appropriations. The appropriations provided the aid which had been outlined in the policy speech.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was for the purpose of providing aid.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. It was in line with the procedure we had followed every year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was somewhat similar to the tripartite agreement of 1950. That was not a legislative act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; it was a declaration of a policy by the Executive.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Was it not stated under that agreement that our policy would be to go to the help of any nation in the Near East which was attacked by another nation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Roughly, that was it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. It said that is the way we would deal with the matter.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I compliment the Senator on his statement. It seems to me that he has certainly made a very persuasive argument why we should support an alternative plan, perhaps something like the Vandenberg resolution, for instance. I am not willing to go quite so far as he has, and would say that as of this moment I would be opposed to the whole proposal, in the event that we were not able to have an alternative plan adopted.

Has the Senator read, recently, chapter 26 of the book by Arthur Vandenberg, Jr., The Private Letters of Senator Vandenberg?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It so happens that I did, because the Senator from Alabama called it to my attention, and pointed out how appropriate it is to the situation that has existed in Congress, and the way so-called bipartisanship was applied during the period involved.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the manner in which the urgency was considered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. I recommend the book to everyone. I read it only recently. The Senator is quite right in saying it is appropriate at this time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Every Member of the Senator should read that chapter before acting on the resolution. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for his remarks.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I take pleasure in yielding to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, whom I think is one of the greatest authorities in this body on the Constitution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator praises me in exaggeration.

I wish to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that Senate Joint Resolution 19 was presented to Congress by the executive branch.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. The resolution was prepared by the executive branch; and if my memory serves me correctly, it was introduced by the chairman of the committee at the request of the executive branch.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is also my understanding.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But it was prepared by the executive branch.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have asked that question because I think it is very important that the public at large should not make the mistake which was made by one of the witnesses to whom the Senator is now referring; namely, the mistake of confusing the President's speech with the resolution. Is it not a fact that the resolution in many instances is in conflict with the speech?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator is quite correct, and the Senator pointed that out in very clear language before the meeting of the joint committees this morning.

As the Senator so well stated, the President's speech indicated that the President would consult with Congress; that he would keep in constant touch with Congress. The very clear effect of the resolution is that there will be no further need to consult Congress at all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not true that the pledge made by the President in his speech of January 5 was completely absent from the draft of the resolution which was presented?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Absolutely; there is nothing in the resolution as it was presented which would have carried out the statement made by the President about keeping in touch with Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that while the President said he would keep in hour-by-hour contact with Congress while Congress was in session, and if Congress was not in session he would call a special session of Congress, such language has been omitted from the resolution, no reference whatsoever being made to it, and the resolution as presented by the State Department, contained in section 4, the diminutive concession to Congress of requiring the President to make an annual report in January?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And nothing else?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is all; that is all it requires.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does not the Senator agree that the resolution is different from every other request which has ever been made in that it constitutes an abdication of congressional power?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree. That is my interpretation of the resolution. I have found no precedent, nor anything which I could consider a precedent for this particular action.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the Senator from Arkansas referred to the Chesapeake case, which occurred when Jefferson was President. In that case, as in the case against the Barbary pirates in 1805, President Jefferson sought to procure united action among the nations of the world, especially the nations of Europe, to resist the activities of the Barbary pirates, as they were properly called. But President Jefferson presented a statement or a convocation of some kind. The other nations did not go along with the proposal, because they found it easier to pay blackmail to the Barbary pirates than to do as Jefferson suggested.

Then, because he was defending a basic American doctrine, namely, the doctrine of the freedom of the seas, and was defending the economy of the United

States, he sent the Navy to repress the pirates, and that action was successful.

Does the Senator not agree that such an action is an emergency action of the President, to defend the rights and the commercial property of citizens of the United States?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, indeed, I do.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is the pending resolution not completely different?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is completely different.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In that it provides, or attempts to provide, authority for the President to use the Armed Forces in the Middle East, or the region of the Middle East, no particular boundaries being established?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The use of the Armed Forces to be in the President's discretion, when some nation, unnamed, in the Middle East asks for such aid?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that the resolution utterly and completely bypasses the Congress of the United States and gives the President the power to go to war whenever some foreign nation requests it, under conditions which nobody in the Senate today can possibly predict?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator; he has stated the situation correctly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, without burdening the Senator from Arkansas with further inquiries, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD as though delivered the testimony which I prepared for the session of the joint Committees on Foreign Relations and on Armed Services this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Does the Senator ask that it be printed in small type?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will read it if necessary. I will deliver the speech, if necessary, later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that in order to have the speech printed in large type, it would be necessary for the Senator to read it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall do that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not possible for the Senator to ask unanimous consent to have the speech printed as if read, as has been customary in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that that is not possible under unanimous consent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was done within the last week.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall not press the point, but later, when the Senator from Arkansas has answered his other colleagues, I shall take the floor in my own right.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield? I wish to ask him 1 or 2 questions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have the highest regard for the Senator both as a Senator and as a citizen.

First, the economic side of the question has not been pressed as much as has the military side.

On the economic side of the question, does not the Senator agree with me that the authority of the President will expire in July of this year, so that both the authority and the appropriation for any year after July 1957 will have to come before Congress for consideration?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So the $200 million which is asked for in the resolution, in order to provide greater leeway, is money which has already been appropriated, as the Senator knows, because he has sat with the committee at times.

The President wants to have a release from three restrictions of the Mutual Security Act, so that he may have freer use of this amount of money.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. If I may say so, on that point there is precedent even for the giving of money with little or no restrictions, but I do not think it is a precedent which ought to be enlarged. It is a practice that I do not necessarily approve of.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not approve of it either.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The President has a substantial amount of money already provided in a special fund. I think he could well do with that. I think this proposal is not in the same category as the delegation of power to declare war, but I do not like to encourage this kind of practice.

Frankly, I do not think we ought to do it. Even in other cases of existing funds, which are supposed to be free from restriction, while legally they may be, nevertheless, in the presentations to the committees, the usual practice is for the executive branch to say, "This is what we expect to do with the money, but we do not want Congress to tie us down to it, because we would like a little flexibility."

Congress has gone along with such suggestions, but I think it is a practice which should be kept very much restricted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not want to make too much of a point on this question, but, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I may say that of the $200 million which the President was given, $100 million was authorized because of the uncertain conditions in the world. As I understand, a substantial portion of that money has been used in Hungary, and an additional amount has been planned for such use, although it has not been used.

Now the President is asking for the same leeway and to be released from three restrictions in the Mutual Security Act, so that a greater amount can be used than the amount used in Hungary and the other amounts to be used as planned.

I agree with the Senator from Arkansas. The only point I wish to make is that the authority in the appropriation on the economic side will expire on July 1, so there will be an opportunity for Congress throughout this spring to decide what it wishes to do in the future.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. On the military side of the question, I wish to ask this question——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Before the Senator leaves the previous point, I should like to discuss further the $200 million. Only 4 months of the present fiscal year remain. I think it would be very difficult to spend wisely an additional $200 million in the area of the Middle East; it could merely be given away, so as to let each government do with it what it pleased. It is impossible to develop new programs of construction, irrigation, or anything else of a permanent nature in this area in four months. So I think it is an unrealistic program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. When we speak about $200 million on the economic side, that includes also military assistance. As I understand, the Richards mission is to determine how much of that sum should go into military assistance as such, as opposed to economic assistance. The Senator agrees that that was the testimony, does he not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My understanding of the use of the $200 million is that the amount is free of any restriction and can all be used for military purposes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct, but the testimony was to the effect that the Richards mission would suggest where that money could best be spent; and if my memory of Admiral Radford's testimony serves me correctly, a substantial amount, if not most of it, would be used on the military side rather than on the economic side.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think the witnesses were quite so definite. As I recall no one attempted to indicate—I know the Secretary of State did not attempt to do so—what would be done with the money. I think the Secretary indicated a desire to do with it what he pleased. I do not think the witnesses undertook to outline the program which in any sense would put them under the slightest obligation to do any specific thing with the money.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. On the military side, the Senator from Arkansas has been basing his argument on the premise of a declaration of war and on taking from Congress the right to declare war. I should like to ask a question in that connection. In the President's address to Congress on January 5, the following appears on page 7, in the fifth paragraph:

> If, contrary to my hope and expectation, a situation arose which called for the military application of the policy which I asked the Congress to join me in proclaiming, I would of course maintain hour-by-hour contact with the Congress if it were in session. And if the Congress were not in session, and if the situation had grave implications, I would, of course, at once call the Congress into special session.

As I understand the joint resolution, Mr. President, its purpose is not to declare war, but, as a practical matter, to try to prevent war, because if one of the affected nations were subjected to an international Communist attack, and if that nation requested assistance, obviously the United States would ultimately become involved. Does not the Senator from Arkansas agree with me as to that? Could there be an international Communist attack or aggression in the Middle East area without causing the United States to become involved ultimately?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is a very speculative question. Whether the United States ultimately would become involved would depend upon the extent of the attack or aggression. I suppose such an aggression could be of so mild a nature that we would not think it threatened very significantly anyone's interest.

My objection to the approach now proposed is that under the provisions of the joint resolution it is sought to grant this power without knowing any of the facts. The approach is highly speculative. I think the joint resolution attempts to reverse the normal practice the United States has followed under the Constitution since the beginning of our Government. Inasmuch as we cannot tell what will happen in that area of the world, let us point out that if such aggression were to occur, the President of the United States would continue to be the President of the United States; and we know that, as a matter of fact the Armed Forces of the United States will go wherever the President tells them to go. If tomorrow the President were to issue an order that the Sixth Fleet, which is lying in the Mediterranean, should do certain things, we have no doubt that the Sixth Fleet would do them. Even if such aggression were of a serious nature, the normal practice would be for the President immediately to come to the Congress and say to it, "Here is what has happened, and I have done so and so. Do you approve?" I would say that is the practice which has been followed in the past. It is very important for us to continue our constitutional practice of requiring that the Executive obtain congressional approval of his action.

On the other hand, under the joint resolution there is an attempt to give the President such approval ahead of time. I say that would establish a very dangerous precedent. Furthermore, I say that the joint resolution is fraught with all kinds of uncertainties. Certainly it would establish a precedent which would no longer make participation by the Congress necessary at all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I respect the intellectual ability and the patriotism of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I am trying to make the point that the purpose of the joint resolution is, not to declare war, but to prevent war. As I have already stated, the President clearly said that if he had to use his authority, he would immediately come before Congress, if it were in session; and if it were not in session, he would immediately call a special session of Congress.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All I can say is that I think there is no doubt among the Members of this body that our purpose is to prevent war. The difference is as to the means of doing so and of how best to achieve that objective.

I am saying that the joint resolution proposes a very ill-advised means of achieving the desired objective. The Senator from Massachusetts has said that the purpose or objective is peace, not war. I agree with him as to that. In a sense, all of us are trying to do the wisest thing which will make war less likely. But the Senator from Massachusetts is confusing the means and the end. I say we are not ready to accept the principle that the end justifies the means.

All of us agree as to the desired end or objective. However, as to the means selected by the administration, the fact is that those means are ill-adapted to the achievement of the desired end. Moreover, I believe those means would be unconstitutional, in the sense that they would violate the established practice which has been followed in this country. When I say "unconstitutional", of course I do not use that word in the narrow sense that the Supreme Court would hold such an act or acts unconstitutional, for I know of no way in which a justiceable issue on this question could be presented to the Supreme Court for consideration. I simply mean that the course proposed is contrary to any taken in our past experience, and I think is a very ill-advised one.

The proper way to achieve the purpose stated by the Secretary of State is simply to make an advisory declaration, which is something Congress has done on many occasions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield once more?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The procedure now proposed has worked very well up to this moment in the case of Formosa and the Formosa Resolution. I listened to some of the questions the Senator from Arkansas asked in connection with that matter. I read some of the colloquy as late as today—including, for instance, the speech made by the Senator from Montana. At that time the Senator from Arkansas asked some questions about constitutional matters.

The result of the Formosa Resolution has been helpful up to the present time. If the Formosa Resolution has been helpful in preventing war, rather than in declaring war, my only point is that the joint resolution now under consideration would seem to be good in the present case, too.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With all due respect to the Senator from Massachusetts, let me say that I do not think the Formosa factual situation is at all comparable to the one in the Middle East. There are many distinctions between the two. In the other situation, we had a treaty with Formosa. In that case, we had an existing situation: Our fleet was already in the vicinity of Formosa, and was then already doing what was sought to be continued by means of the Formosa Resolution. So the Formosa Resolution did not really change the status quo at all, for we already had been protecting Formosa from attack; we had been doing that for I do not know how many years—ever since the end of the war. So the two are not by any means on all fours.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me? I wish to ask him a question in connection with the colloquy the Senator from Arkansas has been having with the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that the situation regarding Formosa was utterly different, in that Formosa was not the property of China when World War II began, for Formosa had been taken from China by Japan, and we took it from Japan in that war. If we had acted in the way that the Russian Soviet Government acts, we would have regarded Formosa as conquered territory. However, we did not do so. Instead, we regarded Formosa as territory of which we were the custodians, to be held until our allies decided what should be done in the name of freedom and progress to set that country free.

In the present case, no such situation as that exists. If the Senator from Arkansas will permit me to do so, I should like to point out to him, in the language of the resolution, what the difference is:

> SEC. 2. The President is authorized to undertake, in the general area of the Middle East, military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance. Furthermore, he is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary to secure and protect—

Not the territorial integrity and political independence of the United States or any of its allies; no. Instead, Mr. President—

> The territorial integrity and political independence of any such nation or group of nations requesting such aid against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism.

Whatever one may say about the desirability of resisting communism, the fact remains that this joint resolution, if it is passed in these words, would remove Congress from the picture, and would place in the hands of the President the power to use the Armed Forces of the United States; he would be authorized to use them at his own discretion, when asked to do so by a foreign nation. I think that is not to be contemplated; it would be an abdication of congressional power, something to which we should never consent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Arkansas yield, to permit me to make a further statement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not wish to detain the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. However, as I have said, I think the joint resolution is proposed in an effort to prevent war, rather than to declare war. We must keep that point constantly in mind.

In his messages to Congress, the President has said that if he has to use the Armed Forces of the United States—which he hopes he will not have to do—

he will immediately come to Congress, if it is in session; or, if it is not in session, he will call a special session of Congress. I do not see that such a situation is any different from many other situations with which I know the distinguished Senator from Arkansas is familiar.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am not complaining about the President's speech. As a matter of fact, I do not know why he did not stop with his speech. But the joint resolution is what we are asked to act on; and it is what I object to.

I see nothing wrong, to speak of, in the President's speech, although it was not the subject of my minute examination. But I think we should make a distinction between a speech and a law.

In the present instance we are asked to pass a joint resolution which, as the Senator has pointed out, would alter the relationship between the President and the Congress, especially the Senate. I say "especially the Senate" because, as the Senator has pointed out, in connection with our foreign relations the Senate has a special role. So if both Houses of Congress were to pass such a joint resolution in regard to this subject matter, the Senate would be more guilty than the House of Representatives.

I think, in all deference, the resolution alters the relationship between the President and the Congress, whereas the speech, of course, does not. I think there is all the difference in the world between the two. Again, I do not believe there is any difference of opinion between us in the objective we have in mind. It is peace. But I submit we cannot ignore the means which are used to achieve the end. The means are all important. For the sake of this particular difficulty—if one wants to call it that—in the Middle East, we certainly should not sacrifice or alter the established constitutional principle and the established relationship between the Executive and the Senate in order to meet a particular problem. I do not consider that to be necessary at all. I think the President can meet it just as Jefferson and other Presidents met emergencies in the past.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not want to break down the Constitution any more than the Senator from Arkansas does.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator does not wish to do so I hope he will give careful attention to the resolution, and will make sure that the resolution carries into effect the President's speech.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all, permit me, along with other Senators, to commend the Senator from Arkansas for the splendid discussion of the resolution, and I underscore the words "discussion of the resolution." The Senator from Arkansas has discussed the text and the body of the resolution, line by line, as has the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], as has the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and as has the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

I was interested in the comment of the Senator from Arkansas. He said the President, through the resolution, seeks to obtain peace. I suggest that therein lies one of the troubles with the administration's statements, because there is a difference between the statements of the President and the policies of his agents. We see that difference demonstrated repeatedly.

If the Senator will permit me to digress at this point, we hear the President saying we must check inflation; only to have an agent of his coming before the Congress who says, "I doubt whether we are going to have anything the President suggests, such as controls." We have the President saying, "We ought to adopt a reduced budget." Then we have an agent of a specific policy saying, "Oh, not in the case of this budget." We have a President delivering an address before a joint meeting of the Congress in which he outlines a doctrine; then his agent, the Secretary of State, comes before the committee with specific legislative language which departs from the doctrine.

I think we owe a debt of gratitude to the Senator from Arkansas for pointing up the differences, as I am sure other Senators have done when I was not present and listening.

I desire to ask the Senator from Arkansas a question relating to a paragraph in his manuscript on page 2, concerning, as the Senator puts it, the dubious kind of limitation relating to the request of the President for the use of Armed Forces as well as economic assistance. Am I correct in understanding the Senator to say that the limitation upon the use of force turns on whether or not a nation or a group of nations under attack wants to have military help?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what the resolution says.

Mr. HUMPHREY. On that basis, is it to be presumed that if a nation asks for military help and says it has been under Communist attack, we are therefore, ipso facto, obligated under the terms of the resolution, to give that nation military help?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is the clear meaning of the resolution, if it means anything at all.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what I wanted to ascertain. What does it mean?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not sure there would be any way to make the President take such action. He might decide not to take it, and Congress could not do anything about it. However, that is what the resolution provides—upon request. What is being sought in that connection, of course, is to avoid the charge that we shall go to the aid of those nations with any imperialistic designs and without request. This illustrates the danger we incur when we try to define the Executive power in a legislative act, which we have never done in the past. This resolution illustrates the danger of following such a procedure. It is an impossible procedure, because if that were not provided in this kind of resolution, we would be open to attack and would be subject to the question, "What are you going to do? Move in?" whereas under a general declaration of policy such as has been mentioned, we would be free from such pitfalls. The resolution is bad in the way it is framed; it is bad to have a resolution seeking to tell the President how to use his Executive power in an emergency about which nobody knows.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator means an emergency which as yet is not fully defined? Is that what the Senator is saying?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not only that we may not fully know about it, but that there is very little known about what might develop in the Middle East.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator makes note of the fact that a problem would arise if aid were to be given at the request of a country, namely, who would do the requesting if the country were controlled by Communists. We could assume that the group which took control of a country would request aid from us to throw them out. Apparently the request would have to come from the deposed government, which would be the government en route to exile, or actually exiled. Then the question would arise as to whether we would follow that kind of doctrine with respect to other governments which have been deposed. I may say there are certain countries in the world that have lost their independence and are in exile which means a great deal to me personally. I am wondering, if that kind of doctrine were carried out in the Middle East, whether we could not be asked, "How about helping us? We are the ones who should be in office." That question could be asked by the exiled governments of Poland, Albania, Hungary, Estonia, or Lithuania. The question might be raised why such a doctrine could not be applied in the case of such governments. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to comment on the question raised by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. We are indebted to him for pointing out the erosion of the power of the Senate. The Senator has noted, as have other Senators, that this is not an advisory resolution. This is not a consensus. This is not a general statement of acclamation of presidential action. As such, it is entirely different from every doctrine, such as the Monroe Doctrine, the Truman doctrine, and a host of other doctrines enunciated during our history. The Senator from Alabama pointed out not only the erosion of the power of the Senate, but the alteration of the power of the Executive. While the Senator and his colleagues have been in colloquy, I have examined again Edward S. Corwin's "The President, Office and Powers." I also sent to the Senate Library for "The Constitution of the United States," annotated by Mr. Corwin, relating to presidential powers.

It has been pointed out that in the Leopard-Chesapeake case an emergency power was involved. If the Senator will

permit one possible interpretation, that seemed to be not quite correct; I do not think Jefferson was interpreting presidential powers that go beyond the Constitution. He was interpreting the presidential power to meet an emergency within the Constitution, provided immediately the congressional processes were followed. The Curtiss Wright case, on the emergency powers of the President, is conclusive on the question.

No power is lodged in the President that is not given him by the Constitution, but the power to protect the vital interests of the country, or the sovereignty of the United States of America from attack, is vested in the President. He can use that power, even in the absence of Congress, provided he immediately comes before the Congress and seeks a reaffirmation of the power he has used and the means and the methods he has employed to pursue the objective.

Does the Senator agree with that interpretation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I announced earlier that I have a memorandum on the distinction between the so-called emergency power and inherent power. As a practical matter, I think they may be the same in the end, but there is a difference in the theory as to how they should be applied. The theory of the emergency power is that the President may exceed the power expressly granted by the Constitution, but he must immediately seek acquittance from the constitutional body, which is the Congress. I think perhaps one may say it is a superior power, but I agree with the Senator that, as a practical matter, when the power is applied, there is no practical distinction.

I only ask the Senator to examine the memorandum which I have inserted in the RECORD. It was a little too long and technical to use in the speech itself, so I inserted it in the RECORD. I grant that the distinction referred to is highly technical and legal.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I claim no expert knowledge in the matter of Executive powers, even though this is an area in which I have long been interested. What limited experience I have had arises from the fact that at one time I was a teacher of political science, and we used to discuss Executive powers in great detail. My own personal recollection is that the inherent powers of the Executive Office include within them the power to meet emergencies. So the powers can be called emergency powers. The doctrines are intertwined.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There are two schools of thought. There is a very respectable group of authority which follows the interpretation to which the Senator refers. I am not sure that the question is worth any great argument. But I personally feel that the theory which Jefferson had in mind in the Chesapeake-Leopard case is perhaps the better way to look at it. Under either theory, this resolution is utterly superfluous and wrong. If the President has inherent power, why give him the resolution? It certainly would not be a proper resolution if we were to follow the inherent-power theory. So, for our purposes, I think there is no use in laboring the distinction, because under either interpretation this resolution is bad.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It happens to be the view of the junior Senator from Minnesota that the only reason this resolution is before the Senate is that Republican orators and Republican propagandists made such a hullabaloo about the United States action in Korea, and the fact that President Truman had met Communist aggression on the field of battle. The same propagandists made such a political issue out of it that ever since that time, before a President of the United States was willing to move to exercise his powers as President, and speak as Commander in Chief and our spokesman in foreign affairs, he felt that he must come trotting down to Congress to get us to agree to something he had already said he is going to do, which leaves us in an almost indefensible position; or he asks us for advice and consent on policies which he has already announced, leaving us, again, in an almost indefensible position.

The resolution which is before us is tied not to the constitutional realities of the President's powers; nor is it tied to the international realities which, in part, may be due to the failure of policies on the part of this Government, but it is tied to the political realities. This administration does not wish to move until it hog-ties every Member of Congress.

As the Senator from Arkansas well stated, the resolution, in effect, was a means of putting the cork into the bottle of Eisenhower-Dulles mistakes, so that we could no longer examine the ingredients thereof. It was designed to seal that cork by the vote of every Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

I am perfectly willing to withhold the cork. I was one of those who wanted to take a look at what was in the bottle—the mistakes of yesterday, or, if that be considered an uncharitable expression, the accomplishments of yesterday. But I do not believe in sealing the political jug. I think we are trying to be a little too polite with one another, when we say this is a great constitutional issue.

In fact, what has been presented to us by the Secretary of State is his interpretation of how to quell the revolt in the ranks of the American people and the Congress of the United States over the mistakes of the Eisenhower foreign policy. That is what we have had laid before us. It will require more than a resolution to still what I believe to be a legitimate complaint against the mistakes of this administration in the field of foreign policy.

I am perfectly willing to argue the constitutional questions involved. The Secretary of State did not argue them well. He argued them very poorly in the presence of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. He did not argue the urgency of the situation very well, in the light of the testimony of Admiral Radford.

The only thing he argued was that the resolution was for peace. Whenever this administration runs out of legitimate arguments, it asks, "Are you against peace?" It can come forward with any kind of concoction, and if anyone is against it, he is against peace. I do not believe we can get peace or solve problems by hastily passing resolutions. We can do it by carefully designed, proposed, and executed policies and programs under mature leadership; and we are lacking in that respect.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LONG. First let me compliment the Senator on what I believe is a carefully considered and statesmanlike presentation of the problem.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for his kind words.

Mr. LONG. The Senator knows that the resolution before us states that the President is to have the authority to employ the Armed Forces "to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any such nation or group of nations requesting such aid," and so forth.

The phrase "to secure the political independence" has a different meaning from the phrase "to protect the political independence." I am sure the Senator recognizes that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I see what the Senator is driving at.

Mr. LONG. It would be possible, under the terms of the resolution, to contend that the President was given power to overthrow a government.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would be possible. I am sure that was not intended.

Mr. LONG. Of course, the great difficulty is to find out what in the world is intended by this resolution, after sitting for 4 days hearing the Secretary of State. As one Senator who, in good faith, tried to cooperate with the Secretary, I found him to be one of the least candid and most evasive witnesses we have ever examined. In my brief experience as a lawyer, and in my experience of 8 years in the Senate, I have never examined a more evasive or less satisfactory witness. I am not undertaking to speak for other Members of this body. I am merely stating my own view.

Let me give an example of the kind of thing which occurred during the 4 days of hearings. Secretary Dulles was complaining about the time the hearings were consuming. Some of us required half an hour to get the answer to a simple question. The junior Senator from Louisiana opened his part of the examination, and finally gave up in disgust. The junior Senator from Louisiana said to the Secretary, in effect, "Mr. Secretary, here is a document prepared for the same two joint committees in 1951. It states the views of the then Executive, President Truman, and other members of the executive department, as to the powers of the President to employ American forces abroad, and it states them very clearly.

The document points out that at least 125 times the President of the United States has used our Armed Forces out-

side the United States, sometimes committing them to the open field of battle.

It goes on to say:

While the most numerous class of these incidents is that involving the protection of American property or American citizens in foreign lands, many of them—such as the intervention in Texas in 1845 and in Mexico in 1917, the intervention in Panama in 1903–04, and the dispatch of troops to Iceland in 1941—are not concerned with the interests of individual citizens, but with the general defense of the United States or the protection of some national interest or some concern of American foreign policy.

Some people may differ with this statement, but I asked the Secretary if this was still the opinion of the executive branch, or whether he differed with this view. If so, I asked the Secretary to favor me with a statement as to the views of the executive department.

The answer was that it would take an interminable period of time for John Foster Dulles to arrive at the answer to one of the most fundamental questions involving his constitutional responsibility.

I have before me the galley proof of the record of the hearings. When pinned down, the Secretary said that it would all depend on the circumstances. Being dissatisfied with such an evasive answer, I said, "Let us consider some of the circumstances." I read from the galley, to illustrate the kind of witness we had before us for 4 days——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before the Senator does so, will he yield for an observation?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I associate myself with the Senator's characterization of the witness.

Mr. LONG. I want to cooperate with the Secretary. I am glad to give him all the cooperation I can; but I think we need honest answers and candid understanding. So far as I was concerned, his answers behind closed doors were not any more satisfactory than the ones he gave in the open.

The following is an excerpt, but I believe it is consistent with the general tenor of the examination:

Senator LONG. Mr. Secretary, all I am going to ask you at this moment does not have anything to do with the wisdom or unwisdom of sending troops or the wisdom or unwisdom of President Truman in sending troops to Korea, anything of that sort. All I am asking you to enlighten me on is just the question of the attitude of the executive department of this Government whether the President does have the power to send the troops without a congressional authorization.

Here is a State Department document which says it is the position of the executive department that he does have the power. That is all I am asking you about, and I am asking you, does he have the power to send the troops without an authorization?

Secretary DULLES. I would not be prepared to answer that question in the abstract, because——

Senator LONG. Let me ask you this question: Did President Roosevelt have the right to put troops on Iceland during World War II?

Secretary DULLES. I don't know.

Senator LONG. I am sure you have given some thought to the matter.

Secretary DULLES. No, I have never given thought to that one.

Mr. President, that was a falsehood, and everyone in the committee room knew it was not true. Let me read on.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

Mr. LONG. I ask the Senator to indulge me for 1 moment more. I read further:

Senator LONG. In your judgment, did President Jefferson have the right to send American forces against the Barbary pirates?

Secretary DULLES. I don't know, sir.

Senator LONG. In your judgment, did President Truman have any right to send American forces or any power to send American forces into Korea?

Secretary DULLES. I never studied that as a lawyer.

Senator LONG. Never considered it?

Secretary DULLES. No, sir.

Mr. President, if I recall correctly, John Foster Dulles was in the State Department at that very time, perhaps working on the Japanese Peace Treaty He said he never thought about a matter on which he is regarded as an expert. That is the kind of answers we got, day after day, until we finally gave up trying to find out what this is all about.

The press keeps saying that the Democrats are not willing to cooperate. Mr. President, I am one who wants to cooperate. However, how can I cooperate if I do not know with what I am supposed to cooperate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for his remarks.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am ready to yield the floor. Does the Senator wish me to yield for some questions?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; for some questions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, before the Senator from Arkansas yields to the Senator from Oregon, will he yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator wish me to yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to ask unanimous consent to make an insertion in the RECORD.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is very important, and has great relation to what the Senator from Louisiana has been saying. I have before me the text of Senate Resolution 19, containing the amendments which I have offered to the resolution. It was printed by the committee as a committee print. It shows the original resolution as presented by the Department and the changes made in it by the amendments I offered. The amendments appear in italics. They demonstrate that my purpose was, so far as I could do so, to cooperate with the administration in giving it authority to bring peace into the Middle East, but in a constitutional manner. I believe that the debate here today will be illuminating if we print the committee print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to make it absolutely clear that it is a committee print the Senator is offering.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Containing the suggestions or recommendations which the Senator from Wyoming made to the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. For clarification before the committee only, and that they were suggestions only, and that no committee commitment was made with reference to them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is absolutely correct. I have made my argument in support of the amendments. In substance it has been repeated here this afternoon in the colloquy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. With that understanding, I shall not object.

There being no objection, the committee print of Senate Joint Resolution 19 was offered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 19

Joint resolution to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence

Whereas a primary purpose of the United States in its relations with all other nations is to develop and sustain a just and enduring peace for all, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations; and

Whereas the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered as long as international communism and the nations it controls seek by threat of military action, use of economic pressure, internal subversion, or other means to attempt to bring under their domination peoples now free and independent; and

Whereas such danger now exists in the general area of the Middle East: Therefore be it

*Resolved, etc.*, That the President be and hereby is authorized to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized to undertake, in the general area of the Middle East, military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance. Furthermore, he is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any such nation or group of nations requesting such aid against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism: *Provided*, That such employment shall be consonant with the Constitution of the United States, with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations, and actions and recommendations of the United Nations, and none of the Armed Forces of the United States shall be ordered into any area for the purposes of employment as authorized in this section until a report of the reasons for and the necessity of such employment has been made (1) to the Congress of the United States, or (2) if the President deems necessary in the interest of the United States, to the following committees of the Congress in executive session: Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, which shall report forthwith to the Congress in executive session; and, as specified in article 51 of the United Nations Charter, measures pursuant thereto shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not

in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the language of the President in his message of January 5, 1957, that the measures authorized by this resolution 'would also, if armed attack occurs, be subject to the overriding authority of the United Nations Security Council in accordance with the Charter', it is hereby declared that the Congress recognizes no overriding authority of the United Nations Security Council with respect to any constitutional exercise of the power granted to the Congress by the Constitution of the United States: *Provided further*, That if a situation arises which calls for the employment of the Armed Forces as herein authorized, the President shall maintain hour-by-hour contact with the Congress if it is in session, and if the Congress is not in session, he shall at once call it into special session for a full report on the proposed action.

SEC. 3. The President is hereby authorized, when he determines that such use is important to the security of the United States, to use for the purposes of this joint resolution, without regard to the provisions of any other law or regulation, except the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and the regulations thereunder, not to exceed $200 million from any appropriations now available for carrying out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. This authorization is in addition to other existing authorizations with respect to the use of such appropriations.

SEC. 4. The President shall, within the month of January of each year, report to the Congress his action hereunder.

SEC. 5. This joint resolution shall expire when the Congress, by concurrent resolution, or the President, by proclamation, shall determine that the peace and security of the nations in the general area of the Middle East are reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise.

Mr MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask a few questions relating to what the Senator from Massachusetts has asked. Senators will recall that the Senator from Massachusetts cited language in the President's special message to Congress in connection with the joint resolution, to the effect that the President said he would keep Congress advised hour by hour.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Is there any such language in the joint resolution?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; there is not.

Mr. MORSE. Is there any language in the joint resolution which places any requirement whatever upon the President to make any report to Congress at the time a crisis develops, or does the language limit itself to two reports, one in January and the other in July?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Actually, the resolution requires only one report, in January.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is thinking of the House version, I believe.

Mr. MORSE. The House amendment provides for reports in January and July.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. There is no language in the joint resolution which places any requirement on the President of the United States to come before a special session of Congress, and through Congress inform the American people of the reasons why he is ordering American boys to die in the Middle East in protection of Arabian oil.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. Let me emphasize one other point, which I do not believe I emphasized sufficiently before. The joint resolution could well continue indefinitely, not only under President Eisenhower, who has had the recent endorsement of the electorate of this country—for better or worse, but in any event he has it—but it could be effective also under the next President and the next President after that; and there would be no practical way of terminating it, until we reached a period of peace, which is certainly not within the foreseeable future at this time. In other words, the joint resolution can continue in effect through many Presidential terms.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is quite right. As a lawyer, does the Senator agree with me that what the President said in a speech before a special session of Congress has no legal binding effect whatever upon a joint resolution passed by Congress? Does the Senator not also agree with me that it is the language of the joint resolution which prevails, not the sanctimonious expression of the President in a speech before a special session of Congress?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite right.

Mr. MORSE. That is a very important point, because we are constantly hearing that the President is seeking to prevent war through the joint resolution. Does the Senator recall that when I asked the Secretary of State if he would accept an amendment placing upon the President the duty and the requirement to come before Congress and report the facts which in his opinion justified the sending of American boys into the Middle East, the Secretary of State made it clear that that would not be an acceptable amendment. Does the Senator recall that?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Oregon is quite correct.

Mr. MORSE. I think this point needs to be stressed, in view of the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts. Let me say to Senators on the other side that, if they are so anxious to give the American people the impression that the President is going to do no wrong under the joint resolution, let them write that guaranty into the resolution, instead of quoting to the American people what the President said in his speech. Let them put such a pronouncement into the joint resolution and make it legally binding upon the President.

I say respectfully that from one side of its mouth the administration tells the American people what the President's motives are and from the other side of its mouth, when we ask that there be written into the joint resolution guaranties to the American people that certain checks will be provided, it says, "We want none of that."

Let me ask another question. The Senator from Massachusetts speaks about this being a preventive war measure. Let us take a hypothetical situation with respect to which the Secretary of State, in my opinion, completely flopped, and in connection with which I agree with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If I have ever seen or listened to an incompetent witness, an evasive witness, a witness who obviously was deliberately trying to circumvent Congress, it was John Foster Dulles in giving his testimony before our committees.

If we did not have to sit there, with some of our colleagues constantly making it very clear by their attitude and remarks that we should hurry up and get through with the examination, and if we had John Foster Dulles in a courtroom, under rules of evidence and cross-examination, and put him through the kind of examination he ought to be put through, let me say that the testimony he gave to us would be shown up for what it was, namely, completely incompetent, and worse than that, pure deception. In my opinion, there is no more deceptive person in public life than John Foster Dulles.

Let us take the hypothetical situation he was dealing with. Let us assume that a Communist revolution occurs in Syria, and Syria goes Communist from within. We all know that, if it went Communist, it would go Communist with the assistance of Communist subversion and infiltration and propaganda, and probably with under-the-table help from Soviet Russia, because that is the way the Russians work.

Let us consider the proposition from two prongs. First, let us assume that the Communist government of Syria pledges its allegiance to Russian communism; in other words, it makes it very clear that, as contrasted with Yugoslavia, it is a part of the so-called international communism. Let us assume further that trouble develops between Syria and Iraq.

The first thing we know, the Arab leaders get themselves into border raids and into military combat, and a war develops between Syria and Iraq. Let us assume that Iraq then calls upon the President of the United States to send American boys to that area to help Iraq. Under that set of circumstances, would it be contemplated that the President should send American boys there to become involved in that war between Syria and Iraq?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should say that is the situation the joint resolution describes.

Mr. MORSE. I will stop there, with the suggestion that the President of the United States take the proposal to a referendum of the American people, after a month's debate, and see what the answer of the American people will be. I say to the supporters of the joint resolution: "You do not dare take it to a referendum before the American people. If you did, the American people would lick you 5 to 1."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield for a brief statement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am ready to yield the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am not asking the Senator to yield the floor. I am asking him to yield very briefly on that point.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Secretary of State may disagree with the Senator

from Oregon, and the Senator from Oregon may not agree with him, and I may not always agree with the Secretary of State; but I have yet to see an instance where he has deliberately deceived Congress or shown that he wanted to deceive Congress.

It is evil, as I understand, if the intention is to tell a lie and not to tell the truth, or not to state the case frankly. That certainly is not the intention of the Secretary of State.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have not the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have the floor, and I should like to yield it, except that I understand the Senator from Montana wishes to ask me a question.

Mr. MORSE. I serve notice on the Senator from Massachusetts that I will reply to him later in regard to the Secretary of State. I will give him plenty of evidence of deception.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I now yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Arkansas a few questions, but first I desire to commend him for the speech he has made this afternoon, and to congratulate him for bringing out the constitutional question involved in the resolution. It is a grave constitutional question, and I hope the Senate will realize its responsibility in considering it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask the Senator this question to begin with. To what countries in the Middle East have we not already supplied arms without this resolution?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Without the resolution? Does the Senator mean under any circumstances, or arms that have been sent as a grant, or arms which we have sold? We have supplied them to Saudi Arabia, but not as they would be supplied under the resolution, I grant. Does the Senator mean under any circumstances at all?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Under any circumstances in the past several years. My reason for asking the question is that, if my information is correct, the only country in the Middle East area which has not received arms from us is Yemen, at the southwest tip of the Arabian Peninsula. I was wondering if the Senator knew of any others.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. If the Senator includes the classifications I mentioned, namely, either by selling arms or giving them away, I think all the countries of that area are included, except, perhaps, Yemen.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator say that our foreign policies have produced a series of truces in Korea, Formosa, and Indochina, but not lasting settlements?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is a very accurate statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator say that the foreign policy of the United States during the past 4 or 5 years has been to maintain the status quo?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Generally speaking, that has been the result. I hope that has not been the objective of our foreign policy, but I think that has been the result.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I mean that has been the result of our foreign policy over that period of time, has it not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator say that many countries, such as Pakistan, vis-a-vis India, India in relation to Pakistan, Israel in relation to the Arabic nations, and the Arabic nations in relations to Israel, fear other factors more than they do communism as a threat to their welfare and security?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator is quite correct. I believe that to be exactly the situation in the areas he has mentioned. Especially is it true with regard to our program concerning Pakistan. It is something which I think needs to be checked. I suggest that our administration should take some new approaches in this field.

For example, I think a moratorium on all arms would be more appropriate than a program of arming everybody, if such a program could be successfully applied. Of course, it would require some cooperation from Russia, and I do not know whether that is possible. But I also do not know whether our administration has ever tried such an approach.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not know either. If we act on the request as provided in the resolution now being considered by the two committees, what will prevent the Soviet Union from doing the same thing?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think we would supply them with example and precedent. In that sense the resolution may well be considered as a challenge to them to do the same thing.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator think that our stand in helping to halt the triple invasion of Egypt has raised our prestige with the Arab-Asian bloc?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it did temporarily; I am not at all certain about the lasting effects of our action.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has answered my next question, because while the situation may be somewhat eased for the moment, my next question would have been, For how long?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it is very questionable, because there have been signs in the past few weeks that Nasser and the Egyptian press have been quite critical of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Apropos that particular statement, is it not a fact that Nasser publicly thanked the Soviet Union and Red China for their assistance in bringing an end to the invasion of the Suez Canal by the three nations concerned, and the subsequent withdrawal?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did Mr. Nasser ever thank the United States for its efforts at that time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To the best of my knowledge, he did not.

Would the Senator say that an Eisenhower doctrine of America bearing gifts to the Middle East would be welcome in that part of the world?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is a difficult question to answer. The administration has taken the attitude that those countries will always accept our gifts. I suppose that so long as the gifts are offered without any conditions, someone will be found who will accept them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Provided there are no conditions attached or that the conditions are not too hard.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct—either no conditions, or very easy conditions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Can the Senator tell us how we could accomplish a solution to the major basic difficulties of the Middle East through this resolution?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think one of the sound criticisms of the resolution is that because of the great publicity which has been given it, the people will assume it proposes something constructive, when actually it does not do anything to speak of. There are basic problems in the area, such as dealing with the refugee question, the matter of the Arab-Israeli war, the building up of the basic economic situation, such as increasing the amount of irrigable land and water supply, and the development of the country generally.

So a resolution such as this, even if it is successful, is for such a limited objective—that is, the repelling of overt armed aggression, which is, I think, in the general view of most people, the least likely of the contingencies to develop in that area—that it will have very limited effect. Yet there is bound to be the creation of a feeling that we have done something significant if we should pass it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator say that the resolution defines, indicates, or signifies a policy on the part of the United States Government?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not see any particular policy in it. It is a gesture which indicates our disapproval of overt armed aggression. That certainly is nothing new. I think it is already clear that we do not approve of overt armed aggression anywhere in the world.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Have we not, either with or without a resolution, disapproved of overt armed aggression by the Soviet Union anywhere in the world?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought it was clear that we disapproved of overt armed aggression a long time ago—certainly at the time of the Korean invasion, when we took action instead of passing a resolution. We actually intervened in that instance to stop overt armed aggression. I assumed that was the understanding, and that everyone knew about it.

But on that particular point, to make a statement again that the Senate approves of such a policy, I said in my original statement that I would go along with it. I would certainly join in a statement approving that particular policy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In my opinion, the Senator from Arkansas has been very consistent throughout the years in his thinking on that subject. I was very much pleased to listen to him deliver his

magnificent speech this afternoon, because in pointing out the constitutional questions involved he indicated quite strongly, I thought, that what was happening was the creation of a series of resolutions, such as the Formosa Resolution, which is entirely different from the Eisenhower proposal, which would seek to limit the President's power, and thereby lessen the strength which he should have under the Constitution as the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Certainly if ever there was a time, a period, or an age when the President needed to preserve and to strengthen the power to act instantly in case of an emergency affecting the security or interests of our country, that time is now. But under the resolution, he is trying to dilute his own power, to share it with Congress, so to speak, when he should be strengthening it.

I sincerely hope, on the basis of the remarks made this afternoon and the testimony given before the joint committees this morning by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senate will recognize and realize its responsibility, both individually and as a body.

I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Montana for his remarks.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. COOPER. I have just heard the distinguished Senator's statement that one of his objections to the resolution is that it will give the impression that it accomplishes something, when, in fact, it does not, according to the Senator.

The Senator has illustrated by saying that a basic problem is the settlement of the Arab-Israeli question, and argues the resolution does nothing toward its settlement.

I wish to ask the Senator if that part of the resolution which would provide the President with authority to use economic aid would not give an opportunity to move toward a resolution of the issues between the Arab States and Israel. I name some avenues through which such an approach might be made: The settlement of the refugee problem, the development of the Jordan River—and there are others.

Is it not a fact that authority to use economic aid would provide an opportunity to begin negotiations and to make advances toward the settlement of these problems and others which do affect Arab-Israeli relations?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the administration has any such programs as that in mind, programs which it feels are constructive and would follow our established and, I think, constitutional processes, it should come before the proper committees and submit them.

I ask the Secretary of State, as did other members of the joint committees, what he intended to do with or for what purposes he wanted $200 million. He certainly never gave any indication that what the Senator from Kentucky has proposed was the sort of thing he had in mind.

Already $750 million has been authorized and appropriated in the mutual-aid bills for this general area. What the resolution does is simply to enable the Secretary to take $200 million of the $750 million and release him from any restriction and allow him to do with it what he pleases.

In all fairness, I cannot believe that is looking toward the kind of project the Senator from Kentucky has mentioned.

The formulation of programs to reach the problems the Senator from Kentucky has mentioned is a plan upon which I certainly would look with a sympathetic eye. But I cannot believe that the joint resolution proposes any such thing. Nothing of the sort is indicated in it. Certainly the President could not spend $200 million on such programs between now and July 1; such programs could scarcely be drawn up by that time.

Mr. COOPER. Of course, that is the Senator's assumption.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. But the Senator from Arkansas will agree that if such programs can be formulated, the provisions of the joint resolution referring to aid could have effect on Arab-Israel relations—and do have meaning.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. However, I see no reason at all why passage of the joint resolution is necessary in order to achieve that objective. If a program of the sort the Senator from Kentucky has mentioned is what the President has in mind, certainly there is no reason why the President could not submit a program to the Congress tomorrow. I see no reason why the President needs the amount of money now proposed, if he has such a project in mind. On the other hand, the only thing we are told in connection with the joint resolution is that it will not be possible for the administration to spend all the money by April 1.

In all frankness, I believe that the intent is to use the money for increased arms aid. However, we do not know that; nothing in the record shows what the President would do with the money.

Mr. COOPER. My second question, perhaps, should be directed to my friend, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], instead of to the Senator from Arkansas. I understand the position of the Senator from Arkansas is that the President has constitutional authority to employ the Armed Forces of the United States and, therefore, does not need any grant of authority from the Congress. I agree that the President has such authority. But I ask this question: If the President has such authority—as the Senator seems to agree—why is it necessary to require the President in the resolution to report to Congress at every step along the way, as the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], has suggested? Is it not true, that the fact that the joint resolution has been brought to the Congress, and the very character of the President of the United States are proofs that in case of a great crisis the President would act with the Congress?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I hate to prolong the debate on this point, because earlier I inserted in the RECORD a memorandum covering much more fully than I have done in my statement, the technical point of the distinction between the inherent powers of the President and his emergency powers. But under either theory, I think the joint resolution is superfluous and bad, and causes confusion.

If the President has the inherent powers which some of my colleagues believes he has, and which many constitutional authorities think he has, then the joint resolution is bad, because it purports to give the President something he already has, and thus it would create a precedent which would indicate that the President does not now have such powers. The joint resolution is superfluous and bad from every point of view.

However, if the President does not have such powers—and under the theory of Jefferson and others he does not have them—then the President does not really have constitutional power or authority to send our troops abroad in an emergency situation, such as the one which probably would develop. The practice of many of our greatest Presidents has been in such a case to respond to a threat to the country, and then to come to the Congress and seek its advice. That policy was followed by Jefferson in the Chesapeake-Leopard case, and that is the policy which Mr. White of Virginia, stated in the first quotation I read. Under either theory of Presidential power, the joint resolution is bad.

Personally, I would prefer, and would think it the sounder constitutional practice, to follow the theory that President Jefferson followed in the case of emergency powers, because that does require consultation with Congress. As the Senator from Kentucky has said, in all probability the President would come to Congress and would explain the situation to it. But if that theory is followed, it is not at all clear that the President would do so.

The Senator from Kentucky has pointed out that the present President of the United States is a very fine man, and that everyone has confidence in him. I only say that the joint resolution is not confined to the present President. Instead, the resolution, as submitted to the Senate, would last for an indefinite time, under perhaps 2, 4, or 10 Presidents. I do not think such a joint resolution should be passed merely because one may think well of the present President. To my mind, that is quite aside from the constitutional principle involved.

Mr. COOPER. I agree with the Senator from Arkansas that it is aside from the constitutional principle involved. But, in view of the fact that it has been questioned whether the President would report, I have wanted to say that there is nothing in President Eisenhower's record, career or life, to indicate that he would not consult with Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield on that point?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. First, Mr. President, let me say that that argument is not relevant or proper in connection with

a discussion of the constitutional principles involved.

Mr. COOPER. Yes, and I have so agreed. But the personal issue has been raised. Let me state that while I was not a Member of the Senate at the time, I remember the "great debate" over sending troops to Europe. At that time many agreed that President Truman had the power and constitutional right to take such action. I believe President Truman argued that point strongly. Nevertheless Congress required that he give notice of his contemplated action in a field in which he and many others thought—and I may say, I thought—he had constitutional power to act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not only that he give notice, but did we not authorize it? I think we authorized it directly.

Mr. COOPER. Yes; authorized or required it. But with the pending resolution, its opponents are taking a different position; it is argued that if such constitutional authority is granted in advance, the President's existing power would be curtailed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Kentucky is mixing up several different matters. In regard to the matter referred to, the Senate voted for the Vandenberg resolution, with only two or three members not voting in favor of it. The action taken in that case was comparable to the action which I believe should be taken in the present case.

Subsequently, and I would say in pursuance of the Vandenberg resolution, the Senate ratified the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or Treaty, and did so very formally, with two-thirds of the Members of the Senate approving. All of that was done under the Constitution, in the most regular fashion. In pursuance of that Treaty, we further authorized—and, as I recall the debate, it was understood that the President was being given the right—to decide on the sending of troops. We voted to give the President that right. There is no question about that procedure.

In the present case, I am arguing, not about the objective, but about the procedure proposed to be followed. I think the two cases are entirely different.

If the President submitted to us a joint resolution requesting from us such authority, under a treaty which we would consider in the normal way, that would be quite a different matter. But in the present case we have a joint resolution, not a treaty; furthermore, the joint resolution does not specify anything, really. It uses the vaguest kind of language; it does not specify any of the details—such as those involved in the sending of troops to Europe. Or, Mr. President, to use another instance—not a precedent, as it has been referred to—in carrying out the Truman doctrine the Congress passed a formal, specific piece of legislation quite similar to our foreign-aid legislation, and it specified in detail just what should be done. In that case it provided that the President was authorized to send to Greece, to act there in an advisory capacity only, certain civilian and military personnel. That measure was limited in that way. It was a very detailed piece of legislation, in contrast to the present joint resolution.

Mr. COOPER. But the Senator from Arkansas will remember that when the question of sending our troops to Germany was argued, the constitutional question was an issue at the time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, certainly it was raised.

Mr. COOPER. President Truman argued that he had constitutional power to take action.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator from Kentucky is correct.

Mr. COOPER. But the Congress limited him or attempted to do so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Kentucky will recall that President Truman had a very broad view of Presidential powers, not only in that instance, but also in the steel case, as I recall. Before the Senator from Kentucky entered the Chamber, we discussed the two well-recognized schools of thought relative to the President's powers. President Truman thought he had very great inherent powers as the Chief Executive, and he had a great deal of support among reputable authorities.

I take the other view, for which I think we also have reputable support and I think it is a preferable way to look at the question. This theory requires the President to come to the Congress after he has taken action, in emergency situations only.

I say under either theory this resolution is bad. I care not which theory one wants to take. If the President has that power, why have a resolution to muddy the waters? What would be the purpose of passing the resolution. It is presumed that Congress does not do a foolish or futile thing, and the passage of a resolution must mean something. Passage of this resolution must mean, therefore, that Congress believes the President does not have such power, and I maintain that would be bad policy. If this resolution is passed, there would be a tendency to believe that the President does not have such power. In the case of a timid Executive, such action might be persuasive upon him not to take certain necessary action, which might be fatal for the survival of this country. I am sure the Senator from Kentucky would not want that to happen.

Mr. COOPER. I cannot believe that would be the purpose or effect of the resolution. I shall speak on my own time, but I should like to speak now briefly, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. I listened a short time ago to the statements made about the Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles. I am not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee so I am not prepared to speak to the issue which has been raised, relating to questions which were directed to the Secretary of State and his answers.

Like many other Senators, I have known the Secretary of State for a long time. I served with him as a member of the United States delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1950 at the time when the aggression by North Korea and Communist China against South Korea was the great issue before the Assembly, and I shall always remember that Mr. Dulles bore in that critical session the burden of our country's efforts and arguments. I also served under him in the Department of State. I cannot accept the statements that have been made about him. Whatever disagreements some may have as to the correctness of the policies which the Secretary may advance I regret the personal attacks that have been made. I am glad to say in every experience I have found him to be a man of integrity and dedicated to this country. I do not accept the statement and I reject the idea that at this time, when we admit we face a grave issue, the Secretary of State would approach the Congress of the United States with deception and falsehood. I make this statement, because I believe it in my heart.

(Mr. THYE and Mr. LONG addressed the Chair.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like very much to yield the floor. If Senators wish to make their own statements, I should like to give them the opportunity to do so. I should like to yield only if they care to address questions to me.

Does the Senator from Minnesota wish to ask me a question?

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question, but I do not wish to hold the floor any longer than necessary to answer questions addressed to me.

Mr. THYE. If the resolution under discussion were passed, would there not be some assurance to small nations in the Middle East that the United Nations were mindful of their problems and were determined that no strong nation, such as Russia, or no nation having great military strength, such as Russia possesses, should endanger their sovereignty,

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With that objective I have no quarrel. As I said in my statement, I think we all agree that that is a proper statement for the Executive and for this body to make in proper form. My objection is not to that objective; it is to the means that are sought to be used. I think this is the worst possible method to reach the objective. I am suggesting we should not use these particular means to give assurance to the people in that area that we would oppose overt armed aggression by Russia.

Mr. THYE. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. THYE. Would it not be of psychological benefit to the United States to have such a resolution passed at this time, since it would put the Soviet on notice that we have specific plans and determinations relative to the Middle East, should the Soviet have any aggressive intentions in that area?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My answer is about the same as the answer I just gave. I do not think the passage of such a resolution would be particularly beneficial to the United States. I think it might be beneficial to the peace of mind of nations in the Middle East. I again have no objection to giving expression, in the

proper way and manner, to such a policy in that area. I again say I am not willing to ignore the means that are to be used to accomplish that end. I think the means are very important. It seems very improvident and foolish to bring confusion, and perhaps something even worse, into the realm of the constitutional relations; that is, the distribution of power between the Senate and the President. I see no necessity for getting involved in that respect. A simple statement of policy, which under the functions of the Senate we could make, could accomplish the purpose the Senator has mentioned, and we would not pass a law which seems to delegate a power, or confuse the situation.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will permit one more remark, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] relative to the character of and his high admiration for the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. I have the highest admiration for him, and I think the Secretary of State has dedicated his entire life, or at least his remaining years, to the service of his country, in endeavoring to bring about an atmosphere in which lasting peace can be created.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think we differ about the objective. I think we all subscribe to the objective of a more peaceful world. Our differences are about the means which are to be employed to accomplish that objective—the wisdom or foresight, or lack of foresight, that is to be shown; the ability or inability to judge the conditions that exist at any particular time. Those are the things about which we differ, and differ legitimately. I hope the issue is not made one of the truthfulness or lack of it on the part of anybody in the administration or in this body. I myself have tried to avoid bringing anyone's motives into issue in regard to this question. There is really no argument about that; it is about the wisdom, of the means which are sought to be employed, from the point of view of constitutional government.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For a question only.

Mr. LONG. The question I had in mind relates to the conduct of the executive branch in dealing with the legislative branch. Would the Senator not agree it is good procedure for an executive witness, particularly behind closed doors, to be very frank and candid and give his best judgment to a congressional committee?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I certainly agree with the Senator. He ought to do it at any time.

Mr. LONG. The Senator has told us what is his view of the power of the President to send Amercan Armed Forces into combat. He expressed his view and also that of those having a different school of thought. Does the Senator believe that we in the legislative branch are entitled to know the views of the executive branch with regard to the Executive power in that connection?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think so. I think Congress ought to be given that information as a basic background for the proposed resolution.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator familiar with the question I mentioned, wherein the Secretary of State refused to state whether he had even considered whether President Truman had power to send troops into Korea at a time when Mr. Dulles was connected with our Government?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. LONG. Did the Senator not hear some laughter around the room at that time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think so.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator recall whether the Secretary of State stated that he had not considered whether the President had power to send American troops against the Barbary pirates?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think so.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator recall the statement of the Secretary of State that he had not given thought to whether President Roosevelt had power to station American troops in Iceland?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator think this country would ever have a Secretary of State who would not have considered those matters?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As the Senator knows, strange things happen in this country.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator know the Secretary of State has discussed those facts for the record, and that appears in the cold, printed record where it can be found, although he had not favored the legislative branch with that information? I should like to quote a few words spoken by Secretary of State Dulles at a time when he was trying to persuade our friends in Europe that the President could commit troops to Europe. This appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 24, 1957:

> I should perhaps explain that under our constitutional system the President of the United States is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, and, as such, has the right to determine their disposition. That is a right which cannot be impaired by action of the Congress.

Apparently someone was able to get an answer from the Secretary of State.

The half hour of time spent by the junior Senator from Louisiana, and the additional 15 minutes spent by the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] in an effort to get some sort of answers to the questions produced no results. I say that we need better cooperation in understanding one another if we are to cooperate on a great foreign program. I should like to cooperate, and I should like to do what I can to better the understanding.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a final question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I raise this question because my friend from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] have expressed some disagreement with my appraisal of the character of the Secretary of State. I shall dwell on that question in my own time later.

Does the Senator from Arkansas recall that when the Secretary was before the committee I asked him a series of questions about the desirability of trying to obtain some commitments from Great Britain and France to join us in the use of troops in the Middle East in case we found ourselves, under this resolution, in a situation in which American boys would be sent there?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do.

Mr. MORSE. The Secretary, in effect, said that he would be against that, and that if he were an American boy fighting in the Middle East, he would not want a British soldier on one side of him and a French soldier on the other. Does the Senator recall that?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I recall that.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator recall that a day later, when there were repercussions following that unfortunate statement by the Secretary of State, the State Department issued a statement to the effect that the Secretary of State testified humorously and jocularly on that point. Does the Senator recall that statement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I recall seeing such a statement in the press.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator heard the testimony. Did the Senator observe at the time that the Secretary was either jocular or humorous?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not observe it at the time.

Mr. MORSE. I will say to my friends from Massachusetts and Kentucky that I think this is another example of the Secretary of State issuing to the American people an unadulterated lie. I said so to the press at the time.

I also say to my friends from Kentucky and Massachusetts that if I were in the same room with the Secretary, and he was asked for the time of day, I would look at the clock.

Mr. HUMPHREY obtained the floor.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to yield to the Senator from Connecticut for a brief period of time, without losing my right to the floor. I understood him to say that he wished to speak for only about 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, without prejudicing his right to the floor, the Senator from Minnesota may yield to the Senator from Connecticut for 5 minutes. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am grateful to my friend for his courtesy to me. I appreciate it very much indeed.

I have sat here all afternoon and listened to the debate by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, and the many questions. I felt that what I wished to say could not be said so well through questioning him as, perhaps, by making a very brief statement of my own.

First, regarding the Secretary of State, I wish to associate myself very firmly with the views expressed by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. I have known the Secretary of State for more than 25 years. I have seen him under many circumstances. He is a former Member of this body. I cannot think of

anyone in my entire acquaintance who would be less desirous of trying to deceive any Senator or any committee of the Senate than the present Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles.

He is a very noble gentleman, a man of high honor, a man of great responsibility. The very last thing which could be said about him with justice would be the accusation that he would deliberately tell an unadulterated lie, or deliberately attempt to deceive United States Senators. I, for one, object very strongly to any characterization of the nature of that which has been made of him this afternoon.

So far as the comments of the Senator from Arkansas are concerned, I believe, with all respect to him, a very brilliant Senator, that the argument about the constitutionality of the joint resolution is not the pertinent thing. The Senator himself says this in the opening part of his remarks:

> The question Senate Joint Resolution 19 puts to this body is not whether America should help reinforce the independence of Middle East nations. It is not whether we should help check the expansion of international communism. It is not whether a President of the United States needs the backing of a united America when he acts as our agent in the search for world peace.

I submit that the question before the Senate, as placed before the Senate in the joint resolution, does involve those very things, and that those are the basic and important things involved in Senate Joint Resolution 19. I believe the question of the Senate yielding its authority or prestige is not involved here.

The Senator from Arkansas asks:

> Shall we strike down the Senate's rights and duties in the conduct of foreign affairs, as defined by 168 years of constitutional practice?

I submit that the joint resolution does not in any way require that we yield our rights or our duties if we vote for the joint resolution; but, on the contrary, that we are simply cooperating with an administration which is not trying to take more power for itself, but which has been consistently recognized as a constitutional administration. President Eisenhower has been repeatedly called a constitutional President, even by those who have not been strongly in support of the things which he has done.

The Senator from Arkansas asked:

> Shall we say "Yes" to a radical proposal whose adoption would mean that we are abandoning our constitutional system of checks and balances; that from now on, naked Executive power will rule the highest and most fateful interests of the Nation?

That question is misleading. We are not doing anything here to abandon our constitutional authority.

We have seldom had a President of the United States who has evidenced so much respect for Congress as has the present occupant of the White House. Last year the minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], produced the record of a series of conferences which had been held with respect to foreign policy by the President with Members of this body and the leaders of the House of Representatives. I think the record shows that never before have there been so many conferences about important matters of foreign policy. The Senator from California has promised that during the course of this debate he will bring that record up to date. I suggest that it will very decidedly show that President Eisenhower has shown a great deal of confidence in the Congress of the United States, and has always had a distinct and constitutional respect for the United States Senate, especially in respect of its obligations in the field of foreign policy.

I thank my good friend from Minnesota for the opportunity of making these remarks, which I intend to extend substantially in the course of the next 2 or 3 weeks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion today relating to the excellent address of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] regarding our foreign policy in the Middle East, and the consideration by the Senate of the so-called Eisenhower doctrine. It had been my intention to make my remarks on this particular subject matter in the middle of this week. However, I have been informed that the Senate will not meet again until Thursday. Inasmuch as I shall be unable to be here on Thursday, and I wish to make my position clear as it relates to the so-called Eisenhower doctrine, I feel compelled to address the Senate today.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I deeply regret that I have an engagement at my office and must leave the Chamber. I should like very much to remain to hear the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate the Senator's kindness.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was told unofficially that no business would be transacted today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand. What the Senator from Arkansas has had to say today is more than adequate for any one session of the Senate. It was a profound statement, and one which I feel may have a decided effect upon the consideration by the Senate of the joint resolution when it is presented.

My observations will be supplementary to those which have been made by other Senators.

Mr. President, there is no more important issue before the United States Congress today than the resolution on the Middle East submitted by the President, and now pending before the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services. I rise to address myself to that resolution, to comment on related matters now developing at the United Nations, and to submit a series of proposals to the committees designed to help clarify the policy of our Nation in this vital area of the world.

It is my feeling that if a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations is to offer suggestions for the consideration of that committee, as it goes into executive session, those suggestions should be submitted publicly on the floor of the Senate. Therefore, since we will be marking up Senate Joint Resolution 19 starting tomorrow, I must reserve time this afternoon to comment upon some of the suggestions and proposals I shall offer in committee.

Several of my colleagues have already discussed this subject with great intelligence, perception, and public zeal. The activities of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and those of the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], whose address on this floor has received national acclaim, and of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who has spoken today, have been in the highest traditions of senatorial debate. Both as a delegate to the United Nations and as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I have been equally concerned over the direction of our policy in the Middle East.

Let me say at the outset that it has been my hope—and it remains my hope—that I can vote for an appropriate resolution reaffirming our determination to resist Communist aggression and constructively to use economic assistance. The dissatisfaction with Senate Joint Resolution 19 that I express in the course of these remarks, and the deep hesitations that have arisen with respect to it and other aspects of our Middle East approach, reflect a troublesome dilemma that many of us face. On the one hand, I am firmly persuaded that the administration program before the Senate is the product of a series of errors of commission and omission which have characterized our Government's Middle East policy for a number of years, and that it itself does not provide the corrective measures necessary for an effective Middle East foreign policy by the United States. On the other hand, for the United States Senate to decline to act favorably on the broad outlines of that program—the objectives of the President's statement—would weaken our Nation's hand in the Middle East, act as a repudiation of our President at a time when his constructive leadership is necessary for world stability, and create misunderstandings as to the true nature of our responsibilities to the world.

I want that remark to be interpreted as meaning that I am desirous of supporting a proposal in Congress which will indicate our determination to resist any form of Communist aggression in the Middle East, and that I am desirous of having an extension of our economic assistance program through constructive channels. But I do not want that statement to be interpreted as indicating any approval of language found in the joint resolution which is anything but helpful, either on a policy basis or under the terms of the constitutional responsibilities of the respective branches of our Government.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that the recommendation of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for an advisory resolution would accomplish exactly the result the Senator has just indicated, and would serve clear notice on Russia and other Communist segments of the world that we do not intend to stand by and let aggression take place?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely do. I am happy the Senator from Arkansas made that suggestion. It is one which has been discussed from time to time elsewhere, but the Senator from Arkansas has pointed it up in a manner which should make it unmistakably clear that those of us who have discussed the joint resolution do not do so with the motive of trying to block an effective presentation on the part of Congress of our determination to support the Executive in the fulfillment of his constitutional responsibilities.

If one thing is clear from the critical events that have occurred in the Middle East in the last few months, it is that we cannot merely reerect the highly inflammable structure that existed before the Israeli, British, and French invasion of last fall. After the armistices of 1949 brought an end to wholesale fighting between Israel and the neighboring Arab countries, there was a gradual deterioration of the peaceful conditions in the opposite direction from that which the armistices were intended to create. From both sides of the armistice lines there were innumerable assaults and forays. Raid followed raid in a retaliatory crescendo until the armistice pacts were reduced practically to shreds and the resumption of all-out fighting became an ever-increasing danger. This danger was greatly multiplied when in the fall of 1955 the Soviet Union began pouring arms into the area in an obvious effort to create trouble and expand its influence in the Arab countries.

In the United Nations during the last 5 or 6 years the great powers discussed the crumbling of the Arab-Israeli armistices. They denounced the truce violations of the armistice terms continued but without much success. The violations of the armistice terms continued and the situation gradually worsened, but nobody seemed willing to take action vigorous enough to halt the descending spiral. Even the arms deal between Egypt and the Communist bloc did not evoke the decisions necessary to ward off disaster.

I note for the RECORD that even that arms deal apparently did not impress the President, because at the Geneva Conference with the leaders of the Kremlin, there was no remonstrance or complaint made on the part of the President—none at least that would appear from any public information issued dealing with that Conference—over the sale of arms to Egypt by the Soviet bloc, and, indeed by the Soviet Union itself. When the explosion came, it was the only logical result of the procrastination, the fence-sitting, and the bluster and bluff of those whose responsibility it was to know better.

The Israeli-British-French invasion, deplorable though it was, had one good result. It brought us sharply to our senses. It has wiped the slate clean, and given us an opportunity to correct our mistakes and make a new start. We now have a chance to pick up the pieces to reshape them in a way that will give us a better prospect for peace. I say that we have a chance. The question before our Government is whether that opportunity will be utilized.

What disturbs me today, Mr. President, is that we are not reshaping the pieces in any way that will give us a better prospect for peace. I intend to comment extensively on the Eisenhower doctrine in a few minutes, but let me first take up an even more urgent and immediate problem.

SANCTIONS AGAINST ISRAEL?

During the past few days it has become obvious that the Government may soon be faced with the highly important decision of whether or not to join or acquiesce in the imposition of economic sanctions against Israel. What I say about this matter I say in my capacity as a Senator and not as a delegate to the United Nations General Assembly. There, as is well known, one's individual views must in case of serious conflict give way to the State Department's position.

I have no hesitancy in saying frankly and forthrightly, Mr. President, that officially and unofficially I am opposed to the imposition of sanctions on the State of Israel. I am opposed to sanctions, despite the fact that I am fully aware of the withdrawal resolutions which have already passed the General Assembly and which Israel is technically violating by refusing to withdraw her troops.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I wonder whether the Senator from Minnesota can enlighten me as to whether there can be any moral justification for the imposition of sanctions against Israel and the refusal, at the same time, to request sanctions against Soviet Russia for its brutal attack on Hungary?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that if our Government were to acquiesce in a decision of the United Nations to impose sanctions upon Israel, or to have a part in formulating policies which would result in the imposition of sanctions upon Israel, and at the same time did not take the leadership in the United Nations to impose sanctions upon others for their violations of the United Nations resolutions, our position before the world would be an impossible one. I would call it diplomatic hypocrisy.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. Would it be possible to distinguish between the imposition of sanctions against Israel and the failure of the United Nations—and, indeed, of the United States—to take any action to impose sanctions on what I hope will continue to be our good friend India for its failure to comply with its commitment and permit a plebiscite to determine the political future of Kashmir?

Mr. HUMPHREY. When one talks of justice, he talks of justice for all parties. If the Senator will recall the President's statement at the time of the British-French-Israeli attack upon Egypt, and if the Senator will recall the President's radio and television address to the American people, he will remember that the President pointed out that we cannot have one law for our friends and another law for our enemies. With equal candor, we cannot have one law for the strong and another law for the weak, or one law for the big and another law for the little.

Quite obviously, what we will be seeing, if we are not careful, will be the development of a situation, for which we will have had a very decided responsibility—a situation in which the United Nations may very well vote to impose sanctions upon Israel, a democracy, let us remember, in the Middle East, while the United Nations has as yet refused, even though it has officially condemned the Soviet action in Hungary, to impose sanctions upon the Soviet Union, or, as the Senator has said, upon India.

By the way, my attitude on this question is not something new. At the time when it was my privilege to address the State CIO convention in the latter part of November, I made quite clear my belief and feelings about the imposition of sanctions upon the Soviet Union for its atrocities and oppression in Hungary. So I am not a Johnny-come-lately. I do not want anyone, either in the executive branch or the legislative branch of the Government, to say, "It's nice to hear from you so late in the day."

My position has been clear from the beginning. I joined with the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] in this very expression at the time we addressed the editorial writers in their annual convention at the Nicolet Hotel in Minneapolis on November 17, 1956.

Mr. CLARK. In the Senator's judgment, would it be a contribution to peace in the Middle East, or, indeed, to the objectives of the Senate joint resolution, to which the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota is presently addressing himself, for us to take a position in the United Nations in support of sanctions against Israel, while failing in any way to indicate our approval of the need for sanctions against Egypt, which, in accordance with my understanding, has violated the armistice of 1949, has closed the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping, has made it impossible for Israeli shipping to enter the Gulf of Aqaba, and has been supporting clandestine raids from the Gaza Strip into Israel? I ask the Senator whether to impose sanctions against Israel would be a salutary contribution to peace in the Middle East.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would not only not make for peace in the Middle East; it would, for all practical purposes, aggravate the situation.

The best thing we can do in the Middle East, in terms of our contribution at this particular moment, is to insist that the armistice agreement be abided by or lived up to. Had we done that earlier—

and this goes back for more than one administration—we would be in our present situation today.

Furthermore, I do not want the Middle East doctrine as presented to us to be interpreted throughout the world as one which implies tanks and guns for Saudi Arabia, and approval for Colonel Nasser, and finally sanctions against and condemnation of Israel. If that should happen, it would place the United States in an incredible situation.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his candid answers to my questions. The RECORD will indicate my complete acquiescence and concurrence in the views which he has so ably expressed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very happy that the Senator from Pennsylvania has joined in this discussion. His questions themselves indicate his deep concern over the problems in the Middle East, as well as his comprehensive knowledge of those problems.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I first wish, if the Senator will permit me, to comment on what the Senator from Pennsylvania has said in the last few minutes. I think that with a series of a few questions the Senator from Pennsylvania, with his penetrating, analytical mind, has gone to the very heart of the whole Israeli problem as it concerns the question of sanctions. I desire to associate myself with all the implications and all the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Now I wish to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question or two bearing upon the threat of sanctions against Israel by the United Nations. Does the Senator agree with me that the instinct of self-defense and self-preservation applies to nations as well as to individuals?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do. I think we have witnessed the application of that principle in recent months.

Mr. MORSE. It is true, is it not, that Israel is really the only free nation in the Middle East, so far as having a constitutional form of government based upon the type of individual rights and freedom that we enjoy in the United States is concerned?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it is certainly fair to say that the constitution, law, and society of Israel are more representative of those we have here than are those of other nations in the area.

Mr. MORSE. It is true, is it not, that for some time past—in fact, almost since the formation of the State of Israel by the United Nations itself—Israel has been subjected to one provocation after another by Arab powers which have repeatedly threatened to wipe the State of Israel off the map?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no doubt about that. I hope that every Member of the Senate is aware of the many statements which have been made by the leaders in the neighboring countries, wherein those leaders have declared their eternal hostility to the very existence of the State of Israel. Some of those leaders have actually said that Israel must be exterminated and that the Jews must be driven into the sea.

Mr. MORSE. It is true, is it not, that the King of Saudi Arabia, with whom the President of the United States has just completed some negotiations, the terms and contents of which we do not know about as yet, said on one occasion that he would be willing to sacrifice the lives of 10 million Arabs to destroy Israel?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what is reported to have been said by the king.

Mr. MORSE. Irrespective of the violations of the United Nations truce and the violations of various resolutions and mandates of the United Nations by Israel, the fact remains, does it not, that those violations have been greatly aggravated by the provocations on the part of the Arab states, by way of border raids which have constantly kept the people of Israel in fear of the lives of thousands of their citizens?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I agree with that statement. I would add, further, that it has also been a source of amazement to me that the people of the State of Israel have been able to maintain a democracy and free political institutions, with all that they imply—free speech, freedom of association, freedom to petition, freedom of religion—in a country which has been surrounded by hostile forces at a time when the people of Israel are living under the constant threat of extinction, or at least the threat of battle.

I will phrase it this way: Israel has been able to maintain free political institutions in a constant state of crisis, and this is quite a tribute to a people and a country as new as the State of Israel.

Furthermore, I think it should be noted that the nations surrounding Israel have given many evidences of their hostility, and this has at times caused retaliation. It is very difficult to know sometimes which raiders first crossed which border; but when one lives under constant threats and warnings of extinction, it is entirely possible for people—in fact, for security forces along the border—to become a little "trigger happy."

Mr. MORSE. It is true, is it not, that as the United States shipped military arms and equipment into some of the Arabian countries and refused to ship arms and military equipment into Israel, the result was a great deal of misunderstanding and perplexity and hurt feelings on the part of the people of Israel toward the United States earlier?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; that is true.

Mr. MORSE. It is true, is it not, that the United States has really never promoted any concerted drive within the United Nations to insist that Egypt lift the boycott against Israel as to the use of the Suez Canal by Israeli ships, other than by notes of protest?

Mr. HUMPHREY. At least to my knowledge, that statement is correct; and from what we have been able to learn in the Committee on Foreign Relations, there has been no concerted effort on our part to have the Egyptians comply with the treaty relating to the Suez Canal and its freedom of access to the ships of all nations.

Mr. MORSE. Although the Senator has covered my next question, I should like to have it in question and answer form in the RECORD.

Does the Senator from Minnesota believe that, since there was a refusal by Egypt to permit Israeli ships to go through the Suez Canal, or, for that matter, a refusal to permit ships of other flags bound for Israel to go through the Canal, there was not only a violation of the treaty, but also a violation of the spirit and the purport of the armistice itself?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course; the Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator believe that today in Israel there is great fear that if further arms are shipped into the Arab States, under the Eisenhower joint resolution, if it is passed, the result may be further to increase the danger to the survival of Israel, if those arms were all at once to be used by the Arab States in an attack against Israel?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course, the people and the Government of Israel fear such a development; and I think they fear it with a certain amount of justification. Many of us in the Senate are deeply concerned about arms-aid program. I intend to address myself to that subject matter.

Mr. MORSE. So far as public knowledge is concerned, Israel has no reason to believe, has it, that the negotiations between the President and the King of Saudi Arabia resulted in a commitment on the part of the King of Saudi Arabia that the enmity of that Arab State toward Israel would not continue?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have neither heard nor read of any such commitment. Let me add that one of the matters I discussed with the Secretary of State at the time of our hearings was the portion of the Mutual Security Act which related to the limitations upon the use of the arms provided under our military-assistance program to any friendly country. There is a whole series of criteria—some 20, I believe—regarding the eligibility of any country to receive those arms. One of the standards or criteria is that we must at all times be permitted to inspect their use, to see how they are distributed and for what purposes they are to be used. As I recall, this is one of the points the King of Saudi Arabia was very much concerned about, and was unwilling to accept. Therefore, I shall be anxious to see what kind of an agreement was ultimately arrived at between our Government and the King of Saudi Arabia.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota think that in this instance the American people are entitled to have followed the Wilsonian principle of open covenants openly arrived at?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I do; in view of the fact that the American people are interested in preventing the destruction of the State of Israel, which state the United States helped to bring into existence. It seems to me that it would be wrong for the United States to enter, with any state in that area, into an agreement which would result in providing military assistance to that state, if we had reason to believe that the result would be the destruction of a state which we had helped create, and with which we have the most friendly relationships.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Minnesota familiar with the statement or paper released by the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Hammarskjold?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator from Oregon referring to his report?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have read it very carefully.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota find in the statement anything which would justify the leaders of Israel in believing that if they yielded to the recommendations of the Secretary General of the United Nations they would have any assurance that they would be protected in their access to the waterways to which they are entitled to have access, and that they would be protected against a recurrence by Nasser of border raids from the Gaza Strip?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not find any such guaranteed assurance. In the report of the Secretary General, to which the Senator from Oregon has referred, I find nothing to indicate that such an interpretation could properly be made. Certainly the Israelis do not wish to have to rely upon the "ifs," "ands," "buts," or "ors." Instead, they would prefer a guaranty that there will not be a resumption of the border raids and the blocking of the use of the Gulf of Aqaba and the denial of the use of the Suez Canal.

Mr. MORSE. I would not ask the Senator from Minnesota to join me in my characterization of the paper issued by the Secretary General of the United Nations. However, I would characterize it as speculation in futuro, as offering to Israel something which could not even properly be considered as a pious hope. I think it is one of the most unfortunate documents to come from the United Nations in a long time, and I believe it has done much to check the confidence of many in the impartiality of the Secretary General of the United Nations. I hope it is not indicative of the approach he is going to make to one of the tinderbox areas of the world, namely, the Arab-Israeli situation.

If the Senator from Minnesota will permit me to do so, in a sentence or two I shall summarize the colloquy I have just had with him, by stating my point of view as follows: I hope Israel will not move an inch, because I think the very survival of Israel is at stake. In the paper of the Secretary General of the United Nations there is nothing, in my opinion, that gives Israel any hope of protection. In the foreign policy of the United States up to this hour there is nothing that gives Israel any hope of protection. At the hearings, every time we questioned the Secretary of State, he attempted to "duck" by saying, "We will refer that to the United Nations."

That is why I have pending before the committee a substitute resolution calling for commitments now, commitments that will pledge the Arab countries and will pledge Israel to peace in the Middle East. I cannot vote for a joint resolution that does not cause those commitments to be made before the fact.

I wish to say that I think Israel would be shortsighted and might very well jeopardize her own survival if she "fell" for what I consider to be the false promises of the United Nations, as implied in the pronouncement of its Secretary General. Furthermore, I think Israel has had enough experience thus far with the Secretary of State of the United States so that certainly Israel should not "fall" for any more of his double talk.

I hope Israel stands firm until the United Nations makes it clear that all nations—Russia, the Arab States, and Israel—are going to have sanctions applied to them if they try to act outside the framework of the United Nations. We have reached the point where we must have a test of this matter. Is it not interesting that some are proposing that the test be made on the weakest of all the nations directly concerned, and the only free one among them?

It is about time for the United States—from the White House, down—to begin to support free nations, and to stop aiding, abetting, and giving succor and encouragement to Fascist, totalitarian, and in some instances semi-Communist nations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me say that I am convinced in my own mind that the leadership of the State of Israel is not about ready to give up its right to survival by withdrawing its forces, thereby permitting it to be the victim of continued raids, both military and political. I am of the opinion that it would be a tragic mistake for our Government to insist upon any such withdrawals unless we ourselves are prepared to guarantee the frontiers and until such time as permanent frontiers or boundaries can be ascertained and agreed upon.

I feel very strongly about this matter. I hope my position is very well known by now. In my statement here, I have pointed out that the issue of Israeli troop withdrawal cannot be considered except in the whole context of our Middle East policy, a policy which in recent months has so conspicuously been marked with failure.

Everyone knows that Israel has already substantially complied with United Nations resolutions. Her military forces remain only in Gaza and Sharmel Sheikh on the Gulf of Aqaba. Everyone knows that other nations in, or involved in, the Middle East have not complied with resolutions outstanding against them. Everyone who has studied the situation knows that a mere restoration of the status quo ante in the Middle East—that is to say, the conditions existing prior to the attack in the Middle East—would be highly dangerous for the possibility of peaceful settlement of outstanding disputes.

Yet, tragically enough, Mr. President, a return to the status quo ante is precisely what would result from a single-minded concentration on the removal of the last Israeli soldier to last October's armistice line, while doing nothing simultaneously to assure Israel against a repetition of border attacks.

Mr. President, I digress to note that the Government of the United States sponsored and supported resolutions saying that we would not settle for a return to the conditions which existed prior to that attack. Our resolutions, which still remain to be acted upon in the United Nations—and we had them pending there a month or a month and one-half ago—were considered by us as being a part of the total United Nations' Middle East policy. I refer now to two of those resolutions. One of them relates to the Suez Canal, and one of them relates to the political difficulties between Israel and her neighbors. Those resolutions still have not been acted upon in the United Nations; they still remain before the General Assembly. They still have not received the active support of the United States of America. Our Government has stated, relative to the preliminary resolution, that we could not permit the restoration of the conditions which existed prior to the October attack of Israel, France, and Great Britain upon Egypt.

There had to be some settlements. There had to be some understandings. I regret to say that once those resolutions were offered, they were permitted to lie there, without active support. Instead we are worried about, unilateral Israeli compliance, and are threatening sanctions to compel it. This is indefensible.

To single out Israel alone for retribution, when many are guilty, would be a travesty of justice. To concentrate on the single issue of Israeli troops is to ignore the reverse side of the coin: that Gaza and Sharmel Sheikh have in the past been bases for Egyptian-sponsored night raiders and for the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba. To single out the question of military withdrawal as the main issue confronting us in the Middle East is to give undue priority to one among many factors, and is to postpone again the urgent attention that we must pay to the whole host of basic problems which confront the Middle East and which pushed Israel last October to her current display of desperation.

I say tonight, if we continue this kind of policy relating to Israel in the Middle East, we may push that country into further acts of desperation, because she is not ready to collapse and be choked to death without a fight for survival. She gave a pretty good account of herself in the last fight. The Israeli have shown their ability to stand up against almost insuperable odds. I might add that here is a country which has been asking for a mutual defense pact and mutual aid, and she is the one we turn away—the one which has the best army in the Middle East, the one which has people in it who are willing and able to die for their country. Yet we say to Israel, "We don't want you." We say she is a political problem.

May I say Formosa is a political problem, too? May I say Saudi Arabia is a political problem? I ask anyone to name for me a country with which we have an alliance or a treaty that is not a political problem. They all are, in a certain sense of the word. But Israel has the capacity not only to defend herself, but to do a little more, if she should be called upon to do so.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator does not know of any great reserve of oil in Israel, does he?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not that I have heard of. I gather that what the Senator is indicating is that our foreign policy may become deeply concerned over resources. That is a legitimate concern, but it ought not to be the exclusive concern of any country.

Mr. President, the Washington Post this morning published an illuminating editorial entitled "Israel's Defiance: Cause and Effect." I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL'S DEFIANCE: CAUSE AND EFFECT

Members of the United Nations have failed in their responsibility toward Israel. The General Assembly is rightly insisting that Israel withdraw her troops behind her borders, but the same Assembly has done nothing to deter Egypt from renewing the undeclared war that provoked the Israeli attack in the first place. That is the real explanation of Israel's defiance. In the circumstances a U. N. vote for sanctions against Israel would be hypocrisy. It is past time for the United States to assert itself so as to avoid such a travesty.

There is no need to condone Israel's defiance of the General Assembly. It is true that Russia has defied the Assembly on Hungary; India has defied the Security Council on Kashmir; and Egypt has defied the Security Council in respect to Israeli shipping in the Suez Canal. The U. N. has been either unwilling or powerless to force observance of its resolutions by larger nations, some of which are sanctimoniously demanding penalties against Israel. Nevertheless, even a collection of wrongs does not make a right, and the refusal of the Ben-Gurion government to comply with the troop withdrawal request should not be encouraged.

But if repeated defiance can destroy respect for the U. N., failure to grapple with realities also can debilitate the effectiveness of the international organization. The present defiance has been invited, indeed made inevitable, by the one-sided view which U. N. members collectively have taken of the Israeli-Egyptian conflict. There has been no security in this area, largely because of the indifference of U. N. members (including the United States), and a narrow and puristic attitude toward Israeli aggression now is decidedly out of place.

The plain fact is that the 1949 armistice between Egypt and Israel has been dishonored from the day it was signed. Egypt proclaimed her continued belligerency; she occupied Saudi Arabian islands in the Gulf of Aqaba so as to blockade Israeli shipping; she denied Israel access to the Suez Canal despite a Security Council resolution; and she unleashed countless raids into Israeli territory by fedayeen gangs. U. N. truce teams could do little to halt the incursions, and the General Assembly apparently was not interested. The 1950 tripartite declaration by Britain, France, and the United States proved weak and ineffective against these provocations. It would require extraordinary mental blinders to think that Israel began the crisis when she struck back last October, however mistaken her action was.

This does not mean that there have been no provocations on the Israeli side, or that the present course of the Ben-Gurion government is unassailable. Israel is wrong, in this newspaper's judgment, in demanding the right to administer the Gaza Strip. She could do a great deal more to conciliate the Arab States by offering to absorb some of the Arab refugees. Israel cannot remain forever an island in a hostile sea; she herself has a responsibility to promote reconciliation with her neighbors. Moreover, she has a particular responsibility to respect the United Nations, to which she owes her existence.

Obviously Israeli troops must be withdrawn from Egyptian territory, and obviously Israel cannot expect to exact formal conditions for compliance with the U. N. resolution. But to say this without qualification is to beg the question. Israel knows that economic sanctions would injure her cruelly, especially if the United States should apply them. She is gambling that they will not be pressed, and her defiance is a measure of her desperation. Israel is the child of the United Nations, and she has a right to look to the U. N. to protect her basic security.

How then can this security be protected and an Israeli troop withdrawal accomplished without resort to sanctions? Moralizing from the administration is unlikely to prevail against Israeli desperation. A statement from Colonel Nasser that Egypt would not renew her belligerency—which American sources are said to be seeking—unquestionably would help, but it scarcely would suffice. What is required is a clear statement from the United States that this country will undertake to guarantee the Israeli-Egyptian border and Israeli navigation rights, through the U. N. if possible but independently if necessary. There need be nothing provocative in such a statement, and it can apply equally to both sides.

Simultaneously it is necessary to avoid the imposition of sanctions—and the Arab-Asian resolution comes up for discussion today. The United States and like-minded countries have the power to stop any such resolution in the Assembly if they wish. To do so, however, the administration will have to avoid any spasm of self-righteousness and put aside any infatuation with its newly purchased popularity among the Arabs so as to provide realistic leadership.

The next task, in the assumption that Israel will comply, will be to move toward strict enforcement of the 1949 armistice. This would mean far more than a return to the status quo before the recent fighting; it would mean an end to Egypt's belligerency and a halt to fedayeen raids, as well as unimpeded Israeli transit in the Gulf of Aqaba and access to the Suez Canal. Vague as it is, the second U. N. resolution looks toward such a step, and that is Secretary-General Hammarskjold's objective.

Under such a plan troops of the United Nations Emergency Force would be stationed along both sides of the border in the Aqaba area as well as in the Gaza Strip. Unquestionably there will be some difficulties because of conflicting interpretations of the resolution; moreover, some countries which have supplied troops to the U. N. force have limited their use. But U. N. members cannot legitimately object to enforcement of the 1949 armistice whch the U. N. itself arranged. American leadership can help clarify the intent of the resolution so as to give Mr. Hammarskjold the leeway and guidance he needs.

Beyond this there remains the question of political settlement. That now seems far off, but in the interim the U. N. ought to concern itself with promoting the stability that may make a settlement possible. If the armistice can be enforced, then it may be possible to look toward the creation of a permanent buffer zone, perhaps by U. N. purchase, as well as the recruitment of a permanent U. N. police force.

In all of this a positive role on the part of the United States is paramount. So far the administration has been content to act very largely through and along with others; and its efforts at fairness toward both sides have been praiseworthy. But it would be a tragic blunder to think that in order to respect the principles of the United Nations the United States must always defer to the opinions of others in the Assembly without asserting its own leadership. That path leads to a dead end. The world is looking to the United States to have the courage of its convictions, and nothing could be more disappointing than for the administration to delude itself with the notion that all action in the U. N. must be reduced to the lowest common denominator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in this difficult and complicated hour, it is a fair question to ask what the administration is doing in the interest of constructing a new order out of the chaos in the Middle East. I have asked that question myself many times, and will ask it in various contexts in the course of my remarks today. No matter how many times I have asked it, I have found no satisfactory answer. I find none at the moment in the issue of sanctions.

Apparently it is the intention of the State Department and the majority of our delegation in the United Nations to seek to avert an open choice on the sanctions matter by continuing to pressure the Israeli Government for an immediate and unconditional withdrawal. It is becoming increasingly apparent that the Israeli Government is determined not to do this of its own free will.

Failing our ability to reverse Israeli policy, the administration hopes to avert the presentation of an Arab-Asian resolution for sanctions against Israel. In case that resolution is offered, and the choice is made unavoidable, apparently it is the intention of our Government to vote for sanctions.

I have no hesitancy in repeating my own stand on this matter. Were a vote taken in the United States delegation to the United Nations, I would vote against sanctions—as apparently would the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], who is the other congressional delegate to the 11th General Assembly.

I am all the more disturbed in trying to come to some conclusions about the sanction issue, however, by the fact that our own Government is at the moment employing pressure against Israel which, for all practical purposes, amounts to economic sanctions.

I believe I am bringing to the attention of the Senate for the first time some of the economic sanctions which this Government is already proposing to be imposed on the State of Israel.

Since October 29, 1956, active economic relations between the United States and Israel have ceased. Twenty-five million dollars of mutual-security funds for Israel are frozen, including $15 million of surplus agricultural commodities, and $5 million worth of nondollar currencies belonging to the United States Treasury. Those are the agricultural commodities under Public Law 480. Negotiations concerning Public Law 480 shipments to Israel have been suspended. Export-Import Bank missions scheduled to visit Israel 3 months ago were canceled. The United States is the only country in the world today, outside the Arab nations themselves, which is banning tourist visits to Israel.

The doubly tragic thing about all this, Mr. President, is that Israel is being deprived of funds and agricultural commodities now, at a time when she is absorbing thousands more refugees than the United States itself has so far been willing to accept. An estimated 80,000 to 90,000 refugees are expected to arrive in Israel in 1957, and the economic sanctions which we are already imposing upon that tiny nation's strained economy will make the problem of resettlement all the more severe.

Mr. President, several times lately I have had occasion on the Senate floor and elsewhere to protest the inactivity of the State Department in connection with the persecution of Jews in Egypt. As a member of the United States Delegation to the United Nations, I protested as early as December 7, 1956, in a letter to The Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, our permanent representative at the United Nations.

I ask unanimous consent that a press release which I issued on December 20 concerning my correspondence with Ambassador Lodge be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, ON PERSECUTION OF JEWS IN EGYPT

All Americans who are concerned about the future of freedom and democracy in the Middle East as well as elementary considerations of morality and justice, were deeply shocked earlier this month over the first reports of the persecution of the Egyptian Jewish community. Apparently, almost half of the 50,000 Jews in Egypt, including "stateless" Jews who have lived in Eypt for generations have been ordered to leave the country within a period ranging from 7 to 30 days. An undetermined number have been imprisoned, held as hostages or in house arrest, and have suffered confiscation of their property and other forms of repression.

On December 7, as a member of the United States Delegation to the United Nations, I protested in the strongest possible terms and asked for immediate action in a letter to our UN representative, Henry Cabot Lodge. The following day Ambassador Lodge replied to me as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *December 8, 1956.*

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
*United States Delegation to the General Assembly,*
*New York, N. Y.*

DEAR SENATOR: This acknowledges yours of December 7. Let me say at once that I strongly deplore the alleged persecution of Jews in Egypt. I am immediately communicating with the State Department telling them of your interest and also asking for information on my own account. I will be in touch with you again soon.

Very sincerely yours,

HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.

The next evening in a speech at the Yeshiva University in New York, I devoted a substantial part of my remarks to examining the facts of this Egyptian persecution and proposed a three-point emergency program.

1. I called upon President Eisenhower to intervene personally with Colonel Nasser to stop this persecution.

2. I proposed a full-dress investigation and action by the U. N. on grounds that this terrorism violated international law, the U. N. Charter, the U. N. Declaration of Human Rights, and the Geneva Convention of 1949.

3. I urged that Congress give immediate priority when it reconvenes in January, to refugee legislation which will include provisions for meeting this new and tragic refugee problem.

During the past 2 weeks I have personally continued to raise this matter both with the State Department and in the U. N. Delegation. I have been encouraged by the response, particularly at the U. N., and am now hopeful that appropriate steps will be taken to ease, if not to halt, this latest outburst of intolerance.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It will be noted, Mr. President, that 2 months ago I urged the following action:

First. President Eisenhower should intervene personally with Colonel Nasser to stop this persecution.

Second. A full-dress investigation and action by the United Nations should be taken on grounds that this terrorism in Egypt is in violation of international law, the United Nations Charter, the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, and the Geneva Convention of 1949.

Third. Congress should give priority attention to new refugee legislation which will include provisions for meeting this new and tragic refugee problem. These same three points are suggested at the conclusion of a 40-page definitive study which has just been released by the American Jewish Congress. The study is entitled "The Black Record: Nasser's Persecution of Egyptian Jewry." This study is the most comprehensive, complete, and authoritative account which we have of the recent persecution of Jews in Egypt.

I want to repeat on the Senate floor today, Mr. President, a comment I made last month in an interchange with the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. We all know that President Eisenhower has seen fit to use the parole provision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, section 212 (d) in permitting Hungarian refugees to come to this country without complete processing until arrival here. If this procedure was considered appropriate for the thousands of Hungarian refugees—and I for one believe that the emergency warranted such action—then I cannot understand why the President has not seen fit to employ the same parole provisions for the few hundred refugees from Egyptian tyranny who are the core of the refugee problem in Egypt?

I agree, of course, Mr. President, that there is grave doubt whether the parole provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act were originally intended for the use for which they were put during the Hungarian emergency. But now that we have that precedent, and pending further legislation during the current session of Congress, it seems to me that the President has the responsibility for using the same administrative machinery to alleviate the current tragedy in Egypt.

Let me return to troop withdrawals and sanctions.

Mr. President, to strike a high moralistic attitude about Israeli troops in Gaza and Sharmel Sheikh and to ignore everything else seems to be the height of folly. Israel reasonably asks assurances—assurances against renewed border raids, assurances against renewed blockades of the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba, assurances that serious and sober efforts will at least be made to settle the bitter Arab-Israel controversy.

Given these assurances, I have no doubt that Israeli troops would withdraw from both Gaza and Sharm el Sheikh. Unless such assurances are given, however, in a form sufficient so that responsible statesmen can afford to rely upon them, I do not believe that we have the moral right to impose sanctions on Israel for her failure to withdraw.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that an editorial appearing in this morning's New York Times entitled "Israel, Egypt, and the U. N." be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL, EGYPT, AND THE U. N.

The State of Israel, after enduring various ordeals during the 10 years of her existence, faces this week in the U. N. the possibility of punitive measures because she will not unconditionally obey resolutions of the General Assembly calling upon her to complete her withdrawal behind the armistice demarcation lines of 1949. The United States, in consequence, faces the choice of supporting such measures, opposing them, or abstaining from voting on them. We can modify them or kill them, if we wish.

President Eisenhower has concededly urged the withdrawal. State Department spokesmen were described in a Washington dispatch to this newspaper yesterday as being both angry and frustrated over Israel's insistence upon guaranties before pulling out.

The desired guaranties are simple. They are in line with at least one interpretation of the General Assembly's second resolution of February 1, which this country sponsored. This is that when the General Assembly said that "withdrawal by Israel must be followed by action which would assure progress toward the creation of peaceful conditions" it meant conditions differing from those that preceded the Israeli invasion of the Gaza Strip and Sinai on October 29.

The conditions then existing included an Egyptian blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba against Israeli ships and restrictions on the movements of Israeli ships and cargoes in the Suez Canal. They also included fedayeen gangs, trained and inspired by the Egyptians, raiding into Israel out of the Gaza Strip and Sinai.

It is argued that the Israelis ought not to be rewarded for their own admittedly illegal invasion of Egyptian or Egyptian-controlled territory. Of course, they should not be. But it is surely illogical to the point of nonsense to contend that the Egyptians should be rewarded for losing a war, and the Israelis punished for winning a war, in which neither side was blameless. Finally, in the interests of peace, it is neither wise nor just to remove some of the conditions making for war and leave others untouched.

We hope that when our spokesmen next express themselves, either in Washington or at the U. N., they will insist, for our own sake and for all nations' sake, not merely for the sake of Israel, that the Egyptians give guaranties to keep the peace before there is any further talk of sanctions against Israel.

The friendship of the Arab States, if that is what we are working for, is not worth while if it has to be bought by subterfuges and injustice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly that our policymakers apparently are unable to keep

ahead of recurring momentary crises. We have been presented with a regular series of these from the Suez seizure to the Israeli move, to the British and French attack, to the current crisis over sanctions. Our time, our effort, our interest, and our usefulness all seem to be wrapped up in last-minute efforts to extricate ourselves from these crises after they arise, rather than to laying the essential constructive groundwork for new and more positive policies. I think that the current crisis over sanctions is an exact case in point. A larger case which I think is equally in point is the whole issue of the Eisenhower doctrine to which I shall now turn my attention.

I wish to say again, in reference to my work as a delegate to the United Nations, that I made it clear to our delegation at the United Nations that we would be faced with the very problem which now confronts our country. Apparently the expressions of opinion on the part of those of us who were working daily with the delegates to the United Nations were expressions which, if they did not go unheeded, did not receive too much consideration.

EISENHOWER DOCTRINE

I am disturbed about the pervading atmosphere in Washington. It is an atmosphere characterized by the administration's insistence upon using ambiguous and generalized appeals, dramatically presented by the President and self-righteously defended by the Secretary of State. All of us know what the words of the Eisenhower doctrine are, but few of us know what they mean, even after 4 weeks of public hearings.

I note again for the RECORD, as the Senator from Arkansas said today, that many people, when they think of the Eisenhower doctrine, think of what the President said in his speech, which was in general terms, relating to American resistance to Communist aggression in the Middle East. He did not refer explicitly to Senate Joint Resolution 19, the resolution which is before the Congress, and which, if enacted, will become law and be binding upon the citizenry of the United States. To the extent that this doctrine is intended to be a warning against Soviet aggression, it is both superfluous and misses the point. No informed observer in Washington seems to feel at the moment that there is a real threat of overt Soviet aggression in Mideast. It can be argued that there is no harm in restating what I have always assumed to be a basic point of American foreign policy: that the United States is prepared to resist by force any attack by Soviet troops across any non-Communist border. But that there is some harm in restating this policy in such grandiloquent terms and at the present dramatic moment is also equally obvious: it could create the illusion of being a policy for the Middle East, when as a matter of fact some of us doubt very seriously whether that policy has yet been determined.

One of the weaknesses I see in the so-called Eisenhower doctrine or resolution is that it was the effect of making the people believe that we have some answers to the Middle East crisis. Thus it becomes a diplomatic barbiturate, a diplomatic opiate, which calms one's nerves and puts him away into a kind of slumberland, when, in fact, the illness still persists, and the drug has in no way relieved the pain or distress.

For that reason, I believe that the President was unwise when he asked the Congress to adopt his resolution. The fact that he could formulate a policy for the Middle East and publicize it for the world without prior consultation with the Congress is to be decried. It shows a greater concern for public relations than it does for the public interest.

Let me say too, Mr. President, that I deeply regret that during the course of the President's campaign for reelection in 1956, he misled the American people into believing that prospects for peace were great as a result of the activities of his administration. In fact, the dangers facing our Nation and the world increased materially during the course of the last 4 years. There is no doubt in my mind that the story is correct in the U. S. News & World Report to the effect that Mr. Eisenhower came to the Congress with his plan in order to counterbalance the erroneous impression that he had helped build up abroad during the campaign that he would go to any lengths to avoid war, even at the sacrifice of our country's national interests in the Middle East. In spite of that fact and in spite of that background, I would like to be able to vote for the Eisenhower doctrine and thus not contribute to a serious divisive face abroad which could be interpreted as a sign of weakness by our enemies. I can only do so, however, if the inadequacies of the Eisenhower doctrine are corrected and if the Congress sets about to place that so-called doctrine within the context of a more constructive national policy.

Here is the effect of the administration's proposal as I see it:

By making it appear that what the administration requests is support for a policy, while in actuality it is rather a declaration of general intent, the Congress would be committed, in advance of their elaboration, to the support of future policies, of whose substance the Congress is at present totally ignorant. The administration asks authority to use force. But it has remained silent about the substantive policies in whose support it intends to use that force, the ostensible one of defense against Soviet aggression not necessarily being the real one.

I shall not go into the constitutional issues involved in Senate Joint Resolution 19, inasmuch as I participated in the colloquy this afternoon with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. However, I repeat that, no matter how we look at the constitutional issue, this resolution does not clarify it. It continues to confuse the issue. First, it confuses the question of the responsibility of the Congress relating to its power to declare war; and secondly, it sets a bad precedent with respect to the Executive's use of his constitutional powers to protect the vital interests of this country as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

Mr. President, we know that in the Middle East there are real and present dangers of regional war, subversion, and poverty. Nothing in the Eisenhower doctrine attempts to meet these real dangers except for the request for discretionary reallocation of some economic aid already appropriated and authorized. We do not even know where that economic aid is to go, to what governments, and for what purposes.

I think it is fair to say that we tried again and again to ascertain from the Secretary of State, both in public testimony and in executive session, to what purposes this aid would be directed. We asked the Secretary if he had any idea of the purposes for which it would be used. The answer came back again and again, either "no" in executive session, or, in public testimony, that if he revealed the purposes the Soviet would be in on the secret. We can play international "cops and robbers" just about so long. After that it becomes a bit boring and tiresome, and rather uninteresting.

I should like the RECORD also to note that in my interrogation of the Secretary of State he was asked whether or not there had been any prior consultation with our ambassadors in the Middle East area, or any prior consultation with our heads of mission of the International Cooperation Administration. In both instances he answered in the negative. Yet we are told that there is a great emergency in the area. But despite the declaration of the Secretary of State of an emergency in the area, he proceeded to say to the committee that he had not consulted with the ambassadors. He had not called them together for an emergency meeting, nor had he consulted with the program planners with respect to economic assistance in the area.

In fact, I may say that I myself am gravely worried that the economic aid aspect of the Eisenhower doctrine may do the cause of economic assistance generally grave harm.

I say that because I have been a champion of economic assistance for underdeveloped nations when there is a realistic probability that this assistance will be used for economically and socially progressive results. In places like India, Burma, Pakistan, and Turkey—nations where hopeful, democratically oriented, welfare-conscious governments are in power—the case for economic assistance is a strong and persuasive one. The state which most conspicuously offers that kind of opportunity in the Middle East, Israel, presumably will not benefit from the economic-assistance aspects of the Eisenhower doctrine.

If I am being unkind or unfair in this instance, it is only because of the failure of the Secretary of State to indicate by word or even by inflection of voice that we would use any economic aid in the State of Israel.

Indeed, it appears that the nations of the Middle East most likely to receive new financial benefits from the United States are those nations ruled by the most feudal and reactionary regimes.

By deliberately asking a Congress, already increasingly skeptical of economic-assistance programs, for authority apparently to bribe feudal Middle Eastern

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

potentates under the guise of an economic-assistance program, President Eisenhower may well have done a disservice to the cause of economic assistance generally. I hope that I am not prophetic when I say this.

May I take this occasion too to reassert the affirmative and constructive purposes which the joint Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate believe they are serving in their prolonged consideration of the Eisenhower doctrine. We are not playing politics, as some Republican newspaper editorial writers keep saying. We are soberly concerned about the drift of our foreign policy in general, and the deficiencies of our foreign policy in the Middle East in particular. I do not believe that anyone who has heard or may read the hearings with Secretary Dulles can come away feeling that the questions asked were not pertinent and fraught with great significance for the future of our country.

Perhaps there has never been a clearer occasion for the exercise of the Senate's constitutional authority in the foreign policy field. By the time the Senate votes on the Middle East proposal, the country will have a better understanding of its implications. Some of the obscurities and ambiguities of the administration's original proposal will have been disclosed and corrected, and hopefully the administration will have been jogged into an awareness of the urgency of action to meet the basic problems in the Middle East which the doctrine itself largely ignores.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senator agree with me that Congress has its responsibility to discharge in this connection? After all, we represent sovereign States in the Senate, and of course there are more than 400 Representatives who represent the people of their States in the House.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. In discharging our responsibility, does it not occur to the Senator from Minnesota that we owe it to ourselves and to the people whom we represent to attempt to find out what the joint resolution is all about, what purpose is to be served by it, and what is to be accomplished by its passage?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should say so. I would say also that one's suspicions relating to the joint resolution cannot be allayed by the manner in which it was presented. If it had been presented publicly and if it had been presented in a statesmanlike manner, and if there had been serious consultation with the leaders of both Houses of Congress—I mean the true leaders, namely, the majority leader and minority leader and the heads of committees—in the very beginning, one might have said, "This is an urgent and serious proposal. The record will reveal that here was a major proposal which affects the very life of the Republic and the whole interpretation of the Constitution. It was handled with a kind of Hollywood public relations treatment.

Days went by before a Member of Congress was even consulted. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I can recall reporter after reporter calling me on the telephone and asking my views of the so-called Eisenhower doctrine, even before there was a joint meeting of Congress, and even before members of committees had been called to the White House. That is a poor way of conducting even domestic politics, let alone international diplomacy.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. As the Senator knows, this subject is so broad and has so many aspect that it is very difficult to decide exactly what the real purpose of it all is. Is it to send troops to the Near East in the event aggression breaks out there? Is it to extend economic aid or to extend military aid? What is it? The Senator has been sitting in the committee hearings, and he knows as well as I do that we have not been able to obtain information, with respect to a single situation, as for what these millions of dollars are to be used. Not one single project has been mentioned.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. I recall the Senator's interrogation of the Secretary of State, along with other members of the committee. I do not recall that we received any information. I do not mean specific information. We did not ask for that. We did not receive any general information; nothing at all as to whether 50 percent of the money would be used for military assistance, or whether 50 percent of it would be used for broad economic projects, such as a river development program, or whether 25 percent of it would be used for immediate cash outlays to bolster the faltering budgets of those countries.

We did not ask for details, knowing full well that the Government would not be able to present detailed information. We asked for general descriptions. We received nothing along that line. Anyone who examines the record will find not a scintilla of evidence to support even a generalized description of the proposed use of the funds which are being requested.

Mr. LONG. As one who sat through the executive or secret sessions, as well as the open sessions, I see no reason for keeping the Secretary's testimony secret, or keeping the stamp of secrecy on it, because he did not tell us anything. After 4 days of testimony we simply did not find out anything. For the most part I could not find out what the whole thing was all about, what was going to be accomplished, or what would be done. Does the Senator recall anything in particular?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I do not. I wish to pay tribute to my friends of the press, because apparently they have been able to discover more information as to what the administration has in mind in connection with the joint resolution than has any Member of Congress, or, particularly, any member of the committees considering the subject. It may be that I am doing a disservice to some of my colleagues in this instance, but I want to say for Admiral Radford, if I may, that his answers were frank and concise and directed to the questions which were asked. It is interesting to note that when an executive officer comes before a committee of Congress and talks frankly and candidly and openly and forthrightly, his testimony is respected.

However, when we have before us a witness whose answers are not responsive to the questions and seem to go around a question rather than to a question, one feels as if he is being dealt with in an unfair manner. I heard one of our colleagues say that he did not so much resent the fact that he had not received any information from the Secretary of State, but that he was being treated like a child.

The Secretary of State has a great responsibility; we know that to be so. I have not been one who has made it a practice of harassing the Secretary of State. Last year, in connection with his brink-of-war announcement, yes, because I considered it poor manners and also deplorable diplomacy. This year, however, I believe that if the President wants our consent, we ought to give it to him.

He did not really need to send the joint resolution to Congress. He could have announced everything contained in the resolution in his State of the Union Message or in his Inaugural Address, or in a statement. George Washington made his statement on entangling alliances without sending a resolution to Congress. President Monroe made his statement on the Monroe Doctrine without benefit of joint resolution. The President sought to follow another course. Since he has, I must say that he must expect to get quite a little advice from Members of Congress, before he will get the consent of Congress for an appropriate resolution.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. First, let me say to the Senator that I agree completely with what he said about Admiral Radford. He was a good witness. The Senator will notice that the time required to examine Admiral Radford was much less than the time required to examine the Secretary of State. I am frank to say that we were able to obtain at least some idea from Admiral Radford as to what this whole thing is about.

Mr. HUMPHREY. From a military standpoint.

Mr. LONG. Yes; and he had something to say also about the diplomatic aspects.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But Admiral Radford was very careful in his statement about the use of the funds, and he confined himself to his responsibility. When we asked him questions in the field of diplomacy, he was very careful to say that what he stated was his personal view. He said he did not have any responsibility in that area, and that he was presenting his personal view. One could not help but like such a witness as that.

Mr. LONG. In that respect, we did gain a somewhat better understanding of what this thing is all about.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He was a very helpful witness.

Mr. LONG. We found out what his understanding was, at least. I wonder whether the Senator will agree that if we are to have a good bipartisan foreign-policy program, it will have to be clear that it will not be something we will do in order to get a great many votes at election time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is certainly correct.

Mr. LONG. Until that is done, it will be impossible to achieve the kind of effectiveness in foreign relations which this country should seek. That is the kind of purpose to which I know the Senator from Minnesota would like to devote himself. So would the junior Senator from Louisiana. So far as I myself am concerned, I do not feel that we need any foreign relations issue to defeat the Republicans in the next election. I believe we will probably win the election on the basis of a number of other issues, such as the one stemming from the high interest rates which the people of the Nation are paying, and the fact that perhaps certain people in certain walks of life have not been treated fairly in their income tax adjustments. There are plenty of issues to contest without either party having to take advantage of the Nation's foreign problems and world problems in any manner which might jeopardize this Nation's security.

Yet to achieve that purpose it is necessary that both political parties should be frank with each other, open-minded with each other, and tell the other exactly what each is seeking to accomplish.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his observations on these matters. He has been in constant attendance at the committee hearings and has been very studious. I imagine that he has come away with pretty much the same thought as I have, namely, that the resolution needs a lot of reworking.

Mr. LONG. I wish to express my high regard for the three nationwide magazines which gave us some understanding of what the world situation is, some of them even before the Secretary of State broke the news to us in Congress. The magazines Time, Newsweek, and U. S. News & World Report have given us as much enlightment as I, for my part, ever received, even behind closed doors in secret session.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of an article entitled "The Eisenhower Doctrine," and written by Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EISENHOWER DOCTRINE

(By Reinhold Niebuhr)

At the height of the Suez crisis, the London Economist, which supported Washington's position rather than that of Sir Anthony Eden, wryly remarked that American policy was to affirm responsibility for the world but not to have a policy for any particular part of it. The Eisenhower doctrine, it seems to me, is a perfect demonstration of the validity of this observation. It is supposed to fill the power vacuum in the Middle East; but it does not touch any of the particular power problems which produced the Mideast crisis in the first place.

The Eisenhower policy has two general lines of attack. The first is the promise of economic assistance to middle eastern nations. This is the extension of the idealistic approach to backward nations. It has its own validity, and I would say nothing to discredit the point 4 approach. Nevertheless, this approach solves nothing in the Middle East, with its oil-rich monarchs and its poverty-stricken peoples. As one Senator noted, the middle eastern nations are rich in liquid assets.

In this program of economic aid, no attempt is being made to tackle the unsolved problems which led to the stormy events of 1956. For years we have had a project ready for Jordan Valley development, but the Arab nations have refused to participate because this would involve cooperation with Israel—a nation which in their eyes does not have a right to exist. We have not insisted, though we might have, that the Jordan project become a part of the new economic-assistance program.

Then there is the Arab refugee problem. The United Nations has ineffectually tried to persuade the Arab governments to settle many of the refugees in their vast and underpopulated domains. The Arab nations, particularly Egypt, prefer the refugees unsettled, in order to exacerbate animosities against Israel. The economic program presented under the Eisenhower doctrine does not offer specific amounts to specific nations for the settlement of refugees. We did nothing about this problem in the past, and are doing nothing now.

Instead of offering unspecified and unvouchered aid to the governments of the Middle East, it would have been more sensible to project a large program for the building of supertankers to bring oil around Africa and from the American Continent. Europe's undue dependence on Middle Eastern oil has been made only too vivid in the last year—not only to us, but to the oil monarchs and to Colonel Nasser, who are fully aware of their new power to control the vital sustenance of the European economy, and are using that power.

A recent dispatch from Washington expresses the official disappointment at Nasser's continued recalcitrance. The Washington officials seemed to feel that a dictator, who had gone very far by inordinate demands, would suddenly moderate these demands in gratitude to the President who had bailed him out of recent difficulties. Political naivete could hardly be more extreme. There is also some disappointment that our common cause with Russia in the Suez affair should not have gone further toward winning the Asian nations. Here is Chou En-lai talking hysterically about the imperialists and monopolists just as if we did not have a President who took time out from leading the alliance of free nations in order to join India's V. K. Krishna Menon in the task of bridge-building between tyranny and democracy.

In every case, power-political realities are being obscured by moralism. One must report in this context the President's remarkable explanation of the contrast between the effectiveness of the United Nations in ordering Britain and France out of Egypt and its ineffectiveness in ordering Soviet troops out of Hungary. Eisenhower explained that our allies were moral nations and the Russians were not moral enough to heed the opinion of mankind. Thus he obscured the flaw in the U. N. Charter (a flaw, incidentally, which cannot be remedied by constitutional changes). The United Nations can act effectively against small nations when the big powers agree, but it can do nothing against either Russia or America.

Furthermore, the U. N. could coerce Britain and France only because the United States furnished the force of coercion by threatening to cut off oil supplies to its allies. Indeed, we did not even grant relief to Europe as quickly as we might have; it required a great deal of arm-twisting by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY to persuade the administration to ship oil before the two countries had obeyed the "forthwith" resolution absolutely. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, like Mr. Menon, was adamant on that point—in order to assert our "moral leadership" and perhaps, to assert our offended majesty.

The moral influence theory in international relations has an ultimate validity in the sense that issues of right and wrong are ultimately potent. But a simple moralism is always pathetic when it obscures the power realities which underlie moral issues. The combination of Eisenhower's moralism, which expresses itself in universal benevolence without regard for strategic necessities, and Dulles' formalism, which makes simple distinctions between nations which obey the moral law and those which do not, might well ruin the prestige of the United Nations by investing it with promises which it cannot fulfill.

The second part of the Eisenhower doctrine is presumably realistic rather than idealistic. It promises military assistance to any nation threatened by Soviet military power. Since Russia is doing very well by subversion in Syria and by arrangement in Egypt, nothing is more unlikely than military aggression by Russia, and nothing is more irrelevant than the promise of military support, particularly when it is added that we will come to the assistance of Middle Eastern nations only on the request of their governments. The only nation which could possibly be threatened in this manner is Iraq. Even Turkey, which may or may not be in the vaguely defined region, and which is, in any case, a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, is not immediately imperiled by military aggression.

Meanwhile, all the real and unsolved problems of aggression remain; these threats do not come from the U. S. S. R. but from its pawns. Israel is still insecure. Her invasion of Egypt was probably more justified than any other. We are trying to force her out of Egypt before she can win any of the guaranties required for her very existence. Recently, the United Nations intimated that if Israel got out, the U. N. emergency force would take over the Gaza Strip and the Gulf of Aqaba. But Israel must get out before the promise is fulfilled, and meanwhile Mr. Menon has solemnly reminded the Assembly that such a strategy for the emergency force would require "renegotiation" with Nasser. (Everything must be cleared with Nasser: Was he not the innocent victim of aggression? And must we not prove to him that we are obedient to the moral law?)

The doughty Israelis have thus far been tardy in acceding to this. When a small nation is fighting for its existence and is unaided because a fog obscures the vision of the greatest of the powers, one is grateful for a little realism.

Perhaps Israel ought not to have been planted in this troubled world with its patchwork of tawdry nations, but it will certainly be a greater mistake to abandon her. Not one clear word has been spoken by the administration about our stake in Israel's survival; and it is still the official doctrine that to grant her arms would aggravate the arms race. It is true that her army is superior to the surrounding forces, but if the Arab world were united and armed against her, Israel would be lost. We ought both to guarantee Israel and to prevent the unity of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the Arab world under Nasser. The latter job should not be too difficult, even though the British mistakenly thought it would be easy to bring Nasser down in Egypt itself. We certainly ought not to make the mistake of building up Nasser's prestige elsewhere in the Islamic world.

There are, in short, a multitude of detailed problems in this power vacuum. There are no pat solutions for any one of them. But it is idle to leave them all unsolved while we propose the grand solution of economic aid and military support.

How irrelevant this grand solution becomes was shown on January 19, when we witnessed the ultimate in confusion in the United Nations. By an overwhelming majority, composed of the Arab-Asian, American and Soviet contingents, with France alone coming to Israel's defense, the General Assembly again voted to order Israeli troops out of the two strips Israel was holding until she could get satisfactory guaranties from Egypt on the free passage of shipping, and security from attack through a U. N. occupation of Gaza. Although no such guaranties have been given, we nevertheless joined with Russia and her cohorts in ordering Israel out. If she yields now, as she probably must, not only will she sacrifice the last chance of real security, but the West will lose the chance of building an alternative pipeline, which would be possible if the U. N. neutralized the Gulf of Aqaba. Israel will have the consolation of praise from our President for being more "moral" than Russia, because she heeded a U. N. resolution, but she would probably prefer security to praise under such circumstances.

One has the uneasy feeling that our vagueness is not merely the particular weakness of the Eisenhower administration, but that we are witnessing the reemergence of a perennial flaw in American foreign policy. Edward Buehrig, in his excellent book, Woodrow Wilson and the Balance of Power, elaborates the thesis that Wilson and the British wanted the League of Nations for quite contrary reasons. We wanted it in order to express our responsibility to the world without assuming any particular responsibilities. The British wanted it in order to make us responsible for the fate of Europe. The British failed in their intention, and another world war was required to draw us out of our isolation. We emerged from that war with so much power, and are so remote from the trouble-spots of the world where our power impinges, that we have merely drifted into another version of the old vagueness, and have adopted new methods for being responsible in general without being responsible in any particular problem.

The vagueness of our policy was accentuated when assurances were given at the Senate hearings that we would not station troops in the Middle East. It is further made apparent when one considers that we do not have the military equipment to wage local wars; we only have atomic superiority for the ultimate war. Therefore, the very threat of force from us bears the connotation of massive retaliation, and our pacifism in immediate situations is ominously joined with threats of total war. Perhaps that is why we have lost almost as much prestige in Europe through recent events as the Russians have. The danger of Soviet ruthlessness is well understood, but so are the perils of our amiable and complacent stupidity. If we are going to be the Rome of the modern era, we ought at least to apply ourselves more assiduously to the arts of dominion, and learn that grand strategy without tactical skill is worth nothing.

Individual statesmen have their peculiar weaknesses and virtues, and different eras have their own peculiar moods. But when an idealistic Democratic internationalist with an academic background, reigning almost a half century ago, proves to have similarities with a current Republican President with a military background, one may justifiably surmise that the common elements they share are prompted by something in the national situation. That something could be the contrast between the power and comfort of this Nation and the troubles and turmoils of the world at large, as well as the remoteness of the great seat of power from the trouble spots on which our power impinges. We are idealistic enough to feel responsible, powerful enough to feel frustration when the power does not solve all problems—and so comfortable that we don't like to be bothered. Therefore, the best thing to do is to write a check and threaten to send the corner policemen if the boys do not behave. It's a hell of a way to exercise responsible dominion in a troubled world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would note especially the first paragraph of this splendid article, because it is so pertinent to our discussion. It reads as follows:

> At the height of the Suez Canal crisis, the London Economist, which supported Washington's position rather than that of Sir Anthony Eden, wryly remarked that American policy was to affirm responsibility for the world but not to have a policy for any particular part of it. It is supposed to "fill the power vacuum" in the Middle East; but it does not touch any of the particular power problems which produced the Mideast crisis in the first place.

Mr. President, it is very difficult to find time these days to read all the printed material which comes to one's attention, but I hope that my colleagues will read this perceptive and provocative article written by Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, who as we all know, is a great theologian and a profound student of international relations, as well. He incorporates in his thinking both constructive policy and ethics. The article was published in the New Leader magazine for February 4, 1957, and I am in substantial agreement with it.

Mr. President, Henry Ford II said a couple of weeks ago:

> We should be on our guard against hypocrisy.

Mr. Ford warned against the besetting danger of American foreign policy—the danger of striking high moralistic attitudes without the fundamental moral force created by realistic policy decisions and constructive diplomatic energy.

I must say that Mr. Ford's address was one of the really fine contributions to the current discussion of American foreign policy.

Because I am convinced that the President and the Secretary of State have often confused moralizing with moral strength, I was grieved all the more when the President recently complained that Senate critics of the Eisenhower doctrine were speaking only from "hindsight," and that they had no constructive proposals to offer. No one who knows the real facts of the matter will agree with the President's comment.

I am only 1 of 96 Senators, many of whom have warned about the inadequacy of our Middle East policy for years. To select only two instances, let me take this occasion to remind the President that I twice took the Senate floor a year ago, on February 16 and 17, 1956, to say among other things the following:

> I charge on the floor of the Senate that our Nation has exemplified no consistent foreign policy in the Middle East that is ascertainable or definable. It is because we have been playing the policy of expediency when we should be principled. We should be using the good offices of the United States of America to bring peace in this area, rather than to contribute to the arms race. Ultimately such a course will lead to war.

The following day I added:

> I suggest that the Subcommittee on Near Eastern and African Affairs conduct an examination with a view to recommending whether a full-scale investigation by the Foreign Relations Committee would be in order. Our military and economic policies should be reviewed dispassionately and immediately, in view of the growing tensions in the Middle East.

Mr. President, time after time during past years in the Senate, I have noted in the RECORD, by the presentation of articles, editorials, and by words of my own, the difficulties in the Middle East and the dangers which lurk there. I have said again and again on the floor that the Middle East is historically regarded as the cradle of civilization, and that it could well become the deathbed of civilization.

I have tried as best I could to alert our fellow citizens to the gravity of the situation in the Middle East, but I must say that any argument which any of us made went unnoticed, and the conditions went often unheeded.

We are now going to have such an investigation after the explosion has occurred. It did not take a Cassandra to predict the Middle Eastern crisis. Neither I nor any of my colleagues take credit for having warned about it in advance. But the President is incorrect when he accuses some of us of hindsight criticism.

He is equally incorrect when he claims that no constructive proposals have been made. I can only reiterate some of my own. In the specific situation in which the Senate now finds itself, in the midst of the debate on a largely inadequate, if not irrelevant Eisenhower doctrine, here are a few of the suggestions which I have to offer.

I may say for the RECORD that these suggestions are not necessarily new. Many of them I have offered in public addresses over the radio and television, in the Senate itself, and in committees during the past 2, 3, or 4 years. They have related to our foreign policy in the Middle East. Also, these are suggestions which have been discussed on occasion with the United States delegation at the United Nations.

MILITARY AID

First. The first is on the subject of military aid.

To the extent that a case can be made for a new declaration of American intention to resist Communist aggression in the Middle East, it is important that this be done in a manner and for a purpose consistent with the Charter of the United Nations. It is my suggestion, therefore, that any employment of United States forces under this program take place at the request of the United Nations unless the President of the United States specifically and in writing declares that the urgency of the situation and the self-interest of our Nation

precludes prior United Nations action. In stating that our armed activity in the Middle East should be in accordance with the charter and the decisions of the United Nations, I want to make it very clear that this includes the Security Council or the United Nations General Assembly acting under its uniting-for-peace procedure.

It is necessary, however, that we appreciate the limitations of direct military assistance under the Eisenhower doctrine. To promise military assistance to any nation requesting it which is threatened by Soviet military power is, in fact, only to assert a very limited policy for the Middle East. Military aggression by Russia and its satellites is quite remote in the Middle East area. The Communist world is doing quite well by internal subversion in Syria and by power manipulations in Egypt, without risking direct military intervention in this area. It is only Iraq which could plausibly be threatened in this manner and in all likelihood, therefore, this program of direct military intervention by United States troops can play only a limited role in preventing Communist aggression.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator has made a suggestion which occurred to me. I regret that I did not attempt to develop it with the Secretary of State when he was before the committee. Perhaps my success in getting an answer to it would have been no better than it was with respect to some of the other questions which I propounded to him. But I certainly think we should take the attitude that not only the Security Council of the United Nations, which is subject to a veto by any of the major powers, but also the General Assembly of the United Nations, will be respected by the United States.

It seems to me that in the areas which could lead to a third world war, when a crisis develops we should always be willing to submit our case to an international forum. Thus far we have been willing to abide by the views of the General Assembly of the United Nations; and, as we well know, although the Security Council has repeatedly failed to act to solve the problems, the United Nations General Assembly has proved itself capable of arriving at a decision.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG. The Uniting for Peace resolution came, as the Senator may recall, when the Soviet Union had returned to the United Nations Security Council, following the terrible Korean war. The United States and the United Nations forces working together brought forth this kind of resolution. It has been found that the General Assembly has been able to take very constructive action under the terms of the resolution.

The Senators knows, with all due deference to the President's intentions—and I am certain that his intentions are good and meaningful—the truth of the matter is that when he told us he would be willing to accept the view of the Security Council of the United Nations, he was making a very meaningless statement, because obviously any Communist country which is a member of the Security Council, particularly the Soviet Union, will veto any action by the United States to outlaw Communist aggression.

It is like having the President say in this instance that he would be willing to obey the General Assembly whenever Russia is in a position to veto the action by the Security Council, and the resolution is directed against Communist aggression. It goes without saying that it would be a meaningless gesture.

If the President said he would abide by the recommendations of the General Assembly of the United Nations, then he would be making a commitment to subject to an element of international restraint his power to use the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course the Senator from Louisiana is correct, and I have accommodated his point in my suggestion, since Security Council action depends on Soviet agreement, the Uniting for Peace procedure is all the more relevant.

UNITED NATIONS POLICE

Second. The second principle which should motivate our policies in the Middle East is to do what we can as a nation to strengthen the military forces of the United Nations in the Middle East. We should use appropriations hitherto made pursuant to the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, to furnish facilities and military assistance to the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East.

Within the councils of the United Nations, we should initiate proposals for the immediate strengthening in size, flexibility, and continuity of this existing U. N. force. Our objective should be not only to utilize it for current purposes, that is, to interpose the U. N. troops between Israel and Egypt and at such strategic assignments as the Gaza Strip, the Straits of Tiran, and the Sinai frontier outposts, but we should also use the U. N. force as a permanent body ready for service any place in the Middle East, as circumstances may demand.

My colleagues know of Senate Resolution 15, submitted on January 7, 1957, by Senators SPARKMAN, HILL, KEFAUVER, MANSFIELD, and myself. I am hopeful that this resolution will be a vehicle for spurring the administration on to greater initiative in the achievement of a permanent U. N. police force. In this connection, Mr. President, I asked the Foreign Affairs Division of the Library of Congress to prepare an analysis of recent commentary on the proposal for a permanent U. N. police force. I believe that the report which the Legislative Reference Service has sent to me will be of use to Members in their consideration of this problem. I do not believe that all of the obstacles raised in the report are unsurmountable, but I specifically asked that they be raised, so that those of us interested in this problem can view it from the widest perspective. I ask unanimous consent that the manuscript to which I have just referred, and which was prepared by the Library of Congress at my request, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

ARMS TRAFFIC

Mr. HUMPHREY. Furthermore, Mr. President—

Third. We should initiate proposals to end the arms race in the Middle East by an effective embargo against shipments from any outside source other than under United Nations auspices. To this end, we should seek the establishment by the United Nations General Assembly of a Special Commission on Arms Traffic, which Commission would be charged with responsibility for proposing early recommendations on regulating all flow of non-United Nations materiel into that region.

Mr. President, let me explain this proposal, since it is partially a result of our recent hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament.

Very close to the heart of the present difficulty in the Middle East is the fact that the Soviet Union has tried to stir up trouble for its own benefit, by making massive injections of arms into the region. If this deliberate policy of fomenting disorder continues, it could not only imperil other measures which the United Nations and the United States might adopt to pacify Arab-Israeli relations and defend the Middle Eastern area, but it might also lead to an eruption that would endanger the peace of the world. By intruding into the Middle Eastern area with large supplies of arms, Moscow runs the serious risk of transforming any future armed conflict in that area into a war that would reach around the globe and involve us all. Because it so directly involves the policies and interests of the major powers, I consider the problem of controlling the traffic in arms in the Middle East as one of the gravest we must face.

As an immediate step, I propose that the United Nations, in connection with its current consideration of the Middle Eastern question, establish this Special Commission on Arms Traffic to explore and make recommendations for international regulation of the arms trade into this region. I realize that the overall problem of international control of the arms traffic is more far-reaching than the crisis we confront at the moment in the Middle East, and ultimately I would hope that it would be explored within the broader framework of general disarmament negotiations. Right now, however, the urgency of affairs in the Middle East is so great that there can be no delay in considering this question in relation to that area.

There are two principal ways in which regulation of the arms traffic can be approached. The aim of both of them, of course, is not only to prevent a serious arms imbalance that might trigger off military aggression, but also to prevent an arms race that would be very burdensome to the economies of the countries concerned and fraught with the danger of mushrooming into another outbreak of hostilities.

One way of mitigating the effects of an undisciplined arms flow to the Middle

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

East would be to throw the spotlight of publicity on this trade, through an international reporting system. In other words, all countries supplying arms to the Middle Eastern States would be required to make, to a central agency, reports of their shipments. It would be highly appropriate for this agency to be under the jurisdiction of the United Nations. The agency would compile and publish the information. An international reporting system, while it would not absolutely guarantee an airtight regulation of the arms trade, would bring to bear upon it the influence of world opinion; and this, experience has shown, can have a very salutary effect. The weakness in a system of this sort is that, unless procedures of verification could be agreed upon, it would rely upon the good faith of the reporting countries; and if that were lacking, the reporting system would be undermined.

Another approach would be direct international control and policing of the arms commerce going into the Middle Eastern area. This would require the concurrence of at least the major Western Powers and the Soviet Union. Under this system an international supervisory council of nations, which might be composed of the major powers, as well as other countries, preferably organized under the United Nations, would have the ultimate right of decision for allocating or withholding arms shipments to Middle Eastern countries. Jointly, they would provide for policing the transport routes into the area, to insure that authorized quotas of arms imports into each country were not exceeded. By this means, dangerous arms deals could be averted and militarist leaders prevented from obtaining the weapons necessary for realizing their aggressive ambitions.

The international control system should have the cooperation of the Soviet Union. The United States, Great Britain, and France, under a tripartite policy adopted in 1950, for some years controlled their armaments trade with the Arab-Israeli nations, with a view to stabilizing relations between them. This tripartite arrangement worked reasonably well so long as the Soviet Union did not disturb it by channeling arms into the countries concerned; but as soon as Moscow decided to do so, the whole system was circumvented. It is clear, therefore, that if the Soviet Union is unwilling to cooperate in a system of joint control, quite different methods of restricting the arms flow will have to be sought.

Meanwhile, no time should be lost in exploring these proposals.

PILOT INSPECTION SYSTEM

Fourth. We should consider proposing a pilot project, open-skies aerial and ground inspection system over the Egyptian - Israeli - Jordanian - Syrian - Saudi Arabian border areas. Since many of these governments supported the 1955 United Nations resolution giving priority to these proposals on a wider scale, the same governments might be asked to assist in the reduction of tensions in their own areas, as well as help promote the usefulness of this concept for disarmament negotiations generally, by agreeing now to such a pilot mutual inspection system to be conducted by themselves or by outside parties, as agreed upon.

Again, Mr. President, let me explain briefly what I have in mind, since the proposal is a new one.

In working for the establishment of peace in the Middle East, it would be highly desirable to have the cooperation of the Soviet Union. I think on such problems as controlling arms traffic we should really put up to the Soviet leaders the question of whether they want to aid the cause of stability in the area or whether their real intentions are to continue to foment strife. Since the men in the Kremlin more often than not pursue a policy of strife, rather than one aimed at achieving tranquillity, I do not have great expectations that their assistance will be forthcoming. If it is not, we shall at least have exposed once again the Soviet Union's true nature.

We need not, however, base all plans and proposals designed to eradicate the conflicts in the Middle East on the willingness of the Soviet Union to cooperate. We have previously made progress in solving world problems, despite continued provocation and threats by the Communists. In the Middle East it is essential to adopt measures which will minimize the likelihood of an outbreak of hostilities. The nations of that area would then have a relatively calm period in which to solve the major political problems that beset them.

In proposing that the United Nations institute a pilot inspection system in the Middle East, I have in mind a system designed to guard against two of the real dangers which increase tension in the area. One is the fear of surprise aggression, either of the type that Israel launched against Egypt last fall, or of the commando-type raids across borders, which so often cause a chain of retaliatory action.

The second fear that is manifested by each side is the fear that the other side is gaining in the arms race. Each side hears of armaments the other side is receiving, and that prompts a renewed effort to increase the amount of arms shipments into the area.

An inspection system would guard against an increase in arms shipments and the ability to engage in surprise attacks.

The type of inspection system I would like to see tried is a combination of the three proposals advocated by the major powers in 1955, but applied to the Middle East. At that time, President Eisenhower proposed a plan for aerial surveys between the United States and the Soviet Union. Premier Faure of France proposed an inspection system based on the control of budgetary procedures, and Marshal Bulganin of the Soviet Union called for the stationing of ground inspectors at key points.

The institution of ground inspectors at ports, railroad terminals, airdromes, and other key points would insure that any agreement to curtail arms to Middle Eastern nations would be observed. The use of the United Nations Emergency Force along the borders would permit inspection against a build-up for raids and surprise aggression. The aerial surveys and the use of budgetary procedures would act as additional checks that clandestine arms trade and mobilization of forces were not going on. The inspection system would have the added objective of thwarting efforts of the Soviet Union to stir up trouble through internal subversion.

It may be questioned whether the Arab States and Israel would accept such an inspection system. We certainly will never know until we try to negotiate with them on these proposals. Existing evidence indicates, I believe, that these nations would be sympathetic to such an approach. At the Tenth United Nations General Assembly, a resolution which was passed instructed the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Canada, and the Soviet Union, as members of the United Nations Disarmament Subcommittee, to give priority to the inspection systems proposed at Geneva by President Eisenhower, Premier Faure, and Premier Bulganin. I want the Senate to know that Israel and every Arab State then a member of the United Nations voted for that resolution. If the nations of the Middle East thought well enough of the inspection proposals to recommend them to the major powers, to help prevent a major worldwide nuclear war, they must be willing to consider their application in order to prevent armed conflict in the Middle East, their own homelands.

The details of the inspection system, such as the recruitment and nationality of inspectors, would have to be carefully worked out in the United Nations, and with the close collaboration of the nations in the Middle East. To me, it is imperative that the United States in the United Nations give leadership to get the planning for such an inspection system started.

WATERWAYS

Fifth. We should recognize the critical importance of reestablishing the principle of free navigation on international waterways, specifically including free, unfettered access to the use of the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba for the shipping of all nations. To this end, we should be taking the leadership in the United Nations, where already existing resolutions in this matter remain to be implemented and reinforced.

We should do more than that, for the problem of an international waterway running through the territory of a national state is a serious one, indeed. Even if we accept the legal right to nationalize, which right Colonel Nasser exercised last summer over the Suez Canal, the question remains whether the nationalization of a waterway so important to many nations should ever come under the unquestioned rule of one nation. The Secretary of State has said many times that the canal should be isolated from national politics. But this is a statement of principle which has not been implemented.

One reason why it has not been implemented is that the Egyptians would resent—with some justification—sin-

gling out the Suez Canal for special treatment. The United States would be in a position to exert more effective leadership on this question if it were to examine the possibility of proposing that all similar international waterways be put under a special type of international control.

Mr. President, this issue was raised at the Potsdam Conference of 1945, when President Truman suggested the internationalization of all the world's strategic waterways, including the Turkish straits, the Rhine-Danube waterway, and the Suez, Panama, and Kiel Canals.

In an interesting article entitled "Steps Toward a Middle Eastern Peace" James P. Warburg amplifies on this proposal. The article appeared in the Reporter magazine for February 7, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I myself am not committed to this proposal; but I am committed to the importance of exploring it. It occurs to me that one possibility which should not be overlooked is to put all international waterways under special international control—related to, but not under the direct control of, the United Nations. Outright ownership and operation could remain with the nation involved under such a proposal—Egypt, in the case of the Suez Canal; the United States, in the case of the Panama Canal; and Germany, in the case of Kiel Canal. But an independent body, similar to this country's Interstate Commerce Commission, could be chartered, under the United Nations, to fix maximum rates and minimum standards of operation. This body could also act as a board of arbitration for any complaints.

As the editors of the Harvard Crimson said in an editorial on this proposal last September 27:

> If the United States would make such a proposal, it would shake the world. It might well cut right through the ice which is now clogging the canal issue, and effect a settlement which should benefit all concerned. It would give Nasser an easy way to accept a form of international control. It would answer legitimate western fears about Egypt's intentions. And it would take the next move away from the Soviet Union, which now seems to be the biggest and most important question mark in Suez and, indeed, the whole Middle East.

GOOD OFFICES

Sixth, Next, Mr. President, it seems to me that we should propose the establishment of a United Nations Good Offices Commission, whose purpose would be to reduce tensions in the Middle East by promoting direct negotiations between the current antagonists, and by mediating among them if direct negotiations prove to be impossible. The Commission should be specifically charged with unremitting exploration of the possibility of negotiations on the central problems of determination of boundaries, resettlement of Arab refugees from Israel and of Jewish refugees from Egypt and Syria, and the conclusion of treaties of peace.

The basic disputes which must be settled, and which a Good Offices Commission could help to settle, were admirably covered in a series of four articles which appeared last month in the Washington Star. They were written by William L. Ryan, Associated Press news analyst. I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit C.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we shall have to recognize, that ultimate peace in the Middle East will depend upon such negotiations. A Good Offices Commission could go to work at once on the real business of the hour: striking at the roots of conflict in the Middle East.

Seventh. Finally, Mr. President, we must help break the stalemates of inertia and blockade by promoting dynamic projects to help raise living standards, strengthen economies, and encourage orderly social progress in the Middle East. We should reaffirm our interest and support for long-term regional economic development programs sufficiently broad to encompass multinational river development projects for the Jordan, Nile, and Tigris-Euphrates River valley systems. Toward this end, we should take the initiative in the United Nations in proposing a Middle East Development Authority, as an administering agency for the mutual pooling of capital and technical aid in the region, the Board of Directors of which would contain representatives of all Middle Eastern states, as well as of all other states furnishing capital aid and technical assistance.

In a speech which I gave in New York at the Overseas Press Club on December 20, 1956, I first advocated this mutual development authority. Unknown to me at the time was an excellent review of a similar proposal published in the London Observer for December 16. This particular article has already received widespread comment in this country, but it has not been reprinted here. I believe it is of such merit that I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article also be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit D.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I consider these proposals to be sound, practicable, and indicative of the positive approach which the United States must soon adopt. I know that it will take courage and daring to adopt such an approach in the Middle East.

Without these qualities, however, we shall continue to muddle, moralize, and probably miss the opportunity to be of constructive use in the Middle East. With these qualities, we can at least hope that our courage will be rewarded.

I conclude by stating that the resolution now being considered by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the Senate Committee on Armed Services does not have within its confines, either by direct word or by insinuation, proposals such as have been suggested in the Senate today, or proposals such as have been suggested by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], or proposals such as have been proposed by the present Presiding Officer, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The proposals which I have made in the Senate today are not at all exclusive or inclusive. They are merely suggestions. I make them because I want to note for public attention that the so-called Eisenhower doctrine is not one that gets at either the immediate or the continuing problems of the Middle East area. At best, it is a framework in which policies could possibly be constructed. At best, it is an invitation to the formulation of programs and policies. It is no policy itself, and we may properly complain of the administration that it has tried to palm it off as one.

EXHIBIT A

A UNITED NATIONS PERMANENT POLICE FORCE

This paper presents published statements that have been made in regard to the creation of a permanent United Nations police force and analyzes various obstacles and the alternative ways of meeting them.

PUBLISHED STATEMENTS

At tab I will be found a collection of published statements, arranged alphabetically by author. By way of summary, it can be said that recent discussion of creating a permanent U. N. police force has not been extensive, though many have voiced the conviction that the present U. N. emergency force should be kept along the armistice line and in the gulf of Aqaba until a peaceful settlement is achieved. No statements have been found that oppose or seriously question the idea of a permanent U. N. force. Most of those calling for a permanent U. N. force do not go beyond this except to cite its importance in preventing further incidents along the Israel border. Some do go further and say it should be made up of men from the small or neutral nations and preferably on an individual rather than national unit basis to increase fighting effectiveness and international character. Those that discuss the question feel the police force should be directly under U. N. command and be stationed in an area on either side of the Israel-Egyptian border from the Mediterranean to the Gulf of Aqaba. None call for it to be a real army and several emphasize its symbolic character as a police force to prevent outbreaks and keep order. Only three actually emphasize the fact that the force would be used in other situations to implement U. N. resolutions. Two also called for large contributions of money to the permanent force by the United States and/or other major powers, while the smaller and neutral nations supplied the manpower.

OBSTACLES

Though several nations undoubtedly favor the creation of a permanent U. N. police force there are grave problems confronting this action. The financial burden would be great and some nations have balked at even the $10 million bill incurred by the present U. N. emergency force. States such as India would probably fear the possible use of the police force in disputes in which they are involved, while Egypt and Israel have yet to be sold on the idea. Nor has the experience of the U. N. under the uniting-for-peace resolution or the formation of the U. N. guard given any encouragement to the belief the majority of the members would actually support the creation and maintenance of a permanent police force. Some of these problems might be eased by provisions and guaranties of substantial contributions by the



UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

United States and/or other large powers so that little additional financial burden would fall on the smaller or disinterested states supplying the manpower. Also, making the U. N. force permanent in the Middle East would meet the possible fears of some that it would be used against them. This would change the nature of the force, however, so that it would not be a general arm of the U. N. to be used anywhere. These ideas are developed under tab II of this paper.

ALTERNATIVES

It would appear that even the present small U. N. emergency force, if made permanent and stationed along the armistice line from the Mediterranean to the Gulf of Aqaba, would be effective in preventing and dealing with future incidents along the Israel border. Perhaps an enlarged U. N. force could deal with a war between two small, weak powers. But a full-scale war involving the Middle East powers that are growing in military strength could probably not be met effectively by the U. N. except with substantial great power support, as in Korea. There are grave questions whether it would be feasible to use a permanent U. N. force in a great many other situations with which the U. N. deals, such as Hungary, Kashmir, or perhaps Poland. Finally, past experience seems to indicate that it would be difficult to develop an effective, large, permanent U. N. force without substantial great power support and manpower. Since great power participation is not envisaged and it is difficult to prognosticate sustained support by the smaller powers, probably the most that could be hoped for is an effective U. N. border force to deal with small border incidents.

There are two sets of problems. One set involves a permanent U. N. police force that would be used anywhere in the world. The other involves a U. N. force to deal with the possibility of renewed fighting between Israel and her Arab neighbors, especially border incidents. The alternatives for accomplishing these ends are: a general permanent U. N. police force, a continuation of the present emergency force on a permanent or indefinite basis along the Israel border, or a considerably expanded force with strong United States aid in materials and money. These are discussed under tab III.

*I. Statements in favor of a permanent U. N. police force*

Writing in the New York Times of January 4, 1957, Hanson Baldwin held that the "fundamental problem" in the Middle East is to find a solution, if only a transitory one, to the Arab-Israeli feud. He suggested that one important means of achieving this was to establish neutralized frontiers imposed and enforced by permanent U. N. forces.

Mr. Wallace Campbell, Director of the Cooperative League of the United States of America, wrote in a letter to the editor of the Washington Post (January 13, 1957) that the establishment of the U. N. emergency force raised the need for a formula to finance a permanent police force which "could meet emergencies, or, even better, prevent emergencies in other parts of the world." He suggests that the United States make a voluntary contribution of 1 percent of its national defense budget to the U. N. to pay the cost of the police force. The United States would recommend similar action to other nations. He feels that such an allocation would more than cut the need for our own defense operations by 1 percent. If the idea met with success the United States could increase the percentage in later years. Thus, the larger nations would meet the cost of the U. N. force, while the smaller ones supplied the manpower as in the present emergency force.

The Canadian delegate at the U. N. General Assembly stated on December 5, 1956, that the Middle East situation had demonstrated that there was a middle way between adopting resolutions and fighting a war. He said that UNEF was "not so much a fighting force as a police contingent endowed with international authority." The delegate, Mr. Roch Pinard, asserted that now was the psychological moment to start organizing a permanent force prepared for future emergencies.

Secretary of State Dulles, testifying before the joint meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees, on the President's proposed Middle East policy statement, said, "I would be glad to see, myself, some more or less permanent character given to this (United Nations Emergency Force)." He continued, "It raises quite complicated problems, but in principle the idea of such a force is good." He noted that the U. N. Charter called for the creation of a U. N. military force and concluded that a permanent police force would be "a very constructive thing indeed."

Representative PETER FRELINGHUYSEN of New Jersey, has come out in favor of a permanent U. N. police force (letter to the editor, Washington Post, January 14, 1957). He urges the recruitment of "a truly international police force" that would be recruited directly by the U. N. instead of being made up of separate national contingents. This, he holds, would eliminate the aspect of effectiveness being dependent upon the "political position" taken by the nations which furnish the soldiers. Members of the force, also would acquire a loyalty to the U. N. which he feels is proper and necessary to the effective development of the organization.

In addition to the sponsors of Senate Resolution 15 and Representative FRELINGHUYSEN, it is also reported that Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND has advocated the creation of a permanent U. N. police force.

Malvina Lindsay, a columnist for the Washington Post, advocating the formation of a permanent U. N. police force in order to "fire young zeal" (January 31, 1957). She cites a poll among the members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs which shows backing for such a plan by a ratio of 27 to 1. The author feels that a permanent police force should be composed of volunteers, recruited directly by the U. N. and under a commander directly responsible to the U. N. National units composed of volunteers would be an acceptable second choice. She answers charges that a permanent U. N. force would be overrun "in any buffer zone by even a corporal's guard of a nation on the warpath," by stating that the "mere physical presence of the U. N. force would cause second thoughts about any reckless action." She also feels this would be a start in building the "moral" authority of the U. N. and that the Middle East is an excellent area to begin because of the "special prestige" the U. N. enjoys as a result of its technical assistance work there.

The Manchester Guardian has advocated the creation of "some more permanent embodiment" for the U. N. emergency force (January 17, 1957). This British newspaper feels the continued presence of such a force in Sinai is the only way to prevent a recurrence of border incidents but, that it will take strong pressure on Nasser by the United States, India, and other U. N. members in order to force Egyptian agreement to the continued presence of these troops.

James P. O'Donnell, an associate editor of the Saturday Evening Post comes out in favor of a permanent U. N. police force, in the January 26, 1957 issue of the magazine. In an article entitled "Sortie into Suez" he concludes that a permanent U. N. police force should be stationed on the Gaza Strip which would be ceded to the United Nations. "U. N. E. F. needs a permanent base, a permanent cadre, a modern air base and its own troop-carrying planes. There will come a day, some future Budapest—or Warsaw or Berlin or Prague—when this army may be needed in a bigger hurry than the hurry that brought it into being and brought it here (to Egypt)."

Pakistan's Foreign Minister, Firoz Khan Noon, said on December 7, 1956, that there was no doubt in his mind that unless a permanent police force was created to insure the carrying out of U. N. resolutions, the U. N. "will have failed completely like the old League of Nations."

The Washington Post in an editorial on January 6, 1957, came out in favor of a permanent U. N. police force that would occupy a buffer zone along both sides of the Israeli-Egyptian border from the Gaza Strip down to, and including, the coastline around the islands at the tip of the Gulf of Aqaba. The Post feels that ideally the U. N. should purchase this narrow border zone from both countries and administer it as an international territory.

The paper advocates a permanent police force because the nations that have contributed to the emergency force regard it as a temporary measure, in some cases have indicated they would refuse use of their troops to facilitate a political settlement, and because a police force made up of diverse national elements would be subject to "constant pulling and hauling." Thus, they urge the permanent force be recruited as a unit, probably under a commander responsible to the U. N.'s Secretary General and General Assembly.

The Swiss Review of World Affairs, (January 1957) advocates an "efficient, standing United Nations police force in the Middle East * * *." Such a force, the journal holds, should be a development from the current U. N. emergency force, should be stationed in the Suez Canal area, and continue to be staffed by the "disinterested" powers. This would have the triple effect of keeping local peace, greatly reduce the dangers of outside intervention, and secure the Suez Canal. Coupled with this was the proposal that the U. N. purchase a zone on each side of the armistice line from Gaza on the Mediterranean to the Gulf of Aqaba. The substantial cost of the permanent U. N. policy force would be met by new contributions from some of the major member States of the U. N. regardless of whether or not they are called upon to contribute contingents of their own to the U. N. force.

On January 28, 1957, the New York Times called for the extension of the functions of the U. N. emergency force or perhaps the creation of a permanent U. N. police force. The paper felt that only an agency of the U. N. could bring a "just and quite" solution to the Arab-Israeli dispute. The police force would be recruited from small and "neutral" countries, carry small arms, presumably make arrests, and operate by consent. "It would be able, if intelligently organized and directed, to prevent what may be called accidental wars." The paper recognized that the "delicate question" remained of whether the U. N. force operating on consent must withdraw if Egypt so demands.

*II. Obstacles*

There is no question but that the U. N. General Assembly has the power under the Charter to create a permanent police force and to recommend the bases on which member states would provide armed forces, funds, and material. The real question here is, would the project be supported by enough States to secure its creation and maintenance?

Canada, Pakistan, the United States, probably the United Kingdom, France, and some others are favorably inclined toward the project. It is questionable whether India would agree to such an organization for fear Pakistan might seek to have the U. N. use it in the case of the dispute over Kashmir. Indian opposition could dissuade many other powers from approving the project. It would also appear to be difficult to gain

the support of both Israel and Egypt to the creation of the permanent U. N. force.

There are other reasons why it would be difficult to achieve the necessary support in the General Assembly. The expense of a permanent police force of any substantial size would be great. In the case of the U. N. emergency force, each member state provides the salary and equipment of the unit it contributes. The Secretary-General has proposed that the other expenses of the force be met by an additional levy on all the member states on the basis of the percentage relationship that applies to the regular U. N. annual budget. So far, $10 million has been appropriated and there has been considerable opposition from the members to this added financial burden. That it is a burden is readily seen by the fact that the budget of the entire U. N. for the financial year 1956 was only $45½ million. Actually, the cost of operating the U. N. emergency force is considerably above the appropriated $10 million and has only been met by voluntary contributions of members and nonmembers like the United States, Italy, and Switzerland. Would the entire U. N. membership be willing to assume a permanent additional annual burden of anything from $10 million to $30 million?

The experience of the U. N. under the uniting for peace resolution has not given encouragement to those who would like to see a permanent U. N. police force. That resolution provided, among other things, that a member state would maintain within its national armed forces elements formed and organized for service as a U. N. unit on the recommendation of the Security Council or the General Assembly. The resolution was adopted by the General Assembly by a vote of 52 to 5 (Soviet bloc) and 2 abstentions (Argentina and India). But very few nations have done anything about it and it has become a dead letter. Even the proposal to form a U. N. guard of 800 men to protect U. N. missions in the field (after the assassination of Count Bernadotte in Jerusalem in 1948) was not adopted. Instead, the Assembly approved a U. N. field service of 500 men to be a branch of the Secretariat. They are unarmed and their chief job is to operate and maintain communications and transportation equipment. And, of course, the deep split between the Soviet Union and the free world since the end of World War II made it impossible to arrive at any workable arrangement in the U. N. Military Staff Committee for the enactment of any of the military agreements called for in article 43 of the U. N. Charter.

Does it appear that the opposition and neglect that attended these earlier efforts, coupled with the opposition to even the financial burden of the small U. N. emergency force now in existence will be overcome in a current proposal for a permanent U. N. police force? It is obviously impossible to say in the abstract. The present critical situation in the Middle East that will surely endure for some period of time could well induce greater sacrifices on the part of the member states than heretofore. Clearly the provisions as to the conditions under which the police force could be used by the U. N. would make a difference. If it could be used only with the consent of the state in which it was to serve, more might favor the plan than otherwise. Actually, it would seem that the U. N. force could only operate under these circumstances for otherwise the U. N. has not been notably successful in dealing with situations it judges are a threat to international peace and security that are also domestic situations (Spain, Hungary, South Africa, etc.).

There is a final fear that some nations may possess and that would be difficult to overcome. That is the fear that the U. N. might try to use the permanent police force in situations where it was obviously impossible for the U. N. to perform a useful military role. In such an instance the result would be a military disaster and/or a serious injury to the prestige of the U. N. due to the failure it would involve.

These are all problems confronting the establishment of a permanent U. N. police force but, they are not insuperable. Perhaps, a financial arrangement could be made to the effect that guaranteed voluntary contributions from a few major powers would reduce the financial burden on the U. N. as a whole to a relatively insignificant figure. It is possible that if some geographical permanency were given to the police force in the Middle East, countries like India might find it more acceptable, though this would substantially change the nature of the police force as a general permanent arm of the U. N.

*III. Alternatives*

The Arab-Israeli situation is one in which the U. N. has served a very useful role and where a U. N. police force could be highly effective. This is basically true because it is an area where both Russia and the United States recognize that neither can undertake military dominance without serious opposition from the other. That would seem to be the result of Moscow's rejoinder to the so-called Eisenhower doctrine. An effective U. N. police force could serve the United States purpose of preventing further fighting along the Israel borders without at the same time risking the dangers of a United States-Soviet military clash. Further, a U. N. police force would be more acceptable than just a United States military unit to some of the Middle East countries that resent continued Western or so-called colonial influence in the area. But there is also the problem of how effective the U. N. force could be in other possible situations in which the U. N. might seek to use it.

What are the conditions under which its effectiveness might be tested and which would therefore give some impression of the usefulness of such an organization? The first possibility is that of renewed border incidents involving a few troops or guerilla fighters in a relatively small area. In such a situation, even the present U. N. emergency force of 5,000 men would be effective if it were able to control the entire armistice line and return the fire of the invaders. Unless it could be deployed along that line, however, it would be almost useless to deter even border incidents. Under those circumstances it would not be noticeably more effective than the U. N. Truce Supervision Organization that has had to record hundreds of incidents since the armistice but has been able to do little more than this.

A second possibility is that of full-scale invasion of Israel by one of the Arab States or an invasion of one of the latter by Israel. In this situation even a permanent form of the present U. N. emergency force would not in itself be noticeably effective in maintaining peace or securing the retreat of the overt aggressor. Effectiveness here would require a U. N. force greatly expanded beyond the size of the present emergency force. It would also require substantial military arms and equipment and authority from the U. N. to actually be a fighting army rather than a police force. But beyond this, it is highly questionable that a U. N. police force would be effective in the face of a determined invasion without real backing from a major power. It is universally recognized that United Nations' military aid to the Republic of Korea would have been thoroughly insignificant in turning the invasion from the north without the United States military participation. If the military buildup of Syria and Egypt continues it is not inconceivable that a military situation similar to that in Korea would be repeated along the borders of Israel. Then, a U. N. permanent police force composed solely of the forces of the small or disinterested powers and specifically excluding the Big Five members of the Security Council would be ineffective. Here a U. N. police force composed of only the small powers would find it difficult to secure its goal even with substantial monetary and service aid from a major power. Yet, there is no sentiment for including the major powers in the U. N. police force for that makes it ineffective in avoiding a great power struggle rather than a settlement of the issue on its merits.

Since this would be a permanent arm of the U. N. it must be considered how useful this police force might be in other parts of the world. What could the U. N. force have done if it had been in existence and its aid had been requested by the short-lived Nagy Government of Hungary? How could it be of assistance if the U. S. S. R. should decide to forcibly replace the government of Mr. Gomülka in Poland? Could the U. N. realistically be able to cope with a request from Pakistan that a permanent U. N. police force be used to prevent annexation of disputed Kashmir by India. These are all cases which probably involve aggression and in which it would be logical for a permanent U. N. police force to be utilized to implement the resolutions of the Security Council or General Assembly. At the same time, however, each is a situation in which (a) it would be difficult to gain substantial support of the nations to have their forces participate in the U. N. police action and (b) the U. N. does not have a realistic military role to play because of the direct challenge it would make to the most vital interests of a major, or near major power. The result of the presence of the permanent U. N. police force in such a situation would either be a disastrous military action that would deeply injure the real functions of the U. N. in the world today or the refusal of the U. N. to use the police force which would be interpreted as a failure of the U. N. to be useful in settling the problems of the world. The frail, yet important moral stock of the U. N. would be eliminated.

In general, the U. N. has been and can be most successful in a situation greatly in flux that does not involve a direct clash between the vital interests of the U. S. S. R. and say, the United States. This is the role it played in Indonesia, Palestine, and Libya. In each case the U. N. served the purpose of supervising an unavoidable change in such a way that the area in flux did not fall under Soviet influence. Where the U. N. has dealt with a direct clash between the interests of major powers, as in Korea, it was largely the overriding power exercised by one of the major combatants under the sanction of the umbrella of a U. N. resolution. An effectively set up permanent U. N. police force could contribute to the effectiveness of the U. N. in the type of situation where the U. N. has been effective in the past, even taking into account the increased voting strength of the Asia-African nations in the General Assembly.

Under these circumstances, it might be desirable to form separate, temporary, U. N. police forces, similar to the present U. N. Emergency Force in Egypt. In this way, the U. N. could act where it was deemed it could be effective, avoid the constant burden of a standing military establishment, and probably be more effective because of wider national participation in a crisis situation. It would, of course, suffer from the fact that it was hastily assembled as in the present case. But, it would not be as bad, for basic plans of organization, maintenance, equipment, and so forth could be worked out in advance on the basis of the experience of the U. N. emergency force in Egypt.

A final aspect to be considered is that of how effective a military fighting unit can be achieved from the contributions of a great number of nations. The experience of Korea was that the forces of a great many nations

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

could not be easily welded into a highly effective fighting force under international directorship without a preponderant role being played by a major military power and considerable standardization of forces. Perhaps this problem could be overcome by careful standardization of equipment, training procedures, language-training, and practice in working together as a truly international fighting force under a U. N. commander. But it is difficult to conceive of the bulk of the medium and smaller nations undertaking the burden required to make this a reality over a long term. Even if this could be done, the resulting force would probably not be effective in a real war unless it had substantial participation from at least one major power. Thus, apart from great power participation, the most that could be hoped for would probably be an armed force that could effectively cope with a very small war between two weak states. Even this type of force would be difficult to maintain because of the heavy burden on the participating smaller nations.

The United States has clearly indicated it seeks to prevent renewed fighting between Israel and her Arab neighbors. How would the various alternatives of U. N. police action contribute to the attainment of this goal which is most likely a prerequisite both for dealing with the deeper problems of Middle East tension and stability and to preventing a direct military clash with the Soviet Union in that area? A continuation of the present emergency force indefinitely or in the form of a permanent U. N. police force for the Middle East, stationed along the Israel border, could probably prevent the renewal of local border incidents. Presumably, the same could be accomplished by a general permanent U. N. force that was kept along these borders for the time being. It seems likely that in any case extensive United States financial, material, and service support would be required to maintain even this force. If, however, a full-scale war should develop between Israel and one or more of her neighbors, it is difficult to envisage any of these U. N. forces dealing with it effectively. Probably, it would be necessary for the United States to make a clear policy declaration that it would act both inside and outside the U. N. to stop any renewal of aggression there and back up the declaration with the stationing of sizable forces for ground fighting in that end of the Mediterranean. In the absence of this, the declaration would probably evince no more dependable response than did the Tri-Partite Declaration of 1950.

---

EXHIBIT B

STEPS TOWARD A MIDDLE EASTERN PEACE

(By James P. Warburg)

The plan for promoting peace in the Middle East here put forward is not an alternative to the Eisenhower doctrine. Instead, it is intended to suggest a course of action through which the President's broad enunciation of principle may be put into effect.

The Anglo-French invasion of the Suez Canal Zone has destroyed what remained of British influence in the Arab world as a whole, and has seriously endangered what is left of Britain's preferential position in the Persian Gulf area. Similarly, the invasion of Egypt further weakened the French hold on Algeria and diminished, though it did not wholly destroy, the chances for the emergence of a western oriented north African federation consisting of the Arab States of Morocco, Algeria, Tunis, and perhaps Libya.

The United States and the Soviet Union have a clear interest in preventing each other from moving into the vacuum created by the diminution of Anglo-French influence and power. United States oil companies have a huge investment in the oilfields of the Middle East. The United States is committed to the defense of Western Europe, whose economic life depends on assured access to the oil resources of the Arab countries. In addition, our Nation is committed to the preservation of Israel, whose creation we sponsored.

The Soviet Union's primary interest in the Middle East is to remove western military power, especially United States power, from positions which, in the event of war, would threaten Russia from the South. (The present state of affairs is roughly comparable to one that would exist in reverse if Russia had bomber bases in Cuba and Mexico.) Russia has no need for the oil of the Middle East, but the Kremlin certainly is interested in making western access to Middle East oil as precarious as possible. In addition, Russia has for centuries tried to get control of the Turkish straits and to break into both the Mediterreanean and the Persian Gulf.

Until the arms deal with Egypt in 1955, Soviet influence in the Arab world was negligible. Since then, the Soviet Union has been able for the first time to establish itself as a major factor in the area. This happened chiefly because the United States, obsessed with the single notion of completing the military encirclement of the Communist world, ignored the complicated forces at work in the Middle East, and inadvertently opened the door to Soviet penetration. The ill-considered Baghdad Pact, especially the rearming of Iraq, plus the West's refusal to rearm Egypt, gave the Kremlin a long-sought opportunity.

When we tried to construct the so-called northern tier alliance, we overlooked two facts of vital importance; that Arab nationalism was and is infinitely more antiwestern and anti-Israeli than anti-Communist; and that in any competitive wooing of Arab nationalism the Kremlin would not be hampered by dependence upon Arab petroleum resources or by a conflicting commitment to preserve a Jewish state which the Arabs seek to destroy.

It is no longer a question of keeping Russia out of the Middle East but of getting the Soviet Union out of a position that already threatens our vital interest. Since with our bomber bases we are in a position to threaten the vital centers of the Soviet Union, especially its major oil fields, it is apparent that the essentials for negotiation exist.

It is equally apparent that in such a negotiation we shall be at a disastrous disadvantage so long as a Moscow-backed regime in Cairo controls the Suez Canal, and so long as Arab antiwesternism is kept alive by our support of Israel, which the Arabs want to extinguish.

NEUTRALIZATION

Our ultimate objective must be to negotiate an agreement with the Soviet Union that would permit the Middle Eastern countries themselves to fill the vacuum left by European withdrawal. Such an agreement would provide not only for a mutual renunciation of any plans or hopes to dominate all or any part of the area but also for a mutual undertaking not to arm any of the Middle Eastern countries and to strip any economic assistance of political implications. In effect, it would provide for military and political neutralization of the whole area.

In the absence of a Suez settlement and an Arab-Israeli peace, the Soviet Union is hardly likely to consider any such agreement, since it would obviously appear more profitable to the Kremlin to continue to exploit the advantages of the status quo. Therefore, our immediate aim should be to break the strangle hold on Europe's throat now held by the Cairo-Moscow axis and, by bringing about a just peace, to eliminate or at least diminish the very substantial part of Arab antiwesternism that derives from hatred of Israel.

It is hardly necessary to list the reasons why neither the European nor Asian canal users nor the United States would be satisfied to leave the Egyptian Government in absolute control of the Suez Canal. It is equally unnecessary to give the reasons why Egypt, backed by Moscow, wants to retain full control. The fact is that there is a deadlock which even the skillful diplomacy of Dag Hammarskjöld is unlikely to resolve, unless he is given the means by which to bring about a solution.

WORLD WATERWAYS

The means are in our hands. At the Potsdam Conference of 1945, Mr. Truman suggested the internationalization of all the world's strategic waterways, including the Turkish straits, the Rhine-Danube waterway, and the Suez, Panama, and Kiel Canals. Stalin was interested only in the Turkish straits and the Kiel Canal. Churchill, according to Truman's memoirs, did not want to discuss Suez at Potsdam in 1945. He explained that "the British had an arrangement with which they were satisfied and under which they had operated for some 70 years without complaints." To this Molotov prophetically replied: "You should ask Egypt." Other business supervened, and nothing came of the project.

However, there is nothing to prevent our Government from resurrecting this proposal in modified form to meet altered circumstances.

If the administration were to offer to place the Panama Canal Zone under United Nations control, provided that Egypt would take similar action with regard to Suez and the narrow entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba, it would become very nearly impossible for President Nasser to refuse.

If the Russians reopened the question of the Turkish straits and the Kiel Canal, the answer would be that Turkey would be asked to take similar action when and if an overall security agreement was reached with respect to the whole Middle East area; and that Germany would be asked to take similar action with respect to the Kiel Canal when and if the Rhine-Danube waterway was placed under U. N. control.

TWO OBJECTIONS ANSWERED

The essence of this suggestion was put forward by the writer in a letter to the New York Times dated September 10, 1956, some 6 weeks before the Middle East crisis erupted into war. In subsequent letters to the Times and in others addressed to the writer privately, two objectives were raised:

It was argued that there was no analogy between the lawfully established position of the United States as to Panama and the illegal seizure of Suez by the Egyptian Government. As a matter of historical fact, there is an analogy. The procedure by which President Theodore Roosevelt acquired the Canal Zone in 1903 was so flagrantly in violation of treaty rights and international law that some 20 years later the United States paid the Republic of Columbia an indemnity of $25 million. Theodore Roosevelt himself made no bones about saying in his autobiography, "I took Panama." But even if our position in Panama were impeccable, this would be no reason not to relinquish it in the interest of accomplishing our present purposes in the Middle East.

A far more cogent objection—cogent, that is, if valid—is that turning over the Panama Canal Zone to the United Nations would seriously weaken the security of the United States. The facts, however, do not support this contention. Not being a sea-level canal, the Panama waterway is very vulnerable to enemy attack by nuclear weapons. A single atomic bomb could wreck one of its six giant locks and put the canal out of commission for months if not years. Worse yet, a single bomb could breach the Gatun Dam, turning Gatun Lake into a mudhole and rendering the canal nonexistent for a long time. It is precisely for this reason, and because the locks will not accommodate our Navy's new supercarriers and

supertankers, that the question of making the Panama Canal into a sea-level waterway has been seriously considered by Congress and by our military authorities. This project would, however, take 10 years and cost an estimated 4 to 5 billion dollars. These being the facts, it might well be that the Panama Canal would be safer if it were owned and operated by the United Nations. In any case, it would certainly be no less safe, since its air defense would have to be conducted far out over the Caribbean or the Pacific.

A U. N. ZONE

If Nasser could be persuaded to place the Suez Canal and the Tiran Strait under U. N. control and if Egypt and Israel could be persuaded to cede or sell to the U. N. a zone running from the Gaza Strip on the Mediterranean along the Israel-Egyptian frontier to the Gulf of Aqaba, certain desirable objectives would be attained:

The canal users, including Israel, would be assured of the uninterrupted availability of the waterway. They would also be assured of an alternative site for an additional canal and for pipelines running through neutral U. N.-controlled territory from the Red Sea to the Mediterranean.

A neutral zone would be established between Israel and Egypt.

By free transit through the neutral zone, a land bridge would be established between Egypt and the Arab States of Asia Minor.

By similar free transit, Israel would have access to the port of Elath and unimpeded entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba through the Tiran Strait.

The United Nations would have a suitable base for the maintenance of a permanent Middle East police force.

A plan of this nature has been sugegsted by various European writers, notably in the London Economist, but it becomes practical only if the United States makes the opening move of offering to place the Panama Canal Zone under United Nations jurisdiction and control.

This is the key to the whole problem of Suez and to much of the problem of bringing about an Arab-Israeli peace settlement.

What if we made the offer and Nasser refused? Nasser could not refuse without incurring the condemnation of every eastern and western nation interested in assured passage through the Suez Canal. He could not refuse without losing what support he now enjoys from the Arab states interested in selling their oil. If, in spite of these considerations, the Egyptian president should reject the proposal, it would seem unlikely that he would stay in power very long.

ARAB-ISRAELI SETTLEMENT

This first step would constitute a major advance toward an Arab-Israeli peace settlement. It would remove from contention the question of Israel's right of transit through the Suez Canal and through the Gulf of Aqaba to Elath. So far as Israel and Egypt are concerned, it would put an end to border raids and reprisals, and it would establish a trip wire against major aggression such as the recent Israeli invasion of Egypt.

The second step would be the freezing of the present armistice boundaries between Israel and the neighboring states of Lebanon, Syria, and Jordan, pending the determination of final boundaries at an Arab-Israeli peace conference. This freezing of the boundaries would be enforced by detachments of the international police force based in the U. N. neutral zone.

It would be the function of the U. N. to bring both Israelis and Arabs to the realization that both sides have suffered injustice, that neither side is wholly right or wholly wrong and that both would benefit from a peace based upon mutual concession and forgiveness.

Several factors could help immeasurably to bring about such reconciliation. A renunciation by Israel of any ambition for further territorial aggrandizement and a promise to accept whatever territorial adjustments may be deemed just as between the original U. N. partition and the present armistice lines would go far toward obtaining the acquiescence of the Arabs in Israel's existence.

A determined effort by the U. N. to obtain both Israeli and Arab cooperation in repatriating or resettling the Arab refugees could be greatly helped by generous contributions from Jews in other parts of the world, especially from Zionist groups in the United States who have sponsored and supported Israel.

The greatest impulse toward the pacification of the whole area could, however, be given by the adoption of an overall regional development scheme such as that suggested by a group of independent experts in the December 16, 1956, issue of the London observer.

OIL AND DEVELOPMENT

The basic assumption of this group is that there can in future be no security from expropriation of commercially owned oil installations and no security from sabotage of pipelines controlled by private oil companies unless foreign control of those assets is firmly backed by Middle Eastern public opinion and international law.

The group puts forward substantially this proposal: that by international agreement a United Nations Middle East development authority be authorized to place a levy upon all oil shipments from Middle Eastern ports, and that, in addition, the development authority should take over and operate all Middle East pipelines, charging an additional levy to cover operating costs and existing charges for transit rights. The proceeds from both would then be contributed toward an approved economic development program for the entire area.

The authors of the plan contend that by this means the oil companies and their customers would obtain greatly increased and internationally guaranteed security of operation. They would also be relieved from dependence upon tankers too large for European terminals, since they would be able to pipe unlimited supplies to Mediterranean ports. Admittedly, they would pay more for Middle Eastern oil than they pay now, but not as much as it will certainly cost them if Middle East conditions continue as anarchic as they otherwise must become.

Under this proposal, the nations of the Middle East would have a big enough stake in oil reevnues to give them a strong interest in uninterrupted production and marketing. Since their collective revenues would be channeled through the U. N., the Middle Eastern countries would have reasonable assurance that these funds would be equitably shared and applied where they would most benefit the area instead of being monopolized by the big oil-producing countries.

It goes without saying that the oil-rich areas would at first be less enthusiastic for such a scheme than Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, and Egypt. Nevertheless, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and the Persian Gulf sheikdoms stand to gain but little from their rich oilfields if production and transportation are subject to continued threats of interruption.

The writer would propose an addendum to the foregoing plan: that the United States offer to channel its intended contributions to the economic development of the Middle East area through the U. N. regional authority, provided that the Soviet Union agrees to do likewise. If the Soviet Union were to accept such a proposal, one of the major aims of a Middle East settlement would be achieved—the removal of all political overtones from both American and Soviet economic assistance. If we made the proposal, and the Soviet Union rejected it, the expansionist aims of the Kremlin would be unmasked and Communist influence in the area would diminish.

EISENHOWER DOCTRINE INSUFFICIENT

Clearly, more is needed than a mere reaffirmation of the Truman doctrine and its explicit extension to the Middle East. A declaration of so far and no further, backed by the threat of nuclear power, may be necessary to prevent Soviet miscalculation and consequent overt aggression such as occurred in Korea. But such a declaration would provide no defense whatever against the far greater danger of increasing political penetration. The Truman doctrine did not prevent the rape of Czechoslovakia. The Eisenhower doctrine is unlikely to save Syria from a similar fate. Nor can we now forestall any such disaster with economic aid, since Syria refuses to accept aid from us so long as we back Israel's right to exist.

The problem we face in the Middle East is quite different from that which arose in 1947, when Britain was forced to drop the defense of Greece and Turkey on our doorstep. The Arab States have not asked for protection. Few if any of them would accept an American protectorate in the existing circumstances. Any attempt to take over the British position, as we did in Greece and Turkey, would not only alienate the Arabs and drive them closer to the Soviet Union; it would also cost us the newly gained good will of most of the Afro-Asian peoples.

The ultimate problem of the Middle East consists of aiding the completion of the social and economic revolution that has begun. The ultimate problem concerns people rather than nations. It concerns the emancipation of ignorant, impoverished, and oppressed people not only from foreign domination or exploitation but from anarchonistic social and economic conditions.

The first step toward this goal is the creation of an environment in which the Middle Eastern revolution may peacefully complete its course. This requires that the Soviet Union be prevented from pushing farther into the area on the heels of European retirement.

But the United States cannot prevent Russia from filling the vacum by attempting to do so with its own influence and power. We can prevent further Soviet penetration only by negotiating with Russia a mutual hands-off agreement, permitting the Middle Eastern peoples to develop their full independence. That we cannot do with our diplomacy hog tied by the unsolved problems of Suez, an Arab-Israeli peace settlement, and a system of exploiting Middle Eastern resources which creates inequalities, injustices, and conflicts within the area.

The proposal here put forward attempts to deal directly with these handicaps to our diplomacy. Admittedly, it entails certain sacrifices. Perhaps others can devise a plan that will accomplish the same ends at lesser cost. The fact remains, however, that unless and until the existing handicaps to our diplomacy are removed, Soviet penetration of the area will continue; and, short of war, the United States will be powerless to prevent it.

---

EXHIBIT C

ARAB STABILITY SEEMS BIG NEED OF MIDDLE EAST

(By William L. Ryan)

Two world wars started in places few Americans knew about. It was Sarajevo in 1914, Danzig in 1939.

If there is another, it could start in a place called Mosul, or Aleppo, or some other unheard-of dusty outpost of the Middle East.

The Eisenhower doctrine says the United States will fight any Communist-led invasion of the Middle East. But will the United

States fight to save the Middle East from communism? That fight is much more difficult. The Russians already are attacking one or two Arab worlds. The Communists care little for the world of the Arab leaders. They are more interested in the world of the Arab people, and particularly that small world of educated Arabs whose pent-up bitterness against the West makes them inviting targets.

ARABS HOPELESSLY DIVIDED

The Arab people and their leaders mostly are at cross purposes. You can't say "the Arabs want this" or "the Arabs will agree to that." The Arabs themselves are hopelessly divided on virtually every question except common enmity for Israel. They are highly vulnerable to the sort of indirect attack Communists use.

Even on the question of Israel there is no real agreement. Many Arabs would like to turn their backs on the problem and devote themselves to trying to bring about some measure of stability in their world.

Israeli leaders I have interviewed say they would gratefully welcome such an attitude. They, too, say they believe only stability among the Arabs, in governments and economies, offers any chance of peace.

But in the Arab East there is a desperate poverty of leadership. Much of it is leadership by demagoguery, Arab politicians can arouse passions over the Israeli issue, and this is an invitation to political power. A leader can inflame the streets and win support by promising an Arab solution to the twin questions of Israel and the million uprooted Palestine refugees. He may have no hope—indeed no intention—of following through on the promises. But the situation is made to order for a political opportunist.

REDS COVET MIDDLE EAST

For many reasons, Soviet armed attack in the Middle East seems unlikely. But the Communist world covets the Middle East—not for the oil so much as to deny that vital commodity to the economies of Western Europe. If that could be accomplished, the Communist job in the West would be easier.

This is what the Middle East is like today:

Iraq: A nation of about 5 million people, 90 percent illiterate, a third nomadic. As Mesopotania, it supported 30 million. More than any of its neighbors, Iraq is rich in resources—oil, minerals and above all the precious water of the Tigris and Euphrates. Much of the land below a surface of dust laid on by centuries of neglect can be made fertile again. A forward looking program using oil money is reclaiming land. But the program is long range, and the lot of the average Iraq remains a sorry one.

SYRIAN LEADERS PRO-SOVIET

Syria: This country of 4 million is dominated by its army intelligence section whose leaders are pro-Soviet, but not pro-Communist. The Russians are supplying Syria with significant amounts of arms. Officially outlawed, the Syrian Communist Party operates openly and wields influence through its wily leader, Khaled Bagdash, a member of the Kurd minority.

Jordan: The future of this little nation of 1½ millions—a million of whom can consider they owe no allegiance to young King Hussein—is shaky. Carved originally from Britain's Palestine mandate. Trans-Jordan was a nation of a half million largely backward Bedouins under the Emir—later king—Abdullah. The late Abdullah annexed that part of Palestine not taken by Israel after the Arab-Israeli war, and annexed a headache. A million Palestinians, many of them educated, now dominate the nation. Jordan, seeming headed for disintegration, may become the object of a Syrian-Iraqi clash.

Saudi Arabia: King Saud seems worried. Like other Arab rulers, he faces a youthful restlessness characteristic of the whole area. Saud, due to visit the United States the end of this month, has little claim to stability in his feudal country. His economy depends wholly on oil dollars.

LEBANON THRIVING

Lebanon: A little country of 1½ millions, half Christian and half Moslem, Lebanon often seems to an outsider an oasis of sense in an illogical world. The Lebanese have a thriving economy. They are subject to pressures from Syria and Egypt, but have resisted the pressure. The Government, backed by a small but ably commanded army of about 7,000, remains a staunch friend of the West and a possible bridge between West and Middle East.

Yemen: This feudal country of 4½ millions provides a quick test for the Eisenhower doctrine. The Yemen, a feudal monarchy ruled by its Imam, has concluded a deal with Russia for arms to use against the British in the neighboring Aden Protectorate. Nothing in the Eisenhower doctrine seems aimed at stopping this sort of penetration.

Egypt—Israelis and Westerners alike said they had great hopes for the Arab world when Egypt's revolution ousted King Farouk in 1952. Washington entertained rosy hopes for young Gamal Abdel Nasser, who took over as premier in 1954 and later made himself president. The young officers announced a planning program which some day might rescue the fellaheen—the unshod, unwashed and disease-ridden peasantry—from their eternal misery.

Israel—created in 1948 when Britain left Palestine—showed the world what Western knowhow and determination could do with hostile soil. While her victorious army, enlisting every able-bodied citizen in time of emergency, stood guard on the frontiers, Israeli pioneers made desert areas bloom and built a modern nation in the heart of a backward world.

Israel has big problems. Hemmed into a tiny strip of land and surrounded by hostile nations, her economy still depends on goods imported from abroad.

---

MIDEAST CRISIS LINKED TO LACK OF UNITED STATES POLICY

(By William L. Ryan)

The worst enemies of the United States in the Middle East are ignorance, fear, corruption, and poverty.

It will take more than a declaration against armed aggression to defeat these allies of communism. Even a generation of patience, planning, and cooperation might not be enough.

At best, the Eisenhower doctrine or some substitute will be a modest beginning toward a continuing policy. It indicates the dawning of an American realization that the last chance in the Middle East is at hand.

As it stands, the Eisenhower doctrine fails to answer basic questions from either Arab or Israeli. It does not commit the United States to much more than was understood already. An armed Communist attack in any event would have created a world war situation. On the economic side, given any improvement in political climate, some American program was to be expected.

WOULD WELCOME CLEAR POLICY

The most common criticism of the United States in the Middle East is that it never really has had a policy there. In addition, the United States is frequently criticized for seemingly seeking quick solutions to complex problems. Arab and Israeli alike would welcome a clear statement of American policy for the area, but as yet none has been forthcoming.

The core of the problem is an area known as the fertile crescent, made up of Iraq, Syria, Jordan, and Palestine. In area it is slightly bigger than the State of Texas, in population less than the State of New York. This area, the home of about 14 million people, is alive with ferment.

How did it get that way? The story is centuries old, a record of oppression, feudalism, backwardness, and the broken promises of the West. Centuries ago this area was the center of Arab grandeur. From this cradle sprang the three great religions of Western civilization—Christian, Hebrew, and Moslem.

For many generations the people of the Arab East lived without national identity under the oppressive rule of the Ottoman Empire. Kept in ignorance and poverty, they nevertheless resisted assimilation. Toward the beginning of this century the empire was laced with secret societies plotting first for Arab independence, then for fertile crescent unity. Only in such unity, the leaders felt, could they hope for a healthy, viable state.

World War I brought hope. Turkey was allied with Germany, wooing the aid of the Arabs. Britain and France made glowing promises of a paradise to come if they would rise against Ottoman rule. The two Western allies provided the slogan: Independence and unity.

To the Arab East the British sent Thomas Edward Lawrence—the famed Lawrence of Arabia—to help Sherif Hussein and the Emir Faisal, nationalist leaders in the Hejaz, plan their revolt. With them was a young Arab officer of the Turkish Army, Nuri Said, a fervent nationalist who today, as Premier of Iraq, is detested by Arab nationalists. Together they moved all the way into Damascus with the British, averting the danger of a German push into the Middle East.

When the war was over, the British and French conveniently forgot the promises. They cut up the Arab world, imposed arbitrary boundaries, carved out spheres of influence. In the fertile crescent France took over what is now Lebanon and Syria. Britain took what is now Iraq, Jordan, and Israel.

Between the two big wars Britain and France smothered the idea of unity. The fertile crescent countries had different laws, different education systems, different currencies, frustrating customs barriers. Imposed on them were rulers interested mostly in their own intrigues. Politicians learned how to corrupt political movements, how to buy power in the streets, and turn out mobs for political ends. Arab turned to plotting against Arab. Talk of unity was reduced to nonsense.

RESENTMENT GROWS

Lacking hope of political or social reform, Arab resentment grew. The Arabs had no popular political parties, no ideology they could call their own, no social program. Among the thin layer of educated Arabs the feeling grew that the whole world was against them. The demand of this section of the Arab public for reform grew to a roar, but World War II interrupted the movement.

Disappointed once in the Western Allies, Arab sympathies turned toward Germany. When the Germans were defeated popular interest centered on Soviet power. Arabs noted that in return for Russian blows against the Germans, Britain had made concessions in the Middle East, permitting, for example, Soviet cultural centers in key cities. Uninformed about communism, the Arabs heard mostly its trumpeted promises of social reform.

The war also brought economic change. The rise of new industries favored development of what the Russians call a proletariat. Communist fortunes improved in the Arab world. They began a campaign exploiting the themes of feudalism, colonialism, imperialism and peace. And again the West was forgetting its promises.

Power politics brought independence for Syria and Lebanon as separate nations. Trans-Jordan, nominally independent, had a

British-commanded armed force and a King—the old rebel Emir Abdullah—enthroned by Britain. Iraq was independent, but Britain directed her policies. Saudi Arabia, a power in the area with British aid, carried on bitter quarrels with the Hashemite royal families of Jordan and Iraq. Egypt, still dominated by Britain, was ruled by a corrupt monarchy.

The Arabs still had mass ignorance, poverty, and political chicanery. The masses were apathetic. But the tiny, young educated class seethed.

THE PICTURE CHANGES

Then came 1948. Britain gave up her League of Nations mandate in Palestine. Israel proclaimed herself a State. The Arabs fought and lost. Divided, ill armed, poorly equipped, their armies of physically sick men were no match for Israelis with grim determination to found a state and an abundance of Western know-how and equipment.

Israel's victory served to increase Arab bitterness and frustration and to direct it at Britain and the United States.

An Arab-Israel armistice brought no peace. Palestine was partitioned. Close to a million Arabs left their homes in what became Israel and were quartered in miserable refugee hovels in surrounding Arab countries. Hit-and-run attacks and sudden assaults exploded on the Israel-Jordan and Israel-Egypt frontiers.

In 1955, Britain, with the backing of the United States, formed an alliance with Turkey and Iraq, a northern tier against the possibility of Soviet aggression. Later it was to be joined by Iran and Pakistan. Arabs saw this as British imperialism again, an attempt to keep the Arab States divided. New friction came to the area. It coincided with the rise of Gamal Abdel Nasser in Egypt as the Arab world's new hero.

And something else new was added. Soviet geopoliticians found communism could leap easily over the northern tier. They concluded a deal with Colonel Nasser for arms he could not get from the West, arms he insisted he needed as a defense against Israel. Russian influence was intruding itself into the Middle East with a vengeance. And world communism welcomed the climate of bitterness in which it might hope to flourish.

---

ARABS SEE UNITED STATES ATTACKING SYMPTOMS, NOT DISEASE

(By William L. Ryan)

Grinning with satisfaction, a prominent Arab leader showed me a message.

It informed him the sheiks of Kuwait, wallowing in oil riches, were to contribute huge sums to Egyptian relief after the British-French-Israeli attack.

"The sheiks were nudged," he admitted, "and this quick reply is a symptom. The sheiks, like most Arab leaders, are afraid."

The sheiks showed, the only way they knew how, that they were on the side of the Arab people—the young, the unpropertied, the frustrated, the angry people restlessly seeking change. Arab rulers, long aloof from their subjects, seem to sense danger.

LISTENING INTENTLY

Against such a background, President Eisenhower has the leaders of the Arab East listening intently—perhaps hopefully.

But they are far from agreeing.

The Arabs have heard him say the United States will resist Communist-dominated armed aggression in the Middle East and consider a new program of economic aid. The Arabs will find much wrong with this declaration—but the most significant fact is that they are listening. They seem to be saying: "Let's start from the Eisenhower doctrine and talk."

Indications that many an Arab leader is both interested and anxious can be found in the guarded reaction. The Eisenhower declaration actually risked a severe setback in the prestige the President had built up in the Middle East in the past few months. The stress on military action itself, and the idea of filling a Middle East vacuum, ordinarily would have been enough to bring a chorus of angry indignation.

CAUTIOUS APPROVAL

But the controlled press of Egypt, and even in a guarded way in Syria, had some words that sounded almost like cautious approval. This seems to confirm a belief held by some observers that the Arab leaders hope the United States will light a way out of their current dangerous dilemmas and get them on the road to stability.

Both Arabs and Israelis will find the Eisenhower doctrine full of holes and objections. It leaves many important questions unanswered. It avoids obvious stumbling blocks.

But the fact that the President made his declaration at this tense moment tends to fill one of a number of menacing voids in the Middle East. In effect the President committed the United States to fight if Communist armed forces move into the area and the affected nation asks help. That would tend to plug up one avenue of danger.

Yet there are many other dangers, much more likely than open Communist aggression, and many unpleasant facts not faced as yet by slowly developing American policy.

Arabs accuse Americans of attacking the symptoms and not the disease.

ISRAEL ON HER OWN

Israelis are saying the Eisenhower doctrine would intensify the cold war in the Middle East and place Israel wholly on her own in defending herself.

The heart of unrest in the area is the Palestine problem. The Eisenhower doctrine said nothing about it. But unless there can be some easing of the tension it generates, there can be no hope of making a start toward calming and stabilizing an area which can mean life or death to West Europe's economies.

Arabs protest that Mr. Eisenhower spoke only of aggression from a Communist source and mentioned no other source of attack. Secretary of State Dulles a few days ago tended to strengthen this objection by explaining that a stand against any agression would have required the United States in October to oppose Israel, Britain and France.

Other Arab critics say the doctrine centers on open Soviet aggression, skirting what is more likely to happen—attempts at indirect political and economic infiltration.

---

MANY ARABS BELIEVE DOCTRINE IS NO SOLUTION

(By William L. Ryan)

The young Western-educated Arab slammed his first on the table in anger.

"How long," he demanded, "must I go on being ashamed for my own people? How long must I go on despising the rulers of my own country?"

My young friend—call him Sa'ad—frankly described himself as a member of the growing group of young people calling themselves the "mutathemurin"—the disgusted ones of Iraq.

"We are like many other young people in Arab countries," he said. "We are becoming desperate. We will take any change—so long as it's a change.

"You Americans speak of a vacuum here. There is your real vacuum. It is not military. The young people of the Arab world will make its future for better or worse. You must help give them something to look forward to."

COPIES WESTERN WAYS

Sa'ad, like many another in the area, wants to be a friend of the West. He likes and copies Western ways. He suspects Russians and Communists.

Will he welcome the Eisenhower doctrine? Only in the sense that the United States is taking more direct interest in the Middle East. The Eisenhower statement promised nothing that would directly solve Sa'ad's problems or the problems of Israel either, for that matter.

If it means there will eventually be a clearcut American policy in the Middle East, Sa'ad will welcome the statement. He feels the absence of a common Western policy in the Middle East permitted Communist infiltration. The Communists made such strides that the Arab nations, recognizing the danger, outlawed the party and jailed Red leaders.

But Sa'ad seems to think the Eisenhower statement misses the point. He wants desperately to have the United States spell out in detail just what it considers its interests and responsibilities.

MILITARY OVEREMPHASIZED

For Saud and many like him the President laid too much stress on military action and showed too little inclination to face up to the facts of life.

Both Arabs and Israelis have indicated above all else they need a period of quiet—freedom from the interminable tension. Only if this can be achieved, they say, can there be any attempt to attack the real roots of the danger.

The danger is this:

Not a single Arab State in the Middle East can offer its people a firm promise of security. Not an Arab State in the area—possibly excepting Lebanon—can lay claim to any stability.

For hundreds of years the Arab world has lacked mature political leadership. It has been a world without any social policy or economic progressiveness. Much of it lives today as it did centuries ago.

Only slight beginnings have been made—in Iraq, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and the oil areas. Much of the beginning has been smothered by the march of events and the race for armaments.

RESOURCES GO TO ARMS

So much of the resources of Egypt and Syria went into arms that there is little left for social reforms. Jordan teeters on the edge of extinction, a skeleton of a country for her neighbors to squabble over.

All of these things postpone the dream of stability. In addition, the Arab sense of injustice at the creation of Israel, and the sense of frustation at the superiority of Israel's military, economic, and social life, add yeast to the growing ferment.

The Arab remembers his long colonial history. The memory makes him hate the Baghdad Pact, which links Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, and Britain to Arab Iraq. This, they say, is an area pact imposed by Britain as a manifestation of continuing colonialism and an effort to keep the Arab world divided.

These, say the Arabs, are the real vacuums in the Middle East. These are the situations the Communists feed upon.

Many thoughtful Arab leaders are seeking a way out of the area's pressing troubles. Frequently the suggestion is heard that a new league of Arab States, under United Nations auspices and with a fund sponsored by the United States, make an exhaustive study of the resources and how they could be used to develop the area.

If such a program should get under way with American technical help, it might go a long way toward providing an effective weapon against the sort of Communist penetration which cannot be fought off with guns.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN LIBRARIES

EXHIBIT D

[From the London Observer of December 16, 1956]

A MIDDLE EAST PLAN

The crisis through which the world has just passed in the Middle East has marked the end of an epoch. No other event has shown so strikingly the limits imposed by the world forces of the present day on "imperialist" actions of the 19th-century type, even in areas where vital economic interests of the old industrial nations are genuinely at stake. Rarely if ever has world opinion expressed itself as quickly, effectively, and unanimously, regardless of national boundaries or ideological divisions, as in the face of the Anglo-French attempt to break the deadlock over Suez by force.

The deliberate use of armed force in the interest of a power or group of powers against weaker nations is still possible in this age, as the tragedy of Hungary has shown; but it is now possible only for those who are prepared to pursue it with reckless disregard of the consequences and of the cost in international political good will.

But it would be wilful blindness to assume that the final demise of the old imperialist system will automatically ensure the emergence of a new international order.

On the contrary, the void left by the retreat of the former imperial powers is being filled by the new nationalisms of the ex-colonial nations with their own conflicts, on one side, and, on the other, by the efforts of the two contending blocs, grouped around the two superpowers of this age, to exploit these conflicts in their competition for the allegiance of the new nations.

OPPORTUNITY

Nor would it be true to say that the danger to peace in these contested regions arises exclusively from such attempts at great-power exploitation of local conflicts. The conflicts are there, on both the national and economic planes. They are most desperately explosive among young and poor nations which, having barely emerged from long periods of foreign domination and often suffering from pressing overpopulation, feel they have nothing to lose.

The fact has to be faced that national sovereignty cannot by itself furnish a sufficient foundation for an international order ensuring peace.

If dangerous explosions of national conflict in such critical regions as the Middle East are to be prevented, if their exploitation by the great powers, at the risk of an eventual worldwide conflagration, is to be stopped, a comprehensive attempt must be made to deal with the problems of regional security and regional economic development as a whole—in a regional and not a national framework.

But though such an attempt will eventually require the agreement, and the contributions, of the great powers, it cannot command the necessary confidence, especially the essential confidence of the Middle East countries themselves, if it is advanced by any particular group of powers, or even emerges from a deal between them.

The only sponsorship for a regional security and development plan that could at present be made acceptable to the nations of the Middle East is that of a truly disinterested international institution—the United Nations.

The germs for such an extension of the activity of the United Nations exist. For some time now the small permanent staff of the United Nations has been beginning to assume some of the functions of a "welfare superstate" by sponsoring economic programs and maintaining standing agencies for the relief of children and refugees, for improving public health and for technical exchanges. On a number of occasions the Security Council or the Assembly has also appointed teams of observers to watch international danger spots, and during the present crisis the General Assembly has for the first time expanded one of these teams into a true international police force. Never before has world opinion been as favorable as now, under the impact of the acute Middle Eastern conflict, to the idea of making such an international preventive force permanent.

Never has there been such an opportunity for the establishment of such a force as part of a constructive international effort for assuring the peace of this vital region.

SECURITY

The Middle East presents in an extreme form most of the tensions and frictions characteristic of our time. It is in a ferment of rapid social, economic and political change. The most modern forms of industry, agriculture and social life exist side by side with ancient methods and customs. Contrasts in incomes, dress, in expectation of life, in education and in beliefs could hardly be greater. Traditional political patterns mingle with the latest political doctrines; an absolute or a constitutional monarchy can be matched with a brand-new republican democracy or dictatorship.

No part of the world so urgently needs intelligent and disinterested help from more developed industrial nations to solve its problems; yet nowhere have the blunders and rivalries of great powers produced such dangers of chaos, political, economic and military. No underdeveloped region has so valuable an export as Middle East oil; yet the human ingenuity which enables it to drive so many million engines has so far done relatively little to harness its proceeds to the development of the region from which it is exported.

Intelligent attention to economic development has greatly increased in the Middle East states in recent years. In some countries with oil revenues, such as Iraq and Kuwait and to a certain extent Persia, a good beginning has been made. But other countries, such as Egypt and Jordan, at present lack the capital which oil revenues provide to deal with their desperate economic and social problems.

The Middle East needs not merely technical help and more capital on a regional scale; it needs above all security. The lack of security from both internal and external conflicts has been the biggest obstacle to its progress.

History in the Middle East stretches uncommonly far backward and most of it has been violent. When the burden of Turkish rule was replaced by British and French control, the area benefited materially from a more enlightened administration. But new conflicts were created between the desire of the Middle Eastern peoples for political independence and the fear of Britain and France that if they withdrew entirely, other possibly hostile great powers would take their place. Discord was made worse by the arbitrary political divisions imposed on the area by the great powers and the development of the Zionist movement in Palestine leading up to the creation of Israel.

Most of the people in the Middle East would like to be left free from the military control or influence of any outside great powers. But they are not strong enough themselves to insure the international security of the area without outside help. Nor have they been able to find a way by themselves of keeping peace in their chief internal conflict, that between the Arab States and Israel. But support, invited or imposed, from any great powers now increases tension, both internally and on a world scale between the great powers themselves. Where, then, are the peoples of the Middle East to turn for help in securing both peace and freedom? This dilemma has to be solved both for the sake of the Middle East and for world peace.

Recent events have shown that the only possible way out is through the United Nations, and that if the United Nations cannot maintain peace in the Middle East, the danger of a third world war cannot long be averted.

Strategically, the key to the Middle East is in the Suez area where the Mediterranean is joined by the canal to the Red Sea, and where Asia meets Africa within a short air journey from Europe. Politically, the key to the Middle East peace is a settlement between Israel and the Arab States; so long as there is not at least peaceful coexistence, and eventually a final peace between them, no general peace in the Middle East is possible.

U. N. FORCE

Any effective outside help for Middle East security has to be concerned with these two points, and recent events have not only shown their interrelation but have indicated a way of dealing with both together. Only the United Nations can give the peoples of the Middle East the support needed to maintain the international security of the area without intervention, control or influence from rival great powers. It is now clear that one essential requirement for peace is a United Nations guarantee of the present Arab-Israel armistice lines and eventually of the agreed frontiers. Only this can permit both Arabs and Jews to disarm sufficiently to attend to their urgent economic and social problems.

But if this guaranty and this support are to be effective, there must be at least the nucleus of an efficient standing United Nations police force in the Middle East, strategically placed, and there is no better location for such a force than the area of the land bridge between Asia and Africa and of the Suez Canal.

Such a force could not "fill the strategic vacuum" created by the withdrawal of great powers from the area, but it would be sufficient to preserve local peace and greatly to reduce the dangers of outside intervention throughout the area. Internationally it would be a "trip wire" which could not be touched without sounding the alarm, committing the United Nations to action and bringing much greater forces into operation.

Part of this security problem concerns the Suez Canal itself, whose vital importance for the economy not only of the Middle East and Western Europe, but of all Asia and Australia as well, has been strikingly illustrated by the present crisis. One obvious lesson of the crisis is the impossibility of ever returning to military or economic control of the canal by the Western European powers originally associated with its creation and with the old Suez Canal Co., or for that matter to control by any other power or group of powers. But it is equally true that military control by Egypt alone cannot produce the confidence necessary to eliminate international tension over this key world waterway, nor can Egypt's unassisted operation or complete economic control of the canal command confidence from some of the principal user nations on economic grounds.

The presence of a United Nations force in the neighborhood to help the Middle East live in peace would also remove the international security problems of the Canal. United Nations control of the technical and economic operation of the canal itself would similarly both safeguard Egypt against interference and establish confidence among the user nations.

While Egypt has rejected international management of the canal, she has so far accepted in negotiation certain international limitations on her control of the canal. The first are those concerning freedom of navigation embodied in the 1888 convention. The others concern consultation with the users on the level of tolls and on the development of the canal, with possible United Nations arbitration.

Egypt's objection to going further toward complete international operation lies partly in her sensitivity about her national sovereignty due to her modern history, partly in the way the proposals seemed to be presented under threat and pressure, and partly in the exceptional character of the proposals. Why should Egypt alone hand over operation of a precious asset, which happens to be on her territory, to any international institution if everybody else preserves exclusive control of their national resources?

Our answer is to propose United Nations control of the canal and the permanent stationing of a United Nations force in its neighborhood not as isolated measures, but as part of a Middle East security and development plan which is also to insure greater use of the proceeds of the oil resources, now operated primarily by Anglo-American companies, for the benefit of the whole region, including Egypt.

The board responsible for the impartial operation of the canal, while backed by the authority and force of the United Nations, should moreover be directly linked with the Regional Development Board to be created, and be composed primarily of the representatives of the regional states themselves and those participating in the development plan.

Nor must this system be thought of as something applicable only to Egypt and the Middle East. United Nations control must inevitably in time be extended to other fields, such as atomic energy, involving other countries and regions of the world.

Far from being subjected to an out-dated tutelage, the Middle Eastern countries would be offered the honorable role of pioneers in a system of world government toward which we must all move if we are to escape destruction.

One good result of the November crisis has been to call a United Nations force into existence and to secure its dispatch to Egypt, if only on a token basis and amide much hasty improvisation. Another is that the force, unlike the only previous United Nations army, that which fought in Korea, is drawn mainly from the disinterested states and excludes the great powers. It must therefore be a cardinal objective in the interests of world peace to see that this United Nations force, suitably reinforced and organized, with an adequate system of reliefs, is permanently maintained on the Israeli-Egyptian frontier, thus protecting it against either local or outside interference.

Suggestions have been made for a United Nations purchase either of the entire Sinai Peninsula, which belongs to Egypt, or of a corridor from Gaza on the Mediterranean to the Gulf of Aqaba along both sides of the Egyptian-Israeli border, with access across the corridor from Israel to the port of Eilat, which would remain Israeli, and, similarly, access across international territory from Egypt to Jordan and Saudi Arabia. The islands commanding the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba should also form part of this international territory. The second at least of these suggestions would have much to commend it.

The interposition of a strip of international territory betwen Egypt and Israel might do more than anything else could to help the establishment of peace between Jews and Arabs. The strip could also carry a highway and pipelines connecting Mediterranean and Indian Ocean ports, and safeguarding a possible future route for a supplementary canal which might sometime be needed. Moreover, it would afford a valuable demonstration area for United Nations technical and economic development programs. Such programs could absorb numbers of Arab refugees from Palestine, and thus make a further essential contribution toward Middle East peace.

A United Nations zone and force along the Egyptian-Israeli border, and United Nations control of the Suez Canal, would go far to promote peace and confidence between Jews and Arabs and remove friction over vital international communications. They would not, however, eliminate the friction between competitors for Middle East oil, and between the oil exploiters and the impoverished peoples who see the oil reserves of the area being taken at low prices for the benefit of the wealthier advanced countries. There is an obvious and practical means by which this problem might also be tackled, so as to enable the use of pipelines across the desert to be assured to consumers throughout the world, while assuring the people of the Middle East that a fair share of the proceeds of their oil would be invested for their common good.

DEVELOPMENT

This approach would accept it as a fact that there can be no security from sabotage of pipelines controlled by individual oil companies, and that there can be no security from expropriation for commercially controlled oil installations—unless they are firmly backed by Middle Eastern public opinion and international law.

It would call for the establishment of an international concern under the United Nations which would take over and operate all Middle East oil pipelines and would charge not only the economic cost (taking account also of transit payments already being received by Middle East countries) but a fixed levy to be paid into the funds of a Middle East Development Agency to be set up under the Technical Assistance Board of the United Nations.

An equivalent levy would by international agreement be levied on all oil shipped from ports of Middle Eastern territories, and the combined proceeds (together with the receipts from other sources) would be applied to meet the cost of an approved program of development and welfare plans for the area.

By this means, the oil companies and oil consumers would get a greatly increased and internationally guaranteed security of operation. They would also be relieved of the need to become dependent on tankers too large for existing European terminals by being able to pipe unlimited quantities of oil to Mediterranean ports. In return, they would pay more for the oil—but much less than they will certainly have to pay if the present anarchic conditions in the Middle East persist, as is fairly sure to happen if nothing is done to prevent it.

The Middle East countries, on the other hand, will have a sufficient collective stake in the oil revenues to ensure that whatever interrupts the production and distribution of oil will threaten their plain and vital interests. Moreover, being channeled through a United Nations agency, the money will be equitably shared where it can best be applied, instead of being monopolized at those points where the oil happens to be produced. The existence of such a Middle East Development Agency under United Nations control could also prove a most important political and social force for the stabilization and peaceful progress of the Middle East.

It could help with such urgent long-term problems as the regulation and development of the waters of the Nile, the Jordan, and other Middle Eastern rivers. Irrigation schemes which are possible in many areas would form a most fruitful field of work for the agency and it could play a part in easing the political frictions associated with the use of international rivers. Such an agency should also support social as well as economic development schemes, particularly measures of family planning to assist population control.

THE COST

We have briefly outlined the heads of a Middle Eastern stabilization, security, and development scheme based on a United Nations police force, to include the raising of revenue from oil exports to finance a United Nations Middle East Development Authority. There is nothing in this program which is not surely practicable in the light of previous experience in the Middle East or elsewhere. It will, however, clearly be expensive, and although the main cost economic development may be met from oil revenues (especially if they are used to guarantee interest on loans) there will be other substantial expenditure, particularly on a permanent United Nations police force. It is here that the Middle East problem merges into the problem of world peace.

This cost can evidently be met only by substantial new contributions from some of the major member states of the United Nations—contributions that would have to be made irrespective of whether these member states are called upon to furnish contingents of their own for the United Nations force.

In view of the fact that peace in the Middle East and security of the canal are a vital interest of all the major powers, and that it has proved impossible for any of them effectively to safeguard this interest by the use of national force, we suggest that even a major monetary contribution for an international force devoted to this purpose would prove to be in fact an economy for each of them.

This is certainly true from the viewpoint of British interest. There could be no better demonstration that Britain has learned the lesson of her Suez failure than an indication of willingness to help financially on a generous scale to give a permanent United Nations force in the region a good start.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## VISIT BY MARSHAL TITO TO THIS COUNTRY

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have received several letters urging me to protest to President Eisenhower in the event that he should decide to invite Marshal Tito, the President of Yugoslavia, to visit this country. I do not believe that I should do so.

President Eisenhower is uniquely qualified to decide for himself whether it will advance the cause for American foreign policy by arranging a face-to-face conference with Marshal Tito. There are many problems involved here that go beyond the ability of most Americans, and even most Members of Congress, to fully assess.

I am one of those who has voted against military and economic aid to Yugoslavia during the last 2 years. Nevertheless, this Nation has invested hundreds of millions of dollars in assisting Yugoslavia to maintain its independence. There are undoubtedly a great number of matters on which it would be helpful to have a better understanding between our two Governments. I can think of a number of these myself, and I am certain that the President and his advisers can think of many more.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

If Yugoslavia can be depended upon to guard its neutrality and prevent the use of its airspace as the avenue of a surprise attack upon American airbases and naval units in the Mediterranean area, that single item will remove a very formidable threat to the United States forces in the Mediterranean and to our allies whom we are committed to assist in the event they are attacked.

The issue in this case is not the question of our regard for Marshal Tito and the form of government which he maintains in Yugoslavia today. The issue is whether we wish to uphold the hand of the President in his efforts to make peace more secure and to save this Nation and its people if war is forced upon us.

The people of the United States have expressed their overwhelming confidence in the judgment and the good intentions of their President. Those who founded this Nation wisely imposed upon the Chief Executive the heavy burdens and responsibilities of the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. They wisely decreed that this Nation should speak in foreign affairs with a single voice. We are fortunate that they did so. This Nation could never have continued its existence had it been necessary to obtain agreement of a majority of the 96 Senators and 435 Congressmen before we could decide upon a course of action.

President Eisenhower has explained that he wishes to consult with various heads of state, some of whom are not popular in America. The President has told us that he believes he can persuade some of these people to accord us a greater degree of cooperation if he is able to meet with them face to face. The President's motive is worthy, and his logic in this respect makes good sense. Completely aside from the matter of international politics, I regard it as morally right that a national leader should undertake to persuade other national leaders who differ with him of his honorable motives and his peaceful intentions. He should exert his best efforts to persuade them to cooperate and collaborate in our effort to preserve mankind from extermination in an atomic holocaust.

Some of those who are most concerned for fear that Marshal Tito may gain greater international respectability by visiting this country are particularly concerned because of the lack of religious freedom, as we know it, under the Tito regime. I would hope that our President would use his best efforts to persuade Marshal Tito to the American view of religious freedom and tolerance.

I have never posed as a teacher of religion. Nevertheless, I have tried to acquaint myself with certain Christian teachings. It seems to me that the Master would have wanted us to be tolerant of the other man's point of view. He would have wanted us to attempt to persuade our enemies in the path of peace and freedom, rather than engage them in mortal combat or to insult and offend them. When the life of our Saviour was taken by a maddened multitude, He prayed for those who knew not the sin they were committing.

A few days ago the junior Senator from Wisconsin told us that if it required discourtesy to Tito to assure that he would not visit this country, the junior Senator from Wisconsin was prepared to exhaust his wits in ways to be discourteous and insulting. I disagree with that course of action.

The President should know whether it might advance America's position in the world to invite Marshal Tito to visit him in Washington in order that the chief executives of the United States and Yugoslavia could discuss matters that concern both countries. This is not the kind of decision that a highly placed White House adviser will determine for the President. The problems the President might feel in need of discussing involve a subject matter in which President Eisenhower made his reputation as a world statesman and military planner.

I do not propose to tell President Eisenhower that he should invite Marshal Tito to visit him; nor that he should not do so. I would very much prefer that the President use his own good judgment in this matter. If the President should decide to invite Marshal Tito to visit him, then I am certain it will not help matters for any of us to be insulting or offensive to the President of Yugoslavia. Mr. President, you do not accomplish much just going around being mad at people and insulting folks.

Marshal Tito cannot expect to receive from me or many other Americans the warm and enthusiastic reception that has been accorded other world leaders who have called upon our President, but I shall certainly do nothing for the purpose of making Marshal Tito dislike our country or reduce the esteem in which we are held in Yugoslavia and other nations.

President Eisenhower is barred by the Constitution from seeking another term as President. Under these circumstances, we can be certain that he will place his decision in this matter above and beyond politics. I would like to assure him that he can depend on my cooperation.

I have discussed this matter with a number of my distinguished colleagues, especially some of those who are member of the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees. I am confident that the views which I hold on this subject are consistent with those held by the majority of the Members of the Senate.

---

## PROPOSED NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senators from Washington [Mr. JACKSON and Mr. MAGNUSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish on public lands of the United States a National Wilderness Preservation System.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1176) to establish on public lands of the United States a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, to provide for the protection and administration of the areas within this System by existing Federal agencies and for the gathering and dissemination of information to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness for its appropriate use and enjoyment by the people, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation Council, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill which the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] just introduced, the national wilderness preservation bill, of which I am proud to be one of the cosponsors, remain at the desk until Thursday, for other possible sponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the bill would establish on public lands of the United States a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, to provide for the protection and administration of areas within this system by existing Federal agencies and for the gathering and dissemination of information to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness for its appropriate use and enjoyment by the people, to establish a national wilderness preservation council, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, this 85th Congress has a remarkable opportunity to establish sound and enduring policies that will assure Americans a continuing enjoyment of the outdoor recreation that has always meant so much to us.

A few days ago we welcomed the introduction by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] of a bill to provide for a careful and thorough study of all our outdoor recreation needs and resources and to establish for this purpose a national outdoor recreation resources review commission. I commend the Senator and his cosponsors, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senators from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER and Mr. MORSE], the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. CARROLL], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] for their leadership in advancing this legislation, and I offer them hearty and eager support.

I note with special interest that four Senators are cosponsors of both this recreation bill and the wilderness bill.

I agree with Senator ANDERSON's comment that the proposed outdoor recreation resources review will be "instrumental in helping to preserve a fine, long-standing American tradition—the healthful and alluring appeal of the

great outdoors." It is as a contribution to this objective that I now urge further the establishment of our National Wilderness Preservation System, as provided in this Wilderness Bill, a measure that deals with areas that already have been dedicated in one way or another to protection through programs that are thoroughly consistent with their preservation as wilderness.

These areas of wildness will play an important role in the total outdoor recreation program which I hope to see developed as a result of the proposed outdoor recreation resources review. But while we are conducting the inventory which that review requires and developing the recommendations on which the program it envisions can be based, I am sure we should not delay in establishing firmly our policies for preserving our remaining areas of wilderness. I therefore urge this Wilderness Bill as another essential measure in what I hope will be the successful legislative program of this Congress for establishing a sound and effective national policy for outdoor recreation and conservation.

Those of us in the Congress who are vitally interested in conservation are worried, and I think with good cause. We see the pressure that is coming, and as elected representatives it is our clear duty to do something before the horse is out of the barn. There seems to be a crisis every day in the world in which we live, and the only way we are going to change this is by looking ahead and taking timely action.

That is what in this Wilderness Bill I propose we do. Instead of waiting until the crisis has engulfed us, I propose that we make secure the preservation of those areas that do now in fact constitute our national wilderness system—the areas that are now in fact being handled as wilderness, even though they serve other and consistent purposes also. Doing that now means providing security for what we already have, perpetuating the multiple purpose programs we now have on these areas, and making sure that multiple purpose on these lands always includes wilderness preservation.

Mr. President, here is a measure designed to make sure that some parts of America may always remain unspoiled and beautiful in their own natural way, untrammeled by man and unmarred by machinery. It is a measure that gives expression to a policy which has long been a reality in the minds and hearts of the American people but has never yet been embodied in legislation.

THE NEED FOR WILDERNESS

Nearly 2 years ago, on June 1, 1955, it was my privilege to receive unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address on the Need for Wilderness which had been delivered at the National Citizens Planning Conference on Parks and Open Spaces for the American People here in Washington, D. C., on May 24, 1955. In this address, as I then pointed out, the executive secretary of The Wilderness Society, Mr. Howard Zahniser, had not only discussed our various needs for areas of wilderness and the underlying philosophy for their appreciation. He also had proposed a practical program for preserving a system of such areas without sacrificing any other program or enterprise—and doing this as a part of existing Federal land-management programs, through the existing agencies.

When this address and my remarks regarding it were reprinted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and distributed to interested groups there was a remarkable response from all parts of the country. There was apparent a great inspired hope that, with a minimum of administrative time and expense and with only slight modification of our present land-management policies, we could see affirmed a national policy to preserve for all time some areas of our pristine American wilderness.

Conscious of the special interest which this prospect held for many Members of Congress, I spoke of these developments in the Senate almost a year ago now—on February 29, 1956—and presented a compilation of excerpts from the many letters which had been received.

At the same time I had urged the interested conservation leaders to cooperate with me in the development of this proposal in bill form. As a result, through the cooperation of a number of conservation leaders and organizations, I was able to introduce this Wilderness Bill in the Senate last June 7 (1956) with the cosponsorship of nine of my esteemed colleagues of both parties, from Maine to California.

On the occasion of this introduction I also presented statements in support of the proposal from the interested conservation organizations and leaders and a number of editorials and newspaper columns commenting on it. These are in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 7, 1956.

In an effort to obtain the widest possible consideration of this proposal and to benefit from every possible suggestion, reprints of my own explanatory remarks in introducing the bill and comments by my colleagues, the Senators from Oregon, were widely distributed during the past summer, including the full text of the bill and the statements regarding it to which I have referred. The response once again was most encouraging, and the various suggestions received have led to improvements, corrections, and clarifications in the bill.

When the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, introduced a companion bill in the House of Representatives and spoke with great force and eloquence in that Chamber on July 12, 1956, reprints of his remarks also were obtained and distributed, including likewise the full text of the bill. Many letters in support of this measure have been received from all parts of the country, and Representative SAYLOR has had excerpts from them prepared in a compilation which he has kindly made available to me on this occasion. I thank him for this. With Mr. SAYLOR's approval, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that collected excerpts from these letters may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

TWO ASSUMPTIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this bill is based on the assumption that we still can preserve in America an adequate system of wilderness areas without sacrificing any other program. It is based also on a parallel assumption that there will not long be any such areas unless we do deliberately preserve them as wilderness.

In accordance with these assumptions I consider this program both readily feasible and also urgent. It appears to me to be as easy to accomplish as it is important.

PART OF AN OVERALL PROGRAM

I should like to emphasize that the preservation of wilderness which we here propose will be part of an over-all land-management program that encompasses also our other needs. There need be no essential conflict. No area now devoted to any economic purpose, or to any other development program, is withdrawn from its use by this legislation. The proposed legislation rather is based on the understanding that we in America still have the opportunity for preserving wilderness while at the same time meeting, outside our wilderness reserves, all our needs for commodities and for developed recreation areas.

Instead of being in conflict with other aspects of our over-all program, our wilderness preservation is actually dependent upon them. Upon their success depend our hopes for wilderness.

Our program is based on this cooperative understanding.

I wish to make clear, for example, that this bill is in no sense, in conflict with, or in competition with, forestry for timber and other economic products. On the contrary foresters are among those upon whom our wilderness program is in reality dependent for its success. If ever the American people come to the borders of our wilderness areas with a need for timber that cannot be met elsewhere, then, I say to you, our wilderness areas will be doomed.

Thus it is to the foresters of America, and to their effective programs for sustained yield cutting, on their production forests, that we must look for success in wilderness preservation.

We recognize this, and we face our program in a spirit of cooperation and with a feeling of dependence on the intelligent foresters of America for support.

Similarly we contemplate cooperation and integration with other enterprises that may likewise be inconsistent within a wilderness and yet thoroughly consistent with the preservation of wilderness as part of an overall program.

After long controversy we recently, for example, found it possible to establish an Upper Colorado River Project that includes a gigantic program for the construction of huge impoundments and magnificent reservoirs and at the same time provides for the protection of national parks and monuments.

There should be no unavoidable conflict between other projects for the wise development and use of our water or other resources and this wilderness preservation program. Wherever there are

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

perplexities I can assure you, Mr. President, that the proponents of this legislation will face them cooperatively and constructively.

A MULTIPLE-USE PROGRAM

Not only in a general or over-all sense, but also specifically, with regard to each area involved, this proposal is one that respects the importance of other programs.

It is a multiple-purpose wilderness program.

Every area included in this System is now serving some other purpose, or purposes, consistent with the continued protection of the area as wilderness. Under this legislation these areas will continue to serve these purposes, and they will be administered by the same agencies that now handle them.

With regard to the 36 wilderness, wild, and roadless areas immediately included and the 44 primitive areas to be added later, the bill has been prepared in accordance with the wilderness policies, programs, and practices of the United States Forest Service and, I may add, in admiration for them. The national forest areas that will be included are those that have been designated by the Forest Service as wilderness, wild, primitive, or roadless, and they will be administered under regulations drawn up in the Forest Service.

This bill will not interfere with, but will perpetuate, the present multiple-purpose administration of these national forest areas.

The central concept of this measure, I repeat, is that our present areas of wilderness can be preserved within the existing land-management pattern if the preservation purpose is made a matter of fundamental policy.

Rather than upsetting the multiple-purpose program of the Forest Service, for example, this legislation will help prevent the upset that will result if the wilderness areas are not protected from the uses that would destroy them as wilderness.

As to the 48 national parks and monuments included, the bill gives added protection as wilderness for the portions not needed for roads and accommodations, and yet sets no limitation on the portions that may be designated for such use as needed. Park areas will continue to serve park purposes, just as forest areas will continue to serve the forest purposes.

The 20 national wildlife refuges and ranges included—20 out of our total of 264—will continue to serve their wildlife purposes. Some wilderness is essential for the preservation of our native species of wilderness wildlife. This measure accordingly will help insure our having a few areas devoted primarily to the preservation of wildlife through the protection of their wilderness environment.

As with parks, as with forests, as with refuges, so with every area included in this system, its wilderness preservation will be an aspect of its management for some other concurrent purpose.

May I emphasize this also in the negative by pointing out that the bill does not establish any special-use privilege nor provide for any special users.

Rather than being concerned with any special use or user, this bill relates instead to the character of the areas involved. Hunting, for example, although it is not mentioned in the bill, will continue to be a major recreation within many national-forest units of the system and will be prohibited in national parks. Wherever there is hunting, it will be wilderness hunting. That is the force of this measure.

Uses of all the various kinds of lands involved will continue to vary. The common concern is that wilderness conditions will persist, whatever the uses.

THE EFFECT ON EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Mr. President, I emphasize and reiterate some of these explanations because of misunderstandings, or misinterpretations, that have been brought to my attention. Among these have also been claims that this legislation would put in the hands of Congress the administration of the areas involved, including a charge that the legislation would (and I quote) "cede to Congress final and permanent authority." Intrigued by this charge and interested to know what the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress might comment on these points, I addressed an inquiry to that service. In response to this request, Mr. John P. Earner, of the American Law Division, prepared a report in which he expressed the opinion:

> The legislation gives sanction to the policies and programs developed by the Forest Service, the National Park Service, and other Federal conservation agencies under whose administration the existing resource of wilderness has so far been preserved.
>
> The effect of this bill—

as interpreted by Mr. Earner—

> will be to bring into a single system, for the purpose of insuring their continued preservation as wilderness, the various federally owned areas designated as wilderness by the departmental heads or by Executive order. In no instance will the jurisdiction of a single area be transferred from one agency to another. Areas controlled, for example, by the Forest Service will continue to be managed by that agency. Furthermore, it will be the Forest Service under the Secretary of Agriculture that determines the precise area of the unit of its wilderness land to be included in the Wilderness Preservation System. And it will be solely the responsibility of the Forest Service under law to preserve the wilderness character of that area. No wilderness area of the Forest Service thus made a part of the Wilderness Preservation System may be modified or removed from the system except by action of the Secretary of Agriculture which has not been disapproved by Congress. In a similar manner lands under the jurisdiction of other executive agencies may be affected by this legislation.

Mr. Earner stated categorically:

> The notion that enactment of this legislation would take from the executive branch of the Government and give to Congress a power to dictate all matters concerning wilderness areas is simply not true.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report by Mr. John P. Earner, of the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, on "A bill to authorize a National Wilderness Preservation System," dated December 4, 1956, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON S. 4013, 84TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, A BILL TO AUTHORIZE A NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

(Prepared at the request of the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, by John P. Earner, American Law Division, December 4, 1956.)

It is the purpose of the National Wilderness Preservation Bill to establish by act of Congress a clear-cut national policy for preserving for both the present and the future, some of what remains of our resource of wilderness. No act of Congress does this at present.

The legislation gives sanction to the policies and programs developed by the Forest Service, the National Park Service and other Federal conservation agencies under whose administration the existing resource of wilderness has so far been preserved.

The effect of this bill will be to bring into a single system, for the purpose of insuring their continued preservation as wilderness, the various federally owned areas designated as wilderness by the departmental heads or by Executive order. In no instance will the jurisdiction of a single area be transferred from one agency to another. Areas controlled, for example, by the Forest Service will continue to be managed by that agency. Furthermore, it will be the Forest Service under the Secretary of Agriculture that determines the precise area of the unit of its wilderness land to be included in the Wilderness Preservation System. And it will be solely the responsibility of the Forest Service under law to preserve the wilderness character of that area. No wilderness area of the Forest Service thus made a part of the Wilderness Preservation System may be modified or removed from the System except by action of the Secretary of Agriculture which has not been disapproved by Congress. In a similar manner lands under the jurisdiction of other executive agencies may be affected by this legislation.

The notion that enactment of this legislation would take from the executive branch of the Government and give to Congress a power to dictate all matters concerning wilderness areas is simply not true. This legislation would give to Congress nothing Congress has not had since the Constitution was adopted:

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting * * * property belonging to the United States" (Constitution, art. IV, sec. 3, cl. 2).

This has never been a power of the Executive. Any exercise of the power by departmental heads has been by virtue of authority delegated by the Congress.

By the act of 1897, as amended (33 Stat. 628), Congress granted to the Secretary of Agriculture the power to manage and regulate the national forests. There has never been any question raised about the ownership and control of the Federal timber, of the protection of vegetation within the national forests. They are functions inherent in the act of 1897.

Court decisions resulting from national forest grazing regulation violations have affirmed the constitutionality of this congressional delegation of administrative power (*U. S.* v. *Grimaud* (220 U. S. 506); *Light* v. *U. S.* (220 U. S. 523)).

There is no explicit congressional recognition of recreation and wilderness reservations as a major purpose of Forest Service administration. Timber, water, and forage are uniformly accepted as national forest resources by law, court decisions, executive office directives, and regulations. Recrea-

tion, however, has only been proclaimed a fourth major forest use by Forest Service administrative regulations with occasional approval by the Secretary of Agriculture.

There has been infrequent legislative acknowledgment that recreation is a legitimate forest use, but only for isolated areas or special situations. No broad provision for national forest recreation, of which wilderness reservations are a part, has been made by Congress.

Congress authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to rent or lease national forest areas near mineral springs for erection of sanitariums or hotels open for public health or pleasure (act of February 28, 1899, 30 Stat. 908; U. S. C. 16:495).

Congress authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to secure and protect for all time the big trees known as Sequoia Washingtoniana in the Calaveras Bigtree National Forest (act of February 18, 1909, 35 Stat. 626; U. S. C. 16:494).

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to grant permits for the construction of homes, resorts, and stores in the national forests needed for recreation and public convenience (act of March 4, 1915, 38 Stat. 1101; U. S. C. 16:497).

Congress authorized the President to designate certain national forest lands as refuges for the protection of game, birds, or fish (acts of August 11, 1916, 39 Stat. 476, amended June 25, 1948, 62 Stat. 860; U. S. C. 16:683; and March 10, 1934, 48 Stat. 400; U. S. C. 16:694).

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to set aside 5,000 acres within the Angeles National Forest of California for camping purposes, and such lands shall not be subject to mining laws (act of February 24, 1925, 43 Stat. 969).

Certain national forest lands in northern Minnesota were withdrawn from entry or appropriation under the public land laws for the express purpose of conserving the natural beauty of lake and stream shorelines for recreational use. Limitations are placed on logging near the shorelines, and water levels and adjacent features in this region were to be preserved in an unmodified state of nature (Shipstead-Nolan Act, July 10, 1930, 46 Stat. 1020; U. S. C. 16:577, 577 (a), (b)).

The Thye-Blatnik Act gave congressional recognition to the unique qualities and natural features of the remaining wilderness canoe country on national forest lands in Minnesota, and gave authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire private lands where such might impair wilderness values (act of June 22, 1948, 62 Stat. 568; U. S. C. 16:577 (c)).

In view of the varied delegations of congressional power to deal with public lands, there can be no legal question of the right of Congress to enact legislation which promises the preservation of large areas in undeveloped condition on any Federal lands.

THE BILL DESCRIBED SECTION BY SECTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like finally to describe the bill section by section and to urge upon all interested the fact that the bill speaks plainly its own purposes and intentions. Many of the questions that have so far been raised with regard to it have been settled, I have noted, when the questioners have read the proposed measure.

The bill comprises five sections which may be described as follows:

The opening section defines the term "wilderness" both in the abstract and as used specifically in this bill and, recognizing the hazards to wilderness in the midst of our civilization, declares it to be a desirable policy for our health, welfare, and happiness to preserve wilderness as an enduring resource for the benefit of present and future generations. Accordingly, the continued preservation of federally owned areas of wilderness is given congressional sanction, and a National Wilderness Preservation System is established to "serve the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conserva- by the people."

Section 2 names the areas that will constitute this System, and makes provisions regarding additions, modifications, or eliminations. It takes cognizance tional, and historical use and enjoyment also of the fact that within certain of the units of this System there are needs for designating portions of the areas to be used for roads and certain other installations that are exceptions within wilderness. Section 2 comprises 6 subsections.

NATIONAL FOREST WILDERNESS

Subsection (a) designates 36 areas within the national forests to become units of the National Wilderness Preservation System. These are not entire national forests; they are special areas inside the forests. The Forest Service has found them to have highest value as wilderness and has already designated them as wilderness, wild, or roadless areas. In addition, there are 44 areas now classified as "primitive" that are earmarked to be included in this System when the Forest Service has carried out its plans to reclassify them as either "wilderness" or "wild" areas. A 10-year period is provided for this reclassification program. Including all these primitive areas which are to be added eventually, this System will have included special areas within some 80 of the 149 national forests. Out of the 181 million acres in our national forests some 14 million acres will be in this System. As at present, the administration of the national forest areas will be in accordance with regulations by the Secretary of Agriculture. This bill, either in section 2 or in section 3, makes provisions that in effect give sanction to and continue the present regulations that have been so ably developed by the Forest Service for the sound administration and protection of wilderness. An additional safeguard against an undesirable elimination of any wilderness is provided in that, after completing the process for such action as now provided by Department regulations, such proposed action will have to be reported to Congress, where for 120 days it is subject to disapproval. Additional areas may be designated by the Secretary of Agriculture, and such additions must also be reported to Congress, and for 120 days be subject to disapproval by either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

WILDERNESS IN THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

Subsection (b) of section 2 designates 48 out of the 181 areas in the National Park System as units of the National Wilderness Preservation System, 26 of which are national parks, 20 are monuments, 1 is a recreational area, and 1 is a memorial park. Our national parks and many of our national monuments include within them our superbly beautiful pristine areas of wilderness. The chief threats to their preservation as such, under existing legislation, come from prospects for the extension of roads and the intrusion of recreation developments, perfectly good in themselves, that nevertheless are out of place in wilderness.

Unless provision is made to protect the primeval within the parks, eventually the developments may take over.

This process may be gradual, but, nevertheless, it is a prospect against which we can now set guards with no sacrifice. There are other places for the development of our recreation facilities that require roads and other conveniences. Our parks are reservoirs of wilderness.

It is true, however, that certain portions of the parks must be used for the roads and accommodations that make them accessible and hospitable. Accordingly this bill provides for the designation of such portions for this purpose. A 10-year period is provided for the several designations, and the provisions of this law will not take effect for any park or monument until the designations have been made.

The National Park Service, under its so-called Mission 66, is undertaking to provide systematically during the next 10 years for the proper and economical development of the roads and accommodations within the parks and monuments.

The designations of the areas provided for in this bill can thus be made, park by park, as the plans for Mission 66 materialize.

Provision will in this way be made for the proper handling of developed areas but also for the protection, without development, of our wilderness in the back country.

If ever additional areas are needed for developments, they can be designated, but only after a public notice that will give all concerned an opportunity to weigh the importance of diminishing the area of wilderness.

In any case, wilderness preservation becomes a congressional policy in the specified national parks and monuments. The primeval back country receives an added protection. At the same time, this bill takes care to point out that within the areas designated for developments the present protection afforded by the National Park Act of 1916 is not affected.

Additions of national parks and national monuments to the wilderness System could be made by the Congress or the President. Only Congress could remove a park or monument from the System.

WILDLIFE REFUGEES

Subsection (c) of section 2 designates 13 national wildlife refuges and 7 ranges as parts of this System.

As with National Park System areas, provision is here made for designation by the Secretary of the Interior of areas that are required for roads and installations inconsistent with wilderness. In this instance these are required for administration of the refuge or range for wildlife.

Refuges or ranges could be added to the System by the Secretary of the Interior, subject to congressional disapproval within 120 days. Only Congress

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

could remove a refuge or range from the System.

THE INDIANS' WILDERNESS

Subsection (d) of section 2 designates 12 roadless areas and 3 wild areas within Indian reservations as possible units in the National Wilderness Preservation System, but no such area will actually become a part of the System unless its inclusion is approved by the Indians. The consent of the Indians is also required for the regulations by the Secretary of the Interior that are to govern the administration, addition, modification, or elimination of areas.

This subsection is so drawn as to give the Indians the privilege of having included in this System their areas that have been classified as roadless or wild, but the principle of doing nothing with regard to Indian lands without Indian consent has been observed. Care is taken also to say that no Indian treaty is abrogated nor any hunting or fishing rights affected.

Subsection (e) of section 2 recognizes that Congress may designate additional areas within the wilderness System and also provides for the designation of such areas within any federally owned or controlled areas by appropriate officials.

Subsection (f) of section 2 provides for reports to Congress of certain additions, modifications, or eliminations, and it also authorizes the acquisition of any privately owned lands within units of this System.

Throughout section 2 provisions are made for reports to be made to the National Wilderness Preservation Council that will be established by section 4 and will be the repository for files pertaining to this System.

USE OF THE WILDERNESS

Section 3 specifies the proper uses of areas within the System and the practices that are to be excluded. It includes special provisions with regard to existing "nonconforming" uses of areas of wilderness included in the System.

At the outset this section says that nothing shall be interpreted as interfering with the purpose for which any of the lands involved were set aside, except that the "wilderness character" of the area is to be preserved.

Each administering agency is to administer the areas in the wilderness System for such other purposes as are appropriate but do this in such a way as to preserve the wilderness.

The System will be devoted to public purposes that are summarized as recreational, educational, scenic, scientific, conservational, and historical. All use will be in harmony with the wilderness environment and its preservation.

This section provides that the administration of the areas in the wilderness System shall be in accordance with regulations to be adopted by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior, as the case may be, or by such other official or officials responsible for the lands and waters involved. This section also states categorically that the Wilderness Preservation Council provided for in section 4 "shall have no administrative jurisdiction over any unit in the System nor over any agency that does have such jurisdiction."

Special provision is made for the protection of existing rights and privileges of any areas involved. Grazing within the national forest areas is provided for as at present, and existing uses authorized or provided for in refuges are also permitted. The termination of nonconforming uses is provided for whenever this is agreeable to those making the uses.

With one main exception, this bill thus proposes, not reform, but such security for what we have so far preserved as we can achieve without disrupting our present administrative and other practices.

The exception to which I refer has to do with mining. It relates primarily to the areas within the national forests.

Spokesmen for the United States Forest Service, as well as other conservationists, have long and insistently warned that a prime threat to the preservation of wilderness within the national forests comes from the prospect of mining. After careful thought it seems unwise to propose wilderness legislation that does not deal with this threat in these national forest areas.

Accordingly, this bill provides that there shall be no mining—although, of course, existing private rights are protected in this case as in all others.

A WILDERNESS PRESERVATION COUNCIL

Section 4 would create a National Wilderness Preservation Council to serve as a focus for the various interests in wilderness represented in the System, to provide an information clearinghouse and a headquarters for the records relating to the System as such, and to provide a medium through which information regarding wilderness and its use and preservation may be gathered and made available.

The Council will have no administrative jurisdiction over the areas of wilderness within the System, nor over any of the agencies that will continue to have such jurisdiction. The Council will not even have any coordinating responsibilities with regard to the administration of these areas. It will comprise administrators and citizens, will represent our special and distinctive interest in our wilderness resource *as wilderness*, and will make annual reports to Congress regarding the System.

The Council will include the heads of the bureaus that administer areas within the System—Forest Service, National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Indian Affairs Bureau—and also the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. Six citizen members will complete the eleven-member Council.

The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution will be the secretary of the Council, and will maintain its files and provide its headquarters. This arrangement will help make clear that the Council is not responsible for any area or agency administration. Involved with no land areas within the System, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution will not be concerned with any inter-agency administrative problems regarding such areas. Selection of this official as secretary of the Council further emphasizes the function of the Council as an information focus and a repository of records. It likewise will serve to bring to attention the scientific interest in wilderness preservation and the values of wilderness areas as living museums.

Section 4 provides that the members of the Council shall serve in this capacity without compensation, but receive transportation expenses and a per diem for attendance at meetings of the Council. Provision is made for the expenses of the Council.

Section 5 specifies a name: "National Wilderness Preservation Act."

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, our civilization moves fast. Our population pressures are growing. The time when we still have the opportunity to provide for the preservation of wilderness without having to interfere with other programs will not be with us long. I urge prompt and sympathetic consideration of this bill. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks to be followed by an article entitled "Conservation Wilds" which appeared in the New York Times on February 3, 1957.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1176) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, in order to secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness, there is hereby established a National Wilderness Preservation System. As hereinafter provided this System shall be composed of areas of public land in the United States and its Territories and possessions retaining their natural primeval environment and influence and being managed for purposes consistent with their continued preservation as wilderness, which areas shall serve the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservational, and historical use and enjoyment by the people in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness.

(b) The Congress recognizes that an increasing population, accompanied by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, is destined to occupy and modify all areas within the United States, its Territories, and possessions except those that are set apart for preservation and protection in their natural condition. Such preservation of areas of wilderness is recognized as a desirable policy of the Government of the United States of America for the health, welfare, and happiness of its citizens of present and future generations.

It is accordingly declared to be the policy of Congress (1) to secure the dedication of an adequate system of areas of wilderness to serve the recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, and conservation needs of the people and (2) to provide for the protection of these areas in perpetuity and for the gathering and dissemination of information regarding their use and enjoyment as wilderness. Pursuant to this policy the Congress gives sanction to the continued preservation as wilderness of those areas federally owned or controlled that are within national parks, national forests, national wildlife refuges, or other public lands, and that have so far retained under their Federal administration their primeval character. It is pursuant to this policy and sanction that the National Wilderness Preservation System is established. Within the units of this System designated for inclusion by this act, and

in those that may later be designated in accordance with its provisions, the preservation of wilderness shall be paramount.

(c) A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a member of the natural community, a wanderer who visits but does not remain and whose travels leave only trails.

For the purposes of this act the term "wilderness" shall include:

(1) The wilderness, wild, roadless, and primitive areas as presently designated by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service within the national forests;

(2) Those units within the National Park System herein or hereafter designated as units of the National Wilderness Preservation System, except those portions set aside hereunder for roads, motor trails, buildings, accommodations for visitors, and administrative installations;

(3) The national wildlife refuges and ranges or areas therein, herein or hereafter designated as units of the National Wilderness Preservation System, except those portions set aside hereunder for roads and buildings and other installations for administration and protection of the refuge or range for wildlife;

(4) The areas within Indian reservations classified as roadless or wild and included in the National Wilderness Preservation System with the consent of the tribal council or other duly constituted authority; and

(5) Such other areas as shall be designated for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System in accordance with the provisions of this act.

NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

SEC. 2. The National Wilderness Preservation System (hereafter referred to in this section as the System) shall comprise (subject to preexisting private rights, if any) the federally owned or controlled areas of land and water provided for in this section and the related air-space reservations.

NATIONAL FOREST AREAS

(a) The System shall include the following roadless, wild, and wilderness areas within the national forests: Caribou, Little Indian Sioux, and Superior Roadless Areas, Superior National Forest, Minn.; Chiricahua Wild Area, Coronado National Forest, Ariz.; Galiuro Wild Area, Crook National Forest, Ariz.; Sierra Ancha Wild Area, Tonto National Forest, Ariz.; Cucamonga Wild Area, San Bernardino National Forest, Calif.; Hoover Wild Area, Toiyabe and Inyo National Forests, Calif.; San Gorgonio Wild Area, San Bernardino National Forest, Calif.; Thousand Lakes Wild Area, Lassen National Forest, Calif.; Yolla Bolly-Middle Eel Wilderness Area, Mendocina and Trinity National Forests, Calif.; Maroon Bells-Snowmass Wild Area, White River National Forest, Colo.; Mount Zirkel-Dome Peak Wild Area, Routt National Forest, Colo.; Gates of the Mountains Wild Area, Helena National Forest, Mont.; San Pedro Parks Wild Area, Santa Fe National Forest, N. Mex.; Linville Gorge Wild Area, Pisgah National Forest, N. C.; Diamond Peak Wild Area, Willamette National Forest, Oreg.; Gearhart Mountain Wild Area, Fremont National Forest, Oreg.; Kalmiopsis Wild Area, Siskiyou National Forest, Oreg.; Mount Hood Wild Area, Mount Hood National Forest, Oreg.; Mount Washington Wild Area, Willamette National Forest, Oreg.; Mountain Lakes Wild Area, Rogue River National Forest, Oreg.; Strawberry Mountain Wild Area, Malheur National Forest, Oreg.; Three Sisters Wilderness Area, Deschutes and Willamette Area, in portions of Gifford Pinchot and Snoqualmie National Forests, Oreg.; Goat Rocks Wild Area, Gifford Pinchot National Forest, Wash.; Mount Adams Wild Area, Gifford Pinchot National Forest, Wash.; Mazatzal Wilderness Area, Tonto National Forest, Ariz.; Superstition Wilderness Area, in portions of the Crook and Tonto National Forests, Ariz.; Marble Mountain Wilderness Area, Klamath National Forest, Calif.; Bob Marshall Wilderness Area, in portions of the Flathead and Lewis and Clark National Forests, Mont.; Gila Wilderness Area, Gila National Forest, N. Mex.; Pecos Wilderness Area, in portions of the Santa Fe and Carson National Forests, N. Mex.; Eagle Cap Wilderness Area, in portions of Wallowa and Whitman National Forests, Oreg.; North Absaroka Wilderness Area and South Absaroka Wilderness Area, both in the Shoshone National Forest, Wyo.; Teton Wilderness Area, Teton National Forest, Wyo.

Additional wilderness and wild areas may be designated for inclusion in this System by the Secretary of Agriculture. Such designations shall be reported, with maps and descriptions, to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council established hereunder. These designations by January 1, 1966, shall include, but shall not necessarily be limited to, the following areas within the national forests classified as primitive by the Department of Agriculture on January 1, 1956, with such modifications in boundaries as may be made upon reclassification as wilderness or wild:

AREAS CLASSIFIED PRIMITIVE

Blue Range Primitive Area, Apache and Crook National Forests, Ariz. and N. Mex.; Mount Baldy Primitive Area, Apache National Forest, Ariz.; Pine Mountain Primitive Area, Prescott and Tonto National Forests, Ariz.; Sycamore Canyon Primitive Area, Coconino, Kaibab, and Prescott National Forests, Ariz.; Agua Tibia Primitive Area, Cleveland National Forest, Calif.; Caribou Peak Primitive Area, Lassen National Forest, Calif.; Desolation Valley Primitive Area, Eldorado National Forest, Calif.; Devil Canyon-Bear Canyon Primitive Area, Angeles National Forest, Calif.; Emigrant Basin Primitive Area, Stanislaus National Forest, Calif.; High Sierra Primitive Area, Inyo, Sierra, and Sequoia National Forests, Calif.; Mount Dana-Minarets Primitive Area, Inyo and Sierra National Forests, Calif.; Salmon Trinity Alps Primitive Area, Klamath, Shasta, and Trinity National Forests, Calif.; San Jacinto Primitive Area, San Bernardino National Forest, Calif.; San Rafael Primitive Area, Los Padres National Forest, Calif.; South Warner Primitive Area, Modoc National Forest, Calif.; Ventana Primitive Area, Los Padres National Forest, Calif.; Flat Tops Primitive Area, White River National Forest, Colo.; Gore Range-Eagle Nest Primitive Area, Arapaho and White River National Forests, Colo.; La Garita-Sheep Mountain Primitive Area, Gunnison, Rio Grande, and San Isabel National Forests, Colo.; Rawah Primitive Area, Roosevelt National Forest, Colo.; San Juan Primitive Area, San Juan National Forest, Colo.; Uncompahgre Primitive Area, Uncompahgre National Forest, Colo.; Upper Rio Grande Primitive Area, Rio Grande National Forest, Colo.; West Elk Primitive Area, Gunnison National Forest, Colo.; Wilson Mountains Primitive Area, San Juan National Forest, Colo.; Idaho Primitive Area, Challis, Salmon, and Payette National Forests, Idaho; Sawtooth Primitive Area, Boise, Challis, and Sawtooth National Forests, Idaho; Selway-Bitterroot Primitive Area, Clearwater, Nezperce, Lolo, and Bitterroot National Forests, Idaho and Mont.; Absaroka Primitive Area, Gallatin National Forest, Mont.; Anaconda-Pintlar Primitive Area, Beaverhead, Bitterroot, and Deerlodge National Forests, Mont.; Beartooth Primitive Area, Gallatin and Custer National Forests, Mont.; Cabinet Mountains Primitive Area, Cabinet and Kootenai National Forests, Mont.; Mission Mountains Primitive Area, Flathead National Forest, Mont.; Spanish Peaks Primitive Area, Gallatin National Forest, Mont.; Black Range Primitive Area, Gila National Forest, N. Mex.; White Mountain Primitive Area, Lincoln National Forest, N. Mex.; Mount Jefferson Primitive Area, Deschutes, Mount Hood, and Willamette National Forests, Oreg.; High Uintas Primitive Area, Ashley and Wasatch National Forests, Utah; North Cascade Primitive Area, Chelan and Mount Baker National Forests, Washington; Bridger Primitive Area, Bridger National Forest, Wyo.; Cloud Peak Primitive Area, Bighorn National Forest, Wyo.; Glacier Primitive Area, Shoshone National Forest, Wyo.; Popo Agie Primitive Area, Shoshone National Forest, Wyo.; Stratified Primitive Area, Shoshone National Forest, Wyo.

Addition to or modification or elimination of wilderness, wild, or roadless areas shall be in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish in conformity with the purposes of this act. Copies of such regulations and any subsequent amendments shall be forwarded to and filed by the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council established hereunder.

Any addition, modification, or elimination of any national forest area or part thereof to, in, or from the System shall be made only after not less than 90 days' public notice in acordance with section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 238, U. S. C. 5:1003), and the holding of a public hearing, if requested, and shall be reported with map and description to the secretary of the said National Wilderness Preservation Council and shall take effect as provided in subsection (f) below.

NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM AREAS

(b) The System shall include, at the times and in the manner hereinafter provided for, the following units of the National Park System: Acadia National Park, Maine; Arches National Monument, Utah; Badlands National Monument, S. Dak.; Big Bend National Park, Tex.; Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument, Colo.; Bryce Canyon National Park, Utah; Capitol Reef National Monument, Utah; Carlsbad Caverns National Park, N. Mex.; Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, N. C.; Channel Islands National Monument, Calif.; Chiricahua National Monument, Ariz.; Colorado National Monument, Colo.; Crater Lake National Park, Oreg.; Craters of the Moon National Monument, Idaho; Death Valley National Monument, Calif. and Nev.; Devils Postpile National Monument, Calif.; Dinosaur National Monument, Colo. and Utah; Everglades National Park, Fla.; Glacier National Park, Mont.; Glacier Bay National Monument, Alaska; Grand Canyon National Park and Grand Canyon National Monument, Ariz.; Grand Teton National Park, Wyo.; Great Smoky Mountains National Park, N. C. and Tenn.; Hawaii National Park, T. H.; Isle Royale National Park, Mich.; Joshua Tree National Monument, Calif.; Katmai National Monument, Alaska; Kings Canyon National Park, California; Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif.; Lava Beds National Monument, Calif.; Mammoth Cave National Park, Ky.; Mesa Verde National Park, Colo.; Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska; Mount Rainier National Park, Wash.; Olympic National Park, Wash.; Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument, Ariz.; Petrified Forest National Monument, Ariz.; Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo.; Saguaro National Monument, Ariz.; Sequoia National Park, Calif.; Shenandoah National Park, Va.; Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, N. Dak.; White Sands National Monument, N. Mex.; Wind Cave National Park, S. Dak.; Yellowstone National Park, Idaho, Mont., and Wyo.; Yosemite National Park, Calif.; and Zion National Park, Utah.

Additional units of the National Park System may be designated for inclusion in the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

System by act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President. No unit of the National Park System shall be removed from the System except by act of Congress.

Ninety days after giving public notice in accordance with section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 238, U. S. C. 5: 1003) the Secretary of the Interior shall designate within each unit of the National Park System named for inclusion in the System such area or areas as he shall determine to be required for roads, motor trails, buildings, accommodations for visitors, and administrative installations. A notice of each such designation, together with a map and description of the affected area or areas, shall be forwarded to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council established hereunder. Each such unit of the National Park System, exclusive of such area designated as required for roads, motor trails, buildings, accommodations for visitors, and administrative installations, shall become part of the National Wilderness Preservation System when this designation has been made. Designations shall be made not later than January 1, 1966, or within 2 years after the unit has been added to the System, whichever is later. Should the Secretary fail to make such a designation for any such unit of the National Park System within the time limit specified, that unit shall in its entirety automatically then become a part of the System.

No designation of an area for roads, motor trails, buildings, accommodations for visitors, or administrative installations shall modify or affect the application to that area of the provisions of the act approved August 25, 1916, entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes." (39 Stat. 535, as amended; U. S. C. 16: 1 et seq.) The accommodations and installations in such designated areas shall be incident to the conservation and use and enjoyment of the scenery and the natural and historic objects and flora and fauna of the park or monument in its natural condition.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGES AND RANGES

(c) The System shall include, at the times and in the manner hereinafter provided for, the following national wildlife refuges and ranges: Aleutian Islands National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska; Aransas National Wildlife Refuge, Tex.; Bogoslof National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska.; Cabeza Prieta Game Range, Ariz.; Cape Romain National Wildlife Refuge, S. C.; Charles Sheldon Antelope Range, Nev.; Delta National Wildlife Refuge, La.; Desert Game Range, Nev.; Fort Peck Game Range, Mont.; Kenai National Moose Range, Alaska; Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska; Kofa Game Range, Ariz.; Moosehorn National Wildlife Refuge, Maine; Montana National Bison Range, Mont.; Nunivak National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska; Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge, Ga.; Red Rock Lakes Migratory Waterfowl Refuge, Mont.; Seney National Wildlife Refuge, Mich.; Sheldon National Antelope Refuge, Nev.; Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, Okla.

Additional national wildlife refuges and ranges or areas therein may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior for inclusion in the System. Such designations shall be reported, with maps and descriptions, to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council established hereunder. No wildlife refuge or range shall be removed from the System except by act of Congress.

Ninety days after giving public notice in accordance with section 4, Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 238, U. S. C. 5: 1003) the Secretary of the Interior shall designate within each national wildlife refuge and range or area therein named for inclusion in the System such area or areas as he shall determine to be required for roads and buildings and other installations for administration and protection of the refuge or range for wildlife. A notice of each such designation together with a map and description of the affected area or areas shall be forwarded to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council established hereunder. Each national wildlife refuge and range or area therein named for inclusion in the System, exclusive of such area designated as required for roads and buildings and other installations for administration and protection of the refuge or range for wildlife, shall become part of the National Wilderness Preservation System when this designation has been so made for that national wildlife refuge or range or area therein. Designations shall be made not later than January 1, 1966, or within 2 years after a refuge or range or area therein has been added to the System, whichever is later. Should the Secretary fail to make such a designation for any such national wildlife refuge or range or area therein within the time limits specified, that refuge or range or area therein shall in its entirety automatically then become a part of the System.

THE INDIANS' WILDERNESS

(d) The System shall include the following roadless areas and wild areas within Indian reservations and such additional roadless and wild areas on Indian reservations as the Secretary of the Interior may designate, but no such area shall be included until the tribe or band within whose reservation it lies, through its tribal council or other duly constituted authority, shall have given its consent to the inclusion of the area within the System: Black Mesa Roadless Area, Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.; Black River Roadless Area, Fort Apache and San Carlos Indian Reservations, Ariz.; Columbia-San Poil Divide Roadless Area, Colville Indian Reservation, Wash.; Fort Charlotte Wild Area, Grand Portage Indian Reservation, Minn.; Goat Rocks Roadless Area, Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash.; Grand Canyon Roadless Area, Hualapai Indian Reservation, Ariz.; Grand Portage Wild Area, Grand Portage Indian Reservation, Minn.; Mesa Verde Roadless Area, Consolidated Ute Indian Reservation, Colo.; Mount Adams Wild Area, Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash.; Mount Jefferson Roadless Area, Warm Springs Indian Reservation, Oreg.; Mount Thomas Roadless Area, Fort Apache Indian Reservation, Ariz.; Mission Range Roadless Area, Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont.; Painted Desert Roadless Area, Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.; Rainbow Bridge Roadless Area, Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.; Wind River Mountains Roadless Area, Shoshone Indian Reservation, Wyo.

Any proposed addition, modification, or elimination of roadless and wild areas within Indian reservations shall be in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior shall establish in conformity with the purposes of this act subject to the consent of the several tribes or bands, through their tribal councils or other duly constituted authorities, each with regard to the area or areas within its jurisdiction. Any addition, modification, or elimination shall be reported with map and description, to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council. Nothing in this act shall in any respect abrogate any treaty with any band or tribe of Indians, or in any way modify or otherwise affect existing hunting and fishing rights or privileges.

OTHER UNITS

(e) The System shall also include such units as may be designated within any federally owned or controlled land and/or water by the official or officials authorized to determine the use of the lands and waters involved. Addition to or modification or elimination of such units shall be in accordance with regulations that shall be established in conformity with the purposes of this act by the official or officials authorized to determine the use of the lands and waters involved, and said official or officials shall forward a notice of such addition, modification, or elimination to the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council.

ADDITIONS, MODIFICATIONS, AND ELIMINATIONS

(f) Any proposed addition to, modification of, or elimination from the National Wilderness Preservation System otherwise than by act of Congress, except on Indian reservations, shall upon receipt of notice be reported to Congress within 10 days by the secretary of the National Wilderness Preservation Council and shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of 120 calendar days, of continuous session of Congress, following the date on which the report is received by Congress; but only if during this period there has not been passed by either House of Congress a resolution opposing such proposed addition, modification, or elimination. Within any federally owned unit within the National Wilderness Preservation System the acquisition of any privately owned lands is hereby authorized and such sums as the Congress may decide are hereby authorized to be appropriated for such acquisition out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

USE OF THE WILDERNESS

SEC. 3. (a) Nothing in this act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purpose stated in the establishment of any national park or monument, national forest, national wildlife refuge, Indian reservation, or other Federal land area involved, except that any agency administering any area within the National Wilderness Preservation System shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area and shall so administer such area for such other purpose or purposes as to preserve also its wilderness character. The National Wilderness Preservation System shall be devoted to the public purposes of recreational, educational, scenic, scientific, conservation, and historical uses. All such use shall be in harmony, both in kind and degree, with the wilderness environment and with its preservation.

The administration of wilderness, wild, and roadless areas in the national forests as units of the System shall be in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish in conformity with the purposes of this act. The administration of the included national parks, national monuments, and wildlife refuges and ranges as units of the System shall be in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior shall establish in conformity with the purposes of this act. The administration of roadless and wild areas within Indian reservations included in the System shall be in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior shall establish in conformity with the purposes of this act subject to the consent of the several tribes or bands, through their tribal councils or other duly constituted authorities, each with regard to the area or areas within its jurisdiction. The administration of any other area added to the System and not otherwise provided for in this section shall be in accordance with such regulations as shall be established by the official or officials authorized to determine the use of the lands and waters involved. Copies of the regulations established for such administration of any unit or units of the System and copies of any subsequent amendments thereto shall be forwarded, by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, or such other official or officials as shall establish such regulations, to the secretary of the

National Wilderness Preservation Council. The Council shall maintain a public file of such regulations but shall have no administrative jurisdiction over any unit in the System nor over any agency that does have such jurisdiction.

(b) Except as otherwise provided in this section, and subject to existing private rights (if any), no portion of any area constituting a unit of the National Wilderness Preservation System shall be devoted to commodity production, to lumbering, prospecting, mining or the removal of mineral deposits (including oil and gas), grazing by domestic livestock (other than by animals in connection with the administration or recreational, educational, or scientific use of the wilderness), water management practices involving diversion, impoundment, storage, or the manipulation of plant cover (except as required on national wildlife refuges and ranges for the management of habitat in maintaining wildlife populations), or to any form of commercial enterprise except as contemplated by the purposes of this act. Within such areas, except as otherwise provided in this section and in section 2 of this act, there shall be no road, nor any use of motor vehicles, or motorboats, or landing of aircraft, nor any other mechanical transport or delivery of persons or supplies, nor any structure or installation in excess of the minimum required for the administration of the area for the purposes of this act.

SPECIAL PROVISIONS

(c) The following special provisions are hereby made:

(1) Roads over national forest lands included in the System reserved from the public domain and necessary for ingress and egress to or from privately owned property shall be, and roads over national forest lands otherwise acquired may be, allowed under appropriate conditions determined by the forest supervisor.

(2) Within national forest areas included in the System grazing of domestic livestock and the use of aircraft or motorboats where these practices have already become well established may be permitted to continue subject to such restrictions as the Chief of the Forest Service deems desirable. Such practices shall be recognized as nonconforming use of the area of wilderness involved and shall be terminated whenever this can be effected with equity to, or in agreement with, those making such use.

(3) Nothing in this act shall modify the restrictions and provisions of the Shipstead-Nolan Act, Public Law 539, 71st Congress, 2d session, July 10, 1930, and the Humphrey-Thye-Blatnik-Andresen Act, Public Law 607, 84th Congress, 2d session, June 22, 1956, as applying to the Superior National Forest or the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture.

(4) Any existing use authorized or provided for in the Executive order or legislation establishing any national wildlife refuge or range may be continued in accordance with permit granted under such authorization or provision, but any nonconforming use of the areas of wilderness involved shall be terminated whenever this can be effected with equity to, or in agreement with, those making such use.

NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION COUNCIL

SEC. 4. (a) A National Wilderness Preservation Council is hereby created to consist ex-officio of the persons at the time designated as the chief of the United States Forest Service, the director of the National Park Service, the director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and also six citizen members known to be informed regarding, and interested in the preservation of, wilderness, two of whom shall be named initially for terms of 2 years, 2 for terms of 4 years, and 2 for terms of 6 years, by the President. After the expiration of these initial terms, each citizen member shall be appointed for a 6-year term. When initial or subsequent appointments are to be made to this Council any established national organization interested in wilderness preservation may make recommendations to the President regarding candidates any of whom would be deemed suitable for appointment to the Council. The President shall designate from among its members a chairman, who shall serve for a 2-year term. The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution shall be the secretary of the Council and, subject to the Council, shall maintain its headquarters.

(b) The Council shall serve as the repository for, and shall maintain available for public inspection, such maps and official papers regarding the National Wilderness Preservation System as may be filed with it. Upon receipt of a report of a proposed addition, modification, or elimination of an area as required under section 2 of this act, the secretary of the Council shall report within 10 days such proposed action to the Senate and to the House of Representatives. The Council shall serve as a nonexclusive clearinghouse for exchange of information among the agencies administering areas within the System. The Council shall make, sponsor, and coordinate surveys of wilderness needs and conditions and gather and disseminate information, including maps, for the information of the public regarding use and preservation of the areas of wilderness within the System, including information and maps regarding State and other non-Federal areas which the Council shall consider important to wilderness preservation. The Council is directed to consult with, advise, and invoke the aid of the President, the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture, and other appropriate officers of the United States Government and to assist in obtaining cooperation in wilderness preservation and use among Federal and State agencies and private agencies and organizations concerned therewith. The Council, through its chairman, shall annually present to Congress, not later than the first Monday in December, a report on the operations of the Council during the preceding fiscal year and on the status of the National Wilderness Preservation System at the close of that fiscal year, including an annotated list of the areas in the System showing their size, location, and administering agency, and shall make such recommendations to Congress as the Council shall deem advisable.

(c) The Council shall meet annually and at such times between annual meetings as the Council shall determine, or upon call of the chairman or any three members. Members of the Council shall serve as such without compensation but shall receive transportation expenses and in addition a per diem payment to be fixed by the Council, not to exceed $25 a day, as reimbursement for expenditures in connection with attending any meeting of the Council. A sum sufficient to pay the necessary clerical and administrative expenses of the Council and its members, not to exceed an annual expenditure of $50,000, and such additional sums as the Congress may decide for carrying out the purposes of the Council, including printing, are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. The Council is authorized to accept private gifts and benefactions to be used to further the purposes of this act, and such gifts and benefactions shall be deductible from income for Federal tax purposes and shall be exempt from Federal estate tax.

SEC. 5. This act shall be known by the short title "National Wilderness Preservation Act."



[From the New York Times of February 3, 1957]

CONSERVATION: WILDS—A BILL IN CONGRESS AND A CONFERENCE SEEK TO SAVE WILDERNESS AREAS

(By John B. Oakes)

Of all the conservation problems facing the new Congress, none is more important—or likely to cause more controversy—than the bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System. This measure was introduced last session by two of Congress' leading conservationists, Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, Republican, of Pennsylvania, and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota. It has already been reintroduced this session by Mr. SAYLOR and at least five other Members of Congress.

The basic purpose of the bill, which was discussed in this column for May 13, 1956, is to establish existing Federal wilderness preserves on a firm legislative foundation. Of the 2¼ billion acres in the United States, some 58 million—a mere 2.5 percent of the total—are protected wilderness areas, almost all of which are on federally owned or controlled land. The bulk of these unspoiled and as yet uninvaded tracts of mountain or forest country have been designated as wilderness merely by administrative action, and they can be wiped out by administrative action as well. The proposed bill would make it a matter of national policy to preserve forever intact these last remnants of primeval America against the increasing pressures of exploiters and developers.

SIERRA CLUB MEETING

A conference on the necessity of erecting more adequate defenses around America's vanishing wilderness will be held next month in San Francisco under auspices of the Sierra Club, one of the Nation's leading conservation organizations. Special attention at this gathering—known as the Fifth Biennial Wilderness Conference—will be paid to the extent to which dedicated primitive areas, believed safely set aside, are coming under the threat of commercial exploitation and to what desirable areas may still be added to the Nation's scenic resources.

In this connection, the Sierra Club itself has proposed a National Scenic Resources Review, a full-scale inquiry by a commission appointed by the President "to find what scenic resources are still left, to make an estimate of the future's need for them, and to devise ways of protecting them in time." As David R. Brower, the Sierra Club's dynamic executive director, points out, commodity producers—those who use up the Nation's natural resources—are planning their requirements many years ahead. But what about the conservationists, who want to preserve some of those resources—particularly the scenic resources—for permanent, nonmaterial, nonexploitative enjoyment? We do know what lands have been set aside in parks and preserves; but we simply do not know how much usage those lands can sustain and we do not yet know what other areas could and should be preserved against all inroads, for the benefit of future generations.

SPIRITUAL NEEDS, TOO

In his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower specifically noted that the conservation and development of "our soil, water, mineral, forest, fish and wildlife resources * * * are vital to the present and future strength of the Nation." The President surely could not have meant to allude only to material strength. Conscious as he evidently is of the spiritual needs of the people, he doubtless meant also to draw attention to the intangible but very real values of America's incomparable scenic resources as well. A major effort such as the

Sierra Club suggests, to determine through a Presidential commission just what are these resources, what are the conflicting demands, and what are the highest uses, ought to have a strong appeal to the President.

The Sierra Club's proposal is spelled out by Mr. Brower in an article entitled "Scenic Resources for the Future," in last December's Sierra Club Bulletin, which, in that issue at least, is no bulletin but a handsomely illustrated magazine containing material of interest to conservationists not only on the west coast but all over the country.

Particularly relevant to the problem of wilderness preservation is an article by Grant McConnell, professor of political science at the University of California, on the Cascades Wilderness, a little-known area of northwest Washington that is at present only partially protected against incursion and yet is described as scenically "among the superlative areas of the continent." This region, according to Professor McConnell, is under rapidly growing pressure for expolitation of its undoubted timber and possible mineral resources. It is relevant to ask whether areas of such completely primitive quality and remarkable beauty should not be maintained for a much higher purpose than transitory but destructive commercial development. Such areas, as Professor McConnell remarks, could well be considered not only as the playgrounds of the Nation, but rather its sanctuaries.

---

EXHIBIT 1

COMPILATION OF EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS TO THE HONORABLE JOHN P. SAYLOR REGARDING THE WILDERNESS BILL FROM EDUCATORS AND SCIENTISTS

James Munro, associate professor at the University of Oregon School of Law, Eugene, Oreg., writes:

"The general purpose of this bill is most constructive and helpful. For years we have needed legislation which would give greater protection to wilderness country. This bill would accomplish this purpose and, in addition, would provide an orderly procedure for the expansion of wilderness. In my opinion this Nation will need in the future not less, but more of these areas, where, in the words of the bill . . . 'the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a member of the natural community who visits but does not remain and whose travels leave only trails.' "

Robert E. Gregg, of the department of biology, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo., writes:

"Wilderness areas and all natural features are so delicately balanced that the least interference by man inevitably modifies them and in many instances destroys them beyond recovery."

Dr. Gregg emphasizes that the spiral of rapidly rising populations is creating pressures which can be harmful to the integrity of wilderness, and he writes that this is of great concern to biologists and ecologists as well as to other persons. In speaking of the pressures upon the national parks, Dr. Gregg feels that a national wilderness preservation system would "unquestionably . . . strengthen the hands of the administrative personnel whose job of guarding the values of the parks now all but overwhelms them." He continues:

"If we are going to save wilderness, and really mean it, then we have got to save wilderness with decidedly firm policies, for the fundamental and undeniable reason that wilderness will not tolerate any halfway measures and compromises. And the people who administer must be dedicated to the work for its sake, resistant to any additional opening of the wilderness which is now reduced to minimum levels that will permit self-perpetuation. . . . The best managed wild area is the one receiving the least so-called management, for it is not wilderness that needs managing but rather man who needs to be managed!

"It is becoming even more apparent that wild areas and their contained animals and plants constitute a limitless reserve of genetic or hereditary materials, the potentiality of which can be glimpsed by considering the achievements of plant and animal breeding. Such breeding has been chiefly among already domesticated species, but consider the possibilities when perpetually maintained wild populations are investigated. This is a resource of the first magnitude, and it must not be lost. It is one that can be most easily destroyed, but fortunately one which can reproduce itself interminably if so permitted.

"Aside from the foregoing, there are many other reasons, scientific and cultural, to support the passage of a wilderness preservation act . . ."

From other scientists and educators have come such expressions as these—

Armin K. Lobeck, professor emeritus of geology, Columbia University: "There is no time to be lost in alerting this Nation to the need of preserving wilderness areas and of establishing new ones while it is still possible to do so."

Tom McKnight, assistant professor, department of geography, University of California, Los Angeles: "I firmly believe that this legislation, if passed, will prove to be one of the 2 or 3 most significant conservation measures in the history of the United States. For my grandchildren and their grandchildren, I thank you."

Lawrence S. Hamilton, associate professor of forestry, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.: "I am certainly very interested in the subject of wilderness preservation and * * * support this measure, and your remarks on the subject."

L. G. Hines, professor of economics, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.: "It is hard for me to express how strongly I agree with you on this matter."

Lloyd C. Hulbert, assistant professor, department of botany and plant pathology, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans.: "Perhaps the most important provision, at the present time, is the one that will allow control of mining claims, which certainly is a major threat to many areas at present. Also important is the part of the bill which strengthens the agencies such as the Forest Service in maintaining the wilderness and wild areas which they have set aside."

Sherman P. Lawton, President, Oklahoma Anthropological Society, University of Oklahoma, Norman: "The bill represents an action which the Oklahoma Anthropological Society hopes can be approved by the next (85th) Congress."

Harry L. Buckalew, principal, Jefferson School, Fresno, Calif.: "I can conceive of no higher form of patriotism than the preservation of parts of our wonderful national heritage of unmatched natural beauty for ourselves and for generations yet unborn. The time is late and the urgency immediate."

In addition to the above expressions of approval have come from the following educators and scientists: S. C. Dellinger, head, department of zoology, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Henry I. Kohn, M. D., radiological laboratory, University of California, San Francisco; John H. Cover, director, College of Business and Public Administration, University of Maryland, College Park; Leroy B. Nydegger, associate professor of biology, Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa; George C. Wheeler, department of biology, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks; William F. Kimes, assistant superintendent in charge of business, Orange Coast College, Costa Mesa, Calif.; Lloyd A. Rider, conservation chairman, New York Association of Biology Teachers.

FROM CONSERVATION ADMINISTRATORS

Unsolicited letters of approval have been received from the following State conservation administrators: Paul D. Dalke, Leader, Idaho Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit; Henry H. Brown, New Mexico Game and Fish Commission; I. T. Quinn, Executive Director, Virginia Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries; C. Eric Reppun, President, Board of Agriculture and Forestry, Territory of Hawaii.

Seth Gordon, Director of the California Department of Fish and Game writes: "We have read your proposed Wilderness Bill and feel it is a real step forward in the conservation of the wild lands remaining in the Nation. Rest assured that we are heartily behind your program."

Dave Gaskill, geologist, writes:

"Establishment of a National Wilderness Preservation System is an almost desperately needed measure if we are to preserve the remnants of our country's pristine beauty from man's inexorable campaign to subvert every wild spot on earth. . . .

"Most of us are quite aware of the never-ending, ever increasing commercial efforts to render unto themselves that which might be gained from any source, even God's purest temples, and we are all more or less a party in this race to 'feed ourselves and our Nation's economic appetite.'

"I know from my own experiences that wilderness values cannot be measured in monetary terms, for they stem from the very wellspring of life. My own most treasured moments have been lived among innumerable frost-shattered, ice-scalloped peaks and passes, tundra gardens, untrampled forests, wilderness fiords, and canyon lands of the Colorado Plateau. Nor can we experience these values from the highways and beaten paths, for each wilderness jewel lies beyond the outposts of civilization, and none survive for long the trampling and 'improvement' of man.

"This bill defines a need, and offers basic legislation, with legal responsibility for preserving these values. I agree that the chief threats to wilderness in our parks is from road extensions and so-called recreational developments; the latter of which is rapidly bringing our national parks into competition with amusement parks everywhere while offering the possibility of nobler Coney Islands with scenic backdrops."

FROM SPIRITUAL LEADERS

Reverend Arthur W. Brandt, St. Catherine's Rectory, Quarryville, Pa., writes: "I hope it [the measure] will go far toward saving America's wilderness. I know you realize the magnitude of your undertaking."

Robert McConnell Hatch, Suffragan Bishop of Connecticut: "I am familiar with the provisions of the bill, and I feel that they have been worked out with an acute awareness of all the needs that are involved in this matter. I feel that it is a wonderfully good bill, and I greatly hope that it will be enacted. The cause of wilderness preservation is very dear to my heart."

Mrs. James M. Evans, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America: "It is a bill important to the future of our country and to future generations."

Professor Otto A. Piper, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.: "A rather extended trip through our country, during the summer months, has convinced me both of the wonderful treasures we possess in our wilderness, and the serious threat that advancing civilization and military demands make on those areas.

"All who think in terms of coming generations, and not only of the actual, or imaginary, needs of the present day, do hope sincerely that the new Congress will enact your bill."

FROM PHYSICIANS AND PSYCHIATRISTS

Robert C. Murphy, Jr., M. D., Waverly, Pa.: "I think the preservation of islands of beauty in our scarred and plundered planet is as important as life itself."

William C. Menninger, M. D., Topeka, Kans.: "I'm deeply interested and concerned about the preservation of our wilderness system and all that implies in our forests, national parks, wildlife refuges and ranges, and our Indian reservation areas. I just wish there were many more of them."

Sidney F. Thomas, M. D., Palo Alto Medical Clinic, Palo Alto, Calif.: "The need for this is apparent, especially here on the west coast where intrusions by roads and industry are diminishing the effect of many of the wilderness areas."

In addition, commendatory letters have come from Harold E. Crowe, M. D., Los Angeles, Calif.; Karl Menninger, M. D., Topeka, Kans.; James C. White, M. D., Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston; Eugene R. Grether, M. D., Alexandria, Va.

FROM CONSERVATION LEADERS

Fairfield Osborn, president of the New York Zoological Society, writes: "Please allow me to express our warm approval of the Wilderness Bill."

Mrs. Neil Haig, trustee and conservation chairman, Seattle Audubon Society, Seattle, Wash.: "We heartily endorse the efforts of the nonpartisan sponsorship in this matter. We favor this legislation and trust that it will receive the approval of the new Congress as much as it is meeting the approval of the public."

Mrs. C. Reed Cary, chairman of conservation reports, Conservation Council of Eastern Pennsylvania:

"After careful reading of your excellent preamble and the proposed bill itself, I think you have avoided every possible objection the AFA [American Forestry Association] could have and I sincerely hope they will join with all lovers of wilderness areas in writing this magnificent bill into law."

Letters of support have also been received from Mrs. LeRoy Clark, chairman, national parks committee, the Garden Club of America; Mrs. Arthur A. Dugdale, conservation chairman, the Garden Club of Virginia; Harold Kruse, president, Citizens Natural Resources Association of Wisconsin; Clifton R. Merritt, chairman, wilderness and refuge committee, Flathead Wildlife, Inc., Kalispell, Mont.; Joel H. Hildebrand, past president, Sierra Club, Berkeley, Calif.; Gerald R. Hunter, vice president, region III, Georgia Conservation League; Maurice Broun, board of directors, Hawk Mountain Sanctuary Association; Allston Jenkins, president, Philadelphia Conservationists, Inc.; and many others.

Philip Hyde, a distinguished photographer and wilderness traveler, writes:

"One of the things that concerns me a great deal is the continuing threat to wilderness areas from mining. I note that you are a member of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, so you may have some ideas on this. I do not deny the great need for strategic materials, and the great good that the mining industry has sometimes done for the country—but I have too often been made painfully aware of the great damage that mining can do. A few miles from my home are acres and acres of fine silt piles, tailings from a now defunct copper mine. In many parts of the county in which I reside are the unsightly traces of mining debris, and so often the story is one in which a mining group came in, on Federal land, that is, yours and my land, did whatever they pleased in the way of destroying timber, wrecking streams, tearing up topsoil, and otherwise creating havoc with the natural scene that they found. More often than not, they never found what they were looking for, or found it in such minute quantities that they abandoned the mess, and left for other parts, to repeat the process, leaving nature to repair the damage their wantonness caused.

"If this were a thing of the past, I should be saddened at the evidence of such frontier negligence, but go my way, secure in the belief that it could not happen in these enlightened days. But, it is certainly not a thing of the past. It goes on apace today, and this is where my concern mounts: It happens far too frequently in dedicated wilderness areas. This summer, I was privileged to visit an area of the Washington Cascades that contains some of the Nation's most superlative mountain scenery. This is an area now up for reclassification by the Forest Service, and about which you may have heard: the Glacier Peak Limited Area. Here, in the heart of this fine area, which has a tremendous value as wilderness because of its close proximity to the population centers of the Puget Sound region, mining operations are busily tearing up a large area on a ridge, from which one of the finest views of Glacier Peak is obtained. In an area of some square miles, timber has been wantonly cut, trash and debris scattered, mining tailings abound, and the scene generally resembles more the scene of a battle than the scene of a benevolent industry about its daily work. Some of this land is patented, from old mining claims, some of the debris is undoubtedly from older operations. But the new operation seems to be doing its best to maintain the standards of former years.

"It is my understanding that it was still not decided whether there was enough ore here, of a high enough grade to make it economical to take out. We can only hope there isn't. In any event, it is evidently a marginal operation. The big question is, can we afford to have a marginal mining operation in the heart of a superb wilderness area, whose recreational value should easily exceed whatever mineral value that is present?

"In the same area, a little farther along the trail, we camped beside a beautiful lake whose morning-still surface shimmeringly mirrors the glacier-clad slopes of Glacier Peak which rises across the deep Suiattle River canyon from the lake. That night we encountered a prospector, just coming over the ridge above the lake, who told us of his asbestos claim on a ridge far into the hinterlands to the north. He opined that his claim wouldn't be much good if he had to carry the stuff out on burros, as he was prospecting. But he was confident that the Government would build him an access road up this "inaccessible" canyon, and make it easy for him. How much asbestos he might get out is anybody's guess. Would it be worth the cost of the road? Quite probably not. Would it be worth the irreparable loss of the large segment of the wilderness that the road would cut and destroy? How much asbestos for several dozens of square miles of wilderness? How critical a mineral is asbestos? How short is it in supply?—as short in supply as wilderness? I think not. But his chances of getting his road may be better than the chances of over a million people in the Seattle area seeing this area without a road, in its pristine natural state."

"How much longer can we afford to give the mining industry carte blanche in our public lands and wilderness, to do as they please with it, wreck, destroy, and leave virtually permanent debris, whether or not there is mineral to justify it, and whether or not the area has a higher potential value used for something else than a graveyard for mining stocks?"

FROM OUTDOOR GROUPS

Al Jenkins, president, Billings Rod and Gun Club, Billings, Mont., writes:

"We have gone on record endorsing your bill and will help in every way possible to make it become a reality. Our club is made up of 1,500 spirited people who are interested in conservation of natural resources, hunting, fishing, and outdoor recreation. Many members are intensely interested in wilderness preservation for its invaluable primitive aspects and for preserving diminishing species of fish and wildlife that are making their last stand against the advance of civilization and man.

"Educational, scientific, and spiritual value must not be overlooked when evaluating wilderness. When roads, mechanical vehicles, or exploitation takes place, these God-made wonders lose most of their value. The United States covers such vast and varied areas that we believe the few million acres set aside as wilderness would not affect the economy of our Nation or its people where esthetic values are an issue. The President of our country and all the thinking people of today are concerned with our young people and what the future might hold for them. Is it possible to have a strong nation or good government without healthy, strong, and spirited people to guide its destinies and to protect our heritage and culture so dear to all of us? Clear thinking and great energy have made our Nation the envy of the world. Wilderness played a part in the beginning and is more essential than ever today for the part it will play in the future of our country. What we have today was preserved for us by men of great vision, always keeping in mind the needs of our people."

Tom Deckert, vice president, Montana Wildlife Federation:

"The people of the State of Montana, where well over half of its population might be classified as outdoor people, are tremendously interested in assisting in every way possible to make this excellent bill become a reality. We are very sincere in our belief that wilderness is a valuable natural resource that belongs to the people, and that its preservation for educational, scientific, and recreational use, along with restoration and propagation of fish and wildlife, is part of a balanced conservation program essential in the survival of a healthy, strong, spirited people so necessary if our civilized culture is to survive and our Nation be kept strong.

"We take special pleasure in the Wilderness Bill because it constitutes a step toward which our organization, together with many other groups and individual conservationists, has been working for so long. The people who value the things that make America beautiful will be ever grateful for what is being done to make wilderness preservation a reality."

Robert K. Koonce, president, Otero County Wildlife Association, Alamogordo, N. Mex.:

"The Wilderness Bill is the only hope for protecting wildernesses from commercial, military, and similar attrition which, at the present rate, is rapidly destroying them.

"Two local situations will illustrate.

"Northeast of here the Sierra Blanca (12,003) is the southernmost alpine, out-of-timberline peak in the United States. Rising from desert, it supports 6 of the 7 world life zones, from Sonoran Desert to Arctic-Alpine. A Forest Service wild area established several years ago should have preserved some of its ecological and recreational value.

"Today the resort town of Ruidoso invades and grows in the area, with roads instead of trails, stables, and nightclubs instead of trees and pure mountain streams. The Forest Service is in retreat, relocating the wild area on the opposite mountain slopes.

"Possibly the most unique natural attraction of all, the snowy gypsum dunes of White Sands National Monument originate in Lake Lucero to the west. Theoretically a written agreement between the Secretaries of War and Interior protects the monument from inroads. Nevertheless, roads, powerlines, and installations have been built in the Lake Lucero portion, harmful in themselves but

also inviting such depredation as pillaging of the spectacular crystal beds. In addition, a general military campaign of harassment is obviously aimed at taking over the entire monument when opportune. Anyone doubting this has only to remember the military attempt to make a private hunting preserve of newly acquired land here, a case with which you are doubtless familiar.

"Multiply these examples across the land and it is obvious that present administrative practices are unequal to the task of conserving our wildernesses intact, and that congressional action is the only reasonable long-range hope.

"Once we have lost the few lands remaining in their virgin, natural condition we will have lost values forever irreplaceable; and we will then have people walking around who are spiritually and therefore mentally and physically sick, wondering what is wrong with themselves and the world."

Robert J. Redinger, secretary, North Rocky Mountain Sportsmen's Association:

"By order of the membership of this organization, I am writing you concerning your Wilderness Bill.

"Our membership, at the regular meeting of November 20, 1956, has voted unanimously to go on record in support of this bill. You are to be congratulated for your sponsorship of this legislation. We feel that this bill is the best thus far, toward the assurance that we will always have a system of wilderness areas in this country."

Letters of approval from other outdoor groups include: J. A. Canade, secretary, Rock Tavern Rod and Gun Club, Maybrook, N. Y.; Don Maxwell, field director, Bird Club of Westfield, N. J.; R. O. Doolittle, public relations secretary, Peoria Rod and Gun Club, Peoria, Ariz.; A. W. Black, secretary, Albuquerque Game Protective Association, Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Marion Alman, chairman, National Conservation Committee, American Bowhunters Association, Louisville, Ky.; Oscar Hawksley, national conservation chairman, American White Water Affiliation, Warrensburg, Mo.; Walter S. Atwood, Green Mountain Club, Palisades Park, N. J.

FROM MEN OF LAW

United States Circuit Judge Albert Branson Maris states his personal feeling as follows: "I have read with a great deal of interest your speech delivered in the House on July 12 last in support of the bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System. Your speech is unanswerable and I am enthusiastically in accord with it. I have also read the text of the bill with some care and it seems to me to be well designed to carry out the objective of preserving the wilderness areas now owned by the Federal Government with the minimum interference with the control of those areas by the various agencies presently having them in charge. I assume that this is as far as we could have hoped to go at the present time. The machinery of the system can, of course, be further developed as experience dictates but the basic thing is to establish as law the principle that these wilderness areas are to be preserved intact and this your bill will certainly do."

Harvey Broome, attorney, Knoxville, Tenn. (and vice president of The Wilderness Society): "It is warming indeed to find such interest and understanding of wilderness needs in Congress. Future generations will always be in debt to Representatives like yourself [Mr. SAYLOR], and Mr. METCALF, of Montana, and to Senators HUMPHREY, KUCHEL, NEUBERGER, and others for your courageous and unstinting work on behalf of basic conservation legislation."

Robert Brown, attorney, St. Joseph, Mo.: "The least I can do is to express my thanks and to tell you that I am very much interested in the proposed legislation; that I think it is well considered and well drawn; and that I sincerely hope it is enacted into law."

Other attorneys who have written to declare their approval include: Bruce Bowler, Boise, Idaho; K. B. Steinmetz, Knoxville, Tenn.; V. J. Muench, Green Bay, Wis.; Arthur Roberts, Duluth, Minn.

Herbert J. Powell, architect, Los Angeles, Calif., writes:

"I wish to strongly endorse this bill. It has been my practice for many years to take walking trips through our High Sierra country and I know many people who enjoy this activity.

"We know, that once these wilderness areas are developed, it is impossible to ever again recapture that character which made them so attractive to a large body of Americans who enjoy a chance to get away from the pressures of civilization.

"It is my hope that the 85th Congress will adopt this measure and I wish to commend you for your activity in its behalf."

David S. Wood, councilman, city of Sierra Madre, Calif., writes: "I feel strongly that this is a wise and necessary step in national land use planning. I have found from personal experience that visits to wilderness areas from time to time are an invaluable aid in maintaining a balanced perspective toward life in our modern and complex society. Physical separation of one's person from the surroundings of the machine age render it considerably simpler to view that age and society with its complex (and fascinating) problem from an objective and detached point of view. I believe that such a process of standing off and looking at life from a distance, so to speak, is of the utmost value to the individual at appropriate intervals."

FROM PUBLISHERS AND WRITERS

George X. Sand, president, Florida Outdoor Writers Association, Deerfield Beach, Fla.:

"Since I happen to be president of the Florida Outdoor Writers Association, a statewide group of some 180 magazine, newspaper, radio, and TV writers, and programists, I am taking the liberty of recommending your proposed legislation to them for favorable consideration.

"You are to be complimented for making known the startling fact we have no legal assurance from Congress that our wilderness areas cannot be further exploited."

William Hard, roving editor, the Reader's Digest: "Much applause for your splendid contribution to wilderness preservation."

Louis Mecker, literary editor, the Kansas City Star: "I hope nothing will interfere to mitigate your efforts in this splendid cause."

William B. Edwards, technical editor, Guns magazine, Skokie, Ill.: "May I commend you on the approach and ideas contained in your plea for wilderness preservation by enactment of Federal legislation 'in perpetuity.' As I sit here looking out on the brick bungalow jungles of Greater Chicago, I remember even more vividly the peace and the sense of freedom which came to me in those infrequent moments when, on trips to national parks and other areas, I had been in 'the wilderness.' . . . In the wilderness man can touch the bedrock of human existence, and regain a point of view from which one can only look upward. This, from our present supposedly high spot on the scale of evolution, is important. It may give the man who is so occupied with material progress a reevaluation of where we are going, but knowing from what we have come."

Among other writers who have written in to encourage this bill are outdoor columnists John Willard, Helena, Mont., and Ralph A. Fisher, Sr., Phoenix, Ariz.

FROM BUSINESSMEN

Mortimer R. Proctor, president, Vermont Marble Co., Proctor, Vt.:

"I only wish to say that that is a subject very close to my heart and has been for many years. It almost seems like a sacrilege to see the way civilization is intruding on our wilderness areas.

"For many years I have hunted and fished and it is a sad aspect of changing times to see this most valuable asset for the happiness, wealth, and welfare of our people gradually destroyed."

Walter A. Schmidt, president, Western Precipitation Corp., Los Angeles, Calif., writes in approval, as do John R. Elliott, R. S. Elliott Arms Co., Kansas City, Mo.: C. F. Erwin, Erwin's Drugstore, Harbor Springs, Mich.; Oscar Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.

Michael Frome, Department of Public Relations, American Automobile Association, writes: "This is a matter that merits definite interest and study."

THE FAMILY INTEREST

R. P. MacIntosh, Alameda, Calif.: "I and my family pack into one of these areas in the High Sierra each summer. We know the values of these areas and we are in full support of your excellent work. Please continue for the benefit of all those Americans who enjoy the out-of-doors."

Mr. and Mrs. S. F. Nicol and Louise, Jim, Rob, and Lori, Stratford, Conn.: "It is difficult to express my feelings on this subject. I thank God there are men of foresight and courage to go ahead with this bill. I cannot believe that it will not pass. It is too important—too vital—to our generation—to future generations."

Mrs. Cornelius James Cannon, Cambridge, Mass.: "How people 100 years from now will bless you when they can leave their crowded cities to go to the wilderness you have preserved for them. I feel personally grateful as well as grateful for my children and grandchildren."

John Taylor, New York, N. Y.: "My wife and I deeply appreciate receiving information of such hope toward preserving those wonderful areas which mean so much to us and to some of our friends. Each year we go on a trip into a great peaceful area because as you have said there is a 'deep need for areas of solitude and quiet, for areas of wilderness where life has not yet given way to machinery.' Each trip helps us to adjust ourselves out of our pressures by impressing on us something much, much greater than we."

Henry S. Chafee, Providence, R. I.: "We who live in the East know that most of the national parks are in the West, and since we have lost so much of our own wilder areas, we are particularly interested in the preservation of such extensive tracts of land. Mrs. Chafee and I have visited a great many of the national parks and wilderness areas. We do not want them encroached upon so that our children and grandchildren may similarly enjoy them and obtain the peace of mind which comes from visits to them."

Warren E. Fisher, Glendale, Mo.:

"I am deeply interested in seeing to it that areas of wilderness are set aside and protected so that our children and all that come after us may have a place where they can become enrapport with Mother Nature and her creatures.

"We need it, too, as a place where we can meditate in peaceful quiet away from the tensions of our hectic everyday life that the spiritual man may be unfolded.

"I had the pleasure in 1954 of making a 10-day canoe trip through the Quetico Superior National Forest under auspices of the forestry association. It will never be forgotten; the call of the loons, the angelic song of the hermit thrush and the sad, sweet song of the white throated sparrow can still be heard when I sit quietly alone."

Mr. and Mrs. Allan B. Ross, Haddonfield, N. J.:

"We have been particularly concerned over the uranium mining activities of which we had first hand opportunity to observe re-

cently in some of the Western States. It is our sincere hope that the National Wilderness Preservation Bill will bring better control over this vicious exploitation.

"Another of our hopes has been that much of the road-building programs within all our public lands will be cut to a bare minimum for reasons well known to every true conservationist."

Kathe B. Leidke, West Englewood, N. J.: "Our family has read (your bill) with interest and we are proud and happy that you and others in our legislative branch of Government have taken up the matter with vigor and skill. We hope that a good law, to preserve the beauty and wilderness in parts of our country, will be passed in the 85th Congress."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Finally, Mr. President, I join in the request of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that the bill be held at the desk until the close of Senate business on Thursday to allow for additional cosponsorship if desired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, few Members of the Senate in our time have demonstrated so keen an interest in the preservation of natural resources as has the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

I am pleased again to be associated with him in the introduction and sponsorship of this bill which seeks to protect the relatively few outdoor solitudes left within the borders of our country. I think I can speak with some experience when I say that these upland fastnesses are the heritage of future generations of Americans quite as much as any other part of our legacy. It has been the privilege of my wife and me to camp and hike in some of these wilderness areas. There are a number in my State—some of the finest, in fact. Had some earlier generation permitted such fastnesses to be looted and wiped away, we would never have experienced this marvelous adventure. Surely we owe to the people who will come after us quite as much as our own predecessors have been obligated to us.

Mr. President, the urgent need for some form of congressional action to safeguard these scenic realms has just been indicated by a decision of the Department of Agriculture to remove from the Three Sisters Wilderness Area of Oregon some 53,000 acres of majestic forest canyons and ridges, as well as of supremely important botanical content. I ask that two telegrams which I have just received from Oregon conservationists appear at this point in the RECORD, for they highlight the importance of providing some congressional protection for our career foresters from the pressure and leverage of their political superiors, regardless of which party those superiors may represent.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 11, 1957.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

We understand Wilderness Bill is to be reintroduced soon with your cosponsorship. Recent decision regarding the Three Sisters shows how imperative is need for firmer protection of our wild lands. Our full support is with you.

AL SCHMITZ.

---

EUGENE, OREG., *February 11, 1957.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Pleased to learn that Senator HUMPHREY reintroducing Wilderness Preservation Bill Monday with your support. You can cite Three Sisters Wilderness decision as evidence such legislation urgently needed. Eugene Register-Guard has strong editorial today saying Wilderness boundaries now much too easily changed by administrative fiat alone and that Humphrey bill providing Wilderness System and requiring congressional sanction for boundary change should be reintroduced. Appreciate your good work.

KARL ONTHANK,
*President, Federation Western Outdoor Clubs.*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Let me state by way of explanation that these cogent messages are from Dr. Karl W. Onthank, of Eugene, Oreg., president of the Western Federation of Outdoor Clubs, and from Al Schmitz, of Portland, Oreg., one of the leaders in the famous Sierra Club.

I am not assailing, or attacking, or criticizing anyone in the Forest Service or in the Department of Agriculture for the Three Sisters decision. What I am saying is this: Such a decision is virtually for eternity. Once those 53,000 virgin acres have been logged—even under selective-cutting conditions which are supervised so carefully by the Forest Service—they never, through all the epochs of time can duplicate their original primeval state. So final a verdict, Mr. President, ought to be reviewed by the Congress of the United States and it should not be merely within the fiat of an executive agency. The Congress, after all, is the supreme policymaking agency of the American people, to whom these national forest solitudes actually belong.

That is what the bill offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and some of the rest of us is all about. That is why its introduction today is so pertinent and timely, because it was only 4 days ago that the determination of the executive arm of Government to eliminate 53,000 virgin acres from the Three Sisters Wilderness Area was announced. And let me explain that the addition of some less unique and extraordinary acreage elsewhere in the Cascade Range does not constitute adequate atonement or compensatory action.

Mr. President, some sincere and conscientious outdoor enthusiasts have had a few reservations about the bill being introduced. I would be less than candid if I did not confess such a fact. Many of these enthusiasts have had highly favorable relations with the staffs of the Forest Service and the Park Service over the years, and they would naturally hesitate to see any of the authority of these splendid career officials reduced.

One person to express such doubts has been a close personal friend of mine and a brilliant individual, Mrs. Martha Ann Platt, of the Mazamas, which is Oregon's great mountain-climbing club. Mrs. Platt, on December 20, 1956, addressed such a letter to me. I, in turn, submitted her communication to Mr. Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of The Wilderness Society, which has played a pioneer role in helping to draft and revise the legislation being submitted to the Senate today.

I believe that further background and information about this bill will be provided for Senators if the letter from Mrs. Platt, as well as Mr. Zahniser's very complete and thorough reply, dated January 30, 1957, are made a part of the RECORD at this point. I ask unanimous consent that this be done.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAZAMAS ROOF STUDIOS,
*Portland, Oreg., December 20, 1956.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
*Portland, Oreg.*

DEAR SENATOR: I did regret, at such a delightful teaparty at your house, making a discordant note concerning the Wilderness Bill because I am heartily in favor of its principle that we need such congressional protection for our wilderness areas. But this bill is controversial and will be strongly opposed by mining, grazing, and water-power interests. However, the opposition I am concerned about is that from the agencies themselves, and we might be in the peculiar and uncomfortable position of opposing those whom we are trying to help. Since some of their objections may be sound, I think we should take a long, hard look at what the bill encompasses.

I'll begin first with the Indian lands. Has there been a thorough check to determine their classification under the old treaties and the probable attitude of the tribal councils for this new status? I know some lands in reservations have been set aside for wilderness purposes, so there is not only awareness but appropriate action for this need. However, I am wondering if elimination of grazing and timber-cutting would be compatible with the Indian economy; more than that, I am wondering if we are not tampering with a people's prior rights and way of life. I hope I am wrong, but I understood that neither the Bureau of Indian Affairs, nor representatives of the tribal council, had been consulted about this bill. If so, this could be a serious oversight, as I think we must be truly and honestly considerate of Indian rights and feelings. There must be no cause for misinterpreting our motives by the opponents of this bill, nor in our attempts to provide an improved status for Indian lands.

Concerning refuge lands, there is that no-grazing stipulation again. In some wildlife refuges such as the Malheur and Red Rocks, controlled grazing greatly improves the feeding and nesting areas for waterfowl. Impoundment of water in dams and reservoirs is part of the management program and probably could be continued under existing authority, but I would want assurance of this. Certainly, I can't see the compatibility of oil drilling and mining with wildlife protection and think prohibitive legislation for these practices is urgently needed.

Both the Park Service and Forest Service would be expected to protest and I think their objections should be learned and studied carefully. I have high regard for the program of the Park Service and the philosophy that has guided it, and I have confidence in its personnel, and am grateful for the degree of congressional protection it enjoys. This bill would not increase its protection but rather be a check on the administrative freedom now exercised. I think the Service has real concern that a Wilderness Bill with less protection might be passed which would weaken the strong position the Park Service now has. However, the bill would prevent a Director or Secretary of the

Interior from unusual or unfortunate courses of action, if such should ever arise.

The Forest Service would benefit from freedom from mining and power dams in the wilderness areas. However, there will be opposition from these interests, and also from the Service itself when serious curtailment of staff is involved and loss of administrative flexibility.

I heartily agree with Mr. Lyle Watts that there should be a conference between the department heads and the sponsors of this Wilderness Bill to determine areas of disagreement and any defects in the bill itself. If objections continue, we should know about them so that we may make our proper defense. This bill will have to have support beyond the ranks of the conservationists. The average citizen will expect or understand minor differences between Congress and bureaus, but he will be suspicious and negative if they are fundamental or important.

A lot of the strength of the conservationists has been their selfless interest—no economic benefits accruing to them as the result of their support. This bill may bring cries of "special legislation to lock up the wilderness for a few users." Certainly, wilderness can never be justified on the basis of use, but rather must be defined as the creation of a special kind of permanent, unspoiled, natural treasure for all to own, to see, or to enjoy vicariously. Few of us would ever be privileged to visit all the national parks, or refuges or wilderness areas, but we glory in our ownership and delight in the experiences we do achieve. And it is a good feeling to know that others in different parts of our country are sharing our excitement and pleasure in our natural treasures, and that we can work together to make their heritage more permanent.

Very best wishes for a wonderful year.

Sincerely,

MARTHA ANN PLATT.

---

THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY,
*Washington, D. C., January 30, 1957.*

The Honorable RICHARD NEUBERGER,
*United States Senate,*
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR DICK: I am glad to comment on the questions that Mrs. Martha Ann Platt has raised regarding the Wilderness Bill, as you request, and would enjoy discussing them with you further if you should so desire. These are excellent and important questions, representing a keen interest in wilderness preservation, and they lead to an expectation of excellent cooperation from Mrs. Platt. I trust that these comments are helpful to this end.

For your convenience I am enclosing a copy of the bill as reintroduced in the House this year, with changes made during the summer and fall as a result of comments received. I am using for this purpose Mr. METCALF'S H. R. 1960 and am making my references to it.

INDIAN LANDS

Mrs. Platt begins "first with the Indian lands," asking as to the consideration given Indian rights and feelings in the preparation of the bill.

The answer, in brief, is that the bill has been prepared in accordance with a deep interest in the rights of the Indians and in their right of consent. We trust that the Indians recognize that this bill when enacted into law will give them the privilege of having their areas (roadless and wild) included in the System if they so wish—but not unless they do so indicate.

The bill in section 2 (d), lines 5 to 8 on page 15, provides that no area shall be included "until the tribe or band within whose reservation it lies, through its tribal council or other duly constituted authority, shall have given its consent to the inclusion of the area within the System."

In this same subsection, lines 6 to 13 on page 16, it is provided that additions, modifications, and eliminations shall similarly be subject to the Indians' consent.

Section 3 (a) provides that any Indian areas included in the System will be administered in accordance with regulations adopted subject to the Indians' consent.

Section 2 (d) in lines 15 to 18 on page 16 provides further that "nothing in this act shall in any respect abrogate any treaty with any band or tribe of Indians, or in any way modify or otherwise affect existing hunting and fishing rights or privileges."

The bill as regards Indian lands was drafted in cooperation with the Washington representative (and attorneys) of the Association on American Indian Affairs. It provides for inclusion of the Indian lands if the Indians so desire. The bill recognizes the wild and roadless areas that have already been designated but gives legal recognition to the Indians' right of consent with regard to them.

WILDLIFE AREAS

As regards the wildlife refuges and ranges and the controlled grazing to which Mrs. Platt refers, the bill provides in section 3 (c) (4), lines 13 to 19 on page 21, that "any existing use authorized or provided for in the Executive order or legislation establishing any national wildlife refuge or range may be continued in accordance with permit granted." This provision was drafted after informal consultation with, and with help from, the Fish and Wildlife Service. It covers the grazing on Red Rock Lakes to which Mrs. Platt refers specifically. The other refuge to which she specifically refers, Malheur, is not included in the bill. In fact, Malheur (which I admire greatly and have enjoyed visiting and writing about) can represent those excellent refuges which are such because of the way in which men have "developed" them as refuges—valuable but not primeval.

Only 20 of the 264 refuges and ranges are included in the wilderness system—only those in which wilderness preservation as a management policy is appropriate. The areas so managed now, and proper for inclusion, were determined in informal consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service.

NATIONAL PARKS AND MONUMENTS

As to the national parks and monuments the bill gives added protection as wilderness for the portion not needed for roads, accommodations, etc., and yet sets no limitation on the portion that may be designated for such use. Other than requiring that such a designation be made deliberately and that the primeval back country be recognized as wilderness the bill includes no "check on the administrative freedom now exercised." In connection with Mission 66 every park is being studied for development needs. The designations called for in the Wilderness Bill can be made at the same time.

The national park system areas were included in accordance with an overwhelming consensus of conservation leaders concerned with wilderness and in accordance with a modus operandi suggested some years ago at a Sierra Club wilderness conference by a park superintendent.

An early draft of the bill was taken to the National Park Service and changes were made to meet criticisms made. As Mrs. Platt suggests, intensive efforts have been made to ascertain any National Park Service objections. As understood these have been carefully studied, but we have not yet obtained the concurrence and cooperation of the National Park Service leadership, and we are still working on this.

A special statement recently prepared on the subject of National Park Service areas in the Wilderness System is as follows:

"The national parks and monuments containing areas of wilderness should be included in the proposed National Wilderness Preservation System both for the sake of making the System complete and for the sake of making more secure the preservation of the wilderness back country of the park system itself.

"Existing legislation does not insure the preservation of areas within the parks and monuments as wilderness. Under the existing legislation all the roads and buildings now in the parks and monuments have been constructed, and more and more could be built. There is nothing in our legislation now to protect future administrators from mounting pressures to use more and more of the back country for developments that would destroy them as wilderness.

"The proposed Wilderness Bill would provide protection by making wilderness preservation a paramount congressional purpose.

"Yet the bill deals realistically with the needs for accommodations. It gives authority to designate for this purpose whatever areas are needed. It places no limit on the size of such areas. It includes nothing that would prevent designation or additional areas if determined to be needed. And it provides for the application of the new law over a period of time which makes it possible for the administrators to designate the development areas at the same time that they make the plans for Mission 66.

"Including the National Park System makes complete a wilderness system that is seen as an effective means of preserving our various kinds of primeval areas and doing this in a feasible way at this late date in our land management history.

"The essence of this proposal is the certain continuation of wilderness preservation, where appropriate, along with the objectives in managing lands for other purposes, also, and doing this without interfering with the status quo, without changing jurisdiction over the areas, and without creating any new land-management agency.

"Parks continue to be for the use and enjoyment of the people, wildlife refuges for the protection and increase of wildlife, forests for the multiple purpose administration that includes watershed protection and various other uses on various areas—each and all of these in consistence (as they now are) with preserving the areas as wilderness.

"Including the superb wilderness of the National Park System is essential to the completeness of any such program.

"To bring these varying interests to focus and to provide a central repository for files and records and a source of information—but not to supervise in any way or to coordinate in any way the administration of any areas or any agencies—there is proposed a National Wilderness Preservation Council. The Director of the National Park Service and the heads of the other land-management agencies administering areas in the Wilderness System would be members of this Council along with citizens appointed by the President. The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution would be a member also and would be the Council's secretary. This emphasizes the character and purpose of the Council and places the Council's headquarters outside those of any agency concerned with land administration.

"This proposed legislation provides a new and further opportunity for extending the influence of the national park principle and for developing further the cooperation and leadership of the National Park Service in helping to preserve our heritage of wilderness."

NATIONAL FOREST AREAS

As regards the wilderness, wild, primitive, and roadless areas within the national forests this bill has been prepared after many consultations with the Forest Service. It has been prepared in accordance with the wilderness policies, programs, and practices

of the Forest Service and is designed to strengthen the forest administrators' hands in carrying out these policies and programs.

There is no "curtailment of staff" involved and no loss of administrative flexibility.

The areas included are those that have been designated as wilderness by the Forest Service, and the bill provides that these areas shall be administered under regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture, which means Forest Service as at present.

The bill does provide for elimination of mining in the areas included in the System. This is something that Forest Service spokesmen have been emphasizing. The bill in this respect was strengthened in the way suggested by Lyle Watts when he reviewed a draft of the bill during the Northwest Wilderness Conference in Portland last April.

With the exception of this mining prohibition, the bill includes no reforms, and even here the bill protects any existing private rights. Grazing, for example, is permitted to continue on national forest areas as at present (sec. 3 (c) (2), lines 22, p. 20, and following.)

The Forest Service would file reports with the Council established, but the bill provides explicitly (sec. 3 (a), lines 17 to 19 on p. 19) that the Council shall have no administrative jurisdiction over any area or agency. The head of the Forest Service would be a member of the Council.

This bill would not interfere with but would perpetuate the present multiple-purpose administration of the wilderness, wild, primitive, and roadless areas in the national forests. Its central concept is that our present areas of wilderness can be preserved within the existing land-management pattern if this preservation purpose is made a matter of fundamental policy. Thus the effect of the legislation is not to upset the present multiple-use program of the Forest Service but rather to prevent the upset in this program that will result if the wilderness areas are not protected from the uses that would destroy them as wilderness.

EFFECT ON EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

At the request of Senator HUMPHREY the Legislative Reference Service made a study of this bill and prepared a report which included comments that seem pertinent in connection with Mrs. Platt's interest in cooperation with the administrative agencies. Said this report:

"The legislation gives sanction to the policies and programs developed by the Forest Service, the National Park Service, and other Federal conservation agencies under whose administration the existing resource of wilderness has so far been preserved.

"The effect of this bill will be to bring into a single system, for the purpose of insuring their continued preservation as wilderness, the various federally owned areas designated as wilderness by the departmental heads or by Executive order. In no instance will the jurisdiction of a single area be transferred from one agency to another. Areas controlled, for example, by the Forest Service will continue to be managed by that agency. Furthermore, it will be the Forest Service under the Secretary of Agriculture that determines the precise area of the unit of its wilderness land to be included in the Wilderness Preservation System. And it will be solely the responsibility of the Forest Service under law to preserve the wilderness character of that area. No wilderness area of the Forest Service thus made a part of the Wilderness Preservation System may be modified or removed from the System except by action of the Secretary of Agriculture which has not been disapproved by Congress. In a similar manner lands under the jurisdiction of other executive agencies may be affected by this legislation."

These observations of the Legislative Reference Service are, of course, what might be expected, for the basic intention of this legislative proposal has been to accomplish wilderness preservation without disrupting any other program and to do this through existing agencies and in the ways developed by these several agencies.

The purpose thus is rather simple; namely, to accomplish wilderness preservation without disturbing the status quo.

It is the status quo that is somewhat complex, thus making the legislation seem complicated until its true purpose and the actual situation are recognized.

THE WILDERNESS COUNCIL

Special comment in this connection seems called for with regard to the proposed National Wilderness Preservation Council. This is not a superagency. It has been misinterpreted as such by some opponents of the measure, and in earlier drafts was misunderstood by some supporters of the bill. The Council, however, was not so conceived, and efforts have been made to clarify and make more explicit its true nature and purpose.

The name, for example, has been changed to Council from Commission in order to avoid implying such authority.

A sentence has been added to the bill in section 3 (a)—lines 17 to 19 on page 19—providing explicitly that the Council "shall have no administrative jurisdiction over any unit in the System nor over any agency that does have such jurisdiction."

Section 4—which makes provision for the Council—has been painstakingly examined and clarified to make as certain as possible that the true character of the Council is expressed. Much help in this has come from your office, including the careful study and cooperation of Hans A. Linde.

The Council, as it is conceived in this legislation, is, in fact, a corollary of the basic purpose of preserving a Wilderness System through the independent operations of the various executive agencies, each agency handling its own areas of wilderness in its own way and in keeping with its own other purposes. As a center of information and a nonexclusive clearinghouse, the Council provides an essential focus for such a System, but in doing so is actually a device for making unnecessary any superagency whatever.

OPPOSITION TO THE BILL

Mrs. Platt's fear that "this bill is controversial and will be strongly opposed by mining, grazing, and waterpower interests" seems well founded on the basis of some expressions so far, as does also her concern about opposition from the executive agencies involved.

Regarding the latter it has been the purpose of this letter to indicate the degree to which possible opposition of the executive agencies would seem to have been met and obviated by the provisions of the bill. As further comments are received from the agencies, continued effort will be made to clarify and correct the bill.

If the opposition proves to be directed against the establishment by Congress of wilderness preservation, on the land, this bill can hardly be expected to meet it, but my confident expectation is that agreement actually can be reached. I have strong hopes for the cooperation of these agencies, and am working toward it.

We also are hopeful for, and in quest of, cooperation from other interests.

Grazing interests are not damaged by this legislation. No area now available for logging is included. Waterpower interests could possibly be affected only to the extent that there cannot be found any alternative to a project that might be located within a wilderness. Our success in resolving the Echo Park controversy gives hope for an understanding that in general we can accomplish our waterpower purposes within an overall program that can also include wilderness preservation. Even the mining interests can realize that the areas involved that are now available to them are relatively small.

Our objective is not to fight these other interests but to work out a way of preserving a system of wilderness areas without sacrificing other purposes. We need further educational and cooperative work to this end, but I am sure we need not be dismayed.

The key concept in the program proposed in this bill is that of wilderness preservation as a part of other programs and as an important aspect of our culture, along with and dependent on other interests, including the economic. When this concept is understood and when we have succeeded in perfecting its expression I am confident that opposition will be much less than might now be assumed.

We recognize, for example, that wilderness preservation can be realized only if we have successful forestry outside the wilderness to provide us our needed forest products. It is thus the efficient lumberman who makes possible our enduring opportunity to preserve wilderness. As lumbermen realize that this is our concept and that we are all working together for a total land management that meets all needs, and as this understanding becomes clearer to all, I am confident that we shall reach the agreement necessary to enact the legislation.

We are not trying to urge the bill so hard and fast that it cannot be understood by all who are involved. We wish to encourage careful discussion of it. Hearings we hope will be held this June in Washington and perhaps be followed during the summer with hearings in the field. By the second session of this Congress we should thus have a sound basis for putting the legislation in form for enactment, with the benefit of the comments and suggestions of all who are concerned.

THIS IS LEGISLATION FOR ALL—NOT SPECIAL

Mrs. Platt very effectively emphasizes that wilderness is a permanent, unspoiled, natural treasure for all to own, to see or enjoy vicariously. She thus expresses the philosophy of this proposed legislation and provides us with an answer to the cries she mentions of special legislation to lock up the wilderness for a few users. She deals thus with one of the most subtly damaging of the misinterpretations of the bill that have been used against it, but one that is bound to be corrected as the bill is understood.

As indicated repeatedly in this letter, the Wilderness Bill has been designed throughout in recognition of the multiple uses of our areas of wilderness. It does not provide for any special users of the wilderness whatever. Its concern is with preserving the character of the areas as wilderness while they serve various other purposes also.

It may accurately be described as a multiple-use wilderness bill.

Mrs. Platt and the rest of us, I am sure, can continue to defend this purpose with the confidence that in so doing we are motivated by the same selfless interest which she recognizes as the source of a lot of the strength of the conservationists.

The title of this bill labels it as for the permanent good of the whole people.

Section 1 states its purpose as to secure a wilderness resource for the American people and provides that the areas shall serve the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservational, and historical use and enjoyment by the people.

Section 3 (a) specifies clearly, lines 2 to 9, page 18, that nothing in this act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purpose stated in the establishment of any national park or monument, national forest, national wildlife refuge, Indian reservation, or other Federal land area involved, except that any agency administering any area within the National Wilderness Preservation System shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area.

And these specific provisions are explicit statements of a principle and objective that are implicit throughout the bill. Wilderness preservation under this act will be accomplished along with other uses of the areas involved and as part of an overall land-management program and policy.

CONCLUSION

I trust that you will excuse the length of this letter and recognize that it is so because of the opportunity that Mrs. Platt's thoughtful and sympathetic comment affords to provide an explanation of problems that are of interest to many others also. I note in Mrs. Platt's letter of January 7 to you that she has also sent copies of her letter to other members of the Oregon delegation in Congress, to Senator HUMPHREY, and to Representative JOHN SAYLOR, who likewise has called the letter to my special attention. In her transmittal note to Representative SAYLOR, Mrs. Platt writes that her letter addressed to you "expresses my approval of the bill but indicates my concern about agency opposition to it." For the benefit of our cooperators and supporters, I have accordingly attempted in this commentary to interpret the bill in the light of the opposition to which Mrs. Platt has referred. I trust that it proves helpful.

Finally, may I say that I share also with Martha Ann Platt the appreciation of you which she expresses so enthusiastically in her letter of January 7. It is a great pleasure to be privileged to work along with you on these problems and a great encouragement to know of your championship of wilderness preservation.

With all good regards,

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD ZAHNISER,
*Executive Secretary and Editor.*

Mr. NEUBERGER. In conclusion, Mr. President, let me make three very brief points of my own. They are these:

First. This bill in no way reflects on the wonderful career services which now are in charge of wilderness areas and similar outdoor realms, but it actually seeks to safeguard these splendid men and women from undue political pressure, no matter what the source.

Second. The bill recognizes the ultimate authority of the Congress in matters as important as America's comparatively small remaining supply of wilderness domain.

Third. The bill recognizes that wildlife, waterfowl, migratory fisheries, and similar resources require outdoor fastnesses and solitudes in which to survive, and that these must be safeguarded by some form of legislative shield.

Mr. President, once again I state that it is a pleasure to stand shoulder to shoulder with my warm friend, the Senator from Minnesota, in so worthy and historic a cause. Natural resources come this way but once. When gone, they can never be adequately replaced—whether they be resources of minerals, scenery, or a species of wildlife.

## AMENDMENT OF LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, RELATING TO METHOD OF DEALING WITH LABOR DISPUTES IN VITAL INDUSTRIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, expiration tomorrow of the 80-day Taft-Hartley injunction in the New York longshoremen dispute indicates again the ineffectiveness and inadequacy of the emergency disputes provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. I am introducing the legislation governing emergency disputes which I have offered before on similar occasions as a means of furnishing the machinery for dealing with these situations that is so evidently needed.

The bill I introduce is the one that was studied carefully, redrafted in some respects, and recommended for passage by the Senate Labor Committee in 1952.

This morning's press reports a collapse of negotiations between the longshoremen and the New York employers in the face of the employers' rejection of the settlement proposed by Federal mediators. Louis Waldman, general counsel for the International Longshoremen's Association, is quoted today by a New York newspaper as saying "There is no hope whatever of a settlement before 5 p. m. Tuesday. If there is no settlement, there is no alternative to a strike."

The Taft-Hartley injunction which halted the strike was issued last November. This indication that the strike will be resumed illustrates again that the machinery of the Taft-Hartley Act is inflexible and not conducive to collective bargaining. What is urgently needed is a rewriting of the emergency disputes section to provide a more flexible system under which the President and Congress can fulfill their responsibilities, and through which labor and management have an opportunity to work out their differences at the bargaining table.

My proposal was first made in 1950, when I introduced S. 3169 to cope with the crisis in the coal industry. It appeared at that time that seizure by the Government might be used as a last resort. My bill recognized the incapacity of Taft-Hartley to deal effectively with emergency disputes, the industrywide disputes of that kind that endanger the national welfare.

In 1952, I introduced the bill again. It was introduced at the time of the crisis in the steel industry when Taft-Hartley's emergency disputes language again proved inadequate. The bill I am offering today is the product of extensive hearings at that time by the Senate Labor Committee, and several redraftings by the committee. It provides for a continuing procedure under which the President and Congress keep constant surveillance of emergency disputes. Both executive seizure and injunctions are permissible, with a congressional veto of such action. The bill emphasizes keeping the disputing parties guessing to provide real incentives for bargaining now lacking in the law.

I ask that the text of my bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1177) to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to provide a more effective method of dealing with labor disputes in vital industries which affect the national security, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1177

A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to provide a more effective method of dealing with labor disputes in vital industries which affect the national security

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That sections 206, 207, 208, 209, and 210 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 206. Whenever the head of an appropriate department or independent agency reports to the President, and the President finds, that a national emergency is threatened or exists because a stoppage of work or operations has resulted or threatens to result from a labor dispute (including the expiration of a collective-bargaining agreement) in a vital industry or plant which seriously affects the security of the United States, and the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service advises the President that all possibilities of mediation and conciliation have been exhausted without success, the President shall issue a proclamation to that effect and call upon the parties to the dispute to refrain from a stoppage of work or operations, or, if such stoppage has occurred, to resume work and operations in the public interest.

"PROCEDURE FOLLOWING PROCLAMATION

"SEC. 207. (a) Immediately after issuing a proclamation pursuant to section 206, the President shall submit to the Congress for consideration and appropriate action, a full statement of the case based upon such information as has been made available to him through the appropriate agencies of the Government, together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make as to procedures for effecting final settlement of the dispute and, pending settlement, for maintaining operation of the enterprise or enterprises involved.

"(b) The President may include a recommendation that the United States take possession of and operate the business enterprise or enterprises involved in the dispute. The President may make such additional reports and recommendations as he deems advisable. If the President recommends that the United States shall take possession of and operate such enterprise or enterprises, the President shall have authority to take such action forthwith. If the Congress by concurrent resolution within 10 days after the submission of such recommendation to it determines that such action should not have been or should not be taken, any property seized shall be returned to its owners and no future seizure shall take place during that dispute without congressional authorization by concurrent resolution: *Provided,* That during the period in which the United States shall have taken possession, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall continue to encourage the settlement of the dispute by the parties concerned, and the agency or department of the United States designated to operate such enterprise or enterprises shall have no authority to enter into negotiations with the employer or with the labor organization for a collective-bargaining contract or to alter the wages, hours, or the conditions of employment existing in such industry or plant prior to the dispute, except in conformity (in whole or in part) with the recommendations of the emergency board: *Provided further,* That in case an emergency board assumes jurisdiction over any form of union security which requires an employee to join a union as a condition of continued employment, the putting into effect of its union security recommendations, during a period of Government possession shall require the acceptance of the labor organization and the

employer concerned in the dispute. If the Congress or either House thereof shall have adjourned sine die or for a period longer than 3 days, the President shall convene the Congress, or such House forthwith for the purpose of consideration of an appropriate action pursuant to such statement and recommendations.

"(c) After the issuance of a seizure order it shall be the duty of any labor organization of which any employees who have been employed in the operation of such enterprise are members, and of the officers of such labor organization, to seek in good faith to induce such employees to refrain from a stoppage of work and not to engage in any strike, slow-down, or other concerted refusal to work, or stoppage of work, and if such stoppage of work has incurred, to seek in good faith to induce such employees to return to work and not to engage in any strike, slow-down, or other concerted refusal to work or stoppage of work until the dispute is settled or until possession of such enterprise is relinquished by the United States, whichever occurs sooner.

"(d) After the issuance of a seizure order, or any time thereafter the President may direct the Attorney General to petition any district court, having jurisdiction of the parties, to enjoin such stoppage of work or operations, and if the court finds that the President has reasonable cause to believe that a national emergency is threatened or exists because a threatened or actual stoppage of work or operations may result or has resulted from a labor dispute (including the expiration of a collective agreement) in a vital industry or plant which seriously affects the security of the Nation, it shall have jurisdiction to enjoin such stoppage of work or operations, or the continuing thereof, and to make such other orders as may be appropriate. In granting such injunction or relief, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the act entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes, approved March 23, 1932 (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 29, secs. 101–115). Such injunction or order shall be dissolved when the dispute is settled or the property of which possession has been taken is relinquished by the United States, whichever occurs sooner.

"EMERGENCY BOARDS

"SEC. 208. (a) After issuing such a proclamation, the President may appoint a board to be known as an 'emergency board.'

"(b) Any emergency board appointed under this section shall promptly investigate the dispute, shall seek to induce the parties to reach a settlement of the dispute, and in any event shall, within a period of time to be determined by the President but not more than 30 days after the appointment of the board, make a written report to the President, unless the time is extended by agreement of the parties, with the approval of the board. Such report shall include the findings and recommendations of the board and shall be transmitted to the parties and be made public. The recommendations shall be consistent with all laws and regulations otherwise applicable to compensation, hours, and other terms and conditions and incidents of employment. The Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall provide for the board such stenographic, clerical, and other assistance and such facilities and services as may be necessary for the discharge of its functions.

"(c) An emergency board shall be composed of a chairman and such other members as the President shall determine, and shall have power to sit and act in any place within the United States and to conduct such hearings either in public or in private, as it may deem necessary or proper, to ascertain the facts with respect to the causes and circumstances of the dispute.

"(d) Members of an emergency board shall receive compensation at the rate of $75 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the board, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses.

"(e) For the purpose of any hearing or inquiry conducted by any board appointed under this title, the provisions of sections 5 (f), 9, and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 45 (f), 49, and 50, as amended), are hereby made applicable to the powers and duties of such board.

"(f) When a board appointed under this section has been dissolved, its records shall be transferred to the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

"(g) No member of an emergency board shall be an officer or employee of the organization of employees or any employer involved in the dispute.

"SEC. 209. (a) In the event that the Government shall take possession of and operate any business enterprise or enterprises involved in a given dispute, the President shall designate the agency or department of Government which shall take possession of any business enterprise or enterprises including the properties thereof involved in the dispute and all other assets of the enterprise or enterprises necessary to such continued operation thereof as will protect the national security.

"(b) Any enterprise or properties of which possession has been taken under this title shall be returned to the owners thereof as soon as (1) such owners have reached an agreement with the representatives of the employees in such enterprise settling the issues in dispute between them, or (2) the President finds that the continued possession and operation of such enterprise by the United States is no longer necessary under the terms of the proclamation provided for in section 206: *Provided*, That possession by the United States shall be terminated not later than 60 days after the issuance of a seizure order unless the period of possession is extended by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

"(c) Beginning not later than 30 days after issuance of a seizure order, the United States shall impound and hold all income received from the operation thereof in trust for the payment of general operating expenses, just compensation to the owners as hereinafter provided in this subsection, and reimbursement to the United States for expenses incurred by the United States in the operation of the enterprise. Any income remaining shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. In determining just compensation to the owners of the enterprise, due consideration shall be given to the fact that the United States took or continued possession of such enterprise when its operation had been interrupted by a stoppage of work or operations or that a stoppage of work or operations was imminent; to the fact that the United States would have returned such enterprise to its owners at any time when an agreement was reached settling the issues involved in such stoppage of work or operations; and to the value the use of such enterprise would have had to its owners in the light of the labor dispute prevailing, had they remained in possession during the period of Government operation: *Provided*, That any increase in wages or other compensation or any increase resulting from a change in the method of computing wages or other compensation which are agreed to retroactively for the period of Government operation or any portion of that period shall be deemed costs or expenses for such period.

"(d) During the period in which possession of any enterprise has been taken by the United States under this section, the employer or employers or their duly designated representatives and the representatives of the employees in such enterprise shall be obligated to continue collective bargaining for the purpose of settling the issues in the dispute between them.

"(e) (1) The President may appoint a compensation board to determine the amount to be paid as just compensation under this title to the owner of any enterprise of which possession is taken. For the purpose of any hearing or inquiry conducted by any such board the provisions relating to the conduct of hearings or inquiries by emergency boards as provided in section 208 of this title are hereby made applicable to any such hearing or inquiry. The members of compensation boards shall be appointed and compensated in accordance with the provisions of section 208 of this title.

"(2) Upon appointing such compensation board the President shall make provision as may be necessary for stenographic, clerical, and other assistance and such facilities, services, and supplies as may be necessary to enable the compensation board to perform its functions.

"(3) The award of the compensation board shall be final and binding, unless within 30 days after the issuance of said award, a party moves to have the said award set side or modified in the United States Court of Claims in accordance with the rules of said court.

"SEC. 210. When a dispute arising under this title has been finally settled, the President shall submit to the Congress a full and comprehensive report of all the proceedings, together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make."

SEC. 2. This act shall become effective upon its enactment.

## THE THREE SISTERS WILDERNESS AREA, OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an editorial entitled "Let's Wait," published in the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of January 22, 1957, dealing with the decision of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ervin Peterson, in regard to the Three Sisters Wilderness area. I think it particularly appropriate that I introduce this editorial into the RECORD today, in view of the fact that the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the junior Senate from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], has just introduced his so-called Wilderness Area Council bill.

There is a very serious problem in my State in connection with the so-called Three Sisters Wilderness area. There is great pressure to open it up for the harvesting or cutting of timber, even though, in the surrounding Federal forests, we are not beginning to approach the allowable cut to which those forests could be subjected in the interest of sound conservation.

My colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER] and I have sought to get the Department of Agriculture to postpone the decision on this question until the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs could take action upon a recommendation which the two Senators from Oregon expect to make to the committee, because we think that the announced decision of the Department of Agriculture, through the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Peterson, is an unfortunate mistake. In my judgment it involves, once again, a failure on the part of the Eisenhower administration to

recognize even the meaning of conservation; a failure on the part of the Eisenhower administration to recognize the great moral duty, which is ours in this generation, to preserve for future generations these wilderness areas in their original beauty and state.

I regret very much that apparently greedy interests, more interested in the profit dollar today than in the welfare of the American people in decades to come, are able to exercise such an influence on the Eisenhower administration as to obtain the kind of unfortunate and unwise decision which Mr. Peterson, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, has just issued.

Peterson knows better, because he comes from my State. But he is a typical representative of the reactionary economic forces in my State which are perfectly willing to gut the natural resources of the State for the profit dollar of the privileged few.

I am glad to be able to place in the RECORD this afternoon as a part of my remarks this editorial from the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, which is anything but a Morse-supporting newspaper.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S WAIT

Senator WAYNE MORSE and Ervin Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, are not getting along well. The Senator urges the Assistant Secretary to delay still longer the decision about reducing the size of the Three Sisters Wilderness area. He says he'll try to get a bill through the Congress freezing the area at its present size if the Secretary does not agree to the delay.

Mr. Peterson, who was Oregon's director of agriculture before he went to Washington, replies that the Department already has all the information it needs. He opposes further public hearings on the question, pointing out that extensive hearings were conducted in Eugene 2 years ago and that he, himself, visited the area last August.

From where we sit it looks as if the Senator is nearer right than the Assistant Secretary. Indeed, if the Department of Agriculture really has all the information it needs, why hasn't there been a decision? There has been time, ample time. It is obvious that the decision has been delayed for 1 of 2 reasons. Either the administration feared the political consequences of acting on the matter, or information is still coming in.

While we do not think the area should be frozen in size pending enactment of an overall wilderness bill of the type sponsored by several Senators last session, we do see the need for still more time. More information is needed, and it will be forthcoming. Even now the Forest Service is conducting land-use studies in the upper McKenzie area. Scientific studies are also in progress. The increasing population and the recent softness in the lumber business hint that we may have to reassess our resources.

If logging is permitted in the area and then we find we are sorry, the wilderness will be gone forever. But if we delay another year or two nothing will be lost, and a great deal may be gained. Let's just wait.

Mr. MORSE. In this editorial, the editors of the Eugene Register-Guard say that perhaps I am right on this question. That makes it an additional pleasure for me to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The opening sentences of the editorial are:

Senator WAYNE MORSE and Ervin Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, are not getting along well.

That is the understatement of the year in Oregon.

The Senator urges the Assistant Secretary to delay still longer the decision about reducing the size of the Three Sisters Wilderness area. He says he'll try to get a bill through the Congress freezing the area at its present size if the Secretary does not agree to the delay.

Mr. Peterson, who was Oregon's director of agriculture before he went to Washington, replies that the Department already has all the information it needs.

It has made up its mind, regardless of the facts. That is what he means.

He opposes further public hearings on the question, pointing out that extensive hearings were conducted in Eugene 2 years ago and that he, himself, visited the area last August.

From where we sit it looks as if the Senator is nearer right than the Assistant Secretary.

That is a great sentence, a remarkable sentence, to be written by the editor of the Eugene Register-Guard.

I shall not read the remainder of the editorial, which has already been placed in the RECORD. Let me say to the Eugene Register-Guard that I deeply appreciate the support on this issue which that newspaper is giving to a sound conservation program in Oregon.

I am very appreciative of the fact that the Eugene Register-Guard shares my point of view and the point of view of my junior colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER]; also the point of view of the Democratic Representative in Congress from my district [Mr. PORTER], as well as the point of view of the other two Democratic Representatives from our State, Mrs. EDITH GREEN and Mr. AL ULLMAN, all of whom campaigned with me last fall on the great issue of a sound conservation program for our natural resources. We are delighted to have the help of the Eugene Register-Guard.

I thank the Eugene Register-Guard for sharing our point of view in regard to the Beaver Marsh conservation problem, in opposition to the Eugene Water Board, a supposedly public municipal body, which has demonstrated time and time again that it has become naught but the bellwether of the private utilities in our State, which are trying to sell to the people of our State the highly fallacious and phony partnership scheme of the Eisenhower administration, which simply means partnership for the private utilities, for the profit dollars of the private utilities, and for cheating the people as a whole out of their full heritage in their own water resources.

Some progress is being made, when we Democrats can get this allegedly independent newspaper in my hometown—with emphasis on the word "allegedly"—to support us on this issue.

I ask unanimous consent also to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks two telegrams which I have received; one from Al Schmitz, of Portland, Oreg., in support of the position I have taken with respect to the Three Sisters Wilderness area, and the other from Karl W. Onthank, president of the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, likewise supporting the position I have taken with respect to the Three Sisters Wilderness area problem.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 11, 1957.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

The recent decision on Three Sisters points out the strong need for the wilderness bill which with your cosponsorship is to be reintroduced in Senate. Be assured of our full support.

AL SCHMITZ.

---

EUGENE, OREG., *February 11, 1957.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Just informed Senator HUMPHREY reintroducing wilderness preservation bill, know you will support it. Recent decision by removing administrative fiat alone 53,000 acres from Three Sisters Wilderness is convincing evidence such legislation needed. Eugene Register-Guard editorial today points this out saying Humphrey bill requiring congressional action for wilderness boundary changes should be reintroduced on behalf of Federation Western Outdoor Clubs 25,000 members, Friends of the Three Sisters Wilderness, the Eugene Obsidians, Eugene Natural History Society all substantial organizations strongly favoring such legislation and joining in this message, express appreciation your active support of it.

KARL W. ONTHANK,
*President, Federation Western Outdoor Clubs.*

Mr. MORSE. Let me make it clear that these are sample telegrams. I may burden the RECORD later with a much larger number of telegrams and letters which I have received on this question. However, they suffice to serve notice on the Department of Agriculture that there is growing concern in my State about the shortsightedness of the Department on another issue, along with many others with respect to which it has suffered an economic myopia for a long time under the administration of Ezra Benson. I wish to say from the floor of the Senate today that the Department of Agriculture will hear more from us in Oregon in regard to the Three Sisters-Wilderness area decision which has just been announced.

All we asked for, as the elected representatives of the people of the sovereign State of Oregon, was a postponement of the action of the Department until the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate could hear us in connection with our bill. But if one's design is to get while the getting is good, he must oppose postponements and delays aimed at protecting the interests of the people. Here again, what is needed is full public disclosure of what this administration is up to in the field of natural resources. We ask for it in the Three Sisters bill.

The Eisenhower administration cannot stand full public disclosure on one issue after another, when it comes to public resources in particular. We had some of that for 3 months or so during the summer and fall in our State; there

was a great deal of public disclosure. The people responded by rejecting the natural resources program of the Eisenhower administration. Let me say that in the whole area of this part of Oregon the Three Sisters matter was an issue in that campaign. That is further evidence, so far as the Department of Agriculture is concerned, that it makes not one whit of difference to it what the decision of the people at the polls may be on an issue; it will continue to proceed to thwart the interests of the people by serving selfish interests that want to go into the Three Sisters Wilderness area and mow down a primitive forest. Forest areas of this special type should be left for the enjoyment of future generations of Americans, with our forestry officers taking such care of the forest as will protect the trees from disease and overripeness, which might jeopardize the whole forest.

One of the most fallacious arguments used by the Department of Agriculture is that it is necessary to open up the forest in order to protect it. It is possible to maintain a wilderness area and at the same time take sound forestry preventive steps which are necessary in order to protect it in its primitive state from the ravages of disease and insects, and also by the adoption of sound fire prevention practices within the forests.

Mr. President, I hope that we have not reached the time in our history when we are to blind ourselves to what God's natural resources in their original beauty do to the spirit and the culture of a people, and the opportunities they afford in which to spend leisure time, as more and more Americans travel across their country, and will continue to do so in the years which lie ahead.

I think it is a shameful thing to see the kind of pressure to which I have alluded increasing under this short-sighted administration in connection with our great natural resources. When we talk about a question of this kind it is difficult to get people to comprehend fully what natural resources remaining in their original primitive beauty do to the spirit of a people.

No American can walk through the Three Sisters Wilderness area, as I have, and no American can go to the other great scenic natural beauty sites in their original primitive form, and spend any time there, and leave without knowing that he has been closer to the Almighty as a result of the experience. No one can travel through one of these wilderness areas and leave it without being a better man or woman. Such areas do something to a person. They make him realize many things. They teach him humility. They broaden his perspective as to the mysteries of life itself. They bring him closer to the very meaning of life.

So long as I stay in the Senate I shall continue to do what I can to preserve the heritage of the American people in God's gift to them in the form of their natural resources. I shall oppose every short-sighted decision of any administration, be it Republican or Democratic, which seeks to turn over a great natural cathedral to a wrecking crew of economic plunderers. That is what the Peterson decision adds up to. I would make the same fight for the preservation of a wilderness area in any other State if facts existed in support of its preservation, as they do exist in the case of the Three Sisters area. I am not making this fight because the site is located in Oregon, primarily. I am making it because I believe in conservation across America, not only in my own State.

I am at a loss to understand this Peterson decision. It can be reversed. I hope that if the Secretary of Agriculture becomes aware of the decision, he will at least issue a stop order until the elected representatives of the people have an opportunity to view a bill on which the two Senators from Oregon propose to hold hearings. I shall say more about this subject both before the committee and again on the floor of the Senate at a later date. Suffice for today that I raise the issue.

In closing this item, I do so with a plea on my lips to the Secretary of Agriculture that he give serious consideration to a review of the unfortunate decision of his assistant secretary, a decision so bad that not even a great Eisenhower newspaper can support it, as evidenced by the Eisenhower newspaper in my home town, the Eugene Register-Guard editorial, which I submitted for the RECORD earlier in my remarks.

Mr. President, I now come to another matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

## HEBER LEE BOND

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, out of order, a bill for the relief of Heber Lee Bond. I introduce the bill on behalf of myself and my colleague. I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1180) for the relief of Heber Lee Bond, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in the administration of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, Heber Lee Bond, of Portland, Oreg. (RRB No. A-317520), shall be deemed to have been an employee of the Chicago & North Western Railroad Co. on August 29, 1935. No annuity for any period before the date of enactment of this act shall be deemed to have accrued by reason of the enactment of this section.

## AMENDMENT OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, out of order, a bill dealing with amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, to eliminate the exemption of small telephone exchanges from the overtime and minimum-wage provisions of the act.

I also ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1178) to amend section 213 (52 Stat. 1067, as amended by 53 Stat. 1266) of title 29 of the United States Code, the same being a section of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, so as to eliminate the exemption of small telephone exchanges from the overtime and minimum-wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 213 of title 29 of the United States Code (52 Stat. 1067, as amended by 53 Stat. 1266), the same being a section of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, be amended by striking out subsection (a), clause 11, thereof which reads as follows: "any switchboard operator employed in a public telephone exchange which has less than 750 stations."

## HAROLD GEORGE JACKSON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, out of order, a bill for the relief of Harold George Jackson.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1179) for the relief of Harold George Jackson, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## COLUMN BY DREW PEARSON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have one other point on which I wish to comment briefly, before I yield the floor. I announced earlier that I would discuss today some of my observations of the Eisenhower doctrine, and particularly its constitutional features. But I shall postpone that speech until a later date.

However, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of a column which was originally written by Mr. Drew Pearson for publication in the Washington Post and Times Herald. I am advised that the column was not printed. The column has to do with Middle East problems. Following the printing of the column, I shall make a few brief comments.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DREW PEARSON SAYS: OIL WORKS IN PECULIAR WAYS TO INFLUENCE BOTH CONGRESS AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT; ANTHONY EDEN WAS TWICE DEFEATED BY AMERICAN OIL COMPANIES; KING SAUD'S VISIT WRAPPED UP IN MAJOR UNITED STATES POLICY

WASHINGTON.—There is one major thread running through the warp and woof of American policy for the Near East as it affects the following rather remarkable events in and out of Congress today:

1. The manner in which Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, rammed the Eisenhower

doctrine through the House of Representatives under a gag rule forbidding amendment. Regardless of the merits of the Eisenhower doctrine—and it has some—it should have been open to full debate and amendment. The man who prevented this was RAYBURN. JOE MARTIN, the man supposed to promote the Ike doctrine, was lukewarm. RAYBURN, who doesn't like Ike, was dictatorial and demanding that the House support him.

2. The fact that Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, also of Texas, also supposed to be against Eisenhower, also demands that the Eisenhower doctrine be passed soon.

3. The fact that President Eisenhower is welcoming King Saud, of oil-rich Saudi Arabia, here just after he has refused to meet with the Prime Ministers of England and France; and that he took the rather unpopular step of greeting the King at the airport personally—the only time he has thus greeted any foreign visitor.

4. The manner in which the Eisenhower administration dropped criminal charges in the huge antitrust suit started against the oil industry by the Truman administration and has dragged out the civil suit.

5. The interminable delay in the Justice Department's case against the Arabian-American oil group for overcharging the United States Navy to the tune of $67 million. These are the same companies which support King Saud, of Saudi Arabia.

6. The loans, economic aid, and shipments of arms to Saudi Arabia at the expense of the American taxpayer.

"PROTECT OIL"

All of the above, some of them geographically unrelated, actually are woven together into the cardinal American policy, both foreign and domestic, which can be summarized in two words: "protect oil."

Critics also describe it as: "kowtow to oil." In some cases their description is quite accurate. For the State Department and the Texas leaders of Congress have gone to amazing lengths not merely to protect oil, but to give the oil industry all kinds of bonanzas the ordinary citizen, company, and taxpayer do not get.

When powerful SAM RAYBURN cracks the whip over the House of Representatives to put through the Eisenhower doctrine without free debate or any amendment, it partly means that Texas oil friends have spoken. And when Sam refuses to permit any Congressman who opposes the 27½ percent oil-depletion allowance, it definitely means that the Texas oil lobby has spoken. The Texas oil lobby can put Sam out of Congress any time it desires, merely by redistricting his Fourth District and infiltrating it with Republicans from Dallas. The lobbyists do not have to speak too loud.

NUDGING THE STATE DEPARTMENT

The hand of the oil companies is not always so apparent in nudging the elbow of the State Department. Sometimes it is—as when the Washington lobbyist for Aramco gave air-cooling equipment to Loy Henderson, the State Department official in charge of the Near East—a gift similar to the deep-freeze deal for which Gen. Harry Vaughan got panned so deservedly and so unmercifully.

But, on the whole, you do not see the hand of the oil companies guiding major foreign policy. Nevertheless, it's there—skillfully, emphatically, vigorously there. It influences both war and peace. It guides the question of loans and gifts. It affects the money the average taxpayer has to put up when he fills out his tax returns.

Take two vital examples: In 1935 when Mussolini started to invade Ethiopia in what the diplomats recognized as a prelude to World War II, the League of Nations took a courageous stand that might have stopped war, not merely in Ethiopia but the world war to follow.

Led by Anthony Eden and with the unofficial but potent backing of Franklin Roosevelt, the League voted economic sanctions against Italy. This meant cutting off all exports to Italy and refusal to receive all imports.

The one key product in these sanctions was oil. Without oil Mussolini's navy could not move. Without gasoline his airplanes could not fly. His invasion could have been stopped overnight.

EDEN SLAPPED DOWN

The British and American oil companies could have stopped it. But they didn't. They decided that profits were more important than peace. They bucked the League of Nations.

And the State Department, which has nearly always taken its cue from the oil companies whether Democrats or Republicans be in power, bowed to the oil companies. The American Navy was not used to stop the shipment of their oil to Mussolini.

He got away with his trial war. The dictators in Germany and Japan watched the breakup of the world's peace machinery. Later they followed the example of Mussolini.

Six months ago, somewhat the same thing happened—in reverse. This time the oil companies wanted to stop a war over Suez. This time the same Anthony Eden was involved. This time he was on the fighting end, not the pacific end. But again he got slapped down.

This time the oil companies did not want any fighting over Suez because the transit of their oil through the canal was involved and because their pipelines across Arab countries were in jeopardy. So again they cracked the whip. Again Anthony Eden felt the full lash of that whip—in a defeat that ended his career.

The public thought that he was defeated by his health, by British politics, and by Eisenhower's refusal to see him. All true, in part. But the main motivating factor, more important than any of these, was the whip-cracking of the oil companies on American policy.

The story of how this happened, and how the visit of King Saud is one byproduct, will be told in another column.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I make these comments not because this is a singular case. It has been my observation that the practice has been occurring rather frequently in American journalism these days. In my State, for example, it has been known that a column written by Thomas Stokes was not published because apparently, I assume, at least, the contents of the column did not correspond to the political policies, convictions, or campaign tactics of the publisher of the newspaper.

On another occasion, a column written by Doris Fleeson was eliminated from an Oregon newspaper. I assume again that that was because the publisher of the newspaper did not like some of the political implications of the column.

On several occasions, either Drew Pearson's column has been eliminated entirely from an Oregon newspaper, or else those paragraphs of the article which might refer to the senior Senator or the junior Senator from Oregon were eliminated, on the assumption, I presume, that the publication of those paragraphs might have been helpful to the candidates politically, and detrimental to the attempts of our opposition to eliminate us from public life.

If that were all there was to this issue, I do not feel that there would be any basis for quarreling with the newspapers which follow what, in my opinion, is a very reprehensible practice.

I might add, however, that this practice is not limited to newspapers alone. It has begun to crop up in another important medium of communication. For example, consider the amazing action of the Columbia Broadcasting System last week in refusing to broadcast the usual 5-minute news commentary of Eric Sevareid. Mr. Sevareid is a reputable and responsible reporter and newscaster. Yet CBS executives exercised the blue pencil on him when it suited their purpose. And it almost goes without saying that the material ruled objectionable had to do with this administration's foreign policy and its shortcomings.

Fortunately, the broadcast we were not allowed to hear was published by the Washington Evening Star. So that the readers of the RECORD, as well as those of the Washington Star, may have the full benefit of Mr. Sevareid's able analysis, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the item entitled "Why Did CBS Fade Sevareid," appearing in the Washington Star of February 9, 1957, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY DID CBS FADE SEVAREID?

(By Bernie Harrison)

When the Columbia Broadcasting System took Eric Sevareid off the air last Wednesday for editorializing when he should have been analyzing, a wave of curiosity swept over much of the listening public—including this segment. What did he say?

Here (direct from Mr. Sevareid's office) is the portion of his prepared script that caused it to be kept off the air:

"Mr. Dulles' present argument—and this caught the President by surprise today at his news meeting—is that the Chinese are trying to do a deal—will release the 10 American prisoners they illegally hold if he lets the American reporters go in; that this is blackmail and that he won't submit to it. Now this statement was pursued by questions all right, but if time had permitted it might have been pursued much further. Among others, there would have been a few questions like these:

"Is this not the third distinct argument used for withholding these passports? First, that the Government is unable to protect the reporters, which they did not expect, anyway; second, that the men could not go in until the prisoners were let out—this was the President's last argument; now, that the men cannot go in because then the prisoners will be let out and this smacks of Communist blackmail.

"Since the Secretary admits the reporting from China would not necessarily be favorable to the Red regime, what quid would they get getting for their quo? If this would be paying a 'price' as the Secretary puts it, how do you get the prisoners released without paying any price? Nowhere in all the discussion has the humanitarian aspect been mentioned; what is the prisoners' attitude as they rot in their cells? Do their families have any say in all this?

"If this would be yielding to blackmail, what did the United States Government do when it paid a ransom to the Hungarian Reds for the release of the American businessman, Robert Vogeler? In that one, the prisoner was prominent and had powerful friends who kept fierce pressures on the

State Department until a deal was arranged. While we're on the subject, when does a diplomatic agreement represent respectable bargaining and when does it represent an unsavory deal?

"The Secretary said that if the prisoners are released he would then review the question of letting the reporters go in; but later he indicated they still wouldn't be allowed to go in because we don't recognize Red China; so the next question would be, then why was this matter of the prisoners ever brought into the argument at all?

"There would be other questions; how does the Secretary answer private legal opinions that his prohibition violates the first amendment? Would the Government be willing to have a judicial finding on the constitutional question of the American people's right to be informed about other parts of the world by their fellow Americans?

"Well, there would be lots of questions, and, no doubt lots of answers; under present handicaps both are intermittent and incomplete."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the Pearson column which I have placed in the RECORD, I am not involved at all, so I certainly can discuss it. That is true also of the Stokes column, as I recall, from the standpoint of the principle I wish to mention. But I am concerned about American journalism. I had something to say about it in a press statement a couple of weeks ago, following my examination of the Secretary of State in the joint committee hearings on the Middle East resolution.

In that examination I was seeking, in a lawyer-like fashion, to lay the foundation of a record for future reference in Senate debate. I asked the Secretary of State for his views on an amendment which I proposed to offer, and have offered, to the Eisenhower resolution, an amendment which would seek to require the President to attempt, at least, to negotiate some commitments from Great Britain, France, and other European countries to make their armed forces available along with ours in case of an outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East.

In that examination of the Secretary, I pointed out that his own statements were premised, for the most part, upon the importance, as he put it, of Arabian oil to the economy of Europe, with, of course, resulting effects upon the American economy if the supply of oil from the Arab States to Europe should be cut off.

I thought the Secretary presented perfectly obvious factual material to support his premise that if Arabian oil were cut off from Europe, a depression would develop in Europe; and if an economic depression should develop in Europe it would be only a matter of time before one would develop in the United States.

I think that by now most people have come to realize what many of us, for many years, have been trying to point out, namely, that economic isolationism is as passe and unsound as a policy for the United States as was the old policy of diplomatic isolation.

But I suggested to the Secretary of State that if what he said was true, I had difficulty in reconciling myself to his proposal that only American boys should be pledged to do the dying in the Middle East to protect Arabian oil. The record will show that I brought out in the examination the admission from the Secretary of State that the oil reserve of the Arab States, based upon 1955 production rates and 1955 prices, is worth the tidy sum of $98.4 billion.

In that examination, I suggested that maybe the good old mortgage principle ought to apply; that if Saudi Arabia should find its pipelines cut, the Suez Canal blocked, and its immediate source of collecting royalties restricted for the time being, it might ask the United States for a loan, with Saudi Arabia putting up collateral. I thought that was a pretty good capitalistic practice, only to have it suggested by the Secretary of State, as the record will show, that under the circumstances—and, Mr. President, that is about as definite as you can ever get him to be; it was remarkable that he could be prevailed upon to say "under the circumstances"—he thought the power of the President to make grants rather than loans, with the blanket discretionary power which the resolution proposes to give the President, should be retained.

I respectfully suggested that he ought to tell that to the American people. In fact, as I said earlier today in the Senate, I suggested that the proposal be submitted by way of referendum to the mothers and fathers of all boys of military age in this country—even the sweethearts, I think, would like to vote in such a referendum, too—because it appears to me that one of the most serious objections to the resolution, outside the constitutional points which I mentioned earlier today, and also in two previous speeches, is that it amounts, in fact, to giving the President the power, if he so desired to exercise it, of sending American boys to die in the Middle East, in protecting Arab oil for Europe, with no concomitant commitments on the part of the European countries to join us then and there.

But, Mr. President, do you know what the alibi rationalization is? It is that if we get into that kind of situation overseas, we can take it for granted that our allies will come in.

I would ask the question: With how much delay?

Why should we blind ourselves to a residue of ill feeling which lurks in the European public opinion among the peoples of cur allies; to the stored up feeling that on a couple of other occasions their fellow citizens did a lot of dying before we came in?

Who among us can gainsay that there is not the best feeling within the population of Great Britain and France today about our attitude only a few weeks ago, when they were taking action in the Middle East which they felt was a part of our responsibility as well as theirs, too; at least, with regard to which they felt we had some causative influence.

So I simply suggested to the Secretary of State in my examination that he consider my amendment, which would place the responsibility on the President to try to negotiate some commitments from France, Great Britain, and other allies. But he would have none of that. When an attempt is made to tie this resolution down to anything specific, this administration shies away from it as a horse would shy away from a bear. I knew the Presiding Officer is not a very good horseman, so I want to tell him that horses generally fear bears.

Then the Secretary of State made his very unfortunate remark that if he were an American boy fighting in the Middle East, he would not want either a British soldier or a French soldier on his right or on his left. He explained his remark by saying that he made it because of the feeling of the Arabs toward the British and the French. That testimony was given by him in all seriousness and earnestness. However, it had quick repercussions in Europe; and the repercussions were such, in fact, that soon the State Department issued a State announcement that the Secretary of State had been misunderstood abroad, and that in fact he had testified humorously and jocularly. Of course, the State Department's statement was exactly what I characterized it to be in a press release made by me the day after that statement was issued: It was an unadulterated lie, and those in the State Department knew it. However, that State Department statement was published in the press, with no attempt on the part of the press to tell the American people the facts about the matter. The press correspondents sat at the hearing, and I thought they were entitled to better protection than what they received from their editors. However, Mr. President, a newspaper publisher called me and took great umbrage at my castigation of the press.

I have never been one of the politicians who tremble in the knees at the reaction of a newspaper. I happen to believe that when the press is guilty of a public disservice, politicians should say so. I have done that. It has not made me very popular with the press; I suppose it is a part of the reason why the late campaign, practically all the daily newspapers in my State not only were opposed to me, but bitterly fought me. Of the Oregon dailies, only two small newspapers did not oppose me. One of them was the Medford Mail-Tribune, which happens to be published and edited by the only Pulitzer prize winner among the newspapermen of the State of Oregon. I would rather have his support than the support of all of the newspaper publishers who opposed me. I was also supported by the fine daily newspaper in Coos Bay. One or two, including the Pendleton East Oregonian, remained neutral. But all the other newspapers in Oregon joined in the yellow journalist parade under the headline slogan "Get MORSE." However, Mr. President, they did not succeed. In fact, I thought that only one person in the country could phrase so well the statement about that matter, which was made after the election. I do not feel free to state his name; but, Mr. President, you might guess it. The morning after the election, I was called by one of the great leaders of the Democratic Party, and he said, "Wayne, they went out to get you, but they got got"—which I thought summarized the matter quite well, and demonstrated that the press is not nearly so powerful as most of the

newspaper publishers think. That is because the American readers are becoming more and more wise to the kind of journalism against which I am protesting this evening. They are becoming more and more wise to the fact that when they pick up a newspaper, it no longer is a free newspaper in the true meaning of the primary journalistic obligation that a newspaper owes a free people, namely, the duty of keeping faith with the great journalistic ethic that old Bob La Follette used to print on the masthead of La Follette's magazine, which he published for so many years—

Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make ye free.

But, Mr. President, today, to a great extent, we find newspaper after newspaper adopting an unfortunate technique of yellow journalism; namely, the coverup technique, the "snow job" technique, the blue-penciling of material which might be embarrassing to the Eisenhower administration. Of course, there are exceptions, but they are all too few.

As I have indicated to the "top brass" of the Washington Post, when I pick up the Washington Post in the morning, I would like to feel—as I once did, but no longer—that I was not picking up a censorship exhibit but, instead, that I was picking up an open newspaper which, if willing to print the column of a certain columnist, would print it regardless of whether the newspaper agreed with him or disagreed with him, save and except—as I said not long ago to one of the officials of the Washington Post—if they could show or if they had reasonable grounds for believing that to publish the entire column might subject the newspaper to a libel suit. Of course, under those circumstances, I think the publishers of the newspaper have the right and the legal duty to protect its stockholders from a libel suit. But, when it comes to a conflict of ideas or to a "value judgment" rendered by an editor as to whether a particular column might have this or that effect upon public opinion or this or that effect upon the operations of the Government, I think the publisher ceases to publish a free newspaper when he exercises that kind of censorship. So, Mr. President, I have almost reached the point that when I read a column by a particular columnist I wonder whether I am going to have to telephone him to ascertain whether the newspaper published his entire column or published only the parts of his column which pleased the "value judgment" of the publisher.

Mr. President, a free press is vital to the preservation of our freedom. I happen to be so strong a supporter of the precious right in the Bill of Rights known as the freedom of the press that I believe that a free press is still one of the greatest protections the American people have for the perpetuation of a free government.

But I abhor censorship, and I abhor a situation in which a newspaper becomes a propaganda sheet or a "snow sheet" or a "coverup sheet." When I pick up a newspaper, I wish to know that if its publishers think the articles of a particular columnist are worth printing at all, they will permit him to speak for himself, subject only to the right on the part of the publishers to protect, by the use of a blue pencil, the stockholders of the newspaper from libel suits, but not subject to censorship by eliminating from the column what the publishers or editors do not like.

I am so stanch a supporter of a free press that I wish to point out that the American newspaper is still the greatest educational institution in our country, and is still the greatest instrument we have in carrying out the great teaching of Jefferson, when he said that a democracy can never be any stronger than the enlightenment of its people. Even with our formal school system and our other media of informing and enlightening the people, I still believe—although, of course, I would now include also the radio and television—that the so-called institutions whose rights stem from the Bill of Rights guaranty of a free press are our greatest educational institutions, because they are the educational institutions for our adult citizens who have the responsibility of citizen statesmanship. I would keep them free. I would like to believe that when a young man or young woman selects the noble profession of journalism, which it is, those who run the profession at the top will not cow or silence or warp or limit the freedom of the correspondents to present the truth as they find it in carrying out their journalistic duties.

I hope that never again will I experience further evidence that our columnists are to have strings attached to them to be pulled by editors and publishers in case the columnists write the truth as they believe it to be, but it does not correspond with the prejudices or political objectives or aims of the editors or publishers.

Oh, no, it is not pleasant for anyone in public life to cross swords with the newspaper profession, because some of my friends have told me on other occasions when I have done what I am doing this evening, "Don't you know, Wayne, the press always has the last word?" Of course I know it, but I do not accept the premise that the people follow the last word of a newspaper; but, to the contrary, the people now have come to ask the question, "What is the other side?" They ask this all-important question when they find someone in public life subjected to the kind of journalistic practices which unfortunately have come to dominate so many newspapers that have ceased to be the great, pure educational institutions they should be, because they have failed to keep faith with the journalistic tenet I have mentioned—their responsibility to print the truth as they find it, knowing that La Follette was right when he used that notable masthead slogan "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make ye free."

## ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the order previously entered, until Thursday, February 14, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 11, 1957:

### Treasury Department

Fred G. Scribner, Jr., of Maine, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, vice Andrew N. Overby, resigned.

### United Nations

Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. (Reappointment.)

### United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange

Laird Bell, of Illinois, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1960, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified. (Reappointment.)

### United States Attorney

D. Malcolm Anderson, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania for a term of 4 years, vice John W. McIlvaine, resigned.

### Civil Service Commission

The following-named persons to be Civil Service Commissioners for the terms indicated:

Frederick J. Lawton, of the District of Columbia, for the term of 6 years from March 1, 1957;

Christopher H. Phillips, of Massachusetts, for the term of 4 years from March 1, 1957; and

Harris Ellsworth, of Oregon, for the term of 2 years from March 1, 1957.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 7, 1957:

### Department of State

C. Burke Elbrick, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

### Diplomatic and Foreign Service

John Hay Whitney, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Great Britain.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion as indicated:

*To class 3*

William B. Kelly.

*To class 4*

Dallas L. Jones, Jr.
Walter L. Nelson.

*To class 5 and also consul*

Charles W. Brown.
Joseph P. Christiano.
Walter T. Kamprad.
Abraham Vigil.

### Department of the Interior

Ross L. Leffler, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, Department of the Interior.

### Department of Agriculture

Robert L. Farrington, of Oklahoma, to be General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Frederick C. Nash, of Michigan, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

James Tolman Pyle, of Maryland, to be Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Elliot Lee Richardson, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Parke Monroe Banta, of Missouri, to be General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Alms Chamberlain McGuinness, of Pennsylvania, to be Special Assistant on Health, and Medical Affairs to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Richard F. Mitchell, of Iowa, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1963. (Reappointment.)

Laurence Walrath, of Florida, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1963. (Reappointment.)

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Edward T. Tait, of Pennsylvania, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years from September 26, 1956.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

Arthur R. Campbell, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Leslie A. Blake, of Maine, to be collector of customs for district No. 1, with headquarters at Portland, Maine.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

*Promotions to permanent rank of rear admiral in the United States Coast Guard*

Stephen Hadley Evans
Edward H. Thiele
Allen Winbeck

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following nominations for permanent appointments to the grades indicated, subject to qualifications provided by law:

*To be lieutenant commanders*

John R. Plaggmier (effective Jan. 28, 1957)
Leonard S. Baker
Eugene W. Richards

*To be lieutenants*

Kenneth A. MacDonald
Edwin K. McCaffrey
Clifford W. Tupper
Richard H. Houlder

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

Kelley E. Taggart (effective Feb. 1, 1957)
Robert J. Black
Albert J. Hamlett, Jr.
Oscar L. Doster
Lavon L. Posey

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## MONDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in our prayer at this noon hour, we are earnestly beseeching Thee that the hearts of men and nations everywhere may be changed and charged with a nobler and finer spirit.

Take away from the mind of man all attitudes of provincial narrowness and sectarian antipathy and everything that mars and limits the true spirit of cooperation and considerateness, of fellowship and fraternity.

May our diplomats and statesmen who have been entrusted with leadership in the sphere of international relationships be inspired to manifest a spirit of friendliness, of frankness and fair dealing.

Grant that it may be the aspiration and aim of our life to establish and advance a social order and a civilization in which freedom is coordinated with discipline and all are laboring for the highest welfare of humanity.

In Thy name we ascribe all the glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 7, 1957, was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3845. An act extending for 1 year the time in which the Boston National Historic Sites Commission shall complete its work.

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT E. JONES ON PROPOSED BILL FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, since the enactment of Public Law 519, known as the Lease-Purchase Act of 1954, Congress has approved approximately 150 projects for construction by the General Service Administration and the Post Office Department. Only one project has been commenced, and there is very little likelihood that any other project can be commenced or constructed under the provisions of this act. This legislation has proven most ineffectual. Therefore it is apparent that unless we have a change in this legislation our whole public building program must be discontinued or abandoned.

I am introducing today a bill that will provide a more direct, efficient, and economical plan for construction of Federal buildings.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill authorizes a public building program by direct appropriation under the basic authority provided in the Public Buildings Act of 1926, as amended—Public Law 281, 69th Congress. It repeals the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 and section 202 of the Post Office Department Property Act of 1954—Public Law 519, 83d Congress.

An appropriation of $1,500,000 is authorized over a 5-year period, until July 1, 1962, to carry out the program.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Section 1 repeals title I of Public Law 519, 83d Congress—Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954—which confers authority on the Administrator of General Services to negotiate and enter into lease-purchase agreements for leasing and ultimate acquisition of public buildings. It also repeals section 202 of title II of such Public Law which confers a similar authority on the Postmaster General with respect to post-office buildings.

A savings clause provides that the contract which has actually been entered into with respect to the public building project at Rock Island, Ill., shall not be affected by the repeal of the law under which it was entered into. Further, under this section the Administrator of General Services would be able to make purchase contract agreements for certain public buildings in the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., for which prospectuses have previously been approved by the Senate and House Committees on Public Works as if the lease-purchase provisions of law had not been repealed with respect to those projects.

Section 2 amends the Public Buildings Act of 1926, as amended—Public Law 281, 69th Congress—which is presently in effect and which contains the basic authority for the construction by the Federal Government of public buildings through the Administrator of General Services. The amendment is designed to insure the equitable distribution of public building projects throughout the United States with due regard for the comparative urgency of need for such projects by prohibiting appropriation for any project until the Administrator of General Services has submitted a prospectus for each proposed public building to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives and the committees approve such project.

Section 3 is necessary because of the repeal of section 202 of the Post Office Department Property Act of 1954 in the first section of the bill and amends the various sections of title II of Public Law 519 to insure that the Postmaster General's authority will be limited to lease agreements only with respect to post-office buildings.

Section 4 authorizes an appropriation of $1,500,000,000 over a 5-year period, until July 1, 1962, to carry out the purposes of the Public Buildings Act of 1926, as amended. This would permit appropriations in varying amounts not to exceed this total from time to time as the program would require without any limitation for any fiscal year.

LEASE-PURCHASE PUBLIC BUILDING PROJECTS APPROVED UNDER PUBLIC LAW 519, 83D CONGRESS

LOCATION AND BUILDINGS

Abingdon, Va.: Post office and courthouse.
Albuquerque, N. Mex.: Federal office building.
Atlanta, Ga.: Motor-vehicle shop and garage.
Atlanta, Ga.: Communicable disease center.
Baltimore, Md.: Federal office building.
Beaver, Pa.: Post office and Federal office building.
Bellflower, Calif.: Post office.
Bemidji, Minn.: Post office and Federal office building.
Benton, Ill.: Post office and courthouse.
Biloxi, Miss.: Post office and courthouse.
Boston, Mass.: Federal office building.
Brainerd, Minn.: Post office and Federal office building.
Breese, Ill.: Post office and Federal office building.
Brooklyn, N. Y.: Courthouse and Federal office building.
Brunswick, Ga.: Post office and courthouse.
Burlington, Iowa: Post office, etc.
Burlington, Vt.: Post office and courthouse.
Camden, Ala.: Post office, etc.
Camden, N. Y.: Post office.
Carthage, Tenn.: Post office, etc.
Cashmere, Wash.: Post office.
Charleston, W. Va.: Courthouse and Federal office building.
Cincinnati, Ohio: Federal office building.
Council Bluffs, Iowa: Post office and courthouse.
Daingerfield, Tex.: Post office and Federal office building.
Dallas, Tex.; Courthouse and Federal office building.
Denton, Md.: Post office and Federal office building.
Denver, Colo.: Post office.
Denver, Colo.: Courthouse.
Detroit, Mich. (North End station): Post office.
Durham, N. H.: Post office, etc.
East New York Station, N. Y.: Post office.
Emporia, Kans.: Post office, etc.
Fort Dodge, Iowa: Post office and courthouse.
Fort Mill, S. C.: Post office.
Franconia, Va.: Warehouse building.
Gainesville, Tex.: Post office, etc.
Garland, Tex: Post office.
Gering, Nebr.: Post office.
Grand Prairie, Tex.: Post office.
Green Bay, Wis.: Post office and courthouse.
Greenville, Miss.: Post office and courthouse.
Greenwich, N. Y.: Post office.
Grundy, Va.: Post office.
Guilford, Conn.: Post office, etc.
Hartford, Conn.: Federal office building.
Helena, Ark: Post office, etc.
Hot Springs, Ark.: Post office and courthouse.
Houston, Tex.: Post office.
Houston, Tex.: Courthouse and Federal office building.
Hudson, Mass.: Post office.
Huntington, W. Va.: Federal office building.
Jamestown, N. Y.: Post office and courthouse.
Jefferson, Ohio: Post office.
Jersey City, N. J. (Bergen): Post office.
Jonesboro, La.: Post office and Federal office building.
Kansas City, Kans.: Post office and courthouse.
Kingsport, Tenn.: Federal office building.
LaFayette, Tenn.: Post office and Federal office building.
LaFayette, La.: Post office, etc.
Lake Charles, La.: Post office and courthouse.
Lansford, Pa.: Post office.
Laurel, Miss.: Post office and Federal office building.
Leavenworth, Kans.: Post office and courthouse.
Little Rock, Ark.: Federal office building.
Livingston, Ala.: Post office and Federal office building.
Los Angeles, Calif.: Customhouse and Federal office building.
Madison, Tenn.: Post office.
Manning, S. C.: Post office and Federal office building.
Maplewood, N. J.: Post office.
Marshfield, Mo.: Post office, etc.
Martinsburg, W. Va.: Post office and courthouse.
McKinney, Tex.: Post office and Federal office building.
Miami, Fla.: Federal office building.
Milledgeville, Ga.: Post office and Federal office building.
Minden, La.: Post office, etc.
Minneapolis, Minn.: Courthouse and Federal office building.
Moberly, Mo.: Post office and Federal office building.
Monticello, Fla.: Post office and Federal office building.
Moorhead, Minn.: Post office and Federal office building.
Mount Hope, W. Va.: Bureau of Mines.
National City, Calif.: Post office.
New Orleans, La.: Post office, etc.
New Orleans, La.: Post office, garage facilities.
New Richmond, Wis.: Post office.
New York, N. Y.: United States mission to U. N.
New York, N. Y.: Customhouse and Federal office building.
Newark, N. J. (Roseville): Post office.
Newkirk, Okla.: Post office.
Newtown, Pa.: Post office.
Ocala, Fla.: Post office and courthouse.
Oklahoma City, Okla.: Courthouse and Federal office building.
Omaha, Nebr.: Post office and courthouse.
Ontonagon, Mich.: Post office.
Orange, Tex.: Post office and Federal office building.
Oxford, Pa.: Post office.
Parkersburg, W. Va.: Courthouse and Federal office building.
Philadelphia, Pa.: Post office garage.
Phoenix, Ariz.: Courthouse and Federal office building.
Pittsburgh, Pa. (Homewood): Post office.
Pittsburgh, Pa.: Federal office building.
Pittsford, N. Y.: Post office.
Point Pleasant, N. J.: Post office.
Portland, Oreg.: Federal office building.
Portsmouth, Va.: Post office and Federal office building.
Redwood Falls, Minn.: Post office and Federal office building.
Refugio, Tex.: Post office.
Richmond, Va.: Federal office building.
Rittman, Ohio: Post office.
Rock Island, Ill.: Post office and courthouse.
Ronceverte, W. Va.: Post office, etc.
Sacramento, Calif.: Courthouse and Federal office building.
Salt Lake City, Utah: Federal office building.
San Francisco, Calif.: Courthouse and Federal office building.
San Marcos, Tex.: Post office and Federal office building.
Scranton, Pa.: Post office.
Sedan, Kans.: Post office and Federal office building.
Sharon, Pa.: Post office and Federal office building.
Sheboygan Falls, Wis.: Post office.
Sioux City, Iowa: Morningside Post Office Station.
Sisseton, S. Dak.: Post office, etc.
Skaneateles, N. Y.: Post office.
Smithville, Tenn.: Post office, etc.
Sparta, Mich.: Post office.
St. Louis, Mo.: Federal office building.
St. Louis, Mo.: Federal records office.
St. Marys, Ohio: Post office.
St. Paul, Minn.: Post office and customhouse.
Teaneck, N. J.: Post office.
Terrell, Tex.: Post office and Federal office building.
Toledo, Ohio: Federal office building.
Toronto, Ohio: Post office.
Tupper Lake, N. Y.: Post office.
Two Harbors, Minn.: Post office.
Victoria, Tex.: Post office and courthouse.
Wailuku, T. H.: Post office and Federal office building.
Waukesha, Wis.: Post office.
Wayland, N. Y.: Post office.
Waynesboro, Va.: Post office and Federal office building.
West Memphis, Ark.: Post office.
Winnetka, Ill.: Post office.
Washington, D. C.: Federal office building No. 5.
Washington, D. C.: Federal office building No. 6.
Washington, D. C.: Federal office building No. 7.
Washington, D. C.: Federal office building No. 8 (HEW).
Washington, D. C.: Federal office building No. 9 (CSC).
Washington, D. C.: Federal office building No. 10.
Washington, D. C.: Meteorological Center (not yet approved by Senate).
Washington, D. C.: United States Geological Survey Building.

## SANCTIONS AGAINST ISRAEL

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, my voice must be added to those which have questioned the merit of sanctions by the United Nations against Israel. In doing this I do not uphold Israel's action in Gaza, although I know this little nation was sorely provoked. I object to the United Nations persistence in making an example of Israel after having passed over, with little apparent concern, other transgressions, some of them much more deplorable and much less understandable.

I find no effort by the United Nations to impose sanctions on Russia for the massacre of defenseless Hungary. Indeed, we gave Hungary no sign that we were seriously concerned with her gallant fight for freedom. I find no word of sanctions against Egypt for seizing the Suez, thereby prompting the entire mideastern crisis. Strangely we even appear to be on Egypt's side. I find no hint of sanctions against India for the annexation of Kashmir. Through the years India haughtily has accepted our offerings; then alined herself with our enemies.

Is Israel, then, different from other transgressors? Is Israel to be scorned because she has no oil-rich lands? Is Israel's courage and pride and her example of dynamic young nationhood of less interest to us than the perpetuation of feudal dynasties with their disregard for the welfare of people?

I am not impressed, Mr. Speaker, with the conduct of the United Nations or

the leadership we offer it. If sanctions are now to be imposed other than in order of occurrence, let them be based on the magnitude of the transgression; not in inverse ratio to the size of the transgressor.

## ALL THE PERFUMES OF ARABY CANNOT HIDE OUR SURRENDER OF PRINCIPLE

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, before the ink on the Eisenhower doctrine is dry, we have a chance to see it in operation.

Like so many other Members, I voted for the Eisenhower doctrine, because I did not wish there to be any doubt that this country would resist armed Communist aggression in the Middle East, and because the economic-military aid part of the proposal came to us in an attractive package. On the economic side, the President told us that our aim would be to create a Middle East "where economic conditions are such as not to make communism seem an attractive alternative." On the military side, Secretary Dulles assured us that there would be no aiding of an arms race between the Middle Eastern states.

Now that King Saud is no longer a guest in our house, we can begin to appraise act I in the implementation of the Eisenhower doctrine. Many of us kept our peace about the visit of King Saud, despite our distaste for it, because we wished to leave the administration unhampered to achieve what should have been some important goals of such a negotiation. If King Saud is indeed a leader of the Arab nations, then our most important objective should have been a commitment by him to use his position of leadership to end the attempt to wipe Israel from the face of the earth. Another objective, for King Saud to display a decent respect for the human dignity about which he speaks so eloquently by ending the discrimination against American citizens because of their religion, and by making some effort to alleviate the potentially explosive plight of the 7 million downtrodden people of Saudi Arabia.

Now the negotiations are ended, and the communique has been issued. Already the court poets in the administration and in the press are announcing that the negotiations have been a great success because King Saud has accepted the Eisenhower doctrine. I ask, Mr. Speaker: What is so wonderful about King Saud's accepting the Eisenhower doctrine, his giving his royal assent to having us protect his country against invasion—if he asks—and his willingness to receive our guns and dollars? What our national interest really requires from King Saud is an end to the anti-Israel movement, and a beginning for human rights. We are getting neither one.

Peace in the Middle East is going to be achieved by keeping arms out, not by sending arms in. Arms to King Saud, I submit, are going to be used not to fight Russian invaders, but to continue the subjugation of his own people, to threaten neighboring Arab States, and above all to menace Israel.

As for economic aid, the kind that will do some good is the kind that will help alleviate the ghastly poverty and ignorance of the masses of people. The aid to King Saud on which the administration is now embarking, without any visible strings, will simply accentuate the extremes between ruler and ruled, and augment King Saud's capacity to export hatred and provocation throughout the Middle East. Since Saud did nothing for his people when he had his $300 million of yearly oil revenues, I see no reason to assume that he is suddenly going to change now that there is about to be substituted a more direct handout from us.

But it will be said that we must pay this backsheesh to Saud or he will fail to renew our lease on the Dharhan airfield. To this I say: Let us lease ourselves another Middle Eastern airbase, in Iran, for example, where we had a base during World War II, where our relations are friendly—partly as a result of our $250 million aid program—and where the field would be several hundred miles closer to its potential target. And if it be said that it would cost millions to move our Middle Eastern base from Dharhan to wherever we go, I would suggest that we remember what Americans said once before when we were blackmailed by an Arabian pirate, "Millions for defense, but not 1 cent for tribute."

And then there are those who say that the free world needs Arabian oil, and that unless you do everything Saud asks, he will cut off his oil. I would remind them that Mossadegh of Iran tried this, but found that he couldn't get his oil out of the ground, and that his country needed the oil revenues more than the West needed his oil. The Mossadegh experience should be illuminating to others.

So what does it all come down to? We have apparently yielded on every important principle, fair treatment for Americans, peace with Israel, and a better life for the Saudi Arabians, all in return for an airbase which could as well be plunked down somewhere else in the Middle East. Unless the State Department has some justification for these squalid negotiations which it has not yet disclosed to the public or to Congress, I can come to but one conclusion. This is crude dollar diplomacy in aid of the real party in interest, the American oil companies which control Arabian oil and have apparently convinced the administration that no price is too high for business as usual in Arabia.

If this is so, all the perfumes of Araby, and of Madison Avenue, cannot cover up our abject surrender of principle. Mr. Speaker, I intend to oppose the Arabian deal in every responsible way I can.

## NO SANCTIONS AGAINST ISRAEL

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, lest we forget, 145 years ago we went to war with Great Britain for our ships and sailors with those of all other nations to sail without interference on the seas of world commerce. The State of Israel in the present matter of threatened sanctions asks only that for which we accepted the hazards of war with the then most powerful nation in the world when we were 23 years young under our Constitution. Unilateral sanctions on Israel to compel her to abandon that for which we fought can receive no encouragement or support from the American people or from the American Government.

Much as we desire to be helpful to the Arab States in their legitimate aspirations, it is well at the very beginning of our negotiations looking for grounds of understanding and of common interest that they should understand that there will be no appeasement at the cost of Israel's security, her right to live and to grow, and of her ships to enjoy without interference and as to those of other nations passage through the seas of world commerce.

I respectfully urge the Secretary of State officially and promptly to make such announcement to the world. When Secretary of State Dulles appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, then having under consideration House Resolution 117, in answer to a question propounded by me he said:

> I can assure you, sir, that we shall not in any application of this policy or any of our discussions with the Arab countries do anything whatsoever that would detract from the statements so often made by this administration and others by the Congress that the preservation of the State of Israel is a vital part of the United States foreign policy.

I accepted this statement as having been made in all good faith. I expect the administration and the Secretary of State to abide by it with all fidelity. The Gaza Strip and the Gulf of Aqaba hold the lifeline of the State of Israel. The State of Israel stands on solid moral ground in making guaranties of the free passage of its ships through the waters of this area a condition of withdrawal of its forces. The suggestion that the United States should place its influence behind the threat of unilateral sanctions against Israel, to compel Israel to abandon that for which we fought 145 years ago would be a betrayal of every principle of international morality for which our people in every succeeding generation steadfastly have stood.

## COTTON SUPPORT PRICES

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, apparently the only place in the national economy where the Eisenhower administration can find a device to reduce prices is in the suffering field of American agriculture, and the farmer who already is in the midst of a general depression in this country has just been struck another body blow by the man who is supposed to be in charge of helping our farmers.

The Secretary of Agriculture has just announced a cut in the price support of eight commodities. While the 1957 crop estimates are not yet finalized, it is possible to estimate these results, based on 1956 crop totals.

On this basis, the Secretary of Agriculture has just taken from the pocket of the American oats farmer $7,633,000.

He has taken from the barley farmer $29,800,000. He has taken from the rye farmer $2,587,000. He has taken from the grain sorghum producer $15,790,000. He has taken from the soy bean producer $27,352,000. He has taken from the flax seed producer $8,281,000. He has taken from the cotton seed producer $10,990,000, and he has taken from the cottongrower $78,488,000 in 1957. The total loss in income from these eight products is estimated at $230,921,000.

In our State of Oklahoma the loss is expected to total nearly $4 million. This is Mr. Benson's reduction in income for farmers of this State which already has been recognized by the President as suffering a farm depression in view of drought conditions.

According to one unofficial estimate, the Oklahoma cotton producer alone will receive $1,800,000 less under the new support levels. The cottonseed producer loses $390,000; the producer of oats, $665,000; the barley grower, $310,000, and so on.

The Secretary of Agriculture has yet to prove that these cuts in support prices are beneficial to anyone except the processor, who has been the only beneficiary of the Benson farm program.

## WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, February 22, 1957, Washington's farewell address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## LOWERING OF FARM PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] has told us what Secretary Benson's action in lowering price supports is costing Oklahoma. I now would like the gentleman here to know that Montana, too, is seriously hurt by this action, even though Montana's major crop, wheat, is not at the moment involved. For four of the grains involved at the moment Montana's loss totals $2,819,960. This is based on a decline of $2,378,080 for barley, $353,500 for oats, $11,880 for rye, and $76,500 for flax. My computations are based on the 1956 level of production and assuming that the price falls by the amount in the support level; it also naturally assumes that 1957 production will be equal to that of 1956.

It is my belief that Secretary Benson has adjusted farm price supports so that they will not support. The Secretary himself has finally realized that cheap feed results in cheap livestock, but he apparently is not ready to admit that the sliding scale increases production rather than reduces it. In the 4 years of Secretary Benson's low prices our farmers in America have produced the biggest crop on record in an effort to get enough gross income to pay their bills. It is only logical to think that the new lower price supports will inevitably result in heavier production, more surpluses, and a further worsening of the farm situation. The United States now has lost nearly three times as much on farm price support operations during the Eisenhower administration as the Nation lost during the 20 years of Democratic administration.

Still another terrific loss to the Government was involved in the Secretary's lowering of farm-price supports. By this one announced action on supports the Secretary produced a $50,402,000 direct loss to the United States through the Commodity Credit Corporation. Based on December 31, 1956, inventory of stocks held by the CCC and the new price support difference, these losses are: Cotton, $39,960,000; barley, $3,274,000; oats, $1,677,000; grain sorghum, $4,737,000; rye, $751,000; flaxseed, $2,000; and soybeans, $1,000. Were corn and wheat to have their price supports similarly lowered, losses would be astronomical.

The Secretary's action on farm price supports is a shock to the entire Nation's agricultural economy and consequently to the economy of the entire Nation.

## RECREATIONAL BENEFITS RESULTING FROM CONSTRUCTION OF ANY FLOOD CONTROL, NAVIGATION, OR RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to make the evaluation of recreational benefits resulting from the construction of any flood control, navigation, or reclamation project an integral part of the project planning.

Identical bills have been introduced by other Members of this body as well as the other body. Our objective is to correct a situation that Congress has too long neglected. Recreational aspects of the great projects constructed by the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation should have been taken into account from the beginning.

Many projects already constructed, such as Lake Texoma in my own congressional district, have become showplaces of the Nation. They attract hundreds of thousands of visitors every year.

Existing law does not take into account the potential recreational value of these great projects when they are in the planning stage. The results achieved have been far from satisfactory from the standpoint of recreation. It therefore is essential that we start immediately to make adequate provision to take care of the large numbers of people who desire to visit these projects for camping, fishing, swimming, and other recreational purposes.

My bill provides that recreational benefits would be figured as a nonreimbursable item up to a maximum of 15 percent of the total cost of a project. It sets up a formula for establishing recreational benefits that would be directly related to the number of visitors a project would be expected to serve. The formula provides that recreational benefits would be figured on the basis of the average number of visitors per year multiplied by $1.

The bill specifices that development of recreational resources is not to conflict with the major purposes of the project. State and municipal governments would be invited to participate in the development of recreational facilities.

## JUDGE CHARLES N. PRAY

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege at this time to pay tribute to a leading citizen of my State, a former Member of this body, and a distinguished member of the bar and bench of Montana, Judge Charles N. Pray. Mr. Pray, who is now in his 88th year, has recently submitted his resignation as judge of the United States Court for the district of Montana.

Judge Pray thus brings to a conclusion a long career which has included 6 years as a Member of this body, from 1907 to 1913, and 33 years, from 1924 to 1957, as a member of the Federal judiciary.

Charles N. Pray was born in 1868 in Potsdam, N. Y., near the Canadian border. He was educated in the public schools in Salisbury and Middlebury, Vt., and attended Middlebury College and the Chicago School of Law.

In 1892, he was admitted to the bar at Chicago, Ill., commencing a long and intimate association with the law which has only ended this year.

Soon after his graduation from law school, like many another professional man of his time, Judge Pray headed

west, and subsequently entered the practice of the law at Fort Benton, Mont. He married Edith Charlotte Wackerlin, of Fort Benton, several years later.

An easterner by birth, Judge Pray's entire adult life has been spent in his adopted State, or in the service of his State.

When Judge Pray arrived in Montana, it had only recently been admitted as a State. Only several years before, the Director of the United States Census had reported the disappearance of the frontier as a discernable line on population maps of the United States. Only a few years before, the last important Indian battle of the United States had taken place in the neighboring State of South Dakota.

While the frontier was vanishing, Montana still exhibited in some respects the characteristics of a frontier State. Disputes over land claims, particularly claims to rich mineral lands, were frequently before the courts. As a young lawyer Judge Pray early became a specialist in problems arising from the land laws of our country. Reports of cases involving such laws, which were later decided by him have become an important part of this Nation's legal literature.

Judge Pray entered local politics as a member of the Republican Party soon after his arrival in Montana. From 1893 to 1895, he served as assistant prosecuting attorney of his home county, and in 1898, 1900, 1902, and 1904, he was elected prosecuting attorney.

His first appearance upon the national political scene came in 1906, when he was elected a Representative-at-Large from the State of Montana to the United States Congress. The State, it might be remarked, had but one representative in Congress until 1913.

The occasion also marked the first political candidacy of another of Montana's sons, the late Senator Thomas J. Walsh. Senator Walsh, who was Mr. Pray's Democratic opponent, lost the election by 28,000 to 23,000 votes.

Mr. Pray was reelected in 1908 and 1910 by equally decisive majorities. He was defeated, however, by John M. Evans, in 1912, by a margin of only 995 votes.

While in Congress, Judge Pray served on the House Committees on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic, Mines and Mining, and Public Lands. Among his colleagues on these committees were Nicholas Longworth, later Speaker of the House of Representatives, Adolph J. Sabath, Senator, Joseph T. Robinson, then a Member of the Lower House, and Andrew J. Volstead.

Among the subjects in which Mr. Pray took a particular interest during his years in Congress was the problem of mine safety. He was a strong supporter of the pioneer safety and rescue efforts of the United States Bureau of Mines.

In the course of a congressional speech on this subject, in 1910, he pointed out that the United States death rate in mines was 4 times as large as that in France, and approximately 3 times as large as the death rate from mining accidents in Belgium and Great Britain. He cited the fact that for every 167,000 tons of coal mined in the United States one life was lost as reason for increasing the annual appropriation of United States Government mine rescue stations.

Another subject in which Mr. Pray took a strong interest was the proposal to establish a system of postal savings banks.

Mr. Pray pointed out on the floor of the House in 1910 that "economy and thrift in the people of any land contribute to the prosperity of the nation as a whole." Due to a then widespread distrust of banks, some $1 billion—then considered to be a rather large sum of money—was kept out of circulation by hoarding. As a result, he pointed out, assuming that $1 of cash deposited in a bank made possible the issuance of $4 in credit, the Nation was losing the productive use of much of its resources.

Many of Mr. Pray's congressional speeches, and the subject of bills introduced by him, had to do with questions of the public lands. He was the author of various resolutions regarding entry on homestead lands and authorizing land surveys in his home State.

In the congressional sessions of 1909 and 1910, he was the author of reports by the Committee on the Public Lands recommending establishment of the Glacier National Park. In the 62d Congress he was the author of H. R. 1679, authorizing the Government to accept the cession of lands constituting the present Glacier National Park.

Another subject in which he took a constant interest was the creation of an additional United States judicial district in Montana. Judge Pray was the author of resolutions to this effect in the 60th and 61st Congresses.

Retiring from Congress in 1913, Mr. Pray returned to the practice of the law as a member of the firm of Pray, Callaway, and Toole at Great Falls, where he still makes his home. In 1916, he received the Republican nomination for the United States Senate. His successful opponent was the incumbent, Henry Lee Myers.

Mr. Pray was appointed judge of the United States District Court for Montana by President Calvin Coolidge on January 21, 1924, in which post he has served for 33 years. His retirement was announced on January 17 of this year by President Eisenhower, to become effective upon qualification of a successor.

During his service on the bench, Judge Pray was president of the United States District Judges Association for the 9th Judicial Circuit in the years 1950–54.

Although he is retiring from active duty, Judge Pray hopes to carry on his judicial work to a limited extent, so that Montana may have 3 judges.

In approving his retirement, on January 17 of this year, the President praised his splendid service to the Federal judiciary. He stated that the judge's career has been a distinguished one marked by ability and devotion to the public good.

Judge Pray's retirement brought forth praise from Montana editors all over the State. I have selected two of the many editorials as representative of the praise and commendation that Judge Pray received. The first is from the Great Falls Tribune, Judge Pray's hometown newspaper and one of Montana's great dailies:

JUDICIAL SERVICE OF STATURE

In legal circles throughout the Nation as well as in Montana, Federal Judge Charles N. Pray has long been held in highest esteem as a jurist practicing and exemplifying the qualities most needed and desired in the judicial branch of government.

Thus it is with appreciation of his long and valuable service to Montana and to the Federal judicial system that we view with regret the announcement of his plans to retire from active service on the bench.

Prior to his appointment as United States District Court judge in Montana 33 years ago, Judge Pray, as a Member of Congress, had left his imprint on the furthering of irrigation, homesteading, mining and other development enterprises of the West. He also is known as one of those most responsible for the creation of Glacier Park.

During his long service on the bench Judge Pray has scrupulously avoided intermingling in activities political or organizational which might in any way bear upon the unbiased exercise of his judicial functions.

As the president of the San Francisco Bar Association fittingly remarked in introducing the veteran Montana jurist to a west coast meeting of Federal judges: "It would be well that every man upon the bench and every lawyer practicing before the bar look to Judge Pray * * * to follow in this life of ours."

The second is from the Hungry Horse News, one of the Nation's fine weekly newspapers, in which editor Mel Ruder discusses another aspect of Judge Pray's character:

We are a country editor by choice, and the pleasures of this business include meeting many fine people. Some have money and position and some have not. That doesn't make a man fine.

High on that list we place Judge Charles N. Pray, Great Falls, who last Saturday announced his retirement from the Federal bench.

Judge Pray was appointed by President Coolidge as a Federal judge on January 21, 1924, after distinguished service as an attorney, Chouteau County prosecuting attorney, and a Member of Congress.

Last July we met Judge Pray at the dedication of the Charles N. Pray rustic log shelter at the head of Two Medicine Lake. The August 3, 1956, Hungry Horse News had a picture series on the dedication.

Judge Pray was Montana's lone Congressman from 1907 until 1913. He was this State's Congressman during those years when the fight was on to set aside 1 million acres of northwestern Montana as Glacier National Park. Glacier became a national park in 1910.

Judge Pray was elected president of the Ninth Circuit District Judges conference in 1952, and again in 1953, 1954, 1955, and 1956. The Great Falls Tribune termed this precedent shattering tribute to his skill as a judge.

In fact the Tribune, Montana's leading newspaper, started out their story of Judge Pray's retirement with: "Federal Judge Charles N. Pray, 88, dean of United States District Court judges and respected throughout the West and Nation for distinguished service as a jurist, Saturday announced his plans for retirement after 33 years on the bench."

There are many big things about Judge Pray, and attorneys and the press are sincerely complimentary.

We'd like to bring out little things. We sent Judge Pray copies of our pictures last August. He wrote back much concerned that we were going to considerable expense. We

weren't and after all it was for a man who helped create Glacier.

We sent the judge three or four extra copies of the Holiday Pictorial blue section since it had a small picture of the Pray shelter. Back came a thank you note handwritten by the judge. He also commented on the story about the U. S. S. *Glacier* in the January 4 issue and Eddie Boyles, the skating master.

Our thought is that the characteristic of being considerate and appreciative about little things is also the mark of a big man. Judge Pray is most sincerely that way.

## PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we were informed that the Secretary of Agriculture has decided to cut $200 million from the price-support program for eight major farm commodities this year. This action can only be interpreted as one more indication that the administration is not interested in farmers except during an election year. It can only accelerate the deterioration of our farm economy.

It seems that Mr. Benson has borrowed a page from the field of foreign policy and has applied economic sanctions to the American farmer. We have just granted the administration a free hand to give $200 million to King Saud and his pals. Apparently, Mr. Benson has decided that the American farmer should pick up the tab for this handsome gift. Can it be that the administration is more concerned about taking care of the oil interests in the Middle East than in safeguarding agriculture in the Middle West? It would seem that the voice of the Arabian-American Oil Co. speaks louder than the voice of millions of hard-pressed American farm families.

Recently, Department of Agriculture statisticians forecast a 50-percent increase in farm income for 1957. Apparently, this report so alarmed Mr. Benson that he immediately set out to make sure that farmers had no such luck this year.

For 5 years we have watched farm income decline while the cost of everything that the farmer buys continues to rise. In my State, farmers are being driven from the land at a rate of nearly a thousand a year. Young farmers particularly find themselves caught in an economic vice consisting of rising costs and high interest rates on one hand, and disastrously low farm prices on the other.

Each month the farmer's share of the consumer's food dollar becomes proportionately less. The inevitable result is the drying up of farm purchasing power and the collapse, not only of agriculture, but of the main street and industrial economy that depends upon farm buying power. The lesson of the 1920's and early 1930's leaves no doubt as to the eventual result of a farm depression on the Nation as a whole.

Yet, Mr. Benson announces another cut of $200 million in farm price supports on eight major farm crops. We are told that this action is necessary to reduce farm surpluses. This is either unadulterated nonsense or else it is a part of a malicious and calculated plan to drive the family farmer from the land and replace him with corporation farms.

The plain truth of the matter is that there is no surplus of oats, barley, rye, grain sorghums, soybeans or flaxseed—all products included in those on which Mr. Benson is dropping the price-support level. Who can talk seriously about a surplus of oats, for example, when the Nation has only an 18-day supply on hand? Last summer, in my home State, farmers were driving from farm to farm and from elevator to elevator trying to scrape up a few bushels of oats to meet the feed shortage. If the terrible drought that grips the Southwestern States should spread farther north, we would be confronted with a feed shortage of the most dangerous proportions.

One fact is certain. If we do not act soon to stop the deterioration of American agriculture, we will not have the economic strength to carry on constructive economic aid abroad, nor will we be able to avert a nationwide depression at home. This Congress should move now to strip Mr. Benson of his powers to drop farm prices and should establish a firm price-support program that will assure the farmer a decent return on his investment and labor.

## THE CITIZENS FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE AND ITS PROGRAM

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, it was with some disappointment that I read in this morning's newspaper of the newly formed Citizens Foreign Relations Committee, the aims of which are announced to be to urge the breaking of diplomatic ties with the Communist countries and support for "democratic subversion" behind the Iron Curtain.

Among the directors listed for this new organization are several prominent Republicans, including five distinguished Republican Members of this House. I have no doubt as to the sincerity of purpose of these Members, most of whom have a very commendable record of support for the cause of freedom of captive nations.

I have no quarrel in principle with them in their urging the breaking of diplomatic ties with the Communist regimes, though in the case of countries like Poland, this would certainly seem very unwise at this time. It would only bring back to power a more pro-Russian and Stalin-like regime to replace Gomulka, who has at least shown a remarkable independence from Moscow and who has given the Polish people a degree of liberalization which, slight as it might be, is a great relief from the tyranny which they have suffered for many years and to which they would probably revert if the present regime should fail.

What does disturb me greatly, however, is that part of the statement of the new committee which states that "we should fight fire with fire, and do unto them what they are doing unto us." Further the statement says, "To make ourselves perfectly plain, we are talking about volunteer fighters for freedom and about democratic subversive cells and groups behind the Iron Curtain."

To me this sounds terribly cynical and immoral. It sounds like the old slogan: "Go ahead, let you and he fight. I'll just stand by."

Whose fire does this committee propose to use to fight fire with? Whose lives does this committee propose to heroically sacrifice to "do unto them what they are doing unto us"? Just what help will this committee give to these patriots whom it asks to lay down their lives to save us from the eventual fate which these countries now suffer? Does this committee remember what aid we promised in slogans to the Hungarians, only to let them down when the real test came? And what help are we giving poor Israel which has been suffering from continued attacks from Moscow-supported Egypt?

Do these people expect the Poles to forget that we let them down in 1939 when they were brutally invaded by the Nazi hordes, and that later as a reward for their courage, patriotism, and bloody sacrifice, we let them down again by turning them over into Communist slavery through the Yalta Pact? Has this committee not heard Dulles' assurance given to Moscow that if these nations revolt, the United States will stand by and offer them no help?

No, I cannot approve of the program as outlined by this committee. It is brutal, inhuman, and will certainly not be heeded by those to whom it is directed. The people of Poland have learned the bitter lesson that they cannot count on anyone but themselves to work out their destiny. In the recent events in Poland they have shown remarkable good sense in their restraint and in their approach to the gigantic problem of regaining their complete independence. They realize this may take a long time, much patience and much sacrifice, but they will, I hope, never again lay down their lives needlessly against impossible odds, until some assurance is given that they can reasonably depend on aid from the West.

If this committee wishes to make a real contribution to the cause of freedom of the captive nations, may I suggest that it demand from our Secretary of State that we give full support to the request for immediate and effective economic aid to the peoples of Poland, who have already sufficiently demonstrated their deep and unshaken loyalty to the cause of freedom and democracy. Nothing could build our prestige and restore the confidence and spirit of these nations more than early and successful conclusion of the negotiations now going on for effective economic aid by the United States to the people of Poland.

I sincerely hope and trust that this goal will soon be achieved.

## STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to protest the imposition of sanctions upon the brave State of Israel—our fellow nation in freedom. Is the valiant State of Israel, that has labored so arduously to develop into a strong and free nation, to be brought to defeat and ruin by her natural friend and ally, the United States? Where is the rule of law in international affairs, to which the President so often refers, in the face of what is a dangerous double standard in dealing with our friends and with our enemies? As William Henry Chamberlin observed in the New Leader of January 7, 1957, there is a new political double standard:

> But a new and perhaps still more dangerous double standard seems to be emerging from the Middle Eastern and Hungarian crises. This may be summed up as follows: When three free countries, Great Britain, France and Israel, resorted to arms to redress grievances which neither the processes of diplomacy nor the United Nations had given any promise of redressing, they were duly censured with bell, book and candle. The very strong pressure put on these countries to withdraw from occupied positions was not accompanied, as it should have been, by equal pressure on Egyptian dictator Nasser to clear the Suez Canal and open it to all shipping under tolerable regulation, or on Syria to repair the wanton destruction of an oil pipeline running through its territory.
>
> But when the Soviet Union committed a most flagrant act of fenocidal aggression, overthrowing the legitimate government of Hungary and substituting a puppet regime, ruthlessly crushing over a period of many weeks the active and passive resistance of the overwhelming majority of the Hungarian people, nothing happened except the passing of a series of plaintive, utterly futile protests by the United Nations.

Have we not yet learned from the shambles of our foreign policy that appeasement will not work, that we must act in accordance with the principles we profess? Let us make clear that Israel acted in accordance with the inherent right of self-defense, that she acted because the U. N., the United States and the other nations had defaulted on their obligations. Israel has a right to demand assurances that there will not be a return to the conditions which obtained on October 29 and which precipitated the hostilities. Israel must be given a sense of security that she will not be attacked by her Arab neighbors. Let us uphold the high position of the United States among the free nations of the world by insisting upon one standard of morals in dealing with world crises, by insuring that the U. N. live up to its charter in resolving disputes in conformity with the principles of justice and international law.

## THE FARMER HAS LOST BUT NO ONE ELSE HAS GAINED AS A RESULT OF THE BENSON-EISENHOWER FARM PROGRAM

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, took another blow at the income of cotton farmers.

He announced a reduction in the support price of cotton of approximately $6 per bale. He did this in spite of the fact that cotton stocks are in much better position than they have been for a long time. He did this in spite of the fact that more cotton was sold last year than in many preceding years. He did this in spite of the fact that over the years and particularly during the past 4 years, his losses on the cotton-loan program have been less than on dairy products, wheat or corn. He did not reduce the support price of any of these other commodities. In his news release on Saturday, he indicated that this reduction in the support price of cotton would not reduce the price that the farmer receives because he pointed out that cotton was already selling above the support price. He intimated that the support price could be lowered without affecting the domestic market. This simply isn't true. With the present supply situation, the support price fixes the domestic market and holds the domestic market price just a little above the support price. This is true because the law requires the domestic purchaser to pay 105 percent of the support price. When the support price goes down, the domestic price goes down in almost exactly the same amount. This was but an effort to mislead the producer and to keep him from realizing just how serious the blow was going to be.

Here are the figures for each of the major crops:

*A comparison of values of the total 1956 production of crops, at the 1956 support rates and at the 1957 support rates announced by Secretary Benson*

| Crop | Value 1956 crop at 1956 support rate | Value 1956 production at 1957 support rate announced by Mr. Benson | Difference in value |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cotton | $1,952,000,000 | $1,872,000,000 | $80,000,000 |
| Rice | 217,000,000 | 210,000,000 | 7,000,000 |
| Oats | 749,000,000 | 692,000,000 | 57,000,000 |
| Barley | 379,000,000 | 350,000,000 | 29,000,000 |
| Rye | 28,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 3,000,000 |
| Sorghum grain | 227,000,000 | 210,000,000 | 17,000,000 |
| Flax | 151,000,000 | 143,000,000 | 8,000,000 |
| Soy beans | 980,000,000 | 953,000,000 | 27,000,000 |
| Cottonseed | 264,000,000 | 253,000,000 | 11,000,000 |

NOTE.—The wheat and dairy products support levels have been set at the same rates as 1956. There is no ready means of comparing the effects of 1956 and 1957 loan rates for corn, due to the variety of supports provided in 1956.

It seems to me that this is a rather appropriate time to look at some of the operation results of 4 years of Bensonism. Let us note a few figures. On January 1, 1953, the total price support losses that had been accumulating over the previous 20 years amounted to $1,064,617,225. On January 1, 1957, after Mr. Benson had had control of the Department for 4 years, these losses amounted to $4,005,229,643. Thus, we find that the 4 years of Bensonism cost the taxpayers almost 3 times as much as 20 years of Democratic administration of the Department. The figures are:

| | |
|---|---|
| 20-year loss (1933–52) | $1,064,617,225 |
| Loss (1953 through 1956) | 2,940,612,418 |
| Total losses to date | 4,005,229,643 |

It is, of course, interesting to observe that most of these losses were incurred on nonbasic commodities where the support level was never fixed at a rigid figure. Prior to the time Mr. Benson took over, most of the losses are attributable to potatoes, but supports had been removed from potatoes before Mr. Benson became Secretary. The major item of losses in the last 4 years has been dairy products. On dairy products, we have, up to January 1, 1957, lost a total of $1,283,395,042, but at the time Mr. Benson took office January 1, 1953, the losses on dairy products were only $121,523,383. In other words, this program alone has incurred losses during Mr. Benson's tenure of office of $1,161,871,659.

| | |
|---|---|
| Losses as of Jan. 1, 1953 | $121,523,383 |
| Losses as of Jan. 1, 1957 | 1,283,395,042 |
| Losses under Benson-Eisenhower | 1,161,871,659 |

Compare this with the losses on the basic commodities which were firmly supported at 90 percent until last year. On the date Mr. Benson took office, there was a net profit of $13,011,290 on the 6 basic commodities. There is now, as of January 1, 1957, a net loss of $1,222,671,853. It is interesting to note that the $13 million profit was dissipated and within the first 4 months after Mr. Benson took office, had turned into an $8 million loss.

| | |
|---|---|
| Profit as of Jan. 1, 1953 | $13,011,290 |
| Losses as of Jan. 1, 1957 | 1,222,671,853 |
| Lost under Benson-Eisenhower | 1,235,683,143 |

It might also be noted that at the time Mr. Benson became Secretary, the CCC support program for cotton showed a profit which was retained so long as cotton was supported at 90 percent. One year ago, this profit still amounted to $267 million, but this entire profit was wiped out in 1956 and the cotton program now shows on January 1, 1957, a loss of $161,850,872.

| | |
|---|---|
| Profit on cotton program Jan. 1, 1956 | $267,000,000 |
| Loss on cotton program Jan. 1, 1957 | 161,850,872 |
| Lost in 1 year under Benson-Eisenhower | 428,850,872 |

Of course, if the sugar program were computed with the basics, and sugar has always been supported in excess of 90 percent of parity, the record would look a little better. Mr. Benson took over an actual profit on the sugar operations amounting to $309,903,290. The sugar program now shows a total profit of over $365 million.

In view of these tremendous losses that have been incurred during the Benson-Eisenhower administration, one would reasonably assume that the inventories of these commodities must have been greatly reduced. Unfortunately, the facts show that on January 1, 1953, Mr. Benson took over CCC inventories amounting to $2,452,000,000, but on January 1, 1957, he held CCC inventories amounting to $8,211,000,000.

| | |
|---|---|
| Total CCC inventories as of Jan. 1, 1953 | $2,452,000,000 |
| Total CCC inventories as of Jan. 1, 1957 | 8,211,000,000 |
| Total increase under Benson-Eisenhower | 5,759,000,000 |

Broken down, the investments in various commodities are as follows:

*CCC investments (inventory and loans)*

| Crop | Amount | Value |
|---|---|---|
| Cotton: | | |
| Jan. 1, 1953 ..... bales | 1,097,000 | $166,779,000 |
| Jan. 1, 1957 ..... do | 10,263,000 | 1,723,711,000 |
| Wheat: | | |
| Jan. 1, 1953 ..... bushels | 467,847,000 | 1,081,545,000 |
| Jan. 1, 1957 ..... do | 1,089,029,000 | 2,693,452,000 |
| Corn: | | |
| Jan. 1, 1953 ..... do | 368,349,000 | 587,274,000 |
| Jan. 1, 1957 ..... do | 1,199,688,000 | 2,045,551,000 |
| Rice: | | |
| Jan. 1, 1953 hundredweight | 168,000 | 878,000 |
| Jan. 1, 1957 ..... do | 22,372,000 | 173,848,000 |
| Peanuts: | | |
| Jan. 1, 1953 ..... pounds | 192,528,000 | 22,644,000 |
| Jan. 1, 1957 ..... do | 336,435,000 | 35,664,000 |
| Tobacco: | | |
| Jan. 1, 1953 ..... do | 544,067,000 | 250,373,000 |
| Jan. 1, 1957 ..... do | 1,075,660,000 | 673,554,000 |
| Dairy products: | | |
| Jan. 1, 1953 | | 8,445,000 |
| Jan. 1, 1957 | | 111,031,000 |
| Total CCC investments: | | |
| Jan. 1, 1953 | | 2,452,000,000 |
| Jan. 1, 1957 | | 8,211,018,000 |

All of the above shows rather clearly that although the farmer has received far less from the Government-support program since Mr. Benson and President Eisenhower took over, the taxpayer has had no relief. Inventories are almost 4 times as great as they were on January 1, 1953. The total cost of support programs during the Benson-Eisenhower regime has been approximately 3 times as great as it was during the entire 20 preceding years. On Mr. Benson's own favored flexible support program on dairy products, the losses have been nearly 10 times as great during the 4 years of the Benson-Eisenhower program as during the 20 preceding years, and on the basic commodities that, in the old days were supported at 90 percent of parity, the Benson-Eisenhower program has actually changed a small profit into a $1¼ billion loss, and yet farm prices are 18 percent below what they were when Benson started.

## ADMISSION OF HAWAII AND ALASKA AS STATES

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, admission of Hawaii and Alaska to the Union of States is of vital importance to the United States and to its future. It might be said with considerable justification that no more important business is before the Congress of the United States. We cannot, and still revere our honor and integrity as a Nation, advocate the right of self determination for peoples elsewhere and do less for our own people. Nor can our political parties lightly regard their solemn promises to the American people.

I agree with Thomas Jefferson who said, "I tolerate with the utmost latitude the right of others to differ from me in opinion without imputing to them criminality. I know too well the weakness and uncertainty of human reason to wonder at its different results." But when opponents, on a matter of such national importance, argue from falsehoods, half-truths, and wrong facts, there is not only reason, but positive necessity, to wonder at and to consider their motivation.

As of the opening of the 85th Congress, statehood for Hawaii and Alaska was in a most favorable position. Time and the record had demonstrated that the oppositions fears were not being realized.

However, since the opening of the Congress and since its general attitude has become known, an increasing number of arguments, appealing almost solely to the emotions, have been raised against statehood.

In the Sunday Star, an article by Frank R. Kent does just this. It is not my purpose to defend Harry Bridges. He seems quite able to defend himself. But the fact is—and Mr. Kent's ignorance of this I find incredible—that Mr. Bridges is a naturalized American citizen and a registered Republican. Thus corrected, Mr. Kent's emotional appeal falls flat on its face. He also refers to a Ben Dillingham as one of the Territory's most substantial and influential businessmen. This is not a fact, with all due regard to my friend, Ben Dillingham.

People using such arguments are doing a great disservice to the United States. Subversion can, and is, served by indirection. We cannot, when the issue at stake is so important, when honesty is so imperative, allow such people—whose business is to know better—to blear the air with falsehoods, with half-truths and with patent insincerity. To do so is to bring irreparable harm to the United States and to the future of our peoples.

## ISRAEL AND SANCTIONS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the General Assembly of the United Nations is insisting Israeli troops withdraw behind her borders without receiving from the United Nations any assurances that Egypt will not again resume attack upon the territory of Israel. The only reason Israel marched onto the territory adjacent to its borders was to protect its status as a free democratic nation and to stop outside attacks against its territory.

Israel originally was created by the United Nations and for that great body to now ask that Israel again expose itself to outside attacks merely to satisfy the warlike spirit of Egypt is beyond comprehension. Criticisms from certain sources are now leveled at Israel for attempting to defy the United Nations' orders to withdraw its troops. Israel is the only free democratic nation in the Middle East area and the United Nations apparently is now deserting its only friend in this controversial part of the globe. Israel's enemies have already defied the Security Council of the United Nations in several instances, to wit; Russia defied the Assembly on Hungary; Egypt defied the Security Council in respect to Israeli shipping in the Suez Canal; India has defied the Security Council on Kashmir.

Why should the United Nations now use its power against the only democratic nation in the Middle East when it failed to enforce its resolutions on larger nations who are demanding penalties from Israel? Regardless of the United Nations mishandling of this situation, I think it is high time for our State Department to make a clean-cut ultimatum that the United Nations should guarantee law and order on the Israeli-Egyptian border and also protect Israeli navigation rights. This statement and assurances by U. N. and our Government should not offend any nation in this area but would be equitable and fair treatment to the nations concerned.

The United States, Great Britain, and other free countries have the power to stop an economic penalty sanctions resolution against Israel in the General Assembly of the United Nations and should do so at once.

## AN EXCHANGE OF CABINET JOBS

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there have been some people who have suggested that the Secretary of State should resign. I have a better idea. I think the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Agriculture should exchange places and then perhaps Mr. Dulles would come out with a Middle West plan and we could give $200 million to the hard-pressed farmers of the Middle West while Mr. Benson who has again cut the farmer's income could devote his talents to cutting out some of the $200 million we are going to give to King Saud and the Middle East.

## SANCTIONS AGAINST ISRAEL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, sometimes those who call themselves statesmen are indeed greatly impressed with their own elongated shadows in the late afternoon sun. The fanfare they have whipped up among themselves in the United Nations against the position of Israel in its controversy with Nasser's Egypt is both fantastic and ridiculous.

We are informed that today is the day in the United Nations. It is the day when this assembly of world statesmen is going to make Israel walk the plank. This is the day this great assembly of statesmen is to engage in debate on the subject of whether or not the United Nations will impose sanctions on Israel. There will be lots of talk about international law. Lots of talk about what constitutes an aggressor, lots of talk about national morality.

Every one of these statesmen who can will get into the act because here is an opportunity for them to show they are on the job in the United Nations without worry or fear of saying anything which might have a negative effect upon their own nations' future. They are not arguing today for sanctions against mighty Communist Russia because of her wrongful aggression against little Hungary. To engage in such a debate might really involve statesmanship. They are arguing today for sanctions against the tiny little State of Israel, so small that one bomber trip from end to end could annihilate it, so small it scarcely has room in which to breathe. These statesmen are in favor of sanctions against Israel because they have nothing to fear. Here is their chance to sound off; to talk in legal terms, in diplomatic language, to orate about what is legal, what is moral, what is a violation of international law. You will not hear, however, very much about rights. To analyze the question of rights involved might not be popular statesmanship.

Long has it been the position of this great United States of America that might does not make right. It is our position, however, that right does make might. In this controversy, the State of Israel is so right in its position that the debate in the United Nations which is to take place some time today is nothing less than a ludicrous fiasco.

The Government of the United States will make a very grave mistake if it supports the resolution of sactions against the State of Israel pending in the United Nations today. It is my view, and I believe the view of an overwhelming majority of my colleagues here in the Congress, that if the executive department of the Government of the United States authorizes American support of the resolution of sanctions, the executive department will not have the support of the Congress of the United States. It is my view that the Congress is overwhelmingly opposed to a support of any resolution of sanctions against the State of Israel for the admirable stand it has taken for protection from the fedayeen hordes of Nasser's Egypt.

Now, just what are the facts regarding this controversy between Israel and Egypt? With the overwhelming support of the United States, the State of Israel was created by the United Nations in 1948. From the very beginning Egypt has refused to recognize Israel's legal existence as a state. From the very beginning a state of hostility has existed between Israel and Egypt. Nasser and his Egyptian Government are severe and outspoken. They are determined to destroy Israel completely. In fact, no Arab nation will even negotiate with Israel. Nonrecognition is the policy of the Arab world. Determined to achieve its purpose, Egypt forced the Israeli to fight to save their lands from invasion and complete annihilation by the Egyptian military forces.

In order to stop this aggressive action on the part of Egypt the United Nations, largely due to pressure from the United States, succeeded in getting Egypt to agree to an armistice with Israel in 1949. This agreement provided for an end to all military action between the two countries. Almost immediately Egypt refused to honor this agreement. From the very moment it was signed Egypt occupied Saudi Arabian islands in the Gulf of Aqaba so as to blockade Israeli shipping. Egypt denied Israel access to the Suez Canal. Egypt resorted to gang warfare and unleased countless raids by fedayeen gangs into Israeli territory. Time and time again Israel appealed to the United Nations to have these violations of the 1949 armistice stopped, but the General Assembly did nothing and apparently was not even interested. These violations of the 1949 armistice continued right up until Israel struck back last October. Night after night citizens of Israel were kidnaped from their homes and horribly murdered by these fedayeen gangs. The Government of Egypt refused to make any effort to stop the operations of this gang warfare. In fact, if the truth were known, the Nasser Government encouraged them and supplied them with the equipment necessary to conduct the raids. It is perfectly obvious to any student of international affairs that Egypt as a government and as a nation was continuing its hostile acts without regard to the 1949 armistice and for the purpose of destroying the State of Israel.

In the months prior to October 1956, General Nasser and the Egyptian Government assembled large supplies and military equipment on the Israeli border. These supplies were provided to Egypt by Communist Russia. It was perfectly obvious to anyone having any ability to appraise what was going on that Egypt was preparing for a devastating blow against Israel. It was obvious that Egypt was getting ready to destroy Israel regardless of any agreement and regardless of protestations by the United Nations.

Faced with this grave threat to its very existence, Israel did what any nation alert to such a situation would do—Israel struck back, and defeated the Egyptian armies. It is beyond my comprehension how any person who considers himself a statesman, in view of these facts, can arrive at any puristic, legalistic conclusion that the act of Israel in attacking first constituted aggression. To call it aggression is to refuse to face the facts, and to refuse to face the facts is a complete failure of statesmanship. Since the defeat of Egypt by Israel, and due to pressures brought by the Department of State of the United States through the United Nations, Israel has withdrawn her military forces from all Egyptian territory except the Gaza Strip and Sharm El Sheikh in the mouth of the Gulf of Aqaba. As for value, neither of these areas is worthy of a second thought.

For Israel, however, the Gaza Strip is important, for its was in this flea-bitten little rectangle of sand, smaller than a Texas ranch, that the Egyptian Government permitted the operation of the fedayeen gangs. Israel has refused to evacuate this area unless and until it has guaranteed protection from a renewal of these raids by the fedayeen gangs. Israel is right in this stand.

In regard to the evacuation of Sharm El Sheikh at the mouth of the Gulf of Aqaba, Israel will withdraw from this area providing Israel has an enforceable iron-clad assurance that Egypt will not be permitted to reemploy the Egyptian naval blockade of the small Israeli port of Elath, nor interfere with the free use of the Suez Canal for Israeli shipping. Again, the Government of Israel is right.

As a child of the United Nations, established in the middle of a large, hostile Arab sea, Israel has the right to depend upon the United Nations for the complete protection of her security. By treaty agreement, Israel has the right to depend upon the United States for her security.

In view of these facts, it seems to me that the duty of the United Nations and the duty of the Government of the United States is quite clearly defined.

In international affairs, the concept of aggression and what constitutes an aggressor has developed rather complex and variable meanings. As a matter of fact, the interpretation of what constitutes an aggressor in the United Nations seems to be somewhat based upon the military strength of the power in question. Certainly in an extremely hostile situation where in all reality a state of war exists, such as the Israeli-Egyptian controversy, it is extremely difficult to understand how any statesman possessing a full knowledge of the facts could arrive at a conclusion that Israel had performed an act of aggression and was in fact an aggressor nation.

Yet it is based upon this idea, and this conclusion, that Israel in fact did perform an act of aggression by its October defense against the assembled Egyptian-Russian military might. This, of course, is utterly and fantastically ridiculous.

All through the history of the United States of America in our foreign relations, we have tried to determine the right course. Where the principle of right was involved, it did not matter

whether the nation in question was militarily strong or weak, or whether the nation was large or small. A principle of right is involved in this Israeli-Egyptian controversy and, upon analysis, there is no question but what the right is on the side of Israel.

In the United Nations, however, there appears to be sufficient fanfare to cause these legalistic statesmen to split hairs and arrive through some form of illogical logic at the conclusion that Israel is guilty of aggression.

Because of this trumped-up guilt, these wise and tried and experienced statesmen state that unless Israel backs away from the right and retreats from the Gaza Strip and the Aqaba Gulf areas their very national existence will be threatened by the establishment of sanctions.

Now what is, in reality, this so-called punishment known as sanctions? It is one of those legalistic phrases the legalistic statesmen have developed for the purpose of trying to whip into line a wrong-doer nation. Of course it never works in the case of a strong nation. It was even foolish, therefore, to even think about it in regard to the Russian aggression against Hungary. And it never works against a small, weak nation, particularly if that nation has right on its side. From long experience, the American people know that the strongest thing in this world to break is the will and determination of a free man or a free people.

The purpose of sanctions, therefore, is to break the back economically of the nation involved. Its purpose is to bring said nation to its knees and if applied against Israel, its purpose is to break the spirit of this young and vigorous nation.

From the viewpoint of conscience, there are different ways in which an act of aggression can take place. It can take place by military force and it can also take place by denying to free men and their families bread and food and the necessities to sustain life. It does not make much difference whether a man dies by a bullet or by starvation. He is dead in either case. In both cases, his death is the result of decisions reached by a more powerful nation or group of nations.

In all seriousness, I submit to you for your very grave consideration the very fact that if the United Nations votes to establish international sanctions against Israel, that that act will in itself constitute an aggression against the State of Israel. Certainly, the United States of America should not approve any such decision. It is my view that the United States Department of State should make its position crystal clear. As a free Government and the leader of free nations throughout the world, the United States of America certainly cannot have any part in any act which is colored in legalistic phraseology but actually has the same effect as military force and used for the purpose of breaking the will of an associated free nation.

I hope my country, as represented in the United Nations, will vote against and use its prestige against any approval of sanctions against Israel, for the noble and respected stand this little nation has taken in defense of its own sovereignty in the knowledge it is in the right.

## ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an address by Representative DURHAM.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday I had the privilege of joining several of my colleagues on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in attending the ceremonies at Argonne National Laboratory near Chicago to witness the beginning of the regular operation of the first nuclear powerplant in this country designed exclusively for the production of electric power. As was so well pointed out by our colleague, Mr. DURHAM, chairman of the joint committee, this was truly "an event of historical significance in man's development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes."

It was indeed fitting that 5 Members of this House on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy were present at the ceremonies. For the joint committee has played an important part in lending active support to this project for the past 5 years. I think tribute should also be man Hilberry, present acting director, of Argonne Laboratory, and to Dr. Norman Hilberry, present acting director, and their staffs at Argonne for their magnificent achievement.

The road has not been easy and there have been many technological problems along the way. But, I am sure that the devotion and perseverance of the scientists, contractor personnel, and others, who brought this project to successful completion, is representative of the will and desire of our people to bring the benefits of nuclear power as rapidly as possible to all mankind.

The dedicatory address of our colleague, Hon. CARL T. DURHAM, was complete and very instructive, and I ask unanimous consent that his address may be included as an extension of my remarks.

There is no question but that the possibilities of atomic energy are being expanded tremendously.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, here is the informative address of our colleague, Mr. DURHAM.

REMARKS BY HON. CARL T. DURHAM, CHAIRMAN, JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, AT LUNCHEON MEETING, ARGONNE NATIONAL LABORATORY, FEBRUARY 9, 1957

The beginning of regular operation of the experimental boiling water reactor as an electric powerplant is a particularly significant occasion and one of deep personal gratification to me and members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

This occasion ushers in what history will record as a year of highly important accomplishments in the Nation's program to develop atomic power for peace.

My individual gratification at this event stems from my good fortune in having participated in the early deliberations of the Congress which led to the establishment of the Atomic Energy Commission as a civilian agency of Government. Prior to that time, I had followed the Manhattan District program as a member of the House Military Affairs Committee. I also have been privileged to be a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Congress from its very beginning. From that vantage point I have observed at firsthand, and heartily approved, the formulation of plans for the Argonne National Laboratory. I have watched the laboratory grow into a great and proud institution which today is playing a major role in the development of the peacetime applications of atomic energy in the United States.

It is interesting to note that when our committee asked the Atomic Energy Commission in 1953 to submit a program for civilian reactor development, 3 of the 5 reactor types recommended for intensive research and development work were the products of fertile minds of the staff of this laboratory. These were the pressurized water, the boiling water, and the fast breeder reactors. The last 2 of these 3 key projects are being carried out directly by Argonne personnel.

This impact of the Argonne Laboratory on the nuclear power program is no mere coincidence. The history of atomic energy development in this country is full of the accomplishments of Argonne and of its wartime predecessor, the Metallurgical Laboratory.

It is fitting that this electric power generating pilot plant, the first in this country designed and built exclusively for experimentation on the production of electricity, should come from the same laboratory that, in 1942, ushered in the atomic age with the first self-sustaining nuclear chain reaction achieved by man.

As you know, this was but one of many wartime achievements of the Chicago group. Among other outstanding accomplishments were the first production of tritium, the construction and operation of the first heavy water moderated nuclear reactor—the CP-3 which was the forerunner of today's CP-5. The laboratory also provided the conceptual design for the Hanford reactors and the first process for extraction of uranium and plutonium from irradiated uranium.

Those developments were produced in the heat of the war, but once the war was over the scientific talents of the laboratory staff were quickly turned to the discovery of ways to use the tremendous energy of the atom for the peaceful benefit of man.

Today I don't need to tell you that your great national establishment is engaged in a broad program of basic research activities in the fields of biology and medicine, chemistry, and physics, contributing to the important fund of new thoretical and experimental knowledge that is essential to a better understanding of nature in general and of atomic energy phenomena in particular.

Coupled with this program of basic research, the postwar program of Argonne has consisted of extensive engineering development work in all fields closely related to nuclear reactor engineering. But it is appropriate on this occasion, I believe, to call particular attention to the laboratory's record of achievement in the development of reactors for the purpose of producing power. And in this connection, I wish to pay tribute to Dr. Walter H. Zinn, the former director, to whom is due so much credit for the work done in this laboratory, and to Dr. Hilberry, long Dr. Zinn's strong right arm and his acting successor.

The list of Argonne achievements includes the conceptual design for the Nautilus reactor, and the demonstration of the breeding of nuclear fuels which was accomplished with the experimental breeder reactor No. 1, designed and developed by Argonne scientists and engineers. And the EBR will be remembered as the reactor used in the first known

experimental generation of electricity from nuclear energy at the Idaho testing station, on December 20, 1951.

One of the matters in which the joint committee has been very interested is the training of scientists and engineers in the atomic energy program. Throughout its history Argonne has served as a training ground for people in all aspects of the national atomic energy program. Another Argonne first was the on-the-job training of employees of industrial firms engaged in atomic energy activities. Just as the wartime laboratory had trained industrial engineers to prepare them for the construction and operation of the plutonium production facilities at Hanford, Wash., Argonne, in 1948, gave on-the-job training to technical personnel of Westinghouse and the United States Navy. In 1950, hundreds of employees of the du Pont Co. were trained at Argonne for their part in the establishment of the Savannah River plant of the AEC and more recently members of many industrial firms have received training at the Argonne facilities. And today, as part of the President's atoms-for-peace program, Argonne is actively engaged in the training of scientists and technicians from friendly nations in nuclear subjects.

The laboratory's performance in all respects, but particularly its accomplishments in the training field, is a tribute to the University of Chicago which has operated this establishment for the AEC. The university under Chancellor Kimpton and Vice President Harrell has rendered the Nation a great service through judicious guidance that has maintained at Argonne a truly scientific atmosphere. In fact, the basic idea for the boiling-water reactor can be attributed to the scientific atmosphere which prevails here. I am told that it was the accepted belief that a reactor would not work if the water which serves as moderator and coolant were allowed to boil. This belief was eventually challenged and the scientific search for the proof led to the boiling water reactor experiment (Borax) which successfully demonstrated this concept.

From the early experiment in 1953 came the boiling reactor powerplant, Borax III, which was the first in this country to supply nuclear electric power to an entire community, the town of Arco, Idaho. The next logical step in the development of this new approach to nuclear power was the design and development of the plant we are dedicating today. This plant in which steam is generated in the reactor vessel and sent directly to the turbine-generator without benefit of heat exchanger is a long step toward reducing to its simplest terms the process of transforming nuclear energy into electric power.

We have watched this project with great interest from the time it was recommended to the Congress until today. We shall continue to keep a close watch on it for I believe this technology holds a large measure of promise for the future.

As many of you are undoubtedly aware, I have always advocated a vigorous and aggressive national program looking toward early achievement of the objective of economic nuclear power. I think our national interest and international commitments demand this. I am gratified, as I said earlier, by the achievement we are observing today. I want to commend the laboratory and especially the team under John West for this latest of its long list of achievements. At the same time, I wish to congratulate the Atomic Energy Commission and the industrial organizations such as Allis-Chalmers which have participated in making this achievement possible. In particular I would like to commend the Chicago Operations Office of AEC, which under its able manager, John Flaherty, and his staff have done so, much to expedite the work on this project.

I am confident that with the continued teamwork of Government and private industry our national goal of economic nuclear power is well within reach.

## UNITED NATIONS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, our very delightful colleague from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] called our attention this morning to the fact that 145 years ago we had a little trouble with the most powerful nation in the world, Great Britain. His recollection seems to be that at that time Great Britain was taking some of our seamen off our ships and forcing them to serve in their navy. Whether it was on commercial or warships, I do not recall. In any event, the point is that if 145 years ago we could successfully defy the greatest nation then in all the world, why is it that today we are so weak, so lacking courage that we surrender to the President of the United States—and he is my President; I supported and voted for him? He received the biggest majority in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan—70 percent—of any district of Michigan. How do you like that? Why is it that we avoid our responsibility? If we must now turn over to him that power, as you in your greater wisdom did the other day—not you? All right, some of you; but not the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS]—the authority to use our armed services wherever he might deem it necessary, not to maintain our own national integrity, our own independence, but the territorial boundaries and national independence of other nations—and, mark you, under the direction and command of the United Nations—just how far have we fallen in our courage and ability when 145 years ago we could stand on our own feet?

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, due to absence from Washington to attend the funeral of our late beloved colleague, Thurmond Chatham, I did not respond on rollcall No. 7. If I had been present, I would have voted "Nay."

## TAXATION WITH REPRESENTATION

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the other day while reading through the file of mail on my desk, my eyes chanced to fall on a most appropriate statement.

At the bottom of page 3 of the Mandate, a periodic newsletter of the National Federation of Independent Business, was this provocative line:

> If Patrick Henry thought taxation without representation was bad, he ought to see it with representation.

We are the representatives mentioned in that comment, Mr. Speaker. What are we waiting for? How long must we delay? Certainly, when business and individuals alike are asking for relief from the burdens of taxation, when local governments are finding it difficult to find adequate funds because the Federal Government has preempted so many avenues of revenue. The time has come to respond to the requests of our people, and prove to them that taxation with representation can once again be fair, moderate, and unoppressive.

## INVESTIGATION OF FISH IMPORTS URGED

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain tables from the Census Bureau showing the enormous increase in imports of canned fish in the United States during the past 10 years.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, imports of canned crab, canned salmon, canned tuna, canned oysters, canned clams, and other fish products are coming into the country in such rapidly increasing quantities as to threaten the destruction of the American fisheries industry.

Imports of canned salmon from Japan prior to 2 years ago never had exceeded the negligible quantity of 63,000 pounds. However, in 1955, canned-salmon imports from Japan were 5 million pounds and in the first 9 months of 1956 increased to the enormous quantity of 19,243,000 pounds. The 9-month imports of salmon from Japan were the equivalent of 401,000 cases of 48 one-pound cans or almost 20 million one-pound cans. When figures for the entire year are available, these probably will disclose Japanese salmon imports to have exceeded 25 million pounds in 1956 or more than 25 million cans.

In the years between 1941 and 1947, no canned crab was imported from Japan. In 1947, the United States imported 377,000 pounds of canned crab. Every year since then canned-crab imports from Japan have increased until, for the first 9 months of 1956, these amounted to 5,233,000 pounds, which is the equivalent of 540,000 cases—24 cans of 6½ ounces net weight—or about 13 million cans. These imports for the whole year probably reached 7 million pounds.

Imports of canned oysters and canned clams also increased alarmingly, and I assume canned-tuna imports did also, although I have not as yet been able to obtain the official figures on tuna imports.

FISHING INDUSTRY IMPERILED

These astounding figures of the increase in canned-fish imports from Japan, I believe, should convince any reasonable American that these imports must be slowed down or the American fishing industry will be destroyed. If it is destroyed that, of course, will mean the loss of prosperity to a very important segment of the Nation's food-producing industry and the destruction of jobs for tens of thousands of food-producing workers.

Furthermore, destruction of our American fishing industry means the wiping out of a very important arm of national defense. Often in wartime, we heard it said that "food is a weapon." It is. Fish are a very important food supply, and we Americans will not wisely allow ourselves to become largely dependent on a foreign source of this food supply.

Also, American fishermen play an important part in civilian and wartime defense of the Nation. They ply their trade miles off our coastal shores and are the first to spot enemy planes and enemy submarines. Our very defenses will be weakened if we, by unwise free-trade policies, drive our fishing boats off the seas.

I do not deny that to assist Japan to rebuild her economy and thereby increase her strength is a desirable objective of American foreign policy. It will be unwise, however, in my opinion to seek to build up Japan at the cost of destroying certain of our own industries. We will be destroying certain of these industries, including fishing, if we allow unlimited quantities of low-wage produced Japanese products to unrestrainedly flood the American market.

Wages rates in the Japanese fishing industry are about 11 cents an hour with no extra pay for overtime. A Japanese fisherman or cannery worker for a 12- or 13-hour day of labor receives about what an American fisherman or cannery worker is paid for 1 hour of work. The small tariff now imposed on foreign fish products imported falls far short of compensating for the difference in cost of labor in Japan and at home.

I have introduced in the House of Representatives, today, a resolution directing an immediate investigation by the Federal Tariff Commission of the increase in food fish imports and their impact on the American industry and American economy to the end that remedial measures may be taken to slow down these imports and the American fisheries industry be saved from impending ruination.

The Federal Tariff Commission has at its disposal experts on imports and their effect on the domestic fishing industry. It can obtain and compile reasonably quickly all of the facts upon which a sound and constructive solution of the problem can be based.

I hope the House Ways and Means Committee to which this resolution will go will act upon it promptly and direct the Tariff Commission to make the investigation my resolution seeks. I, then, hope the Commission will act promptly to make the investigation and its report to the end that the Commission then by invoking the peril point or the escape clause in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act or the State Department by invoking the Antidumping Act or that the Congress will enact such legislation as the report and situation may require to obtain a lessening of these increasing foreign fish imports which already are demoralizing our fishing industry and which unless curtailed surely will destroy this industry.

I have devoted several weeks to obtaining up-to-date statistics from authentic governmental sources to show just what is happening in fish imports. I supplement this speech, so that members of the Ways and Means Committee and Members of the Congress may have this information, with several tables showing the increase during recent years in fish imports.

*Canned salmon imports—Salmon, not in oil or in oil and other substances in airtight containers weighing, with contents, not over 15 pounds each: United States imports for consumption, by principal countries, 1946–55 and January–October 1956*

[Quantity in thousands of pounds; value in thousands of dollars]

| Country | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 | 1949 | 1950 | 1951 | 1952 | 1953 | 1954 [1] | 1955 [1] | January–October 1956 [1] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Quantity | | | | | | | | | | |
| Japan | | | | 24 | 3 | 39 | 63 | 26 | 9 | 5,000 | 19,243 |
| Canada [2] | 55 | 32 | 882 | 893 | 416 | 529 | 9,480 | 12,138 | 11,341 | 9,644 | 4,805 |
| All other | 1 | (3) | (3) | 1 | (3) | | 1 | 1 | 21 | | |
| Total | 56 | 32 | 882 | 918 | 419 | 568 | 9,544 | 12,165 | 11,371 | 14,644 | 24,048 |
| | Foreign value | | | | | | | | | | |
| Japan | | | | 8 | 1 | 16 | 23 | 12 | 6 | 1,689 | 7,647 |
| Canada [2] | 26 | 12 | 299 | 246 | 112 | 177 | 3,191 | 4,313 | 3,711 | 3,484 | 1,844 |
| All other | (4) | (4) | (4) | 1 | (4) | | 1 | (4) | 6 | | |
| Total | 26 | 12 | 299 | 255 | 113 | 193 | 3,215 | 4,325 | 3,723 | 5,173 | 9,491 |

[1] Preliminary. Beginning in 1954, individual importations for immediate consumption that do not amount to more than $250 under a statistical classification are not included in the data in this table.

[2] Includes Newfoundland and Labrador.

[3] Less than 500 pounds.

[4] Less than $500.

NOTE.—The weight of a case of 48 cans, each containing 16 ounces of salmon, is 48 pounds.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

*Canned crab imports—Crab meat, crab sauce, and crab paste, prepared or preserved in airtight containers: United States imports for consumption, by principal countries, 1946–55 and January–October 1956*

[Quantity in thousands of pounds; value in thousands of dollars]

| Country | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 | 1949 | 1950 | 1951 | 1952 | 1953 | 1954 [1] | 1955 [1] | January–October 1956 [1] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Quantity | | | | | | | | | | |
| Japan | | 377 | 480 | 1,118 | 1,761 | 1,957 | 2,033 | 3,864 | 2,845 | 4,920 | 5,253 |
| Norway | 15 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 13 | 11 | 19 | 37 | 10 | 25 | 18 |
| Republic of Korea [3] | | | | (3) | 1 | | 27 | | 10 | 5 | |
| Canada [4] | (3) | (3) | 2 | 1 | 2 | (3) | | 85 | | | |
| Soviet Union | (3) | | 850 | 1,180 | 2,293 | | | | | | |
| All other | | | | | | | 1 | (3) | 2 | 1 | (3) |
| Total | 15 | 378 | 1,337 | 2,307 | 4,070 | 1,968 | 2,080 | 3,986 | 2,867 | 4,951 | 5,271 |

See footnotes at end of table.

*Canned crab imports—Crab meat, crab sauce, and crab paste, prepared or preserved in airtight containers: United States imports for consumption, by principal countries, 1946–55 and January–October 1956*—Continued

[Quantity in thousands of pounds; value in thousands of dollars]

| Country | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 | 1949 | 1950 | 1951 | 1952 | 1953 | 1954 [1] | 1955 [1] | January–October 1956 [1] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Foreign value | | | | | | | | | | |
| Japan | | 302 | 396 | 1,066 | 1,361 | 2,095 | 2,204 | 3,956 | 2,900 | 4,701 | 4,958 |
| Norway | 11 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 11 | 18 | 6 | 13 | 7 |
| Republic of Korea [2] | | | | (3) | 1 | | 10 | | 8 | 3 | |
| Canada [4] | (3) | (3) | 1 | (3) | 2 | (3) | | 74 | | | |
| Soviet Union | (3) | | 350 | 950 | 2,304 | | | | | | |
| All other | | | | | | | 1 | (3) | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 11 | 303 | 751 | 2,020 | 3,673 | 2,100 | 2,226 | 4,048 | 2,916 | 4,718 | 4,966 |

[1] Preliminary. Beginning in 1954, individual importations for immediate consumption that do not amount to more than $250 under a statistical classification are not included in the data in this table.
[2] Includes North Korea prior to Jan. 1, 1952.
[3] Less than 500 pounds.
[4] Includes Newfoundland and Labrador.
[5] Less than $500.

NOTE.—The weight of a case of 24 cans, each containing 6½ ounces (net weight) of crabmeat, is 9.75 pounds.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

*Canned oyster imports—Oysters, oyster juice, or either in combination with other substances, in airtight containers: United States imports for consumption by principal countries, 1946–55 and January–October 1956*

[Quantity in thousands of pounds; value in thousands of dollars]

| Country | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 | 1949 | 1950 | 1951 | 1952 | 1953 | 1954 [1] | 1955 [1] | January–October 1956 [1] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Quantity | | | | | | | | | | |
| Japan | | | 12 | 83 | 203 | 731 | 491 | 606 | 891 | 1,286 | 1,376 |
| Hong Kong | 18 | 20 | 18 | 12 | 19 | 184 | 120 | 62 | 231 | 181 | 162 |
| China | 48 | 89 | 128 | 234 | 215 | 86 | | | | | |
| All other | | (2) | (3) | 7 | (2) | 19 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 3 |
| Total | 66 | 109 | 158 | 336 | 437 | 1,020 | 613 | 670 | 1,128 | 1,471 | 1,541 |
| | Foreign value | | | | | | | | | | |
| Japan | | | 6 | 50 | 97 | 335 | 275 | 324 | 369 | 505 | 513 |
| Hong Kong | 17 | 18 | 18 | 12 | 13 | 133 | 82 | 60 | 246 | 166 | 140 |
| China | 50 | 88 | 118 | 238 | 152 | 61 | | | | | |
| All other | | (3) | (3) | 3 | (3) | 11 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | (3) |
| Total | 67 | 106 | 142 | 303 | 262 | 540 | 358 | 385 | 618 | 673 | 653 |

[1] Preliminary. Beginning in 1954, individual importations for immediate consumption that do not amount to more than $250 under a statistical classification are not included in the data in this table.
[2] Less than 500 pounds.
[3] Less than $500.

NOTE.—The weight of a case of 24 cans, each containing 6¼ ounces (drained weight) of oysters is 9.75 pounds. Imports into Hawaiian customs district are negligible.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

*Canned clam imports—Clams (except razor clams) and clams in combination with other substances (except clam chowder): United States imports for consumption, by principal countries, 1946–55 and January–October 1956*

[Quantity in thousands of pounds; value in thousands of dollars]

| Country | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 | 1949 | 1950 | 1951 | 1952 | 1953 | 1954 [1] | 1955 [1] | January–October 1956 [1] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Quantity | | | | | | | | | | |
| Japan | | | 24 | 245 | 345 | 430 | 374 | 398 | 329 | 392 | 599 |
| Mexico | 146 | | | 9 | 13 | | | (3) | | | 2 |
| Italy | | | 4 | 14 | (3) | 2 | 13 | 18 | 2 | 1 | |
| China | | 1 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 1 | | | | | |
| All other | (3) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 4 | | 2 | (3) |
| Total | 146 | 2 | 32 | 278 | 367 | 438 | 393 | 420 | 331 | 395 | 601 |
| | Foreign value | | | | | | | | | | |
| Japan | | | 13 | 110 | 95 | 149 | 147 | 200 | 173 | 231 | 334 |
| Mexico | 74 | | | 4 | 7 | | | (3) | | | (3) |
| Italy | | | 3 | 5 | (3) | 1 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 1 | |
| China | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | | | | | |
| All other | (3) | (3) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | | 1 | (3) |
| Total | 74 | 1 | 18 | 124 | 106 | 153 | 155 | 208 | 174 | 233 | 334 |

[1] Preliminary. Beginning in 1954, individual importations for immediate consumption that do not amount to more than $250 under a statistical classification are not included in the data in this table.
[2] Less than 500 pounds.
[3] Less than $50.

NOTE.—The weight of a case of 24 cans, each containing 8 ounces (drained weight) of whole clams or minced clams is 12 pounds.

In 1955, 144,069 pounds were entered in the Hawaiian customs districts. In the first 9 months of 1956, 182,783 pounds were entered in the Hawaiian customs districts.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

*Other clam imports—Clams, quahaugs, not in airtight containers: United States imports for consumption, by principal countries, 1946–55 and January–October 1956*

[Quantity in thousands of pounds; value in thousands of dollars]

| Country | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 | 1949 | 1950 | 1951 | 1952 | 1953 | 1954 [1] | 1955 [1] | January–October 1956 [1] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Quantity | | | | | | | | | | |
| Canada [2] | 3,112 | 1,965 | 3,257 | 4,641 | 4,280 | 3,506 | 3,221 | 4,401 | 2,538 | 2,103 | 1,429 |
| Japan | | | 6 | 50 | 252 | 345 | 1,022 | 213 | 144 | 239 | 424 |
| Mexico | 2,021 | 155 | 308 | 255 | 828 | 405 | 560 | 1,113 | 293 | 298 | 352 |
| All other | 4 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 2 | [3] 109 | [4] 32 | | | 11 |
| Total | 5,137 | 2,124 | 3,572 | 4,958 | 5,368 | 4,258 | 4,912 | 5,759 | 2,975 | 2,640 | 2,216 |
| | Foreign value | | | | | | | | | | |
| Canada [2] | 372 | 453 | 593 | 804 | 939 | 870 | 655 | 901 | 528 | 466 | 393 |
| Japan | | | 2 | 16 | 45 | 52 | 134 | 32 | 32 | 52 | 97 |
| Mexico | 337 | 18 | 51 | 33 | 137 | 41 | 44 | 114 | 32 | 30 | 35 |
| All other | 2 | 1 | 1 | [5] | [5] | 1 | [3] 17 | [4] 23 | | | 3 |
| Total | 711 | 472 | 647 | 853 | 1,121 | 964 | 850 | 1,070 | 592 | 548 | 528 |

[1] Preliminary. Beginning in 1954, individual importations for immediate consumption that do not amount to more than $250 under a statistical classification are not included in the data in this table.
[2] Includes Newfoundland and Labrador.
[3] Includes 108,000 pounds, valued at $16,000, from Iceland.
[4] Includes 31,000 pounds, valued at $23,000, from the Republic of Panama.
[5] Less than $500.
Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

## ACREAGE RESERVE PROGRAM

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to give all producers of commodities eligible for inclusion in the 1957 acreage reserve program an opportunity to participate therein. Regardless of the merits or demerits of the soil bank legislation passed by this body, I do not think there was a single man who voted for the legislation who thought or even had the faintest idea at the time he voted that people would have to stand in line all night, and in some cases longer, to be able to sign up, and then after they had signed up and shown that they were eligible to participate in the soil bank that nine-tenths of them would be turned away because they did not get there in time. In other words, the early bird in this case got the worm. That is not fair. That is not fair legislation. If we are going to have soil bank legislation, let us let everybody participate in it on a fair and equitable basis.

## TECHNICAL AID FOR DEPRESSED AREAS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the National Planning Association, among many other world groups, public and otherwise, declared that this Government should extend to the depressed economic areas of this Nation the same type of technical aid that we have been giving and will continue to give, under certain circumstances, to certain foreign nations.

This is a distinguished nongovernmental private agency, composed of great leaders in industry, commerce, and finance in the Nation. I recommend to you the recommendation of the President in his message last year to the House and the platforms of both great political parties, and I appeal to you and to the Committee on Banking and Currency of this House that my bill (H. R. 638) on this subject be listed for hearing as soon as possible.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to join the gentleman from Pennsylvania in urging the Committee on Banking and Currency to start hearings on this legislation immediately.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 11, 1957]

AID PLAN FOR DEPRESSED UNITED STATES AREAS IS SUGGESTED BY PRIVATE STUDY GROUP

The National Planning Association urged yesterday that the Federal Government extend to depressed areas in this country the same sort of technical aid it gives to some foreign nations.

A special committee of the private study group suggested this as one facet of a vigorous Federal program which it said is needed to relieve chronic local unemployment.

The 20-member group of industrialists and economists said such a program should be carried out in cooperation with local and private agencies.

Other Federal aids suggested included new plant financing through direct loans or Government guaranties of private loans, and special types of tax exemptions to stimulate business expansion.

The committee based its report on a study by William H. Miernyk, director of business and economic research, Northeastern University, Boston.

The group suggested that a program of technical assistance to explore and encourage new business possibilities is the first kind of assistance to be given to communities facing problems of chronic unemployment.

"Work of this kind has been liberally and successfully financed by the Federal Government in its overseas economic aid programs," it said. The methods developed there can be appropriately applied to our own country.

Miernyk made case studies of redevelopment activities in affected areas in New England, Pennsylvania, and other areas to illustrate a variety of approaches to the depressed community problem.

"Remedial measures," Miernyk asserted, "should be carefully timed and put into operation during the upswing of cyclical fluctuations in employment."

He said both the extremes of labor shortage and chronic unemployment might be avoided if the entire relief program could be broadly conceived and coordinated through an agency which viewed the problem as a whole. State, local, and area development organizations would play an important role in the combined efforts.

Miernyk said the main causes of chronic local unemployment are technological change, migration of industry, shifts in demand such as from coal to oil, protracted seasonal unemployment, tariffs and depletion of natural resources.

On the basis of his findings, the NPA committee suggested:

Technical assistance.

The possibility of Federal financing for new plants either through primary loans, supplementary loans, or the guaranty of loans made by private agencies. Alfred C. Neal, a member of the committee and former Boston Federal Reserve bank official, dissented in part from this. He said there should be no need for primary financing by the Federal Government.

Special tax relief to serve as a powerful inducement to a company to expand and thus increase employment.

Work relief for those who cannot find jobs elsewhere or who refuse to abandon their homes to seek them. This could be given either on public works or through Government procurement contracts to local firms.

## NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION WEEK

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution which would authorize the President to proclaim a National Transportation Week. Its purpose is to awaken in the minds of Americans a new appreciation of what transportation means to America every moment of the day and the night.

The far-off whistle or siren of the railroad locomotive; the roar of the big truck on the nearby highway, and the reverberations of the multiengined plane overhead stir the youth of America to dreams of future careers. Those sounds should be a reminder to adult America that every minute of every day there are men and women whose skills, painstakingly exercised, contribute to the necessities and the pleasures of life—to say nothing of the maintenance of defense readiness.

For 1 week it would be fitting that the communities of America be reminded that the transportation system of the country plays a constant role in their lives. For that week it would be fitting that the men and women who operate our transportation system know that the people of their communities are being given a new awareness of the importance of the work they are doing.

Sponsored by the Associated Traffic Clubs of America, whose membership includes men and women engaged in all forms of transportation work for both shippers and carriers, the week of May 12 to May 18, 1957, has been set aside for the observance of National Transportation Week.

Through this celebration, in which railroads, motor carriers, airlines, water carriers, and those who direct the shipping of the Nation's goods will participate, it is hoped that Americans everywhere will gain a better understanding and appreciation of the vitally important role played by transportation in our everyday lives, our national economy and in the national defense.

We should be proud to recognize that this Nation has the finest transportation system in the world, and the only such system in the world privately owned and operated.

## FARM PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I have been disappointed that none of the Republicans has arisen to defend the newly announced farm price support program of the administration. I can see where it might be difficult. After 1952 the administration stood by its campaign program for 2 years, but this year they have stood by it for only 2 months. Of course, we will be told that Mr. Benson arrived at this decision after prayer. All of his other decisions were arrived at after prayer. It is good that he prays. I do not know whether Mr. Benson, and other members of this administration pray more or better than did the members of previous administrations. They do appear to pray more in public and to have their private prayers more widely publicized.

Mr. Dooley's observation regarding the McKinley administration: "that it opened its meetings with a prayer that the administration would watch over providence" has some application to this administration.

The responsibility of Congress is not to pass judgment on the piety of Mr. Benson, or other members of the administration, but to pass judgment on his recommendations and his performance.

## EXTENSION OF CERTAIN TAX RATES

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 160, Report No. 54) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4090) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

## HOME LOAN MORTGAGE FUNDS

Mr. COLMER, on behalf of Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 161, Report No. 55) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 209) to provide interim assistance, through the Federal National Mortgage Association, in relieving the shortage of funds for home loans pending further investigation of housing credit conditions. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

## OPERATION OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 93)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

This is my first annual report on the operation of the trade agreements program. It is submitted to the Congress pursuant to section 350 (e) (1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended by section 3 (d) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955. The trade agreements program is carried out under the authority contained in the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 and its various amendments and extensions.

Our present trade policy objectives, which I outlined in my special message on foreign economic policy of March 30, 1954, were established after study by the bipartisan Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, constituted in 1953 pursuant to Public Law 215, 83d Congress. Most of the Commission's recommendations have been adopted and put into effect. This report outlines the steps which have been taken to achieve these foreign trade policy goals.

The major efforts undertaken in recent years have been concentrated, first, upon improving the substance and administration of the existing trade agreement system. These activities are described in section I of this report. They were directed primarily to a basic review of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. This review resulted in proposals for the improvement of the substantive provisions of the general agreement and in the drafting of an agreement to establish an Organization for Trade Cooperation. I have requested the Congress to authorize United States membership in the proposed organization. Establishment of the Organization for Trade Cooperation is essential to make our trade-agreements program more effective in the interest of American industry, agriculture, and labor.

The United States has also taken gradual steps under authority granted by the Congress to reduce barriers to trade through reciprocal tariff negotiations. The most recent of these negotiations was carried on under new authority set forth in Public Law 86, 84th Congress. Safeguards for domestic industry are contained both in the escape clause and peril point provisions of this law and

in the administrative procedures established thereunder. A detailed account of these negotiations is given in section II.

The United States has also worked successfully through the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to obtain the reduction or elimination of quotas that have restricted United States export trade. These activities are described in section III.

Section IV of this report covers actions under special legislative provisions affecting the trade agreements program—the escape clause and the national security amendment.

The final portion of this report, section V, summarizes developments in our trading relations with those countries which are not parties to the general agreement but with which the United States has bilateral trade agreements.

Since this is the first Presidential report on a program that has been in effect for a number of years, the report is not limited to the 1956 calendar year but includes such earlier developments as are necessary to replace recent events in perspective. Detailed accounts of individual actions taken under the trade agreements program are included in the Tariff Commission's annual report to the Congress.

Exports and imports are important to our economic strength and to the well-being of our people. International commerce is beneficial to the community of nations and conducive to the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the world. Our national trade policy, which seeks to promote the continued growth of mutually profitable world trade, is thus doubly in the self-interest of the United States; it furthers both our prosperity and our national security.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 11, 1957.*

---

## REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS DEALING WITH IRAN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out at the very beginning that the report of the Subcommittee on International Operations of the Committee on Government Operations, dealing with Iran, which is frequently referred to as the Hardy subcommittee report, makes a valuable contribution to our information about the operations of the United States foreign-aid program. It has brought to light a number of facts which should be known by every Member of Congress and which should be in the minds of the Foreign Affairs Committee during its consideration of any future mutual security legislation.

### SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT GIVES INCOMPLETE IMPRESSIONS

The report does not purport to tell the whole story of the foreign aid program in Iran and in discussing a number of issues makes clear that no effort has been made to evaluate or pass judgment upon the policy issues involved. Because the report does not tell the whole story of what has gone on in Iran since our foreign-aid operations began there, it is possible for those who study the report to get certain impressions from reading it which are not complete.

One such incomplete impression might be that the United States assistance to Iran has been entirely wasted and that our program there has been a failure. I am convinced, and I believe that it could be demonstrated to the satisfaction of anyone who is willing to study what has happened in Iran, that the mutual security program for Iran is an outstanding success.

The subcommittee report on Iran marshals a substantial array of facts and cites numerous specific occurrences which speak for themselves. I personally am not aware that the report contains any error of fact. Nevertheless, there are a number of instances where a different interpretation from that of the International Operations Subcommittee would seem to me to be justified. Let me mention two instances. First, the report says, on page 55, "There was, as well, a failure to tell the Congress that $10 million of United States aid funds used to underwrite a currency issue could have been obviated by a change in Iranian law." I believe this statement refers to the possibility of revaluing the gold reserve of the Iranian currency as an alternative to underwriting this currency with United States funds. The statement in the report, if it refers to such a possibility, is entirely accurate. Legislative action by the Iranian Government to revalue its gold reserves would have made unnecessary the United States expenditure referred to in the report. The problem was, however, that there was at the time this particular problem arose no Iranian legislature in existence which could take the necessary action. The Mossadegh regime had just been thrown out and the new government was just getting started. Under these circumstances, it would have been folly to reconvene the old parliament which had supported Mossadegh, and the Shah had very wisely decided not to call a parliament until new elections could be held and a new group of the people's representatives could be constituted. In the judgment of our Government the currency crisis faced by Iran at that time was so serious that it was impossible to wait until elections were held and a parliament convened. Consequently, the United States underwrote the currency. The note issue underwritten by United States funds was gradually retired and within less than a year every dollar of United States note cover had been returned to the regular aid account.

### PAY RAISE TO IRANIAN CIVIL SERVANTS JUSTIFIED BY EXISTING CONDITIONS

Another case where a different interpretation can be put on facts accurately stated in the report, appears on page 45 of the printed document which refers to the fact that shortly after the United States began to contribute $27 million a month to the budget deficit of the Government of Iran, the Iranian Government raised the salaries of all its civil employees. Certainly on its face this appears to have been an act which did not reflect prudence on the part of the Iranian Government or careful conservation of United States funds by our own authorities. What happened, however, should be interpreted in the light of the following circumstances. The Shah had just been returned to power and a new regime established. Inflation which had become serious as the Mossadegh government's tenure came to an end was a major problem. The loyalty of the civil service to the new government was by no means assured. In the judgment of our authorities the demoralization of the employees of the various ministries and the agencies of the Government had to be brought to an end as quickly as possible in order that the Zahedi regime could perform governmental functions effectively. For that reason United States officials accepted the decision of the Iranian Government to raise the pay of its civil servants. The instances I have just cited are two examples where the subcommittee report is accurate in its facts, but where I believe a different interpretation of what happened is well justified by the results obtained.

Let me say in passing that the Hardy report contains a lot of material which is helpful to me and to my fellow members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. However, the committee is not and has not been entirely dependent upon the Department of State or upon our foreign aid officials for its information concerning developments in Iran. I personally visited Iran before the Mossadegh era and delegations from the Foreign Affairs Committee were in Iran in 1953, 1954, and 1955. In addition, members of the Foreign Affairs Committee have an opportunity, as do all Members of the House, to listen to the reports of former employees returning from overseas service. The committee has not made a detailed spot check of conditions in Iran comparable to that conducted by the Subcommittee on International Operations, but at the same time I think we have been, and are, in a position to evaluate what has happened in Iran in terms of our foreign policy objectives.

I would like to give a little attention to certain of the general points made by the subcommittee report. First, the report develops the fact that the United States assistance program for Iran started out as a point 4 technical assistance operation, but very soon departed from that purpose and became something else. Second, the subcommittee makes abundantly clear that administrative control over the United States aid program for Iran was decidedly unsatisfactory. Third, the report indicates that United States funds were spent to build dams and factories that should not have been built, and fourth, according to the report, the Iranian Government does not appear to be putting its house in order and its deficits are not being reduced.

### PROGRAM SHIFTED FROM TECHNICAL COOPERATION TO ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

I would like to make some comment and supply a little background on each of

these points. In the first place, let me agree that the United States program for Iran started out as a small technical-assistance operation and that it very shortly was transformed into something much larger and more expensive. This was due to the fact that just after it began, Mr. Mossadegh took over as Prime Minister. Mossadegh was not a Communist, but I think it is generally admitted that he was somewhat eccentric and he took office on a 100 percent anti-foreign platform. There was in Iran a highly organized and well-financed Communist fifth column which immediately got on the antiforeign bandwagon. Prime Minister Mossadegh did not know how to maintain the welfare of the country or keep his government functioning without revenue previously derived from the sale of Iranian oil. Conditions got progressively worse and the Communists lost no chance to aggravate the difficulty.

Our State Department did not believe that there was any practicable alternative but to assist in keeping the Mossadegh government afloat. Mossadegh's predecessor had been assassinated and it appeared that if Mossadegh went under during the first several months of his tenure he would be succeeded by a Communist. As a consequence, the United States transformed its aid program from technical assistance to large-scale economic aid, including programs to provide employment and direct budgetary support to the Iranian Government.

There are perhaps those who do not believe that it was in the interest of the United States to prevent Iran from falling under Communist domination. To those holding such views, our action in Iran does not make much sense. On the other hand, it seems to me that anyone who acknowledges we were confronted with a real emergency must recognize also that it was essential that the United States act promptly, using whatever means were at hand to meet the situation. This was done and an exceedingly grave situation was successfully met.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEFICIENCIES DUE IN PART TO INABILITY TO SUPPLY PERSONNEL

The second point that I want to comment on is the fact clearly demonstrated in the subcommittee's report that the administrative control, particularly with respect to accounting, was definitely unsatisfactory. It seems to me that in this matter the United States faced this problem. The administrative staff and the accounting procedures which were available in Iran at the time Mossadegh came into power were there to handle a small technical assistance operation. We had one of two choices which had to be made quickly. First, we could either go ahead giving assistance on a large scale and expand our operations rapidly, or second, we could wait until our own procedures and personnel were ready to take care of the enlarged and new type operation. Our officials, faced with a quick choice, decided to push ahead to meet the emergency and to let our accounting and control catch up as rapidly as possible. Subsequent events proved this to be a wise and fruitful choice.

Our administrative controls did not catch up for a long time. I am not sure that those officials directing our program in Iran were as zealous or as competent in this respect as they should have been. Nevertheless, they faced almost insuperable obstacles in developing an adequate administrative staff. In the first place let me state, on the basis of my own personal observation, that life in Iran differs in many respects from life in the United States. Conditions there are such that recruitment of personnel is and has always been difficult. During the period in which the United States aid program was being transformed there were other complications. In the first place, all new recruits were being subject to a comprehensive security clearance procedure which took on the average of 5 months to complete. While I find no fault with comprehensive security clearance, this procedure meant not only an inevitable 5-month delay before new people could be sent into the field, but also had the result that many people selected felt they could not wait 5 months to get on the payroll, and accepted other employment. In addition to this situation, in early 1953 our Embassy in Iran believed that conditions were sufficiently dangerous that no more Americans should be sent to Iran. Consequently, all movement of additional personnel to that country was suspended.

I confess that some of the facts concerning our accounting and control procedures set forth in the Hardy report appear to me to be difficult to justify under any conditions. Nevertheless, it seems clear that we could neither delay our aid program until satisfactory controls were available nor establish such controls as would have been reasonable under different circumstances.

There are two further points I would like to make in regard to administrative and accounting control in Iran. The first one is that United States officials responsible for directing the Iranian program did not sit idly by and do nothing until the Subcommittee on International Operations came along and pointed out that something was wrong. Our foreign aid officials became aware of our deficiencies of control in the early months of the operations of the enlarged program and at once began to initiate corrective measures. That their efforts were successful is indicated by the statement of the General Accounting Office in its report on Iran submitted to the Congress on March 15, 1956. Let me point out that the General Accounting Office reported before the Subcommittee on International Operations began its investigation of the Iranian situation. The GAO report, on page 7, includes this statement:

> Significant administrative deficiencies existed in prior years, but have been substantially remedied.

ALL UNITED STATES DOLLARS IN IRAN PAID OUT IN ACCORDANCE WITH STANDARD DISBURSEMENT PROCEDURES

The other point I want to emphasize in connection with accounting is that at no time in the operation of the Iranian program were American dollars handed out indiscriminately without any record being kept as to what was done with them. My experience has always indicated that United States Government disbursement procedures were quite complicated and that there was a considerable amount of redtape connected with making payments. I am informed that normal disbursement procedures were followed at all times in connection with the program for Iran. Officials of the International Cooperation Administration in Washington have recently made this statement to me in regard to the program in Iran: "Every dollar was paid out on the basis of vouchers certified by bonded officers on the basis of documentation indicating delivery and receipt of goods and services called for under binding obligations of the United States with contractors and vendors." These payments were made by regular State Department certifying officers, not by employees of the International Cooperation Administration. Officials of the Comptroller's Office of the ICA have expressed to me the belief that if any agency of the Government had either the time or the money to undertake the task, an accounting of all of the dollar expenditures made in connection with the Iranian program could be reconstructed under any headlines desired such as "Health," "Education," "Economic development," "Machinery, or Budgetary support" from documents now in existence in the possession of the United States Government.

The principal reason why such detailed accounts, properly classified for purposes of administration, were not kept from the beginning, was, as I have pointed out before, because the original system installed in Iran was designed for a small scale technical assistance program and did not provide for such records. The personnel to install a more adequate system could not be made available for a considerable period. I should make clear further, that the statement I have just made refers to United States dollar expenditures. Much of the criticism of financial control in the Hardy report refers to expenditures of Iranian currency derived from the sale in Iran of commodities purchased with United States dollars. Title to these funds was technically vested in the Government of Iran. The extent to which the United States can or should exercise accounting control, as distinct from programing over such expenditures, raises a number of political and policy questions which I will not raise at this time. The only point I want to make is that the dollars we used in Iran were not handed out carelessly.

UNITED STATES TOOK OVER DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS INITIATED BY GOVERNMENT OF IRAN

Let me turn to the third point I mentioned a moment ago—the fact that United States money was invested in building dams and factories that at best were poorly planned and in some cases should not have been built at all. I want to make clear that by no means all of our construction work and development expenditures in Iran fall within this category. There is much that is tangible in the form of roads, railway improvements, factories, and public utilities in Iran, which the United States has helped to finance, the value of which is readily apparent. It is necessary to recognize,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

however, that before Mossadegh nationalized the Iranian oil industry, a large scale economic development program, initiated by the Government of Iran, had already gotten under way utilizing revenue derived from the sale of oil. A number of factories were being built under this program and certain power projects were also in progress. When the oil revenue stopped, this entire development program would have been terminated without United States financial assistance. The choice confronting the United States was something like this: We could on the one hand say to the Iranian Government: "You brought this crisis on yourselves, find your own solution to it," or we could offer our assistance to keep some of the development projects going in order to prevent unemployment and popular resentment against the government in power. Our State Department chose the latter course of action, believing that the consequences of the complete suspension of the economic development program would lead to a public reaction not in the direction of reinstating the oil revenues as quickly as possible, but instead toward supplanting the existing government with one definitely alined with the Communists.

The dams and factories for which United States funds were used under this program were not planned or initiated with our approval. We merely took over what was already under way.

UNITED STATES FINANCING OF IRANIAN DEFICITS SUBSTANTIALLY REDUCED

The fourth impression, mentioned previously, which might be derived from reading the report of the Subcommittee on International Operations, is that the Government of Iran is not putting its affairs in order and that we are continuing to underwrite deficits without taking any corrective action. In the first place, let me cite some additional figures which have been submitted to me by the International Cooperation Administration. They show that such budgetary aid has declined during recent years. The United States contribution by fiscal years to financing the deficit of the Iranian Government during the last 2 years has been as follows:

| | *Million* |
|---|---|
| 1955 | $52.8 |
| 1956 | 35.0 |
| 1957 | (1) |

[1] No contribution.

Although the current fiscal year is not yet over, the United States has not as yet contributed any fiscal 1957 funds to finance the deficit of the Iranian Government and has no intention of doing so, although the full consequences to Iran of the closing of the Suez Canal may not yet be known.

I want to point out, in addition, that one of the reasons why the Iranian Government has continued to run a larger deficit than was anticipated at the beginning of the post-Mossadegh era, is that Iran has undertaken a substantial defense program with our full approval and support. Military expenditures consequently have become substantially larger than had been anticipated and Government revenues have not kept pace. The latest figures indicate that the production of oil in Iran has now reached a level higher than was the case prior to the nationalization of the oil industry. Although Iran has not yet accomplished a basic reform in its tax system its Government revenues during the first half of the current fiscal year were running 32 percent ahead of last year. The United States is consistently urging major tax reforms on the Government of Iran and has made available the services of experts in this field. Nevertheless, the Iranian Parliament is slow in acting, possibly for the same reasons that legislatures in other countries are reluctant to impose new taxes. The subcommittee report suggests that oil revenues therefore should properly be used to finance the Iranian Government deficit, rather than using United States funds for this purpose. The reason why this has not been done goes back to the oil settlement which was reached by the new Government of Iran following the fall of Mossadegh in order to get Iran's oil production going again. Let me remind you that foreign domination was and still is perhaps the major political issue in that country. It was essential in working out an agreement with the Iranian Government which would permit the resumption of Iranian oil production to reassure the people of Iran on this point. Consequently it was agreed that most of the oil revenues derived by the Government of Iran would be used for development purposes and that they would not be diverted to support the Government. The United States believed that such an arrangement was desirable under the circumstances and undertook to finance the Iranian deficit during the period when such assistance was necessary. Our aid funds thus indirectly enabled the Iranians to go forward with their own basic economic development.

TANGIBLE EVIDENCE AS TO USE OF UNITED STATES FUNDS

In conclusion, let me emphasize two things. First, there are many tangible results of our foreign-aid operations in Iran since the beginning of the program, although the subcommittee report speaks of dams not constructed and factories not yet completed.

I want to point out that in Iran with our assistance and encouragement their own planned highway system has been accelerated, electric generation has increased, and railroad locomotives and signal equipment have been provided. School buildings have been erected as a result of our help, and 12,000 Iranian teachers, 40 percent of the total number of teachers in the entire country, have received training under the United States aid program. I would like to cite also the fact that 20,000 villages have been sprayed in carrying out a United States supported antimalarial campaign. The incidence of malaria in these villages has been reduced from 95 percent of the population to 5 percent. I think there is no question but that these people who have benefited so directly from our help know where our money went.

During the years in which the United States has contributed to the budget of the Iranian Government we have met about 20 percent of the total cost of keeping that Government in operation.

I believe that the examples which I have cited make clear that even though our records in Iran have been defective, the money which has been spent did not just melt away without leaving anything to show for it.

UNITED STATES AID SAVED IRAN FROM COMMUNISM

The final point I want to make is that Iran almost fell to the Communists and that the United States aid program was, in the judgment of the best qualified observers, the factor which tipped the scale in the right direction when the crisis was reached.

Let me review what happened. After the expropriation of the oil industry the country found that it could not live without oil revenue. Prime Minister Mossadegh was so committed to expropriation and to the doctrine of making no concessions to foreigners that he gradually bankrupted the country. By the summer of 1953 it was becoming impossible for the Government to perform its functions, primarily because salaries and operating expenses could not be met.

In June 1953 Mossadegh sent a letter to President Eisenhower stating that unless the United States would provide him adequate financial support he would look elsewhere, presumably to the Soviet Union. The President, in his reply, indicated that so long as Iran was not prepared to do its utmost to utilize its own natural resources, it could not expect budgetary aid from the United States. When this exchange of letters became public, a most serious crisis began to develop in Iran.

In August 1953 the Shah issued a decree dismissing Mr. Mossadegh and appointing General Zahedi as Prime Minister in his stead. Mossadegh arrested two emissaries of the Shah who had requested his resignation. During the succeeding week, Iran began to slide rapidly in the direction of international communism. Communist-led mobs dominated the streets. They carried Communist slogans and sang Communist songs. Americans and other foreigners who ventured from their homes were attacked. Not only in Teheran, but in other prominent cities, slogans were displayed condemning the United States, praising the Soviet Union, and threatening the lives of American citizens.

Just at the moment when it seemed Iran might lose its independence, an uprising took place in Teheran and spread rapidly to other parts of the country. This spontaneous upsurge was in favor of the Shah and a free Iran, and against the forces which had brought Iran into such a perilous state. Within a period of 12 hours after this rioting had started, the tide had turned; General Zahedi took over as Prime Minister with the support of the army, gendarmerie, police, most civilian officials, and the overwhelming majority of the people.

It is my belief, and it is likewise the judgment of most United States officials who were in a position to observe and evaluate what was happening in Iran, that United States cooperation with that country during the period after the expropriation of the oil industry made it

possible for the non-Communist government to take over. The presence of Americans scattered throughout the nation and their friendly contacts with the Iranian people was an important supplement to our more tangible financial assistance. Undoubtedly a further favorable influence was the fact that we had never at any time taken over the management of the affairs of Iran. We always worked with the Government in power, whether we approved its policies or not. It certainly would have been easier and perhaps quicker for us to have established a more direct relation with and responsibility for the conduct of Iranian affairs during the years following expropriation. There were occasions when we might have given orders or delivered ultimatums. Had we resorted to such actions I do not believe the people of Iran would have turned to the United States for guidance and help in the summer of 1953 as they did.

UNITED STATES AID TO IRAN IS A SUCCESS

I am convinced that if you look at the picture as a whole you will agree that our program of aid to Iran is one of the most successful ever undertaken by the United States. Let me compare it with what happened in Greece. In Greece there are approximately 8 million people, and over a period of years the United States has spent $1,800,000,000 for nonmilitary aid in preventing that nation from going Communist. It is my opinion that nearly everyone agrees that our effort there has been worth while. Consider the situation in Iran, where there are 20 million people, and where we have spent so far roughly $270 million.

I have noted in a popular magazine an article referring to United States aid to Iran, bearing the title, "How Not To Handle Foreign Aid." I emphasize as strongly as anyone that we need careful control and sound management of our programs in every country where we undertake to render assistance. I believe that we could have and should have done better in the administration of the program in Iran. Nevertheless, when we look at the problem with which we were confronted in Iran and see the result of our efforts, I think we might very well say that we have handled foreign aid in that country very effectively.

In closing I want to express my appreciation to my colleague from Virginia and the members of his subcommittee for their diligence in carrying through their investigation of the operation of the mutual security program in Iran. I can assure them that their findings and recommendations will receive careful consideration by the Committee on Foreign Affairs in its consideration of future foreign-aid legislation. I am sure that the United States will do a better job in the future as a result of their work.

## SANCTIONS AGAINST ISRAEL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, much is being said in this House and in the other body with reference to the action proposed in the United Nations of sanctions against Israel. I agree with much of what has been said but I wish to add this additional point. Keeping in mind our purpose in the United Nations, keeping in mind the purpose of the United Nations within its charter, keeping in mind the original signatory powers to that document, and keeping in mind, further, the manner in which the number of nations under the signatory to the charter has been increased—almost doubled—it is important that this Nation, under no circumstances, have its arm twisted or its policy dictated by what has now become a shift in the balance of power within the signatory nations.

You have now actively functioning a unit within a unit, a wheel within a wheel. This is the new Afro-Asiatic combination of some 27 states with certain other fringe allies. There is a clear development of an influential majority by number but not in fact, for you have now a new combination of powers, a third force, so to speak, of African-Asiatic nations that are combining together for their purposes and can in that way be the balance of power, if not the actual majority within the signatory powers of the charter. Here you have a group of sovereign, yes, but small, economically unstable, so-called culturally backward nations, who because of the provisions of the charter are now in position to be so, with reference especially, Mr. Speaker, to the matter which is of serious, vital, dangerous and material concern to the welfare of this Nation and to the peace of the world.

Separate and distinct from the merits which are patent and clear as to why this Nation should not vote sanctions against Israel, as has been delineated by Members on both sides of the aisle today—I say separate and distinct from those merits—I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House, the other equally if not more important danger in the shift of this balance of power which from now on, not only in this case but in many others, can seriously affect the purposes, as laudable as they are, of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, from the statements of President Eisenhower at his press conference and those of Secretary Dulles there arises the implicit probability that the administration would go along with the United Nations if it voted to impose sanctions against Israel.

Such administration action would be morally insupportable, and I think it would be also a diplomatic defeat; and another cheap triumph for the little Hitler of the Middle East, Egypt's Nasser.

There is no question that a primary condition of establishing peace in the Middle East is Israeli withdrawal from the Gaza Strip and the Gulf of Aqaba area.

It is equally basic that a primary condition of withdrawal should be the firm assurance to Israel that Gaza and Aqaba will be under the protection of the U. N. Emergency Force.

Egypt insists on a blank check withdrawal. If the administration should support a U. N. sanction vote, it would be endorsing President Nasser's blank check, and it might turn out to be a rubber check as well.

The U. N. Assembly adopted 10 resolutions against Soviet aggression in Hungary, which Russia spurned. Did the U. N. take punitive action against Russia? It did not. Did the U. N. take punitive action against India for moving into Kashmir? It did not. Did it take any action against Egypt for ignoring the resolution on the Suez Canal? It did not.

Has the U. N. considered any sanctions on evidence that the armistice terms have been and are being flagrantly violated in North Korea? It has not.

The case for Israel is good enough to stand on its own, and against such a background of U. N. sidestepping it becomes impregnable. The President has said this Nation is committed to support the U. N. Very well. The best way to stop a sanction vote, and thus avoid the embarrassment of supporting it, is to let the U. N. know the administration's opposition and to know it now. Certainly the administration will not deny that its influence in the U. N. is always formidable and often decisive.

The State of Israel came into existence on May 14, 1948. On the very day of her birth she found herself at war with her neighboring Arab States: Egypt, Jordan, Syria, and Iraq attacked her, and war raged for almost a year. In the end, Israel emerged victorious. In 1949 armistice terms were signed with all these Arab countries. But the Arabs did not, and still do not, recognize the State of Israel. They have no relations with her, have deliberately ignored her existence, and have done everything to weaken and destroy her. They have boycotted Israel, and have imposed, through Egypt's control of the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba, a fairly effective blockade. The governments of these Arab countries have also helped to organize commando groups for the purpose of raiding Israeli villages and settlements.

The United States has large stakes in the Middle East. It is also keenly interested in the well-being of Israel. At the same time, it has tried to remain on friendly terms with the Arabs, hoping to aid in the settlement of Arab-Israeli differences. In December of 1955, the United States promised to help Egypt financially in the projected Aswan Dam. Six months later, we withdrew the promised financial aid. As an immediate response, Egypt nationalized the Suez Canal. Difficulties and disagreements arising from that action led directly to the recent Israeli-Egyptian war and the Anglo-French intervention in Egypt.

The United Nations cease-fire resolution that brought the fighting to an end called for the withdrawal of Anglo-French forces from Egypt and also for the withdrawal of Israeli forces behind the Israeli-Egyptian armistice lines of 1949. By that resolution a U. N. force was created to take over the areas vacated by the occupying forces. The Anglo-French force has already withdrawn and the Israeli Government is under heavy pressure from the U. N. to follow suit.

Judging by the published reports and declarations it seems that the adminis-



UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

tration does not intend to take the initiative to secure a settlement of the Suez Canal question and the Arab-Israeli controversies. These problems are being passed on to the United Nations, but not much will be accomplished by this approach for the African-Asian bloc of nations are likely to obstruct any measures intended to bring the peoples of the Middle East to a peace table. It is, therefore, imperative that the United States take the leadership and responsibility in dealing with these problems, inside and outside the U. N. The simple method would be for the President and Secretary of State to summon the representatives of the Arab States and of Israel to sit down and negotiate, with a view of settling their differences.

Unless we take this kind of forthright and vigorous action, the United Nations and the new United Nations emergency force will merely be instruments for the restoration of the status quo ante. The Egyptians will reoccupy their old positions in the Sinai Peninsula and in the Gaza Strip, resume their raids on Israeli settlements, and their blockade against Israeli shipping through the Straits of Tiran. We would be making a serious blunder if we remained idle while the Egyptians and the United Nations turned the clock back to October 28.

Egypt should not go back into the Gaza Strip. While I am not prepared to say what the ultimate fate of that Strip should be, we should keep in mind that it has been the scene of stark poverty and misery for 8 years because neither Egypt nor the other Arab States have done anything to help solve the plight of the Arab refugees. To permit Egypt to go back into Gaza is to perpetuate a waste of human life. It would be in the best interests of all if the Israelis remained in control of Gaza along with the United Nations. We might then see some positive steps forward to a resettlement of at least a part of the Arab refugees.

The other crucial issue is the Gulf of Aqaba. Events of the last few weeks have demonstrated how Egyptian control of the Suez Canal can mean life or death to the economies of the nations of Western Europe. There is an urgent need for an alternative route. The alternative is to establish a pipeline from Eilat across Israel to the Mediterranean. But Eilat and the Gulf of Aqaba will not be accessible to Israeli shipping if the Egyptians return to Sharm el-Sheik and reestablish their military position there. This should not be allowed to happen.

It is for these reasons that I hope that our Government will not favor an automatic and mechanical return to the past. We must go forward to a peace settlement. We must press for a resolution in the United Nations which calls for peace negotiations, and under no circumstances should we press the Israelis to make further withdrawals from Sinai and Gaza until we have made it absolutely clear that Egypt will not return to these two critical areas.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) for 30 minutes on Thursday next.

Mr. HOFFMAN, for 10 minutes, on Thursday next.

Mr. FLOOD today for 30 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY (at the request of Mr. BYRD) for 20 minutes on Thursday, February 14.

Mr. MACK of Illinois for 20 minutes on next Thursday.

Mr. CARNAHAN for 30 minutes today.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. JONES of Alabama on the subject of flood management on the Tennessee River.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (at the request of Mr. JONES of Alabama) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Georgia).

Mrs. SULLIVAN and include a speech of a colleague.

Mr. WRIGHT.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $179.67.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii.

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KRUEGER and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts to revise and extend the remarks she made in the House today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. COLMER).

Mr. COLMER and to include extraneous matter.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3845. An act extending for 1 year the time in which the Boston National Historic Sites Commission shall complete its work.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, February 14, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

454. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a plan for works of improvement, pursuant to the authority vested in the President by section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 667) and delegated to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget by Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

455. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

456. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal section 2 of the act of August 2, 1956, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

457. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report reflecting estimated obligations by principal activities of the Small Business Administration for the period July 1 through December 31, 1956, pursuant to section 215 of the Small Business Act of 1955; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

458. A letter from the president, D. C. Transit System, Inc.; transmitting a report covering the operations of D. C. Transit System, Inc., for the period August 15 through December 31, 1956, with balance sheet as of December 31, 1956, pursuant to an act of Congress approved June 10, 1896, and an Act of Congress approved March 4, 1913 (Public 435); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

459. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Alaska Road Commission, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1955, and 1956, pursuant to section 107 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 374), and the act of June 30, 1932 (48 U. S. C. 321a); to the Committee on Government Operations.

460. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 3731 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to appeals by the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

461. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

462. A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting the 35th Annual Report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to section 16 of the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

463. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to clarify the general powers, increase the borrowing authority, and authorize the deferment of interest payments on borrowings of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation"; to the Committee on Public Works.

464. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report on the status of training of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and the progress made in strengthening of the Reserve components during fiscal year 1956, pursuant to subsection 260 (b) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

465. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

466. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, transmitting the interim report, pursuant to Public Law 601, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. Annual report for the year 1956, pursuant to House Resolution 5, 85th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 53). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 160. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4090, a bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates; without amendment (Rept. No. 54). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 161. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 209, a joint resolution to provide interim assistance, through the Federal National Mortgage Association, in relieving the shortage of funds for home loans pending further investigation of housing credit conditions; without amendment (Rept. No. 55). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 4633. A bill to make the evaluation of recreational benefits resulting from the construction of any flood control, navigation, or reclamation project an integral part of project planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4634. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a legislative assembly in the Territory of Alaska, to confer legislative power thereon, and for other purposes" with respect to the incorporation of certain businesses; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4635. A bill to provide for settlement and entry of public lands in Alaska containing coal, oil, or gas under section 10 of the act of May 14, 1898, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 4636. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits, and to liberalize the provisions under which such earnings are charged for purposes of such deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 4637. A bill to provide an improved farm program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4638. A bill to provide a defense cloud modification program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 4639. A bill to provide additional funds for education in the several States without Federal direction, control, or interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 4640. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to payments from voluntary contributions accounts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4641. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act amendments of 1956 to provide that the date of death of certain deceased Federal employees shall, for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, be the effective date of that act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4642. A bill to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. R. 4643. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4644. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4645. A bill to amend the Panama Canal Construction Service Annuity Act of May 29, 1944, to extend the benefits thereof to persons otherwise eligible therefor who are naturalized as United States citizens after December 7, 1941, and before December 8, 1943, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 4646. A bill to provide for additional research and technical assistance on public health problems created by mosquitoes and other blood-sucking arthropods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4647. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to a Bear River Compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 4648. A bill to make the evaluation of recreational benefits resulting from the construction of any flood control, navigation or reclamation project an integral part of project planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 4649. A bill to reauthorize construction and operation of the New Melones project, California, as an integral part of the Central Valley project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 4650. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 4651. A bill relating to involuntary conversions of real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 4652. A bill to give all producers of commodities eligible for inclusion in the 1957 acreage reserve program an opportunity to participate therein; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 4653. A bill to provide for registration, reporting, and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefit plans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4654. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4655. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for carrying out provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain timber access roads, to permit maximum economy in harvesting national forest timber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLT:

H. R. 4656. A bill to authorize a 4-year program of Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 4657. A bill to provide for the creation of an Office of Administrator of Legal Assignments for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4658. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1952, with respect to the crediting for civil-service retirement purposes of certain service performed by civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4659. A bill to provide for examination, licensing and regulation of dispensing opticians and optical technicians in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 4660. A bill to repeal the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954, to require certain distribution and approval of new public building projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 4661. A bill to allow credit or refund of gift tax erroneously paid by reason of treating nontaxable divisions of community property as gifts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4662. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for certain amounts paid by a teacher for his further education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 4663. A bill to remove wheat for seeding purposes which has been treated with poisonous substances from the "unfit for human consumption" category for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 4664. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and reenact the Wagner Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 4665. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to make the Small Business Administration a permanent agency of the Government and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4666. A bill to encourage new residential construction for veterans' housing in rural areas and small cities and towns by raising the maximum amount in which direct loans may be made from $10,000 to $12,500, to authorize advance financing commitments, to extend the direct loan program for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 4667. A bill to amend section 512 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide a 12-month moratorium on payments required in connection with direct loans made to veterans residing in major disaster areas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 4668. A bill to make the evaluation of recreational benefits resulting from the construction of any flood control, navigation,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

or reclamation project an integral part of project planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4669. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretaries of the military departments to settle claims against the United States for damages caused by aircraft and guided missiles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 4670. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing import quotas under specified conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 4671. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 4672. A bill to create a Commission on Human Resettlement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4673. A bill to prohibit the importation of manufactured articles from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and other Communist-dominated countries; to the Committee and Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 4674. A bill to provide increases in annuities of certain individuals retired prior to April 1, 1948, under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 4675. A bill to provide that certain employees under the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Public Lands and those under the Jurisdiction of the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the Territory of Hawaii shall be subject to the civil service laws of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 4676. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4677. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 10-percent increase in the annuities and pensions payable to railroad employees and their supervisors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. R. 4678. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that interest on series E United States savings bonds shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:

H. R. 4679. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of earnings individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4680. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits thereunder, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable to both men and women at age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 4681. A bill to repeal those provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which give tax preference to individuals who receive dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 4682. A bill to provide immediate annuities to widows under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 4683. A bill to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under leases entered into for the provision of commercial recreational facilities at the Lake Greeson Reservoir, Narrows Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 4684. A bill to create a National Petroleum Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 4685. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of amounts payable to aliens under trust funds created by American citizens; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 4686. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1958, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 4687. A bill to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U. S. C., sec. 184), in order to promote the development of phosphate on the public domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4688. A bill to amend section 1 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for employees engaged in law-enforcement work who, because of disability or other reasons, are unable to complete 20 years of service in such work; to the Commitee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4689. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend its protection to postmasters, officers, and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H. R. 4690. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act with respect to its application to producers of fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 4691. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 4692. A bill to amend Public Law 410, 78th Congress, with regard to compensation for overtime, Sunday, and holiday work of employees of the United States Public Health Service, Foreign Quarantine Division; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 4693. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4694. A bill to raise the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4695. A bill to reduce the maximum workweek under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to 35 hours, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4696. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of employers who are engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce, to eliminate certain exemptions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4697. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 4698. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to women at age 62 in the case of wives and age 55 in other cases, and to provide that entitlement to old-age insurance benefits shall not prevent a widow from receiving widow's or mother's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4699. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $100 to $250 the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits, to reduce from 72 to 70 the age at which such deductions terminate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4700. A bill to provide health insurance for Government employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4701. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4702. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped; to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4703. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4704. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4705. A bill to establish a basic workweek of 35 hours for employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4706. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase from $1 to $1.25 the minimum hourly wage prescribed by section 6 (a) (1) of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 4707. A bill to raise the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4708. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of employers who are engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce, to eliminate certain exemptions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 4709. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to rice acreage allotment history; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOW:

H. J. Res. 226. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:

H. J. Res. 227. Joint resolution to provide that the United States shall withhold from representatives of foreign nations privileges which such nations withhold from representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. J. Res. 228. Joint resolution to provide for the honorary designation of St. Ann's churchyard in the city of New York as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. J. Res. 229. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period from May 12, 1957, to May 18, 1957, as National

Transportation Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. Res. 162. Resolution requesting the President to establish a Mission for Peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 163. Resolution to provide funds for the expense of the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 157; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. Res. 164. Resolution requesting an investigation of fish imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma—relating to home loans for veterans, etc., to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana seeking an adjustment in the Federal farm program as it relates to the grower of quality wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to expel Russia from the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile and fish imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to a stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the first land survey in Death Valley; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for Federal funds to construct the Del Puerto Canyon Road between Patterson and San Jose, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States commending the National Guard of the State of Idaho and the National Guard system, and recommending that all persons enlisting in the National Guard be given adequate training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to expel Russia from the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile and fish imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to the opposition of the people of the State of Wyoming to any form of Federal, regional, or watershed rules or regulations set up either by legislative act or Executive order, in which the States involved would have no real voice in administration thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to passing legislation to control noxious weeds on federally owned or controlled lands; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to making adequate appropriations for authorized reclamation projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to the compact commission approach to the solution to the need for greater coordination and integration of development of land and water resources of regional watersheds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to passing legislation to modify the standard repayment period for irrigation features of water development projects to 60 years; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause I of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 4710. A bill for the relief of Maria Sebbio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 4711. A bill for the relief of Tarcisio Passerini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4712. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Loukas Emanuel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHER:

H. R. 4713. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chui Sam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 4714. A bill for the relief of Oscar D. Mejia-Mauricio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 4715. A bill for the relief of Edward David Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 4716. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States in Wagoner County, Okla., to Henry S. Ahrens; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H. R. 4717. A bill for the relief of Sun Chen Hwa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4718. A bill for the relief of Tommy Cheung (also known as Chung Tom); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4719. A bill for the relief of Jaw Ling Tang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4720. A bill for the relief of Fu Muh Po; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4721. A bill for the relief of Fu Li Tsing Ing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4722. A bill for the relief of Ivy May Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 4723. A bill for the relief of Bobby Lawson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 4724. A bill to authorize the award of a Medal of Honor to Comdr. Hugh Barr Miller, Jr., United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 4725. A bill for the relief of Dr. T. F. Tsai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 4726. A bill for the relief of Mario Guiffre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 4727. A bill for the relief of Yahya Rafi Mayeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 4728. A bill to provide for the advancement of Brig. Gen. Manus McCloskey, United States Army, retired, to the grade of major general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4729. A bill for the relief of Eulalee Skeffrey and Madge Skeffrey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4730. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jennie B. Prescott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 4731. A bill for the relief of George Angeles (Georgios Angelopoulos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 4732. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Sclauzero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 4733. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annie Bertha Yarnold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Hermann J. Abs, Visitor From West Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. EMMET F. BYRNE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 11, 1957*

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my distinct pleasure to meet a distinguished visitor from West Germany, Hermann J. Abs. Through the hospitality of a mutual friend from Chicago, Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, I was privileged to discuss with Mr. Abs in some detail the problems of West Germany.

Mr. Abs is a firm advocate of close economic ties between Western Powers in the common endeavor to halt Communist economic and political aggression. He has been called the Bernard Baruch of Germany by some Members of Congress. Mr. Abs is one of Europe's most outstanding international economists, financial adviser to Chancellor Adenauer, and president of Germany's largest bank, the Suddeutsche Bank.

Mr. Abs did not come to the United States to seek funds for his country. Among other things he did meet and discuss with officers of the International Finance Corporation and the International Monetary Fund economic problems facing his own and other European countries. He emphasized the importance in the economic picture of the division of his country—60 percent in the Federal Republic and 40 percent in the East.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. Abs also attended the second inauguration of President Eisenhower and was greatly impressed with the dignity, simplicity, and solemnity of the occasion. He was extremely gratified that the President, in his inaugural address, predicted the reunification of Germany. Mr. Abs declared that it was difficult for the average United States citizen to appreciate this division and its impact on his countrymen.

Mr. Abs is the original proposer of a world Magna Carta to preserve the sanctity of private property and investment. He believes such a document, adopted by all the nations in the free world, would go a long way toward securing the objectives of friendly international relations, especially today in the struggle between freedom and communism. While in Washington he discussed this important matter with Members of the Congress and the result was a resolution introduced in the Congress calling for the recognition of such a uniform code governing investments, trade, and commerce among the free nations of the world.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that all the Members of the House were not able to meet and talk with this man who personifies the new, democratic Germany, a country that has become one of our strongest allies in the NATO family.

## Federal Aid for Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 11, 1957*

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the drive is on again to revive the old proposal for Federal aid for our public schools. Last year this same proposal to grant Federal aid to States to construct school buildings was overwhelmingly defeated in the House. This was done largely through the cooperation of Southern and conservative Republican Members. But, this year the advocates of this program feel more optimistic. Their optimism is based almost entirely upon the hope that the new or "Modern Republicanism" emanating from the White House will be strong enough to whip the Republicans into line.

Moreover, they hope to keep the so-called Powell amendment out of the bill this time. But, with or without the Powell amendment, southerners will consistently oppose the invasion of the Federal Government into our public school system.

It all boils down to this. The Powell amendment is immaterial in either form. For, whether adopted or not, no one could be so trusting as to believe that the Federal Government officials charged with administering the program would allocate funds in violation of the Supreme Court decree to States not complying therewith. Even if they so desired, they would in all probability be enjoined by the Federal courts. The end result, if such legislation were passed, would be that the people of Southern States, who are determined to have segregated schools, would be taxed to build schools in other wealthier States without receiving any aid themselves.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection we submit herewith a timely editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News.

The editorial is as follows:

FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOLS

Here's expressing the hope that the Mississippi delegation in Congress will stand firm against voting any form of Federal aid to public schools with strings attached.

Federal aid heretofore has been given under the guise of grants of various kinds for special purposes. It is something the public school system in Mississippi can get along very well without and now is the time to declare our independence.

Already beginnings have been made. One of the most insidious is the giving of surplus food to the schools for use in cafeterias. Some school systems have spurned this gift with strings, but others have accepted it and thus have become dependent on the Federal handouts.

Federal grants would make the schools more expensive to taxpayers instead of less so. In the case of every tax dollar that goes to Washington and comes back in the form of a grant, from a fourth to a half sticks in the Capital. It goes to pay for bureaucratic administration and control.

In addition to making the schools cost more, Federal aid would take away local control by those who know best the needs of their schools. It would impose uniform textbooks across the Nation and political brainwashing of pupils.

The big push for Federal aid comes from leftists who want to dictate from Washington what the schools shall teach. They agree with Nikolai Lenin, who wrote, "Give us the child for only 8 years and it will be a Bolshevik forever." That could happen here if the schools are federalized.

America's governors, at their meeting last year, strongly opposed Federal grants for education. They realized that Federal aid would quickly bring Federal control and that this control would be hard to throw off.

When he was head of Columbia University, Dwight Eisenhower strongly opposed Federal aid to education. He denounced it as the forerunner of Federal control. His stand then was in line with the history of Federal grants to the States.

John J. Tigert, former Commissioner of Education, said "My experience in handling Federal subsidies for education under the limited acts now in existence is that you must have either Federal control or misappropriation of funds and waste."

Some unrealistic educators still are calling for Federal aid, refusing to look far enough to see its ultimate effects. Fortunately, the demand that such aid be on a desegregated basis seems likely to block action this year, as it did in 1956.

## Birthdays of Lincoln and Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 11, 1957*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, February 12 is an anniversary twice sacred to me and other Polish-Americans. It is the birthday of two men devoted to freedom, our own Abraham Lincoln, and Thaddeus Kosciusko, of Poland.

Kosciusko served freedom during the American Revolution, at Saratoga and at Yorktown. He left America when the infant Republic had secured its independence and returned to his beloved homeland, whose freedom had yet to be won.

He fought Russian and Prussian with skill and courage, and refused to become a pawn of either empire after his homeland was reduced to submission.

He was one who fought for freedom wherever it was in danger. If he had been asked why he fought in faraway places for the liberty of men of another nationality he would have explained, as do all Poles, "For your freedom and our own," a simple recognition that no one may be truly free while some are enslaved.

## Pearl Harbor Is Remembered—The "Arizona" Is a Shrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN A. BURNS
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 11, 1957*

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, on February 4, 1957, my esteemed colleague, the able gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. LOSER] inserted in the RECORD an article dated December 7, 1956, by Ed Clark Ford from the Nashville Banner.

My distinguished colleague pointed out in his introduction to the article that Mr. Ford presented a matter of great concern and importance to all citizens of our country. Mr. Ford did just that. Very ably, with deep sympathy and understanding, as well as great patriotism, he presented his feelings as he stood on the deck of the U. S. S. *Arizona*, the tomb of 1,102 of America's finest.

Mr. Clark's concern that the memory of Americans might be so perishable as to allow "the first to die (to) sleep in a decaying tomb" is most commendable. However, Hawaii's Americans—and all Hawaiians are Americans—have not forgotten.

In 1949, the Legislature of Hawaii created the Pacific War Memorial Commission as the sole war memorial agency of Hawaii. Nearly 100 plans for a memorial have been carefully considered by this Commission. As a result of this careful consideration, a master plan designated the Pacific Memorial System was evolved.

On April 7, 1953, the Legislature of Hawaii unanimously approved, ratified, and confirmed these plans as the plans of the people of Hawaii. The resolution expressing this approval established the System to express the Nation's gratitude toward its fallen heroes and serve to inspire the living to build for a world without war—a world wherein there is peace with honor, respect for both the dignity of the individual and the rights of minorities—and where all peoples place their faith in God.

The Pacific Memorial System plan binds together several historic sites in a majestic setting in Hawaii. It extends from Pearl Harbor, birthplace of World War II, to the National Cemetery of the Pacific in Punchbowl Crater, last resting place of 14,000 war dead—heroes all—and beyond that to Honolulu's best-known landmark, Diamond Head.

The sunken battleship *Arizona* will be the Pearl Harbor terminus of the System. Necessarily, it has taken time to develop the plans and to obtain clearances as well as agreement from the various agencies of Government involved. As of the moment, final details are being worked out for a bill which will authorize construction of the *Arizona* monument and acceptance of funds which the Pacific War Memorial Commission will raise by a public fund-raising campaign. I hope to have the honor and privilege of introducing this bill within the near future. Actual commencement of one part of this Pacific Memorial System called The Gardens of the Missing is expected in the immediate future.

Hawaii and America have not forgotten.

## The Rochambeau Commission Celebration of the Victory at Yorktown, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, February 11, 1957*

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as of historical interest, on account of the third annual Rochambeau Commission's commemoration of the Unknown Revolutionary Soldier at Yorktown, including messages from the President of the United States and others to Charles Parmer, of Virginia, the Rochambeau Commission chairman, who directed the religious-military rites over the graves in the French cemetery on the field where Gen. George Washington fought the decisive battle of the Revolution.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, October 12, 1956.*

CHARLES PARMER,
*Chairman, Rochambeau Commission, Alexandria, Va.:*

On the 175th anniversary of the victory of Yorktown I send greetings to all participating in this historic occasion, and a special welcome to your distinguished guests from overseas.

As this battle was won with the aid of friends led by General Rochambeau we remember the gallant men of France, Ireland, Poland, and other nations who gave their lives for our freedom. We remember the men under Cornwallis who were our enemies but whose descendants, in blood and spirit, are now our staunch allies.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

His Excellency, Mr. John Joseph Hearne, Ambassador of Ireland, was the distinguished guest who delivered the eulogy over the graves of the Unknown Revolutionary Soldiers—"gallant men of France, Ireland, Poland, and other nations who gave their lives for our freedom." The following is a portion of a letter from him:

AMBASAID NA HEIREANN,
EMBASSY OF IRELAND,
*Washington, D. C., October 22, 1956.*

Mr. CHARLES PARMER,
*Chairman, the Rochambeau Commissions (ca.).*

DEAR MR. PARMER: I have just received your letter of today's date conveying to me your thanks for my attendance at the 175th anniversary celebration of the battle of Yorktown at the French Cemetery on the battlefield on Friday last, the 19th October.

I was greatly honored to accept the invitation of the Rochambeau Commission through its distinguished chairman to attend these exquisite ceremonies, and it gave me the greatest pleasure to accept it. As you say in your letter, it was indeed an historic day, memorable in the annals of Yorktown, and especially for all of us who had the honor and happiness of participating in the proceedings. For myself I shall always recall it with happiness and gratitude as the first Ambassador of Ireland to have taken part in the anniversary proceedings and for having been called upon to deliver the address in commemoration of the unknown soldiers whose remains rest in the nameless graves upon the holy ground on which we stood. It was, I am sure, the first occasion in which the national anthem of Ireland was played by the Army bands on that most famous field of all.

I am, dear Mr. Parmer,

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN J. HEARNE,
*Ambassador of Ireland.*

In the absence of His Excellency, M. Hervé Alphand, Ambassador of France, the following message from him was read by Admiral André Jubelin, head of the French Naval Mission:

"THE EMBASSY OF FRANCE,
"*October 19, 1956.*

"I wish to express the profound gratitude of the French Government and of the French people to the organizers of the commemoration of the 175th anniversary of the surrender of Yorktown for having given such eclat to this manifestation of Franco-American friendship.

"Nothing could be more gratifying to the French than the fidelity with which the American people preserve the souvenir of the assistance France brought them at the glorious time of their revolution. For it is from this time that our friendship was born, a friendship truly unique in the history of nations, since it has outlived two centuries of wars and revolutions and is still, today, the cornerstone of our foreign policies.

"The infant United States, whose birth we assisted, has become a giant and a mighty friend. This mighty friend came in our days to the assistance of France in the First World War and insured the liberation of our country at the end of the second.

"The situation of France has changed, but her friendship has endured. Today, as charter members of the North Atlantic Pact, France and the United States are, more than ever, associated in an organization for the defense of the great heritage for which they fought at Yorktown and, since then, on many a glorious battlefield.

"In our day-to-day relationship, we may at times differ about methods, details or timing, but our goals remain the same and, today, as 175 years ago, our friendship does rest and will continue to rest on the principles so clearly enunciated by the negotiators of the Treaty of 1778: Real good will and manifest interest."

The chairman read this eulogy, written especially for the Rochambeau Commemorations at Yorktown by Dr. Samuel White Patterson of New York, distinguished American historian and Rochambeau commissioner at large:

"We stand on hallowed ground. Historic Yorktown once heard here the measured tread of martial men—men who met their fate with stout and manly hearts and spirits unafraid.

"For liberty and the rights alike of gallant foe and valiant friend they fought though little did that foe then know that the one command of Washington and Rochambeau must lead to victory.

"As we salute these graves of heroes dead and sing their national airs, as we eulogize their sacrifice and lay these garlands down in gratitude, and plant the precious seedling; as we sound the ruffles and drop the flowers in silent reverence; as we invoke the divine blessing on all who nobly served and on ourselves, their humble beneficiaries, may all we do and say ring bells of memory that the providence of God raised men of valor in this our homeland and from overseas, that justice and the right prevail.

"May these simple rites help keep alive the spark of thankful thought toward Rochambeau who, selfless, risked both life and fame to light a special candle of enduring friendship between the lands represented here today. May we devoutly pray requiescat in pace—and not only for the leader but the led under whatever flag they served.

"In remembrance of things past but ever present too, may we hope that the day of universal peace draw near and that the shadows flee to deepen the sunlight in happy glades of amity and good will. May the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts show forth to men everywhere our dedication to human brotherhood under God, not only at this solemn hour but at every hour of every day in all the years ahead."

Hon. A. Glenn Mower, Rochambeau Commissioner, representing the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, said in part: "The march of the American and French Armies from New York to Yorktown in 1781, under the command of Washington and Rochambeau, marked the first time in the history of modern states that soldiers of two governments on two continents marched together to achieve an objective.

"On this 175th anniversary of Yorktown, we should hold in grateful remembrance the aid that France supplied through ships, men, and money.

"Now, with a deep feeling of appreciation of the heroic services of all those who made victory possible at Yorktown, this spray of ivy from Mount Vernon is placed at this spot hallowed by the mute presence of some of the brave men who gave their lives so that liberty might become a reality to all mankind."

Count Henry Harrison De Frise, curator of the Roger Morris—Jumel Mansion (General Washington's headquarters in New York), and Rochambeau Commissioner at Large, said:

"France was our first ally: she is our oldest friend. French Governments may change, governing heads rise—and depart; but still stands firm the entente cordiale sealed by the blood of the best of her sons—shed here at Yorktown, the Revolution's decisive battle."

## E. A. Hester

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 11, 1957*

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was with sadness that I read today of

the passing of Mr. E. A. Hester, a lawyer here in the District of Columbia. Mr. E. A. Hester was associated with his brother Clinton in the practice of law and the two of these gentlemen have many, many friends here in the Congress. Mr. Hester was a most considerate man and gave much of his time in counseling with Members on various facets of legislation affecting industry.

Mr. Hester has practiced law here since 1940, previously having been employed by the Federal Alcohol Control Administration and the Commerce Department. He was also employed by the Social Security Board in Akron, Ohio, before coming to Washington. I know his absence on the Washington scene will be felt by many.

---

## Additional Funds for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 11, 1957*

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to provide additional funds for education without Federal direction, control, or interference.

The measure provides that 1 percent of the taxes collected on individual and corporate incomes in each State shall be returned to the State for use for educational purposes. District directors of internal revenue will make quarterly payments to the proper State officials. This will be a simple bookkeeping transaction without Federal direction, control, or interference in the expenditure of the additional funds provided to the State school systems.

It is similar to the bills sponsored by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] and to the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] which was adopted in the Committee of the Whole during debate last year.

Anyone who is sincerely interested in providing additional funds for public schools as quickly as possible will support this measure. On the contrary, those who are interested in Federal control of education may be expected to oppose it.

Introduction of this bill should not be considered as an indication that I believe the States are incapable of providing for their schools. To the contrary, I believe that the States can solve any problems in education that now exist. As was stated at the White House Conference on Education, no State has proved its incapacity. Several have proved their unwillingness to undertake the additional levies or to modernize bonding limits. Several have shown eagerness for Federal funds and reluctance to discharge their responsibilities so long as there is hope for Federal assumption of those responsibilities. A few, to their everlasting credit, have gone ahead and proved that they can and will build all of the classrooms they need without Federal help.

The fact remains that we are in grave danger of the enactment of the Federal control of education bill.

I think the danger was stated very clearly by our President a few years ago when he wrote the following to the gentleman from New York:

> I would flatly oppose any grant by the Federal Government to all States in the Union for educational purposes. Such policy would create an ambition—almost a requirement—to spend money freely under the impulse of competition with other localities in the country. Very frankly, I firmly believe that the army of persons who urge greater and greater centralization of authority and greater dependence on the Federal treasury are really more dangerous to our form of government than any external threat that can possibly be arrayed against us. In short, unless we are careful, even the great and necessary educational processes in our country will become yet another vehicle by which the believers in paternalism, if not outright socialism, will gain still additional power for the central government.

Mr. Eisenhower recognizes in that letter that the freedom of our public schools under local supervision and with local support is a very important part of our free government. Also, that Federal aid means Federal control, because our responsibility to the taxpayers requires we exercise careful and prudent control of the expenditures of their money.

As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] said last year, our free public schools are second only to religion in the hearts of our people. They are a birthright that we dare not sell or exchange at any price.

Still, there is the demand in many areas for more money for schools and there is a real danger that Congress will succumb to that demand.

As a last resort, to avoid the dull uniformity of Federal control, I offer this income-tax refund proposal.

The chart which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks shows in column 1 the amount of Federal tax revenue from each State that would be required to support the $600 million grant of the Federal control of education bill. Column 2 shows the amount each State would receive for education under that bill. Column 3 shows the net gain or loss to each State.

Citizens of Ohio would contribute $40,404,000 of the total required. In return, Ohio would receive Federal aid amounting to $30,354,624, a net loss to Ohio taxpayers of $10,049,376.

I am indebted to Paul O. Peters for an analysis showing that six States, California, Illinois, Michigan, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, would contribute over 57 percent of the Kelley bill grants. The bill means a net loss of $130 million to the taxpaying citizens of these six States.

Column 4 of my chart shows 1956 collections of individual and corporate income taxes. Column 5 shows what each State would receive under my proposal. Column 6 shows the total effect on each State, being the amount of taxation that can be avoided by rejecting the Federal control bill together with the amount retained under my proposal.

Only a few States would receive less than the net benefit of the Federal control bill.

The total amount to be distributed among the States, without control, would be slightly greater than the amount the Federal control bill envisions.

I think the issue is plain. Those who want to provide the greatest amount of money for schools as swiftly as possible will, of necessity, endorse my proposal. Those who are primarily interested in Federal control, in enlarging the Federal bureaucracy, and in extending the paternalism of the Central Government will oppose it in favor of the control bill.

The chart follows:

| State | Kelley bill | | | Income and corporate tax collection, 1956 | Bow bill | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Taxes required | State will receive | Net gain or loss to State | | States retain | Net gain to State |
| Alabama | $3,258,000 | $13,452,987 | $10,194,987 | $428,121,000 | $4,281,100 | $7,539,100 |
| Arizona | 1,392,000 | 3,806,529 | 2,414,529 | 174,547,000 | 1,745,470 | 3,137,470 |
| Arkansas | 1,356,000 | 7,970,935 | 6,614,935 | 168,357,000 | 1,683,570 | 3,039,570 |
| California | 46,720,000 | 41,318,729 | −4,401,271 | 5,255,898,000 | 52,558,980 | 98,278,980 |
| Colorado | 5,382,000 | 5,416,983 | 34,983 | 711,563,000 | 7,115,630 | 12,497,630 |
| Connecticut | 11,046,000 | 7,173,843 | −3,872,157 | 1,141,175,000 | 11,411,750 | 22,457,750 |
| Delaware | 7,728,000 | 1,252,575 | −6,465,425 | 790,853,000 | 7,908,530 | 15,636,530 |
| Florida | 5,802,000 | 11,435,853 | 5,633,853 | 799,257,000 | 7,992,570 | 13,794,570 |
| Georgia | 6,012,000 | 15,348,251 | 7,336,251 | 643,358,000 | 6,433,580 | 12,445,580 |
| Idaho | 918,000 | 2,537,685 | 1,619,685 | 114,649,000 | 1,146,490 | 2,064,490 |
| Illinois | 49,368,000 | 30,370,893 | −18,997,107 | 5,202,922,000 | 52,029,220 | 101,397,220 |
| Indiana | 13,722,000 | 15,339,985 | 1,617,985 | 1,349,669,000 | 13,496,690 | 27,218,690 |
| Iowa | 4,530,000 | 9,630,192 | 5,100,192 | 538,648,000 | 5,386,480 | 9,916,480 |
| Kansas | 4,314,000 | 7,125,041 | 2,811,041 | 450,087,000 | 4,500,870 | 8,814,870 |
| Kentucky | 11,400,000 | 12,476,955 | 1,076,955 | 482,227,000 | 4,822,270 | 15,222,270 |
| Louisiana | 4,644,000 | 12,135,344 | 7,491,344 | 513,147,000 | 5,131,470 | 9,775,470 |
| Maine | 1,464,000 | 3,367,314 | 1,903,314 | 166,309,000 | 1,663,090 | 3,107,090 |
| Maryland [1] | 16,536,000 | 24,393,222 | 7,857,222 | 1,541,014,000 | 15,410,140 | 31,946,140 |
| Massachusetts | 16,314,000 | 15,860,536 | −453,464 | 1,770,309,000 | 17,703,090 | 34,017,090 |
| Michigan | 52,266,000 | 25,588,331 | −26,677,669 | 5,378,497,000 | 53,784,970 | 106,050,970 |
| Minnesota | 9,096,000 | 11,549,724 | 2,453,724 | 997,464,000 | 9,974,640 | 19,070,640 |
| Mississippi | 1,200,000 | 9,760,329 | 8,560,329 | 153,892,000 | 1,538,920 | 2,738,920 |
| Missouri | 15,192,000 | 13,762,065 | −1,429,935 | 1,554,304,000 | 15,543,040 | 30,735,040 |
| Montana | 1,002,000 | 1,391,280 | 383,280 | 120,241,000 | 1,202,410 | 2,204,410 |
| Nebraska | 3,540,000 | 4,831,364 | 1,321,364 | 343,254,000 | 3,432,540 | 6,942,540 |
| Nevada | 726,000 | 699,490 | −26,510 | 84,049,000 | 840,490 | 1,566,490 |
| New Hampshire | 1,068,000 | 1,919,532 | 851,532 | 129,216,000 | 1,292,160 | 2,360,160 |
| New Jersey | 17,664,000 | 17,015,508 | −648,492 | 1,884,102,000 | 18,841,020 | 36,505,020 |
| New Mexico | 912,000 | 3,481,185 | 2,469,185 | 115,786,000 | 1,157,860 | 2,069,860 |
| New York | 112,449,000 | 49,192,062 | −63,256,938 | 12,612,648,000 | 126,126,480 | 238,575,480 |
| North Carolina | 13,236,000 | 18,267,824 | 5,031,824 | 755,800,000 | 7,558,000 | 20,794,000 |
| North Dakota | 546,000 | 2,586,487 | 2,040,487 | 66,214,000 | 662,140 | 1,208,140 |
| Ohio | 40,404,000 | 30,354,624 | −10,049,376 | 4,154,769,000 | 41,547,690 | 81,951,690 |

[1] Maryland includes District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

| State | Kelley bill | | | Income and corporate tax collection, 1956 | Bow bill | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Taxes required | State will receive | Net gain or loss to State | | States retain | Net gain to State |
| Oklahoma | $5,364,000 | $8,572,823 | $3,208,823 | $357,861,000 | $5,578,610 | $10,942,610 |
| Oregon | 3,666,000 | 5,839,930 | 2,173,930 | 469,421,000 | 4,694,210 | 8,360,210 |
| Pennsylvania | 45,672,000 | 37,658,605 | −8,013,395 | 4,627,820,000 | 46,278,200 | 91,950,200 |
| Rhode Island | 2,544,000 | 2,667,824 | 123,824 | 277,196,000 | 2,771,960 | 5,315,960 |
| South Carolina | 2,166,000 | 10,508,622 | 8,342,622 | 252,223,000 | 2,522,330 | 4,688,330 |
| South Dakota | 612,000 | 1,587,065 | 975,065 | 75,118,000 | 751,180 | 1,363,180 |
| Tennessee | 4,374,000 | 13,762,065 | 9,388,065 | 518,121,000 | 5,181,210 | 9,555,210 |
| Texas | 18,720,000 | 32,973,646 | 14,253,646 | 2,157,833,000 | 21,578,330 | 40,298,330 |
| Utah | 2,544,000 | 3,253,444 | 709,444 | 159,301,000 | 1,593,010 | 4,137,010 |
| Vermont | 648,000 | 1,447,882 | 799,882 | 65,678,000 | 656,780 | 1,304,780 |
| Virginia | 9,234,000 | 13,810,866 | 4,576,866 | 738,707,000 | 7,387,070 | 16,621,070 |
| Washington [1] | 7,104,000 | 9,532,589 | 2,428,589 | 822,125,000 | 8,221,250 | 15,325,250 |
| West Virginia | 2,514,000 | 8,621,625 | 6,107,625 | 291,918,000 | 2,919,180 | 5,433,180 |
| Wisconsin | 11,142,000 | 13,111,377 | 1,969,377 | 1,183,119,000 | 11,831,190 | 22,973,190 |
| Wyoming | 486,000 | 1,171,239 | 685,239 | 52,707,000 | 527,070 | 1,013,070 |
| Hawaii | 1,164,000 | 2,114,738 | 950,738 | 131,466,000 | 1,314,660 | 2,478,660 |
| Total | 597,996,000 | 600,000,000 | | 62,972,969,000 | 629,729,690 | 1,226,640,590 |

[1] Washington State includes Alaska.

## Meeting the Challenge the Free Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 11, 1957*

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, throughout our country these days we are witnessing an old phenomenon of freedom—the meeting of a great need through the voluntary cooperation of those who can fill it. In this case, the need is for scientists—far more than we have ever produced before. It is being met through the cooperation of universities and industries, who are providing science scholarships for qualified young people; the cooperation of educators at all levels, and particularly at the secondary-school level, who are arousing young minds to the opportunities—and rewards—of careers in science; and the cooperation of American parents and American students, who, accepting the need for scientists, are directing their efforts to meet that need.

I am informed by Dr. Alan Waterman, the director of the National Science Foundation, that the number of scientists is increasing, as a result of the concentrated emphasis on this problem. We still need more and better science teachers in the high schools and universities—teachers who can arouse the minds of young people who are not predisposed to science, but who are capable of becoming good scientists if challenged.

At the same time, it is a source of satisfaction to learn that few students are lost to science today for lack of funds to continue their education. Government, education, industry, and public-spirited individuals are jointly providing the funds where needed.

For their part, America's young men and women are rising impressively to the challenge that has been placed before their generation.

As an example of this great cooperative effort, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from the Batavia Daily News of February 5, 1957, about a young man in my district who, with an average of 97.7 percent in science, has been selected for a Bausch & Lomb scholarship in science at the University of Rochester:

ROBERT WHITE TOP SCIENCE STUDENT—CITED FOR BAUSCH & LOMB SCHOLARSHIP; HAS 97.7 AVERAGE

With an average of 97.7 percent in general science, biology, and chemistry, Robert White, of Ellicott Street, is the top science student in the senior class at Batavia High School.

He will receive the Bausch & Lomb honorary science award at graduation in June and is eligible to try for one of a group of major science scholarships sponsored by Bausch & Lomb Optical Co. at the University of Rochester. Robert is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert C. White.

Bausch & Lomb provides for not less than three scholarships with a flexible stipend based on need and with a total 4-year value of $9,600.

In the 13 years that the program has been in effect, 53 young men and women have been enrolled at the University of Rochester under Bausch & Lomb science scholarships. In addition, because of the high caliber of the contestants, the university has awarded to 80 runners-up other scholarships of comparable value.

The Rochester scholarship committee studies all applications and selects 30 of the most promising candidates late in March. The finalists from all parts of the country are then invited to Rochester for 3 days, with all expenses paid, for interviews and competitive tests.

## The Surgeon General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN. J. FLYNT, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 11, 1957*

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 7, 1957, I called to the attention of this House an incident which I considered had worked an injustice and hardship upon a physician, a resident of my district, who had been tendered an appointment in the Medical Corps of the Regular Establishment of the United States Army.

As soon as this matter was brought to the personal attention of the Surgeon General, Maj. Gen. Silas B. Hays, this matter was thoroughly inquired into by him with the result that the earlier action of the Surgeon General's Office was promptly confirmed and the tender of an appointment in the Medical Corps of the Regular Army was reinstated. I want to personally express to Maj. Gen. Hays my profound appreciation for the prompt and equitable manner in which he acted in keeping with the highest traditions of the Army and of the branch of the Army which he so ably commands.

## Lincoln's Legacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 11, 1957*

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow the Nation will celebrate the birth of President Lincoln. It is timely that we recall some of the circumstances of his life.

In a crude hunter's hut deep in Kentucky's desolate woods, it happened. On a bed of poles covered with corn husks, a cold February wind penetrating the cracks in the cabin, Abraham Lincoln was born.

What dreams dared poor Nancy Hanks Lincoln entertain on that bleak Sunday morning of 1809? Hounded by gossip and consigned by her wedding vow to share a woodsman's hardship on a barren farm that had cost 66 cents an acre, what a difference it might have made to her could she but have lifted the curtain of the future and foreseen the marble shrine on the Potomac which now attracts more than a million visitors a year.

She died 9 years later, convulsed with pain on a wretched dirt floor pallet of leaves and bearskins. Her last words were a halting, whispered plea to Abraham and his sister to live right, to be kind to each other, to worship God. Perhaps she knew he would not forget.

Life was never easy for Lincoln. He was dogged by defeat, hounded by failure, stalked by tragedy. The idyllic youthful love he shared with Ann Rutledge ended in abiding heartache. He failed in business, fell deep in debt, had a legal judgment lodged against him, finally left New Salem for Springfield on a borrowed horse, felt the frustration of repeated political defeats.

At the age of 49 he confessed:

With me the race of political ambition has been a flat failure.

After his loss to Douglas for the Senate, a newspaper lamented editorially:

Hon. Abe Lincoln is undoubtedly the most unfortunate politician who has ever attempted to rise in Illinois.

This is the man who was strangely catapulted into the Presidency at perhaps the most critical moment in the Nation's history. Even there, he seemed at first doomed to mediocrity, even

failure. His cherished dream had been to forge a settlement of differences and save the Union. He saw this dream dissolve before his eyes, the bands of union crumple and ignite.

His generals failed him, his Cabinet snubbed him, the public reviled him, even his wife is said to have held him in contempt. A nation at war was of no mood to embrace Christian charity, and it was this of which Lincoln was made.

When McClellan showed his contempt, Lincoln offered to hold his hat. When Salmon P. Chase humiliated him and plotted against him, Lincoln praised Chase and made him Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. After Stanton had scorned him as an imbecile and a gorilla, Lincoln made him his Secretary of War.

When the North, finally tasting victory, would mete out a vindictive full measure and more to the prostrate South, Lincoln, too big for vengeance, proposed that the Southern States be paid $400 for their slaves. Not one member of his Cabinet would agree.

In the end, even death was not merciful. For 9 long hours after the assassin's bullet had pierced his head, Lincoln suffered. It remained for Stanton, his former detractor, to speak the fitting tribute:

> There lies the most perfect ruler of men the world has ever seen (and) now he belongs to the ages.

The plea of poor Nancy Hanks was not in vain. The legacy she bequeathed has enriched the Nation and the world. It was the patience and humility with which she imbued her son that did, in the final analysis, save the Union. Today, almost a century and a half later, enshrined in marble and in human hearts are the most profoundly Christian words ever spoken by a head of state. If you have not read them lately, they will bear reading again, slowly, while remembering that they were uttered at a time when all about him raged the hot hatred of war:

> Neither party expected for the war the magnitude or the duration which it has already attained. Neither anticipated that the cause of the conflict might cease with or even before the conflict itself should cease. Each looked for an easier triumph, and a result less fundamental and astounding. Both read the same Bible and pray to the same God, and each invokes His aid against the other. It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces, but let us judge not, that we be not judged. The prayers of both could not be answered. That of neither has been answered fully. The Almighty has His own purpose. "Woe unto the world because of offenses; for it must needs be that offenses come, but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh."
>
> If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of those offenses which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove, and that He gives to both North and South this terrible war as the woe due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to Him? Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said, "The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."
>
> With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

## Report From Representative McCarthy, of Minnesota, to His Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, February 11, 1957*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a document entitled "Report No. 1, From the Office of EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Member of Congress, Representative From the Fourth District, Minnesota," dated February 1957, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is a report to Representative MCCARTHY's constituents relating to the first month's activities of the Congress of the United States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT NO. 1 FROM THE OFFICE OF EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE FOURTH DISTRICT, MINNESOTA

DEAR FRIENDS: In the first month of the 1st session of the 85th Congress, only one issue of significance has come before the House of Representatives. This was the Middle East resolution proposed and drafted, not by Congress, but by the State Department. After limited hearings, the House Foreign Affairs Committee recommended the passage of the resolution. The resolution was presented under a closed rule, preventing House amendment. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is continuing its hearings and is demanding fuller explanation of the implications and of the language of the resolution.

I opposed the closed rule, as I believed the resolution needed clarification and modification. I then voted against the resolution.

The Secretary of State declared that the passage of the resolution would dispel doubts about the United States willingness and determination to resist Communist aggression in the Middle East. Certainly there is nothing in the record of the Congress to indicate hesitation or reluctance, or to cause doubt. If such doubt exists, it has arisen as a result of the administration's hesitation and uncertainty, and it could, I believe, be dispelled by affirmative decision and action on the part of the administration.

The resolution spoke of authorizing the President to use military forces. Not even Mr. Dulles would say that the resolution was necessary for this. The resolution provided authorization to the President to spend in the Middle East $200 million of previously appropriated funds. Mr. Dulles, in hours of questioning, failed to give any real explanation of how he is going to use this money. He admitted that he had enough for any expenditures that might be necessary during the next 60 days. I realize that some freedom must be given in the expenditure of money appropriated for overseas use, especially in an area as unstable as is the Middle East, but I also believe that Congress should have some indication, at least, of the general areas of expenditure—such as capital goods, direct aid to people, and major projects which may be contemplated. No explanations were given.

Between July 1, 1951, and June 30, 1956, the United States allotted a total of $136,295,000 to the 5 Middle Eastern Arab States—Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, and Saudi Arabia. Of this amount only a little more than $70 million, or slightly over 50 percent of the amount, has been spent in 5 years. There is, therefore, nothing in the record to indicate that the administration could get real economic development started if Congress gave emergency authority for additional millions of dollars.

I am hopeful that in the course of Senate hearings and Senate debate the resolution will be clarified and improved, and that the administration will indicate more positively and specifically what its policy and program for the Midde East actually is and that the House of Representatives will, in the future, be less hurried in acting on resolutions such as this, and more thorough in its inquiries and debate.

The controversy on this resolution raises the difficult question of the responsibility of the opposition party in the field of foreign affairs. Opposition should not be opposition for its own sake. Especially in the field of foreign affairs, it should be considerate, and taking into account the difficulties and uncertainties of world affairs. On the other hand, especially since decisions in foreign affairs are so important, foreign policy must be subject to debate and to challenge. If the people of the country are to make difficult decisions in this field, they must have sufficient information. The same is true of the Congress. Initiative and major responsibility rests with the President and his Department of State, but residual congressional responsibility remains. It is my opinion that the House of Representatives did not exercise its full responsibility in dealing with this resolution, and that it missed an opportunity to take a more vital part in the development of foreign policy.

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE J. MCCARTHY,
*Member of Congress.*

## Address by Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., at Presentation of the American Way Award to the Secretary of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, February 11, 1957*

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a splendid address by the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., House minority leader, in presenting the American Way Award of the Sertoma Club of Washington, D. C., to the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, and a former Governor of Michigan. Secretary Brucker's

response dealing with the American way and national defense was followed by his acceptance of an honorary membership in the Sertoma Club. The Sertoma Club symbolizes "service to mankind."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sertoma's Annual Freedom Week will be observed this coming month, February 17–23, not only in the United States but also in Canada and Mexico. It will be observed in many ways to alert people to the advantages enjoyed in free nations and to promote good citizenship, especially with youth.

It is appropriate that our own Sertoma Club in the Nation's Capital should set an example to the Nation in conducting a vital freedom program, or, as we continue to call it the American way program.

Actually we are celebrating the Sertoma Freedom Week tonight in selecting this occasion, our club's third anniversary banquet, to honor a great American of our times with the American Way Award for 1957.

My thoughts go back to this same festive setting 3 years ago when Washington Sertoma Club received its charter. It was my pleasant privilege then, as it is tonight, to present our club's American Way Award. Then, as now, Sertoma was conscious of the importance of a strong national defense for the preservation of our precious heritage of freedom. The young man we honored in 1954 came here fresh from a great achievement in streaking through the skies from coast to coast in a new record time for a jet airplane. In recognition of this exploit, Sertoma was the first civic club to honor Col. W. W. Milliken of the District of Columbia Air National Guard, first line of defense of our Nation's Capital.

On our first anniversary observance in this room in 1955, Sertoma recognized the importance of the National Guard Bureau to our Nation's security. General Abernathy accepted the American Way Award on behalf of the Bureau from the hands of our distinguished fellow Sertoman, Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant, III.

Last year Sertoma paid a deserved honor at Kenwood Country Club to our gallant Navy when Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, proudly accepted the American way plaque from his Naval Academy classmate and Sertoma's second president, Comdr. Raymond Leavitt. Charter President Ed Place also has played an important role in the organization's patriotic, charitable and other laudable activities.

Sertoma has not lost sight of the basic truths that our national freedom depends upon military strength, patriotism, good citizenship, a consecrated devotion to our country and its ideals, and a fundamental belief in God.

Washington Sertoma Club was the first in the land to adopt the revised Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. The author of the legislation, Congressman RABAUT, of Detroit, personally led the club in the pledge when President Eisenhower signed the bill. Sertoma printed and distributed more than a half million copies of the pledge to local schoolchildren. For 3 years, without fanfare or publicity, Sertoma has presented every man and woman admitted to citizenship in the District of Columbia with a facsimile copy of the Declaration of Independence, averaging 100 or more each month. Sertoma similarly honors each of its weekly luncheon speakers.

Col. Heber Rice and Col. A. C. Eastburn are presently in charge of Sertoma's American way and citizenship activities.

These preliminary remarks, Secretary Brucker, will indicate to you the tradition and the spirit that have prompted Sertomans to select you as the 1957 American Way Award recipient.

From the day you enlisted in the Michigan National Guard in 1915 and served on the Mexican border as a member of the 33d Infantry, Michigan National Guard, in 1916 and 1917, you have exemplified the American way in your private and public life.

Your experience as a soldier in World War I, as Governor of Michigan, and in the legal profession were steppingstones to your present post of great responsibility as Secretary of the Army.

One of the great responsibilities which the Secretary of Defense has delegated to Secretary Brucker is the executive supervision of the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway in partnership with Canada. The billion-dollar seaway-power project is the outstanding example in the world today of free nations working together harmoniously and effectively for the common good.

Sertoma International, together with other international service clubs have played a very important part in bringing about this mutual understanding and good will.

There are close ties between the Sertoma Clubs of Buffalo, Niagara Falls, Detroit, Chicago, and other American seaway cities and the Sertoma Clubs of Hamilton, St. Catherine's Welland, Chatham, London, Sarnia, and Windsor located along the Canadian seaway.

It may be of interest, Mr. Secretary, that the Toronto newspaper correspondent assigned to cover your recent Canadian seaway inspection tour was a leading Sertoman of the last Ontario district.

As a Sertoman, Members of the Congress, and a longtime friend, I am pleased beyond measure to present you with this plaque with its citation inscribed to you, "For Leadership in National Defense."

## Shortage of College Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, February 11, 1957*

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a further statement on my suggestions for alleviating the shortage in college facilities.

This statement was made on January 24, 1957, before the American College Public Relations Association and the American Alumni Council, in Atlantic City.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE OF NEW JERSEY

It is a great pleasure to have a chance to talk before your organizations today on the need for expanding college facilities. As many of you know, I have proposed consideration of a program of Federal aid for the establishment and expansion of 2-year public colleges. In developing this proposal I have had the benefit of suggestions and comments from many of you and I am indeed grateful.

In a way, to attempt to discuss the shortage of college facilities at a meeting of this kind is almost like talking about presidential possibilities at a conference of Senators—and, I should add, governors. You know the problem intimately and all too well. Working together, we shall have to concentrate on gaining public support for a plan which can meet the problem.

I have a feeling that this chore could be a bit less difficult if groups such as yours were not so restrained in publicizing your own problem. It is clear to me, as it has been to you, that the need for assistance to public schools will have priority in Congress. I am hopeful indeed that this session of Congress will enact a school-aid bill. The President's emphasis on this in his message to Congress indicates that he plans to exert vigorous leadership to achieve this.

But let us not forget that this bill has been years in the making. It did not spring full-blown from idea into enactment in a few months or even a few years. I emphasize this because I feel it points up the need for starting to explore ways and means for meeting the problem of a growing shortage in college facilities. We are losing ground in our goal of increasing educational opportunities. This problem calls for the best we can muster in imagination and initiative. There is no greater natural resource than our young people—with them lies the security of the Nation. Now is the time to develop ideas and hammer them out on the forge of public discussion into a real instrument for progress.

The problem of adequate college facilities has two major dimensions. We must increase total college capacity, and we must keep the cost of college education within the budgets of American families.

We are pricing our youth out of college. The days are gone when one could say to an ambitious young man, "If you want to go through college, where there's a will there's a way." There used to be a way and there still will be for some, but many who got through college in the days when you and I worked our way through can no longer do so. The task is too formidable—the costs are too high.

A New York Times survey of college tuition costs around the Nation, which was reported on Sunday, showed that higher operating costs have forced many of the Nation's colleges and universities to increase tuition costs 50 to 100 percent in the last 10 years.

At the same time, the other costs of a college education are also rising. One major college has announced a $200 increase in tuition and room-and-board charges for next September. This will bring the cost of tuition, room, board, and incidentals at this college to $1,800 a year.

Clearly, increases such as this—and these do not meet the actual current costs of students at such institutions—tend to deny education to those least able to afford the higher costs. One university official quoted in the survey said "There are a number of qualified students who apply for scholarship aid and, when it is not available, do not go on to college. On top of this, there is a large but unknown number of young people who never even consider a higher education because of the cost."

As many of you know, I have proposed consideration of an emergency program of Federal aid to provide classrooms at 2-year colleges through grants-in-aid to the States. The reaction to this proposal has been generous indeed. I have been particularly impressed by the comments made by the presidents of some of the Nation's largest colleges. Although they would receive no assistance under this program, many of these officials have commended the proposal and urged its enactment.

Let me explain briefly what my plan contemplates. It would provide a 5-year emergency program of Federal assistance to the States to help 2-year colleges get started or help existing ones to grow. The aid would be made available on a formula reflecting the number of youngsters in a State who are of college age and the per-capita income of the State. The funds would be granted for physical plant and equipment on a matching basis, with the State government putting

up two-thirds and the Federal Government the remaining one-third.

The States would develop a statewide plan for the location and operation of the units. This should help avoid concentration of too many units in one area of the State and a shortage in other parts of the State. In our less populated States, there may be only one centrally located unit. The location of colleges near the homes of youngsters will encourage many to enter college. For the youth who lacks either dormitory fees or tuition, or lacks both, the public 2-year college nearby may be his only chance for higher education.

In general, I would expect the units would try to meet the needs of two groups of students: (1) Those seeking 2 years of college preliminary to taking 2 or more years at another institution; and (2) those planning to wind up their college career in the 2 years and who therefore want terminal courses in general education and vocational fields. Many colleges which offer this kind of program are known as junior or community colleges. Some have attempted further to meet the needs of the community by adding a program of adult education for those who are employed, but feel the need for additional training.

The general effect of such institutions in many areas is to extend the public-school system by 2 years. For this reason, there are varying techniques for administering the 2-year colleges. In some, a local board directs the activities; in others, a State board or the State department of education and in others, the existing high school takes over. But, and I should like to emphasize this, municipal or State officials control the educational program. This is as it should be.

In outlining this plan, I, of course, realize that such a program would only partially meet the need for expansion of college capacity. I do not think this program alone will assure a gown and a diploma to each youngster with the qualifications for college. On the other hand, it promises the most economical way of bringing higher education within the reach of the most people.

In the month since I have unfolded this plan, many letters have arrived at my office commenting on the proposal. I should like to discuss some of the comments here. Of course, my reactions are not intended as a final statement of position since I am still studying the problems involved.

The need for a program to help colleges seems generally accepted in these letters. There is some difference of opinion over the extent of the need, but no doubt about its existence.

Some of the letters have urged incorporation of a scholarship program in my proposal. I recognize the need for attracting our brightest minds into the college classrooms, and I think that a general expansion of capacity will have this effect. A scholarship program by itself, it seems to me, would help the brilliant youngster enter college, but unless total capacity is expanded, he cannot help but displace a less talented youth. In the long run, I think there is a need probably for both added capacity and scholarship aid, but I feel the first should have the priority in legislative action.

Another suggestion has dealt with the emphasis on vocational training. There are some who feel that the 2-year colleges should become centralized schools for training in many occupations. My own thought is to emphasize such training as would fit a young man or women for the subprofessions and occupations of a technical nature and putting this in a framework of general education. As someone has commented, "We must educate for living, not merely for making a living." Today's scholars, scientists, professionals and even technicians are going to manage the society in which we live. They are becoming the captains of industry and labor, the leaders of government, the people who will shape the future.

Among those who are eager for enactment of the proposed program are some who have urged that it be offered as a part or as an amendment to the Federal aid for public school legislation. This, I feel, would not be wise. By adding another area of discussion, and possible differences, as well as a large sum of money, we might jeopardize the much-needed public-school bills. First things first, but let us not forget either that today's high-school freshman is only one presidential administration removed from trying to become a college student. Colleges are not established nor are buildings erected overnight. It is not too soon to start planning for the future of these young people, and of our Nation.

The extent of the problem cannot be overlooked. Only this week, I noticed a statement by John W. Gardner, president of the Carnegie Corp. He declared that "the growth of higher education has been even more dramatic than that of education at lower levels. While the population was increasing less than 4 times between 1870 and 1950, the college population was increasing more than 50 times. And it will continue to rise. There is reason to believe that the college population will at least double and possibly treble in the next 20 years."

This problem will require a high order of leadership, experience, and cooperation. There are many facets to this problem, such things as how to handle accreditation, State and local financing and recruitment of college teachers. I urge you to continue your attention to this problem and I welcome the benefit of your thoughts. My proposal is not a finished one—the commas have not been placed and until the last one is in position, there is room for improvement.

---

## Status of Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 11, 1957*

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, now that the House has voted to give the President authority to send our Armed Forces to the Middle East to any country requesting aid against overt armed aggression from another nation controlled by international communism, the question comes to my mind as to what nation is going to have jurisdiction over our troops.

By the rules of international law, if our forces are in another country by consent of that country, they are not subject to the jurisdiction of the place. However, we have over 50 agreements now in effect that give criminal jurisdiction for transgressions of our servicemen in other countries to the courts of the countries in which they are serving. Are we going to give the same obeisance to the nation or nations we may go to to protect in the Middle East?

I know that there are certain internationalists among us, particularly those who concocted these agreements or are now defending them, who claim there is no rule of international law such as I have mentioned. Passing over the pronouncements of Chief Justice Marshall, and our Supreme Court and the position we and other nations have taken in the past, I want to bring to the attention of the House the words of a court in Japan in an opinion last May. The court said:

An armed force constitutes the fighting power of a country and is a symbol of its dignity. Consequently, it is a well-established rule of international law that an armed force stationed in a foreign country in accordance with a treaty is not subject to civil or criminal jurisdiction of the receiving state.

We have certainly lost face in Japan through the administrative agreement giving them jurisdiction over our servicemen. Apparently our forces are no longer a symbol of the dignity of our country, for the court said we had surrendered our rights under international law through the administrative agreement, and proceeded to show its contempt of the United States by its judgment.

Canadian troops are a part of the international police force now in Egypt. When a member of the House of Commons of Canada asked the Minister of Defense, the Honorable Ralph Campney, under what code of discipline these troops would be serving, this colloquy took place—I am quoting from House of Commons debates of November 29, 1956, page 171:

Mr. PEARKES. Would the Minister of National Defense advice us concerning the code of discipline under which these troops will be serving? Will the Canadians be governed by the Canadian Code of Military Discipline? When punishment has to be dealt out, will the men involved be tried by their own commanding officers or a Canadian court, or will they have to be tried by an Egyptian court or by some international court-martial? We would like to have some information as to the exercise of discipline and the protection of any of our men who may through some misfortune fall afoul of some commander from some other unit, or the laws of Egypt or elsewhere.

Mr. CAMPNEY. This matter is now under discussion in the United Nations. But it is our contention, and we are acting on this contention for the present and will continue to do so until there is any change, that our forces will be governed by Canadian law and discipline will be administered under our own Canadian system. As I say, the question is being reviewed now in the United Nations.

Mr. PEARKES. Would that apply to any civil offense which might be alleged against a Canadian soldier?

Mr. CAMPNEY. Yes. We have taken the view that that should obtain. Whether or not we will maintain that, whether other courts of an international nature will be set up or what the final disposition will be, I do not know; but as for now, that is our contention.

Mr. PEARKES. I should like to express the opinion that it is very desirable that we remain firm in that stand.

Mr. CAMPNEY. We feel quite strongly about it.

I admire the Canadians for looking after the interests of their armed forces serving in Egypt.

Will our spine be stiff enough to take the same position?

I regret that the record would seem to indicate not.

Our own Government has not had an equal interest in preserving the constitu-

tional rights of the members of our Armed Forces.

It is time we begin to feel strongly enough about this to call a halt to the exercise of criminal jurisdiction over our servicemen by foreign powers.

## Macaroni Is Better To Eat When Made Completely From Durum Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. OTTO KRUEGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 11, 1957*

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, everyone who likes puffed wheat for breakfast or macaroni for lunch or spaghetti and meatballs for dinner has an interest in a comparatively small but extremely important part of the wheat program we will consider this year.

The purpose of H. R. 2160 which I introduced is to insure an adequate supply of durum wheat for the macaroni processing industry.

Durum wheat is a specialty wheat. It has qualities which fill the particular requirements of the macaroni industry. I want to say more about this in a moment, but first I would like to explain briefly the provisions of this bill.

H. R. 2160 can be stated simply as a "1-to-1 acreage incentive" to wheat producers in the Dakotas, Minnesota, Montana, and in a section of California. It provides that in the designated durum producing areas in these States growers can increase their total plantings above their normal wheat allotment in relation to the amount of durum they seed.

It works out like this. If the normal allotment is 100 acres, and the producer plants 60 acres in other wheat and 40 acres in durum, he receives an extra 40 acres which can be seeded to durum, or a total of 140 acres: 80 of durum and 60 of other wheat. This is safeguarded by the provision that his traditional cropland cannot be exceeded by this increased allotment—he cannot plow up pastureland to put more acres into wheat under this bill.

Now, I said earlier, durum is a specialty wheat. It cannot be raised just anywhere. A few years ago the durum triangle in my State raised just about all the durum produced in this country. Durum requires special weather and soil conditions which are present in the areas set out in the bill.

The principal question is this: Do we need durum wheat legislation for 1957? The answer is "Yes" and I want to present some of the reasons for that answer.

Production of durum in 1956 was equal to the normal annual production for the past 10 years and is ample to meet our present needs. But total durum acreage in 1956 was not on a firm foundation. The North Dakota acreage for 1956 was about 58 percent of the average durum plantings for the years 1945 to 1954. On the other hand, in Montana, widespread winterkill of the winter wheat crop for 1956 provided a great deal of acreage for durum plantings.

Per acre yields of durum in 1956 were considerably above the average for the previous decade. Had normal yields prevailed, the 1956 crop would have produced approximately 29 million bushels of durum rather than 39 million bushels.

The Department of Agriculture has estimated an 8½ million bushel carryover of durum on July 1. If normal acreage were planted and normal yields resulted, this 1-for-1 program might not be necessary. But if there is no incentive to plant durum, such as H. R. 2160 and similar measures would provide, there is every indication that plantings will be far below normal again in 1957.

Montana last year suffered a bad winterkill of winter wheat. A successful Montana winter wheat crop means a shrinkage of almost 50 percent and possibly more in durum plantings in Montana in 1957.

In North Dakota, grower intentions and the hundreds of letters and telegrams I have received indicate clearly that durum wheat acreage in my State will be down unless there is an incentive provided the grower.

15–B rust hits the durum crop, it makes durum a risky crop, and so unless there is an incentive to plant durum, the wheatgrower is going to turn to rust-resistant Selkirk spring wheat in 1957. That was borne out in a survey taken at Langdon, the county seat of Cavalier County, N. Dak., where the annual State durum show is held. This showed that before the 15–B rust epidemic, 80 percent of the wheat acreage of the growers questioned was planted to durum wheat. Unless there is an incentive program, only 45 percent of the acreage will be planted to durum this year.

The North Dakota Farm Bureau Federation and North Dakota Farmers' Union have gone on record favoring the 1-for-1 incentive. The Devils Lake Chamber of Commerce favors it, the Lakota Commercial Club has wired their support, and just a few days ago the 35th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota passed House Concurrent Resolution A which I would like to have entered in the record, and which says in part, "planting of durum wheat will be discouraged and curtailed if positive and favorable action is not taken on the Federal level of government to revise and change the laws and regulations governing acreage planted in durum wheat."

Moreover, the processors of macaroni and spaghetti products have tried mixing other strains of wheat with durum in their product. They indicate it has not been satisfactory and that consumption has thereby fallen. Further, some producers are convinced that processors will not return to 100-percent durum use until carryovers higher than the so-called normal are in evidence.

Mr. Speaker, there is a need for durum legislation for 1957. It is needed to insure an adequate supply of a vital specialty wheat. This program provides the needed incentive, and it does so in a manner which will help reduce plantings of other wheats which are in surplus. It will reduce the plantings of other wheats and will increase the planting of durum.

For these reasons I urge favorable consideration of the 1-for-1 acreage incentive durum bill.

House Concurrent Resolution A

Concurrent resolution requesting the United States Secretary of Agriculture to support legislation revising acreage controls on durum wheat during 1957

Whereas North Dakota normally produces approximately 85 percent of all durum wheat grown in the United States, and the legislature of this State is vitally interested in the production of this crop;

Whereas the demand for export of durum wheat has greatly increased, as has its domestic demand, especially in the macaroni industry;

Whereas planting of durum wheat will be discouraged and curtailed if positive and favorable action is not taken on the Federal level of Government to revise and change the laws and regulations governing acreage planted in durum wheat; and

Whereas the North Dakota congressional delegation will introduce legislation which should promote the interests of basic agriculture in the United States by enabling wheat growers to produce the durum wheat necessary to fill the increasing demand therefor: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein)*, That the United States Secretary of Agriculture is hereby urged and requested to support legislation introduced by the North Dakota congressional delegation for consideration by this first session of the 85th Congress, designed to revise the laws and regulations governing acreage control of durum wheat farmers: be it further

*Resolved*, That the secretary of state is directed to forward copies of this resolution to the United States Secretary of Agriculture, to the North Dakota congressional delegation, and to the chairmen of the respective Committees on Agriculture of the United States Senate and House of Representatives of the 85th Congress.

B. WOLF,
*Speaker of the House.*
GERALD L. STAIR,
*Chief Clerk of the House.*
CLYDE DUFFY,
*President of the Senate.*
VIC GILBREATH,
*Secretary of the Senate.*

## The Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 11, 1957*

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the formation of a new publication, the Free Enterprise, which is published by the Free Enterprise Foundation which is a nonprofit and nonpartisan organization. This Free Enterprise has, indeed, a most noteworthy motto which says:

The function of government is to prevent the use of force in the exchange of human services.

Since I am pleased to welcome and congratulate Free Enterprise upon its birth, I would like the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD to reflect something of the background of this publication, and the foundation which is responsible for it. The Free Enterprise is organized along the lines of the Ford Foundation as a trust. It will not be endowed with funds by a single wealthy family but its annual contributions will come from many Americans in average circumstances who can afford $10 to $100 a year and by some who can afford $200, $500, or $1,000. The contributors will be the patriots of America who will wish to see their money used most effectively in a combined fund to help educate American leaders in business and in the professions to save economic freedom in America.

The trustees of this foundation will be noted patriotic leaders, including Dr. Elmer V. McCarthy, physician and surgeon, of Chicago; Mr. Thurman L. McCormick, attorney, of Kansas City, Mo.; Mr. Thomas E. O'Connor, manufacturer, of Chicago. The national board of advisers will include Robert B. Dresser, attorney, of Providence, R. I.; Willis E. Stone, engineer, of Los Angeles; Samuel B. Pettengill, attorney, of Grafton, Vt.; and many other outstanding American patriot leaders who will be asked to serve.

The objective of this foundation will be the preservation of economic freedom through the preparation and distribution of program materials and the operation of a speakers' bureau for service clubs, church groups, and patriotic organizations, such as the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, DAR, SAR, Minute Women, and community associations for better government.

The mediums of communication will include free-enterprise newspaper, slide films and movies, chalk talks and speakers, pamphlets and booklets, and radio and television.

Formation of the Free Enterprise Foundation will have many advantages:

First. It will be free to work with all organizations, as it is not connected directly with any.

Second. Its contributions will be tax deductible as a purely educational effort.

Third. It will not require too much in funds from any one individual but through the participation of twenty to forty thousand contributors it can provide a fund of from $500,000 to $1 million per year to fight the expansion of Marxism in America. With this modest beginning it can grow through its own efforts to a fund of many million dollars invested in the education of American businessmen to lead in the effort to save America's economic freedom under our system of limited, constitutional government. These businessmen, civic leaders, and professional men will be encouraged to serve as a local council of responsible leaders to educate the people in their community through full-page newspaper ads and radio and TV broadcasts. Thus, the investment of $1 million per year may result in billions of dollars of advertising in the local communities to educate the American people as a whole.

The original founders of the Free Enterprise Foundation will include those who make their contributions now. Each contributor will receive a wall plaque or certificate which will hang in his office or home. Contributions may be made annually, quarterly, or monthly. They may be from $10 to $1,000.

The executive editor of Free Enterprise is Margaret J. Everingham, Berwyn, Ill.

I know both Mrs. Everingham, the executive editor, and her husband, Harry T. Everingham. They are devoted and loyal Americans.

---

## Speech by Senator Carlson Before National Association of Wheat Growers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, February 11, 1957*

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered at the annual convention of the National Association of Wheat Growers, at Lincoln, Nebr., on February 8.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR FRANK CARLSON, ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL WHEAT GROWERS ASSOCIATION, LINCOLN, NEBR., FEBRUARY 8, 1957

It is truly a very great pleasure to meet with friends—and here at this meeting of the National Association of Wheat Growers I know that I am among friends.

Representing, as I do, one of the greatest wheat-producing regions in the world in the Senate of the United States, there necessarily are large areas of agreement in many of my views and the views of this organization. I assure you that I have enjoyed in the past and shall in the future look forward with pleasure to the continued development and growth of this organization, and I trust that I may have your aid, assistance, and advice on matters affecting wheat.

The growing strength and vigor of the National Association of Wheat Growers is, I believe, essential to the well-being of wheat markets. Since the close of the Korean hostilities, the problems confronting wheatgrowers have become increasingly more difficult.

It is no secret that wheatgrowers have not been as highly organized as some of the other commodity groups, and as a result your voice in legislation has not been heard as clearly and as distinctly as it might have been. I, therefore, want to congratulate you on your progress. It is a good sign—a sign of strong and vigorous leadership.

I would like to talk to you today about some of the agricultural legislation which is currently pending before the Congress, particularly as it relates to wheat.

You may recall that about a year ago when the Secretary of Agriculture was testifying before the Committee on Agriculture, he stated that wheat was the No. 1 agricultural problem of the Nation.

Although the problems of wheat have by no means diminished, I doubt whether the Secretary would at this moment so characterize wheat today—instead, I am inclined to believe that the Secretary would readily admit that corn is his No. 1 problem at the moment.

Perhaps I should discuss briefly the bills relating to corn which are currently pending and receiving consideration by the Committee on Agriculture of the House and the Senate.

You will remember, I am sure, that it was from the corn area as well as from the top echelon in the Department of Agriculture that we met the strongest opposition to the domestic parity plan for wheat in the last session of the Congress.

In order to understand fully the present corn proposal, we need to turn back a year or two to gain a better perspective of the issues.

In the Agricultural Act of 1954 the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act authorizing the establishment of marketing quotas for corn—and providing penalties for noncompliance—with such quotas were eliminated. Thus, corn farmers alone of all the producers of basic crops in 1955 had only to stay within their acreage allotment to be eligible for price support.

Any corn farmer who exceeded his acreage allotment, although he would be ineligible for price support, would not be forced to suffer a marketing penalty.

The acreage allotment established in 1955 for the commercial corn producing area was 49,842,697 acres. This was the situation under which the corn provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1956 were enacted.

Actually, there has been no substantial reduction of corn acreage in the corn producing area for the past several years. Acreage has remained rather constant at about 55 million acres. The 1955 planted acreage totaled 55,614,000 acres, against the allotment of about 50 million acres.

When the Soil Bank Act of 1956 was under consideration special provisions were written into that act for corn. Under the terms of this act, a corn base acreage of 51 million acres was established for 1956. Although called a base acreage it was in substance an allotment of 51 million acres. This was about 8 million acres higher than it would have been had it been established in the normal way upon the basis of the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, since the supply level would have required an allotment of 43 million acres.

This new corn base or allotment of 51 million acres would have continued after 1956 if two-thirds of the producers voting in the referendum had approved the program, but the level of price support would have been discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture at any level ranging from zero to 90 percent of parity. In the event that this new program should not be approved by two-thirds of the corn producers voting, it was provided that regular acreage allotment established under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 37 million acres would be effective for 1957.

The corn growers, as you know, failed to approve the new program by the necessary two-thirds majority, with the result that to be eligible for price support this year corn growers must stay within their allotment, based on a 37 million acre national allotment.

In my own State of Kansas, we have 20 counties in the commercial corn area, and only 3 of those counties voted for the new program.

If they desire to participate in the Soil Bank Acreage Reserve Program, they must reduce their acreage below their allotment.

In view of the fact that corn growers planted about 55 million acres last year, it is obvious that there will be little if any corn acreage going into the soil bank. Instead of the acreage being reduced, the Department is estimating a corn acreage of about 58 million acres.

It is my opinion that unless there is a change in the Government programs for corn, surpluses of the grain may become even larger.

There is no doubt in my mind but what the farmers were highly dissatisfied with the

cut in price supports in 1957 and so expressed themselves in the December referendum.

It is interesting to note that the 1956 production was 3,451 million bushels of corn, compared to 3,242 million bushels in 1955.

At the same time, corn acreage totaled 75,950,000 this year and 79,530,000 last year. These figures indicate that despite the drought, a record yield of 45.4 bushels an acre was grown. This compares with a 40.6 bushel yield in 1955.

Corn production in 1956 was 363 million bushels above the 10-year average and the second largest crop on record.

A number of bills have been introduced in this Congress which would establish either for the years 1957, 1958, or 1959, the period that the soil bank will be in operation, or permanently, a minimum corn allotment of 51 million acres for the commercial corn-producing areas.

Farmers who comply with their allotment based on a 51-million-acre base—and divert as much as 15 percent of their cropland to either the acreage or to the conservation reserve—would be eligible for price-support and soil-bank payments. Hearings have just been completed on these bills in the House and hearings are expected soon in the Senate.

In the course of the hearings before the House, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in testifying on the measure stated that one of the principal reasons that corn is in trouble is because acreages diverted from cotton, wheat, tobacco, peanuts, etc., under the marketing quota program were planted to corn and other feed grains.

It is true that much of this acreage from wheat, cotton, etc., did go into corn and feed grains and thereby increase the total supply of feed grains. In fact, this is one of the fundamental points that wheatgrowers have been stating for the last several years. I argued this point on the Senate floor when the wheat domestic parity program was being debated and pointed out that the domestic parity program would help rather than harm corn producers.

As you know, it was being contended by spokesmen from the corn areas that the domestic parity program for wheat would add to the feed-surplus conditions. It was shown that although 20 million acres of land had been taken out of wheat and wheat production was being reduced by some 7 million tons, the production of oats, barley and grain sorghums were being increased by more than 11 million tons. As a result we had a net gain of 4 million to 5 million tons in feed grain supply not counting corn.

If the domestic parity program for wheat had been in operation and the acreages had remained in wheat instead of being diverted to feed grain—and all of the production therefrom had gone into the feed market—there would have been far less feed available than there was as a result of the diverted acres going into feed grains.

This fact I am sure is not fully understood by the Members of Congress nor by the rank and file of the corn producers or their representatives. It is a point upon which much light needs to be shed, and I know of no better way to publicize pertinent facts such as these than through an organization such as yours.

Since these bills are now pending before the Congress, your organization—if it has not already done so—will wish to take cognizance of them.

In the course of the hearings before the House Committee on Agriculture, a number of the members have contended that it would not be fair or just to establish a 51 million acre allotment for corn—which is only about 2 million acres less than was harvested last year—and which is 14 million acres more than the acreage which would be allotted under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act—and then give price support and establish eligibility for soil-bank payments upon such increased acreage. It is contended that this is unfair because producers of other basic crops have already been forced to cut back their acreage severely, and they receive no soil-bank payments for doing so.

Furthermore, in order for them to be eligible for soil-bank payments they must make still further cutbacks below this reduced acreage.

Another point has also been made, which, in my opinion, has considerable validity, and that is that under this proposal, there will not necessarily be any reduction in corn acreage, since the full 51 million acres can be planted to corn and 15 percent of some other crop land may be placed in the conservation reserve.

Since much of the additional supply of feed grains has been produced on land diverted from other basic crops, it has been suggested that greater soil-bank participation and thus a greater reduction in feed-grain supply would be obtained through a program designed to reduce the planting of feed grains on diverted acres by providing soil-bank payments in such amounts as will attract diverted acreage now in feed grains into the soil bank.

This proposition apparently is receiving considerable attention and if adopted, could have an important bearing on wheat producers. It may be something that your organization will want to look into rather carefully.

Senator ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, recently stated "American agriculture will experience no major changes in price-support legislation during 1957, due to an apparent insistence by the administration to give the soil bank a chance to prove itself when operated in conjunction with the flexible price support system."

Although the foregoing statement is merely a matter of opinion by the chairman of the committee, I am inclined to agree with him that there will be no major attempt at this session of the Congress to change the fundamentals of the price support law, and that it is generally believed that the soil bank should be given a chance to function.

From my personal studies of the soil-bank program and its actual operation on the farm, I believe there are some adjustments that must be made if it is to be effective in carrying out the intention of the original act.

This does not mean, however, that there will not be important agricultural bills to consider involving legislation which may vitally affect the welfare of wheat growers. The corn legislation to which I have already referred is an example of legislation in which the wheat growers might have a very genuine interest.

There are also pending before the Committees on Agriculture of the Senate and the House bills directly relating to wheat which if enacted would materially affect wheat growers as well as their current wheat program.

Perhaps the largest number of these bills, both in the Seante and in the House, are designed to exempt wheat producers from liability for marketing penalties for excess wheat if all the wheat produced on the farm is fed on the farm to livestock or poultry owned by such producer.

The Secretary of Agriculture by executive communication has requested the enactment of such legislation, but in the legislation recommended by the Secretary, it would extend the exemption to wheat used for the production of human food to be consumed on the farm and would make the legislation retroactive to the 1954 crop of wheat.

This proposed legislation is almost identical with S. 46, a bill which passed the Senate in the last Congress, but failed to pass the House. It would materially broaden the exemption now in the law which exempts from quotas any farm whose wheat acreage does not exceed 15 acres.

These bills should hold a great deal of interest for your organization.

The present wheat program has never permitted recognition of the fact that substantial quantities of wheat could and should be marketed or used as feed. The problem which is pointed up by these bills and a group of other bills which would authorize or direct the sale of 100 million bushels of wheat annually for feeding purposes is that the existing program is adequate and fails to give wheat growers an opportunity to reach this market outlet.

It is a problem which cannot be solved by reducing price support even to the lowest level permitted under the flexible scale.

Although these bills demonstrate the need for changes in the program, any revision or change in the wheat program to be sound must be fair to all wheat farmers. It must also be fair to all poultry and livestock producers, regardless of where they are located.

Any sound revision of the program must also do more. It must go to the root of the problem and effect basic solutions.

I can assure you that it is not an easy matter to tell a farmer or wheatgrower that he cannot produce wheat on his own land for feed and use for his own livestock without being subjected to Federal penalties.

Do these bills do that? Or do they merely give partial recognition to the shortcomings of the present program and provide inadequate remedies? We should ask ourselves some fundamental questions.

Will measures such as these increase or decrease total wheat production? Will they tend to balance or create further imbalance in supply and demand?

Can they be put into operation without threatening the administration of the basic program?

Is it fair to deprive livestock and poultry producers of the opportunity to buy wheat at feed-grain prices, or to deprive some livestock and poultry producers of the right to use their own wheat for feed purposes, because they market some wheat for purposes of human food?

These are questions which wheatgrowers will be required to decide. They must decide whether the partial satisfaction of the demand for wheat for feed will provide a sound wheat program and whether it will assist or hinder the ultimate adoption of the domestic-parity plan for wheat under which wheatgrowers could maximize their returns from the food markets and at the same time expand their outlets in the feed and export markets.

These are the types of immediate problems facing you as wheatgrowers. In my opinion, they constitute a real challenge to you and your organization.

It is interesting to note the support which the "wheat for feed" proposals seem to have from the eastern-seaboard livestock- and poultry-producing areas and then to compare the votes of the Senators from those areas, most of whom voted against the adoption of the domestic-party program for wheat, which would have permitted far greater utilization of wheat for feed at feed grain prices than would the pending bill.

Before the domestic-party program is voted on again, it would be well for your organization to see that the Senators from these areas fully understand the program and how it would benefit their areas.

Another matter which will be before this Congress is the matter of the parity formula. In the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Congress froze the parity prices of the basic commodities at the 1956 level of 95 percent of old parity. It also directed the Secretary of Agriculture to make a thorough study of possible methods of improving the parity formula and to report his recommendations not later than January 31, 1957.

The Secretary's report has just been filed. It is a lengthy document of about 55 pages. Although I have not had the opportunity to study it in detail, the Secretary in essence recommends that the present formula be retained and that only one major change be made, namely, a shift from the 1910–14 base to a 1947–56 base. The change from the 1910–14 to the 1947–56 base would result in reductions averaging about 2 percent in parity prices. Wheat parity would be reduced from $2.48 to $2.26 per bushel.

The Secretary in his report indicated that he favored retention of the commodity purchasing power concept, and rejected cost of production and income parity formulas.

Unless the Congress takes some action this year, the transitional parity formula which permits a drop of 5 percentage points each year until new parity becomes operative, will become effective at the beginning of next year.

The whole subject of parity is a highly complex statistical formula. I would urge your wheat organization to give this matter your early and careful consideration.

Let us turn now and have a look at the current wheat situation. Perhaps the greatest single factor of improvement in the wheat situation generally has been the larger wheat exports. Wheat exports have increased markedly and it is now indicated that exports of wheat and wheat products for the 1956–57 marketing year will total about 415 million bushels.

This, together with domestic disappearance, will give a total disappearance of slightly more than a billion bushels. This increased export demand is due to a number of factors, such as the reduction in this year's European wheat crop and its poor milling quality; the short French crop and the disappearance of France as a wheat exporter, the need to build up reserve stocks in many importing countries, increased demands for food grains in the less developed regions of the world, continued large United States expenditures abroad, the various special export programs authorized by the Congress, and, of course, the heavy United States export subsidy.

The export of wheat has also been aided and returns to growers enhanced by a change in the wheat export program under which (1) export subsidies are paid in kind, (2) export sales are permitted to be handled by the private trade from the free grain supply, (3) Government participation is limited principally to barter transactions and noncommercial surplus disposal programs.

We should not let the improved export picture blind us, however, to certain basic facts and fundamental problems which are likely to continue to plague us for some time.

Although we may export the indicated 415 million bushels of wheat this marketing year, the outlook for next year is that we will do well to reach 350 million bushels.

There are a number of unfavorable factors with which we must continue to reckon. Importing countries throughout the world are continuing their efforts to attain a higher degree of self-sufficiency either by expanding acreages or by obtaining higher yields per acre.

Many of these importing countries maintain support prices for homegrown wheat at higher than world market levels and also maintain rigid import controls.

Other exporting countries are making strenuous efforts to develop and expand outlets in world markets and are resorting to various devices to achieve their objectives.

Many countries engage extensively in bilateral and barter arrangements for importing grain from nondollar sources, thus sealing off markets for wheat which might otherwise be supplied in whole or in part by the United States.

Wheat production outside the United States has increased constantly over the last several years under various systems of guaranteed prices to producers, supplemented in some instances by subsidized exports.

This upward trend is likely to continue. In contrast wheat acreage in the United States has been going down, and under the soil bank, it may be reduced even further. There is no doubt but that we will need the strongest and best program that can be devised, coupled with adequate promotion programs, if we are to maintain a reasonable share of the world's wheat market.

As most of you know, I introduced on January 23 of this year a bill embodying the provisions of the domestic parity program for wheat. The provisions of this bill are the same as those included in H. R. 12, the bill which passed both Houses of Congress last year and was vetoed by the President. The number of my bill is S. 774. The bill was cosponsored by Senators NEUBERGER, MORSE, CASE of South Dakota, CHAVEZ, BARRETT, MAGNUSON, JACKSON, YOUNG, CURTIS, HUMPHREY, and LANGER.

As I have stated earlier, it was not anticipated at the outset of this session of the Congress that there would be much major change in agricultural legislation. I have, however, attempted to review briefly some of the measures which are likely to receive consideration this session and which would directly affect wheatgrowers and perhaps the future of the domestic parity program.

I know I need not extol to this group the advantages of the domestic parity concept as a permanent program for wheat over the existing programs, or other programs which have been presented.

I do believe that as wheatgrowers, and as leaders of organizations representing wheatgrowers—and as persons interested in the welfare of the wheat farmer—we all need to face up squarely to the problems confronting wheat.

If we are to succeed, we must stand firmly by our principles and philosophy. We must not waver in our determination to obtain enactment of the soundest and best programs that we can develop for the long-run benefit of wheatgrowers.

If we yield to expediency or accept the patch-upon-patch type of approach to the wheat problem, we may lose—perhaps not forever, but at least for a long, long time—the gains we have made and the many opportunities that are ours.

---

## Financial Stability as a National Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, February 11, 1957*

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered before the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, in Washington, D. C., February 5, 1957.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINANCIAL STABILITY AS A NATIONAL RESOURCE

(By Senator HARRY F. BYRD)

It is a great pleasure for me to be here today and to speak on the subject, "Financial Stability as a National Resource."

I am very pleased to meet with those associated with the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report—an organization which has done so much to promote economy and efficiency in the Federal Government.

I can assure you the need for both economy and efficiency at this moment is greater than it has ever been.

I have been a strong supporter of the program of the Hoover Commission to reorganize the Federal Government, to eliminate waste and extravagance and confine the functions of the Federal expenditures to those things that are proper under our form of government.

What we need now is to translate the Hoover recommendations into actual reductions in expenditures. What we need now is for the President to incorporate into the budget the retrenchments in spending as recommended by the Hoover Commission.

I would like so much to see a special message sent by the President to the Congress asking that the remaining recommendations of the Hoover Commission be enacted into law, and then to have the President issue a directive to the Budget Bureau to require that the economies in the various Hoover reports be embodied in the Federal budget.

I am beginning my 25th year in the Senate. I have survived the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and the present deal.

The present deal seems to be settling down midway between the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

I took my oath of office with President Roosevelt March 4, 1933.

Mr. Roosevelt was elected on an economy platform. He accused Mr. Hoover of being a spendthrift and throwing discretion to the winds. This spendthrift Hoover was then spending less than $4 billion a year and was the only President in our history to leave office with less Federal employees than when he came in.

The first bill I voted on as a Senator was titled "A bill to preserve the credit of the United States Government."

Mr. Roosevelt had promised a reduction of 25 percent. His bill provided for a reduction of 15 percent—a fair performance as political pledges go.

Within 6 months Mr. Roosevelt changed his course and then began an orgy of Federal spending which has continued to this day under both Democratic and Republican administrations.

My thoughts turn to the vast changes that have come to us in this period. There is much in the last quarter of a century to be found on the credit side. We have made an unparalleled progress. Our living standards are the highest, and our military power the greatest. Our business techniques and mass-production methods are unrivaled in superiority. I pray God we may preserve this progress and strength as a sound base for a vast new and constructive development which our children must carry on if freedom and civilization are to survive.

But let us not deceive ourselves. High prosperity has never been permanent as all history shows. It has its ups and downs, and for these we must be prepared.

With this in mind, it is well at this time to stop and take stock and to remember that the time of the greatest success too frequently is the time of the greatest danger. It is, too, so easy in such times to assume responsibilities beyond our capacity to carry them.

On the debit side I would place first the loss of one-half of the purchasing power of the American dollar since 1940—16 years. Compared to the 1935–39 period, the dollar lost 48 cents of its value up to 1952. In 1953, 1954, and 1955 the value of the dollar was stabilized, but in 1956 inflation began again, and an additional 2 cents of dollar value was lost. This 2 cents is actually 4 percent of our present dollar value.

This new inflation has disastrous possibilities. We cannot continue to cheapen the American dollar. This present-day inflation will be most difficult to control, especially because our regular Federal budget expenditures for the coming year is the largest

peacetime budget ever presented to the Congress.

In my 25 years the Federal debt has risen from $22 billion to more than $275 billion. It is taking more than 10 percent of our total tax income to pay the interest.

In the first 150 years—up to 1932—we were practically on the pay-as-you-go basis. We had our wars and buckled down and paid off the cost. These years may be ridiculed by some as the horse-and-buggy days but they were the days of frugality, thrift, and work.

It was that period that makes possible our prosperity of today.

Andrew Jackson paid off, in toto, the public debt and was the only President to do so.

Now we of this generation are spending the fat accumulated in those days of savings and work.

In addition to the direct Federal debt, the Federal contingent liabilities have increased from practically nothing 25 years ago to $275 billion.

We have increased the Federal civilian payroll from 575,000 to 2½ million employees, and increased their pay from less than $1 billion 25 years ago to more than $10 billion yearly. This huge Federal employment is an index of big Federal Government and the concentration of power in Washington. We have 273,000 civilians employed in foreign lands—26,000 in France—98,000 in Germany, 129,000 in Japan.

I have just received a special report from the staff of the Senate Finance Committee as to the tax collections for the year 1956. In that year the gross total take—Federal, State, and local—was $99.8 billion out of a national income of $334 billion. Let me explain—this means that 29 cents out of every dollar earned goes for taxes, one kind or another. This is an increase of $10 billion in the collection of all taxes over the year 1955.

When we speak of taxation we think mainly in terms of Federal taxation because it is consolidated under one Government. The fact is, however, that there are more than 116,000 governmental units in the United States—3,000 counties, 16,000 principalities, 17,000 townships, and 79,000 school and special districts, many of which have the power to levy taxes. These State and local taxes have been increased by leaps and bounds.

How long can we continue to tax and tax and spend and spend and at the same time continue our progress and preserve our solvency?

As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I am convinced that the time is overdue for substantial tax reduction.

We have still on the books what are known as the Korean war taxes that are being continued from year to year. But I could not support any tax reduction unless the expenses of Government are reduced to a level which would make tax reduction possible on a sound basis.

I know of no more certain road to financial suicide than to reduce taxes and thereby create deficits and debt.

It is up to the people themselves. If the pending budget is substantially reduced, a tax reduction should follow.

Do the people want a tax reduction? Yes. Then let them communicate with their elected representatives urging them to support reduction of expenditures sufficient to allow reduction of taxes and the public debt.

This is democracy at work.

The pending budget admits of no tax reduction if enacted as it now stands.

I agree with the very able Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, for whom I have the highest regard. His abilities are preeminent. He said that expenses should and must be reduced and that a continuance of high spending will bring about a depression that will "make your hair curl." This, of course, assumes that the Federal Government has left you enough hair to curl. Both George and I are a little deficient in this respect.

I agree with the Hoover report that many billions can be saved. Mr. Hoover estimated 5½ billions.

If citizens want to reduce taxes, reduce Federal spending to support a tax reduction, they must demand it constantly. Their demands must be specific and forceful. Citizens can appear before Congress more often than they do in order to take an active position against specific spending. Again and again streams of persons appear before congressional committees requesting money. Few indeed are those who appear in opposition to spending money. Citizens must think of Federal spending in terms of the national interest and stop pushing spending programs of local interest and those of the spending lobbies. All of us must sacrifice something in the difficult days ahead. We must stop asking the Federal Government for things we should do for ourselves.

The regular budget just presented to the Senate provides for $3 billion more of spending than the previous year. It is somewhat paradoxical that the President stated his opposition to inflation, yet the only way this $3 billion of additional revenues will come to the Treasury is by inflation. It is unsound, in my judgment, to predicate a budget upon an anticipated increase in revenue from an existing tax base.

When the effort is made to reduce Federal spending, we are always told that such reduction cannot be made without disastrous results.

Just to mention two of the new proposals in this budget:

Why, may I ask, for example, should the Federal Government embark upon a $2 billion local school construction program and the health insurance program proposed in the budget now pending? This will open up a Pandora's box of Federal spending.

These two alone will cost billions.

They start as a mouse and quickly grow into the size of an elephant. In the 1958 budget there are 18 new State-aid programs, making 78 in all.

It is alarming to me to see that while the Hoover Commission has made great contributions to the efficiency of the Government, yet at the same time we witness a tremendous rise in Federal spending.

To my mind, one of the greatest achievements in the interest of economy occurred in 1953. The outgoing President, Mr. Truman, submitted an expenditure budget of $78.6 billion. This was reduced by the Congress, acting under the direction of President Eisenhower, to $67.8 billion, a saving of nearly $9 billion in 1 year.

President Eisenhower made a further reduction in fiscal 1955 to $64.6 billion, but the alarming and discouraging thing is that the President's budget for fiscal 1958 is the largest peacetime budget in our history and proposes an expenditure of $71.9 billion. Compared to the previous year, it would be $73.7 billion, as in this budget the road funds of $1.8 billion are put in a trust fund and do not function through the regular budget.

An examination of a comparison of expenditures in fiscal 1954 and fiscal 1958 are even more discouraging. In fiscal 1958 we will spend $2 billion less than in fiscal 1954 on the military, but we will spend approximately $7 billion more in domestic, civilian expenditures. The veterans' expenditures have gone up $700 million, labor and welfare $1 billion, agriculture $2.5 billion, about double, and so on down the line.

In 1932 the Federal Government expended $250 million for so-called grants to the States. It is now spending over $3½ billion in more than 54 grant programs. Of course, reduction in expenditures is difficult, if not impossible, if we assume that such Federal appropriations as these and others of like character are a part of the true obligations of the Federal Government.

Take foreign economic aid, the Marshall plan had a 4-year limitation, and under it $15 billion was expended. I voted for it in the years just after World War II, because at that time there was need for this economic aid. But then, after the expiration of the Marshall plan, we have spent over $40 billion more in additional foreign aid. This year the Congress is requested to increase the foreign economic aid appropriation and to open up a vast new area for such spending.

The Congress made a reduction of $1 billion in foreign aid last year, but this billion was taken from unexpended balances, so no retrenchment occurred.

It is time for the American people to realize that, while we have great potentialities of wealth, there is a limit beyond which we cannot go. We must realize that creeping paternalism of the Federal Government is just as bad as creeping socialism. The end result is the same—the destruction of the principles of our free Government.

There is one principle we must always preserve if our democracy is to survive and that is: "It is the duty of the people to support the Government and not the Government the people."

Today 37,817,000 citizens are receiving payments from the Federal Government. We are approaching the danger zone. If we consider the dependents involved, it is possible that more than half of our population is affected by regular Federal payments.

The very base of all we have in free government is our fiscal solvency. Without it we cannot preserve our representative democracy. Without it we cannot have military preparedness except under totalitarian methods such as those in Russia. Without the solvency of the American Government, we would enter an age of international darkness. Ours is the only currency in which everybody, everywhere in the world has confidence.

Our free-enterprise system is the greatest deterrent in the world today to Russian aggression. It is our first line of defense. Our military forces are merely the tools through which the strength of this system is applied in war. Our competitive-enterprise system can only exist under solvent government.

This fine audience needs no definition of the free-enterprise system from me. It is the system that, within a relative short span of one-hundred-and-sixty-some years, has brought us from the impotency of 13 ununited colonies to our present position of world leadership.

This American system has developed individual freedoms under constitutional democracy to the fullest measure ever known to man. It is the system that supplies the incentive to every American to start at the bottom and rise to the top. It has enabled us, with only 6 percent of the world population, to outproduce the rest of the world combined.

You, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, have done a great work. I salute you. But you must not demobilize now, as your work is not over. You must make it your job to compel the budget and the Congress to institute economies made possible by the Hoover recommendations. You have not won the war until this is done. The $5.5 billions of savings by the Hoover Commission recommendations would do much to preserve our financial stability.

It is no exaggeration to say that there is literally nothing on earth more important than the preservation of the fiscal integrity of the Federal Government of the United States of America and the freedoms upon which our Republic is founded.

Let us pledge to ourselves that these freedoms shall be preserved so that the future generations of Americans can live as we have in the security of our constitutional democracy.

## Tennessee Valley Flood of January–February 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF


## HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA


IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 11, 1957*

I. SYNOPSIS

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee Valley has experienced a valleywide, flood-producing storm of near record proportions over a period of some 2 weeks beginning late in January. Regulation by the TVA water control system has lowered flood flows on the major tributary streams below storage reservoirs, and on the Tennessee River to the extent that damage has been light.

At Chattanooga, Tenn., the river stage was held to about 32 feet, only 2 feet above flood stage. Early preliminary estimates made independently by the United States Weather Bureau and by TVA show that the natural flood would have reached a crest stage of at least 52 feet without control by the TVA system. For a 52-foot stage, the damages averted within the city were estimated to be more than $50 million on the basis of 1953 property values and improvements. Present indications are that this estimate is conservative, and that the natural stage would have been near 54 feet, in which case the recent flood ranks as the second largest in history at Chattanooga, exceeded only by the flood of 1867 at a crest stage of 57.9 feet. Damages averted for a flood that would have reached 54 feet would be in excess of $65 million.

In the valley of the Clinch River, the city of Clinton was spared damages in the order of $250,000. This does not include damages averted at the AEC facilities which were successfully protected against damage and the interruption of vital operations.

While there has been a slackening off of rainfall over the valley region with dropping streamflow, the storm-producing weather conditions still exist. Thus, a final account cannot be made at this time.

The capacity of the TVA system to regulate floods has by no means been exhausted. However, the valleywide flood season extends into April, and it is now necessary to restore and preserve the flood regulating capacity of the system. At present the flood-control operation continues in the form of relieving the system of stored water by means of controlled releases from both main-river and tributary projects. Good progress in this phase of the operation has been made to date.

II. TVA SYSTEM—CHATTANOOGA LEVEE

The TVA water control system deals with a drainage area of some 41,000 square miles. It includes reservoirs located on headwater streams in Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Georgia, and main-river developments located along the Tennessee River from Knoxville downstream to Paducah, Ky., where the Tennessee River enters the Ohio River.

In flood-control operations, there are two principal focal points. Within the valley the main focal point is the city of Chattanooga. The other principal focus of operating concern is the lower Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. Approximately half the 41,000 square-mile drainage area lies upstream from Chattanooga. In this area the water-control system comprises 10 multiple-purpose storage projects on major tributary rivers and 3 multiple-purpose projects along the Tennessee River between Knoxville and Chattanooga. In each of the 10 tributary projects substantial storage capacity is reserved for flood-control operations, and facilities are included for power generation. Each of the three main-river projects above Chattanooga also provides storage capacity for flood control, power installations, and navigation locks. Downstream from Chattanooga, the river is developed by six additional multiple-purpose projects equipped with navigation locks and power facilities. Five of these six reservoirs provide further flood storage capacity. The key project for the regulation of Ohio and Mississippi River floods is the Kentucky Dam and Reservoir where 4 million acre-feet of flood storage is available.

This farflung system provides substantial flood protection along the tributaries below the storage dams and at communities along the main river. It also has the capacity to effectively reduce flood crests on the lower Ohio and Mississippi. While flood protection afforded to the city of Chattanooga is substantial for most great floods that may be expected, full protection will require the construction of a levee system. Plans for such a levee system were prepared some 20 years ago, presuming that such facilities would be constructed if the city of Chattanooga would furnish the necessary right-of-way and satisfy other requirements. These levees have not yet been built, and the city of Chattanooga remains vulnerable to damage in the event of great floods.

III. THE JANUARY–FEBRUARY FLOOD OF 1957

Storm conditions: The recent valleywide flood in the Tennessee watershed resulted from an extended period of almost continuous rainfall from January 24 until February 5. The rainfall above Chattanooga averaged nearly 9 inches. At many points in tributary streams the total rainfall for the period approaches 10 inches. High points along the eastern valley rim received greater amounts, as at Clingmans Dome in the Smoky Mountains, where over 14 inches was recorded. In the early stages of the flood-producing storm the rainfall was heaviest over the northern portion of the valley, particularly in the northwest and northeast portions. This heavy rainfall also produced flash floods on the headwaters of the Cumberland River and Kentucky River in the State of Kentucky and also on streams tributary to the Ohio having their headwaters in Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia. In this area notable floods occurred at Barbourville, Pineville, and Hazard, Ky., and at Pound, W. Va. Similar flash floods on small tributary streams were also experienced in the headwaters of the Tennessee River. Big Stone Gap and other communities along the upper Powell and Clinch Rivers upstream from the control afforded by the major tributary reservoirs were affected. In the later stages of the storm the rainfall spread over the southern portion of the Tennessee Valley, and the heavy precipitation became valleywide.

Preflood conditions: The reservoirs of the Tennessee Valley system were low and, therefore, in good condition in late January to enter a flood-control operation. Main-river reservoirs extending from Knoxville to the mouth of the river at Kentucky Dam were being held at the scheduled low seasonal levels, thus providing the planned amount of flood-control storage capacity. Tributary storage reservoirs were at levels lower than those required for flood operations as the result of an extended dry fall and early winter and heavy demands for hydro use in supplying power loads in the service area. It is notable in this particular storm that streamflow in the Tennessee Valley changed in less than a week from a subnormal state to major flood proportions.

Flood-control operation: Operations for flood control in the Tennessee Valley system involve more than simply the impoundment of water in reservoirs. The operation is actually a dynamic one involving three principal steps or stages that blend together. The first stage is one of accelerating flood threatening flows through the main-river reservoirs to preserve flood control storage capacity. The second stage involves the impoundment of water thus reducing the crest of the flood. The third stage in the operation requires the relief of the system from the accumulated floodwaters as rapidly as possible to regain and preserve the storage space essential for the regulation of new floods that may follow. The valleywide flood season in the Tennessee Valley extends from December into mid-April. Therefore, reservations in the reservoirs for flood control must be preserved into the spring months.

Actual operations in the recent flood involved these basic steps. As streamflow built up along the main stem of the Tennessee River, discharges were increased at each of the three main river projects above Chattanooga and also at the downstream projects, passing the early higher flows through the system. Tributary storage projects impounded practically all of the inflow with a minimum release to supply the basic power requirements. For example, in the case of Norris Reservoir, the inflow reached a rate of 86,000 cubic feet per second early in the flood while at the same time the discharge was held to a level of about 7,000 cubic feet per second. At Douglas Reservoir, the inflow reached a rate of 110,000 cubic feet per second with a discharge at that time of 15,000 cubic feet per second. At other main tributary reservoirs the same pattern was followed. As the storm inflow into the system increased, discharges at main-river dams were further increased to the highest safe levels downstream and were held at

these levels of discharge, passing the greatest amount of water through the system that could be handled at the various critical points. In the operation, thus far, there were two points of principal concern on the Tennessee River. The first, which is always a target point for TVA, was the city of Chattanooga. The second point was at Florence, Ala., where TVA has under construction an additional navigation lock for the Wilson project. Here the construction work is proceeding behind a massive cofferdam. Taking into account the effect at other downstream locations, discharges from Wilson spillway were so regulated that they did not overtop the cofferdam. Taking into account the effect at other downstream locations, the hazard of flooding the cofferdam existed, however, and construction equipment was removed from the cofferdam area as a prudent operation, in anticipation of the possible need of deliberately flooding it. It has been possible, thus far, to prevent the flooding of the work with a considerable saving in cost of construction.

Results to date: At Chattanooga, Tenn., the river stage has been held to about 32 feet, only some 2 feet above flood stage. Preliminary estimates of the flood stage that would have been experienced under natural conditions have been prepared by the United States Weather Bureau and by TVA. These estimates made before the crest would have occurred agree and showed that the natural flood without regulation by the existing water-control system would have reached a crest stage of at least 52 feet. Subsequent estimates using more complete data show that these preliminary estimates were conservative, and that a crest stage near 54 feet would have been reached.

Estimates by TVA of the damage averted within the city of Chattanooga show that a reduction from a 52-foot stage to 32 feet would amount to more than $50 million on the basis of 1953 conditions. If a complete appraisal of the flood crest that would have been reached under natural conditions shows that a 54-foot stage would have been reached as compared with the 32-foot stage that was experienced, the estimated damage averted would increase to in the order of $65 million or $66 million, on the basis described above.

The above appraisals include damages averted to physical property and also the indirect damages averted including loss of payroll, disruption of communications, and transportation facilities. The great variety of intangible losses that would be experienced at Chattanooga as a result of such great floods is not included. Damage estimates are based on a survey conducted by TVA in connection with the proposal for construction of a levee at Chattanooga. These estimates were made by a detailed inspection and evaluation of the damage that would be experienced at the various flood levels in the range to be expected at this location. Thus, the estimates are not generalizations but have a sound basis of careful inspection and appraisal of the losses that would be involved at each building and business establishment. They have not, however, been extended to the 1957 status of development in the city nor to the 1957 dollar values. Furthermore, they do not include the damages that would be experienced in areas adjacent to the city limits in the general vicinity of Chattanooga.

Extensive damages were also averted at communities and locations on the tributary streams below the tributary storage projects and also at locations on the lower river. On the Clinch River below Norris Dam, it is estimated that the natural flood crest would have exceeded flood stage by approximately 10 feet. Had the river reached this stage, damages of about $250,000 would have resulted in the Clinton vicinity and in the areas immediately downstream. The production facilities of the Atomic Energy Commission are also located in the lower portion of the Clinch River Valley. Here the reduction in stage prevented the overtopping of the main water supply pumping station which supplies Oak Ridge and the AEC production facilities. Protection was also afforded installations farther downstream where power supply and pumping facilities would also have been affected in the form of interruptions or direct damage. Appraisals of damage averted at other locations within the valley are incomplete at this time.

Total accumulated direct damage averted at Chattanooga since the completion of the Tennessee Valley water control system amounted to approximately $53 million prior to this flood. Adding the preliminary estimate of damages averted at Chattanooga in the recent flood, and including damages averted from prior floods on the lower Ohio and Mississippi, the total damage averted to date in some 20 years of operation, but including only 12 years of operation with all major projects completed, amounts to more than $125 million.

Of the total investment in the Tennessee Valley water control system, approximately $180 million has been allocated to flood control. Thus, the accumulated damages averted to date at Chattanooga alone represent substantially more than one-half of the investment that has been so allocated.

Effect on power generation: On the other side of the ledger, large quantities of water being discharged from the tributary projects at the present time to relieve the system of the floodwaters accumulated and to prepare for future floods. Most of this water being discharged is passing through sluiceways at the tributary projects and over spillways at the main-river projects downstream, and thus is lost for power generation. This loss is a part of flood control operation. However, there is a brighter side of the picture with respect to lost power generation in that some of the water might otherwise have been spilled in a strictly power system, and also in that flood-control operations, by lowering main-river stages, preserved the operating capacity at main-river plants to a degree that would not be possible in a power-only system.

IV. OUTLOOK

The valleywide flood season extends from December into April. Some of the greatest floods of history in the region have occurred in March. Thus, it is necessary, following a large flood early in the flood season, to regain and preserve the regulating capacity of the system. Weather conditions that can produce heavy rainfall have not entirely dissipated. However, good progress is now being made in disposing of surplus flood waters and returning the reservoirs to scheduled seasonal levels.

---

## Congressman James Roosevelt's Speech in St. Louis on Current Labor Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 11, 1957*

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, members of the labor movement in St. Louis were deeply impressed by an address made by our colleague, the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, on January 27, 1957, at the 14th annual City-Wide Shop Conference.

The speech is as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES ROOSEVELT

Last week we had an inauguration in Washington. There were between 75,000 and 100,000 visitors. Those who came by rail, as they emerged from Union Station, saw on the plaza horizon the large, modern building which is the home of the national headquarters of the Teamsters Union.

Those visitors who were quartered in the Mayflower Hotel could look two blocks north and see another modern, large building, even newer. It is the Washington headquarters for the Machinists.

Those devout folk who might have attended Sunday services at the church of Presidents, St. John's Episcopal, across the park from the White House, would have been next door to the grand new building which is the headquarters of the joint AFL–CIO, where George Meany has his office.

On Tuesday, after attending the inaugural ball, perhaps some of our visitors cashed a check in Washington's oldest and second largest bank; a bank controlled by the independent United Mine Workers of America.

A visitor who saw any or all of these buildings, or any of the other national buildings of other unions, or who cashed his check in one of the 11 branches of John L. Lewis' bank, probably left Washington impressed by the size and financial stability of organized labor. He probably left Washington realizing that organized labor has the power that goes with strong membership and a healthy financial condition.

He would be right. Only a fool would deny the fact that labor unions handle relatively large sums of money, and represent millions of workingmen and women, and that the funds and the people, joined together in a common cause, represent real power.

Now our ordinary visitor, when he left Washington, probably felt proud that he lived in a country where men and women who work for wages could achieve such outward vestiges of strength.

However, if he stuck around for a day or so, after the city returned to its normal pursuit of politics, he might get a different

impression, for he would be apt to hear the old refrain of the union haters. He might read them loud and clear from Capitol Hill; then again, if he is close enough, he might hear the whisperings and gentle hints in the executive branch. Whether loud and clear, or in an undertone, he will be told that unions have grown too powerful, they are run by evil men, and they threaten free enterprise.

Perhaps he heard a demagog, borrowing from the poison pen brigade, assailing union officials as white slavers, or racketeers or Communists, or all three.

Then there is the mournful cry of the campaign committee chairman, complaining that few of his candidates were supported by organized labor.

And there is the hardy perennial—unions should be made subject to the antitrust laws, just because John L. Lewis has a decent office, in a nice building. Well, it's not quite that simple, but almost so.

Old timers in the American labor movement remember how the antitrust laws applied to unions and were used to hinder, hamper and harry labor organization and collective bargaining efforts. It requires but little imagination to foresee what would happen if we have an attorney general administering antitrust laws who is a politician first and a dedicated lawyer second. We have seen how political administration of the National Labor Relations Board has had an adverse effect on the welfare of those who work.

Unfortunately, the enemies of labor can point to an isolated case, here and there, and by use of the guilt by association technique, plus gross magnification, condemn the entire labor movement and those responsible for guiding its course.

We all know that labor unions are organizations of people, and the leaders are people. As such, each member and each official is subject to the usual human weaknesses. So it must be admitted that, here and there, you shall run across an official, highly placed or otherwise, who succumbs to human temptations and uses the trust placed in him, or the funds he handles, for personal gain.

Thinking and responsible people realize that statutory laws, plus organization regulation, are equipped to apprehend and handle the occasional violator of trust. The methods of congressional committees may often be properly questioned but, it is proper and legal for committees of the Congress to investigate the operations of labor organizations to determine the need for remedial and protective legislation. In my opinion, it behooves labor unions to cooperate to the fullest extent in these investigations, and I am happy to note that responsible leaders have stated that that is just what they intend to do.

That doesn't hinder labor's foes who, in this case, would destroy the entire orchard because of 1 worm in 1 apple, but who would not condemn the building and loan industry because 1 bookkeeper—a grandmother—recently stole more than a million dollars from a Norfolk, Va., association.

The people who lead the chorus of blanket criticism of labor are strangely silent about these instances. I haven't heard this chorus devoting itself to Robert Tripp Ross, the Assistant Secretary of Defense whose wife heads a firm that has been awarded a very large contract to make pants for the Defense Department. I understand Mr. Ross said that he and Mrs. Ross do not discuss their separate activities with each other.

For goodness sake, what in the world do the Rosses talk about at breakfast?

Labor's foes might take a leaf from labor's own book but, of course, they won't. During the past few years a local labor group out in Salem, Oreg., has been having difficulties achieving recognition in the garage operated by the McKay family—Douglas McKay, the former Secretary of Interior who tried, but failed, to unseat a great statesman, Senator WAYNE MORSE. Mr. McKay has been quoted as refusing to do business with "those goons."

Now, if labor unions used the tactics of their enemies, the entire automobile dealer business would have been condemned and vilified. But this didn't happen.

Instead, your responsible legislative agents in Washington endorsed and lent their support to a bill—which was passed—that freed the local new car dealer from domination by Detroit.

That is an illustration of how responsible unionism operates, how it uses its power, which is vast only when compared with the power of unions 20 to 30 years ago, unselfishly to promote the general good.

This particular measure was designed to help conserve one group of small, independent business; it was a bill which is part of the effort to promote and maintain competition.

The real issue is not whether unionism has power, and how much, but how it uses that power.

Labor unions have a record of service to all the people, not just to their own members. It is a far cry from the old days, but it represents the maturity of the labor movement, for it recognizes that the well-being of people who work depends upon something more than wages, hours, and shop conditions, basic as they always must be.

In the struggle to gain recognition, in the struggle for better wages, for fringe benefits, working people have learned the value of joint action, and today they use that same pattern to achieve ends which benefit the whole society.

We see it on the national level in Washington. I am a member of two committees—Education and Labor, and the Select Committee on Small Business.

Your national legislative representatives, at the AFL–CIO level, consult with me on matters involving small business and education as frequently, if not more frequently, than they do about strictly labor legislation.

I'll admit that in the present climate very little legislation beneficial to labor has a chance to take root, and in a different climate we might have more consultations in the labor field. I will continue to hope and work for that day.

You here in St. Louis and your brothers throughout the land are interested in better schools, and you do not want private enterprise to disappear—and this will happen unless we halt the trend toward monopoly—so your national leaders widen their interests and activities.

So, we cannot judge today's unions with yesterday's. The size of unions today, and the power exerted, is far from vast when we observe the areas in which it is channeled. It only becomes vast when we compare it with 1900 or 1930.

Today's labor union uses its power in a variety of ways. One of the best examples is your own community action department. You don't need me to remind you of your accomplishment. You know, too, that none of these accomplishments could have been achieved had you acted as individuals.

None of these concrete examples of the wise and beneficial power labor unions have, however, answers the constant demand to apply antitrust laws to unions. The 1955 report of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study Antitrust Laws, the merger of AFL–CIO, together with the new buildings, have all combined to give renewed vigor to the foes of labor.

Antitrust laws once were used to hamper labor unions. The hated injunction was based upon the Sherman Act. In 1914 Congress, in the Clayton Act, spelled out the theory that the labor of a human being is not a commodity or an article of commerce, and therefore it was thought labor unions were withdrawn from jurisdiction. While this was a victory for the labor movement, it proved to be empty because clever lawyers found loopholes, and it came to mean only that people could join a union, but that activities of the union could be prosecuted.

One of the most famous cases—and illustrative of what may be done under the antitrust laws when applied to labor—is the so-called Danbury Hatters case. The court decided that boycott of non-union-made hats violated the Antitrust Act. A heavy fine was levied. The entire treasury of the union was confiscated, but this was not enough. Homes and life savings of individual members were seized to the extent necessary to pay the fine.

It was not until the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act and the Wagner Act that the climate was created for organized labor to grow and thrive.

Then came Taft-Hartley to repeal the Norris-LaGuardia Act and restore the hated injunction, and to remove many another protection of labor.

So now we come to the demand to once more make the antitrust laws applicable to labor unions. The language is familiar. We hear the ominous catch phrases, "monopolistic power of unions," "giant unions," etc., repeated with the monotonous regularity of the huckster making a hard sale for a mouth wash, a deodorant, or some other cure-all for an imaginary ailment.

Just how big is organized labor? Total union membership is about 17 million, or much less than half the labor force, and perhaps 10 percent of the total population.

Total financial resources of all unions amount to about a billion dollars. I'll admit that to the old Knights of Labor this is a whale of a lot of money, but it is not very much when we give it a 1957 look.

One corporation, General Motors, has earned twice that in one year.

We have single corporations with assets many times that figure. For instance, American Telephone & Telegraph has assets approaching the $20-billion figure, and General Motors itself has more than $5 billion in assets.

So organized labor's billion dollars isn't very large. These assets shrink further when we realize that organized labor is not centrally controlled. The combined AFL–CIO is not one gigantic organization, controlled top to bottom from George Meany's office. Instead, it is 150 separate national and international unions. Each sets its own policies. In turn, these separate unions are made up of locals, numbering about 60,000, each of which goes its own way.

Dave Beck is not told how to spend teamsters' money by George Meany, nor does Beck in turn tell local 688 what to do with its money, beyond the normal share of dues which goes to the international and the AFL–CIO.

In addition, there are the independent unions, such as United Mine Workers of America, and the various local independents which may or may not be company unions.

Actual ownership of the billion dollars is spread pretty thin—it is chopped up into a great many pieces—and George Meany would have a pretty difficult time trying to borrow a few hundred million using these assets as security.

He would have about as much success as the president of the United States Chamber of Commerce would have trying to borrow a few hundred billion dollars putting up as security the $268 billion in combined assets of all the Nation's corporations.

But these facts and figures do not worry the hucksters of union hate. They go right on repeating the same old catch phrases, and then list the following abuses and evils:

1. Secondary boycotts.
2. Featherbedding.
3. Jurisdictional disputes.
4. Price fixing and market control.

5. Opposition to technological improvement.

6. Industrywide bargaining.

We can dismiss the first three of these allegations, because each is already banned in the Taft-Hartley law. If the Attorney General could proceed under the antitrust laws, a labor union and its individual members could also then be prosecuted by the Department of Justice, and be subject to civil suit.

Coming to point 4, I do not see how a labor union can fix prices and control a market on its own initiative. I would think not only the cooperation of the employer is required, but the initiative must be from that direction.

At any rate union labor generally frowns upon such a practice; and furthermore, unions may be prosecuted for this practice under existing interpretations of the antitrust laws.

In a series of decisions handed down by the Supreme Court in the 1939–41 period the status of labor unions and the antitrust laws has been clearly defined. The Court has held that when a union acts alone in behalf of the interests of its members, its activities do not fall under the antitrust laws. The Court also has held that when a union acts in collusion with an employer to fix prices and control a market, it does fall within the scope of antitrust laws.

Collusion between union and employer to fix prices and control markets defeats the general aims of labor unions, and becomes, I believe, poor leadership. If it does happen, Government already possesses the necessary tools without further legislation.

The charge that unions resist technological development—mechanization, automation (the terms change from generation to generation)—simply does not square up with the facts, although it is easy to see how a mistaken interpretation may be given. The traditional position of organized labor has been to secure some of the benefits of technical improvements for labor. It has not opposed the advances. In most fields it is labor that leads the way in trying to make possible a human, fair adjustment to the age of automation.

The 40-hour week is a prime example of how organized labor has sought and obtained advantages for the worker from mechanization.

In the current concern over automation the voices of organized labor have never once been raised in opposition, only in warnings that serious economic dislocations will result unless part of the benefits from use of magic electronic devices comes to labor.

Why do you suppose the 35-hour week was raised as an issue in the last campaign?

There is a wide gap between obstructionism and a demand for consideration. Labor has the right and must fight for that consideration.

Finally, there is the charge of industrywide bargaining. Close study has shown that what is loosely regarded as "industrywide bargaining" might be the negotiations for a new steel contract.

What happens is that every steel company holds back until the United States Steel Corporation and the steelworkers reach an agreement; then and then only do the other companies fall in line, signing a similar agreement. What this proves, if it proves anything, is that United States Steel dominates the industry, and this is nothing that can be laid to the door of David McDonald.

In practice, it should be pointed out, the scope of a bargaining unit is determined by agreement between both management and labor.

Moreover, the whole issue of industrywide bargaining was considered in 1947 and 1948. A prohibition on industrywide bargaining was proposed as part of the Taft-Hartley law, and it was too much for even the anti-labor 80th Congress, for the proposal was rejected. But some "old soldiers" of industry never do die or even fade away.

There is little or no foundation to the charges that organized labor is a monopoly, that it is a giant, that it is guilty of violating the antitrust laws. But this will not stop labor's enemies from raising the issue at every opportunity.

Unfortunately, in these days and times, not all of our fellow citizens have the opportunity to study the operations of a labor union—even some who themselves might belong to a union. The fact remains, however, that some 90 percent of our population does not carry a union card, and only a few of these are students of labor. The rest depend upon the headlines, and the people who speak with an eye on the makeup desk. This doesn't always make for an objective picture of organized labor.

What can an individual union member do? What can a local do to help create a better understanding among all the people?

One answer is what you in Local 688 are doing. I'll venture the people with whom you have worked on slum-clearance problems, to keep sidewalks safe, to control rat infestation, and the many, many other projects have a pretty good opinion of Local 688 and the folks who belong to it.

I'll bet, too, that every time some demagog screams about the evil men in labor these folks think of you, whom they know to be good, and disbelieve.

That is one of the best answers to unbridled criticism and I want to congratulate you for doing a fine job for yourselves, for your community, and for the whole labor movement.

These days and times are times of crises for labor. Never before has it been so necessary to exploit unionism to the utmost. Never before has the need been so great for leaders of organized labor to exercise such responsibility of direction. Finally, never before has the need been so great for the individual members to tell their friends and neighbors what it means to be a union member; to be evangelistic in demonstrating the value to the community of the benefits in responsible citizenship that results from active participation in a labor union.

If this challenge to the leadership and to the rank and file is not met, then you risk the loss of everything you have gained. If you do meet it, and I firmly believe you will, you will help keep your country really free. The fate of human dignity at home and in far-off lands depends so much on you. Your victory is the victory of men of good will and brotherhood all over the world.

---

## The Eisenhower Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 11, 1957*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 16, 1957, my colleagues EMANUEL CELLER and JAMES ROOSEVELT and I testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee while it was considering House Joint Resolution 117, which has come to be known as the Eisenhower doctrine. Congressman CELLER's testimony before the committee was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the 17th day of January and appears at pages 801–803. Congressman ROOSEVELT's testimony appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the 24th day of January at pages 869–871. My own testimony appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the 22d day of January at pages 654–657. In order that the RECORD be complete, I am submitting herewith, with the consent of my colleagues Congressmen CELLER and ROOSEVELT, the questions addressed to each of us and the answers we made thereto:

ECONOMIC AND MILITARY COOPERATION WITH NATIONS IN THE GENERAL AREA OF THE MIDDLE EAST

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
*Washington, D. C., January 16, 1957.*

The committee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:40 a. m., in room 1301, New House Office Building, the Honorable THOMAS S. GORDON (chairman) presiding.

Chairman GORDON. The committee will come to order. Ladies and gentlemen, we are meeting to continue hearings on House Joint Resolution 117. Our first witness this morning will be Congressman CELLER, of New York. Mr. CELLER is a lawyer by profession who has served with distinction in the House of Representatives since 1922. He also has the honor to be chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CELLER, we are very glad to have you with us this morning and appreciate your taking time out to give us the benefit of your views on this pending resolution. Mr. CELLER.

STATEMENT OF HON. EMANUEL CELLER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. CELLER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I take this opportunity to congratulate you after many years of service in reaching the summit of this committee. I certainly, as a chairman of a coordinate committee of the House, knowing of the difficulties surrounding a job like a chairmanship, wish you well.

Chairman GORDON. Thank you.

Mr. CELLER. I take this opportunity to note that one of our New York Members is one of your newest additions to your committee. He has had a brilliant career in our New York Legislature, I am sure he will be a credit to you and to the Congress.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Thank you, Congressman.

Mr. CELLER. I would wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman and the members of the committee, for the opportunity this committee has given me to express my views on the so-called Eisenhower plan for the Middle East area. I have welcomed this opportunity because for years now I have had a special and active interest in the development of that region and it is my fear that the plan outlined by the President may and can be used as an oversimplification of one of the most complex problems that faces us today.

I wish to start off by saying that it is well for the United States to place the Soviet Union, as well as the rest of the world, on notice that the Middle East area is of active and vital concern to its national security. This was a belated conclusion on the part of the administration. It was obvious to many of us when Soviet arms over a year ago started pouring into Egypt that we had failed to see the significance of Soviet penetration. With one step forward and two steps back, Secretary Dulles, in the handling of the Suez seizure by Egypt, succeeded only in convincing the American public and the world that the United States was not seriously interested in a region which, as President Eisenhower now has pointed out, bears directly upon the safety of Western survival.

I do not wish to belabor the points of nonfeasance on the part of our administration, but the public estimates made by both Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles on the Suez

situation and the penetration of Soviet influence in that area have direct bearing on the resolution now before us. A year ago, Mr. Dulles said, "The problem of the Suez has been successfully resolved." He listed the evacuation of the British among the events which, he said, made the Suez situation "better and brighter." And in April, the President detailed Suez as one place where we were winning the cold war.

Permit me also the luxury of quoting a few instances of the clouded crystal ball as Time magazine peered into it. On January 3, 1955:

"Dulles is the man of 1954 because, in the decisive areas of international politics, he played the year's most effective role * * * Regionally, 1954's greatest area of success for American diplomacy and the man who runs it was the Middle East * * * After decades of dispute, the status of the Suez Canal area was settled more firmly than ever before."

And on August 6, 1955, Time reported:

"The United States had speculated that Egypt's Nasser might seize the Suez Canal in retaliation but State—meaning the State Department—did not rate the chances very high."

On July 30, 1956:

"On the broad chessboard of international diplomacy the United States moved decisively last week in a gambit that took the breath of professionals for its daring and won the assent of kibitzers for its intrinsic rightness. John Foster Dulles advised Egypt's President Gamal Abdel Nasser that the United States is no longer interested in building the $1.3 billion Aswan high dam. The risk of Soviet penetration was no greater than the risk of having Nasser go on with his fast-and-loose game in the precarious Middle East. It was highly possible that Chessmaster Dulles had his opponents in check."

Then, of course, it is difficult to forget the use of the "peace" theme in a recent campaign. Now we are faced with a delayed reaction on the part of the administration. But I fear that again we are not being asked to look at the whole picture and see it whole. Can we realistically divorce the problem of Soviet penetration, or the possibility of overt Soviet aggression in the Middle East, from the regional problems, which problems are being used by the Soviet Union as a lever for its entrance into that area? The division is made in the proposal before us between overt Soviet aggression and the problems of Suez and the Arab-Israeli dispute. No such division can be made.

Moreover, it has seemed to me—and I know that my viewpoint is shared by millions of our constituents—that the administration has never made clear what it means when it uses the term "aggression." History does not begin at any set hour of the day; it is a stream that flows around many bends. What was the provocation that led to the intervention of England and France in the Suez? What was the provocation that led to the Israeli intervention? Was not the seizure of the Suez by the Egyptian Government without notice in itself an act of aggression? Was not the failure of the Egyptian Government to guarantee free access to all nations an act of aggression? Were not the border raids by fedayeen, the ignoring by Egypt of the United Nations resolution demanding free access to Suez to Israel acts of aggression? The United Nations has never clarified, nor has the administration lent its collective mind to an examination of what constitutes aggression.

The Suez and the Arab-Israeli dispute, we are told, are to be left to the United Nations. Until the United Nations has means of enforcing its resolutions, has means of acting to stem the defiance of these resolutions, the United Nations can play no greater role than moral persuasion permits it. The United Nations was able to prevent the extension of the war in Egypt only because England, France, and Israel voluntarily accepted its resolution; but it could not end the Soviet aggression against Hungary. It could not make Nasser live up to the terms of clearance of the canal, which was not to be dependent on the withdrawal of foreign troops, but upon the actual order of cease-fire. It has been helpless to stop the fedayeen raids against Israel. It has been impotent in forcing the puppet Government of Hungary to accept the presence of United Nations observers. When Egypt denied transit through the Suez Canal to Israeli ships, sent commando raids into Israel, and violated the Treaty of Constantinople, the United Nations could not act. Even now, it is impossible for the United Nations to negotiate with Nasser. It is Nasser who sets the terms and the United Nations police force is there on sufferance of the Egyptian dictator.

The United States cannot then leave the decision on these important matters, which must be United States responsibility, up to the United Nations. That is ducking responsibility.

The United States will not have discharged its full responsibility by saying we stand behind the United Nations, for the United Nations can only be as strong or as weak as the United States chooses to make it. To say "Let the U. N. do it" is not policy; it is a way to avoid making hard and difficult decisions. In common parlance, it is passing the buck.

Viscount Cherwell, nuclear scientist, in the House of Lords recently sought to dispel exaggerated notions of the great power of the United Nations. He said:

"In the Assembly, 5 percent of the world's population can carry the day against the other 95 percent, and 10 percent could claim a two-thirds majority. * * * Half the population of the world is represented by 4 delegates, the other half by 75. Some are the most highly educated and civilized countries on the planet. The inhabitants of others can scarcely read or write. * * * The vote of 400 million (East) Indians or 160 million Americans is equated by the vote of 4 million Bolivians."

As for the U. N. police force in Egypt, Viscount Cherwell stated, "it * * * could be swept away by one brigade of Israelis and probably even by two or three divisions of Egyptians." To be "of any use," a U. N. police force would have to be stronger than any nation or combination of nations. What "sort of force would be required to turn Russia out of Hungary, of America out of Formosa, should the Afro-Asian bloc, voting with the Latin American or the Iron Curtain countries, secure an Assembly vote to this effect?"

Small wonder the New Yorker calls the United Nations the "United Notions."

How, then, can these problems which affect the entire world—these problems of Suez and Arab-Israeli relationships—be left to the United Nations, when they constitute the tinder box from which world conflagration can start? The Arab-Israeli dispute is obstructed by a Soviet veto in the Security Council and in the General Assembly we have the Arab-Afro-Asia-Soviet bloc forming a coalition to frustrate the best of intentions. How far from simple this problem is when we consider that the United Nations presses Israel to withdraw from Sharn el Sheikh in the Sinai Peninsula. It was here that the Israelis stopped the batteries which shelled United States and British vessels in the Gulf of Aqaba. Can we stop communism from literally walking into the Middle East if, with Communist weapons, the Egyptians control the Gulf of Aqaba which becomes significant as an alternate route to the Suez?

True, the Soviet Union will be placed on notice by this resolution that the United States is determined to protect its national security in the area of the Middle East. But this constitutes only one step, and it is no more than that. This we must recognize lest smugness overtake us in the mistaken belief that we have devised a policy, rather than having made just a beginning toward reaching a realistic coordinated policy which includes all these variants.

I call the Eisenhower plan only a beginning, and this the Congress will surely recognize. What part do we play in assuring that all nations shall have access to the canal and the Straits of Aqaba? What role do we play in insuring that the Arab world will recognize and acknowledge the existence of the State of Israel? Let us not forget that in that region the Arab-Israeli dispute—If I can use so weak a word—is of greater immediacy to them than any potential Soviet threat.

The plan is only a beginning toward a workable policy. The proposal is that we deploy troops to the Middle East only when there are overt acts of aggression by the Soviet Union or a Soviet-dominated country and then only upon consent of the threatened nation. It leaves out of consideration completely the problem attendant upon subverted governments. Once a government has been subverted—and there is the usual Soviet putsch—we can hardly expect that it will ask for our aid against Soviet domination.

How clearly this matter of oversimplification stands out when we consider the Middle East itself. We are dealing here with nations of diverse composition, economically, socially, culturally. Yemen and Jordan, for example, are hardly viable states, dependent as they are upon foreign government subsidies. Iraq and Saudi Arabia, despite the enormous oil royalties which they receive annually, are, as far as the people themselves are concerned, underdeveloped to a point of misery.

Egypt has a degree of political maturity lacking in such countries as Saudi Arabia, Jordan, or Yemen. Again, it is only a beginning because it leaves out of account the various rivalries that exist among the Arab nations themselves. The one note of unity, and the only note of unity, exists in their attitude toward Israel. In the Middle East we find one country oriented toward the West, politically mature, a practicing democracy, with skilled technologists, a managerial class, and a background of science and experimentation—which is Israel.

At this point I wish to direct the attention of the committee to some facts which I believe will have total relevance to the examination of the proposal before it. The figures I am going to give you I have obtained from State Department sources.

The Arab countries receive a total of $83.8 million each month from the petroleum industries in the form of royalties, taxes, or other payments. Saudi Arabia, based on 1955 figures, will have received each month during 1956 the equivalent of about $24 million, in dollars, pounds, and francs, paid to it by Aramco, which is owned by Standard of New Jersey, Standard of California, the Texas Co., and Socony-Mobil. In other words, American companies contributed totally to this figure.

Iraq will have received, in the year of 1956, approximately $18 million per month from the petroleum industries, 23.75 percent of which is from American petroleum interests. Iran will have received about $13 million per month, 40 percent of which comes from the American oil industry.

Kuwait will have received $25 million each month of the year 1956 from the petroleum industry, 50 percent of which is American. Qatar will have received about $3 million per month, 23.75 percent coming from American petroleum interests.

Bahrein will have received approximately $800,000 each month during 1956 from the

petroleum industry, all of it derived from American interests.

The total received by these four countries is over $1 billion a year.

I note that King Ibn Saud will visit with the President. In discussing the conditions of his country with him, the President can perhaps determine how much of oil royalties are used for the betterment of Saudi Arabia economically. It is well, however, for the President to hear firsthand reports from the heads of these governments, and it would not be amiss for the administration to invite the Prime Minister of Israel, David Ben-Gurion, likewise, to give firsthand reports of the fears and the tensions in the Middle East.

I should like to quote from the U. S. News & World Report which, after all, cannot be said to be unfriendly to the administration. In discussing the Eisenhower plan, it says:

"Does this increase the chance of war? The idea is that, by warning of American intent to resist aggression, the United States will restrain Soviet Russia. Will it mean American troops for the Mid-East? No. This is just to be a warning to Russia to keep out. Will it mean bigger United States Armed Forces? No. United States already has powerful naval forces in the eastern Mediterranean and very powerful Air Force strength not far away in the western Mediterranean. Will it call for marines to patrol the area? There is no thought of that. Will United States be committed to move in on local wars? Not necessarily. That would be a United Nations job. What's it all about, then? The latest United States move primarily is designed to warn Russia against new adventures."

It is not that this warning should not be given; I believe it should be given. It is only that we must recognize that, in and of itself, it cannot insure peace. The United States must make its position equally clear vis-a-vis Egypt. It must leave neither side guessing in the Arab-Israeli dispute, of the United States conviction that Israel is here to stay; that the United States is firm in its stand that the Suez must be held accessible for all nations, bar none; that it will insure the territorial integrity of the nations in the Middle East as against each other as well as against the Soviet Union; and to the end of promoting peace in that area, it will impose an embargo on all arms to the Middle East and demand all nations do so. An embargo, not including the Soviet Union, however, could do great mischief.

The question, too, must be asked: "Are we going it alone?" It cannot be gainsaid that the oil from the Middle East is the lifeblood of Europe; that European interest in that area is equally urgent. Must we not ask ourselves if this is not a further downgrading of England and France, whose stake in the continuance of civilization is certainly as great as ours?

Again we must take a close look at the program for economic aid as outlined in this resolution. Economic aid designed as a crisis program must fail, in and of itself. The tragic economic plight of the Middle East needs no recounting here. But must we not examine the dangers inherent in a blanket allotment which can be manipulated politically, which is withdrawn from standards placed upon its spending by the Congress? Must not the Congress assure itself that these moneys will be spent for the region as a whole, such as the Johnson irrigation plan which has been rejected by the Arab nations because, while it will be of benefit to themselves, will also be of benefit to Israel? There are other plans that could be considered on a regional basis.

The administration at times has appeared to adopt a philosophy of abstention, conciliation, and pacification—all virtues at times, but any of which, under certain circumstances, can be a vice. Peace at any price is fraught with evil. One may speculate whether the price the Nation will have to pay in the long run, even for its present domestic tranquillity, in terms of moral stagnation, intellectual sterility, issues unrecognized, and problems unsolved, may not be too costly and excessive in the end.

It has been the Dulles and Eisenhower policy to avoid problems—push them under the rug—in order to preserve a false front of uninterrupted tranquillity. But in the end the difficulty of solution becomes exacerbated. You cannot keep these difficulties under the rug.

The resolution does not come to grips, as I have tried to emphasize, with such agents of destruction and obstruction as Nasser; does not come to grips with the pouring of Communist arms into the Middle East; does not come to grips with our self-interest in maintaining a democracy like Israel in the Middle East; does not come to grips with the real economic woes of the whole region. And I wish to reemphasize in my conclusion that this resolution is not a program, but only the beginning of one; and while these problems cannot be met properly in the form of the resolution requested of Congress, most certainly the members—and this I want to emphasize—of this distinguished committee can set this forth in the report accompanying the resolution so that there will be for all the world to read that the United States is not unmindful of the complexities, not unmindful of the mistakes heretofore made, not unmindful of what yet remains to be done.

My position is this: The military warning expressed by the President might have a restraining influence on any rash Russian action. In that sense the Eisenhower doctrine may be commended—but only in that sense.

The second part of the doctrine involves a blank check—blanket authority to spend $400 million within 2 years for economic aid. I hope the committee will separate the two proposals and treat them separately. I want the military warning to Russia to be given. But I don't wish to be stampeded or bludgeoned into granting this huge sum for so-called economic aid under these conditions. Are we again yielding to the old business of blackmail without any assurance that our aid will be used for real social and economic reform in 10th-century feudal Arab bailiwicks? We have seen the evidence of vast sums siphoned off by Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Kuwait, and Bahrein. Kuwait is the only sheikdom which spends that money wisely for the social and economic betterment of the fellaheen.

Senator KNOWLAND, Senate Republican leader, said yesterday before the Joint Committee of Armed Services and Foreign Relations in the Senate: "I am greatly troubled by the request to include economic aid in the measure."

It would be difficult to recite how President Eisenhower could spend an additional $200 million each year for 2 years in the Middle East—the angry Middle East.

Saudi Arabia is bursting at the seams with oil money at the rate of $288 million each year (figures for 1956). Iraq gets $216 million in oil royalties each year. The President, in addition, under the Baghdad Pact has great sums to bolster the defenses of Iraq.

Syria is fast becoming a Soviet puppet, if she is not such now. Already she has refused our dollar aid at Russia's urging. Nasser, in Egypt, is making great anti-American noises. Cairo radio and press daily denounce us and call the Eisenhower doctrine "American imperialism." Jordan may go the way of Syria. Anyhow, Britain subsidizes Jordan with $35 million a year. Britain might resent our replacing her. Mr. Dulles admitted before the Senate Joint Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees that we would not pick up the "tab" for Britain's subsidy of Jordan. Actually, Israel is the only nation left, plus Lebanon and Yemen. Four hundred million dollars would not be spent on these three nations. Where, I ask, is this taxpayers' money to go and how?

Indeed, most intensive hearings should be used to inquire how, when, and why this money is to be spent. We dare not buy a pig in a poke. Mr. Dulles must be subjected to sharp questioning in this regard. In the absence thereof and in the absence of adequate answers, I am extremely doubtful of this request for blanket, unqualified economic aid.

Finally, Mr. Dulles has yet to outline the projects for which mony will be spent. It is no answer to say that the whole area would be lost unless the money is forthcoming. That is nonsense. If true, where was Mr. Dulles the month before? Such a debacle must have been discernible and danger signals set over a year ago. He was derelict a year ago or is just indulging in sophistry and mere debate now. He should be compelled to spell out a well-defined, long-range, short-range economic aid or programs for the Middle East. He only has given the committee vague assumptions. When he has been severely questioned, as was the case recently, he talked differently. The Senators closely interrogated him, and he has offered to restrict the broad proposed language and use the money for such things as paying security forces in the Middle East nations, tiding them over budget deficits due to major impending cuts in the oil royalties because of the closed Suez and blown-up pipelines.

He should be asked to give, if he can, reasons other than which he gave yesterday and the day before as to the use of this money.

It is incumbent upon you to recall him so that he unfolds to you just how this money will be spent. Don't let him frighten you with his crass announcement that unless $400 million is forthcoming all will be lost.

That is my statement. I will be very glad to present myself for interrogation.

Chairman GORDON. I am going to call on our next witness. At this time I want to introduce to the members, our good friend and fellow Member, Representative MULTER, from New York.

Mr. MULTER is also a lawyer and a distinguished member of the Banking and Currency Committee, which has so kindly loaned us this room for our hearing. Mr. MULTER has been a Member of Congress since the 80th Congress. We welcome your appearance and shall give your views our most careful consideration. We will hear Mr. MULTER'S statement and then question Mr. CELLER and Mr. MULTER together under the 5-minute rule.

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for that generous introduction. May I first express a similar word of commendation and congratulations to you upon your taking over the chairmanship of this great committee, and say that I am most appreciative of the opportunity you again give me to appear before your committee to present to you my views with reference to the important problem that now confronts us. I am sure that much of the factual information at my disposal will be spread upon your record before you close these hearings.

There is no doubt in my mind, and there should be none in the minds of our allies or of our enemies, present and potential, that every member of this committee and every Member of both Houses of Congress is sincerely devoted to the establishment of world peace, and when I say "world peace" I mean peace in every part of the world, a peace that will prevail not only between nations but between all peoples within each nation. That being so, while we may differ in our methods

of approach, we certainly should be able to agree upon the form of a resolution which will state that purpose, not only so that all will understand, but so that none can misunderstand.

In approaching this problem, we cannot overlook the fact that under our Constitution the burden, the responsibility and the leadership in making foreign policy is, in the first instance, upon our President.

If he has failed us in that respect, if indeed as many have claimed—and with some justification—that he is now, to use the vernacular, "passing the buck" to the Congress, then let us assume that responsibility and move forward. Let us fill the void that has existed these many years, created by a lack of foreign policy of the United States, and positively, affirmatively, and without cavil or quibble, announce such policy, in one-syllable words, if necessary, so that freedom-loving people everywhere will know where we stand and, what is more important, those who would subjugate the world and enslave its people, will know that a Patrick Henry has risen among the nations, renewing the clarion call, "Give me liberty or give me death," knowing that free nations have ceased to engage in oratorical displays and are finally and at last ready to fight, if necessary, for that freedom.

It would be well if this committee, and its counterpart in the other body, could avoid the pressures being exerted upon us by the President and his Secretary of State for immediate action on the resolution you have before you, and that such action be postponed until such time as the appropriate committees of the Congress have entered upon and completed a thorough investigation of the conduct of our foreign affairs. With the election campaign behind us, and another presidential campaign 4 years away, this is the time to conduct such a study.

The American people are entitled to know why we have been repeatedly told by the highest responsible officials in our Government that all was well at home and abroad, only to have each such statement immediately followed by another crisis. We are entitled to know why the highest officials of our Government have dared to say to the American people and to the Congress that they had no advance knowledge of what our friends and allies were doing nor of what our potential enemies are doing.

You must agree with me that it was their duty to know these things. I say to you, that they had the means at hand at all times to know these things and to properly evaluate them. If you disagree with that statement then I say, conduct the investigation I suggest.

If our Secretary of State stayed at home long enough to read the reports and the dispatches that are on file in his office, he and our President would have had advance knowledge of many of the things about which they pretended ignorance. Their lack of knowledge must be attributed primarily to refusal to read and to listen and to understand.

I suggest to you that if you called upon our intelligence agencies to submit to you copies of their factual reports, if you called upon our Security Council to give you such reports, if you called upon our Joint Chiefs of Staff therefor, if you called upon our Secretary of State to submit to you the reports he has received from our Embassies, you would after reading them come to the same conclusion that I do, that all of the information they needed was always at hand upon which to base firm policies and to make them known in time to have prevented trouble.

It should be unnecessary for me to remind this committee of the grand and glorious history of our country, or to point out that after our country was born out of a war of revolution, we have never hesitated to fight for liberty, not only our own liberty, but for the liberty of all freedom-loving people. In that Revolutionary War we accepted not only the encouragement of people from outside the confines of this continent, we accepted their financial help and their military aid. We welcomed and used the Lafayettes, the Pulaskis, the Kosciuskos and all other "foreigners" who came to our aid.

How different from what we did when, after encouraging the Hungarians to rebel against their Communist dictators, we turned our back on them, giving them nothing but sweet, but very empty, words.

We asked no country's consent to enter the War of 1812 to fight for the freedom of the seas. That endeavor was not only for our own personal advantage but to establish an important principle of international law. We asked no country's consent when in 1898 we fought with Spain for the freedom of Cuba.

We asked no country's consent when we wiped out the pirates of Tripoli. We asked no country's consent when we sent General Pershing at the head of the United States Army into Mexico, where they stayed for some 11 months routing out Pancho Villa and his bandits who had dared to cross our border and kill six Americans.

Are we now going to rewrite history and label the United States the aggressor in all of those, and in many other instances in our history? Are there any among us who will say that those actions were not justified by moral law, as well as international law? If we follow the thinking of Mr. Dulles as applied to our friends and allies in the Middle East, we must rewrite all our traditions. If he really doesn't know the difference between self-defense and aggression; if he doesn't know the difference between self-preservation and aggression; if he doesn't know that a people or a nation which refuses to allow itself to be robbed, even if it uses force to prevent the thievery, is neither morally nor legally an aggressor; if he doesn't know that a people or a nation which will disarm its enemies who have threatened to annihilate it, is not an aggressor, then, indeed, ladies and gentlemen, this Congress cannot move fast enough to present a resolution which will clearly define the differences for him.

Obviously, Mr. Dulles has not learned the lessons of history. He refuses to acknowledge that among the major mistakes we made in the recent past was standing idly by as Manchuria was conquered, as Ethiopia was ravaged, as Poland was raped, and as Hitler was appeased and even now as Hungary is destroyed. Apparently he thinks that appeasement of Nasser of Egypt has not brought us to the threshold of world war III.

I say to this committee that when the history of these times is written, one of the darkest blots upon its pages will be recording the shameful conduct of our country in rising up in the United Nations to join with our sworn enemy, the Communists, to denounce our sworn friends, the British, the French, and the Israelis.

I say to you that the only thing wrong about what the British and French did was their delay. They had a right to move in and take the Suez Canal from Nasser the day he nationalized it. When they withheld such action, at the suggestion of Mr. Dulles, they did all that could be expected of them. They complied with his suggestion for a London conference. When that failed, and the United Nations failed to take positive and firm action against Nasser with reference to the Suez Canal, they had every right to move in and put Mr. Nasser in his place. I understand our President claims to have been very much annoyed by the fact that he was not consulted in advance of that action. He denied himself the right to be consulted about it.

All the world knew that Britain and France were moving planes and tanks and troops into Cyprus in preparation for moving on Nasser if he didn't live up to his international obligations. During all these long days of preparation by the British and the French, why didn't the President or his Secretary of State convene the Security Council, not for the purpose of preventing Britain and France from protecting their lifeline, but for the purpose of bringing international pressure to bear, world opinion as they say, upon the international brigand who was stealing that which belonged to the international community.

Let me recall to you the words of our President. Mr. Eisenhower said that international law must be the same for the big nation as for the little nation. International justice requires that the same rule apply to the small nation as it does to the big nation. We must agree.

The trouble with that statement is that it comes very late. Too long have we been condoning international thievery under the euphonious title of "nationalization." Long before we wrote into our Constitution the prohibition against the taking of property, even for public purposes, all moral law, which must be considered a basis and a part of international law, prohibits such taking.

Now let's apply this doctrine which the President has so properly enunciated. What would you do if the President sent us a message stating that the Republic of Panama had nationalized the Panama Canal? I doubt whether this Congress would have waited for a message from the President before it acted. You would have acted the minute the news came to our attention. What's the difference in the two situations?

Geographically, the Suez Canal runs right through the middle of Egypt. Similarly, the Panama Canal runs right through the middle of the Republic of Panama.

The Suez Canal is an international highway, made such by the solemn obligations of duly executed treaties of many of the most important sovereign nations of the world. As a matter of fact, the State of Egypt owes its very sovereignty to the acts of most of those nations.

The Panama Canal is an international highway pursuant to the solemn obligation of a treaty entered into between the Republic of Panama and the United States of America.

No Panamanian money built the Panama Canal. No Egyptian money built the Suez Canal.

Although unilateral action of the Egyptians blockaded the Suez Canal, little or no Egyptian money will be used to clear it. And let no one say that the sinking of the ships by the Egyptians in the Suez Canal was an act of self-defense. It was a deliberate act of sabotage. It was a cold-blooded statement by Nasser to the user nations that he was taking their property and he would destroy it before he would let them have it back.

If the Republic of Panama acted similarly with reference to the Panama Canal, is there an American anywhere in this country who would say that we should consult with any other nation before we moved in on the Republic of Panama and took the canal back? I doubt it.

What we would do with the Panama Canal, we should have done to help Britain and France and the rest of the free world do with reference to the Suez Canal, and we may yet have to do it.

To those who would say that one of the provisions in the treaty covering the Suez Canal is that title to the canal will pass in a matter of years to Egypt, I say that when the time comes, the free nations of the world will abide by that covenant. However, if they have any sense, in the meantime they will either build another canal in that area or pipelines through countries like Israel and Lebanon, supplemented with sufficient large-sized tankers so that the free world will be

in a position to negotiate with a Nasser, if one still be around at that time, for the perpetual internationalization of that canal.

In that connection, some of you may say that there were pipelines running through Syria and when this struggle started those pipelines were destroyed. Such is the fact. Whether they were destroyed by the Syrian Government, or by Communists aided and abetted by the Syrian Government, is unimportant. A Secretary of State who was alert to protect the interests of a free world should have presented that matter to the United Nations for apppropriate action and, if necessary, we should have moved into Syria, yes—with armed forces, to protect that property.

This is not a new theory. Do I have to remind you that that is precisely what we did, in substance and in effect, in Guatemala? We consulted with none of our allies. We moved on Guatemala, despite the protests of Communist Russia, because we believed the Communist threat in Guatemala was an imminent danger to our security and the security of our neighbors in this hemisphere.

Let me pass on to another facet of this principle. At this very moment there is fighting in the Middle East, between Yemen and the British Protectorate of Aden. Is there any doubt but that the Yemenite invasion of Aden's borders is Communist inspired, supervised by Communist technicians, and fortified by Communist arms? Or is this another matter, knowledge of which is lacking to our Secretary of State because he hasn't had the time to read the dispatches? What are we doing about it? Why hasn't our Secretary of State instructed our delegate to the United Nations to bring the matter forthrightly before the Security Council and, if necessary, before the General Assembly? Or is this a matter to be talked about in secret executive session?

I, like some of the members of this committee, am fed up with this so-called executive-session business. It is labeled "top secret" by the administration. All the world knows about it, and you read it in the newspapers in the first editions on the streets after the close of the executive session. Not because of any leaks from the committee, but because it is either leaked by the Department of State or it is dug out of the Department by alert reporters who will not be denied the information they have a right to present to the public, and which the public has the right to get authentically, in the first instance, directly from responsible Government officials.

I can understand that matters of high policy involving our national security and defense should be presented to certain congressional committees behind closed doors.

It is high time, however, that our Government officials realized that secret diplomacy as to policy affecting the attitudes and conduct of governments has long since lost its usefulness. It accomplishes nothing except to create suspicions and ill feeling, and produce more grist for the false propaganda mills of the Communists.

There is no doubt in our minds about our sincerity in seeking world peace. There is no doubt in our minds that we want no colonies and that we want to subjugate no people.

Our only desire is a free and peaceful world. Any and every plan working toward that end can be and should be freely, fully, and completely discussed in the open, without reservation. Any other approach gives the Communists the right to cry that we are being deceitful, and gives the neutralist the right to suspect not only our motives but our goals. We will not gain any friends by pretending that the policy or doctrine which we intend to apply to such friends or with such friends must be negotiated secretly.

Let me assure those who are fearful that the plans of the enemy may be made known, or that the enemy may find out how much we know about his plans, the enemy knows his plans. We can talk about them publicly, first, to alert our friends, and, secondly, to let our enemy know that we are wise to him. Every last word that is uttered to any committee of the Congress with reference to the allegedly new doctrine that you are asked to endorse should be publicized so that our friends will know that we mean to help them and so that our enemies will know that we intend to deter them.

Now, let's talk for a moment or two about the resolution and what it seeks to do. The idea seems to be to tell the Communists that we will stand for no more of their incursions upon the rights of free peoples and, at the same time, to show our friends that we are ready to help them economically. If I have read the newspaper reports correctly, our Secretary of State has conceded, at least before the committees in the other body, that the President already has the full authority to do the things asked for by this resolution. I believe that, in answer to the question as to why these things have not yet been done, he says that if we have been late in doing them, let's at least do them now.

Ladies and gentlemen, when I returned from the Middle East in December of 1955, I told everybody in our Government who would listen to me about the situation as I found it there. You will find much of the story in my testimony before this committee on May 8, 1956.

There cannot be any doubt but that the authority which the President now seeks he has always had. He has merely failed to exercise it.

You remember that only a few days ago he told a joint session of Congress that this country had security pacts with 42 nations and pacts of a similar nature with 3 other nations. The Baghdad Pact between Turkey, Iran, Iraq, and Pakistan was brought into being by the United States and at its instigation. When those countries asked the United States to join that pact, the excuse was given by our Secretary of State that to do so would antagonize some of the other Arab States, and particularly Mr. Nasser, of Egypt.

The State of Israel has repeatedly asked for a security pact, indicating that she would need no additional arms if she had such a security pact. Mr. Dulles' excuse for not giving the State of Israel such a security pact was that he couldn't do that without giving a similar security pact to the other Arab States. When asked why we didn't enter into such security pacts with the other Arab States, the answer came back: They won't take such a security pact because an important feature of each such security pact is an understanding that the country will not engage in acts of aggression against any of its neighbors. The country that will not enter into such a covenant labels itself a potential aggressor.

Economic aid throughout the Middle East, to the Arab countries as well as to Israel, has been available for many years. It has been offered to the Arab States and to Egypt repeatedly. From 1948 to 1952 none of the Arab States would take such aid from us because, as a condition of giving such aid, we insisted upon a firm obligation being entered into by the recipient to recognize the existence of the State of Israel, and to agree not to be an aggressor against it or any other neighbor.

For the last 4 years the policy of our State Department has been different. It has tried to buy the friendship of the Arabs by offering aid without insisting upon peace treaties and without insisting on covenants against aggression.

The result has been more and more and more aggression by Egypt, Syria, and Jordan against Israel. If you will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the 84th Congress, you will find that hardly a week went by without my inserting a list of the incursions and invasions and ravagings and murderings by Arabs against Israelis on Israeli territory; the guerrillas, fedayeens, and commandos being armed by the Egyptians and the Arabs, and crossing from Egyptian and Arab territory into Israel and then returning home after their escapades of destruction.

Whether these were the acts of their governments is as unimportant as it is obvious. In any event, those acts were the responsibility of the Arab governments. When those governments did not suppress and effectively prohibit those raids, the State of Israel had every right to use force to stop them. Israel had as much right to do that as the United States had to send General Pershing and our United States Army into Mexico to rout out the Mexican bandits when the Mexican Government either could not or would not stop their depredations.

I do not remember a single instance when our Secretary of State went before the United Nations and asked that that kind of conduct by Egypt and Syria and Jordan be stopped. I do remember how he first insisted that the Egyptians must get more arms to create a balance of power as between it and Israel. I also remember how he first urged Canada and France not to send arms to Israel, and then reversed himself and urged that they do send arms to Israel.

Any sensible person would have known that the arming of the Egyptians meant that they would use those arms, and that the very type and quantity meant they would be used for aggression. Similarly, any sensible person must know that the Israelis—if pushed as hard as they were—they would use their arms in self-defense, and by self-defense I mean going into the neighboring countries and disarming those who threatened Israel with annihilation.

Ladies and gentlemen, you have a great opportunity as a result of some buck passing. I hope you will grasp the opportunity and bring forth a resolution which will be resolute and specific. You can use some, if not most, of the language of the resolution presented to you by the State Department. You must, if you will do your full duty, make some important changes, and you must add some important limitations.

I hope you won't believe me too presumptuous in submitting to you herewith the language which I think you should use in this resolution. Permit me to summarize my changes briefly.

In the first paragraph, instead of indicating the granting of a new authorization, my resolution indicates that we are merely confirming the authority that the President already has.

In the first whereas clause, I have inserted language to show that we are not going to limit our high principles by the United Nations Charter but that we are standing firm in our principle for a just and enduring peace and will seek it by every means available, including the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

In the third whereas clause, I have made it clear that the Communist threat exists all over the world but has recently been accentuated in the Middle East.

In section 1, instead of pretending to give the President new authority, my language confirms the authority that he now has and makes it clear that such authority extends to the Middle East.

I have stricken from section 2 the words "requesting such aid."

If this resolution is to mean anything, it is essential that it be realistic and forthright. There is no longer time to hedge or doubletalk. We are either prepared to fight for our liberties or we are not. Such of us, if any there be, who think that we can any longer sit silently by and let any part of the world be enslaved by the Communists,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

cannot vote for any kind of a resolution on this subject, whether it be that proposed by the President or any modification thereof.

If we are to wait for a request from a country attacked, before we move in to prevent Communist aggression, the task that will confront us will not be one to prevent the aggressors from getting in but rather the almost impossible job of driving them out.

Who will make the request of us in that area?

Israel has been making similar requests and being ignored.

Syria, which is fast being completely dominated by the Communists, tells us that she will not make the request and wants no part of this resolution. There is good reason for that, and apart from her feud with Israel, Syria has never given up the idea that Lebanon has no right to be a free and independent sovereign nation. Syria insists that Lebanon must eventually be a part of Syria. She would love to have the opportunity and is even now being urged by the Communists, to prepare for the day when Syria can incorporate within her boundaries, all of Lebanon. If Syria should decide to march on Lebanon, it will do so under the leadership of Communist "technicians" and by the time we receive the Lebanese request for aid, it will be necessary for us to move in to drive the Communists out of that country.

Will Egypt ask for our help when she has mortgaged her economy for the next 50 years to pay for Russian arms?

The only effective policy we can have for that area must be as firm and as definite and as precise as the Monroe Doctrine was.

We will have to make the decision of whether the Communists are the aggressors, and we will have to make the decision of whether or not we will go to the aid of these countries in the Middle East, and which of them will be sincerely attempting to avoid subjugation by the Communists.

We must serve notice now that we will not permit the Communists to enslave any of those peoples or subjugate any of those countries, and we must serve notice that, if necessary, we will move our Armed Forces into those countries to prevent the Communists from taking them over. Nothing less than that will stop them. If we don't intend to do that, we should take our 6th Fleet out of the Mediterranean, recall our marines from that area, and let the world know that we don't intend to act; if we do intend to act and to use those ships and troops, we should let the Communists know in no uncertain words that an infringement upon the liberty of any people anywhere in the world is an infringement upon the liberty of all the free peoples in every part of the world.

I add a new section 3, which limits sections 1 and 2 so that no aid, military or economic, may be given to any country, except and upon condition that it first agrees:

1. That it will not be an aggressor nation;

2. That it will not permit its citizens or residents to engage in acts of aggression, guerrilla or otherwise, or in raids and pillaging, or in causing injury, death or damage to any of its neighbors;

3. That it will faithfully abide by and fulfill its international obligations and abide by the ethics and principles of international law, and will not discriminate on account of race or religion.

The one country in this world which has failed to answer the questionnaire on slavery as requested by the United Nations is Saudi Arabia. It is the one country today which is a slave nation. Its peoples are slaves in every sense of the word. It is the only country on the face of the world that has not advised the United Nations as to that condition.

It is the one country that refuses to allow an American citizen who is a Jew while wearing the uniform of our Armed Forces to enter an American base in that country. It goes further and will not let a chaplain in the Armed Forces wear the insignia of his office, the crucifix, upon his uniform when in Saudi Arabia. Yet it is the King of this country who is shortly to visit with our great President. I wonder what they will discuss.

4. That it will negotiate in good faith, peace treaties with its neighbors; and

5. That it will not submit to domination by any foreign nation.

It should be made crystal-clear in your report on this resolution that a nation seeking to enforce international obligations is not an aggressor; that a nation defending itself against acts of warfare, guerrilla or otherwise, is not an aggressor; that a nation which disarms a potential killer is not an aggressor; that a nation which blockades international highways is an aggressor; and that a nation which violates international law is an aggressor. Your report should also indicate, without equivocation, that negotiation in good faith of peace treaties requires the parties to meet around the peace table and confer about all of their problems with a view to settling all thereof, without either party to the controversy in advance of the meeting insisting upon an agenda which will include or exclude any parts of the controversy or delimit the extent of the negotiations with reference to any thereof.

It is utter nonsense for our Secretary of State to say that the United States is prepared to guarantee the boundaries of the countries in the Middle East if and when they will agree upon such boundaries. The requirement must be that the parties in good faith must meet in an attempt to agree upon such boundaries.

The same applies to the question of the resettlement of refugees and compensation that may be due to the parties or any of their nationals. Those are all matters about which the parties must confer and compromise between themselves, without advance commitments or limitations as to what they will or will not talk about with reference thereto.

I have changed section 4 so as to require the President to advise the Congress fully concerning any new uses as and when he approves them.

I have modified section 5 so as to provide that the resolution shall expire 2 years after its enactment unless extended by the Congress. This is a much safer way of handling the matter, than continuing the authority until such time as the Congress by concurrent resolution may terminate it. A fixed termination date will require the Congress to review the entire subject matter after the program has been in operation for a fair period of time.

Again, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for the courtesy of listening to me. If there are any questions you may care to address to me, I shall try to answer them.

(The resolution is as follows:)

"[H. J. Res. 166, 85th Cong., 1st sess, in the House of Representatives, January 16, 1957]

"Mr. MULTER introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs

"Joint resolution to confirm the authorization of the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independency

"Whereas a primary purpose of the United States in its relations with all other nations is to develop and sustain a just and enduring peace for all, in accordance with the will of God and the desire of mankind and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations; and

"Whereas the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered as long as international communism and the nations it controls seek, by threat of military action, use of economic pressure, internal subversion, or other means, to attempt to bring under their domination peoples now free and independent; and

"Whereas such danger now exists and has now been accentuated in the general area of the Middle East: Therefore be it

"*Resolved, etc.*, That the authority in the President, be and hereby is confirmed, to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East, as well as elsewhere, in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence.

"SEC. 2. The authority of the President is hereby confirmed to undertake, in the general area of the Middle East, military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance. Furthermore, he is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any such nation or group of nations against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism: *Provided*, That such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations and actions and recommendations of the United Nations; and, as specified in article 51 of the United Nations Charter, measures pursuant thereto shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

"SEC. 3. Neither economic nor military assistance shall be given to any country except and upon condition that it first agrees:

"(1) that it will not be an aggressor nation;

"(2) that it will not permit its citizens or residents to engage in acts of aggression, guerrilla or otherwise, or in raids and pillaging, or in causing injury, death, or damage to any of its neighbors;

"(3) that it will faithfully abide by and fulfill its international obligations and abide by the ethics and principles of international law, and will not discriminate on account of race or religion;

"(4) that it will negotiate in good faith, peace treaties with its neighbors; and

"(5) that it will not submit to domination by any foreign nation.

"SEC. 4. The President is hereby authorized, when he determines that such use is important to the security of the United States, to use for the purposes of this joint resolution, without regard to the provisions of any other law or regulation, not to exceed $200 million from any appropriations now available for carrying out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. This authorization is in addition to other existing authorizations with respect to the use of such appropriations.

"SEC. 5. The President shall within 30 days after his approval of any new use or allocation of funds hereunder report to the Congress his action.

"SEC. 6. This joint resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the nations in the general area of the Middle East are reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, but in any event 2 years after the enactment hereof, unless extended by joint resolution of the Congress."

Chairman GORDON. Mr. MULTER, I want to thank you for your strong and impressive statement. We will now begin the interrogation of both Congressman CELLER and Congressman MULTER. Mr. CELLER, I have just one question. On page 6 you suggest that

the United States impose an arms embargo on the Middle East. How would such an embargo be enforced?

Mr. CELLER. I think first a declaration must be made by the United States that it will act in concert with all nations not to supply any arms to any Middle East nation.

I don't want the situation to develop where Russia will keep sending arms to Egypt as she has and then we not send arms to Israel to set up a balance.

When there is a balance of arms, there is usually peace. How it shall be enforced, I would suggest that, first, the matter be presented to the United Nations in form of a resolution to be voted upon by all nations.

If, on the other hand, the United Nations fails to act expeditiously or is unable for any reason to act in that regard, then a Western embargo would be useless.

Chairman GORDON. Would you favor United States Armed Forces to be used to insure the territorial integrity of the nations of the Middle East as against each other?

Mr. CELLER. The United States has a tripartite agreement, effectuated, I think, in 1950, between France, Great Britain, and the United States. Mr. Dulles yesterday in his testimony said that as far as the United States is concerned that tripartite agreement is still in effect, although he indicated that France and Great Britain had felt it had been so chipped away as to be ineffectual.

If it is not effective, then I think a new agreement should be made with those nations and ourselves whereby we would guarantee the sovereignty of the borders of all these Middle East states.

Chairman GORDON. Thank you, Mr. CELLER. Mr. VORYS.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. CELLER, on page 5 of your statement you said:

"Yemen and Jordan, for example, are hardly viable states, dependent as they are upon foreign government subsidies."

Mr. CELLER. Will you repeat that, John? I did'nt get it.

Mr. VORYS. It is in the second paragraph. You say:

"Yemen and Jordan are hardly viable states, dependent as they are upon foreign government subsidies."

Israel is also a state that is dependent upon foreign government subsidies; isn't that correct?

Mr. CELLER. I wouldn't say that is quite correct. I would differentiate. It is true that American Jewry and world Jewry does contribute a great deal to Israel. I imagine that is what you have in mind.

Mr. VORYS. I have a report of a special study subcommittee from our Foreign Affairs Committee which says that the United States Government aid reached a high in aid to Israel of $72,800,000 in fiscal year 1953, that in 1955 it amounted to $54.5 million. That is Government aid. And of course the sale of bonds, and so forth, is in addition to that.

I heard on the radio this morning an estimate of way over $100 million that came from the United States. In any case, whether you call it subsidies or not, if it came from the United States Government and its citizens, Israel would not be a viable state without it; isn't that correct?

Mr. CELLER. I don't think that is correct. Israel has a tremendous potential. She is developing her technological, cultural, and economic frontiers.

Israel is receiving great numbers of new immigrants every year. She is keeping her doors open to the distressed wandering Jew who has been tossed about like dried leaves through the years. She is viable despite that. She gets this aid primarily to take care of those who are coming in. She needs that aid to keep those doors open.

If Israel closed her doors, I don't think she would have any trouble maintaining herself without governmental aid, without the aid that she gets from American Jewry, provided there is peace. If there is peace in that area, Israel would be able to balance her budget and bridge the difference between exports and imports. But those doors are kept open and for good reason. There is a constant stream of new seed immigration coming in. She must house them, clothe these people, feed them. She must receive them economically, provide jobs for them. That, of course, needs outside help. But Israel has tremendous potential.

Mr. VORYS. I thought you were not talking about potentials; I thought you were talking about viable states right at the present time. While apparently you disagree with my own view I think that in the same way that these other states are dependent upon outside support, Israel is not viable at the present time without outside support.

Mr. CELLER. I don't agree with you. I will make this distinction. I would say that Yemen and Jordan could not possibly exist without outside aid. Israel could exist. She would tighten her belt and she would maintain herself with tremendous sacrifices. Any one of you who have been there will realize she is willing to do this. In that sense I would say she is viable. She would have difficulty.

Mr. VORYS, I would say a portion of this money is being used to develop the arid areas in the south. She is a state with agricultural projects flourishing, industry advancing, and science harnessed for progress. You cannot compare Yemen and Jordan with Israel in speaking of nonviable states.

Mr. VORYS. On the same page you use the phrase, "American companies contributed totally to this figure." You don't consider that the payment of royalties, for oil that is sold for a profit, are a contribution in the sense that we think about subsidies or contributions in these other cases, do you?

Mr. CELLER. I didn't say they were the contributions to be looked upon as the same thing as subsidies from governments. But it indicates there are vast sums of money pouring into Saudi Arabia and in these other countries. What is happening to these moneys?

Mr. VORYS. You used the word "contributed." I am sure you didn't mean that it was anything except a payment that you would expect to make when you buy oil.

Mr. CELLER. That is right. As Mr. MULTER just said, it is like a gratuity from another state. I think this is the first time these figures have appeared. They are very important in your consideration.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, is it your purpose that we question Mr. MULTER at this time?

Chairman GORDON. Yes. You can question Mr. MULTER.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. A parliamentary inquiry. How much time is each member going to be given?

Chairman GORDON. Five minutes for each witness.

Mr. MORANO. Did you say 5 minutes for each witness?

Chairman GORDON. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS. I have only one question for Mr. MULTER. On page 3 of his statement he lists a lot of times when the United States has gone to war without any other country's consent, and then says:

"Mr. Dulles has not learned the lessons of history. He refuses to acknowledge that among the major mistakes we made in the past was standing idly by—"

and then gives a series of instances.

Mr. MULTER, do you mean by that "major mistake" business and "standing idly by" to conclude or infer that we should have gone to war with Japan in 1931, with Italy in 1935, with Germany in 1937, and Russia in 1946?

Mr. MULTER. If we didn't intend to live up to the principle that we urged be primary covenants in the setting up of the League of Nations, we should never have sponsored the League of Nations. We should never have urged the making of any of those covenants.

Mr. VORYS. We didn't enter the League of Nations. I thought we should have but we did not.

Mr. MULTER. You are correct on that. What I meant to say was that the same covenants or principles which we had enunciated and lived by all through our history and which we sought to have written into the covenants of the League of Nations would have required us to take firm and positive action in Manchuria——

Mr. VORYS. By "firm and positive action" you mean to fight?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. VORYS. Thank you. On page 2 you say that we ought to have reports from the CIA, the Joint Chiefs, and so forth. I, with members of this committee and other Members of Congress from both sides of the Capitol and both parties, was in the White House on August 12, October 9, and January 1, and I can assure you that we had such reports before us.

While you apparently have sources of knowledge of all of this which is not available to our Government, yet the Members of Congress received the reports that you refer to.

Mr. MULTER. May I respectfully suggest that this committee and the Members of the House and the Senate have as much availability to the sources of information as I have, both inside and outside the Government. I am sure that many of you have learned about all of the matters I referred to.

The statement I made before this committee on May 8, 1956, was not telling the committee anything it did not know and had not been able to get from official and unofficial sources that I had gotten, but it was a story that had not been publicly told and has since been ignored by the Secretary of State.

Mr. VORYS. I just wanted to let you know that the Members of Congress have had information of the type that you describe, although it is not the same information that you portray in your statement. Thank you very much.

Chairman GORDON. Dr. MORGAN.

Mr. MORGAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to commend the two distinguished gentlemen from New York and colleagues in the House for their very forceful statements. I am sure every member of this committee had listened to their statements and will find them very helpful in making their decision on this resolution.

Mr. CELLER, you feel the resolution should be divided into two parts, one on policy and the other on economic?

Mr. CELLER. Correct.

Mr. MORGAN. Do you feel the statement of policy in the Eisenhower resolution is strong enough?

Mr. CELLER. I think it is strong enough, but I would humbly suggest it be in the form of a concurrent resolution rather than a joint resolution.

Mr. MORGAN. You feel the resolution as written by the State Department would be a sufficient statement of policy?

Mr. CELLER. I do.

Mr. MORGAN. Do you feel that the economic aid mentioned in the Eisenhower resolution would be sufficient to do the job over there?

Mr. CELLER. Would do what?

Mr. MORGAN. Would be sufficient to do the job, the $200 million.

Mr. CELLER. I don't know what the job is to be done. I think we ought to find out from Mr. Dulles or some other responsible source exactly what the money is to be used for specifically, and why it is to be used for that purpose and whether there is a reasonable degree of success in the use of the money.

Mr. Richards, the very distinguished former chairman of your committee, is scheduled to go over. Why not wait until he comes back and makes his report? He is a

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

man of great astuteness. He will find out what the situation is. He will be sent over after the money is to be authorized. I want to find out where this money is going. I think the money should be used, if I may say at the threshold here, for regional development.

I mentioned, for example, the Johnson plan for irrigation, which was a very good plan. Everybody who had read it approved of it. The Arabs refused to accede to it because it might afford some help and benefit to Israel. Therefore, they rejected it. I would like to know more about plans for the use of the money. Is this plan envisaging a general irrigation and water plan for that area? Water is so desperately needed there by all these Arab nations, which would be of great benefit and make that area fructify like a rose.

I hope it would envisage a proposal such at that, but we don't know. I think we ought to be told what it is all about. I don't know.

It ought to be a simple matter for Mr. Richards when he comes back to tell us. It ought to be a simple matter for Mr. Dulles to outline. When closely questioned, Mr. Dulles departed from his original statement, which was a statement that he was impervious to giving any detailed information as to how the money was spent. Yesterday he said it would be used to make up certain deficits that these countries might experience. They may experience those deficits because they are unduly buying arms.

Are we going to make up deficits for the purchase of arms? Those arms might be purchased from Soviet Russia. I would like to know. We are just like blind men in a dark room looking for a black hat. That is my complaint. I don't object to the aid. I want to know what the aid is.

I don't object to the military matter. I think it is long overdue. I think it must be given. That is my position.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. CELLER, these figures that you incorporate in your statement as to the oil royalties, you said you got those from the State Department?

Mr. CELLER. Yes. They are very impressive figures.

Mr. MORGAN. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GORDON. Mrs. BOLTON.

Mrs. BOLTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you both for your statements. I really have no questions. However, I would like to say that I think anyone who has been to Israel knows the tremendous energy that is being poured out by the people of Israel to build their country. Just the terracing of the hills is very dramatic and very exciting in relation to the future. They are not just doing it for today. The figures on the terracing that they gave me when I was there a year ago were that it cost at least $200 an acre just to terrace, which was the preface to any possible planning.

I think the world at large will give great credit always to the zeal and the energy being expended by the Israeli people. I just want to add my word of recognition at this meeting. I really have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CELLER. I was in one of these settlements, a kibbutz, and said to a dweller there: "You have wonderful potatoes." They were large, solid potatoes. I asked him, "What do you mix in your soil?" He thought a minute and said, "Brains." That is the answer.

Mrs. BOLTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GORDON. Mr. CARNAHAN.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to express my appreciation to our two colleagues for their carefully prepared statements.

Mr. CELLER, in your opening sentence you say, "I wish to thank you for the opportunity this committee has given me to express my views on the so-called Eisenhower plan for the Middle East."

Is there any particular significance to the use of those words, "The so-called Eisenhower plan?"

Mr. CELLER. No.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I would like to ask your reaction to a statement attributed to Mr. Dulles. In the New York Times of this morning there is an article under the headline, "Dulles says planning averting a war." It is by William S. White. I would like to read the first short paragraph:

"WASHINGTON, January 15.—John Foster Dulles asserted today that the alternative to President Eisenhower's Middle Eastern program would be a 'very great likelihood' that United States troops would have to fight there."

Would you care to give your reaction to that statement?

Mr. CELLER. I think Mr. Dulles is using rather tall language. He was trying to bludgeon some of the Senators into accepting the plan in its entirety, including economic aid.

He was closely questioned yesterday on the reasonableness of his request for that economic aid. I think he used that language so as to force or frighten the Senators into accepting the whole program.

He said that unless the aid were given, together with the warning, that there would be a war, or there would be sending of troops. I don't think that is true. He probably used it as a result of the emotions that probably developed because of the very close questioning that was directed to him.

He was in a pretty tight spot at times before that very last group of intellectuals which comprise the Armed Services and the Foreign Relations Committee.

I don't wish to infer by that that this committee is not equally intellectual.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. MULTER, you have suggested a House joint resolution. We appreciate your suggestion. I wanted to ask: Have you introduced your resolution?

Mr. MULTER. No, sir; I have not. I will introduce it today.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Do you have any particular preference, apparently you must have, between a House joint resolution and a concurrent resolution?

Mr. MULTER. I followed the form as closely as I could as suggested by the Department. You will notice that I put a termination date in it. There has been talk about the resolution as sent up, that even though it is a House joint resolution it should have a termination provision, not only by proclamation of the President, but also a provision permitting termination by concurrent resolution.

I put in a fixed termination date, 2 years after its enactment. I do that for the sole purpose of requiring the entire matter to come before the Congress again for review.

Mr. CARNAHAN. You are also stating in your resolution that we are merely confirming the powers the President already has?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. CARNAHAN. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GORDON. Mr. MERROW.

Mr. MERROW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. CELLER and Mr. MULTER, I want to join with my colleagues in saying that we are very happy to have you with us this morning and appreciate your coming before the committee to give us the benefit of your views.

Mr. Celler, you have stated that the program or the resolution before us is just a beginning, and also indicated that you are in favor of the military warning, and on page 7 have listed the various things which the resolution does not provide for.

Am I right in inferring that you are in favor of this resolution even though you think perhaps it doesn't go far enough?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct. I hope you will recite very strongly in your report something of those items that I refer to.

Mr. MERROW. One thing more. On page 4 you spoke about the United Nations and said, "Small wonder the New Yorker calls the United Nations the 'United Notions.'"

Do you mean to be extremely critical of the United Nations or may I put it this way: Don't you thing that the United Nations has made a great contribution to the solving of some of our problems?

Mr. CELLER. It has done what you say. It may have in some respects, but it has dwindled more or less into a debating society as we know it now because of the inherent defect involved in the Soviet veto.

We are probably as much to blame for demanding the veto as the Soviets, because I don't think we could have gotten it through the United States Senate without that veto. I stress the fact that in addition to the veto we have now the development, probably after those good things were done by the United Nations, the development of the Asian-Afro-Communist bloc, which can work its will any way it wishes and render abortive anything that we may want to do.

Unfortunately we were in bed with those nations when we offered and abetted the resolution of condemnation against Britain and France and Israel, which I think was an egregious blunder and historians will mark it as such.

Of course, the United Nations has done a lot of good, but it can't be used to solve all problems. These are some of the problems that can't be solved. For example, how can you say it can solve the Israeli-Arab problem when we had a solemn resolution passed by the United Nations as to Egypt on shipping. Nothing happened. Nasser just thumbed his nose at the United Nations resolution. Did naught concerning it. I can't say that is much of a success.

I repeat it can do great things, but it can't solve everything.

Mr. MERROW. I agree it can't solve everything. Don't you think its prestige has been increased in recent months by the turning of the United States to the United Nations and working through the United Nations?

Mr. CELLER. No; it has not. Its prestige has been decreased, not because of the United States attitude, but because of the inherent difficulties that grow out of its rules and regulations.

There is proof positive. For example, it has recommended sanctions against, in the debates at least, Britain and France because of its action in reference vis-a-vis the Suez after it passed a resolution of condemnation branding those countries as an aggressor. It branded Russia an aggressor against Hungary. The United Nations assumes a double standard. Russia with no sanctions although it is an aggressor. Britain and France and Israel sanctions although it is an aggressor. In that sense the United Nations has shown a real weakness.

Mr. MERROW. But it does seem to me, and probably you wouldn't agree, that the marshaling of opinion in the General Assembly does have some effect throughout the world; and although it may not be able to enforce everything it decides, in fact it does marshal public opinion more so perhaps now than in the past, and with the support of the resolutions that the United States has presented is of great value.

Mr. CELLER. We have yet to see the results of our forceful support of the United Nations. Up to this point I don't think it has been greatly successful in solving all problems. I repeat it can solve numbers of problems. But there are some problems that it can never solve. Witness the fact that we ourselves don't have all faith and confidence, total faith and confidence. We make these separate arrangements. We have made all kinds of pacts, SEATO, NATO. I don't know how many there are outside the United Nations. We have done that ourselves, which is indicative that we don't place total confidence in the United Nations to solve all of the world's problems.

Mr. MERROW. You would agree we should work through it as much as we can?

Mr. CELLER. Of course I do.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. MULTER, on the first page of your statement——

Mr. CELLER. May I just say something else. This very plan, this Eisenhower doctrine itself is outside the United Nations. It is a unilateral action, isn't it?

Mr. MERROW. Well, the resolution provides that the action shall be consonant with the United Nations. As a matter of fact, the resolution states—

"*Provided*, That such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations and actions and recommendations of the United Nations."

I have no quarrel with a plan that operates outside of the United Nations when the security of the country is at stake.

Mr. CELLER. Then you do agree that all these problems cannot be solved by the United Nations?

Mr. MERROW. I don't think all problems can be solved, but I thought it had increased a good deal in its prestige and power, and I hoped that would be the pattern of the future.

Mr. CELLER. I don't think there is any difference between us; it is only a matter of degree. I am sorry I interrupted.

Mr. MERROW. Thank you, Mr. CELLER. On the first page of your statement, Mr. MULTER, you state—

"In approaching this problem, we cannot overlook the fact that under our Constitution the burden, the responsibility, and the leadership in making foreign policy is, in the first instance, upon our President—"

with which I think we agree.

Then you went on to say, "If he has failed us in that respect, if indeed as many have claimed," and so on. Do I infer from that statement that you feel the President has failed to exercise his constitutional powers in giving leadership?

Mr. MULTER. I do, sir, in this very area. I say that if he had entered into security pacts with the State of Israel or directed his Secretary of State to negotiate a security pact with the State of Israel and security pacts with the Arab nations that would have taken them, we wouldn't have this difficulty.

Mr. MERROW. Don't you think he exercised leadership in going to the Congress and asking for the passage of a resolution to put into effect the policies that he advocates in reference to the Middle East?

Mr. MULTER. You mean this resolution?

Mr. MERROW. Yes.

Mr. MULTER. That is not leadership. He has the power to do those things. He should have done them affirmatively. I am sure the Congress would back him up. He doesn't need this authorization to do this from the Congress.

Mr. MERROW. For the sake of argument, and we agree that he has the power, doesn't that put us in a much better position before the world, to have the Congress backing the Executive in the statement of United States policy?

Mr. MULTER. Unfortunately the atmosphere is being created in foreign circles that unless the Congress approves this resolution that we will be differing with our President on these matters of principle. I say that it is unfortunate that that impression is being created.

Of course, we are going to back our President when he is right. On matters of principle as he enunciated here, he is right and we will back him. We will have to indicate to the world that there is unanimity of opinion between the President and Congress on these important matters of high principle.

I say again, just as in the past, many Presidents have acted on matters of foreign policy and come to us and said, to all the world, "Here is our policy and here is what we are going to do." He could have done the same thing.

Mr. MERROW. He asked for power in the Far East, which we passed with an overwhelming vote. That, it seems to me, was the exercise of great leadership. Though, there may be a difference of opinion, it would seem to me it was the exercise of great leadership, even though he has the power, to come to Congress and ask the Congress to go along with him, so that in the eyes of the world the executive and the legislative branches are together.

Mr. MULTER. May I remind you, sir, on that occasion, too, there were many of us who agreed that he didn't need to go to the Congress to back him up at that time. Then, too, we were put in a position that if we didn't give him the resolution somebody might interpret it abroad that we were disagreeing with him and that we were not unified.

The Congress was assured that that action would not be taken as a precedent for a President coming to the Congress again in the future under similar circumstances and saying, "Authorize me to do that which I have the authority to do," and now that very instance is being given to us as a precedent for repeating the action today.

Mr. MERROW. Don't you think that had great psychological effect?

Mr. MULTER. I don't think so. I think it would have been stronger if in each instance the President had enunciated the policy of this Government and said, "Here it is, Mr. Communist," and I am sure that every Member in the House and Senate would have risen to his feet and applauded, instead of going through this procedure of passing a resolution that we were behind our President. Not only the Congress but the people of our country would indicate approval.

Mr. MERROW. On page 3, Mr. MULTER, where you criticized our action in reference to Hungary, I would like to ask if you would just comment on that. Do you feel we ought to have gone to war over the Hungarian situation?

Mr. MULTER. If we didn't go to war, the least we should have done was to supply those people with the arms to fight the Communists. Even if that is an act of war, we owe it to the Hungarian people to give them the wherewithal to fight the tyrants and dictators. That is how this country came into being. We should help every other freedom-loving people to do the same thing. We did just that for Russia when fighting Hitler, before we got into World War II.

Mr. MERROW. You feel we should have gone certainly much farther than we did?

Mr. MULTER. Yes; and I say the major part of the responsibility rests upon us, the Government of the United States, in getting those people to rebel.

It is all right to say that Radio Free Europe is a private institution and that what they said was not American doctrine nor said for American officialdom. Everything they said was attributed by those people to our United States Government; just as everything that comes out of the Voice of America is attributed to the United States Government; everything that comes out of the USIS is attributed to us.

If we don't want Americans going abroad stirring these people up, we ought to tell them so and keep them at home. Just as the American University in Beirut is no more an American University than any other private university in this country. There isn't a man abroad who doesn't say the American University is a United States institution. There are Americans as trustees running it but it is not under our Government's control. They don't draw a distinction between the American University in Beirut and any other American institution.

Chairman GORDON. Your time is up, Mr. Merrow.

Mr. MERROW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GORDON. Mrs. KELLY.

Mrs. KELLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to compliment both of my very able colleagues from New York for their forthright and factual statements.

I would like to ask both if you believe that this resolution should be in the form of a joint resolution? I notice Mr. MULTER's own proposal is in such form. Do both of you agree that this should be a joint resolution?

Mr. MULTER. For myself, I am more concerned with the principle and substance than the form. I don't think it matters too much whether it is going to be a joint resolution, which will then be signed by the President, or a concurrent resolution giving him what he has asked for, provided the Congress retains the right to review this program.

I say the Congress should impose the duty upon itself to review this program by putting in a fixed limitation as to how long the resolution will run.

Mrs. KELLY. Then you do not think the measure before us is strong enough?

Mr. MULTER. It is stronger in that before it becomes effective it requires the signature of the President and has the force of a statute.

So far as the form is concerned, whether we pass a concurrent resolution or a joint resolution, the world will understand what we have done here once we have done it.

Mr. CELLER. I believe that it would be preferable to have a concurrent resolution. I will accept the joint resolution, but I feel a concurrent resolution would make it more or less the sense of the Congress. It might jeopardize or have the effect of jeopardizing the powers of the President.

I think the President has most of these powers that you have recited in this matter of military warning. I don't think it is necessary, therefore, to rise to the height of a joint resolution, which must be signed by the President.

I think also there may be a little danger in a joint resolution in the sense that foreign nations will think the President hasn't such power unless he gets that power from Congress by way of a joint resolution. Unless there is a joint resolution forthcoming, they may get the impression that the President hasn't such a power. He has the power. We simply reaffirm it by a concurrent resolution.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. CELLER, you stated that you believe that the provision for a request for aid by a nation should be eliminated.

Mr. MULTER. That was my suggestion.

Mrs. KELLY. My question would be to Mr. CELLER. You agree with Mr. MULTER, that requested aid——

Mr. CELLER. I am willing to accede to the superior judgment of my colleague.

Mrs. KELLY. Have either of you any idea, I know Mr. MULTER used the term "we," who will decide when a country is Soviet dominated?

Mr. MULTER. I meant the United States acting through its President.

Mrs. KELLY. Do you agree with that, Mr. CELLER?

Mr. CELLER. Yes; I agree with that.

Mrs. KELLY. On page 3, Mr. MULTER, you refer to the fact that Hitler was appeased. I presume that is the time in history of Chamberlain at Munich?

Mr. MULTER. Munich is the outstanding example of appeasement of Hitler.

Mrs. KELLY. That being the case, the onus of Munich on Mr. Chamberlain should possibly be removed at this point in history since we have condemned the action of Mr. Eden in moving in.

Mr. MULTER. I think rather than getting into the question of who should be condemned and who is right and who is wrong,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

let's learn the lessons of history and move forward from this point and not repeat those mistakes.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Would you yield to me at that point?

Mrs. KELLY. Yes.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I can agree with that. We have heard a lot of sanctimonious approbation from the other side of the aisle about "Let's not get into recriminations about who got us into this mess." But insurance companies do not, after a driver has a dozen wrecks in a row, give a person money to buy a dozen Cadillacs. They take away his insurance, and usually revoke his driver's license; and I think that would be a good thing to do with our Secretary of State.

Mr. MULTER. May I say that we in this House have no say about that. The recommendations coming from our side of the aisle wouldn't be taken on that matter.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. We don't have to buy the Cadillacs.

Mrs. KELLY. Do you believe from this resolution it is definite that the United States is going it alone in this area?

Mr. CELLER. I think at times it is necessary for the United States to act alone. Just as I believe it was essential for France and Britain to act without the United States, because they met with considerable rebuffs from our Secretary of State and they acted alone.

We condemned Britain and France for acting more or less alone when we seek to act alone here. I think sometimes it is necessary to act alone.

Certainly, for example, as Mr. MULTER put it, if somebody interfered with the operation of the Panama Canal, we certainly wouldn't wait for any cooperative action but would act immediately. There are occasions when we must act alone.

Mrs. KELLY. Do you believe that we should pay for the clearing of the Suez Canal without guaranties from Egypt that this should be an international canal?

Mr. CELLER. Forgive me. I didn't quite hear that.

Mrs. KELLY. We are to pay, have agreed, have guaranteed we will pay for the clearing of the Suez Canal. Do you believe we should do this without——

Mr. CELLER. We are facing a fait accompli. It is busted up. It is blocked with ships. I think it is essential for our own self-interest to get that canal cleared.

France and Britain and the others haven't the wherewithal to defray all the expenses. We should help. I think it is incumbent upon us to help pay those expenses. It is unfortunate. I think, however, as I set forth in my statement, we should not do all this unless we have some reasonable assurance that Mr. Nasser, who is a sort of megalomaniac, suffering delusions of grandeur that he will become a modern Pharaoh, will leave it open to all shipping without interference. We haven't those assurances.

Chairman GORDON. Your time is up. It is 12:30. We will recess until 2:30 this afternoon, at which time we will continue the hearing.

Mr. CELLER. Do you want us to return?

Chairman GORDON. Yes. We would like to have you back this afternoon at 2:30 in order that we may finish the questioning.

We will have as our first witness Mr. ROOSEVELT, who is patiently waiting. We will start with him.

Mr. CELLER. Is it possible for me to be excused? I have a conference with my counterpart on the Republican side, Mr. KEATING, concerning the appointment of committees.

Chairman GORDON. I can't interfere, Mr. CELLER.

Mr. FULTON. Could we add in the record that we thank you for coming and that I personally was interested in your presentation of your views.

(Whereupon, at 12:33 the committee recessed, to reconvene at 2:30 p. m.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(The committee reconvened at 2:30 p. m. in room 1301, New House Office Building, Hon. THOMAS S. GORDON (chairman) presiding.)

Chairman GORDON. The committee will be in order.

Our next witness is Mr. JAMES ROOSEVELT, a Member of Congress from California.

As the able son of our great President, Mr. ROOSEVELT needs no introduction.

Mr. ROOSEVELT, I am indeed happy to welcome you to be with us this afternoon and shall be very glad to have the benefit of your views on the pending Middle East situation.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

When do the rest of us, who did not get a chance this morning, get to question the previous witnesses?

Chairman GORDON. Mr. ROOSEVELT will make his statement and we will go back to Mr. MULTER to proceed with the questioning. Mr. ROOSEVELT, you may proceed with your statement.

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank my colleagues very much for giving me this opportunity to go ahead at this time.

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the committee, in coming before you and the members of this great committee, I come only because of my deep conviction that the subject matter of the resolution you are considering deeply affects every American that we as Congressmen represent. Each of us individually will have to report and explain our vote on this resolution in its final form. It may well be the most important vote that any of us will be called upon to cast in the 85th Congress.

It seemed, therefore, that it was my responsibility to raise certain questions before this committee and to ask that certain matters be clarified, both in the presentation of the report of the committee and in explanation on the floor.

First, let me repeat what has been said by others. Is there here a serious and important constitutional question?

Stripped of its frills, divorced from the somewhat tortuous explanations of Secretary of State Dulles, this resolution in the form requested by President Eisenhower boils down to an undated congressional declaration of war to become effective at a date chosen, not by Congress, but by the President, not against a nation named by Congress, but one named by the President and under circumstances not judged by the Congress, but judged solely by the President. In other words, Congress is being asked to abrogate its constitutional function. To justify this serious step, if indeed it can be justified, there must have been made a clear case of great emergency.

To the contrary, Mr. Dulles, in a statement before a joint committee of the other body, indicated only a threat of infiltration and subversion, rather than overt aggression. This threat may very well be, as Secretary Dulles said, the gravest we have faced in 10 years. So far as the American people have been told, and so far as this Member of Congress has been told, the threat on January 15, 1957, is no graver than it was last October.

There may be urgency for military action. If so, the resolution requested does not even itself so indicate, for its language is not the language of a resolution designed to cope with an immediate situation. As described by the President, we shall use armed forces if Soviet Russia, or if a nation dominated by Soviet Russia, attacks a nation in the Middle East, and if that nation in turn requests assistance.

That, to inherit a phrase, is too "iffy."

Whatever it is, it is not a forthright declaration; a declaration suggesting fast, emergency action.

If such an emergency should govern us, then it is up to the administration either to tell us, or to act to meet the emergency. Neither course has been followed.

History records many instances where Presidents have used troops, either to fight or to occupy territory, to protect what was considered the vital interest of the United States, without first coming to Congress to seek a conditional declaration of war.

President Truman, who thinks Congress should adopt this resolution, did not come to Congress and request a resolution when the Communists invaded South Korea. Even before the United Nations acted, Mr. Truman ordered naval and air units in the area to help the South Koreans because he believed the vital interests of the United States were threatened, and he justified it because he had the constitutional powers to do so, in his opinion.

To carry out that policy, and to meet our commitments to the United Nations, Mr. Truman came to Congress many times for authority and money in connection with the rearmament program.

President Roosevelt issued orders to the Navy to shoot to kill, and he sent troops to Iceland without coming to Congress, because he felt such action was necessary to protect United States interests in the face of unrestricted U-boat warfare in the Atlantic.

As a result of these and other actions he, of course, had to come to Congress for money and authorizations. Congress generally then ratified what he had done, although one issue of ratification—the draft extension—passed by but one vote.

The Eisenhower administration itself a few years ago was thinking out loud of using troops in Indochina. The President said "No" but had he said "Yes" at Denver there was no indication he would have come to Congress.

If we have a serious and emergency threat in the Middle East now—and I do not say we do not have—or if one develops at some later date the President can and should act immediately. In the absence of proof of immediate emergency at this time, we must assume no urgency is attached to this declaration of war.

Does not the President himself, in the very body of his message to us, indicate the possibility, and to my mind, the desirability of maintaining the constitutional prerogatives of both the executive and legislative. The President stated to us:

"If, contrary to my hope and expectation, a situation arose which called for the military application of the policy which I ask the Congress to join me in proclaiming, I would of course maintain hour-by-hour contact with the Congress if it were in session. And if the Congress were not in session, and if the situation had grave implications, I would, of course, at once call the Congress into special session."

The words speak for themselves.

We will be consulted, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, after the act has been done and not before. We are now asked to simply again write a blank check although we will be graciously told about it after the check has been used.

And I should like to respectfully suggest that if this committee has facts to justify such a far-reaching proposal, then it should present these facts to the membership of the House—and the American people.

There are other aspects to the military side of this so-called Eisenhower doctrine, quite apart from the fundamental question of necessity.

An important aspect is our ability to fulfill these blanket commitments. If we can't—and there is reason to question our ability—then this becomes nothing but another gigantic bluff, something we cannot afford. If we can afford to add to our existing commitments, which certainly are pretty wide, I think we need more specific information from our military forces to satisfy the many questions of responsible Congressmen.

The avowed purpose of the administration's military policy, we have been told, is to maintain a force that would not concern itself with "brush fires," but would lay back and wait for the big one.

Now it is suggested that we may have to fight a number of brush fires, and presumably, we are not equipped to do so, unless we borrow from the forces earmarked for the "big one." Have we cut too deeply to be able to fight a series of brush fires, or will we cut into our forces earmarked for the "big one," and then leave our homeland to the mercy of the enemy? The American people are vitally interested and have a great stake in the answers to these questions.

Serious doubts also exist as to the use our military aid may be put to in the Middle East. I wonder whether the nations to whom we give such aid will be able to use it, and if they can, will they use it to repel Communist aggression alone or to attempt to destroy Israel, the one democratic oasis in the entire area? If so, we are playing directly into the hands of the Communists who depend upon the age-old rivalries to so weaken the area that it can be added to the Kremlin orbit with ease.

The published and spoken words of Colonel Nasser and many other governments of the Middle East, including some of those within the orbit of the Baghdad Pact, have repeatedly declared that their primary aim, now and always, would be to drive the people of Israel into the Mediterranean Sea. I cannot believe that the American people would want to contribute in the slightest manner to such a possible catastrophe. Indeed, I believe they realize the importance to our own country and to the principles of freedom everywhere that Israel should be protected from aggression and encouraged to contribute her already proven ability to raise the standard of living of all the peoples of the Middle East.

There is ample reason to wonder, too, whether the governments of the Middle East can make most effective use of modern weapons that we would be shipping there. Egypt had received a number of deliveries of arms from the Communists when the Suez crisis erupted last fall. We all know how easily they were captured by Israeli forces. I believe some of you are familiar with the well-known story told immediately after this happened when somebody said that Colonel Nasser called up the Kremlin to ask if he could now be replenished with another set of arms and the Kremlin was supposed to have said to him if Mr. Ben-Gurion wanted more arms he could call him direct on the phone and, of course, I think that is very obvious from what happened there.

Are we to allow American arms to fall as easily to Russian domination?

If there is ground for doubting the urgency of the military aspect of the Eisenhower doctrine, there is extremely little justification for speed on the economic side, although, in my opinion, economic aid is the greatest tool we have to build a just peace, not only in the Middle East but throughout the world.

President Eisenhower has already informed us that he will need no additional funds for the current fiscal year. For the 2 subsequent fiscal years he asks for the modest sum of $400 million. This can be studied later; it can be a part of our regular foreign aid bill.

But we have been asked now, as an emergency proposition, to grant a blank check, again, beyond June 30. Considerable clarification is required. We should know where the money shall be spent, and in what manner. We should be advised what the individual nations of the area want and perhaps, above all, can use. I suggest no more than an extension of the "partnership" philosophy into the field of foreign development.

As of now, we in the Congress are completely in the dark. There has been no official indication of how this economic assistance is to be used.

We have had some speculation that we shall take over the $35 million payments Britain once made to Jordan. There have been vague mentions of the Jordan River development, and some vague press speculation about Aswan Dam again, in Egypt, as well as developments down in the Euphrates area—and our off-again-on-again tactics in connection with this project contributed a great deal to the current sad state of affairs in the area.

These might be very wonderful projects. Certainly, the harvesting of the Jordan probably could make a tremendous impact on the economy of the area. However, we all agree that it alone can never go forward until the Arab States and Israel settle all their main problems. This, as the President noted, is not even in the slightest way affected by this resolution.

Until those problems are settled, there is little hope that local interest will jell, insofar as a Jordan Valley Authority is concerned, because more than one nation is involved. We in the West are more than familiar with the age-old struggle for the waterhole. In southern California we have recently lost a struggle where water was the central issue, and we in the Congress can appreciate the forces that make it so difficult for two areas to reach agreement on division of the benefits.

It has been suggested that Congress has no alternative but to go along with the President. We do have an alternative. We can—and I think we should—go to the United Nations and encourage the formation of an adequate security force to handle overt aggression anywhere in the world, and especially where they are in essence brush fires, and specifically Communist aggression in the Middle East. A congressional expression of opinion might be of tremendous value in promoting such a force.

Once such a force is established we should support it, and provide some of the manpower. One of the weaknesses of the United Nations intervention in Suez today was that the Secretary General raised an army without help from us, and in his dealings with Nasser the Egyptians acted in the light of a promise by President Eisenhower that our troops would not be involved. Yet, today, strangely, it is suggested we go it alone in that area.

At the same time we should encourage the various United Nations programs—those in existence as well as proposed—for economic development. Our aid should and must be worked out as part of a joint United Nations program, even though we administer it ourselves.

Neither the additional drive we would then develop through the United Nations, nor our own participation, necessarily, should infringe upon our right to make our own foreign policy, nor to deploy our military forces where national interests require them. But to the greatest extent we should use the United Nations to help us carry out our own policy. And, Mr. Chairman, I submit that this is not properly spelled out in the resolution which has been proposed to this committee.

Now if the United Nations security forces are inadequate to halt aggression, there is no reason why the United States should not fill the gap in the Middle East or any other area vital to us. But with our full cooperation we increase the chances for the success of a United Nations security force, which is, it seems to me, the one hope around which can be built the hope for eventual worldwide disarmament.

Similarly, in the case of economic development. If assistance is not forthcoming from the United Nations—or if it is blocked by the Soviet group—then the world shall know where responsibility lies. We can stand ready to fill that gap also.

I insist, we need a reaffirmation of the position Congress has held traditionally. The President makes foreign policy. The Congress implements that policy. If we disagree, we do not implement. We can and should resolve; we should not—and I hope will not—legislate in the field our Constitution says belongs to the responsibility of the President.

A decade ago the foreign policy of this country took an affirmative course in opposing Communist expansion, either by military aggression or by political and economic infiltration. In fact, the very area of our concern now, the Middle East, was a major factor in acceptance of the Truman doctrine, and its implementation by voting assistance to Greece and Turkey.

President Truman, by his deeds in Korea, proclaimed that United States policy included armed intervention, if necessary, to halt Communist aggression. Congress implemented that decision time after time.

This is a new Congress. And I would like, at this point, to insert in my prepared text that it seems to me very important to recognize the difference between a concurrent resolution and a joint resolution. A concurrent resolution is an affirmation of policy by the Congress, and it seems to me would fit properly into what I have been talking about here; whereas the joint declaration is very clearly writing substantive law, and having the Congress invade the President's prerogative. An expression, reaffirming the traditional position of previous Congresses and previous Presidents, may be of value, as well as reaffirming what we know to be the President's powers. The need for such an expression indicates that our traditional opposition to Communist expansion and aggression has been weakened in the most recent past. In fact, it points up the inherent weakness of a policy of drifting and dreaming.

If such a declaration by the Congress is needed to let the world know that this time the administration means it, it should not be in a form so broad, so endless, nor so servile as the President has requested. It should be stated in the time-tested fashion of American policy. Its force will be as strongly deterrent to irresponsible Soviet Russian action and it will encourage, not discourage, those new partners we so earnestly seek in the fight for freedom if they are sincere and trustworthy.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, may I just add that I think the committee has been doing a tremendous service in examining so carefully into this really historic undertaking.

I thank you, sir.

Chairman GORDON. Thank you very much, Mr. ROOSEVELT, for your fine and interesting presentation. I am indeed happy to have the benefit of your comments and judgments on the pending Middle East resolution.

We will now proceed with our witness of this morning, Congressman MULTER. Our next Member to ask questions, I believe, is Mr. FULTON. Mrs. KELLY finished this morning, and it is with you, Mr. FULTON.

Mr. FULTON. I want to congratulate my good friends, Congressman MULTER and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Congressman ROOSEVELT on their fine statements, as well as Congressman CELLER, who appeared this morning. It is direct statements such as these which give us the different points of view, and give us the impact of the various sections of the resolution that we should look into.

I do feel that, as you three men are personally very much interested in this Middle East section, we should have your views, because they come from places as far apart as California and New York.

I would like to ask each of you whether you feel that House Joint Resolution 117 is properly couched when there is provision for going through United Nations procedures, first. Do you think that is a gain, or do you think that is a defect? From what you have said of the United Nations actions, I wondered whether at a particular point it might not be a retarding circumstance or condition, in your opinion. If you would like to comment, I would like to hear it shortly.

Mr. MULTER. Well, my own opinion, sir, in that connection is that when emergencies of this kind come upon us, we cannot wait for the United Nations to talk about it until ready to decide what to do. We must be there first. We have to get in and act and hope that their judgment will coincide with what this country thinks, and that they will approve of our actions.

Mr. FULTON. The United States has that power already, under our mutual assistance agreements, as we act bilaterally with a particular country. Under article 51 of the United Nations Charter, we likewise can have collective actions as a regional group for mutual self-defense without first clearing it with other member nations.

Mr. MULTER. It is with that in mind that I have been urging through the years, security pacts with each of the nations in this area.

Mr. FULTON. You would strongly, as I do, recommend that we have a mutual assistance pact, both military and economic, with the State of Israel?

Mr. MULTER. With all of the states in that area. With all who will enter into them. As I said this morning, the state that will not enter into a pact such as that, with us, labels itself a potential aggressor.

Mr. FULTON. Then the United States should go individually to each of the states in this Middle East area, rather than try to make a collective defense pact such as the Rio Pact or Southeast Asia Pact, or even entering into the Baghdad Pact.

Mr. MULTER. Theoretically, the regional pact is by far the better thing to do but we must be realists about this and face the situation as it is. It is impossible to get the Arabs and the Israelis to sit down across the table and talk about their own immediate troubles. Surely we are not going to get the Arabs and the Israelis to join into one single pact. I would love to see it done, but I think the realistic method is to approach them separately and get separate pacts with each nation individually.

Mr. FULTON. Do you think that if the President of the United States would request that these nations in this area come to a conference prior to action under this resolution that we are speaking of, it would help? A Mid-East conference under our United States sponsorship where we try to get all these countries to put their representatives around a table to discuss regional development; do you think that would help?

Mr. MULTER. Yes; I do. In December 1955, I brought back from Arab leaders the information that if the United States took the firm position and moved forward in that direction and said, "We must have these pacts, we must have peace here, and we insist that this be done, that you sit down and talk about these things and enter into proper treaties and pacts," the Arabs would have fallen in line and done it. I reported that to the high officials of our Government and nothing was done along that line. It is not yet too late.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would thoroughly agree with both Mr. MULTER and your own comments, but I would want to stress again that I believe the Secretary of State testified before this committee that the urgency of this immediately is not in the light of armed intervention that is contemplated or feared even at this time, and that, therefore, certainly our every effort should be made at the present time to avert the necessity of our ever having to act alone. What I am afraid of is that, unless we harden more specifically to existing avenues of prevention such as the United Nations armed force in the area, that we tend to discourage these deterrents and we emphasize that the only deterrent is unilateral action by the United States.

Mr. FULTON. As you realize, House Joint Resolution 117 does not affect a situation where there is not overt armed aggression and, of course, it does not affect the situation where the particular country acted against does not request us to act. So that where there is the major premise that you speak of, where there might be internal subversion by a Communist force taking over a government by peaceful means, this resolution has no effect whatever. Would you agree the way is clear for our American policy to act, independent of this resolution, in those areas?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think it is absolutely clear as of today, and I think what we need to do now is to perhaps reaffirm that the President has these powers, that the Congress would expect him to use them and that, however, we hope they never will be used because we feel we should redouble our efforts to build through the United Nations a system which would make it unnecessary for us to ever have to use that force.

Mr. FULTON. In closing, would you gentlemen favor using the term Mid-East, which I have suggested, instead of Middle East. The term Middle East is a British term and I believe it better if we coined our own American phrase for the area. I would like to put in an amendment to supply $100 million for Austria—for the Hungarian refugees, to take care of them. I understand Austria can't afford the expense any more. Likewise, I would recommend $20 million for the refugees in this area caused by the Egyptian crisis. Would you agree to something of that kind, expanding this resolution?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would not want to pass judgment on that. That would be up to the committee. I would certainly welcome it. I would also welcome an affirmation of appreciation on the part of this country of the tremendous job that Austria has done, when we think that she undertook the load, has had the load to carry, and compared to her resources, it seems to me, has accomplished almost a miracle.

Mr. FULTON. Thank you. I agree with you in many respects.

Mr. MULTER. For myself, Mr. FULTON, in answer to that question which I think you addressed to both of us, I think it would be an extremely bad thing to take a resolution of this kind and ignore the Hungarian situation. If you could add something to it which would show our interest and our determination to help that situation, it would strengthen rather than weaken this resolution.

Mr. FULTON. We might refer to the refugees in Austria and the Egyptian-Israeli area.

Chairman GORDON. Mr. HAYS of Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My congratulations to both of these gentlemen and also to Mr. CELLER for their statements. I think, taken together, they have contributed a great deal to pinpointing what most charitably you can term the neglect of this situation by the State Department in the period immediately after the 6th of November and perhaps at worst you could call it criminal negligence.

Now, Mr. Dulles said over on the Senate side in open session that he proposes to use some of this money that he wants from this resolution as direct budgetary payments to the Arab governments, and he mentions two specifically, Egypt and Syria, which are suffering because of the closure of the Suez Canal and the blowing up of the pipeline.

Direct budgetary payments means, of course, that we give them a cash grant to make up any lack of cash that they may have in their own treasuries.

Do you think it is conceivable then and probable and possible that we could be contributing money which Mr. Nasser could use then to pay Soviet Russia for arms and with which Syria could pay Russia for arms they are getting?

Mr. MULTER. I do not know that we would deliberately contribute money for them to pay for the arms they are getting, but we would certainly help them bolster their defense budget, and if they did not use the money we gave them for that purpose, by using that for bolstering their economy, that releases other money for their treasury to put into the defense fund.

Now you can be sure that the last Egyptianization of all industry, banks, insurance companies, and private industry in Egypt is just another word for nationalization. They will take those funds, dump them into the Egyptian treasury and use them for offense.

I do not think anybody will argue that the arms and munitions dumps that were built in the last 2 years in Egypt were needed for the defense of Egypt. They were specifically intended for offensive purposes. Now that that has been destroyed or taken from them, we certainly ought not to help them rebuild for offense.

That is why I say no matter which of the countries in this area are to be helped, in a resolution like this, you should write into the resolution very specific restrictions and limitations and at least, if nothing else, get the written signed commitment from these countries that they will not be aggressors and that they intend to live in peace with their neighbors.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I think we can agree on the terminology here: If our money were not used directly in payment to Russia, then it would be used to replace money that had been and the substance would be about the same, would it not?

Mr. MULTER. Yes; I agree with that.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. And, if I may add to that, Mr. HAYS, is it not also true that that would be very probably true about some of the arms we would ship to them? Would it not simply mean that instead of having to get them from the Communists they would get them from us?

In the last Congress we were assured over and over again that the American arms that were being shipped to Iraq were only arms that were going to be used in the internal security, for the police force of the area. Only about a week ago there appeared a picture of those arms in the newspapers in the United States. What were they? 155 millimeter cannon and very large tanks were certainly things that could not be used for internal police security. I, for one, just do not trust the people we are sending them to, and, secondly, I do not think we have the ability to control where the money would be spent or what the arms would be used for.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I have another question. Do either of you know of any democracy in the countries of the Near East, excluding the Baghdad Pact area, except perhaps in Lebanon and Israel? Do you know of any other country there that we could call a democracy, or, to get away from semantics, a re-

public, or anything that we commonly consider popular government?

Mr. MULTER. I know of no other there, sir, that in actual practice is a democracy. They went through a form of election in Egypt of electing Nasser president, but it was just form.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. You had two choices. You could vote for Nasser or you did not vote for anybody.

Mr. MULTER. It was like the Communist form of voting "da" (yes) or go to jail.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Having established that fact—and I doubt that anyone would care to argue that it is not a fact—I am asking this for my own information. If you do not have the information—and you very well may not—I would like the staff or someone to try to get it. I would like to know the per capita income from outside sources for Israel and for Saudi Arabia, for instance. There has been a good deal of talk here, and it might be well to get the income from outside sources for Lebanon, too, and Israel, getting money from outside sources.

Saudi Arabia got the sum of $186 million from oil royalties. That is money that came in from the outside. I would guess that that is a greater per capita income than any other country in the Near East has. And yet the condition of the population of Saudi Arabia, except the King and his immediate family, is probably the worst of any country in the Near East. You might exclude from that the employees of the Aramco Co., who are a great minority of the population.

Do you not think it significant that the American people ought to know before any money is granted to Saudi Arabia, to pick out one example, that such a condition exists and that the money there in all probability would not be used to better the conditions of the population there or create any democratic conditions?

Mr. MULTER. I do not know what the figures are on the income from outside sources for any of those countries. I know there is a large sum raised in this country every year by the United Jewish Appeal for Israel, which is in the nature of a charitable contribution.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I have been to Israel and you have been to Israel, and I have also been to the Arab countries. I would have to say, in all fairness, that in Lebanon and Israel—one is an Arab nation and one is not—that the people there live with a degree of dignity and have a standard of living which is in a degree comparable to our own, and you certainly cannot say that for the mass of the population in any of the other countries.

What I am trying to establish is that there is difference in the way that the money is being used and we should not pour any more money into fastening tighter upon those people a government which certainly does not care very much about their welfare.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Could I suggest it might be helpful not only to find out how much money from outside sources was being received into those countries but what the comparable income per capita was of the individuals in that country. That, I think, will be the real test. In other words, that will show you just what they are putting their money into, whether it is going into the pockets of a few people or being used for the welfare of all of the people in the country.

Mr. MULTER. Take Turkey, which is a 98-percent Moslem country, and Lebanon, which is an all-Arab country, but half Christian and half Moslem, and Israel, which is Arab and Jewish, with the preponderance today of Jewish inhabitants. The three countries are improving their standards of living and have been doing it consistently. Because they have been trying to live at peace and improve the conditions and the welfare of their people. There is not any doubt about that. The only excuse we get for helping Saudi Arabia at all is that we need a military base there. Now there isn't a doubt in the world that our people here at home, and everyone in the Secretary of State's office, including the Secretary, know that it is a slave state and there is no attempt on the part of the King to improve the condition of his people or remove slavery or improve the standards of living of his people. Now, if we do not need that military base there, we should stop doing business with them. If we do need it, we have no alternative but to say: "We have to trade with this particular dictator, with this King, in order to maintain that base there for our own security."

There is no other excuse in that area.

Chairman GORDON. Mrs. CHURCH.

Mrs. CHURCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MULTER. I have read your statement with interest. I would like to say that too to Mr. ROOSEVELT.

Some of us have been making an intense effort to determine the truth about the present oppression of Jews in Egypt and to find out what steps should be taken or are possible.

I am wondering if your proposed limitation upon gifts as outlined on page 2, section 3, would cover the situation of internal oppression?

Mr. MULTER. You are referring to section 3 of my proposed resolution?

Mrs. CHURCH. On page 2; yes, where you put limitations upon, or prohibitions against, giving economic or military assistance. I wonder if any of those proposals seek to deal with the internal situation in a country.

Mr. MULTER. They do very definitely deal with internal situations.

Mrs. CHURCH. Would you point to the phrase in this section which would provide for such protection?

Mr. MULTER. When I say, "It will faithfully abide by"—subdivision 3, section 3—"and abide by the ethics and principles of international law and not discriminate on account of race or religion."

Mrs. CHURCH. I think that the connotation, unless otherwise defined here or extended might seem to put the limitation on international obligations because of your typewritten insertion of the words "will not discriminate on account of race or religion."

The supposition is that this would operate only in an international situation. Should a clarifying clause be inserted to definitize the inclusion of cases of internal suppression?

Mr. MULTER. I intended to mean that in that specific language. I have no objection to using the strongest possible language to implement that and to show precisely what we mean. While ordinarily any country has the right to say to us, "You mind your own business as to how we run our affairs internally—" it is the moral obligation of all people in the world to talk up and be heard when any particular group of people, whether they be Christians, Jews, or Moslems, are being discriminated against or being persecuted. It is our duty to talk up. And while we cannot go into those countries and say, "You stop this," we certainly can say to them, "We will deal with you and make obligations and treaties with you and give you money and help and loans, only if you abide by the moral principles that are recognized by civilization."

Mrs. CHURCH. You would not object to a clarification of the paragraph to insure exact interpretation of your meaning?

Mr. MULTER. On the contrary, I would welcome clarification.

Mrs. CHURCH. If the resolution, House Joint Resolution 117, should be passed out of this committee in its present form, would you both feel obligated to vote against it.

If that is an unfair question, you need not answer it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think it is a fair question. If the resolution is not changed and there are no modifications such as have been suggested before this committee, I would find it most difficult to vote for it.

Mrs. CHURCH. Well, now do you think there is any substance to the fear that has been expressed here that failure to pass the resolution would weaken our authority? I mean, that we would possibly be weakening the prestige of the President and of the administration and of this country, which, after all, is the ultimate thing, if the authority sought by the President were not granted.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Well, Mrs. CHURCH, I, for one, in explaining my vote, would reassert that the President has the powers he asks for; and, as an individual Congressman, in voting "no," I am not voting that the President should not use his powers against aggression. In fact, I would urge that he use them, and I am only objecting to the kind of resolution which has been submitted, which I do not feel does the job that ought to be done, and I am protesting against that.

Mrs. CHURCH. Do you subscribe in toto to Mr. MULTER's resolution? Have you seen it before and studied it?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am sorry I have not had a chance to study it. In essence, I would find myself in agreement with it.

Mrs. CHURCH. Thank you.

Mr. MULTER. May I say, in answer to Mrs. CHURCH's question, I could not bring myself to vote for the resolution as it appears in 117, in that form, but that is not what will be submitted to the Congress, if I may be so bold, because on the other side Mr. Dulles himself has already indicated to the Members there in committee that he was ready to accept various modifications. I am sure that it is not going to get to the House or to the Senate in the form in which it has been submitted.

I think that this committee itself will, as it has the right to do and should do, modify that resolution.

I do not think the Members are going to be called upon to vote for that precise resolution, or none. I think you are going to give us a resolution by which we can show to the world we are standing with our President in supporting these high principles.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. And I would much prefer that, Mrs. CHURCH.

Chairman GORDON. Mr. BYRD.

Mr. BYRD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to address my remarks and questions, first of all, to my colleague and friend, Mr. MULTER.

Mr. MULTER, I have had quite a number of letters from my constituents advising me to vote against this resolution. I have yet to receive a single letter in support of it. But I am going to vote for some kind of a resolution. On the basis of the information that I have, and as I think I see the facts, I feel that we are going to have to pass some kind of a measure.

I am constrained to believe that it was a mistake for the administration to ask for passage of this resolution because I think that virtually every witness who has appeared before us has expressed the belief that the administration is asking for power that it already has.

I go further to say that the administration's action might eventually be recorded by historians as being not only a mistake but also a disservice to our country, because if this resolution should be defeated or if a close vote on it in either House occurs, it could be and would be interpreted by the Communists and our friends around the world as meaning that the American people are unwilling to pit their forces against an overt act of aggression. That would be a mistaken interpretation because the American people have shown their willingness before and they will do it again. Mr. MULTER, do you believe that the military and



UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

economic features of the resolution might well be separated and that they are not really companion pieces at all?

Before you answer that question, let me say, if I remember correctly, the Secretary of State has indicated to this committee that this resolution is not phrased to cope with acts of subversion and covert aggression. The Secretary and other witnesses have gone on to say that they do not expect or anticipate any overt acts of aggression to be committed.

Then if the resolution purportedly will not deal with subversion, and only deals with an overt act, and if the overt act is not anticipated, and if further they say they expect no limited wars to be fought, then can we not rightly suppose that the military features are in reality but a subterfuge? Maybe the word "subterfuge" carries the wrong connotation, but can we not be excused for taking the position that the military features are but a subterfuge offered to secure that which the administration really wants most, and that is section 3 of the resolution, the authority to transfer funds for economic assistance from other areas to the Middle East?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. BYRD, I regret the two things are wrapped in one in this case, or together in this resolution. However, I again ask you whether we should argue as to whether or not there should be two separate resolutions or one resolution. I am concerned with the important principles involved, as I am sure you are, too.

There is not any doubt that this can very easily now be interpreted as a resolution attempting to soften the use of military forces by offering economic aid. It can easily be interpreted as the big fellow coming along with the stick in one hand and the money bag in the other: "You take it under my terms or you don't."

That is not the impression we want to create.

I have been urging as many other Members have since 1947 before there was a State of Israel, that we must go into that area with economic aid if we are going to prevent that area from going Communist. In 1947 I started urging that. I still urge it and I urge it today. I do not care how it is done. Whether we wrap them together or do it separately. But if we are going to prevent the subversion that the Communists have a knack of accomplishing, we must go in and help these people in that area, even against their will, to improve their standards of living.

Now the military purpose of this, I think, could have been much better done with a forceful statement of policy by the President of the United States. I think we would have backed him up to a man. We are now confronted with the situation as he gave it to us. We cannot afford to let either our enemies or friends abroad be mistaken about our unity at home, as to our desire to accomplish both the prevention of Communist aggression and the helping of our friends to improve their conditions of livelihood.

Chairman GORDON. Your time is up, Mr. BYRD.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, I understood that we were to be given 10 minutes.

Chairman GORDON. Five minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I thought I had 5 minutes with each witness.

Chairman GORDON. You have 5 minutes with Mr. MULTER and now you have 5 minutes with Mr. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. BYRD. Thank you.

Now, Mr. MULTER, if we are agreed, as most of us seem to be, that the President as Commander in Chief already has authority to use American armed force, why have a termination date on any resolution that we finally pass?

Mr. MULTER. To use the vernacular, we in the Congress have been put in a box. Now, let us start pitching. If we put a termination date on it, it will require us to review this very program again within 2 years.

Now, if he did not want us to take jurisdiction and have continuing jurisdiction, he should not have given it to us in the first place; but, now that we have it, let us keep it.

Mr. BYRD. If we put a termination date on it, are we not in a sense saying that he has that power only through congressional authority, rather than through constitutional authority?

Mr. MULTER. I do not think so. Any statute we enact to limit the powers of the President as given to him by the Constitution might just as well not be enacted because whether they have a date or not they are unenforcible and will be declared void when tested.

Mr. BYRD. Can you briefly give me an answer to this: Is the kibbutz a democratic institution?

Mr. MULTER. The kibbutz is the Hebrew word for village and there are many types of kibbutzim, or villages, in Israel.

There is the so-called collective kibbutz where the people gather together and pool all their interests and the title to everything is in the village, in the municipality. It is the ideal socialistic state where the community owns everything and everyone works for the community. That type of kibbutz is in the minority in the State of Israel. It has not taken on just as it did not take on in many places in this country, such as Oneida, N. Y., and Zion, Ill. It has never spread beyond that because it is not a very popular way of making a living. All over the world men are individualists. We want to own what we acquire and produce. Most of the kibbutzim or villages in Israel are municipalities of the same type we know here.

Mr. FULTON. And there is freedom of choice to join in such communities.

Mr. MULTER. There is freedom of choice in every respect even in the collective "kibbutz." No one is compelled to join it, nor to stay in it.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRD. I hesitate not to yield to my colleague, but I do want to say one other thing.

Chairman GORDON. Mr. BYRD has the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment Mr. MULTER and Mr. CELLER. I have not read Mr. ROOSEVELT's statement but I know the usual kind of excellent presentation that he makes.

Mr. MULTER, if you will recall last year I, on the floor of the House of Representatives, opposed and almost stood alone in opposing the proposal to ship arms to Israel, and I did it because, after having been to Israel and the Arab countries, I felt that Israel could take care of itself very well militarily against any combination of Arab powers. My position was misinterpreted and misunderstood, perhaps, but I felt that in the best interests of the United States we should not send arms to Israel at that time. I think that subsequent events have proved my position to have been right because the Israelis have pretty well taken care of themselves militarily in the more recent past.

Let me say to you today that I think your statement is bold and forthright, and it is a good presentation. Someone has said, "Be bold, and mighty forces will come to your aid."

You have made one mistake, as I see it, in your presentation, and that is on page 4 where you say that the only thing wrong with what the British and the French did was their delay.

I think the British and French were in error in doing two things. First of all, they should never have attacked Egypt. Israel could have done the job much better itself. The second mistake that Britain and France made was in pulling out after they had gone in. They should have completed the mission of destroying Nasser first.

Mr. MULTER, I say to you that I agree with you today that Nasser is a menace, and I am not anti-Arab, but the sooner this Government of ours takes off its kid gloves in dealing with him, the better off we are going to be and the better off Israel and the other free countries of the world are going to be, and that includes the adjoining Arab States and Egypt as well.

Thank you very much.

Chairman GORDON. Mr. LECOMPTE.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I do not believe I have any question, but I do want to express my appreciation to Mr. CELLER and Mr. MULTER, whom I heard this morning—I did not get to hear your remarks, Mr. ROOSEVELT, but I will read them very carefully. It is fine when Members of Congress come before this committee and assist us who are laboring with the problem of foreign affairs and give us the benefit of your thoughts on the subject.

I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GORDON. Mr. SELDEN.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, before I begin my questions, Mr. FARBSTEIN would like to ask a question and I will be glad to yield to him.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. MULTER, in connection with your description of kibbutz, would you make any distinction between a Socialist or cooperative organization? Could we just as well call that a cooperative as well as a Socialist organization, this kibbutz of which you are speaking?

Mr. MULTER. Yes. There are also cooperative kibbutzim in the State of Israel.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. In other words, all the property is owned by the individuals, just like people buy apartments in a building. They each have an undivided share.

Mr. MULTER. That is the way they live in some of their established villages and towns.

Mr. BYRD. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. May I say, Mr. MULTER, I did not ask that question with any intent of being critical. I was merely struggling for a correct understanding of the word and the system. I think that you have helped me a great deal.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. BYRD, I have always respected you for your sincerity of views and I did not attach anything but that to any of the questions you have asked or to the statement you referred to earlier. I think on the floor, at that time, I said in so many words that I respected you for your views and for your sincerity in presenting them.

Mr. BYRD. Thank you very much.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to my colleague, Mr. ROOSEVELT: Do you think that the failure to adopt a resolution along the lines the President has recommended, although you believe that he is asking for power that he already has, would or might cause some dangerous miscalculations on the part of our potential enemy?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Well, Mr. SELDEN, I think that largely in agreement with what Mr. BYRD said earlier and especially due to—if I may use the word—propaganda which the administration put out before this came up to the Congress and since, that if no resolution was forthcoming along these general lines and for these general purposes, that it might well be misinterpreted. I think so much emphasis has been put upon the need for national unity, being behind the President in his policy, that it particularly would be seized by the Communists and twisted, if some resolution was not forthcoming. Therefore, I would thoroughly agree, and I sincerely hope that a strong resolution will be forthcoming, but not the resolution in exactly the form in which the President has presented it to us.

Mr. SELDEN. In other words, you do not favor the wording of this resolution but feel it should be along the general lines recommended by the President.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think it should be along the lines of the President's right to exercise such powers, and I say that we intend to stand behind the President, but we do not intend to make the decisions for him. That is not our job.

Mr. SELDEN. In that event, wouldn't we have to change the resolution substantially if we did not go along with his request to authorize the use of troops?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No, I think it is an important point not to authorize something that he can do but to affirm our knowledge that he has the right to do it.

In other words, as you know, and from the past history of many governments, when little by little, one branch of the Government refuses to exercise its duties and the other takes it over, eventually that power is lost. While the view has been expressed that the President would always have those powers, it might become such a precedent in time that it would be felt that the President could never exercise the power without a resolution by the Congress for him to do so. And if that ever grew up to a precedent that would be accepted by the people, even though the Court might sustain somebody who violated that precedent, a weak President would feel that he had to come to the Congress, and we might not always be blessed with someone with vision enough to act when he should act. Therefore, I am afraid of the precedent unless it is couched in the proper form.

Mr. SELDEN. In other words, you would change the wording so you would not authorize him to use our Armed Forces but you would state in the resolution that he already has that right?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would even go so far as to say we hope he will do so.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. MULTER, is that your feeling?

Mr. MULTER. Yes. I have been presumptuous enough to suggest my own form of resolution where I suggest just that. A confirmation of his authority.

Mr. SELDEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GORDON. Mr. PILCHER.

Mr. PILCHER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MULTER, you are so familiar with the Israeli problem over there, do you not agree that the whole problem in the Middle East or Mid-East—call it whatever you want to—is the Israeli-Arab situation? In other words, anything that we do that does not take into account trying to settle that, we would not ever have peace over there until that problem is worked out?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. PILCHER, up until last year I felt that was the only problem, but with the coming to power of Mr. Nasser, there is an additional problem.

Mr. PILCHER. That is an Israeli-Arab problem, the Nasser problem?

Mr. MULTER. No; the Nasser problem is peculiarly the problem of the entire area and of world peace. Mr. Nasser is determined, as you will find if you read his book, which is almost a rehash of Mein Kampf by Hitler—he is determined to be the Hitler of that whole area. He wants to consolidate all of that area. All of the Arab countries and Israel under his leadership. And one of the steps to bring him to that point of power is his taking of the Suez Canal. Whether there was an Israel there or not, he would have done that, once he felt his oats and felt he was then strong enough to take over and dominate that whole area.

So we have that additional situation there. As I say, I believe that up until last year, the Arab-Israeli dispute was the sole source of trouble there, but now we have something much more serious. Wipe out Israel tomorrow, which I hope will not happen, and if Nasser stays, world war is just around the corner.

Mr. PILCHER. In other words, you agree with what Britain did?

Mr. MULTER. Most emphatically. Only I think they did it too late. I also agree with Mr. BYRD that once they moved in, they should not have moved out.

Mr. PILCHER. Do you think that when Mr. Nasser took over the canal, that our Government should have joined with the British Government automatically right then and told him that he could not do it?

Mr. MULTER. Yes; and we could have stopped that act by Nasser. The first time he said Israeli ships cannot go through the canal, we should have said they will go through. When he stopped British ships, Greek ships, and Italian ships, we should have said, "You cannot do this. This is an international waterway."

If we did that he never would have dared take over the canal.

Mr. PILCHER. How far do you think our relations with the United Kingdom have been strained?

Mr. MULTER. They have been strained, but not to the point where they cannot be rebuilt and strengthened again. I think the British are our natural allies. I think free people all over the world are our natural allies, and we should do everything possible to make sure that they understand that we want them as our friends and we want to be their friends.

Mr. PILCHER. I agree with you.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. PILCHER, if I may add to that, I spent about a week, a very few weeks ago in England, and I had an opportunity to talk with the new Prime Minister, to Mr. R. A. Butler, and to a number of the other people there, and I would say there is no lessening in the desire to have a firm partnership and friendship with the United States on the part of the British people or the people in the Government and the people out of the Government, the people on the labor side. But I think there is a very real feeling of disillusionment and of distrust of the present Secretary of State. I think, to be very honest and very frank about it, that as long as he is there and as long as he is the one who is in charge of our contacts there, there is very grave question as to how close our relationships with our allies will be.

Mr. PILCHER. Thank you.

No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GORDON. Mr. O'HARA.

Mr. O'HARA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This to me has been a very profitable and inspiring day. The contribution that Congressman CELLER, Congressman MULTER, and Congressman ROOSEVELT have made to our discussion has been immeasurably beneficial to us all.

It seems to me one of the benefits we are deriving from the introduction of this resolution has been that in its consideration instead of responding to a demand for quick action, and without adequate deliberation and exchange of viewpoints, in the wisdom of the chairman of this committee, this hearing has gone on for many days and we have been hearing expressions of opinion from all sides.

As I stated before, mine is an open mind. I came as a new member to this committee with a sense that what we now are facing is a fight to save Western civilization. I think that the period we are passing through is that serious. In the 81st Congress, I voted against armed aid to Europe because I did not believe that the road to peace was in a race of armaments. Having lived in the early years of this century, when France and Germany were in a race of armaments, I remembered how we in the United States who then were far away saw the folly in such a course. We wondered why the money they placed in a race of armaments was not more profitably put into building the foundations to peace by improving their own economics. Because we were so far away, and so disinterested, we clearly could see the end. As then we foresaw, the race of armaments ended in destroying forever Britain as a world empire, it destroyed Germany and France.

Now we follow the same course, hoping to reach a happier termination than any race of armaments in all history has ever recorded.

When it was suggested that we should arm peoples in Europe, I thought if Russia were arming the Mexicans and the Nicaraguans and the Costa Ricans, our people would start getting excited, and when we got sufficiently excited we would take the arms away from those close to us as neighbors, which a power far from our hemisphere had given them.

Now I see we are spreading arms all over, and as has been brought out in the testimony today we do not always know what use is being made of these arms, these weapons of destruction that we are spreading all over the world and we cannot control their use.

I am merely reciting that as though I were thinking out loud with you. I am here now on this committee. I am a member of the party in opposition. The President of the United States—not the President of my party, but the President of the United States, of us all, has said that a grave crisis exists and he is asking us with almost a unanimous vote to adopt this resolution, and he thinks that in this will be a way to peace. It has been presented to us that at the present time Russia is not in a position to fight a world war, that we reasonably can expect that Russia will seek for the next 2 years to avoid a third world war, but if in the next 2 years because of the vacuum now existing in the Near East area, we permit Russia without fighting a war to obtain these large oil resources and the geographical advantages that then in 2 years we will be faced with a world war under disadvantageous conditions.

Now that is the way it is presented to us. We all are reaching out for peace.

The Secretary of State has said that he felt that without the passing of this resolution war was very likely and by a war, he meant a major war, and not a brushfire war.

I have been very much helped by the testimony of you, my three colleagues, for whom I have esteem and affection. You have expressed many thoughts that are my thoughts. My mind is still open on how to vote on this resolution. I have no question to ask but I thank you all for the fine contribution you have made to our meeting today.

Chairman GORDON. Mr. FOUNTAIN.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. No question, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GORDON. Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. FASCELL. Gentlemen, I ask these questions jointly and I would like to get your opinion on them:

I think we can all agree that on the affirmation of the question of armed force that once the problem has been presented we ought to go ahead and reaffirm it. I think it is justifiable, however, to discuss the problem as to whether or not we will abrogate any constitutional authority if we do so, and also it is very wise, as Mr. ROOSEVELT has pointed out, not to establish a precedent by which we would weaken ourselves in future cases. But the testimony has been very clear before this committee and also before the other body that we are not talking about direct overt armed aggression at this time. This is not the primary purpose of this resolution and, as the President has stated in his own message in sending it down to Congress, it is nothing but a reaffirmation of a statement that he had made twice in 1956 with respect to armed aggression in that area. So we have nothing new there. It is just a question of Congress joining in and echoing statements the President has already made.

However, it has been made very clear here before this committee and also in the other body that there is great fear on the part of the administration with respect to section 3 of the resolution should it fail

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and that deals with $200 million. Specifically, it exempts that $200 million from any provisions of the Mutual Security Act.

Now, I point out some facts in relation to what you gentlemen have testified to: First of all, it has also been made very clear that we are not talking about long-term development economic projects, to stabilize the economy of the people in that area over a long period of time. It has also been made very clear by the witnesses that what we are talking about are emergencies that deal with the economic situation in those countries. Primarily from the loss of revenues and because of certain military assistance.

Now let us assume for the moment—furthermore, I might add that the Secretary of State testified here that he is not seeking any authority beyond this fiscal year, June 30. Any $400 million or other appropriation beyond the $200 million, would be sought in subsequent acts before the Congress. So we are talking now about removing the restrictions and the limitations on the use of $200 million so that the administration can use that money as it sees fit, where it sees fit, and under the conditions it deems best for the country.

These things raise several very important questions and we are getting down now to the root of the problem and what I want to get your opinion on:

Would you, Mr. MULTER, in your case, attach the same strings and restrictions that you have laid out in your resolution to the use of the money under these emergency conditions?

Mr. MULTER. I would, sir. And let me say that some of these things, I suggested to this committee last May, that they be incorporated into the authorization bill we were then considering. You saw fit not to do so. Some of the things were referred to in the report, some of these limitations and restrictions.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. MULTER, suppose the administration came right back and said, "While these are fine ideals, it is impractical and unrealistic to think that we are going to go around there with an open pocketbook and get a lot of conditions and commitments when what we are trying to do for the present is retain the status quo so these governments do not just collapse from bankruptcy and the Russians come in."

Mr. MULTER. Which countries that exist there do we want to prevent collapsing? We do not agree that if any government collapses, the Communists will walk in because of that. In the present Syrian Government, if it collapses and a new government comes into being that is Communist controlled, it is because of the Communist subversion that has been going on there for 3 years at least in Syria.

If the Nasser government collapses, the Communists are not going to come in there and take over that government because Nasser is out. We will get another government there and maybe a better government. But are we now, without any conditions, going to give Nasser as much money as he needs to balance his budget after what he has done? After he has run out on the very commitments he made to the United Nations? He invited the United Nations armed forces to come in there to keep the peace. After they arrived he said they are going to get out of there as soon as he tells them to get out.

There was no condition imposed at that time that the clearing of the Suez Canal would be started when all of the foreign troops are out. That was to be started as soon as the British and the French got out. As soon as the British and the French got out and the U. N. armed forces got in, he then came along with a new condition. He now says, until Israel gives up the Gaza Strip, no clearing of the Suez Canal. What is the connection between the two except the desire of Mr. Nasser to show who the boss is?

You cannot deal with that kind of a man except you say to him, if we are to help you sustain your economy and balance your budget, you must do this, that, and the other thing.

We were told for years while Nasser and his predecessor were carrying on, and saying the one aim they had in life was to annihilate and destroy Israel, we were told, "That is just for home consumption. They do not mean it. Let them talk. It is just to keep their people amused."

Actually it was more than amusement they were talking about. They were talking about deadly destruction.

Now, if Nasser is not going to agree, as a condition of getting even $1 of this $200 million, that he will not be an aggressor nation, he should not get the dollar.

Mr. FASCELL. I think I got your position quite clear, which is you would not want to remove any restrictions from the use of their money so that our Government can deal with the governments over there any way they want to without any agreements or pacts or any understanding of what actually the current financial situation is in those countries.

Mr. MULTER. That is my position.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would agree with that, and I think you will think back as to whether or not this $200 million is going to save any government from collapse over there, on an emergency basis—first of all, you have not been told by I think your own admission what those governments would be. Secondly, I think you have already heard from the governments of most concerned, Egypt and Syria, that they are against this whole project anyhow. They are not going to ask for any money from us anyhow on that basis. So where is the emergency on this thing? Who is asking for it? Who is about to collapse? I do not think that point has been proven in any way, shape, or form. If there is that emergency perhaps you should grant it. But until that emergency has been proven and it has been shown that certain governments friendly to us will remain friendly if they get our aid, that would be one thing, but I do not think that has been shown.

Mr. FASCELL. No; it has not.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Therefore, is not the real problem a long-range economic program that will really do something for the people so that the governments who do come in will be democratic governments because the people will be benefited in the long run?

Mr. FASCELL. I do not think there is any argument about that and I think most Members have expressed their concern about stability over a long period of time but how do you answer the American people when the President of the United States says in his message, "Nevertheless, weaknesses in the present situation and increased danger from international communism convinced me that we ought to take this act" and the Secretary of State backs it up by saying, "If you do not give us section 3," which is the economic part of this thing and the heart of the whole movement, "if you do not give us that, the whole thing will fail."

How do we answer the American people?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think you answered that, that the Congress still has a responsibility to the people to have justification for its acts in backing up the President. If the President in other instances felt he needed money, he came and told why he needed money. If it is impossible to spell it out, then, believe me, the money isn't needed; and I think the Congress has the duty to tell the people that in sufficiently clear form that the propaganda machine can't override it.

Mr. FASCELL. As I understand it, you would favor the idea of expressing the sense of Congress in concurring with the President on our policy with respect to aggression and Communist control, but separating the question of economic assistance.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I most certainly would, sir.

Mr. FASCELL. You feel the same way, Mr. MULTER?

Mr. MULTER. I would prefer to see them dealt with separately, but I would not object to taking them together if there were restrictions imposed.

Mr. FASCELL. Do you see any danger in the fact, now that they have been lumped together that if the Congress should separate them, that it might be subject to misinterpretation around the world?

Mr. MULTER. No; I think the important enunciation of principle we must make is that we are against and will continue to be against the Communists and Communist aggression.

Mr. FASCELL. All right, sir. Let me ask another question, now: Do you think the separating of these matters as has been suggested will have any important effect upon the people of the United States?

Mr. MULTER. I would say that if you separated them and very promptly announced your position on the matter of Communist aggression, the country at large would certainly applaud. If you took your time about making the announcement or pronouncement about economic aid and what you would do and took your time and had a thorough investigation and legislated on that in the usual way, again the American people would applaud, because there you are hitting their pockets?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would thoroughly agree with Mr. MULTER.

Mr. FASCELL. How do you reconcile the fact that an announcement was made yesterday that all men in the National Guard, now, commencing April 1, because of military considerations at the present time, will have to serve 6 months on active duty?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Could I reply to that? How, on the other hand, do you justify a new Reserve policy which cuts down the training period of everybody and intimates we don't need to get so excited about it? It seems to me one contradicts the other.

Mr. MULTER. I might facetiously offer the suggestion that we use the same answer as when we sent 3,000 marines to join the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean Sea. It was announced by our Government officials that that was just a routine practice engagement.

Mr. FASCELL. One other question and then I am through: Would both of you gentlemen agree with the idea that we ought to support the principle of a strong U. N. force in the area in order to use that as a basis for achieving a settlement of the Arab-Israel dispute?

Mr. MULTER. Let's put it "to keep the peace."

Mr. FASCELL. Until such time as we can go further.

Mr. MULTER. I would heartily approve of such act.

Mr. FASCELL. If the resolution adopted by this committee or proposed by this committee would include that, you would support that?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would personally welcome it, as I said in my testimony.

Mr. FULTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I certainly will.

Mr. FULTON. I believe the purpose of this House Joint Resolution 117 was to insure that it would make less the need for United States troops.

Mr. FASCELL. U. N.

Mr. FULTON. On the previous comment you gentlemen were making, it might have been a little partisan about reducing the amount of training necessary for United States troops. You talked about the 6-month period of active service for the Reserves.

Mr. FASCELL. I just commented on the fact that an announcement had come out which stated that because of military considera-

tions, all men in the National Guard, commencing April 1, would have to serve 6 months on active duty.

Mr. FULTON. I thought that you were thinking the United States was letting down our armed force strength.

Mr. FASCELL. One of the witnesses brought up the question about the Reserves.

Mr. FULTON. The point I would make is that if we pass this resolution there would then, according to the Secretary and the President, be less need for American troops being used in this area than there would be otherwise. Isn't that really within the purposes of House Joint Resolution 117?

Mr. FASCELL. It might be if you didn't have a countervailing announcement that all National Guardsmen would be on active duty. I mean, I don't see how you can have one and the other at the same time.

Chairman GORDON. Mr. FASCELL, your time is up.

Mr. COFFIN.

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. MULTER, if I understand your answer to Mr. FASCELL correctly, you would prefer to leave the resolution with a statement of policy and take up the economic aid in a more orderly, planned way?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. COFFIN. If that were done there would not be much sense in having this a joint resolution, because that would be leaving us with just a statement of policy on what we felt the President was now authorized to do.

Mr. MULTER. I completely agree. If you take out the economic aid you are making a declaration of policy which would be more appropriately a concurrent resolution. If you are making a legislative authorization it should be a bill or a joint resolution requiring the approval of the President. You are quite right, sir.

Mr. COFFIN. That would be your preference?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. COFFIN. It seems to me from reading your statements that Mr. ROOSEVELT's chief emphasis is on giving military assistance and giving economic aid through the United Nations, whereas your emphasis, Mr. MULTER, is on building up a series of pacts on specific conditions.

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. COFFIN. You did say you would welcome a U. N. police force in the area to keep the peace?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. ROOSEVELT, would you go along with the inclusion in any economic aid programs, of the restrictions that Mr. MULTER has specified?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes; I certainly endorse them heartily.

Mr. COFFIN. Would either of you think that including these specifications might indicate to the nations of the Middle East that here we were again holding out the big stick and the big purse that could only be availed of if very definite strings were tied? I mean isn't that a danger when you lay down five restrictions, that you are negating any good will that you might seek to build up?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I don't think so, Mr. COFFIN, for this reason: I think the first point is that most nations who object to restrictions object to them because they take away from that nation some sovereignty, something that belongs to them or impose something for the sole benefit of the nation putting on the restrictions.

In this case Mr. MULTER has suggested is actually only the insurance of the application of recognized international principles of civilized governments and therefore no one could properly object to them in my opinion.

Mr. COFFIN. Isn't this a possibility that no one would object to them? That a man like Nasser would perhaps leap to the opportunity of signing a pact agreeing to these five things? Isn't it something like requiring the loyalty oath that most patriotic Americans would be very glad to sign, but those who are subversively minded would also sign it because the oath doesn't mean anything to them?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think that is true, but I think it is also true that because we have an organization of nations, today, in the world, that it is necessary to spell certain things out in order to develop that world opinion that needs to be behind us. And if it isn't spelled out, and if a nation doesn't then specifically break a firm engagement that has been entered into, you are not so likely then to get that world opinion, which is not sophisticated in world affairs. It hasn't had the opportunity yet. But they do understand that once a country agrees to do something and breaks that agreement, it is an outlaw, and I think we have to be able to point that finger very specifically in these cases.

Mr. COFFIN. Of course, you realize that in any event that might arise under a pact with Egypt or Syria or any other country that might sign it with internal reservations, there would always be an argument as to whether they had or had not broken their agreement, but you still feel a pact would have some importance.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think an example of that is Nasser's seizure of the canal. He has tried to justify it, but there is no question about it that world opinion has ruled against him, that it was an actual seizure.

Mr. COFFIN. One final question: The suggestion was made yesterday to this committee that perhaps one of the first things that could be done, aside from the police force to keep the peace, is to proceed by a conference in which we would not be members and neither would Britain or France or Russia, but other nations, 5 or 6 neutral nations, would sit down with the disputants in that area and on a private basis try to develop the rock-bottom demands of each area to see whether or not agreement could ultimately be reached.

What do either of you gentlemen think of such a suggestion?

Mr. MULTER. I am for any kind of a conference that will bring these disputants together, or even in separate rooms, get them talking about grounds on which they can meet and enter into peace agreements. No matter how it starts, either by neutral nations or any other source—anything that would get it started would be good and only good could come from it.

Mr. COFFIN. Do you think that would be a practical suggestion, from your own knowledge of the Middle East?

Mr. MULTER. I know from discussions with Arab leaders that if somebody had only come along—particularly they named the United States—and said, "Look, you have to sit down and come to an understanding on these problems," they would do it. All we had to do was give them a means of saving a little face as far as their own people are concerned. Whether it has gone too far or not, I don't know, but I still think we must make the effort.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. COFFIN, may I just add to that, any way to start getting them to sit around a table to settle their differences would certainly be acceptable but at some point if there is such great interest on the part of the United States and Russia and England and France on all those problems, I don't see how you can exclude them on a permanent basis. At some point they have to enter into those discussions. Who starts the negotiations doesn't make much difference. Let's get them under way.

Mr. COFFIN. I only hope when I appear before your committees I will be as well versed as you have been in appearing before us.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GORDON. Mr. FARBSTEIN.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Not alone are your statements complimentary to yourselves, gentlemen, but the fact that you have been kept here for so long a period and caused to engage in discussion in the fashion you have is evidence of what the committee thinks of the views of you gentlemen, and your opinions.

There are different phases of this resolution which seem a bit puzzling in this sense: It was said—and I don't recall whether the Secretary of State did so—that the prime purpose of the resolution was more psychological in nature insofar as the Soviet is concerned.

Now if that is so, if all we are seeking to do is to warn Russia to stop, why do we need section 3 dealing with economic aid?

As against that, knowledgeable opinion has come before us and has said "I don't think that we need concern ourselves about the Soviet Union making a military move or aggressing overtly in the near future, but that the main cause of tension is the existence of strife and tension between Israel and the Arab States."

Now that would seem to negate the need for warning Russia to stay away. If the latter, that is strife between Israel and the Arab States, were the real need for a resolution, why was any reference to agreement betweeen these groups omitted?

Mr. MULTER. Assume Israel's destruction, tomorrow, which I hope will not happen. The trouble in Syria, the trouble in Egypt, the desires of Nasser of Egypt, the trouble in Jordan would still exist. You've got a bad situation that is being made worse daily by the Communists. There isn't any doubt about it. Our State Department should have known it for at least the last 3 years. There has been infiltration and subversion in Egypt and Syria and Jordan for the last 3 years at least and they have been making headway and they are making headway in Lebanon. Now there isn't any doubt about that and they would be doing that whether there was a State of Israel or not.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Would you say that the prime fear we should be concerned with is the Soviet Union coming into the area, or would you in your opinion say that it is the existence of tension and strife between Israel and the Arab States?

Mr. MULTER. Both problems exist, today, and both must be faced forthrightly.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. FARBSTEIN, may I add to that, the proof they are tied together is Russia's antagonism to Israel. Israel is and has been one of the prime targets of the Russians. If she in any way can use this crisis to get rid of Israel, that fits in with the Russian plan. It seems to me you can't divorce them. They are all part of the same picture but not exclusively so. Anybody who says there is just one simple part to this question I think is underestimating its complexity.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. If both phases of the situation are a presently existing condition, do you feel there should be something in this or any other document or paper—call it resolution, a joint or concurrent resolution, containing a direct statement in connection with the existing Israeli-Arab situation?

To make it a bit more definite, Senator FULBRIGHT had some language of this type:

"And further under the United Nations Charter, strive toward reduction in tensions between Israel and the Arab States, the resettlement of refugees, the protection of holy places and the conclusion of treaties of peace, and until these purposes are accomplished, seek the continued intervention of the United Nations police force between Israel and Egypt."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I believe Mr. MULTER's resolution says it more simply and perhaps more understandably, in that it would pledge the United States to resist acts of aggression against any aggressor nation. I mean by any aggressor nation, against any nation in the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Middle East, which would therefore include Israel. And as to today, except for the tripartite agreement about which there is some question as to whether or not it does still apply, there is no evidence that the United States is willing to stand up and be sure that Israel is included in the prohibition against aggressive action.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I think it was yesterday that the Secretary of State said insofar as the United States is concerned, any disputes between Israel and the Arab States have got to be handled by the United Nations and we will have no part of it.

I think he said that before the Senate committee.

Mr. MULTER. It is a most unrealistic statement.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It is almost stupid because obviously if Communist arms came into Egypt as they did and are used by any nation against Israel, why, it is still Communist aggression.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I want to take one other phase of it and then I will be through: Do you think that form rather than substance is of prime importance here, whether it is a joint resolution or a concurrent resolution? In other words, supposing we were to give the President the joint resolution that he asked for and incorporate within that joint resolution those amendments which we deem desirable in order to cover those problems which the Congress feels are facing this Nation?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. FARBSTEIN, as a legislator with a tremendous amount of experience—I think you were the senior member in the New York State Assembly before coming here—you know, to get something enacted into law, you will not quarrel about form. The legal draftsman leans toward the technical form, but to get the principle over, what difference does it make whether we call it a concurrent resolution or a joint resolution? We have the idea. Let's do it.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GORDON. Mr. SAUND.

Mr. SAUND. As I look at this resolution, and recall the inferences I have drawn from listening to the testimony so far, I see in the resolution nothing more than a notice and a declaration of policy on behalf of the Congress saying to the Communist nations that we are not going to put up with any more nonsense in the Middle East. When they divide the resolution into two parts and when the President asks for authority for armed intervention, he is asking for nothing more than he already possesses as Commander in Chief?

Let's take just one aspect of it. Do you agree with my supposition?

Mr. MULTER. I think you are absolutely correct, sir.

Mr. SAUND. Under those circumstances, if the President of the United States feels that there might be misunderstanding in the minds of the peoples of the world, and particularly the Communists, that the Congress may not be back of the President, because of what was said during the last election by different candidates, and because of the fact that while the President received an overwhelming vote of confidence, he did not succeed in getting his party elected so that they could have charge of the Congress.

Under those circumstances, why shouldn't we give that notice?

Mr. MULTER. I am in hearty agreement with giving that notice in such language as this committee will recommend and the Congress will deem appropriate and proper under the circumstances.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If I may say it, I think earlier we both replied to a question by Mrs. CHURCH that we feel there are changes necessary in this communication by the President and that it does not in any way mislead anybody to have proper changes made and that it is an abdication by the Congress if we fail in our responsibility to make those proper changes, providing the final result still says in essence what the President wants said to the Communist world.

Mr. SAUND. The President wants to have the limitations removed on the spending of the $200 million. If the President believes that it is necessary right now for him to give some financial aid to the governments of those countries where there might be trouble, unemployment, or unrest because of the situation existing in the Suez Canal, why should there be so much objection to giving him that authority? Is it a fact that President Eisenhower has not been too anxious to use the Armed Forces of the United States of America in the emergencies which have arisen during his term of office? Now I am not an apologist of Mr. Dulles, at all. I think he has made many serious mistakes and maybe we would not be in this present state of emergency in the Middle East if we had some man who had more vision as Secretary of State during the past 4 years. But the President is asking for that authority. Is it not the fact that he has been very reluctant to use his authority to deploy the Armed Forces of the United States in many instances?

Mr. MULTER. I wonder, Judge, if I am to assume from your statement, that because of his reluctance to use the Armed Forces, therefore, that makes out a case for removing the restrictions for the use of the money?

Mr. SAUND. No; not necessarily so.

We are bringing so many other matters into this resolution. I think the President justifies by his conduct in the last 4 years our giving him the authority he asks.

Mr. MULTER. I think it is necessary for you as a legislator to review requests of the President. It is the function of the Congress to legislate on these matters of authorizations, as to how much shall be spent and all the details thereof. The President sent his budget message to the Congress today. Do you think if he insisted that the matter be taken care of today that the Committees on Appropriations would throw everything aside and report his bill? I don't think they would.

You ask shouldn't we rely on the President and have confidence in him and give him what he asks. I say not until he indicates that he has given us all the facts whereby you can say "I must now remove all restrictions and let him use $200 million in any way he pleases, without restrictions."

I as one Member am unwilling to do that. Not because I have no confidence in him. I want to know, as Mr. CELLER said this morning, how is he going to use it, where he is going to use it, and what proper limitations, if any, he intends to impose. I think we should give him the standards that he should follow:

Mr. SAUND. Mr. ROOSEVELT, you have been sitting with your colleague from New York and I want to ask you this question: Do you agree with him and would you condone the action of England and France in what they did in Egypt during October?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I have given much thought to that. My own feeling is that there is some excuse for what they did, because of the fact that I think the record will show that they were misled and that they were prevented from taking action through the United Nations which in my opinion they should have taken. I do not agree they took the right action. I think they should have taken action through the United Nations much more forcefully and that we should have supported it. However, I do agree that once having gone in, they made the ultimate mistake in not finishing the job. I do not agree they were initially justified in taking the action.

Mr. SAUND. Do you or do you not condone the action of England and France in taking the action which they took, when they did not even inform their best ally, the United States, about their intentions?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I do not condone it, but I dispute the fact that they did not inform us. I think the record of history will show that they did inform us, that we knew about it, that every agency of our Government knew about it and that in order to cover up our own mistakes in having led them into the action, that we unfortunately sold our own allies down the river. I do not however condone their action and I think it was wrong.

Mr. SAUND. Thank you.

Chairman GORDON. Before the witnesses leave, Mr. CARNAHAN has a question for Mr. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. CARNAHAN. This question would be for both of the gentlemen.

I wanted to read something from the President's address before the joint session and then I am going to ask your opinion of what he was saying in this language. I read now from the President's address:

"If, contrary to my hope and expectation, a situation arose which called for the military application of a policy which I asked the Congress to join me in proclaiming, I would, of course, maintain hour-by-hour contact with the Congress if it were in session and if the Congress were not in session and if the situation had grave implications, I would, of course, at once call the Congress into special session."

I am wondering if the President is saying that he means he will use his constitutional powers and meet aggression in the Middle East if we pass House Joint Resolution 117, or is he saying that even though we pass the resolution, he will seek even further sanctions from the Congress before using his Executive powers.

Mr. MULTER. I don't think either of us has a right to talk for the President and indicate what he meant by that statement.

Mr. CARNAHAN. What would you interpret that to mean?

Mr. MULTER. May I call it oratorical rhetoric. That is my humble opinion.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. ROOSEVELT, would you care to comment?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. As I pointed out in my previous statement to the committee, I interpret what the President said as indicating that he would still need congressional action in order to carry out powers which are vested in him as President; that he would call us back and that he would try to make us feel that we were always in on the picture at all stages, even after he had exercised the powers which he wants us to join with him in reaffirming, here.

I think it was a very clear piece of politics to make us all feel that "don't worry, fellows, I am not forgetting about you, just because I am asking for your cooperation, now, I will continue to ask it later," and I think it was quite effective.

Mr. CARNAHAN. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GORDON. Thank you, Mr. MULTER and Mr. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. SELDEN. May I make just one observation?

Chairman GORDON. Yes.

Mr. SELDEN. On page 4 of your statement, Mr. ROOSEVELT, you refer to economic aid, and state that we had been asked as an emergency proposition to grant a blank check beyond the 30th of June.

Just for clarification I would like to point out that in this resolution as presented to us, it does not go beyond the 30th of June, it merely authorizes the administration to reshuffle what has already been appropriated up to $200 million.

I asked specifically the question whether or not this authorization would go beyond the 30th of June and neither Secretary Dulles nor Mr. Hollister could give me an answer on it.

Mr. Hollister said he did not think that the authorization would extend beyond the 30th of June but he would make that information available for the committee before we actually considered the resolution.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would be most interested in his answer because I think that the impression is that it is $400 million to be taken away from what the Congress previously authorized and directed in a certain direction and now they want to do it any way they please. $200 million in each of two fiscal years, as I understand it.

Mr. SELDEN. Only $200 million is affected by this resolution—Mr. Hollister stated specifically that any additional funds would be asked for in the mutual security bill. I thought you would be interested in that information since you touched on it in your testimony.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GORDON. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you for the privilege of being here.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank you, too, very much.

Chairman GORDON. Our next witness is Mr. Kenneth M. Birkhead, American Veterans Committee.

---

# SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1957

Rev. Joseph J. Valantiejus, of St. Joseph's Lithuanian Parish, Waterbury, Conn., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Lord of justice and mercy, look down with favor upon us gathered here in the observance of the Independence Day of Lithuania, the land of our fathers—or, rather, in the memory of an independence that today is denied her.

We pray, first of all, for the United States of America, wherein we have found the freedom of life and opportunity with which Thou hast endowed our nature, but which is cruelly repressed in many parts of the world today. We ask Thy guidance upon its leaders, not only that they may lead our country in the ways of peace and prosperity, but that they may achieve that which we believe to be the destiny of America—to extend the blessings of freedom and peace to all the peoples of the world.

We pray for our mother country and for her hard-pressed children; for those who, whether by choice or by force, have remained in that unhappy land, and are both witnesses and victims of an alien domination that outrages their every national, cultural, and religious aspiration, as well as for those whom circumstances have compelled to abandon their native soil and their homes. Grant to them, O Lord, strength and courage to bear the burdens and the hardships that are put upon them, but do Thou also strengthen our efforts to come to their relief and assistance.

We are particularly mindful this day of the words of Thy vicar on earth, our Holy Father, that Lithuania is the most northerly outpost and bulwark of Thy church in Europe; and we dare to hope that this is indeed the mission which Thy divine providence has in store for her. Wherefore, with all the greater confidence do we pray that she remain not subject to a power which does not acknowledge Thy law, and oppresses Thy church, but that the agony which she today endures may be the promise of a more glorious resurrection unto her appointed place among the free Christian nations of the world, and unto the mission which Thou hast designed for her.

In Thee, O Lord, do we place our hope, and we know that it shall not be confounded. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 11, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Mansfield D. Sprague, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## PROTOCOL TO INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR REGULATION OF WHALING—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive E, 85th Congress, 1st session, a protocol to the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling signed at Washington under date of December 2, 1946, which protocol was signed at Washington under date of November 19, 1956, for the United States of America and 16 other governments, and that the protocol, together with the President's message, may be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the Protocol to the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling signed at Washington under date of December 2, 1946, which Protocol was signed at Washington under date of November 19, 1956, for the United States of America and 16 other Governments.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the Protocol.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 14, 1957.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Certified copy of the Protocol to the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling.)

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing with illustrations and binding of proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late Chief Justice Edward Douglass White; and

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution to print for the Committee on Public Works certain data on the Arkansas, White-Red River Basins and water resources of the New England-New York region.

## COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs are holding joint hearings on the general oil problem. Secretary of the Interior Seaton and Director of Defense Mobilization Flemming testified before the joint subcommittee all morning. I ask unanimous consent that the hearings may be continued during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until Monday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar under Rule VIII on Monday next be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## THE URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], has a report which he desires to file.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report, with amendments, House bill 4249, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, and I submit a report (No. 65) thereon. Of course the bill will now go to the Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the Calendar.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee whether it will be agreeable to him to have action on the urgent deficiency appropriation bill scheduled for Monday next.

Mr. HAYDEN. That will be entirely agreeable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the Senator from Arizona aware of any controversy over the bill which would require extended debate?

Mr. HAYDEN. No such controversy appeared in the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the bill reported unanimously?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if it is agreeable to the minority leader, it will be the purpose of the leadership to make the bill just reported (H. R. 4249) the pending business on Monday, and to proceed immediately to consider and dispose of it; and then to take up the four contempt resolutions, if that is agreeable to the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations and if they will not involve prolonged discussion. If a prolonged discussion is indicated, the leadership would move instead that the Senate take up the joint resolution on the Middle East, on which we expect to have a report filed from the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee. I expect to have that joint resolution taken up some time on Monday, and then to have the Senate sit in session from day to day until debate is concluded.

Let me ask the Senator from California whether that schedule is agreeable to him.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That schedule is agreeable, Mr. President.

So far as the urgent deficiency appropriation bill is concerned, I believe that normally, under our procedure, it would have the right-of-way.

I do not believe there will be prolonged discussion of the contempt resolutions, in view of the general understanding the majority leader has indicated, to the effect that there will not be prolonged discussion. Otherwise, I can see no objection to holding them over until after the Senate disposes of the Middle East joint resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let me state to the Senator from California that I cannot assure him that there will not be prolonged discussion of the contempt resolutions; but I do assure him that if there is prolonged discussion, we shall put over those measures until after the Middle East joint resolution is disposed of.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Does the schedule which has been announced mean that there will be a regular session of the Senate on Washington's Birthday?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to make an announcement on that subject later in the day, after I have conferred with the minority leader. My present view is that there will not be a regular session on Washington's Birthday; but on that point I should like to be informed of the wishes of the minority leader and the views of the administration and the views of the chairmen of the committees. If the Senator from New York will permit me to do so, I shall confer with those mentioned, and shall talk later to the Senator from New York, and then shall make an announcement to the Senate.

Mr. IVES. I thank the Senator from Texas.

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED REPORTS ON ACREAGE PLANTED TO COTTON

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for reports on the acreage planted to cotton, to repeal the prohibitions against cotton acreage reports based on farmers' planting intentions, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering contracts negotiated under sections 2 (c) (11) and (16) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, for the period July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON SURVEY OF BACKGROUND, OPERATIONS, AND ADMINISTRATION OF STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting pursuant to law, his report covering a survey of the background, operations, and administration of the basic stockpiling program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF SECOND LIBERTY BOND ACT, RELATING TO INTEREST RATE ON UNITED STATES SAVINGS BONDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act to authorize a change in the maximum interest rate permitted on United States savings bonds (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY FOR ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify the general powers, increase the borrowing authority, and authorize the deferment of interest payments on borrowings, of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, HAYDEN LAKE UNIT, IDAHO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Hayden Lake unit, eastern division, Rathdrum Prairie project, Idaho, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON TRINITY RIVER DIVISION, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the status of negotiations with prospective purchasers of the falling water to be produced by the Trinity River division of the Central Valley project (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JOSEPH CHITTO ET AL. V. THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings in the case of *Joseph Chitto et al., members and as the representatives of and on the relation of the Choctaw Indians east of the Mississippi River* v. *The United States* have been finally concluded (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF MARCH 3, 1911, RELATING TO RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF SPRINGFIELD CONFEDERATE CEMETERY, SPRINGFIELD, MO.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1077), to remove restrictions on the use of a

portion of the Springfield Confederate Cemetery, Springfield, Mo., and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD AND MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administration, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLICATIONS ENTITLED "STATISTICS OF ELECTRIC UTILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1955" AND "ESTIMATED FUTURE POWER REQUIREMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES, 1955–80"

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of its recently issued publications entitled "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1955" and "Estimated Future Power Requirements of the United States, 1955–80" (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO PUBLIC AIRPORTS IN ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska," as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Chung-Liang Liang from a report transmitted to the Senate on January 16, 1956, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOE KAWAKAMI

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Joe Kawakami (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ROBERT BURNS DEWITT

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt (with an accompanying paper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CAPT. THOMAS C. CURTIS AND CAPT. GEORGE L. LANE

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Capt. Thomas C. Curtis and Capt. George L. Lane (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuand to law, a report of the Commissioner of Education, including a detailed statement of receipts and disbursements, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

STATEMENT OF PENALTY MAIL

A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing the number of envelopes, labels, wrappers, cards, and other article bearing penalty indicia procured or accounted for through that Department, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 9

"Memorializing Congress to take action on flood control embracing the valley of the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River in West Virginia.

"Whereas the valley of the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River in the State of West Virginia has recently been visited by a flood disaster which might have been averted to a marked degree by a proper system of flood control; and

"Whereas the recent flood has caused damage to the extent of at least $10 million in the valley of the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River; and

"Whereas other floods have occurred at great frequency during the past few years in said valley, resulting in damages to the extent of many millions of dollars; and

"Whereas the distressing conditions due to floods tell a more powerful story than any that might be calculated in terms of the cost of a proper flood-control system: Therefore be it

*"Resolved by the senate (the house of delegates concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to take such action as will provide a suitable and proper system of flood control in order to avert another such disaster in the valley of the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River; and be it

*"Resolved further*, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to forward attested copies of this resolution to the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the West Virginia delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 9, adopted by the legislature on February 7, 1957, according to the official records in my office.

"J. HOWARD MYERS,
*"Clerk, Senate of West Virginia."*

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Resolution 45

"Relative to Federal aid to Del Puerto Road

"Whereas there are no east-west highways between the San Joaquin Valley and the seacoast between the Altamont Pass and the Pacheco Pass, a distance of over 50 miles; and

"Whereas such a crossing would be of inestimable value as an escape route should there be a need for dispersal of the citizens of this State concentrated on the heavily populated peninsula below San Francisco in case of an atomic attack or other invasion of our shores; and

"Whereas the Del Puerto Canyon offers an excellent route for such a highway to connect the cities of Patterson and San Jose; and be of great economic benefit to the coast counties and the northern part of the San Joaquin Valley; and

"Whereas, in addition to the national defense benefits of such a highway, it would also contribute substantial economic benefit to the areas involved: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California*, That the President and Congress of the United States are respectfully memorialized to provide for Federal funds to construct the Del Puerto Canyon Road between Patterson and San Jose, Calif.; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative of the State of California in the Congress of the United States.

"I hereby certify that the above resolution was adopted by the Senate of the State of California on January 25, 1957.

"J. A. BEEK."

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Denver, Colo., relating to the rising price of gasoline, and so forth; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The petition of Edward A. Smith, of Vero Beach, Fla., relating to a reduction in Federal expenditures; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Two resolutions of the Alameda, Calif., County Coordinating Republican Assembly, relating to the retirement of Senator KNOWLAND, and unqualified support to President Eisenhower's Middle East doctrine; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. BENNETT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution of the senate and house of representatives memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a realistic program of active duty basic training for the Army National Guard

"Whereas the Army National Guard of the State of Utah has attained the unprecedented peacetime strength of 4,443; and

"Whereas the Army National Guard of the State of Utah is organized into 57 units and organizations located in 27 communities in this great and sovereign State; and

"Whereas the Army National Guard of the State of Utah is the exclusive military force of this State and under the command of the Governor as provided by the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas the Army National Guard of the State of Utah has served its country with distinction in time of emergency; namely, the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, and in the Korean emergency; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Department of the Army of the Government of the United States has directed that all non-prior-service enlistees of the Army National Guard of this State be required to undergo a period of 6 months' active duty training with the United States Army as a condition precedent to their enlistment; and

"Whereas this proposed action is an administration determination by an executive branch of the Federal Government; namely, the Department of Defense which appears to negate legislative intent of the elected representatives of the people in the United States Congress; and

"Whereas this requirement is unreasonable, unrealistic, exceedingly detrimental to the Army National Guard of the State of Utah and will cause a serious reduction in the strength thereof; and

"Whereas the 6 months' active duty training program can be accomplished in approximately 3 months with efficient organization and the omission of unnecessary features; and

"Whereas a 3 months' active duty basic training program as a condition of enlistment is acceptable to the Army National Guard, and would encounter little if any opposition from industry, educators, religious groups, and the parents and the young men of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah*, That it views with great alarm and disapproval the unwarranted action of the Secretary of the Army of the Government of the United States and that the Congress of the United States be called upon to establish a realistic program of active duty basic

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

training for the National Guard; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Members of the State of Utah in the National Congress."

By Mr. PASTORE (for himself and Mr. GREEN):

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution 28

"Resolution memorializing Congress to reduce the cabaret tax

"Whereas experience has indicated that the 20-percent carbaret tax is self-defeating in that there has been a steady decline in the number of restaurants and hotels offering good food plus entertainment; and

"Whereas since 1940 over 25,000 musicians have lost their employment in establishments subject to such; and

"Whereas such tax is blighting on normal, healthy outlets for social life throughout the country; and

"Whereas the United States Congress has recognized the self-defeating purpose of the amusement tax on other categories of shows and entertainment by reducing said tax to 10 percent of the admission charge: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island takes cognizance of the danger which is confronting the amusement and entertainment facets of our economy and now does respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to reduce the entertainment tax on cabarets from 20 percent to 10 percent; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, urging them to use their good offices in seeking the passage of such legislation."

## THE ARMY AND THE AIR NATIONAL GUARD—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF KANSAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Legislature, which is now in session, has adopted a concurrent resolution relating to the Army and Air National Guard.

The resolution calls upon the Kansas delegation in Congress to take every action which might be necessary to bring about an accelerated 3-month training program for the Army and Air National Guard.

As this is the view of the elected representatives of the people of the State of Kansas in their own legislature, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 11

Concurrent resolution relating to the Army and Air National Guard

Whereas the Congress of the United States in the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 deemed it wise to increase the preparedness of our country for national defense by ordering all the Reserve forces, including the National Guard to take not less than 3 nor more than 6 months' basic training, and the Army National Guard has repeatedly requested the Secretary of Defense to implement an accelerated 3-month basic training program as well as a 6-month program to enable young men who wish to continue their education to obtain this training without sacrificing a semester from their educational program, and the Secretary of Defense has, since the passage of that act, and continues to refuse implementing such program: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein)*, That we call upon the Kansas delegation in Congress to take every action which may be necessary to bring about implementation of an accelerated 3-month basic training as an alternate to the 6-month program now in effect for those members of the Army and Air National Guard who wish to take advantage of same in order to continue their education without interruption; be it further

*Resolved*, That the secretary of state is authorized and directed to send an enrolled copy of this resolution to each member of the Kansas delegation in the Congress.

## RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present, for appropriate reference, resolutions adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts entitled "Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States Against Granting Concessions on Textile Imports From Foreign Countries" and "Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States Against Granting Concessions on Textiles and Fish Imports From Foreign Countries."

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries

*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to pass no legislation granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

Senate, January 31, 1957, adopted.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk*.

House of Representatives, February 5, 1957, adopted, in concurrence.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk*.

A true copy.

Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
*Secretary of the Commonwealth*.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textiles and fish imports from foreign countries

*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to pass no legislation granting concessions on textiles and fish imports from foreign countries; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

House of representatives, January 31, 1957, adopted.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
*Clerk*.

Senate, February 5, 1957, adopted, in concurrence.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
*Clerk*.

A true copy.

Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
*Secretary of the Commonwealth*.

## JOINT RESOLUTION OF MONTANA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Senate Joint Memorial No. 1 passed January 29, 1957, by the Montana Legislature. The memorial deals with the control of infestations and outbreaks of grasshoppers on range and grazing lands.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 1

Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to Dwight D. Eisenhower, the President of the United States; to the Honorable James E. Murray and the Honorable Mike Mansfield, Senators from the State of Montana; to the Honorable Lee Metcalf, and the Honorable Leroy Anderson, Representatives from the State of Montana; to the Honorable Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States; relating to infestation and the control of grasshopper outbreaks on range and grazing lands

Whereas grasshoppers constitute a threat to range and grazing lands each year, with the intensity and scope of infestation varying from as much as 380,000 to 7,500,000 acres from one year to the next and from less than 100,000 to 2 million acres in a similar period with no particular pattern of infestation evident in any succession of years nor any relationship between geographic areas or intensity within a given infestation that can be used as a basis for prediction; and

Whereas during years of low grasshopper populations, infestations are confined to relatively small acreages which can be handled by the landowners themselves. In years of widespread outbreaks each individual infestation, which taken together constitute an outbreak, is so large that the total holdings of several farmers or ranchers may be involved. With the large acreage involved, which is usually accompanied by low precipitation and consequent lower yields, an economic situation is created whereby the landowner cannot combat the problem with his own resources; and

Whereas by administrative decision, the present Federal-State Cooperative program authorized under Public Resolution 91 of the 75th Congress is based on the theory of outbreak prevention and on the concept that outbreaks can be predicted from existing infestations and that all grasshopper in-

festations spread to adjoining areas from existing infestations; and

Whereas comprehensive research has shown that infestations develop through unpredictable changes in conditions existing in the areas so infested; and

Whereas comprehensive research has shown that the extent of damage done is not necessarily a result of the number of grasshoppers present, but appears to be related to the species of grasshopper present and the growing conditions of the plants, making it impossible to predict damage prior to its onset following the hatch of grasshoppers; and

Whereas hatching dates differ so widely from one area to another, even within the same species, that damage may be severe in one area before it appears in another; and

Whereas the present administrative decisions upon which the Federal-State Cooperative program is based do not consider the problems posed by populations of those grasshopper species which infest nor the added problem of acres diverted to the soil bank which could become breeding grounds for the migratory species; and

Whereas the present administrative decisions allow only 33⅓-percent Federal participation in the cost of control on privately owned lands which is inadequate to bring the cost down to a level that can be economically borne by the landowner under widespread outbreak conditions; and

Whereas the administrative decisions under which the present Federal-State program operates are so rigid that the program cannot be effectively adapted to the unpredictable situations which occur from year to year and its objectives of control from the standpoint of outbreak and migration prevention are not only inconsistent with research findings, but do not allow for the most effective use of available moneys at a time and in such places that the landowners can derive the maximum benefits: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the 35th Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That we respectfully recommend and urge the President of the United States, the Senators and Representatives from Montana and the Honorable Secretary of Agriculture to secure the reconsideration and revision of the administrative decisions upon which the present Federal-State Cooperative program is based to the end that it will better serve the needs of range landowners and provide an adequate and fairly administered program of range land protection; be it further

*Resolved*, That consideration be given to conducting cooperative Federal-State control programs on the basis of range land protection rather than outbreak prevention and that the rancher-farmer be given the opportunity to elect when, where, and by whom the work shall be done; that the Agriculture Department of the State of Montana, in conjunction with the United States Soil Conservation offices, cooperate in the work and administration necessary to attain the objectives contained in this program; be it further

*Resolved*, That Federal moneys be made available to the extent of 50 percent of the cost of control on a matching basis regardless of the source of the matching money; be it further

*Resolved*, That the program be administered to the end that everyone participating in grasshopper control receives his proportionate share of the public moneys available regardless of their course; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the Senate of the State of Montana to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Honorable James E. Murray and the Honorable Mike Mansfield, Senators from the State of Montana; to the Honorable Lee Metcalf and the Honorable Leroy Anderson, Representatives from the State of Montana, and to the Honorable Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States.

PAUL CANNON,
*President of the Senate.*
EUGENE H. MAHONEY,
*Speaker of the House.*

## CHAPLAINS' DAY—RESOLUTION OF NORWALK (CONN.) FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a resolution sent to me which was adopted by the Norwalk Aerie of the Fraternal Order of Eagles of Norwalk, Conn., on February 6, 1957, which is entitled "Chaplains' Day Resolution."

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPLAINS' DAY RESOLUTION

Whereas on February 3, 1948, the U. S. S. *Dorchester* was sunk in the North Atlantic, during World War II, with the loss of more than 600 American lives, including 4 chaplains of 3 great religious faiths; George L. Fox, Protestant; John P. Washington, Catholic; Alexander L. Goode, Jewish rabbi; and Clark V. Poling, Protestant minister; and

Whereas these 4 chaplains gave up their lives that others might live, going down together on the deck of the U. S. S. *Dorchester*, to give to the world for all time a dramatic example of human brotherhood, courage, and selflessness, and an inspiring demonstration of interfaith unity and understanding; and

Whereas in order that the meaning and significance of their heroic deed may be perpetuated each year, memorializing not only the supreme sacrifice of the 4 chaplains, but the supreme sacrifice of all chaplains who gave up their lives for others, inspiring all Americans by their example of faith and courage: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we urge the Congress of the United States to set aside the first Sunday in February each year, as Chaplains' Day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the 4 chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country.

Above resolution adopted by Norwalk Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, on February 6, 1957.

WALTER G. SMITH,
*Worthy President.*
WM. K. MALKIN,
*Secretary.*

## RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF NIAGARA COUNTY, N. Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Niagara County, N. Y., relating to the development of additional power on the Niagara River.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas by the collapse of the Schoellkopf station of the Niagara Mohawk Corp. on June 7, 1956, a serious power shortage has occurred in the Niagara frontier which represents a considerable financial loss to the citizens, residents, and industries of the Niagara frontier and further that it seriously jeopardizes production for the defense of the United States of America; and

Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress of the United States legislation to grant the New York State Power Authority power to develop the available water supply on the Niagara for the purposes of hydroelectric power as allocated by the treaty between the United States and Canada of 1950, together with additional sources of water supply as heretofore allocated the Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.; and further

Whereas this matter has been before the Congress of the United States for some 6 years; and further

Whereas the Board of Supervisors of the County of Niagara are seriously concerned about the failure in the development of the water resources located within the boundaries of the county of Niagara: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That this board of supervisors does seriously urge the Congress of the United States to enact into law legislation authorizing the State power authority to develop the waterpower resources upon the Niagara River; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to the Honorable IRVING M. IVES, the Honorable JACOB J. JAVITS, United States Senators from the State of New York; Hon. WILLIAM E. MILLER, Congressman; the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee; and the Public Works Committee chairman of the House of Representatives.

Respectfully submitted.

G. K. BOYER,
*Majority Leader.*

## RESOLUTION OF CLEVELAND DENTAL SOCIETY

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Cleveland Dental Society at its council meeting on January 31, 1957, relating to taxes for certain self-employed persons.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas a proposal known as the Jenkins-Keogh bill can give the professional man some of the tax benefits denied to him since the Internal Revenue Code was enacted; and

Whereas the principles of this bill have been before our national legislators for over 6 years in some form or other and have favorably impressed these lawmakers by their soundness and fairness; and

Whereas under this bill, the self-employed individual would be able to set aside money for future retirement, tax free, such as corporations now set aside for their pension plans; and

Whereas such savings thus set aside would present a definite hedge against inflation: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Cleveland Dental Society support the principles of the Jenkins-Keogh proposal and urge the 85th Congress to enact them into law; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Cleveland Dental Society urge Senators JOHN BRICKER and FRANK LAUSCHE, Representatives MICHAEL FEIGHAN, FRANCES BOLTON, CHARLES E. VANIK, and WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and Representative JERE COOPER, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means to use their support and influence to secure an early enactment of this proposal.

Respectfully submitted.

JAMES M. GENTILLY,
W. J. STERLING,
HARRY J. GEURINK,
*Chairman, Legislative Committee of the Cleveland Dental Society.*

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Res. 24. Resolution to amend rule XIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (Rept. No. 71).

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress (Rept. No. 66);

S. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of hearings held by the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary (Rept. No. 67);

S. Res. 75. Resolution to authorize additional clerk hire for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (Rept. No. 69); and

S. Res. 93. Resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the report on an investigation of airpower, and providing for additional copies (Rept. No. 68).

## COOPERATION WITH NATIONS IN THE MIDDLE EAST—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 70)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, sitting in joint session, I report favorably, with amendments, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

I understand the majority leader has indicated that the joint resolution will be considered on next Monday.

The report of the joint committee will be filed later today.

I call the attention of Senators to the fact that the two volumes of committee hearings on the joint resolution have today been sent to all Members of the Senate. The hearings have been marked with different press release dates.

Subsequently, Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, jointly, submitted a report (No. 70) on the above joint resolution.

## EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of State.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1181. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Federal building in Newnan, Ga.: to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1182. A bill to prescribe the procedure of courts of the United States in the issuance of injunctions and the punishment of disobedience thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 1183. A bill to amend chapter 21 of title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the jurisdiction of the justices, judges, and courts of the United States; and

S. 1184. A bill to establish qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1185. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1186. A bill for the relief of certain dependents of the late Darwin Philo Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1187. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps commemorating the 150th anniversary of the founding of the city now known as Hot Springs National Park, Ark.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1188. A bill to amend title II of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, with respect to the settlement of labor disputes resulting in national emergencies; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 1189. A bill to amend section 10 of the Federal Airport Act of 1946 to provide for increased Federal participation in the acquisition of runway clear zones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1190. A bill to authorize purchase of certain bonds issued by States and local units of government to finance the development by such States and local units of government of facilities to transport water for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1191. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange lands at Olympic National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1192. A bill for the relief of Irma B. Poellmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1193. A bill to amend subparagraph (c), paragraph I, part I, of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases becoming manifest within 3 years from separation from service; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1194. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Myrtle Golden, of Milnesand, N. Mex.;

S. 1195. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Carl Bedwell, of Yucaipa, Calif.;

S. 1196. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Richard L. Robinson, of Jal, N. Mex.;

S. 1197. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Walter T. Linam, of Hobbs, N. Mex.;

S. 1198. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Elmer M. Gandy, of Lubbock, Tex.; and

S. 1199. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Joseph E. Shipp, of Snyder, Tex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (by request):

S. 1200. A bill to authorize funds for the improvement by the Secretary of Commerce of the Pentagon Road Network and that portion of the Henry G. Shirley Memorial Highway in Arlington County, Va., and to provide for the transfer of such highways to the Commonwealth of Virginia; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHAVEZ when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GREEN (for himself, Mr. BUSH, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PURTELL, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1201. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. GREEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1202. A bill for the relief of Arsene Kavoukdjian (Arsene Kavookjian);

S. 1203. A bill for the relief of Lydia Anne Foote;

S. 1204. A bill to provide for the incorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, organized 1883, 74 years old; and

S. 1205. A bill to recognize the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., a national nonprofit, nonpolitical war veterans' organization, for purposes of bestowing upon it certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 1206. A bill for the relief of Antoine Velleman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1207. A bill for the relief of An-Shih Cheng; and

S. 1208. A bill for the relief of Ludwik Abramski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BUSH, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. IVES, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. POTTER):

S. 1209. A bill to amend titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act so as to further assist the States in extending aid for medical care to persons eligible for public assistance under such titles; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 1210. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1211. A bill to define the application of the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts to certain pricing practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1212. A bill for the relief of Evangelos Demetre Kargiotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT (for Mr. WATKINS):

S. 1213. A bill to promote the development and use of improved methods for the humane handling, transporting, and slaughtering of livestock and poultry in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1214. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1215. A bill to permit unmarried annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to elect survivorship annuities upon subsequent marriage; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 1216. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps commemorating the 300th anniversary of the founding of Charles County, Md.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. BEALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCNAMARA:

S. 1217. A bill to reduce the maximum workweek under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to 35 hours, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1218. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special stamp in commemoration of the opening of the Mackinac Bridge; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1219. A bill to authorize a system of acreage-poundage allotments for tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1220. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1221. A bill to make the evaluation of recreational benefits and wildlife development resulting from the construction of any flood control, navigation, or reclamation project an integral part of project planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1222. A bill to provide that any child of a quota immigrant, if such immigrant is entitled to a fourth preference quota, shall also be entitled to a fourth preference quota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1223. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1224. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. 1225. A bill to authorize the award posthumously of Congressional Medals of Honor to Chaplain George L. FOX, Chaplain Alexander D. Goode, Chaplain Clark V. Poling, and Chaplain John P. Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRIDGES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1226. A bill to prohibit the introduction of cigarettes into interstate commerce unless each package containing such cigarettes is labeled to indicate every substance or material contained in such cigarettes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRD (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. 1227. A bill for the relief of Stavros Georgas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MCNAMARA, and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 1228. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish as one of the National Institutes of Health a National Radiation Health Institute, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 1229. A bill to provide a loan program to promote the development of forestry on small tracts of forest lands and lands suitable for forest production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. STENNIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1230. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide urban planning fellowships; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. BEALL):

S. 1231. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the frigate *Constellation* and to provide for her rehabilitation, berthing, and restoration within the area of Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1232. A bill for the relief of Spiros Kaloniktis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 1233. A bill to encourage aviation education and training for cadet members of the Civil Air Patrol; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. PURTELL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on a Just and Lasting Peace; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. PURTELL):

S. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating February 16 of each year as Lithuanian Independence Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution to authorize the continued use of the horse-drawn caisson in military funerals at Arlington National Cemetery; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating the first Sunday of February of each year as Chaplains' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BEALL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS):

S. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BYRD when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

## STUDY OF RATIFICATION OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL MARITIME CONSULTATIVE ORGANIZATION

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 95), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the United Nations organization has been concerned with adverse developments affecting the proposed organization of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization following withdrawal of the Government of Greece, and other maritime nations have previously recorded they could not participate in the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization as presently constituted;

Whereas 9 years have passed since the drafting of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization Convention and it has been accepted by only 4 of the 15 countries having the largest merchant shipping tonnage, including the Government of the United States;

*Resolved*, That a study would appear desirable to ascertain whether the present ratification status of Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization could be detrimental to the best interests of the United States; said study to be made by the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study of the ratification of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization.

---

## AMENDMENT OF LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, RELATING TO SETTLEMENT OF LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title II of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, with respect to the settlement of labor disputes resulting in national emergencies.

In this connection, and at this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of a statement I have prepared, which deals with this matter, and also the text of the bill itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1188) to amend title II of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, with respect to the settlement of labor disputes resulting in national emergencies, introduced by Mr. IVES, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1188

A bill to amend title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, with respect to the settlement of labor disputes resulting in national emergencies

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is amended by striking out sections 206 to 210, inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"NATIONAL EMERGENCIES

"SEC. 206. Whenever the President finds that a national emergency is threatened or exists because a strike or lockout has resulted or threatens to result from a labor

dispute (including the expiration of a collective-bargaining agreement) in a vital industry which affects the public interest, he shall issue a proclamation to that effect.

"SEC. 207. (a) After issuing such a proclamation, the President shall promptly appoint a board to be known as an 'emergency board.'

"(b) An emergency board appointed under this section shall promptly investigate the dispute, shall seek to induce the parties to reach a settlement of the dispute, and in any event shall, within a period of time to be determined by the President, but not more than 60 days after the appointment of the board, make a report to the President, unless the time is extended by agreement of the parties, with the approval of the board. Such report shall include the findings and recommendations of the board and shall be transmitted to the parties and be made public. The Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall provide for the board such stenographic, clerical, and other assistance and such facilities and services as may be necessary for the discharge of its functions.

"(c) After the President has issued a proclamation pursuant to section 206 and until the emergency board appointed under this section has made its report to the President, the parties to the dispute shall refrain from engaging in a strike or lockout.

"(d) An emergency board shall be composed of a chairman and such other members as the President shall determine, and shall have power to sit and act in any place within the United States and to conduct such hearings either in public or in private, as it may deem necessary or proper, to ascertain the facts with respect to the causes and circumstances of the dispute.

"(e) Members of an emergency board shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the board, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses.

"(f) For the purpose of any hearing or inquiry conducted by any board appointed under this title, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 49 and 50, as amended), are hereby made applicable to the powers and duties of such board.

"(g) Each emergency board shall continue in existence after making its report for such time as the national emergency continues for the purpose of mediating the dispute, should the parties request its services. When a board appointed under this section has been dissolved, its records shall be transferred to the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

"(h) A separate emergency board shall be appointed for each dispute. No member of an emergency board shall be pecuniarily or otherwise interested in any organization of employees or in any employer involved in the dispute.

"SEC. 208. In any case in which a strike or lockout occurs (1) after the emergency board has made its report to the President pursuant to section 207 (b), or (2) in violation of section 207 (c) before the emergency board has made its report, the President shall submit immediately to the Congress for consideration and appropriate action a full statement of the case, including the report of the emergency board, if such report has been made, and such recommendations as he may see fit to make. If the Congress or either House thereof shall have adjourned sine die or for a period longer than 3 days, the President shall convene the Congress, or such House, for the purpose of consideration of an appropriate action pursuant to such statement and recommendations.

"SEC. 209. When a dispute under this title has been finally settled, the President shall submit to the Congress a full and comprehensive report of all the proceedings, together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make."

The statement presented by Mr. IVES is as follows:

Once again the national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act have proved inadequate to deal with a serious labor dispute which has tied up shipping along the Atlantic coast of the United States. The 80-day cooling-off period provided by the present law has expired, and there is no Federal law in existence further to cope with this serious situation.

It seems to me that the primary purpose in any statutory provision aimed to meet the problems inherent in labor-management disputes, which imperil the national health and safety, is twofold. Of first importance is the settlement of the dispute and the reaching of an agreement which is satisfactory to all the parties to the dispute. Of next and almost equal importance is the prevention of a work stoppage attributable to such dispute—or at least the limiting of any work stoppage to such a point that it will not prove damaging to the national health and safety.

As is generally known, the Taft-Hartley provisions, which deal with this type of emergency, provide for a cooling-off period and a fact-finding board, as well as other procedures calculated to bring about settlement of the controversy. However, if the dispute is not settled during the injunction period, the parties are again free to engage in strikes or lockouts. The provisions of the amendment I am introducing today would replace the present provisions of the act covering national emergencies.

Under these provisions, the President would be authorized to find that a national emergency is threatened or exists when a strike or lockout has occurred or threatens to occur in a vital industry which effects the public interest. After issuing such a proclamation, he would appoint an emergency board which would be required to make a report to him within 60 days, including the findings and recommendations of the board, which also would be transmitted to the parties to the dispute and made public. During this 60-day period the parties would be required to refrain from engaging in strikes or lockouts. In the event that a dispute is not resolved before the emergency board has filed its report with the President or if any of the parties have engaged in strikes or lockouts prior to the time that the emergency board files its report with the President, he would be required immediately to submit a full statement of the case to the Congress, including his recommendations as well as the report of the emergency board. If the Congress should not happen to be in session, he would be required to convene it immediately for this purpose.

I believe that this proposal offers a means by which national emergency disputes, such as the present dock strike, can be prevented from endangering the general welfare of the people and the national defense of this country without granting to the Chief Executive a dangerous amount of authority and without burdening the Congress with an excessive obligation.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD following my prepared remarks and the text of the bill, the text of an editorial which appears in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFTER TAFT-HARTLEY WHAT?

It is significant that the longshoremen's strike, which has tied up east coast shipping from Portland to Hampton Roads, began 80 days to the minute after a Taft-Hartley Act injunction had been served on the union. The dock workers obeyed the letter of the law and no more. The theory of the act is that, if a strike is postponed or interrupted for 80 days, tempers will cool and agreement is likely to be reached. Instead, tempers have flared anew; union spokesmen assert they have been insulted; and the vote of union members on the employers' last offer, as required by the act, produced a 14-to-1 rejection.

The President invoked Taft-Hartley after the strike had been in progress only 9 days in November. If the renewed immobilization of shipping should produce another national emergency, presumably the President could seek another 80-day injunction. But that might bring open defiance or still more bitterness in the employee-union bargaining sessions. In short, the emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act have proved utterly inadequate to the handling of this national emergency in shipping.

It is not clear whether the presence in New York of Harry Bridges, czar of west coast longshoremen, who is seeking a common expiration date of dock workers' contracts, had anything to do with the waning hopes for a prompt settlement. Wholly apart from Mr. Bridges' influence, the effect of a strike is usually to harden the demands of both parties. So it would be unrealistic to suppose that continued mediation is all that will be needed. If the paralysis of shipping imperils the national security, Congress may be compelled to intervene. In any event, it should consider overhauling the ineffective emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act so that the national interest may be protected.

---

## AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT, RELATING TO FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN ACQUISITION OF RUNWAY CLEAR ZONES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the question of air safety has loomed large in recent weeks. We have all been shocked by some of the tragedies which have occurred.

A problem that has been increasingly brought to the fore is that of providing runway clear zones beyond the normal boundaries of our airports. I am introducing a bill today to help with that problem.

This measure would increase from 50 percent to 75 percent the amount of Federal participation in programs to acquire land beyond the normal airport boundaries, where the acquisition is made under orders from the Civil Aeronautics Board. The bill is designed to apply to the costs of acquiring land.

There is precedent for this action in the program for high intensity airport lighting. I ask that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for early action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1189) to amend section 10 of the Federal Airport Act of 1946 to provide for increased Federal participation in the acquisition of runway clear

zones, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## DEVELOPMENT OF FACILITIES TO TRANSPORT WATER FOR DOMESTIC, MUNICIPAL, INDUSTRIAL, AND OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are many tragic aspects of the drought situation which is sweeping the great Southwest. But one factor which is frequently overlooked outside that section is the great impact it is having on our cities.

In water-rich sections of the country, we think of drought in terms of farms and ranches. We read stories about land baking under the sun; about cattle dropping from thirst; about landowners forced to leave land which was settled by their grandfathers.

Those stories are all based on fact. They merely neglect to add that in our great cities people are now drinking water that is barely palatable; that they are forced to restrict their use of water; that industry is feeling the pinch of short supplies.

Furthermore, the city shortage is not merely a reflection of drought conditions. It is a direct result of the fabulous growth of our population in the past few decades—a growth that has turned what were once adequate supplies into shortages.

This is a problem that is nationwide. I am introducing a bill today designed to help our cities in this situation. It is similar to a measure which has been introduced in the House by Representative WRIGHT, of Texas.

This measure would authorize the Federal Government to cooperate with State and local authorities in developing water sources for our cities. It would recognize, however, that the primary responsibility would remain on the local level.

The bill would authorize the Government to buy tax or revenue bonds from local authorities issued to finance the construction of transportation facilities for water. No more than $250 million worth of bonds could be purchased in 1 year and no more than $5 million from any one local unit.

The measure provides safeguards to protect against ill-advised ventures. It would apply only to financing which the local unit cannot otherwise obtain.

Mr. President, action now on our part can stave off a developing crisis in our cities. I hope this measure can receive early and favorable consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1190) to authorize purchase of certain bonds issued by States and local units of Government to finance the development by such States and local units of Government of facilities to transport water for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

## IMPROVEMENT OF PENTAGON ROAD NETWORK

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to improve the Pentagon road network. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary of Commerce, requesting this proposed legislation, may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1200) to authorize funds for the improvement by the Secretary of Commerce of the Pentagon road network and that portion of the Henry G. Shirley Memorial Highway in Arlington County, Va., and to provide for the transfer of such highways to the Commonwealth of Virginia, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The letter presented by Mr. CHAVEZ is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
*Washington, February 6, 1957.*

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
*President of the Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Submitted herewith is a draft of proposed bill "to authorize funds for the improvement by the Secretary of Commerce of the Pentagon road network and that portion of the Henry G. Shirley Memorial Highway in Arlington County, Va., and to provide for the transfer of such highways to the Commonwealth of Virginia."

During World War II the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce constructed a network of highways in Arlington County, Va., known as the Pentagon Road Network and that portion of the Henry G. Shirley Memorial Highway in Arlington County, Va., with funds made available by the Defense Highway Act of 1941. These highways were constructed upon lands under the jurisdiction of various departments and agencies of the United States Government and lands owned by the Commonwealth of Virginia and Arlington County, Va.

This system of highways has served admirably. Designed for a Pentagon Building occupancy of 35,000 people and a rational increase in traffic, commensurate with the need to conserve materials, manpower, and funds at the time of a national war effort, it has met increasing demands of traffic which after the war were explosive in character. As elsewhere in the United States, the increase in motor-vehicle traffic has exceeded all reasonable expectations; indeed, the increase in the Arlington County area and the traffic across the Potomac River bridges has increased at a more rapid rate than elsewhere as shown by the figures that follow:

| Bridge | 1940 | 1954 | Percentage increase |
|---|---|---|---|
| Highway Bridge | 38,512 | 101,733 | 164 |
| Memorial Bridge | 32,288 | 53,910 | 67 |
| Key Bridge | 30,189 | 46,846 | 55 |
| Chain Bridge | 4,638 | 14,136 | 205 |
| Total | 105,627 | 216,625 | 105 |

Since their construction these roads have been maintained by the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce at an annual expense of approximately $77,000, with funds provided each year from Defense access funds. It is a continuous drain on the Federal Treasury. Traffic upon these highways has increased to such an extent since their construction that repairs, restorations, changes, and additions are necessary to accommodate present and anticipated traffic with safety and convenience. It is desired at this time to make the necessary additions to meet present and future traffic needs and to place the roads in such shape that the Virginia Department of Highways will be willing to accept title to the lands and the highways and maintain them in the future as part of the State highway system. The Commonwealth of Virginia has expressed a willingness to accept title to said highways and maintain the same after the necessary repairs, restorations, changes, and additions have been made thereto. This willingness is expressed in a resolution of the Virginia Department of Highways passed on March 24, 1955, attached hereto.

It is estimated that the cost of making the necessary repairs, restorations, changes, and additions to the Pentagon road network and that portion of the Henry G. Shirley Memorial Highway located in Arlington County, Va., is $4,950,000. It is estimated that an additional amount not to exceed $200,000 will be needed immediately for survey of the right-of-way of said highways and preparation of plans and specifications for work contemplated by the proposed draft.

The draft of proposed bill, attached, is intended to provide the necessary authorization for appropriations to accomplish the program of repairing, restoring, and making necessary changes and additions to these highways. It is further intended to provide the necessary authorization to expend immediately not to exceed $200,000 from unexpended balances of the appropriation access roads (act of September 7, 1950) for a survey of the right-of-way of said highways and preparation of plans and specifications for work contemplated by the proposed bill.

Information relating to estimated additional man-years of civilian employment, and expenditures for personal and other services, required in connection with the proposed legislation under the act approved July 25, 1956 (70 Stat. 652), is contained in a statement attached hereto.

The Department of Commerce recommends this proposed legislation for the favorable consideration of the Congress.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that it would interpose no objection to the submission of the draft legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
*Secretary of Commerce.*

Whereas on December 9, 1954, the Bureau of Public Roads submitted to the State highway department a proposal for the State highway department to take over and maintain certain roads, including the controlled access features thereof, which were built as defense access projects by the Bureau of Public Roads in Arlington County, provided that the Bureau do certain resurfacing, widening, and other improvements; and

Whereas on February 9, 1955, the Bureau of Public Roads by letter to the department of highways set forth the roads requested to be taken over and maintained, and the details of the resurfacing, widening, and other improvements agreed to be accomplished on same prior to such taking over and maintenance by the State highway department; and

Whereas on March 8, 1955, the Bureau of Public Roads by letter to the department assured the department that the necessary right of way would be obtained for the grade separation at the intersection of Washington Boulevard and entrance to Fort Myer, Va., in order to permit unconditional compliance with the Bureau of Public Roads' agreement to provide grade separation structure at the aforesaid intersection; and

Whereas on March 17, 1955, the department of highways, by letter to the Bureau of Public Roads, notified said Bureau that the department in light of the assurance in the Bureau's letter of March 8, 1955, that it would obtain the necessary right of way for the grade separation at the intersection of Washington Boulevard and entrance to Fort Myer, Va., considered itself and the Bureau to be in accord and agreement on the items of work to be performed and the roadways requested to be taken over and maintained: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That those roads set forth in the Bureau of Public Roads' letter of February 9, 1955, described as the Pentagon network of roads and the Shirley Highway in Arlington County, including the controlled access features thereof, be taken over and maintained by the department of highways provided and conditioned upon the Bureau of Public Roads' completion of the items of work including resurfacing, widening, and other improvements to the above-described network of roads as set forth in the Bureau's letters of February 9, 1955, and March 8, 1955, and its conveyance to the Commonwealth of the title to the right-of-way of such roads by a metes and bounds description of said right of way, including in such metes and bounds description of the property to be transferred to the Commonwealth of Virginia, the building now occupied by the maintenance forces of the Bureau, together with the adjacent equipment area.

MARCH 24, 1955.

## REPEAL OF CERTAIN LEGISLATION, RELATING TO THE PURCHASE OF SILVER

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators BUSH, DOUGLAS, KENNEDY, PASTORE, PURTELL, and SALTONSTALL, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prohibit the mandatory purchases of silver by the Treasury. Under the silver-purchase laws which this bill would repeal, the Treasury must purchase all domestic silver offered to it regardless of the need for such silver. Under these laws the Treasury has accumulated nearly 2 billion ounces of silver.

The bill, if enacted, will bring to an end certain unsound monetary practices. The silver-purchase laws require the Treasury to print and issue paper money to pay for the silver purchased regardless of the need for such paper money. Only a portion of the silver purchased is set aside as backing for these paper dollars, and this silver is arbitrarily valued at $1.29 per ounce. The only real value of such silver is the market value, which is currently around 91½ cents an ounce.

This bill will end the subsidy and support price which is paid to the producers of copper, lead, and zinc regardless of need.

This bill will permit a free and open market for silver instead of the present mandatory purchases of domestic silver by the Treasury which permit control of the silver market by foreign interests.

Hearings were held on a similar bill during the 84th Congress. A complete case was made in favor of the bill. The opposition utterly failed to present a case for the retention of the silver-purchase laws. Not a single producer of silver appeared before the Federal Reserve Subcommittee holding hearings on the bill. In fact, the only witness to appear was the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The opposition in the last Congress relied on delaying tactics to prevent passage of the bill. So I ask the chairman of the committee handling this bill to give the opposition adequate notice of hearings and thereafter to proceed as expeditiously as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1201) to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GREEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, RELATING TO VENDOR MEDICAL PAYMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators MCNAMARA, GREEN, BUSH, HUMPHREY, YOUNG, IVES, KENNEDY, DIRKSEN, NEUBERGER, MORSE, COTTON, JAVITS, BRIDGES, JACKSON, MAGNUSON, SALTONSTALL, LANGER and POTTER, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act. These sections refer to the matching of assistance expenditures for medical care, intended "to promote the health of the Nation by assisting States to extend and broaden their provisions for meeting the cost of medical care for persons eligible for public assistance by providing for separate matching of assistance expenditures for medical care."

As I understand the foregoing statement of purpose, the medical care provisions of the act were intended to encourage the States to broaden their medical care programs. This is an objective which has my strongest support. However, the act as amended in the last session had the effect of forcing some States to either curtail their existing medical care programs or to change drastically the methods of operating their assistance programs. I believe that this was not intended for it was not known at the time the Finance Committee adopted the provision that this would be the effect.

I introduced an amendment providing for the same provisions, in a slightly different form, to the social security bill last session, and it passed the Senate, but was lost in conference.

Under a provision of the act adopted in 1950, a State may use matching funds for vendor medical payments—that is, payments to the hospital, doctor, dentist, or nursing home which renders the service, rather than to the individuals who receive the care—within the present $60 limit the Federal Government provides a matching of the funds. Since this provision was adopted, a number of States have established medical payments programs for public assistance recipients which are quite extensive, and in which the payments average more than $6 per month for each person. Presently, to the best of our knowledge, the following States and Territories make medical payments averaging more than $6 per recipient in one or more of the categories for public assistance: Connecticut, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, Washington, and Wisconsin.

Last year's bill separated medical payments from cash payment and limited Federal matching for medical payments to one-half of $6 a month for each adult and one-half of $3 a month for each child. This means that the States and Territories listed above have only one of two alternatives open to them under the act as amended. They can either, first, continue their systems as they now operate them and lose Federal funds on one or more of their medical payments programs, or second, they can limit their medical payments to $6 and increase their case payments, and thus receive the maximum Federal contribution, but at the cost of impairing their existing medical program. Neither alternative is desirable.

After many consultations with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Senate Legislative Counsel, and the staff of the Finance Committee, the amendment to the Social Security Act provided for in the bill I am introducing has been worked out. It would permit any State to receive Federal matching funds for medical payments up to the $6 limit, and would further permit the States to continue using matching funds for cash payments to operate their medical care programs if they chose to do so. In other words, it would combine the old provisions of the law and the new medical care provisions of last year's amendments to the law.

The amendment I am introducing permits a State to receive in Federal matching funds what it could get under the present act if it chose the second alternative, that is, holding its medical payments to $6 and increasing its cash payments so as to maximize the Federal contribution. However, there is some added cost because my amendment allows an averaging of the matchable funds. Another way of putting it is that the amendment permits the States to operate medical payments plans as under the law before it was amended last spring with additional Federal matching of the one-half of $6 a month for each adult recipient.

I believe that it was the intention of the Congress to encourage all States to develop as good a medical care program for the recipients of public assistance as they can. This amendment makes it simpler to achieve that objective.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1209) to amend titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act so as to further assist the States in extending aid for medical care to persons eligible for public assistance under such titles, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## DEFINITION OF APPLICATION OF CLAYTON AND FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACTS TO CERTAIN PRICING PRACTICES

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to define the application of the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts to certain pricing practices. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1211) to define the application of the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts to certain pricing practices, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Clayton Act (38 Stat. 730; 15 U. S. C. 13), as amended, is further amended by deleting the period at the end of section 2 (b) thereof and adding the following: ": *And provided further*, That in any proceeding involving an alleged violation of this section, it shall be a complete defense to a charge of discrimination in price, or in services or facilities furnished, if the seller shows that his lower price, or his furnishing of greater services or facilities, was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of, or services or facilities of comparable value furnished or offered by, a competitor: *And provided further*, That it shall not be a violation of this act for a seller acting independently, to sell at delivered prices, or to absorb freight to meet in good faith an equally low price of a competitor. Any price or pricing practice permitted by this or the preceding proviso shall not be prohibited under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (38 Stat. 719, as amended, 15 U. S. C. 45): *Provided, however*, That a seller shall not be deemed to have acted in good faith within the meaning of that term as used in this section if he knew or should have known that the competitor's offer or price was unlawful and nothing in this section shall make lawful any contract, combination, or conspiracy in restraint of trade or any act to monopolize, or conspiracy or attempt to monopolize, trade or commerce among the several States."

The letter presented by Mr. CAPEHART is as follows:

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
*Washington, D. C., May 25, 1954.*

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: In accordance with a request by the President, the Bureau of the Budget has worked with your representative and representatives of the interested Federal agencies in preparing certain suggestions for changes in S. 1377, "to define the application of the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts to certain pricing practices." There is attached a draft bill based on S. 1377, but incorporating the changes agreed upon by you, us, and the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, the Assistant Attorney General in Charge of Antitrust Division, and the representatives of the Secretary of Commerce and the Council of Economic Advisers. An explanation for these changes also is attached.

I am authorized to inform you that enactment of the draft bill would be in accordance with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

ROWLAND HUGHES,
*Director.*

## THREE-HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF CHARLES COUNTY, MD.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on April 13, 1958, Charles County, Md., will celebrate the 300th anniversary of its charter as a county within the colony of Maryland. Charles County citizens are presently making elaborate plans for a celebration to commemorate the county's tercentenary year.

Mr. President, Charles County, Md., has offered much to the history of this nation. Among other eminent persons, it has produced the first President of the United States in Congress Assembled, John Hanson. It was within the confines of Charles County that most of the drama of the flight of John Wilkes Booth occurred. In addition, the public records of Charles County, beginning in 1658, are reputed to be the oldest continuous public records in this country.

When one visits Charles County, he is immediately impressed with the determination of its residents to retain all that has survived over the years which is representative of the history of that area.

Mr. President, today, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to direct the issuance of a postage stamp commemorative of the tercentenary celebration of the founding of Charles County, and I ask that it be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1216) to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps commemorating the 300th anniversary of the founding of Charles County, Md., introduced by Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. BUTLER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## ACREAGE-POUNDAGE ALLOTMENTS FOR TOBACCO

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize a system of acreage-poundage allotments for tobacco. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by me before the Farm Credit Conference of the North Carolina Bankers Association on February 11, 1957, relating to the same subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the speech will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1219) to authorize a system of acreage-poundage allotments for tobacco, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The speech presented by Mr. SCOTT is as follows:

SPEECH BY HON. W. KERR SCOTT, OF NORTH CAROLINA, FARM CREDIT CONFERENCE OF THE NORTH CAROLINA BANKERS ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 11, 1957

The Farm Credit Conference of the North Carolina Bankers Association is an unusual institution. It has become an annual event that reflects the basic foundation upon which our State's economy rests—that is, the close relationship and interdependence of agriculture and business.

The entire population is indebted to the bankers for the foresight and leadership you have shown in sponsoring this event. It has become a sort of farm and business fair—an exposition—a place where farmers and businessmen get together to discuss mutual problems and share ideas.

Because of the outstanding work the association has done in agriculture with such things as this conference, your short course in modern farming and your judging contest, the North Carolina association is widely recognized as a leader in farmer-banker relationships throughout the Nation.

The fact that the NCBA has won 12 consecutive American Bankers Association agricultural awards is proof of this, and it is a real accomplishment of which all of you should be very proud.

There is another thing about the association that I feel is unique and a credit to you and our State. By and large, you are an association of small bankers, a group of independent businessmen who meet and share common problems.

For this reason you are close to the problems of the State. You work and do business at the grassroots level. You are the thermometer of our economic life.

Because of the nature of your business, I don't have to tell you that money is not as plentiful as it was a year ago—or 2 years ago. All around us, the economic belt is tightening.

Here in North Carolina it is more serious than just moving the belt over a notch or two, because we have certain problems of a special sort that have arisen out of changing conditions.

The general "tight money" situation has been added to some other very serious economic problems we are faced with because of the sharp reduction in farm income in recent years.

As a result of these two powerful forces influencing our overall economy, the bankers are put into a position of extraordinary responsibility.

I am certain that you know the importance of having sufficient funds available to keep the economy fluid, and I am sure you are going to do all you can to have on hand the needed reserves and resources to finance all legitimate farm and business operations at all times.

This is especially important for two reasons.

First, the slump we are now experiencing in the farm economy, is, I am confident, a temporary situation.

Second, we are, and will be for many years to come, basically a State of small farms and small businesses and small industries. In the final analysis, the economic health of our entire State is largely dependent on the condition of our farm economy because a great deal of our business and industrial activity involves the manufacture, processing, and distribution of our native farm products.

As the push-button age of science and machines turns more and more of our attention to industrial development, we cannot afford to make the fatal mistake of taking our farm economy for granted.

Just as a factory must keep up with the pace of automation, so must the farmer keep pace with the changing times in agriculture.

With these thoughts in mind, I would like to talk for a few minutes tonight about an extremely serious problem that is confronting our farmers this very minute.

I am speaking specifically of the tobacco problem. Cotton, grains, poultry, and other commodities also have serious problems, but because I sincerely feel tobacco is facing a problem of emergency nature, I would like to confine my remarks to this one crop.

Since the beginning of the Federal Government's acreage-control and price-support programs, tobacco has enjoyed a unique position.

Unlike most of the other price-support programs, the tobacco program is operated and controlled by the farmers themselves. More so than in any other commodity, the tobacco program has been the farmers' program. We certainly want to keep it that way.

So far, the tobacco program has been the most successful of all the commodity price-support programs because it has always operated without loss to the Government.

In all, its history shows that the tobacco program has been a very successful program in every respect because it has been a sound program. And now, and in the future, we must see to it that it remains sound.

To be sound, the tobacco program must first of all meet the needs of the law of supply and demand.

During the past several years there have been some drastic changes in consumption patterns which in turn have greatly changed the needs of manufacture.

At the same time, our need and desire to increase yields per acre have gotten us into a maddening race. It is a natural result of our efforts to increase yields to make up for reduced acreages, but it is a serious problem.

We have a two-pronged problem. We must not only produce the quantity of tobacco that is needed, but we must also produce the quality of tobacco the market demands.

Increases in yield are fine tributes to the know-how of our farmers, but we must remember that increased yields are of no value at all unless they are accompanied by the production of the types of tobacco that are in demand.

In the past few years, we have sacrificed a great deal of quality in the tobacco we have produced in our efforts to increase the yield.

The time has come when it is suicide not to control quality as well as quantity.

During the past few years we have greatly reduced our tobacco acreage in an effort to bring production in line with demand.

However, we have been losing ground steadily because of the introduction of new higher yielding varieties.

At the same time we have been producing great quantities of tobacco that are simply not wanted in the markets.

So, under the system of acreage controls we now have, we are producing neither the proper types nor amounts of tobacco that are necessary.

This means that if we expect to save the tobacco program as a farmers' program, that we have got to overhaul it to meet the needs of the day. We have got to find a more realistic approach.

I have given this problem a great deal of thought and study, and I think the best answer is a system of acreage and poundage controls. Today we are allotting tobacco in acres, but we always have and always will sell it at the market time by the pound. Until we find a system that will control production in terms of pounds, then we are missing the core of the problem.

A combination system of acreage-poundage controls such as I have in mind would work this way:

Each farmer would be assigned a base acreage allotment and a poundage quota.

To make the program fair, I think it would be wise, in computing the poundage allotments, to use a formula similar to that used in the soil-bank program to determine the average yield per acre. That is, each farmer's poundage allotment would be the highest average per acre yield of 3 of 5 preceding years, with certain limitations.

I think it would be a good idea not to let any individual farmer's per acre poundage quota go higher than 25 percent more than the county's average yield.

And in order to take care of farmers hit by disasters or crop failures, each farmer should be given an average of at least 80 percent of the county average regardless of his production history.

For the purpose of discussion let's say a farmer has base acreage allotment of 4 acres.

Let's say his average yield is 1,500 pounds per acre.

From these 4 acres the farmer would be allowed to market 6,000 pounds of tobacco, which would be his poundage quota.

If the farmer has a bad year and produces only 5,000 pounds, then he would be allowed to produce an additional 1,000 pounds above his allotment the next year. His acreage allotment would be increased by the same proportions as his poundage allotment.

The program would work the same in reverse for those farmers who overproduce in a given year.

If a farmer produces 1,000 pounds more than his poundage allotment, his poundage allotment is reduced by that amount the following year and his acreage allotment reduced in proportion.

To be fair, so long as any farmer stays within his acreage allotment, he should not be required to pay a penalty on his overproduction. However, in fairness to other farmers, he would have to take reductions in both acreage and poundage the next year.

I mention the penalty situation because it is very important to the success of such a program. First of all, if cash penalties were imposed on overproduction, it would encourage farmers to destroy the lower grades of tobacco and sell only the top grades of a crop. This could create serious problems because we need balanced supplies of various grades in the supply pipelines at all times.

It is also important for another reason. By not imposing penalties on overproduction and letting the farmers who do overproduce take poundage and acreage reductions the next year, there would be little chance of marketing cards being bought, sold, and bartered. By tying acreage and poundage allotments directly to the individual farmer's actual production each year a very important enforcement problem would be solved.

There are many other things about such a plan that appeal to me.

First of all, it would be a far more effective way of controlling actual production than under the present system.

It would be a way to avoid many of the problems that are inherent in a plan whereby you allot acres and harvest pounds. If we are going to keep supply in line with demand, then we must adopt an effective system of controlling poundage as well as acreage. That is the nerve center of this whole thing.

Under such a plan, there would be a lot more justice than we now have. Under an acreage-poundage system, everybody would be fed out of the same spoon, so to speak.

The farmers who overproduced would be the ones who would take the acreage reductions.

Under the present system, the farmers who produce anything under the average yield have to pay a double penalty when acreage is reduced, because they have to plant fewer acres to make up for the farmers who overproduce.

Some people may say this is putting a premium on inefficiency, but that is not true.

Increased per acre yield has a point of diminishing returns, and we have very definitely reached that point.

We can increase our per acre yield to almost any level we want, but if we are not producing the kind of tobacco that is in demand, then we are not efficient. And I think all will agree that that is what we have done in recent years.

Another thing that appeals to me about an acreage-poundage program is the fact that it carries with it a built-in system of crop insurance.

I should think that bankers, landlords, merchants, and creditors of all types would have a deep interest in such a program for this reason.

Under such a plan, if weather, disease, or anything else brings about a crop failure, all is not lost. Each and every farmer would have an opportunity to increase his acreage and poundage the next year and recover his losses.

To me, this feature of the program would certainly make it a lot easier for farmers and everybody who does business with them to make long-range plans with far more safety.

I do not want to create the impression that I feel such a plan would solve all the problems of tobacco. There are many others that are also very serious.

But I do feel that such a plan would enable us to come to grips with, and solve, many of our supply and demand problems and many of the problems of quality control.

I mention this to you because unless some far-reaching steps are taken in the very near future, the entire tobacco price-support program will be in very grave danger.

I will appreciate getting any ideas you have on this matter. If you feel the program I have mentioned is not the proper approach, I would certainly like to have your suggestions about solving the problems we have in this very important segment of our farm economy.

I say this because if we try to ride this thing out, if we take the attitude that time will take care of it, then we are in for a great shock and disappointment.

It has been a real pleasure being with you. I would like to add one thing—if you're ever up in Washington on business—or just on a vacation—drop by to see me. It's always good to see folks from home.

---

## AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me relating to the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1220) to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER (Democrat, Tennessee), today introduced an amendment to the Natural Gas Act exempting from regulation unaffiliated producers whose total annual production is deemed too small to have appreciable effect on gas prices.

Senator KEFAUVER said that he was introducing the bill because of inquiries he had made regarding the Federal Power Commis-

sion as a result of its action recently in permitting a 108-percent increase in prices charged by Union Oil & Gas Co., of Louisiana, without first investigating and scheduling a public hearing. This company delivers natural gas to Texas Gas Transmission Co., which in turn serves large portions of west Tennessee and other areas.

"The proposal that I am making could be adopted administratively," Senator KEFAUVER said. "However, the Federal Power Commission has not done so, and as a result develops a bureaucratic tangle which I suspect is used as a cloak for not hearing and investigating the really significant price increases. In other words, a bogged down docket offers an excuse for failing to hear such increases as that permitting the 108-percent increase by Union Oil & Gas, the result of which will be a substantial increase in the retail prices in a large market."

The bill introduced by Senator KEFAUVER covers the sale of natural gas in interstate commerce "at or prior to the conclusion of production or gathering by a person whose total sales of natural gas in interstate commerce individually or in the aggregate with affiliated producers do not exceed during the calendar year 2 billion cubic feet computed at 14.65 pounds per square inch absolute at 60° F. provided such person is neither a natural-gas company by reason of other activities nor affiliated with a natural-gas company."

Senator KEFAUVER said that this would leave about 200 producers subject to the regulation out of almost 5,000 who now have schedules filed with the FPC. The Commission could thereby do a better job of regulation with the same staff, he said.

Senator KEFAUVER said that he is considering mandatory legislation requiring FPC to grant public hearings in all those cases in which there are protests, but he doesn't think that would be possible unless it were preceded by legislation exempting such small producers.

"The basic trouble," he said, "is a lack of zeal in the public interest by the present Commission."

## PROPOSED AWARD OF MEDALS OF HONOR TO "DORCHESTER" CHAPLAINS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill cosponsored by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] to authorize the President to award posthumously, in the name of Congress, Medals of Honor to Chaplain George L. Fox, of Cambridge, Vt.; Chaplain Alexander D. Goode, of Washington, D. C.; Chaplain Clark V. Poling, of Schenectady, N. Y., and son of the distinguished Dr. Daniel A. Poling, of my State of New Hampshire; and Chaplain John P. Washington, of Arlington, N. J. These men sacrificed their lives in the sinking of the troop transport, *Dorchester*, in the North Atlantic in 1943.

The United States troop ship *Dorchester* was plowing her way through Arctic seas during the early morning of February 3, 1943, when an enemy torpedo burst in the ship's engine room. Wounded men, shocked by the explosion, fought their way upward through the holds of the disintegrating ship. Oil, which had been sprayed throughout the ship by the blast, made the ladders and catwalks perilous. In their desperate scramble from below, many of the troops left behind their life jackets. There were many men on deck who were waiting to plunge into the water without their life jackets. This would have been apparent suicide, the water being so cold that a man could not hope to survive more than a few minutes. When there were no more life jackets available, the four chaplains removed their own life jackets and gave them to the soldiers who had none. The chaplains knew that, by their actions, they were giving up any chance they might have for survival. They were the last men left on the deck. Their gallant deed will long be remembered as one of the outstanding examples of heroism during the Second World War. The contemplation of this conduct brings to mind the words of Saint John, the Apostle, who said:

> Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends (John 15: 13).

I believe that prompt consideration and passage of the bill would be appreciated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1225) to authorize the award posthumously of Congressional Medals of Honor to Chaplain George L. Fox, Chaplain Alexander D. Goode, Chaplain Clark V. Poling, and Chaplain John P. Washington, introduced by Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

## NATIONAL RADIATION HEALTH INSTITUTE TO PROTECT MANKIND FROM ATOMIC FALLOUT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 3 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the past few years there has been growing concern and grave discussion of the sinister impact of radiation from nuclear explosions on human health, and particularly on the health and growth of young children and of future generations. Yet, despite an annual budget of $2 billion on all sorts of activities, civilian and military, in the fields of nuclear developments, our Government has lagged in undertaking programs to protect people from the menace of radiation.

There is no doubt of the danger of radiation to mankind. Scientists may differ over the degree of the risk, but as to the existence of the peril doubt has vanished. Long ago, we knew of the tragic and agonizing death of workers who painted radium dials for timepieces—at a time when the physiological effects of radiation were not yet understood. Since man has cracked the atom, each nuclear explosion unlooses cosmic forces which spread mysterious but fatal radiation particles through the world.

The two greatest perils to health which have been identified and widely discussed as consequences of radiation are the danger of cancer and the danger of genetic damage and possible increases in future births of defective human children. Listen to this warning from Dr. William G. Cahan, attending surgeon at the Memorial Center for Cancer and allied diseases, in a letter to the New York Times which the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 9:

> There have been increasing numbers of leukemias developing in the Japanese who had been exposed to the atomic blast in Hiroshima. These have taken from 5 to 10 years to manifest themselves. In all probability, cancers attributable to this radiation will develop as time goes on.
>
> Although the gross contamination to which we have so far been exposed does not, presumably, approach these examples given, there is, in our present state of ignorance, a further ominous unknown.

Mr. President, can we tolerate a "state of ignorance" regarding a hazard so insidious and awful that eminent scientists fear it might induce bone cancer in little children?

Similarly, Mr. Warren Weaver, a vice president of the Rockefeller Foundation and the chairman of the group who wrote on genetics in last year's report on radiation of the National Academy of Sciences, recently testified on the serious genetic risk of radiation before the Disarmament Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He estimated that even the limited radioactivity from weapons tests to date will seriously handicap 6,000 live births throughout the world in the coming generation and perhaps 60,000 live births some 50 generations from now, and that a far greater number of future individuals will suffer minor physical handicaps as a result of these spreading genetic injuries. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that excerpts of Mr. Weaver's testimony, from a Washington Post article of January 17, 1957, appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 17, 1957]

FALLOUT HELD SURE TO HURT 6,000 BABIES—SCIENTIST TESTIFIES AT SENATE HEARING ON DISARMAMENT

(By Warren Unna)

Radioactive fallout from nuclear weapon testing to date will account for some 6,000 of the 30 million handicapped babies to be born in the coming generation, one of the Nation's top scientists declared yesterday.

Warren Weaver, vice president of the Rockefeller Foundation and chairman of the group of scientists who wrote the genetics section of last June's National Academy of Sciences radiation report, made this estimate in testimony before the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee.

* * * * *

Weaver made it clear that he thought the interests of national security required the continuance of nuclear tests. And he said the relative increased genetic danger from test radiation was small compared with both natural background radiation already existing on the globe and man-made radiation from X-rays.

But Weaver also warned: "There is no radioactive dose which is too small to count from the point of view of genetics". And he characterized as "very unfortunate" an official statement last year that the genetic effects from test radiation were "harmless."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

After the hearing, Weaver identified the author of the remark as Atomic Energy Commission Chairman Lewis L. Strauss.

In actual experience, Weaver said the people involved in the 1945 A-bombing of Hiroshima were too few—genetically—to give science any data. But projected from animal and vegetable experiments, Weaver said radioactivity from weapons tests to date:

Will "seriously handicap" 6,000 live births in the coming generation and perhaps 60,000 live births some 50 generations from now.

Will cause "small physical handicaps" in far greater number, "which will accumulate to the point where either fertility or the length of life is reduced, or both."

Weaver said his National Academy of Sciences study, which is still continuing, hasn't gone into the effect of test radioactivity on miscarriages and still births—but he left the impression that it undoubtedly existed.

The Rockefeller Foundation executive agreed with Subcommittee Chairman HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, that it was "inevitable in terms of the history of the human race" that there would be an increase in the current rate of exploding test bombs.

He said there would be double the number of handicapped live births—12,000, if the test rate doubled. And he acknowledged that, with the human tolerance level for radioactivity dropping, and the existing amount of concentration going up, "the gap is narrowing."

Weaver agreed that recent test data would require revision of the National Academy radiation report. But he denied that the AEC had influenced the scientists in their deliberations. He termed "incorrect" and "unfortunate" a story in the Washington Post last October 29 which reported the AEC had succeeded in "softening" the academy's radiation report and that scientists had been asked to sign their names to the report before seeing the final draft.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In view of these hazards with which our epochal discoveries in nuclear science confront us and our descendants for many years, I believe the time has come, Mr. President, when we must undertake some elementary steps toward preparing to live, in health and in safety for the human race, with the byproducts of these awesome discoveries. Therefore, I am introducing today a bill which proposes two such steps. I am honored to be joined in sponsoring the bill by the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], my senior colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. MANSFIELD], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1228) to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish as one of the National Institutes of Health a National Radiation Health Institute, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted etc.*, That title IV of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART E—NATIONAL RADIATION HEALTH INSTITUTE

*"Establishment of Institute*

"SEC. 441. There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a National Radiation Health Institute (hereafter in this part referred to as the 'Institute').

*"Radiation health research and training*

"SEC. 442. In carrying out the purposes of section 301 with respect to diseases and conditions resulting from atomic radiation, the Surgeon General, through the Institute and in cooperation with the National Advisory Radiation Health Council (hereafter in this part referred to as the 'Council'), shall—

"(a) conduct, assist, and foster researches, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the causes, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of diseases and conditions resulting from atomic radiation;

"(b) promote the coordination of research and control programs conducted by the Institute, and similar programs conducted by other agencies, organizations, and individuals;

"(c) make available research facilities of the Service to appropriate public authorities, and to health officials and scientists engaged in special studies related to the purposes of this part;

"(d) make grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or private agencies and institutions, and to individuals for such research projects relating to diseases and conditions resulting from atomic radiation as are recommended by the Council, including grants to such agencies and institutions for the construction, acquisition, leasing, equipment, and maintenance of such hospital, clinic, laboratory, and related facilities, and for the care of such patients therein, as are necessary for such research;

"(e) establish an information center on research, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of diseases and conditions resulting from atomic radiation, and collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, information as to, and the practical application of, research and other activities carried on pursuant to this part;

"(f) secure from time to time, and for such periods as he deems advisable, the assistance and advice of persons from the United States or abroad who are experts in the field of atomic radiation, and the diseases and conditions resulting therefrom;

"(g) in accordance with regulations and from funds appropriated or donated for the purpose (1) establish and maintain research fellowships in the Institute and elsewhere with such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) as he may deem necessary to train research workers and to procure the assistance of the most brilliant and promising research fellows from the United States and abroad, and, in addition, provide for such fellowships through grants, upon recommendations of the Council, to public and other nonprofit institutions; and (2) provide training and instruction and establish and maintain traineeships, in the Institute and elsewhere in matters relating to the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of diseases and conditions resulting from atomic radiation with such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) for trainees as he may deem necessary, the number of persons receiving such training and instruction, and the number of persons holding such traineeships, to be fixed by the Council, and, in addition, provide for such training, instruction, and traineeship through grants, upon recommendation of the Council, to public and other nonprofit institutions.

*"Administration*

"SEC. 443. (a) In carrying out the provisions of section 442, all appropriate provisions of section 301 shall be applicable to the authority of the Surgeon General, and grants-in-aid for research and training projects in diseases and conditions resulting from atomic radiation shall be made only after review and recommendation of the Council made pursuant to section 444.

"(b) The Surgeon General shall recommend to the Secretary acceptance of conditional gifts, pursuant to section 501, for study, investigation, or research into the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of diseases or conditions resulting from atomic radiation, or for the acquisition of grounds or for the erection, equipment, or maintenance of premises, buildings, or equipment of the Institute. Donations of $50,000 or over for carrying out the purposes of this part may be acknowledged by the establishment within the Institute of suitable memorials to the donors.

*"Functions of the Council*

"SEC. 444. The Council is authorized to—

"(a) review research projects or programs submitted to or initiated by it relating to the study of the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of diseases and conditions resulting from atomic radiation, and certify approval to the Surgeon General, for prosecution under section 412, any such projects which it believes show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of such diseases and conditions;

"(b) review applications from any university, hospital, laboratory, or other institution or agency, whether public or private, or from individuals, for grants-in-aid for research projects relating to atomic radiation and the diseases and conditions resulting therefrom, and certify to the Surgeon General its approval of grants-in-aid in the cases of such projects which show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of diseases and conditions resulting from atomic radiation;

"(c) review applications from any public or other nonprofit institution for grants-in-aid for training, instruction, and traineeships in matters relating to the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of diseases and conditions resulting from atomic radiation, and certify to the Surgeon General its approval of such applications for grants-in-aid as it determines will best carry out the purposes of this act;

"(d) collect information as to studies which are being carried on in the United States or any other country as to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of diseases and conditions resulting from atomic radiation, by correspondence or by personal investigation of such studies, and with the approval of the Surgeon General make available such information through appropriate publications for the benefit of health and welfare agencies and organizations (public and private), physicians, or any other scientists, and for the information of the general public;

"(e) recommend to the Surgeon General for acceptance conditional gifts pursuant to section 501 for carrying out the purposes of this part; and

"(f) advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Surgeon General with respect to carrying out the provisions of this part."

SEC. 2. (a) The first sentence of section 217 (a) of the Public Health Service Act is

Approved For Release 2005/11/21 : CIA-RDP80B01676R003100020001-3

amended by inserting after "National Advisory Heart Council," the following: "National Advisory Atomic Health Council,".

(b) The second sentence of section 217 (a) of that act is amended (1) by inserting after "National Advisory Heart Council" the following: "National Advisory Radiation Health Council," and by inserting after "heart diseases," the following: "atomic radiation diseases and conditions,".

(c) Subsections (d) and (h) of section 301 of that act are each amended by inserting after "National Advisory Heart Council," the following: "or, with respect to atomic radiation diseases and conditions, recommended by the National Advisory Radiation Health Council,".

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is directed to establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Office of Radiation Health Control, which shall—

(a) collect from the National Radiation Health Institute and from other sources, and disseminate to the public, information on the manner and extent to which present and future human health, well-being, and living conditions may be affected by radiation;

(b) with such scientific assistance as may be available from the National Radiation Health Institute, formulate a program for making available to each person in the United States a voluntary simple and efficient means of keeping a permanent record of measurable amounts of radiation to which he is exposed during his lifetime;

(c) in accordance with this program, prepare a form of permanent personal radiation exposure record and instructions for its use; and

(d) provide for the wide dissemination of personal radiation exposure record forms, and of instructions for their use, with priority to children and to persons likely to have closer than normal proximity to sources of radiation, through appropriate channels such as Federal, State, and local agencies, medical practitioners (particularly pediatricians) and dentists, hospitals (particularly maternity departments), schools, the armed services, industrial establishments and labor organizations, and radiologists, and operators of any equipment using or creating radiation.

Mr. NEUBERGER. First, this bill would create a National Radiation Health Institute, alongside the other famous National Institutes of Health which are doing so much toward pushing back the frontiers of medicine in half-a-dozen critical areas of human health. As in the case of the other Institutes, the proposed National Radiation Health Institute would have extensive functions of research and study in all phases of the impact of nuclear radiation on human health and well-being—through experiments by its own personnel, scholarships and fellowships, and stimulation and coordination of similar research studies elsewhere. The National Radiation Health Institute would become a central source of the most complete and advanced information and education in this vital new field of medical science.

Secondly, my bill would initiate a program which has immediate importance for every person who would participate in it, and which could also aid greatly in future research on the impact of radiation. This is a program of developing and disseminating a permanent personal record form on which any person can, voluntarily, maintain a lifetime record of exposures to measurable amounts of radiation.

### VOLUNTARY RADIATION RECORDS WOULD PROTECT AGAINST OVEREXPOSURE

Such a lifetime record will be of particular value to young children and to those who will be born in the future. Consequently, it should be of primary concern for the Office of Radiation Health Control, which section 3 of my bill would establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to disseminate an uncomplicated and easily usable permanent exposure record form through children's doctors and hospital maternity wards and schools, with simple instructions for entries by dentists and X-ray technicians and others whenever the individual is knowingly subjected to radiation. Another group who will increasingly need a reliable means of keeping a permanent record of radiation exposure will be scientists themselves, industrial workers, and other who are more likely than the average to come into repeated proximity to nuclear radiation.

This section of my bill, Mr. President, would enact a recommendation of last year's report by the National Academy of Sciences, published under the title "The Biological Effects of Atomic Radiation." A section of that study recommended that, because of the ever-increasing quantity of atomic particles in the air, "the medical use of X-rays should be reduced as much as is consistent with medical necessity."

But how would doctors or anybody else know the exact amount of X-ray exposure to which a man, woman or child had been subjected? And so the report of the National Academy of Sciences proposed:

One, records should be kept for every individual, showing his total accumulated lifetime exposure to radiation.

Two, the average exposure of the population's reproductive cells to radiation above the natural background should be limited to 10 roentgens from conception to age 30.

Three, individual persons should not receive a total accumulated dose to the reproductive cells of more than 50 roentgens additional up to age 40. About half of all United States children are born to parents under 30, nine-tenths to parents under 40.

It has amazed me, Mr. President, that the Government and Congress have never acted on this urgent recommendation by the distinguished staff of the National Academy of Sciences that records be developed to permit any individual to keep track of his total dosage of radiation, from the cradle right on through the rest of his or her life. When we consider that too large a dose of radiation could mean the impairment of reproductive processes or even death, the failure to act seems incredible. Is this not one area where any error should be always on the side of safety?

### COMPANION BILL SPONSORED BY OREGON REPRESENTATIVE

Last autumn I discussed this crucial problem with Oregon's brilliant new Member of Congress from the Fourth District, CHARLES O. PORTER, as he and I drove together for many hundreds of miles during the campaign. We listened at night on the car radio to warnings about radiation voiced by leading scientists and by such eminent political figures as Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, the Democratic nominee for President; and by other such distinguished leaders concerned with our public policies in the nuclear field as the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], then chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and both Senators from the State of Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER and Mr. GORE].

CHARLES PORTER and I resolved that, if we ever had the opportunity to work together in the Congress, we would make a joint effort to seek the establishment of Government programs designed to protect people from the dreadful menace of radiation. The result is the bill which I have introduced today, and a companion bill which Mr. PORTER is introducing in the House of Representatives. We believe that the establishment of a greatly expanded, central research program, through a national radiation health institute, and a personal radiation-record plan, are the minimum steps which should be taken now. These programs could well be coordinated, without undesirable duplication, with other work now being done or planned at places such as the Medical Research Center at Brookhaven National Laboratory, at Oak Ridge and Argonne National Laboratory and academic centers such as the University of Rochester. We know that radiation can be a tool of medicine as well as a destructive force, and that much progress has been made in its constructive use.

### PERILS MAGNIFIED IN HANDLING OF ATOMIC MATERIALS AND WASTE

Another area which will need much additional study before we can fully utilize the constructive potentials of atomic energy is safety in the handling and disposal of atomic materials and waste products.

Mr. President, I have visited on a number of occasions the great Hanford atomic works along the upper Columbia River in the Pacific Northwest, where plutonium-235 for the atomic and hydrogen bombs is produced. This process causes a great amount of waste material. Disposal of this material is one of the most hazardous and difficult tasks confronting the skilled operators of the Hanford works. For example, it must be buried permanently in huge tunnels hundreds of feet beneath the upland desert and encased in enormous tubes of concrete and lead. An article in the January 1957 issue of the magazine Railway Progress, entitled "Hottest Freight on Earth," by Edward A. Herron, describes the delicate and painstaking precautions which must be taken to protect from radiation the men operating the trains dispatched to carry this atomic waste material to its deep and remote burying places.

This merely serves to demonstrate to us the grim peril lurking in the slightest contact with materials which give off radiation. I grant that few in their daily lives share the danger involved in operating what Mr. Herron has described in Railway Progress as "the hottest freight

on earth." Yet, still, Dr. Cahan in his letter to the New York Times has told how a wild muskrat near the atomic plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., was found to be cancer ridden, presumably because some radioactive material had sifted into the river along which the animal lived. The muskrat had bone cancer, reported Dr. Cahan, evidently from eating plants at the water's edge. Earlier the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] submitted this letter for printing in the RECORD.

RADIOACTIVE STRONTIUM MAY ENTER FOOD AND FIBERS

Mr. President, we have had repeated warnings from eminent scientists about the danger from such radioactive substances as strontium 90, a calciumlike material which, when it enters into living organisms, has a tendency to be permanently absorbed into the bone structure. These warnings cannot be disregarded. Nor do we solve the problems of living with the new era of nuclear technology simply by developing and setting off so-called clean H-bombs with assurances that these will not spread a deadly fallout all over the globe. We need to look beyond only the short-range future of bomb tests. We need an agency, outside of those whose essential concern is for atomic developments themselves, which will be responsible primarily for the consequences of these developments for human health and for the safety of life in a world in which we will be increasingly surrounded by radiation.

Mr. President, our field of knowledge in this perilous realm is not nearly wide enough. Note this paragraph in last year's report by the National Academy of Sciences:

> At present the contamination is negligible. But the maximum tolerable level is not known. There is not nearly enough information about the long-term biological effects on man or animals from eating radiation-contaminated foods. Research in this area is urgently needed.

This would be a vital project for the new Institute which my bill proposes. What, Mr. President, could be more urgent to us all? Particles of strontium 90, the deadly substance resulting from nuclear fission, steadily come to earth and enter into vegetables, and into grass and plants eaten by grazing animals, among them dairy herds. People drink the milk given by these cows, particularly children, for milk is a major part of a healthy child's nutrition.

Surely we cannot leave to chance and to fragmentary bits of research and investigation, done in far-separated laboratories, the collection of every possible bit of knowledge about the impact of radiation upon the future sources of the food we and our children will eat. A government which can invest $40 billion in weapons of war can invest a tiny fragment of this, perhaps as relatively little as $15 million, in the establishment and operation of a National Radiation Health Institute to tell us what we now do not know, in the words of the scientists of the National Academy of Sciences, "about the long-term biological effects on man or animals from eating radiation-contaminated food." And the same applies to the other unknown effects of radiation and their prevention or treatment.

The time to begin is now—before the danger becomes so critical that we will have to start sudden and wasteful "crash" programs without adequate preparation, without sufficient numbers of trained and experienced specialists. Let us, for once, be foresighted in this life-and-death matter, and prepare immediately for protecting the people's health in the atomic era.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD part II of the report of the National Academy of Sciences entitled "The Biological Effects of Atomic Radiation," which is a brief digest of the findings and recommendations of this report; the article by Edward A. Herron, from Railway Progress of January 1957 entitled "Hottest Freight on Earth"; and an article from the Washington Post of February 8, 1957, which reports the findings of three Columbia University scientists that "today man has absorbed only a fraction of the maximum amount of strontium 90 his body can safely stand from radioactive fallout, but that the average is higher for children and is rising for all age groups."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PART II. BRIEF DIGEST OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is generally agreed that, in the peacetime development of atomic energy, man has been lucky. He has been dealing with an enormous new force whose potential effects he has only dimly understood. Thus far, except for some tragic accidents affecting small numbers of people, the biological damage from peacetime activities (including the testing of atomic weapons) has been essentially negligible. Furthermore, it appears that radiation problems, if they are met intelligently and vigilantly, need not stand in the way of the large-scale development of atomic energy. The continuing need for intelligence and vigilance cannot be too strongly emphasized, however.

The problems of radiation fall naturally into two main classes: (1) The effects on human beings; (2) the various ways in which radiation can reach human beings through the environment.

EFFECTS ON HUMANS

The inheritance mechanism is by far the most sensitive to radiation of any biological system.

Any radiation which reaches the reproductive cells causes mutations (changes in the material governing heredity) that are passed on to succeeding generations.

Human gene mutations which produce observable effects are believed to be universally harmful.

Everyone is subjected to the natural background radiation which causes an unavoidable quantity of so-called spontaneous mutations. Anything that adds radiation to this naturally occurring background rate causes further mutations, and is genetically harmful.

There is no minimum amount of radiation which must be exceeded before mutations occur. Any amount, however small, that reaches the reproductive cells can cause a correspondingly small number of mutations. The more radiation, the more mutations.

The harm is cumulative. The genetic damage done by radiation builds up as the radiation is received, and depends on the total accumulated gonad dose received by people from their own conception to the conception of their last child.

So far as individuals are concerned, not all mutant genes or combinations of mutant genes are equally harmful. A few may cause very serious handicaps, many others may produce much smaller harm, or even no apparent damage.

But from the point of view of the total and eventual damage to the entire population, every mutation causes roughly the same amount of harm. This is because mutant genes can only disappear when the inheritance line in which they are carried dies out. In cases of severe and obvious damage this may happen in the first generation; in other cases it may require hundreds of generations.

Thus, for the general population, and in the long run, a little radiation to a lot of people is as harmful as a lot of radiation to a few, since the total number of mutant genes can be the same in the two cases.

It is difficult to arrive at a figure showing how much genetic harm radiation can do. One measure is the amount of radiation, above the natural background, which would produce as many mutations again as occur spontaneously. It is estimated that this amount is 30 to 80 roentgens.

(The roentgen is a unit of radiation. To give an idea of its value, the average dental X-ray delivers five roentgens to the patient's jaw, but only five-thousandths of a roentgen of stray radiation to more remote parts of the body such as the gonads.)

It is also estimated that a dose of 10 roentgens to every person in the United States would cause something on the order of 5 million mutant genes which would then be a part of the population's inheritance pool. This figure is subject to considerable uncertainty.

At present the United States population is exposed to radiation from (a) the natural background, (b) medical and dental X-rays, (c) fallout from atomic weapons testing. The 30-year dose to the gonads received by the average person from each of these sources is estimated as follows:

(a) Background, about 4.3 roentgens.

(b) X-rays an fluoroscopy, about 3 roentgens.

(c) Weapons test, if continued at the rate of the past 5 years would give a probable 30-year dose of about 0.1 roentgen. This figure may be off by a factor of 5; i. e., the possible range is from 0.02 to 0.5 roentgen. If tests were conducted at the rate of the 2 most active years (1953 and 1955) the 30-year dose would be about twice as great as that just stated.

If the exposure of the general population to radiation is limited to levels which the genetics committee believes reasonable (see recommendations at the end of this part), there should be practically no pathological effects in the persons receiving the radiation.

Larger exposures (say 100 roentgens and up) of the whole body or a large part of it are generally harmful when received in a single dose. (Much higher doses may, however be safely and usefully delivered to limited portions of the body under the controlled conditions of medical treatment.) Very little is now known about how to treat the pathological effects of radiation or how to protect the body against them in the first place. Much research is needed in these fields.

One of the effects is a shortening of life. This seems to involve some generalized action. Irradiated individuals may age faster than normally even if they do not develop specific radiation-induced diseases like leukemia. It has not been shown that exposures small enough to be genetically tolerable have this effect. Furthermore, the permissible exposure levels that have been established for persons working with radiation appear to be within the limits of safety.

However, it is not yet known what minimum dose, if any, would be necessary to produce a statistically noticeable reduction of life span when very large numbers of people are concerned.

ENVIRONMENT AND FOOD SUPPLY

Radiation in the general environment has not yet become a serious problem. In a few decades, however, radioactive waste products from atomic powerplants will represent an enormous potential source of contamination. How much of this radioactivity will actually reach the population depends on how successfully it can be kept out of the great network—ocean and air currents, food and water supplies—which connect man to his surroundings.

At present test explosions of atomic weapons are the only significant source of radiation in the general environment, above the natural background.

Meteorologists have found no evidence that atomic explosions have changed the weather or climate. Nor do they believe that continued weapons tests, at the same rate and in the same areas as in the past, would have such an effect.

Radiation from explosions passes into the atmosphere and much of it eventually returns to the ground as fallout.

Fallout divides into three classes: (1) close-in—material that comes down within a few hundred miles of the explosion and within 10 to 20 hours, (2) intermediate—material that descends in a few weeks after the explosion, (3) delayed—material that remains in the air for months or years.

Close-in fallout from test explosions affects only restricted, uninhabited regions.

Intermediate fallout would descend very slowly if it were pulled down only by gravity. It is mostly washed out of the air by rain and snow. It spreads over large parts of the earth, but its effect over a small area may be accentuated if there is heavy precipitation while the radioactive cloud is overhead.

Delayed fallout is stored for long periods in the stratosphere. Meteorologists know very little about the interchange of air between the stratosphere and lower layers, so they cannot predict exactly how long the material will stay up, or where it is likely to descend.

At this point the oceans are not receiving any significant quantities of radioactive material. But eventually they will undoubtedly be used as a repository for some of the radioactive waste products of atomic powerplants.

Before this can safely begin on a large scale, much research is needed to determine the mixing rates between various parts of the seas. Materials deposited in some of the deep parts of the ocean may remain there 100 years or more, so that most of their radioactivity would be gone before they reach surface water. On the other hand, material dumped into coastal and other surface waters would directly affect marine life and, within a few years, would contaminate all parts of the world because of the relatively rapid circulation of surface layers.

Radioactive tracers can be used to chart ocean and air currents and to study the interrelationships of marine animals. Many important experiments in these fields will be possible only within the next 10 or 20 years. Increasing radioactive contamination of the sea and atmosphere will make it impossible after that to detect the tracers against the heightened background.

Radiation from fallout inevitably contaminates man's food supply. Radioactive elements in the soil are taken up and concentrated by plants. The plants may be eaten by humans, or by animals which in turn serve as human food.

At present the contamination is negligible. But the maximum tolerable level is not known. There is not nearly enough information about the long-term biological effects on man or animals from eating radiation-contaminated food. Research in this area is urgently needed.

Probably the most important potential food contamination is strontium 90—a radioactive element that concentrates in bone tissue. Already, detectable although biologically insignificant traces of it have turned up in milk supplies thousands of miles from the site of atomic explosions.

Food from the oceans is also subject to radioactive contamination. Marine plants and animals extract and concentrate various radioactive elements that get into seawater. The concentration is cumulative, increasing as it proceeds up the chain from microscopic plankton to edible fish.

Properly used, radiation can enhance man's food supply rather than damage it. Radiation techniques have already opened important new fields in agricultural research and will undoubtedly become increasingly valuable. No drastic change in agricultural production appears imminent, however.

Tracer studies will help us understand basic metabolic processes in plants and animals. They will also be applied to practical problems such as the use of fertilizers.

Mutation rates in plants are being artificially speed up with radiation in the hope of producing new and superior strains. Thus far, only a few new economic varieties have been found, but the method is promising. The use of radiation to sterilize packaged food may have dramatic impact on food technology by reducing the need for refrigeration and extending the shelf-life of many products.

Holding radiation to a tolerable worldwide level will require adequate methods for disposing of, or, rather, for containing radioactive wastes from power reactors.

Some of these wastes will remain dangerously radioactive for centuries.

Research has indicated some apparently feasible systems for controlled disposal, but none is yet at the point of economic operating reality.

The major problem in routine disposal is what to do with the wastes resulting from the processing of reactor fuel. The wastes from normal operations of reactors themselves can be more easily handled.

A second major problem is to anticipate the accidents that will inevitably occur and to set up safety standards which will insure that they do not become catastrophes.

Considered in this light, it appears feasible to use nuclear reactors in central station power plants and in naval vessels.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of these findings the study committees have made a number of recommendations. Those of the genetics committee apply most directly to all of us. They are:

(I) Records should be kept for every individual, showing his total accumulated lifetime exposure to radiation.

(II) The medical use of X-rays should be reduced as much as is consistent with medical necessity.

(III) The average exposure of the population's reproductive cells to radiation above the natural background should be limited to 10 roentgens from conception to age 30.

(IV) The 10-roentgen limit should be reconsidered periodically with a view to keeping the reproductive cell exposure at the lowest practicable level.

(V) Individual persons should not receive a total accumulated dose to the reproductive cells of more than 50 roentgens up to age 30 years, and not more than 50 roentgens additional up to age 40. (About half of all United States children are born to parents under 30, nine-tenths to parents under 40.)

Other recommendations of general interest are:

(VI) Techniques for monitoring worldwide fall-out should be further improved.

(VII) Measurements of the storage of radiation in the stratosphere should be continued and extended.

(VIII) A national agency should control and keep records of all dumping of radioactive material in the ocean.

(IX) An international body should set up safe standards for the marine and air disposal of radioactive materials as soon as possible, based on current knowledge.

(X) Research in marine disposal should be carried out on a cooperative international basis.

(XI) Until advances in reactor technology substantially reduce potential hazards buildings that house reactors located near populated areas should be sealed against the release of radioactive materials in the event of accident.

(XII) Research should be continued and accelerated, particularly in the fields of:

Fundamental genetics, mammalian genetics, human and population genetics.

Pathological effects of radiation.

Mixing between various parts of the atmosphere.

Mixing between various parts of the oceans.

The role of plants and animals, both on land and in the oceans, in concentrating radioactive materials.

The tolerable levels of radioactivity in human and animal food.

Geophysical and geochemical aspects of the ultimate disposal of radioactive wastes.

Selection of biologically suitable sites for various atomic facilities.

Safety devices for the control of accidental power surges in reactors.

---

[From Railway Progress of January 1957]

HOTTEST FREIGHT ON EARTH—HOW WOULD YOU FEEL WITH THE INSIDES OF AN A-BOMB RIDING IN THE BOXCAR NEXT DOOR?

(By Edward A. Herron)

At 6 o'clock on a calm, sunlit morning, Conductor Bill Cantwell takes a last, approving glance at his white-painted, shingle-sided home, ducks under a stilled elm tree by the sidewalk, and starts off for the roundhouse. The early morning hour, the brilliance of the sun, and the complete absence of wind all fit into a pattern. It forms a background for the fact that this morning Cantwell's train will carry the hottest freight on earth.

Every foot of ground in the 7 miles he drives to meet his train is owned by the people of the United States. Every home that he passes is owned, not by the people who live within, but, again, by the people of the United States. Invisibly, the Great Seal of the United States is stamped on the grocery stores, the drugstores, the taxi stands, and the theaters. It's part of the lampposts and molded into the fireplugs.

The treee-lined town of Richland, marooned on a high desert plateau in the State of Washington, is owned by 169 million Americans and cared for by 1 of the most unusual landlords in the United States.

The General Electric Co., agent for the people, maintains the sewerage system, the water system, the police and fire departments. It stocks the libraries and hires the teachers for the 5 schools for the town of 27,000 which only 12 hurried years ago was a tiny village of 250 persons surrounded by sagebrush and sand. Among other activities, it operates a railroad, and each week General Electric hands to Conductor Bill Cantwell a paycheck for shepherding the most dangerous material ever manufactured by man. Only a breath of wind away from Richland, behind a barricade wire and a barrier of secrecy, is another General Electric project, the Atomic Energy Commission's Hanford plant. The product of the billion-dollar plant and its 9,000 employees is plutonium, the ingredient of the atomic bomb. One of

the byproducts of the mammoth plant hidden in the desert is the skill to be applied in the peacetime use of the atom. A waste product of the atomic process is a deadly radioactive residue which must be disposed of safely and without hesitation.

While the rest of industry talks about the coming of the atomic age, the 150-mile railroad within the barricades of Hanford is already deep into it.

Down the black-top highway from Richland, and not quite to the barricade where armed guards maintain a 24-hour vigil, is a vast maintenance shop where trucks, company buses, official passenger automobiles and assorted mobile equipment share space with a fleet of diesel locomotives. The shop is exceptionally new and exceptionally clean, and, unlike any other railroad maintenance shop in the country, it is liberally sprinkled with the purple shamrock insignia marked: Radiation zone.

Here Conductor Cantwell meets Engineer Bill Dye and Trainman A. H. Cox, and receives with them his orders for the day: burial detail.

In the tire industry, when a mold becomes faulty, the tiremakers call in a repairman, or telephone a scrap dealer to come pick it up. Up in Hanford, when a piece of highly radioactive equipment becomes faulty, they bury it.

A special work permit is issued to the train crew, and a radiation monitor is assigned to accompany them on the mission. A little kit resembling an auxiliary lunch bucket is handed out, each kit containing two pen-sized dosimeters for spotting gamma radiation, and a film badge which responds weirdly to invisible rays. A card is prepared for each man on which will be entered a running total of the radiation to which each crewman is exposed. It's the job of the accompanying monitor to keep tabs on exposure, to tell a man, if need be, "You're burned out—no more radiation for the rest of the week."

Getting dressed for the burial detail is a ritual. Full length coveralls are pulled on, a surgeon's skull cap, then a white hood which is tucked under the coveralls. White canvas shoe covers are donned, followed by heavy rubbers. Finally the trainmen pull on surgeon's gloves, topping them off with canvas gloves whose edges are bound with masking tape. If the job is extremely hot, assault masks are included, and the man-from-Mars look is complete.

The 3 crewmen and the radiation monitor then shuffle out to the 1,500 horsepower diesel that is waiting on the track adjoining the maintenance shop. They climb aboard and the locomotive inches ahead. Just as they leave the shadow of the maintenance building, a Northern Pacific steamer, last of the fleet operating out of the nearby Pasco yards, brings in a line of cars. An Atomic Energy Commission yard switcher moves forward to take over the outside freight.

The crew aboard the diesel is cleared through security at the barricade, picks up a string of 10 empty flats, and rolls smoothly over the desert to the tall stacks silhouetted against the horizon. The stacks mark the chemical separations plant where plutonium is separated from irradiated uranium fuel elements.

From the outside, as the odd train advances, the building looks as innocent as a soap factory. Inside is the most advanced manufacturing equipment ever devised by man, some of it dangerously contaminated with radioactive materials.

Engineer Dye takes the diesel onto a spur that leads directly to one of the grim buildings. With Cantwell directing the operation, he pushes his empties toward the windowless building. Waiting for them is a burial box mounted on a flatcar. Dye has 10 cars between him and the box. Cox and Cantwell necessarily are closer when they make the coupling. When they shuffle back to the locomotive, the radiation monitor runs his counter over them in a precautionary check.

Before the arrival of the train, the wornout and contaminated objects had been dropped into the box, inside of which was a 12-inch layer of sawdust to soak up any moisture dripping from the wornout equipment. Steel clamps had snapped shut when the lid was dropped in place on the sponge-rubber gasket surrounding the lip of the box. The precautions were all necessary in order to prevent any stray gust of wind from lifting radioactive dust from the box and scattering it over the desert.

Dye keeps the "funeral train" at a 10-mile-per-hour pace on the run to the burial ground, far out in the desert wastes of the 640-square-mile Hanford project. He brings the train to a gliding stop beside a huge hole dug in the desert. A long cable, threaded through loops along the spacer cars, is peeled loose and attached to a tractor 500 feet away. At a signal from Cantwell, the box is skidded down from the flatcar down a ramp, and into the hole.

The radiation monitor is alert, measuring constantly for radiation. Low clouds, dust, or vapor particles cause skyshine, a radiation that travels mysteriously from the contaminated box, up to the dust barrier, then downward to the crewmen. A signalman, standing high on a crane boom, directs the burial. Bulldozers push earth over the crated equipment. The locomotive and the train crew move away.

The flatcar on which the box has been secured is placed out on a desert siding. Sometimes a vigorous steam cleaning is sufficient for decontaminating a car. In severe cases, weeks or months, even years, may go by before a car is safe for use again.

The locomotive is checked for radiation by monitors who swarm over the husky EMD. On each job the diesels pick up contamination in some degree and are treated accordingly. Back in the maintenance shop the crew is carefully checked. After disposing of the white duck coveralls, boots, gloves, and hoods, they step upon a "hand-and-foot" counter which reveals any vestiges of radiation. When a radiation card shows that a trainman is "burned out," he is removed from all contact with "hot material" until a designated time period is ended.

Burial of extremely heavy equipment, too unwieldly to be boxed, is handled in a more bizarre fashion. When a giant concentrator must be disposed of, it is lashed securely on a flatcar, and Cantwell and his crew go in after it. A tunnel, 500 feet long, has been dug beneath the desert within the Hanford area. A spur leads back into the tunnel, where Dye rolls the flatcar, with its somber load. Cox uncouples the car, and the train pulls out into the sunshine. When the EMD and the white-shrouded crew are safely outside, a huge water-filled concrete barrier drops down, sealing off forever the flatcar and its burden.

The tunnel can swallow 12 flatcars. When it is filled, the spur will be shifted to a new cavern.

Seniority does not prevail at Hanford. The 31 employees of the line, including 8 conductors, 11 switchmen, and 8 engineers, are divided into 8 crews working on rotating assignments. The men who handle fiercely radioactive material 1 day may be pushing a string of lumber cars the next. The major portion of their workday is similar to that of railroad men working the yards outside Los Angeles or around Chicago. But the exciting portions of their work are blazing new trails in industrial America.

In the very near future nuclear fuel will be shipped all over the world. Today it is being shipped daily by rail from one spot to the other within the Hanford works. Plutonium and unfissioned uranium are taken from Hanford's atomic reactors in cylinders. The much-publicized elements are encased in lead-lined casks which in turn are eased into water-filled "wells" mounted on the specially built railroad cars Trainman Cox waves into position. The water in the wells helps absorb the heat generated by the intensely radioactive slugs. Dye hauls the weird freight over to the separation plants, miles away, where the uranium and plutonium are separated. The uranium is recovered and reused; the plutonium is shipped to other Atomic Energy Commission installations. The highly radioactive fission products, now in waste solution, are safely stored.

Today some of those fission products have turned out to have great value in medicine, in industry and agriculture, and the railroads soon will be moving them.

Despite the nature of the work performed on the line, there has never been an injury as a result of radiation in an operation that continues 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

In the more normal railroad operations around Hanford 30,000 cars a year move in and out of the barricades, mostly from the Union Pacific, the Northern Pacific, and the Milwaukee. Four 1,000-horsepower Alco diesels, three 500-horsepower General Electric yard switchers, and one 1,500-horsepower EMD keep the cars moving about the 150 miles of rail within the barricade.

Living in a small town so close to a source of radiation is remarkably calm, country-like. Constant monitoring of stack emission is maintained. Once in a great while an extra-heavy puff coming from one of the reactor stacks will send white-coated monitor crews scurrying about Richland, checking the radiation fallout. But with the tremendous safety factors devised with 12 years of experience, living in Richland is just as safe as living in any other suburban community within the United States.

But there's no denying that railroading is different, no denying that the rules are being rewritten up in Hanford as Cantwell, Cox, and Dye ease radioactive slugs about the desert. The experience gained at the atomic-energy plant will soon be appearing in the operating manuals of railroads in every section of the country as they get ready to do their share in moving the hottest freight on earth.

---

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 8, 1957]

MAN FAR SHORT OF ABSORPTION LIMIT OF STRONTIUM 90, SCIENTISTS REPORT, BUT PERIL MAY INCREASE FIFTYFOLD BY 1970

NEW YORK, February 7.—Three scientists said today man has absorbed only a fraction of the maximum amount of strontium 90 his body can safely stand from radioactive fallout, but that the average is higher for children and is rising for all age groups.

The scientists said such fallout produces "hazards to the human race." They said "the development of bone cancer" is an internal hazard.

The scientists, J. Laurence Kulp, Walter R. Eckelmann, and Arthur R. Schulert, of Columbia University, published their findings in the February 8 issue of Science.

However, they said at a news conference, "there is no evidence of anyone being in danger at the present time."

They added that the average man probably could stand fallout from explosions of 1,000 megatons a year. The Atomic Energy Commission has said nuclear explosions have contributed an average of 3 megatons a year during 1955 and 1956.

The scientists said the "tolerable level of external gamma radiation for genetic effects is not well defined." But they determined that by the fall of 1955, man had assimilated a worldwide average of about 0.12 micromicrocurie of strontium 90 from nuclear explosion fallout.

The average is about one-ten-thousandth of the accepted maximum permissible con-

centration, the scientists said, but will rise to 1 to 2 micro-microcuries by 1970. If tests continue at their present rate, the scientists estimated, the average man will have assimilated 4 to 8 micro-microcuries, or about one-two-hundredth of the maximum amount, by 1970.

A micro-microcurie is one-millionth of one-millionth of a curie, a measure of radioactive emanation from 1 gram of radium.

---

## SMALL FORESTRY LOANS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 3 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Mississippi may proceed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which might be called the small-forest credit bill. I shall briefly explain its need and what it will accomplish if enacted.

The commercial forest land of the Nation comprises 489 million acres. It is surprising to note how much of this land is owned by farmers, housewives, professional and retired persons, and other private individuals not associated with any forest industry. Small forests of less than 100 acres each, both farm and nonfarm, for example, comprise roughly a third of all commercial forest land in private ownership. If woodlands ranging in size from 100 to 500 acres are added, the total forms 61 percent of our privately owned commercial forest area. Looking at it in another way, it has been estimated that about 1 out of 10 American families owns a small forest. These small forests could and should provide a very substantial portion of the total raw-material needs of our forest industries.

On the other hand, it is on these same small private forest-land holdings where the most difficult problems in American forestry are found. It is here that the poorest forest-management practices are applied, and the smallest percentage of potential growth and value are obtained. Although encouraging progress in forest management has been made on forest tracts in public and industry ownership, advances on the smaller private holdings are still disappointingly slow. It is on such lands, accordingly, that both the need for improvement and the potentialities for betterment are greatest.

Public cooperative programs on the part of Federal and State agencies and also industrial and other assistance programs are already helping the owners of small forest tracts in a number of ways. My firsthand observations, however, clearly indicate that further assistance is urgently needed. Too frequently the small forest landowner has to sell his timber while it is still immature and of small value. Too often his trees are prematurely cut in order to obtain immediate cash in order to pay medical, educational, and other pressing family bills. In many cases, he does not have and cannot obtain the money needed to finance timber stand improvement and other forestry measures which would yield substantial returns in increased value of subsequent cuts.

Certain credit is now available, but this is limited and falls far short of meeting the need. National bank loans secured by forest land and timber, authorized within the past few years, are limited to 2-year terms except when special provisions permit a maximum 10-year period. Federal land bank timber loans, available in certain areas, are limited to properties having a substantial amount of merchantable timber or a good growth of young timber approaching merchantable size. Soil and water conservation loans by the Secretary of Agriculture are available only to finance farm land improvement. I understand forest loans by certain of the life insurance companies have been increasing, but these have been limited for the most part to larger industrial borrowers. My bill would supplement credit sources now available by providing loans designed specifically for small owners.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to owners of not more than 500 acres of forest land or land suitable for forest production, and for either of two purposes. The first, for the acquisition, planting, improvement, protection, and management of forests. Secondly, for the payment of expenses or for the refinancing of indebtedness, providing such expenses or indebtedness would otherwise interfere with sustained yield forest management practices.

The bill provides that loans shall be secured by a mortgage on forest land or lands suitable for forests, including permanent improvements and growing timber thereon, and are at no time to exceed 80 percent of the fair market value of the property. Loans are to be repaid over a period of from 5 to 50 years in annual or periodic installment of not more than 5 years. In the case of forest properties expected to increase in value during the development period without producing income that might be used to amortize the loan, permission may be granted for repayment to be deferred up to a maximum of 35 years. Interest rates under the bill are not to exceed 3 percent.

A major feature of the bill requires the borrower to adhere to such standards of forestry and woods practice and to maintain such forest protection measures as are deemed necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture. In this connection the Secretary is to establish standard procedure for approving forest management plans submitted by borrowers, and for inspections to insure such practices and plans are being followed.

Further, the bill permits the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce the borrower's obligation up to 50 percent of the loan in the event of partial or total destruction of the timber by a cause beyond the control of the borrower and not resulting from any act or negligence on his part. In reducing the loan under such circumstances, the Secretary would give due recognition to any recovery available to the borrower from insurance or other sources.

Mr. President, our forests are our basic resource for major industrial expansion. Their improvement and development are essential to keep pace with growing demands. At present, southern forests supply about 9 billion board-feet annually of softwood timber, and this is expected to remain fairly constant to 1975. Demand for hardwood timber will probably increase from the 4.7 billion board-feet in 1952 to 5.3 billion board-feet in 1975.

Southern forests produced 14.4 million cords of pulpwood in 1952 and 18 million cords in 1955. Projected demand by 1975 is expected to be about 26.5 million cords. Thus, we have a great potential for expanding uses for forestry products. We must do everything possible to assist our landowners to increase their production of quality timber.

Well-managed and well-stocked timberlands are a sound investment and provide a good source of income and employment. Considering both woods and mill operations together, it is estimated by the United States Forest Service that for every 80 acres of well-stocked timberland, 1 man will be afforded full-time employment. On this basis, 8,000 acres of timber would provide 100 new jobs. The Forest Service further estimates that 100 new workers could make the following changes in a community: 296 more jobs; $590,000 more personal income per annum; $270,000 more bank deposits; and $360,000 more retail sales per annum. Thus it is not hard to visualize the real opportunities we have with our forests and the importance of bringing them up to full production.

Enactment of such a loan program for small forest landowners, supplementing assistance already available in existing programs, would, in my opinion, be a significant contribution to the development of our Nation's forests. In addition, there would be provided increased yields and increased income for our small owners. These provisions would be a major step forward in the solution of this very important nationwide problem.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I believe that one of the major benefits which would come from such a program, if properly carried out, would be to enable our small landowners to continue as landowners. Forestry property is fast passing out of the hands of the so-called smaller holders and into the hands of the larger holders. In the southeastern and south central and southwestern parts of our country, as well as in many other areas, a proper loan of the kind authorized by the bill would go a long way toward enabling the small landowner to continue to hold his land. It would constitute another bulwark to insure the continuance of a sound America. It would provide the small landowner with a means of holding his land, and also leasing it on long-term leases to the companies and operators of the woods products manufacturing plants, giving them a supply of materials to work with, affording the landowners an income, while at the same time enabling them to continue to own their land.

The leasing of acres on a long-term basis by large wood-products operators is a new plan which is taking hold rapidly. It is one of the best and one of the soundest plans of which I know. It keeps the land in the hands of small owners, it

provides industry with raw material, and it provides a long-term financing plan whereby the small owner can continue to hold on to his land.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, out of order, I may introduce the bill, and that it may be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1229) to provide a loan program to promote the development of forestry on small tracts of forest lands and lands suitable for forest production, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. STENNIS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in order to obtain the substantial public benefits resulting from the development of good forest management and the application of sustained yield forest practices on small tracts of forest lands and other small tracts of lands suitable for forest production, and thereby conserve the forests, provide for the continuous production of forest products, and promote soil and water conservation, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to provide for a system of forest credit to owners of small tracts of forest land and lands suitable for forest production.

SEC. 2.(a) In order to effectuate the policy of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized and empowered to make direct or insured loans to owners of no more than 500 acres of forest land or lands suitable for forest production, upon such terms and conditions not inconsistent with the provisions of this act as he may prescribe, for any of the following purposes, provided owners cannot obtain such credit from private lending agencies:

1. To provide for the conservation, acquisition, planting, improvement, protection, management, and operation of forests;

2. To provide for the payment of expenses or for the refinancing of any indebtedness, whether or not such expenses or indebtedness are incurred for forestry purposes which may interfere with carrying on sustained-yield forest management.

(b) Loans under this section shall be based upon the fair market value of the property and shall be limited to a principal obligation of not more than 80 percent of such value.

(c) All such loans shall be secured by a first mortgage (which term shall be construed to include deeds of trust and other security instruments acceptable to the Secretary) on forest lands or lands suitable for forests, permanent improvements thereon, and growing timber. Every such mortgage shall contain an agreement providing for the repayment of the loans on an amortization plan by means of annual or periodic installments, which installment periods shall not exceed 5 years, sufficient to cover (1) interest on the loan at the rate in effect at the time the loan is made, which rate may be fixed by the Secretary from time to time, but which shall not exceed — percent; and (2) such amounts for application on the principal as will extinguish the debt within an agreed period, not less than 5 nor more than 50 years.

(d) To the extent that the annual or periodic payments provided in subsection (c) of this section represent amortization payments on the principal of the mortgage debt, they may be deferred at the time the loan is made for any period up to a maximum of 35 years in the case of mortgaged properties on which timber is to be grown under the management practices required by the Secretary pursuant to this act and which, during this period of development, should increase in value without producing income that might be used to amortize the loan. Payments shall be made thereafter annually or periodically at not longer than 5-year intervals.

(e) In addition to the authority granted in subsection (d) for deferment of payments, the Secretary may, when in his judgment conditions justify it, extend the payment of the whole or any part of the principal and defer the payment of the whole or any part of the interest which may be due or unpaid under the terms of any mortgage given pursuant to this section, and may accept payment thereof within 5 years from the date of such extension.

(f) If a loan is granted for such development, and the prospective increase in value of the property by such development is taken into consideration in determining the amounts to be loaned, no part of the portion of the loan based upon such prospective increase shall be paid out by the Secretary until through such development the total value of the property has been so increased that the total amount paid out will remain within the limits set up in subsection (b) of this section.

(g) Every borrower who shall be granted a loan shall agree in the mortgage executed by him that if the whole or any portion of the loan shall be expended for purposes other than those specified in the application therefor, or if the borrower shall be in default at any time in respect to any covenant or condition of the mortgage, or any other covenant or condition, the whole of said loan shall, at the option of the Secretary, become due and payable.

(h) The Secretary shall require as a prerequisite for the approval of any loan or extension thereof, agreement by the borrower to adhere to such standards of forestry and woods practices and to maintain such forest protection measures as the Secretary deems satisfactory. The Secretary shall establish such standards for borrowers and a procedure for approving plans submitted by, or formulated for, borrowers or prospective borrowers for the management of their forest properties, and for making inspections to ascertain if such practices and plans are being followed.

(i) Every mortgage shall provide that in the event of the borrower assigning, selling, or otherwise transferring the forest land or any interest therein, or in the event of an involuntary transfer or sale, the successor or successors-in-interest shall agree to adhere to the standards of forestry and woods practices provided for in subsection (h) of this section and shall agree to comply with all of the obligations and conditions of the mortgage and upon failure of any such successor-in-interest to so agree, the Secretary may declare the amount unpaid on the loan immediately due and payable.

(j) In the event of the partial or total destruction of the timber on a tract subject to a loan under this section by any cause beyond the control of the borrower and not resulting from any act or negligence on his part, the Secretary may reduce the borrower's obligation not to exceed 50 percent of loan, giving due recognition to any recovery for such destruction that may be available to the borrower from insurance or other sources.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make loans to the Secretary of Agriculture upon the request and approval of the Secretary of Agriculture in such amounts as the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time determine to be necessary for making loans authorized in section 2 of this act. For the purpose of making loans pursuant to this section the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that act are hereby extended to include such loans to the Secretary of Agriculture. Moneys received by the Secretary as payments by borrowers of principal and interest on loans made pursuant to section 2 of this act, and all moneys received from the resale of any property purchased or acquired by the Secretary under subsection (a) of section 4 of this act, shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the repayment of loans made to him by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to this section. Repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury on such loans shall be treated as a public-debt transaction of the United States.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this act the Secretary may—

(a) Bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or other sale, or otherwise acquire property pledged or mortgaged or conveyed to secure any loan or other indebtedness owing to the Secretary under this act; accept title to any property so purchased or acquired; operate or lease such property for such period as may be deemed necessary to protect the investment therein; and sell or otherwise dispose of such property.

(b) Perform such acts and prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem proper to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the administration of this act.

---

## URBAN PLANNING FELLOWSHIPS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to provide fellowships in public or private nonprofit institutions of higher education for the graduate training of qualified persons in urban planning and related fields.

This fellowship program is urgently needed as an integral part of the urban renewal program authorized under the National Housing Act. All major cities, and hundreds of smaller towns, counties, and State agencies are currently engaged in active city planning and housing programs. In all of these programs, there is an increasing need for highly skilled professional and technical personnel. It is estimated that from 300 to 400 new positions are being created each year in local government agencies alone. In every year since 1946, there have been several hundred vacant positions in cities throughout the country. In Baltimore, for example, the mayor's urban renewal study board reported 16 unfilled positions in the city planning staff, and recommended a doubling of the number of positions in order to permit the city to develop an adequate urban renewal program.

Despite this unprecedented demand, the public and private institutions of higher learning that offer graduate training in this field have been unable to expand rapidly enough to meet the needs of local communities. Twenty-

one institutions offer graduate degrees in city planning; 10 of these were established during the postwar period. Last year, the total number of graduates of these courses was only about 150.

The shortage of graduate students is clearly not a result of career opportunities, nor is it a result of low salaries. Many local governments offer higher salaries for well-trained people than do Federal or private agencies. The shortage stems in part from the relative newness of the profession, and in part from the lack of fellowship assistance to finance needy students.

My proposal would authorize a 3-year program at a cost of $500,000 a year, which would permit the training of an additional 200 students a year. This would provide for an average award of between $2,000 and $2,500, which is typical of fellowship programs in the fields of public health, physics, chemistry, and other fields supported by the Federal Government. The program would be administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which has facilities presently being used for graduate training of foreign students coming to the United States for study under various programs of technical assistance. Fellowships would be awarded on a merit basis to individual students who would be free to elect the school of their choice.

Last year, the Senate included a provision in its general housing bill (S. 3855, sec. 603) which would have provided for a program similar to the one I am proposing today. This program failed of enactment in the closing days of the session last year, despite the fact that it did not appear to be a controversial part of the bill. The Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, although he did not support the specific provision in last year's bill, testified to the urgent need for action to alleviate the acute shortage of trained personnel which is now a major impediment to housing, urban renewal, and many other programs of urban development.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1230) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide urban planning fellowships, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

---

## AVIATION EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR CADET MEMBERS OF CIVIL AIR PATROL

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to encourage aviation education and training for cadet members of the Civil Air Patrol. A companion bill, H. R. 3232, has been introduced in the House of Representatives. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD excerpts from a letter which explain the purpose of the proposed legislation, which I have received from Col. Daniel F. Boone, secretary of the National Legislative Committee of the Civil Air Patrol.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the excerpts will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1233) to encourage aviation education and training for cadet members of the Civil Air Patrol, introduced by Mr. PURTELL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The excerpts presented by Mr. PURTELL are as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize the appropriation of public funds to assist the Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of the objectives set forth in section 2 (b) of the act of July 1, 1946, chapter 527 (36 U. S. C. 202 (b)), to provide aviation education and training for its cadet members.

Aviation has become a dynamic force for the welfare of the Nation which, though increasingly felt, is but partially understood by many people. Aviation's expanding role in the life and security, both of the Nation and of each individual, makes it essential that (a) a better understanding of aviation and its potential be developed among the general public, and (b) an adequate supply of personnel be assured to meet the ever-increasing demands created by aviation development. The President of the United States on May 26, 1954, approved the following statement of policy: "It is the United States policy to capture and hold the interest of the youth of America in aeronautics and the aeronautical sciences through a dynamic national program to stimulate active participation in all aspects of aviation."

The Civil Air Patrol is a nonprofit organization primarily dependent upon the volunteer services of its members. The financial support for its youth training program is derived from an annual $3 per capita senior membership dues, an occasional small donation, and limited local fund raising activities; yet, it is the leading organization attempting to further a national civil air program by active conduct of aviation training for our youth on a nationwide basis.

The present Civil Air Patrol cadet program occupies a unique position in the instruction of the youth of the Nation. The resultant indoctrination points out the need for, and appreciation of, adequate air power and air preparedness. It offers, in addition, basic training for young men and women in performing the increasingly technical and specialized work peculiar to military, commercial and private flying and their related industries. The course of study and training for CAP cadets emphasizes and demonstrates that a solid foundation in mathematics and science subjects is essential to a successful career in aviation. This organization also encourages and fosters civil aviation in local communities throughout the United States and its Territories. Through these activities, CAP offers an incentive and stimulus for youth to further develop and improve our national status by their entering into and acquiring proficiency in the aeronautical and scientific skills.

The United States is the only Nation in the free world which alone has the potential national resources—industrial and technological capability and national income—necessary to insure that the aeronautical and scientific achievements of the Soviet bloc never become superior to those of the United States and its allies. Our friends and allies are depending upon the strength, support and leadership of the United States for their own freedom.

To insure that this leadership is maintained, there must be a continuing and increasing flow of youth into aeronautical, technical and scientific training. The shortage of engineers, scientists and technicians in the United States is reflected in the help wanted advertisements of thousands of newspapers and magazines.

The number of our secondary schools offering complete basic and advanced courses in mathematics and science has declined.

College graduations in engineering and scientific fields have also declined. Education and training in the scientific and technical fields is now, and has been for many years, available to all who desired it, but experience has shown that the number motivated into taking this training was insufficient to produce enough technically trained men to meet our requirements.

A strong influence must be exerted on our youth to cause them to desire technical training. The program of youth training Civil Air Patrol is striving to conduct, with its limited resources, is potentially capable of arousing and stimulating extensive youth interest in aviation and allied scientific and engineering fields.

Two factors are limiting the scope of Civil Air Patrol's training and motivation program at the present time. First, the attractiveness of the present program, without flight training, has been insufficient to induce the maximum desirable number of youth to participate in the program. Second, the cost of an adequate and appropriate program is beyond CAP's capability to support without the aid provided for in this bill.

The Civil Air Patrol, an active nationwide organization, has in actual operation a program for the indoctrination of youth in aviation activities. This program emphasizes the need for technical and scientific training in aviation and related fields. The national benefits to be derived from the CAP cadet program are directly proportional to the scope of the training available and the number of youth induced to join and remain in the program until their training is completed.

Federal financial support will enable CAP to expand its present youth program to include flight instruction and additional technical training. The resulting increased attractiveness of the training program should greatly increase the number of highly motivated cadets entering into further training and employment in the aeronautical and related technical and scientific fields.

As you will remember, Gen. Carl A. Spaatz, former Chief, USAF, testified extensively in behalf of the compensation bill that became a public law last year. He is vitally interested in this proposed legislation to assist Civil Air Patrol's youth training program. Your consideration at your earliest possible convenience is respectfully requested.

---

## DESIGNATION OF FEBRUARY 16 OF EACH YEAR AS LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to designate, by proclamation, February 16 of each year as Lithuanian Independence Day. I am joined in sponsorship of the joint resolution by my distinguished colleague from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter I have received from the Connecticut Luthuanian Catholics, an organization representing Lithuanian church groups in my State, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. President, on Saturday, February 16, will occur the 39th anniversary of

the founding of the Republic of Lithuania, a nation now enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

In the light of recent events in Eastern Europe, the fate of Lithuania takes on a new significance. Last fall, the people of the free world were horrified by the brutal suppression of the Hungarian people by the Soviet Union. It came as a grim reminder to the free peoples of Soviet brutality, and it taught the free world a new lesson, just as the destruction of Lithuanian independence in 1940 has long been a tragic lesson in Soviet treachery.

In the long and honorable history of Lithuania there have been many chapters which tell of courageous resistance to oppression, and of fighting for freedom. I am confident that that spirit still lives in the Lithuanian people, and I know that their aspirations for freedom have the full sympathy of the people of America.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 55) authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating February 16 of each year as Lithuanian Independence Day, introduced by Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. PURTELL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

CONNECTICUT LITHUANIAN CATHOLICS,
*February 4, 1957.*

The Honorable PRESCOTT BUSH,
*The United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: The 39th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day will be celebrated on February 16, 1957. In commemoration of this the Connecticut Lithuanian Catholics respectfully request the Senator to submit a formal resolution for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD recognizing this observance and that same be released for the press and radio news bureaus.

On this day the Lithuanian people throughout the world pay tribute to the memory of a free Lithuania and offer their prayers for its citizens who have undergone violent brutality in their efforts to retain their dignity as a people and a democratic nation.

The spirit of freedom remains alive in Lithuania, and we Americans of Lithuanian descent continue the battle for the freedom of our homeland so that one day its people may again regain the liberty which is their rightful heritage and enjoy the happiness they once had as a free and independent nation.

We extend our sincere appreciation for your assistance in this regard.

Respectfully,

REV. FRANCIS J. PRANCKUS,
*Spiritual Adviser.*

WM. V. TARAGOUSH,
*President.*

ANNE W. GECEVICH,
*Secretary.*

## CONTINUED USE OF HORSE-DRAWN CAISSON FOR MILITARY FUNERALS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the continued use of the horse-drawn caisson in military funerals at Arlington National Cemetery.

The joint resolution provides for retention of the horse-drawn caisson in military funerals at Arlington Cemetery. I suppose it is true that a motorized hearse could be obtained for less than is required for the horse-drawn caisson. However, the use of horses is such a time-honored tradition, having been continued for more than 100 years, that I believe it should be continued in tribute to our honored dead.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 56) to authorize the continued use of the horse-drawn caisson in military funerals at Arlington National Cemetery, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

## PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF FEBRUARY 3 AS CHAPLAINS' DAY

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, last month both Houses of Congress agreed to a resolution to set aside a special day this year to honor the four Army chaplains who gave their lives when the U. S. S. *Dorchester* was sunk by enemy action off the coast of Greenland on February 3, 1943.

The day designated for the commemoration was the 14th anniversary of the great tragedy—Sunday, February 3.

Since the sacrifice made by those four chaplains, who were of different religious faiths, has become another great symbol of the strength we can find in the recognition of the brotherhood of man, I feel that the entire Nation should set aside a Chaplains' Day each year to commemorate their heroism.

I, therefore, submit a resolution to designate the first Sunday of each February as a special day of observance to honor the chaplains who went down with the *Dorchester*, and I ask that a copy of my resolution be printed in the RECORD immediately after my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that a resolution which has already been adopted by the delegates at the 1956 Grand Aerie convention of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, as well as by Cumberland Aerie, No. 245, Fraternal Order of Eagles, be printed following the measure I am introducing.

I am indebted to Ira M. Boyer, Herman L. Myers, and George J. Mengele for their kindness in letting me know of the highly commendable action taken by the members of their groups. Mr. Boyer is worthy president and Mr. Myers is secretary of the Cumberland Aerie, and Mr. Mengele is a member of the legislative committee, State Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 57) authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating the first Sunday of February of each year as Chaplains' Day, introduced by Mr. BEALL, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The resolution presented by Mr. BEALL is as follows:

Whereas on February 3, 1943, the U. S. S. *Dorchester* was sunk in the North Atlantic, during World War II, with the loss of more than 600 Americans, including 4 chaplains of 3 great religious faiths; George L. Fox, Protestant; John P. Washington, Catholic; Alexander L. Goode, Jewish rabbi; and Clark V. Poling, Protestant minister; and

Whereas these four chaplains gave up their lives that others might, live, going down together on the deck of the U. S. S. *Dorchester*, to give to the world for all time a dramatic example of human brotherhood, courage, and selflessness, and an inspiring demonstration of interfaith unity and understanding; and

Whereas in order that the meaning and significance of their heroic deed may be perpetuated each year, memorializing not only the supreme sacrifice of the four chaplains, but the supreme sacrifice of all chaplains who gave up their lives for others, inspiring all Americans by their example of faith and courage: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we urge the Congress of the United States to set aside the first Sunday in February each year, as Chaplains' Day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country.

## PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION, RELATING TO APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to appropriations. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an explanation, prepared by me, of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 58) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to appropriations, introduced by Mr. BYRD (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The explanation presented by Mr. BYRD is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Federal expenditures for domestic-civilian programs have been increased more than 45 percent since fiscal year 1954. The need for vetoing some of these programs is obvious.

I am hopeful that the Congress will veto some of the domestic-civilian expenditures proposed by the President in the budget for fiscal year 1958, beginning next July 1.

In order that the President may have an opportunity to veto increased spending added by Congress, Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, and I today are introducing a resolution for a constitutional amendment giving the President the power of item veto.

The spending record since fiscal year 1954, including the President's new budget estimates for the coming fiscal year, follows:

[In billions of dollars]

| | Fiscal years | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1954 | 1955 | 1956 | 1957 | 1958 |
| Domestic-civilian: | | | | | |
| Veterans services and benefits | 4.3 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 5.0 |
| Labor and welfare | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 3.5 |
| Agriculture | 2.6 | 4.4 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 5.0 |
| National resources | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 1.5 |
| Commerce and housing | .8 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.3 | 1.7 |
| General Government | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 1.5 |
| Interest | 6.5 | 6.4 | 6.8 | 7.3 | 7.4 |
| Contingencies | ---- | ---- | ---- | .2 | .4 |
| Budget total, domestic-civilian | 19.3 | 21.8 | 24.1 | 25.6 | 26.0 |
| Transferred to so-called trust accounts: | | | | | |
| Highways | ---- | ---- | ---- | 1.2 | 1.8 |
| FNMA | ---- | ---- | .1 | .3 | .7 |
| Total, domestic-civilian, including highways and FNMA | 19.3 | 21.8 | 24.2 | 27.1 | 28.5 |
| National security: | | | | | |
| Military functions | 40.3 | 35.5 | 35.8 | 36.0 | 38.0 |
| Stockpiling and DPA | 1.0 | .9 | .6 | .4 | .4 |
| Atomic energy | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.3 |
| Total, national defense | 43.2 | 38.3 | 38.0 | 38.4 | 40.7 |
| Foreign aid: | | | | | |
| Military | 3.6 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.6 |
| Economic | 1.5 | 2.0 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 2.1 |
| Total, foreign aid | 5.1 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| International affairs | .2 | .2 | .2 | .3 | .4 |
| Budget grand total [2] | 67.8 | 4.6 | 66.5 | 68.9 | 71.8 |

[1] This figure would be $0.7 billion higher if the budget request for increased postal rates should not be enacted.
[2] Grand totals exclude highway trust fund expenditures for fiscal years 1957 and 1958 and FNMA trust fund expenditures for fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1958. (Figures rounded; may not add to totals.)

With this sort of Federal spending in view, I sincerely hope a constitutional amendment allowing the President to exercise item veto may be submitted to the States for their ratification.

Forty State governors now have item veto authority. From my own experience I know the authority can be used effectively and constructively.

## URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—NOTICE OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following notices in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4249) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

Page 8, after line 6, insert:

"CHAPTER V—PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

"DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL

*"Construction, general*

"That portion of title III of the act of July 2, 1956 (Public Law 641, 84th Cong., 70 Stat. 474, 480), that pertains to the purchase of lands and improvements in the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District in lieu of protecting said Buford-Trenton Irrigation District in connection with development, construction, and operation of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, is amended to read as follows:

" 'That in lieu of protecting the East Bottom of Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, the sum of $1,621,791 of the funds herein or hereafter appropriated for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River shall be available for the purchase of lands and improvements in and contiguous to the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, exclusive of tracts Nos. H. H. 3170 and H. H. 3168, and not to exceed $2 million shall be available to the Corps of Engineers for protection of the intake structure of the pumping plant in Zero Bottom and for the construction of bank protection to prevent erosion in the Missouri River adjacent to the Buford-Trenton irrigation project. The substitution of land acquisition for protection shall be made and the Secretary of the Army shall acquire such land and improvements if all of the landowners, except Lester G. Larson, the heirs of Louis Morin, Jr., and the heirs of A. Desjarlais, on or before June 30, 1957, have offered to sell their property on the terms agreeable to said landowners, and within the amount provided for such land acquisition: *Provided*, That the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, is authorized to acquire by condemnation proceedings, in the appropriate United States district court, tract 208C of the Buford-Trenton project, Williams County, N. Dak., according to the recorded plat thereof which tract is owned by Lester G. Larson, the public domain allotment of A. Desjarlais, now deceased, described as Government lots 5 and 8 in section 19 and Government lot 1 in section 30, township 153 north of range 102 west of the fifth principal meridian, North Dakota, and the public domain allotment of Louis Morin, Jr., now deceased, described as the west half southwest quarter, section 16, and the north half southeast quarter, section 17, township 153 north, range 102 west, fifth principal meridan, North Dakota, in connection with the construction and operation of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir: *Provided further*, That in the event land acquisition is undertaken in lieu of protection of the East Bottom, that in recognition of the increased per acre annual operation and maintenance cost of the remaining lands in the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, the construction charge obligation assignable to the remaining lands of said district pursuant to the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 119), as amended, and the proposed contract between the United States and Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, approved as to form February 23, 1955, shall be nonreimbursable, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to enter into a contract with the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District to transfer operation and maintenance responsibility for project works constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation for the benefit of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District to such district.' "

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4249) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

Page 7, line 23, after "1958" insert ": *Provided*, That the limitation in section 2 (a) of the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbian-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956, on the acceptance of offers for delivery of ores under said Act in any one calendar month, shall not apply to offers made between December 1, 1956, and the end of the month preceding the date of enactment of this Act, and the quantity of such offers which may be accepted shall be on a cumulative basis."

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 4249, making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notices.)

Mr. POTTER submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4249) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 6, after line 10, insert a new chapter (with consequent renumbering of succeeding chapters), as follows:

"CHAPTER III.—AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

"CONSTRUCTION OF MEMORIALS AND CEMETERIES

"To the extent that the Commission may find necessary or desirable, the appropriation granted under this head in the General Government Matters Appropriation Act, 1957, shall be available for the purposes of the act of April 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 84)."

Mr. POTTER also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 4249, making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

## ENFORCEMENT OF STATE STATUTES PRESCRIBING CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] may be added as cosponsors to the bill (S. 654) to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities, introduced by me on behalf of myself and other Senators on January 17, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## TRAINING OF NATIONAL GUARD—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], a very distinguished military commander, and formerly the head of the Pennsylvania National Guard, may be added to the names of the sponsors of Senate bill 1017, previously introduced by me. The bill would authorize two

training periods for the National Guard to accomplish the 6 months' training program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ADDITIONAL SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] may be added as a cosponsor on the bill (S. 1138) to permit coverage under social security of service performed by an individual in the employ of his son, daughter, or spouse, and service performed by a child under the age of 21 in the employ of his father or mother, the next time the bill is printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## PROPOSED NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 11, 1957,

The names of Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. MAGNUSON were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1176) to establish on public lands of the United States a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, to provide for the protection and administration of the areas within this System by existing Federal agencies and for the gathering and dissemination of information to increase the knowledge and appreciation of wilderness for its appropriate use and enjoyment by the people, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation Council, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. MORSE, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. CLARK) on February 11, 1957.

## SELF-DETERMINATION FOR PEOPLE OF CYPRUS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of my colleagues the junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] may be added as cosponsors to the resolution (S. Res. 81) favoring self-determination for the people of Cyprus, submitted by me on January 30, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER (S. DOC. NO. 26)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 28, 1956, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of report on the lower Mississippi River—area enclosed by White River backwater levee system, Arkansas, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, adopted September 23, 1949. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustration, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by uanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address entitled "The United States and the United Nations," delivered by him at Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., on February 11, 1957.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Lincoln Day address entitled "Republicanism As I See It," delivered by him in California on February 11, 1957,

By Mr. RUSSELL:

Address delivered by Senator TALMADGE before joint session of Georgia General Assembly, on February 11, 1957.

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement prepared by him, entitled "Milwaukee Celebrates National Crime Prevention Week," together with two articles from the Milwaukee Journal of February 10, 1957, dealing with the celebration of National Crime Prevention Week in Milwaukee.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

Lincoln's Birthday address delivered by the Secretary of Agriculture at Pierre, S. Dak.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Program and transcript of proceedings at fifth annual dedicatory prayer breakfast held at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on February 7, 1957.

## NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

D. Malcolm Anderson, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania for a term of 4 years, vice John W. McIlvaine, resigned.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, February 22, 1957, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

## NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today a list of 103 nominations covering appointments of Foreign Service officers of various classes. The list appears elsewhere in the Senate proceedings of today.

Notice is given that these nominations will be eligible for consideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

## THE NEW FEDERAL BANKING CODE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Commerce Clearing House, Inc., in its Federal Banking Law Reports has published a pamphlet entitled "New Federal Banking Code Explained." It is an explanatory analysis of the committee print bill entitled the "Financial Institutions Act of 1957," now pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The publication is an excellent, well organized document, and will be of great assistance to the committee in its consideration of the bill introduced by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from the publication, entitled "Highlights of the New Code." I believe the information contained in this portion will be helpful to the Senate.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE NEW CODE

*1. First legislative steps begin*

Banking and financial interests throughout the country are currently engaged in a careful study of a 253-page proposal to amend and revise the Federal laws governing banks, savings and loan associations, and credit unions.

The document in question is the Committee Print of a measure now under consideration by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. It was submitted to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee by a subcommittee early in January. Full public hearings are scheduled to begin January 28, 1957. All persons desiring to appear and testify at the hearings should notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, 303 Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D. C., telephone National 8-3120, extension 865, before the close of business on Monday, January 21, 1957. After the hearings conclude, a bill will be introduced in Congress.

*2. The code and its purpose*

Seven basic financial statutes are amended and revised in the proposed code which is entitled the "Financial Institutions Act of 1957." The statutes included in full text are the National Bank Act, the Federal Reserve Act, the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, the Federal Savings and Loan Association Act, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation Act, and the Federal Credit Union Act. Suggestions are incorporated from the Federal agencies concerned, various financial groups, a 27-man advisory committee, and many individuals.

The proposals are designed to make the Federal financial laws more workable and understandable by eliminating obsolete provisions, to add new authority where needed so that financial institutions may more effectively meet the present day needs of the communities in which they do business, and to realine supervisory authority along more logical lines. The many changes and new provisions in this measure are comparable

in impact and importance to the wholesale revision of the Federal tax structure in the 1954 Internal Revenue Code.

This book presents a detailed explanation of this proposed legislation to acquaint those interested with the scope and content of these sweeping changes. Copies of the Committee Print are available from the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

NATIONAL BANK ACT

*3. Consumer installment, dairy cattle, and frozen food paper*

Today's record volume of consumer installment paper has increased correspondingly the needs of sellers and dealers for an expanding market for their paper. National banks are authorized to acquire such paper from one dealer or seller in amounts up to 25 percent of their capital and surplus if such paper carries the full recourse endorsement or unconditional guaranty of the seller or dealer (par. 135).

An obstacle to the convenient financing of the sale of dairy cattle is removed by an express authority for a national bank to acquire obligations of dealers in dairy cattle arising out of the sale of dairy cattle, in an amount not exceeding 25 percent of the bank's capital and surplus in the case of any one dealer. This paper must also carry the full recourse endorsement of unconditional guaranty of the seller as in the case of consumer installment paper (par. 135).

Frozen-food loans are also included within the 25-percent limit applicable to loans to one borrower. Recent developments by frozen-food processors in freezing and storing foods has made unrealistic the present restriction that the security for loans against marketable staples must be nonperishable. The new loan authority requires that refrigerated foods must be insured and that these loans may not run for more than 6 months (par. 135).

*4. Financing industrial and commercial construction*

To facilitate the financing of new plant and commercial construction, national banks are given authority to make 18-month loans where there is a binding agreement by a financially responsible lender to advance the full amount of the bank's loan upon the completion of the buildings. The total of such loans, including residential and farm construction loans, may not exceed 100 percent of the capital and surplus. These construction loans are classed as ordinary commercial loans rather than as real-estate loans (par. 137).

*5. Financing public building construction*

Financing aid in the construction of public buildings by the General Services Administration and the Post Office Department is given through a new authority for national banks to make loans for such construction on the security of purchase agreements. These loans are placed outside the limits established for real-estate loans (par. 137).

*6. Leasehold loans*

Unrealistic provisions in the existing law restricting leasehold loans by national banks to leases having a renewable term of 99 years or more or a term of 50 years beyond the loan's inception date have been replaced by the more lenient requirement that all leasehold loans must involve a lease running at least 10 years beyond the maturity date of the loan (par. 137).

*7. Working capital loans*

Loans to supply needed working capital for established manufacturing and industrial concerns may be made without regard to the limits set for real-estate loans, even though the national bank holds a mortgage on the real estate as an added precaution. As long as the bank looks primarily to the operations of the borrower for repayment, rather than to the mortgage security, the working capital loan will be considered as an ordinary commercial loan (par. 137).

*8. Total limits for real-estate loans*

The total amount which a national bank may lend on real estate is liberalized by adding to the present two alternatives for computing this maximum a limitation based upon demand deposits. Thus, the proposed National Bank Act would fix the total at (1) the amount of capital and surplus, (2) 60 percent of the time and savings deposits, or (3) 20 percent of the demand deposits, whichever is the greatest. The new basis of demand deposits is intended to aid national banks in communities where competition for savings deposits is such that they have difficulty in acquiring such deposits in amounts sufficient to enable them to meet the normal demand of their customers for real-estate financing. The present criteria of capital and surplus and 60 percent of time and savings deposits is considered unnecessarily restrictive in the case of banks having a relatively low proportion of time and savings deposits (par. 137).

*9. Investments in bank buildings*

Higher investments by national banks in their premises are permitted by substituting for the present maximum of 100 percent of the bank's capital the limitation that such investments may not exceed 100 percent of the bank's capital or 50 percent of its capital and surplus, whichever is greater. Under the present act, a bank with a large surplus in relation to its capital suffers in contrast to a bank of the same general size maintaining a large capital in relation to its surplus (par. 144).

*10. Purchases of bank stocks*

The absorption by a national bank of another bank is made easier by new authority for the national bank to acquire the stock of such other bank for a period of not more than 90 days as a step in the takeover process. The present statutory prohibition against a bank's purchasing corporate stocks is absolute and banks have been deprived of this convenient means of effecting otherwise unobjectionable absorptions (par. 133).

*11. Total bank indebtedness*

The debt limit of a national bank is increased to 100 percent of its capital and surplus. The present limit of 100 percent of capital less losses on debts unnecessarily restricts banks in borrowing from other banks in the normal course of correspondent banking and in connection with the maintenance of required Federal Reserve balances (par. 138).

*12. Stock option plans for employees*

National banks are given authority to compete more effectively in today's labor market under a new authority to issue stock options to their employees or to employees of their subsidiaries, and to issue and sell shares of their capital stock without first offering them for sale to the stockholders. There is no present statutory authority by which national banks are permitted to establish stock option programs which are generally recognized as a major solution to the problem of developing and maintaining high-grade personnel in business and industry (par. 132).

*13. Preferred stock, note, and debenture issues*

Greater access to the capital market for needed bank funds is afforded by express authority to issue preferred stock of one or more classes, capital notes, and debentures. Under the present law national banks may issue preferred stock only in the event of an emergency and they have no authority to issue capital notes or debentures. This restriction, which compels reliance on common capital, is considered unreasonable in view of the fact that other types of securities issues may offer a better and more feasible means of acquiring additional capital (pars. 121, 122).

*14. Reports to the Comptroller*

A new approach to reporting by national banks takes advantage of the development in recent years in sampling techniques. Furthermore, the proposed law recognizes the fact that there is no need for all banks to report the same information, regardless of size. Accordingly, the Comptroller is authorized to require reports of condition and dividends on a sample basis or from a selected list of national banks without requiring such reports from all banks. He is also permitted to prescribe different forms of such reports and make different requirements as to their publication for different banks according to their location, size, or other reasonable classification. The time within which reports must be submitted to the Comptroller after a call has been issued has been increased from 5 to 10 days, and a burdensome requirement of attestation of national bank reports by 3 directors has been omitted (par. 153).

*15. Large stock transactions to be reported*

Any single transaction involving the purchase or sale of 10 percent of a national bank's stock will have to be reported immediately to the Comptroller by the president or cashier. This is similar to the present requirement under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, calling for reports to the Securities and Exchange Commission of transactions in securities registered on national securities exchanges by beneficial owners who are defined as owners of 10 percent or more of the corporation's securities (par. 124).

*16. Insurance agency and real estate brokerage powers*

If State law authorizes State banks to act as insurance agents or real estate brokers, national banks are given co-extensive authority, and the present limitations, restricting a national bank's exercise of these activities to towns having a population of not more than 5,000 are inapplicable in such States. Furthermore, if a national bank has been lawfully acting as agent or broker in a town with a population of not more than 5,000, the authority to so act is not terminated if the population subsequently expands beyond 5,000 (par. 146).

*17. Ban on State licensing*

No State may examine or license national banks in the exercise of authority given them by Federal law. This prohibition extends to all political subdivisions of the State. The prohibition is directed at legislation in various States requiring national banks to be licensed in order to qualify as licensed lenders (par. 152).

*18. Gifts to schools and community projects*

Power to participate more actively in community affairs is given. Charitable gifts to nonprofit educational institutions and civic improvement organizations are new categories named as beneficiaries of national bank contributions (par. 132).

*19. Branches after merger*

A national bank which continues after a merger or consolidation may keep the branches which it operated prior to such reorganization without obtaining new approval by the Comptroller. This is designed to eliminate unnecessary paperwork both by banks and the Comptroller (par. 140).

*20. School savings plans*

Participation in school thrift or savings plans by national banks is authorized by the proposed act. Acceptance of school children's savings by a bank employee at the school, if located in the bank's trade area and within the State, is not to be considered branch banking (par. 140).

*21. Cumulative voting*

Mandatory cumulative voting for directors is ended. However, if stockholders so provide in their articles of association, this

method of concentrating voting power is still permitted. This is intended to promote a higher degree of unity in the directorate and in the official staffs of national banks (par. 127).

Election days sometimes fall on legal holidays. A new authority to meet on the next day simplifies the mechanics of holding the election (par. 127).

FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

*22. Federal Reserve bank directors*

Both the term of office and the requirements as to a director's residence have been changed. All three classes (Classes A, B, and C) of directors are restricted to serving for two consecutive terms and there can be no third term until a three-year period has elapsed. A chairman of the board is permitted to serve three consecutive terms (par. 217).

There is no limitation under existing law as to where Class A or Class B directors, who are elected by the member banks in the Federal Reserve district, and Class C directors, who are appointed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, are presently required to have been a resident of the district for two years. The new Code requires all three classes of directors to be residents of the district or reside within a 50-mile radius of the Federal Reserve Bank on the board of which they are serving. Each director must terminate his directorship when he ceases to meet these residence requirements (par. 217).

*23. Reporting requirements*

As in the case of national banks, reporting requirements are simplified for state member banks. The Board of Governors may prescribe different forms for reports of condition and earnings and dividends for various groups of State member banks, such as reserve city banks and country banks, or large and small banks. Reports may be required on a sample basis rather than from every bank on every call, and the publication of reports may be waived (par. 223).

*24. Reports of large stock transactions*

Immediately following any single transaction involving the purchase or sale of 10 percent or more of the bank's outstanding shares, the president or cashier must report such transaction to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (par. 223).

*25. Purchases of bank stock*

State member banks are given authority coextensive with the new permission given to national banks to acquire stock in another bank for a period of not more than 90 days as a step in the absorption of such other bank (par. 223).

*26. Investments in bank buildings*

Increased investments by State member banks in their premises is authorized. Amounts up to 100 percent of their capital or 50 percent of their capital and surplus, whichever is greater, are permitted (par. 223).

*27. Loans to bank officers*

A more realistic ceiling of $5,000 is placed on loans which a member bank may make to an individual executive officer. The present maximum is $2,500. A further change is a liberalizing of the reporting requirements for officers' indebtedness to their banks (par. 228).

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT

*28. Management of FDIC*

The form of organization of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is changed by the establishment of the position of Administrator to replace the board of directors. This abolishes the present Board of 3, consisting of 2 appointed by the President, and the Comptroller, ex officio. To serve in an advisory capacity to the Administrator is an Advisory Board consisting of the Comptroller, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board or his designee, and 1 of the State bank supervisors (pars. 302, 306, 307, 342).

*29. Bank mergers*

The act provides for the approval of all bank mergers involving insured banks (heretofore only mergers which reduced capital required FDIC approval) by the Comptroller if the resulting bank is a national bank, by the Board of Governors if the resulting bank is a State member bank, or by the FDIC if the resulting institution is a nonmember insured bank (par. 323).

*30. Payment of interest*

The language of the Federal Reserve Act prohibiting the payment of interest on demand deposits has been incorporated in the act. There is a conflict in ruling between the Board of Governors for member banks and the FDIC for nonmember insured banks on whether the absorption of exchange is the payment of interest on demand deposits and hence prohibited by law. This resolves the conflict and establishes a uniform interpretation in accord with the present ruling of the Board of Governors which prohibits the absorption of exchange as constituting the unlawful payment of interest on demand deposits (par. 326).

*31. Shareholders' list*

The president and cashier of every insured bank must keep at all times a full and correct list of the names and residences of all the shareholders in the bank, and the number of shares held by each, in the office where its business is transacted. In addition, the Administrator must be notified immediately of any single transaction involving the purchase or sale of 10 percent or more of the outstanding shares of the bank (par. 327).

*32. Termination of insured status*

Provisions on the termination of insurance of insured banks for unsafe and unsound practices have been strengthened. A change in the wording of the statute enables the Corporation to terminate insured status if an unsafe practice is "engaged in" as compared with being "continued" (par. 329).

*33. Payment to depositors of closed insured bank*

In all cases where an insured bank is closed without adequate provision being made for the payment of its depositors, the Corporation has immediate authority to discharge its insurance obligation, and, upon payment, the Corporation is subrogated to the rights of such depositors to the extent of the payment. This new provision strengthens the position of the Corporation when this situation arises (par. 330).

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ACT

*34. Management policy standards*

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board is given express authority to set up standards of sound management and home financing policies, nonconformance with which may deprive a nonmember of the right to obtain advances from a Federal home loan bank or result in the loss of membership in a Federal home loan bank (par. 407).

*35. Advertising by uninsured members*

No uninsured member of a Federal home loan bank may lawfully advertise, off the premises on which is situated its main office or any branch office, that it is a member of a Federal home loan bank or is otherwise associated with the Federal Home Loan Bank System, unless such advertising is expressly authorized by regulations of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board (par. 404).

FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION ACT

*36. Interest rates*

Interest rate limitations on Federal savings and loan associations are revised to clarify the extent to which interest rates and charges by Federal savings and loan associations are, on the one hand, governed by State or local law, or are, on the other hand, governed by Federal law and regulations of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. Rates are limited to such rates as are allowed by applicable law to other lenders, or such other or higher rates or charges as are allowed by applicable law to any class of other similar local mutual thrift and home-financing institutions, or as are allowed by regulations of the Board (par. 504).

*37. Branches*

Branches of Federal savings and loan associations located outside of the State in which the home office is located are prohibited. However, branches in operation when the code becomes effective may be retained (par. 506).

*38. Dealings with officers and employees*

A ceiling of $15,000 is placed on the amount which an association may lend to an executive officer for home mortgage purposes. No Federal savings and loan association is permitted to pay a greater rate of return to directors, officers, employees, or attorneys than is paid to other holders of similar accounts (par. 507).

FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION ACT

*39. Scope of amendments*

Among the more important changes proposed in the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation Act are those relating to mergers or consolidations of insured associations, the payment of insurance premiums after a merger or consolidation, and the regulation of holding companies controlling savings and loan associations.

New provisions require the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation's approval of mergers or consolidations of insured associations which supply needed authority lacking in the present law. The Corporation is given broader authority to reject applications for insurance as in the case of institutions whose home-financing policies are considered unsound (par. 604). The double payment of premiums would be eliminated in situations where, following a merger of savings and loan associations, the surviving institution's new premum year begins shortly after it has paid the premium due (par. 605). Holding companies in the savings and loan industry are restricted by new provisions which make it unlawful for such company to control more than one insured institution or to acquire more than 10 percent of the stock with power to vote of more than one insured institution. Willful violations of these provisions could result in a fine of $10,000 (par. 609).

FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT

*40. Scope of amendments*

Among the more important changes in the Federal Credit Union Act are those relating to annual audits, salaries, and loan limits. Annual audits by independent individuals or firms are required of all Federal credit unions with assets of $50,000 or more. Smaller credit unions will be subject to annual audits made by the Bureau of Federal credit unions. Another new provision allows compensation for the treasurer only, instead of for such officers as may be entitled to compensation under the credit unions' bylaws. Specific authority is given to the Director of the Bureau to impose maximum loan limits by regulation. This supersedes the present limit of 10 percent of the credit union's capital and surplus. The unsecured loan limit is raised from $400 to $500 (par. 701).

## IMPORTANCE OF GREATER MULTILATERAL TRADE—IMPORTATION OF WATCHES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I believe it is generally recognized that one of the basic elements in establishing a true and lasting peace is the encouragement of greater multilateral trade among the free nations. Many significant and encouraging developments in this direction have recently been taking place in Europe—particularly, the acceptance of the so-called common market. In view of this trend, it is most distressing to find that, despite President Eisenhower's general statements in support of expanded international trade, the Republican administration has frequently taken specific actions which greatly hamper efforts by foreign countries to sell their products within the United States.

Perhaps the best reflection of the wide divergence between America's promises and its performance under the present administration is seen in the watch-importing industry. In addition to invoking a 50-percent increase in duties in 1954, the administration has engaged in a series of actions and threats of actions aimed at curtailing the importation of Swiss watch movements into this country. Only 2 weeks ago, we witnessed the latest of these harassments when the Treasury Department drastically revised a long-standing customs regulation on watch adjustments which will have the effect of increasing duties and placing considerable hardship on watch importers and their foreign suppliers.

One excuse which the administration has employed in an attempt to justify some of these actions has been a claim that the domestic watch manufacturing industry is essential to national security. As many Members of the Senate will remember, the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, of which I am a member, conducted an exhaustive study last session concerning the impact of so-called defense essentiality claims on our foreign-trade policy. The subcommittee, which used the experience of the watch industry as a case study, issued a report which I believe is worthy of the thoughtful attention of Members of the Senate.

One of the most important conclusions of the subcommittee was that:

> Protection of the watch industry by trade restrictions in the name of defense is unwarranted because first, it will not be effective in preserving the domestic industry, and second, it represents an undue burden on other industries, as well as consumers. The burden on other industries and on the trade of the free world will detract from national security.

The Office of Defense Mobilization is now reexamining its earlier conclusion that the domestic watch manufacturers are essential and should be preserved through Government intervention—a position which, strangely enough, was accepted by the administration in 1954 in the face of a directly contrary conclusion reached by the Defense Department. In connection with this current reexamination, I have seen two reports in the press which I believe will be of interest to the Members of the Senate.

The first is an excellent editorial carried in the Toledo Blade, on January 19, 1957. It contains the timely warning that:

> The "defense" gimmick is a tempting device for all manner of thwarted protectionists. President Eisenhower, who has been somewhat fickle in support of the liberal trade policy he advocates, will have to be on guard to prevent its use to "stop the clocks" of other competitors than the Swiss.

The second article which I should like to recommend is a very enlightening study entitled "Does Protectionism Really Protect Us," written by Douglas Cater in the Reporter magazine for January 10, 1957. It underscores the peculiar logic that led to the earlier ODM finding that the watch industry is essential to national security, and emphasizes the vital importance of using great care in the present ODM proceedings if we are to avoid establishing an unfortunate precedent which may undermine our foreign economic policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Toledo Blade editorial and Mr. Cater's article printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Toledo Blade of January 19, 1957]

### STOPPING THE SWISS CLOCK

Less than 3 years after President Eisenhower granted a 50-percent increase in the tariff on jeweled watches the domestic watch industry is back crying for still more protection from the ingenious Swiss. Once again the contention is that this is necessary to preserve United States horological skills in the interests of national security.

Even granting that some type of preferential treatment is essential to maintain watchmaking skills in this country—a highly debatable point—the question remains whether tariffs or import quotas are a proper mechanism to achieve this.

The plain truth is that the Swiss excel in the manufacture of timepieces and only the most punitive restrictions can prevent them from competing successfully on the American market.

They not only reduced the impact of the 1954 increase in the duty on jeweled watches by shipping in watches to which jewels were added here, but they made inroads in the field of inexpensive nonjeweled watches dominated by American manufacturers. Now not only American makers of jeweled watches but also pin-lever watch and clock makers have joined in the cry for further protection.

But isn't the Swiss competitive spirit and enterprise just what the United States is always extolling? Aren't we always stressing the need for friendly nations to be allowed to earn their way on the world market by exercising their special skills?

If the American watchmaking industry can't compete with the Swiss and has to be supported by artificial means in the name of defense, then wouldn't it be preferable to use some other form of subsidy besides tariff or quotas? Certainly the use of the latter device in this connection is not only an injury to a small and admirably industrious nation but is damaging to the whole reciprocal trade structure under which we sell to other nations as well as buy from them.

The Swiss watch case seems to suggest a need to re-examine the whole relationship of the new concept of "defense essentiality" as it has been connected with tariffs and quotas. In a recent article in Reporter magazine, Douglas Cater points out that a number of other industries besides the watchmakers are attempting to use national security to justify increased protectionism.

The Office of Defense Mobilization is considering the pleas of cordage and twine as well as watch manufacturers. The request list includes thermometers, wool felt, and wooden boats. Mr. Cater notes—and we hope he was merely being ironic—that reports have clothes-pins and dehydrated garlic waiting in the wings.

The defense gimmick is a tempting device for all manner of thwarted protectionists. President Eisenhower, who has been somewhat fickle in support of the liberal trade policy he advocates, will have to be on guard to prevent its use to "stop the clocks" of other competitors than the Swiss.

---

### DOES PROTECTIONISM REALLY PROTECT US?

(By Douglass Cater)

President Eisenhower, having not long ago braved the protectionist wrath of the groundfish-fillet producers by overriding the Tariff Commission's recommendation for higher levies on foreign competition, may shortly be challenged to an even more soul-searching test of his trade policy. The groundfish fillet, it turned out, was fortuitously intertwined with our network of mutual security—more particularly our recently jeopardized forces on little Iceland. But Swiss watches, quite the opposite of helping our defenses, some insist, currently threaten to undermine them. Eisenhower's Director of Defense Mobilization, Arthur S. Flemming, has scheduled hearings for January 7 to investigate the matter.

A strange overlay of strategic doctrine envelopes the arguments of the opposing sides. To listen to the four domestic jeweled-watch manufacturers, who initiated the complaint, their own economic self-interest is scarcely a part of the case. Paul Mickey, a Washington attorney who is vice president of the American Watch Manufacturers Association, claims that should the Government decide the American industry is not essential to security, it will be a matter of great simplicity and greater profits to import Swiss movements and to shift plants to other fields of precision engineering. In opposition, the voluminous literature of the watch importers lays grave stress on America's real security requirements in fighting the proposed quota on the Swiss. Both sides have developed elaborate treatises on the nature of future wars.

For a few independent souls who have tried to make head or tail of these competing strategies, there is a serious question whether the hurdle called "defense essentiality" recently added to our trade-policy procedures hasn't been set up in the wrong part of the playing field. It threatens to trip up our whole reciprocal trade program. Already the Office of Defense Mobilization (ODM), a comparatively recent addition to the Executive Office of the President meant to deal in long-range planning, has become a busier center than the venerable Tariff Commission for American businesses clamoring for very immediate protection. Only now the businessmen and their lawyers are speaking in terms of "maintenance of the mobilization base," "minimum defense requirements," "pools of essential skills," etc.

The watch controversy provides an illuminating case study of this confusion. The Swiss, traditional craftsmen of jeweled lever watches, have held a major share of the market in America since 1936, when the 2 nations negotiated a reciprocal trade agreement. At the other end of the quality scale, American pinlever watch and clock manufacturers have dominated the inexpensive-watch field.

The innumerable Swiss watch-part and movement manufacturers are banded into an interlocking system of trade organizations

that their American competitors condemn as a cartel. Cartel or not, the system has not prevented the Swiss from competing among themselves as well as with American producers in the United States market. The Swiss have led in technological innovations, first developing the shockproof watch, the self-winder, the chronograph, and the various gadgetry wrist watches that have found eager customers in this country. Along with the American importing and asesmbling concerns, they have pioneered in adapting watch-sales techniques to our radically changed postwar market. Well before their American competition, they engaged in mass advertising campaigns. They removed the wrist watch from the exclusive sanctum of the jewelry shop and sold it in department, drug, and even discount stores.

With some justice, the Swiss can claim that they worked to create the volume market for jeweled wrist watches in America while their domestic competitors lagged behind. The American manufacturers, holding onto a steadily declining share of a steadily expanding market, claim that cheap Swiss labor is threatening the livelihood of approximately 4,000 watch workers, many of the highly skilled. The Swiss reply that it is not their labor, the highest paid in Europe, that is the cause but rather un-American lack of enterprise. They claim American trade barriers will threaten an industry which accounts for nearly half of their dollar sales and which is essential to their country's very existence.

WALTHAM STARTS IT OFF

Pressure for a political solution to this economic problem began to build in Washington in 1949, when the Waltham Watch Co., a century-old institution, went on the rocks after what impartial observers agreed was a half century of bad management and had to be taken over by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Elgin and Hamilton soon joined in sounding the alarm along with Bulova, an importing company that has established a sizable domestic plant in the United States.

The Truman administration responded to the extent of inserting an escape clause in the Swiss trade agreement, but in 1952 Truman emphatically rejected a Tariff Commission recommendation for a 50-percent boost in watch duties, declaring this "would be striking a heavy blow at our whole effort to increase international trade and permit friendly nations to earn their own dollars and pay their way in the world."

Two years later, President Eisenhower authorized the boost. His ODM, said the President, had found as a result of an interdepartmental study that the preservation of the unique skills of the watch industry was essential to the national security. It is not certain that Mr. Eisenhower realized that he was establishing a precedent. In the following year, Congress hardened that concept into law by tacking to the Trade Agreements Act a new section a great deal more loosely phrased than the traditional escape-clause and peril-point provisions. Section 7 simply specifies that "whenever the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization has reason to believe that any article is being imported * * * in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security, he shall so advise the President. * * *" The President, if convinced by an investigation, "shall take such action as he deems necessary to adjust the imports of such article to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security." The dark shadow of quotas loomed over our international trade policy.

Skeptics, both at home and abroad, were inclined to suspect the legitimacy of this new security program, pointing to all-too-obvious signs of political wheeling and dealing. There had been the economic recession during the winter of 1953–54 with a resulting protectionist clamor from powerful Republican warriors on Capitol Hill. The administration was engaged in battling through 1-year extensions of the Trade Agreements Act and waiting rather desperately for the Randall Commission report to provide a rationale for something more. Mr. Eisenhower, who feels a deep, if not particularly truculent, devotion to liberal trade, had already rejected four escape-clause recommendations served up to him by the Tariff Commission. There was a mounting feeling that a sop to the protectionists was in order.

Watches had a particular urgency that year. In Massachusetts, home of Waltham, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican whip and chairman of the Armed Services Committee, was facing a tough battle for reelection. In Illinois, home of Elgin, the Republicans were throwing everything into the fight to lick Democratic Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, an outspoken administration critic on economic matters. In Pennsylvania, home of Hamilton, the Republican machine was in trouble.

On June 30, 1954, the same day ODM Director Flemming sent his report to the President, the Armed Services Subcommittee staged a hearing at which a long succession of Members of Congress from the affected States made it clear that jeweled watches were essential to their political security. Only ex-Senator Millard Tydings, a former Armed Services Committee chairman who is counsel for the watch importers' association, spoke in dissent.

CROSSED SIGNALS IN DEFENSE

But the most intriguing byplay occurred within the executive branch. In preparation for the ODM report, the Department of Defense undertook a study based on what Assistant Secretary C. S. Thomas described as "a most thorough examination by technical experts" and "careful consideration by cognizant officals of the Department." Teams were sent to inspect the four jeweled watch companies as well as other precision-engineering factories. The conclusion, astonishingly, was that "the needs of the Department of Defense for industrial capacity clearly reveal that no special nor preferential treatment for the [jeweled watch] industry is necessary."

This conclusion was kept tightly classified until nearly a year later, when Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, who had been tipped off, demanded that Thomas's report be released. To an irate brace of Republican Senators, Defense Secretary Wilson apologized lamely that it had meant to imply that the entire horological industry, including pin-lever watches and clocks, was essential to the mobilization base. He regretted the wrong inference that had been drawn. A careful reading of the report fails to reveal one word to support Wilson's explanation.

The ODM report to the President failed to mention the conclusion reached by this Defense Department study, but drew heavily on one from the Commerce Department based in the main on nonmilitary needs during the Second World War. It scaled down the Commerce Department recommendation from 3 to 2 million watches as a minimum annual production for the domestic industry.

PUBLICITY WAR

Eisenhower's decision to raise the duties on watches in 1954 provoked a decidedly hostile response, both at home and abroad. A nationwide survey of editorial opinion, financed by the importers, showed that 79 percent of the United States daily newspapers that commented on the watch decision were opposed to it. The CIO took a vigorous stand against it. From Geneva, Michael L. Hoffman, New York Times correspondent, wrote, "With one blow, the President proved to the satisfaction of everyone in Europe who cares about such things, that all that the Socialist, Communist, neutralist, and homegrown anti-Americans say about United States trade policy is right, and that everything Mr. Eisenhower, the Randall Commission, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and every United States ambassador in Europe says is wrong."

The watch decision also signaled the start of unrestricted guerrilla warfare between the watchmakers. Both sides possess a clear understanding of the vital nexus that exists between Madison Avenue, the Washington law firm, and the politician. Neither is lacking in legal or advertising talent.

The American watch companies wheeled up their big gun in the person of General of the Army Omar N. Bradley, now chairman of the board of the Bulova research and development laboratories. "May I Speak Up?" Bradley spoke up in full-page newspaper advertisements, arguing forcefully that it was essential "solely for reasons of defense to preserve a hard core of watchmaking skills in this country." The Bradley ad also indicated that further steps were necessary to protect domestic watchmakers.

The watchmakers of Switzerland in turn undertook to drum on the raw pocketbook nerve in a series of newspaper advertisements all over the country. "Tote That Bale * * * to Switzerland!" was the appeal in the Houston Post, pointing out that the Swiss, a $150 million yearly cash customer of the United States, "buy thousands upon thousands of bales of good American cotton." "Business is Business in Detroit, Michigan, or Bienne, Switzerland" ran an ad in the Journal of Commerce, concluding direly that "The same tariff burden that could deny a Swiss watch to the man in Detroit can very well strip American equipment from the plant in Bienne."

The President's tariff decision was only the first of a series of governmental actions which convinced the Swiss that they were in for rough sailing. Three months later, the Justice Department filed an antitrust suit against the Swiss manufacturing associations and the American importers. (It alleges, ironically, that Swiss combination and conspiracy has the effect of maintaining the price of Swiss watches in the United States at arbitrary and noncompetitive levels.) In March 1955 the Treasury Department tried to institute a ban against up-jeweling, the practice of adding jewels after arrival in the United States to avoid the prohibitive tariff on above-17-jewel movements. Failing that, it urged legislation in Congress to affix a processing tax on such movements.

Treasury officials, also began to explore ways of applying the costly adjustment duty on unadjusted Swiss watches because new assembly processes have made the latter just as accurate. In December 1955 the Justice Department instituted a second suit involving the Swiss watchmaking-machinery industry.

Finally, that same month, the United States jeweled watch industry came back to ODM asking further protection on the grounds of defense essentiality. They were joined this time by the pin-lever watch and clock makers.

The unhappy fact was that not only had the fifty percent tariff boost not noticeably helped the sale of domestic jeweled watches but it was apparently helping play hob with the pin levers. The total market for high-jeweled watches has fallen off appreciably. At the same time there has been a fantastic boom in Swiss nonjeweled watches, which approach in accuracy, if not long life, the more expensive variety. Slim and highly attractive in design, they are cutting deeply into the sales of their bulky American counterparts. The cheap pocket watch, formerly a major part of American production, now appears to be a vanishing breed.

WHAT THE INDUSTRIALISTS SAID

So it is that the American pin-lever clock and watchmakers will be standing alongside the jeweled watch representatives during the ODM hearing this month, bearing the testimonial from Secretary Wilson that they too are essential to the Nation's security. The jeweled watchmakers' petition claims they must be allowed to produce approximately 3.6 million watches annually, if ODM's objective for maintenance of the industry in a healthy and vigorous condition . . . is to be achieved.

But other factors have entered the picture. For one thing, part of the agony of the pin-lever group arises from the growing imports of West German clocks. And West Germany, unlike neutral Switzerland, is a vital and fairly fragile member of the western defense alliance.

Also, there have been promptings to re-examine the basic concept of defense essentiality. Last January, a group of American industrialists called on ODM Director Flemming and made some telling arguments. C. H. Percy, president of Bell & Howell, said that he could have sought tariff protection against German cameras produced with much lower-paid skilled labor than the Swiss. Instead, his company perfected automation processes that have kept its optics division in business. John S. Coleman, president of the Burroughs Corporation, told how electronic testing enabled his company to achieve the fine tolerances necessary for the Norden bombsight faster and more effectively than with human skills. He also claimed that with very little difficulty a top-grade toolmaker from his plant could make the most delicate equipment used in the watch industry; the group of American industrialists agreed that tool- and die-makers, the absolutely essential skills, are interchangeable among industries. Thomas Reid, of the Ford Motor Co., a former assistant Director for Manpower in ODM, added that quite a segment of the industrial world shared the feeling that the tariff was not the proper means to protect critical skills.

This reexamination went even further last June when the Bolling Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress undertook a case study of the watch industry. William L. Batt, former Vice Chairman of the War Production Board during the Second World War and former president of the S. K. F. Industries, argued that putting a fence around segments of American industry tends to weaken rather than strengthen national security: "I consider that the important thing to develop and preserve in American industry today is versatility. * * * It is for that reason that I look with grave concern on a proposal that freezes 4,000, or whatever number it may be, men in an industry * * *." There was testimony that the watch of the not distant future may be a radically different, possibly electronic timepiece, requiring other types of skills.

The subcommittee concluded unanimously that "Protection of the watch industry by trade restrictions in the name of defense is unwarranted because, first, it will not be effective in preserving the domestic industry, and, second, it represents an undue burden on other industries as well as consumers." In a separate appendix, Senator RALPH FLANDERS, Republican, of Vermont, sorrowfully castigated the American watch industry for lack of enterprise over the past half century, but concluded that it was essential to defense as a nursery for microprecision skills. He did not specify how it was to be preserved.

VOLUNTARY QUOTAS

There have been straws in the wind that the Eisenhower administration believes it has hit upon a new, painless approach to its tough trade problems. Last September, in a speech to the Northern Textile Association, Sherman Adams, the assistant to the President, pointed pridefully to the voluntary quotas which the Japanese had agreed to impose on their cotton-textile exports to the United States. "I should like to suggest that in broader aspect this arrangement is * * * prophetic of Federal action most certainly to ensue in similar exigencies," said Adams, with clearer intent than syntax. Secretary of Commerce Weeks hinted at the same thing more recently when he lectured an importers' convention on the advantages of moderation.

But trade experts are quick to point out that quotas, whether voluntary or involuntary, have the same detrimental effect on competition. In addition, the voluntary quota, negotiated as a result of American threats, obliges the foreign government to interfere in private enterprise in a way we have righteously sought to discourage. In the case of the Swiss, it would result in the farcical spectacle of the United States Government conspiring with the same cartel that it has brought antitrust action against.

There is a faint hope among some observers that the President may undertake a really new approach. They hope he will remove defense essentiality from the area of trade policy and put it where it belongs—in the Defense budget. The 1954 ODM report on watches indicated that a subsidy to the watchmakers, if carefully applied, would not inhibit competition the way trade barriers do.

This would also mean that manufacurers would be obliged to get acceptance, not just acquiescence, from the politicians before they could win special benefits. It would mean that the cost of maintaining defense-essential industries would get regular review rather than be forever buried in the tariff structure. It would mean that a noisy few could not do lasting damage to our foreign trade—estimated to be worth $29 billion for 1956—and our even more precious system of alliances.

Alternatively, an ever-lengthening procession of security cases can be expected to line up outside the White House. Cordage and twine are already being given solemn consideration by ODM. Behind watches on the request list come analytical balances, fluorspar, thermometers, wool felt, and wooden boats. There are reports that clothespins and dehydrated garlic are waiting in the wings.

## THIRTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, Saturday of this week will mark the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Americans of Lithuanian descent and those of Lithuanian lineage throughout the free world will mark the day with appropriate prayers and ceremonies.

In Lithuania itself, the valiant people of that great land, yoked by Communist brutality, will hold no public observances. Rather, there will be private devotions in the heart of each citizen as he prayerfully rededicates himself to the day when Lithuania will once more take her place in honor and dignity among the free nations of the world.

Mr. President, Lithuania—the first victim of Soviet aggression—remains unconquered and unpossessed. Her spirit, gleaming with a desire for freedom, shines through the somber blackness of the Iron Curtain.

The unceasing heroism of her people has heretofore brought her back from periods of subjugation and misery. The deep religious devotion of her sons and daughters has enabled them to withstand the fiendish tyranny of the Soviet oppressors.

In Lithuania we are witnessing the glorious spectacle of freedom being kept alive in the hearts of men and women in the face of overwhelming odds.

We in America, and all of us in the free world, must help to sustain these people in their period of trial and oppression. We must continue to assure them of our deep and continuing conviction that they will be restored to their rightful place in the world as free men and women.

The Lithuanians hold a place of honor in the hearts and minds of free men everywhere. They, who have fought so valiantly for freedom in their homeland and in behalf of freedom all over the world, are an inspiration and an example of the heroic cast of men and women whose sacrifices in its behalf have dignified liberty as one of God's most precious gifts to mankind.

I am most happy, Mr. President, to join with my distinguished colleague from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] in introducing a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim February 16 of each year as Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. President, let us note this anniversary of Lithuanian independence with renewed determination to pursue our efforts in behalf of the enslaved peoples of the world toward the day when the curtain of slavery shall be lifted and the sunlight of freedom shall shine undimmed throughout the world.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a country which is dedicated to freedom should always pause to observe the great anniversaries of freedom. One of those will take place this Saturday—the day on which Lithuania won its independence.

It is tragic that the 39th anniversary of this great occasion should take place when Lithuania is ground under the iron heel of a tyrant. For the Lithuanian people, freedom was all too brief.

But a people who have tasted the blessings of liberty cannot be held forever in slavery. They will know that the hearts of freemen everywhere are with them, and that the day will come again when they will rid themselves of their oppressor.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, February 16 marks the 39th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania. It is a privilege to join my fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent in observing this historic occasion.

There is no Lithuania today because the colossus of Soviet communism has gobbled it up, along with many other nations where the heartfelt desire of the people is for liberty and national independence.

But so long as the spirit of freedom lives in the Lithuanian homeland and is fed by sympathy and support from America, Lithuania lives. We have seen in the past year how indomitable the spirit of freedom is. From that spirit, combined with the prayers and assistance of the people of the free world, will come inevitably the restoration of the Republic of Lithuania to the commonwealth of free nations.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, Saturday, February 16, marks the anniversary of

the short-lived independence of Lithuania from her Russian oppressors. Thirty-nine years ago today, her freedom was established and she emerged as a free and independent nation with great hopes for a new future.

Lithuania, the largest and most thickly populated of the three Baltic States, first gained her freedom from Russian domination in modern times during the First World War. On February 16, 1918, at Vilnius, the Lithuanian Taryba or National Council, proclaimed the restoration of an independent Lithuania. However, it was not until July 12, 1920, that relations with Soviet Russia were regulated by the Treaty of Moscow.

In 1939 Lithuania was again overrun by Russo-German aggression. The Germans first seized the port of Memel and then assigned the whole country to the Russian sphere of influence. For the second time in history, Lithuania was transformed into a Russo-German battleground.

Lithuania revolted again in 1941, and after a few days of freedom was overrun by and held firmly in the grip of the German forces. The fast-moving Russian offensive in 1944 dislodged the Germans and with the accompaniment of a reign of terror, reestablished Russian authority. Since then, Russia has confirmed the forcible incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

We all experienced the great surge of hope that accompanied the uprisings in Poland and Hungary, and felt that perhaps they would emerge free again. One can imagine the feelings of the Lithuanians that perhaps their day, too, had come again.

There can be no doubt that the recent rumors of unrest from the Lithuanian underground are true. These people, who have been uprooted from their homeland and resettled where their captors chose to settle them, yearn for their country to be reestablished; they yearn to practice freely the religion of their choice; and they yearn to live in freedom.

How long they must bear being illegally occupied by the Soviet dictators, who have attempted to rob them of their human dignity and to reduce them to the status of a people without a name or a language, we do not know. But let us all join together in fervent hope and prayer that the people of this gallant country may soon join the family of free nations to live again in the light of freedom and independence.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] was called from the city today. He asked me to have placed in the RECORD a statement he has prepared concerning the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

I join with the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota in expressing the sincere hope that a new day of freedom for the gallant people of Lithuania is not far in the future.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement prepared by the junior Senator from Minnesota be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

February 16 marks the 39th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. After more than a century of Russian domination, the Lithuanian people broke the yoke of Soviet tyranny and became an independent nation, enjoying the freedom and happiness of an independent republic.

For 22 years thereafter, the democratic government of Lithuania prospered and made great strides as a nation to advance and improve the economic and social welfare of its citizens. As an honored member of the family of free nations, Lithuania faithfully fulfilled all of her obligations.

On June 15, 1940, the Soviet Government snuffed out the freedom of the little Baltic State, enslaved its people and destroyed every vestige of their independence. Lithuania was incorporated in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and since that day, her people have endured untold hardships at the hands of the aggressor. The Soviet Union has made every effort to obliterate the national sentiment of the Lithuanian people. Today there is no independence day in Lithuania, no national anthem, no flag.

Yet her spirit persists, and today all freedom-loving people join in the Lithuanians' hope of the eventual realization of their aspiration to resume their existence as an independent republic. The free world will never accept the Soviet annexation of Lithuania, and we share the spirit of freedom that exists within them, and the hope that the day of liberation is not far distant.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on Saturday, February 16, the freedom-loving peoples of the world will pause to pay tribute to the great country of Lithuania. The occasion is the 39th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

To really appreciate what the Lithuanians have gone through, it is fitting at this time to give a brief résumé of the history of Lithuania since its independence in 1918.

Lithuania was an exemplary nation and a respected member of the family of free nations, honorably fulfilling all her obligations.

In 1922 she installed the first Land Reform Act in all Europe. This was one of the most important events in her history, as three-fourths of her population was engaged in agricultural pursuits. It was this Land Reform Act which counteracted the influence of Communist propaganda.

Lithuania did not concern herself only with the physical aspects of progress, but in 1930 introduced compulsory education, with the result that the illiteracy of the people was reduced from 64 percent to 15 percent and the number of pupils in grammar schools rose from 45,000 to nearly 300,000.

Lithuania's rapidly developing cooperatives raised the standards of commerce, agriculture, and industry—thus transforming Lithuania from a self-subsisting nation to one of a commercial type.

Her state opera, ballet, and theater were a mecca for internationally famous conductors and artists, and contributed immeasurably to the culture of this ancient nation.

But then in 1940 the Soviet steamroller moved into Lithuania on its road to world domination. As we speak here today there is in Lithuania a rigid censorship which prevents the rest of the world from learning of the deportations enforced by the Russians under the guise of volunteer work elsewhere. There has been a systematic effort by the Soviet Union to merge Lithuania organically into the Soviet system and to exterminate the hostile native anti-Soviet element by killing members of resistant groups.

But this proud country has not yielded; she still fights on; and Americans of Lithuanian extraction will bow their heads in prayer on Sunday, February 16, and ask the Almighty to free their mother country from the chains and shackles which bind her. Here in our great country there are more than 1 million Lithuanian-Americans and it is truly fitting that these people should observe an anniversary which is denied them in their home country.

To my friends in Rhode Island of Lithuanian extraction and to their brothers throughout the freedom-loving world, I say, "Keep the torch of freedom burning in your hearts. Never let it die out, for your faith in the future is the instrument which keeps alive the hope that beats in the breasts of your countrymen."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement I have prepared on the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS ON LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

In commemorating the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian national independence there is new hope in the hearts and minds of free men everywhere that the Lithuanian people will soon be free and independent again. There are several basic reasons for this new hope which are worthy of mention in connection with todays' commemoration.

A number of years have passed since Lithuania and the other captive nations behind the Iron Curtain lost their freedom and national independence. With the passing of these years there has been a tendency in some quarters to feel that the Communist police state methods were so severe and tight that it would be impossible for the people behind the Iron Curtain to do anything effective to regain their freedom. This has been compounded by a myth which has been built up that the Red army was invincible and it's naked power was felt everywhere throughout the Communist empire. As a result there had developed a feeling of frustration and even despair among some people. This added to the ever present danger that our policymakers would fall victim to the temptation that there was nothing we could do but accept a situation of "status quo" with the Russians.

The Polish and Hungarian patriots have shaken the free world out of its lethargy and have put to rest the notion that there is any degree of finality in the situation as it exists today behind the Iron Curtain. These brave people have, by their raw courage, placed upon the conscience of all mankind an obligation that there can be no rest for anyone until tyranny and despotism and dictatorships have passed from the affairs of men. Freedom's cause has been lifted up by these historic events and it must never

again be allowed to slip or to be misread by men who know not the power of the will of men who want to be free.

The Hungarian freedom revolution has destroyed the twin myths that the Communist police state makes revolution impossible and that the Red army is invincible. The Hungarian patriots destroyed the police state of communism and held in their hand for a period of 4 days that freedom and independence for which they were prepared to die. They put the Red army to rout—chased them out of their beloved Budapest and drove them to cover and retreat all over Hungary. All these things they did without one bit of help from the free world. These are the things they did with practically their bare hands—it was a great victory won by students, workers, intellectuals; by children in their early teens and old folks in the twilight of life. It was an unforgettable demonstration of what a whole nation can do when its people are determined that they will no longer be slaves.

The patriots of Poznan served warning on the masters in the Kremlin that the days of Communist terror and national degradation in Poland, too, are short numbered. The Russians have made a supreme effort to calm down the Poles and have made all sorts of promises through their agent, Gomulka. But the people of Poland will choose their own course, and there is no turning them back by any power on earth.

In Lithuania the same forces for freedom are at work today. Sooner or later they will make their bid for freedom. I cannot tell you when this will occur or under what circumstances, but I have not the slightest doubt that Lithuania's destiny is with freedom and not with the slavery of the Russians. The whole history of the Lithuanian people gives testimony to this fact; the very character of the people makes certain this will happen as surely as day follows night.

Let us all hope that we will not be called upon for many more years to commemorate Lithuanian national independence day with an alien power in control of that brave little nation. Let us all work harder for the day when Lithuania will once again hold its position among the free, sovereign, and independent nations of the earth.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as February 16 will be the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, I join with all Americans in commemorating, with their fellow citizens of Lithuanian descent, this great event. This day is a symbol of the love of freedom which is so strong in the Lithuanian people—a freedom which was cruelly taken away from them by the Russians after they had enjoyed it for so short a time. We are happy to have so many fine citizens of Lithuanian descent in this country of liberty, and we share their earnest hopes for a return to freedom of the country of their origin. I know that our Government, guided by high principles of human dignity, will continue its efforts to bring release to the captive peoples of the world. I know I speak for all Americans when I say that we pray the time is not too far off when we can welcome Lithuania back to her rightful place of honor among the free nations of the world.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the leaders of the Communist world are becoming more and more acutely aware that the yearning for freedom, independence, and self-determination is universal and indestructible. Wherever it has once flourished, there will it retain its vitality; nihilistic barbarism becomes powerless to expunge it from the hearts of freedom-loving peoples. On February 16, 1 million Lithuanians in America, along with Americans of Lithuanian descent, joined by their friends everywhere, will celebrate the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, in a demonstration once again of the devotion of the human spirit for liberty.

Russian imperialism overwhelmed this gallant people in June 1940, bringing to an abrupt termination 22 rich and progressive years of development as a free nation. The United States, however, continued to recognize the independence of the Lithuanian nation because our Government and its citizens know full well that the present status of Lithuania was brought about by brutal aggression and without the consent of its people.

The strong common bond among lovers of freedom is an earnest fount of our sympathy and friendship with the courageous Lithuanians. We in America are proud to unite with them in this celebration and the proclamation of this anniversary, and we look forward with hope to the day when they will once again proudly enjoy their ancient rights and freedoms.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the bravery and spirit of the Lithuanian people in the face of great adversity is a source of admiration to all of us.

I am greatly pleased that Rev. Joseph Valantiejus, pastor of St. Joseph's Lithuanian Roman Catholic Church in Waterbury, Conn., is with us today and has given the invocation at the opening of the session of the Senate.

The 39th anniversary of the founding of the independent Republic of Lithuania will be observed on Saturday, February 16, 1957, and I know that Americans everywhere will be proud of join in this observance.

For much of the past two centuries, the people of Lithuania have suffered under the rule of an oppressor—first the Russian czars, later the Germans, and now, since 1939, of the Soviets. During their 21 years of independence, the Lithuanians showed themselves worthy of self-government. Their Republic was progressive, and it achieved much in raising the standards of living of its citizens.

Under Soviet Russia, the people of that small country have endured much, but no brutality has been sufficient to stamp out their burning desire to regain their lost freedom. A strong underground of loyal Lithuanians is helping to keep alive the flame.

Miss Claire M. Grigaitis of the Knights of Lithuania of Massachusetts has written me a letter in which she says:

> We Americans of Lithuanian descent retain an indomitable determination to continue the battle for the freedom of our homeland so that one day the land of Lithuania will, in the fullness of God's time, regain the freedom which is its rightful heritage, and enjoy the happiness they once knew as a free and independent nation.

We in the United States, who believe in the right of all peoples to self-determination, are hopeful that the day will soon come when Lithuania will once again proudly achieve the liberty and independence to which she is so eminently entitled.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, Saturday, February 16, marks the 39th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. This anniversary serves once again to focus our attention on the fact that since 1940, Lithuania has not enjoyed the rights and privileges of a free nation.

Rigid Soviet censorship and the passage of time tend to conceal the extent to which the Commuists have desecrated Lithuania. But the awful tyranny which bears down on this brave Baltic people is the same heel of totalitarianism which butchered the freedom-loving people of Hungary last fall. How hypocritical can the men in the Kremlin be? How dare they talk of colonialism when the Baltic States and Eastern Europe are but the pawns of their ruthless empire? Have they no feelings of compassion—they who exploit their captive lands and peoples with the vengeance of Tartar hordes?

May we in America never forget that the Lithuanian people were once free. We know that the spirit of liberty smoulders still in the hearts of these valiant people behind the Iron Curtain. We look forward to the day when Lithuania will once again be free and independent and will resume her position among the free nations of the world—a position she enjoyed from 1918 to 1940.

It is a privilege to join with the 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent in paying tribute to the people of Lithuania on the occasion of the 39th anniversary of their country's independence.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in what they have said on the occasion of the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. The rape of Lithuania may prove to be one of the events which will undo Soviet Russia, because it demonstrates not only Communist colonialism, but brutal Communist colonialism.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding Lithuanian Independence Day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITHUANIA—IN COMMEMORATION OF FEBRUARY 16, 1918, LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

We are commemorating today the declaration of February 16, 1918, Lithuanian Independence Day. This date signifies the achievement of national independence for which the Lithuanians had so long been striving. The bitter years spent opposing the increasing encroachments of Russia had not dimmed Lithuanian hopes for freedom. And with the 1918 proclamation of independence the long-sought goal was finally realized. We are, therefore, indeed proud to add our voice to the steadily growing numbers who want to see the end of Lithuanian oppression and national humiliation.

The February 16, 1918, declaration by a Lithuanian nationalist group for independence was the culmination of three centuries of struggling for the re-unification of Lithuania. The dozen or more independent principalities which were finally united in the 13th century were buffeted about by outside forces over the centuries with the machinations and increasing pressures of Muscovy,

the principal ones with which to reckon. The Lithuanian drive for independence, however, was too strong to be repressed forever, and after World War I, Lithuania's dream for a free and independent Lithuania came true. Unfortunately the hopes engendered by this period of independence were short-lived, for in 1940 Soviet Russia again crushed Lithuania into submission. Since Lithuania was incorporated within the U. S. S. R. more than 500,000 Lithuanians have become victims of Soviet genocide with estimated thousands going into exile each month. These obvious difficulties have constantly plagued the Russian Communists within Lithuania, so that the complete sovietization of Lithuania has proved impossible. And the Soviet Union has admitted the repeated setbacks within Lithuania.

On the other hand, the American people have been constant in their open acknowledgment of the right of Lithuania to independence and to their steadfast belief that the principles which govern relations between nations must be the rule of justice, of reason, and of law. We repeat again, as we have so often done in the past, that the United States does not and will not condone the abuse of a nation's spirit or the perpetuation of injustice. We, therefore, fervently pray for the restoration of Lithuanian freedom and political independence.

---

## DULUTH-SUPERIOR PORT

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles concerning the Duluth-Superior port which appear in the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce publication Greater Minneapolis for February 1957.

These articles point up the importance of this port on Lake Superior in terms of present tonnage. However, the articles also portray the potential growth of this shipping center as the work on the St. Lawrence Seaway and the connecting channels progresses.

I have always championed the St. Lawrence Seaway and the connecting channels legislation. I have given my all-out support for the full use and development of the Duluth-Superior Harbor.

There is now taking place in Duluth much planning designed to expand the facilities of this port. Representatives of industry, labor, civic groups, city officials are all drafting plans for the expansion of the port.

The full development of the Duluth-Superior port will have a great impact on the growth and expansion of the entire Midwest. The completion of facilities will mark a new era of progress and advancement in our Nation's economic and social history. I commend the reading of these articles to all of my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIGHT FUTURE: DULUTH'S SHIP IS COMING IN

Bustling, brawny Duluth, with a full century of rich and colorful history behind it, has good reason to look forward. Poised at the westernmost finger of the Great Lakes, it is today eagerly scanning the eastern horizon of Lake Superior—for Duluth's ship is coming in.

Duluth's ship is no figment; already the world's second busiest port, it stands to see a great spurt in foreign shipping once the St. Lawrence Seaway project is completed in 1959. And while Duluth busily prepares to provide the facilities for handling giant ocean-going freighters, the rest of the one-time landlocked upper Midwest is enjoying the foretaste of becoming a primary area of deep-water commerce.

In truth, the good that will accrue to the upper Midwest's some 8 million residents from the 7 seas is something that has stirred businessmen, industrialists, and shippers throughout the area. Robert T. Smith, executive director of the Duluth Port Authority, foresees a tremendous expansion in exporting and importing—if expanded port facilities can be provided.

The port authority is now conducting a comprehensive survey of all business establishments in its sphere of influence—roughly the upper Midwest—to determine the potential of commerce funneling through the twin ports of Duluth-Superior.

Smith says the potential export volume of manufactured and processed goods that exists today in the upper Midwest is around 350,000 tons annually. Significantly, much of the industrial development that can generate this volume lies in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area. These exports, of course, do not include such shipments as grain and other bulk commodities such as soybean oil or linseed oil, which are exported in great quantities.

Similarly, the import potential of the twin ports is equally bright. Here again, the outlook depends on the harbor and ship-handling facilities that can be provided. But Smith points out that Duluth could become a great importing center for such items as fertilizer, sugar, coffee, and manufactured equipment. Coffee, incidentally, would be a natural import commodity for Duluth, Smith says, because the city's air-conditioned climate would permit prolonged storage.

Smith believes that the 600,000-square-mile area of the port authority's theater of operations—which includes Minnesota, North and South Dakota, and parts of Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, Wisconsin, and upper Michigan—offers tremendous possibilities for world commerce. The area lends itself to industrial development because of great reserves of natural resources, such as iron and taconite, forest products, oil, lignite. Most valuable, too, are the area's tremendous reservoirs of fresh water, which is vital to industry.

The shipping potential for Duluth is unlimited, says Smith, but some years will elapse until the full impact of the seaway will be realized. But he points out that by sea, Duluth is only 783 miles further from Liverpool than is New York—and the cost per ton-mile for shipping by lake is about fifteen one-hundredths of a cent, the lowest cost system of bulk transportation in the world. So sooner or later, Duluth and the upper Midwest will take advantage of this deep-water commerce.

The seaway's coming means that Duluth-Superior Harbor itself must be refurbished to accommodate deep-draft ocean vessels. The harbor already has 17 miles of dredged channels, 25 feet deep at the ore docks and 21 feet at the grain elevators. Army engineers are contemplating increasing these depths commensurate with the 27-foot channel of the seaway itself.

As for port facilities, the port authority has plans for a mammoth public terminal wharf which will be the most modern on the lakes. Governor Orville Freeman, incidentally, has asked the Minnesota Legislature for $500,000 per year for the next 2 years to study and plan the development of the port of Duluth.

The new public terminal would be built in three stages, says Smith. The first stage will cost some $10 million and will accommodate three great ocean vessels or half a dozen lake boats. This facility, which may cost $40 million by the time it's completed, will be financed with revenue bonds. When finished, it will handle 11 of the largest type vessels engaged in foreign commerce.

Meanwhile, Duluth is not forgetting the iron legs on which it stands. Down through the years the Duluth-Superior twin ports have grown through the great shipments of iron ore. An annual average of some 51 million short tons of this red gold passes through Duluth on its way to steel mills to the east.

Although the supply of rich ore of the giant Mesabi and two smaller ranges, Vermilion and Cuyuna, is waning, the burgeoning processing and shipment of taconite has opened a new Minnesota frontier. Second to iron ore on the twin port's manifest is coal, followed by grain. While the twin ports are now the third largest grain center in the Nation, it is expected that the seaway's coming will force enlargement of the present grain-storage capacity of 56 million bushels to about 100 million bushels.

Actually, the Duluth-Superior Harbor is one of the finest natural harbors in the world. With nearly 50 miles of shoreline within the harbor lines and 75 miles altogether, including outer bays, it has plenty of room. It has plenty of bulk-freight docks, 7 iron-ore docks, 21 coal docks, 23 grain elevators on the waterfront, 4 automobile docks, and ample facilities for handling salt, stone, cement, scrap iron, and a host of other commodities.

With the improvements now in the planning stage, the harbor should readily adapt itself to the stepped-up tempo of shipments that will come with the St. Lawrence Seaway. Here's what John S. Coleman, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States predicts for Duluth alone:

"I honestly expect the population of Duluth will double in a relatively short time after the completion of the seaway."

Likewise optimistic is Geography Professor Harold M. Mayer, of the University of Chicago:

"With greatly augmented opportunities for industrial development opened up by the seaway in the major port cities as well as others in the Midwest—not only on the lakes but also in the interior—there will be a greatly enlarged demand for labor.

"Not only will thousands of people be engaged in direct operation of the port and shipping services, but additional thousands will be required in associated services. These include banking, ship chandlering, shipbuilding and repair, marine insurance, and many other activities.

"Many more thousands will be needed by industries attracted by the advantages of lower cost transportation and expanding markets, local and in distant areas, directly and indirectly attributable to the seaway."

So, as Duluth prepares for yet another domestic shipping season, it also is laying the plans which, come 1959, will mark its entry in major league foreign commerce. Port Director Smith entertains no doubts about the twin ports' future.

"If we provide good facilities," he says confidently, "commerce will flow."

---

WHAT TO EXPECT FROM THE SEAWAY

(By N. R. Danielian, president, Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association)

The mighty Midwest has a date with destiny coming up in 1959. That is the year that the St. Lawrence Seaway, a controversial issue for generations, will be open for large ocean vessels—up to 7,500-ton "general cargo carriers and 25,000-ton carriers of iron ore. This means that only 2 years from now America's fourth seacoast opens for business.

What can the the Midwest expect from this new waterway? Too many people think of the seaway as a sudden piece of magic which will overnight create a new industrial

revolution in the areas it touches. This, of course, is too visionary.

The seaway presents an opportunity to utilize large ships with greater cargo-carrying capacity over a water route which already is in existence. It is merely the tool, which if properly used, can create the setting for favorable changes in the Midwestern economy.

Interest has built up slowly, due to the long period of uncertainty as to whether there would be a seaway at all. But the seaway now finds its ranks of supporters greatly expanded. The New York Journal of Commerce quotes an anonymous Cleveland banker as saying that his bank had inquiries of all types on the seaway.

Said the banker:

"When you see all the correspondence and the activity at many local levels, you can't brush off the seaway. There are too many interests involved—railroad customers, truck-line customers, and manufacturing customers—are impressed at the way the seaway has been taken up by nearly everyone."

This broad interest must result in basic changes which will affect everyone in the seaway area.

As an example of just how significant the change will be, Steel magazine has predicted that in the next 15 years the major part of an anticipated 50-percent expansion in the steel industry will be centered in the Great Lakes area.

The two factors which lead Steel to this prediction are the availability of water for industrial cooling, and the availability of water for transportation. Expansion of the steel industry in the Midwest will mean more men in industry, more dollars in payrolls, and more customers for every item manufactured in the Great Lakes area.

This growth will engender new industries and enterprises which will broaden the economic base of the Midwest.

There are direct effects which also will be important. For the first time, manufacturers in the Midwest can ship their products overseas in quantity without braving the tangle of loading, unloading, shipment transshipment, and all the other costly complications which are necessary now with the long rail haul to the east coast ports serving as outlets to the world markets.

With the seaway, shipments made in lake ports can be loaded and not touched again until the ship arrives at its overseas destination. This will permit savings in time, money and losses due to damaged goods.

All of these things are possible, and indeed probable, when the summer of 1959 rolls around and the seaway opens. But there are several knotty problems still to be solved before the seaway can take its place as a major mover of world commerce.

An equitable system of rates and tolls must be established to pay the costs of constructing and operating the seaway, and at the same time encourage its use; demurrage and rail rate questions must be resolved for the Great Lakes ports; the ports themselves must be deepened and improved to handle adequately the increased trade, and an active program of trade promotion must be started to create the cargoes which will move along the seaway.

Progress and the earnest efforts of many past years are giving us the St. Lawrence Seaway. How effective it will be in aiding in the creation of a Golden Age of prosperity depends on the efforts of midwestern people.

## STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the people of the State of Montana, who themselves are in the great American pioneer tradition, long have been stanch supporters of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. One of the most recent expressions of their feelings in this momentous matter is set forth in an editorial published in the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of February 6, 1957. The Great Falls Tribune is one of the foremost newspapers of the American Northwest.

Because of its pertinency to two measures now pending before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this very timely editorial be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### ALASKANS BATTLE INACTION

The Alaskan Statehood Committee has issued a statement asking American people to come to the support of their statehood drive. They have had this to a considerable extent for a good many years. In the Rocky Mountain area of which Montana is a part, such support has been widely expressed in the press. In Montana, our legislative assembly has more than once passed memorials asking Congress to grant Alaskan statehood.

Informed Washington observers report chances brighter for approval of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii in this session of Congress than in previous sessions. It cannot be overlooked, however, that such predictions have been heard at the beginning of each Congress for quite a number of years.

When Senators-elect Ernest Gruening and William Egan and Representative-elect Ralph Rivers were introduced in the Senate a few weeks ago they received a rousing ovation. Supporters of their statehood clause had read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD many editorials and articles favoring statehood for Alaska. This editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal should give some of those Congressmen who have engineered stalling tactics some cause for thought:

"A hardy group of Alaskans are in Washington, lobbying for statehood, and we wish them luck. They are not ordinary lobbyists. On the contrary, they are two regularly elected senators and a representative, legally qualified to take their seats in Congress the moment Alaska is admitted to the Union.

"The Alaskans, like the Hawaiians, have been used for political footballs much too long. They qualify for statehood; they want statehood; they should have statehood.

"But we wonder if perhaps the Alaskans haven't been knocking too long on the wrong door. The Territory is some distance from the United States. It is cheek by jowl to Canada, though, and the ties between Canada and Alaska have been growing every day. We have an idea that the Canadians would be more than happy to have our valuable, strategically vital northern outpost under the Maple Leaf.

"Washington couldn't very well delay the Alaskans the right to a referendum on whether or not they would like to become a part of Canada, with the full rights and privileges of Canadian citizenship. But we have an idea that there would be a lot of startled looks and quick second thoughts in Congress if the Alaskans were to ask for one. If the door in Washington refuses to open this year, perhaps the Alaskans should try knocking on another one."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as the Great Falls Tribune editorial points out, statehood for Alaska and Hawaii is long overdue. The first Alaska statehood bill was introduced in Congress more than 40 years ago. The issue has been actively debated in successive Congresses for the past 8 years.

This year, for the first time as President, Mr. Eisenhower gave support, in his budget message, to statehood for Alaska as well as to Hawaii. On the first day for presenting bills in this Congress, I introduced measures to admit both Territories to statehood. I was joined by more than 20 distinguished Senators from both sides of the aisle as cosponsors. Appropriately, the symbolic numbers S. 49 and S. 50 were assigned to these historic measures.

The committee immediately submitted these bills to the executive agencies concerned with requests for reports and an expression of views.

Despite President Eisenhower's statement in support of statehood for both Territories, and despite the fact that the provisions of both bills are thoroughly familiar to the administration, the executive agencies concerned have not yet furnished the committee with reports on them.

I take this opportunity, Mr. President, to call upon the administration to put into practice what President Eisenhower has preached, so to speak, and to comply forthwith with the committee's request for reports on the statehood bills, so that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may proceed to act on these bills in a bipartisan manner and with knowledge of the administration's views.

## FOURTH ANNUAL BLOOD DONORS' PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the blood bank, under the auspices of the American Red Cross, the Senate Ladies, and the Senate Secretaries Association, will be open for donations of blood in the Senate Office Building tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that an announcement on the subject be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

Tomorrow Members of the Senate and their staffs will be given an opportunity to participate in the fourth annual blood donors' program conducted by the American Red Cross under sponsorship of the Senate Ladies and the Senate Secretaries Association.

The purpose of this program is to maintain a blood bank for the benefit of all Senate employees and members of their families. Those who can or will donate a pint of their blood for this purpose will find arrangements made for them in rooms 154 and 155 of the Senate Office Building between the hours of 10 a. m. and 4 p. m. tomorrow.

The importance and significance of this program, Mr. President, is illustrated by the fact that one of our colleagues, the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota, Senator LANGER, is now in the Bethesda Medical Center and has received four blood transfusions in recent days. When the fact of his need for blood was publicized there was received at the hospital a telegram from a tribe of Indians in California offering to provide it.

That was a tribute to our colleague and an indication of the regard in which he is held by some of the groups of Americans he has served during his tenure in the Senate, but I am sure that neither in this case nor in any other where one of our associates or a related family member is in need will there

be a shortage of blood because of the failure of our group to take care of its own.

The opportunity for participation has been simplified by bringing the Red Cross facilities to our own building. I am sure I need say no more.

## INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION GROUP

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, next Tuesday the United States members of the Interparliamentary Union group will meet in the Senate Appropriations Committee room F–39, in the Capitol, to elect officers. I ask unanimous consent that my announcement, as well as two statements on the subject, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

The meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in London in August of this year will be of major significance to the American group because at that time the Soviet Union and its satellite countries will renew their efforts in behalf of the admission of Red China as a member of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Interparliamentary Union is one of the oldest peace organizations in the world, dating back to 1899, with 49 nations holding membership, the United States being one of the charter members.

On next Tuesday, February 19, the United States members of the Interparliamentary Union group will meet at 9:30 a. m., in the Senate Appropriations Committee room F–39 in the Capitol for the purpose of electing officers for the ensuing year.

In order that the memory of Senate Members may be refreshed concerning the history of the Interparliamentary Union, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a brief history of the union prepared in the fall of 1953 by the Library of Congress and a list of the capitals of the world in which conferences had been held from 1889 through 1953, to which I have added Vienna, Helsinki, and Bangkok for the 3 years following 1953 and London, where the meeting will be held in September of the current year.

---

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION, 42D CONFERENCE, OCTOBER 9–14, 1953, UNITED STATES CAPITOL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

(Compiled by the Library of Congress)

*Origin and purposes*

The Interparliamentary Union is an association of the members and ex-members of the legislatures of the world. Its stated primary purpose is the peaceful settlement of disputes among nations—the promotion of conciliation and arbitration. With this purpose it has combined the furthering of better relations generally, through the study of international law, international organization, the reduction of armaments, economic problems, intellectual relations, social questions, and, particularly, the evolution of the representative system of government.

The formal history of the Interparliamentary Union, originally called the "Interparliamentary Union for International Arbitration," dates from 1889, although the international efforts of its founders started in the 2 preceding years. To Wiliam Randal Cremer, of England, tribute has been paid by the organization through the sixty-odd years of its expanding existence for his initiative and effort, from which the Union evolved. In 1887, he crossed the Atlantic as the head of a delegation representing 234 members of the House of Commons in an attempt to secure an Anglo-American arbitration treaty. Though this plan failed, the principle of arbitration was lauded the following year on the floor of the French Parliament by Frederick Passy.

The collaboration of Cremer and Passy ensued; and, following a preliminary meeting of British and French parliamentarians, they successfully launched in 1889 the first of the conferences of the Interparliamentary Union, held annually ever since, except during World Wars I and II. At the conference held in Paris, in June 1889, 9 countries were represented by some 96 legislators, including 1 delegate from the United States. By 1939, 51 countries had become members of the Union, which is made up of national groups. All Members of the Congress of the United States are automatically members of the American group. Representatives are chosen by the group for the annual conferences.

*Conferences*

Although the Union has permanent headquarters (now at Geneva), the annual meetings are held in different cities, usually at the capital of one of the affiliated countries. The last conference was the 41st, at Berne, in 1952; the 40th, at Istanbul, was in 1951. The next meeting is scheduled for October 1953, in Washington, D. C., for which Congress has apropriated the sum of $150,000.

An interparliamentary council, composed of two delegates from each affiliated parliament, meets annually to plan the conference, its agenda and arrangements, and the nominations to be made. This council is not to be confused with the Inter-Parliamentary Bureau, the central office of the Union (Geneva), which is composed of paid officers headed by the Secretary General.

*Funds*

Funds for the organization began with voluntary contributions by one or two governments. Today national groups contribute according to an agreed scale based on membership. A small amount of revenue comes from interest on investments and the sale of publications.

*Publications*

The proceedings of the annual conferences of the Interparliamentary Union appear in both English and French, in a publication known as the Compte Rendu, which has been issued since 1896. The latest was published in January 1953, and covers the 1952 Bern Conference.

Many of the interparliamentary groups issue publications of their own, but not at regular intervals. A Handbook of the American Group appeared in 1914, and yearly accounts appeared from 1918 onward in the Advocate of Peace (Washington), later renamed World Affairs Annual American group meetings since 1934 have been recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Besides the annual publication of the Union, there is the official organ, the Inter-Parliamentary Bulletin, normally published eight times a year, in both English and French. Another regular publication of the Union is the Constitutional and Parliamentary Information quarterly, which contains the texts of legislative and constitutional documents, sometimes in full, sometimes condensed, with translations into English and French.

Special publications suffer for lack of funds but have appeared occasionally. Among the most important are a 50th anniversary volume giving the history of the Union from 1889 to 1939, and two collections of the resolutions of the conferences and decisions.

*Resolutions*

Although sometimes criticized as visionary, the Inter-Parliamentary Union has, from its incipience, earned a reputation for its foresight and the influence of its resolutions upon international thought. From this union came the first proposal for a world court. Five years or more before the first Hague convention of 1899 the suggestion had been made by this organization. To it, therefore, may be credited the precursors of the present-day International Court of Justice. The Inter-Parliamentary Union was spoken of as early as 1904 as "the originator of the general congresses of nations, and intellectual parent, a point now admitted, of the Hague conference.[1]

Before World War I, the Union had passed resolutions which recommended the development of machinery for international cooperation on a lasting basis. One of these favored the creation of a permanent body for The Hague conferences.

The League of Nations system followed various recommendations of the Union. The League's lack of an international police force was not for want of such a recommendation. The Inter-Parliamentary Union passed a resolution proposing such a force in 1931.

Resolutions concerning disarmament, the designation of an aggressor, military and economic sanctions, and various others relating to international security were among those made in the 1930's.

Recommendations dealing with colonialism, with specific economic and social problems with aerial warfare, and with miscellaneous matters, have been more recent, yet in advance of those treated in an almost identical fashion by more formal international organs in later years.

It is sometimes difficult to determine whether resolutions of the Union preceded, followed, or were simultaneous with those of other organizations, but their effect could scarcely fail to carry weight. In pursuit of the basic concept of promoting international peace and in recognition of the fact that the chances for it depend on an informed and responsible public opinion in all countries, resolutions of the Union have dealt with an ever-widening field of international affairs. As legislators, the members of the Union are both the representatives of the people and their opinion, and the medium of reaching them and influencing it. As such their influence has reached incalculable proportions during several generations.

*Affiliation with United Nations*

The Inter-Parliamentary Union is affiliated with the United Nations as a class A organization with representation on the Economic and Social Council, with the right to originate proposals and to advocate them on the floor of the ECOSOC meetings during the year. Organizations in category A are those which have a basic interest in most of the activities of the Council and are closely linked with the economic or social life of the areas which they represent.

---

*Previous conferences of the Interparliamentary Union*

| No. | Date | Place | Presidents |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1889 | Paris | Messrs. Whiting, Jules Simon, Philip Stanhope. |
| 2 | 1890 | London | Lord Herschell, Mr. Philip Stanhope. |
| 3 | 1891 | Rome | Mr. Biancheri. |
| 4 | 1892 | Bern | Mr. Gobat. |
| 5 | 1894 | The Hague | Mr. Rahusen. |
| 6 | 1895 | Brussels | Baron Descamps. |
| 7 | 1896 | Budapest | Mr. von Szilagyi. |
| 8 | 1897 | Brussels | Mr. Beernaert. |
| 9 | 1899 | Christiana | Messrs. John Lund and Horst. |
| 10 | 1900 | Paris | Messrs. Fallieres and Beernaert. |
| 11 | 1903 | Vienna | Baron von Plener. |

[1] Quoted from the Washington Star of September 24, 1904; in Among the World's Peacemakers by Hayne Davis (New York), (1908), p. 66.

*Previous conferences of the Interparliamentary Union*—Continued

| No. | Date | Place | Presidents |
|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | 1904 | St. Louis | Mr. Bartholdt. |
| 13 | 1905 | Brussels | Mr. Beernaert. |
| 14 | 1906 | London | Lord Weardale. |
| 15 | 1908 | Berlin | Prinz zu Schönaich-Carolath. |
| 16 | 1910 | Brussels | Mr. Beernaert. |
| 17 | 1912 | Geneva | Mr. Gobat. |
| 18 | 1913 | The Hague | Mr. Tydeman. |
| 19 | 1921 | Stockholm | Baron Adelswärd. |
| 20 | 1922 | Vienna | Mr. Mataja. |
| 21 | 1923 | Copenhagen | Mr. Moltesen. |
| 22 | 1924 | Bern-Geneva | Mr. de Meuron. |
| 23 | 1925 | Washington-Ottawa. | Messrs. William McKinley and Belcourt. |
| 24 | 1927 | Paris | Mr. Paul Doumer. |
| 25 | 1928 | Berlin | Mr. Walther Schücking. |
| 26 | 1930 | London | H. G. the Duke of Sutherland. |
| 27 | 1931 | Bucharest | Mr. Pompéiu |
| 28 | 1932 | Geneva | Count Carton de Wiart |
| 29 | 1933 | Madrid | Mr. Besteiro |
| 30 | 1934 | Istanbul | Hasan Bey. |
| 31 | 1935 | Brussels | Count Carton de Wiart. |
| 32 | 1936 | Budapest | Baron Láng. |
| 33 | 1937 | Paris | Mr. Mario Woustan. |
| 34 | 1938 | The Hague | Mr. Bongaarts. |
| 35 | 1939 | Oslo | Mr. Ivar Lykke. |
| 36 | 1947 | Cairo | H. E. M. H. Haekal Pasha. |
| 37 | 1948 | Rome | Mr. Carlo Sforza. |
| 38 | 1949 | Stockholm | Mr. Georg Andrén. |
| 39 | 1950 | Dublin | Mr. Frank Fahy. |
| 40 | 1951 | Istanbul | Mr. C. Baban. |
| 41 | 1952 | Bern | Mr. Ayron de Denarclens. |
| 42 | 1953 | Washington | Hon. Homer Ferguson. |
| 43 | 1954 | Vienna | Mr. Barthold Stürgkh. |
| 44 | 1955 | Helsinki | Mr. Lennart Heljas. |
| 45 | 1956 | Bankok | General Phra Prachonpachanuk. |
| 46 | 1957 | London | |

## A SPECIFIC EXAMPLE OF THE DIFFICULT TARIFF PROBLEM: THE CASE OF JAPANESE PLYWOOD

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have frequently indicated on the Senate floor that the tariff problem is still one of the most difficult facing our Nation.

On the one hand, as I have pointed out, very often—most recently, just a few days ago—America is interested in worldwide economic health. We want to encourage the two-way flow of goods and services. We are anxious to assure an increasing market overseas for American manufacturers and other products.

On the other hand, we face, very frankly, the hard fact that already, here in our own country, in certain specific industries, hardships are definitely being experienced because of exceedingly low-priced foreign competitive products.

How to fulfill all of our responsibilities; how to satisfy our worldwide interests, while at the same time protecting our natural domestic interest—this poses the problem. It cannot be solved by an off-the-cuff judgment.

The facts must be secured in each instance. The American market is, of course, the greatest in the world. Naturally, first chance in the American market belongs to the American producer.

I wish to call attention now to one particular situation which illustrates the problem.

I feel that all men of good will, including those who do desire economic health overseas, but who also want economic health at home, will want to study it.

Between 1935 and 1941, Japanese plywood exports to this country averaged approximately 1½ million feet a year. Today Japanese plywood imports have reached a total of 650 million feet, and the Japanese have captured 45 percent of the market. Other exporting countries, which are entitled to consideration, are not receiving it. Meanwhile, our own plywood factories are closing, and American labor is being rendered idle.

I have before me a statement furnished to me by Walter W. Smith, one of the American plywood manufacturers. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Congress, friends, and associates in the nationwide plywood industry, I represent Linwood, Inc., of Gillett, Wis., one of the smaller plants in our industry.

The purpose of our presence here today is in line with the fact that ever since the advent of man, self-preservation has been the first law of nature, and providing for the health and welfare of our loved ones is uppermost in our hearts and minds as we follow our daily vocations.

You men of the Congress, having human tendencies, have enjoyed an opportunity to realize how much an increase in one's earning capacity adds to the peace of mind, well being and sense of security of yourself and loved ones. By comparison, we in the plywood industry can look forward to no security or increase in the future of our business or financial returns from the labor of our hands.

What is causing the forboding and precarious future outlook in our hardwood-plywood industry? Our Government has tried to fashion a system of import tariffs on plywood, the purpose of which, we hope we are right in assuming, is an effort to extend to all peoples throughout the world an equal opportunity to do export business with this country. The hope in so doing is that it may stimulate world trade, wage increases, and higher standards of living in the participating foreign countries.

You may be interested to know just how successfully such equality of opportunity to trade with this Nation is working out in the plywood industry. A summary of reports on imports of plywood during the years 1955–56 indicates that Japan has monopolized 74 percent of all such imports, leaving 26 percent for 28 other friendly exporting foreign nations. Among exporters to this country are Canada, Finland, the Philippines, Denmark, Sweden, West Germany, and other friendly nations, each of which has higher standards of living and wage scales than has Japan and consequently a higher cost of production.

Does Japan have any inherent right over other foreign countries to monopolize our import-plywood markets as she is doing?

From 1935 to 1941, inclusive, Japanese plywood exports to this country averaged approximately 1.5 million feet per year. Prior to 1934 she had little or no plywood production. During the year 1956 Japanese plywood imports reached the total of 650 million feet and no end in sight.

After World War II Japan's economic and industrial life was stimulated by a combination of circumstances including technical and financial assistance to plywood manufacturers and other most-favored-nations treatment by our Government. The quality and productive ability of Japanese labor is known throughout the world as is also their low-wage scale and long hours of work. Those two factors together makes it possible for Japan to underprice all other foreign nations in their endeavor to sell plywood in our country. The same inequality of production costs hampers our efforts to sell our own plywood in, what we hope, is still our own country.

Japan is presently enjoying three-quarters of the plywood imports into this country and a total of approximately 45 percent of all hardwood plywood consumed in the United States while at the same time domestic plywood plants are suffering financial difficulties all over this country. Is there anything in this situation which assures greater national security in time of war?

Japan has usurped this volume of plywood sales not alone to the loss and damage of all other foreign plywood producers but also to the loss and damage of labor in all phases of domestic plywood production.

It is reported that some Japanese plywood is delivered in this country at prices lower than on sales made in Japan.

We are all aware that you men in Congress are facing a multitude of problems and yet we feel sure you are concerned over the welfare of tens of thousands of tax-paying workers in all phases of the far-flung plywood industry. May we ask that after a full study of the facts involved you take steps to establish import plywood quotas on all foreign plywood imports and a realistic antidumping act by congressional action to safeguard the inherent rights of the people of your States and Nation.

We pray that this will be done.

WALTER W. SMITH,
*President and General Manager, Linwood Inc., Gillett, Wis.*

---

An incomplete listing of Wisconsin's plywood and veneer users and the plants which supply a part of their needs: 28 veneer and plywood plants, 28 boat builders, 33 door manufacturers, 8 casket manufacturers, 113 furniture manufacturers, 14 brush manufacturers, 15 hotel and restaurant furniture manufacturers, 103 mill and woodwork manufacturers, 18 veneer cheese box manufacturers, 66 wooden cabinet manufacturers.

---

## FLOOD DISASTER IN WEST VIRGINIA, KENTUCKY, AND VIRGINIA

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have just returned from a visit to that portion of my State which, along with parts of neighboring Kentucky and Virginia, suffered a terrible flood disaster on January 29 and 30. I was appalled at the extent of the damage to communities in southern West Virginia, in the Tug River and Guyandotte River valleys, and along tributaries of those streams. The extent of the damage to homes, businesses, highways, and public institutions, while not fully determined, will run into the millions of dollars. The hardships and suffering this disaster imposed upon thousands of people in the flood-stricken regions is almost beyond comprehension. One must see for himself the havoc wrought to understand fully the extent of this recent disaster.

Let me say here, Mr. President, that I have only the highest of praise for the quick response made by Government agencies to alleviate the distress resulting from this tragedy of nature. The people in the affected areas, their local units of government, representatives of Federal agencies near the scene, and humanitarian organizations labored day and night to care for more than 1,000 persons left homeless in my State. It soon became evident, however, that the local people could not alone cope with this disaster. It became necessary for the Federal Government to provide assistance and the speed with which the various agencies acted is deserving of the highest praise.

I was first informed of the scope of the disaster when I received a telegram from Mayor Ira Cooper, of Matewan, on January 30. He informed me that more than 80 percent of the homes in the town of Matewan were under water, and that the situation was more than the local people could cope with. He appealed to me to do what I could to obtain assistance from the Federal Government. I talked by telephone with other municipal officials in the towns affected and sensed the need for immediate action on the part of Federal agencies. Such action was forthcoming speedily and efficiently. In fact, when I talked with officials of the Federal Civilian Defense Administration here in Washington on January 30, I was informed that they were already moving in to help alleviate the distress. The American Red Cross was already sending in supplies. The Second Army began moving in a contingent of soldiers to help in rescue work and to restore public services. The National Guard had already responded in a most helpful way.

I immediately communicated with Gov. Cecil H. Underwood of West Virginia, on the gravity of the situation. He already had sent representatives into the affected areas. On request the President declared a six-county region of southern West Virginia a major disaster area, and directed the full force of the Federal agencies to go to the aid of the stricken people. A civil defense force was sent into the area at once to survey the extent of the damage and to assist local officials in rehabilitation work. Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, chairman of the American Red Cross, visited the stricken area personally and supervised the extensive aid rendered by that great humanitarian organization. I have at hand a letter from General Gruenther on that phase of the flood relief, and at this point, I ask unanimous consent to have his letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS,
*Washington, D. C., February 4, 1957.*

MY DEAR SENATOR REVERCOMB: I have just completed a survey of the areas in Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia which were devastated by the recent flash floods. A flight over the affected area and personal visits to some of the hardest hit communities gave me a chance to see the heavy damage and understand the extent of the Red Cross job in helping these people to get back on their feet. The total effect of the disaster is much greater than had been indicated by earlier reports. Over 19,000 families and small businesses have been affected with hundreds of homes totally destroyed or badly damaged. Reports received to date reveal that in West Virginia 3,377 families have been affected. Heaviest damage occurred in the counties of Mingo and Logan.

Since I have only recently assumed the responsibilities as president of the American Red Cross, I was greatly interested to obtain firsthand information about Red Cross relief activities within the affected areas. It was truly gratifying to learn that hundreds of volunteers quickly mobilized to provide food, shelter, and clothing for the victims. During the peak emergency, the Red Cross sheltered and fed over 10,000 persons.

I was much impressed with the leadership and cooperation between the Red Cross, civil defense, State, and municipal officials. The work of the Armed Forces has also been outstanding. During the course of my survey, I was able to talk personally with a number of small-business men and families who suffered losses as a result of the floods. There was no spirit of defeatism and I am proud to report the people of your State are showing true courage and are exercising maximum initiative in overcoming the effects of this catastrophe.

The Red Cross is now confronted with the long-term job of assisting families and small businesses to recover from the effects of the flood. A staff of over 200 experienced disaster workers from all parts of the country are being assigned to assist local Red Cross chapters to carry out this phase of our program. Estimates are necessarily incomplete, but there is every indication now that the Red Cross will expend over $3 million.

Let me assure you that we shall stay on the job until all who need Red Cross assistance have been helped.

Sincerely,

ALFRED M. GRUENTHER.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the Small Business Administration also responded forthwith to the need and established a special office at Williamson to process quickly applications for flood-disaster loans. Other Federal agencies were already on the scene to offer aid and counsel to local authorities. With all of this assistance, together with the great effort put forth by the people themselves, the effects of the disaster were alleviated to a great extent. The Salvation Army moved quickly into the area with clothing and other help. Citizens of nearby communities and industrial companies delivered food and usable water for those persons in need. My heartfelt praise goes out to all those who responded so willingly and so generously.

It is now imperative, I feel, that everything possible be done to prevent such catastrophes in the future. And, after seeing first-hand the terrific damage caused in my State, I am convinced that we must explore every possibility of flood control along those streams which periodically overflow their banks. For that reason, I have requested the Army Corps of Engineers to complete as quickly as possible an up-to-date survey of the Tug River and Guyandotte River Basins and their tributaries in southern West Virginina, and all streams in this major disaster area, to determine to what extent flood-control projects may prevent further catastrophy in that part of my State. Col. H. J. Skidmore, of the Huntington, W. Va., Army Corps of Engineers, who for a time was with me on a tour of the flood area, has assured me that a complete report will be made by his office as quickly as possible.

I am pleased to note that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has also presented immediate and long-range recommendations for future flood protection along the Big Sandy River, which recomendations, if carried out, will help prevent further flood damage to one area in my State. His recommendations deserve the most careful consideration and early action.

## FIFTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF SINKING OF THE BATTLESHIP "MAINE"

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, 59 years ago tomorrow night, February 15, 1898, the battleship *Maine* was mysteriously blown up at her mooring in Habana Harbor. Without warning, at 9:40 o'clock a double explosion rent the great vessel in two. As a result, 260 American officers and men were killed or drowned.

The events of that terrible night in Cuba fused American public opinion behind the cause of the Cuban patriots who long had had our Nation's sympathy. With "Remember the *Maine*" as their battle cry, American forces on land and sea avenged the sinking of that great ship. The battle cry was the echo of another fateful day in American history—the day at the Alamo, and it was to be echoed again decades later, at Pearl Harbor.

Today, the significance of the destruction of the *Maine* remains as a warning to all who would launch an unprovoked attack against the United States. May the loss of the battleship *Maine* remind us Americans, too, of our responsibilities as a world power, and of the necessity in these troubled times of maintaining our watchful strength—a strength which is undeniably the greatest deterrent to aggression today.

It is a privilege for me, as a citizen of the State of Maine, to pay tribute today to the memory of the battleship *Maine* and to the 260 American men who lost their lives in her sinking.

## NINETY-EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF ADMISSION OF OREGON TO THE UNION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, today marks the 98th anniversary of the entrance into the Union of the State I have the honor, in part, to represent. On February 14, 1859, the act admitting Oregon was officially approved by President James Buchanan. Since that eventful moment, Oregon has made important contributions to the national welfare, to national prosperity, and to national defense.

Oregon has been blessed by a generous Creator with vast resources of soil, timber, water, wildlife, fisheries, and scenic grandeur. Oregon also has a population consisting of imaginative, vigorous people who look constantly to new frontiers of faith and vision. Oregon is an enlightened State. It has a high degree of literacy, and a splendid system of schools and colleges, both publicly and privately supported.

Oregon has given to the Nation such innovations in democratic government as the initiative and referendum. It was the first State to provide for direct election of United States Senators, thus helping to broaden the base of American democracy. This, in many respects, has been our State's most permanent contribution to political vitality in the United States. Oregon also led the way in fixing maximum-hour and minimum-wage standards for women and children in industry. The constitutionality of such protective laws first was upheld by the United States Supreme Court in the historic case of Muller against Oregon.

My wife and I have traveled over the entire trail of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, where those first of all westbound Americans carried our flag from

St. Louis to the mouth of the mighty Columbia River, which today is recognized as the North American waterway with the greatest potential for hydroelectric-power production. No one could look upon Oregon's majestic uplands and seacoast from that historic trail and not feel a sense of pride and contentment in being a resident of so favored a domain.

Mr. President, I wish to add that I am paying this brief tribute to our wonderful State on its 98th birthday in behalf of both the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself. He is in the West, where he is addressing the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco and the western regional meeting of the Democratic Party. He has advised that he desires to join in heralding to the Senate the anniversary date of Oregon's membership in the Federal Union of States known as the United States of America.

On this birthday anniversary of the great State of Oregon it is appropriate to call to the attention of the Senate the historical role which Oregon has played in the opening of the West. The first structure to be built by Americans along the Pacific slope was erected some 151 years ago on Oregon soil. This was the famous Fort Clatsop, which housed the intrepid explorers of the Lewis and Clark Expedition during 1805 and 1806, when they waited out the winter at the western terminus of their cross-country trek, near the mouth of the Columbia River.

During the last session of Congress, there was enacted legislation to study the Fort Clatsop site as the location for a new national monument. I was pleased to introduce the bill, which eventually led to commencement by the National Park Service of surveys of the Fort Clatsop area. It is my hope that it will some day become the newest addition to our system of historic shrines, so that suitable recognition can be given to Oregon as the location of the first settlement by the Americans whose discoveries paved the way for the great western migration which followed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an article, which I wrote for the New York Times of November 25, 1956, detailing some of the background of Fort Clatsop and its erection by the Lewis and Clark expedition.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONUMENT ON THE PACIFIC: HISTORIC FORT IN OREGON MAY SOON BECOME NATIONAL SHRINE

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. NEUBERGER, junior United States Senator from Oregon, is author of the bill authorizing a national monument at Fort Clatsop.)

ASTORIA, OREG.—The oldest of all American settlements on the Pacific coast soon may become the country's newest national monument. Under the terms of legislation passed by the 84th Congress, the National Park Service is presently studying the possibilities of creating a national shrine at rebuilt Fort Clatsop, near the picturesque mouth of the vast Columbia River. This was where Meriwether Lewis and William Clark spent the bleak winter of 1805–06, after they had carried the flag of the United States from St. Louis to the shores of the Pacific Ocean.

Fort Clatsop has an eminent rank in history. It was the first American military post anywhere west of St. Louis. It was the first habitation by Americans along the Pacific seaboard. It was the first edifice to house white persons in the Pacific Northwest. It was where American conquest of the West began.

Last year, as part of the sesquicentennial observance of the arrival of Lewis and Clark at tidewater, Fort Clatsop was totally reconstructed on the exact site of the original post. The drawings and sketches of Lieutenant Clark, found in the expedition's journals, were followed faithfully. The famous fort is 50 by 50 feet in dimensions, with three rooms along one wall and 4 along the other. A military parade ground occupies the center square, for the men of Lewis and Clark were enlisted in the United States Army.

COMMUNIST PROJECT

Reconstruction of Fort Clatsop was a community project. The Oregon Historical Society had strained a limited budget to obtain the site. The Crown-Zellerbach Corp. provided all the logs for the stockade and buildings. The logs were cut to the exact proportions of those described in Lieutenant Clark's 150-year-old plans. Even the flagpole was made the precise height of that from which flew the original Stars and Stripes to wave within sight of the Pacific Ocean.

In recreating Fort Clatsop, difficulty was encountered in finding men with experience at constructing a log fort. The most skilled cabinetmakers and woodworkers did not have this type of skill. Two Finnish immigrants, recently arrived in the United States, at last were discovered. They had just the talents needed.

These men, at daily carpenter's wages, undertook the major construction job. Thomas Vaughan, director of the Oregon State Historical Society, considers them actually responsible for the success of the project. Thus did two newcomers to America rebuild the oldest buildings which ever housed Americans west of St. Louis.

As a national monument, Fort Clatsop will possess many fascinating features. During the summer months of 1956, even with the most minimum sort of custodial care, more than 10,000 visitors trekked to the fort. The stockade commands a panorama of the sloughs, inlet, and bays which surround the wide mouth of the Northwest's greatest river. Lofty trees of Douglas-fir form a natural fortress beyond the man-built bulwarks. On clear days, stately freighters and sleek passenger liners can be seen standing out to sea, ready to breast the Columbia's rolling bar.

STREAM NAMED FOR EXPLORERS

Fittingly, a near-by smaller stream is named the Lewis and Clark River. It meanders off into the wooded hills. In the distance bulks the 3,266-foot summit of Saddle Mountain, one of the highest peaks in the gentle coast range. Lewis and Clark themselves referred to this spectacular landmark in their journals, but never bestowed its nomenclature. Elk and deer inhabit the forests, and are tracked down during Oregon's hunting seasons. Indeed, the abundant supply of game induced the explorers to settle at the site of Fort Clatsop in 1805, rather than across the river in what today is the State of Washington.

The location of firepits, barbecue pits, log remains, and other remnants has left no doubt that the rebuilt structure is on the ground occupied by the original Fort Clatsop, which Capt. Meriwether Lewis named for the Clatsop Tribe of coastal Indians. Both the Oregon Historical Society and the National Park Service have taken great care to locate the site accurately.

At least $50,000 has been invested in the site and in the reconstruction of the celebrated fort. With the establishment of a national monument, Thomas Vaughn of the Historical Society believes that it will become one of the principal tourist attractions of the north Pacific seacoast.

Visitors who glimpse the reconstructed fort also will have an opportunity to savor of some of the finest boating, hiking, fishing, and surf bathing anywhere in the West.

The spacious Clatsop beaches stretch southward for many miles from the mouth of the Columbia River. These beaches, of sand as white as glacial snow, are frequently guarded by towering headlands and lofty capes. The surf is foamingly picturesque, although often too chilly for all except the most Spartan swimmers. Back and forth across the Columbia's bar prowls the Engineer Corps dredge *Essayons*, largest in the world, deepening the river entrance to 48 feet. This has long been a goal of mariners and pilots. Peacock Spit, near the Columbia's mouth, has claimed more vessels than any other shoal off the north Pacific coast.

Astoria, a few miles from Fort Clatsop, is the principal salmon-fishing community in the Northwest. During the late summer, hordes of Chinook salmon return to the Columbia from the sea, where they may roam as far as the Kamchatka. These fish must ascend to the river's remote headwaters. There it is their destiny to spawn and then to die. They run a gantlet of sports fishermen and commercial gill netters en route.

The Chinooks frequently weigh up to 50 or 60 pounds. Although Lewis and Clark wearied of this diet, they are among the tastiest of fish. Tourists catching a river giant like to have their salmon canned at a custom cannery, with the proud fisherman's own name on the fancy labels.

TRANSPORTATION

No railroad passenger trains serve Astoria, but there is frequent service by Greyhound buses and West Coast Airlines. The highways are excellent. U. S. 101 threads along the seacoast, hugging cliffs and looping headlands, State Route 26 twists across the Coast Range via the Wolf Creek drainage basin. The distance from Portland is 98 miles. Route 26 goes through Seaside, Oregon's most popular beach resort, which is approximately 18 miles from the site of reconstructed Fort Clatsop. Lewis and Clark strolled along the generous beaches and distilled salt from sea water at Seaside to cure their elk steaks and roasts.

When they were in Oregon long ago, some of the argonauts of Lewis and Clark climbed a great cape back of Seaside now known as Tillamook Head. In the lonely solitude of that vast scene, they were relieved to get back to the snug coziness of their stockade of logs at Fort Clatsop. The rebuilt version of that first of all American homes in the West is being studied today by the National Park Service for establishment as a national shrine. Fort Clatsop, after all, symbolizes America's beginning as a nation which stretches from sea to shining sea.

## RECORD OF THE MAINE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, as all my distinguished colleagues know, there is at the present time a growing furor over the training of the National Guard. While the central core of the controversy is the active-duty training requirement to be imposed on men enlisting in the Guard, certain statements made in the heat of the argument have cast unwarranted discredit on the record of the National Guard. I happen to be one who firmly believes that the National Guard

has long been one of our first lines of defenses, and has served with credit whenever called. In order that the record may be complete, I request unanimous consent that a brief history of the Maine National Guard, of which it was my privilege to serve as commander in chief during my term as Governor of Maine, be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HISTORICAL OUTLINE OF DUTY PERFORMED BY THE MAINE ARMY AND AIR NATIONAL GUARD IN FEDERAL AND STATE STATUS

The history of the Maine National Guard subsequent to World War I is the history of the National Guard of the several States, Territories, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. Reorganization of the National Guard to meet additional requirements in the event of Federal and State emergency and in accordance with training directive promulgated by the then War Department placed the Maine National Guard in a highly effective status when at the direction of the President, it was called for active duty in connection with World War II in two increments.

The 240th Coast Artillery (Harbor Defense) Regiment was ordered into active military service on September 16, 1940. The regiment assumed its tactical position in the harbor defense of Portland and together with many recruits trained to fulfill its wartime mission of harbor defense. After training replacements and furnishing many officers and men for the activation of the antiaircraft artillery which were being formed to counter the airpower of the enemy, the regiment was broken up on October 7, 1944, leaving only Battery E, 185th Coast Artillery Battalion (formerly Headquarters and Headquarters Battalion, 240th) to carry on the lineage and to man the 16-inch harbor guns at Peaks Island, Maine.

The 152d Field Artillery Regiment was inducted into active Federal service on February 24, 1941 together with the 103d Infantry Regiment as a part of the 43d Infantry Division. The 43d Division was comprised of men from Maine, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Connecticut and was known as the Winged Victory Division. At the time that the 152d FA Regiment went into service the infantry division was triangularized and the Maine battalion was redesignated as the 203d FA Regiment, later to be redesignated as the 203d FA Battalion. The battalion went through training at Camp Shelby, Miss., and later to Fort Bragg, N. C. From Fort Bragg, the unit moved to Camp Shanks in California and subsequently to the New York Port of Embarkation. After a period of maneuvers in England they landed at Omaha Beach on the 23d of June 1944. The battalion was attached to the 30th Infantry Division and participated in the destruction of St. Lo. They participated in the breakout from the Seine bridgehead and followed the campaign across northern France, Belgium, and Holland. The battalion made the dash to the Elbe River and fired in support of the assult on Magdeburg. During its long months of combat, the 203d fired more than 68,000 rounds in hurling 3,200 tons of steel and flame at the enemy. In 318 days of combat, 1 officer, and 8 men were killed, while 2 officers and 50 men were wounded. The battalion's observation planes flew 450 combat missions, and the outfit moved 60 times in covering 1,450 miles from the beach to the last firing position. A proud record it was, and the driving force which made it possible was the spirit behind the numbers of the 203d.

The history of Maine's 103d Infantry paralleled the history of the 43d Infantry Division through training in the United States to tour of duty in New Zealand when it appeared likely that the Japanese might invade that country. It was shipped to New Caledonia for a brief stay and early in 1943 participated in the Guadalcanal campaign. Early in 1943 following this they participated in the Guadalcanal campaign. Early in 1943 following this they participated in the invasion of the Russell Islands, and in late June of 1943 with elements of the Navy and Marines assaulted New Georgia landing on Rendovia Island. The publication "Fighting Division" published by the Infantry Journal has the following to say with regard to this National Guard Division of which Maine units were a part:

"For 35 days of what many authorities believe to be the dirtiest, roughest campaign of the early war in the Pacific, the 43d fought for Munda Airport. As yet inexperienced in the ways of jungle fighting, the 43d was opposed by some of the crack elements of the Imperial Japanese Army. All the tricks of the jungle which eventually became old stuff to our troops were strange to the men of the 43d in the fight for Munda. They had to learn the hard and bloody way, and they did. On August 5 the 43d broke the Japanese resistance and seized its prime objective—the vital Munda airstrip."

From Munda, the division fought in Guinea at Aitape and had a share in the bloody battle of the Driniumor River. Following this campaign, they drew the assignment to invade the island of Luzon with the mission to take the left flank and secure the hill masses and road network to block off strong Japanese forces in the mountains at Baguio. The division bore the brunt of the fighting in this area. Later the division moved to the east of Manila and helped to clear the Japanese from the hills near the city and free the Ipo Dam which was the main water supply for the city of Manila. The 43d Division left Manila and arrived at Yokohama and were later located about 45 miles from Tokyo at a large Japanese air training field. The 103d Infantry returned to the United States from Japan with the 43d Division, it being the first division to return to the United States from the Pacific theater as a complete division.

The Maine Guard reorganized following World War II and at the outbreak of the Korean incident was ready to take its place as a first line defense unit should the need arise.

On July 28, 1950, the 703d AAA Battalion, and the attached 354 Signal Radar maintenance unit, were ordered to active duty effective August 15, 1950, at which time they were relieved of assignment to First Army and assigned to Third Army at Camp Gordon, Ga. At the end of the training period, the battalion was sent to Fort Hancock, N. J., where it remained in the AAA Defense (Antiaircraft) of New York City until its relief from service on April 14, 1952. In this connection, it is of interest to note that the battalion was levied for many of its officers and men who saw service in other organizations in Korea.

Also inducted on February 1, 1951, was the 101st Fighter Wing, Maine National Guard, who after a short period of time at Dow Air Force Base was sent to Grenier Field in New Hampshire where many remained.

The 104th Aircraft Control and Warning Squadron located in South Portland, Maine, was ordered to active duty on September 1, 1951 to serve for a period of 24 months. The unit comprised of 16 officers and 156 airmen at the time of induction was assigned to Continental Air Command. The unit reported to Camp Edwards, Mass.; here it became part of an aircraft and warning control group and in February of 1952 was merged with the 102d Aircraft and Warning Squadron. In April of that year, the squadron was alerted and moved to Camp Kilmer, N. J., and embarked for Tripoli, Libya, and north Africa where it set up equipment in connection with its assigned mission. The unit was released to State control on November 1, 1952, after having served with distinction.

At no time in the history of the Maine National Guard has the training effort of either the Army or the Air side been found wanting by the active Army or Air Force. In connection with its State mission, the Air National Guard has been called out by its Governor in connection with textile strikes, floods, and forest fires. The action of the units under State control has reflected great credit upon the men and their commanders. The quality of Maine National Guard units, both Army and Air, has been tested from time to time by State and Federal emergencies and the status of training of these units is evaluated annually by the active Army and Air Force headquarters having training jurisdiction. Reports covering the training for these units for fiscal year 1957 rated Maine units as highly satisfactory.

---

## THE FARMER AND THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a friend of mine showed me a little soliloquy entitled "The Man and the Mule," which he said he received from a farmer who voted Republican in 1956. An accompanying letter, he said, explained that it was sent because of Secretary of Agriculture Benson's recent order reducing farm price supports, and the writer's complete disillusionment as to the sincerity of administration farm promises. The soliloquy is relatively short, and I believe all Senators will appreciate its humor, if not its point, so I shall read it:

THE MAN AND THE MULE

Over the hill trailed a man behind a mule pulling a plow.

Said the man to the mule: "Bill, you are just a mule, the son of a jackass. I am a man, made in the image of God; yet we work hitched up together year after year, and I wonder if you work for me or I work for you. Verily, I think it is a partnership between a mule and a fool, for surely I work as hard as you, if not harder.

Soon we will be preparing for a corn crop. When the crop is harvested, I give one-third to the land owner as rent, one-third goes to you, and the rest is mine. You consume all your portion except the cobs, while I divide mine with seven children, six hens, two ducks, and a banker, after a small portion goes to my wife. If we both need shoes, Bill, you get yours. You are getting the best of me; and I ask you, is it fair for a mule, the son of a jackass, to swindle a man—lord of creation—out of his subsistence?

You never work without me; but often when I work, you look over the pasture fence and he-haw at me. All the fall and winter the whole family works to earn money for taxes, buy a new set of harness for you, and pay the mortgage on you. And what do you care about the mortgage? Not a thing, you ornery cuss. I even have to worry about the mortgage on your tough, ungrateful hide. And about the only time I am your better is on election day, when I can vote and you can't. After the election is over, though, I realize that I was fully as big a jackass as your papa.

Mr. President, while I deeply regret that the farmer who sent me that little story—and a few million other citizens—did not see through the great deceptions of 1956 before November 6, 1956, I feel

that the indictment is too harsh, and unjust.

Last year the American people were harangued by experts at deception, and in agriculture they were harangued by such experts in the most sanctimonious terms.

From early 1956 until after election, farmers were told that the sun was finally rising for agriculture. On January 16, 1956, Secretary Benson told the convention of the National Council of Farmers Cooperatives:

> A new buoyancy in the market place—a new hope—a new vigor and zest—can be anticipated * * * surely it should be reflected promptly in prices and incomes.

In the immediately ensuing months, the administration started boosting farm price supports a little, instead of keeping up their relentless reductions.

President Eisenhower, in vetoing the farm bill, raised supports for wheat from a previously announced level of $1.81 per bushel to $2. Corn was raised from $1.40 to $1.50. Butter support was raised 2.4 cents per pound. Manufacturing milk supports were raised a little. The oil crops—soybeans, flaxseed, and cottonseed—all got a little boost.

Having thus shifted away from its constant downward pressure on farm prices, the administration proclaimed that the salvation of farmers was at hand.

Secretary Benson declared at Idaho Falls, Idaho, on August 17, 1956, that—

> Farm prices and the parity ratio have not only stopped falling—they are definitely climbing.

The Republican Party platform, adopted August 21, 1956, said:

> We are gratified by the improvement this year in farm prices and income as a result of our policies.

Two days later President Eisenhower echoed the platform, by declaring:

> Recent improvement in farm prices indicates that we are on the right track.

And then Secretary Ezra Benson, on the stump, reechoed Mr. Eisenhower in telling the feed and grain dealers on September 11, 1956:

> We are on the right track. The downward slide in prices has been checked. Yes; we are on the right track, and we are going to stay on it.

The farm voters of the Nation were led to believe that the administration had seen the error of its ways; that the ruthless and relentless downward pressure on farm prices was over; and that recovery and salvation could be anticipated.

Secretary Benson rejected with a display of self-righteousness the charge that the slight raising of the administration's low price supports was a political move. In his most righteous manner, he declared that no amount of improper pressure could cause him to deviate one iota from the course he deemed best for farmers.

It was in this sort of a situation that American farmers went to the polls in November 1956, and cast their ballots—some of them still, unfortunately, believing that the Republican oppression of agriculture was over, and that the higher price supports represented a new, right track toward farm recovery.

"Yes," said Secretary Benson, "we are on the right track and we are going to stay on it."

Mr. President, for a long time I was reluctant to believe that Secretary Benson would engage in deliberate misrepresentation. After all, he was not a party to President Eisenhower's golden promises to the farmers in 1952. He was not in the Eisenhower entourage when they were made. He was appointed Secretary of Agriculture after the election, and apparently he did not feel himself bound by the campaign talk of 90 percent and 100 percent of parity for farmers. He might have rationalized that he did not make the promises of 1952, and therefore had no obligation to keep them.

But Secretary Benson cannot today escape the responsibility for leading farmers to believe that in 1956 the administration was on a new right track, and for adding that we are going to stay on it, and then for turning back at his first opportunity, in 1957, on the old track, the course of relentlessly driving farm prices further and further down.

It was completely clear to those of us who followed the administration farm policy closely for 4 years that the 1956 price-support increases were pure, unadulterated politics, regardless of Secretary Benson's proclamation of righteousness. But I can understand how many farm people, busy with their own work and their own problems, were misled.

The important fact which confronts Congress today is that the squeeze on farmers has been renewed; and that unless this Congress adopts positive, mandatory new farm policies, the administration is going to continue to make farmers economic goats and to drive agriculture into bankruptcy.

So long as farmers continue to want to pay their bills, their taxes, interest, and family living expenses, and to make both ends meet, lower prices are going to mean increased production. And virtually all farmers want to make both ends meet.

The only way the Benson theory that lower prices mean lower production can ever be made to work is to reduce agriculture to such bankruptcy that the farmers are driven from the land.

Repeated reductions in farm price supports between February 1953, when Mr. Benson started hacking at feed prices, and 1956, resulted in the biggest farm production in history. The index of production last year stood at 113 percent of the 1947–49 average. The largest previous production was in 1952, when it was 107 percent of the 1947–49 average.

The administration assured livestock producers that they would benefit from low feed costs. The result in 1956 was livestock production 123 percent of 1947–49, and all-time record, with low, disastrous prices.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table showing administration actions in reducing farm price supports, starting with Mr. Benson's first move against feed price levels in February 1953.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARM SLIDE

February 1953: Reduced cottonseed meal from ceiling ($80 per ton) to $75 per ton for Commodity Credit Corporation holdings.

March 4, 1953: Announced no price supports on hay and pasture seeds.

March 1953: Reduced CCC cottonseed meal price from $75 to $70 per short ton.

April 20, 1953: Reduced CCC cottonseed meal price from $70 to $57 per ton. (Memphis market broke $10 per ton from April 15 to April 21 on news of this reduction).

May 22, 1953: Reported sale of 527,000 tons of cottonseed meal at the new lowered price levels.

October 14, 1953: Reduced tung nut oil support from $63.38 to $54.96.

October 20, 1953: Reduced barley supports from $1.24 to $1.15 per bushel; reduced supports on oats from 80 cents to 75 cents per bushel; reduced grain sorghum supports from $2.43 to $2.28 a hundredweight; reduced supports on cottonseed from $54.20 to $54 a ton.

January 22, 1954: Reduced soybean supports from $2.56 to $2.22 a bushel.

February 14, 1954: Reduced supports on butter from 67 cents to 56 cents a pound; on manufacturing milk from $3.74 to $3.14 a hundredweight.

March 4, 1954: Reduced supports on dry edible beans from $7.79 to $7.24 a hundredweight.

April 9, 1954: Reduced flaxseed supports from $3.79 to $3.14 a bushel.

September 15, 1954: Cut wheat supports from $2.24 to $2.08 a bushel.

December 13, 1954: Reduced supports on grain sorghum from $2.28 a hundredweight to $1.78 a hundredweight; reduced oats supports from 75 to 65 cents a bushel; cut barley supports from $1.15 to 94 cents a bushel; reduced supports on rye from $1.43 to $1.18 a bushel; reduced soybean supports from $2.22 to $2.04 a bushel; reduced supports on cottonseed from $54 to $46 a ton.

March 24, 1955: Cut supports on corn from $1.62 to $1.58 a bushel.

April 8, 1955: Reduced supports on dry edible beans from $7.24 to $6.36 a bushel.

May 13, 1955: Cut rice supports from $4.92 to $4.66 a bag.

June 10, 1955: Reduced wheat supports from $2.08 to $1.81 a bushel.

October 11, 1955: Cut supports on tung nuts from $54.96 to $51.06 a ton.

December 30, 1955: Rice supports cut from $4.66 to $4.03 a bag.

February 1956: Corn supports reduced from $1.58 to $1.40 a bushel; cotton, cut from 31.7 to 29.3 cents a pound.

February 1956: Supports on peanuts reduced from 13.6 to 13.2 cents a pound.

March 1, 1956: Supports on dry edible beans reduced from $6.36 to $6.31 a bushel; supports on honey reduced from 11.4 cents a pound to 9.7 cents a pound.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the table does not include a considerable number of technical, indirect ways, Secretary Benson and his staff have found to chisel down farm prices.

One such example was the changing of parity for manufacturing milk. Secretary Benson discovered that he had discretionary authority to change the base period on which manufacturing milk parity was calculated. He found that he could thus lower parity, and thereby could lower price supports. So he adopted a new base period for manufacturing milk.

My friends from the wheat-producing States tell me that the Department has recently discovered two ways to reduce farm returns from wheat. Western durum wheat handlers discovered that they could save about 10 cents a bushel by exporting wheat from the west coast during the winter months, and by paying the farmers some of that saving. This was so alarming the Department of Agriculture hastily suspended export subsidies on durum until it could put in a lower, differential subsidy on wheat exported from west-coast ports.

Also, I am advised, the Department is preparing to revise the standards under which wheat is graded. This will be on the pretext of improving quality, but the only actual result will be to reduce farm returns.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table of the slide in price supports from 1953 through 1955—the slide which preceded our record production of 1956.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*The sliding scale has slid, supports from 1953 through 1955*

| Commodity and unit | 1953 | | 1954 | | 1955 | | Change [2] | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Average support price | Support level, percent | Average support price | Support level, percent | Average support price | Support level, percent | Support price level | In percent, level |
| Butterfat, pounds | .673 | 90 | .562 | 75 | .562 | 76.0 | −.111 | −14 |
| Milk, manufacturing, hundredweight | 3.74 | 90 | 3.15 | 75 | 3.15 | 80.0 | −.59 | −10 |
| Barley, bushels | 1.24 | 85 | 1.15 | 85 | .94 | 70.0 | −.30 | −15 |
| Oats, do | .80 | 85 | .75 | 85 | .61 | 70.0 | −.19 | −15 |
| Rye, do | 1.43 | 85 | 1.43 | 85 | 1.18 | 70.0 | −.25 | −15 |
| Sorghums for grain, hundredweight | 2.43 | 85 | 2.28 | 85 | 1.78 | 70.0 | −.65 | −15 |
| Flaxseed, bushels | 3.79 | 80 | 3.14 | 70 | 2.91 | 65.0 | −.88 | −10 |
| Soybeans, do | 2.56 | 90 | 2.22 | 80 | 2.04 | 70.0 | −.52 | −20 |
| Beans, dry edible, hundredweight | 7.79 | 87 | 7.24 | 80 | 6.36 | 70.0 | −1.43 | −17 |
| Cottonseed, ton | 54.20 | 75 | 54.00 | 75 | 46.34 | 65.0 | −7.86 | −1 |
| Mohair, pounds | .607 | 80 | .643 | 83 | .70 | 91.0 | +1.43 | +8 |
| Honey, do | .105 | 70 | 1.02 | 70 | .099 | 70.0 | −.006 | |
| Tung nuts, ton | 63.38 | 65 | 54.96 | 60 | 51.06 | 60.0 | −12.32 | −5 |
| Wheat [1], bushels | 2.21 | 91 | 2.24 | 90 | 2.08 | 82.5 | −.13 | −6 |
| Corn, do | 1.60 | 90 | 1.62 | 90 | 1.58 | 87.0 | −.02 | −3 |
| Cotton, upland, pounds | .3080 | 90 | .3158 | 90 | .3170 | 90.0 | +.009 | |
| Peanuts, do | .119 | 90 | .122 | 90 | .122 | 90.0 | +.003 | |
| Rice, hundredweight | 4.84 | 91 | 4.92 | 91 | 4.66 | 86.0 | −.22 | −5 |
| Tobacco, flue cured, pounds | .479 | 92 | .479 | 90 | .483 | 91.0 | −.004 | |
| Tobacco, fire cured, do | .35 | | .348 | | .346 | | +.004 | |
| Burley, do | .466 | 91 | .464 | 91 | .462 | 91.0 | −.004 | |
| Wool, do | .531 | 90 | .532 | 90 | .62 | 106.0 | +.089 | +16 |

[1] Minimum support for 1956 is $1.81 equal to 76 percent of parity. Support level in 1953 exceeded 90 percent of parity due to "forward pricing provision," also reflected elsewhere in the table.

[2] Apparent inconsistencies in case and percentage level are due to transition from old to new parity.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Secretary Benson's reduction of price supports, as announced last weekend, should make it crystal clear to everyone that the administration is not on any new track; but that in February 1957 it is again on the track on which it started traveling in February 1953—a course of relentless oppression of the farmers, of continued reduction of their price supports, and of continued squeezing from them of food at lower prices, to offset rampant inflation in other segments of the economy.

The action taken last weekend was indeed a shock to the farmers. All this week I have received frantic telephone calls from cottongrowers in Tennessee. They say this will be a heavy blow to them; and it certainly will.

The cut in the supports on flaxseed and cottonseed dropped them from 70 percent to 65 percent; and on cotton, from 84 to 77 percent.

This new price level means $5.40 less per bale of cotton, and $2 less per ton of cottonseed. On last year's total cotton crop, such a cut means a total loss to the cotton farmers of between $89 million and $90 million.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, the Democrats cannot alone prevent the Government from pursuing this course. President Eisenhower has demonstrated that he will use his veto power to kill any proposed legislation which would halt and reverse this slide.

Our only real hope is that the countless members of Mr. Eisenhower's and Mr. Benson's own party here in Congress, who know that disaster lies ahead for agriculture unless the course is changed, will defy the administration lash, and will join in writing mandatory farm legislation restoring at least 90-percent price supports.

Farm-program costs have doubled and trebled under Eisenhower and Benson. Production has soared. The situation has worsened year after year. And now we are back on the same old road to agricultural ruin.

Democrats are virtually unanimously prepared to reenact strong price-support legislation. But we must have substantial assistance from our colleagues across the aisle. Only they can supply the majority necessary to override the inevitable veto which will be affixed to such legislation at the White House or at some quail farm or vacation resort.

With the administration's position again clear, the responsibility for continuing or changing the course is the responsibility of the Republican Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. They alone can "veto" a veto. I am sure there is nothing the farmers of America would like to hear more than the news that a caucus of Republicans in Congress had determined to end the Benson fiasco and to join the Democratic majority in enacting legislation, a veto notwithstanding, to save the farmers and the economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article on the meaning of the farm vote in the last election. The article was published in the U. S. News & World Report of February 1, 1957.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT HIT THE REPUBLICANS IN MIDWEST—HERE'S THE WAY THEY SEE IT

Was there really a farm revolt in 1956? Did farmers in large numbers turn away from the Republican Party? Does the loss of ground by Republicans in congressional and governorship races west of the Mississippi in 1956 mean that a Democratic sweep is in the making for 1958 and 1960?

These questions, arising at the White House in the wake of the 1956 election, now are drawing answers from the Republican National Committee. Careful studies of the voting in farm precincts of the Middle West have been made by the committee's fieldmen.

The committee report, now in the hands of White House officials, pulls no punches in its appraisal of the seriousness of the shift in farm votes, so far as the Republican Party is concerned. The ballots cast by the farmers in 1956 are to have much to do with shaping administration farm policies in the months ahead.

LOCAL UPRISINGS

"While there was no national farm revolt, there certainly were some violent local uprisings," a farm expert of the Republican National Committee informed a White House official.

The reports from the field were peppered with criticism of the administration's farm policies since 1952. They were sharply critical, in several cases, of Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture. And the election figures, collected at the precinct level, detailed the story of Republican losses.

A fieldman for the National Committee in Iowa said Secretary Benson should resign. Another, in North Dakota, wrote: "If the Department of Agriculture is not cleaned up the entire Midwest will go solid Democrat in 1958." In Minnesota, a third fieldman

said Republican losses there were due to "failure to convince farmers of our sympathy for them and their problems."

WHITE HOUSE STARTED IT

The study was prompted by an inquiry from a White House official. He asked the national committee research staff: "Was there a farm revolt?"

After a preliminary study, the national committee replied that the farm vote held up pretty well east of the Mississippi River, that President Eisenhower seemed actually to have received more farm votes in the South than he did in 1952. But the committee reported:

"In some parts of the Midwest and Great Plains States, especially where the economic problems of farmers were compounded by drought, there was a sharp drop-off from the 1952 farm vote for President Eisenhower. Here, the decline in rural support for Republican candidates for the Senate and House was even more pronounced."

West of the Mississippi, the report said, there was a definite fall off in Republican strength among farmers in virtually every State. It said the drop was substantial in the wheat and cattle country, but also was large in Iowa and Minnesota, where agriculture is widely diversified.

Analyzing the results of congressional races in the Middle and Far West, the committee found the greatest losses in areas where farm incomes had been slipping. It was here that Democrats had aimed their heaviest punches of the 1956 campaign.

In States west of the Mississippi, Republicans lost 10 House seats in 1956, although they managed to hold these areas for Mr. Eisenhower. Close results in two other House races in this region were contested.

The national committee found that, in every case except 1 among the House races, Republican candidates had won by good margins in 1952, won by smaller margins in 1954, and lost to Democrats in 1956. They started from a high level of votes in 1952, with healthy winning margins and moved steadily downhill during the period of the Republican administration. The one exception was in Nevada, where candidates and conditions differed from those in the other races.

UNREST ON FARMS

A close look at the voting convinced committee experts that, while the farm problem may not have been the decisive factor in all of these losses, it was important. They concluded that at least three of the losses could be traced with some certainty to farm unrest and drought conditions. The report added:

"While farm unrest may not have been the most prominent issue in certain of these 12 contests, the fact remains that, had the farm vote stayed as Republican as it was in 1952, our candidates would have won in spite of other problems. Had the farm vote held at the 1952 level, we would not only have retained these House seats west of the Mississippi but we would actually have picked up several in such States as Missouri, Wisconsin, and Minnesota."

The report pointed out that virtually all of the Republican Members of the House and Senate west of the Mississippi who were elected won by reduced margins. Often, even in areas that have been stanchly Republican in the past, the margin of victory was only a few hundred or few thousand votes.

BASIS FOR WORRY

"The Members of Congress involved are understandably concerned over 1958," the report said.

Pursuing the matter, national committee officials began to dig more deeply into the question. Fieldmen of the committee in 9 States of the Middle West were asked to pick 4 rural precincts in each of their home counties and make detailed studies of the voting in 1952 and 1956.

The precincts studied were at least 85 percent rural. The study brought together comparative figures on presidential, senatorial, House, and governorship races. Fieldmen were asked to note the changes in vote totals compared with 1952, the types of population in the precincts, the condition of crops, and the reasons for vote changes. The overall results of this study are depicted in the charts on pages 60 and 61.

Almost without exception, the study showed a decline in Republican votes. Similarly, in all of the areas a great many voters stayed at home. In very few cases did the total vote come up to what it had been in 1952, and rarely did Democratic candidates pick up as many votes as Republican candidates lost.

In brief, the study showed:

Wisconsin precincts are in an area where crops were good. This area is peopled largely by persons of Scandinavian descent. The fieldman noted a trend to Democrats in every precinct. Mr. Eisenhower carried all 4 precincts in 1952, lost 2 of them in 1956. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, a Republican, carried all 4 precincts in his 1956 race for reelection.

In the House races, the farmers of these precincts shifted sharply. In 1952, a Republican candidate for the House carried all 4 precincts. But, in 1956, Representative LESTER R. JOHNSON, a Democrat, trying for reelection to the seat he had won in 1954, got a majority in all four of these precincts. He was reelected.

The fieldman said the local organization of Republicans was ineffective and there was strong opposition from the farmers union.

Colorado precincts studied are in an area that had felt drought for 5 of the last 6 years. One precinct holds many Mexican laborers. This precinct turned Democratic in all contests. It had given Mr. Eisenhower and Adlai E. Stevenson a tie in 1952, and had voted Republican in other contests, by narrow margins.

Mr. Eisenhower carried 3 of the 4 precincts in 1956. The Republican candidate for governor won two. At the same time, the Democratic candidate for Senate got 3 of the 4 precincts. The Democratic candidate for Representative won 2 of the 4 and tied in a third. Overall, the congressional district in which the precincts are located reelected Representative J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, a Republican.

The fieldman said the Republican decline was caused by drought, general farm unrest, an unpopular wheat program, and Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

Iowa precincts included also are in drought country. Crops were poor. The population of the precincts is 80 percent of German and Luxembourg descent, 60 percent Catholic.

All of the precincts showed a Democratic trend. Mr. Eisenhower had carried the four precincts in 1952. He lost one in 1956. The Republican candidate for the Senate lost 2 of the 4. The Republican candidate for governor lost 3 of the 4; the Republican candidate had lost two in 1952. CHARLES B. HOEVEN, the Republican candidate for Representative, carried all four precincts. He had no opposition in the district in 1952.

The Republican fieldman said the losses were due to drought, general farm unrest and the unpopularity of the Republican governor. In the statewide voting, Iowa elected a Democratic governor.

North Dakota precincts surveyed are in an area where crops were fair to poor. The population is largely of German and Scandinavian descent.

A Democratic trend showed in all precincts. Mr. Eisenhower got all 4 in 1952, lost 1 in 1956. The Republican candidate for the Senate won all four in 1956. Democratic candidates for the House and for Governor carried 2 of the 4. North Dakota kept its Republican House delegation, and Republicans held virtually a solid grip on State offices. But they were shaken.

The fieldman, urging that the Agricultural Department be "cleaned up," said declines in Republican votes in the area were due to wheat-acreage controls, poor crops, low prices for barley, Farmers Union activity.

South Dakota precincts in the study are in an area of poor crops.

A swing to Democrats was noted in all precincts. Mr. Eisenhower had carried the four in 1952. He carried 1, tied in 1, lost 2 in 1956. The Republican candidate for the Senate lost two of the precincts. The Republican candidate for Representative lost one. The Republican candidate for Governor carried all four. This district elected a Republican House Member.

Here, the Republican fieldman said the losses were due to drought, disparity in "soil bank" payments, Farmers Union activity and general farm dissatisfaction.

Kansas precincts showed their biggest shift in the governor's race. Two of the four precincts swung back of the Democratic candidate for governor. The 4 precincts are in an area that has suffered from drought for 4 years. Mr. Eisenhower held all 4 precincts as he did in 1952. In the House race, all four precincts also remained Republican.

Nevertheless, the fieldman noted an overall trend to Democrats. He said it was due to drought and a lack of organized Republican effort.

Missouri losses were attributed by the fieldman to the drought, to poor organization, and to failure to sell the Republican farm program.

The overall trend in the four precincts was Democratic. Mr. Eisenhower carried 3 of the 4 in 1952, 2 of the 4 in 1956. Democratic candidates for Senate, House, and governor also carried 2 of the 4. The State elected Democrats for Senate and governor, gave its electoral vote to Mr. Stevenson, and this district elected a Democratic Representative.

Minnesota studies were made in an area of good crops. Population is largely of Bohemian or Norwegian descent.

Democrats gained all along the line. Mr. Eisenhower carried all 4 precincts in 1952, lost one in 1956. This same precinct voted for Democrats for Representative and for governor. The district elected a Republican Representative.

The Republican fieldman reported opposition by the Farmers Union and a lack of good Republican organization.

In Ohio, the principal shifts showed up in the races for Senator and governor. Crops were good. The county in which the studies were made has many part-time farmers who work in industrial plants. Mr. Eisenhower and the Republican candidate for Representative—who also was reelected—held all 4 precincts, as they had in 1952. Their margins were a little lower.

In 1952, the Democratic candidate for the United States Senate lost all 4 of these precincts. But, in 1956, FRANK J. LAUSCHE, a Democrat, carried 3 of the 4 in his successful race for the Senate.

STRAIGHT-TICKET VOTERS

In the main, experts of the national committee reported that most of the farmers voted straight tickets. Unlike other voters who, in many cases, voted for Mr. Eisenhower for President and for Democrats for other offices, the report said, farmers showed few signs of such switches.

Notable exceptions were in the senatorial race in Ohio, in the governorship races in Kansas and Iowa. In these races, Eisenhower

voters leaped across the line to vote for Democrats—Mr. Lausche, George Docking, and Herschel C. Loveless. Mr. Docking and Mr. Loveless became the first Democrats to move into the governors' mansions of their States since New Deal days.

Of the States west of the Mississippi, Mr. Eisenhower ran a little better in 1956 than in 1952 in 7 States: Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and Louisiana. His gains ranged up to 9.7 percentage points. He lost ground, however, in 15 States west of the Mississippi. These losses ranged up to 12.9 percentage points in South Dakota.

THE FINDINGS

In checking over the studies, White House officials are finding these things:

Republican candidates have been losing ground steadily in the farming regions since 1952. The trend is reflected both in congressional losses and in smaller pluralities for Mr. Eisenhower.

The losses were heavier in areas affected by drought, but they were not confined to these areas. They reached into every farm area and affected almost every contest.

This is a point that is going to stand at the forefront of all decisions affecting farm politics in the months ahead. The Republican National Committee is acutely aware of the situation. Republican Congressmen from the farm States are emphasizing the point to the President. All of them are troubled about what will happen in 1958 if the trend is not checked.

---

A REPUBLICAN SPOT CHECK ON THE 1956 FARM VOTE

In each of the counties listed below, the Republican National Committee selected four typical farm precincts for a comparison of the 1952 and 1956 votes. The results:

WISCONSIN: IN DUNN COUNTY, DAIRY AND CORN AREA

*For President*

| | Republican | Democrat |
|---|---|---|
| 1952 | 1,070 | 546 |
| 1956 | 830 | 710 |

Republican loss: 240 votes.
Democratic gain: 164 votes.

*For Representative*

| | Republican | Democrat |
|---|---|---|
| 1952 | 1,033 | 502 |
| 1956 | 666 | 832 |

Republican loss: 367 votes.
Democratic gain: 330 votes.

COLORADO: IN SAGUACHE COUNTY, POTATO AND CATTLE AREA

*For President*

| | Republican | Democrat |
|---|---|---|
| 1952 | 826 | 506 |
| 1956 | 710 | 608 |

Republican loss: 116 votes.
Democratic gain: 102 votes.

*For Representative*

| | Republican | Democrat |
|---|---|---|
| 1952 | 829 | 517 |
| 1956 | 604 | 741 |

Republican loss: 225 votes.
Democratic gain: 224 votes.

NORTH DAKOTA: IN BOWMAN COUNTY, GRAIN AND CATTLE AREA

*For President*

| | Republican | Democrat |
|---|---|---|
| 1952 | 490 | 166 |
| 1956 | 293 | 256 |

Republican loss: 197 votes.
Democratic gain: 90 votes.

*For Representative*

| | Republican | Democrat |
|---|---|---|
| 1952 | 423 | 157 |
| 1956 | 252 | 218 |

Republican loss: 171 votes.
Democratic gain: 61 votes.

IOWA: IN PLYMOUTH COUNTY, CATTLE AND HOG AREA

*For President*

| | Republican | Democrat |
|---|---|---|
| 1952 | 1,463 | 657 |
| 1956 | 1,190 | 780 |

Republican loss: 273 votes.
Democratic gain: 123 votes.

*For Governor* [1]

| | Republican | Democrat |
|---|---|---|
| 1952 | 1,119 | 934 |
| 1956 | 825 | 1,037 |

Republican loss: 294 votes.
Democratic gain: 103 votes.

[1] No contest for Representative in 1 year.

Source: Republican National Committee.

SOUTH DAKOTA: IN LYMAN COUNTY, WHEAT AND CATTLE AREA

*For President*

| | Republican | Democrat |
|---|---|---|
| 1952 | 117 | 30 |
| 1956 | 64 | 57 |

Republican loss: 53 votes.
Democratic gain: 27 votes.

*For Representative*

| | Republican | Democrat |
|---|---|---|
| 1952 | 115 | 25 |
| 1956 | 75 | 47 |

Republican loss: 40 votes.
Democratic gain: 22 votes.

KANSAS: IN CHASE COUNTY, HAY AND CATTLE AREA

*For President*

| | Republican | Democrat |
|---|---|---|
| 1952 | 520 | 128 |
| 1956 | 437 | 139 |

Republican loss: 83 votes.
Democratic gain: 11 votes.

*For Representative*

| | Republican | Democrat |
|---|---|---|
| 1952 | 432 | 197 |
| 1956 | 405 | 173 |

Republican loss: 27 votes.
Democratic gain: 24 votes.

MISSOURI: IN HOLT COUNTY, CORN, HOG, AND CATTLE AREA

*For President*

| | Republican | Democrat |
|---|---|---|
| 1952 | 1,237 | 731 |
| 1956 | 1,006 | 806 |

Republican loss: 231 votes.
Democratic gain: 75 votes.

*For Representative*

| | Republican | Democrat |
|---|---|---|
| 1952 | 1,185 | 662 |
| 1956 | 957 | 835 |

Republican loss: 228 votes.
Democratic gain: 173 votes.

MINNESOTA: IN RICE COUNTY, HOG, CORN, AND DAIRY AREA

*For President*

| | Republican | Democrat |
|---|---|---|
| 1952 | 809 | 391 |
| 1956 | 596 | 502 |

Republican loss: 213 votes.
Democratic gain: 111 votes.

*For Representative*

| | Republican | Democrat |
|---|---|---|
| 1952 | 914 | 289 |
| 1956 | 674 | 498 |

Republican loss: 240 votes.
Democratic gain: 209 votes.

OHIO: IN LICKING COUNTY, CORN, HOG, CATTLE AND DAIRY AREA

*For President*

| | Republican | Democrat |
|---|---|---|
| 1952 | 798 | 363 |
| 1956 | 761 | 384 |

Republican loss: 37 votes.
Democratic gain: 21 votes.

*For Representative*

| | Republican | Democrat |
|---|---|---|
| 1952 | 831 | 289 |
| 1956 | 723 | 383 |

Republican loss: 108 votes.
Democratic gain: 94 votes.

---

## PROPOSED SANCTIONS AGAINST ISRAEL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to speak relative to what occurred in this Chamber when, led by the minority leader, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], there was a great protest against our Government's backing sanctions against Israel. There now have been second thoughts on sanctions, constructive thoughts, dealing with the danger to national survival which confronts Israel and has confronted her since hostilities began on October 29, 1956. The key appears to be United Nations actions in reference to its ability to maintain the peace, and United States willingness to implement them, both inside and outside the United Nations.

A hopeful proposal is pending relating to the Gulf of Aqaba and the security of transit through the international waters, one of the two great issues raised in the debate on sanctions against Israel. We have a right to hope that there will be a solution along the lines proposed with respect to the Gulf of Aqaba. We also have a right to hope that our Government will not be swayed by threats from present efforts to get a solution, but will look at the alternatives of breaches of the peace, chaos, and more Communist interference in the tinderbox that is the Middle East.

We also have hope that our Government, along the lines of the moral principles to be applied with respect to the Gulf of Aqaba, may also present a suggested solution to the problem involving the Gaza strip.

I think the debate on Monday last at least made an important contribution toward putting our feet, at long last, on the constructive road to the establishment of international peace in this very troubled area.

---

## A BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials from newspapers in South Carolina. The first, which is entitled "Senator BRIDGES Offers a Solution," was published in the Charleston Evening Post on February 4, 1957. The second, which is entitled "Legion Head Challenge To Speak Up Fearlessly Against Increasing Government Control," was published in the Edgefield Advertiser on February 6, 1957.

I wish also to comment briefly on the proposal made by the Senator from New

Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for a constitutional amendment to require the President and the Congress to balance the budget each year. That is the subject of the editorial in the Charleston Evening Post. I want to make it clear that the editorial approves the idea of a balanced budget.

In my opinion, millions of Americans all over the country also approve—and not only approve, but greatly desire and seek—a balanced budget as a required method of operating the Federal Government. I know that the proposed budget this year is said to be within the revenue anticipated, but there have been too many years in which spending far exceeded revenues.

The public debt totals $275,906,294,121.74. Even if we maintain a balanced budget, we should also make greater efforts to reduce the public debt at a faster rate.

At the present rate, it will take generations to pay off the debt, even if no additional indebtedness is incurred, and none can foretell what emergencies may arise.

The Federal Government would do well to follow the example of some of the States with reference to the handling of revenues and appropriations. I shall not attempt to go into the details at this time, but the facts show that the States are in much better financial condition than the Federal Government.

However, I call to the attention of the Senate the provisions for a balanced budget in my own State of South Carolina.

Article 10, section 2 of the State constitution provides that—

> The General Assembly shall provide for an annual tax sufficient to defray the estimated expenses of the State for each year, and whenever it shall happen that the ordinary expenses of the State for any year shall exceed the income of the State for such year the General Assembly shall provide for levying a tax for the ensuing year sufficient, with other sources of income, to pay the deficiency of the preceding year together with the estimated expenses for the ensuing year.

That means, first, that the General Assembly is obligated to secure estimates from the financial officers of the State to insure that appropriations for any year do not exceed anticipated revenue. Second, it means, that if an error is made in estimating revenue for one year, it is the obligation of the General Assembly to provide for the deficiency to be paid off during the succeeding year.

As Governor of South Carolina from 1947 to 1951, I required the financial officers of the State to give me a statement when the single-package appropriations bill was sent to me for my signature, certifying that the bill was in balance.

I recommend this procedure as highly satisfactory. It keeps the State of South Carolina in excellent financial condition It would do the same for the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (S. C.) Evening Post of February 4, 1957]

SENATOR BRIDGES OFFERS A SOLUTION

We approve the purpose of Senator BRIDGES' proposed constitutional amendment, even though we doubt the likelihood of its passage or even its effectiveness.

His proposal is that the President be required to submit a balanced budget each year.

It provides also that Congress may not throw it out of balance; that it may not increase spending without a corresponding boost in taxes.

Senator BRIDGES told his colleagues he had "never sponsored a resolution which I thought had more potential as far as the future welfare of this Nation is concerned."

The provisions could be suspended in war or other grave national emergency by a three-fourths vote of Congress.

We're afraid it wouldn't be difficult for the spenders to drum up an emergency. We have experts in that art.

A similar proposal at the preceding Congress made no headway, and that is likely to be the fate of Senator BRIDGES' resolution.

Yet no budget that won't be balanced by revenue should be proposed or adopted; and taxes adequate to finance all Government expenses should be imposed. Deficit financing should be rejected as inflationary and unsound.

But it is not simply a problem of balanced budgets. The basic problem is that of keeping budgets within bounds. Bloated budgets, such as those of recent years, are bad for the country even when balanced. They siphon off too much of the Nation's substance. They necessitate taxes that have inflationary effects by leading to wage demands and higher prices of goods and services. No constitutional amendment can cope with that situation. Only an aroused public opinion, implemented at the polls, will ever turn the trick.

---

[From the Edgefield (S. C.) Advertiser of February 6, 1957]

LEGION HEAD CHALLENGE TO SPEAK UP FEARLESSLY AGAINST INCREASING GOVERNMENT CONTROL

National American Legion Comdr. Dan Daniel has written one of the most impressive summaries of the Americanism versus communism issue we have yet read. It appears in the American Legion Magazine and its title is "Why Trade Our American Birthright for a Mess?"

"Our own system of government and economics is not much older than the Communist Manifesto. Our Constitution, granting man the right to be his own master and the master of the politicians who run the Government, is less than two centuries old. * * *

"What has happened to the downtrodden people who have been forced to live under communism? * * * terror * * * the firing squad * * * to compel acquiescence * * * mass arrests and deportations * * * execution without trial * * * fear and desperation. * * * The socialist system provides no curbs upon the absolute power of the socialist bureaucracy. * * *

"England's socialism," says Daniel, "is not the violent kind but it too meant spreading poverty."

In conclusion he writes:

"We stand in the shadow of those who pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to bring forth on this continent a new nation dedicated to the proposition that citizens shall control and dictate to the Government, not a government dictating to the citizens. We would be less than honorable if we failed to speak up fearlessly against the continued and increasing Government control of our rights.

"We would be traitors indeed if we now deserted the tenets of the Founding Fathers which have brought us so successfully into our great American heritage."

The accent which was placed on "letting the Government do it," back in the thirties, created exactly what the best citizens, in Edgefield, in Greenwood, in Saluda, and throughout South Carolina and the whole United States, said it would create.

The words of warning of very wise folk are noted with a surprising degree of similarity to the conditions which prevail a generation later.

They warned of mounting Government debt.

At the present time 83 percent of the entire income-tax load in America is borne by people with yearly incomes below $6,000.

As for repayment of Government debt, at the present rate of retirement it could not be paid off in 50 years.

Then there was the sage counsel against government paternalism itself which would encourage dependence.

The results are seen in the crime rate, the feverish buildup of organizational and union power for a sort of security, and the ever-growing demands upon government for more and more bureaucratic services.

This week came a strange sound from Washington, a cry almost as with uplifted hands, to the effect that the people will have to stop demanding more services if the Federal budget is ever to be cut and if government is to be a limited government.

Finally, one of the most far-seeing admonitions back in the thirties was that when government spends lavishly and accumulates new powers it attracts to it and to public life ambitious individuals who have a lust for such powers, and the tendency will be toward the elevation of sharpsters, political grafters, power-hungry racketeers who know and care little about constitutional government, patriotic citizenship, and love of country.

The exact pattern of change which was clearly counseled against by those in every community who were the wise and the good and the patriotic and the unselfish and the industrious and those devotees to the constructive upbuilding of free institutions has surely and gradually come about.

Still there is widespread complacency, and still running with full tide is the habit of going along for all one can get out of it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from South Carolina on his remarks, and comment that the junior Senator from Arizona should like to join in full support of the Bridges-Byrd amendment.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if he realizes two facts. Does the Senator know that the United States today has a greater national debt than the combined debts of all of the other countries in the world?

Mr. THURMOND. That is my understanding. Our debt is larger than that of all of the other nations of the world put together.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator realize also that every baby born today has a $1,675 first mortgage hanging around his neck?

Mr. THURMOND. I have not calculated the exact amount, but I should say it is at least that much.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to have the floor in my own

right after the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] addresses the Senate; if the Senator from South Carolina will yield to me for a moment on this particular subject, I desire to thank him for his statement and to say I know how the very courageous Senator from South Carolina stands on this matter, and we all appreciate it.

I wish to say very sincerely that, after my service of 21 years in the Senate, it seems to me, as it seems to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who has cosponsored this proposal, and who has been in the Senate longer than I have, the only practical way we shall be able to obtain any assurance of a balanced budget over a period of time is by a constitutional method such as is proposed.

While there may be flaws in the proposal to have a constitutional amendment such as we suggest, it is the most practical approach and I think it is at least a partial answer to the long-range problem. I feel that if the Congress will pass the joint resolution, it can be ratified by the States in the course of the next 2 or 3 years, because there is a growing feeling in favor of such a move.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have the names of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] added to the list of cosponsors of the joint resolution.

In case the names of the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is not on it, I also ask unanimous consent that his name be added to it, as well as the name of my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## PROTESTS AGAINST PROPOSED VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES BY MARSHAL TITO

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have received and continue to receive a large volume of mail from residents of New Hampshire, as well as from citizens throughout the Nation, protesting the proposed visit to this country of Marshal Tito.

The latest communication which I have received on this subject comes from one of New England's outstanding newspapers, the Manchester Union Leader, which is published in Manchester, N. H. This newspaper has taken a courageous and straightforward position in opposition to a visit by Tito on the grounds that such an occurrence would be an insult to the moral principles and intelligence of all thinking Americans.

Recently the Manchester Union Leader conducted a poll among its readers, whereby opportunity was given for individuals to register their written objection to this proposal. As a result of the poll, I have just had delivered to me something over 2,000 signed protests, representing a substantial cross section of New Hampshire's reading public.

Mr. President, one of the hallmarks of the freedoms which we enjoy in this country is the privilege of each American to be well read and accurately informed. By the same token, it is the responsibility of news media to see that the American public is not only well informed, but that each individual has opportunity to express his or her views on issues of grave international importance. The Manchester Union Leader meets this test, and this most recent poll is indicative of the constructive public service to which it is dedicated.

I think my views with regard to any proposed visit by Tito are well known and it is hardly necessary for me to repeat them at length. I may say, however, that I am not convinced of the necessity for inviting the dictator of Yugoslavia to be our official guest in Washington.

I should like to make it clear that I do not rule out the value of discussing common problems with persons with whom I do not agree. In many cases, it is conceivable that a basis for agreement can be reached, and I certainly am prepared to listen to any reasonable suggestion which might contribute to the cause of peace and the avoidance of American bloodshed.

In Tito's case, however, it does not appear to me that a useful purpose would be served by any high-level talks he might have with President Eisenhower in the event he should visit this country. We have had experience enough with Tito's thinking and policies. He has a long and bloody record of broken promises and duplicity. It is a record which demonstrates lack of good faith and lack of principle. I have no evidence that he has changed for the better, and I have serious doubt that it would be possible to arrive at an understanding with Tito, which would be worth more than the paper upon which it was written.

Tito has consistently played both ends against the middle. First, he gravitates toward us and the rest of the free world, and then back towards the Communists, whichever suits best his needs and ambitions of the moment. Insofar as I can determine, therefore, the only value which might accrue from such a visit, would accrue to Tito and not to us. Bearing in mind that any head of a foreign state must be accorded full diplomatic honors when he visits this country, it seems to me that the only purpose which Tito's visit would serve would be to enhance his personal prestige and give impetus to his personal lust for power. I believe further that such a visit might do irreparable harm. I wonder, for exemple, what detrimental effect there would be on the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain who look to us as the leader among free nations. It might well appear to them that murder, banditry, and double dealing bring richer rewards than the exhausting struggle for freedom in which so many millions of human beings are engaged.

I have opposed the extension of economic and military aid to Yugoslavia, and I shall continue to express my opposition to the proposition of buying Tito's good will. I would be less than honest with my convictions if I did not oppose his visit to this country.

Mr. President, I commend the Manchester Union Leader for the public service it has performed in communicating to me the opinion of so many of its readers, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial which prompted this response be inserted in the body of the RECORD immediately after the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOTE AGAINST TITO VISIT

As our readers are aware, a plan is being formulated in Washington to desecrate American soil by inviting the depraved Communist dictator of Yugoslavia, Marshal Tito, to visit our shores. All thinking citizens will rebel against this insult to their moral principles and to their intelligence.

Several prominent American patriots, among whom are Senator Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire; Senator William F. Knowland, of California; United States Representative John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts; "Dan" Daniel, national commander of the American Legion; and Cooper T. Holt, commander in chief of the VFW, are vigorously protesting this deliberate insult to the American people. Unfortunately, their voices are few, and they need your support.

Your name and address signed below and mailed to the Union Leader office in Manchester will signify your opposition to this planned crime against humanity. Your vote against Tito will be forwarded to Senator BRIDGES for appropriate action.

I herewith protest Tito's visit to the United States, as agreed to by Secretary of State Dulles with President Eisenhower's obvious approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

## NEED TO RESUSCITATE THE GOLD MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last month we celebrated the anniversary of the discovery of gold in California, an event which altered the course of history on this continent.

At a location on the American River some 30 miles east of what now is Sacramento, the capital of my State, James Marshall was engaged on January 24, 1848, in the construction of a sawmill for the fabulous John Sutter when the glint of gold in the millrace excited his attention and very soon the attention of all the world. Within 2 years, 100,000 people had gone by wagon, by ship, on horseback, and on foot in search of fortune in the Golden West. They went from the eastern seaboard and the Mississippi Valley, and from other lands all around the globe. California, a part of the territory which now constitutes the southwestern portion of our Nation and which had been possessed by the United States as a result of our war with Mexico, became a full-fledged component of this Union almost literally overnight. By reason of the spectacular population increment incident to the gold rush, we were catapulted into statehood, under an act of Congress approved on September 9, 1850, without going through the usual probationary period as a Territory.

I hope I may be pardoned if I recall in passing that many of the communities of the gold rush—such as San Fran-

cisco, Marysville, Sacramento, Hangtown, Auburn—were depicted lithographically by my great uncle, Christian Kuchel, who with his brother, my grandfather, were early residents of San Francisco after coming to the United States from their native Germany in search of American freedom and opportunity.

During the three decades following Marshall's discovery, gold was produced in hundreds of millions of dollars annually, and the economy of California was a mining economy. Gold mining continued as an important industry until the year 1942. Its demise can be pinpointed at October 8 of that year, the date the War Production Board issued Order L–208, suspending nonessential mining operations.

Meantime, by a Presidential order promulgated under the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, the price of newly mined gold had been fixed at $35 a fine ounce. This was an increase of 69 percent in the value of gold which had been maintained throughout the previous 100 years.

During the past 23 years, despite multiple increases in the price of every other commodity and every service in the American economy, the $35 price for gold has been inflexibly enforced, creating a condition under which it has been impossible to reopen the gold mines of my State and of our Nation. Such production of gold as there is today is only a byproduct of the production of copper, lead, zinc, and other metals.

The manifest purpose of Order L–208 was to divert manpower from the mining of gold to the mining of metals critically needed for conducting our war against the Axis Powers. Its accomplishments in this regard were negligible. Gold miners, deprived of their usual means of livelihood, did not leave their homes for jobs several hundred miles away.

I think I can say that that is particularly true in the Mother Lode area of California, the State which I have the honor, in part, to represent. The gold miners, deprived of their usual means of livelihood, dispossessed of their historic line of work, found employment in nearby sawmills, or in the shipyards and other installations where high weekly earnings were available. The gold-mining industry, nevertheless, was effectively throttled.

It did not recover when the wartime restrictions on manpower and materials were lifted, because it could sell its product only at the price fixed during the depression. At 1957 costs, the mines obviously cannot operate at a profit, and are closed down, with very few exceptions.

The effect of this has been pronounced upon the economy of communities whose dependence on gold mining was great. In some cases it has been quite devastating. Lumbering, recreation, and other activities suited to the terrain where gold usually is found have provided substitute sources of income for a number, but by and large the towns of California along our famous Mother Lode have not shared in the growth and prosperity which has been the happy lot of most American communities in recent years. I believe this is true also of mining towns in Arizona, Montana, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, Colorado, and other Western States where gold is one of the natural resources.

This local economic impact in itself is unfortunate. It is a problem in which our Government may most properly interest itself. Resumption of gold mining would create many thousands of jobs both in the mines and indirectly throughout the land. Beyond that, I am convinced the time has come for Congress to examine most completely the effect upon our economic structure which may have been occasioned by stopping, or nearly stopping, the production of new gold.

As to the former, I am delighted that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has introduced two bills with this, as well as the immediate ills of the gold-mining industry, clearly in view. I allude, of course, to Senate bill 325, "to permit the free marketing of newly mined gold," and to Senate Joint Resolution 16, "to establish a joint committee to investigate the gold-mining industry."

It seems reasonable that many American gold mines would resume operations if the free marketing of newly mined gold were permitted again. I should like to express the hope that Senate bill 325 will receive hearings very soon, and I very much hope, also, prompt consideration thereafter by the Senate. It is proposed legislation which appeals to me on the basis of its practicability. Industry, the professions, and the arts have some need of a supply of gold. Their domestic source now is the United States Treasury. The metal is sold at the established monetary value, $35 an ounce, whereas the world price ranged last year from $38.50 at Brussells to $52.40 at Bombay. What our own frozen price structure actually amounts to is a subsidy for industrial users at the expense of the producers of gold; albeit most of the present production, as I have pointed out, is a byproduct of copper and other mines. The annual consumption of gold by industry—$100 million—represents more than double the annual gold production of the United States.

Early action upon Senate Joint Resolution 16, introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], likewise is highly desirable, for the measures complement one another. Certainly they constitute a sincere effort to deal with a problem which has been neglected altogether too long.

It would appear that in due time the proposed National Monetary and Financial Commission provided for in Senate bill 599, introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and other Members of this body, would desire to include in its studies a consideration of our monetary gold situation, both as to the stocks owned by the United States and the production and supply of the metal.

I might observe parenthetically that in my conversations with the senior Senator from Indiana, he told me that, in his judgment, the verbiage embodied in his resolution was sufficiently liberal in scope to include such an investigation.

The gold holdings of our Government are somewhat less than $22 billion, with approximately $12,500 million in the Fort Knox vaults and the rest in the Philadelphia, San Francisco, and Denver mints and the New York Assay Office. It is common knowledge that short-term banking liabilities of the Federal Government to foreigners amount to nearly $14 billion, payable in United States gold on demand. Foreign holders of dollars have an additional claim on our gold reserve of approximately $8 billion if they choose to convert their dollars. I, for one, should like to be advised without too much delay as to what the consequences to our economy would be if these obligations had to be liquidated. The bill of the Senator from Indiana, therefore, has more than an ordinary interest for the gold-mining industry of my State.

I am frank to say that I have a primary interest in seeing justice done to a segment of the economy of California which was an innocent casualty of the Second World War. In retrospect, we know that the War Production Board order of October 8, 1942, was a mistake. But ought the injustice to be continued and compounded by denying to the producers of gold the opportunity to sell their metal to industrial users? Is it right to deny them the right to trade in the world market? Is the price for monetary gold established in 1934 realistic today? Is it logical or necessary to continue the United States Treasury as the sole domestic merchant of industrial gold?

These are questions which I hope and believe the Congress of the United States will endeavor to answer fully at its present session. I am prepared to assist in every way I can.

## STUDY OF MATTERS RELATING TO THE ELECTION, SUCCESSION, AND DUTIES OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2), to create a joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President.

## AWARD OF SILVER QUILL TO SENATOR BYRD

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD excerpts from the proceedings of the state of the Nation dinner of National Business Publications, Inc., at Hotel Statler, in Washington, D. C., on January 26, at which Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON presented the 1956 Silver Quill award of NBP—the highest tribute of the business press—to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for distinguished services to business

and industry, through untiring devotion to sound fiscal policies for the government and for unswerving support of tax measures that have helped make possible the best of free enterprise benefits for the American people

This annual Washington dinner features a question-and-answer period in which captains of industry, Cabinet officers, and other Government leaders gage the state of the Nation by discussing the prospects in their respective areas of the economy.

The award conferred on the senior Senator from Virginia is a very high one, and all of us are proud of this tribute to our colleague.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY MASTER OF CEREMONIES N. M'K. KNEISLY, PRESIDENT, THE IRVING-CLOUD PUBLISHING CO., AND CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC.

Permit me, please, just a few words about NBP and its purpose.

National Business Publications is an association of publishers of 203 technical, professional, industrial, scientific, merchandising, and marketing magazines.

Business Publications perform a unique service to the economy. They facilitate the exchange of business education and industrial know-how. They stimulate our enterprise. They power the progress of our technology.

Business magazines are designed to serve the needs of the specialist who must keep abreast of newest developments in his highly specialized field.

The history of business publishing parallels the growth of business and industry in America.

The result is that there are today fields of vital activity never dreamed of only a few years ago that are served by technical periodicals specializing in electronics, antibiotics, supersonics, atomics, and the like, keeping technically trained men and women in touch with quick-changing know-how in such areas as virus vaccines, merchandising and marketing, automation and nuclear propulsion.

Among NBP's principles of practice, which are found on the back cover of your program, there is one that pledges active allegiance to the American system of free competition. And therein lies our real reason for being here tonight.

Sound business decisions are essential to the continued prosperity of our enlightened economy.

Business magazines are dedicated to the enduring service of providing the knowledge that is necessary for those sound decisions.

That is why we seek each year to present our silver-quill award to that person who has best demonstrated those things for which we stand and in which we serve.

The silver quill of NBP, like the organization that awards it, is synonymous with consecrated service to business and industry and to the Government that guarantees our freedom of enterprise.

As in past years, it is our hope that this state of the Nation dinner may serve as a fair-weather forecast of things to come. These leaders from Government and industry have graciously consented to briefly answer one specific question that is related to our future welfare. All have agreed to operate under a tight 3-minute rule.

Now, then, Mr. Speaker, will you please come to this lectern and set the stage and the clock for us by answering the first question?

STATE OF THE NATION; QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

*Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture*

Question: Mr. Secretary Benson, as always, we are indeed happy to have you at our Silver Quill head table and we will appreciate your authoritative views on the general outlook for agriculture.

Answer: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, Senator Byrd, members and friends of NBP. Our objective is a prosperous, expanding and free agriculture. We are moving toward that objective. The farm outlook for 1957 is for an improvement over 1956, and 1956 showed an improvement over 1955. We are not out of the woods, but agricutlure is sound and we are embarked upon programs which promise to help keep it so, and improve the opportunity for farmers to further increase their income in the months ahead.

During the months ahead we will come closer to what will make for real prosperity in agriculture, and that is a balance between production and use of farm products, instead of the endless creation of new price-depressing surpluses for Government storage. Achievement of balance is being brought about, first, by intensified liquidation of surpluses—largely through increased exports and expansion of use at home—and, second, by better management of our productive capacity—through the operation of the soil bank.

That we were on the road from the postwar lows in agriculture became visible in 1956. Net income of farm operators moved upward last year by 5 percent. The only other such rise since the peak of 1947 came in 1951—another war year. We are looking forward to still further progress in this peacetime year, 1957. We estimate that there will be another increase of 5 percent in farmers' net income this year.

Along with an expanded surplus disposal program, with diversion of some of our productive land into the soil bank, there will be a continuance of supports along the sounder lines provided by the Farm Act of 1954 as modified last year. The flexibility of this program gives farmers the freedom to adjust their operations to the changing needs of an expanding, dynamic economy.

In brief, then, here's the outlook for agriculture—farm income is rising, surpluses are declining, the storage problem has passed its peak, domestic consumption is increasing, markets are expanding at home and abroad. We are moving forward in the direction of great freedom for the American farmer. Yes, we are headed in the right direction. The outlook is encouraging.

*Alfred E. Perlman, President, New York Central System*

Question: In your opinion, what does the transportation industry need to keep healthy now and to do its share in the event of national emergency?

Answer: The rapid growth of our population, our expanding national economy, and tremendous developments on scientific frontiers, offer an exciting future for the transportation industry.

To meet this challenge, the New York Central has projected a 5-year budget on half a billion dollars for improved plant and equipment. But, while we are converting our plant to radar controlled push-button freight yards—electronic, centralized traffic control—and working with atomically activated locomotive parts—our governmental transportation policies still date back to the 1890's. These outmoded policies were conceived in the days when railroads had a virtual monopoly upon inland transportation, and railroads are, therefore, being regulated as if this monopoly still existed.

The policies used for the newer forms of transportation are based on concepts of fledgling industries—even though they have long since come of age. To illustrate, gasoline taxes put on highway carriers are used to build highways for the benefit of the users. But what happens to the tax on railroad transportation which all of us pay? It goes—not to help the railroads—but into general funds to build waterways for barges, highways for trucks, and airports for airplanes—literally subsidizing our competitors while strangling the railroads.

And the wartime excise tax is still kept on some forms of transporation. It's been taken off since then in the movies. But it only applies to the common carrier, which is the poor man's mode of carriage. It, therefore, drives business away from the common carrier to the tremendous fleets of completely unregulated trucks and barges—which are not required to pay these taxes.

Thus, the railroads are earning less than 4 percent but must pay 5 percent for the money we are borrowing to finance our plant requirements. How long can such regulation be tolerated by fairminded Americans?

Each form of transportation, whether by air, highway, water, or rail, has certain obvious inherent advantages. The President's Cabinet Committee last year asked Congress for legislation which would permit each to exercise its proper economic functions. If—and only if—this is done, can privately financed common carriage take from the shoulders of the Government the burden of financing transportation facilities with public funds—the bills for which rise each year.

The greatest need, therefore, in keeping our transportation industry—and thus the whole economy—vital and healthy, is a reappraisal by Congress of the archaic national transportation policies. Then the taxpaying common carriers of this country, whether by air, highway, water, or rail, may expand and improve in keeping with the dynamic changes in America's scientific and economic frontiers.

*Elisha Gray II, president, Whirlpool-Seeger Corp.*

Question: Mr. Gray. On one hand, we hear stimulating predictions for 1957 for the appliance industry, due to widespread demand for the new styling and improved efficiency that are being engineered by progressive manufacturers. But, on the other hand, we hear disturbing comments about the industry's inability to show a profit. From your strategic position, can you clarify the situation for us?

Answer: "Stimulating" is a very good adjective to use in describing 1957's outlook for the appliance business, but it is even more appropriate in describing the next decade for this industry.

For an immediate 12-month forecast we believe there will be only a modest increase, probably of 3 to 5 percent, in appliance sales spread about evenly over each half of the year.

I say "only" because this estimate is well below the average annual growth for this industry since the war and it represents only one-half the rate of increase which some of us calculate for each of the next 10 years. As such, 1957 will represent only a pause for breath on the part of the consumers purchasing appliances.

The appliance industry has now become a mature and an important segment of the economy. It ranks third behind home building and automobiles in annual sales of consumer durable goods. Its forward pace which appears to be at a rate of about two times the rate of growth of our total economy is built upon four prime factors:

1. The population growth. Our customers for the next 20 years are already born and have been counted. Today's school classroom shortage is a dramatic measure of the onrushing numbers of tomorrow's customers.

2. The redistribution of wealth has quietly revolutionized the market. In 1940 the av-

erage family in the United States earned only $2,000—hardly a prospect for major appliances. Today, families earn an average of $6,500 and even that figure is rising steadily. That makes almost everyone a customer as far as ability to pay is concerned.

3. The appliance industry has invested huge sums on an ever-increasing scale to engineer and design more attractive products that do much more for the housewife and at a price that excites her appetite to buy. The rate at which new appliances will reach the market will increase greatly each year.

The fourth significant factor is the need and desires for modern appliances. More women than ever are working outside the home. It is astonishing to note from census figures that more women than men have joined the national labor force in the last 5 years. This trend goes hand in hand with strong appliance sales. Modern household appliances—by easing the housewife's burdens—have either permitted her to seek outside employment or have forced her out of the house from sheer boredom with her new-found leisure. I don't know which.

Principally for these reasons, appliance predictions show a strong upward surge for years to come. The line zigzags upward, of course. We predict 1957 will zag slightly and show a sales increase of 3 to 5 percent, which is less than average growth for this industry.

Now, profits? That's a much harder question. However, with the events in our industry of the last few years behind us, I think it is safe to predict that we are now on the threshold of a more stable era—a mature phase, if you please. Heaven knows it's highly competitive and the consumer is getting more than ever for her dollar. But with the enormous volume of business to be done, and the desperate need of capital to finance this growth (capital which can best come from earnings), I think you will see the majority of companies in our industry generating a satisfactory profit next year.

*Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army*

Question: Mr. Secretary Brucker—Is the Army keeping abreast of the tremendous advances being made in the atomic age?

Answer: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, Senator BYRD, members of this great organization, ladies and gentlemen: We have made a lot of progress in 1 year. Last year, the question asked of me, as Secretary of the Army, was this: "Is the Army obsolete?" This year, the question is stepped up: "Is the Army keeping abreast?" We have made great progress in 1 year. Thank you very much.

I wish I were as sure of everything as I am that the research and the development and the production of the new atomic weapons and all of the things that go with this new atomic age were coming along and are coming along and that the Army is representing what you expect in the country—I wish I were as sure of everything as I am of that.

As an indispensable member of a great defense team—Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force—no one of them to be lost sight of and, altogether, a great group and ensemble with a great punch—the Army's part is progressing very satisfactorily, because we have gone all the gamut—the whole way—in electronic, radar, nuclear, atomic, and modern weaponry. Such things as the Honest John, the free-swinging rocket, the Nike guided missile and, now, the Nike B, the improvement upon the old, the Corporal ballistic missile that follows the trajectory of a bullet or an old artillery shell, except at great distances, and then the Redstone, a free-wheeling rocket that goes in medium range so many miles I wouldn't want to mention it. Then, in addition to that, the antitank, antiarmor guided missile, the Dart, the Little John, and soon others.

A great arsenal of weaponry and, along with it, a new concept of the battlefield. We have now streamlined our divisions, world around, to what we call the Pentomic Divisions—that's a contraction of two words, pentana and atomic—and it means that, now, instead of the old-fashioned divisions, we have the five-battalion size instead of the three regimental and they are streamlined so that, with the equipment of atomic power, they can proportion and tailor the strike to exactly the proportion of strength that is desired at the particular moment.

In company with the Atomic Energy Commission, we have been very interested in the developing and the furthering of the progress of reducing the package size of the atomic warhead, until it is down to the place where now it can be fired at great distance or a distance depending upon the target to be hit and Army has that capability and can deliver it night or day, rain or shine, fog, weather nothing to the contrary notwithstanding, any distance within the range of this new battlefield of hundreds of miles wide, hundreds of miles deep and reach into the enemy territory and still not become a target because of dispersion and ability to move quickly, to move about that battlefield, seek out its target and then move to the next, tailoring and proportioning the force to the thing that is to be hit.

In addition to that, we are developing a peaceful atomic capability. Over at Fort Belvoir, right near Washington, we have the first Army Package Atomic Power Reactor Station of its kind in the world and it will be open to the public and dedicated in April and, in addition to that, another peaceful use. We have the use of atomic energy for the irradiation of food and now, as a purveyor of food, the Army is able to preserve it for, not days, weeks, months, but for years and that, likewise, will be of great capacity on the battlefield, with troops and sailors and airmen, the world around.

But, all the while, we have got to be ready for something else. We have got to have the dual punch—the left hand, the first on that side's got to be the conventional weapon, the thing that keeps up for the kind of war that may break out that we want to stamp out before it gets to be a general global war. And the other side, the punch that will put it out with an atomic weapon before it gets started too far.

Yes, the Army has come a long distance in its concept of the new and modern and streamlined, but I want to say just this about the gadgets and the weaponry. With all of the weaponry that we can have—the radar, and it is great; the electronics, and it's wonderful; the nuclear and the atomic weapons, and they are magnificent, there never will be a final weapon. There will always be an antimissile missile. Man's ingenuity will always devise it. There is only one ultimate weapon and that's man himself and that's where the Army and the rest of these forces come in. The men of the forces of the defense team are the ultimate weapon and they ultimately will prevail. And the secret weapon, if I can let you in on something, is the great know-how of business and industry—our secret weapon that can lick the world by giving us the arsenal we need.

*Charles Thomas, Secretary of the Navy*

Question: Mr. Secretary Thomas, you have said that the Navy is in process of shifting from steam to nuclear power; from subsonic to supersonic aircraft; from guns to missiles. In view of the fact that the United States Navy is now the most powerful in the world, to what advantage will these revolutionary innovations be put?

Answer: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, and distinguished guests—I should first like to say that the mission of the Navy today, in this nuclear age, is no different than it was at the inception of the Navy 180 years ago—and that mission is to control the seas, in case of war.

The transition that the Navy is making today gives us the power to carry out that mission. To give you an example of this, the use of atomic power will give our ships a range that we have never dreamed of before. In World War II, a ship could never drive its steam propulsion plant for more than 12 consecutive hours at full speed, full power. Atomic-powered ships can literally run for days, for weeks, for months, at full steam, at full power. The only practical limitation will be the endurance of the crews.

Missiles are very rapidly replacing guns in the Navy today. Our new missiles are reaching out farther and farther, with more deadly accuracy, to destroy our targets and I think that the greatest potential weapon to come up, in our arsenal today, is the medium-range ballistic missile that is a 1,500-mile missile that will be launched from a submarine as a launching platform.

We can take a nuclear-powered submarine and, by placing it in certain strategic ocean areas and firing the missile from there, hit virtually any major target in the world. Jet power is giving our new high-performance carrier-based planes the range and speed that they need in this nuclear age. These high-performance, high-speed planes being launched from carriers that will be hundreds of miles at sea can literally hit and destroy any target that might jeopardize our control of the sea.

The Marines are using and developing the most advanced techniques in amphibious warfare, by using helicopters and what they call vertical envelopment that can go on any beach or over any beach and go over it and on it in depth.

I can assure you, ladies and gentlemen, that your Navy—and it is your Navy—as a part of our great defense team, with its new weapons and with its superb military leadership, is ready, willing, and able to carry out any assignment that either the President or the Congress might give it.

*R. E. Salvati, president, Island Creek Coal Co.*

Question: Mr. Salvati, will you be good enough to give us your views regarding the prospects for the coal industry throughout 1957?

Answer: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Vice President, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure to be here and to say hello to my friends of the coal industry. I would like to say that the American bituminous coal industry may now definitely be classed as a "growth industry." This is something new in the picture. While coal has always been regarded as supplying a basic need—the evergrowing market for energy—it has in the past 15 years seen its competitors increase their share of the energy market while its own share has constantly decreased. The result has been that, except war and post-war season, coal has lost its position, but we in this industry think our losses have run their course. It is my belief, shared by many other coal executives, that from 1954 on the trend is definitely upward and that the growth in demand can become great enough to strain the ability of the coal industry and of the transportation facilities to meet it.

To provide a capacity sufficient to supply this demand and, at the same time, replacing exhausting mines will require billions of dollars of new capital—dollars which will be justified only by reasonable profits return.

Because of mechanization of operations, both underground and above ground, the capital cost of developing new coal mines has risen sharply. The greater quantities of coal consumed by large enterprises have made large output mines more desirable. These two factors combine to make larger corporate organizations necessary and are, therefore, promoting mergers, consolidations,

purchases, and the current trend toward larger scale organizations is both necessary and healthy.

The industry is recognizing the trend toward larger corporate units. In the last 2 years, much has been accomplished in this direction and more will be accomplished in 1957 and the years ahead.

For the year 1957, we can view the coal industry with optimism. Most of the so-called career coal companies see a bright future for the coal industry and are properly planning and working for an increasing share of that future.

The task ahead is not an easy one. No industry can satisfy a growth of demand such as that projected for coal without encountering difficulties and difficult problems. Like any other growth industry, we in coal are faced with the problem of finding the capital with which to finance our business. We of management are naturally striving for increased profits, as a means of providing a large part of the needed capital and we in this industry accept these responsibilities with optimism and confidence.

*Donald Quarles, Secretary of the Air Force*

Question: Mr. Secretary Quarles, is defense so preoccupied with security against general war that it is failing to meet the dangers of little wars?

Answer: Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, I believe we all agree that our primary security objective is to thwart aggressive exploitation of the Communists' military might. This is a free world objective in which our own military services share the responsibility with the military forces of our friends and allies around the world. It is a two-pronged objective requiring, first, strength around the periphery that will block Communist nibbling tactics and, second, strategic reserve power, primarily air-atomic power, that is ready to retaliate with devastating effect on any overt Communist attack.

We achieve our first objective by maintaining such strength around the periphery as to block Communist tactics of infiltration and subversion, thus forcing any Communist aggressive moves out into the open where they can be recognized as such by the whole world. We achieve our second objective by maintaining such a powerful air-atomic striking force as to convince the Communists that they could not profit by a massive all-out attack.

Because we feel that the potential danger of massive Communist aggression far exceeds all other threats to the security of our country, one might say that our defense is preoccupied with security against general war. We all recognize, however, that there are many different situations that might develop and many different kinds of military force that might be required.

I do not believe that, in making defense against all-out war our prime objective, we are failing to meet the dangers of little wars. First, we should make it clear that there could be many different kinds of little wars, most of which should not involve participation by our military forces, except perhaps as components of a United Nations police force. If we are talking about a little war in which our vital interests are violated and in which we are therefore forced to participate, it is my point of view that we should do so with whatever it takes to make our participation effective, including the use of such of our quality weapons as may be required.

Moreover, I believe that the general knowledge that we are determined to be effective, if we do have to participate, is the best guaranty against such things happening in the first place. Finally, I believe that sufficiency to meet the massive threat tends to be more than sufficient to meet any lesser danger.

I hope I may have left you with the impression that the Air Force is ready to take on any of these tasks.

*Walter Williams, Under Secretary of Commerce*

Question: Mr. Secretary Williams, we understand that you have just returned from openings of the international trade fairs at Bogota and Bangkok, the latter marking the second anniversary of official participation in trade fairs throughout the world. From your observations, do you feel that our trade-fair program is effective?

Answer: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, other upper-deckers, lower-deckers, and paying members of the Grass Root Society, the answer to—I think these should be the ones to applaud; they didn't pay, you did—the answer to your question, Mr. Chairman, is a ringing, well-qualified "Yes."

I hardly need to say to this group of scintillating intellects gathered in this room that we are engaged, at the present time, in a gigantic struggle between the free world and the unfree world. If I were to paraphrase Dale Carnegie, I would say that the objective of America is to win friends and keep them won and to influence people and keep them influenced, in the way we want them to be influenced, by telling them the truth about the free world and America.

That is what we are doing in connection with our international trade fair program. Up until mid-1954, Russia and her communistic satellites had everything her own way in participating in these trade fairs. Then, President Eisenhower, recognizing the potential effectiveness of this instrument in waging the cold war, made available some funds so that we participated for the first time, in December 1954, in Bangkok, Thailand.

Since that time, Congress and the executive branch have joined to make funds available for a continuance of this program. Actually, this year's budget calls for about $3½ million. That may seem like a lot of money and it is, in one sense, but, when you contrast it with the fact that Russia and her satellites are expending an estimated $50 million per year and appearing in twice as many fairs as are we, you get a little idea of the competition that we are confronted with.

There have been 45 fairs in which America has participated in these last 2 years. This year, this summer, for the first time, we are waging an offensive attack, in the sense that we are going behind the Iron Curtain to appear in Poznan, Poland. The answer is "Yes" to the fact that we are having an effective job done by these fairs.

Now, for just a moment, by way of a corollary thought related to these fairs. As your chairman has indicated, I completed recently a 47-day trip around the world, touching upon 4 continents. I suppose that, perhaps, because of tightness of schedule I might label the title of these remarks from here on out as "4 Continents on 2 Shirts," because it became necessary for me to wash my dacron shirts in the washtub very regularly each evening.

I gained many impressions and had very many interesting experiences as you might gather. But there were two impressions that I want to mention here, by way of relating it to the subject matter—namely the international trade fairs. I found, in talking with the ministers of finance, the ministers of economy, the ministers of industry of these different countries that I visited, that there was a particularly poignant problem that confronted them, all the way along the line: How do we keep our foreign exchange reserve account in balance? And that relates itself to these visiting folks from America who go to these different countries and an American is singled out, I suppose, for two reasons. First of all, because he is American and you can spot him blocks away, because he is just a different breed of animal and, secondly, because an American has with him, in his pocket, that magic thing called the American dollar. And that, somehow or other, is sensed very quickly by the natives in these various countries.

Now, all these programs and the dollars that we are spending, both as tourists and as business people and in the different foreign aid and military procurement programs are fine and our international trade fairs are fine. But, there is one little ingredient that we must never overlook and it relates back to what Mr. Brucker said a little while ago when he was talking about the men. Incidentally, my friends, I encountered some stories and I suspect that some of you who have been over there have, too, that, when we have our American citizens go over there, they don't always follow the right kind of pattern of individual behavior.

Now, I don't like to overlook the opportunity to make a sale when I have the chance to make one and I am cognizant of the fact that I am standing here now within the presence of a group of people who write the printed word. Therefore, you have an influence away beyond the ordinary group that might meet in a room of this sort. I would like to invite you to join with me in a project—namely, to see to it if we can arouse the consciences and consciousness of the American citizens, so that, when they go abroad, they will not merely be a member of a group; that they will not merely be a member of a commission; that they will not be a member of an educational group or somebody else, but that they will be an American citizen, recognizing the fact, as individuals, that they are living in a glass cage; that they are under inspection by those people of the foreign countries, every moment of the time that they are visiting those countries, then behave accordingly.

If you of the controllers of the printed word will join me in that project and help arouse the conscience and consciousness of the American citizens, believe you me, then these programs such as the international trade fairs and all the rest of them will not just be more or less formal things, but they will be live, dynamic things and we will all, as individuals, contribute greatly to the winning of this titanic struggle.

*T. M. Evans, president, H. K. Porter Co., Inc.*

Question: Mr. Evans, in view of the "tight money" situation, do you feel that the very large corporations have unfair advantage over small- and medium-size businesses—and do you feel that the business press of the Nation is doing an adequate job in discussing such matters?

Answer: Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, before answering your question, I would like to clear up the distinction between large and small business. We all know that the largest corporations in this country have as much as $4 to $7 billion in sales and that some earn as much as $2 billion before taxes. I do not think that any of us will argue that these are not large. The confusion here in Washington seems to be in defining exactly what is small business.

A progress report by the President's Cabinet Committee on Small Business, dated August 7, 1956, singled out those corporations earning less than $25,000 a year, before taxes, as being small business. In this economy, I don't think they actually can be considered as businesses—they are more like individuals running stores or gas stations. In my opinion, we should define small business, under our current economy, as those with less than $25 million in sales and earning less than $2,500,000 before taxes.

In considering the tight money situation, we must remember that loaning and investing money under this economy, based on high income taxes, is in the hands of professionals or people handling money for others, since

few if any individuals have surplus funds for investment under the present taxes. When professional investors, with responsibilities to others, have demands from the leading corporations for all or most of the funds they have to invest or loan, naturally there is little, if any, left over for the small- or medium-sized, less well-known concern, either in the form of loans or the form of money to invest in the common stock of such companies. If any money at all is available to loan the smaller companies, it is usually at rates up to 50 percent higher than the largest companies pay; this is natural, but is a distinct disadvantage to such companies.

The smaller company, operating in only one field, has another disadvantage, in that it has depreciation from only that one field, while a larger corporation, operating in many fields, can use the depreciation from one division that may not be growing rapidly to generate cash for a division that is growing.

An additional problem of small business, under the 1954 tax law, is that the increased depreciation rates apply only to new machinery. I think almost everyone will agree that because a small company cannot afford to buy new machinery and, therefore, must buy it secondhand, such small companies should not be penalized in their depreciation rates, compared to the company which was able to buy new machinery.

Since I definitely feel that the largest corporations have a great advantage over the smaller companies, particularly in this period of tight money, I think that the most practical and effective method of overcoming this would be to tax smaller business at lower rates than the very largest corporations, just as we have eased the burden on individuals in the lower income-tax brackets, compared with those in the higher brackets. However, the problem is not a simple one. I am both surprised and disappointed to find that you editors and publishers of business publications, in general, have not taken a stand. You are among those best qualified and in the best position to study and assess the problem and bring it to the attention of your readers in the business world. I hope that, in the future, you will do just that.

REMARKS OF RICHARD M. NIXON, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, IN PRESENTING THE 1956 SILVER QUILL AWARD OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC., TO SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, Senator BYRD, distinguished guests at the two tiers, and ladies and gentlemen in the audience, I am honored to be with you for the third time at this dinner and I would like to note, before making the presentation, two firsts, with regard to this dinner, that I think all of us will appreciate. This is the first time that I have ever been in this room, as a matter of fact, when I have seen the people who pay $20 for the $2 seats in the back, get a break with regard to the program. I congratulate those responsible for the program who have done this. And this is also the first time, standing up here as I have many times, either as a speaker or in this capacity, that the speaker has the opportunity to see how foolish he looks on television, all around the room.

But, not only is it the first time in those respects for me but this is also a very special occasion, in that I am honored to join with you in presenting this award to our guest of honor this evening. You know as much about him, I am sure, as I do and I can only underline some of the things that have already been mentioned, but which we should remind ourselves of from time to time.

When I think of Senator BYRD, there are so many things that are worth mentioning that it is difficult to select the few that I will mention here. First of all, he is a Virginian and, as a Virginian, he has the courtliness, the grace, and the charm which we have learned to expect from those who are cast in the mold of tradition of great Virginians—men like Washington, Jefferson, and Robert E. Lee.

In the second place, HARRY BYRD is old-fashioned. He is old-fashioned in a number of ways. I refer, first, to the fact that he is old-fashioned with regard to some of his ideas. He is so old-fashioned that he thinks that a government shouldn't spend money until it already has it. I might say that that, with regard to this evening, is the only thing that I find rather incongruous. This is a Silver Quill Award and it is a silver award with a number of ounces—a hundred or so, as I recall—and all that I can say is that I know of no man in America today who is probably further away from the ideas of free silver and further away from the principle of the gold standard than HARRY BYRD. This, for HARRY BYRD, in more ways than one, should be a gold award rather than a silver award this evening.

Then, I refer, also, to our guest of honor this evening in another capacity, with which I am sure you will be familiar—as a man who is a Democrat. I should say, I think, that he is very proud of his party designation, as all of us are of ours, but, in making this presentation to him this evening, I would like to pay to him what I think is even a higher tribute. There are some men in the House and the Senate who have partisan affiliations who will leave a mark long afterward which is greater than their party. There are men who rise above their party, become Congressmen of our districts and States, and Senators of our States and of the Nation. In presenting this award this evening, I can think of no more appropriate thing to say than this—we honor HARRY BYRD as a Senator from Virginia. We honor him as a Senator from the Democratic Party, but, most of all, we honor him as a great Senator, belonging to all America, and in that spirit I make the award this evening.

REMARKS OF SENATOR HARRY FLOOD BYRD, OF VIRGINIA, CHAIRMAN, SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE, IN RECEIVING THE 1956 SILVER QUILL AWARD OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC., JANUARY 26, 1957, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen, I simply do not know what I have done to deserve it, but I appreciate it more than I can express. I realize the award is not made of gold but I am told that the silver is pure silver and, if an emergency should occur, it should have some value.

I am very grateful to my good friend, DICK NIXON. I can still call him Dick—I don't know what may happen later on. I am very appreciative to him for his very gracious remarks about me, which I will always remember.

I just want to say, first, a word of appreciation to the Nation's business press for the very splendid service that it has rendered. It is alert, vigilant, enterprising, and responsible and, as a publisher myself, I am keenly aware of the responsibilities which rest upon all of us in these turbulent times. The type of information the business press provides is an absolute necessity in practically every field of business endeavor.

I have watched the Washington corps of business-publication correspondents grow in both size and stature. They are doing a magnificent job. I welcome this opportunity to congratulate them, their editors, their publications and their clients on the fine contribution they are making for the dissemination of vital intelligence. As a business man who uses the product, I can testify to the value.

Now I am entering on my 25th year of service in the United States Senate. I have survived the New Deal, I have survived the Fair Deal and we now have the Present Deal. I sometimes think that the Present Deal will finally land in the middle of the New Deal and the Fair Deal. But, in looking back on these 25 years of service, my thoughts turn to the vast changes that have come to us in this period. I doubt if there is any period in the history of the world when so many momentous things have happened, so many changes have occurred, as have in the last 25 years. There is much in the last quarter of a century to be found on the credit side. In this period, we have made unparalleled progress. Our living standards are the highest, and our military powers the greatest, and let me say that it must always be the greatest. Our business techniques and mass production methods are unrivaled in superiority. I pray God we may preserve this progress and strength as a sound base for a vast new and constructive development which our children must carry on if freedom and civilization are to survive.

But let us not deceive ourselves. High prosperity has never been permanent, as all history shows. It has its ups and downs, and for these we must be prepared.

With this in mind, it is well, in this time of prosperity, to stop and take stock and to remember that the time of the greatest success too frequently is the time of the greatest danger. It is so easy in such times to assume responsibilities beyond our capacity to carry them.

Just let me mention some of the liabilities that have arisen in this 25-year period. I would place first the loss of one-half of the purchasing power of the American dollar. Compared to the 1935–39 period, the dollar lost 48 cents of its value up to 1952. In 1953, 1954, and 1955, the value of the dollar was stabilized, but, in 1956, inflation began again, and an additional 2 cents of dollar value was lost. That's equivalent to 4 percent of the value of the 50-cent dollar. We do not have to be expert economists to appreciate what is going on because all you have to do is to go into the store to make your purchases or, if a business man, to buy the things you need.

Now, this new inflation that has started has disastrous possibilities. We cannot continue to cheapen the American dollar. This present day inflation will be most difficult to control, especially because our regular Federal budget expenditures for the coming year are estimated at $72 billion, the largest peacetime budget ever presented to the Congress.

In this 25-year period, the Federal debt has risen from $22 billion to more than $275 billion. It is taking more than 10 percent of every tax dollar to pay interest on this direct Federal debt. In this period, we have collected from the taxpayer and paid in interest the vast sum of $88 billion on this debt. And this we will continue to do for many, many years and perhaps even forever.

For the first 150 years, up to 1932, we were practically on the pay-as-you-go basis. We had our wars, many of them, but after they were over we buckled down and economized and paid the cost of these wars. Those years may be ridiculed by some as the horse and buggy days, but they were days of frugality, thrift, and work. It was that period that laid the basis for the great prosperity that we are enjoying today. It was Andrew Jackson, that great man, who paid off, in total, the public debt, the only President in the history of our country to pay off, in total, the public debt, for which Mr. Jackson expressed great pride.

I have been asked, from time to time, what kind of a Democrat I am. Speaker RAYBURN, my dear friend, has made some inquiry about that, and, in fact, he was just discussing it with me tonight a little. So, I want all the world to know that I am an Andrew Jackson Democrat. In other words, I am a liberal based upon fiscal conservatism.

We of this generation are spending the fat accumulated in those pay-as-you-go days of saving and saving and work. Not only do we have the direct Federal debt of $275 billion, but we have contingent liabilities of another $275 billion. No one knows to what

extent the Federal Government will have to pay on this contingent liability.

We have increased the Federal payroll, within the past 25 years, from 575,000 to 2,500,000 Federal employees, and have increased their pay from less than $1 billion a year to more than $10 billion each year. This is an index of the big Federal Government and the concentration of power in Washington.

I have just received a special report from the staff of the Senate Finance Committee as to the total tax collections for the year 1956. In that year, the gross total tax take—Federal, State, and local—was $99.8 billion, nearly $100 billion, and that was taken out of a national income of $334 billion. This means that 29 cents out of every dollar that we earn goes for the payment of taxes of one kind or another. This is an increase of $10 billion in the collection of all taxes over the year 1955.

I am speaking of all taxes—local, State, and National. When we speak of taxation, we think mainly in terms of Federal taxation because it is consolidated under one government. The fact is, however, that there are 116,000 governmental units in the United States, most of which have taxing powers; there are 3,000 counties, 16,000 cities, 17,000 townships, and 79,000 school and special districts that have this taxing power. And these taxes, the State and local taxes, will go up day by day and it makes no difference to the taxpayer what pocket he pays it out of because he has to pay it in one way or another.

Now, let me ask you, in all seriousness, how long can we continue to tax and tax and spend and spend and, at the same time, continue our progress and preserve our solvency? I think all of us should take this question to heart and consider it. As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I am convinced that the time is overdue for substantial tax reduction. We have still on the books what are known as the Korean war taxes—past 10 years or more ago—that are being continued from year to year. But I could not support any tax reduction unless the expenses of government are reduced to a level which would make tax reduction possible on a sound basis.

I know of no more certain road to financial suicide than to reduce taxes and thereby create deficits and debt.

It is now up to the people themselves. If the pending budget—this great peacetime budget, spending $3 billion more than any other budget in peacetime history—is substantially reduced, a tax reduction may follow.

Now, do the people want a tax reduction? Yes, they do. Then let them communicate with their elected representatives urging them to support reduction of expenditures sufficient to allow reduction of taxes and something, if but little, on the public debt. I am not asking miracles. I am not asking that projects that have been started be wiped off the books—I am asking moderation in public spending; asking at a time when taxes are taking 29 cents out of every dollar you earn. If the people and the Congress should reduce this budget, and Mr. Eisenhower says that he is willing to have reductions, then that is democracy at work. The pending budget admits of no tax reduction, if enacted as it stands.

I agree with the very able Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, who said that expenses should and must be reduced and that a continuance of high spending will bring about a depression that will "make your hair curl." This, of course, assumes that the Federal Government has left you enough hair to curl. Both George and I are a little deficient in this respect.

Now, I agree with the Hoover report that many billions can be saved. Mr. Hoover has given his personal assurance that he thinks that the budget and expenditures can be cut $5½ billion and that applied to last year's budget and not for the budget that is now pending.

If the citizens want to reduce Federal spending to make possible a tax reduction, they must demand it constantly. Their demands must be specific and forceful. Citizens can appear before Congress more often than they do, in order to take an active position against specific spending. Again and again, streams of persons appear before congressional committees requesting additional money. Few indeed are those—and I think that Congressman CANNON, chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House, who is here tonight, will agree with me—few of those appear in Washington to oppose spending money. Citizens must think of Federal spending in terms of the national interest and stop pushing spending programs of local interest and those of the spending lobbies. All of us must sacrifice something in the difficult days ahead. We must stop asking the Federal Government for things we should do for ourselves.

The regular budget just submitted to the Senate provides, as I have said, for $3 billion more of spending than the previous year. It is somewhat paradoxical that the President stated in his message his opposition to inflation, yet the only way that this $3 billion of additional revenue will come to the Treasury is by inflation. It is unsound, in my judgment, to predicate a budget upon an anticipated increase in revenue from existing taxes.

When the effort is made to reduce spending, we are always told that such reduction cannot be made without disastrous results. Now, I just want to mention 2 or 3 of the proposals that have recently been made.

First, is the proposal of the Federal Government to build local schools and to have local health insurance programs. This will open up a pandora box of new spending for the Federal Government to build the public schools or assist in building the public schools and—let us not forget this—that, when these spending schemes start, they begin as a mouse and quickly become an elephant. And that can be proven. Time and time again, we may have started a program for $200 million or $300 million, yet a few years later the demand will be so great on the Federal Government for the money to go back to these localities that it will be greatly increased. As an evidence of that, in 1932 the Federal Government expended $250 million—only $250 million—for so-called grants to the States. Now, the Federal Government is spending over $3½ billion for grants to the States, covering 45 programs. Of course, reduction in expenditures is difficult, if not impossible, if we assume that such activities as building schools and having health insurance and many like functions are proper obligations of the Federal Government.

Now let's take foreign economic aid. The Marshall plan has a 4-year limitation—that's what we voted on when we passed it—and we spent, under the Marshall plan, $15.2 billion. I voted for it in the years just after World War II because, at that time, there was need for this economic aid. But then, after the expiration of the Marshall plan, we continued to spend for foreign aid so that we spent $40 billion more after the Marshall plan and this year the Congress is requested to increase the foreign economic aid and to open up a vast new area for such spending.

Now, if it is necessary to spend economic aid in certain new areas, then certainly there should be reduction in other areas.

It is time for the American people, ladies and gentlemen, to realize that, while we have great potentialities of wealth, there is a limit beyond which we can go. We must realize that creeping paternalism of the Federal Government is just as bad as creeping socialism. The end result is the same—the destruction of the principles of our free government.

There is one principle we should always preserve if we are to go far as a democratic country and that is: "It is the duty of the people to support the Government and not the Government the people."

Today there are actually 37,817,000 citizens receiving direct payments from the Federal Treasury. If we consider the dependents involved, it is possible that half of our population is affected by these regular Federal payments.

The very base of all we have in free government is our fiscal solvency. Without it we cannot preserve our representative democracy. Without it we cannot have military preparedness except under totalitarian methods such as those in Russia. Without the solvency of the American Government, we would enter an age of international darkness. Ours is the only currency in which everybody, everywhere in the world, has confidence. Our free enterprise system is the greatest deterrent in the world today to Russian aggression. It is our first line of defense. Our military forces are merely the tools through which the strength of this system is applied in war. Our competitive enterprise system can only exist, as I have said, under solvent government.

This fine audience needs no definition of the free enterprise system from me. It is the system that, within a relatively short span of 160 some years, has brought us from the impotency of 13 ununited colonies to our present position of world leadership.

This American system has developed individual freedoms under constitutional democracy to the fullest measure ever known to man. It is the system that supplies the incentive to every American to start at the bottom and rise to the top. It has enabled us, with only 6 percent of the world population, to outproduce the rest of the world combined.

It is no exaggeration to say that there is literally nothing on earth more important than the preservation of the fiscal integrity of the Federal Government of the United States and the freedoms upon which our Republic is founded. Let us pledge ourselves that these freedoms shall be preserved so that the future generations of Americans can live as we have in the security of our constitutional democracy.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I thank you with all of my heart for the privilege you have given me to address you tonight and the honor that you have paid me will be cherished as long as I live.

---

## ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES F. BYRNES AT THE ANNUAL PEORIA MEETING AND LINCOLN DAY DINNER

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable James F. Byrnes at the annual Peoria meeting and Lincoln Day dinner of the Illinois State Bar Association, in cooperation with the Peoria Bar Association, on February 9, 1957.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES F. BYRNES, AT THE ANNUAL PEORIA MEETING AND LINCOLN DAY DINNER, OF THE ILLINOIS STATE BAR ASSOCIATION IN COOPERATION WITH THE PEORIA BAR ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 9, 1957

Long ago thoughtful people of the South realized that Abraham Lincoln was correct in his opposition to slavery.

For the indefensible traffic in human beings many people were responsible. Traders

from Spain and France, as well as from Great Britain, encouraged the African chiefs to sell their people into slavery. Later, New England traders brought thousands of slaves to our shores.

Southerners who bought and worked African slaves shared the guilt of the slave traders. Certainly, I would make no defense of slavery. God never made a man wise enough or good enough to own another human being.

Most southerners now believe that had Lincoln lived, the South would not have been subjected to the oppressions of the reconstruction period which aroused more resentment than the sufferings of the war.

They believe, too, that Lincoln would have appreciated that the heroic fight of Confederate soldiers, the vast majority of whom owned no slaves, was due, not to the desire to perpetuate slavery, but to their belief that under the Constitution of the United States it was the right of each State to regulate its own internal affairs.

They feared that if the right of a State to control its internal affairs in one instance was denied, the Federal Government would soon make further encroachments upon local governments.

The people of the South respect the written Constitution of the United States. Heretofore they have had great respect for the Supreme Court because they have regarded that Court as the defender of the Constitution. They have relied upon the Court for protection against either the Executive or the Congress, acting in violation of the Constitution.

When we speak of the law of the land we refer to the United States Constitution which, according to article 4, "shall be the supreme law of the land."

We regard the Constitution as a statement of principles by which all departments of government are bound, the liberties of the people assured and that it can be altered only in the manner provided in the instrument.

In the early days of the Republic, the people were vigilant in protecting their liberties.

But in time, the people became busy and indifferent. Gradually in the courts there were developed the doctrine of judicial review, but it was founded on the principle that acts of government contrary to the Constitution were void.

All of us will agree, as Chief Justice Marshall stated in the Marbury-Madison case, "The Constitution is either a superior paramount law, unchangeable by ordinary means, or it is on a level with ordinary legislative acts and, like other acts, is alterable when the legislature shall please to alter it."

If the latter be true, a written Constitution is an absurdity. It is equally clear that if the Constitution is the superior paramount law, it cannot be altered whenever the Supreme Court wishes to alter it. That would be an absurdity.

If the Supreme Court can alter the Constitution by its decisions, then five men—a majority of the Court—can make the Court a constitution maker instead of a constitution defender.

Throughout our history, Presidents of the United States from Washington to Franklin D. Roosevelt have warned against the Court attempting to usurp such power.

Time and again the Court itself has declared it had no power to amend the Constitution. Now it is agreed by students of the law that the Court, while still admitting its lack of power to amend, is exercising new powers without the public realizing that the powers are new.

The trend is well illustrated by the school case.

In 1952 a 3-judge court presided over by Hon. John J. Parker, senior judge of the fourth circuit, in a case from Clarendon County, S. C., held that the segregation statutes of South Carolina did not violate the 14th amendment. Lawyers for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People appealed to the Supreme Court.

Some months after the case was first argued, the Court asked for further argument. Because the 14th amendment makes no reference to schools, the Court requested counsel to direct their arguments to the question "What evidence is there that the Congress which submitted and the State legislatures and conventions which ratified the 14th amendment, contemplated or did not contemplate, understood, or did not understand, that it would abolish segregation in public schools."

The attorneys general of all States interested in the issue, were invited to file briefs. Many of them responded. Among other things it was shown that about the time the amendment was submitted Members of the Congress proposed that in the Constitution and in statutes, segregated schools should be prohibited. The proposals were rejected.

The legislative history so conclusively demonstrated that the prohibition of segregated schools was not contemplated either by the framers of the 14th amendment or by the States in ratifying it, that the Supreme Court could not assert otherwise. The most it could declare, in an effort to justify its decision, was that the legislative history was inconclusive.

When the 14th amendment did not mention schools and the Court decided the legislative history was inconclusive, the Court should have declared, as it did only 11 months ago, in March 1956, in the case of *Ullman* v. *U. S.* (350 U. S. 427), that "nothing new can be put into the Constitution except through the amendatory process."

The Court should have upheld the Constitution its members are sworn to uphold. It should have upheld the doctrine of separate but equal facilities which had been sustained by the Supreme Court in eight different cases since 1896.

Instead, the Court declared, "We cannot turn the clock back to 1868 when the amendment was adopted, or to 1896 when *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was written." Then why did the Court ask counsel to file briefs as to the intent of the Congress in 1868? And why did the Court ask counsel to argue whether the Court was bound by its previous decisions such as *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*?

If the Court could not turn the clock back to consider the intent of the drafters of the 14th amendment in 1868, what chance is there of the Court turning the clock back to 1778 when the Constitution was drafted?

If age so outmodes the eternal truths of the Constitution, what chance would the Ten Commandments have with the present Court?

The doctrine of stare decisis is not sacred but when a case involves an interpretation of the Constitution and that interpretation is sustained by the Court's decisions over a period of 60 years, we should be able to rely upon it as the law.

*Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was not the only case precedent. There were seven others. When the Court included such great Justices as Taft, Holmes, Brandeis, and Stone, it declared, in *Gong Lum* v. *Rice* (275 U. S. 78), that segregation in public schools had been "many times decided to be within the constitutional power of the State legislatures to settle without interference of the Federal courts under the Federal Constitution."

In another case, Chief Justice Hughes said the question could "no longer be considered an open one."

Relying on the decisions of the Court, while Governor, I urged the issuance of bonds and the levying of a sales tax to build schools under the segregated system. Of the first $75 million we allotted 70 percent to Negro schools, even though Negro students constituted only 39 percent of the total enrollment.

The Supreme Court could not cite a single legal precedent in support of its segregation decision. It cited only the writings of a group of psychologists, several of whom had been declared by the House of Representatives Un-American Activities Committee and by the Department of Justice to be subversive.

A law-abiding citizen may ask, If a decision is not based upon law, is that decision law?

If the Court can disregard the process for amendment of the Constitution and add a prohibition as to segregated schools, why can it not add prohibitions on other subjects, destructive of the rights and liberties of the people?

If the Constitution is whatever the Supreme Court says it is, instead of taking an oath to defend the Constitution, citizens should be required to swear to uphold and defend the decisions of the Supreme Court.

After the Court adopted the school amendment to the Constitution, it had a further hearing to determine how the new 14th amendment should be enforced. Let us look at the 14th amendment itself.

The 5th section of the 14th amendment reads: "The Congress shall have the power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this article."

In the case of *Fay* v. *The People of the State of New York* (332 U. S. 261) decided 10 years ago, the Supreme Court indicated in the absence of congressional authority, it had no power to enforce the 14th amendment.

That case involved alleged racial discrimination against Negroes serving as jurors. The Court called attention to an act of Congress specifically prohibiting such discrimination, by which it was controlled. Referring to the 5th section of the 14th amendment, the Court said:

"It is not said the judicial power of the General Government shall extend to enforcing the prohibitions and to protecting the rights and immunities guaranteed. It is not said that branch of the Government shall be authorized to declare void any action of a State in violation of the prohibitions. It is the power of Congress which has been enlarged. Congress is authorized to enforce the prohibitions by appropriate legislation."

Clearly, then, when the Court added to the 14th amendment the prohibition against segregation in public schools, that prohibition, like all other prohibitions of the amendment, could be enforced only by congressional legislation.

Instead of legislating to prohibit it, Congress for 75 years specifically appropriated for segregated schools in the District of Columbia.

And in recent years in appropriating for the school-lunch program, Congress, by implication, approved segregated schools by providing that if a State maintained separate schools for races, funds should not be paid unless they were equitably distributed between the segregated schools.

But the Court that was unwilling to leave the amendment of the Constitution to the Congress and the States, as provided in that instrument, likewise was unwilling to leave to the Congress the enforcement of the new 14th amendment.

It substituted the courts for the Congress. That means the power of injunction. The power of injunction is a dangerous power, often abused.

Where Congress, in precise language, applicable to all citizens, would define what constitutes a crime, and the punishment therefor, already it is apparent that the judge-made laws will radically differ in the different jurisdictions.

In July 1955, the Honorable John J. Parker, senior judge of the fourth circuit, speaking for the three-judge court having jurisdiction of the South Carolina segregation case, said that the Supreme Court "has not decided that the States must mix persons of

different races in the schools or must require them to attend schools, or must deprive them of the right of choosing the schools they attend. What is has decided, and all that it has decided, is that a State may not deny to any person, on account of race, the right to attend any school that it maintains. * * * The Constitution, in other words, does not require integration. It merely forbids discrimination."

That court held voluntary segregation possible. However, in Tennessee a United States district judge took a different view. He issued an order on January 4, 1956, which according to him, "requires adoption by school authorities of Anderson County of a program of integration that will expeditiously permit the enrollment of Negroes of high-school grades to the high school of that county."

Later that district judge enjoined certain parties who were named, and all others who may be acting in counsel with them from interfering with what the judge called the integration order or from picketing Clinton High School, either by words or acts or otherwise.

Subsequent events demonstrate the chaos that will result from these judge-made laws. In Clinton, Tenn., troops and tanks were ordered to a school, but disorders continued, in and out of the school. When the soldiers withdrew, the Attorney General of the United States ordered an investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of violations of the court order.

In December a white minister who had no connection with the school, voluntarily accompanied certain colored students to the school. After he left and while passing some citizens on the street in front of the police station, he was struck in the face by a man who claimed the minister shoved him. The minister was not seriously hurt.

By order of the court, the man who struck the minister, along with about 12 other persons including another minister and a woman, who were on the sidewalk where the fight took place, were charged with criminal contempt for violating the injunction order. Released under heavy bond, they were to have a hearing on January 28 but the hearing was postponed.

The people of many States await with interest the result of that hearing. They are anxious to know:

First, whether the district judge instead of enjoining discrimination against individuals, had the power to issue an order requiring the adoption of an integration program.

Second, whether striking a citizen who has no connection with the public schools, at a point some distance from the school building, constitutes an interference with the court's integration order.

Third—heretofore it has been thought that where an act was alleged to violate an order of injunction and at the same time violate the criminal law of the United States, or any State, the defendant was entitled to trial by a jury. The people want to know if this has been repealed by the court.

Fourth—whether the presence of citizens at a place on the street, where an assault and battery is committed upon a person not connected with the school or its students, constitute an interference with the court's integration order, justifying punishment by a judge with or without a jury trial.

The President was quoted as saying in response to a question at a recent press conference, that the problem at Clinton was now in the hands of local courts and local officials. If correctly quoted, the President was misinformed. The citizens have been arrested by order of the United States district judge and the school children have been threatened with the secret police of the United States who were sent to the scene by the United States Attorney General.

The only local official in the picture is the prosecuting attorney of the county who was so thoroughly frightened that he told the assembled children of the school that if they were guilty of misconduct they would be reported to the FBI and "uncalled-for provocations will be dealt with swiftly and harshly."

If school children who engage in a fist fight or other disorderly conduct at school are not to be punished by school authorities, a juvenile court, or other State tribunal, but are to be arrested by the FBI and without trial by jury, are to be sentenced by a United States district judge for violation of an injunction, I fear the consequences in districts where the races are evenly divided.

In the Tennessee school of 804 pupils, only 14 are Negroes. In the school district in South Carolina where there originated the case decided by the Supreme Court, the school population is 2,900 Negroes and 290 white students. There are many such districts in the South and they present a far more serious problem than the situation in Clinton.

In Tennessee a man was sentenced by the district judge to imprisonment for 1 year and a fine of $10,000 for making a speech which the judge regarded as inciting people to violation of the injunction and to acts of violence. That individual was not a citizen of Tennessee or any Southern State.

The facts of the case I do not know. But law-abiding Southerners do not encourage or condone acts of violence. If a white man from a Northern State comes South and does incite white people to violence, he should be regarded with the same disfavor as the professional agitator from the North who comes to incite our colored neighbors to acts of violence. In our midst, we have trouble makers in both races. They need no assistance from other States.

The Southern people know the United States Government has the military power to enforce the orders of its courts. They say, however, that the Supreme Court which ordered this experiment in sociology must enforce it. It cannot expect the States to voluntarily enforce a decision they regard as having no basis in the Constitution or any statute.

When they are criticized by some of the metropolitan press, they recall that only a few decades ago the Constitution was lawfully amended in the manner provided in that instrument and prohibition laws were enacted. Unquestionable, that was the law of the land. Many of the present critics of the South strongly urged the nullification of the prohibition laws. They made it fashionable to carry whiskey flasks and boasted of distilling gin in bathtubs. They did not cease fighting for nullification until the 18th amendment was repealed.

The Supreme Court did not create the people of the United States. The people created the Supreme Court. And the people gave to Congress in article 4 of the Constitution, the specific power to regulate the appellate jurisdiction of that court.

Congress should exercise that power. It should deny to the Supreme Court the power to invalidate the provisions of a State constitution affecting public schools or affecting the security of the State or the United States Government.

In view of the judicial threat to take out of the Constitution, through the injunctive process, the guarantee of trial of all crimes by a jury, Congress by legislation should protect the people against judicial abuse of the power of injunction.

Heretofore when a man has been charged with a felony and has pleaded "not guilty," he has said he would be tried "By God and my country." We must make certain that a man charged with committing a crime, as well as violating a judicial order, is not forced to plead that he will be tried—not by God or his country—but by a United States district judge.

One could not discuss this segregation decision without admitting that entirely apart from the legal phases, there is a fundamental objection by the people of the South to the social experiment of the Supreme Court.

They fear the purpose of many of those advocating integration in schools is to break down social barriers in the period of adolescence and ultimately bring about intermarriage of the races. They are opposed to this and they are determined to resist in every legal way the efforts to mix the races in the schools. This is not petty prejudice. It is a serious problem of race relations.

Pride of race has been responsible for the grouping of people along ethnic lines throughout the world. Race preservation is the explanation of the political unrest and race tension in south Africa.

Pride of race as well as loyalty to religion contributes to the conflict between Jews and Arabs in the Middle East, which today threatens the peace of the world. Jews do not marry Arabs. Several Arab governments will not even allow a Jew to enter those countries.

It was a realization of the wisdom of segregating races that prompted 46 governments, including the United States, to agree in the Geneva Convention of 1929 that "belligerents shall, so far as possible, avoid assemblying in a single camp prisoners of different races or nationalities."

In the United States, pride of race is not confined to the South. Today in 23 States, intermarriage of the races is prohibited by law. The degree of race tension in various States and communities is dependent upon the percentage of Negro population.

In the mountainous areas of the South there are few Negroes and little tension. There are other areas where the races are more evenly divided. There the race problem is acute and is the principal topic of conversation among all classes of people.

Similarly in northern States in the rural areas there is little tension while in the great cities of New York, Detroit, Washington, and Chicago, there is increasing tension.

It is useless for men to argue whether the racial instinct is right or wrong—it exists. It is nothing new.

Thomas Jefferson, the patron saint of the Democratic Party, when he was nearly 80 years of age, said "Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free; nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government. Nature, habit, opinion, have drawn indelible lines of distinction between them."

Abraham Lincoln, who signed the Emancipation Proclamation, and has been regarded as the patron saint of the Republican Party, said in his joint debate with Douglass, at Charleston, Ill., on September 18, 1958, "I will say then that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races; that I am not, nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say, in addition to this, that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality."

Lincoln further said, "Whether this feeling accords with justice and sound judgment is not the sole question, if indeed it is any part of it. Universal feeling, whether well or ill founded, cannot be safely disregarded." (Vol. 4, Writings of Abraham Lincoln, edited by Arthur Brooks Lapsley.)

The prophesies of these two statesmen, were made a century ago. In the early days, following the war, the people of other sections showed no great interest in educating the

recently freed slaves. The problem of helping him educationally and economically was left to the impoverished peope of the South. They so generously did what they thought was right, now they can boast that since the days of reconstruction the Negro in the South has made greater progress than he has made in any country of the world.

I am proud of their progress in South Carolina. They are in all the professions. Some few are engaged in banking, hundreds in insurance, and real estate. They are engaged in merchandising, farming, and in the skilled trades. They own radio stations. More than 18,000 own their own farms. Others manage farms. Thousands own their homes which are equipped with television and electrical refrigeration.

With a Negro population of approximately 800,000 Negroes, about 140,000 own automobiles.

I am confident the number of automobiles owned by Negroes in South Carolina is greater than the number of automobiles privately owned in Russia with its population of 200 million.

As a result of the educational program which I sponsored while Governor, there is at least one Negro high school in every school district. Because these schools are new, in most instances, they are better than the high schools for white pupils.

In the State we have 7,500 Negro schoolteachers. In New York City with a larger Negro population, less than 5 percent of the regular teachers are Negroes.

For the State of Illinois with a Negro population of approximately 700,000, I do not have the figures, but I am certain the number of Negro teachers is not one-half the 7,500 in South Carolina.

Proud as I am of this progress, I am even prouder that in the last 25 years there has been a vastly improved relation between the races.

Because this is true, the decision of the Supreme Court was a tragedy. It has undone all that men of good will in both races had accomplished in improving race relations. Instead of improving, the situation is worsening. Now we fear for the future.

In the cities, where Negro homes are concentrated, schools were built near their homes. Students are assigned to the schools nearest their homes. If, however, a district judge insists on disregarding State assignment laws and orders the mixing of the races in the schools, I fear the American people will have as serious a problem in the Southeast as we now have in the Mideast.

In several States laws have been enacted providing that "if by order of any court, State or Federal, a student is assigned to a school different from that to which he is assigned by school officials, all appropriations for the school to which that student is assigned and all appropriations for the school from which he comes, shall immediately cease."

Counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People predict the Supreme Court will declare these laws unconstitutional. I do not think so, but in view of the segregation decision, I would not bet on what the Court would do.

However, I predict that if the Court shall declare unconstitutional all State statutes having in its opinion the effect of continuing segregation, then with great regret, many States will discontinue public schools.

In anticipation of this last resort, provisions in State constitutions requiring appropriations for public schools have been repealed by the voters. Private schools will be preferred to integrated schools.

Of one thing I am confident, should the Supreme Court cause the closing of public schools, leaders of the white race in the South will see to it that the innocent Negro children receive an education. They must not be permitted to suffer because of the well-intentioned but misguided efforts of overzealous do-gooders.

In South Carolina a similar law was passed as to recreation parks. There are parks for both races. When a suit was brought by several Negroes to be admitted to a park set aside for white people, the legislature passed a law closing that park. A United States district judge recently held the question of discrimination was moot because the park was closed.

The people do not feel as keenly about integration in parks as in schools. Recreation is desirable, but education is essential. However, law officers believed that with the existing tension, integration in parks where there are cabins for lodging and swimming pools, was dangerous.

Governors of several States have announced they will not follow the Tennessee example and call out the National Guard to escort Negro children to white schools. They take the position, taken by the Governor of Texas, that under the police powers, it is the duty of a Governor to quell disorders, not to cause them.

In its decision, the Supreme Court said that segregation would retard the development of Negro children. It did not comment upon the effect integration would have upon the development of white children. We believe the presence of troops and tanks, and the secret police, at a school will do great psychological harm to children—white and colored. Instead of thinking of mathematical problems, they will think of race problems.

The people of the South are not an alien people. They are loyal Americans. Whatever may have been the differences between the North and South 100 years ago, in the Spanish-American War southerners proved their devotion to the United States. In World War I and again in World War II they demonstrated their patriotism and their courage on the battlefields of the world.

Today they are overwhelmed by this problem of race which was inherited by them more than a century ago. Through the years that cross has borne heavily upon them.

Now they earnestly appeal to you for understanding, as they pray that their burdens may be lessened, if not lifted.

## ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that under the order previously entered, the Senate now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, to Monday, February 18, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 14, 1957:

### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Walter K. Schwinn, of Connecticut, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

D. Chadwick Braggiotti, of Connecticut, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Vaughn R. DeLong, of Maryland, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Frederick B. Haskell, Jr., of Maryland.
Lewis M. Lind, of Maryland.
Warren F. Looney, of the District of Columbia.
William L. Uanna, of Massachusetts.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4:

Edward S. Benet, of Texas.
Jesse D. McElroy, Jr., of Georgia.
William B. Snidow, of Virginia.
Robert L. Ware, Jr., of New Jersey.
Vernon B. Zirkle, of Virginia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Charles M. Gerrity, of Georgia.
Karl F. Mautner, of Pennsylvania.
Neil N. Muhonen, of Virginia.
William H. Rusch, of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Miss Faith V. Andrus, of California.
Fred A. Durling, of New York.
Clifford J. Glennon, of Utah.
Seymour S. Goodman, of Virginia.
Miss Teresa Offe, of Pennsylvania.
Joseph E. O'Mahony, of New York.
Neil L. Parks, of Maryland.
Edward M. Peach, of Virginia.
Miss Elizabeth Rice, of Florida.
Regulo Rivera, of California.
Mrs. Helen E. Sheehy, of Arkansas.
Fred A. Somerford, of Maryland.
Robert G. Sturgill, of Utah.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Henry Bardach, of New York.
John R. Bietz, of Virginia.
Albert Beryl Hudes, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 7 to class 6:

James H. Bahti, of Michigan.
Melville E. Blake, Jr., of California.
Byron E. Byron, of California.
Charles W. Henebry, of California.
Wilbur W. Hitchcock, of New Jersey.
Ernest A. Nagy, of Ohio.
Russell A. Price, of California.
Warren E. Slater, of New York.

Miss Alice C. Mahoney, of Arizona, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John J. Bentley, of California.
Miss Hulda Christiansen, of California.
Glen H. Fisher, of Indiana.
Miss Edna T. Flach, of Texas.
Archibald Lappin, Jr., of California.
Frederick E. Myers, of Ohio.
Leland A. Pyle, of Virginia.
Martin G. Ryerson, of New York.
Miss Lois M. Unger, of Ohio.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8 vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Alfonso Arenales, of New York.
Miss Joan E. Bennett, of California.

Miss Alix S. Bouldin, of California.
Benjamin N. Brown, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Robert S. Cameron, of California.
Miss Pamela Cheatham, of Pennsylvania.
J. Chapman Chester, of Wisconsin.
George E. Chewning, of Virginia.
William Clark, Jr., of California.
Peter D. Constable, of New York.
John E. Crump, of Kansas.
Curtis C. Cutter, of California.
Robert B. Dollison, of Pennsylvania.
Marvin B. Durning, of Louisiana.
Miss Doris Ann Fetters, of California.
Rudy V. Fimbres, of Arizona.
Robert L. Flanegin, of Illinois.
Miss Dagmar Frahme, of Ohio.
Benson Lee Grayson, of New York.
Miss Elinor Greer, of the District of Columbia.
William H. Hallman, of Texas.
Charles H. Hallock, of Virginia.
Miss Jo Ann Hallquist, of Wisconsin.
William Bruce Harbin, of California.
Thomas J. Henighan, of New York.
Miss Evelyn R. Hessler, of New York.
Marvin J. Hoffenberg, of Maryland.
Martin Jacobs, of New York.
James D. Johnston, of California.
Samuel C. Keiter, of New York.
James E. Kerr, Jr., of Virginia.
John W. Kizler, of Texas.
George B. Lambrakis, of New York.
Henry Ellis Mattox, of Mississippi.
Robert Marden Miller, of California.
F. Pierce Olson, of Minnesota.
John A. Perkins, of California.
Kenneth W. Preston, of New York.
Robert G. Ryan, of New York.
George M. Scanlan, of New York.
C. Richard Spurgin, of Illinois.
Ulrich A. Straus, of Michigan.
George H. Wall, of North Dakota.
Howard L. Worthington, Jr., of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Arthur L. Funk, of Florida.
Dwight B. Herrick, of New Jersey.
Henry C. Palm, Jr., of California.
Henry H. Stephen, of New Jersey.
John M. Stuart, of New York.
Miss Geraldine B. Stibbe, of Ohio, a Foreign Service reserve officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Robert M. Snyder, of West Virginia.
Vasia C. Gmirkin, of California.
Miss Frances D. Hyland, of California.
Mansfield D. Sprague, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Gordon Gray, resigned.

## WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate February 14, 1957:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mansfield D. Sprague, of Connecticut, an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Carter Lane Burgess. (Received on January 14, 1957.)

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Peter P. Cinikas, executive director, Lithuanian Daily Draugas, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

O Eternal Father, Lord of the Universe, God of Love and Mercy, we give Thee thanks and praise for the many great gifts Thou hast seen fit to bestow on our land and its people. We thank Thee especially for the material gifts which have made our land strong and powerful, for the deep faith in God which has imbued our people and leaders with the unquenchable love of liberty and for the qualities of mercy and understanding for the downtrodden and the oppressed.

O Eternal Father, bless our President, grant him strength and health, wisdom, prudence, and patience, and above all, shine Thy guiding light upon him as he wrestles with the momentous problems of mankind. Thou knowest his love and thirst for peace. Aid him in his quest to bring the peace of Bethlehem to every corner of the world.

O Heavenly Father, bless this august body of lawmakers, enlighten their minds with wisdom as needed to steer the true course through the tempestuous seas of strife, hatred, and prejudice to the port of peace. Fill their hearts with mercy toward the underprivileged in this country and those who live in want and in the shadow of fear all over the world. Make them ever strong in the struggle against those who seek to rule by force, to enslave nations, and to stamp into dust under the heel of tyranny.

We pray Thee, Father of Heaven and Earth, to keep the Members of this august body ever under Thy protection. Give them the light to see and the power to perform their tasks as they see them and according to Thy holy will. Make them strong in their fight against Thine enemies. Help them extend a generous hand to the nations which know not Thy peace, whose people are held in bonds and chains of slavery. Help them return peace and liberty to the land of Lithuania whose people last possessed it 17 years ago and who today writhe in agony and terror in the merciless grip of a godless oppressor who seeks to bring the entire world under the rule of his clenched fist.

We beseech Thee, O God of Mercy, to shorten the days of darkness and tyranny for these people and all other peoples whose homelands have been oppressed. Grant us the grace to share the blessings of Thy generous bounty with all peoples and nations. Grant our President and this august body the loving heart, nobility of spirit, firmness of purpose to be the hope of the oppressed, to carry the torch of freedom that shines brightly in our land, to all nations.

We humbly implore Thee, Our Father, grant us this blessing on this, the anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, where freedom has been suppressed by brute force. May Thy name, O God, be forever glorified by us, Thy children. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 11, 1957, was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 394. An act to waive the limitation on the time within which a medal of honor may be awarded to Comdr. Hugh Barr Miller, Jr., United States Navy.

## TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night, February 15, to file a report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD reserved all points of order on the bill.

## FAILURE OF THE LEASE-PURCHASE PROGRAM

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the fact which I am sure you noticed in the news this morning that the much-vaunted lease-purchase program had been suspended in the interest of the control of inflation. But that is not the reason it was suspended. As a matter of fact, it was not suspended. It has simply bogged down and ground to a halt.

During the 3 or 4 years since it has been authorized I am informed that only one building has been even started. What is the reason for that? It is the administration's hard-money policy. They have been unable to get anybody to finance these buildings at a return of 4 percent as provided in the law. This is just another effort of the administration to cover up a dismal failure.

Moreover, this hard-money policy has brought practically to a halt the building of homes for veterans. If it is continued, we will be faced with deflation and a recession. After all, the hard-money policy affects only the small homeowner and in no way limits or holds in check the huge corporations and giant industries, who always are able to get funds for their own building and expansion.

## COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means and the subcommittees thereof be authorized to sit during sessions of the House during the 85th Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit today while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SOIL BANK AND PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the primary concept of our democratic form of government is equal treatment under the law. This is our heritage. It is the distinction between a totalitarian state and a democracy.

The architects of our government, the framers of our Constitution never conceived of a way of justice that dispensed its favors on a first-come, first-served basis.

Yet this deplorable travesty on equality under the law is what we see today in the shameful treatment of our farmers, thousands of whom have stood in line to enter their land in the soil bank, which was their right—but only to be turned away.

The Congress passed the soil-bank law last year when it was the only action open to us after the President by use of his veto power thwarted the Congress in the restoration of 90 percent of parity price supports for the basic crops.

But it never was the intention of this Congress that the benefits of this program should be put on a first-come, first-served basis.

This is the work of the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Ezra Taft Benson. I do not challenge his motives, but I do criticize his judgment. He may have thought that the soil-bank funds were large enough to accommodate all the farmers who wanted to enter their acres into it and maybe he could not foresee what is taking place.

Our newspapers in the South are displaying photographs of hundreds of farmers standing in lines, reaching around city blocks, wanting to exercise what is their right—to place in the soil bank. The news accounts tell of soil-bank funds in the various counties being quickly exhausted, and of thousands of farmers being turned away. We hear that in some counties a very few farmers, perhaps eight or ten or a dozen, got contracts for the total funds allotted for the soil bank, and the rest of the farmers got none.

Mr. Benson may not have foreseen the travesty his "first come" policy would cause but, Mr. Speaker, his mistake now certainly is abundantly and tragically clear to him, and the Secretary, in the name of justice to our farmers, forthwith should scrap that policy and come forward with a program to open the soil bank to every farmer who wants to invest his land in the acreage reserve.

This Congress should insist upon it.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my nature to seek satisfaction or even amusement in an I-told-you-so attitude when somebody blunders. And it is not in that attitude, but rather with a feeling of regret and gloom that I must emphasize what has happened to agriculture in this country since the attack was launched 4 years ago to break down the firm 90 percent of parity supports for the basic crops.

The firm-support program was destroyed in 1954, and we now have the sliding-scale supports—and the so-called soil bank.

Now we must ask: What has happened in these 4 years since the assault was launched on the firm supports for the major crops; how have our farmers fared? Where are we now?

The report of the Commodity Credit Corporation, just published, contains some astounding facts and figures. It shows that the CCC has spent $3 billion in the last 4 years in its price-support operations, which is almost exactly three times the $1,064,000,000 spent in all the previous 20 years of these price-support operations.

It sets forth that where the CCC supports for the basic crops actually showed a profit of $13,011,000 4 years ago, after 20 years of operation, a loss of $1,235,000,000 has occurred in these operations since January 1, 1953.

Mr. Speaker, let us look particularly at cotton. We all know that for almost a century this harvest of southern fields was America's greatest export crop, and it maintained this Nation's financial integrity in the world. So it has been with cotton in the price-support picture. Cotton, by the huge profits realized on its support program, had maintained a profit on the balance sheet of CCC support costs for all the basic crops. At this time a year ago CCC showed a profit of around $267 million on its cotton-support operations for 23 years. Now that profit has vanished, under the bargain sale export program, and the cotton operations now show a loss of $161,850,000.

And what have we gotten for all these expenditures?

Four years ago our total surpluses, in CCC inventories or on loans, totaled only $2,452,000,000. Today the figure is $8,211,000,000.

And, whereas our farmers had enjoyed prices at 100 percent of parity or better for 11 consecutive years, 1941 through 1952, these prices now are down 18 percent to only 82 percent of parity.

It would be well if the whole Nation took a look at what has happened during the time the firm-price system for agriculture was being destroyed. I fought as hard as I could against it, and I now have pending a bill proposing to restore the 90-percent supports for the basic crops.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I call upon the administration in power: First, to undo the injustices in the soil bank and come forward with a program that is fair and just to all our farmers; and, second, to review forthwith the disastrously low price supports set by the Secretary for 1957, and then to give to our farmers a level of prices that will hold some hope that they may shake off the depression that now grips them and that they will share, as our other citizens, in the prosperity of this great Nation.

LAWS RELATING TO CAMPAIGN PRACTICES

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 483, which created a special committee to investigate the election of Members of the House of Representatives, I had the honor to serve as chairman of that special committee which included among its duties the investigation and reporting to the House with respect to—

5. The violations, if any, of the following statutes of the United States:

(a) The Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

(b) The act of August 2, 1939, as amended, relating to pernicious political activities, commonly referred to as the Hatch Act.

(c) The provisions of section 304, chapter 120, Public Law 101, 80th Congress, 1st session, referred to as the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

(d) Any statute or legislative act of the United States, or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination of reelection to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute, or statutes, would affect the qualification of a Member of the House of Representatives within the meaning of article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States.

6. Such other matters relating to the election of Members of the House of Representatives in 1956, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith, as the committee deems to be of public interest, and which in its opinion will aid the House of Representatives in enacting remedial legislation, or in deciding any contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the House of Representatives.

Serving with me were my colleagues, ROBERT E. JONES, RICHARD BOLLING, KENNETH B. KEATING, and PATRICK J. HILLINGS.

I invite the membership of the House to study anew our report No. 2968, which is available. We were in unanimous agreement that at least one complete safe generalization could be made about the testimonies at the public hearing we had last December.

The laws relating to campaign practices, and particularly the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, are in drastic need of sweeping revisions, to be effective in the economy in which today's political campaigns must be conducted. None of the witnesses before the committee were completely satisfied with existing regulations.

Most of the shortcomings of the present laws, and the complaints made about them, are well known to Congress and the public. The difficulty which has prevented the enactment of corrective amendments over the years has been the inability of any majority of the Congress, and of the witnesses who have

repeatedly appeared, year after year, before various committees of both Houses, to agree on all specific measures.

Our committee, in the short period of its existence and with the limited funds available to it, did not presume that it would find solutions to the problems that have been pondered by Congress for so many years, or even to arrive at any definite consensus of its own members as to specifics of corrective legislation.

The first point on which there is no disagreement perceived by us is that the ceilings on campaign expenditures imposed by present law are too low.

Another point of general accord is that the public is entitled to a full disclosure of the expenditures made and contributions received by candidates and political committees, and that present reporting requirements do not provide full disclosure.

There appears to us to be a preponderance of opinion that full disclosure means at least these things:

(a) Extension of financial reporting requirements to include contributions and expenditures of State and local political committees which influence or attempt to influence the outcome of an election for Federal office.

(b) Official publication by the House and Senate, in tabular form, of the total contributions and expenditures shown on all financial statements filed by candidates and committees.

The general agreement that exists among the members of the committee and the witnesses we heard on the above broadly stated principles, does not include agreement on these specific questions:

First. In extending financial reporting requirements to State and local committees which influence or attempt to influence the outcome of Federal elections, should all such committees be included—no matter how small—or should some exemptions be granted? If exemptions are granted, what sizes or types of committees should be exempted?

Second. Should financial reporting requirements be extended to include contributions received and expenditures made by candidates and committees in connection with campaigns for nomination—primaries, nominating conventions and caucuses, and preference primaries?

And, on slightly different but closely related subjects, these additional questions were raised, with, in our view, no consensus reached:

Third. Should the provisions of the Federal Communications Act requiring radio and television stations to grant equal time, at the same price, to all candidates for a particular office, if time is allowed to one, be amended? Should it be repealed altogether—as a spokesman for the industry suggested?

Fourth. Should the Federal Government encourage the broadening of the base of political financial support by allowing a tax deduction, or an outright tax credit, for small contributions to political parties or candidates?

We do not pretend that these limited recommendations begin to cover all the problems existing in this field. But it is certain that all the other problems will come into a clearer focus when Congress and the public have the benefit of full disclosure and full knowledge of all contributions and expenditures made in campaigns for Federal elective office. The present reporting requirements are so fragmentary as to be meaningless.

Today I have introduced a bill, drawn by our committee counsel, Gillis W. Long and Raymond D. Watts. Mr. Long served as counsel for a similar committee in 1952. Both of these men are splendid lawyers and have a thorough understanding of all election laws pertaining to Federal office. I have introduced this bill not as chairman of the special committee. It does not necessarily represent in and of itself any thought which may be in the minds of my valued and respected colleagues on that committee. Neither do the lawyers who have actually prepared the bill, nor I, have any pride in authorship. We do not claim that it is a model fair-elections law. We recognize that there may be found many controversial provisions.

Because of the justified interest of the millions of voters in this country in the proper conduct of elections, I have felt that a start should be made somewhere. The purpose of this bill is to present most of the constructive suggestions which have come from many places and from many people for an improvement in existing law.

Accordingly, I hope that the Speaker will make reference to the proper committee in order that full, thorough, and complete hearings may be conducted in the hope that that which is good in this suggested bill may be retained and that which is not sound may be discarded. Only in this way will the House be permitted to work its will. In that spirit have I painstakingly suggested the language in the bill offered today.

Thorough hearings and full debate in the Committee of the Whole should result in a fair-elections law which will establish confidence in the American people.

## REVISION OF FLUE-CURED TOBACCO PROGRAM

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it was my intention to introduce in the Congress today a resolution directing the Secretary of Agriculture to increase the acreage allotment of flue-cured tobacco 10 percent. Realizing a revision of the entire flue-cured tobacco program is necessary, I have today introduced a bill for that purpose.

This bill, if enacted into law, would do two things:

First, it would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to put into operation farm acreage and poundage allotments for most types of tobacco under certain conditions. For several years we have had a system of farm acreage allotments for most types of tobacco. In the case of flue-cured tobacco, and I believe the same is true for some other types, under the acreage allotment system, the incentive is to produce quantity rather than quality. This has been a major problem in my State for some time and it seems to be the consensus of most tobacco growers that the most effective way to encourage the production of the kind of tobacco that the market wants is the adoption of a system which would provide for poundage quotas along with the acreage allotments.

Second, this bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to call a referendum among flue-cured tobacco growers within 30 days after its enactment if he determines that the anticipated reduction in poundage because of the adoption of the new system of allotments would warrant an increase in flue-cured tobacco acreage.

*Estimated production of flue-cured tobacco for 1957 based on average yield for 6 years, 1951 to 1956, inclusive*

| | |
|---|---|
| Yield per acre: | |
| 1951 | 1,309 |
| 1952 | 1,229 |
| 1953 | 1,245 |
| 1954 | 1,261 |
| 1955 | 1,497 |
| 1956 | 1,609 |
| Total | 8,150 |
| Average yield per acre | 1,358 |
| Multiplied by allotted acres for 1957 | 712,600 |
| Total production for 1957 | 967,711,000 |
| Less (soil bank) | 70,000,000 |
| 1957 production | 897,711,000 |

Marketing quota for 1957, 1,172 million.
Deficit, 274 million.

Since the Department of Agriculture announced on November 27, 1956, a national quota of 1,172 million pounds, and 712,600 acres for flue-cured tobacco for 1957, several factors have appeared which will undoubtedly materially reduce the total production of flue-cured tobacco in 1957.

On December 18, 1956, Department of Agriculture announced that support prices for three high-yielding varieties of flue-cured tobacco, namely, Coker 139, Coker 140, and Dixie Bright 244, would be reduced 50 percent. In other words, the support price level for the above-named varieties will be 45 percent of parity instead of 90 percent of parity. Coupled with this announcement, meetings were held throughout the flue-cured area to acquaint growers with the fact that the above-named varieties would not carry the 90 percent support prices.

As a consequence of this action by the Department of Agriculture and the publicity given to this action, there has been a drastic reduction in the planting of seed of the high-yielding varieties. Best estimates place the 1956 plantings of these varieties at 55 percent of the total crop, while the estimate for 1957 is not over 5 percent.

The switch from the high-yielding varieties to other varieties will undoubtedly result in a lower yield per acre for 1957. We believe that this factor alone will reduce the poundage at least 10 percent.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Another factor which will result in a lower production for 1957 is the soil bank. It is now estimated that 6 percent of tobacco acreage will be put in the soil bank.

These two factors, added together, will cut production at least 15 percent. If these conclusions are correct, and if growing conditions equal the favorable conditions of 1956, the 1957 production will only be 65 percent of the 1956 production. If weather conditions should be less favorable than those of 1956, the crop would be reduced even more. Another factor that will cut production in 1957 is the disease factor. Many growers who have been planting the resistant varieties, which have been discontinued, will plant nonresistant varieties in 1957. The incidence of black shank, Granville wilt, and nematodes will undoubtedly increase, and will result in a loss of poundage throughout the flue-cured tobacco belt.

The yearly requirements of domestic manufacturers amount to approximately 750 million pounds. The average exports of flue-cured tobacco amount to around 450 million pounds. Therefore, the total requirements for domestic and export trade are about 1,200 million pounds. The yield per acre for the 6 years 1951–56, inclusive, has averaged 1,358 pounds per acre. If we assume that the yield per acre for 1957 will be 1,358 pounds, then the production from 712,600 acres would amount to 968 million pounds. If we deduct from this figure 70 million pounds taken out of production through the soil bank, the total production for 1957 would be approximately 898 million pounds. Therefore, the anticipated production for 1957 will be more than 300 million pounds short of annual disappearance.

If we use the average production per acre for the 5 years 1951–55, inclusive, and multiply this figure by the allotted acres, the production would be 932 million pounds, after deducting 70 million pounds for the soil bank, which means a total production in 1957 of 862 million pounds, or 338 million pounds below normal annual requirements.

Throughout the years, exports of flue-cured tobacco have played an important part in the economy of the areas producing flue-cured tobacco. Over the past 10 years, $1 out of every $3 received by growers from the sale of flue-cured tobacco has come from foreign countries. The production from one acre out of every three is shipped to and consumed in foreign countries.

Another important point to be considered is the fact that during the past 2 years, especially during the past year, manufacturers in many foreign countries have held their purchases to a minimum in order to avoid purchasing leaf from the undesirable varieties. As a result of this development, many of these foreign manufacturers are expecting and hoping to make larger purchases from the 1957 flue-cured crop since they will be assured that the 1957 crop will have but little of the undesirable varieties in it. If these foreign customers, by reason of the anticipated reduction in production, are not able to secure their requirements of United States flue-cured tobacco, they will look to other sources for their requirements. These export markets, once lost, are extremely difficult to regain.

These facts fully justify a 10-percent increase in the acreage of flue-cured tobacco recently allotted for 1957. They represent developments which have taken place, in part, since the marketing quota for 1957 was determined late in 1956.

## MILO (GRAIN SORGHUM) SUPPORTS DISASTROUS

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I deplore the sliding-scale price concept, especially as administered by Secretary Benson. His recent announcement that the 1957 grain sorghum crop would be supported at only 70 percent of parity is shocking and regrettable. I contend that the foremost responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture is to serve the farmers.

A parity support price of 70 percent is absurd for grain sorghum growers. In my own community of Rolla, Kans., I know of seven young GI farmers with families who went broke on their 1955 crop of grain sorghum supported at 70 percent of parity and their crops were good. As the concept of parity itself has been watered down since that time the announced 70 percent of parity for the 1957 crop is ridiculous. It is also unjust to support the grain sorghum price at a figure materially lower than corn price supports. It is impossible in my district to rely on raising a corn crop because of weather conditions. Grain sorghum, however, is acclimated to this area and under irrigation may be counted on to yield substantially year after year. Due to drought conditions nearly 90 percent of the 1957 wheat cropland in my area is in the soil bank and the only chance left for profits from 1957 crops was in the raising of grain sorghum. This opportunity was obliterated by Mr. Benson with his announcement of only 70 percent of parity.

In protest to this announcement the following telegram was sent by myself to the Secretary:

FEBRUARY 12, 1957.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
*Secretary of Agriculture,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

I view with great alarm and regret your announcement of only 70 percent of parity as the price support for the 1957 milo crop. A great portion of the milo in the United States is produced in the drought area toured by yourself and the President early last month. The further slashing of prices of farm commodities in these areas is not compatible with the emergency assistance asked by the President. Nor do I see any justification for supporting milo prices at a lower rate than corn. In the southwest Kansas section of the drought area milo has offered farmers practically their sole income for the past few years. Lowering the support price from 76 percent of parity to 70 percent of parity will have only one noticeable effect. It will cost the milo growers approximately $15,790,000 in income this year. You have continued to urge lower support prices on the theory that such action will discourage production. This theory has not worked to date. It will not work in this instance. It will not cut production nor the amount of surplus grain sorghums carried by Commodity Credit Corporation. But it will again be an expensive experience for CCC. The new support price will become the market price and will thus drive down the dollar value of milo that is presently in CCC stocks, thus costing the Federal Government millions of dollars. The sliding scale price supports partially explain the nearly $3 billion loss which CCC has experienced in the last 4 years. Your longtime contention that lower crop supports will discourage production has been proved false again and again. Even the 25-cent wheat of the early thirties did not cause the farmers to lay down their tools. Instead they continued to produce more wheat. No individual farmer is going to hold his land out of production voluntarily to force higher prices. I feel very strongly that the sliding-scale-price approach to controlling farm surpluses has failed. The price factor will not control farm output. Because of higher and higher costs of production, milo farmers will certainly go broke on 70 percent of parity. I urge that farmers be given full parity and the chance to once again share in the prosperity of the Nation.

J. FLOYD BREEDING,
*Member of Congress, Fifth District of Kansas.*

## CAREER OPPORTUNITIES FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, there have been two recent newspaper articles on which I would like to comment. They both pertain to remarks of the President concerning Government employees. In one article, which I am including with my remarks, the President is reported as being concerned over the loss of engineers and scientists to private contractors with Government cost-plus contracts.

We, too, in our Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization, have been concerned about this. We have repeatedly pointed out that the Government itself, through exorbitant allowances for recruiting expenses and salaries, is permitting tax money to be used by holders of defense contracts to pirate Government scientists essential to defense work. This is something the President can and should take steps to correct.

In another newspaper article he was reported as saying to a United States Coast Guard and Geodetic Survey meeting that—

> People who leave Government employment for higher paying positions "have lost all comprehension of what public service is."

A close look at the record might reveal some reasons why Government employees are leaving the Federal service. There are some things the Republican

administration can do to help hold career employees other than by castigating them.

Every red-blooded American should be looking for legitimate means of advancing himself. Unless the individual advances the Nation will suffer. By and large, advancing means greater return for one's efforts. Those returns can be financial or they can be in the form of recognition. Everyone knows that the regular civil service does not offer a great deal of financial return or recognition. In the main, it offers a chance to serve with reasonable security.

How much recognition has this administration given career employees by appointing them to higher positions in the public service? What opportunities have the Republicans given them to comprehend what public service might be? It is common knowledge that several hundred top-level career employees, many with 15 or 20 years of service, have been turned out to make room for political appointees. Is their comprehension of public service the same today as it was before this happened? Of course not. This has had a very disrupting impact upon career employees.

Mr. President, are you sure in your heart that your advisers "have a comprehension of what public service is" and how a career servant can be devoted to the public service without regard to party or personalities? Perhaps more positive steps on the part of this administration to create career opportunities would eliminate the need for negative steps to prevent the loss of employment.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 10, 1957]

SCIENTIST "PIRATING" TROUBLES EISENHOWER

(By Joseph Young)

President Eisenhower reportedly has expressed his concern over a congressional committee's finding that private contractors with Government cost-plus contracts are luring away Federal engineers and scientists with offers of higher salaries.

Administration insiders say that at a recent cabinet meeting Mr. Eisenhower told Cabinet members and other agency heads to take steps to control such contracts so that the Government's personnel won't be raided by private contractors.

A House Civil Service Subcommittee headed by Representative DAVIS, Democrat, of Georgia, last month pointed out that private contractors were using Federal funds to deprive the Government of critically needed engineers and scientists and other professional employees by paying them higher salaries.

Mr. Eisenhower is reported to have asked that Government cost-plus contracts be so worded to limit contractors from paying salaries in excess of that paid by the Government.

Federal officials, particularly of the defense and scientific agencies, have expressed concern about the difficult problem of retaining and attracting key engineering and scientific personnel. Yet, the Davis subcommittee pointed out, the Government's own policies on cost-plus contracts is making the situation that much worse.

The President's concern over the situation may have further significance for the entire Federal service. Some administration officials say the White House is apt to look askance at another general Federal pay raise if it feels that this would result in contractors using Government cost-plus funds to pay even higher salaries in raiding Federal personnel.

That is why it is vitally important to all Government personnel as to what the defense and other agencies will do to curb the pirating of key personnel by private contractors.

## COMMUNIST PARTY CONVENTION

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington News, February 12, 1957, issue, page 17, carries an editorial entitled "Comrades Spat," and reads as follows:

COMRADES SPAT

Delegates to the convention of the Communist Party in New York are fighting among themselves. The issue is said to be which party line the stooges in this country will follow—Stalin, Khrushchev, or Tito.

The delegates are meeting in secret, natural for their ilk.

There are 350 of them, which means the central conspiracy has tagged them to be the ones who show their faces. These are not the commies who are the most dangerous—they are the front, the gaudy ones, the promoters of confusion.

The real spies and subverters keep out of sight, posing as something they aren't.

The Communist Party, as such, is said to be a little frayed at the cuffs, squabbling internally, short on funds, low on official membership.

But whatever faction comes out on top in that ruckus in New York, the whole caboodle is dedicated to one project—destruction of our way of living. You'll note they agreed on one thing—an impudent telegram to President Eisenhower suggesting he keep his nose out of the Middle East, where the Russians are trying to start a fire.

Wrangles and purges among the comrades suit us fine. They even may be amusing. But there is nothing amusing about the purpose of these intriguers, whatever their inside difference. They are against us and everything we believe in.

This editorial correctly points out the fact that the delegates to the Communist Party convention in New York were the ones who were expendable, and that they were not the most dangerous members of the Communist Party, the party advocating the violent overthrow of our Government. The editorial is, also, correct in taking note of the impudent telegram to President Eisenhower, suggesting he keep his nose out of the Middle East.

I want to supplement the editorial by calling attention to the fact that the same convention, and the same Communists, also telegraphed President Eisenhower demanding that the Supreme Court's decision in the school cases be speedily complied with and, also, that the same convention, and the same Communists, recommended passage of civil rights legislation now pending in Congress. Of course, that same convention, and those same Communists, demanded again that full equality be granted to the Negroes. That is no more than was to be expected, for there is not a shadow of doubt but that the Communist Party in the United States was the leader in the demand for the breakdown of segregation and the amalgamation of the races. The Communist Party's platform of 1928 indisputably proves that these demands were spawned by the Communists and are their babies, and no one can deny that these demands are their offspring.

The amazing thing is that the demands set out in the Communist Party's platform of 1928 have been complied with by Executive, administrative, and judicial decrees. These demands were designed not for the purpose of helping anybody but the Communist Party and for the expressed purpose of creating dissension and strife. The tragedy of the age is that maybe they are going to succeed. Let us shake the Communists off while there is yet time.

## INTEREST RATE ON SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the House that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I, as chairman of the committee, are today introducing a bill, at the request of the administration and the Treasury Department, to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, to authorize a change in the maximum interest rate permitted on United States savings bonds.

I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a copy of a press release issued by the Treasury Department today explaining this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

The Treasury announced today that it has requested the Congress to enact legislation which will permit an increase in the interest rate on new sales of United States savings bonds.

The Treasury's request to the Congress called attention to the important role that the savings-bonds program has played in our national life over the last 22 years, serving to encourage thrift and to place the Government's finances on a sound basis. Today about 40 million persons own more than $41 billion of series E and H savings bonds.

Identical proposed bills were transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives today which would give the Treasury the same flexibility with regard to interest rates on savings bonds that it has on other types of Treasury bonds. Passage of the legislation will permit the Treasury to go forward with plans to offer improved interest-rate terms on all series E and H bonds sold on or after February 1, 1957.

If the proposed legislation is passed, the Treasury plans to increase to 3¼ percent the interest rate on new E-bonds held to maturity, in place of the present 3 percent. The issue price and face value of the new E-bond will be unchanged, but the present 9 years and 8 months maturity will be shortened to 8 years and 11 months. Terms of any extension privileges for the new bonds will be determined later.

Also, redemption values of the new bond for the early years will be increased to provide a substantially higher yield to owners who find it necessary to redeem their bonds before maturity. The return on the new bond, if held 3 years, would be 3 percent, compared with 2¼ percent at present.

However, present owners of bonds will generally find it advantageous to continue holding them. For example, a $100 E-bond has a redemption value of $79.20 when held 2½ years. That bond will earn $20.80 more to reach its full $100 value at first maturity, and this $20.80 is slightly more than 3¼ percent on $79.20 for the remaining period of 7 years 2 months, compounded semiannually.

People holding bonds which have reached maturity and are being retained under the 10-year extension privilege will also find it to their advantage to continue holding them. Such bonds reaching the extension period since May 1952 are already paying a full 3 percent interest compounded semiannually and are redeemable on demand, and bonds of an earlier period show a still greater return.

The Treasury also plans to offer, effective February 1, 1957, a revised 10-year series H bond with yields generally comparable to the new E bond and returning 3¼ percent if held to maturity. The new H bond, like the present bond, would pay interest by check each six months in contrast to the appreciation-type E bond.

On passage of the legislation, all bonds dated February 1957 or thereafter would bear the new terms automatically. Existing stocks of bonds in the hands of the Treasury's more than 20,000 E bond issuing agents would be used until supplies of the new bonds are available. Since the issue date on the bond would determine its terms, no purchaser who received an old form of bond dated February 1957 or thereafter need feel that he should exchange it for a new bond when it is available—although he may if he wishes.

The E and H savings bonds rank among the best investments in the world for the average saver. The man who buys a savings bond has something that other bonds do not offer—complete freedom from market fluctuations. He also has something many other forms of saving do not have—a guaranteed interest rate over a period of years. He has the unusual protection of safety against the physical loss or destruction of his securities; a million separate bonds have been replaced by the Treasury over the years.

Series E bonds have acquired greater attractiveness in recent years because of the country's substantial success incurbing inflation. Government fiscal and monetary policies will continue to be directed toward the twin goals of economic growth and stability in the value of the dollar.

Because of the more attractive features of the new series E and H bonds, the limit on bonds which may be purchased by one individual in any 1 year is being reduced from $20,000 to $10,000 face amount for each series. The Treasury is withdrawing the present investment-type series J and K bonds from sale, effective April 30, 1957. Both of these decisions underline the Treasury's desire to emphasize the savings bond as a security designed for millions of average individual American savers.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I also desire to announce that 1 week from today, on Thursday, February 21, the Committee on Ways and Means will hold a public hearing on this legislation.

## COUNCIL BLUFFS REST-HOME FIRE

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, a terrible tragedy took place on February 13 in a rest home situated on a high hill overlooking the historic, beautiful, and progressive city of Council Bluffs, Iowa.

Within the space of a few minutes fire destroyed the entire frame building. Fourteen people are now dead. Many others are in hospitals suffering from agonizing burns.

We cannot aid those who perished. They are with God.

We cannot aid those who are in pain. All that is humanly possible is now being done to help them.

We cannot demand changes in State and local firesafety regulations. That is a matter under the jurisdiction and control of State and local authorities.

We can and we must insist on stern firesafety measures being enforced in all rest homes and other private and State-operated institutions receiving Federal aid.

We can—all Americans can—pray for the victims of the Council Bluffs rest home disaster.

This is my prayer: "Almighty God, accept into Thy love these, Thy servants, who came to Thee in fire. Heal Thou those who still live whose bodies are wracked with the agony of burns. Give unto us who have been entrusted with the stewardship of making the laws of the United States the strength and the wisdom to legislate so that the tragedy at Council Bluffs shall never be repeated. This we ask, in Christ's name. Amen."

## INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the president of the Interparliamentary Union, the Honorable DANIEL A. REED, of New York, I announce a business meeting of that organization to be held on Tuesday, February 19, in room F-39 in the Capitol, at 9:30 o'clock a. m.

## THE ETERNAL LIGHT

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with my colleagues in hailing the forthcoming 39th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence. The unquenchable thirst for freedom exhibited by the Lithuanians, throughout their years of enslavement by the Soviets has been an inspiration, and a confirmation of something the Soviet should have learned long since. Namely, that they can enslave human beings; they can shoot down rebels; they can crush dissenters; but they can never kill an idea. Certainly, they can never extinguish man's hope to be free.

In all man's history, there has never been an idea so viable, so inspiring and so enduring as the idea of freedom and independence. We owe a debt of gratitude to the Lithuanians for reminding us of this, by means of their annual Independence Day observation. They have never in their hearts submitted to the Soviet tyranny, and they never will.

More power to them. The distinguished minority leader of the other body, Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, recently voiced the opinion on one of my television programs that we would see the breakup of international communism in our lieftime. Certainly this is a consummation devoutly to be wished; and if it comes about, it will be chiefly because such people as the Lithuanians kept the light of freedom burning, however secretly, during the long Soviet night, against the inevitable day when it could again flame forth to light the path to the future.

## SPOKANE FARM FORUM

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the Spokane Farm Forum early this week and I want to share as much of that experience as possible with my colleagues. It is my conviction that our farm programs require a long look at this time. I feel that we can no longer endure the controls that present farm legislation impose on our domestic producers. For one thing, our present legislation is holding the umbrella over commerce in agricultural products of the entire world.

As we reduce acreages in accordance with basic legislation first enacted in 1938, we find other countries enlarging their acreages in the same commodities. We also find discrepancies among our own domestic producers which have the effect of transporting wheat acres from Kansas to Indiana and cotton acres from one State to the other—all being done in a legal way.

It is my conviction that our agricultural legislation does require a long look. We need to analyze and consider the effect of our entire pattern of controls. It is also my conviction that they are not controls but roadblocks and frustrations. I am equally convinced that our long look should consider action not to add more shingles to a leaky roof until the rafters collapse but the elimination of controls until, like the chambered nautilus, we at last may find a free agriculture.

It is for this reason that I propose to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the next few days excerpts from talks given at the Spokane farm forum. Farm forums provide a sounding board

that could be of great use to those of us who are responsible for initiating, servicing and correcting any farm legislation that may be upon the Federal statutes. They are held in many parts of the United States. The farm forums at Des Moines and Minneapolis are of long standing. The one I attended at Spokane is younger—the one held this week being their fourth annual farm forum. But it was well-attended and provided a sounding board for at least seven of the Pacific Northwest States. Among the speakers was our own Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, who spoke to the banquet last Monday evening, and I believe it is significant to say that at least 500 people who wanted to hear the Secretary had to be turned away for lack of space. Another speaker at the farm forum was Dr. O. B. Jesness, Chief of the Division of Agricultural Economics at the University of Minnesota. Dr. Jesness is perhaps the dean of all of our agricultural economists in the United States. Mr. Robert C. Liebenow, the youngest president of the Chicago Board of Trade in history, also spoke as did Anthony B. Sparboe, vice president of Pillsbury Mills, and Dr. Bottum, agricultural economist from Purdue University, J. Earl Coke, vice president of the Bank of America, and former head of the Federal Extension Service, Mr. W. B. Camp, a farmer with interests in both South Carolina and California, and many others.

I do hope that my colleagues if they are interested in a reflection of the problems, constructive criticisms and, perhaps, some possible solutions of agriculture's afflictions, will read these insertions as they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

## AMENDING THE SECURITIES ACT TO PROVIDE INVESTORS ADDITIONAL PROTECTION

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to amend subsection (b) of section 3 of the Securities Act of 1933, to provide that responsible officers or other persons shall be liable in damages on account of untrue statements or material omission in statements or documents filed under such subsection as a condition of exemption from the registration provisions of the act.

This bill is identical to H. R. 9319, which I introduced in the 84th Congress. Extensive hearings were held on this legislation by the Commerce and Finance Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The subcommittee and the entire committee reported this bill favorably to the House. The Rules Committee also approved it and scheduled it for debate. However, there was not sufficient time left during the remainder of the 84th Congress to get this bill considered by the House and the Senate. So it was not brought up for debate.

As I explained in a speech on the floor of the House on July 27, 1956—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 13820—a large segment of American investors, principally small investors, are being solicited to invest their savings in securities which are exempted from the registration provisions pursuant to section 3 (b) of the Securities Act. The public offerings pursuant to this exemption have been substantial and amount to approximately $250 million annually. Investors in such securities are admittedly not receiving adequate protection against false and misleading statements made in the selling literature on the basis of which the public is being solicited to invest its savings.

It is for the purpose of providing investors in these exempted securities with additional protection that I introduced H. R. 9319 in the 84th Congress, and am reintroducing it today. This legislation would impose certain liabilities on those who are responsible for making false and misleading statements with respect to the securities being offered. The imposition of such liabilities would result in the exercise of greater care and diligence by those who prepare these statements. It would result in more accurate disclosure of information regarding the securities being offered publicly. My proposal now takes on added significance in view of the fact that a bill has been introduced in the Senate—S. 843—which proposes to raise the exemption from the presently permissible limit of $300,000 to $500,000, in line with the recommendation of the President's Committee on Small Business.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that a prospective investor in securities has a right to adequate and accurate information concerning the securities he is asked to buy. I believe that the Congress owes a duty to the public to see that such investor gets the additional protection provided for in my bill, which he does not now have. It is for these reasons that I shall press for early consideration of my bill.

## EQUALIZATION OF RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1957, I introduced H. R. 689, entitled "A bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942—56th United States Statutes at Large, page 368." By the indulgence of the House, it is now my privilege to explain the purpose and import of this bill. It is a short bill, and I shall make my explanation similarly short.

First, let me emphasize that this bill neither expands nor otherwise amends the intent of Congress when it enacted this measure originally in 1942, nor its intent in its reenactment in the Career Compensation Act of 1949. My bill would serve simply to restate the plain intent of the Congress that there shall be no discrimination between regulars and reserves with comparable service. That intent has been both confirmed and denied by conflicting administrative and legal decisions, and as it remains therefore in doubt this bill appears needful to terminate this confusion.

First. Paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942—56th United States Statutes at Large, page 368—is the only portion of the 1942 act which remains in force, and it reads as follows:

> The retired pay of any officer of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, hereafter retired under any provision of law, shall, unless such officer is entitled to retired pay of a higher grade, be 75 percent of his active-duty pay at the time of his retirement.

This provision was reenacted by exception from repeal by section 531 (b) (34) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949—63d United States Statutes at Large, page 302—when it was clearly and almost exclusively applicable to officers of the Reserve components with World War I service.

Second. The Congress has repeatedly said that there shall be no discrimination between regulars and reserves with comparable service. Notwithstanding this long-established policy and the clear, unambiguous words effectuating it, the administrative agencies have persistently applied the 1942 law and its 1949 reenactment only to Regular officers. Evidence is clear and unequivocal, and includes statements of two Senators who served on the committee of the Senate which drafted this measure in 1942, including the chairman of the subcommittee which was charged with it, that it was intended to apply without discrimination to Reserve as well as Regular officers with World War I service.

Third. H. R. 689 reads as follows:

> Paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368) is clarified to read as follows:
>
> "The retired pay of any officer of the Armed Forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, heretofore or hereafter retired with pay under any provision of law, shall, unless such officer is entitled to retired pay of a higher grade, be 75 percent of the active duty pay of his rank and length of service."

Fourth. The only purpose of this bill is to clarify the 1942 law—and its 1949 reenactment—and to confirm the expressed will of Congress. Neither the intent of Congress nor the legal significance of the 1942 and 1949 acts is changed. The words "the Armed Forces of the United States" have been substituted for "the services mentioned in the title of this act" because all of the 1942 act except this paragraph 4 of section 15 has been repealed, and the substitution is the more modern terminology. The words "including the Reserve components thereof" have been added to spell out the intent of Congress in terms which cannot be abro-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

gated. The words "heretofore or" have been restored to be consistent with section 513 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. The words "with pay" have been inserted to insure that only those officers—Regulars and Reserves—who have otherwise qualified for retirement under a general law are within its provisions. The words "at the time of his retirement" have been replaced by "of his rank and length of service" to make certain that all retired officers will get the benefit of increased pay scales enacted after his retirement without the necessity for special legislation.

Fifth. There are about 7,000 Reserve officers, otherwise qualified for retirement, who are entitled to 75 percent special retired pay for World War I service. By actuarial computation, they are dying off at the rate of about one a day, and nearly all will be gone within the next 25 years. The average annual cost as to them will be approximately $6,956,400. This cost was anticipated by Congress when the law was passed in 1942 and reenacted in 1949.

Sixth. The enactment of this bill will be one more step toward equalization between Regulars and Reserves, as so long and frequently and expressly stated to be the will of the Congress.

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, or any of its subcommittees, may have permission to sit during general debate in the sessions of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## ADJOURNMENT OVER — PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF FEBRUARY 18

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, will the gentleman give us the program for next week as far as he has it?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be very happy to.

Monday: Under suspension of the rules, H. R. 348, a bill to amend the enabling acts of Montana, Washington, and North and South Dakota.

Tuesday: The Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for 1958.

Wednesday and Thursday: H. R. 4090, the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1957; House Joint Resolution 209, a stopgap relief bill relating to FNMA mortgages; H. R. 1056, the military substandard housing bill.

Friday: George Washington's Farewell Address will be read.

Any further program will be announced as it develops.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, can tell us when the bill to suspend Britain's payment of $82 million on the debt she owes us will be called up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Aside from newspaper comments, this is the first direct information I have had come to my attention that legislation might be necessary. I am sorry I am unable to advise my friend; I have no knowledge as to its status or as to whether legislation is required. I can assure the gentleman that it will not come up next week.

Mr. GROSS. But the gentleman will assure us so that we will have plenty of time before the bill is called up?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman knows that the gentleman from Massachusetts always cooperates with him and all other Members.

Mr. GROSS. I am very much interested in where the money is now and whether we are going to get it.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## EMPLOYMENT OF TWO ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

House Resolution 165

*Resolved*, That, effective February 15, 1957, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the basic rate of $2,460 per annum each, for the employment of 2 assistant legislative clerks, 1 for the office of the majority floor leader and 1 for the office of the minority floor leader, respectively.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ISRAEL—A VALUABLE ALLY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, reliable reports of new Soviet shipments of tanks, jet planes, and other armaments to Egypt in violation of the United Nations cease-fire resolution of November 2, are spurring the realization everywhere that the Middle East crisis is getting worse, not better, and that in spite of assurances from the administration, we are rapidly losing control of the situation. Let us not ignore that we are responsible for a major share of the difficulty in which we now find ourselves. We cannot go on making enemies of our friends and appeasing our enemies, and thereby hope to prevent war. Every day brings fresh evidence that the administration will have to do something better than try to muddle through with a policy of bluff, bluster, and blunder.

One victim of that policy is Israel, and Secretary Dulles' threat to give serious consideration to sanctions against Israel is another of those incredible aberrations that have convulsed American foreign policy under his administration. Who can forget the international storms whipped up in the past by his threat of massive retaliation, his boast of carrying America to the brink of war, and his recent slur at the soldiers of Great Britain and France?

Now, the mounting storm of criticism and protest that his reckless, irresponsible statement against Israel has stirred up is a tribute to the American public for its sense of justice and fair play. All across the country voices are rising against the shameful spectacle of the United States bringing economic pressure against little Israel because that struggling democracy has the courage to insist on the right to live in peace and security. We cannot, and we should not, deny Israel the right to demand that Egypt stop making war against its people by raids and blockades.

Indeed, we should be the ones to make that demand on Israel's behalf and to insist that Egypt end the state of belligerency which she claims as justification for her warlike acts against Israel. We should be demanding commitments from Colonel Nasser and insisting that the United Nations Emergency Force remain in full control of Sinai until Egypt agrees to make peace.

We ourselves are responsible for the Middle East crisis because the administration doesn't have the courage to tackle the basic problems of the area. Dulles' brinkmanship is no substitute for genuine statesmanship; and no one-sided, ad hoc, catch-as-catch-can policy that flaunts advertising slogans and diplomatic clichés in place of sound, carefully thought through programs and long-range plans is going to see us through this crisis successfully.

The United Nations is spending many millions to clear up the sabotage that Colonel Nasser did to the Suez Canal, and within the next few weeks the canal will be open to shipping once more. We are turning it over to Colonel Nasser without having obtained any agreement from him to keep the Suez an international waterway, open to the shipping of all nations without discrimination. We picked up this dictator, dusted him off after the thorough defeat he suffered because his war against Israel boomeranged, and put him back in power without asking him for as much as a promise of good behavior.

There is no reason to believe that Colonel Nasser has been chastened by his shattering defeat. On the contrary, there is every indication that he may use this newly restored power to bar British, French, and Israeli ships from the Suez if this serves his political purpose. He has given no commitments to the United Nations nor to our Government that international shipping will go through the Suez Canal as a matter of right rather

than his tolerance. Do we then propose to permit Egypt to take over complete control of the canal when it is opened in the next few weeks? Colonel Nasser has successfully defied the Security Council resolution of September 1, 1951; there is every reason to believe that he will prove more stubborn and recalcitrant in his illegal blockades now.

We have no moral justification for insisting that Israel withdraw from Gaza and Sharm-el-Sheikh unless we first obtain from Colonel Nasser a commitment to end Egypt's belligerency. The United Nations should guarantee Israel against blockades and border raids not only as a matter of simple justice but in fulfillment of its own resolution of November 2, 1956. The numerous incidents that occurred during the years when Egyptian guns commanded the Straits of Tiran and thus blockaded the Gulf of Aqaba demonstrate Colonel Nasser's complete disregard for international law. This was an illegal blockade because the Straits of Tiran is an international waterway which, under international law, should be open to the ships of all nations.

The United Nations Charter to which Egypt adheres calls on members of the United Nations to settle their international disputes by peaceful means. Egypt and the other Arab States, which are also members of the United Nations, stand in open violation of the charter by their acts of belligerency against Israel.

I cannot conceive that there is one law for Israel and another for Egypt in the United Nations, one law for the little and one law for the big. The United Nations has never voted sanctions in all the years of its existence in spite of the fact that its resolutions have been defied by Egypt, by all the Arab States, by the Soviet Union, and by India. Any such action would be a distortion of the aims and principles of the charter and would mark the beginning of the end for the United Nations. Thus not only is it shocking to find our Secretary of State willing even to contemplate sanctions against Israel, it will also be the greatest tragedy of our times if the United States were to lend its great prestige and support to any move for sanctions against a fellow member of the United Nations. The United Nations itself would pay the greatest price.

It is fantastic to find our country in this untenable position, and one can only hope that the administration will extricate itself from this latest extraordinary blunder without destroying the United Nations in the process.

It is time that we stopped being frightened by false stereotypes and propaganda clichés about the Arabs and the Middle East. The illusion of a united, all-powerful Arab world ready to act as one force in a holy war against the outsider has been shattered by the events since October 29. Words like colonialism, imperialism, and Arab nationalism have taken on an unwarranted power to frighten and intimidate. Moreover, we ought to no longer be taken in by population statistics that cannot stand the light of day. This applies especially to our Secretary of State who did not hesitate to wave the figure of 40 million Arabs over the heads of Congress when he was testifying early last year on our failure to aid Israel. How can 2 million Israelis hope to stand against 40 million Arabs, ran the argument in those days. Who has counted these 40 million? No one knows what the Arab population is. Our State Department experts have themselves pointed out that there has not been a census of the Arab people since the time of Julius Caesar.

Another bogyman that is brought out from time to time is the mandate that an estimated 22 million Egyptians are alleged to have given Colonel Nasser. We are warned about his great popular support, but we fail to recognize that Egypt and other Arab governments are run and controlled by small cliques of self-seeking, power-hungry demagogues with no mass support or roots in the people whatsoever. There are no political parties in Arab countries that resemble our own concept of a political party in any manner. We should be dealing with realities, not specters.

Vast sums of money have been paid to Arab countries as royalties for their oil, but almost none of this gets to the poverty-stricken peasant. In Egypt, in Syria, in Saudi Arabia, and in Iraq, the fellaheen live in a grinding poverty that is beyond our ability to describe and our capacity to comprehend. Yet these countries have not hesitated to come to us for additional millions of dollars in aid—American tax dollars which the administration plans to give to these Arab rulers in the form of guns, tanks, and planes.

The agreement which we recently concluded with slaveholding King Saud calls for the shipment of many million dollars of American arms over a period of 5 years and the doubling of Saud's army. No one has told the American public that we would be starting an arms race all over again by such arms shipments, that they would upset the policy of maintaining a rough balance of arms between Israel and the Arab States, and that we would be stirring up fears of Saudi expansionist ambitions among the British-protected states along the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean. We should take note that last year Saudi Arabia collected almost $300 million from American oil companies. And despite a Senate resolution deploring Saud's discrimination against Americans on the basis of their religion, the administration is again yielding to this infamous practice. Freedom of religion. Not for Americans on an American military base in Saudi Arabia. As Americans, we must share this shame.

The policy of arming the Arab rulers which was begun by this administration is one of the major factors in the Middle East crisis and a contributory reason for the state in which we now find ourselves. This policy was responsible for stirring up the rivalry between Iraq and Egypt to a new high pitch and tempted Colonel Nasser to open the gates of the Middle East to the Soviet Union, thus giving the Kremlin the opportunity she had been seeking in vain for more than a century. The extent of Communist penetration of Egypt, the large numbers of so-called technicians, and the vast stores of Soviet-bloc arms that were built up in Egypt shocked the free world when they were exposed by the Israeli sweep across the Sinai.

Today we are witnessing the beginning of another Soviet buildup in Egypt. If we continue to treat Colonel Nasser with kid gloves, we will be derelict in our defense of the free world, and all our fine words about resisting Communist aggression will be exposed as empty bluster. Whether or not Colonel Nasser is a tool in the hands of Communist masters is idle speculation. The plain hard fact is that he was playing the Kremlin's game long before our State Department experts woke up to the fact. For over 2 years Cairo radio and Moscow have been speaking with one voice, carrying on aggressive psychological warfare against Israel and the West. Directed by Nazi exiles who once worked under Goebbels, Cairo radio is the most powerful voice in the Middle East and Africa today, and its 12 transmitters hurl a daily barrage of subversive propaganda in a war of nerves against Great Britain, the United States, France, Israel, Iraq, and Turkey.

By using the modern techniques of subversion and all the devices of propaganda, as well as by sea blockade and by guerrilla warfare, Egypt has been an effective spearhead of Communist aggression in the Middle East. It was Egypt that started the guerrilla attacks against the British forces in the Suez and finally led Britain to withdraw entirely from the canal, a move by which she gave up control of her lifeline to the East and in which the United States played a decisive role. It was Egypt that encouraged the North Africans to rise against France, and it was Egypt under Colonel Nasser which, with Soviet inspiration, engineered the expulsion of Glubb Pasha, the British strong man in Jordan and the founder of its famous Arab Legion. Let us not forget that it was Colonel Nasser who undermined the Jordan Government with American dollars borrowed from Saudi Arabia's oil royalties and set his henchmen in control. And while he hoodwinked our State Department with sweet talk about a social revolution and raising the living standards of his impoverished countrymen, Colonel Nasser opened fire on the American-sponsored Baghdad Pact with deadly effectiveness and set up his own counteralliances along the Arabian southern tier.

At the same time Colonel Nasser stepped up the war that Egypt was waging against Israel. Israeli leaders made concrete offers of peace, including provision for a free port at Haifa, duty-free transit to Jordan and the release of $8,500,000 of Arab funds frozen in Israel banks, but Colonel Nasser responded by developing an extensive spy and sabotage network on Israeli territory. Early in 1955, Israeli army intelligence disclosed that 24 Egyptian agents had been caught in 1954, and that 10 had been killed. Egyptian fedayeen attacks mounted in frequency from bases along the Gaza Strip, and the sea blockades of Suez and Aqaba grew in intensity with consequences that resulted finally in the hostilities of October 29.

Colonel Nasser was finished both politically and militarily as a result of his defeat at the hands of Israel but we

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

rescued him politically and put him back in power, while the Kremlin is now restoring his military power. We did it deliberately and at the expense of our traditional allies and friends, Great Britain, France and Israel. We did it without conditions despite the fact that we were no longer under any illusions about the kind of person the Egyptian dictator is. And we did nothing when Colonel Nasser took on more and more of the trappings of a Hitler. His persecution of Egyptian Jews, many of whom are stateless even though they are native born, the roundups that follow the Nazi pattern of closing off a part of the city, one block at a time, and then sending troopers on night raids through each house and each apartment picking up innocent victims and shipping them to concentration camps, the expropriations of property and finally the deportations—these are the signs of a tragedy most of us remember too well. Fifty thousand Egyptian Jews watched helplessly when these persecutions began, and so far more than 6,500 Jews have been robbed and deported, some without even a chance to bid their families farewell. The decrees published in the Egyptian press warn those still in Egypt that their days are numbered.

Not only Jews but Christians too are being persecuted in Colonel Nasser's drive to "Egyptianize" his country. In the pattern established by totalitarian dictators, he has followed his drive on the Jews by expropriating the property of all Western business establishments and closing all French and British schools. Great Britain, France, and Israel have all protested to the United Nations against this violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and our Government has expressed its grave concern, but that is all.

There should be no doubt in anyone's mind that we cannot appease Colonel Nasser. We ought to wake up to the fact that we are permitting Egyptian troops and Communist armor to go back to the positions they formerly occupied, where Nasser can start a new round of hostilities. It is still not too late to mend our damaged relations with Britain and France, and help make Israel secure against Communist aggression.

It is time we woke up to the harsh reality that the Middle East would long ago have been lost to communism if Israel had not stood firmly across the Egyptian dictator's path. There is every reason to believe that Syria, Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Iraq would by now have fallen to Colonel Nasser if it had not been for Israel. The economic dislocation that Europe is suffering now is a mild tremor compared to the financial catastrophe and military collapse that would follow if Colonel Nasser controlled Arabian oil as well as the Suez Canal. Our own security would be hanging in the balance.

Israel has been standing between Europe and a Communist-puppet controlled Middle East. Instead of appeasing Colonel Nasser we should be strengthening Israel. Instead of cutting off all economic and technical aid to Israel as we are doing and threatening to support United Nations sanctions against her, we should be working at top speed in full cooperation with Israel to restore peace and stability through direct Arab-Israel negotiations. The full weight of our prestige and power ought to be behind this effort now because only if there is peace between the Arab States and Israel can we concentrate on the job of keeping communism out. With peace there will be freedom of the seas, and a start on such vast projects as the Johnston plan for the development of the Jordan Valley. With peace there will come further programs to resettle the Arab refugees and restore these unfortunate men and women to full, productive lives.

The measure of Israel's strength is the measure of our own strength in the Middle East, and we play directly into Communist hands whenever we reinforce her enemies.

If the assurances that Secretary Dulles is reported to have given Monday to the Ambassador of Israel can be considered more than a face-saving device, then they will be a welcome step in the right direction. A guaranty by the United States that it will insist on free navigation through the Gulf of Aqaba can be meaningful if it is implemented in the United Nations by clear, firm measures leading to the establishment of peace. One such measure which would be imperative to the restoration of the rule of international law is a commitment by Egypt to renounce its state of belligerency against Israel. This must follow if our guaranty of the principle of free international waterways is a firm undertaking. Under those circumstances, we can look forward to the world's strongest democracy marching together with the youngest democracy in the quest for a lasting peace in the Middle East.

Those of us who are at all conscious of the way history is made—and who is there today who has not had this consciousness impressed upon him?—must recognize that a new era has begun in the Middle East and in the history of the world. This is an era filled with pitfalls and dangers of enormous proportions, but it is also a period of great hopes and tremendous potentialities for the good of all mankind. The Middle East can make a worthy contribution to that future if the Arab countries can be brought to work together with Israel and the West in a vast program of regional cooperation, economic progress and the development of human and natural resources. Not by force and threats but upon the determination of our country and its people rests in great part the strength of the United Nations, and upon the effectiveness of the United Nations rests the hope of the world for peace between Israel and her neighbors and between East and West.

---

## THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY introduced a bill on Thursday, February 7, 1957, to extend coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act. This bill covers the subject matter recommended to the Congress by both the President of the United States and by many interested groups. It is a matter of such far-reaching import to the constituents of nearly every Member of Congress that I asked for and have received an explanation of the bill, H. R. 4575, both in summary and in a section-by-section analysis. I trust it will be of service to my colleagues.

EXPLANATION OF BILL TO EXTEND THE COVERAGE OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT, H. R. 4575

The coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act would be extended under the bill to million- of low-paid workers now denied its protection (a) by relaxing certain restrictive definitions now contained in the act; (b) by basing coverage on activity engaged in by the employer rather than on activity engaged in by an individual employee as is now the case under the act; (c) by extending the act's protection to employees wherever an employer is engaged in any "activity affecting commerce"; and (d) by eliminating 8 exemptions now in the act and tightening and clarifying the remaining 7 exemptions.

The bill does not raise the minimum wage nor make any changes in the maximum number of weekly hours of work that are permissible under the Fair Labor Standards Act without payment of overtime compensation, nor does it change methods of computing overtime prescribed in the act.

Proposals to raise the minimum wage from its present level of $1 an hour to $1.25 an hour, and to reduce the maximum workweek from its present level of 40 hours to 37½ hours after 2 years, and to 35 hours after 4 years are contained in separate bills.

A section-by-section explanation and analysis of the Fair Labor Standards Act coverage bill follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

*Section 1. Title*

This section simply sets forth the proposed official title of the proposed bill, namely, "The Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1957."

*Section 2. Findings and declaration of policy*

This section amends the Findings and Declaration of Policy contained in section 2 of the present Fair Labor Standards Act by making clear that "labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standards of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers" ought to be corrected and as rapidly as practicable eliminated, not only in "industries enaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce," as now provided in the act, but also in "industries engaged in * * * any activity affecting commerce" where some 13,500,000 workers now excluded from the act are employed. The act is to be applied broadly and liberally in such a way as to effectuate the carrying out of its remedial and humanitarian purposes, "subject only to the limitations expressly prescribed in this act," in order to bring as many of these workers as possible within the coverage of the act.

*Section 3. Definitions*

Subsection (a) of this section amends the definition of the term "produced" contained in section 3 (j) of the present Fair Labor Standards Act to read as it did before the

1949 amendments to the act were enacted. Prior to these amendments "produced" was defined as including, not only production of goods itself, but also "any process or occupation necessary to the production thereof." In 1949 this phrase was amended to read, "any closely related process or occupation directly essential to the production thereof", with the result that workers were excluded from the protection of the act if their work was not in a process "closely related" or in an occupation "directly essential" to production. This restrictive change would be revoked by H. R. 4575, and the original language of section 3 (j) of the act would be restored.

Subsection (b) of section 3 amends the definition of "wage" contained in section 3 (m) of the present Fair Labor Standards Act by adding to it a new, clarifying proviso. Under the present law, the reasonable cost, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, of board, lodging, or other facilities customarily furnished by an employer to his employees is included in the employees' wages for the purpose of determining whether they have been paid in compliance with the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the act. The proposed proviso specifies that the cost of such facilities is not to be taken into account "if the furnishing of such facilities is an incident of and necessary to * * * employment and such facilities are practicably available only from the employer."

Subsection (c) of section 3 adds a number of new definitions to section 3 of the present Fair Labor Standards Act. Each of them must be read in conjunction with changes that the bill proposes to make in other sections of the act.

Paragraph (p) must be read together with the changes proposed to be made in the basic provisions of the act dealing with minimum wages, maximum hours, and child labor. It proposes a new basis of coverage by these provisions. Its effect is to extend the protection of the standards provided for in the act, not only to employees who are "engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce", but also to employees who are employed by an employer who is "engaged in any activity affecting commerce". As defined in this paragraph, "activity affecting commerce" includes "any activity in commerce, necessary to commerce, or competing with any activity in commerce, or where the payment of wages below those prescribed by this act burdens or obstructs or tends to burden or obstruct commerce or the free flow of goods in commerce". This definition is substantially similar to that contained in the National Labor Relations Act, and the effect of its inclusion is to make the basic coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act substantially similar to the coverage of that act.

Paragraphs (q), (r), and (s) define three new terms which are used in the revised exemption applicable to employees employed in agriculture which is proposed in section 8 (a) of the bill (see clause (5), p. 4). Read in this context, these terms are designed to distinguish between the large-scale industrialized types of agricultural enterprises whose employees would be brought within the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the small or family operated farms that would continue to be exempt from the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the act. Paragraph (q) defines the term, "hired farm labor" as including the labor of any person employed on a farm, "except the labor of the farmer and his immediate family". Paragraph (r) defines a "farm enterprise" as comprising "all tracts of land, whether contiguous or not, under one management, located in a county and immediately adjacent counties" on which farm operations, as defined in section 3 (f) of the act, are carried on. Paragraph (s) defines the term "man-day" as meaning "any day on which hired farm labor is performed".

The term "American vessel", which is defined in paragraph (t), is used in the revised exemptions applicable to seamen which are proposed in section 8 of the bill (see clause 7, subsection (a), and clause (3), subsection (b), p. 4). As defined in this paragraph, the term includes any vessel defined as a "vessel of the United States" under title 18, United States Code, section 9, or which is "documented or numbered under the laws of the United States". Vessels of the United States, as defined in the code section referred to, are not limited to vessels belonging to the United States, but include vessels belonging to any citizen of the United States or to any corporation created by or under the laws of the United States, or of any State, Territory, District, or possession of the United States.

*Section 4. Special industry committees for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands*

This section amends section 5 of the present Fair Labor Standards Act to authorize the appointment of special industry committees to recommend the minimum rate or rates of wages to be paid under section 6 of the act to employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands who are employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise where their employer is engaged in any activity affecting commerce. Taken together with sections 5 (c) and 7 (a) of the bill, this section applies to the fixing of minimum wage rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands the same coverage tests, based on activities of the employer, rather than activities of the employees, as the bill applies to the minimum wage, maximum hours, and child labor provisions of the act (see sections 5 (a), 6 (a), and 8 of the bill). The present tests of coverage, based on whether the employee is "engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce", however, would also be retained.

*Section 5. Minimum wages*

This section amends section 6, the basic minimum-wage provision, of the present Fair Labor Standards Act in three respects: (1) It extends the coverage of the minimum-wage provisions to employees who are employed by any employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce; and (2) it makes wage orders applicable to employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands who are employed by any employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce.

Subsection (a) provides that the minimum wage prescribed by section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act shall be paid, not only by every employer to each of his employees who is "engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce," but also by every employer who is "engaged in any activity affecting commerce" to each of his employees who is "employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise where his employer is so engaged. It thus adds to the present coverage tests based on each individual employee's activity a new test based on the activity which is being engaged in by his employer. If the employer is engaged in any activity affecting commerce, his employees employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise where he is so engaged will be covered by the minimum wage provisions of the act, regardless of the activity in which the individual employees may be engaged.

Although some 6,700,000 workers are denied the protection of the minimum-wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act at the present time as a result of specific exemptions contained in section 13 (a) of the act, more than twice this number are excluded, because they do not meet the present tests of being "engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce." Even if all exemptions were eliminated from the act, these workers, numbering more than 13,500,000, would still be excluded from the protection of the act unless action is taken to broaden the basic coverage so as to bring them within its protection. In the case of retail workers, for example, elimination of the retail exemptions might bring approximately 1,140,000 of these workers under the act. The status of more than 5,500,000 retail workers who are excluded, because they do not qualify under the tests of basic coverage now contained in the act would not, however, be changed. A change in the basic coverage of the act, along the lines proposed in the bill, is necessary for this purpose.

It has been estimated that the changes in basic coverage and exemptions proposed in the bill will bring within the protection of the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act some 9,652,000 workers who are now denied this protection. The types of employment in which these workers are engaged, and the numbers of employees engaged in each type of employment, are as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Retailing and service (including laundry and cleaning) | 3,960,000 |
| Outside salesmen | 1,351,000 |
| Agriculture | 1,500,000 |
| Construction | 1,400,000 |
| Wholesaling | 242,000 |
| Hotels and inns | 235,000 |
| Agricultural processing | 233,000 |
| Finance and insurance and real estate | 117,000 |
| Seamen | 117,000 |
| Small logging operations | 110,000 |
| Mining and manufacturing | 101,000 |
| Local transit companies | 80,000 |
| Small newspapers | 32,000 |
| Seafood processing | 26,000 |
| Taxicab companies | 20,000 |
| Small telephone exchanges | 18,000 |
| Miscellaneous | 210,000 |
| Total | 9,652,000 |

Subsection (b) of section 5 amends section 6 (c) of the present Fair Labor Standards Act, which gives effect to minimum wage rates specified in special industry wage orders in the case of employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Under the provisions of the bill, these rates are extended to employees "employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise" where their employer is "engaged in any activity affecting commerce." These rates will, of course, continue to apply to each employee who is "engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce."

*Section 6. Maximum hours*

This section amends section 7, the basic maximum hours provision, of the present Fair Labor Standards Act in three respects: (1) It extends the coverage of the maximum hours provisions to employees who are employed by any employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce; (2) it repeals the 14 workweek exemption from the maximum hours provisions which is applicable under the present act to workers employed in industries of a seasonal nature; and (3) it also repeals the exemptions from the maximum hours provisions which are applicable under the present act to employees engaged in various types of processing of farm commodities.

Subsection (a) extends the coverage of the maximum hours provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to employees who are employed by any employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce in exactly the same way in which the minimum-wage provisions would be extended to such employees, as explained in the discussion of section 5 (a) of the bill above.

Subsection (b) strikes out of the Fair Labor Standards Act the provision contained in section 7 (b) (3) thereof, by which em-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ployers are exempted from compliance with the maximum hours provision "for a period or periods of not more than fourteen workweeks in the aggregate in any calendar year in an industry found by the Secretary of Labor to be of a seasonal nature." The only overtime exemptions will be in section 13 (b).

Subsection (c) strikes out of the Fair Labor Standards Act the provisions contained in section 7 (c) thereof, by which employers engaged in certain agricultural processing operations enjoy total or partial exemptions from the act's maximum-hours provisions. As noted above, the only overtime exemptions to be continued under the bill will be in section 13 (b).

*Section 7. Wage orders in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands*

This section provides that it is the policy of the Fair Labor Standards Act with respect to industries in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands to reach as rapidly as is economically feasible without substantially curtailing employment the minimum wage level specified in section 6 (a) (1) of the act, which is currently $1 an hour, not only in the case of industries engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, but also in the case of industries engaged in any activity affecting commerce. Special industry committees appointed by the Secretary of Labor under section 5 of the act would be authorized to recommend the minimum rate or rates of wages to be paid under section 6 of the act by employers in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands who are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce or who are engaged in any activity affecting commerce.

*Section 8. Child labor provisions*

This section extends the coverage of the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to employers who are engaged in any activity affecting commerce in substantially the same way in which the minimum wage provisions are extended to the employees of such employers, as explained in the discussion of section 5 (a) of the bill above. It amends section 12 (c) of the act to provide that it shall not only be unlawful for an employer to employ oppressive child labor in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, but it shall also be unlawful for any employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce to employ any oppressive child labor in or about or in connection with any enterprise where he is so engaged. Oppressive child labor, for purposes of section 12 of the act, is defined in section 3 (l) of the act.

*Section 9. Exemptions*

This section amends section 13 of the present Fair Labor Standards Act which contains numerous exemptions from the minimum wage, maximum hours, and child labor provisions of the act.

Subsection (a) strikes out eight of the exemptions from the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act that are now provided for in section 13 (a) of the act. These eight exemptions are the following:

(a) Clause (4), applicable to employees of certain retail establishments processing goods;

(b) Clause (8), applicable to employees of certain weekly, semiweekly, and daily newspapers;

(c) Clause (9), applicable to employees of local transit companies;

(d) Clause (10), applicable to employees engaged in certain agricultural processing operations within the "area of production";

(e) Clause (11), applicable to switchboard operators employed in public telephone exchanges having up to 750 stations;

(f) Clause (12), applicable to employees of taxicab companies;

(g) Clause (13), applicable to employees in retail or service establishments engaged in handling telegraphic messages under an agency or contract arrangement with a telegraph company; and

(h) Clause (15), applicable to employees of small logging operations.

Subsection (a) also renumbers the remaining 7 clauses of section 13 (a) of the present Fair Labor Standards Act that would be retained. Thus renumbered, clauses (1), (2), (3), (5), (6), (7), and (14) would become clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7), respectively.

Finally, subsection (a) amends these clauses as follows:

1. Clause (1) eliminates the present exemption for outside salesmen.

2. Clause (2) eliminates the exemption for employees of chain or large independent retail and service enterprises and for employees of enterprises in the selling and service fields that do an essentially nonretail business, even though they do make some retail sales or perform some retail service functions. The exemption would be limited to employees employed in a retail or service establishment "by an employer having neither more than four such establishments nor more than a total annual dollar volume of sales of goods or services of $500,000." An establishment would be deemed to be a "retail or service establishment," for purposes of this exemption, only if not more than 25 percent of its annual dollar volume of sales of goods or services is for resale or is made to customers who are engaged in a mining, manufacturing, transportation, commercial, or communications business. Under the proposed bill, however, the small corner grocery store, cleaning and pressing establishment, neighborhood drugstore, and the like, would continue to be exempt.

3. Clause (3) revises the exemption applicable to employees of laundering, cleaning, and repairing establishments in a manner substantially similar to that in which the exemption applicable to employees of retail and service establishments is proposed to be revised. Employees of the large industrial and commercial laundries and cleaning establishments would no longer be denied the protection of the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The small home laundry, however, would continue to be exempt.

4. Clause (4) eliminates the present exemption applicable to fish and seafood processing (fish and seafood canning are already covered by the minimum wage, but exempt from the maximum hours, provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act), but retains the exemption applicable to fishing and gathering of seafood and other aquatic forms of animal or vegetable life.

5. Clause (5) limits the exemption for employees employed in agriculture so as to bring within the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act employees of large, industrialized agricultural enterprises, while leaving the small, farmer-operated farm exempt. The exemption would be limited to employees employed during any calendar quarter by a farm enterprise which used less than 400 man-days of hired farm labor during each of the preceding four quarters other than labor performed by members of the family of a farmer-operated enterprise.

6. Clause (6) continues without change the exemption included in the present law for learners, apprentices, and handicapped workers pursuant to orders issued by the Secretary of Labor under section 14 of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

7. Clause (7) eliminates the exemption for seamen employed on American vessels which is now contained in the law. It also provides that the compensation these employees receive must amount to not less than the minimum hourly rate prescribed in section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act for all hours during which they are actually on duty (not including off-duty hours aboard ship when they render no service). Seamen on other than American vessels continue to be exempt from both the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the act. Under subsection (b), seamen on American vessels are exempt from the maximum hours provisions.

Subsection (b) strike out three of the exemptions from the maximum hours provisions that are now contained in section 13 (b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act. These three exemptions are the following:

(a) Clause (1), applicable to motor-vehicle employees subject to section 204 of the Motor Carrier Act of 1935;

(b) Clause (4), applicable to employees engaged in canning fish, shellfish, or other aquatic forms of animal or vegetable life, or byproducts thereof; and

(c) Clause (5) applicable to outside buyers of poultry, eggs, cream, or milk, in the raw or natural state.

Subsection (b) also renumbers the two remaining clauses of section 13 (b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act that would be retained. Thus renumbered, clauses (2) and (3) would become clauses (1) and (2). A new clause (3) would be added. The new clauses (1), (2), and (3) would provide as follows:

1. Clause (1) exempts from the maximum hours provisions employees of express, sleeping car, refrigerator car, and railroad carrier companies subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act;

2. Clause (2) continues to exempt from the maximum hours provisions employees of carriers by air subject to title II of the Railway Labor Act; and

3. Clause (3) exempts from the maximum hours provisions seamen employed on American vessels (see discussion of proposed revised clause (7) of section 13 (a) of the act, above).

Subsection (c) amends the exemptions from the child-labor provisions contained in section 13 (c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Aside from minor language changes, its principal effect is to limit the exemption for children employed in agriculture to those who are employed on small, farmer-operated farms. Such employees may be employed only outside school hours for the school district where they are living while so employed. The exemption for children employed as actors or performers in motion pictures or theatrical productions, or in radio or television productions, which is contained in section 13 (c) of the present act, is continued.

Subsection (d) continues the exemption from the minimum wage, maximum hours, and child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act which is now applicable to employees engaged in the delivery of newspapers to the consumer, but specifies that such delivery to the consumer must be at his residence. An exemption from the child-labor provisions would also be provided for employees otherwise engaged in the delivery of newspapers to consumers, for example, as newsboys, but only if they are more than 16 years of age and are so employed outside of school hours for the school district where they are living while so employed.

The special exemption for American Samoa in section 13 (e) is not affected by the bill.

*Section 10. Effective date*

This section specifies that the changes in the Fair Labor Standards Act proposed in the bill shall take effect 90 days from the date of the bill's enactment.

## LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may

extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanians form one of the oldest ethnic groups in Europe. More than 700 years ago they established an independent state in northeastern Europe, and they had grand and glorious days. Late in the 18th century, however, Lithuania was annexed to Russia. But the liberty-loving and independent-minded Lithuanians were never reconciled to the Czarist regime, and during the First World War when that regime collapsed, they saw their dream come true. On February 16, 1918, they proclaimed their national political independence anew, and set up their own democratic form of government. Soon that government was recognized by other governments, and in due time Lithuania was admitted into the League of Nations. In the course of two decades industrious and patriotic Lithuanians made their homeland a prosperous, progressive, and happy land in which everyone was enjoying full political, economic, and religious freedom.

The turn of world events of the late 1930's were disastrous to the Lithuanians. In 1940 they were cruelly annexed by the Soviet regime. After suffering under it for about a year, their country was overrun by Nazi forces, and for some 2 years it was under German occupation. Early in 1944 the Red army returned once more, again the country was incorporated into the Soviet Union, and again Lithuanians were placed, against their will behind the Soviet Iron Curtain. Since then it has been effectively sealed off from the outside world, and all forms of freedom have been denied to them. Ideas of freedom, liberty, independence, and individual initiative are rigidly proscribed.

We all hope that this will not long be so. God grant that the day is not far off when Lithuania will once again be a free and independent nation.

---

## HOSPITALIZATION INSURANCE FOR OLDER CITIZENS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill designed to assure to many of our older citizens benefits of hospitalization insurance—a type of protection which, in all too many cases, is not now available to elderly people.

More than younger people, those over the age of 65 are prone to illness which requires hospitalization, and this vulnerability increases for each individual with each passing day. Yet it is the practice, under many private health-insurance plans, to discontinue or reduce the hospital benefits available to an insured person after age 60 or 65. At present, fewer than one-third of our people over age 65—and only a sixth of those over 75—have hospitalization insurance of any sort, and not all of this gives anything like adequate coverage. In the rest of the population, more than 2 persons in every 3 now have some form of hospital insurance or more comprehensive health insurance.

The problem of paying hospital bills is particularly serious for our older citizens because their greater need is accompanied by reduced economic means. Their incomes, on the average, are smaller than for the rest of our people. Among our 14 million people 65 years of age or over, only about one-third have money incomes exceeding $1,000 a year, and only about 1 in 5 has as much as $2,000 a year. The 6 million who depend on old-age insurance benefits are receiving, on the average, $105 a month for a retired worker and his wife, or about $64 a month for a retired worker alone. Even those who receive the maximum allowable retirement benefits get only $162.80 a month for a couple, $108.50 for an individual. This level of income cannot cover more than a few days of hospitalization. Few of these couples have any significant additional income, and few have savings to fall back on.

To individuals in such circumstances, sickness and its attendant expense are disastrous—and the financial difficulties and worries which accompany a stay in the hospital often aggravate the difficulties of restoring good health.

Persons over the age of 60 or 65 are generally unable to obtain hospital insurance coverage if they do not have it when they reach that age, and many who do have it earlier find that they are no longer permitted to renew it. Private plans in most instances not only refuse to accept older people as new members; they also commonly drop them as they reach age 60 or 65. Where coverage is offered to older people, it is placed beyond their financial reach or made less helpful because the premium is substantially greater or the permissible benefits are substantially less than for younger people. In this way, by eliminating the more costly risks—and elderly people, unfortunately, are in the category of costly risks—the private plans hold down their premium rates to a reasonable level for the majority of the people. But our older people are either priced out or locked out of this insurance protection at the very time when it is of utmost importance to them.

Private plans offer little tangible hope of meeting this need reasonably soon. And we will wait a long time indeed if we expect help from the administration's old reinsurance proposal—which the insurance groups themselves rejected—or from the limited permission for pooling of risks which the administration has now substituted. These programs are merely hortatory; they hold no promise of providing hospital insurance for the aged people who now lack the means to buy such insurance.

The bill which I have introduced provides a simple and straightforward remedy. It adds a new type of benefit—hospitalization benefits—to the present social security system.

Under this bill, anyone who, upon filing application, would be entitled to receive monthly payments of old-age and survivors' insurance benefits, would also be eligible for up to 60 days of hospitalization in a semi-private room in any calendar year. The cost would be paid from the old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund. The dependents and survivors of insured aged persons, as well as the insured individuals themselves, would be eligible—a total of some 13 million persons who would be given this protection at the outset. The bill provides for appropriate utilization of qualified State agencies and private nonprofit organizations, and it preserves the right of each patient, upon referral by a licensed physician, to make his own choice of a hospital.

The insurance in the bill would include the usual services, drugs, and appliances furnished by a hospital—that is, bed and board and the nursing, laboratory, and ambulance services, use of operating room, staff services, and those other services, drugs, and appliances which are customarily furnished by the hospital to its bed patients. The insurance would not cover any medical or surgical care, except such as is generally furnished by hospitals as an essential part of hospital care. It would not cover hospitalization in any tuberculosis or mental hospital or an institution which furnishes primarily domiciliary or nursing care.

The cost of these benefits, to be paid from the trust fund, has been estimated at about $400 million for the calendar year 1958. This represents an increase of about 7 percent over the present rate of benefit disbursements from the trust fund. It would be equivalent to less than one-fourth of 1 percent of covered payrolls.

My bill proposes to add the hospitalization benefits with no advance over the contribution rates already scheduled. I am confident that this can be done without impairing the financial integrity of the fund. A cost of one-fourth of 1 percent of payrolls is within the generally accepted margin of error of the overall estimates. Even more reassuring is the fact that, even with the benefit improvements that have been added over the years, the status of the fund has steadily improved as a result of rising earnings. Under present schedules of benefits and payroll taxation for old-age and survivors' insurance, the income of the trust fund grows faster in periods of rising income than do the payments or liabilities for benefits. The primary monthly cash benefit is based on monthly earnings in covered employment over the working life of the retiring worker—after dropping out up to 5 years of lowest or no earnings—and is computed at 55 percent of the first $110 plus 20 percent of the next $240. As average earnings rise, a larger part results in benefits computed at the 20-percent rate, rather than at the 55-percent rate.

It will be noted that the bill does not require a person to retire in order to receive hospitalization benefits. Millions of people continue to work beyond

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the age of 65, as long as they are able to. They should not be deprived of hospital benefits for themselves and their dependents just because they have chosen not to apply for retirement benefits. For this reason the bill provides that individuals—including their dependents and survivors—shall be eligible for hospital benefits if, upon application therefor, they would be eligible for the cash benefits. This new relief from the financial burdens of hospital bills may, in fact, enable some of our older working people to obtain needed hospital care which they cannot otherwise afford—and thus to defer their retirement even longer. This would be an offsetting financial gain to the trust fund, but, much more important, it would be a tremendous boon to these elderly people and to our society as a whole.

The proposed extension of hospitalization insurance will not only benefit the millions who are eligible for this protection; it will also reduce the costs to hospitals and charitable organizations for handling the cases of elderly people who cannot now afford to pay. There will doubtless be some savings in public-assistance expenditures. And the hospitals will be assured of adequate and prompt payments for services rendered.

In view of all the humanitarian features of this bill, its economic advantages, and its administrative simplicity, I am sure my proposal will commend itself to the Committee on Ways and Means and to the membership of the House. I look forward confidently to its early enactment.

## AMENDMENT OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. BURNS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, through the gracious kindness of the able and distinguished Senator from Illinois, the Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS, I am privileged today to introduce a bill to amend titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act so as to further assist the States in extending aid for medical care to persons eligible for public assistance under such titles.

Under the provisions of the act adopted in 1950, Hawaii and 13 States must either curtail their existing medical-care programs or drastically change the methods of operating their assistance programs. Neither alternative is desirable. The amendment permits the States to operate medical payment plans as under existing law with additional Federal matching of the one-half of $8 per month for each adult recipient.

The statement of purpose of the sections of the Social Security Act referred to leads to the belief that the medical-care provisions of the act were intended to encourage the States to broaden their medical-care programs. It is not believed that it was the desire of the Congress in adopting the amendment it did at the last session to change this purpose.

## BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. J. Res. 202) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand there are quite a number of resolutions coming from the Committee on House Administration. They have all been reported out unanimously, and there is no opposition to any of them, is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. That is correct, sir.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, be filled by the appointment of John Nicholas Brown, a citizen of Rhode Island, for the statutory term of 6 years, to succeed Everette Lee DeGolyer, deceased.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## REAPPOINTMENT OF DR. ARTHUR H. COMPTON

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. J. Res. 23) to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Arthur H. Compton as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, which will occur by the expiration of the term Dr. Arthur H. Compton, of St. Louis, Mo., on September 20, 1956, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of 6 years.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PROVIDING FUNDS FOR EXPENSES FOR STUDY AND INVESTIGATION

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 158 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved*, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 128 of the 85th Congress, incurred by the Committee on House Administration, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $75,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 1, after "That", insert "effective January 4, 1957."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF HOUSE REPORT

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 62 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That there shall be printed 5,000 additional copies of the report of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives entitled "Price Discrimination, the Robinson-Patman Act, and the Attorney General's National Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws" (H. R. 2966, 84th Cong.), of which 4,000 copies shall be for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the House document room.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF HEARINGS ON NATIONAL HIGHWAY PROGAM

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 82 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held by said committee during the 84th Congress, 2d session, on the national highway program.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "1" and insert "2".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF UNITED STATES DEFENSE POLICIES

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 97 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved*, That the document entitled "United States Defense Policies Since World War II" by Charles H. Donnelly, Library of Congress, be printed as a House document.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF HEARINGS ON EXCISE TAXES

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 104 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 2,500 additional copies of the hearings on excise taxes held by that committee during the 84th Congress, 2d session.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF PUBLIC LAW 880, 84TH CONGRESS

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 120 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved*, That there be printed 28,400 additional copies of Public Law 880, 84th Congress, the social security amendments of 1956, for the House document room.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ACCEPTANCE OF STATUE OF THE LATE CHIEF JUSTICE EDWARD DOUGLASS WHITE

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 6 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there be printed as a Senate document with illustrations and bound, in such style as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, the proceedings in Congress at the unveiling in the rotunda, together with such other matter as the joint committee may deem pertinent thereto, upon the occasion of the acceptance of the statue of Chief Justice Edward Douglass White, presented by the State of Louisiana; and that 3,000 copies be printed, of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of and distribution by the Representatives in Congress from Louisiana; and 1,000 copies shall be for the use of and distribution by the Senators from the State of Louisiana.

SEC. 2. The Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized to have the copy prepared for the Public Printer.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ARKANSAS-WHITE-RED RIVER BASINS AND WATER RESOURCES OF THE NEW ENGLAND-NEW YORK REGION

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 7 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Public Works the amounts stated of the following reports transmitted by the Secretary of the Army from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on review of report on the Arkansas, White-Red River Basins, Senate Document No. 13, 85th Congress, 3,000 copies, and report on water resources of the New England-New York region, Senate Document No. 14, 85th Congress, 3,000 copies, which reports were authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1950.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## LITHUANIAN NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House desiring to do so may extend their remarks on this subject, following the remarks I am about to make.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for 1 hour's time in order that we Members of the House may give appropriate recognition to Lithuanian National Independence Day which is being commemorated in most countries of the free world. Many Members of Congress intend to make a statement with reference to this historic occasion. A number of important events have taken place since last Lithuanian Independence Day was commemorated here in the United States; revolt and revolution behind the iron curtain have been the most significant and encouraging of those events. In Poland that gallant nation gave indications of turning loose its entire pent up fury against the Russians. The will of the people has been temporarily halted by Gomulka, who himself hangs precariously between his masters in the Kremlin and the wrath of the humiliated, but determined Polish people.

All the world knows the story of the Hungarian revolution—of the fight of the entire Hungarian nation to win freedom and national independence from the Russian occupier. Free men everywhere owe a great debt to the Hungarian people for the indelible contribution they have made in exposing the myth of Russion invincibility and Communist superiority. Several months ago when the Hungarian revolution was at its peak, I stated publicly that the Hungarian people had won their revolution because without weapons and with absolutely no support from the free world, they demonstrated how vulnerable the Red army really is and what terrible cowards the Communists really are. All the people behind the Iron Curtain will take added courage and firm determination to throw off the Russian yoke as a consequence of the Hungarian fight for freedom.

Against this background of inspiring events, we cannot at this time overlook the dangers to the cause of human freedom and the independence of nations posed by the ill-conceived notion that there is such a possibility as national communism or independent communism. The silly notion has been foisted upon the free world by the Communist dictator, Tito, and unfortunately it has been picked up and accepted by people in high positions in the United States who ought to know better. Acceptance of these false beliefs are, in my opinion, the primary reasons why the United States of American froze up in the face of the Hungarian revolution and did no more than offer a weak protest to the Kremlin and a few well-meaning speeches in the United Nations. While the big planners in our Government were theorizing on how to bring about regimes based on so-called national communism or independent communism the Hungarian people were fighting and dying for purposes which were exactly opposite to any kind of communism. The Hungarian people fought for their freedom and absolute national independence. This acceptance, I am sorry to say, accounts for the humiliating posture of political paralysis which overtook our Government during the days of the historic Hungarian revolution.

There is a lesson to be learned from this which has great meaning to all people who have worked for and looked forward to the ultimate freedom and independence of Lithuania and all the other nations subjugated behind the Iron Curtain. It is significant that up until now our Department of State has not recognized the illegal takeover and Russian occupation of Lithuania and her sister republics of Latvia and Estonia. Moreover, we have maintained diplomatic relations with the governments in exile of all three Baltic nations. This is all fine, but it also is extremely dan-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

gerous when thought of in terms of the trend toward official support of so-called national communism or independent communism.

Suppose the Communist regime in Lithuania should suddenly—and of course, with the approval of the Kremlin, declare itself to be based upon the concept of national communism or independent communism and then seek full diplomatic recognition from the United States. If such declaration were made, our present policymakers would probably be quick to recognize officially such a phony regime, and be even more eager to hand over a big downpayment of the American taxpayers' money.

This is not an impossible situation. The Department of State will very shortly, I am reliably informed, propose that an extensive foreign aid program be offered to the Gomulka Communist regime in Poland. Congress will be told that Gomulka is a "national Communist," that he desires to be "independent" of Russian control, and that it is in our national interest to aid him in his efforts to bring "freedom" to the Polish people. The reality of this possibility is again emphasized by an Associated Press dispatch from Moscow dated February 9 which indicates that one M. A. Gedvilas, a quisling Lithuanian, is being built up by the Russians as one of their new "Khrushchev reformers." This same Gervilas, upon whom the Russians conferred the title of Chairman of the Legislative Proposals Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities, has begun to make strange noises about "the necessity of expanding the rights of the republics in the juridical sphere." This is only the opening gun for Gedvilas, but in my judgment, he will be rapidly built up by the Russians as the champion of "independent communism" in Lithuania. When this occurs, the stage will have been set for the complete sellout of the gallant Lithuanian people. That sellout will be condemning them to the degrading slavery of "national" or "independent communism." Lithuania is deserving of a far better destiny than that which some of our policy planners in the Government have marked out for her. She deserves and must get nothing less than complete freedom and absolute national independence. On this commemoration of Lithuanian National Independence Day it would do all of us well to bear this in mind and to make certain that the just due of a great nation shall be accorded Lithuania.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I want to compliment the gentleman on his taking time today to bring this matter to the attention of the American people. I also want to compliment the gentleman on the very valiant effort he has been making on behalf of the people who today are behind the Iron Curtain. His remarks today on Lithuania are important and timely. I shall present my own views on this subject.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the gentleman from Ohio in paying tribute to the people of Lithuania on this, their Independence Day.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and also to incorporate in my remarks a proclamation issued by the Governor of Indiana setting aside February 16 as the Republic of Lithuania Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, February 16 is an important day for all Lithuanians, and those of Lithuanian descent, to commemorate because this day is an important milestone in Lithuania's long battle for self-government and independence. Lithuania's history goes back beyond the 10th century when the country was divided into a number of separate principalities. In the 13th century, Lithuania became united under the rule of King Mindaugas.

During the intervening centuries, Lithuania has enjoyed independence and self-government only at intervals because of periodical invasions by the Russians and Teutons in their mad rush for conquest and European domination. Lithuania during these long years succeeded in retaining its identity and at times independence as a national power until the 18th century when the nation suffered a major decline. For 120 years during this period, the patriotic and liberty-loving Lithuanian people conducted five major revolts against powerful Russian domination.

World War I presented the hope which eventually resulted in freedom for the Lithuanian people and the establishment of a free and independent Government on February 16, 1918. On that date, Vilna was established as the capital and Lithuania severed all political ties which linked it with neighboring nations. On this date the Constitution of Lithuania was promulgated. No other nation in world history, large or small, demonstrated more ability to progress in self-government than Lithuania in such a short time as it did during the first 20 years of its freedom as an independent nation. Among the outstanding accomplishments of the Lithuanian nation during this period was its program of land reforms. During that time almost 300,000 independent farms were established in this agrarian reformation. Industrial development kept pace along with agricultural progress. By 1939 over 16,000 industrial enterprises were established within the borders of Lithuania. Educational progress was remarkable in the fact that the new Government established and increased school facilities in every area throughout the nation. Transportation facilities were expanded and great steps were made in social and welfare legislation for the benefit and well-being of all the people.

I need not recite the recent history of World War II wherein Lithuania was the victim of attacks and infiltration by both the Nazis and Soviets which eventually resulted in the present Communist domination of Lithuania by the Soviet tyrants and Lithuanian freedom and independence was again shattered.

The historical battle for freedom on the part of the Lithuanian people still continues. During recent years, numerous indications are present which convinces thinking people of the free world that "all is not well" in the Communist orbit where their dictators have enslaved over 600 million people. The highly publicized Soviet economic utopia is rapidly proving to be a failure. This fact has been affected by the uprisings and rebellions in East Germany, Poland, Hungary, and other areas behind the Iron Curtain.

The efforts of Bulganin, Khrushchev, and Tito to visit and sit down with leaders of the free world is but part of the Soviet strategy to mislead and build personal prestige for their faltering governments and the communistic system in general. As a member of two special congressional Communist investigation committees during the 82d and 83d Congresses, we recorded volumes of sworn testimony exposing communistic strategy and deceit which their system uses in an effort to enslave the world.

Dozens of former leaders of the present captive Soviet nations, including Lithuania, testified before our committee warning the leaders of the free world against being taken in by Soviet trickery and deception. Dictator Tito's proposed visit to the United States was part of this Soviet trickery in order to enhance the prestige of Communist leaders throughout the free world. I firmly believe that the congressional petition signed by so many Members of Congress, which Majority Leader McCormack, Congressman McDonough, Congressman Keating, and I caused to be circulated, was the No. 1 reason for Tito's canceling his proposed visit to the United States. The nations of the free world must continue our fight against the cold war of the Communist dictators. We must not retreat or appease. If we continue exposing the truth about the Communists and curtailing the further expansion, communism is destined to failure and collapse. When that day arrives, Lithuanians, as well as other enslaved nations, will again enjoy freedom and independence.

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 17, in the city of Gary, Ind., the Lithuanian people of the Calumet region will assemble in a large mass meeting commemorating Lithuanian independence of February 16, 1918. The people assembled at this meeting will repledge their efforts to regain Lithuanian independence. I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks a proclamation by Hon. Harold W. Handley, Governor of Indiana, setting aside February 16, 1957, as Republic of Lithuania Day.

PROCLAMATION—REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1957

*To All to Whom These Presents May Come, Greeting:*

Whereas the 16th day of February 1957 will mark the 39th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people whose origin is from the Baltic State of Lithuania; and

Whereas Lithuania lived at peace with her neighbors until the forceful occupation by Russia in 1941, when she was compelled to become a part of the U. S. S. R.; and

Whereas more than 700,000 Lithuanians suffered deportation from their homeland to

Siberia and many tens of thousands of these people were exterminated; and

Whereas, despite untold hardships and brutal occupations, the people of Lithuania have never lost hope of ultimate freedom; and

Whereas the residents of Indiana feel deep sympathy for the gallant people of Lithuania and of other countries, presently enslaved by the Kremlin imperialism: Now, therefore,

I, Harold W. Handley, Governor of the State of Indiana, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1957, as Republic of Lithuania Day throughout the State of Indiana, and commend all interested groups, organizations, and individuals to appropriately observe the occasion, encouraging the Lithuanian people and wishing that they soon attain their goal of freedom and independence which they so ardently desire, and to which they have every right.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Indiana, at the capitol, in the city of Indianapolis, this 25th day of January 1957.

HAROLD W. HANDLEY,
*Governor of Indiana.*

By the Governor.

[SEAL] FRANK A. LENNING,
*Secretary of State.*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, communism has been the curse of freedom-loving humanity for four full decades. Its baleful influence and impact have been felt everywhere. And its enslavement of the human being, of both the body and the soul, is known to all. All of us live under the fear that Communist ambition has created, but fortunately some of us are still free to enjoy the elemental human rights. That is not true of the many countries in which peoples have been overpowered by the Soviet steamroller. Lithuania with its bighearted and valiant inhabitants is one of those countries in northeastern Europe.

Lithuanian independence was born after the untiring and persistent struggle of the liberty-loving Lithuanians against the czarist autocracy. When that dreaded regime collapsed, Lithuanians were fully prepared to proclaim their national independence, as they did on February 16, 1918. The independence they thus regained was well-earned and richly deserved. Centuries past when their freedom was in danger, the brave Lithuanians fought against the invading hordes of the east and against the teutonic knights of the southwest. And in all of these struggles they gave a good account of themselves. In 1918 and in subsequent years they were prepared to do the same, but it was not possible for a few million Lithuanians to resist the Red army, at that time the largest army in the world. Lithuanian independence thus became an early casualty of the last war.

Today Lithuanian Independence Day is being celebrated by Americans of Lithuanian origin, even though the Moscow-trained Communist regime of Lithuania does not permit its observance there. I ardently hope that the chains of communism will soon be shattered there, that Lithuania will once more regain its independence, and that Lithuanians will once again celebrate their most cherished holiday, their independence day, in their beloved homeland.

Mr. Speaker, as I view the world today, the fight for liberty is going to be fought in Europe.

The Middle East is important; it is important from a geographical angle, it is important from the angle of its natural resources in the economic life of many nations throughout the world, among whom are the nations in the non-Communist world; but the people of the Middle East with few exceptions have never had any experience in possessing liberty and the rights of the individual which come under the head of liberty. They are inherently in the minds of the people of those countries and potentially there of the Middle East who have never known and enjoyed individual liberty. Some time in the future when advancement is made in the art and science of representative government under established law they will possess liberty, and they will understand and appreciate the significance of liberty. But it is in Europe, in Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and other Communist-subjugated nations that the fight for liberty is going to be waged, the fight which is going to stop and destroy international or atheistic communism. We have seen it during the past number of weeks in the case of the brave people of Hungary.

Millions of persons in other subjugated countries entertain the same strong desire to have liberty under their own government, a government that is noncommunistic in nature. The people of Lithuania are overwhelmingly opposed to communism; the people of other Communist-subjugated countries are overwhelmingly opposed to communism. Even in the Soviet Union itself the great majority of the people which comprise it and are under the domination of the Soviet Union are non-Russians, and millions oppose communism. For example, the people of the Ukraine despise and condemn communism. Little Lithuania has, for hundreds of years, been fighting for its freedom and for its right to possess liberty.

So the battle to stop communism and ultimately defeat it is not going to take place in the Middle East; it is in Europe, it is in the hearts and minds of the men and women who have enjoyed liberty in the past, and who despise communism, who love liberty, who want a government of their own under law and under God; and who, as the great people of Hungary have clearly manifested, are willing to give their lives if necessary to attain their goal and to remove oppressive conditions that become so burdensome that people have to resort to extreme means in order to regain their liberty.

Little Lithuania is one of those countries in which the great majority of the people, probably 98 percent of the people, not only have contempt for communism in any form, but are waiting and praying for the day of their deliverance. They look to America as do the people of other subjugated nations.

What policy has America? Have we a policy in the case of Hungary? Have we a policy in the case of Lithuania if its people revolt against communism tomorrow? Czechoslovakia and other satellite nations when their tomorrow comes? And it is bound to come in their willingness to give up life in order to possess liberty. It is vitally important that our country formulate a policy to bring hope to those people, not only hope but to bring to those people aid and assistance in their struggle for liberty.

Today we pause in this branch of the Congress to pay our respects to the brave people of Lithuania, to join with all of those of Lithuanian origin in America or throughout the world in expressing hope that that brave country will quickly regain its independence, and its people their liberty. But in pausing to pay our respects to these great people, we also pause to pay our respects to the brave people of all other countries in Europe and throughout the world where there are people who desire real liberty under their own law and in accordance with their own culture.

So this is the fight of men and women everywhere who want to be free. They are the Patrick Henrys of today, "Give me liberty or give me death." There are countless millions of Patrick Henrys today in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Poland, Yugoslavia, and in the Soviet Union itself, who are looking to America for the guidance and leadership and the assistance that will enable them to quickly regain the independence of their country and the liberty of their people.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the hope and the desire of my colleagues that Lithuania will gain its independence which it so richly deserves.

I have had some experience in meeting with Lithuanian people in my district. I find that they are very intelligent, capable, liberty loving and conscious of the need for a type of government that will give them an opportunity to express their talents and they are seeking and hoping that the United States will be the nation through which this liberty may be obtained.

It seems to me that we should make a move through the United Nations, as one of the powerful nations of the United Nations, to demand that nations like Lithuania, Estonia, Poland and others have their individual representation in the United Nations rather than to be blanketed under the umbrella of Soviet Union control and domination, that they may be privileged to express their views in the council of the United Nations as an individual nation without that control by Russia over them at all times. Mr. Speaker, today is the 39th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. But there is no celebration in that country today, no observance to mark a day of liberation. There is only the silent prayers of freedom-loving Lithuanians that there may one day be an end to the enslavement of this nation by Soviet Russia.

Following World War I in 1918, the people of Lithuania gained independence after more than 100 years of struggling

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

against subjugation by the Russian Empire. Lithuania became a republic, and the Lithuanian people rejoiced as their country took its place among the democratic nations of the world.

In 1940, after just 22 brief years of freedom, Lithuania was again seized by Russia, this time to fall under the domination of communism. This was a tragic blow to the cause of freedom in the world, and the liberation of Lithuania is a matter of deep concern not only to the people of Lithuania and those of Lithuanian ancestry, but to all freedom-loving people everywhere.

The people of Lithuania are dedicated to the principle of individual liberty and national independence, and they have maintained their national identity in spite of their long term of enslavement. During their brief existence as an independent nation, Lithuania improved the economic status and physical welfare of Lithuanian citizens and instituted standards of commerce, agriculture, and industry in accordance with democratic principles.

Today on the 39th anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania, all Americans join with the Lithuanian people and those of Lithuanian ancestry in a prayer for the liberation of these gallant people and that Lithuania may be delivered from its captivity to become once again a free and independent nation.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the 39th anniversary of Lithuania's most recent Independence Day, February 16, it is a privilege and a pleasure to speak for that country of indomitable courage, of undying devotion to freedom. In commemorating that day we honor Lithuania, ancient and modern, small in size but great in spirit, undaunted and indestructible at home and abroad. We in the United States have never acceded to the domination of Lithuania by the Soviets.

We have only to look at Lithuania's history for eloquent testimony of the character of her people and the promise of their future. Through centuries of invasion, conflict, revolution, and international migration this nation, known to have existed in prehistoric times, has been distinctive. The ancient Phoenicians found Lithuanians on the shores of the Baltic. Etruscan, Greek, Roman, Arab travelers told of Lithuania, "the gold of the North". Archeologists today have found traces of the Lithuanian people on the site of their homeland throughout the ages.

The melting pot of Europe was never able to mar their identity. Unlike most of the peoples of the world they have retained their separate racial characteristics through centuries of settlement, conquest, occupation, insurrection, expansion, international union, partition, massacre, and dispersion.

These Lithuanians were the people who, embracing Christianity in the 12th century, are said to have suffered martyrdom for their religion more than any other people except the early Christians. Similarly, they have endured conflict for the sake of freedom.

These are the people whose nation, dating from the Middle Ages, has emerged from repeated attacks of powerful enemies. They have typified the cause of liberty; they have championed freedom through the centuries.

These people, who won their latest independence after World War I only to suffer Communist oppression with World War II, have withstood the upheavals of history. They are certain to emerge again in enduring independence and in final freedom.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in this observance of the 39th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. This little nation, whose sons and daughters have contributed so much to the building of America, is, of course, neither independent nor free. But this annual commemoration of her independence gained 39 years ago serves a most useful purpose. It is a reminder of the tragic fate of Lithuania and other small states which were formerly free but which today are fettered by the chains of Communist slavery. But this occasion is far more than a time of tribulation and sorrow over the fate of Lithuania and these countries which are existing in the darkness of the Iron Curtain. Let us make it a time of rededication in the eternal fight for freedom and independence.

This observance here and throughout other lands where people of Lithuanian blood are living today will be heard behind the Iron Curtain. It will demonstrate to the people of the motherland that they are not forgotten, that their struggles are the struggles of the freedom-loving world. It will help to keep bright in their minds and hearts the flames of hope for the day of liberation.

Fortunately for Lithuania and for the free world, the Soviet masters who have made captives of their bodies have never captured the minds and the souls of these freedom-loving people. There is no Lithuanian flag in Lithuania; there is no national anthem there, but these symbols of nationalism and liberty still shine brightly in the hearts of their people.

We have fresh memories in the past year of events in Poznan and in Hungary. These are visible cracks in the Iron Curtain. We know that there are many other unseen cracks. The disintegration of the Communist empire has begun. A government based on the ruthlessness of the police state, upon the whiplash of the slave master, must eventually crumble and die.

This is the hope of Lithuania as we observe the anniversary of her independence today.

LITHUANIA LIVES

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 39th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. It has become the practice of this House to pay tribute to the Lithuanian people whose devotion to freedom and independence has led them to heroic feats to resist Russian tyranny.

The recent heinous events in Hungary brought to light the truth about the Soviet Union's cruel imperialism. The dramatic flight of Hungarian refugees bared to the world the brutal Soviet oppression of Hungarian liberties and gave the lie to the Soviet propaganda that they are the peace-loving defenders of human rights against Western imperialism and colonialism. This February 16, the anniversary of Lithuania's independence, it is particularly fitting that we recall that once-free Lithuania, like Hungary, was the victim of Soviet aggression. It is imperative that we remember that once-free Lithuania, like Hungary, is still enslaved by the Kremlin.

Lithuania had long known the Russian yoke. In 1795 Russia and Prussia partitioned Lithuania, and Russian domination lasted until 1915. During those 120 years Moscow tried to eradicate Lithuanian nationality by banishing the Lithuanian language from the schools, closing the famous university of Vilnius, substituting Russian for Lithuanian law, and even prohibiting the printing of Lithuanian books in Latin characters. Almost every generation rose in revolt against the regime of the invaders, but each was brutally crushed.

On February 18, 1918, while German armies occupied their country, Lithuanian statesmen proclaimed independence. By the Treaty of Moscow of 1920, Soviet Russia recognized the sovereignty and independence of Lithuania. Today it is ironical to read article 1 of that treaty:

> In conformity with the right declared by the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic of all peoples to a free self-determination, including the right of full secession from the state of which they were a part, Russia recognizes without any reserve the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridical consequences resulting from such recognition, and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory.
>
> The fact that Lithuania was ever under Russian sovereignty does not place the Lithuanian people and their territory under any obligation to Russia.

Here in a formal treaty, the Soviet Union solemnly proclaimed its high convictions with regard to sovereignty and independence, the same principles that Communist officials mouth again and again at the United Nations and at every opportunity where they have an audience. But what about Communist deeds? Lithuanians, since the reoccupation of their country by the Red army in 1940, can attest to Soviet hypocrisy. The inhuman mass deportations in which parents were separated intentionally from their children, the forced collectivation and suppression of religion, the slave-labor camps, the mass exterminations—these were all part of the Red terror that swept Lithuania.

But the barbaric Communist treatment has been no more successful in crushing the Lithuanian spirit of freedom than were the earlier efforts of Czarist Russia. According to the latest information to come out of Lithuania, the leader of the Lithuanian Communist Party has complained that elements similar to those that raised the flag of rebellion in Hungary are active in Lithuania.

Throughout the Sovet empire there is ferment. The Iron Curtain is not thick enough to muffle the outcries of the captive peoples. We call upon the Soviet

Union to live up to its solemn pledge of freedom to Lithuania, which it has so cynically ignored. Today, on the anniversary of Lithuania's hard-won independence, our prayers go out that the time may not be long distant when Lithuania, as well as the other captive Baltic countries and those of Eastern Europe are restored to their rightful positions as free and independent states.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, once again it is singularly fitting that we pay especial tribute to the enslaved people of Lithuania. Their courage in the face of almost unendurable trials and tribulations has been superb. Their loyalty to the principles of freedom-loving peoples is admirable. Their devotion through suffering is such that we, in peaceful and prosperous countries, have also been given strength and determination to help, in every way possible, all countries behind the Iron Curtain that some day they, too, may know the way of life we find so beautiful, so inspiring, and so human.

Our hearts go out to these brave and valiant people. And may the day they are free be not too far away is the fervent prayer from their American friends as we mark the 39th anniversary of Lithuania's Independence Day in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege for me to join with my colleagues in commemorating the 39th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian Republic.

We in America have come to recognize February 16 as a date with special significance. It is a day to be set aside for tribute to, and prayers for, a people who have refused to bow down before the might of godless transgressors. Although Lithuania has been overrun by the Red hordes since 1940, the torch of liberty continues to burn bright in the hearts of her people.

The strength of this spirit testifies to the fervor and permanence with which they embraced democracy in 1918. And I am confident that spirit will never die.

Although we have reasons for despair that Lithuania is not free today, my friends of Lithuanian descent would be the first to assure me we have no reason to give up hope. They know that the Lithuanian people will not cease in their efforts to gain liberty. Repeatedly, through her history, Lithuania has proven that her people can overcome any temporary occupation. The faith which in 1399 emerged triumphantly over the Tartar invasion and helped save Europe from barbarism is still with her today. It gives the people of Lithuania the spiritual vigor to outlive any ungodly dictatorship.

My home city of Rochester, N. Y., has been singularly blessed with many fine Americans with Lithuanian origins. Their contributions to the community, blending their rich heritage and customs with ours, have been many. They have provided examples of good American citizenship while remaining true to the traditions of their native land.

This Sunday, the Rochester Chapter of the Lithuanian American Council will be holding a rally commemorating the 39th anniversary of the proclamation of Lithuanian Independence. Peter Norkelunas, president and Anthony Sabalis, secretary of this outstanding organization, inform me that Jonas Matulionis, president of the Supreme Committee for the Liberation of Lithuania will deliver the main address. It should be a memorable occasion and I regret I shall not be able to attend.

Mr. Speaker, meetings such as that to be held in Rochester and occasions such as this today, providing us with an opportunity to renew our pledge of dedication to the cause of Lithuanian independence, do much to bolster the spirit of those behind the Iron Curtain. Through mediums such as the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe, these people know they are not forgotten.

Recent unrest behind the Curtain raise the hopes of all of us that a free Lithuania will some day soon be a reality. From my own friendship with my fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent, I know that deep in the heart of every Lithuanian is that dedication to liberty and freedom which never dies. There is no power on earth which can forever enslave a people determined to be free.

Until the light of freedom once more shines on Lithuania, our hearts go out to her brave people. Until that day, no lover of liberty can rest.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Many of us in Congress have made it a regular practice to note the anniversaries of independence of the countries behind the Iron Curtain enslaved by the tyrannies of communism. Some people may ask what concrete good comes of such periodic tributes on our part. It appears to me that it is our duty and obligation as representatives of a free people to express our abhorrence of those powers which keep other peoples in a state of subjugation and fear. Communist Russia, I am sure, welcomes the day we in the United States cease to raise our voices against the plight of the citizens of Lithuania and other countries dominated by the Communists.

The sparks of freedom still exist in the hearts of these people. This has been evidenced by the recent uprisings in Poland and Hungary. These people look to us as the leader of the free world to provide them with both moral and spiritual support which they need for the perpetuation of their great crusade for freedom. We cannot fail them. That is why this Congress should continually express its strong sentiments against Soviet colonialization until every Iron Curtain country is freed from its terrorists.

The recent history of Lithuania follows the formula of a country broken by the Russian imperialists. After an all too short 22 years of independence from 1918 to 1940, Lithuania was once again "conquered" by Russia, after the banishment of 60,000 Lithuanian citizens from the country, who may have supplied the spirit and the leadership to overthrow the Russian invaders.

The Lithuanian-American Information Center communicated with me recently and I would like to quote parts of that letter as it portrays dramatically the tremendous oppressive force against these people and the spirit they have, which refuses, in the face of adversity, to die:

> As you know, there is no observance of the day (Independence Day) in Lithuania; no national anthem, no flag. It is marked in silence or a silent prayer. That is why nearly one million Lithuanian-Americans in every State in the Union, will commemorate the day, pledging moral and spiritual support to their kin in the homeland enslaved by the Soviets.
>
> Visitors are barred from Lithuania. No one is permitted to leave Lithuania. The recent drive to return to the homeland to inveigle the living witnesses of the horrors of the first Soviet invasion to return back, ended in dismal failure. From the meager news trickling through the Iron Curtain, we know that a resistance movement still exists, that there is an invincible will for freedom and independence.

I am pleased and honored to be among those who speak against the actions of totalitarian Russia in their attempts to communize the earth. This master plan must fail. History has proven to us in the past that the enslavement of people and the denial to them of their culture, their church and their freedom, is doomed so long as the will for those cherished things exist. I am confident such will exists in the heart of every Lithuanian. Because of this unyielding will the battle for the preservation of human dignity and independence is more than half won.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, since the House of Representatives will not be in session on Saturday, February 16, I would like to take this opportunity to join with my colleagues today in paying tribute once again to the courageous people of Lithuania.

After years of Russian domination and oppression, Lithuania proclaimed its independence 39 years ago on February 16, 1918. Unfortunately that independence was very short-lived, and after 22 years of freedom as an independent republic, Lithuania was again seized by Soviet Russia in 1940.

Her people have suffered shameful persecutions and hardships at the hands of the Communists, and yet they still continue to resist this tyranny, and work for the day when they will again be free.

While the people of Lithuania cannot openly celebrate this anniversary, Lithuanians all over the world will acknowledge the day, as we do here in the United States.

We must continue to give reassurances to these people that we still recognize the independence of that country, and deplore the aggressive and predatory actions of the Soviet Union in subjugating Lithuania.

On this anniversary of the declaration of independence by Lithuania, we here in the United States who are so blessed with freedom and liberty, wish to give continued encouragement and support to that brave nation and her gallant people, who have been an inspiration to free men throughout the world. God grant that their liberation is close at hand.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Americans are free to celebrate

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

with gladness the 39th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania on February 16. But those who have the greatest right and desire to celebrate that day, the people of Lithuania themselves, are denied that right, because their little country is now subject to the tyrannical rule of Soviet oppressors. Americans view this with sadness, and will work and hope for better days for Lithuania.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, today, in commemorating the 39th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, we speak for those whose voices have been silenced, for those once free who are now chained. Yet, we can be sure that the memory of the centuries-long struggle of the Lithuanian people for freedom and justice lives warmly within their hearts and renews their hope for the future. Their courage and determination to regain their liberty will forever stand as a symbol of devotion to the cause of freedom.

Since the 13th century, the Lithuanian nation has enjoyed periods of liberty and self-government but has also been the victim of attack and domination. Yet it maintained its spirit and belief in the dignity of human liberty and ever continued to fight for freedom. The First World War brought a new era for the liberty loving Lithuanian people. On February 16, 1918, their leaders proclaimed the independence of their country and so realized a dream of Lithuanians for over 100 years. During the following 22 years in every respect Lithuania made great progress as a free and independent nation and took her place in the League of Nations. Then in 1940, without justification and in violation of nonaggression pacts with the Baltic States, Soviet forces occupied Lithuania. The world is acutely aware of the sufferings endured by those who have felt the iron heel of Soviet communism.

Despite the tortures and oppressions which the Lithuanian people suffer, we know that the spirit of liberty has not died and that they continue their fight as they have in the past. Man can be prevented from exercising his natural right of freedom; but he cannot be forced to accept and believe in the tyranny imposed on him.

We join with all who commemorate this day—in prayer that the spirit of the Lithuanian people may be strengthened, and in dedication of ourselves once again to the cause of freedom and justice for all people everywhere.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in paying tribute today to the people of the nation of Lithuania on this 39th anniversary of the declaration of their independence.

On February 16, 1918, the small republic of Lithuania regained its freedom and the right to a separate national destiny. After centuries of Russian oppression, Lithuanians at last were able to enjoy their God-given right to self-government and to look forward to a future of continuing fulfillment.

An era followed of peace and economic and industrial progress, until in 1940 the Red Army marched into Lithuania and Lithuania was subjected to a systematized oppression which reached into every phase of the existence of its people. The wholesale deportations to Siberia, a rigidly enforced border control, together with collectivization of agriculture and industry have made in Lithuania the typical pattern of Soviet rule. But in spite of what are surely the most brutal and trying vicissitudes, the people of Lithuania have not lost heart.

We pray that the day may be near at hand when their courage will be rewarded and a liberated Lithuania will be welcomed once more into the community of free nations.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1957, will mark the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. An independence that was won by the great effort and will of freedom-loving people.

Unfortunately this small nation has been brought behind the Iron Curtain and made captive by the evil forces of the Kremlin. But, nevertheless, the spirit of freedom still remains and God willing, Lithuania will once again, take her place among the independent nations of the free world.

Thousands of Lithuanians have perished in the slave camps of Siberia. Thousands have been driven into exile from their native land. Yet the spirit and will for freedom cannot be extinguished.

It is most fitting that all Americans joining with those Americans of Lithuanian descent take time out to send warm greetings to those who, through no fault of their own, are forced to live under the Soviet yoke. Our thoughts and hearts are with them as together we all strive for a better world in which all men will be free.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to pay tribute to the people of Lithuania who are commemorating the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. Unfortunately, there is today no measure of freedom for this proud people who are forced to bear the yoke of Soviet Communist imperialism.

I know that free men everywhere in the world join with their Lithuanian brothers in abhorrence of the manner in which the Soviet Union has crushed not only freedom but life itself in Lithuania. The mass deportations of Lithuanians to Soviet slave labor camps is a transgression of national and individual liberty not easily forgotten. The economic bleeding of the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain in the interest of the Soviet Union will leave a mark which cannot be readily erased.

I join with the Lithuanian people in the fervent hope that their homeland will soon enjoy full freedom from Soviet tyranny.

I wish to include in the RECORD at this time a statement by my good friend, Mr. Leo C. Mazotas, a highly respected leader of the Lithuanian people in the State of Connecticut:

At 3 p. m. on Sunday, February 24, 1957, the Lithuanians of the Greater Hartford area are commemorating the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, which date was actually February 16, 1918. Exercises will be held at the Holy Trinity School Hall at 329 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, Conn.

As history has recorded Lithuania lost its independence again in June of 1940 when Lithuania and its neighbors Latvia and Estonia were occupied by Soviet forces despite all solemn promises to the contrary, despite existing friendship and nonaggression pacts between the Baltic States and Soviet Russia.

Since that time Lithuania and its neighbors have been the victims of Soviet social engineering (planned periodical annihilation of the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia). Literally hundreds of thousands of innocent victims, men, women, and children have been brutally deported into the Soviet Union slave labor camps. It is estimated that since the beginning of the Soviet annihilation program on June 13–14, 1941, the population of Lithuania has been depleted from over 3 million to 1,500,000 to 2,000,000. Her neighbor nations have suffered a like fate. Where in the history of the world can there be found a more vivid example of inhumanity and brutality? Where can there be found a more vivid example and warning of the goal of a totalitarian, avaricious force such as the communism of Soviet Russia was, is and always will be? For other examples and warnings we need only to point to the fate of Poland, Czechoslovakia, China, Manchuria, Northern Korea, Indochina and yes, even more recent, Hungary. How much more convincing does the free world need?

Lithuanians and people of Lithuanian extraction need no further examples of warnings of Soviet communistic intentions. They and their neighbor nationalists know only too well the result of apathy, ignorance, and inaction in the face of the communistic menace. Lithuanians will never cease their unending fight to regain their lost freedom and independence. They will never cease to endeavor to point out to the free world the ever-existing menace of Soviet communism. They will never cease to urge all free peoples to become informed regarding this great threat to world freedom, to realize that the materialistic philosophy of Soviet communism has and always will have only one unwavering goal—world revolution and the ultimate enslavement of all mankind.

Lithuanians will always set aside the period around February 16, their independence day, as the one period during which special emphasis will be made to keep the free peoples of the world ever reminded of the inhuman wrongs perpetrated by the Soviet Union upon Lithuanians and all of the other victims. This, Lithuanians have dedicated themselves to do until Lithuania and the other enslaved nations have been restored to positions of dignity and freedom in the world, and the threat of the scourge of communism has been destroyed.

And so once again, this time in the year 1957, Lithuanians all over are extending their warning to the unwary world and praying that their day of liberation for Lithuania and the others is 1 year closer to realization.

LEO C. MAZOTAS.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the 39th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, the little Baltic Republic which was founded on February 16, 1918, occurs this Saturday. Unfortunately, its independence lasted only some two decades until it was wiped out by Soviet Russia.

Nevertheless, during this brief span of independence, Lithuania was a democratic country in the finest sense of the word, and its people achieved great progress in all fields of human endeavor, such as social, cultural, economic, and political.

Today, the people of Lithuania are a captive nation of Communist Russia. They are subjugated and enslaved under the brutal yoke of communism. Its people have paid a great toll in human suffering. Yet, despite this suffering, they have never given up their fight for freedom and their hopes for national liberation.

The people of Lithuania are sealed off from any contact with the rest of the world. No one can go there, and no one is permitted to leave the country. What little news seeps through the Iron Curtain from Lithuania tells us that the indomitable desire of the Lithuanian people for freedom and independence has not been extinguished—that it still lives on in their minds and in their hearts.

The annual observance of the anniversary of Lithuania's Independence Day is one way of keeping alive this desire for freedom, as well as the spiritual affinity of the Lithuanian people with all other freedom fighters and with all nations enjoying the fruits of freedom. It also serves as moral encouragement to the nearly 1 million people of Lithuanian descent in this country who commemorate this day and renew their pledge of support to their kinsmen in Lithuania.

I am proud to know that Americans of Lithuanian descent have not forgotten their kinsmen abroad. On this occasion of the anniversary of Lithuania's independence, we send our heartfelt greetings. We pray and hope for a better day to come—when the Communist nightmare will meet its ignominious end. We pray that this day will soon come, and the people of Lithuania will know the true meaning of freedom and national independence, and their country will again take its rightful place among the free nations.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1918, was a happy day for Lithuania, for on that historic date, after more than a century of Czarist oppression, she achieved her independence. During the following two decades, this democratic Republic made rapid progress. Lithuania was a proud member of the community of nations.

Unfortunately, World War II marked the end of liberty for Lithuania. A new conqueror, Soviet Russia, engulfed the country and extinguished freedom. Since that time, the people of this captive country have been unable to mark February 16 as a day of celebration. Accordingly, it has become an occasion when the free world, in the name of these silenced people, protests the fraudulent incorporation of this helpless nation into the Soviet Union.

In this country Lithuanian-Americans and all other Americans express this concern for these enslaved Lithuanians by proclaiming that their conscience will never know peace until these subjugated people once again will resume their rightful place among the free nations of the world. Furthermore, we Americans take this opportunity to reassure the captive Lithuanian people that we have never accepted their bondage and that we will never condone any agreement perpetuating that enslavement.

It is also fitting on this 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence that we remind these captive people that we have not forsaken them. In all fairness, we should not encourage false hopes for liberation. But we should assure them that we will constantly work realistically for the truths expressed in the Atlantic Charter, that all peoples have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live.

Our feelings for these oppressed people on this anniversary day are perhaps best expressed by the words of our own Declaration of Independence—that all peoples have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We are confident that these truths, in the end, will prevail and that freedom and liberty once more will be restored in Lithuania.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the patriotic and freedom-loving Lithuanians throughout the world, who on February 16, 1957, will observe the 39th anniversary of their national independence.

Perhaps no national holiday is so meaningful and of such great significance as that which marks the beginning of a people as an independent sovereign nation, its independence day. This is true for all nations, but perhaps more so for a nation such as Lithuania which had the misfortune of losing its independence, which has long suffered under alien rulers in the homeland, which then succeeded in regaining its independence, only to lose it again.

More than 700 years ago, Lithuania was a leading power in eastern Europe, but by the beginning of the 19th century it had been absorbed by the Russian Empire and had lost its independence. In 1918, the Lithuanians regained their independence and for two full decades thereafter enjoyed their freedom. They lost it again early in the last war.

Lithuanians in their homeland are not permitted by their Communist masters to celebrate this occasion, at least not outwardly. Fortunately, the Communists cannot see what goes on in the hearts of the people, and I am sure that in their hearts, the people of Lithuania will be joining with their brethren of the free world in commemorating their day. Let us all hope and pray that soon the Lithuanians will once more become the masters of their fate, and in a free Lithuania celebrate independence day.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to call attention to the proclamations issued by the Honorable Goodwin Knight, Governor, State of California, and the Honorable Norris Poulson, mayor, city of Los Angeles, Calif., in commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day. The proclamations follows:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
*Sacramento.*

Seven hundred and four years ago, Mindaugas united all Lithuanians and declared that country bordered by Latvia, Poland, and the Baltic Sea a Christian Kingdom. Many years later on February 16, 1918, Lithuania was proclaimed an independent Republic by the people, climaxing a long struggle for freedom by a courageous and gallant nation.

Today, tens of thousands of Americans of Lithuanian origin and ancestry live in the Golden State. On February 16 of each year these fine citizens commemorate the freedom of their land of origin with special services and meetings emphasizing their faith in the American way of life and demonstrating their belief in the inalienable rights of people. They look with hope to the day that this country of their ancestry will once again be able to taste the sweetness of freedom.

Therefore, I, Goodwin J. Knight, Governor of California, do hereby urge my fellow citizens to pay tribute to those of Lithuanian lineage; to take part in programs commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day, and to offer a solemn prayer that their day of liberation will soon dawn.

Cordially,

GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,
*Governor.*

---

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
*Los Angeles, Calif.*

PROCLAMATION

*To the Citizens of Los Angeles, Greetings:*

Whereas the Republic of Lithuania came into being 39 years ago and it took its rightful place in the family of nations after being denied independence by Czarist Russia for more than a century; and

Whereas as a result of World War II, the Iron Curtain of Communist Russia has descended on Lithuania, establishing a reign of terror in this freedom-loving country; and

Whereas thousands of persons of Lithuanian descent in the Los Angeles area will hold a mass meeting commemorating the independence of their homeland which one day will arise from enslavement and occupation by Soviet forces.

Now, therefore, as mayor of the city of Los Angeles, I do hereby proclaim Saturday, February 16, 1957, as Independence for Lithuania Day, and I direct public attention to the high value that Americans of Lithuanian descent place on the freedom which we all too often take for granted, and I further urge that we join with them in praying for the freedom of their native country.

NORRIS POULSON,
*Mayor.*

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, February 16 is the 39th anniversary of Lithuania's independence—again this year a forbidden holiday in Lithuania still dominated by Soviet Russia. In this country, however, a million Lithuanian-Americans will in all solemnity pledge their moral and spiritual support to their oppressed and suffering compatriots.

America joins with them in their pledge and in their hope and dreams of the coming day that shall see Lithuania once more stand free and independent. That day will come! The despotic totalitarian power now crushing the proud Lithuanian people cannot endure forever. Lithuania shall again take her place among the free nations of the world in the not too far distant future.

On this anniversary of her independence I am happy and proud to join with her people here in our country and with her people in the homeland in a heartfelt pledge to continue all efforts to speed the birth of Lithuania's freedom.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to join with my colleagues in the commemoration of the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence which will fall on Saturday, February 16.

This valient little nation has historically been the victim of domination by its power neighbors and it was only in

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

1918 that she was able to declare her independence. Tragically her freedom was short lived and now once again she is in the unhappy situation of being dominated by a totalitarian power.

But although freedom does not prevail in Lithuania today, the spirit of freedom is fully prevalent in the hearts of the people and we can take hope that their determination and courage will eventually gain for them their rightful place in the family of nations.

We here in America who are fortunate enough to enjoy the fruits of democracy are deeply sympathetic with those persons behind the Iron Curtain who are not blessed with a democratic government, and we congratulate them for their courage. We are sure that their struggle will not be in vain.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, February 16, will mark the 39th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. On this occasion nearly one million Lithuanian Americans will in an atmosphere of solemnity commemorate the day, offering spiritual and moral support to their dear ones in the homeland, captives of the Soviet tyrants.

This should represent a day of rejoicing and happiness but unfortunately it is not. For Lithuania, while it courageously set out as an independent nation, is now a Communist slave state.

The brave people of this little nation have survived other oppressions and the information gathered through news seeping through the Iron Curtain indicates that an active resistance movement still exists there. The people have retained their indomitable spirit and despite the ruthless Communist methods to enslave and destroy, the Lithuanians flatly refuse to recognize Communist Russia as their overlord. Their determination not to show allegiance to Moscow exemplifies the sterling character of these extraordinary people.

The people of the United States must continue to send encouragement to the people of Lithuania. We cannot stand aloof and watch as communism tramples upon them. My sincere wish is that the flag of freedom will soon wave again over these courageous people. Their many sacrifices will not be in vain for their determination and invincible spirit will surely lead them to final victory over their cruel aggressors.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanians who have come to the United States have brought with them an earnest dedication to the principles of freedom. In the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence of February 16, 1918, the people of Lithuania reasserted their adherence to the democratic way of life. For over 20 years, Lithuania remained a free republic of a proud and independent people.

The United States Government still recognizes the independence of Lithuania because it cannot accept the ruthless Soviet annexation of this ancient land against the will of its people. Our continued recognition of Lithuanian independence testifies to our overwhelming belief in the justice of the Lithuanian cause and our determination to let the whole world know our faith in the ultimate restoration of a free nation. Today, in marking the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, we reaffirm that faith.

To Americans of Lithuanian descent, both those who are now citizens of this country and those who are in the process of achieving citizenship, all Americans extend a cordial hand of fellowship. All of us in some measure share a common pride and gain a common inspiration in the undying free spirit of Lithuania.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to add my voice to the many the world over who will, on February 16, acclaim the spirit of the Lithuanian people on the 39th anniversary of their independence.

I salute again the Lithuanian American Information Center for its continuing efforts to remind the world of the sorrowful plight of Lithuania.

I salute your courageous countrymen who, despite overwhelming obstacles, tenaciously hold to their principles which fostered the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence.

Freemen everywhere will not forget the people of Lithuania in their efforts to regain the right of self-determination. We must continue to support the policy of nonrecognition of the Russian annexation of Lithuania.

Again, congratulations on this memorable day in the history of a free people.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 1918 was a memorable year for Lithuania, for it was in November of that year that Lithuania became an independent Republic. But it was a compartively short-lived independence, as the Soviet Russian troops occupied and overran that territory in 1940. In true Soviet style, the citizens of Lithuania were ruthlessly persecuted and their freedoms were outlawed. In spite of such tyranny, however, these brave people held on and resisted all attempts to make them forget they were Lithuanians. They were deported, enslaved, imprisoned, and deprived of necessities, yet they continued, and still continue, their fight against their oppressors.

We in this country are aware of their attempts to regain their beloved freedom and hope and pray with them that their independence will soon again be realized. We salute them on this, the 39th anniversary of their declaration of independence.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that the House should pause on this day to join with Lithuanian people and other lovers of freedom throughout the world in celebrating Lithuanian Independence Day.

Although the darkness of oppression now falls upon the historic land of Lithuania, this day forcibly brings to mind the indomitable will of the Lithuanian people to recapture the freedom which has been stolen from them by ruthless Communist dictatorship.

The history of the noble Lithuanian people shows unmistakably that freedom is part of the Lithuanian character, and for that freedom the people of Lithuania will never cease to struggle and to fight and to make every sacrifice.

What has happened in Lithuania in recent years would probably dishearten and discourage less hardy advocates of freedom than the Lithuanian people. But, thank God, though their lot has been difficult, and the path bestrewn with suffering, privation, hunger, and brutality, the people themselves have never faltered in their basic aims to recover control over their own Government and to restore their precious, God-given liberties.

The presence of so many persons of Lithuanian blood, heritage, and background here among us in America furnishes us with special reason to be vitally interested in the problem of Lithuanian liberation, because the Lithuanians here in this country have won the respect, esteem, and regard of all our fellow citizens for their unfailing loyalty throughout the years, in war and peace, to the free principles for which our own great Nation stands.

It is a happy circumstance indeed that America has had the benefit of the admixture of the illustrious Lithuanian heritage which has been a source of great enrichment of our own national life. The Lithuanians in this country have not only shared our opportunities to live in this greatest of all democracies, but they have also assumed their full burden of responsibility for guarding, protecting, and developing the Nation. Lithuanian-Americans are among our foremost citizens in every field, and I am proud indeed to acknowledge and laud the striking example of fine Americanism which they furnish to all our fellow citizens. It is my special privilege to enjoy the friendship of a great many persons of Lithuanian ancestry. In my view the nation that has them for citizens is indeed fortunate, and the people who have them as neighbors all attest to their splendid personal qualities and their unexcelled patriotism and devotion to the truths of freedom.

It is for us as a Nation to continue to exhibit our friendship for the Lithuanian people and the cause of Lithuanian independence which we celebrate today.

By our words here, as well as by our official action, let us provide them with the assurance that this great free Nation will ever be interested in and concerned with the rebirth of their freedom and the restoration of their democratic government, that we pledge ourselves anew to the principles of self-determination and to aid and assist in every way we can in the reestablishment of free institutions in their afflicted country.

Let us make it clear again on this great day to the oppressors of Lithuania that free men and free women everywhere will never cease their efforts until freedom once again is restored to the great Lithuanian nation and the other helpless, defenseless peoples suffering under the cruel, heartless lash of Communist tyranny.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, once again this year as in recent past years, we are privileged to give public recognition to one of the truly valiant little countries who continue their struggle against the forces of communism. To Lithuania on the 39th anniversary of

her independence, I offer my prayerful wishes that she may soon join that commonwealth of free nations.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, today is the 39th anniversary of the day which all Lithuanians remember and revere because it is commemorated as the inauguration of Lithuania's independence.

In spite of cruel Communist oppression the spirit of independence will always be part of the Lithuanian people. Today must serve to remind us of our duty to these oppressed people. We must resolve in concert with other freedom-loving people, that the enslaved people shall be aided to realize their dreams of a return to freedom. With the aid of all free nations—and the free nations must act positively and forcefully in order to maintain their precious freedom—and the underground movement behind the Iron Curtain, the day will come when Lithuania and other Communist-dominated countries will be restored to liberty and freedom.

Lithuania attained its political independence at the close of World War I. For the next 20 years, the country prospered economically and made great strides in social and cultural fields. Twenty short, precious years, and again in 1940 Lithuania was overtaken by a powerful tyrant. We are all too familiar with reports of brutalities and massacres which have been inflicted upon the Lithuanian people during the last 17 years. A large part of Lithuania's population have been deported to slave-labor camps. Nevertheless, in the face of all such tyrannical measures the mass of people are still carrying on their resistance to their oppressors. Twenty short, previous years imbedded in the hearts of all patriotic Lithuanians the spirit of freedom. Tyrants can destroy men and institutions, but they can never destroy the love of liberty.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, February 16, is the 39th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. Though this largest and most populated of the three Baltic states has been deprived, by the Soviet Government, of the place she once took among free nations, I think it proper that we join the nearly 1 million American Lithuanians in commemorating with their brethren this day, the spirit of which has not diminished.

In light of such defiance as burns behind the walls of other Communist satellites, that is, Hungary, I urge that we stand also in recognition of an anti-Communist Lithuania. Even under the blanket of tyranny—first spread out when the Nazis and Soviets carved up the Polish corridor in 1939—Lithuania has not forgotten the value of freedom. Here too, we trust, will occur someday a revival of independence.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, another year has passed and once again we approach the 16th day of February, the day which means so much to the people of Lithuania, the anniversary of the declaration of independence of that country.

Those of us who have friends and neighbors of Lithuanian descent realize how much we are indebted to Lithuania and how greatly the sons and daughters of that country have contributed to the progress of America.

Our hearts go out to those in the Lithuanian homeland, who have suffered so greatly under the domination of the Communist government of Russia.

The recent courageous struggle for freedom against overwhelming odds in Hungary made clear to all the suffering and the tyranny by which people have been confronted in all the captive nations which have been forced against their will behind the Iron Curtain.

All of us appreciate Lithuania's fine contribution to the world as a whole during the period of its independence.

All of us share the sorrow of its people in the termination of that independence by force.

All of us join on this memorable occasion in sympathetic greetings to all those in Lithuania and in the hope for the dawn of a new day in which they may again enjoy freedom as a nation and again contribute to the progress of the free world.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday the 16th of February, the men and women of Lithuania and Lithuanian ancestry will be celebrating the 39th anniversary of that nation's independence. Lithuanians everywhere except in their own homeland, where her people still writhe beneath the iron heel of a Communist dictatorship. And if we in free lands can do no more than offer heartfelt sympathy to this proud but enslaved nation, by so doing we can at the same time serve warning to all oppressors that free men everywhere look with scornful disdain and repugnance on their deeds of tyranny. If they who strive with godless might to put out the bright spark of freedom that still smoulders in the breasts of those they believe have been conquered would only thumb backwards through the pages of history they would read there in glowing letters the indisputable forecast of their ultimate failure. For just as a tiny band of men led by a humble fisherman 2,000 years ago rose up in triumph over mighty Rome and left an imprint on all time to come, so too will tiny Lithuania and the other oppressed nations of the world one day fling off the chains of pagan communism and know again that freedom under God, of which today they only dream.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 16th, the freedom-loving people of Luthuania will celebrate the 39th anniversary of her independence. However, this celebration will not be filled with joy and happiness because Communist treachery still continues to subjugate this nation into a state of slavery.

While observance of this anniversary is not permitted in that country because of Soviet occupation, the one million Lithuanian-Americans in this country will commemorate the day with renewed pledges of moral and spiritual support of their people.

We know of the courage of these people and that their cry for liberty and freedom cannot and will not be extinguished.

We, in America, who enjoy the great liberties and freedoms of a great democracy, extend our warm understanding and encouragement to the Lithuanians in their determined struggle for freedom and independence. We hope that before long these sinister obstacles will be removed and that peace, security and independence will again be enjoyed by Lithuania and its people.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 16, the thousands of Lithuanian-Americans throughout this country will celebrate the observance of the 39th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. I desire to associate myself with the gentleman from Ohio in calling the attention of the House to this occasion.

Like her Baltic neighbors to the north, Estonia and Latvia, Lithuania was one of the first of the captive nations to lose her sovereignty and freedom to Communist tyranny. But even though she was unable to resist the might of the invading Soviet armies, even though she has since then been unable to openly assert the true desire of her brave people for independence, the heroic people of Lithuania have shown in many ways their belief in and adherence to the principle of genuine self-determination. They have displayed to the free world that their spirit has not been crushed and that they, too, still have a passionate conviction that freedom will again be theirs. It is important on this anniversary day to reassure them that the people of the United States share that conviction to the fullest degree.

It is also important to remind the House that the display of courage and patriotism of the Hungarian people which thrilled the world last fall is likewise to be found among all the captive peoples of Communist Europe, including of course, the Lithuanian people. I therefore wish to join my other colleagues in paying tribute to the people of Lithuania on this occasion of their independence and again to repeat to them that the Government and the people of the United States will do everything possible to the effect that that sacred right of man, immortal freedom, will again be theirs and that one day the unconquerable spirit of independence will break down the Iron Curtain and spread throughout what is today the Communist slave empire. Freedom, that precious commodity which is God-given cannot permanently be denied by the works of men, no matter how brutal the forces of repression.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in this House 1 year ago I had the pleasure of commencing the tributes to the people of Lithuania on their day of independence. I also introduced a resolution stating:

> That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should never agree to a perpetuation of the injustice [the annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union] and should morally aid the people of Lithuania in restoring their freedom, human rights, and political independence.

Recently this resolution has become vitally significant, for the Hungarian revolt and its subsequent repercussions throughout all of Eastern Europe and the Baltic have buttressed and substantiated the beliefs, hopes, and deep resolves expressed by all of us at that time. Furthermore, our fervent desire that Soviet colonialism should be exposed

to the world also has been realized with the rebellion of the people of Hungary against the tyrannous rule of Communist Russia. Hungary, one of the Soviet satellites, has demonstrated that the strength of a nation's will to be independent and free can shatter even the steel-like tentacles of the Soviet Communist octopus. This demonstration of courage has made Hungary the symbol of liberty for all the world. It has shown a people may prefer to die free rather than live enslaved. And Lithuania, a so-called "autonomous" republic within the Soviet Union, also has shown this same indomitable will to resist tyranny and oppression. In fact, Lithuania today stands in the vanguard with Hungary in the fight against Soviet oppression, because she is the first Baltic republic publicly to express anti-Communist feelings. In December 1956 the first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party's Central Committee, Antanas Snechkus, admitted to the press that "bourgeois nationalist elements and their various accomplices begin to raise their heads." He also admitted the unrest in Lithuania had been encouraged by the Hungarian revolt. We can make, therefore, no greater gesture to the Lithuanians on this day than to reaffirm our declarations of last February and to continue to press for an end to the grave injustices the people of Lithuania suffer at the hands of Soviet Russia.

Historically, Lithuania has had to cope with the steady encroachments of Russia for centuries. Repeatedly she has tried to roll back Russian incursions, but the power and pressures of Muscovy always proved relentless and implacable. Harsh as has been the treatment meted out by the Russian invaders, however, the Lithuanian desire for freedom and national independence was never crushed. Finally on February 16, 1918, a Lithuanian National Council proclaimed the reestablishment of an independent Lithuania. But this period of independence was short lived for in July 1940 Lithuania was made the 14th republic of the Soviet Union.

During the period of Soviet domination, resistance efforts developed and underground groups began to plague the Communist officials. Exploitation, forced labor, and collectivization were resisted so effectively that Moscow openly admited her dissatisfaction with this inadequate "sovietization" of Lithuania. And the national determination of the Lithuanians to achieve political unity and to regain an independent status is at this moment worrying the Soviet Union. The candid admission this last December by the first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party's Central Committee that the armed revolt in Hungary had encouraged "reaction" and caused "principles of party spirit" to be undermined is a revelatory disclosure of Communist difficulties in Lithuania.

In conclusion, therefore, we Members of Congress can take a great measure of pride from the fact we have gone on record that the United States should "morally aid the people of Lithuania in restoring their freedom, human rights, and political independence."

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 16, Lithuania will be observing—but, unfortunately, not celebrating—the 39th anniversary of her independence. Since the spring of 1940 this brave small country on the Baltic has been a Soviet concentration camp and its people victims of ruthless Soviet domination. Tens of thousands of Lithuanians have been deported to slave labor camps in Siberia. The iron chain of Communist tyranny keeps Lithuania in a state of constant terror and exploitation by the Kremlin masters.

It is fitting and proper that in the Congress of the United States, which represents the hearts and minds of the American people, we express our faith in the rebirth of a free and independent Lithuania. Not only do we join the many Americans of Lithuanian descent, but we join the free peoples all over the globe who remember Lithuania as once a free nation and who pray for her delivery from Kremlin domination and control.

We must continue to give heart to the millions upon millions of enslaved peoples all over the world. They must never lose hope. Their faith in us must never be diminished. More important, however, than our own faith and our support is their own determination that they will be free again. The people of Lithuania have never lost their courage and their determination. With a deep faith in a Divine Creator, they know that liberty and freedom must ultimately triumph over tyranny.

As chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I join with my many colleagues in a tribute to the brave, gallant, and freedom loving Lithuanian people. They will one day, I am certain, regain their freedom and independence and again take their rightful place among free peoples who are striving together to make this a better world.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish once again to pay tribute to the gallant spirit of freedom of the Lithuanian people.

February 16 marks the 39th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

Here in the Congress of the United States we pause in our occupation to commemorate this day. But in Lithuania there is no such celebration. There is only silent prayer.

Therefore, it is only fitting that we who enjoy the blessings of liberty and freedom of speech, pay tribute to these people who know not defeat, to a nation whose pride has been trampled, but whose head is held high.

It is our fervent prayer that one day soon February 16 will be observed as Lithuanian Independence Day not only in the United States, but also across the seas in the little country which knows not surrender.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, throughout the 19th century, for more than a hundred years, some 3 million devout and patriotic Lithuanians worked and prayed for the day of their freedom from Czarist oppression. At last they saw their cherished dream come true in 1918. When the Czarist regime in Russia collapsed, they saw their chance for freedom and proclaimed their national independence on February 16 of that year.

For more than two decades Lithuanians enjoyed their newly won independence. They organized a democratic form of government, rebuilt their war-ravaged country, revived their national institutions, introduced many progressive social and economic legislative measures and in a short time Lithuania became a respected member in the family of nations. Unfortunately, however, the new republic was not to have a long life, and in the ensuing world turmoil of the late thirties its independence was endangered. In the fall of 1939, it was forced into a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union, and in the summer of 1940 it was incorporated into the Soviet empire.

Since then Lithuanians have not known freedom. During the war the country was under Nazi occupation for 2 years; in 1944 the dreaded Red army returned with its commissars and secret police, and it has been there ever since. Literally hundreds of thousands of innocent victims, men, women, and children, have been brutally deported into the Soviet Union slave-labor camps. Where in the history of the world can there be found a more vivid example of inhumanity? Where can there be found a more vivid example and warning of the goal of a totalitarian, avaricious force such as the communism of Soviet Russia? For other examples and warnings we need only point to the fate of Poland, Czechoslovakia, China, Manchuria, northern Korea, Indochina, and yes, even more recent, Hungary. Is it any wonder that these brave people will never cease to fight and pray that the Soviet yoke which they have carried around their necks, but not in their hearts, might again be broken.

Lithuanians have been cut off from the outside world and the country has been forcibly estranged from the free world. Behind the Iron Curtain, Lithuanians cannot celebrate their independence day, but here, in the heart of the free world they can, and do. In fact, I am looking forward to Sunday, the 17th, when I will be the guest of the Lithuanian-American Council in Waterbury, Conn., participating in exercises commemorating the 39th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues in the House on this solemn occasion, and I salute the peoples of Lithuania and their Baltic neighbors for their courageous and unconquerable spirit, their inflexible determination to restore their lands to freedom which, one day, will unquestionably be crowned with victory.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, another year has passed since I spoke here on the occasion of the anniversary of Lithuania's independence. It was a year of great historical events and drastic political changes. We have witnessed a bloody uprising in Hungary preceded by a calmer but, perhaps, more effective revolution in Poland.

Unfortunately, this cannot be said about Lithuania, whose 39th anniversary we are celebrating once again. And

what is worse, is the fact that here, as in the case with the other Baltic States we do not deal even with the so-called peoples democracies, but merely with another republic of the Soviet Union. Lithuania, a great country with a great history, great traditions, and a great people is being represented by the "gentlemen" of the Kremlin.

After the "thaw" of Kremlin's tactics that followed the death of Stalin, we watched carefully developments in communist-occupied countries. At first we were amazed by the sudden speech of Khrushchev denouncing his longtime friend, colleague, and disciple—Stalin. To prove his "sincerity" he slightly opened the Soviet border admitting Western tourists, businessmen, and correspondents. Most of them visited Moscow, some went to Leningrad, Stalingrad, and a very few went as far as the Urals. None of them were shown Kolyma, and other places where there are still large concentrations of slave labor camps, with inmates from all Communist-conquered countries but mainly from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. I wonder how many of the visitors have asked permission to go to those latter countries, and see for themselves what Soviet terror has done to them. How many have been inquisitive enough to see the changes that have affected these countries in the past decade, from the day when Moscow made them "Lithuanian Republic of the U. S. S. R." and so forth? A complete blackout has descended on the Soviet-dominated Baltic States and today for us here in the free world it is even difficult to determine how many of the original natives are still in their countries and how many have been deported. This, perhaps, has been the greatest tragedy of these states.

Mr. Speaker, only a quarter of a century ago the great President Wilson, when drafting his 14 points for the newly established League of Nations, did not forget to bring Lithuania with the other neighboring countries into the family of all sovereign states. We did not forget her when the Atlantic Charter was drafted and it's meaning referred just as much to her as to Poland, Estonia or Latvia. I can see no reason why we should forget her today. Time and again on previous occasions have I mentioned her glorious past as an independent and sovereign state and as a great democracy. Lithuania's heroic stand against foreign domination—and there were many of them—has been stressed year in and year out by all the distinguished colleagues of this great democratic body, but, unfortunately, so far in vain.

It seems incredible that the fate of the Baltic States has so far been sealed and the fact that they are mere republics of the U. S. S. R. has been taken for granted. Isn't there anyone in the present administration who has courage enough to ask the Soviet leader, point blank, how long they intend to play their game? Isn't there anyone dealing in an official capacity with the Soviets who will finally ask them whether they are trying to annihilate the peoples of these states just as much as Hitler tried to annihilate the Jews?

Today, on the occasion of the 39th anniversary of Lithuania's independence let us think again before it is too late. Let us keep our honor and the promises given years back, and not long ago, and let us pray that Lithuania and the other Baltic States shall find themselves among the other free nations in a free world.

For though usurpers sway the rule awhile,
Yet heavens are just and time suppresseth wrongs.

—*Shakespeare*, King Henry VI.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, as I have done in the past, I am again joining with my colleagues who will speak for Lithuania in the House today. February 16 marks the 39th Independence Anniversary of this country. Because the date falls on a Saturday of this year, we are paying tribute to courageous Lithuania today.

On February 16, 1918, after more than 120 years of oppression under Czarist Russia, Lithuania proclaimed its independence. Although her freedom lasted for only 21 years, in that short period of time Lithuania prospered under a democratic system of government and became a respected member of the international community.

Tragically, this hard-earned independence was lost during World War II. With the aid of a so-called mutual security pact, imposed under the threat of force, the Soviets incorporated the Lithuanian nation into the Soviet Union. Once again their freedom was obliterated.

The tactics employed by the Reds to subdue this helpless nation profoundly shocked the American people. Furthermore, the Soviets have continued to use terror tactics to keep the Lithuanians under subjugation.

Although still enslaved, today—the 39th Anniversary of their independence—the Lithuanian people have not lost their desire for freedom. Despite the constant threat of persecution and deportation, resistance continues in this brave country. Positive proof that opposition continues is seen in the number of underground newspapers published in Lithuania today.

Furthermore, it has been estimated that in spite of Communist brutality, Lithuania has the smallest Communist Party membership of any of the satellite countries—approximately 0.87 percent of the entire population. Even the Communists in Lithuania admit that resistance continues. Recently, the head of the Red party in Lithuania stated that the Hungarian revolt had once again stirred the nationalists in the country.

The American people have not forgotten Lithuania's constant struggle against oppression. Evidence of our concern was the formation by Congress of the House Baltic Committee to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, legislation which received my wholehearted support. Eyewitness testimony given before this committee allowed all the world to see the pattern of Communist aggression in the Baltic countries. This well-documented investigation should be a source of encouragement to these oppressed people by assuring them that we have not condoned their captivity.

This anniversary date gives the American people an opportunity to express this thought once again. We have not become reconciled to their enslavement. Lithuanian independence day also allows freedom-loving Americans a chance to join with Lithuanian-Americans in protesting the inhuman tactics of Soviet aggression as well as transmitting a message of hope for the eventual freedom from their bondage. We are confident that Lithuania's will for freedom will prevail and the Soviet despotism will not perpetuate its rule over a nation that loves God, freedom and liberty.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the proclamation of our former colleague, the Honorable Norris Poulson, mayor of Los Angeles, designating February 16 as Independence for Lithuania Day, strikes a responsive chord in many Members of this Congress.

Since we are in such hearty agreement, I ask unanimous consent to have it reproduced in the RECORD.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
*Los Angeles, Calif.*

PROCLAMATION

*To the Citizens of Los Angeles, Greetings:*

Whereas the Republic of Lithuania came into being 39 years ago and it took its rightful place in the family of nations after being denied independence by czarist Russia for more than a century; and

Whereas as a result of World War II the Iron Curtain of Communist Russia has descended on Lithuania, establishing a reign of terror in this freedom-loving country; and

Whereas thousands of persons of Lithuanian descent in the Los Angeles area will hold a mass meeting commemorating the independence of their homeland which one day will arise from enslavement and occupation by Soviet forces.

Now, therefore, as mayor of the city of Los Angeles, I do hereby proclaim Saturday, February 16, 1957, as Independence for Lithuania Day, and I direct public attention to the high value that Americans of Lithuanian descent place on the freedom which we all too often take for granted, and I further urge that we join with them in praying for the freedom of their native country.

NORRIS POULSON,
*Mayor.*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1957, will mark the 39th anniversary of the independence of the heavily oppressed state of Lithuania, whose people are forced to live under Soviet domination.

While the Iron Curtain prohibits anyone from entering or leaving this small, but gallant state, the spirit of independence and the will for freedom knows no barriers. This indomitable spirit never left Lithuania and continues to exist among these valiant people as it has throughout their long history of resistance to tyranny and subjugation.

Having experienced a free form of government in the past, they will not cease in their courageous struggle for liberty.

The people of Lithuania must know that their countrymen throughout the world and we, in the United States particularly, have not forgotten them. In marking this day, we reaffirm our faith in this brave country's devotion to liberty and independence and express the hope

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

that we may soon again welcome Lithuania as a member of the free world community.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, I am honored to pay tribute to the people of Lithuania. That country, which had stagnated for over 100 years under Czarist Russian imprisonment, underwent a glorious renaissance after it won its freedom in 1918. For 22 years Lithuania occupied an honorable place among the family of nations. By their dedication to democratic principles and their gigantic achievements toward economic and social betterment, the Lithuanian people gave ample demonstration of their capacity for self-rule.

Then came in 1940 the monstrous crime of the Kremlin. The Communists, after agreeing with Hitler on a division of Europe, cynically marched into Lithuania to "protect" its independence. The terrors of the mass deportations, murders, and religious persecutions inflicted upon Lithuania by the Communist tyrants are well known. We know, too, of the heroic resistance of the Lithuanian people to the mailed Communist fist that still clutches the nation by its throat.

On this, the anniversary of Lithuania's independence, we send the greetings of the American people to the captive peoples of Lithuania. We send these words of assurance that they have not been forgotten in their darkest hour. We send our vow to keep up the battle against the Communist conspiracy until the day when Lithuania, and all men, are again free to choose their own destiny. We pray that, with God's help, the day will come speedily.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the opportunity to participate in the observance of the 39th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania's independence.

During Lithuania's brief span of independence, she earned the admiration and respect of the family of free nations; she made great progress in the social, cultural, economic, and political fields. When Lithuania became the victim of Communist aggression, it was a tragic blow not only to her people there, but to the many Lithuanian Americans and the friends of Lithuania throughout the world.

There can be no rejoicing in Lithuania today. For that reason, it is highly important that we take recognition of her anniversary of independence and let her know that we are thinking of her people and that we support her in her desire to regain the freedom she has lost. We know that the people of Lithuania have determined that they will one day regain their independence; we admire them for their courage and faith in the cause of freedom. They have our promise of continued moral support and we hope that the enslaved Lithuanians will find some comfort in the fact that they have our great respect and sympathy and that free men everywhere look forward to the day when Lithuania will be free of the burdens of oppression under which she now suffers.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanian independence day on February 16 will not be forgotten in Lithuania. But it will only be observed in silence and in silent prayer.

In the United States, on the contrary, the day will be widely commemorated by the nearly 1 million Lithuanian Americans in every State of the Union. On this occasion they will take the opportunity, as they have in the past, to renew their pledge of moral and spiritual support to their enslaved kinsmen.

The spirit of liberty has not died among the Lithuanian people in spite of the long night of their captivity. From the meager bits of news trickling through the Iron Curtain, we know that there is an invincible will for freedom and independence and that a resistance movement does exist. But the believers in freedom struggle against overwhelming odds. A recent report tells the story of tens of thousands of young people in the Baltic countries being deported to distant parts of the Soviet Union for so-called labor service. Most of these will never return to their native soil. Thus the Soviet Government is renewing the worst practices of the Stalinist era in an effort to extinguish the flaming hopes lighted by the Hungarian revolt.

We can but hope and pray that our generation will live to see the dawn of a new day in Eastern and Central Europe where 100 million people long for liberation. But if this day is to dawn, it will dawn as the result of the labors of those who look toward the future. The peoples of captive Europe and their friends in the West must look to the past, yes, for inspiration, for examples of that dauntless courage which is the eternal heritage of free men. But there is danger in too much looking to the past, the danger of languor, of vain regrets, of inacitivity.

And so, in looking to the future, in what direction should the efforts of the friends of Lithuania be joined, in striving for a liberated Lithuania, for a liberated Europe?

In the first place, we should do what lies in our power to share with the captive peoples our continued hope and faith in the eventual liberation. True, the horror of modern weapons has added a new dimension to the ancient battle for freedom. These weapons in the hands of tyrants provide a powerful deterrent to the forces of freedom. But it could never be said in the past, and it cannot be said now, that the sword, however mighty, is mightier than the spirit. In captive Europe the human will, the human mind, the human heart will yet prevail over the brute forces of the despots.

By the very spirit of resistance, fed by hope, the captive peoples can do much to deter further Soviet imperialism and to weaken the Soviet system. For example, although we may be inclined to think that the Hungarian revolution has ended in failure, has it indeed wholly failed? Has it not laid bare to the world the fact that the Soviet despots can never again count on the loyalties and the arms of the peoples of the European satellites? Has not this knowledge offered new opportunities to the West to press for a peaceful return by the Soviet Union to its prewar borders?

In the second place, the concept of the liberation of Eastern and Central Europe must be kept in step with the concept of European unity. European integration has been making rapid strides since the cold war was launched in all its virulent fury. Our hope and faith in an eventual rollback of the Iron Curtain should take into account that the Europe of the future should not follow too closely the pattern of the Europe of the past, whose rivalries and conflicts led to such tragic consequences. The recent somber history of the Baltic States points to the weakness and vulnerability of small sovereign nations in a lawless world. Congress has gone on record in favor of a strong, united Europe. This is an objective that promotes the true interests of all Europeans as well as of the United States. Indeed, the Assembly of Captive European Nations, representing Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania has declared in its statement of aims and principles that—

> Our work * * * is intended to serve the general interest of the free world through the integration of our homelands into a united Europe.

Central to this concept of European unity is the belief in the inalienable rights of the individual, rights which in their fundamental aspects should be beyond the power of government to curtail. This belief is the cement that binds the larger Atlantic community.

May the friends of the subjugated Lithuanian people find ways of helping to keep alive their faith in eventual liberation and of contributing toward the strength of a united Europe which could eventually throw its protective mantel around the captive nations.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the fight for freedom and independence is a never-ending one and once achieved a nation must be very vigilant and alert to protect its liberty. Our own history reveals this to be the fact because we won our independence through courage and faith in the ultimate justice of things and indeed through great sacrifice. Once achieved, we have continued to make sacrifices in order to protect our sovereign independence.

Such being the case we as a Nation naturally look with great sympathy and a feeling of fraternity to those countries who in this troubled world today have lost their freedom through the domination of some overpowering force. Therefore, it is very fitting for us to pause a moment in our active lives to do honor to a little nation established many years ago, who cherished its freedom but now exists under the domination of a foreign power. It is a privilege to salute the unquenchable desire for freedom which is characteristic of the Lithuanian people and in commemoration of the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence let us offer a fervent prayer that the constricting bonds of domination by others may soon be severed and that once again this great people may enjoy their inheritance in the knowledge of the sympathetic support of our country that stands forth as the champion of personal liberty.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 39th anniversary of the Lithuanian independence. It is a privilege for me at this time to give encouragement and support to the ideals and principles of the hundreds of thousands of American citizens of Lithuanian birth and descent on the occasion of this anniversary, and to pay tribute to the captive people of Lithuania, whose bold spirit has been an inspiration to the whole freedom-loving world. In Rhode Island we have a segment of the population who are of Lithuanian extraction. They have made a most worthy contribution to the civic life of our community. In their diligent work, in their respect for the Constitution and the laws of our community, they are exemplary citizens.

The Lithuanians behind the Iron Curtain look to America as the beacon for ships of freedom throughout the world.

The people of Lithuania through 8 centuries enjoyed liberty and self-government for long intervals. They have also been oppressed for long periods, during which their independence disappeared. They have been the victims of aggressors and have suffered through the centuries from attacks and rule of tyrants.

In 1918 Lithuania, still threatened with foreign pressure, was determined to rid her lands of invaders. The last battle with the Red forces was fought in 1919, and a peace treaty was signed in Moscow. Following this action, Lithuania was soon recognized by other powers, and she began her happy, though short, future as a free democratic republic. Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations in 1921. The next 20 years saw a period of progress and achievement in Lithuania. Following World War I, Lithuania made up for lost time brought about by the foreign invaders. The Government took the initiative in bringing about land reforms and social legislation. Improvements in transportation and education were pursued with diligence. The advancements made by the new republic would certainly serve as proof that Lithuania was capable of governing its own affairs, and that national sovereignty had been long overdue.

With the outbreak of World War II, Lithuania attempted to remain neutral. However, in October 1939, Soviet Russia forced upon Lithuania a "mutual assistance pact" which provided for the maintenance of a large Russian military garrison in that territory. The following year, in complete violation of their agreement, the Russians rushed in troops and dealt a final blow to the independence of Lithuania. Along with tanks and bayonets the Soviets brought in their elaborate system designed to enslave both body and mind. The NKVD began ruthless persecutions. All religious and cultural organizations were outlawed. Religion was proclaimed "the opium of the people." Portraits of Stalin and Lenin were placed in classrooms. Children were forced to join youth organizations where they were taught to spy on their parents, to abandon religion, and forget "that they were Lithuanians."

As professed lovers of liberty, we cannot, Mr. Speaker, allow this subjugation of a free people to go unnoticed and without some word from the free world. I believe that it is proper for us, on this anniversary of Lithuania's independence, to reaffirm our dedication to the principles which call for liberty and self-determination for all nations.

In expressing our deepest sympathy to the people of Lithuania may we reassure them that our Nation shall not rest until the yoke of oppression is lifted from their weary shoulders.

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, the Lithuanians in America will join together to commemorate the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

We all know the extant circumstances of Lithuania today. Likewise we know that during their independent status, they assumed their place in the family of free nations.

I hope and pray that in the not too distant future the people in Lithuania will again know that their independence is not a dream of the past but a reality of the present.

Those Lithuanians who have come to America and have integrated themselves in the American way of life are a great source of inspiration to their people abroad who are still under Communist domination.

I join all of you in praying that our fellow men in Lithuania will be given renewed faith and courage and hope for a brighter tomorrow.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on this 39th anniversary of the Lithuanian independence, we must again ask ourselves how long can we permit tyranny to dominate the freedom-loving Lithuanian people behind the Iron Curtain.

Can we bask in freedom's light while the shadow of oppression and terror afflicts so many of our friends behind the Iron Curtain?

It is indeed important that this Congress and the American people should consider the plight of the Lithuanian people. Our Government was the very first to recognize the independence of the Lithuanian people. The 3 million Lithuanians behind the Iron Curtain look to America with hope. They may be terrorized, they may be oppressed but they will never succumb to the force of communism.

In Cleveland, we have a large segment of the population who are of Lithuanian extraction. They have made a tremendous contribution to the civic life of our community. In their diligent work and provident thrift, in their respect for the Constitution and the laws of our community, they are exemplary citizens. They have always been proud of their culture and heritage. They have always been concerned with the welfare of their less fortunate relatives and friends who remained in Lithuania.

On Sunday, February 17, over 1,000 Americans of Lithuanian descent will attend a program in the WHK auditorium in Cleveland to commemorate this 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence under the auspices of the American Lithuanian Council in Cleveland. The spirit of Lithuanian independence must be kept alive until it is the privilege of the Lithuanian people as well as the other oppressed people in the world.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in December 1956 the Lithuanian Communist party secretary openly admitted bourgeois deviation from the official Communist line, adding the courageous and downtrodden people of Lithuania to the ever-growing list of dissenting Soviet captive areas. Of course, the Lithuanians had not been submissive under Soviet Communist rule for they had been resisting the sovietization of their country since its inception. There are other reasons, however, for us to commemorate with the Lithuanians the proclamation of their independence, because this late 1956 display of disaffection for the Communists was the first time such an admission had appeared in any of the Baltic Republics. We salute the Lithuanian people for this courageous step.

The struggle for independence had been an unceasing one since their dozen or more principalities were first united in the 13th century. Increasing application of power from the outside led to war and eventual Russian domination over their homeland, but the Lithuanians stubbornly refused to deny themselves their nation's survival. National consciousness persisted over the years, and they strived constantly to fulfill their democratic goals based on their glorious historical past. In 1916 Lithuanian delegates accredited to an international conference put these desires into print:

> * * * the Lithuanian nation with its own traditions, culture, national ideals and its individuality, believe that the only way a nation can survive is to acquire its own rights in all domains of life, and that the nation should direct its own destiny.

With this declaration, the free nation of Lithuania was launched once again on an independent course.

Independence was brief, however, and once again in 1940 the Lithuanians felt the stultifying impact of Russian hordes. And between 1941 and 1948, the fate of Lithuania was one of mass murder and vicious oppression. Hundreds of thousands died at the hands of the Communists. Nevertheless, the Russians had to appeal in early 1956 in a radio broadcast to the anti-Communists to surrender to the authorities, giving testimony that after 15 years of Soviet occupation an anti-Soviet underground existed.

This hope of a year ago is now becoming a reality when less than 2 months ago a Lithuanian Communist had to admit that bourgeois nationalist elements and their various accomplices begin to raise their heads. This so-called bourgeois nationalism, he also admitted, was a result of the recent armed Hungarian revolt. This was tacit admission by the Communists themselves that Lithuania had joined the vanguard for liberty with their valiant Hungarian compatriots. We are proud, therefore, to repeat our fervent wish for the achievement of Lithuanian national goals.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure on this occasion to salute the gallant people of Lithuania and the many United States citizens of Lithuanian origin on the 39th anniversary of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the independence of Lithuania, February 16, 1957.

It is a time which cannot be celebrated in Lithuania itself and when we in America must reaffirm our traditional friendship for the devout and dedicated people of that sorrowful land.

The Lithuanians enjoyed only a brief span of independence before that country again fell prey to Communist aggression. It is up to all of us as free Americans to send them our encouragement to carry on in the cause of liberty.

Our hopes and our prayers go out to them not only today but every day. Lithuanians and the other Baltic peoples must know that they will never be forgotten.

We look forward confidently to that time—we trust in the not too distant future—when they may again be restored to their rightful place in the family of free nations.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, Lithuanian Independence Day is celebrated February 16, which marks the 39th anniversary of the independence of that valiant nation. Behind the Iron Curtain the celebration is forbidden by Soviet aggressors so that the oppressed Lithuanians in that unhappy land observe the event with litanies of prayers beseeching Almighty God to deliver them from the hands of their cruel persecutors.

Mr. Speaker, the pages of history are filled with political systems whose existences are based on oppressing the inherent rights of people and crushing the spirit of other nations. Lithuania, too, has suffered this all-too-familiar fate. Nevertheless, Lithuania has continued to strive for independence and freedom. Her undying passion for democratic principles and her equally undying passion for the convictions and beliefs that make those same democratic principles possible, have nurtured the Lithuanian desire for national survival. This, too, has placed Lithuania in the vanguard with other courageous nations who continue to strive for liberty and independence. We commemorate today, therefore, the proclamation of Lithuanian Independence Day, pausing to show our admiration for this great determination to survive.

The Lithuanians, descendants of an eastern branch of the Indo-European race, were united as early as the 13th century. Their unification was accomplished in spite of devastating wars and unending foreign pressures. The Lithuanian spirit and drive for freedom and national independence, however, could not be broken and finally in 1918 Lithuanian officially proclaimed her independence. This period of independence was short lived for she was forcibly incorporated within the U. S. S. R. in 1940. But the inherent determination of the Lithuanians to regain their status of national independence and their desire to exist as a free nation has not been obliterated. Lithuanians know—as do all of us of the free world—that the existence of tyranny anywhere is a threat to freedom for all nations. We cannot afford this sort of complacency at any time, but particularly not today, when totalitarian ideologies are on the march. We salute, therefore, the valiant nation of Lithuania on this day of her independence anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, America is proud of the Lithuanian immigrants who came to our shores and by their character, industriousness, and loyalty to their adopted land, have made marked contributions to the progress and development of this great Nation.

In my congressional district in Pennsylvania, we have many fine Lithuanian families whose children represent a generation of American citizens of the highest caliber. These young men and women have served their country with honor and distinction in all the wars in which it has engaged, reflecting to a marked degree the love of freedom exemplified by their parents many of whom came here as immigrants seeking the liberty denied them in their native land.

Today the American Nation, in its salute to the freedom-loving people, joins in their prayers that a just and merciful God will hasten the day when they may break the shackles that now consign them to a life of suffering and servitude.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, today we pause to celebrate the 39th anniversary of the proclamation of Lithuanian independence. We all know that Lithuania was conquered by Soviet Russia at the beginning of World War II and has been incorporated into the Soviet Union itself. But some may not realize that the story of the Lithuanian people goes on today. They were crushed by Soviet armed might and exist now under the repressive heel of the Soviet Communist bureaucracy. But the Lithuanian people continue to seek that freedom which they experienced as an independent nation from 1918 until 1940. In this hour we are testifying to their unquenchable thirst for freedom, for that liberty which we are often tempted to take lightly because ours seems so secure. But also in this hour we are calling the attention of the world once again to the Soviet denial of independence to the foreign nations in her control. Soviet Russia practices this repression of the Lithuanian people, but in the next breath pledges her undying devotion to the cause of freedom for oppressed and exploited peoples everywhere. We must not cease to make this hypocrisy clear.

The Lithuanian people have never surrendered themselves to communism. Ever since the end of World War II, they have resisted Communist attempts to Sovietize their country. Great numbers of Lithuanians were deported and there were large-scale movements of Russians into Lithuania. The Soviet Union attempted to collectivize the Lithuanian farms. Any celebration of the Lithuanian Independence Day was forbidden and the flag of free Lithuania could not be displayed. The Soviet authorities admitted last year that the spirit of resistance lived on in spite of this, for they began an unsuccessful drive to lure back the anti-Communist underground still at large in Lithuania. They proclaimed an amnesty for all such fugitives, but the Lithuanians fought on.

At the very end of 1956 when the eyes of the world were focused on the Soviet brutality in Hungary and Poland's attempt to gain freedom from Soviet domination, the seeds of discontent were also blossoming forth in Lithuania. The educated men and women of Lithuania had begun to attack Soviet culture in all its aspects—the arts, the sciences, and, of course, Soviet philosophy. The Soviet Union vowed a campaign against what it called these instances of bourgeoisie ideology. But what is this bourgeoisie ideology Russia wants to kill? It is the claim to freedom from domination by the brute power of a foreign totalitarian state. It is the claim to the right which Christians have affirmed for 2,000 years, the right to know the truth and to act on the belief that the individual man has infinite value, for he is the child of God. The freedom which Soviet Russia gave was only the freedom to live within the mental chains of a foreign-imposed communism.

We who live in America salute the freedom-loving people of Lithuania on this occasion of their independence day. We salute them with knowledge that the world will not be permitted to forget that they live under Soviet domination. We salute them with our renewed devotion to fight the threats to liberty that may arise in our own land. We pray that they may be strengthened to bear the harshness of foreign totalitarian rule and that God, in his infinite mercy, may lighten their burden.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to associate myself with my colleagues in this House who are commemorating the 39th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, which falls on February 16.

It seems to me that we can best and most fittingly observe this anniversary, which is a milestone on the obstacle-strewn roadway of human freedom, not merely by felicitations, in which all of us may join with the greatest sincerity, but more particularly by using this House, this assembly of the elected representatives of a free people, as a sounding board to reach the whole world, and especially the cruel and graceless and godless lords of Communist imperialism, to send out messages of hope and encouragement to the nearly three million people now living in Lithuania who are actually in captivity behind the Iron Curtain.

They cannot leave. If they could, our country gladly would provide asylum for many of them, as we are doing for those who have been able to escape from the Red terror in Hungary. Doubtless many of them would not wish to leave their homeland if they could; but they do yearn for freedom, the freedom which they won when the Czar was overthrown in 1918, the freedom which they lost when in 1940 the armed might of Communist imperialism crushed the resistance of the Lithuanian people, who number in total approximately the same as the population of my own State of Connecticut, and forced them against their will to become a Soviet in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

To emphasize the mockery which Soviet Russia perpetuated, the people of

the Republic of Lithuania have had no opportunity to have a free election, have had no say about their government, which is conducted on direct orders from Moscow. Lithuania has no direct contact with the outside world, except as directed by Soviet Russia.

We all know that, in this era when all over the world new nations are emerging by self-determination to independence and freedom, Soviet Russia is the biggest colonial empire in the world. The Kremlin counts Lithuania as one of its colonies.

But the 10,000 Americans of Lithuanian birth who live in my State, and their tens of thousands of children and grandchildren, and their friends and neighbors by the hundreds of thousands who admire and respect them and the land of their origin, know that Lithuania will not willingly continue to be a colony of any empire.

The fires that light and warm the way to freedom still burn in Lithuania, although their brightness may not today be visible across the seas. Here, today, let us assure our friends in that beautiful country on the Baltic, that we admire their courage, and that we look forward to the day when we may be able to help them to secure again the freedom which they won 39 years ago, and to see them take their place among the United Nations as a free and independent country.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to say that this 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence should again alert all freemen to the price of freedom. Lithuania today portrays a truth we cannot permit to grow dim—the truth that a lack of adequate strength and unity among free nations spells Soviet domination. We cannot view this truth as a Nation apart from immediate threat, for only through mutual vigilance, strength, and unity among all who cherish liberty can independence be attained, maintained, or regained.

It is timely that we recall the Soviet aim. On the eve of the conquest of Lithuania, Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov boldly stated that Lithuania "should begin now to initiate your people into the Soviet system which in the future shall reign everywhere."

It is well that we and other free nations recall the Soviet's tactics—professed friendship, professed guaranties of territorial integrity, the peaceful entry of military units under a so-called mutual-assistance treaty, internal subversion, an incident coupled with demands, and, finally, rigged elections leading to the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

Nor can we forget the consequences—the mass deportation of Lithuanians to the Soviet Arctic, the warping of the thought and culture and economy of Lithuania to the perverted mold of communism, the stifling of religion and the sacrifice of human liberties to the monstrous appetite of Soviet dictation.

On this independence day, Americans join with Lithuanians everywhere in reasserting the inalienable right of all men to be free. We join in recognition of the undying will of a people to throw off their bonds and again to exercise their freedom. The will of a nation to assume its rightful identity still flames, and with the patient and watchful unity of all free peoples, history will again confirm the reality of Lithuanian independence.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, the Republic of Lithuania proclaimed its independence. After hundreds of years under the control of the Russian Czars, Lithuania became a free nation. Unfortunately, the people of Lithuania had only a short period of freedom, for in 1940 the Soviet Union brutally seized this democratic nation. Nevertheless, the social and economic accomplishments of the Republic of Lithuania were many during this period of independence.

We all feel sadness that on the 39th anniversary of their independence the people of Lithuania are not able to join with us in commemorating this momentous event. I know that they are observing this day as best they can with the hope that the Republic of Lithuania will soon be once again free from Russian domination. I am certain that love of liberty is very strong in the hearts of the Lithuanian people.

I want to take this opportunity to reassure the Lithuanian people that they are not forgotten, and that their valiant resistance to oppression, and their love of freedom, are remembered well by the American people. I would like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the courage of the Lithuanian people and in extending to them our best wishes on this 39th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the Republic of Lithuania.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, the 39th anniversary of Lithuania's independence was observed by Lithuanians the world over last Saturday, February 16, and once again it gives me pleasure to join with my colleagues in honoring that valiant nation. As we commemorate this anniversary, it is fitting that we, and all other freedom-loving people reflect upon the tragic events which brought about the enslavement of this courageous country whose heroic history dates back to the Middle Ages.

On February 16, 1918, after more than 120 years of Russian domination, Lithuania achieved her independence. Her status as an independent nation lasted a brief 22 years, during which time she made great progress in economics and education, and outstanding achievements in commerce, agriculture, and industry. In 1940, Russia violated its treaty commitments, the Red army marched in, and this brave little country again fell under the yoke of Communist oppression. Nevertheless, the spirit of her stalwart people still burns brightly, and their firm stand against their aggressors is a source of inspiration to oppressed people everywhere. Their determination to restore freedom to their country will eventually lead them to victory over their oppressors, and it is my fervent hope that the day is not far distant when Lithuania will regain her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues here on the floor of Congress and pay tribute to a gallant nation and its courageous people.

Lithuania, with great traditions of national sovereignty going far back in time, finally proclaimed its independence on February 16, 1918. This after centuries of subjugation by the Russian regime. Unfortunately, as has been so well developed here today, that independence was short-lived. As a result of a series of military occupations during World War II, the Lithuanian Republic was destroyed and its people once again enslaved. The tragic story of the brutal assault of this noble and courageous nation by Soviet Russia has been repeated many times. In spite of this long history of continuous oppression, the Lithuanian people have managed to preserve their nation and their national heritage. Endowed with an indomitable will and inspired by intense patriotism—patriotism purified in the crucible of oppression—the people of this small Baltic state continue to resist their oppressors now as they have done so many times in the past. They are displaying the same tenacity and vigor that their forefathers did in years gone by.

As I have previously said on this same floor of Congress, the contribution of the Lithuanians in America and their descendants gives us some idea of the national vitality of that country. It is an indication that confidence and faith in Lithuania's future is well placed. The distinctive culture, the deep-rooted traditions, and the rich folklore of the Lithuanian people have greatly enriched our own country. Their contribution has been magnificent, and I am proud that so many of them are citizens of my State of Rhode Island. Today the Lithuanian people are held in the grip of the greatest tyranny of modern times. For these courageous people all the world raises its voice in a common cry of righteous indignation. No one knows just what the future holds in store for Lithuania. Of one fact, however, the Lithuanian people can be very sure—they have the sympathy and good will of all the free world.

For the past several years it has been my custom to speak briefly in the House of Representatives on this occasion of the anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. Each year I have expressed my sincere hope that the next anniversary would find the noble people of Lithuania restored to the family of free nations. And each succeeding year I have been a little more disheartened to realize that little progress has been made.

Now, however, there appears to be an increasing indication that perhaps in the not too distant future our pious hopes may become reality. From rumblings within the Iron Curtain the free world learns that Soviet intervention in the affairs of Eastern European nations has caused a rebirth of the drive for independence. It could be but a question of time before this drive gains the proportions of an all-out crusade, sweeping before it the Russian oppressors and returning valiant Lithuania to its rightful place as an independent nation. May God will it so.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in northeastern Europe some 3 million Lithua-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

nians live in an area of only a little more than 20,000 square miles. They are one of the smallest national groups in all Europe, though the important role they have played in European history has no relation to their size as a nation. Through most of the Middle Ages and part of the modern times they have been the upholders and defenders of Western Christian civilization. In the course of their turbulent history they have managed to hold their own and safeguard their freedom, even in adversity. By the beginning of the 19th century, however, the powerful Russian advance overwhelmed them. Their country was then overrun and incorporated into the Russian empire. In 1918 when the Czarist regime collapsed the Lithuanians took advantage of the situation and proclaimed their national independence on February 16 of that year. Unfortunately the independence thus regained lasted only two decades. In 1940 the Lithuanians were annexed to the Soviet Union.

Since then Lithuanians in their beloved homeland have not known freedom. Under the unbending regime there, installed by the heartless men of the Kremlin, they are denied all freedom. They cannot leave the country, and they are sealed off from the free world. We of course know that those brave and patriotic Lithuanians do not have even the freedom to celebrate their independence day. Let us ardently and heartily hope that soon these deserving souls, suffering under Communist tyrants, will regain their freedom once more and celebrate their national holiday, the Lithuanian Independence Day, in their beloved homeland.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, anniversaries often commemorate different kinds of occasions. Sometimes they recall memories of stirring or happy events in the past. The observance of the birthdays of two great Americans makes this month of February especially important to us. Often, however, anniversaries are solemn reminders of the injustices still being countenanced in the world today. Such an anniversary was February 16—the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

For an all-too-brief score of years, Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors, Estonia, Latvia, Finland, and Poland had freedom to develop their own national and democratic way of life. During her period of independence, from 1918 to 1940, Lithuania made remarkable progress in every phase of life, and received the recognition of the other free nations for her cultural, educational, and economic growth.

However, in August of 1939, the Soviet Union concluded an infamous agreement with the Nazis to divide eastern Europe between them—a fate suffered by these peoples on several occasions throughout history. By terms of this most unholy alliance, the Baltic countries, including the eastern half of Poland, fell into the sphere of the Soviet Union. The Russians were not long in extending their influence over these valiant little republics which had asked no more than the right to live their own lives in peace. They were annexed in 1940 by the Russians; then by the Nazi armies from 1941 to 1944, and then reoccupied and ruled by the Soviet forces up to the present day. During these years of agony, the people of these Baltic republics were forced to choose between some desperate alternatives—to flee over the perilous Baltic to the friendly Scandinavian countries or to Germany, knowing that a very uncertain fate awaited them in Hitler's crumbling Reich, or to stay, knowing that death or deportation awaited many of them at the hands of the Soviets. Few people have endured such a cruel ordeal.

The example of Hungary has shown us that the spirit of freedom and independence burns brightly in eastern Europe, masked, perhaps, by a sullen compliance with the Soviet overlords as eloquent as open revolt itself. Over Eastern Europe has descended, in the words of Winston Churchill who was speaking of an earlier era of oppression, "a long night of barbarism, unbroken by even a star of hope" unless we in the United States forever insist and maintain that under no circumstances will we ever be parties to the bargaining away of the right of independence of Lithuania and her sister republics. We must continue to refuse to recognize the occupation of the three Baltic countries.

The people of Lithuanian descent have contributed much to America and the other lands in which they have settled in search of haven and a new life. I join with others in commending them for their steadfast devotion to those principles espoused by the two great Americans whose birthdays we celebrate this month. What Lincoln and Washington stood for are as applicable to Lithuania as to the United States. Liberty is indivisible, and tyranny, wherever it is found, threatens our own liberties. Let us hope that our expressions of tribute to Lithuania on this occasion may once more demonstrate to the entire world our firm desire that other peoples of the world may come to enjoy the blessings of freedom that we have always known.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, as the free world continues to occupy itself with the grave concerns of Soviet aggression it is fitting to consider for a moment the example of Lithuania, where black totalitarian night remains pierced by the love for liberty of a courageous and indomitable people.

February 16 marked the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence—an independence which was extinguished in one of the earliest excesses of the Soviet Union. It was created as a nation in the surge of hope and idealism that followed World War I; during the brief time that Lithuania occupied her rightful place in the family of free nations the cultural, economic, political, and social contributions of its people were outstanding.

Today, as we commemorate this anniversary, there is no longer a Lithuania. Its flag has been destroyed; its national anthem made mute. More than a half-million Lithuanian men, women, and children—one-sixth of the total population—have been deported to Soviet slave-labor camps or have died in prison or massacre.

Visitors are barred from Lithuania; no one is allowed to leave the country. Yet, the little news that we manage to obtain from that land tells us that a resistance movement flourishes there, that the will for freedom remains invincible. The fate of Lithuania should serve to remind us that our hopes for a free world can be fulfilled only if we insist upon freedom for every nation.

Mr. DELLAY. Mr. Speaker, I salute the Americans of Lithuanian descent who are celebrating the 39th anniversary of the adoption of the declaration of independence at Vilnius, as well as the good and brave people of Lithuania, existing under the heel of the oppressor. In spite of persecution and indescribable humiliation, they have had the fortitude and courage to carry on a resistance against their oppressors. It has become a tradition with Lithuanians to fight for liberty and freedom and for the belief in the church of their ancestors. It is indeed commendable that they still hold high the torch of their tradition and look to the day when the march of communism is ended. In view of the splendid record and generous contribution to humanity given by this small country, we earnestly hope for her quick recovery. Until then we must exert ourselves to keep the light of freedom burning brightly until it illuminates the whole world. On that day a new proclamation of liberty will bring joy to the hearts of the people of Lithuania and all other freedom-loving nations of the earth. Again, I salute these valiant people.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 Americans of Lithuanian ancestry commemorated the 39th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania. All over the world, Lithuanians gathered to renew their efforts and to encourage one another to continue to work for the independence of their homeland. In Baltimore, the Council of Lithuanian Societies also observed this anniversary with a large rally and dinner, which it was my privilege to attend. On this occasion, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

At the annual banquet, commemorating the 39th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania, sponsored by the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore, Md., held on the 16th day of February 1957, at Lithuanian Hall, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas during the past year Soviet leaders in the Kremlin have had serious disagreements among themselves as to the methods, doctrines, and accomplishments of their former idol, Joseph Stalin; and

"Whereas unrest and uprisings in Russian satellite nations have demonstrated that the yearning for freedom still burns strongly in the hearts of the people of subjugated countries existing behind the Iron Curtain; and

"Whereas in particular the spontaneous October rebellion in Budapest, Hungary, against Kremlin rule certainly indicates that Soviet imperialism is in trouble; and

"Whereas many thousands of Hungarian refugees, leaving behind their martyred companions, escaped from their homeland rather than submit to Soviet tyranny and found haven in the United States of America; and

"Whereas the spirit displayed by the Hungarian people in their fight for freedom from Soviet rule is a shining example to the subjugated people of Lithuania and their Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia; and

"Whereas the Hungarian cause of independence is essentially the same as and synonymous with the Lithuanian cause; and

"Whereas the signs of disintegration of the Soviet regime hold out a new ray of hope to people everywhere to strive unceasingly until liberty and freedom are again achieved: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the leaders of our country be urged to continue to maintain the fight for peace, justice, protection, and freedom for all people; and be it finally

"*Resolved,* That any new immigration laws to be enacted by Congress take into consideration that loyal Lithuanians are just as desirous of finding freedom and refuge in the United States of America as the patriotic Hungarians."

In Lithuania the bright flame of freedom which lighted that nation with such promise and progress has been darkened by the bitter night of communistic tyranny.

Thirty-nine years ago, Lithuania stood forth as an independent, democratic republic with a happy, prosperous people who faced the future with confidence in their destiny.

Today, the bright star of Lithuania's freedom has been clouded over by the violent storms of oppression. We gaze with sadness upon the advancinng tragedy of sacrifice to ruthless Russian imperialism that has enveloped Lithuania.

The world does not know all the terrible details of what has happened and is still happening to Lithuanians behind the dark, impenetrable Iron Curtain. However, we do know that behind that dreadful Iron Curtain, hundreds of thousands of God-fearing Lithuanians have been liquidated, martyred for their patriotism, their religious faith, their steadfast resistance to tyranny.

Hundreds of thousands of good Lithuanians, just as the unfortunate people in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and other satellite nations have been torn from their families and their homes for service as slaves in Siberia. It is slave labor that the Communists are using to equip Russia for further expansion, for further despotism, for further persecution, and perhaps even for war.

Certainly we cannot continue and must not continue to close our eyes to this injustice, to close our ears to the calls for help, to close our hearts to the suffering we know is going on behind the Iron Curtain.

Without losing our honor, we cannot much longer ignore the human tragedy the Iron Curtain conceals. We cannot much longer hold up our heads in self-respect, if we continue to give silent approval to a group of atheistic political leaders who have demonstrated themselves to be devoid of Christian humanity and sense of Christian justice.

The cause of Lithuania and the other small nations is a challenge to the moral conscience of this Nation and the United Nations to establish the great, basic principles of freedom and liberty for all peoples.

To rally the support that we ourselves must have from God-fearing nations of this world, we must openly state that we will work for the liberation of all countries that have been enslaved by the Red Russian imperialism.

There is no other course to follow if Christian peace and freedom is to be retained on this earth. With the help of Almighty God and the persevering sacrifice of all Christian peoples, I belive that all of us will see the dawn of a new era of freedom and peace for Lithuania and the world.

May that day be not far away.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 39 years ago, Lithuania threw off the shackles of czarist brutality and proclaimed her independence. For the following 22 years, every February 16 was joyfully celebrated by the Lithuanian people.

It was natural and proper that these free people proudly observed every independence day. Each year found Lithuanian growing in all the attributes that makes a free nation strong. Through the creative energy of her people Lithuania became a progressive independent democratic republic. With freedom there naturally followed internal consolidation. Industrial establishments grew in number. Socially, great strides were made to insure the health and general welfare of the people. Rapid progress was also made in education. Politically, Lithuania became a respected member of the international community.

However, now, on the 39th anniversary of independence, Lithuania is no longer free. Nevertheless Lithuanians throughout the world still commemorate this glorious day.

Unfortunately, today, the people in this enslaved nation will have to mark it in their hearts. For the past 17 years, Soviet oppression has prevented any open celebration of this day.

Consequently, it rests with the free world to transmit hope and aspiration to them on this occasion. It is especially important that the United States, the leader of the free world, speak for these silenced Lithuanians. It is just that we Americans remind these brave Lithuanians that we have not forgotten their suffering. It is also just that we assure these persecuted people that we will continue to renounce the fraudulent incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union; and continue to demand the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live.

The American people will not rest until Lithuania once more is master of her own fate. We will not sit idly by as long as any nation with such an historical record of independence remains enslaved.

The recent events in Hungary perhaps has provided us with an opportunity to aid these oppressed peoples. This revolution is indicative of the unrest that is spreading throughout the Communist-controlled world. Accordingly, it might be the opportune time to negotiate with Russia on the satellite problem.

With this in mind I recently joined with 10 other Democrats in offering President Eisenhower a plan for achieving the peaceful liberation of the satellite countries. This plan would provide a startling point for negotiation with the Soviet Union. Briefly, the plan included the demilitarization of the area between the Rhine and Soviet Russia; international guaranties of constitutional liberties in the liberated nations; and economic aid to promote regional federation and economic integration.

I think it is appropriate on the anniversary of Lithuanian independence that we Americans remind the captive Lithuanian people that we have not become reconciled to their fate. The plan that was submitted to the President is evidence that we are constantly trying to find a solution to the satellite problem. We assure the Lithuanian people that we will continue to work for conditions that will eventually lead to their freedom.

## TITO PROTEST PETITION

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, in a joint statement issued by Representative GORDON L. McDONOUGH, Republican, of California, with the cooperation of KENNETH KEATING, Republican, of New York; JOHN McCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts; and RAY MADDEN, Democrat, of Indiana, sponsors and circulators of a petition to the President of the United States protesting an invitation to Marshal Tito as an official guest of this country, they stated:

Since the objective of the petition has been obtained by the refusal of Tito to accept an invitation to visit the United States as an official guest at this time, we do not intend to submit this petition to the President of the United States at this time, and will hold the petition in abeyance until further action initiating such an invitation from the White House or the State Department is taken.

The petition was signed by 168 Members of the House of Representatives, representing 41 States. We will not release the names of the Members signing this petition until it is submitted to the President. The petition is available for signing by any Members of the House who have not already signed.

Inside sources say that actually Dulles had no part in initiating the invitation to Tito. He was in the hospital when that idea was advanced and got underway. When he got back on his feet, he felt he had to go along with what had become an official line. The old Acheson crowd in State, it is said, started the move to invite Tito and has tenaciously held to it. Privately, it is reported that Jacob Beam, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, is the bureaucrat who pushed the matter for the crowd.

## ACCOUNTING BY CONGRESS OF COUNTERPART FUND EXPENDITURES

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced legislation that should be welcomed by every member. It is a simple bill, but its purpose is extensive. That purpose is to require the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

committees of Congress in the future to budget and account for the expenditure of counterpart funds.

Mr. Speaker, there isn't a Member of this House who has not been damaged by a recent disclosure that two employees of the other body used thousands of dollars in counterpart funds for a free-spending, free-wheeling tour of Europe. The justifiable discharge of these employees, does not correct the damage done, for in the public mind remains their statement to the effect that they had done "nothing that was not a general practice of Members of Congress."

Until the people of this Nation are permitted to know how counterpart funds are spent by Members of Congress and its committees, this statement will stand uncontradicted by any evidence they will accept.

In introducing this legislation, I do not question the wisdom of using counterpart funds to help finance trips we make under committee auspices to foreign countries. I do not challenge the value of those trips. On the contrary, I am convinced that with few exceptions the work of Congress in its investigative capacity here and abroad, saves the taxpayers thousands of dollars for every dollar spent. Because I believe this, I am confident that full disclosure and budgeting of these funds in the future would convince the public mind once and for all that they are not being misspent.

My bill is simple in purpose and content. It provides merely that the amount of counterpart currency—local currency of a foreign nation—used to defray the expenses of any committee shall be charged against the amounts available to the committee in the respective contingent funds of the House and Senate.

This is only orderly accounting procedure. Under the practice that now prevails, the various committees are allowed a definite budget for travel expenses.

In addition, however, committees have been spending undisclosed amounts of counterpart funds to finance travel abroad. As a result, the Members and the public have no idea of the extent of travel by Members and committees. This is poor budgetary procedure. If a committee can justify a budget of $100,000 per year for travel it should have that budget. If it can use counterpart funds to meet a portion of the cost of this travel, it should do so. But, it should not, as is presently the case, justify an expenditure of $100,000 and then supplement this budget with undisclosed and unregulated amounts of counterpart funds.

I have faith that every Member of Congress would spend counterpart funds wisely and with more confidence in the future if he knew that these funds were subject to the regular scrutiny that other congressional expenditures are. As is presently the case, the entire membership suffers from the impact of rumors that some Members and some committees are abusing this privilege. I have found that rumors grow and that in every case the rumors exaggerate by many times the situation which started them in the first place.

We require the employees of the executive agencies to account for the expenditure of counterpart funds. We should be held to the same accountability. I can think of no situation as indefensible as the one now confronting us—that is, to require by law the justification of expenditures of public funds—counterpart or otherwise—by Government employees, and then exempt ourselves from the duty so imposed.

---

## FIFTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SINKING OF THE BATTLESHIP "MAINE"

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRD). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the 59th anniversary of an event and tragedy that in the development of sequences started the United States of America on the road to her destiny. As the House will not be in session tomorrow, I am taking advantage of this opportunity again to pay respect to the memory of the 266 men who went down with the battleship *Maine* in Habana Harbor on February 15, 1898.

For more than half a century I, with other veterans of the Spanish-American War, annually have paid tribute to the memory of those heroes. When I came to this body there were four Members of the House who had served in the Spanish-American War. Of the four, I alone remain, and this year, as in every year since I have been a Member of this House, I have asked and graciously have been granted by unanimous consent 1 hour to pay tribute to the heroes who died on the battleship *Maine*.

Mr. Speaker, I have in this a purpose. So dramatic and dynamic have been the events that followed one after another in the 20th century that those great, momentous events in the last years of the 19th century, events that were drawing the blueprint of our history, have largely been forgotten. I know that sometime there will come a period when historians will give greater and more understanding scrutiny to the last half decade of the 19th century and the early years of the a-borning 20th century. It was then that in every American's blood was the feel of the destiny for his country that was at the end of the trail that he as a part of his generation was building. It was a feeling, indefinite and undefined, that possessed him and as a magnet drew him into a crusade of patriotism to prepare his country for her rendezvous with destiny.

When we went to war with Spain, Spain still was regarded as one of the four great powers of the world. With an army and a navy composed entirely of volunteers, we engaged the enemy in the waters and on the land in the areas of the Pacific and the Atlantic. Our volunteer forces, soldiers and sailors alike, fought with a brilliancy that never had been equalled in all the history of warfare. So quick, so decisive were the victories that one could have only the sense that guiding those victories was the will of Providence.

It was my fortune to witness the naval engagement on July 3, 1898. The proud ships of Spain came out of Santiago Harbor to do battle. They were good ships, the pride of the Spanish navy, ably and courageously officered and manned. Within almost a matter of minutes they were destroyed one after the other, and I, then a boy of 16, watching that engagement from the heights near Aquadores whereat my regiment of American infantry was stationed, wondered if in that which I was seeing with my human eyes was not indeed part of the pattern of Providence to make of our country the instrumentality for carrying mankind to greater heights.

I am hopeful that when the day comes when historians of later generations seek to recapture the spirit of 1898, the spirit that has carried us to our present position of world responsibility, some researcher going through the files of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by chance may hit upon some of the remarks in the annual observance in this Chamber of the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine*.

For the Members of this House I have a feeling of very warm affection. It has been entrusted to me by my comrades in the various sessions of the Congress to introduce the bill to increase the very small pension paid to the widows of our Spanish War veterans. Each year the House so graciously, so generously and with such fine spirit has passed this bill, only to have it go to the other body and there fail to meet the understanding that our cause has met in the warmth of the membership of this great body.

I am hopeful this year that the House early will pass the three Spanish War bills; the widows' bill, the bill for the neglected naval veterans and for our Moro veterans and that similar favorable consideration will be given in the other body.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California who fought so valiantly all during the years for the Spanish War veterans.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois. I realize that he speaks from his experience as a witness of the events of that great war that the United States fought, not to acquire additional territory or wealth for the United States, but for the freedom and independence of another nation.

I also join with him in his appeal to the House that the bill before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will come to the floor and be favorably acted upon to increase the pensions to the surviving widows of the Spanish-American War veterans. I have introduced a companion bill and I join him in the hope that the other body will see the light of day as the House has seen it.

This war about which the gentleman has been speaking and in which we spent our manpower and wealth in order to win, was different from any other war that has ever been fought. Here was a great nation, the United States, fighting to obtain independence from Spain for two other nations, the Philippines and

Cuba, which independence since has been given to them—and which has become the nucleus on which we can depend upon having the kind of freedom and independence that we hope will eventually be established in the great far eastern Pacific area. We indoctrinated them with that spirit. They have preserved that spirit and given expression in their country to the great views of constitutional rights, through the sentiments expressed by their President Magsaysay.

If the war of 1898 had not been fought we would not now have that friend in the Far East, the Philippine Islands, which is a point that the researchers in history, to which the gentleman from Illinnois referred, have overlooked entirely. It was the Spanish-American War that gave us the opportunity to establish freedom and independence in the Far East through the Philippine Islands.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the distinguished and able gentleman from Illinois, who has again so eloquently and forcefully presented the cause in which he is so deeply interested, which should and does appeal to every truly patriotic American. He has pointed out that this war was won by volunteers, fired by the spirit of youth with a vision of the destiny of our country. We have become the world power envisioned by these volunteers. We must not shirk the obligations owed to their widows.

I want to assure the gentleman that I shall support the bill for the support of the widows of the Spanish-American War and I certainly hope the gentleman will have success in the other body as well as in the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to our beloved majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I join with my colleagues in congratulating my dear friend from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] on taking the floor today to make the stirring and eloquent speech he has in commemoration of those who fought at Manila, and particularly those who went down with the United States battleship *Maine*.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is the only Member of this House who served during the Spanish-American War. The Members of the House have an affection for the gentleman from Illinois. One of the reasons for the deep affection we have for him is his loyalty to the comrades who served with him and all those who served our country during the Spanish-American War.

The fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] takes the floor to make the stirring and eloquent remarks he has in relation to the anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine*, and particularly with reference to those brave men who went down with the *Maine*, is the best evidence of his love and affection for all those who served our country so ably and so well during that war.

The remarks of my friend from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] are very appropriate as to the far-reaching effect that has flowed from the Spanish-American War. On the occasion of the anniversary exercises in this House for our late President, William McKinley, I made reference to the far-reaching effects of the Spanish-American War in the life of our country.

My State of Massachusetts is one State of the Union that has shown in a most effective and concrete manner the extent to which we honor those who served in the Spanish-American War, and particularly those who went down with the *Maine*. I am very happy that I am on the floor while my friend from Illinois is making his eloquent speech of commemoration, and I thank the gentleman for yielding to me so that I might make my slight contribution of tribute.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, from the bottom of my heart I thank the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK] for the friendship he has shown on every occasion to the cause of the Spanish War veterans and the widows who so sorely are in need.

The Ninth Massachusetts was brigaded with the regiment of infantry in which I was a corporal. We trained together. We went to Cuba together. Occasionally today I hear from one of the veterans of the old Ninth Massachusetts and always there is warm reference to our distinguished and beloved majority leader. I know the veterans of the old Ninth Massachusetts will appreciate the gentleman's joining us today in paying tribute to the memory of the 266 American heroes whose lives were wiped out in Havana Harbor 59 years ago tomorrow. Spanish War veterans everywhere have a very soft spot in their hearts for JOHN McCORMACK.

Mr. Speaker, I marvel how little this generation understands the great events of the Spanish American War period and their relation to the problems of today. Let me refer briefly to one incident. The Spanish War period ran from 1898 through 1902 and included the Boxer Expedition when our troops marched with those from Germany, Japan, Russia and Great Britain to the rescue of the imprisoned personnel of the embassies in Peking. Reaching Peking, these troops scaled the walls of that city and it was there that the great son of Illinois, Captain Riley, was killed.

In the march to Peking the Russians were our allies, but they could not be controlled. They wantonly were killing Chinese men, women, and children and throwing their mangled bodies into the river. At one time the Americans attacked them in force to end such inhuman conduct. This is part of the record of that period.

The American soldiers were the first foreigners to set foot in the Forbidden City. For a year or so American soldiers policed the sacred grounds that theretofore no foreigners had ever entered. The relation of the Americans with the Chinese was most cordial in striking contrast to that of the Russians with the Chinese.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Mississippi). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his fine statement. The gentleman performs a great service to the House by reminding us on this anniversary every year of the great contribution made by the gallant men of the Spanish-American War to the destiny of this Republic. I have a colony of Spanish-American war veterans in my district. I am proud to number them among my constituency. I join my colleague in saluting them and their comrades and widows on this date.

## ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF BLACKBURN COLLEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, no one person, institution, or organization can rightfully take credit for the phenomenal, if not fantastic, growth of America. But when we analyze our progress and development we must take cognizance of the immense contribution our educational institutions have made in catapulting our Nation into a position of world leadership.

One candle lighting the darkness of this continent over the past 100 years is an educational institution located in the Land of Lincoln, known to all as Blackburn College.

Yesterday, February 13, 1957, Blackburn marked its 100th anniversary of the granting of its charter by dedicating a $350,000 science building constructed entirely by student labor. Appropriately enough, this new addition to the Blackburn campus will stand as a cornerstone as this institution enters its second century of educational progress.

For any person or any institution to exist for 100 years is indeed a praiseworthy accomplishment, for time is most destructive, and few can boast of having withstood its ravages for so long a period.

To me, the centennial anniversary of a school is even more noteworthy than is the 100th anniversary of an individual, for in a school such as Blackburn many lives, richened by college experience, have matured in the span of a century of educational and social growth. The influence of such a school is unlimited as its students go into the world to become leading citizens and to share their education with many hundreds of others whose personal lives are brightened by the light of knowledge and strengthened by the practical lessons in self-discipline and cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I appear here in the House today to take note of this centennial anniversary which will be celebrated

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

by Blackburn College throughout this year. I do so with a feeling of pride and humility. I am especially proud because Blackburn is my college and is located in my hometown of Carlinville, Ill. I am humble because I feel that I personally benefited by attending this institution, whose learning and labor program is unique, not only in the State of Illinois but also throughout the world.

SELF-HELP COLLEGE

Mr. Speaker, the story of Blackburn is the story of America. Its development is typical of the democratic development of this country itself. Blackburn is not an ordinary college. It is a self-help school where every student is required to carry his share of the load by working on the college property 15 hours each week. The Blackburn self-help plan has truly been a plan of democracy at work.

Rev. Gideon Blackburn, a Presbyterian minister, founded the forerunner of the present institution in 1837. Twenty years later, on February 13, 1857, the college received its charter from the State of Illinois, and this is officially considered as the actual beginning of the present college. Blackburn was originally established as a Presbyterian theological seminary and still maintains some contact with the Presbyterian Church. But people of all denominations, from all nations, attend this college today. One of the present ushers is Jewish, and the chaplain is an Episcopalian. There has never been any racial segregation at Blackburn College, and the chairman of one of the most important committees on the campus is a quiet, popular Negro boy from Virginia.

The work-plan was brought to Blackburn College by Dr. William M. Hudson, who became president in 1912 and made the school what it is today. This work-plan is not just a device to help students who could not otherwise go to college. It is a liberal education in community effort that trains hands in skills, levels executive ability and stresses the spiritual value of shared work.

Dr. Hudson in advocating the now famous work-plan system called for young people who ordinarily could not afford to attend college. It was his idea that these vigorous young men and women could work on the college's farm and aid in the construction of new buildings that would necessarily be needed as time went by.

It was not easy in the early days; stock for the farm and building material had to be begged or borrowed. Dr. Hudson, however, soon showed tangible evidence of the success of his project. He found more and more people willing to give him support and more and more students interested in working to secure an education.

In the early fall of 1927, the main building of Blackburn College was completely destroyed by fire only 3 weeks before the opening of the school year. Dr. Hudson was determined to keep the school open. In the few weeks which were left, he secured abandoned railroad coaches and hastily converted them into offices, reading rooms and classrooms.

Under the inspiration and guidance of President Hudson, the college was gradually built up, and students came from all over the United States as well as many from other countries to take advantage of the work, study, play tradition that has given Blackburn the high scholastic standing that it enjoys today. In 1945 Dr. Hudson retired leaving a rich legacy of 33 dedicated years to his dream of a college. His successor, Dr. Robert P. Ludlum, is carrying on the tradition of this school and is continuing to expand the student enrollment as well as the institution itself. Dr. Ludlum is an energetic person and an inspired educator. He believes in the democracy-in-action idea at work at Blackburn, feeling it is the duty of a school to do more than to formally educate and that graduates of Blackburn are mentally adult and fully aware of the wonderful virtue of being useful to themselves and to others.

Although this famous work-plan started as an economic measure, it was retained because of its educational value. All students work equal time and, therefore, have equal time for study and relaxation. The jobs range in variety from farm chores and construction work for the boys to kitchen maintenance and secretarial duties for the girls. The work, although sometimes difficult, is never toil because everyone participates, and the atmosphere is always one of good will and cooperation. The students at Blackburn live in modern, two-student rooms in attractively furnished dormitories. There is a beautiful modern dining room, and each student receives three nourishing, well-balanced meals for approximately $1 per day. Blackburn College is a coeducational liberal arts college offering a bachelor of arts degree in eight different areas as well as offering professional courses in prelaw or medicine. The college is fully accredited by the State of Illinois for teacher training.

AMERICA'S MOST EXCLUSIVE COLLEGE

Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that Blackburn is America's most exclusive college. It is exclusive, however, not for the select few who can afford a higher education but for those who desire to participate in a self-help program.

In the early days of the work-study system, the prospective students had to sign a statement saying that they were financially unable to attend another school, but there is no longer any such restriction. Today, many boys and girls from well-to-do families are among the enrollment of approximately 350 students. Students in all economic brackets like the Blackburn tradition because a common goal makes a more unified, friendly student body, and everyone has a definite feeling of being an integral part of a vital growing organization. There is no room for snobbery in their hearts, for the students at Blackburn recognize the dignity of labor. The work they do lives on with the Blackburn Institution. The cornerstone is not laid by a visiting dignitary but by the students through the ages who have laid the bricks in the buildings at the institution as they have worked their way to a higher place in life through the self-help program at Blackburn.

Blackburn is not the only work college in the country. There are two others—Berea College in Kentucky and Park College in Missouri, both with commendable work programs. But it is my understanding that Blackburn is the only college in the country where the students are building and have built the actual college plant. All of the meals are cooked and served by students. Some of the food served is grown by students and some of the meat comes from animals raised by students on corn grown on a Blackburn farm.

When a student leaves Blackburn, he carries with him a part of the deep tradition of self-reliance and resourcefulness. He realizes the necessity of being a useful member of society and an active, functioning citizen. Perhaps this accounts for the large number of graduates who have taken responsible places in public life and the military service.

The spirit of Blackburn is well brought out in the following quotation from the September 1953 issue of Red Book magazine:

> Blackburn College, in Carlinville, is indeed a rare college. Fortunate are the students who go there, and they know it. . . . Many a university graduate from the finest schools in the land has yet to learn what the Blackburn freshman discovers in his first few months at the college. That is the satisfaction, even the enjoyment of work, and its value in developing skill and self-reliance and revealing latent abilities.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SIKES for 20 minutes on Monday and Thursday next.

Mr. VAN ZANDT for 30 minutes on Monday, February 18.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. NATCHER and to include editorials.

Mr. DURHAM.

Mr. LONG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HORAN in four instances.

Mr. WEAVER and include two articles.

Mr. RADWAN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINO and to include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. HUDDLESTON.

Mr. HOLTZMAN (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRD (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EBERHARTER (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALTER.

Mr. NORRELL (at the request of Mr. FEIGHAN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZELENKO (at the request of Mr. BREEDING) and include extraneous matter.

## SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 394. An act to waive the limitation on the time within which a Medal of Honor may be awarded to Comdr. Hugh Barr Miller, Jr., United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on Feb. 11, 1957, present to the President for his approval a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3845. An act extending for 1 year the time in which the Boston National Historic Sites Commission shall complete its work.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, February 18, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

## OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

> "I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by each of the following Members and Delegates of the 85th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

ALABAMA

1. Frank W. Boykin.
2. George M. Grant.
3. George W. Andrews.
4. Kenneth A. Roberts.
5. Albert Rains.
6. Armistead I. Selden, Jr.
7. Carl Elliott.
8. Robert E. Jones.
9. George Huddleston, Jr.

ARIZONA

1. John J. Rhodes.
2. Stewart L. Udall.

ARKANSAS

1. E. C. Gathings.
2. Wilbur D. Mills.
3. James W. Trimble.
4. Oren Harris.
5. Brooks Hays.
6. W. F. Norrell.

CALIFORNIA

1. Hubert B. Scudder.
2. Clair Engle.
3. John E. Moss.
4. William S. Mailliard.
5. John F. Shelley.
6. John F. Baldwin, Jr.
7. John J. Allen, Jr.
8. George P. Miller.
9. J. Arthur Younger.
10. Charles S. Gubser.
11. John J. McFall.
12. B. F. Sisk.
13. Charles M. Teague.
14. Harlan Hagen.
15. Gordon L. McDonough.
16. Donald L. Jackson.
17. Cecil R. King.
18. Craig Hosmer.
19. Chet Holifield.
20. H. Allen Smith.
21. Edgar W. Hiestand.
22. Joe Holt.
23. Clyde Doyle.
24. Glenard P. Lipscomb.
25. Patrick J. Hillings.
26. James Roosevelt.
27. Harry R. Sheppard.
28. James B. Utt.
29. D. S. (Judge) Saund.
30. Bob Wilson.

COLORADO

1. Byron G. Rogers.
2. William S. Hill.
3. J. Edgar Chenoweth.
4. Wayne N. Aspinall.

CONNECTICUT

1. Edwin H. May, Jr.
2. Horace Seely-Brown, Jr.
3. Albert W. Cretella.
4. Albert P. Morano.
5. James T. Patterson.

*At large*

Antoni N. Sadlak.

DELAWARE

*At large*

Harry G. Haskell, Jr.

FLORIDA

1. William C. Cramer.
2. Charles E. Bennett.
3. Robert L. F. Sikes.
4. Dante B. Fascell.
5. A. S. (Syd) Herlong, Jr.
6. Paul G. Rogers.
7. James A. Haley.
8. D. R. (Billy) Matthews.

GEORGIA

1. Prince H. Preston.
2. J. L. Pilcher.
3. E. L. (Tic) Forrester.
4. John J. Flynt, Jr.
5. James C. Davis.
6. Carl Vinson.
7. Henderson Lanham.
8. Iris Faircloth Blitch.
9. Phil M. Landrum.
10. Paul Brown.

IDAHO

1. Gracie Pfost.
2. Hamer H. Budge.

ILLINOIS

1. William L. Dawson.
2. Barratt O'Hara.
3. Emmet F. Byrne.
4. William E. McVey.
5. John C. Kluczynski.
6. Thomas J. O'Brien.
7. James B. Bowler.
8. Thomas S. Gordon.
9. Sidney R. Yates.
10. Harold R. Collier.
11. Timothy P. Sheehan.
12. Charles A. Boyle.
13. Marguerite Stitt Church.
14. Russell W. Keeney.
15. Noah M. Mason.
16. Leo E. Allen.
17. Leslie C. Arends.
18. Robert H. Michel.
19. Robert B. Chiperfield.
20. Sid Simpson.
21. Peter F. Mack, Jr.
22. William L. Springer.
23. Charles W. Vursell.
24. Melvin Price.
25. Kenneth J. Gray.

INDIANA

1. Ray J. Madden.
2. Charles A. Halleck.
3. F. Jay Nimtz.
4. E. Ross Adair.
5. John V. Beamer.
6. Cecil M. Harden.
7. William G. Bray.
8. Winfield K. Denton.
9. Earl Wilson.
10. Ralph Harvey.
11. Charles B. Brownson.

IOWA

1. Fred Schwengel.
2. Henry O. Talle.
3. H. R. Gross.
4. Karl M. LeCompte.
5. Paul Cunningham.
6. Merwin Coad.
7. Ben F. Jensen.
8. Charles B. Hoeven.

KANSAS

1. William H. Avery.
2. Errett P. Scrivner.
3. Myron V. George.
4. Edward H. Rees.
5. J. Floyd Breeding.
6. Wint Smith.

KENTUCKY

1. Noble J. Gregory.
2. William H. Natcher.
3. John M. Robsion, Jr.
4. Frank Chelf.
5. Brent Spence.
6. John C. Watts.
7. Carl D. Perkins.
8. Eugene Siler.

LOUISIANA

1. F. Edward Hébert.
2. Hale Boggs.
3. Edwin E. Willis.
4. Overton Brooks.
5. Otto E. Passman.
6. James H. Morrison.
7. T. A. Thompson.
8. George S. Long.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

MAINE

1. Robert Hale.
2. Frank M. Coffin.
3. Clifford G. McIntire.

MARYLAND

1. Edward T. Miller.
2. James P. S. Devereux.
3. Edward A. Garmatz.
4. George H. Fallon.
5. Richard E. Lankford.
6. DeWitt S. Hyde.
7. Samuel N. Friedel.

MASSACHUSETTS

1. John W. Heselton.
2. Edward P. Boland.
3. Philip J. Philbin.
4. Harold D. Donohue.
5. Edith Nourse Rogers.
6. William H. Bates.
7. Thomas J. Lane.
8. Torbert H. Macdonald.
9. Donald W. Nicholson.
10. Laurence Curtis.
11. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.
12. John W. McCormack.
13. Richard B. Wigglesworth.
14. Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

MICHIGAN

1. Thaddeus M. Machrowicz.
2. George Meader.
3. August E. Johansen.
4. Clare E. Hoffman.
5. Gerald R. Ford, Jr.
6. Charles E. Chamberlain.
7. Robert J. McIntosh.
8. Alvin M. Bentley.
9. Robert P. Griffin.
10. Elford A. Cederberg.
11. Victor A. Knox.
12. John B. Bennett.
13. Charles C. Diggs, Jr.
14. Louis C. Rabaut.
15. John D. Dingell.
16. John Lesinski.
17. Martha W. Griffiths.
18. William S. Broomfield.

MINNESOTA

1. August H. Andresen.
2. Joseph P. O'Hara.
3. Roy W. Wier.
4. Eugene J. McCarthy.
5. Walter H. Judd.
6. Fred Marshall.
7. H. Carl Andersen.
8. John A. Blatnik.
9. Coya Knutson.

MISSISSIPPI

1. Thomas G. Abernethy.
2. Jamie L. Whitten.
3. Frank E. Smith.
4. John Bell Williams.
5. Arthur Winstead.
6. William M. Colmer.

MISSOURI

1. Frank M. Karsten.
2. Thomas B. Curtis.
3. Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan.
4. George H. Christopher.
5. Richard Bolling.
6. W. R. Hull, Jr.
7. Charles H. (Charlie) Brown.
8. A. S. J. Carnahan.
9. Clarence Cannon.
10. Paul C. Jones.
11. Morgan M. Moulder.

MONTANA

1. Lee Metcalf.
2. LeRoy H. Anderson.

NEBRASKA

1. Phil Weaver.
2. Glenn Cunningham.
3. Robert D. Harrison.
4. A. L. Miller.

NEVADA

*At large*

Walter S. Baring.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. Chester E. Merrow.
2. Perkins Bass.

NEW JERSEY

1. Charles A. Wolverton.
2. Vacant.
3. James C. Auchincloss.
4. Frank Thompson, Jr.
5. Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr.
6. Florence P. Dwyer.
7. William B. Widnall.
8. Gordon Canfield.
9. Frank C. Osmers, Jr.
10. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.
11. Hugh J. Addonizio.
12. Robert W. Kean.
13. Alfred D. Sieminski.
14. Vincent J. Dellay.

NEW MEXICO

*At large*

Vacant.
John J. Dempsey.

NEW YORK

1. Stuyvesant Wainwright.
2. Steven B. Derounian.
3. Frank J. Becker.
4. Henry J. Latham.
5. Albert H. Bosch.
6. Lester Holtzman.
7. James J. Delaney.
8. Victor L. Anfuso.
9. Eugene J. Keogh.
10. Edna F. Kelly.
11. Emanuel Celler.
12. Francis E. Dorn.
13. Abraham J. Multer.
14. John J. Rooney.
15. John H. Ray.
16. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.
17. Frederic R. Coudert, Jr.
18. Alfred E. Santangelo.
19. Leonard Farbstein.
20. Ludwig Teller.
21. Herbert Zelenko.
22. James C. Healey.
23. Isidore Dollinger.
24. Charles A. Buckley.
25. Paul A. Fino.
26. Edwin B. Dooley.
27. Ralph W. Gwinn.
28. Katharine St. George.
29. J. Ernest Wharton.
30. Leo W. O'Brien.
31. Dean P. Taylor.
32. Bernard W. Kearney.
33. Clarence E. Kilburn.
34. William R. Williams.
35. R. Walter Riehlman.
36. John Taber.
37. Sterling Cole.
38. Kenneth B. Keating.
39. Harold C. Ostertag.
40. William E. Miller.
41. Edmund P. Radwan.
42. John R. Pillion.
43. Daniel A. Reed.

NORTH CAROLINA

1. Herbert C. Bonner.
2. L. H. Fountain.
3. Graham A. Barden.
4. Harold D. Cooley.
5. Ralph J. Scott.
6. Carl T. Durham.
7. Alton Lennon.
8. A. Paul Kitchin.
9. Hugh Q. Alexander.
10. Charles Raper Jonas.
11. Basil L. Whitener.
12. George A. Shuford.

NORTH DAKOTA

*At large*

Usher L. Burdick.
Otto Krueger.

OHIO

1. Gordon H. Scherer.
2. William E. Hess.
3. Paul F. Schenck.
4. William M. McCulloch.
5. Cliff Clevenger.
6. James G. Polk.
7. Clarence J. Brown.
8. Jackson E. Betts.
9. Thomas L. Ashley.
10. Thomas A. Jenkins.
11. David S. Dennison, Jr.
12. John M. Vorys.
13. A. D. Baumhart, Jr.
14. William H. Ayres.
15. John E. Henderson.
16. Frank T. Bow.
17. J. Harry McGregor.
18. Wayne L. Hays.
19. Michael J. Kirwan.
20. Michael A. Feighan.
21. Charles A. Vanik.
22. Frances P. Bolton.
23. William E. Minshall.

OKLAHOMA

1. Page Belcher.
2. Ed Edmondson.
3. Carl Albert.
4. Tom Steed.
5. John Jarman.
6. Toby Morris.

OREGON

1. Walter Norblad.
2. Al Ullman.
3. Edith Green.
4. Charles O. Porter.

PENNSYLVANIA

1. William A. Barrett.
2. Kathryn E. (Mrs. William T.) Granahan.
3. James A. Byrne.
4. Earl Chudoff.
5. William J. Green, Jr.
6. Hugh Scott.
7. Benjamin F. James.
8. Willard S. Curtin.
9. Paul B. Dague.
10. Joseph L. Carrigg.
11. Daniel J. Flood.
12. Ivor D. Fenton.
13. Samuel K. McConnell, Jr.
14. George M. Rhodes.
15. Francis E. Walter.
16. Walter M. Mumma.
17. Alvin R. Bush.
18. Richard M. Simpson.
19. S. Walter Stauffer.
20. James E. Van Zandt.
21. Augustine B. Kelley.
22. John P. Saylor.
23. Leon H. Gavin.
24. Carroll D. Kearns.
25. Frank M. Clark.
26. Thomas E. Morgan.
27. James G. Fulton.

28. Herman P. Eberharter.
29. Robert J. Corbett.
30. Elmer J. Holland.

RHODE ISLAND

1. Aime J. Forand.
2. John E. Fogarty.

SOUTH CAROLINA

1. L. Mendel Rivers.
2. John J. Riley.
3. W. J. Bryan Dorn.
4. Robert T. Ashmore.
5. Robert W. Hemphill.
6. John L. McMillan.

SOUTH DAKOTA

1. George S. McGovern.
2. E. Y. Berry.

TENNESSEE

1. B. Carroll Reece.
2. Howard H. Baker.
3. James B. Frazier, Jr.
4. Joe L. Evins.
5. J. Carlton Loser.
6. Ross Bass.
7. Tom Murray.
8. Jere Cooper.
9. Clifford Davis.

TEXAS

1. Wright Patman.
2. Jack Brooks.
3. Lindley Beckworth.
4. Sam Rayburn.
5. Bruce Alger.
6. Olin E. Teague.
7. John Dowdy.
8. Albert Thomas.
9. Clark W. Thompson.
10. Homer Thornberry.
11. W. R. Poage.
12. Jim Wright.
13. Frank Ikard.
14. John Young.
15. Joe M. Kilgore.
16. J. T. Rutherford.
17. Omar Burleson.
18. Walter Rogers.
19. George Mahon.
20. Paul J. Kilday.
21. O. C. Fisher.

*At large*

Martin Dies.

UTAH

1. Henry Aldous Dixon.
2. William A. Dawson.

VERMONT

*At large*

Winston L. Prouty.

VIRGINIA

1. Edward J. Robeson, Jr.
2. Porter Hardy, Jr.
3. J. Vaughan Gary.
4. Watkins M. Abbitt.
5. William M. Tuck.
6. Richard H. Poff.
7. Burr P. Harrison.
8. Howard W. Smith.
9. W. Pat Jennings.
10. Joel T. Broyhill.

WASHINGTON

1. Thomas M. Pelly.
2. Jack Westland.
3. Russell V. Mack.
4. Hal Holmes.
5. Walt Horan.
6. Thor C. Tollefson.

*At large*

Don Magnuson.

WEST VIRGINIA

1. Arch A. Moore, Jr.
2. Harley O. Staggers.
3. Cleveland M. Bailey.
4. Will E. Neal.
5. Elizabeth Kee.
6. Robert C. Byrd.

WISCONSIN

1. Lawrence H. Smith.
2. Donald E. Tewes.
3. Gardner R. Withrow.
4. Clement J. Zablocki.
5. Henry S. Reuss.
6. William K. Van Pelt.
7. Melvin R. Laird.
8. John W. Byrnes.
9. Lester R. Johnson.
10. Alvin E. O'Konski.

WYOMING

*At large*

Keith Thomson.

ALASKA

*Delegate*

E. L. (Bob) Bartlett.

HAWAII

*Delegate*

John A. Burns.

PUERTO RICO

*Resident Commissioner*

Antonio Fernós-Isern.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

467. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for reports on the acreage planted to cotton, to repeal the prohibitions against cotton acreage reports based on farmers' planting intentions, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

468. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report stating that an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Hayden Lake unit, eastern division, Rathdrum Prairie project, Idaho, has been completed as a part of the investigations required in the formulation of a definite plan for project development, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

469. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a report covering the contracts negotiated by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics for the period July 1 to December 31, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 413, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

470. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report which presents a survey of the background, operations, and administration of our basic stockpiling program, pursuant to section 708 (e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

471. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,'" approved May 1, 1906, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

472. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to borrow motor vehicles for use in a motor-vehicle driver education and training course in the public schools of the District of Columbia, to excuse the owners of vehicles loaned to public, private, or parochial schools for driver training purposes from the payment of certain fees and taxes during the period of such loan, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

473. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska,' as amended"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

474. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting recently issued publications as follows: (1) Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1955; and (2) Estimated Future Power Requirements of the United States, 1955–80; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

475. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report with respect to the present status of negotiations with prospective purchasers of the falling water to be produced by the Trinity River division of the Central Valley project, pursuant to Public Law 386, 84th Congress (H. Doc. No. 94); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

476. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1077), to remove restrictions on the use of a portion of the Springfield Confederate Cemetery, Springfield, Mo., and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

477. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report stating that proceedings that have been concluded with respect to the following claim:

*Joseph Chitto et al., Members and as the Representatives of and on the Relation of the Choctaw Indians East of the Mississippi River, Petitioners,* v. *The United States of America, Defendant* (Docket No. 52); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

478. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Capt. Thomas C. Curtis and Capt. George L. Lane"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

479. A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, transmitting a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, wrappers, cards, and other articles bearing penalty indicia procured or accounted for through this Department during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 785, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

480. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

481. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the Sixth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education on the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815, 81st Congress, as amended, including a detailed statement of receipts and disbursements for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, pursuant to subsection 7 (c) of Public Law 874 and subsection 208 (c) of Public Law 815; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

482. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill for the relief of Joe Kawakami"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

483. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

484. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act to authorize a change in the maximum interest rate permitted on United States savings bonds"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

485. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting correspondence with reference to the case of Chung-Liang Liang, A–6263743, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1953, as amended, and requesting the case be returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 348. A bill to amend section 12 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676), relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington by providing for the use of public lands granted to the States therein for the purpose of constructing, reconstructing, repair, renovation, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said States; with amendment (Rept. No. 56). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 202. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 57). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 23. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Arthur H. Compton as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; without amendment (Rept. No. 58). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 158. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 128; with amendment (Rept. No. 59). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 62. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 additional copies of House Report No. 2966, 84th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 60). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 82. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on the national highway program for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives; with amendment (Rept. No. 61). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 97. Resolution authorizing the printing of the United States Defense Policies Since World War II as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 62). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 104. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on excise taxes held by the Committee on Ways and Means during the 84th Congress, 2d session; without amendment (Rept. No. 63). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 120. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Public Law 880, 84th Congress, the social security amendments of 1956, without amendment (Rept. No. 64). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 6. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing with illustrations and binding of proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late Chief Justice Edward Douglass White without amendment (Rept. No. 65). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 7. Concurrent resolution to print for the Committee on Public Works certain data on the Arkansas, White-Red River Basins and water resources of the New England-New York region; without amendment (Rept. No. 66). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Report of Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary pertaining to Spanish sheepherders; without amendment (Rept. No. 67). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 4734. A bill to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act to authorize a change in the maximum interest rate permitted on United States savings bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED:

H. R. 4735. A bill to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act to authorize a change in the maximum interest rate permitted on United States savings bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 4736. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit employees to deduct their contributions under private unemployment compensation disability benefit plans where such contributions are in lieu of contributions otherwise required by State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4737. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that interest received by individuals upon United States savings bonds shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4738. A bill to provide salary increases for Government employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 4739. A bill to encourage new residential construction for veterans' housing in rural areas and small cities and towns by raising the maximum amounts in which direct loans may be made from $10,000 to $12,500, to authorize advance financing commitments, to extend the direct loan program for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 4740. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4741. A bill to amend the act of August 24, 1912, to increase the compensation of members of the legislature of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. R. 4742. A bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be paid compensation at the rate of $2.50 per day for each day spent in hiding during World War II or the Korean conflict to evade capture by the enemy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 4743. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum hourly wage provided for therein to $1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4744. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 3 of the Securities Act of 1933, to provide that responsible officers or other persons shall be liable in damages on account of untrue statements or material omissions in statements or documents filed under such subsection as a condition of exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4745. A bill to authorize the enlargement of the administrative headquarters site for Isle Royale National Park, Houghton, Mich., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 4746. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to review certain claims for benefits and payments under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 4747. A bill to reorganize the Capitol Police force in order to increase its efficiency in the performance of its duties; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 4748. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1955, to extend the time during which annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims subject to that act may be made; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4749. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to connect the sewage system of St. Joseph's Indian School with that of the town of Chamberlain, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 4750. A bill to amend section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4751. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, in order to correct certain inequities in the computation of service in the Coast Guard Women's Reserve; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 4752. A bill to amend titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act so as to further assist the States in extending aid for medical care to persons eligible for public assistance under such titles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4753. A bill to amend section 3731 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to appeals by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4754. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to fees of United States marshals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4755. A bill to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4756. A bill to amend section 544 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the bonds of United States marshals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4757. A bill to include certain officers and employees of the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the General Services Administration, and Federal probation officers within the provisions

of sections 111 and 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to assaults and homicides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 4758. A bill to provide for transmission in the mails at the rate provided for books of 8-millimeter films and related matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4759. A bill relating to the definition of head of household for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4760. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that a deceased employee shall be "completely insured" if at his death he was entitled to an annuity which began to accrue during 1948 on the basis of an application filed before 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 4761. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the western district of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 4762. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to allow credit for certain service rendered States or instrumentalities thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 4763. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 4764. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954 to provide that counterpart funds used by a committee of Congress overseas shall be charged against the amount available to such committee from the contingent fund of the Senate or the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4765. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide insurance thereunder against the cost of hospitalization for insured aged persons and their dependents and survivors, and for insured disabled persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4766. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisiors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 4767. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H. R. 4768. A bill to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the county of San Jacinto, Tex., and authorizing named parties to bring suit for title and possession of same, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 4769. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 4770. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit policemen and firemen in positions covered by retirement systems to obtain social security coverage on the same basis as other State and local employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 4771. A bill to give all producers of commodities eligible for inclusion in the 1957 acreage reserve program an opportunity to participate therein; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 4772. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the northern district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 4773. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits in certain cases for brothers, sisters, and other relatives of individuals who die fully insured under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 4774. A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. R. 4775. A bill to repeal the ban on filling the vacancy in the judgeship for the middle district of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 4776. A bill to restore to the rolls certain emergency officers heretofore granted retirement pay; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4777. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 4778. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 4779. A bill to continue the exemption from the Classification Act of 1949 of certain employees whose compensation is fixed and adjusted in accordance with prevailing rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4780. A bill to prohibit the mailing of certain material by a Member of Congress, under his frank, to destinations outside the State or district which he represents; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 4781. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, so as to change the interest rate applicable to loans and to provide for the payment by borrowers of a fee to assist in paying the administrative costs incident to loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 4782. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 4783. A bill to authorize the Chief of Engineers to survey areas of water supply shortages and to prepare reports and recommendations thereon with a view to alleviation of shortages in order to assure future development of the Nation; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4784. A bill to authorize a survey and investigation with respect to the relocation of the Ferry County Highway, paralleling Lake Roosevelt, Columbia Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4785. A bill to establish a Columbia Interstate Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 4786. A bill to provide for the procurement of judge advocates and law specialist officers for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4787. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the rank of certain officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 4788. A bill to amend section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, pertaining to burley tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4789. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act to require conservation practices on land placed into the soil reserve; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4790. A bill providing for price reporting and research with respect to forest products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4791. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large retail establishments whose activities affect interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 4792. A bill to repeal the tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 4793. A bill to amend title V of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 4794. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on lacrosse sticks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4795. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 4796. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4797. A bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H. R. 4798. A bill to eliminate the financial limitation on real and personal estate holdings of the American Historical Association; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 4799. A bill to provide that coverage for lawyers under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system shall be on a voluntary basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4800. A bill to provide that coverage for self-employed farmers and ranchers under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system shall be on a voluntary basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 4801. A bill to increasse the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4802. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Columbia Basin Project Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 4803. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicagoland Commerce and Industry Exposition, to be held at

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 4804. A bill for the relief of the Newington School District, New Hampshire; to the Committee on the Judicary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 4805. A bill to provide that pensions for non-service-connected death shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II and Korean veterans under the same conditions as apply to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4806. A bill to provide that the declining balance and certain other methods of depreciation shall be available for income tax purposes only in the case of property with a useful life of 10 years or more, and to terminate the provision for amortization of emergency facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4807. A bill to provide that pension for non-service-connected permanent and total disability may be paid to single veterans who have a dependent parent, and whose annual income does not exceed $2,700; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4808. A bill to permit any veteran of both World Wars to elect to have his service in World War I counted as service in World War II for the purpose of determining eligibility for certain benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4809. A bill to release and quitclaim all rights and interests of the United States in certain real property to Walnut Ridge, Ark.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 4810. A bill to provide for payments by the United States to local educational agencies from the proceeds of sales of federally owned land; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4811. A bill to release and quitclaim all rights and interests of the United States in certain real property to the Newport Special School District, Jackson County, Ark.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 4812. A bill to release and quitclaim all rights and interests of the United States in certain real property to Newport, Ark.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4813. A bill to extend the life of the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H. R. 4814. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the western district of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4815. A bill to provide permanent authority for the Postmaster General to establish postal stations at camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces, and at defense or other strategic installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 4816. A bill to repeal section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, relating to protests in cases where instruments of authorization are issued or renewed without hearing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 4817. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4818. A bill to make the evaluation of recreational benefits resulting from the construction of any flood control, navigation, or reclamation project an integral part of project planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 4819. A bill for the establishment of a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to study the outdoor recreation resources of the public lands and other land and water areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 4820. A bill to provide for research, study, and prevention and treatment of effects of atomic and nuclear radiation on human health, development, and living conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4821. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to extend and improve existing housing programs, to establish new programs to meet special housing needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4822. A bill for the establishment of a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to study the outdoor recreation resources of the public lands and other land and water areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4823. A bill to make the evaluation of recreational benefits resulting from the construction of any flood control, navigation, or reclamation project an integral part of project planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 4824. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for self-employed physicians and dentists; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 4825. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in operation of industries affecting commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 4826. A bill to authorize the per capita distribution of certain funds belonging to the members of the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAUND:

H. R. 4827. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California, and to redesignate the present southern district of California as the central district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4828. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to incerase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 4829. A bill to increase the national marketing quota for burley tobacco by 10 percent; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHUFORD (by request):

H. R. 4830. A bill to authorize revision of the tribal roll of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4831. A bill to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4832. A bill to establish an effective student exchange program with Latin American countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 4833. A bill to provide for research and technical assistance relating to the control of salt-marsh and other pest mosquitoes of public health importance and mosquito vectors of human disease; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4834. A bill to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 4835. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 4836. A bill to provide for examination, licensing, and regulation of dispensing opticians and optical technicians in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 4837. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income-tax exemption for a taxpayer if he or his spouse is totally and permanently deaf as well as blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 4838. A bill to incorporate the Military Order of the Purple Heart, a national organization of combat wounded composed solely of Purple Hearters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4839. A bill to authorize the President to appoint to the grade of general in the Army of the United States those officers who, in grade of lieutenant general, during the period from March 15, 1947 to March 31, 1953, commanded United States Army in Europe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4840. A bill to incorporate the Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 4841. A bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children or mentally or emotionally ill children, and to encourage the development of programs of rehabilitation for such children through grants to nonprofit institutions and to State educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 4842. A bill to provide for the control of certain advertising on federally owned or controlled lands adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and to encourage such control on other lands adjacent to such National System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 4843. A bill to incorporate the USCDC (United States Civil Defense Council); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 4844. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of employers who are engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce, to eliminate certain exemptions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 4845. A bill to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government retired under section 1 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as

amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to personnel employed by the House Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the investigations ordered by House Resolution 104, 85th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution to amend title III of the National Housing Act to provide interim assistance for home loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States repealing the 16th amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. J. Res. 233. Joint resolution to encourage and foster the cooperation of private and State historical commissions with the National Historical Publications Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. J. Res. 234. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H. J. Res. 235. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. J. Res. 236. Joint resolution requesting the President to instruct the permanent representative of the United States to the United Nations to request the Security Council without delay to convene the Arab States and the state of Israel and other interested nations in a peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. J. Res. 237. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the popular election of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. Res. 166. Resolution to authorize the Select Committee on Small Business to investigate and study the problems of small business with respect to basic and applied scientific research and development work; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. Res. 167. Resolution providing for sending the bill H. R. 3875 and accompanying papers to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN: Resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts calling for the expulsion of Soviet Russia from the United Nations Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile and fish imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take such action as will provide a suitable and proper system of flood control in order to avert another such disaster in the valley of the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River; to the Committee on Public Works.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 4846. A bill for the relief of Mario Bellich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4847. A bill for the relief of Lea Kummer O'Connell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4848. A bill for the relief of Gudrun Luebik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 4849. A bill for the relief of Reza Rezazadeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 4850. A bill for the relief of Ester Pollak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 4851. A bill for the relief of Mrs. M. E. Shelton Pruitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4852. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Altacher Kefauver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 4853. A bill for the relief of Stephen Kuang-Tao Hsu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4854. A bill for the relief of Victoria Galea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4855. A bill for the relief of Evangelia G. Alexandris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 4856. A bill for the relief of Charles Henry Willsmore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 4857. A bill for the relief of Arsene Kavoukdjian (Arsene Kavookjian); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4858. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wilma Aldridge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4859. A bill for the relief of Ingeborg F. Bauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 4860. A bill for the relief of Alex P. Collins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 4861. A bill for the relief of Yrjo (George) Israel Erkinpoika Haapanen, Anna Esther Alfhild Haapanen (nee Talkari), Seppo Pellervo Haapanen, Timo Juhani Haapanen, and Eira Telervo Haapanen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 4862. A bill for the relief of Han Liang Huang and Zing Wei Tang Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 4863. A bill for the relief of Daniel Ventura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4864. A bill for the relief of Roger Fouti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4865. A bill for the relief of Shamouil Shamilzadeh; his wife, Shoushan Shamilzadeh; and their son, David Shamilzadeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4866. A bill for the relief of Mr. Abraham A. Rubin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4867. A bill for the relief of Raffaele Gargiulo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4868. A bill for the relief of Pierre Negler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4869. A bill for the relief of Yenovk and Siranouche Shegerian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4870. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Safura Rahmatulla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN (by request):

H. R. 4871. A bill for the relief of Chi-Tsu Tsang; his wife, Yung-tsing Hwang Tsang; and their children, Arlene Bai-Hwa Tsang, Betty Lai-Hwa Tsang, Carl Yang-Hwa Tsang, Doris Tiau-Hwa Tsang, and Diane Si-Hwa Tsang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 4872. A bill for the relief of Sister Gabriele (also known as Mikalina Vaicaityte); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 4873. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Vallefuoco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H. R. 4874. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1956, entitled "An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Columbia Historical Society in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4875. A bill for the relief of the dependents of John Henry Wright, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. R. 4876. A bill for the relief of Chun Tin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 4877. A bill for the relief of Paul J. Rackl and George E. Rackl, copartners, doing business as Craftsmen's Plastics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4878. A bill for the relief of Nicoleta P. Pantelakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 4879. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Delfina Cvavez-Soto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 4880. A bill for the relief of Olaf Nielsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 4881. A bill for the relief of U. C. Martin, Blair Jones, and the estate of R. A. Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H. R. 4882. A bill for the relief of Kathleen R. Ranes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4883. A bill for the relief of Gregario Gasman Ancheta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4884. A bill for the relief of Ruth Erika Lerche Conrad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4885. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Navarette-Navarette; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4886. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yio Gik Him (nee Guadalupe Reyes Chip); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4887. A bill for the relief of Ta-Kwan Wue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 4888. A bill for the relief of Ignazio Boffoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4889. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Agnes Olson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4890. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret (Corner) Scarrit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 4891. A bill for the relief of Rosa M. Sinfuego; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4892. A bill for the relief of Jose Nicolas Villador; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 4893. A bill for the relief of Edith Kohn Vogel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 4894. A bill for the relief of Henning B. Dieter, Rolf Dieter, and Annelies Dieter Wiskott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 4895. A bill for the relief of Josip Kavran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4896. A bill for the relief of Marica Sutej; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Alabama: The New Economic Horizon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.**
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the Home Builders Association of Alabama is launching a new trade magazine called the Alabama Builder. For the first issue, Mr. Arthur E. Stewart, of Montgomery, Ala., executive vice president of the association, has called on me to contribute an article dealing with the future of Alabama. With the thought that my article expressing strong faith in our State's bright economic future may be of interest to the Members, I am happy to include it in the RECORD under leave heretofore granted.

The article follows:

Alabama's economic horizons were never brighter.

A great new industrial era is about to dawn in our State. Indeed, few other sections of the earth have such a brilliant outlook in prospect for the future.

We in the South are sometimes prone to overlook our own potentialities in scanning the distant skies. For long years our chambers of commerce have battled for every plant, every factory, every national shop located in Alabama. The day is approaching, however, when we shall no longer have to go out in search of industry. Industry has found us.

Alabama has what few other areas can offer. In short, we have the natural resources—water, in particular—and labor supply. Alabama enjoys a mild climate, which workers more and more are demanding. And our State has the space which new industries require.

In our lifetimes we have seen our agricultural economy happily balanced with industry. Now, Alabama has diversification of industry. The day is just around the corner when we will see the decentralization of industry in our State. Large plants no longer seek the large industrial centers of the East. They are looking South, and particularly to Alabama.

The key to our economic future lies in the development of what we have—our resources.

We have in abundance what no other section of the United States has enough of, and that is water. Water alone can bring great industrial advances, for there are numerous factories which cannot operate without plenty of water. These industries have to go where they can get the water they need.

Over 1,000 American cities were short of water last year. Outside of the Southeast, the United States has an annual rainfall of about 22 inches. In Alabama, our rainfall totals about 50 inches per year. Abundant water is in Alabama, and it's one of our biggest assets.

Our mild climate is also going to assist us in attracting more industry. Before the advent of the 40-hour week, factory workers had little time except for sleep and work. Now, they look for outside relaxation and recreation in their leisure hours. This means that workers are going to want to live in a climate where they can be out of doors the year around. Alabama affords workers this opportunity.

We offer sites away from the crowded, congested areas of the large industrial centers of today. A modern assembly-line factory requires space which is difficult to locate in most cities. For this reason, industry is heading for the wide open spaces. There, efficient new plants can be designed, allowing plenty of room for parking. The highly industrialized centers of the United States have about reached the saturation point. As renovations and expansions are required, the exodus will begin.

Not only are more and more plants going to be moving south but more plants will be started here than ever before. We have the capital to launch industry. This is because of the fact that our growth and prosperity as a State is dependent, to a large degree, upon the continuing expansion of our industries.

New plants mean more payrolls, and consequently more money spent at home for new clothes, new automobiles, new homes. Increased buying power raises our standard of living and boosts the economy of our entire State.

We do not have to depend on heavy industry alone, however. In many fields, we have certain advantages over other areas. Take tree farming, for instance. Money does grow on trees in Alabama. Or take our cattle industry. We've got the green pastures and the mild climate it takes.

If our great resources are properly developed, Alabama can become one of the most prosperous sections of the world. I have complete confidence in our economic future. In my humble opinion, Alabama is on the verge of an economic awakening and a vast industrial expansion.

## Ben Phipps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. WALT HORAN**
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I am privileged to pay a tribute to one who served faithfully and well for nearly a quarter of a century in the Federal service.

The usual thing is for all of us to criticize bureaucrats. Somehow we seem to get a lift by doing that. How much better it would be if we were more discerning and paid tribute and allowed credit where it was due.

Today I have that privilege. The case at point is a man whom I have known all my life. We were roommates at college. No kinder, friendlier or more responsible man ever lived. He was dedicated to his duties and performed them with enlightened zeal.

When Ben Phipps passed away I lost a friend, his neighbors lost a counselor and the Federal service lost one of those who fully understood the constructive purposes that inaugurate the many Federal programs that we have caused to be initiated and who tried diligently and successfully to carry out the will of Congress.

The death of Benjamin R. Phipps at Wenatchee, Wash., on January 18, 1957, brought to a close some 22 years of distinguished service to farm families in Washington State.

Ben Phipps had been serving Washington farmers as assistant State director of the Farmers' Home Administration for the past 4 years. Previous to that he had been a field representative with a large portion of the State under his direction. Mr. Phipps' first appointment with the Agency, then known as the Resettlement Administration, was in July 1935, as county rehabilitation supervisor at Wenatchee.

The Secretary of Agriculture awarded Mr. Phipps a citation for superior service in May of 1949, the highest type of award ever given for work in his agency. Among the accomplishments leading to the award was State leadership in number of improved farm practices set up on family farms under a supervisor's guidance.

Born on a farm near Wenatchee in 1904, Mr. Phipps had prepared himself for his specific service by graduating in 1929 from Washington State College at Pullman with a bachelor of science degree majoring in horticulture.

Immediately after his graduation, he went to Los Angeles city schools to teach elementary agriculture, but left after a year because of illness. For a few years he operated an orchard and farm on his own account near Wenatchee before his entry into Federal service. In 1934 and 1935 he worked for the Washington Emergency Relief Administration and the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation and then transferred to the predecessor agency of the Farmers' Home Administration.

He is survived by his widow, Mrs. Benjamin Phipps, who lives in Wenatchee.

## Private Enterprise and Publicly Owned Corporations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the American business community is now witnessing a major struggle by a leading industrial corporation to gain control of another company. This type of acquisition is no new phenomenon on the American scene. However, in the case of the Penn-Texas Corp., which is endeavoring to acquire control of the management of Fairbanks, Morse & Co., of Chicago, a normal business rivalry is being used to aim unwarranted smears and character attacks against a distinguished American citizen, his company, and his associates.

It is basic to the system of private enterprise that the management of publicly owned corporations should reflect the will of the stockholders and not the capricious whims of paid officeholders.

The chairman of the board of the Penn-Texas Corp., Mr. Leopold D. Silberstein, has been leading an effort by his company and his associates to acquire control of Fairbanks, Morse & Co. The Penn-Texas Corp. had its inception in May 1951, when Mr. Silberstein bought control of the Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Co., which was then a dying enterprise. The company operates in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. My district includes communities whose people had a direct economic stake in the mines of the Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Co. It is, therefore, natural for me to take a keen interest in the history of this company and the part played by Mr. Silberstein and his associates in reviving a dying enterprise and restoring its idle workers to gainful employment. This was achieved by progressive, far-sighted management concepts. It was accomplished by mechanizing the Pennsylvania Coal & Coke mines to reduce operating costs. Within 1 year after the introduction of the new management, the company was able to report profits.

Since that time, the Penn-Texas Corp. has become a company whose components include some of the most respected names in American industry. These components take in the Industrial Brownhoist Corp., of Bay City, Mich.; the Quick-Way Truck Shovel Co., of Denver; the Pratt & Whitney Machine Tool Co., of Hartford; the famous old Colt Firearms Co.; the Liberty Produce Co., of Long Island, manufacturers of precision aircraft parts; the Hallicrafters Co., of Chicago; the Bayway Terminal Corp., of New Jersey, and the Crescent Co., of Rhode Island.

The Penn-Texas Corp. is doing vital work for our Government, which is evidence in itself of the respect and confidence reposed in Mr. Silberstein and the management of his companies.

It is therefore a shocking derogation of our fundamental American concepts of fair play that a respected citizen who has made, and continues to make, a highly useful and constructive contribution to the economic progress of our country and several of our individual communities should be a target of unbridled attack by business rivals whose derelictions in their own affairs are open to serious challenge. The shortcomings of the Fairbanks, Morse management were apparent as long ago as 1941, when a distinguished Member of the Senate, the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES of New Hampshire, disclosed that company's singular role in the so-called public ownership movement of that period. Senator BRIDGES' remarks are in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 8, 1941, commencing on page 57.

The methods that have been used in connection with management control of Fairbanks, Morse are now a subject of inquiry by the Securities and Exchange Commission. I hope that this agency will examine with the closest scrutiny the charges and countercharges that have characterized this entire matter.

In my view, Mr. Silberstein and his associates are justified in feeling confident that a fair and open inquiry will afford the best evidence that they have been unfairly and maliciously attacked by the Fairbanks, Morse incumbent management and its hirelings.

For myself, I want to make it plain that I resent deeply the unsupported character attacks against Mr. Silberstein and his associates and I intend in all respects to see to it, both in and out of Congress, that these most useful citizens are accorded the fair treatment that is due every decent member of our community.

## The Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, an agreement of great significance to the free world has just been signed. The Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany, speaking for 22 Jewish organizations throughout the Western World, and IGIL—I. G. Farben in liquidation—have reached an agreement whereby IGIL is making available approximately $7.5 million to compensate former inmates of the infamous Auschwitz concentration camps who had been compelled by Hitler's SS Corps to labor in IG facilities. About $7 million of this amount will be paid by the Claims Conference to former Jewish concentration-camp laborers, while the balance will be distributed directly by IGIL to former non-Jewish concentration-camp workers.

This agreement holds great moral significance to the free world because it was negotiated not under threat of force or through intimidation but by the free will of the parties involved. The payment is voluntary; as a matter of fact, the agreement does not disturb the IG contention, borne out by the Nuremberg trials, that they were forced to use the concentration camp labor by the Nazi SS who kept the workers under their own rigid disciplinary control. The German liquidators of the once famous IG trust have welcomed the opportunity to redress some of the wrongs of the Nazi era, an era which the new Germany seeks to leave behind as it emerges as a full partner in the free world.

The moral victory gained by this agreement is emphasized by the fact that it was concluded between nongovernmental bodies. It serves as a fitting successor to the restitution agreement between Germany and Israel. Indeed, how many of us would have imagined some 15 years ago that what has just transpired would have been possible. Our efforts to restore free-world morality are truly bearing fruit.

## The Late Dr. John Von Neumann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of sorrow that I ask permission to address the House. On Friday, February 8, Dr. John Von Neumann, Commissioner on the Atomic Energy Commission, died, after a long battle with cancer. His illness, however, did not keep him from attending important Commission meetings until close to the end. He often left the hospital in an ambulance to attend these meetings.

Dr. Von Neumann was a most unusual and brilliant genius. His specialty was the most difficult kind of mathematics. He was able to devise the mathematical approach for the solution of many of the problems of the day. This mathematical approach could be used to study economic behavior, social organization, and even strategy in war. Dr. Von Neumann used this mathematical ability as the key to unlock a secret in the modern concept of physics through his contributions in the development of the quantum theory, a physical theory arrived at through the use of mathematics.

But even this ability of mathematical analysis was not his only gift. For he saw the need for finding a new way of making mathematical computations and he applied his highly specialized mathematical skill to the more concrete task of creating an electronic computing machine which would perform the tedious mathematical work quickly and accurately. Because he was able to build the first electronic computer, this country was mathematically armed with a machine capable of performing the necessary difficult calculations involved in the design of the very first hydrogen weapon.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

For this work, Dr. Von Neumann was awarded the first Fermi award, granted by the Atomic Energy Commission in April 1956. He was also given the Medal of Freedom by the President.

Dr. Von Neumann made many appearances before the joint committee. While his outstanding intellectual capacity was always apparent, the members of the joint committee will always remember him for his humble but forthright attitude. He was indeed a genius who made many outstanding contributions to the defense of this Nation. I need not remind anyone that he came to this country in 1930 from Hungary and he lived a life symbolic of the freedoms he found here and he helped in the defense of those freedoms without thinking of personal financial gain for himself. His abilities and his genius will be sorely missed in this country in the years to come.

## Drought Relief Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, it is with keen disappointment that I have noted the lack of action on the part of the Department of Agriculture in connection with the drought situation which existed in western Louisiana during the latter part of 1956 and January of 1957. It is very difficult to understand why the western parishes of Louisiana, which are separated from the eastern counties of Texas only by the Sabine River, are not treated equally in the matter of drought relief. Certainly the matter of a boundary line could not make any material difference in the climatic conditions of these adjacent areas.

In September 1956, Gov. Earl K. Long of Louisiana requested that certain areas of Louisiana be declared as disaster areas because of the existing severe drought. Other States were also suffering from drought conditions and also asked for relief through the disaster program.

Despite the fact that Governor Long submitted his request in September of 1956, the Louisiana State Disaster Committee was not brought into the picture until late January 1957 at which time winter pastures had begun to produce and the drought condition had become alleviated. The excuse given for denying the request for disaster relief was that the Louisiana Disaster Committee in their recommendations did not indicate the need for relief. Certainly the drought conditions that existed in September of 1956, at which time the original request for relief was made, did not exist in the same degree in late January of 1957 when the recommendation was made. It would seem to me that in fairness to all areas which should share equally in the disaster relief program, that requests should receive attention as soon as practicable after having been submitted to the Department of Agriculture.

It cannot be said that our State officials were lax in their efforts to secure drought relief. The Louisiana State Commissioner of Agriculture, S. J. McCrory, has been in constant touch with Department of Agriculture officials since the September request was made. He made a special trip to Washington and conferred with officials there together with members of the Louisiana congressional delegation in an effort to secure action. There have been letters, telegrams, and telephone conversations from the Commissioner's office as well as from members of the Louisiana delegation in Congress concerning this problem. I wonder why Louisiana farmers are being deprived of disaster relief benefits, whereas practically every county in Texas and all those Texas counties along the western border of Louisiana have been declared as drought areas by Federal authorities.

This constitutes another phase of the agricultural program which is disheartening and discouraging to our Louisiana farmers and which is frustrating to our public officials who are striving so diligently to secure the much-needed aid required by agriculture in Louisiana.

FEBRUARY 13, 1957.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
*Secretary of Agriculture,*
*Department of Agriculture,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am greatly disturbed over the general condition of our farmers in Louisiana and the handling of the drought relief program has certainly done little to alleviate their distress. It is particularly hard to explain to farmers residing in the western parishes of Louisiana why they do not qualify for drought relief, whereas farmers across the state line in the eastern counties of Texas do qualify for drought relief.

The unfairness in the way this drought relief program has been handled is clearly spelled out in the attached release from the Louisiana Department of Agriculture and Immigration, Baton Rouge, La. I wholeheartedly endorse the position and the statements of Louisiana State Commissioner of Agriculture, S. J. McCrory, relative to this matter. Since farmers in my congressional district look to me for an explanation as to why they were not afforded an equal opportunity to participate in the drought relief program, I, in turn, would appreciate very much having a realistic explanation from you which I can pass on to them.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

GEO. S. LONG,
*Member of Congress.*

## Fighting Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, one reason why we have far less juvenile delinquency in the Kensington area of Buffalo, N. Y., is because the citizens there take an active interest in promoting activity for teen-agers.

After considerable success with the Kensington Little League, organization is now under way to form two leagues—a Babe Ruth League for baseball and a Pop Warner League for football.

It takes the effort of the fathers in the district to supply the necessary stimulant for such activity. It is being done, and I want to take my hat off to this small but important segment of America.

## Pesticides—These Agricultural Chemicals Protect Your Food and Assure Unparalleled Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, during the past year many of us have received inquiries on the use of pesticides in the production of food. While most were seeking information, some showed alarm and fear.

In checking with the Food and Drug Administration and the United States Department of Agriculture, they assure me that our food supply is safe as far as pesticides are concerned.

I have had an opportunity to examine two articles, written by authorities in this field, which deal directly with this subject and am quite certain that my colleagues will find them both factual and very interesting as well as enlightening.

The first article, High Quality Food Supply Aided by Pest Control, was written by Dr. A. L. MILLER, my colleague from Nebraska, who authored Public Law 518 of the 83d Congress. This amendment to our Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act requires that a tolerance or an exemption from a tolerance be established for a pesticide chemical, when a residue remains, before it may be used in the production of food.

The second article, Consumers Given Unparalleled Protection, was written by Dr. Bernard E. Conley, of the American Medical Association.

The articles follow:

HIGH QUALITY FOOD SUPPLY AIDED BY PEST CONTROL

(By Hon. A. L. MILLER, M. D.,[1] Member of Congress, Nebraska)

It has given me much satisfaction to have sponsored the most recent major amendment to our Nation's Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for, with the passage of the bill, it gives complete assurance that our food is safe insofar as agricultural chemicals are concerned.

The American food supply, undoubtedly, is the safest in the world. In recent years, we have experienced sweeping changes—not

[1] Dr. A. L. MILLER practiced medicine for 30 years, and served as director of public health, State of Nebraska. He is a fellow in the American College of Surgeons, and is now serving his seventh term in Congress.

only in production, processing and distribution but in diets as well. All have been beneficial.

The average person's diet now contains 15 percent more calcium, 25 percent more riboflavin, 20 percent more thiamine and niacin, 15 percent more iron, about 5 percent more protein and 5 percent more of vitamins A and C, than it did 25 years ago.

The American diet is better because we eat more milk products, meat, poultry, eggs, vegetables, and fruits, but it is still not the best possible.

As I have pointed out, we now have 5 percent more vitamins A and C in our average diet. However, dietitians feel this should be increased considerably. These vitamins are found in leafy green and yellow vegetables and citrus fruits. These crops could never be produced in sufficient quantity without the use of agricultural chemicals for these specialty crops are highly susceptible to infestation and complete destruction by various pests. Of the more than 80,000 kinds of pests in the United States, about 7,000 are injurious to crops. Over 80 high-vitamin crops could never be produced without the use of agricultural chemicals.

Looking at the long-range problem—and it is a very serious one—one cannot help but become highly concerned over whether we will be able to produce enough food and fiber for our population even within the next 25 years.

Dr. Grover W. Ensley, staff director of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, recently pointed out that our population can be expected to increase to about 190 million persons by 1965. It can be expected that our diet level will continue to rise, but even if we are to feed 175 million people at the same rate as we have now, our domestic consumption of farm products must increase 9 percent. On this basis alone, by 1960, we would need to have each year about 2 billion more pounds of meat, an additional 500 million dozen eggs, an extra billion pounds of milk solids, and about 8 million tons more of feed grains than we produced in 1952.

Even as we must produce more food, vast armies of the rival world—insects—are devouring billions of dollars of food annually. They are attacking incessantly—the planted seed, the growing crop, stored foods, and even in the home. Insects are not the only source of loss. Weeds drain the vital juices of over $4 billion worth of United States crops annually.

Public Law 518, popularly known as the Miller amendment, is the vehicle which the Food and Drug Administration uses to establish, on a scientific basis, the amounts of chemical residues which can remain on crops. Literally millions of dollars are spent in research checking the safety of the various chemicals which are used.

These residues are very minute, many as low as one-tenth of a part per million. Others, due to their chemical structure, leave no residues whatsoever, and some are not harmful to humans and require no tolerance.

Of course, everyone should wash fresh fruits and vegetables and follow other commonly accepted steps for the safe handling of food. I say this as a medical doctor and as a former director of public health for the State of Nebraska. This should be done not only to wash away any residue, but to wash away filth from rodents, or flies and other insects. While many illnesses and deaths have been caused by the latter, the United States Public Health Service reports that there has been no illness or death attributed to the proper use of agricultural chemicals.

Public Law 518 is an excellent example of progress being speeded by legislation. I sincerely feel this law serves the interests of everyone, because it sets up standards of safety for all.

CONSUMERS GIVEN UNPARALLELED PROTECTION

(By Dr. Bernard E. Conley,[2] secretary, committee on pesticides, American Medical Association)

Pesticides play an important role in providing the Nation's food supply and protecting the public health. Thanks to the Miller amendment to the Federal Food and Drug Act the consumer is assured of an unparalleled degree of protection.

The Miiller amendment requires the pretesting of a pesticide chemical for the protection of the consumer.

Safety is based on knowledge. We as members of the committee on pesticides of the American Medical Association are very much interested in any program or effort to increase people's knowledge of how to use pesticides properly.

Pesticides can be safely used. However, disregard for the basic safety measures and precautions may result in accidents. Persons using pesticides should read the directions carefully and take the precautionary steps outlined on the label.

Naturally, we are interested in the safety program of the pesticide industry being sponsored by the National Agricultural Chemicals Association in cooperation with the National Safety Council. This program is a forward step in educating everyone concerned with the safe and judicious use of these materials.

## Cooperative Relationship Between Postal Organization and New York Postmaster Robert H. Schaffer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. PAUL A. FINO**
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, it is not always that we hear of employee groups speaking well of their employers. So that when we do hear of an extremely satisfactory relationship between, not one but several, labor organizations and the boss, that deserves special attention and commendation. I refer specifically to the cordial and cooperative relationship that exists between postal organizations in the New York post office and Postmaster Robert H. Schaffer.

In a letter addressed to me and signed by the presidents of nine employee organizations in the New York post office, these groups reaffirm their wholehearted support of Postmaster Schaffer. They state that they are enjoying more benefits than ever existed. The morale of their combined membership has improved as a result of changes introduced by Postmaster Schaffer. They salute him for his progressive mindedness and for his genuine cooperation in improving labor-management relationships in the post office. In substance, they extend a vote of confidence to Mr. Schaffer, whom the boys in New York affectionately and respectfully refer to as Ray.

I wish to join these postal groups in their expression of satisfaction for a man who has creditably filled the office of postmaster with honor, dignity, and humaneness. I concur in this salute to Ray.

[2] Dr. Bernard E. Conley received S. M. and Ph. D. degrees from the department of pharmacology of the University of Chicago, and is now a research associate there. He is presently secretary of both the committee on toxicology and the committee on pesticides of the American Medical Association.

## Jones' Doorknob

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. WALT HORAN**
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill which gives the Army engineers and other interstate agencies, a clear mandate and a full congressional authorization to seek out sites which would be adequate for storing water as stored water. Your first thoughts on this idea might be that it is superfluous, since upstream developments with power, reclamation, domestic water, navigation, flood control, recreation, and wildlife, all may, and usually do, add some storage water to the Nation's rivers and streams. However, I must point out, that up to now, water storage has been merely incidental or in addition to. It has never been the initial, and therefore, the prior consideration.

I was born on the banks of the Wenatchee River, a very short mile from its confluence with the mighty Columbia. As a boy, I used to search for arrowheads along that river and watch the sternwheelers churn upstream from Wenatchee to Riverside, Wash., in high water and sail downstream from Pateros to Wenatchee in low water. Even then we used to talk of the high water of 1894—which came "clear up to Jones' doorknob." The Jones family lived in a house near the Columbia. We do not have to think back 63 years ago to remember water up to Jones' doorknob. The terrible flood of 1948 and the flood last summer have focused our attention anew on flood control and have accented our observations and our efforts on those developments that will help us to avoid the devastations of extreme high water.

Yes, today, stored water means flood control and water stored during the runoff is the simple key to our future power development throughout the Nation. Speaking for the district I represent, stored water is the key to development of the Columbia River drainage basin. It is a must that we should know the potential in the light of the newest knowledge and procedures—and we should know the other problems involved and how to solve them. Stored water should be the main accent on our plans for future power development and future power supply.

A recent survey of power needs throughout the United States estimates that by 1975 the need for power will have increased 90 percent. Thus, we have reached a point now, in the overall development of the Columbia and other

rivers, when we must make the storage, as stored water, the first and primary consideration in any part of that development, and the farther we go up the system toward the Great Divide, the more important the fact should be. Aside from the problems of fish, which we all want fully met, storing water is now, more than ever, the very crux of our strivings for more power, more flood control, better navigation, better reservoir level control and adequate water for irrigation and domestic uses. The very naive lady who asked: "What do you do with the water after you get the electricity out of it?"—brought forth the well-known fact that you never get electricity out of water as long as it is falling. The same bucketful, stored, if possible, could have its electricity removed a score of times before it joined the Pacific.

I feel that by placing emphasis on storage, as stored water, we are beginning to place new emphasis on the potentials of the important but lesser tributaries. In my own district new projects have become feasible because of other developments, as in the case of the Omak-Goose Lake possibilities which I had the Army engineers first explore in 1946. Possible combinations with Chief Joseph Dam and power output now make this a project worthy of full study. Another possibility in my district is the Wenatchee hydro project which would store water in the Lake Wenatchee area. I believe, this is sometimes referred to as the Chiwawa.

Let me sum up by saying that as long as we have mountain ranges, and canyons with water flowing down them, we will have the responsibility of harnessing that water for progress and guarding against the damage of floods. Those mountains and those canyons also give us the God-given opportunity to make the most of our storage potential with a minimum of cost.

I must say that we are making new starts for immediate promise to our power needs, and some multiple benefits. But the need is for the much broader view—stored water, during the spring runoff that can be regulated to supply the benefits of a maximum flow the year around. The promise of escape from interruptive power, the elimination of floods and their damage, the realization, at last, of the full value of our mighty river assets—these are within our grasp.

The key, as I have said, is storage. Storage first, and the others will be added to it.

## Insulting Remarks About Mexicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.**
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which was sent today to Mrs. Frederic A. Groves, national president of the Daughters of the American Revolution:

DEAR MRS. GROVES: Permit me to commend you for disassociating yourself and the policies of your national organization from the undemocratic remarks about Mexicans, made by Mrs. Charlotte C. Rush, a member of your Denver, Colo., chapter. Your statement should further serve to indicate that the DAR has come a long way since the unfortunate Marian Anderson incident in 1948, in espousing the ideals of real Americanism. As the Representative in Congress of a principal segment of the Mexican population in Detroit, I can proudly attest to their loyalty and fine citizenship.

It is no secret that treatment of Mexicans in certain parts of this country, coupled with attitudes reflected in such remarks made by Mrs. Rush is a source of animosity I know to exist against white Americans among many people in Mexico. I hope that your quick rejection of her statement will contribute toward assuaging their feelings and binding the ties demanded by decent instincts and our common interests with the Mexican people.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.,
*Member of Congress.*

## Spanish Sheepherders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER**
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 107, a resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary or any subcommittee thereof, to conduct studies and investigations relative to matters within the committee's jurisdiction, which includes immigration, I have submitted today to the House a report containing findings and recommendations arrived at after a study of the problem of Spanish sheepherders was made last year.

The House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality undertook last year to check on reports, according to which a considerable number of sheepherders admitted to the United States under three special laws passed in 1950, 1952, and 1954, respectively, have abandoned their employment with ranchers in the Western and Mountain States and drifted into the mining industry, dairy farms, various processing plants, and restaurants, mostly in California and Nevada, to the detriment of our woolgrowing industry.

A careful review of the results of our investigation has caused us to recommend that no special immigration laws admitting sheepherders for permanent residence be enacted by the Congress in the future. Instead, and mindful of the interests of the ranchers and woolgrowers as well as of the needs of our textile industry, we are recommending that after the practice of admitting sheepherders under special legislation is discontinued, they be permitted to enter this country under existing general laws which provide for the importation of needed workers on a temporary basis. This system has for the last few years worked to everybody's satisfaction in the case of agricultural laborers coming from the British West Indies for the purpose of supplying the necessary manpower for our citrus fruit growers, tobacco farmers, and sugar beet planters.

We have found that the circumstances of employment in the sheepraising and woolgrowing industry are no different from the employment of foreign skilled workers in other branches of agriculture. We therefore do not believe that the sheepherders should benefit from special, preferential and privileged treatment. Our studies have conclusively shown that the legitimate interest of American employers will be better served if workers for the sheepraising and woolgrowing industry were admitted temporarily for appropriate periods of time, and that at the conclusion of such periods they were required to return to their country of origin and to their families, while other workers—from domestic labor sources, if available—or other foreign workers similarly skilled be given an opportunity to accept temporary employment.

My report urges the Immigration and Naturalization Service to implement this recommendation and to use their experience obtained in the administration of the British West Indies program in establishing procedures after consultation with the Department of Labor, the interested labor unions, the National Woolgrowers Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, and with the California Range Association, of Fresno, Calif., under which skilled sheepherders could enter this country on a rotating basis so as to assure a continuous supply of this type of labor.

Most of the sheepherders admitted to the United States under special legislation came from Spain. Under the special laws, the immigration quota for Spain was reduced by 50 percent through the fiscal year 1960 under a "mortgage" provision in order to have the 750 quota immigrant visas issued to the special sheepherders "paid up" over several years. In fairness to immigrants born in Spain, we recommend in our report that this mortgage be canceled as of the beginning of the forthcoming fiscal year. This recommendation has already been implemented in a bill which I introduced in the Congress in January of this year.

## The Madisonville Messenger of Madisonville, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER**
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, it came as no surprise to those of us who know the Madisonville Messenger of Madisonville, Ky., when the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post 5480, presented it with a

plaque in appreciation of the paper's contribution to public safety.

In 1956 Kentucky suffered 769 traffic fatalities of the 40,200 throughout the United States. The Messenger, realizing some time ago the seriousness of the situation, began a crusade for public safety consisting of excellent news stories, photographs showing the horrifying results of traffic accidents, and backed this with a series of editorials. This program undertaken by the Messenger has been evaluated by the National Security Council as ranging up to 10 times its recommended performance.

The city of Madisonville is very fortunate in having a newspaper that has always been published in a fair and impartial manner. A newspaper that reports factually matters of concern to the community, State, and Nation, and with a firm editorial stand taken and upheld. The credit for publishing such an outstanding newspaper goes to the owner, Edgar Arnold, Sr., ably assisted by his son, Edgar Arnold, Jr.

Madisonville owes a debt of gratitude to Mr. Arnold and his son as excellent newspapermen, dedicated citizens, and outstanding Kentuckians. With the development of each fair and impartial newspaper a community in our Nation becomes a safer, better place to live, and freedom of the press takes a new and deeper meaning.

## Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House of Representatives a civil-rights bill which contains the four-point program called for by the President, and, in addition, contains the following four provisions:

First. Strengthening of basic civil-rights statutes by increasing punishment where death or maiming result from violations of these statutes.

Second. Clarification of these basic civil-rights statutes to facilitate prosecutions under them.

Third. Provision for judicially enforced penalties and remedies both criminal and civil in cases of segregation in interstate transportation.

Fourth. Provision for a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights with subpena powers.

The issue of civil-rights legislation is hardly a new one. Since 1944 both Democratic and Republican Party platforms have advocated an overhaul and reinforcement of the existing machinery. On two occasions President Truman tried to enact a civil-rights program, but on both occasions Senate filibusters defeated him.

The present administration has also encouraged efforts to end the many and degrading forms of discrimination which can be found throughout the country. Where progress has been significant—in the antidiscrimination measures of the armed services and other Federal activities—we take pride in a feeling of accomplishment. In the field of congressional legislation, we look forward to successful enactment of this legislation during the current Congress.

The first point in the four-point program of the President calls for the creation of a bipartisan commission to investigate asserted violations of civil rights and to make recommendations, appraising Federal laws and policy in attempting to insure equal protection under the laws of the Constitution. The commission would have the power to subpena, but would be, above all, a moral force. By bringing study and publicity to bear upon the problem, the commission would have an educational influence on all phases of public opinion.

The second point of the proposals calls for an enlargement of the Department of Justice. Thus civil-rights questions, formerly handled by a small section of the Criminal Law Section, would in their own right constitute a major new field.

The teeth of the program are found in the third and fourth points, where the Attorney General is at last given power to institute proceedings in behalf of the aggrieved party in a discriminatory action. And these proceedings may, for the first time, constitute civil action. In other words all those persons unable to afford the expense of an involved criminal suit on their own behalf would be protected from illegal discrimination, as they are now from such criminal offenses as kidnaping. In particular, the right to vote, one of the cornerstones of our great country, will be protected.

By passage of this bill then it would be possible to insure a greater approximation of equal protection under the law to all citizens. It would be possible to reduce the great economic waste that results from discrimination, a waste estimated by Elmo Roper to cost American industry at least $30 billion a year. It would also be possible to cut the social costs, the irrevocable damage done to innocent individuals who have suffered because of their race, religion, or sex. It would be possible for all citizens to enjoy the political rights promised by the Bill of Rights.

Opponents of this measure base their arguments upon a concept of the Constitution that is justified neither by the original intent of the framers, nor by the present times. The States are, indeed, given residual powers in the Constitution, but in no way can those powers be construed to mean violation, or even just neglect, of decisions handed down by the Supreme Court. In no way should they mean the refusal of suffrage rights to citizens on grounds of ill-concealed racial prejudice. Moreover, as was frequently pointed out in the hearings of the House Rules Committee last year, instances of discrimination are not limited to any one State, or even any one geographical distribution of States, a fact which only increases the desirability of the civil-rights legislation proposed.

One more element, perhaps more significant than any other, has also led me to introduce these proposals. The passing of such a measure will show to the world, more dramatically than any other word or gesture, that the United States is a land where freedom and opportunity really are equal for all. Free nations everywhere will appreciate the extent of our freedom, just as totalitarian and puppet governments will try to discredit it. Insofar as we can uphold these highest standards of justice, we can prove ourselves equal to our mighty heritage of freedom, and worthy of our responsibilities of leadership.

## Budget Suggestions and Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, every off election year I send to the people I represent in the Fourth Congressional District in Nebraska a questionnaire which deals with the many problems facing the Congress. This year I will include a list of farmers' bulletins from which they may select 4 or 5 for their use.

Mr. Speaker, I have had many letters from Nebraska which indicate a serious concern about the size of the Federal budget and some of the new spending programs recommended. All the letters complain about the budget being too high and that wasteful spending must be trimmed out of the budget.

To analyze, condense, and summarize the budget for the 85th Congress is quite a task. It actually weighs more than 6 pounds and contains 1,521 pages. It lists thousands of items and carries an overall expenditure of nearly $72 billion. This is the largest peacetime budget in our history.

The President has indicated he is greatly concerned about inflation. He recognizes that excessive spending can jeopardize our Nation's economy. I agree with him wholeheartedly. I believe, also, that the first way to control inflation is to cut Federal spending. It cannot be done when there are many new items and programs for spending in the budget.

I know the budget is inflationary. It just seems, Mr. Speaker, that the President has had rather liberal-minded individuals giving him economic advice. The budget does not reflect, in my opinion, a course of action that would help put the brakes on the tide of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I have made some specific recommendations to the Bureau of the Budget and the President as to how and where the budget can be cut, and they are as follows:

1. Adopt all the Hoover Commission recommendations and save about $5 billion.

2. Sharp cutdown or complete elimination of our economic foreign aid pro-

gram. It now goes to 40 different countries and costs about $5 billion a year.

3. Reduce the number of Federal employees that now total about 2,400,000 by not hiring additional employees when vacancies occur until the payroll has been reduced at least 10 percent. The cost of the present civilian Federal payroll is about $11 billion a year. The present budget calls for adding about 27,000 more persons.

4. Stop advocating new programs for Federal spending. This would include Federal aid to education and 6 or 8 additional items recommended by different departments of government. This would save in the neighborhood of $3 billion.

I believe if these suggestions are followed, we could cut about eight or ten billion dollars from the present budget.

I want to represent the folks of the Fourth District honestly. I want to go along with the President when I feel he is right. I just could not go along with the Middle East resolution which included additional spending in this area of about $200 million now and an additional $400 million later on. If our drafted boys went to this area, some might even be under foreign leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the budget, as I understand it for 1958, is as follows:

| | *Billion* |
|---|---|
| Interest on the public debt | $7.4 |
| National defense | 39.5 |
| Veterans benefits | 5.0 |
| Foreign aid | 5.0 |
| The Federal payroll | 10.2 |
| Miscellaneous items (subsidies, grants-in-aid, etc.) | 4.7 |
| Total Federal budget | 71.8 |

QUESTIONS

1. Where would you cut this budget?
2. Should postal rates meet expenses?
3. Do you favor Federal aid to education?
4. What type of farm program do you suggest?
5. Do you favor a meeting of the President with top rulers of other countries? Including Russia and Red China? Yugoslavia?
6. Do you favor economic or military aid to Communist-controlled countries?
7. Do you favor foreign aid of any kind?
8. Does the present trend in Government point toward socialism?
9. Do you favor a balanced budget before a cut in taxes?
10. Do you favor statehood for Alaska? Hawaii?

Send replies to Congressman A. L. MILLER, room 1025, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

## Milwaukee Celebrates National Crime Prevention Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared, entitled "Milwaukee Celebrates National Crime Prevention Week," together with two articles on the same subject from the Milwaukee Journal of February 10, 1957, showing how cities can and do fulfill their responsibilities.

There being no objection, the statement and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILWAUKEE CELEBRATES NATIONAL CRIME PREVENTION WEEK

In last Sunday's issue of the Milwaukee Journal, there were two most interesting articles which I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues. They were written in connection with the current celebration of National Crime Prevention Week.

LOW RATE OF CRIME IN MILWAUKEE

The first article, appearing on page one of the second part of the Journal, reported the pleasant fact that commercial gambling in Wisconsin's largest city is probably at a lower rate than in any comparable-size city in the Nation.

Milwaukee has been, remains, and will be, a clean town. We are mighty proud of that fact. We are proud of its model law enforcement. Even more important, we are proud of its law-abiding citizenry.

The second article illustrated the "Why" of Milwaukee's excellent record. The article described some of the plans for the grassroots celebration of Crime Prevention Week. Included in that particular article was a description of the splendid observances by Milwaukee religious leaders, and by laymen, law enforcement experts, and others. All of these fine observances are designed to keep the citizenry well-informed on the nature of the crime prevention problem.

EVERY CITIZEN'S JOB

Crime prevention is every man's and every woman's job. Keeping a community vice-free depends on teamwork—public law enforcement, religious leadership, laymen support. Yes, it is helped by good work being done by upstanding private investigation agencies, as well—those agencies which uphold the highest standards of professional conduct.

POLICE JOB BELONGS LOCALLY

As a former member of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, I have always pointed out this fact: America will reduce its very high crime rate when all the local communities throughout the land become genuinely determined to do the basic job of law enforcement themselves.

OUR HUGE CRIME PROBLEM

We remember that for 1956, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, reported that there were as many as 2½ million major crimes unforunately committed in the United States. That shocking figure is enough to give deepest pause to all of us.

Uncle Sam through the ever-alert FBI and other arms can and will do his job to help the States and localities on combatting the many crimes involving Federal jurisdiction.

But the basic answer to the battle against crime must come from relentless State and local enforcing of their own anticrime laws. For, if there is any concept which is basic to this Nation, it is this: Police work—law enforcement—basically is not a Federal problem; it is a local problem and it must remain so. We do not believe in a national police force.

A KEY POINT IN FBI STORY

One of the greatest glories of the FBI under J. Edgar Hoover has always been that it has so superbly fulfilled its work within its own jurisdiction, while carefully refusing to infringe on any rights which must reside basically in the States and localities.

In his universally acclaimed book on the FBI, entitled "The FBI Story," the noted reporter, Don Whitehead, wisely stresses this fact: Mr. Hoover's and the FBI's great judgment in refusing the efforts of those who unwisely wanted to convert the FBI into a national police force. How right they have been in resisting any such misguided effort.

---

LID IS TIGHT ON GAMBLING—NEVER SO QUIET HERE, POLICE INSPECTOR SAYS ABOUT PRO ACTIVITY

(By Doyle K. Getter)

Commercial gambling has almost come to a standstill in Milwaukee. For a city of this size, it has probably less gambling going on than anywhere else in the country, according to men familiar with such activity.

"I've never seen it so quiet," Police Inspector Hugo Goehlen said Saturday. "We hear of an occasional floating card game, but they are small and never in the same place."

Police raided 10 floating games last year, cards and craps, without picking up a single professional gambler of any stature. Just small fry engaged in dime or quarter betting.

Not one gambler purchased a Federal gambling occupational tax stamp last year in Milwaukee. There is no commercial gambling house in the city, no regular horse handbook. Just 3 or 4 curbstone bookies, whose office is in their hat.

NO BASEBALL POOLS REPORTED

There were no baseball pools reported in Milwaukee last summer. Eight and ten years ago a football better could find football pool tickets in almost any tavern. There were more than 20 different pools.

Last fall three football pools, limited largely to factories, made a brief appearance. Police arrested and obtained convictions against 2 men for having tickets of 1 of the pools in their possession. That pool disappeared, and the other two pools disappeared with it.

There is not a commercial crap game in the city, according to dice players who ought to know. The old Ogden Social Club has disappeared, along with another crap game that met infrequently in hotel rooms.

FEDERAL TAX KILLED POLICY

Policy, which used to support 11 wheels in the Negro district with the nickels, dimes, and quarters of many hundreds of players, has been dead in Milwaukee since the Federal gambling tax went into effect in 1951. One wheel tried to make a comeback in 1954. It collapsed after a week.

Of the 40 to 50 professional gamblers whose names made news in the John Doe investigation of gambling here in 1948, fewer than a handful are still in business here—gambling business, that is.

Several have turned to roofing and siding business and have found it pays better, frequently much better, to be legitimate than illegitimate.

* * * * *

POLICE ARE TOLERANT

One tried booking basketball at the beginning of the season but his losses were so high that he quit. He made big money during the lush gambling years and is still probably well off.

At least two of the old-timers have moved to Nevada and are now in the gambling business legally.

Most of what gambling there is in Milwaukee is done in private homes or clubs—gin and poker games, contract bridge for stakes.

---

CRIME WEEK PLANS LISTED—YUL BRYNNER TO AID

Crime Prevention Week, which begins Sunday, probably will be the biggest concerted effort the city has seen to get the crime prevention message across to parents and youth.

The main attraction will be the shaven-headed stage and screen star, Yul Brynner, who will speak at the dedication of a monolith of the Ten Commandments at 10:30 a. m. Monday at the city hall and at a rally for parents and youth at 7:30 p. m. Monday at Marquette University Brooks Memorial Union, 620 North 14th Street.

Crime Prevention Weeks were observed in Milwaukee in the 1930's. A National Crime Prevention Week was started in 1947 by the National Exchange Club, a service luncheon club, with the Milwaukee branch of the group sponsoring activities here. This year for the first time the club and the metropolitan commission on crime prevention have joined forces for an enlarged effort.

SERMONS ARE SCHEDULED

On Sunday, religious emphasis day, many announcements and sermons concerning crime prevention are expected to be given in Milwaukee area churches. Fifty thousand inserts on the subject have been prepared to be slipped into church bulletins. The Milwaukee Catholic archdiocese and the Milwaukee Ministerial Association are cooperating in the effort.

Brynner will speak at the monolith dedication along with Judge E. J. Ruegemer, St. Cloud, Minn., national chairman of the Eagles youth guidance commission and originator of the monolith idea; Donald Hayne, Hollywood, Calif., executive assistant to Cecil B. De Mille, producer of the Ten Commandments, and District Judge Robert W. Hansen, former national president of the Eagles. Mayor Zeidler will accept the monolith from Judge Hansen for the city.

Ray MacArthur, crime prevention commission member, will preside. Rabbi Louis J. Swichkow, of Beth El Ner Tamid Synagogue, will give the invocation. The Rev. Hoover T. Grimsby, pastor of Ascension Lutheran Church, will give the benediction. Pastor Grimsby is chairman of the metropolitan crime prevention commission and cochairman of Crime Prevention Week with Arthur Johnson, 6224 North Berkeley Boulevard, Whitefish Bay, a member of the Milwaukee Exchange Club. In case of bad weather, the dedication will be in the city hall rotunda.

EVENING RALLY SLATED

At the evening rally, speakers wil be Brynner, Judge Ruegemer, and Hayne. Robert J. Cunningham, president of the Exchange Club, will preside.

Monday also being schoolday in crime prevention week, assemblies on crime prevention have been planned in many public and parochial schools. Some will be addressed by members of the Exchange Club and law enforcement agencies. Four schools will be presented trophies of the Exchange club for outstanding safety cadet records.

On Tuesday, law enforcement day, policemen in uniforms will visit the lower grades in schools to tell the children that they should regard them as their protectors and friends. Each child will receive a paper badge saying "Crime Prevention Police."

PROGRAMS SCHEDULED

On Wednesday, youth activities day, youth groups will hold crime prevention programs or have exhibits to show profitable uses for leisure time, such as hobby activities. Probably the largest program will be at the Milwaukee Boys' Club, 1640 North Franklin Place, which will hold a mothers and sons dinner and work in the crime prevention theme.

Thursday, Exchange Club day will be marked by a luncheon of the Exchange Club at the Milwaukee Athletic Club. Some 30 Milwaukee and suburban police officials, plus youth group leaders, members of the metropolitan crime prevention commission and principals of the 4 schools winning safety awards will be guests of honor.

Public institute day, Friday, will be observed at Brooks Memorial Union. A panel of youth leaders from 4 high schools will discuss "Youth and the Community" at 9:30 a. m. The members will be Barbara Brickhouse, Bay View High School, president of the Milwaukee Inter-High School Student Council; Michael Kramer, Messmer High School, Catholic representative on the metropolitan youth commission; Susan Lins, Rufus King High School, a member of the police youth advisory board, and Robert Rosenberg, Milwaukee Country Day School, president of the Milwaukee AZA Council of B'nai B'rith.

PANEL SESSION LISTED

At 2 p. m. Friday there will be a panel on "Where and How Has the Community Failed?" Members will be John E. Burke, warden of the State prison at Waupun; Marvin R. McMahon, superintendent of the Wisconsin School for Boys at Waukesha, and Sister M. Euphrasia, director of girls at the House of Good Shepherd. Maurice Wolkomir, a member of the metropolitan crime prevention commission, will be moderator.

Again on Sunday many churches are expected to present a crime prevention message, this time in connection with the opening of Brotherhood Week.

Some of the Crime Prevention Week activities will extend over several days. Thousands of upper grade pupils in elementary schools are expected to take guided tours of the safety building and suburban police departments during the week. They will receive booklets on the work of the police department. The booklet will be given out at the other programs in the week, as well.

Each day except Tuesday, which is Lincoln's Birthday and a legal holiday for county offices, a dozen or so selected young people will visit courts to observe procedures.

---

## Discussion of Proposed Civil-Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. W. F. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a discussion of proposed civil-rights legislation which I was recently requested to prepare by Mr. Gordon Freeman, managing editor of the Pine Bluff Commercial, a daily newspaper published in my congressional district at Pine Bluff, Ark.

The discussion appeared in the Sunday edition on February 3, 1957, under the caption "What Is Meant by Civil Rights? NORRELL Answers Oft-Asked Query," and with the following editor's note:

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Because of inquiries by readers asking an explanation of legislation on civil rights, the Commercial went to Congressman NORRELL for this data. He has written an article packed with information, and it is especially timely, since a modified form of the measure will be the subject of hearings on February 4 by the House Committee on the Judiciary.)

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED CIVIL-RIGHTS LEGISLATION

(By W. F. NORRELL)

Many questions have arisen in the minds of citizens as to what is meant by civil rights, and what would be the effect of a proposed new Federal law that has the outward appearance of undertaking to increase the protection every citizen is granted by statutory law in the exercise of the rights conferred upon him by the Constitution of the United States.

In this sense, civil rights relate to the individual citizen's right to legal proceedings under the Constitution and statutory law for the protection of his rights, privileges, and immunities.

An American citizen has many rights. They are secured by the Constitution. They are guaranteed to him by constitutional amendments known as the Bill of Rights and by the laws enacted thereunder to provide a course of action in the courts for the redress or remedy of an infringement upon his rights.

Each clause of the Constitution was designed for the protection of the individual—of his life, his liberty, and his property.

The first 10 amendments to the Constitution placed limitations upon the National Government with respect to protection of fundamental rights of persons. Comprising the Bill of Rights, these amendments guarantee, among other things, the four freedoms with which everyone is familiar: freedom of worship, of speech and of the press, of assembly, and of petition. Another guarantees the security of citizens against unlawful search and seizure of persons and property. Others guarantee the right of due process of law (the established course of proceedings in the courts), and to the right of trial by jury.

The 10th amendment embodies the doctrine know as States Rights, holding that all rights not specially delegated by the Constitution to the National Government belong to the separate States. The constitutions and statutory laws of the separate States further protect his rights at the local level.

Our Constitution was built upon the fundamental principle that government derives its just power from the consent of the governed—which means the people. Our rights have always been defended by specific limitations of power in the National Government, and by the division of power between the National and State Governments.

Under the United States Constitution, each State has sovereign authority—the right to govern itself within its own area and to enact laws and regulations within the framework of the State constitution for safeguarding and promoting the general welfare of a community and its citizens. Thus the maintenance of law and order is primarily a State and city responsibility. Thus it is that the State has authority to prescribe necessary regulations governing public education, voting qualifications of its citizens, and the many others that protect and promote the welfare of the citizens of a community.

Turning now to the legislative measure which was proposed in 1956 by Attorney General Brownell and recommended by the President, one of the questions at issue was whether the National authority should be expanded to reach matters which have historically been within the jurisdiction of the States and the people. For example, it would extend Federal jurisdiction over the regulations in the separate States of the right to vote.

Specifically, the legislation proposed the creation of a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the National Government, with authority to investigate allegations that certain citizens of the United States are being deprived of their right to vote or are being subjected to unwarranted economic pressures by reason of their color, race, religion, or national origin.

The Commission would be authorized to hold hearings at any time or place, and authority would be vested in the Attorney General to subpena any citizen for attendance and testimony and/or to produce rec-

ords in evidence if so ordered; and any failure to obey such order may be punished as contempt of court.

The powers of the Commission would also include the use of services of voluntary personnel in the investigations prescribed, whose traveling and subsistence expenses would be paid by the Federal Government. A full-time staff director and unspecified number of personnel for the Commission, and a new Assistant Attorney General in the Department of Justice, to be in charge of a new Civil Rights Division with a large staff of lawyers, would be authorized.

Another part of the measure proposed the amendment of existing criminal conspiracy statutes, which provide that an individual has the right to a course of action in the courts for damages as a result of conspiracies to deprive him of rights to equal protection of the laws and equal privileges under the laws.

The two new sections proposed to amend the existing civil rights statutes would empower the Attorney General in the name of the United States to bring civil actions or other proceedings in Federal courts whenever any persons have engaged or are about to engage in any acts or practices which would deprive any other person of any right or privilege secured by the act. This action could be brought even before State judicial and administrative remedies now required by law were exhausted. The United States would be liable for costs of the litigation. And the Attorney General could institute action in the Federal courts without the knowledge or without the consent of the person designated as the aggrieved party.

The foregoing sections would attempt to legislate in areas where the Congress has no constitutional authority to act, and would invade the sovereign authority of the several States. The 14th amendment to the United States Constitution under which the new legislation is proposed, is directed against State action denying civil rights, but it does not give the Congress authority over the actions of private individuals.

A fourth part of the proposed legislation would amend the civil voting statute by making it unlawful for a private individual as well as persons acting under State authority to interfere with the right to vote at any general, special, or primary election concerning Federal offices; and would authorize the Attorney General in the name of the United States to bring a civil suit for damages or injunctive relief whenever any person has engaged or is about to engage in any act or practice which would deprive any other person of the right to vote. This part also abolishes the present requirement of exhausting State administrative and judicial remedies before proceeding to Federal courts.

The Federal Government cannot, either through the executive, the judicial, or the legislative branches, exercise any power not expressly granted to it by the Constitution. Our forefathers who framed the Constitution knew the dangers of concentration of governmental powers in a centralized system, and the counterbalance of power for the protection of the basic rights of the people is found in the 10th amendment.

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited to it by the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

This proposed legislation, which was brought before the House in the previous Congress, would in effect attack the sovereignty of all the States and the real civil rights of all the people—of all races, creeds, and points of origin. It has been well said that it could ultimately violate more rights than allegedly it intended to protect.

New measures have been introduced in the present Congress, some of which are similar to the old measure under discussion, and several of which contain some modifications and other changes. The House Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled hearings to begin on February 4.

---

## The National Guard Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, the following is the statement which I submitted on February 9, 1957, to Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Committee on Armed Services in connection with the pending hearings on the Military Reserve program:

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT C. BYRD, SIXTH DISTRICT, WEST VIRGINIA, PRESENTED TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, FEBRUARY 9, 1957

Mr. Chairman and members of Subcommittee No. 1, I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to add my voice in protest against the recently proposed order of the Secretary of Defense, to become effective April 1, 1957, under which enlistees of the National Guard would be required to take the same 6 months' basic training as the short-term reservists.

If the Secretary's decision is grounded upon views similar to those in his utterance that the National Guard was a foxhole for dodgers during the Korean conflict, it manifestly follows that the Secretary's order was an arbitrary act without justification. Moreover, I believe my feeling is amply justified in the light of the history and ever-ready performance of the National Guard.

Under the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, pursuant to which the Secretary issued his directive, the basic training program is authorized to be "not less than 3 months or more than 6 months." In the past, neither in time of war nor in time of peace has the Army considered necessary a 6 months' basic training program. As a matter of fact, it is my understanding that the Army program under the 1955 act contains only 8 weeks of basic training with the remainder in travel, furlough, unit training, and supposedly some individual specialist training. It does seem indefensible for the Army now to state that it takes 6 months to train a basic soldier—the same period of time that has been considered sufficient training for commission as second lieutenant.

If the contemplated program is inflicted upon the National Guard, it has been estimated that the present strength of 405,000 will be reduced by 100,000 within 2 years. Mindful of this fact, the National Guard Association proposed a mandatory 3-month program which was not accepted by the Department. It has also been pointed out that a National Guard man enlists after graduation from high school, and at that time a 6-month training program would interrupt his first year of college. A 3-month basic-training program could permit the individual to return for service school or advanced individual training in many fields provided by the Army school system.

Should the Secretary persist in his demand for a 6-month single dose, then it is not unreasonable to assume that there is a method to his madness; namely, a desire to subject the Guard to the same central control as is exercised over the Reserves. It should not be forgotten, however, that the National Guard is normally subject to the control of the State, and its commander in chief is no less than the governor himself. The Constitution of the United States provides that the President shall be Commander in Chief of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States. In other words, the President does not have the same duty and power over the militia as he does over the Military, Air, and Naval Forces.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress shall have power—

"To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress."

In 1820 the Supreme Court of the United States in *Houston* v. *Moore* (5 Wheat. 1, 16) had occasion to rule on the validity of a State statute which prescribed penalties for failure to obey the President's call of the militia. In upholding the State statute the Supreme Court in its opinion stated, in part, as follows:

"It is admitted on the one side, that so long as militia are acting under the military jurisdiction of the State to which they belong, the powers of legislation over them are concurrent in the General and State Government. Congress has power to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining them; and this power being unlimited, except in the two particulars of officering and training them, according to the discipline to be prescribed by Congress, it may be exercised to any extent that may be deemed necessary by Congress. But as State militia, the power of the State governments to legislate on the same subjects, having existed prior to the formation of the Constitution, and not having been prohibited by that instrument, it remains with the States, subordinate nevertheless to the paramount law of the General Government, operating upon the same subject."

It was not until the National Defense Act of 1916 that the Congress saw fit to exercise this constitutional power. The 1916 act contains specific provisions on the instruction, training, and discipline of the National Guard. I am not aware that those provisions can be construed to mean that the guard shall be subject to the identical training program that is required for the various branches of our Armed Forces. Likewise, there is a question in my mind concerning the authority of the Secretary of Defense to issue the instant directive under the provisions of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955.

Since its history, which can be traced to the early 17th century, the National Guard has played an important part in providing well-trained troops and units for the several wars in which the United States has engaged. The National Guard, aware of its part in preserving the defense of our country, has pointed out that the underlying purpose of greater combat readiness can be had with a basic training program of less than six months' duration. The guard has pointed out that a shorter program would permit it to maintain National Guard strength at about its present level.

In my opinion, the recommendations of the National Guard in the instant controversy warrant the consideration of the subcommittee from the standpoint of the interests of our National Government. Moreover, we should not lose sight of the possible effect which the Secretary's proposal could have upon the very maintenance of law and order within our States. Any action by the Federal Government which will serve to subordinate the normal supervision of the various States over the guard might well result in the implication of our National Government in local disorders and issues. So long as the guard's training

program can achieve the greater combat readiness called for by the Congress, I do not believe it is unreasonable to ask the Secretary of Defense to defer to the recommendations that have been submitted on this issue by the guard itself.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the subcommittee give serious consideration to the probable effects of the proposed order of the Secretary of Defense.

## Columbia River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I am privileged to explain to my colleagues a bill I have today introduced to create a locally controlled interstate commission for the progressive development of the great Columbia River.

Mr. Speaker, in 1945 I first introduced a bill which provided for the establishment of the Columbia Interstate Commission. I have reintroduced this legislation in every succeeding Congress since then and, today, I did so again.

I was born on the banks of the Columbia River and the maximum development of this mighty stream has always been close to my heart. I fully realize that in order to obtain the maximum benefits, many problems must be encountered, discussed and, eventually, solved.

In previous Congresses, much legislation has been introduced providing for the orderly development of the Columbia, such as the so-called Valley authority bills. I have been conducting my own study over a period of many years on this subject and my bill is a result of this study and it has been objectively and constructively criticized.

I might say that I have been sympathetic to the sincere objectives of the standard proponents of the valley authority principle, however, I have encountered numerous obvious defects in the authority bills. My bill is designed to remedy these errors and still attain the objective of comprehensive regional development.

I wish to make a brief statement summarizing my proposed bill pointing out the essential differences between it and the other bills. I assure you—they are not the same.

The purpose of my bill is to provide a vehicle for the orderly development of the tremendous resources with which God has blessed this region; to give voice to the residents of the Pacific Northwest in determining the policies directing the course of this development; to extend the benefits of that development to the growth of the true, native private enterprise in the area and to guarantee to the Federal Government a sound administration of the projects in the Columbia region in which the taxpayers have a multibillion dollar investment.

My basic objections to the valley authority bills have been mainly:

First. No adequate provision was made to give the people of the area—through their State governments—an effective voice in policy matters.

Second. Provisions made in the valley bills for local advisory councils have been proposed on a pressure group basis. This is a black mark on American traditions.

Third. No effective guaranty has been made as to rights of employees of the authority either through civil service or collective bargaining.

Fourth. The authority proponents, attempting to avoid colonialism by Wall Street, have advocated colonialism by Washington, D. C. I feel that either condition for the Pacific Northwest is intolerable. My bill, I feel, would give all responsible people and agencies a chance to express their desire for balanced progress.

I have written this measure in a sincere attempt to bring the people of the area affected fully into the governing and operation of the Columbia River. I have tried, in this measure, to properly recognize the place of the States. This bill creates a real partnership between the States and the Federal Government.

This matter was a real issue in the last presidential campaign. The warning signals against Federal domination were raised and demands were made by many for more home rule and States' rights.

My bill is an attempt to meet the issues of today as they affect the Columbia River.

This present Columbia Interstate Commission bill is based on 10 years' study of all valley authority proposals and alternative schemes. It gives statutory authority to the principle of the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee and allows immediate progress on the programs of the Army engineers and Bureau of Reclamation but transfers the balance of control to the people living in the Pacific Northwest States.

The Columbia River is both an interstate and international stream. Since it drains large areas of western Montana, a small part of Wyoming, nearly all of Idaho, and more than half of Oregon and Washington, and draws one-third of its flow from British Columbia in Canada, the interests of both the Pacific Northwest and the Nation require that its resources be harnessed in an orderly manner.

The Columbia River is North America's most potent stream: Developed to the fullest, it can bring 3,840,000 acres of new land under cultivation, insure an adequate water supply to 1,500,000 partially thirsty acres, develop some 45 million horsepower in electricity, nourish a $100 million fisheries industry, supply water for atomic energy and supersonic aeronautical research—and still have water left over for navigation and other purposes.

The Columbia River will be developed, inevitably, in the public interest. National defense, the need for the resources of the Northwest and growing population in the area require it. The only question is whether the basic control of its development will rest in Washington, D. C., Wall Street, or within the area through which its mighty waters flow.

The Columbia Interstate Commission bill answers the demand of the people of the Pacific Northwest for an agency capable of carrying out an orderly, comprehensive program of development of the Columbia region's resources, through the use of Federal investment and the abilities of specialized Federal agencies, which at the same time guarantees to residents of the region a full measure of local control in determining the policies to be followed in attaining this development. Dozens of organizations and thousands of people in the Northwest are on record as favoring the creation of a Federal corporation to supervise resource-development activities in the Columbia River region provided it gave them a real voice in controlling the corporation's activities. The Columbia Interstate Commission bill is the only proposal which meets that requirement.

The Columbia Interstate Commission consists of two main elements: A board of commissioners, consisting of one man each nominated by the Governors of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington, and one named at large and directly appointed by the President, all serving staggered 7-year terms, would provide continuity in the supervision and construction of projects for development. The board members would receive salaries of $15,000 per year and must be free of any connection with businesses which would be affected by the corporation's activities.

The advisory council set up under CIC would consist of the governors and other representatives of those 4 States and 1 representative of the State of Wyoming, 17 in all. The advisory council, whose composition would constantly reflect changing political sentiment with each general election, would keep the commission's activities in line with the will of the people. By holding public hearings on all project proposals and issuing reports on them before they could be sent to Congress, the advisory council would provide a constant check on the commission's activities. The CIC is the only proposal for comprehensive river development in which the residents of the area have a truly representative voice in its control.

The Columbia Interstate Commission bill is the only proposal for a Federal corporation which guarantees the full benefits of collective bargaining to its laborers and mechanics, and the security of civil-service status to its administrative personnel.

The Columbia Interstate Commission, under authorization from Congress, would assume responsibility for all activities of reclamation, navigation, flood control, pollution control, power generation, fisheries conservation, watershed protection, and such other activities as may be desirable in making the resources of the area available to farmers and industries of the area. At the same time, it provides for continued operation of existing agencies, such as the Soil Conservation Service, in those fields where such operation is preferable.

The Columbia Interstate Commission does not invade the field of private enter-

prise. While preserving the traditional public-preference provisions of Federal power development, it allows the people of any given area to have the form of local power distribution they prefer. It is the only Federal power development proposal which gives first consideration in power distribution to farmers and home consumers. The CIC provides for opening up resources of the Northwest to new industries, agriculture, and to veterans seeking a source of expanding economy.

The Columbia Interstate Commission preserves the general principles of reclamation, flood control, and river-development policies built up over a long period of Federal history, but adapts those principles to the regional concept of interstate cooperation in the Pacific Northwest. It is the only proposal making specific provision for cooperation with Canada for international water-development planning.

The Columbia Interstate Commission bill provides for full repayment to the United States Treasury of all Federal money borrowed or appropriated for power and irrigation projects. It also provides for payments in lieu of taxes to State, county, and municipal governments whenever such taxes would be applicable.

The Columbia Interstate Commission is the only proposal for Columbia River development providing for an advisory council not composed merely of pressure groups. It is the only proposal making specific provision for conservation of fisheries. It is the only proposal providing for full public hearings on all activities of the corporation.

The Columbia Interstate Commission allows residents of the Pacific Northwest to determine for themselves the priority of project planning—to protect the forests, fisheries, navigation, grazing lands, mining areas, Indian rights, and the like. It is the only proposal requiring specific representation of each of the States affected.

The Columbia Interstate Commission is tailored to the needs of the Pacific Northwest.

## Negro History Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, as most of my colleagues are aware the week of February 10 began the annual national observance of Negro History Week, a salute to the progress and hard-won achievements of black Americans.

Analyzing historical developments is by no means one of my personal skills; but I feel that very little disagreement will be encountered if we divide the 100-year-old Negro struggle for first-class citizenship into three general stages.

In the first stage we would find Negro leaders whose courageous efforts put national attention on the injustice of slavery. These great men and women—some in bondage and some free—spoke loudly and acted boldly to stir much public sentiment against the inhuman practice of working, treating, and selling men, women, and children as if they were animals.

Such fighters as Nat Turner, who led a slave rebellion, Phyllis Wheatley, Sojourner Truth, and Frederick Douglas were, in a large part, responsible for growing northern resentment which led to the Civil War and emancipation.

These brave crusaders very well could have considered the abolishment of slavery as victory enough to allow them to rest on their laurels, but, those who lived did not rest. They continued to contribute their aid and counsel in the critical readjustment that followed.

The end of slavery created many problems for both Negroes and whites, serious problems that led to friction, violence, and the birth of Jim Crow. By the beginning of the 20th century—almost 50 years after emancipation—racial relations had reached such a critical point that some compromises were bound to be advanced.

Most of us remember the approaches to a solution that were made by Booker T. Washington and Marcus Garvey. Washington promoted a theory which, while bringing about a climate of interracial cooperation for the immediate good, was never intended to serve as a permanent pattern. Garvey, on the other hand, hit on the idea of ridding white America of its problem by having all Negroes leave the country and start their own republic in Africa. Garvey attracted much attention with his UNIA movement, but his efforts also generated waves of protest from Negroes who saw no solution in leaving, and from clear-thinking whites who did not want to see them leave.

This, indeed, was a period of dilemma and frustration; of half-truths and hollow promises; of brave arguments and violent rebuttals. It was during this period that two organizations which have become the prime champions of social, political, and economic equality for Negroes came into being—the NAACP and the CIO.

These groups threw their memberships open to anyone who believed in true democratic principles and freedom of opportunity, and this is what Negroes wanted. The emergence of a vigorous, intelligent type of Negro leadership is proof that Negro history, as an uphill fight for freedom, has reached its third and final stage.

We have seen the ground laid for ultimate victory by Mary McLeod Bethune and Walter White. We have been kept abreast of developments by Robert S. Abbott, Robert L. Vann, and John H. Johnson. We have been brought closer to economic independence by C. C. Spaulding, Dr. Maceo Walker, and Charles C. Diggs, Sr. We have contributed to the pride and happiness of the Nation through Joe Louis, Jackie Robinson, Nat "King" Cole, Duke Ellington, Marian Anderson, and Dorothy Dandridge. We have made equality have real meaning through the efforts of Thurgood Marshall, Roy Wilkins, and our NAACP.

We have shown that we have political unity and intelligence by electing 5 Negro Congressmen since 1900, 3 in the past 15 years. We have demonstrated through Rev. Martin Luther King that we never intend to leave this Nation, nor do we see the need to compromise with democratic principle. We are fully conscious, now, that we are Americans, too; and that there is no turning back from our desires and rights to enjoy every blessing promised to every citizen of this Nation.

Today, the climax of Negro history, as such, is being written. Today, through securing equal housing, equal education, and equal economic opportunity through achieving equal voting privileges, through electing qualified men to high public offices, through insisting on the right to contribute our talents and energies to America's progress, Negro citizens are writing the most glorious chapter in Negro advancement.

The Negro is confident and inspired by the knowledge that, in fulfillment of the responsibilities of citizenship, he has worthily contributed to the social and cultural advancement of our national life. In the following poem, with which I have taken certain liberties, written by Rev. William Holmes Borders, distinguished pastor of Wheat Street Baptist Church, Atlanta, Ga., the Negro declares his Americanism:

I AM SOMEBODY

I am somebody—
I am a poet in Langston Hughes.
I am an author in Frank Yerby.
I am a creator of rhyme in Paul Lawrence Dunbar.
I am a Christian Statesman in J. R. E. Lee.
I am a diplomat in Ralph A. Bunche.

I am somebody—
I am somebody. I am a soldier in Gen. B. O. Davis.
I am courage in Crispus Attucks and Dorie Miller.
I am a humorist in Eddie "Rochester" Anderson.
I am a television artist in Nat "King" Cole.
I am a concert singer in Leontine Price.
I am a renowned baritone in Robert McFerrin.
I am a great contralto in Marion Anderson.

I am somebody—
I am somebody. I am an athlete in Harrison Dillard and Ira Murchison.
I am a basketball star in Bill Russell and Wilt Chamberlain.
I am an intelligent pen in the hand of DuBois.
I am a college president in Mordecai Johnson.
I am a breaker of world records in Jesse Owens and Eddie Tolan.

I am somebody—
I am somebody. I am an orator in P. James Bryant and Howard Thurman.
I am a preacher in C. T. Walker and L. K. Williams.
I am a composer in Nathaniel Dett.
I am an actor in William Marshall, Frank Silvera, Sidney Poiter, and James Edwards.
I am a boxer in Sugar Ray Robinson.
I am a knockout punch in Floyd Patterson.
I am a baseball player in Jackie Robinson and Hank Aaron.
I am a home-run hitter in Larry Doby and Willie Mays.
I am a world famous pitcher in Don Newcombe and Satchel Paige.

I am somebody—
I am somebody. I am a scientist in George Washington Carver.
I am an industrial educator in Booker T. Washington.
I am a Congressman in WILLIAM L. DAWSON, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, and CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr.
I am a skin specialist in Dr. Lawless, of Chicago, and teach what I know at Northwestern University.
I am a judge in Wade H. McCree and Elvin L. Davenport.
I am a musicmaker in Duke Ellington and Ella Fitzgerald.
I am a pathologist in Julian Lewis and serve on the University of Chicago faculty.
I am the first successful operator on the human heart in Daniel Hale Williams.
I am an entertainer in Eartha Kitt and Harry Belafonte.

I am somebody—
I am an Assistant Secretary of Labor in J. Ernest Wilkins.
I am loyalty in the armed services.
I am insight in Sojourner Truth and Frederick Douglas.
I am an advocator of justice in Roy Wilkins and Thurgood Marshall.
I am a labor leader in A. Phillip Randolph.

I am somebody—
I am somebody. I am a molder of character in Nannie Burroughs.
I am a banker in R. R. Wright and L. D. Milton.
I am a certified public accountant in Jesse Blayton and Richard Austin.
I am a sculptor in Henry O. Tanner.
I am a businessman in Alonzo Herndon and Charles C. Diggs, Sr.
I am a grand specimen of womanhood in Mary McLeod Bethune.
I am a publisher in John Sengstacke, Mrs. Robert L. Vann, and John H. Johnson.

I am somebody—
I am somebody. I am an insurance executive in C. C. Spaulding.
I am a zoologist in Ernest E. Just.
I am a historian in Carter Woodson, J. Hope Franklin, and J. A. Rogers.
I am a lover of education in Charlotte Hawkins Brown.
I am a beautician in Madames Walker, Washington, and Malone.
I am a trustee in slavery. I protected my master's wives and daughters while he fought to keep the chains of slavery about my body.
I am a bishop in W. A. Fountain and George Baber.
I am a ball of fire in Richard Allen.
I am a laborer in John Henry.
I am a true Christian, for indeed, I practiced the religion of Jesus at points better than my master from whom I learned it.
I am somebody.

The climax of Negro history is today being written in the extension of the frontiers of democracy to encompass freedom and justice for all people.

---

## Your Congressman Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I herewith insert in the RECORD my address delivered Saturday, February 23, over Radio Station WHK, Cleveland, on the regular weekly program conducted by WHK Radio Station to enable the Congressmen from the Greater Cleveland area to offer regular reports from Washington to their constituents. This program is known as Your Congressman Speaks and my address follows:

This is my first report from Washington since last July when Congress adjourned.

Immediately upon the convening of the 85th Congress we were confronted with what the present administration called an issue involving war or peace. This has more lately been termed the Eisenhower doctrine for the Middle East.

Congress was warned by the President and the Secretary of State that unless Congress adopted a resolution making clear to the Russians that the United States intended to prevent further infiltration of Russian influence in the Middle East area, the Russians would then engage in actions which might very well bring about world war III. This has been the overriding issue in Congress since the day it convened.

During debate on the floor of the House, I expressed very serious misgivings and grave reservations about the Eisenhower resolution. In the first place, the resolution was very limited in that it suggested opposition only to international communism. The clear inference was that national communism was acceptable to the administration. I expressed concern that the loose wording of the Eisenhower resolution would make it possible for the Communist dictator Tito to infiltrate the Middle East with his brand of communism and that the administration would not be empowered to stop him. Upon questioning during the debate, I was assured that the Eisenhower resolution did not intend to do this despite its faulty language. The second concern I expressed was that if Congress did pass the Eisenhower resolution we would, in fact, be endorsing support for what Secretary Dulles has fanatically defended as national communism or independent communism. I raised this question in the House because for many months I have been concerned with the lack of understanding shown by Secretary Dulles of the latest Kremlin tactical maneuver to confuse the leaders of the free world on the basic question of communism. To those people who have been compelled to live under the tyranny of communism, there is absolutely no difference between the two brands and it is obvious that the Russians have merely invented the slogan of so-called national communism as a device for confusing gullible people throughout the world. Again I received assurance that in voting for the proposed Eisenhower resolution, I would not be endorsing the devotion of Secretary Dulles to the misguided notion that we can defeat the Communist conspiracy by splitting its camp into various so-called national or independent segments.

It was only after receiving assurances on the floor of Congress on these vital points that I voted for the resolution. By this process I removed any doubt on these two critical points as to the intention of Congress with respect to the Eisenhower resolution. I shall keep a close watch on developments to make certain that the Eisenhower administration does not violate the spirit of the resolution or the intent of Congress.

Upon conclusion of Senate hearings, the resolution was amended to make it clear beyond any doubt that we are prepared to use force if the Russians move into the Middle East.

While Congress has been giving very careful study to the proposed Eisenhower doctrine for the Middle East, Secretary of State Dulles suddenly and unexpectedly proposed that sanctions be imposed upon Israel unless it abided by a United Nations resolution calling for the withdrawal of the Israeli troops from the Gaza strip. The new Dulles proposal for sanctions against Israel raises a series of very pertinent questions which apparently had not occurred to the Secretary of State or his advisers in the Department of State. Those questions are—

First, how could we recommend to the United Nations that sanctions be imposed against Israel for noncompliance with a United Nations resolution when we have made no effort to impose sanctions upon the most infamous aggressor, the Soviet Union, for its failure to comply with a United Nations resolution passed last December, calling for the removal of all Red army troops from Hungary. In this connection it will be recalled that after the Hungarian freedom fighters had driven the Russians out of Budapest and had won 4 historic days of freedom and independence, the Red army reinvaded Hungary in the early morning hours of November 4. At the very time the Red army had reentered Hungary with 5,000 tanks, 200,000 reinforcements of infantrymen and supported by a major effort of the Russian Air Force, the Russian representative in the United Nations, then meeting in emergency session, was assuring all the United Nations delegates that the Russian troops were withdrawing and there was no cause for the United Nations to be concerned with developments in Hungary. A few hours later, when the cruel and shocking truth of the Russian slaughter of the Hungarian patriots was made known to the free world, public indignation reached the point where forthwith and decisive action by the United Nations appeared necessary for the survival of the United Nations itself. This caused the United Nations General Assembly eventually to pass a resolution demanding the withdrawal of all Russian troops from Hungary, a resolution which the Russians and their satellites voted against and which, up until today, the Russians have refused to recognize.

It would be a violation of all that is just and decent if we, as a nation, were to support any resolution imposing sanctions against Israel unless equal sanctions were simultaneously voted against the Russian Communists. There is firm support for this position among all people who seek a just and lasting peace, and the prevention of world war III.

The second pertinent question raised by the Dulles proposal to apply sanctions only against little Israel is whether our current foreign policy is based upon the notion that we should punish little nations when they stand up for principle. It is important that the American people remember that Israel has taken a public stand against the Russian Communists and has pledged itself to fight against any Russian maneuvers in the Mideast area. Has Colonel Nasser, the Egyptian leader, given similar assurances to our Government? The answer is "No." The record shows that Colonel Nasser has been receiving military assistance and economic aid from the Russian Communists. Before the conflict in the Middle East broke out, it was a known fact among competent newspapermen—but apparently not to the Central Intelligence Agency of our Government—that there were over 5,000 so-called Russian technicians on Egyptian soil, who in fact were Russian military officers, jet pilots, and Russian secret-police operatives. It is also interesting to note that the Israeli troops captured a stockpile of 1 million Russian-made army blankets in the first days of the conflict—which indicates the number of so-called volunteers the Russians intended to parachute into Egypt. On the record, there can be no reasonable doubt that it would be national folly to put any dependence upon Colonel Nasser. He has collaborated with

the Russian Communists and betrayed his own people.

Congress now has been called upon to cooperate with the administration by simply putting a rubber stamp on Mr. Dulles' proposals. We should not depart from our time-honored position as protector of the smaller and persecuted nations. We should not depart from the principle of equal treatment for all nations, large and small. We Democrats stand ready to give full cooperation to the Eisenhower administration in meeting any and all situations which in any way threaten the safety, progress, and security of the American people. We are prepared to take an active part in the formulation of foreign policy. We are prepared to help the administration out of its present confused position, but we must be in on all phases of planning the rescue.

It is regrettable that our Government took only half-hearted action in connection with the Hungarian revolution and the heroic effort of the Hungarian people to throw the Russian Communists out of their beloved homeland. If the courage of the Eisenhower administration in facing up to this matter was one-half that of the brave little children of Hungary, the conspiracy of communism would be in its death throes and we would be on the way to lifting the terrible burden of taxation from the backs of the American people.

It will be to our everlasting discredit if we, as a nation, fail to take action in support of the cause of Hungarian freedom and national independence. It is not too late for us to take action. Popular public opinion can force the Eisenhower administration to call for the expulsion of the Russians from the United Nations unless they get out of Hungary.

---

## The United States and the United Nations

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "The United States and the United Nations," which I delivered on Monday night, February 11, at Georgetown University.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED NATIONS

In the Nation's Capital we meet here tonight at a time when the world remains divided. On the eve of the birth date of the Great Emancipator we recall the words of Abraham Lincoln in his house divided speech of 1858:

"If we but knew where we are and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it."

Twelve years ago at San Francisco the United Nations came into being. Men of good will at home and abroad had high hopes that this organization might be the foundation upon which a system of international law and order could be built that could preserve peace with honor for ourselves and our children.

There are five major defects in the functioning of the United Nations. If not corrected now, any one of them could result in the United Nations going the way of the League of Nations:

These are:

1. The abuse of the veto power by the Soviet Union.
2. A growing "double standard" of international morality.
3. The increasing trend to bloc voting.
4. An expanding tendency to interfere in the internal affairs of member nations.
5. Unwillingness of many of the 80 members to equitably share the monetary costs and other obligations of the United Nations and its related activities while insisting on a full and equal voice in the making of decisions, the burdens of which must be assumed by others.

ABUSE OF VETO BY THE SOVIET UNION

In the Security Council of the United Nations the veto power has been used 86 times. Of the permanent members having the veto power the record is as follows: Soviet Union, 79 times; France, 4 times; Great Britain, 2 times; China, 1 time; and United States, 0 times.

Was the veto intended to permit a permanent member to invalidate its obligations under the charter? I think not. Is there either logic or morality in assuming that the charter obligations are binding or can be enforced upon the law-abiding or the small nations but are invalid against a lawless nation armed with a veto? Such a condition cannot continue to be acceptable to the American people or free men anywhere.

Is it not time that we recalled the admonition in Second Corinthians:

"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: For what fellowship has righteousness with unrighteousness and what communion has light with darkness?"

Unless the charter now contains a means of circumventing a Soviet veto we are tragically enmeshed in a spider web in which the spider has all the advantages over the fly, the butterfly or the moth.

Article 108 relating to amendments to the charter states:

"Amendments to the present charter shall come into force for all members of the United Nations when they have been adopted by a vote of two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly and ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by two-thirds of the members of the United Nations, including all the permanent members of the Security Council."

Unless the Soviet Union can be expelled from membership in the meantime, that Godless Communist totalitarian dictatorship holds a veto in perpetuity on any charter amendment.

A GROWING DOUBLE STANDARD OF INTERNATIONAL MORALITY

This second weakness stems in part from the first—the Soviet abuse of the veto power. But even without the veto this defect might still exist, being based on a fear of Soviet power or an attempt of the neutralists to play both ends against the middle.

The Afro-Asian bloc voted for prompt action against the British, French, and Israeli aggression in Egypt and time after time abstained from voting on the several resolutions relative to Soviet aggression against the people of Hungary.

Even now they are urging sanctions against Israel, which has at least partially complied with the United Nations resolution to withdraw from Egypt, while they remain silent on the Soviet refusal to pay the slightest attention to the Hungarian resolutions.

Is the United Nations to condone a doctrine of "might makes right"? Are the processes of the United Nations to be applicable to the free nations and not to the dictatorships? To the small and not to the large? To Israel because Gaza is not evacuated, but not India or the U. S. S. R. because Kashmir and Hungary are not evacuated?

India, through its present representative at the United Nations, Krishna Menon, has assumed the leadership of the Afro-Asian members, though there is some evidence that this is not entirely satisfactory to all the members representing Asian and African countries. As a matter of fact, a number of the neutralist countries of Asia and Africa broke away from the Indian leadership on several of the resolutions relating to Soviet aggression against Hungary. This was the first hopeful sign challenging the danger of bloc voting, where preconceived viewpoints may act to prevent the United Nations from functioning on the facts presented rather than on predetermined positions.

THE INCREASING TREND TO BLOC VOTING

Since the inception of the United Nations there has been an increasing trend to bloc voting in the General Assembly. By combining blocs it is possible to prevent action by the General Assembly in those cases where a two-thirds majority is required.

With an increase in the membership of the so-called Afro-Asian bloc, this tendency has become more noticeable.

AN EXPANDING TENDENCY TO INTERFERE IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF MEMBER NATIONS

The Charter of the United Nations, in article 2, section 7, states: "Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under chapter VII."

Despite this there is a movement, particularly among the Afro-Asian nations, to inject the United Nations into matters clearly within the domestic jurisdiction of a member state.

If this trend continues it will not be long before the United Nations is injecting itself into a study of the class system in India and the segregation problem in some sections of the United States. Both of these are problems in the respective countries concerned as there are comparable situations existing in most other nations of the world.

However, these problems must be solved by the people and the governments directly concerned and not by intervention or interference by the United Nations. Already the Republic of South Africa has withdrawn from active participation in the United Nations deliberations because of what they felt was unwarranted action by the United Nations.

UNWILLINGNESS TO SHARE EQUALLY THE COSTS AND OBLIGATIONS OF UNITED NATIONS MEMBERSHIP

In the support of the United Nations the United States now bears the largest and approximately one-third of the total cost and a higher percentage in some of the related agencies.

The United States contributes $16 million of a total assessment of $48 million; 11 nations contribute less than $25,000 each.

The United States contribution is paid each year in dollars which are usable in all areas of the world. Of the other 79 members of the United Nations, there are a number who because of economic conditions within their country are unable to meet their assessments. Others pay their assessments in full but in a local currency which has little or no value elsewhere in the world.

In the debate on the creation of the United Nations emergency force in the Middle East, a number of nations abstained because they did not wish to be bound to assume any of the cost of such an operation. Others voted in favor of the force but reserved the right to determine what, if anything, they should contribute to its upkeep. Still others agreed to apply the present ratio

for the allocation of expense that is now used in support of the United Nations itself but if subsequent costs are involved they reserved the right to make a lesser contribution if they made any contribution at all.

It is going to be very difficult to expect the nations which are bearing the heavy burden of costs to continue to assume that burden if smaller nations under the sovereign equality section of the charter continue to insist on the voting of obligations without a willingness to assume their full share of the burdens.

Since the admission of Japan on December 18, 1956, we now have 80 members in this organization.

On December 11, 1956, in the House of Lords, Lord Cherwell, the Right Honorable Frederick Alexander Lindemann, said:

"The population of the biggest is more than 1,000 times greater than that of the smallest. The discrepancy in wealth and power is far more than ten-thousandfold. Yet in the Assembly, which is the ultimate governing body of the United Nations, each has an equal vote.

"Thus barely 5 percent of the world's population can carry the day against the other 95 percent, and 10 percent could claim a two-thirds majority in the Assembly.

"Or, to put it another way, half the population of the world is represented by four delegates and the other half by 75 delegates. What is more, these nations are represented in the Assembly by any group or body or individual which may succeed in seizing power.

"Anybody who has seized power—I believe, for instance, Mr. Kadar in Hungary—can, and does—send a delegate to vote on his behalf."

No adequate reappraisal of the United Nations has yet been made. Nor, in the limited time we have here tonight, is it intended that these remarks of mine can do that assignment which, I believe, needs to be done.

Like all human institutions, the United Nations has its assets and its liabilities. It is unfortunate for that organization that some of its friends oversold it to the people of the United States. Perhaps, because of that, we expected more than it was able to accomplish.

Both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations have made the United Nations a keystone of our foreign policy. Both of our major political parties have endorsed the United Nations in the two party platforms. These party platforms were adopted before the Soviet aggression against Hungary and the futility of U. N. resolutions was known.

Does the record of the United Nations warrant a continuation of our policy and our support?

That the United Nations has achieved constructive accomplishments in a number of areas of activity and geographic locations no fairminded person will deny. For example, the 1946 withdrawal of Soviet forces from the Province of Azerbaijan in Iran.

To be sure, the withdrawal of the Soviet Union was made after much delay and considerable pressure by the United Nations, the Government of Iran, the United States, and Great Britain. The latter two countries also had forces in Iran during World War II and withdrew them in advance of the Soviet withdrawal though as part of the understanding that all three nations would withdraw their troops.

In 1946, it must also be remembered, the free world had the atomic weapon and the Communist world did not. Can this explain the Soviet-delayed obedience to a United Nations resolution then and its failure to respect any of the resolutions relative to Hungary in 1956 and 1957.

In other areas and at other times the success or failure of United Nations action is, to say the least, debatable.

Korea is the classic example. Despite the 1950 action of the Security Council calling on all members (then 60 in number) to assist the Republic of Korea in its defense against North Korean and Chinese Communist aggression, only 16 member nations outside the United States supplied any armed forces. These amounted to 40,000 or less than 10 percent of the more than 450,000 supplied by the United States.

If we consider the combined forces of the United States (450,000) and the Republic of Korea (600,000) the United Nations supplied less than 5 percent of the effective manpower.

Is this an acceptable standard of collective security? My answer is definitely and emphatically "No."

Nor can all the propaganda put out by nor all the apologists for the United Nations make it so.

The United States, in addition, supplied more than 90 percent of the resources used to gain the stalemated armistice in Korea.

Largely, I believe, because of our United Nations entanglements we declined to permit our pilots to follow Communist planes across the Yalu in hot pursuit, and we allowed the Communists a sanctuary across the river for their arsenals, staging centers, ammunition depots, and transportation network.

Never before in all of our history have our field commanders been so handicapped or our men asked to die in a war they were not permitted to win.

But at least, with the exception of the Soviet bloc and a few neutralists, even though the manpower and material resources of the 60 nations was not fully committed, the moral force of the United Nations was mobilized against the Communist aggressor.

The words in the United Nations Charter are still as noble and challenging as they were in 1945 when first adopted.

Let me read some of its notable provisions:

Article I: "To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: To take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace."

Article 2, section 4: "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

Section 5: "All members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present charter, and shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action."

I might add that these are clearly obligations on all members, including those on the Security Council. They are binding on the permanent as well as the nonpermanent members.

To continue:

Article 2, section 1: "The organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members."

Section 2: "All members, in order to insure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present charter."

At the time of the Korean aggression the Soviet Union and supplied the guns, tanks, ammunition, and planes to make war against the United Nations forces. And to make their disrespect of the United Nations Charter complete, they publicly admitted it.

At that time I urged that steps be taken to expel the Soviet Union from membership under article 6.

Article 6: "A member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present charter may be expelled from the organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

Or at the very least that they be suspended from the exercise of their rights and privileges under article 5.

Article 5: "A member of the United Nations against which preventive or enforcement action has been taken by the Security Council may be suspended from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council. The exercise of these rights and privileges may be restored by the Security Council.

The question may be asked, "How is the Soviet veto to be avoided?" I believe it can be avoided by invoking a proviso of section 3 of article 27, where there is an issue clearly a violation of the charter which relates to the specific settlement of disputes under chapter VI.

Article 27, section 3: "Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members, including the concurring votes of the permanent members: *Provided*, That in decisions under chapter VI and under paragraph 3 of article 52, a party to a dispute shall obstain from voting."

If the Soviet Union makes a point of order that they are exempt, let the point of order be overruled by the Chair and sustained by the other Security Council members.

At this point the Soviet Union might decide to walk out, as Hungary did last December. So be it.

If the action of the U. S. S. R. during the Korean and Hungarian conflicts are examples of what we must contemplate for the future, the United Nations will have a better chance of survival without the Soviet Union than with it. I believe this to be the case.

Of course, this procedure would no longer be available once Communist China was admitted as a member and received a permanent seat on the Security Council.

In that case the Soviet Union could veto action against Red Chinese aggression in Asia, while Communist China could reciprocate by using the veto on any Security Council action against the Soviet Union in Europe or the Middle East.

On June 29, 1945, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg in a Senate speech spoke on the charter of the United Nations. In the course of his remarks he discussed the veto which had been agreed to at Yalta.

"There was no other basis available to the American delegation at San Francisco. The late President Roosevelt pledged his country to this formula at Yalta. We Americans have a habit of keeping our country's word—a habit, by the way, which needs to become contagious if any sort of world order shall survive. The late President exempted from the formula the right of a great power to veto an inquiry by the Security Council into its own dereliction; and we at San Francisco successfully resisted an extreme interpretation which would have permitted the use of the veto against full hearing and discussion of any other threats to peace and security. Otherwise the Yalta formula was clear. To have denied it at San Francisco would have been to kill the Conference before it ever got under way.'"

Then he went on to point out the responsibility that went with this power. It is this sacred public trust mentioned by Senator Vandenberg that the rulers in the Kremlin and their agents at the United Nations have continuously violated.

"To meet these special and particular responsibilities the great powers obviously must have special and particular authority.

Without the latter, the former are impossible. This special and particular authority may be looked upon as special and particular privilege. But, in the last analysis, it is the privilege of serving the world. If it ever becomes a selfish privilege, an exploited privilege, this organization will die of cancer.

"These privileges which the great powers thus accept are the most sacred public trust ever created in the affairs of men. It is indispensable that this obligation be accepted in this spirit by all concerned."

Thus spoke Senator Vandenberg at the birth of the United Nations almost 12 years ago.

Now we have had the experience of the practical operations of that organization for more than a decade. We have a right and a duty to weigh the assets and the liabilities.

The Soviet Union has time after time violated the "sacred public trust" and used its veto power as a "selfish privilege" 79 times.

Do we have to sit back and take it, or do we have some constructive alternatives?

I have mentioned several here tonight. Legalistic arguments will be advanced as to why nothing can be done. Inertia on the part of governments who do not want to disturb the status quo will be a barrier. Fear of the Soviet reaction or of its resignation will be advanced for remaining quiet. Those who believe the United Nations is Utopia will brook no criticism.

As for me, I am unimpressed by these arguments or these obstacles.

The safety of our country and the survival of this Republic and other free nations is involved.

Nations can die while delegates talk. In World War II Holland was attacked and surrendered to Nazi Germany in 6 days, Belgium in 20 days.

From October 27, 1956, to January 10, 1957, a period of 76 days, the General Assembly passed 10 resolutions, while freedom in Hungary was strangled to death and the United Nations stood impotent.

As I see it, our policy in regard to the United Nations should make it clear:

1. That our foreign policy is an American policy and is not and will not be tied as a tail to a United Nations kite.

2. The United Nations cannot take a moral leadership in the world unless the Soviet Union veto can be limited to those matters which impinge on its sovereignty and not those where the Soviet Union is violating the sovereignty of others. Hence, we should not compromise our moral leadership by diluting it with a Communist lack of international morality.

3. On the basis of its record to date, no free nation, including our own, dare risk its security on the United Nations ability to function effectively.

4. As an international forum for debate and discussion, it has a real value, but a substantial question remains as to whether this limited value is worth the price?

5. If the United Nations is to be saved for use as an effective agency for collective security, steps must be taken to remedy its defects now, not a year from now or 10 years hence.

I believe human freedom is a greater force than totalitarian tyranny. Under the present charter, the dictatorships have made a mockery of the noble words in that document. We should make a mighty effort to make United Nations deeds coincide with the charter's words.

It was America and our constitutional form of government to which Lincoln referred in his second annual message to Congress. Nothing, including the United Nations, must be allowed to compromise that message, which was so eloquently stated in these words:

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. * * * We—even we here—have the power and bear the responsibility. In giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. * * * We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope of earth."

---

## Five Great Crises Confronting the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on Monday, February 11, my distinguished colleague [Mr. TALMADGE], in response to an invitation extended by joint resolution of the two houses of the General Assembly of Georgia, delivered an address before a joint session of that body. The theme of the Senator's address was the five great crises confronting the American people. I am sure Senators will find this able address to be most informative and interesting, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Address of United States Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE, of Georgia, delivered before a joint session of the Georgia General Assembly meeting at the State capitol. Mr. TALMADGE was invited to speak by a joint resolution of the State legislation authored by Senator Clint Brannen, of Unadilla, and Senator Wilton Hill, of Reidsville. The theme of the Senator's address was the five great crises confronting the American people.)

Governor Griffin, Lieutenant Governor Vandiver, Speaker Moate, members of the general assembly, and my friends, your thoughtful invitation for me to speak to you was an unexpected honor. It is one I accept with pleasure and satisfaction for the wishes of the people of Georgia and their most representative embodiment—the Georgia General Assembly—are my commands.

I thank you all and extend special appreciation to the authors of the joint resolution inviting me here, my good friends, Senators Brannen and Hill.

I commend our courageous chief executive, Gov. Marvin Griffin.

I commend our able lieutenant governor, Ernest Vandiver.

I commend our forthright speaker of the house, Marvin Moate.

And I commend the distinguished members of this legislature.

I commend you for your vigor, for your patriotism, and for your determination to stand firm and immovable at the ramparts of defense in this life-or-death struggle to preserve our sacred institutions.

You have demonstrated your courage in turning back assault after assault on constitutional processes darker and more insidious than those hurled against the people of this State in the days of reconstruction.

For this, the people of Georgia and loyal, thinking Americans the country over are grateful to you.

I am proud to be a soldier in your ranks. Addressing you seems like old times for me.

These hallowed halls hold pleasant memories of warm friendships and the drama of fiery debate of years past.

I see here many old friends and many new faces and I extend to you all my heartfelt greetings.

It is with humility and a deep sense of gratitude that I acknowledge the cordial reception and substantial assistance accorded me at the outset of my service in the United States Senate by that wise statesman and sagacious gentleman of gentlemen, my colleague, our beloved and respected senior Senator, Richard B. Russell.

A hearty thank you also goes to all of the capable and dedicated members of the Georgia delegation in the House who have extended to me every help possible.

And I would like to say here that the other Members of the House and the Senate I have been privileged to meet, as well as representatives of the press, radio, and television, have been friendly, thoughtful, and patient.

I shall strive at all times to reciprocate this courtesy in both act and deed.

This is my first trip back home to Georgia on the weekend.

Many friends from Georgia have been coming by to visit with me both at the office and at our house in Falls Church, Va. I appreciate these visits very much for two reasons. First, I enjoy the company and seeing old friends and, second, I get many shades of opinion from each person with whom I talk about pending national issues. This is of inestimable value to me in developing a proper perspective on questions of the day.

Whenever any of you are in the vicinity of Washington, I wish you would say to yourself, "Herman wants to see us; we shouldn't go back to Georgia without dropping by to see him."

It is essential for every Senator or Congressman, if he is to represent his constituents effectively, to have the benefit of their views and counsel on important matters. Unfortunately, many Georgians seldom get to Washington. The lengthy sessions make it hard to keep abreast of thinking in the home State.

I am expecting the people of Georgia to keep me informed and advised through personal visits and letters and in matters of extreme urgency by telegraph or telephone.

It is my solemn conviction that our Nation is in this hour confronted with five great crises, any one of which if not met and overcome, will result in the gravest of consequences in the future.

These crises are:

1. The constitutional crisis.
2. The farm crisis.
3. The military security crisis.
4. The world crisis.
5. The economic crisis.

The most serious of these crises is the attack on constitutional government. I say this for it goes to the very heart of our existence as a Nation.

Once we lose our rights under the Constitution, we cannot defend ourselves against these other threats.

What threats have been posed to constitutional government in the last few years?

We have seen the United States Supreme Court, in a series of partisan political decisions, openly flout the Constitution of the United States, and, in defiance of established law and precedent, substitute in their stead impractical and unproved socialistic theory.

These decisions contain no more logic nor demonstrate any more responsibility than the fanatical utterances of a soap box orator in Central Park.

The Federal judiciary has invaded and sought to obliterate the reserved rights of the States in many fields of their internal activity.

The Court has sought to outlaw separate schools and segregation laws in 17 States.

The Court has sought to outlaw antisedition laws in 12 States, Alaska and Hawaii.

The Court has forced Federal regulation of natural-gas production in 30 States.

The Court has sought to limit the power of States and cities to discharge employees

when they plead the 5th amendment against self-incrimination.

The Court has sought to usurp State authority in cases of criminal appeals.

These decisions are unconstitutional on their face.

They are not the law of the land, as some falsely insist on calling it.

They are the law of force, and force alone.

It is not the people of the South who defy the Constitution; it is, rather, they who uphold it.

When a Federal district judge, acting under this peculiar new doctrine of force, issues a blanket edict that anyone who exercises the right of freedom of speech in this country may be hauled into court and fined for criminal contempt without a jury trial, then, I say to you, the time has come for us to restore the real constitutional law of the land.

We will never submit to unlawful and unconstitutional tyranny.

We are going to resist its imposition with all of the strength at our command.

We are not going to sit idly by while freedom of speech is destroyed and thought control is imposed on the people of this Nation.

We are not going to sit idly by while an unconstitutional, arbitrary, and illegal extension of Federal judicial power is attempted.

This is not only an attack on the rights of the States to govern their own affairs, but constitutes a gross abuse of judicial processes imperiling the civil liberties of every American citizen.

As a result of this outrageous usurpation of power, many bills are being introduced in the Congress to check this growing danger.

These measures will have my wholehearted support.

And it is my intention, as soon as they are prepared to offer proposals to remove our schools from Federal judicial authority, to require a reasonable minimum of experience for the appointment of Federal judges and to insure a jury trial in all cases of contempt citations by Federal courts.

Equally dangerous to the liberties of all the people of the whole United States are the so-called civil rights proposals now pending.

This nefarious six-point program is a grave threat to our traditional concept of constitutional government.

If it is enacted an army of Federal agents will swarm over every State harassing and intimidating the people and usurping the functions of local law-enforcement authorities.

The so-called civil rights commission that is proposed would be empowered to subpena any American and haul him off to Washington for the purposes of brain washing and interrogation.

Under another one of these bills the United States Attorney General would be placed in the position of representing private individuals.

Still another proposal would write into law a provision overturning the legal doctrine of the ages requiring an exhaustion of administrative remedies as a prerequisite to judicial relief.

Every fledgling lawyer knows that the real civil rights of every citizen of this country are contained in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution.

These 10 amendments have been known since the beginning of this Nation as the Bill of Rights.

They are written in plain, unmistakable language.

From them spring all the rights necessary for the preservation of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the serious nature of these civil-rights bills and their far-reaching implications for evil results.

It shall be my purpose to use what limited influence I may have in the fight to prevent these measures from being foisted on the American people.

Another dangerous proposal is that of limiting debate in the United States Senate.

For all practical purposes there has been unlimited freedom of discussion on all issues in the United States Senate since the year 1806.

The present rule XXII, under which the imposition of cloture is permitted in the Senate, was adopted in 1917 and was revised in 1949. It provides for cutting off debate only after an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Senators duly chosen and sworn.

This provision affords an adequate safeguard against abuse of the privilege of free speech and at the same time helps to maintain the delicate balance of powers afforded under our form of government.

The right of a Senator to present all of the facts in connection with an issue, to turn the light of truth and justice and fairness on that issue goes to the very heart of the protection of minorities, individuals, and States as well.

As long as the United States Senate remains a forum free and unfettered, as long as a vigorous and determined minority of Senators can present all of the facts surrounding any measure, the rights of the people of this country will be more nearly secure.

Now, of major concern to us in Georgia, is the farm crisis.

We have found out that the Republican Party has nothing to offer the farmer of this country but privation and despair.

Declining farm prices, aggravated by the Benson plan of flexible price supports, coupled with discrimination in the administration of the soil-bank program, and the natural disasters of flood and drought, all have combined to deal a heavy blow to American agriculture.

I regret that it looks now as though the Congress will not pass any effective major farm legislation this session. The hostile policies of the Secretary of Agriculture toward rigid farm price supports at 90 percent of parity would assure a Presidential veto.

You are, of course, familiar with the utter discrimination being practiced in the operation of the soil-bank program. Some States are being grossly favored over others. Even counties within the States are discriminated against. The benefits are being administered on an unfair first-come, first-served basis and cover only a fraction of the needs already demonstrated.

The records show that the Southeast was granted far less than its proportionate share of these funds.

Such a situation demands immediate corrective action.

As a representative of the people of Georgia, and as a member of the Senate Agricultural Committee, I am working diligently to obtain:

1. Equal treatment in the distribution of these benefits to all farmers; and

2. For all States their just share of funds available for this purpose.

I have said before and repeat now my conviction that unless something is done, and done soon to give the farmer a better opportunity, this Nation will suffer irreparable damage.

Another cause of grave concern to every citizens is the state of America's military security.

About 10 days ago, the Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Senate's Committee on Armed Services released a report on airpower and its findings are cause for alarm.

Russia is leading us in the development of many weapons and aircraft, is rapidly closing the gap in others, is graduating twice as many scientists and engineers as we are and is ahead in some phases of guided-missile development. She has four times the number of submarines as the United States and a greater capability for production.

These startling disclosures make it imperative that there be a general reevaluation of our whole defense effort.

I was shocked recently at the statement questioning the patriotism of men in the National Guard during the Korean emergency.

Our memories are not so short that we do not recall what took place when the Korean emergency was declared. While those at the Pentagon were scurrying about searching for their paper armies, the Georgia National Guard and our reservists in this State were ready for orders, and many of them took their places on the firing line in foreign lands.

Today we find ourselves in the midst of another world crisis.

Communist imperialism and domination moves toward the Middle East. It threatens that area's vast oil resources which represent two-thirds of the world's total reserves.

The President and the Secretary of State have recognized this fact.

They have asked Congress for adoption of a twofold resolution calling for the United States to serve notice to the world that she will defend the Middle East against any armed aggression by Russia or her satellite countries.

And, further, that the President be given unlimited authority to utilize, without regard to existing law or regulation, an amount not to exceed $200 million in both arms and economic aid funds for countries in the Middle East.

The President is the only responsible official in the country who has access to full reports from the overseas intelligence agencies of our Government.

The responsibility for action in such situations largely must be his, subject to the constitutional safeguards of congressional authority.

There is much sentiment to separate the military aspects from the aid request made by the President.

That would be the wisest policy for the Congress to follow.

I do not favor any plan whereby American troops would be committed for an indefinite period to wage diplomatic wars such as the Korean police action, where the hand of victory was stayed by an indecisive State Department.

Nor do I favor any commitment of American soldiers to United Nations control under any circumstances without prior consent of Congress.

I do not favor giving the President blank check authority to parcel out foreign aid.

There is talk that some of this money may be used for Nile Valley development in Egypt and in the Sudan. This would create another great cotton growing area which would put the American farmer out of business as far as its export market is concerned.

I do not favor the United States assuming unilateral responsibility for defense of the Middle East. Our failure to support Britain, France, and Israel in restoring order to the area will be recognized by historians as a costly diplomatic mistake and a military blunder of catastrophic proportions.

During the last decade our Nation has shown the greatest growth of any period in its history.

Yet this growth is being threatened by irresponsible Federal Government fiscal policies.

The brave pronouncement of stabilizing the cost of living has fallen by the wayside.

The policy of hard money for the people and easy money for bureaucrats doesn't make sense.

During the coming fiscal year the Federal Government expects to collect in taxes out

of the people of this country the stupendous total of $75.8 billion.

This means that about one-sixth of the gross national product of the country is paid in taxes to the Federal Government.

One wonders how long this Nation will survive such a drain on the economy.

In conclusion, I make this observation.

Washington needs to pause for reflection and for a re-evaluation to realize fully once again from whence comes all freedom, all equality, all strength, all integrity, all security and all those other precious attributes identified with our growth as a Nation.

There must be a complete return and a sincere rededication to the fundamental teachings of the Holy Writ.

There must be a renewed respect for the true meaning of the Constitution and a respect for law as it is written.

There must be a practical recognition of the fundamental laws of nature.

There must be an instillment of sound business practices into the Government.

And, there must be a solid determination on the part of all public servants to keep faith with the people.

Americans must be freed of the attendant evils of bureaucracy, red tape, intimidation, and tyranny so that our people may once again be masters of their own destiny.

Sometimes we may be justified in feeling frustrated with the policies of our Government.

But we must never sell America short nor should we discount the loyalty, the courage, the honesty, the ability, and the sincerity of purpose of the American people.

They have demonstrated again and again their rugged determination to meet and to overcome whatever challenge may confront them.

Because of this, I am confident that the Nation will survive in spite of all the mistakes governmental leaders may make.

As for me, and the future of this country, I put my faith in Almighty God and in the sound judgment of my countrymen as we work shoulder to shoulder for right and justice.

To this concept, I am pledged.

To this concept, I give my energy and devotion.

---

## Modern Republicanism As I See It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on Monday night of this week, I was privileged to address a splendid Republican dinner in San Bernardino, Calif., which was sponsored by the Republicans of San Bernardino and Riverside Counties. The chairman in charge was Gen. Carl C. Bank, United States Army, retired, a West Point classmate and wartime associate officer of President Eisenhower's.

At General Bank's suggestion, I addressed myself to the theme, Modern Republicanism As I See It. Inasmuch as both of our major political parties appear to be reappraising their guiding tenets and restating the fundamentals of their political faiths, Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of my Lincoln Day address in California.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MODERN REPUBLICANISM AS I SEE IT

(By Senator KARL E. MUNDT)

My fellow Republicans, it is indeed a pleasure and a challenge for me to address this fine Lincoln Day banquet here in California tonight. By the next presidential election your State appears certain to be the second most populous in the Union and Californians in high places are equally certain to be among the most respected and renowned voices in our Republican Party at that time.

I have long been privileged to include among my personal friends many of the nationally known and respected Republican leaders of California. As one who has addressed well over 30 meetings in your State over the past dozen years or so it always gives me pleasure to salute these California leaders as I visit among you. As you know, our great Vice President, DICK NIXON, has been a close associate of mine both in the House and in the Senate. This friendship has continued during his career as Vice President where he has been doing an outstanding job. Our great and good Republican leader of the Senate is another close friend of mine; BILL KNOWLAND is a man commanding the respect of the entire Senate and his growing influence extends throughout the land, I was among those campaigning for the reelection of TOMMIE KUCHEL as I visited California several times during the recent election. Tommie is a comer in the Senate and when he dons his new mantle as senior Senator from California after the retirement of BILL KNOWLAND his influence will correspondingly expand. I know and admire your great Governor, Goodwin Knight, who has done much to keep this great State in the Republican ranks and whose record of good government is a credit to our party.

You have many fine Republican Members in the House of Representatives from California. I cannot here tonight salute and name them all but I do want to mention two of the typically fine, progressive, patriotic, and courageous young Republicans that you have in Washington today. PAT HILLINGS, is a man with a future, and his consistent record of service in the House marks him as a superior Congressman by every standard. DONALD JACKSON, with the added advantage of being born in South Dakota, is establishing a record in the Halls of Congress of which every Californian should be proud. His great work on the House Committee of Un-American Activities has made him nationally known and his sturdy voice and dependable vote in support of sound and successful policies in Washington mark DON JACKSON as a top-flight Congressman with sufficient seniority of service to place him in a command position in the House.

So, indeed, California is indeed fortunate in the type of Republicans it has selected to elevate to high office. They serve as a tribute to your good judgment.

After more than 100 years of achievement and service as a political party, it seems fitting that on the anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth we should devote some time to appraising the present-day purposes and programs of the Republican Party which Lincoln helped to found and which he greatly honored by his service as President of the United States.

Lincoln was a man of vision and action and these qualities he did much to breathe into the early life and activities of the Republican Party. More than a century later, our great party continues to serve as a national vehicle to implement the sound suggestions of citizens of vision and to move forward actively and aggressively to new and expanded vistas of individual opportunity.

My invitation to address this gathering carried the suggestion that I speak to the topic of Modern Republicanism. I think this is a most fitting subject for this important occasion since the emancipation proclamation of Lincoln's day freed men from the shackles of human slavery and in our generation our great party continues its mission of expanding human liberty and of freeing our citizens from the shackles of political power and the exalted, all-embracive centralized government.

We hear and read the phrase "Modern Republicanism" frequently these days, and I am indeed happy to have the opportunity of discussing it before this intelligent and important audience.

Since the President first introduced this phrase into our present-day political vocabulary, he has not had either the time or the opportunity to detail for us exactly, precisely, and completely what he envisions as a Republican policy suited to that term. A few of his associates have offered their individual views and a great many columnists, commentators, and editorial writers have attempted to place their own interpretation upon what the President has in mind. President Eisenhower, himself, has made a few brief and rather general statements on the subject in news conferences and public statements, but in the main, and with regard to specific suggestions, he has not set out in clear detail his own interpretation and ideas of a political and economic philosophy patterned and tailored to fit the phrase, "Modern Republicanism."

Speaking for myself, as a Republican Member of the United States Senate from the State of South Dakota, may I say first of all that I like the phrase. I like it because like most of you I recognize that any effective partisan position, public program, or political party today must be modern and up to date if it is to prevail and if it is to meet the problems of our time. I like it also because it gives fully as much emphasis to the term "Republicanism" as it does to the term "Modern."

Insofar as I personally am concerned, and speaking with what knowledge I have of the Eisenhower program and the President's point of view, here is what I believe Modern Republicanism offers to the voters of America. In all events, this is what I believe it should imply and this is what I believe it should proclaim.

In the field of foreign policy, I think that Modern Republicanism means that the Republican Party today offers to the voters of America a program of leadership dedicated to the cause of peace and prepared to exercise the strength and resources of this Republic to strengthen the forces of freedom throughout the world by programs within our economic means and short of war. The Republican Party abominates communism and has a consistent, courageous record of opposing it both at home and abroad. We reject communism not only as an organized form of tyranny and a godless conspiratorial movement, but we also reject the programs, the policies, the drift toward absolute statism, and the socialistic experiments which lead so directly into communism.

Our foreign policy is devoted alike to the maintenance of peace and to the preservation of freedom. We abhor war, but we likewise refuse to cringe before communism or to barter our liberties and freedoms as the price for peace. We are dedicated to those activities and programs which will tend to weaken the power of communism wherever it tries to promote or push its tyrannical concepts beyond the borders of Communist Russia itself. We support programs and policies designed to strengthen our friends throughout the free world. We invite the so-called neutral nations to leave

their ivory towers of unreality and to cooperate with the free world to the end that peace and freedom may be preserved and so that sovereign nations may continue their rights of self-determination.

Recognizing that the march of history has placed the mantle of world leadership squarely upon our country in this momentous hour, we propose to lead from strength and to exercise the full responsibilities required of world leadership in our own enlightened self-interest and in the overall interests of world peace and international justice.

President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles have been doing a magnificent job in exercising American world leadership in the interests of peace and international justice. They deserve the commendations of all Americans.

Peace is a bipartisan objective and Democrats and Republicans alike have contributed toward its preservation. It is our Republican position today to so administer our international responsibilities as to warrant the continued cooperation of citizens of both our great political parties.

MODERN REPUBLICANISM AT WORK AT HOME

In the field of domestic policy, I am sure that President Eisenhower's concept of a program moving forward under the banners of Modern Republicanism incorporates, first of all, the words and wisdom of Abraham Lincoln, whose memory we honor here tonight, in the following quotation that I have heard the President use so frequently: "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all or cannot do so well for themselves in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves government ought not to interfere." In one way or another, at one time or another, I have heard Dwight D. Eisenhower use those words so frequently that I am convinced they are one of the enduring guideposts that he has in mind in shaping a program for today which will be both modern in function and truly Republican in concept.

I am confident, in the second place, that Modern Republicanism has a second guidepost which we could probably define in three short and eternally timely sentences. They are: Hold fast to that which is good. Test carefully that which is new. Move steadily toward that which is better.

As the doctrine of Modern Republicanism is applied to the ceaseless flow of new problems which present themselves to the Federal Government, I believe that Modern Republicanism also means that we shall continue using some such screen as the following in determining those things which should be undertaken by the Federal Government and those things which should be considered beyond the purview of the central state. For example, when there are those among us requesting that the Federal Government undertake some new project for the general welfare, I believe these five criteria have generally been employed by the Eisenhower administration, and I feel they should consistently be used in testing the wisdom and propriety of any such undertaking:

1. Is the project or program necessary?
2. Will it work?
3. Can we afford it?
4. Is it impossible to solve the problems or to meet the need by local or private undertaking?
5. Is it impossible to solve the problem or meet the need through a partnership arrangement between the State and the Federal Government, or between the people and the central state?

It is only after affirmative answers have been made to questions like these that government under Modern Republicanism as I envision it will enter into new and novel undertakings in unexplored areas of activity.

Modern Republicanism, I believe, rightfully recognizes the concern of the Federal Government in the general welfare of our people. It does not expect the citizens of our atomic age to enjoy only the opportunities and blessings of the era of the kerosene lamp. It denies alike the false concepts that some of our citizens are condemned to a lifetime of hamstrung opportunities or that some of our citizens are privileged characters guaranteed a lifetime of unearned enjoyments or special favoritism.

However, on programs to promote the general welfare, Modern Republicanism proposes to use political persuasion and leadership instead of the punitive political power employed by the New Deal and the Fair Deal. We propose to employ the concepts of political partnership programs instead of resorting to the outmoded formula of the paternalistic state.

By any comparison of the techniques of the Fair Deal and the New Deal, embodying as they do their consistent exercise of programs expanding the central power of the all-inclusive state, any form of republicanism designed to restore and retain power in the hands of the people is, in fact, an ultramodern approach to public problems. The antiquated, outmoded, and disproved formula of the topheavy paternalistic state were discredited in countless countries of Europe and Asia long before they were dusted off and tried again under new names and with new selling slogans by the architects of the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

Even if Modern Republicanism chose to embrace only the traditional forms of freedom encompassed by our constitutional forefathers at Philadelphia and set in motion during the early formative days of this Republic, it would be modern indeed compared to the throwback to tyrannical powers by the central state which played such an inherent part in so many of the changes proposed by our political adversaries during their recent 20-year span of authority in Washington.

Let us turn now to some specific illustrations of appropriate devices by which Modern Republicanism moves forward to meet the problems of our people within the true framework of liberty and freedom which characterizes our way of life as free Americans.

Let us take for example such an obvious necessity as the right of our citizens to purchase insurance against unpredictable and unavoidable disasters whether man made or from the caprice of nature. Few among us, I am sure, would deny the right of individual citizens to purchase insurance against disaster. Private enterprise throughout the history of the country has done a magnificent job of establishing a fabric of insurance protection whereby citizens have been able to purchase, at reasonable actuarial rates, insurance to protect them against illness, against death, against accident, fire, tornado, hail, public liability, and a long list of other perils of one form or another.

However, the farmers of America until comparatively recently, in our national history, have not been able to employ the use of insurance to protect them against the most disastrous, the most unpredictable, and the most crippling of all their contingencies—total loss of crop as a result of drought, insect plagues, or other caprices of nature. For years, farmers and farm leaders urged the private insurance industry to work out actuarial tables and set up policy provisions enabling the farmer to enjoy the opportunity of protecting himself by insurance as his city cousin was permitted to do if he were a merchant trying to guard himself against burglary and fire a physician trying to protect himself against accusations of malpractice, or almost any other city dweller faced with any other peril. Understandably, America's insurance industry was reluctant and unable to assume the risk of writing policies at reasonable rates in an unexplored field like crop insurance.

Consequently, modern Republicans supported in Congress the initiation under a previous administration of a crop-insurance program to supply a need private capital was unable or unwilling to provide. In this program our friends in the other political party defined a need and met it not by unnecessary encroachments into private or State affairs but by the partnership formula which is so evident in the program of Modern Republicanism. Under the Eisenhower administration, consequently, this crop-insurance program has been improved, refined, and extended and to it we have added a program of flood insurance devised along analogous lines and providing protection to supply another unmet need.

Let us turn to another area of American activity. For years New Dealers and Fair Dealers among us promoted within our midst the concept of state medicine. Socialized medicine, they told us, was the only way in which the Federal Government could manifest an interest in improving the overall health and physical well-being of our people. The Congress consistently refused to take that long and fateful step into the realm of socialism. Instead, Congress approached the problem in conformity with the type of considerations that Modern Republicanism recognizes as a responsibility to the people, but which avoided the centralized control and the socialized devices which lead so directly to the development of the authoritarian state.

Congress passed legislation whereby on a partnership basis the Federal Government makes available to States companion funds to help erect hospitals in areas needing them to meet needs defined by local and competent authorities within the State. Our Republican administration has provided increasingly generous funds to stimulate research in a host of areas dealing with cancer, heart disease, cerebral palsy, arthritis, and many other maladies the eradication or alleviation of which would contribute greatly to the general welfare. By stimulating medical and scientific research, Congress has helped to meet the needs of the people in a way which encourages rather than discourages the genius of private medicine and the health program of America which has remained unexcelled anywhere in the world.

The Eisenhower administration recognizes the Federal Government as a partner of the States and as a partner of the people. It has steadfastly refused to consider the Federal Government as the master of either. Sometimes it participates with the States or with communities as a big brother—sometimes as a little brother—in the solution of their problems, but it consistently refuses to participate as an opulent and petulant sugar daddy picking up the check for all expenditures and issuing directives for all the people to obey.

WHAT CHARACTERIZES "MODERN REPUBLICANISM?"

Sometimes the question is asked either by honest interrogators or by chronic critics—"Just what is the difference between Modern Republicanism and either the New Deal or the Fair Deal?"

Regardless of the motivation which might inspire such a query, it is a fair question and it deserves a clear and consistent answer. The distinctions become as clear as the path to the country schoolhouse when Modern Republicanism is defined and described in terms of the programs, policies, and purposes which it embraces as I understand and utilize the phrase. And speaking for myself, I am confident that these programs, policies, and purposes which I describe here tonight are not substantially different from what the President has in mind. Certainly, until and unless he, himself, spells out those differences and enunciates some new defini-

tions of his own, I am content to believe that between the Modern Republicanism of the Eisenhower era and the Fair Deal of Harry Truman or the New Deal of FDR there are many sharp and substantial differences.

Among them—to answer the foregoing question directly, I would list the following in addition to those already developed here tonight:

Modern Republicanism believes that the Federal Government should live within its means. It has balanced the budget and proposes to keep it balanced. That has been typical of Republican administrations for many years—but clearly it is a modern departure from the history of government during the preceding two decades.

Modern Republicanism is opposed to State socialism and it opposes it in practice as well as in principle. Like our political opponents, we criticize the weaknesses and frustrations of socialism, but unlike our political opponents, we practice what we preach. The Eisenhower team in the executive agencies and in Congress has supported programs which have divested the Federal Government of many functions, operations, and actual ownership situations which were inherited by it when we took over the administration on January of 1953.

You ask for examples? I am glad to give them to you: Our Government owned synthetic rubber plants that have been sold to private owners and operators. The Federal Barge Line of the Missouri-Mississippi River has been sold to a private company which now makes a profit plying the same river route where the Federal Government consistently operated at a loss. Many parcels of real estate have been sold and are being sold thus relieving the Federal Government of ownership costs and problems while putting the property back on the tax rolls where it belongs. The President has recommended over 2,000 divestments—some small and some large—whereby he has ordered the return to private ownership and operations of such curious experiments in socialism as coffee roasting plants; barb wire factories, paint factories, machine shops, pop bottling works, furniture factories, and a host of other fabricating and repair works operated by the Defense Department or by other agencies of the Government when President Eisenhower took the oath of office.

And on the credit side of the ledger, I can think of no single step backward into socialism or sidewise into the creeping morass called communism that has been taken by Republicans in these modern times.

Modern Republicanism—to cite another difference between it and the outmoded concepts of statism paraded before us under New Deal and Fair Deal labels—believes in and supports the rights of States and the dignity of the individual citizen as guaranteed under the 10th amendment to our Constitution—that crowning arch of our entire Bill of Rights. Under our predecessor Presidents since 1932, the functions of the State governments were slowly being down-graded to the point where they would be left no revenues to tap and no authorities to exercise. They were in danger of degenerating into institutions performing only ceremonial functions.

The Central State was getting stronger and the State capitals of each of our 48 great commonwealths were growing weaker. The centripetal force of the dizzy days of dealers new and fair by which the propulsion power of government was moving everything toward the center has ended. States are once again looked upon as important entities. The great new Eisenhower highway building program, for example, moves forward as an achievement of Modern Republicanism. The States and the Federal Government plan, and promote, and pay together as we initiate and implement the greatest highway-building program in the world.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have thus far listed five important differences between Modern Republicanism as we view it in practice and the New Deal and the Fair Deal as we view them in retrospect. They are:

1. Modern Republicanism embraces the concept of partnership procedures rather than that of centralized and exalted political power.

2. Modern Republicanism does not accept new approaches to old problems simply because they are new but accepts them only if they produce progress when the people themselves or the local authorities are unable to provide solutions.

3. Modern Republicanism believes the Federal Government should live within its means.

4. Modern Republicanism is opposed to State socialism in both principle and practice.

5. Modern Republicanism proceeds in conformity with constitutional concepts and recognizes both the validity and importance of the 10th amendment setting out the doctrine of the rights of States and the political authority of individual citizens.

There are, of course, many other important differences between the Modern Republicanism of today and the Fair Deal and the New Deal of their respective eras. Those things from those eras which were good and sound and in the interests of promoting opportunity and well-being in conformity with our American concepts, we have retained. Some have been expanded and improved. In other important areas, as indicated by the five foregoing points of difference, we have pointed America in a new direction and moved forward with new and strengthened impetus.

But some of these other and additional differences should at least be enumerated here tonight:

Modern Republicanism has put an end to corruption and cronyism in government.

Waste has become an ugly word in Washington again and to a great degree it has been curtailed and stopped.

Employment of Communists in high places has been abruptly halted and even our most articulate and active opponents recognize that achievement to the point where suggestions about subversives in government are now not even heard.

Emphasis has once again been placed upon projecting our system of private ownership so as to provide expanding opportunities for increasing numbers of our citizens.

The reward of merit system has been utilized to produce progress; success through political favoritism is once again the exception to the rule.

In the all-important field of taxation, taxes are again considered as a means of raising revenue for the Federal Government and not as a punitive device for pushing reforms, punishing rivals, or rewarding friends.

Americans who have developed an ethical maturity in the exercise of personal freedoms and traditional liberties can move forward to pinnacles of personal success in the clear knowledge that so long as they violate no laws and do nothing to impinge upon the freedoms and opportunities of their fellow citizens, the Federal state will protect one and all against discrimination, favoritism, and unfair and un-American governmental snooping into their personal lives and the intimidation of their private practices.

The symbol of America is once again that bewhiskered gentleman in the big hat—Uncle Sam—rather than the furtive figure of a blue-nose busybody known as Peeping Tom.

It is the function of government under the mantle of Modern Republicanism to do better those things which government should do at all and to refrain entirely from doing those things which no American government should at all undertake.

Modern Republicanism believes that there is nothing wrong with America that the importation of any foreign ideology can cure or that adherence to our constitutional concepts cannot correct.

Thus we favor cooperative grants-in-aid to stimulate better hospitals and the faster advance of the curative arts, but we oppose socialized medicine.

We favor the Federal encouragement of education but not Government schools or centralized control over the curriculum and the teachers using it.

We favor the expansion of REA and RTA where needed but not the unnecessary imposition of public power whereby politicians from the central government own and operate the generation of power and determine who shall get it first and cheapest.

We favor the development of the great new force of atomic power by partnership projects with private enterprise where possible and not through socialized projects which give the know-how and experience to the Government and comprise a threat to all the privately owned utilities and oilfields in America.

We favor competitive bidding over force-account contracts on Federal construction—we believe private contractors, engineers, and builders can build the necessary Federal structures more economically and effectively than Government bureaus and political employees.

We believe a stabilized dollar and an honest monetary system better serves the public than arbitrary Federal action designed to create inflation or deflation and devoted to relating economic curves to the political polls of prevailing public opinion.

In short, Modern Republicanism believes that America—the most modern, up-to-date, and efficient country of them all did not get to be the biggest, strongest, and most influential nation in the world by doing everything all wrong.

In 1960, the American voter is going to confront something, in my opinion, that he has not witnessed in a quarter of a century. He is going to face a presidential election in which principles and policies are going to dominate the scene over the importance of personalities. He is going to the polls to vote for ideas and ideals dear to his heart rather than for or against individuals whom he loves or hates. Since 1932, Americans in the main have voted for or against dynamic individuals because they either liked or disliked the man at the top of the ticket. Neither party seems likely in 1960 to produce a candidate so popular or unpopular; so pleasing or so displeasing; so well loved or so ardently hated that voters, in the main, will determine their votes by their like or dislike of the personality involved.

In my opinion, it is good that we appear to be facing an election where issues rather than individuals will become the dominant and determining factor.

I believe that in 1960, Americans will write the answers rather clearly that they want to have recorded to at least five major and prevailing questions:

How big do they want government to grow?

How much do they want government to cost?

How much do they want government to own and operate?

How much do they want government to control and regulate?

How far do they want America to move in the direction of the welfare or the paternalistic state?

It is my conviction that Modern Republicans will embrace the position and that the American voter will select the party that answers those five questions by indicating that government should be less costly, smaller in size, more restricted in scope, less pushy and punitive in character, and closer to the concept that, "That government is

best which governs least." I expect our political adversaries and opponents to embrace the position they supported so consistently from 1932 until 1952; namely, that government is an institution which should steadily increase in size and expand in function.

Thus, I believe issues are in the making which will once again divide our two parties from each other. I anticipate there will be a considerable transmigration of voters and political adherents as the lines of battle become steadily more visible. Some who are Republicans today will move over to join those who believe in bigger and more embracive Federal operations. Some who are Democrats today—not New Dealers or Fair Dealers, but Jeffersonian Democrats or Constitutional Democrats of the type that prevail in so many areas of the South and the Southwest—some who are today called Democrats primarily because they are not Republicans will cross over to join up and become an active, articulate part of our modern Republican Party and position.

Speaking for myself, I welcome such a movement and countermovement of political forces and of partisan adherents. For too long our two major parties have meant too little to too many who support them. On too many issues, the parties' platforms have served more to confuse the voters than to clarify opposing points of view. It is long past time when we should reexamine our faiths and find that party in which we feel the most comfortable and can be associated with the greatest percentage of congenial and like-minded citizens.

Modern Republicanism regards the past not as a hitching post to tie America to the status quo but as a guidepost toward a constantly better future. We reject the concept of the leftwing which apparently regards the past simply as a launching ramp into the great unknown.

Our great President has frequently emphasized the importance of party responsibility as a companion to the doctrine of individual accountability in the administration of public programs. As Republicans, this means we must meet that challenge by electing in 1958 a Republican Congress to team up with our Republican President. We must increasingly elect Republican officials in our State, county, and municipal elections so that in implementing the partnership concept of government which is so inherently a part of our political philosophy we shall find people of authority at various levels of government dedicated to that concept and eager to make it operate successfully. Having chartered a consistent forward-moving course in full harmony with American concepts, we need to equip ourselves with the manpower required to operate it effectively, economically, and efficiently.

When I first ran for Congress out in South Dakota, I took as a slogan a theme from which I have never had occasion to depart. It was my own, personal definition of what I considered to be the appropriate province of the Federal Government. I defined it then as I deem it to be today—simply, "To Provide a Fair Chance for a Free People." No American citizen should receive less than that. No American citizen should expect more. Each of us should be given a fair chance to succeed in a free economy extending its rewards on a merit system. Thus, A Fair Chance for a Free People is the basic formula our country should and must make available to each and all.

Beyond providing that basic formula for opportunity and justice, organized government today—and always on this continent—recognizes its responsibility to promote conditions, programs, and policies which will assist the unfortunate, strengthen the weak, ease the burdens of the ill and aged, and in general concern itself with the general well-being of its people.

In fact, there is nothing new or modern or novel about that concept of the full responsibility of government. It started on this continent in the year 1789 when our Constitution was adopted, including those all-important words so prominent in its preamble. Let me recall them to you again: "We the people of the United States in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for a common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Every word in that preamble—every word in our Constitution—was chosen, selected, and interpreted with meticulous care. Today, the program of Modern Republicanism finds its lode-star in the words of that preamble which so carefully and clearly defines the duty of government to be "to provide for the common defense" and "to promote the general welfare." The Army, the Navy, the Marines, and the Air Force and their arms and armanent including nuclear weapons we provide. Schools, hospitals, decent labor conditions, old-age assistance, etc., we promote. Therein lies, in my opinion, the fundamental difference in our concept of freedom and the formula of the welfare state, of socialism, and any other concept of the ultimate and uncontrollable state.

Our first great President—the immortal Washington—added his own words of guidance to us all when he said: "Government, like fire, is always a dangerous servant and a fearful master."

Modern Republicanism, as I see it, accepts that axiom. We believe that of equal importance to the controls which government must exercise is the fact that the people must control their government. We modern Republicans believe, as I envision our mission, that the Federal Government is the sum total of its parts but that it is not the total governmental entity of these United States. We believe that private initiative and free enterprise have brought more happiness and greater welfare to more people in our one area of the world than has been brought to the rest of the human race by all the other economic and political formula of all the other countries of the world in all of human history.

We believe freedom must be exercised to be eternal. We believe in the dignity of the human soul and the individual citizen and reject the concept that infallibility is the characteristic of big government. We abhor all unnecessary and unnatural monopolies—whether private or political—but we recognize that political monopoly is the curse of half the world today and that private monopolies against the general welfare can be dispersed and ended by free men and women utilizing rightfully the functions of sound constitutional processes.

Tonight I have discussed and defined what I believe Modern Republicanism implies and portends for America. I have detailed and described what I envision to be its creed. This that I have devoted myself to tonight is what I believe it to be—what I believe it should be—what I believe it is.

In closing let me in all events summarize for you what I have said—this I believe.

---

## Food for Thought About Our Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am privileged to include a speech delivered by the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, at the Spokane Farm Forum.

Actually Mr. Benson's address is an analytical and critical inventory of American agriculture today.

He complains that existing legislation tends to tie his hands and deny the full force of the Department to adequately serve the rural businessmen of today.

Certainly our agricultural place in the commerce of the world deserves a long look. It is for this reason that I urge a close, critical, and constructive consideration of the Secretary's speech.

I deem this an honor, a privilege, and a challenging responsibility. It is a pleasure to be with you. This is the first time my schedule has permitted me to attend the Pacific Northwest Farm Forum, but I have followed the reports of your very successful meetings. I congratulate you on this your fourth annual forum. I am highly privileged to be able to share thoughts and ideas with you.

This is my country. I am at home here. I was born, and reared in Idaho, and I farmed and traveled the State for 8 years for the University of Idaho. Because your roads were better, I often traveled through Oregon and Washington to get from Boise to the panhandle of Idaho.

Out here in the great Pacific Northwest you have good farms and good country. Your industry and your agriculture have grown side by side. And that is as it should be. That is what has made this entire Nation of ours the choice land—the almost incredibly blessed land—it is today: The free capacity of our people to cooperate—to prosper together—to grow together.

The general theme of your forum—Building a Healthier Farm Economy—has been the general theme of our thinking in the Department of Agriculture since this administration came into office. Our objective has been, and is, a prosperous, expanding, and free agriculture.

We took over at a discouraging time for farmers. Prices had been dropping for nearly 2 years. Yet, under the incentive of 90-percent emergency price support, production was running wild. Agriculture was borrowing tomorrow's prosperity and spending it today. It was like a man head over heels in debt trying to get out of debt by borrowing more money.

When we took office there were $2½ billion worth coming in. Production controls had been removed. Many farmers were producing not for markets—not for stomachs—but for Government loans and warehouses. I felt like somebody suddenly asked to take over a train hurtling through the night at 90 miles an hour with the throttle stuck wide open and the brake level thrown out the window.

Our job was to build a healthier farm economy. But agriculture was traveling in a vicious circle. Rigid and unrealistic supports were pricing commodities out of their normal markets and into storage, while at the same time encouraging more production. This in turn was driving market prices even lower, causing still more dependence on price support and still bigger surpluses in Government warehouses.

Our hands were tied by legislation which made rigid price support mandatory through the 1954 crops. So the surpluses inevitably mounted higher and higher before we could do anything effective to slow the build-up.

Government should not be in business in competition with its tax-paying citizens. As a Nation we should leave to private enterprise those things which private enterprise is willing and able to do. I believe that continued substitution of Government for pri-

vate trade would mean, in time, the socialization of agriculture and the end of freedom as you and I know it.

Yet the Commodity Credit Corporation, in its price-support operations, had become the market for a wide variety of food and fiber that no one else seemed to want. CCC's obligation to acquire these commodities is so extensive that it staggers the imagination. When its bins and warehouses become filled, still more storage space is provided. When CCC begins to run out of money, either its notes are cancelled or its borrowing authority is extended.

Twenty-one years ago the capital funds of CCC totaled $100 million. Today CCC not only has those funds, but in addition it has a borrowing authority of $14.5 billion—145 times as much as in 1936.

That tells the story of how Government has moved in.

Our first task in building a healthy farm economy was to get agriculture out of the price-support straitjacket. The farm economy cannot be frozen to the past, to uneconomic patterns, to some historical condition that changing markets have made, or will make, unrealistic. Agriculture must be flexible, adjustable. Freedom to change must be retained in the hands of each farm family. Only a free and flexible agriculture can stay tuned to its markets; and only an agriculture that stays in tune with its markets can be expanding and prosperous.

During the past 4 years three great victories have been won for the benefit of farm people.

The battle against rigid price supports was won in the 83d Congress and successfully defended in the 84th.

We secured enactment of legislation to reduce production of surplus crops with a soil-bank program.

And this administration sponsored and secured passage of legislation to speed up the disposal of Government-owned farm commodities. Now, for the first time in many years a Secretary of Agriculture is able to report such favorable peacetime developments as the following:

Prices received by farmers have been running 5 to 7 percent above a year ago.

Realized net farm income in 1956 was 5 percent above 1955. There have been only 2 years since 1947 that farm income increased. One was 1951, during the Korean war. Another was 1956, a year of peace.

Investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in farm products owned and under loan are expected to total approximately $7.6 billion on June 30, 1957, a net reduction of $700 million in a period of 12 months. This will be a net reduction of approximately $1.3 billion since the peak holdings of February 1956.

Domestic consumption is increasing. Diets are improving. Markets are expanding at home and abroad.

Our outlook specialists expect further modest increases in farm prices and farm incomes during the year ahead. They anticipate further decreases in surplus holdings and a better balance of supplies and markets.

Our exports of farm commodities are running at an alltime high. For the July–December period of 1956, these exports were 39 percent higher in value than for the same period of 1955, and 45 percent larger in quantity.

United States wheat shipments in the current 1956–57 marketing year may be in the neighborhood of 450 million bushels, 30 percent more than a year earlier.

A big part of this larger export demand has come to the Pacific Northwest, partly because most of the sales for foreign currency agreements have been made with Asian nations.

As a result of heavy Pacific Northwest exports, the carryover in this area next July 1 will be greatly reduced. Because of this active export demand, Pacific Northwest wheat prices, as you know, are much higher relative to support levels than are prices in most other parts of the country. Prices of soft white wheat at Portland early this month were at a high for the season to date—37 cents above the effective loan.

The national wheat situation is improving. Winter seedings last fall fell to the smallest acreage since 1913, nearly a third less than average. Based on conditions as of December 1 and on normal conditions for the remainder of the growing season, the 1957 winter wheat crop may be about 625 million bushels.

Wheat farmers signed up 10.7 million acres in the 1957 winter wheat acreage-reserve program of the soil bank. If they take about 3 million acres of spring wheat out of production the total wheat crop may be about 810 million bushels.

Domestic use and exports may be around 950 million bushels in 1957–58. A crop of 810 million bushels, therefore, would be 140 million bushels below consumption. This would bring about a substantial reduction in carryover at the end of the 1957–58 marketing year.

Actually, prospects of a reduction in carryover in the Pacific Northwest in 1957–58 are relatively more favorable than for the Nation as a whole. Forward export commitments will result in continued heavy exports. This will not only further reduce the carryover in this area, it will also maintain prices well above the support levels.

Now let's take a quick look at a few other crops. About one dollar in eight of farmers' total cash receipts in both Oregon and Washington comes from milk. As your population grows, a larger proportion of milk is being used in fluid form.

This proportion is likely to increase in the next several years. Milk prices received by farmers in the past several months have been equal to or a little above a year earlier. The outlook for 1957 is encouraging.

Our Government stocks of dairy products are way down. We have no butter on hand. Our stocks of dried milk are small. Only cheese stocks are of significant size, and these also are down sharply from 1954. All this, of course, has been an expensive operation. We are continuing to move dairy products through the 480 program and other operations at considerable cost to the Government.

In the years since the war, beef cattle have recaptured and increased their market. The cattle industry has satisfied a fast-growing demand by consumers for beef. Last year both the number of cattle on farms and the quantity of beef produced were at record highs. Consumers on the average ate about 84 pounds of beef, the most in this century. When we recall that beef consumption averaged 55 pounds in 1951, the increase becomes truly phenomenal.

The Northwest has shared in this expansion. Your producing herds have been on an uptrend. You have taken advantage of new advances in cattle feeding. You feed your cattle a more scientifically balanced ration, and you produce a better quality animal in less time and at less cost.

We are now at the crest of the present cattle cycle. Although the cycle is not yet far enough along to move immediately into the next stage of reduced supplies and higher prices, we are headed in that direction. Prices in January were a dollar higher on the average than a year ago—up 7 percent. This is in spite of the fact that the devastating drought in the Southwest is forcing many farmers and ranchers to throw their cattle on the market.

The poultry industry is growing in importance here in the Northwest. This quick-changing, progressive industry offers opportunity for resourceful persons. Though the picture is changing, a western regional research project a few years ago showed that per capita consumption of chickens in the Western States was only two-thirds to three-fourths as large as the average for the entire country.

As for fruits and tree nuts, here again we can look for an expanding market. Most of the 1956 crops here in the Northwest were smaller than in 1955, mainly because of weather. Average prices were higher. Looking ahead, we see a rapidly increasing population and an expanding economy. There is almost certain to be a larger per capita market for frozen and canned fruits, vegetables, and juices—and for milk, meat, poultry, and eggs. Studies of food consumption indicate very strongly that as incomes increase these foods make up more and more of the diet.

Of course, agriculture is not out of the woods. As we all know, our farm people are feeling the pressure of a price-cost squeeze. Much of this squeeze comes from rising costs. Ten years ago—in 1947—net farm income was at an all-time high. Four-fifths of the drop in net farm income since 1947 has come from increased production expenses. Only one-fifth of the decline has resulted from lower gross farm income.

Farm people have a saying which expresses their view eloquently. "Collective bargaining," they say, "means that labor and industry bargain together and then collect from us."

There is much truth in this saying, and I think that everyone in the country is concerned, not just farmers. When there is, as now, strong demand for industrial products and a tight labor market, soft settlements of wage disputes are all too frequently made, with wage increases outrunning gains in productivity. These increased costs are passed forward to consumers in the form of higher prices and backward to producers of many raw materials, especially farm products, in the form of lower returns.

The adverse effects of soft wage settlements hit farmers harder than any other group, because farmers lack bargaining power. Furthermore, farmers get hit twice, once when they buy and once when they sell.

But all consumers feel the pressure of rising prices. The threat to overall economic stability is the greatest danger of all. Inflation is nobody's friend.

All groups, including labor and industry, should so conduct themselves as to check the development of a condition contrary to the national welfare. Experience indicates that if needful restraints are not exercised voluntarily, there is a resort to stronger measures—measures contrary to the goals of a free society.

We can build a healthier farm economy. But we can do so only if we keep our agriculture dynamic.

Today's farms are fewer and larger. In 1940, there were 6.1 million farms in the United States. Now there are only 4.75 million.

Output per man-hour has gone up 96 percent. The number of people working in agriculture has gone down 27 percent.

Just before World War II, farm people made up 23 percent of the population. Now they are only 13 percent, and the figure may drop further.

These trends are full of meaning. One conclusion that stands out crystal clear is that farm people must look to the support of their city neighbors for such agricultural programs as may be needed.

Programs that clearly do not serve all the people will have hard going.

Most of the programs affecting agriculture fall into two broad groups. In one group are programs designed to increase farmers' efficiency in producing and marketing—such as research, education, conservation, electrification. In the other are programs intended primarily to improve here and now the relative prices and incomes received by farmers.

Programs in the first group benefit not only farmers but the Nation as a whole. They produce a better product, find new uses for crops, enable farmers to grow more units per acre, more meat per animal, more milk per cow, more eggs per hen. They result in food and fiber of better quality; food that is more nutritious, fiber that is better fitted to specific uses.

They expand existing markets—create new markets. They cut marketing costs—reduce spoilage in transportation, handling, and processing.

Programs that produce such results sell themselves to the people.

Programs of the second type—programs directly concerned with the relative prices and incomes of farmers—also should be expected to prove that they serve the whole people. Price supports are useful as aids in promoting orderly marketing and fostering stability of farm income. But we know that they can be so used as to fail of their purpose. Misused, they cause more problems than they solve. They involve much larger expenditures of public money than, for example, programs of research and education. They involve the Government in producing, marketing, and price making of farm products. They do not reduce costs. They do not increase efficiency.

The misuse of price support helped bring on our present huge surpluses. Our technicians estimate that accumulated surpluses and excessive output have reduced net farm income by nearly $2 billion a year, or about 20 percent.

We are concentrating, as we properly should, on surplus disposal and on the soil-bank program to restore a balance in agriculture. We are both asking and requiring farmers to accept strict production controls in order to get our from under our surpluses.

But the problem on the horizon, as I see it, is this: Under present law, farmers face continued controls. Chief effect of the disposal operations will be to boost the level of price support while continuing all the paraphernalia of production controls. And production controls have been only partially effective.

Our special programs of surplus removal will, with the existing formulas in the law, have the effect of boosting prices of the basic commodities back to 90 percent of parity. Controls will be continued in an effort to keep supports at that level. The evidence is that the high price supports will cause loss of markets and that the controls will be less than properly effective.

In agriculture, therefore, because of the price objective in the basic law, committed to continuous production controls on the one hand and continuous surplus disposal operations on the other? If this be true, would it not be well to reexamine the price objective? This is a question to which not only the Congress but farmers and all of our people should devote much careful thought.

In building a healthier farm economy, then, we must focus our efforts on measures that serve agriculture directly and all our people at least indirectly.

Let me mention very briefly a few areas in which the interests of agriculture and the whole Nation clearly go hand in hand.

In many areas of America water is the greatest limiting factor for both agricultural and industrial development.

Our present national use of water is approaching 200 billion gallons per day. This use is expected to double in 25 years.

We must save all the water we can. We must conserve more water if we are to keep our surface and underground reservoirs full, and our soil moisture up to what it should be.

We must use more effectively the best storage we know about—the earth itself. Our soils and underground reservoirs constitute the greatest potential storage we have.

We need to intensify our research as applied to the Northwest on the best way to use and conserve every drop of water that falls from the heavens.

Second. Conservation of land and timber.

Conservation is more than terraces to control soil erosion, important as that practice may be. It is more than the planting of trees and grass, despite the fact that this is one of our most important means of achieving conservation.

Conservation is using our resources in such a way that the needs of people today and tomorrow are best served. It is getting a larger return of the product without eating up the capital.

Here in the Northwest, a very large part of your income is derived from forests and forest industry. Operation Outdoor is vitally important. As you know, last week we announced the creation of the Three Sisters Wilderness area and the Mt. Washington and Diamond Peak wild areas in Oregon. This adds 32,000 acres to the national forest wilderness area bringing the total to about 750,000 acres in Oregon.

There are many aspects of conservation that I should like to discuss with you if there were time: The preservation of unique scenic areas in their natural state which we are proving in the national forests—the operation of the national forests on a multiple-use sustained-yield basis for the benefit of all our people— the need for maintaining a healthy, privately operated forest products manufacturing industry—the enlargement of fish and wildlife values—the agricultural development of the Columbia River Basin.

These are some of the aspects of conservation here in the Northwest in which we are all intensely interested. We want to do the best possible job we can in all these fields—working with the States—working with you, the people. We know that the only successful programs of conservation are those initiated and developed by the local people, and managed by them, with the help of both State and Federal Governments where needed. That is our philosophy. That is our goal.

Third. Research and extension.

The most basic longtime program for agriculture is a program of research and education. We all know what hybrid corn has meant to agriculture and to the American people. Between 1931 and 1933 we used around 110 million acres of land to grow about 2.5 billion bushels of corn. In the past 3 years we have been using about 79 million acres to produce nearly 3¼ billion bushels of corn.

Of course, there were other factors besides hybrid seed, but the net result is that we are producing about 30 percent more corn on about 30 percent fewer acres than we did a quarter century ago.

Wheat yields on a national basis have gone up 40 percent since the early 1930's.

Last year we produced on less than 16 million acres nearly as much cotton as we produced on more than 40 million acres around 1930.

In 1940 there were nearly 11 million persons engaged in agriculture. With the same level of productivity per worker as existed in 1940 it would have required 15 million farm workers to product last year's output. The 1956 output was actually produced with 8 million workers.

It is not sufficient, however, merely to produce our food and fiber efficiently. We must also market them efficiently. We must find new markets and new uses. We must expand existing markets. We must constantly seek ways to process and merchandise our foods and fibers at lower costs and in a manner more attractive to consumers at home and abroad.

Research finds the facts and extension carries them to the field.

In the years I have been Secretary, Federal appropriations for agricultural research have increased 75 percent. Included in these Federal appropriations, the grants to State agricultural experiment stations have increased by 115 percent.

Likewise Federal appropriations for extension work have increased 54 percent.

The Federal appropriation for agricultural research now totals $102.5 million. The Federal extension appropriation totals $53.5 million.

Extensive research is going forward on all of the crops of major importance to the Northwest—production research and marketing research. Research is steadily making progress in adapting crops to new areas. Perhaps soybeans or some other alternative crop can satisfactorily be adapted to portions of the Pacific Northwest.

We know what the development of frozen fruits and vegetables has meant to growers here and in many other fruit and vegetable areas. But we sometimes forget the long road that was pioneered by researchers before these developments became possible.

For more than 50 years the packaging and preservation of frozen foods have been under continuous study by Department scientists.

Way back in 1904 and 1905 scientists in the United States Department of Agriculture were conducting experiments with frozen fruits. The first USDA bulletin on this subject was put out 50 years ago.

A special frozen pack laboratory was established in Seattle in 1930. It led to better quality and lower processing costs. It was a critical time in the birth of this new industry, and these were critical developments.

Then, in the midthirties, our four agricultural regional research laboratories were set up. The western laboratory, at Albany, Calif., adopted a program of research in frozen foods as a major activity.

The point I want to stress is this. Most of the progress in our agriculture has come about through such developments as those I have been mentioning. We push ahead through research and education. We go forward on the vehicle of new ideas—new ways of producing more efficiently, marketing more effectively, ideas for using established crops in new ways—ideas for developing new crops.

Besides conservation, research, and education, we have a common interest in development programs. Our rural development program is successfully launched. It is helping open the doors of opportunity to the million and a half farm families with incomes of less than $1,000 a year. This is a program destined to grow in influence and worth.

A fifth vital need in building a healthy farm economy is credit. Credit needs must be met for production requirements, farm purchase, and emergency needs.

In all our farm programs the emphasis must be on building an expanding, prosperous, and free farm economy for the benefit of the entire Nation.

Our immediate task is to achieve a balance between production and the market demands of peacetime, to eliminate surpluses, to rebuild normal markets and to develop new ones, and to encourage and strengthen the marketing system upon which farm people and the entire Nation depend.

Our continuing objective is expanding opportunity, bigger markets, and higher incomes for farm people, all in an atmosphere of freedom. The freeing up of agriculture is foremost among our goals.

As I close I would like to pay tribute to one of this Nation's greatest leaders in the cause of freedom. He did such big things that the world has almost forgotten some of the lesser events that came to pass under his leadership—such as the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, the beginning of Federal research programs, the start of the system of land-grant colleges and universi-

ties. I am speaking, of course, of Abraham Lincoln.

There is a quality about Lincoln that we sometimes overlook. Carl Sandburg points out that Lincoln used the word "responsibility" almost as often as he used the word "freedom."

Let us take to our hearts Lincoln's concept of responsible freedom. Listen to his words: "It is for us, the living, rather, to be dedicated to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us."

Let us apply these words to ourselves, as we deliberate here in this great Pacific Northwest farm forum on building a healthier farm economy.

With God's help, and in the cause of responsible freedom, let us go forward.

---

## Fifth Annual Dedicatory Prayer Breakfast at the Mayflower Hotel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last Thursday morning 950 persons, including the Vice President, members of the Cabinet, the courts, Members of the Senate, Members of the House of Representatives, Government officials, delegates to the conference, and representatives of the Council of Christian Leadership Groups attended the Presidential prayer breakfast at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C. Conrad Hilton was host on the occasion.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the program and transcript of the proceedings of this service.

In my opinion, this prayer breakfast, attended by outstanding leaders in every field will add much to the religious life of our Nation.

There being no objection, the program and transcript of proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM FOR PRESIDENTIAL BREAKFAST, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, FEBRUARY 7, 1957

Presiding: Hon. FRANK CARLSON, United States Senate, president, International Council for Christian Leadership.

Invocation: Mr. Richard Halverson, assistant executive secretary, International Christian Leadership.

Scripture lesson: Hon. BROOKS HAYS, Representative from Arkansas. (Isaiah 42: 1–4; Titus 2: 11–14.)

Message of welcome: Senator FRANK CARLSON.

Greetings from our host: Mr. Conrad Hilton.

Message: The Vice President of the United States, Hon. RICHARD NIXON.

Greetings from the House of Representatives Breakfast Prayer Group: Hon. JAMES B. UTT, of California.

Greetings from the Senate Breakfast Prayer Group: Hon. JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi.

Address: Christian Responsibility, Mr. Kenneth Keyes, Miami, Fla.

Prayer of dedication: Abraham Vereide, executive secretary of International Council of Christian Leadership.

The fifth annual prayer breakfast was opened by Senator FRANK CARLSON, president of the International Council of Christian Leadership.

FIFTH ANNUAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Senator CARLSON. We are going to have the invocation this morning by Richard Halverson. Following that we will remain standing and have a verse for the President, a hymn led by Fague Springman, of the music department, University of Maryland.

Mr. HALVERSON. Let us unite together in prayer.

Our Heavenly Father, we gather together this morning in this comfortable fellowship knowing that there are millions of men and women who never know the comfort that we enjoy and who would never dare to meet in fellowship in the name of Jesus Christ.

We meet here in reflection and respect for our Government leaders, and there are millions who fear and hate those who are over them in rule and authority.

We meet here to enjoy good food and drink, and there are millions who never know the luxury of a full stomach.

Our Heavenly Father, deliver us from the complacency that would make us indifferent of these gifts that come so easily and grant as we gather here this morning in the name of Jesus Christ that this breakfast shall be a testimony to the fact that we take Christ seriously and we in America love God and believe that we are called of Him to serve Him. Use these blessings to Thy glory we pray in Christ's name. Amen.

(Solo.)

Senator CARLSON. We are going to enjoy the breakfast, but during this breakfast period I would like to announce that we are going to be favored by some music, songs, and a quartet. This quartet is known as the Visionaires and they have just flown over from Manila, the Philippine Islands, where they have concluded a very fine and effective evangelistic campaign.

We are going to be favored at this time with one number from the Visionaries quartet. And immediately following that number we will hear from the distinguished Congressman from the State of Arkansas [BROOKS HAYS], who will read the Scripture lesson, Isaiah 42: 1–4, Titus 2: 11–14.

We meet here this morning at a prayer breakfast. It was 23 years ago in Seattle, Wash., that a group of men met and organized the first laymen's breakfast prayer group. It also founded International Christian Leadership. This is in reality the annual meeting of these breakfasts. There are prayer groups all over this Nation. And it is also the first session of the International Christian Leadership.

Today there are hundreds of these prayer groups meeting in foreign countries as well as all over our Nation. It is a laymen's movement for spiritual deepening and for consideration of the practical problems which can be solved, we believe, through vital Christianity.

Membership in the United States is made up of all segments of our social and economic life—from commerce and industry, from government, the House and the Senate, labor, banking, all of the professions. Awakened and concerned laymen believe that the solution to this crisis lies in taking the initiative in practicing and promoting moral and spiritual principles in our daily lives. They believe the root of the American greatness is a Christian heritage. They believe that in these troubled and uncertain times we need and must rely on divine guidance.

It was St. Paul who wrote, "The effectual, fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much."

The theme for this meeting is mobilizing Christian men around the world to assume their responsibility in human affairs.

This session is the first session of the International Christian Leadership. We are going to have meetings for the next 3 days. While I am on my feet I want to announce a very important annual banquet dinner tonight. I urge you to make it a point to attend. Dr. Billy Graham will be the speaker. It will be in the presidential room of this hotel at 7:30. Tickets will be available across the hall.

This morning is the fifth consecutive year that we are privileged to be the guests of a great American, who has made an outstanding success in the business world. We applaud him for this great success, but I want to commend him for his deep and fundamental interests in the problems of mankind.

It was several years ago that our host wrote the prayer, "America on Its Knees." I am advised that he has personally printed and distributed in practically every country on the face of the globe a total of over one-half million copies of this prayer.

America has a great heritage, and, we of this generation, owe much to those who have gone before, but we do have an obligation to preserve for future generations—our children and their children—the fundamental principles advocated by the Man of Galilee who walked the shores 2,000 years ago.

I am pleased this morning to present to you our host, Mr. Hilton. [Applause.]

Mr. HILTON. Mr. Vice President, Mr. Chief Justice, Mr. Chairman, Reverend Clergy, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen: First, I should like to say my congratulations to all of you, to ourselves on this fifth anniversary of our prayer breakfast. It is an outgrowth of an original small group of Senators and Members of the House who for years met regularly to pray together.

The prayer breakfast has quietly grown into a national event. It has survived I think because in between our annual prayer meetings we have learned to do something more about religion than just talk about it. In these past 5 years I think we have come to realize most deeply that we had better do more than just talk about religion if we want to survive.

We have learned that the democracy which forgets its God is a democracy that is through. I am not saying that religion is good because it helps democracy. That is like saying it is good because it helps business. What I am saying is that religion for a country is not something to be accepted or rejected as the nation is inclined. I am saying that religion, your relationship with God as a nation and as individuals, is of first importance.

This sum of our obligations to a personal God is what gives us dignity as a nation, dignity as persons. Let us illustrate. A man is standing at 50th and Park Avenue in New York City. He is waiting for the light to turn. Who is he?

To the statistician standing at the window high above, he is one unit in a crowd.

To the biologist, he is a specimen.

To the physicist, a formula of mass and energy.

To the chemist, a compound of substances.

He is of interest to the historian as one of the billions of beings who have inhabited this planet of ours.

To the politicians, as a vote.

To the merchandiser, as a customer.

To the mailman, as an address.

The behaviorist sees him from his office across the street and tags him as a man modified by conditioned reflexes.

And the psychiatrist in the next suite as a particular mental type, deviating in one way or another from the alleged normal.

Each science pinpoints the poor fellow from some particular angle and makes him look foolish, like the candid camera shot that catches you in the middle of a yawn. Let any of these specialists get hold of you and get you to look at yourself through his

single eye, and what you see will not be a man, but a fragment of a man.

You will be the elephant examined by the five blind men. One felt his ear and said, "An elephant is like a blanket." Another his tail and said, "No; like a rope." The third his leg and insisted "Like a tree." The fourth bumped into his side and decided it was "Like a wall." The last grabbed his trunk and said, "Definitely an elephant is like a snake."

But what is man like? Why are all these experts focusing their spotlight on him? Why is he the target of biologists? Why has man a finger in every pie? Why is he so universally important? By what right? What is it that is the center of him that holds the attention of the universe and gives him a unique dignity?

Beware of asking. That way lies religion. And religion, according to our Communist friends, is the enemy of man, the enemy of democracy.

According to the Supreme Soviet the people is religion, the absolute sovereignty of the people without subjection to God or the laws of justice. For communism the new democracy, the new gospel according to Marx and Lenin, gives order and significance to the whole of the human past and direction for the human future.

Man was born yesterday, and in the new gospel lies his salvation.

I tell you that is wrong. When 2,000 years have gone to the making of a Christian people they cannot be scaled down to materialism in a small, mean, slavish view of themselves, either by Communist teachers or by Soviet tanks.

But to avoid it we must return to a Christian realism and be aware that both democracy and Christianity today are fighting the same animal. You and I know that communism would wipe both off of the face of the earth. However, I am convinced that under the influence of this common enemy democracy and Christianity are coming together in a fashion. But the cementing of the union is not yet accomplished. Perhaps that is where we come in.

One thing I am quite sure: that democracy cannot do it alone. Christianity and democracy must stop walking down individual roads or prepare for the destruction of our common world.

I am not trying to impose religion on anybody, but the minimum reading of history will convince you that religion is the background of our modern democratic ideal, and the two forces had better get together if democracy is to work.

Now I should like to close with a suggestion for the next year's prayer breakfast. I propose it not as your host but as a simple member of our group here this morning.

First, let me say that there are over 79 countries in the United Nations, most of which are non-Christian. My suggestion is this: Next year we might invite to our breakfast two members from each of our foreign non-Christian religions who live in Washington in the diplomatic service of their respective nations. For instance, we might have with us 2 Buddhists, 2 Shintoists, 2 Mohammedans, 2 Hindus and the like.

I make this suggestion because of the new stature which the United Nations has assumed in the past few months. There has been a change in the character of that organization resulting from the recent accession of 19 new members a few months ago, most of which are of the Afro-Asian bloc, now the largest section of the Assembly.

I should like to see the unifying principle of the United Nations be anti-atheism rather than anti-colonialism or anti-communism. The Afro-Asian is a potent bloc in world councils today and will go onward year by year with the addition of newly emancipated African peoples. I see great good in inviting these men who believe in God, but who are not Christians, to break bread with us, a non-sectarian Christian group; to join us for breakfast and conversation, children of a common Father.

And now, Mr. Vice President, a year ago I had the pleasure of presenting a silver plaque to President Eisenhower on which was engraved the prayer that he delivered on the occasion of his first inauguration. Today I take pleasure in presenting to President Eisenhower, through you, a similar silver plaque containing a prayer he delivered on the occasion of his second inaugural address. With it go our affectionate greetings and wishes for his continued good health and happiness, and that continued success may come to him in the great work that he is doing in bringing peace to a troubled world. [Applause.]

Vice President NIXON. Senator Carlson, Mr. Hilton, Mr. Chief Justice, all of the distinguished guests and ladies and gentlemen who are here this morning: Before accepting this plaque on behalf of the President I would like to say just a word on behalf of all of us who are your guests this morning for allowing us again to be with you for what has now become this annual event on our calendars.

This is a very unusual breakfast in many respects that I think of. For some of us it is quite rare to get up this early in the morning to come downtown to breakfast, I can assure you. For many of us it is also rare, I would say, to get up this early in the morning for a worship service; and for virtually all of us it is most unusual to add to our traditional ham and eggs not only doughnuts, and not only sausage, but hominy grits as well.

May I say also that it is a great privilege to welcome our visitors from out of Washington who are here for the two events that are being commemorated on this particular occasion. I will regret that I will not be able to be present personally tonight—because of an engagement at the White House—for the dinner which will be held across the hall, at which Billy Graham will be speaking. I notice that he has been sitting right here. I know that he is preparing for what I think is one of the most courageous crusades that he has undertaken.

I think most of us will agree that this young and vigorous religious leader has been courageous in many instances in moving into areas where they said it couldn't be done. [Applause.]

I learned 6 months ago that Billy Graham and his associates had contracted to take Madison Square Garden for 3 months beginning this summer. I realize that here is a man who certainly had the strength of his convictions, and he was willing to back it up in this very tangible way. So may I take this occasion before he speaks tonight to wish him and all of his people well in this new venture which we will be witnessing in a very few weeks.

Now may I officially accept on behalf of the President of the United States this plaque. I know that he has always enjoyed his attendance at these breakfasts in the past. This morning he has a National Security Council meeting. It will begin at 9 o'clock. And that of course explains why he cannot be in more than one place at one time. The President almost always does that but even he has not found a way to attend more than one meeting at one particular time.

I think that there is no more appropriate way to express appreciation for him for this plaque, and also to initiate these conferences that will be held in the next few days, than to read the message which he sent to all of you and to us this morning.

"Please give my greeting to your guests assembled in the Capital City for the fifth annual prayer breakfast. In the company of fellow believers united in faith and hope there is strength for renewed effort to serve our God and neighbor. In such a spirit the magnitude of our common tasks diminishes, the obstacles to their accomplishment less and less formidable. This is a time to confront our common problems with confidence. I am sure the Nation and the world can and will find the wisdom and courage, the inspired leadership required for the living of these days. Congratulations and best wishes to you all. Dwight D. Eisenhower." [Applause.]

Senator CARLSON. Thank you, Mr. Vice President, and Mr. Hilton.

First, Mr. Hilton again for this splendid breakfast and your generosity to each and all of us and for your kindness in permitting us to come as your guests; and for the Vice President in being with us this morning.

I am not going to read any number of messages but I do want to read one this morning that comes from the honorary president of the International Council of Christian Leadership. It is a message from Her Royal Highness Princess Wilhelmina of Holland:

"I offer you on the occasion of your meeting my best wishes. May the light you received within radiate through all ICCL undertakings in the midst of a battle for everyday life, and you be the channels through which the living water flows into the spiritual distress of our world."

We are especially honored to have at our head table this morning some people who are not going to participate in the program. It is always a feeling of satisfaction and comfort and security when we have with us our distinguished guest, the Chief Justice, Hon. Earl Warren.

We have at the superior table a very personal friend of mine. I am delighted to have him here. He is a regular attendant at these breakfasts, the assistant to the President of the United States, Governor Sherman Adams.

We have here at the head table Governor Sigurd Anderson, who is chairman of the entire conference proceedings for the next 3 days. Governor Anderson.

We also have with us Judge Boyd Leedom, who is vice chairman and director of the executive council of the International Christian Leadership.

As I have stated before, every Wednesday morning we have a prayer breakfast in the United States Senate. They have a prayer breakfast in the House of Representatives on Thursday morning. We are favored this morning to have greetings from these two groups.

We are going to be represented from the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, Hon. JOHN STENNIS, and from the House by the very able and distinguished Congressman, Hon. JAMES B. UTT.

First we will have a word of greeting from Congressman UTT, followed by Senator STENNIS.

Congressman UTT, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Chief Justice, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to bring you greetings from the House prayer breakfast group. I will say that we are affiliated with the ICL. We meet every Thursday morning in the family dining room of the Senate. We have about 100 members with an average attendance of between 40 and 50 members. I might say that we are a little bit selfish, which perhaps isn't the Christian spirit, but we do not permit visitors nor do we permit outside speakers. We kind of feel it is a family devotional affair. We can take down our hair and we can have more freedom and candor of expression regarding our religious experiences and inspirations without outside visitors and for that reason we confine it to Members of the House and one or two other people who are in regular attendance.

I might say that it is entirely nonpolitical and nondenominational. We have about the same amount of Democrats as we do Republicans, and I might say Christianity being the common denominator of man we have no seniority in that one section of the House. A freshman Congressman is a peer of the oldest Congressman who belongs to our group, and has the same seniority that anyone else has.

Among our members we have some terrific fighters, some terrific Sunday school teachers. And I have heard—with all due respect to my minister from the First National Presbyterian Church, Mr. Billy Graham—some of the finest sermons in the sanctuary of God that I ever expect to hear come from laymen. It is truly a fine religious experience.

We have also a melting pot. The Democrats finally decided that the Republicans weren't the devil's advocates. We Republicans discovered that the Democrats weren't all that we said about them during the campaign.

I might also say that the doctrine of predestination takes high priority over the Eisenhower Mid-East Doctrine. We have a considerable amount of banter between the denominations there, more than we do over any political problems. And I might say that it generally revolves around the Baptists and around the Presbyterians.

There are some Baptists. BROOKS HAYS, who just read the Scripture, is a Baptist, and he believes that 20,000 Leagues Under the Sea was a story about baptism by immersion.

When you cross these denominations it is terrific what you get. My mother was a Methodist and my father a Baptist. Out of that holy union were born five little Presbyterians.

I can hardly account for that. But we do have a terrific group there. And I think it has an effect upon Congress and our legislation. We are there to dedicate ourselves to God and to help preserve this, a nation under God.

Senator CARLSON. We will now hear from Senator STENNIS, of the Senate prayer breakfast group.

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Vice President, Mr. Chief Justice, Mr. Hilton, and other friends, it is my great privilege to bring you greetings from the Senate breakfast group. Certainly all of us here this morning gain spiritual strength from each other. Our regular weekly meetings which are attended by from 12 to 18 or 20 Senators, are based primarily on fellowship, personal fellowship and Christian fellowship. We meet there in an exchange of thought on spiritual matters. And as we sit around the table as individuals coming from all parts of the Nation, representing all the Christian faiths, and different party affiliations, we realize and recognize that the real common bond between us is based on spiritual values, and I believe in the oneness of God.

And this exchange of thought and discussion there on spiritual values gives us a better understanding of each other and our responsibilities, and our problems, as we seek solutions to our national matters. And as we search for spiritual truth we help each other to realize that all of us strive in vain as we seek an enduring peace unless spiritual values are at the foundation of our entire efforts.

So let us, as individuals, charged with the responsibility of representing our people in the leading Nation of the world, quietly and humbly and without a show of pretense, let us let the American people know that spiritual values do have a place and do control our basic and fundamental actions here. In that way we can contribute to the faith of our people and keep burning alive the great basic Christian principles which are the basis after all of our great form of government.

I end as I start, with the thought that all of us gain spiritual strength by meeting here today.

God bless our President and our host. [Applause.]

Senator CARLSON. Thank you, Senator STENNIS, and Representative UTT.

We have been blessed in this Nation by men and women who have visions and who had the courage and convictions to carry those visions into effect. We have been blessed because we have had leaders in the business world, in government, and in prominent places in our entire economy as Christian leaders. This morning we are going to have a message from one of those outstanding Christian businessmen who has given much time to advance that thought. He comes from Miami, Fla. He is president of the National Association of Real Estate Dealers in the United States. He is going to speak on Christian responsibility. I now present Kenneth Keyes. [Applause.]

Mr. KEYES. Mr. Vice President, Mr. Chief Justice, Senator CARLSON, ladies and gentlemen, one of the words that came to have a very real meaning to us during the last war was the word "priority." We learned that things most important to the war effort had to be given the right-of-way over everything else; that they had to come first. And I believe with all my heart, friends, that the thing this world needs most today is for believers in the Lord Jesus Christ to put first things first.

In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus said, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness." And he promised that if we would do that all things necessary to our well-being would be provided.

Now when we pause to think about it the reasons why God should have first priority over our lives are very clear and very plain. God is certainly entitled to first claim on our time because He controls our time. The years that you and I will spend on this earth are in God's hands. God should have first claim on our energies and our abilities because He gives us our energies and our talents of varying kinds.

And it follows very logically that God should have first claim on our money, for the dollars we earn are simpy the end product of our God-given time, energy, and ability.

It isn't really difficult to recognize that God is clearly entitled to first claim on our lives and what we produce with them, but the hard part comes when we try to apply this truth and make it work in the busy world in which we live.

Surely if we are to put God first, there must be a portion of each day set aside for the reading of His word, and for a vital prayer. We must never be too busy to respond to calls for service in our church. We must witness for Him in our businesses and professions, and use our energies and abilities to serve Him in our daily living.

Many of us find it especially difficult to put God first in our money making.

God wants us to remember always that it is He who gives us the time, energy and ability to earn the dollars we receive. He gives us in His word a simple practical plan that we are to adopt as a reminder that all of our blessings come from Him. God asks us to set aside the first tenth of our income or profits, the Scriptural tithe, to dedicate that tenth to His glory and use it to further His work on earth.

It is interesting to note I think that when God first established the Jewish people he gave them the law of the tithe in these words: "And all the tithes of the land, whether of the seed of the land or the fruit of the tree, is the Lord's." Note that God didn't say the tithes should be given to the Lord. He said the tithe is the Lord's. It belongs to God.

And centuries later in accusing the people of failure to keep this law God didn't say, "You haven't been liberal enough"; God didn't say, "You haven't done your duty on this matter of giving." God said: "Ye have robbed me of tithes in offering."

Our Lord was tithing when he was here on earth. The early church considered it the duty of every Christian to tithe. And the early believers must have considered tithing not only a duty but also a high privilege, for history records that Saint Cyprian, the Bishop of Carthage, once punished the people of his congregation by forbidding them to bring their tithes and offerings until the ban was lifted.

There are some Christians today who conscientiously believe that the law of the tithe was binding only on the Old Testament believers. I do not hold this view, but to me the legal angle is unimportant especially if we substitute this question: Should not our love for God, our gratitude to Him for the salvation we have through His Son, and our appreciation for all the other blessings that He provides so abundantly, prompt us to give as much as the Old Testament believer was commanded to give under the law?

If we answer this question honestly surely we would all agree that the tenth is the minimum Christians should use for God's honor and glory.

God usually blesses financially when we share our incomes liberally with him. We read in Malachi: "Bring ye the whole tithe into my storehouse and prove me now herewith, sayeth the Lord, if I will not pour out a blessing there shall not be room enough to receive it."

In 20 years in speaking on this subject I have yet to meet a tither who was faithful in giving God his tenth who did not receive a real blessing. Even though the income doesn't increase, God somehow seems to make the nine-tenths go further than the ten-tenths did before.

If time permitted, I could tell you of many leaders of industry and finance who honor God with their tithe—Colgate, Haines, Hershey, Kellogg, Penney, Wanamaker, to name just a few.

I could tell you of a real-estate salesman who started tithing when he worked for us in the middle thirties, later established his own office in another city and put 25 percent of his income into a special bank account in the name of the Lord. Or the story of the North Carolina lumberman who after tithing for many years increased God's tithe to 15 percent, then 20 percent, and finally dedicated 50 percent of the profits of his planing mill to the Lord.

I could tell you about the well-known industrialist who put not 25 percent, not 50 percent, but 90 percent of all his assets in a fund for religious purposes and is still getting along just fine on the 10 percent.

But I can sum up their experience in just one short sentence: We can't outgive God. The more of our time, our energy, our ability, and our money we use to further His work on earth, the more God will pour out His blessing.

But the financial blessing that usually comes to the tither isn't the main consideration. The spiritual blessing is far more important. When we tithe we have the satisfaction of knowing that God's prior claim is being recognized in this vital money-making part of our lives. With this knowledge comes the realization that we are actually in partnership with God. We need not worry about our business deals when He is at the helm of our ship.

It is glorious to have God as a partner, to know that he will guide and direct our lives, if we acknowledge Him.

But there is another equally important facet to tithing. It brings great joy to the tither's heart to feel that he is God's partner, too. Our tenth helps erect buildings to the honor and glory of God, helps to operate churches where Christ's message can be proclaimed to a world that needs it today, helps to send missionaries to carry the

gospel of God's love to the far corners of the earth.

It is thrilling to have a part with God in all these things.

Many years ago I heard a true story I shall never forget. It took place on the coronation date for King George VI.

On his way to his office an English gentleman invited a ragged little lad to see the parade from the balcony of his building near Westminster Abbey. Hand in hand they worked their way through the crowds that lined the street and finally reached the balcony. As the parade came along the man named for the boy the different regiments as they proudly marched by. He pointed out the Ambassadors of some of the important countries as they passed in their stately carriages. But he noticed that the little lad didn't seem to be at all interested until the King's carriage came along, and then with beaming face he looked up at the man and said, "Mister, do you see them lamps on the King's carriage? How brightly they shine."

"Lad, I don't understand you at all," said the man. "All those interesting things passed in review before your very eyes and all you seemed to see were the lamps on the king's carriage."

"But Mister, you don't understand," replied the boy. "The girl that I work for had the contract to refurbish the King's carriage and it was my job to polish them lamps."

Would to God that you and I in this busy day in which we live could each demonstrate in our own lives the singleness of purpose shown by that little English lad. Or if we could just put in a secondary place in our thinking and our living, our jobs, our businesses, our sports, our pleasures, our social lives, and put God and his kingdom first ahead of everything else. What a different world this would be.

And just as we as individuals have a responsibility to put God first, using our time, energy, ability, and money to further the work of His kingdom here on earth, God likewise challenges us today as a nation to use our moral, physical, and spiritual strength to honor Him in this troubled world in which we live. Our country was brought into being under God. We recognize our dependence upon Him and our national motto "In God We Trust." And in spite of the fact that we as individuals and as a nation have at times strayed far from Him, God has blessed and prospered us above all the countries on earth.

And God who controls the destinies of all nations has seen fit to elevate our United States into a position of unquestioned world leadership.

These blessings impose upon us a responsibility which far transcends the mere making of loans or grants of money, food, or other material aid to our less fortunate neighbors, helpful as these are.

We must impart something of our spiritual strength to the peoples of these lands.

May we therefore through God-centered Christian statesmanship lead the peoples of the world to recognize clearly, first, that America today is in position to help others primarily because God has blessed our Nation whose foundations were laid in trust in Him, and, second, that our help to others is prompted not only by defense considerations but also by a sincere desire to be faithful stewards of the blessings that God has poured out so abundantly upon us.

May we therefore as individuals and as a Nation gratefully acknowledge that all of our blessings come from God and recognize more fully that we have a responsibility and indeed a challenge to administer our stewardship, using our time, energy, ability, and money in ways that will honor God and help our fellowman.

Senator CARLSON. Mr. Keyes, we deeply appreciate that splendid message on Christian responsibility. It is a very inspiring message.

We are going to rise and have a prayer of dedication by our very fine friend Abraham Vereide, and we will sing together, led by Fague Springman, "Mine Eyes Have Seen the Glory of the Coming of the Lord."

Mr. VEREIDE. Open our hearts to be aware of Thee, O Lord. For here and now we desire to do just what we have been challenged to do, recognizing our stewardship, and to dedicate ourselves and our Nation afresh to Thee. We thank Thee for revealing Thyself to us and saving us from groping in the dark and stumbling in ignorance, but we can walk forth in the blessing sunshine of real truth, and in the knowledge of Thee through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, and know that in Him and through Him we have been relived and we have forgiveness. May we therefore, O God, learn this day and every day to humble ourselves and to pray and to forsake every evil way and to seek Thee and Thy face. And so we thank Thee for this hour and the opportunity of being together, and our Lord God we pray for Thy blessing with infinite wisdom and Thy guidance to our President, our Secretary of State, our judiciary, our whole Cabinet and their associates, our Senate and House, our military leaders, and our people in the Federal, State, and local level.

Lord God Almighty, we pray for Jesus' sake, forgive us and help us to rise to every difficulty, that we may with courage and character like granite go forward with stamina and strength to do Thy will in all things.

So we thank Thee for hearing us and accepting us this day and granting us Thy blessing for Christ's sake, and to Thee be the glory here at home, throughout the world, and in the endless ages to come. Amen.

(Group singing.)

---

## Lincoln's Birthday Address by the Secretary of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, February 14, 1957*

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address delivered by the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, at the capital of my State, Pierre, S. Dak., on the anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, EZRA TAFT BENSON, AT LINCOLN DAY CELEBRATION, PIERRE, S. DAK.

It is a pleasure to join with you here tonight in honoring the memory of the Nation's first Republican President—a man whose words, whose deeds, whose selfless devotion to the cause of human liberty are still so much a part of our American heritage. I am especially happy to have the privilege of attending a Lincoln Day dinner in South Dakota because your State has a great Republican tradition—and I am convinced it will continue to march in the front ranks of the party.

I believe this because I believe that the fundamental things our party stands for are right.

PARTY OF THE FUTURE

In his acceptance address at the Republican National Convention in San Francisco last August, President Eisenhower called the Republican Party the "party of the future." The President said:

"Now, the first reason of the five I shall give you why the Republican Party is the party of the future is this:

"First, because it is the party of long-range principle, not short-term expediency.

"My second reason for saying that the Republican Party is the party of the future is this: It is the party which concentrates on the facts and issues of today and tomorrow, not the facts and issues of yesterday.

"Third: The Republican Party is the party of the future because it is the party that draws people together, not drives them apart.

"And now the fourth reason: The Republican Party is the party of the future because it is the party through which the many things that still need doing will soonest be done—and will be done by enlisting the fullest energies of free, creative, individual people.

"Finally, a party of the future must be completely dedicated to peace, as indeed must all Americans. For without peace there is no future."

So long as the Republican Party remains dedicated to those principles set forth by the President, it will fulfill its role as the party of the future.

Moreover, I believe that these basic principles set forth by President Eisenhower apply in the field of agriculture, just as they do in other areas of American life.

In its approach to the problems of the farmer, I believe we must always be guided by long-range principle, not short-term expediency.

I believe that as Republicans we must concentrate on the facts and issues of today and tomorrow, not on the facts and issues of yesterday.

I believe we must work toward drawing farm and city people more closely together and not drive them apart.

I believe further that the many things which still need doing in the field of agriculture can best be done by enlisting the fullest energies of free, creative, individual people. And I would emphasize that word "free" for the individual, be he farmer, businessman or professional man, can invariably solve his own problems better as a free man than he can when shackled with government controls and regimentation.

MUST UNDERSTAND PROBLEM

I believe also that to solve any problem, agricultural or otherwise, we must first understand clearly what the problem is. In that connection, I am reminded of a rather famous Lincoln story. It was during the Civil War at a time when the Union forces had suffered severe reverses and President Lincoln was under heavy personal attack by many newspapers.

"I guess I'm like the chap who was riding along a backwoods trail and was caught in a storm," Lincoln said. "He kept plodding ahead until his horse gave out and then it grew dark. He had only the lightning to show him the trail. The thunder was terrifying and when one bolt seemed to crash at his very feet he fell on his knees. 'Oh Lord,' he prayed, 'If it's all the same to You, give us a little more light and a little less noise.'"

I am positive that most American farmers would add to that prayer a hearty "Amen."

We could use "a little more light and a little less noise" in discussing farm policy. The whole broad field of agriculture involves much more than just acres and animals and machines. Most important of all it involves farm people—22 million of them.

Agriculture is also of vital concern to the 148 million of our people who live in the villages, towns and cities of the Nation—for all

of us are consumers—all of us must eat—all of us must buy clothing—and therefore all of us have a direct interest in the continued production of adequate supplies of food and fiber. That is another way of saying that all Americans have an important stake in the maintenance of a free, prosperous and expanding agriculture.

It is appropriate to speak here of the tremendous contribution to our higher standards of living that has been made through the enormous increases in agricultural productivity. As I mentioned a moment ago, there are 22 million farm people in the United States. They comprise only about 13 percent of our total population. When I was a farm boy in Idaho in the early 1900's there were about 32 million farm people in the Nation, and they made up more than one-third of our total population.

Then 1 farm worker—and there were some 13 million of them—then 1 farm worker produced enough food and fiber to provide for his own needs and those of 6 additional persons in the towns and cities. Today the farm labor force numbers a little more than 8 million, and each of these workers produces enough for himself and 19 others. Output per man-hour on the farms of America has shot upward by more than one-third in just the last 10 years.

THREE DEVELOPMENTS

Now, this amazing revolution in agriculture has brought three important developments:

First, for farmers themselves it has required increasingly greater investments in land and equipment. To remain competitive in a changing agricultural world farmers have become more efficient. They have adopted the newest techniques in crop and livestock production. Many of them have expanded the size of their farming operations to utilize the full potential of expensive machines and equipment. Along with this, farmers have borne most heavily the burden of price-depressing surpluses that accumulated as agricultural output climbed faster than effective demand.

Secondly, the record production of food and fiber from the farms of America has provided consumers in this country with the highest level diet in our history—and at reasonable prices. It has also made possible the sharing of our abundance with other less fortunate nations. The production miracles performed by American farmers in recent years not only have served our national interest but, at the same time, have been dedicated to the cause of freedom and human need throughout the world.

A third consequence of our amazing agricultural efficiency is reflected in the total national economy. Literally millions of people who would be engaged in farming under a less efficient system are instead working in factories and at the various trades and professions. They are building homes, highways, automobiles, television sets, and a multitude of things that we associate with our daily living. They are in such field as science, education, medicine, and law. A substantial part of our basic strength as a Nation stems from the fact that so small a percentage of America's total labor force is required to meet our food and fiber requirements. Nowhere else on the face of the earth do so few people produce so much to feed so many.

From all of this it is clear that the major benefits of our vastly expanded agricultural productivity have accrued to the Nation as a whole, rather than to farmers as a group. Agricultural abundance has held down prices paid by consumers for food and fiber but it has also depressed farm prices and income. To emphasize this point, I cite the estimate by economists of the United States Department of Agriculture that net farm income last year would have been one-fifth higher—$2 billion more—had it not been for the existence of price-depressing surpluses.

Farmers themselves know from experience that excessive supplies can exert tremendous downward pressure upon free-market prices. This administration also is keenly aware of that fact. From the very beginning, our efforts have been mainly directed toward achieving a better balance between supply and demand. We have sought to accomplish this in three ways: by increasing consumption at home, by boosting exports to other countries, and now, through the soil bank, by retiring a part of our agricultural plant from active production.

This administration will maintain adequate stockpiles of food and fiber. Our national security demands that we keep on hand sufficient reserves of wheat, corn, cotton, and other key commodities. Such supplies are a safeguard against critical shortages which might develop as a result of drought or other natural disasters. The short corn crop of 1947, for example, forced a significant reduction in livestock numbers and thereafter a curtailed supply of meat. That hurt farmers and consumers alike.

In safeguarding our economy through the maintenance of adequate reserves, however, we need to distinguish between necessary stockpiles and unmanageable surpluses. The plain truth is we now have supplies of a few major crops in excess of what any foreseeable emergency would demand. We must pull them down to more nearly normal proportions as a means of strengthening farm prices and at the same time reducing heavy storage costs which now approach $1,200,000 a day.

It would be unfair, however, to ask farmers to bear, in the form of lower prices and income, a major share of the cost of maintaining for all of us an adequate reserve of food and fiber. We are determined that farmers shall be free to sell their commodities in the open market without the constant threat of Government competition.

In that connection, the Department of Agriculture has adopted a policy of withholding wheat for export sale so that farmers may move their own current marketings directly into channels of trade rather than into Government hands. As supply and demand come into better balance, it will be possible for Government to withdraw completely from the business of acquiring and merchandising farm commodities—a function which traditionally and properly belongs to private enterprise. That will be a happy day for farmers and for all of us.

Because the Government itself encouraged a vast expansion in farm productivity to meet the unprecedented demands of war and postwar rehabilitation, this same Government has a moral obligation to assist farmers in making the adjustment to peacetime conditions and in restoring a marketing system that moves the products of agriculture into consumption rather than into Federal ownership. The full attainment of those objectives is a major goal of this administration.

In our determination to foster conditions under which farmers will share equitably in the Nation's unprecedented prosperity, we shall never attempt to apply political remedies to economic problems. While it is true that individual farmers have their own political preferences, American agriculture as a business is completely nonpartisan.

The consequences of unwise, shortsighted farm policies affect all farmers, whatever their political affiliations. Drought, floods, hailstorms, and insects attack the crops of Republicans and Democrats with impartiality. The problems of surpluses and high operating costs know no party lines.

While experience demonstrates that partisan treatment often compounds agriculture's ills, the political approach has never succeeded in curing the patient.

ATTACK PROBLEM, NOT SYMPTOMS

This administration has steadfastly sought to attack the basic causes of the farm problem rather than its symptoms. As I mentioned a few minutes ago, we have concentrated our efforts upon the fundamental problem of surpluses. We have encouraged increased consumption. We have sought to bring production into better balance with current needs. One of the first tasks we undertook was to regain lost and shrinking export markets.

The results of that action are now clearly apparent. In the 1954 fiscal year the dollar value of farm exports was up 7 percent over the previous 12-month period. In fiscal 1955 they climbed an additional 4 percent. And for the last fiscal year they were up still another 9 percent. For the final 6 months of 1956, farm exports were running at the highest rate in history. Since July 1953 we have moved into use abroad and at home $8 billion worth of surplus agricultural commodities.

The Republican 83d Congress enacted the Agricultural Trade and Development Act as a device for expanding farm exports without unduly disturbing world markets.

The sharply increased use of American farm products both at home and abroad is making itself strongly felt in the market place.

Prices received by farmers in recent months have been running from 5 to 7 percent higher than a year ago.

Realized net farm income in 1956 was 5 percent above the 1955 level. This reverses a downward trend which continued at an almost uninterrupted pace since 1947. In fact, farm income has shown increases during only 2 years since 1947. One of these was the Korean war year of 1951. The other was 1956—a year of peace.

The outlook is for further modest increases in farm prices and income during the year ahead. The size of those increases will depend largely upon our ability to keep exports moving at a high rate and upon the effectiveness of the Soil Bank in retiring from production a part of our agricultural plant. For some areas which have been hard hit by drought—and South Dakota is among the seriously affected States—rain is, of course, the most important unknown factor in the farm income equation.

I would point to one further piece of evidence that the overall farm situation is showing substantial improvement. Commodity Credit Corporation's investment in farm commodities is expected to total about $7.6 billion next June 30. That would represent a reduction of about $700 million for the fiscal year and a drop of $1.3 billion from the record high reached during February 1956.

While I would not minimize the seriousness of a situation which finds the Government owning outright or having under loan $7.6 billion worth of farm commodities, I am gratified that at long last our accumulations are decreasing, rather than increasing. There could never be solid, basic strength in free-market prices of farm products so long as production continued to outstrip demand and new surpluses were piled upon old surpluses year after year.

LARGE AGRICULTURAL BUDGET

Only last month, the President submitted to Congress the largest agricultural budget in history. It calls for expenditures totaling $5.3 billion during the next fiscal year. This represents an increase of $2.4 billion over the budget submitted for the first full fiscal year of the Eisenhower administration.

During the last fiscal year, realized costs of programs designed primarily to support farm prices and income reached $1.9 billion. This figure is equal to about 16 percent of farm operators' net income in 1956. The costs of these programs will probably increase sharply during 1957 as our surplus-disposal efforts are stepped up and the soil bank gets into full operation.

In pointing to these vast outlays, I neither criticize nor apologize. If the programs they represent are considered temporary for the

most part and, if they get the job done, it will be money well spent. To have taken any other course would have been even more costly and, in the long run, harmful to American agriculture.

CORN PROBLEM

Because corn is so important to the farm economy of part of your State, I should like to speak briefly on the problems posed by the present price-support program.

In a referendum held December 11, 1956, corn farmers were given a choice between a continuation of the allotment program and a shift to a "base acreage" program for 3 years, after which acreage controls would no longer apply. As you know, 61 percent of the corn farmers who voted approved the base-acreage approach, but this fell short of the two-thirds required under the law.

As a result, we must now administer a corn program with allotments fixed according to law at a very low level, 37.3 million acres. Price supports were set in accordance with a schedule provided by law at $1.36 per bushel. The allotment is so low that compliance will in all likelihood be negligible. Few corn farmers will be inclined to reduce below their limited allotments in order to participate in the soil bank. Consequently, corn supplies could increase further, corn prices could be low, livestock production could be excessive and the whole feed-grain-livestock balance could be disturbed.

The problem is broader than corn. Farmers who have signed up or expect to participate in the acreage reserve program with cotton or wheat or tobacco, or even in the conservation reserve, must plant within their corn acreage allotments. It seems obvious that we need a new program which would give farmers a realistic corn acreage allotment for price support purposes and would provide a basis for operating an acreage reserve program.

People tell me that the base acreage program would have carried in the referendum except for the feeling that corn was being removed from the list of "basic" commodities.

Corn is a basic crop economically and legally. I have no wish to see it removed from the list of basic crops. In fact, I would be happy to see it designated as a "super-basic" crop if the Congress wishes because that is what it is. What I desire and what corn farmers desire is a program that works. The evidence is that the corn allotment program does not work. Sixty-one percent of the corn farmers who voted have said essentially that and we should heed their counsel.

DROUGHT PROBLEM

As you know so well, here in South Dakota, all or parts of 15 States are in the grip of a severe and prolonged drought. This drought, now in its 6th and 7th years in some areas, has exhausted the resources of many farmers and ranchers. Despite the fine spirit of these people and despite a broad program of assistance on the part of the Federal Government, the situation remains critical for many families.

President Eisenhower recently made a 2-day tour of the drought area. At the same time a special meeting on drought and other natural disasters was held at Wichita, Kans., involving some 190 farmers, ranchers, businessmen, agricultural leaders and workers, and Government officials. At the close of his tour the President received progress reports from this group and expressed his own views as well.

As immediate steps in meeting the drought problem, these proposals have been laid before the Congress, with the President's approval:

1. Authority has been requested to use $25 million from the disaster revolving fund, to provide additional emergency feed assistance to farmers and ranchers in the drought area.

2. Extension until June 30, 1958, has been requested for $25 million of unobligated funds appropriated for Agricultural Conservation to enable the Department of Agriculture to make payments to farmers to carry out wind-erosion and other emergency conservation measures.

3. An additional appropriation of $26 million has been requested under Title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, primarily for refinancing farm indebtedness by direct loans.

Longer range measures already in operation include the Great Plains Program, the program on upper watersheds and the Conservation Reserve of the Soil Bank.

During the period from June 30, 1953, through August 31, 1956, the Department of Agriculture provided $629 million of Federal funds in order to relieve distress brought about by natural disasters, chiefly drought. This is in addition to purchase programs for livestock products, which had their origin at least partly in drought problems. In South Dakota we have made available nearly $6.5 million in the form of emergency credit, feed grain and roughage and free food.

From our extensive experience in administering emergency drought programs, the one conclusion which stands out among all others is an urgent need to make these programs a joint undertaking by the Federal, State and local governments. We believe this would materially improve the effectiveness and administration of these programs. Greater State and local responsibility would facilitate the development of programs better adapted to the particular circumstances within individual States.

There is one thing about our people in the drought-stricken areas which has always impressed me, as I know it did the President on his recent tour. That is their courage, their determination to stick it out. They look to the future with confidence and I am enough of an optimist to believe that confidence will be vindicated.

The best years for American agriculture are still ahead of us. Research, education, and market expansion—the tools which have brought so much progress to our farms in the past—promise even greater gains for the future. Agriculture must be geared to keep pace with the ever-expanding demands for the products of American farms and ranches, for ours is a growing, dynamic Nation.

I am convinced that our farm economy is headed in the right direction and I base that conviction upon the fact that agricultural prices are rising while surpluses are diminishing. With such weapons as the Soil Bank, more adequate farm credit and increased authority to push consumption of agricultural products both at home and abroad, we can effectively continue the fight to win for farmers a greater share of our record-breaking national income.

The future is bright—our problems of today are only passing ones.

May God grant us the vision and the resolution to work toward greater freedom for our farm people in a healthy, expanding and prosperous agricultural economy.

# SENATE

## MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1957

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, in whom alone is the strength of our hearts and the hope of our world, we come in this noonday fellowship of prayer, not so much to seek Thee, as to open our fitful, faltering lives in penitence to Thy waiting strength. In the midst of events so global and colossal that, as individuals on the confused world stage, we seem so puny and inadequate, lift us from small routines into the only greatness we shall ever know, by using us as the channels of Thy purpose and intent for mankind. Give us spaciousness of mind and a transparent purity of heart such as characterize true brotherhood which spans all barriers of border and breed and birth, so that we may see clearly and follow faithfully the things that belong to our peace and to the peace of this wounded, weary world. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 14, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Arthur H. Compton as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; and

H. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 additional copies of House Report No. 2966, 84th Congress;

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on the national highway program for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives; and

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on excise taxes held by the Committee on Ways and Means during the 84th Congress, 2d session.

## HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following joint resolutions were each read twice by their titles and referred or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Arthur H. Compton as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

H. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the board of regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress; placed on the calendar.

## HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following concurrent resolutions were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 additional copies of House Report No. 2966, 84th Congress:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That there shall be printed 5,000 additional copies of the report of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives entitled 'Price Discrimination, the Robinson-Patman Act, and the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws' (H. Rept. No. 2966, 84th Cong.), of which 4,000 copies shall be for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the House document room."

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on the national highway program for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held by said committee during the 84th Congress, 2d session, on the national highway program."

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on excise taxes held by the Committee on Ways and Means during the 84th Congress, 2d session:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 2,500 additional copies of the hearings on excise taxes held by that committee during the 84th Congress, 2d session."

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to make an announcement for the information of the Senate.

First, I desire to apologize to the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. In my absence, it was stated—I am sure with the best of intentions and with no desire whatever to usurp the prerogatives of the majority leader—that on Washington's Birthday, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] would read Washington's Farewell Address. In the spirit of comity which exists between the leadership of the two sides in a 49-to-47 Senate, I plan to support that announcement, although it was made without my knowledge. I point to it only for the purpose of suggesting that an attempt be made to keep me informed, even if I am not in the Senate, about the days on which the Senate will meet.

Mr. President, after consulting with various Members of the Senate, including the distinguished minority leader, it has been agreed that we should make an announcement as far in advance as possible in regard to the Easter recess, for two reasons: First, so that no significance may be attached to our taking a normal recess, other than the purpose of the recess itself; and, second, so that all Members may know how to make their plans.

The leadership will recommend to the Senate that the Senate go over from Thursday before Good Friday until the following Monday. If our motion is supported by a majority, that will be done; and I understand that such an arrangement has the approval of the minority leader. On Monday, we plan to have a session of the Senate, but no votes, insofar as we are able to control the situation. Senators may make speeches, but all Senators may be informed that if they need to be in their States on Monday and Tuesday, they will be at liberty to do so, with the understanding that the leadership will attempt to protect them from the taking of votes.

On Wednesday, we plan to have another session of the Senate, and all Senators should be prepared to be present and to vote, in case voting is necessary.

To summarize: Senators should be prepared to be in the Senate on Thursday before Good Friday; and at the conclusion of the business of the Senate on that day, we plan to go over until Monday. On Monday, we plan to go over until Wednesday. But Senators should be prepared to be in their seats and ready to vote on the Thursday before Good Friday and on the Wednesday following Good Friday.

Let me ask whether that announcement is clear, and whether it is in accordance with the understanding of the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, Mr. President; let me say to the Senator from Texas that his announcement is in accordance with my understanding; and the proposed arrangement, as the Senator from Texas has explained it, is satisfactory.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend, the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I think perhaps the distinguished Senator from Texas misunderstood my question of last Friday. My question was whether we would have a business session of the Senate on Washington's birthday, the coming Friday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The answer is no.

Mr. IVES. In other words, no business will be transacted then, except for the reading of Washington's Farewell Address?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Farewell Address will be read by the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], as has been announced. I may say to the Senator, for his information, that sometimes in the past the Senate has been in session on Washington's Birthday, and sometimes it has not been in session on that day. However, because announcement has been made that the Senator from Arizona will read Washington's Farewell Address on Friday, I do not want the Senator from Arizona and his constituents to expect that on Friday he will read Washington's Farewell Address, but that the Senate will not then be in session. So the Senate will be in session at that time, but no business will be transacted, insofar as the taking of yea-and-nay votes is concerned. At that time Senators may make insertions in the RECORD and may make speeches, but we shall attempt to protect Senators from the taking of votes on that day.

I am sorry I did not previously have information about the arrangement made for Washington's Birthday anniversary, but the announcement was made without my knowledge, and I am attempting to proceed in accordance with the announcement.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Are we to understand that on Washington's Birthday, speeches on the Middle East joint resolution may be made by Senators?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes; any speeches which Senators may care to make on that day may be made; but no votes will be taken.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Texas.

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are 2 or 3 matters which I must place in the RECORD at this time, as I have to do occasionally. If other Senators will indulge me, so that I may do so, and so that I may then go on to plan other matters for the Senate, I should like to make the insertions at this time, now that I have been recognized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

## NEGOTIATIONS ON THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the headlines describe the situation in the Middle East as an impasse and a deadlock. I hope this will not revive the talk about sanctions or other methods of coercion.

An impasse or a deadlock can be broken by one of two methods. Either the parties will be persuaded somehow to keep on talking, or they will go ahead and fight.

We seek peace, not war. This means that we seek talking, rather than fighting. I hope the possibilities will be explored of finding means, other than direct coercion, of keeping some form of negotiation going—possibly through a third party.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to announce it will be our purpose not to call the Executive Calendar today, but to proceed immediately to the consideration of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, at the conclusion of which we shall take up the resolutions on the calendar relating to citations for contempt. When they are concluded, we hope to proceed with the discussion of the Middle East resolution.

I am not one who cares to speculate on the amount of time it may take to discuss the resolution, but I hope, after studying the history of discussions of general importance in this historic Chamber, my colleagues may feel that by the end of next week it will be possible for us to act on the Middle East resolution.

The troops-to-Europe resolution was in committee some 50 days, I believe. I say that for the information of those who may think we have been dragging our feet on the Middle East resolution, and so people who live in glass houses will not be throwing stones. The same matter was debated in the Senate for 20 or 21 days. We have improved somewhat the administration of the business of the Senate and the efficiency of its operation, because of the very fine attitude that exists among all Members of the Senate. I sometimes think we have 95 leaders in the Senate and one follower.

I told Mrs. Johnson one night, when I had trouble sleeping and she thought I ought to be able to go to sleep, that I had read that Margaret Fuller once said, "I accept the universe," and Carlyle replied, "My gad, she'd better." Margaret Fuller said she had never encountered an intellect equal to her own.

I said, "I would not repeat that statement, but I can say I deal with 95 men each day who do have such intellects."

I hope all Senators will understand that in arranging the schedule of the Senate, we try to arrange it for the majority and to accommodate Senators on both sides. But the Middle East resolution is a very important measure. The President has asked for the resolution. Some of our best-informed Senators have spent days and evenings studying it. They have made their contributions. They have made their recommendations. Amendments will be offered. We hope the resolution can be passed by the end of next week, or certainly by the early part of the following week. That will give Senators adequate time to offer amendments in an attempt to improve it in any way they can, but I hope the resolution can be agreed to in substantially the form in which it was reported by the committee.

## APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announces his approval of the following appointments:

Nineteen hundred and fifty-seven Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy: Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia; Senator CHARLES E. POTTER, of Michigan; Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, of Kentucky.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-seven Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy: Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island; Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota; Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-seven Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy: Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-seven Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy: Senator WILLIAM A. PURTELL, of Connecticut.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-seven Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy: Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico; Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, of North Dakota; Senator GORDON ALLOTT, of Colorado.

National Monument Commission: Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky; vice Senator George H. Bender, of Ohio.

Board of Directors of Gallaudet College: Senator EDWARD J. THYE, of Minnesota, reappointment.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

### PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH (S. DOC. NO. 27)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental appropriations for the legislative branch in the amount of $845,000 for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

### EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistant Act of 1954, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

### REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A confidential letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the 6-month period, July–December 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

### REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation in that Department; to the Committee on Appropriations.

### DORTHY E. GREEN AND THELMA L. ALLEY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Dorthy E. Green and Thelma L. Alley (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

### APPOINTMENT OF NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR, MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART, INC.

A letter from the national commander, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, Inc., Washington, D. C., informing the Senate of the appointment of Victor F. Kubly as national legislative director for the Military Order of the Purple Heart, Inc., effective February 14, 1957; to the Committee on Armed Services.

### SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT ON STUDY OF SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF NICKEL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplementary report dated February 15, 1957, to report entitled "Study of Supply and Distribution of Nickel," of that Department, dated December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

### AUDIT REPORTS ON ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

### AUDIT REPORT ON SOUTHEASTERN POWER SYSTEM AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on southeastern power system and related activities, Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, and Southeastern Power Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

### REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering personal property made available for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil-defense organizations, and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

### AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

### CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, LITTLE WOOD RIVER PROJECT, IDAHO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Little Wood River project, Idaho, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the

production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROHIBITION OF TRANSMISSION OF CERTAIN GAMBLING INFORMATION IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit the transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

WILLIAM HENRY DIMENT, MRS. MARY ELLEN DIMENT, AND MRS. GLADYS EVERINGHAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, and Mrs. Gladys Everingham (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 2

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to repeal the transportation excise taxes

"Whereas for the purpose of meeting wartime emergency necessity, the Congress of the United States enacted as excise taxes a levy upon the transportation of persons and property; and

"Whereas one of the principal purposes of levying such tax upon the transportation of persons was to discourage unnecessary wartime travel; and

"Whereas today, 12 years after the cessation of hostilities, there continues a 10 percent levy on the transportation of persons and a 3 percent levy on the transportation of property; and

"Whereas it is the opinion of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado that excise taxes should not impose an unfair burden on the long distance shipper and the long distance traveler as does the present tax on the transportation of property and persons; and

"Whereas it should be a principle of Federal taxation to levy taxes in such a manner as to prevent them from falling as an unequal burden on citizens residing in different areas of the country; and

"Whereas the distances to, from, and within the West impose an unfair burden on the western traveler and shipper; and

"Whereas the present transportation tax on property is unfairly burdensome upon the State of Colorado as it adds what is in effect an additional tariff on the goods shipped from Colorado to the eastern and western markets; and

"Whereas the development and preservation of open markets leads to the efficient development and stimulation of the agricultural resources of the Nation; and

"Whereas the State of Colorado is particularly interested in preserving the eastern and western markets as open markets in which the agricultural products of Colorado, may compete freely without the hindrance of artificial barriers such as the present transportation tax; and

"Whereas the State of Colorado is particularly interested in protecting and developing its vacation and tourist travel on an equal basis with other vacation travel areas; and

"Whereas the transportation of both persons and property plays such a vital role in the economic life of this country to the extent that the costs of transportation should always be kept at the lowest possible level; and

"Whereas transportation is in no sense a luxury but is a vital necessity and there is, therefore, sound reason for distinguishing between the transportation taxes and other excise taxes that are imposed upon luxury items; and

"Whereas it is the opinion of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado that the best interest of the country and particularly the Western States, who are now discriminated against by the present transportation taxes, would be served by a repeal of those taxes; and

"Whereas there is presently pending before the Congress of the United States legislation which would repeal the tax on transportation of property and which would repeal the tax on transportation of persons: Now, therefore be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the 41st General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein)*, That the General Assembly of the State of Colorado respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact into law such legislation or any other bill or bills which would accomplish the same purpose; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from Colorado in the Congress of the United States.

"FRANK L. HAYS,
*"President of the senate.*
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
*"Secretary of the senate.*
"CHARLES R. CONKLIN,
*"Speaker of the house of representatives.*
"LEE MATTIES,
*"Chief clerk of the house of representatives."*

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to making adequate appropriations for authorized reclamation projects

"Whereas Colorado has several water-development projects which have been authorized for construction under the Federal reclamation laws; and

"Whereas the completion of these projects on a progressive and economical construction schedule is most desirable from the standpoint of the State and Nation: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the 41st General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein)*, That the Congress of the United States of America, be and it is hereby memorialized to appropriate adequate funds so that the authorized reclamation projects in Colorado and the units of the Colorado River storage project can proceed on a progressive and economical construction schedule; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator GORDON ALLOTT, United States Senator JOHN A. CARROLL, Representatives in Congress BYRON G. ROGERS, WILLIAM S. HILL, J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, and WAYNE N. ASPINALL, the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation.

"FRANK L. HAYS,
*"President of the senate.*
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
*"Secretary of the senate.*
"CHARLES R. CONKLIN,
*"Speaker of the house of representatives.*
"LEE MATTIES,
*"Chief Clerk, house of representatives."*

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Finance:

"H. R. 98

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take corrective measures to equalize imports; and for other purposes

"Whereas the impact of imports of steel, toys, recreational equipment, textiles, and similar materials has more than a direct effect upon the economy of this Nation; and

"Whereas it is important to maintain, within the bounds of this Nation, facilities for the production of such items and to have the equipment utilized in such production available for use of this Nation in times of national emergency; and

"Whereas the importation of foreign produced goods that are produced by laborers that have failed to achieve the standards of living of the American laborer and to enable these goods to be placed on the market to compete with American-made goods endangers the living standard of the American laborer; and

"Whereas these foreign-made products, with few exceptions, are grossly inferior to comparable American-made products; and

"Whereas it is desirable that corrective measures be taken to prevent foreign produced goods from obtaining a marketing advantage in American markets over American produced goods: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia*, That the Federal Government be memorialized to take appropriate action to equalize the imports of steel, toys, recreational equipment, textiles, and other foreign produced goods so as to protect the economy of the American people; be it further

*"Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Georgia delegation in

the Congress of the United States, to the President of the United States; to the clerk of both Houses of the Congress of the United States; to the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, and to the Secretary of the Department of Commerce."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

*"To the Honorable Fred Seaton, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable James Murray, Chairman of Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the United States Senate; the Honorable Clair Engle, Chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Felix Wormser, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Minerals; the Honorable Waino Hendrickson, Acting Governor of Alaska; the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska; and to the United States Congress:*

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 23d session assembled, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas there is located on the highly mineralized Seward Peninsula of northwestern Alaska over 1,000 square miles that are considered by the United States Geological Survey and the United States Bureau of Mines to have commercial tin possibilities; and

"Whereas there are within this area large quantities of tin-bearing material proven by test drilling; and

"Whereas World War II spotlighted the appalling lack of tin in the United States, either stockpiled or in the ground, as known reserves; and

"Whereas two-thirds of the world supply of tin is produced in those countries now under the influence of or dominated by communism; and

"Whereas Asia, and particularly Malaya, Indonesia, and Thailand, the chief source of supply, would immediately be cut off in case of war; and

"Whereas Bolivia, the remaining chief source of supply, has through expropriation and nationalization of tin rendered the industry extremely unstable and precarious; and

"Whereas a dependable supply of tin is an absolute essential to our ever-expanding economy and to our national security both in time of war and peace: Now, therefore,

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 23d regular session assembled, urges that the Congress of the United States enact legislation to bring domestic tin into the same category as tungsten and other strategic metals, extending over a period of years sufficient to allow ample time for privately financed exploration, and thereafter development and production from the existing domestic deposits and those which may be discovered.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the Senate February 4, 1957.

"VICTOR C. RIVERS,
*"President of the senate.*

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
*"Secretary of the senate.*

"Passed by the House February 11, 1957.

"RICHARD J. CREUEL,
*"Speaker of the house.*

"Attest:

"DOLORES D. GOAD,
*"Chief clerk of the house."*

The petition of Joseph Camp and Della M. Camp, of Redondo Beach, Calif., relating to the construction of atomic-bomb shelters; to the Committee on Armed Services.

The memorial of Leroy H. Duncan, of Homer, Alaska, remonstrating against the admission into the Union of Alaska as a State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Holy Name Society of St. Adalbert's Parish, Elizabeth, N. J., expressing disapproval of an invitation to Marshal Tito to visit the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. THURMOND):

A concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Concurrent resolution to memorialize the United States Department of Agriculture to measure the acreage allotment of cotton, tobacco, peanut, and wheat farmers sufficiently early each year to enable such farmers to plant other crops in case the acreage planted is in excess of that allotted

"Whereas the cotton, tobacco, peanut, and wheat farmers of the State operate under acreage allotments set by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas it is required that the acreage planted in these crops be measured by a representative of the United States Department of Agriculture; and

"Whereas the representatives of such Department seldom measure the acreage planted until it is too late to plant another crop if the particular acreage of cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and wheat is found to be in excess of that allowed the particular farmer by the United States Department of Agriculture; and

"Whereas it is essential that such crops be measured sufficiently early each year in order that any excess may be plowed under in time to permit the planting of another crop; and if the acreage in the particular crop is found to be under that allowed, then more of the same may be planted: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)* that the United States Department of Agriculture is memorialized to have acreage allotted to cotton, tobacco, peanut, and wheat farmers of the State of South Carolina measured each year not later than May 1 in order that any excess acreage may be plowed under and shortage may be added to while it is still time to plant; be it further

*"Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture in Washington and that a copy of this resolution be furnished each United States Senator from South Carolina and each Member of the House of Representatives of the Congress from South Carolina, and that they be urged to assist in this matter which is vital to the farmers of the State.

"[SEAL] INEZ WATSON,
*"Clerk of the house."*

A concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to make additional money available for the soil-bank program

"Whereas the purpose of the soil-bank program is to help curb the surplus of certain farm commodities by paying the farmers not to plant certain crops; and

"Whereas many farmers who desire to take advantage of this program are unable to do so as there is a limited amount of money available for the program; and

"Whereas the purpose of this program cannot be effectively carried out unless additional funds are made available: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring),* That Congress be memorialized to take such action as will provide the soil-bank program with such additional funds as may be necessary to allow all farmers an opportunity to participate in the program; be it further

*"Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all Members of Congress from South Carolina.

"[SEAL] INEZ WATSON,
*"Clerk of the house."*

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to exert its efforts on behalf of the agricultural and livestock industries of New Mexico

"Whereas the agricultural and livestock industries of New Mexico, due to the prolonged and extreme drought conditions that now exist in this State, are in extreme financial difficulties; and

"Whereas users of contract workers in the 11 Western States under the present work contract between Mexico and the United States are now being inspected by the United States Department of Labor to determine if all employers are meeting the maximum housing requirements out in the work contract; and

"Whereas the maximum housing requirements are excessive according to present standards, nonetheless, if such standards are not met, a $10,000 fine and a sentence of 1 year in jail may be imposed and the contract workers taken away; and

"Whereas the minimum housing standards are presently adequate, suitable, and equal in quality to others provided for domestic workers in the area, and under present economic conditions on farms and ranches of this area are all that can be financially afforded; and

"Whereas this legislature is of the opinion that the enforcement of the rigid maximum compliance regulations on housing will add more economic burdens to the already severely depressed agricultural and livestock industries of New Mexico: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico,* That the Congress of the United States of America be hereby memorialized to earnestly exert its efforts with the United States Department of Labor on behalf of the economy of the agricultural and livestock industries of New Mexico in order that the maximum compliance regulations on housing under the work contract agreement between the United States Government and Mexico be eased and that housing suitable to the climate and of equal quality provided for domestic workers be acceptable; be it further

*"Resolved,* That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the Congress of the United States and addressed to the Members of Congress from the State of New Mexico.

"JOE M. MONTOYA,
*"President of the senate.*

"GRACE MCAFEE,
*"Chief clerk, senate.*

"DONALD D. HALLAM,
*"Speaker, house of representatives.*

"FLOYD CROSS,
*"Chief clerk, house of representatives."*

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

"House Joint Memorial 7

"Joint memorial memorializing the congressional delegation from New Mexico to have an Atomic Energy Commission use their best efforts to have an Atomic Energy Commission uranium concentrate buying station established in New Mexico.

"Whereas New Mexico has the largest proven uranium reserves in the entire world; and

"Whereas New Mexico is the logical center for the uranium industry in the United States; and

"Whereas under the present circumstances, it is necessary for millers of uranium ore to ship their product to Grand Junction, Colo., at great expense and inconvenience; and

"Whereas great benefits would accrue to the State of New Mexico and a savings to the Atomic Energy Commission and to the United States of America if a uranium concentrate buying station were established in this State; Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Legislature of New Mexico,* That the congressional delegation from New Mexico be urged to use their best efforts to have an Atomic Energy Commission uranium concentrate buying station established in New Mexico; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That a copy of this memorial be sent to each member of the congressional delegation from New Mexico.

"DONALD D. HALLAM,
*"Speaker, house of representatives.*
"FLOYD CROSS,
*"Chief clerk, house of representatives.*
"JOE M. MONTOYA,
*"President, senate.*
"GRACE MCAFEE,
*"Chief clerk, senate.*

"Approved by me this 13th day of February 1957.

"EDWIN L. MECHEM,
*"Governor, State of New Mexico."*

## RESOLUTION OF OREGON STATE SENATE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have received from the Oregon State Senate a copy of Senate Memorial No. 1, concerning the termination law for the Klamath Indian Reservation in Oregon, Public Law 587 of the 83d Congress.

This memorial, among other findings, calls for the enactment of legislation postponing the effective date of the termination program so that a substitute comprehensive plan may be provided which will protect the irreplaceable timber resources of the Klamath Reservation as well as the interests of the Klamath tribe.

On January 9 I have introduced S. 469, cosponsored by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], which would provide a postponement of termination for the purpose of making such changes. Hearings have been held, and I expect that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will soon report this legislation to the Senate. I also plan to introduce legislation to provide for the purchase of the timber stands of the Klamath Reservation from the tribe so that they may be added to the national forests for long-range, sustained yield management in the best interests of the Indians and of the economy of the area in which the reservation is located.

I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself that Senate Memorial No. 1, adopted by the Oregon State Senate on February 7, 1957, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, under the rule, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:*

We, your memorialists, the Senate of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas under Public Law 587 of the 83d Congress, it is provided for termination of the Klamath Indian Reservation; and

Whereas as a part of said legislation it is further provided that an appraisal shall be made of the assets of said tribe, to be completed in February 1957, after which the members of said tribe shall have the opportunity to elect to withdraw from said tribe and convert their interest into money, immediately upon completion of said appraisal; and

Whereas said policy may lead to a forced liquidation of a fine stand of pine timber, does not provide for sustained yield, and is opposed by the management specialists employed to put said act into effect; and

Whereas said bill does not provide for a period of rehabilitation wherein the Indians on said reservation will be prepared intellectually and emotionally to become full-fledged members of our society; and

Whereas said law does not provide for a guaranteed fair market value of said resources, does not reserve to the members of the tribe the right to bid on the assets of the reservation, and does not make any provision regarding hunting and fishing rights: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon:* That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to provide stopgap legislation extending the period of time in which Public Law 587 is to become effective; be it further

*Resolved,* That the Oregon Members of the United States and House of Representatives promote and support such legislation; be it further

*Resolved,* That a substitute comprehensive law be enacted, providing for liquidation of the assets of the Klamath Tribe over an extended period of time, for protection of the timber resources on a sustained yield basis, for education and rehabilitation of the members of the tribe at the cost of the Federal Government, and for continued consultation with the members of the tribe regarding promulgation and carrying out of the proposed legislation; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and hereby is directed to send a copy of this memorial to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, Vice President of the United States, to the Honorable Frederick A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to the President and Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to all Members of the Oregon congressional delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by senate February 7, 1957.

[SEAL]

ZYLPHA ZELL BURNS,
*Chief clerk of senate.*
BOYD R. OVERHULNE,
*President of senate.*

## RESOLUTIONS OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is unavoidably away from the Senate today on business, and has asked me to bring the following matter to the attention of the Senate. He has just received a resolution from the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota. This resolution passed the Minnesota Legislature on February 7 and was approved by the Governor on February 11. It memorializes the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Army to reconsider a recently announced policy requiring 6 months of active duty training of members of the National Guard, to the end that more realistic and workable requirements, agreeable to the State, be prescribed.

The junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] also received another resolution from the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota which I bring to the attention of the Senate. This resolution passed the Minnesota Legislature on February 6 and was approved by the Governor on February 11. It memorializes the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to secure a removal of all military facilities and activities from Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport-Wold-Chamberlain Field, located in Hennepin County, Minn.

On behalf of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I ask unanimous consent that the text of these resolutions be printed at this point in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolution 1

"Resolution memorializing the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Army to reconsider a recently announced policy requiring 6 months of active duty training of members of the National Guard, to the end that more realistic and workable requirements, agreeable to the State, be prescribed

"Whereas the Minnesota National Guard, in Minnesota's 100 years of statehood, has a distinguished record of service to the State and Nation in war and peace and its continued existence in strength and effectiveness, and, its status as both a Federal and State force is vital to the State and the Nation; and

"Whereas the qualifications for membership therein are, under the United States Constitution, the exclusive responsibility of the State; and

"Whereas no changes in the qualifications of National Guard membership should be effected by the Federal Government without the consent of the State; and

"Whereas a directive has recently been issued by the Department of Defense and the Secretary of the Army, establishing a policy, to become effective April 1, 1957, which will require all non-prior-service enlistees in the National Guard to perform 6 months of active military training as a condition of enlistment; and

"Whereas the purported intent of this change in policy is to improve the training and the combat readiness of the National Guard, which is an objective the State and the military authorities thereof are constantly striving to achieve; and

"Whereas it is believed a compulsory 6 months active training program for all members of the National Guard will not gain the desired objectives as to training and readiness for the reasons that such a program is difficult to reconcile in the educational and employment planning of our young men and will so greatly reduce the rate of enlistments as to make it impossible for the National Guard to fulfill its responsibilities to the State and Nation and under such a program there is serious question that it can long survive; and

"Whereas it would appear that there should be a common ground for the establishment of a practical and workable solution to the enlistment and requirements of the National Guard which will be acceptable both to the State and Federal Government: Now, therefore be it

*"Resolved by the house of representatives, the senate concurring,* That the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army, reconsider the action which has been taken in prescribing a compulsory 6 months training program for all non-prior-service members of the National Guard and in collaboration with the Governor and the adjutant general of Minnesota, and those of other States, establish realistic and workable policies relative to the enlistment and training of the National Guard, which will assure it continued maintenance of strength and effectiveness in the State and Nation's plan of national defense; be it further

*"Resolved,* That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota, be instructed to transmit copies of this joint resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army, and to each Member of Congress of the United States from the State of Minnesota.

"A. I. JOHNSON,
*"Speaker of the house of representatives.*
"KARL F. ROLVAAG,
*"President of the senate.*

"Passed house of representatives February 6, 1957.

"G. H. LEAHY,
*"Chief clerk, house of representatives.*

"Passed senate February 7, 1957.

"H. Y. TERRY,
*"Secretary of the senate.*

"Approved February 11, 1957.

"ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
*"Governor of the State of Minnesota.*

"Filed February 11, 1957.

"JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,
*"Secretary of the State of Minnesota."*

To the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Resolution 2

"Resolution memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to secure a removal of all military facilities and activities from Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport-Wold-Chamberlain Field, located in Hennepin County, Minn.

"Whereas the Minneapolis-St. Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission is a public corporation created, organized, and operating under the laws of the State of Minnesota, Minnesota Statutes 1953, sections 360.101–360.125;

"Whereas such commission acting under and as required by the act creating it did on August 14, 1944, take possession of Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport-Wold-Chamberlain Field and did on that date take over the operation, management, maintenance, and development of such field, and has at all times since and is now in possession of such field and operating, managing, maintaining, and developing the same;

"Whereas such field was established as a civil airport and at all times since such establishment has been operated as a civil airport, to which commercial airlines have been and are carrying on very extensive passenger, mail, and cargo operations;

"Whereas the military—Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, and Minnesota National Guard—have facilities in the vicinity of such field and are engaged in military aviation activities to, from, and in the vicinity of such field, including as a part thereof the operation of jet military aircraft;

"Whereas the operation of jet military aircraft by the military resulted in several crashes during the spring of 1956 resulting in loss of life and destruction of property;

"Whereas military aviation operations at such field are deemed by the commission as detrimental to the safe and efficient operation of the airport as a civil airport, and constitute a constant hazard to residents living in the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul and the village of Richfield and to all others living in the general vicinity of the airport;

"Whereas the commission has gone on record from time to time as opposed to the continuance of said military aviation activities at such field and in connection therewith has suggested to the military that their facilities and activities be removed to another site well away from the populated areas of the cities and village aforesaid;

"Whereas a removal of the military from such airport will necessitate action by the Congress of the United States with the approval of the President of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota,* That the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States be requested to do all in their power to bring about the removal of all military facilities and activities from Wold-Chamberlain Field and from the vicinity thereof to a site to be acquired and facilities to be constructed by the Government well away from the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul and populated areas in the vicinity thereof; be it further

*"Resolved,* That the Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"A. I. JOHNSON,
*"Speaker of the house of representatives.*
"KARL F. ROLVAAG,
*"President of the senate.*

"Passed house of representatives February 1, 1957.

"G. H. LEAHY,
*"Chief clerk, house of representatives.*

"Passed senate February 6, 1957.

"HY TORREY,
*"Secretary of the senate.*

"Approved February 11, 1957.

"ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
*"Governor of the State of Minnesota.*

"Filed February 11, 1957.

"JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,
*"Secretary of the State of Minnesota."*

## RECOGNITION OF THE PRESENT HUNGARIAN GOVERNMENT—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, Senate Concurrent Resolution F, as approved by the 35th Legislative Assembly, State of North Dakota, on January 8, 1957. The resolution opposes recognition of the present Hungarian Government as being nonrepresentative of the people of Hungary.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution F

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Government of the United States not to recognize the Kadar regime as the present Hungarian Government.

Whereas the valiant efforts on the part of the Hungarian people to secure for themselves a free and independent government have been repressed by the forces of the Russian Government in order to retain its control over the Hungarian people; and

Whereas the act of the Russian Government in killing so many thousands of unarmed Hungarian civilians has shocked the entire world; and

Whereas the present Government of Hungary which is the Kadar regime is merely a puppet government of Soviet Russia and does not represent the people of Hungary, but is used in carrying out Russian policies of world domination: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein),* That the Government of the United States do not recognize the Kadar regime as the present Government of Hungary and; be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the senate to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

CLYDE DUFFY,
*President of the senate.*
VIC GILBREATH,
*Secretary of the senate.*
B. J. WOLF,
*Speaker of the house.*
GERALD L. STARR,
*Chief clerk of the house.*

## REPEAL OF TRANSPORTATION TAX, AND PENALTY FOR PER DIEM CHARGES—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. YOUNG. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two resolutions adopted by the Northwest Shippers Advisory Board at its 34th annual meeting held at St. Paul, Minn., January 31, 1957. These resolutions suggest the repeal of the transportation tax on passenger, sleeping car accommodations, and freight, and support of legislation which will give the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to impose penalty per diem charges in periods of emergency.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NORTHWEST SHIPPERS ADVISORY BOARD AT ITS 34TH ANNUAL MEETING, ST. PAUL, MINN., JANUARY 31, 1957

REPEAL OF TRANSPORTATION TAX

Whereas the transportation tax on passenger and sleeping car accommodations was a war measure to discourage travel; and

Whereas the transportation tax on freight was a war measure to increase revenue for the conduct of World War II; and

Whereas inasmuch as the assessment of these taxes places an undue burden on the shipping and traveling public and further handicaps common carriers in their efforts

to meet competition of private transportation; and

Whereas this unfavorable situation has been further aggravated by successive increases in freight charges: Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Northwest Shippers Advisory Board instruct its secretary to transmit its opposition to these taxes to all Members of Congress from the States comprising this board area and to members of the Senate and House Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PENALTY PER DIEM CHARGES

*Resolved*, That this board go on record as supporting legislation which is presently pending before Congress which will give the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to impose penalty per diem charges in periods of threatened emergency: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Northwest Shippers Advisory Board instruct the Secretary to transmit this resolution to members of the Senate and House Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and all congressional members of the board area States.

## THIRTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the Ukrainian people are now celebrating the 39th anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence. In that connection, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, president of the North Dakota Branch of Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., be printed in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that a Ukrainian Independence Day declaration signed by many residents of Ukrainian descent and the transcript of a radio broadcast presented over a North Dakota radio station on the significance of Ukrainian independence be likewise printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and declaration were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS
COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
*Bismarck, N. Dak., February 9, 1957.*

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
*United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: We are privileged to communicate to you, as a friend of long standing of groups and peoples fighting for freedom and against the threat of Communist conquest of the world, that many communities of our State have held a solemn celebration of the 39th anniversary of the proclamation of the Ukrainian Independence in Kiev on the 22d day of January 1918.

In connection with our celebrations in our State which went on simultaneously with the dignified marking of Ukrainian Independence Day in the Nation's Capital by prayers being read by members of the Ukrainian Church hierarchy in the United States Senate and in the House of Representatives, many communities have unanimously adopted a statement of unity of purpose in the fight for the liberation of our Ukrainian brothers enslaved within the Communist empire, the text of Ukrainian Independence Day declaration and speech given, we submit herewith for your possible utilization in your legislative activities, and I would appreciate your inserting these statements, including this letter, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a matter of public record.

Respectfully yours,

DR. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
*President, UCCA, State Branch of North Dakota.*

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY DECLARATION

We, Americans of Ukrainian descent, gathered at a celebration of the 39th anniversary of the proclamation of the free, sovereign, independent and democratic Ukrainian National Republic by act of its parliament and government on January 22, 1918, hereby appeal to the conscience of the free world and to all free and freedom-loving nations to help the people of Ukraine enslaved by the colonial empire of Communist Russia to reassert their independence and once again join the proud ranks of free nations.

We protest on this anniversary of Ukrainian independence against the employment by Communist Russia of Ukrainian nationals in the ranks of the Soviet armed forces to crush the liberation movements of other nations and to be ordered to slaughter people rising and bidding for freedom. We also wish to call attention of the people of these United States to the fact that the fate of Ukrainians living in the so-called satellite countries or people's democracies is no better than within the Soviet Union. Most recent reports assert that about a quarter of a million Ukrainians in Poland are being subjected to persecution along with Jews, Byelorussians and others. This fact has been editorially reported in the New York Times of January 10, 1957, and should serve as a warning to the free world that in spite of ostensible ideological differences, the dictators of the satellite countries are dedicated partners of the Kremlin in the crimes of oppression, extermination and genocide committed upon people seeking freedom and constituting a threat to the colonial empire run by Moscow.

Ukrainians in their enslaved homeland and their blood-brothers scattered throughout the free world will never give up the fight until Ukraine is once again united, free and sovereign just like during the time of proclamation of the acts of independence and unity in Kiev on January 22, 1918 and 1919.

This community of Americans of Ukrainian descent in the city or Belfield, N. Dak., hereby goes on record as being of one heart and purpose with the freedom-seeking people of Ukraine until the day of final liberation.

Ann E. Palaniuk, Pearl M. Basaraba, Mary Shypkoski, Myri Gawrylow, Anna York, Oleksa Gawrylow, John N. Ewoniuk, William N. Kordonowy, Sam Ewoniul, Matt Hawerluk, Metro Dolyniuk, Steve Klem, Katie Logus, Mr. and Mrs. Mike Fedora, Mrs. Mary Makaruk, Wasyl Fedora, John Basaraba, Stephen Dolyniuk, Peter Kordon.

SIGNIFICANCE OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY CELEBRATION, 39TH ANNIVERSARY OF RENEWED UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

(Speech given by Steve F. Hlebichuk, vice president of State Branch of UCCA, Inc., over stations KFYR, Bismarck, N. Dak., KDIX, Dickinson, N. Dak., and KLPM, Minot, N. Dak., January 27, 1957)

On January 22, 1918, at the close of World War I, the Ukrainian people reached another milestone in their historic development when they established a united, democratic, and independent republic. The event was of epochal significance not only for the Ukrainians, but for the whole of Eastern Europe as well. After almost two centuries of foreign domination by Russia and Austria, Ukraine finally attained its full freedom and independence.

The young republic, which was prompt to call an all-national parliament, the Ukrainian Central Rada, promulgated a series of liberal laws affecting the social and economic life of the population and assuring all minorities of equal rights as full-fledged citizens, but Ukraine could not enjoy for long peace and prosperity in freedom.

Although the Red leaders, Lenin and Trotsky, recognized the independence and sovereignty of Ukraine, Bolshevik Russia unleashed its newly organized Red army and in a series of invasions and large-scale battles, succeeded in destroying the young independent State of Ukraine, and imposed upon the Ukrainian people—by force and terror so well demonstrated now in Hungary—the oppressive yoke of Russian communism. Even such a marked event as the union of all Ukrainian lands by an act of union of January 22, 1919, a year after the proclamation of independence, could not sustain the Ukrainian people in their effort to preserve their hardly won freedom in the face of the numerically superior forces of Communist Russia. By the end of 1920, the vast Ukrainian lands—with the exception of western Ukraine, Carpatho-Ukraine, and Bukovina and Bessarabia—were subjected to the totalitarian domination of Moscow.

The free world has lived to regret the downfall of the Ukrainian National Republic before the onslaught of Communist aggression. Thus, the great French statesman Georges Clemenceau admitted in 1924 that France and the Allied Powers had made a grave mistake in 1918–1919 by withholding armed aid from the Ukrainians in their fight against aggression and conquest by Moscow. Had this error not been committed, said Clemenceau, the world would not be facing such a dangerous enemy.

The martyrdom of the Ukrainian people under the Bolshevik regime has been measured by countless crimes committed against them by Moscow. But neither mass executions of Ukrainian patriots and deportations of millions of Ukrainians to Siberia, nor forcible Russification and outright genocide could ever break the determination of the Ukrainian people to regain their freedom and independence.

During and after World War II, the vast Ukrainian underground forces, led by the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), challenged Moscow's domination by stubborn and systematic resistance to Russia. Even in the Soviet slave-labor camps of Vorkuta, Norilsk, Karaganda, and others, the Ukrainian political prisoners have been bold and recalcitrant defenders of freedom and human decency, and have staged bloody strikes and rebellions that have shaken the entire system of Soviet slave labor camps in 1953 through 1956.

It is the spirit of independence that keeps the Ukrainian underground forces alive even today and the Ukrainian people united against the alien rule of Moscow. In May 1956, the Ukrainian partisans attacked several Soviet military supply trains in Ukraine. During the Hungarian revolution in November 1956, Ukrainian freedom fighters blew up Soviet supply trains en route to Hungary at the railroad stations of Stanislaviv, Kolomeya, Nadvirna, and Vorokhta in western Ukraine and in Carpatho-Ukraine. At the critical hour in Hungary, many Ukrainians from the Soviet armies not only refused to fight against the Hungarians, but went over to the latter's side with tanks and ammunition and joined the Hungarians in their struggle against the Russians.

Today, as Ukrainians the world over commemorate the 39th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, the free world must take cognizance of the plight of the Ukrainian people under Russian tyranny. For all these long years, the Ukrainians were almost alone and unaided in their struggle against Moscow. Russian tyranny, as evidenced in Hungary, is by no means limited to Ukraine; it threatens to spread in Asia and in the Middle East, and indeed, to the Western Hemisphere.

The celebration of the anniversary of the renewal of Ukrainian independence is the occasion for us Americans to think of the

future of the world, of the future of our America. Admiration alone for freedom fighters in Ukraine and Hungary and elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain will not help these people to get rid of Russian domination. We must do more than that if we still believe in the principle that all nations, however great, however small, should be free and independent.

## RESOLUTION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF NORTH CAROLINA DENTAL SOCIETY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the North Carolina Dental Society, relating to taxation of self-employed persons. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas corporate employees covered by an approved pension plan are not required to pay income tax on the employer's contribution to the pension fund, under the present provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; and

Whereas self-employed individuals are not granted a similar privilege under the Internal Revenue Code in respect to amounts they might set aside in a retirement fund; and

Whereas the Jenkins-Keogh bills (H. R. 9 and 10) seek to correct this existing tax inequity: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the executive committee of the North Carolina Dental Society, on behalf of the membership of the society, endorses the Jenkins-Keogh bills (H. R. 9 and 10) in principle; firmly convinced that enactment of this legislation would not only correct existing tax inequities under the present Internal Revenue Code, but would strengthen the economy of the Nation by providing the proper incentive to sound savings practices on the part of self-employed individuals; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the 1,050 dentist-members of the North Carolina Dental Society strongly urge the 85th Congress to enact this proposal into law without delay and request the support of the North Carolina congressional delegation in the achievement of this objective.

## REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 94. A bill for the relief of Lee Chong Taik (Rept. No. 73);

S. 96. A bill for the relief of Corazon A. Manayan (Rept. No. 74);

S. 97. A bill for the relief of Dr. Cheng-en Lu (Rept. No. 75);

S. 184. A bill for the relief of Mary C. Frederick (Rept. No. 76);

S. 185. A bill for the relief of Mary Palanuk (Rept. No. 77);

S. 271. A bill for the relief of Johannes Sukevainen (Rept. No. 78);

S. 589. A bill for the relief of Margaret Kwei Chang (Margaret Hua-Chen Kwei) (Rept. No. 79);

S. 615. A bill for the relief of Josephine Ray (Rept. No. 80);

S. 753. A bill for the relief of Georgiana Ching Hsien (Liang) New (Rept. No. 81);

S. 827. A bill for the relief of Guillermo B. Rigonan (Rept. No. 82); and

S. 890. A bill for the relief of Redentor Ligot Romero (Rept. No. 83).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 189. A bill for the relief of Peter V. Bosch (Rept. No. 84);

S. 288. A bill for the relief of Esther Guagliardo (Rept. No. 85);

S. 407. A bill for the relief of Julian D. Dycaico (Rept. No. 86);

S. 493. A bill for the relief of Irene Montoya (Rept. No. 87); and

S. 797. A bill for the relief of John Leary (Rept. No. 88).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 120. A bill for the relief of James F. Walsh (Rept. No. 89); and

S. 649. A bill for the relief of Yee Chung Fong Ming, Yee Chung Nom Ming, and Gee Shee Ming (Rept. No. 90).

## REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 156 TO COURT OF CLAIMS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution, referring to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 156) for the relief of M. F. Comer Bridge and Foundation Co. and submitted a report (No. 91) thereon.

The resolution (S. Res. 97) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the bill (S. 156) entitled "A bill for the relief of M. F. Comer Bridge & Foundation Co." now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims: and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

## REPORT BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ENTITLED "PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS" (S. REPT. NO. 72)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I submit a report entitled "Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights," and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Wyoming.

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Eva Kelly Bowring, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Board of Parole;

Dorothy McCullough Lee, of Oregon, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board;

Albert M. Morgan, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the northern district of West Virginia;

Chester A. Weidenburner, of New Jersey, to be United States attorney for the district of New Jersey;

Antonio C. Baza, of Guam, to be United States marshal for the district of Guam; and

Thomas James Donegan, of New York, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Leon H. A. Pierson, of Maryland, to be United States attorney for the district of Maryland.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

E. Perkins McGuire, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense;

Robert Dechert, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense, vice Mansfield D. Sprague;

Mansfield D. Sprague, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Gordon Gray, resigned;

Maj. Gen. Donald Prentice Booth, Army of the United States (brigadier General, U. S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant general;

Brig. Gen. Marvin Edward Kennebeck (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), United States Air Force, for temporary appointment as major general in the United States Air Force;

Vice Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Personnel and Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel in the Department of the Navy, and also for commands and other duties determined by the President, in the rank of vice admiral while so serving;

Lt. Gen. Walter Leo Weible, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), Lt. Gen. William Kelly Harrison, Jr., Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), and Lt. Gen. Ralph Julian Canine, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), to be placed on the retired list with the rank of lieutenant general.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in addition, I also report favorably 3,790 names for temporary and permanent appointment and promotion in the Air Force and Air Force Reserves. Included in this group are 104 general officers and 3,686 officers in grades from major to second lieutenant. In the Navy there are 73 flag officers for temporary and permanent promotion and 1 vice admiral for retirement, as well as 9,455 officers for temporary and permanent promotion in the grade of captain and below. In the Marine Corps there are the names of 2 lieutenant generals to be retired, 26 general officers for temporary and permanent promotion, and 1,933 officers for temporary and permanent appointment in the grade of lieutenant colonel and below.

All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 1234. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Barron-Aragon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1235. A bill for the relief of Eleftherios (Loukas) Moschos; and

S. 1236. A bill to incorporate the National Academy of Design; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1237. A bill to provide for national scholarships for college and university undergraduate study; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which will appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1238. A bill to amend title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956 so as to provide for the utilization of surplus agricultural products through the use in motor fuels of alcohol manufactured from agricultural products grown on farms in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (by request):

S. 1239. A bill to amend section 2 of the Missing Persons Act, so as to provide that benefits thereunder shall be available to certain members of the Philippine Scouts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 1240. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Tulios; and

S. 1241. A bill for the relief of Edward Martin Hinsberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1242. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act to authorize in certain cases the award of scholarships and graduate fellowships to individuals who are not citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JACKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1243. A bill for the relief of Domenico Mascarin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1244. A bill for the relief of Teiko Watanabe Holderfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1245. A bill to provide a right-of-way to the city of Alamogordo, a municipal corporation of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. TALMADGE):

S. 1246. A bill to provide for the revestment of certain lands or interests therein acquired for the Clark Hill Reservoir, Georgia, by the reconveyance of such lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1247. A bill to provide that epilepsy shall no longer be a cause for excluding aliens from admission into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 1248. A bill for the relief of Fred G. Clark;

S. 1249. A bill for the relief of Martha A. Calvert; and

S. 1250. A bill for the relief of John S. Adams (also known as Ivan T. Atanasoff); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1251. A bill for the relief of Florinda Mellone Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG (by request):

S. 1252. A bill for the relief of Miss Alstje J. Van Dyken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1253. A bill for the relief of Myung Ok Shin; and

S. 1254. A bill to accelerate consideration by the courts of criminal proceedings involving treason, espionage, sabotage, sedition, and subversive activities, and to increase to 15 years the statute of limitations applicable to such offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself and Mr. PAYNE):

S. 1255. A bill to amend the act of August 3, 1956, relating to the payment of annuities to widows of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1256. A bill for the relief of Harlan D. Conkey; and

S. 1257. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pao-Shu Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

S. 1258. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Robert A. Espe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1259. A bill to amend the Dependents' Medical Care Act to entitle certain retired members of the uniformed services to the same benefits as certain dependents of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1260. A bill for the relief of Frank Deakins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 1261. A bill for the relief of Richard Edward Wylie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1262. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to remove the $250,000 limitation on construction grants under such act; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 1263. A bill to permit weekly newspapers to suspend publication for not more than two issues in any one calendar year without loss of second-class mail privileges; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 1264. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1265. A bill to supplement the lease-purchase provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1949 by establishing a Federal Building Finance Administration to provide a self-financing means for the construction of certain Federal buildings and certain public-school buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1266. A bill authorizing the construction of local flood-protection works on the Mississippi River at St. Paul and South St. Paul, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. MCNAMARA):

S. 1267. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of employers who are engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce, to eliminate certain exemptions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution relating to Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mrs. SMITH of Maine when she introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a United States Women's Armed Services Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

S. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution to designate the 4th day of May as Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating the first Sunday of February of each year as Chaplains' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution relating to the stockpile of extra long staple cotton under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were submitted and reported:

Mr. STENNIS submitted Senate Resolution 96 relating to appointments to the Supreme Court, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See resolution printed in full where it appears under a separate heading.)

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported (S. Res. 97) referring to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 156) for the relief of M. F. Comer Bridge & Foundation Co., which was placed on the calendar.

(See resolution printed in full where it appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

## SCHOLARSHIPS FOR COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATE STUDY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, 10 days ago the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] introduced, on his own and my behalf, the bill (S. 1134) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for primary and secondary education.

Today I introduced, on behalf of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself, a companion bill which would provide Federal assistance in the field of higher education.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1237) to provide for national scholarships for college and university undergraduate study, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement explaining the nature of the bill and the reason for urging its passage, together with a summary of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is now widespread recognition that education in this Nation is in crisis. It is a crisis that should never have been allowed to develop. If the Nation had taken the advice, years ago, of many far-seeing people—and among the outstanding of these was the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]—the Federal Government would long since have accepted its responsibilities in the field of education and would have been in a position to deal with our present difficulties before they developed.

I believe there is now general agreement that deterioration in education is not merely a matter of State and local concern, but a matter of fundamental concern to the whole Nation. It is now recognized that the States and local governments simply do not have from their own resources sufficient money to meet all the needs of a rapidly expanding school population. I come from a relatively wealthy city, and yet I know that the tax resources of my city are stretched to the breaking point. State and local tax systems are neither flexible enough nor productive enough, and the pressing educational needs and local tax resources are spread unequally among States and among school districts. Consequently, it is acknowledged that the Federal Government must accept its share of responsibility for action to meet our national educational needs.

The contention which the Senator from Oregon and I present today is that acceptance of Federal responsibility should not be permitted to stop with primary and secondary education. There is as great a need for Federal action in the field of higher education.

Many of our colleagues have recognized this fact. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] has introduced a bill for aid to junior colleges. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has proposed a bill for Federal loans to college and university students. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has proposed loans for the training of teachers. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has introduced a bill for both Federal scholarships and loans for higher education. The Clark-Morse bill would authorize a scholarship program similar in some respects to that proposed by the Senator from Minnesota but differing in some important particulars.

In its interim report issued last November, President Eisenhower's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, headed by Mr. Devereux C. Josephs, presented again the cold statistics which measure the need for us to act, as a nation, in higher education.

The Committee said: "A study of the current American manpower situation clearly points up two closely related facts. First, of our Nation's most talented high-school graduates who do not go on to college, approximately 100,000 each year are deterred chiefly for financial reasons, perhaps another 100,000 chiefly by lack of motivation. Second, there is a serious shortage of trained and competent persons in almost every field."

A comprehensive report prepared in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress summarizes the findings of a number of recent studies. It concludes that "Fewer than half of the upper 25 percent and only 6 out of 10 of the top 5 percent of high-school graduates are obtaining the higher education needed for full development of their potential usefulness to society."

This is a tragic waste of the most precious resource of our Nation. We have programs for the conservation of soil, and of forests, and of minerals—yet we have no Federal program, or even a national policy, to prevent the needless waste of a large part of the finest talent of every generation.

Happily, there have been many instances in the life of our country where a man born in a log cabin and educated only in a little red schoolhouse has risen to national leadership. But these are the exceptional cases. In the main, and certainly in the most highly specialized fields, an individual can realize his highest potential only through higher education.

The loss of 200,000 highly capable students is first of all a series of individual tragedies. But it is far more than that. To use the words of the National Science Foundation in its annual report to the Congress, it is "an appalling loss to the Nation."

A year ago, the junior Senator from Arkansas told this body, "In this period of competitive coexistence with the Soviets, the intelligence and training of our population may well be the key to our survival."

And yet, every year brings forth new and alarming evidence that the Soviets are surpassing us in the education of trained specialists—particularly scientists and engineers.

Mr. Allen Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, has told us that in this decade the number of graduates in the basic physical sciences, including engineering, in the Soviet Union will be one-third greater than in the United States. In 1950 we were graduating almost twice as many engineering students as was the Soviet Union—52,000 against 28,000—thanks largely to Federal aid under the GI bill of rights. But in the next 5 years, the U. S. S. R. more than doubled its annual number of graduates to 63,000. In the same period, the number being graduated each year in the United States declined to 23,000. Since then, the gap between our two countries has continued to widen.

Last Friday, Dr. Edward Teller, who had so much to do with development of the hydrogen bomb, said that in 10 years scientific supremacy will pass from the United States to the Soviet Union because of Soviet superiority in scientific manpower.

Let me read the words of Marshal Bulganin, delivered at the 20th Communist Party Congress in Moscow a year ago this month:

"Our country now has an army of specialists numbering over 5,500,000. Specialists are our gold reserve. We are proud of them and we value them. It is no wonder that certain public figures in the capitalist states are not without concern that their own countries are behind us in the training of specialists.

"Under the sixth 5-year plan the number of specialists to graduate from higher and secondary schools will considerably increase. Altogether 4 million specialists are to graduate. That is nearly as many as were trained during the last two plans.

"Higher schools are to supply more than 650,000 engineers for industry, transport, building, and agriculture. This is twice as many as the fifth 5-year plan produced."

In the same speech, he announced that all tuition fees were to be abolished in higher education.

This illustrates the value placed upon higher education by our antagonists in the great world struggle. It illustrates the intensive, concentrated effort they are putting into outstripping the rest of the world in the advanced training of their most able young people.

This great Communist effort is the ominous backdrop against which we must examine the waste of talent in America.

I desire to call special attention to the fact that higher education is not only free in the Soviet Union but additional allowances and perquisites are granted on an extensive scale to the most capable students. I hope we will never have to admit that in America—the land of opportunity—there is in truth less opportunity for the children of the poor than there is in Communist Russia. That would be a shame upon our Nation.

But we do not rest our case solely upon the dreadful challenge of Communist education. Regardless of the Soviets, if America does not provide opportunity for all our children it is a shame in any case. It is the genius of America that there shall be equal opportunity. It is repugnant to our tradition that the privilege of higher education should be subject to a means test. Yet, for perhaps 400,000 young people—half of the 800,000 superior students who should now be in college but have dropped out—the means test for higher education is a reality today.

And there is no reason to think that this situation will correct itself. The cost of higher education is rising rapidly. Tuition fees are being increased in many institutions. A recent study of 35 institutions showed that all but 6 had raised their rates in the last 2 years. The difficulties that now force 100,000 students a year to drop out are becoming not less but greater. Yet as college enrollment grows these are the young people whom the Nation can least afford to lose.

Now—what is the answer?

In all of the many studies that have been made on this subject over the past decade, no real solution has ever been advanced except to use a portion of the growth in our national income, through the Federal budget to provide scholarships to our ablest students who cannot otherwise go on to college. I quote again the findings of these studies, as summarized in the report of the Legislative Reference Service: "The nationwide shortage of highly educated manpower is critical in many fields. There are various estimates of the amount available and the amount needed for scholarships, but it appears that the amount needed is at least three times as great as the amount available. Data suggest that awarding a sufficient number of scholarships would cause three-fourths instead of only one-half of the top 27 percent of high-school graduates to enter college.

"According to findings from a current study of a nationwide sampling of 13,669 students the principal reason for dropouts from college after the first year is economic problems."

I commend to each Member of this body this excellent report by Mr. Charles A. Quattlebaum, which contains a wealth of background information on the need for assistance to students in higher education.

The bill which the Senator from Orgeon and I are submitting today would meet this problem directly. It would provide 50,000 scholarships a year—enough for half of those who now drop out for economic reasons. The aid would be continued during the student's undergraduate years, provided that he remained in good standing at an accredited institution. Both the scholarships and the available funds would be apportioned among the States on the basis of the number of high school graduates in each State, and the State, rather than the Federal Government, would administer the program, subject to Federal standards. The student would have freedom of choice as to his course of study and his choice of a university, within or outside his own State. He could go to a public university, a private college or a church-supported institution, and he could select any course leading to a baccalaureate degree.

Many persons have proposed scholarships for science and engineering alone. While there is no question as to the imperative need for scientists and engineers, there is need for scholars and trained leaders in every field. Western civilization developed not only through the physical sciences, but through the social sciences, the humanities, and the arts. In the pervasive contest between freedom and communism, we must defend and enrich western civilization through

the growth and dissemination of knowledge in all fields.

Even in regard to science and engineering, the important thing is to enlarge the pool of able, qualified young people who as undergraduates receive intellectual stimulation and scholastic discipline over a broad range of subjects. From this enlarged pool, a greater number of potential scientists, engineers, and leaders in other fields can be selected for advanced training in their specialties.

Our bill is designed to get the greatest number of able young people into college at the least cost, while still retaining freedom of choice on the part of the student. Consequently, the amount of each scholarship would be determined on the basis of the cost of his particular course of study, and his resources and need, taking into account the extent to which he can earn his own way. It is sometimes suggested that a flat grant be made, unrelated to need or that need alone be considered without taking into account the difference in the cost of attending different institutions. We think the greatest economy will be achieved if both factors are considered. Based on these criteria, the awards would range from zero to $1,000, with the average in each State not to exceed $500. This is somewhat less than the average amount awarded by the National Merit Scholarship Corporation, which uses the same criteria, and it is considerably less per student than is allowed under the GI bill.

Our program will cost up to $25 million the first year and rise to $100 million by the fourth year when it is in full operation. It may be argued by some that now is not the time to spend for purposes such as these because it would help to unbalance the budget and, hence, would be inflationary. To this argument we reply that the Nation must determine how our available resources will be distributed among various social purposes—industrial expansion, consumer goods, housing, highways, education, and so on. If it is suggested that purposes as vital as education have to be neglected because inflationary pressures arising in other fields are too great, then it is up to us to take measures to check the inflationary pressures in the fields where they arise—not permit education to be sacrificed. And I would add that expenditures for the education of our ablest young people are the type of expenditures that ultimately pay for themselves, through the added wealth and income and tax revenues that a more highly trained citizenry creates.

Finally, our bill contains what we hope are adequate safeguards that the scholarships will be awarded solely to the most highly qualified persons, on the basis of merit only, through the maximum use of objective methods of selection which rule out favoritism. We have also included as strong a prohibition against Federal control or supervision of higher education as anyone has so far been able to compose. If stronger or clearer language can be drawn to dispel this bugaboo of Federal control, which has so long blocked progress in education we would welcome that language.

Almost 10 years ago, President Truman's Commission on Higher Education proposed a system of Federal scholarships and said, "The Federal Government assumes responsibility for supplementing State and local efforts in military defense against the Nation's enemies without; surely it may as justifiably assume responsibility for supplementing State and local efforts against educational deficiencies and inequalities that are democracy's enemies within." That Commission proposed Federal scholarships for 20 percent of our college students—a proportion somewhat higher than we propose. President Truman subsequently recommended a scholarship program to the Congress.

Now, almost a decade later, President Eisenhower's Committee on Education Beyond the High School is again studying this issue. I quote three of the preliminary conclusions of this Committee:

"Our ideals and the increasing complexity of our civilization require that each individual develop his or her talents to the fullest. We must find ways of eliminating the waste of talent inherent in the fact that tens of thousands of our superior high school graduates do not go on to college."

"There must be promptly formulated an explicit, considered policy as to the role of the Federal Government in education beyond the high school. * * * In recent years the Federal Government has spent more than a billion dollars annually in educational activities beyond the high school, and yet no overall policy exists."

"Even with the best possible utilization of existing resources, additional financial support must be provided if the additional millions in the population are to be enabled to develop their talents to the fullest. It is already crystal clear that post-high school education will cost much more in total as each year advances."

The senior Senator from Oregon and I submit that the Congress need wait for no further studies. The needs are clear. We should proceed at this session of the Congress to recognize the national interest in higher education and the imperative demands of our national security.

We should wait no longer. We submit that in our massive competitive struggle with the Soviet Union, we dare not wait.

There follows a summary of our bill:

SUMMARY OF CLARK-MORSE BILL, NATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP ACT OF 1957

Section 1 is the short title of the bill, "National Scholarship Act of 1957."

Section 2 is a declaration of purpose, stating that the national interest and the national security of the United States require the fullest development of the talents of its young men and women.

Section 3 defines certain terms used in the act.

Section 4 establishes a National Scholarship Council in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, consisting of the United States Commissioner of Education as Chairman and 12 members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Section 5 authorizes the Council to establish rules and regulations and assign administrative responsibility to the Commissioner of Education except where it is specifically delegated to the Council.

Section 6 provides for State participation in the program. Any State desiring to participate may do so by establishing a State commission on national scholarships and submitting a State plan which is approved by the Council. The plan will provide for the selection of individuals to be awarded national scholarships, and determination of the amount of each award. In the event any approved plan is altered so that it no longer meets these requirements, the Council may, after a hearing, determine that a State is no longer eligible to participate, and until the State again becomes eligible the Council will perform the functions of the State commission.

Section 7 authorizes 50,000 new scholarships per year. They shall be allocated among the States in proportion to the number of secondary school graduates in each State. Each State shall also be allocated an amount equal to $500 per scholarship winner per year.

Section 8 provides that each candidate for a national scholarship who meets standards of eligibility established by his State shall apply to the State commission.

Section 9 provides that each State commission shall select from eligible candidates those most highly qualified, on the basis of merit only, as indicated by scholastic achievement and aptitude and academic promise. Objective measures shall be used as far as possible. Each State commission shall employ such selection methods as may be prescribed by the Council.

Section 10 provides that each scholarship winner shall report to the State commission the course he has selected and will provide information as requested as to his need for financial assistance. This shall include information which the council may prescribe to be collected from all individuals holding national scholarships. Each scholarship winner shall have freedom of choice as to his course of study, provided that it leads to a baccalaureate degree.

Section 11 provides that the State commission shall determine the amount of the award based upon the cost of undertaking the proposed course of study, the financial resources of the individual taking into account what he can earn, and the amount of assistance he needs. These determinations shall be based upon objective measures of cost, resources, and need. No award shall exceed $1,000 per academic year, and in instances where no financial need exists the scholarship may be awarded without a stipend.

Section 12 provides that the scholarship payment shall be granted for the time normally required to complete the undergraduate curriculum, if the recipient remains in good standing in his institution.

Section 13 authorizes appropriations for scholarships amounting to $25 million in the first fiscal year rising to $100 million in the fourth and subsequent years, and for administrative expenses of the council and the commissioner.

Section 14 provides that scholarship winners shall have freedom to choose any institution of higher education which will admit him, in his own or another State.

Section 15 establishes the administrative procedures for payment. The check will be transmitted through the institution, which will transmit it to the student upon certifying that the recipient is pursuing his work in his designated field and is in good standing.

Section 16 directs the council to study the desirability of a comparable program of financial aid for graduate work and to make recommendations to the Congress. It also provides for regular reports on the effectiveness of the act and on needed revisions.

Section 17 authorizes employment of experts and consultants.

Section 18 prohibits the exercise of any direction, supervision or control by any Federal representative over the curriculum or program of instruction of any educational institution or over its administration or personnel.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the bill which the senior Senator from Oregon and I have just introduced, read together with the education bill which he and I sponsored and which was introduced on February 7, is intended to be a comprehensive answer to the problem of Federal aid to education.

This particular bill would provide 50,000 national scholarships a year, to eliminate some of the shocking waste which results from the fact that 100,000 highly qualified American boys and girls each year are unable, after completing their high-school education, to continue with higher education in college because of lack of financial means, and another 100,000 drop out of school for lack of motivation to utilize their talents to the greatest extent.

In the face of the enormous strides which are being made by Russia with

respect to the problem of education, the senior Senator from Oregon and I feel most strongly that we can afford to delay no longer in placing the full force of the Federal Government behind a program to make it possible for American boys and girls to be trained, not only as engineers and scientists, but for all the many careers with respect to which we are at present suffering from an enormous lack of skilled and specialized manpower.

## AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956, RELATING TO UTILIZATION OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the utilization of surplus agricultural products through the use in motor fuel of alcohol manufactured from agricultural products.

Today in the House of Representatives, my friend, the able Representative from western Iowa, Mr. BEN JENSEN, is introducing a companion bill, identical in text with the one I have just sent to the desk. Mr. JENSEN is also placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the House side a statement which we have jointly prepared, pointing out directly how alcohol blends in motor fuels can eliminate the surplus problem in connection with agricultural products in the course of not more than 3 years, and probably in 1 or 2 years, depending upon the percentage of commercial alcohol used in the motor fuel blends.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, the text of the bill which I have introduced.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1238) to amend title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956 so as to provide for the utilization of surplus agricultural products through the use in motor fuels of alcohol manufactured from agricultural products grown on farms in the United States, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. YOUNG), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (relating to disposal of surplus agricultural products) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"USE IN MOTOR FUELS OF ALCOHOL MANUFACTURED FROM AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

"SEC. 213. (a) As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'agricultural product' means any agricultural product grown on farms within the United States.

"(2) The term 'motor fuel' means any petroleum product (including gasoline, kerosene, naphtha, benzine, and crude oil) which (A) has a specific gravity of 36° or above, Baumé scale, and (B) is suitable for use as fuel in an internal-combustion engine.

"(3) The term 'United States' means the various States of the United States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

"(b) (1) Beginning 6 months after the effective date of this section, it shall be unlawful for any person to sell motor fuel in interstate or foreign commerce unless at least 2 percent, by volume, of such motor fuel is alcohol manufactured from agricultural products.

"(2) Beginning 18 months after the effective date of this section, it shall be unlawful for any person to sell motor fuel in interstate or foreign commerce unless at least 5 percent, by volume, of such motor fuel is alcohol manufactured from agricultural products.

"(3) Any person violating the provisions of paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. Each sale of motor fuel in violation of paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection shall constitute a separate offense.

"(c) Subsection (b) of this section shall not apply to sales of motor fuel during any period prescribed in a proclamation by the President declaring that, for purposes of this section, agricultural products from which alcohol is produced are not in surplus.

"(d) This section shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins more than 10 days after the date of its enactment."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am very happy to yield to the great agricultural expert, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I wish to compliment the Senator from South Dakota for introducing the bill. It proposes one of the real solutions of the agricultural surplus problem. If he does not mind, I should like very much to join him as a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. I should be very happy to have the distinguished Senator associate himself with me in the introduction of the bill.

## AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1950

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 10 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1242) to amend the National Science Foundation Act to authorize in certain cases the award of scholarships and graduate fellowships to individuals who are not citizens of the United States; introduced by Mr. JACKSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the amendment to the law I propose would authorize the awarding of scholarships and graduate fellowships for scientific study or work in special cases to individuals who are not citizens of the United States, where, in the judgment of the Foundation, the national interest can thereby be served. My amendment defines such special cases as outstanding students who have not yet had an opportunity to become citizens of the United States, but who have expressed their desire to do so.

It is not necessary to remind the Senate that all of us are, at one stage or another, products of the Old World. This Nation is great today because it has been accessible to young men and women from abroad. Here they could fulfill their hopes and aspirations, bettering their own lot, and at the same time improving their new environment. The contributions of people from the Old World are legion.

Among the young men and women who are coming to this country there are some of exceptional talent in the sciences. And, Mr. President, there is a shortage of scientists in this country. Our deficiencies are quantitive, but they are also qualitative. In the words of James R. Killian, Jr., president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology:

> We have an acute shortage of scientists whose creative and conceptualizing powers are exceptional. There is, indeed, a shortage of numbers in many but not all fields of science and enginering; we could better cope with such a shortage did we not also have an even more severe shortage of quality, depth, adaptability, and up-to-dateness.

Where there is outstanding talent among persons coming to this country, we should see that no time is lost in its development. A few scholarships and fellowships, judiciously awarded, might turn up another von Neumann, another Teller, another von Karmen, or another Wigner.

With this in mind, I believe this amendment could contribute significantly—possibly decisively—to our national security and to our industrial progress.

## AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT RELATING TO VICTIMS OF EPILEPSY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to correct an unfortunate defect in our present immigration laws.

The bill is very simple. It would simply strike from the list of the present disqualifications against admission of aliens to the United States the illness known as epilepsy.

At present, aliens are ineligible to receive visas if they are afflicted with, in the words of the law, "psychopathic personality, epilepsy, or a mental defect."

But the best medical evidence today confirms that there is no justification whatsoever for leaving epilepsy in the same category with psychopathic personality or mental defect.

Fortunately, modern medical science has brought an ever-increasing number of cases of epilepsy under control.

In any event, an epileptic may be a genius, or a person of average or low intelligence. There should be no automatic barrier against the epileptic. He should be judged on his individual merits and qualifications and condition.

As background for my introduction of this bill, I should like to point out that in the 84th Congress there was enacted Private Law 687, to admit into the United States Mrs. Charlotte Muhlfeldt Jahnke, the wife of a citizen of Grafton, Wis.

Mrs. Jahnke, an epileptic, would have been excluded from the United States because section 212 (a) (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, had not the

special Wiley bill—S. 2104—been enacted to permit her admission.

The fact that Congress passed that law, the fact that the President signed the law, is in my judgment, ample confirmation of the soundness of the more general legislation proposed today.

What we permitted in one case, we should now permit as a matter of general policy; namely, a fair break for otherwise qualified epileptics.

I send to the desk a brief supplementary statement which I have prepared on this subject, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1247) to provide that epilepsy shall no longer be a cause for excluding aliens from admission into the United States, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The case for this bill has been well made by the National Epilepsy League, headquartered at 130 North Wells Street in Chicago. The league has done invaluable work throughout the United States on behalf of people afflicted with epilepsy; yes, on behalf of their families as well—families which too often suffer untold heartache because of wrong public and private attitudes toward the epileptic.

FINDINGS OF SCIENCE

It is reported that some 1½ million people in the United States suffer from epilepsy in some form or another.

Fortunately, during the past two decades science has made tremendous strides in research into epilepsy and in treatment and rehabilitation. The disease has been determined to be a symptom of brain damage. It manifests itself in periodic lapses of consciousness and/or muscular control.

Epilepsy cases may vary tremendously in degree. Fortunately, through modern medical treatment, 80 percent of cases respond to medication. In over half of these instances seizures are reported to be completely prevented. Let me repeat that fact. In more than half of these cases seizures are completely prevented.

WISCONSIN IN VANGUARD OF MODERN ATTITUDE

I am delighted to say that a number of States of the Union have, in the light of modern medical evidence, revised what have heretofore been completely obsolete and discriminatory laws. Wisconsin, for example, has been an outstanding example. The 1955 meeting of the State legislature, with the full cooperation of our able State medical society, made a number of extremely important revisions in Badger State laws which had heretofore discriminated unnecessarily against the epileptic.

Unfortunately, a great many other States still have on their books a host of laws which were written in a bygone day when epilepsy was neither understood nor controlled.

THE LARGER MEANING OF TODAY'S BILL

In urging action today on this modest immigration bill to amend title 8, United States Code, section 182 (a) (4), I am doing no more than to permit the relatively few individuals who might desire to emigrate to our country to become eligible for possible admission.

By enacting this law we will take a great forward step. We will signify to ourselves and to the world that we are bringing our laws up to date—and, I hope, our attitudes.

Passage of this law will, we believe, be a significant green light for the entire movement in the United States designed to assure justice for the epileptic.

This is the authoritative judgment of the National Epilepsy League. It is the judgment of thinking, civic-minded individuals who have devoted a great amount of personal resources—time and energy—toward assuring justice for the epileptic.

BILL SHOULD NOT BE MISINTERPRETED

But let me point out quite clearly that if an epileptic alien does suffer from a mental disease or from mental retardation, such an alien would continue to be denied admission.

In other words, the epileptic would still have to meet the other standards which the United States has set. But we would no longer automatically impose a complete bar—a bar which is not justified.

We all recognize that there must be numerous standards maintained as regards the admission of aliens. But this definitely should not be an automatic standard of denial of entry.

BILL DOES NOT OPEN THE FLOODGATES

I do not, of course, presume myself to have any particularly expert knowledge in this field of medical science. Nor do I presume myself to be an expert in immigration law as such.

I do count, however, most heavily on the judgment of experts whom I do respect in both of these fields—and who support this proposal. Again, I should like to answer pointblank the very basic question: "Does this bill, so to speak, open the floodgates to a mass of what might be regarded by some people as undesirable individuals?"

The answer—I repeat—is that it definitely does not. It does not make available a single additional quota number as such, over and above present quota limitations. It does not open the floodgates, so to speak.

It simply means that in the future, a number of individuals—(a group which will probably numerically be very, very small) may—I emphasize—may be admitted. These will be persons who otherwise will qualify completely in terms of all of the other strong limitations in our immigration laws, but who might have been disqualified by the present prohibition against epileptics. It is this comparatively small group of individuals who will henceforth be eligible for admission.

PAST WILEY EFFORTS FOR HANDICAPPED

Let me point out that my interest in this matter is part and parcel of my overall interest in the subject of justice for the handicapped, a matter which is evidenced by my fight down through the years on a great many other fronts.

Witness my efforts on behalf of: National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week which, like many other advances, is due to the pioneering efforts of the American Federation for the Physically Handicapped under President Paul Strachan, here in Washington. Second, injury funds for encouragement of the employment of the physically handicapped. Ending of cruel job discrimination against handicapped veterans, against the blind—whether veterans or nonveterans, and against other afflicted persons and on other fronts as well.

SUMMARY

Let us move ahead now to blot a totally wrong stigma against these, and other handicapped, a stigma born of ignorance and superstitution.

Let us now help the epileptic to stand on his own feet and take his rightful place in the community, rather than being shunted off like a pariah.

Let us help him to help himself or herself.

Let us no longer say, in effect, to an epileptic child:

"You must live under a cloud all your life—a cloud of public ignorance, indifference and/or public distaste or fear."

Let us bring epileptic youngsters, particularly, into the sunshine of understanding and friendship and help.

Young and old, let us deal with them with justice, in the true American tradition.

## AMENDMENT OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to remove the $250,000 limitation on construction grants under such act.

The purpose of this bill is to eliminate one of the provisions of this important measure, which discriminates against the larger cities. The provisions of Public Law 660, which became a law during 1956, strike me as discriminatory to cities over 100,000 population, though adequately assisting smaller towns and cities.

I appreciate the fact that the pollution-control program of a single metropolis could take all of the authorized appropriation for a full year of the construction grant program authorized by this law. Therefore, the limitation in section 6 (d) would appear to have some merit whereby "at least 50 percent of the funds so appropriated for each fiscal year shall be used for grants for the construction of treatment works servicing municipalities of 125,000 population or under." But to go further and say that, as a matter of law, any city contemplating a project in excess of $830,000 must be content with a smaller percentage of Federal assistance than a city which is building a project of $800,000 is patently unfair.

Aside from the fact that it is known and demonstrable that the per capita cost of local government increases as the size of the locality increases, it would seem that the purpose of this kind of program should be to encourage elimination of pollution wherever it is found. If the greater need is found to be in metropolitan centers, the administrator of the program should be allowed to direct the assistance there. It is my understanding that the greater pollution problem is generally connected with the larger cities. It is then unrealistic to restrict the effectiveness of the water pollution-control program to the smaller communities. I submit that it is not only unrealistic but unfair, and I ask that the Senate give serious consideration to the possibility of correcting the legislation we passed last year when we included this provision limiting grants for construction to a maximum of $250,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1262) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to remove the $250,000 limitation on construction grants under such act, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself

and Mr. CARROLL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

## PERMISSION FOR WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS TO SUSPEND PUBLICATION WITHOUT LOSS OF SECOND-CLASS MAIL PRIVILEGES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to permit weekly newspapers to suspend publication for 2 weeks a year without loss of second-class mailing privileges.

This bill is identical to the one introduced in the last Congress by the very able Senator from Montana, and I am pleased that he has agreed to join me in cosponsoring this measure today.

The rural areas of Montana have much in common with the rural areas of my own State of Colorado. Both are dotted by many small communities which are served by small weekly newspapers. Often these newspapers are only a 1- or 2-man shop.

In most cases these small publishers are literally chained to their jobs, because Federal regulations governing second-class mailing privileges, plus State laws relating to legal advertising, require that they continue publishing week after week, continuously and without interruption.

These publishers do not have the trained personnel to permit them to rotate their employees so that they can enjoy an annual 1- or 2-week vacation.

Mr. President, the proposed legislation which the Senator from Montana and I are introducing is permissive in character. It merely gives the individual publisher the right to suspend publication for 2 weeks each year if he so chooses.

Rural America is still the storehouse of democracy. The voices of our rural citizens must be heard, and they must have an instrument by which their audience can be reached.

The small weekly editors across the country, who are near to the people and reflect their thoughts, have provided an irreplaceable medium of news and independent editorial opinion.

It seems to me that every measure should be taken to strengthen the small local press—not discourage it. Centralization of the press and news media in general is a most dangerous thing.

The tendency has been toward more centralization and consolidation, and it is time we did something to encourage and stimulate the small independent news outlets.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1263) to permit weekly newspapers to suspend publication for not more than two issues in any one calendar year without loss of second-class mailing privileges, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## SELF-FINANCING PUBLIC BUILDING PROGRAM

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to help break the log-jam that has developed in the construction of needed office, post office, and public school buildings.

The bill is entitled "A bill to supplement the lease-purchase provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1949 by establishing a Federal Building Finance Administration to provide a self-financing means for the construction of certain Federal buildings and certain public school buildings, and for other purposes."

The bill would create a Federal Building Finance Administration which would have the General Services Administration, the Post Office Department, and local public-school districts for clients. It would be authorized to sell revenue bonds to finance construction of Federal office and post office buildings and also to disburse such funds, plus some appropriated funds for the construction of public school buildings on a lease-purchase basis.

The Federal office and post office buildings would largely have to meet the requirements of the Public Buildings Act and the Lease-Purchase Act, which this bill is intended to supplement.

The public school buildings would have to be recommended by a State advisory committee, similar to the requirement for construction of hospitals under the Hill-Burton Act. Thus, both the determination of need and all control as to the educational features would be left with the States and the local school districts.

To prevent neglect of any area, the Administration would be required to give priority to the construction of two post office buildings in each congressional district over the period of the 3 years following enactment.

To insure coordination of the issuance of bonds with Treasury financing plans and general governmental policies, the bill establishes a 6-man advisory board consisting of 3 members appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate, plus the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, and the Administrator of the General Services Administration, or their designees.

The bonds outstanding at any one time could not exceed $5 billion. Their repayment would be the obligation of the rental clients—which would be, of course, the Federal Government, which already is incurring responsibility for rents for the inadequate quarters these buildings would displace, and public school districts that have been approved by a State agency.

Repayment of the funds used to construct school buildings to rent to school districts on the lease-purchase basis would be assured by making ineligible for further projects States where delinquency in repayment reached 5 percent.

This plan would make it possible for school districts unable to finance construction through local bond issues to meet their school building needs in much the same way that farmers unable to get local credit, but with earning power, get loans from the Farmers Home Administration.

Thus, the school construction feature, while not Federal aid in the customary sense of making outright grants or gifts, would meet what my observation has indicated to be the real problem. Many districts can raise current payments, but cannot float large bond issues.

The bill does require a local contribution of 10 percent. That may be cash, an approved site, or, to the extent applicable, design and architectural plans. I believe this will help many more really needy districts than grant-in-aid plans which require large local matching bond issues.

Mr. President, the breakdown in the operations of the Lease-Purchase Act presents a crisis. I started work on this bill some time ago, when it appeared that this breakdown was developing. I had not anticipated that a complete suspension of operations under that act would take place this soon, but it has. Tomorrow, committees of both the Senate and House are starting hearings on that situation. I venture to offer this bill as providing one way by which to solve some complex problems.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1265) to supplement the lease-purchase provisions the Public Buildings Act of 1949 by establishing a Federal Building Finance Administration to provide a self-financing means for the construction of certain Federal buildings and certain public-school buildings, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the "Federal Building Finance Act of 1957."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "Administration" means the Federal Building Finance Administration established by this Act.

(b) The term "Director" means the Director of Federal Building Finance appointed pursuant to section 3 (b) of this Act.

(c) The term "Board" means the Advisory Board established by section 3 (c) of this Act.

(d) The term "fund" means the Federal building finance fund established by section 4 (a) of this Act.

(e) The term "State" means any State, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, or the Canal Zone.

(f) The term "State school authority" means the board of education or other agency or officer of any State primarily responsible for the supervision of public elementary and secondary schools within such State, or, if there is no such officer of agency, an officer or agency of such State designated by the governor thereof or by State law.

(g) The term "local school authority" means the board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of free public education in a city, county, township,

school district, or political subdivision of any State, and includes any State agency which directly operates and maintains public schools. If a separate public authority has responsibility for the provision or maintenance of school facilities for any local educational agency or the financing of the construction thereof, such term includes such other authority.

(h) The term "school facility," except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, means any building used or to be used chiefly for classroom use by any primary or secondary school operated by any local school authority, and includes any related facility (including initial equipment, machinery, and utilities necessary or appropriate for school purposes). Such term does not include any (1) athletic stadium or other structure or facility intended primarily for use for athletic exhibitions, contests, games, or other events for which admission is to be charged to the general public, (2) off-site improvement, or (3) structure or facility designed for use exclusively for any special activity, such as a single-purpose auditorium or gymnasium.

(i) The term "construction," when used in relation to any school facility, means the preparation of drawings and specifications for such facility; erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending such facility; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of such facility.

ADMINISTRATION ESTABLISHED

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established in the executive branch a Federal Building Finance Administration, which shall be subject to supervision by the President, but which shall not be a part of or supervised by any other department or agency in the executive branch. The principal office of the Administration shall be located in the District of Columbia, but it may establish such branch and regional offices at other places in the United States as may be determined by the Director to be necessary to fulfill the responsibilities imposed upon it by this Act.

(b) Subject to policies promulgated by the Advisory Board, the Administration shall be administered by the Director, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and whose annual rate of basic compensation shall be $20,000. The Director may appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees of the Administration, and make such expenditures, as may be necessary to carry out the responsibilities of the Administration under this Act.

(c) There shall be within the Administration an Advisory Board which shall determine the policies of the Administration in the execution of its responsibilities under this Act. The Board shall be composed of—

(1) the Secretary of the Treasury, or an officer of the Department of the Treasury designated by the Secretary to represent the Department of the Treasury;

(2) the Postmaster General, or an officer of the Post Office Department designated by the Postmaster General to represent the Post Office Department;

(3) the Administrator of General Services, or an officer of the General Services Administration designated by the Administrator to represent the General Services Administration; and

(4) two members appointed from private life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Individuals serving as members of the Board pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) shall so serve without additional compensation. Individuals appointed as members of the Board pursuant to paragraph (4) while so serving shall receive basic compensation at the annual rate of $17,500. The Board shall select a chairman from among its members.

(d) Neither the Director nor any member of the Board appointed under paragraph (4) of subsection (c) may engage in any other business, vocation, or employment while so serving.

(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administration such sums as may be required for the performance of its administrative functions under this Act.

FEDERAL BUILDING FUND

SEC. 4. (a) There shall be established on the books of the Treasury a Federal building finance fund, which shall be composed of (1) the proceeds of the sale of such obligations as may be issued from time to time by the Administration pursuant to subsection (b), and (2) such additional sums, not exceeding $300,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be appropriated thereto for the purpose of financing school construction pursuant to section 5 of this act.

(b) The Administration is authorized from time to time to issue interest-bearing obligations in such amounts as may be required to yield proceeds sufficient to carry into effect the provisions of this act, except that the face value of all obligations so issued and outstanding shall not at any time exceed $5,000,000,000. Such obligations shall be the obligations of the Administration, and shall be issued upon such terms and conditions as the Administration may prescribe, except that each such obligation shall (1) plainly state that it is not an obligation of the United States, is not guaranteed as to principal or interest by the United States, and does not constitute a debt or obligation of the United States, and (2) bear interest at the rate prescribed by section 201 (d) of the Social Security Act for obligations which may be purchased for the account of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. Notwithstanding the provisions of such section, the managing trustee of such fund is authorized from time to time to invest in obligations issued under this subsection such sums from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund as the director may determine to be necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized to act as depositories, custodians, or fiscal agents of the Administration in the performance of its powers under this act.

(c) All obligations issued by the Administration under subsection (b) shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation (except estate, inheritance, and gift taxes) now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority.

(d) The director is authorized to expend from the fund from time to time such sums as may be required to fulfill the obligations of the Administration under any construction contract or agreement entered into by it in conformity with the provisions of section 5 or section 6 of this Act. All sums received by the Administration under any such contract or agreement shall be deposited in the fund, and shall be available for (1) the repayment of the principal amount of any obligation issued by the Administration, (2) the payment of interest due upon any such obligation, and (3) expenditure by the Administrator to fulfill the duties of the Administration under any other construction contract or agreement entered into in conformity with the provisions of this act.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS

SEC. 5. (a) Whenever any local school authority determines that (1) it has need for any additional school facility and (2) the acquisition, construction, or improvement of such facility cannot be financed by any means other than by a school construction contract executed under this section, such authority may prepare a detailed plan for the acquisition, construction, or improvement of any school facility in conformity with the requirements of this section.

(b) Each such plan shall include:

(1) the name and address of the local school authority requiring such school facility.

(2) the name and address of the local school authority which will become a party to any contract executed under this section and will be responsible for the repayment of any sum advanced by the Administration thereon, if such authority is not the authority named under paragraph (1).

(3) evidence satisfactory to the Administration as to the legal capacity of such local school authority to enter into and to be bound by any such contract.

(4) a statement explaining the nature and extent of the need so to be satisfied.

(5) a description of the measures taken by such authority to finance the construction of such school facility by other means, and the reasons why such construction cannot be financed by any means other than that authorized by this section.

(6) a description of the site upon which the contemplated school facility would be constructed under such plan, and complete architectural and engineering plans and specifications for any school facility the construction of which is contemplated by the plan.

(7) a detailed analysis of the estimated total cost of the execution of such plan, together with a statement of the basis upon which such estimate was prepared.

(8) evidence satisfactory to the Administration of the willingness and capacity of the local school authority which would become a party to any contract executed under this section to furnish not less than 10 per centum of such total cost through (A) the application of funds available to such authority, (B) the furnishing of land suitable for use as a site for any school facility the construction of which is contemplated by the plan, or (C) the rendition of architectural or engineering services incident to such construction, which land or services shall not be credited for such purpose at any value in excess of that determined by the Administration to be reasonable.

(9) a statement of the term in which such local school authority will repay in conformity with the provisions of this section any sum advanced by the Administration for the execution of such plan.

(c) Each such plan shall be deemed an approved plan if (A) it has been approved by the State school authority of the State within which the local school authority which prepared such plan is situated and (B) the Administrator of General Services has approved the architectural and engineering plans and specifications for any school facility the construction of which is contemplated by the plan, and the site upon which such contemplated facility is to be constructed.

(d) The Administration is authorized to advance from the fund to any local school authority such sum as may be required to carry into execution any approved plan prepared in conformity with this section upon the execution of a contract between the Administration and the local school authority concerned which:

(1) requires such local school authority to convey to the Administration, before the making of any such advance, marketable title in fee simple to the land upon which any school facility financed in whole or in part by such advance is to be constructed.

(2) requires such local school authority to transfer to the Administration title to such school facility in such manner and at such time as the Administration shall prescribe.

(3) requires such local school authority to repay the sum so advanced, together with interest on the unrepaid balance of such

sum at the rate or rates specified by the Director, by equal annual installment payments made for not less than 10 or more than 25 years.

(4) requires such local school authority to make adequate provision for the care, maintenance, and utilization of such school facility until the completion of such payments.

(5) upon the completion of such payments, requires the Adminristration to convey to such local school authority title to such school facility and to the land conveyed to the Administration pursuant to paragraph (1).

(6) provides that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on construction work performed in the execution of the plan shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276a–276a–5), and that every such employee shall receive compensation at a rate not less than 1½ times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of 8 hours in any workday or 40 hours in the workweek, as the case may be. The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan No. 14 of 1950 (15 F. R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276c).

(7) contains such other terms and conditions as the Administration determines to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States and to secure the performance by such local school authority of its obligations under such contract.

(e) No contract executed under this section may provide for any advance of funds in any amount in excess of 90 percent of the estimated total cost of the execution of the plan for which such advance is to be made. No contract shall be executed by the Administration under this section with any local school authority of any State at any time which—

(1) the aggregate unrepaid balance of all indebtedness to the Administration theretofore incurred by such local school authority equals or exceeds $2,500,000; or

(2) such local school authority is in default in the performance of its obligations under any contract between such local school authority and the Administration previously executed under this act; or

(3) the aggregate amount of the annual installment payments due but unpaid upon all contracts in effect between the Administration and local school authorities of such State exceeds 5 percent of the aggregate amount of all sums advanced by the Administration under all such contracts then in effect.

(f) Except as specifically provided by this section, nothing contained in this act shall authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or prescribe any requirement with respect to, any (1) State school authority, local school authority, or school to or on behalf of which any funds have been or may be advanced pursuant to this section, or (2) curriculum or program of instruction of any school or school system.

(g) No money advanced by the Administration under this section to any local school authority for the execution of any plan may be expended by such authority for any purpose not required for the execution of such plan. Whoever, being an officer, employee, or agent of any local school authority, willfully appropriates to his own use any money so advanced, or expends or attempts to expend, or combines or conspires with any other person to expend, any money so advanced for any purpose not required for the execution of such plan, with knowledge that such expenditure is not so required, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION AGREEMENTS

SEC. 6. (a) Whenever the Administrator of General Services determines that (1) the need for public-building space for permanent activities of the Federal Government in any particular area cannot be satisfied by the utilization of any available property owned by the Federal Government, and (2) no means other than an agreement authorized by this section is available to provide such space, he may prepare in conformity with the provisions of this section a detailed plan for the acquisition, construction, or improvement of such structures or facilities as he determines to be required to satisfy such need. Whenever the Postmaster General determines that (1) the need for public-building space for postal purposes in any particular area cannot be satisfied by the utilization of any available property owned by the Federal Government, (2) the receipts of the post office serving such area exceed $10,000 per year, and (3) no means other than an agreement authorized by this section is available to provide such space, he may prepare in conformity with the provisions of this section a detailed plan for the acquisition, construction, or improvement of such structures or facilities as he determines to be required to satisfy such need. Such plans may be prepared with respect to needs occurring within any State.

(b) Each such plan shall include:

(1) the name of each department, agency, or activity of the Federal Government requiring the space to be provided thereunder.

(2) a certificate of need for such space executed by the head of each such department, agency, or activity, together with a statement explaining nature and extent of the need so to be satisfied.

(3) a description of the measures taken by or on behalf of such department, agency, or activity to obtain such space by other means, and the reasons why such space cannot be provided by means other than that authorized by this section.

(4) the certificate of the Administrator of General Services, or in the case of needs of the postal service the certificate of the Postmaster General, that suitable space required to meet such need is not owned by the Federal Government, and cannot be obtained through the rental of private property at a cost commensurate with the costs to be incurred by the using department, agency, or activity under the terms of the plan.

(5) a description of all property to be acquired, and each structure or facility to be acquired, constructed, or improved pursuant to the plan.

(6) a detailed analysis of the estimated total cost of the acquisition, construction, or improvement contemplated by the plan, together with a statement of the basis upon which such estimate was prepared.

(7) a statement of the sum to be paid annually under the plan by each using department, agency, or activity of the Federal Government in repayment of the sums advanced by the Administration for the execution of such plan.

(8) a statement of the amount of any rent and other housing costs currently being paid by each such department, agency, or activity for building space which would not be paid if the plan were to be executed.

(9) a statement by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that the execution of the plan is necessary and in conformity with the policy of the President, which statement shall be based upon budgetary and related considerations and shall not constitute approval of the specific terms or provisions of any proposed agreement or of the selection of any particular contractor for the execution of any part of the plan.

(c) Each such plan shall be deemed to be an approved plan upon the expiration of the first period of sixty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which such plan is transmitted to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives, unless between such date of transmittal and the expiration of such period there has been passed by either House of the Congress, by the affirmative vote of a majority of the authorized membership of that House, a resolution stating in substance that such House does not approve such plan.

(d) The Administration is authorized to advance from the fund to the Administrator of General Services, or to the Postmaster General, as the case may be, such sum as may be required to carry into execution any approved plan prepared by such officer under this section in conformity with an agreement entered into with such officer under which such officer undertakes to repay such sum, together with interest on the unrepaid balance of such sum at the rate or rates specified by the Director, by equal annual installment payments made for not less than 10 or more than twenty-five years in compliance with the requirements of this section. Appropriated funds now or hereafter available for the payment of rent and related charges for premises by any department, agency, or activity of the Federal Government occupying any public building space provided through the execution of such plan shall be available to such officer for application to such annual installment payments.

(e) Upon the execution of such agreement with respect to any approved plan prepared by the Administrator of General Services, or the Postmaster General, as the case may be, such officer is authorized to (1) acquire such real and personal property and to enter into such contracts as may be required to carry such plan into effect, and (2) apply to the discharge of obligations so incurred money advanced by the Administration under such agreement. Except as otherwise specifically provided by this section, all contracts entered into by the Administrator of General Services or the Postmaster General under this section with any private contractor shall be executed and carried into effect in compliance with all requirements of law applicable to like contracts executed by such officer under which the obligations of the United States are to be discharged through the payment of appropriated funds.

(f) No agreement entered into pursuant to subsection (d) upon any approved plan shall provide for the payment to the Administration by the Administrator of General Services or the Postmaster General of any annual installment payment which exceeds 15 per centum of the fair market value of the property to be supplied pursuant to such plan, determined as of the date of execution of such agreement or, in the case of any plan contemplating the future construction of any structure or facility, the date of completion of such construction.

(g) For three years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administration in entering into agreements for the financing of approved plans prepared under this section shall give priority to approved plans for the construction of not more than two additional post office buildings within each congressional district for which plans for such buildings shall have been prepared and reported to the Congress as eligible projects under the Public Buildings Act of 1949 (40 U. S. C. 352–355).

GENERAL POWERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 7. (a) The Administration, in the performance of its duties and in the exercise

of its authority under this Act, shall have power—

(1) to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act;

(2) to adopt, alter, and use a seal which shall be judicially noticed;

(3) to issue interest-bearing obligations of the United States subject to the provisions of this act;

(4) to enter into, and perform its obligations and enforce its rights under, contracts and agreements authorized by sections 5 and 6 of this Act;

(5) to accept, hold, and convey title to real and personal property incident to the performance of such obligations and the enforcement of such rights;

(6) to sue and be sued in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction, or in any district court of the United States, in any case or controversy arising from the execution or with respect to the performance of any contract executed under section 5 of this Act, except that no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Director, the Administration, or its property; and

(7) in the event of any default on the part of any local school authority upon its obligations under any contract executed under section 5 of this Act, to assign, lease, or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, upon such terms and conditions as the Director determines to be reasonable, any property the title to which is held by the Administration to secure the performance by such local school authority of its obligations under such contract.

(b) In administering the provisions of this Act, the Administration is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government. Payment for such services and facilities may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon by the Director and the head of the department or agency concerned.

REPORTS

SEC. 8. (a) The Administration shall transmit to the Congress in January of each year a report which shall contain a full and complete description of all operations conducted under this act during the preceding calendar year. Such report shall contain information with respect to—

(1) offices established, and personnel employed, by the Administration:

(2) the nature and extent of the utilization by the Administration during such year of services and facilities of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government;

(3) the financial status of the fund;

(4) outstanding obligations of the Administration;

(5) contracts and agreements entered into by the Administraiton under sections 5 and 6 of this Act during the preceding calendar year;

(6) the status of any construction undertaken for the execution of any plan for which any advance of funds has been made under section 5 or section 6 of this Act;

(7) the nature and extent of any default on the part of any department or agency of the Federal Government, or on the part of any local school authority, under any such contract or agreement in effect;

(8) action taken by the Administration with respect to any such default; and

(9) facts concerning the termination, during the preceding calendar year, of any such contract or agreement.

(b) Such report may contain such recommendations for such additional legislation as the Administration may consider necessary or desirable to improve the administration of this Act.



## AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of employers who are engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce, to eliminate certain exemptions, and for other purposes, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a section-by-section analysis of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1267) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of employers who are engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce, to eliminate certain exemptions, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. MCNAMARA) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1267

A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of employers who are engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce, to eliminate certain exemptions, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the "Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1957."

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the "Act"), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that the existence in industries engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce or in any activities affecting commerce, of labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers (1) causes commerce and the channels and instrumentalities of commerce to be used to spread and perpetuate such labor conditions among the workers of the several States: (2) burdens and affects commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce; (3) constitutes an unfair method of competition in commerce; (4) leads to labor disputes burdening and obstructing commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce; and (5) interferes with the orderly and fair marketing of goods in commerce.

"(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act, through the exercise by Congress of its power to regulate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, subject only to the limitations expressly prescribed in this act, to correct and as rapidly as practicable to eliminate the conditions above referred to in industries engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce or in any activity affecting commerce without substantially curtailing employment or earning power."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (j) of section 3 of such Act, defining the term "produced," is amended to read as follows:

"(j) 'Produced' means produced, manufactured, mined, handled, or in any other manner worked on in any State; and for the purposes of this Act an employee shall be deemed to have been engaged in the production of goods if such employee was employed in producing, manufacturing, mining, handling, transporting, or in any other manner working on such goods, or in any process or occupation necessary to the production thereof in any State."

(b) Subsection (m) of section 3 of such Act, defining the term "wage," is amended to read as follows:

"(m) 'Wage' paid to any employee includes the reasonable cost, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, to the employer of furnishing such employee with board, lodging, or other facilities, if such board, lodging, or other facilities are customarily furnished by such employer to his employees: *Provided*, That the cost of board, lodging, or other facilities shall not be included in the wage paid to any employee if the furnishing of such facilities is an incident of and necessary to his employment and such facilities are practicably available only from the employer."

(c) Section 3 of such Act is further amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following new paragraphs:

"(p) 'Activity affecting commerce' includes any activity in commerce, necessary to commerce, or competing with any activity in commerce, or where the payment of wages at rates below those prescribed by this act burdens or obstructs or tends to burden or obstruct commerce or the free flow of goods in commerce.

"(q) 'Hired farm labor' includes the labor of any person employed on a farm, except the labor of the farmer and his immediate family.

"(r) 'Farm enterprise' comprises all tracts of land, whether contiguous or not, under one management, located in a county and immediately adjacent counties on which any of the operations enumerated in paragraph (f) of this section is carried on.

"(s) 'Man-day' means any day on which hired farm labor is performed.

"(t) 'American vessel' includes any vessel which is defined as a 'vessel of the United States' in title 18, United States Code, section 9, or which is documented or numbered under the laws of the United States."

SPECIAL INDUSTRY COMMITTEES FOR PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary of Labor shall as soon as practicable appoint a special industry committee to recommend the minimum rate or rates of wages to be paid under section 6 to employees in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands, or in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce or employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise where their employer is engaged in any activity affecting commerce, or the Secretary may appoint separate industry committees to recommend the minimum rate or rates of wages to be paid under section 6 to employees therein engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce or employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise where their employer is engaged in any activity affecting commerce in particular industries. An industry committee appointed under this subsection shall be composed of residents of such island or islands where the employees with respect to whom such committee was appointed are employed and residents of the United States outside of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. In determining the minimum rate or rates of wages to be paid, and in determining classifications, such industry committees shall be subject to the provisions of section 8."

MINIMUM WAGES

SEC. 5. (a) Subsection (a) of section 6 of such Act is amended by inserting after the

words "for commerce" and before the words "wages at" a comma and the following: "and every employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce shall pay to each of his employees employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise where he is so engaged."

(b) Subsection (c) of section 6 of such Act is amended by inserting after the words "for commerce" and before the words "only for" a comma and the following: "or employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise where his employer is engaged in any activity affecting commerce."

MAXIMUM HOURS

SEC. 6. (a) Subsection (a) of section 7 of such Act is amended by inserting after the words "for commerce" and before the words "for a workweek" a comma and the following: "and no employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce shall employ any of his employees employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise where he is so engaged."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out clause (3) thereof.

(c) Section 7 of such Act is further amended by striking out subsection (c) thereof.

WAGE ORDERS IN PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

SEC. 7. (a) Subsection (a) of section 8 of such Act is amended by inserting after the words "for commerce" and before the words "is to reach" in the first sentence the following: "or in any activity affecting commerce"; and by inserting after the words "for commerce" and before the words "in any such industry" in the next to the last sentence the following: "or in any activity affecting commerce."

CHILD LABOR PROVISIONS

SEC. 8. Subsection (c) of section 12 of such Act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and no employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce shall employ any oppressive child labor in or about or in connection with any enterprise where he is so engaged."

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 9. (a) Subsection (a) of section 13 of such Act is amended by striking out clauses (4), (8), (9), (10), (11), (12), (13), and (15) thereof, by renumbering clauses (1), (2), (3), (5), (6), (7), and (14) as clause (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7), respectively, and by amending such clauses to read as follows:

"(1) any employee employed in a bona fide executive, administrative, or professional capacity (as such terms are defined and delimited by regulations of the Secretary of Labor); or (2) any employee employed in any retail or service estbalishment by an employer having neither more than four such establishments nor more than a total annual dollar volume of sales of goods or services of $500,000: *Provided*, That a 'retail or service establishment' shall mean an establishment not more than 25 per centum of whose annual dollar volume of sales of goods or services (or of both) is for resale or is made to customers who are engaged in a mining, manufacturing, transportation, commercial, or communications business; or (3) any employee employed in any establishment engaged in laundering, cleaning, or repairing clothes or fabrics by an employer having neither more than four such establishments nor more than a total annual dollar volume of sales or servicing of $500,000: *Provided*, That not more than 25 per centum of such employer's annual dollar volume of sales or servicing shall be made to customers who are engaged in a mining, manufacturing, transportation, commercial, or communications business; or (4) any employee employed in the catching, taking, harvesting, cultivating, or farming of any kind of fish, shellfish, crustacea, sponges, seaweeds, or other aquatic forms of animal or vegetable life, including the going to and returning from work and loading and unloading when performed by any such employee; or (5) any employee employed in agriculture during any calendar quarter, by a farm enterprise which used less than 400 man-days of hired farm labor during each of the preceding four quarters other than labor performed by members of the family of a farmer-operated enterprise; or (6) any employee to the extent that such employee is exempted by regulations or orders of the Secretary of Labor issued under section 14; or (7) any employee employed as a seaman on a vessel other than an American vessel: *Provided*, That an employee employed as a seaman on an American vessel shall be paid not less than the rate that will provide the employee, for the period covered by the wage payment, wages equal to compensation at the minimum hourly rate prescribed by section 6 for all hours during which he was actually on duty (not including off-duty periods aboard ship when the employee rendered no service)."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 13 of such Act is amended by striking out clauses (1), (4), and (5) thereof, by renumbering clauses (2) and (3) as clauses (1) and (2), and by amending such clauses, and inserting a new clause (3), to read as follows:

"(1) any employee of an express company, sleeping car company, refrigerator car company or carrier by railroad subject to the provisions of Part I of the Interstate Commerce Act; or (2) any employee of a carrier by air subject to the provisions of title II of the Railway Labor Act; or (3) any employee employed as a seaman on an American vessel."

(c) Subsection (c) of section 13 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The provisions of this section shall not apply with respect to any empolyee employed in agriculture who is exempt under clause (5) of subsection (a) of this section, if such employee is employed outside of school hours for the school district where such employee is living while so employed, or to any employee employed as an actor or performer in motion pictures or theatrical productions, or in radio or television productions."

(a) Subsection (d) of section 13 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The provisions of sections 6, 7, and 12 shall not apply to any employee engaged in the delivery of newspapers to consumers at their residences: *Provided*, That section 12 shall not apply to any employee otherwise engaged in the delivery of newspapers to consumers when such employee is employed outside of school hours for the school district where such employee is living while he is so employed, and such employee is 16 years of age or over."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 10. This Act shall take effect upon the expiration of 90 days from the date of its enactment.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1, title: This section simply sets forth the proposed official title of the proposed bill, namely, "The Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1957."

Section 2, findings and declaration of policy: This section amends the findings and declaration of policy contained in section 2 of the present Fair Labor Standards Act by making clear that "labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers" ought to be corrected and as rapidly as practicable eliminated, not only in "industries engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce," as now provided in the act, but also in "industries engaged in * * * any activity affecting commerce." The act is to be applied broadly and liberally in such a way as to effectuate the carrying out of its remedial and humanitarian purposes, "subject only to the limitations expressly prescribed in this act."

Section 3, definitions: Subsection (a) of this section amends the definition of the term "produced" contained in section 3 (j) of the present Fair Labor Standards Act to read as it did before the 1949 amendments to the act were enacted. Prior to these amendments "produced" was defined as including, not only production of goods itself, but also "any process or occupation necessary to the production thereof." In 1949 this phrase was amended to read, "any closely related process or occupation directly essential to the production thereof," with the result that workers were excluded from the protection of the act if their work was not in a process "closely related" or in an occupation "directly essential" to production. This restructive change would be revoked by the proposed bill, and the original language of section 3 (j) of the act would be restored.

Subsection (b) of section 3 amends the definition of "wage" contained in section 3 (m) of the present Fair Labor Standards Act by adding to it a new, clarifying proviso. Under the present law, the reasonable cost, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, of board, lodging, or other facilities customarily furnished by an employer to his employees is included in the employees' wages for the purpose of determining whether they have been paid in compliance with the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the act. The proposed proviso specifies that the cost of such facilities is not to be taken into account "if the furnishing of such facilities is an incident of and necessary to * * * employment and such facilities are practicably available only from the employer."

Subsection (c) of section 3 adds a number of new definitions to section 3 of the present Fair Labor Standards Act. Each of them must be read in conjunction with changes that the bill proposes to make in other sections of the act.

Paragraph (p) must be read together with the changes proposed to be made in the basic provisions of the act dealing with minimum wages, maximum hours, and child labor. It proposes a new basis of coverage by these provisions. Its effect is to extend the protection of the standards provided for in the act, not only to employees who are "engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce," but also to employees who are employed by an employer who is "engaged in any activity affecting commerce." As defined in this paragraph, "activity affecting commerce" includes "any activity in commerce, necessary to commerce, or competing with any activity in commerce, or where the payment of wages below those prescribed by this act burdens or obstructs or tends to burden or obstruct commerce or the free flow of goods in commerce." This definition is substantially similar to that contained in the National Labor Relations Act, and the effect of its inclusion is to make the basic coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act substantially similar to the coverage of that act.

Paragraphs (q), (r), and (s) define three new terms which are used in the revised exemption applicable to employees employed in agriculture, which is proposed in section 8 (a) of the bill (see clause (5), p. 4). Read in this context, these terms are designed to distinguished between the large-scale, industrialized types of agricultural enterprises whose employees would be brought within the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the small or family-operated farms that would continue to be exempt from the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the act. Paragraph (q) defines the term "hired farm labor" as including the la-

bor of any person employed on a farm, "except the labor of the farmer and his immediate family." Paragraph (r) defines a "farm enterprise" as comprising "all tracts of land, whether contiguous or not, under one management, located in a county, and immediately adjacent counties" on which farm operations, as defined in section 3 (f) of the act, are carried on. Paragraph (s) defines the term "man-day" as meaning "any day on which hired farm labor is performed."

The term "American vessel," which is defined in paragraph (t), is used in the revised exemptions applicable to seamen which are proposed in section 8 of the bill (see clause 7, subsection (a), and clause (3), subsection (b), p. 4). As defined in this paragraph, the term includes any vessel defined as a "vessel of the United States" under title 18, United States Code, section 9, or which is "documented or numbered under the laws of the United States." Vessels of the United States, as defined in the code section referred to, are not limited to vessels belonging to the United States, but include vessels belonging to any citizen of the United States or to any corporation created by or under the laws of the United States or of any State, Territory, District, or possession of the United States.

Section 4, special industry committees for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands: This section amends section 5 of the present Fair Labor Standards Act to authorize the appointment of special industry committees to recommend the minimum rate or rates of wages to be paid under section 6 of the act to employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands who are employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise where their employer is engaged in any activity affecting commerce. Taken together with sections 5 (c) and 7 (a) of the bill, this section applies to the fixing of minimum wage rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands the same coverage tests, based on activities of the employer, rather than activities of the employees, as the bill applies to the minimum wage, maximum hours, and child-labor provisions of the act (see secs. 5 (a), 6 (a), and 8 of the bill). The present tests of coverage, based on whether the employee is "engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce," however, would also be retained.

Section 5, minimum wages: Subsection (a) provides that the minimum wage prescribed by section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act shall be paid, not only by every employer to each of his employees who is "engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce," but also by every employer who is "engaged in any activity affecting commerce" to each of his employees who is "employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise" where his employer is so engaged. It thus adds to the present coverage tests based on each individual employee's activity a new test based on the activity which is being engaged in by his employer. If the employer is engaged in any activity affecting commerce, his employees employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise where he is so engaged will be covered by the minimum wage provisions of the act, regardless of the activity in which the individual employees may be engaged.

Subsection (b) of section 5 amends section 6 (c) of the present Fair Labor Standards Act, which gives effect to minimum wage rates specified in special industry wage orders in the case of employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Under the provisions of the bill these rates are extended to employees "employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise" where their employer is "engaged in any activity affecting commerce." These rates will, of course, continue to apply to each employee who is "engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce."

Section 6, maximum hours: Subsection (a) extends the coverage of the maximum-hours provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to employees who are employed by any employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce in exactly the same way in which the minimum-wage provisions would be extended to such employees, as explained in the discussion of section 5 (a) of the bill above.

Subsection (b) strikes out of the Fair Labor Standards Act the provision contained in section 7 (b) (3) thereof, by which employers are exempted from compliance with the maximum hours provision "for a period or periods of not more than 14 workweeks in the aggregate in any calendar year in an industry found by the Secretary of Labor to be of a seasonal nature." The only overtime exemptions will be in section 13 (b).

Subsection (c) strikes out of the Fair Labor Standards Act the provisions contained in section 7 (c) thereof, by which employers engaged in certain agricultural processing operations enjoy total or partial exemptions from the act's maximum hours provisions. As noted above, the only overtime exemptions to be continued under the bill will be in section 13 (b).

Section 7, wage orders in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands: This section provides for changes in the scope of "commerce" for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands similar to those already noted.

Section 8, child-labor provisions: This section extends the coverage of the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to employers who are engaged in any activity affecting commerce in substantially the same way in which the minimum-wage provisions are extended to the employees of such employers, as explained in the discussions of section 5 (a) of the bill above.

Section 9, exemptions: Subsection (a) strikes out eight of the exemptions from the minimum-wage and maximum-hours provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act that are now provided for in section 13 (a) of the act. These eight exemptions are the following:

(a) Clause (4) applicable to employees of certain retail establishments processing goods;

(b) Clause (8), applicable to employees of certain weekly, semiweekly, and daily newspapers;

(c) Clause (9), applicable to employees of local transit companies;

(d) Clause (10), applicable to employees engaged in certain agricultural processing operations within the "area of production";

(e) Clause (11), applicable to switchboard operators employed in public telephone exchanges having up to 750 stations;

(f) Clause (12), applicable to employees of taxicab companies;

(g) Clause (13), applicable to employees in retail or service establishments engaged in handling telegraphic messages under an agency or contract arrangement with a telegraph company; and

(h) Clause (15), applicable to employees of small logging operations.

Subsection (a) also renumbers the remaining seven clauses of section 13 (a) of the present Fair Labor Standards Act that would be retained. Thus renumbered, clauses (1), (2), (3), (5), (6), (7), and (14) would become clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7), respectively.

Finally, subsection (a) amends these clauses as follows:

1. Clause (1) eliminates the present exemption for outside salesmen;

2. Clause (2) eliminates the exemption for employees of chain or large independent retail and service enterprises and for employees of enterprises in the selling and service fields that do an essentially nonretail business, even though they do make some retail sales or perform some retail service functions. The exemption would be limited to employees employed in a retail or service establishment "by an employer having neither more than four such establishments nor more than a total annual dollar volume of sales of goods or services of $500,000". An establishment would be deemed to be a "retail or service establishment", for purposes of this exemption, only if not more than 25 percent of its annual dollar volume of sales of goods or services is for resale or is made to customers who are engaged in a mining, manufacturing, transportation, commercial, or communications business. Under the proposed bill, however, the small corner grocery store, cleaning and pressing establishment, neighborhood drugstore, and the like, would continue to be exempt;

3. Clause (3) revises the exemption applicable to employees of laundering, cleaning, and repairing establishments in a manner substantially similar to that in which the exemption applicable to employees of retail and service establishments is proposed to be revised. Employees of the large industrial and commercial laundries and cleaning establishments would no longer be denied the protection of the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The small home laundry, however, would continue to be exempt;

4. Clause (4) eliminates the present exemption applicable to fish and seafood processing (fish and seafood canning are already covered by the minimum wage, but exempt from the maximum hours, provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act), but retains the exemption applicable to fishing and gathering of seafood and other aquatic forms of animal or vegetable life;

5. Clause (5) limits the exemption for employees employed in agriculture so as to bring within the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act employees of large, industrialized agricultural enterprises, while leaving the small, farmer-operated farm exempt. The exemption would be limited to employees employed during any calendar quarter by a farm enterprise which used less than 400 man-days of hired farm labor during each of the preceding four quarters other than labor performed by members of the family of a farmer-operated enterprise;

6. Clause (6) continues without change the exemption included in the present law for learners, apprentices, and handicapped workers pursuant to orders issued by the Secretary of Labor under section 14 of the Fair Labor Standards Act;

7. Clause (7) eliminates the exemption for seamen employed on American vessels which is now contained in the law. It also provides that the compensation these employees receive must amount to not less than the minimum hourly rate prescribed in section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act for all hours during which they are actually on duty (not including off-duty hours aboard ship when they render no service). Seamen on other than American vessels continue to be exempt from both the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the act. Under subsection (b), seamen on American vessels are exempt from the maximum hours provisions.

Subsection (b) strikes out three of the exemptions from the maximum hours provisions that are now contained in section 13 (b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act. These three exemptions are the following:

(a) Clause (1), applicable to motor vehicle employees subject to section 204 of the Motor Carrier Act of 1935;

(b) Clause (4), applicable to employees engaged in canning fish, shellfish, or other aquatic forms of animal or vegetable life, or byproducts thereof; and

(c) Clause (5) applicable to outside buyers of poultry, eggs, cream, or milk, in the raw or natural state.

Subsection (b) also renumbers the two remaining clauses of section 13 (b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act that would be retained. Thus renumbered, clauses (2) and (3) would become clauses (1) and (2). A new clause (3) would be added. The new clauses (1), (2), and (3) would provide as follows:

1. Clause (1) exempts from the maximum hours provisions employees of express, sleeping car, refrigerator car, and railroad carrier companies subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act;

2. Clause (2) continues to exempt from the maximum hours provisions employees of carriers by air subject title II of the Railway Labor Act; and

3. Clause (3) exempts from the maximum hours provisions seamen employed on American vessels (see discussion of proposed revised clause (7) of section 13 (a) of the act, above).

Subsection (c) amends the exemptions from the child-labor provisions contained in section 13 (c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Aside from minor language changes, its principal effect is to limit the exemption for children employed in agriculture to those who are employed on small, farmer-operated farms. Such employees may be employed only outside school hours for the school district where they are living while so employed. The exemption for children employed as actors or performers in motion pictures or theaterical productions, or in radio or television productions, which is contained in section 13 (c) of the present act, is continued.

Subsection (d) continues the exemption from the minimum wage, maximum hours, and child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act which is now applicable to employees engaged in the delivery of newspapers to the consumer, but specifies that such delivery to the consumer must be at his residence. An exemption from the child-labor provisions would also be provided for employees otherwise engaged in the delivery of newspapers to consumers, for example, as newsboys, but only if they are more than 16 years of age and are so employed outside of school hours for the school district where they are living while so employed.

Section 10, effective date: This section specifies that the changes in the Fair Labor Standards Act proposed in the bill shall take effect 90 days from the date of the bill's enactment.

## PROPOSED LEGALIZATION OF FATHER'S DAY

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, as an American woman, I sometimes feel just a little embarrassed at the deification accorded us by the male population. Philip Wylie, in his Generation of Vipers, wonders if we have not been more hindered than aided by what he calls all this momism. I am all for loving and honoring our mothers. I am in favor of the legislation passed by the Congress in 1917 legalizing Mother's Day.

As far as I can gather, it seems that the Congress has been guilty now for 40 years of the worst possible oversight, to say the least, perpetrated against the gallant fathers, young and old, of our land.

As a daughter, as a woman, and as a United States Senator, I must say as strongly as I know how, that the conduct of the Congress in this regard should cause us to hide our faces in shame. And here is why:

Either we honor both our parents, mother and father, or let us desist from honoring either one. But to single out just 1 of our 2 parents and omit the other is the most grievous insult imaginable.

Congress represents all of our citizens, men and women. At least, I always thought so. But instead of considering the feelings of both men and women, you gentlemen have only considered your own feelings; you were too self-conscious to honor yourselves, as fathers, so every year you have pigeonholed every resolution introduced in this Chamber to legalize this fine American institution, now firmly established and observed, which the people affectionately call Father's Day.

As the only woman Member of this august body, I feel certain I speak for the women in the country when I say to you here and now, "Gentlemen, you are mistaken. You did wrong when you failed to pass the Father's Day resolutions year after year. Mothers are proud that you have designated a day for them. But they are filled with chagrin that you have rejected their life partners, their sweethearts, the protectors of their land and their homes, the fathers of their children."

Begone your small, sensitive feelings, gentlemen. Respond to the call of more than 100 million American citizens who look to you, after all these years, to rectify this slur on our manhood. You might say this is too insignificant a matter to waste time upon, when we face the gravest perils of history in the world today. You could not be more mistaken. The peril we face in today's world is the lessening of respect for law and order, for home and integrity, for the sanctity of family ties. The enemies of free people today have no respect for the head of the home. Their God is the state. Ours is the individual. Let us, then, pay homage to the head of our home. Let us revere the morality, the religion which is the responsibility of the father, the head of our family system.

Father's Day was founded in the church. In 1910, the Ministerial Union of Spokane, through Mrs. John Bruce Dodd of that city, founded Father's Day. One of the Ten Commandments in our Bible reminds us to "Honor thy father and thy mother." We can do no less, gentlemen, than obey that Bible, which is the foundation stone of this free Republic.

And so, Mr. President, today I introduce, for appropriate reference an equal-rights joint resolution, which will authorize the President of the United States to proclaim the third Sunday of each June as Father's Day throughout all the 48 States and in all our possessions around the world, for if we have a Mother's Day, then the inescapable logic and equity of equal rights must be invoked by legalizing Father's Day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 59) relating to Father's Day, introduced by Mrs. SMITH of Maine, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PRINTING OF REPORT ON EFFECTS OF ADDITIONAL DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN AT CHICAGO (S. DOC. NO. 28)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, Department of the Army, transmitting a report from the Secretary of the Army prepared at the request of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to meet a need for information on the subject of the effect on the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River of an increase of 1,000 cubic feet per second in the diversion at Chicago, together with illustrations. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address by him at Lithuanian Independence Day anniversary in Chicago, Ill., on February 17, 1957.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

Address delivered by him before 42d annual meeting of American Association of State Highway Officials at Atlantic City, N. J., on November 27, 1956.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

Address delivered by him before the Vermont State Legislature on February 13, 1957.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

Testimony by Senator TALMADGE before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Committee on Judiciary, February 16, 1957.

By Mr. BUTLER:

Statement by him on the anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

## PROTOCOL TO INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive F, 85th Congress, 1st session, a protocol to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries signed at Washington under date of February 8, 1949, which protocol was signed at Washington under date of June 25, 1956, for the United States of America and nine other governments, and that the protocol, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and that the President's message may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed, and the protocol, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message from the President will

be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the protocol to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries signed at Washington under date of February 8, 1949, which protocol was signed at Washington under date of June 25, 1956, for the United States of America and nine other governments.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the protocol.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 18, 1957.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Certified copy of the protocol to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries.)

## TWO ANSWERS TO MOSCOW—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in connection with the pending debate over our so-called Middle East policy and the Eisenhower doctrine, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD, because of the importance of the matter, an editorial from the New York Times of last Friday, February 15, entitled "Two Answers to Moscow."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO ANSWERS TO MOSCOW

The Soviet propaganda offensive against the Eisenhower doctrine has received two prompt and conclusive answers. One was given yesterday by the Steering Committee of the United Nations General Assembly, which refused to dignify the Soviet charges against this doctrine, and the whole American foreign policy, as worthy of consideration. The other was given by the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees, which voted, 20 to 8, to confirm the President's authority to use both American troops and American money to implement this doctrine in the Middle East.

The resolution adopted by the two Senate committees is somewhat less precise and on some points more restrictive than the text proposed by the administration and approved an overwhelming bipartisan majority in the House of Representatives. But lest the partisan wrangling of a few Democratic Senators create a false impression abroad, it must be emphasized that in substance this resolution also provides for full congressional support of that doctrine and the warning it sounds against Communist aggression in the Middle East. It may still be hoped that the full Senate will follow the House and restore the original wording. But if an effort toward that end should threaten further delay, it would be better if both Houses adopted the committee version with as near unanimity as possible, in order to demonstrate that in substance the whole country stands behind the President's program.

Such a decisive vote would carry more conviction abroad, and thereby make the doctrine more effective as a deterrent to war, than any hairsplitting over a few words. This is all the more true because this hairsplitting is being done not over the doctrine itself but primarily over the domestic constitutional issue involving the President's powers as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and the prerogative of Congress to declare war.

The President's power to use the Armed Forces outside of the United States to defend the country against aggression is and remains unchallenged. But because American interests have become so worldwide that an attack even far removed from our shores can constitute a deadly danger to our security, because we have assumed special obligations to resist aggression under the United Nations Charter, and because President Truman's use of our forces in honoring these obligations in Korea without specific congressional sanction aroused Republican rightwing criticism—perhaps also because Mr. Eisenhower is a military man leaning over backward to avert suspicions of military usurpation—the President has sought prior congressional authorization for the exercise of his constitution powers.

In substance there is only a verbal difference between the two versions of the resolution before Congress, with the Democratic version obviously designed to uphold President Truman's action in Korea. For this effort Mr. Truman himself has little thanks, and urges his partisans to back President Eisenhower. Mr. Truman had to act immediately in an emergency; President Eisenhower's move is designed to avert an emergency. But the Democratic version may also hide a contrary reservation hinted at by its author, Senator MANSFIELD, who declared that any action in the Middle East must be taken within our constitutional processes.

This could imply, in emulation of Republican rightwing contentions, that any action to put our preparation to use Armed Forces into practice is subject to another prior congressional approval, which might entail another prolonged debate when the emergency is upon us. It is the duty of the Senate to make plain that, if the Democratic version is finally adopted by Congress, the constitutional processes on this issue will have been completed and that the President will then in fact be authorized to act, on his own responsibility, but without delay or further challenge.

## DR. JOHN VON NEUMANN

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, in the passing of Dr. John von Neumann a week ago Friday, science and the free world suffered a tragic loss.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and as chairman of its Subcommittee on Military Applications, it was my honor to know Dr. von Neumann, and to have the benefit of his wise counsel. This, I can assure the Senate, was an honor indeed.

His scientific talents were famed the world over. His contributions to this scientific century were monumental. They continue to benefit both the security of our country and the free world, and the welfare of all mankind.

His was the rare combination of the genius of the scientific mind, on the one hand, and the genius of good judgment, on the other. His scientific counsel was supported by an intuitive appreciation of political, economic, and social institutions. He not only grasped the limitless future of science, but he deeply comprehended the nature of the human community in which science must be applied. He was impelled to exploit science to the maximum to save our free institutions and to make possible a better world for people everywhere.

Dr. von Neumann's life is another reminder of the priceless contribution made by those among us who were not born in the United States, but who sought America as a place of opportunity for freemen. Born in Budapest, Hungary, he shared the birthplace of three other great scientific spirits—Dr. Edward Teller, father of the H-bomb, Dr. Theodore von Karman, dean of aeronautical scientists, and Dr. E. P. Wigner, pioneer designer of nuclear reactors. The achievements of Dr. von Neumann should cause us all to reflect upon one of the greatest sources of our strength—men and women who have come to our country from the Old World, who do not hesitate to challenge the unknown.

Mr. President, in concluding my remarks on Dr. von Neumann, I ask unanimous consent that two editorials in praise of his life and record be printed at this point in the RECORD. These editorials are from the Washington Star of Monday, February 11, 1957, and from the Washington Post of Tuesday, February 12, 1957.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 11, 1957]

DR. VON NEUMANN

The Atomic Energy Commission has not exaggerated in describing the death of Dr. John von Neumann as an "irreplaceable loss to the Commission, to science, and to the Nation." For he was a man of unique and very great genius, genius of the kind that expresses itself not only in the formulation of far-reaching abstract theory, but also in the translation of such theory into the tangible substance of operating reality. In that respect, like few other individuals, he played a key role in shaping the fast-changing, revolutionary character of our age.

Almost as soon as he arrived in this country from Hungary in 1930, which was long before he became a member of the AEC, Dr. von Neumann began to contribute significantly to our national life and security. As one of the world's most brilliant mathematicians, a scientist in the purest sense, he probably did more than any other man—certainly more than any other American—in the fabulous and rather mind-reeling business of designing and building computing machines. He was called not for nothing, the human brain behind the development of electronic brains, those marvelous but hard-to-understand contrivances that answer within a matter of days or months mathematical problems whose solution would otherwise require several lifetimes of human effort. Because of what he accomplished in such fields as this, his impact on our era was a major one in terms of developing atomic weapons and the hydrogen bomb, or in terms of harnessing nuclear energy for industrial power and similar beneficent purposes.

It is sad to think that Dr. von Neumann was only 53 years old when he died. Yet, in his tragically too-brief lifetime, he rendered service to the United States on a scale of incalculable value. This was not the land of his birth, but he was one of its most distinguished and priceless parts even before becoming a naturalized citizen in 1937. His AEC colleagues mourn his loss in a way that the whole Nation has reason to mourn his loss—as a human being full of personal charm, warmth, a sense of humor, and tremendous mental gifts. It probably will be a long time before we see his like again.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 12, 1957]

JOHN VON NEUMANN

The untimely death of John von Neumann is a loss not only to the laboratory and seminar but to the world of affairs where he played so large and honorable a role. Dr. von Neumann had been a valued adviser to the Government long before his appointment to the Atomic Energy Commission in 1954. Not the least of his services was his warm defense of J. Robert Oppenheimer in that most painful of loyalty controversies.

Through much of his career Dr. von Neumann was as celebrated among scientists as he was unknown to the public. Yet he was one of the rarest of scientists; his mind dwelt in the abstract universe of mathematics, but his feet were firmly on earth. We owe to his genius the development of electronic calculators, a theory of games which has proven a useful economic tool, and even an improved method of weather forecasting.

Dr. von Neumann's life is, as President Eisenhower rightly stressed, an example of how American society has been enriched by refugees from other lands. A native of Hungary, he came to this country from Germany in the 1930's; Dr. von Neumann was a key figure in the virtual league of nations that enabled America to construct an atomic bomb. Those who would close our doors of asylum might ponder how empty America's pantheon of science would be if this were literally a land without aliens.

## RUSSIAN OPPRESSION OF ARMENIA

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, Communist Russia seized the country of Armenia in December 1920, but on February 18, 1921, just 36 years ago, the Armenians rose up and regained their freedom.

Unfortunately, the overwhelming force of the aggressor made their independence relatively brief, and since that time they have been subjected to Russian oppression. However, we know that the desire for liberty remains strong and undying in the hearts of Armenians, and we may hope that the day will come before too long when Armenia will once again join the number of free and independent nations of the world.

## DEATH OF JUDGE EDWIN M. HOLDEN, OF THE IDAHO SUPREME COURT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I learned recently, with great regret, of the death of a personal friend who was one of Idaho's illustrious citizens, Judge Edwin M. Holden. Judge Holden came to Idaho from Iowa in 1896, and commenced the practice of law at Idaho Falls. From that time forward, he rendered a lifetime's service to his State and country. He was a veteran of the Spanish-American War, in which he fought as a lieutenant in the Army. In 1932, he was elected to the Supreme Court of Idaho, where he served with great distinction until his retirement on July 17, 1950. Several times during that period he was chief justice of the court. With the passing of Judge Holden, Idaho has lost a worthy citizen who will be sorely missed, but long remembered by all who knew him.

## LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on Saturday, February 16, more than 1 million Americans of Lithuanian origin observed Lithuanian Independence Day—the 39th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania as a free and independent nation.

In the homeland of their ancestry this historic anniversary is commemorated only in the hearts of the courageous Lithuanian people. There is no independence in Lithuania today, no freedom, no justice. Since 1940 that ancient land of culture has been held captive by the savage tyranny of Communist aggression.

Lithuania is oppressed and persecuted by the armed might of a foreign invader, but the spirit of independence has not been crushed. It lives on to inspire hope that the day of liberation may be close at hand. Sustained by faith in God and the righteousness of their cause the brave people of Lithuania look forward with complete confidence to the eventual triumph of honor and justice.

We who enjoy the blessings of freedom can help them maintain the tradition of freedom that is sacred to all men of good will. As Americans we may be proud that the United States has never recognized the conquest of Lithuania and the other Baltic States. We support their just claim to free and independent sovereignty.

In recognition of Lithuanian Independence Day I extend greetings to my fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent and join them in prayer for the speedy restoration of Lithuania to its rightful place of honor among the free nations of the world.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to commend my colleague from Pennsylvania for the very fine remarks he has just made with respect to Lithuanian Independence Day. I ask unanimous consent to have my comments on the same subject incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLARK

It is a privilege to join in paying tribute to the people of Lithuania, whose Independence Day was marked on February 16. The State of Pennsylvania, which I represent, has among its citizens 40,000 who are of Lithuanian descent, and the growth and development of the State owes much to the labor, the talent, and the devotion of these people.

Lithuania stands with her sister Baltic States as a symbol around which all freedom-loving people may unite in giving the lie to Soviet claims that the West is imperialistic and Russia the friend of captive colonies. Lithuania was a prospering nation, proudly independent since the end of World War I. It was a nation which was flourishing in every sphere of activity—economic, political, social, and cultural. But it was an obstacle to Russia's westward expansion. The Soviets imposed a mutual-assistance pact on it in 1939, claiming fear of the Nazis, but using the opportunity to station Soviet troops on Lithuanian soil. Next came outright conquest in June 1940, followed by ruthless suppression of opposition and single-slate elections which set up a Communist government. In August 1940 that puppet government asked the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union to admit Lithuania as a Soviet republic within the U. S. S. R.

Since World War II, the entire Lithuanian nation has been remolded in the Soviet image. Sovietization was carried out with the most brutal methods—mass deportations and arrests, slave labor, forced collectivization, terror and suppression. During the recent suppression of the Hungarian revolt, reports coming out of Hungary indicated that the people of that nation had not forgotten the treatment given to the Baltic States by the Soviets, who were again using the weapons of deportation, false arrest, slave labor, to penalize the freedom fighters.

The revolutionary events behind the Iron Curtain during the past several months have brought a thrill of hope to all of us who cherish liberty. They have demonstrated as nothing could the truth that there never has been an imperialism so ruthless and implacable as Soviet imperialism; and they have added a new dimension to our celebrations this year of such historic milestones as Lithuanian Independence Day.

Freedom and independence must one day come to Lithuania again. It must return to the dignity of democracy which it was developing in every sphere of life in the 22 years between its gaining of political independence and its loss of that independence to Soviet tyranny. The people of the United States have never recognized the legality of Lithuania's annexation by the Russians, and we must continue to support Lithuania's moral cause for independence, freedom, and the enjoyment of all those human rights which are dear to us.

OUR HOPES FOR GALLANT LITHUANIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, 39 years ago last Saturday the Republic of Lithuania was proclaimed as an independent nation, marking the end of more than a century of oppression and subjugation by czarist Russia. The anniversary of this event again finds this unfortunate nation, with a glorious history going back to the Middle Ages, dominated and suppressed by Communist Russia.

The short-lived freedom of Lithuania was terminated by heartless infringement of the sovereignty of the Lithuanian people. In violation of every treaty and in disregard of all the principles of decency, the Communists under the cloak of a mutual-assistance pact lowered the Iron Curtain around Lithuania and ruthlessly undertook to sovietize this gallant country.

During the period of Communist domination, thousands upon thousands of Lithuanians have become martyrs in the cause of liberty. But residents of America and other nations where Lithuanians now live have kept alive the spirit of freedom. The United States, which is committed to the restoration of the independent Republic of Lithuania, steadfastly has refused to recognize the tyrannical annexation.

Today, as Lithuanian-Americans recall the short-lived freedom of their homeland, I join in the hope that Lithuania one day will arise from enslave-

ment and that the light of liberty has not been permanently extinguished for the people of that tortured country.

## THE HELLS CANYON DAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on February 15, a letter was sent to the Federal Power Commission by Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton to notify this agency that the Bureau of Reclamation is studying the feasibility of the Pleasant Valley site in the Hells Canyon section of the Snake River for multipurpose development.

The Secretary also disclosed that a special report of the Bureau of Reclamation proposes a high storage dam at the Pleasant Valley site, which would flood out the little Hells Canyon project proposed by the Idaho Power Co. In his letter, the Secretary told the Commission that the detailed study of the high Pleasant Valley Dam was undertaken "in the light of the need for development of additional flood control capacity in the Snake River Basin."

Mr. President, the Pleasant Valley Dam proposal of Secretary Seaton has inadvertently exposed the gigantic hoax involved in the Federal Power Commission decision to license three small Idaho Power Co. dams where the Federal Hells Canyon Dam should be built. Members of the Senate will recall that the Eisenhower administration assented to the Federal Power Commission decision that Idaho Power dams with 1 million acre-feet of flood control storage were "best adapted to a comprehensive plan" for development of the Columbia River Basin.

But now, Mr. President, Secretary Seaton says that more flood control must be built into the Snake River Basin, and he supports further study of a high Pleasant Valley Dam which would flood out 1 of the 3 Idaho Power sites. His action is clearcut evidence that the three Idaho Power dams are not the best possible development.

Senators on the other side of the aisle will remember how the Eisenhower administration used its influence last year to line up a nearly solid Republican vote against the development of needed storage by a high Hells Canyon Dam, the dam which had been recommended by the planning experts of the Corps of Engineers. Now Mr. Seaton has destroyed the illusion voiced by administration spokesmen that the FPC-licensed Idaho Power projects were the best development of Hells Canyon power and flood control potentials. Obviously if high Pleasant Valley Dam—which would inundate Idaho Power's little Hells Canyon site—provides these greater benefits, then the Federal Power Commission has been guilty of licensing inferior development in the Hells Canyon area.

I want to make it clearly understood, Mr. President, that my comments on the Secretary of the Interior's proposal for a high dam at Pleasant Valley do not imply that such a substitute for Hells Canyon is in line with the best development. In my opinion, it is not.

Why does Mr. Seaton propose a storage dam 34 miles downstream from the Hells Canyon site when the Army Corps of Engineers, in its 308 Report as well as the Bureau of Reclamation within the Interior Department itself, recommended such development at the specific and definite Hells Canyon site?

This is a question which the Secretary and his assistants will have to be prepared to answer when the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs holds hearings next month on the Hells Canyon authorization bill.

Mr. President, two wrongs do not make a right. When this story is told, and the full facts about the storage potential of the Middle Snake River are brought out, Congress will want to authorize the high dam at Hells Canyon which is the best project in this or any other river in the Nation, thus rectifying the grave mistake made by the Federal Power Commission in licensing the partial and wasteful projects of the Idaho Power Co.

Now the Supreme Court of the United States has been asked to review these licenses granted by the Federal Power Commission. The National Hells Canyon Association, representing many groups of citizens in the Northwest, has petitioned the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari to review this case which is of such vital and irreversible importance to the Northwest and to river-basin development throughout the Nation. The States of Oregon and Washington have filed with the Court briefs amicus curiae in support of this petition for Supreme Court review. Mr. President, it is inconceivable to me how the administration could possibly justify opposing grant of certiorari and seek to block review of this case by the Supreme Court. The sincerity of the administration's purported restudy of the storage potential of the middle Snake River will be tested by its attitude toward Supreme Court review of the license granted by the Federal Power Commission. I repeat, the Pleasant Valley project which the Secretary of Interior claims to be seriously considering would submerge the site of one of the three dams covered by the licensed projects before the Supreme Court. It would be wholly inconsistent with the license. The fact that it is being studied proves that the FPC's conclusions concerning comprehensive development, upon which the license was granted, are erroneous and plainly inadequate even to the present administration, which is no friend of comprehensive, multipurpose river development.

The administration cannot consistently both maintain that it is restudying this whole issue and simultaneously oppose review by the Supreme Court, under the Federal Power Act, of the FPC decision which is wholly inconsistent with the high Pleasant Valley project allegedly under study. The people of the Columbia River Basin will await with great interest the position of the Eisenhower administration spokesmen toward this case.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD certain excerpts from the brief of the State of Oregon in the Supreme Court in support of the petition for certiorari in the Hells Canyon case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REVERCOMB in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the excerpts from the brief were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, OCTOBER TERM, 1956—NATIONAL HELLS CANYON ASSOCIATION, INC., ET AL., PETITIONERS, v. FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION, RESPONDENT

(On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia)

BRIEF OF THE STATE OF OREGON AS AMICUS CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF THE PETITION FOR ISSUANCE OF THE WRIT

*Interest of the State of Oregon*

The interest of the State of Oregon in the questions presented in this case is dual, economic on the one hand and governmental on the other.

*Economic interest*

The greatest single existing and potential asset to the economy of the State of Oregon is the hydroelectric energy, reclamation and navigation potential of the Columbia River and its tributaries. Full-scale integrated development of the resource potential of the river system is the keystone to the future economic well-being of the inhabitants of this State.

Prior to large scale developments on the river and its tributaries, the economy of the State was, and to a considerable extent remains, lumber and agricultural based. Both such activities are highly seasonal in nature and productive employment therein fluctuates greatly throughout the year.

The availability of low-cost hydroelectric energy and abundant, pure water are the primary attractions offered by the State to industry. Commercial and industrial growth in the State in recent decades, particularly investment in metals and chemicals projects has tended very closely to parallel utilization of low-cost hydroelectric energy. Greater diversification of commercial activity made possible thereby has tended markedly to stimulate the economy of the State as a whole and has had the additional and highly beneficial effect of leveling out peaks and valley in employment.

Even though it forms the backbone of commercial and industrial growth in the area, the Columbia in its natural state is at the same time one of the greatest threats to the economy of the region by reason of violent annual flooding. The ratio of peak runoff to average minimum flow is approximately 10 to 1. On a river the size of the Columbia, such a ratio is unusual and creates critical flood dangers. The tragedy of the 1948 Vanport flood is a solemn reminder of the power of the river to destroy the things that its otherwise beneficial qualities make possible. During 1956 the region narrowly escaped an equally extensive and potentially far more damaging flood.

The full potential of the river system is as yet less than one-third realized, notwithstanding the extent of the existing investment. Maximum development of remaining sites and the integration of such development with existing facilities is of crucial importance to the State and to its people. The channeling of these economic problems within the confines of litigation concerning a particular project must not be permitted to minimize the relationship that each proposed project has to comprehensive development. Integration of each such project into the existing system for the coordinate purposes of reclamation, navigation and especially for flood control storage and power

generation is an underlying factor that must not escape the Court's attention.

The future economic health of the State of Oregon may hinge in large part upon the decision in this case. * * *

*Governmental interest*

The Legislature of the State of Oregon through the years has enacted various statutes relating to the development of water resources, regulation of public utility rates and services, preservation of fish and game resources, licensing of hydroelectric projects, stimulation of hydroelectric energy development, and various other matters of general public concern.

These functions are, as they of necessity must be, carried on against the framework of Federal activity in the same fields. The primacy of Federal jurisdiction relegates State development and administration in such matters to a status ancillary to and, wherever possible, coordinated with, Federal action.

The Federal Power Commission for a variety of reasons, mostly fiscal, has itself been unable actively to engage in full-scale comprehensive study and planning in connection with reclamation, irrigation, hydroelectric generation and flood control aspects of regional development. *City of Tacoma* (10 FPC 424, 92 PUR NS 79 (1951)). The Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, and the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, have long been actively engaged in large-scale regional studies and, from time to time, acting under specific authorizations from Congress, have published comprehensive plans for development and utilization of resources, flood control and related matters. As a result, both implicitly by these congressional authorizations and actually by long-standing custom, the responsibility for the preparation of such comprehensive plans has been exercised by these two agencies. The past practice of the Commission has been to rely upon, and on occasion to specifically adopt, plans developed by its sister agencies. The present case strongly suggests a departure from this long-standing practice.

In order to develop an effective program of State action in these areas, it is essential that the legislature of the State concerned have reasonably certain knowledge as to which Federal agency is responsible for planning and the extent to which other Federal agencies may deviate from comprehensive plans once developed. Whenever a State, relying upon the existence of an approved comprehensive plan developed by either the Corps of Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation, has expended money and constructed projects designed to coordinate with existing or proposed Federal projects, the possibility that a separate agency of the Federal Government might have under its statutes latitude in the implementation of the plan sufficient to negate or render valueless all or a part of the State's existing or proposed program can cause economic stagnation. The same thing is true, of course, of the programs of State administrative bodies which have been given responsibility for such matters by existing legislation.

In this case the most important single provision of the Federal Power Act with respect to these matters is in serious dispute. Until this court speaks authoritatively on the question, the present hamstringing uncertainty will continue to exist. The case presents itself in a fashion proper for authoritative interpretation, and we feel that the situation clearly justifies such action. * * *

*Summary of argument*

1. By reason of the primacy of Federal regulation, the State of Oregon in the execution of its laws is influenced and concerned on a continuing basis by the action of Federal regulatory agencies, particularly the Federal Power Commission. The State has a legitimate and pressing need to have disputed questions involving the scope and nature of the powers of the Federal Power Commission resolved so that the State may with reasonable certainty proceed in its own legislative and administrative activities.

2. The case involves questions of far-reaching public significance arising under the Federal Power Act (41 Stat. 1077, as amended; 16 U. S. C. A., sec. 791 et seq.). The administration of this act is of peculiar and sensitive importance to the State of Oregon and to its inhabitants by reason of the importance of the Columbia River and its tributaries to the economy of the Pacific Northwest and of the State of Oregon.

3. The case involves interpretation and application of portions of the Federal Power Act upon which this court has not heretofore authoritatively spoken and related questions as to which this court has heretofore reserved judgment.

*Argument—Public significance of the problem*

The Constitution reserves to the Federal Government paramount responsibility for comprehensive development of the Columbia Basin. Without authorization from the Congress, Oregon (and the other States of the region) cannot successfully assert effective control over reclamation, navigation, and hydroelectric development on the Columbia and its tributaries. *First Iowa Hydroelectric Cooperative* v. *Federal Power Commission* (328 U. S. 152, 66 S. Ct. 906 (1946)); *Federal Power Commission* v. *State of Oregon* (349 U. S. 435, 75 S. Ct. 832 (1955)).

The Congress by the Federal Power Act has delegated to the Federal Power Commission its authority to license non-Federal projects. But in so doing it has by section 10 (a) strictly confined the powers of the Commission so as to protect the interests of the States and their people in sound, comprehensive, long-range development of their critical natural resources. This mandate for full utilization of those resources is at once an expression by Congress of its understanding of the dependence of our people on such optimum development and a clear-cut recognition of the responsibility which is the concomitant of its constitutionally delegated powers. To construe section 10 (a) as anything but an expression of congressional sensitivity to the profound economic consequences to the regions involved of comprehensive river development is to ignore the entire legislative history and background of the Federal Power Act.

This case has aspects which cut far deeper than does a case involving review of an ordinary administrative order. The licensing power exercised by the Federal Power Commission under part I of the act is wholly dissimilar in nature to its rate-regulating powers under part II of the act and to the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission and other Federal agencies to issue certificates of necessity and to regulate rates. An application for a motor-carrier certificate of public convenience and necessity before the Interstate Commerce Commission, denied today, may tomorrow be granted upon a showing of changed circumstances. New carriers may be authorized to enter service upon development of additional traffic. This may be accomplished in a matter of weeks or, at most, months. An order of the Interstate Commerce Commission or of the Federal Power Commission fixing utility or carrier rates and charges may be modified from time to time to accommodate changing circumstances or to adjust for errors in the original order.

It is not so with a Federal Power Commission license granted for utilization of a river damsite. Once the license has been exercised, circumstances will not permit the correction of error or accommodation for changes, except in the most limited fashion. The licensee, the people of the region, utility consumers and the economy of the States involved must adjust to the project, whether it turns out to be suited to comprehensive regional development or not.

With only partial development of the potential of major storage sites, the maximum utilization of existing project facilities, the engineering features of many of which have been designed to coordinate with full stream regulation potentialities of subsequently developed sites, may never be realized. Modification and downgrading of other potential sites may be necessitated, threatening additional underutilization of overall basin potential. Any compromise with full-scale development at a primary project site will have compounding flood-control, navigation, and hydroelectric generation impact upon the remainder of the system, existing and potential. The opportunity to make certain that the Federal Power Commission has given proper attention to such matters in a particular case exists only once. This is such an occasion.

If, as has been most strenuously urged, the order of the Federal Power Commission in this case is violative of the basic principle of comprehensive development so explicitly enunciated by the Congress in section 10 (a) of the act, it cannot hereafter be corrected without enormous financial sacrifice and economic waste—perhaps not at all. Section 10 (a) forms the very heart of the act insofar as the proper stewardship of the economic interests of the people of the State of Oregon are concerned. Clearly the public importance of seriously disputed questions arising thereunder is such as to justify the court in granting certiorari so that an authoritative interpretation may be made.

*The question has not heretofore been authoritatively determined*

The present case rests squarely upon an interpretation of section 10 (a) of the Federal Power Act. This provision has never heretofore been authoritatively interpreted by this court.

* * * * *

*Conclusion*

We have shown that the State of Oregon and its inhabitants have a significant present and long-range interest in a correct resolution of the presented problems, that certainty in such matters is of great public concern, that this court has heretofore noted the importance of the questions and has not authoritatively spoken thereon. For these reasons and the reasons set out in greater detail above, we most respectfully urge the court to issue the prayed for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Very respectfully submitted.

ROBERT Y. THORNTON,
*Attorney General of Oregon.*

SALEM, OREG., *February 14, 1957.*

## PROPOSED TAX COMMISSION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have pointed out on several occasions on the Senate floor the splendid reaction which I have received from all over our Nation on behalf of my bill, S. 769. This is the bill which I have introduced—with 14 cosponsors—to create a Federal Tax Commission, along the lines of previous Hoover Commission studies.

My earlier comments on this subject may be found in the January 22 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, beginning on page 822, in the January 23 RECORD, beginning on page 890, and in the January 30 RECORD, beginning on page 1256.

OTHER TAX STUDY BILLS

My bill, S. 769, is similar to a measure, H. R. 41, which has been introduced in

the House of Representatives, by Representative FREDERIC COUDERT, of New York. It should be noted that Mr. COUDERT was an author of original proposed legislation along this line, as witness his bill, H. R. 10788, which he introduced on April 25, 1956.

I should also like to note that my colleague, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] likewise introduced a measure for this purpose in the form of Senate Joint Resolution 167, which he introduced on May 9, 1956.

These and other expressions of legislative interest in this subject will, I feel, ultimately find fruit in the enactment of some form of Tax Commission legislation.

In my judgment, it is inescapable that this type of research action should be undertaken by the Congress. Why? Because there is no other feasible alternative to meeting the enormously complicated tax problem.

We cannot forever legislate piecemeal on the tax subject, merely adding and subtracting in bits and pieces to the present tax hodgepodge.

OUR GOALS IN REVISING TAXES

We need consistency in taxes, simplicity, justice, and equity, rather than inconsistency, needless complexity, injustice, and discrimination.

We need to make taxes a spur for free enterprise, an incentive, a stimulus not a straitjacket.

MY INQUIRIES FOR BUSINESSMEN'S REACTIONS

I have previously indicated on the Senate floor that I was writing to a goodly number of leading businessmen throughout the United States, together with other leaders of our private enterprise system—tax lawyers and others—in order to secure their reactions on this subject.

I have done so, particularly with the view of contracting heads of United States corporations, because I feel that probably no single group in American society can see more clearly the heavy impact of taxes—open and hidden taxes—than the men who lead American free enterprise.

It is these men who are the responsible trustees of vast corporate assets. It is these men who must answer to the 8 million stockholders of the United States. It is these men who are responsible for the tens of millions of jobs in American companies.

In writing to them for their reactions, I indicated that I clearly understood that some, in responding, might prefer that their comments be construed as solely in confidence. After all, they are not tax experts as such, and some of them might feel that this is basically a legislative task on which Congress itself can make up its own mind.

I desire to have printed in the RECORD the texts of the initial answers.

In the instances where I am permitted to cite the names of the responding individuals, I have gladly done so. In those instances where my correspondents preferred to communicate, while withholding permission for the use of their names, naturally I have gladly respected their wishes. The latter groups' views, however, are nonetheless helpful and informative.

In any event, the letters appear in full with the exception of minor omissions for sake of brevity only.

LETTER FROM INVESTORS' LEAGUE

Finally, as an additional illustration of the widespread approval which has come from many spokesmen of free enterprise, I send to the desk the text of a welcome letter which I have received from Mr. William Jackman, president of the Investors' League. I congratulate all of my civic-minded correspondents for their contributions.

I ask unanimous consent that all of these communications be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTERN ELECTRIC CO., INC.,
*New York, N. Y., February 11, 1957.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you for your letter of January 31, 1957, asking for my views with respect to the bill introduced by you in the United States Senate which provides for the establishment of a Hoover-style Federal Tax Commission to make a study of our complicated tax structure and make suggestions for improvement. I have read with interest the reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which was enclosed with your letter, setting forth the text of the bill and your views as to the need for legislation of this character.

I am in complete sympathy with and heartily endorse the underlying purpose and objectives of the proposal as stated in the first section of the bill. Taxes in one form or another reach every home and every business concern in America and have a direct bearing on the economic health and way of life in this country. Unquestionably many improvements can be and should be made in our complex tax structure and it is most gratifying to me that the attention of Congress has been directed to the need for this vitally important action.

I wish you every success in this most important undertaking.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR B. GOETZE,
*President.*

---

CITIES SERVICE CO., INC.,
*New York, N. Y., February 8, 1957.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you for your invitation to comment on your proposal to establish a Hoover-style Federal Tax Commission to undertake a study of our whole tax system and make recommendations to the Congress respecting that system.

Over the years, you and I and other adult Americans have witnessed a number of valiant efforts by conscientious citizens and Members of Congress to do something about our topheavy tax structure. None of these efforts have borne notable results. Perhaps this indicates only the magnitude of the problem, for certainly there is no gainsaying the sincerity of those who have earnestly tried to grapple with it. It has been a tragic fact, however, that little has been accomplished, while the problems multiply and the need for tax reforms becomes more acute each year.

Every thoughtful American will want to support an energetic approach to this highly important issue. It is a privilege to wish you every success in your endeavor.

Sincerely yours,

W. ALTON JONES,
*Chairman of the Board.*

---

GENERAL MOTORS CORP.,
*Detroit, Mich., February 15, 1957.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
*The United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your letter of January 31 asking me for my views in respect to your proposal to establish a Federal Tax Commission to make a comprehensive study of the entire Federal tax structure.

In my opinion your proposal has great merit. Since 1939 Congress has been faced with one emergency after another requiring additional funds for national defense with the main consideration being taxes that would yield the revenue without regard to the long-run effect of the tax structure being created.

Federal tax receipts from the public today are approximately 10 times what they were only 20 years ago and we now have a grossly unfair tax structure which in the long run is bound to handicap the rate of increase in our economic productivity. Furthermore, the way in which these taxes are levied in many cases results in a pyramiding of the taxes to the ultimate consumer. For example, one calculation of the ultimate cost of taxes in the retail price of an automobile indicates it is probably as much as 30 percent. In a number of other products of a far less essential nature than automobiles, the effective ultimate tax burden in the retail price to the consumer is considerably less than 30 percent.

The burden of the cost of government which properly should be levied as a business cost and hence be incorporated in the cost of living should not be a function of the form of business enterprise. However, an effective corporate net income tax rate in excess of 50 percent combined with personal income taxes on dividends paid out clearly results in a different tax burden upon the business done by corporations in contrast to the same volume of business when it is done by proprietorships, partnerships, or cooperatives. This is clearly unsound and in the long run will create economic distortions.

All of these problems and the many others involved in this issue are extremely complex and will necessitate long and careful study which the established committees of Congress are hardly in a position to undertake on a year-to-year basis. A commission such as you propose on the other hand could concentrate on the real issues involved, and I am sure that both the public and the Members of Congress would be greatly enlightened as a result of their deliberations and findings. Accordingly, I trust that Congress will see fit to pass your proposed measure, S. 769.

Sincerely yours,

H. H. CURTICE, *President.*

---

FORD MOTOR CO.,
*Dearborn, Mich., February 13, 1957.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: * * * I agree with you that high Federal taxes are one of the biggest problems facing industry and our economy generally. Consequently, I am in complete sympathy with any and every effort having the objective of ameliorating and improving our complicated and burdensome tax system. If the Hoover-style Federal Tax Commission, which you have proposed, can make a contribution to this end, I am certain that every taxpayer in this country will be very grateful.

While I am in complete sympathy with the objectives which you have outlined in your letter, I do not believe that I am qualified

to judge whether the type of commission which you propose is the best medium for accomplishing those objectives, nor whether such a commission approach is compatible with the prerogatives of the Treasury Department or the tax-writing committees of the Congress. Therefore, while I see no objection to the idea of a Federal Tax Commission, I cannot say that this approach is the only one or the best for accomplishing the much needed tax reform and tax relief which is so much desired by all taxpayers.

* * * * *

Very sincerely,

HENRY FORD, *President.*

---

NOPCO CHEMICAL CO., INC.,
*Harrison, N. J., February 15, 1957.*

Re your letter February 12, 1957, on proposed Tax Commission.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I cannot endorse too highly the bill to establish a Hoover-type Commission on Federal Taxation. The statement you made in introducing this bill covers essential ground that must appeal to every United States citizen.

There is no doubt in my mind that the time is here now to take action on this bill. From the experts down to the most bewildered taxpayer all must welcome a definitive start on the awful maze of Federal taxation.

Its importance for the preservation of the United States way of life is very great. It will do a great deal not only to streamline the whole tax system, but will help to create respect and indeed backing for the just and even imposition of taxes.

Sincerely yours,

T. A. PRINTON,
*Chairman of the Board.*

---

RADIO CORPORATION OF AMERICA,
*New York, N. Y., February 6, 1957.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you for your letter of January 31 relative to a Federal Tax Commission to take a new high-level look at our tax structure.

The only body of law which every day affects each of us in practically everything we do is the tax law. Directly or indirectly, the tax law can influence what we eat, where we live, what we wear, what we do for a living, even what we do for entertainment.

I believe it would be in the public interest to undertake a high-level review and study of our tax structure to determine whether present tax law is adequate to serve the American people today and in the years ahead, or whether new law is needed in light of our constantly expanding and changing economy.

* * * * *

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

DAVID SARNOFF,
*Chairman of the Board.*

---

BETHLEHEM STEEL CO., INC.,
*Bethlehem, Pa., February 14, 1957.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: * * * I am inclined to agree with you that our present Federal tax laws are a chaotic hodge-podge, but it seems to me that you are better qualified than I to judge whether an overall look would better be taken by a commission or by a committee or committees of the Congress.

I am glad that you and other Members of the Congress feel that something should be done and are interesting yourselves in the problem. That is to me an important and significant development.

Sincerely,

E. G. GRACE, *Chairman.*

---

UNITED STATES STEEL CORP.,
*New York, N. Y., February 13, 1957.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: * * * There have been several proposals in the past for civilian and congressional commissions to study fiscal policy. We think a commission which would study fiscal policy and tax policy together would be most helpful. We think it would be most effective if the commission were to be made up of congressional, executive department, and non-Governmental civilian membership of sufficient stature to command nationwide respect for its recommendations.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER M. BLOUGH,
*Chairman, Board of Directors.*

---

THE TEXAS CO.,
*New York, N. Y., February 14, 1957.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I received your letter of January 31, relative to your proposal to establish a Hoover-style Federal Tax Commission. As my experience does not include that of being a tax expert. I referred this to our legal and tax people for their consideration. While this has resulted in some delay in replying, it indicates the serious consideration which we have been happy to give to the matter.

We believe there is a good deal of merit in your proposal, and that it would be very useful to have the benefit of an objective study of our tax system by a group of thoroughly experienced, unbiased, and otherwise qualified people, and their recommendations as to what changes would be in the best interest of the Nation as a whole. The difficulty of making such a study would come principally from finding people who are sufficiently detached from specialized interests and who could devote the time necessary to the making of so thorough a study. There would, of course, be efforts on the part of many groups to influence the character of the individuals to be appointed and subsequently to affect the nature of the report. However, if fully qualified people could be obtained, the results should be well worth while.

So far as the oil industry is concerned, I am confident that such a study would show that, contrary to the impression which many people have, our industry is paying, or its products are bearing, a higher proportion of the total revenues collected by Federal, State, and local governments than nine-tenths, if not all, of the other industries of the country. This would tend to promote a greater appreciation of the contribution which our industry makes to the national welfare, and a more sympathetic consideration of its problems. It would, I am sure, also give a special emphasis to the importance of the depletion allowance in maintaining our oil reserves at a satisfactory level and thus contributing to our national security.

Responding to your request that I indicate the use which I am agreeable to have you make of this reply, I should be glad to have you use it in any manner you desire, except that I should like to have it used as a whole and would prefer that no quotations or excerpts be made from it.

I greatly appreciate your giving me the opportunity to express these views upon your proposal. With kind regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

AUGUSTUS C. LONG,
*Chairman of the Board.*

---

BOEING AIRPLANE CO.,
*Seattle, Wash., February 13, 1957.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have read with genuine interest your bill (S. 769) which provides for establishing a Hoover-type Commission on Federal Taxation. This should be an effective way of focusing national attention on this important problem.

Your proposal has my enthusiastic endorsement and, if passed by Congress, I hope that you will make a determined effort to see that constructive suggestions made by the Commission are enacted into law.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM M. ALLEN,
*President.*

---

THE FIRESTONE TIRE & RUBBER CO.,
*Akron, Ohio, February 14, 1957.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: * * * I appreciate your inviting my views on the proposed Hoover-style Federal Tax Commission.

I am in complete agreement with you that our present tax structure is obsolete and chaotic and that a reappraisal looking toward its simplification and objective approach would be of fundamental and lasting service to the American people.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HARVEY S. FIRESTONE, Jr.,
*Chairman.*

---

SOCONY MOBIL OIL CO., INC.,
*New York, N. Y., February 4, 1957.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

It seems to me that your suggestion is in every way an excellent one. We all know that our tax structure has developed over the years in a rather uncoordinated way, and I think many of us feel that at present it contains unsound elements. Taxes, of course, exert a profound effect on the country's economy, and particularly when taxes become high as ours have perhaps of necessity become, it is important that the incidence and effect of taxes be carefully considered in relation to the economy. For these reasons it seems to me that your proposal is not only constructive but exceedingly timely.

Believe me, with best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

B. B. JENNINGS,
*Chairman of the Board.*

---

REEVES BROS., INC.,
*New York, N. Y., February 13, 1957.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: * * * We certainly concur that such a study is long past due.

We will lend every assistance that we can in bringing such a study to reality.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. REEVES, *President.*

---

THE CUDAHY PACKING CO.,
*Omaha, Nebr., February 15, 1957.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
*The United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: * * * Certainly something needs to be done to simplify,

strengthen, and clarify the Federal income-tax regulations. It seems to me that you are approaching the matter from a very sensible standpoint in your proposal for the commission, and we would be very much in favor of the creation of such a commission.

Yours very truly,

L. F. LONG, *President.*

---

REPUBLIC PRODUCTIONS, INC.,
*North Hollywood, Calif., February 15, 1957.*

Mr. ALEXANDER WILEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. WILEY: * * * I agree with you that Federal taxes are entirely too high. Excessive taxes, plus increased wages for union workers, with fringe benefits, make it impossible for Republic to build up sufficient working capital to expand and add the additional stages, buildings, new equipment, etc., needed to take care of the additional business available.

Under the circumstances, we are faced with these problems which we are unable to solve and which should not exist in our free American system. In fact, as I travel over the country, I find other companies in the same situation and in my talks with our employees here, in New York, Scranton and Binghamton, I find with few exceptions, that they all complain of high Federal taxes. It is my humble opinion that before many months have passed, industry as a whole will feel the lack of public spending, which must adversely affect our national economy.

Again, I agree with you that such changes must be made if we expect our economy in the future to remain as satisfactory as it is now at its present level. Even those with whom I come in contact recognize the present existing inflation, and even go so far as to fear that a depression is on the way.

Your resolution to create a 12-man commission on Federal taxation is an excellent procedure, and I believe that this commission will find the same conditions existing over the country that I have referred to herein—and even now an adjustment of Federal taxes, even soon, may be too late.

Warm personal regards.

Yours sincerely,

HERBERT J. YATES,
*President.*

---

INVESTORS LEAGUE, INC.,
*New York, N. Y., February 13, 1957.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: On behalf of the many thousands of members of the Investors League, residing in every State in the Union, we wish to compliment you for your forthrightness in introducing bill S. 769 for the creation of a National Tax Commission at the time and in the manner that you did.

We are writing letters of commendation to the 14 Senators who cosponsored this legislation with you.

The Investors League, after years of frustrating attempts to obtain even piecemeal tax reforms that would encourage rather than destroy incentive, thrift, and investment, came to the conclusion that only a respected top-level group of able and experienced experts, removed from the pressure of partisan politics, could ever undo the hodgepodge mess of laws, amendments, regulations, and interpretations into which our Federal tax codes have deteriorated in the dynamically changing social and economic world in which we have been living during the last several decades.

Officers of the Investors League, testifying before the platform committees of the 1956 national conventions of both major political parties, urged creation of such a Tax Commission as their No. 1 proposal.

Our methods of taxation are obsolete. Methods of doing business have changed and have kept in step with economic conditions. In fact, our way of living has changed, but yet our tax laws are nothing more than amendments to amendments. It might truthfully be said that the tax laws presently on our statute books do not reflect present-day economics. It would, therefore, seem that the best brains and tax experts should be obtained to make this objective study on what is the very backbone of the Nation's economic power. Experts in this field are not necessarily elected officials, and unless provision is made by an act of Congress to utilize their services we will miss a great opportunity for national well-being. With a world constantly being made better by objective research conducted on the largest scale ever known, we are preventing our citizens from reaping the material benefits of their own productive efforts by taxes which unfairly drain off their savings, and, if left unchanged, will surely reach down and destroy the very job security on which most of them depend for existence. Immediate and thoroughgoing tax research right now is imperative to the survival of those things which Americans cherish most deeply.

Certainly, no Member of Congress can conscientiously object to the creation of the type of Commission which you and your esteemed associates have proposed. After all, they are not bound to accept the recommendations of such a Commission. Final lawmaking will still be in their hands. But this legislative atmosphere will have been clarified. Our voting citizens will have been objectively informed of the issues involved and will be in a better position to present their views to their elected Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM JACKMAN,
*President.*

---

From a leading businessman in Chicago:

FEBRUARY 6, 1957.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I appreciate the opportunity to express my views on your bill, S. 769, providing for a commission on Federal taxation.

A thorough study of the Federal tax structure is certainly much needed. The rapid growth of Federal spending, I am afraid, has been responsible for much hurried and poorly conceived tax legislation over the last decade. I believe it would prove most beneficial to all concerned, individuals and businesses, both large and small, to have a nonpartisan, carefully appointed committee of great competence review all tax provisions to determine whether they should be changed, replaced, or eliminated entirely.

If it will be of assistance to you to quote from this letter, I would be agreeable but would prefer that this be done without personal reference.

Sincerely yours,

---

From a leading businessman in Pittsburgh:

FEBRUARY 13, 1957.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: * * * I am heartily in favor of a thoroughgoing review of our Federal tax system by a Hoover-style Federal Tax Commission. A calm, objective appraisal by experts with a legislative mandate but outside the arena of politics is surely desirable.

---

## IMPROVEMENT OF GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTING PROCEDURES

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, recently the Comptroller General of the United States issued the eighth annual progress report under the joint program to improve accounting in the Federal Government. This factual report is an excellent statement of the very outstanding work which is being done by our responsible fiscal officials, particularly the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey; the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Brundage, and the Comptroller General, Mr. Campbell, who are jointly responsible for the program to improve accounting. In connection with the issuance of the progress report, the General Accounting Office has prepared a summary which sets forth the highlights of steps that have been taken to improve procedures in the past year. I ask unanimous consent that this summary be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ILLUSTRATIVE HIGHLIGHTS FROM 1956 PROGRESS REPORT UNDER THE JOINT PROGRAM TO IMPROVE ACCOUNTING IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

This is the eighth in the annual series of reports of accomplishments under the joint program started in 1948. Each of the annual reports contains illustrations of progress in a particular year. This report contains illustrations of accomplishments during the period from January 1, 1956, to September 30, 1956.

This brief summary can only include a few of the many illustrations contained in the report. The items are selected to (1) indicate the more important general developments, (2) identify major areas involving agency financial management improvements, and (3) indicate several types of identifiable savings. Savings which resulted from management use of better financial data are not selected unless they were specifically measured.

A. GENERAL DEVELOPMENTS

These include representative activities in which the three central agencies (General Accounting Office, Budget Bureau, and the Treasury) furnished joint leadership in the governmentwide aspects of the improvement program, and other matters of governmentwide applicability and significance.

Public Law 863 and other financial management legislation was enacted in 1956 to carry out recommendations of the Hoover Commission for the modernization of the budgeting and accounting practices of the Government. Internal organizational changes and strengthening of the Bureau of the Budget provided more active leadership within the executive branch in the development of needed improvements in the agencies. A program has been started to develop a time-phased plan in each executive agency for the installation and maintenance of better financial management practices.

Central accounting and reporting: The central accounts and certain reports of the Government were expanded to include cash assets and related liabilities for such items as bank balances which Government corporations maintain in commercial banks, deposits in transit, imprest and cashier funds, outstanding checks, etc., in order to provide more complete information on the Government's cash operations.

Budgeting: The 1958 Budget Document, prepared in 1956, contains cost-based budgets for 46 appropriations, an increase of 42 over the previous year. Such budgets are based on accrual accounting systems used by the agencies. In addition, cost information developed from agency accrual accounting systems was submitted to the Bureau of the

Budget in justifying the budgets for another 13 appropriation requests. Efforts toward the development of common classifications for programing, budgeting, accounting, and reporting have resulted in improvements in the appropriation and activity structure of 36 independent agencies and constituent units of Departments in the 1958 budget.

Overseas operations: The extension of the joint program to European operations developed improved methods which resulted in utilization by the United States Army in Europe (USAREUR), in the first 2 months, of property valued at more $1 million which had previously been classified as excess material to be disposed of. Later information has been received that USAREUR has recovered approximately $15 million of such material for use through October 31, 1956. Simplification of inventory pricing methods by United States Air Forces in Europe (USAFE) will result in savings in excess of 1 man-year per overseas airbase.

Electronic data-processing systems: The rapidly expanding use of electronic equipment and methods in office automation has highlighted the need for a comprehensive inventory of such equipment in use or planned for use in the Government and its application. This survey was started by the General Accounting Office late in 1956.

B. AGENCY PROGRESS

The various examples of agency progress set forth below have been selected from part II of the report to give some indication of the diversified nature and breadth of coverage of the financial management developments and improvements carried out by the individual agencies largely on their own initiative within the broad principles and objectives of the joint program. These examples do not, of course, show the full picture of the total progress that has been made in the agencies this year.

Revised accounting systems were approved during the year by the Comptroller General for the Office of Information and the Foreign Agricultural Service of the Department of Agriculture. To date, five revised accounting systems of individual agriculture agencies have been approved and the revision, modernization, and simplification of the basic accounting systems of all other agencies of the Department is in active process.

In Department of Commerce, the Bureau of the Census has installed a revised accounting system on a cost basis, and has made revisions in its budget structure resulting in a simplification of the allotment pattern and a more consistent classification in programing, budgeting, accounting, and reporting.

Forty-two finance and accounting offices were established at Department of the Army installations during 1956, bringing the total number of such offices to 263. The finance and accounting offices combine the disbursing, payroll, and allotment accounting functions previously carried on in separate offices, using principles of double-entry bookkeeping and general ledger control with elimination of duplicate recording of expenditures in the command and disbursing channels. The Army Command Management System, which employs principles of accrual accounting, and other systems employing similar principles, have been installed in camps, posts and stations, depots, and engineer districts and divisions in continental United States. The number of budget programs, projects, and subprojects has been substantially reduced. An operation comparable to a commercial supermarket, referred to as the self-service supply center system, has been developed to simplify the distribution of expendable supplies and is being tested.

In the Department of the Navy five additional classes of material amounting to approximately $800 million were included in the Navy Stock Fund. The capital of the Navy and the Marine Stock Funds amounts to $2.5 billion with annual sales approximating $1.1 billion. The installation of a new system of financial management was completed in all naval hospitals. Accounting aboard ships has been simplified.

The Department of the Air Force has extended the depot maintenance management improvement program, tested at one depot last year, to 9 other depots and the general pattern has shown an increase in productivity of about 30 percent. The General Supplies Division of the Air Force Stock Fund was expanded to include base support stocks at all zone of interior depots and by June 30, 1957, will include such stocks on a worldwide basis. The procedures relating to reimbursements between Army and Air Force were simplified.

A study of manpower utilization in the Accounting Operations Branch of the Office of the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has resulted in substantial elimination of duplication, and simplification of requirements and procedures. Other streamlining and simplification of accounts and procedures were made in the Public Health Service and the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.

The 1958 budgets of several of the constituent agencies of the Department of the Interior were submitted on a cost basis.

Paperwork simplification in the Department of Justice resulted in elimination of 92 separate forms used by United States Attorneys and Marshals. The Immigration and Naturalization Service conducted an intensified program for improvement of allotment accounting, and the unliquidated obligations at June 30, 1956, were reduced by more than 50 percent in comparison with the previous fiscal year.

The Post Office Department completed the transfer of the function of issuing pay checks to the 525,000 employees of the postal field service from approximately 38,000 post offices to 15 regional controller offices; has mechanized substantially all of the payroll procedures; is developing unit cost techniques for management purposes; adopted the system of accounting and reporting in terms of 4-week intervals (13 times in a year); obtained legislation and adopted procedures which permitted simplification in agency reimbursement for the use of penalty and franked mail; is conducting a test program to consolidate daily payments of COD collections on a single check; has extended the use of the 3-part money order card form to all post offices; will replace over 5,400 forms by the development of about 55 new forms; and generally has made many refinements in the extensive accounting and related improvements begun in 1953.

Control procedures were strengthened in the overseas fiscal operations of the Department of State. The International Boundary and Water Commission has installed an accrual accounting system and prepared its 1958 budget on a cost basis. The Passport Office has reduced the paperwork required in the application for and issuance of passports and installed a simplified accounting system. The consolidation of the unliquidated balances of prior years' appropriation with fiscal year 1956 appropriation of the International Cooperation Administration resulted in a net decrease of 67 allocations (cash) accounts and a net decrease of 115 allotment accounts.

On August 1, 1956, the Office of the Treasurer of the United States installed the first phase of operations utilizing electronic equipment for the payment and reconciliation of the 350 million checks issued by the Government each year. It is planned to complete the conversion of this operation to electronic processes by July 30, 1957. Progress to date in using electronic methods has confirmed the estimate of more than $2 million a year recurring savings reported last year.

The Division of Disbursement (Bureau of Accounts) of the Treasury Department extended the use of the thermal method of check preparation to all regional disbursing offices in Continental United States and expanded the use of the bill-feed process. Revised systems of appropriation accounting and collection accounting were adopted by the Bureau of Customs. Simplified accounting controls and procedures were installed by the Bureau of the Mint for processing uncurrent coins returned to the mints for redemption. The method for computing and reporting interest on the public debt was changed from a due and payable basis to an accrual basis by the Bureau of Public Debt.

The Atomic Energy Commission is studying the problems involved in developing a standard accounting basis to reflect the operating economics of nuclear electric generating plants. Civil Aeronautics Board has simplified paperwork requirements on the carriers by procedures for the submission of punched-card machine listing of flight and mileage data as support of monthly subsidy vouchers. Federal Civil Defense Administration is mechanizing its accounting procedures. General Services Administration installed a new accrued cost system and revised the accounting procedures of the Nicaro Cuba project. Interstate Commerce Commission installed a revised accounting system. The valuation of about $630 million of fixed assets transferred to the Panama Canal Company from the Panama Canal (agency) was completed. The St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, created in 1954, maintains its accounting on the accrual basis, uses cost-type budgets, and prepares reports which compare work accomplishments with the budget and program schedules. Under a revised procedure of retirement accounting in the United States Civil Service Commission, the number of certifications of the regular monthly annuity roll was reduced from 206 to 6. Veterans' Administration revised its management reports to increase their effectiveness in facilitating executive decisions; developed increased use of budgets on a cost basis; refined its cost accounting systems and procedures; made further improvements in its systems of accounting and internal control; and expanded mechanization procedures to additional areas of operations.

C. EXAMPLES OF SAVINGS

The evolutionary nature of improvements in financial management systems and techniques produces long-range benefits which cannot always be expressed in terms of direct and specific dollar savings. However, examples of substantial savings due to simplifications and improvements during 1956 are recognizable in some of the accomplishments reported by the agencies. Many of these are of recurring significance. Among these identifiable savings are:

1. A substantial number of cases, involving a large volume of documents, which previously were sent to the General Accounting Office for settlement as claims will be settled directly by the agencies under Public Law 798 enacted in 1956. As a result, the General Accounting Office estimates it will eventually save $600,000 a year by releasing or reassigning personnel to more important work.

2. The first year's experience with Government purchase of blanket, position schedule, or other types of surety bonds on employees reflects annual savings to the Government at the rate of $100,000 a year with an increase of more than 50 percent in the amount of indemnity protection. At the same time, the employees (who were previously required to pay for and furnish individual surety bonds) saved $1,700,000 a year.

3. As the result of an intensive utilization survey in Farmers' Home Administration, 2,500 items of nonexpendable property, with an inventory value of $62,500, have been released and 1,800 items have been set aside for planned reserve.

4. Department of the Army saved $1,500,000 through improved management and related accounting and cost control systems at locations financed by industrial funds.

5. The Department of the Navy also reported savings of about $1,500,000 at similar Navy locations. Revisions of Navy military-pay procedures reduced exceptions by the General Accounting Office by about $800,000 in 1956. Improvements in financial management practices resulting from the Navy internal audit program (including contract audits) resulted in procurement savings of $166.4 million; $50,000 in the elimination of nonessential positions and $400,000 in the elimination of duplicate and unnecessary records; $25,000 in the discontinuance of a superfluous officers' mess; and a reduction of $2.8 million in the stock fund of 1 activity.

6. During the first 18 months of operation of the General Supplies Division of the Air Force stock fund, inventories were reduced by more than $32 million.

7. Improvements in the accounting operations of the Office of the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, resulted in recurring annual savings of $17,000.

8. An improved procedure for certifying earnings for disability claims in the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance will save $62,000 annually.

9. Immediate savings of $147,000 resulted from improved procedures relating to 8 million accounts of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance with individuals to which there is infrequent reference, and annual recurring savings of $28,000 are estimated.

10. Annual savings of $93,000 are estimated from other procedural improvements in the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.

11. Improvements in the methods of operation of the Passport Office resulted in annual savings of about $150,000.

12. Improved check preparation processes in the Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, resulted in savings in excess of $100,000 during 1956 and annual savings of about $25,000 are estimated to result from improvements in accounting for transactions of disbursing officers in foreign areas.

13. Improvements in accounting for public-debt transactions in the Bureau of the Public Debt will make possible annual savings of $36,500.

14. Stemming from a program of study conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission on the problem of providing adequate insurance coverage for designers, contractors, and operators of private power reactors, insurance syndicates were formed to make available a liability coverage capacity of $50 million to $65 million for any one accident. This reduces the possible need for a Government indemnity.

15. Annual savings of about $100,000 resulted from improved payroll procedures in the Panama Canal Company-Canal Zone Government.

16. By adopting mechanized procedures, the Government's cost of serving the members of former employee beneficial associations whose life insurance contracts have been assumed by the Civil Service Commission is $75,000 a year less than the cost previously incurred by the beneficial associations.

17. A system of general ledger control accounts, improved control of accounts receivable and travel advances, and a more effective collection system reduced the outstanding balances of delinquent accounts in the United States Information Agency from $92,000 at June 30, 1955, to $5,000 as of October 10, 1956.

18. Estimates indicate savings of approximately $438,000 a year will be realized from the adoption of mechanization procedures for an additional number of high volume insurance operations of the Veterans' Administration.

19. Improvements in the accounting system and related procedures of the United States Government Printing Office resulted in a reduction of 3.7 percent in accounting personnel despite an increase in the volume of the agency's operations; an annual savings of about $70,000.

---

## NATURAL RESOURCES: A CONTINUING CHALLENGE TO DEMOCRACY AND DEMOCRATS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, during the past weekend, a most significant conference of the Democratic National Committee was held in San Francisco, Calif. The place and the occasion derive particular significance from the fact that the West was the region of our country in which liberal and forward-looking candidates of the Democratic Party made their greatest gains in elections on the Federal, the State, and local levels.

The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] attended this conference and, in a major address to the conference, he set forth with his characteristic clarity and forcefulness some of the reasons why Democratic candidates scored wide successes in the Far West—the region in which the conservation and the best development of natural resources are the outstanding issues of national policy.

I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by the senior Senator from Oregon at the Democratic National Conference in San Francisco, Calif., on February 16, 1957, entitled "Natural Resources: A Continuing Challenge to Democracy and Democrats," be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### NATURAL RESOURCES: A CONTINUING CHALLENGE TO DEMOCRACY AND DEMOCRATS

(Address of Hon. WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, at Democratic National Conference, San Francisco, Calif., February 16, 1957)

Fellow Democrats: It is a pleasure, as well as a privilege, to join with you in this party conference. My pleasure is all the greater for being here with Oregon's great new Democratic Governor, Bob Holmes. With little more than 1 month of service, he already has demonstrated the vigor and vision which are the hallmarks of leadership.

Bob Holmes is further proof that there is at least one outstanding characteristic of an Oregon Democrat—you know where he stands. We are an outspoken lot. This past year in Oregon, Democratic candidates told the people what they believed and offered an affirmative program of progress in the public interest. That program was responsible to the needs and aspirations of the people—and they voted for it. As a result, the Democrats of Oregon were successful. Our campaign started when the Eisenhower administration took over. DICK NEUBERGER and EDITH GREEN, with the support of men and women like Howard Morgan, Monroe Sweetland, Jebby Davidson, Virginia Grant, Bob Boyer, Edna Scales, and hundreds more with faith in the future of liberalism forged a new party. The first great gains were won in 1954 by the election of Senator NEUBERGER and Congresswoman GREEN. Two more candidates for Congress—CHARLIE PORTER and AL ULLMAN—forged to within scoring distance. Between 1954 and 1956 they kept up the battle for liberalism, and now Oregon has a delegation in Congress consisting of 5 Democrats—with 1 to go. In 1958, we'll finish that job.

These successes are not mere party successes. They are evidence of the need of our people who respond when competent liberal candidates, supported by a dedicated corps of party members, present a forward looking program between elections, as well as during the campaign.

With such a combination, Oregon and the Pacific Northwest are no longer outposts of the Democratic Party—they are a fortress for liberal government. What are the lessons to be learned from the 1956 election results in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Colorado and the great progress made in California and other Western States? What do those results show about what the people need and want?

Providing the answers to those questions is a man job of this conference. Upon those answers and what Democrats do about them depends the future of liberalism in our country. For this we know—the Republican Party's much advertised modernity is only word deep.

#### AMERICA'S FUTURE DEPENDS ON WISE USE OF RESOURCES

There is little doubt that throughout the West a major issue in the 1956 campaign was the wise use of natural resources.

It was my privilege to address the Democratic Convention at Chicago. On that occasion I discussed three major subjects—constitutional liberalism, the need for development of human resources through education and natural resource development. They have an intimate relationship—the realization of spiritual, intellectual, and material potentialities for a full and free life.

In this discussion of natural resource policy I can do no better than repeat and reemphasize some of the points I made at Chicago and relate them to the situation in which the Nation and our party find themselves now.

Events since last summer underline some lessons of history. With modern speed of communications and technology, the world frequently experiences in a matter of months great movements and crises which in earlier times took years and decades to unfold. Since August we have undergone a major world crisis, a shift in national power relationships which may be as profound as the slower changes which matured into new international alinements during decades in the 19th century.

The Suez crisis is a problem—a whole complex of problems—all by itself. I will not discuss it here, but it has reinforced a grave lesson—the tremendous dependence of whole nations upon a natural source of energy—in this oil. The upheaval of the last eight months has given us a warning. We have seen how the stoppage of oil supplies to Europe has threatened the ruin of the Western Alliance, the collapse of the economy of Western Europe and elevated the political relationships in and with a neglected area—the Middle East—to a position of prominence and crisis.

The whole story is not oil, but it is much of it. And what is oil?—a natural resource for the production of industrial power and fuel for transportation. It is in limited supply—a nonrenewable resource.

Aside from the international aspects of the Middle East, this oil crisis is a warning to us in the conduct of our national affairs. I submit that it is this: we must conserve

and develop our natural sources of power and water at home to insure adequate supplies for the future needs of industry, farming and our homes.

Europe, which has greater sensitivity than we do to the problems of survival, has learned this lesson. In the past few months Western Europe has laid plans for the speediest possible development of commercial atomic power to reduce dependency upon oil for industrial power.

Our domestic oil supply situation is not so critical. But this latest lesson should not be lost upon us. We must plan now to meet our future needs, not only for power, but for an even more critical natural resource—water.

We in the West know how close is the relationship between water and power. Those needs are not limited to the West.

The need for water particularly may prove to be an absolute limitation upon all growth throughout the Nation. There is hardly a community in the country which is not now struggling to insure adequate water supplies for industry, agriculture and homes.

For years now the Great Plains have been gagging upon the dust of an historic drought. So, for example, in the prodigious State of Texas, 244 counties out of 254 have been declared disaster areas because of lack of water.

The heavily settled East is scrambling and scratching to meet increasing needs for water for rapidly expanding populations. Pollution from industry and sewage—too long ignored—is proving a major problem in the new search for water.

California has a chronic water supply problem and is now gripped by a water policy crisis.

Water cannot be made. There are pioneering studies on the conversion of sea water to fresh water. This program, begun under a Democratic administration, has become all but becalmed during the past 4 years. We must press forward with it for the growing needs for water are urgent. The water conversion program may bring relief. For the foreseeable future, we must use more conventional means—conservation and storage.

The first step is recognition of the problem. It is a national problem requiring bold action and determination to formulate programs to prevent our growth from drying up.

SUCCESS IN THE WEST

There is no need to start from scratch. More than 50 years of experience in the West point the way. The history of western reclamation points the way for the future.

As I said in Chicago, it was Theodore Roosevelt who gave this Nation its philosophy of conservation and comprehensive development.

The underlying principle of that program—carried forward by men like Norris, Borah, Hiram Johnson, McNary, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S Truman—is great in its simplicity: natural resources belong to the people and must be developed and used for the greatest public good in the long run.

That principle of justice requires observance of sound engineering through resource development on a comprehensive, basin-wide basis. That principle applies with special force and pertinence to a water-rich area such as the Columbia River Basin. We have seen it applied with great success in the Tennessee Valley.

TVA'S RECENT FLOOD ACHIEVEMENTS

In recent weeks, for example, the Tennessee Valley experienced an epic flood. Because of TVA, it was possible to keep it within bounds and probably the greatest and most successful flood fight in history was carried out.

If the Hoover veto of TVA had not been reversed by Franklin Roosevelt, that basin-wide system of flood control, electric power capacity, erosion control and related purposes would not have stood between the people and the physical wealth of the Tennessee Valley on one hand and the Tennessee River system on the other. Conservative estimates are that the flood savings of the past weeks were $65 million at Chattanooga alone. In less than 20 years property equal to more than half of the flood control cost of TVA has been saved from flood damage.

POWER AND WATER FOR GROWTH

The TVA flood-control system was economically feasible because of the value of TVA electric power. That is one lesson. Another is that a flood fight of this dimension can be a success only when all storage facilities are operated on an integrated basis by one agency which has the authority to move quickly and effectively without regard to temporary losses of power revenue.

So it is in the West. Western water conservation for irrigation and domestic use is not possible on an adequate scale without hydroelectric development. Power is the one element of multipurpose projects that pays for itself quickly enough to make these projects feasible. Let us not forget that power revenues make possible water conservation for irrigation and domestic use. We have the further example of Grand Coulee.

Maximum economic water development can be achieved, as Theodore Roosevelt foresaw, only on a multipurpose comprehensive basis. When we do less, we waste the people's substance.

These are the elements of the fight over Hells Canyon. The Columbia Basin is blessed with tremendous water resources. They also pose a major flood threat. That water flows through areas that cannot produce anything more than sagebrush without irrigation.

Hells Canyon is the greatest remaining dam site in the Nation. Yet the Republican administration has been ready and willing to hand it over to gross underdevelopment for a private profit. Ready and willing—yes. Thanks to Democrats and widespread popular opposition, it has yet to prove itself able to finalize the giveaway.

High Hells Canyon is indispensable for maximum power production, flood control, and aid to irrigation. Its almost 4 million acre-feet of storage, if lost, will be sorely missed in not too many decades simply as a water-storage project. Without the public power revenues of projects like Hells Canyon, irrigation on a large scale will not be possible.

PARTNERSHIP: A FRAUD

For this reason, among others, the Republican administration favoritism for private utility power development and so-called partnership is a fraud upon the people. For the private utility scheme at Hells Canyon and such partnership projects as Bruce's Eddy rob the Nation of revenues needed for feasible flood control and irrigation. In the Northeast the administration is shortchanging heavily settled areas on the flood control so badly needed. In deference to the private utilities it is concentrating on small reservoir projects, where larger dams are needed for more adequate flood control which only public hydroelectric revenues could make possible.

FAIR SHARING OF BENEFITS

In my speech at the Commonwealth Club I discuss the need for fair sharing of water project benefits. Without such sharing these projects will meet strong opposition in Congress. Public investment cannot be justified where the public does not derive the maximum benefit.

ADMINISTRATION "BUSINESS AS USUAL"

Despite the election results in the Pacific Northwest and other States where resource policy was a major issue, the Republican administration has carried on "business as usual."

It has yet to make any substantial change in policy. In the Hells Canyon area it holds out promises of a study of a high Pleasant Valley Dam. It is a phony high dam which would waste the full potential of the Snake River. The administration has made no adequate move to meet the water and low-cost power problems of the Missouri Basin or the Southwest. It continues unchanged its phony partnership proposals in California.

Worst of all, the administration is wasting valuable time in continuing its lost fight for partnership when it should return to the bipartisan policies of the two Roosevelts, Johnson, McNary, Dill, Borah, and Norris, and thereby meet the actual needs of the Nation

The unfair, indefensible resource policies of the Republican administration's first 4 years have not changed. Some feel that the new Secretary of the Interior, Fred Seaton, has changed the administration's unpopular program. Where is the evidence? Not at Hells Canyon, not at John Day, not at Trinity, not in the Southwest or Southeast Power Administration areas.

To take one example in the resource field: Has Seaton made a move to revoke or suspend the regulations or licenses for oil drilling in wildlife refuges? To the contrary, he made his main business in Oregon last summer the defense of those invasions of the refuges.

No; the sad truth is the "elephant" has not forgotten, and it has not learned. And Seaton either will not or cannot teach it new tricks. To change the figure of speech, the production department is unchanged—but the advertising is slicker.

The advertising may fool some people for a while, but not for long because the product is shoddy.

I submit to you that the people are faced by the same problems in the field of natural resources in 1957 and the years ahead as plagued them during the first 4 Eisenhower years.

Therefore, we cannot relax or retreat. The Democratic platform plank of 1956 on natural resources is good. It is sound in the whole resource field, including outdoor recreation. Let us work to put it into practice and resist the administration policies of giveaway and abdication of responsibility.

ELECTION LESSON OF 1956

We saw in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Colorado that vigorous candidates who do not pull their punches can defeat administration lackeys. I submit that means candidates who take the issues to the opposition day in and day out—who do not trim their sails to the momentarily prevailing wind.

JOHN CARROLL, of Colorado, is an example. He was a liberal in the House of Representatives. He ran for the Senate as a liberal—and he made it in 1956 without compromising his liberalism and after years of taking the issues to the opposition.

Some ask: What explains the success of the so many Democratic congressional candidates and the Eisenhower victory? I do not presume to give the answer. But I suggest one major reason.

The Democratic national ticket was better than good—it was superb. Adlai Stevenson would have made a great President, and ESTES KEFAUVER was a great running mate, as he is a great Senator. They made a fighting campaign.

The last weeks of the campaign were strange indeed. Fear, engendered by the Middle East crisis, enabled the administra-

tion to benefit from its own mistakes. That was one factor—and no news.

What I would emphasize is that the Democratic Party never really took the gloves off with Dwight Eisenhower. Not enough Democrats attempted to pierce the protective curtain the press threw around the popular hero. There were a few of us. Paul Butler was one who took the issues to President Eisenhower. Quite a few here today did, too. But the issue-making was left, by and large, to the campaign.

This administration was vulnerable from the day it took office when it attempted to steamroller through a Cabinet riddled by conflicts of interest. Only a few of us opposed Wilson, Talbott, and Kyes.

Dixon-Yates was a national scandal—but few dared to ask—where was President Eisenhower when the swindler was incubating? Where, indeed, was he when it was brought out into the open and exposed? He continued to defend it. But only a few of us dared to criticize him for it. For our pains, we were criticized for bad taste, extremism, and a few other things as well.

A few such efforts were not enough. The public's understandable desire to admire a President, press protection, propaganda from the beneficiaries of the administration's policies required massive rebuttal. It did not take place.

LET'S NOT REPEAT THE MISTAKE

That is behind us. What is done cannot be undone.

But we can do better for the future. • • •

The Democratic Party has won when it was liberal and aggressive in the public interest. We will win again—and only will deserve to win again—when the Democratic Party, not just its candidates, but the party is true to the great traditions of Jackson, Jefferson, Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman.

## THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a few days ago, Secretary Wilson of the Defense Department, expressed his opinion with reference to the National Guard. I am a strong advocate of expressions of opinion even when the opinion may be incorrect, so my statement today is not in the way of criticism of the right of the Secretary to express opinion, but inasmuch as I happen to know and am acquainted with the fine services rendered by the National Guard in all wars, throughout the history of our country, I feel justified in making this statement.

During World War II, New Mexico's entire National Guard was in the Philippines. There they fought under General MacArthur and stayed with General Wainwright after MacArthur left the Philippines. They fought all over the islands, in addition to their activities around Bataan. Hundreds of them died in those activities. Others became prisoners of the Japanese, went through the "death march," learned how to plant and eat rice, and suffered intensely. They stayed there until liberation by American troops. Those who returned to New Mexico are still suffering as a result of their participation in that military campaign.

I ask unanimous consent that the roster of the New Mexico boys who were in the Philippines be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks. I ask unanimous consent that the names be printed with a cross before the names of those who did not come back. The roster which I am sending to the desk contains the names of those boys, and there is a red cross before their names.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Headquarters, Provisional CA Brigade: Charles G. Sage, †James H. Hazlewood, William B. Reardon, †Alfonso B. Melendez, Thomas R. Taggart.

Headquarters Battery, Provisional CA Brigade: Alvin W. Garrett, Joe B. Guiterrez, Arthur J. Harrison, †Edward H. Hein, †Wallace A. Howe, Clarence M. McCan, †Barney E. Prosser, †Frank B. Sarracino, Abelino Vigil, Lonnie M. Weaver.

Headquarters, 1st Battalion, 515th CA: †John W. Turner, Jr., George W. Henfling.

Headquarters Battery, 1st Battalion, 515th CA: †Otho L. Shamblin, Earl R. Brown, J. W. Ashcraft, Robert L. Johns, Mark A. Smith, †Garrison V. Beck, †Robert L. Blauer, †Milton Kilwy, Lee R. Montgomery, Jr., †Cleophas Millard, †Harmon E. Boyd, David J. Rubio, Larry R. Sandoval, †Billy J. Thomas, Gregotio M. Villasenor.

Regimental Headquarters, 515th CA: Harry M. Peck, †John C. Luikart, Jack K. Boyer, James W. Donaldson, Cash T. Skarda, †Allan B. Walker, †George R. Brown.

Headquarters Battery, 515th CA: James McMinn, †John F. Beall, †Karl W. Schrader, Charles M. Brown, †Leonard W. Skiles, †Darwin C. Becker, †Adrian R. Martin, Delbert H. Brooks, †James R. Cain, Jesse L. Finley, James M. Hamilton, †James S. Miller, †George M. Jones, John L. Moseley, †Charles M. Burrus, Calvin R. Hutto, Wilson W. Jones, †John A. Keeler, †Robert L. Rodgers, Edwin S. Lockard, Jessie W. Adkins, Miguel N. Chavez, Melvin C. Waltmon, Ralph F. Clark, Lee R. Pelayo, †Alfonso B. Sanchez, Melvin T. Waldrop, Melvin F. Welsh, Lee J. Gardner, †Arthur W. Robbins, Ted T. Thomas, †Richard E. Frere, †Jose A. Sena, Virginio P. Villarreal, Robert R. Roehm.

Headquarters Battery, 200th Coast Artillery: Memory H. Cain, †Oliver B. Witten, †Ottis C. Bryant, Anthony R. George, †Frederick B. Howden, Jr., Tom J. Sawyer, James H. McCahon, †Howard G. Craig, Robert J. Compton, †Neal B. Shimp, Louis P. Lutich, †Nelson W. Apple, Arthur M. Baclawski, Thomas C. Burrell, Brooks B. Lewis, Maynard C. Meuli, Warren W. Whelchel, †Jack G. Erwin, James T. Huxtable, Joseph L. Pasquale, Lonnie M. Weaver, Lawrence H. Byrne, Thomas E. Atkins, †Glenn O. Warner, Earl P. Wyckoff, Willard F. Zimmerman, †Duane H. Fiohrs, Glenn R. Haynes, Jack S. Lewis, Carlos R. Montoya, Alfred Poe, Angel H. Sakelares, Fred M. Brewer, Bernard E. Brooks, George E. Darling, Virgie I. Ford, Joe B. Gutierrez, Y. C. Lindsay, Clarence M. McCan, †Jim E. Schwartz, Robert N. Bell, †Joseph T. Brown, Jonathan P. Burns, Norman J. Chesser, Thomas G. Cisneros, Kleo I. Curry, †Pedro A. Diaz, John E. Garner, †Wallace A. Howe, Robert G. Johns, Buell McCubbin, Louis O. Mendoza, Alberto D. Pacheco, †Barney E. Prosser, Fred D. Thompson, Ralph Waldron, Thomas W. Welch, Sidney R. Wolf, †Clinton V. Wolfe, †Fred W. Zumwalt, Frederico S. Almeraz, †Manuel G. Almeraz, Sixto O. Aranda, †Julio T. Beserra, William L. Bruce, Earl V. Burhans, †Eugene Burruss, Francisco H. Chaires, Jose S. Chavez, Pablo A. Diaz, Roberto W. Estrada, †Antonio J. Gallegos, †Ramon S. Garcia, Alvin W. Garrett, Willis P. Graves, Irving Gulbas, Donald E. Hill, †Donald R. Kros, †Jack L. Lansford, Carl M. Long, Carlos T. McDermott, Stephen L. Malak, †Rufus A. Patterson, †Juan B. Pena, Norbert R. Roessler, Gunnar E. Sacson, Lawrence A. Weisdorfer, †Joe M. Williams.

Headquarters Battery, 1st Battalion, 200th Coast Artillery: Winnifred O. Dorris, †Fred H. Jordan, †William C. Schuetz, Antonio A. Montoya, James A. Burnett, †Kenneth A. Campbell, Robert J. Dunsworth, Earl W. Guye, †Frederick C. Miller, Clark G. Smith, J. B. Francis, Neal J. Harrington, William J. Leiker, Robert K. Orrill, James F. Schiffner, †Alonzo Dotson, Arthur H. Gilcrease, †Raul Huerta, †John P. Patton, †Willis L. Rogers, Jollie Bailey, †Grady Boyd, Bob A. Campbell, Manuel Carrillo, Charles L. Duncan, †Richard D. Ewing, Migue E. Gallegos, Harold C. Gilman, Arthur J. Harrison, Charles D. Harvey, Ed M. Hern, Frank N. Lovato, Chester J. Perehinczuk, †Frank B. Sarracino, Sidney O. Stephens, †Richard H. Updike, Jr., †Auben E. Armstrong, Thomas Barka, Leonard R. Bell, †Elzie L. Cast, †Filimon C. Castillo, Clovis G. Chavez, Joe D. Chavez, Clifton Cockrell, Delfido L. Duran, Eldwin J. Eagle, Reynaldo Gallegos, †Manuel T. Garcia, †John H. Gipp, Edward H. Hein, John Holyak, Willie C. Jarnagin, Leopoldo Lujan, †Elias Manzanares, †Juan F. Mosley, Paul M. Owen, †Pedro Pacheco, †Lloyd G. Paulson, †Leo Pitman, Archie D. Stever, Pedro Tenorio, †Charlie J. Vlasak, Edward Warren.

Headquarters Battery, 2d Battalion, 200th Coast Artillery: †Henry M. Miller, †Clyde E. Ely, Jr., †Ted E. Parker, †Douglas L. Meek, †J. M. Smith, Olin W. Johnson, Solly P. Manassee, Lester A. Morrison, William W. Wisdom, Robert L. Aldrich, †Thomas C. Bowman, †Cam A. Prince, Jack H. Aldrich, †Doyle R. Greathouse, †Roy Lee, †Edward LeVelle, Robert Lucero, Wendelin F. Tixier, Mario G. Tonelli, †Samuel C. Begley, †Frank S. Bishop, †Billie M. Black, William J. Dosher, J. T. Hill, John B. Hoyl, †Roy J. Hutton, Carl V. Ireton, Jefferson O. Lightfoot, †George P. McMillan, †Douglas W. Miller, Heinz L. Rhee, †Harry A. Rogers, Orie B. Weeks, Don C. Adair, †Rubin M. Althaus, †Matias A. Armijo, Martin Berlanga, †Gilbert G. Chalk, Jr., Clem J. Cherne, †Warner W. Cummings, Nick L. Gallegos, Claude A. Htach, †Leland L. Keeton, Joe L. Kieyoomia, Cleovis M. Lee, †Walter L. Lee, †Candido Luna, Gabriel B. Montano, Gordin L. Morris, †Clement J. Novinski, Ernest D. Prehm, †Santiago S. Saiz, †McKean D. Taylor, Eloy Valdez, Harold L. Whitmer.

Battery A, 200th CA: †James E. Sadler, Jr., Daniel W. Jopling, †Thomas M. Lambert, †Lee C. Tucker, †Lawrence C. Van Cleve, Roy M. Chaffin, Gottlob C. Muller, Timothy C. Muller, Timothy H. Smith, †Reynold P. Armijo, David J. Duran, Harold J. Gannon, †Justin G. Gray, Henry A. Lovato, †Paul D. Millenbaugh, †Richard C. Prettner, †Elbert L. Ruebush, Juan T. Baldonado, †Llewellyn I. Calkins, †Ernest A. Chavez, Orlando J. De Venzio, †Kenneth C. Frame, †Pat F. Guest, †Egbert B. McLaughlin, †Art A. Micheli, †Vincent C. O'Rourke, Orville F. Padilla, †Francis A. Plomteaux, Jack N. Pruette, Frank S. Romero, †Fidel L. Saavedra, †John J. Wilcoxson, Joseph J. Bandoni, †Eliseo M. Barreras, †Michael R. Duran, Robert L. Evans, †Raymond J. Garcia, Joseph Hays, †James J. Jones, †William L. Knight, William E. Parchman Louis G. Romero, †Carl C. Whittaker, †Robert E. Witt, †Jeff A. Wysong, †Santa Cruz Atencio, Alfred Baca, Jose M. Baldonado, Leslie J. Carr, W. T. Clements, Richard L. Cordova, Benny J. Daugherty, †Carl E. Deemer, Aaron C. Drake, Peter J. Eresh, Domenic Ferrari, Leslie G. Fleming, †Lee A. Foster, William C. Guenther, Carl S. Harris, †Clayton F. Howell, Sidney R. Hudgens, Rowland H. Hutchins, Merle A. Kindel, †George M. Klocker, †Dale M. McWilliams, Lloyd G. Malnati, Oscar C. Mann, †Manuel O. Marquez, †Roy E. Miller, Tony B. Montoya, Frank C. Nieto, Adrain E. Oldham, †Myron A. Palmbach, Grayford C. Payne, †James V. Pickens, Wayne D. Roberts, Joe S. Romero, †David C. Savole, Placido P. Serna, †Virgil J. Spiker, Walter A. Starkey, Harry E. Steen, William R. Taylor, †Joseph E. Towner, Eugene C. Vaughn, †Paul A. Walsh, Ben F. Williams,

†Robert A. Wilson, Richard L. Zender, Sam J. Antonio, †Manuel R. Archuleta, Lorenzo Y. Banegas, Julio T. Barela †Charles R. Beaudoen, Thomas P. Bohn, †Freeman F. Borchert, †Pete Botello, Charles W. Breustedt, †Harris Y. Cady, †Lupe B. Carson, Jose I. Cata, David N. Chapa, Beltran Chavez, †Berto Chavez, †Ernest H. Cheama, †Edward Cordova, †Hilario Cordova, Guadalupe F. Cortez, †Glenn L. Crabtree, †Robert E. DuBois, Joe I. Duran, Henry B. Foster, Louis Fredieu, †Leonard P. Fulton, †Manuel O. Gaitan, †Enriques Garcia, †Clifford L. Grafton, Edward C. Greer, †Iulus A. Griffin, Eleito Gutierrez, †Claude B. Haws, †Jess C. House, †George T. Holton, Elvin E. Jackson, †Terecino Jaramillo, Everett M. Jones, †Antonio Kasero, Norbert J. Kranc, Dave B. Lawson, †Seferino Lente, †Virgel L. Looney, Rosenaldo Lovato, †Harold S. Lowe, Natividad J. Lucero, Daniel F. MacIntosh, James D. McKenzie, Polo V. Maldonado, Frank G. Martin, Eduardo Martinez, †Emilio M. Martinez, Tony A. Martinez, Trinidad G. Martinez, †Jose E. T. Mascarenas, Edmund J. Masser, Harwell H. Mitchell, †Jimmie Morris, Frank J. Mucha, †Hugh B. Nance, Benny G. Ortiz, Cruz Ortiz, †Alfonso Perez, Harry J. Pruss, Jose L. Quintana, Juan J. Rodriguez, †Luis Rodriguez, †Henry Salcido, Alfredo F. Sanchez, Victor F. Sanchez, Eduardo A. Sandoval, Filadelfio Sandoval, †Alvin W. Sharp, Joe R. Silva, †Felipe G. Sisneros, William D. Smith, David O. Tellez, †Jesus P. Trujillo, †Joe Urioste, Eliseo G. Vigil, Herman H. Vogt, †Calvin E. Whitley, Wilson E. Willie.

Battery B, 200th Coast Artillery: Frank M. Turner, †Jack L. Ellis, Joe L. Allen, †John D. Gamble, †William C. Holland, †Manuel L. Montoya, William C. Overmier, †Thomas C. Rohrabaugh, Joe T. Cassias, †Homer R. Dawes, †John W. Fleming, †Fred J. Hammond, †Candido L. Page, Johnnie J. Sedillo, Francis E. Bergquist, Robert M. Blattman, Don C. Bloomfield, George H. Bollen, William B. Clark, †John M. Erbacher, †James B. Heard, Woodrow M. Hutchison, Alton R. Jones, Ralph C. Lewis, †Paul Palumbo, Charles F. Sanchez, Salvador J. Armijo, David G. Borunda, James R. Brown, †Benny C. Garcia, Norman C. Brown, Marcos S. Cardenas, †Claude Fleming, †Ben Franklin, Jr., John W. Griffing, John Hamilton, †William L. Hawley, †Warnar A. King, Tony A. Kuretich, Nano C. Lucero, Earn L. McCombs, †Paul E. McCreary, Delbert R. McDaniel, Urban F. McVey, Robert F. Miller, Orlando R. Montoya, †John Oberton, Leo J. Padilla, †William R. Parker, Carl K. Plemmons, Glenn G. Ream, Marlin E. Sartin, Eldred Sattem, Albert F. Schultz, †Caesar J. Selva, Herbert H. Smith, †Homer V. Spensley, †Roy H. Summers, Elmer L. Vanover, †Arnole E. Viitanen, †Santiago S. Analla, †Ramon S. Anaya, †Amadeo Archuleta, Pete M. Armijo, †Juan E. Baca, Charles V. Bain, William L. Bangs, Antonio J. Barela, Robert Borunda, Marvin L. Brown, †Louis B. Calanchi, Coyle A. Campbell, †Joe M. Carriere, Olen Cole, †Julian Z. Cordova, Jr., Louis A. Diaz, William R. Evans, Gregorio Gachupin, †Leonides L. Garcia, Albert Hayes, Irwin H. Herbert, Lawrence L. Holt, †Tranquilino Jaramillo, †Juan S. Lerma, †Lorenzo Lopez, †Jose L. Lucero, James C. McCormick, Arian McKnight, Jake H. Mendenhall, Burl M. Morris, E. C. Oliver, †Billie Ortiz, †Tom Perea, †Talmadge W. Redd, A. J. Roberts, †Benito A. Romero, Claudio Romero, Frank Romero, †Joel R. Ruiz, †Valentine Sanchez, †Teodoro Savedra, †James D. Sims, †Claude O. Smith, Pragedis M. Sora, †Manuel N. Suarez, †Elmer H. Verhagen, †Modesto J. Vigil, Manuel Vidaurri, Jr., Raymond Villa, †Elias Villarreal, Lester L. Wall.

Battery C, 200th CA: †Frederick S. Sherman, Tom C. Cox, †William P. Randolph, Manuel A. Armijo, Marvin L. Baker, James A. Robinson, Jr., Paul A. Roessler, William R. Coleman, †Lewis E. Duke, Cruz Garcia, Walter C. Kiesov, †Connie D. Phillips, Pete Sanchez, Rufus D. Teague, †Ramon Apodaca, Ernesto J. Armijo, †Amadeo Chacon, Rubel Gonzales, Robert C. Jackson, Jr., Genaro B. Lopez, Johnny E. Love, †William E. Love, David M. Nunn, Merrill H. Pyetzki, Gavino Rivera, †John G. Van Beuning, †Richard A. Veal, Robert L. Williams, Otis A. Yates, †William M. Allred, †Charles M. Aycock, John T. Boyles, †William L. Bright, Louis B. Celusniak, Juan Contreras, †George W. Cree, Tomas Garcia, Hubert B. Gater, Roy B. Gebhard, Jesus B. Gutierrez, †John F. Gutierrez, William J. Hagedorn, Orland K. Hamblin, Everette C. Hatton, †George S. Herrera, George W. Howard, Charles Iskra, †Vernie L. James, Alphonso M. Lucero, †Harold J. McAndrew, †Herbert W. McCants, †William D. McGee, Louis L. Preuit, Roy E. Owen, Antonio Reyna, †James S. Roberts, Eugenio M. Romero, Teofilo M. Sanchez, †Tony P. Simoni, †Albert D. Smith, †Edgar J. Stephens, Alex E. Tovar, †Manuel Trujillo, Francis H. Van Buskirk, †Robert L. West, †Jess Woolworth, †Ramon S. Alderete, †John Blazevich, †Adolfo Chavez, Jr., †Francisco Contreras, †Sid Copeland, Barney A. Duran, Robert Duran, Charles F. Gannon, William E. Gateley, †Andres E. Gloria, †Hyman Greenberg, Alfred C. Hill, †Earl C. Hoskins, Harold Hubbell, Glenn Jim, Wayne O. Lawrence, Macedonio B. Leyba, †Ramon B. Leyba, †Nicolas Lopez, Leonard R. McCombs, †Thomas A. Merritt, †Chesley Milligan, †Jacob C. Morgan, Jr., †Manuel M. Muñoz, Vicente R. Ojinaga, †Enoch C. Oliver, Glendon S. Riley, Eusebio Reyes, Basilio L. Rodriquez, †Alfonso M. Sanchez, †Cristobal D. Sanchez, Frank Sanchez, Elias Savedra, †Lonnie T. Slaughter, Albert F. Sweat, †Grabiel Tafoya, Francis R. Thomson, †Carlos T. Turrieta, Robert S. Unger, John Urioste, Vicente Pl Vigil, Marcario Villaloboz, †Sam Vivian, †Arthur Waldman, †William B. White, †John H. Wiest.

Battery D, 200th CA: Claud W. Stump, Lloyd W. Rogers, †Charles V. Safford, †Edward F. Tammony, Pete Espinosa, Walter P. Cornell, Everitt W. Gray, Thomas W. Ratcliffe, Truman M. Barker, Clinton R. Brewer, William M. Burrola, Charles R. Nunn, Foy E. Pribble, †Lester L. Roberts, Clinton C. Seymour, Robert J. Welch, James Argeanas, †Ernest M. Birner, †Damian Espinosa, David R. Etter, Jr., Anthony Q. Galindo, †Leonard D. Gates, †Johnny Hamilton, Carlo A. Menini, †Harold V. Phillips, Espeedie G. Ruiz, James G. Smith, †Frederick J. Wallace, †William G. Bowra, †Denzel O. Bush, Marlett E. Byars, †Louis Chavez, Robert C. Crawford, Valentine R. Dallago, Porfirio Diaz, Jr., Solomon L. Diaz, Homer L. Edmonds, Donald D. Evans, †Pablo Fragua, Adolfo C. Garduno, †Fernando Gomez, Jr., †John J. Gonzales, †Richard J. Hardy, †Lorenzo Hernandez, Ervin Keilholz, Celso H. Lucero, John T. McGee, †Vernon L. Meyer, Benjamin L. Osborne, †Wyman L. Parks, Dagoberto S. Ramirez, Clarence Ray, †Tony Regalado, Charles D. Sagash, †Raymond G. Scanlon, †Joe Schovanec, Carl Shaw, Harley L. Shaw, Joseph A. Stemler, Julius H. Tecumseh, Wayne N. Wasson, †Mervin J. Williams, Johnnie Wisneski, †Markie R. Archuleta, Joe Barreras, †Ernest C. Barron, James C. Boyd, Reginald Burrola, David Chavez, †Oziel Chavez, †Raymond Chavez, Lorenzo P. Cimerone, †Henry F. Crowder, †George B. Duke, Ralph E. Duncan, Abedon Garcia, †Uvaldo Garcia, †Anatolio Gonzales, Eliseo R. Gonzales, Manuel F. Grijalba, James C. Gunter, Pablo P. Gutierrez, Jose G. Hernandez, †Eusebio Herrera, Juan S. Lovato, †Howard F. Lyons, Myrrl W. McBride, Catalino Madrid, Susano Madril, †Antonio Martinez, Benjamin E. Martinez, Domingo B. Martinez, Rosenaldo Martinez, Andres A. Montoya, †Jose B. Nickerson, †Onnie A. Oja, Juan Paiz, Ignacio G. Perea, Aniseto Perez, Carmel Quintana, †Crux Regaldo, †James A. Robertson, Dave E. Romero, Faustin Salazar, Joe L. Sanchez, Valentine S. Santillanes, †Hilbert I. Schneider, Aldon L. Schoolcraft, Walter F. Schuette, Sam Sena, †Marvin R. Sheriff, †Averill H. Smith, †Martin J. Tafoya, †Herbert J. Tieken, Trinidad H. Torres, Joe R. Villanueva, †Zaragosa C. Zamora.

Battery E, 200th Coast Artillery: †Burney H. Smith, James P. Richards, Oswald C. Ruckman, †T. B. Bryant, †Melvin E. Jones, Cecil E. Mauldin, W. A. Noffsker, †John E. Reynolds, Prentice G. Riley, †Oscar A. Ruckman, †Christopher A. Wiggins, †Harry O. Williams, George W. Burton, Rochell Cochran, †Henry A. Drake, †Marshall E. Kelly, John W. May, †Glendell L. Nonk, Cone J. Munsey, Floyd C. Reynolds, †Wayne C. Rodgers, †John S. Shields, †Earl R. Stirman, †Neal C. Ticer, †Guido Andreoli, †Bryon C. Beal, Minter Box, †Laudente Chavez, Howard T. Chrisco, Reece L. Clay, †Leon Z. Fought, †Paul C. Glentzer, Sam H. Gribble, Walter W. Houston, †Wendell R. Jackson, Buren D. Johnston, Alvin A. Jordan, Harold A. Knighton, Stanley J. Krolikoski, William E. McLendon, †William J. Moore, †Kemp C. Pepper, Delbert W. Perry, †William D. Pilling, Lee C. Roach, Leonard L. Robinson, †Bertram O. Sandoval, Virgil E. Sherwood, Clyde Stone, †Durrell A. Tidwell, Cecil C. Uzzel, John D. West, Johnnie L. Abel, Keats Begay, John Y. Begaye, †Abram R. Boese, Lloyd M. Dibble, †John P. Ferrell, Ben T. Garcia, George V. Hernandez, Homer B. Hobbs, Jr., †Robert D. Huchton, Toney James, †Jose G. Jauriqui, †David Lopez, †Edgar Lunasee, Ambrosio Madrid, †Eutimio Medina, Miguel Medina, †Julian A. Mestas, Luke Mondello, Alejandro G. Montes, Sam Nez, †Inocencio Nunez, Robert K. Oliver, Primitivo N. Pena, Lalo Ramos, †Harmon A. Reynolds, †Marion Roe, †Douglas Sanders, Samuel J. Smith, Thomas D. Suazo, Willie L. Tillman, †George S. Torres, Jos T. Torrez, John B. Trujillo, Abelino Vigil, †Oliver Hartford.

Battery F, 200th Coast Artillery: †Frank H. Grimmer, Dan A. McCartney, †William J. McKenzie, James W. Chaney, Thomas P. Foy, †Floyd E. Ward, Sam P. Buse, John C. Barberia, Lean D. Beasley, Calvin C. Buckner, Donald M. Dansby, †Kenneth E. Davis, Charlie F. James, Richard R. Malone, †Thomas E. Paddock, †Constantine L. Papadeas, Anthony J. Ruchalski, Jackson J. Rupe, Phil Witherspoon, †Elmer D. White, †N. J. Ammons, William G. Ballou, Eugene P. Burkeholder, Donald H. Cox, Franklin R. Cullum, †Henry G. Fugate, †Howard W. Johnson, Newton F. Kemp, Virgil LaRue, Louis E. Loman, Mason H. Nesbitt, †Wayne H. O'Brien, Emory C. Schlick, James L. Strain, Roy T. Terry, †Alva Turbett, †Bernard G. Valencia, Jess J. Whitted, Don H. Adams, Thomas U. Austin, Steve Berger, Carl E. Bohannon, †George W. Bounds, Mavis S. Brown, Loyal B. Brunt, †Robert A. Byard, Roy C. Castleberry, John A. Conner, Robert L. Cunlap, †Lester E. Fevurly, Carl C. Foster, Lee S. Garner, †Oliver A. Gore, †John V. Grange, †Charley C. Hightower, †Elmer Hill, †Guy W. Hillard, Rollie H. Keller, Robert M. Malone, †Jessie F. Mash, †Jeff W. Morris, †James O. Parson, Alexander P. Petruzela, Wallace R. Phillips, Chester A. Philpott, †William B. Richardson, James N. Ridgway, †Frank J. Sanchez, Joseph B. Simeroth, John P. Stabrylla, †Gilberto G. Tafoya, James R. Thompson, Alton W. Tice, George C. Tidwell, Allen J. White, Thurman B. Williamson, Sammie Wright, Homer Yahnozha, †Robert E. Young, Eligio Baca, †Henry F. Biri, †Adam Branning, Burl A. Brewster, Thomas G. Cardin, Albert C. Charmelo, Ben T. Chavez, Bruce N. Choate, Oscar A. Cox, Jessie W. Crabb, †William C. Ferguson, Carmen Guerra, Jr., Eugene E. Hamrick, †Lorenzo R. Herrera, †Henry A. Hood, †Kenneth L. Lane, Martin S. Long, Jose M. Loya, Joe P. Martinez, Joe S. Montano, †Albert L.

Peterson, Gayle M. Pruiett, Adrain Rachall, Moses Sanchez, †Jose C. Suarez, Frank Syrinek, †Bryan M. Tidwell, †Dionicio Trujillo, Walter D. Utter, Ben Vidal, Edward L. Wilkerson.

Battery G, 200th Coast Artillery: †Albert K. Field, †Joseph D. Thorpe, †Dwayne A. Davis, †Austin J. Curtis, †Henry F. Scally, William E. Salars, Stephen H. Alex, †James P. Allen, †Delbert O. Covert, Donald C. Harris, Cipriano M. Hernandez, †Wellington E. Hollingsworth, †Melvin R. Hulbert, †Robert E. Mitchell, †Fred S. Simoni, Ernest E. VanWinkle, †Elmer L. Worthen, Vernon A. Youngblood, †Robert E. Carpenter, †Dick W. Catlett, Thalis R. Cook, †Dorance J. Danielson, †Alfredo Enriquez, Bedelio F. Gurule, †Melvin C. Harsh, Thomas O. Hodges, †John A. James, †Robert N. Luther, Ralph E. Moore, †John E. Osowski, †Anthony Pomillo, Eugene W. Schmitz, Eugene F. Snyder, Dean E. Uhl, Thuman I. Vandagriff, †Harold M. Anderson, Waldon L. Burchfiled, †Charles T. Clark, †Louis L. Clark, †Rexell B. Coffindaffer, †Quentin D. Colburn, Joseph J. Duncan, †Damacio Espalin, Jr., †Jose B. Gallegos, Plutarco Garza, †Parker McCool, †Wayne L. Mahler, †Jeremias G. Martinez, Luciano Martinez, †Robert P. Pintarelli, †Richard G. Pitsor, †Julian Ponce, Fred C. Starnes, †Charles E. Taylor, †William M. Taylor, †William J. Winter, Telesforo V. Archuleta, †Garrett M. Arledge, Arquin G. Atencio, †Thomas G. Baca, †William M. Barnes, †Alfred E. Brink, Nestor Bustamente, †Fidel Canales, †Juan Casaus, Jr., †Bernard Cavanaugh, Ramon B. Cisneros, †Kenneth Coffey, †Gilbert H. Ellegood, †Porfirio C. Franco, †Bruno G. Fuentes, †Adalfo Gallegos, †Clemente Garcia, Virgilio Gomez, Agustin Gonzales, †Frankie D. Gonzales, †Jose I. Griego, †Othon Q. Guillen, †Joyl H. Hamilton, Alfred A. Haws, †Arturo Hernandez, †William R. Hooten, Trino C. Huerta, †Solomon D. Levin, Alfredo N. Levrier, †Joe C. Mauellito, George Martinez, Antonio U. Mata, Edras S. Montoya, Ralph M. Perry, †Cenobio Ramirez, †Luciano C. Salaz, Vincent Saputo, †Emil K. Wagner, †John C. Ward.

Battery H, 200th Coast Artillery: Dallas P. Vinette, †Clayton E. Irish, †Gerald B. Darling, Jack B. Kenneman, John M. Vickery, †Jimmie Lujan, Robert K. Boggs, Joseph M. Burrola, †Herbert C. Fincke, Earl R. Harris, James B. Jones, Jimmie K. Lujan, Chester L. Nicholson, †Thomas Santistevan, Miguel N. Tafoya, Paul Trujillo, †Dwight H. Fowler, Jr., Clemens A. Kathman, Ben Montoya, †Arthur C. Palmer, Luther E. Ragsdale, Albert Rowland, Joe A. Segura, †Irwin U. Steagall, †Martin E. Trojillo, †Jacob N. Willoughby, †George E. Zimmer, †Walter W. Brinkerhoff, †Ocie E. Brown, Ray Burch, Irvin R. Butler, †Marvin F. Cates, †Alfred R. Cox, Armando Del Frate, †Telesfor Gonzales, Louis R. Herring, †James A. Hopkins, David L. King, †John A. Lemke, Raymond V. Mares,† Antonio B. Martinez, Joe A. Medina, Robert Medina, Alton L. Montgomery, Horacio H. Montoya, Onofre Montoya, Teodoro J. Montoya, Robert J. Moore, Phillip F. Rivera, †James S. Roberts, †Richard G. Romero, Gustavo R. Santistevan, General L. Shelton, †Ernest O. Suttles, †Richard B. Swaim, †Charles B. Thomas, †Charles A. Trujillo, †Reynaldo Trujillo, †Felix Aragon, Floyd R. Besher, Eloy P. Cardenas, †Joe E. Carrillo, Max M. Casaus, Thomas Charles, †Fernando Concha, †Filadelfio Cordova, †Jose Cordova, †Rubin H. D. Davenport, Doyle V. Decker, Pinex Fletcher, Ernest N. Garcia, †Manuel J. Garcia, †Maclovio A. Gonzales, Warren D. Graves, Ben S. Hallett, †Joseph J. Kairunas, †Peter Kierner, Morris L. Lerner, †Ben F. Leslie, †Gustavo R. Lucero, †Jerry Lucero, †Joe I. Lujan, Joe G. Maestas, George Mares, Harry Martin, †Leonard B. Martin, Juan J. Martinez, †Luciano S. Martinez, †Jose L. Mascarenas, †Moises Miera, Conrado G. Vigil.

Medical Detachment, 200th Coast Artillery: †George T. Colvard, John W. Farley, Vetalis V. Anderson, William A. Blueher, †Charles A. Schubert, Roger D. Campbell, †Arnold A. Orosco, Pat F. Barela, Howard Higgins, †Michael A. Morris, †Horace Chavez, Tony P. Chavez, Henry W. Day, Abel Garcia, †Reuben E. Garcia, Robert Garcia, Salvador J. Garcia, Sipriano Griego, John J. Murphy, Jake P. Padilla, Foch F. Tixier, †Ralph P. Chavez, Gus L. Davis, Reginald E. Guker, Jr., †Charles E. Hasso, John A. McCarty, Sam M. Palasota, Arthur L. Storts, †Ernest H. Ulrich, †John Nickolas, †Milton M. Northcutt, †Jake J. Padilla, †Lowell Priest, †Melvin L. Reid, Keyton F. Roberts, Santana S. Romero, †Reynaldo L. Salaiz, Felix M. Salas, †Ambrocio J. Sandoval, Eduardo A. Sandoval, Santiago Sarracino, Leslie J. Schellstede, Hollis Scruggs, †Jose G. Sisneros, Melvin O. Treider, †Belarmino J. Valdez, Arthur C. Vandagriff.

Band, 200th Coast Artillery: †Thomas M. Palmer, †Newton J. Patton, †Donald W. Burrell, †William M. Norris, †Titus W. Rouse, Russell Clark, George F. King, †Ernest Baca, Robert D. Baldwin, Clair L. Case, †Jack B. Chamberlin, Donald Clark, Pete Domenicali, Frank Franchini, Frank A. Gabaldon, Wilber W. Heinsohn, †Roy D. Hobbs, William S. Horabin, †Joe E. Jezek, Earl E. Pyatt, Cipriano B. Ramirez, †Salvador H. Ramirez, Herman O. Tafoya, Henry K. Warth, †William J. Wells, John W. St. Clair.

Headquarters, Second Battalion, 515th Coast Artillery: †Paul W. Schurtz, †Jack G. Ashby, Russell J. Hutchinson.

Headquarters Battery, Second Battalion, 515th Coast Artillery: Orville E. Drummond, Morgan T. Jones, †James R. Williams, Bud J. Kelly, Reuben Rockwell, Vincent W. Wilkerson, Donald H. Kedzie, Eliseo Lopez, †Dean R. Chalk, †Joe G. Nieto, DeForrest B. Walker, †Kermit L. Goll, Albert L. Parker, Robert H. Rutledge, †Jeptha P. Taylor.

Battery A, 515th Coast Artillery: Marvin H. Lucas, Dan C. Limpert, LeMoyne B. Stiles, †Alvin F. Watson, †John R. Flowers, William W. Phebus, Albert C. Senter, George L. Smith, Jesse J. Armour, Ernest J. Chavez, Hubert F. Gilliland, †William H. Meyer, Charles N. Williams, †Ned L. Abraham, Malcolm T. Bull, Damon W. Dunagan, Bruce Klinekole, Max Leyba, Ernest Montoya, †William A. Phelps, Carlos F. Roybal, †Herman P. Barela, Melvin Chato, Valademar A. De Herrera, Alvin H. Fails, John A. Genovese, Robert R. Godfrey, Marion W. Heck, †Boyd H. Henry, David S. Histia, †Johnnie D. Hood, Eugene L. Hughes, Floyd J. Johnson, Albino Lopez, Miramon Maldonado, †Leo A. Manuelito, Laddie Miller, †John B. Moses, †Eugene Mott, Paul R. Nateswa, †William G. Noffke, Thomas M. Nunn, Faustino Olguin, †Stanley F. Ozimkiewicz, †Benjamin Pacheco, Andrew J. Panno, †Leroy G. Plubell, Emilio T. Porras, †Patricio J. Quintana, †Reuben E. Ray, †Sam D. Salazar, Brooks L. Tanner, Edwin E. Trujillo, †Tito M. Vigil, Fred E. Archuleta, †Ignacio Baca, †George L. Driggars, Gregorio Lopez.

Battery B, 515th Coast Artillery: †Hubert P. Jeffus, †Melvin R. Millard, Edward F. Lingo, †David E Kells, †Edwin S. Landon, Jack L. Finley, †John W. Norton, †Raymond F. Baca, †Wesley S. Bowman, †Charles A. Coggshall, †Raymond L. Kenney, †Nick V. Parada, Joe F. Romero, †Ollin A. Roper, †Jessie D. Sandell, †John H. Austin, †Charles R. Booth, †Clarence D. Brantley, †Joe B. Chavira, †Francis E. Donnelly, †Virgil F. Funk, †Arthur C. Garde, †George H. Huston, †Ernest F. Lueras, †William E. Rorie, Joe Sanchez †Martin E. Sass, †Don G. Tenorio, Richard A. Trask, †George I. Tindol, †Don Watson, †James R. Young, †Maxwell G. Anderson, †Bulen Barnes, †Howard O. Blythe, †Solomon Cohen, †Adolfo Cordova, Jr., †Domingo Coriz, Demetri L. Doolos, Charles B. Gavord, †Thomas V. Long, †Arthur O. Mann, Belarmino Martinez, Sam Milligan, George R. Powell, †Leonard R. Thompson, †Manuel A. Aguilar, †Haymond L. Barker, Lellon Barnes, Lazaro A. Chavez, Francisco Garcia, †Manuel Garcia, Henry A. Gobble, John L. Johnson, †Wayne E. Light, †Robert J. Maes, †Charles N. McCarty, Jr., †Chee McKinley, †Igancia Muniz, †Frank Ortiz, †Santiago McOsnua, †Dennis J. Peterson, †Martin Quintana, Jr., †Manuel Salazar, †Napoleon Sanchez, Ralph Sedillo, †James R. Slade, †Mike Sokol, †Enrique G. Tellez, †Maximiano Vasquez, †Trinidad M. Virgil, Buster Wilkerson, †Jerry C. Zaruba.

Battery C, 515th Coast Artillery: †James R. Thwaits, †Glenn E. Bailey, †Robert J. Remondini, †Samuel A. Candiello, Richard J. Daly, †Bill W. Brown, Fred H. Swope, Juan Blea, †Abie A. Carrillo, Lloyd R. Harman, Henry P. Latham, †Loyd L. Maness, †Barnes Olmstead, Carl A. Pasurka, †Charles H. Sims, Jr., †Durward H. Wright, †Royal E. Agens, Francis E. Bell, †Harlan C. Bickford, Dwight R. Cable, Aubrey L. Campbell, Charles E. Cheney, George M. Craig, Adolfo S. Hernandez, Joe T. Lucero, Errett L. Lujan, †Theodore G. Martinez, Wayne W. Nieman, Pete Ortega, †Pat A. Quintana, †Eloy Ruiz, Jesus M. Silva, Virgil V. Wallace, †Manuel Martinez, †George J. Millikeh, †Adolph F. Mueller, Jesus A. Padilla, †Edgar B. Parker, Milton A. Pearce, Aurelio Quintana, William C. Ross, Arthur B. Smith, Vernon A. Snyder, Harold R. Taves, †Ralph J. Trujillo, †Raymond T. Tucker, Elzie C. Williams, †Pablo Baca, Wilbur J. Beger, †Shilley L. Bolton, J. L. Bradley, †Ray S. Chavez, †Jose D. Fajardo, †Valentin M. Garcia, †Paul C. Guerrera, †Juan F. Gurule, Ferrill E. Harrison, †Samuel Lopez, Jose G. Lucero, †James G. Mares, †Charleston J. Miller, †James C. Moulton, †James G. Odell, †Benito A. Paiz, †Chester O. Pounds, †Clarence W. Radcliff, Marcos R. Rael, Andres G. Ramos, Juan Ramos, Jr., †Lloyd H. Reeves, †Woodrow W. Rhodes, †Santiago Romero, †Reynaldo Saiz, †Adan N. Sedillo, Louis Sena, Walter P. Strus, Antonio J. Tobar.

Battery D, 515th CA: †Eddie T. Kemp, Jack W. Bradley, Edward J. Junker, †Joseph R. Radosevich, †Menzies Wyper, Jr., †Thomas E. Hunt, Frank E. Wilson, Robert N. Amy, John V. Constant, Robert C. Davis, Frank H. Pecarich, Edward L. Rollie, †Carl A. Stober, Nick Terrazas, †Felipe N. Trejo, Dale W. Walker, Rufus E. Whiteman, Virgil L. Aimes, †Carlos A. Armijo, Arthur J. Calderon, Juan M. Chavez, †Buford F. Cooksev, †Frank A. Duran, Espiridion A. Garduno, Harold C. Hise, †John S. Hnidak, †Myron R. Lugibihl, Jr., †Simon R. Parra, †Orville A. Pruehsner, Isadore Sabbota, †Adelardo I. Sanchez, Gregorio M. Sanchez, Agapito G. Silva, Edward J. Vertz, Jr., Balta M. Apodaca, Frank S. Arceneaux, Benerito A. Archuleta, Tony Bolf, Silverio Garley, Ehpren J. Landavazo, †Trine Mora, †Wayne R. Thomas, Ruben Flores, †Carlos G. Gonzales, †Raymond K. Pence, Amado Romero, Anselmo Sisneros, Jr., Erminio L. Ybaben, Charlie W. Baker, Charley R. Barron, †Joseph G. Diaz, †Darrel C. Edwards, †Miguel S. Fierro, †David H. Franklin, Moises R. Gallegos, Cleofas Garcia, Pedro Garcia, Eddie Graham, †Frank G. Jones, Jr., Jake M. Light, Jose A. Longoria, Luis Lopez, Lorenzo Mirabal, Henry I. Moore, Ernest Z. Otero, †James B. Reyes, †Tommy B. Reyes, †Jerome G. Rodarte, Joe M. Sanchez, †Joseph Singer, †Henry L. C. Smith, †Jose M. Tafoya, Jose I. Valdez, Antonio J. Vigil.

Battery F, 515th Coast Artillery: †Reynaldo F. Gonzales, †Dean H. Craft, Frank A. Forni, James A. Oden, Jr., Joe S. Smith, †Ralph S. Brink, William P. Bunch, Richard A. Hnulik, †Gene R. Davis, John P. Donati, †Frederick W. Leber, †Charles E. Mitchell, †George G. Moore, †Roy M. Morton, †George W. Robinson, †Joe D. Smith, Paul F. Womak, †LaFaye Armour, Marvin Bailey, Arnold R. Clanton, Glen Farmer, †Russell L. Haney, Roy

J. House, †James P. Hunter, †Walter R. Johnson, †Steven Kish, Robert J. Knight, †Larry A. Loggins, †Edward K. Pope, †Lawrence M. Sanchez, Leonard L. Wolfenbarger, †Alexander J. Antosiak, †John J. Bacak, Francis G. Bain, Cipriano Chavez, †Jose C. Cruz, †Juan Gomez, Everette M. Morris, Clifford M. Omtvedt, Michael Pulice, †Marcelo Tafoya, †Roderick E. Warren, †Joe Westbrook, Gregorio Barrera, †Frank Bianco, †Ocia Brown, Jack A. Cater, †Raymond Chapman, Luis G. Espinosa, †John F. Galdikas, Albert M. Gonzales, †Edubigen E. Hernandez, Simon R. Hernandez, †Jesse C. Holcomb, †Walter Kolocek, Porfirio Lara, †Pedro A. Montoya, Dionico R. Pena, Julian Prada, Jr., †Herman S. Quintana, †Gerardo Rodriguez, †John C. Romero, †Manual A. Romero, †Astor N. Sanders, Jesus Santos, Ernesto O. Serrano, Boyce Springer, Robert E. Stephens, Miguel R. Torres, Juan A. Trujillo, †Manuel Ulibarri, †Fidel Vela, Clarence A. Wharton, Frank L. Yonan.

Battery G, 515th Coast Artillery: Dow G. Bond, Prior Thwaits, Alvin F. Wheeler, Al T. Suttmann, Arvil L. Gale, Lloyd R. Byers, †Baylor Duncan, Walter J. Gentry, Wallace A. Hall, †Burl C. Howell, David Johns, †Aubrey L. Maddux, †Louis F. Martinez, Winston H. Shillito, †Jack D. Sprunk, Bensis Torres, Rhea F. Tow, †Walter M. Upchurch, Jr., Richard P. Burke, Rhodun M. Bussell, Nick Chintis, Abel R. Escalante, †Luther A. Henderson, †LeRoy Huddleston, †Ellis M. Hunter, †Curtis C. Jones, †Harry Kelly, †James A. Mayes, William J. Mitchell, Fausto Noche, †Raymond H. Olson, Feliciano R. Alderete, Douglas F. Brown, Asier Chavez, †Kenneth Coffey, Joseph K. Goforty, Billy E. Jensen, †Richard B. Hunt, †George J. Hynes, †Edgar V. Long, †Buford L. Lunsford, August McGraw, †Aaron B. Melvin, Lee L. Savage, Dorris Stevens, Ira D. Wallace, †Ignacio A. Delgado, Juan S. De Luna, Stanley J. Dzierlatka, †Fidel Garcia, Clyde D. Gomez, †Nestor Herrera, †Gerald L. Jones, Amador B. Lovato, Santiago Lucero, Marcos Martinez, †Trinidad F. Otero, Laurencio Pena, Mike S. Peralta, Louis B. Polansky, Antonio Quintana, †Albert Rodriguez, Aristotel S. Romero, Emilio E. Romero, Sirenio C. Ruiz, †Leonardo M. Salazar, †Juan J. Sanchez, †David Sidney, Vincent Silva, Stanley Skweres, †Rex R. Swagart, †Jesus M. Tafoya, †Martin A. Tafoya, Neal S. Tsosie, †Vincente Turrieta, †Peter D. Vallo.

Battery H, 515th CA: †Alvin L. Bayne, †James E. Hunter, †Frank C. Thomas, ‡Gordon A. Lee, Calvin R. Graef, Etcyl E. Burchell, Jack D. Fogerson, †Milus L. Hall, †Gustav Kelsey, Luis G. Le Roux, †Charles M. Mares, Robert D. Mitchell, †Lloyd W. Munson, John W. Neville, William A. Nolan, †Charles W. Oles, Joel L. Rogers, Chester R. Scott, Edgar R. Beck, †Edward H. Domroehs, †Vernon V. Ginnings, †Delbert M. Lorenz, Alexander H. Mathews, †John D. Moss, †James L. Oliphant, Herbert H. Rolstad, †Arthur Sandoval, Louis A. Silverstein, Lyle C. Stine, Norvel E. Tow, †Lloyd P. Wynn, James W. Beck, †Chunkie F. Bell, †Joe L. Coca, †Adonaiz N. Cordova, †John C. Cotten, †Billy B. Kanally, Tom Lee, †Lupe Lucero, Joseph E. McLeod, Loye E. Murrell, †Ohmer O. Richmond, Stephen J. Sanchez, †Herbert Sherman, Armando E. Trujillo, †Reynaldo Trujillo, Louis H. Whitlock, †Manuel Alderete, †Charles E. Clark, †Kermit Clayton, Ramon Z. Corona, †Arthur A. Dorrance, Burnise L. Fay, John M. Fuentes, Evangelisto R. Garcia, †Pascual Garde, Herschel R. Gardner, John R. Goddard, †Hershel A. Grooms, Thomas G. Healy, †Lester D. Herring, †Carl W. Jones, Howard A. Lauscher, Benjamin Manzanares, †Arnold H. W. Oldenettel, Gene Ortega, †Jack A. Parrish, †James F. Pope, †Juan Ramires, Adolfo E. Rivera, Jose M. Romero, Robert B. Sills, †Austin J. Smith, †Luis Taylor, John H. Wall, Grover L. Will.

Medical detachment, 515th CA: †Richard M. Riley, †Julian O. Long, Curtis Burson, Orlando Stevens, Edward E. Chavez, David A. Chavez, Murray M. Sullivan, Jose S. Garcia, Ralph Rodriguez, Jr., Esperidion Archibeque, Miguel H. Chaires, Levi Chis Chilly, William R. Cochran, Jr., Oscar J. Crowson, Clifford E. Herr, †Orall L. Huling.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask Senators, when they read the list of the boys who did not come back, to pay special attention to the names of boys of Spanish or Mexican ancestry, who died not as Mexicans or Spaniards or Latin Americans, but as Americans, by the grace of God and nothing else. They died in American uniforms, generally the fatigue type. They died carrying the American flag and none other. This should be a complete answer to the indiscreet lady in Colorado who objected to a so-called Mexican carrying our flag.

## FINANCIAL STRENGTH OF MAJOR OIL COMPANIES IN OIL LIFT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a table prepared by the staff of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, showing the assets, gross sales, and net income, after taxes and depletion, of the 15 major oil companies engaged in foreign commerce which were originally designated by the Executive to administer the oil lift to Europe.

Attached to this statement there is another table which I should like to have printed in the RECORD as a part of this exhibit, showing the number of retail stations in the United States which are operated by these companies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. These two tables which will appear in the RECORD will indicate the scope of the study which is being made by the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, in cooperation with the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, concerning the effect upon our national economy of order establishing the Middle East Emergency Committee to administer the Government program.

I protested last November, before the 85th Congress convened, on the ground that the plan of handing over control to one segment of the oil industry developed a conflict of interest. These giant integrated corporations, having unmeasured interests in the oil of the Middle East and Latin America, are scarcely qualified to represent the domestic petroleum industry or the people of the United States. They are international economic states and not arms of the Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I agree completely and wholeheartedly with what the Senator from Wyoming has said, but I wonder if the Senator will tell the Senate why he thinks the Government has handed over to one segment of the industry this program? Is it not because 15 members of the committee come from major oil-producing sections of the Nation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There are 15 members of the committee who come from oil-producing sections of the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may have an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### IMPORTANT PRODUCERS AND REFINERS OVERLOOKED

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the point I wish to make is simply this, that the independent producers were overlooked as were also the independent refineries. No one was invited to take part in the formation of this committee except the major corporations engaged in the petroleum industry in the Middle East. Some of these same companies, most of them, in fact, have producing properties in the Middle East and in Latin America. A number of Members of the Senate from oil-producing States, including the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], and myself, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], who was the originator of the motion, and other Senators desired to prevent the importation of cheap oil from the Middle East and cheap oil from Latin America. The Senator from West Virginia offered an amendment to secure that end. The amendment was not adopted when the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act was extended, and a section was written into that act——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not know whether this is a correct statement, but I have been informed that this committee appointed to make recommendations in connection with the oil supply to Europe is made up of 15 corporations which are identified with major companies and 1 corporation which is identified with independent companies. I have no objection to having representatives of the major companies on this committee. In fact, in order to be representative of the industry, that would have to be the case. But the number is completely out of balance. I ask the Senator if that is his information.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The information is clear. There were 15 major companies. I urge the appointment of an independent producer and an independent refiner, at least one. One independent refiner was named.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There are 15 majors and 1 independent; is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, but they are not individuals; they are corporations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has again expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, since several questions have been addressed to me, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to say that there was a great deal of correspondence with independent producers. They showed a reluctance to participate because they had had no experience in the international field. There are, in fact, only about 20 operating in that field. Obviously, since they were to deal with the Middle East, I suppose the 15 largest were chosen to deal with the questions involved, because they related to tankers, to Venezuelan supply shipments for our own east coast, and to many other problems. The correspondence has gone into the record.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Did the independents decline to serve?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The fact is that the independent producers refused to serve. They declined to follow the recommendations that they should be on the committee, because they were opposed to the importation of crude oil while there was a law giving the Government the right to stop such importation. It has not been stopped, but Dr. Flemming, head of the Office of Defense Mobilization, has testified before our committee that he was unhappy about it, and he has had much correspondence with the producers.

I am not trying to argue today the merits of this matter——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am seeking information. The Senator from Illinois has given me considerable information on the subject. I was under the impression that Dr. Flemming was exercising his authority under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and had held a hearing and was giving consideration to the subject when the crisis developed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. Action was suspended at that point.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, one of the questions asked in the course of the hearing was why the prohibition against——

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator from Minnesota permit me to complete my statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Again the Chair must advise the Senator that his time has expired.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wyoming may be allowed another 3 minutes on the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to point out that these tables will show that the assets of the 15 foreign operating corporations total $20,162,034,000; that their net income, after taxes and depletion, amounts to $1,929,695,000; and I am also advised that a depletion allowance of 27½ percent is given to these corporations operating in foreign commerce, based on production from their foreign sources of supply as well as upon their domestic sources of supply.

Of the 15 companies, 9 are operating 239,053 filling stations in the United States, some of them in all the States and the District of Columbia; 1 company operates stations in the 48 States; 1 company in 44 States, 1 company in 40 States, 1 company in 38 States, 1 company in 31 States, 1 company in 29 States, and 1 company in 26 States.

So integrated companies, which operate on a worldwide scale, are operating the oil lift.

The inquiry, which was approved by the Committee on the Judiciary, was to determine the effect of this operation upon our domestic economy. It was in no sense an attack upon independent producers, nor was it to be an attack upon independent refiners, and I so stated at the opening session of the committee hearings. Nor is it an attack on the majors. It is simply an effort to get the facts.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. THYE. My primary concern is with the independent refiners and the smaller operators who may be hard pressed because they have a large supply or a large inventory, but do not have adequate markets, and are excluded from shipping refined gasoline abroad. They are hard pressed to keep in operation because of their large inventories and supplies, the rise in the price of crude oil, and the fact that they are not able to meet the competition.

I wish to state at this point in the colloquy that we need to concern ourselves with the problem of the small, independent operators and refiners, who are faced with the rise in the price of crude oil.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has again expired.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an additional 3 minutes be granted to the Senator from Wyoming, so that this subject may be thoroughly discussed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the time of the Senator from Wyoming is extended for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. THYE. In conclusion, I commend the Senator from Wyoming for having initiated this colloquy, because the record will now show that the independent refiners had been invited to serve on the committee, but the independent producers asked to be excused because they were not as familiar with the oil lift——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. One independent refiner did accept the invitation.

Mr. THYE. I am aware of that.

STATEMENT OF INDEPENDENT PRODUCERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wyoming may have printed at this point in the RECORD the requests made of the individual members of the independent segment of the oil industry and their replies refusing to serve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President all that information is contained in the statement made by the general counsel for the independent companies, Mr. Brown. All the correspondence is there.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. First, let me get this point settled.

As I understand, the Chair has ruled that the statement of Mr. Brown, which I propose to offer in response to the inquiry of the Senator from Texas, and upon his unanimous-consent request, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas asked unanimous consent that the Senator from Wyoming might have printed the requests made of the members of the independent segment of the oil industry and their replies.

Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to say, first, to the Senator from Minnesota, because I am most happy to have had him make the statement he has just made, that the investigation is being conducted without any political or partisan shade whatsoever. The committee is merely trying to get all the facts.

But I will say further that the situation affords a magnificent opportunity to ascertain the manner in which the giant corporations, representing big business, are pushing independent and small business off the economic map.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has again expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wyoming may be granted an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. To make certain the record is complete—and I think I do justice to the record—I was of the impression when the hearings began, that the major producers were the only ones who were thinking about a price increase. Then I discovered from a distinguished geologist from Wyoming, a man of real discernment and ability, who came before the committee——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. At the invitation of the chairman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, indeed; in all fairness that must be said.

The geologist testified that the small producers ought to have a 75-cents-a-barrel increase.

The independent producers of my State cited increases in the cost of pipe, labor, exploration charges, deeper wells, and so forth, which made a price increase imperative. Thus the picture becomes somewhat complicated when we try to see the equities on all sides.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There have been many price increases, including the cost of pipe, both alloy and carbon, machinery, and others that the producers have become victims of inflation, this existence of which is now recognized by the administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

EXHIBIT 1

*Middle East Emergency Committee (1955)*

| | Assets | Gross income (sales) | Net income after taxes and depletion |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) | $7,164,105,000 | $6,272,441,000 | $709,310,000 |
| 2. Socony Mobile Oil Co., Inc.[1] | 2,361,912,000 | 1,720,998,000 | 207,434,000 |
| 3. Gulf Oil Co | 2,160,821,000 | 1,895,670,000 | 218,064,000 |
| 4. Texas Co | 2,114,576,000 | 1,767,266,000 | 262,730,000 |
| 5. Standard Oil Company of California | 1,855,610,000 | 1,277,840,000 | 231,139,000 |
| 6. Sinclair Oil Corp | 1,250,125,000 | 1,110,067,000 | 80,710,000 |
| 7. Cities Service Oil Co | 1,094,741,000 | 923,240,000 | 49,307,000 |
| 8. Creole Petroleum Corp. (95 percent owned by Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey)) | 1,026,207,324 | 856,310,521 | 292,943,913 |
| 9. Tidewater Oil Co. (14 percent owned by Getty Oil Co.) | 485,365,000 | 478,764,000 | 37,790,000 |
| 10. Getty Oil Co | 153,670,000 | 14,000,000 | 11,182,000 |
| 11. Venezuelan Petroleum Co. (96 percent owned by Sinclair Oil Co.) | 76,639,000 | 31,238,000 | 5,039,000 |
| JOINTLY OWNED COMPANIES | | | |
| 12. American Independent Oil Co. (jointly owned by other MEEC members): | | | |
| Phillips Petroleum Co. (33.5 percent) | 1,201,872,000 | 910,769,000 | 95,203,000 |
| Hancock Oil Co.[2] (15 percent) | 57,778,000 | 47,405,000 | 7,080,000 |
| Signal Oil & Gas Co. (15 percent) | 106,639,000 | 55,743,000 | 9,640,000 |
| Ashland Oil & Refining Co. (12.7 percent) | 154,820,000 | 245,881,000 | 10,106,000 |
| 13. Arabian-American Oil Co. (jointly owned by other MEEC members): | | | |
| The Texas Co. (30 percent) | 2,114,576,000 | 1,767,266,000 | 266,141,000 |
| Socony Mobil Oil Co. (10 percent) | 2,361,912,000 | 1,720,998,000 | 207,434,000 |
| Standard Oil Company of California (30 percent) | 1,855,610,000 | 1,277,840,000 | 231,139,000 |
| Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) (30 percent) | 7,164,105,000 | 6,272,441,000 | 709,310,000 |
| 14. Caltex Oil Products Co. (jointly owned by other MEEC members): | | | |
| Standard Oil Company of California (50 percent) | 1,855,610,000 | 1,277,840,000 | 231,139,000 |
| Texas Co. (50 percent) | 2,114,576,000 | 1,767,266,000 | 266,141,000 |
| 15. Standard Vacuum Oil Co. (jointly owned by other MEEC members): | | | |
| Standard Oil Co. (N. J.) (50 percent) | 7,164,105,000 | 6,272,441,000 | 709,310,000 |
| Socony Mobil Oil Co. (50 percent) | 2,361,912,000 | 1,720,998,000 | 207,434,000 |
| Total, excluding duplication | 20,162,034,000 | 16,720,064,000 | 1,929,695,000 |

[1] Includes assets of subsidiaries in Western Hemisphere only.
[2] Year ending June 30, 1956.

| | Retail dealers in United States [1] | Number of States [2] |
|---|---|---|
| American Independent Oil Co. (owners)[3] | 27,975 | 38 |
| Arabian-American Oil Co | None | |
| Caltex Oil Products Co | None | |
| Cities Service Co | 16,683 | 39 |
| Creole Petroleum Corp | None | |
| Getty Oil Co | None | |
| Gulf Oil Corp | 36,426 | 40 |
| Sinclair Oil Corp.[4] | 35,400 | 48 |
| Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc.[4] | 34,025 | 44 |
| Standard Oil Company of California.[4] | 12,034 | 29 |
| Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey)[4] | 28,160 | 31 |
| Standard Vacuum Oil Co | None | |
| Texas Co | 38,500 | 49 |
| Tidewater Oil Co.[4] | 9,850 | 26 |
| Venezuelan Petroleum Co | None | |
| Total | 239,053 | |

[1] "Retail dealers" includes all retail outlets supplied directly or through distributors. It includes outlets that earn more money through sale of other products even though they handle petroleum products.
[2] Including District of Columbia.
[3] The majority of the capital stock of American Independent Oil Co. is owned by Phillips Petroleum Co., Sunray-Midcontinent Oil Co., Hancock Oil Co., Signal Oil Co., and Ashland Oil & Refining Co.
[4] Parent company figures were obtained by adding up responses of subsidiaries.

Source: National Petroleum News Factbook, 1956, pp. 170-173 and 175.

EXHIBIT 2

STATEMENT OF RUSSELL B. BROWN, GENERAL COUNSEL, INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 12, 1957

My name is Russell B. Brown. I am general counsel of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, a national trade association whose members are engaged in the production of crude oil and natural gas. The membership of the association is representative of all oil and gas producing areas of the United States.

Our association very much appreciates the opportunity to participate in the study of this committee. Such hearings provide a forum where the actions and problems of an industry can be fully discussed and thus better understood.

The expanding use of petroleum in the United States has had the effect of making the petroleum industry of vital interest to the daily life of almost every citizen. It is of even greater importance when related to the national security. Its importance to our economic life and also security is indicated by the fact that today petroleum, including both oil and gas, supplies almost 70 percent of our total energy requirements. Petroleum enjoys a position of far greater importance in the United States than in any of the principal European countries. The position of oil in the energy economy of European countries for the year 1955 according to a recent report of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) is 18 percent of the total. The position in the principal individual countries is as follows:

| Country: | *Ratio of oil to total energy (percent)* |
|---|---|
| United Kingdom | 13 |
| France | 20 |
| Germany | 9 |
| Italy | 33 |
| Sweden | 44 |
| Norway | 25 |
| Netherlands | 26 |
| Belgium-Luxembourg | 16 |

In view of the very prominent position of oil in the economy of the United States we realize that our industry cannot succeed unless the public generally and the Congress are satisfied with the conduct of our activities. We feel that our industry has a responsibility to present the full facts. Our association, therefore, welcomes the opportunity to participate in this proceeding. We are firmly convinced that when the facts are presented, the activities of the domestic producing industry will be fully justified in the eyes of the public and the Congress.

My testimony will be confined to the operations of the Middle East Emergency Committee in the European oil supply program.

Limitations on MEEC authority: At the time the Middle East Emergency Committee was formed our association took the position that the program of supplying oil to Europe resulting from the Suez crisis involved a problem of our Government in international relations and, therefore, should be left to the Government officials responsible for such matters. In order to clarify our position the president of our association, Mr. Robert L. Wood, addressed a letter dated August 13 to Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. In that letter he said:

"I have been reluctant to interfere with or make comment on the situation resulting from the announced seizure of the Suez Canal. To me the complications involved in this issue were of such serious consequences, that I have believed governmental representatives on whom this responsibility rests should be free of local influence as far as is possible."

Our primary concern with respect to the MEEC was that the few individual companies comprising this committee not be given any authority, with antitrust immunity, to take any actions with respect to or which would adversely affect the petroleum industry within the United States. It was our feeling that MEEC members, which are companies extensively engaged in international trade and have very substantial interests in foreign operations, should not be selected apart from the entire domestic industry to determine programs or take actions that would have an impact upon or in any way affect the domestic petroleum industry.

It was the purpose of Mr. Wood's letter to Dr. Flemming under date of August 13 to make clear our position in this regard.

In response to this letter Dr. Flemming under date of August 21 gave us what we consider to be assurances that the committee would not be authorized to take actions with respect to, or that have impacts upon, domestic industry operations. In Dr. Flemming's reply he stated:

"The Middle East Emergency Committee was formed to act under Government supervision and direction to assist in the transportation, refining, and production adjustments that may become necessary in foreign areas.

"The questions to which you refer concerning reserve productive capacity and availability of transportation, terminal, refining and other facilities to meet any demands upon the domestic industry will be developed from appropriate domestic sources. You comment that domestic operators are best equipped and most affected with respect to domestic facilities and capacities, and I am sure you will agree that those companies which operate in foreign areas are best equipped and most affected with respect to supply problems outside of the United States."

We felt that Dr. Flemming in this letter made it clear that MEEC would be confined in its programs and activities to foreign operations. In this regard Mr. Wood in a second letter to Dr. Flemming, dated August 21, stated, "I am relieved that you feel this authority does not extend to domestic operations in the United States."

Mr. Wood's letter of August 13, Dr. Flemming's letter of August 21, and Mr. Wood's letter of August 21, are attached as appendix I.

I desire to make clear that as a result of our understanding with Dr. Flemming our association has never taken the position that the domestic independent producing industry should be represented on MEEC. As was stated by Dr. Flemming in his testimony before this committee the primary purpose of MEEC is tanker pooling and the direction of tanker movements. In view of that purpose, together with the assurances that Dr. Flemming gave us, we concluded that there was no place on the committee for an independent producer and that no useful purpose could be served by a producer being on the committee. An independent producer with no tankers could not voluntarily agree to do anything which would contribute to tanker movements.

Subsequently on December 12, 1956, ODM Director Flemming issued a press release (No. 553) announcing certain amendments to the plan of action under which MEEC operates. In this release one of the amendments was described as being designed principally to permit participants to "take actions within continental United States under approved programs which result in making petroleum or petroleum facilities available to foreign areas."

Although the amendment is somewhat indefinite and vague, an explanatory note in the release said:

"It in no way gives to the participants any power or authority over domestic petroleum operations or operators."

Although we were somewhat apprehensive about this amendment, we concluded that Dr. Flemming's assurances set forth in his letter of August 21 to the effect that MEEC operations would be confined to foreign activities, were still effective and controlling over these amendments.

More recently under date of February 1, 1957, in a press release from the office of the Secretary of Interior, Assistant Secretary Wormser announced approval of two additional schedules under which MEEC operates. These are schedule No. 3 and schedule No. 4. Schedule No. 4 is described as being aimed at increasing the flow of petroleum from inland ports to gulf coast shipping points and specifically authorizes the following:

"Arrangements to change operations of pipelines and other transportation facilities within the United States to increase the volume of deliveries of domestic crude oils to the United States gulf coast for delivery to Europe and other foreign areas affected by the Middle East petroleum transport stoppage, or for shipment to the United States east coast and Canada east coast in substitution for petroleum supplies diverted to Europe and other affected areas in accordance with schedules Nos. 1 and 2."

We were again apprehensive about the effect of Schedule No. 4 since it would appear to give a few companies who are members of MEEC clearance to take certain actions "within the United States" free of the antitrust laws, which clearance would be denied to all other companies operating similar facilities within the United States.

It is my understanding that within the past few days, actions by MEEC under schedule No. 4 have been suspended by Assistant Secretary of Interior Wormser.

We assumed again, therefore, that the assurances contained in Dr. Flemming's letter of August 21 continue to be effective and that no actions will be permitted under schedule No. 4 which might violate those assurances. It appears to us, however, that this schedule should be permanently terminated.

Failures of MEEC: It is my understanding that the congressional committees participating in these hearings are interested in information that might indicate deficiencies or failures in the operation of MEEC. We have been particularly conscious of what we thought were such failures, because of the severe criticism that has been directed against domestic independent producers in connection with the European emergency problem. This criticism has charged that independent producers are responsible for the failure of European oil-supply program. We feel that this blame is misplaced. We further feel a careful analysis of the facts will show that the failures primarily lie with the members of MEEC.

The members of MEEC, including subsidiary companies, operate two-thirds of the refining capacity on the United States east-gulf coast area. This is the area most directly affected by the Suez crisis and from it all of the emergency shipments are made. An analysis of the activities of these companies indicate that the MEEC as a group and that the members thereof as individual companies, have failed and are continuing to fail to take actions which would maximize oil shipments to Europe. As a result Europe is receiving less oil than otherwise would be possible and in addition, the failures of these companies in this respect are having adverse effects upon the domestic economy.

The specific failures on the part of MEEC, and the individual member companies thereof, may be summarized as follows:

1. Members of MEEC, together with other importers, have increased imports from the Caribbean area despite the fact that crude oil from this area is of the type more suitable for European needs than is domestic oil and, in addition, the tanker run from that area is shorter.

2. Members of MEEC have continued to process excessive amounts of crude oil through their refineries on the United States east-gulf coast, resulting in the production of unnecessary quantities of gasoline with the final result that less crude oil is available for shipment to Europe.

3. Members of MEEC have continued to ship refined products to Europe of the type which if kept in the United States for consumption here would permit a reduction in United States refinery runs of imported crude oil, thereby providing for the diversion to Europe of Caribbean crude from which could be produced more fuel oil for industrial use that is in critical short supply.

4. Members of MEEC, comprising the agency to which Government has delegated authority to carry out the European supply program, have contributed to misunderstandings regarding the failure of the program; the committee has left the misleading impression that domestic producers are the cause for failure of the program whereas, as a matter of fact, the members of the committee could take actions under the voluntary agreement, along the lines above suggested, which would greatly increase shipments to Europe.

In a letter dated January 31, 1957, Mr. Robert L. Wood, president of our association, called these failures on the part of MEEC to the attention of Secretary of Interior Seaton. In a memorandum dated February 4, 1957, these deficiencies were also called to the attention of ODM Director Flemming. A copy of the letter and memorandum are attached as appendix II.

The diversion to Europe of Caribbean oil being imported into the United States is specifically contemplated and authorized under schedule No. 2 of the plan of action of MEEC. The possibility of making such diversion, therefore, obviously has been before MEEC.

The companies which comprise MEEC account for almost 80 percent of the crude oil that is imported into the United States from Venezuela. They account for 40 percent of petroleum product imports. Instead of diverting these imports to Europe, these companies have actually increased Venezuelan imports into the United States since the Suez crisis. The following table shows crude oil imports from Venezuela into the United States east-gulf coast:

| | *Crude oil (barrels daily)* |
|---|---|
| October 1956 | 432,100 |
| November 1956 | 464,800 |
| December 1956 | 496,700 |

In appearing before the House Interstate Committee on February 7, 1957, the Director of Oil and Gas Division, Department of Interior, stated that total imports from the Caribbean area have been about 600,000 barrels daily during January 1957, which indicates a further increase in Venezuelan imports.

Detailed information on imports of petroleum (both crude and products) into the United States is attached as appendix III.

On the opening day of the hearing, Dr. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, stated that he was dissatisfied with the failure of the members of MEEC to divert to Europe Caribbean oil that is being imported into the United States in increased quantities. This failure on the part of MEEC companies involves the national security of the United States. As stated by Assistant Secretary of Interior Wormser in his press release of January 27, 1957, the national security is here involved. In that release he said:

"Our relationships with Western Europe are of fundamental importance to us. Our NATO associations are basic to our security. Both are likely to be seriously undermined unless the economic effects of the oil shortages on vital industries of Western Europe are mitigated. The supply of oil to the civil economy of Europe is of major importance to our own Armed Forces."

As a result of these increases in imports into the United States, total imports of crude oil are today in excess of the level which has been found to endanger the national security. As Director Flemming testified the President's Cabinet Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy, after careful study, in February 1955, found that oil imports in excess of the relationship that imports bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954, would endanger the national security by retarding the domestic industry. The President has recognized the soundness of this finding of the Cabinet committee. In a memorandum dated October 12, 1956, to ODM Director Flemming concerning a study of a possible

Government oil tanker construction program, the President said:

"The study should proceed, of course, on the assumption that plans which are developed are to be consistent with the requests that you have made to oil importers to voluntarily keep imports of crude oil into this country at a level where they do not exceed significantly the proportion that imports bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954."

Yet today imports exceed the 1954 relationship. Crude oil imports alone—not considering products—currently continue at a rate 100,000 barrels daily or more over the 1954 relationship.

The national security being involved, and in the absence of voluntary action on the part of MEEC members, the question is presented as to whether or not the Government has authority to curtail imports and thereby divert them to Europe. It is our opinion that the Government has ample authority under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 to take action which would compel the diversion of Caribbean oil to the European shortage area. That section of the law, aimed specifically at protecting the national security, provides as follows:

"In order to further the policy and purpose of this section whenever the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization has reason to believe that any article is being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security, he shall so advise the President, and if the President agrees that there is reason for such belief, the President shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine the facts. If, on the basis of such investigation, and the report to him of the findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds that the article is being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security, he shall take such action as he deems necessary to adjust the imports of such article to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security."

In his testimony before this committee, Dr. Flemming stated that prior to the Suez crisis he had reached the conclusion that oil imports into the United States were at such high levels as to threaten to impair the national security and that had it not been for Suez, he would have taken action under section 7 by certifying to the President that the national security was endangered. He also pointed out that his efforts, over a long period of time, to persuade the importing companies to voluntarily limit imports had failed. He further testified, as pointed out above, that he was dissatisfied with the failure of MEEC to divert to Europe Caribbean oil. This suggests that so far as Director Flemming is concerned he would now be willing to invoke the authority of section 7. It further suggests that other members of the President's Advisory Committee which has continued to perform as an advisory group to the director of ODM, are resisting the exercise of such authority.

We believe that in view of the failure of MEEC members to divert Caribbean crude oil to Europe and since the national security is involved, that the President should exercise section 7 authority to limit oil imports so as not to threaten to impair the national security.

Under section 7 the President has ample authority to establish a quota, a tariff, or any other method of restriction that would limit imports from the Caribbean area. If this were done, Caribbean crude oil, in search of a market, would be diverted to the European shortage area.

Contribution of domestic industry: There has been a great deal of misinformation concerning the contribution that the domestic petroleum industry has made to the European oil supply program. There have been charges that domestic producers and State governments have connived to cut back production and to withhold oil from the European market. The facts show the contrary.

Since Suez (October 1956) United States production of crude oil has increased more than 500,000 barrels daily, or 7 percent.

Since Suez United States production of crude oil has been at an all-time record level.

Since Suez the domestic industry has taken out of storage an average of 350,000 barrels daily of crude oil alone and made it available to free world markets.

Since Suez the domestic industry has increased shipments of oil to Europe from 50,000 barrels daily to 475,000 barrels daily.

Since Suez the European countries have had less than their normal oil requirements but currently are receiving in the order of 90 percent or more of their normal oil requirements; since oil constitutes only 18 percent of their total energy, this means that they are now short 1.8 percent of their normal requirements of total energy; this compares with the fact that domestic oil producers, during the past several years, due to excessive imports absorbing domestic markets, have been cut back in their operations some 25 percent or 30 percent below their capacity.

Since Suez the domestic industry's very high inventory position (above ground stock), which was at the highest level in history, has provided a cushion that has geratly contributed to the ability of the United States to increase oil shipments to Europe from 50,000 barrels daily to an average of 475,000 barrels daily.

Since Suez the United States oil inventory position, although utilized extensively in contributing to the European supply program, continues to remain at a level which is favorable in comparison to previous years; this comparative situation is shown in the following tables:

*Total United States crude oil inventory*

[All figures in barrels]

| | 1955–56 | 1956–57 | Compared with year ago |
|---|---|---|---|
| Sept. 30 | 256, 269, 000 | 278, 791, 000 | +22, 522, 000 |
| Oct. 31 | 259, 201, 000 | 286, 560, 000 | +27, 359, 000 |
| Nov. 30 | 260, 707, 000 | 275, 995, 000 | +15, 288, 000 |
| Dec. 28 | 262, 033, 000 | 264, 241, 000 | +2, 208, 000 |
| Jan. 25 | 258, 406, 000 | 254, 190, 000 | −4, 216, 000 |
| Feb. 1 | 258, 210, 000 | 253, 991, 000 | −4, 219, 000 |

*Total United States four principal products inventory*

[All figures in barrels]

| | 1955–56 | 1956–57 | Compared with year ago |
|---|---|---|---|
| Sept. 30 | 376, 070, 000 | 409, 315, 000 | +33, 245, 000 |
| Oct. 31 | 389, 136, 000 | 415, 736, 000 | +26, 600, 000 |
| Nov. 30 | 377, 033, 000 | 405, 244, 000 | +28, 211, 000 |
| Dec. 28 | 344, 960, 000 | 395, 053, 000 | +50, 093, 000 |
| Feb. 1 | 325, 813, 000 | 359, 554, 000 | +33, 741, 000 |

The east gulf coast area of the United States may be of particular interest since it is from this area that all of the oil shipments to Europe originate. The following table shows the inventory position of the four principal products in this area:

*East-gulf coast four principal products inventory*

[All figures in barrels]

| | 1955–56 | 1956–57 | Compared with year ago |
|---|---|---|---|
| Sept. 30 | 181, 822, 000 | 196, 143, 000 | +14, 321, 000 |
| Oct. 31 | 188, 683, 000 | 203, 069, 000 | +14, 386, 000 |
| Nov. 30 | 184, 684, 000 | 196, 344, 000 | +11, 660, 000 |
| Dec. 28 | 165, 282, 000 | 187, 086, 000 | +21, 804, 000 |
| Feb. 1 | 147, 410, 000 | 161, 891, 000 | +14, 481, 060 |

This inventory position shows that the product situation is such as would permit a reduction in the refining of crude oil on the United States east coast thereby making available tankers that could be used in transporting larger quantities of Caribbean oil to Europe instead of the United States.

Interrelationship of MEEC members: To understand fully the conduct of the members of MEEC and the other large importers, in their failures to take actions that would further the European supply program, it is necessary to examine the makeup of the members of MEEC and the interrelationship of the importing companies, which determine the economic forces that guide their actions.

There are 15 members of MEEC. But examination reveals that 5 of these companies own 95 percent or more interest in 5 other companies. A sixth company owns controlling interest in another. In reality, therefore, there are only 9 members of MEEC with 15 votes. This interrelationship between members of MEEC is shown in the first chart contained in appendix IV.

In addition, membership of MEEC includes the five largest importers of oil into the United States. These companies are Gulf Oil Corp., The Texas Co., Standard Oil Co. of California, Socony Mobil Oil Co., and Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey). These five companies together with the Royal-Dutch Shell Group and British Petroleum (formerly Anglo-Iranian Oil Co.) are engaged in partnership arrangements throughout the world. The joint and commingled enterprises of these seven international companies are shown in the second chart contained in appendix IV. The scope of operations of these seven companies is indicated by the fact that they control approximately 90 percent of all the oil reserves in the free world outside the United States.

The basic economic interest of the five American companies, all members of MEEC, is very substantially in foreign countries. For example, the Gulf Oil Corp. in 1955 derived 67 percent of its net income from foreign operations and Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) derived 74 percent from foreign operations. This source of income for the past several years is shown in the third chart contained in appendix IV.

Inadequacy of pipelines: A matter which has been emphasized by the Suez crisis is the present inadequacy of domestic oil pipeline facilities for the movement of crude oil within the United States and particularly to tidewater. This involves not only the temporary problem of supplying Europe during the present shortage, but, even more important, it involves the long-range security of the Nation and health of the domestic petroleum industry. The present inadequacy of domestic crude oil transportation has been created by the lack of an incentive to expand transportation facilities in view of the high levels of imports that have continued during the past several years. Imports exceeded the national security danger point throughout 1955 and 1956. As a result of these excessive imports, there is a very substantial crude oil

productive capacity in the United States that cannot be moved to tidewater or other points of use.

So long as imports were excessive, and there was no market for domestic crude that would be produced, there was no incentive to expand domestic oil pipeline facilities. As a result, they are inadequate today.

Dapartment of the Interior studies show that the domestic petroleum industry has a reserve productive capacity of over 2 million barrels daily—over and above current needs—available for any emergency. This constitutes a reserve ability of more than 25 percent. I believe it is safe to say that no other major industry is in a position to make a comparable contribution to national security.

Department studies further show that only about one-half of this reserve productive capacity can be transported to tidewater, even with the employment of emergency methods of transportation.

It follows, therefore, that had excessive imports during previous years been voluntarily avoided or otherwise prohibited, the domestic industry today would be able to make even greater supplies of oil available to Europe. The blame for this failure rests, not upon domestic producers, but upon members of MEEC and the few other large importers of oil, who have ignored for 2 years the repeated pleadings of the Federal Government to voluntarily, in the name of national defense, limit imports.

The history of oil imports into the United States, revealing the rapid rise to excessive current levels, is shown in the chart [not printed].

This past record of excessive imports has damaged, beyond measure, the security of the Nation. The past, however, dwarfs in comparison with the future. Prior to Suez the members of MEEC and the few other large importers, according to their plans filed with the ODM, were to increase imports during 1957 very substantially above the 1956 all-time high levels. We know also that there is a tremendous tanker construction program now underway throughout the world including supertankers suitable only for such hauls as Middle East to the United States. We know that large new refineries have been and are being built on the East Coast for the exclusive use of Middle East oil. We know that Middle East countries, once Suez is reopened, will be anxious to redeem lost revenue by increasing production that will be seeking a market in the United States.

Unless some positive action is taken now the outlook for future imports, after Suez, spells far greater damage to the national security. The dangers of excessive imports, leading to dependency on uncertain sources, have been illustrated to us in a most dramatic and firsthand way, by the Suez stoppage, resulting in all of Europe suddenly being faced with a loss of its oil supply. Surely we in this country should take heed of this hard lesson.

Conclusion: The members of MEES, together with other large importers, control a substantial part of the refining capacity in the United States. They control a substantial part of the domestic pipeline transportation system. They continue in their refinery operations to make excessive quantities of gasoline thereby reducing the amount of crude oil available for Europe. They have permitted the domestic transportation system to become inadequate. They continue to refuse to divert to Europe oil that is now being imported into the United States from the Caribbean area.

These facts which reveal the failures on the part of members of MEEC and the few other large importers, and the above cited facts which reveal the contributions that the domestic oil industry has made to the European oil supply program, we submit, speak plainly to the answer as to where the primary blame lies for such failures as have developed.

The record of the domestic petroleum industry during World War I and World War II demonstrates that it is ready and willing to meet every real need within its capability.

APPENDIXES TO STATEMENT OF RUSSELL B. BROWN, GENERAL COUNSEL, INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 12, 1957

*Appendix I*

1. Letter dated August 13, 1956, from Robert L. Wood, president, Independent Petroleum Association of America, to ODM Director Arthur S. Flemming.

2. Letter dated August 21, 1956, from ODM Director Flemming to Robert L. Wood.

3. Letter dated August 21, 1956, from Robert L. Wood to ODM Director Flemming.

INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
*Midland, Tex., August 13, 1956.*

Dr. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
*Chairman, Cabinet Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR DR. FLEMMING: Responding to your announcement for reactivating your study of the relationship of petroleum imports to domestic production of oil here in the United States, representatives of most of the domestic producers of oil have filed with you a comprehensive statement reflecting fully the facts on this question.

We commend to you and your staff the careful study of these facts, which we believe demonstrate the harmful results of excessive imports on the domestic producing industry in the United States.

These facts demonstrate as well that the first reliable source of petroleum supply for the security of our Nation is within the boundaries of the United States, where there now exists capacity to produce petroleum sufficient to the full requirements of our domestic economy and national security.

I have been reluctant to interfere with or make comment on the situation resulting from the announced seizure of the Suez Canal. To me the complications involved in this issue were of such serious consequences that I have believed governmental representatives on whom this responsibility rests should be free of local influence as far as is possible.

My attention is now called to developments that arouse our concern that misunderstanding of the true facts of our situation may lead to actions and programs for action, based on an incorrect understanding of the facts, that could result in permanent undermining of our defense structure and our domestic economy itself.

I have a copy of press memorandum of August 9 from the Office of Defense Mobilization calling attention to meeting with "representatives of several oil companies to make the organization arrangements to permit companies to consider jointly such aspects of the Suez Canal situation as may later be referred to them." Commenting on this meeting, the Wall Street Journal of August 10 named 13 companies who met with Government and said, "The Government asked 13 American oil importers to work out plans for meeting any oil shortage in the United States or Europe that might result from the Suez Canal crisis."

Petroleum Week for August 10, after setting out the details of the committee, said: "The emergency program set up would involve cutting off Middle East imports to the United States and replacing these imports with domestic, Venezuelan, and Canadian oil."

The Oil Daily of August 10, commenting on the same meeting, quoted you as saying the "committee had been asked to recommend a plan of action to cope with any situation that may result from the Suez Canal situation. Then, the Oil Daily stated further, "One of the main points to be nailed down, it was learned, involves reserve capacity in the United States available to meet possible increased demands overseas."

These news stories raise two questions of great concern to us.

The first is a presumption that shortage of oil in the United States is expected if the Suez crisis is not properly settled.

This presumption is unfounded and unjustified. There is now producing and reserve excess producing capacity in the United States in excess of total imports and far in excess of all oil shipped through the Suez Canal for the United States.

The other question raised is that this question should be settled by representatives of importing companies only, and that these representatives are to be permitted, working together, to draft plans and programs of action. Such action must contemplate releasing these companies from the application of our antitrust laws, their programs, therefore, to be secretly arrived at, and confidentially withheld from others.

We believe this to be an improper approach to the solution of this problem.

Outside the violation of the antitrust laws involved, it contemplates passing on the position of the domestic industry and its abilities to supply our demands by those representing companies whose outside interest in production is greater than in the United States. I refer to representatives of importing companies who have long been trying to convince the American public, contrary to the facts that United States oil could not be relied upon for our requirements. As they have for some time demonstrated, their interest is in reducing United States production in favor of outside sources.

We have experience to support our fears in the results obtained through their action in settling the shutdown in Iran. We were told that that settlement contemplated that as Iran oil reached the market the production from other Middle East areas, where production had been increased to supply the market lost by Iran, would be reduced accordingly.

We do not know whether that was provided for by those entering the Iranian consortium. We do know that there has been no such reduction in other areas and excesses are coming from all areas.

Therefore, if there is to be a study of the important question of United States producing capacity, those best equipped and most directly affected should have a part in such study; these are the producers of oil in the United States.

In conclusion, may I again say that there is no need for any consumer of oil in the United States to worry about a supply of oil products for lack of sufficient crude petroleum from the fields in the United States.

Only those purchasing oil products from refineries in the United States using Middle East crude need have their supply interrupted. That interruption is easily and quickly remedied by turning to domestic oil for their refineries.

A misunderstanding of our domestic supply situation could cause such concern with the consumers of petroleum products and with governmental agents as to lead to action involving military programs or war.

There is now no need to go to war to insure abundant supplies of petroleum products for American consumption.

Whatever oil problem now presented through the Suez crisis is, insofar as American consumers are concerned, one of the market convenience of a few American companies.

We recognize that their representatives are the proper ones for Government conference on that question. When the question of our own productive capacity is involved representatives of domestic producers become the ones that should be consulted.

This Suez controversy may result in a determination of ownership of the canal or the tolls to be charged. It could spread the nationalization movement to other countries where oil is now produced by American companies. As much as we are or may be concerned with such a course of action we should not permit our concern to go so far as to permit foreign operating companies to determine the course of domestic production for consumption requirements in the United States.

The supply of oil for Europe is a broader question, where, perhaps, importers and domestic producers should be consulted.

Since this question is one of public interest and this letter comments on quotations from your public statements, I am releasing copy of this letter to our membership and for such press use as may be desired.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT L. WOOD.

---

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
*Washington, D. C., August 21, 1956.*

Mr. ROBERT L. WOOD,
*President, Independent Petroleum Association of America, Midland, Tex.*

DEAR MR. WOOD: In your letter addressed to me of August 13, 1956, you have urged that the statement filed by 19 oil producers trade associations be given careful consideration and, secondly, you have expressed apprehension concerning the implications arising from the organization of the Middle East Emergency Committee composed of members from the Foreign Petroleum Supply Committee.

With regard to the associations' statement, let me assure you that it will receive full consideration in the deliberations of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy and of its task force.

I am deeply conscious of the importance of petroleum to national security and the Nation's expanding economy and the need of a balanced, objective study for the use of the Presidential Advisory Committee members in their deliberations. The consultants assisting the task force were selected with particular attention to two things: First, that they be people who have the special qualifications to make a careful analytical study and have recognized ability in the petroleum field; second, that all pertinent aspects and arguments both for and against the restrictions of imports be developed and made available for the consideration of the Presidential Advisory Committee.

I am sorry that misunderstandings and misinterpretations have arisen with respect to the formation of the Middle East Emergency Committee. In my capacity as Director of Defense Mobilization it is necessary that plans be developed to meet defense contingencies that may or may not occur. The problems that would arise from a stoppage of the Suez Canal or the pipelines from the Middle East to the Mediterranean are directly related to supply deficiencies that would occur in Western Europe and to our defense relationships with the countries affected. The Middle East Emergency Committee was formed to act under Government supervision and direction to assist in the transportation, refining, and production adjustments that may become necessary in foreign areas.

The questions to which you refer concerning reserve productive capacity and availability of transportation, terminal, refining, and other facilities to meet any demands upon the domestic industry, will be developed from appropriate domestic sources. You comment that domestic operators are best equipped and most affected with respect to domestic facilities and capacities, and I am sure you will agree that those companies which operate in foreign areas are best equipped and most affected with respect to supply problems outside of the United States.

All meetings of the Committee and subcommittees formed will be conducted under agenda prepared by the Government and must be attended by an authorized governmental representative. Full and complete minutes must be kept of all meetings and sent to the Administrator of the Voluntary Agreement Relating to Foreign Petroleum Supply, as amended, dated May 8, 1956 (Secretary of the Interior or the Assistant Secretary of the Interior—Mineral Resources), and made available to the Department of Justice. The meeting to which you refer was attended by Hon. Felix E. Wormser, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Mineral Resources; Mr. H. A. Stewart, Director, Office of Oil and Gas, Department of the Interior; Mr. J. Ed Warren, who represented me; and by a number of other Government representatives.

I am attaching hereto the press releases that have been issued with respect to the formation of this Committee. None of them suggest that it was formed to deal with a shortage of oil in the United States.

I am sure you realize that we had to make preparation for a possible emergency as quickly as possible and further that in the event that no emergency develops action under this agreement will not be necessary.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
*Director.*

---

INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
*Midland, Tex., August 21, 1956.*

The Honorable ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
*Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR DR. FLEMMING: I am glad to have your assurance that the fears expressed to you in my letter of August 13 in regard to activities of the Foreign Petroleum Supply Committee will not be realized.

The ODM press memorandum of August 14 clarifies the committee's position as to membership and as to scope of activity.

I am relieved that you feel this authority does not extend to domestic operations in the United States.

The industry is fortunate in having the deep interest and concern that you are giving to this problem.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT L. WOOD.

*Appendix II*

1. Letter dated January 31, 1957, from Robert L. Wood, president, Independent Petroleum Association of America, to Secretary of Interior Fred Seaton.

2. Memorandum dated February 4, 1957, from Robert L. Wood to ODM Director Arthur S. Flemming.

INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
*Washington, D. C., January 31, 1957.*

The Honorable FRED SEATON,
*Secretary of the Interior,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The members of the Independent Petroleum Association of America are gravely concerned about several matters which are related to the present emergency program to supply oil to Europe. As a result, this is to request that you give consideration to the following matters.

The Middle East Emergency Committee has been authorized, with anti-trust immunity, to take certain actions aimed at increasing the supply of oil to the European shortage area. Outside their actions as a committee these companies individually have a responsibility to conduct their activities in a manner that will make a maximum contribution to the objective. They also have the responsibility to conduct their activities in a manner that will not have disruptive effects upon the domestic industry. I know that you individually and the executive branch of Government desire the accomplishment of both of these ends.

There are indications that in several respects the operations of these companies are not being conducted in a manner that will contribute the maximum to the emergency program. It is the purpose of this letter to bring some of these matters to your attention for consideration by the Government.

In considering the European supply problem, it should be recognized that the tanker run to Europe from the Caribbean area is substantially shorter than from the United States Gulf Coast. In adidition, Caribbean crude is generally of the type most suitable for European requirements for fuel oil.

Despite these considerations, Caribbean imports of crude oil into the east-gulf coast continue to increase. For example, the attached table shows that during December 1956 crude oil imports from Venezuela were greater than during the third quarter of 1956 and also greater than during October and November 1956.

Although later statistics showing the origin of imports are not available, information indicates that during January of this year imports from Venezuela have increased further.

Apparently the only diversion to the European shortage area has been Middle East oil formerly imported into the United States. This diversion was quickly and fully replaced by domestic oil. It is reasonable to conclude, therefore, that any diversion of Caribbean oil would likewise be quickly and fully replaced by domestic oil.

While imports from the Caribbean area into the United States have increased shipments of United States oil to Europe, consisting of both products and crude oil, have been moving at the rate of several hundred thousand barrels daily. The question is therefore presented as to whether both the national interest and that of the European shortage emergency would not be better served by substituting the shorter haul and more suitable Caribbean oil for the crude oil and products which is now being shipped from the United States.

With respect to this problem, it is noted that stocks of the four principal products on the east-gulf coast as of January 25, 1957, were more than 15 million barrels above the same period in 1956. This indicates that refinery runs and yields could be adjusted to also make additional supplies available to Europe. With respect to this possible means of increasing the supplies to Europe, it is encouraging to note that Assistant Secretary Wormser, in his press release of January 27, 1957, called for such adjustments in refinery runs and yields.

The members of the Middle East Emergency Committee and other large importers who report to Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, control a substantial portion of the refinery capacity and pipeline facilities in the United States, and also purchase most of the domes-

tic crude oil production. In order to further the Government's efforts to supply oil to Europe during the emergency shortage and to insure that the individual actions of these companies is not at cross purposes with the program, it is urged that each of the importing companies be requested to file with the Government information showing the following:

1. How much additional pipeline transportation from domestic producing areas to tidewater has each company provided since the Suez crisis, expressed in barrels daily.

2. How much more pipeline capacity to tidewater can each company assure will be provided in 1957.

3. To what extent has each company adjusted refinery operations in terms of refinery runs and adjusted yield; and how much additional oil has thereby been made available to Europe during the emergency.

4. To what extent will each company assure diversion to Europe of Caribbean oil now being imported into the United States, together with information on their plans, if any, to replace such imports with domestic oil either through increased production, withdrawals from storage or adjustments in refinery operations.

Obviously, this information is necessary for the guidance of the Government and also the Middle East Emergency Committee. It is equally important that such information be available as a guide to the domestic industry and the oil producing States as to how much domestic production is required. It should, therefore, be made public so that all concerned may be informed and thus more fully contribute to the European shortage emergency. The criticism that has been directed toward domestic producers and the producing States convincingly reflects the need for the publication of this information.

A second matter, which goes beyond the emergency movements to tidewater, is the overall problem of adequate pipeline facilities throughout the United States. This involves the long-range security of the Nation and health of the domestic industry. The Suez crisis has served to emphasize the present inadequacy of these facilities for national security purposes or other emergencies. The present inadequacy of domestic transportation has been created by the lack of an incentive to expand transportation facilities in view of the high levels of imports that have continued during the past several years.

Several months ago, prior to the Suez crisis, the Department of Interior requested the National Petroleum Council to undertake a study of tanker capacity. It was my understanding at that time that the Department would also request a study of domestic transportation facilities. I assume that such a request may be submitted at the next meeting of the National Petroleum Council, now scheduled for March 7, 1957. This will involve a further delay in initiating this study. In view of the emergency nature of this matter, it is requested that you immediately submit such a request to the National Petroleum Council and ask that it be initiated promptly under emergency procedures.

I shall greatly appreciate your consideration of these requests.

The members of the executive committee of our association, in meeting last week, were very much concerned about these matters and requested me to inform the membership of the association of any actions taken by the officers in this regard. I am, therefore, enclosing a copy of this letter in a report to the membership.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT L. WOOD.

---

INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
*Washington, D. C., February 4, 1957.*

Memorandum to Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of Defense Mobilization, on Emergency Oil Shipments to Europe:

The closing of the Suez Canal and the Iraq pipeline created a serious oil supply problem for western Europe. The most critical shortages are in residual fuel oil, and crude oil from which European refineries can produce relatively large yields of residual fuel.

It has been United States Government policy to handle the Suez crisis with the least possible Government interference. Under this policy, and from an organization standpoint, the responsibility for supplying western Europe rests directly on the Middle East Emergency Committee.

The members of the Middle East Emergency Committee, including subsidiary companies, operate two-thirds of the refining capacity in the United States east-gulf coast area, which is more directly affected by the Suez crisis and from which all the emergency shipments to Europe are made. The following facts indicate that the Middle East Emergency Committee as a group, and the members as individual companies, have failed and are continuing to fail to fully discharge their responsibilities of maximizing oil shipments to Europe and minimizing the impact on the domestic economy and on other segments of the domestic petroleum industry:

1. Refineries on the United States east-gulf coast have continued to use crude oil to produce unnecessary quantities of gasoline, thereby reducing the amount of crude oil available to alleviate shortages in Europe.

2. Members of the Middle East Emergency Committee have continued to ship refined products to Europe of the type more suitable for domestic requirements, thereby reducing the amount of crude oil that could be shipped to Europe to produce more of the residual fuel oil that is in critical short supply.

3. Members of the Middle East Emergency Committee have given no indication of their intentions or plans to provide additional domestic pipeline facilities from producing areas to tidewater.

4. Members of the Middle East Emergency Committee have continued to ship United States crude oil to Europe which could be used in the United States east coast refineries to replace Caribbean crude oil that could be diverted to Europe. This failure to make diversions, continues to reduce shipments to Europe because of the shorter tanker movements that would result.

5. Members of the Middle East Emergency Committee have increased imports of Caribbean crude oil without advising the domestic producing industry or state conservation agencies as to the amount of Caribbean crude oil that they would divert to Europe or the amount of domestic oil needed to replace oil imported from Caribbean sources.

6. As the primary source of information for the Government with regard to the program of supplying oil to Europe, the Middle East Emergency Committee has apparently contributed to the misunderstandings regarding the need for increased domestic crude oil production when the members of that committee could greatly increase shipments to Europe voluntarily as set forth above.

It is requested that the Government take whatever action may be necessary to insure that the activities of the Middle East Emergency Committee, and the activities of the members of that Committee as individual companies, be conducted so as to make the maximum contribution toward alleviating European oil shortages and minimizing disruption of the domestic economy and domestic industry. In addition to the activities of the Middle East Committee, Government authority to control United States exports and imports could be exercised to correct, in large part, the above failures to maximize shipments to Europe.

ROBERT L. WOOD,
*President, Independent Petroleum Association of America.*

*Appendix III*

1. Table showing total crude oil imports into the United States by source, last half of 1956.

2. Comparison of actual imports with 1954 relationship to domestic crude oil production as recommended by the President's Cabinet Committee.

3. Table showing United States imports and exports of crude oil and refined products, 1918–56.

4. Table showing crude oil imports into United States by company and source, last half of 1956.

*Total crude oil imports into the United States by source—Last half of 1956*

[All figures in thousands of barrels daily]

| | Pre-Suez | | Post-Suez | | | | Pre-Suez | | Post-Suez | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 3d quarter | October | November | December | 4 weeks ending Jan 25 | | 3d quarter | October | November | December | 4 weeks ending Jan. 25 |
| To west coast: | | | | | | To east-gulf coast: | | | | | |
| Middle East | 82.4 | 110.8 | 81.9 | 76.7 | (1) | Middle East | 309.0 | 254.2 | 130.6 | 87.1 | (1) |
| Canada | 75.5 | 87.3 | 85.6 | 102.7 | (1) | Venezuela | 446.8 | 446.2 | 463.3 | 496.7 | (1) |
| Venezuela | 45.6 | 16.3 | 13.1 | 5.4 | (1) | Other Western Hemisphere | 74.9 | 85.4 | 96.3 | [2] 78.4 | (1) |
| Other Western Hemisphere | 8.2 | 3.8 | | | (1) | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Total | 830.7 | 785.8 | 690.2 | 662.2 | 665.5 |
| Total | 211.7 | 218.2 | 180.6 | 184.8 | 183.5 | Grand total | 1,042.4 | 1,004.0 | 870.8 | 847.0 | 849.0 |

[1] Not available.
[2] Includes estimated 50,000 barrels daily principally from Canada to Mid-Continent area not reported to Texas Railroad Commission.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Mines except December based on data submitted by importing companies to Texas Railroad Commission in January and 4 weeks ending Jan. 25 from American Petroleum Institute.

*Comparison of actual imports with 1954 relationship to domestic crude-oil production as recommended by the President's Cabinet Committee*

[Thousand barrels daily]

| | Year 1954 | Year 1955 | Year 1956 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Actual imports: | | | |
| Crude oil | 656 | 782 | 930 |
| Refined products | 396 | 466 | 485 |
| Total | 1,052 | 1,248 | 1,415 |
| United States crude oil production | 6,342 | 6,807 | 7,169 |
| Import rate based on 1954 ratio to domestic crude oil production: | | | |
| Crude oil (10.34 percent) | 656 | 704 | 740 |
| Refined products (6.24 percent) | 396 | 424 | 447 |
| Total (16.58 percent) | 1,052 | 1,128 | 1,187 |
| Excess, actual imports over 1954 ratio to domestic production: | | | |
| Crude oil | ---------- | 78 | 190 |
| Refined products | ---------- | 42 | 38 |
| Total | ---------- | 120 | 228 |

*United States imports and exports of crude oil and refined products yearly averages, 1918–1956*

[Thousands of barrels daily]

| Year | Crude oil | | | Refined products | | | Total crude oil and refined products | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Imports | Exports | Net export balance [1] | Imports | Exports | Net export balance [1] | Imports | Exports | Net export balance [1] |
| 1918 | 104 | 16 | (88) | 3 | 170 | 167 | 107 | 186 | 79 |
| 1919 | 145 | 17 | (128) | 3 | 158 | 155 | 148 | 175 | 27 |
| 1920 | 290 | 25 | (265) | 7 | 193 | 186 | 297 | 218 | (79) |
| 1921 | 344 | 26 | (318) | 9 | 170 | 161 | 353 | 196 | (157) |
| 1922 | 349 | 30 | (319) | 24 | 174 | 150 | 373 | 204 | (169) |
| 1923 | 225 | 48 | (177) | 48 | 232 | 184 | 273 | 280 | 7 |
| 1924 | 213 | 50 | (163) | 45 | 270 | 225 | 258 | 320 | 62 |
| 1925 | 169 | 37 | (132) | 45 | 275 | 230 | 214 | 312 | 98 |
| 1926 | 165 | 42 | (123) | 58 | 319 | 261 | 223 | 361 | 138 |
| 1927 | 160 | 43 | (117) | 37 | 345 | 308 | 197 | 388 | 191 |
| 1928 | 218 | 52 | (166) | 32 | 371 | 339 | 250 | 423 | 173 |
| 1929 | 216 | 72 | (144) | 82 | 375 | 293 | 298 | 447 | 149 |
| 1930 | 170 | 65 | (105) | 119 | 364 | 245 | 289 | 429 | 140 |
| 1931 | 130 | 70 | (60) | 106 | 271 | 165 | 236 | 341 | 105 |
| 1932 | 122 | 75 | (47) | 82 | 207 | 125 | 204 | 282 | 78 |
| 1933 | 87 | 100 | 113 | 37 | 192 | 155 | 124 | 292 | 168 |
| 1934 | 97 | 113 | 116 | 41 | 201 | 160 | 138 | 314 | 176 |
| 1935 | 88 | 141 | 53 | 56 | 212 | 156 | 144 | 353 | 209 |
| 1936 | 88 | 137 | 49 | 68 | 223 | 155 | 156 | 360 | 204 |
| 1937 | 75 | 184 | 109 | 82 | 289 | 207 | 157 | 473 | 316 |
| 1938 | 72 | 212 | 140 | 76 | 319 | 243 | 148 | 531 | 383 |
| 1939 | 91 | 198 | 107 | 71 | 320 | 249 | 162 | 518 | 356 |
| 1940 | 117 | 140 | 23 | 112 | 216 | 104 | 229 | 356 | 127 |
| 1941 | 139 | 91 | (48) | 127 | 207 | 80 | 266 | 298 | 32 |
| 1942 | 34 | 93 | 59 | 65 | 228 | 163 | 99 | 321 | 222 |
| 1943 | 38 | 113 | 75 | 136 | 298 | 162 | 174 | 411 | 237 |
| 1944 | 122 | 94 | (28) | 130 | 474 | 344 | 252 | 568 | 316 |
| 1945 | 204 | 90 | (114) | 107 | 411 | 304 | 311 | 501 | 190 |
| 1946 | 236 | 116 | (120) | 141 | 303 | 162 | 377 | 419 | 42 |
| 1947 | 267 | 126 | (141) | 170 | 325 | 155 | 437 | 451 | 14 |
| 1948 | 353 | 109 | (244) | 160 | 260 | 100 | 513 | 369 | (144) |
| 1949 | 421 | 91 | (330) | 224 | 236 | 12 | 645 | 327 | (318) |
| 1950 | 487 | 95 | (392) | 363 | 210 | (153) | 850 | 305 | (545) |
| 1951 | 491 | 78 | (413) | 353 | 344 | (9) | 844 | 422 | (422) |
| 1952 | 573 | 73 | (500) | 385 | 363 | (22) | 958 | 436 | (522) |
| 1953 | 648 | 55 | (593) | 386 | 347 | (39) | 1,034 | 402 | (632) |
| 1954 | 656 | 37 | (619) | 396 | 319 | (77) | 1,052 | 356 | (696) |
| 1955 | 782 | 31 | (751) | 466 | 334 | (132) | 1,248 | 365 | (883) |
| 1956 | 930 | 80 | (850) | 485 | 330 | (155) | 1,415 | 410 | (1005) |

[1] Parentheses indicate net import balance.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Mines and the Petroleum Almanac. Data for year 1956 is partially estimated.
Prepared by the Independent Petroleum Association of America February 1957.

*Crude oil imports into the United States (excluding west coast) by company and source, last half of 1956*

[All figures in thousands of barrels daily]

| | 3d quarter | October | November | December | 4th quarter |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| To east-gulf coast: | | | | | |
| The Atlantic Refining Co.: | | | | | |
| Middle East | 15.1 | 15.1 | 7.7 | 14.6 | 12.5 |
| Venezuela | 61.4 | 40.5 | 63.5 | 47.9 | 50.6 |
| Other Western Hemisphere | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- |
| Total | 76.5 | 55.6 | 71.2 | 62.5 | 63.1 |
| Cities Service Co.: | | | | | |
| Middle East | 20.9 | 29.8 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 15.6 |
| Venezuela | 9.9 | 11.1 | 3.4 | 7.1 | 7.2 |
| Other Western Hemisphere | 1.2 | 3.3 | ---------- | 3.5 | 2.3 |
| Total | 32.0 | 44.2 | 11.8 | 19.2 | 25.1 |

| | 3d quarter | October | November | December | 4th quarter |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| To east-gulf coast—Continued | | | | | |
| Eastern States Petroleum Co.: | | | | | |
| Middle East | 22.4 | 23.6 | 25.1 | 5.6 | 18.1 |
| Venezuela | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- |
| Other Western Hemisphere | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- |
| Total | 22.4 | 23.6 | 25.1 | 5.6 | 18.1 |
| Gabriel Oil Co.: | | | | | |
| Middle East | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- |
| Venezuela | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- |
| Other Western Hemisphere | 5.6 | 5.5 | 7.1 | 3.4 | 5.3 |
| Total | 5.6 | 5.5 | 7.1 | 3.4 | 5.3 |

*Crude oil imports into the United States (excluding west coast) by company and source, last half of 1956*—Continued

[All figures in thousands of barrels daily]

| | 3d quarter | October | November | December | 4th quarter |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| To east-gulf coast—Continued | | | | | |
| Gulf Oil Corp.: | | | | | |
| Middle East | 59.0 | 56.0 | | 37.0 | 31.0 |
| Venezuela | 79.0 | 84.0 | 85.0 | 103.0 | 90.7 |
| Other Western Hemisphere | | | | | |
| Total | 138.0 | 140.0 | 85.0 | 140.0 | 121.7 |
| Hancock Oil Co.: | | | | | |
| Middle East | .6 | | | | |
| Venezuela | | 4.2 | | | 1.4 |
| Other Western Hemisphere | | | | | |
| Total | .6 | 4.2 | | | 1.4 |
| Lake Superior Refining Co.: | | | | | |
| Middle East | | | | | |
| Venezuela | | | | | |
| Other W. Hemis. (Canada) | 4.6 | 5.5 | 4.0 | 5.2 | 4.9 |
| Total | 4.6 | 5.5 | 4.0 | 5.2 | 4.9 |
| Phillips Petroleum Co.: | | | | | |
| Middle East | | | | | |
| Venezuela | 11.6 | 12.5 | 18.9 | 16.0 | 15.8 |
| Other W. Hemis | | | .1 | .1 | .1 |
| Total | 11.6 | 12.5 | 19.0 | 16.1 | 15.9 |
| San Jacinto Petroleum Corp.: | | | | | |
| Middle East | .5 | | | | |
| Venezuela | 1.4 | | | | |
| Other Western Hemisphere | | | | | |
| Total | 1.9 | | | | |
| Shell Oil Co.: | | | | | |
| Middle East | | | | | |
| Venezuela | | | | | |
| Other Western Hemisphere | .5 | | | | |
| Total | .5 | | | | |
| Signal Oil & Gas Co.: | | | | | |
| Middle East | .5 | | | | |
| Venezuela | .6 | | | | |
| Other Western Hemisphere | | | | | |
| Total | 1.1 | | | | |
| Sinclair Oil Corporation: | | | | | |
| Middle East | 17.5 | 20.2 | 14.5 | | 11.6 |
| Venezuela | 59.1 | 57.0 | 52.9 | 70.9 | 60.3 |
| Other Western Hemisphere | | | | | |
| Total | 76.6 | 77.2 | 67.4 | 70.9 | 71.9 |
| Socony-Mobil Oil Co., Inc.: | | | | | |
| Middle East | 16.1 | 16.9 | 3.7 | | 6.9 |
| Venezuela | 33.1 | 43.7 | 32.2 | 29.7 | 35.2 |
| Other Western Hemisphere | 17.3 | 23.9 | 21.7 | 16.2 | 20.6 |
| Total | 66.5 | 84.5 | 57.6 | 45.9 | 62.7 |
| To east-gulf coast—Continued | | | | | |
| Southwestern Oil & Refining Co.: | | | | | |
| Middle East | | | | | |
| Venezuela | | | | | |
| Other Western Hemisphere | 2.5 | | 3.8 | | 1.3 |
| Total | 2.5 | | 3.8 | | 1.3 |
| Standard Oil Company of California: | | | | | |
| Middle East | 52.7 | 40.0 | 18.0 | | 19.3 |
| Venezuela | 26.1 | 30.0 | 52.9 | 55.3 | 46.0 |
| Other Western Hemisphere | | | | | |
| Total | 78.8 | 70.0 | 70.9 | 55.3 | 65.3 |
| Standard Oil Co. (Indiana): | | | | | |
| Middle East | | | | | |
| Venezuela | 19.7 | 3.5 | 18.6 | 28.5 | 16.9 |
| Other Western Hemisphere | 2.2 | 3.3 | 7.0 | | 3.4 |
| Total | 21.9 | 6.8 | 25.6 | 28.5 | 20.3 |
| Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey): | | | | | |
| Middle East | | | | | |
| Venezuela | 82.7 | 88.0 | 68.0 | 78.0 | 78.0 |
| Other Western Hemisphere | 1.3 | | | | |
| Total | 84.0 | 88.0 | 68.0 | 78.0 | 78.0 |
| Standard Oil Co. (Ohio): | | | | | |
| Middle East | .4 | | | | |
| Venezuela | 2.7 | | 5.0 | 9.6 | 4.9 |
| Other Western Hemisphere | | | | | |
| Total | 3.1 | | 5.0 | 9.6 | 4.9 |
| Sun Oil Co.: | | | | | |
| Middle East | 44.7 | 36.2 | 25.8 | | 20.7 |
| Venezuela | 10.6 | 12.4 | 7.6 | 4.0 | 8.0 |
| Other Western Hemisphere | | | | | |
| Total | 55.3 | 48.6 | 33.4 | 4.0 | 28.7 |
| The Texas Co.: | | | | | |
| Middle East | 30.8 | 17.7 | 22.3 | 11.4 | 17.1 |
| Venezuela | 37.6 | 25.8 | 29.5 | 30.3 | 28.6 |
| Other Western Hemisphere | 6.4 | 8.1 | 4.2 | | 4.1 |
| Total | 74.8 | 51.6 | 56.0 | 41.7 | 49.8 |
| Tide Water Associated Oil Co.: | | | | | |
| Middle East | 20.3 | | 6.4 | 9.9 | 5.4 |
| Venezuela | 9.3 | 19.4 | 27.3 | 16.4 | 21.0 |
| Other Western Hemisphere | | | | | |
| Total | 29.6 | 19.4 | 33.7 | 26.3 | 26.4 |
| Total to east-gulf coast: | | | | | |
| Middle East | 301.5 | 255.5 | 131.9 | 87.1 | 158.2 |
| Venezuela | 448.8 | 432.1 | 464.8 | 496.7 | 464.6 |
| Other Western Hemisphere | 41.6 | 49.6 | 47.9 | 28.4 | 42.0 |
| Total, above companies | 787.9 | 737.2 | 644.6 | 612.2 | 664.8 |
| All other | 42.8 | 48.6 | 45.6 | 45.0 | 46.4 |
| Total | 830.7 | 785.8 | 690.2 | 657.2 | 711.2 |

Source: Company data from Texas Railroad Commission.

*Crude oil imports into United States west coast by company and source, last half of 1956*

[All figures in thousands of barrels daily]

| | 3d quarter | October | November | December | 4th quarter |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| To west coast: | | | | | |
| Douglas Oil Company of California: | | | | | |
| Middle East | | | | | |
| Canada | | | | | |
| Venezuela | | | | | |
| Other Western Hemisphere | 2.7 | | | | |
| Total | 2.7 | | | | |
| Shell Oil Co.: | | | | | |
| Middle East | | | | | |
| Canada | 33.6 | 49.6 | 37.6 | 36.6 | 41.3 |
| Venezuela | | | | | |
| Other Western Hemisphere | | | | | |
| Total | 33.6 | 49.6 | 37.6 | 36.6 | 41.3 |
| Socony-Mobil Oil Co., Inc.: | | | | | |
| Middle East | | | | | |
| Canada | 17.4 | 17.9 | 31.7 | 26.8 | 25.5 |
| Venezuela | 15.1 | 6.9 | | | 2.3 |
| Other Western Hemisphere | | | | | |
| Total | 32.5 | 24.8 | 31.7 | 26.8 | 27.8 |
| To west coast—Continued | | | | | |
| Standard Oil Company of California: | | | | | |
| Far East | 16.6 | 20.5 | 27.3 | 16.5 | 21.4 |
| Canada | 9.6 | 7.9 | | 16.3 | 8.1 |
| Venezuela | 3.8 | | | | |
| Other Western Hemisphere | | | | | |
| Total | 30.0 | 28.4 | 27.3 | 32.8 | 29.5 |
| The Texas Co.: | | | | | |
| Far East | 9.2 | 15.8 | 4.0 | 11.0 | 10.3 |
| Canada | 8.0 | 5.9 | 6.1 | 5.9 | 6.9 |
| Venezuela | 7.2 | | | | |
| Other Western Hemisphere | 4.2 | 3.8 | | | 1.3 |
| Total | 28.6 | 25.5 | 10.1 | 16.9 | 17.6 |
| Tide Water Associated Oil Co.: | | | | | |
| Far East | 34.5 | 51.5 | 35.0 | 29.1 | 38.6 |
| Canada | 6.5 | | | 3.8 | 1.3 |
| Venezuela | 3.6 | | | | |
| Other Western Hemisphere | 1.3 | | | | |
| Total | 45.9 | 51.5 | 35.0 | 32.9 | 39.9 |

*Crude oil imports into United States west coast by company and source, last half of 1956*—Continued

[All figures in thousands of barrels daily]

| | 3d quarter | October | November | December | 4th quarter |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| To west coast—Continued | | | | | |
| Union Oil Company of California: | | | | | |
| Middle East | 3.3 | 6.4 | 10.4 | 9.7 | 8.8 |
| Canada | | 8.0 | 4.1 | 7.9 | 6.7 |
| Venezuela | 7.1 | | | 5.4 | 1.8 |
| Other Western Hemisphere | | | | | |
| Total | 10.4 | 14.4 | 14.5 | 23.0 | 17.3 |
| Wilshire Oil Co.: | | | | | |
| Middle East | 13.6 | | 10.1 | 10.4 | 6.8 |
| Canada | | | | 5.4 | 1.8 |
| Venezuela | 7.5 | 14.3 | 8.1 | | 7.5 |
| Other Western Hemisphere | | | | | |
| Total | 21.1 | 14.3 | 18.2 | 15.8 | 16.1 |

| | 3d quarter | October | November | December | 4th quarter |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total to West Coast: | | | | | |
| Middle and Far East | 77.2 | 92.2 | 86.8 | 76.7 | 85.9 |
| Canada | 75.1 | 89.3 | 79.5 | 102.7 | 90.7 |
| Venezuela | 44.3 | 21.2 | 8.1 | 5.4 | 11.6 |
| Other Western Hemisphere | 8.2 | 3.8 | | | 1.3 |
| Total, above companies | 204.8 | 208.5 | 174.4 | 184.8 | 189.5 |
| All other | 6.9 | 9.7 | 6.2 | 5.0 | 7.0 |
| Total United States | 211.7 | 218.2 | 180.6 | 189.8 | 196.5 |

Source: Company data from Texas Railroad Commission.

*Appendix IV*

1. Chart showing interrelationship between members of Middle East Emergency Committee.
2. Chart showing joint enterprises in foreign crude-oil operations by seven principal companies.
3. Chart showing source of net income of Gulf Oil Corp. and Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey).

[Charts not printed.]

## IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN PLYWOOD

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the contents of a brief brochure entitled "Import of Foreign Plywood."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and it is ordered.

(See exihibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, this brochure was prepared by our domestic plywood industry in an attempt to demonstrate to the American public the peril which faces the plywood and veneer industries as a result of increased competition of plywood imports from low-wage countries, principally Japan.

In a very few pages, this brochure tells the story of how these two important domestic industries have been adversely affected by increased imports. It cites facts and figures which show that foreign imports from all competing countries have increased 1,000 percent since tariff reductions were effected on plywood and veneer products in 1951 and also that they have now reached the point where they constitute 46.6 percent of the total plywood consumption in the United States.

During the same period, 1951 through 1956, imports from Japan have increased 4,120 percent. As we know, in this country our plywood and veneer industries by law must pay their employees a minimum of $1 an hour. In Japan, however, plywood workers sell their services to Japanese manufacturers at the rate of 11 cents an hour.

In order to save these two industries, which are vital to our Nation in time of peace as well as in time of war, the answer lies not in a wage scale reduction, but, rather, the answer lies in a reasonable import quota which will afford these industries some measure of protection from low-wage competition.

Mr. President, I believe in reciprocal trade, and I believe free-world trade must be fostered. At the same time, however, I do not believe that our domestic industries should be sacrificed upon the altar of so-called reciprocal trade.

I regret, Mr. President, that it is necessary to come to the Congress and ask for legislative quotas on the importation of foreign plywood. This is necessary, however, because administrative relief has been denied by the Tariff Commission to our domestic plywood industry. An escape-clause complaint was filed by the plywood industry in 1955, but the Commission blamed the plywood problems in this period of economic prosperity on a business recession in 1954.

Mr. President, the plywood industry also tried to work out a system of voluntary quotas with the Japanese Government in 1955. A voluntary quota agreement was arranged; but the paper upon which it was written turned out to be of more value than the agreement, as has been the case with many of our agreements with foreign countries.

This brochure, in a section entitled appropriately "The Quota That Wasn't There," gives all the facts on this attempt to work with the Japanese.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional one-half minute in which to complete my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the Senator from South Carolina may proceed for an additional one-half minute.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, these industries need relief, and they need it now. Already plywood and veneer plants have closed in a number of States, and even more have been forced to cut back on their working hours, thus throwing many American employees out of work, and shifting countless others to only part-time employment.

I am preparing a bill which I believe will provide some relief to these important industries. The Honorable JOHN MCMILLAN, dean of the South Carolina delegation in the House of Representatives, is also preparing similar proposed legislation for introduction in the House. I hope these legislative proposals, when introduced, will receive the full support of the Congress.

EXHIBIT 1

THE STORY OF IMPORTS OF FOREIGN HARDWOOD PLYWOOD

The tariff slashes on plywood were made at the great international tariff negotiations (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) in 1951 in disregard of the strong protest of American industry. Here is the effect of the reduction:

*Hardwood plywood imports* [1]

[Quantity in thousands of square feet]

| | 1937 | 1946 | 1951 | 1955 | 1956 estimate [2] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Japan | 3,294 | ------ | 12,894 | 428,626 | 510,000 |
| All other countries | 1,227 | 20,305 | 53,867 | 199,133 | 180,000 |
| Total | 4,521 | 20,305 | 66,761 | 627,759 | 690,000 |

[1] Bureau of Census, Department of Commerce.
[2] Based on imports for January-November 1956. Reconciled with 1955 imports.

You see the increase in imports, now look at how the foreign plywood ate up the American market.

*Ratio of plywood imports to domestic shipments and consumption*

[Quantity in thousands of square feet]

| | Domestic [1] | Imports [1] | Consumption | Ratio imports to domestic shipments | Consumption |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | *Percent* | *Percent* |
| 1951 | 805,000 | 66,761 | 871,761 | 8.2 | 7.6 |
| 1955 | 881,000 | 627,759 | 1,508,759 | 71.2 | 41.8 |
| 1956 | [2] 810,000 | [3] 690,000 | 1,500,000 | 85.2 | 46.0 |

[1] Bureau of Census, Department of Commerce.
[2] Estimates based on January-September Census Bureau Report and 4th quarter 1956 HPI reports.
[3] Based on Bureau Census Reports January-November 1956.

THE AMERICAN PLYWOOD INDUSTRY

In the 5 years since 1951, United States industry in general has undergone a tremendous industrial expansion, as shown by official United States Government figures.[1] But this vast expansion just didn't happen to the 140 American plants manufacturing

[1] Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System.

hardwood plywood for sale. The American hardwood plywood industry, because of the steadily increasing imports of cheap foreign plywood has been forced to cut back production all the way to the 1951 level. Hardwood plywood market shipments in 1956 will amount to 810 million square feet, a mere 5 million square feet, or 0.6 percent more than 1951.

Since 1951 costs of making our products have increased from 30 to 40 percent. Wages have increased materially. Prices of hardwood plywood, due to the depressing effect of low priced imports, have not increased in relation to the increase in costs. The United States Labor Department index for hardwood plywood stands at 104, whereas the index covering wholesale price for commodities other than farm products and food, is 124.[2]

Since 1951 the consumption of hardwood plywood in the United States has increased from 871 million square f et to 1,517 million square feet, or 74 percent.[3] American industry was able to capture only 0.6 percent of this increase. The unfairly low-priced imports from Japan and other low-wage-scale countries deprived the American hardwood plywood industry of its rightful share of this increase in use and the benefits which should have accrued to you. The constant whittling away of the American producers' share of the United States market will, unless imports are curtailed, force more and more curtailment of production, loss of work hours and plant closings such as occurred in 1956 when several plants were forced to close down. It can't happen here? Oh, yes; it can!

American hardwood plywood producers just can't compete with imported plywood priced duty-paid at less than the cost of production of a comparable American panel—that is, not until our United States workers decide to work for Japanese wages—that's ridiculous and impossible? Of course it is—but you get the idea.

THE JAPANESE PLYWOOD INDUSTRY

The Japanese plywood industry is singled out because: Japanese plywood is sold in the United States for less than cost of production of American plywood; Japanese wages in the plywood industry are 11.5 cents an hour as compared to a legal minimum wage in the United States of $1; the Japanese work 205 hours an average month with no overtime and Japanese labor cost per 1,000 square feet of plywood is $4.17 against $30 to $34 in the United States.

The following table illustrates the tremendous growth in capacity of the Japanese plywood industry in the 21 years from 1935 (125 mills) to 1956 (220 mills) with a capacity in 1956 of 2.9 billion square feet per annum, double the capacity of United States plants.[4] Further, in 1951 the production of the Japanese plywood industry was only 625 million square feet and Japanese production has increased to 2.4 billion square feet in 1956, or a 400 percent increase against an increase by United States producers of an infinitesimal 5 million square feet increase or 0.6 percent. In the 1st quarter of 1956, the United States shipments of hardwood plywood were 236 million square feet in contrast to 3d quarter 1956 shipments of 187 million square feet.[5] It is to be remembered that the 220 Japanese plants have the most modern equipment,[6] most of it modernized or newly built with United States financial aid with little or no cost to their owners. Bear in mind that the Japanese plywood industry is a cartel (forbidden by law in the United States) which controls production, prices, and exports.[6]

The table also shows the astronomical increase in Japanese exports in the years 1935 to 1950—an increase percentagewise of approximately 1,000 percent.

*Japanese plywood industry*

[Unit in thousands of square feet]

| Year | Number plants | Production | Exports | Capacity |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1935 [1] | 125 | 429,820 | 64,028 | |
| 1940 [1] | 200 | 831,430 | 150,744 | |
| 1951 [1] | 222 | 625,732 | 126,260 | |
| 1953 [1] | 225 | 1,043,711 | 156,833 | |
| 1955 [2] | 220 | 2,050,000 | 629,510 | |
| 1956 [2] | 220 | [2] 2,343,488 | 700,000 | 2,900,000 |

[1] Japanese Forestry Agency.
[2] Foreign Service dispatch 894.391/3-2756—Production fixed by cartel.

One more point, United States foreign dispatch No. 893.371/12/2156 dated December 12, 1956, from our Embassy in Tokyo says:

"In the past few years there has been a considerable increase in Japanese exports of plywood, particularly to the United States. Plywood exports, which were valued at $9.5 million in 1953, increased in value to $26 million in 1954 and to $37 million in 1955. It is estimated that the value of plywood exports in 1956 will approximate $43 million. The importance of the United States market will be appreciated when it is seen that the United States absorbed approximately 62 percent ($16 million) of all Japanese plywood exports in 1954 and 73 percent ($27 million) in 1955. In 1956 based on 9-month figures the United States may take as much as 82 percent (approximately $35 million) of Japanese plywood."

THE QUOTA THAT WASN'T THERE

In October 1955, the Japanese Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI) by decree No. 54 placed an export quota with a thickness basis of 4 mm. on lauan, sen and birch plywood exports to North and South America, Caribbean Seacoast and Hawaii.[7] The first quota period was October 1955–March 1956 and the second April 1956–September 1956. The table on page 11, column 1, shows the amount of the quota as established by MITI.

In December 1956, the United States Embassy at Tokyo advised that the plywood quota had been changed from that originally set by MITI Order No. 54. The table, column 2, sets out the quota as revealed in December 1956. The dispatch[8] also revealed for the first time that the 4 mm. basis had been abolished. Birch and sen plywood and two-ply, ribbon grained, curved, strengthened, fancy face and special construction of all species were no longer included in the quota.[8]

The table, column 3, gives the plywood imports from Japan on a 4 mm. basis (the quota thickness base), column 4 the imports into the United States, Canada, and South America as the alleged quota included North and South America, Caribbean Seacoast and Hawaii. The figures in the table establish that the quota was never complied with even allowing for the exclusions which were disclosed only after compliance with the quota was questioned.

[7] Foreign Service dispatches 400–749/11–1955, 400.949/3–2756.
[8] Foreign Service dispatch 894.391/12–1256.

*Comparison Japanese quota and United States, Canada and South American imports from Japan*

[Unit 1,000 square feet]

| Period | By MITI order 54, 4 million basis [1] | By dispatch of Dec. 21, 1956 [2] | United States imports, 4 million basis [3] | Imports United States Canada, and South America [4] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| October–December 1955: | | | | |
| Lauan | 49,700 | 54,430 | 96,628 | 102,450 |
| Sen and birch | 8,760 | 9,707 | 21,036 | 22,406 |
| Special A | [5] 10,000 | A. 20,000 | | |
| Special B | [5] 20,000 | [6] B. 40,000 | | |
| MITI | [5] 11,000 | | | |
| Total | 99,400 | 124,137 | 117,664 | 124,856 |
| January–March 1956: | | | | |
| Lauan | 56,604 | 59,364 | 85,273 | 92,868 |
| Sen and birch | 9,636 | 10,583 | 17,174 | 18,547 |
| Special A | [5] 12,000 | 22,000 | | |
| Special B | [5] 20,000 | [6] 40,000 | | |
| MITI | [5] 12,000 | | | |
| Total | 108,000 | 131,947 | 102,447 | 111,415 |
| April–June: | | | | |
| Lauan | [7] 75,225 | 76,040 | 111,925 | 124,432 |
| Sen and birch | 13,275 | 16,006 | 18,158 | 19,610 |
| Special | 1,500 | 12,850 | | |
| MITI | 10,000 | | | |
| Total | 100,000 | 104,896 | 130,083 | 144,042 |
| July–September 1956: | | | | |
| Lauan | [7] 75,725 | 89,358 | 151,948 | 159,717 |
| Sen and birch | 13,275 | [8] | 16,899 | |
| Special | 1,500 | [8] | | |
| MITI | 10,000 | [8] | | |
| Total | 100,000 | 89,359 | [9] 168,847 | 159,717 |

[1] Foreign Service Despatches 400–749/11–1955, 400.949/3–2756.
[2] Foreign Service Despatch 894.391/12–1256.
[3] Bureau of Census Converted Despatch 894.391/12–2156 and MITI publication of exports by thicknesses, 1955 and 1956.
[4] Foreign Service Despatch 894.391/12–2156.
[5] Special quota includes United Kingdom and Ireland.
[6] According to Foreign Service Despatch 894.391/12–2156 this quota covered unpopular sizes and grades and was not used, so says the despatch. The quota was abolished later.
[7] Foreign Service Despatch 400–949/3–2756.
[8] Abolished.

[2] BLS—Price Index.
[3] BDSA, Department of Commerce.
[4] Japanese Forestry Agency.
[5] Facts for Industry, Bureau of Census.
[6] Foreign Service Dispatch 894.391/3–2756—Production fixed by cartel.

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE

In the past 4 years the Hardwood Plywood Institute and many prominent manufacturers have worked long and hard to bring relief from this situation. Efforts have been made to bring about a solution by working with appropriate Federal agencies and departments. They have opposed the enactment of legislation to prevent further duty reductions, as well as moves to authorize United States membership in the Organization of Trade Cooperation (OTC), an internationally controlled tariff regulatory agency. An escape clause complaint was filed and, after hearing, denied on the ground that the 1954 business recession and not imports, were the clause of the industry's damage. Anti-dumping complaints were filed against Japan and Finland, both were denied on the ground that the amount of dumping was not sufficient to do any real damage. In both these matters arbitrary Federal agency discretion prevailed over good and compelling evidence.

In July 1956, the hardwood plywood manufacturers organized the Hardwood Plywood Manufacturers Committee to act as a vehicle for an educational program to bring the story of hardwood plywood imports to industry, the workers and the public. Memberships in the committee include plywood plants located in all parts of the United States, veneer producers, and other suppliers to the hardwood plywood industry. Its work enables us to bring this vital story to you.

WHAT MUST BE DONE

The efforts of the administration to turn foreign trade regulation and tariffs over to that international body called OTC must be opposed. Efforts of foreign interests to emasculate the Antidumping Act and the Buy-American Act must be fought.

Finally, legislation must be had which will provide a quota on plywood imports so that the United States plywood industry will be allowed to produce 85 percent of the plywood needed for domestic consumption and that foreign imports be limited to a maximum of 15 percent—this quota to be set by the United States Government not by that of Japan. The concerted efforts of industry and labor will be required to secure favorable action on such legislation.

HOW YOU CAN DO IT

The problem that has been created for the plywood industry by the Government's foreign trade policy is being brought home to you and we hope by you to your wife, family, and friends. American workers will recognize that their jobs are in jeopardy and their security threatened. So the first job is to get this story before as many people as possible—affected people, those who supply the hardwood plywood and veneer plants and those who supply their workers. We mean "the butcher, the banker, the candlestick maker" and the banker, and the town officials. We mean the firms that sell the plywood plant its raw materials; glue, etc., and its machinery, spreaders, sanders, presses, knives.

Finally, we mean those "very important people," your representatives in Washington. Tell them how you feel about it and what it means to you and yours, your plant, and your workers and their families. No one in the Nation's capital is more interested in you than the people you sent there to represent you—they welcome your views on matters that affect your welfare.

One last thought—this isn't a new battle and it's not going to be won in a day. It takes time, perseverance, and patience to get relief. The effort must be a continuing one—but don't let that keep you from getting started today.

HARDWOOD PLYWOOD MANUFACTURERS COMMITTEE.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder whether the Senator from South Carolina knows why the plywood industry has not taken hold of this situation itself and made representation to the Tariff Commission. Three weeks ago I undertook to do something in behalf of the plywood industry, and I went to the highest places to which I could go. Lo and behold, a week later I found that for the past 2 years the plywood industry did not make any representation in its own behalf anywhere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I believe that under the order, I am entitled to have 3 minutes in which to speak in my own behalf.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an extension of my time for 1 minute, in order to give my friend, the Senator from Vermont, an opportunity to present his views on this matter.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, for the purpose just stated, the time of the Senator from South Carolina be extended for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. So, Mr. President, I believe that the representatives of the plywood industry probably have a good case at this time. Two years ago the appeal of the plywood industry to the Tariff Commission was turned down because it was found that the industry was then in fairly good condition and did not need increased protection. However, during the past 2 years the situation has changed, and I believe now the representatives of the plywood industry should prepare their case and should go to the Tariff Commission and, if necessary, should go higher up, in order to seek relief.

It is asking considerable of a Member of the Senate or a Member of the House of Representatives to request that he prepare the case of the plywood industry for its representatives and try to accomplish by means of legislation what the representatives of the industry do not seem inclined to attempt to accomplish through the regular channels, which could afford relief. It appears to me that the plywood industry is far more likely to receive help through the regular authorized channels provided by law than it is from depending upon a change in the law itself.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the course of the statement I have made, I think I have outlined the situation. I am sure that the plywood industry deserves relief. The representatives of the industry have pursued the courses now available under law; and at this time the only procedure which seems to remain available to them is the introduction of a bill for that purpose.

## MEETING OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE'S SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS DURING THE SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, of the Committee on the Judiciary, be permitted to meet today during the session of the Senate. I am informed that in executive session today the subcommittee agreed to terminate the hearings on pending civil-rights proposals on Tuesday, March 5, 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I do not intend to object—I should like to state that I wish to be notified when the subcommittee is meeting. I am a member of the committee, and I was at the meeting this morning. However, I did not know that the subcommittee was to meet this afternoon; I was not told anything about it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I was merely following the usual custom. The request was transmitted to me by a member of the staff of the subcommittee; and, as majority leader, I would make such a request for any committee of the Senate. I have no knowledge of the inner functions of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe the request is only for today; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes; to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I have no present intention of exercising that right—I wish to make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I am a member of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. This morning at 8:15 a. m., I was notified, for the first time, by my administrative assistant, that there would be a special meeting of the subcommittee at 9 a. m. to pass on matters of procedure in respect to the bills on so-called civil rights, pending before that subcommittee. My administrative assistant advised me at that time that he had been given telephonic notice only a moment before.

I am personally at a loss to understand why I did not receive notice earlier, because, having spent Monday of last week driving 440 miles, and having spent the other days of last week, including Saturday, in virtually all-day committee sessions, I stayed in my apartment all the time from Saturday afternoon until this morning, when I left it to attend the special meeting of the subcommittee. I have a telephone listed in the Washington City Directory in my name. My administrative assistant has a telephone listed in the Washington City Directory in his name. My secretary has a telephone listed in the Washington City Directory in his name. I do not wish to

take too much umbrage at the fact that I received such belated notice, because, so far as missing my breakfast is concerned, that does not make any difference, inasmuch as I have enough excess calories stored up; but I did not have time to take a shave, and my peculiar style of pulchritude is such that it does not show up to best advantage when I am not shaved.

When I reached the committee I was confronted by a motion, which was agreed to over the dissenting vote of the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina and myself, whereby it was decreed by the subcommittee that it would cease holding hearings at the time stated by the majority leader, that when the clock reached a certain point the subcommittee would refuse to take further testimony, or receive further enlightenment, and would proceed to take action.

The motion agreed to by a majority of the subcommittee over our dissenting votes is to take full effect today, and the result is that a Senator who feels that it is his duty to sit on the subcommittee, and also feels it is his duty to be present on the floor when the Middle East resolution is considered, is compelled to elect whether he will represent his constituents on the floor of the Senate or whether he will sit in the subcommittee.

I respectfully submit that the action taken is without precedent in the annals of the Senate. While it may hasten the enactment of legislation at this time, legislation which some Senators may consider desirable, it may be used in the future as a precedent by a majority of a subcommittee to practice what is tyranny on the minority of such subcommittee. So far as I am concerned, I should like to sit on the subcommittee even if I have to sacrifice my right to represent my constituents on the floor of the Senate during the consideration of the Middle East resolution. But I submit that the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives, as well as the people of the United States, had better see to it that those of us who entertain views which accord with mine be given a reasonable opportunity to present this matter and bring it fully to the attention of the American people.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not a member of the subcommittee, and I had nothing to do with voting on the motion cutting off the hearings on March 5. If I had been a member of the committee, I would not have voted for such a motion; but in view of the fact that the motion has been adopted and that hearings are to be ended, does not the Senator think it would be better for the committee to meet longer each day, in order to get all the information possible?

Mr. ERVIN. In reply to the inquiry of the Senator, I give an affirmative answer, because one of the bills which the Attorney General of the United States urges us to report favorably provides that so-called civil rights cases shall be tried in equity proceedings, under which litigants would be denied the right of trial by jury, and in which parties to the proceedings could be punished for criminal contempt without trial by jury. Not only that, but if section 55 of title 8 of the United States Code means what it says, the decrees in such cases can be enforced by the President of the United States calling out the Army, Navy, or militia. That is the kind of bill we are asked by the Attorney General of the United States to pass. Title 8, section 55, of the code has been recodified as title 42, section 1993.

Since I think there ought to be as much consideration of such a bill as possible, I agree with the observation made by the distinguished majority leader. It would be better for us to consent to have the subcommittee sit while the Senate is in session, even though such course denies our right to represent our constituents in an effective manner in the consideration of the Middle East resolution. Therefore I offer no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I desire to make it abundantly clear that I am carrying out the usual function of the majority leader in presenting to the Senate the request made by a committee. Now I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I merely wish to take a moment to say that the observations made by the Senator from North Carolina represent his estimate of the meaning of the bills, and not the interpretation accepted by the Attorney General of the United States. The Attorney General is not advocating a bill which will result in the denial of certain fundamental rights.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. I agree in part with the observation of the Senator from South Dakota, because I do not think that, until Saturday afternoon, the Attorney General knew that his bill would authorize the President to call out the Army, the Navy, or the militia to enforce judicial processes in suits in which the right of trial by jury would not exist.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have the question put?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Illinois have an observation to make on this question? I may say I think we shall have further discussion on this subject later in the session. [Laughter.] I remind Senators that the President has urged the adoption of the measure which the subcommittee is considering.

I yield now to my delightful friend from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not deem the action taken by the subcommittee as extraordinary. I am not a member of the subcommittee, but it has been rather common in some subcommittees, where controversial legislation is pending, to have a certain day set for the conclusion of testimony, so that, at long last, a vote can be had. I apprehend that what happened this morning was that there was a motion made to set the 5th day of March as the date for the termination of all testimony. We must consider the request in the light of what has happened before. I point out to my exteemed friend that long hearings were held on this subject last year, first in the subcommittee, and later in the full committee.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi, if that is agreeable to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr EASTLAND. Mr. President, did the Senator from Illinois attend any subcommittee hearings last year on this subject?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. I think there were hearings before the subcommittee.

Mr. EASTLAND. There were no subcommittee hearings last year.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My recollection is that there were hearings in the subcommittee, up until the time I made the motion that the full Committee on the Judiciary take testimony.

Mr. EASTLAND. But there had been no hearings before the subcommittee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There were hearings before the full committee, over which our distinguished friend from Mississippi so ably presided.

So the action suggestion is by no means extraordinary. Similar action has been taken before. I think the request must be considered in the light of the background involved. This question has been before us for a long time. I am always glad to have more light and better understanding of any subject. So if the subcommittee wishes to meet three times a day, I give it my full sanction, in the interest of expeditious action.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. This year the subcommittee has had referred to it approximately 16 bills, occupying about 115 pages of printing. They contain scores of provisions. There are a number of amendments which, so far as I know, have never been considered.

Certainly we are entitled to be enlightened. I do not believe that the fact that evidence was introduced against A when he was tried on a criminal charge should dispense with the necessity of producing evidence against B when B happens to be tried for a similar offense at some time in the future.

Reference has been made to past hearings. I believe that the question involved is crucial to the American Government. As I say, these bills would allow the Attorney General of the United States, one human being in the entire universe, to determine, in the first place, whether the bills, if enacted, would be put into operation at all.

In the second place, they provide that if the man who happens to be the temporary occupant of the Attorney General's Office at any particular time determines to put the Federal law in motion, State laws prescribing administrative remedies will fall to the ground. So we have, not government by laws, not government by men, but government by the whim and caprice of one man, the temporary occupant of the Attorney General's Office.

I submit that we should not be compelled to absent ourselves from the Senate to attend hearings before a subcommittee while the Senate is considering one of the most momentous proposals ever considered by it, namely, the resolution relating to the Middle East.

Such far reaching proposals as are involved in the bills before the subcommittee should receive adequate consideration. They cannot receive such consideration under the motion adopted by a majority of the subcommittee.

Nevertheless, I shall not object to the pending request, if that is what is desired by a majority of the subcommittee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I was engaged in discussion with one of my colleagues. Did the Chair put the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from South Carolina desire me to yield to him?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am delighted to yield to my friend from South Carolina. But let me say first that at the conclusion of the colloquy on the unanimous-consent request I shall move to proceed to the consideration of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill. Then each Senator who is recognized may speak without operating under the 3-minute rule. That is the only effect my motion will have.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I shall not require more than 3 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I may say to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and other Senators who desire to speak that when the appropriation bill is made the unfinished business, each Senator who desires to speak, may speak for as long a time as he wishes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before making the request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. THYE. A number of Senators thought they would be given an opportunity to be heard during the morning hour. They are still in the Chamber awaiting an opportunity to be heard during the morning hour. In the event some Senator should obtain the floor and hold it for any length of time, a great many Senators who have been waiting to be heard during the morning hour would not have that opportunity.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not believe any Senator would deprive his colleagues of the opportunity to be heard. I shall make the motion to which I have referred; and, after a trial, if we find that we have made a mistake, we can back up.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to concur in everything the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has said.

I received my notice this morning while I was at the breakfast table, at 8:15. I rushed to the hearing room, and arrived a little after 9 o'clock, when the subcommittee was supposed to meet.

I am a new member of the subcommittee. I did not have the advantage of study last year with other members of the subcommittee.

We have about 16 bills before us, and it is my understanding that the 16 bills have all been combined into 1 bill, which is called an omnibus bill. I understand that it is to be reported in that form.

I have not had the time to read all the bills. Neither have I had time to read what is known as the omnibus bill.

People throughout the Nation, including the governors of the various States, the attorneys general of the various States, and the bar associations of the various States, are intensely interested in this question. The president of the Bar Association of South Carolina has notified me that that association would like to be heard. It is said that there is considerable danger awaiting us in the bills which are being rushed through without being looked into properly. That being so, I did not vote to close the hearings within 2 weeks. There are many persons throughout the Nation who should have an opportunity to be heard.

In order to save time, at the subcommittee meeting this morning the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and I submitted in writing our protest concerning the action of the subcommittee. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this protest be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks in order that Senators and the public may know just what took place and what the present situation is.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Dictated by Senator ERVIN at close of executive meeting of Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, February 18, 1957, 9:30–10:30 p. m.)

Senators OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, and SAM J. ERVIN, JR., of North Carolina, protest the adoption of the motion on each of the following counts:

1. First, that such motion setting an arbitrary time limit for consideration of these bills by the subcommittee is unprecedented in Senate annals.

2. That such motion requires the committee to sit while the Senate is considering one of the most momentous proposals ever considered by the Senate in the long course of its history, namely, the resolution relating to the Middle East. As a consequence, it disables a Senator who happens to be a member of the subcommittee to give proper consideration to either the Middle East Resolution now being heard in the Senate or the bills pending before this committee.

3. The motion compels Senators who attempt the vain process of performing both of these senatorial duties, to perform the same while they may be in a state of virtual physical and mental exhaustion.

4. The motion provides for the cutting short hearings before any ample opportunity is given the subcommittee to determine whether the governors and attorneys general of sovereign States can adapt their official schedules so as to attend the sessions of the subcommittee during the limited time.

5. The motion deprives the governors and attorneys general of sovereign States and famous constitutional lawyers who desire to be heard of an adequate opportunity to even study an analyze the 16 or 17 so-called civil rights bills now pending before the subcommittee.

6. The motion is alien to the traditions of the Senate in that it prevents this subcommittee from acting as a deliberative legislative body.

7. The motion establishes a tragic precedent for the government of Senate committees in that the rule established by it will permit tyrannical practices in the future by the majorities of Senate subcommittees.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I asked that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee be notified of the request which comes from his committee and the discussion which has taken place in connection with it, but I have been unable to reach him.

In view of the fact that Senators do not care to object, I hope the question can be put, so that we may proceed to other matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4249, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4249) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to express my thanks publicly to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and others who have been helpful to the leadership.

## THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this morning three very important documents were published in the press.

The first of these was the memorandum which Secretary of State John Foster Dulles submitted to the Ambassador from Israel on last Monday, February 11.

The second was the reply handed by the Ambassador of Israel to Secretary of State Dulles on last Friday, February 15.

The third was the statement of the President of the United States, issued on yesterday, February 17.

I hope all these documents will be studied in detail by the people of the United States.

If they are examined in the light of the situation which now exists in the Middle East, it will be seen that, unless American policy is changed decidedly in the next few days, the results may be disastrous to peace, to the United States, and to the free world.

On two separate occasions, I have previously discussed the issues now before the world, in connection with the Gulf of Aqaba and the Gaza Strip. I have pointed out that if the Israeli troops are withdrawn, and if the Egyptian troops then move into those positions, in the absence of clear, definite, and binding provisions, the same situation will in all probability develop once again which existed prior to October 29 of last year.

As we may remember, Egyptian troops and shore batteries prevented the access of any ship sailing from the Red Sea into the Gulf of Aqaba, or sailing out of the Gulf of Aqaba into the Red Sea. The Egyptian troops thus sealed off the Gulf of Aqaba from commerce.

I pointed out that if this situation is allowed to occur once again, it will be impossible to have any effective alternative or supplement to the Suez Canal and to the pipelines which run across Syria.

If the Gulf of Aqaba is opened to traffic, it will then be possible for tankers to come from the Persian Gulf, which is the center of the Mideast oil reserves, to go into the Red Sea and then, instead of going through the Suez Canal, to go up the Gulf of Aqaba, and there to discharge their oil at Elath, from which place the oil can be pumped across Israel in pipelines to a Mediterranean port, where, in turn, it can be put on board tankers for Western Europe. This will make the West more independent of Colonel Nasser and the Syrian military clique.

In the exchange of notes between the Government of Israel and the Government of the United States, Israel is merely taking the position that if and when her troops move out from the strategic positions in the Gulf of Aqaba, they should be replaced by the United Nations police force, which would then neutralize the area and protect the right of free access.

The memorandum which was submitted by Secretary of State Dulles to Israel on the 11th refused to make any such definite promise. Instead, a very ambiguous statement was made, that "the United States, on behalf of vessels of the United States registry, is prepared to exercise the right of free and innocent passage and to join with others to secure general recognition of this right."

However, the Secretary of State did not define what he meant by these general words. He did not say whether the United States was prepared to send ships through the Straits of Tiran into the Gulf of Aqaba, and to defend the right of those ships to move, as Jefferson defended the right of our commerce to move freely in the Mediterranean at the time the Barbary pirates were perpetrating their outrages.

Secretary of State Dulles did not say what sanctions, if any, the United States would be prepared to invoke if Egypt once again closed the entrance. His was general language, which needed clarification and definition.

The Ambassador from Israel, in his reply of Friday, is now shown to have said:

> Failing such an arrangement for the stationing of UNEF—

That is the United Nations police force—

> the Government of Israel suggests that a precise guarantee be afforded for the specific protection of the Israel-bound shipping exercising its right of passage in the straits and the gulf.

It would seem to be a most modest and most appropriate request, "that a precise guaranty be afforded for the specific protection of Israel-bound shipping."

I am disappointed that in the statement which the President of the United States issued yesterday he declared:

> The United States believes that the action of the United Nations of February 2 and the statements of various governments, including the United States memorandum of February 11, provide Israel with the maximum assurance that it can reasonably expect at this juncture, or that can be reconciled with fairness to others.
>
> Accordingly, the United States has renewed its plea to Israel to withdraw in accordance with the repeated demands of the United Nations and to rely upon all friends of justice to bring about a state of affairs which conform to the principles of justice and of international law and serve impartially the proper interest of all in the area.

Then there was this final paragraph:

> The United States, for its part, will strive to remain true to, and support, the United Nations in its efforts to sustain the purposes and principles of the charter as the world's best hope of peace.

I take it that this is, in polite language, a rejection of the request of Israel for a clarification of the American policy. In other words, the American Government as of this moment is taking the position that Israel should withdraw now, and then later take its chances as to what may happen in the Gulf of Aqaba or in the Straits of Tiran.

Mr. President, I submit that this is a very dangerous policy, which, if carried out, will result, in all probability, in Egypt moving in as Israel moves out; and then we will return to the conditions which existed prior to October 29, which were so unsatisfactory that war broke out.

We should remember in this connection that Egypt has been in violation of decisions of the United Nations since 1951, when it closed the Suez Canal to ships of Israeli origin, in violation also of the agreement of 1888.

Certainly it was also a violation of international law to close the Straits of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba.

Last Thursday, the Secretary of the United Nations, Mr. Hammarskjold, said that Egypt had given private assurances that this area might be neutralized. In the few remarks which I made on that day I asked whether Egypt was not willing to make this alleged private assurance public so it would become binding upon the country to the degree that any such pledge may be binding. No such public pledge was given. We do not know what happened, but the press dispatches from Saudi Arabia and Cairo indicated that the Arabian countries did not look kindly upon any public pledge based on the alleged offer of the Secretary of State to do something to get the Straits of Tiran open for navigation.

In any event, Mr. President, unless the American attitude changes we are likely to become involved in grave trouble and play directly into the hands of Nasser and the Arab bloc, with the result that war may break out. If that occurs, no one knows where it will stop.

Mr. President, I should also like to speak briefly, if I may, on the question of the Gaza strip itself. This territory is only 6 miles wide and 25 miles long, but it has within it 200,000 Arab refugees and about 60,000 Palistinean Arabs. It was not at any time a part of Egypt. It was a part of Palestine under the British mandate. By the armistice agreement of 1949 it was put under the military protection of Egypt.

Mr. President, wrongs have been committed on both sides in connection with the Gaza Strip, and we should not maintain that Israel has been entirely innocent in this matter, because from the evidence that I can gather, Israel made a raid upon Gaza in February 1955. But this raid was followed by a series of reprisals by Egypt with armed but nonuniformed guerrillas, some 600 operating from the Gaza strip into Israeli territory. Many Israelis were murdered. It was in part to prevent these raids from continuing that the Israelis launched their attack on October 29.

If Gaza is allowed to return to the conditions existing prior to October 29 and the Egyptians move back in, we may be quite certain that these raids will continue. If they do continue, there will be a series not only of irritations but of conflicts, and conflicts of this nature may burst into a general war.

It would seem that the proper thing to do is for the United Nations, with its police force, to occupy the Gaza Strip and to neutralize it against attacks by Egypt on Israel or attacks by Israel on Egypt. Here, as in the case of the Straits of Tiran, there is a great need for the United Nations to neutralize the area and to insulate it from violence.

Three weeks ago the very able representative from Canada on the United Nations Lester Barson urged just such a policy as this. I believe that it would have been supported by Great Britain, by France, by the countries of the British Commonwealth, and, in general, by the free world. The American delegate, Mr. Lodge, however, chose not to support that proposal. Instead, he advanced a

meaningless second resolution which apparently is being pushed into the background and emphasis is being placed upon the first resolution, namely, complete and unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli troops.

If this is to be the policy of the United States the results within the next few days as I have repeatedly said, may be disastrous, and we shall find that instead of reducing the danger of war in the Middle East we may have increased that danger.

I wish to urge, therefore, Mr. President, that the President and the State Department think this matter over once again very solemnly. If they do, in my judgment they will support the proposal of Canada, namely, that there should be a permanent occupation by the U. N. of the Straits of Tiran, the western shores of the Gulf of Aqaba, and the Gaza strip.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks the three documents to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 18, 1957]

UNITED STATES STATEMENTS ON ISRAELI IMPASSE—MEMORANDUM TO ISRAEL

The United Nations General Assembly has sought specifically, vigorously, and almost unanimously, the prompt withdrawal from Egypt of the armed forces of Britain, France, and Israel. Britain and France have complied unconditionally. The forces of Israel have been withdrawn to a considerable extent but still hold Egyptian territory at Sharm el Sheikh at the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba. They also occupy the Gaza Strip which is territory specified by the armistice arrangements to be occupied by Egypt.

We understand that it is the position of Israel that (1) it will evacuate its military forces from the Gaza Strip provided Israel retains the civil administration and police in some relationship to the United Nations; and (2) it will withdraw from Sharm el Sheikh if continued freedom of passage through the straits is assured.

With respect to (1) the Gaza Strip—it is the view of the United States that the United Nations General Assembly has no authority to require of either Egypt or Israel a substantial modification of the armistice agreement, which, as noted, now gives Egypt the right and responsibility of occupation. Accordingly, we believe that Israeli withdrawal from Gaza should be prompt and unconditional, leaving the future of the Gaza Strip to be worked out through the efforts and good offices of the United Nations.

We recognize that the area has been a source of armed infiltration and reprisals back and forth contrary to the armistice agreement and is a source of great potential danger because of the presence there of so large a number of Arab refugees—about 200,000. Accordingly, we believe that the United Nations General Assembly and the Secretary General should seek that the United Nations Emergency Force, in the exercise of its mission, move into this area and be on the boundary between Israel and the Gaza Strip.

The United States will use its best efforts to help to assure this result, which we believe is contemplated by the second resolution of February 2, 1957.

EGYPTIAN STAND RECALLED

with respect to (2) the Gulf of Aqaba and access thereto—the United States believes that the gulf comprehends international waters and that no nation has the right to prevent free and innocent passage in the gulf and through the straits giving access thereto. We have in mind not only commercial usage, but the passage of pilgrims on religious missions, which should be fully respected.

The United States recalls that on January 28, 1950, the Egyptian Ministry of Foreign Affairs informed the United States that the Egyptian occupation of the two islands of Tiran and Sanafir at the entrance of the Gulf of Aqaba was only to protect the islands themselves against possible damage or violation and that this occupation being in no way conceived in a spirit of obstruction in any way innocent passage through the stretch of water separating these two islands from the Egyptian coast of Sinai, it follows that this passage, the only practicable one, will remain free as in the past, in conformity with international practice and recognized principles of the law of nations.

In the absence of some overriding decision to the contrary, as by the International Court of Justice, the United States, on behalf of vessels of United States registry, is prepared to exercise the right of free and innocent passage and to join with others to secure general recognition of this right.

It is, of course, clear that the enjoyment of a right of free and innocent passage by Israel would depend upon its prior withdrawal in accordance with the United Nations resolutions. The United States has no reason to assume that any littoral state would under these circumstances obstruct the right of free and innocent passage.

The United States believes that the United Nations General Assembly and the Secretary General, as a precautionary measure, seek that the United Nations emergency force move into the straits areas as the Israeli forces are withdrawn. This, again, we believe to be within the contemplation of the second resolution of February 2, 1957.

(3) The United States observes that the recent resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly call not only for the prompt and unconditional withdrawal of Israel behind the armistice lines but call for other measures.

We believe, however, that the United Nations has properly established an order of events and an order of urgency and that the first requirement is that forces of invasion and occupation should withdraw.

The United States is prepared publicly to declare that it will use its influence, in concert with other United Nations members, to the end that following Israel's withdrawal, these other measures will be implemented.

We believe that our views and purposes in this respect are shared by many other nations and that a tranquil future for Israel is best assured by reliance upon that fact, rather than by an occupation in defiance of the overwhelming judgment of the world community.

---

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 18, 1957]

TEXT OF ISRAELI REPLY TO UNITED STATES PROPOSALS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Following are full excerpts from the aide memoire handed by Israeli Ambassador Abba Eban to Secretary of State Dulles last Friday, as released by the Israeli Embassy last night.)

The Government of Israel deeply appreciates the sympathetic interest of the President and the Secretary of State in its problems, and their willingness to devote earnest study to the quest for solutions. It regards this constructive interest as a further expression of American friendship for Israel and of American concern for peace in the Middle East.

Israel has noted with satisfaction the affirmative approach of the United States to the question of free navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba and the Straits of Tiran.

The Government of Israel expresses its agreement in principle with the approach to this question defined by the Secretary of State in his aide memoire of February 11 and in his conversation with the Ambassador of Israel on that date:

(1) The affirmation that the gulf comprehends international waters, and that all nations, including Israel, have the right of free and innocent passage in the gulf and through the straits giving access thereto.

(2) The invocation in the aide memoire of the assurances conveyed by Egypt to the United States on January 28, 1950.

(3) The statement of the readiness of the United States, on behalf of vessels of United States registry, to exercise the right of free and innocent passage, and to join with others to secure general recognition of this right.

(4) The suggestion that as a precautionary measure the UNEF move into the area of the straits as the Israeli forces are withdrawn.

DANGER POINTED OUT

While giving full weight to these policies and attitudes, the Israeli Government is conscious of the danger which would arise to the freedom of Israeli shipping in the gulf and to peace in the area if Egypt were to resume occupation of the Straits of Tiran before the attainment of a settlement. For many years Egypt has maintained restrictions in the Suez Canal contrary to the convention of 1888 and to decisions of the Security Council which, under article 25 of the charter, have binding effect on all members of the United Nations.

These policies, together with corresponding restrictions in the Gulf of Aqaba, have cut Israel off from her freedom of commerce with large parts of the world; have inflicted enormous losses and burdens upon Israel's economy, and have constituted a danger to peace and security in the Middle East.

Despite the disapproval of the United Nations and of the maritime community, including the United States, no effective steps were taken to insure the termination of these practices.

Recent expressions of Egyptian policy give ample grounds for the belief that, if no preventive measures are taken, the Egyptian restrictions in the Gulf of Aqaba and the Straits of Tiran will be resumed, with consequent peril both to Israel's national interests and to peace in the area.

SAFEGUARDS ASKED

In order to meet this danger, the Government of Israel supports the suggestion that units of the UNEF move into the straits as Israeli troops withdraw. But it holds that these units should be stationed along the western coast of the Gulf of Aqaba until a peace settlement is achieved, or until an agreed and permanent arrangement for freedom of navigation is otherwise secured. In this connection Israel has noted the proposal made on behalf of the United States by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge in the United Nations on January 28 and February 2, 1957.

Failing such an arrangement for the stationing of UNEF the Government of Israel suggests that a precise guaranty be afforded for the specific protection of Israel-bound shipping exercising its right of passage in the straits and the gulf.

The Government of Israel has studied the observations in the aide memoire of February 11 on the Gaza Strip. It has, in particular, noted the following elements:

(1) The recognition that this area, until recently under Egyptian occupation, "has been a source of armed infiltration and reprisals" and of "great potential danger because of the presence there of so large a number of Arab refugees."

(2) The fact that the United States has not crystallized a final view on the future

of the Gaza Strip but that this future, in its view, "should be worked out through the efforts and good offices of the United Nations."

The Government of Israel wishes to add the following comments:

The Gaza Strip, occupied during the invasion of 1948, was never Egyptian territory. The armistice agreement under which Egypt occupied the strip was continuously broken by Egypt. In violation of the United Nations Charter and of the decision of the Security Council against belligerency, Egypt conducted hostile acts against Israel. These actions were based on a doctrine of a state of war with Israel, which Egypt still declines to relinquish, despite the fact that this doctrine, and any actions arising therefrom were repudiated by the Security Council in 1951. In these circumstances there is no basis for the restoration of the status quo ante in Gaza by the return of Egypt to an area which she used exclusively for the purpose of establishing an aggressive base against Israel.

THREE PROBLEMS CITED

Israel's stand on the Gaza question is influenced by three problems:

(a) The security of Israel, and especially that of its villages and settlements in the south and the Negev;

(b) The welfare and economic situation of the local population;

(c) The problem of the refugees.

Israel is prepared to make a supreme effort to help raise the standard of the residents of the area from the fearful poverty which grew increasingly disastrous during the Egyptian occupation.

The Government of Israel is ready to make its contribution to a United Nations program for settling the refugee population of the Gaza Strip. Israel's contributions, within this framework, will consist both in the payment of compensation and in the settlement of a part of the refugee population of Gaza. Israel is confident that the United States will understand the significant effect of this step for the solution of basic problems which have been deadlocked for several years.

PROBE MISSION SUGGESTED

In view of the vital importance of the Gaza problem and the contribution envisaged by Israel towards its solution, it is suggested that an effort be made to find a suitable arrangement which might be submitted to the United Nations.

This examination, which might include an investigation of the position in the area by a suitable mission, should not take a long time. The steps immediately envisaged are the withdrawal of Israeli forces and the discussion of a suitable relationship between the U. N. and the local and Israel administrative services.

Israel believes that it is necessary to prevent a recurrence of the turbulent conditions out of which the recent hostilities arose. There should be a new era in the relations between Egypt and Israel. By constantly violating the armistice, through the invocation of belligerent rights and the conduct of blockades and hostilities, Egypt distorted the fundamental character of the armistice agreement as a transition to peace, and emptied it of its central purpose. At a time when the agreement had full legal force, Egypt regarded it as an expression of "a state of war." In these circumstances, Israel cannot legitimately be requested to return to the status quo ante, and to resume adherence to an agreement which Egypt has nullified throughout a period of 8 years by claiming and exercising a policy of belligerency inconsistent with its terms.

At the same time, the Government of Israel declared that it does not seek or claim any belligerent rights against Egypt, and that it undertakes to abstain, on the basis of reciprocity, from any hostile act whatever against Egypt.

SHIPPING PROBLEM RAISED

The aide memoire of February 11 deals with the questions of Gaza and the Gulf of Aqaba, since problems exist in both areas in connection with the withdrawal of forces. While no context of withdrawal arises in the case of the Suez Canal, the Government of Israel emphasizes its hope for United States support in securing the implementation of Israel's rights under the 1888 convention. On many occasions, the most recent of which was President Eisenhower's public statement on February 6, the United States has noted the violation by Egypt of its obligations under the 1888 convention in respect of Israel-bound shipping.

The United Nations has devoted great effort to secure the clearance of the Suez Canal for navigation. If the Suez Canal is to be reopened physically and then to be operated with discrimination, the United Nations will have inadvertently become responsible for expediting the renewed violation of international law.

It is inconceivable that the Suez Canal can be opened by the United Nations and remain closed to any of its member-states. It is essential, in the interest of peace and security, to ensure that Egypt refrains from interference with Israeli and Israel-bound shipping exercising the right of free and innocent passage in this international waterway. The Government of Israel would welcome a clarification of United States policy on this point.

The constructive and affirmative approach expressed by the Secretary of State in the conversation and aide memoire of February 11 confirms the belief that the United States and Israel have a common aspiration to strengthen peace in the Middle East. In view of the great measure of proximity between the viewpoints of the two governments on these questions under discussion, the Government of Israel attaches great importance to a continuing discussion of the two respective positions.

---

[From the New York Times of February 18, 1957]

UNITED STATES STATEMENT OF ISRAELI IMPASSE

EISENHOWER STATEMENT

The Department of State is today making public a memorandum which the United States gave to the Government of Israel on February 1. It relates to Israeli withdrawal to within the armistice lines as repeatedly called for by the United Nations. The memorandum outlines the policies which the United States would, thereafter, pursue in relation to the two matters—the Gulf of Aqaba and the Gaza Strip—which so far lead Israel not to withdraw.

Israel would prefer to have the future status of the Gulf of Aqaba and the Gaza Strip definitely settled to its satisfaction prior to its withdrawal, and as a condition thereto. But all members of the United Nations are solemnly bound by the Charter to settle their international disputes by peaceful means and in their international relations to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity of any state. These undertakings seem to preclude using the forcible seizure and occupation of other lands as bargaining power in the settlement of international disputes.

The United Kingdom and France, which occupied portions of Egypt at about the time of Israel's attack upon Egypt of last October, withdrew promptly and unconditionally in response to the United Nations resolution that called for Israeli withdrawal.

They deferred to the overwhelming judgment of the world community that a solution of their difficulties with Egypt should be sought after withdrawal and not be made a condition precedent to withdrawal. The United States believes that Israel should do likewise.

President Eisenhower's letter to Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion of Israel of November 8, 1956, urged, as a matter of highest priority that Israeli forces be withdrawn to the general armistice lines.

"After which," the President said, "new and energetic steps should be undertaken within the framework of the United Nations to solve the basic problems which have given rise to the present difficulty."

Prime Minister Ben-Gurion in his reply said: "In view of the United Nations resolutions regarding the withdrawal of foreign troops from Egypt and the creation of an international force, we will, upon conclusion of satisfactory arrangements with the United Nations in connection with this international force entering the Suez Canal area, willingly withdraw our forces."

The international force referred to by the Prime Minister has been created and pursuant to arrangements which the United Nations has deemed satisfactory, has entered into and is now within the Suez Canal area. But while there has been a partial withdrawal of Israeli forces from Egypt, Israel persists in its occupation of Egyptian territory around the entrance of the Gulf of Aqaba and of the Gaza Strip.

The United States is aware of the fact that Israel has legitimate grievances and should, in all fairness, see a prospect of remedying them. The United Nations General Assembly by its second resolution of February 2, endorsing the Secretary General's report, gave such a prospect. We believe that that prospect is further assured by the view which the United States has formulated and communicated to Israel in its memorandum of February 11. There, the United States took note of Israeli views with reference to the Gaza Strip and the Straits of Aqaba and made clear what the United States would do, after Israel's withdrawal, to help solve the problems that preoccupy Israel. Our declaration related to our intentions, both as a member of the United Nations and as a maritime power having rights of our own.

The United States believes that the action of the United Nations of February 2 and the statements of various governments, including the United States memorandum of February 11, provide Israel with the maximum assurance that it can reasonably expect at this juncture, or that can be reconciled with fairness to others.

Accordingly, the United States has renewed its plea to Israel to withdraw in accordance with the repeated demands of the United Nations and to rely upon the resoluteness of all friends of justice to bring about a state of affairs which will conform to the principles of justice and of international law and serve impartially the proper interest of all in the area.

This, the United States believes, should provide a greater source of security for Israel than an occupation continued contrary to the overwhelming judgment of the world community.

The United States, for its part, will strive to remain true to, and support, the United Nations in its efforts to sustain the purposes and principles of the charter as the world's best hope of peace.

---

## STATE DEPARTMENT'S REFUSAL OF PASSPORTS TO COMPETENT AMERICAN REPORTERS OF EVENTS IN RED CHINA

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, any governmental policy that diminishes the amount of accurate and reliable information the American people can obtain on significant events in the world must be justified by overwhelming affirmative evidence showing genuine need for its continuance.

The State Department's expressed policy of refusing passports to competent American reporters who seek merely to report the events as they find them in Red China has been condemned by almost every branch of American journalism.

By withholding the opportunity of honest and objective reporting of conditions our competent American newspapermen find there, we are forced to rely for our information on secondhand rewrites of news reported by journalists of other countries.

Our loss in this warmed-over coverage is not merely the loss to our periodicals, but a loss to the American public itself. The keen insight which could be exercised by our own newspapermen, the penetrating examination of facts versus propaganda, which is possible only by on-the-ground coverage, is lost by such a policy as the State Department insists on keeping in force.

Certainly this policy involves the fundamental right of the freedom of the press. But, more importantly, it involves the right of Americans to know, which is the basic reason for this constitutional guaranty.

The reasons thus far given by the State Department have failed completely to justify a continuation of their policy. Unless more compelling reasons can be submitted by the State Department, we can only conclude that they insist on the power to prohibit the right of access to news whenever their opinion dictates such a course.

This comes perilously close to censorship of news gathering at the source and is incompatible with our ideals of a free press.

Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the RECORD with my remarks several editorials from the Nation's leading newspapers on this subject.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHINA REPORTING: MR. DULLES' BAN

We can hardly wait for Secretary of State Dulles' next press conference and the next State Department explanation of why American correspondents are being barred from Red China by this country.

The act is better than that of any quick-change artist.

Now Dulles says that the Chinese Communists are attempting to use the correspondent issue as an instrument of diplomacy. He outdoes himself on this one, stating that the Reds had picked correspondents they wanted to come to China and contending that passports are never issued for travel to a country whose regime we do not recognize.

The Chinese Communists may now be trying to use the correspondent issue as a form of blackmail, although Dulles has given no evidence whatsoever to support the charge. Even so, the United States should have refused to recognize a link between correspondents and prisoners, if it was proposed. It should have recognized from the start that the American public is entitled to know from representatives of its own newspapers what is going on in Communist China. (Milwaukee Journal.)

Mr. Dulles, in discussing the State Department's ban on the entry of newspapermen into Red China, has made a bad matter worse. He says now—this is the first the public has heard of it—that the Chinese Communists "have said in effect that they want to have certain American correspondents come to Communist China and will hold Americans in jail until we allow them to come."

Mr. Dulles' implication that only correspondents favorable to Red China would be sent was wholly unfair. Had it not been for the State Department's opposition, backed by the threat of coercion at law, Mr. A. T. Steele would have gone to Red China for this newspaper—a correspondent whose loyalty, ability, and experience of China are beyond cavil.

If American newspapermen go to Red China, it will not be because of any Communist blackmail. A free press is not a subject for barter. The State Department cannot send correspondents anywhere in the world. That is done by the newspapers themselves, in the interest of the readers' right to know. (New York Herald Tribune.)

What the State Department is doing amounts to bargaining with a right of the American press: If Peiping will abandon its illegal and inhumane detention of the prisoners, then Washington will allow the press to do its duty in China.

There is no evidence that keeping the American press out of Red China is alleviating the plight of the prisoners. This restraint of the press is simply keeping Americans from obtaining accurate accounts of what is going on in a nation afflicted with a particularly virulent brand of communism. (St. Louis Post-Dispatch.)

The American public is entitled to know from their own observers what is happening in Communist China. This is a question of freedom of the press and freedom of knowledge, and it is farfetched to say, as Mr. Dulles did, that it means yielding to Communist blackmail and would set a precedent dangerous to Americans in other countries in the future. The Peiping government may have linked the entry of American correspondents to the release of American prisoners, but if so, the United States should have refused to recognize such a link. * * *

Mr. Dulles claimed that he was not aware that any correspondents tried to go to China before the recent group. This is extraordinary, because his Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, Carl McCardle, and his Deputy Under Secretary, Robert Murphy, among others at the State Department, have known for at least 2 years that American correspondents were trying to get to China and were blocked by the State Department. * * *

The sooner the State Department drops its present position on American correspondents going to Communist China the better. As Mr. Dulles must have realized at his conference, the Amercian press feels strongly about this and is not going to let up the pressure. (New York Times.)

---

## TRIBUTE TO JAMES BOBO, FORMERLY CHIEF COUNSEL OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that a young man whom most Senators know and respect is today taking up new duties as assistant to the mayor of the great city of Memphis, in my home State of Tennessee.

Mr. James Bobo, a fine young lawyer, who has served for the past 3 years as chief counsel of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, and who deserves much of the credit for the outstanding service performed by that subcommittee, has decided to return home and become associated with Mayor Edmund Orgill. Mayor Orgill, an outstanding businessman and civic leader, is serving his first term as mayor of Memphis, and Mr. Bobo's cooperation in assisting him in the attack which he has launched on municipal problems will be both rewarding and provocative.

I know that most Senators share with me the regret at the loss to the Senate of such an outstanding staff member, but join in wishing him well in these new fields of public endeavor.

I recently read in the Memphis Press-Scimitar an article written by Washington Correspondent Milton Britten, which is both an excellent description of the work which Mr. Bobo has done so well while in Washington, and an announcement of his new position. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORGILL PICKS JIM BOBO AS AIDE—NOW COUNSEL FOR SENATE GROUP

Mayor Edmund Orgill announced today he will appoint as his administrative assistant James H. Bobo, chief counsel for the United States Senate subcommittee investigating juvenile delinquency.

In Memphis today after a trip to Washington, D. C., Orgill said: "I talked with Jim Bobo about it while in Washington. I intend to talk with members of the City Commission about it tomorrow.

"Jim was born in Memphis. He was graduated from Bruce School, Bellevue Junior High and Tech High. He served in the Air Force almost 4 years. He is a graduate of Memphis State with a B. S. degree in history, and he got his law degree at Vanderbilt.

"His experience in other cities as associate counsel and as general counsel of the Senate Judiciary subcommittee on juvenile delinquency will be of value to us here."

NAMED BY ESTES

Bobo was appointed to the committee post by Tennessee's Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, who chaired subcommittee until it was reorganized this month. New committee chairman is Senator TOM HENNINGS (Democrat, Missouri).

Bobo, 35, practiced law in Memphis 2 years before going to Washington 3 years ago. Recently, he was nominated in the Memphis Junior Chamber of Commerce competition for outstanding young man of the year.

STARTING FEBRUARY 15

Orgill said Bobo's present job in Washington will be completed February 7, and they discussed his going to work in Memphis February 15. Bobo will succeed William W. Farris, named city personnel director.

As chief counsel for the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, Jim, a big (6 feet, 5½ inches, 267 pounds) attorney and Baptist layman, has come face to face with the czars of American smut.

In the course of his 200,000-mile travels throughout this country and Alaska he has sat across counsel tables from the sleazy representatives of the $500-million-a-year pornography industry.

He has questioned filth-peddlers who sobbed in fear for their lives and invoked the fifth amendment rather than give testimony about others of their ilk who, they feared, might kill them.

The investigations he spearheaded were followed by at least one death. The body of a major pornography distributor who had customers in 35 States, Canada, and Mexico, was found crushed and lifeless between the

cars of a moving freight train in Houston, Tex. It was called a suicide.

Jim has also questioned the respectable citizens—the substantial ones—the ones you'd never suspect of peddling black market babies in interstate shipment.

And he has done his bit to snarl the drug traffic—the pushers who "hook" high school kids who perhaps spend the rest of their lives trying to get the "monkey off their backs."

"At first we heard," says Jim, "that the pornography racket was Communist inspired and the narcotics traffic was a Red Chinese plot, both aimed at undermining our American youth.

"We found this wasn't so. We found that the pornographers were just a bunch of good-for-nothings who peddled for money. Almost without exception the peddler was a man between 45 and 65 who had an extensive police record for various offenses, no apparent means of livelihood, and a reported income of between $25,000 and $75,000 a year."

VILLAINS AT HOME

"We found the same crumby type of character was also involved in the narcotics traffic. Above all, it was a profit motive. Apparently there are enough Americans willing to undermine our youth that we don't have to look abroad for villains.

"Those in the black market baby business were mostly pretty well known—doctors, lawyers, midwives; pretty substantial people whom you'd never suspect. They had probably been at it so long that they justified it as a public service and got to believing it. But the profits were tremendous. Babies sold for an average of $1,500 to $3,000, the only cost being for the prenatal care and hospitalization of the mother."

After 3 years, isn't Jim's faith in people jarred a little?

"Well, yes and no," he says.

For he has also questioned clergymen and teachers and parents and social workers and civic leaders—folks just as concerned as he and the Senate subcommittee about the future of American youth.

Since it was formed in late 1953, the subcommittee has spent $458,000 in its investigation, and has come up with 10 reports—on the effect of motion pictures, TV, comic books, obscene literature on juveniles, on juvenile delinquency in Alaska and among the Indians, on youth employment and education as they relate to delinquency, and others.

There has been some criticism against the amount of time and money spent on the subcommittee's work. But Jim thinks the work has justified itself.

Jim's a bachelor. He is a member of the First Baptist Church in Memphis.

## APPOINTMENTS TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the announced retirement of Supreme Court Justice Stanley Reed on February 25 presents the President with another, and his fourth, opportunity to select an eminent jurist to fill a vacancy on the Supreme Court of the United States.

I sincerely hope that the nominee will be selected primarily on the basis of judicial merit and experience. In years past many such appointments have been on the basis of other considerations. In failing to protest, and even to stop, such practices, the Senate has contributed to this unsound procedure, and has thereby failed to exercise one of its basic and positive constitutional functions; that is, "advising" with the President as to such appointments.

Article II, section 2 of the Constitution provides:

He (the President) shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint * * * Judges of the Supreme Court.

Last year I submitted Senate Resolution 264. This would require that at least 1 of each 2 successive nominees confirmed by the Senate for the office of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court should have had at least 10 years of prior judicial service before confirmation. At the time of the submission of the resolution I sought to alert the Senate to its constitutional duty, long neglected, to advise with the Chief Executive prior to the appointment of a person to fill such a vacancy.

I know that I am not alone in my concern about the recent trend in Federal Court decisions resulting from the practice of making appointments to the Supreme Court on other bases than judicial merit and experience.

At the time the resolution was submitted I pointed out that the advice and consent clause of the Constitution, article II, section 2, was grounded in Anglo-Saxon law and that its use in America antedated the American Constitution by some 140 years. It is found in the Second Charter of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. The advice and consent concept is perhaps the most firmly grounded idea in Anglo-Saxon law. A study prepared by the Library of Congress at my request traced this concept back to the year 755, the theme of the advice being concurrence in a proposed action given by wise men to the sovereign; the concept is reaffirmed in the ad hoc committee of barons which exacted from King John the great charter—Magna Carta. In its preamble it is explicitly stated that it is granted at the advice of various individuals, high churchmen and nobles, all mentioned by name.

Again, it appears by act of Parliament in 1700, and was carried forward into the American concept of government in colonial charters prior to the emergence of our own Constitution. To me it is evident that the framers of our great charter intended to retain the advice and consent concept by creating, in effect, a fourth branch of government consisting of the President and the Senate in regard to the highly important matters of appointments to offices specified in the Constitution and to the conduct of our foreign affairs by treaty and otherwise. This is the concept which has been lost. This is a constitutional duty of the Senate, long neglected. Recognition of our duty in this regard can come no earlier than the Senate's awareness of its responsibility.

Consent is not advice. In practice, the word "advice" as it appears in article II, section 2 of the Constitution is meaningless. There is no play on words here. Two different functions are involved, and the Senate has historically—at least since Washington's second term—neglected its duty to advise with the Executive prior to the placing of a name in nomination. It has limited its activity to the admittedly arbitrary process of confirmation. I send to the desk and ask to have printed a resolution identical in form and substance to that submitted last year, which reads as follows:

*Resolved*, That from and after the date of adoption of this resolution, at least 1 of each 2 successive nominees confirmed by the Senate for the office of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court shall, at the time of the confirmation, have had at least 10 years of judicial service. For the purpose of this paragraph, "judicial service" means service as a justice of the United States (as defined in sec. 451 of title 28, United States Code), a judge of a court of appeals or district court, or a justice or judge of the highest court of a State or of any other State court having general jurisdiction.

In plain terms, the resolution means that the Senate advises in advance that it will require that at least half of the Supreme Court nominees be persons having at least 10 years of prior judicial experience; otherwise the nominations will not be confirmed.

The language is simple, but the simplicity of the resolution's language is not intended to be misleading. Its effect, within the letter and spirit of the Constitution, is to establish qualifications for the office of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. There is, in my mind, a serious constitutional question whether this could be done by law, but there is no doubt in my mind that the Senate may, in the exercise of its duty to advise the President on nominees, establish criteria for confirmation.

Its effectiveness will, of course, depend upon the self-discipline of the Senate, but the first question to be answered is whether the qualifications to be established are reasonable. I do not believe that anyone will seriously argue that less than the best available legal talent should be the area of selection for persons to fill vacancies in this highest tribunal. Certainly, experience should be seriously considered as a qualification for each nominee. Judicial experience, with its tempering influence of years of detached consideration of legal problems presented, must be the highest type of experience which could qualify anyone for this post. The resolution provides that only one of two successive—or half of the—nominees shall have had sufficient experience to demonstrate his ability as a judge. So far as this resolution is concerned, the other half may be chosen on any other criteria which may lead the President to make the nomination. Some such latitude is desirable, and I do not wish to restrict unduly any Chief Executive, nor do I desire completely to disqualify large groups of capable lawyers,

I sincerely hope that by my submitting this resolution early in the session it will result in its receiving the considered attention of all Senators, and that favorable action may eventually be taken during the session.

The response to my resolution last year was very gratifying. I appreciate the number of thinking citizens from all sections of the country who share my concern about the lack of prior judicial experience of present members of the Court, and those who understand that the Senate is not a rubber stamp in the appointing process.

The results of the present methods of selection are well known. The 85th Congress may look forward to a host of bills designed to correct the mischief done by inexperienced men placed in a position of great judicial power—on the Supreme Court of the United States.

There are, of course, issues on which men of good will may disagree, and, as is pointed out, there are two sides to every lawsuit. However, the number of revolutionary innovations in the constitutional law of this country, promulgated in incomprehensible opinions in recent years, has led to a legislative stampede to reverse individual Court decisions by specific legislation.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to read a list of ten bills passed in the last 20 years by Congress for the sole and specific purpose of reversing Federal Court opinion arrived at contrary to the intent of Congress in enacting the statutes under consideration. The list is not comprehensive, nor is it probable that an absolutely complete list could readily be compiled. Other examples will occur to Senators as they review these instances in the light of recent American legislative history.

The cases and the subsequent acts of Congress since 1935 include *Kessler* v. *Strecker* (307, U. S. 22 (1939), 54 Stat. 673)—deportation of alien Communists; *United States* v. *South Eastern Underwriters Ass'n.* (322 U. S. 533 (1944), 59 Stat. 33)—regulation of insurance companies; *Anderson* v. *Mt. Clemens Pottery Co.* (328 U. S. 680 (1946), 63 Stat. 910)—portal-to-portal pay; *Dobson* v. *Commissioner* (320 U. S. 489 (1943), 62 Stat. 991)—review of Tax Court Decisions; *Wong Yang Sung* v. *McGrath* (339 U. S. 33 (1950), 64 Stat. 1048)—application of Administrative Procedure Act to deportation of aliens; *Schwegmann Bros.* v. *Calvert Distillers Corp.* (341 U. S. 384 (1951), 66 Stat. 631)—Fair Trade Acts, resale price maintenance; *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19 (1947)); *United States* v. *Louisiana* (339 U. S. 699 (1950)); *United States* v. *Texas* (339 U. S. 707 (1950), 67 Stat. 29)—submerged land; *United States* v. *Wunderlich* (342 U. S. 98 (1951), 68 Stat. 81)—finality clauses in Government contracts; *Federal Power Commission* v. *East Ohio Gas Co.*, (338 U. S. 464 (1950), 68 Stat. 36)—regulation of gas distributing companies; and *United States* v. *State of Wyoming and the Ohio Oil Company* (331 U. S. 440 (1947), 62 Stat. 1233)—lands held and developed in good faith.

Besides invading the legislative field, and through decisions arriving at irreconcilable interpretation of Federal laws, the Court has also upset its own body of case law to the extent that judicial precedent probably means less in the Supreme Court of the United States than in any other court, State or Federal, in the country. Actually, 36 cases have been specifically overruled by the Supreme Court of the United States since 1932. This is 7 more than the 29 which were overruled by the same Court during the first 142 years of its history, from 1789 to 1932.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRICKER. How many of those decisions were subsequently overruled by action of the Congress?

Mr. STENNIS. I do not know.

Mr. BRICKER. Quite a number that I remember very well have been changed by subsequent action of the Congress, when the Congress felt there was a misinterpretation on the part of the Supreme Court of the law as written.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. In the cases I cited earlier I gave some illustrations of the cases in which the Congress has expressly overruled the interpretations made by the Supreme Court.

Mr. BRICKER. Yes. The Senator from Mississippi mentioned some 36, did he not?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. Thirty-six cases have been specifically overruled by the Supreme Court of the United States since 1932.

Mr. BRICKER. Those were reversals of the Court's own position, taken previously, were they not?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; the Court was reversing its own prior decisions.

Mr. BRICKER. In other words, in those cases the Court failed to follow the precedents established by its previous decisions; is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. Those 36 are 7 more than the 29 which were overruled by the Supreme Court of the United States during the previous 142 years of its history.

Mr. BRICKER. How many of the 36 were involved in actions of the Congress legislatively to upset decisions of the Court?

Mr. STENNIS. I am sure I can supply the Senator from Ohio with that information, but I do not have it before me at this time.

Mr. BRICKER. I should like to have the information supplied for the RECORD.

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for a further question?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. I think the Senator from Mississippi will agree with me that there is no way to enforce such a resolution, other than for the Senate to stand by its own judgment in such a matter.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Ohio is correct. I have said it will be a question of self-discipline on the part of the Senate. However, I believe the proposed action should be taken, and can be taken.

Another course would be to incorporate such a policy into the rules of the Senate. However, amendment of the rules of the Senate is a rather touchy subject at this time; and I wanted to obtain a more practical approach to the matter, and one which might result in earlier favorable action.

Mr. BRICKER. I think it might be well for the Senate to discipline itself in that respect to such an extent that if the President were to make an improper appointment to the Supreme Court, the appointment simply would not be confirmed by the Senate.

However, I agree with the Senator from Mississippi that the more emphasis we place upon the necessity for a requirement of judicial experience on the part of the judges on the Supreme Court, the better off the country will be.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's opinion, which is a most worthy one.

If the Senate would see fit to announce, in advance, by a solemn resolution, its judgment on this highly important subject, it would have great weight with any President. In a few minutes I shall refer to a news item, and I shall also refer to what the present President has already done along the line of making appointments on the basis of judicial experience.

I thank the Senator from Ohio for his contribution.

Mr. President, I am gratified by the fact that since the submission of my resolution last year, the President selected a State judge as his only nominee for the office of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. This is a healthy reversal of the trend which necessitated the submission of the resolution; and, of course, if judicial experience becomes a qualification applied in making nominations in the future, the purpose of the resolution will have been achieved.

Again, I express the strong hope that the President, in seeking a choice to fill the vacancy to be created by Justice Reed's retirement, will select only a mature and seasoned jurist with proven judicial capacity and experience on the bench. There are a number of such men on our courts of appeals, our district courts, our State supreme courts, and our trial courts of general jurisdiction.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a news item from the New York Times of February 6, 1957. The headline is "Eisenhower Favors a Jurist in Reed Job."

At this time I wish to read one sentence from the article:

> The President said he would not state it as an unqualified rule that he always would appoint men with judicial experience. But that was his preference, he continued, and he would depart from it only "in a very unusual circumstance" and for a "man who enjoyed in the United States a reputation in law something like that of the late John W. Davis, Elihu Root, or someone of that character."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> EISENHOWER FAVORS A JURIST IN REED JOB
>
> WASHINGTON, February 6.—President Eisenhower reiterated today his preference for men with judicial experience for appointment to the United States Supreme Court.
>
> His answer to a news conference question appeared to rule out speculation that the next vacancy, to be created by the retirement of Associate Justice Stanley F. Reed on February 25, might be filled by appointment of Herbert Brownell, Jr., Attorney General, or former Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York.

By his reply, the President again centered attention on judges now serving in the Federal courts—either at the district or circuit court levels—or in State supreme courts.

The President said he would not state it as an unqualified rule that he always would appoint men with judicial experience. But that was his preference, he continued, and he would depart from it only "in a very unusual circumstance" and for a "man who enjoyed in the United States a reputation in law something like that of the late John W. Davis, Elihu Root, or someone of that character."

Mr. Root, a noted lawyer, also was Secretery of State under President Theodore Roosevelt, and Republican Senator from New York. He died in 1937. Mr. Davis, who died in 1955, was Democratic presidential nominee in 1924.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for a further question?

Mr. STENNIS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I do not wish to interfere with the orderly presentation the Senator from Mississippi is making.

Mr. STENNIS. I am very glad to yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, as I remember the Senator's resolution, it would apply such a requirement only to every other appointment made.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. Thus, the resolution would provide an opportunity for the appointment of a person such as Charles Evans Hughes, who in my opinion was one of the great Justices of the Supreme Court, but had no previous judicial experience.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Ohio has stated my own idea exactly. It is not my purpose to attempt to place an iron jacket on any President, insofar as such appointments are concerned. I do not care to attempt to exclude from consideration and appointment the very large body of trained, outstanding, fine lawyers who would not be eligible under an absolute requirement that only judges be appointed. The resolution leaves the door wide open for the consideration of persons who have not had judicial experience.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, regardless of when the impending vacancy is filled, this resolution should be duly considered and agreed to. This should be done without consideration to any prospective nominee or any particular President or any particular party in control of the executive department of the Government. We are dealing with a principle of government, and are legislating for generations to come. We have positive constitutional power, and hence we have a positive constitutional duty to perform.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Would it be fair to deduce from the statements made by the able Senator from Mississippi and his attitude that in order to demonstrate that he would have no reference to a particular vacancy or pending appointment, his resolution would not apply to a pending vacancy.

Mr. STENNIS. That point is very well made, and certainly that would be my intention. I would not wish to encumber any nomination or this resolution with personal considerations.

That is the very thing we want to get away from. I express the hope that the vacancy will be filled in accordance with the spirit of the resolution, but, of course, I do not expect it to apply, because of the time involved. I would expressly make an exception of any pending nomination.

The Senate should make a definite, clear-cut statement of its position on this important matter, and that position should be known in advance by the people, by the members of the bench and the bar, and by the appointive power. After a nomination has been made, personalities, matters of party loyalty, and loyalty to the President enter. These considerations should not be controlling, but they too frequently are controlling.

The United States Supreme Court should be the crowning achievement of our constitutional Government. It can reach this goal only through the exercise of the greatest caution in making selections of the members of the Court. Any President should be relieved of at least some of the pressures surrounding him in making such selections. The adoption of the resolution proposed would aid rather than hinder a President in performing his task.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. While I have no authority over the Supreme Court, I may say it has been my privilege to submit names for five vacancies on the Federal bench since I have been a Member of the Senate. Of the 5, 4 of the nominees served as circuit judges and 1 as a county judge in my State.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has a commendable record. I thank him highly for his interest in this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Mississippi will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 96) submitted by Mr. STENNIS was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

*Resolved*, That from and after the date of adoption of this resolution, at least 1 of each 2 successive nominees confirmed by the Senate for the office of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court shall, at the time of the confirmation, have had at least 10 years of judicial service. For the purpose of this paragraph, "judicial service" means service as a justice of the United States (as defined in section 451 of title 28, United States Code), a judge of a court of appeals or district court, or a justice or judge of the highest court of a State or of any other State court having general jurisdiction.

## STUDY OF MATTERS RELATING TO THE ELECTION, SUCCESSION, AND DUTIES OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2), to create a joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President.

## URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 63, House bill 4249, making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4249) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

## VISIT TO THE SENATE BY CONCORDIA COLLEGE CHOIR

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, we have in the gallery with us today the choir of Concordia College of Minnesota. They are in the gallery to the right of the Presiding Officer, and to my left. I ask the members of the choir of Concordia College to rise so that Senators may see them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

[The members of the choir rose in their places and were greeted with applause.]

Mr. THYE. The director of the choir is Paul Christiansen. He is the son of the late F. Melius Christiansen, who was the founding director of the famous St. Olaf's College Choir. It is a distinct pleasure for me to introduce to the Senate this splendid group of young folks from Concordia College. They will sing this evening in Washington.

## FORTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the Boy Scouts of America have just concluded the celebration of their 47th anniversary. This event was marked by activities in every city, town, and hamlet of our Nation.

Scouting's 4-year program, Onward for God and My Country, has challenged the youth of America. There are now 4,500,000 boys and leaders actively enrolled in this great movement, and since 1910, when scouting was established in the United States, 26 million boys and leaders have been members.

More than 1 million men and women have volunteered for service in scouting as leaders of the numerous units. They are rendering a great public service.

In its nationwide, nonpartisan get-out-the-vote campaign, the Scouts distributed more than 36 million Liberty Bell doorknob hangers to the homes of America and more than a million posters urging citizens to vote.

One of the great events of 1957 will be the fourth national jamboree to be held in July at Valley Forge. More than 50,000 Scouts, explorers, and leaders will attend. This will be followed by a jubilee jamboree to be held in England in commemoration of the 100th birthday of the founder of the Boy Scout movement, Lord Baden-Powell, and the 50th anniversary of the establishment of scouting in the world. Sixteen hundred American Boy Scouts will attend.

Mr. President, I have a proud recollection of my own part in the early days of scouting. I recall with real pleasure that back in 1911, a year after the Boy Scout movement was inaugurated in America, I organized a troop of Scouts in Waynesburg, Pa., and served as their scoutmaster for 3 years.

The record of these boys in later life has been compiled, and I am proud to say that without exception they became upright Christian citizens. Some of them achieved prominence in business, industry, and the professions. Of the 45 boys in the troop, 31 served in the Armed Forces during World War I. Four gave their lives in action, all members of the 110th Infantry, in which I served and later commanded.

## PROPOSED JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, late last session, 16 of my colleagues joined me in sponsorship of a joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Scientific Research. Others came to me later, stating that they were not in time to add their names to the list of sponsors during the week the resolution laid on the desk, but stated that they wanted me to be advised of their support.

On January 7 of this year, I again introduced this resolution and it was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I rise now, Mr. President, to urge that action be taken at this session of Congress on this joint resolution. I intend to elaborate briefly at this time on the nature, purpose, and urgency of this resolution and to make myself available to answer possible questions from my colleagues.

Mr. President, I cannot overemphasize the importance of this resolution. I would like first to make it clear that I am not one of those who pessimistically prophesy that war is inevitable. To the contrary, I believe this generation has the opportunity to build for a peaceful era which will last far beyond your lifetime or mine. I firmly believe this Nation can best help build for this lasting peace by maintaining her scientific and technological leadership.

I think we all realize, however, that modern warfare is based on science and technology. Therefore, Mr. President, if the peoples of this world were to be so unfortunate as to become involved in world war III then we can be certain that the nation which would be victorious would be the nation which had the greatest scientific and technological advancement. The arsenal and frontline of our defense is the classroom and the laboratory. We are told that our scientists and technicians are doing an outstanding job in our schools and in the laboratories of private industry, but a great gulf exists between this legislative body and the scientist. The joint committee which I have proposed would bridge this gulf.

I think we will all agree that, as of this date, our Nation still maintains its leadership in scientific and technological development. However, our best intelligence reports indicate that the Soviet Union is today graduating more than twice as many scientists and engineers as are being graduated in the United States. We are faced with alarming decreases in the number of teachers at both the high school and college levels in the basic sciences and mathematics. The number of students taking mathematics, physics, chemistry, and related courses is dropping off.

The crux of the problem is this: at the same time that science and technology are moving to a position of unprecedented importance, the manpower to maintain that progress is declining.

Mr. President, it is for this reason that I introduced the joint resolution to establish a joint committee of the House and the Senate on scientific research.

We, in Congress, cannot escape our share of the responsibility for solving this alarming problem of advanced research and development. We, in Congress, must accept the facts; and the truth of the matter is that we are going to become more deeply involved, as time goes on, in entire field of science and technology. We, in the legislative branch, will be called upon more and more frequently to work with plans and programs in this area as established by the executive branch of our Government. Each of us will have to be better informed if we are to meet these problems with intelligent solutions.

To make certain there is no misunderstanding, I should like to make it absolutely clear that the joint committee I have proposed will in no way conflict with or attempt to replace the functions of any present congressional committee. I wish also to point out that there is no existing committee which could logically assume the responsibilities I propose for this Joint Committee on Scientific Research. Each standing committee now has an agenda which presses it to the limit.

The committee which I have proposed, though similar in structure to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, would embrace an entirely different field of activity. It would be broader in scope and interest and would in no way conflict with the Atomic Energy Committee or any other committee.

The committee which I have proposed would have as its main concern the field of manpower in scientific and engineering research and study. It would also serve to gather and maintain scientific information which will help us in the legislative branch to deal with problems in this field more intelligently.

I wish also to make it clear that the proposed Joint Committee on Scientific Research would not conflict with the 19-man committee for the development of scientists and engineers as appointed last year by President Eisenhower. Rather, the committee I have proposed would direct itself toward the solution of legislative problems arising from the scientific and engineering manpower needs of our country. In this way it would complement the efforts being made in the executive branch.

President Eisenhower, by his action, has demonstrated that he is alert to the problems which I have brought to the attention of Senators. The President has appointed some truly outstanding Americans to his advisory committee, and I know that they are doing a highly commendable job. I know this first-hand, inasmuch as one of the members of the committee is a neighbor and close personal friend, Dr. Larry Gould, President of Carlton College at Northfield, Minn. Now, it is up to the Congress to assume its share of this responsibility so that we will be able to meet the rapidly arising problems with a maximum of intelligence.

Since I first introduced this joint resolution in the Senate last session I have been the recipient of letters, newspaper, and magazine clippings, and other messages of approval, testifying with one accord as to the critical scientific and engineering manpower shortage. As Mr. David Sarnoff, Chairman of the Board of the Radio Corporation of America, stated in his testimony on April 25, 1956, before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

> The existence of the problem of scientific and technological manpower shortage is by this time fairly common knowledge. There has been no dearth of warnings about the shortage of trained men for our vast and ever-growing industrial complex.

In other words, Mr. President, we are agreed on the problem, but thus far, this body has done little to acquaint itself with all the facts or even think about a solution of the problem. Yet there is little doubt but that eventually, legislative action will have to be taken to avert the ramifications inherent in this problem.

Only by working with the executive branch of our Government and with the leaders of education, labor, industry, and the military can we fulfill our responsibility.

It is essential that Congress approach the problem of a manpower shortage in the fields of science and technology and the problem of being well informed on scientific research and progress in the United States by the best means possible. Mr. President, I propose that the best medium available for meeting these problems is a Joint Commitee on Scientific Research.

I respectfully urge that my joint resolution receive consideration during this session of Congress.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am very happy indeed to hear what the Senator from Minnesota has said on this very important subject. My question is: How does the Senator's proposal relate to the National Science Foundation, which we have been working with for several years?

Mr. THYE. The National Science Foundation, and even the Presidential Advisory Committee, would be working outside the confines of the proposed committee. Much as the distinguished Senator from New Jersey is interested in the educational phase of our Nation's problems, I know that, with his many other legislative responsibilities and duties, he can give only occasional thought and study to that subject. What is needed is a committee, with an adequate staff, to devote its entire time to this important question, so that Senators, serving as they do on numerous committees, may know that there is in existence a committee which is directly concerned with this subject. We could feel certain, then, that the students of our high schools who showed the greatest aptitude in scientific fields would have an opportunity to enter college to pursue their scientific studies, and that college students, if they were found qualified, could continue their studies in advanced scientific fields.

If we fail in our endeavor along that line, we can be certain that Russia will surpass us, because of its greater manpower resource. If the information we have gathered is correct, the Soviet Union is making a much greater use of its advanced students than we are. This is particularly true with respect to its encouragement of students who show great scientific aptitude.

I believe the establishment of the committee I have in mind would give Senators contact with the kind of scientific committee I believe to be necessary, if we are to make certain that students with scientific aptitude will be encouraged to pursue advanced scientific studies.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Would the committee the Senator has in mind be a committee similar to the Select Committee on Small Business?

Mr. THYE. I would rather compare the proposed committee with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator is proposing a joint committee, consisting of Members of the House and of the Senate; is that correct?

Mr. THYE. Yes; Members of the House and the Senate would be selected for membership on the joint committee. That is what I have in mind. I know that the Members of the House and of the Senate who serve on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will invariably excuse themselves from almost every other duty in order to be present at a session of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. They do that because they know that the joint committee deals with a field involving advanced scientific development.

They know that if they fail to be present at a session of the joint committee, they not only fail to learn what is brought out in that particular session of the joint committee, but also fail to give the type of service that membership on the joint committee demands of them, in connection with developments in that advanced field.

As I see it, my proposal would provide the same basis as is now provided by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and that it would bring about unity within the legislative field on the subject of scientific research, so that we in Congress could be certain that students with special aptitudes in the scientific field would be given the opportunity and, if necessary, the financial means of advancing into higher learning, and that such students would not be denied the opportunity of getting into advanced scientific fields.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I should be very happy to identify myself with his proposal.

Mr. THYE. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

---

## URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4249) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Chapter I—Department of Agriculture—Agricultural Conservation Program Service—Emergency Conservation Measures," on page 2, after line 4, to strike out:

For an additional amount to enable the Secretary to make payments to farmers who carry out emergency measures to control wind erosion on farmlands or to rehabilitate farmlands damaged by wind erosion, floods, hurricanes, or other natural disasters when, as a result of the foregoing, new conservation problems have been created which, (1) if not treated, will impair or endanger the land, (2) materially affect the productive capacity of the land, (3) represent damage which is unusual in character and, except for wind erosion, is not the type which would recur frequently in the same area, and (4) will be so costly to rehabilitate that Federal assistance is or will be required to return the land to productive agricultural use, and for reimbursement to the appropriation to the President for "Disaster relief," for allocations to the Secretary of Agriculture for such purposes, $15 million: *Provided*, That this appropriation may be expended without regard to the adjustments required under section 8 (e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h), and may be distributed among States and individual farmers without regard to other provisions of law.

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

Not to exceed $25 million of the appropriation granted under the head "Agricultural Conservation Program Service," in the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration Appropriation Act, 1956, shall be available until June 30, 1958, to enable the Secretary to make payments to farmers who carry out emergency measures to control wind erosion on farmlands or to rehabilitate farmlands damaged by wind erosion, floods, hurricanes, or other natural disasters when, as a result of the foregoing, new conservation problems have been created which, (1) if not treated, will impair or endanger the land, (2) materially affect the productive capacity of the land, (3) represent damage which is unusual in character and, except for wind erosion, is not the type which would recur frequently in the same area, and (4) will be so costly to rehabilitate that Federal assistance is or will be required to return the land to productive agricultural use, and for reimbursement to the appropriation to the President for "Disaster relief," for allocations to the Secretary of Agriculture for such purposes: *Provided*, That this appropriation may be expended without regard to the adjustments required under section 8 (e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h), and may be distributed among States and individual farmers without regard to other provisions of law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Farmers' Home Administration—Disaster Loan Revolving Fund," on page 4, line 5, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$25,000,000," and in line 12, after "(68 Stat. 81, 88)," to insert a colon and the following proviso:

*Provided*, That, from the funds available, upon request of the Governor of any State, assistance to farmers, ranchers, and stockmen in major disaster areas under section 2 (d) of the act of April 6, 1949, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1148a–2 (D)), in providing roughage for livestock shall include assistance in procuring cottonseed meal or pellets which are available in the area, in amounts recommended by the State extension service as necessary to supplement available grazing or roughage to preserve basic herds of range livestock, upon conditions that such assistance shall be available only to farmers, stockmen, and ranchers who have customarily fed such protein supplements to their range livestock and that the price of such protein supplements, whether acquired by the State or by the Secretary of Agriculture and resold at less than cost or acquired by the farmer, rancher, or stockman from commercial suppliers, shall not exceed the average price charged by suppliers during the calendar year 1956. Insofar as funds are available, the Federal contribution hereunder for cottonseed meal or pellets shall be comparable in amount to the assistance made available to farmers in major disaster areas in the purchase of feed grains under section 301 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U. S. C. 1427).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I make the point of order that this amendment would constitute legislation on an appropriation bill, and is, therefore, out of order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With reference to a legislative provision in a general appropriation bill, when the

House of Representatives inserts a legislative provision in a general appropriation bill, the Senate, under its precedents, has the right to propose legislative amendments, which, however, must be germane to the House provision.

A point of order will not lie against the Senate amendment on the ground that it is general legislation, but a question can be raised against such an amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the House language.

In such a case the Presiding Officer does not rule upon the question of germaneness, but is required, under paragraph 4 of rule XVI, to submit it to the Senate for a decision without debate.

The Senator from Delaware may raise a question of germaneness.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, Mr. President; I do not want to raise a question of germaneness. I was raising a point of order——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All in favor of the adoption of the amendment——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, there are several Members who are off the floor who may wish to vote, and I shall suggest the absence of a quorum before a vote is taken.

Under this amendment we are proposing to authorize a policy which is a complete departure from existing law. Under existing law we have been making available for these relief programs commodities which are in surplus and which the Commodity Credit Corporation already owns. The language of the amendment does not say "may"; it says "shall." It will compel the Commodity Credit Corporation to enter the competitive market and buy these protein feeds for distribution. This will raise the price on all protein feeds which now are not in oversupply. It would unquestionably give an unfair competitive advantage to operators and feeders living in the drought areas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Department of Agriculture, dated February 15, 1957, in which these objections are pointed out, and in which it is stated that the adoption of this amendment would unquestionably raise the cost of administering the drought relief program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*Washington, February 15, 1957.*

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
*United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: The Department of Agriculture has opposed the inclusion of high protein concentrates in our drought relief program this season. Our position is based on the following:

1. High protein concentrates are relatively low in price and easily available. Hay and roughage in the drought area is high priced and must be shipped long distances. It is the thought of the Department of Agriculture that we can better assist drought-stricken farmers in aiding them to purchase high cost roughage and leave to the farmers the acquisition of the relatively low cost and easily acquired protein meals.

2. There is little doubt that if high protein concentrates are included in the program, an announcement of such action by the Department of Agriculture would result in a rise in price and the increase would offset any assistance that might be given the purchaser.

3. We have a large number of letters from dairy farmers, poultry raisers and feeders outside the drought-designated areas protesting the inclusion of high protein concentrates on the grounds that such action by the Department would make the purchase of these concentrates much higher in price to them.

4. If assistance is given in purchasing these concentrates in the drought-designated areas unquestionably there would be a demand for the same assistance outside the drought areas.

5. Assistance in the purchase of protein concentrates inside the drought-designated area given to a dairyman would give that farmer an advantage over the dairyman that might be located in an adjoining county in the same milkshed but outside the drought-designated area.

6. The Department now gives assistance to eligible farmers in drought-designated areas in the purchase of corn, oats, barley, and sorghum grains, all of which are held in surplus stocks by the Federal Government. Inclusion of assistance in the purchase of protein concentrates would result in less use of surplus stocks of grain held by the Federal Government.

7. Giving assistance in the purchase of protein concentrates in drought-designated areas would make the cost of the program considerably higher.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
*Acting Secretary.*

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think, Mr. President, that this amendment should be adopted. It certainly should not be adopted without hearings wherein testimony can be taken. This language was written at the last minute by the Senate Appropriations Committee. Similar language was rejected by the House Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. HAYDEN. Identical language was not presented in the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The House Agriculture Committee had rejected the principle.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the bill to which the Senator refers provided for the purchase of protein meals with no price limitation involved. This provision would limit the price of such protein supplements. I would not be in favor of a widespread purchase of protein meals.

The hay program is a good illustration. The Department, under the same law, purchased hay, or contributed $7.50 a ton to the farmer or ranchman who needed hay for drought relief. Immediately, the price of hay went up. The result was that no benefit accrued to anyone and it cost the Treasury $7.50 a ton.

In this instance, there can be no increase in price. That is why the committee inserted a provision which would limit the price. If the protein supplements cannot be bought for that amount, they will not be bought.

But the Senator from Delaware is mistaken when he says there is no authority of law for it, because the same law which provides for hay also provides authority for proteins.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If protein meals cannot be purchased except within the price limit, why is it desirable to have the provision in the bill? It would amount to a permanent support price for these protein feeds.

I should like to read from the Department of Agriculture the letter which I have just asked to have incorporated in the RECORD:

There is little doubt that if high protein concentrates are included in the program, an announcement of such action by the Department of Agriculture would result in a rise in price and the increase would offset any assistance that might be given the purchaser.

We have a large number of letters from dairy farmers, poultry raisers, and feeders outside the drought-designated areas protesting the inclusion of high protein concentrates on the grounds that such action by the Department would make the purchase of these concentrates much higher in price to them.

If assistance is given in purchasing these concentrates in the drought-designated areas, unquestionably there would be a demand for the same assistance outside the drought areas.

I understand the House Committee on Agriculture rejected this proposal. This proposal should go to the Committee on Agriculture and be considered by that committee, and not acted upon behind closed doors by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DIRKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire what the parliamentary situation is. Was the point of order overruled?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order was overruled, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Was the point of order made on the ground that the amendment is not germane to the provision in the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I made no point of order on the question of germaneness. I thought it would be better to vote directly on this question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think our distinguished chairman will bear me out that I first raised this question in the committee when it came up, because there were a great many inquiries from my section of the country that inasmuch as there was no surplus of protein feed, this provision would require the Department to go into the market and buy protein feeds.

I think I concur in the statement of the chairman of the committee that there is authority, because in the colloquies which we had in the committee with the Department officials they indicated that they had authority, but that they had no intention of pursuing this program.

The difficulty might be surmounted by simply substituting the word "may" for

the word "shall", and then the Department could exercise its own discretion. If there are surplus protein meals which can be procured it might be well as a matter of economy so to do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I repeat that I think the Department of Agriculture is correct. The amendment should not be agreed to. It would unnecessarily raise the cost of administering the program and would give an unfair competitive feed advantage to those in the drought area, an advantage which could not be overcome by those on the outside. It would result ultimately in an expansion of this type of program throughout the country.

I urge that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. President, before a vote is taken, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum, because there are some Senators who wish to be present when the vote is taken.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. Does the Senator know what comparison there is between the price of these proteins today and the average price in 1956?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that the price today is slightly higher than it was in 1956.

Mr. MORTON. What is meant by "area"? How far would the proteins move, in other words?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In those areas or those counties which are certified to be drought areas or counties.

Mr. MORTON. Is it only within a county?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It could be within a State, if the drought area were statewide. If a whole State were certified as a drought area, then the area would be the whole State. Otherwise, the area would be only within the immediate lines of the county certified.

Mr. MORTON. In other words, under the proviso, if it be agreed to and made a part of the bill, it would not be contemplated, would it, that cottonseed meal would move from Memphis to the drought area in Texas or Oklahoma, or other places in the Southwest?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, I understand that the meal could move in any direction, but it could be distributed only in the areas certified as being drought areas.

Mr. MORTON. Then, if there was a movement suggested into an area of protein need, there would be an increase in the cost of protein everywhere. There would be an increase in the cost of production of livestock in Delaware, in Kentucky, and in all other parts of the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Unquestionably the cost of feed would be affected in every area of the country by the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I might add that the price of cottonseed meal today is $7.20 a ton more than the average price for 1956. That, of course, is rather perplexing in connection with this amendment, because one naturally would wonder what good the amendment is if he could not buy any cottonseed meal under it.

The answer seems to be that there may be those who are desirous of writing congressional policy into a permanent law, which would provide cottonseed meal for those who finish their livestock.

As I read the bill, it would provide cottonseed meal not to all those in the drought counties, but only to those who have customarily fed such protein supplements to their livestock or to those who have finished or partly finished their stock on the range or on the feed lot.

Mr. HAYDEN. This provision is for the distribution of feed on the range.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, but the provision of the bill reads:

> Shall be available only to farmers, stockmen, and ranchers who have customarily fed such protein supplements to their range livestock.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. And not to those in the mountain areas, such as Colorado, Montana, and Wyoming, who raise young cattle in those areas, and then move them into some other areas for finishing or partial finishing, and where they buy protein meal at the full price in order to finish their cattle.

Mr. HAYDEN. The intent of the amendment is to provide for the winter feeding of cows and heifers on the range. There is no other idea in mind than that. That is the way the feeding is done in my section of the country.

Mr. AIKEN. It would not affect those who have had poor pasturage and have moved their young cattle to better places. They would not get any benefits under the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. The idea is to keep the foundation herds alive on the ranges.

Mr. AIKEN. But the corn and wheat which the Government owns and which it distributes contain 14 percent protein. Cottonseed meal contains, I think, between 30 and 40 percent.

Mr. HAYDEN. That high protein content is what keeps the cattle alive.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true; but they get 14 percent protein anyway in the corn and wheat.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me tell the Senator from Vermont what the practice is in Arizona. The ranchers mix cottonseed meal or cake with salt; then the meal is taken to the range. It can be carried on a light truck or on a packhorse. The animals eat only so much of the meal with the salt content; then they have had enough meal for that day. After that the animals drink water and then they will go out on the range and eat whatever roughage they can find.

But if the rancher were to take some grain out to the range, the animals would stay right there and wait until the next day for another bale of hay or more grain. That kind of feed is too expensive and impractical. What is proposed in the bill is the only practical way to furnish feed.

Last October, we in Arizona asked that cottonseed cake or meal be supplied in the regular way, the way in which it has always been used in that area, but our request was denied, on the ground that if the Government purchased any feed, the price of it would be increased throughout the country.

The cattle raisers then went to the cottonseed-meal producers in that area and asked, "Will you agree to sell your meal at a price no higher than you sold it to us before?" That was a reasonable price, and it was less than the price in 1954, and less than the price in 1955. They got such an agreement from the producers.

The Department was still afraid that it would make the same mistake it made with respect to hay. The same authority which will allow hay to be purchased in the program will allow cottonseed to be purchased; there can be no question about that.

When the Government bought hay, it simply announced that $7.50 a ton would be allowed to anyone who needed hay as a supplement. The result was that the price of hay went up $7.50 a ton. What we are trying to do is put a price ceiling on the cost of the cottonseed supplement.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me ask the Senator how the bill would apply to a rancher who summers his cattle in Montana, where there is plenty of grass, and then brings the cattle south for the winter, where most of the cattle are finished for the market. How would the bill affect such a rancher?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is talking about fattening cattle; I am talking about trying to keep intact just the foundation herds of stockmen in the drought-stricken area so these cattle can live on the range, and the cattlemen will not have to sell them.

What has happened in Arizona has been that the cattlemen have had to strip the ranges of their herds, put the cattle on trains, and ship them to Los Angeles, where they got 6 cents a pound for very lightweight cows. I have not known of such a low price since the beginning of the great depression.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have had some experience in connection with the situation about which the Senator from Arizona speaks. I concur wholeheartedly in which the Senator recommends. I am familiar with the experience of cattlemen under the whole program.

This administration is trying to be helpful to those of us who are so unfortunate as to live in drought-stricken sections. There is much criticism of the drought program. Some of it is justified; some of it is not justified. The main reason for the criticism is that the Government tried to tell us in one breath that it does not want to control the farmer, while in the next breath it tells us what our cows have got to eat.

The average cowman knows that the basic herd of range livestock cannot be preserved in the wintertime in the drought section with a lot of dry hay. But the Department of Agriculture says to him, "You will have to feed the cattle hay, and it will have to be bought this way."

The dealers then say, "All right. How much will the Government allow on the hay?"

The Government says, "Seven dollars and a half a ton."

So the dealers then raise their price to $7.50 a ton. That is the kind of relief we get with respect to hay.

The next thing the Government says is, "You will have to feed your cows with chicken feed."

So we get some maize. We can buy the maize, and the Government will deduct $1.50 a hundred pounds for it. But the Government says that we have got to feed the cows with maize.

The cowman asks, "Why cannot I go to the mill and buy some cottonseed? That is what gives the cattle strength in the wintertime. I can buy it cheaper, and it is better for my cattle."

The Government says, "No. We will not give you relief along that line. We will not give you relief on cottonseed, because the feed dealers do not want us to do so. You have got to use maize."

I do not say many ranchers are doing it, but I know that some are getting maize and are getting it at $1.50 a hundred off. I am not sure that I can state the names and the places where that is occurring, but rumor has it that the maize is being fed to chickens and to hogs, and that some ranchers are going to the banks and are borrowing what money they can borrow in order to buy cottonseed cake to feed to their cattle.

If we are to have a drought-relief program and if the purpose is to preserve the basic herds of range cattle and if we are to spend $25 million on that program, we should not say to a cattleman, "I will let you have jello, but you cannot have lemon pie," or "I will let you have this type of feed, that the feed dealer wants you to have; but I will not let you have another type that will do the job."

Any cowman, Democrat or Republican, who has to feed his cattle on the range in the wintertime will tell any of us that the most economical feed he can get now is cottonseed cake, bought from the mill. The feed dealers will not say that. But if that is the most economical thing to feed the cattle, and if the Government is to have a program of this kind, why not permit the most economical type to be used?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to make a comment which I think is pertinent at this point, namely, that such an amendment would not result in creating a new market for this type of feed. In fact, the cattlemen have always used concentrates as feed; it is the most economical kind of feed they can buy. But if it should result in increases in price, the Department of Agriculture will not be able to spend the money to buy cottonseed, pellets, and so forth.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will yield further to me, let me say there is no use in saying that we are going to give this money to the people of Nebraska, to permit them to fatten the calves that the Texas cattlemen send to Nebraska. In the first place, I doubt that Nebraska is in the drought area, although I do not know whether that is so; and I doubt that Nebraska would qualify for such relief. Furthermore, the language of the amendment makes the meaning of the amendment, as written, abundantly clear, namely, that such protein supplements are to be ordered to protect the Government from the very thing the Senator from Vermont has been talking about, and from the very thing that I understand the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] talked about—although I was not in the Chamber when he spoke—namely, to preserve the basic herds of range livestock, and to require that the "price of such protein supplements shall not exceed the average price charged by suppliers during the calendar year 1956."

The feed dealers say it cannot be purchased for the average price charged during the calendar year 1956, and some Senators say it cannot be obtained. If it cannot, then the amendment will not be applicable. But if such a protein supplement can be purchased—and some of those in Texas say it can be purchased—then the amendment will be applicable.

I do not think that an administration that is dedicated to removing controls from the farmers should, on the one hand, say "I will give you drought relief," and on the other hand should say "But I will tell you what your cow has to eat, where you can buy it, who is to sell it, and how much profit he can make in selling it."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I cannot understand the urgency of placing into permanent law a provision establishing a congressional policy for something which on its face cannot possibly work.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Arizona yield further to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The urgency is that the amendment relates to feed, and we are now in the middle of the winter. The urgency is that in some places in my State there has not been a wet year for 10 years. The urgency is that the cattle have eaten the roots out of the ground, and have pulled out the grass, and now the ground is just like a flower bed. The urgency is that it is necessary to feed those cattle now. And the urgency is that otherwise our people would be required to try to feed the cattle maize and hay from which the feed dealers would profit. That is the urgency.

Mr. AIKEN. How could the cattle be fed cottonseed meal furnished by the Government, when on the face of things it is not possible to buy the cottonseed meal?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We would not require that cottonseed meal be furnished by the Government. We favor the purchase of cottonseed cake from the mills, and that is what I understand the amendment is intended to cover.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If that amendment is included in the law, the dealers will not be able to raise the price, as they have done in the case of the hay program and the other programs.

Mr. AIKEN. It may be that the dealers in the Southwest are more charitable than the dealers in the Northeast are, but I do not know about that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I make no claims or charges regarding the charity of feed dealers anywhere. All I say is that our information is that the cottonseed cake can be purchased. If it cannot be purchased, the inclusion of this amendment will not harm anyone or anything.

Mr. AIKEN. Why would the cut-price cottonseed meal be restricted to use by those who have been able to buy it and pay the full price in tthe past? Why should not the amendment also apply to those who, perhaps, last year were not able to buy cottonseed meal?

Mr. HAYDEN. I cannot understand the Senator's reasoning.

Mr. AIKEN. The provision of the amendment is that: "Such assistance shall be available only to farmers, stockmen, and ranchers who have customarily fed such protein supplements to their range livestock."

That would eliminate many of them from consideration.

Mr. HAYDEN. What the Department of Agriculture feared was that if the words included in the amendment at that point were protein supplements, the amendment would then lead to a demand for the use of soybean meal or other kinds of protein supplements. We tried to restrict the amendment, so that it would result in what is common practice in the drought-stricken areas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wonder whether it would satisfy the Senator from Vermont if we were to include in line 23, after the words "ranchers who have customarily fed such protein supplements," the words "and ranchers who desire to feed such protein supplements."

If the Senator from Vermont wishes to extend the application of the amendment, and if that is his real purpose, would not such additional language achieve what he desires? Then we could permit the farmer to decide for himself what he would feed his cattle. Have we reached a point where the Government must make that decision for the farmer?

Would such additional language be agreeable to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. AIKEN. If there were a termination date—for instance, July 1 or September 1 of this year—rather than to call for a Government policy of purchasing a particular type of feed for distribution at cut rates to producers, that would be an improvement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would the Senator from Vermont be willing to support the amendment if we were to include a termination date?

Mr. AIKEN. For instance, the 1st of July? I would be very happy to have such a provision included.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would prefer the 1st of September, in order that the Senator's committee, which in the past he has so ably headed, would have an opportunity to hold hearings on the matter. I think the appropriate committee to consider such proposed legislation is the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I have entire confidence in the fairness and justice of the Senator from Vermont. If he will agree to a September 1 date, I will agree to it.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe there is before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry proposed legislation in this field. I, for one, would be glad to have a hearing on the proposed legislation before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I can assure the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Arizona that we have every sympathy in the world for those who live in the drought-stricken communities.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Vermont will exercise some of his sympathy today; I hope he will agree to permit some of this cake to be fed, instead of requiring the ranchers to feed their cattle some of the old, worn-out dry hay which is profitable only to the feed dealers. Instead of doing that, let us take steps to permit the ranchers to feed the cottonseed cake during this emergency. We are willing to agree to a September deadline. Then the Senator's committee can get busy on its hearings, and can report proposed legislation on the subject, and the Senate can pass it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I shall be only too glad to accept a limitation as to the date.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire who has the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if we can enlist the support of the powerful Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I shall be glad to include such a date. But there is no point in including it, if the members of that committee are going to object to the amendment anyway.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not wish to complicate the situation or delay the proceedings, but I should like to have the RECORD show the entire story. When inquiry was first made of me in regard to this matter—namely, whether protein feeds were to be purchased—of course, I assumed that they would be purchased in the open market. I proceeded on the theory that it would be necessary to go into the open market, because there were no surpluses of such commodities.

In view of the fact that at the end of the fiscal year the Commodity Credit Corporation will either by indebted for commodity purchases or will have loans to the extent of $7,500,000,000, certainly it would not seem wise for the Government to buy for this purpose a commodity which was not in surplus supply, inasmuch as there are surplus feed grains which already belong to the Government's account.

Mr. HAYDEN. But they do not serve the purpose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand, and I am not quarreling about that at all. That is why I did not resist the amendment in the committee, because—as a result of freight rates, and geographical considerations, including distances from market, and so forth—there is a very particular problem in that part of the country, and it is a problem which the farmers in the State which I in part represent prorably do not face.

But I wish to have the RECORD show clearly that this program is not confined to "worn out hay," which I believe was the expression used by my friend, the Senator from Texas; but that, instead, something else is involved, namely, the question of going into the market and making purchases, notwithstanding the billions of dollars the Government now has invested in commodities which have been purchased by it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate the position of the Senator from Illinois. If the Senator from Arizona will yield, in order to permit me to reply, I shall appreciate it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly, Mr. President, I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the assistance of the Senator from Illinois, and we are very grateful for it, because the drought-stricken rancher needs help, and needs it badly, and I think the administration is trying to help him. In this case, we are hung up on only one point, namely, whether to try to force him to force his cattle to eat some kind of feed that will not nourish them during this period.

If we simply had a disposal program, and that was all, there would be some merit to taking it in surpluses; but it is not merely a question of the disposal program. It is a question of cattle getting the protein they need. I am afraid the present program, if the truth were known, is being abused by some people, because the feed is going to chickens and hogs, but in the case of cattle, the growers go to the bank and say, "I have to feed my cattle cake," or they go to an oil mill, because they can keep their cattle sustained on two pounds of oil cake a day, since it is cheaper.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I think the amendment is very meritorious. Those of us who live in drought areas have some real problems. I think the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. HAYDEN] expressed it well when he said under the law with respect to hay no benefit accrued from the $7.50 a ton which was allowed. In the States of Kansas, Colorado, Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico, the hay must originate in Nebraska, Minnesota, or some other northern State. Every day thousands of tons of hay go through Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and I assume Arizona, the State of the chairman of the committee. If we can assist the ranchers to use cottonseed meal, it will be advisable to do so. I hope the amendment will be adopted. It may be too broad. It may be that we shall have to set a date, but I think the amendment will be helpful.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. There are 2 or 3 matters I should like to touch on briefly. First of all, I believe, on an overall basis, the amendment is meritorious. However, I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from Texas, who has just discussed the matter, the fact that while it may not be possible to carry cattle through the winter on old-worn-out hay, it is just as impossible to carry them through on cottonseed without some roughage. So it becomes a dual feeding process. Ranchers are probably better qualified to discuss this subject than I, but we all know it is true.

Secondly, it seems to me while we are talking about the amendment for the RECORD, I should mention that one of the most serious faults in the administration of the law is that there is not a uniform method of administration throughout the States. For example, one State may have very stringent rules for the administration of the law. Some States and some counties have even gone so far as to require financial statements from the persons who receive assistance under the drought program. The practical effect is that a premium may be imposed on some people who have put forth the same effort. There are situations of which I am aware in which a man on one side of the road could obtain assistance because he had used his bounty of the last few years, while the man across the road could not because he had a little credit left at the bank.

Mr. HAYDEN. What the Senator complains about is due solely to the fact that the Department of Agriculture has never issued uniform regulations, but has left the matter up to the various States to be handled by them in their own way.

Mr. ALLOTT. There is a regulation, but it is so loose that States can interpret it with a great deal of latitude. In fact, I know in the States of New Mexico, Colorado, and Texas there was a great difference in administration last year, and the program operated very greatly to the detriment of my own State.

I should like to make another statement to clear the RECORD. It does not pertain to the subject directly under discussion, but I think in comparing what has been done credit should be given to the railroads for the voluntary part they have played in the drought program. As the program is being administered they are not receiving any funds for themselves, and they have forsaken half of their freight rates. They are donating that income out of their own pockets.

Mr. HAYDEN. The railroads should be commended.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think the attention of the Congress should be called to that fact.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, would the Senator from Arizona

be willing to modify his amendment? I call this proposal to the attention of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], not because I expect them to be favorable to it, but so they may have information as to what I am doing. I ask the Senator from Arizona this question: Is it agreeable to the Senator to strike out in line 22 the word "only"?

Mr. HAYDEN. I was trying to limit the provision. I would not object, if it would help accomplish the objective.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to strike out the words "have customarily" at the end of line 22 and the first part of line 23. Then I should like to strike out the word "fed" and substitute the words "desire to feed," so that the language would read: "shall be available to farmers, stockmen, and rangers who desire to feed such protein."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out that the Senator is opening this program now to everybody in that area, and we would have to provide another $100 million, because with the amount provided hardly a start could be made.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware has knowledge of a great many subjects. I do not know how much he knows about cattle feeding in Texas. Now many ranchers feed cattle cottonseed cake. I do not think many new ones would be brought under the program. The suggestion comes from the former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It is perfectly agreeable to me, and I hope it is to the chairman of the committee. If so, I should like to try to comply with the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. What is to stop a dealer from saying, "We will sell you this ton of cottonseed meal for $60, and we will sell you soy meal for another $10?"

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Not a thing in the world, any more than we can stop a man from committing suicide or lying or thieving or anything else. It is abundantly clear that he shall not sell cottonseed cake or meal or pellets for more than the average price charged. I think crooks would be found under any formula, but the Senator from Vermont has been one of the most able exponents in this body of the idea of giving farmers some freedom and removing some controls and taking away some restrictions and getting some handcuffs off them and getting them out of straitjackets. I admit some administrations of my own party have contributed to enacting more regulations than I liked, but today all we are trying to do is get a practical program which will result in the feeding of some hungry cows in the winter with something they ought to eat, instead of something feed dealers want them to eat.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In connection with the request of the Senator from Texas, would he accept a provision requiring some form of State participation, under which the State of Texas and other States would make more contribution to its own citizens, rather than asking the United States Government to underwrite all the relief?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I favor State participation. I think the Federal Government ought not to enter many fields of activity which it does enter. I frequently feel that the States neglect some of their responsibilities by not supplying assistance when it is needed, and permitting the Federal Government to take over. But I do not want Old Muley, out on the range, to wait for all the State legislatures to meet before she can eat, unless she eats some Republican maize which carries a big profit for feed dealers. I want her to eat the cheapest feed she can get. If we can pick up the vote of the Senator from Delaware, and if I can persuade the Senator from Vermont to agree with me, I am willing to provide for a termination date, so as to allow the program to continue for 4 or 5 months, trusting the committee to hold hearings.

However, I have had a bill in the committee which has not been reported. I have fought the feed dealers before. I know the hand of Jacob and the voice of Esau. I know how the feed dealers operate. They say to us, "You ranchmen cannot feed cottonseed cake under the drought-relief program. You cannot use the feed which you customarily and traditionally have used." Anyone in the cattle-raising business, whether he be a Republican, a Democrat, or what not, knows what feed a cow ought to have in the wintertime, when she cannot get good grass. Yet we are told, "You cannot feed that product, because we will not allow it under our administration. You must feed some Republican maize, which is handled by a Republican middleman, who collects a Republican commission, or you must feed some of this old dry hay the price of which has already been increased $7.50"—taking away all the benefits the Government proposed to confer.

I do not believe that Members of the Senate wish to do that. I am not willing to wait for State legislatures in all the States to meet. February, March, and April will pass, and the winter will be over before we can obtain action. I am willing to agree to a termination date, if the Senator from Delaware will support the amendment with a termination date. I think the Senator from Delaware is against the amendment in any form.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I supported the programs for relief, but I want some commonsense used in administering them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is approaching the question in a roundabout fashion. For 3 weeks I have heard the Secretary go around and around the mulberry bush. He is a good man, and I think he is trying to do the best job he can, but he never answers a question "yes" or "no."

Let me ask the Senator from Delaware this question: If we agree to the suggestion which has been made, that there be a termination date, in order that the committee may have an opportunity to hold hearings and bring forth some legislation, so that the cows can get something to eat in February and March, will the Senator go along? Will the Senator from Delaware go along with this amendment if I agree to a termination date?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will, provided the Senator will also agree to the other part of the proposal, namely, to provide for a 25-percent State participation. If the States involved do not have enough sympathy to make some contribution to its own citizens, there is something wrong.

As to whether or not the ranchers are being gouged by the feed dealers in your area, the Senator is in a better position than I am to know the character of those men. If the Senator says they are all crooks and are gouging, I will not attempt to defend them.

I think the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should look into the situation, however, if the situation is as bad as you describe it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let me answer the Senator's observations one at a time. I wish to give direct answers.

I have made no charge that any group of men are a bunch of crooks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator says they are gouging your farmers, and if that be true it is a serious charge.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The record shows that when the hay program allowed them $7.50, the price went up $7.50. I am not willing to say that because a man makes a profit of $7.50 he is a crook. But I do say that he does not help a drought-relief program. I will say to the Senator that I would not care to nullify the effect of this amendment by waiting for all the State legislatures to meet. It might be that after hearings the committee would wish to require some State participation. I would be willing to agree to a termination date of September 1, so as to meet the present emergency with this proposed legislation. Then let the committee hold hearings, and if the committee decides to recommend that the States participate, and the majority of the committee agrees to that proposal, the Senator from Texas will be glad to follow it.

So far as Texas is concerned, let me say that there are not many people in Texas who vote in Delaware. It is becoming popular, in some quarters outside of Texas, by implication and otherwise, to criticize Texans and to talk about their not having any interest in this, that, or the other thing. I recognize the situation. However, let me say to the Senator from Delaware that I went to Texas and to other drought-stricken States in company with our distinguished President some time ago. We met with a number of governors. It is true that I do not always see everything in the same light as the ex-governor of that State, Governor Shivers, who participated in that meeting. We have had our differences, as Senators are well aware. Yet Governor Shivers was the only governor I heard who told the President of the United States, after he had advocated State participation, that he stood ready, if the Government

would evolve a national plan and establish standards, to recommend such a policy to his legislature.

I know, and every other Senator who has been here long enough to draw a paycheck knows, what the purpose of the Senator from Delaware is. First, he talks about an expiration date. Second, he talks about State participation. He says he will not support the amendment, even if we insert an expiration date in it.

The Senator from Delaware is against the amendment, and he is frank and honest enough to say so. He will defeat it if he can. So I do not think there is any purpose in watering it down further, to try to satisfy a Senator who is against it anyway. The Senator is convinced that it does not serve the best interests of the people of his State. If he is convinced of that, he ought to oppose the amendment. I do not reflect on his State. I do not imply that the citizens of his State are not citizens with the most patriotic instincts. I do not think they always exercise the best judgment at election time—but I do not use the Senator from Delaware as an exhibit in that respect. However, the citizens of Delaware do not always vote as I would vote.

I hope the Senator from Delaware, who does not live in the drought-stricken area, and who does not have a herd of hungry, bawling cows who need feed, will not force the money of Federal Government taxpayers into old, dried hay which will not sustain a cow in the wintertime.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is nothing in the amendment that mentions hay. The ranchmen can obtain any type of commodity on hand in the Department of Agriculture. Of various commodities, $8 billion worth are being held in inventory by the Department of Agriculture. Certainly they are not damaged. They can be used for these programs and their use will not affect market prices.

As to refusing the farmers of Texas the right to use cottonseed meal, they can use all they wish. All we are talking about is what the United States Government is to give them.

Furthermore if ranchers have been obtaining maize under this relief program and feeding it to chickens in violation of the law, then I certainly am interested and will ask the Department for a report tomorrow. I am sure the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will check this charge. If the Senator from Texas knows of any such misuse of feed, I would appreciate it if he would bring it to the attention of our committee. I am sorry to hear that the recipients of relief in your area are abusing the program in such a manner as you describe.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let me point out one abuse. One abuse is that, without the language suggested, the only alternative we have is to feed hay or grain; and we think that is more expensive, less nutritious, and less productive than the proposal we make. We feel that our proposal would save money. If the Senator will not require us to feed hay, and will not require us to go hat in hand to the feed dealers and carry out their wishes, I think we shall all be better off.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Since 1943 I have had legislation pending before this body which would provide balanced diets for hungry people in this country. The Department of Agriculture tells us that there are 25 million people who get unbalanced diets today, and who could be enjoying balanced diets. Such diets would enable them to make their full contribution to our economy and society, if they could get the food they ought to have at reduced prices. I have been promoting that idea for 14 years; and I have never seen one one-hundredth part of the excitement on the floor of the Senate in behalf of such legislation as 100,000 Texas steers threatened with unbalanced diets have created.

I still think that we should take care of people, because there are so many of them, for one thing, particularly the people who are not enjoying a balanced diet, before we go into the question of Texas steers and cows and bulls, and any other livestock which do not have a balanced diet.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will yield at that point, I should like to say that if the distinguished Senator from Vermont ever becomes chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—and I pray to heaven that that tragedy will never befall this Nation—and if the farmers of the United States must look to that great agricultural section of Vermont for a chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and if he should be powerful enough to persuade a majority of the members of his committee to report to the Senate his bill, which has been in his own committee for 14 years—and I have not read the Senator's bill—that would be a tragedy indeed. I say further that it is an indictment of the Senator from Vermont to say that he had had a bill in his own committee for 14 years and that he cannot convince a majority of his committee to report the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. That is not an indictment of the introducer of the bill, I will say to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Apparently he cannot get his own committee to report the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. The fact of the matter is that after a great deal of effort we did get legislation passed which permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to give cornmeal flour to the hungry people of this country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have read some of the comments made by some of my friends on the other side of the aisle about some of the great proposals that have been made from time to time to distribute surplus food, such as the food-stamp plan.

Mr. President, that is not the issue. I am willing to support such a plan. I call to the attention of every Senator who has been listening to this debate that this is merely a move to becloud the issue, and that it is something intended to confuse Senators and to make the Department of Agriculture continue to serve the feed dealers, and something which would require us to continue to use Government money for that purpose. The only thing we cannot use money for, apparently, is for old dried hay. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] asked, "Why is it always Republican hay, not Democratic hay?"

In answer to that question I will say that although we raised a great deal of hay, we did not make much last November. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, the Senator from California is always fair with me, and I will revise my remarks, with the permission of Senators, and I will say that it is Republican and Democratic hay, because it is just as bad as it can be in wintertime, compared with cottonseed cake, whether it is Democratic or Republican.

I believe the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, one of the wisest Members of the Senate—supported by men like the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, and by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the ranking minority Member on the subcommittee, who has great knowledge in the field of agriculture—has brought before the Senate an amendment which will provide much relief, and will permit a more honest operation of the program, and will put more weight on our cows and bulls. That is something that even the Senator from Vermont ought to commend.

Mr. AIKEN. When we do for livestock exactly what we do for people, I believe that ought to be good enough.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; that is not the situation. I believe it ill behooves the Senator from Vermont, and so-called self-advertised exponents of free enterprise, and the men who go around the country saying, "We are taking regulations and controls off," to come to the Senate and say, "Yes; we will do that, but we will tell you what kind of feed to buy for your cows, and we will tell you that you must buy it from the feed dealer, with a middleman profit being paid, and that if you do not do it that way, we will not let you have any money."

Many ranchers go to the cotton oil mill and are able to buy cottonseed cake without paying any middleman's profit. He can buy the seed which his experience determines is best for his cattle.

If we adopt the amendment of the Senator from Arizona, that situation will prevail. If we do not adopt the amendment, we will make the rancher buy the kind of feed he does not think is best for his cattle, and it will be more costly and will get less desirable results for the cowman.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to make one observation. From the first day I have served in the Senate my respect and regard and confidence in the distinguished majority leader has increased.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator; but I hope that he will not ask me to do something that will change that situation. When I hear a compliment like that, I become very much concerned.

Mr. COTTON. The fact remains—and we can express it in any words we wish—that if the language in the appropriation bill means anything, it means that we are going to include in the drought relief program commodities which are in short supply and which are not in surplus. I am perfectly aware of the fact that the distinguished majority leader has suggested that through some kind of manipulation, the feed can be purchased at the price stated in the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

However, I represent some people in New Hampshire, as does the distinguished Senator from Vermont, in his own State, who are dairy farmers and poultry farmers, who all through the years have never had the benefit of price supports. The fact remains also that when we have passed agricultural measures providing price supports, we have in that way raised the price of grain which the people we represent must buy to feed to their cows and to their poultry.

If it were true—and I am not suggesting that the Senator is not completely sincere in what he says—that this provision would insure against a price rise, and that there would be an abundance of this protein cottonseed meal to relieve the drought conditions without causing its price to increase, I would be the last one in the world to hold up my hand and try to deny them that relief.

However, within the past few minutes I have already heard that amendments will be offered to broaden the provision and increase the threat to New England farmers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to yield at that point to say to him that the information we have from the area which is the great cottonseed, cotton cake, cotton meal, cotton-pellet producing area, is that, first of all, there is not only a substantial supply, but one of the largest supplies we have ever had on record; secondly, those who have the supply, are willing to sell it at a price not in excess of that provided by the limitations placed in the bill; thirdly, I will say to the Senator, if they are not willing to do so, the provision in the bill will not apply, and not a dollar will be spent.

Mr. COTTON. My information is that——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. COTTON. It does not quite answer it. I will say that I have heard——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator restate his question, so that I may answer it?

Mr. COTTON. I will say to the Senator that if what he says proves to be correct, he answers my question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Very well.

Mr. COTTON. However, let me add a further word. It is my information, obtained from experts in the Department of Agriculture, that there is no back door from which it is possible to get these protein feeds, and that in order to get them it is necessary to go beyond the price of 1956. If we place this entering wedge in the appropriation bill, and in that way go on record, then if it does not work out, we will have to expand the provision a little more, and then in a short time we will have an expanded provision dealing with that subject. I cannot go back to my farmers, under such circumstances, and say that I have done all I could to protect their interests.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I want the Senator to protect his farmers. I would be the last man to do anything to harm a New Hampshire or a Vermont farmer, because we look to that great area of our country to make its appropriate contribution in supplying the food and fiber by which this great Nation exists.

I will say to the Senator that I am not an expert on backdoors; I do not know anything about backdoors. I do not know what the Department of Agriculture knows about them. But why the Department of Agriculture, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] should want to require those of us who live in the drought-stricken areas to feed our cattle something the cattle do not want, I cannot understand. It would be more expensive for the taxpayers and, ultimately, the farmers would pay a part of the bill. The administration has said, "We will give you $7.50 a ton on hay." Then the price jumped $7.50 a ton. That is what the record shows; is it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. That is what we are trying to avoid.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Our problem is to get proper feed for our animals. Those animals are not in Delaware or Vermont or in New Hampshire. I appreciate the solicitude of my friends. I will follow them on matters which involve food for their people, but we cannot spend a dollar under this provision if the price exceeds the 1956 price. Furthermore, I assure the Senator that if it is determined that we cannot get the feed at that price, I shall not be here wanting to change this section and moving it to 1957–58.

One of the first things I did when I came here was to introduce a bill providing for an economical way of feeding our cattle.

Do not make us buy the feed from this particular place or that particular place. Do not make us buy this particular type or that particular type, but let us buy the cheapest and the best.

Mr. COTTON. Why does the Senator not want his cows to eat other food supplements? Why does he force them to eat cottonseed products?

Mr. HAYDEN. That was done to cure the situation of which the Senator complains.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the bill provides for the inclusion of cottonseed meal and pellets which are available in the area. Soybeans make a very good high protein supplement, and soybeans are in surplus. I do not know why we should force a cattleman to feed something that is not economical and would result in a hardship to him.

I should like to say to my friend from New Hampshire that dairy supports will be around 83 percent of parity this year. Last year dairy supports for the program were by far the most expensive of all price-support programs. Price supports for feed grains have been lowered for 1957 to around 70 percent of parity.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to say one more word to my friend from New Hampshire. The administration want to force the cowman from Texas or from New Mexico or from Arizona or from Colorado or from Nevada to feed hay, and allows $7.50 a ton after it has gone up $7.50. That is the present program.

Then they say, "We will force them to feed grain." Why force the cattlemen to feed something that is impracticable? The most practical thing, the cheap thing, the wise thing to do, as proved by the men on the range for years, is to feed the cows cottonseed in the wintertime if there is no grain.

Mr. President, there is an old saying in Texas, "If you know you are right, just keep on coming and no gun can stop you."

I have enough confidence not only in the charity of my friend from New Hampshire, but in his good judgment and fairness, to think that he will not require us to buy something that it is not good business to buy. If he is going to help us with the program at all, let him help us to apply it most efficiently and get the most for our dollars as an ordinary yankee businessman would.

Mr. COTTON. I have not said, and I do not say, that we want to force anyone anywhere to buy anything for his cows that the cows do not want to eat. I simply say that even though I enjoy listening to these arguments, I am not going to be lulled to sleep and made to believe that buying something which is in short supply will not raise its price. I cannot believe that, even if it is stated by the most charming and eloquent gentleman of my acquaintance. We have something that is in short supply, and sooner or later we are going to have to pay for it. Cows can starve even when there is not a drought. They can starve if their owners cannot afford to buy feed. The Department of Agriculture says this provision will raise the price. That is the reason why they refused to favor it. They say it will raise the price to other farmers throughout the country. We are those other farmers, and we want to be heard.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, we have been on this subject for some time. I know it is an important subject. I have discussed it with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and other Senators. I wonder if the Senator from Arizona would be willing to accept an amendment along the line previously suggested, only providing that the authority shall expire on July 1, 1957. In other words, that would take us through the fiscal year, and in the meantime, presumably, the Committee on Agriculture will be meeting.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator will look at the bill, he will see that the date is September 1, 1957.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest until July 1, 1957.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not wish to be adamant. I would be willing to accept September 1, but I see no great advantage in moving it

up to July. Would the Senator agree to August 1?

Mr. HAYDEN. I will split the difference, and make it August 1.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no intention of quibbling as between September and July. An amendment has been suggested by the Senator from Delaware, and, like the Senator from Texas, I am inclined to believe there is a good deal of merit in it. I am not inclined to oppose it, but I suggest that on line 16 where the word "shall" appears, it be changed to "may."

While the Senator from Arizona says—and it is probably true—that the Department has authority at the present time, I think this educational discussion on the floor, which I think has a great deal of merit, at least fortifies the Senator to the extent that it bears on the particular conditions which may exist in his part of the country, and which may not exist elsewhere. This proposal would not tie the hands of the Department of Agriculture. I think it would give the Department a sound educational background.

In the meantime, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry could proceed to hold hearings. If the committee felt, after holding the hearings, and after giving the Department ample time in which to present its views, that it was desirable to make the provision mandatory in the case of either this or any other grain, the situation would be entirely different.

But I think that when a mandatory provision is included in an appropriation bill, without the holding of the full hearings which would normally be held before a legislative committee, we are going pretty far.

I think the Senator has established quite a useful record, one of which, I think, the Department of Agriculture will certainly take cognizance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate my friend's argument. I assume he is aware that the effect of his amendment would put us back where we are today.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Except, as I think the Senator will agree, that we have laid a background in the Senate today, and thus have a stronger case than I think normally has been presented, so far as I know, on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appeal to my friend from California in this respect. I think we have had a background. We have appealed to the Department of Agriculture consistently since the program has been in effect. We have appealed to the President. We have introduced proposed legislation which has been referred to the appropriate committees. A similar bill passed the House only last week by an overwhelming vote, permitting proteins in the form of cottonseed cake, and doing, in effect, the same thing the committee amendment proposes to do.

If the Senator strikes out the word "shall" and inserts the word "may," I would want to warn one of the greatest exponents of having the coordinate branches of Government exercise their appropriate responsibilities that we will be right back at the point of allowing discretion to the executive department. Mr. Benson will finally determine whether we will have to continue to use hay and grain, or whether we can get cottonseed cake which is produced in the area, and which we want to use.

It is my opinion that, if we strike out "shall" and insert "may," Mr. Benson, in his own judgment—and I do not question his sincerity—will not want us to have cottonseed cake, because he has not permitted us to have it up until now.

The only way in which we are going to get cottonseed cake is by having Congress say what it wants. If we simply say "may," maybe we will not get it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I want the cows in Texas, and the bulls and steers, and whatever else there may be, whether they be Republican or Democrat, to have a diet which will keep them going and will fatten them. But, at the same time, in an appropriation bill, when we are dealing with some important matters of legislation, I do not want to be doing something which will adversely affect other farmers, whether they be in New Hampshire, Vermont, or any other section of the country.

There is apparently some concern—and I think it is a legitimate concern—on the part of some other Senators, as well as on the part of the Senator from Texas, about this matter.

All I am saying to the Senator is—and the Senator asked a categorical question of the Senator from Delaware—that if he is prepared to accept those two amendments, and only those two amendments, and to support those amendments on the floor, and to urge their adoption, I think the matter then becomes permissive, not mandatory, but it puts a termination date on the program.

The Senator from Vermont has said he believes the matter should be considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I think a good foundation has been laid for the beneficial effects of the cottonseed cake, and I think some progress has been made without the doing of something which might dislocate economic conditions in some other area.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There is no man whose support I would welcome more than I welcome that of the Senator from California. I can understand that he would want to be certain that the people of New Hampshire, Vermont, and other areas of the Nation are properly protected.

My chief concern is to see that economical feed is moved into drought-stricken areas. I am not unaware of the problem of the cattle raisers and farmers of that region. Because of the awareness of their problems, we have tried to give them all the protection which the English language can give them, even though the feed dealers say it cannot be done. If it cannot be done, the only ones who will suffer are the cows of the drought-stricken areas and the owners of those cows.

I call the Senator's attention to lines 2 and 3, on page 5, which provide that the price "shall not exceed the average price charged by suppliers during the calendar year 1956."

That is the limitation, that is the protection, which even the Senator from New Hampshire said he was not afraid of.

What the Senator is afraid of is that subsequently we might return and say that we cannot get the cottonseed for that price, so give us money.

There is proposed legislation pending which would provide the money, but I say to the Senator that the time to fight that provision is when we come to it, if we ever do.

I am willing to ask unanimous consent—and I so ask unanimous consent at this point—and I ask the Senator from California to follow me—that in line 16, after the word "shall", the committee amendment be modified in the following respect: add a comma after the word "shall" and insert the following: "until August 1, 1957."

Will the Senator from California go along with that? May we have that proposal acted on?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am certain the Senator from Texas would not want to foreclose any subsequent amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Oh, no.

Mr. KNOWLAND. So far as the date is concerned, since we were talking about whether to make the date July 1 or September 1, I have no objection, and would concur in this proposal as one amendment. However, I would not want to be foreclosed——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas would never attempt to do that to the Senator from California if he could. But the Senator from Texas could not do it.

All I am asking is that we get things straightened out and provide for a limitation, which seems to be desired by Senators who are not even for the amendment. I think we can stop that part of the argument.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Texas will go along with the suggestion of the Senator from California and will agree to changing the word "shall" to "may."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will come to the Senator's request in a moment. Let us not gobble up all the requests at once.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think it is very important that the two changes go together. I think the Department of Agriculture is sincere in its objection to the proposal. The distribution of cottonseed meal was tried once before, but its abuse became so widespread that it was necessary to discontinue its use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware object to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I urge the Senator from Delaware not to object. If this amendment shall be agreed to, I will try to continue the discussion, in the hope of getting an agreement on the other amendment. But I think the language is improved to this extent, and I think its proponents have a right to modify the amendment, in any event.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I do not think so, unless we vote on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am surprised. I thought the Senator, earlier in the day, suggested this amendment. In any event, it came from his side of the aisle. I did not want to put the date in at all. I am trying to be agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware object to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am seeking recognition before a vote is taken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator. Before the question is put, the Senator from Delaware has some questions to ask.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not quite know how I lost the floor, but I am not going to quarrel about it.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I have only one reservation in connection with this question, and it is simply this: If any of the high protein feed were going into feed lot operations, that would be absolutely improper. It would be improper for the Federal Government to subsidize a person who was in the business of commercially feeding steers or fattening cattle.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. THYE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator from Minnesota, and so does the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. As we have previously stated, we have tried to limit the use of this particular feed, so that it will be used only by "farmers, stockmen, and ranchers" for the following purpose: "to preserve basic herds of range livestock." This legislative record should be perfectly clear to those who must administer the program; we should make it perfectly clear that the only purpose is to preserve basic herds of range livestock, and not to preserve the feeder livestock.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. President, the other reservation I have in connection with this emergency feed program for the drought-stricken area is simply this: We know that a young animal, such as a calf that is nursing from a cow that is underfed, may find the cow's milk supply inadequate; it may be inadequate to keep the calf in thrifty condition. Therefore, it will be necessary to provide high-protein feeds as a supplement to the other grains, if that young animal is to be brought through the winter in thrifty condition. That was the motivating factor which led me to support the amendment in the Appropriations Committee—namely, the thought that there might be on the range some young livestock whose physical condition would be in jeopardy unless we made some high-protein feed available.

The other purpose was to safeguard the program, so as not to subsidize those in the commercial business of handling feeder cattle. Furthermore, we should not put the Department of Agriculture in the position of making this protein available in unlimited quantities to the feeders. I wish to be certain that we do not get into that position.

My other point is that protein which is needed by an undernourished calf, if the calf is to be brought through the winter in a normal manner, should be made available.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It seems to me that we should return to the language of the bill which is before us. I say so in view of the observations made by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

First of all, this money is available under the disaster loan revolving fund, and it cannot be used except in a major disaster area. That is clear as print can make it. Consequently, the appropriation is an emergency appropriation, pure and simple.

One other thing which should be disposed of is the question of State participation. I think the chairman of the committee will bear me out when I say that, so far as I know, in the basic law there is no requirement for State participation. So I see no reason why we should start on that line now.

Furthermore, in the case of the hurricane which occurred in Rhode Island, we should remember that we did not require the Rhode Island Legislature first to make money available, before Federal funds were made available. In the committee the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] raised that question, and I think we explored it rather thoroughly. So those points should be disposed of.

Finally, Mr. President, let me point ou that under the present program there are being made available to ranchers and cattlemen mixes that contain 20-percent protein, at a price of approximately $72.50 a ton. That is available now. Those who operate this program did not care particularly about participating in a program which would provide 100-percent protein; but they testified that they are making available now, under this program, mixes that contain a very substantial amount of protein.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no doubt about that, and it is 20 percent. But cottonseed meal contains 40 percent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I appreciate that. But I remember the observations made by our friend, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], namely, that it would appear that that has not been done before. But protein mixes are being made available under the existing program, and they have been made available for quite some time. So the question is whether we shall make a little more protein or a little less protein available.

The distinguished Senator from California raised the question of whether this provision shall be made discretionary, rather than mandatory. I think the answer to that point is to be found in the testimony given before the committee by Mr. Berger. Mr. Berger has had a great deal of experience. During World War II, he handled the feed distribution program for the entire country. At the hearing before the committee he testified:

> You want to remember that I was down here during World War II, and had charge and responsibility of distributing all feed supplies all over the United States. I am very, very fearful of walking into this one. I certainly recommend that we do not.

Mr. President, I believe we should leave it to those who have administrative charge of the program. If they want to do it, all right. Then those who need it will have the burden, at least, of persuading them that they should raise the protein content by going to a cottonseed and pellet diet for some of these famished animals.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senators permit us to dispose of one thing at a time? We are seldom in agreement on anything, but I think both sides are now in agreement as to the date.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am content.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. So, Mr. President, before we proceed to anything else, I should like to see whether I can modify the amendment in such a way as to improve the language in the way suggested by some Senators on this side of the aisle.

The first modification is to insert, in lines 16 and 17, the words "until August 1, 1957."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed modification of the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 4, in line 16, after the word "shall", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words: "until August 1, 1957."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will further modify the language by striking out the word "shall," and inserting the word "may," I shall go along with this proposition. I say that for the reason that I have great sympathy for those in the drought-stricken area who are in bona fide need of this program.

Whenever the question of drought relief has been before us, I have supported that principle. However, I believe we would have a better administered program if there were some form of State participation. I think that should be required, regardless of the State involved—whether it be Texas, Delaware, or any other State.

But I think the amendment before us now takes us into a dangerous area. When the first drought-relief program was inaugurated, the Department of Agriculture included cottonseed meal and pellets as a part of the program; and widespread abuse was found to exist. For instance, the Department called to our atttention the fact that the Kings Ranch, in Texas, which has a million and one-quarter acres—an area larger than the entire State of Delaware—was on relief; and under the first program, the King Ranch purchased—and a similar proposal is before us for approval

today—930 tons of cottonseed pellets, at a reduced price, or subsidy from the American taxpayers, of $32,585. A few days after the check was paid to the King Ranch, one of the King Ranch horses won the Belmont Sweepstakes, and the King Ranch had other race horses in various other tracks of the country at the time. The American people did not know, Mr. President, that the horse that won the Belmont Sweepstakes—a horse belonging to the King Ranch—was on relief, and that the American taxpayers all over the country were subsidizing this King Ranch and its race horses.

The representative of the Department of Agriculture have a valid point when they say they do not want to make this program wide open, so that the King Ranch and others that do not need relief can receive it. I will vote for relief if it is demonstrated that the relief supply will go to those who are in bona fide need of relief. But I will not support such a program if it brings about a return to the old situation which was wide open and loose, as the representatives of the Department of Agriculture have said. At that time they said that under the loose language of the law, they could not do anything to prevent the King Ranch from going on relief.

I favor allowing the Department of Agriculture to exercise discretion in connection with the program. If those who administer the program for the Department of Agriculture are allowed to exercise their discretion, they will not permit all who are ineligible for relief to receive it.

If they do permit abuse to occur again, we will take them to task. I shall not support the proposal if it is made mandatory that the relief must be provided to every resident in the drought-stricken area, including those who operate the King Ranch.

Mr. WILLIAMS subsequently said:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Department of Agriculture under date of June 29, 1954, be incorporated following the remarks I made earlier today.

This letter confirms that the King Ranch in Texas was receiving relief in 1954 under the same type program we are about to vote on here today.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*Washington, June 29, 1954.*

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
*United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is with further reference to your letter of June 1 in which you asked for a complete report of any assistance of any nature which has been extended by the Department of Agriculture to owners of the King Ranch in Texas. This matter has been looked into carefully and we believe that the only assistance given was in connection with the drought-emergency-feed program which was in effect in that area for a few weeks last fall.

The county USDA drought committees for the area in which the King Ranch is located approved and there was delivered to King Ranch 931 tons of cottonseed pellets at $35 per ton. This was the price at which cottonseed pellets were being made available at the time from CCC stocks, being approximately one-half the prevailing market price. It is our estimate that this meant a reduction of $32,585 in the cost of this quantity of feed to the King Ranch. We have been unable to find evidence of any other assistance or relief in any form that has been extended to the King Ranch or any of the owners thereof.

This is an outstanding example of a large livestock ranch, where it is common knowledge that the owners have substantial resources, which received assistance under the emergency-feed program. The county committees which handled the feed applications were informed and knew that the King Ranch had a large number of cattle on hand and that there were serious drought conditions in that area. We believe the county committees acted in good faith.

As I mentioned to you during our telephone conversation a few weeks ago, the most difficult problem in an emergency-feed program is that of restricting the assistance to established stockmen who are actually in need of such assistance. It is not possible to write regulations that can be used automatically to accomplish this purpose. We think there is a great deal of merit in having these programs administered by carefully selected committees in the counties and States. In view of the heavy responsibility that such committees have, we think they are entitled to and must have a reasonable amount of discretion in which to exercise judgment in the handling of day-to-day transactions.

We have been reviewing the experience with these programs carefully and seeking the suggestions of State and county people who have been on the firing line for the purpose of firming up the procedures and striving to further guard against the possibility of abuses. The areas in which these emergency-feed programs have been available have been watched continually and aggressive action taken to discontinue the assistance as quickly as local conditions warranted. For some time the program has been available only in a section of Colorado and part of New Mexico where the prolonged drought continues.

We will be pleased to discuss this matter with you further or stand ready to furnish any additional information which you may desire.

Sincerely yours,

K. L. SCOTT,
*Director, Agricultural Credit Services.*

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. My colleagues are perfectly competent to judge the quality of the arguments that have been made both for and against the proposal. I am not informed as to who won the Belmont horse race, and I am not informed as to whether the horse that won it was on relief. I do have more than a casual acquaintance with the owners of the King Ranch in Texas. They are good, honorable, God-fearing Americans—and they are Republicans.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And perfectly able to pay their own expenses. And I care not what their politics may be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. So far as I know, they have supported this administration through thick and thin. I do not believe that, as an honest man, Ezra Benson, careful and prudent as he is, would take this section, which the staff tells me requires a certification that a man does not have the funds and does not have the credit before he is eligible, and certify ranchers who do not need the help. But I assume it is still possible for people who have accumulated large holdings and preserved those holdings to suffer from a drought. I am not a racehorse fan. I do not follow the bookies as some of my friends. A staff member tells me the Secretary of Agriculture would never certify under this section someone who had won many purses and who had many resources. I am willing to follow the judgment of the staff.

If the Senator from Delaware wants to offer an amendment along the line he has suggested, he knows his rights, and he knows how to protect them. As soon as the Senate acts on the amendments which were suggested by Senators on the other side of the aisle, I shall be glad to relinquish the floor so the Senator may offer an amendment, and we can let the majority of the Senate determine the question. I think that is the appropriate way to proceed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to say one more word about the price. It has been said the proposal could not result in the price of cottonseed oil being raised. I do not think that is accurate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May I say to the Senator there will be an opportunity to debate that question. The present question is on the date.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have the question put?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas, to the committee amendment, which the clerk has stated. Does any Senator desire that the amendment be stated again? Hearing no such request, the question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on page 4, line 22, I ask unanimous consent to strike out the word "only"; following the word "who" in the same line, to add the words "desire to"; at the end of line 22 and the beginning of line 23, to strike out the words "customarily fed" and insert the word "feed."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator insists, I shall go along with his suggestion that the Senate act on his proposal, but if we could, I should like to have the Senate vote on striking out the word "shall' and inserting the word "may" in lieu thereof, because it would make a great deal of difference to me now how I would feel about the Senator's other amendment if we could act first on the amendment I have just mentioned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have made my request, and since I happen to be ahead this one time, I should like action taken. Then the Senate can vote on the Senator's suggestion later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Has the Senator from Texas completed his request for an amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry, so we may be perfectly clear. As I understand, the proposed amendment is to the committee amendment on page 4, line 22, to strike out the word "only"; at the end of that line and the beginning of line 23 to strike out the words "have customarily fed", and insert in lieu thereof "desire to feed." Is that corect?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment to the committee amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the door is being opened much wider, unless the Secretary is given some discretion. If the Secretary were given discretion, I would support the amendment. Without that change I would not go along.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Delaware opposing the request?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest that the Presiding Officer ask for a vote by saying "Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no.'"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No objection having been heard——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Delaware objects. If the Chair will put the question properly, we shall not be in this difficulty. Will the Chair please say, "Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no,'" to determine the sense of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask for a division, Mr. President.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe if the Chair will recognize the Senator from Connecticut we may be able to proceed to a vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Connecticut desire recognition on this question?

Mr. BUSH. I wanted to suggest that the word "shall" be changed to "may."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, that is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have a vote on my proposal? That is all I want. Please say, "Those in favor say 'aye.'" [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have another amendment to offer, to make it abundantly clear that we are all talking about cottonseed products. Otherwise, either with a mandatory requirement or with discretionary authority, the language might be interpreted as not including cottonseed cake. I ask the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee whether or not it is intended to permit the purchase of cottonseed cake as well as cottonseed meal under this amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In order to make it abundantly clear, on page 4, line 17, after the word "meal", I propose to insert a comma and the words "cottonseed cake."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Would the Senator accept a modification so as to include soybean meal?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let us dispose of my amendment first, and then the Senator can offer his amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. The reason I make the suggestion is that soybean meal is a good high-protein feed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Cottonseed cake is already included in the definition. I merely wish to spell it out. When my amendment shall have been disposed of, the Senator can offer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 17, in the committee amendment, after the word "meal" it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "cottonseed cake."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] to the committee amendment on page 4, line 17.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I offer an amendment at the end of line 16 on page 4, to strike out the word "shall" and insert in lieu thereof the word "may."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from California to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, at the end of line 16 in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "shall" and insert "may."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to the committee amendment on page 4, line 16.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hope my friend from California will not insist on this amendment. If we substitute the word "may" for the word "shall," in the opinion of the Senator form Texas we modify ourselves completely out of all the effect this amendment would have. The Secretary may take such action. The Secretary may buy cottonseed meal. The Secretary may buy cottonseed cake. The Secretary has been able to do so all along, and he may do so now. If we use the word "may" this language is superfluous, because the discretionary authority is in the existing law. We tried the "may," but cows cannot eat "may," and the Secretary will not furnish them cake, unless we say "shall" to him.

I do not say that we should not have State participation. Like the Senator from California, I am willing to have the appropriate committee consider the question, but we are faced with an emergency.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say to the distinguished majority leader that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry considered this question. When this proposed legislation was considered, that specific issue was presented, and the committee, by a large majority, declined to add the condition suggested, the reason being, as already stated by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], that this was an amendment to the Distress Act, which applies not only in cases of drought distress, but also in cases of hurricanes, earthquakes, great fires, and other disasters.

It was clear that speed of action was a very necessary ingredient in bringing relief to distressed areas. The committee, in its wisdom, by a very large majority, declined to accept the idea of the State's contribution in that sort of case.

Moreover, the committee felt that the State where the disaster took place was already the largest contributor among the units of government and that no matter how much relief the Federal Government might afford in some particular State whose people had suffered from disaster, those people naturally experienced the greater measure of injury and damage. It was felt that the least the Federal Government should do would be to bring its little measure of help, which I believe, in this case, amounts to a reduced rate on feed, without placing any price upon it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I deeply appreciate the contribution my friend from Florida has made. I appreciate the information he has brought to the Senate. He is always helpful.

I plead with my colleagues not to modify ourselves completely out of all we have sought to achieve, and all that was accomplished by the vote in the committee, by striking out "shall" and inserting "may."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the pending amendment is adopted, we may as well strike all the language now provided in the bill under consideration.

As has been pointed out on several occasions, the Secretary of Agriculture already has the right to do what we are seeking to compel him to do, but he will not do it.

When this amendment was proposed to the Committee on Appropriations it was carefully drafted. A mere reading of it

will show that the amendment is clothed with all manner of restrictions.

To begin with, the meal or cake proposed to be purchased must be available in the area where the cattle are, that is, in the drought area. The meal is intended to be used, not to fatten cattle, as was argued today on several occasions, but merely to preserve the basic herds of range cattle.

Further, the price of the meal must not be in excess of the average price charged by suppliers during the calendar year 1956. We have protected the Department of Agriculture in every way possible, as to price, where the produce is to be used, and the purposes for which it is to be used.

We now have before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry several bills relating to drought relief problems which are now being considered by a special subcommittee, headed by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The provision contained in the pending bill is only of a temporary nature. We hope that in a short while we shall have before the Senate a bill covering the entire subject matter.

I hope the pending amendment will be defeated.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not believe that the amendment of the Senator from California leaves things quite where they are now, because, in effect, it would be a directive to the Department of Agriculture to give consideration to the furnishing of cottonseed meal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not want "consideration." We have had consideration. The Secretary is one of the most considerate men I have ever known, but he still says "no."

We are a coordinate and independent branch of the Government. I have heard the distinguished Senator from California say time and time again that we must act on our own. Upon one occasion the distinguished former Senator Millikin of Colorado said to me, "I am glad I do not have to go downtown and find out what the position of the executive department is before I take a position."

I know how the Secretary of Agriculture feels on this subject. What I want the Secretary of Agriculture to know is how the Congress feels about it. If we say "may," he will be perfectly within his rights in still refusing to permit us to follow the economical route. The Senator from California does not contend that he would be compelled to permit us to do so. That is the reason the Senator offers the word "may"—in order that there will be discretion.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Apropos of what the distinguished Senator from Vermont has said, and with full realization of the comment just made by the Senator from Texas, I feel that this amendment would be an improvement so far as the people who desire to use cottonseed cake are concerned.

I think it would put the Secretary of Agriculture on notice, first, that the Committee on Appropriations has reported an amendment using the word "shall"; second, that there has been considerable debate on the floor of the Senate pointing out the reasons why a great many Members of this body, including some holding extremely responsible positions as committee chairmen or ranking members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as well as other Senators, have indicated that they think that there is a great deal of justice in permitting ranchers to use cottonseed as a means of feed.

The Secretary is certainly put on notice that wherever feasible he ought to try this procedure. Personally I think he should do it. I do not know whether he is right or whether the Senator from Texas is right. However, rather than to have a mandatory provision compelling such procedure in every area where it was requested, the Secretary could select certain locations to give the plan a trial, so as to determine whether the Secretary is right, or whether those on the other side are right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the only language the Senator from California knows is the language of frankness and candor. I ask him this question: If the amendment is adopted, will there be anything in the bill which will require the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish cottonseed products under this program?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I will say to the Senator from Texas, not from a mandatory point of view; but I believe that if the Secretary of Agriculture should read the RECORD and the statements which have been made on the floor of the Senate, he would be very wise to determine whether it would not be feasible to use some of the cottonseed products.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from California has been in the Senate a long time, and the Senator knows of men in high positions in government who have not always acted wisely.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; but I have also known of people in high places who were responsive to discussions on the floor of the Senate with respect to Government policies.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is what I want the Senate to do; I want the Senate to say what it means. We have reached the point, after months of experience and thousands of dollars of waste in the program, where the Senate ought to prescribe a standard and write into law what it wants done. I hope and pray that the people of my State will not have to be subjected to the mercies of an administrative official. We have presented our facts to the committee, and we have had favorable action by the committee. There is no reason why we should now nullify or modify ourselves out of court by striking the word "shall" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "may." I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. AIKEN. On which amendment is the vote to be had?

Mr. KNOWLAND. On my amendment, to strike out the word "shall" and insert the word "may."

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to speak on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on the amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the amendment is a very simple one. It is a clear-cut amendment. It is an amendment every Senator can understand, without any detailed explanation. It merely strikes the heart out of the entire amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations. It nullifies the entire effect of the committee's amendment. It, in effect, says that the Secretary of Agriculture may do something that he already may do. It says that he may continue to waste taxpayers' money and use that money only for hay and only for grain in areas where cottonseed is produced and where cottonseed products are in abundance, and where they can be bought at not to exceed the average price charged by suppliers in 1956.

It has no ill effect on the chicken producer. As a matter of fact, it probably makes more grain available for the chicken business. It relates solely to cottonseed cake, cottonseed meal, and other cottonseed products. The Secretary of Agriculture has discretion now. He has refused to exercise the discretion. He has required the purchaser to use drought dollars to buy feed that he would not ordinarily feed his cattle.

I think the time has come for Congress to say, if we want to participate in drought relief, that we will permit the farmers to buy the most economical feed they can get and the feed which will give the best results. I think it ill behooves an administration that rides into power on the platform that they are going to take the shackles off the farmers to tell a farmer or a rancher in a drought-stricken area what kind of feed he must give to his animals. I hope we have not reached that point. I hope this amendment will be overwhelmingly defeated.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, with all due respect to my friend from Texas, I believe this amendment will be helpful to the ranchers who may properly feel that there is some advantage in feeding cottonseed meal. I think the Secretary of Agriculture would be well advised at least to try it out to see whether those who are advising him are correct or whether those who are urging this amendment are correct.

I think a sufficient foundation has been laid here—certainly it has been

educational to me—to undertake this permissive action, at the same time giving recognition to the importance of cottonseed meal——

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Is it the understanding of the Senator that the Secretary of Agriculture would furnish cottonseed meal in an area in Texas, Arizona, Oklahoma, or anywhere cottonseed was grown——

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator that I do not understand it would be mandatory, but it seems to me that would be a sound procedure wherever it could be done at a price equivalent to the other grains, where the local ranchers feed in that way and where it will not dislocate the economies of New Hampshire, Vermont, and other States. I think he would be well advised to try it and experiment and see whether he can get the facts.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have recognized that hay has been shipped from Minnesota, Wisconsin, and the Dakotas all the way down into Texas. That involves a tremendous amount of freight. Then, in return, cottonseed cake is shipped across country to the feed lot or dairy lot to be fed to that type of livestock. The feed is shipped in the form of cottonseed cake to be used in the feed lots and dairy barns of the north and northeast. My only concern is in connection with the man who has young stock or cattle that are run down and must have high protein feed. If I thought we could accomplish the objective by the use of the word "may" I would support the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that it would not be mandatory on the Secretary to do it in drought areas, nor would it be mandatory for him to do in it other areas where drought conditions do not prevail, but I think wherever it could be done and wherever it would be feasible to do it, the Secretary should try it out.

GOVERNMENT VERSUS COMMONSENSE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say that so far as commonsense is concerned in a matter of carrying out the legislative intent of Congress, my State is 600 miles long and 400 miles wide. The hay in northern Nevada was shipped to Texas while southern Nevada's application for hay in the drought area was pending, then when southern Nevada was put on the hay program the hay was shipped from the Middle West area. I do not know how much commonsense the Secretary of Agriculture might use but our experience and observation in such application in the usual bureaucrat—it might be well to direct what the Congress really wants.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Apropos of what the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] said, I wish to point out that I do not know what he would do if he were Secretary of Agriculture. I should dislike to lose him from the Senate, but, on the other hand, I should like to see him as Secretary of Agriculture, because I think my farmers would get very understanding and very sympathetic treatment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, so long as we are shrinking from a war economy to a peacetime economy, I do not think I would like to be Secretary of Agriculture. I told the Secretary of Agriculture that I thought he was entering into a most difficult assignment when we were passing from a war economy to a peacetime economy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I did not suggest that the Senator become Secretary of Agriculture. I merely went along with the implication of my friend from California. But if the Senator from Minnesota were the Secretary of Agriculture and read this RECORD and saw that the Appropriations Committee had unanimously reported this amendment, and that the distinguished Minority Leader struck out the word "shall" and inserted the word "may" thereby giving the amendment the same effect that the present law now has, leaving it discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture, I believe the Senator from Minnesota, if he were the Secretary of Agriculture, would feel that it was definitely within his rights not to approve the cottonseed-cake program for all the drought-stricken areas.

I think if he read the RECORD he would say, "Why do they not say what they mean and mean what they say?"

I have sat here and listened to the great Senator from Ohio who talked about the three separate and independent branches of the Government, each performing its separate functions. I have sat at the feet of the great Senator from California and heard him day after day say he would speak his mind, and then he comes here today and says, "I will strike out the word 'shall' and make it read 'may'."

I do not think the Senate should do that. I hope the Senator from Nevada and the other Senators will not go along with it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will simply say again that while I do not quite agree with the distinguished Senator, I respect his opinion. I hope that nothing will be said which will undermine the legislative record I was trying to build up, because I think the Senator, in what he is seeking, is strengthened by the proposed language as contrasted with what the law now provides.

I think that in the event the amendment is agreed to, the Secretary will be on notice that this is a matter of concern to Congress; and in areas where it is feasible to do so, I think the Secretary would be well advised to try out this process, without its being mandatory on him in every section of the country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think Congress ought to say what it wants to have done. I think Senators from the drought-stricken States and Senators from agricultural States who are familiar with the way the program operates believe that Congress has the right to say that cottonseed cake shall be used. That is what the committee said unanimously.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Missouri does not happen to be receiving any drought aid. We do not have any hay or grain for our drought-stricken farmers. Only in the last month have we been extended any credit, and this despite the fact our pastural conditions are but 26 percent of normal, which is, with the exception of Texas and Oklahoma, the lowest rating of any State in the Union, according to the records of the Department of Agriculture.

In Missouri, we also grow cotton. Many persons do not know that in some years cotton is the largest cash crop in Missouri. We would like to see as much cotton, and products from cotton, used as possible.

In examining this farm and drought picture, I find that some States have been given unusual assistance. I do not object to that. But I believe the State of Missouri also has a right to have its drought problems considered. In my humble opinion we should not continue to nit pick this whole agricultural program. Rather we should attempt a broad approach to the program, instead of having various people working very hard for their particular crops, and often against other crops.

On that basis, I hope the amendment will be defeated, and that the Secretary of Agriculture will be directed by Congress to handle cottonseed cake as he is directed to handle other feeds as provided in the law.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I want to say a few words about the practical side of the question. Under the chairmanship of the able senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], who was here a moment ago—I hope he will return to the Chamber—I traveled with other members of the committee through the States of Kansas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Texas in the first year when the drought impact was so severe that Congress enacted the present law. At that time the program was confined to grains and other feed products which were in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Also hay, which, of course, was not in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The fact was that at that time cottonseed meal and cottonseed-meal products were in great surplus. There was a large quantity of these on hand. We found that that was one of the feeds still under the program of reduced price, which was doing a great deal of good throughout the area where we were traveling.

I think that if every Senator had had the experience which our subcommittee had one night, he would feel a little more sympathetic toward this subject. We were stopping at a motel in the northern part of Arkansas—and I observe the two Senators from Arkansas in the Chamber. It was a fine place at which to stay; but under the drought conditions which prevailed that night, we were most miserable, because the small herds of cattle which remained—and

they were all that remained, because the herds had been cut down to basic size—did not have sufficient feed and they were complaining all through the night, so that the members of the subcommittee could not get any sleep at all. It was indeed a pitiful sound. I do not suppose that anyone who has not heard it will realize the impact it made upon us.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Florida said that the cattle were complaining. In other words, the cattle were simply bawling because of plain hunger. One of the most pitiful sounds a person can hear is the incessant bawling of cattle, hour after hour, simply because they want feed. I think that is a better word than "complaining." Cattle do not complain when they are hungry; they bawl.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. I accept his word. I think that is a better explanatory word. But it was a miserable sound, and it kept us awake the whole night through.

The next day we were made even more miserable as we found that numerous animals had died along the road because of insufficient feed, while others were so thin and miserable that we could see they could not live very long.

I am not talking about the whole animal population of that area, but only about the basic herds which had been held together.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I invite the Senator's attention to the language beginning on line 17, page 4, of the bill, as follows:

Procuring cottonseed meal or pellets which are available in the area.

Does that refer to the area where the cottonseed meal is produced?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not necessarily at all; but to cottonseed meal which is available in the area where the need exists—that is, the drought area.

As a matter of fact, there are words of limitation which are more apt. The words of limitation which are the most businesslike ones in the amendment are those which require that the price shall not exceed the 1956 levels.

I was going to say that under the earlier program we did not have to worry about any such consideration as that, because we were confining the Federal assistance to the sale, at partial value, of stocks which we had on hand and which were in surplus. But now, in order to prevent any such result as that which is feared by my distinguished friends from the dairying and the poultry areas of the Nation, a condition is imposed that under no considerations can cottonseed products be used unless they can be found and offered at not more than the 1956 price.

Mr. BARRETT. But I refer to the matter of the price, on page 5, which is contained in this language:

Insofar as funds are available, the Federal contribution hereunder for cottonseed meal or pellets shall be comparable in amount to the assistance made available to farmers in major disaster areas in the purchase of feed grains under section 301 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

I call the Senator's attention to the fact that a 50-percent reduction is allowed for corn taken from the stockpile. Does that mean that assistance will be given on the same percentage basis for the purchase of cottonseed meal and pellets?

Mr. HOLLAND. My understanding is that this provision applies only to cottonseed meal and pellets which are bought through the regular channels of trade, and that they will be bought on a comparable basis with feed grains now being bought from the Government, that is, emergency funds will be used to pay $1.50 per hundredweight of the cost.

The limitation here is that the total purchase price paid by a stockman shall not exceed the average price charged by feedmen in 1956.

Mr. BARRETT. In order to make the RECORD abundantly clear, I should like to invite the attention of the majority leader to the language on page 4, line 18, where reference is made to "procuring cottonseed meal or pellets which are available in the area." Exactly what does that language mean?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I may say to my distinguished and able friend from Wyoming that I have consulted with the staff member of the Committee on Appropriations who is familiar with the meaning of this language in its original draft, and who understands its effect and implications. He informs me the meaning of the clause is that cottonseed meal and pellets and cottonseed cake will, under the amendment as now amended, be available to those areas where it may be produced, processed, or customarily fed to range livestock.

Mr. BARRETT. That would mean that in a drought disaster county in Wyoming where cottonseed cake or cottonseed pellets are customarily fed to livestock, advantage may be taken of this proposed legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have visited the Senator's State of Wyoming, and I have great respect for its people. We get some of the best cattle from the Wyoming Hereford cattle ranch. I know those men have good judgment. I know that in the dead of winter they will not feed dry hay which is not nutritious, if they can get cottonseed cake which is full of proteins. I know that cottonseed cake has been customarily fed in that area. I say to the Senator from Wyoming that the answer to his question is "Yes," that they could feed cottonseed cake to range cattle in Wyoming if they were in the drought area.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his unequivocal statement, making this point abundantly clear. Furthermore, let me say that the compliment the Senator from Texas paid to the cattle produced in my State, particularly the W. H. R. bulls produced at the celebrated Wyoming Hereford Ranch at Cheyenne, is quite a compliment, coming, as it does, from the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say that if I were the Secretary of Agriculture—and I certainly am happy that I am not—I would hope very strongly that the pending amendment to the committee amendment would be rejected; because if it were adopted, it would throw upon him controversial decisions which the Secretary of Agriculture will not have thrown upon him if the committee amendment as now worded is adopted, without the pending amendment to it, which—on page 4, at the end of line 16—would strike out the word "shall" and insert the word "may."

It seems to me that about the most indecisive thing we could do—since we know that the Secretary of Agriculture now has permissive authority, but has not exercised it—would be to say all over again, "You may do this thing that you have not seen fit to do." Instead, it seems to me we should decide whether in our own judgment this thing should be done.

Personally, I think it should be done, although I am happy to say that not a county or an acre in my State is affected by it. But having decided that it should be done, I think we should use the word "shall"; and I believe the Secretary of Agriculture would be the most relieved man in the Capital when we did that, because that would mean that the Congress was taking the responsibility. I think Congress should take it, and I think there is ample justification for having the Congress take it.

I hope the pending amendment to the committee amendment will be rejected; I refer to the amendment proposing that the word "shall" be stricken out and the word "may" be inserted. I hope that after rejecting that amendment to the committee amendment, we shall then proceed to adopt the committee amendment.

### CUSTOMARY USE OF COTTONSEED CAKE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. As long as we are stating for the RECORD where cottonseed cake has customarily been used, I wish to say that in my State of Nevada in both good times and bad, cottonseed cake is fed to both sheep and cattle.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that the Appropriations Committee reported the amendment, and I am told that the committee voted unanimously to do so. I further understand that on page 4, at the end of line 16, the word "shall" appears. My question is this: Is the Senate about to vote on the following amendment proposed to the committee amendment, namely, to strike out the word "shall," and insert the word "may"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in my opinion if that amendment to the committee amendment is not rejected, the whole effect of this entire

provision will be nullified. I appeal to my colleagues to defeat the proposed change.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wonder whether the sponsors of the bill would include provision that the fund may be used for the purchase of corn, as well as for the purchase of cottonseed meal. Corn is an unexcelled food for both man and beast, and I would hate to see the Senate vote to confine the diet of cows to cottonseed meal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I agree completely with my distinguished friend from Illinois. He and I do not agree on everything, but generally speaking we are in agreement.

The corn producers are always a little bit ahead of the cotton producers. Corn is already included in the program, so it would be entirely useless to include corn in this provision of the bill, inasmuch as corn is being included and is being used.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then I take it that there will be no objection to making line 17 read "in procuring corn and cottonseed meal or pellets."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If that change is to be made, I think every commodity now being used should be set forth at that point, and I believe that would be a mistake.

The pending question is whether the committee amendment should be amended, on page 4, in line 16, by striking out the word "shall" and inserting the word "may."

If the Senator from Illinois desires to offer, later, the amendment to which he has referred, as an amendment to the committee amendment, he may do so. However, at this time, the question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to the committee amendment; and on that question the yeas and nays have been ordered. Therefore, I hope my friend, the Senator from Illinois, will permit us to vote on that question. After it is voted on, the entire subject will be open to amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hope my friend, the Senator from Texas, will show compassion for the Middle West by accepting, as a part of the committee amendment, inclusion of the word "corn." I hope that will be done before the vote is taken on the pending question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is not my prerogative to accept such a change. The pending amendment was offered by the distinguished minority leader to the committee amendment, and on that question the yeas and nays have already been ordered. That amendment to the committee amendment calls for striking out the word "shall," at the end of line 16, on page 4, and inserting the word "may." As soon as we either accept or reject that amendment to the committee amendment, if the Senator from Illinois then desires to insert the word "corn" in the committee amendment, he may propose such an amendment to it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think there might be a better chance of having the word "corn" included if that insertion were proposed now, rather than after the vote is taken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois well knows the rules.

I ask that the vote on the pending question be taken.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, now that the debate has been reduced to the level of giving opinions, I should like to give my opinion, which is as follows: If the bill as now proposed is passed and is enacted into law, there will be a substantial increase in the cost of feed to dairy and livestock producers—a substantial increase of possibly as much as $3 or $4 a ton, within the next 8 weeks.

Furthermore, I should like to say that the cotton grower will get nothing from the bill, because according to my information, he has already disposed of his seed, and those who bought it at a low price will be able to get what they can in the future.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to point out that the committee has taken adequate precautions, and there is in the committee amendment a provision that no purchase price shall "exceed the average price charged by suppliers during the calendar year 1956."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to use just 20 seconds to say that corn, barley, oats, and grain sorghums are already in the program; and the 2 types of feed now being supplied must have either 75 percent or 60 percent of these surplus grains in them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to the committee amendment, to strike out, on page 4 at the end of line 16, the word "shall," and insert the word "may."

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] are necessarily absent.

Also necessarily absent are the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—32

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Goldwater | Payne |
| Beall | Hickenlooper | Potter |
| Bennett | Javits | Revercomb |
| Bricker | Jenner | Saltonstall |
| Bush | Knowland | Smith, Maine |
| Case, N. J. | Kuchel | Smith, N. J. |
| Cooper | Lausche | Thye |
| Cotton | Martin, Iowa | Watkins |
| Dirksen | Martin, Pa. | Wiley |
| Dworshak | McCarthy | Williams |
| Flanders | Morton | |

NAYS—49

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allott | Green | Mundt |
| Barrett | Hayden | Murray |
| Bible | Hennings | Neuberger |
| Blakley | Hill | O'Mahoney |
| Byrd | Holland | Pastore |
| Carlson | Jackson | Robertson |
| Carroll | Johnson, Tex. | Russell |
| Case, S. Dak. | Johnston, S. C. | Schoeppel |
| Church | Kefauver | Scott |
| Clark | Kennedy | Sparkman |
| Curtis | Kerr | Stennis |
| Douglas | Long | Symington |
| Eastland | Malone | Talmadge |
| Ellender | Mansfield | Thurmond |
| Ervin | McClellan | Young |
| Fulbright | McNamara | |
| Gore | Monroney | |

NOT VOTING—15

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | Frear | Magnuson |
| Bridges | Hruska | Morse |
| Butler | Humphrey | Neely |
| Capehart | Ives | Purtell |
| Chavez | Langer | Smathers |

So Mr. KNOWLAND's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Knowland amendment to the committee amendment was defeated.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. On page 5, line 5, have the words "cottonseed cake" been added as a perfecting amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There seems to be a discussion of the question at the clerk's desk.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. On page 5, line 5, in the committee amendment, following the words "cottonseed meal," there should be inserted a comma and the words "cottonseed cake."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that those words have not been inserted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that following the words "cottonseed meal" on page 5, line 5, there be inserted a comma and the words "cottonseed cake."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 5, line 3, after "by", it is proposed to insert "the respective"; and on page 5, line 4, after "1956", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "or in the case of new suppliers, the average price for 1956 of the county in which the supplier is located."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] to the committee amendment on page 5, beginning in line 3.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have conferred with the Senator from Colorado. This is a perfecting amendment, which I think improves the provision. I am glad to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado to the committee amendment is agreed to.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce to Senators who may be interested that it is our hope that we may be able to complete consideration of the appropriation bill this evening. I am sorry that we have had to spend most of the time arguing about "shall" and "may."

It was expected that we would take up the contempt citations today. However, I will say to the Senate that it will be too late this evening to do that. Therefore, any Senators who may be waiting, expecting those citations to be taken up this evening, should have this information, I should also state to the Senate that consideration of the joint resolution dealing with the Middle East situation, reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, will not be taken until some time tomorrow, I hope after we have completed consideration of the contempt citations.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 8, after the words "carry out" it is proposed to insert: "(or who, after having requested and been granted approval by their county agricultural stabilization and conservation committees, have carried out subsequent to September 30, 1956)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado is an amendment to the first committee amendment, which has heretofore been agreed to. Without objection, the vote whereby the committee amendment was agreed to will be reconsidered, in order that the amendment of the Senator from Colorado may be in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 8, in the committee amendment, after "carry out," it is proposed to insert: "(or who, after having requested and been granted approval by their country agricultural stabilization and conservation committees, have carried out subsequent to September 30, 1956)."

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Delaware that the purpose of this amendment is to carry out the original intent of the legislative enactment concerning drought. It will be observed from the committee amendment that its purpose is to apply the benefits of the program to those who carry out emergency programs in the future.

What has really happened under this program is this: There is an unexpended balance of approximately $38 million. Twenty-five million dollars is to be applied to a wind-erosion program. However, that means that in about five States there are hundreds of farmers who have filed their applications, and have treated their soil under the wind-erosion program, and who are now asking to be included in the program.

Today, after examining the records of the House, I called the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Peterson, and told him of the information which came to me today from Colorado. Some farmers came to see me and told me their story. I will say to my distinguished colleague from Colorado that they came from his area.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I wish it to be made perfectly clear, if the Senator will so state, that he has conferred with representatives of the Department regarding this amendment. Of course, retroactive legislation is not looked upon with favor either in this body or in the other body. However, in connection with such proposed retroactive legislation, if the Department is willing to confine it to cases in which approval was granted with respect to a request which had been made, and the Department did not get around to doing anything, I shall be glad to take the amendment to conference and see what can be done with it. However, I am sure that unless it is recommended by the Department of Agriculture it is not likely that it will be agreed to in conference.

Mr. CARROLL. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Arizona that the statement of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Peterson was that he had not had an opportunity to take up the question with the Farm Policy Committee. I accept the recommendation of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee that the amendment be taken to conference. I hope the Farm Policy Committee of the Department will give it support. I believe that in all equity we should give consideration to farmers who have been made this promise. I think that is a fair statement of the whole situation.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the statement on the part of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that he is willing to take this amendment to conference. I sincerely hope that it will be adopted.

I was prepared to offer an amendment which I think would have been stronger than the language just offered by the Senator from Colorado and accepted by the chairman of the committee. I had intended to offer an amendment on page 3, line 8, after the word "out" to insert the words "or who, subsequent to September 30, 1956, have carried out." That would take care of farmers who, in October, November, and December of last year did this chiseling, which prevented wind erosion in a great area, and entitled them to some payment. We paid them in 1955, so we did it retroactively. This is nothing new. We have done the same thing before. The farmers who delay work on the soil which badly needs work in the entire area are the ones to be paid under the present program. As I understand, under the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado, those who made application for payments and were certificated previous to that time would be paid. The amendment of the Senator from Colorado would not go as far as I would like to go, but in view of the fact that the chairman has offered to take the amendment to conference, I shall not press my amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to make the amendment clear. There is one thing which has not been mentioned as to the effect of the program. If we make this program retroactive, what we are doing is encouraging the people who have done their work conscientiously upon their farms. If we do not adopt such an amendment as this, or the one suggested by the Senator from Kansas, we shall be penalizing the conscientious people who have done this listing and chiseling on their farms. This is the only amendment by which they can obtain payments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] to the committee amendment on page 3, line 8.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I must object, because I want the RECORD to show that I am opposed to the committee amendment as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Loan Authorizations", on page 5, line 13, after the word "amended", to

strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$26,000,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter II—Small Business Administration—Salaries and Expenses", on page 5, at the beginning of line 22, to strike out "$1,100,000" and insert "$1,200,000", and in line 23, after the word "Administration", to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

*Provided*, That this authorization shall be effective only upon enactment of S. 637, or similar legislation, increasing the limitation on the amount of business loans which may be outstanding at any one time.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Revolving Fund," on page 6, line 6, after the figures "$45,000,000," to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

*Provided*, That this authorization shall be effective only upon enactment of S. 637, or similar legislation, increasing the limitation on the amount of business loans which may be outstanding at any one time.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter III—Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Public Health Service—Foreign Quarantine Service," on page 6, after line 15, to strike out:

The provisions of law that govern the financing (including rates of pay for personnel) of the overtime activities of the Bureau of Customs, Department of the Treasury, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, shall, effective 60 days after the enactment hereof, also govern the financing (including rates of pay for personnel) of the overtime activities of the Foreign Quarantine Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: *Provided*, That in case of difference between provisions of such law, the provisions governing the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall govern the Foreign Quarantine Service: *Provided further*, That wherever a title of a Government official or employee, name of an organizational unit, designation of an appropriation account, or similar nomenclature, appears in such law, the most nearly comparable title, name, designation, or descriptive term in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shall be substituted for the purposes of this paragraph.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

For an additional amount for "Foreign quarantine service," $67,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement I have prepared with relation to the amendment just agreed to.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER IN SUPPORT OF SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE REMAINDER OF FISCAL 1957 TO ENABLE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE TO PROVIDE 24-HOUR QUARANTINE INSPECTION, FEBRUARY 18, 1957

I wholeheartedly urge the granting of the President's request for a supplemental appropriation of $67,500 to cover 24-hour quarantine inspection by the Public Health Service of vessels arriving in United States ports.

At the present time quarantine inspection by the Public Health Service of vessels arriving in United States ports is provided only on the basis of a 12-hour day. This means that no matter how much it costs vessels to lay over in order to wait their turn at quarantine inspection, and no matter how willing the steamship companies are to pay inspectors for overtime services, quarantine inspections are permitted only 12 hours out of every 24; from 6 a. m. to 6 p. m., or 7 a. m. to 7 p. m.

The undisputed testimony presented to the House and Senate committees is to the effect that inability to obtain quarantine inspection 24 hours a day is costing the owners of American-flag vessels about $12 million a year. In turn, the United States Government, which has valuable recapture rights in the case of profitable subsidized operators, plus taxation rights—is losing between $5 million and $6 million a year.

As Members of the Senate all know, the Department of Defense's Military Sea Transportation Service operates a great many merchant vessels. Some it operates with its own personnel; others it operates by contractual arrangements with private companies. The fact that the United States Government foots the bill for the operation of these vessels does not entitle them to any special treatment insofar as quarantine service is concerned. MSTS vessels, like privately owned and operated merchant vessels, must wait until the next morning for quarantine inspection if they arrive in port after 6 or 7 p. m. Those who have computed what this enforced layover of MSTS vessels is costing the taxpayer tell us that it exceeds the $67,500 here being sought.

There is one final factor worthy of mention. In times such as these, we have, generally speaking, a shortage of vessel tonnage in relation to the actual demand. Artificial delays such as that being caused by the fact that quarantine inspection is afforded only 12 hours out of every 24, aggravates the actual shortage.

I respectfully submit that it is clear beyond a shadow of a doubt that to save $67,500 by turning down the President's request will cost the United States many, many millions of dollars. Such a course, obviously "pound foolish," is at the same time far from "penny wise."

Accordingly, I urge all Senators to vote in favor of granting this supplemental appropriation request.

I attach hereto to be printed in the RECORD, a copy of a letter which I wrote to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations on February 5, 1957, concerning this matter.

The letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 5, 1957.

The Honorable CARL HAYDEN,
*Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,*
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On January 14 President Eisenhower requested a supplemental appropriation of $67,500 for the fiscal year 1957 in order that the Public Health Service could provide 24-hour quarantine inspection of vessels arriving in United States ports. The House Committee on Appropriations has denied this request. Because of the importance of this matter, I felt I should write to you today to urge that your committee recommend approval of the President's request. If the Senate approves, the House, in conference, will reinstate the sum, I am sure.

At the present time the maritime inspectional services of the Public Health Service's Division of Foreign Quarantine are dispensed only on the basis of a 12-hour day. This means that no matter how much it costs vessels to lay over in order to wait their turn at quarantine inspection, and no matter how willing the steamship companies are to pay inspectors for overtime services, quarantine inspections are permitted only 12 hours out of every 24; from 6 a. m. to 6 p. m. or 7 a. m. to 7 p. m.

Inability to obtain quarantine inspection 24 hours a day has cost the owners of American-flag vessels, as I recall the latest figures, about $12 million a year. This means that the United States Government, which has valuable recapture rights in the case of profitable subsidized operators, plus taxation rights, is losing approximately five to six million dollars yearly.

And this is not all. I am reliably informed that the present 12-hour-a-day program is costing the Military Sea Transportation Service (MSTS) a great deal more than the sum needed to provide 24-hour service.

It is thus clear, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that to save $67,500 by turning down the President's request will cost the United States many millions of dollars. I respectfully suggest that such a course is not even penny-wise.

Accordingly, I urge that your committee give this matter the serious consideration it merits. I am confident that if this item is restored, our colleagues in the House will see the wisdom and justification of our position.

Sincerely,

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
*United States Senator.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Social Security Administration—Grants to States for Public Assistance," on page 7, line 14, after the figures "275,000,000," to strike out the colon and "*Provided*, That not more than $15,728,000 of this amount may be used for State and local administration."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 16, to insert a new chapter, as follows:

CHAPTER IV—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

*Acquisition of strategic minerals*

For an additional amount for "Acquisition of strategic minerals," $30,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1958: *Provided*, That the limitation in section 2 (a) of the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956, on the acceptance of offers for delivery of ores under said act in any one calendar month, shall not apply to offers made between December 1, 1956, and the end of the month preceding the date of enactment of this act, and the quantity of such offers which may be accepted shall be on a cumulative basis.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wonder whether I might ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield for a question.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senate adopted the amendment on page 7, lines 9 and 10, to provide $67,500 for the Foreign Quarantine Service. Is that considered an adequate amount to provide around-the-clock inspection service, which so many ports on the west coast and on the east coast have been requesting? It is essential that ships not be unduly delayed and detained.

I ask that question because a great many people in the shipping business and in the maritime business and in the navigation business, and in commerce generally, have been writing to me from my State, which is a seacoast State, re-

questing that the quarantine service receive an adequate amount of money with which to conduct a round-the-clock operation.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the sum which was estimated by the Department to be sufficient to take care of the work necessary to be done between now and the 30th of June.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That was the question I asked. Was that amount considered adequate?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is the sum—$67,500—that was estimated to be sufficient; is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator. I shall support the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the amendment that has just been stated, authorizes $30 million, for the acquisition of certain minerals, namely tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum. None of these four minerals, according to the Secretary of Defense, are needed in our stockpile program. There is sufficient testimony throughout the RECORD that these minerals are not needed in our defense stockpile. For that reason and since the language is obviously legislation on an appropriation bill, I make the point of order against that chapter in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will sustain the point of order.

Mr. HAYDEN. To which section of the amendment does the Senator make his point of order?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I make the point of order to the entire chapter IV.

Mr. HAYDEN. To the entire chapter?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the acquisition of strategic minerals in the amount of $30 million is authorized by law. I concede that a point of order may be made against the proviso, because that is not authorized by law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the ruling of the Chair, the point of order will be sustained against the entire amendment. The Senator from Arizona may offer an amendment containing language which does not include the proviso.

Mr. HAYDEN. The point is that the language for the additional amount involved for the acquisition of strategic materials is authorized by law. The proviso is not authorized by law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. HAYDEN. I concede that the Senator from Delaware may make a point of order against the proviso.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is my understanding that under rule XVI, section 2, a point of order may be made against the entire chapter; therefore I made the point of order against the entire chapter.

Mr. HAYDEN. I concede the point of order. I now move to insert in the bill at page 7, lines 21 and 22:

For an additional amount for "Acquisition of strategic materials, $30 million, to remain available until December 31, 1958."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment is in order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I make the point of order that I have been trying to get recognition. I tried to get recognition while the Chair was making its announcement with respect to the amendment being agreed to without objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that the vote on the amendment has been announced but I wish to oppose this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I make the point of order that I was trying to get recognition.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the action by which the Senate adopted the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona be reconsidered, so that the Senator from Delaware may be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona if there was any testimony given before the committee to the effect that these minerals would be needed in the stockpiling program.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the strategic stockpile has been filled. The purpose of the appropriation is not to build up the stockpile any further. It is designed to take care of a situation that exists; namely, that the administration has promised to submit to Congress a bill designed to encourage the mining of strategic minerals and metals in the United States. This is an intermediate program, to take care of the situation in the meantime, because these particular items in the bill are already fully supplied in the stockpile.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not a fact, according to all the testimony before the committee, that in the event of an all-out war, if all the foreign importation were stopped and if all the domestic production were stopped, there would be enough tungsten on hand to last a minimum of 5 years?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have heard no such guaranty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Was not that the testimony that was given before the Senator's committee? It is so stated in the House report.

Mr. HAYDEN. I know that tungsten is a metal the steel industry must use. I doubt that a 5-years' supply is on hand for the entire steel industry.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to read from the report from the House committee on this question. First, I should like to have the Senate note that the House committee issued a very strong report on this section, and I should like to read an excerpt from that report, if I may.

I quote from page 11 of House Report No. 24, 85th Congress, 1st session:

The committee has disallowed the supplemental budget request of $30 million to continue, under Public Law 733, the domestic purchase of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum for the remainder of the current fiscal year. Considering that there is clearly no defense justification for further acquisition of these minerals, the committee feels that continuation of this subsidy program at an estimated total cost of $91 million is entirely unwarranted.

The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization assured the Congress in June 1956, that there was no defense justification for further domestic purchase of any of these four minerals, pointing out that in each instance the amount on hand and on order met both the minimum and long-term stockpile objectives. For example, Mr. Flemming testified as follows concerning tungsten, for which $68,750,000 has been proposed, representing 80 percent of the total purchase program:

"Tungsten on hand exceeds both the minimum and long-term stockpile objectives. The inventory plus orders is larger than the total 5-year wartime requirements. * * * There is clearly no defense justification for a continuation of this program because even without any access to either domestic or foreign sources of supply in the event of war, we would have enough in the stockpile to meet total requirements for approximately a 5-year period."

Continuing, the committee said:

The committee believes there is even less justification for continuing this subsidy program at this time than there was on August 14, 1955, when the President vetoed H. R. 6373, which would have directed the continuation of the existing domestic minerals purchase programs under the Defense Production Act for certain minerals, including at least 3 of the 4 in question. In his veto message, the President said:

"Finally, the provisions of H. R. 6373 would apply to only a small segment of the domestic minerals industry and would not reach the fundamentals of the program. Indeed this bill would make solution of the overall problems of the industry more difficult. * * * The interests of the domestic minerals industry will be better served by proceeding with the careful development of a long-range minerals program than by approving a stopgap measure extending substantial Government aid to only a segment of the industry."

It is obvious that no long-range program has yet been developed by the administration. This is best evidenced from a review of the situation prevailing in the tungsten industry. Since 1951 the Government has purchased from domestic producers, at $63 per unit, 3 million short-ton units under Defense Production Act authority at a total cost of $187,562,751. During this period, the Government also awarded certificates of tax necessity and provided assistance under Defense Minerals Exploration programs to many of these same producers.

During the first half of 1956 almost all of the domestic production was being delivered to the Government under the purchase program at the price of $63 per unit, while industrial needs were being supplied from imports at about $43 per unit. As the amount on hand and on order exceeded even long-term stockpile objectives, it was necessary in June 1956 to discontinue defense purchases from domestic producers.

Under the new subsidy program, the Government has purchased since August 1, 1956, over $15 million worth of tungsten from domestic producers at $55 per unit while the United States market price was approximately $35. It should be noted that while it was contended that about 700 domestic producers might benefit from this program, only

49 producers have participated, 9 of whom have received 87 percent of the funds.

The largest purchase during this period was from a group of 3 affiliated companies and totaled $2,875,730, representing 19 percent of the total. A top executive of these companies testified previously that the authorizing legislation was needed in order that the domestic mines "can survive foreign competition." The committee was astounded to discover through its own investigation that a dominant company in this group has the largest contract to supply tungsten to the Government from foreign mines. The committee is advised that this contract, for the purchase of over $39 million of tungsten at $55 a unit, will not terminate until December 1959.

In the light of these facts, there can be no sound justification for continuing in peacetime a subsidization program for the sole benefit of a very limited segment of the industry at such an exorbitant cost to the taxpayers of the Nation.

I point out again as the House report states Mr. President, this $30 million is to subsidize one phase of the mineral industry in that it would commit the United States Government to buy tungsten of which we have sufficient to last us for 5 years in the face of any foreseeable emergency, even an all-out war. Representatives of the department testified to that effect. But we are trying to expand the program to permit the Government to buy tungsten at $55 a ton and to store it in another hole in the ground, when the prevailing market price is only $35 a ton. That represents a heavy subsidy.

During the recent campaign a great deal was said by Members of the Senate about desiring to curtail expenditures. We have all of us been shedding tears with our constituents about the necessity of bringing Government expenditures under control. Every Member of the Senate has been telling his constituents, whenever an item that is not essential has been pointed out, that he will support a cut in the appropriations.

Here is an instance of $30 million going down a rathole for the benefit of a few people at the expense of the American taxpayers. Certainly, Mr. President, this is one amendment which should be defeated.

USES OF TUNGSTEN NO SURPLUS—A SHORTAGE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Delaware if he has ever heard of Mr. Ickes who, for 20 years, said we had no tungsten in the United States and that it had to be shipped across major oceans, which, incidentally, of course, would be impossible in wartime.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not recall that.

Mr. MALONE. He said that we had very little tungsten—and must save it and import all we used.

The administration policy through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—free trade—put the sweatshop foreign labor in direct competition with our high standard of living wages—so of course none could be produced without a guaranty price.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was quoting the testimony of representatives of the Government who say we have adequate supplies of tungsten on hand.

Mr. MALONE. Has the Senator ever heard of Mr. R. H. Thielemann?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I have not heard of him, but I have heard from a large percentage of the 170 million taxpayers who say they are tired of subsidy programs which cannot be justified. Here is another program which, in my opinion, cannot be justified.

Mr. MALONE. I have just asked the Senator a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think I have the floor. If the Senator from Nevada wishes to approach this problem from the standpoint of raising the tariff, to protect our industry, I would certainly agree with him; but I would not agree that we can continue in this country to pay $55 a ton for this product when there is not a steel company or manufacturing company in America that is using the product. It is all being stored in the Government's stockpile. Certainly, in my book, that is not the proper way to handle the problem. I hope the amendment will be rejected. By so doing we can save a minimum of one-half of the $30 million involved.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware has not heard of Mr. Thielemann, perhaps the outstanding metallurgical research expert in the Nation today. Will the Senator from Delaware yield for another question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask if the Senator has heard of Mr. Thielemann's recent investigation results showing that the only way we can make a jet engine function with a 2,000-degree heat resistance metal is through the use of tungsten alloys. And that perhaps 50 percent of this metal will be tungsten—trebling or quadrupling our annual use of this indispensable metal.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; but I come back again to the point that I do not say it is not an essential commodity. I do not say we do not need it, but we should not be exceeding the maximum amount recommended by all the departments. There are many other things we need in this country.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for another question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. This is what Mr. Thielemann, one of the outstanding research men in metallurgy, has said.

The difficulty with most predictions of use of metals is that they ignore research and laboratory work.

I heard Mr. Thielemann testify before a House committee in San Francisco. He said that to attain a 2,000-degree heat resistance metal tungsten alloys would be used and that there would probably have to be 50 percent tungsten in the alloys, and that instead of 8 million units, a minimum of 25 million units annually will be needed.

We do not have a surplus on the basis of present knowledge—we have a shortage.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If there is such testimony it should be presented to the departments of the Government and to the committees of the Congress. As of this moment there has been no evidence presented to the Congress or to the committees which would justify this amendment or change the present position that we now have more than an adequate supply of this metal.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Surely.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. Quarles testified before our committee last year. Mr. Quarles had never heard of the production of tungsten in this country. He still thought it to be in short supply—and must be rationed—that is, the amount of tungsten which could be used in jet engines, or percentage must be reduced below the needed amount for a maximum life of the engine. The life of the engines was very much shortened through this shortsighted policy.

However, as soon as he learned that we were producing large amounts of tungsten in this country he abolished the limitation provision.

I should very much like to have the Senator from Delaware listen to what I am saying, because I believe he needs the information.

Government officials are generally the last persons to learn what domestic producers can do, since 24 years of education has gone on that we cannot produce critical metals.

We had a Secretary of the Interior who for 20 years maintained that the United States had no critical materials at all—no tungsten, no manganese, no critical raw materials of any kind. He mouthed the Harry Dexter White and Alger Hiss program of importing all such critical materials and shutting our own mines down.

Now, since we have fixed a price which merely represents the difference between the wage standard of living and the cost of doing business abroad and in the United States, we know that we can produce all the tungsten we need in this country.

As the research experts say, we need three times the amount of tungsten we we are now using, and we need it right away for high heat resisting tungsten alloys. We have no surplus on that basis and we can now break the news to the bureaucrats.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement by Mr. R. H. Thielemann, chairman, department of metallurgy, Stanford Research Institute, of February 8, 1957.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TUNGSTEN AND THE HIGH TEMPERATURE AGE

(By R. H. Thielemann, chairman, department of metallurgy, Stanford Research Institute, February 8, 1957)

INTRODUCTION

Since the beginning of World War II, accelerated technology in many fields has been moving constantly in the direction of higher and higher temperatures. This trend is particularly significant in the development of new and improved military devices, but there are many known commercial requirements for higher temperature operation. Today, the situation is particularly critical. In practically every field, engineering technol-

ogy has advanced to the point where the only direction left for realizing significantly improved performance is by going to higher temperatures. The main obstable is materials, and it follows that we simply do not have the materials available to withstand the high temperature conditions that are being called for. We are utilizing the properties of our presently available nickel and cobalt base super-high-temperature alloys to the maximum possible and there is reason to believe that any future gains which might be realized in the high temperature properties of these types of alloys will be marginal, at best.

In analyzing the problem, it appears that there is only one course available to us and that is to develop alloys based on the refractory metals which have melting points considerably higher than those of the iron, nickel, and cobalt base alloys that we have been working with. Of the 18 metals which have higher melting points than those of iron, nickel, and cobalt, there are only four which have significantly higher melting points that are available in sufficient quantities to be considered for the applications intended. These four refractory metals are columbium, molybdenum, tantalum, and tungsten. Although all four of them will undoubtedly prove to be important in developing alloys for service at temperatures of 2000° F. and higher, tungsten appears to be the most attractive for the extreme high temperature requirements.

APPLICATION AND PROBLEMS

Probably the most important application for improved high-temperature materials is in the gas-turbine field. The gas turbine is a thermal device in which the kinetic energy of a high-velocity gas which is at high temperature and pressure is converted to mechanical energy by expansion through the turbine. The efficiency of the cycle increases as the pressure and temperature of the gas are increased. Although the gas-turbine engine has great promise as a prime mover for power generation and for ship and other types of propulsion, its main application is in the turbojet engine to power aircraft.

As we all know, we are moving into the jet age very rapidly. All of the military combat aircraft are now jet-propelled and within a year, the debut of commercial jet transportation will have occurred. There is every reason to believe that the turbojet engine will be with us for some time to come and that its continued development will place increased emphasis on improved reliability, increased efficiency, and the desire to obtain more and more power from the lightest weight engine possible. The limiting factor in the ultimate development of the turbojet engine will be the ability of materials to withstand the high temperatures which are encountered in the turbine and combustion components. With the advent of higher energy fuels, and nuclear heat sources, the importance of being able to increase turbine temperatures is even more critical and we must find materials which will permit us to take full advantage of these benefits which are technologically available.

The Pratt and Whitney J-57 turbojet engine, which is shown in figure 1 [not printed in the RECORD], is fast becoming the "workhorse" engine in both military and commercial aviation. Without the afterburner, this engine develops over 10,000 pounds of thrust. The alloys that affect the performance of a modern turbojet engine the most are the so-called super-high-temperature alloys that are used for the turbine blades, vanes, and disks. A typical jet-engine turbine wheel is shown in figure 2 [not printed in the RECORD]. The turbine blades in a wheel of this type may be either forgings or precision castings. The alloy used must have high creep and fatigue strengths at the high operating temperatures and at the same time be capable of resisting oxidation, thermal shock, and mechanical abrasion. With all of the work that has been done to develop improved turbine-blade alloys, we are still limited to a maximum temperature of about 1,650° F. for a stress of 20,000 pounds per square inch and a 1,000-hour life.

In considering the development of a new high-temperature alloy, the main factors, aside from the strength problem, are oxidation resistance and metallurgical stability. In retrospect, it is interesting to look back over the high-temperature alloys which have been and still are prominent in the applications for which they were developed. The compositions of six alloys that are well known and have been used in substantial quantities in critical high-stressed, high-temperature applications are shown in table 1. It is significant that tungsten is present in all six of these alloys.

The cast X–40 alloy (Stellite 31) was developed in 1943 and is still being used for the turbine blades and vanes in our most advanced jet engines. During the course of the research program sponsored by the Tungsten Institute at Stanford Research, it was decided to investigate the effect of increasing the tungsten content on the rupture properties of the X–40 alloy. As shown in figure 3, the effect of increasing the tungsten content from 7.5 percent to 12.5 percent is to double the rupture life at 1,600° F. with a stress of 20,000 pounds per square inch. If, however, a small amount of an effective carbide former, such as columbium, is added so that the tungsten can act as a solid solution strengthener, the rupture life with 15 percent of tungsten is more than 30 times that of the original X–40 alloy.

This investigation was carried further to find an optimum composition which would have improved properties at 1,600° F. and 1,700° F. and have good castability. As a result of this work, an analysis designated WI–52 was arrived at. The composition and properties of the WI–52 alloy are shown in table II. The rupture properties of the WI–52 alloy are 75° to 100° better than the average properties of the original X–40 alloy composition. Cast nozzle vanes of the alloy, as shown in figure 4, have been made and submitted to one of the leading engine builders for evaluation. The reports from the preliminary tests indicate that the alloy shows considerable promise and plans are being made for full-scale engine evaluation. Even though the WI–52 alloy offers the possibility of improved life at temperatures of 1,600° F. and 1,700° F., it must be looked upon as an interim alloy that is still limited to operations where, under stress, the temperature will not significantly exceed 1,650° F.

If we look ahead to the possibilities that present themselves in the turbojet, nuclear power, and missile fields, it is apparent that to meet the high temperature requirements for materials, we will have to develop alloys based on the refractory metals which have melting points considerably higher than those of the iron, nickel, and cobalt base alloys that we have been working with. In all pure metals and alloys, the loss of strength with increasing temperature is gradual until a certain temperature level is reached. Above this temperature level, the loss of strength is markedly accelerated. We have known for some time that the limiting temperature at which a pure metal will still have a useful load-carrying ability has a definite relationship to the melting point of the metal. This limiting temperature is the temperature at which deformed grains in the metal will recrystallize on heating. Textbooks tell us that the recrystallization temperature of pure metals is approximately 40 percent of the melting temperature in degrees absolute. From experience, we also know that we can raise the effective recrystallization temperature of some of the metals several hundred degrees by proper alloying.

The recrystallization temperatures as determined for several metals are shown in figure 5 [omitted in the RECORD]. It is readily apparent that the four refractory metals, columbium, molybdenum, tantalum, and tungsten are the ones that we must develop if we are to achieve our goals. It should be possible by alloying these metals with each other or with other metals to develop alloys which will have useful engineering properties at temperatures up to 3000° F.

If we examine the physical properties of these four metals, as shown in table 3, it is seen that all of them have certain properties which make them attractive for high temperature. They all have low coefficients of thermal expansion which is important where thermal stresses resulting from rapid heating and cooling are involved. They all have a body centered crystal structure, which is indicative of inherent ductility. The low density of columbium is attractive, but the low modulus of elasticity is not indicative of high strength. Molybdenum is attractive in all respects except for the low melting point of its oxide. Tantalum has a high melting point but in combination with its high density, the modulus of elasticity is low. Tungsten, except for its high density, has a combination of properties which are the most attractive from the standpoint of being able to develop alloys which will have useful engineering properties at temperatures over 2,000° F.

A tabulation of the available tensile properties at various temperatures for the four metals is shown in table 4. Even though only two tests are available for tantalum, it would appear that it is the weakest metal of the four and that tungsten is the strongest with molybdenum and columbium in between.

The one problem with all of these metals is to find methods of protecting them from oxidation at the high temperatures. The only metals that resist oxidation at temperatures much higher than 2,000° F. are the noble metals, of which platinum is outstanding. So the job for the research worker is to find an alloy system that has the oxidation resistance of platinum. At the same time the alloy must be sufficiently ductile so that it can be rolled into thin sheet, formed, and bonded to the refractory metal. Some of the rarer metals which are now becoming available, such as yttrium, rhodium, and rhenium have characteristics that may be useful in solving this problem. With the high melting point metals, it seems quite likely that the protection problem is going to be more important than the strength problem.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, the need for metals and alloys which will have useful engineering properties at temperatures of 2000° F. and higher is urgent. The best and probably the only method we have of developing these materials is with the four higher melting point refractory metals—columbium, molybdemum, tantalum, and tungsten. Because of its high recrystallization temperature and high modulus of elasticity, tungsten appears to be the most promising for the more severe applications.

The development of new high temperature alloys which are based on the high melting point refractory metals will be expensive and there will be many difficult problems to solve, but the stakes are high. The Tungsten Institute, through the research program it is sponsoring at Stanford Research Institute to develop high temperature alloys based on tungsten has started the ball rolling. Studies are now underway to determine the most promising alloy systems and equipment is being installed to melt and

fabricate these alloys. It is hoped that this work will stimulate other research and development activity on tungsten and tungsten alloys, as a great deal of work needs to be done.

The United States Government, through its stockpiling program, has created the incentive to find new sources of those metals which have been in short supply. Known deposits of columbium and tungsten have been found in the Western Hemisphere which could supply fairly large requirements. Since the application for these metals will be strategically important, it is imperative that methods be found to provide the incentive for keeping both the exploration and domestic mining operations active. This is the only way by which a stable supply of these metals can be insured. In the case of tungsten, the United States is now consuming about 10 million pounds annually. If a satisfactory tungsten base alloy can be developed which will have useful engineering properties at temperatures of 2000° F. and higher, the expected consumption would be doubled or tripled.

Now that the Department of Defense has rescinded its orders which limited the use of the six critical metals in aircraft, there is assurance that once the improved refractory, high temperature alloys are available, they will be used. Interest in these alloys is increasing, and the one job remaining is to develop the alloys and methods of protecting them from oxidation so that our engineers and scientists can move forward on all fronts and realize the improvements in design, performance and operation that they know are possible.

TABLE 1.—*Important tungsten-containing high-temperature alloys*

| | TPA valve steel | Cyclops 17W | S-816 | NA-22H (Blaw Knox) | X-40 (Stellite 31) | L-605 (Stellite 25) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Carbon | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.15 max. |
| Chromium | 12.0 | 15.0 | 20.0 | 28.0 | 25.0 | 20.0. |
| Nickel | 12.0 | 15.0 | 20.0 | 48.0 | 10.0 | 10.0. |
| Molybdenum | | | 4.0 | | | |
| Columbium | | | 4.0 | | | |
| Tungsten | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 7.5 | 15.0. |
| Cobalt | | | 45.0 | | Balance | Balance. |
| Iron | Balance | Balance | 5.0 max | Balance | 2.0 max | 2.0 max. |
| Form | Wrought | Wrought | Wrought | Cast | Cast | Wrought. |
| Principal usage | Exhaust valves in aircraft engines. | Turbo supercharger blades and disks. | Jet engine blades | Furnace supports | Jet engine blades | Combustor components in jet engines. |

TABLE 2.—*Composition and properties of WI-52 alloy*

COMPOSITION

| Element | Range | Aim |
|---|---|---|
| Carbon | 0.35/0.45 | 0.40. |
| Manganese | 0.50 max | Low. |
| Silicon | 0.30 max | Low. |
| Chromium | 19/21 | 20.0. |
| Tungsten | 10/12 | 11.0. |
| Columbium | 1.25/1.75 | 1.5. |
| Nickel | 3 max | Low. |
| Iron | 2 max | Low. |
| Cobalt | Balance | Balance. |

TENSILE PROPERTIES

| | |
|---|---|
| Room temperature tensile strength. | 105,000-110,000 lb/sq. in. |
| Elongation in 2 inches | 2.5-5.0 percent. |

| Temperature, ° F. | 100-hour rupture strength | 1,000-hour rupture strength |
|---|---|---|
| 1,600 | 24,000 | 20,000 |
| 1,700 | 19,000 | 15,000 |

TABLE 3.—*Physical properties of refractory metals*

| Property | Columbium | Molybdenum | Tantalum | Tungsten |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Melting point °F | 4,487 | 4,720 | 5,425 | 6,150 |
| Density lb./cu. in. | 0.310 | 0.369 | 0.600 | 0.697 |
| Lattice structure | BCC | BCC | BCC | BCC |
| Linear expansion coefficient in./in./°F×10⁻⁶ | 4.0 | 2.7 | 3.6 | 2.4 |
| Young's modulus of elasticity lb./sq. in.×10⁶ | 15.1 | 40 | 27 | 60 |
| Meltingpoint of oxide °F | 2,660 | 1,463 | 3,450 | 2,676 |

TABLE 4.—*Tensile properties of recrystallized refractory metals*

[Short-time tensile strength in lb./sq. in.]

| Temp. °F | Columbium | Molybdenum | Tantalum | Tungsten |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Room temperature | 50,000 | 68,000 | 50,000 | 80,000 |
| 1,600 | 23,000 | 25,100 | | 36,600 |
| 1,800 | 18,000 | | | 36,500 |
| 2,000 | 17,000 | | | 33,500 |
| 2,200 | 14,800 | 18,000 | 9,400 | 31,800 |
| 2,732 | | | | 10,700 |
| 3,182 | | | | 8,250 |
| 3,632 | | | | 5,800 |
| 4,082 | | | | 3,400 |

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from Delaware has overlooked two facts; first, that the $30 million is for a program for six metals; it is not limited to tungsten. Second, he overlooked the fact that the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, Mr. Flemming, in his statement before the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs last spring said:

In view of the fact that the purchase program is about to terminate and that all defense needs have been met, we believe that this also is a situation where Congress should take appropriate action to assist the industry by providing for the purchase of specified amounts from nondefense funds until Congress has had time to consider recommendations from the Department of the Interior for a long-term program.

Mr. Flemming further said:

I suggest that where a domestic purchase program is about to terminate, and where all defense needs have been met, the Congress should make provision beyond the scope of defense legislation to assist the industry by providing for the purchase of specified amounts from nondefense funds until the Congress has had time to consider recommendations from the appropriate nondefense agency, namely, the Department of the Interior, for a long-range program.

That bore directly upon the tungsten program.

The other point which the Senator from Delaware overlooked is that other metals are included in the program, and the defense needs have not been met as to those metals. I call attention to the fact that Mr. Liebert, speaking for Mr. Wormser, as the Assistant to the Assistant Secretary on Mineral Resources, said this:

Ferro-columbium and ferro-columbium-tantalum is used primarily in the manufacture of stainless steel. However, columbium-bearing high-temperature alloys which are unsurpassed for use in jet engines and gas turbines may now require more columbium than the stainless steels. This is a new technological development and if technology continues to develop in this direction columbium is going to be far more important as a strategic material than it is today and the quantities which would be used would be far greater than anything we are using today.

Chairman HAYDEN. There are American sources.

Mr. LIEBERT. There are very few American sources of columbium and tantalum, sir. In fact, it is one of the things for which we feel there must be a continuing program.

This $30 million is to make possible a continuing program, so that columbium and tantalum reserves may be increased, so that other sources may be developed, so that we can have this material for the jet engines.

Senator BRIDGES then asked:

Where are the American sources located?

Mr. Liebert answered:

The largest source of columbium and tantalum today is in Idaho and small amounts of columbium and tantalum have been delivered under this program from New Hampshire and South Dakota. It is expected that other new deposits will be brought in as they are discovered and can be developed.

I want this final sentence to be heard by Senators, because the Senator from Delaware has given the impression that no one connected with the Government wanted to have this program continued—or, at least, I think that might be a fair inference.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not until the Senator has heard this sentence. This is the statement of Mr. Leibert, representing the Secretary of the Interior:

We must, in my opinion, develop additional sources of these strategic materials in the United States if we are not going to be utterly dependent on sources outside the United States for our industrial supplies as well as our future defense requirements should they be increased above the current requirements.

There was an official representing the Department of the Interior supporting a budget estimate for the continuation of this program. He was basing his support upon the need for developing the sources of supply of columbium and tantalum and some of the other metals

which are a part of the continuing program.

I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What I said, Mr. President, was that no representative of any agency of the Government has said there was a need for the further stockpiling of these metals. I know there are some officials, including the Director of the Budget, who have said they will go along with $30 million under certain circumstances, although I recall also that last year the Director of the Bureau of the Budget wrote a rather strong letter against this program on which we are acting today. In addition, last year the President vetoed a similar bill on the basis the minerals were not needed.

Why they have changed their position, I do not know. But I do know that in changing their position, they said they were not changing it based upon the fact that we needed the minerals, but rather based upon the fact that the industry itself might need some help. Are they going to establish a relief program now for every industry in America every time they get in trouble? If so then let us stop talking about cutting the budget.

The budget can only be cut by votes here in the Senate.

If at any time those representing the Department of Defense, or those who are in a position to know, will come before Congress and say that they need these particular metals, I shall vote for the further acquisition of these metals. I certainly am not placing myself in the position of being a better authority than they are. But as of today, those metals are not needed and the responsible officials all say they are not needed.

In addition to that, if we need greater amounts of tungsten, we can buy all we want at $35 a ton. Why pay $55? Why not remember the American taxpayers for once?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from Delaware is persisting in his error of trying to judge the program upon tungsten production. He is overlooking the direct testimony. He is attempting to say that no responsible official has said that we have need for it. But I read what the representative of the Department of the Interior said, namely:

> Columbium-bearing high-temperature alloys which are unsurpassed for use in jet engines and gas turbines may now require more columbium than the stainless steels.

He said:

> This is a new technological development—

And—

> we must develop additional sources of these strategic materials in the United States if we are not going to be utterly dependent on sources outside the United States for our industrial supplies as well as our future defense requirements.

So it seems to me that there has been a responsible official of the Government who has said that this program is needed and should be continued.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I want to add one thought. I think this should be made abundantly clear, because I believe the Senator from Delaware misstates the true purpose of the act. In the report, at page 8, the committee has said:

> In recommending the initial appropriation ($21 million was agreed to in the conference committee) the committee gave its approval to the intent of the authorizing act, which is to grant interim relief to the producers of tungsten, asbestos, acid-grade fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum until such time as a long-range nondefense minerals policy is submitted to and acted on by the Congress.

The law to which that refers is Public Law 733, 84th Congress, and was passed at the last session.

What I think is not seen by those who oppose the measure is the true nature of the proposal. The question has been asked, Do we need it? If so, we can go out and buy it on the world market.

Yes, we can; that is true. But we could also buy oil on the world market in 1941 and 1942. I have used this example, in fact, I used it before the committee, when it was having hearings on the bill during 1942. I saw ships of the United States burn and sink off the shores of Florida. We could not get that oil for this country.

Today we have another good example, because today the situation at the Suez Canal is limiting the oil shipments to a considerable portion of the Western World. Two years ago, the great Senator Millikin, then the senior Senator from Colorado, and I and the 2 Senators from Wyoming and the 2 Senators from Utah and several other Senators supported the provision for the development of the oil shale lying in our Western States. The reserves of that shale are fantastic, as compared with any other known oil reserves. Today many of us wish we were closer to having the ability to produce that oil in competition with other sources of oil, because, as we have learned, the other sources of oil may be shut off at any time, as has occurred in the case of the oil from the Near East and Middle East.

At this time I should like to refer to the remarks of the chairman of the committee, as they appear at page 96 of the hearings:

> Chairman HAYDEN. There seems to be some confusion as to the purpose of this program. The program was authorized by the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956. A copy of this act will be included in the record.

The act was accordingly set forth in the hearings.

Mr. Liebert stated very concisely—as appears on page 98 of the hearings—the real reason for this proposed legislation. I read his statement:

> With respect to the four minerals, we well considered last year that these industries would die if they were not supported for an interim period within which their operations could somehow be oriented to our normal peacetime economic life, or otherwise provided for by some method of assistance through the long-term minerals program which was promised the Congress.

On page 99, he said, in reply to a question:

> In many cases particularly in your big mines which are usually deep mines, you have a water problem always. If you pull your installation then you pull your pumps, your mine floods with water, your timbers rot, and your mine caves in. It might be true that there is some ore left in the mine but the excessive costs of going after that ore are enormously greater than they were in the first instance.

So, Mr. President, what this boils down to, as I see it, is that last year we passed Public Law 733, in which we enunciated the policy of the Congress of the United States in keeping alive these industries, which produce vital and strategic minerals for this country. It was not a program to build a strategic stockpile. It was a program to keep those industries alive, so we would not lose these valuable tungsten, columbium, and other mines which have been developed in the last few years. Relying upon that, the miners developed their mines. In many instances they refurbished their equipment, and in many more instances they bought new equipment. Having done so, and having relied upon the expressed intent of the Congress, as set forth in that law, and as the committee has so well expressed it, we, according to the Senator from Delaware, should now say to them, "We did not mean what we said."

Mr. President, all of us are looking forward to the long-term minerals program. Let us keep our faith with those who are doing their job in keeping these strategic minerals mines going, until the time comes when we can debate and pass upon a long-term minerals program for the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it has been said here that the Government officials are opposed to this program. I call attention to the fact that the Bureau of the Budget and the President of the United States submitted this item for $30 million, in order to meet the requirements of an act passed by the Congress. That act has been discussed here today, and $30 million has been requested by an authoritative representative of the Government. That fact negatives anything said to the effect that some officials have said we do not need this or that. The President of the United States has said we do need the appropriation of this amount of money in order to carry out the provisions of the law; that cannot be gainsaid. The $30 million is included in the budget the President sent to the Congress.

I also call attention to the fact that the Senator from South Dakota suggested a very important consideration; namely, that other minerals, in addition to tungsten, are included in this item. My State of Utah is interested in tungsten. The miners of my State have developed this industry in good faith. They have made heavy investments, and they are trying to carry on until the so-called long-range minerals policy is developed.

The fluorspar operators have done the same thing, but they are caught in a special squeeze. The metallurgical fluorspar producers were told that the program would apply to them, and that it would not be necessary for them to be mentioned in this particular act, because of the situation then existing; namely, that the Office of Defense Mobilization would have sufficient authority to grant them relief and to buy the metallurgical fluorspar. But because of a $6 freight differential, they were not given any relief whatsoever. I went to the Office of Defense Mobilization last year and called its attention to the fact that a $6 freight differential was working against the producers of metallurgical fluorspar. Then the Administrator, Dr. Flemming, said, "We will remedy that"; and he did so at once.

So we advised the Utah operators that they could go ahead under that arrangement, and they did so. Suddenly they are told that the House committee and the House of Representatives have jerked the rug completely from under their feet, because now there will be no money with which to go ahead, as authorized by the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Mr. President, the $30 million item should not be stricken from the bill. The position of the Senate committee should be sustained. The amendment of the Senator from Arizona should be agreed to. Then we shall have the funds with which to meet those obligations.

I have received from those producers the following telegram:

> Regarding House Appropriations Committee refusal to appropriate money for fluorspar program: Utah producers have already mined and have ready to ship several thousand tons of ore. Have purchased equipment, reopened mines at high cost; would be badly hurt now if program stopped without warning. House takes up bill Tuesday. Do all in your power to keep program going.

Mr. President, when the authorization for this program was made, last year, the Congress in effect assured these small businesses that they would be justified in hanging on for a little longer. They were told that this was an interim program for the purpose of keeping certain strategic mines in operation until Congress could consider long-term minerals policy legislation. Mr. President, if we now follow the lead of the House of Representatives in respect to this cut, we shall be telling those producers, in effect, "We are reneging on our commitment. We can find money for foreign aid and a record peacetime budget, but you producers who have critical defense minerals can go it alone, while this country continues to open its gates to the dumping of minerals produced by low-paid miners overseas."

Mr. President, all we request is fair play. We ask this Government to keep its commitments. But the Government cannot do so without the necessary appropriations. The administration knows of the commitments, and has requested this appropriation; and it should be made. It seems to me that we cannot afford to break faith with these producers, who have acted in good faith in opening the tungsten mines and all the other mines, and have kept them in condition, so as to enable this industry to go forward. I know that other areas can produce fluorspar, and can do so at a much lower rate. For instance, Mexico is able to do so. But Mexico does not have the same high standard of living the United States has, and the producers in Mexico do not pay the same wages the Utah operators pay.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Arizona will be agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall be very brief.

In reference to the statement of the Senator from Utah regarding the obligation of the government to keep faith and to appropriate this $30 million, let me say—and I am sure the Senator from Utah will agree with me—that the government has kept faith. The government either has paid or will pay for every pound that has been purchased under any authorized program.

This amendment has nothing to do with past commitments. Nobody is talking about not paying for the contracts which have been made. What we are talking about is appropriating $30 million so some more purchases can be made. Therefore, we do have a right to stop it.

As to promises which have been made, what promise has been made more prominently throughout the country, both by the administration and by Members of Congress, than that each one of us would do what we could to reduce the cost of government? Certainly, here is one place where we can reduce it. There is no necessity to contiue buying tungsten at $55 a ton, when all that is wanted can be bought at $35 a ton. They are begging us to buy at $35.

I quote again from the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, who is charged with operating the stockpiling. Mr. Fleming said:

> There is clearly no defense justification for a continuation of this program because even without any access to either domestic or foreign sources of supply in the event of war, we would have enough in the stockpile to meet total requirements for approximately a 5-year period.

After listening to all the testimony presented before the committee as to the need for the program, both by those who are for it and those who are against it, the House committee came up with this final conclusion, which I quote from the last paragraph of the report:

> In the light of these facts, there can be no sound justification for continuing in peacetime a subsidization program for the sole benefit of a very limited segment of the industry at such an exorbitant cost to the taxpayers of the Nation.

Certainly the argument against the amendment is well summed up by the paragraph which I have just read from the House report.

As to the argument that we are dealing with little miners throughout the country, I point out that the same testimony established that while there are about 700 domestic producers who could benefit from the program, only 49 have participated to any extent, and out of that number, 9 have received 87 percent of the total. Certainly, we are dealing with a direct subsidy for just a few major operators.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator desire to address himself to the amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Delaware completely misses the purpose of the Purchase Act of 1956. First, let us clarify a few things, and let us show that the House can be wrong. The Senator quoted from the House report to show that only 49 producers benefited from the program. I suggest that the Senator look at the Senate committee testimony, because the larger mills buy from the smaller producers, and, according to the testimony submitted to us, more than 250 were benefited by the program.

When we were stockpiling for defense these four particular minerals were omitted from the stockpile. That was the reason for the conference with the White House staff and with Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle. We finally got the minerals purchase program for 1956, involving four of these minerals.

My friend from Delaware misses the point in that it is not the size of the stockpile that is so important; it is the question of whether we are going to stockpile to our capacity to produce the minerals. By that I mean, assuming we have enough tungsten for awhile, what about the vessels carrying tungsten that are now on the bottom of the Caribbean and elsewhere, that never got to this country in wartime? The head of the minerals division who testified was sent to Korea, and was wounded many times, in an effort to get a mine in operation so that we could get tungsten into the country, which was so badly needed to carry on our war effort.

I ask the Senator from Colorado if that is not correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Fluorspar is mined in Kentucky, Nevada, and Illinois. The program can run until the 15th of April, when the program would be concluded, and that would be the end of the fluorspar industry in the United States of America. Then see what would happen to the price of imported fluorspar from Spain and Mexico. Manufacturers in that country are just waiting to put our industry out of business. Then we shall pay through the nose before we get through.

All those minerals are indispensable to the economy of this country. What we had in mind was to conserve the productive capacity of the industry, and to stockpile the product, and to keep the mines going. There is not any question that the imported commodity can be brought in from other countries at a cheaper price, but when our own mining industry got on its uppers and could no longer perform, then we would see the

price go up everywhere in the world. That is what is involved in this situation.

I sincerely hope the Senate will not be so shortsighted as to destroy the productive capacity of our mining industry and leave us high and dry in case of an emergency.

One other thing, and then I am through. Something has been said about keeping faith. Let us see what the record shows. When the first estimate was made last year, $91,600,000 was asked for this particular program. That estimate was taken to the Appropriations Committee. We said, "We will give you $21 million, and that will run you until the first of January 1957." We cut $70 million out of the estimate last year. So in the second supplemental appropriation bill committee report, this is what we said:

> The budget estimate was $91,600,000. We are supplying enough to carry on to January 1957.

And then we said, as an Appropriations Committee, and as an instrumentality of the Senate:

> It is expected that the budget will submit a supplementary request.

That is what the Appropriations Committee of the Senate said. That is what is before the Senate now—the supplementary request to which we referred to in connection with the second supplementary appropriation bill of last year.

Finally, Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that all that can be bought under the program are domestically mined minerals. Not 1 pound of fluorspar mined in Mexico or in Spain can be bought. Not 1 pound of columbium-tantalum mined elsewhere can be bought. Not 1 pound of tungsten that comes from Korea or Brazil or somewhere else can be bought. The provision is designed to energize the mining industry of the United States, and we shall be in a desperate plight that day when our mining industry can no longer continue.

I know a little something about the mining industry. I know what will happen on the Ohio River. That is water territory. When the mines are no longer pumped, the water comes in. Machinery, generators, and other equipment have to be pulled out. It costs money to maintain that equipment, but if there is no business, are the operators to be expected to pay out of their pockets to maintain their installations which in the first instance cost from $350,000 to $2 million?

That is what will happen to those industries. They will be on their uppers. Then let us see what happens to our domestic minerals industry in an hour of emergency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have the record show that I fully subscribe to everything the very able Senator from Illinois has said. I believe that to defeat this amendment would be disastrous to our defense. I think it would be unfair to our producers, and I think it would totally ignore the best interests of this country.

Mr. President, I am prepared to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I desire the floor in my own right.

Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, coming from the West, I feel it incumbent upon me to try to clarify the record very briefly. Some of my good friends from the West, like my friend from Illinois, plead for this proposal as a defense measure. Of course there is no defense involved in it. There is not one iota of national defense in it. That stands for the record. If this were a defense measure, Mr. Flemming, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization would not want any legislation, because he is authorized under the National Defense Production Act to purchase minerals deemed essential for national defense.

Why is this proposal before us? Because a year ago Dr. Flemming said he was not authorized to buy any of these minerals inasmuch as they were not needed for national defense. It is that simple. So this proposal is entirely aside from any consideration of national defense.

The record will sustain me when I say that for several years I have pointed out the essential and vital needs for working out a long-range program, not only for tungsten, but for all the other critical and strategic minerals.

Later I shall tell the Senate how much production of tungsten we have in this country.

My colleagues who have been shedding tears on the floor of the Senate and in the committee sessions, both in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am a member, and the Appropriations Committee, on which I happen to serve, should be doing something for minerals like antimony, because we produce in this country only 6 percent of the primary antimony we need for our annual requirements. Does anyone cry about the national defense aspects of a mineral when we produce only 6 percent? No. Do we hear anyone plead for the purchase of cobalt, a very vital and critical material? In 1952, according to this very valuable volume provided by the senior Senator from Nevada, we have the following statistics: 81 percent of the cobalt was produced in Africa, and only 10 percent in the United States and Canada.

There are many other minerals. I shall not take the time to enumerate them. I merely wish to point out that if we discontinue a nondefense purchase program with respect to tungsten, the mines will flood out. I agree with the Senator from Illinois that that is largely true. But will not that happen to the mines of domestic producers who, without a nickel of subsidy, have endeavored conscientiously and persistently to produce minerals which we need, and which are produced primarily, if not solely, in Africa? What will happen to those mines?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Not at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. We need certain minerals for national defense. I told the committee that I could go along with the proposal with respect to fluorspar and certain other minerals, such as asbestos, columbium, and tantalum, because we are producing, in the case of asbestos, only about half of what we require for annual consumption in this country.

But what is the situation concerning tungsten? I obtained certain figures from the General Services Administration. I will say to my friend from Nevada that I have no desire to argue for or against this measure. However, the Senator from Idaho deplores the efforts of anyone to foul up the record.

According to GSA, the domestic production of tungsten in 1955 was approximately 16 million pounds. What was our consumption in this country that year? Approximately 8 million pounds, or half.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Not at this point.

So we produced twice as much tungsten in 1955 as we consumed in this country.

What did we get in imports? We got approximately 21 million pounds, or 2½ times our annual requirements.

The record shows, according to statistics admitted by GSA, that in 1955, we produced or imported 4½ times as much tungsten as our annual requirements, considering both domestic production and imports.

So I say to my good friends that I will join them in pleading not only for the National Defense Act aspects of stockpiling vital strategic materials, but developing and stimulating sources from which we can replenish exhausted stockpiles.

Why do we shed tears over tungsten, when, in domestic production and imports in 1955, we had 36½ million pounds, or 4½ times the amount of tungsten required for all our commercial uses in this country? The record will show that. Those are not my figures.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the Senator was present when Mr. Liebert testified. He testified very frankly that we could liquidate the stockpile we have and make a profit on it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator was present; and the record certainly should be clarified in that connection. I do not care what Mr. Liebert, from the Department of the Interior, testified. He said, when I asked him questions about the other minerals, that he was an authority only on tungsten. He preferred not to answer my questions about any of the other minerals. When Mr. Liebert said we could sell that stockpile at a profit, he told an untruth. If a stockpile is purchased with big subsidies, where are we going to sell a 20-year stock of tungsten? Are we going to sell it to people in Africa, who can buy it

at about two-thirds the price we pay for it? How are we going to make a profit on it?

A PERMANENT MINERAL POLICY; THE MALONE BILL, S. 34

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. A permanent program should be forthcoming. I believe that Senate bill 34, which I introduced on January 7 is a good permanent program. It includes all the minerals which my good friend from Idaho mentioned. I have no doubt that such a program will be adopted, but in the interim we must keep the mines open.

I ask unanimous consent to have my bill printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 34) to provide relief for producers of certain critical minerals, metals, and materials indispensable in the construction of jet engines was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.—*

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is declared to be the policy of the Congress—

(a) to facilitate and encourage trade with foreign nations on the basis of fair and reasonable competition;

(b) to maintain an investment climate through the principle applying equally to the whole country;

(c) to provide necessary flexibility of import duties, on certain critical minerals, metals, and materials, thereby making possible appropriate adjustments in response to changing economic conditions;

(d) to assure the accomplishment of these objectives by returning to the provisions of the Constitution (article 1, section 8) in the control over American import duties on such critical minerals, metals, and materials, now subject to international agreements;

(e) that as used in this act and amendments made by this act the term "critical metals, minerals, and materials" includes antimony, asbestos, beryllium, chromite, cobalt, columbium-tantalum, fluorspar, lead, manganese, mica, molybdenum, nickel, titanium, tungsten, vanadium, uranium, and zinc, all being used in the production of jet engines;

RESTATEMENT OF EXISTING IMPORT DUTIES

SEC. 2. Title I, paragraphs 1 to 1559, inclusive, of the Tariff Act of 1930 are hereby amended by repealing the classifications and rates therein contained on critical minerals, metals, and materials, and substituting therefor the classifications and rates obtaining and in effect on the expiration of 90 days after the date of enactment of this act, by reason of proclamations of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or otherwise; and all other acts and parts of acts inconsistent with any of the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

ADMINISTRATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS

SEC. 3. Title III, part II, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by adding after section 331 the following new section:

"SEC. 331A. Administration of trade agreements

"(a) All powers vested in, delegated to, or otherwise properly exercisable by the President or any other officer or agency of the United States in respect to the foreign trade agreements on critical minerals, metals, and materials, entered into pursuant to section 350 of this act are hereby transferred to, and shall be exercisable by the Commission, including, but not limited to, the right to invoke the various escape clauses, reservations, and options therein contained, and to exercise on behalf of the United States any rights or privileges therein provided for the protection of the interests of the United States.

"(b) The Commission is hereby authorized and directed—

"(1) to terminate as of the next earliest date therein provided, and in accordance with the terms thereof, all the foreign trade agreements on critical minerals entered into by the United States pursuant to section 350 of this act;

"(2) to prescribe, upon termination of any foreign-trade agreement, that the import duties established therein shall remain the same as existed prior to such termination, and such import duties shall not thereafter be increased or reduced except in accordance with this act."

PERIODIC ADJUSTMENT OF IMPORT DUTIES

SEC. 4. Title III, part II, section 336, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 366. Periodic adjustment of import duties

"(a) The Commission is authorized and directed from time to time, and subject to the limitations hereinafter provided, to prescribe and establish import duties on critical minerals, metals, and materials, which will, within equitable limits, provide for fair and reasonable competition between domestic articles and like or similar foreign articles in the principal market or markets of the United States. A foreign article shall be considered as providing fair and reasonable competition to United States producers of a like or similar article if the Commission finds as a fact that the landed duty paid price of the foreign article in the principle markets or markets in the United States is a fair price, including a reasonable profit to the importers, and is not substantially below the price, including a reasonable profit for the domestic producers, at which the like or similar domestic articles can be offered to consumers of the same class by the domestic industry in the principal market or markets in the United States.

"(b) In determining whether the landed duty paid price of a foreign article, including a fair profit for the importers, is, and may continue to be, a fair price under subdivision (a) of this section, the Commission shall take into consideration, insofar as it finds it practicable—

"(1) the lowest, highest, average, and median landed duty paid price of the article from foreign countries offering substantial competition;

"(2) any change that may occur or may reasonably be expected in the exchange rates of foreign countries either by reason of devaluation or because of a serious unbalance of international payments;

"(3) the policy of foreign countries designed substantially to increase exports to the United States by selling at unreasonably low and uneconomic prices to secure additional dollar credits;

"(4) increases or decreases of domestic production and of imports on the basis of both unit volume of articles produced and articles imported, and the respective percentages of each;

"(5) the actual and potential future ratio of volume and value of imports to volume and value of production, respectively;

"(6) the probable extent and duration of changes in production costs and practices;

"(7) the degree to which normal cost relationships may be affected by grants, subsidies (effected through multiple rates of export exchange, or otherwise), excises, export taxes, or other taxes, or otherwise, in the country of origin; and any other factors either in the United States or in other countries which appear likely to affect production costs and competitive relationships.

"(c) Decreases or increases in import duties on critical minerals, metals, and materials, designed to provide for fair and reasonable competition between foreign and domestic articles may be made by the Commission either upon its own motion or upon application of any person or group showing adequate and proper interest in the import duties in question: *Provided, however,* That no change in any import duty shall be ordered by the Commission until after it shall have first conducted a full investigation and presented tentative proposals followed by a public hearing at which interested parties have an opportunity to be heard.

"(d) The Commission, in setting import duties so as to establish fair and reasonable competition as herein provided, may, in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, prescribe specific duties or ad valorem rates of duty upon the foreign value or export value as defined in sections 402 (c) and 402 (d) of this act or upon the United States value as defined in section 402 (e) of this act.

"(e) In order to carry out the purposes of this act, the Commission is authorized to transfer any article from the dutiable list to the free list, or from the free list to the dutiable list.

"(f) Any increase or decrease in import duties ordered by the Commission shall become effective 90 days after such order is announced: *Provided,* That any such order is first submitted to Congress by the Commission and is not disapproved, in whole or in part, by concurrent resolution of Congress within 60 days thereafter.

"(g) No order shall be announced by the Commission under this section which increases existing import duties on foreign articles if the Commission finds as a fact that the domestic industry operates, or the domestic article is produced, in a wasteful, inefficient, or extravagant manner.

"(h) The Commission, in the manner provided for in subdivisions (c) and (f) in this section, may impose quantitative limits on the importation of critical minerals, metals, and materials, in such amounts, and for such periods, as it finds necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act: *Provided, however,* That no such quantitative limit shall be imposed contrary to the provisions of any foreign trade agreement in effect pursuant to section 350 of this act.

"(i) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) the term 'domestic article' means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of the United States; and the term 'foreign article' means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of a foreign country;

"(2) the term 'United States' includes the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia;

"(3) the term 'foreign country' means any empire, country, dominion, colony, or protectorate, or any subdivision or subdivisions thereof (other than the United States and its possessions);

"(4) the term 'landed duty paid price' means the price of any foreign critical mineral, metal, and material, after payment of the applicable customs or import duties and other necessary charges, as represented by the acquisition cost to an importing consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, or the offering price to a consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, if imported by an agent.

"(j) The Commission is authorized to make all needful rules and regulations for carrying out its functions under the provisions of this section.

"(k) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the entry and declaration of foreign articles with respect to which a change in basis of value has been made under the provisions of subdivision (d) of this section, and for the form of invoice required at time of entry."

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 337

SEC. 5. Title III, part II, section 337, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended as follows:

(a) Subdivision (a) thereof by striking out the word "President" and substituting therefor the words "Tariff Commission."

(b) Subdivision (b) thereof is hereby repealed.

(c) Subdivision (d) thereof is hereby repealed.

(d) Subdivision (e) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) Exclusion of articles from entry: Whenever the existence of any such unfair method or act shall be established to the satisfaction of the Commission, it shall direct that the articles concerned in such unfair methods or acts, imported by any person violating the provisions of this act, shall be excluded from entry into the United States, and upon information of such action by the Commission, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, through the proper officers, refuse such entry."

(e) Subdivision (f) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) Entry under bond: Whenever the Commission has reason to believe that any strategic and critical mineral, metal, and material is offered or sought to be offered for entry into the United States in violation of this section, but has not information sufficient to satisfy it thereof, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon its request in writing, forbid entry thereof until such investigation as the Commission may deem necessary shall be completed; except that such articles shall be entitled to entry under bond prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury."

(f) Subdivision (g) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(g) Continuance of exclusion: Any refusal of entry under this section shall continue in effect until the Commission shall find and advise the Secretary of the Treasury that the conditions which led to such refusal of entry no longer exist."

STATISTICAL ENUMERATION

SEC. 6. Title IV, part III, section 484 (e), of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) Statistical enumeration: The Chairman of the Tariff Commission is authorized and directed to establish from time to time, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, a statistical enumeration of imported articles in such detail as he may consider necessary and desirable to effectuate the purposes of this act. As a part of each entry there shall be attached thereto or included therein an accurate statement giving details required for such statistical enumeration. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to make such reasonable and proper digests from, and compilations of, such statistical data as the Chairman requests. In the event of a disagreement between the Chairman and the Secretary of Commerce as to the reasonable and proper nature of any request the matter shall be referred to the President, whose decision shall be final."

REVISED TEXT OF TARIFF ACT

SEC. 7. The Tariff Commission, as soon as practicable, shall prepare and cause to be printed as a public document available for public distribution a complete revised text of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended: *Provided*, That all acts or parts of acts conflicting herewith are hereby repealed.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 8. This act shall take effect upon the expiration of 90 days after the date of its enactment, but no foreign trade agreement shall be entered into under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, after the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point my letter to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. HAYDEN], and our imports from foreign producers in 1955.

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
*February 7, 1957.*

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
*Chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You, of course, are familiar with the fact that the Congress, in June of last year, enacted Public Law 733, a measure which directed the Secretary of the Interior to embark upon a purchase program covering four of our more strategic minerals and to continue over a period of 30 months. This same act authorized the appropriation of funds necessary to implement it.

I also need not remind you that there was appropriated only $21 million, which was anticipated would carry the program in its entirety until Congress reconvened in January 1957. Again I need not remind you of this because had it not been for your personal efforts in the closing days of the 84th Congress, this implementing appropriation probably would not have been made.

I am deeply concerned over the failure of the House of Representatives to include an appropriation for the implementation of this minerals purchase program during the coming months until the new 1957–58 appropriation bill becomes effective. It is my information that at the conclusion of a "bobtail" hearing before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, this item was deleted from the administration's recommendations in respect to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

The record should be made clear, Mr. Chairman, in respect to the Wah Chang contract with the Office of Defense Mobilization. In its report the House Committee, apparently not familiar with the full details, stated that:

"The committee was astounded to discover through its own investigation that a dominant company in this group has the largest contract to supply tungsten to the Government from foreign mines. The committee is advised that this contract for the purchase of $39 million of tungsten at $55 a unit will not terminate until December 1959."

What the committee failed to mention, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that this contract was entered into on June 22, 1951, with the Wah Chang Trading Corp., when this Nation vitally needed all the tungsten it could possibly get (wartime). The contract, which the report also did not mention, called for the acquisition of 710,694 units of tungsten, and up to date less than one-third of that quantity has been delivered, and, Mr. Chairman, this tungsten is coming from Brazil.

In 1951, when this contract was executed, foreign tungsten was being offered at $80 per unit for the simple reason that our domestic mines had been closed at the end of World War II, and we were at the mercy of producers in foreign fields. At this same time other contracts were entered into with foreign producers totaling more than 5 million units, with an average price of approximately $55 per unit, which reflects good trading on the part of our Government people. It was only when our domestic price of $63 per unit was established that we were able to put a break on the exorbitant demands of foreign producers, and it was this price which gave the incentive to prospect for and open up new mines in this country—tungsten mines which may conceivably some day be the deciding point between victory and defeat in a worldwide conflict.

For 20 years all Government officials, special writers, and internationalists claimed that we had no tungsten in this country. Now with the price fixed enough above the world price to make up the difference between the wages, and the cost of doing business in this country and in the chief competing nation, we are currently producing twice as much tungsten annually as the United States is consuming which embarrasses all of the claimants that it could not be produced in the United States.

What is needed is, of course, to let the critical materials, without which you cannot make a jet engine, return to the Congress from Geneva, and the Tariff Commission, an agent of Congress, could then set the flexible duty in accordance with that difference in cost. Pending that time, we must keep the purchase program alive to keep the mines open because if they were closed (and they would be very soon if no money were appropriated) many would fill with water and be lost.

During the hearings held in April and May of 1956 by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, out of which grew Public Law 733, we had testimony from highly qualified expert witnesses that this country should acquire every single pound of tungsten available, not only in this country, but from every country abroad. Highly militarized countries abroad are acquiring all the tungsten they can get and it stands at the very top of the critical list of metals which are vital for our defense.

To keep our mines open is not a subsidy for the benefit of the few; it is an insurance policy against annihilation of the Nation. Without burdening the record, Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that foreign producers, operating in an area where a slave wage is the rule rather than the exception, are always in a position to cut prices—so much for the contention of the House subcommittee that present-day industrial needs are being supplied from imports at about $35 per unit—and when it suits their purpose to jack that price up to $80 per unit, sure they can sell it, and at a profit due to the slave's wages paid for $35 a unit, but the minute we close up our mines they will yank the price back up to $80 a unit, or any other figure they deem the traffic will bear.

Mr. Chairman, I deem inclusion of the funds necessary to carry on to its conclusion in December of 1958 the minerals purchase program called for in Public Law 733 as one of the most serious matters your committee will be called upon to perform during the present year, and I urge you and your fellow members to write in to the presently being considered urgent deficiency appropriations bill, the amount necessary to carry on the program through the balance of the present fiscal year, and at the appropriate time to appropriate the additional sums necessary to carry the program to its completion.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. MALONE.

*Tungsten, United States general imports, first 11 months, 1955, ore and concentrates*

| | Gross weight, pounds | Tungsten content, pounds | Value |
|---|---|---|---|
| Canada | 3,472,004 | 1,867,742 | $6,636,051 |
| Mexico | 1,410,742 | 718,987 | 1,955,683 |
| Peru | 1,548,943 | 876,319 | 2,851,948 |
| Bolivia | 8,829,936 | 4,247,506 | 13,883,949 |
| Brazil | 2,216,431 | 1,231,160 | 2,949,171 |
| Argentina | 1,669,734 | 888,255 | 2,548,443 |
| Netherlands | 33,098 | 17,780 | 36,021 |
| United Kingdom | 18,734 | 14,860 | 29,524 |
| France | 286,732 | 150,772 | 255,476 |
| Finland | 97,002 | 52,412 | 86,730 |
| Spain | 1,963,622 | 1,032,998 | 3,253,226 |
| Portugal | 3,001,637 | 1,696,702 | 3,679,337 |

*Tungsten, United States general imports, first 11 months, 1955, ore and concentrates*—Continued

| | Gross weight, pounds | Tungsten content, pounds | Value |
|---|---|---|---|
| Burma | 587,184 | 312,845 | 4473,473 |
| Thailand | 1,193,753 | 663,046 | 1,127,993 |
| British Malaya | 213,225 | 116,087 | 179,494 |
| Korea, Republic | 3,920,000 | 2,170,986 | 3,286,057 |
| Japan | 263,844 | 152,132 | 281,388 |
| Australia | 3,075,499 | 1,678,583 | 4,996,561 |
| New Zealand | 4,274 | 2,203 | 3,368 |
| Belgian Congo | 1,800,000 | 1,014,139 | 2,727,265 |
| Union of South Africa | 609,034 | 316,515 | 1,238,599 |
| Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland | 19,322 | 10,043 | 16,939 |
| Total | 36,234,750 | 19,232,132 | 52,496,696 |

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the Senator. He wants to keep only the tungsten mines open.

Mr. MALONE. No. I want to keep the critical mineral mines a going concern until a permanent policy can be adopted. Mr. Flemming testified that he could buy the minerals which were included in the original 1953 Malone-Aspinall Mineral Purchase Act. This is an interim measure to keep the mines operating until a permanent program can be devised.

The permanent policy suggested is outlined in Senate bill 34 and includes antimony, asbestos, beryllium, chromite, cobalt, columbium-tantalum, fluorspar, lead, manganese, mica, molybdenum, nickel, titanium, tungsten, vanadium, uranium, and zinc.

The bill includes 17 critical metals without which you cannot make a jet engine.

The bill would withdraw these minerals from Geneva and put them back under the Tariff Commission, an agent of Congress, to fix the flexible tariff or duty in accordance with the Constitution—article 1, section 8. The duty would be adjusted on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and you would be back in business.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a table showing the production, imports, and consumption of tungsten from 1939 to 1956.

There being no objection the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Salient statistics of tungsten ores and concentrates in the United States, 1939–54*

[Pounds of contained tungsten]

| Year | Production | Shipments from mines | Imports for consumption | Consumption | Industry stocks at end of year | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Producers | Consumers and dealers | Total |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| 1939 | 3,429,047 | 4,080,024 | 1,485,157 | (1) | 283,803 | 2,667,738 | 2,951,541 |
| 1940 | 4,872,806 | 5,062,199 | 5,610,882 | 9,955,000 | 93,618 | 2,803,249 | 2,896,867 |
| 1941 | 6,420,303 | 6,249,945 | 11,522,190 | 16,699,000 | 263,626 | 2,404,876 | 2,668,502 |
| 1942 | 8,977,575 | 8,882,403 | 14,326,470 | 17,389,000 | 355,864 | 3,416,438 | 3,772,302 |
| 1943 | 11,472,985 | 11,368,295 | 19,445,017 | 19,313,000 | 458,586 | 2,459,246 | 2,917,832 |
| 1944 | 9,764,647 | 9,786,537 | 18,396,277 | 19,165,000 | 435,634 | 1,510,419 | 1,946,053 |
| 1945 | 5,388,639 | 5,266,818 | 4,773,861 | 14,146,000 | 557,042 | 3,784,429 | 4,341,471 |
| 1946 | 4,671,042 | 4,942,282 | 6,869,438 | 6,458,000 | 285,865 | 3,694,256 | 3,980,121 |
| 1947 | 3,026,470 | 2,944,622 | 6,018,005 | 7,812,000 | 368,316 | 3,343,392 | 3,711,708 |
| 1948 | 4,033,389 | 3,838,287 | 7,548,101 | 8,853,000 | 563,418 | 5,284,901 | 5,848,319 |
| 1949 | 2,896,084 | 2,631,506 | 6,274,102 | 4,958,000 | 827,045 | 4,229,444 | 5,056,489 |
| 1950 | 3,965,040 | 4,587,687 | 16,147,313 | 6,597,000 | 216,468 | 5,121,206 | 5,337,674 |
| 1951 | 5,913,750 | 5,972,551 | 6,376,513 | 11,410,000 | 234,282 | 4,037,502 | 4,271,784 |
| 1952 | 7,233,199 | 7,243,589 | 17,416,368 | 8,634,000 | 208,300 | 2,816,405 | 3,024,705 |
| 1953 | 9,272,513 | 9,141,572 | 27,923,573 | 7,734,000 | 362,891 | 4,334,710 | 4,697,601 |
| 1954: 1st 6 months | 5,910,000 | 5,564,000 | 13,903,778 | 2,453,000 | 726,000 | 3,588,000 | 4,314,000 |
| 1954 | 13,136,000 | 13,050,000 | 24,132,426 | 4,032,000 | 458,000 | 3,913,000 | 4,371,000 |
| 1955: 1st 9 months | 11,420,000 | 11,520,000 | 15,201,000 | 6,622,000 | 322,000 | 3,189,000 | 3,561,000 |
| 1956: 1st 11 months | ---------- | ---------- | 19,232,132 | 8,036,000 | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- |

[1] Not available.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator is interested only in tungsten.

Mr. MALONE. No.

Mr. DWORSHAK. There is no provision for antimony or cobalt. I stated that I could go along with the proposal with respect to fluorspar, asbestos, columbium, and tantalum.

Mr. MALONE. I have just called the Senator's attention to Senate bill 34—which would adopt a permanent policy—and antimony and cobalt are included in the 17 critical materials—the flexible duty or tariff would then be adjusted on the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Liebert testified only with respect to tungsten. How does the Senator explain his statements about columbium and tantalum? Mr. Liebert said:

> There are very few American sources of columbium and tantalum, sir. In fact, it is one of the things for which we feel there must be a continuing program—to preserve that small industry which we had developed for defense purposes, and to try to keep it alive so that the operators could go out and develop new and additional sources of columbium in the United States.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his contribution. As I stated in the committee, and now repeat, I would be willing to go along with the proposal with respect to fluorspar, asbestos, columbium, and tantalum. There is a reasonable need, even though we have complete defense schedules for those minerals. But Mr. Liebert was asked questions about the other minerals. Not a single ton of antimony is produced in this country except as a byproduct of one of the silver mines in Idaho.

No one is interested in the defense aspect of that mineral, apparently.

This is a wonderful spectacle, Mr. President, when we cry our eyes out for national defense, and can justify anything on the basis of national defense.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. DWORSHAK. I take, in good grace, the suggestion of one of my colleagues sitting near me, and I say again that I did not intend to make a speech or any comment on this subject. If I had intended to do so, I would have come to the floor with all the facts. The reason I am not making any particular fight on this subject is because that a year ago when I offered an amendment to restrict the purchases to 5,000 units a month, I received a fairly good vote.

However, the Senators who wanted to do something for the small miner said, "No, we do not want any restrictions." Mr. President, there are nine big producers of tungsten who supply 87 percent of all the Government purchases.

The Senator from Idaho has made these few brief comments because, futilely, within the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and within the Committee on Appropriations he has endeavored to point out that the argument is being made that it is justifiable to spend $200 million—that is what we have spent—for the acquisition of domestic tungsten, and we must keep on buying it, because we do not want the mines to be flooded and because we need it for national defense. If that is a logical argument, what are we doing for the minerals of which we produce practically none in this country?

I want my colleagues to give me an answer to that question.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. DWORSHAK. Just one further point. I wish to reiterate that I come from one of the great mining States of the West and that I do not want to do anything that will jeopardize the welfare of our domestic mining industry. It is an important and integral part of our national preparedness program. We cannot wage war without strategic minerals, any more than we can win a war with only tungsten.

Perhaps the stand I take is not very popular. I know that the entire problem will be projected before the Committee on Appropriations and before the Senate sometime between now and June, and that we will have an opportunity to make a full appraisal of the matter. The reason I have been endeavoring to concentrate attention on this subject is that there is not one iota of national defense involved, notwithstanding what any Member of the Senate may say on the floor. I stand on the record.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. DWORSHAK. I make this last appeal. I ask that we act like statesmen, interested in national defense, instead of merely paying lipservice to it, because, as I have asked time and time again before the Committee on Appropriations, if we become involved in war, will my colleagues say that we will need only tungsten to win the war?

If we could stipulate with the leaders in the Kremlin, because we have been building up stockpiles only of tungsten, that only tungsten would be used in the next war, that would be fine. No one, apparently, cares about the other minerals. We can get them from Africa.

Of course, as my friend from Illinois has stated, perhaps the ships will be sunk, and these other strategic materials will not reach our country.

I am not concerned about what action will be taken today, and I am serving notice on both the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations, as well as on the Senate as a whole, and also on the executive department, that we are trying to do something along the line of the objectives which we have tried to reach, and the principles to which we have adhered, but to which, apparently, we are paying only lip service. We ought to insist upon some achievement.

We were told 2 years ago by the President, when he vetoed a comparable bill to S. 733, that the administration would send to Congress a long-range mining program. That was 2 years ago. We do not have any program. I believe we will get one, although it may take 5 or 10 years to do so. Perhaps in the meantime we can arrange with the leaders in the Kremlin to hold up any aggression until we adopt a long-range, composite mining program and acquire productive sources in this country for the other strategic minerals. We should not continue to spend millions and millions of dollars, in addition to the $200 million we have already spent, to pile up a 30- or 40-year stockpile of tungsten.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the yeas and nays have been ordered. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, line 17, it is proposed to insert the following:

CHAPTER IV—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

*Acquisition of strategic minerals*

For an additional amount for "Acquisition of strategic minerals," $30,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1958.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the question is on agreeing to the amendment stated by the clerk, offered by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on public business. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] are necessarily absent.

Also necessarily absent is the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 17, as follows:

YEAS—64

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allott | Hennings | Morton |
| Barrett | Hickenlooper | Mundt |
| Bennett | Hill | Murray |
| Bible | Holland | Neuberger |
| Blakley | Jackson | O'Mahoney |
| Carlson | Javits | Pastore |
| Carroll | Johnson, Tex. | Potter |
| Case, S. Dak. | Johnston, S. C. | Russell |
| Church | Kennedy | Saltonstall |
| Clark | Kerr | Schoeppel |
| Cooper | Knowland | Scott |
| Dirksen | Kuchel | Sparkman |
| Douglas | Lausche | Stennis |
| Dworshak | Long | Symington |
| Eastland | Malone | Talmadge |
| Ellender | Mansfield | Thurmond |
| Ervin | Martin, Iowa | Thye |
| Fulbright | McCarthy | Watkins |
| Goldwater | McClellan | Wiley |
| Gore | McNamara | Young |
| Green | Monroney | |
| Hayden | Morse | |

NAYS—17

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Case, N. J. | Revercomb |
| Beall | Cotton | Robertson |
| Bricker | Curtis | Smith, Maine |
| Bush | Jenner | Smith, N. J. |
| Butler | Martin, Pa. | Williams |
| Byrd | Payne | |

NOT VOTING—15

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | Frear | Langer |
| Bridges | Hruska | Magnuson |
| Capehart | Humphrey | Neely |
| Chavez | Ives | Purtell |
| Flanders | Kefauver | Smathers |

So Mr. HAYDEN's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 6, to insert a new chapter, as follows:

CHAPTER V—PUBLIC WORKS

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

*Department of the Army*

Rivers and Harbors and Flood-Control Construction, General

That portion of title III of the act of July 2, 1956 (Public Law 641, 84th Cong., 70 Stat. 474, 480), that pertains to the purchase of lands and improvements in the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District in lieu of protecting said Buford-Trenton Irrigation District in connection with development, construction, and operation of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, is amended to read as follows:

"That in lieu of protecting the East Bottom of Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, the sum of $1,621,791 of the funds herein or hereafter appropriated for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River shall be available for the purchase of lands and improvements in and contiguous to the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, exclusive of tracts numbered H. H. 3170 and H. H. 3168, and not to exceed $2 million shall be available to the Corps of Engineers for protection of the intake structure of the pumping plant in Zero Bottom and for the construction of bank protection to prevent erosion in the Missouri River adjacent to the Buford-Trenton irrigation project. The substitution of land acquisition for protection shall be made and the Secretary of the Army shall acquire such land and improvements if all of the landowners, except Lester G. Larson, the heirs of Louis Morin, Jr., and the heirs of A. Desjarlais, on or before June 30, 1957, have offered to sell their property on the terms agreeable to said landowners, and within the amount provided for such land acquisition: *Provided*, That the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, is authorized to acquire by condemnation proceedings, in the appropriate United States district court, tract 208C of the Buford-Trenton project, Williams County, N. Dak., according to the recorded plat thereof which tract is owned by Lester G. Larson, the public domain allotment of A. Desjarlais, now deceased, described as Government lots 5 and 8 in section 19 and Government lot 1 in section 30, township 153 north of range 102 west of the fifth principal meridian, North Dakota, and the public domain allotment of Louis Morin, Jr., now deceased, described as the west half southwest quarter, section 16, and the north half southeast quarter, section 17, township 153 north, range 102 west, fifth principal meridian, North Dakota, in connection with the construction and operation of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir: *Provided further*, That in the event land acquisition is undertaken in lieu of protection of the East Bottom, that in recognition of the increased per-acre annual operation and maintenance cost of the remaining lands in the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, the construction charge obligation assignable to the remaining lands of said district pursuant to the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 118), as amended, and the proposed contract between the United States and Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, approved as to form February 23, 1955, shall be nonreimbursable, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to enter into a contract with the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District to transfer operation and maintenance responsibility for project works constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation for the benefit of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District to such district.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter IV—Legislative

Branch", on page 11, line 1, to change the chapter number from "IV" to "VI."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 3, to insert the heading "Senate."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 3, to insert the subhead "Salaries, Officers, and Employees." The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 4, to insert:

Office of the Vice President: For an additional amount for clerical assistance to the Vice President, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 6, to insert:

Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators: For an additional amount for administrative and clerical assistants for each Senator from the States of Louisiana and Ohio so that the allowance for each Senator from the State of Louisiana will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a population of over 3 million, the population of said State having exceeded 3 million inhabitants, and so that the allowance for each Senator from the State of Ohio will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a population of over 9 million, the population of said State having exceeded 9 million inhabitants, $8,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. I offer a perfecting amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, line 9, after the word "for," it is proposed to insert: "Senators, to provide additional clerical assistants for."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the item on page 11, lines 5 and 6:

For the Office of the Vice President, there is an increase of $5,000. In 1952, the predecessor of the present Vice President received for clerical assistance $50,370.

When Mr. NIXON, the present incumbent, became Vice President, the amount was increased to $55,410.

In 1954 and 1955, the amount remained the same.

In 1956, Congress saw fit to increase the amount to $78,150.

In 1957, the amount was increased to $86,925.

If the present amendment shall be agreed to, it will mean that the yearly expenses for the Office of the Vice President will be, for the last quarter of the fiscal year 1957, at the rate of $101,925.

In other words, since the present incumbent has become the Vice President, the Senate has increased his office expenses by twice as much as those of his predecessor.

I simply thought I would bring this to the attention of the Senate. It strikes me that we ought, in some way, to begin to curtail expenses. This is a rather small amount; but year after year the expenses of the Senate have been increasing tremendously. It strikes me that we in the Senate ought to show an example if we intend to ask other departments to reduce expenses.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Are those figures base figures or gross figures?

Mr. ELLENDER. They are gross figures. As I have said, the rate of pay for the clerical expenses of the office of the Vice President for the last quarter of the fiscal year 1957 will be at the rate of $101,925.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I ask this question because of a lack of experience. I wondered if the increase in the office expenses of the Vice President has been commensurate with or at the rate of expenses of Members of the Senate from States of varying population.

Mr. ELLENDER. The highest amount paid, as I understand, is to the Senators from New York. The gross is $97,000. That is my understanding.

But the point I desire to make is that the amount provided for the office of the Vice President has been doubled. The Vice President, I am certain, has been receiving a large amount of mail. He has been traveling throughout the world. As the Senator knows, he is a candidate for President, and the chances are that that is what has increased his workload. But there is no reason why the taxpayers should carry that burden.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I merely asked the question to ascertain whether the measuring stick was the proportionate amounts Senators were receiving in comparison with the previous authorized expenses.

Mr. ELLENDER. Senators from all States except a few are receiving a total of $49,980. It is only to the Senators from States whose population is in excess of three million that a greater amount is paid. But the Senators from most States receive a base amount of $49,980.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 17, to insert:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount for expenses of inquiries and investigations, fiscal year 1956, $25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 12, to insert:

Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount for expenses of inquiries and investigations, $820,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 2, to insert:

Automobile for the President pro tempore: For an additional amount for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the President pro tempore of the Senate, $2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 6, to insert:

Automobiles for the majority and minority leaders: For an additional amount of purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of 2 automobiles, 1 for the majority leader of the Senate, and 1 for the minority leader of the Senate, $4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 11, to insert:

Joint Committee on Navaho-Hopi Indian Administration: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Navaho-Hopi Indian Administration, $5,000, to remain available during the existence of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments having been agreed to, the bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I submit an amendment which I ask to have read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, after line 10, it is proposed to insert a new chapter (with consequent renumbering of succeeding chapters), as follows:

CHAPTER III.—AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

CONSTRUCTION OF MEMORIALS AND CEMETERIES

To the extent that the Commission may find necessary or desirable, the appropriation granted under this head in the General Government Matters Appropriation Act, 1957, shall be available for the purposes of the act of April 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 84).

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, last year Congress passed a bill authorizing the Battle Monuments Commission, of which I have the honor to be a member, to prepare plans and to select a site for a memorial to General Pershing. In the authorization, no provision was made for funds to carry out the mandate of Congress, and the Commission is prohibited by law from using for this purpose funds which they now have in the general appropriation bill.

The amendment authorizes the Federal Battle Monuments Commission to carry out the mandate of Congress in the bill passed last year by using existing funds which have already been appropriated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4249) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. KNOWLAND conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier this afternoon the Senate considered an amendment to H. R. 4249, known as the Knowland amendment, on page 4, line 16. The amendment changed the word "shall" to "may."

If I had been on the floor of the Senate at the time of that vote, I would have voted against the amendment. I want to make a statement in explanation of my failure to vote on the amendment.

It so happens that I was away from the floor of the Senate on official business, taking care of a matter presented to me by Mr. James Johnson, president of the Port Commission of Coos Bay, Oreg., and Mr. Robert Belloni, attorney for the Port Commission of Coos Bay, Oreg. The matter involves the so-called Port Chicago issue, which is of great concern to the economic welfare of the Coos Bay area in the State of Oregon.

The port commission had made representations to me to communicate and confer with representatives of the Military Establishment in connection with the Port Chicago matter, and I was away from the Capitol performing that service in behalf of those constituents in regard to this very important matter.

Mr. President, I have not ordinarily taken the floor of the Senate to place in the RECORD an explanation of my absence from a yea and nay vote; but recently I finished a very interesting campaign; and in that campaign some gross, uncalled for misrepresentations were made about the record of the senior Senator from Oregon. So that there can be no doubt in the future, whenever I have to be absent from a yea-and-nay vote, I intend to make a little speech of the sort I am making now, so the RECORD will show in black and white where I was and what business I was transacting. I shall do so because what I am reporting now has been characteristic of my entire record for 12 years. If a very important matter in behalf of my State calls for my absence from the floor of the Senate, and requires me to go to the Pentagon Building, the Department of Justice, the Department of the Interior, or elsewhere, that is what the people of my State have me here to do. I absented myself today, after I made inquiry, and was advised that it was not expected that there would be any yea-and-nay votes. Therefore, I went ahead, and performed for the people of my State the service for which they elected me.

Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show where I was; I want it to show that I was transacting business in behalf of the Port Commission of Coos Bay, Oreg., when the unexpected yea-and-nay vote was called. Although agreeing that in many respects the issue will be called a minor one, nevertheless I intend to make my record so clear that the kind of misrepresentation to which I was subjected during the recent campaign will be answered by this kind of documentation.

## PRINTING OF REPORT ON AIRPOWER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 66, Senate Resolution 93.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 93) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the report on an investigation of airpower, and providing for additional copies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

---

## THE KEY TO AIRPOWER

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, one of the outstanding airmen of history writes regularly in the excellent publication Flying. Mr. Gil Robb Wilson has long expounded learnedly and vigorously on airpower and its place as the pivotal point of our military strategy. In calling attention to the 50th anniversary of airpower he has placed in concise form the history and the theory of airpower, and has done so in such an understandable manner that I urge my colleagues to read the article which I now ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the body of the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCEPT: KEY TO AIRPOWER

(By Gil Robb Wilson)

The half century past has been dynamic with controversy, change, and challenge. Civilization made more technical progress in this era than in all combined previous centuries. In terms of productive power, each United States citizen is the equal of his grandfather plus 50 helpers. Aviation provided the incentive and was the gateway for much of this progress, playing an ever-expanding part in the midst of radical social and economic changes and in the convulsion of two great wars. That the United States rose to increased international stature during this period, and today stands prosperous, unravaged, and free, is due in no small part to the guided evolution of its airpower.

The 50th anniversary of this power in the United States falls in this year. Its origin was a directive to establish an Aviation Division in the Army Signal Corps, August 1, 1907. From that directive, in convulsive steps, evolved the United States Air Force. We must follow principally that development since it is the constituted agent of our Defense Establishment aloft.

Centuries hence, the historian will frame the American airman of the past century as the pioneer, not alone of flight, but of an intellectual and spiritual process which overcame static and divisive forces and opened the way to realization of a common humanity—meanwhile preserving the people from conquest. Already, for example, we can confidently assume continuous global surveillance of armament by manmade satellites. The same medium will give us 100 percent weather coverage, will be the automatic source of all long-range navigation, and will revolutionize the coverage of such communications mediums as radio and television. Such an antisocial device as an iron curtain will be a physical impossibility. All such unifying routine of daily life, if permitted, inevitably will add up psychologically to better chance for spiritual and intellectual unity. So even now we can assure the historian that the founders of the air age walked with open eyes toward his day, fully realizing the mission of the tools with which they wrought on the temples of time.

We approach with considerable reticence the task of reflecting something of the fateful era now in limbo. A mere chronology of events has no flavor. The tempo and timing of progress had no cadence. Development was fitful. All was gray with the half light that prevails when the new day is wrestling with the old night. Civil and military effort and effect were often inextricably intertwined. A private pilot frequently led the way to military achievement. Much must be omitted and more but lightly scanned. Moreover, we begrudge to spend time with the sere yesterdays when the tomorrows are so green. The old airman in a man cannot afford to fade away as the old soldier in him might be content to do. The great realizations of the air age are still ahead. We have thus far skirmished only on the near horizons.

Nevertheless, the fires and pressures of the introductory years have fused some nuggets of abiding value, so purpose may be served by setting them properly in the ring of circumstance.

But first let us connote airpower as we have conceived it over the years. No pat definition will suffice since definition implies restriction and airpower is embracive of all power. Its medium is the all prevailing firmament. Power in the firmament is not one of a trinity of powers—land, sea, air—but is comprehensive of all. It is the power. To retain any major degree of influence on the modern stage, sea forces must protect themselves aloft into the air ocean. To move or to hold, armies must secure permission from air superiority.

The transition from traditional military forces to those of airpower have taxed both the concepts and routines of military organization. Young men came sooner to the responsibility of command. The honored educational institutions of surface forces lost control of "the party line." Where the officer formerly prepared his men for battle, the men now prepared the officer for battle. The I. Q. of technical personnel demanded by airpower was unique in military requirements. Air forces based on a great network of airports broke down the old line of demarcation between the civilian and the military. Airpower procurement had a thousand lines in industry where the old establishment had one. And there have been a hundred additional sources of irritation as logic shifted the relative roles of the service branches.

The gage is not the airplane and the missile but the imagination to orient national security and foreign policy in terms of a new methodology. It also must be apparent that the various adaptations of aviation—defense, commerce, business, industry, pleasure—stem from common roots of research and development; and that in a democracy a tutored public and official mind is a vital component of airpower. One who sought to speak advisedly of it as an isolated military phenomenon would be grossly unfaithful to his subject.

In view of the violent nature of human history, it is not to be wondered that earliest evidence of the possibility of flight was given a warlike connotation. Benjamin Franklin, who has been called "The First Civilized American," watched Montgolfier balloons in France and immediately wrote home of their battle potential. Even before Franklin's day, a German scientist proposed bombing of enemy lines of communications, using gas bags as the vehicles. The

French did indeed use free balloons for reconnaissance in the Napoleonic wars and, in the American Civil War, the Union Army kept Confederate lines under frequent surveillance with a civil component of seven balloons. Army also used tethered observation balloons in Cuba during the Spanish-American conflict.

It was then inherent to the situation that no sooner had the Wright brothers put together the winning combination of propulsion, airfoil and control mechanism, than they approached the Government with the suggestion that their work involved a contribution to military science. Nor was it long until pioneers such as Glenn Martin and Larry Bell were tossing down flour sacks on ground targets and warning the Nation that the display was a portent of things to come. Congressman Parsons of New York sent President Theodore Roosevelt a magazine clipping recording the Wright brothers' flight. "T. R." forwarded it as a matter of course to William Howard Taft, Secretary of War. Glenn Curtiss built the original hydro-aircraft at San Diego and like a homing pigeon winged it out to the battleship, *Pennsylvania*. Even before the flying machine was out of science fiction, Phil Parmalee, a civilian showman, and Lt. Myron Crissy of Army, constructed a live bomb and dropped it on the Tanforan Racetrack at San Francisco. Didier Masson, a Martin pilot, went even further. He hired out to the Revolutionary Government of Mexico and bombed naval targets in Guaymas Bay. This was the first actual combat use of an aircraft in the Western World but already precedent had been set in the Old World. On November 4, 1911, during the Italo-Turkish War, Captains Moizo and Piazza of the I. R. A. F. had bombed an Arab column near Ain Zara, Africa. By then, also, bomb experiments were going on at College Park, Md.

I have no wish to infer that the Founding Fathers and earliest apostles of flight were a bloodthirsty lot or that they set out deliberately to create air weapons. This is far from the truth. The elements of historic fact to be brought out are that the airplane arrived on the world stage at a time of intense national rivalry. Military aviation thus has been in great degree the scientific and economic sponsor of happier phases of aviation, but before Kitty Hawk there had been such incredulity about the actual achievement of human flight, that neither the military nor civilian mind was in the least prepared for the fact of it. There was no capital eagerly poised to promote the advent of the flying machine as a commercial vehicle. There was no national or world expectancy hanging on its arrival. Under such conditions, its creative source logically was a handful of imaginative private citizens whose sole wealth was their ideas. And its first market was logically the Military Establishment.

The charge has been made that military leadership of aviation's introductory years was incredibly tradition-bound. Nor can this be denied—with some bright exceptions. But let us look at both sides of the coin. For decades Army and Navy had lived largely isolated from civilian life—unappreciated, underpaid, undermanned, lonesome on frontier posts and naval bases. "Soldiering on the job" was a civilian phrase descriptive of shiftlessness. "Drunk as a sailor" was a civilian phrase of opprobrium. Nonetheless, the services were sternly disciplined, inordinately proud and not a little hidebound. The United States, defeating Spain in the Pacific, was emerging as a world power. The British navy was no longer vital to the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine. The devils of the Old World had been thrust behind the protecting Atlantic and Pacific. North America was a Western Gibraltar—from a military viewpoint. The immigrant who fled Old World conscription agreed. The War and Navy Departments were understandably well convinced that they had the world by the tail. It took much in addition to an "Academy" education to foresee the obsolescence of the fort and the dreadnaught.

Then suddenly on this scene was thrust the flying machine. If the military mind did not see it, neither did the political mind nor the press nor the public. Only three daily papers in the whole Nation carried the original Kitty Hawk dispatch. I do not excuse the Services for the cynicism which generally prevailed, but point out that they were merely products of their time with probably more excuse than press, education, and politics to be "fat and happy." Nor can it be contravened that even before Kitty Hawk there were individual islands of receptivity in the Military Establishment to applaud the imagination of Chanute, the Wrights, Grover Loening, Alexander Graham Bell, Glenn Curtiss, Martin, and a score of others who thrilled over the advent of flight. Thus, some 4 years later we find the historic order emanating from the Signal Corps. True, it was a gesture prompted by a few individuals rather than an inspiration of general foresight, and it came from far down the chain of command. But so have most great advances come. And now a mere Captain, Charles Chandler, was assigned to head the new Aviation Division—to explore and exploit the potential of the airship and the flying machine for military usage.

Chandler was a capable advocate. Shortly after his appointment, the Board of Ordnance and Fortifications was nudged into the aircraft procurement business with requests for bids on one airship and later, December 23, 1907, bids for one flying machine. Prophetically, the knowledgeable and the unknowledgeable rose like trout to the lure of Government contracts. There were 41 respondents. All but three retreated as hastily as they had come forward when the provisions were learned—10 percent of the suggested price to accompany the bid, and a 2-place machine to cruise at a minimum of 40 miles per hour for at least 1 hour duration. Eventually, even the two other knowledgeable bidders withdrew in favor of the Wrights and on February 8, 1908, Wilbur and Orville signed to deliver a "Flyer" within 200 days for a price of $25,000. Incidentally, Tom Baldwin won the airship contract and delivered his nonrigid in August as did the Wrights their "Flyer." If truth be told, the airship was much more in vogue than the flying machine.

The Wright Flyer arrived at Fort Myer, Va., on August 20, 1908, and on September 9, Orville took Lieutenant Lahm for a ride, the first airplane flight by an Army officer. Shortly thereafter Orville took Lieutenant Selfridge aloft and crashed from a low altitude. Selfridge was killed and Wright severely injured. Acceptance trials were then postponed till the following year.

On July 30, 1909, an improved version of the Flyer remained aloft for 72 consecutive minutes and averaged 42-plus miles per hour speed. The performance was better than the official impact of the event. When the following year the Signal Corps requested funds to purchase 20 additional planes, a Congressman reportedly grumbled, "Why all this fuss about airplanes for the Army—I thought we already had one!" So not until March 3, 1911, did Congress make an appropriation for aeronautics—$125,000. And here for the first time we find authentic industrial competition in aircraft procurement. Five planes were purchased—3 Wright B's and 2 Curtisses—all pusher types. As a matter of interest, the original Flyer remained in service for some years and was eventually converted to a tricycle gear.

Meanwhile Army's first flying school had been opened at College Park, Md., and supplemented in successive months by fields at Fort Sam Houston (the parade ground), Fort Leavenworth, Kans., North Island, San Diego, and Augusta, Ga. Even Hawaii and the Philippines temporarily had schools. By late 1913, Army had 40 pilots and 28 aircraft. In March of that year, Congress authorized 35 percent additional base pay for "military" aviators.

The modern Air National Guard man may note that his service originated thus early when, in February 1911, an aeronautical detachment was formed in the 7th Company of the California Coast Artillery.

Another odd twist to the devious course of airpower in those days was that an enlisted man of this original detachment of weekend warriors was a civil barnstormer named Eugene Burton Ely. He never wore Navy blues, and even had a particular aversion to the sea, but Ely believed aircraft could operate from ocean vessels and foresaw the aircraft carrier. In 1910, he took off from a platform on the U. S. S. *Birmingham* in Chesapeake Bay, and on January 18, 1911, landed on a similar platform on the U. S. S. *Pennsylvania* in San Francisco Bay. Vision is where you find it.

Straws in the airpower wind of those few years prior to the 1914 outbreak of World War I in Europe were not lacking. A machine gun was fired from an airplane at College Park, Md.; a Marine Lieutenant, A. A. Cunningham, was ordered to duty "in connection with aviation"; the first Aero Medical officer, Lt. John P. Kelly, was assigned to the Signal Corps; the flying boat, a Curtiss "F," made its military debut, 15th Aircraft in the Signal Corps stable; Lt. Paul Beck from over Selfridge Field sent a radio-telegraphic message earthward; out in the Philippines, Corp. Vernon L. Burge became the first enlisted Army pilot; in the struggle between Huerta and Carranza in Mexico, Phil Rader and Dean Lamb took pistol shots at one another from aloft. A book of incident and accident could be written on such detail. It represented progress of a sort. If it had been the result of any vestige of understanding in high military and political circles, it could have meant much more. The efforts of the valiant handful on the flying fields were not matched by appropriations in Congress, by research in Government facilities or by tactical and strategic evaluation in the General Staff.

The most important factor of those times—one which scarcely has been brought into focus—was the quality of young officers volunteering for aviation duty. There was no incentive careerwise for such a step and there was definite hazard. The move had to spring from deep conviction about the role of aviation in the future of military science. It involved a constant battle against scepticism within the military family—never a pleasant prospect for a young officer. It took exceptional intellectual courage to step out of line and go over to an unproven and unpopular phase of service. The vehicle itself floundered within narrow limits—60 mph—6 or 7 thousand feet of ceiling—a couple of hours flight duration—90 hp or less to pull or push the contraption—and structural problems of every conceivable nature. Never can too much credit be given the earliest military airmen—not credit alone for airmanship, but for qualities of exceptional courage and vision.

And now, another neglected page of the record—the best ally of the young military airman was his civil confrere. The importance of this could hardly be appreciated today, but in those days when the military and civil were widely separated, it was a significant contribution to Army airpower. The civil performance of aviation kept the pressure on Congress and the Service leadership. Civil air progress was never out of the public spotlight. Galbraith Rogers made it coast-to-coast in 49 days via a devious route of 3,390 miles—but it was a "first" and rated news coverage. Glenn Curtiss salvaged American prestige by winning the Gordon Bennett trophy at Rheims, France. Earle Ovington flew the first airmail intra

Long Island. Tom Baldwin, the old airship pioneer, denied the military oldster an "out" on the excuse of age when he learned to fly an airplane at 60. Lincoln Beachey, J. A. D. McCurdy, Charley Willard, Cliff Harmon, Hugh Robinson, Walter Brookins, Ralph Johnstone, Charlie Hamilton, Arch Hoxey, Frank Coffin, Harry Atwood, Eddie Stinson, Becky Havens, Roderick Wright, and a hundred more—each was a magnetic name in evolving acrobatics, in pushing up performance records, in extending cross-country, in learning better flight techniques, and in developing scores of ingenuities. Even the ladies got into the act—Harriet Quimby, Blanche Scott, Ruth Law, Katherine Stinson, and others. Newspapers and corporations put up rich prizes for milestone performances. The Aero Club of America shed its gas bag enthusiasm and joined the airplane apostles. All of this was grist in the mill of the pilot in uniform. On one hand it gave him added confidence in the future of the airplane and on the other it persuaded the reluctant Military Establishment into a greater tolerance of its young aviators. Of course, it did not prompt budget action—that would have been asking too much—but it made life a little less frustrating for the soldiers with wings.

An added arrow to the quiver of the little group of stalwarts—and it should have been the sharpest of all to further their cause with higher authority—was the burgeoning aviation activity of the restless governments in Europe. The Balkan wars of 1912–13 had produced considerable combat air activity. Germany, France, Great Britain, Russia, were now spending dollars where the United States was spending nickels. By 1914, when war broke out, the Kaiser had a fleet of 500 military planes; France had twice that number; Great Britain half as many; and the designers of Russia were already flying multiengined aircraft. Furthermore, the technicians of the Old World had pushed engine output above 200 horsepower, and the aerodynamically improved planes were cruising easily above 10,000 feet with a duration of 3 to 4 hours. This bespoke a background of extensive research and development and testified that the aviation industry of the European powers was something more than a bit of technical adventure. Names which have been conjured with in world balance of power ever since were even then well in evidence—Heinkel, Fokker, Junkers, deHavilland, Sopwith, Breguet, Bleriot, Sikorsky, Caproni, Zhukovsky, Lebedff—to list just a few. It was symptomatic of the stature of military aviation in Europe that the German mobilization order was based on the claim that France had bombed the borders of Germany via Belgium.

One might presume that this state of affairs, which was of such vast concern to the American lieutenants in the cockpits, would also have had some effect on the higher officials. But not so. Political orators spouted about a million men springing to arms if America were threatened and the Defense Establishment clenched its horny hands—ready with rifle, bayonet, and armor-piercing shells to repel all boarders. But again, we must remember that the Atlantic seemed a mighty barrier. It was perhaps too much to expect that a government and a people so isolated from the Old World should be deeply concerned. And if the few Americans flying with the French and British wrote home that modern Lafayettes needed wings—well, young soldiers of fortune weren't military experts.

At this time the American scene had about a dozen units of aviation industry turning out some three dozen plane models, not one of which had any combat potential. Among the companies were Aeromarine, Benoist, Burgess, Cooke, Curtiss, L-W-F Engineering Co., Glenn L. Martin, Sloane, Sturtevant, Thomas Bros., and, of course, Wright. Some of these companies had vision and skill but they had an extremely thin market and scant capital. America was anything but a leading airpower and a rude awakening was at hand.

It came in 1916—the American punitive expedition into Mexico. Captain Foulois took an eight plane detachment of the 1st Aero Squadron to the border. A month of scanty field service finished the planes. Public spotlight blazed on the pitiful equipment. The lack of foundation research and development stood exposed. Congress responded with an appropriation of $600,000—a vacuous gesture—and the Signal Corps, with nothing better to buy, purchased a dozen more Curtiss R–2's. So fateful 1917 rolled around and the United States stood 14th in air strength among the nations. This strength was composed of 142 assorted aircraft, 131 officers and 1,000 enlisted men divided among 7 squadrons. Seventy-eight of the officers were pilots. And now the years of lost research would foreclose their mortgage. The waste of haste would set its stamp on American airpower from then till now.

The story of United States airpower in World War I is not complex. Ninety percent of the fighting was done by shavetails from college campuses whose 25 percent flying pay of a lieutenant's base pay made it a cheap deal. Reserve military aviators they were called. And no promotions overseas, with rare exception. Moreover even as late as Armistice Day, the AEF mustered only 744 pilots and some 450 observer-bombardier-gunners, manning a stable of 740 assorted planes—all foreign except 198 American-made Flaming Coffins—DH–4's with Liberty engines. Not a single pilot had a parachute. A handful became aces in plane-to-plane combat, but most just slugged it out in low altitude bombing, artillery regulage, aerial photography and kindred chores. There weren't enough regulars to staff the headquarters and direct the training let alone lead the squadrons, of which there were some 46, with a few score Americans scattered among French and British outfits. Not a dozen of the Signal Corps originals so much as got a flight over enemy lines. They had their hands full just keeping the show on the road. It was "a hell of a war" as far as being a studied military achievement was concerned. It got by without exposing the waste of haste too flagrantly simply because nobody notices your missing teeth when you knock the other fellow out. The postwar investigations were strictly high colonic whitewash, with a generous purgative of romancing.

It must be noted, however, that the effect of the American airmen was all out of proportion to their numbers. When the United States entered the war the struggle had degenerated into a series of muddy, bloody, trenchbound convulsions. All combatants were desperately exhausted—the Allies more so than the Central Powers. Strategic consideration was negligible. Weight was all that counted. The original flower of all European forces was dead or hors de combat. The poilu jibed, "The last man standing with a rock in his hand will win the war."

America brought critical weight to the side of the Allies and had a salutary effect in accomplishing an Allied Central Command. As soon as it was demonstrated that the American soldier or sailor was a willing and able fighter, the end of the war was in sight. Several fierce German thrusts were thrown back. Our armies and naval units were brilliantly led. Being fresh, they were relentlessly aggressive, as war-weary troops cannot be.

This pattern was duplicated in the air. The United States squadrons tore after the Fokkers and Pfalzes as though the supply was liable to run out before everybody had a souvenir. The enemy was outmanned and outshot by the kids from the campuses who didn't know one military regulation from another but who had been reared in competitive courage after the American tradition.

Finally the German armies marched home with flowers in their guns and the German Navy revolted at Kiel. The "homefires" went dead under the Kaiser and, for the first time in 4 years, dispatches told the truth when they said, "all quiet on the western front." Europe was bled white and has never had much character since. Russia was prepared for her slavery.

Dispite everything that was expressed about "the raggedy-assed cadets" and the air war fought at the Crillon Bar, World War I marked some monumental values in the history of United State airpower. The American airman won the respect of both his allied confreres and his enemy. The thoroughness of his training stood out like a lighthouse. Although a comparative few got overseas, some 15,000 were trained—and well trained—in the States. It was established that the Americans took to flying with great readiness; and the mechanics were revealed to have a fantastic ingenuity. The rudiments of sound tactics were cemented into the combat airman's mind and the imaginations of many were stirred as to the limitless potential of aviation. Eyes were opened to the possibilities of the airplane—but further than that, to the possibilities of the air ocean. Losses had been comparatively heavy among airmen and a certain sense of dedication to aviation as a memorial to lost comrades pervaded many minds.

So it transpired that the most important of all the war's constructive effects on American airpower was to recruit to the postwar forces a body of enthusiastic pilots and mechanics with aviation career ambitions. Most of these were unimpressed by rank and didn't distinguish between an outmoded military concept and any other kind of a ghost. They were out to make their own concepts and when, after the war, their numbers were added to the handful of "regulars," the combination was potent.

It would be a contradiction of fact to claim that any Allied government emerged from the war with the faintest idea of the ultimate significance of airpower. The treaty-makers of Versailles restored Germany's sovereignty aloft and approved restoration of her peaceful aviation enterprise. Allied airmen insisted in vain that scientific and industrial roots of airpower were indivisible into civil and military categories; and that their most vital concern was not with the vehicles of aviation but with the nature of the medium in which they operated, the sky itself, the air ocean. They said bluntly that restoration of German air industry was open sesame to another world war. But there was no ear to listen to the rankless airmen. In 1925, the Paris Accord helped to hasten the day of reckoning. So a mere two decades later the authors of "Blitzkrieg" were in the saddle of international affairs. Germany had captured the imagination of dictator governments to form the axis; had inaugurated far-flung networks of air commerce; had, in rapprochement with Russia and in sub rosa deals elsewhere, developed the foundations of her own and Soviet airpower; had awed the constitutional governments of Europe with propaganda about her qualitative and quantitative air superiority and was ready to nail down world conquest. The benevolent Allied statesmen who had dreamed of a new social order through the League of Nations, along with the military figures who had led a war to make the world safe for democracy, had rejected the one yardstick of consideration which would have realized their objectives—an understanding of airpower.

In the United States, the postwar result of this dim view of air potential was apathy everywhere except in the mind of the airman. The momentum of the budding aircraft industry ground to a halt. The civil

market, and the Military Establishment itself, were saturated with obsolete surplus, 2 items alone, 5,000 DH–4's and 5,000 JN–4's. In June 1920, Congress passed the Army Reorganization Act, under which the Aviation Service became the Air Corps, "a separate and coordinate branch of the line of the Army." It then mustered 1,516 officers and 16,000 enlisted men but its equipment was a millstone around its neck.

One would be hard put to make out a case for progress in evidenced airpower during the immediate postwar years. There was a reshuffling of the wartime aviation industry, and the international counter was full of spare parts bargains. Atlantic City, N. J., built the first municipal airport in the United States—a portent of the eventual self-interest of many communities. The mail routes were extended. Navy got an NC flying boat across the North Atlantic via Newfoundland and the Azores. Dr. Sanford Moss came up with a solid contribution by invention of the supercharger. The engineers at McCook Field wrestled with the idea of variable and reverse pitch props. Down at Maxwell, tactical problems engrossed the young officers. Charley Lawrence made some progress on radial air-cooled engines. The use of liquid oxygen and supercharging began to shove up the altitude record from approximately 18,000 to 30,000 feet.

In 1921, Brig. Gen. "Billy" Mitchell put some life into the anemic military concept in his congressional testimony concerning need for budget. Mitchell said aerial bombs could sink battleships and he would prove it if they would give him the chance. Partly because they didn't believe Mitchell's claim and partly because public opinion was grinning at their discomfiture, the Services had to agree. Mitchell put the monkey on their backs by rolling under the old German battlewagon, Ostfriesland, in Chesapeake Bay, July 1921. One immediate result was that the White House authorized formation of a Naval Bureau of Aeronautics; and the following year the U. S. S. *Langley* was commissioned as an aircraft carrier. Also as a result of the drama on Chesapeake Bay a joint Army-Navy Board made a declaration: "It has become imperative as a matter of national defense to provide for the maximum possible development of aviation in both the Army and Navy." Such a conclusion seemed ridiculously tardy but everyone out of short pants knew it for another facelifting job and it marked no change of character in the Military Establishment. However, the bomb evaluation tests were continued and in September 1923, Mitchell's lumbering machines sank two battleships, condemned by arms limitation agreement, the *New Jersey* and the *Virginia*, off Cape Hatteras.

In 1924, Army airmen struggled around the world in stages, flying Douglas "World Cruisers." Douglas had organized in Los Angeles in 1921.

The year 1925 was exciting. The Curry bill, proposing a unified air service, was defeated in Congress—courtesy of Navy. President Coolidge signed the Kelly Act, a law which authorized the Postmaster General to contract airmail with operators. This was of vast import—a foundation for air commerce and a wedge into military air logistics alike. Beacons were installed on the air route between the east coast and Chicago. The first Wright Cyclone was tested—450 horsepower. The Navy dirigible *Shenandoah* cracked up. This and the lame duck equipment Army was still flying brought an ear-splitting blast from Mitchell. He was court-martialed.

Mitchell's trial was international news and the fires of controversy blazed fiercely. Bill, son of a United States Senator from Wisconsin, on outbreak of the Spanish-American War, had enlisted in a Wisconsin regiment, been promoted to a second lieutenancy, Signal Corps, fought in Cuba and later in the Philippines. Thereafter, he received a regular commission in the Army. Gradually, he had become a stormy petrel and, coming from the background that was his, was not in the least awed by rank. Moreover, he had traveled worldwide, was multilingual, an avid student of history, had a flair for the dramatic and withal was one of the most penetrating minds I ever knew.

In the middle of World War I, 1916, he was serving in the war room at the White House and on weekends slipped down to Newport News and got preliminary pilot training. He had seen from war dispatches that aviation was playing an increasing part in the conflict. Maybe too, the idea of combat such as Fonck, Von Richthofen, Guynamer, Nungesser, Immelman, Ball, Bishop, and others were engaged in, whetted his dramatic appetite. In any case, he wangled an assignment to Europe, managed a little more flight training and, although he had backed into aviation even this late, was soon a central figure. Wartime aviation was a big enough field, even for his imagination, and ideas started to fly off his mind like sparks from an emery wheel. The more brake the Regular Establishment applied to him, the thicker came the sparks. We youngsters egged him on since he was about the only "brass" we ever dared address. And he stretched our imaginations to the breaking point.

But we must not misplace Mitchell, if we are to understand the history of American airpower. Bill's proper place is not that of a great airman or a war hero, although he was a passable pilot and had guts for 10 men. He was "John the Baptist" of military modernization. Offensive airpower was the "locusts and wild honey" upon which he thrived. He had other dishes, too, but they had not the flavor of such urgency—radio, modern vehicles, the submarine, the aircraft carrier supplanting the battleship, the paratroop infantry—anything which would shake up complacency. All these things rather than aviation alone combined to disturb the existing order of military affairs. Bill was impartial—he tramped on all obsolescence with equal scorn. Moreover, he had distinguished company, fellow spirits with plenty of gold braid, especially in the Navy—Simms who taught the Navy how to shoot, and Admirals Fiske and Fullam, and Senator Wadsworth and General Patrick of the Army. These, added to everyone who ever flew an airplane bolstered him mightily. Farsighted leaders such as Air Marshal Trenchard, of the Royal Flying Corps, the father of airpower, if any one man can be so designated, and famous Royal Navy admirals such as Scott and Hall lent him power.

Some have said that the court-martial broke Mitchell's heart and others that he sought it. Neither is accurate. Bill got nowhere, or at least not far, with his modernization ideas in the Regular Establishment or with the politicians. He simply thought the matter was vital to the country and took the issue over the heads of defense and politics to the people. If that involved court-martial—well, so be it. His appeal to history would be the more vivid, and he understood history. Of course it hurt him, and he was needled into some pretty tall talk. But things were never simple black and white for him any more than they are for anyone who struggles in the area of progress. There were plenty of high military rankers who loved the young disrupter despite thinking him guilty of insubordination. In fact, I can think of worse offenses myself—one being willful refusal to explore a possibly decisive force upon which the life of your country may depend. There is a time when insubordination may be essential to patriotism. The timing is the key to the intent. History is the judge.

The actual result of the court-martial was not that it censured Mitchell. The actual result was that it focused attention on the necessity of military modernization. The impact was not only servicewide in the United States but among other governments as well. And of course, the Mitchell stand fortified the determination of the United States airmen who now went about hacking out the intellectual framework of future airpower. So profoundly were the young men impressed by what resulted from these studies that they began to see that airpower could result only from a continual educational progression. When following World War II, the United States Air Force was created, the first major move was to establish an air university dedicated to intellectual freedom as the living heart of American airpower. To this process, the career officer is continuously exposed. The air university is the greatest single sentry in America today against military obsolescence.

There were many conditions about which the military airman could do nothing—budget, organization, pure research, personnel assignments, etc. But at that particular time, there was a requirement more important than all of these things together—a foolproof concept of airpower. Undramatically, but with their backs bowed to the job, the airmen in uniform dug into it. I wish I could tax reader patience to muster all the names, but a few will suffice to illustrate their quality: Foulois, Lahm, Arnold, Spaatz, Brereton, Milling Eaker, Andrews, the Harmon brothers, the Giles twins, Kenny, George, Streit, Fairchild, Harper, Twining, Doolittle, Hale, Yount, Ent, Bill Ocker, Pop Haines, Dargue, Brett, Curry, Gilmore, Pratt, Eubank, Cousins, Westover, Brandt, Tinker, Turner, Power, Chennault, Echols, McNarney, McMullin, authors of airpower. Their area of study was so unregarded in those days that historians will never even note it. Yet it was the very essence of history and I want to record the fact for once at least.

The character and doctrine of United States airpower did not "just happen." These men, thus, soon after World War I, began to blueprint its foundations to global scale; projected its technical progress to foreseeable limits; contrived its doctrine in relation to future United States requirements; and estimated priority of efforts to be progressively tackled. As an example of creative thinking, the putting together and timing of the nature of American airpower must stand as one of the most brilliant intellectual achievements in military annals. Mitchell had been the imagination stretcher, but he was far from alone.

Here is the tenor of how the "hangar flying" might go at Maxwell, Dayton, March, Kelly, Langley, or a dozen other old military fields.

"The Treaty of Versailles was unrealistic. Germany was not devastated by the war and her intact industries have high skill in armament—especially air armament. Her scientists can set up shop in Scandinavia, Switzerland, Russia, and where not, to keep research going, even though German industry is presently restricted in arms. We can't count on Germany's growing technically behind the times. Germany is made up of three essential elements—the Junkers, the Industrial Barons and the Volk. The Volk pulled out from under the Kaiser; Hindenberg still not able to hold them permanently. Some 'Deutchland über alles' politician will come along to catch their imagination. The Junkers and the Industrialists will have to go along. Germany will resurge and disclaim the Versailles Treaty. Then watch out.

"International conflict may go either of two ways. Germany may go east—Poland, the Balkans, Russia, the Mediterranean—oil, minerals, timber and the theory of a great land mass—Europe plus Asia, with Africa falling into the basket as a bonus. Or Germany may move west initially and, if victorious, the east will come easy later. In either case, a German victory would leave the United States isolated, geographically

and politically. It seems inevitable that the United States will be involved in conflict again when Germany once more threatens Europe.

"By the time this situation matures the decisive nature of surface power—sea and land—will have retrograded. The bulk of firepower will be in the hands of the airplane. The Mercator maps will be obsolete for airmen who must reach over battlelines and destroy military industry across oceans or deep in hinderlands. Surface forces increasingly will spend a big share of their budgets merely in trying to survive against airpower. This will absorb much of their offensive capability. We must have not only long-legged planes, but ones which can get far upstairs without sacrifice of striking accuracy. Only airpower can defeat airpower, and surface forces can move only where there is air superiority. Airpower alone has the potential to keep war from coming to the home countryside.

"And don't leave Russia out of consideration. As either an ally of Germany or as a victor over Germany, the Bolsheviks have the greatest incentive to develop airpower—long distances, poor surface transportation, a vast variety of people to hold together.

"And," somebody was likely to interject, "I don't feel comfortable about the Alaskan situation. Too many people across the line up there still call Alaska Russian America. When the air trade routes reach over the world instead of around it, the Bolsheviks might move in to reclaim Alaska."

And so it went, on and on—this debating in the eagle nests—and there was little in the foreseeable future that it didn't explore—the possibility of having to defeat the German Navy at sea with airpower—the vulnerability of Panama—the possibility of having to contain invading forces on the Florida and Carolina shores—the possibility of the Philippines becoming the base of vast airpower to stabilize the empire—crazy Japanese—the possibility of bomb screening moving ahead of advancing infantry; the possibility of transporting striking air forces under ice into the Arctic on submarines. The air history of World War I was perused avidly for tidbits of operational ingenuity which might apply to the future, but inevitably would come the warning not to be trapped in that kind of thinking. Never did a handful of veterans more relentlessly put the past behind them than did the postwar airmen in the United States. Never were so few experience books written on a serious subject. The answers all lay ahead. That was the philosophy.

The connotation of such ideas was staggering. It implied the creation of new sciences, the reorganization of military forces. It suggested that the statesman must rework his values; that the Nation must spend unparalleled sums for research; that the oceans had lost their protective value; that the airmen must have intellectual freedom within the defense area. Scant wonder that the established order of military affairs backed off from such suggestion—that further war would inevitably be global war; and no warning declarations and mobilizations.

The situation was further made difficult by the fact that the whole Military Establishment was considered rather an anachronism. The world was now safe for democracy—wasn't it? So, who were these aviators who were talking not only about further wars, but wars of such scope and suddenness that even peaceful civilians far from battlefields would be involved? Of course, this rhetoric was fanned by the usual fringe whose "peace at any price" would leave the world in the hands of the devil. All in all, airmen who were dealing with the concept of future national security and preservation of world peace found no ready ear for their thesis. It requires mental fortitude to walk the path of conviction when you are young and uncertified to deal with problems which have no precedent. This breed had that mentality. The evidence is not to be found in military statistics but in the tall stature of the United States through the continuing years. However, if anyone wonders why some young officer was always trying to climb 1,000 feet higher or go a few miles faster, or deliberately fly in thunderstorms, or navigate solely on instruments, or test a new bomb for its shrapnel pattern, or bail out with some newfangled parachute, or fly to sea to intercept some ocean liner—the reason must be clear. It was a reaching out and up to put the tools of a concept together against the day when the chips would be down. And the vast bulk of it was done on junior officer's pay and without acclaim—the Nation's biggest bargain.

In 1927, Charles Lindbergh, a product of Army Air Corps training, and a reservist with probably more air mail time "on the gauges" than any pilot then alive, hopped nonstop from New York to Paris. With that event the insulating North Atlantic started to become just another point of reference. The radial aircooled engine proved itself. So did Lindbergh's navigational techniques and flight instruments. The flight was a "concept" triumph. This one event set the country by the ears. Following Lindbergh came "the era of the explorers"—Dick Byrd, Lester Maitland, and Albert Hegenberger, Clarence Chamberlain, Bernt Balchen, Ernie Smith, and Emory Bronte, Noville, Ben Eielson, Bert Acosta, Art Goebel, Roger Williams, and Lon Yancey, and a score more—they went everywhere and saw everything.

By this time, too, the surplus equipment of World War I was disappearing and the industry had a growing market. The Post Office Department relinquished the last of its mail routes to private enterprise. Cabin planes began to dominate open cockpits—Bellanca, Travel Air, Waco, Lockheed, Stinson, Curtiss, Boeing, Douglas, Rearwin, Fairchild, Cessna, and other long-familiar names. Communities began to scramble for a place in the developing airline network. Federal regulation had come into the picture, as had Assistant Secretaries of Air for War and Navy. The National Air Races became a showcase for engine durability and aerodynamically clean aircraft. Roscoe Turner, Jimmie Wedell, Freddie Lund, Amelia Earhart, Bennie Howard, Frank Hawks, Speed Holman, Jim Wray, and scores of names became household familiar, even as the barnstormers of earlier days had been. Army and Navy demonstrated at the races, but never raced. They were outspeeded in any case by the homebuilders.

In 1929, the depression iced up all aviation activity. Civil airlines remained aloft largely by virtue of mail subsidy. General aviation bailed out into the light plane—the very light plane. Military budgets were channeled to housekeeping. Research in military aviation suffered accordingly. Pilot recruitment had more applicants than could possibly be handled.

In 1934, came the airmail cancellations—a piece of political folly that backfired. Army was put to flying the mail and found the clouds full of rocks. The political and military parsimony that had not made adequate instrument training available to Regulars and Reserves was exposed to public knowledge. The unabashed administration restored the airmail routes to the only people who could fly them—the airlines; and the embarrassed Army "passed the buck" back to the Air Corps, which plunged into a frenzy of all-weather flying with whatever funds it could scrounge from any source. One by-product of the depression was a make-work program of airport construction. The shovel-leaners on civil airports were thicker than seagulls at a clambake, but the military projects with better supervision realized a solid investment. Many new fields were developed and old ones expanded.

The Air Corps already had a weather eye on Europe. Hitler had been the man to catch the imagination of the Volk and the National Socialist Party had brought the swastika to the flagpole. As expected, too, airpower was the keynote of Germany resurgent. It was evident that a great storm was in the making. Overcrowded Italy sought to prepare a cradle for her pregnancy in the colonization of Ethiopia. Japan jumped Manchukuo in another move toward her conquest of the Far East. Hitler and Stalin tried to outflank each other, and incidentally Europe, via the Iberian Peninsula in what the Western World naively called the Spanish Civil War. In all of these preliminary buildups to the hurricane which was developing into global proportions, the airplane played an increasing part. Blitzkrieg became a familiar word. France, with her Maginot Line, and Britain, whose administration carried an umbrella but ironically didn't know how to use one in world affairs, at last saw they were late with little. They began to order aircraft from the American aviation industry. This circumstance may or may not have helped them immediately, but it had an ultimately great influence on the outcome of World War II. It got the United States off to a flying start in the mass production of aircraft—and it was mass operation of comparatively obsolescent equipment that finally decided the issue.

On September 1, 1939, German troops crossed the frontier into Poland. "Hap" Arnold, who had previously been made Chief of Army Air Forces, heard the news and sighed, "During all the years since World War I, we have had time and no money. Now we will have money and no time."

It was a rough ordeal to have spent your life attempting to keep the country from war in the one way that the objective could have been accomplished—Western air supremacy—and then come to a moment when willful ignorance not only brought war to the world, but brought your country to the brink of disaster. And you couldn't even talk to the administration of your own country about it. The price in your own service would be 23,000 planes lost in action and 120,000 casualties. You didn't know what such figures would be, but you knew the penalty of visionless leadership in a global dimension war would set a new record for human tragedy.

In this moment you had one rock to lean on, one cornerstone to build on. You and your confreres understood the character of airpower. You had a through concept of its employment if you could get the tools and the manpower to operate the mass of it that must now serve against the technical superiority of the enemy.

To all who believe that "There's a divinity that shapes our ends, rough-hew them how we will," the victory of the free nations in World War II lends vivid support. Never in the annals of time did any man have the world so firmly in his grasp, and grow palsied, as did Hitler. He in turn, like the treaty-makers at Versailles, did not understand airpower nor did the key people around him.

On June 30, 1939, Germany flew a rocket plane—the Heinkel 176. On August 27, 1939, she also flew the world's first jet-engined aircraft, the He–178. And on April 5, 1941, her twin-engined jet fighter, the He–280, with 1,200 pounds thrust per engine, was flying rings around the Luftwaffe's best standard fighter of the time, the Focke Wulf 190. Even this latter date was some weeks before the first flight of Frank Whittle's prototype jet engine in Britain, and 18 months prior to October 1, 1942, when the United States Bell XP–59A, powered by an adaptation of Whittle's engine, experimentally took the air.

This one brief set of statistics would normally have been the key to decision in the war. Had the United States or British airmen possessed such technical advantage, there would have been no war. We would have used it to prevent the momentum of conquest just as currently we have used strategic air supremacy for a decade to keep the Communist Soviet in check.

It was a strange twist of fate that German air leaders did not know how to employ airpower. In the mid-thirties, well after the Luftwaffe was on the high road, Goering once told me how Ju–52 transports could be convoyed by fighters, and that there was no sense in building great bombers. I suspect German airmen had to tailor airpower to relative army and navy budget and so never got into the very costly heavy bomber business. Certainly such designers as Dornier, Junkers, Heinkel, and Messerschmitt were not strangers to big ship design, and Milch had been a Lufthansa executive before he transferred to the military side. He knew the potential of long range, or he should have at any rate. Udet, whom many of us knew well, should have understood airpower. Some student officer at the Air War College might dig into the history of compromised military funds in Germany, as they affected her defeat. There should be plenty of testimony. And certainly if a nation was defeated because it tried to keep peace in its military family, we could profit by a study of the subject.

Of course, the Stuka blitzkrieg looked good initially as the mechanized German columns plowed around Europe, but the surface-bound airpower came a cropper at so narrow a roadblock as the English Channel. If the aircraft which eventually came over Britain in segments had been four-engined bombers en masse and accompanied by jet fighters, the war would have been over almost immediately. Hitler could have taken Russia later in stride, climate and all.

What clipped the immediate and decisive development of the jets in Germany, poses a vast complex of industrial jealousy, staff failure, political favoritism, and probably on the technical side lack of any great appreciation between the scientist and the politician. One thing seems sure—airwise, Hitler depended on Goering and Goering degenerated from an airman into a political figurehead. The mighty Luftwaffe was caught in the middle. And that fact in major degree bailed out the lost years of research and development in American aviation. Prewar German jet power never got a decisive crack at the volume of relatively obsolescent aircraft with which Anglo-American airpower leveled Festung Europa. The imaginations which Mitchell had stretched to regard airpower as a decisive force of global magnitude, could use even a dull tool for victory.

Following the Battle of Britain where the offensive strength of the jetless Luftwaffe was met and destroyed piecemeal by the brilliantly directed RAF, Mr. Churchill declared, "Never did so many owe so much to so few." Gallant words and well put by a statesman with few equals in all time. And maybe that is the way history should be permitted to stand. But I think we cannot let it go at that in the case of anything so dynamic as airpower, where the subject is yet to be grasped. So again let us read the other side of the coin. It says, "A handful of British airmen, neglected for two decades by military and political leaders entrenched in outmoded tradition and by a public sterile of vision, rose in the hour of crisis and gave their lives to redeem from folly those who made the sacrifice necessary."

Nor could the worn side of the coin better fit the American airpower scene. As World War II approached in Europe, the United States stood sixth among the nations in air strength. Even as late as Pearl Harbor, the Air Force mustered only 200 bombers of the B–17 type; 750 mediums of the A–20, B–25, and B–26 types; and some 2,000 fighters of the P–40 and P–39 type. Scarcely any type was adequate by prevailing combat standards. Happily the Japanese backed away from initial victory in the Pacific as had the Germans in Europe.

In January 1939, Franklin Roosevelt had asked Congress to build an Air Corps strength of 5,500 planes; to train 2,000 crewmen and to construct or extend military airbases. A single year later he was calling for 50,000 airplanes immediately and an annual production rate of 50,000. This meant 100,000 pilots and 2 million airmen. The disparity between those 2 sets of figures enunciated within a single year, was more eloquent of the aviation astigmatism around the American high command than anything which can be said. Furthermore, nowhere on earth but in the United States could such a schedule have been greeted by other than ridicule. Here the aviation industry was accustomed to bizarre consideration and happily the young lieutenants, now matured in years, had prepared themselves, despite neglect and opposition, to operate such a force. The result has been called a miracle. That's one side of the coin. The other side says it was Golgotha—a place where the dedicated went up to redeem the wilful blind and the contented ignorant.

Does this belabor needlessly a day that is past? Not at all. This is the record and the day is not past. The issue of whether we grasp the air age in America is as pertinent today as it was then. The fine phrases become epitaphs when they divert attention from the ugly facts. It is the history of civilization that each great nation has had within itself the seeds of its own destruction. Nor is there any mystery about the nature of those seeds. They are attitudes of mental and emotional withdrawal from that which requires change. Preoccupation with the established order blinds men to creeping decadence. So the world in motion spins off the rusty and the crusty. Foreign conquest is only the final exposal of intellectual stagnation.

The advent of the air age would have spun off the sovereignty of the United States, but for the fact that within the Nation was a cadre which fought against the intrenched order and prepared themselves to deal with the challenge of new things. It was a measure of the mental rust of their times that they were referred to as aviation enthusiasts. Aviation was merely the tool they used. Their basic concern was with national destiny in view of the new mobility of military forces and the physical propinquity which had come to governments and peoples. What would the future hold for the American people when all humanity rubbed shoulders rather than posing at arm's length? Who would reach for the throat of whom? What convulsions of society would remake the political and economic map of the globe? How would the rich wine of the old verities survive without new wineskins? These were equations to be wrought in terms of aircraft performance, sound doctrine, and enough military reorganization to give elbowroom for a man with wings.

The testimony of the efficacy of airpower was written large during World War II. One would suppose that the leaders of the free nations could at least believe their own eyes. But not so. With the absolute power to establish free government throughout the world by virtue of having overwhelming air supremacy, the responsible leaders of the United States and Britain turned over the Balkans to Stalin. The satellite slave pattern of communism resulted. This was easily foreseen. All airmen saw it. One day during the latter stages of the war in Europe, Maj. Gen. John Curry, United States representative on the Allied Commission to Rumania, said to me, "I do not know whether the Anglo-American agreement with Stalin on the Balkans will or will not help to win this war; but I know that it will make world war III inevitable." Only a brace of years later, I watched the first tragic evidence of that forecast unfolding in Greece.

When the proposed draft of the division of Germany among occupation forces, and the segmenting of Berlin, street by street, reached "Tooey" Spaatz, he almost had apoplexy. With the power to abolish all dictators, the free nations were now ordered to bed with the worst of them. The Berlin blockade was the almost immediate result.

Nor did the pattern differ around the globe. With Kenny's air forces and naval aircraft carriers, the Pacific was cleared for MacArthur's return to the Philippines. LeMay's strategic airpower already had isolated and saturated Japan. The atom bomb was poised for use. Then the Soviet was invited to share the Pacific. Subsequent division of Korea a la European pattern, and the gift to Stalin of islands abutting Japan were foreshadows of the abandonment of Chiang in China. Thus China's Red armies were made available for Korea. The stage was set for the Korean war. It was fought with airpower tethered to a tent peg.

So, another occasion to secure world peace and human freedom by the one agency which had decisive power to assure the result—airpower—was passed up. Indochina followed Korea—and now Hungary and Suez. And so on and on the futility goes—the stench of a dead peace marking the insane wanderings of dictators with the body of ravaged humanity in their arms.

The question is not one of peace. Peace has been murdered. The question is, When will free men realize that civilization in the air age cannot afford tyrants? With a hydrogen bomb in his hand, a dictator is no longer a local bully. It is not alone the Soviet citizen or the satellite slave who must quail when the Kremlin roars. It is the world. Can there be a civilized future under such a condition?

World War I was fought at incalculable sacrifice and the peace was lost by failure to evaluate the progressing character of a new decisive force in human affairs—airpower. World War II was fought and again the peace was lost by an even more tragic failure of kindred nature. The wind has been sown and now we reap the whirlwind and toss in history's weary pattern of self-destruction.

The one hope to escape the inevitable is the seemingly inexhaustible determination of the airman to reach out and up in demonstrable capability of his power to stay the hand of the dictator. His hazard in this enterprise is equal to the combat of any war ever fought. His greatest handicap, however, remains the same as in the days of yore—the struggle to secure the sinews of his power in the light of eternal compromises with the fond traditions.

Meanwhile the ability of the citizen to purchase his continued freedom must reach a foreseeable climax. The availability of skilled manpower is even now critical. With some knowledge of the relative developments of airpower in the United States and in the slave state, I estimate that the annual American airpower budget necessary to remain ahead in the struggle for survival must reach $100 billion within the decade. Dictators are expensive pets.

Today we are in a new phase of air-age development—the intercontinental missile. We passed up the opportunity of air supremacy over the years to decree and enforce freedom for all men. This new phase may possibly restore that opportunity briefly.

If the free world loses the race to achieve the intercontinental missile and the practical establishment of satellite surveillance, the die already has been cast. The blind

will have led the blind into the ditch of oblivion.

If the free world first gains the intercontinental missile and the satellite surveillance to use it effectively—what then? Will there be another dalliance with disaster and a prolongation of the mockery which cries peace, peace, to the authors of war on one hand, and on the other turns over to them the fate of humanity?

If so, we already are intellectual slaves to the forces of a dead past and the physical chains will not be historically important.

Or will there be a national understanding of the fatefulness that is approaching so that, with the backing of the free American people, our spokesman—speaking from a position of strength once more—may stand forth and invite humanity under the United Nations to proclaim a Declaration of Independence for all people everywhere—without veto?

Nor is this a rhetorical question. The day is inevitable. The time is not far distant. This will be the last chance to survive as a free world. Fifty years of airpower have led to this valley of decision.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I should like to announce, before I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow, that on tomorrow we shall take up the resolutions which provide for the printing of additional copies of hearings. I think they are Calendar No. 66, Senate Resolution 93, the unfinished business, which authorizes the printing as a Senate Document of the report of an investigation of airpower, and providing for additional copies; Calendar No. 65, Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, providing for the printing of additional copies of hearings held by the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, of the Committee on the Judiciary; and Calendar No. 67, Senate Resolution 75, authorizing additional clerk hire for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, if there is no opposition; and any other resolutions which may pertain solely to the printing of additional copies of reports.

Then we shall proceed to consider the contempt citation resolutions reported from the Committee on Government Operations, under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

At the conclusion of the consideration of the contempt citation resolutions, we shall proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 68, Senate Joint Resolution 19, authorizing the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence. I am hopeful that we can debate that joint resolution very thoroughly all this week and perhaps next week, and perhaps reach a vote on it in the latter part of next week or the early part of the following week.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 19, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 18, 1957:

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Arnie J. Suomela, of Oregon, to be Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife, Department of the Interior.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for the terms indicated:

For terms of 4 years:

Dr. Michael Ellis De Bakey, of Texas.

Dr. Thomas Francis, Jr., of Michigan.

Dr. Ernest Henry Volwiler, of Illinois.

For terms of 3 years:

Dr. Basil G. Bibby, of New York.

Dr. Jean A. Curran, of Massachusetts.

Dr. Champ Lyons, of Alabama.

For terms of 2 years:

Miss Mary Louise Marshall, of Louisiana.

Dr. Isidor Schwaner Ravdin, of Pennsylvania.

For terms of 1 year:

Dr. Worth Bagley Daniels, of the District of Columbia.

Dr. Benjamin Spector, of Massachusetts.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Donald C. Moseley, of Louisiana, to be United States marshal for the western district of Louisiana for a term of 4 years, vice Louis E. LeBlanc, resigned.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, as we again assemble in Thy name, may our souls be quickened with those desires and longings which Thou dost delight to satisfy.

Inspire us to believe that when life seems so baffling in its demands and so desperate in its needs then by trusting in Thee we may find the secret of remaining strong and steadfast.

Show us how daily we may enter into a more intimate fellowship with our blessed Lord who came to lead and lift mankind toward the light.

Incline our hearts to feel that it is our noblest obligation and our highest privilege to be partners with Him in building the kingdom of brotherhood and in helping those who have fallen and giving courage to all who have failed.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 14, 1957, was read and approved.

## READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to a special order agreed to on February 11, 1957, the Chair designates the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately following the reading of the Journal on February 22, 1957.

## HUNGARIAN REFUGEES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, my attention has just been called to an editorial cartoon that appeared in a morning Washington newspaper, a paper which I have never found the time to look at. However, if my information about the point of the cartoon is correct, I would like to call your attention to some very important facts in connection with the admission into the United States of Hungarian refugees.

My own position has not been inconsistent. I have contended from the very beginning of the emergency program that the least we can expect is a decent, thorough screening of people to whom we issue immigrant visas authorizing them to remain in this country permanently. We have a right to know who is coming into the United States. I did say that I was satisfied with the screening of the second group of refugees that came under the parole provisions of the immigration code. These were the brave young students who fought tanks with their bare hands, and I felt that anybody who did that we could take a chance on. But, as to the first group, the ones which obtained immigrant visas in a hurry, I repeat what I said in the very beginning: They are opportunists who took advantage of a crack in the Iron Curtain, or Hungarians who were fleeing from the ire of their fellow countrymen. Among them were the Hungarian Communists against whose regime the revolution was succeeding. So I say it is not my position that is inconsistent, nor is the position of this newspaper inconsistent, because you will find it always on the side against the security of our beloved Republic.

## THE CORDINER REPORT

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, for several weeks now we have been reading about the Cordiner report in the newspapers. As I understand it, the report is the result of the work done by a citizens' committee for the Secretary of Defense. It is my further understanding that Mr. Cordiner is the president of General Electric Corp. and has rendered a gratuitous service to the armed services. The report is supposed to make some drastic recommendations to the Secretary of Defense. I say that these are drastic changes, but my knowledge of these changes is based solely on the articles that have appeared in the newspapers.

I do not want to comment on the recommendations in the report, because

I have not seen the report. Instead, I would like to confine my remarks to the report itself and to the technique of secrecy being used by the Defense Department. From the outset, however, I would like to make it plain that my record will show an almost consistently friendly disposition toward the Military Establishment.

After having had inquiries from constituents about the proposed pay increases contained in the Cordiner report, the House Armed Services Committee was contacted to find out if a bill had been introduced to complement the report. On learning that there was no such bill, I endeavored to secure a copy of the report from the Defense Department so that I could answer my constituents more intelligently. Much to my amazement I was informed that they would not make the report available to me. They said that only the chairman and ranking members of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees could see the report at present. What kind of a run-around can a Member of Congress get? To me this is a strange sort of thing that is happening across the Potomac. I think that this is just another case of the Congress being notified of Government business by the news media.

How do we inform our constituents of official Government business? Do we tell them to read the newspapers and let it go at that? Are newspapers the only source of information for a Member of Congress?

The House Government Information Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee has taken a long look into this practice of withholding information, and I compliment them. I think that the newspapers have testified over and over again that the various Government agencies have withheld nonstrategic information from them for no good reason. After all, the Government's business is the people's business. But the case at hand is the reverse of that practice by the Defense Department. The Defense Department tells me that this Cordiner report reached the Army Times through a mistake. I have read about the report in all sorts of newspapers, but the Defense Department refuses to make the report available to me. I can see no logical reason for them to withhold the report. It seems to me that every Member of Congress should have access to the official report.

I would like to call on the House Government Operations Committee to make an investigation into the matter. After all, I think that this is a new technique and a demarcation from the usual practice in the withholding of information by a Government agency.

## INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, Representative HENRY TALLE, secretary of the Interparliamentary Union, at my request, as president of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union, gave notice on the floor of the House of Representatives, Thursday, February 14, 1957, of a business meeting of the Interparliamentary Union to be held Tuesday, February 19, 1957, in Room F–39 on the Senate side of the Capitol at 9:30 a. m. The old Supreme Court room in the Capitol is not available for this meeting.

As president of the American group, I wish to give further notice at this time of the business meeting, to make sure that those members who may have been absent during the past week will be apprised of this important meeting.

## THE LATE R. CLINT COLE

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, one of my predecessors, R. Clint Cole, died on February 8 at Findlay, Ohio. He was 86 years of age.

Mr. Cole represented the Eighth Ohio District in Congress for 3 terms from 1919 to 1925. A brother, Ralph D. Cole, also held the same office for 3 terms from 1905 to 1911. Both were prominent, nationally known orators of their day.

Clint Cole graduated from the Ohio Northern University at Ada, Ohio, in 1900. He practiced law in Findlay and was its city solicitor from 1912 to 1916.

The Republican-Courier of Findlay had these complimentary remarks on the occasion of Mr. Cole's death:

> Gifted with the power of fluent and appropriate speech, Clint Cole was in demand as a speaker all over the country. He was active as a speaker from Maine to California in the campaigns of six Republican candidates for president. Upon assignments by the national Republican speakers' bureau he addressed gatherings in 20 States of the Union.
>
> He possessed a facile and ornate power of vivid and graphic description, and won from his friends a well-merited appellation of the prince of storytellers.

## OTHER THAN HONORABLE DISCHARGES IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, for more than 2 years prior to the time I filed H. R. 1108 on January 3, 1957, I majored my attention to the problem of the thousands of less than honorable or other than honorable discharges given by the military units annually in our Defense Departments. Having studied the problem considerably on my own and without saying much about it, I then asked the Defense Department to answer 23 questions which I directed to them involving the subject of other than honorable discharges in the total military service of the United States each year. The Defense Department promptly cooperated with me, but this did not alter the fact that there were so many thousands of American teen-agers and youths discharged by our military department each year that I was, in fact, shocked to find the comparably great number who were, according to the record furnished me by the Defense Department itself. When you read in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my extension of remarks, which will include some of the answers given me by the Defense Department to some of my 23 questions asked them, you also will realize the fact that this needs a major treatment and prompt major emphasis and consideration by this great legislative body.

This is also a fact because the military advised me that under the present existing statutes they cannot take into consideration the later good conduct nor rehabilitation of a lad which he acquires or achieves in civilian life after he has been discharged from the military with less than honorable or other than honorable types of discharges.

What does H. R. 1108, which I filed the first day of this session, provide and what are its worthy objectives which I so vigorously support and ask your good will toward? You will find much more satisfactory answers in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD than I have time to here give.

First. H. R. 1108 proposes to amend existing statutes which do not authorize any of the military review or correction boards to take into consideration that a person has rehabilitated himself in civilian life as a ground for correcting the type of military discharge formerly received by him upon his discharge or dismissal from the Military Establishment.

Second. H. R. 1108 authorizes an application before the appropriate military board for an individual not less than 3 years after he has been dismissed or discharged from the military under other than honorable or under less than honorable conditions endeavoring to establish to the satisfaction of the military board by oral or written evidence or both that such individual has rehabilitated himself in civilian life and that his character and conduct and activities and habits have been good for a reasonable time; in no event not less than 3 years after his original discharge.

Third. The military board shall take into consideration each case on its own merits and shall consider the factors involved in the original discharge and dismissals, including the reasons for the nature of the original discharge or dismissal.

Fourth. Applications and reapplications may be filed at any time beginning after 3 years from the date of original discharge.

Fifth. No Government benefits shall be afforded any individual who may be issued a new discharge or release by the military board upon review of his application.

Sixth. If the military board corrects and changes the type of original dis-

charge it shall be dated back to the date of the original discharge and the corrected discharge shall be under honorable conditions.

Mr. Speaker, from my personal conversation with dozens of Members of this great legislative body about the terms and objectives of H. R. 1108, I mention that almost every Member, if not every Member, will be especially interested in it.

Mr. Speaker, it involves thousands of American military personnel every year. You will notice the numerical tables given me by the Defense Department which will be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I believe most of you will be shocked at the very large number involved. I wish to repeat that the Defense Department cooperated with me and even appointed an ad hoc committee last August to study my questions and give me the answers. I believe that the facts revealed by their answers further strengthens my earlier decision to try to be constructively helpful in finding a practical solution which would at least substantially remedy this condition which I believe is manifestly unsound and unnecessary as well as unfair to thousands of lads and their families.

Mr. Speaker, my bill has no purpose to interfere with military discipline nor to make it more difficult. Discipline is no cinch nor child's play. But, Mr. Speaker, I believe that if the objectives of H. R. 1108 are put into fair and practical application by the Military Establistment that increased morale will logically result. This will be true, because under the objectives of H. R. 1108 discharges and dismissals under less than honorable conditions will logically be treated substantially different than at present. Also thousands of American lads each year will have reason in fact to praise the American military instead of to condemn it; because, they have had a fair, a just, and equitable opportunity and chance to prove that their infractions of military rules and regulations were only minor; were not intended to be serious nor felonious in intent or result; but that they were, while in the military and still are, patriotic, loyal, and law-abiding American citizens.

To the desk of each of you, my distinguished colleagues, there should have been delivered a copy of H. R. 1108 together with my first comments about it.

Mr. Speaker, in the brief time remaining, I wish to call to your attention a typical answer given to me personally by many Members of the Congress who were formerly active leaders in the Military Establishment and some of them still active in the Military Reserve, which was the answer of one such distinguished Member, who, upon discussing the bill with me, said: "Congressman DOYLE, if your bill only removes the stigma and makes it possible for one American to deservedly remove the stigma and get dignified employment, your bill is justified." I think perhaps the Member of this House who made that answer will recognize that I am trying to quote him exactly.

## OUR BELOVED CHAPLAIN

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned that our beloved Chaplain is 70 years young this day. I know of no man who has the warm affection of this House more than he. He has endeared himself to us all. I want to express to him my own feeling and that, I am sure, of all my colleagues, and wish for him at least 70 more happy birthdays.

May God bless you, and keep you always, Dr. Braskamp.

## TAX REDUCTION

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has submitted to the Congress for approval the highest peacetime budget in the history of our country. This budget amounts to more than $72 billion and indicates a definite trend on the part of this administration to spend up to the maximum income of the Nation. According to press releases the Secretary of the Treasury has said that the budget should be cut; also, it has been indicated that the President himself believes his own budget can and should be cut.

In the face of these indications, and also in view of the fact that the administration has indicated we will have a surplus of some $800 million, it is my firm opinion that the time has come for this Congress to act on a tax reduction. We know full well that this administration will recommend a tax cut next year—it being an election year—regardless of the fiscal conditions at that time. I hope that the leadership of this Congress, and the Members of the Committee on Ways and Means handling tax legislation, will come forth at an early date and recommend a tax reduction for the low income people of America. I feel definitely that the present personal exemption of $600 for each taxpayer could be raised to at least $700. This would cost in the neighborhood of $2 billion and would still leave ample income to supply a reasonable budget for carrying on the affairs of our Government; and, at the same time, leave some money in the Treasury for retirement of our bonded indebtedness.

Certainly in view of the rising cost of living and high interest rates, the low income people of America deserve some relief in the form of a tax cut. It is my earnest hope, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that a tax cut can be voted this year and show to the American public that the Democratic leadership, to whom they have entrusted the legislative branch of our Government, is sincerely interested in protecting the welfare of the American people, without election year political implications.

## CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, there is only one bill on the Consent Calendar. I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar be dispensed with today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

## COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I ask unanimous consent that that committee have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 4602.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

## PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT CAPITALS OF NORTH DAKOTA, SOUTH DAKOTA, MONTANA, AND WASHINGTON

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 348) to amend section 12 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676), relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, by providing for the use of public lands granted to the States therein for the purpose of constructing, reconstructing, repair, renovation, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said States, with committee amendments recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 12 of the act relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, approved February 22, 1889, is amended to read as follows:

"That upon the admission of each of said States into the Union, in accordance with the provisions of this act, 50 sections of unappropriated public lands within such States, to be selected and located in legal subdivisions as provided in section 10 of this act, shall be, and are hereby, granted to said States for public buildings at the capital of said States for legislative, executive, and judicial purposes, including construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishings, equipment, and any other permanent improvement of such buildings and the acquisition of necessary land for such buildings, and the payment of principal and interest on bonds issued for any of the above purposes."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect as of February 22, 1889.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, when the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington were admitted to the Union by the enabling act of February 22, 1889, there was a grant by section 12 of that act of 50 sections of unappropriated land for the purpose of erecting buildings at the capitals of those States. There was also by section 17 of that act a grant to the State of Montana of 150,000 acres for the same purpose of erecting public buildings at the State capital and the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Washington by the same act acquired different amounts of public land. In December of this year, the Montana Supreme Court in passing on a bond issue that had been issued by authority of the Legislature of the State of Montana decided that the word "erected" in the enabling act in section 12 meant that the money from this capital land grant be used only for the purpose of building new buildings, and that it could not be used for the purpose of repair or reconstruction or building on or any of the other purposes. The capitol building of Montana was built in 1899, and it needs extensive repairs. Since this enabling act was passed, the money in this trust fund has been used at least three times to pay off bond issues, for the purpose of building on or adding new construction and for the repair and renovation of the State capitol. But, the supreme court has said that it cannot be used for that purpose any longer. That casts doubt not only upon the bond issue that was before the court, but upon at least three previous bond issues. Therefore, I have sought this amendment to the enabling act to provide that the money in that trust fund, and it is only this capital land trust fund, can be used for these additional purposes, to broaden the use of the trust fund. The chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the chairman of the subcommittee and the leadership here have been very cooperative in bringing this bill up early so that it can be accepted by the State Legislature of the State of Montana and the other State legislatures concerned because an amendment to the enabling act not only has to be passed by the Congress, but has to be accepted by the people of the States involved. Since the Montana Legislature is now in session, and will be in session only until the 7th of March, there was some urgency to get this bill through at this early time in order that it could be accepted before adjournment. The amendment will permit the use of this State capital land trust fund for purposes other than the erection of new buildings. The supreme court decision has cast into doubt not only the proposition that you cannot use the money for the erection of new buildings, but it has cast doubt upon the proposition that you cannot use the State capital trust fund for the purposes of paying interest, and you probably cannot use it for the purpose of acquiring additional land. This corrects that situation.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Would the gentleman explain to the House the situation in which Montana finds its capital at the present time? And, for that matter, over the last 15 or 20 years, and also the situation in which some of the officials, including the Governor of the State of Montana, find themselves?

Mr. METCALF. I mentioned that there have been three bond issues passed—at least three—which were in violation of this supreme court decision. One was for the repair of the State land board and the building of a new vault for that board. A $25,000 bond issue was funded and repaid. Two years ago $300,000 worth of bonds were sold for the repair of the State capitol building. The only obligation of the State is the pledging of the State capital land grant fund.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will the gentleman tell us why the State capitol building needs repair?

Mr. METCALF. If I may mention one other bond issue. There was a bond issue of $650,000 in the last session of the Legislature of Montana, and it was that bond issue that brought about the Supreme Court decision.

The Capitol of Montana was built in 1899. In 1899 we did not know as much about concrete construction as we know today. The cinder concrete in that portion of the capitol has deteriorated to such an extent that the floors are collapsing, and the capitol was very badly shaken in a series of earthquakes. And that time it was not repaired except temporarily. Now, as a result of those earthquake shocks and as a result of deterioration of the materials with which the capitol was built, extensive repairs are needed.

According to surveys by the consulting engineers the following are some of the repairs that are needed and represent the type of construction and renovation contemplated if this bill passes:

First. Complete replacement of floor structures in the original building.

Second. Structural tie beams to tie the various portions of the building together. The use of these tie beams was based on the assumption that the bearing walls and partitions of the original building were of sound construction and that the materials used in the construction of walls and partitions were properly bonded together. This would enable these walls and partitions to be utilized as shear panels to resist the horizontal forces imposed by earthquake.

Third. General building repairs as required.

Fourth. Modernization of all building areas.

Fifth. Cleaning, repairing, and waterproofing of all exterior building surfaces.

Sixth. Installation of new elevators.

Seventh. Replacement of all plumbing and heating facilities and the installation of a complete new air-conditioning system for the entire building.

Eighth. Replacement of all electrical services in the original building and the installation of new power and lighting facilities in the original building.

On February 9 a section of the floor of the rotunda buckled so that the area had to be blocked off. This is just the latest in a series of incidents that support the architects' and engineers' contention that the building needs extensive repair and construction.

As a result of this supreme court decision the Governor of Montana, the attorney general of Montana, and the secretary of State of Montana, the officials who authorized this bond issue, and who have expended part of the money are personally liable for the expenditure of public funds in violation of the law. That was one reason the committee decided that in addition to passing an amendment to the act, it would be a good idea to make this act retroactive to February 22, 1889. The Supreme Court of Montana said there is nothing in the record or in the history of the Enabling Act which indicates what the intention of Congress was in enacting that statute, save insofar as the intent is found in the words used by the Congress in framing the statute. That is the word "erecting." It is the purpose of this legislation to give this court, and other courts in the West, language to determine and ascertain the congressional intent. It was for that reason that we made this act retroactive.

Mr. ASPINALL. Does the gentleman see in this legislation any endangerment or impairment of bond issues or any endangerment or impairment of future bond issues issued under the Enabling Act if this provision is modified?

Mr. METCALF. On the contrary, this legislation as presently drafted will act to validate all bond issues. It liberalizes the purposes for which the money in this capitol building fund will be used. It will not only not endanger bond issues but it will act to validate bond issues in some States that may have been issued in violation of the original act as interpreted by the Montana supreme court.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, I can agree with many of the statements that have been made by our colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF]; and if section 2 had not been added to this bill I sincerely believe it would have done just what the gentleman from Montana has stated the bill would do, but the committee instead of being satisfied with the bill went further and therein lies the trouble.

Let us go back and look carefully at what has happened. In 1889 to Congress of the United States admitted four States to the Union: North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington. Section 12 of that enabling legislation provided that upon the admission of those States to the Union certain sections of unappropriated public lands should be given to the respective States and the income therefrom was to be used for the purpose of erecting public buildings at the capital of the several States for legislative, executive, and judicial purposes.

Section 17 of the same act provided how the States themselves were to use the money.

You will notice that the amendment we are considering and being asked to approve here under suspension applies only to section 12. Nobody has done anything with regard to section 17.

On the 7th day of December 1956, the Supreme Court of the State of Montana in a case entitled "C. L. Brown Appellant against the Board of Examiners," decided that the State of Montana could not use moneys that are presently in this fund for the purpose of repairing the State capitol.

I think it is of extreme importance that you realize that this section has been interpreted by the courts of other States that are involved, and the courts in those States have come to the direct opposite conclusion. In the State of Washington on the relation of the Bookstore, plaintiff, against W. G. Potts, treasurer, respondent, reported in 141 Washington State Reports, page 110, decided November 24, 1926, the Supreme Court of the State of Washington having this same question before it came to the exactly opposite conclusion. I think it is important that the Members of Congress should know that the case in the State of Washington was not cited by either party in the Montana case.

The situation, according to a letter I received from the Governor of Montana, is this: The capitol building and land grants include 124,563.84 acres of land. On December 31, 1956, which is the latest available figure, the State of Montana had in this fund $205,629.43. I say they should be entitled to use this for the repair of their capital buildings; and I certainly believe, in view of the strong dissent that was written by several of the judges of the State of Montana, that had the Attorney General of the State of Montana cited the Washington case we would not have had this problem before us today.

If we add section 2 to this bill and make this bill retroactive to 1889 then we do something far more reaching, and I want to call this to the attention of all the Members of Congress who come from the so-called public lands States. I have been able to determine that in the enabling legislation admitting to statehood all of the other public land States you will find this same provision that is in the act which we are now amending.

Bonds have been issued and approved by bond companies throughout the western part of the United States and I am afraid if we attempt in this bill without further hearings to make it retroactive to 1889 we are going to cause more trouble in the public bond market of the 17 Western States than we are curing. By adding section 2 to the bill you are endangering bonds that are outstanding now and creating a question in all of the other Western States who have issued and who will proceed to issue bonds because once this has been brought to the attention of the bond attorneys they will raise this identical question in every bond issue hereafter. In my opinion, the best method of handling this would be to strike section 2 from the bill and if that were done I would have no objection whatsoever. Then we could take the other matter up in a separate piece of legislation clearing it up for all the western public lands States.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The effect of this legislation will not be in any way to cost the Federal Government more public lands or to cost the Federal Government any money?

Mr. SAYLOR. This bill will not cost the Federal Government any money at all.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The effect of it definitely will be, if the committee is correct in its belief, to secure or make fast the legality of these bond issues that now have been placed under a cloud more or less by this supreme court decision?

Mr. SAYLOR. I do not believe so. I think we are going far beyond our powers in adding section 2 to the bill. If we took section 1 and the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] there would be absolutely no objection to this bill at all. Section 1 would say that from this point forward these 4 States could use any money in this fund that comes from lands given to them for any purpose for public building or repairing. But I am afraid that we are dabbling with serious financial problems in trying to make this retroactive to 1889.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is aware of the fact that the committee has on it Representatives of practically all of these public-land States, the Western States, and the gentleman is also aware of the fact, I believe, that practically all of these Representatives held a different view than that held by the gentleman as to the dangers to their past bond issues by the passage of this act; is that correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. I do not know. The day we had the vote on it there was considerable discussion, and it was interesting to note that most of the people on the committee who came from the East seemed to feel there was a tremendous problem being created in connection with outstanding bonds if you tried to make this retroactive.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Does the gentleman have any information from bondholders in the East that they view with alarm this legislation?

Mr. SAYLOR. I have not been approached by any bondholders in the East with regard to this legislation at all.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The information which I had understood was in the committee's possession was to the effect that the bondholders felt it would be very desirable to pass this legislation.

Mr. SAYLOR. That was with regard to the legislation as originally presented and did not include section 2. That is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the Members of the House that we did have a thorough discussion on this bill in the subcommittee and in the full committee before reporting it out. The gentleman from Pennsylvania voiced the only objection, having voiced it well, as he has here, but after thorough consideration it was the consensus of opinion of the members of the committee that in order to take care of the situation as it now exists the bill should be passed immediately. It is our understanding that the bill will be handled immediately when it goes over to the other body.

The amendments that were made were to take care of, first, the validating, if any question exists, of the bonds already issued; and second, an amendatory provision to take care of the situation existing in the State of Washington. The second amendment was suggested by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] and was accepted unanimously by the committee. I know of no other opposition except that expressed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] was the one who called the committee's attention to the case that was cited by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. That case was carefully read and analyzed by the members of the committee. It was a 5 to 4 decision, and it was not diametrically opposed to the Montana decision. It provided that where there was new construction and furnishings and equipment in a new building, the furnishings and equipment could be paid for out of the fund. At the request of the gentleman from Washington we put one of the amendments in the bill to liberalize it still further so that there would never be any question in any of the public-land States anywhere that we were not liberalizing and broadening the uses to which these public lands funds could be put and that we were not invalidating a single bond issue anywhere in the United States.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to support this bill as amended by the committee. The committee added the words "furnishing" and "equipment" in the list of purposes for which proceeds of the land might be spent. This was done at the request of the State of Washington so that the section as amended would conform to the interpretation which the Supreme Court of the State of Washington has placed on the original language of the section. It is my understanding, therefore, that the amendment is fully as broad as the interpretation given the original language in my State.

I am inserting at this point in my remarks a letter I have received from the Honorable John J. O'Connell, attorney

general of the State of Washington, explaining the reason for the amendment:

THE STATE OF WASHINGTON,
*Olympia, February 7, 1857.*

Hon. DON MAGNUSON,
*Congressman at Large,*
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MAGNUSON: This office has received an inquiry from you concerning the position which the Senators and Congressmen of the State of Washington should take with regard to certain legislation to be introduced in both Houses of Congress by members of the congressional delegation of the State of Montana.

The legislation in question would amend the act of Congress, popularly known as the Enabling Act, approved February 22, 1889, 25 Statutes at Large 676, under which Montana, Washington, North Dakota, and South Dakota were admitted to the Union. By the terms of the Enabling Act, donations of public land owned by the Federal Government were made to the States concerned for various specified purposes, one of which was for public buildings at the State capital.

Section 12 of the Enabling Act presently provides that the land grant shall be used for the purpose of "erecting public buildings." It is our understanding that the proposed amendment would modify this language, so that section 12 would expressly state that this land was granted "for public buildings, including construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, and any other permanent improvement of such buildings, and the payment of principal and interest on bonds issued for any of the above purposes."

You have indicated that this amendment is thought to be necessary because of a recent decision by the Supreme Court of Montana providing that proceeds from the capitol building land grant could be used for erecting the buildings only, and for no auxiliary purpose, such as renovation or repair. *C. L. Bryant* v. *The Board of Examiners of the State of Montana et al.* (docket No. 9700, decided December 7, 1956).

It is our belief that the Montana amendment in its present form would be of no benefit to the State of Washington. In the case of *State ex rel. Bookstore* v. *Potts* (141 Wash. 110, 250 Pac. 1090) our supreme court considered section 12 of the Enabling Act together with section 17, which grants certain lands to the State of Washington "for public buildings at the State capital." The court concluded that the intent of Congress was that the income from the capital building land grant could be used not only for the erection of public buildings but for their furnishing as well.

It will readily be seen that this broad construction allows an even more liberal use of the capital land grant funds than the Montana amendment would permit. If such an amendment were to pass, it might later be construed to mean that the Congress had specifically intended that this income should not be used to furnish public buildings at the State capital, since the precise uses to which the income might be put would be spelled out in the amendment. Were this to happen, of course, the State of Washington would not have the freedom in its use of income from the capital building land grant that it presently enjoys.

My suggestion is, therefore, that Washington not support the amendment in its present form. In the alternative, it might be possible to suggest amending the amendment in some such fashion as this:

"For public buildings, including construction, reconstruction, furnishing, equipment, repair, renovation, and any other permanent improvement of such buildings, and the payment of principal and interest on bonds issued for any of the above purposes."

I hope the foregoing sufficiently answers your question and will be of assistance to you.

Very truly yours,
JOHN J. O'CONNELL,
*Attorney General.*

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY].

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that so far as South Dakota is concerned, we are one of the four States that came into the Union under the same enabling act that Montana came in under. At the time of the hearing I filed with the committee a letter from the attorney general of our State in which he said that this would in no way affect South Dakota and that South Dakota was really not interested because we have never been called upon to use any of these funds for maintenance purposes, but that so far as South Dakota is concerned we would favor the passage of such legislation.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill to amend section 12 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676) relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, by providing for the use of public lands granted to the States therein for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishings, equipment, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said States."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## THE LAST DEFENSE FOR CONSUMERS IS CONGRESS

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Thursday, I called to the attention of the Members an article by Mr. Edward F. Woods of the Washington Bureau of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch reporting the details of a bill which the oil industry has drafted and has submitted to the administration to destroy effective regulation of natural gas prices in the field.

Mr. Woods dug up the story and reported it in full, with its full significance to the consumers of this country. I am puzzled by the fact that I have not seen in any other newspaper any reference to this newest natural gas grab or the fact that the oil industry has apparently managed to break the heretofore solid front of local gas distributing companies which last year opposed the Harris bill.

It seems to me that the story which Mr. Woods wrote for the Post-Dispatch, and which does not seem to have been denied or disputed in any significant point, is one of the major news developments of the day and is entitled to the broadest possible attention. That is why I inserted it in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 14, at page A1009.

As a followup to Mr. Woods' exposé the Post-Dispatch last Tuesday printed an editorial entitled "The New Gas Barrage" analyzing the bill from the facts Mr. Woods uncovered, and adding:

The gas gang is growing bolder despite two vetoes of previous bills and the disclosures of arrogant lobbying. * * * The lobby has returned for another gas grab, and has the encouragement of the Eisenhower administration.

When a special interest lobby prepares a bill and a national administration favors the project, the last defense for consumers is Congress. There are 40 million of them and hundreds of millions of their dollars are at stake. Consumers should waste no time in appealing to Congress because the gas barrage is rolling fast.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include the full text of this Post-Dispatch editorial, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 12, 1957]

THE NEW GAS BARRAGE

The oil and gas industry is now attempting to write legislation for the American people.

Edward F. Woods, Post-Dispatch Washington correspondent, reports that a gas industry group representing Standard Oil of Indiana and other firms held a series of closed door meetings in New York, and on February 1 produced an 18-page document. This document was not just a report or a protest. It was a proposed amendment to the Natural Gas Act. It was not delivered to Congress, but to Jerome Kuykendall, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission.

In short, the gas lobby drafted the bill for the administration which appointed Mr. Kuykendall. Neither President Eisenhower nor his appointee believes that the FPC should regulate gas production prices. They have said as much. And the lobby's bill would require the FPC to show more concern for the industry it is supposed to regulate than for the public it is supposed to protect.

The proposed bill would give the FPC the guise of gas regulation, but would also permit the agency to authorize price increases in original gas contracts or in escalation agreements.

The bill would permit FPC to consider the reasonable market value of gas, but it would prohibit FPC from considering a producer's costs in determining what is reasonable—a rejection of customary regulatory practice.

The bill would allow States, cities, or local gas companies to protest gas price increases, but it would not require producers to demonstrate any need for them—another departure from sound regulation.

This is taking the lid off Federal gas regulation. Under such a bill, the FPC would still hold the line on gas pipeline charges, and State agencies would hold the line on local utilities' distribution charges. But who would hold the line on the price of the gas that goes through those pipelines and

local utilities to the American home and factory?

Harry Wrench, president of the Minneapolis Gas Co., says, "It's worse than the Harris-Fulbright bill." Mr. Wrench, a local utility man, attended one New York meeting and was told by the gas producers, "If you don't agree you don't belong here."

The gas gang is growing bolder despite two vetoes of previous bills and disclosures of arrogant lobbying. Last year brought revelations of the rejected pay-off to Senator CASE of South Dakota and of the issuance of fake telegrams by Standard of Indiana. Still, after all this, the lobby has returned for another gas grab, and has the encouragement of the Eisenhower administration.

When a special interest lobby prepares a bill and a national administration favors the project, the last defense for consumers is Congress. There are 40 million of them and hundreds of millions of their dollars are at stake. Consumers should waste no time in appealing to Congress because the gas barrage is rolling fast.

## FOOD INDUSTRIES AMENDMENTS OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide greater coverage for employees in the food industries.

This measure complements the omnibus bill, H. R. 4696, which I have previously introduced to increase the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act in many industries. My new bill, the Food Industries Amendments, concentrates on the retail, fish processing, area of production, agricultural, and seasonal exemptions. But it carries the same provisions for these exemptions as does H. R. 4696.

My bill seeks to call the attention of Congress to the unjustness and unreasonableness of the food industry exemptions in the Fair Labor Standards Act. The special provisions which allow the noncompliance with the dollar minimum wage and the 40-hour maximum workweek in certain parts of the food industries is a prime example of why we, in Congress, must amend the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The purpose of the Fair Labor Standards Act is explicitly stated as seeking to end "labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standards of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being." Yet, in many of the industries where the need for accomplishing this noble purpose is the greatest the Fair Labor Standards Act does not apply.

The exemptions in the food industries doom millions of Americans to the harshest type of poverty. Some of these men and women working in exempted areas earn as little as 40 or 50 cents an hour. And they are able to work only a part of the year for even that miserable wage.

The alibi for the food industry exemptions is that they protect small businesses and ones which are local in character. If that is the only concern of those who seek to keep the exemptions. I can ease their fears. My bill will cover only larger businesses—the chain retail stores, the canneries, the corporation farms. Small or family-type establishments will be left exempt by my bill.

The Food Industries Amendments under the Fair Labor Standards Act would cover industries "engaged in activities affecting commerce" as well as those "engaged in commerce or in the production for commerce." This principle has been used in virtually every type of legislation enacted by Congress. It is, for example, used in other labor legislation, such as the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. There is no reason why this extension of the commerce clause should not apply under the Fair Labor Standards Act, in order to bring its protection to millions of workers who would otherwise not have it.

Retail establishments are now exempt from both the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The Food Industries Amendments would bring coverage to all employees of retail establishments which have more than 4 stores or an annual gross income of more than $500,000.

The retail grocery industry is currently becoming more and more dominated by large supermarket chains. In 1954 supermarkets handled 52.3 percent of the $18.2 billion of grocery sales. Many of these supermarkets are parts of large chains which immensely affect commerce. The A. & P. Tea Co. and Safeway Stores, for example, have some 2,000 stores each across the Nation. There is no economic justification for not covering large retail enterprises.

Workers processing fish and seafoods are also exempted from all benefits of the Fair Labor Standards Act. This exemption has no economic basis. Other food processing industries are covered by the act as long as they are not in the area of production.

The result of this exemption is the payment of pitiful wages to men, women and children who work under sometimes health-hazardous conditions. My food industries amendments would end the fish processing exemption. It would bring the $1 minimum wage, 8-hour workday and 40-hour workweek to all employees in this industry.

Another senseless exemption is one which provides that food processing workers in the area of production—that is open country or in a rural community—need not be covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act. In other words, a poultry processing firm in Omaha must meet the standards of the act, but a plant within the area of production less than 100 miles away, need not, under certain conditions. This is rank discrimination. Both firms probably supply the same market. Both have approximately the same costs. But one may legally exploit its workers by not establishing even the absolute minimum of working conditions and thereby get a real—if somewhat immoral—competitive advantage.

The food industries amendments would wipe out the senseless and unfair area of production exemption.

Agricultural workers are completely exempt from this act. This is so because many of us in Congress are under the mistaken impression that all of agriculture is still composed of family-type farms. This, perhaps unfortunately, is untrue. Playing a huge and increasing role in American agriculture are the corporation farms which cover tens and even hundreds of thousands of acres, have the same type of managerial structure as our modern industrial giants, and use machinery and up-to-date industrial practices to the optimum.

Farm laborers on these corporate giants earn an average of about 80 cents an hour. They are actually the ones who need the Fair Labor Standards Act the most. Yet are completely outside its scope.

My food industries amendments would include the workers of the corporation farms. It would leave the family farms exempt. I want to emphasize this point. Only the farms which employ workers, other than from among the family of the employer, for 400 man-days of labor would be included. Because of the seasonality of agricultural employment, this would bring only the larger farms under the act.

Workers engaged in processing, canning or packing seasonal agricultural products are exempted from parts of the maximum hours provision of the Fair Labor Standards Act. For more than one-fourth of the year, these employees may be worked for 12, 14, 16 or any amount of hours without receiving time and one-half pay. For more than another quarter of the year, they may be worked 12 hours a day before the premium rate is paid.

This exemption, too, causes great hardship. Many unions have shown it to be unnecessary. They have provided against the use of the maximum hours exemptions in their labor-management contracts and the firms have not suffered. The food industries amendments would end the seasonal exemption.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the basic provisions of the food industries amendments which I have introduced to bring the Fair Labor Standards Act more into line with economic commonsense and humanitarian requirements. These amendments are reasonable and just. I hope they will have the support of both Democrats and Republicans. They are long overdue.

## WEAKNESSES IN OUR IMMIGRATION LAWS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the recent upheaval in Hungary and the resulting outpouring of thousands of refugees and escapees from that Communist-oppressed country has underscored with dramatic clarity weaknesses in our immigration laws and policy. Of the 170,000 Hungarians who have fled into Austria or from there into other Western

countries, 24,000 have now been admitted into the United States. This skillfully handled emergency operation reflects great credit upon those American officials and private relief agencies which have played a role in managing this human exodus. But creditable though our achievement has been in this emergency, it has brought grave problems in its wake and raised serious questions as to what we should do when the immediate task of aiding these victims of tyranny is completed. For the events of the past few months have demonstrated that the problem of affording a haven to the Hungarian refugees is only part of two much larger problems—what our long range policy should be toward those who want to break away from Communist rule and flee to freedom, and what basic policy should be adopted toward those everywhere in the world who desire to migrate to the United States.

The first question we must face up to is whether, as a matter of policy, we want people in Eastern Europe to attempt to escape. If we do, then logically we have to share our immigration policy to accept the consequences of this decision. If we do not, then that decision too should be reflected in our immigration laws. I have not the slightest doubt which alternative we should choose, for the overwhelming mass of the American people want the people of Eastern Europe to rewin their freedom and regain that independence that is rightfully theirs. They want that not only because of the tremendous sympathy they have for those people, but also for sound reasons of security and national interest.

Within the framework of the peaceful methods which we have adopted for encouraging a rebirth of freedom in Eastern Europe, one of our basic aims is to keep alive the fires of hope that are the wellspring for the sort of political evolution we desire and which, as a matter of fact, is already under way. I can think of no more effective means of killing the hopes of the Poles, the Hungarians, and the other courageous peoples behind the Iron Curtain than for us to tell them they are unwanted if they flee to us for refuge and for safety. If they know that there is always a haven of security where they are always welcome if they are compelled to escape from their homeland, then their attitudes toward their Soviet masters will be positively affected. This is why it is so vital for the success of our policy aims in Eastern Europe that we give confidence and assurance to the peoples of that area by making available to them a permanent and reliable refuge.

In the Hungarian emergency the President, under existing laws, was able to give limited and temporary relief to thousands of refugees. The Refugee Relief Act afforded openings for a few thousands, and the Immigration and Nationality Act gave discretionary authority for emergency entrance of additional numbers. However, these laws of their very nature are not suitable to constitute a long-term basis for a refugee program. The quotas of the Refugee Relief Act are used up, and it is not proper that unlimited numbers be authorized for entry under the emergency clauses of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Furthermore, those clauses do not allow entrants into this country to come in under conditions affording a long-term solution of their status. Consequently, I am introducing two bills today to correct this situation.

The first bill provides for the issuance of 30,000 nonquota immigrant visas each year to Hungarian and other East European escapees. Despite the many thousands of Hungarians who have been accepted into the United States and other countries in Europe and elsewhere, there are still 65,000 left stranded in Austria where they are imposing a heavy burden on the economy and the charity of the Austrian people. And more are constantly coming in. In other words, there is still a terrific problem left to be solved. Can we in the United States permit countries like Austria, Germany, and Italy, which already have complex economic problems of their own to bear the main burden of refugee support simply because of their proximity to the danger area? As the leader of the free world and the nation most blessed with the resources for a solution of the escapee problem, can we create an impression of unwillingness to bear our fair share? It would be folly to allow this impression to be created simply because we have not put laws on our books to implement a policy we have already adopted and which the American people so clearly want.

The Hungarians, however, are only part of a large problem. There is a considerable backlog of other refugees and escapees in Europe who should be permitted to migrate, and there are untold thousands in the Eastern European countries themselves who will certainly become refugees or escapees in the future. What would happen if next week or next month Poland or another captive country blew up in a manner similar to that of Hungary? It is only commonsense that we should not perpetually allow ourselves to be thrown from crisis to crisis because we have not been foresighted enough to enact the proper legislation. If we do not provide a secure haven for both present and future escapees, then we run the serious risk of driving back to their Communist homelands those who have already fled to us in good faith, and of discouraging those who now are restive under Communist oppression.

This bill will apply to any person from a Communist, Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied country in Europe who flees because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion. It stipulates that, in general, those provisions of the Refugee Relief Act that relate to assurances of employment and housing, security investigations, priorities, and cooperation between the United States Government and by other governments in migration matters, will apply to East European escapees. All the safeguards of the Immigration and Nationality Act are to apply to those who would be admitted by this bill, save for certain exceptions. These exceptions include a provision that escapees afflicted with tuberculosis can enter this country if they are members of family units that are entering and if arrangements satisfactory to the Attorney General and Surgeon General can insure that the person afflicted will not become a public charge or endanger public health. Obviously, total exclusion of tubercular persons would work considerable hardship not only on them and their families, but would also handicap solution of the pressing refugee problem. With modern vaccines and methods of therapy, tuberculosis is no longer the scourge it used to be. Scientific progress has made it possible for us to amend old attitudes and this clause of the bill reflects that fact.

This bill also relaxes the requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act to the extent that a person excludable because of previous membership in a Communist, totalitarian, subversive, or similar type of party or organization can now be admitted if he can establish to the satisfaction of the Attorney General at the time he applies for a visa that he is actively and permanently opposed to the party or organization in question and if his admission is deemed to be in the public interest.

A second bill I am introducing today is intended to correct a situation that has arisen in regard to most of the Hungarian escapees who have been received into this country. They were admitted under the emergency parole provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act, but this provision leaves open the question of what the future status of these escapees will be. Their admission as parolees does not permit permanent residence or the acquisition of citizenship. Now quite obviously the United States does not intend to send these people back to Hungary or tell them to get out and go to some other country. Consequently, their status here must be resolved and resolved promptly. By clearing up this situation quickly and by doing now what will eventually have to be done anyway, we will add to the fund of good will these recent Hungarian arrivals already feel for us and will hasten their incorporation into the American body politic. The easiest way to accomplish this is to consider them admitted for permanent residence as nonquota immigrants, provided they make such an application. My bill will authorize this procedure.

The Hungarian escapee question is, however, only a part of the entire problem of immigration into the United States. Ever since the end of World War II the problem of migration into the United States from other parts of the world has been acute. The revolutionary political developments that have occurred in Europe and Asia, as well as the vast movement of economic forces around the globe, has uprooted millions of individuals and sent many of them clamoring at the doors of the United States. The problem this has created for us is affected by the fact that wealth has responsibilities and even more by the consideration that the maturity and wisdom of our leadership is being put to a test. We are being closely scrutinized by the world not only because they want to see how many immigrants we will allow on our shores, but also because

they want to know what standards we will apply in admitting them.

For many years our immigration policy has been constructed on a national quota foundation. In plain terms this means that we have applied racial factors in determining who should have the privilege of migrating into the United States. Not only that, but by basing our system of national quotas on an immigration pattern established years ago and now outdated, we have made it ineffectual and artificial as far as present needs are concerned. More than one-third of the total annual quota is allotted to a nationality group that neither wants nor uses an allotment of that size. In many cases only tiny quotas are assigned to nationalities that could literally use thousands of visas. Unfortunately these inequities, in many cases, involve precisely those nationality groups who make up our refugee and escapee problem.

The third bill I am introducing today is framed to make long needed reforms in United States immigration law. It is a companion bill to that introduced by the distinguished Congressman from New York, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, last month—H. R. 3364. It provides the only sane and reasonable approach to the immigration problem. It is framed not only to give the greatest possible recognition to all those who want to enter this country, but it also establishes a practical and humane approach to the long-term refugee problem.

First of all, it casts aside the nationalities principle as a gage of who should or should not pass over the threshhold of the United States. There would be no discrimination based on national origins or race. It would therefore not only greatly benefit those from Eastern Europe who are at present handicapped by meager quotas but it would also be an invaluable means of assisting certain groups, like the Jewish and other expellees and refugees from Egypt, that are suddenly faced with personal catastrophe and expulsion from their homelands.

In place of the nationalities principle, this bill sets up five classes of immigrants—family unification, occupational, refugee, national interest, and resettlement. These classes would fall within an overall annual quota of 250,000, which is about 100,000 more than the present quota. The number that would fall into each of these classes would be flexible. Each year the President would fix an allocation for each one of these classes. This would be submitted for the approval of Congress which would have 60 days in which to make its decision. The big advantage of adopting this flexible principle of annual allotment by classes is that our immigration policy can be constantly molded and remolded to fit the particular needs of the times. In order that no one nationality will be unduly favored, the bill provides that within each class no more than 15 percent can be assigned to inhabitants of any one country.

Other outstanding features of this bill are that it takes the long-overdue step of wiping out distinctions between native-born and naturalized citizens and reforms the administration of immigration by eliminating the State Department and concentrating directive authority in an assistant attorney general serving as director of a bureau of immigration and citizenship.

In a word, this bill would revamp the immigration law of the United States to put it completely in harmony with the democratic principles of our way of life and permit us, far more flexibly than we can at present, to reshape our immigration quotas each year to make them fit our needs and the needs of the world.

With these three bills which I have just described, the American people can have a fully rounded immigration policy enabling them to resolve the immediate and urgent problems that confront them at the present moment, as well as the problem of long-term immigration policy, in a manner that will redound to their honor and their best national interest. I strongly urge that they be thoughtfully considered and promptly passed.

## PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED BY THE SMALL CIGAR INDUSTRY IN FLORIDA DUE TO PRESENT TAXES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, unnoticed in most areas today is the fact that the cigar industry is in desperate straits. The smaller cigar factories in Florida and other States are going out of business at the rate of one every other day. Excessive taxation is, in part, responsible. The present discriminatory bracket system—imposed during World War II and never changed—is inequitable and excessive for an industry of predominantly small factories operating under depressed conditions.

The best chance for tax relief of the cigar industry at this time is through a bill that makes technical revision of the present excess tax system so that cigar taxes are equitable to all segments of the industry and which eliminates the discriminatory features of the bracket system. Such a bill would give both the producer and the consumer a break. Consequently, I am today introducing a bill based on the ad valorem plan of taxation.

Actually any change from the present bracket system must do more than merely reduce taxes. A revision must be made in the cigar industry system that will eliminate the cause of the cigar industry's plight, and it must help expand the market for the tobacco farmer's product. The tax revision bill must free the cigar industry once and for all from the rigidities of the archaic bracket system of taxation. It must provide the industry with the incentive to increase its sales and tap the vast potentials of the mass market, thereby increasing cigar consumption.

A technical revision at the present cigar-tax structure that will accomplish all of these objectives will also result in only a modest reduction in the Government's revenue. My studies of the problem of the cigar industry in Florida and the rest of the country has led me to the conclusion that the 8 percent ad valorem tax is the one that best meets all of these criteria. My colleague, Congressman SADLAK of Connecticut, already has introduced this type of bill. My district grows some of the finest tobacco in the world. It is vitally affected by this problem. Therefore, I am also introducing such a bill and I trust that with bipartisan support we may have early action by the committee and the Congress on this legislation.

## THE RED PIPER'S NEW TUNE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, stalking through the world today, there is an illicit force concealed under the veil of deceit and stealth. Like a silent army of termites, small and voracious, it threatens to eat away the very foundations of our democracy.

It works best in the dark areas of ignorance and apathy. We call this force communism, and it literally depends upon weakening the strong stanchions of our democratic institutions of freedom for its survival in America. Conceived in violence, nurtured on the blood of countless thousands of innocent persons, communism's evil philosophy rears its vicious form like the many-headed hydra in every corner of our land. Its faces are many and varied. And like the mythological monster slain by Hercules, when 1 head is cut off 2 threaten to grow back.

A little over a decade ago, we emerged from the terrible ordeal of a world war. We were not unscathed—our wounds were deep; yet we knew they would heal. And for the most part, they have, except for the Red dagger of poison plunged into America's back by a deceitful ally, Russia.

We can be thankful today that some realized what a critical blow had been struck. But while the stiletto of betrayal was extracted, it was not done before the Red poison penetrated the vital organs of our form of government. This poison is personified by the less than 20,000 Communists who have been unrelenting in their efforts to destroy America. Other nations were not so fortunate—the infamous blow they received was a fatal one, and they succumbed to communism.

From February 9 through 12, 1957, the revolutionaries who call themselves the Communist Party, USA, held their national convention at the Chateau Gardens in New York, the city which has become the Communist den and the State in which more than 50 percent of the Communist Party membership lives.

As we saw in press accounts handed to newsmen by delegates from the Reds' secret sessions, the party has supposedly chosen to make it own way in this country without blindly following the line laid down by their Soviet masters. They claimed to have given up the idea that violent proletarian revolution is necessary for Red domination of our Nation. These announcements, along with their

change in the organizational setup, however, are but added grease paint smeared over the face of the Communist actor as he continues to play out his farce of peaceful coexistence.

If we are to believe the Communist Party announcements, only a little over 300 persons attended this sinister conclave.

What harm can this handful of Reds do us? To answer this question, we need only to reflect upon those Iron Curtain countries which were a few short years ago free nations. The horrible retaliation suffered by the heroic and freedom-loving people of Hungary should clinch the answer.

While I have served over the years on the House Appropriations Committee, taking part in the allotment of funds to that first bulwark of defense which is the FBI, I have had the pleasure of discussing with Director J. Edgar Hoover in closed and open session the menace of communism in America. His has been a veritable "voice in the wilderness" since the early 1920's seeking to awaken our Nation to the insidious dangers of the Communist conspiracy, but only in the last few years have we heeded and cast aside the cloak of indifference.

What do we have to fear from the nucleus of the Communist Party in this country? Mr. Hoover's answer is forthright and to the point: The Communist Party, USA, continues to be the most dangerous subversive organization in the United States.

Certainly, we cannot blithely ignore this sincere and succinct admonition of danger. But what is the menace of communism? What are its aims? These are the questions which all American patriots should ask each day. We must cast the light from the lamp of truth into every dark corner from which the Red tyrants spew their hatred and cajolery. In this way we can insure that this Nation will not awaken someday to find its freedoms destroyed.

The Communist of today is no longer that weird-looking little character the cartoonists depicted him to be several years back—the bristly-bearded Bolshevik with black hat and cloak carrying a sputtering bomb in his arms. Today's Communist is a master at artifice and subterfuge. Recently Mr. Hoover wrote that whatever false facade of cooperation is erected, "the true Communist Party line remains unchanged. The overthrow and destruction of our constitutional democracy by any and all means at their disposal remains the aim of Communists."

Can we deny the effectiveness of the Communist line? Italy once had but 15,000 party members. This figure grew into 2 million. A quarter century ago, China's population was estimated at 475 million persons. In that multitude there were 10,000 Communists. Count them today.

What peace-loving citizen in the countries which have succumbed to the Soviet sickness in the last quarter century could have known that today he would wear the yoke of Communist domination and regimentation? The Red scourge now embraces one-quarter of the world, and the Iron Curtain has been inexorably drawn around country after country, not by wars but by diabolical scheming. The Red masters of deceit and treachery pulled from their bottomless bag of tricks the worthless beads and baubles of communism and the now-enslaved people they dominate swapped away their freedom.

The stout walls of the American fortress have blunted every attack made thus far by the ever-probing, twisting lie of communism. In seeking to overrun the bastions of patriotism and independence of this country, the Soviets have gone full-circle in their treacherous designs. They have zigzagged, tacked, backed up, gone forward, and leapfrogged their way along until now they have created a monstrous maze of doubletalking fraud against humanity which includes the "desanctification" of their great idol Stalin.

A few months ago, the stooges in our Nation were blissfully spouting the Stalin line when all at once the puppet strings from Moscow went slack. Suddenly, they found themselves stalking down Stalin Street while Nikita S. Khrushchev and company had veered again and were strolling down Lenin Lane. The new Communist bosses in Moscow had done a complete about-face and were blaming Joseph Stalin for what few mistakes communism had made. It was like whipping a dead horse that has thrown its rider.

The rest of the world was shocked at what Mr. Hoover has called the "new look," but the hard-core disciplined Communist on the American stage faltered momentarily, missed a few syllables in his diatribes and deftly changed props, tossing the Stalin picture into the wings and unveiling the new Lenin pose of sweetness and light and peace.

We must not be duped by the donning of this velvet glove over the mailed fist. Peace, of course, is a beautiful thought, and we desire it so earnestly that it becomes an attractive lure dangling at the end of the Communist line. Some will grab for it and be hooked. But by and large, if Americans will educate themselves to the one aim of Russia, and if they will not forget for one instant that this aim is for a Soviet America, then the Red plague will never destroy us.

But what of this new brand of hokum? Why has it been foisted off on the world? The same reason as always: The Reds want our country.

The Russians scored their most stunning success toward this end during World War II when they fought the Nazis on the side of the democracies. In those years Communist Party membership reached its alltime high of 80,000, according to the writings of William Z. Foster, their former national chairman. We lay down with the Russian wolfhound and got up with its fleas.

As the liberals and progressives of this country saw day by day the true nature of the Soviet aim for domination, this 80,000 figure began to decline. The Communist organizers saw their gains diminishing at an alarming rate, and they frantically cast about for new ways to bring the gullible into the fold. They ran the gamut of treachery with no success, and some panicked into putting into conspiratorial words and actions the fact that our Nation must be overcome, even if it were to be by force and violence. As they ventured out of their lair of lies, the FBI pounced upon them, and more than a hundred party functionaries paid for their indiscretion by being prosecuted under the Smith Act and related statutes and by going to prison. Mr. Hoover and his agents proved swiftly to the Communists that this conspiracy was not the right tack to take.

Although the Communist "super intellectuals" would never stoop to the use of so simple a saying, they have now reverted to the idea that "more flies can be caught with molasses than with vinegar." In Moscow and in Communist circles here, the saber-rattling has given way to the equally dissonant sound of their song of "peaceful coexistence." They do not explain, of course, how they can resurrect Lenin and leave his teachings of revolution behind in the grave. They cannot. Their new theme is merely a concession, and listen to Lenin's view of this tactic: "Without concessions we shall not be able to carry out our program. Concessions do not mean peace with capitalism, but war on a new plane." Violence, he has said, must accompany the collapse of capitalism.

But while an attempt at forcible overthrow of our Government is always an ominous cloud, for the moment the Communists want us to bask and grow lethargic in the sunlight with their false smiles.

No amount of chicanery or glib versatility, however, can camouflage the ruthless hunger for power which is emblematic of Lenin and his unholy disciples. While they attempt to lull us into a dreamworld of brotherhood with their baleful tune of peace, the sinister melody of carefully calculated deception can be detected in the strains.

Listen again to one of Lenin's tenets:

> The more powerful enemy can be conquered only by exerting the utmost effort, and by necessarily, thoroughly, carefully, attentively and skillfully taking advantage of every, even the smallest, rift among the enemies, of every antagonism of interest among the bourgeoisie of the various countries and among the various groups or types of bourgeoisie within the various countries, and also by taking advantage of every, even the smallest opportunity of gaining a mass ally, even though this ally be temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable, and conditional. Those who do not understand this do not understand even a particle of Marxism, or of scientific, modern socialism in general.

The Communist goading is clearly apparent in the Middle East today. They would like nothing better than to hand the war club to a Middle Eastern leader foolish enough to swing it and unwise enough to set off the chain reaction that would inevitably lead to world conflict.

We can remember similar tactics on a smaller scale in numerous instances in our own country.

The so-called Peekskill riots are a prime example of the opportunistic tac-

tics of the Communists. The August 15, 1949, issue of the Daily Worker reported that singer Paul Robeson was to be the featured artist at the Fourth Annual Outdoor Concert for the benefit of the Harlem Chapter of the Civil Rights Congress, presented by Peoples Artists, on August 27, 1949, at Peekskill, N. Y. On August 28, 1949, the New York Times reported that a free-for-all between those attending the concert and about 1,000 protesting veterans broke up the affair.

Seizing on this opportunity to place themselves in a pitiable position, the Communists announced in the September 2, 1949, edition of the Daily Worker that Robeson would return for the engagement at Peekskill on September 4, 1949. According to the New York Times of September 5, 1949, fighting again raged. The immediate bleats of police brutality" and anguished claims of "discrimination" from the Reds showed clearly their purpose in returning to Peekskill. But the pity they hungered for was not forthcoming. Their pawn, Paul Robeson, was checkmated when Americans saw through the sham of the plan.

Here in Paul Robeson we have a man who partook of everything this country has to offer—a man endowed by God with the enviable talent of a great voice, a voice which moved great audiences the world over. But now mouthing the falsehoods of communism the voice has become a mousey squeak in the dark cellars of communism, unheeded by all save his own ilk. Surely, the Reds are disappointed in the results of this despicable scheme. It was not difficult for them to play upon his monumental vanity and ply him with the intoxicating brew of communistic philosophy. And when he was drunk from this vile concoction they thought they had readied him to lead his race down the glorious path of communism. But it did not work.

All true Americans, including those of his own race who were the target of this plan, turned from him and he sank into the quagmire of anonymity. Only an occasional plaintive cry of so-called persecution comes from the morass into which Robeson has wandered.

I am proud of the people of my own State of Georgia, both white and Negro. That there are few Reds in the whole State is tangible evidence of the patriotism of the white and colored man in the South.

The two races have had their troubles in the past and are having them now; we all know that. But we also know we do not want, do not need, and will not tolerate the planting of the Red virus of dissension by Communist quacks prescribing a panacea as deadly as stagnant water.

When the Communists' modern-day carpetbaggers seek to prey on Georgia's troubles, they will report back to their Soviet masters that they have come with empty pockets.

I need not tell you of the splendid job the FBI has done in rooting out and jailing the most violent of the Soviet followers in this Nation. It is nothing short of miraculous how the FBI has penetrated the inner sanctums of the Communist Party and Russian espionage circles in this country through informants and other means.

In my opinion, the American taxpayer gets more for his dollar from the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation than from any other Federal agency on the national scene. The Reds imprisoned through the efforts of the FBI, however, are fortunate in one respect. They have better accommodations in our Federal penitentiaries than they would have in downtown Leningrad. They had hoped for the glory of martyrdom, but their fist-shaking harangues at the time of arrest failed. Their screams of persecution soon faded into the shadows when the glaring spotlight of open court trials showed them to be the Kremlin's messenger boys. No microscopic study was needed to recognize the germs of hate which they hoped to nurture into an epidemic.

Of course, they have not been forgotten by their Red cohorts and will not be unless their usefulness becomes completely nil. While in prison, traitors such as Gus Hall, Gil Green, Robert Thompson and Henry Winston are still looked upon by the Communist Party as leaders.

Does this indicate these fanatically loyal exponents of the Communist lie are considering any letting up in their attacks against our freedoms? The actions of their former general secretary, Eugene Dennis, speak eloquently of the depth to which they are imbued with the Red falsehood. After serving a prison sentence for conspiring to violate the Smith Act, Dennis was released conditionally and supervised by Federal authorities until December 26, 1955. In January 1956, like a rattlesnake waking from hibernation, he struck out hungrily, seeking to spread his stored-up venom throughout our democratic institutions.

Dennis played a major role in the Communist Party national convention, and we can now look for a further closing of the party's ranks as it attempts to adapt itself to the new conditions imposed by the Soviet denunciation of Stalin. From this convention there has emerged a more solidified, dynamic and dangerous Communist Party.

As America girds for battling this "new look," the gravest responsibilities rest on the shoulders of J. Edgar Hoover and the agents of the FBI, but as they have done in the past, we can be sure they will strip away every vestige of camouflage and report the true activities of the Communist Party, USA.

The Congress of the United States must carry out its responsibilities of keeping the people informed and of bringing out into the open the nefarious Red schemes through committee probes into un-American activities. And our citizens must do their share, remaining alert to the menace so that they will not succumb to the saccharine words of promise from the lips of the most treacherous antagonist we have been called upon to face.

Some weeks ago Nikita S. Khrushchev, exultant over the successes of communism in the world, said that if there was a God, the Russians would owe Him thanks for their many accomplishments. Such a philosophy surely must perish, and I thank Almighty God I am not in the ranks of the Communist horde which will someday feel the terrible wrath of His retribution.

## REPEAL OF EXCISE TAX ON TRANSPORTATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on January 3 I introduced H. R. 976, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to repeal the taxes imposed on the transportation of persons and property.

The Federal excise tax that H. R. 976 will repeal was among the tax measures adopted during World War II, to restrict and discourage all but the most essential of public carriers.

Even before Pearl Harbor the Government levied, primarily as a revenue measure, a tax of 5 percent on travel.

As the demands of our war effort added increasingly to the burden on public carriers and to the Government's need for additional revenue, this tax was raised to 10 percent and finally, in 1944, at the peak of the war, to 15 percent.

A tax of 3 percent on freight, together with a tax of 4 cents a ton on coal, was applied in 1942 before the United States had been at war a year.

A prewar tax on the movement of oil by pipeline was raised to 4½ percent in 1941.

In 1954, 9 years after the end of the war, Congress reduced the tax on travel to the present level of 10 percent, but left unchanged the taxes on freight, including those on coal and oil.

As discouragers of nonessential travel and shipping and as a source of additional revenue, the passenger and freight taxes were useful, even necessary, throughout the war period.

But the heroes of that day are now the villains of this, for the two taxes are still in effect, still serving to discourage the use of public carriers and, in general, causing widespread harm to users, carriers, and the Nation as a whole.

In its effect on passengers, the tax on travel alone adds some $215 million annually to the cost of transportation and the burden falls most heavily on those least able to afford it.

These persons are the 3 out of every 10 families in the United States who do not have private means of transportation and are, therefore, compelled to use the transportation services subject to the tax.

The burden of the passenger tax is borne, in fact, only by those persons who travel by public for-hire transportation services within the United States—for travel to most foreign destinations is not subject to the tax.

Thus, the American citizen who travels in his own country by bus, rail, or plane is discriminated against, not only in favor of those who travel by private means but also in favor of those who travel abroad.

The tax on freight, including oil, adds another $487 million annually to the cost of transportation, and again the burden falls heavily on those least able to afford it.

It falls on the thousands of small businesses which rely on public transportation.

In their effect on for-hire carriers, the taxes are particularly harmful.

Because they apply only to transportation for hire and not to private transportation, the taxes encourage greater use of automobiles for travel and encourage the acquisition and use of large fleets of private trucks and private barges.

Total intercity travel, excluding commutation, is today almost double what it was in 1946, but common carriers are now handling actually fewer passenger-miles than in that year. Whereas in 1946 common carriers handled a little more than one-fourth of all intercity travel, today they handle only a little more than one-tenth.

And even that small share is getting smaller.

It is getting smaller despite the increase in total traffic and despite a strenuous and continuing effort on the part of all common carriers to improve their services and make them more attractive to the traveling public.

Although the tax on freight was levied primarily as a revenue measure, its diversionary effect on the freight traffic and revenues of all types of for-hire carriers is nonetheless apparent.

In the 11 years since the end of World War II, regulated carriers as a group have steadily lost ground to the private carriers not subject to the tax.

As recently as 1949, intercity freight traffic in the United States was divided between railroads and regulated motor carriers on the one hand, and private carriers on the other, in the ratio of about 9 to 1 in favor of the regulated carriers.

The ratio is now about 4 to 1, and the trend away from regulated carriers is continuing—still artificially stimulated by the tax on the public carriers.

It should be pointed out also that traffic which is lost to private trucks and barges is not likely to be regained since the use of private means, once they are acquired, tends to be long lasting, if not permanent.

While, of course, many factors doubtless influence the shifts toward private carriage and away from for-hire carriage, it is a highly dubious policy for Federal taxation to encourage such a trend.

The passenger and freight taxes produced in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, total revenue of $702 million. However, this was not a net revenue gain to the Government because to the extent that the transportation was for business purposes, the taxes paid were deductible from income as ordinary and necessary business expense, thereby reducing the amount of revenue received from the income tax.

With the greater part by far of the transportation taxes paid by corporations and with the income of corporations taxed up to 52 percent, it is clear that repeal of the taxes would increase the Government's revenue from the income tax, and to that extent reduce its net revenue loss.

Transportation, more than any other factor, is part of everything this Nation uses or consumes.

Repeal of the transportation taxes would, therefore, benefit each and every person and the entire national economy.

Congress itself, in its declaration of national transportation policy, recognizes the vital need for strong, dependable, efficient public transportation "adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense."

Yet, the transportation taxes, discriminatory as they are against the public carriers, are not calculated to achieve that essential end.

Indeed, they directly contravene the congressional policy, for instead of encouraging the growth and development of a sound system of public transportation to serve the Nation's commerce and defense, they encourage an uneconomic growth of private transportation.

The taxes on transportation, especially the tax on freight, are harmful to the Nation's economy because they are inflationary—inflationary to a degree far exceeding that which is indicated by the tax rate.

This is true because the freight tax is imposed at each step from production or manufacture to marketing, thereby pyramiding the cost to the ultimate consumer of every product requiring transportation.

Moreover, on the typical product requiring transportation from manufacturer to wholesaler, from wholesaler to retailer, and thence to the consumer, it is estimated that the cumulative seller's markup, assuming a 50 percent markup at each stage, increases the prices to the consumer by an amount more than three times that of the cumulative tax itself.

Thus, each $9 of freight tax spread over the whole operation from manufacturer to consumer is estimated to add over $32 on the average to the prices paid by consumers for manufactured articles.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the legislation he has introduced and say to him that I am wholeheartedly in favor of it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia who has always been very helpful in working out the repeal of these taxes that is doing so much to the jobs of the American workingman.

Mr. Speaker, since not one cent of the increases contributes to increasing the value of a commodity at any stage of the process, the tax represents the ultimate in inflation.

The transportation taxes, by undermining an industry that is absolutely vital to defense and the waging of war, are also undermining our national strength and preparedness.

In World War II, transportation, in the thinking of some, threatened to become a weak spot in our war effort.

Continuation of these taxes could contribute to making this threat a reality in the event of another war.

The inconsistency of these taxes with our defense effort was suggested by no less an authority than Commissioner Anthony Arpaia, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, when he said in an address at Houston, Tex., on November 8, 1956:

> The Government clings to the excise taxes on freight and passenger service which bring $637 million to the Government in revenue, although this tax is an important factor in retarding the progress of an efficient, up-to-date, organized system of public transportation which is an integral part of the machinery of defense which costs billions.

This organized system of public transportation to which Commissioner Arpaia referred was called upon in World War II to handle all but an insignificant amount of all military freight and military passengers, moving in organized groups.

At the peak of World War II, in 1943 and 1944, regulated carriers handled well in excess of 96 percent of all freight—military and civilian combined.

And everything suggests that they would be called upon to repeat this performance, and more, in the event of another war.

In seeking repeal of the excise taxes on transportation, I fully recognize that transportation is but one of the necessities of life, which, many years after the end of the war, are still bearing the burden of a similar war tax.

The continuing need of Government for large amounts of tax revenue to meet the growing threat of another war and to strengthen defenses throughout the free world is also recognized.

Finally, I am appreciative of the increasing pressure which is being brought to bear for relief from other taxes from every quarter.

But while it may not now be possible to afford all the relief sought, or even all that is justified, it is possible, through repeal of the taxes on transportation, to extend a measure of relief to each and every person in the United States, without any serious loss of revenue to the Government.

Indeed, by removal of these taxes as a business expense for purposes of the income tax and by freeing the flow of commerce to produce greater business activity, resulting in more net income subject to Federal tax, such action presents for the Government the distinct possibility of a net revenue gain.

Add to this the benefits to be gained by all consumers through the cumulative effect of lower prices at each stage of manufacture, wholesaling and retailing, and it is difficult to conceive of another step which could be taken with greater resulting benefit to more people or to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, the relatively small amount of revenue produced by these wartime taxes is far outweighed by the adverse effect they have on users of transportation on our essential public carriers and on our commerce and defense.

Therefore they should be repealed by this Congress.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PRESTON for 30 minutes today.

Mr. MCGOVERN for 1 hour on Thursday, February 21.

Mr. HOFFMAN for 10 minutes on Tuesday and Wednesday.

Mr. BAILEY for 25 minutes on Wednesday, February 20.

Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) for 20 minutes on tomorow.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. SULLIVAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FORRESTER in two instances and to include an editorial.

Mr. COAD and to include parts of a farm soil bill.

Mr. GROSS.

Mr. SAYLOR and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENSEN and to include a release.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and to include a letter.

Mr. COLLIER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAY and to include a statement.

Mr. EVINS (at the request of Mr. BASS of Tennessee) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois (at the request of Mr. MINSHALL) and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HÉBERT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING (at the request of Mr. MINSHALL) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANFIELD and to include an article in Parade by Mr. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 19, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

486. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report relative to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the period July to December 1956, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

487. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a report on an overobligation of funds by the regional director of the Atlanta region, from the appropriation "Facilities, 1957" for the quarter ended October 19, 1956, and an overobligation of funds by the regional director of the Cincinnati region, from the appropriation "Transportation, 1957" for the quarter ended October 19, 1956, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

488. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a report stating that an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Little Wood River project, Idaho, has been completed as a part of the investigations required in the formulation of a definite plan for project development, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

489. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting 60 reports covering 82 violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, entitled "Administrative Control of Appropriations within the Department of Defense," pursuant to section 3679 (1) (2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

490. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of Federal contributions for the quarter ending December 31, 1956, pursuant to subsection 201 (1) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

491. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Dorthy E. Green and Thelma L. Alley"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

492. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of our efforts and accomplishments in attempting to achieve fair and equitable distribution of nickel-plating materials, which supplements a report of December 31, 1956, entitled "Study of Supply and Distribution of Nickel," submitted pursuant to Public Law 632, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

493. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report covering personal property made available for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations under section 203 (j); and all real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions under section 203 (k), pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

494. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

495. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 95); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

496. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

497. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the 36th Annual Report of the Federal Power Commission for 1956; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

498. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, and Mrs. Gladys Everingham"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

499. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

500. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

501. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

502. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 14, 1957, the following bill was reported on February 15, 1957:

Mr. GARY: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4897. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 68). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted February 18, 1957*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4602. A bill to encourage new residential construction for veterans' housing in rural areas and small cities and towns by raising the maximum amount in which direct loans may be made from $10,000 to $12,500, to authorize advance financing commitments, to extent the direct loan program for veterans, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 69). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 14, 1957, the following bill was introduced on February 15, 1957:

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 4897. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

[*Introduced and referred February 18, 1957*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 4898. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of employers who

are engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce, to eliminate certain exemptions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4899. A bill to raise the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 4900. A bill to amend section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 4901. A bill to establish a minimum acreage allotment for corn; to provide acreage reserve programs for diverted acres and for feed grains; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 4902. A bill to incorporate the National Academy of Design; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:

H. R. 4903. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of earnings individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 4904. A bill to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of certain deceased officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and those of other persons receiving pension relief allowance or retirement compensation under the act of September 1, 1916, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 4905. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the western district of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4906. A bill to provide for the control of certain advertising on federally owned or controlled lands adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and to encourage such control on other lands adjacent to such National System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4907. A bill to provide for the issuance of 30,000 special nonquota immigrant visas annually to Hungarian and other East European escapees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4908. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4909. A bill to provide that certain Hungarian escapees paroled into the United States may upon application be admitted to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 4910. A bill to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4911. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act of August 2, 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 4912. A bill relating to the affairs of the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 4913. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that certain aliens may be deported for failure to register as required under authority of section 3 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 4914. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 4915. A bill to permit certain additional services to count for retirement purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 4916. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska," as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4917. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 4918. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 4919. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Columbia Basin Project Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 4920. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to evaluate and to waive collection of certain financial assistance loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HYDE (by request):

H. R. 4921. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 4922. A bill to establish a minimum acreage allotment for corn; to provide acreage reserve programs for diverted acres and for feed grains; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 4923. A bill to amend title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956 so as to provide for the utilization of surplus agricultural products through the use in motor fuels of alcohol manufactured from agricultural products grown on farms in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 4924. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to provide for approval of State plans for aid to the blind without regard to the existence in any State of other programs of assistance to blind persons financed entirely by the State, and to provide for approval of any State plan for aid to the blind even though such plan makes provision for payment of a fixed monthly money payment to eligible blind persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 4925. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that special equipment for disabled individuals shall not be subject to the tax on automobile parts and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOSER:

H. R. 4926. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 4927. A bill to amend section (8) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4928. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4929. A bill to provide for the construction of a new customhouse and Federal office building in Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H. R. 4930. A bill to include producers and feeders of hogs among the producers and feeders who are eligible for special livestock loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 4931. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4932. A bill to amend the act of July 11, 1947, to increase the maximum rate of compensation which the director of the Metropolitan Police force band may be paid; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 4933. A bill to provide that compensation of a Federal officer or employee shall be subject to State tax only in the State where he is domiciled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4934. A bill to increase, in the case of children who are attending school, from 18 to 21 years the age until which child's insurance benefits may be received under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 4935. A bill to amend title I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act so as to further assist the States in extending aid for medical care to persons eligible for public assistance under such titles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 4936. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4937. A bill to provide for further research and technical assistance required for the control of mosquitoes and other arthropods capable of adversely affecting the health and welfare of man; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4938. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 4939. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property of the United States located in Juneau, Alaska, known as the Juneau Subport of Embarkation, to the Territory of

Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 4940. A bill to establish a minimum acreage allotment for corn; to provide acreage reserve programs for diverted acres and for feed grains; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4941. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, with respect to the annuities of certain retired employees who served in Alaska and on the Isthmus of Panama; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4942. A bill to establish the principle of a basic single salary wage scale in the Canal Zone for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4943. A bill to provide and adjust certain allowances, expenses, and other fringe employment benefits for certain Government employees stationed overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 4944. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to provide that deductions on account of earnings shall not be made in the case of beneficiaries who have attained retirement age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 4945. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in West Palm Beach, Fla., to the Port of Palm Beach District; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4946. A bill to include certain service performed for Members of Congress as annuitable service under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 4947. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of employers in the food industries who are engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce, to eliminate certain exemptions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 4948. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit policemen and firemen in positions covered by retirement systems to obtain social security coverage on the same basis as other State and local employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT of North Carolina:

H. R. 4949. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act to increase its benefits in the case of tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4950. A bill to provide for connections with the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways at Panama City, Pensacola, and Tallahassee, Fla., under section 7 of the Federal Highway Act of 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4951. A bill to amend section 5701 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to adjust the rates of tax on cigars, and to add a new definition to section 5702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4952. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to foreign tax credit for United Kingdom income tax paid with respect to royalties and other like amounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4958. A bill to amend section 812 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H. R. 4954. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 with reference to furnishing of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4955. A bill to exempt the sale of materials for certain war memorials in the District of Columbia from the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 4956. A bill to prohibit the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, into interstate commerce of switchblade knives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 4957. A bill to amend section 391 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 4958. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide more flexibility in refinancing loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 4959. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to provide for insurance to be granted thereunder to certain employees of States whose positions are financed entirely from Federal funds; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 4960. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the Knights of Columbus; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 4961. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act so as to authorize assistance to the States in furnishing two half-pints of milk a day to schoolchildren; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4962. A bill to amend the wheat-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4963. A bill to authorize the National Potato Grade Labeling Act, which provides quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4964. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange lands at Olympic National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 4965. A bill to amend section 605 of the National Service Life Insurance Act to provide for the investment of 20 percent of the national service life insurance fund in making direct home loans to veterans and in purchasing loans guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. AVERY:

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. J. Res. 239. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIMTZ:

H. J. Res. 240. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday of September as Senior Citizens Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. J. Res. 241. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and celebration of the quadricentennial anniversary of the establishment of the first European settlement in Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. J. Res. 242. Joint resolution requesting the President to instruct the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations to request the Security Council without delay to convene the Arab States and the State of Israel and other interested nations in a peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Con. Res. 117. Concurrent resolution to commemorate the quadricentennial anniversary of the establishment of the first settlement in Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT: Memorial of the Legislature of Oklahoma, relative to certain statements made by Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense, etc.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to making adequate appropriations for authorized reclamation projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to exert its efforts on behalf of the agricultural and livestock industries of New Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide stop-gap legislation extending the period of time in which Public Law 587 is to became effective, relating to the Klamath Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging the enactment of legislation to bring domestic tin into the same category as tungsten and other strategic metals, etc.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 4966. A bill for the relief of John Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4967. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Galbo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4968. A bill for the relief of Aron Schatten (Soten); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4969. A bill for the relief of certain Polish sailors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 4970. A bill for the relief of Joy Kulis and Janet Arline Kulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H. R. 4971. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yousra Haddad and her three minor children, Daad Haddad, Latifeh Haddad, and Marie Haddad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 4972. A bill for the relief of Sui-an Fung and Shu-nung Wu Fung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H. R. 4973. A bill for the relief of Lum Shen Ng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 4974. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Dege, his wife, Anna Dege, and son, Helmuth Dege; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4975. A bill for the relief of Dezio Blascovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. R. 4976. A bill for the relief of Angelos Karydis and Maria Karydis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASKELL:

H. R. 4977. A bill for the relief of Gyula Nandor Szabo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 4978. A bill for the relief of Hans Friedrich Thee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4979. A bill for the relief of Julia Char Lee and Jenny Pey Yuen Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 4980. A bill for the relief of Franz Oberschall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 4981. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Berta Rakovsky de Spikilis; to the Committee on the Judicary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 4982. A bill for the relief of Max Warman and his wife, Rachel Warman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4983. A bill for the relief of Arthur Barnett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4984. A bill for the relief of Dominick Moro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 4985. A bill for the relief of Cesar Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 4986. A bill for the relief of the widow and children of John E. Donahue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4987. A bill for the relief of Isaac Behar and Mrs. Susan Behar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 4988. A bill for the relief of the Thomas Cruse Mining & Development Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 4989. A bill for the relief of Sara Aryeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 4990. A bill for the relief of Fred Chia-chun Hung and Hwa Ching (Lok) Hung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 4991. A bill for the relief of Waldo E. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 4992. A bill for the relief of Michael D. Ovens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 4993. A bill for the relief of Serafin Llorca Domingo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 4994. A bill for the relief of John B. Sutter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4995. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Gubbins & Co., of Lima, Peru, and Reynaldo Gubbins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (by request):

H. R. 4996. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rita Maria Agnes Larksi Settlemoir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4997. A bill for the relief of Stephanie Perlhefter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 4998. A bill for the relief of John Nicholas Christodoulias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 4999. A bill for the relief of Leopold Katz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5000. A bill for the relief of Hermengildo V. Santos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5001. A bill for the relief of Ernest Braun (Mikulas Neufeld) and Judith Braun (Judith Neufeld); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

84. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Catholic State League of Texas, San Antonio, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to protesting the use of Federal funds for school construction purposes, etc.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

85. Also: petition of the president, Holy Name Society of St. Adalbert's Parish, Elizabeth, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to unanimous opposition to any offer, inducement, or invitation to Marshal Tito to visit the United States of America as the recognized leader of Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

86. Also: petition of Ohio Bell, Chicago, Ill., relative to stating a grievance relating to a claim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, February 18, 1957*

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, February 16 is the anniversary of the independence of the small but brave and gallant nation of Lithuania. We in America continue to be inspired by their heroic refusal to succumb to the atheistic and tyrannical onslaught of the Soviet dictators who relentlessly seek to stamp out the rich traditions of freedom and independence which for countless centuries have been an essential part of life in Lithuania. In recognition of this significant date, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief statement outlining Lithuania's ceaseless struggle to be free.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

(Statement by Senator BUTLER)

The Lithuanians constitute one of the smaller ethnic groups in Europe, but they have played a conspicuous role in the history of northeastern Europe. They founded an independent state more than 700 years ago, and during the 13th and 14th centuries Lithuania became a great power—a Christian power, to be reckoned with by the invaders from the East. Early in modern times the Lithuanian and Polish ruling houses united and from then on the fate of the Lithuanians was linked to that of the Poles. Finally, late in the 18th century when Poland was partitioned and ceased to exist as an independent state, Lithuania suffered a similar fate and became a Russian province.

The loss of independence did not deter the tough and tenacious Lithuanians from clinging to their ideals of national independence. For more than 100 years, they kept alive their belief in liberty, and in 1918 they attained their goal.

On February 16 of that year, the Lithuanians proclaimed their national independence and at once began to shape their own destiny in their own way. From then on for some 20 years, the democratic government they established worked near miracles, both in the task of rebuilding the country and in educating the people in democratic and progressive ways. In this difficult but rewarding task the Lithuanians were so successful that their government in its social, economic, educational, and political working became a model for many other countries. But the life of bare two decades was something like an Indian summer in Lithuanian history. Soon after the outbreak of World War II, Lithuania was forcibly annexed to the Soviet Union. In 1941 the Nazis overran the country and liberated it, only to hand it back to the Red Army in 1944. Since then Lithuania has been turned into a vast concentration camp, completely sealed off from the free world. Under this tyranny, the Lithuanians cannot celebrate their most cherished holiday, the anniversary of their independence, but it is not forgotten here in America. All Americans join with those of Lithuanian descent in the celebration of this day.

## Catholic Press Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 18, 1957*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, as February draws to a close, I am happy to note that this month has been celebrated all across the country as Catholic Press Month.

As a regular reader of the Catholic Courier-Journal, the diocesan publication printed in Rochester, N. Y., I can testify at first hand to the fine work being done by our Catholic press. The Courier-Journal, which ranks high among newspapers of this type, consistently supplies complete, accurate, and readable news of particular interest to the Catholic reader. Its editor, Msgr. John S. Randall, deserves praise for the way in which he has put into practice high standards of morality and journalism.

Mr. Speaker, the Catholic publications in this country are filling a vital need for an important segment of our population. I am delighted to have this opportunity to salute this significant branch of America's fourth estate, and to voice my confidence that the Catholic press of this Nation will continue to dispense its high caliber journalism.

## The Use of Surplus Farm Products in Motor Fuel Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 18, 1957*

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, before the advent of the auto, truck and tractor, our horses and mules consumed the crops from 43 million acres. Our grain surpluses should now be consumed in motor fuel. The following is a news release:

JOINT NEWS RELEASE FROM THE OFFICES OF SENATOR KARL E. MUNDT AND REPRESENTATIVE BEN JENSEN

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 18.—Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, South Dakota, and Representative BEN JENSEN, Republican, Iowa, today introduced identical bills to achieve use of surplus farm products in motor fuel production in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

On introducing their legislation the two solons told reporters their bill would require that motor fuel used in the United States contain a minimum of 5 percent by volume of alcohol manufactured from agricultural products. Commenting further, MUNDT and JENSEN said, "Experience has shown us that long storage of grain under Government loan is not a practice which can be justified either technologically or economically, since after long periods of storage grain becomes largely lost as a useful commodity. We feel that these farm surpluses, the fruits of American farm production, can be put to work for the good of all our country."

MUNDT and JENSEN pointed to the fact that on January 9, 1957, the Department of Agriculture had nearly a billion bushels of corn in storage. Their legislation calls for a minimum mixture of 5 percent alcohol with gasoline which they estimate would have the potential of using up our stored corn surpluses in 1 to 2 years.

In commenting further, MUNDT and JENSEN said, "We believe this legislation provides the means for the intelligent use of our agricultural surpluses and that Congress has the serious responsibility for development of sensible programs in this field." MUNDT and JENSEN told reporters the United States would not be pioneering in a new field if their bill is passed, since foreign countries such as Brazil and Cuba have operated similar programs with success.

Senator MUNDT and Congressman JENSEN expressed optimism that their bill, if enacted into law, would have an immediate effect. "We are informed that our present distillers of alcohol for medicine and beverage need only to operate their plants less than 25 percent of the time to meet their present requirements, so we feel satisfied that substantial production under the legislation we are sponsoring could be quickly achieved.

Earlier this month, MUNDT and JENSEN spent a morning with the President's Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Commodities after which they expressed themselves as highly gratified at the interest and attention the Commission is devoting to the alcohol motor fuel proposal.

## Senator Gore Calls for Leadership by United States in Building Atomic Reactors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 18, 1957*

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I ask to have reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from a recent address by Senator GORE, of Tennessee, delivered at Vanderbilt University on the need and importance of the Nation assuming and capturing the leadership in atomic development.

Excerpts from the address which appeared in the Nashville Banner follows:

SENATOR GORE CALLS FOR LEADERSHIP BY UNITED STATES IN BUILDING ATOMIC REACTORS

Senator ALBERT GORE has renewed his fight for the Government, through construction of demonstration reactors, to chart America's path to leadership in the field of peaceful atomic power.

GORE today told the Vanderbilt University assembly and the Nashville Shrine Club he has reintroduced a bill to provide "$400 million for the governmental construction of demonstration atomic power reactors of large and intermediate sizes, all on Federal property with their output to be used entirely by Federal installations."

PROGRESS A "MUST"

GORE said immediate United States progress in the field is a "must" because:

Britain and Russia are setting the pace.

World markets for atomic power equipment and technology soon will escape us.

The United States, developer of atomic power for war, has a world obligation to be the leader in its use for peace.

GORE's bill, he said, is similar to his bill of last year which was approved by the Senate and narrowly defeated in the House of Representatives.

GORE said he was concerned that "not one license for a large-scale power reactor has been issued" under a 1954 bill that placed reliance for the construction of reactors upon private companies under a system of licenses to be issued by the Atomic Energy Commission.

"An atomic power reactor now under construction at Shippingport, Pa., is of intermediate size," GORE continued, "but it was not licensed under terms of the 1954 act. This reactor is being financed largely with Government funds and under Government technical direction, and by terms of the act that was repealed in 1954."

LITTLE TO SHOW

"Thus, several years after our explosive announcement of having harnessed the atom, we have little to show as far as peacetime power uses are concerned—no atomic power reactors of even moderate size in operation. By what standard can this be held to be 'adequate progress'?" GORE said.

GORE said "the Atomic Energy Commission has shown little concern over reports of foreign progress, and the policy makers have been reluctant to adopt policies which will insure that the United States will advance to the front of the race.

"* * * Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, has recently shown a tendency to favor increased governmental participation in the atomic power field. However, his proposals would continue to restrain the Government from the immediate construction of atomic power reactors.

"Admiral Strauss includes in his eight-point program a proposal that 'the Commission substantially increase the existing opportunities for Government assistance in this respect, by assuming a greater share of the cost of research and development as distinct from actual construction costs.'

"The Chairman continues that if acceptable civilian proposals are not 'forthcoming on all the specified types within a reasonable period of time, the Commission would take prompt and positive steps to build these reactors on its own initiative.'

PROGRAM INADEQUATE

"I reiterate: Why continue to rely solely on a program that is so demonstrably inadequate? It has been characterized only by continued delay when delay could be most costly. The extended period this Nation has waited for actual atomic power reactor development has already exceeded a reasonable period time. We cannot afford to wait longer.

"Experience in the actual construction and operation of large-scale reactors is one of our most pressing needs," GORE continued.

"Regardless of what we would like to believe, our relative position in the atomic power race is far from ideal. Reasons to be complacent are absent.

"Russia has announced as ambitious plan for atomic production of some two to two and one-half million kilowatts before 1961. Some proposed Soviet reactors are to be capable of producing 200,000 kilowatts.

"The British, who already have a successful atomic reactor in operation at Calder Hall, announced a new 10-year program early in 1955 for the construction of 16 large reactors during the ensuing decade, with a total capacity of one and one-half to two million kilowatts.

"By comparison, the maximum nuclear power capacity foreseen in the United States before 1961 is well under 1 million kilowatts, maybe only a fraction of this amount."

FOREIGN MARKETS EFFECT

GORE cited what he termed the effect of the United States production lag on foreign markets. "When I was in Japan last summer, I found the Japanese authorities on the verge of entering into a contract for the purchase of a $75 million reactor from Great Britain. I undertook to persuade them of the advantages of buying an American-type reactor.

"While on my visit, I was advised that a representative from an American firm and a British firm had recently come to Japan to interest the Japanese in a reactor. It turned out the Britisher had been far more convincing because he described a plant that had actually been constructed and a process that already was producing economic atomic power, while the American was speaking more theoretically of a design and type that had not been proven."

GORE said that in offering his bill, "I do not seek to provide a public power versus a private-power fight. There is ample room and need for both atomic electricity, just as there is room and need for both in the generation and distribution of conventional power.

"The point is that only the Government has the means to bring to early fruition the

enormous potential of the atom. Timely action by our Government will foster private enterprise by advancing the date at which there can be widespread participation by both large and small in the atomic-power industry."

GORE concluded: "I emphasize that we cannot afford to delay our program any longer. Our Government must take advantage of the opportunity by immediately developing demonstration power reactors. Then, and perhaps only then, private enterprise will vigorously enter the field.

"In the eyes of the world, we have placed major emphasis upon atomic destruction, as indeed we have. We, therefore, have a clear moral responsibility to be the first to make this marvelous new source of energy available to improve the lot of mankind.

"If the Government will unbind its hands in the atomic-power field and obtain a foothold in it for future development by industry, then it can render a real service while once again meeting successfully a major requirement of the time."

## White Population Dips in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 18, 1957*

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington News, February 14, 1957, issue, carries a United Press story dated February 14, headlined from Chicago, reading as follows:

WHITE POPULATION DIPS IN CHICAGO

CHICAGO, February 14.—Chicago's white population has declined since 1950 while the number of nonwhites has increased, a study reveals.

It showed that by mid-1956 the city's white population had declined from 3,112,000 in 1950 to 3,039,000 in 1956. The nonwhite population increased by 197,000 during the 6 years, from 509,000 in 1950 to 706,000 in 1956.

The study showed that nonwhites make up 19 percent of the city's population.

According to that article, the white population of Chicago has declined since 1950, but the number of nonwhites has increased. It is startling, I am sure, to the white citizens of the great city of Chicago, that in 1950 the white population in Chicago was 3,112,000 people, but after a lapse of 6 years, and during the most prosperous times in the history of this country, the white population has decreased to where it is only 3,039,000 white people. I feel certain that the white people of Chicago will also be interested to note that the nonwhite population in the same 6-year interim had increased from 509,000 people in 1950 to 706,000 in 1956.

I think that I can say to the people of Chicago that they need have no doubt that this nonwhite population is going to increase. The good people of Chicago may want to know what has happened to so many of their fine white citizens that have seen fit to move from their borders. I am happy to tell them that quite a few of them have now become firmly rooted down in south Georgia, and in the district that I have the honor to represent, and that we are thoroughly delighted with those new citizens. These people who have left their Chicago homes and come down to live with us are making a splendid contribution to our section, and to our American way of life, and we are most delighted to send them some more of our nonwhite population in exchange for those fine white citizens who have found that Chicago is no longer congenial to their thoughts and to their traditions. Keep it up, Chicago, because we will take all of your good people that want to come and want to be a part of us.

## Plight of a Midwest Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 18, 1957*

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, this last Thursday, February 14, was a day which obviously will long be remembered in the Ernest W. Mueller family circle. You see Ernest W. Mueller is—or was—a young Iowa farmer of approximately 35 years of age who lived 5 miles west of Knoxville, Iowa. He grew up on a large farm just north of Winterset, Iowa, and graduated from the Winterset High School. At the time he was drafted in World War II he lacked just 1 or 2 quarters of graduating from the agricultural course at Iowa State College.

Now an interesting thing about Mr. Mueller is that last fall during the campaign Secretary of Agriculture and his party were entertained for lunch in the yard of the Ernest Mueller home. There were pictures in the paper of the party eating dinner there and also interviews on television.

Now, I learn through a sale bill in the Iowa newspapers that Ernest Mueller is selling out and getting off the farm. It is my understanding that he plans to become a salesman for a livestock feed concern.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the kind of a farm program which has consistently been espoused and fostered by this administration is ruinous to the American farmer. Here is concrete evidence that all is not well on the farm when those who are loyal Republicans cannot stand the financial strain which has been thrust upon them through the policies of their own party.

In the next few days I understand that we are to have an opportunity to debate openly a bill designed to aid the farmer. At that time, Mr. Speaker, I will state further my views on the plight of the Midwest farmer.

A condensed copy of the Ernest Mueller sale bill is as follows:

LARGE PUBLIC SALE

I will sell at public auction at the farm located 5 miles west of Knoxville on Highway 60–92, north of highway near Roadside Park, on Thursday, February 14 (must start 10:30 a. m. sharp; in case of bad weather sale will be held in the loafing shed), 95 head of Holsteins, 39 head of hogs, dairy equipment, farm machinery, 3 Ford tractors, livestock equipment, 8-year-old Shetland gelding, 300 bales 3d cutting alfalfa.

ERNEST W. MUELLER.

(Lunch served on grounds. Peters, Bingley, Richards, auctioneers. Iowa State Bank, clerk.)

(Closing-out sale.)

## Recommendations for Cutting the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 18, 1957*

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter I am sending to the President of the United States, making certain suggestions for cutting the budget:

FEBRUARY 12, 1957.

The President of the United States DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
*The White House,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR PRESIDENT EISENHOWER: Since the President's budget of nearly $72 billion has been presented to the Congress and the country, there has been a wave of indignation and resistance to the largest peacetime budget in the history of our country. The President and the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, has suggested that the Congress should examine the budget carefully and make any cuts they feel can be made.

I note the President and his economic advisers are greatly concerned about inflation and how it should be controlled. I believe they recognize that excessive spending can jeopardize the Nation's economy. The President had strong words to say about inflation, asking labor and industry to use caution in advancing prices. Recently, there have been suggestions that certain controls might have to be imposed if inflation is not halted.

While we complain about inflation, we note that the budget contains money for several new projects and continues others that might well be trimmed. I respectfully make the following suggestions as to how and where this budget can be reduced:

1. Adopt the Hoover Commission recommendations in total and save about $5 billion.

2. We cannot continue to carry the world on our back in giving foreign aid. There are now about 40 countries receiving our assistance, costing on an average of $5 billion a year. This can be drastically cut and in some instances, eliminated altogether.

3. Reduce the swollen 2,400,000 Federal employees by not hiring additional employees when vacancies occur, until the Federal payroll has been reduced at least 10 percent. The present budget calls for adding 27,000 new employees. No one would be hurt by not hiring a replacement for those who resign, die, or leave Government employment.

4. Call a halt to all new spending programs, including Federal aid to education, and 6 or 8 new programs now being proposed. This would save an additional $3 or $4 billion. The overall savings in these suggestions would be close to $10 billion.

There is no question about the budget being inflationary. I am sure that inflation cannot be stopped by calling for the biggest peacetime budget in the history of the United States. The Government should set the example. We need a little of the old-fashioned

spunk that you showed during your 1952 campaign when you said:

"Our opponents say you cannot cut taxes. You cannot end or minimize Korean losses. You cannot stop inflation. You cannot stabilize international relations. What kind of stuff is that? Of course we can and will."

May I suggest, Mr. President, that we can and do cut the budget.

Very truly yours,

A. L. MILLER,
*Member of Congress, Fourth District, Nebraska.*

## Will We Have a Depression?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 18, 1957*

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, Carl H. Wilken, economic analyst for the Raw Materials National Council, has just published his summary of 20 years of research in which he has analyzed the operating record of the United States.

The title of the publication is "All New Wealth Comes From the Soil." The material in the publication analyses the record of our economy from 1910 to 1956. It specifically points out the reasons for the depression following 1929 and the tremendous economic loss suffered by the United States.

The past 11 years of our economy are set forth specifically in terms of national income, additions to the total debt, public and private and the severe dislocation between rural America and the rest of the Nation.

The publication points up the fact that we have added $600 billion to the total debt in the period following 1940 and that this debt has become a large part of the operating costs at the present time.

During the past 2 years it has required $120 billion to offset the loss of earned income due to relatively low farm prices which affect all the people in rural America. To offset this increase in debt requires approximately a 10-percent increase in the consumer price level.

The publication uses the State of Iowa as an example of current dislocations in our economy. It points out that Iowa lost $1 billion in 1955 and again in 1956. This in turn meant a loss of $700 million of retail sales in Iowa, a market lost to Iowa businessmen and American industry.

Mr. Wilken also points out that in 1956 even though consumer-goods sales were at the highest dollar level in history, they represented only 48.5 percent of the national income as compared to 55.3 percent, the average for 1946–50. This drop in percentage represents a relatively low level of consumer buying in ratio to national income in 1956 amounting to $22 billion. This loss of earned consumer-goods sales is being offset by excessive increases in the total debt.

In commenting on the future, the publication points out that unless we get our rural economy back in balance with American industry a depression is just a matter of time. Loanable funds as a result of excessive credit are at too low a level to carry on the economy with debt.

The results of another depression are specifically pointed up. A 25-percent drop in the current consumer price level would set the stage for a cutback of $190 billion of current national income and would force a reduction of $700 billion in property and other capital values existing at the present time.

Mr. Wilken in commenting on the effect of such a happening said: "It would curl the hair of even a baldheaded man."

## CG–249 Would Stagnate Oil Exploitation and Charter Fishing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 18, 1957*

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, following the hearings held on October 16, 1956, in Washington, D. C., regarding the proposed agenda, CG–249 to give force and effect to Public Law 519, I have been deluged by my constituents who fear that CG–249 will become the rule with only minor changes.

I have taken the opportunity to inform myself of the contents of CG–249 and after listening to the legitimate complaints thereof, have concluded that if adopted in rule form, even with major revisions, serious hardship and even stagnation of the oil exploitation and charter fishing industries in the district I represent would be a certainty.

This agenda, as has been pointed out to me, was written without consultation with either the shipbuilders or operators and is, to say the least, arbitrary and unreasonable. While trying to prevent accidents, it goes to such lengths and into such details that it would certainly—

First, require many more persons in the Coast Guard to even begin enforcement; second, prevent builders from utilizing newer concepts of small boats necessary to meet the competition from other forms of transportation not similarly affected—helicopters; third, threaten, by increasing the cost of boats to such an extent, the profitable nature of the commercial venture.

It would appear that the accidents which we are trying to prevent have been caused principally by, first, unauthorized use of butane gas; second, overloading of vessels; third, inexperienced or negligent operating personnel; fourth, fires and/or explosions due to gasoline and fed by oil-soaked wooden hulls.

Because of the resistance that CG–249 has met with and the need to protect the lives and property of passengers on vessels affected, a solution is suggested that should give the desired force and effect to Public Law 519, namely:

First. Throw out CG–249.

Second. Inspect under Public Law 519 using the rules for uninspected vessels—Motor Boat Act of April 25, 1940.

Third. As experience and the industry concur, augment these rules with certain provisions relating to the overloading and the prevention of fires and explosions on gasoline powered and/or wooden vessels.

## Distressed or Surplus Labor Area Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 18, 1957*

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, for many years, I have been advocating enactment of so-called distressed or surplus labor area legislation. I have contended that such action is a necessary step toward achieving economic stabilization on a countrywide basis. It would serve to bridge the gaps and crevices which inevitably occur along the road to economic progress in a highly industrialized society.

My program calls for a Federal program designed to assist in maintaining a high level of prosperity and employment. It provides for the planning and construction of useful public facilities, not only to mitigate substantial unemployment, but to provide permanent capital improvements of a nature which will strengthen the national economy and increase the well-being of all citizens.

As a firm advocate of the free economic system, unfettered by Government restraints and devoid of Federal invasions into fields of business, I feel that my program would in effect serve to safeguard this philosophy. I believe that my proposal is especially necessary in a period of international uncertainty, for it would help to maintain the industrial flexibility required for a sound defense structure. It is additionally essential in an era of rapid technological advance in which local employment conditions are subject to sudden disruptions with extended applications of automatic devices. In brief, the legislation which I propose would tend to allay whatever fear might otherwise seize workingmen and women when automation threatens to dispense with their jobs.

Introduction of new machines has engendered consternation in human minds through the ages, at least since the time that the industrial revolution in England had a tragic impact upon so many families. Their jobs taken away by the use of power-driven machines, they were ruthlessly turned into the streets to forage for themselves. At times in isolated areas of this country there have been parallel cases, though to a lesser degree. The thought has continued to plague segments of the working populace. To counteract it, Congress should adopt my program and thereby substitute a feeling of security in place of trepidation.

Obviously, automation should be encouraged. One of the most lucid and

logical explanations to be presented on this subject was contained in the testimony of Thomas Roy Jones, president of Daystrom, Inc., when he appeared before the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization of the Joint Economic Committee last year. Mr. Jones started his engineering career as a laborer on a railroad signal gang, and in his rise to the top level of industrial management he has familiarized himself with the many advantages of technological progress. Here is a summary of his reasons for wanting to accelerate the application of automation:

First. Automation is essential to the economy in that it provides an opportunity for the American worker to increase his real wages through increased individual productivity.

Second. It is a psychological necessity that man continually seek to extend himself to the limit of his inherent capabilities.

Third. Automation is essential to the national defense, for it could determine the extent to which the civilian economy could support military production.

Mr. Speaker, some of the recommendations contained in Mr. Jones' testimony might well be adopted by Congress in its determination to accelerate training of technical talent and to encourage more of our youth to pursue a teaching career in science and engineering. I would suggest that, when the committee report is available, my colleagues peruse this convincing statement advocating a step-up in the drive toward further automation.

Once this philosophy is accepted, enactment of surplus labor area legislation should follow immediately. We in Pennsylvania have had ample evidence of the need for such a program. When coal mining companies invested in labor-saving machines to increase productivity, the United Mine Workers of America made no protest. They realized that employment would be affected, yet they refused to oppose progress. Had my proposed legislation been made into law, the surplus workers could have moved into public works projects while waiting for new industry to enter the State and absorb them. Certainly it has not been fair to penalize this far-sighted organization for its unselfish attitude toward mechanization.

The solution to the situation calls for continued cooperation between management and labor, plus application of sound Christian social principles. The latter consideration requires passage of a surplus labor area bill as quickly as possible.

## Sonic Boom Explosions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 18, 1957*

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for the past 4 or 5 years, our office has been contacted relative to jet airplane sonic boom explosions, thereby causing property damage. This office has contacted Lambert Field at St. Louis where these planes are supposed to be based, for information relative to this situation. The answers have never been understandable. The complaints of damage to homes, both in urban and rural areas, business houses and even livestock, have been very prevalent.

The Federal Government cannot be sued without its consent. Under the Federal Tort Claims Act, the United States sovereignty has been waived under certain types of suits. It is questionable whether the Federal Tort Claims Act would cover or be sufficient over claims for damages by jet explosion. I have asked the legislative counsel to draft legislation whereby the Federal Government would waive its immunity to suit under conditions herein described. I will introduce it the day it is available.

I feel that it has reached the point where damage claims should be allowed or the jet explosions controlled.

## H. R. 4678

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 18, 1957*

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my remarks regarding interest on E-bonds as part of the standard income tax exemptions as provided in the bill I introduced on February 11, 1957, H. R. 4678.

It has been repeatedly implied that the United States Treasury Department proposes an increase in the interest rate on long-term bonds as it has already done on short-term obligations. In the interest of stemming inflations within the processes of our Federal fiscal system, I propose that the Treasury Department entertain a plan to exempt the interest on E-bonds as part of the standard income tax exemptions.

May I point out, under the existing law interest of $25 realized after 10 years is taxed at a figure of 22 percent or $5.50 per a net gain of $19.50 on a hundred dollar denomination.

It seems to me that the ultimate goal of the Government is to encourage the public not only to hold but to buy bonds and, in this manner, hold down deposits and reserves created when the Treasury borrows from banks.

I believe that we are all aware of the fact that Treasury borrowing from banks is an inflationary process. I should like to point out further that in my opinion the public could be induced to buy and keep E-bonds by making the interest tax exempted. At the same time, it would tend to arrest the inflationary cycle.

Exempting interest on E-bonds and other publicly held securities would work toward this objective. Furthermore, redemptions and conversions would undoubtedly decline, thus resulting in a saving in clerical cost and operation.

In conclusion may I suggest that the United States Treasury Department and the Committee on Ways and Means give serious thought to this proposal.

## Lithuania Will Be Free Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 18, 1957*

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, previously given, I desire to again reaffirm a statement I have made many times before; namely, that some day Lithuania will again enjoy liberty and freedom. One cannot safely say just when this will be, but there is a just God that rules the universe and it is safe to say that liberty and freedom is a by-product of Christianity and in the normal course of events the freedom so devoutly cherished by the people of Lithuania is bound to be realized.

Mr. Speaker, history will record that one of the high crimes of this century will be the subjugation of the Baltic States by the ruthless masters who rule from the Kremlin. There was no justification, no good reason, for Russia to physically impose its will on the free countries adjacent to its borders in the Baltic region.

It is well to point out, Mr. Speaker, that when World War II started in Europe the price of Russian help to Germany greatly increased and Germany was obliged to cede to Russia all three Baltic States in addition to the Ukrainian and White Russian sections of Poland. While the Germans had actually occupied those countries prior to the outbreak of the war, their actions like the Russians' were not justified. Prior thereto, Russia had always maintained what the Baltic people believed was a friendly attitude but events have proved that she was only waiting for a better opportunity to seize the nations and at a time when the other great European powers might be engaged in war. And so it was in 1939 that she disclosed her real intentions by assembly of a young army of 1 million or more near the Baltic boundaries and addressed these three Baltic States with separate ultimatums demanding still greater friendship; namely, admission of Russian garrisons and occupation of strategic military points in those countries.

Obviously, these three Baltic States were in no position to defend their borders against what was obviously a Russian determination to occupy and dominate their lands.

Mr. Speaker, the high crimes committed by the Russians against these peaceful nations will never be forgotten and with the light of liberty still burn-

ing brightly in the hearts and minds of Lithuanians who have since migrated to this country, I repeat again, that someday Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia will be free.

As part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am including an address by Mr. Peter Petrusaitis, chairman of the Lithuanian American Council in my own city of Racine, Wis. The Lithuanian people in Wisconsin are holding high the torch of liberty and freedom.

I also include as part of my remarks a resolution adopted by the Lithuanian American Council, Racine branch, on February 16, 1957:

ADDRESS BY PETER PETRUSAITIS, CHAIRMAN, LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, RACINE BRANCH

It is my proud privilege to extend my most heartfelt greetings to all of you gathered here.

Today, 39 years ago, the Lithuanian people declared to the world that they wanted to be free again. They had to conquer many hardships to achieve their goal. That determination became reality.

I am proud to state to everyone that Lithuania during the 22 years of independent life proved to be a worthy member of those nations who had contributed to the welfare of mankind.

The brute force, which is even now threatening to destroy freedom everywhere, extinguished the liberty of Lithuania and enslaved her people. Although the physical enslavement is torturing the bodies of the Lithuanians, they continue to be free in their hearts. I want to point out that no nation can ever be conquered as long as the faith and the will of the people is stronger than that of their oppressors. Such a nation will survive throughout all hardships.

The Communists have failed to win the people of occupied countries to their side. Especially, their failure is visible in the ranks of the working classes and the youth of the land, which should be assuring backbone of the growth of communism. There is no one disputing this fact. Let us see the inside story of the Hungarian revolution:

There was no carefully prepared advance scheme to revolt. The ferment of discontent was brewing through all the years of oppression. It broke into the open all of a sudden during some clashes between the police and the demonstrating crowd. We know that the most active participants in the revolution, which is still going on, have been workers, students, and even children. Let me quote an announcement from the freedom fighters controlled radio station Budapest: "Now, children, it is getting late. You must be very tired. Please, put down your guns and go to sleep like good boys and girls."

Poland's revolt won some concessions. Smaller scale revolts occurred in Lithuania, Estonia, and other countries, including Russia herself.

It is very likely that these unrests started from growing discontent with the cruel rule of Communists. On the other hand, however, it was a well-known fact for a period of 4 years that the oppressed peoples believed that the United States was pursuing a cause of advocated liberation.

I am sorry to state that this was not true.

Now we know, that our administration has adopted a new do-it-yourself policy for the satellites and even has let the Kremlin know that enslaved countries are strictly a Russian affair. This sudden switch of policies occurred during the culmination of unrest in the Red empire.

I believe that those men who are elected responsible leaders of this great Nation should reexamine their consciences and their past course of action to determine whether or not such courses of action are causing peoples to believe in the faith of freedom to lose such a faith, both in themselves and those whom they want help.

However, I am fully convinced, that we all are firm believers in the faith of freedom and human dignity. Let us hope, too, that there are scores of good people who also believe that universal liberty is the cause of all free men.

Therefore, we must pledge anew that we must never cease to fight until the sun of liberty will shine over all lands, including Lithuania.

---

Whereas while driving for world conquest, the Soviet Russia has forcibly occupied many free countries, including Lithuania; and

Whereas the variable Communist tactics do not change their basic aim which is to destroy every free nation; and

Whereas by every standard of national and international conduct, Soviet Russia, under its present regime is an outlaw nation; and

Whereas the existence of freedom throughout the world today can only be preserved in those countries where people firmly believe in the policy of deterring aggression by their very own strength and belief in their unity; and

Whereas the tolerances of adherence to a double standard of international morality are giant steps away from the unifying beliefs and principles of a free country and free people: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That this meeting wholeheartedly support President Eisenhower's Middle East program as a sound countermeasure against the challenge of imperialistic communism which is creating and has already created a grave threat to world peace and security in that area; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we oppose any policy advocating the present status quo in Europe as permanent and even as a desirable balance for so-called lasting peace because this policy is simply an expedience of the total overall communistic plan; and be it further

*Resolved*, That our Nation through its constituted voice of freedom, the Congress, should cause legislation to be enacted in the United Nations giving assurance that the members of that great body would not be allowed to practice a double standard of international morality which practice is a flagrant abuse of principles of the founders of this great Nation; and be it finally

*Resolved*, That this mass meeting gratefully express its sincere gratitude to the executive and legislative branches of our Government for its various efforts to aid all men who seek freedom and for its nonrecognition of the annexation of Lithuania into Soviet Russia.

PETER PETRUSAITIS,
*Chairman.*
STANLEY P. BUDRYS,
*Secretary.*

RACINE, WIS., *February 16, 1957.*

## National Crime Prevention Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDWIN H. MAY, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 18, 1957*

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the Exchange Clubs are performing a great service for the citizens of this Nation by sponsoring the annual observance of National Crime Prevention Week. This year the period from February 10 through 16 has been designated for this purpose.

I am particularly proud of the excellent job being done by the Exchange Clubs of the State of Connecticut. On Monday, February 18, the New Britain Exchange Club will play host to 15 Exchange Clubs from all over the State of Connecticut. The theme for the evening will be: "Lawlessness, a Major Threat to Our Way of Life."

This program is designed to bring to the attention of the general public the vital need for a year-round program of crime prevention. The emphasis should be placed on educational programs designed to acquaint the public with problems concerning crime they often do not realize exist. Public apathy is one of the most prevalent factors in creating an atmosphere most suitable for the development of a strong and flourishing criminal element.

J. Edgar Hoover, in a very timely and realistic statement, has brought to the Nation a warning that crime is increasing at an alarming rate throughout the Nation. We could very easily find ourselves in a situation reminiscent of the gangsterism that accompanied the bootleg days of prohibition.

I congratulate the Exchange Clubs of Connecticut and of the Nation for their effective program in educating the public to a very real public danger.

## "I'm Shocked by Our New Schools"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 18, 1957*

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is not hard to know and admire Rhode Island's friendly, sincere, and hard-working Congressman, JOHN FOGARTY. He and I came to the House together in January 1940, and it was only a matter of a few days that I knew him as a builder—not just because he was a journeyman bricklayer in Providence when elected—it was so obvious he was anxious to promote legislation to help people in need of life's most precious asset, good health. Today all of us know him as the No. 1 pioneer of the Congress sponsoring Federal medical research to isolate and exterminate the germs known as man's greatest killers.

When last Sunday's issue of the weekly newspaper supplement Parade came to my door, I quickly spied an article written by JOHN FOGARTY and captioned "I'm Shocked by Our New Schools." I found it most interesting and challenging. Parade describes it as an "eye-opening report for every United States parent and taxpayer by a Congressman-expert who is chairman of the House subcommittee handling funds for the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

The article follows:

I'M SHOCKED BY OUR NEW SCHOOLS

(By Representative JOHN FOGARTY)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—If you live in an average community, your school-building program probably is in a mess. Chances are you don't have enough classrooms, and the few under construction seem to cost more than you expected.

You're unhappy about it—and you should be. Few community problems affect you more directly than adequate schools. They affect your child's welfare; they take the biggest bite out of local taxes. Yet in no other area is there such public confusion.

I favor Federal aid to school construction, but my purpose here isn't to argue about that. My purpose is to warn you not to be lulled into thinking Federal money, if approved this time, will solve your school expansion problem. Over 180,000 new classrooms are needed right now; another 210,000 are needed to keep up with future increased enrollment. The majority of States are losing ground to the blossoming birthrate.

And here's what bothers me. The classroom shortage is being compounded by an appalling ignorance of how to build them. Too many communities, to cut costs and save time, are trying rash experiments.

Last year in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., parents complained a new school with wide windows and no cellar was freezing the children. A New England school eliminated the ventilation for its gym; during opening ceremonies, condensation formed on the ceiling and it rained on the audience. Viers Mill Village, Md., bought a prefabricated school on the theory it could be built cheaply in less time. It cost more to build, will cost more to maintain—and is only temporary.

This prefab idea is the newest gimmick offered desperate communities. But every school site has its own grade or slope, its own soil condition or drainage, its distinctive utility connections, its own exposure to wind, heat, light. No plan will fit two sites without extensive—and expensive—changes.

And there's no such thing as "average classroom cost." It costs more to shut out the cold in Connecticut than in Texas. Materials and labor vary. What's high in Columbus, Ga., may be low in Chicago.

Recently I checked on some low-cost schools going up across the country, and got pretty excited by what I discovered.

In Springfield, Ohio, Architect Arsene Rousseau has turned out schools for $7 to $9 a square foot, a remarkably low figure. The Rousseau technique stresses simple design, high-quality materials—and no frills.

COST AND SAFETY

In St. Louis, Architect George Hellmuth has won awards for Riverview Gardens High School, which cost $10.85 a square foot, several dollars under the local market. In his system, the interior walls support the building. Outside walls are brick "curtain" walls, saving steel.

In Houston, Tex., architect Don Bathelme has built schools with slim marble panels in steel frames. Cost: $9 to $10 a square foot.

More important than school cost, however, is school safety. I'll bet you don't know about the minimum standards demanded by your building code or how well your children are protected.

Until 1954, for example, people thought a one-story school of combustible construction was safe if it had enough exits. Then fire flashed through a one-story frame school in Cheektowaga, N. Y., a Buffalo suburb, killing 14 children. Despite two large exits, the children were trapped inside.

Additional exits might have saved more children. But are you willing to assume your child won't panic? To me, it's reckless to base safety provisions on a child's coolness and fleetness.

Cutting school costs isn't for amateurs. In wrong hands, it can be expensive, even dangerous. But you can get better, cheaper schools. Here's what I recommend:

Form a local school improvement committee, including several local architects, builders, and labor representatives. Select a subcommittee as a permanent advisory council to the school board.

See to it that the council and the board plan a 10-year advance program of building for your community. You can adjust targets from year to year as needed.

Insist on simple designs, elimination of frills and use of proven materials.

Ask for regular appearances of local architects, builders, educators, and labor leaders to explain school needs and plans.

You may think this is a lot of trouble to go to just to get good schools. But remember: it's your pocketbook and your children's education at stake. If you shrug off your responsibilities to them, you'll forfeit the welfare of both.

---

## Lithuanian Independence Day Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, February 18, 1957*

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by me yesterday afternoon at the Lithuanian Independence Day anniversary celebration in Chicago, Ill.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY UNITED STATES SENATOR WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY ANNIVERSARY, FEBRUARY 17, 1957, AT CHICAGO, ILL.

We are commemorating the 39th anniversary of the declaration of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania, February 16, 1918, and the 704th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian State when Mindaugas the Great was crowned the first king of Lithuania in 1253.

In the long recorded history of civilization it has been a limited period of time during which the people of Lithuania have been subjected to Communist brutality. To the people there and to the relatives of the dead or those in Siberia it must seem to be an eternity.

Some will claim that the fate of Lithuania, a nation which after all only secured its recent independence in 1918, was not important in the world scheme of international relationships and policy. These individuals, many of them from so-called neutral nations, have forgotten the most basic lesson of history—that freedom is indivisible and is diminished everywhere when it is lost anywhere.

The largest group of American citizens of Lithuanian descent is located here in Chicago and I am pleased to be able to meet with this representative gathering here today on the anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

With the exception of the American Indian all of us in this New World—ourselves or our parents, grandparents or more distant forebears—came from the Old Worlds of Europe, Asia, or Africa.

While as citizens of the United States our loyalty is to this great Republic it is also natural that there remain ties of historic interest, family or racial connections, and religious beliefs, together with our natural humanitarian instincts, that makes what happens in Budapest, Berlin, London, Peiping, Cairo, or any other city, large or small, more than just a newspaper dateline.

There are many great problems confronting our country, domestic and foreign, but to me the greatest issue of the day is human freedom. Under either Republican or Democratic administrations our foreign policy should be based upon it. What advances freedom we should support and what retards or endangers it we should oppose.

There are principles of international morality that cannot be compromised without fatal effects on the compromiser or on the sacrificial victim. Czechoslovakia was a casualty of such an exchange and Munich should have taught the world that appeasement is not the road to peace but is only surrender on the installment plan. Communism is an evil thing. It is destructive of religion, freedom, family life, and the other human rights that freemen honor and hold dear. Dare we forget the admonition in II Corinthians:

"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship has righteousness with unrighteousness and what communion has light with darkness?"

Kadar, Khrushchev, Gomulka, Chou En-lai are not to be trusted. The policy of international communism has been, is, and will remain the destruction of freedom and national sovereignty. Any nation in Europe, Asia, or the Middle East that ignores this basic fact will do so at its peril.

A propaganda barrage is developing here and abroad to give economic aid to the Communist States of Eastern Europe. For what purpose? To lessen the drain on the Soviet Union so it will have more economic resources to use against the nations of the free world or to subvert the uncommitted countries outside the Iron Curtain? To sustain godless local Communist chieftians who would not last a month were it not for the support of Soviet bayonets within their borders? To give character and prestige to men whose hands are red with the blood of those patriots whose love of freedom for their countrymen was greater than their love of life? Are we to bolster sagging Communist economies whose own workers, by strikes, slow down or sabotage in the face of death penalties and prison terms have contributed to the weakening of an important segment of the Communist regime?

None of these things make sense to me. I shall oppose the taking of a single dollar from the overburdened American taxpayer to build the economic strength of any Communist country behind the Soviet Iron Curtain or to give military aid to any Communist State anywhere in the world.

If the Soviet Union wants peace there is an honorable proposal that could be made to that Government.

Withdraw all Soviet forces from Lithuania, Poland, Albania, Latvia, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria and guarantee free elections under United Nations supervision. Let the people decide, free from the force of Gomulka counterfeit elections such as Poland was insulted with on Sunday, January 20, while Soviet troops still occupy that restless country.

Let the great powers and the United Nations guarantee the neutrality of all of these Eastern European states after the withdrawal of all Soviet troops and after the free elections under United Nations auspices have been held.

Both the Soviet Union and the West could then be assured that these free states would be similar to the neutral positions which today exist in Austria, Switzerland, and Sweden. They could not be used as a springboard for invasion against the free world or against the Soviet Union.

The free world has no quarrel with the people of Russia. They were the first victims of Communist aggression. It is not the Russian people but the Soviet Communist regime which has broken all of its international agreements with non-Communist powers and which has been a disturber of the peace of the world and still threatens it.

With such a settlement in Eastern Europe the burdens of armaments could be lifted to a considerable extent from the backs of the people of the free world and the Soviet Union as well. Then the people of Russia who do not have the privileges of the small but relatively well off Communist Party hierarchy would be able to enjoy during this lifetime better housing, more consumer goods and a certain amount of luxuries which are now enjoyed by urban and rural workers in the free world.

But let us not as a great free republic ever compromise the basic principle of human freedom. Let us never give our moral or legal blessings to the enslavement of millions behind the Iron Curtain who long to be free. Nor should we permit any international organization of which we are a member to compromise us in this regard.

At the time of the Korean aggression the Soviet Union supplied the guns, tanks, ammunition and planes to make war against the United Nations forces. And to make their disrespect of the United Nations Charter complete, they publicly admitted it.

At that time I urged that steps be taken to expel the Soviet Union from membership under article 6.

Article 6:

"A member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present charter may be expelled from the organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

Or, at the very least, that they be suspended from the exercise of their rights and privileges under article 5.

Article 5: "A member of the United Nations against which preventive or enforcement action has been taken by the Security Council may be suspended from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council. The exercise of these rights and privileges may be restored by the Security Council."

The question may be asked, "How is the Soviet veto to be avoided?" I believe it can be avoided by invoking a proviso of section 3 of article 27, where there is an issue clearly a violation of the charter which relates to the specific settlement of disputes under chapter VI.

Article 27, section 3: "Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members, including the concurring votes of the permanent members: *Provided*, That, in decisions under chapter VI, and under paragraph 3 of article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting."

If the Soviet Union makes a point of order that they are exempt, let the point of order be overruled by the Chair and sustained by the other Security Council members.

At this point the Soviet Union might decide to walk out as Hungary did last December.

If the action of the U. S. S. R. during the Korean and Hungarian conflicts are examples of what we must contemplate for the future, the United Nations will have a better chance of survival without the Soviet Union than with it. I believe this to be the case.

How can any nation ignore the moral issue involved in Soviet destruction of freedom in Hungary and want sanctions applied in the case of troubles in the Middle East? What organization can survive such a double standard? Either we have a system of law and order or the doctrine of might makes right is recognized. Communism cannot be allowed to place itself above international law or God-given moral law.

Nations can die while delegates talk. In World War II Holland was attacked and surrendered to Nazi Germany in 6 days, Belgium in 20 days.

From October 27, 1956, to January 10, 1957, a period of 76 days, the General Assembly passed 10 resolutions while freedom in Hungary was strangled to death and the United Nations stood impotent.

The Soviet Government is not entitled to sit among the civilized nations of the world. Their record of brutality and broken agreements cannot be disputed.

Our President Abraham Lincoln said:

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. * * * The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down to the latest generation. * * * We, yes even we here, have the power and bear the responsibility * * * in giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. * * * We shall nobly save or meanly lose this last best hope on earth."

## Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 18, 1957*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with my friends of Estonian descent in commemorating Estonian Independence Day, which occurred yesterday.

Estonia's long history is studded with her attempts to gain freedom from various forms of political domination. Throughout these years her desire for freedom has never faltered, nor have Estonia's people lost their distinctive culture and mores.

It was 39 years ago, on February 24, 1918, that Estonia proclaimed herself a republic. For some years she thrived as a member of the family of free nations. However, in 1940, the Soviet Union, violating previous promises, marched in and occupied the country. Disregarding American protests, the Russian invaders embarked on a particularly brutal campaign to wipe out the heart and fight of the Estonian people.

It is a tribute to their faith in God and faith in the eventual triumph of freedom and justice that these brave people have not bowed down before the tactics of mass deportations, murders, arrests and other terrorist activities. No, Estonia's spirit has not been broken and her people continue to resist the Red oppressors.

There is, of course, no celebration today of what should be a joyful occasion. But it is fitting that on this 39th anniversary of Estonian independence we assure these noble people that they have not been forgotten, and that we in America hope and pray for the day when they will once again enjoy the freedom which is the birthright of all men.

## Harriman Hits President on Violence Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 18, 1957*

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the Evening Star, Thursday, February 14, 1957, page B-18, carried an article entitled "Harriman Hits President on Violence Issue." I think that that article would be of interest, and I quote that article as follows:

HARRIMAN HITS PRESIDENT ON VIOLENCE ISSUE

NEW YORK, February 14.—Gov. Averell Harriman says President Eisenhower has ignored a request from Southern Negro ministers that he publicly condemn violence against Negro homes and churches.

The Democratic Governor says this is more than a discourtesy—it is a tragic failure to assert his responsibility and to speak the conscience of the American people.

Governor Harriman, who spoke at a brotherhood in action rally at Madison Square Garden last night, noted that two-thirds of the world's people are nonwhite.

He added that violence in the Deep South or the housing riots in the Middle West impair our effectiveness among the peoples that have newly come out of colonialism.

Governor Harriman, former United States Ambassador to Russia, pressed his attack on the Eisenhower administration's policy in the Middle East.

"In the United Nations," he said, "We must not support a double standard of morality. In the Israeli-Egyptian dispute it is immoral to invoke moral principle on one side and ignore it on the other.

"Dictator Nasser (of Egypt), supported by the Kremlin, has for many years flouted the United Nations resolutions and Israel is entitled to have our support in her demand that Egypt as well as Israel accede to the United Nations directives."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that everyone will agree with me that, while Mr. Harriman is still a candidate for the nomination by the Democratic Party for the high office of President, he is willing to promote strife and confusion in order to forward his own selfish ends.

While there are many things that our President has done that I do not agree with, and things that I sincerely deplore that he did do, I believe every right-thinking individual will agree with me that the President was correct in his refusal to go down into the South and make a speech concerning the rights of Negroes, and to add fuel to a flame that is now burning, and can be made to burn brighter easily by any demagog, such as Mr. Harriman has long since proven to the rank and file of the people that he is.

Mr. Harriman's tirade is nothing new to the people of the South. As a matter of fact, we have known for a long time that Mr. Harriman was antiwhite.

I would like to point out to Mr. Harriman and to the leaders of the Democratic Party that just such rantings as Mr. Harriman has done in this instance afford reasons why the President of the United States carried 41 of our 48 States. As a matter of fact, only seven Southern States saw fit to vote for Mr. Stevenson,

the far-to-the-left Democratic nominee for the Presidency. I believe it is time to tell the people that Mr. Eisenhower was not elected on account of his tremendous popularity. The President is not possessed of all of the glamour that some people would endow him with. The truth is, that Mr. Eisenhower simply had no competition. The people of the United States, that is, the rank and file, would save this country and our republican form of government, if they had a fair chance so to do. Anyone who was familiar with the political picture, and the election of last November 6, is bound to realize that up until about 30 days before that election, it was a horse race between the Democrats and the Republicans. It was only after Mr. Stevenson had completely demonstrated to the people that he was absolutely wild, and would abolish the draft and would stop the atomic-bomb tests, and that his actions had the approval of Bulganin, that the people were called upon to choose between the lesser of the two evils. Let Mr. Harriman make no mistake, he is simply adding fuel to the flames, and he is simply making it easier, for any candidate for the other major party to defeat any Democratic nominee believing in such trash as Mr. Harriman does, and putting it where that the Republican Party can elect anyone that they nominate, irrespective of his popularity.

I believe that the last election, when honestly analyzed, will prove to both parties that the rank and file of the voters of this country, and God bless them, are hoping and praying that some time they will have the opportunity of electing to the Presidency of the United States a man who is inclined to the right and a man who believes somewhat in conservation of our resources, both in money and in character.

---

## Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, February 18, 1957*

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address delivered by me before the American Association of State Highway Officials at Atlantic City, N. J., on November 27, 1956, may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DENNIS CHAVEZ, UNITED STATES SENATOR, NEW MEXICO, BEFORE THE 42D ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS, ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., NOVEMBER 27, 1956

Through the kindness of the people of my State, I do happen to be the chairman of the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate. Through the kindness of the people in many other States, I do happen to have a fine committee, including the gentleman who addressed the gathering this morning, Senator MARTIN. He is the ranking man on the minority side.

I want to assure you that that committee is not a political committee, and on one ever thinks about party politics when considering what is good for the country as far as that committee is concerned. I want to assure you that I have received the cooperation of Senator MARTIN, Senator CASE, Senator KUCHEL, Senator HRUSKA, Senator COTTON, and Senator BUSH of the minority side of that committee in everything that was good for roads or in passing legislation that would take care of the water pollution which is so acute, especially around this area. The chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads is Senator GORE of Tennessee. Senator GORE had hearings by the week, over and over again, listening to the tales of woe of people from all over the country who were interested in good roads. And we were. After due hearings and consideration by the full committee, the committee reported out the bill that has become the law and which is the program about which you gentlemen and ladies are to work on for the next 13 years. It is a 13-year program with a 3-year space to start with, which means 1957, 1958, and 1959, after which Congress will again look the matter over and provide for the funds necessary to continue the program for the next 10 years.

I consider myself most fortunate in being chairman of that committee and in other committee assignments that I have. Because as chairman of the Committee on Public Works we pass the basic legislation authorizing the project, but I am also No. 3 in appropriations which will get you the money to complete your project.

I want to pay my compliments today to the President of the United States in selecting a director, or the headman, who is to handle the matters of public roads in the Department of Commerce, and that is Mr. Tallamy. Of course it was suggested that there should be two appointed but Congress thought otherwise and they decided that one would be enough. But either Mr. Volpe or Mr. Tallamy, I am sure, would have done the job fine and I know that Mr. Volpe will. I want to assure him this afternoon that as far as the Committee on Public Works of the Senate is concerned, that he will have our complete cooperation because we do believe in good roads in this country.

I think for a moment, at this particular time, it would not be amiss if we would all stand up and stay silent for 30 seconds in respect for a great roadman who passed away a short time ago, the late Robert Reindollar, of Baltimore, Md. (Audience stands in silent tribute to Mr. Reindollar.)

The history of roads in this Nation is a wonderful history. I have tried to emphasize it at highway gatherings over and over again, but I don't think it would be amiss to say it again. Directly after the War Between the States, we were all isolated in sections. The so-called rebel was down in the Deep South and the damn yankee was up in his area. They would cuss one another and they would both cuss we people out in the wild and woolly West. But it happened in the early part of the century that Mr. Ford had an idea. He developed the jalopy. Of course the jalopy had to have somewhere to go and a place to go on as a result of which people commenced to think about roads. How are we going to get them on roads. Then people began to think that, after all, that jalopy needs some gasoline, needs some lubricants and needs some rubber, which all made for the development and the progress of the country as a whole. Nowadays, due to the results of the road program throughout the United States, you can have four school teachers from deep Tennessee or deep Alabama or Mississippi get together and go up to northern Maine and the northern States and find out that they are just the same as any other American that the trials and tribulations are identical, that they have the same problems and the same thing happens with your transcontinental highways from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Only a few days ago I was in Los Angeles, San Diego, and San Francisco on the Pacific, now we are over here on the Atlantic, and I can visualize that if this program is carried out that it won't be long before you will be able to go from Atlantic City, N. J., to San Francisco or San Diego or Los Angeles, on a four-lane highway and safety at that. I can see it. I believe in it.

Prior to the Reorganization Act, the Monroney-Mansfield Act, roads were authorized through the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. Then came the Reorganization Act which created the Committee on Public Works and other committees. It is a fine committee. I know and probably Senator MARTIN told you that a lot of folks think it is a secondary committee, but what is better for the American people than good flood protection, good roads, and the control of water pollution as far as it affects the American people. That committee has for its functions everything that has to do with navigation, even in Philadelphia, everything that has to do with rivers and harbors, even in Philadelphia, everything that has to do with flood controls and you people in the Northeast are learning about flood control the hard way. We always knew about them out in the West, but it took Hurricane Carol to actually find out what flood control really meant. It is interesting at times, sometimes it was amusing. The boys in the East and Northeast that were fighting flood control are now the most anxious to work for flood control. Well, that comes under the same committee.

With the road bill we passed a water-pollution bill. It is important, especially to the States in the East. What the Ohio and Monongahela does to Pittsburgh, to Wheeling, to Louisville, and to Cincinnati is out of this world. Now the Committee on Public Works and the Congress of the United States thinks it is a Government responsibility to try to do something about those matters on interstate streams. Basic legislation has been passed for that. But I am getting off of my subject.

Now when it comes to the question of the roads themselves. You are the boys who are going to do it. You have the responsibility. You and the Bureau of Public Roads. But you should have that teamwork that one of the speakers this morning spoke about. He says we ought to work together with the Bureau of Public Roads and your State highway officials, which is correct. But don't forget the third party, Mr. Citizen. That is the reason we provided in this piece of legislation that hearings be had in all communities wherein the people would join you. They might have differences of opinions until the Bureau explained and the State highway officials explained, and then the matter would end as a love feast. And isn't it fine that you would have the American people, the citizen who, after all, is the fellow who is paying for these roads, a partner in dealing with the construction of the roads throughout the Nation. I think that is a great provision. I understand that a gentleman from one of the States, a State highway official, is to give you a paper on the matter of the hearings later on in the program.

Teamwork is necessary; hearings are necessary because it will express the opinion.

Now the impact. What does it mean to the economy of this country, this proposition of this terrific construction? Let me give you a few excerpts around here and tell you about the dollars and cents to start with.

In the 13 years the American people are going to spend $24,825,000,000 on roads. In 1957, which is next year—and I hope the program is ready by that time so that we can start it moving; I know some States are hav-

ing quite a time with the proposition of rights-of-way and other things, but I do hope the State highway officials will get busy in their home States and get out a program so we can keep on rolling—in 1957, $1,000,000,000; 1958, $1,700,000,000; 1959, $2,000,000,000; 1960, $2,200,000,000; 1961, $2,200,000,000; 1962, $2,200,000,000; 1963, $2,200,000,000; 1964, $2,200,000,000; 1965, $2,200,000,000; 1966, $2,200,000,000; 1967, $2,200,000,000; in 1968 it commences to taper down to $1,500,000,000; in 1969, $1,025,000,000, making a total of $24,825,000,000 that will be spent for roads—that is, the overall system taken in, your primary, your secondary, urban, and interstate traffic.

It is interesting to break it down. The apportionments of the Federal-aid highway funds authorized for the fiscal 1957 and additional sums authorized by the Federal act of 1956, for instance, will take your neighbors around the neighborhood. The total will be $1,125,000,000. The little State of Delaware will spend a total of $6,783,214. New Jersey, primary, secondary, urban, interstate system, a total of $24,278,783. Pennsylvania will spend a total of $59,639,230 in 1957 only. That is the first year of the 3-year program. In 1958 Delaware will spend a total of $14,250,856; New Jersey, $55,388,479; Pennsylvania, a total of $132,143,200. Of course, that will have a tremendous impact on the economy of those States, on the labor of those States, on the equipment people of those States, on the men who supply gravel for the concrete roads in those States, the cement factories, and everyone else. I have a little something on that I would like to leave with you for what it is worth with reference to the impact.

It is my good fortune to be the chairman of this Senate Committee which deliberated for two sessions of the Congress and which recommended Highway bill now enacted into law. It is entitled the Federal Highway Act of 1956, Public Law 627, 84th Congress, 2d session, which I believe will go down in history as one of the most far reaching and progressive pieces of legislation in our time. It is the biggest highway bill that has ever been enacted in the history of the world—the biggest one. My experience in the field of highway legislation has been continued since becoming a Member of the Senate in 1935, and during these 21 years I have worked continuously in the development of legislation which has as its goal the construction of a system of highways to adequately connect the cities and towns along the Atlantic with those of the Pacific and the Gulf of Mexico, and to connect from our neighbors in Canada to the Republic of Mexico. Not only do we want to provide fine avenues for traffic between these areas for commercial interchange, but we want to provide facilities so that our farmers, our ranchers, oil and gasoline producers and marketers, automotive manufacturers and other segments of our economic makeup can easily and rapidly distribute their products between one another. The legislation which we now have is intended to enable us to complete a network of 41,000 miles of roads and expressways to connect all of the 48 States.

The program calls for accelerating work on the 235,000 miles of roads in the primary system and 525,000 miles in the secondary system. In addition work would be carried on in improving forest roads and trails, national park roads, Indian roads and roads on public grants. In evaluating the economic results of the program, a great volume of statistical data has been accumulated. Among those many figures we find what? The following requirements for each billion dollars of new highway contract construction: 7,500 tractors, 3,200 scrapers, 3,000 power cranes and shovels, 2,500 mobile graders and 2,500 rollers. In all, it is estimated that 57,000 units of equipment will be needed for each $1 billion of new contract construction. The units will have a value of a half a billion dollars and would be expected to produce about $7 billion of highway construction. In carrying the analysis to its conclusion, it is estimated that for a $28 billion program, the value of the equipment will be around $2 billion. It has been estimated that by 1960, highway construction would require the services of 900,000 men, while occupied in producing materials and transporting them to the job would probably amount to another 900,000 men. After the completion of the monumental job of constructing this vast system of highways contemplated, there would be available routes for the efficient and rapid transportation of our national products. This would result in many billion dollars of economic benefit as well as the saving of many thousands of human lives.

The Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway engineers have before you a tremendous challenging job of converting legislative authorization into highways over which our people may travel. In accomplishing the job before you design standards must be developed. Many location problems must be overcome and many contracts must be executed and supervised. I am certain that while in the days you are in conference here in Atlantic City many problems will be discussed and agreements reached.

Among the items which I feel deeply strong about and which I certainly would require very careful consideration is the acquisition of rights-of-way, relocation of highways with respect to bypassing and going through communities and providing adequate approaches and exits for presently developed areas. You gentlemen of the Bureau of Public Roads and State highway departments have the responsibility of executing and carrying out the great program of highway construction, and I know that you will proceed with care in locating said roads so there will be a minimum loss to existing business enterprises consistent with good engineering, designing practices. I am sure you realize that a program such as the one which you are now embarking on will require great tact and judgment so that many of the existing businesses along many highways and in communities will not be forced out of their means of livelihood. In other words, couple your fine engineering talents with a complete economic study in considering the routing.

In my own State of New Mexico, the program of highway construction is progressing quite rapidly and I want to compliment the State highway engineer, Mr. Wilson, and his associates, Mr. Miller and Mr. Wiley, for their diligence. The one discordant note is the expression of fear of many roadsides and businessmen that the proposed Interstate System will bypass them to the extent that they will be seriously affected. I have received many letters from such people and I am certain that more will be received requesting that I intercede in their behalf. That affects every State. We have to consider the man who is now in business, and in developing our design and our plans to see whether we can keep him in business instead of putting him out of business.

No doubt you people who are responsible for this program realize the importance of constructing a system of highways which will not become obsolete in a short time because of congestion along the rights-of-way. I am certain also that you realize that a highway which no one can get on or off could be of little value to the surrounding community. In sparsely settled areas of the West, and I want you folks to especially understand this, Montana, Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Idaho, the Pacific, Arizona, New Mexico understand it. Remember that we have tremendous area, but very small population. New Mexico has an area of 122,000 square miles. It is not like building a short road in Delaware. One hundred twenty-two thousand square miles of which possibly 60 percent belongs to the Federal Government and is not on the tax roll. Forty percent pays for the cost of State government and State government is not getting any cheaper. It is like Uncle Sam, it is going up every day in the week. So you see why we are concerned with the formulas that go in developing and distributing the Federal dollar for the different States. Well, those folks understand that the bypassing of a little community in Wyoming, Montana, New Mexico, or Arizona, creates a hardship in that particular community. Bypassing, or not having an underpass or an overpass where a fellow with his cattle can get from one side of the highway to the other creates an economic hazard and a personal problem for the fellow who is handling that problem. In sparsely settled areas of the West it would seem to me that direct entrance or exits from the highway could be permitted and if and when traffic is generated at these points which would create a hazard, then consideration could be given to prohiting such direct entrance to the highway. I would like to suggest that when you contemplate a highway location that you discuss your plans with local people who will be affected and give them a chance to be heard. The law provides that they be heard. That is where they provide for hearings. Then consider very carefully the economics as well as the engineering factors of the project.

I want you to know that I am extremely happy to be here. I am sorry that GEORGE FALLON wasn't able to come. I am sorry that ALBERT GORE or Senator KERR were unable to come. I know they would have. I was due in Guatemala also, but I would rather talk roads in the United States than go to Guatemala. I will go to Guatemala in the future.

I thank you and God bless you.

---

## A Plan of Action for One of the World's Greatest River Valleys—Address by Congressman Richard Bolling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 18, 1957*

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have heard numerous comments from among those who attended the Mississippi Valley Association meetings in St. Louis about the excellent address made there last Tuesday by our colleague, the Honorable RICHARD BOLLING, of the Fifth District, Missouri, who spoke on Water and Progress.

Congressman BOLLING outlined a plan of action under which all interested groups in the Mississippi Valley area would coordinate their activities and their efforts to help build up the economy of the entire area—one of the world's greatest river valleys.

All of us in the House of Representatives know Congressman BOLLING as a great student of national affairs as well as a hard-working and conscientious Representative of his own district. In this address, he analyzes the regional problems and promise of the great Mississippi Valley area. His address, I know, will be of broad general interest, and therefore I submit a partial text for

printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

WATER AND PROGRESS

(Partial text of address by Hon. RICHARD BOLLING, Member of Congress, Fifth District, Missouri, before the Mississippi Valley Association at St. Louis, Mo., February 12, 1957, Hotel Sheraton-Jefferson)

I have chosen "Water and Progress" as the title of my remarks this morning for I believe those words can tell the story, past and future, of the Mississippi Valley. Your association has played a great role in the story of the past progress of this area.

Let us look at this great midcontinent area of the United States. Today it has a population of over 77 million people, or close to half the total population of the United States. In 1919 when the Mississippi Valley Association was organized the population was only about 53 million.

At that time there were less than 100 miles of dependable 9-foot navigable channels in the Mississippi River and its tributaries above Vicksburg. Today there are more than 6,000 miles of channels with a navigable low water depth of 9 feet.

In 1919 there was not one common carrier barge line operating on the Mississippi River system. In 1954 there were 163 common carrier barge and towing vessel operators on our inland waterways in addition to more than a thousand contract and private carriers and the Federal Barge Lines.

America's waterborne tonnage today is over 1 billion tons annually. On the inland waterways alone, there has been a traffic increase of more than 200 percent in the last 10 years, and an increase of 800 percent in the last 25 years. Since 1940 the rate of increase in inland water traffic has been second only to the rate of increase of traffic carried by trucks, while railroads, for example, have had a great decrease in percent of total traffic carried.

Of the amount spent by the Army Corps of Engineers for inland water improvements—about $4.5 billion so far—90 percent of that has been spent since 1910, and about 60 percent within the last 25 years.

In 1954 in this great area of the Mississippi Valley there were about 7 million manufacturing employees, while in 1919 there were about 3.8 million. From 1951 through 1954 there was over $16 billion of new capital expenditures, and we all know of the new industries and expansion of others which has meant expenditures of hundreds of millions of dollars in the last few years.

To these impressive statistics must be added those earmarks of progress which can't be measured as easily—our great schools, enviable cultural opportunities, and friendly happy people. Truly, as your association has so long proclaimed, the Mississippi River Basin is "our greatest manufacturing, commercial, agricultural, and mining center. It is the workshop, foodshop, and natural resources storehouse of America."

But progress is a relative term, and there is some evidence that the present is not as bright as it could be; that there is still a lot of work to be done to make the future what it should be.

Let us look at some of that evidence.

According to the latest figures available (1952) less than one-half of the Mississippi River system, I repeat, less than one-half, is 9 feet or more in depth. In dollars, of about $6.2 billion of authorized projects for the Corps of Engineers, less than half, or about $2.5 billion was actually appropriated through fiscal 1954.

And impressive as are the annual tonnage figures, we must remember that water project construction traffic accounts for a significant amount of the total in some areas.

As to flood control and other projects, General Sturgis of the Army Corps of Engineers, stated less than a year ago that there isn't a single river valley in the United States that is more than two-thirds completed.

Yes; progress can seem great when the past of one area is compared to its present, but that progress seems to be and is much less impressive when that area is compared to a different area over the same period of time.

Let us look again at our population growth, for example. From 1950 to 1956 only 5 States in our 23-State watershed area showed population increases greater than the national average. Two States, Mississippi and Arkansas, had population decreases, while Oklahoma, Alabama, Kentucky, and Iowa had increases of less than 3 percent. This compares to a national average increase of 10.9 percent. Furthermore, the percent of the United States population which lived in the Mississippi Valley region in 1919 was about 50.4 percent; in 1954 it was 46.2 percent, and today it is probably even lower.

Likewise, in the great industrial expansion which is taking place throughout the United States, the Mississippi Valley area is not doing much more than holding its own. Latest figures indicate that during the period from 1947 to 1954 the percentage change of manufacturing employees was down in New England, up in the Pacific area, while our area showed only a slight percentage increase.

Another qualification to be placed upon the progress record of our Mississippi Valley area is that not all parts of our area have progressed at the same rate.

One very graphic illustration of this uneven development with which you are all familiar is found in the statistics of the annual tonnage carried on the various rivers of the Mississippi system. On the one hand, there is the Ohio with 71 million tons in 1955, the lower Mississippi with 44, the Illinois with 21, and the Tennessee with 10. On the other hand, there is the lower Missouri with 1.3 million tons annually, the upper Missouri with 1.9, and, of course, the Arkansas system has much less than that.

Uniform progress is not to be expected, of course, but perhaps the words spoken yesterday by General Itschner bear repeating: "* * * it becomes more apparent with each year that * * * development must be planned on a basin-wide basis, with coordination, cooperation, and integration the only alternatives to destructive waste and confusion of working at cross purposes. We want to develop every water resource potentiality of every river valley. But more and more in our thinking and planning, we must not think so much of the Ohio or the Missouri or the Arkansas as of the Greater Mississippi Valley—the one big basin in whose overall welfare and progress we are all inseparably bound together."

Yes, spotty progress, I submit, means less progress for all, for ours is an economically interdependent area.

Finally, in this review of our progress we should ask ourselves whether or not we are ready for what seems to be a new era in water resources development. Throughout the United States we see how water is becoming a very critical resource, especially for industrial and domestic users. We have in quantity what is becoming a scarce commodity in other regions. We who are finally controlling our waters must now take advantage of those controlled waters or else be found guilty of lacking the foresight in not planning for the full and proper utilization of those waters. Industry and people must be brought to water and not vice versa. This calls for new energies to be exerted in promotion and planning—more research and new emphasis.

If you accept my thesis that our region can achieve an even greater rate of progress, let's look now at what can be done to make certain that that progress will occur.

We must, of course, continue those efforts which have proven to be effective in the past. Cities and towns, industry, and organizations such as yours must continue and expand the work they have been doing.

When we look for other paths to progress, I suggest we are not reaping the full benefit which could come from a cohesive and active congressional delegation in Washington. There are more than 200 Congressmen and nearly half the country's Senators from the Mississippi Valley area. This group of legislators, once it understood what needed to be done, would be a source of great strength. We need only to look to the Northwest or Southwest for examples of successful political action in behalf of an area.

But this more effective coordination and use of our area's great political strength will not be achieved simply by Congressmen and Senators talking to each other. All of us are inclined, and inevitably so under present circumstances, to work hardest for those projects which directly affect our constituency. I, for example, have at the top of my priority list, flood protection for the great city I am privileged to represent and the completion of the 9-foot channel from Kansas City to the mouth. But, if all of us could see the truth of our interdependence, one district dependent on all the others, one State dependent on all the others of our area; and, if our constituents in whatever district and State also recognized the truth, that the development of our valley is one great project composed of many interdependent projects—with the whole being greater in its benefits to us all collectively and even separately than the sum of each of the benefits standing alone—then the way would be open for maximum progress through effective coordinated teamwork.

But this understanding of interdependence and the achievement of real team work among the legislators of this great area will be achieved only when all the economic interest groups of the area come to understand that unless we in our area hang together we will hang separately, hang on the economic gibbet of an area going backward because it fails to keep pace with the progress of other areas of our country.

Progress, as I have said, is relative. In one sense we have made great progress in absolute terms, in the other sense of progress, progress relative to that of other areas, we find ourselves not in the lead. This we can change by each one of us, whatever his interest or area, recognizing that our strength in the end will be the strength of the whole. The inadequate and incomplete Missouri channel hurts not just Omaha, Kansas City, St. Louis, and other areas adjacent to the Missouri, it also hurts the economies of Ohio, the lower Mississippi and all other parts of our great valley.

Now, of course, the achievement of understanding of this truth and of greater coordination in legislative effort in the halls of Congress is in part the responsibility of us legislators, but it will not be achieved unless you and those whom you represent—people, corporations, interest groups, even more effectively attack the problem.

All of the people of our area have a common desire for progress for our area. I hope you will not consider me presumptuous when I suggest that the difficult task I outline will only be accomplished when the active groups working together to achieve our common goal include an even broader representation of all the people of our area. The leaders of industry, agriculture, business, labor, and research and planning groups working together can accomplish much more for our area than any 2 or 3 of these groups working without the added strength of mind, energy, and influence of the others.

I see no good reason why this association should not play a leading role in this basic task of broadening the base of support for the most speedy and effective development of our valley. Unless I misread the signs and the statistics it is an urgent matter for all

of us. Lack of broad vision and adequate action today can cause untold hardship tomorrow.

Ours is one of the world's greatest river valleys. We have the opportunity and the responsibility to achieve its full potential for good living. The accomplishment of this, our responsibility, requires of us the broadest vision, the most thoughtful planning and the most effective coordinated action of which we are capable. We have done much. "Much" is not good enough. We must do more. To that I pledge my best efforts, as I know you do.

---

## Address by Hon. Ralph E. Flanders, of Vermont, Before Vermont Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, February 18, 1957*

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand the manuscript of an address which I delivered before the Vermont State Legislature on February 13, on modern education, a subject which I find is gaining quite a toehold in my State, and which I also believe has some elements in it which threaten the training of mathematicians, physicists, engineers, and scientists for the country as a whole, with particular reference to our defense preparations. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Governor Johnson, Lieutenant Governor Stafford, Speaker Brown, members of the senate and house of the Vermont Legislature. The invitation to address you from time to time is a privilege and an honor for which I am deeply grateful. It is fitting that I should report to you, the elected representatives of the people who elected me, such items of national policy as affect all of us citizens of Vermont and of the United States of America.

In previous appearances my subjects have related to national problems and national policy. Since my subject today is a consideration of State policies in education, it may at first seem that I am departing radically from previous practice. The departure is in seeming only, for my immediate concern is with the armed defense of the United States, and I believe it can be shown that our own school system in Vermont can help or hinder our national defense.

The military strength of a nation in these times still depends to a large degree on the training, endurance, courage, and skill of the infantryman. Yet, no matter how good these qualities may be, they alone are not sufficient for a successful defense. To them have been added in succession the machine-gun, long range artillery, the tank, the airplane for strafing and bombing, the elaborate antiaircraft missiles and aiming mechanism for bringing down the enemy planes, and then the "blockbuster" bombs.

These have now been followed by the terrifying atomic and hydrogen bombs, and the even more terrifying strategic guided missiles and, finally, the intercontinental ballistic missile, or the "ICBM" as it has come to be known. Warfare, even defensive warfare, is dependent ever more heavily, year by year, on science and engineering and on the mathematics which underlies these subjects. That is why the quality of the teaching of mathematics and science has become a matter of more than Vermont concern. It is a matter of national concern.

Beginning about 50 years ago, there has been a revolution in the theory and practice of education. In a one-room, ungraded country school I learned to read, to spell, to write. I studied English grammar, geography, and American history. In that one-room schoolhouse I was prepared to enter a high school which gave a better classical education—for what it is worth—than colleges give today. Beside that I progressed in mathematics to trigonometry, studied physics and world history, and was trained in English literature and composition. Such an education is not now automatically obtained even in college. It is only for those who wish it and demand it.

Now let me say something about the changes in education which have been taking place since my youth. These changes began with the new ideas which were introduced by Vermont's intellectual, the philosopher, John Dewey. He properly called attention to the individual and made clear the necessity for training him to take his place as a cooperating member of society—in his town, his industry, his State, and the Nation. This step was all to the good.

The next steps were not so good, for they tended to focus the whole effort of education on making the boy or girl a happy member of society. This step had little interest in teaching him to discern what was good and what was bad, what was right and what was wrong for individuals, for groups, for local governments, and for national policy. In fact, it specifically denied the existence of standards of good and bad, right and wrong in human affairs. Our personal and national judgments are to be based on the expediency of the moment.

Beside abandoning standards of conduct the new education lost its interest in the pupils' acquirement of knowledge. It was concerned, principally, with his success as a "member of society."

It was Dr. William Heard Kilpatrick, a pupil of John Dewey, who took his basic ideas, elaborated and exaggerated them beyond all reason, and made them the basis of modern education in Teachers College, at Columbia University in New York. From here they have spread over the country. It has now come to the point that the standing and promotion of teachers, even their very acceptance into the school systems, depends little on their knowledge of the subjects they teach or on their ability to interest and instruct their pupils in the subjects. It depends primarily on how much they have studied the new education and what degrees they have attained in it.

I could spend hours on this, but let us get down to practical matters. How do Vermont schools stand in the preparation of our children for life as they will have to live it, and for serving our country as it must be served?

Whether as parents or as citizens we are interested in the training given our children. As parents we want them to be able to read, write, spell, and be competent in the mathematics generally assigned to grade schools and the high schools. Can you be sure that these subjects are properly taught in your own schools? Do the teachers mark your children as to their ability in these subjects? I must confess that in looking at the report cards of schools in my hometown of Springfield, Vt., I cannot for the life of me tell how either the pupil or the parent is to know how much has been learned.

That the standards of knowledge acquired may be low all over the State seems to be indicated in the report of the State board of education referring to Lyndon Teachers College where it says on page 46: "Entering students with specific deficiencies in the basic subjects, particularly reading, spelling, composition, and mathematics have been given intensive remedial work. Definite standards of achievement have been set, below which a student is not allowed to continue in teacher preparation." How comes it that high school graduates have deficiencies in the basic subjects? Did they know they had these deficiencies? Did their report cards indicate them? Why should not a definite standard of achievement be set for entrance, not for permission to continue?

A couple of weeks ago I spoke at a small new college. One of the buildings on the campus had a sign on it that said "Reading Clinic." I was told that it had become necessary to teach this elementary and grammar school subject to students who had been graduated from high school before coming to college. What is happening to us? The president of one of Vermont's colleges tells me that the freshmen come to him uneducated. They don't know how to spell. Some of these freshmen come from Vermont and some from the outside. The complaint seems to be universal.

Three of my grandchildren are in high school, but in this particularly woeful case I am glad to say not a Vermont high school. They do excellent work in writing compositions and essays but they don't know how to spell. Worse yet the teachers don't correct their spelling. If this thing goes on, will the teachers themselves know how to spell? Have we already arrived at the point where the teachers don't know how to spell?

This fundamental matter of spelling is basic to a student's usefulness in whatever stage his formal education is finished. It is particularly important for those who are going on into science and engineering and form the needed body of those who are to keep it abreast and ahead of the rest of the world in national defense. An illiterate scientist is a pitiful object. There will not be any in Russia; why should there be any in the United States?

Mathematics is another subject that needs attention. In looking into this matter in my own hometown I was glad to find the textbooks satisfactory. The local school management had fortunately not advanced to the point where there was an endeavor to teach the high school subject of algebra and geometry in some easy way. This easy way was offered one of our children a generation ago and led to a frustrated experience in a mind capable of understanding mathematics as a science. Our daughter afterward went to a college with high scholastic standards, majored in mathematics and graduated with a cum laude—that is, with honor in her specialty. Any student who is going into a professional life of his own or of service to his country in science or engineering must stand on a basic foundation of mathematics as a science. Be sure that this is really taught in your schools. I assured myself that the textbooks and teaching were satisfactory in the schools in my own town but I did not find the report cards giving the information which both parent and pupil have a right to know.

The drift toward the easy life in a pupil's education has been stimulated by the fact that now every child has a right to a high-school education in view of the fact that he is not permitted to work until he is 17. This means that young people with all sorts of different capacities and capabilities must be taken care of in our secondary schools. The way to take care of them is not to grade down the whole level of the teaching in these schools in such subjects as mathematics and science. Nor even in such things as reading and spelling. Before closing I am coming back to this question of how we can best provide a solid secondary education to all of our young people below the age of 17. It

must not be done by denying proper training to those whose future lives will require proficiency in the harder subjects.

A word or two at this point may be in order as to the nature of the training now being given to teachers in the conventional schools of education. As I said earlier, from Teachers College the influence of Dr. Kilpatrick has gone throughout the country to such a point that it is difficult for teachers to get positions in public schools unless they carry degrees in education from institutions which for the most part follow the Columbia Teachers College training. If you are merely competent in your subject, you may teach in a university, but not in a high school.

In practice the conclusion that man is a social animal and nothing else results in a concentration on working together—teacher working with students, students with each other, and both working on the family. This leads toward an easy curriculum—one that is easy for everyone. There is a definite tendency to ignore languages, mathematics, spelling, standard literature, and other elements of the education which we elders enjoyed. For instance, the official biographer of Professor Kilpatrick quotes him as saying "There are linguistically gifted people for whom the study of languages is profitable. But even for them, I begrudge the time it takes to master the language. If it could be done quickly and easily, and if they could begin the study of literature or whatever else they plan to do with the language, my objection would not be so strong."

Asked if this applied to modern languages, he said that "it holds in less degree" because they are quicker and easier to learn, but he still believed that for the average student it was a great waste of time. In terms of rich, vital interests that might lead to individual growth, languages offer meager possibilities. Similar statements relate to the 3 R's which were so important in the curricula which were devised for our training in our own youth.

The new education calls itself democratic and makes loud and earnest professions that it is indeed so. This is about as untrue to facts as it well could be. The democracy of the new education resembles the "democracy" of the Soviet Government. This education has been conceived in the recesses of Teachers College. It has been introduced when parents weren't looking and it has become deeply entrenched without the parents' understanding or counsel. The appearance of democracy is given by discussions in class as to what things mean and what we are to do next. Even this is not democracy for it is inevitable that mature teachers should guide the deliberations of immature scholars.

Let me congratulate the board of education and the State on the decision to keep the three teachers colleges going. I hope that two of them at least will be a bit old-fashioned. I hope they will turn out teachers who know the subjects they are to teach and who are trained in the ability to transmit their knowledge. The ability to transmit knowledge is a basic requirement of a teacher which, as you may judge by modern report cards, is not now considered to be of prime importance. The teacher who can transmit knowledge, who knows his or her subject, who can transmit this knowledge enthusiastically and who can generate interest and perhaps even enthusiasm in her pupils, is the kind of teacher we want. I sincerely hope that a course of studies in Johnson or Lyndon can be turned into this direction. If so, they will serve the State well.

But here we run into a difficulty. Can such teachers be satisfied under the present standards set up by our State board of education? The giving of a certificate seems to be largely based on the teacher's training in subjects which embody modern education. I would earnestly urge the State board of education to concern itself with more practical standards of teaching so that certificates may be available not merely to new graduates of "normal" normal schools, but also to that very useful body of old-fashioned teachers whose status is that of part-time or emergency teachers. Some of the best teaching in our schools is done today by this uncertified group.

This brings us to the nub of the whole matter. By setting up a science of education, a pseudo-science—or phony science as I am inclined to call it—the Teachers College at Columbia University and the great mass of teaching courses and training schools that have followed it, have erected a monopoly. Unless you are trained in this pseudo-science, you cannot be certified. Thus, the system preserves its grip on the schools, the pupils and the parents of this country. I hope that our school board and our local boards will break this grip.

We need to spend more money on education in Vermont, but where and how much? The first call would certainly come on adding schoolrooms and seats to schools which are overcrowded. But close behind that should come increased salaries for teachers who can teach, and this includes many who do not have the Kilpatrick blessing.

Considering further the teachers and our interests, I quote a short passage from the commencement address which I delivered at Johnson Teachers College last June. These remarks were directed to the newly graduated teachers:

"We will owe you monetary rewards, but we will owe you more. We will owe you recognition for the great task we have laid upon you and for your successful participation in it. We will owe you moral support and more active help. This the parent-teacher associations are preparing to give but these must not carry out their function in any formal, impersonal way. Parents, children, and teachers must live together.

"You are entering into a life which is fundamentally one of values. Make them strong and sound. While not neglecting these things which can be counted and measured, do not forget the intangibles. They are in the long run by far the more important. It is your great privilege to train the children of this generation. Train them above all to have a deep and sound sense of ethical value."

The buildings are important. The equipment is important. The curriculums are important. The administration is important. But important above all else is the teacher.

A few moments ago I said that I would return to a suggestion as to what kind of education we should have to serve the interest and the future of our students of all kinds of abilities under 17 years of age. While the ideas I am about to express were the result of original thinking, I decided to make a visit to my old friend, Marion Folsom, now Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to get from him and from his staff any suggestions as to meeting this new and difficult problem. Secretary Folsom introduced me to the heads of the various branches of the Educational Division of the Department. I was delighted to find in that group men who as professional educators had come to about the same conclusion that I, an amateur, had arrived at.

It would seem to me that three types of courses should be carried out in our high schools—all in the same building and with the students intermingled in their activities and in all those classes which are common to the three types.

The most difficult course would be the preparation for entrance into college. It should not be necessary later for these pupils to take remedial courses in any basic high school subject. Let us relieve colleges of this burden and the students of this necessity. On such basic things as spelling, reading, and writing, therefore, high standards should be maintained and achievements objectively marked.

This requirement applies with even more force to mathematics and science as well as to progress in a language or languages offered as a college entrance requirement. If the students find such treatment severe, they should be reminded that they have chosen of their own free will to meet severe requirements. No Vermonter should seek to enter a school of higher education, whether it be Lyndon, California, or Harvard, if he is sloppily prepared.

Another type of education would be vocational training. If we are to be honest with the pupil we must train him rigorously, examine him objectively and report to his parents honestly on the technical subjects of the vocation which he is studying. It may be so arranged that he can slide through high school easily in these subjects but that is not being honest with him. When he tries to practice his vocation in real life, he will meet with hard facts instead of easy treatment. Therefore, he must pass the same standards of scholarship in his vocational studies as does the college preparatory student in his entrance requirements.

Most certainly in business courses, particularly as relates to stenography for instance, good spelling is a major requirement. I think that most employers of newly trained graduates in this field from our high schools will agree in wondering whether spelling is a major requirement. Perhaps the pupil comes to high school without having learned what should have been taught in grade school. Perhaps he should there have been subjected to the requirements of the old-fashioned spelling bee.

The third type of education presents this problem. What shall we do with the students who are neither going to college nor wish to be trained for a vocation? Various names for this course might be suggested. Perhaps the title of "Citizenship" course should be given to it.

The thing we must not do is to attach any stigma of inferiority to the pupils, whether in naming the course or in the treatment of the students taking it. They should be prepared for citizenship in the greatest country in the world, which has responsibilities heavier than any nation has ever encountered before. The social studies which are such a large element in modern education will apply particularly to these pupils. We must be sure that such studies ground them firmly in the history and the ideals of their country. We must be sure that they have some understanding of the way in which all the citizens of the country, all the places of the country and all the occupations of the country, work together to produce the highest standard of living the world has known. It is not necessary that they accept the idea that our system is a perfect one. It will never be perfect until equality of opportunity becomes a fact rather than an ideal. It is a fact that we are constantly getting closer to that ideal, but the facts should be known and realized.

There will be much in this citizenship course which will also be taught in the vocational and college preparatory courses. In these subjects the three groups should be all mixed together. They should be all mixed together in the social and extracurricular activities of the school. There must be no social or class distinctions of any sort, for not all of those who complete the college preparatory course will be able to go on to college.

I myself am a living witness of the fact that a full and satisfying life may be led by one who does not go beyond the high school. The possibilities of this must be made plain and must somehow become instinctive in the thoughts of the teachers, the students, and the parents.

Our valid objective is the training of our young people to be citizens of a great country now exercising the leadership of the

Western World. This country is faced with the hostile leadership of a government bent on power for its own sake, which denies the existence of the soul of men and ruthlessly tramples upon his personality.

This is the challenge to America which its young people must understand. They and the great body of citizens must be prepared to take the responsibility which this challenge evokes if American institutions are to survive. Challenge and response—that is what we face.

Vermont has a great opportunity. The eternal vigilance of its citizens will preserve the basic values in our school system which have been leaking out through the cracks in many of our sister States. The responsible citizens and the appointed and elected officials of our State can have the vision of the new national opportunities and responsibilities toward which we are being driven. Let us be worthy of the leadership which is ours for the grasping.

---

## Testimony by Hon. Herman E. Talmadge, of Georgia, With Reference to Constitutional Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, February 18, 1957*

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on Saturday, February 16, 1957, my distinguished colleague [Mr. TALMADGE] testified with reference to so-called civil-rights legislation. I am sure that there will be a great deal of interest in his very able analysis, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that his testimony may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appear before you today to express my views on the need for protecting the civil rights of the citizens of the United States.

Our Nation has grown great and stands today as the world's foremost bastion of individual freedom because of our jealous regard for our civil rights and our diligence in providing for the free exercise of them by all citizens.

History teaches us that people lose their civil rights because of governmental action. It was because of that fact of life that our Founding Fathers deemed it wise to enumerate in the Bill of Rights of our Constitution the inalienable rights of free men and to insure their perpetuity by prohibiting governmental interference with the enjoyment of them.

Every civil right which we as citizens of the United States cherish is set forth and guaranteed in that Bill of Rights. They are:

Freedom of religion.
Freedom of speech.
Freedom of press.
Freedom of assembly.
Freedom of petition.
Freedom to keep and bear arms.
Freedom from the quartering of troops in homes.
Security of persons, houses, papers, and personal effects.
Freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures.
Protection from unfounded warrants.
Freedom from trial without indictment.
Freedom from double jeopardy.
Freedom from self-incrimination.
Protection from deprivation of life, liberty, and property without due process of law.
Guaranty of compensation for property taken for public use.
The right to a speedy, public trial by an impartial jury.
The right to be tried in the State and district of the alleged offense.
The right to know the charges made against one.
The right to confront one's accusers.
The right to have assistance of counsel.
The right to seek damages in court.
The right to jury determination in civil cases exceeding $20.
The full protection of common law.
Protection against excessive bail.
Protection against excessive fines.
Protection against cruel and unusual punishment.

And the enjoyment of all other rights not prohibited by the Constitution.

These guaranties are stated clearly and unequivocably in languages which can readily be understood by any person with a fourth-grade education.

They are express prohibitions with no exceptions, no qualifications, and no loopholes.

They are as finite in their provisions as are the Ten Commandments and well can be likened unto them—the commandments constituting the "thou-shalt-nots" for men living under God and the Bill of Rights constituting the "thou-shalt-nots" for a nation living under God.

The Bill of Rights is all inclusive in its guaranties. It employs the word "person" as distinguished from the word "citizen" in setting forth the civil rights to be enjoyed by those living in this Nation.

The Bill of Rights is emphatic in assuring that there shall be no legislative infringement of the liberties it enumerates. It declares that Congress shall make no law circumscribing any of the guaranties it sets forth.

Section 2 of article III of the Constitution is specific in establishing the manner of recourse for any person denied any of these civil rights. It vests in the Federal judiciary the power to hear and determine all cases in law and equity arising under this Constitution.

Therefore, gentlemen of this subcommittee, I submit to you that legislation on the subject of civil rights not only is unnecessary but also would be duplicative of and perhaps in direct conflict with the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights.

I further submit to you that any person—regardless of his race, color, creed, previous condition of servitude, or place of residence—is fully protected in the enjoyment of his civil rights and has available to him immediate remedies in the event those rights are circumscribed or violated in any degree.

To those who insist that the enactment of new laws and the establishment of new procedures are necessary to the protection of civil rights in this country, I would like to ask these questions:

What rights would you protect which already are not guaranteed by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights? Are new rights to be created? If so, what rights?

Why is it necessary to create a commission to do what State and Federal courts already are empowered to do? Is it because the courts have failed? If so, in what way?

What procedures or recourses for redress in cases of civil-rights violations would you substitute in lieu of those already established by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights?

Why do you feel that the constitutional guaranties and processes under which this Nation has achieved the greatness, prosperity, and liberty it enjoys today are not adequate to meet the needs of present and future generations?

It is my view, Mr. Chairman, that the protection of the civil rights of our citizenry lies not in the enactment of a welter of confusing, contradictory, and possibly unconstitutional laws but rather in a strict adherence to the constitutional guaranties, processes, and prohibitions which already are the law of the land and which, without question, are adequate to meet every requirement of those who are concerned about protecting the rights of the American people.

As a strict and undeviating constitutional fundamentalist who believes the Constitution of the United States means word for word what it says, I am greatly concerned about the effect upon our constitutional civil rights which enactment of the proposed legislation under consideration by this subcommittee would have.

There are, I believe, some 17 so-called civil-rights bills before this subcommittee. They represent, in varying degrees the four-point program offered by the administration. And, in the interest of time and clarity, I should like to address myself generally to those four proposals and to point out for the consideration of this subcommittee the grave constitutional pitfalls they present.

Fraught with greatest danger to constitutional guaranties and processes is the proposal for the creation of a Commission on Civil Rights with unlimited authority to delve into the affairs of any person, firm, group, or agency under the guise of investigating developments deemed by its six members to constitute a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution. Armed with full and unrestricted power of subpena and citation for contempt, the Commission would be an absolute power unto itself, answerable only to the consciences of the individual members. No right of appeal is provided and our citizens would be deprived of this fundamental right.

On 24 hours' notice this Commission could summon anyone from any part of the United States to any place it might designate to defend himself against charges of which he was totally ignorant prior to receipt of the subpena. It could compel him to bring with him all personal and business records which the Commission might desire to inspect. Furthermore, he would be required to comply at his own expense and failure to do so in any particular would make him subject to fine, imprisonment, or both for contempt.

Under the broad, loose and ill-defined powers it would possess, the Commission could summon a minister to explain one of his sermons; an editor, one of his editorials; a political candidate, one of his speeches; a Government official, one of his official acts; a group or organization, a petition it might be circulating.

It is hard to conceive of an instance in the pursuit of its investigations in which the Commission would not violate at least one of the very civil rights it would be created to protect.

To make my point crystal clear, let me cite a hypothetical case.

We will assume these facts:

A Miss Wong, a Chinese-American of the Buddhist faith, was discharged from her job in San Francisco as personal secretary to John Smith, president of the Smith Bubble Gum Co., because of her inability to spell correctly.

Mr. Smith replaced her with a Mr. O'Reilly, an Irish Catholic and a member of Mr. Smith's own faith.

Miss Wong filed a civil suit seeking $100,000 damages, claiming she was unable to obtain employment elsewhere as the result of Mr. Smith's refusal to give her a good recommendation. At the same time she wrote to the Commission on Civil Rights and charged that the real reason she was fired was because Mr. Smith was prejudiced against women in general and Chinese Buddhist women in particular.

Notwithstanding the fact that the case already was a matter of litigation, the Commission voted to investigate it under its authority to "investigate allegations in writing * * * that certain persons in the United States * * * are being subjected to unwarranted economic pressures by reason of their sex, color, race, religion or national origin."

At 9 a. m. on Monday the Commission issued a subpena ordering Mr. Smith to appear before a closed hearing of the Commission in Washington, D. C., at 9 a. m. on Tuesday and to bring with him all records and correspondence concerning Miss Wong's employment and dismissal.

Mr. Smith, already under court order to appear in court in San Francisco with the same records at the same hour, advised the Commission he would be unable to appear at the designated time. He, in turn, was advised if he did not appear he would be cited for contempt.

Mr. Smith then appealed to the judge who, being up for reelection and vitally concerned about the Chinese-American vote, said Miss Wong's attorney would not agree to a postponement and advised Mr. Smith that failure to appear at the designated time also would result in his being cited for contempt.

To resolve the dilemma, Mr. Smith's attorney negotiated a hurried out-of-court settlement which cost Mr. Smith $25,000 and a letter of recommendation. Miss Wong agreed to withdraw her complaint to the Commission.

The Commission, meeting the following day, decided against dropping the case and renewed its subpena to Mr. Smith and issued another for Miss Wong—both being ordered to appear the following day. It asked the American Committee for the Protection of Chinese-Americans to assist and advise it in the inquiry; an organization, which, as you might suspect, was not impartial in its viewpoint.

After 3 weeks of hearings and 6 transcontinental round trips by Mr. Smith's subordinates to produce subsequently subpenaed records, the Commission took the case under advisement.

Six months later the Commission issued its report. While it did agree that Miss Wong really could not spell very well, it concluded nonetheless that Chinese-American minorities must be protected against unwarranted economic pressures. It recommended that such be accomplished through the enactment of legislation requiring every company engaged in interstate commerce to hire Chinese workers in the same percentage as the Chinese population of the city in which its home office is located.

News accounts of the report resulted in the picketing of Mr. Smith's plant and the boycotting of his products by militant minority groups—all because Miss Wong could not spell very well.

Mr. Smith, who estimated the entire episode cost him half a million dollars in personal expenses and lost business, sold his plant, and retired an embittered and disillusioned man.

An extreme case? I think not.

I am confident that anyone with any imagination at all can visualize similar circumstances in his own hometown.

Anyone who ever has held public office—and I am sure you gentlemen will agree—can imagine investigations just as ludicrous as my hypothetical example which might result from inquiries into some of the many fancied, exaggerated and deliberately untruthful wrongs which are often the subject of correspondence to public officials. Reflect on your mail about civil-service jobs and you will have some idea of the fancied wrongs that will be involved.

It is quite easy to see how such a Commission, through its investigations, could deprive a man of his rights of freedom of speech, security of papers and personal effects, freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures, protection from unfounded warrants, freedom from double jeopardy, freedom from self-incrimination, freedom from deprivation of property without due process of law, the right to a speedy, public trial by an impartial jury, the right to be tried in the State and district of the alleged offense, the right to know the charges made against him, the right to seek damages in court, the right to confront his accusers, the full protection of common law and the other unspecified, but nevertheless, inalienable rights such as respect for the dignity and integrity of a free man living in a free country.

Furthermore, and if for no other reason I would be opposed to it on this ground, it would have as its basis the complete reversal of the fundamental tenet of American jurisprudence that every man is presumed to be innocent until proved guilty.

I do not believe such a Commission could stand the test of the Constitution; that is, if such test be applied according to a strict interpretation of the Constitution rather than according to some preselected modern authority.

However, even though it conceivably could be upheld on the basis of such extra-level authority as the United Nations Charter, I cannot bring myself to believe that the members of this subcommittee or of this Congress would vote to so jeopardize the inherent constitutional civil rights of their constituents. It represents a threat to the civil rights of every citizen of every State and Territory of this Nation.

In operation the effect of such a Commission would be the exact opposite of protecting civil rights. To the contrary it would, through attempts to police the thoughts and actions of private citizens, serve to deny them the full and unfettered enjoyment of the rights which are their constitutional birthright.

Briefly, I would like to make these points about the other three administration proposals:

1. The creation of a special Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice under the direction of an additional Assistant Attorney General would provide no protection of civil rights not already presently afforded by the Constitution. It would mean a further expansion of the Federal bureaucracy and the hiring at public expense of a small army of lawyers and investigators to harass and intimidate the officials and governments of our States, counties, cities, and other political subdivisions and public institutions.

(Parenthetically, I would like to point out in this regard that the Attorney General already makes such investigations without specific authority—as the people of my State know from actual experience—and what he apparently wants is an ex post facto law legalizing what he already is doing.)

2. The threefold proposal to strengthen civil-rights statutes is one which would be hilarious if it were not so serious in its implications.

The requested authorization of the Attorney General to seek injunctions to restrain persons who "are about to engage in any acts or practices which would give rise to a cause of action" is ridiculous on its face; that is, unless it also is to be accompanied with an authorization to hire mindreaders to advise the Attorney General when and where such acts are being contemplated. Such flies in the face of all basic legal doctrine and the repeated rulings of our Federal courts that injunctive relief cannot be afforded in speculative instances.

An adjunct of that authorization would be to allow the Attorney General to file injunctive proceedings and civil suits for private individuals whom he considers to have been deprived of their civil rights whether those individuals desire to go into court or not. Not only does such a proposal presuppose the existence of an Attorney General with the wisdom of Solomon but also it anticipates making him a glorified nationwide public prosecutor and protector and the de facto legal guardian of 166 million Americans.

The most alarming of all the aspects of this proposal is that to empower the Attorney General to initiate his lawsuits "without regard to whether the party aggrieved shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law." Enactment of that proposal, gentlemen, would be the death knell for State and local self-government in this country and apparently indicates that the Department of Justice no longer considers the 10th amendment an integral part of the Constitution of the United States.

3. The proposal to protect the right to vote by providing for injunctive proceedings initiated by the Attorney General against any individual who may be thought to be interfering with the right of another individual to vote is totally without constitutional authority. The Supreme Court has held repeatedly that the 14th and 15th amendments can be implemented only with respect to State action and only then in cases where the franchise is denied due to unlawful discrimination on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Regulation and protection of the franchise except in these instances is a constitutional prerogative of the States. To make it otherwise clearly would require a constitutional amendment.

Gentlemen of the subcommittee, I have attempted to be factual and specific in the presentation of my view that the legislation which you have under consideration threatens to destroy the civil rights of the American people.

While I am aware of the partisan, political motivations of these proposals, I have tried to discuss them from a national rather than a sectional viewpoint. I can see in these bills a grave threat to the civil rights of all Americans whether they live in Chicago or Atlanta, Oregon or Maine. And I feel it incumbent upon me, as a Senator of the United States, to speak out in warning of the potential consequences of such legislation.

I would be less than realistic if I did not admit to myself and to you that these measures are aimed at the peculiar problems of my State and region. And I would be the last to deny that those problems exist though, in all fairness, I must hasten to add that they are not problems of our own creation.

In a nation as large as ours, it is possible to find examples of injustice anywhere—from the Indians of the southwest to the Eskimos of Alaska. Civil rights are violated in the middle west and the east just as often as they are in the south and on the west coast.

But the mere fact that injustices do occur and civil rights are sometimes violated cannot by any stretch of the imagination be said to be justification for the destruction of constitutional government and the abrogation of constitutional guaranties. State and Federal courts are now available and no one has said they are not handling their jobs.

Just as a farmer would not burn down his barn to get rid of the rats, so would no thinking American wish to jeopardize his heritage of constitutional freedom in search of a quick cure for human failings which have plagued mankind since Eve bit the apple in the Garden of Eden.

To those who might disagree with my viewpoint I would point to the example of Samson.

It is true that by pulling down the temple he destroyed his enemies.

But it likewise is true that in the process he also destroyed himself.

# SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1957

*(Legislative day of Monday, February 18, 1957)*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. C. D. Payne, Protestant chaplain, House of God, Mooseheart, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Across the paths of the long yesterdays Thou didst guide our fathers to their promised lands. Thou didst inspire those hardy pioneers of ours, who pushed back the western frontiers and laid across America the foundations upon which was built the superstructure of our civilization.

We, their sons, pray to Thee to lead us in this perplexing, baffling hour of our sojourn on earth. May we have the courage to build bravely the empire of love among the children of men. Give unto us the unshakable faith of those who know that their times are in Thy hand. So often we have forgotten that every good and perfect gift comes from Thy bounty.

Even in the valley of the shadow, when we have fought down our fears and met our defeats, we have learned how much better it is to walk with Thee in the dark than to walk alone in the light.

We pray for those this day who are discouraged, disappointed, disillusioned. Release those who live in habit prisons builded by their own hands, and give them a new freedom.

We implore Thee to cover all men everywhere with Thy forgiving love. We ask this for Thy name's sake. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 18, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 11, 1957, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 637) to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available thereunder for business loans.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 348) to amend section 12 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676) relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, by providing for the use of public lands granted to the States therein for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishings, equipment, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 348) to amend section 12 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676), relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, by providing for the use of public lands granted to the States therein for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishings, equipment, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said States, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Public Buildings Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today; and I also ask unanimous consent that the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today; and I call the attention of the minority leader to the fact that two subcommittees—the Internal Security Subcommittee and the Public Buildings Subcommittee—wish to sit during today's session of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, by authority of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which are holding joint hearings on the oil lift to Europe, I ask unanimous consent that the two subcommittees, meeting jointly, may be permitted to sit during the sessions of the Senate this afternoon and tomorrow afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming has conferred with the majority and minority leaders, and the request is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, what is the request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The request is that the two subcommittees named by the Senator from Wyoming be permitted to meet during sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow. The Senator from Wyoming has conferred with the majority and minority leaders. Witnesses are in attendance, ready to appear before the subcommittees, and the Senator from Wyoming would like to continue the sessions of the subcommittees.

Mr. LONG. Is this request made on behalf of the Internal Security Subcommittee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. It is made on behalf of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Wormser, and several other officials are present and ready to testify.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming has spoken to me. I have no objection to the request so far as it relates to today. I would prefer that the request be made on a daily basis. I understood that it was only for today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will be glad to modify my request accordingly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That was my understanding of what the request was to be.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming, as modified? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## FORTHCOMING VISITS OF THE PRIME MINISTER OF FRANCE AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief announcement, if my colleagues will indulge me:

It has been agreed that we should announce, and I now do so with great pleasure, that on February 27, at 3:30 p. m., the Senate will be addressed by the Prime Minister of France, the Honorable Guy Mollet.

On March 7, there will be in the Hall of the House of Representatives, a joint meeting of the House of Representatives and the Senate, at which time we shall receive President Heuss, of the Federal Republic of Germany.

I make this announcement for the information of all Members of the Senate.

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, during which Senators may present petitions

and memorials, introduce bills, and transact other routine business, subject to a 3-minute limitation on statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of overobligations of appropriations in that Department (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation under "Repair, improvement and equipment of federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

FURNISHING SUPPLIES AND SERVICES TO FOREIGN VESSELS AND AIRCRAFT

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish supplies and services to foreign vessels and aircraft, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

UNIFORM ALLOWANCES TO CERTAIN PERSONS OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the payment of uniform allowances to certain persons originally appointed, temporarily or permanently, as commissioned or warrant officers in a regular component of an armed force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON LIQUIDATION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, dated December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ESTATE OF HIGA KENSAI

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of the estate of Higa Kensai (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF PERFORMANCE RATING ACT OF 1950

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2 (b) of the Performance Rating Act of 1950, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Long Beach, Calif., Council of Republican Women, Federated, relating to a reduction of the national budget; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Concurrent Resolution 11

"Concurrent resolution relating to the Army and Air National Guard

"Whereas the Congress of the United States in the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 deemed it wise to increase the preparedness of our country for national defense by ordering all the Reserve Forces, including the National Guard to take not less than 3 nor more than 6 months' basic training, and the Army National Guard has repeatedly requested the Secretary of Defense to implement an accelerated 3-month basic training program as well as a 6-month program to enable young men who wish to continue their education to obtain this training without sacrificing a semester from their educational program, and the Secretary of Defense has, since the passage of that act, and continues to refuse implementing such program: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein)*, That we call upon the Kansas delegation in Congress to take every action which may be necessary to bring about implementation of an accelerated 3-month basic training as an alternate to the 6-month program now in effect for those members of the Army and Air National Guard who wish to take advantage of same in order to continue their education without interruption; be it further

*"Resolved*, That the secretary of state is authorized and directed to send an enrolled copy of this resolution to each Member of the Kansas delegation in the Congress.

"I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the House, and was adopted by that body February 4, 1957.

"JESS TAYLOR,
*"Speaker of the House.*
"A. E. ANDERSEN,
*"Chief Clerk of the House.*

"Adopted by the senate February 12, 1957.

"JOSEPH W. HINKLE, Sr.,
*"President of the Senate.*
"RALPH E. KARKER,
*"Assistant Secretary of the Senate."*

By Mr. CURTIS:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Legislative Resolution 7

"Whereas the Army National Guard of the State of Nebraska has attained the unprecedented peacetime strength of 3,522 officers, warrant officers, and men; and

"Whereas the Army National Guard of the State of Nebraska is organized into 45 units located in 30 communities of this great State; and

"Whereas the Army National Guard of the State of Nebraska is under the Constitution of the United States a State force under the command of the Governor and becomes a Federal force only when called or ordered into active Federal service; and

"Whereas the Department of the Army and the Department of Defense of the Government of the United States have repeatedly attempted to degrade and deemphasize the achievements of the Army National Guard in organizing units, recruiting personnel, maintaining Army equipment, and in training; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Army has advised the President of the United States that the National Guard is 83 percent untrained notwithstanding the fact that the results of the continental Army command tests conducted last summer proved the opposite to be true; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Department of the Army of the Government of the United States has directed that all nonprior service enlistees of the Army National Guard of this State be required to undergo a period of 6 months' active duty training with the United States Army as a condition to their enlistment; and

"Whereas this requirement is unreasonable, unrealistic, unnecessary, exceedingly detrimental to the Army National Guard of the State of Nebraska, and in excess of the minimums specified by the Reserve Forces Act of 1955; and

"Whereas a similar requirement applied to the Army Reserve has failed materially to attract any significant number of young men into the Army Reserve despite herculean efforts by the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army and the expenditure of millions of dollars in an effort to overcome opposition thereto; and

"Whereas adequate basic training can be provided in a period of 3 months; and

"Whereas the Army National Guard recognizes the need for a 3-month period of basic training and would accept such a period as a prerequisite to the enlistment of nonprior service enlistees; and

"Whereas a 3-month active duty basic training program as a condition of enlistment in the Army National Guard would encounter little if any opposition from industry, educators, religious groups, and the parents and the young men of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 68th session assembled—*

"1. That the State of Nebraska views with alarm and disapproval the unwarranted action of the Secretary of the Army of the Government of the United States, and urges its Representatives in the Congress of the United States to seek legislative action which will provide a realistic program of active duty basic training to be established for the Army National Guard.

"2. That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as presiding officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member from Nebraska in the Congress of the United States.

"DWIGHT W. BURNEY,
*"President of the Legislature.*

"I, Hugo F. Srb, hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of Legislative Resolution 7, which was passed by the Legislature of Nebraska in 68th regular session on the 7th day of February 1957.

"HUGO F. SRB,
*"Clerk of the Legislature."*

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

## ADJUSTMENT OF CERTAIN WHEAT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS—RESOLUTION OF MONTANA SENATE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Memorial No. 2 adopted by the Montana Senate on February 12. The memorial deals with the need for adjustment of acreage allotments between soft, low quality wheats, which are in surplus, and wheats of high milling quality which are in demand.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the

rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate memorial to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Secretary Ezra Taft Benson, Montana's Congressional delegation, and members of the United States House and Senate Committees on Agriculture, seeking an adjustment in the Federal farm program as it relates to the grower of quality wheat

*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

Whereas all wheat acreage allotments and marketing quotas were meant to control surpluses, but there is no surplus of the kind of wheat raised in Montana;

Whereas millers are again asking for more high milling quality wheat of which Montana is the principal producer;

Whereas Montana growers are still subject to the same restrictions as are growers of soft, low quality wheats, which are said to be in surplus;

Whereas huge drought areas have cut production levels and greater export demand for wheat appears certain;

Whereas some higher acreage allotments for our small operators will tend to redress a balance which is badly needed and the present pressure on all operators is curtailing too much production of high protein wheat: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by Montana's Senate in 1957 session assembled,* That all officials noted above be asked to see that revisions are made in the Federal farm program to permit increased production in areas which grow wheat of high milling quality: Now, therefore, be it further

*Resolved,* That this senate memorial be read in full and spread on the minutes of the Senate Journal.

PAUL CANNON,
*President of the Senate.*

## CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, Senate Concurrent Resolution DD adopted by the North Dakota Legislature expressing its concern regarding the serious illness of our esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and their best wishes for his speedy recovery.

Mr. President, the sentiments expressed in this most appropriate resolution are shared I am sure by all the Members of the United States Senate. We hope and pray that he soon recover.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution DD

Concurrent resolution wishing United States Senator WILLIAM LANGER a speedy recovery from his current illness

Whereas the senior Senator from North Dakota has recently been stricken with pneumonia and pleurisy and is reported to be seriously ill; and

Whereas the senior Senator has spent the greater part of his life in public office serving the people of North Dakota; and

Whereas during his many years of service to the State of North Dakota, Senator LANGER has always given his faithful and untiring devotion to this State, which has endeared him in the hearts of the people of North Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein),* That the Legislative Assembly and the citizens of the State of North Dakota extend to Senator LANGER their best wishes for the senior Senator's very speedy recovery from his illness; be it further

*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate forward copies of this resolution to the senior Senator from North Dakota and Mrs. Langer.

CLYDE DUFFY,
*President of the senate.*
VIC GILBREATH,
*Secretary of the senate.*
B. WOLF,
*Speaker of the house.*
GERALD L. STAIR,
*Chief Clerk of the house.*

## CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SENATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, Senate Concurrent Resolution P as approved by the 35th Legislative Assembly, State of North Dakota, on Tuesday, the 8th day of January 1957.

This resolution concerns the lack of industry and employment for Indian families on the Turtle Mountain, Fort Totten, and Standing Rock Reservations in North Dakota during the winter months. It requests the Congress to study this situation and by legislation or other means alleviate the difficult situation in which these people find themselves.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution P

Concurrent resolution urging Congress to study and legislate in the field of Indian employment

Whereas there are now approximately 650 employable Indian families receiving general assistance on 3 Indian reservations in North Dakota—Turtle Mountain, Fort Totten, and Standing Rock; and

Whereas there is no employment available nor industry established to enable heads or members of these employable families to work for their living during the winter months in North Dakota; and

Whereas the extension of general assistance to any people, Indian or white, is on an emergency basis because it is relegated to employable people who need assistance because they do not have employment; and

Whereas the passive acceptance of general assistance does not teach work habits and when it is extended over a length of time and for many years in succession it not only does not establish work habits for a good portion of the year, but it can be actually detrimental to the habits of industry that the Indian desires and that society wants for him; and

Whereas the program and planning of the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior, in connection with future industries is commendable and should be increasingly vigorously pushed as time goes on; and

Whereas the basic deficiency of relocation plans in the past is that many Indian families do not desire to leave their homeland, a desire which is understandable to those acquainted with their generation after generation living in the reservation areas: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein),* That the United States Congress is hereby urged and requested to study this vital situation on North Dakota Indian reservations and to implement through legislation or any other means a program that will insure an even more vigorous stepping up of industrial development on or near or adjacent to Indian reservations; and to recognize that vital to future industrial development is the interim establishment of suitable and substantive work projects to be available to unemployed Indians to teach industry and work habits, and that the establishment of work projects be consummated immediately for the hundreds of Indians out of work this winter on the three North Dakota Indian reservations; be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the North Dakota Congressional delegation, to the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs, to Gov. John E. Davis, and to Mrs. Josephine Kelly.

CLYDE DUFFY,
*President of the senate.*
VIC GILBREATH,
*Secretary of the senate.*
B. F. WOLF,
*Speaker of the house.*
GERALD F. STAIR,
*Chief Clerk of the house.*

## THE NATIONAL GUARD—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF CITY COMMISSIONERS, BISMARCK, N. DAK.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution of the Board of City Commissioners of Bismarck, N. Dak., which relates to remarks made by Defense Secretary Charles Wilson relative to the National Guard.

The resolution justly reaffirms the confidence of the Bismarck City Commission in the men and officers of the North Dakota National Guard.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it resolved by the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Bismarck:*

Whereas the North Dakota National Guard has served our State and our Nation with distinction and valor over the years in war and in peace; and

Whereas the North Dakota Army and Air National Guard has provided a continuing source of strength and confidence not only to North Dakota but to the entire United States, and as a continuing assurance that the citizenry of North Dakota is mindful and appreciative of the American way of life and the American heritage of freedom, liberty, and justice; and

Whereas the Bismarck City Commission has been presented with a copy of the Bismarck Tribune dated Tuesday, January 29, 1957, wherein on page 1 in an Associated Press dispatch from Washington, D. C., are certain insulting and defamatory remarks attributed to Secretary of Defense, Mr. Charles Wilson, concerning the National Guard; and

Whereas the said edition of the Bismarck Tribune has been called to the attention of the Bismarck City Commission by Lieut. Col. Robert W. Carlson, Commander of North Dakota National Guard's 188th Armored Field Artillery Battalion, in a public appearance at the regular meeting of the Bismarck City Commission on February 5, 1957, at which said appearance Lieutenant Colonel Carlson

termed the remarks of Secretary of Defense Wilson as unfounded and insulting and asking that the Bismarck City Commission take cognizance of the insulting remarks attributed to Secretary of Defense Wilson: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Bismarck City Commission at its regular meeting on February 5, 1957, does reaffirm its deep pride in the men and officers of the North Dakota National Guard for their services to our State and to our Nation in all of the wars of the United States and in all emergencies arising within the State of North Dakota; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Bismarck City Commission does recognize the North Dakota National Guard as a continuing source of strength in which the citizens of Bismarck and all North Dakota take deep pride and recognize that the North Dakota National Guard is a source of strength upon which our beloved country can rely in all emergencies and disasters; be it further

*Resolved*, That the Bismarck City Commission does reaffirm its confidence in the men and officers of the North Dakota National Guard and their intelligence, character, valor, patriotism, and devotion to the United States of America and its way of life; be it further

*Resolved*, That the remarks of Secretary of Defense Wilson having been called to our attention as quoted in the Bismarck Tribune of January 29, 1957, reflecting discreditably upon our distinguished and brave fellow North Dakotans who have served and are serving in the National Guard, we do request with all our vigor that Secretary of Defense Wilson issue a complete retraction of the remarks attributed to him in aforesaid statement and an apology to the North Dakota National Guard, its men and officers; be it further

*Resolved*, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, United States President; the Honorable William Langer, United States Senator; the Honorable Milton Young, United States Senator; the Honorable John E. Davis, Governor and commander in chief of the North Dakota National Guard; and Maj. Gen. Heber L. Edwards, North Dakota adjutant general.

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
*County of Burleigh,*
*City of Bismarck, ss:*

I, Tom Baker, the duly appointed, qualified and acting city auditor of the city of Bismarck, N. Dak., do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original resolution of the board of city commissioners of said city adopted at a regular meeting held on February 5, 1957.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of the city of Bismarck, N. Dak., this 14th day of February 1957.

[SEAL] TOM BAKER,
*City Auditor.*

## THE NATIONAL GUARD—RESOLUTION OF MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in view of public attention given recently to the remarks of the Secretary of Defense relative to the importance of the National Guard, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Missouri House of Representatives in tribute to the contribution of this great organization.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has been stated by a high official of the Federal Government that the National Guard has provided a means of evading active service in the Armed Forces; and

Whereas there appears to be a reasonable doubt that such a statement is wholly justified; and

Whereas at the outbreak of World War II, units of the National Guard were called to duty and served with distinction on many fronts; and

Whereas the National Guard for many years has had a twofold function, "To provide a Reserve component of the Army of the United States, capable of immediate expansion to war strength able to furnish units fit for services anywhere in the world," and to "provide sufficient organizations in each State so trained and equipped as to enable them to function in the protection of life and property and the preservation of peace, order, and public safety"; and

Whereas the guard has functioned admirably in the protection of life and property during disasters such as floods, prison riots, droughts, and other emergencies: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the Missouri General Assembly go on record as commending the officers and men of the National Guard for the outstanding service they have rendered in the past; and be it further

*Resolved*, That despite any reckless statements to the contrary, the National Guard is an excellent organization devoted to duty and representative of the fine young men of the Nation; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the house be instructed to send copies of this resolution to Maj. Gen. Albert D. Sheppard and to each member of the Missouri delegation in Congress.

## RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I present resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce at Hoisington, Kans., the Chamber of Commerce at Ellinwood, Kans., and the St. John, Kans., Chamber of Commerce, urging the Defense Department and other agencies which contract for the production of manufactured goods to give consideration to placing subcontracts in our agricultural areas.

Personally, I cannot stress too strongly the urgency for this relief in many areas where agriculture has been the predominant factor in the economy.

It occurs to me that we should give every consideration to a program of this type for a long-range policy of strengthening the agricultural areas and maintaining a strong economic position in every section of the Nation.

It may be conducive for agencies making these contracts to give them to large concerns in congested areas, but I maintain it is good business in the long run—even though it may cost more—to keep a general distribution of our production in this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions may be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
*Hoisington, Kans., January 9, 1957.*

Whereas the area comprising the Central Kansas Industrial Development Association is in the drought-stricken area of Kansas, and whereas this drought condition is of such serious nature that regardless of favorable weather conditions, it will affect the economical condition of this area for not less than 2 years in the future. And, whereas the oil industry which we have enjoyed for the past many years, is rapidly depleting; and whereas many small machine shops which have been tied in with the oil and agriculture, are finding it impossible to stay in business and that such industries are manned with the very best of mechanical help;

Now, therefore, we, the members of the Hoisington Chamber of Commerce in regular assembled meeting on this the 8th day of January 1957, do hereby memoralize our Government to consider a means of assisting such small industries as well as additional industries in financing, leasing, and otherwise securing the necessary machine tools to participate in the many subcontracts which the national defense program is creating, thus furnishing them with the necessary help and information needed to participate in these lettings.

This is one positive way of balancing the economy of this area which is and has been depending entirely on oil and agriculture, and will create part-time employment for many small farmers, who otherwise will have to move off the farm.

Copies of this resolution will be mailed to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, with copies going to Senators Carlson and Schoeppel, Congressman Breeding, and Secretary of Interior Fred Seaton, Secretary of Agriculture Benson, as well as to Governor of Kansas George Docking.

C. H. SMITH,
*President, Hoisington Chamber of Commerce.*

RAY SMITH,
*Chairman, Industrial Committee, and Central Kansas Industrial Development Association.*

---

ELLINWOOD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
*Ellinwood, Kans., February 7, 1957.*

The Honorable FRANK CARLSON,
*The United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON:

Whereas the area comprising the Central Kansas Industrial Development Association is in the drought-stricken area of Kansas, and whereas this drought condition is of such serious nature that regardless of favorable weather conditions, it will affect the economic condition of this area for not less than 2 years in the future. And whereas the oil industry which we have enjoyed for the past many years is rapidly depleting. And whereas many small machine shops, which have been tied in with the oil and agriculture, are finding it impossible to stay in business and that such industries are manned with the very best of mechanical help;

Now, therefore, we, the members of the Ellinwood Chamber of Commerce in regular assembled meeting on this 7th day of February 1957, do hereby memorialize our Government to consider a means of assisting such small industries as well as additional industries, in financing, leasing, and otherwise securing the necessary machine tools to participate in the many subcontracts which the national defense program is creating, thus furnishing them with the necessary help and information needed to participate in these lettings.

This is one positive way of balancing the economy of this area which is and has been

depending entirely on oil and agriculture, and will create part-time employment for many small farmers, who otherwise will have to move off the farm.

GAYL M. DEVORE,
*President, Ellinwood Chamber of Commerce.*
O. D. HEDRICK,
*Chairman, Industrial Committee.*

---

Whereas the area represented by the Central Kansas Industrial Development Association is in the drought-stricken area of Kansas; and whereas this drought condition is of such serious nature that the economics of the area will be affected adversely for at least 2 years beyond the return of normal moisture conditions; and

Whereas the oil industry, which has contributed so greatly to this area for several years is in a period of decline which seems certain to continue as oil reservoirs are being depleted; and

Whereas many shops and other businesses which have thrived because of direct or secondary connections with the oil industry and agriculture are suffering to the point of elimination; and

Whereas the future welfare of this area is threatened with further damage unless compensating business volume can be developed and obtained to offset the shrinking oil development and agriculture income; and

Whereas this area is blessed with a wealth of talent capable of producing a wide variety of products, including many which are doubtless in demand by the Government through subcontract arrangements; and

Whereas information outlining procedure and other requirements essential in obtaining subcontracts is not generally available in this area; and

Whereas products manufactured in smaller plants by subcontractors, and materials which may be supplied by smaller plants are not generally known in this area: Now, therefore, we the members of the St. John Chamber of Commerce, in a sincere desire to assist the economic welfare of this city, this community and this area by developing of local industry and possibly interesting new industry, hereby appeal to our representatives in Government to furnish us with information as to methods, procedure, tool needs, plant needs, identity of firms and individuals who can assist us, in our effort to help ourselves, our city, our community, our area, our Nation.

We feel that with sufficient and proper information, we will be able to develop our own economy, to the end that part-time employment may be available for farmers whose agricultural income has been cut drastically, to others who need employment and are capable of handling responsible jobs, and finally to produce goods which are held in need by the Government in its program of further self-defense.

We feel that present channels of information are not sufficient in the matters presented above; we will appreciate your sincere consideration and assistance, as suggested.

Copies of this resolution are being sent to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Senator Frank Carlson, Senator Andrew Schoeppel, Congressman Floyd Breeding, Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton.

Adopted by the St. John Chamber of Commerce, St. John, Kans., February 2, 1957.

---

## WISCONSIN CONTINUES TO OPPOSE CHICAGO WATER DIVERSION—ARTICLE, RESOLUTION, AND TELEGRAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday, as reflected on page 1863 of the RECORD, there was authorized to be published as Senate Document No. 28 a letter from the Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, providing information with regard to the effects on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River, of an increase of 1,000 cubic feet per second in the diversion at Chicago.

This is a subject which I have previously discussed many times on the Senate floor in connection with my continued unalterable opposition to what has come to be known to us, of the Midwest, as the Chicago water steal.

Needless to say, once more the public officials and citizens of my State are up in arms, so to speak, as are officials and citizens of other Lake States, in opposition to Chicago's latest efforts at so-called temporary water diversion.

I have in my hands, for example, the text of an article from the Saturday, February 16, issue of the Milwaukee Journal, indicating the reactions of the able municipal port director of Milwaukee, Harry Brockel, to this engineers' report.

I also have in my hands the text of a few of the many expressions from leading officials of my State on this issue.

For example, on January 24 of this year the Honorable Vernon W. Thomson, Governor of Wisconsin, stated in a letter to me:

> I am deeply appreciative of your continued support and concern in our perennial fight to prevent additional water diversion by the Chicago Sanitary District and the State of Illinois.

I also have the text of a resolution adopted by the mayor and common council of the City of Manitowoc, opposing the Chicago effort, together with a message from the chairman of the Board of the Harbor Commissioners of Racine, the Honorable Frederick Young.

I present these various items, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Committee on Public Works.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of February 16, 1957]

BROCKEL SEES CHICAGO GAIN—COMMENTS ON REPORT OF ARMY ON EFFECTS OF WATER DIVERSION

Chicago would gain and other Great Lakes cities and States would lose if Congress allowed the increased diversion of 1,000 cubic feet a second of water from Lake Michigan.

That view was expressed Saturday by Harry C. Brockel, municipal port director, in commenting on a report of the Army Corps of Engineers describing the effect both a temporary and permanent increase in diversion at Chicago for sanitary and navigation purposes on the Illinois waterway.

The engineers' report was submitted Friday to Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, in Washington, D. C., by Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner, chief of engineers.

DROP IN LEVEL SEEN

The engineers' report, authorized by Congress in 1952, said that the diversion of 1,000 additional cubic feet over a 3-year period would lower Lakes Michigan and Huron five-eighths of an inch. If the extra diversion were permanent, giving Chicago the right to boost its withdrawals from the lake to 2,500 cubic feet a second, the levels of the 2 lakes would drop 1 inch over a 15-year span, the report stated.

Lakes Erie and Ontario would be affected less in either case, the engineers said.

But they pointed out that power production losses to New York State and the province of Ontario would range between $408,000 and $918,000 over the 3 years and $708,000 a year if the permanent diversion were allowed.

POWER GAIN FOR CHICAGO

At the same time the Chicago drainage district's powerplant at Lockport, Ill., would gain additional power valued at $202,000 over the 3 years, and $67,000 a year if the diversion were permanent, the report stated.

Economic losses to navigation would be $240,000 a year to the American fleet on the lakes, the engineers estimated. This would be caused by the fact that ships could carry less cargo.

Brockel said that while the engineers minimized the economic losses due to increased diversion, there still was a great danger that once Chicago obtained the additional 1,000 feet it would seek more.

Many bills have been introduced in Congress to authorize the additional conversion.

---

Whereas the city of Manitowoc is faced with a serious problem in the request of the Chicago Sanitary District for a large increase in water diversion to alleviate low water in the Mississippi River; and

Whereas this question has been before Congress on various occasions wherein it was resolved that such diversion can only present serious problems to navigation on the Great Lakes, and particularly the port cities bordering on said lakes; and

Whereas the citizens of the city of Manitowoc depend on the Great Lakes and its port for a large share of its marine traffic and business: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the mayor and Common Council,* That we oppose any further diversion of the water from the Great Lakes to be used by the Chicago Sanitary District; be it further

*Resolved by the mayor and Common Council,* That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Governor of the State of Wisconsin, the attorney general of Wisconsin, to Senators WILEY and MCCARTHY, to Congressman JOHN BYRNES, and to the Great Lakes Harbor Association.

---

RACINE, WIS.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
*The United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

May we again bring to your attention the political plans of Chicago and Illinois to drain the Great Lakes and use to their personal gain possibly challenging the worth of our channel uses the depth of our harbors, and urge that you use every facility at your disposal and do not allow this continual scandalous endeavor to course away our Godgiven gifts which Milwaukee and Wisconsin have fought for through the years and which we should not lose now.

F. M. YOUNG,
*Chairman, Harbor Commission, City of Racine.*

---

## INDEPENDENCE RESOLUTION BY LITHUANIAN-AMERICANS OF RACINE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive today from Stanley P. Budrys, secretary of the Lithuanian-American Council of Racine, a resolution which was adopted at a mass meeting of American citizens of Lithuanian descent in the city of Racine, Wis.

The resolution commemorates the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. The meeting was held under the auspices of the local branch of the Lithuanian-American Council.

The resolution wisely endorses President Eisenhower's Middle East program against Communist aggression.

In addition, it rightly stresses the importance of the continued American policy of nonrecognition of the forcible illegal, immoral conquests by the Soviet Union of the Baltic States, and other lands.

Although the Lithuanian and other people have been subjected to brutal genocidal practices on the part of the Soviet Union, although they remain under the terror of the Moscow regime, the flame of liberty still burns brightly, I am sure, in the hearts of the Lithuanian people.

I present the Racine resolution and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas while driving for world conquest, the Soviet Russia has forcibly occupied many free countries, including Lithuania; and

Whereas the variable Communist tactics do not change their basic aim which is to destroy every free nation; and

Whereas by every standard of national and international conduct, Soviet Russia, under its present regime is an outlaw nation; and

Whereas the existence of freedom throughout the world today can only be preserved in those countries where people firmly believe in the policy of deterring aggression by their very own strength and belief in their unity; and

Whereas the tolerances of adherence to a double standard of international morality are giant steps away from the unifying beliefs and principles of a free country and free people: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That this meeting wholeheartedly support President Eisenhower's Middle East program as a sound countermeasure against the challenge of imperialistic communism which is creating and has already created a grave threat to world's peace and security in that area; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we oppose any policy advocating the present status quo in Europe as permanent and even as a desirable balance for so-called lasting peace because this policy is simply an expedience of the total overall communistic plan; and be it further

*Resolved*, That our Nation through its constituted voice of freedom, the Congress, should cause legislation to be enacted in the United Nations giving assurance that the members of that great body would not be allowed to practice a double standard of international morality which practice is a flagrant abuse of principles of the founders of this great Nation; and be it finally

Resolved, That this mass meeting gratefully express its sincere gratitude to the executive and legislative branches of our Government for its various efforts to aid all men who seek freedom and for its nonrecognition of the annexation of Lithuania into Soviet Russia.

PETER PETRUSAITIS,
*Chairman.*
STANLEY P. BUDRYS,
*Secretary.*

RACINE, WIS., *February 16, 1957.*

## THE NATIONAL GUARD—RESOLUTION OF CITY COMMISSION, SANFORD, FLA.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Commission of Sanford, Fla., commending the officers and men of Company B, 154th Armored Infantry Battalion of the Florida National Guard, located in Sanford, for their patriotism in serving our country and expressing appreciation and confidence in their ability as citizen soldiers.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Company B, 154th Armored Infantry Battalion of the Florida National Guard, located in Sanford, has served our community, our State, and our Nation honorably and well, both in times of peace and when our Nation was at war; and

Whereas many citizens of Sanford and Seminole County were called to active duty in the Armed Forces of our Nation from our local National Guard unit in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war, and served faithfully and honorably, many of whom gave their lives that this Nation might live; and

Whereas the Sanford unit, although not called for Federal service during the Korean conflict, stood ready to defend our community, our State, and our Nation should the call have come; and

Whereas the local unit of the Florida National Guard has a great and heroic history to bulwark its claim to competence; and

Whereas we feel that service as a citizen soldier in the Florida National Guard provides a young man or a veteran with an excellent opportunity to serve in a reserve military force; and

Whereas we feel such service is important to the defense and preparedness of this Nation at the least possible cost: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the City Commissioners of the City of Sanford Fla.:*

1. We acknowledge with grateful hearts those among our citizens who, when called to active service from the local National Guard unit, in either of the great wars or Korean conflict, gave their lives that we might continue our democratic form of Government.

2. We extend to the officers and men of Company B, 154th Armored Infantry Battalion of the Florida National Guard our appreciation for their service and confidence in their ability as citizen soldiers and commend to the young men of our community service in our local unit as an overt manner of expressing patriotism and opportunity to learn the need of discipline, honor, and integrity; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to United States Senators SPESSARD L. HOLLAND and GEORGE A. SMATHERS, and Congressman A. S. HERLONG, JR., and the press.

[SEAL]

CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SANFORD, FLA.,
DAVID M. GATCHEL,
*Mayor.*
F. D. SOON,
MERLE W. WARNER,
OTT HIGGINBETHAN,
A. J. WILSON.

Attest:

C. B. SOYER,
*City Clerk.*

## RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, at the request of my friends in the Polish-American Congress and for the information of Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the resolution adopted as a statement of policy by the board of directors of that organization at their recent meeting in Washington, February 1 and 2, 1957.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF POLICY

(Adopted at the meeting of the board of directors of the Polish-American Congress at its meeting at the Raleigh Hotel in Washington, D. C., February 1 and 2, 1957.)

Whereas the recent changes occurring in Poland may have a serious effect on the United States search for peace in the world; and

Whereas the Polish-American Congress, organized 13 years ago and which now has delegates from Polish-American organizations in the United States with a membership of 7 million, has been asked for a statement of policy on these changes; and

Whereas the underlying purpose of the Polish-American Congress, Inc., from its very inception has been to wage a relentless struggle against a world Communist conspiracy which has unremittingly sought to enslave mankind; and

Whereas the recent changes in Poland would tend to indicate that perhaps the present rulers of Poland have to some degree drawn themselves away from the strict control of the Kremlin; and

Whereas the Polish-American Congress, Inc., firmly believes that these changes forced upon the present rulers of Poland by a gallant people whose dedication to the principles of freedom dates back 1,000 years, and most recently were so heroically demonstrated during the Poznan uprisings; and

Whereas even though the Polish people do not yet enjoy complete freedom of assembly, freedom of press, freedom of self-government, the present Communist rulers of Poland nevertheless mirror to some degree a diminution of the terror and exploitation which prevailed in Poland up to the Poznan uprisings; and have restored to a certain degree religious freedom in that country: Be it therefore

*Resolved*, That—

1. The Polish-American Congress shall continue its unaltered opposition to the international Communist conspiracy which would enslave the world, and with it eventually the United States.

2. That despite the continued presence of Communist rulers in Poland, the gains made toward freedom in Poland must be recognized and the Polish people must be encouraged to continue their peaceful effort toward complete liberation from Communist rule.

3. That this process can best be served at this time by speedy economic and technical assistance to the Polish people by the United States.

4. That economic assistance to Poland at this time will strengthen her internal economy and bolster her people in their struggle against Communist ideologies.

5. That, because a free and independent Poland is the key to peace in Europe, it lies in the best interest of the United States to undertake this economic assistance, particularly since the indomitable spirit of the Polish people in resisting Russian domination and exploitation gives the world hope

that international communism carries within it the seeds of self-destruction.

6. That the economic and technical assistance given to Poland be carefully controlled by this country perhaps through the use of American inspection teams to assure that machinery and other equipment sent to Poland actually remains in that country for the express purpose of helping Poland and is not later diverted to Russia or her satellites.

7. That, because until the next harvest, Poland will be faced with near famine due to coerced and catastrophic collectivation of her farms, the United States undertake to seek permission from the Polish Government for the sending of CARE packages into Poland.

8. That in addition to the shipment of CARE packages into Poland the United States seek permission for the American Relief for Poland, Inc., or other recognized American relief agencies to operate in Poland for the express purpose of distributing American surplus farm commodities to the Polish people.

9. That the Congress of the United States consider the possibility of reducing United States mailing charges on packages being sent by Americans into Poland thus encouraging a greater flow of these packages which would help the Polish people in their economic crisis.

10. That the United States seek a reduction or elimination of the high-duty tariffs imposed by the rulers of Poland on relief packages now being sent into Poland by Americans. The United States should insist that the rulers of Poland abandon these tariffs before any serious discussions regarding economic assistance to the Polish nation are considered.

11. That the United States take steps immediately to recognize Poland's western boundaries as established in the Potsdam agreement to assure the Poles that these lands will not be taken away from Poland. Through this act the United States could bolster the faith of the enslaved nations in American leadership and dispel the captive peoples' fear that the revival of predatory militarism of Germany is being achieved with American help.

12. That the recognition of Poland's western boundaries along the Oder-Neisse Rivers would deprive Russia of her only claim for keeping Soviet troops in Poland under the guise of helping Poland protect those western boundaries.

13. That we believe Poland's western boundaries to have been formally set at the Potsdam Conference not only on the basis of the nation's historic right to these lands but on the basis of reparation from the German nation for the great and grievous wrong inflicted on the Polish nation in World War II.

14. That the Polish American Congress reaffirm its traditional opposition to the seizure of Poland's eastern lands by Russia and urge the United States to seek through diplomatic intervention the return of these lands to Poland.

15. That the United States delegation to the United Nations continue to press for free and unfettered elections in Poland despite the recent alleged elections held in that country which, in fact, did not give the Polish people complete freedom of self-expression.

16. That the $75 million Polish private assets frozen in the United States not be released until the zloty-dollar exchange is brought to a more equitable level.

17. That the Congress of the United States adopt amendments to the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act which would change the quota system from the 1920 obsolete and unfair formula to a more realistic system which would grant larger quotas to Poland and other middle European nations.

18. That the United States Department of State take immediate steps to enlarge its Embassy staff in Warsaw to facilitate the issuance of immigration and tourist visas to Polish nationals.

19. That the Polish American Congress send to the suffering Polish nation warm and sincere congratulations on their basic faith of a free people living under God, and we congratulate the Polish people for the magnificent manner in which they have conducted themselves in bringing about the great changes in Poland. The world owes these gallant people a debt of gratitude for piercing the first significant hole in the Iron Curtain.

In conclusion, we pledge our moral strength and all material resources of the Polish American Congress to help Poland in her difficult progress toward full freedom—and to support American policy in its search for a just and lasting peace and international security in a world where freedom reigns.

THADDEUS V. ADESKO.
Rev. VALERIAN S. KARCZ.
STANISLAW R. J. SUCHECKI.
SOPHIA WOJCIK.
ROMAN PUCINSKI.

## AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT—MEMORIAL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a petition signed by Albert E. Cartwright, and 24 other citizens of the State of Illinois from the Granite City, East St. Louis, and Alton area, urging opposition to any new natural-gas bill which would injure the interests of consumers.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRANITE CITY, ILL., *January 11, 1957.*

Hon. PAUL DOUGLAS,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: We the undersigned are extremely intered in the forthcoming attempt to pass another natural-gas bill. Based on the information that was brought forth during the last session of the Congress, and a review of the background of this proposed legislation we do not believe it to be in the interest of the consumer of natural gas and would therefore respectfully suggest that the proposed natural-gas bill be vigorously opposed.

(Signed by Albert E. Cartwright and 24 other citizens of the State of Illinois.)

## SENATOR BYRD'S PROPOSAL TO REDUCE THE FEDERAL BUDGET FOR 1958 BY $5 BILLION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my brief remarks a resolution from the Sumter (S. C.) Chamber of Commerce endorsing the proposal of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to reduce the Federal budget for 1958 by $5 billion.

The people of Sumter County have always manifested a keen interest in keeping our country solvent and on a sound financial basis, and they practice at home what they preach to others. I have always found the people in this great county willing to shoulder their own burdens and to work out their own problems without outside aid or interference. And, Mr. President, they have done a remarkable job in this respect.

In passing this resolution, the Sumter Chamber of Commerce has paid high tribute to a man whom we in South Carolina hold in the highest esteem. In the general election last November, the people of Sumter County cast a majority of their votes for the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to be President of the United States, even after the distinguished Senator had stated that he did not aspire to this high office.

I believe, with the Senator from Virginia, there are many places where unnecessary and unwise government spending in nondefense areas can be reduced. I hope it will be possible for the Congress, under the prudent leadership of the distinguished Chairman of the Finance Committee, to make these reductions in the budget proposed for 1958.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two editorials from outstanding newspapers in South Carolina which laud the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for his efforts to reduce Government spending. The first editorial is entitled "Might Eventually Win"; and it appeared in the February 18 issue of the State, of Columbia, S. C. The other editorial is entitled "Would Force Balanced Budget." It was published in the February 17 issue of the Times and Democrat, of Orangeburg, S. C.

There being no objection, the resolution and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas a record peacetime budget of $71,800,000,000 has been presented to the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, has stated that this budget should be cut by at least $5 billion in nondefense areas; and

Whereas Senator BYRD has embarked on a campaign to put these cuts into effect; and

Whereas the Sumter Chamber of Commerce feels that this action is the unanimous desire of the members of this organization: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the Sumter Chamber of Commerce endorses the action of Senator BYRD and commends him in the highest for his foresight and dedication to the public interest; and be it further

*Resolved,* That we respectfully urge and request that our Senators and Representatives give this action of Senator BYRD their wholehearted support and assistance; and be it further

*Resolved,* That our Senators and Representatives be asked to take whatever action they deem necessary to put these budget cuts into effect in the appropriations now being considered before the United States Congress.

Adopted this 12th day of February 1957, by the board of directors, Sumter Chamber of Commerce, Inc., representing its 525 members.

J. E. ELDRIDGE,
*President, Sumter Chamber of Commerce, Inc., Sumter, S. C.*
G. WERBER BRYAN,
*Chairman, Legislative Committee.*

[From the Columbia (S. C.) State of February 18, 1957]

MIGHT EVENTUALLY WIN

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, is one of the few Members of the Federal Congress

who acts as he talks when it comes to economy in government.

The time honored approach on the subject calls for weeping and wailing about how the taxpayer's money is being wasted on wild spending schemes. Once in power, however, the cryers-for-economy make an abrupt 180-degree turn. They dedicate themselves to spending more and more money in a way most likely to influence favorably the greatest number of voters.

Senator BYRD, however, has been economy minded during several administrations. He doesn't talk in glittering generalities. He goes to the trouble to denounce uncalled-for spending, and then proceeds to show precisely where he thinks spending can be curtailed.

Only recently he announced he was going to show where $5 billion fat could be squeezed out of the Eisenhower budget for the coming fiscal year. Most of his fellow workers only criticize spending. They make no effort to study the budget carefully enough to say what items could be pared down.

The thought occurs that if we could turn financing of the Government over to a few HARRY BYRDS, the country might get out of debt in a couple of centuries.

---

[From the Orangeburg (S. C.) Times and Democrat of February 17, 1957]

WOULD FORCE BALANCED BUDGET

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, New Hampshire Republican, and Senator STROM THURMOND, South Carolina Democrat, and other Senators, have introduced a resolution which would require the President and Congress to balance the budget each year. The resolution would make it the responsibility of Congress to see that appropriations during the year are not larger than expenditures.

If this turned out to be the case, because of erroneous revenue prediction, it would be up to Congress to straighten up the budget books the following year. A number of States already operate on this principle and they have been able to stay out of debt as a result of it. In fact, those States which have constitutions requiring a balanced budget are generally in better financial shape than the United States Government.

Of course, in times of emergency, the resolution would not be interpreted to rule out defense expenditures. In such times, emergency spending is recognized as necessary. In peacetime years, the resolution would require the Federal Government to operate in the black and we think this would be a good thing for the taxpayers of this country.

---

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. NEUBERGER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 469. A bill to authorize the United States to defray the cost of assisting the Klamath Tribe of Indians to prepare for termination of Federal supervision, and to defer such termination for a period of 18 months (Rept. No. 92).

---

## EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING REPORT ON INVESTIGATION PERTAINING TO TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND RELATED MATTERS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 99) to extend the date for filing a report on the investigation of matters pertaining to technical assistance and related matters, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That section 3 of Senate Resolution 162, agreed to February 8, 1956, to investigate matters pertaining to technical assistance and related programs, as amended by Senate Resolution 60, agreed to January 30, 1957, is further amended by striking out "February 28, 1957" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1957."

---

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Arthur Larson, of Pennsylvania, to be Director of the United States Information Agency;

John M. Allison, of the District of Columbia to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Indonesia;

Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York, to be a representative on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, reappointment; and

Laird Bell, of Illinois, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, reappointment.

---

## BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 1268. A bill for the relief of Don Q. Gee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 1269. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended; and

S. 1270. A bill to incorporate the Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S.1271. A bill for the relief of Daniel Alcide Charlebois; and

S. 1272. A bill for the relief of Zisimos Niforatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNAMARA (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1273. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of employers in the food industries who are engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce, to eliminate certain exemptions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 1274. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1077), to remove restrictions on the use of a portion of the Springfield Confederate Cemetery, Springfield, Mo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 1275. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit amounts paid for the institutional care of a disabled person to be deducted as a medical expense; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1276. A bill for the relief of Emilio Valle Duarte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1277. A bill for the relief of Edgars Pedraudze and his wife, Alma Pedraudze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1278. A bill for the relief of Ernest C. St. Onge;

S. 1279. A bill for the relief of Shih Hing Lee; and

S. 1280. A bill for the relief of Antonio da Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1281. A bill for the relief of Enrique R. Godinez; his wife, Enriqueta P. Godinez; and their daughter, Lydia M. Godinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1282. A bill to amend title II of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to provide educational benefits to persons who perform active service in the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955, while compulsory military service is required under existing laws of the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1283. A bill for the relief of Garth Cecil Briden; and

S. 1284. A bill for the relief of Josef Salamon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER (for himself, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania) (by request):

S. 1285. A bill to incorporate the Military Order of the Purple Heart, a national organization of combat wounded composed solely of Purple Hearters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 1286. A bill for the relief of Ursula Ann McFarland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1287. A bill for the relief of Heinz August Schwarz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1288. A bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the Office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEELY (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1289. A bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, school board, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1290. A bill for the relief of Lee-Ana Roberts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1291. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property of the United States located in Juneau, Alaska, known as the Juneau Subport of Embarkation, to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. WATKINS when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

---

## RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were submitted or reported and referred, as indicated:

VARIOUS STUDIES OF NATION'S POULTRY INDUSTRY

Mr. SCOTT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 98) which was re-

ferred to the Committee on Agricultural and Forestry, as follows:

Whereas there is much concern over continued low prices for broilers and movement of market eggs; and

Whereas broiler producers supplied consumers with 30 percent more meat in 1956 than in 1955, but received only 1-percent increase in gross income; and

Whereas the broiler-feed ratio has deteriorated to the extent that it discourages broiler production, and the egg-feed ratio likewise is discouraging: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry shall arrange for exhaustive studies into the Nation's poultry industry with the view of determining—

(1) The entire price structure of poultry and poultry products from hatchery to market;

(2) Methods employed by producers to continue and expand production;

(3) Problems of markets and market outlets;

(4) Feasible action to stabilize the poultry industry.

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 99) to extend the date for filing a report on the investigation of matters pertaining to technical assistance and related matters, which was placed on the calendar.

(See resolution printed in full which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

## AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO DEDUCTION OF CERTAIN MEDICAL EXPENSES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit amounts paid for the institutional care of a disabled person to be deducted as a medical expense.

Let me explain, by citing an actual case with which I am familiar, the need for favorable action on this bill.

One of my constituents has been supporting his aged mother since he was 15 years of age. His mother is now 94 years of age, and requires constant medical attention. If she were kept in a hospital my constituent could deduct the expense for income tax purposes. But the cost of continuous hospital care is prohibitive to him.

He has, however, at an annual expense of more than $2,000, had his mother provided the constant medical attention she requires in a rest home. But he is now advised that this annual expenditure of more than $2,000 annually is not tax deductible. Hospital care is deductible. Rest home care is not.

I have had considerable correspondence regarding this case with the Internal Revenue Service, and I am sure that some of my colleagues have tried to get administrative relief for constituents in similar situations. I have found the IRS people sympathetic and understanding. But they feel that under existing law they cannot allow as tax deductions expenditures such as those incurred by my constituent.

I feel that the current law and interpretation placed upon it are most unfair to many fine citizens who are doing their best to discharge their obligations to their families and their Government, and I hope that this injustice will be corrected speedily.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1275) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit amounts paid for the institutional care of a disabled person to be deducted as a medical expense, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS TO CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which will provide formal educational training, on-the-job training, and on-the-farm training, for veterans who are not now eligible under the Korean GI law.

It will be recalled that the delimiting date for veterans of the Korean war was January 31, 1955. None of our servicemen entering the Armed Forces after that date are presently eligible for educational benefits.

This bill, if enacted, would provide educational benefits for servicemen enlisting or being drafted so long as there is compulsory military service in the United States.

This proposed legislation would offer 1½ days of education or training for each day of active service up to a maximum of 3 calendar years. Thus, 24 months of service would provide 36 months of school. The 36 months is equal to 4 college years of 9 months each.

Obvious additional benefits would accrue to the country and the veteran under the bill. One would be the raising of veterans' incomes. It has been said by some that the additional revenue derived from income taxes paid by veterans whose income levels have been increased by GI training will cancel out the cost to the Government of that training.

Another national benefit will be to provide a means for the United States to obtain more engineers and technical specialists. This is a field of great need. Young men could build on their military technical training and become graduate engineers.

Also, I believe the offering of this benefit will help to solve the recruitment problems of the armed services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1282) to amend title II of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to provide educational benefits to persons who perform active service in the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955, while compulsory military service is required under existing laws of the United States, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## PREFERENTIAL PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTIONS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the bill, prepared by me, may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1288) to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The analysis presented by Mr. DOUGLAS is as follows:

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES BILL

PURPOSE: TO ENCOURAGE STATES TO HOLD PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENTIAL PRIMARIES

1. Establishes a national commission of 5 persons appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate for terms of 5 years, with one appointment per year, no more than three of which may be members of the same political party. To be eligible a commissioner must represent a party which polled at least 10 million votes in the last preceding presidential election.

2. Provides for a commission staff.

3. Provides that the commission will certify, under certain conditions, the names of presidential candidates to the States by March 1. To be eligible a candidate must have at least 1,000 names on a petition filed with the commission from each State if less than 4 States, or 1,000 names from 75 percent of the States if more than 4 States, and must designate a specific political party under which his name shall be placed.

Provides that a potential candidate's name will be certified unless he withdraws it.

4. Provides for payments to the States for expenses incurred in holding a presidential primary:

(a) A top limit of 20 cents per vote in the presidential primary.

(b) No payment for votes cast for a party which received less than 10 million votes in the last preceding presidential election.

(c) Proper accounting shall be made by a responsible State official to the commission.

5. To be eligible States must:

(a) Have a presidential preference primary law in effect by January 1 of the year of the primary.

(b) Provide that the primary be held between April 1 and July 31.

(c) Allow only those candidates certified by the commission to be on the ballot.

(d) Provide that voters may qualify to vote if they are eligible to vote for the most numerous body of the State legislature.

(e) Provide that voters may vote only in the preferential primary of the party of which they have registered affiliation.

(f) Provide that the results of the primary be "binding to a reasonable extent" on the delegates to the national conventions. The commission shall decide the meaning of "binding to a reasonable extent."

## CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill

to authorize the conveyance to the Territory of Alaska of a 10-acre tidal flat adjacent to the city of Junean, Alaska.

An identical bill was introduced in the 84th Congress too late to gain approval of both Houses before adjournment. The original sponsor of the bill, Representative A. L. MILLER, of Nebraska, is reintroducing it on the House side, and I am introducing it in the Senate in an effort to help expedite its passage before conclusion of the 60-day biennial session of the Territorial Legislature, which is now meeting.

If the land is conveyed to the Territory of Alaska, the Territorial Legislature plans to lease the property to the National Guard of Alaska for a headquarters site. It formerly was used as the headquarters of the Juneau Subport of Embarkation.

No objections were offered to this proposed legislation when it was before the House at the last session, and I hope that we can expedite the measure in both Houses at this time and thus assist the Territory and the National Guard. The land in question is tidal land which would be transferred to the Territory at statehood, as a routine matter. My proposal would merely expedite the transaction as a courtesy to the Territory. Additional details are provided in House Report 2583 of the 84th Congress, 2d Session, filed in connection with H. R. 6779.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1291) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property of the United States located in Juneau, Alaska, known as the Juneau Subport of Embarkation, to the Territory of Alaska, introduced by Mr. WATKINS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## ADJUSTMENT OF CORPORATE NORMAL TAX AND SURTAX RATES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 150) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to adjust corporate normal tax and surtax rates, introduced by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] an January 7, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WATKINS:

Address delivered by him before national western mining conference, in Denver, Colo., on February 9, 1957.

By Mr. BEALL:

Statement prepared by him on 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Article entitled "A Republican Prescribes for His Party," written by Senator CASE of New Jersey, and published in the magazine section of the New York Times of February 17, 1957.

## CRITICISM OF THE PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, under the 2-minute rule, I wish to submit for the RECORD an editorial from a Canadian newspaper, the Calgary Herald, in criticism of the Dulles foreign policy. I desire to make the following comment: In the great crisis which now has existed for many weeks in the field of foreign policy, I am glad to note that our foreign policy has finally moved off the golf course and out of Georgia hunting grounds and back into the White House. At least the wild turkeys of Georgia will be safer, even though the people of Israel and their free institutions may not.

I know that some of my colleagues feel that we would perform a disservice to the country if we insisted on full debate in the Senate on our unfortunate foreign policy as presented by the Eisenhower doctrine. However, such debate will occur in the Senate, regardless of whether anyone may feel that there should be insistence on quick, steamroller action in the Senate on the Middle East joint resolution.

In regard to the Israeli situation, my feeling is as follows: I certainly hope that Israel sits tight until it obtains from the United Nations guaranties of its survival, because I know of no fact which would justify Israel in accepting any guaranty from the United States, outside the United Nations. I am one Senator who thinks that American unilateral action in the Middle East should cease. I completely agree with the editorial in the Canadian newspaper, in criticism of the Dulles foreign policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. DULLES OUGHT TO BE FIRED, NOW

Mr. John Foster Dulles, the United States Secretary of State, has now opined that any American soldier called upon to fight in the Middle East would feel a lot safer if he did not have British and French troops alongside him.

Mr. Dulles was arguing for support for his new policy under which the President would have standby power to use United States troops in the Middle East to repel Communist aggression.

The plain implication in his newest statement is that Britain and France have behaved so badly, have discredited themselves so thoroughly, that any United States soldier's life would be endangered if that soldier were so unfortunate as to be caught in the company of a British or French soldier.

This, we are forced to say, is just about the most remarkable way to win and retain allies we have ever heard of. But it does not surprise us that this preposterous utterance comes from Mr. Dulles, the earth's most undiplomatic diplomat, international fumbler and downright menace.

We don't think it would be going too far to say that the two greatest dangers to world peace at this moment are the Kremlin and Mr. Dulles personally. The former must be beside itself with joy at the sight of the crumbling Western alliance, and Mr. Dulles scarcely lets a day go by without hacking another great chunk out of that alliance. Long ago we expressed our belief that Mr. Dulles is an international catastrophe, and we see no reason to alter that opinion except to question whether it is strong enough.

It has been quite nauseating enough to contemplate this ham-handed and peripatetic meddler proposing that the United States adopt the kind of policy that the British and French would have welcomed with open arms a year or so ago, after having forced them to warlike action by insipid, supine and gauche United States foreign policy.

But surely it is intolerable to hear this same man airily tagging the British and French as dangerous companions for United States boys in any future move in the Middle East. If Mr. Dulles had not been so appallingly blind, ignorant, arrogant and stubborn a few months ago the whole tragic business might never have happened. It is an unendurable insult to have this same person condemn those who had the plain, old-fashioned guts to do what had to be done while the United States, at his wholly headed instigation, stood fiddling on the sidelines—which it chose to call the high ramparts of moral authority.

Mr. Dulles must hold the record for losing more international friends and international good will than any other United States Secretary of State in history. His stupidity is scarcely credible. President Eisenhower ought to fire him forthwith.

## FARM PRICES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last week I reported to the Senate the fact that Secretary of Agriculture Benson was presenting to the Congress and the people figures for realized net farm income which did not include any adjustment for inventory. That had to do with farm income.

Now I present what would appear to be another misleading presentation by Mr. Benson, having to do with farm prices, also given the Congress last month, and since repeated by him in talks around the country. Mr. Benson asserts:

Prices received by farmers have been running 7 percent above a year ago.

It is true prices in December 1956 were 7 percent higher than in December 1955; but why did not Mr. Benson give the complete picture? If he had, he would have said that prices for the year 1956 averaged exactly the same as in 1955.

The figures from his own Department prove it. They show the price index was 236 for 1955, and 236 for 1956. All who read or listened to Mr. Benson's statement might well believe that prices in 1956 were 7 percent above 1955. Nothing could be further from the facts.

Let me present how dangerous is this apparent policy of lifting out of context the month most favorable for the position desired.

Mr. Benson told the Senate Agriculture Committee on January 29 that "prices received by farmers have been running 7 percent above a year ago."

At that time he was one-half right, even though the only month in 1956 in which prices were 7 percent above the same month of 1955 was December.

When he repeated it in St. Louis, Mo., on February 7, however, he was wrong. Prices received by farmers were not "running 7 percent above a year ago," because prices in January 1957 were not 7 percent above those in January 1956.

Mr. President, if we are ever going to arrive at a sound program for the family-size farms, in addition to the factory-size farms, it is first going to be necessary for us to obtain all the truth, not merely a part of it, because partial truth is an evasion of truth.

## AIR MECHANICS' RATINGS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on February 4 I addressed myself to the subject of the Cordiner report, and its relationship to the retention of trained personnel in our armed services. Because of my interest in this field, I asked my staff to conduct a research into the air mechanics' ratings which existed in the Air Corps between 1926 and 1942. These ratings were made possible by Public Law 446, passed on the 2d of July 1926. They were abolished by Public Law 607 of the 77th Congress under the Reorganization Act, in 1942. Our air forces, ground forces, and naval forces need this type of trained skills now just as much as they needed them in 1926.

I ask unanimous consent that the study my staff made of this subject be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

Without objection the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR MECHANICS' RATINGS, AIR CORPS, 1926–42

Congress, in 1926, enacted legislation designed to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing the efficiency of the Air Corps of the United States Army. The bill, among many other things, elevated the military air arm of the Army from the status of a service to that of a corps. In addition, the legislation recognized that the newly established Air Corps needed highly qualified personnel to maintain its complicated equipment.

This latter matter had received considerable attention by a special aircraft committee of the House of Representatives and the President's Aircraft Board, known respectively as the Lampert committee and the Morrow board. Both of these committees, and particularly the Lampert committee, recommended:

"That additional compensation necessary to secure and adequate number of competent mechanics to maintain aircraft in efficient operation, be provided; that such mechanics should be relieved of routine military duty."

Under then existing law, enlisted personnel in the Army were classified in seven pay grades from $21 to $126 a month. In addition to these basic pay rates, Congress, by act of June 3, 1916, as amended by act of June 4, 1920, established a system of bonus pay for certain specialists ranging from $3 to $30 a month.

It was brought out in the hearings of 1926 that these bonuses were not sufficient to attract and retain required Air Corps skills in view of the fact that:

"In the automobile industry the average monthly wage of those who do the same kind of work is $150.22 a month. In the Airmail Service the average wage is $154.04."

Based upon the justification presented by the Air Corps, the act of July 2, 1926 (Public Law 446) provided:

"Enlisted men of the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades in the Air Corps who have demonstrated their fitness and shown that they possess the necessary technical qualifications therefor and are engaged upon the duties pertaining thereto may be rated as air mechanics, first class, or air mechanics, second class, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe. Each enlisted man while holding the rating of air mechanic, first class, and performing the duties as such shall receive the pay of the second grade, and each enlisted man while holding the rating of air mechanic, second class, and performing the duties as such shall receive the pay of the third grade: *Provided*, That such number as the Secretary of War may determine as necessary, not to exceed 14 percent of the total authorized enlisted strength of the Air Corps, shall be rated as air mechanics, first class, or air mechanics, second class."

Taking the then existing pay rates (see table 1), any man in the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh pay grades who held the rating of air mechanic, first class, would be entitled to receive the pay of a second-grade airman, or $84. Any man in these grades classed as an air mechanic, second class, would receive the pay of an enlisted man of the third grade, which at that time was $72.

It should be noted that the Secretary of War determined the number of ratings that were needed but he was limited by law to restrict the number of ratings not to exceed 14 percent of the authorized strength of the Air Force. For example, the act of July 2, 1926, which laid down a 5-year program of expansion of the Army Air Corps, both as to equipment and personnel, established a force of 1,800 planes, 1,650 officers, and 15,000 enlisted personnel in the Air Corps. Actually, however, as of June 1928 the Air Corps had 9,493 enlisted men of which 305 were rated as air mechanics, first class, and 577 were rated as air mechanics, second class. On June 30, 1930, the Air Corps had 12,034 enlisted personnel, of which 616 were rated as air mechanics, first class, and 882 were rated as air mechanics, second class. In 1941 (the last year that this system of classification was used) the enlisted strength of the Air Corps totaled 133,775, of which 3,713 were rated as first class air mechanics and 4,753 were rated as second class air mechanics.

In the hearings of 1941 before the Senate Subcommittee on the Committee of Military Affairs, which preceeded the enactment of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, an Interwar, Navy, Treasury, and Commerce Departments Committee, reporting on the specialist rating system, stated:

"Theoretically the system is good, but as a matter of practical application it is not satisfactory. Modern equipment, its maintenance, repair, and operation requires that many of these specialists exercise command incident to the supervision as well as the instruction of others. Many of the duties for which specialists' ratings were designed require highly intelligent and able men who are either not to be found in the lower grades or who should not be kept there. It is recommended that specialist ratings be paid on the basis of grades rather than trades. If this is done grades would be used in lieu thereof by the Army and Marine Corps as is now done in the Navy and Coast Guard."

It was brought out in the hearings that the Air Corps was abolishing these specialist ratings "as fast as they [the Air Corps] can reprint the Tables of Organization." Therefore, under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607, 77th Cong.), specialists' pay ratings were abolished and the monthly base pay of enlisted personnel ranging from $50 to $138 was established.

An analysis as to how effective the air mechanic specialist ratings were in improving the retention of airmen in the Air Corps can be gleaned from a review of the Air Corps reenlistment rate for the period fiscal year 1926 to 1940. These statistics are contained in table 2. Table 3 shows the reenlistment rates in the infantry corps for certain comparable years. It is realized, of course, that the comparatively better reenlistment rate in the Air Corps was naturally due in some part to such factors as "glamour" of the Air Force, and opportunities for receiving training in skills that would be of value in a civilian occupation. It is also recognized that the economic consequences following the stock market crash of October 1929 also played a large part in influencing enlisted military personnel to reenlist. However, this latter factor was equally as true of the infantry as it was of the Air Corps. Yet from the statistics given, the rate of Air Corps retentions was considerably greater than it was for the infantry. Thus it should be concluded that special pay attractions offered air mechanic specialists did play a large part in improved Air Corps retention rates in the pre-World War II period.

TABLE 1.—*Act of June 10, 1922, Public Law 235, 67th Cong.—Monthly base pay of enlisted men of the Army and Marine Corps*

| Grade: | Amount |
|---|---|
| 1st | $126 |
| 2d | 84 |
| 3d | 72 |
| 4th | 54 |
| 5th | 42 |
| 6th | 30 |
| 7th | 21 |
| Specialist ratings: | |
| 1st | 30 |
| 2d | 25 |
| 3d | 20 |
| 4th | 15 |
| 5th | 6 |
| 6th | 3 |

TABLE 2.—*Air Corps reenlistments, fiscal years 1926–40*

| Fiscal year | Air Corps total enlisted strength (end of fiscal year) | Number discharged | | Number reenlisted within 3 months after discharge | Percent rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Expiration of service | Other [1] | | |
| 1926 | 8,723 | 1,585 | 1,949 | 1,262 | 35 |
| 1927 | 9,077 | 2,410 | 2,087 | 1,735 | 38 |
| 1928 | 9,493 | 1,619 | 2,110 | 1,605 | 43 |
| 1929 | 10,890 | 1,739 | 2,295 | 2,025 | 50 |
| 1930 | 12,034 | 2,703 | 2,470 | 2,817 | 54 |
| 1931 | 13,194 | 2,443 | 1,859 | 2,947 | 68 |
| 1932 | 13,369 | 2,964 | 1,742 | 3,401 | 73 |
| 1933 | 13,497 | 3,849 | 1,637 | 4,132 | 75 |
| 1934 | 14,314 | 3,257 | 910 | 3,341 | 80 |
| 1935 | 14,719 | 2,931 | 1,414 | 3,565 | 82 |
| 1936 | 15,640 | 3,368 | 1,241 | 3,785 | 82 |
| 1937 | 17,299 | 3,704 | 1,795 | 4,100 | 74 |
| 1938 | 18,909 | 3,034 | 1,570 | 3,967 | 86 |
| 1939 | 20,838 | 3,799 | 2,780 | 5,318 | 81 |
| 1940 | 47,812 | 4,643 | 8,448 | 12,479 | 91 |

[1] Honorable causes such as: Return from overseas with less than 2 months service retainability, disqualified as flying cadet, special cases, accept appointment as officer, enter flying training.

TABLE 3.—*Infantry reenlistments*

[Sample year]

| Fiscal year | Total Infantry enlisted strength | Number discharged | | Number reenlisted within 3 months after discharge | Percent rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Expiration of service | Other [1] | | |
| 1926 | 40,344 | 8,955 | 6,624 | 5,504 | 36 |
| 1927 | 39,574 | 12,208 | 6,624 | 7,596 | 41 |
| 1930 | 41,259 | 11,533 | 5,486 | 8,056 | 48 |
| 1931 | 40,569 | 9,497 | 3,652 | 7,604 | 57 |
| 1933 | 39,049 | 10,993 | 4,544 | 11,492 | 70 |
| 1934 | 39,476 | 8,629 | 2,027 | 7,001 | 69 |
| 1937 | 54,707 | 8,361 | 4,634 | 8,021 | 61 |
| 1938 | 57,293 | 7,667 | 5,467 | 8,341 | 64 |

[1] Honorable causes such as: Return from overseas with less than 2 months service retainability, disqualified as flying cadet, special cases, accept appointment as officer, enter flying training.

## PLEASANT VALLEY DAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I shall not take the time to read

but which I have already sent to the newspapers, setting forth my criticism of the Secretary of the Interior for his move in regard to the Pleasant Valley Dam. I urge the appropriate Senate committee to see to it that the Seaton program is thoroughly investigated, because when it is investigated its phoniness will be shown up for what it is.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORSE RAPS SEATON MOVE ON PLEASANT VALLEY DAM

"It will not fool many people for long."

This comment came on the Senate floor this afternoon from Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, in discussing the proposed "study" of the so-called high Pleasant Valley Dam which was announced on Monday by Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton. Such a dam would flood out site of the Hells Canyon Dam.

"Seaton in this case is merely proving out the prediction I made when introducing the bill to authorize the great high dam at Hells Canyon," MORSE declared. "That prediction was that Seaton would seek to exploit the political popularity of the semantic term 'high dam.'"

The Oregon Senator said:

"Seaton is involved in a political attempt to save face without effecting any basic change in the wasteful resource program of this administration. His letter informing the Federal Power Commission of a forthcoming 'study' of high Pleasant Valley means very little and does very little.

"What it fails to do, however, is of the utmost gravity. It fails to emphasize the need for full and comprehensive water resource development, which is what the Hells Canyon controversy is all about.

"The new dam under study would wash out the Idaho Power Co.'s low Hells Canyon Dam—1 of the 3 dams in the company's so-called plan.

"Seaton's action underlines the critical need for upstream storage for flood control and power in the Columbia Basin. Pleasant Valley would not make up the storage deficit if the high Hells Canyon Dam is lost.

"The Secretary of the Interior can prove that he is genuinely and sincerely interested in flood and power storage by reopening the Hells Canyon case before the Federal Power Commission, as he now apparently is introducing a new factor into the Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley case before the FPC.

"Until Seaton makes such a forthright move, I can only conclude that the administration's resource giveaway policies of the past 4 years are still in force."

## SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE PARENT-TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to take occasion to mark the 60th anniversary of the founding of the Parent-Teachers Association. It was in 1897, a year after I was born, when McKinley was President, William P. Frye, of Maine, was President pro tempore of the Senate, and Thomas B. Reed, of Maine, was Speaker of the House, that this organization was established in the Nation's Capital. It had a noble purpose which has been consistently maintained, namely, the well being of the children, who are the citizens of tomorrow. This organization has grown until today it has more than 42,000 units with a membership in excess of 10 million, including more than 3½ million men. How closely it is identified with schools can be seen from the fact that more than 700,000 teachers and school administrators are members.

Yet, Mr. President, the PTA has carefully avoided seeking to dominate or control schools and education. It is still devoted to its original purposes—good schools where the anchors of character are formed, good communities where the right atmosphere prevails, and a good country where opportunity is safeguarded and each shall have a chance to fulfill his destiny.

It is truly an organization of citizens with no selfish ends to pursue and no purpose save the betterment of the schools where children are educated, the communities in which they live, and the country which they will in the future help to direct.

## NATIONAL CHILD LABOR COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, 50 years ago, on February 21, 1907, the Congress by Public Law 103 granted a congressional charter to the National Child Labor Committee. At that time the committee was less than 3 years old, having been founded in April 1904, but already in its short life it had begun to quicken the public conscience and to arouse concern for the hundreds of thousands of children who labored each day in mines and factories and canneries.

It is my happy pleasure and privilege today, when the National Child Labor Committee celebrates the golden anniversary of the charter we granted, to present in the Senate a brief testimonial statement.

A half century ago our country was vastly different from what it is now. Out of a population of 82 millions, 6½ million workers were idle—seeking but unable to find regular employment. Some 4 million of these were public paupers; millions more lived in abject poverty—"underfed, underclothed, poorly housed," in the words of Robert Hunter.

Yet, at the same time that millions of adults were unemployed, almost 2 million children between the ages of 10 and 15 years toiled regular 10- and 12-hour days in mines, in mills, on farms, and on the city streets, ostensibly to help keep their families together and out of the poorhouse. And there were many more thousands younger than 10 whom nobody even bothered to count. Life, like labor, was cheap, and not a day passed but some child was made a helpless cripple. But this was "the era of complacency," as the historian Frederick Lewis Allen called it.

It was in this era of complacency that a small group of humanitarians met in New York City, on April 15, 1904, and formed themselves into the National Child Labor Committee. Resolutely they declared that industrialism must not be allowed to degrade humanity, that child labor was intolerable, that there was need for a national body which would be a great moral force in protecting children, for childhood was a sacred thing. This was the beginning and their voices were to become the articulate conscience of America on this issue. Three years later, 50 years ago, the Congress granted them a congressional charter.

There were 15 founding members of the National Child Labor Committee—Felix Adler, Francis G. Caffey, Robert W. de Forest, Edward T. Devine, Homer Folks, William E. Harmon, John S. Huyler, Mrs. Florence Kelley, James H. Kirkland, V. Everit Macy, Edgar Gardner Murphy, Isaac M. Seligman, Lillian D. Wald, Paul M. Warburg, and John W. Wood. Only one, Homer Folks, now 90, is still alive, but the committee still has an active role to play in fulfilling its original objectives.

Today, 50 years after the granting of a charter by Congress, the National Child Labor Committee can view with considerable satisfaction the great changes it helped to secure. The abusive child labor practices which existed in mill, mine and factory early in the century are now happily a thing of history.

Nevertheless the committee's task is far from finished. In this fortunate land of ours, abundantly blessed by rich resources, most of our children have unparalleled opportunities to grow in security and decency and dignity. But a minority do not. And this is particularly true of the children of migratory farm workers who move with their parents from State to State to help harvest the fruits and fibers which feed and clothe this Nation, and a good part of the world as well.

Many of these children live under abominable conditions, and their educational neglect makes them the largest single source of illiterates in the Nation. The United States Office of Education has estimated that 600,000 of them are not even getting a public-school education, and the United States Children's Bureau has reported that few of them ever get to see a doctor, a teacher, a nurse, or a welfare worker.

According to a presidential commission a few years ago, the average yearly earnings for an adult migrant farm worker amounted to about $520 a year. And yet these migrants are excluded from the Federal minimum-wage law and from the benefits of nearly all social and labor legislation. Most State child-labor laws usually do not apply to the children, and far too few communities make any real effort to encourage their regular school attendance. The National Child Labor Committee is to be warmly commended for its current campaign to expand educational opportunities for this most neglected group of our young citizens.

While a half century has passed since the Congress gave a charter to the National Child Labor Committee, and while vast changes have occurred in our culture and in our economy, the committee has held steadfast to one goal: to stimulate community responsibility and to develop public policy so that all of America's youth might be reared healthfully, grow happily, and mature eventually into productive, creative, and informed citizens of the land.

The name of this voluntary agency suggests, but does not itself completely delineate, the full measure of its interests. Not content with just being against something, the committee is for programs of a positive nature. It is concerned with the children who work and the conditions of their work. And it is also concerned with those children now in school who, in one fashion or another, are being prepared for—or unprepared for—eventual work. It is deeply concerned about those youths whose educational growth has already come to a halt and who aimlessly waste their adolescence in idleness, not at work, not at school, not at any other productive pursuit.

These three groups, the youthful workers, the to-be workers, and the nonworkers, add up to all the children in all the cities and on all the farms and in all the families everywhere across the broad reaches of America. This is the compass of the National Child Labor Committee. May it pursue its worthy aims until its task is completely done.

## ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JAMES F. BYRNES BEFORE THE ILLINOIS STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an outstanding address delivered by the Honorable James F. Byrnes on February 9, 1957, before the Illinois State Bar Association, in Peoria, Ill. The text of this address was printed in many newspapers and in the widely read magazine, U. S. News & World Report. This text appeared in the Anderson (S. C.) Free Press, one of the outstanding and most courageous weekly newspapers in the United States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES F. BYRNES BEFORE ILLINOIS STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

Long ago thoughtful people of the South realized that Abraham Lincoln was correct in his opposition to slavery.

For the indefensible traffic in human beings many people were responsible. Traders from Spain and France, as well as from Great Britain, encouraged the African Chiefs to sell their people into slavery. Later, New England traders brought thousands of slaves to our shores.

Southerners who bought and worked African slaves shared the guilt of the slave traders. Certainly, I would make no defense of slavery. God never made a man wise enough or good enough to own another human being.

Most Southerners now believe that had Lincoln lived, the South would not have been subjected to the oppressions of the reconstruction period which aroused more resentment than the sufferings of the war.

They believe, too, that Lincoln, would have appreciated that the heroic fight of Confederate soldiers, the vast majority of whom owned no slaves, was due, not to the desire to perpetuate slavery, but to their belief that under the Constitution of the United States it was the right of each State to regulate its own internal affairs.

They feared that if the right of a State to control its internal affairs in one instance was denied, the Federal Government would soon make further encroachments upon local governments.

The people of the South respect the written Constitution of the United States. Heretofore they have had great respect for the Supreme Court because they have regarded that court as the defender of the Constitution. They have relied upon the Court for protection against either the executive or the Congress, acting in violation of the Constitution.

When we speak of the law of the land, we refer to the United States Constitution, which, according to article 4, shall be the supreme law of the land.

We regard the Constitution as a statement of principles by which all departments of government are bound, the liberties of the people assured, and that it can be altered only in the manner provided in the instrument.

In the early days of the Republic the people were vigilant in protecting their liberties.

But in time the people became busy and indifferent. Gradually in the courts there was developed the doctrine of judicial review, but it was founded on the principle that acts of government contrary to the Constitution were void.

All of us will agree, as Chief Justice Marshall stated in the Marbury-Madison case, "the Constitution is either a superior paramount law, unchangeable by ordinary means, or it is on a level with ordinary legislative acts and, like other acts, is alterable when the legislative shall please to alter it."

If the latter be true, a written constitution is an absurdity. It is equally clear that if the Constitution is the superior paramount law it cannot be altered whenever the Supreme Court wishes to alter it. That would be an absurdity.

If the Supreme Court can alter the Constitution by its decisions, then five men—a majority of the Court—can make the Court a constitution maker instead of a constitution defender.

Throughout our history Presidents of the United States from Washington to Franklin D. Roosevelt have warned against the Court attempting to usurp such power.

NEW POWERS EXERCISED

Time and again the Court itself has declared it had no power to amend the Constitution. Now it is agreed by students of the law that the Court, while still admitting its lack of power to amend, is exercising new powers without the public realizing that the powers are new.

The trend is well illustrated by the school case.

In 1952 a three-judge court presided over by Hon. John J. Parker, senior judge of the fourth circuit, in a case from Clarendon County, S. C., held that the segregation statutes of South Carolina did not violate the 14th amendment. Lawyers for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People appealed to the Supreme Court.

Some months after the case was first argued, the Court asked for further argument. Because the 14th amendment makes no reference to schools, the Court requested counsel to direct their arguments to the question "What evidence is there that the Congress which submitted and the State legislatures and conventions which ratified the 14th amendment, contemplated or did not contemplate, understood, or did not understand, that it would abolish segregation in public schools.

The attorneys general of all States interested in the issue, were invited to file briefs. Many of them responded. Among other things it was shown that about the time the amendment was submitted Members of the Congress proposed that in the Constitution and in statutes, segregated schools should be prohibited. The proposals were rejected.

The legislative history so conclusively demonstrated that the prohibition of segregated schools was not contemplated either by the framers of the 14th amendment or by the States in ratifying it, that the Supreme Court could not assert otherwise. The most it could declare, in an effort to justify its decision, was that the legislative history was inconclusive.

When the 14th amendment did not mention schools and the Court decided the legislative history was inconclusive, the Court should have declared, as it did only 11 months ago, in March 1956, in the case of *Ullmann* v. *United States* (350 U. S. 427), that "nothing new can be put into the Constitution except through the amendatory process."

The Court should have upheld the Constitution its members are sworn to uphold. It should have upheld the doctrine of separate but equal facilities which had been sustained by the Supreme Court in 8 different cases since 1896.

Instead, the Court declared "We cannot turn the clock back to 1868 when the amendment was adopted, or to 1896 when *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was written." Then why did the Court ask counsel to file briefs as to the intent of the Congress in 1868? And why did the Court ask counsel to argue whether the Court was bound by its previous decisions such as *Plessy* v. *Ferguson?*

If the Court could not turn the clock back to consider the intent of the drafters of the 14th amendment in 1868, what chance is there of the Court turning the clock back to 1778 when the Constitution was drafted?

If age so outmodes the eternal truths of the Constitution, what chance would the Ten Commandments have with the present Court?

The doctrine of stare decisis is not sacred but when a case involves an interpretation of the Constitution and that interpretation is sustained by the Court's decisions over a period of 60 years, we should be able to rely upon it as the law. * * *

SEVEN OTHER CASES

Clearly, then when the Court added to the 14th amendment the prohibition against segregation in public schools, that prohibition, like all other prohibitions of the amendment, could be enforced only by congressional legislation.

Instead of legislating to prohibit it, Congress for 75 years specifically appropriated for segregated schools in the District of Columbia.

And in recent years in appropriating for the school lunch program, Congress, by implication, approved segregated schools by providing that if a State maintained separate schools for races, funds should not be paid unless they were equitably distributed between the segregated schools.

But the Court that was unwilling to leave the amendment of the Constitution to the Congress and the States, as provided in that instrument, likewise was unwilling to leave to the Congress the enforcement of the new 14th amendment.

A DANGEROUS POWER

It substituted the Courts for the Congress. That means the power of injunction. The power of injunction is a dangerous power often abused.

Where Congress, in precise langauge applicable to all citizens, would define what constitutes a crime, and the punishment therefor, already it is apparent that the judge-made laws will radically differ in the different jurisdictions.

In July 1955, the Honorable John J. Parker, senior judge of the Fourth Circuit, speaking for the three-judge court having jurisdiction of the South Carolina segregation case, said that the Supreme Court "has not decided that the States must mix persons of different races in the schools or must require them to attend schools, or must deprive them of the right of choosing the schools they attend. What it has decided, and all that it has decided, is that a State may not deny to any

person, on account of race, the right to attend any school that it maintains. * * * The Constitution, in other words, does not require integration. It merely forbids discrimination."

That Court held voluntary segregation possible. However, in Tennessee a United States District Judge took a different view. He issued an order on January 4, 1956, which according to him, "requires adoption by school authorities of Anderson County of a program of integration that will expeditiously permit the enrollment of Negroes of high-school grades to the high school of that county."

Later that district judge enjoined certain parties who were named, and all others who may be acting in counsel with them from interfering with what the judge called the integration order or from picketing Clinton high school, either by words or acts or otherwise.

Subsequent events demonstrate the chaos that will result from these judge-made laws. In Clinton, Tenn., troops and tanks were ordered to a school, but disorders continued in and out of the school. When the soldiers withdrew the Attorney General of the United States ordered an investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of violations of the court order.

In December a white minister who had no connection with the school voluntarily accompanied certain colored students to the school. After he left and while passing some citizens on the street in front of the police station, he was struck in the face by a man who claimed the minister shoved him. The minister was not seriously hurt.

By order of the court, the man who struck the minister, along with about 12 other persons, including another minister and a woman, who were on the sidewalk where the fight took place, were charged with criminal contempt for violating the injunction order. Released under heavy bond, they were to have a hearing on January 28, but the hearing was postponed.

The people of many States await with interest the result of that hearing. They are anxious to know:

First, whether the district judge, instead of enjoining discrimination against individuals, had the power to issue an order requiring the adoptoin of an integration program.

Second, whether striking a citizen who has no connection with the public schools, at a point some distance from the school building, constitutes an interference with the court's integration order.

Third, heretofore it has been thought that where an act was alleged to violate an order of injunction and at the same time violate the criminal law of the United States or any State, the defendant was entitled to trial by a jury. The people want to know if this has been repealed by the court.

Fourth, whether the presence of citizens at a place on the street, where an assault and battery is committed upon a person not connected with the school or its students constitute an interference with the court's integration order, justifying punishment by a judge with or without a jury trial.

The President was quoted as saying in response to a question at a recent press conference that the problem at Clinton was now in the hands of local courts and local officials. If correctly quoted, the President was misinformed. The citizens have been arrested by order of the United States district judge and the school children have been threatened with the secret police of the United States, who were sent to the scene by the United States Attorney General.

The only local official in the picture is the prosecuting attorney of the county who was so thoroughly frightened that he told the assembled children of the school that if they were guilty of misconduct they would be reported to the FBI and "uncalled-for provocations will be dealt with swiftly and harshly."

FEARS CONSEQUENCES

If schoolchildren who engage in a fist fight or other disorderly conduct at school are not to be punished by school authorities, a juvenile court, or other State tribunal, but are to be arrested by the FBI and without trial by jury are to be sentenced by a United States district judge for violation of an injunction, I fear the consequences in districts where the races are evenly divided.

In the Tennessee school of 804 pupils, only 14 are Negroes. In the school district in South Carolina where there originated the case decided by the Supreme Court, the school population is 2,900 Negroes and 290 white students. There are many such districts in the South and they present a far more serious problem than the situation in Clinton.

In Tennessee a man was sentenced by the district judge to imprisonment for 1 year and a fine of $10,000 for making a speech which the judge regarded as inciting people to violation of the injunction and to acts of violence. That individual was not a citizen of Tennessee or any Southern State.

The facts of the case I do not know. But, law-abiding southerners do not encourage or condone acts of violence. If a white man from a northern State comes South and does incite white people to violence, he should be regarded with the same disfavor as the professional agitator from the North who comes to incite our colored neighbors to acts of violence. In our midst, we have trouble makers in both races. They need no assistance from other States.

The southern people know the United States Government has the military power to enforce the orders of its courts. They say, however, that the Supreme Court which ordered this experiment in sociology must enforce it. It cannot expect the States to voluntarily enforce a decision they regard as having no basis in the Constitution or any statute.

When they are criticized by some of the metropolitan press, they recall that only a few decades ago the Constitution was lawfully amended in the manner provided in that instrument and prohibition laws were enacted. Unquestionably, that was the law of the land. Many of the present critics of the South strongly urged the nullification of the prohibition laws. They made it fashionable to carry whisky flasks and boasted of distilling gin in bath tubs. They did not cease fighting for nullification until the 18th amendment was repealed.

The Supreme Court did not create the people of the United States. The people created the Supreme Court. And the people gave to Congress in article IV of the Constitution, the specific power to regulate the appellate jurisdiction of that Court.

Congress should exercise that power. It should deny to the Supreme Court the power to invalidate the provisions of a State constitution affecting public schools or affecting the security of the State or the United States Government.

LEGISLATION NEEDED

In view of the judicial threat to take out of the Constitution, through the injunctive process, the guaranty of trial of all crimes by a jury, Congress, by legislation, should protect the people against judicial abuse of the power in injunction.

Heretofore when a man has been charged with a felony and has pleaded "not guilty" he has said he would be tried "by God and my country." We must make certain that a man charged with committing a crime, as well as violating a judicial order, is not forced to plead that he will be tried—not by God or his country—but, by a United States district judge.

One could not discuss this segregation decision without admitting that entirely apart from the legal phases, there is a fundamental objection by the people of the South to the social experiment of the Supreme Court.

They fear the purpose of many of those advocating integration in schools is to break down social barriers in the period of adolescense and ultimately bring about intermarriage of the races. They are opposed to this and they are determined to resist in every legal way the efforts to mix the races in the schools. This is not petty prejudice. It is a serious problem of race relations.

Pride of race has been responsible for the grouping of people along ethnic lines throughout the world. Race preservation is the explanation of the political unrest and race tension in South Africa.

Pride of race as well as loyalty to religion, contributes to the conflict between Jews and Arabs in the Middle East, which today threatens the peace of the world. Jews do not marry Arabs. Several Arab governments will not even allow a Jew to enter those countries.

It was a realiaztion of the wisdom of segregating races that prompted 46 governments, including the United States, to agree in the Geneva Convention of 1929 that "Belligerents shall, so far as possible, avoid assembling in a single camp prisoners of different races or nationalities."

In the United States, pride of race is not confined to the South. Today in 23 States, intermarriage of the races is prohibited by law. The degree of race tension in various States and communities is dependent upon the percentage of Negro population.

In the mountainous areas of the South there are few Negroes and little tension. There are other areas where the races are more evenly divided. There the race problem is acute and is the principal topic of conversation among all classes of people.

Similarly, in Northern States in the rural areas there is little tension while in the great cities of New York, Detroit, Washington, and Chicago there is increasing tension.

It is useless for men to argue whether the racial instinct is right or wrong—it exists. It is nothing new.

Thomas Jefferson, the patron saint of the Democratic Party, when he was nearly 80 years of age, said "Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free; nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government. Nature, habit, opinion, have drawn indelible lines of distinction between them."

Abraham Lincoln, who signed the Emancipation Proclamation, and has been regarded as the patron saint of the Republican Party, said in his joint debate with Douglas, at Charleston, Ill., on September 18, 1858, "I will say then that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races; that I am not, nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say, in addition to this, that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality." * * *

The prophesies of these two statesmen were made a century ago. In the early days, following the war, the people of other sections showed no great interest in educating the recently freed slaves. The problem of helping him educationally and economically was left to the impoverished people of the South. They so generously did what they thought was right, now they can boast that since the days of reconstruction the Negro in the South has made greater progress than he has made in any country of the world.

PROGRESS CITED

I am proud of their progress in South Carolina. They are in all the professions. Some few are engaged in banking, hundreds in in-

surance and real estate. They are engaged in merchandising, farming, and in the skilled trades. They own radio stations. More than 18,000 own their own farms. Others manage farms. Thousands own their homes which are equipped with television and electrical refrigeration.

With a Negro population of approximately 800,000 Negroes, about 140,000 own automobiles.

I am confident the number of automobiles owned by Negroes in South Carolina is greater than the number of automobiles privately owned in Russia with its population of 200 million.

As a result of the educational program which I sponsored while Governor, there is at least one Negro high school in every school district. Because these schools are new, in most instances they are better than the high schools for white pupils.

In the State we have 7,500 Negro schoolteachers. In New York City with a larger Negro population, less than 5 percent of the regular teachers are Negroes.

For the State of Illinois with a Negro population of approximately 700,000, I do not have the figures, but I am certain the number of Negro teachers is not one-half the 7,500 in South Carolina.

Proud as I am of this progress, I am even prouder that in the last 25 years there has been a vastly improved relation between the races.

Because this is true, the decision of the Supreme Court was a tragedy. It has undone all that men of good will in both races had accomplished in improving race relations. Instead of improving the situation is worsening. Now we fear for the future.

In the cities, where Negro homes are concentrated, schools were built near their homes. Students are assigned to the schools nearest their homes. If, however, a district judge insists on disregarding State assignment laws and orders the mixing of the races in the schools, I fear the American people will have as serious a problem in the Southeast as we now have in the Mideast.

In several States laws have been enacted providing that if by order of any court, State or Federal, a student is assigned to a school different from that to which he is assigned by school officials, all appropriations for the school to which that student is assigned and all appropriations for the school from which he comes, shall immediately cease.

Counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People predict the Supreme Court will declare these laws unconstitutional. I do not think so, but in view of the segregation decision, I would not bet on what the Court would do.

MAY CLOSE PUBLIC SCHOOL

However, I predict that if the Court shall declare unconstitutional all State statutes having in its opinion the effect of continuing segregation, then with great regret, many States will discontinue public schools.

In anticipation of this last resort, provisions in State constitutions requiring appropriations for public schools have been repealed by the voters. Private schools will be preferred to integrated schools.

Of one thing I am confident, should the Supreme Court cause the closing of public schools, leaders of the white race in the South will see to it that the innocent Negro children receive an education. They must not be permitted to suffer because of the well-intentioned but misguided efforts of overzealous do-gooders.

In South Carolina a similar law was passed as to recreation parks. There are parks for both races. When a suit was brought by several Negroes to be admitted to a park set aside for white people, the legislature passed a law closing that park. A United States district judge recently held the question of discrimination was moot because the park was closed.

The people do not feel as keenly about integration in parks as in schools. Recreation is desirable, but education is essential. However, law officers believed that with the existing tension, integration in parks where there are cabins for lodging and swimming pools, was dangerous.

Governors of several States have announced they will not follow the Tennessee example and call out the National Guard to escort Negro children to white schools. They take the position, taken by the Governor of Texas, that under the police powers, it is the duty of a governor to quell disorders, not to cause them.

In its decision, the Supreme Court said that segregation would retard the development of Negro children. It did not comment upon the effect integration would have upon the development of white children. We believe the presence of troops and tanks and the secret police at a school will do great psychological harm to children—white and colored. Instead of thinking of mathematical problems, they will think of race problems.

The people of the South are not an alien people. They are loyal Americans. Whatever may have been the differences between the North and South 100 years ago, in the Spanish-American War southerners proved their devotion to the United States. In World War I and again in World War II they demonstrated their patriotism and their courage on the battlefields of the world.

Today they are overwhelmed by this problem of race which was inherited by them more than a century ago. Through the years that cross has borne heavily upon them.

Now they earnestly appeal to you for understanding, as they pray that their burdens may be lessened, if not lifted.

## PRINTING OF REPORT ON AIRPOWER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed at the present time, if morning business is concluded, to the consideration of the resolution of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], which was made the unfinished business last evening. I refer to Order No. 66, which is Senate Resolution 93.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be laid before the Senate automatically upon the completion of morning business.

If there is no further morning business, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 93) authorizing the printing of a Senate document of the report on an investigation of airpower, and providing for additional copies.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not know whether the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] cares to make any observations in connection with the consideration of the resolution or not. If he does, this is the appropriate time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I might say that there is an extreme shortage of the report. There are not available a sufficient number of copies to supply Members of Congress. The price of publishing 5,000 more copies is only $600. Therefore, I ask that the resolution be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 93) was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there be printed as a Senate document the report of an investigation of airpower by the Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate; and that 5,000 additional copies be printed for use of the Committee on Armed Services.

## CITATION OF FRANK W. BREWSTER FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 58, Senate Resolution 92, a resolution citing Frank W. Brewster for contempt of the Senate. I call this request to the attention of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 92) citing Frank W. Brewster for contempt of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 92), which is as follows:

*Resolved*, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on Government Operations of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Frank W. Brewster—

(1) to answer questions before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations;

(2) to produce certain papers consisting of described books and records of the Western Conference of Teamsters before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations; and

(3) to produce certain papers consisting of described books and records of Joint Council 28, of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers,

said refusal to answer and to produce the aforementioned papers being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Frank W. Brewster may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, on January 16, 17, 18, and 19, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, began the holding of hearings pursuant to a preliminary investigation the committee had been conducting for some time, looking into conditions that prevail in certain areas of labor and management relations.

At that time we had before us the Secretary of Labor; also, the chairman of the National Labor Relations Board; and a representative of the Treasury Department, I believe Mr. Winkle.

We took testimony from those witnesses regarding the problems of Government in those areas, particularly with respect to existing law, and to what extent those agencies of Government could check against the accuracy of reports and financial statements that labor organizations are required to file with the Government under the law before they can receive the advantage of the services of the National Labor Relations Board and other benefits provided by law.

We found, Mr. President, that their authority in that area is quite limited and quite restricted. We found that what we had ascertained was possibly true, namely, that in some areas some unions were not filing truthful and accurate reports of their financial transactions, and that the Government was being imposed upon by the setting up of what is known as paper unions that had not complied with the law. We found that the officers of the governmental agencies involved had no authority, according to their interpretation of the law, to take any action other than simply to issue certificates or letters of compliance, and also to make available the services the law provides, notwithstanding that the information supplied by some unions in their reports was inaccurate, false, and known to be false, and was intended to constitute an imposition upon the Government.

We also had found, Mr. President, that certain racketeering practices were going on in areas where the Federal Government was procuring goods in the nature of military uniforms and other clothing, and that the racketeering was having an impact upon the cost to the Government of those goods, also resulting, in some instances, in goods being supplied which were inferior to those contracted for.

Our investigation extended to the west coast, to the teamsters union. There it became desirable to hear witnesses from certain labor organizations; and also to hear some witnesses from labor unions in New York.

Mr. Brewster is president of what is known as the Western Conference of Teamsters, a group of labor organizations comprising locals in 11 of the Western States. Mr. Brewster was subpenaed before the committee to testify. He was subpenaed to testify and also to produce certain records of the Western Conference, as well as the records of a certain teamsters' local—Joint Council 28 of the Teamsters in Seattle, I believe, of which he is president.

The subpenas were duly served. Mr. Brewster appeared and took the position that the committee had no jurisdiction of him or of the records, or of the subject matter into which the committee was inquiring. Therefore he refused to answer any questions propounded to him by any member of the committee. He stood upon that challenge of the jurisdiction of the committee.

The committee, under the rules of the Senate, is charged with the duty of studying government at all levels, with a view to determining its efficiency and economy. That is the overall duty with which this committee is charged. It is the position of the committee that it would be derelict in its responsibility if, having information that the practices which I have described prevailed in any union or in any area of the country, it did not inquire into them.

Therefore the issue is joined. This committee will be useless hereafter to the United States Senate if this challenge of its authority and its jurisdiction is sustained.

It is not a challenge merely to the committee. It is a challenge to the United States Senate. It is a defiance of the authority of the United States Senate to determine the facts, through this committee, which has the overall duty and responsibility of policing Government agencies. It is a defiance of this committee and of the authority of the Senate to inquire whether certain labor officials, who have the duty under the law enacted by Congress to file truthful statements of their financial and other activities, have done so.

There is involved a challenge to the authority of the committee to inquire into whether or not labor officials are honestly complying with the law, or whether they are evading the law and committing an imposition upon the Government, and thus Government in this respect is inefficient, and whether remedial legislation is needed.

That is the issue, and I trust the Senate will uphold its committee in the action it has taken. I may say that not only did the subcommittee unanimously recommend this action, but it has been unanimously approved by the full Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very happy to yield to my good friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. As one who once had the honor of serving on this very committee under the chairmanship of the able Senator from Arkansas, I assure him that I will certainly vote to uphold his committee.

I should like to state further that some time ago I noticed that a district Federal judge undertook to hold that a witness could not be in contempt of a congressional committee unless the rules of the Senate provided almost explicitly for the investigation of the particular item involved.

In other words, if a question were somewhat irrelevant, or merely parallel to the investigation, and if it were sought to obtain information which might not have been specifically requested by the Senate, the witness could not be held in contempt. I am frank to say that, as a Member of the legislative branch, I personally resent having any Federal judge attempt to strip the legislative branch of the power granted to it by the Constitution. I urge Members of this body not to confirm, in the future, the nomination of judges who take such a view.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in my judgment, if a challenge could be sustained against the power of the Senate to investigate, it could be sustained against the power of the Congress to legislate. I think that is fundamental.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Arkansas for his statement. I think he is doing very fine work for the American people.

I am one of the so-called liberals in the United States Senate. I have always tried to be for labor. However, there have been instances in which labor did not follow proper practices. There is no reason why the challenge by any group, or any individuals within a group, of the authority of the committee to inquire as to what is going on, should prevail. I congratulate the Senator. I say this as a friend of labor. I think the Senator from Arkansas is doing a great thing for labor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that I agree with his committee's conclusion that in this troubled and very small world it is imperatively necessary that his committee have the support he seeks.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator very much.

I wish to point out one thing more. I spoke of the duty and responsibility of the committee with respect to studying Government on all levels, with a view to determining its efficiency and economy. The committee is also charged with the duty, after having made such studies, to make recommendations to the Senate with respect to legislation which may be needed to improve the economy and efficiency of the Government.

I may say that there is an area here in which, if the present interpretation of existing statutes is correct, very definitely further legislation is needed in order to remedy some conditions the committee has already found to exist, particularly the condition into which it was inquiring at the time this witness testified.

I am ready for the question to be submitted, unless other Senators wish to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 92) was agreed to.

---

## CITATION OF NUGENT LaPOMA FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 89.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 89) citing Nugent LaPoma (alias George Cavano) for contempt of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 89), which is as follows:

*Resolved*, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on Government Operations of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Nugent LaPoma,

also known as George Cavano, to answer questions before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations; to produce certain papers consisting of described books and records of Local 174 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers, said refusal to answer and to produce the aforementioned papers being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Nugent LaPoma may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the remarks I have made on the general premise of the authority and jurisdiction of the committee with respect to the previous resolution are applicable to the resolution now under consideration. Mr. LaPoma is secretary-treasurer of local 174 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers, at Seattle, Wash.

A subpena was duly served on him, and also a subpena duces tecum, to present certain records of the local for the committee's inspection. Mr. LaPoma refused to deliver the records in response to the subpena. He also refused to testify, or to answer questions, saying he would give no information to the committee. Therefore, without laboring the matter further, this resolution involves the same issue which was involved in the resolution previously agreed to. I am ready for the question, unless some Senators wish to be heard on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 89) was agreed to.

## CITATION OF EINAR O. MOHN FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 60, Senate Resolution 91.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 91) citing Einar O. Mohn for contempt of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 91), which is as follows:

*Resolved*, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on Government Operations of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Einar O. Mohn, to answer questions before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Einar O. Mohn may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the pending resolution would cite Mr. Einar O. Mohn for contempt of the Senate. Mr. Mohn is vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, with headquarters in Washington, D. C. At the time he was also acting for the general president of the organization.

He was subpenaed before the committee to testify particularly with respect to a telegram he sent to 12 vice presidents of the international union throughout the country. The telegram was calculated to obstruct and impede the work of the committee, and it was also calculated to encourage witnesses to be in contempt of the committee.

Among other things, after stating the fact that the committee was making its investigation and had subpenaed a number of witnesses and documents and a number of officials of the union and documents of the union, the telegram stated:

4. If any member, officer, or representative of the international or any of its affiliates, after advice of counsel, should assert his constitutional or legal privileges or rights, the assertion of said rights or privileges shall not be the basis for disciplinary proceedings by or within the international.

Mr. President, Mr. Mohn was called before the committee by subpena to testify with respect to having sent this telegram, and he was also interrogated about other matters which were a part of the subject of the committee's inquiry. Mr. Mohn challenged the jurisdiction of the committee, refused to testify, and refused to acknowledge whether he had sent the telegram, although it bore his signature, or to deny whether he sent it.

Mr. President, that was definitely a defiance and contempt of the United States Senate. His other actions were calculated to impede and hinder, if not completely to obstruct, the investigation then underway.

Therefore, Mr. President, unless some other Senator desires to be heard, I ask that the question be put on the adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 91) was agreed to.

## CITATION OF HARRY REISS FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar 61, Senate Resolution 90.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 90) citing Harry Reiss for contempt of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 90), which is as follows:

*Resolved*, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on Government Operations of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Harry Reiss to answer questions before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigation of the Committee on Government Operations, pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Harry Reiss may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this is a case similar to the one the Senate has just disposed of.

Mr. Harry Reiss is administrator of the welfare fund of local 227 and is also an official of the Teamsters' Union. He was called before the committee to testify regarding information he had which was of interest to the committee concerning the conduct of Teamsters' Local 227, particularly in its relations to the Federal Government in connection with statements or other reports which the law requires to be filed. The witness refused to admit that he was a member of the union and refused to answer any questions whatsoever. He was definitely in defiance and in contempt of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to say that the statements I made with respect to the resolution of contempt against Mr. Brewster apply equally to each one of these cases.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that the question be put on the adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 90) was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANTS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief announcement. The policy committee is about to hold a meeting, and I propose to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 67, Senate Resolution 75, at this time, if there will be no extended discussion on it, because I wish to make a brief statement on a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution concerning the Middle East situation.

If the Senator from Alabama is ready to explain Senate Resolution 75, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 67, Senate Resolution 75.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 75) to authorize additional clerk-hire for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 75), which is as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized, from February 1, 1957, through January 31, 1958, to employ four additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the resolution was unanimously reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Rules and Administration. It simply continues the employment of four stenographers on the Committe on Labor and Public Welfare who were originally employed in the 83d Congress, whose services were continued in the 84th Congress, and whose services are now needed by the Committee on Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 75) was agreed to.

## SENATOR CARL HAYDEN, OF ARIZONA

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the other day I happened to read that on February 19, 1957, CARL HAYDEN will have served in Congress for 45 years.

A modest man is CARL HAYDEN. I do not see him on the floor now, but Senators know that he is busily at work in the rooms of the Committee on Appropriations. As chairman of that committee, which carries the heaviest load of any committee in the Congress, and as President pro tempore of the Senate, no one is busier than he.

But it seemed to me that this day ought not to go by without it being noted that it marks the anniversary of the commencement of the longest period of congressional service by any present Member of the Congress of the United States.

I came to know CARL HAYDEN when I was a Member of the House of Representatives and was serving on the Committee on Conference on the Committee on Appropriations, representing the House. The first time I went into a conference with him, I did not know who he was, but by the time the conference was completed, I was eager to ask someone what the background of that man was, because he seemed to have the answer to everything when a time came for a showdown.

Some years ago a man said to me that he thought CARL HAYDEN knew more about the Government of the United States than did any other individual. I have never been disposed to take exception to that observation. Nor have I been disposed to take exception to the observation of another friend, who said he thought that, if anyone knew how to get something done in Congress, it was the senior Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN.

In looking at the Congressional Directory, a few minutes ago, I noted that the biographical sketch of CARL HAYDEN is only seven lines long. It reads as follows:

CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, Phoenix; born Hayden's Ferry (now Tempe), Ariz., October 2, 1877; educated in public schools of Tempe, Normal School of Arizona, and Stanford University; delegate Democratic National Convention 1904; elected treasurer Maricopa County 1904, sheriff 1906, reelected 1908; appointed major of infantry, United States National Army, October 4, 1918; married; elected to 62d and succeeding Congresses through 69th; elected to United States Senate 1926; reelected 1932, 1938, 1944, 1950, and 1956.

One who is not familiar with the history of Congress or with how Congress operates would never glean from that sketch all that would be necessary to understand the ability of Senator HAYDEN, his character, and the high confidence which he enjoys on the part of the other Members of this body.

Going further into the general Biographical Directory of the American Congress (1774–1949), I find that upon the admission of Arizona as a State into the Union, on February 14, 1912, CARL HAYDEN was elected to Congress as Representative at Large and took his seat on February 19, 1912. That is 45 years ago today. The well-remembered Champ Clark, of Missouri, was Speaker of the House of Representatives at the time. Arizona's first two Senators were Henry F. Ashurst and Marcus A. Smith, and they did not take their seats until April 2, 1912.

CARL HAYDEN does not make long speeches on the floor of the Senate, but he always speaks to the subject at hand, briefly and effectively. I have wondered at times if he originated the saying that it is much better to have people wonder why you do not speak than to wonder why you do. When he does speak, Senators know that he speaks with accuracy and authority, so they listen with interest.

Mr. President, I do not desire to make an extended speech, but I did wish to say a few words on this anniversary occasion in tribute to a man who has served in Congress longer than any other Member and served with so much distinction as has the senior Senator from Arizona, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to observe that the majority policy committee toasted the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the senior Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN.

He is one of the great men of the Senate, always kindly, always gentle, always a genuine friend. I know of no more effective public servant in public life today than CARL HAYDEN.

I am informed that this is the anniversary of 45 years of continuous service by CARL HAYDEN in Congress. That period has been exceeded only one time in the history of Congress, namely, by the late Representative Adolph Sabath, of Illinois, who served approximately 45 years and 9 months.

So Senator HAYDEN not only is the sole living person who holds such a distinguished record, but his is second to the alltime record established for congressional service.

Mr. President, it is typical of CARL HAYDEN that he would refuse to come to the Senate Chamber to hear his friends pay tribute to him. He is a man of great modesty and great understanding. The people of Arizona, the people of the Nation, and the Members of Congress are indeed fortunate to have had the benefit of his service throughout the years, and look forward to many more years of vigorous and able service by him.

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 68, Senate Joint Resolution 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before the question is put, I desire to make a very brief statement. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], will make an extended statement explaining the joint resolution; but because I must be away from the Chamber, I should like at this time to make a statement which will take about 3 minutes before the motion is acted upon.

There are a few observations I wish to make on the resolution so that the character of our actions, as I see them, will be entirely clear to all the world.

Throughout my public career, I have consistently held to the belief that an American foreign policy is best made through responsible cooperation. By that I mean cooperation not only between the two parties, but also between Congress and the executive.

This is not always a simple concept to follow. Sometimes there is an understandable disposition upon the part of one branch or the other to operate on a "put up or shut up" basis.

Sometimes there is a tendency to define cooperation as "do it my way or else."

But, Mr. President, responsible cooperation does not flow along those lines. It is not merely a matter of the executive proposing and of Congress either rubberstamping the proposal or acting like a dog in the manger.

Every realistic man, I believe, will recognize that the President of the United States has a very special role to play in the field of foreign policy. He is charged by the Constitution specifically with the conduct of foreign policy of the United States. He is the custodian of the day-to-day information without which no policy can be made.

But Congress also has a special responsibility. It is our task to examine the actions of the Executive; to obtain the facts; and to approve, reject, or make the changes which are dictated by the standards of wisdom and prudence.

The third course is the one which was followed by the committees that considered the resolution.

The resolution came to us under somewhat uncertain circumstances. We first heard about it through a third party. But perhaps this was simply because communications between the two ends of Pennsylvania Avenue were a bit weak.

The Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, sitting jointly, held several days of hearings. We listened to the testimony of many expert witnesses. There were some allegations that some of the witnesses spoke at length but testified to very little.

I will not pursue those allegations beyond saying that I could detect some disposition to take a long time explaining answers to very simple questions. But at the conclusion of the hearings the committees went into executive session and began to work on the joint resolution.

First, the committees discovered that there was no definite date for the termination of the economic aid proposed in the joint resolution. The Department, through the Secretary of State, said that it had no objection to a terminal date, but that somehow it had not been included.

At the suggestion of the very able, very distinguished, very thorough, and prudent senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], that deficiency was corrected.

Then the committees discovered that the authors of the measure were asking for a blank check, and could not tell us then precisely how, where, and when the money would be spent. They said this information would be available later, after the Richards mission had made a tour, a survey, and a report.

At my initiative, an amendment was adopted; and under the present language of the joint resolution as it was reported by the committees, Congress will have an opportunity to examine the projects 15 days before they are finally approved. Before any allocations become final, they must be submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress.

Finally, it became apparent that the joint resolution raised grave questions about the constitutional relationships between the President and Congress. It was difficult to determine who was the Commander in Chief and who had the power to declare war. The junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] prepared an amendment to correct this weakness; and their language, in my opinion, did not water down or did not weaken the joint resolution by a comma. The joint resolution still remains a clear warning to the Communist aggressors: Keep out.

Mr. President, the joint resolution represents to me the true meaning of responsible cooperation in the field of foreign policy. The President advanced a proposal; a coordinate branch of the Government—and I am now specifically speaking of the great committees presided over by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], namely, the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services—considered the proposal at length and wrote in changes which the members deemed wise.

Now—and this is of more than passing significance—the President and the Secretary of State have indicated their willingness to accept the proposed legislation as it has been reported by two committees sitting jointly.

This type of operation, in my opinion, is one which strengthens a policy. It serves notice to the Communist world that it is opposed not simply by one man, not simply by one branch of the Government of the United States. It serves notice that the Communist world is opposed by the institutions representing the united will of the American people.

It is in that spirit that I am approaching the joint resolution. I do not claim that it is perfect. Far from it. But I do believe that it represents balanced judgment and that we can consider it responsibly and in something other than a "yes" or "no" attitude; in something other than a black or white situation.

The joint resolution has been considered expeditiously, but not hastily. It is subject to further consideration, which I am confident the Senate will give it in the same vein. I believe it represents a tremendous improvement over the original joint resolution. In that spirit we can go ahead and can demonstrate that in the defense of our Nation, and against Communist aggression, all Americans are united.

Mr. President, I wish to state for the record some statistics in regard to the troops-to-Europe proposal. The troops-to-Europe proposal was pending before the appropriate committees for 50 days. It was reported to the Senate, and the Senate debated that proposal for 20 days. I do not mean to imply that that situation is comparable to the present one; but for purposes of comparison it does show that in the present case the combined committees have functioned with efficiency, thoroughness, and dispatch. I trust that the entire Senate will do likewise, and that we shall improve on the record set in the other situation.

Mr. President, I desire to express my gratitude to and my commendation of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] for the painstaking care which he exercised in the consideration of the joint resolution, for his unfailing courtesy to every member of the committees, and for the great ability and wisdom he demonstrated throughout the consideration of this measure.

All of us are likewise indebted to our friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], for the contributions he has made. There is no abler Member of the Senate. The Senate is fortunate to have such distinguished Senators working on the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 19.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, jointly, with an amendment to strike out the preamble and all after the resolving clause, and insert:

That the President be and hereby is authorized to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East desiring such assistance in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized to undertake, in the general area of the Middle East, military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance. Furthermore, the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism: *Provided*, That such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the charter of the United Nations.

SEC. 3. The President is hereby authorized to use during the balance of fiscal year 1957 for economic and military assistance under this joint resolution not to exceed $200 million from any appropriation now available for carrying out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, in accord with the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That, whenever the President determines it to be important to the security of the United States, such use may be under the authority of section 401 (a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and without regard to the provisions of section 105 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1957: *Provided further*, That obligations incurred in carrying out the purposes of the first sentence of section 2 of this joint resolution shall be paid only out of appropriations for military assistance, and obligations incurred in carrying out the purposes of the first section of this joint resolution shall be paid only out of appropriations other than those for military assistance. This authorization is in addition to other existing authorizations with respect to the use of such appropriations. None of the additional authorization contained in this section shall be used until 15 days after the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives and, when military assistance is involved, the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives have been furnished a report showing the object of the proposed use, the country for the benefit of which such use is intended, and the particular appropriation or appropriations for carrying out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, from which the funds are proposed to be derived: *Provided*,

That funds available under this section during the balance of fiscal year 1957 shall, in the case of any such report submitted during the last 15 days of the fiscal year, remain available for use under this section for the purposes stated in such report for a period of 20 days following the date of submission of such report. Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall be construed as itself authorizing the appropriation of additional funds for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the first section or of the first sentence of section 2 of this joint resolution.

SEC. 4. The President shall, within the months of January and July of each year, report to the Congress his action hereunder.

SEC. 5. This joint resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the nations in the general area of the Middle East are reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise except that it may be terminated earlier by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.

IMPORTANCE OF THE RESOLUTION

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, all of us appreciate that Senate Joint Resolution 19 is probably the most important foreign policy measure to come before the Senate at this session of Congress. On January 5 the President of the United States took the extraordinary step of addressing a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives relative to the situation in the Middle East. The President asked that Congress join with him in expressing the determination of the United States to assist those nations of the Middle East which desire our assistance against the menace of international communism. Secretary of State Dulles and other representatives of the executive branch subsequently appeared before a joint committee consisting of members of the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, to justify in detail the President's request.

This joint committee, over which I had the honor to preside, has now made its report. It strongly supports the policy announced by the President of using armed forces, if necessary, to help nations of the Middle East resist Communist aggression.

The importance of Senate Joint Resolution 19 has been further emphasized by two reactions from the Communist quarter. We know from experience that the Russians tend to make the most noise when their position is the least tenable. On last January 18 the Governments of the Soviet Union and Communist China issued a belligerent declaration on the subject of the Middle East policy of the United States. On last February 12, 1957, the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union presented to the United States Ambassador in Moscow a 6-point proposal with respect to the Middle East.

I shall not discuss the merit or lack of merit of either of these moves on the part of the Communists. I cite them simply to show the importance which the Communist world attaches to the declaration of Middle East policy which the United States is now in the process of making.

COMMITTEE ACTION

Mr. President, I can safely say that the joint resolution now before the Senate has been given thorough consideration during 16 days of joint committee meetings. Secretary Dulles was before the committee for 6 full days, and Admiral Radford was questioned on 2 days. The joint committee spent 5 days questioning 5 present and former United States Ambassadors to countries in the Middle East. A large number of private individuals and representatives from American organizations presented their views. Three Senators who were not members of the joint committee presented their views.

I wish to pay high tribute to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, who sat with me faithfully and helpfully during the long days of hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 19.

I call the attention of Senators to report No. 70, before them, which contains many details on the Middle East resolution, which I shall not repeat in my remarks.

Mr. President, I introduced the executive branch joint resolution on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], with the explanation that I reserved my right to support amendments which I thought might improve the joint resolution. Such amendments have now been made. As a result, the joint resolution is now a far better one.

The most important amendment concerned the language relating to the possible use of United States Armed Forces in the general area of the Middle East. Senate Joint Resolution 19 as originally introduced contained these words:

He [the President] is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any such nation or group of nations requesting such aid against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism.

The new language adopted by the joint committee reads as follows:

The United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism.

The critical change in this language, Mr. President, is that which avoids use of the words "he is authorized," and substitutes for them the statement that in the circumstances specified "the United States is prepared to use armed forces * * *."

It is my view that this change immensely strengthens the language originally proposed by the President. I so informed the Secretary of State when I discussed this change with him after the joint committee had acted. I am pleased to know that the President of the United States has concurred in this view.

This new language is stronger than that in the original resolution because it states not simply that the President "is authorized," but it declares the policy of the United States. It is much more clear and forthright to state that the "United States is prepared" to take action, than to state only that the President is authorized. The revised language substitutes the whole Government for the Executive branch alone. Furthermore, as the report of the joint committee states, this language has the "virtue" of avoiding a constitutional debate which might have the effect of getting an important foreign policy statement lost in a lengthy discussion of constitutional interpretation.

I do not want to be understood as belittling in any respect the important constitutional questions which were raised by the use of the words "is authorized" in the original resolution. My sole point is that there was great danger that lengthy and profound discussion of constitutional questions might have had the effect of reducing the impact of an important statement of United States policy in an area vital to the security interest of this Nation. Until the joint committee spoke, and until the Secretary of State and the President accepted this new language, there was great danger that the fog of constitutional discussion might blur the new vistas which a forthright statement of our intentions should open up. We are now ready to develop a strong, affirmative Middle East policy designed to preserve the independence of states in that area—states whose independence is vital to us.

I want also to mention an amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] which has made it clear that no new programs are to be inaugurated pursuant to section 3 of the resolution without the submission of a report by the President to the appropriate committees prior to the inauguration of such programs. Several amendments by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] have clarified clauses relating to economic and military assistance.

THE SENATE IS NO RUBBERSTAMP

Mr. President, there are several important lessons to be learned from our experience thus far in considering the resolution which is now before the Senate. These are lessons to be applied in the future if our foreign policy is to be strong, and serve the interests of a united people.

In the first place, it seems to me that it is a mistake for the executive branch of the Government to submit legislative proposals to the Congress and expect Congress to accept every dotted "i" and crossed "t" and to view any changes as defeats. Our discussions in the joint committee indicated that there was widespread and general support for the policies enunciated by the President in his message to us of January 5. But there was also evidence that the administration was too enamored of its own legislative draftsmanship. Most amendments suggested by Senators were rejected by the executive branch quickly and unequivocally, with little evidence that they had received the sympathetic consideration which they deserved. It is time for the executive branch of the Government to recognize that in the field of foreign policy the Senate has never been, and never will be, a rubber stamp.

It is the duty of the President to submit his foreign policy proposals to the Congress. But it is likewise the duty of the Congress to measure those proposals independently, not only with respect to policy, but also with respect to the constitutional implications of those proposals.

This we have done. The product will elicit a wider area of public agreement and acceptance than would the original language of the resolution. The changes made by the joint committee should not be viewed as a defeat for the Executive; they should be viewed as a triumph for our system of separation of powers—a separation which must be preserved if our freedoms are to be safeguarded.

I wish that it were possible to make public some of the debate which took place in the markup sessions of the joint committee. Some of the most profound constitutional discussion in which it has ever been my privilege to participate took place in those sessions. It was a deep privilege for me to preside over those sessions, and I want to take this occasion to thank all my colleagues for their understanding and their hard work.

I can state unequivocally that our meetings in joint session brought together in one room, for a period of nearly 4 weeks, one of the greatest aggregations of United States foreign and military policy experience that has ever been gathered in the Senate. The cumulative experience, judgment, and wisdom of the members of the joint committee was most impressive. The fact that our constitutional system provides opportunity for this kind of judgment and evaluation of presidential proposals assures the American people that the foreign policies affecting the life of this Nation are formulated only after most careful and thorough consideration. Let me repeat again, it is this kind of study that protects our American heritage.

NONPARTISANSHIP

Another lesson to be learned from our committee discussions of this resolution relates to the subject of nonpartisanship. It is with some reluctance that I enter into this subject, which was ably discussed on the floor last week by the senior Republican member of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. WILEY]. But what I am about to say needs saying now if we are to avoid injecting undue partisanship into the formulation of foreign policy—a situation I shall do my utmost to avoid.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, a number of the votes on amendments in the joint committee found members voting along party lines. I do not like this. I do not think most members like it. They were as uneasy and as disturbed as I was.

We must never forget that partisanship breeds partisanship. Tight party lines on one side of the aisle, partisan-motivated attack or defense of foreign policy, will only harden partisan divisions, to the detriment of a strong foreign policy supported by a united people.

The national interest requires that this kind of voting come to an end in the field of foreign policy. There is no higher duty imposed on Members of this body than to exercise independent judgment in the field of foreign policy. It is essential in this area of national policy to put the principle of independent judgment above party regularity.

I say this to members of both parties in the Congress, as well as to members of both parties serving in the executive branch of the Government.

As I have said, it is proper, under our Constitution, for the executive branch of the Government to exercise leadership in the field of foreign policy. But that leadership should be nonpartisan. There should be no occasion in this critical field for party regularity—for whipping the party into line, as the phrase goes.

It may be possible once or twice for partisan action to succeed. But in the end, partisanship in foreign policy, whether it originates in the Executive or in the Congress, can only lead to shattering defeat not only for the proponents of such a policy, but for the policy pressed by this technique. Partisanship in foreign policy will hurt our Nation.

In this connection, I want to pay my highest compliments to the majority and minority leaders of this body. They have both shown their independent foreign policy judgment on many occasions. They have put their responsibilities as Senators above partisan pleading in the field of foreign policy. It is well known that on occasion the minority leader has disagreed on matters of principle with party leadership from the executive branch of the Government. It is equally well known that the majority leader has on occasion cooperated on matters of principle with the leadership in the executive branch, even though that leadership has been vested in representatives of the other party.

This kind of independence is to be commended—not independence for independence sake, but independence for the sake of being able to arrive at independent judgment. It is in the exercise of independent judgment that we find protection for our freedoms.

PUT MISTAKES BEHIND

We all realize that some mistakes have been made in the Middle East. I do not intend, however, to make a point of these errors. The past is over and done with and we must now review the situation as it stands today in the Middle East and take some thoughtful steps forward.

PURPOSE OF THE RESOLUTION

The purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 19 is to announce in no uncertain terms to the world that if the international Communist movement tries by force to expand its influence in the Middle East the United States would regard such an attempt as a threat to the security of the United States. The purpose of the resolution, at the same time, is to make clear to the sovereign nations of the Middle East that they are not alone in their effort to defend their independence and to make a better life for their people.

The resolution also makes clear that the United States wishes only to help, and has no desire to exercise any control in the Middle East. This resolution is not a belligerent step; in fact, the joint committee has been informed at our hearings that no change in the present disposition of United States forces is contemplated; there are no plans to station additional United States forces in the Middle East; and no major change in the levels of military assistance to countries in the Middle East is expected.

Despite the clear statements of our intentions in the resolution, I am aware that there is a danger that countries such as Syria, Egypt, and Yemen may feel apprehensive by virtue of the fact that they alone in the Middle East have accepted Communist arms and Communist technicians. These countries need not be apprehensive about this resolution. The resolution does not threaten any nation in the Middle East. On the contrary, it is intended to extend a helping hand. The only warning contained in the resolution is directed toward international communism.

UNITED STATES INTEREST IN KEEPING THE MIDDLE EAST FREE

It is in the direct and vital interest of the United States that the nations of the Middle East maintain their independence. This interest and United States policies toward this end have been the basis for United States actions for many years.

The record of the United States in this respect stands in marked contrast to that of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union for years has been proclaiming the independence of Hungary, but the world now knows that when the Hungarians seemed on the point of actually realizing some degree of independence the armed forces of the Soviet Union were sent in to crush the attempt.

Our friends and allies in Europe are very largely dependent on the oil of the Middle East for one of their primary energy sources. If the Communists controlled the oil of the Middle East they would be in a position to influence directly the course of events in Europe. But the oil of the Middle East also has importance for us because a very large proportion of the known reserves of the world is found there.

The Middle East is also important to the United States because of the location there of a number of airfields on which we depend, in part, for the defensive striking power which thus far has served as one of the important deterrents to Soviet aggression. We are permitted to use these airfields because we have come to agreement with the countries where they are located that such use is in their interest as well as in our own interest.

Another important interest of the United States in the Middle East is the Suez Canal. Like the oil of the Middle East, the Suez Canal is of importance to us chiefly in an indirect way. United States flag vessels do not make up a high percentage of the traffic through the canal, but the canal has been and will continue to be a vital line of communication and transportation for our friends both in Europe and in Asia.

Finally, the Middle East is important to the United States because of the raw materials which it contains and which we need.

SCOPE OF THE RESOLUTION

The term "the general area of the Middle East" as used in this resolution covers a somewhat indefinite territory, and purposely so. It is not wise to draw a sharp line to separate the Middle East from adjacent areas. Suffice it to say that the general area of the Middle East includes countries all the way from Libya in the west to Pakistan in the east, and from Turkey in the north to the Sudan in the south.

It may be surprising to some to say that there is nothing wholly new in this resolution. The policies and principles embodied in it have been tested and found useful in many parts of the world. The resolution amounts primarily to a reaffirmation of United States policy with particular emphasis on this part of the world at this critical time. There is also a precedent in the similar Formosa Resolution which was enacted in 1955 for the declaration of intention to use United States Armed Forces to resist aggression. However, the language of the resolution now before the Senate represents, as I have said, a distinct improvement over that used in the Formosa Resolution.

References to economic and military assistance in the resolution are for the most part a reaffirmation of existing law. The only new element is contained in section 3. That section makes it possible for the President, with respect to funds already appropriated, to avoid, if need be, some of the procedures in existing law for the administration of the mutual security program. This additional flexibility is limited to not to exceed $200 million of already appropriated funds. Besides this, the additional authority cannot be used until 15 days after the Congress has been informed as to the proposed use of the new authority. During this time the Congress will have the opportunity to review the proposed use and to register its opposition if the proposal does not seem to be wise.

The principal use to which the proposed new authority may be put by the President is the avoidance of the requirement contained in section 105 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1957, that not over 20 percent of mutual security appropriations may be spent in the last 2 months of the fiscal year. This additional leeway is necessary because, due to the recent fighting in the Middle East, our programs there have been badly interrupted in several countries.

It should be pointed out that there is nothing automatic about the commitment which we are undertaking in this resolution. If an emergency arises it will be dealt with by the President and the Congress according to our usual constitutional processes.

It is important also to point out that the resolution does not attempt to deal with all the problems which face us in the Middle East. This is only a first step. It is not intended to be a complete blueprint for progress in the Middle East. It concentrates on the danger from Communist aggression. It purposely does not deal with the danger from Communist subversion. The ways in which the United States can help prevent Communist subversion do not involve the use of the Armed Forces. We resist Communist subversion by helping countries to stay independent and to develop their economies peacefully and democratically.

I wish to underline the fact that the resolution speaks only of a certain type of action in a particular set of circumstances. It is not meant to cover all the possible actions by the United States, and because it mentions some kinds of action it does not thereby limit or in any way affect other kinds of action by the United States in the Middle East or elsewhere.

We are aware now, more than ever before, of the importance of the Middle East, but this does not mean that our policies and objectives in other parts of the world have become less important.

IS THERE A VACUUM IN THE MIDDLE EAST?

It has become popular to say that there exists a vacuum in the Middle East. The reference is, of course, to the fact that there is for the time being understandable resentment against British and French influence in the area. The United States, however, has no intention of rushing to the Middle East to take the place of the British and French. We have no such ambition; we have no colonial pretensions or needs. If there is a vacuum in the Middle East, it is our hope that the vacuum will be filled by the people of the area themselves. It is the intention of the United States to help the people of the area maintain their independence and continue to handle their own affairs in the interest of their own people and in harmony with the rest of the world.

THE RESOLUTION IS NOT A PROGRAM

Senate Joint Resolution 19 constitutes both a warning to the Soviet Union and an assurance to the countries of the Middle East. These things are important, but they are by no means all that must be done. The major portion of our work lies ahead.

The Middle East has been a somewhat neglected area of our foreign policy. We need, and need quickly, a constructive, consistent policy and concrete program which will help the countries of the Middle East to live and grow in peace. We need not, incidentally, ask the countries of the Middle East to choose between the East and the West. They can be neutral if they wish. They must be independent. And it is to preserve that independence that the United States seeks to help these countries to see the dangers in communism. We should, on the other hand, welcome them as our allies if they so choose.

There are three immediate problems, obvious to all, which must be solved if there is to be much hope for the future in the Middle East.

The Suez Canal must be open to the traffic of all nations on some basis which will be fair both to them and to the host country—Egypt.

The long and bitter dispute between Israel and her Arab neighbors must come to an end. Any settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict will necessarily require concessions on both sides, and there are such concessions which both sides can reasonably make.

Finally there remains to be solved the terrible condition of the Palestine refugees. The Government of the United States has long stood ready to help in the solution of the refugee problem, and we have done a great deal to provide the minimum subsistence on which the refugees now exist, but a permanent arrangement is something which lies entirely in the future.

The resolution before the Senate is not designed to help any country engage in an arms race. We have received the assurance of the Secretary of State that the new discretionary power which will be given to the President in section 3 will not be used to avoid the requirement of the Mutual Security Act that military assistance shall be made available solely to maintain the internal security and legitimate self-defense of the recipient nations consistent with the Charter of the United Nations.

In calling on the executive branch to develop Middle East policies which will help achieve our peaceful objectives there, I must remind the Department of State of the evidence developed during the hearings of the joint committee that the State Department machinery and procedures have been at times extremely faulty. It is to be hoped that no more instances will come to light in which the United States Ambassador in a country in the Middle East will learn from the local newspapers of the announcement of United States policies of great concern to the country to which he is accredited.

TASKS FOR THE CONGRESS

Mr. President, in expressing the hope that the passage of this resolution may be the signal for renewed dedication on the part of the executive branch to constructive work in the Middle East, I should call attention to some of the work which the Congress must undertake on its own. First, we must insist that the executive branch develop constructive foreign policies. The Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services must insist on an adequate response by the executive branch to the request which we have made for documents and other materials which will provide a full and fair picture of United States involvement in the Middle East during the last several years. It is my hope that the executive branch will respond quickly to this request. We also expect to receive sufficient telegrams to and from United States Ambassadors in the field and other papers, so that we shall know the essential facts and policies with respect to the relations between this country and other countries during the period in question.

As evidence of the nonpartisan way in which this examination of the Middle East situation should be undertaken, I invite the attention of the administration to the fact that I have appointed a subcommittee, with equal representation from both parties, to assemble the material necessary to an objective evaluation of the situation.

The Senate should complete at an early date its study of the foreign aid

programs of the United States. A great deal of work in this field has already been done, and the special Senate committee created last year for this task has before it a number of fine studies on various aspects of the subject. It is my hope that the special committee will soon develop some helpful policy guidance for the future conduct of the mutual security program.

When the President's mutual security program for the fiscal year 1958 comes before the Congress later on in the year, the Senate should examine it even more carefully than usual and do so in the light of the principles which will be laid down by the Senate Special Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program.

I think all the Members of this body must remain alert to the situation in the Middle East and demand of the executive branch all the information necessary to understand adequately the facts and the trends in that troubled area. We must exercise our surveillance function critically and helpfully.

THE JOINT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THE APPROVAL OF THE RESOLUTION

Mr. President, on behalf of the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, may I say that we have examined the Middle East resolution with great care. We have made judicious changes in the draft resolution which was referred to us. The joint committee believes that it is important for the United States to declare in this resolution that we shall not stand idly by in the event of Communist aggression in the Middle East. The joint committee also believes that we should assure the countries of the Middle East that we intend to conduct our affairs with a view to being of service to them as well as to the people of the United States. The joint committee has concluded that the Congress and the President should act together in stating these two important aspects of United States policy in the Middle East.

I earnestly hope that the Senate will approve Senate Joint Resolution 19.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the senior Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate my distinguished colleague for the valuable contribution he has made this afternoon and for the able manner in which he conducted the hearings held by the committees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to join my distinguished colleague [Mr. PASTORE] in commending the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee not only for the way in which he conducted the joint hearings but for the very able presentation he has made on the floor this afternoon.

I am delighted that in the course of his remarks the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee pointed out that the changes made in the resolution during the course of the joint committee hearings, in effect, instead of weakening the resolution, strengthened it, and at the same time we have upheld the constitutional power of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

I was particularly struck by the paragraph on page 5 of the Senator's speech which I desire to call to the attention of the Senate, and which I think deserves reading once again. I now read it:

> In the first place, it seems to me that it is a mistake for the executive branch of this Government to submit legislative proposals to the Congress and expect Congress to accept every dotted "i" and crossed "t" and to view any changes as defeats. Our discussions in the joint committee indicated that there was widespread and general support for the policies enunciated by the President in his message to us of January 5. But there was also evidence that the administration was too enamored of its own legislative draftsmanship. Most amendments suggested by Senators were rejected by the executive branch quickly and unequivocally, with little evidence that they had received the sympathetic consideration which they deserved. It is time for the executive branch of the Government to recognize that in the field of foreign policy the Senate has never been and never will be a rubber stamp.

I am delighted that emphasis has been placed on this point, because, as the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations well knows, there were three resolutions offered, and on the basis of the report received from the State Department, it was clear that at best only a cursory glance had been given to the resolutions and no sympathetic consideration had been accorded them. They were offered in the spirit of trying to strengthen what the President proposed to do. They were offered in a spirit of responsibility.

Again, Mr. President, I wish to extend my thanks to our distinguished chairman for the fine work he did not only in the committee but on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as a member of the committee of which the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island is chairman I should like to congratulate him on the fair and impartial way in which he conducted the hearings. I also congratulate him on his splendid speech this afternoon, and I wish to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing appreciation for the outstanding work which the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island has done as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. The public, the Congress, and the people of the world know far more about the proposed program because of the able and competent way in which all sides have been permitted to present their views during the course of the hearings. The Senator's speech clearly outlined, in terms which cannot be misunderstood, that the Senate will not yield its prerogative to look into and to consider all matters having to do with our foreign relations. I am personally very grateful to the Senator for the outstanding work which has been done.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I, too, wish to commend the Senator from Rhode Island for the manner in which he conducted the hearings and for what he has said today.

We were very happy that the Armed Services Committee was asked to join with the Foreign Relations Committee to hear testimony on this important question. The hearings were conducted at great length, but in accord with the best traditions of the Senate, in order to get as much information as might be possible on the subject under discussion.

As one member of the Armed Services Committee on this side of the aisle, I should like to join with the Senator from Rhode Island in the expression of his understanding of the resolution, what it purports to do, and what we believe it will do for our Nation's security and for the peace of the world.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in commending the Senator from Rhode Island for the very able way in which he conducted the hearings. Although I did not vote with the Senator from Rhode Island on the final resolution, our difference over the substantive question has nothing to do with my great admiration of the Senator as chairman of the committee.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleagues for their kind words.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am in favor of the joint resolution recommended by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, sitting jointly.

The purpose of the resolution is to increase the opportunities for a more peaceful world by making a clear and forceful statement as to our position with regard to the dangers inherent in the disturbances now occurring in the general area of the Middle East.

On January 5, the President delivered in person a message to the Congress on this subject. On page 5 of that message, in paragraph V, the President said in part:

> Under these circumstances, I deem it necessary to seek the cooperation of the Congress. Only with that cooperation can we give the reassurance needed to deter aggression, to give courage and confidence to those who are dedicated to freedom, and thus prevent a chain of events which would gravely endanger all of the free world.

Again the President said in the same paragraph:

> Nonetheless, weaknesses in the present situation and increased dangers from international communism convinced me that basic United States policy should now find expression in joint action by the Congress and the Executive. Furthermore, our joint resolve should be so couched so as to make it apparent that if need be our words will be backed by action.

In the first sentence of paragraph VI, the President said:

> It is nothing new for the President and the Congress to join to recognize that the national integrity of other free nations is directly related to our own security.

The message contemplates a joint determination by the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, and the Congress of the United States, the constituted legislative body representing the people of the United States.

Upon the basis of this message, the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee introduced Senate Joint Resolution 19. In the second section of the resolution the President "is authorized

to employ the Armed Forces of the United States if he deems it necessary to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any such nation or group of nations requesting such aid against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism," with provisos regarding our treaty obligations and the United Nations Charter.

Of course we will live up to our treaty obligations. Certainly there is no provision in the United Nations Charter that prevents us from taking such action as we believe necessary to promote our own security. When there is an aggression against another nation which may ultimately endanger our own security, we certainly can go to the assistance of that nation until the Security Council takes action, or after a failure of the Security Council to take action.

Our basic United States policy in this regard finds "expression in joint action by the Congress and the executives," to use the President's words. In short, the joint resolution tells the world that the executive and the legislative branches of our Government deem the situation sufficiently serious to our national security to lead them to be willing to go forward together and give the reassurances to the countries in the general area of the Middle East which they deem necessary to deter aggression by the forces of international communism.

The joint committee amended the original language of the joint resolution so that it now reads: "Furthermore, the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to used armed force to assist any such nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed forces from any country controlled by international communism" together with generally similar provisos as in the original resolution.

I was among those committee members who were in favor of the joint resolution as originally written, because I believed that it clearly expressed the determination of the Congress to show the people and the governments of the countries concerned that we in the United States were determined to use our Armed Forces, if necessary to prevent armed aggression in any country in the general area of the Middle East.

I support the joint resolution in its amended form because I believe in substance it gives the same assurances, although not in such effective language. When we say that the United States regards as vital to the national interest and to world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East, we are speaking of the United States Government; we are speaking of the people of the United States.

The two branches of the Government concerned are the executive and legislative. They are the agencies of our National Government which have the responsibility of using our Armed Forces. The President is the Commander in Chief. The Congress has the power to declare war, and the responsibility of providing the money with which to maintain the Armed Forces. I believe, therefore, that it will be clear to the governments and peoples of the countries concerned that the United States intends to help them to preserve their independence and integrity against armed aggression by forces of international communism. In addition, when the President, who is the Commander in Chief, determines that it is necessary to do so, the United States, through its Government, is prepared to use armed force.

When we pass a joint resolution in these terms and it is signed by the President, I feel convinced that any thinking, responsible leaders in the countries concerned will know and understand that the people of the United States, through their elected representatives, will support the President when he determines that it is necessary to use the Armed Forces of our country. This is the external impact of the joint resolution which is so needed.

Of equal importance in this basic purpose is the belief, which I share, that the joint resolution will act as a deterrent to Soviet Russia in whatever aggressive designs she may have in the Middle East. It must be apparent to the rulers of Russia that the adoption of the resolution, providing as it does for military defenses against aggressive acts, means that any aggression on her part will bring consequences which will be both immediate and devastating.

That is why I am convinced that this resolution will act as a strong deterrent to a clash of arms in the Middle East. Its purpose is to make the Soviets think twice before they commit directly or indirectly an aggressive act in the Middle East, in the full knowledge that such an act will mean the use of the Armed Forces of the United States. By the passage of the joint resolution, we believe that armed conflicts will be averted—not started.

When the danger of aggression by international communism has been deterred, it is my conviction that it will then be more possible to create a climate in which the basic problems between Israel and the Arab nations can be approached with a much better chance for their solution and for the establishment of a lasting peace in the Middle East.

The provision relative to the use of the Armed Forces of the United States is, in my opinion, the most fundamental of the three undertakings of the joint resolution. Altogether the resolution makes it crystal clear by stating the position of our country that we will take all steps necessary to prevent the outbreak of a war. This resolution is not a resolution to declare or to start an armed contest. It is to prevent the start of an armed contest. The President has said in his message and news conferences that if he does use our Armed Forces, he will so report at once to Congress for such action by them as is necessary; if the Congress is not in session, he will call it into session.

It is argued that the President has the authority to use the Armed Forces without action by Congress, if he deems it necessary in the interests of our security. There is always a "gray area" as to the limits this authority includes. The argument is also made that Congress should not commit itself to a joint action with the President as Commander in Chief until it knows more clearly the action in which it as asked to participate. Again, I say the action in which we are new joining through the joint resolution is an expression of determination to prevent a war occurring, through deterring, by such expression, any nation from becoming an aggressor in this section of the world we consider vital to our own security.

The joint resolution seeks to strengthen our position by a clear expression of congressional views as to the position of the Congress if an armed aggression should take place.

Mr. President, it has been said that by passing this joint resolution, the Congress will abandon its constitutional obligation to determine whether the country should engage in war. It is also said that the joint resolution is superfluous because the President, under his executive powers, already has the authority and, indeed, the solemn obligation to use the Armed Forces when such action is essential to protect the vital interests of the Republic.

The argument that the joint resolution on the one hand goes too far, and on the other hand is unnecessary because of power already held by the President, seems to me to lack consistency.

Moreover, it is my opinion that the Congress is not relinquishing its responsibility to declare war by this declaration that we are ready to use our Armed Forces against aggression. The principles laid down in the joint resolution appear to me to be comparable to those of the Monroe Doctrine, in which this country expressed its intent to defend other nations in our hemisphere against aggressive acts, without specific mention of just how or when our Armed Forces would be employed. Furthermore, the President has pledged that he will keep Congress fully informed at all times.

The President does, of course, now have authority to use our Armed Forces. However, the joint resolution cannot be termed superfluous when it is considered in the light of its true purpose, namely, as an expression of the unified support of the executive and legislative branches of our Government on a vital question of foreign policy having an important bearing on the future peace of the world.

For these reasons, while I have preferred the language of Senate Joint Resolution 19 as originally written, because it seems to me clearer and simpler, I believe that the language adopted by the committee accomplishes the same result and makes clear the position of the United States Government, as expressed by its executive and legislative bodies. That is why I now support it.

The second purpose of the resolution is to authorize the President to undertake in the general area of the Middle East military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance.

The third purpose of the resolution is to authorize the President to "cooperate

with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East desiring such assistance in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence."

To carry out these purposes, the President is authorized to use for the remainder of the fiscal year 1957 not to exceed $200 million from any appropriation now available for carrying out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. This measure releases him from certain restrictions imposed by that act, but makes it clear that only money in that act provided for military assistance can be used for military assistance under this joint resolution, and that only funds provided for economic assistance can be used for economic assistance under this joint resolution. Furthermore, he must report at least 15 days in advance of actual commitment to certain committees of the House and Senate, to show the object of the proposed use, the country for whom it is to be used, and the particular appropriation of the Mutual Security Act from which the funds are proposed to be derived.

No new appropriation is asked for. The $200 million requested is to be taken from current fiscal year 1957 appropriations. If any further funds are to be had, there must be new authority and new appropriations in the fiscal year 1958.

There are several other qualifications for the use of these funds; but, broadly speaking, these are the significant ones. These provisions are included so as to give to nations which desire such assistance a greater degree of confidence, that we are their friends and that they may have confidence in our support and help to help themselves. In short, the overall effect of this section is mainly psychological.

Mr. President, at this time I should like to read 3 paragraphs of the testimony given by Admiral Radford and 2 paragraphs of the testimony given by Secretary of State Dulles. I believe these five paragraphs summarize more succinctly than any other testimony we received at the committee hearings the purposes of the joint resolution.

Admiral Radford testified:

> I did say yesterday that in my opinion if this resolution is passed and it is thus made perfectly evident that we are going to back up countries who might be attacked by a Communist-controlled country, the Russians will be inclined to review their programs, and so will the countries they are supplying with arms.
>
> In other words, the countries supplied by Russia would receive advance notice from the terms of this resolution that if they become controlled by international communism and attack free nations in the area, we will, on request, come to the aid of the free nations.

Again he said:

> If we adopt the policies that are permitted by this resolution, it is my feeling that the United States' efforts will stabilize the governments that are now determined to remain free from Communist control, and I think we can reasonably hope that some of the Arab countries which have not yet openly taken a stand against the activities of international communism will be encouraged to do so.

That was the testimony of Admiral Radford in explanation of what the joint resolution would do.

Secretary Dulles added from the witness stand, when I read those paragraphs to him:

> I would like, as long as you allowed me two sentences, to say that I have previously testified, I think, that the passage of this resolution will deprive the Soviet Communists of much of their incentive to build up satellites in the area to be used, possibly, to attack other countries, because if they know that having made Egypt or Syria, for example, into a satellite, that if it then should attack Israel or Iraq, then upon the request of the victim attacked we would come into the fray, obviously under those circumstances the satellite would be wiped out.
>
> Therefore, this cuts down very greatly the potential value of satellites in the area; and, since that is the case, I think they will spend less effort to create satellites, just as the Caracas resolution cut down the value to international communism of getting control of the political institutions of an American State. We said if that happens we are all going to go in to deal with that situation. Ever since then, there has been less effort to get control, and I think the same would be the case here.

That was the testimony of Secretary of State Dulles and of Admiral Radford. Those five paragraphs seem to me to summarize all the testimony we heard regarding the value of the joint resolution and the purpose for which our action on it is requested.

It is argued that there has not been sufficient testimony of a specific character to justify having the Congress make it possible for our Government to make available $200 million worth of military and economic assistance to these countries, and that we should know more as to the purposes of the Executive. On the other hand, if more detailed testimony were to be given as to amounts, type of equipment, or economic aid to go to a particularly country, that would immediately create problems with other countries. So it is obvious that greater difficulties are involved in administering an economic aid and military assistance program efficiently and helpfully for the purpose of this joint resolution, which is to achieve greater security for our own country by the turning of the faces of the countries in the general area of the Middle East to the West, rather than to the East, and by giving them confidence in our friendship.

So much for my understanding of the purposes of the joint resolution.

Today the United States is the leader of the free nations of the world. There are constantly devolving upon us new responsibilities to which we must dedicate our abilities and our efforts. All of us who are connected with the Government want to see the United States undertake the responsibilities which we believe will offer greater opportunities for our own security and better chances for a more peaceful world. The situation in the Middle East has become consistently more difficult since World War II. Its importance to our economy and the economy of Europe has become materially greater. The growing importance of oil as a fuel has increased the economic stature of the countries having oil reserves. This has resulted in a heavily increased traffic through the Suez Canal.

Another event of great significance in this area is the establishment of Israel as a free and independent nation. Both Democratic and Republican administrations have stated clearly that Israel must be preserved as a free nation. We want Israel to be our friend. Her real enemies, as I have said before, are not, in the long run, the nations around her, but are Russia and the Soviets, if they come into the Middle East.

These two fundamentals have made the problems of the area more acute. As a result of the acuteness, we have seen the development of the Baghdad Pact, the Tripartite Agreement, and the Organization of the Arab States. Colonel Nasser, the leader of Egypt, has taken arms from Czechoslovakia. Then he seized the canal. The final straw came when Israel, France, and Britain attacked Egypt, and our differences with those countries arose because we refused to join with them as an aggressor against Egypt. As a result of all these developments, we find a constantly increasing effort, through material aid and propaganda by the Soviets, to seek to increase their influence in the Middle East; and it is evident they have made some progress in some nations by their propaganda and by furnishing of arms.

What we and other free nations want is an opportunity to work out with patience, through the medium of diplomacy, the various problems which have arisen. We realize that we must recognize the national aspirations of these countries. We know we have to consider their individual situations. We also recognize the importance to our security and to the economic affairs of the world of the Suez Canal being operated as an international waterway, while recognizing the territorial status of the canal in Egypt. The need to open the Gulf of Aqaba becomes clearer each day. We need time to work out these problems in such a way that as to make certain that Russia will not take over the Middle East, with an irreparable loss to our own commerce and the destruction of the European economy. If Russia should do so, it would almost make certain a new world war. We hope that the people of these nations who want to be free, who are proud of their nationality, and who naturally have economic, patriotic, and independent aspirations, will turn toward the West to get their ambitions fulfilled.

In the pending joint resolution we state firmly that we in the United States, if the President determines it necessary, are prepared to use our Armed Forces. Furthermore, we offer to help these nations with military assistance and with economic support. The President needs the support of Congress to show that we as a Nation are determined to prevent aggression from taking place; and by expressing clearly that intention, we are hopeful that aggression will not take place. If the President does have to use our Armed Forces, he will come promptly to Congress.

Let us keep these fundamental facts clearly before us. This resolution is a resolution to prevent war and not to take aggressive steps. This resolution makes it clear that the Congress, the legislative representatives of the people of the United States, supports the Chief Executive in taking the necessary steps which we pray will prevent war.

I hope the resolution will be passed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to take this occasion to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who made a splendid presentation of the issue which confronts the Senate and of the substance of the joint resolution. I also wish to commend the Senator from Rhode Island for the very effective way in which he conducted the hearings held jointly by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services. In addition I want to express my congratulations to my colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who is the ranking Republican of the Armed Services Committee. The Senator from Massachusetts was speaking from the standpoint of the Armed Services Committee, and, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I desire to congratulate him for his fine contribution to the subject.

In presenting the matter this afternoon, those of us who have spoken or who are about to speak are trying to give a comprehensive picture, from the viewpoints of both sides of the aisle and of both committees, of the purpose of the resolution, and I shall address myself to that subject.

I have entitled the first part of my remarks "Bipartisanship in American Foreign Policy." We are witnessing a fine example of bipartisanship in the way the resolution is being presented, because, while different views will be presented, they will be uttered in a spirit of bipartisanship, and will reflect the determination of a united America on the critical matter of foreign policy.

I. BIPARTISANSHIP IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

The Eisenhower Middle East doctrine has been the subject of intense and searching debate in these Halls since the opening of the present session of Congress. A question of such importance to the security of this Nation and to the peace of the world, merits throughtful inquiry and discussion.

The great events which, less than two decades ago, propelled this Nation to assume a significant and responsible role at the forefront of world affairs also promoted the development of a complementary attitude here in America—national realization that politics must stop at the water's edge. The concept of bipartisanship in foreign affairs affirms the great responsibility shared by the Congress and the President in promulgating an enlightened American policy to guide our relations with other nations and other peoples.

Bipartisanship is the uniting factor in an all-American foreign policy directed at deterring war and effectuating peace. Its essence is responsible cooperation and its process is mature, legitimate debate from all members of our two great political parties, to the end that policy may be constructively formulated in the best interests of this Nation. Responsible cooperation does not abjure, but rather welcomes, legitimate criticism and constructive alternatives stemming from differences in policy positions and appraisals.

It was with deep interest and attention that I listened several days ago to the able address by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] on United States foreign policy, an address which reflected the essence of bipartisanship.

I desire to associate myself with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] in his conception of the sound bipartisan approach. In the address referred to, he used this language:

> The functions of foreign policy are shared functions, shared between the legislative and executive branches of the Government. They can be effectively discharged only when there is leadership in the Presidency and when there is a mutual will to cooperate between the executive branch and Congress.

II. RESPONSIBLE COOPERATION

It was gratifying that the Senator from Montana reaffirmed his belief in responsible cooperation by all parties in Congress and by all organs entrusted with participation in the formulation of United States foreign policy. With this approach I am in complete agreement.

In the interests of constructive debate, however, I believe there are several points in the Senator's address which call for further discussion and perhaps reappraisal. I respectfully differ from the Senator's implications that the recent election campaign concealed "festering" Middle East problems until a point of crisis was reached, and that the handling of the Middle East resolution by the President and the Secretary of State constituted "blatant press agentry." I have put quotation marks around certain words to indicate they are quoted from the remarks of the Senator from Montana.

What actually is the urgency which necessitates immediate adoption of this resolution? It must be remembered that, as the President stated in his message to Congress, the Eisenhower doctrine is not intended to supply answers to all the many problems with which the Middle East is beset. We all acknowledge, as pointed out by the learned Senator in his address, the existence of such highly disruptive factors as Arab-Israeli tension, the intense nationalism and poverty of the Middle East peoples, and the crisis precipitated by the seizure of the Suez Canal. I shall refer to these problems later on in my remarks, but the point I wish to make now is that the reason for the urgent request by the President for the passage of this resolution centers primarily upon the danger which burst upon the Middle East early last November—the peril of imminent Communist expansion into that area. The resolution is designed to secure immediate assistance to the Middle East nations in an effort to bolster their ability to resist communism at this critical moment—a moment when they have become weakened by the withdrawal of British and French influence and have suffered losses of revenue as a result of the closing of the Suez Canal and the destruction of pipelines.

Russian and Chinese threats last fall to send "volunteers" into the area, subsequent to the British-French entrance into the Middle East hostilities, constituted a thinly veiled pretense to disguise actual aggression. The continued existence of this threat is a powerful factor in promoting instability and weakness in the Middle East.

The Eisenhower doctrine was promulgated to offset the imminent peril of Communist expansion in the Middle East and to counteract the dangerous consequences of the increasing weakness of the Middle East nations resulting from last fall's fighting. These very recent, explosive facts have certainly not been concealed, and they have no relation whatever to the recent election campaign.

The criticism of the Senator from Montana fails to differentiate between the recent and imminent Communist threat and the other long-term problems in the Middle East—problems on which the President and the Department of State have been working continually in cooperation with other nations, and in the United Nations. I have had the great privilege and honor of participating in many such conferences.

Nor do I believe that the handling of the resolution by the executive branch had all the "earmarks of blatant press agentry," calculated to press Congress into submission to the executive. Consultation between members of Congress and the executive occurred prior to the President's address to the Congress on January 5. The address was delivered after a determination by the Chief Executive that there existed in the Middle East an emergency situation which demanded the application and reaffirmation by the Congress and the President of basic policies which have been adopted in other areas where Communist danger became imminent. Of the criticisms which have been directed at the resolution since that date, few have denied the validity of the need for a warning to Russia, or the necessity for a stabilizing agency in the Middle East.

Hints of a request by Egypt for volunteers if the Israeli Army fails to evacuate the Gaza Strip and the approaches to the Gulf of Aqaba and, by Yemen in its conflict with Aden, are cogent reminders of the continued existence of this critical situation. The intensive explorations by members of the two committees into all these events fully support the request for urgency by the President.

III. THE DANGERS OF IRRESPONSIBILITY

These are differences of appraisal and approach, differences which are not inconsistent with the flowering of bipartisanship and of responsible cooperation.

Responsible cooperation assumes moderation and deliberation. It deplores the use of excessive exaggeration and of practices which seek to advance partisan political aims under the guise of constructive debate.

However, responsible cooperation ceases to be either responsible or cooperation, and may even become highly dangerous when it fails to perform its constructive function and deviates instead into paths of partisan political blocking of American foreign policy. Obstructionism and irresponsible division are effective only in destroying the impact abroad of an all-American foreign policy and in befuddling and obscuring the issues for the people here at home.

Let us consider the probable consequences of rejection of the President's proposal. There would be a continued invitation to the Soviet Union to expand into the Middle East, or if not to expand, to intensify its drive to keep the area in ferment.

Undiminished unrest in the Middle East would mean continued tension between the Afro-Asian nations and the West, between the Arab States and the free Western nations, and between the Arab States and Israel. A source of friction between Russia and the West would continue to fester and the pressures on peace-sustaining agencies would become increasingly more heavy. The Middle East nations would not be able to benefit from the vast petroleum potential which they possess and neither would the rest of the world. In all probability there would be a rapid worsening of the explosive, tragic, status quo and, above all, an irreparable loss to the free nations of the world.

Destructive and irresponsible assaults upon the Middle East doctrine place an enormous responsibility upon those who make such assaults.

I regret to say that in addition to the carefully considered criticisms of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and other thoughtful presentations in this forum, we have recently heard the use of such indefensible and irresponsible phraseology as "naked executive power will rule the highest and most fateful interests of the Nation"; "power blindly put into his hands by the Congress"; "when we take away from Congress its constitutional powers and substitute Executive power, we start down the road of the police state"; and "this administration does not wish to move until it hog-ties every Member of Congress." Also the irresponsible reflections on the integrity of the Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles, are certainly indefensible in a debate of this character.

Such attacks as those mentioned, in my opinion, do not help to clarify the debate; instead, they tend only to diffuse and confuse. They ignore the traditions of American history and of the American people; they ignore our heritage of constitutional self-restraint; and they insult the American people and their elected representatives. I do not believe that they represent constructive, responsible cooperation.

I do believe that it is time to clear the air of these will-o'-the-wisps of conjecture and to examine, dispassionately and reasonably, both the doctrine and the criticisms directed at it, in order to ascertain what is being asked for and why.

### IV. THE EISENHOWER RESOLUTION AS RELATED TO AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

To the Senator from Montana the Eisenhower resolution represents not isolationism, not internationalism, but isolated internationalism. I believe, however, that an examination of the facts will show that such a characterization is actually misleading and is a misnomer for a resolution which is completely in accord with the objectives of American foreign policy.

The resolution which is under debate has three features: (a) The President is authorized to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East desiring such assistance in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence; (b) the President is authorized to undertake, in the general area of the Middle East, military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance; and (c) a declaration that the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace, the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East, and that if the President determines the necessity thereof—which is the amendment which has been discussed by previous speakers—the United States is prepared to use Armed Forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism; provided, that such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations.

Actually the resolution is a reaffirmation of the United States foreign aid policy to extend assistance to other nations to help them become free and strong, as enunciated in the Mutual Security Act of 1954 and prior acts, as well as in pending legislation. It does remove, because of emergency conditions, certain restrictions on the expenditure of some two hundred million dollars appropriated for the Middle East for fiscal 1957. In this respect it follows a pattern of the waiver of other requirements of the mutual-security program which Congress authorized in 1954 because of an emergency in certain Southeast Asian states.

It supplements our support, financial and diplomatic, of the United Nations in its efforts to attain solutions to the problems of the Suez Canal, Arab-Israeli tension, and relocation of the refugees, problems which that body, with its machinery for negotiation and moral persuasion, is far more suited to handle than is the United States alone.

It is in accord with our determination, as expressed in the Truman doctrine of 1947, and the Vandenberg resolution of 1948, to resist Communist expansion, and to exercise the right of individual or collective self-defense under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter should any armed attack occur affecting our national security.

Finally, it reflects our policy of united action by the President and the Congress—or the Senate—in recognizing that the national integrity of other free nations is directly related to our own security, a policy which we demonstrated in adopting the North Atlantic Treaty, the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the Formosa Resolution, and several other multilateral and bilateral defense agreements.

### V. THE EISENHOWER DOCTRINE—AN ANALYSIS

Mr. President, now let me turn to the Eisenhower doctrine and to an analysis of it. The subject has already been covered by other speakers, but, for the record, I shall discuss it again.

The Eisenhower doctrine from which the resolution emanates does not attempt to cover all the complex problems of the Middle East, many of which are being handled by the United Nations. Its purpose is to shore up the Middle East against Communist penetration at this critical period, and it contains no explicit solutions to the other acknowledged problems of that area. What it seems to accomplish is the creation of an atmosphere of stability under which policies to solve these problems peacefully can be developed. It does not constitute a detailed policy; rather, it is a doctrine, an "umbrella" to protect against disruptive Communist expansion. It provides the essential cover necessary before other measures can successfully be undertaken. It is, to use a slang phrase, the erection of a "no fishing" sign in response to Russian angling in the troubled waters of the Middle East.

We must not distract our attention from the immediate, urgent crisis to in committee centered on this subject, consider other problems and measures now. A considerable amount of debate and the discussion revolved around the issue of whether we should include a long list of local problems of the Middle East in this resolution. The pending resolution is not intended to cover those problems.

Because of the existing distribution of power in the world today, only the United States can issue the strong warning which can deter Russia and simultaneously provide a bolster for the Middle East nations. Our prestige in this respect has been enhanced by our stand in the United Nations in November when we insisted upon cessation of the Suez hostilities.

The doctrine primarily seeks to accomplish the following:

First. To protect the territorial integrity and independence of the Middle East nations by deterring the possibility of attacks upon them from countries controlled by international communism, and it thus attempts to effect for the area a degree of stability essential to the solution of its problems by peaceful means.

Second. To bolster the Middle East nations psychologically at this critical period in order that they may resist communism more effectively.

Third. To assist them, in this emergency and later, in opposing Communist subversion by strengthening them economically and providing them with the means of achieving internal stability.

Fourth. To reaffirm United States policy that we do not intend to intervene

in the affairs of any foreign nation or violate its sovereignty; that we will assist any such nation only by agreement and consent.

I wish to emphasize that point: We are to assist only by agreement and with the consent of the nation concerned.

Fifth. To reaffirm our interest in the development of the Middle East nations toward freedom, independence, and self-determination as member nations in the world, by promoting their economic growth and stability and thus lessening their weakness to external economic pressure.

Sixth. To prevent a third world war and to promote needed peace in the area which will permit its great petroleum and other economic potentials to be used for the benefit of the nations in that area and in other parts of the world.

Many of the objections to the Eisenhower doctrine are not truly valid, because they relate to problems which are extraneous to the immediate emergency which is the concern of the President's proposal, and to problems which are being handled through other means.

Certain objections do pertain to the resolution itself. Prime among them are the charges that economic aid should not be included in a resolution directed at deterring war, and that adoption of the resolution will carry certain undesirable constitutional implications.

The first objection strikes at the heart of the doctrine, and at a fundamental premise of American foreign policy, namely, the objective of enabling other nations to become self-sufficient, independent, and strong enough to resist communism; or, in other words, to help other nations to help themselves.

The second objection, namely, that the resolution is creating a dangerous constitutional precedent, appears to be disposed of by the final form of the language in section 2, which avoids the direct constitutional issue. The resolution as finally reported does not involve the yielding of senatorial authority or prestige, nor does it affect the constitutional power of the President.

Its form as a joint resolution is intended to indicate the solidarity of the Congress and the President in a determination to resist Communist aggression.

It is not intended to authorize the President to declare war, nor is it a delegation of congressional authority in this respect. It is a statement of United States intent directed at achieving the maximum psychological and political impact abroad. I do not believe that its adoption with this interpretation will create an untenable constitutional precedent.

In his address of January 5, the President stated:

> If, contrary to my hope and expectation, a situation arose which called for the military application of the policy which I ask Congress to join me in proclaiming, I would, of course, maintain hour-by-hour contact with the Congress if it were in session. And if the Congress were not in session, and if the situation had grave implications, I would, of course, at once call the Congress into special session.

While the President's statement has not been expressly incorporated into the resolution, the latter can be interpreted, in my opinion, as though the statement were a part of it. He has stated explicitly that he will immediately work in cooperation with the Congress in effecting a program of resistance to an aggressor, but that he alone may have to take steps of initial resistance.

This appears to be a complete adherence to the constitutional principle of legislative-executive cooperation in foreign affairs and in the protection of the security of the United States.

VI. CONCLUSION

Mr. President, in this brief statement supporting the resolution as it is reported by the committee, I have endeavored to point out the reasons for urgency: the military, economic, and subversive aspects of the situation in the Middle East; the need to fill the vacuum of legitimate power brought about by the withdrawal of the British and the French from the area; the carrying out by the President's proposals of the basic principles and practices of the United States, especially since the time of the declaration of the so-called Truman policy in Greece and Turkey. Furthermore, I have endeavored to show why the resolution does not and is not intended to meet the various critical problems within the area. As has been well stated, it acts as an "umbrella" or a shield to protect the area from Communist infiltration, either military or economic. Finally, it aims by joint action by the President and Congress to declare the basic purposes of the doctrine.

One final word. In times of great crises in our history we have been protected by what seems to be a divine hand watching over our destiny. At critical moments we have been given great leaders who had the vision to see the full significance of those forces that guided our ancestors to come to this land in order that they might worship God in their own way, and might discover the road to the true freedom of the individual human being. The names of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln stand out in our history, as well as the names of many others who seem to have been guided to help us in times of great distress.

Now, in this period of world turmoil, we have been given a leader who, by the integrity of his life and his great experience is equipped to point the way to our national security and to ultimate world peace. The greatest military leader of this generation, certainly one of the greatest in our history, is now dedicated, as our President, to peace in the world.

The need for full and unconditional support by the Congress of President Eisenhower at this critical period rises above all thought of partisanship, or differences over mere phraseology. Such support is really a dedication by us all that the United States, conceived in liberty, may help to guide a stricken world to freedom and lasting peace.

It is my sincere hope that the joint resolution will be passed by the Senate by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. First, Mr. President, I should like to commend the Senator from New Jersey for what he has said. It seems to me it supplements and amplifies what the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. GREEN] has said and what I have tried to say. The three statements fit very well together.

Perhaps this is an oversimplification, but as I visualize the purpose of the resolution, it is to have the Congress and the Executive, like two people, walk along the street together and force a way or clear a path; and to demonstrate that it is stronger to go forward together than it is for one person to walk behind and push the other. Is that, in a very simple way, what the Senator's idea is of the resolution?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator. I think we indicate in the resolution the constitutional powers of the President and of the Congress, and our recognition that they complement each other. Neither one precedes the other, as the Senator has so ably suggested.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As the Senator has said, we hang a "No Fishing" sign out over the area to enable us to move forward by diplomatic action toward peace and to be forceful in our efforts if peace is not maintained.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his very lucid remarks.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to compliment and to commend the senior Senator from New Jersey for the address he has just made to the Senate. He has spoken, and spoken well, for the administration's point of view insofar as the Eisenhower resolution, the business now before the Senate, is concerned. There are differences of opinion, as the Senator has so very well brought out, between what the administration thinks should be done to take care of a very delicate and difficult situation in the Middle East, and those of us who feel that there are certain alternatives which might be offered.

The charge has been made that the Democrats at times have a great deal of hindsight but never come up with anything constructive. I am sure the Senator from New Jersey will agree with me that that has not been the attitude of the Democratic Party. While we have criticized, we have not criticized merely for the sake of criticism alone. The Senator from New Jersey will recall that many Senators on this side of the aisle, in finding fault with the proposals sent to the Congress by the administration, have, at the same time, tried to offer something constructive.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I know that has been the attitude of the Senator from Montana, and I am certain that other Senators have also been sincere in their actions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We recognize the difficulties which exist in the field of foreign policy. We know full well the great responsibilities which lie upon the shoulders of the President of the United States, who is charged with the conduct of foreign policy under the Constitution. We are well aware of the tremendous burdens which the able, hard-working Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, has to assume in this difficult and dangerous period in which we live. However, some of us do not feel that this resolution goes to the heart of the difficulties in the Middle East. We feel it would be better to face up to such things as the Arab-Israel dispute, the question of the Suez Canal, the question of Soviet traffic in arms in that area, the question of refugees, the question of subversion, as well as others. Simply because the administration has sent to the Congress a resolution, I do not think we should be placed in the position of having to accept it, as the distinguished Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee said, to the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator, but we must also be alert to condemn tactics of obstructionism.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the able Senator will allow me to continue my discussion of the matter with the Senator from New Jersey, and I should like to conclude.

We wish to cooperate. We think we can offer ideas which may have value. We should like to have those ideas considered, because I wish to assure the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, a man of great intellectual ability, by the way, that we are in accord with the old Vandenberg statement that politics should stop at the water's edge. But we do not think we should have merely something that puts an umbrella over the situation. That is not the answer. The umbrella is there now. We want to make absolutely certain in this thermonuclear age that the President of the United States has the right at all times to act instantly, if he deems it necessary, in the defense of our country.

I was delighted to hear the Senator refer to the amendment added to the resolution by the joint committee. It was proposed and accepted so that the responsibility should be in the hands of the President of the United States prior to a declaration of war.

What the joint committee has done, in effect, has been to reaffirm and to reassert the constitutional power of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. It is my hope that we as Senators will recognize our individual responsibility in that respect, and that the Senate as a body will likewise remember that what we do today or what we may not do may have repercussions decades and centuries hence.

I only wanted to make those few remarks, Mr. President. I desire to again commend the Senator from New Jersey for making a statesmanlike address and to congratulate him on the way he has presented the matter to the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the junior Senator from Montana on the very clear, forthright, able, and patriotic statement he has just made, and to state that I fully subscribe to the views he has expressed not only with reference to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, but about the intent of the majority party in the United States Senate.

When I first became minority leader I said to my conference that I rejected the philosophy that it was the duty of the opposition to oppose, that when I believed the President of the United States, who happened to be a member of another party, to be right, I would hold his hand high and support him. I am proud of the record I have made in that respect. I said that when I believed him to be wrong I would attempt to debate, discuss, and point out the errors as I saw them, and undertake to improve proposed legislation without regard to personalities. That I have tried to do.

The President asked the House and the Senate, a coordinate independent branch of this Government, for cooperation; he sought cooperation; he came here pleading for cooperation; and I will say, Mr. President, he received cooperation. Cooperation does not mean a one-way street. Cooperation does not mean a dead-end street. Cooperation means a contribution of ideas and the improvement of language and actual rephrasing of whole paragraphs. As the majority leader and as the leader of the so-called opposition party I take great pride in the fact that the joint committee inserted a cutoff date in the resolution. We have required reports to be submitted on allocations before finalization. Those reports will come to the Congress. So it can never be charged that we did not know where they came from or who was making them.

Finally, Mr. President, I am glad we said to the President, "If you decide in your constitutional capacity that this is in the best interest of our country, we will stand by your side and support you."

Other peoples of the world may not understand our constitutional system; they may not realize that we have been quibbling over legalistic points in some instances, but the one thing they must not misunderstand is the unity which must exist among the people of this great Republic.

There is no place for politics in foreign policy.

I congratulate the Senator from Montana for what he has said and for what he has done, and I also congratulate the other members of the committee on both sides of the aisle who have made substantial contributions.

One thing which Russia must not doubt is the unity of the American people in an hour of trial.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Texas. I think this exchange of views has told Russia where a united America stands.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I wish, first, to commend and thank my senior colleague from New Jersey for the comprehensive and penetrating statement he has made, and for his clear delineation of what the joint resolution is intended to do and what it is not intended to do. I commend him also for his exposition of the great need for action upon it.

At the same time, I express my personal appreciation, as my senior colleague has done, to the distinguished Senator from Texas and the distinguished Senator from Montana for the spirit in which they have engaged in the discussion this afternoon and for the manner in which they have approached the subject.

As my senior colleague has pointed out, the colloquy which has just been had will make it clearer than ever that there is no disunity in this country, so far as the support of the President is concerned in this delicate and difficult situation, and also that America is behind him and is united for action—I believe and hope the passage of the resolution will make action unnecessary—in the event the circumstances contemplated by the resolution should come into existence.

I wish expressly to say this word in regard to the remarks of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I was very much pleased to hear him state that he wanted no doubt to exist, as I understood him to say, as to his view that the President had the right to act in an emergency as the commander in chief of the Armed Forces of the United States. I say this particularly because I had seen in the press some comment attributed to the Senator from Montana which raised a little doubt in my mind about his view in this crucial matter. I am glad to know from the colloquy today that there can no longer be any doubt.

I conclude by again commending my senior colleague and thanking him for his excellent statement.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my colleague.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I wish to join in the commendation of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who have so very ably stated what the United States is endeavoring to do by the consideration and the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 19. The Senator from New Jersey has very clearly stated what we are endeavoring to do. We, as a nation, through the Executive and Congress, stand shoulder to shoulder in our determination to maintain peace throughout the world.

Nothing could be more encouraging to the smaller nations of the Middle East than to know that the great legislative body representing the people of the

the United States stands with the illustrious and great leader, President Eisenhower, in our efforts as a people to maintain peace throughout the world, and to let the small, indefensible nations—indefensible as to Russia—have the security and the knowledge that we, the United States, are determined by the action which is expressed in joint resolution to give them, first, security, if there is an invading army; and second, that we have proposed economic aid which will give to them, and especially their youth, the understanding and the confidence that in the tomorrow they will have a better economy; that by our assistance they will have better security than their parents ever had in their endeavors to rear their children.

By the joint resolution America is saying to the rest of the world that we will not tolerate Soviet enchoachment upon the indefensible, small nations. We are saying that we want peace, and that we are determined that we shall stand as a nation united in our endeavor to maintain and bring peace to the world.

No action could be more forceful than our unified support of the joint resolution. Nothing could speak more loudly than the passage of the resolution by a unanimous vote.

I commend the Democratic Members of the Senate for the splendid cooperation they have given in the joint committee sessions by affording all persons who desired to be heard the right to be heard, and then discussing and debating the measure, but in the main in coming forward in support of the joint resolution.

In this way we are signaling to Russia what our intentions are. We are at work today in the Middle East trying to clear away the difficulties which exist between the Arabs and the Israelis. We will continue to work in that field, and I am confident that a way will be found by which to solve the difficulties.

But in the main we are showing the world today that we do not intend to allow the small, indefensible nations to become victims of the continuing encroachment of the Soviet Union in its endeavor to spread the philosophy of Communist ideology through the world.

Again I express my commendation of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for their excellent statements.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in view of the approaching meeting at 8:30 tomorrow morning of the President with the leadership of both Houses of Congress on the Middle Eastern situation, I called today a meeting of the majority policy committee of the United States Senate. I requested the members of the Democratic policy committee to give me guidance. I set forth my own views by reading them a letter which I addressed to the distinguished Secretary of State on February 11, 1957.

Subsequently, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the secretary of the majority conference, moved that the entire majority policy committee go on record as endorsing the letter. The motion was seconded by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Democratic whip, and was adopted unanimously, with all Democratic members present.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may include the letter in the RECORD. It is a little long, so I will not ask my friend, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, to indulge me while I read it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield the floor, unless other Senators wish to ask me questions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator. If I may, then, I will read the letter. It is dated February 11, 1957, and is as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
*Washington, D. C., February 11, 1957.*

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
*Secretary of State,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I feel that I should tell you, most frankly, how disturbed I have been by recent stories in the press, which stories have appeared under the bylines of most reputable correspondents, that serious consideration is being given in the General Assembly of the United Nations to imposing economic sanctions against the State of Israel. The purpose of these sanctions would, of course, be to force Israel to withdraw its forces from the Gaza Strip and the mouth of the Aqaba Gulf. This imposition of sanctions would, or so it appears to me, be a most unwise move. It seems to me that this is so irrespective of whatever point of view one may take toward the various resolutions of the Assembly which have called for such withdrawals.

To put it simply, the United Nations cannot apply one rule for the strong and another for the weak; it cannot organize its economic weight against the little state when it has not previously made even a pretense of doing so against the large states. I have, Mr. Secretary, seen no suggestions in the United Nations of the application of economic sanctions against the U. S. S. R. Israel has in very large part complied with the directives of the United Nations. Russia has not even pretended to be polite.

I have, as you know, been urging during the discussion of the Middle East a determined effort by the United Nations and by the United States to go to the root causes of the troubles in the Middle East. One of these causes has been the hostile activity against Israel on the part of Egypt from the Gaza Strip and the threat of activity in the Gulf of Aqaba. I think you will agree that it is not utterly unreasonable for Israel to request guaranties by the United Nations that these attacks against her will not once more be prevalent, once she has withdrawn her troops from these two areas. Yet, I have seen no suggestion in the United Nations that economic sanctions should be applied against Egypt to force that state to agree to permanent cessation of hostile activities from those areas.

There is always a tendency to oversimplify a most complicated issue when one writes such a letter as this and it is my hope that you will not think that this protest is made without some awareness of the complexities. These, however, cannot be stated in the space of this letter nor should they be.

But the merits, the justice and the morality in this situation are clear against such imposition of economic sanction. It is my hope that you will instruct the American delegation to the United Nations to oppose with all its skill such a proposal if it is formally made.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

I wrote that letter in my individual capacity and upon my authority and responsibility as a Member of the United States Senate from the State of Texas. I thought that my associates on the majority policy committee, created by statute of the Congress, should have the benefit of my views; therefore, I have read the letter.

Subsequently, unanimous action endorsing the letter was taken. At this time I have read the letter into the RECORD for the information of all Senators.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The issue the distinguished majority leader has just discussed has always been bipartisan, both in the other body and in this one. I compliment the majority leader upon his sensitivity to the situation, in making the presentation here also a bipartisan one. The minority leader also has spoken to the same effect.

Just as sanctions would hardly be a contribution to a joint resolution designed to meet a difficult situation, but would only be likely to make it worse and aggravate it more, does not the Senator from Texas also feel that the very evident action to be taken by this body on the pending joint resolution will go far toward clearing the air, in the sense that if we are dealing with the Middle East as the Middle East, without Russian puppets operating in it, there is much more chance to have the United States and the rest of the free world obtain some results, rather than if we were dealing with small states in the Middle East when being manipulated by the Communists for their own purposes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think that is true, and I hope that will be the result. I hope that the results which will come from the joint resolution will exceed our greatest hopes.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the benefit of the Senators now present, the Chair wishes to make a brief explanation and statement.

The Senate now has under consideration Senate Joint Resolution 19, dealing with the Middle East situation. The joint resolution has been reported with a committee amendment, which strikes out all after the enacting clause and inserts a complete substitute.

In such cases, under the precedents of the Senate, the substitute is considered as original text for the purpose of amendment, and is subject to amendment in two degrees. An amendment to the original text would have precedence over an amendment to the substitute. Amendments to the original text or to the committee substitute will have precedence over a vote on the substitute itself.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the statement made a few moments ago by the majority leader, the distinguished

senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. In referring to it, I wish to make it clear that I speak for no one but myself.

Today I have heard three very able speeches directed to the pending measure, the Middle East joint resolution. Implicit and announced in those speeches was the necessity for bipartisan or nonpartisan action.

Today, I have read that the President of the United States is returning to Washington to consider a very critical question: that is the impasse which has arisen regarding the actions which may be taken by Israel with respect to the resolutions of the General Assembly of the United Nations. I also understand that on tomorrow there is to be a meeting between the leaders of the majority and the minority, and the President of the United States, to consider the policy of the administration, respecting this question.

I suggest that the consideration of this issue presents an opportunity for a practical application of the policy of bipartisanship or nonpartisanship. In the debate that has commenced today, we are discussing a joint resolution, and the application of bipartisanship to words and to future action. But, before the President of the United States is a situation which calls for present decision in the United Nations. The capacity of the United States to apply effectually the Middle East joint resolution may depend upon what happens in the General Assembly of the United Nations with respect to the response of Israel to the resolution of the United Nations.

Mr. President, the position of the United States is a difficult one. We sympathize with the position of Israel, with the difficulties she has faced because the Arab nations have not recognized her status as a state, the denial of passage through the Suez Canal and to the Gulf of Aqaba, and the attacks against her in the past. I believe we want also to maintain the principle of opposition to force that we have asserted in the United Nations.

I hope the leadership of both parties will not take such inflexible positions as will make the task of the President of the United States more difficult. Before the Mid-East resolution will have a chance to begin to operate, there must be some kind of a peace in the area. The uncertainty, and danger of new outbreaks will continue until a decision is made by Israel as to whether or not it will withdraw its troops. I am certain all of us want to see for Israel progress toward freedom of access to the Gulf of Aqaba. I think the legal situation with respect to the Gaza Strip is more unclear. However, I believe the capacity to achieve these results, to remove the danger of a new outbreak of hostilities, to reach solutions, to maintain the principle of opposing force, depends in large measure in preserving to the President flexibility in working out this difficult situation. For the Congress of the United States or its leadership, or the majority or minority to proclaim positions which will make it more difficult for the President—to move toward the ends we all want, and harden Israel or Egypt in their positions, will not help assure our objectives. As worth while and laudable as may be the general principle which the distinguished majority leader has announced, I think it would be better if such a fixed position were not proclaimed at this time, and full opportunity were given the President and the Secretary of State to work out a peaceful and just solution of the impasse in the United Nations, in accordance with the principles we have taken in that body. If war should break out again, the chances of success of the Mid-East doctrine we are discussing would be dim, indeed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am today submitting an amendment to the pending Middle East resolution which, if adopted, would require any nation receiving assistance under that resolution to give a binding commitment against aggression against its neighbors and to negotiate matters in controversy with neighboring States, and, failing such agreement, to submit such matters to arbitration.

I think it is generally recognized that the principal danger in the Middle East is not overt aggression by the Soviet Union. We are all opposed to that, but that is not the principal danger. There is a danger of Soviet subversion against which the Middle East resolution does not move. The real danger of hostilities is, rather, that one or more of the Middle East nations, a number of which have declared their belligerent intentions, and several which may be armed with Soviet weapons and, instigated by Soviet guile, may commit aggressions against other Middle East nations—to be specific, that Syria may attack Iraq; that Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Syria may attack Israel.

The real need, therefore, goes beyond the assurance of American military support to assist the defense of any country against Communist aggression and to provide unspecified economic and military assistance. It is essential, if it is possible to do so, to try to secure binding agreements from these nations that they will not launch any such attacks, that they will negotiate the disputes which now divide them from their neighbors in a good-faith effort to make a stable peace, and if they are unable to adjust these disputes by negotiation, that they will submit such matters to arbitration. It should likewise be clear that any military assistance afforded under the pending resolution, by agreement, will be limited to use for self-defense.

If such commitments can be obtained and faithfully adhered to, they will thus stop the launching of the most probable breaches of the peace in that area. To supplement the threat of American retaliation against Communist aggression with the promise of recipient nations not to commit aggression against their neighbors would seem to be a desirable strengthening of the present resolution.

I favor other positive measures, including the extension of economic assistance to permit the upbuilding of the Middle Eastern nations, and more adequate provision for the refugees. To condition such economic assistance upon the agreements of the recipient nations outlined above would seem, however, to be a reasonable, if not essential, requirement for our country to make in the interests of the peaceful upbuilding of those countries.

Congress should make it crystal clear that it will not allow the Eisenhower administration to give any nation in the Middle East a blank check to use our assistance for aggressions that are not specified in the resolution in its present form. We should let the nations of that region know that, above all, a peaceful settlement of their disputes with each other should be negotiated. Otherwise we are in grave danger of merely restoring the tinderbox which existed prior to October 29, 1956, and, indeed, by furnishing weapons to the Arab States, may actually increase the danger of war.

In fact, Mr. President, although the Secretary of State has not publicly announced what agreement he concluded with Saudi Arabia, it is nevertheless undoubtedly true, from the press dispatches, that a promise of military assistance of an undetermined but undoubtedly substantial sum was given to Saudi Arabia.

I think there is no doubt that the little state of Jordan will be next in the chow line, and will make a request for additional sums to support its army, to take the place of the British subvention which has been discontinued, and which will probably not be replaced by Saudi Arabia, Syria, and Egypt, despite their pledges.

Therefore, there may well be, in spite of the Eisenhower doctrine, if it is adopted, an increase in the military strength of the Arab States, which they may then use either against each other or against Israel, with the final result that we shall have made the possibility of war in the Middle East more certain and more bloody if it comes.

Mr. President, therefore, I submit an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 19, and request that it be printed and lie on the desk. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the desk; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS is as follows:

On page 6, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

"SEC. 4. In addition to the conditions of eligibility set forth in the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, no military, economic, or technical assistance authorized pursuant to this resolution shall be supplied to any nation unless the recipient nation has made a binding agreement (a) not to commit any act of aggression upon any neighboring nation, (b) to submit all matters in controversy with neighboring nations to direct negotiations with such neighboring nations in a good faith effort to settle such controversies by mutual agreement, and failing agreement to submit the matters in dispute to arbitration, and (c) in the case of military assistance, not to use any such assistance except for self-defense within its own borders without the consent of the United States."

On page 6, line 7, strike out "4" and insert "5" and in line 10, strike out "5" and insert "6:"

HON. JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, before the week shall have run I probably shall make some observations on the pending resolution. My purpose in rising today is to utter a few kind words in defense of the Secretary of State, if he needs any defense from me.

Contemporary opinion is a pretty cruel, captious, and unreasoning thing. Sometimes I think it is more than that. It is too often quite uninformed and purposeful, and sometimes it is vindictive.

When Buchanan was President of the United States it was written of him in an Ohio newspaper that he has stooped exceedingly low, even to the gutter that runs full of the filth of the lowest dregs of political abominations.

When Ulysses S. Grant was President of the United States it was written in the New York World on October 14, 1873, that—

> It is a humiliation to the country that it has a Chief Magistrate who can put forth such a mess of crudities and contradictions with an oracular air of wisdom as if he were explaining important measures.

Still another publication of that day referred to the President and to the Cabinet as "merely phrase makers with far more gab than practical sense."

The Chicago Times was reported as saying, in the Grant administration, that the President's financial views could "scarcely be reconciled with a belief in his sanity."

The New York Graphic, on January 20, 1874, said:

> There is not a first-rate statesman in the Cabinet.

The Detroit News, in November 1873, went a little further. It said it thought that "the classification of Cabinet members with mules was not altogether incongruous."

When Grover Cleveland was President, it was said of him, among other things, that he "is making the most scandalous exhibition ever made by a President."

On another occasion, the same newspaper said:

> If the cant and hyprocrisy were eliminated from him, he would collapse like a punctured balloon.

Still another publication said:

> He thinks our Government is that of an absolute monarchy.

Still another publication said:

> His theory of Government differs materially from that of the American Constitution and follows closely along the lines illustrated by the rule of Henry VIII and Elizabeth.

To make it wholly impersonal, on September 27, 1893, the New York Post said:

> Does the Senate understand that at the present writing it is the most thoroughly despised body of public men in the world?

After Theodore Roosevelt became President, the Natchez (Miss.) Democrat of December 29, 1907, said of him that "he does not care a rap about law, proprieties, or precedent."

The New York Sun said:

> A more conscienceless or reckless demagog never afflicted this country. His message has been dismissed as the lucubration of a mind unhinged.

The Wall Street Journal, in a moment of charity, on March 4, 1908, said of the attacks on President Theodore Roosevelt that "the language of vilification has been exhausted in the attacks upon him."

Nor did Abraham Lincoln escape attack—and this is a good time to allude to it. He was referred to as "silly"; he was referred to as "ludicrous"; he was referred to as "a buffoon." One New York newspaper went so far as to say that Abraham Lincoln shared in the profits from Government contracts. Virtually every calumny which could be uttered was directed against this great American. So it is not surprising that an equally cruel attack should be made on John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State. In its sustained character it reminds me of the letter which Horace Greeley wrote to Senator Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts in August of 1862. Greeley said:

> Do you remember that old theological book containing this: "Chapter 1—Hell; Chapter 2—Hell Continued"? Well, that gives a hint of the way Old Abe ought to be talked to in this crisis of the Nation's destiny.

I think the illustration fits. For John Foster Dulles there has been a great deal of "hell," and "hell continued" in chapter 2. He was charged with being a liar and a deceiver, with wrongful action, with having hurt our allies and our relationships with our allies, with being influenced by the corporate oil connections of his former law firm, and with daily inconsistency. Either expressly or by implication, little has been left unsaid about him, all of which vindicates the thesis I uttered a little while ago when I said that contemporary opinion is a pretty cruel, brutal, pitiless thing.

What concerns me most is the effect of the attack in other lands, what good fuel this is for the flame.

I have had occasion to travel abroad a great deal. Whether it was in Africa or in Asia, whether it was in the Middle East or in Europe, not a day went by when there was not some glaring headline in a foreign newspaper reflecting what was said here in Washington, either in the Congress or elsewhere. What great and incandescent headlines some of the statements made. How much more tortuous and difficult is the road which must be traveled? How effective such attacks are in shattering our own unity and emotional harmony in a time of crisis.

Mr. President, there may be men in Government today who are moved by a greater spirit of dedication to a great cause, the cause of peace, than John Foster Dulles; but if there are, this Senator from Illinois has not yet seen them.

There may be people in Government gifted with greater constancy and unswerving devotion than Mr. Dulles; but if there are, I have not seen them, and I have been a Member of the legislative branch for more than 23 years.

There may be men with greater moral courage than Secretary Dulles—a courage which impelled him to scold and warn our closest allies against the precipitate action they took in the Middle East. That required moral courage. Mr. President, there may be men with greater moral courage than that possessed by Secretary Dulles, but I have not seen them.

There may be men in Government who are more willing to be broken and discarded in their unremitting pursuit of an ideal—the cause of amity and peace—than John Foster Dulles. But, if so, I have not seen them.

There may be men with a deeper recognition of what this country must do, rather than what some would like to have it do, and who, from that recognition, go steadily on and spend themselves in the cause. But if there are such people, I have not seen them.

There may be men in Government with a more lively appreciation of the inexorable fact that security, national freedom, and survival are the real challenges of our time, and that the choice before us is not so much war or peace, as it is victory or ruin. However, if there are people with a more sensitive appreciation of that fact than John Foster Dulles, I have not seen them.

There may be men in Government who have been in a more difficult position than Secretary Dulles in seeking to provide answers to questions day after day and day after day, and at the same time try to remain aware of the impact of their words on a dozen chancelleries abroad. But if there are such people, I have not encountered them.

There may be men in government with greater vision, with a broader outlook, and a great appreciation of the force of Lincoln's observation in the second annual message to Congress that "the dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present." But if there be such men, I have not seen them.

So, Mr. President, I take this occasion to salute a devoted and capable public servant who has labored unremittingly to persuade peoples to live in peace, who has pursued the goal of moral and material strength abroad and unity at home, who has eschewed partisanship, who has never followed the multitude to do evil, and who, like a true statesman, thinks not merely of his own generation, but also of the next and the next and the next. That public servant is the incumbent Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

## TEXAS OIL PRODUCTION AT AN ALL-TIME HIGH

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, information has come to me from the UP News Service of an announcement in Austin, Tex., which I should like

to read into the RECORD for the information of Senators:

AUSTIN, TEX.—The Texas Railroad Commission boosted the State's oil production allowable for March to an alltime high of 3,733,054 barrels, an increase of 210,901 barrels per day.

The allowable is based on 18 producing days, up from 15 in February.

Representatives of most major oil companies had asked for 18 producing days, and told the State's oil regulatory body petroleum stocks range from satisfactory to dangerously low.

Some major spokesmen had urged 17 days.

Independent operators pressed their plea for further investigation by the Commission of what they called pipeline proration and lack of well connections, particularly in west Texas.

The Commission has scheduled hearings April 1 on allegations by five independent oil producers' groups that certain majors are throttling west Texas production so they can increase imports of foreign oil.

The giant east Texas field was put on the 18-day producing schedule, Pantex, 16, and Headlee-Devonian and Dora Roberts Devonian, 6 days each.

Mr. President, a distinguished member of that Commission, Lt. Gen. Ernest Thompson, telephoned a message to my office which states, in substance, as follows:

We raised the allowable this morning 210,901 barrels. This makes us an allowable of 3,733,054 barrels and to that add 536,854 barrels per day production of natural distillate and condensates. This is a total of 4,269,908 per day each and every day for March. In addition to that, your average buildup from new wells for the month will be around 25,000 to 30,000 barrels per day which makes a total increase of 210,901 barrels of crude from wells now in existence plus 25,000 to 30,000 barrels for new wells that will come in during March which will be about 250,000 barrels.

We are having a hearing on the 19th of March in Austin to which all of the chief executives of all of the major oil companies have been summoned to come. This is our regular procedure each March.

We are asking them to tell us how much oil they need for adequate working stock as of April 1 and November 1 on crude and all products.

We have done this historically.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the item the distinguished majority leader placed in the RECORD a moment ago brings to mind that an oil inquiry is under way, and has been for quite some time. The subject is so immense in its dimensions that I apprehend that sometimes we get lost in the machinery. I recited before the investigating committee, since I am a member of that committee, that it brought to mind a man with very modest habiliments who tried to get into a very fashionable church in New York, which has formally attired ushers, and that sort of thing. When he came out, he saw a friend who asked him how it was.

The man replied, "Well, I expect it is one of those places where God got lost in the machinery."

Sometimes it seems to me that the crux of a matter gets lost in the machinery.

Inasmuch as the distinguished majority leader has referred to an increase in oil production in the State of Texas, I thought this might be a good time to sketch rather briefly for the record what is here involved.

Every Member of Congress has received inquiries as to why the price of oil has gone up. It is a very simple inquiry. Perhaps it ought to be simply answered, but there is no simple answer. I doubt whether anything has a simple answer any more. I recall a speech which was made by Charlie Taft, the brother of our late distinguished Bob Taft, before a federation in Washington, D. C. The first line of the speech was as follows: "Nothing will ever be simple again." That statement made me furious for a while, but I have an idea there is some truth in it.

So, Mr. President, there is nothing simple about this problem, because it is a highly complicated one which has ramifications all over the world.

Normally, we would not suspect that a canal 5,000 miles away would have any particular impact upon our own domestic well-being or the well-being of an entire continent. But it was in July that Colonel Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal, and it was in October that vessels were sunk in it and thus made it impossible for the canal to be used for transit purposes. On November 5 the pipeline which extends from Kiruk, in Iraq, across the Syrian desert, to a refinery in Tripoli, in the northern part of Lebanon, was dynamited. So all those events 5,000 miles away from home have suddenly set men, machinery, money, and brains into motion, in the hope that we can offset the rather evil effects of the series of problems which have arisen from that combination of events far away from our own shores.

First of all, Mr. President, we have the question of how to compensate for the loss of Middle East oil, insofar as Western Europe is concerned. Her daily need is 2 million barrels; that is her need when expressed in terms of industrial oil, domestic oil for heating purposes, and oil for other purposes. If there should be industrial collapse in Western Europe, obviously, that would have a tremendous impact upon the economy and well-being of the United States. So the first segment of the problem is how to "lift" oil to Europe.

The second segment is how to divert oil from Venezuela. Of course, the Caribbean area is rich in oil. Among the greatest proven oil reserves in the Western Hemisphere are those in northern Venezuela. The problem was how to divert oil from that area to Western Europe, and then how to compensate the east coast of our own country for the oil we normally derive from the Venezuelan Basin, for this is winter, and people get cold in winter; and in Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and other parts of the United States fuel oil must be available if the people are to keep warm. The winter here has been a rather severe one. On the other hand, we can be grateful that in Western Europe the winter has been exceedingly mild.

So, Mr. President, first of all, we have the question of how to compensate for the loss of Middle East oil, because only about a trickle of oil goes around the African Cape and finally reaches the places where oil from the Middle East had previously been used. However, that is only a minor facet of the problem.

The supply of oil coming to our own east coast has been shut off, and that situation causes a gap for which a supply must be obtained.

So we have the problem of the needs of our own east coast for oil, and also the problem of the needs of Europe for oil, and also the problem of the Suez Canal and when it will be open, when the expedition will finally raise the sunken vessels and make it possible for oil tankers to transit the canal.

In addition, there must be consent by someone to repair the pipeline which was dynamited. I suppose that when it was dynamited, the result was to turn off the valve on that supply of oil, and that was the end of it; and as a result there was a backing up of the oil which up to that time had been coming from the rich Iraqi Basin.

Finally, there is the question of the price of oil.

All these things put together constitute a problem which was being investigated by the Antimonopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. Something must be done in these premises. I shall not undertake to refine the problem. I assume that when these humble remarks of mine come to the attention of other Members of the Senate, they will be quick indeed to find any loopholes and any points of attack. That is perfectly all right, because I seek only to sketch the problem in its larger aspects.

Mr. President, in that situation something had to be done. Let us consider what was done in respect to all those aspects.

First of all, an expedition was sent to the canal, to raise and remove the sunken vessels. I was delighted when the expedition was put in charge of former Lieutenant General Wheeler, of the United States Army. He is a home boy; he comes from the county in Illinois where I live. He had much to do with the construction of the Burma Road. He is a great soldier and a great engineer in his own right. He has been making progress, and there is some hope that probably the canal will be renovated by March, so that oil tankers will be able once more to transit the canal and to ease somewhat the pressure which has been occasioned by the oil shortage.

Then there is the question of repairing the pipeline. I do not know precisely what will be done in that respect, or from whom consent must be obtained. But, after all, that situation is a part of the whole Middle East problem with which we are wrestling, and which at the present time engages the attention of the Congress.

Then there is the question of filling in the gap existing on our own east coast, because of the necessity of obtaining adequate supplies of fuel oil for use in the winter time. Because of that need, oil has been diverted from Venezuela to our east coast and also to Canada. Considerable fuss has been made about that; but it is a fact that oil has been diverted, and some Venezuelan oil has gone to Europe.

Then comes the larger problem of the oil lift. Great to-do has been made regarding whether we have achieved the target. In my judgment, what those who were in charge of the oil lift were expressing was a hope, rather than a daily target in terms of barrels of oil. It is easy to reach into thin air and get a figure, and to say that 500,000 barrels of oil are needed. Perhaps we can deliver 75 percent, 80 percent, or 90 percent; but at best that is a rather elusive hope or expectation, and many factors which may intrude may make it impossible to fulfill the hope.

The Middle East Emergency Committee, made up of 15 of the largest oil companies operating in the international field, was set up. Some of those companies are presently under a charge by the Department of Justice that they have violated the antitrust statutes. They have not been found guilty; as a matter of fact, they have not yet been tried on that charge. There is presently pending a docket for overcharges of the International Cooperation Administration for oil which was procured. I think it involves probably $58 million or $60 million. So eyebrows rise, and people ask, "How can oil companies which are operating in the international field, and which have billions of dollars of assets, be entrusted with the responsibility for operating an oil lift?"

Frankly, Mr. President, I do not know whom we could get, who would have the necessary talent, capacity, genius, and background, to do a job which involves Latin America and the Middle East and Western Europe and the production facilities of the United States. Certainly that job is not one for an amateur. Certainly it is not a job for limited vision and limited perspective. So those companies were brought into the picture, notwithstanding the criticisms which have been leveled. I do not comment now on the criticisms; they have been made, and they must stand for themselves.

In any event, the emergency committee was created; and it has been at work. The latest figure I have seen is that it has achieved the equivalent of approximately 478,000 barrels of oil a day. Probably that does not meet all of Western Europe's present needs, but it goes a long way toward doing so; and in view of the mild winter which Western Europe has experienced, there is not too much danger that suffering will occur among the free countries on the Continent of Europe, because of the present oil-supply situation.

In addition to all those problems, Mr. President, let me point out that there are problems which do not always readily meet the eye, but are related to the problems to which I have already referred. That consideration brings us to the item which was inserted in the RECORD by our distinguished majority leader.

Mr. President, the fact of the matter is that the Federal Government has no control over oil production; that is wholly within the jurisdiction of the States. That is why the State of Texas has a commission, under the leadership of a very distinguished man, General Thompson, who for a great many years has been chairman of the Texas Railroad and Warehouse Commission. I see that there is indication that production has risen rather sharply; but the point I make first of all is that the production of petroleum is in the hands of the States, not the Federal Government. So the thing we have to do, of course, is to confer with the States.

Figures have been submitted to the committee to indicate that daily production has increased by 500,000 barrels. Some of that may have come out of inventories. All of it may come out of the earth in a single day. I am not sure I recall it accurately, but the testimony before the committee was that there was a 500,000-barrel increase in production in order to pick up the slack and meet the extra needs as a result of the Suez crisis and the shut-off of oil going from the Middle East to the Continent of Europe.

So that is one problem that does not meet the eye and which shows we must deal with the States.

Then we come to the question of distribution. How many tankers have been used, I do not know. Of course, oil companies have great fleets of tankers, some of them flying the American flag and some registered under the flags of other countries, like Panama. Certainly in the case of independent tanker owners who operate under charter-hire contracts, my understanding is that there is a provision in the contracts that in the event of hostilities they can charge a wartime rate. Immediately upon the invasion of Egypt, they began to increase tanker shipping costs. That has added somewhat to the cost of oil. That is another facet of the problem which is not always taken into account.

Next comes the import problem. There has been a struggle for years and years between the independent oil producers and the coal producers on one side and the major oil producers on the other with respect to the importation of Venezuelan oil, and particularly residual oil. It has had an impact on the price of coal. It has had a very decided impact on the oil industry in this country, for, in proportion as prices are held down and the producers cannot meet costs, it removes incentives to explore for new wells, in an attempt to keep ahead of the constantly increasing needs.

Our needs, Mr. President, are about 14 million barrels. The distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who is now in the Chair, comes from an oil-producting State. Our needs will increase. The census figures, indicated by the clock in the Department of Commerce, show that growth is the law of the country. We either vegetate or decay. We either grow or die. Of course, America grows, and we are up to a population of 170 million Americans. In the days ahead, that will mean more automobiles, more mechanization, and larger uses for petroleum and its derivatives.

So the wildcatting business has to go ahead. More and more oil resources must be found in this country. But it is an inescapable fact, and I think the best geologists would so testify, that oil wells have to go deeper today. Whether the drilling is done in the State of Colorado, or in the State of Illinois, or in the State of New Mexico, or wherever it is done, drillers have to go deeper for oil sources today. That increases the cost. The costs of pipelines and labor have all gone up. So in connection with this whole matter, we must keep in mind that we must preserve the incentives.

The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization testified in the hearings held on this question. He was ready to take action, when suddenly the Suez crisis developed, and he suspended all action. That was the testimony of Dr. Flemming before the committee.

So the import problem, the impact on our security, and the oil resources of this country in the future are all involved.

Then, of course, the price problem arises.

Mr. President, I am just as allergic to price rises as is anyone else. I can understand the letters and telegrams being sent to Members of the House and Senate by the people back home, but we should not lose sight of the one fact, when we seek to find some devil and whip him around the stump, that the most eminent geologist and producer in the State of Wyoming came before the committee and gave expert testimony indicating that the price of crude petroleum should go up 75 cents a barrel in order to return production costs on at least newly found wells. The only reason why producers have been able to operate is that they have been taking oil from wells found 15 and 20 years ago, when exploration costs were much cheaper, which compensates for the cost of taking oil from wells which have been drilled and explored more recently.

I do not know whether this is correct or not, but I understand that Mr. Curry was complimented by the distinguished chairman of the committee conducting the investigation as one of the outstanding men in the field. He came before the committee and stated there ought to be an increase in price in order to keep ahead and in order to provide the incentives so richly needed to keep us in the foreground.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator has gone into many items which enter into the picture and I should like to mention one other. Kansas is fifth in oil production. We are unable, because of a lack of pipeline and other facilities, to send oil to Europe. Therefore, it is essential to send oil for Europe from the coast. We would like to participate if we could, but we have a problem.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed so. That gives me an opportunity to indicate what the problem of the independent producer is. He is not integrated. In most cases he has no pipeline. He must sell his oil to the large, integrated companies. Whether the Humble Oil Co. posted a price increase I do not know because the president of the company has not been before the committee. He will ap-

pear before the committee next week, and he can speak for himself. However, I know what was testified by the independent producers in the case of those who represent the producers in my own State. Considerable oil is produced in southern Illinois and together with two neighboring States there has been formed a tri-State oil association. That association has been very free to send me information on this subject, and to tell what their immediate problems are with reference to oil production and prices.

I mention this to show that the problems do not readily meet the eye. There is the question of the oil lift, the question of Venezuelan oil, the question of the Middle East, the question of Europe, the welfare of our independent producers, how to get more oil within the jurisdictions of the States, the distribution problem, the price problem, the importation of residual oil, and a great many other problems.

So I end just where I started, with this thesis: When a Senator receives a telegram stating, "The price of oil has gone up. Who is to blame?" That is a very simple question, but at the moment there is not a very simple answer. I sincerely hope the committee, under the expert guidance of a very distinguished Member of the Senate, the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, who made such a superb and gracious chairman, will get all the answers, and probably some substantive proposals can be recommended which will fit in with our economy and with the general American concept, and still take care of the problems that are before us.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAVITS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## RECESS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in accordance with the majority leader's suggestion and pursuant to the order heretofore entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 20, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 19 (legislative day of February 18), 1957:

### UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States circuit judge, fourth circuit, vice Armistead M. Dobie, retired.

### PROMOTIONS IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be captains in the United States Coast Guard:

| | |
|---|---|
| Richard D. Schmidt-man | John P. German |
| John T. Stanley | Joseph B. Feder |
| James D. Craik | Oscar C. Rohnke |
| Anthony J. DeJoy | Karl O. A. Zittel |
| Loren H. Seeger | Gilbert I. Lynch |
| George D. Synon | George R. Leslie |
| Irvin J. Stephens | Albert A. Lawrence |
| Donald T. Adams | Jerry B. Hoag |
| Theodore J. Fabik | Joseph A. Bresnan |
| Reinhold R. Johnson | Carl H. Stober |
| Hollis M. Warner | John R. Kurcheski |
| Walter B. Millington | Frederick G. Wild |

The following-named persons to be commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

| | |
|---|---|
| Benjamin M. Chiswell, Jr. | Kingdrel N. Ayers |
| Joe L. Horne | Victor A. G. Schmidt |
| Helmer S. Pearson | Elmer A. Crock |
| Donald M. Morell | James A. Palmer |
| Robert D. Brodie IV | Bernhard R. Henry |
| Peter Olsen | Robert C. Gould |
| Robert E. Reed-Hill | Raphael T. A. McKenzie |
| Ernest M. Espelie | Ernest D. Murray |
| Chester A. Richmond, Jr. | Peter Madison |
| James M. McLaughlin | Alfred M. Haynes |
| Henry F. Rohrkemper | David H. Douglas |
| Charles F. Scharfen-stein, Jr. | Wilber S. Doe |
| Robert P. Cromwell | John L. Barron |
| Kenneth R. Goodwin | William E. Ehrman |
| James W. Kincaid | Gordon H. MacLane |
| | William J. L. Parker |

The following-named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

| | |
|---|---|
| Burton V. Weston, Jr. | Jay P. Dayton |
| Manson E. Meekins | Richard H. Hagadorn |
| Gordon L. Bates | Robert J. Carson |
| Carleton W. Wahl | Hugh C. McCaffrey |
| Walter J. Felton | Merle L. Harbourt |
| Leonard A. Wardlaw, Jr. | Edwin W. Coleman |
| Bruce H. Jensen | Robert D. Fuller |
| Caleb M. Sickles | Robert S. Capp |
| David Block | Leslie F. Cool |
| Harold J. McCormack | John D. Roberts |
| Earl B. Cooper | Raymond J. Evans |
| Rayner C. Burke | Scott P. Berryman |
| William H. Monger | Willis G. Partridge |
| Joseph E. Gould | William G. Blandford |
| Robert W. Smith | Albert G. Jones |
| James P. Flessas | Stanley G. Perret |
| Robert A. Adamson | John R. Allums |
| David Gershowitz | Norman E. Dion |
| Dono W. Moore | Daniel J. Garrett |
| Eric G. Grundy | William A. Montgomery |

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard:

| | |
|---|---|
| Charles W. Lockwood | John A. Flynn |
| Dudley C. Goodwin, Jr. | Neal E. Williams, Jr. |
| Arthur E. Lawrence, Jr. | Frank L. Shelley |
| Ralph B. Pruett | William T. Adams II |
| Benjamin F. Rush | Arne J. Soreng |
| Harry J. Gardner, Jr. | David F. Lauth |
| Walter Folger | William H. Stewart |
| Frederick O. Wooley | Charles E. Larkin, Jr. |
| Lyle W. Lemos | Henry A. Cretella |
| Frederick W. Folger | Donald B. Russell |
| John V. Caffrey | William S. Schwob, Jr. |
| Karl F. Peterson | Anthony F. Fugaro |
| John E. Wesler | Reginald W. Raynor, Jr. |
| William R. Fearn | Norman B. Binns |
| Laurence J. Hoch | Harold A. Paulsen |
| James S. Gracey | Richard S. Dolliver |
| Richard T. Penn, Jr. | Sidney A. Wallace |
| Charles L. Blaha | Jules B. DuPeza |
| Thomas E. Hawkins | Joseph W. E. Ward |
| Ernest R. Tindle | Robert Schuerch, Jr. |
| Herbert M. Hartlove | Harry H. Keller, Jr. |
| Nicholas Ivanovsky | Wilfred H. Shaw |
| Herbert H. Mulvany | Paul W. Meyer |
| Royce A. Lewis | |

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W-4, in the United States Coast Guard:

| | |
|---|---|
| Peter J. Byrne | Arnold H. Peterson |
| Harry H. Eckels | Robert P. Chirnside |
| Ezekiel D. J. Fulcher | Toivo R. Juntunen |
| Henry C. Wear, Jr. | Herbert E. Mister |
| Clarence J. Pare, Jr. | John Atherton |
| Melvin Handley | Milo A. Jordan |
| Maurice L. Kambarn | Rene J. Chevrier |
| Robert C. Preston | Joseph Etienne |
| Albert H. Hauser | James A. Hadley |
| George E. Cote | Royce O. Tackett |
| Norman A. Cooper | Lowell D. Mead |
| Carl D. Miller | Wilber E. Harris |
| Ralph C. Sidebottom | Benjamin F. Lombard |
| Donald T. Cook | Samuel R. Randolph |
| William O. Adams | |

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W-3, in the United States Coast Guard:

| | |
|---|---|
| Hugh S. Hanna | William H. Mattson |
| Richard V. Bercaw | Anthony F. Glaza, Jr. |
| John F. Malley | George H. Jenks |
| Joseph N. Alewine | Finis C. Key |
| Peter P. Ashton | Franklin H. Wix |
| Peter D. Shost | Milton L. Black |
| Lavine Hubert | Gentry J. Cooke |
| Eugene P. Farley | Harold G. Welchert |
| Eugene C. Colson | William H. Magowan |
| Joseph M. Donovan | Phillip M. Collins |
| Escol J. Parker | Milo A. Cornelius |
| Joseph C. Daniels | James J. Morsey |
| William H. Reed | Frank L. Ryman, Jr. |
| Harry A. Lessey | Ernest B. Fuller |
| Alfred R. Marsh | William R. Jenkins |

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W-2, in the United States Coast Guard:

| | |
|---|---|
| George H. Corston | Thomas J. Hushion |
| Arnold A. Adams | Robert Malaussena |
| John A. Flynn | Charles E. Holden |
| Alfred A. Kolb | Earl A. Boles |
| Emmett Gossen | James M. Mauldin |
| Charles R. Smith | Marvin E. Ginn |
| Frank M. Miller, Jr. | Gustave F. Scholz |
| John J. Gunson | Norman L. Cates |
| Albert L. Lingenfelter | Anthony H. Halko |
| Arthur F. Myers | Raymond W. Trevett |
| William H. Hudson | Charles W. Griffiths |
| George F. Weadon | James C. Rosemergy |
| Frank Bartling | Charles H. Agee |
| Mitchel K. Opsitnik | Henry T. Hutchins |
| Raymond W. Olson | Thomas B. Hurt |
| George F. W. Ehrsam | Harold S. Winther |
| Roy E. Needles | Albert Solberg |
| Warren G. Tubbs | Raymond J. White |
| Herbert L. Simpson | Burton B. Watkins |
| Wallace E. Hulteen | Charles J. Volpe, Jr. |
| Harold E. DeYoung | Dominic G. Swider |
| George R. Peck | Herman J. Lentz |
| William T. Dickinson | John C. Horton |
| Starr C. Burgess | William O. Gaverly |
| Harold A. C. DuChene | Richard R. Spencer |
| Frank B. Wright | Frank E. Smith |
| Michael O'Connell | Thurman T. Cook |
| David F. Ray | Curtis J. Olds |
| Claude A. Robinson | Joseph W. Ellis |
| Herbert S. Lyman | Wendell M. Cahill |
| Paul Schuttpelz, Jr. | Joseph A. Yeager |
| James P. Avila | Lyle E. Cable |
| Maltire N. O'Neal | James A. Wooley |
| Fred A. Shabo | John H. Forbing |
| Frank H. Monty | Dewey H. Scarborough, Jr. |
| George Mathews | Phillip M. Griebel |
| Walter F. Shepich | Seymour Alexander |
| Randall H. Spooner | Robert J. Hanson |
| Harold W. Collins | Harold Eveld |
| Herbert L. Gordon | Walter P. Stipcich |
| Raymond L. Williams | |
| James R. Kane | |

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, may the days of this Brotherhood Week, which we are now observing, be radiant with a clearer vision and understanding of the many noble and helpful things that people of different creeds and races may do together for the welfare of humanity.

May we resolve to covet and cultivate more earnestly that finer spirit which goes out in kindness and sympathy toward the members of the human family and inspires them to live as brothers on the higher levels of peace and good will.

Show us how we may acquire a larger measure of the mind and spirit of our blessed Lord who went about doing good and always sought to give help and hope to the poor and needy, the sorrowing and suffering.

Help us to practice His Golden Rule and fill our hearts with those lofty impulses and feelings which are the progenitors of achievement in the building of a more brotherly social order.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4249. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. KNOWLAND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## ARABIAN AMERICAN OIL CO.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the Arabian American Oil Co., the American corporation operating the Saudi Arabian oil field, has been treating its oil royalty payments to King Saud as a tax rather than as a royalty.

Under Aramco's purported agreement with King Saud, net profits of between six hundred and six hundred and fifty million dollars are divided equally between King Saud and the Arabian American Oil Corp. If the payments to King Saud are treated as a tax rather than a royalty, the Arabian American Oil Co. can deduct the payments made to King Saud from income taxes due the United States. The simple gimmick of arranging for King Saud to treat the royalty payments as a tax permits Aramco to skip payment of income taxes due our Government on a profit of over $300 million each year.

How ridiculous can the business managers of our Government become?

The blood and dollars of the American people are pledged to the protection of the status quo in the Middle East, as well as the integrity of Aramco's oil contracts with King Saud which would otherwise be a meaningless scrap of paper.

What does our Government get from the Arabian American Oil Co. in return for its very costly guaranty of contract integrity—a conspired avoidance of an income-tax obligation on $300 million of income per year?

## FIRETRAPS FOR OUR AGED CITIZENS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Americans, not only in the State of Missouri where the tragedy occurred but throughout the Nation, were shocked by the news of the loss of 71 aged men and women in a fire which destroyed the dilapidated house in which they were domiciled. Unfortunately this is not the only tragedy of similar nature that has marked with shame our neglect of the housing of our senior citizens. The Federal Government and we in the Congress cannot escape our share of the responsibility.

Instead of providing a sound Federal program of housing in a field where private industry is not attracted, we are leaving these old men and women the victims of persons who make their profit by housing them in firetraps. It is all because there is no other place for them to go. Housing and care of our aging citizens can no longer be turned over to the tender mercies of those who take them off our hands for private profit.

In the 1st session of the 84th Congress I introduced a bill to provide a real program of housing for our aged and aging. Other members of the Banking and Currency Committee joined in support of this proposed legislation as sponsors. The public response was immediate, nationwide and tremendous in its favorable volume, for men and women everywhere in our Nation realized that the neglect of housing for our senior citizens constituted a national shame.

I was bitterly disappointed that practically no progress was made in the 84th Congress, despite the almost universal public demand for legislation wiping out the cause of a shame that all good people feel in the existing neglect of the aging and the aged in the matter of livable and safe housing within their financial means.

On the first day of the 85th Congress I again introduced a bill calculated to bring livable and safe housing within the reach of our senior citizens. Bills along the same lines were introduced by other Members. The tragedy of this week in the State of Missouri must awaken us to the immediate need for action. As I have said such tragedies are not unusual. They occur all too often because no one seems to care what becomes of these old people. Of course, people do care because these old people are their own fathers and mothers, grandfathers and grandmothers. But because in this field of housing there are no organized pressure groups to stir us up to do what should be done without urging, nothing ever happens.

For the sake of all that is decent, let the 85th Congress cover itself with glory by providing a housing program that will assure safe and comfortable roofs over all our senior citizens. It is not a matter of who gets the credit. The job of providing decent and safe housing for our senior citizens and doing it now is big enough and commanding enough to encompass every Member, with a heart, of both bodies in this Congress.

## LIMITING EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL YEAR 1958

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House and Senate (section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946) now require that a joint committee—Appropriations and Ways and Means from the House and Appropriations and Finance from the Senate—prepare and submit by February 15 each year a so-called legislative budget, the primary purpose of which is to limit expenditures which may be authorized.

Since no such budget has been prepared or submitted, I am today introducing a resolution to amend the rules of the House by limiting the total which may be authorized or expended in fiscal year 1958 to $65 billion, and which will require that receipts in excess of $65 billion in fiscal 1958 be used one-half to reduce the national debt and one-half for tax reduction.

Mr. Speaker, the demand for a substantial cut in proposed expenditures is countrywide and insistent. We in Congress should lead that movement. I hope this resolution will have the careful attention of all Members of the House, that it will have early hearings before the Rules Committee, and that we may have it on the floor very promptly. Time is important.

## COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary on Monday and Tuesday of next week may have the privilege

of sitting while the House is in session during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## STATEMENT OF POLICY OF OBJECTORS COMMITTEE ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, on February 4 the majority and minority floor leaders appointed their respective personnel of the objectors committees the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] appointing 3 members of his party, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] appointing 4 members of his party. The objectors committees are unofficial committees of the House of Representatives, existing at the request and at the pleasure of the respective floor leaders of the two parties who, in order to facilitate the proper screening of legislation which may be placed on the Consent Calendar, designate Members on each side of the aisle charged with the specific responsibility of seeing to it that legislation passing by such procedure is in the interests of good government.

The rule which is applicable to Consent Calendar procedure is Rule 746 of the House Rules and Manual, found on pages 373, 374, and 375 of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The operation of such procedure is described on pages 95, 134, 135, 136, 173, and 327 of Cannon's Procedures in the House of Representatives.

For several sessions now objectors on both sides of the aisle have followed certain rules for consideration of Consent Calendar bills which they have made known to the Members at the beginning of a session. These rules are not publicized at this time to establish hard and fast procedures but rather to advise the Members of the House as to the manner in which the committee plans to operate throughout the 85th Congress. The members of the committees feel: first, that generally no legislation should pass by unanimous consent which involves an aggregate expenditure of more than $1 million; second, that no bill which changes national policy or international policy should be permitted to pass on the Consent Calendar but rather should be afforded the opportunity of open and extended debate; third, that any bill which appears on the Consent Calendar, even though it does not change national or international policy, or does not call for an expenditure of more than $1 million, should not be approved without the membership being fully informed of its contents, providing it is a measure that would apply to the districts of a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives, in which case, the minimum amount of consideration that should be given such a bill would be clearance by the leadership of both parties before being brought before the House on the Consent Calendar—it has been the policy of the objectors on the Consent Calendar heretofore to put such a bill over without prejudice one or more times to give an opportunity to the Members to become fully informed as to the contents of such a bill, and the Consent Calendar objectors for the 85th Congress wish to follow like procedure; fourth, that if a bill has been placed on the Consent Calendar and the members of the committee having jurisdiction over the legislation show that it has not been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget, by the respective departments affected by such legislation, or that such reports from the committee or from the department show that the legislation is not in accord with the President's program, it should not pass on the Consent Calendar but that the chairman of the House committee having jurisdiction over the legislation should either call it up under suspension of the rules with the permission of the Speaker or should go to the Rules Committee for a rule for such legislation. While the members of the objectors committees feel that a report from the Bureau of the Budget is necessary before a bill should be placed upon the Consent Calendar, they do not wish to take the position that the report from the Bureau of the Budget must necessarily show the approval of such legislation by the Bureau. However, if such approval is not shown, then in the consideration of the legislation, even if considered on the Consent Calendar, the chairman reporting the bill, or the sponsor of the bill, should be willing to accept the responsibility of stating to the Members the action of the budget and the reasons for such action.

The members of the Consent Calendar Objectors Committee also feel it fair to state to the membership that it is not their purpose to obstruct legislation or to object to bills or pass them over without prejudice because of any personal objection to said bill or bills by any one member or all of the members of the Consent Calendar Objectors Committee, but rather that their real purpose, in addition to expediting legislation, is to protect the membership against having bills passed by unanimous consent which, in the opinion of the objectors any Member of the House might have objection to.

The members of the Consent Calendar Objectors Committee earnestly request that the chairman of the standing committees of the House having the responsibility for bringing legislation before the House take into consideration the contents of this statement before placing bills on the Consent Calendar. While it is not absolutely necessary that the sponsors of bills appearing on the consent calendar contact the various members of the Consent Calendar Objectors Committee, nevertheless, in the interest of saving time and avoiding the possibility of having bills laid over unnecessarily, it is good practice to do so; and the objectors welcome the continuance of the procedure of getting in touch with them at least 24 hours before the legislation is called up under the regular consent calendar procedure. In many instances such thoughtfulness on the part of the sponsors will clear away questions which the objectors have and consequently will make for the expeditious handling of legislation.

The majority objectors are WAYNE N. ASPINALL, EDWARD P. BOLAND, and JOHN J. McFALL.

The minority objectors are PAUL CUNNINGHAM, JOHN W. BYRNES, GERALD R. FORD, and PHIL WEAVER.

## RULES GOVERNING COMMITTEE AND HOUSE ACTION ON PRIVATE BILLS AND IMMIGRATION AND CLAIMS BILLS

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a statement of policy as to the rules and procedure in the handling of private bills and immigration bills on the private calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members of the House I wish to give a short explanation of certain policies and rules governing committee and House action on private bills pertaining to immigration and claims. First, let me include at this point the rules of the procedure which the Committee on the Judiciary applies in the consideration of private immigration legislation under the jurisdiction of its subcommittee No. 1. The membership of that subcommittee is as follows: FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania, chairman; MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Ohio; FRANK CHELF, Kentucky; PATRICK J. HILLINGS, California; DEWITT S. HYDE, Maryland.

The rules of procedure read as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE

1. The meeting of the subcommittee shall be held on Monday of each week at 10 a. m., unless otherwise ordered by the chairman.

2. All meetings of the subcommittee shall be public except on the order of the chairman or a majority of the members present.

3. A quorum of the subcommittee shall consist of 2 members for the purpose of holding hearings on private bills and 3 members for the purpose of making recommendations to the committee.

4. Requests for reports on private bills from the departments shall be made only upon a written request addressed to the chairman of the subcommittee or the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary by the author of such bill. That request shall contain the following information which shall be submitted to the committee in triplicate:

(a) In the case of aliens who are physically in the United States: The date and place of the alien's entry into the United States; his immigration status at that time (visitor, student, exchange student, seaman, stowaway, illegal border crosser, etc.); his age; place of birth; address in the United States; and the location of the United States consulate at which be obtained his visa, if any.

(b) In the case of aliens who are residing outside of the United States: The alien's age; place of birth; address; and the location of the United States consulate before which his application for a visa is pending; and the address and relationship of the person primarily interested in the alien's admission to the United States.

5. The staff of the subcommittee shall not receive nor forward to the subcommittee for action any requests for reports which do not comply fully with the provisions of rule 4.

6. The subcommittee shall not address to the Attorney General communications designed to defer deportation of beneficiaries of private bills who have entered the United States as stowaways, or deserting seamen, or by surreptitiously entering without inspection through the land or sea borders of the United States.

Exemption from this rule may be granted by the subcommittee in cases where the bill is designed to prevent extreme hardship. However, no such exemption may be granted unless the author of the bill has secured and filed with the subcommittee full and complete documentary evidence in support of his request to waive this rule.

7. No favorable consideration shall be given to any private bill until a report from the proper Department has been secured.

8. No private bill shall be considered if an administrative remedy exists, unless substantial proof is presented that the subject is not in a position to avail himself of such administrative remedy.

9. Upon the completion of the filing of all evidence pertinent to the case, private bills designed to adjust immigration status shall be scheduled for subcommittee consideration in the chronological order of their introduction, except that priority shall be given to bills introduced earliest in any of the previous Congresses.

10. Consideration of private bills designed to adjust the status of aliens unlawfully in the United States shall not be deferred due to nonappearance at subcommittee hearings of the author of the bill or persons authorized to represent him.

11. Bills tabled by the committee shall not be reconsidered unless new evidence is introduced showing a material change of the facts previously known to the committee.

12. Bills which have passed the House of Representatives during a previous Congress will be ordered favorably reported to the full committee unless they have been acted upon adversely by the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

Bills which have passed the House of Representatives and have been adversely acted upon by the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate will not be considered unless a companion bill passed by the Senate is referred to the subcommittee.

Next I would like to include the rules of procedure which the Committee on the Judiciary applies in the consideration of claims against the United States. With each Congress over 1,500 claim bills are referred to the committee and its subcommittee No. 2 has jurisdiction over claims. The membership of that subcommittee is as follows: THOMAS J. LANE, chairman; E. L. FORRESTER, HAROLD D. DONOHUE, CHARLES BOYLE, USHER L. BURDICK, RICHARD POFF, WILLIAM C. CRAMER. Walter R. Lee, legislative assistant.

The rules of procedure for this subcommittee are as follows:

10. The subcommittee shall not consider any claim adversely reported or rejected by it at a previous consideration, except upon presentation of new or additional evidence disclosing a material change in the facts which, in the chairman's opinion, is sufficient to warrant reopening the case.

11. The subcommittee shall not consider any claim filed with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, considered on its merits and disallowed; or any bill awarding or increasing compensation to an employee or his dependents in lieu of that prescribed by the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended; or otherwise interfering with the provisions and compensation of that act, except bills to waive the limitations of time contained in sections 15 to 20, inclusive, thereof, and this rule may be waived only upon order of two-thirds of the entire subcommittee, present and voting.

12. The subcommittee shall not consider any claim for civil-service retirement benefits, compensation, pension, or gratuity by an employee of the Government, or a member of the Armed Forces or the Reserves, or by his dependents, as the retirement benefits, compensation, pension, or gratuity to which such person may be entitled is specifically covered by general statutes, applicable to all in the same class.

13. The subcommittee shall not consider any claim for injuries or damage, either to a member or to third persons, resulting from service in or activities by the National Guard maintained within the several States.

14. The subcommittee shall not consider any claim over which another tribunal, court, or department has jurisdiction, while such jurisdiction is not exhausted.

15. The subcommittee shall not consider any claim approved by the Congress and vetoed by the President, except upon a material change in the facts or written evidence that administration disapproval has been withdrawn; and this rule may be waived only upon order of two-thirds of the entire subcommittee, present and voting.

16. In all bills carrying an appropriation, a 10-percent attorney's fee clause shall be added: *Provided,* That this rule shall not apply to claims based upon findings of the Court of Claims, court decisions, or where extraordinary services have been rendered. In such cases the committee will determine the amount of fee to be allowed.

17. The subcommittee shall not consider any claim for retirement benefits, compensation, pension, or gratuity under the Railroad Retirement Act when such claim has been considered on its merits and disallowed, or otherwise interfering with the provisions and compensation of that act, except bills to waive the limitation of time, and this rule may be waived only upon order of two-thirds of the entire subcommittee, present and voting.

18. The subcommittee shall not consider a bill which has twice passed the House and been rejected by the Senate Judiciary Committee, unless and until the bill has first passed the Senate. Such rule shall be waived only upon a vote of two-thirds of the subcommittee.

Approved by the Committee on the Judiciary March 8, 1955.

The following statement, governing procedure on all bills on the Private Calendar, has been prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress and is submitted herewith:

A CALENDAR OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (PRIVATE CALENDAR)

Introduction: This calendar, to which is referred all bills of a private nature, is better known as the Private Calendar; the procedure is very interesting; and nearly half, or more, of the laws passed in each session of Congress are printed on and considered from this calendar. This rule aids the House in the expedition of business. Should the House debate each private bill, most of each sesssion would be consumed debating and voting on them.

Nature of calendar and its business: All bills and resolutions on the calendar may be called up 2 days each month for a hearing. The consideration of this calendar on the first Tuesday of each month is highly privileged; the rule makes it mandatory unless determined to the contrary by a two-thirds vote. On the third Tuesday, the Speaker is free to use his own discretion, and he may entertain other privileged business instead. The rule prescribes that the bills shall be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Debate must be confined to the subject of the motions permitted under the rule. Motions to strike out the last word, to reserve objections, to obtain time for debate by unanimous consent, and to request for recognition to make statements are not entertained by the Speaker.

The Presiding Officers had rendered many decisions concerning the old rules defining the procedure for consideration of private bills, but, obviously, most of them became obsolete with the adoption of the present rule.

Procedure under rule: The rule in its present form was adopted on March 27, 1935, setting aside the first and third Tuesdays of each month for this business. On these days immediately after the disposition of business on the "Speaker's table as requires reference only," the Speaker directs the call of the Private Calendar. He announces that today is the first or the third Tuesday, as the case might be, and "Under the rules today is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar." After the first bill is reported by title, he inquires if there is objection to the consideration of the bill. If no objection is heard the Clerk reads the bill (* * * with the following committee amendments). The period for amending a private bill is generally very short, after which the Speaker announces that the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table. Should objection be heard by two or more Members to the consideration of a measure when it is first called up, "it shall be recommitted to the committee which reported the bill or resolution and no reservation of objection shall be entertained by the Speaker." The standing committee is free to hear these bills and report them back to the House as an omnibus bill and on the third Tuesday of each month the Speaker is authorized to give preference to consideration of omnibus bills. The omnibus bills are called up in the same manner described for individual private bills, but they generally consume much time for consideration. They are read by paragraph for amendments. After a paragraph has been read it is in order to offer amendments to that paragraph but the amendment is not in order unless it strikes out, reduces, or places limitations on the amounts of money stated in the original bill. The common practice to offer an amendment to strike out the paragraph which in effect destroys the private bill may be included in another during the same session of Congress. All issues are decided by a majority vote just as in the case in regular legislating. The omnibus bill, consisting of two or more private bills, when passed is resolved into its original parts and engrossed as if they had passed in the House severally.

Where a House bill included in an omnibus bill is similar to a Senate bill on the Speaker's table, it is in order to call up the Senate bill for consideration and substitute it for the House bill.

Unfinished business: Unfinished business from this calendar does not come up the next legislative day; it must wait until a Tuesday on which such bills are in order. If the previous question has been moved on the bill to final passage, it becomes the unfinished business of the House and may be completed on the next legislative day.

*Official objectors.* Generally speaking, the individual Representative is concerned only with the private bills introduced by himself. Consequently, seldom are more than 50 Members present at a time during the consideration of private bills. To the observer there seems to be no interest in these bills passed by the House, but the political parties are very much interested, and they see to it that some check is placed on the number and nature of private bills to be enacted. If no check existed, many billions of dollars would be drawn from the Treasury to pay off al-

leged claims. To prevent this each party has three or more "official objectors." The majority floor leader designates 3 to 5 official objectors; the minority leader to check the majority party does likewise. In each case these objectors are charged by the leaders of their party with respect to what they should oppose and what they should approve. These men are obligated to read all of the measures carefully and pass judgment by remaining silent or objecting when each bill is considered. These men stay on the floor constantly while the Private Calendar is under consideration, and when a bill is called up they readily object if it fails to meet their test.

Objectors on the Private Calendar appointed by the Speaker of the House and minority leader are as follows: KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Alabama, chairman; EDWARD P. BOLAND, Massachusetts; ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, South Carolina; TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, Illinois; WILLIAM K. VAN PELT, Wisconsin; WILLIAM H. AVERY, Kansas.

## THE PRIME MINISTER OF FRANCE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, February 27, 1957, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of receiving the Prime Minister of the Republic of France.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 8]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, Calif. | Green, Oreg. | Pillion |
| Anderson, Mont. | Gubser | Polk |
| | Harden | Powell |
| Baumhart | Hays, Ohio | Prouty |
| Blatnik | Hébert | Rains |
| Boggs | Heselton | Reece, Tenn. |
| Bow | Hillings | Scott, Pa. |
| Bowler | McCarthy | Scudder |
| Carnahan | McIntire | Sheehan |
| Chiperfield | Magnuson | Shelley |
| Corbett | Mason | Sieminski |
| Cretella | Meader | Sisk |
| Dies | Merrow | Thompson, La. |
| Engle | Miller, N. Y. | Tollefson |
| Gordon | Morano | Weaver |
| Gray | Morrison | |

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 383 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

## TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4897) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 3 hours, one half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] and one half by myself.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say to the gentleman from Virginia, I would prefer to let debate run along at least for a period of time and not place a 3-hour limitation on debate at this time.

Mr. GARY. May I suggest I think we ought to have some limit. Will the gentleman agree that the debate shall not continue beyond today, and that the first paragraph of the bill should be read today.

Mr. CANFIELD. I should be happy to agree to that.

Mr. GARY. Then, Mr. Speaker, I so request. I ask unanimous consent that general debate shall not continue beyond today and that the time be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] and myself, and that the first paragraph of the bill should be read today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4897), with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, for the first time since I have been a member of the Treasury and Post Office Subcommittee, our committee has stirred up what appears to be a real controversy in the House. All I ask is that you bear with me while I try to explain to you just exactly what our subcommittee has done. I am certain, if you will follow the debate on this bill, you will agree that the committee has acted wisely. I have stated time and again on the floor of this House that I am very proud of this committee. We have an excellent committee. I have paid tribute time and again to the ranking minority member of this committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] who when the Republicans are in power in the House serves as chairman of the committee. Usually, we have agreed. Unfortunately, today we do not agree, but I will say that has not lessened by one iota my respect for Mr. CANFIELD. When opponents cannot disagree agreeably, it is a sad situation indeed. I do not agree with my friend, but I know he is doing what he considers to be in the best interests of the Nation and I, certainly, am trying to do likewise. In addition to Mr. CANFIELD, we have on this committee Mr. OTTO E. PASSMAN, Mr. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI, and we were very glad this year when the new member of the Committee on Appropriations were assigned that Mr. TOM STEED was assigned to our subcommittee. We also have Mr. EARL WILSON and Mr. BENJAMIN F. JAMES. I want to say that all of them have contributed immeasurably to the deliberations of the committee.

I know practically every Member of this House has been bombarded with telegrams. I have a few of them here in my hand now. They come from my district. They come from men who know absolutely nothing whatever about this bill. Our committee has been studying this bill day after day, week after week, from 10 o'clock in the morning until 5 o'clock in the afternoon, and we have heard witnesses from every division of the departments involved. We have gone into every item of the appropriation, and we have presented to you our report. Here we have telegrams that come from all over the United States, from men who never have seen the bill, who have no idea what is in it, and yet they try to influence your vote on the bill.

Now, at the outset I want to set at rest any doubts which any members of this committee may have as to the recommendations of our subcommittee, particularly with reference to the Post Office Department, because that seems to be the target of the telegrams.

The bill actually provides for an increase, not a decrease, in postal services. It would appropriate $207 million more to the Post Office Department than was available in the current fiscal year. Of that amount it is true $162 million is for contributions to the civil service retirement and disability fund, within-grade promotions, and for an extra working day in the fiscal year 1958, which are compulsory increases. But that leaves $44 million of increase over the current fiscal year for services above the present level.

In postal operations alone, for instance, our committee recommends the appropriation of almost $18 million more than was available in 1957, specifically to take care of the expanding volume of mail and the growth of rural and metropolitan services.

How, then, can anyone logically claim that the fact that we have reduced the budget request, while increasing last year's appropriations, will displace employees now on the payroll? That claim is obviously ridiculous.

If we are going to cut the Federal budget, we must do it bill by bill, item by item, as the testimony justifies. We present a bill which cuts the Treasury-Post Office, Tax Court budget requests only 2 percent. The $58 million cut in the Post Office is a reduction of 1.7 percent from the budget request, yet it provides an increase of $44 million for new services.

Citizens from one end of this Nation to the other are clamoring for a reduction in the inflated Federal budget. The question before the House today is whether the Congress is going to exercise its prerogative and cut the budget or let bureaucracy run wild. I hope the House will sustain us in this case and

not be fooled by unsupported claims reaching us in the final minutes before voting.

I will return to a more detailed discussion concerning the post office later.

At this point, I want to take up with you this bill item by item. Let us consider first the entire bill. The request for 1958 is for $3,965,291,000—nearly $4 billion.

The committee recommended $3,884,927,000, which is a committee reduction of only, may I say, only $80,364,000, approximately 2 percent.

The amount appropriated for 1957 under the entire bill was $3,634,274,850. The recommendation of the committee is, therefore, an increase of $250,652,150 over and above the amounts appropriated for the current fiscal year. It is fair to say that a part of that increase is made up of mandatory increases. You will find those mandatory increases listed on page 2 of the report on this bill. They are itemized as follows: For employer contributions to the Civil Service Retirement Fund $154,600,000. Let me explain that is not actually an increase of expenditure. That item represents the Government's contribution to the Civil Service Retirement Fund. Heretofore the contribution was appropriated in a lump sum for all of the departments and agencies and was carried under another bill. Under the law adopted during the last session of Congress those payments are now charged to each department; and $154,600,000 is charged to the departments contained in this bill. So it is neither an increase nor a decrease in appropriations.

In addition to that the postal employees' automatic pay increase amounts to $24,500,000, and the Post Office Department has to pay that because the Congress ordered them to do so last year.

Then, somehow or other, there is an additional working day next year. It seems that we have one more working day in 1958 than in 1957, and that additional working day costs the departments, just the two contained in this bill—I do not know what it costs the Government in its entirety—but it costs the departments which are in this bill $8 million for that one additional working day.

In addition to that, there is an amount for increase in retirees of the Coast Guard of $1,500,000.

Employer contribution to social security for military personnel, $1,400,000.

Reimbursement to Post Office for registry fees, $700,000; and biennial payment of fidelity bond premiums on behalf of the Post Office, $400,000.

That makes an addition which I have called to your attention of $191,100,000 for mandatory increases. But this bill carries $59,552,150 more than the mandatory increases.

I might add that this bill carries lots more than that.

This is the second largest bill that will be presented to the Congress during the present session. Instead of the $3,884,927,000 which our committee recommends, there is an item in here for permanent appropriations of $8,086,000,000. The largest part of that sum is for interest on the public debt, which has now reached the staggering sum of $7,300,000,000, an estimated increase of $100,000,000 over last year.

In addition to that, we have certain payments from trust funds in the bill amounting to $10,278,000,000. The bulk of these are Federal old-age and survivors' insurance trust-fund payments, which for 1958 are estimated at $7,504,000,000. Therefore, the total amount carried in this bill is $22,329,000,000. The permanent appropriations and the trust-fund payments are fixed by law. The committee can neither deduct from nor add to them. The Treasury pays out what the law requires. Therefore, the only part of the bill that we can operate on is the request for $3,965,291,000.

Of the total appropriation request, $713,831,000 is for the Treasury Department.

The committee recommended for the Treasury Department $691,467,000, which is a reduction of $22,364,000, or 3.13 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I want to be very frank. Let me say, therefore, that this is going to strap the Treasury Department. In my judgment, and I say this without hesitation, the Treasury Department is the most economically run Department in the entire Government of the United States. Several years ago when our subcommittee recommended a management study of that Department, they set up a management committee and they have continued that committee in existence to this day. It was established when Mr. Snyder was Secretary of the Treasury and I am happy to say that the present Secretary, Mr. Humphrey, has continued the committee in effect. Time and again he has paid tribute to its efficiency.

That committee is composed of employees of the Department who are charged with the duty of studying from day to day the way in which the Department can modernize and reduce expenditures. Consequently in the various bureaus of the Treasury Department they are using modern machines and electronic devices that speed up the work. They have done a magnificent job in management improvement. You may ask, Why, then, did we cut their appropriation $22 million? Well, although we cut it $22 million, we have allowed them $42,897,150 over and above the appropriations for 1957.

Of that amount $23 million is for the retirement fund, so that it will reduce the amount that they have for expansion by that amount. And, there are several other items of compulsory increases. But, excluding all of the compulsory increase, we have allowed the entire Department more than they have for the current year 1957.

Let me add, although we cut the Treasury budget 3.13 percent, I have not heard one iota of criticism from the Secretary of the Treasury. So far as I know, it is their purpose to accept that amount. They have not complained to me and no one has mentioned to me any complaints from that Department.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if my distinguished chairman would yield to me.

Mr. GARY. I will be delighted to yield to my distinguished friend from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman has just described the $22 million cut in Treasury items. I am sure that he will want to state that the $8.4 million cut in the Coast Guard aviation account is not merely a cut, because we are awaiting a report and undoubtedly will have to restore the full amount if not appropriate more funds.

Mr. GARY. That is true, and I was going to discuss that item when I came to the Coast Guard. If the gentleman does not mind, I will delay that until I come to the Coast Guard.

There are many divisions of the Treasury Department. Some of them are so small that I do not believe it is necessary for me to bore you with a discussion of all of them. For example, the Office of the Secretary of the Treasury: we cut that $36,000, but that still allows him some little increase for new office equipment but not very much.

The Bureau of Accounts requested $3,155,000, and we allowed them $3,125,000. That was a reduction of $30,000.

In the Division of Disbursements we allowed an increase. Their request was for $17,595,000, and we allowed them $17 million, which was a cut of $595,000. Part of that was for retirement, but the increase over and above retirement is for an additional workload brought about by the increased number of checks they have to issue for the social security program.

Bureau of the Public Debt: as a matter of fact, their budget is below the current year. That is the only bureau in the entire group that we cut below this year, and the reason we did that was because they told us that they are planning to substitute a new method for handling bonds beginning May 1 and they expect that it will save them $500,000. They had not taken that $500,000 out of the budget, so we felt it was a good thing to take it out for them, which we did.

Office of the Treasurer: we had an increase in that office, but it was due largely to the procurement of United States currency. In our times of inflation and prosperity people are using more money. Money becomes damaged more rapidly, and they have to print more money next year than they did this year, and we did not want anybody to run out of money in the United States, so we allowed them an additional amount for the printing of currency.

The Bureau of Customs has done a magnificent job of modernization. Very frankly, the committee hated to cut them at all. We allowed them a little bit more money last year and they brought in custom duties of $2 million more than the year before.

There are three major bureaus of the Department of the Treasury. Two of them are revenue-raising bureaus and you have to be very careful how you cut them lest you reduce your revenues. One is the Internal Revenue Service and the other is the Bureau of Customs. The third one is the Coast Guard which is a national defense unit. We have to watch

that from the standpoint of national defense.

The Bureau of Customs asked for $49,650,000. We allowed them $48 million. That is a reduction by the committee of $1,650,000. But their appropriation for fiscal 1957 was only $44,250,000, so there is an increases of $3,750,000 over 1957. Their retirement contribution takes up $2,654,000 of that, so they have approximately $1 million left over.

We cut out some new buildings along the border that they want and need. But if we are going to cut this budget we have to be careful to restrict appropriations to absolutely essential items because the Federal budget has grown to such proportions that, as the Secretary of the Treasury has warned this Nation, if we do not cut our Federal expenditures, sooner or later we are going to have a recession that will "curl your hair."

The next agency is the Internal Revenue Service. Their request was for $331,500,000. The committee has recommended $325,500,000. We cut them $6 million, but their appropriation for 1957 was $305,750,000. So the increase recommended over 1957 is $19,750,000, nearly $17 million of which is taken up by their retirement fund contribution. There is $2,865,000 over the increase for retirement.

The Bureau of Narcotics we did not cut a penny and the reason is because the narcotics situation is becoming extremely serious throughout the United States. We have had several studies in the Congress of that situation and there have been recommendations to increase the staff of the Bureau of Narcotics. Very frankly, I think we have to be careful because we do not want to make the Bureau of Narcotics another police agency in the United States. Our committee feels that what the Bureau of Narcotics should do is to look after the international situation. And they have done a magnificent job of that. We sent some agents abroad to prevent shipments of narcotics into this country. That is where we can make our greatest progress.

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Anslinger, the Chief of the Bureau of Narcotics, in my judgment, is one of the very able officers of the Federal Government. He told us of the tremendous job that the United Nations is doing in the control of narcotics. From time to time we hear that organization is not accomplishing anything, that we had better abolish it. But he tells us that it has been a great factor in the control of narcotics internationally.

Insofar as the national problem is concerned, we feel that the Bureau should work with the local and State police officers but that the enforcement should be left largely to the local officers because, if the Federal Government undertakes to take it over, the local officers are not going to bother themselves. We just cannot put enough Federal agents in the field to enforce the narcotic laws of the Nation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If the United Nations is doing such a marvelous job of controlling the flow of narcotics, why could not this appropriation have been cut somewhat? We are contributing one-third of all the expenses of the United Nations.

Mr. GARY. The head of the Bureau of Narcotics did not ask for all of the money or all of the personnel that congressional committees have recommended. Since he himself has taken the same view as our committee of the enforcement problem and the relation of his Bureau to it, we thought that we ought to leave it to his judgment. He said he thought that although the number of agents which this appropriation will permit is not as large as has been recommended by congressional committees, he feels that it is ample; so we left the appropriation just as it is.

The United States Secret Service:

We made slight changes in that, but we specifically provided that the reduction should not be applied so as to lessen to any degree the security of the President of the United States or the other persons whom that Bureau is required to protect.

The Bureau of the Mint:

There is a slight increase over the appropriation for the current year but that is due to the fact that, just as we have to have more currency, we must have more coins. The mint asked for an increase in the appropriation for 1958 for minting coins, and we have allowed that increase.

Now we come to the United States Coast Guard which, as I have previously stated, is a defense agency. As you know, it is under the Treasury during peacetime but in wartime it is switched over to the Navy. Therefore, it has to be kept in a state of readiness for peace and for war.

They requested $172 million for operating expenses. We allowed them $169 million, which was a reduction of $3 million. Their appropriation for 1957 was $164 million. The increase over 1957 is $4,150,000, but a large part of that is for compulsory increases. However, there is an allowance of about $700,000 over and above the compulsory increases which the committee allowed, because we know that they are facing a tremendous problem in handling the increasing number of small boats throughout the Nation. You would be surprised at how many people today are getting small boats and running around our rivers and streams. The Coast Guard has certain duties to perform in connection with those small boats.

In addition, offshore oil well sinkings have increased very greatly, which presents additional problems.

The $8 million to which the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] referred was in their request for acquisition, construction and improvement. They asked for $16 million in that item, which would include such vessels as they may need, such airplanes as they may need, and other items of capital outlay.

Included in that was an item of $8,205,000 for airplanes. Our committee has felt for a long time that the one thing the Coast Guard needed was a proper replacement program for aircraft. Therefore, in the previous administration, we urged them to formulate a program for replacement of their aircraft, for two reasons. In the first place, so that the aircraft would be safe for the boys to fly; and in the second place, so that they could spread replacements more uniformly over the years instead of coming in 1 year and asking for a large amount and the next year a smaller amount. They had worked out a program of that kind when this administration took over 4 years ago. The new administration did not ask for the planes that that program called for, and they said very frankly they wanted to study the program. Our committee felt that was entirely reasonable. Consequently, we did not object, but we did ask them to make a study. Four years have passed by now and we still do not have a program for replacement of aircraft for the Coast Guard. There was a request in this bill for $8,205,000 for a blank check for aircraft replacement. They said very frankly to us, "We do not know what airplanes we are going to buy because we have not worked out our program, but we hope to work it out before the next year." So we are saying to them, "You work out the program and then come in and we will look it over before we appropriate the money."

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Does the lack of funds to which the gentleman just referred in any way impair the work of the Coast Guard in their air-sea rescue operations?

Mr. GARY. In no way whatever.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARY. The whole thing is a question of replacement. We know that they need a replacement program. I am frank to say I agree with the gentleman from New Jersey that a part of this money is going to be needed, but how much we do not know because they do not know. They told us that they do not have a program. I do not believe this Congress wants to appropriate money to give any department a blank check for them to go out and buy, as they see fit, on a program that they work out after they come before our committee.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman is discussing a subject in which I have been very much interested for several years. I am delighted that he is discussing it in this manner. The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives has jurisdiction over the Coast Guard. So I understand from the distinguished gentleman who is the chairman of the subcommittee that he feels that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries should hold hearings on this subject and report legislation authorizing the Coast Guard to expand its aviation?

Mr. GARY. No; it is not a question of expansion, it is a question of replacement. They have a lot of old planes. No legislation is necessary.

Mr. BONNER. There is no doubt that the aviation of the Coast Guard does need expansion. That has been shown

in many instances. That is true, and it is true that the Coast Guard aviation has been and continues to be fed by the crumbs that fall from the other armed services, getting the planes that have been discarded by the Army, Navy, and Air Force, which have been turned over to the Coast Guard.

Mr. GARY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BONNER. They have kept their planes in the air by cannibalizing discarded planes and by rebuilding planes. So, as chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I do feel responsible and I have discussed it with the Coast Guard. But the Coast Guard, as you say, being under the Secretary of the Treasury in peacetime, I doubt sometimes whether the Treasury really realizes the service that the Coast Guard renders. They render service in war and in peace that is very similar. While the Navy is sitting like ducks on a pond in peacetime, enjoys all the prosperity from these great appropriations, the Coast Guard is continuously being beaten down and when the time comes when they are called on, they do not have the equipment that they should have.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. What the gentleman says is absolutely correct. That is the thing that our committee has been trying to correct for a long, long time. Not only do they not have the necessary number of planes, in all probability, but those that they do have are hand-downs mostly from the other services and in many cases the equipment is inadequate.

Mr. BONNER. If the gentleman will yield further, I must say I feel there is a certain temerity in the commanding echelon of the Coast Guard to approach the Treasury on this matter.

It will be my purpose shortly to hold hearings and bring officers of the Coast Guard and the Treasury Department down to throw a little light on this matter. If you will bear with me 1 minute, I am delighted that you mentioned this matter of small boats. The expansion of the small boats in this country over the last few years has been enormous. There are 25 million people floating in small boats. The Coast Guard, through this economy that has been practiced against them, has been reducing its shore installations. They are the installations that protect our coast and inland waters, due to the fact that the emergency at sea has decreased. Now, with this tremendous expansion of pleasure boating by our citizens, these installations that the Coast Guard has been reducing are now necessary to protect the citizens of America who indulge in pleasure boating. It is one of the biggest businesses in the country today, the building and utilization of small boats. I am delighted to know that you have taken cognizance of that in your appropriation.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman is one of the best informed Members of this body on the Coast Guard. He has studied it for years, and I agree with what he has to say.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. In connection with the statement that the gentleman made earlier regarding a cut in the funds for operating expenses—I am leaving aside for the moment the reference to the aviation program—but in cutting the operating expenses, will that cut in any way affect the program of the Coast Guard not only for air-sea rescue but rescue work which they have been providing during the floods and hurricanes which we have experienced in the past and are now experiencing?

Mr. GARY. No. It will not. Although we cut their request, we did allow them $700,000 more than they had for the present year. That is true all through this bill. We have not cut the amounts that they are spending. We are cutting their requests. We have cut the additional amounts asked. They came in this year and asked for increases over the present fiscal year and we have cut those increases. In every single instance the amount allowed in this bill is more than the agency had for the current year 1957.

Next, Mr. Chairman, is the Coast Guard retirement pay. We cannot touch that, of course. It is fixed by law.

One of the large items in this bill is the Coast Guard Reserve training program. Under the Reserve Training Act, passed by the Congress 2 years ago, the Coast Guard is covered. Certain standards are prescribed to which they must conform. Therefore they have asked this year for a rather large increase over 1957. They requested $16 million, which even then would not carry out the program recommended by the Congress. But the committee felt there should be a slight cut in that. We cut it $1 million. However, that is an $8 million increase over 1957. We believe we allowed them as much as they could use properly.

We have in this appropriation two small corporations; one, the Public Facilities Corporation, which has been operating the synthetic oil and the tin smelting programs of the Government. We are closing out all of those programs. Therefore their work load is down considerably. They ask for only $50,000, and even that is not an appropriation; it is an authorization for them to spend $50,000 of their own funds.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. How much longer do you think the RFC will go on?

Mr. GARY. It is down pretty well now. RFC is the other corporation I mentioned. They requested $915,000. That is a liquidating process. The committee recommended $800,000, a cut of $115,000. They are liquidating their operations. When you liquidate an organization as big as the RFC was, the more of the good securities you liquidate the harder it is to liquidate the remainder. They are down now to the cats and dogs; they have gotten down to the bottom of the barrel and I think probably within the next year there will be a program to divide the unliquidated assets up among other agencies, and close out the RFC.

Mr. GROSS. I hope so. That has been in process now about 4 years. Is not that correct?

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. How many offices are they operating presently? Surely they are operating more than one.

Mr. GARY. I think they have pretty well cut them down now. They may be operating several offices but they have cut down very materially. They ask for less and less money each year. They have $1,060,000 for this year, for example, and we are giving them only $800,000 for next year, so you see we are cutting them substantially.

Mr. Chairman, we now come to the Post Office Department. At the outset let me say that the Post Office Department asked for $3,250,000,000. The committee recommended $3,192,000,000, which is a reduction of $58 million, or 1.78 percent.

The appropriation for 1957 was $2,984,340,000. The committee recommendation, therefore, is an increase of $207 million over and above the 1957 appropriations. Let me say, however, there are certain compulsory increases in the bill: The increase for retirement of $131 million; for the extra workday $6 million; for within-grade promotions $24 million; for the biennial bond premium $400,000. The exact total of these items is $162,957,780. This means that we have recommended for the Post Office $44,702,000 over and above the mandatory increases for the current year, 1957; and in the language of the boys in the street, "That ain't hay."

I ask you to look at the table on page 183 of the hearings. The suggestion has been made that we might have to cut services. I do not think we will have to cut any services at all because we are allowing more money than for the current year. But suppose we do, are the people paying for the services they are getting? Let us look at that table on page 183 of the hearings. Do you realize that the Post Office has paid its way only 10 years during the last 56 years?

The largest deficit in any one year was in 1952 when we had a deficit of $719,544,091. Right after that we increased the parcel-post rates. The Post Office Department was complaining, and I think properly so, because it thought that certain items that were being charged to it should be charged to other agencies. Our committee agreed with the Department. One was the airmail subsidy. We switched that over to the CAA so we would know what subsidies we were paying. Another was the franked mail. Another was the penalty mail. Still another was the registry service.

Let me say that during the past few years there has been tremendous progress made in modernizing the postal system in the United States. That was started during the previous administration and this administration has carried it on very, very satisfactorily.

I have had people say to me, if you would operate the post office like you would a regular business, you would not have this deficit. I want to say that

absolutely is not true. By modernizing the Department we have made some savings. However, there is not a single business in the entire United States today that I know of that is operating on 1932 receipts and 1957 expenditures and making a profit. It just cannot be done.

The estimated deficit for 1955 was cut by transferring the different items just enumerated to other departments and by modernization and other economies. The Post Office Department is doing a good job on that and I want to pay my respects to them for it. We dropped that deficit to $362,673,686 in 1955.

Do you know what is happening now? It is estimated that the deficit will be up again to $651 million in 1958. In addition to that, there is now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission a petition for an increase in railroad rates for transporting the mail which if allowed by the Commission will cost an additional $101 million. That will run the deficit up to $752 million. There is a bill pending in the Congress today that will increase postal salaries $1 billion, the passage of which would give us a $1¾ billion deficit. Where will this end? But without anything else, just taking it as is, the deficit will be $651 million in 1958.

Do the people of this country want service? If so, let them pay for it. If we will increase the rates and make every classification of mail pay its own way, then I say give the Post Office Department the money and let them go ahead. The people are entitled to any service for which they are willing to pay.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. In discussing the budget with officials of the Post Office Department was there any reflection made as to the amount of money they have saved by discontinuing post offices and combining rural routes?

Mr. GARY. Yes. I think you will find a table in the hearings on that. We inquired into that question.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I keep getting these letters from the regional director of my district saying that we have executed a saving of so many thousand dollars by closing one of my small post offices and by combining two of my rural routes. Yet I see their request for general services, not mandatory increases, continues to rise. I wonder why, if they are making such great savings in this field, that would not be reflected in their budget requests?

Mr. GARY. It is not equal to the increased salaries.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. That is part of the mandatory increases.

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. But I am talking about general increases, not the mandatory increase of $162 million.

Mr. GARY. But we do have these additional increases in salary.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to ask him this: If this $58 million cut is sustained, would it encourage the Post Office Department to further eliminate these small post offices that are giving such great service to our small communities, which would result in combining them into rural routes?

Mr. GARY. It will not affect them particularly.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. How will the $58 million cut be sustained by the Post Office Department?

Mr. GARY. That is up to the Post Office Department. It will be sustained by additional economies in operation.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. But I fear, though, that the only economy that has been called to my attention by the Post Office Department recently is the one just mentioned.

Mr. GARY. The closing of these post offices is a comparatively small item. And I might say to the gentleman that the Post Office Department has changed its policy with respect to that. They were closing them indiscriminately. I understand now that they have changed their policy so that they are only closing them when there is a vacancy in the office and some special reason otherwise.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Regardless of why they are closing them, it still eliminates the postal service for these small communities.

Mr. GARY. The situation is that those post offices were established during the horse and buggy days, and we are now in an automobile and airplane era, and they do not need as many post offices as they did back in those days.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Down in Tennessee we still would like to see these small post offices maintained, and I would have to see this $58 million cut if it would further encourage the Post Office Department to eliminate these post offices and continue to combine them into rural routes and cause delay in the service to the people of the country in getting their newspapers and in getting their morning mail.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I just want to say, apropos of the questions of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] that the Post Office Department closed some post offices in my district. There was some objection to some of those closings. There were a few that I thought were not too well advised, but I am sure that a number of them were very well advised, and if that is one way to make the Post Office Department more efficient and save some money and still allow the people to get their mail and get good service, then I commend the Post Office Department for the courage they exhibited in tackling some of these difficult problems.

Mr. GARY. I will say to the gentleman, not only is that true, but I have had a number of these cases in my own district. In every single instance the patrons have gotten better service at less money, and by closing some of these small post offices and increasing the rural routes we can give the patrons better service and at less money, and for that reason I favor it. I have favored it, and I have commended the Post Office Department for it time and again.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. As an example of the great harm that is being done, the Post Office Department is planning at this time to close a small post office in my congressional district with 23 patrons. But yesterday I received a petition from 311 patrons of that post office protesting it, and my mimeograph machine is replying to that petition today. That may clear it up. I think they got everybody within 20 miles to sign the petition. If there is any question about the accuracy of my statement, I will be very happy to send you a copy of it.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], that in some cases these offices need closing, and I have agreed with the Post Office Department on some of them in my own district. But, at the same time, it is a very small item, as you pointed out, Mr. Chairman, in your statement, that it is very small, but at the same time it is a matter of community identity. These post offices, of course, do not perform the service for which, maybe, they were intended to perform, but they are a vital part of the community, and if it is such a vital part and if it is so vital to the people of the community, I think if we can afford to send $200 million over into the Middle East and to some of these other foreign countries, we can spend $1,000 a year to keep the post office open in a community that really wants it.

Mr. GARY. I should like to read from the hearings before the committee. The witness testifying is Mr. Abrams, Assistant Postmaster General in charge of operations, and on the subject of the closing of fourth-class post offices, he said this:

> In the matter of discontinuing fourth-class post offices, consideration will only be given hereafter to discontinuance when it is clear that equal or better service to patrons can be provided by rural delivery and one of the following conditions also prevails:
>
> 1. There is a vacancy in the office of postmaster;
>
> 2. There is local public support for the closing or at least no significant public opposition;
>
> 3. The post office can be satisfactorily replaced by a rural station;
>
> 4. The postmaster is eligible for an annuity under the Retirement Act.

I hope that will satisfy the gentlemen.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand the gentleman to say that he would advocate charging each category of mail a rate commensurate with the cost of operation of that category of the service?

Mr. GARY. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. And the gentleman would boost the rate for second-class mail, for instance, to a point where the revenue will meet the expenses of operating the second-class mail?

Mr. GARY. Yes, sir; and the third-class and the fourth-class and any other class. I see no reason why the taxpayers of this Nation should pay for services received by patrons of the post office.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield further briefly?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. What provision would the gentleman make, then, for nonprofit and charitable mail?

Mr. GARY. I think that is a matter for the legislative committee to consider; but I am not certain, even, that mail should be carried free in view of the fact that the Post Office Department is a service rather than a charitable organization.

Mr. GROSS. It is not today being carried free, but it does have a very substantially preferred rate.

Mr. GARY. There might be some consideration given to a preferential rate for religious, charitable, and educational organizations. The dissemination of their literature might well be considered a public service.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. Will the gentleman tell us whether first-class mail is now paying its way?

Mr. GARY. According to the latest information we have, it is not. Our committee did not go into that question because there is no question of rates in this bill. We felt that was a matter for the legislative committee and, consequently, although we made some inquiries about it and were told that recent statistics indicate that it is not paying its own way, we did not explore the question extensively.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, a valuable member of our committee.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, is it not true that the gentleman prevailed upon me not to introduce an amendment, in full committee, to cut this bill further by $100 million on the basis of a 5-day mail-delivery system? The gentleman was successful and his point was that we had not heard full testimony on the subject, that we should wait another year.

In view of that fact, how can the Post Office Department come in here with this barrage of wires about closing post offices when we were going to keep them open? What we wanted was this. If acceptable, when the people went to their shopping centers, their Food Fairs and to town on Saturdays, or went to do their other shopping, they would be willing to pick up their mail, if convenient, at the same time. And we were going to allow a special consideration by way of special delivery service for the ill or the invalid and others on that day. So now, how can they come in here with this barrage of letters to us, when we were going to give further consideration to the matter? But the amount in this bill is saved by at least $100 million due to the chairman's persuasiveness, together with Mr. TABER and Mr. CANNON.

Mr. GARY. That is absolutely correct. May I say this further, that during the past administration this committee recommended a very substantial cut in this bill and as a result the Post Office Department eliminated two-delivery-a day service in residential areas. A hue and cry went up for the time being. As chairman of the committee at that time I took the entire responsibility for that, either credit for it or blame for it. I thought there should be credit for it. Some people thought there should be blame for it. But let me say to you that saved the Post Office over $100 million, and it probably runs to $150 million today, and nobody has been hurt by it. I believe that by going to a 5-day week we can save additional money and nobody would be hurt.

We might do this, which was suggested to me. I do not want to take credit for this myself, may I say to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI]. If I had thought about it I would have mentioned it to him at the time we discussed these matters. One of the top officials of the Post Office Department later on in discussing this matter with me said that the Department might cut out the delivery of everything except first-class mail on Saturday. Certainly nobody would be hurt if they did not deliver junk mail on Saturday. He said by that alone they could save $10 million.

Let the Department scratch around and find some of these places where it can save some money.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, and apologize to him for not yielding to him earlier.

Mr. LANDRUM. The gentleman need not apologize. I wanted to ask certain specific questions at this point, the answers to which I think would be helpful to me, and I feel to some of the other Members.

First, does this $50 million cut, to which attention is directed here, cause any present employee of the postal system to have his salary reduced?

Mr. GARY. I see no reason why there should be any reduction in employment or salaries because, after taking into consideration all of the compulsory increases, we are allowing the Post Office Department $44 million more than they are receiving during the present year.

Mr. LANDRUM. Can we understand from that statement, then, that present employees will not have their present salaries reduced?

Mr. GARY. The salaries cannot be reduced because they are fixed by law.

Mr. LANDRUM. I am talking about what the effect of the appropriation would be.

Mr. GARY. The salaries are fixed by law, so you cannot reduce them.

Mr. LANDRUM. The annuities, the sick leave, the annual leave of present employees will not be affected in any way by this reduction?

Mr. GARY. I cannot see how present permanent employees will be affected by this bill in any manner, shape, or form.

Mr. LANDRUM. One other question: will this prevent the Post Office Department from having sufficient funds to fill vacancies to carry on necessary services?

Mr. GARY. It will not.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I should like to ask some questions about the overall employment figures. I noticed in the report on the Treasury Department that there will be an increase of 17,500 in the number of employees. I have figured out that this is roughly an increase of about 3 percent. What is the justification for an overall increase by that number of employees with the population increase being less than 1.2 percent?

Mr. GARY. Most of those are in the Internal Revenue Department. There they need some additional employees for the enforcement of the tax laws. The increase in the Coast Guard is an effort to put them on a proper defense basis. There is some increase in the Bureau of Customs, which will be reflected in an increase in Customs receipts. There is some increase in the Mint, necessitated by the fact that we must have additional coins.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would comment there that the amount of revenue we are collecting has not increased to the same percentage. It would seem to me that any increase in personnel to handle these services for our people should reflect somewhat the same increase in our population. Actually, the increase should be a little bit less because of our productivity and the ability of men to do more is being increased with the new devices that we have. It just seems to me that the overall figures are entirely out of line.

Mr. GARY. One of the things that I have been trying to tell the Members here for the last hour, and then I am going to quit because I have already talked too long, is that our committee has been overgenerous. I hope you will help us sustain this appropriation.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If I may ask the gentleman one further question. I was leading to one other thing. I was talking of the Treasury where you do have the overall figures.

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. But, when I turn to the Post Office I cannot find any overall figures of the total employment. Do you know or do you have those figures? It is not in the hearings, that I can find.

Mr. GARY. I do not have them available at the present time.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I hope the committee can get them because I think those figures, I suspect, would show an increase. On page 136 of the hearings, we have the increase for the city. There is a table which shows the increased growth of delivery service from 1954 to 1958. It shows a considerable increase way beyond the population growth. Although I recognize that refers to city deliveries and we do know there has been a great deal of increase there as opposed to our rural areas.

Mr. GARY. There would be a substantial increase there.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. And one other comment, if the gentleman please, if I can get these overall figures, I notice on page 154 and I am very disturbed about this that your productivity figures, which should be increasing—I do not

agree with Mr. Stepper in his statement there where he says I think we all recognize that at some point we will reach a saturation point on producitivity—not if we are continuing to do a good job in research and development and in the utilization of new machinery and new techniques. The Post Office Department is planning on using them and, yet, the productivity figure is the lowest in 5 years. It is at the lowest rate.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Is it not true that that 17,500 figure to which the gentleman referred applied to the total bill and not just to the Treasury Department?

Mr. GARY. It does apply to the total bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. I should like to direct the attention of the committee to the many inaccuracies in the telegrams that Members have received from certain officers of the national association. They enumerate many losses that will be suffered in the event this very small cut is sustained by the committee, one of them being that they would get tri-weekly rural deliveries. The rural delivery cost estimate for the fiscal year 1958 is $221,334,000 which is a very small part of the overall appropriation for postal operations, and yet they set forth in their telegrams, and I guess all Members have received it, that if we sustain this cut, you would have to go to triweekly deliveries in rural service. I think this statement is just as inaccurate as some of the other claims they set forth in their telegrams. May I ask the distinguished chairman just one question? Is it not true that certain constituents and Members of this body feel that this reduction is entirely too small and that it should have been more?

Mr. GARY. I have just stated that one point I have been trying to tell my colleagues is that we have been overgenerous and, I think, many Members will agree with me in that statement.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. FASCELL. Will the gentleman address himself to the logic of the argument that in considering the pending supplemental request that actually there will not be an overage of $44 million, but a deficit of $8,297,780?

Mr. GARY. There has been, so far, no supplemental request.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. PHILBIN. I wonder if the gentleman could enlighten the House on the question of the change in policy in the construction of new post offices, which has been carried out under the so-called lease-purchase arrangement, which has recently been abandoned by the Department or by the General Services Administration.

Mr. GARY. This bill has absolutely nothing to do with that subject. That is handled separately. There is no request for funds in this bill dealing with that program. This bill will not affect it in any way.

Mr. PHILBIN. And the gentleman has no information about it?

Mr. GARY. If the gentleman will look in the hearings, he will find some discussion of the program and the present status of it. I regret that time does not permit me to go into it now.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. How is it that the post offices are under the supervision of the General Services Administration rather than the Post Office Department?

Mr. GARY. Some of them are and some are not. That is a rather long story and I could not answer it in a minute.

Mr. GAVIN. I realize that, but do you not believe that the post offices should be under the supervision of the Post Office Department?

Mr. GARY. The chief reason for it is that in some of the post office buildings there are other agencies of the Government in addition to the post office.

Mr. GAVIN. And in many instances we find that these post offices are sadly in need of repair. They need to be rehabilitated. Other buildings are being neglected. They cannot get any action from the General Services Administration. They go through the Post Office Department and that goes to the General Services Administration. The plaster is falling off the walls and the water is coming in the roof.

Mr. GARY. We are making considerable progress in that program.

Mr. GAVIN. The question I asked you is, do you believe that the post offices should be under the supervision of the Post Office Department rather than under the General Services Administration.

Mr. GARY. In general; but when the post office is in a building that houses a great many other Federal agencies, then the General Services Administration has control.

Mr. GAVIN. They had better give some thought to rehabilitation of those post offices before many of them fall in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] has again expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I always dislike to use the word "hate." I see our good friend and colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] looking at me. He does not want me to use it now. It is never a good word. But I measure my phraseology when I say to you today, "I hate to have to disagree with my good friend, the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]." Ever since he came to our subcommittee I have had a profound affection for him. The first year I discussed this bill with you, when he came to us as a Member, I referred to him on this floor as "the salt of the earth." I have never changed my appraisal. I know he is very honest and very sincere in the statement of his position on this bill today, but I disagree with him and I shall tell you why.

I am proud, too, of the fact that in our complement we have other very dedicated Members of this House, seven Members, all of them serving as best they can on this grassroots committee, which down through the years has gone out into the field, into the Pacific and into the Atlantic respecting the Coast Guard, to get the true facts of life to help us in these appropriations.

I regret no end that this bill providing funds for the Treasury and Post Office has to be the first appropriation bill to be considered by this body, and I am mindful of the climate that prevails during this consideration, so many of our Members asking for, yea, demanding economy; yet I say to you that historically down through the years the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill has never lent itself to severe or drastic cuts. In the twenties the average appropriation cut ranged from $1 to $3 million. During the thirties and the forties, yes, even into the fifties, the rate was between seven and twelve millions of dollars. And when I think of these figures I am talking about the cuts in finality, not as the bill passed this House or as it passed the other body but as it was worked out in conference and finally sent to the President.

No; this bill does not lend itself to serious cuts. Year after year more and more people, millions are being added to our population, the people of our country are growing more literate and making more use of the mails; I venture to say that during the years I have worked on Capitol Hill some sixty-five or seventy million people have been added to the postal patrons of our country. Year after year the volume of mail increases percentagewise, 1½ to 5 percent. The increase for this year, fiscal 1957, is considerably more than the Post Office Department anticipated a year ago, and that is where we come to the crux of this whole problem.

Today, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] asked the $64 question; he asked about $8 million. I say to you that our consideration today neglects bearing in mind the fact that the Post Office Department of the United States is currently asking the Bureau of the Budget for a supplemental appropriation of $53 million to carry it through fiscal 1957.

And how, may I ask, Mr. Chairman, are they normalizing their postal activities? The answer is just this, with the concurrence of the Director of the Budget, the Post Office Department is borrowing millions and millions of dollars from its fourth quarter apportionment; and unless they have substantially the $53 million, I may say to the gentleman from Florida, that they request for 1957 to carry them through June 30 of this year, they will then have to prescribe payless workdays for the 526,000 employees of the Post Office Establishment.

Our distinguished chairman tells you today that the post office workers of the

Nation, who are currently concerned about this cut and are wiring their representatives in the Congress to do something about it, know nothing about the bill. I challenge that statement, because when they read in the press of the country that this bill projected as it is for fiscal 1958 involves a cut of $58 million, they know that that dollar figure represents the biggest cut in post office operations in all the history of the Department. That is, if that cut is sustained and goes to the President as $58 million.

Mr. Chairman, I served as chairman of this subcommittee in the 80th Congress, also in the 83d Congress. We effected cuts at that time. We had economy demands presented to us by our people. As a matter of fact, we were known as the economy 80th Congress. But we did not cut this bill $58 million. We imposed a lesser cut and saw every dollar of it returned through supplemental appropriations because of the ever-increasing volume of mail.

I wonder how many Members of this body are on record as asking for extensions of delivery from their cities and towns into suburban areas? I have made 8 or 9 requests myself within recent months. I venture to say that most Members of this body have done the same thing.

In this bill providing funds for the fiscal year 1958 we ask for money for 5,000 additional carriers and routes to take care of suburban demands. This bill if passed with the $58 million cut will not provide a cent for such extensions. The gentleman from Florida posed the question and that is the answer. We are millions under our 1957 appropriation if we bear in mind we have got to provide money for the fiscal year 1957.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see my distinguished chairman make a correction in a figure which appears on page 11 of the report. You will note that first table there. It was made to appear before the full committee at least that the only mandatory item required by action of this body or any other body was the $131 million extra for retirement contributions. But look down in the lower table and you will see $31 million more, part of it for that extra payday for 526,000 postal workers, part of it for upgrade promotions required by law and part of it for premiums on security bonds, all the result of congressional action.

Mr. Chairman, I believe my colleagues in the House should fully understand what this bill means. I believe that you will want to know how the postal service will deteriorate if this $58 million cut in the 1958 postal budget is allowed to stand.

This is an arbitrary reduction in what I believe to be an honest budget, carefully prepared by an economy-minded business-type management. Furthermore, this proposed cut was made without any relation whatsoever to the ever-increasing workload of the Post Office Department which is constantly growing as reflected in a doubled mail volume in the past 20 years.

This proposed cut of $58 million in a total budget of $3¼ billion may seem like an intelligent effort to economize. Some may be misled since it is a modest percentage of the total. Its effect, however, is most drastic because the Post Office Department budget submitted to the committee had already been reduced to the workable minimum. Nowhere in the committee's report is there any suggestion how these economies may be made.

Furthermore, the Post Office Department differs from most Government agencies in one fundamental aspect in that it provides daily services essential to the social and economic well-being of 170 million Americans.

May I say right there that I believe, next to the military budget, the 170 million Americans I am talking about are more sensitive to this budget than any other budget. I believe this budget is extremely important to the well-being of the 170 million postal patrons.

The Post Office Department cannot reprogram its activities like most other Government agencies. In fact, the only way the Post Office Department can operate on less money is to reduce the present mail services available to the public.

And, I was glad to see the distinguished chairman of our committee be so frank on that point.

I asked the Post Office Department what it would have to do to meet this budget cut.

The Department informs me that it would have to curtail service in these ways to operate at $58 million less and that these drastic measure are those that would cause the least possible deterioration of the postal service:

First. Restrict Saturday mail deliveries in cities to first-class mail only—$10 million.

Second. Reduce mail deliveries in business sections to two a day—$5 million.

Third. Eliminate the sale of money orders by all except country post offices—$15 million.

Fourth. Eliminate postal savings—$1 million.

Fifth. Defer buying $5 million worth of trucks to replace 6-year-old trucks—$5 million.

Sixth. Defer painting and lighting improvements badly needed in large post offices—$12 million.

Seventh. Fail to provide any new city delivery routes in cities and suburbs—$11 million.

Eighth. Defer buying new mechanical and other equipment badly needed in post offices—$10 million.

Now, that is the program. You can vote for it today if you want to. I will not.

Additionally, the Department advises it might also have to give consideration to reducing the frequency of rural free-delivery service to 35 million Americans now depending upon it for the daily delivery of mail and parcel post.

My friend and colleague from New Jersey would add $100 million more to this cut.

In doing these things, and perhaps others, it would have to reduce the Department's present and projected employment force by about 10,000 necessary jobs.

Why, you may ask, is the Post Office Department in this predicament?

It is in this predicament, first because it submitted an honest, pared-to-the-bone budget.

Secondly, the 1958 estimates were constructed on a 1957 base. With half of 1957 now gone, it is apparent that the 1957 volume will be much greater than anticipated. This unexpected added increase in volume, together with the effect of accelerated growth in city delivery service necessitated by our rapidly expanding suburban regions, has required the Department to seek a supplemental appropriation for this year that may run as much as $47 million for operations.

With this change in base, the estimates for 1958 as submitted now provide for only a 1.5-percent increase in mail volume over 1957. This is less than half of the present rate of growth in volume and less than the growth experience of any year since 1947. It is certain, therefore, that time is proving that the Department's estimates have, if anything, been understated for 1958 and there is no possible way by which cuts of $58 million could be absorbed without curtailment of services to the public.

I have been talking about the overall effect of a $58 million reduction which the committee proposes.

Let me now cite some specific details relating to the appropriations of three of the Department's major bureaus—operations, transportation and facilities.

The reduction of $36.6 million in the bureau of operations appropriation for 1958 proposed by the committee would actually provide the Department with $27 million less for 1958 than the Department says it will require for 1957.

Since 97 percent of funds in the appropriation are for personal services this cut would require a reduction of 8,500 man-years of estimated needs for clerks and city carriers, despite an increase of 1.5 percent to 4 percent in workload. It is obvious that the 1958 mail volume cannot be handled by a reduced level of employment.

Next, the committee has proposed a cut in the appropriation for the Bureau of Transportation of the Post Office Department of $9.7 million. The resulting available funds, after excluding the unavoidable costs added for 1958, would be $700,000 less than those required for 1957. The report of the committee—page 13—in stating that the cut would still leave an increase of $1.3 million over 1957, failed to take into account the fact that the Department has had to transfer $2 million to this appropriation in 1957 from the accounts to meet current transportation requirements—see hearings, page 152. And currently, Mr. Chairman, the railroads are asking for increases in mail rates aggregating $103 million.

A cut of $9.7 million in the transportation appropriation would necessitate a reduction of 2,000 man-years of PTS clerk employment from that requested for 1958. None of the cut can be absorbed in common or contract carrier costs since all possible economies in this area were already allowed for in the Department's request. The resulting man-

years of clerk time available for 1958 would then be less than those actually required for 1957 by 1,700, or a reduction of more than 4 percent. By no possible stretch of the imagination can the Postal Transportation Service handle even today's workload with a reduction of 4 percent in employment, let alone the increased volume that can certainly be expected for 1958.

Next, this reduction in appropriations would mean that the Department would have to materially reduce its research and mechanization programs which are expected to speed up mail deliveries by from 30 to 50 percent through the Nation's badly overcrowded major post offices. The Members of this body who come from the New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago areas should read the hearings to see what this will mean to those areas of the country.

The Department would have to greatly reduce its modernization program to provide light, color, ventilation, and other related benefits to improve working conditions in obsolete buildings.

Mr. Chairman, let us have no mistake about this matter.

Whenever an essential service is curtailed to which the people are accustomed, the Congress is deluged by complaints from irate citizens.

If the Post Office Department is forced to curtail its essential services to the American people because we do not grant it the funds it needs to provide them, no Member of this Congress can pass the complaints of his constituents on to the Postmaster General to answer, for he cannot be blamed for poor mail service.

If we permit the mail service to deteriorate as I have indicated, it will be the responsibility of the Congress—and rightfully so—because the solution lies with the Congress.

There is no one in the House who believes in economy more than I do. I do not, however, believe in capricious or false economy, achieved by curtailing essential services to the American people, and, neither, I am certain, does any Member of this House.

I am convinced that the present management of the Post Office Department has taken every possible step during the past 4 years to make the postal service efficient and economical. The record speaks for itself, in better service, in a complete reorganization of the Department, in economies, in efficiencies.

I have right here the statements of 19 Senators who took the floor to speak out for our Postmaster General on the day he was confirmed for a second 4 years in office. They were led by the distinguished majority leader, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Read the RECORD and see what he had to say about Arthur E. Summerfield, his dedication to his assignment, and the type of job he is rendering the American people with his team downtown.

Perhaps the achievements of this team are best summed up in the fact that in the year 1956, the Department handled 11.5 percent more mail than in 1953 at an increase of only one-half of 1 percent in expenditures.

The Committee on Appropriations, on both sides of the aisle, has commended the Postmaster General for his effective administration of the Post Office Department. I invite a reading of this record so that all members of this House may fully appreciate the improvements made in all phases of the postal management.

Mr. Chairman, we are faced with one inescapable fact—postal costs cannot be cut $58 million without cutting out essential mail services for 170 million Americans. It is up to the Congress to face the facts and decide what we want to do.

I, for one, want no share of the responsibility for curtailing the delivery of the mails.

I feel confident, once this situation is fully understood, once the facts are known, that the vitally needed $58 million will be restored to the Post Office Department's 1958 postal budget.

I ran across some interesting copy as I recapped what I was going to say here today, sitting in my office this morning. I delved into the Republican Party platform adopted on August 21, 1956, and the Democratic Party platform adopted at its national convention on August 15, 1956, on this subject of mail service for our people. The Republican platform said in part:

> We pledge to continue our efforts for a financially sound, more nearly self-sustaining postal service, with the users of the mails paying a greater share of the cost instead of the taxpayers bearing the burden of huge postal deficits.
>
> We pledge to continue and to complete this vitally needed program of modernization of buildings, equipment, methods and service so that the American people will receive the kind of mail they deserve, the speediest and best that American ingenuity, technology, and modern business management can provide.

Now may I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that the Democrats in national convention assembled put more real punch lines in their platform on this subject of mail delivery for our American people, some real punch lines. I am going to give you the plank in full, and I want you to digest it as undoubtedly you did when it was made part of the platform. This is it:

> The bungling policies of the Republican administration have crippled and impaired the morale, efficiency, and reputation of the United States postal service. Mail carriers and clerks and other postal employees are compelled to work under intolerable conditions; communications by mail and service by parcel post have been delayed and retarded with resulting hardships, business losses and inconveniences. Their false concept of economy has impaired seriously the efficiency of the best communications system in the world. We pledge ourselves to programs which will:
>
> 1. Restore the principle that the postal service is a public service to be operated in the interest of improved business economy and better communication as well as an aid to the dissemination of information and intelligence.
>
> 2. To restore postal employee morale through the strengthening of the merit system—promotions by law rather than caprice or partisan politics; payment of realistic salaries—reflecting the benefits of an expanding economy.
>
> 3. Establish a program of research and development on a scale adequate to insure the most modern and efficient handling of the mails.
>
> 4. Undertake modernization and construction of desperately needed postal facilities designed to insure the finest postal system in the world.

May I say to my colleagues on the Republican side and may I say to my colleagues on the Democratic side, did you mean—did you truly mean what you said in these platforms adopted only a few months ago?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield to my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. May I defer to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]?

Mr. CANFIELD. No; I prefer to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey who asked me to yield previously.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am not asking the gentleman to yield; I will speak on my own time later.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I shall do the same inasmuch as the gentleman from New Jersey did not yield to me when the figures were mentioned.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to the gentleman from New Jersey that when our distinguished chairman was speaking and making his main presentation, I did not interrupt him and I tried to be very courteous and very polite. I thought you would try to be a little helpful to me, also. The gentleman from Virginia took more than an hour. I do not intend to take that much time.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I did not know what time the gentleman wanted to take.

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman now who a few moments ago made the statement that this budget ought to be cut $100 million over the $58 million cut.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. The gentleman is loose with the words when he says "ought to be cut." That is point No. 1. Point No. 2, I rose to correct you when you said that never has the Post Office been cut as much as $58 million. When the gentleman was chairman of the committee in 1954, was it not true that a cut of $78 million was offered by the gentleman from the Truman budget?

Mr. CANFIELD. No, that is not true, that is not true.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. All right, the gentleman has answered the question; let it rest there.

Mr. CANFIELD. The statement I made is a fact. If this $58 million cut is sustained, it represents the biggest Post Office Department cut in the history of the United States. If the gentleman has figures in books or anything to show me otherwise, let him show me. I want the gentleman to show me.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Good; that point has been brought out.

Mr. CANFIELD. Does the gentleman know? Does the gentleman know that I am in error? Does he insist that I am in error?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I have the figures here.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. He has the figures. I am asking him for help.

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. According to the RECORD, under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, in 1954, he reduced the Truman budget by $74,550,000. Then again in 1956, this House in its wisdom reduced the Eisenhower budget by $69,117,000. I think you will find both of those figures in the records.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at this time?

Mr. CANFIELD. No, I want to ask my friend if he has the volume and the page where that appears. I challenge those figures. But, I must say you are not getting down to the figures in finality—you are not getting down to what figures were finally approved by the Congress.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman says that it is the largest reduction that was ever made. It is true that when you go over to the other body, then at times you have to agree to things in conference. You reduced the Truman budget by $74,550,000.

Mr. CANFIELD. I challenge that statement.

Mr. PASSMAN. I shall furnish the gentleman the page in the RECORD.

Mr. CANFIELD. But, the gentleman is not being responsive. In my statement, I talked about the figures in finality. I talked about supplemental bills.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I want to make a statement. I do not subscribe as a member of this Committee on Appropriations and as a member of the subcommittee handling Treasury and Post Office funds to this premise that we have to make severe cuts, unrealistic though they may be, on the understanding that the other body always restores all or part of such cuts. I do not think I am discharging my responsibility as a Member of Congress in proceeding under that premise. I want to do a real, honest, factual job.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. GARY. You say you are dealing with figures in finality. Do you consider this figure in finality? Do you think what we do here is going to be the final figure?

Mr. CANFIELD. What do you say about that?

Mr. GARY. I say "No."

Mr. CANFIELD. I say "No," too.

Mr. GARY. Exactly. Now, why can we not compare this cut with previous House cuts? What my colleagues were saying is that the House has cut these figures for the post office in the past more than we are now recommending. We do not know what the other body will do. I hope they will cut it still further, but I have no idea that they will. There is certain discretion that we have to use on this floor.

Mr. CANFIELD. Let me say to my good friend, he knows Mr. Bruce, of the Post Office Department. He has been working in the Post Office Department—I do not know how many years, but we in our committee refer to him as "Mr. Post Office Department," because if anybody down there has the answers, Mr. Bruce has them. I had him go back into the records of these cuts, and here is a little notation from him:

> I have gone back to 1938 and I have found no instance where there has been a reduction by Congress in excess of $33 million made for 1956, which did stand up because there was a supplemental of $17 million.

Those are the words of Mr. Bruce whom we know in our considerations in committee as "Mr. Post Office Department." I see the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE]. She knows Mr. Bruce. She knows what he knows about the Department.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Is it the gentleman's intention to offer an amendment that will restore the $58 million cut?

Mr. CANFIELD. I believe that amendments will be offered by other Members of the House. I hope the gentleman from Tennessee may have some amendment to offer.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I will support such an amendment, but I wanted to find out, if I could, if a member of the Appropriations Committee intended to offer such amendments.

Mr. CANFIELD. In all frankness, I offered an amendment in full committee the other day, and I was turned back. But I do not believe the full committee, when required to act on my amendment was possessed of all the facts. In all frankness, I am sure the gentleman from Virginia will agree with me. In his report the other day the projected increase over 1957 was $76 million, but today it is $44 million, because he gave consideration for the $31 million in mandatory requirements imposed by the Congress of the United States over and above the $131 million required by contributions to the civil-service fund.

Mr. GARY. If the gentleman will yield, as a matter of fact the report said there was $76 million over and above the retirement fund contribution. On page 2 of the report are the mandatory items which totaled the amount the gentleman has referred to. That makes a net cut of $44 million.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am referring to the gentleman's summary table at the very beginning of the report.

Mr. GARY. Yes, but on the very next page we call attention to and list the other mandatory items. There was no intent to deceive anybody in the House. If you will look on page 2 you will find the other details of the mandatory items. All of the facts are shown in the report.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to my friend from Virginia he knows I never would charge him with making an effort to deceive anybody; he just is not that kind of fellow, but I do want to point out that apparently there was an error made on page 11 in the original summary of this bill, because if the Members will turn to the table you will see that we show an increase for retirement fund contributions of $131 million but when the comparative changes for 1957 are considered the amount for mandatory increases should be more like $162.9 million.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. I should like to direct the attention of the gentleman from New Jersey to the fact that "Mr. Post Office Department" whom we refer to as Mr. Bruce, is one of my fellow Louisianians, and we are very proud of him down there.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. If this proposed cut is sustained does not the gentleman believe that it would probably stop the building of a branch post office that has been authorized?

Mr. CANFIELD. Does the gentleman mean under the Lease-Purchase Act?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. No; a branch office which is established, a branch office. Would not that be affected if you curtail these funds?

Mr. CANFIELD. I do not see how it could help being involved in this item.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. It would involve the increase of any activity, it could not help doing so.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman is right, and already in the supplemental request for $53 million for 1957 the Department is being urged by some members of our committee to leave out capital improvements to the amount of some $6 million.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Before I make just a little statement on the gentleman's time, if I may, I want to state that my friend is most compassionate and considerate of others. I express the hope that his bill to provide a pension for the widow of the member of the Secret Service who was killed at the time the attempt was made on President Truman's life, goes through. I have not met a more sentimental man in this House than the gentleman from New Jersey. However, that is sentiment. I think the gentleman agrees with me that we are both shooting at the same target, and that is to give our people of this land a tax reduction and to try to hold postage rates down.

Does the gentleman think that by restoring the $58 million he is working toward a tax reduction or holding the price of stamps down?

Mr. CANFIELD. First I would like to say to my friend from New Jersey that I am not holding the postage rates down. I stand with our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], in his pointed statement that the patrons ought to pay the freight, and I stand for realistic rates. But I do not think we should proceed any further in trying to finance 1957 and 1958 costs on 1932 rates.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I think we are in accord. The gentleman had endorsed a tax reduction. Are we correct in drawing the conclusion that with the restoration of this $58 million the people of America cannot look to this subcommittee to help them in their effort to se-

cure a tax reduction in the next 2 years or 4 years?

Mr. CANFIELD. I will cross swords with my friend from New Jersey in any forum of this country on that very subject.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI], whose heart now is bleeding for the taxpayers, will deny that he voted for $200 million to be given away in the Middle East on a blank-check account.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I should like to preface my question by the statement that the record seems to show that the gentleman voted for every increase for postal employees and voted consistently for even the highest increases. I do not quarrel with the gentleman's right to do so but are we not now in the position of paying the piper?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. First of all, I want to express my high regard for the gentleman from New Jersey, who is an able Member of this body and a stanch advocate of economy in Federal expenditures. I always listen to him with great interest and respect for his views.

He has pointed out here what he believes will be certain curtailments of service if this cut is permitted to stand. I want to make a statement for myself, not undertaking to speak for anybody else. Like every other Member of this body, since the overall budget has been announced I have been besieged with letters from the people, communications, telegrams, and personal interviews, complaining about the terrific cost of the Federal Government. I have tried as patiently as I could to explain to those people that the more service they demand from the Government the greater the cost of Government will be. The only way I know to keep that cost of Government down is to reduce costs whenever you can find a way to do it. Obviously, once in a while it will result in some curtailment of service, some of the things people might like to have from the Government.

I want to make a further observation in order that I may not be misunderstood. I have the same high regard for Postmaster General Summerfield as has been expressed here in the House of Representatives. We all understand that this cut may put him and his Department and the able people working with him to some rather difficult propositions with respect to operating the post office. But I am quite sure that they would not be retrenching as a result of these cuts in ways designed just to make the Congress look bad. I think they would try to do the best with them that they could.

What I am trying to say is this: It has been my personal observation over 22 years as a Member of this body and dealing with the matter of Federal expenditures and taxes, that everybody is for economy if you will take "me" out of it. You cannot economize in that fashion.

Now, I have listened to the gentleman. All of the argument is not in as yet and I shall hold an open mind until all of the argument is in. But as things stand now, I want my position understood. As far as I am concerned, if an amendment is offered to restore this cut I shall not support the amendment.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to my friend from Indiana that I sense the predicament he describes here today. In this connection I want to tell the Members of the House an interesting story. The distinguished Governor of my State, Mr. Meyner, came to Washington 2 weeks ago to address 650 businessmen from the State of New Jersey meeting here under the auspices of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce. In his remarks before that group of businessmen he lashed out at the Eisenhower budget. The next morning he gave the New Jersey Congressmen, Republicans and Democrats, a breakfast at the Congressional Hotel. The whole tenor of his remarks at the breakfast was different. He had some papers from different State agencies that were insisting upon federally budgeted funds, with no cuts, in some instances increases. I had a letter from him. Every member of the New Jersey delegation received that letter, which came 2 days after we had the vote regarding the $2 million cut in funds allocated to the States for the administration of social-security benefits. He was against it.

At night he was telling the businessmen one story, he was indicting the present administration because of its budget. At our breakfast the next morning he was telling us these Federal allocations and grants had to continue.

Now, that is what we are up against. Governor Meyner at this time is projecting in the State of New Jersey a record peacetime budget for that State. But he is not alone. Governor Harriman, of New York, is doing the same thing. Governor Ribicoff, who sat in this body as an able Congressman, is doing the same thing for Connecticut. Governor Mennen Williams, of Michigan, is doing the same thing.

I agree with the gentleman from Indiana that somebody has got to take the bit and do something about this. I know what the gentleman wants to do. But let me ask the gentleman this question: He has had letters from his constituents, he has had talks with his constituents. Has he talked with them about what this bill will do to their postal service back home and has he had their reaction to that?

Mr. HALLECK. No. I must say to the gentleman that I have had a number of communications, and I think all of them, with two or three exceptions, have come from people who are representing the employees of the post office. Of course, I am glad to hear from them; I have had solicitude for them; I have supported legislation through the years of benefit to them, and they realize that.

But I did get one letter from a very estimable gentleman, a businessman in my district, who complained about what these cuts would mean; and what was obvious to me from reading his letter was that the dire things that he thought were going to happen would not happen; maybe some things, but not what he had in mind. And then in the last part of the letter he upbraided me about the size of the budget and asked, "Why don't you do something about cutting the cost of Government down there in Washington?"

Now, we cannot have it both ways, and that is the only point I am making. As I say, the President and the Secretary of the Treasury have said to the Congress, "Do what you can to cut this budget."

I hear proposals for a cut of $3 billion, $4 billion, $5 billion. I do not know whether we can do that or not. I know in my heart that if we make some of these cuts, the people must understand that they cannot have everything that they would like to have from the Government.

And, you refer to the States. The States have to recognize the same thing. All of our people who pay the bills must recognize sooner or later that you cannot have the fancy frills and all of the things you would like to have without paying the bill.

Mr. CANFIELD. I beg to disagree with my friend from Indiana, and I think when the 170 million postal patrons catch up with the facts of life, they are not going to approve a cut of this kind. Now, time will bear you out or time will bear me out. And, I want to say this, too. I noticed over the weekend that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. BRIDGES, presumably on TV, projected cuts in the Federal budget, but he was good enough to document just where those cuts should take place. Did he mention the postal service of the United States? No, he did not. I noticed also on the TV program conducted by our distinguished friend and colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING], and our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. MCCORMACK], he spoke out on Federal cuts, and he gave some documentation. But, did he mention the postal service of the United States? No, he did not.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I have had mail, like our distinguished friend from Indiana and as the gentleman from New Jersey has. We have all had it. And it is our conscientious duty here to cut down on this budget at every place we can. I must say in all frankness I have had some people pick out spots where cuts should be made. I have not received a single letter which has said "Reduce the postal service" or "reduce the service which is given to the patrons." Now, I have not heard all of this debate yet, and I have an open mind, like the gentleman from Indiana, but I want to ask the gentleman from New Jersey in just exactly what way—and he may have covered this before I entered the Chamber—in just exactly what way does the gentleman feel that this $58 million cut will be

carried out in specifics in the delivery of the mail.

Mr. CANFIELD. In all earnestness, I covered that, and it took some 10, 15, or 20 minutes to do it. But, I shall be glad to huddle with the gentleman later and inform him.

Mr. KEATING. I will be glad to read that part of it in the RECORD.

Mr. CANFIELD. And go into it in detail.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from New Jersey is not going to ask the gentleman from Indiana the obvious question. I want to do it. How much is the gentleman from Indiana prepared to cut the foreign aid budget?

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know. That has not come before us. Now, I have voted for cuts. You call it the foreign aid budget.

Mr. GROSS. I call it the foreign give-away budget.

Mr. HALLECK. Just a moment. Mr. Chairman, who has the floor at the moment? I have been asked a question, and I understood the gentleman from New Jersey yielded.

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Since the gentleman has brought it up, maybe this is as good a time as any to say a word or two about it. I happen to believe that the national defense of our country requires us to maintain some offshore operations. I happen to believe that the national defense of our country—of Washington, Iowa, Indiana—is made more secure if we have some friends around the world. I do not believe to call it foreign aid is right. That is not the right term. I think it is a matter of national defense. It is a matter of a balance between what we do at home to defend ourselves and what we do to maintain some of these offshore operations.

I have said this before, but some of the new Members have not heard it and I think it will bear saying again: I feel a little safer in my home at night because some of these American planes are based around the world. I do not know whether the gentleman would bring them all back or not; he has never said. But I also know that the national defense of our country is the largest item we have.

I want to go along on a basis of the best balance that can be worked out between what we do at home and what we do overseas. We want to maintain a strong economy and at the same time maintain our Armed Forces in the field, and we want to achieve a balance between the Air Force, the Navy, the Army, and all the other branches of the service. The problem is something that I am perfectly willing to meet any place on the road when the time comes. But I do not think it has anything to do with the matter presently before us.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, on the other hand I am glad the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] raised that question, because at the outset of my remarks, speaking extemporaneously, I wanted to emphasize this fact. There is not 1 cent in this bill for foreign aid. I would rather see this $58 million restored for necessary postal services for the patrons of the United States, for the 170 million Americans, than give $1 to Tito and his government. I have never voted to give any money to Tito and I am not going to begin now. But we have given him more than $58 million by plenty. It may approach $1 billion.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I have been a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service for the past 2 years. I think this debate will probably be refreshing to the American people. Here we are discussing whether $58 million shall be restored to the Post Office Department. I recognize that there are some real problems in the operation of this Department. But there has been very little said about the $600 million and some deficit. We are talking about restoring $58 million. I think it is an indictment upon the Members of this body that we have allowed the postal rate situation to exist as it is today. From 1932 to 1956 there has not been an increase in the first-class mail rate. If we are going to go along with that, we are going to have to give 1932 service in 1956. If you want 1956 service you are going to have to pay for it.

I recognize the problem so far as the $58 million is concerned. I think probably there are some areas of the Department where they can economize. But I hope that our committee will bring before this body the kind of a postal rate bill that will do something about this deficit. That is long, long overdue. Then I would like to see how many people are going to stand up and be counted in behalf of doing something for the patrons of this country, the taxpayers of this country, when we deal with the postal deficit, which affects every one of them. We can start talking about better service when we meet that issue.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I should like to make one further observation. I am glad the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] said what he did. Of course, he knows that whatever position I held here was shoulder to shoulder with those who have tried in recent years to get some increase in the rates. In connection with that what we are trying to do is to eliminate the deficit in the post offie, which has such an impact on the overall budget. Here on one side is a decrease, if it stands, in respect to certain expenditures. As far as I am concerned, I am ready to support a reasonable rate increase bill which, on the other side, will tend to eliminate the deficit which must be made up by the taxpayers generally.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I intend to support the gentleman's position in regard to the $50 million because I think it is time we waked the people up. If we have to curtail service to do it, then they will wake up their Congressmen.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey understands that I have a very deep affection and a very high regard for him. We are very close personal friends now as we have been in the past and will be in the future. I know the gentleman desires to be fair. A moment ago he named 4 or 5 Democratic governors that had inflated or increased budgets. I wonder if the gentleman meant to imply that it is only the Democrats who operate their States that way.

Mr. CANFIELD. No. The reason I mentioned those governors is that I live in New Jersey, New York is contiguous, Connecticut is right on top of us, and all that. I did mention Mennen Williams because there was recent publicity about him. The Democrats do not have a monopoly on that by any means. It applies to governors everywhere. It is due to the demands of the people, no question about that.

Mr. PASSMAN. I think the Democrats on this side of the aisle are doing everything in their power to make some very small reductions in this overall bill.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am so glad the gentleman has brought that up.

Mr. PASSMAN. I knew the gentleman would be.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman has been on this subcommittee for a good many years.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am the senior member of this subcommittee.

Mr. JUDD. I should like to get the gentleman's estimate of the future. The gentleman says the Post Office Department has come in with a request for a $53 million supplemental appropriation for this fiscal year. What is the gentleman's estimate as to what the Committee on Appropriations will do with that?

Mr. CANFIELD. I think the Department itself, because of the climate of this hour, will proceed to suggest that the figure of $6 million for capital items be deleted, but the Department insisted no later than this morning that the $47 million, the balance of that figure, is needed for postal operations, and they do not see how that can be cut.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman also said that if they did not get that supplemental appropriation, it would mean payless days for postal employees?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is what the Department says.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman believe his committee or this Congress will go through June 30 and not pass supplemental appropriations to provide authorized pay for our postal employees?

Mr. CANFIELD. I do not believe it will, yet I am mindful of the fact that the people of the country are demanding economy. Unfortunately, this bill, which has never, never, never lent itself to severe cuts, is the first appropriation bill to be brought before the House, and the elections of last November are not so far

removed. I wonder what we would do on a bill with this cut next year.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration is to provide funds to operate the Post Office Department and Treasury Department and agencies under the Treasury for fiscal 1958.

After the excellent presentation by our distinguished and able chairman, my contribution doubtless shall be small. The gentleman from Virginia, J. VAUGHAN GARY, is a gentleman in every respect. He is able and courageous; and in my considered judgment, pressure, propaganda and persuasion will never cause this good man to do anything other than what he believes to be right and proper. Those of you who have served with him for many years know that I speak the truth.

Therefore, nothing affords me more personal pleasure than to pay tribute to a great leader, a fair leader and, without a doubt, one of the most able men to serve in this body or in the body of our coequals on the other side of the Capitol. I know you have observed in the presentations of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] that he deals with actual facts and substantiating statistics and documentation.

The Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill is considered nonpartisan and handled by a nonpartisan committee. Therefore, it is to be regretted that the entire membership of the subcommittee handling this bill is not in accord as to the amount necessary to operate the agencies involved for the next fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a congressional district with more than 115 post offices and a larger number of rural routes and star routes, and several cities have city delivery service. Certainly this would indicate that there is an unusually large number of postal employees in my district. I am their friend, and the majority of them are my friends; and I hope that this mutual friendship may continue. However, let me say, here and now and for the record, that persuasion from any of my friends among the postal personnel, including their national officers, will not in any way, shape, form, or fashion cause me to act in any manner other than what I think is absolutely right and proper. Therefore, I enthusiastically support the bill before the committee and back my able chairman on the cuts that his subcommittee made and in the truthful and fair statements he has made in presenting the bill to you.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I know the gentleman from Louisiana has the interests of the postal employees at heart from the way he has spoken. I also have their interests very much at heart. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Does the gentleman feel, as a result of this cut, that the salaries of postal employees would suffer in any way?

Mr. PASSMAN. I think I can assure the distinguished gentlewoman from New York that in no way will salaries be affected. I think our distinguished chairman pointed out in his discussion of the bill that there are funds provided for the ingrade promotions and other benefits to postal employees. I may state further that the overall cut is only 1.7 percent, which is very small when it is considered on the basis of a request for in excess of $3 billion. In my considered judgment, no services will be greatly curtailed; and certainly reductions will not apply to personnel, unless it should possibly be to fringe personnel such as perhaps part-time employees.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman. I was under the same impression since these salaries were enacted by act of Congress, and certainly nothing in this appropriation could change them.

Mr. PASSMAN. I may also state that there have been similar cuts in the past. I do not know why there is such a fight at this time to keep this Subcommittee on Appropriations from doing its duty and making small cuts in these money bills. If we are not going to consider these bills, and make cuts where we think we can make them, then why not bring the budget directly to the floor and not waste the time of the members of the committees in conducting hearings for weeks and months?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am happy to yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. GARY. I would like to point out one paragraph from the report which reads as follows:

> The budget provides an estimated average employment for fiscal year 1958 of 638,200, including military personnel of the Coast Guard as compared with a presently estimated average for 1957 of 620,700 an increase of 17,500. The amounts recommenmed in the accompanying bill should result in reductions of approximately 9,500 in the estimated average employment for 1958.

So, rather than reducing the number of employees, this bill would still allow for a substantial increase in the number of employees.

So that it not only will not reduce any salaries, but it will provide for some increases in employees.

Mr. Chairman, the time has finally arrived when the Congress must take into its own hands the job of bringing expenditures in line with revenues. For example, during the past 4 years, a period when our revenue reached an all-time high, may I point out that the present administration with the aid of the Congress has spent all of the revenues collected by the Federal Government and, in addition thereto, expended an additional $10 billion. Putting it another way, during the past 4 years, the public debt has increased by $10 billion.

Therefore, we must, as businessmen and elected Representatives of our people, take hold of the situation and do something about it. Unless we act with a determination to reduce expenditures, then to some extent we will have placed the economy of this great Nation in jeopardy.

Would it be true and fair to say that at heart Congress knows what is wrong, but does not dare correct it? While expenditures have grown to new and dizzy heights, we have refused to raise revenues sufficiently to offset the increased expenditures. More particularly is this true with respect to the postal operation. It has been said there is not a group, a faction or a party in Congress that dares to go on record in favor of cutting unnecessary expenditures. Well, I want the record to show that I am in favor of reducing expenditures promptly and drastically so that we may not only have a balanced budget but a reduction in the staggering public debt.

I am beginning my 11th year as a Member of Congress and my 9th year as a member of the Appropriations Committee, and I would be less than honest not to admit that the pressure groups are so powerful within and without the Government, the explanations of the need are so plausible and so polite that if the Member of Congress is not careful, he receives a terrifically effective selling job, regardless of the weaknesses or sound merits of many of the presentations.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to again pay tribute to the Postmaster General, Mr. Arthur Summerfield. In my opinion, General Summerfield is one of the outstanding Postmasters General of this age. I doubt if any President in recent history has had a Cabinet member who excelled Mr. Summerfield in astuteness and downright business ability. To pay tribute to this man who has done a great job for the American people affords me much satisfaction.

The bill before you does not provide as much money as the Postmaster General and members of his staff would like to receive; but General Summerfield is a businessman, he knows how to cut corners, he knows how to control expenditures. I am sure if we provide the Postmaster General with the sum recommended in this bill, he will do an excellent job and at a subsequent date commend the committee for its forthright action in making a small reduction in the Department's request.

As pointed out by our chairman, the postal deficit estimated for fiscal 1958 is $651 million. If the application for an increase of railroad transportation costs is granted in the amount of $103 million, that will bring the estimated deficit to $754 million. If everything should be taken into account in the operation of the postal service, then the deficit would be, in all probability, double that amount.

Mr. Chairman, if the Post Office Department were forced to operate on the same basis as business in our great free-enterprise system, then the story would be far more unfavorable. Do you realize that the postal establishment uses thousands of buildings rent free? It does not have to pay any income tax; it operates free of county or State ad valorem and other property taxes. It does not have to pay occupational license fees. Neither does it have to carry various types of insurance on buildings and contents. In other words, the postal establishment

gets a free ride as compared to the manner in which private businesses operate. I point this out so that you may better understand that the deficit, in all probability, would be a billion plus if it were not for the many advantages that the postal establishment enjoys which are not afforded to private enterprise.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank my distinguished chairman.

Such is a matter of fact, and it is true also of all other Federal agencies.

I do hope that this Congress will increase postal rates so that the Post Office Department can operate on a self-sustaining basis. It is not right to continue demanding greater services from the postal operations and at the same time refuse to increase postal rates. May I again remind you that letter rates are the same today as they were in 1932. Without any intent of offense, I say for the record that this is gross neglect and positively political.

May I also say that it costs a certain amount of money to operate the postal service, and the difference between the revenue and the cost of operation is withdrawn from the Treasury and paid for by the taxpayer. Tens of millions of our poorer American families are having to pay taxes to subsidize the heavier users of the mails. Inasmuch as the difference between the expenses and the revenues must be borne by the taxpayers, why should not the Congress muster sufficient courage to do the proper thing and increase postal rates. Let those who use the mails pay for the cost, rather than force 165 million of our 170 million Americans to subsidize the other 5 million.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I know the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. PASSMAN. I certainly do.

Mr. JOHANSEN. If the gentleman will yield further, I may say that this House last year performed its responsibility in the matter of rate increases.

Mr. PASSMAN. And I may say to the gentleman that I supported the rate increase and will do so very enthusiastically this year. It is a privilege for me to follow the Postmaster General's recommendation in this important matter.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Will the gentleman yield further to clear up one or two other points?

Mr. PASSMAN. Certainly.

Mr. JOHANSEN. We appreciate, of course, the gentleman's splendid remarks regarding the Postmaster General, and it is a typical display of fairness on the part of the gentleman. There is one question I would like to ask as a member of the legislative committee. Is there anything in this budget either as originally presented or as reduced which contemplates any increases in pay for the postal employees in the next fiscal year?

Mr. PASSMAN. I may say to the distinguished gentleman that this is an appropriations committee. Certainly we cannot legislate. Any legislation of that type would be subject to a point of order. Such legislation would have to come, of course, from the legislative committee. If they can make a justifiable case on the floor of the House I shall support a pay increase. Is that what the gentleman wants to ask me?

Mr. JOHANSEN. My only point—and this does not apply to the gentleman—is that I have some difficulty in reconciling some of the new-found interest in economy on a certain side of this House on the part of those who voted for very substantial pay increases two years ago.

Mr. PASSMAN. I say to the gentleman that I voted for the pay increases; I have voted for every pay increase bill presented on this floor for the postal employees; and I stand ready to support an increase in postal rates to offset some of the increased operating costs.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHLEY. I want to say that I agree with what the gentleman has to say about economy, but I think he will agree, too, it is absolutely essential that we maintain an excellent postal service in the United States. I see on the report that the gentleman has referred to that it is estimated for 1957 the amount of mail handled will be 58,024,000 pieces. This, as I see it, cost as far as the postal operations are concerned $2,126,730,000. That is without any supplemental appropriation. Your report says it is estimated there will be a 2.8 percent increase in the amount of mail handled for the fiscal year 1958 and your committee is proposing that this be done for $17 million, is that right?

Mr. PASSMAN. This committee proposes to try to effect some economies. I say to the gentleman that there will doubtless be some cuts in the postal operations. But it should be borne in mind that there is transferability of funds. If you will read the entire report you will discover that in the past certain funds have been transferred out of one division into another, more especially in new operations. I do not know what the total amount would be which might be transfered out of any one department into another, but it is a substantial sum. If the gentleman will read the report in its entirety, the gentleman will doubtless agree that we have reported a sound bill.

Mr. Chairman, we should, we must, and I believe that we will, muster sufficient courage to reduce expenditures, remembering, if you please, that almost every year after the Congress effects a small reduction in the President's budget, we actually conclude the fiscal year by spending billions of dollars more than the budget called for.

For example:

| | |
|---|---|
| Fiscal 1956: | |
| President Eisenhower's original budget estimate submitted 2 years ago | $62.4 |
| Fiscal 1956 closed last June 30 showing actual spending of | 66.5 |
| The actual overrun was | 4.1 |
| Fiscal 1957: | |
| President Eisenhower's original budget estimate submitted a year ago | 65.9 |
| His revised spending estimate for 1957 (as shown in the 1958 budget last month) | 70.1 |
| The overrun now estimated | 4.2 |

Another example:

The Congress is again granting authority to draw money from the Treasury by various devices other than through appropriation bills.

In recent hearings, Secretary Humphrey and Budget Director Brundage said that in the last session of Congress, while cuts of $300 million were being made through the appropriation bills, the Congress enacted into law in bills other than appropriation bills, various authorizations to draw on the Treasury to the extent of $1,700,000,000 more than was recommended by the administration.

Mr. Chairman, I think you will agree that the time has come for every Member of this House, be he a member of the Appropriations Committee, a legislative committee or a special committee, to associate himself with the figures with which the members of the Appropriations Committee must deal continuously. I am sure that any member who will devote sufficient time to go as far into such matters as a majority of the members of the Appropriations Committee necessarily do, will reach the conclusion that a majority of the members of the Appropriations Committee have long since reached, which is that we must bring Federal expenditures under control in this day of great general prosperity. You and I know it is not right to continue indefinitely the spending year in and year out of billions of dollars in excess of our revenues, and winding up each fiscal year by spending several billion dollars more than the President asked for in the beginning.

Mr. Chairman, let us face the issues fairly and squarely, and start reducing every appropriation bill that reaches the floor of this House, if we can justify the reductions. We must not succumb to propaganda or pressure groups or to persuasion for selfish reasons. Sooner or later we are going to have to face up to the facts; and so far as I am concerned, this is a good place to start.

I trust that you will remain on the floor and support the committee's action on this bill. The committee has submitted to you facts and statistics that you can take back to your respective districts and justify your favorable vote.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. First, I should like to commend the Members on both sides of the aisle who have been discussing this subject, because I think they have given us much information in the public interest that the public needs to know about and understand more fully than they have. Now, coming from a rural district, as I do, I am somewhat disturbed about the statements made about the curtailment of rural service, of which I have so much in my district. My question is this: Was there any testimony before your committee and/or in your opinion will there be any definite curtailment of rural route service if the committee report is sustained?

Mr. PASSMAN. In my candid opinion, certain adjustments will have to be made somewhere to absorb the $58 million cut, if the position of the committee is sustained; but I think I can answer the

gentleman's question a little better by reading a telegram, which I will be pleased to show to you. I quote from the telegram:

It was noted in today's news that the House Appropriations Committee cut the Post Office appropriation $58 million. It is urgent that you vote for the restoration of that amount when the bill comes before the House next Tuesday. The Post Office up to now has been operating on such a strenuous economy program it is getting to the point that it is almost impossible to give your constituents the mail service they deserve. This cut may mean a cut in personnel, discontinuance of delivery route extensions, no Saturday delivery, and the placing of rural routes on a triweekly basis. Your support will be appreciated in advocating the kind of mail service the people deserve and the better working conditions of the postal personnel.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. It is the gentleman's candid opinion, then, that there will be no substantial curtailment of personnel or rural mail service?

Mr. PASSMAN. If I thought there would be a substantial curtailment of personnel or rural mail service I certainly would not have supported this amendment in the committee to make certain small reductions, small percentagewise—only 1.7 percent.

I think our distinguished chairman pointed out that there are increases in the funds for personnel, rather than decreases. Please keep in mind that we are appropriating for the postal service $207 million more than was appropriated last year. If the mandatory items in the bill are removed from this consideration, the appropriation is for $44 million plus more than was available for the current year for operating the postal service. So, if there is some curtailment of unessential services, if that has to be done to effect some economy in Government, let us recognize the facts and act accordingly. My hope is that I may be helpful in bringing about some way of checking this trend toward giving away money and spending money for nonessential services we cannot afford.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman has a good point and, with his permission, I should like to pursue this just a little bit further.

Mr. PASSMAN. This may not be politically favorable for me a year or so from now, but I am going to stick by it.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. In the matter of the building program, we have been told that it will be necessary to curtail some of this building program. Is it not true that many of the building programs in progress now are not being carried on at the taxpayers' expense?

Mr. PASSMAN. I do not think there is anything in this bill for any building program. The building program comes under the jurisdiction of the legislative committee and carries a different authorization.

I might say here to the gentleman that I wasted several hours of the time of several hundred constituents down in Jonesboro, Jackson Parish, La., telling them we were going to provide them a beautiful lease-purchase post-office building. They have been 1 year now trying to find some architect to draw the plans and specifications, but they cannot even agree on the architect. Now, lo and behold, just as my election is approaching about a year from now, I notice the decision that they are not now going to build these lease-purchase buildings.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas, for whom I have such a high regard.

Mr. AVERY. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I believe I heard the gentleman make the statement quoting the Director of the Budget that although the Committee on Appropriations had decreased the suggested budget by approximately $500 million at the same time the gate was open whereby $1,700,000,000 extra authorization was granted.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

Mr. AVERY. That rather intrigued me. Just how does the Congress appropriate money except through the Committee on Appropriations and the action of the House?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is done in many instances through granting contract authority. There is the highway program, for example, concerning which some enthusiasts have estimated that gas tax revenues would bring in $2 billion annually and the expenditures would be at some other figure. I do not know what the deficit would be. If it should cost $2 billion annually to carry on the highway program and only half a billion dollars should be received in revenues for the program, the other $1½ billion would necessarily come from the United States Treasury. That would be accomplished without coming before the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, today's vote on appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments comes at a time of mounting public opinion against the size of the Federal budget. It is no exaggeration to say that men and women throughout the country, of both political parties, were shocked at President Eisenhower's recently announced $72 billion budget for fiscal 1958—largest ever in our peacetime history.

Subsequent statements by both the President and Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey have made it clear that this administration has abdicated its responsibility with respect to this budget. We are told that Congress has the responsibility for making cuts in the President's budget but neither he nor his Department heads give the slightest indication of where these cuts should be made.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that Congress will conscientiously endeavor to accept the responsibility for effecting economies. But to do this intelligently we must not succumb to the pressure of public opinion which quite naturally has been aroused by the administration's irresponsibility.

We are all aware that the most controversial item before us today is the committee proposal to cut $58 million from the proposed Post Office Department appropriation for fiscal 1958. We are also aware that the biggest single cut would be a $36,637,000 reduction from the proposed funds for postal operations. The Committee on Appropriations is recommending that Congress make available $17,825,000 more than was available in 1957 to care for the constantly expanding volume of mail and the continuous growth of our metropolitan areas which require ever-increasing service additions. In other words, the committee is only recommending an increase of funds for postal operations for fiscal 1958 of eight-tenths of 1 percent over the amount appropriated for fiscal 1957.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot effect a real economy by impairing the operational efficiency of the Post Office Department for the sake of a bookkeeping "saving." Yet this is precisely what the proposed cut would accomplish.

In a period of intensifying industrial activity and a recordbreaking population increase, more mail is being handled now than ever before. Last year the volume of all mail handled increased by 2.2 percent, and there is no reason to suppose that the volume will not continue to increase similarly in the immediate months and years ahead. What this figure means, Mr. Chairman, is that our postal clerks and carriers last year handled 1,207,000,000 more pieces of mail than they did in the preceding year.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the way to effect real economy is, on the one hand, to encourage efficiency of operation by instituting long overdue reforms to protect the employment rights of Federal employees and to create incentives through programs of promotion based upon merit; and on the other hand, to base postal rates of first-, second-, and third-class mail, respectively, on the actual cost of handling the distribution of each.

Personally I find it difficult to cry economy and vote for a $58 million cut in post office operations while at the same time acquiescing in the overt subsidization of large firms and other heavy users of second and third class mail.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I will vote to restore the $36 million reduction for postal operations. To do otherwise would mean curtailment of an essential service and a crippling of the Post Office Department's program of modernization which is so long overdue.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, if there is anything of which I am proud in my membership in this House over and beyond that membership, it is my membership on this subcommittee that brings you here today the appropriation bill for the Treasury and Post Office Departments.

In his opening remarks, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], our able chairman, took occasion to laud collectively and individually the members of his subcommittee. I know that we all appreciate those remarks, and in return I know that we shall all

extend to him our highest fraternal affection, our esteem and respect.

That also goes, I know, from the Members on the other side of the House as well as on this side of the House for the alternate chairman of this subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], and I know, too, that that feeling of deep friendship and companionship extends throughout and to each and every member of this subcommittee.

I have been a member of this subcommittee now for 8 years, and during that time I have seen this same bill brought before the House for debate and discussion, but this is the first time in those 8 years when there has been a division of essential opinion between the membership of the subcommittee. I almost said between the two sides, between the two party memberships, but that, even in this instance, I am sure does not exist because we have never operated since I have been a member of this subcommittee on a partisan basis.

Our interrogations of the witnesses who came before us to justify their requests for funds have always been of the highest order. We have had full and complete response because of the nature of the interrogations we made. I feel that on every occasion we have had complete information, complete justification, and everything else needed for our committee to sit down and make a wise and proper determination concerning what this bill should contain when presented to the House.

In the 8 years I have been a member there were three Democratic postmasters that came before this subcommittee. I am going to say to you here and now that when those men came from the other side of the House they were no less dedicated and devoted to their work than has been the Republican postmaster who has come before us in the past few years. But I do recall this, that in each and every session of this subcommittee we have finally marked up the bill to provide for what are called cuts. I remember, too, that in each and every case supplemental estimates were brought before the House to restore a substantial part and practically the total amount of the cuts that we made. We are putting in this day-to-day friendly debate but we are not getting anywhere, in my opinion, because the cut that is being made will most assuredly about this time in 1958 be brought before us and enacted in the form of a supplemental appropriation bill.

I think it has been a very, very good thing for the subcommittee itself, and long may it live, that we have some disagreement. We have gone along for too many years in the highly polished Alphonse and Gaston attitude. This time we have had for several brief moments what might have seemed to some of the members a near riot among ourselves. I can assure you that when this is over, when we finally dispose of our bill, we will go back to doing whatever we have to do in our subcommittee with the same spirit of confidence in each other, with a great and true friendship, and that our work will continue in that vein.

If we do have a movement here of some kind, and I do not know where it is going to come from and I do not care where it comes from, to restore to this bill an amount of money that can be reasonably justified, I am going to vote for it because I feel on my own behalf, and I am speaking for no one else, that when the Post Office Department came before this subcommittee they fully, completely, and absolutely justified every cent of money that they requested. I believe it probably is true that a careful scanning of these requests—although I think we gave it that—might divulge here and there a few dollars that we will not have to restore in a supplemental appropriation bill at about this time in 1958. However that may be, I am not going to go into figures. We have heard plenty of figures today. We have heard all the figures that are necessary. We have heard all of the reasons for those figures. We have heard all of the reasons why these figures should be higher and also why they should be sustained. But, I am going to devote a few of the remaining minutes of the time I am taking to say that we are never going to satisfy fully the requirements of the Post Office Department insofar as their needs and their funds are concerned. We will have to do it by principles. By doing it by principles, we will have to charge the people who use the services of the Post Office Department at least what it costs to operate that Department.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES. I yield.

Mr. CORBETT. I would like to ask the distinguished member of the subcommittee if a cut applied to the Post Office Department appropriation at this time, in view of the fact that they have a certain deficit coming, is not a false type of economy because they will be back here for a supplemental appropriation. They will have to extend the services. This is not analogous to a cut, let us say, in the armed services appropriation where there would be a limitation on their spending. This would not be a limitation on the spending of the Department, would it?

Mr. JAMES. I undertook to say that very thing a little while ago. Perhaps I did not express it clearly.

Mr. CORBETT. I am sorry I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. JAMES. Let me put it this way. Whatever amount is cut now will be restored about this time next year in a supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. CORBETT. In other words, if we were to make this cut stick, we would just be increasing the deficit rather than decreasing the cost.

Mr. JAMES. Deficit would not be the word, of course, because the Post Office Department does not operate on a balanced budget. What you are referring to as a deficit is that sum of some $651 million of real deficit which comes, of course, through the services the Post Office Department renders to other parts of the Government.

Mr. CORBETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JAMES. We in the end, of course, will have to pay the bill. We cannot have payless paydays. Everybody knows that. So the money must be provided and it will be provided without a question of a doubt.

Mr. Chairman, to come back to what I wanted to say. I do not know that it should be said here again today and yet, I think, it cannot be repeated too often. We have to in common conscience and in commonsense make rates for the postal service commensurate with the cost of the postal services. Unless a bill is brought in to do that very thing by the legislative committee, we can look forward certainly in another year to higher expenditures and greater requests for funds, budget cuts, and other supplemental bills. But, if we can put the Post Office Department in a position where it collects for its services in the sale of stamps and other documents and services that the Post Office Department renders; if we can do that, then we will avoid in the future any question of whether or not the Post Office Department has justified its position. They have justified their position with respect to their request this time, in the minds of some of us, to the fullest extent, and in the minds of others they have not. We can avoid all that by seeing to it that the Post Office Department increases the cost of postal rates. If there is a movement to restore a portion of what has been cut by the committee, I shall vote for it. If there is not such a motion and the bill is passed with the cut, I shall not lay the blame or make fault against any person or persons. I shall not weep. I shall not even say, "I told you so."

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, there is little I can add in behalf of this bill after the explanations which have been given by our distinguished chairman, VAUGHN GARY, and the distinguished ranking minority member, GORDON CANFIELD. However, I would like to express my own complete confidence in the economy-mindedness of the heads of the two Departments affected—the Treasury and Post Office.

Treasury Secretary George Humphrey and Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield are among the most competent and conscientious Cabinet members this country has ever had. Their objectives are completely sincere as they seek to give our people the best service possible for the least amount of money. They certainly are not men who would attempt to pad their budget requests. We can rest assured that they have already cut their requests as low as they think the requests can safely be cut without impairing the services of their Departments.

Let us not forget that theirs are Departments of service to our people. Service is their entire function. No one can dispute that the cost of such functions has increased greatly, as has the cost of similar services throughout the country. Any material reductions made in this

bill will necessitate supplemental appropriations before the fiscal year is ended.

If we expect the Post Office Department to continue the service it is giving the people, to make rural route extensions, which are going to be necessary in these growing communities and outlying areas, we must appropriate the money for them. Otherwise we are going to be hearing from the people. They are used to having the service and they will expect it to continue.

There might be just a little politics involved here. Sometimes we go out and attempt to cut an appropriation bill and if we cut it a few million dollars it will make headlines across the country. Of course it will be welcomed by the people. We have cut expenditures. We are economy-minded. If people would only realize that there is no real economy being effected by the cut, because it simply will be restored in a supplemental appropriation bill later on, that we are only kidding them, then I gather there would not be as much political gain by the headlines. Before the fiscal year is ended we have restored the cut, and probably more.

I therefore think it would be wise for us to consider seriously the budget requests when we vote on this bill rather than to try to kid the people and make them think we are easing the tax load for them but at the same time carrying on the services they have a right to expect.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, coming from one of the greatest agricultural States of our Nation, and one that depends a great deal on corn in its farm economy, I would like to address a few remarks to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in an effort to impress on them the vital necessity of immediate action on the corn base acreage problem. In many areas of our Nation corn planting will begin within a few weeks. Furthermore, the deadline for participation in the acreage reserve program for corn in 1957 is April 15.

I am sure that the Members of the House are familiar with the Agricultural Act of 1956 dealing with corn and the corn farmers' participation in the soil bank. I am sure that you are aware that 61.5 percent of the farmers voting in the referendum held on December 11, 1956, said that they favored the farm base acreage approach rather than to return to the corn acreage allotment program. I think it was unfortunate that the Congress required a two-thirds vote in this referendum. A clear majority—59.5 percent—of the corn farmers voting in Iowa favored the base acreage approach, and in my district 65.6 percent favored the base acreage approach.

Under the provision of law as it now stands farmers in the commercial corn area will not comply with the 37.3 million acre allotment, and I think we will see roughly 58 million acres of corn planted in the commercial area in 1957. This simply means a continuation of a surplus position in corn, with consequent adverse effects on livestock production and prices, and this will have an effect on the whole economy of the Nation.

It is contended by some that giving corn growers a corn base acreage of 51 million acres, for purposes of participating in the soil bank and price support, is unfair in relation to cotton and wheat farmers.

There does not seem to be much disagreement that: (a) the acreage taken out of wheat and cotton has mainly gone into feed grains, (b) as a result, feed grains produced on these diverted acres have been substituted for corn and (c) this has resulted in the feed grain surplus appearing in the corn carryover which (d) has caused the decline in corn acreage allotments.

Farmers in the commercial corn area as determined for 1957 have continued to plant approximately 58 million acres, even though allotments have decreased in the past few years, until now the allotment is 37.3 million acres.

Without a change in this situation, most commercial area corn farmers will not participate in the soil-bank program and thereby will not contribute to bringing supplies into line with demand. As a short run proposition, farmers can make more money growing corn for livestock. They cannot afford to cut 37 percent from their normal corn planting to get down to their corn allotment in order to begin to participate in the soil bank. On the average a corn farmer with 50 acres of corn would be required to cut to approximately 32 acres and then be paid an average of $43 per acre for each acre he cut below the 32 figure.

Surplus feed grain, estimated by the United States Department of Agriculture at 800 million bushels, was grown on acreage diverted in 1954 and 1955, most of which was taken out of wheat and cotton for which cotton and wheat farmers received price supports. Both directly and indirectly Government price supports have subsidized the production of surplus feed grain. Surplus feed grain has resulted in surplus livestock which has weakened livestock prices. Therefore, farmers everywhere are paying heavily for uneconomic price supports which are causing shifts into livestock production.

Corn farmers do not have a minimum national corn allotment or base similar to the minimum for wheat and cotton. If the allotments for wheat and cotton were to be determined on the basis of what is needed to keep supplies in line with demand, as is done in the case of corn, the national cotton allotment would be 3.9 million acres instead of 17.6 million acres; the national wheat allotment would be 12.4 million acres instead of 55 million acres.

From the foregoing, it is logical to assume that if cotton and wheat are to be treated the same as corn, if corn is given a minimum base of 51 million acres with the requirement that an acreage of cropland equal to 15 percent of the farmer's allotment must be taken out of cropland and put into the soil bank, you would have the following equation:

| | Corn | Wheat | Cotton |
|---|---|---|---|
| (a) Present acreage needed to keep supplies in balance with demand (millions of acres) [1] | 37.3 | 12.4 | 3.9 |
| (b) Percent increase to bring corn to 51 million acres and wheat and cotton to a comparable basis | 36.8 | 36.8 | 36.8 |
| (c) Acres increase on a comparable basis (millions of acres) | 13.7 | 4.5 | 1.4 |
| (d) Farmers would begin to earn soil bank acreage reserve payments when they cut below the following acreage (millions of acres) (a)—(c) if corn, wheat and cotton were on same basis | 51.0 | 16.9 | 5.3 |
| (e) Minimum allotment for 1957 | 0 | 55.0 | 17.6 |
| (f) Advantage of wheat and cotton over corn on the basis of each commodity keeping supply in line with demand (millions of acres) | ------- | 38.1 | 12.3 |

[1] Supply and demand formula in present acreage allotment and marketing quota laws. See AAA 1938 and amendments in other acts down through the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, statement Jan. 29, 1957, before the Senate Agriculture Committee.

This clearly shows that wheat and cotton farmers would not be treated unfairly if the proposed 51-million-acre soil-bank base is used. In addition to the advantage minimum allotments give cotton and wheat those farmers are not required to contribute to the soil bank such as is required of corn farmers.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HARRISON] has introduced a bill that could very well be adopted at this time that I think might hold the solution to this very real problem that exists in the farm economy.

I have been waiting patiently for the Democratic-controlled House Agriculture Committee to come out with some kind of a proposal that would be acceptable to corn farmers. If I understand the situation in the House Agriculture Committee, currently there is little likelihood that constructive legislation can be worked out before corn-planting time. This, I think, is very regrettable and I would plead with my colleagues in the House Agriculture Committee to come forward with a simple proposal such as provided in H. R. 4589 or H. R. 4555—the Harrison bill introduced February 7, 1957. The two Senators from Iowa—Senator HICKENLOOPER and Senator MARTIN—have joined in a similar bill, S. 1125.

These compromise bills simply provide that each corn farmer in 1957 will have the same choice as he had in the referendum that was held on December 11, 1956. Why not let the farmers vote with their corn planters? Let us not forget that 61.5 percent of those voting last fall voted for the base-acreage approach. If those voting for the continuation of acreage allotments at 37.3 million acres want to choose this program—well and good—but how in good conscience can the Congress refuse to give the farmers of the commercial corn area this clear choice.

Individual farmers already have both their base-acreage and allotment figures which would be applicable under this proposal. There would be little administrative work to be done by the Department of Agriculture or the local ASC offices. Therefore, immediate consideration and passage of a temporary corn program for 1957 is urgently needed and I, for one, will find it difficult to explain to the corn farmers in my district why the Congress was reluctant to pass this very badly needed legislation, other than to simply observe what the thinking farmer knows too well—he is being used as a pawn politically. In my mind, it is high time to quit playing politics with the farmers and farm economy. Time is running out. If we honestly want to do something for the farm economy, let us get at it now.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED].

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I only joined this subcommittee this present year, I have not sought to take part in the general debate on the bill here today. I rise only for the purpose of publicly expressing the high esteem and appreciation I have developed for my colleagues on that subcommittee and for the fine, conscientious job that I know they have done in bringing this bill here today.

I also want to take this occasion to say that I have followed this bill and the leadership of my colleagues on the committee as closely as I know how and that I am here today supporting the bill as it was reported by the committee. I have full confidence in its soundness and I hope the House will see fit to sustain the committee in the work it has done.

I yield to no one in the House in my devotion to giving the American people a good postal service. If I honestly felt this bill as it now stands would do any harm or violence or result in any unnecessary curtailments in the services that are provided for, I would not take the position I am now taking.

I believe it is a sound bill, I think it will give the people the service they want and I hope the House will support the committee in what it has done.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, the Post Office Department has wisely set up its budget on the basis of anticipated services for an increasing population.

There is an apparent provision to take care of salaries and fixed obligations with no intent to detract from employee benefits.

The Post Office Department unavoidably operates in the red because of postage rates insufficient to sustain its regular routine services.

In the light of the usual demand for annual deficiency appropriations the proposed cut of 58 million from its request seems futile.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, namely.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. METCALF] having assumed the chair, Mr. FLYNT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4897) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] what he has in mind for the program regarding the pending bill.

Mr. GARY. I will state to the gentleman that it is my understanding that we will take it up first thing tomorrow morning and continue on with it until it is completed.

Mr. CANFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. BOYLE) for one-half hour on Wednesday, February 20.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HEMPHILL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. RODINO) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. RODINO) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. GRANAHAN in two instances and to include a letter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in four instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. MCGREGOR and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FRIEDEL (at the request of Mr. GARY) and to include a statement and a newspaper article.

Mr. DOLLINGER (at the request of Mr. BOYLE) and to include extraneous matter.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 20, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

503. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on an overobligation of allotment under "Repair, improvement, and equipment of federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia," relating to funds allotted to the regional commissioner, region 4, Atlanta, Ga., pursuant to title 31, United States Code, section 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

504. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the payment of uniform allowances to certain persons originally appointed, temporarily or permanently, as commissioned or warrant officers in a Regular component of an Armed Force"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

505. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the quarterly report on the progress of liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to December 31, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 163, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

506. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting the annual report of the Civil Aeronautics Board for fiscal year 1956; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

507. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of the estate of Higa Kensai"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

508. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 16, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on John Day River, Oreg., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, and the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted November 22, 1937, and February 10, 1938, respectively; to the Committee on Public Works.

509. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish supplies and services to foreign vessels and aircraft, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

510. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

511. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the activities to provide war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public as of December 31, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 763, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

512. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 2 (b) of the Performance Rating Act of 1950, as amended"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calender, as follows:

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 293. A bill to authorize settlement for certain inequitable losses in pay sustained by officers of the commissioned services under the emergency economy legislation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRICE: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1544. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Cobb County, Ga., to the trustees of the Methodist Church, Acworth, Ga.; without amendment (Rept. No. 135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 52. A bill to provide increases in service-connected disability compensation and to increase dependency allowances; without amendment (Rept. No. 136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 259. A bill to prescribe a method by which the Houses of Congress and their committees may invoke the aid of the courts in compelling the testimony of witnesses; without amendment (Rept. No. 137). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILSON of California: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2781. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enlarge existing water-supply facilities for the San Diego, Calif., area in order to insure the existence of an adequate water supply for naval installations and defense production plants in such area," approved October 11, 1951; without amendment (Rept. No. 138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3025. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to surrender and convey to the city of New York certain rights of access in and to Marshall, John and Little Streets adjacent to the New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N. Y., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANKFORD: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4285. A bill to authorize the sale of degaussing equipment by the Department of the Navy to the owners or operators of privately owned merchant ships of United States registry; with amendments (Rept. No. 140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2460. A bill to improve the career opportunities of nurses and medical specialists of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; with amendments (Rept. No. 141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOYLE: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2797. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of a military department to furnish stevedoring and terminal services and facilities to commercial steamship companies, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1298. A bill for the relief of Vincent N. Caldes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 70). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1315. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Page; with an amendment (Rept. No. 71). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1316. A bill for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 72). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1324. A bill for the relief of Westfeldt Bros.; without amendment (Rept. No. 73). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1325. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertha K. Martensen; without amendment (Rept. No. 74). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1348. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Gallagher, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 75). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAMER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1365. A bill for the relief of Elmer L. Henderson; without amendment (Rept. No. 76). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1375. A bill for the relief of Otto B. Hauffe; without amendment (Rept. No. 77). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1390. A bill for the relief of Robert Francis Symons; without amendment (Rept. No. 78). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1419. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hannah Mae Powell; without amendment (Rept. No. 79). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1431. A bill for the relief of Edward M. Thompson; without amendment (Rept. No. 80). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1440. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Bingham; without amendment (Rept. No. 81). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1441. A bill for the relief of the estate of Grady Ward; without amendment (Rept. No. 82). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1460. A bill for the relief of Tom R. Hickman and Nannie Conley and husband, Jack Conley; without amendment (Rept. No. 83). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1474. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Maurello; without amendment (Rept. No. 84). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1494. A bill for the relief of the Southwest Research Institute; with an amendment (Rept. No. 85). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1536. A bill for the relief of Allison B. Clements; with amendments (Rept. No. 86). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1575. A bill for the relief of Col. Adolph B. Miller; with an amendment (Rept. No. 87). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1667. A bill for the relief of Fred G. Nagle Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 88). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1672. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Frederick Redmond; with an amendment (Rept. No. 89). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1673. A bill for the relief of Bernhard F. Elmers; without amendment (Rept. No. 90). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1679. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kathryn H. Wallace; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1689. A bill for the relief of George S. Ridner; without amendment (Rept. No. 92). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1693. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Albi; without amendment (Rept. No. 93). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1724. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary A. Sansone; without amendment (Rept. No. 94). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1725. A bill for the relief of Ciro Picardi; with an amendment (Rept. No. 95). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1732. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Gentile; with an amendment (Rept. No. 96). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1733. A bill for the relief of Philip Cooperman, Aron Shriro, and Samuel Stackman; with amendments (Rept. No. 97). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1772. A bill for the relief of Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 98). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1804. A bill for the relief of Robert B. Cooper; amendments (Rept. No. 99). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1831. A bill for the relief of Oather S. Hall; without amendment (Rept. No. 100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1863. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John William Brennan; with an amendment (Rept. No. 101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1864. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lidie Kammauf; with an amendment (Rept. No. 102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1884. A bill for the relief of Jack Carpenter; with an amendment (Rept. No. 103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAMER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2046. A bill for the relief of August J. Strigga; without amendment (Rept. No. 104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2049. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Blanche Houser; without amendment (Rept. No. 105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2116. A bill for the relief of Seymour Robertson; without amendment (Rept. No. 106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2267. A bill for the relief of Charlie Sylvester Correll; without amendment (Rept. No. 107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2269. A bill for the relief of Truck & Axle Manufacturing Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2346. A bill for the relief of Irmgard S. King; without amendment (Rept. No. 109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2347. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Deckard; amendments (Rept. No. 110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2654. A bill for the relief of the Martin Wunderlich Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 111). Referred to the Committee of Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2717. A bill for the relief of June Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2747. A bill for the relief of John H. Parker; without amendment (Rept. No. 113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2904. A bill for the relief of the Knox Corporation of Thomson, Ga.; without amendment (Rept. No. 114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2951. A bill for the relief of Walter E. Durham; without amendment (Rept. No. 115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2963. A bill for the relief of Edwina L. Lincoln, widow of W. Irving Lincoln; without amendment (Rept. No. 116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3126. A bill for the relief of Bunge Corp.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3283. A bill for the relief of William Badinelli; without amendment (Rept. No. 118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3288. A bill for the relief of Dr. Frederic S. Schleger; with an amendment (Rept. No. 119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3440. A bill for the relief of Lillian Schlossberg; without amendment (Rept. No. 120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3468. A bill for the relief of J. A. Ross & Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAMER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3679. A bill for the relief of the E. B. Kaiser Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3687. A bill for the relief of Paul Levitt; without amendment (Rept. No. 123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3723. A bill for the relief of Maj. Gen. Julius Klein; without amendment (Rept. No. 124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3921. A bill for the relief of Helmuth S. Heyl; without amendment (Rept. No. 125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4159. A bill for the relief of Z. A. Hardee; without amendment (Rept. No. 126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4230. A bill for the relief of W. C. Shepherd, trading as W. C. Shepherd Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4336. A bill for the relief of the First National Bank of Birmingham, Ala.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4535. A bill for the relief of Ernest C. St. Onge; without amendment (Rept. No. 129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4730. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jennie B. Prescott; without amendment (Rept. No. 130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1288. A bill for the relief of Ralph Landolfi; with an amendment (Rept. No. 131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2753. A bill for the relief of Charles C. Lewis; without amendment (Rept. No. 132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3673. A bill for the relief of Franz Krudewig; without amendment (Rept. No. 133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 5002. A bill relating to marketing quotas and price supports for Virginia fire-cured and sun-cured tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 5003. A bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in Italy and other oversubscribed areas in the following year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 5004. A bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 5005. A bill to suspend for 2 years the duty on crude chicory and to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to chicory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 5006. A bill to direct the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization to conduct a particular survey in order to assist in promoting the production of concentrated iron ore and steel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 5007. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:

H. R. 5008. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to raise the limitation on the total amount of voluntary contributions for additional annuities which members and employees may make; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 5009. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide for furnishing the Coast Guard Academy and the United States Merchant Marine Academy with surplus dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 5010. A bill to amend section 161 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 5011. A bill to grant a pension of $100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I who are 60 years of age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 5012. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Texas among the States which may obtain social-security coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5013. A bill to amend the act of June 22, 1936, to provide that the Federal Government shall improve or participate in the improvement of certain navigable waters affecting drought areas if the benefits exceed 80 percent of the estimated cost; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 5014. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from the manufacturers' excise tax certain automobiles furnished without charge to schools for use in driver-training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 5015. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 5016. A bill to provide for the establishment of rates of compensation for positions in the Federal Government in appropriate relationship to local prevailing rates for similar positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 5017. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional exemption for a taxpayer or spouse who is permanently disabled, and an additional exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is permanently disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H. R. 5018. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of employers who are engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce, to eliminate certain exemptions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5019. A bill to raise the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5020. A bill to reduce the maximum workweek under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to 35 hours, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 5021. A bill to transfer to the government of the District of Columbia the public employment service for the District of Co-

lumbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5022. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to permit an individual with 40 years' service to retire regardless of his age, and to increase certain annuities by providing a new alternative base for computing monthly compensation in the case of service before 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5023. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 5024. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $1,200 to $1,500 the amount which may be taken into account in computing the retirement income credit thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 5025. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5026. A bill to provide for the issuance of not more than 25,000 special nonquota immigrant visas annually to certain persons who escape from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and whose services are determined by the Attorney General to be urgently needed in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIMTZ:

H. R. 5027. A bill to provide overtime pay for service of postal employees on Saturdays and Sundays during the month of December; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5028. A bill to reduce postage rates on parcels containing only food, clothing, medicines, or drugs sent by mail for relief purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 5029. A bill to establish an effective student-exchange program with Latin American countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 5030. A bill to increase the supply of scientific and technical manpower in the United States by providing a system of scholarships for college and graduate level study of scientific subjects, to be administered by the Commission of Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SAUND:

H. R. 5031. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 5032. A bill to allow civil actions on certain claims arising out of injury to, or loss of, property caused by shock waves emanating from aircraft flying at a rate of speed equal to, or greater than, the speed of sound, to be brought in district courts of the United States and certain other courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 5033. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 5034. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to authorize agreements with State banking authorities for the elimination of duplicate examinations of banks which are insured under such act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 5035. A bill to amend Public Law 598, 81st Congress, to provide for a further extension of patents under that act for certain veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H. R. 5036. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to Klamath County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 5037. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 5038. A bill to amend the act of August 15, 1953 (Public Law No. 280, 83d Cong.), to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with any State or political subdivision to share in the cost of criminal law enforcement within Indian country; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5039. A bill to amend section 2 (a) of the Federal Airport Act, so as to provide that periodic application of surface treatments to airport pavements to avoid ultimate reconstruction shall be deemed to constitute repairing of the airport; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5040. A bill to amend the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 to broaden its coverage to include all natural disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5041. A bill to prohibit insurance companies doing insurance business of an interstate character from issuing group health, hospitalization, and accident insurance which may be canceled after a period of 18 months for any reason other than nonpayment of premium; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 5042. A bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 5043. A bill to establish a Bureau of Crime Prevention in the Department of Justice, and to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5044. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 5045. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to increase the penalty for transmitting false distress signals by radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5046. A bill to aid navigation and protect the fishing industry in the waters adjacent to New York City by prohibiting the dumping of certain materials in such waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5047. A bill to aid navigation and protect the fishing industry by prohibiting the dumping of certain materials in the coastal navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 5048. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the frigate *Constellation* and to provide for her rehabilitation, berthing, and restoration within the area of Fort McHenry National Monument and historic shrine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 5049. A bill to amend titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act so as to further assist the States in extending aid for medical care to persons eligible for public assistance under such titles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5050. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5051. A bill to increase the monthly rates of pension payable to widows and former widows of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5052. A bill to increase the annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5053. A bill to repeal the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954, to require certain distribution and approval of new public building projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5054. A bill to establish a pension program for veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5055. A bill to authorize the flood-control project for the Saline River and tributaries, Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOORE:

H. R. 5056. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5057. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HESS:

H. J. Res. 243. Joint resolution designating the 7-day period beginning October 20, 1957, as Cleaner Air Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. J. Res. 244. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating the first Sunday of February of each year as Chaplains' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. Res. 168. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 169. Resolution to provide funds for the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 168; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RAY:

H. Res. 170. Resolution to amend the rules of the House to limit expenditures for fiscal year 1958; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. Res. 171. Resolution to provide funds for necessary expenses of the Committee on Banking and Currency; to the Committee on House Administration.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK: Senate Concurrent Resolution F of the 35th Legislative Assembly, State of North Dakota, memorializing the Government of the United States not to recognize the Kadar regime as the present Hungarian Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Montana seeking an adjustment in the Federal farm program as it relates to the grower of quality wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to viewing with alarm and disapproval the unwarranted action of the Secretary of the Army of the Government of the United States relating to the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 5058. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Drina Sinovcic and Vincence (Vincent) Sinovcic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5059. A bill for the relief of Katherine S. Collins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 5060. A bill for the relief of Vladimir Landow and Irina Landow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 5061. A bill for the relief of Harry V. Shoop, Frederick J. Richardson, Joseph D. Rosenlieb, Joseph E. P. McCann, and Junior K. Schoolcraft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 5062. A bill for the relief of Albert H. Ruppar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 5063. A bill for the relief of Ching-Hsien Chiang and his wife, Chun-I Chiang (nee Wang); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H. R. 5064. A bill for the relief of Oei Swan Nio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5065. A bill for the relief of Raimundo Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5066. A bill for the relief of Maria Rosario Cecere Santoianni; to the Committee on the Judicary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 5067. A bill for the relief of Angelos Karydis and his wife, Maria Karydis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 5068. A bill for the relief of Claudette Yuin Rubin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5069. A bill for the relief of Mary B. B. Sherwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 5070. A bill for the relief of Maria M. Haderecker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5071. A bill for the relief of Elenora Pollifione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 5072. A bill for the relief of Johan Karel Christoph Schlicter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5073. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosa Costa Monroe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 5074. A bill for the relief of Col. Fred E. Dueker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 5075. A bill for the relief of Masako Myakoshi Zimmerman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 5076. A bill for the relief of Dr. Milorad V. Dordevich and his minor son, Dusan Dordevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5077. A bill for the relief of Antonio Hernandez-Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5078. A bill for the relief of Stepan Amirayan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5079. A bill for the relief of Crocifissa Sparacello Beltempo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5080. A bill for the relief of Maria Domenica D'Angelo Padovani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5081. A bill for the relief of Capt. Thomas C. Curtis and Capt. George L. Lane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5082. A bill for the relief of Joe Kawakami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5083. A bill for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 5084. A bill for the relief of Maria Alma Dizon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5085. A bill for the relief of George Kuosing Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H. R. 5086. A bill for the relief of Azzam Issac Rafidi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 5087. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eloisa Rodriguez de Monterrosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 5088. A bill for the relief of David Mark Sterling and Judith Kobudeh Sterling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 5089. A bill to authorize the award, posthumously, of Congressional Medals of Honor to Chaplain George L. Fox, Chaplain Alexander D. Goode, Chaplain Clark V. Poling, and Chaplain John P. Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 5090. A bill for the relief of Pashupati Adhikary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5091. A bill for the relief of Zygmunt W. Gutowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 5092. A bill for the relief of Tomas Enciso Dy Liacco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 5093. A bill for the relief of Joseph Diana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 5094. A bill for the relief of Julia Mateo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5095. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annamarie Eibl Rogers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 5096. A bill for the relief of Vasilios Kavalieratos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

87. By Mr. BURDICK: Resolution of the New Rockford, N. Dak., Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, urging that the first Sunday in February of each year be set aside as Chaplains' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

88. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Ottumwa Aerie No. 114, Fraternal Order of Eagles, urging that the first Sunday in February of each year be set aside as Chaplains' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

89. By Mr. SADLAK: Petition of the Fraternal Order of Eagles in respect to the setting aside of the first Sunday of February each year as Chaplains' Day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

90. By the SPEAKER: Petition of David H. Johnson, Draper, Utah, stating a grievance relating to case No. 3651, *State of Utah* v. *David H. Johnson, defendant;* to the Committee on the Judiciary.

91. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Regina E. Kane, Washington, D. C., transmitting material in support of a Federal lottery bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## A Divided Policy in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 19, 1957*

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the President has repeatedly warned against the constant increase of the elements of a depression. Secretary Humphrey warns that unless we stop inflation we shall have a depression "that will curl your hair." I believe he is right. The President is right.

On the other hand, what do we find? The Bureau of Engraving is about to install a new currency printing press that is, so it is said, capable of turning out currency twice as fast as the old press. Apparently the Bureau of Engraving is looking ahead and preparing for the future.

More bills will have to be printed if we can come anywhere near keeping up with the appropriations intended for foreign countries. The only thing that has stopped a further rise in inflation is that the old press couldn't turn out the bills fast enough. Now, with the advent of this new press the way is cleared for the foundation of one of those depressions that, as Humphrey says, "will curl your hair." How you can stop inflation by turning out bills faster is a mystery I cannot solve.

These bills will be backed by United States bonds drawing interest, the bonds will be sold to the large banks, and these same bonds will be surrendered to the Government as security for the new currency, and the banks will distribute the currency; and for their trouble they will get the interest on the bonds. The Government will collect the interest on the bonds without charge and hand the proceeds over to the banks. If this is not contributing to an inflation, I don't know what else could.

The only stoppage of more inflated currency has been the inability of the Bureau to print money faster, to keep up with appropriations. Congress could stop this inflation by refusing gigantic appropriations, running into the billions—but for some reason Congress does not act. If the new press gets to going in good shape the doors will be open to more currency on which interest will have to be paid, and finally the debt retired by the next generation. In view of the appropriations now demanded by the administration, it might be wise not to discard the old press but keep that and the new press both going.

With this back door left entirely open and the bills coming out in ever-increasing volume, it is difficult to understand how the President is going to stop inflation. There seems to be no logic in a situation where the Government keeps turning out bills by the wholesale, and at the same time talking about heading off inflation and one of Humphrey's depressions.

I am not supposed to be very smart, and am quite inexperienced in the causes of depressions, but with what little I know and read in the newspapers this divided policy in Washington does not seem sensible.

I think the Bureau of Engraving made a great contribution to the people when they put the article in the paper describing how this new machine could turn out bills twice as fast as the old press.

Logically, I should think that to stop the further issuance of bills and more bills the proper move would be to cut down the capacity of the old machine and not buy the new one. Reason dictates that the only barrier to more inflated currency has not been due to anything Congress has done, but solely due to our inability to print money faster.

Will some educated genius in the administration please explain to ordinary Members of Congress how it is planned to stop inflation, when the same administration is hell-bent on issuing more currency?

## Thirty-Ninth Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, February 19, 1957*

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by me regarding the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BEALL

I recently received a letter from a person who has kept as close contact as possible with the situation inside Lithuania, and one sentence of that letter was so inspiring and encouraging that I would like to quote it at this time. It was as follows: "What meager news trickles through the Iron Curtain tells that there still exists a resistance movement and that there is an invincible will for freedom and independence." Having just observed the 39th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, we can all feel heartened that the flame of democracy is not merely flickering in Lithuania but that there is a strong fire—an invincible will—which is raging within the hearts of those who refuse to bow under the oppressor's yoke. Since the 16th century, Lithuania has struggled against totalitarian giants, and although her fight for the principles of justice has frequently been waged against almost overwhelming odds, the fact remains that it has been carried on valiantly and has become an example to the freedom-loving people of the entire world. Yes, we all owe much to Lithuania for it has shown us that the spirit of a free people cannot be crushed beneath a tyrant's heel. Therefore, let us remember the words of the Rev. Joseph J. Valantiejus, of St. Joseph's Lithuanian Parish in Waterbury, Conn., who observed the anniversary of Lithuanian independence in this great room by praying to the Almighty that the agony which Lithuanian endures today may be the promise of a more glorious resurrection.

## A Forward Step in Preserving and Strengthening the Dual Banking System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 19, 1957*

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to authorize agreements with State banking authorities for the elimination of duplicate examinations of banks which are insured under such act.

Presently these banks are examined yearly both by the State examiners and the appropriate Federal examiners. In the interest of economy and avoidance of duplication, it is my thought to work out an alternating schedule under which the State supervisor would agree to accept the Federal Reserve or Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation examiners report one year and have the State examiners report accepted by the Federal agency the next year. It should not be mandatory, I feel, but only permissive. Such a step would enable real savings to be made in cases where the efficiency and standards of State departmental examinations were considered adequate by the Federal Reserve, or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation authorities.

I believe this would be a forward step in preserving and strengthening the dual banking system and in promoting proper governmental economy.

The text of my proposed bill is as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 10 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Board of Directors, with respect to insured State nonmember banks in any State where the efficiency and standards of bank examinations (as conducted by the State authority having supervision of such banks) are determined by such Board to be adequate, shall have power to enter into an agreement with such State authority to eliminate duplication in examinations of such banks by establishing an alternating examination schedule under which (1) the examination of such banks will be made by the Board (and the report of the Board's examiners will be accepted by the State authority) in any year specified in such agreement and every second year thereafter, and (2) the examination of such banks will be made by the State authority (and the report of the State examiners will be accepted by the Board) in each alternate year.

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal Reserve Board, with respect to insured State member banks in any State where the efficiency and standards of bank examinations (as conducted by the State authority having supervision of such banks) are determined by such Board to be adequate, shall have power to enter into an agreement with such State authority to eliminate duplication in examinations of such banks by establishing an alternating examination schedule under which (1) the examination of such banks will be made by the Board (and the report of the Board's examiners will be accepted by the State authority) in any year specified in such agreement and every second year thereafter, and (2) the examination of such banks will be made by the State authority (and the report of the State examiners will be accepted by the Board) in each alternate year."

## Interest Rates on VA Mortgages Should Not Be Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 19, 1957*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is my statement before the Veterans' Affairs Committee on February 18, 1957:

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I appreciate the privilege of making my views known to you on this important subject with which you are now concerned.

The entire New York Democratic delegation joins me in vigorously urging your committee to reject all attempts to increase interest rates on VA mortgages.

Guaranteed mortgages are as good as Government bonds and should pay no higher net return.

Raising interest rates will not bring mortgage money to this market. Tax-exempt and high-return investments are taking all available money. You can sustain the VA mortgage market either by granting tax exemption to all VA mortgages that limit the

return for interest and discounts to a maximum return of 3½ percent per annum or by making available for direct loans to veterans $1 billion of United States Government life insurance funds until the mortgage market returns to normal. Every insurance company and every pension fund invests the bulk of its money in long-term mortgages. Government insurance funds should be similarly invested.

## Poland: A Test for American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.**
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 19, 1957*

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the triumph of the so-called national communism in Poland is one of the most interesting results of the recent unrest in the Soviet satellite States. In a complex series of political maneuvers the pro-Soviet Stalinists were apparently replaced by a group of "national Communists" as apart from "Soviet Communists." Communism, whatever the special title given to it, however, remains as the guiding philosophy of the Polish state.

This development in Poland is highly significant for the world Communist movement in general. It also has a bearing on Polish-American relations. It is, however, a situation which is charged with a high degree of uncertainty. The press reports such development in Poland would undoubtedly ease domestic tensions. However, no one knows when the regime may harden its attitude, if the circumstances require it.

The Polish problem is complex; it is difficult.

America's approach to this whole situation must be circumspect. Our policy should be determined by factors that bear either directly or indirectly upon what is best for our national interest. In this instance, it would seem that our interest is being served by the breaking down of Soviet control over Poland. Were this to take place throughout all the satellite states of Eastern Europe; the range and depth of Soviet power would be perceptibly reduced.

To accomplish this, however, is another matter. A call for liberation by open revolt would in all probability result in Soviet intervention and a wanton sacrifice of human life. America does not want this. What America does want is a policy that will aid the people of Poland and generally alleviate their depressed condition.

Today Poland is in a state of severe economic crisis. Reports in the press indicate that grain and fats will probably be in short supply before the next harvest. Machinery for coal mining is also needed. America might well, therefore, consider a program of economic aid for Poland. In this way prospects for a better life for the Polish people might be somewhat improved.

Whatever the United States decides to do, it must be done with the greatest circumspection, bearing always in mind the danger of provoking an intervention by the Soviet Union. In many respects American policy toward Poland is impaled upon the horns of a dilemma: If the United States does not provide some form of aid to Poland, the economic situation may worsen, in which case the Polish Stalinists might be able to reimpose their own rule. On the other hand, if the United States does aid Poland, there is always the chance that the Soviet Union might interpret such aid as a provocation. The risks of intervention are, therefore, always present.

America's ties with Poland are many, and they are strong. Millions of men and women of Polish ancestry live in the United States. Great traditions have created spiritual bonds between the United States and Poland. Thus, Americans are naturally stirred by a deep sense of concern for the welfare of the Polish people and it is this, our concern for the Polish people themselves, that may provide the key to our dilemma. What I mean is that if the administration does decide to give aid to Poland, and there is much talk of doing that these days, then the aid should be so designed that it contributes to the people's welfare. It should not support the Gomulka regime as such. It would not have the effect of strengthening communism. But if a way can be found to channel help directly to the people of Poland themselves, a way of easing their burdens and of putting food on their tables, then it would be welcome and worthy of support.

## No Sanctions Against Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO**
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 19, 1957*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, all of us are deeply concerned over the situation in the Middle East. We are concerned over the fate of Israel and its security and survival as a free and independent state. We are concerned over the attitude of some of the Arab countries, especially Egypt, because of their friendly relations with Communist Russia and for enabling that country to obtain a foothold in this vital area. We are concerned over Russian efforts to gain control of the Middle East, capture its oil resources, weaken the West and endanger our whole position. Most particularly, are we concerned lest events in this area might lead to a new world war with more dire consequences than in the past.

Unfortunately, our country has pursued a policy of drifting and stalling in recent years as far as the Middle East is concerned. We have not acted with firmness, as befits a world power such as the United States. Today, Nasser of Egypt and others of his ilk are dictating the terms and putting forth the demands—instead of the United States telling them what to do in the best interests of the free world. Many of these countries are dependent on us for foreign aid, then they turn right around, flirt with the Russians, purchase arms from them and keep the whole Middle East in turmoil.

The State of Israel could no longer withstand the constant provocations from Egypt and the raids by Arab gangs across its borders, and was forced to march into the Sinai Peninsula to wipe out the attackers in defense of its population. Britain and France could no longer stand idly by while Nasser seized the Suez Canal and disrupted their commerce, and they sent troops to occupy the canal. What did we do? Did we pursue a policy of aiding our friends and allies? No, we criticized them severely and condemned them in the United Nations. We insisted that Britain and France leave the Suez Canal at once. We helped maintain Nasser in power from which he was about to topple—and now we have a worse mess in the area.

Then we insisted that Israel give up the Sinai Peninsula, withdraw to its previous borders, and relinquish the Gaza Strip, which never belonged to Egypt anyway. Now that Israel asks for firm guaranties for its shipping in the Gulf of Aqaba and protection against the renewal of raids from Gaza, we are talking about applying sanctions against Israel in order to strangle this little state, the only true democratic state in the Middle East.

Many of the leaders of both parties in Congress have warned that imposing sanctions against Israel is not only immoral and unjustified, but that it would be a most shameful way of meting out punishment to the weak and small states. Soviet Russia was permitted to get off scot free for her acts of murder and brutality against the people of Hungary. India has taken over Kashmir, while completely ignoring world opinion. Egypt seized the Suez Canal, has obstructed passage through the canal to the detriment of Western Europe, is agitating its neighbors to rise up in arms against France, and has carried on a constant state of war and provocations against Israel—but not a word from the United Nations or the United States to apply sanctions against her.

Is it right that there should be a double standard of morality, one for the weak and another for the strong? Can sanctions against Israel be justified, if no similar measures were taken against Soviet Russia, India, and Egypt? Can the United States, which is recognized far and wide as the moral leader of the free world, still continue in that role if we support sanctions against Israel?

It is high time for the United States to point out the hypocrisy involved here, or else be branded in the eyes of all the little and weak nations as being on the side of the bullies and the demagogs. I should not like to see our country placed in the same category with such preachers of morality as Russia's Khrushchev and India's Nehru. The world, the right-thinking people in this world, sized them up for what they are a long time ago.

The United States has the power to stop any harsh and foolish action in the United Nations which can only serve the purposes of Communist Russia in keeping the Middle East stirred up. Let us not be a partner to such deeds which we may regret for many years to come and which may take a long time to rectify. Sanctions against Israel, whether moral, economic, or military, will not bring its people to their knees; it will only make them more miserable, more bitter, more desperate. What may come out of a situation of this kind is not difficult to understand.

I earnestly hope that this country will not allow itself to become involved in supporting the double standard of morality as currently practiced in the United Nations. In the long run, it will prove more dignified and more secure for our country to defend the rights of the little countries. It may also help save the United Nations from its present ineffectiveness and make it a valuable instrument of peace, instead of tearing it down completely.

Our policy now should be: No sanctions against Israel. Let us state it in clear and unequivocal terms.

## The Torch of Liberty in Trust—Remarks on Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 19, 1957*

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, on this past Sunday, the Philadelphia branch of the Lithuanian-American Community of the United States, Inc., conducted a program of exercises commemorating the restoration of Lithuania's independence during that brief period between the two World Wars.

The affair, attended by hundreds of Philadelphians of Lithuanian descent, and by other Americans who admire the courage and the love of freedom of the Lithuanian people, was held in Lithuanian Music Hall, 2715 East Allegheny Avenue. It was an honor for me to be invited by Mr. Jonas A. Stiklorius to attend the meeting and to speak to the group.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I submit the text of some remarks which I made on the occasion of Lithuanian Independence Day, as follows:

THE TORCH OF LIBERTY IN TRUST

(Remarks by Congresswoman KATHRYN E. (Mrs. WILLIAM T.) GRANAHAN at ceremonies commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day, Lithuarian Music Hall, Philadelphia, February 17, 1957)

I appreciate very much the kind invitation from Mr. Jonas A. Stiklorius to meet here this afternoon with Philadelphians of Lithuanian descent to join with you in the observance of Lithuanian Independence Day.

Of course, we all know that what we celebrate here in free America today is an event which is not being celebrated and which cannot be celebrated by the people who actually live in what was once free Lithuania. They are prisoners, prisoners of communism, prisoners of Soviet Russia, of a foreign power which occupies their land and which seeks to destroy the national characteristics of the Lithuanian people.

It is fitting that here in Philadelphia we observe Lithuanian Independence Day, for it is true, as a group of great Americans who met here in our city nearly 200 years ago maintained, that abridgment of freedom anywhere is an abridgment of our freedom.

We hold the torch of liberty and of freedom in trust for the people of Lithuania, until that day when the nation shall again be free. I look forward to that great day, as I know all of you do who are here today.

I did not come here to make a speech. I came to meet with you, to join with you in what is not so much a happy celebration as a solemn one.

Some of you here, I am sure, were in Lithuania on that eventful day 39 years ago when the brave and freedom-loving people of that nation seized the opportunity to declare the independence of their country. I am sure it was a day any of you who were there will never forget. I suggest to you that you never let any of us forget it either. It is so long since America won its freedom—so many generations ago—that often we tend to forget the struggles and the heartaches and the difficulties and suffering which went into the achievement of our freedom.

You—any of you who were present in Lithuania when freedom came there 39 years ago—should make it a point when you are talking with other Americans to tell them of those days and what they meant to you. This is the kind of talk, of propaganda for freedom, which we all need to hear once in a while. We all need to know how it feels to live in slavery and to finally come into the bright light of freedom; how it feels if any of you lived through the nightmare—of going from freedom back to bondage.

These are thoughts and concepts which we must relearn in this country, because those of us who were born here have learned of these things only by hearsay—second-hand or third-hand, or out of books. We need to know it more familiarly—by talking to and listening to those who have experienced personally these great changes in human relationships.

But, as I said, I did not come to meet with you today in order to make a speech. Making speeches is still a somewhat new experience for me. But meeting people, getting to know the interests of others, finding out the problems which people find themselves beset with—these are familiar things for me, for I did those things during all the years when my husband was the Member of Congress in the family, and I went along with him to so many of the affairs where he met the people of our district.

In Congress now, we are discussing various means of achieving world peace—of ending the threat of hydrogen warfare. We know of the acute and ever-present danger which confronts us from the Communist conspiracy. I think that as a people, and as a country, we are pretty aware of the dangers.

But we have not yet learned, I think, to pay enough attention to the human problems involved. Our immigration laws are too severe, too strict, too exclusive. We have arranged many elaborate propaganda stunts—either through the Government or through private organizations—to encourage brave people to escape from behind the Iron Curtain, but then, too often, we let them sit and rot somewhere while we argue over where such a person can go to start a new life.

That is the sort of thing we have not handled well enough, I think, in this cold war with communism. I hope we can improve the situation, and take care of that problem, in new immigration legislation. I will certainly support it. I am pledged to support it.

And now I want to say in conclusion that I am glad I came—that I am happy to be here—and that I hope that next year—or in some year not far from now—when we celebrate Lithuanian Independence Day, it will be at a time when Lithuania is again free and independent.

I know we all look forward to that happy day—to that bright and shining and wonderful day.

Thank you.

## Equal Justice Under the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 19, 1957*

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the entire world has always looked up to the United States as the land that translates great idealism into positive action on behalf of righteousness. "Equal Justice Under Law" is not only carved in solid marble over the entrance to the United States Supreme Court, but it is equally imbued into our philosophy of government. The spirit of fair play is but another manifestation of our adherence to the Golden Rule. May I now make an appeal to the moral conscience of America, in order that the luster of its great name and just fame not be dimmed?

As an American, I express profound concern over the situation in the Middle East, and as a Member of the Congress of the United States, I appeal to the Executive, and particularly to its State Department, to judge the case of Israel with the sense of equity and fair play which has at all times characterized American policy at home, as well as abroad.

Having withdrawn its forces from the Sinai Peninsula, with the exception of Sharm el Sheikh and Gaza, Israel now requests that Egypt make a promise of nonbelligerency upon the complete withdrawal of Israeli troops. There can be no question that the Gaza strip was used as the base for fedayeen raids, and that fedayeen raids still are part of Egyptian and general Arab policy. Israel's wish for protection is thoroughly understandable, and her request that Egypt make a mere elementary promise to desist from the blocking of Israeli shipping and the slaughter of innocent Israeli citizens through raids would constitute an action which would assure progress toward the creation of peaceful conditions.

Furthermore, to apply sanctions against Israel for noncompliance would stand out in striking contrast to the complete failure of the United Nations to impose, or even to suggest, the imposition of sanctions against Egypt for its 6-year defiance of the Security Council

resolution on Suez, or against the Soviet Union for its cruel and inhuman suppression of the brave Hungarian struggle for freedom.

I submit, what Israel is entitled to is reassurance that the United States will not permit a mere return to the previous unsatisfactory relationship. Therefore, a means must be found by which Israel and her Arab neighbors can get along in peace with each other.

I affirm that the State of Israel, whether or not as a result of a stipulated bargain, must be made secure inside its frontiers. It must, like the rest of the world, enjoy equal rights of navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba and through the Suez Canal, and it must not be treated by its Arab neighbors as though a state of war was still continuing.

I earnestly urge that the United States not become involved, through the imposition of sanctions against the tiny State of Israel, in what history will surely judge to be a double standard of morality.

That all right thinking Americans share this view can readily be seen in the editorial pages of our country's press. Thus, for example, the Baltimore Evening Sun, of February 18, 1957, in an editorial, says in part, which I quote:

The United States thus stands firm on the policy originally outlined for solving this unfortunate dilemma. That Israel, whose rights have too often been disregarded in the past, should be skeptical is understandable. However, if the United States and the other members of the United Nations do not intend to deal with this problem now in a way to safeguard Israeli interests they are going to incure a terrible responsibility. Such a failure would do more to break down international law and frustrate the processes of the United Nations than anything that could be imagined. In brief, the scales are heavily, even overwhelmingly weighted in favor of eventually translating the assurances so far given to Israel into the guaranties which Israel is asking.

## A Republican Prescribes for His Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, February 19, 1957*

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Sunday last, February 17, there was published in the magazine section of the New York Times a notable and thoughtful article entitled "A Republican Prescribes for His Party," written by my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REPUBLICAN PRESCRIBES FOR HIS PARTY

WASHINGTON.—It is obvious that an impressive majority of Americans regard President Eisenhower as the symbol-in-chief of the basic philosophy which they believe should govern this country. Taking the country as a whole, I think it is equally obvious that neither of our political parties is presently so regarded.

I believe the Republican Party can become an effective exponent and instrument of this philosophy. Perhaps the Democratic Party can also, though inner cleavages make the task more difficult for them. But my concern is with the Republican Party and I share, for two reasons, President Eisenhower's concern that our party meet the challenge.

In the first place, it is my deep conviction that, for our country's sake and the world's too, it is of crucial importance that this philosophy continue to determine the policies and actions of the Government of the United States. And, in the second place, the situation presents our party with an unparalleled opportunity to erase from the minds of far too many people the identification of Republicanism with the doctrines and thinking of a bygone age. We can, if we will, establish a valid and irresistible claim to national leadership for the indefinite future.

To define this philosophy in which most Americans believe is a formidable task. In one sense, it does not exist. We are a pragmatic people, with little interest in elaborate philosophies. It is broadly true that America does not have an ideology; it is one.

But there are certain principles in which most Americans believe deeply. We believe that people (the individual rather than collective man) are the most important things in the world. Toynbee and others have suggested that the underlying basis for this is religious: the belief that each human being is created in the image of God or, at least, with a spark of the Divine in him. I think they are probably right. But whatever its basis, the belief exists: people are entitled to equal treatment, to protection, to a fair break. Americans are compassionate.

And Americans are optimistic. They believe that things can always be improved and that they ought to be.

But Americans have commonsense, too. They have never worn rose-colored glasses when they looked at human nature. They know that man is rational and capable of great accomplishments. But they know, too, that man is not perfect, that he has enormous capacity for evil, to say nothing of lesser frailties, and that therefore no single man or group of men can be allowed to run the show. Americans have always insisted on a division of power. This has been true in both the structure of our Government and the organization of society.

Our insistence on civilian control of the military is an illustration of this. So is our skeptical reaction whenever suggestions are made to center authority in the hands of an élite. Characteristically American is the comment of Judge Learned Hand: "Plato jumped hurdles that are too high for my legs."

Surely this principle is one of the basic reasons for our strong belief in private property and a capitalist system of economics. But since we believe in these institutions pragmatically, not dogmatically, we have never permitted them to be ends in themselves. We do not shrink from governmental intervention to insure that our economy produces a constantly improved standard of living shared as widely as possible. And we insist that the Government intervene to protect the individual against hardships he cannot master through his own efforts.

Americans believe in work. Not just in work for the masses, with leisure for a chosen few. We believe that each should make his own way.

The American understands that while change is inevitable—and desirable—it must not be too rapid. George Kennan recently noted that progress must not be attempted at so fast a pace that the experience of the father has no relevance to the problems of the son.

Just as he rejects violent or revolutionary change, the American also rejects, as destructive of the general feeling of security, any effort to pit one group of Americans against another. He knows that he cannot be secure unless everyone else is also secure. With occasional lapses which, happily, are short-lived, he gives little heed to demagogs. Americans understand that tolerance and consideration for everyone are not only virtues but necessities, if we are to maintain a democratic society under government by consent.

These, I think, are some of the things Americans believe—not all Americans all the time, but most Americans most of the time. Americans, it is true, do not always live up to their own beliefs, but, by and large, they have seen to it that these beliefs govern their collective actions. And they generally respond to, and insist on having, leadership which stands for these principles.

This list of things in which Americans believe does not purport to be exhaustive. But I believe that a better understanding of what America is can be found in terms of this blend of compassion, optimism and commonsense than in any of the explanations more commonly offered in ideological terms, such as "liberalism" or "conservatism."

Actually, America is neither liberal nor conservative. Or perhaps it would be more accurate to say she is both—liberal in spirit and motivation, and conservative in action. For my own part, I should prefer not to use either of these terms, for they only make understanding more difficult. For example, among those wide of the mark are the self-styled "liberals" whose liberalism in recent years has been reduced to little more than sterile hostility to the American business system and an effort to solve all our problems through the aggrandizement of Federal power. Another group yearns to establish some sort of "conservatism" on a model vaguely drawn from European feudal experience and wholly irrelevant to the American scene.

Still another group insists that salvation lies only in a return to pure laissez faire as if, to paraphrase Mr. Justice Frankfurter, Adam Smith were a prophet whose generalizations had been imparted to him on Sinai and not merely a thinker who addressed himself to the elimination of restrictions which had become fetters upon initiative in his day. It is becoming clearer to everyone that none of these doctrinaire approaches can lead us anywhere.

Yet Americans do have a working philosophy. Compassion—or decency, if you will—optimism, and commonsense are basic elements in that philosophy and, as I have suggested, they are what America looks to find in its leaders. It is, I think, because most Americans feel that President Eisenhower possesses these characteristics to a degree greater than any other public figure today that he holds so unshakably the trust and confidence of the American people.

Of course, these are simple things. We are all familiar with the criticism that the President speaks in platitudes, albeit sincerely. Platitudes or not, these are principles that Americans believe in. And it is in large measure because of these principles that we have been able to prove that a great nation, despite its incomparable diversity and the enormous centrifugal forces which it contains, can nevertheless exist under government by consent.

At the outset, I suggested that, taken as a whole, the people of America do not think that either of our political parties, as a party, is an effective exponent of these principles. I believe this is so and I do not think that either party, as a party, can take much comfort from the results of the recent election. But if either of our two major parties could persuade the American people that it effec-

tively embodied these characteristics the American people would give it their overwhelming support.

A party seeking this support must stand for an affirmative program and policies, ever pushing forward in accustomed areas, and ever breaking new ground as fast as fiscal prudence and social stability permit. This is the true middle of the road which Americans in overwhelming numbers believe is right.

There are those who admonish the Republicans not to attempt this affirmative role. They argue there is no political advantage in being moderately progressive, since those who are will always be outpromised by the ultraradicals. A minority of the small group who advance this argument have a purely selfish interest in opposing any change. Others hold the pessimistic view that mankind is bent on a headlong dash to self-destruction and that the most that can be done is to slow the descent.

The pessimists overlook the commonsense of America. What they fear could become a reality only if the course they advocate were followed. Americans will turn to ultraradical leadership and dangerous tinkering with our institutions only if they feel that they have no alternative in the form of steady progress at a sound and balanced pace.

Nor would a party seeking to establish itself as the symbol of affirmative leadership have to make undue concessions to any particular group. The American people have many times demonstrated that they will support leadership in which they have confidence without receiving special favors.

The problem, of course, is how either party—and my concern is with the Republican Party—can gain this confidence.

This is not as easy as it might seem. It is not a simple thing, within the framework of American political habits and institutions, for either of our political parties, as parties, to present to the public a clear and convincing picture of what it stands for. Nor is it easy for a party to change its public image once one has been established.

For this purpose, party platforms have little, if any, value. The public knows perfectly well that platforms are not blueprints for an integrated program of action and that the parties' candidates do not feel any real sense of commitment to their provisions.

Nor do pronouncements by the national committees of our parties, or by their chairmen, have any appreciable effect on the public mind. The people know that our national committees are not policymaking bodies. The refusal of Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON to serve on the policy advisory committee recently announced by the Democratic national chairman is a significant confirmation of this.

An American political party has its great opportunity to establish a convincing public character when there is a strong President who is a member of that party. This is true even though the public has a tendency to regard a successful national administration as the personal accomplishment of the President and not of his party.

The Democratic Party accomplished this in Franklin D. Roosevelt's first term. In that period, which for most Americans was the bitterest in our history since the Civil War, the Democratic Party succeeded in identifying itself in the public mind with efforts to help people. It managed to achieve this public image for itself, as a party, despite the fact that the President himself was an outstanding personality. The New Deal was, indeed, F. D. R.'s, but the public came to feel that it was the Democratic Party's, too. How was this accomplished?

It was accomplished, in large measure, because the great majority of Democrats in both House and Senate were really behind the President and the measures he proposed. (And both the specific measures and their objectives were always explained in terms of helping people.) The Democrats sounded like a team and they acted like a team. Both are important.

There were dissident Democrats all through the New Deal, of course. But, through a combination of their own self-restraint and of the Roosevelt political skill in dealing with individuals and in playing down the most seriously divisive issues, such as civil rights, the dissidents were regarded as a small minority not representative of the Democratic Party as a whole.

When proposals came from the White House, Democrats in Congress were loud in their praise. The leaders in both Houses and other prominent Democratic Members worked effectively, through the committees and on the floor, to see that these measures became law. There was close cooperation between the party leadership in Congress and the White House; disagreements between them were for the most part adjusted privately. Both the appearance and the fact of unity between the President and congressional Democrats were sustained with solid legislative results.

This period ended, for all practical purposes, with the defeat of the Supreme Court packing bill in 1937. But by that time the Democratic Party had acquired a solid reputation for being for the people. That reputation lasted much longer than the period of truly effective cooperation between the President and his party in Congress. Indeed, it is still a political fact of considerable significance.

Is not the lesson for the Republicans plain? I think it is. And I believe there is no reason why we cannot act upon it.

It would be pointless to pretend, of course, that there are no factions within the Republican Party or that any kind of forward-looking program, partywide in concept, could be adopted without a certain amount of friction. Our party, like the Democratic Party, is a coalition of many groups having many diverse regional, social and economic goals. The vitality of a political party in America depends, not upon a monolithic singleness of purpose, but upon its ability to give and take in particulars while remaining united on common objectives.

There are, for example, some prominent members of our party (the Democrats suffer from the same schizophrenia) who are opposed, in while or in part, to the idea of foreign economic aid, which is a cornerstone of our current foreign policy. And, in the domestic field, there are those who object on principle to the Federal Government's taking a leading role in relieving local shortages of schools, health services and similar welfare needs. Still others feel that almost every Government undertaking should be held subservient to the goal of achieving a balanced budget. Indeed, there are some who take a skeptical view of all that is embraced in what is loosely and imprecisely defined as "Eisenhower Republicanism."

My brief is, however, that this represents a decidedly minority view within our party—and a diminishing one. I also believe that we can find very substantial agreement on the principles of the various legislative proposals which are necessary to give effect to the basic philosophy for which the President stands.

But there is a vital difference between acquiescence in principle and the kind of active, vocal and effective support which Congressional Republicans must give to a comprehensive, affirmative program if the party is to achieve public acceptance as a party dedicated to the Eisenhower philosophy.

It is necessary for the Republicans in Congress and their leadership to make a conscious and deliberate decision to give their collective support to the enactment of such a program. They must push as hard for progressivism as for prudence. Individual members, except where they cannot do so in good conscience, must support the program in its entirety—not merely those parts the need for which is immediate and pressing in their own constituencies. Committees and committee chairmen in both Houses, though they must have full opportunity to exercise their responsibilities, must not be permitted to abuse their authority by bottling up legislation.

I do not suggest that either Republicans or Democrats in Congress should be mere rubber stamps. But I have tried to demonstrate that what Americans believe in and seek—and find exemplified in the President's philosophy—should present no difficulties in principle for the great majority of Republican legislators.

For most of them—not all, of course, but certainly a great majority—the problem is not one of switching to a whole new and different set of basic principles, as was the case, for example, in Senator Vandenberg's reorientation in the field of foreign policy. Such change as is necessary is mainly in emphasis and approach. It involves discarding certain attitudes and habits of speech understandably acquired during long years when the Republicans were the opposition party. It involves accepting with energy and enthusiasm an affirmative responsibility for providing the kind of leadership, at once progressive and prudent, which most Americans seek. Surely a party which can't do this has no right to expect the confidence and support of the American people and no valid claim to leadership. And, in the minds of the people, we Republicans in Congress are the Republican Party.

It is hard to conceive a more favorable opportunity to win the confidence and support of the American people than that which the next few months and years present to the Republican Party. It rests with the Republicans in Congress and with the leadership from the White House whether we shall grasp that opportunity.

---

## Some Thoughts on the $10 Billion Advertising Industry While Driving to Trenton, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 19, 1957*

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a companion measure to Senator NEUBERGER's bill providing standards for the control and limitation of billboards within 500 feet of the right-of-way on each side of the highways to be built under the huge road program authorized by the 84th Congress.

This does not mean that I do not approve of billboards, but I fear what certain abuses can do to the landscape along this new highway system. In their proper place billboards serve a useful purpose and in that place I approve of them, just as I approve of the $10 billion American advertising industry.

I hope, however, that this new Federal highway system can be built to the high standards of excellence which have been set in my State by the New Jersey State Turnpike and the Garden State Parkway, for these highways are an inspiration to the entire country. Absence

of an unsightly array of billboards has helped put these New Jersey highways so far ahead of some highways in some other States that it is hard to believe they are in the same country.

Certainly the practice of plastering our great traffic arteries from one end of the country to the other with an endless string of billboards carrying a monotonous repetition of advertising copy is one of the less appetizing aspects of American advertising—one that could well cost this essential $10 billion industry, and the American business firms which use it, much of the good will which they now have.

The great growth of the automobile in our country is due in part to its efficiency, and it has become a necessity in our everyday business life.

But there is in each of us something of the nomad, and we like nothing better than to get out on the open road, leave the clutter of the city behind and head for the country, the green fields, the woods, the fresh streams.

With the growth of urbanization, the countryside is diminishing and we find there is no escape from the city. It stretches along the eastern seaboard for hundreds of miles. The green fields, the woods, the fresh streams these days are increasingly and effectively hidden behind an overpowering, depressing, and never-ending forest of billboards.

Yet this is but one aspect of advertising.

There is another side, a side which we must foster. It is with this other aspect that I am particularly concerned. My measure is a hopeful attempt to save American advertising from excesses that undoubtedly will be harmful to it in the long run.

Let us look at the brighter side, the contribution of American advertising to educational and cultural values.

Today if we want Shakespeare and Shaw, Sibelius and Mozart, a lesson in music appreciation or the ballet, a collective lecture on literature from the foremost savants of our time, or a pictorial presentation of the great events of history it is no longer supplied us, as in the past, only through the classrooms of our schools. The education and the pleasures that go with it are ladled out to us in enormously expensive portions by Ford and General Electric, by Goodyear and Firestone, by Westinghouse and the manufacturers of kitchen appliances, cornflakes, soap and cosmetics, floorcoverings and hardware. These juvenile and adult educational curricula augment the education we receive in our schools.

The businessman, I imagine to his own amazement, has found a new bonanza of public relations and commercial approach. This approach is through the medium of the dissemination of the richest materials in western civilization.

Electronics is the new and additional conduit for the education of the American people. Instead of merely endowing a school, as in the past, the businessman or the corporation he runs has now become in effect the board of overseers, the chancellor, the faculty board, and everything else in a new order of things where the classroom is the collective living rooms of America.

This is a potential of such significance to the progress of mankind that we here are too close to its origin and development to appreciate its significance for the future.

Just how much the advertising enthusiasm of our age has contributed to the public welfare and to the enlightenment that brought with it the hunger for better living and more and still more public education, I cannot say.

But the contribution has certainly been immense.

Recognizing all this, and with all due credit to business and advertising, I still say that gross imperfections have developed because it is not the primary function of business to educate us in the arts and the humanities. Nor, as we see from much of roadside advertising, for instance, does business make any pretense of being the educator of America and the promoter of America's cultural interests. The net effect is mixed. There is an obvious conflict between maintaining and improving America's cultural values and persuading us to buy a particular package of breakfast cereal or a particular automobile.

Nor can it be gainsaid that while the contribution of the businessman's advertising budget to the culture of our country has been considerable, much of the contribution cannot be called culture at all.

I am hopeful that America's $10 billion advertising industry will see its long-term interests in this matter and join me in supporting this measure which I am introducing.

American business, which consumes the raw materials and the rich resources of the earth in such phenomenal quantities, has become conservation minded and has adopted techniques for the wise and efficient use of these resources.

So I have hopes that American business and the advertising industry generally will do what it can to make America more beautiful, and support legislation which has this end as its purpose.

I include here an article from the New York Times of February 24, 1957:

A BILLBOARD BILL—NEW LEGISLATION TO RID UNITED STATES HIGHWAYS OF COMMERCIAL SIGNS IS EXPLAINED

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. NEUBERGER, the junior Senator from Oregon, is sponsor of a bill to control and regulate billboards along the new federal system of interstate highways.)

Despite the inexorable growth of industrial suburbs and residential subdivisions, the American countryside still retains some of its original glory and grandeur. Will motorists have a fair and fighting chance to thrill to this outdoor majesty as they drive through the land over the 41,000 miles of the new interstate highway system? The vista seen by these travelers either can be the green solitudes of trees and fields or else a never-ending stockade of signboards.

During the next 13 years an unprecedented sum totaling $25 billion is going to be invested in the expansion and rebuilding of an interstate road network which will link all 48 State capitals, to say nothing of its contacts with every major metropolitan center in the Nation. Because the Federal Government will contribute 90 percent of the huge amount, I believe Congress has an obligation to protect wayside beauty along this vast mosaic of four-lane roads from being blotted out by commercial signs and similar blemishes.

THREE REQUIREMENTS

For this reason I have introduced legislation in the Senate imposing three specific requirements. They are these:

1. The Secretary of Commerce shall prepare a set of standards for the control and limitation of billboards within 500 feet of the right-of-way on each side of interstate roads.

2. These standards will apply directly wherever the interstate system crosses Federal public lands.

3. On other lands the Federal Government will pay 90 percent of the cost of buying up advertising rights along the 500-foot adjoining strip beside the highways whenever any State wishes to join cooperatively in such a project.

Many nomads of the open road, unalterably opposed to a picket fence of billboards between them and God's country, will wonder why this method was chosen for approaching the problem.

It is a concession to the issue of States rights, which was successfully raised on the Senate floor against an antibillboard proposal that Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, and I had included in the original interstate highway bill of last year. After this earlier billboard-regulation clause had been eliminated, it seemed obvious that any future proposal must provide for joint action with the States in order to have the slightest chance of prevailing against the well-organized lobby which invariably represents the signboard interests.

My present bill attempts to meet the States-rights argument by offering to every legislature in America an opportunity to put into effect high standards of roadside beautification at little financial cost to the individual States.

The Federal Government will pay 90 percent of what is required to buy up advertising rights along the new roads. Furthermore, any State government declining to take advantage of this bonanza will be under heavy pressure from those among its citizens who feel that billboards and scenery do not blend.

OLDER ROADS

Because some of the interstate system merely will be reconstructed rather than started from scratch in the open countryside, motorists have expressed curiosity over the fate of signboards which already line a considerable number of these highways.

One method will be employment of Federal funds to purchase from adjoining landowners their rights both to existing and prospective use of their land for advertising purposes. Another proposal is to require the old signs to come down after they have been amortized over a period of 3 or 4 years. Such a delay might not be too serious because completion of the interstate system will require at least 13 years.

It also is well to remember that the prohibition against signboards under my bill will be absolute and final in one realm where such protection of the outdoors is most needed and merited—on the vast Federal lands of the Western States. This includes national parks, national forests, wildlife refuges, public domain and all other Government acreage threaded by roads. In some of these thrilling areas, billboards already are taboo. But in others they stand, competing uncouthly with the wide open spaces for the eye and attention of the tourist.

CRITICAL MOMENT

The urgent nature of antisignboard legislation at this particular moment should be self-evident. The Nation is about to begin

upon the most ambitious roadbuilding program in American history. The time to protect these roads from defacement by commercial signs is now. Unless some proposal such as mine becomes law soon, more and more billboards will be erected beside thoroughfares destined to become part of the interstate system.

Some so-called grandfather rights will be acquired by these billboard owners. It will become more expensive to buy them out. Even under compulsion of Federal purchase, they will demand more time to amortize their investment. In addition, there will be protests of discrimination by advertisers who failed to get in under the wire against those already paralleling the new roads.

Lest I seem unduly harsh with the signboard companies, several points should be made clear. It is quite evident under my bill that advertising signs still will be legal in the crowded metropolitan areas, where most Americans now live. This bill is designed only to protect the scenic outdoors, not to redesign American cities. On top of all that, the bill specifically exempts any sign in a commercial area alongside the interstate highways which advertises a business or activity which takes place in such a commercial area.

The other side of the argument is crucial, too. The motorist pays for the highway with his fuel taxes, the excise levies on his car, and in a myriad of other invasions of his wallet. Because he has paid for the road, surely there should exist some right on his part to enjoy the road free of a clutter of signs and billboards. Without the road, the billboard would be worthless.

The highway gives the signboard its entire value. Thus the owners of the interstate system of highways—namely the traveling public of the United States—ought to retain final decision as to whether or not their roads are to be hemmed in by a corridor of billboards.

## Prevention and Treatment of Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 19, 1957*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which deals with a very vital problem in the life and the future well-being of our Nation, namely, the prevention of crime and the treatment and control of juvenile delinquency. I consider it vital because it concerns the most precious commodity which this country possesses—our children, who are this Nation's active citizens and leaders of tomorrow.

I have long been interested in the question of juvenile delinquency and have given considerable study to this problem. As a city magistrate in New York I dealt with many youthful offenders and this whole problem in its stark reality became even clearer and more urgent. As I look back upon that period when I sat on the bench, I recall that the cases involving youthful offenders were the most difficult to handle because I was not interested merely in meting out stern judgment but in helping to rehabilitate character and broken young lives.

The most deplorable manifestation of this problem is the rise in the number of youthful criminals and the serious offenses committed by them. Because of the menace it constitutes for our youth, juvenile delinquency has become a problem of national concern. Parents of growing children—and that means millions of us—are deeply worried over the associations and the interests of their children.

There are all sorts of theories, facts, and statistics on crime and its causes. I shall not go into these at this time. Nor am I ready to blame any particular segment or factor in our life for this deplorable situation. It is very definitely a combination of factors, and all of these should be thoroughly examined and analyzed. Perhaps the most deplorable of all is that we—and by that I mean the Federal and local authorities, the courts, the police, the schools, the parents—have been derelict in dealing with the problem of juvenile delinquency from a preventive standpoint.

About a year or so ago, a Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee pointed up sharply the need for national leadership in this field, with particular emphasis on the following: First, the striking gaps in existing programs for the control and the prevention of juvenile delinquency; second, the need for better coordination of services; third, the need for more training programs for personnel working with delinquent youth. If these and other efforts were undertaken, I feel certain that considerable headway could be made to curb the growth of crime and to reduce it to a minimum.

My bill seeks to provide national leadership in an all-out effort to find a solution to this problem. I believe that Congress should lead this crusade against crime. Congress has the authority to do this, it enjoys the respect of the Nation, and it will unquestionably receive wide support in an effort of this sort.

Mr. Speaker, in order to get to the roots of this situation I am introducing this legislation which I believe to be a step in the right direction. Specifically, the bill is entitled "Crime Prevention and Delinquent Children's Act of 1957" and is comprised of six major sections or titles, as follows:

Title I provides for the establishment of a Bureau of Crime Prevention in the Department of Justice as a permanent agency. It shall be the task of this bureau to conduct a continuous study and investigation to discover methods of preventing crime and curbing juvenile delinquency. The bureau will be required to set up an office in each State and to cooperate with Federal and State agencies in initiating crime-prevention programs.

Title II provides for grants to the States to strengthen and improve programs to combat juvenile delinquency. Such grants are to be authorized for a period of 7 years, beginning with a sum of $5 million for the fiscal year 1958, then a sum of $7,500,000 for 1959, $10 million for 1960, and such sums as Congress may determine in subsequent years. Grants are to be appropriated on the basis of the child population in each state and its ratio to the child population of the country. These funds are to be used by the States to determine the most urgent needs and the localities for control and treatment of juvenile delinquency, for developing plans to deal with the problem, treatment and aftercare of delinquent youth, research on the causes and extent of delinquency, and for similar other purposes.

Title III provides for grants to train personnel for employment in programs for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency. The purpose here is to have trained personnel available to cope with the preventive and the correctional aspects of delinquency. Congress is to appropriate the necessary funds for a period of 8 years as grants to the States and to approved nonprofit institutions of higher education for training such personnel. It is recommended that a sum of $5 million be appropriated for the fiscal year 1958.

Title IV provides for an annual appropriation of funds as grants to States and to institutions of higher learning for research on special projects which hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the strengthening of programs to combat juvenile delinquency and to demonstrate improved techniques for its control. A sum of $1 million is requested for the fiscal year 1958 for this purpose.

Title V contains a number of general provisions aimed in carrying out the purposes of the bill after its enactment. The Attorney General is to make studies and disseminate information dealing with the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency, to render technical assistance to the States in connection with such programs, and to provide short-term technical training courses for a period of 2 years. The Attorney General is also to submit a report to the President and to Congress by January 1, 1963, of the experiences encountered by Federal, State, and local agencies in administering the act and further recommendations for its continuance or expiration.

Title VI seeks to amend title 18 of the United States Code in connection with the mailing, importation, or transportation of obscene or crime-inciting matter. The purpose of this amendment is to make possible the prosecution of violators of this law at any point through which such matter is apprehended in the mail, whereas at present prosecution of such crimes is limited only to the place where the matter was mailed. The major weakness of the present law is the inability to enforce it in the courts because prosecution is limited to the court jurisdiction where the post office of original mailing is located. The disseminators of crime-inciting material select for mailing those jurisdictions which they find lenient. Adoption of the new amendment will make prosecution possible at the scene where the actual damage to our youth has been committed.

Mr. Speaker, I regard this measure as an important and fundamental piece of legislation. The future of our country depends on how well we raise our youth

and how we prepare them for responsible citizenship. The dollars we spend today and in the next few years will be paid back a hundredfold in helping the youth of America to become better citizens tomorrow.

I urge the committee to whom this bill has been referred to schedule early hearings on it, so that we may have the opportunity to bring this measure before the House for early action. It is also my sincere hope that Congress will approve the bill as soon as possible so that the problem of juvenile delinquency can be dealt with in an effective manner.

## Results of McGregor Poll on National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 19, 1957*

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD the results of a questionnaire I sent to the citizens in the 17th Ohio District whom it is my proud honor to represent in the Congress of the United States. The questions were concerned with pertinent national and international problems facing Congress today.

I regret I could not send a questionnaire to each of my constituents in the district but it is my belief that the replies received represent the opinions of a cross-section of those I represent. In the questionnaire I ask them to list their occupation or profession. This gives me the opportunity to tabulate them as separate groups, which in turn helps me obtain a more complete analysis of their thinking. Especially gratifying to me is the large percentage of the completed forms which contain comments on the questions and proves to me that the average constituent of my district is interested in the important issues now before this legislative body and is anxious to express his views on them.

The population in my district is composed of about half rural and half urban with nearly all of the labor and farm organizations represented, as well as large and small business. Included also are two colleges and two universities. Through the medium of this questionnaire, I feel that I have gained the majority opinion of those I represent.

The questionnaire and the results are as follows:

FEBRUARY 1957.

From: J. HARRY MCGREGOR, Member of Congress, 17th Ohio District.

A QUESTIONNAIRE

In an endeavor to learn the views of the folks back home relative to several subjects of national importance that will be before the Congress, may we have your considered opinion?

*President Eisenhower has requested Congress to declare a policy for this Government to follow in regard to aggressors against Mideast countries*

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| | *Percent* | *Percent* |
| Aid for Middle East countries: Do you favor— | | |
| (a) The President having the authority to provide economic and military aid to Mideast countries, upon their request? | 43 | 57 |
| (b) The President having the authority to use American forces if needed and requested when invasion occurs? | 53 | 47 |
| Hungarian refugees: Do you favor— | | |
| (a) Placing a limit on the number of refugees being admitted to the United States from Communist-dominated countries? | 86 | 14 |
| (b) Continuation of the McCarran-Walter Act? (rigid yearly quotas) | 70 | 30 |
| (c) Giving the same privilege of admittance to those who might rebel in other satellite countries? | 51 | 49 |
| Federal aid to schools: Do you favor Federal aid— | | |
| (a) For the construction of school buildings? | 58 | 42 |
| (b) For all school expenses, including operation? | 25 | 75 |
| (c) For segregated schools? | 31 | 69 |
| The farm program: Do you believe— | | |
| (a) That all farmers should be allowed to vote on the crop referendum regardless of their crop acreage? | 83 | 17 |
| (b) That the soil-bank program should be continued? | 55 | 45 |

*Percentage distribution of replies to questionnaire*

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| | *Percent* | *Percent* |
| Aid for Middle East Countries: Do you favor— | | |
| (a) The President having the authority to provide economic and military aid to Middle East countries, upon their request? | | |
| Total results, all occupations | 43.0 | 57.0 |
| Attorneys | 64.0 | 36.0 |
| Business, industry and salesmen | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| Farmers | 34.0 | 66.0 |
| Housewives | 37.0 | 63.0 |
| Labor | 30.0 | 70.0 |
| Ministers | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| Organizations and occupations not given | 41.0 | 59.0 |
| Doctors, dentists | 55.0 | 45.0 |
| Public officeholders and Federal employees | 27.0 | 73.0 |
| Retired | 49.0 | 51.0 |
| Teachers | 64.0 | 36.0 |
| Students | 75.0 | 25.0 |
| (b) The President having the authority to use American forces if needed and requested when invasion occurs? | | |
| Total results, all occupations | 53.0 | 47.0 |
| Attorneys | 57.0 | 43.0 |
| Business, industry and salesmen | 58.0 | 42.0 |
| Farmers | 45.0 | 55.0 |
| Housewives | 43.0 | 57.0 |
| Labor | 43.0 | 57.0 |
| Ministers | 40.0 | 60.0 |
| Organizations and occupations not given | 42.0 | 58.0 |
| Doctors, dentists | 68.0 | 32.0 |
| Public officeholders and Federal employees | 47.0 | 53.0 |
| Retired | 60.0 | 40.0 |
| Teachers | 69.0 | 31.0 |
| Students | 75.0 | 25.0 |
| Hungarian refugees: Do you favor— | | |
| (a) Placing a limit on the number of refugees being admitted to the United States from Communist dominated countries? | | |
| Total results, all occupations | 86.0 | 14.0 |
| Attorneys | 80.0 | 20.0 |
| Business, industry and salesmen | 83.0 | 17.0 |
| Farmers | 89.0 | 11.0 |
| Housewives | 86.0 | 14.0 |
| Labor | 84.0 | 16.0 |
| Ministers | 25.0 | 75.0 |
| Organizations and occupations not given | 99.5 | 0.5 |
| Doctors, dentists | 82.0 | 18.0 |
| Public officeholders and Federal employees | 84.0 | 16.0 |
| Retired | 87.0 | 13.0 |
| Teachers | 84.0 | 16.0 |
| Students | 75.0 | 25.0 |
| (b) Continuation of the McCarran-Walters Act? (rigid yearly quotas) | | |
| Total results, all occupations | 70.0 | 30.0 |
| Attorneys | 56.0 | 44.0 |
| Business, industry and salesmen | 69.0 | 31.0 |
| Farmers | 77.0 | 23.0 |
| Housewives | 76.0 | 24.0 |
| Labor | 81.0 | 19.0 |
| Ministers | 25.0 | 75.0 |
| Organizations and occupations not given | 81.0 | 19.0 |
| Doctors, dentists | 61.0 | 39.0 |
| Public officeholders and Federal employees | 76.0 | 24.0 |
| Retired | 76.0 | 24.0 |
| Teachers | 55.0 | 45.0 |
| Students | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| (c) Giving the same privilege of admittance to those who might rebel in other satellite countries? | | |
| Total results, all occupations | 51.0 | 49.0 |
| Attorneys | 70.0 | 30.0 |
| Business, industry and salesmen | 53.0 | 47.0 |
| Farmers | 49.0 | 51.0 |
| Housewives | 48.0 | 52.0 |
| Labor | 41.0 | 59.0 |
| Ministers | 89.0 | 11.0 |
| Organizations and occupations not given | 40.0 | 60.0 |
| Doctors, dentists | 77.0 | 33.0 |
| Retired | 46.0 | 54.0 |
| Teachers | 69.0 | 31.0 |
| Students | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| Public officeholders and Federal employees | 50.0 | 50.0 |

*Percentage distribution of replies to questionnaire*—Continued

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| | *Percent* | *Percent* |
| Federal aid to schools: Do you favor Federal aid— | | |
| (a) For the construction of school buildings? | | |
| Total results, all occupations | 58.0 | 42.0 |
| Attorneys | 44.0 | 56.0 |
| Business, industry and salesmen | 52.0 | 48.0 |
| Farmers | 56.0 | 44.0 |
| Housewives | 58.0 | 42.0 |
| Labor | 64.0 | 36.0 |
| Ministers | 70.0 | 30.0 |
| Organizations and occupations not given | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| Doctors, dentists | 49.0 | 51.0 |
| Public officeholders and Federal employees | 70.0 | 30.0 |
| Retired | 66.0 | 34.0 |
| Teachers | 77.0 | 23.0 |
| Students | 98.0 | 2.0 |
| (b) For all school expenses, including operation? | | |
| Total results, al' occupations | 25.0 | 75.0 |
| Attorneys | 25.0 | 75.0 |
| Business, industry and salesmen | 17.0 | 83.0 |
| Farmers | 31.0 | 69.0 |
| Housewives | 22.0 | 78.0 |
| Labor | 27.0 | 73.0 |
| Ministers | 30.0 | 70.0 |
| Organizations and occupations not given | 20.0 | 80.0 |
| Doctors and dentists | 18.0 | 82.0 |
| Public officeholders and Federal employees | 27.0 | 73.0 |
| Retired | 28.0 | 72.0 |
| Teachers | 30.0 | 70.0 |
| Students | 26.0 | 74.0 |
| (c) For segregated schools: | | |
| Total results, all occupations | 31.0 | 69.0 |
| Attorneys | 23.0 | 77.0 |
| Business, industry and salesmen | 30.0 | 70.0 |
| Farmers | 42.0 | 58.0 |
| Housewives | 32.0 | 68.0 |
| Labor | 38.0 | 62.0 |
| Ministers | 13.0 | 87.0 |
| Organizations and occupations not given | 24.0 | 76.0 |
| Doctors, dentists | 22.0 | 78.0 |
| Public officeholders and Federal employees | 43.0 | 57.0 |
| Retired | 19.0 | 81.0 |
| Teachers | 23.0 | 77.0 |
| Students | 26.0 | 74.0 |
| The farm program: Do you believe— | | |
| (a) That all farmers should be allowed to vote on the crop referendum regardless of their crop acreage? | | |
| Total results, all occupations | 83.0 | 17.0 |
| Attorneys | 57.0 | 43.0 |
| Business, industry and salesmen | 75.0 | 25.0 |
| Farmers | 99.6 | .4 |
| Housewives | 86.0 | 14.0 |
| Labor | 88.0 | 12.0 |
| Ministers | 89.0 | 11.0 |
| Organizations and occupations not given | 89.0 | 11.0 |
| Doctors, dentists | 82.0 | 18.0 |
| Public officeholders and Federal employees | 78.0 | 22.0 |
| Retired | 79.0 | 21.0 |
| Teachers | 77.0 | 23.0 |
| Students | 75.0 | 25.0 |
| (b) That the soil bank program should be continued? | | |
| Total results, all occupations | 55.0 | 45.0 |
| Attorneys | 68.0 | 32.0 |
| Business, industry and salesmen | 61.0 | 39.0 |
| Farmers | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| Housewives | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| Labor | 49.0 | 51.0 |
| Ministers | 75.0 | 25.0 |
| Organizations and occupations not given | 43.0 | 57.0 |
| Doctors, dentists | 75.0 | 25.0 |
| Public officeholders and Federal employees | 62.0 | 38.0 |
| Retired | 53.0 | 47.0 |
| Teachers | 72.0 | 28.0 |
| Students | 74.0 | 26.0 |

## Congressman Dollinger's Annual Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 19, 1957*

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is my practice to send a report to my constituents at the close of each session of Congress. When the 1st session of the 85th Congress ends, I shall include in the RECORD my report covering legislation and accomplishments of the Congress during the session. I feel that it is important that the people I represent be given such information.

## A Concentration of Business and Power Is Neither Desirable Nor Inevitable in America—Russia Places Her Entire Emphasis on Centralized Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 19, 1957*

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in this cold war period, when there are constantly occurring the kind of situations that face us in the Middle East, in Korea, in Indochina, the two most powerful nations of the world are in fundamental opposition in almost every aspect of their life. This competitive struggle is all the more awesome and crucial in view of the tremendous nuclear forces which each has within its power to release.

Certainly, given these conditions, it seems to me that we must make every effort to strengthen our economic and political system with its emphasis on individual liberty and responsibility. Only in this way can we advance the prosperity of our people and the security of our Nation and our way of life. Only in this way will it be possible to defeat whatever schemes and plans the Communist dictatorship in Russia may devise.

Russia places her entire emphasis on centralized control of her economy, and this is productive of certain strength but also of many weaknesses.

Our own system has been built up by small-business men, by small farmers, and the working men and women of our country whether in the factory or in the professions. This has been the basic strength of our country which has made it the greatest and most productive Nation in the world with a concern for the individual and the cultural values he represents which has been the inspiration of the entire world for three and a half centuries.

This week Senator PAUL DOUGLAS saw a threat to our way of life in the trend toward bigness in business and industry which, he said, threatens to replace democracy with plutocracy. The collectivization of modern business Goliaths by the state is no solution, he said, for Russia has shown that complete collectivism destroys freedom completely.

He emphasized the need for the protection of consumers from the exactions of the big oil and gas combines, and a reform of our taxing system.

DOUGLAS, one of the great public servants of our time, said:

> I would further urge that a concentration of business and power is neither desirable nor inevitable and that what we should seek, instead, is a broader distribution of property and of power to the end that all may have enough to be secure but not so much as to menace others. This is the underlying economic and social problem of our times.

Senator DOUGLAS went on to say:

> If the present trend toward bigness continues, then society will become divided between a relatively small group of managers and large groups of petty officials and workers. I am convinced that the economic efficiency of the modern business Goliaths is probably exaggerated and that their advantages are primarily financial and marketing. Their increase threatens indeed to replace democracy with a plutocracy administered by a managerial class. Moreover, as Whyte has pointed out, the type of organization man which develops under this system is not the self-reliant American whom we prize.
>
> European Socialists are content to let these giants become ever larger, believing that ultimately the state will then collectivize them. But even if this did occur, it would not be desirable. For power and control would be within even fewer hands. If the state controls the vast proportion of economic activity and a political party controls the state,

how much freedom would there be for opponents? Few political leaders are deeply tolerant by nature. They have to be taught tolerance by the balance of political and economic power within the state. Let that balance become overwhelming or put almost complete power in their hands, then they will almost certainly use that power to coerce opposition. Russia should have taught us the lesson that complete collectivism is ultimately destructive of freedom.

The founders of American progressivism, Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln in former times, and La Follette, Norris, and Brandeis in our generation had a sounder vision. They wanted to distribute power more broadly so that initiative would be stimulated and so that men could be more free.

CONSTRUCTIVE PROPOSALS FOR SMALL BUSINESS AID

Senator DOUGLAS makes these points, Mr. Speaker, that we should try to democratize the great corporations by developing more stockholders like Lewis Gilbert and promoting minority representation upon boards of directors.

We should try to protect small and moderate size business and the family farm.

We should seek the further democratization of the big unions which big industry has called into being.

The overall goal of Government should be distributivism rather than collectivism.

So far in this session of the Congress I have introduced six major bills designed to deal with various aspects of this basic and fundamental issue. They are:

H. R. 8, to establish corporate income-tax rates of 22 percent normal tax and 31 percent surtax.

H. R. 487, to provide for registration, reporting, and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefit plans.

H. R. 2513, to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to abolish the Loan Policy Board of the Small Business Administration, to make the Small Business Administration a permanent agency of the Government, and for other purposes.

House Resolution 166, to authorize the Select Committee on Small Business to investigate and study the problems of small business with respect to basic and applied scientific research and development.

H. R. 5034, to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to authorize agreements with State banking authorities for the elimination of duplicate examinations which are insured under such act. Such permissive legislation would enable real savings to be made. This proposal was made in testimony given before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, January 31, 1957, by former Congressman Charles R. Howell, now Commissioner of Banking and Insurance for the State of New Jersey. Mr. Howell appeared on behalf of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks.

TAX CUTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS

In the Cabinet committee report last year there were 4 recommendations for tax cuts for small business: First a rate reduction from 30 percent to 20 percent; second, accelerated depreciation on the first $50,000 spent for purchase of used equipment; third, permission for some corporations to pay taxes as partnerships; and, fourth, permission for installment payment of the estate taxes.

The cost of this whole package was estimated at $600 million in tax revenues, and the cost broke down as follows: $400 million on the rate reduction and $200 million on the last three recommendations.

The President says that because of circumstances beyond his control we cannot get the tax reduction promised the small firms in the campaign last fall by the administration. He adds, however, that he is favorably disposed on some tinkering with taxes as long as this tinkering effect on tax income is minimal. More than this, in a press conference recently Secretary Humphrey mentioned that $50 million might be a minimal figure.

If the President and Treasury Secretary George Magoffin Humphrey stick by these announced positions the question then becomes: How should this tax revision be made to give the brightest ray of hope to small firms?

George Burger, of the National Federation of Independent Business, has offered a very constructive proposal to me. He writes:

Why not see if it is possible for the Government to revise its business tax regulations to allow both corporations and unincorporated firms to deduct from their yearly taxable income, say $500 or $1,000, providing businessmen have spent this on expansions, improvements, or other things to improve their businesses. If a businessman has spent, say, $2,000 he would be able to take, under this thinking, $500 of that as a complete deduction from taxable income and compute his depreciation and other figures on the balance.

Perhaps some change in tax law like this might fit in with the $50 million figure mentioned by Secretary Humphrey. That is something I don't know, and is something that would have to be worked out by those people who do know the tax situation. However, this strikes me that if Congress were to do any one thing, if this particular thing were possible it might have the greatest meaning to small, independent businessmen. For it is not a matter of percentages they might not appreciate or understand, not a matter of accelerated depreciation on the first $50,000 of income spent on used machinery—most of the small fellows I suppose never get close enough to $50,000 to know what it smells like—and not like the other thing which might or might not have meaning to the great bulk of businessmen. On the other hand $500 or $1,000 in hard cash is something that they can all understand, and very clearly.

On the basis of this constructive recommendation and other like proposals I have developed and am introducing a bill, H. R. 5703, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer to deduct from gross income certain amounts paid or incurred for the expansion or improvement of a trade or business. The text of H. R. 5703 follows:

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer to deduct from gross income certain amounts paid or incurred for the expansion or improvement of a trade or business

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That (a) section 162 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction for trade or business expenses) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (2);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) amounts paid or incurred for the expansion of the trade or business or for the permanent improvement and betterment of property used in the trade or business, and amounts paid or incurred in restoring property used in the trade or business or in making good the exhaustion thereof, to the extent that such amounts do not exceed $1,000 during the taxable year."

(b) Section 263 (a) of such code (relating to capital expenditures) is amended by striking out "No deduction" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in section 162 (a) (4), no deduction."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1956.

## Statement on Civil-Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 19, 1957*

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith my statement before Subcommittee No. 5, House Judiciary Committee, in opposition to proposed civil-rights legislation:

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FIFTH DISTRICT, SOUTH CAROLINA, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5, HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

I am grateful for the opportunity of appearing before the committee to submit my views on proposed civil-rights legislation, and I want to thank the chairman, Mr. CELLER, and his staff for their courtesy in arranging this hearing. In behalf of my State, I appreciate your giving us an opportunity to be heard and I understand that representatives will appear before you next week.

It has not been my privilege to be a Member of Congress when other civil-rights legislation was considered but it has been my privilege to be a citizen and a member of the armed services, and as a citizen I am one of those whom this bill either is designed to help or to hurt, or to crush or to uplift. Let me say here and now, emphatically, that with no disrespect to the motives which prompts such legislation, that civil-rights legislation is unnecessary in this country today. If it is designed to crush the beliefs of the white people of the South and their way of life, and their traditions, it is doomed to failure from the start; you gentlemen will remember prohibition as an attempt to legislate morals was a failure. If it is designed to help the colored man, it is also doomed to failure, because the abuses which are possible and probable under this legislation will give rise to hatred of the bitterest kind, and in place of mutual respect will create antagonism which will not only continue but be magnified and enlarged through the years. I say this not as a prophet, for I am not one in any sense of the word, but I am an American and the future of America is as dear to me as it is to you.

Since World War II, I have been actively interested in politics; during that time I have never seen any man deprived of his right to vote because of race, creed or color. I

have been in the courts both as a defender of the white man, yellow man, and the colored man, and as a prosecutor, and I have never seen a man denied justice because of his race, creed, or color. In my own State, and in adjacent States, the schools erected for the colored, in many cases, exceed in architecture, beauty, and accommodations the schools which the white children attend. In the stores and on the streets and in the business world, as we have done for years, the colored man treats the white man with respect, and the white man treats the colored man with respect. If a poll were taken, by secret ballot, honestly, and sincerely, you would find that 90 percent or better of both races would vote against civil-rights legislation such as you propose here.

If the Congress passes some civil-rights legislation, a few misguided stirred up, or persons used by others for spurious advancement, will cause accusations to be made, expensive trials and hearings to be had, bitterness to be implanted in the hearts and minds of people, which could never be erased. I know of no State whose laws are not sufficient to take care of the civil rights of any of its citizens regardless of race, creed, or color, and certainly I would not say that of any of the States of which you gentlemen come, particularly New York, a State in whose laws I have every confidence.

Some have said that this legislation is aimed at the South. I hope and pray that we are above sectional legislation in this Congress. I hate to think that I would sit down next to a man in the assembly who had a hatred of my section of the country and who had designed to impose on my section some burden, or some laws, not in the best interest of that section. I certainly have no feeling against any other section, and I have served in the armed services with men from every part of the country and count them among my friends today. But, if such legislation is designed against the South then it is destined to open old wounds.

You must remember that we of the South are the only Americans whose forebears have ever been conquered. You must remember also that following that unfortunate war known as the War Between the States, there came to our beautiful and hospitable part of the country, a type of renegade which we were to call the carpetbagger, because he brought what he had on his shoulders and came to ravage the country of its goods, its profits, and its way of life. The heel of the tyrant was heavy upon us and we lived in poverty, and the long climb back bespeaks only of the determination of those whose forebears had not only fought in the War Between the States, but who had participated in the Revolution, pushing back the frontiers, establishing a free religion, and other things so sacred to a free people.

Not until the turn of the century did we start a recovery from the economic burdens resulting from that conflict and only in the last 25 years has an industrial South really come into its own. During these years, race relations, which were at their worst in that disgraceful period known as reconstruction, have steadily improved. Compassion of one race for the problems, trials, and tribulations of another have increased. A new thing, the professional colored man has come into our focus, and receives respect and consideration at every hand. The colored man votes as he pleases and the fact that sometimes the block votes may have been criticized, but has never been cause for denying him that right. His educational facilities have been improved, but no attempt has been made to force upon him a state of mind, a way of living, or a degree of thinking contrary to his desires, his environments, and his background. Nowhere, so far as I have been able to determine, has the ability of any race been minimized or unappreciated, especially in the Southland. To submit or subjugate any people to investigations, prosecution, subpenas, or the like, will reopen the wounds which have healed. Time has erased most of the scars and we have made progress far beyond our wildest dreams and I ask you to leave us alone if your design be selfish, as we, as a part of America, want to continue along the road to progress.

If I am correct in my recollection of history, Lincoln himself was opposed to civil-rights legislation such as you propose here, as he knew the abuses which would take place.

Let me reverse the situation just for a moment. Suppose I had been in the Congress for many years and I had proposed a bill aimed at some other section of the country and I had had that bill sent to my committee and I sat in judgment on the merits or demerits of its approval or its disapproval. Think just a minute, if your section were the target, and then ask yourself how you would feel. I do not say this is true, but there is always a time to stand up and be counted.

As I understand the present situation, your consideration is primarily channeled toward H. R. 1151, which is the counterpart or reconstitution of H. R. 627 of the 84th Congress, the only civil-rights legislation to pass the House last year and just one of a number of bills before the Judiciary Committee during the last Congress.

From the publicity given this subject at the national conventions of both parties last summer and from the campaign tactics and promises indulged in by many of the candidates, I assume that even a greater number of the so-called civil-rights bills will appear in this Congress. I understand there is an omnibus bill, which is a veritable book or catalog, containing all these bills or campaign promises.

I know the committee does not have the time to concern itself with all these bills. I assume that, as was the case last year, only the New York proposals will receive serious attention. For that reason, I confine my objections to the Brownell bill, H. R. 1151, offered by Mr. KEATING, and the Celler bill, H. R. 2145, offered by the esteemed chairman.

In the testimony before your committee, Mr. Brownell has incorporated his testimony of last year. I note in that testimony, on page 12 of part 2, serial No. 11, under date of April 10, 1956, he gave the following statement: "Now, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the need for more knowledge, and greater understanding of this very complex problem is quite clear." If the statement of the Attorney General be true, civil-rights legislation is premature at this time because of the lack of information. Highly controversial legislation such as this should never be predicated on half truths, or partial information. In this connection, I note that in his written statement he says that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has investigative jurisdiction in this subject matter (p. 2 of testimony given February 4, 1957) but its authority is limited to investigating specific charges of violations of Federal criminal statutes. If information is needed, let us make available to the FBI funds which would otherwise be channeled into making up an adolescent, uninformed, and inexperienced Civil Service Commission, or an inexperienced department, or section of the Department of Justice, and direct the Federal Bureau of Investigation to make a complete investigation of the subject, and inform, not only the Congress, but the entire United States, of the true situation, and the facts as they exist. Then we would not be subjected to legislation purportedly designed to correct the situation, the whole truth of which is not known to the Attorney General, who seems to be pushing this legislation.

May I point out at this point that for some purpose, it is sought to place in the Department of Justice powers not heretofore given to any executive branch of the Government (p. 13, pt. 2, dated April 10, 1956). It is admitted that section 1971 of title 42, is applicable here. I would like to place in the record at this point not only section 1972, but section 1972 of title 42 of the United States Code:

"Section 1971. Race, color, or previous conditions not to affect to vote: All citizens of the United States who are otherwise qualified by law to vote at any election by the people in any State, Territory, district, county, city, parish, township, school district, municipality, or other territorial subdivisions, shall be entitled and allowed to vote at all such election, without distinction of race, color, or previous condition of servitude; any constitution, law, custom, usage, or regulation of any State or Territory, or by or under its authority, to the contrary notwithstanding."

"Section 1972. Interference with freedom of elections: No officer of the Army or Navy of the United States shall prescribe or fix, or attempt to prescribe or fix, by proclamation, order, or otherwise, the qualifications of voters in any State, or in any manner interfere with the freedom of any election in any State, or with the exercise of the free right of suffrage in any State."

On page 15 of testimony previously referred to certain aspects of the situation appear, of which you should take note. In the first instance, mention of alleged restraint in voting in Mississippi by virtue of certain affidavits is given as an illustration. I am sure that the distinguished Attorney General, having had the legal experience he has had will realize that affidavits are easily obtained, especially from prejudiced people, aroused by either false information, or irresponsible organizations. On the same page, he admits the amount of ill feeling stirred up by virtue of civil rights violations, which I have tried to point out previously in this statement, in telling you that hatred and ill feeling will be bred and nurtured by this proposed legislation.

I should like first to comment on H. R. 1151, sponsored by the Attorney General, Mr. Brownell, because this was the only bill that could clear the committee last year, and as amended passed the House on July 23, just piror to the holding of the national conventions.

Part I of this bill would appear simply to add to our long, ever-growing list of governmental commissions. But if we examine the duties and powers of the Commission, with its broad powers of subpena, with enforcement provisions through court orders and punishment for contempt, it unfolds before our eyes that we are authorizing a "grand inquest" into the private lives of our good citizens.

And who is to conduct this inquiry? We see in one section 104 (b) of the bill that the Commission may accept and utilize services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel. Where would these volunteers come from? Naturally they would be paid for and supplied by the various organizations which have been lobbying for this legislation over the period of years—the ADA, the NAACP, the left wing political action committees of the rich labor groups.

When we examine our own House, we find that our standing rules only grant the power of subpena to three of our committees—Appropriations, Government Operations, and Un-American Activities. Even our great Judiciary Committee—the great judicial committee of this House—does not possess this power. Likewise, in resolving election contests and in deciding the qualifications of our Members, the other great judicial committee of this House—the Committee on House Administration—may not use the subpena. Indiscriminate investigative power, backed up by contempt orders and penal

provisions, could become one of the most ill-conceived evils of our time.

H. R. 1151 represents an attempt by its authors to have Congress delegate to an Executive commission investigatory functions which are even beyond the constitutional authority of the Congress in the first instance. If an appraisal needs to be made of the laws and policies of the Federal Government and an investigation is necessary to get that appraisal, then the proper procedure would seem to be for Congress to make its appraisal first hand and not through a delegated commission operating through volunteers. If the Judiciary Committee feels the need of this appraisal, it would seem proper to apply to the House for approval of a resolution granting the necessary authority and funds.

I doubt seriously whether a committee of the Congress itself, much less one to whom that authority had been delegated, could by subpena so probe into the private affairs of our individual citizens. The Supreme Court has time and again recently been called upon to remind us of the limitations imposed when it comes to investigating the private affairs and efforts of individuals. H. R. 1151 speaks of investigating economic pressures among individuals and of studying economic, social, and legal developments and appraising the laws and policies of the Federal Government. It would just as well include an examination of the hearts and minds of men.

We recall the broad investigatory powers sought to be exercised by the Lobbying Committee during the 81st Congress. For a refusal to give certain information to that committee a Mr. Rumley was cited for contempt and convicted. The Supreme Court affirmed a decision of the court of appeals dismissing the indictment. The Supreme Court declared that no authority exists under the Constitution for a committee to inquire into all efforts of private individuals to influence public opinion (*United States* v. *Rumley* ((1953) 345 U. S. 41)).

If existing laws are being violated we already have sufficient law-enforcement machinery to bring offenders to justice. If additional legislation is needed it would appear that this committee—the Judiciary Committee—should conduct that investigation.

AN ADDITIONAL ATTORNEY GENERAL—CREATION OF A DIVISION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Part II of H. R. 1151 is, of course, Mr. Brownell's proposal to make a division out of the present Civil Rights Section of this Department. This is another of the many instances in which departmental officers have sought to gain more power and influence by expanding their organization at the taxpayer's expense. This type of expanded governmental activity reached its peak in the late thirties and Congress was forced to do something about it. As a result, the Hoover Commission was created by an act of July 10, 1953 (67 Stat. 142). This Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch is at work carrying out the declared policy of Congress "to promote economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of the public business in the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government by: recommending methods and procedures for reducing expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions; eliminating duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions; consolidating services, activities, and functions of a similar nature; abolishing services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of Government; eliminating nonessential services, functions, and activities which are competitive with private enterprise; defining responsibilities of officials; and relocating in departments or other agencies those agencies now responsible directly to the President."

I have seen no recommendation submitted by this Commission that more effective administration of justice can be achieved by expanding beyond all proportions a section of the Justice Department which is currently chiefly employed in handling gripes rather than violations of our laws. If we examine an organizational chart of the Department of Justice we see that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is the right arm of that Department. It is my opnion that this great Bureau is already equipped to safeguard our people. The Bureau has 6,269 full-year investigative employees and an additional 8,100 full-year clerical employees. Its 52 field offices extend from one end of the country to the other. It is the fact-gathering and fact-reporting arm of the Department of Justice and has jurisdiction over some Federal investigative matters, encompassing both general investigative matters and domestic intelligence operations. See Annual Report of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, in Attorney General's report, 1955. In 1924, when the Department of Justice was reorganized, the FBI was divorced completely from the vagaries of political influence which had plagued the Attorney General's office for so many years. This was achieved through the efforts of the Attorney General, Harlan Stone, later Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. See Encyclopedia Americana.

I am in favor of continuing this cardinal rule against political influence in the affairs of the lives of our people. I see no need for an additional Attorney General nor for an additional division of the Justice Department.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ENTERS THE FIELD OF INSTITUTING PRIVATE CIVIL SUITS TO RECOVER MONEY DAMAGES AGAINST INDIVIDUAL CITIZENS: CONDUCT OF ELECTIONS BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL RATHER THAN BY THE STATES: USE OF INJUNCTIONS OBTAINED IN FEDERAL COURTS TO DECIDE POLITICAL QUESTIONS

Part III of the Attorney General's bill (H. R. 1151) is designed to give fresh life to the old civil-rights and enforcement acts passed during the stirred feelings of a sectional war for the purpose not only of enfranchising the newly freed slaves, but also of disenfranchising the white man in the South.

The passage of the very act sought to be strengthened here (act of July 31, 1861, amended April 20, 1871) has been described as ironic by none other than the Swedish Socialist sociologist upon whose studies the Supreme Court based its decision in the school cases. Had the Supreme Court bothered to read the full text of Mr. Myrdal's report they would have found the following:

"If the North had not been so bent upon reforming the South it is doubtful whether and when some of the Northern States would have reformed themselves." (Myrdal, An American Dilemma, pp. 438–439 (1944)).

Ostensibly as one advocate of civil rights legislation has pointed out, Mr. Will Maslow, director of the commission on law and social action of the American-Jewish Congress:

"It is ironic that efforts to enfranchise Negroes in the Northern States during and immediately after the war were defeated in one State after another. Only adoption of the 14th amendment compelled the Northern States to change their rules on suffrage." (Vol. 20, University of Chicago Law Review, p. 369.)

It is a commonly known fact that Mr. Brownell's own State, New York, from whence originate the principal bills now under discussion, was at passage of the Civil Rights Act and until 1887, the only State in the Union which by positive terms in article II of its constitution of 1846 excluded the Negro from the right to vote. After granting the right of suffrage to white male citizens, New York's constitution limited the Negro as follows: "But no man of color, unless he shall have been for 3 years a citizen of this State, and for 1 year next preceding any election shall have been seized and possessed of a freehold estate of the value of $250, over and above all debts and incumbrances charged thereon, and shall have been actually rated and paid a tax thereon, shall be entitled to vote at such election. And no person of color shall be subject to direct taxation unless he shall be seized and possessed of such real estate as aforesaid."

INJUNCTIONS ISSUED BY FEDERAL DISTRICT COURTS TO ENFORCE POLITICAL RIGHTS, SO-CALLED CIVIL RIGHTS

The United States Supreme Court has on numerous occasions declared emphatically that political rights cannot be enforced either by mandamus or the alternative injunction. See *Colegrove* v. *Green* ((1946) 328 U. S. 549, 555) and *Stevenson* v. *Johnson* ((1948) 170 Fed. 2d 108, cert. den. 336 U. S. 904).

On this subject let me read from American Jurisprudence, the law of injunctions—the type of injunction the Attorney General seeks to go forth indiscriminately and obtain (American Jurisprudence, vol. 28, pp. 267–268):

"To assume jurisdiction to control the exercise of political powers, or to protect the purely political rights of individuals, would be to invade the domain of the other departments of the Government or of the courts of common law, and might result in grave consequences, both to the courts and the people. This rule restricting persons to remedies at law, to the exclusion of equitable remedies, for the vindication of political rights is not a denial of due process of law, or of the equal protection of the laws. The rule assumes, of course, that the acts in question are purely political and involve no substantial injury to property rights. If there is a foundation for equitable jurisdiction to issue injunctive relief because some injury to property rights is involved, the fact that the determination of the controversy may depend upon the decision of a political question will not deprive the court of jurisdiction. It is only where the property right involved is merely incidental to a political question that equity will not assume power to grant injunctive relief. An election is a political matter, and as such falls within the principle that courts of equity will have nothing to do with such matters, and, subject to recognized exceptions involving injury to property rights, injunction will not issue for the purpose of restraining the calling or holding of an election, or of directing or controlling the mode in which, or of determining the rules of law in pursuance of which, an election shall be held. Nor will equity undertake by injunction or otherwise to supervise the acts and management of a political party for the protection of a purely political right. Equity does not interfere by injunction to determine questions concerning appointment or election of public officers or their title to office. In accordance with their policy not to interfere in regard to matters of a political nature, courts have also declined to enjoin a citizen from petitioning either branch of legislature upon any subject of legislation in which he is interested, since such an injunction would be an unauthorized abridgment of the political rights of the party enjoined."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL SEEKS POWER TO CONDUCT OUR LOCAL AND STATE ELECTIONS AS WELL AS OUR CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS

Part IV of H. R. 1151 is one of the most fantastic pieces of legislation ever recommended to the Congress. The design, drafted in the concise language of a law of Congress, seeks to so thwart our Constitution as to substitute

the Attorney General and the courts for the States in determining how our elections are to be conducted.

The objective of the Attorney General is sought by amending section 1971 of title 42, United States Code. If we examine the very next section of the United States Code, that is, section 1972 of the same title, anyone can see that even the Congress which submitted the 14th amendment made it plain that they wanted no interference with the freedom of our elections from governmental officers, whether of the Army or the Navy, or by order of anyone, much less the Attorney General.

Section 1972, enacted February 25, 1865, reads as follows:

"No officer of the Army or Navy of the United States shall prescribe or fix, or attempt to prescribe or fix, by proclamation, order, or otherwise, the qualifications of voters in any State, or in any manner interfere with the freedom of any election in any State, or with the exercise of the free right of suffrage in any State."

Anyone familiar with the history of the expansion of our country westward from the seaboard across the plains to the Pacific knows the many instances when Federal troops were stationed in Territories solely to swell the vote and affect one way the organization of the Territory or its admission to the Union. This was the case in Nevada. At one time the Missouri constitution denied the right of soldiers to vote. Texas still denies the right to vote of members of the Regular Establishment. Practically every State in the Union has a constitutional provision that a member of the Armed Forces does not gain residence for purpose of voting merely by being stationed in the State.

Here, in part III of H. R. 1151 we have the Attorney General moving into the States, on the basis of simple affidavits or ex parte statements, and using the civil process to conduct registration and voting. In the Attorney General's own statement to this committee on April 10, 1956, he explained:

"And second, to authorize the Attorney General to bring civil proceedings on behalf of the United States or any aggrieved person for preventative or other civil relief in any case covered by statute." (Civil Rights, pt. 2, hearing before Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 84th Cong., 2d sess., p. 15.)

Does this authorize the Attorney General, as a preventative measure to get court orders against our local registration and election officials and have voters into court on election days? If so, it would violate the present laws of every State and the constitutions of most of our States. For instance, let us look at New Jersey's law:

"Section 19: 4-4: Arrest under civil process on election day.

"No person who shall have a right to vote at any election shall be arrested by virtue of any civil process on the day on which such election shall be held."

All of these laws governing use of troops and the civil process on election days have been passed for one reason: to safeguard the voter and to allow the States to conduct their elections according to law.

A study of the administration of the various civil rights laws shows conclusively that they did not succeed. For the most part they were declared unconstitutional They were finally repealed by the Republicans under President Taft on March 4, 1909, upon a revision of the United States Criminal Code (35 U. S. Stat. 1088).

Actually the Civil Rights Acts, even during the worst years of the reconstruction period, were not effective. Attorney General after Attorney General reported to Congress that convictions could not be obtained because most judges thought the laws were unconstitutional. See United States Attorney General, Reports 1870-1897. So the Republican Congress in 1909, upon the recommendation of the Attorney General, dropped the remaining Civil Rights Laws, except those in the Judicial Code vesting district courts with original jurisdiction to enforce sections 19 and 20 of the old criminal code having to do with action of a State in depriving citizens of their rights and privileges secured by the Constitution. See *United States* v. *Classic* ((1941) 313 U. S. 299).

That in 1909, as is the case today, no need existed for Federal civil-rights legislation is clearly borne out by two factors.

The first is that prosecutions under the old acts flickered out. As the table I have here indicates, there were 314 cases in 1871, only 25 cases in 1878, and none in 1897.

I should like this table made a part of my testimony. It is taken from the reports to Congress of the Attorneys General from 1871 to 1897:

*Cases of all types under the enforcement acts handled by the Attorney general*

| Year | Prosecutions, including cases pending | Terminated cases |
|---|---|---|
| 1871 | 892 | 314 |
| 1872 | (1) | (1) |
| 1873 | 1,960 | 1,304 |
| 1874 | 366 | 966 |
| 1875 | 299 | 234 |
| 1876 | 142 | 152 |
| 1877 | 305 | 234 |
| 1878 | 56 | 26 |
| 1879 | 297 | 146 |
| 1880 | 269 | 70 |
| 1881 | 158 | 95 |
| 1882 | (2) | (2) |
| 1883 | 25 | 9 |
| 1884 | | 23 |
| 1885 | (2) | (2) |
| 1886 | 11 | 10 |
| 1887 | 28 | 6 |
| 1888 | 2 | 59 |
| 1889 | 6 | 12 |
| 1890 | 3 | 2 |
| 1891 | 3 | 12 |
| 1892 | 0 | 0 |
| 1893 | | 92 |
| 1894 | | 8 |
| 1895 | | 31 |
| 1896 | | |
| 1897 | | |

[1] Included in 1871 and 1873 reports.
[2] Undetermined.

The second and perhaps the chief reason was the very important fact that the States had acted to preserve the ballot for all people—white and colored. Also, they had acted to prevent mob violence.

I have here, for instance, the text of laws now in force in South Carolina and Virginia to punish lynching. I should also like to insert here the laws of these two States. Most of the other States have similar and effective laws against lynching. I have a table here showing there have been only four lynchings throughout the United States in the last 5 years. There were none in 1953 or 1954.

"SOUTH CAROLINA ANTILYNCHING LAW (SOUTH CAROLINA CODE OF LAWS (1952), TITLE 16, SECTIONS 16-57, 16.59.4)

*"Article 2. Lynching*

"Section 16-57, lynching in the first degree: Any act of violence inflicted by a mob upon the body of another person which results in the death of the person shall constitute the crime of lynching in the first degree and shall be a felony. Any person found guilty of lynching in the first degree shall suffer death unless the jury shall recommended the defendant to the mercy of the court, in which event the defendant shall be confined at hard labor in the State penitentiary for a term not exceeding 40 years or less than 5 years at the discretion of the presiding judge.

"Section 16-58, lynching in the second degree: Any act of violence inflicted by a mob upon the body of another person and from which death does not result shall constitute the crime of lynching in the second degree and shall be a felony. Any person found guilty of lynching in the second degree shall be confined at hard labor in the State penitentiary for a term not exceeding 20 years nor less than 3 years, at the discretion of the presiding judge.

"Section 16-59, mob defined: A 'mob' is defined for the purpose of this article as the assemblage of two or more persons, without color or authority of law, for the premeditated purpose and with the premeditated intent of committing an act of violence upon the person of another.

"Section 16-59.1, persons present deemed members of mob: All persons present as members of a mob when an act of violence is committed shall be presumed to have aided and abetted the crime and shall be guilty as principals.

"Section 16-59.2, duties of sheriff and solicitor when mob commits act of violence: When any mob commits an act of violence the sheriff of the county wherein the crime occurs and the solicitor of the circuit wherein the county is located shall act as speedily as possible to apprenend and identify the members of the mob and bring them to trial.

"Section 16-59.3, solicitor may investigate to apprehend members of mob: Pursuant to section 16-59.2 the solicitor of any circuit shall have summary power to conduct any investigation deemed necessary by him in order to apprehend the members of a mob and may subpena witnesses and take testimony under oath.

"Section 16-59.4, civil liability of members of mob: This article shall not be construed to relieve any member of any such mob from civil liability."

"VIRGINIA ANTILYNCHING LAW, VIRGINIA CODE (1950), TITLE 18, SECTION 36-42

*"Article 2. Lynching*

"Section 18-36, mobs and lynching defined: A collection of people, assembled for the purpose and with the intention of committing an assault or a battery upon any person and without authority of law, shall be deemed a mob for the purpose of this article; and any act of violence by a mob upon the body of any person, which shall result in the death of such person, shall constitute a lynching within the meaning of this article.

"Indictment using word 'mob' without elaboration is sufficient: Defendant was charged with being one of a mob and in that capacity with feloniously assaulting another. The lynch law (this section) defines a mob. Therefore, an elaboration in the indictment of these statutory provisions defining a mob is not necessary, as they are too plain for argument and could not possibly have been misunderstood.

"Statement of member of mob at time of assault admissible: Objection was made to the admissibility in evidence of statements made by a member of the mob at the time of the assault to the effect that the person assaulted had run his wife away from home and put her in an institution. It was held that all that was then done and said was part of the resgestae and competent.

"Section 18-37, lynching deemed murder: The lynching of any person within this State by a mob, shall be deemed murder, and any and every person composing a mob and every accessory thereto, by which any person is lynched, shall be guilty of murder, and upon conviction, shall be punished as provided in Article 1 of this chapter.

"Section 18-38, assault and battery by mob: nature of offense: Any and every person composing a mob which shall commit a simple assault or battery, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and punished as provided for by section 19-265; and any and every person composing a mob which shall maliciously or unlawfully shoot, stab, or wound any person, or by any means cause him bodily injury with intent to maim, disable, disfigure, or kill him, shall be guilty of a felony

and upon conviction shall be confined in the penitentiary for not less than 1 year nor more than 10 years; provided however, that if such injury shall result in death of such person, each and every principal and accessory of such mob, and accessory thereto, shall be guilty of murder, and upon conviction, shall be punished as provided in section 18–37.

"Section 18–39, apprehension and prosecution of participants in a lynching: The attorney for the Commonwealth of any county or city in which a lynching may occur shall promptly and diligently endeavor to ascertain the identity of the persons who in any way participated therein, or who composed the mob which perpetrated the same, and have them apprehended, and shall promptly proceed with the prosecution of any and all persons so found; and to the end that such offenders may not escape proper punishment, such attorney for the Commonwealth may be assisted in all such endeavors and prosecutions by the Attorney General or other prosecutors designated by the Governor for the purpose; and the Governor may have full authority to spend such sums as he may deem necessary for the purpose of seeking out the identity and apprehending the members of such guilty mob.

"Section 18–40, civil liability for lynching: Nothing herein contained shall be construed to relieve any member of any such mob from civil liability to the personal representative of the victim of such lynching.

"Section 18–41, persons suffering death from mob attempting to lynch another person: Any person suffering death from a mob attempting to lynch another person shall come within the provisions of this article, and his personal representatives shall be entitled to relief in the same manner and to the same extent as if he were the originally intended victim of such mob.

"Section 18–42, jurisdiction: Jurisdiction of all actions and prosecutions under any of the provisions of this article shall be in the circuit court of the county or corporation court of the city wherein a lynching may occur or of the county or city from which the person lynched may have been taken, as aforesaid."

*Chronology of incidence of so-called lynching in the United States (as reported by Tuskegee Institute, department of records and research)*

| Year | White | Negro | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1900 | 9 | 106 | 115 |
| 1901 | 25 | 105 | 130 |
| 1902 | 7 | 85 | 92 |
| 1903 | 15 | 84 | 99 |
| 1904 | 7 | 76 | 83 |
| 1905 | 5 | 57 | 62 |
| 1906 | 3 | 62 | 65 |
| 1907 | 2 | 58 | 60 |
| 1908 | 8 | 89 | 97 |
| 1909 | 13 | 69 | 82 |
| 1910 | 9 | 67 | 76 |
| 1911 | 7 | 60 | 67 |
| 1912 | 2 | 61 | 63 |
| 1913 | 1 | 51 | 52 |
| 1914 | 4 | 51 | 55 |
| 1915 | 13 | 56 | 69 |
| 1916 | 4 | 50 | 54 |
| 1917 | 2 | 36 | 38 |
| 1918 | 4 | 60 | 64 |
| 1919 | 7 | 76 | 83 |
| 1920 | 8 | 53 | 61 |
| 1921 | 5 | 59 | 64 |
| 1922 | 6 | 51 | 57 |
| 1923 | 4 | 29 | 33 |
| 1924 | 0 | 16 | 16 |
| 1925 | 0 | 17 | 17 |
| 1926 | 7 | 23 | 30 |
| 1927 | 0 | 16 | 16 |
| 1928 | 1 | 10 | 11 |
| 1929 | 3 | 7 | 10 |
| 1930 | 1 | 20 | 21 |
| 1931 | 1 | 12 | 13 |
| 1932 | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| 1933 | 4 | 24 | 28 |
| 1934 | 0 | 15 | 15 |
| 1935 | 2 | 18 | 20 |
| 1936 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| 1937 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| 1938 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| 1939 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 1940 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| 1941 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| 1942 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| 1943 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 1944 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 1945 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1946 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| 1947 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1948 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 1949 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 1950 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 1951 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1952 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1953 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1954 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1955 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Total | 195 | 1,795 | 1,990 |

*Chronology of incidence of so-called lynching in the United States (as reported by Tuskegee Institute, department of records and research)*—Continued

Similarly, my State, South Carolina, has repealed the poll tax to remove any doubt as to whether this tax could be used to deny persons the right to vote. Actually, the tax was used to support schools and we badly need the funds, but anyway the tax has gone.

A BRIEF EXAMINATION OF THE SCOPE OF THIS PROPOSED LEGISLATION REVEALS THAT IT IS LEGALLY NOT CONSTITUTIONAL

I assume that you gentlemen are sufficiently versed in the laws of the land and the various States, by reason of your being on the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, to realize that in every State there are not only applicable, but adequate criminal statutes, or, common law provisions in effect, to guarantee any necessary civil rights to any person or persons. The scope of the proposed legislation as it appears to me as a lawyer, is to encompass the administration of whatever laws are in effect, and this the Supreme Court of the United States has held to be without the jurisdiction of the Federal courts and, therefore, unconstitutional. In 1898 in the case of *Williams* v. *Mississippi*, evidently all certiorari from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, the Supreme Court of the United States held (vol. 170, pp. 213–219): "It has also been held, in a very recent case, to justify a removal from a State court to a Federal court of a cause in which such rights are alleged to be denied, that such denial must be the result of the constitution or laws of the State, not of the administration of them."

If this is an attempt to substitute the laws of the United States for the laws of the States then we are doing an injustice to every State of the Union, including your own.

It is neither practical nor legal to attempt to place a protective umbrella over all the real or imaginary evils of man's humanity or man's inhumanity to man, especially in the field of race relations. We are witnessing here an attempt to reach beyond the Constitution, usurp the powers of the States and create a monster, which will probably, if created, be out of control long before its maturity. Such was realized in the case of the *United States* v. *Reese et al.* (vol. 92, pp. 214–221, U. S. Repts.) where an attempt was made to divest Kentucky of its right to set forth the qualifications of electors.

You gentlemen are doubtless familiar with the facts that the defenders in that case were indicted for their conduct of a municipal election, demurred to the indictment on the grounds the Supreme Court of the United States had no jurisdiction. In holding the States had the right to set the qualifications for electors the Court stated:

"It would certainly be dangerous if the legislature could set a net large enough to catch all possible offenders, and leave it to the courts to step inside and say who could be rightfully detained, and who should be set at large. This would, to some extent, substitute the judicial for the legislative department of the Government. The courts enforce the legislative will when ascertained, if within the constitutional grant of power. Within its legitimate sphere, Congress is supreme, and beyond the control of the courts; but if it steps outside of its constitutional limitations, and attempts that which is beyond its reach, the courts are authorized to, and when called upon in due course of legal proceedings must, annul its encroachments upon the reserved power of the States and the people."

I bring these cases to your attention, as I am certain you would not wish to pass legislation, or even consider it, if it were unconstitutional by nature and beyond the powers of the Federal Government in scope.

CONCLUSION

I hope you will look around and get the truth before you bring out this legislation for any consideration. In every part of the country, progress has been made and is being made in race relations, and especially in that part of the country in which I am privileged to live, and which I represent. Then, aside from political pressures, inconclusive investigations, and the opinions of biased organizations, you can make a decision.

I deeply appreciate your time.

## Address by Hon. Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah, Before National Western Mining Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, February 19, 1957*

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which I delivered before the National Western Mining Conference, in Denver, Colo., on February 9, 1957.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and friends of the mining industry, when Bob Palmer requested the title of my talk at this session, I suggested what now appears to be a rather formidable and formal title: "Incentives for the Domestic Mining Industry."

You men in the mining business who describe your conference banquet as your annual sowbelly dinner, probably can better appreciate what I am about to discuss by a slight rephrasing of the title. What I intend to talk about really is: The Time To Treat a Dying Patient Is While He's Still Kicking.

By this slight digression into semantics, I do not mean to imply that our domestic industry is a dying industry. If it is, then gathered in this hall are some of the liveliest, healthy appearing corpses that Denver has seen since the days of H. A. W. Tabor and other pioneers of the Colorado mining industry.

No, I think there is still a tremendous future for our domestic mining industry. All we have to do is to survive a now-prolonged period of near starvation and strangulation by our friends that would have meant the demise of a less robust and independent industry. But survival is no easy matter under present circumstances. And in looking back over the difficult years which have intervened since 1946 when I first was

elected to Congress, I am pleased and not a little relieved that we still have a domestic mining industry that is alive and kicking—and if you don't think you're kicking, I invite you to come back and read my mail for a few days.

During this decade of postwar readjustment—or midwar readjustment, if you prefer—the mining industry has been somewhat in the position claimed for several years by a great old reclamation expert and oil official in my State, the late W. R. Wallace. As he entered his late eighties, "Uncle Billy" Wallace used to tell friends that this is the way he started his day. As soon as he awakened in the morning, he would call for the morning newspaper and scan the obituary columns. "If my name wasn't in the obituaries, "Uncle Billy" would declare, with that characteristic twinkle in his eyes, "I would get up, eat breakfast, and get to work."

In this past decade, I feel it extremely likely that a large number of domestic mining enterprises have been intently scanning the business obituary columns. Some, I regret to say, eventually found their names recorded therein, because the brutal facts of life for our materials producers are that virtually any domestic producer can be forced out of business by low pay, lower cost foreign producers if there is no control over foreign entry into the highly prized American market. This is a conviction that I brought to Washington in 1946 and which I retain with even more intensity today.

Unfortunately, I and some of the other representatives of the Western States have not been in the majority in our national legislative body. In the populous manufacturing States of the East, there has existed a belief that those States could best prosper if their manufactured goods could be sold in foreign markets in exchange for low-cost raw materials. This belief has found expression in the concept "free trade," which has been sold to the American people by an expensive, high-pressure propaganda campaign over the past two decades. More recently, it masquerades under the slogan, "Trade, Not Aid."

This eastern-oriented free-trade campaign has been supported by our neighbors in the Southern States, largely because those States historically had depended on an economy based largely upon exports of cotton and tobacco. Today, however, the South is dotted with manufacturing plants, and this bastion of free trade is weakening under the impact of 59-cent blouses and other low-cost textile imports. Even the free trade haven of New England is smarting from this foreign textile competition and its fisheries have had a recent taste of the same medicine.

I don't have to tell you what happened to lead-zinc mining during this period. This subject has been well researched and documented by spokesmen from western mining organizations, including a couple of able Utahans, my friends Mike Romney and Otto Herres. Manager Romney, of the Utah Mining Association, was back in Washington in mid-January, pointing out to Presidential economic advisers that lead-zinc prices show very little gain over the 1947 level, but that mining and marketing costs have increased 100 percent in that same period.

Otto Herres, on no less than two occasions, in my presence, has demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt to Government officials that under present conditions United States producers have as their primary market limited stockpile requirements, while foreign competitors have as their almost exclusive market our expanding domestic consumptive needs.

There is a real need for factfinding studies and expositions of this kind and I commend the mining industry for its vigorous and continuing efforts to keep the Congress, the executive branch, and the country at large well informed about their problems.

And I can testify that you've been rewarded so far, with no end of sympathy and promises, but not very much effective action.

If I recall correctly, the platforms of both parties in 1948, 1952, and in 1956 pledged effective support for the domestic mining industry.

Mineral resources were included in the broad, 18-month study of the President's Materials Policy Committee, appointed in 1951.

More recently, the industry's problems were considered by the President's Cabinet Committee on Minerals Policy, which rendered a report on November 30, 1954.

Relief for the lead-zinc industry was recommended by the Tariff Commission under the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act.

Yes, there has been a lot of prescribing, but I think you will be the first to agree with me, that the patient, while alive and kicking, is far from being cured.

At the same time, I believe that, in all fairness, we must concede that there have been improvements made—some recognizable gains for the industry in recent years.

During the past 4 years, for example, we have witnessed and participated in the following accomplishments:

1. Abolition of price controls, which had tended to aggravate the competition from noncontrolled foreign imports.

2. Increased depletion allowances for two score strategic and critical materials.

3. Extension of the defense-purchase program of strategic and critical materials.

4. Use of stockpiling authority to extend domestic production of strategic minerals, including lead and zinc.

5. Inauguration of long-range program for mining and metallurgical research.

6. Authorization—for the first time—of multiple mineral development of the same tracts of public lands.

7. Passage of the so-called "weekend miner bill," to end abuse of the mining laws and to reduce undeserved criticism of the mining industry by conservationists.

8. Culmination of a long-range development program for the domestic uranium industry, which moved us from a have-not status to relative abundance of uranium in less than a decade.

10. Elimination of an unwarranted discrimination against western fluorspar producers in the purchasing directives for stockpiling ores.

I cannot pass over an opportunity to make a brief comment on this last point, because it represents a case wherein we obtained corrective action within a week after bringing this problem to the personal attention of ODM Chief Arthur S. Flemming.

When a bill to increase the stockpiling price for fluorspar was considered in the Senate during the 84th Congress, Director Flemming had assured us that the ODM had sufficient authority to end the discrimination being shown to western producers of metallurgical fluorspar under the stockpiling program. In this program, a unique freight differential had been assessed against western producers. This differential, however, persisted in a reduced form in the new purchasing directives announced last fall, so I led a delegation of producers into a meeting with the ODM chief in mid-December. Dr. Flemming agreed with our report of his position in the Senate hearings and promised action by the end of that week. True to his word, he investigated the matter and issued a letter ending the differential, right on schedule. For me, this set an all-time record for expeditious action on a western minerals problem.

More recently, the House killed the effect of this effort by knocking out a deficiency appropriations bill funds for stockpile purchases of certain strategic minerals. Representatives from mineral States put up a valiant but losing effort on the House floor to educate some of their colleagues on the need for this program, which was passed to sustain producers of four critical minerals until passage of long-range legislation. Before I left Washington, I appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee with an appeal for restoration of these funds and I am hoping that we can succeed in getting these funds back into the bill. Fortunately for the West, the Senate Appropriations Committee is headed by our good friend Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, who understands the complex problems we face in this part of the country.

In balancing losses against gains, it is only fair to note that minerals producers are watching with concern recent increases in the purchase of stockpile materials abroad by barter for our surplus agricultural commodities.

A recent report by the President on the surplus disposal program disclosed these figures for barter contracts for strategic materials:

[In thousands of dollars]

| | 1949–50 through 1953–54 | 1954–55 | 1955–56 | July–December 1956 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Minimum stockpile | 71,800 | 5,700 | 4,900 | ---------- |
| Long-term stockpile | ---------- | 152,800 | 189,700 | 20,100 |
| Supplemental stockpile | ---------- | 100,900 | 109,900 | 112,600 |
| Total strategic | 71,800 | 259,400 | 304,500 | 132,700 |

Now, this report looks good to those concerned with whittling down our mountains of agricultural surpluses. But it has disturbing overtones for the domestic minerals industry.

I have no doubt that we can extend or broaden markets for surplus agricultural products by bartering them for foreign minerals. And it may be successfully argued that the removal of those foreign minerals by this method bolsters the world market and thereby aids our own domestic producers whose prices, for all practical purposes, are based upon the lowest competitive foreign price.

However, we must be aware that the provision of this auxiliary market for foreign ores contributes to building up our overseas competitors, who, when the stockpile barter program ends, will be in an even better position to eliminate our domestic mines. This factor, in my opinion, underscores the necessity for expediting the development of long-range mineral policies that will help our domestic mines survive in the face of accelerated foreign dumping.

I have discussed briefly the background of the problem confronting our domestic mining industry. Now, I come to the difficult portion, what is the solution to these problems?

Will, I want to say emphatically that I think we have had just about enough diagnosis and prognosis. I think we cannot only concede that the patient is sick, but also that he is ready for, if not the operating room, at least the treatment room.

The solution appears to be the formulation and passage of legislation establishing long-range policies for preservation and continued operation of our domestic mining industry. And this should be enacted this session for very obvious reasons.

As most of you are aware, the President's Cabinet-level Committee has studied this problem and made some formal recommendations. The President has promised to send up specific recommendations for such legislation early this session, and I am persuaded that such proposals will be forthcoming in the near future.

When the proposed bills reach the congressional hoppers, I presume that thorough hearings will be conducted. This is one of the reasons why I have been pressing for

early introduction of these measures. Legislation proposing long-range policies for a major industry like mining deserves extensive hearings and intensive study by all facets of the industry. In fact, when this matter comes up before the Senate Interior Committee, I plan to request that hearings be held at a central place here in the West, so that we can have the benefit of the thinking of our people who have to meet the day-to-day problems of the prospector and miner, without requiring you to prepare written testimony or to travel back to Washington to appear before our committees.

If the legislation is introduced early enough this year, I see no reason why action could not be completed during the present 85th congressional session. You may be assured that I am pressing the executive branch to come through with its recommendations as promptly as possible.

Unfortunately, this legislation, even if drafted with extreme care and sound vision, will be the answer to all your problems. We are just legislators—not magicians. And if you ever discover that you have no problems, you can rest assured that you're no longer in the mining business.

However, I feel sure that enactment of such legislation will do much to apprise the public of the industry's problems, and to take the initial steps toward some long-range remedies which we hope will move the industry to new progress and stability.

However, I have been around Congress a few years now, and I am aware that even the best of legislation can get sidetracked or suffer agonizing delays for no good and sufficient reason. Therefore, if it appears that the long-talked-about long-range legislation is not going to pass this session, or if it appears that more immediate legislation is necessary, then I am prepared to resubmit a measure which I proposed in the 84th Congress as an amendment to H. R. 1, the 1955 bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

This bill proposes a return to the Congress of substantive control over escape-clause proceedings under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. In its action on the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1955, the Congress accepted in lieu of my amendment a compromise vital-industry amendment. This provision authorized the President to limit imports of specific products if they became large enough to threaten an industry vital to the national security. So far, this so-called vital-industry clause has made no appreciable contribution to the preservation of domestic industries, which Tariff Commission studies have indicated need relief, so I have concluded that the approach my amendment outlined was preferable, after all. It would make escape-clause recommendations of the Tariff Commission final, unless either House of the Congress, by a majority vote, passes a resolution to the contrary.

If we get some firm support from domestic raw materials producers, who suffer under this policy of trade, not aid, I believe that we can put it across this session, if such action is deemed necessary.

Please don't misunderstand me. I don't propose that such an amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is an acceptable substitute for long-range mining policy legislation, which must include other elements as well. It is not. The Congress should, and eventually will, come to grips on the fundamental question of "Shall our domestic mining industry be preserved?" The answer to this question, in my opinion, has to be long-range policy legislation that will contribute to that end.

However, such an amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act appears very desirable legislation and has far more long-range values in it than stockpiling, which has definite defense values and which did much as a short-term relief measure. Furthermore, this proposal would interfere in no way with overall solutions that may be reached under a long-range program; in fact, it would effectively supplement any apparent remedy in sight at this time.

I have been kicking this problem around since the early 1940's and discussing with mining people the pros and cons of assorted remedial proposals. And after all the talking and the arguing is done, the mining problem boils down to these fundamentals:

1. Domestic minerals industries are essential both to our economic development and our national defense. We simply cannot get along without them.

2. To survive, the domestic mines require a return commensurate with their vastly increased costs of exploration, production, processing, and financing. Maintenance of minimum operation levels of big mines is no solution. The little miner must survive, too, and the industry must have incentives to explore new reserves and to effect production economies.

3. Provided with adequate incentives, American prospectors and miners can locate and produce most of the vivtal strategic minerals, or acceptable substitutes, in the quantity needed. This you people have demonstrated in the success of the uranium, tungsten, fluorspar and other defense programs.

4. Low-paid foreign labor, utilizing American-produced mining machinery can mine most ores at substantially lower costs than we can here in America. If these low-cost foreign ores are delivered via cheap water transportation to American ports, they can undersell most rail-hauled domestic ores, even, in some cases, with a tariff imposed at our ports of entry.

5. Stockpiling has not solved any long-term basic economic problems. Instead, it has deferred an eventual solution, while contributing some real defense values.

6. Domestic mines deserve continued access to the American market, not just to preserve an essential industry, but also to guarantee American consumers against price manipulations and heavy gouging by foreign cartels.

The answer to some of these problems will be provided by my proposed amendment to the Trade Agreements Act.

The amendment does not prescribe any new, untried legislative remedies. It merely reasserts congressional control over the escape clause mechanism of the Trade Agreements Act, which provides for adequate review by the experts on the Tariff Commission and the application of remedies through imposition of tariffs or other forms of import controls. Such remedial action already has been recommended in the case of lead and zinc, but application has run into a real block, presumably in the State Department, where concern for foreign relations traditionally has overridden domestic economic considerations. In my opinion, in resolving these two concerns the Congress should play a larger role in the future than it has since 1934.

If such action does not appear warranted this session, I believe that the least we can accept, either in long-range legislation or in separate legislation, is adequate tariff protection for critical defense raw materials. Many people now regard tariffs as old-fashioned and there is still strong resistance to tariffs and all other import controls. But I think that you will agree with me that it was under protective tariffs that our domestic industries were built up in the early years of this century to the point where this Nation became the strongest and most important industrial Nation of the world. And I feel sure that most mining people would gladly accept tariff safeguards for strategic minerals either as an interim remedy or as part of the long-term program.

This is one fact that we must keep sight of in any proposal to provide more adequate incentives for the domestic minerals producers. It is this: Now is the time to effect such long-term policy legislation. The election year is behind us, so that the Congress can deal with such a basic problem without conflicting partisan overtones and election-year diversions. Furthermore, the bipartisan responsibility shared by the Democratic Congress and the Republican executive branch should contribute toward a bipartisan approach to a solution of this problem in response to 1956 platform pledges.

Furthermore, I want you to keep in mind that in the White House today we have one of the greatest friends to the West ever to occupy the Presidency. His international problems are heavy and complicated, and he is obliged to take considerable advice from the State Department—free trade's historical sounding board. However, from my personal dealings with this great man, I can assure you that when all the facts are in and available to him for adequate review, President Eisenhower characteristically makes sound decisions in the best interests of all the people of the Nation.

In the important hearings to come on long-range minerals policy let us assure that mining's case is reasonable and sound and that it is presented with conviction and a high degree of unanimity.

In conclusion, I reassert that if our domestic mining industry is to survive there is a pressing need for a far-reaching and effective long-range minerals policy. And the best policy is to assure our own domestic industries its rightful share of the American market. Looking the world over, no one can find a better market. Therefore, let us give first consideration to our own producers, who deserve not only a chance for survival but a healthy, hungry market for their products.

This program has far more than mere regional interest, because the mining industry is absolutely essential to our national economy and to our national defense. As loyal and practical Americans, we cannot stand idly by and see it weakened and destroyed.

Make no mistake about it, we are fully justified to going to the lengths necessary to assure not only that the mining industry is kept alive, but also that it remains healthy and vigorous and in a position to render continuing service to this great Nation in peace as well as war.

---

## Without Fear, Without Hindrance, Without Harassment—Remarks on National Freedom Day, February 1, 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 19, 1957*

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 1 it was my pleasure and privilege to speak at a luncheon in the Warwick Hotel in Philadelphia arranged by the women's committee of the National Freedom Day Association.

This association, founded by Maj. R. R. Wright, Sr., nationally prominent Philadelphia banker and business leader, was instrumental in the passage of legislation sponsored by the late Senator Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, to proclaim February 1 of each year as National Freedom Day to commemorate action by Congress in recommending to the States the 13th amendment to the Constitution abolishing slavery.

Chairman of the luncheon was Mrs. Harriet Wright Hines, daughter of Major Wright. Purpose of the affair, in keeping with the aims of the National Freedom Day Association, was to promote the rededication of all citizens to the ideal of freedom, the basis of our democracy.

"Let freedom and fair play reign throughout the Nation" is the motto of the National Freedom Day Association—one which all of us could subscribe to.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the remarks which I made at the Freedom Day luncheon on February 1, as follows:

WITHOUT FEAR, WITHOUT HINDRANCE, WITHOUT HARASSMENT

(Remarks by Congresswoman KATHRYN E. (Mrs. William T.) GRANAHAN, of Pennsylvania, at annual luncheon, National Freedom Day, February 1, 1957)

First of all, I want to say how much I appreciate the kind and courteous invitation which I received from the chairman of your women's committee, the very gracious Mrs. Harriet Wright Hines, to attend this luncheon and to speak to you on this occasion. The invitation came to me only a few days after I was elected to the Congress, and as part of the invitation there was a note of congratulations which was so warming and pleasant that I just couldn't possibly say "No" to the invitation.

Of course, I had no reason to want to say "No." As I wrote to the chairman, the only reason I would have for not being here today would be in case of some emergency situation in the House of Representatives, which required my attendance in Washington.

I am glad, therefore, that the legislative situation was such that I do not have to be in Washington today and can be here and join you in this annual observance of National Freedom Day.

With so much of the world still in slavery, with so many of the peoples of the world in chains of the soul and the mind and even in physical bondage—it is a good thing for all of us as Americans to do just what your association has taken the lead in doing; that is, to rededicate ourselves to the ideal of freedom.

It is a sobering thought that the occasion we observe and commemorate today—the constitutional amendment abolishing slavery in the United States—occurred only 92 years ago. There are Americans today who were living at that time, on that date of February 1, 1865, when the 38th Congress proposed the 13th amendment to the legislatures of the States. So we have had slavery in our country, under law, within the lifetime of some of our citizens.

It is perhaps well to keep this in mind, all of us, whenever we tend to regard ourselves as being superior to the rest of the world, or smarter, or finer, or more humane. Thank God our ancestors were able to throw off this hideous thing, and build a new rock foundation for the exercise of freedom in this great land.

But, of course, they did not do the whole job at that time. They abolished slavery, yes. They wrote into our great Constitution a provision which said the practice of slavery may not exist in this land.

Then they wrote some additional amendments into the Constitution—the 14th, to guarantee the rights of citizenship to all, and to guarantee the equal protection of the laws, and the right of due process—and the 15th, to guarantee the sacred right to vote.

The guaranties have been in the Constitution for nearly 100 years—but we must fight every day in the year, every year, to make them meaningful.

For freedom is a day-by-day, everyday, day-after-day objective. It is not a thing which once won, is forever secure. It must be rewon, and rewon again and again.

The constitutional guaranties are important. They are vital. But the hearts of men must be won over to those principles, and kept won to them, made to believe in them, and to want to uphold them.

And that is the hardest part of all, in the never-ending battle for human decency here in our country.

My interest in your Freedom Day observance today is more than casual. As many of you know, my husband and I were always very close to the late Senator Francis J. Myers. My husband succeeded Senator Myers in the House of Representatives, and I now serve in that same district—once represented by Senator Myers in the House. Naturally, whenever we visited together—and it was often—the talk veered around to Congress and legislative matters, and that's how I first learned of National Freedom Day.

The Senator told my husband and me about the Freedom Day resolution he was trying to get through Congress in 1947 and 1948, in the 80th Congress—that was at a time when a Republican represented our district in the House and Mr. Granahan was not in office. The Senator had introduced Senate Joint Resolution 37 in the 80th Congress and it was that particular bill, Senator Myers' bill, which was passed by the Congress and was signed by President Truman on June 30, 1948, to establish National Freedom Day on February 1.

Senator Myers had earlier been successful in getting through Congress a resolution honoring and commemorating the great George Washington Carver, designating January 5 as the George Washington Carver Day. This effort, as I recall his discussion of it, was stimulated by a group in Pittsburgh. After he got that through Congress, he told Bill and me, he just could not rest—he had no choice but to fight as hard as he could—to do at least as well for your founder, Major Wright and the National Freedom Association in Philadelphia.

Of course he meant that to be humorous, but all of you who knew the Senator knew that deep down, he was deeply serious about the whole question of human rights and civil rights and human decency, and it was he who led the fight in the Senate to eliminate the filibuster as a means of preventing civil-rights legislation.

I am proud, therefore, as one who valued his friendship and his political guidance, too—he was a tower of strength to me when I first decided to run to succeed my husband in Congress—I am proud, I repeat, that one of my first talks as a Member of Congress is in commemoration of the Freedom Day observance provided for in a resolution sponsored and introduced by Senator Francis Myers.

As a comparatively new Member of Congress, I cannot come to you today and say that I personally will make sure each piece of legislation you desire to see passed will absolutely become law this year. It is still too early to know what progress we will make on the civil-rights bills, for instance. The filibuster in the Senate is, of course, a serious obstacle. There must be enthusiastic administrative support if we are to get legislation through. That was lacking, as I understand it, last year.

But I can say this—and I can say it to you as friends whose opinion I respect and whose respect I treasure—I will do everything I can—everything within my power—to see to it that the spirit of the 13th and 14th and 15th amendments to our Constitution is carried out and adhered to in the laws we pass. I will not rest until Americans of all races can live secure in their rights, without fear, without hindrance, without harassment. That is my pledge, and my goal.

As a member of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, which helps administer the city of Washington, D. C., I know I am going to have my hands full, because as all of you know, this committee has even had submitted to it the proposal to restore segregation to the schools there.

All I can say about that is, my vote will certainly never be cast for prejudice.

---

## Governor Harriman's Proposal To Preserve Buildings and Sites of Great Historic and Architectural Interest Merits Support, Says New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 19, 1957*

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Governor Harriman, of New York, merits the support of everyone concerned with the preservation of buildings and sites of historic and architectural interest for his proposal that a New York State Commission be established to make a survey of those buildings most worth saving. He has urged the New York Legislature to take immediate steps to establish a coherent and long-range program for the acquisition of such properties and for "adequate, continuous financing" of their maintenance.

The rate of destruction of notable buildings in this country in the last two decades either by fire, demolition, or alteration is so dangerously high that thoughtful citizens are becoming deeply alarmed lest we be largely despoiled of the landmarks, sites, and notable objects which identify the historic achievements of the people of this Nation. As Prof. James Grote Van Derpool said so well in a letter he addressed to me some months ago:

> The inspiration to be derived from the great lessons of the past are of immense significance in guiding present and future generations toward similarly worthy standards and attainments. It seems somewhat futile to be deeply concerned about our future if we have little comprehension of our past. Certainly our great historic sites, buildings, and objects are compelling ways of realizing the worthy quality of our past attainments.

Following the enactment of the Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1935—49th United States Statutes at Large, page 666—the Nation Park Service of the Department of the Interior began making a nationwide survey of historic sites, buildings, and objects for the purpose of determining which of them are of outstanding national historical importance in the history of this country. The information which was collected has proven to be of basic importance and has been utilized in preparing data for Presidential proclamations, national historic sites designation orders, departmental reports on proposed legislation, replies to senatorial and congressional inquiries, and answers to private and

semipublic requests regarding preservation of nationally important historic buildings and sites.

When this important survey was approximately 50 percent complete it was interrupted by World War II in 1941. It has never been resumed and this situation has thrown an undue burden upon the States.

My own experience and observation of the situation convinces me that never, in the entire history of our country, has there been an administration in office in Washington with less real interest or concern for the historic past of our country as ememplified in its historic sites, buildings, and objects.

No other great nation in the world shows the blithe unconcern with its own history that is so readily apparent in Washington today. In other countries great historic buildings are preserved as national treasures. Here at home this administration seems capable of planning nothing but their early destruction.

During the 1st session of the 84th Congress I began to campaign for the preservation of the historic Patent Office Building at Seventh and F Streets NW., in Washington, D. C., and later protested the plan to survey, with a view to razing, some 31 other historic buildings across the country such as the fine old Customshouse in Charleston, S. C.

Fantastic as it may seem, the present administration proposed to tear down the old Patent Office Building to provide parking space on the site it occupies.

While these great buildings were given a temporary reprieve there is no way of telling how soon the drive for their destruction will be resumed.

Now this administration proposes to destroy most of the buildings on the west side of Lafayette Park in the Nation's Capital and replace them with a huge office building.

It will now be only a matter of time before this remarkable park going back to the early days of our country will be changed beyond recognition.

A huge office building on the west side of this park will inevitably lead to a huge office building on the east side, as was planned some years back.

Then it will be clearly in the public interest to provide parking facilities on or under Lafayette Park. The same kind of logic that led the administration to recommend the destruction of the historic Patent Office Building in order to provide parking facilities at Seventh and F Streets NW., will inevitably lead to similar recommendations for Lafayette Park.

This is progress?

In this context the forthright action of Governor Harriman assumes added significance. In this context, too, the procedures developed by the administration and announced with much fanfare in July 1956 for the preservation of historic buildings are clearly shown to be just more doubletalk.

In striking contrast with the disregard and unconcern which this administration consistently shows toward our buildings, objects, and sites of great historic and architectural interest is the regard and concern for our great cultural heritage shown by the American people. Here I would like to commend the National Gallery of Art which has become a world art center with 24 million visitors in 15 years for its due regard for our cultural heritage.

Great American symphony orchestras unequaled in technical skill and virtuosity anywhere in the world constantly play the greatest masterpieces of the past four centuries and devote their entire programs to this music, so much so that music written in our own time by our own composers seldom if ever is heard.

The great masterworks of the stage are constantly before us in the theater, the motion pictures, and television.

The great literature of the West is available in our libraries, bookstores, and even in our drugstores and on our newsstands.

Why then this total blindness to our great heritage of buildings, sites and objects by the present administration?

I include here articles from the New York Times, the Washington Star, and a report by the Commissioner of Public Buildings.

As to this report by the Commissioner of Public Buildings, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that there is nothing deader than a law or a regulation which this administration is determined to ignore. I intend to keep asking this question, therefore: "When does this administration intend to begin to comply with the spirit and the letter of the Historic Sites Act of 1935?"

[From the New York Times of February 18, 1957]

HISTORIC STATE

Governor Harriman merits the warm support of the New York Legislature in his proposal that immediate steps be taken to preserve buildings and sites of historic and architectural interest in this State from threatened destruction.

Pointing out that New York is unusually rich in the number, range and quality of historic structures within its borders, the Governor asks for establishment of a temporary State commission to make a survey of those most worth saving and to draw up specific recommendations for their preservation. In this way he hopes to establish a coherent and long-range program for the acquisition of these properties and for adequate, continuous financing of their maintenance without running to Congress or the Federal Government.

For nearly a quarter century, the Governor says, "despite numerous offers and opportunities, no new sites have been acquired by the State, and little has been done to develop those we already possess." Meanwhile, many buildings of great value as irreplaceable links with the past have been destroyed; and hardly a week goes by without news of threats to the very existence of another structure or another site that properly belongs in our great historic heritage.

Governor Harriman specifically singled out for immediate action the Walt Whitman house on Long Island, which has been offered the State, and the John Brown farm in Essex County, which is owned by the State but has not been restored and developed. There are many important sites and buildings—including structures along the Erie Canal—that it would be almost criminal vandalism to lose for future generations through the carelessness or indifference of this generation. Much more than a survey is needed; but an up-to-date survey is doubtless the prerequisite to a vigorous and effective program to preserve the priceless relics of the past that we simply cannot afford to lose.

---

[From the Washington Star of February 17, 1957]

LAFAYETTE SQUARE PLAN GIVEN RELUCTANT O. K.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation announced yesterday that it will go along with the Government's plan to build a huge Federal office building in the historic block between Jackson Place and 17th Street across Pennsylvania Avenue from the White House.

Richard H. Howland, president of the trust, said his group regretted, however, to see "so many changes in the architecture of Lafayette Square, involving the demolition of the few remaining 19th-century houses on the west side of the square."

The Federal Government already owns most property in the big block, and recently took title through condemnation proceedings to the remaining nine privately owned land parcels—all of them along Jackson Place.

Proposed is a $27.4 million Federal office building which was to have been built as part of the Federal lease-purchase public building program. Exact status of the project is thrown in doubt, however, by the administration's action last week in temporarily deferring any further construction under lease purchase.

WOULD SAVE THREE HOUSES

Mr. Howland noted that the National Trust itself will have to move from offices it occupies at 712 Jackson Place.

He said the trust had been assured that the historic Blair House and Blair-Lee House on Pennsylvania Avenue, and the Decatur House at Jackson Place and H Street will be preserved intact.

He said the General Services Administration also has stated that the "facade on the Federal building facing Lafayette Square will be low and small in scale and will harmonize in architectural style with these three historic houses."

Mr. Howland expressed hope that adequate parking will be provided for the new building, and added:

"We are also informed that three of the houses on Jackson Place, which were privately owned, were scheduled for demolition to make way for an office building, in the event the Federal Government did not require the properties in this block for its own use.

USE NOT YET DESIGNATED

"In these circumstances, the trust cannot protect against the Government's action, especially in view of the plans the GSA has made for a harmonious building on Jackson Place."

GSA obtained clearance from congressional committees to go ahead with site acquisition and design planning for the building last year. It has not designated a specific use for the new building. Testimony on Capitol Hill, however, indicated that one possibility might be to provide space for crowded White House executive offices.

Another provision of Congress' approval was that the building provide space for the United States Court of Claims. The court now occupies an old building in the same block, on the corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 17th Street NW.

---

[From the Washington Star of February 17, 1957]

DOOMED JACKSON PLACE ONCE HOUSED HISTORY, SCANDAL, AND GAY SOCIAL LIFE

(By Kenneth Anderson)

The Federal ax has fallen after 50 years of warning, and the historic block known as Jackson Place has now become Government property.

Only Decatur House, at the corner of Jackson Place and H Street has been exempted from the march of progress. All the other buildings, with the possible exception of 700 Jackson Place, are slated to be torn down or merged into a new Federal office building to take 3,250 overflow employees from the bulging executive offices.

The new office building will complete the transition of Jackson Place from its early role as a center of Washington's social and intellectual life. Once called 16½ Street, and then Lafayette Square West, it owes its present name to the equestrian statue of President Andrew Jackson, which stands in the center of Lafayette Park, on which Jackson Place faces.

THE YARD WAS TOO BIG

Back in 1801 a brick kiln and an old market stood in what is now the park. It had been intended that this piece of ground, once an apple orchard, would be part of the White House grounds. But Thomas Jefferson separated what is now the park from the White House property, saying: "It made too large and ostentatious a front yard."

Decatur House, oldest and finest of the Jackson Place residences, was built in 1819 for the intrepid Commodore Stephen Decatur. He paid for it with part of the prize money he drew for captures of enemy ships. He lived in the house less than 2 years before he was fatally wounded in a duel with Capt. James Barron and brought home to die in 1820.

After the commodore's death, the house was occupied by Baron Tuyl, the Minister from Russia; Henry Clay, Martin Van Buren, Edward Livingston, and foreign ministers Sir Charles Vaughan and Baron Hyde de Neuville and others. It was purchased after the Civil War by Gen. E. F. Beale and remained in the Beale family until 1956, when, by the will of Marie Beale, it went to the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

The side yard of Decatur House was purchased by Robert S. Brookings, and a large building, now the home of the National Grange, was erected there. Putting the building there cut off the view of the White House from a second-floor window of the Decatur House which Martin Van Buren had cut in the wall so he might exchange signals with his close friend President Jackson.

The large house next to the Grange building, No. 736, was first occupied by William F. Marcy, Secretary of War for President James K. Polk and Secretary of State for President Pierce. James G. Blaine lived there and it was also occupied by President Theodore Roosevelt during the summer of 1902 while the White House was being renovated. The Women's City Club and the National Lutheran Council later used the premises.

No. 734 was for many years the home of Charles C. Glover, Washington banker. Secretary of the Navy R. W. Thompson also lived there while in the Cabinet of President Hayes, and for many years it served as the office of the Christian Science Parent Church. It is now mainly used by the publications division of the Brookings Institution.

The fine old brownstone house, No. 730, is now occupied by the United States Conference of Mayors. The unusual hand-carved walnut fireplaces and other woodwork in this house have been carefully preserved. It was once the home of the editor, William J. Murtagh, who established the newspaper, the National Republican, and of Gen. Frank Steele.

SICKLES PROVIDED SCANDAL

The main building of the Brookings Institution, at 722 Jackson Place, stands on the site of the home of Gen. Daniel E. Sickles, who provided Washington with more excitement over a longer period of time than almost any other resident. While serving in Congress as a Representative from New York, General Sickles found good reason to suspect Philip Barton Key, United States attorney for the District of Columbia, of "flirting with his wife." General Sickles armed himself with a revolver and two derringers, then met the unarmed Mr. Key near the corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and Madison Place, at the east end of the park.

Shouting, "You have dishonored my home and my family," the general shot Mr. Key three times with the revolver and would have shot him a fourth time as he lay on the ground, but the cap failed to fire. General Sickles was acquitted, became a Civil War general, lost a leg at Gettysburg, then returned to Congress, where he served with distinction.

The United Automobile Workers' Union now occupies the new building at 718 Jackson Place. Here once stood the home of Mrs. Violet Blair Janin. Mrs. Janin, born in Blair House, was well known as a linguist and, on meeting visiting diplomats at Washington social gatherings, astounded many of them by conversing in their own languages.

In order to have a Washington headquarters while the National Art Gallery was under construction, the two houses at 716 and 712 Jackson Place were purchased for the use of the A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust. These houses, now restored and modernized, were once the homes of a number of distinguished Washingtonians, including Senator Arthur P. Gorman, and Col. Henry R. Rathbone, who accompanied President and Mrs. Lincoln to Ford's Theater on the tragic night of April 14, 1865. The National Trust for Historic Preservation is now located in No. 712.

Col. William L. Phillips, John R. McLean, and a Mrs. Green, daughter of Admiral Dahlgren, were occupants of No. 708 which was acquired by the United States Government some time ago.

MINISTER TO CHINA ON CORNER

One of the first residents of the big corner house, No. 700, was Peter Parker, Minister to China. Franklin A. Dick, lawyer and partner of Montgomery Blair, owned and lived in No. 704. Both these houses became the office of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace until this branch of the organization moved to New York and the property was sold to the Government.

It has taken the Government a long generation to move in on Jackson Place. The Charles C. Glover family sold their splendid townhouse at No. 734 in the midnineties because of a rumor that the Government would soon take over. When buying property on Jackson Place, Mr. Brookings commented that "it is the finest location in Washington." Apparently the representatives of the Government have finally decided Mr. Brookings was right.

---

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
*Washington, D. C., July 23, 1956.*

Re Buildings of historic value.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: You have asked to be informed as to to the procedures developed for the purpose of establishing the authenticity of federally owned properties that may have historical value. The following procedures for the referral and review of obsolete Federal buildings scheduled for demolition have been developed jointly by the National Park Service and GSA:

1. GSA will notify the National Park Service of the proposed demolition of an existing Federal building at the time GSA includes a project for its replacement in its lease-purchase or other construction programs. The notification will be in memorandum form which will give the name of the building, its location, and its date of construction; a separate memorandum will be forwarded on each project.

2. The National Park Service, upon receipt of the memorandum of notification, will examine the project file in the GSA's Washington Office; and, if necessary, borrow pertinent documents, maps, and photographs for study.

3. After preliminary study, if the National Park Service finds no apparent historical value in the property, GSA will be notified to this effect. If definite historical value is believed to exist and field investigation is required, GSA will also be notified and provided with a statement of the probable time required for the report and determination as to the national historical significance of the structure.

4. The National Park Service will provide GSA with a written determination on the historical significance of the structure within a feasible time and if possible, within a 60-day review period.

These procedures are now in effect, and the National Park Service has already cleared five obsolete buildings which have been scheduled for demolition.

Sincerely yours,

F. MORAN MCCONIHE,
*Commissioner of Public Buildings.*

---

# SENATE

## WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1957

*(Legislative day of Monday, February 18, 1957)*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God and Father of mankind, in whose will is our peace, in whose love is our rest, in whose service is our joy: grant us Thy empowering to work into the colorful tapestry of life we are daily weaving, in our character, and in our deeds, the radiant qualities of the divine; so that, as the flowers of the earth put on garments of gold and crimson and purple through their partnership with light, our spirits may become as the garden of the Lord, clothed with the bright blossoms of faith and peace through their union with Thee, who art light and in whom is no darkness at all. With our eyes upon that sun of righteousness which no earth-born clouds can dim, we lift our gaze from the valley of seeming futility and despair to the hills of eternal verities which stab the horizon with great and glorious spires. In the strength of that beckoning vision, make us strong to endure, that we faint not nor fear. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

---

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 19, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

---

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting

nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. O'MAHONEY, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business, subject to a 3-minute limitation on statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS PROGRAM, FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Battle Creek, Mich., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal contributions program, obligation of Federal funds, Federal civil defense, for quarter ended December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUDIT REPORT ON EXCHANGE STABILIZATION FUND

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Exchange Stabilization Fund, for the period July 1, 1955 to June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the General Counsel, United States Information Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUDIT REPORT ON EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Export-Import Bank of Washington, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

CERTIFICATION OF SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, JUNIPER DIVISION, WAPINITIA PROJECT, OREGON

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, certifying, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Juniper division, Wapinitia project, Oregon, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CIVIL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF CERTAIN SECURITY PROVISIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR-RISK INSURANCE AND CERTAIN MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION CONTRACT NO. AT (30-3)-222

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of Atomic Energy Commission contract No. AT (30-3)-222 with Yankee Atomic Electric Co., dated November 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Niagara Falls, N. Y., relating to the construction of facilities for the development of power on the Niagara River; to the Committee on Public Works.

## FLOOD CONTROL—RESOLUTION OF SENATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution of the Senate of the State of West Virginia, memorializing the Congress of the United States to act with respect to flood control in that State. I may say the resolution comes after disastrous floods in the southern part of the State. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, together with the certificate of the Honorable D. Pitt O'Brien, Secretary of State of West Virginia, transmitted with the resolution, and my letter, in reply to Mr. O'Brien, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution, certificate, and letter were referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 9

Memorializing Congress to take action on flood control embracing the valley of the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River in West Virginia

Whereas the valley of the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River in the State of West Virginia has recently been visited by a flood disaster, which might have been averted to a marked degree by a proper system of flood control; and

Whereas the recent flood has caused damage to the extent of at least $10 million in the valley of the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River; and

Whereas, other floods have occured at great frequency during the past few years in said valley, resulting in damages to the extent of many millions of dollars; and

Whereas, the distressing conditions due to floods tell a more powerful story than any that might be calculated in terms of the cost of a proper flood control system: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the senate (the house of delegates concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to take such action as will provide a suitable and proper system of flood control in order to avert another such disaster in the valley of the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River; and be it

*Resolved further*, That the Secretary of State is hereby directed to forward attested copies of this resolution to the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the West Virginia delegation in the Congress of the United States.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 9, adopted by the legislature on February 7, 1957, according to the official records in my office.

J. HOWARD MYERS,
*Clerk, Senate of West Virginia.*

I, D. Pitt O'Brien, secretary of state of the State of West Virginia, hereby certify that the annexed and hereto attached is a true and correct copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 9, adopted by the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, regular session, on the 7th day of February, 1957, as appears from the records of my said office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the said State at the city of Charleston, this 12th day of February 1957.

D. PITT O'BRIEN,
*Secretary of State.*

FEBRUARY 19, 1957.

Hon. D. PITT O'BRIEN,
*Secretary of State,*
*State of West Virginia,*
*Charleston, W. Va.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have received the certificate which you sent me containing Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 9, in which the Congress of the United States is requested to take such action as will provide a suitable and proper system of flood control in order to avert another such disaster in the valley of the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River. Be assured that I am in full accord with the purpose of this resolution. In keeping with the views expressed therein, I have already taken steps which I hope will bring about a realization of more flood control in our State.

I have requested the Chief of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army to proceed promptly with plans for flood control requirements on the Big Sandy River and its tributaries including Tug Fork of that river. This authority is already vested in the Corps of Engineers with respect to this river.

Further, I have prepared a resolution for action thereon by the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate directing the Corps of Engineers to bring up to date its survey and plans for the Guyandotte River and its tributaries.

Request has also been made of the Army Corps of Engineers to complete as quickly as possible its plans and proceed with construction of the flood control project at Williamson under Public Law 685.

I shall be very pleased if you would convey my response to the Senate of West Virginia

and advise the senate that I shall do all I can to establish more flood control where most needed in our State.

Very truly yours,

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB.

## CONTROL OF GRASSHOPPERS—JOINT RESOLUTION OF MONTANA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Joint Memorial No. 1, adopted by the Montana Legislature now in session. The memorial deals with the need for an adjustment in the cooperative program to fight infestation and control of grasshopper outbreaks on range and grazing lands.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 1

Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to Dwight D. Eisenhower, the President of the United States; to the Honorable James E. Murray and the Honorable Mike Mansfield, Senators from the State of Montana; to the Honorable Lee Metcalf and the Honorable LeRoy Anderson, Representatives from the State of Montana; to the Honorable Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States; relating to infestation and the control of grasshopper outbreaks on range and grazing lands

Whereas grasshoppers constitute a threat to range and grazing lands each year, with the intensity and scope of infestation varying from as much as 380,000 to 7,500,000 acres from 1 year to the next and from less than 100,000 to 2,000,000 acres in a similar period with no particular pattern of infestation evident in any succession of years nor any relationship between geographic areas or intensity within a given infestation that can be used as a basis for prediction; and

Whereas during the years of low grasshopper populations, infestations are confined to relatively small acreages which can be handled by the landowners themselves. In years of widespread outbreaks each individual infestation, which taken together constitute an outbreak, is so large that the total holdings of several farmers or ranchers may be involved. With the large acreage involved, which is usually accompanied by low precipitation and consequent lower yields, an economic situation is created whereby the landowner cannot combat the problem with his own resources; and

Whereas by administrative decision the present Federal-State cooperative program authorized under Public Resolution No. 91 of the 75th Congress is based on the theory of outbreak prevention and on the concept that outbreaks can be predicted from existing infestations and that all grasshopper infestations spread to adjoining areas from existing infestations; and

Whereas comprehensive research has shown that infestations develop through unpredictable changes in conditions existing in the areas so infested; and

Whereas comprehensive research has shown that the extent of damage done is not necessarily a result of the number of grasshoppers present, but appears to be related to the species of grasshopper present and the growing conditions of the plants, making it impossible to predict damage prior to its onset following the hatch of grasshoppers; and

Whereas hatching dates differ so widely from one area to another, even within the same species, that damage may be severe in one area before it appears in another; and

Whereas the present administrative decisions upon which the Federal-State cooperative program is based do not consider the problems posed by populations of those grasshopper species which infest nor the added problem of acres diverted to the soil bank which could become breeding grounds for the migratory species; and

Whereas the present administrative decisions allow only a 33⅓ percent Federal participation in the cost of control on privately owned lands which is inadequate to bring the cost down to a level that can be economically borne by the landowner under widespread outbreak conditions; and

Whereas the administrative decisions under which the present Federal-State program operate are so rigid that the program cannot be effectively adapted to the unpredictable situations which occur from year to year and its objectives of control from the standpoint of outbreak and migration prevention are not only inconsistent with research findings, but do not allow for the most effective use of available moneys at a time and in such places that the landowners can derive the maximum benefits: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the Thirty-fifth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That we respectfully recommend and urge the President of the United States, the Senators and Representatives from Montana and the Honorable Secretary of Agriculture to secure the reconsideration and revision of the administrative decisions upon which the present Federal-State cooperative program is based to the end that it will better serve the needs of range landowners and provide an adequate and fairly administered program of rangeland protection; be it further

*Resolved*, That consideration be given to conducting cooperative Federal-State control programs on the basis of rangeland protection rather than outbreak prevention and that the rancher-farmer be given the opportunity to elect when, where, and by whom the work shall be done; that the Agriculture Department of the State of Montana, in conjunction with the United States Soil Conservation offices, cooperate in the work and administration necessary to attain the objectives contained in this program; be it further

*Resolved*, That Federal moneys be made available to the extent of 50 percent of the cost of control on a matching basis regardless of the source of the matching money; be it further

*Resolved*, That the program be administered to the end that everyone participating in grasshopper control receives his proportionate share of the public moneys available regardless of their source; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of the Senate of the State of Montana to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Honorable James E. Murray and the Honorable Mike Mansfield, Senators from the State of Montana; to the Honorable Lee Metcalf and the Honorable LeRoy Anderson, Representatives from the State of Montana and to the Honorable Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States.

PAUL CANNON,
*President of the senate.*
EUGENE H. MAHONY,
*Speaker of the house.*

## CHAPLAINS' DAY—RESOLUTION OF LAS VEGAS (NEV.) FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Las Vegas Aerie of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, of Las Vegas, Nev., on January 22, 1957, which is entitled "Chaplains' Day Resolution."

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPLAINS' DAY RESOLUTION

Whereas on February 3, 1943, the U. S. S. *Dorchester* was sunk in the North Atlantic, during World War II, with the loss of more than 600 American lives, including 4 chaplains of 3 great religious faiths; George L. Fox, Protestant; John P. Washington, Catholic; Alexander L. Goode, Jewish rabbi, and Clark V. Poling, Protestant minister; and

Whereas these four chaplains gave up their lives that others might live, going down together on the deck of the U. S. S. *Dorchester*, to give to the world for all time a dramatic example of human brotherhood, courage, and selflessness, and an inspiring demonstration of interfaith unity and understanding; and

Whereas in order that the meaning and significance of their heroic deed may be perpetuated each year, memorializing not only the supreme sacrifice of the four chaplains, but the supreme sacrifice of all chaplains who gave up their lives for others, inspiring all Americans by their example of faith and courage: Now therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we urge the Congress of the United States to set aside the first Sunday in February each year, as Chaplains' Day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country.

Above resolution adopted by Las Vegas Aerie, 1213, Fraternal Order of Eagles, on January 22, 1957.

CHESTER COBAIN,
*Worthy President.*
A. G. BLAD,
*Secretary.*

## REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 348. An act to amend section 12 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676), relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, by providing for the use of public lands granted to the States therein for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishings, equipment, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said States (Rept. No. 93).

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 1292. A bill to reduce loss of life, personal injuries, and property damage resulting from automobile accidents by establishing an Automobile and Highway Safety Division within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to work in cooperation with other public and private agencies for

such purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 1293. A bill for the relief of Eithaniahu (Eton) Yellin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1294. A bill for the relief of Maria del Carmen Viquera Pinar; and

S. 1295. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theodore (Nicole Xantho) Rousseau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 1296. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. CURTIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1297. A bill for the relief of Walter Wettschreck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KERR, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. AIKEN, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. IVES, Mr. THYE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. WILEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. POTTER, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. MCNAMARA):

S. 1298. A bill to assist States in providing needed vocational education of less than college grade in essential occupations, including retraining made necessary by scientific and technological developments, through establishment and maintenance of area vocational school programs providing vocational training and retraining for persons residing in the State or area, including related instruction for apprentices; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 1299. A bill for the relief of Irma Kurrle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1300. A bill to authorize John R. Quigley to construct and maintain a sign, 50 feet by 30 feet, on certain property of the United States in Montana; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 1301. A bill for the relief of Sam A. Reeks, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1302. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 1303. A bill for the relief of the cities of Mandan and Bismarck, N. Dak.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1304. A bill to provide for reports on the acreage planted to cotton, to repeal the prohibitions against cotton acreage reports based on farmers' planting intentions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 1305. A bill for the relief of certain members of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 1306. A bill for the relief of Pao-Wei Yung; and

S. 1307. A bill for the relief of Toribia Basterrechea (Arrola); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONE (for himself and Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 1308. A bill for the relief of Carmen Jeanne Launois Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1309. A bill for the relief of Susanne Burka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1310. A bill for the relief of certain aliens; and

S. 1311. A bill for the relief of Maria Gradi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1312. A bill for the relief of Harry G. Brown and Frances Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. BEALL):

S. 1313. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1314. A bill to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 1315. A bill to authorize the National Potato Grade Labeling Act, which provides quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 1316. A bill to reduce the percentage depletion for oil and gas wells; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 1317. A bill for the relief of Herman Sung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. WILEY):

S. J. Res. 64. Joint resolution to implement the Convention between the United States of America and Norway, which entered into force on November 9, 1948, for the disposition of the claim against the Government of the United States of America asserted by the Government of Norway on behalf of Christoffer Hannevig; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. GREEN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

## INVESTIGATION BY TARIFF COMMISSION OF EFFECT OF IMPORTATION OF FURS

Mr. MCCARTHY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 100), which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

*Resolved*, That the United States Tariff Commission is hereby directed, pursuant to section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to make a thorough investigation of the effect upon the American fur-producing industry of the importation of furs, and to report thereon to the Congress on or before November 1, 1957.

SEC. 2. Such investigation shall be made after due notice and opportunity for hearing is given to interested parties. The report of the Commission shall set forth the facts affecting the relative competitive position of foreign and domestic fur producers, including the impact of trade practices, methods of distribution, and imports on domestic producers, and shall take into account reports that foreign furs are being dumped on the American market.

## ESTABLISHMENT OF AUTOMOBILE AND HIGHWAY SAFETY DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss briefly a problem which can best be described as a continuing national catastrophe. It is a problem with which we live every day of our lives, but which rarely intrudes into our conscious thoughts. It is a problem of life and death, and its very familiarity has bred either contempt or indifference.

Occasionally we see statistics which tell us that a killer is loose in our country. Between 1947 and 1955, it slaughtered 320,000 Americans. More than 38,000 died in 1955 alone, and another 110,000 were permanently crippled. In half a century, this killer has taken more than twice as many American lives as all our wars. The property damage has run into the billions of dollars, and there is no measure of the agony and privation that have been caused.

I am referring to the deadly toll of highway accidents.

It is not a simple problem, because we live in a nation that is committed to the automobile as a way of life. For every 3 people in America today, there is 1 automobile. Sixty-five percent of our families own a car. There are 66 million licensed drivers.

Retail motorcar and truck sales amount to more than $30 billion yearly. In Detroit alone, half a million workers are employed by the automobile industry.

The automobile has transformed our whole society. It has given us mobility, employment, and a new measure of freedom. It has also given us death on an unprecedented scale.

We cannot abolish the automobile, but neither can we ignore the problems that it brings to us. There is a responsibility here which we must face.

I am introducing today a bill to establish an Automobile and Highway Safety Division in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There is a clear-cut role which such a division can play.

It can collect information; it can work with State and local governments; it can cooperate with such organizations as the Cornell study group and the National Safety Council; it can promote research into improved designs for automobiles and highways to prevent accidents and to reduce the severity of injuries in automobile accidents.

It can constantly bring to the public's attention the facts of life and death in highway safety. It can inform the public on the currently known and proven measures which will increase highway safety.

Mr. President, it is my hope that this step will make a positive contribution to solving a problem that has caused death, destruction, and untold agony on an unprecedented scale.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1292) to reduce loss of life, personal injuries, and property damage resulting from automobile accidents by establishing an Automobile and Highway Safety Division within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to work in cooperation with other public and private agencies for such purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## AMENDMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT OF 1936

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators HRUSKA, CARLSON, GOLDWATER, BARRETT, YOUNG, and MCCARTHY, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to repeal the requirement that 25 percent of funds made available for loans to Rural Electrification systems shall be apportioned to States in the proportion that the number of nonelectrified farms in a State bears to the national total of nonelectrified farms.

As is well known, the provision for allocating this portion of the funds appropriated annually was reduced to 25 percent by a law enacted in 1955. At that time, hearings on the amendment made it clear that, with about 95 percent of our farms now electrified, the allocation serves no useful purpose. During the 1955 hearings, REA representatives and testimony of farm organizations sought repeal of the allocation.

This proposed legislation will benefit our fine REA program, and obviate a cumbersome procedure. In addition, it will serve the interest of economy in government, in that allocation of funds to a State will not guarantee that the funds will be used in that State. Loans can be made only if valid applications are submitted. It has frequently been necessary for the Rural Electrification Administration to draw down funds far in excess of the amount needed for a particular loan because of the allocation formula.

For many years, there has been sincere effort to abandon the allocation formula, and I believe that we can, by avoiding it, be of service to our REA systems. We all know of the importance of sound REA development for farms and farm homes. I am sure we are all interested in giving our REA program this added help.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1296) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, introduced by Mr. CURTIS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1957

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators FULBRIGHT, SPARKMAN, TALMADGE, JACKSON, HENNINGS, CARLSON, COOPER, HUMPHREY, KERR, LANGER, MONRONEY, MORSE, PASTORE, MURRAY, SCOTT, ERVIN, MANSFIELD, CHAVEZ, AIKEN, SMITH of Maine, IVES, THYE, PAYNE, YOUNG, MAGNUSON, CHURCH, O'MAHONEY, CARROLL, SYMINGTON, KEFAUVER, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, CLARK, MCCLELLAN, WILEY, KENNEDY, POTTER, NEUBERGER, JAVITS, and MCNAMARA, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to assist States in providing needed vocational education of less than college grade in essential occupations, including retraining made necessary by scientific and technological developments, through establishment and maintenance of area vocational school programs providing vocational training and retraining for persons residing in the State or area, including related instruction for apprentices. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me, explaining the purposes of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1298) to assist States in providing needed vocational education of less than college grade in essential occupations, including retraining made necessary by scientific and technological developments, through establishment and maintenance of area vocational school programs providing vocational training and retraining for persons residing in the State or area, including related instruction for apprentices, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. HILL is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HILL

The primary purpose of the measure is to assist States in the further development of vocational training in essential occupations for youths, adults, and older persons, residing in areas not now being adequately served. It would be especially helpful to States in providing training and retraining made necessary by new scientific and technological developments and relocation of industries.

If enacted into law, this measure will help our Nation to win the economic war with Russia, which is beginning to take form. The future of America is tied inseparably to the skills and productivity of the masses.

This proposed legislation will encourage States and local communities to develop vocational programs of less than college grade in keeping with local, State, and National needs. A recent survey shows that virtually every State is now operating one or more area vocational education programs. Federal funds would help stimulate the further development of this vital program and thus greatly strengthen our Nation.

The bill, if enacted, would authorize appropriations as follows: $5 million for the 1st year; $7,500,000 for the 2d year; $10 million for the 3d year and such amount for each fiscal year thereafter as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of the act. It contains provisions for minimum amounts for States with small populations. It also authorizes an appropriation of $500,000 for State supervision of industrial arts education. The measure provides for allotting funds to States on a composite of the formula used in the George-Barden Vocational Education Act. This formula has proved satisfactory for more than 20 years.

Funds appropriated under the provisions of the measure would, after the first year, be matched by State or local funds or both—75 percent of the funds must be matched the 2d and 3d years and 100 percent thereafter. Funds may be used for determining need, planning, developing, and operating area vocational education programs, including among other things, salaries and necessary travel expenses of personnel; purchase, rental or other acquisition, and maintenance and repair of instructional equipment; and purchase of instructional supplies and teaching aids.

To receive benefits under the measure a State board for vocational education may submit to Federal authorities a separate State plan or an amendment to its present State plan for vocational education. The program at the State level will be under the supervision and control of the State board for vocational education. It will be administered at the national level by the United States Commissioner of Education under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

As defined in this measure, "the term 'area vocational school program' means a program of a tax-supported school operated by State or local public school authorities consisting of one or more less-than-college-grade courses of vocational training and related instruction (including related instruction for apprentices) on an organized, systematic class basis, made available to residents of the State or an area thereof designated and approved by the State board, who either have completed junior high school or, regardless of their school credits, are at least 16 years of age and can profit by instruction offered."

## AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT, RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX, AND RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators MURRAY, NEELY, KENNEDY, NEUBERGER, COOPER, and BEALL, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill containing a group of railroad retirement and unemployment insurance amendments to existing legislation.

Congress has an unfinished job and an unfulfilled obligation to discharge—the enactment of railroad-retirement legislation. Toward the close of the last Congress I called on Congress to do that by deciding upon the final plan of a bill for railroad-retirement amendments and then to enact that bill.

Unforunately that was not done. We in the 85th Congress must do the job, without dragging our feet, in order to do justice to retired railroaders and their survivors and those who are working toward retirement. We have the duty to them and the community at large to

keep up to date the retirement purchasing power of the people who make our railroads run.

Toward that end I am introducing a bill to improve the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. It is a companion to H. R. 4101 recently introduced by the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

As chairman of the subcommittee on railroad retirement I shall do everything that I can to insure that this bill, and any others on the subject, receive prompt and thorough consideration so that a fair and workable bill will come before the Senate. To that end I plan hearings for the week of March 11. The exact dates will be announced soon.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a brief analysis of its provisions, may be printed in the RECORD, and that the bill lie on the table for the remainder of this week, for the addition of the names of other cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and analysis will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 1313) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.—*

PART I—AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937

SECTION 1. (a) Section 2 (a) 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"3. Individuals who will have attained the age of 60 and will have completed 30 years of service or, in the case of women, who will have attained the age of 62 and will have completed less than 30 years of service, but the annuity of such individual shall be reduced by one one-hundred-and-eightieth for each calendar month that he or she is under age 65 when the annuity begins to accrue."

(b) Section 2 (d) of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "If, pursuant to the third sentence of this subsection, an annuity was not paid to an individual with respect to 1 or more months in any calendar year, and it is subsequently established that the total amount of such individual's earnings during such year as determined in accordance with that sentence (but exclusive of earnings for services described in the first sentence of this subsection) did not exceed $1,200, the annuity with respect to such month or months, and any deduction imposed by reason of the failure to report earnings for such month or months under the fifth sentence of this subsection, shall then be payable. If the total amount of such individual's earnings during such year (exclusive of earnings for services described in the first sentence of this subsection) is in excess of $1,200, the number of months in such year with respect to which an annuity is not payable by reason of such third and fifth sentences shall not exceed 1 month for each $100 of such excess, treating the last $50 or more of such excess as $100; and if the amount of the annuity has changed during such year, any payments of annuity which become payable solely by reason of the limitation contained in this sentence shall be made first with respect to the month or months for which the annuity is larger."

(c) Section 2 (e) of such act is amended by striking out "than an amount" and inserting in lieu thereof "than 110 percent of an amount."

(d) Section 2 (g) of such act is amended by inserting after "wife under age 65" the following: "(other than a wife who is receiving such annuity by reason of an election under subsection (h))."

(e) Section 2 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) A spouse who would be entitled to an annuity under subsection (e) if she or he had attained the age of 65 may elect upon or after attaining the age of 62 to receive such annuity, but the annuity in any such case shall be reduced by one one-hundred-and-eightieth for each calendar month that the spouse is under age 65 when the annuity begins to accrue."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 3 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended (1) by striking out "3.04", "2.23", and "1.52" and inserting in lieu thereof "3.35", "2.51", and "1.67", respectively; and (2) by striking out "$200" and inserting in lieu thereof "$250."

(b) Section 3 (c) of such act is amended by inserting after "or in excess of $350 for any month after June 30, 1954," the following: "and before July 1, 1957, or in excess of $400 for any month after June 30, 1957."

(c) Section 3 (e) of such act is amended (1) by striking out "$4.55" and "$75.90" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5.00" and "$83.50", respectively; (2) by striking out "is less than the amount, or the additional amount" and inserting in lieu thereof "is less than 110 percent of the amount, or 110 percent of the additional amount"; (3) by inserting after "age 65," the following: "women entitled to spouse's annuities pursuant to elections made under subsection (h) of section 2 to be entitled to wife's insurance benefits determined under section 202 (q) of the Social Security Act,"; and (4) by striking out "such amount of such additional amount" and inserting in lieu thereof "110 percent of such amount or 110 percent of such additional amount."

SEC. 3. (a) Sections 5 (f) (1) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended (1) by striking out of the first sentence the following: "who will have died leaving no widow, widower, child, or parent who would on proper application therefor be entitled to receive an annuity under this section for the month in which such death occurred"; (2) by inserting in the first sentence after "10 times the employee's basic amount" the following: ", but not to exceed a total of $750,"; and (3) by striking out the fourth sentence.

(b) Section 5 (f) (2) of such act is amended by striking out "and 7 percent of his or her compensation after December 31, 1946 (exclusive in both cases of compensation in excess of $300 for any month before July 1, 1954, and in the latter case in excess of $350 for any month after June 30, 1954)," and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "plus 7 percent of his or her compensation paid after December 31, 1946, and before January 1, 1957, plus 7½ percent of his or her compensation paid after December 31, 1956, and before January 1, 1958, plus 8 percent of his or her compensation paid after December 31, 1957 (exclusive of compensation in excess of $300 for any month before July 1, 1954, and in excess of $350 for any month after June 30, 1954, and before July 1, 1957, and in excess of $400 for any month after June 30, 1957),".

(c) Section 5 (h) of such act is amended by striking out "$33", "$176", and "$15.40" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "$36.30", "$193.60", and "$16.95", respectively.

(d) Section 5 (1) (1) (ii) of such act is amended by striking out "or in which month he engaged on seven or more different calendar days in noncovered remunerative activity outside the United States (as defined in sec. 203 (k) of the Social Security Act)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or, having engaged in any activity outside the United States, would be charged under such section 203 (e) with any earnings derived from such activity if it had been an activity within the United States."

(e) Clause (A) (i) of section 5 (1) (9) of such act is amended by striking out the word "and" appearing after "July 1, 1954," and by inserting after "June 30, 1954," the following: "and before July 1, 1957, and any excess over $400 for any calendar month after June 30, 1957."

(f) Clause (A) (ii) of section 5 (1) (19) of such act is amended (1) by inserting "and before 1957" after "1954" where it first appears; (2) by inserting after "$4,200" where it first appears the following: ", or for the calendar year 1957 is less than $4,500, or for any calendar year after 1957 is less than $4,800,"; (3) by striking out "$350" and inserting in lieu thereof "$400"; and (4) by striking out "and $4,200 for the years after 1954, by" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", $4,200 for years after 1954 and before 1957, $4,500 for the year 1957, and $4,800 for years after 1957, by."

(g) Section 5 (1) (10) of such act is amended by striking out "44", "11", "$350", "$15.40", "$33.66", "$27.50", and "$14.66" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "49", "12", "$400", "$16.95", "$40.33", "$30.25", and "$16.13", respectively.

SEC. 4. All pensions under section 6 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, all joint and survivor annuities and survivor annuities deriving from joint and survivor annuities under that act awarded before July 1, 1957, and all annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935, are increased by 10 percent.

SEC. 5. (a) The amendments made by section 1 (other than subsec. (b) thereof), by subsections (a) and (c) of section 2, and by subsections (c) and (d) of section 3 shall be effective only with respect to annuities (not including annuities to which sec. 4 applies) accruing for months after June 1957. The amendment made by subsection (b) of section 1 shall be effective with respect to annuities accruing during the calendar year 1957 and subsequent calendar years. The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of section 3 shall be effective only with respect to lump-sum payments (under secs. 5 (f) (1) and 5 (f) (2) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937) in the case of deaths occurring after June 1957. The amendments made by subsection (g) of section 3 shall be effective only with respect to annuities accruing for months after June 1957 and lump-sum payments (under sec. 5 (f) (1) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937) in the case of deaths occurring after June 1957. Section 4 shall be effective only with respect to pensions due in calendar months after July 1957 and annuities accruing for months after June 1957.

(b) All recertifications required by reason of the amendments made by this part shall be made by the Railroad Retirement Board without application therefor.

PART II—AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT

SEC. 201. (a) Sections 3201, 3202 (a), 3211, and 3221 of the Railroad Retirement Tax Act are each amended (1) by striking out "after December 31, 1954" wherever it appears and

inserting in lieu thereof "after June 30, 1957", and (2) by striking out "$350" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$400."

(b) Sections 3202 (a) and 3221 of such act are each further amended by striking out "after 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "after June 1957."

(c) Sections 3201 and 3221 of such act are each further amended by striking out "6¼ percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "7½ percent."

(d) Section 3201 of such act is further amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu of such period a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That the rate of tax imposed by this section shall be increased, with respect to compensation paid after December 31, 1969, for services rendered after such date, by a number of percentage points (including fractional points) equal at any given time to the number of percentage points (including fractional points) by which the rate of the tax imposed with respect to wages by section 3101 at such time exceeds the rate provided by paragraph (2) of such section 3101 as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1956."

(e) Section 3211 of such act is further amended by striking out "12½ percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "15 percent", and by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu of such period a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That the rate of tax imposed by this section shall be increased, with respect to compensation paid after December 31, 1969, for services rendered after such date, by a number of percentage points (including fractional points) equal at any given time to twice the number of percentage points (including fractional points) by which the rate of the tax imposed with respect to wages by section 3101 at such time exceeds the rate provided by paragraph (2) of such section 3101 as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1956."

(f) Section 3221 of such act is further amended by inserting "(a)" before "In addition", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The rate of tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be increased, with respect to compensation paid after December 31, 1969, for services rendered after such date, by a number of percentage points (including fractional points) equal at any given time to the number of percentage points (including fractional points) by which the rate of the tax imposed with respect to wages by section 3111 at such time exceeds the rate provided by paragraph (2) of such section 3111 as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1956."

SEC. 202. The amendments made by section 201 shall, except as otherwise provided in such amendments, be effective only with respect to compensation paid after June 30, 1957, for services rendered after such date.

PART III—AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

SEC. 301. Section 1 (i) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out the proviso in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof ": *Provided, however,* That in computing the compensation paid to any employee, no part of any month's compensation in excess of $300 for any month before July 1, 1954, or in excess of $350 for any month after June 30, 1954, and before July 1, 1957, or in excess of $400 for any month after June 30, 1957, shall be recognized."

SEC. 302. (a) Section 2 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out the language between "(i)" and "(ii)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "for each day of unemployment in excess of four during any registration period, and".

(b) Section 2 (a) of such act is further amended by striking out columns I and II and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

| "Column I Total compensation | Column II Daily benefit rate |
|---|---|
| $500 to $699.99 | $4.50 |
| 700 to 999.99 | 5.00 |
| 1,000 to 1,299.99 | 5.50 |
| 1,300 to 1,599.99 | 6.00 |
| 1,600 to 1,899.99 | 6.50 |
| 1,900 to 2,199.99 | 7.00 |
| 2,200 to 2,499.99 | 7.50 |
| 2,500 to 2,799.99 | 8.00 |
| 2,800 to 3,099.99 | 8.50 |
| 3,100 to 3,499.99 | 9.00 |
| 3,500 to 3,999.99 | 9.50 |
| 4,000 and over | 10.20." |

(c) The proviso in such section 2 (a) is amended by striking out "50" and "$8.50" and inserting in lieu thereof "60" and "$10.20", respectively.

SEC. 303. Section 2 (c) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu of such period a colon and the following: *"And provided, further,* That, with respect to an employee who has 5 or more years of service as defined in section 1 (f) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, who did not voluntarily leave work without good cause or voluntarily retire, and who had current rights to normal benefits for days of unemployment in a benefit year but has exhausted such rights, the benefit year in which such rights are exhausted shall be deemed not to be ended until the last day of the extended benefit period determined under the following schedule, and the maximum number of days of, and amount of payment for, unemployment within such benefit year for which benefits may be paid to the employee shall be enlarged to include all compensable days of unemployment within such extended benefit period:

| "If the employee's 'years of service' total— | The extended benefit period shall begin on the first day of unemployment following the day on which the employee exhausted his then current rights to normal benefits for days of unemployment and shall continue for successive 14-day periods (each of which periods shall constitute a registration period) until the number of such 14-day periods totals— |
|---|---|
| 5 and less than 10 | 39 |
| 10 and less than 15 | 65 |
| 15 and less than 20 | 91 |
| 20 and over | 117 |

but no such extended benefit period shall extend beyond the beginning of the first registration period in a benefit year in which the employee is again qualified for benefits in accordance with section 3 of this act on the basis of compensation earned after the first of such successive 14-day periods has begun. For an employee who has 5 or more years of service, who did not voluntarily leave work without good cause or voluntarily retire, who has 14 or more consecutive days of unemployment, and who is not a 'qualified employee' for the general benefit year current when such unemployment commences but is or becomes a 'qualified employee' for the next succeeding general benefit year, such succeeding benefit year shall, in his case, begin on the first day of the month in which such unemployment commences."

SEC. 304. Section 3 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out "$400" and inserting in lieu thereof "$500."

SEC. 305. Section 4 (a–2) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out subdivision (iv), and by striking out the semicolon at the end of subdivision (iii) and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

SEC. 306. Section 8 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended (1) by inserting after "June 30, 1954" where it first appears the following: ", and before July 1, 1957, and is not in excess of $400 for any calendar month paid by him to any employee for services rendered to him after June 30, 1957"; (2) by inserting after "June 30, 1954" where it appears for the second time the following: ", and before July 1, 1957, and to not more than $400 for any month after June 30, 1957"; (3) by inserting after "June 30, 1954" where it appears for the third time the following: ", and before July 1, 1957, or less than $400 if such month is after June 30, 1957"; (4) by striking out "1947" in paragraph 2 and inserting in lieu thereof "1957"; and (5) by striking out the table (except the column headings) in such paragraph 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

| | |
|---|---|
| "$450,000,000 or more | 2 percent |
| $400,000,000 or more but less than $450,000,000 | 2½ percent |
| $350,000,000 or more but less than $400,000,000 | 3 percent |
| $300,000,000 or more but less than $350,000,000 | 3½ percent |
| Less than $300,000,000 | 4 percent." |

SEC. 307. Section 8 (b) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended (1) by striking out "3 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "4 per centum"; and (2) by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: ", and before July 1, 1957, and as is not in excess of $400 paid to him for services rendered as an employee representative in any calendar month after June 30, 1957."

SEC. 308. The amendments made by sections 302, 303, and 305 shall be effective with respect to benefits accruing in general benefit years which begin after the benefit year ending June 30, 1957, and in extended benefit periods which begin after December 31, 1956. The amendment made by section 304 shall be effective with respect to base years after the base year ending December 31, 1956. The amendment made by clause (1) of section 307 shall apply with respect to compensation paid for services rendered in calendar months after June 30, 1957.

The analysis presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

ANALYSIS

PART 1. THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

1. All annuities (age and disability retirement, spouses', and survivors') pensions, and insurance lump sums, under the Railroad Retirement Act would be increased by 10 percent (except annuities which are, or would be, based on the equivalent of the annuitant's average monthly compensation while working in the railroad industry);

2. An employee who was retired on an annuity by reason of disability would not lose the annuity for any month in which he earned more than $100 in outside employment if his total earnings in the year, which includes such month, do not exceed $1,200; and if such earnings exceed $1,200, the annuitant would not lose more than 1 month's annuity for each $100 of such excess, treating the last $50 or more of such excess as $100;

3. Women railroad employees with less than 30 years of service, would be eligible for annuities at age 62 rather than age 65, but the annuity would be on a reduced basis (women with 30 years of service are now, and will continue to be, eligible for full retirement at age 60);

4. A spouse's annuity would be payable at age 62, rather than age 65, upon election

of the spouse to receive such annuity on a reduced basis;

5. The "insurance" lump sum (which is not now payable if the deceased employee is survived by a person entitled to an annuity in the month in which the employee died) would be payable even if the deceased is survived by a person so entitled, but the amount would in no case exceed $750;

6. The maximum creditable compensation under the act would be increased from $350 to $400 a month, effective with respect to compensation for service after June 30, 1957;

7. The residual lump sum would be increased to reflect the increase in the maximum creditable monthly compensation; and

8. For survivor beneficiaries who work outside the United States the work limitations on benefits would be the same as are now provided for work in the United States.

PART. II. THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT

In order to provide funds for the proposed increases in benefits, and to take care of any present deficiency in the railroad retirement account, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act would be amended as follows:

1. The tax base would be increased from the present maximum of $350 a month to $400, effective with respect to compensation for service after June 30, 1957;

2. The tax rates on employers and employees would be increased from the present 6¼ percent of payroll on each side, up to $350 a month, to 7½ percent of payroll on each side, up to $400 a month, effective with respect to compensation for service after June 30, 1957;

3. The tax rates on employee representatives would be increased from the present 12½ percent of payroll, up to $350 a month, to 15 percent of payroll, up to $400 a month, effective with respect to compensation for service after June 30, 1957; and

4. An additional increase in tax rates with respect to compensation paid for services beginning January 1, 1970, is provided, but such increase would be conditioned upon, and would be equal to the number of percentage points (including fractional points) of, the increase in the rate of social security employment taxes which, as now scheduled, would not be effective before 1965. (The reason for this proposed conditional increase is that if social-security taxes increase as scheduled, the retirement account will be charged correspondingly more under the financial interchange arrangement, and to the extent of such increases scheduled for 1965 and thereafter it is necessary to increase retirement taxes to the same extent on compensation paid after 1969 in order to continue on an actuarily sound basis.)

PART III. THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

In order to improve the lot of unemployed railroad workers, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act would be amended as follows:

1. The daily benefit rate would be increased from 50 percent of compensation for the employee's last employment in a base year, to 60 percent of such compensation;

2. The maximum daily benefit rate would be increased from $8.50 to $10.20;

3. Sundays and holidays would be treated as days of unemployment for unemployment purposes;

4. The number of days for which benefits may be paid in the first registration period in a benefit year would be 10 (instead of 7), the same as in subsequent registration periods in the same benefit year;

5. For a career railroad employee (one with at least 5 years of railroad service) who is out of work through no fault of his own, the bill would extend the period during which he may receive benefits. These extended periods would vary in length, depending, generally, on the length of the beneficiary's previous employment, so that an unemployed man with 20 or more years of service would receive benefits for as much as 4½ years longer than he might otherwise receive;

6. The minimum earnings in a base year which would qualify an employee for benefits in the benefit year would be increased from $400 to $500;

7. The maximum taxable earnings in a month would be increased from $350 to $400; and

8. The contribution rate would be increased to 2 percent of creditable compensation when the balance in the railroad unemployment insurance account would total $450 million or more; and this rate would be increased, by steps, to 4 percent of such compensation when the balance in the account fell below $300 million.

The bill (H. R. 3665) by Mr. McCARTHY would exempt from Federal income tax and withholding all employees railroad retirement taxes.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, today I introduced a bill in behalf of myself, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL].

I wish the RECORD to show definitely that neither the first sponsor of the bill nor the cosponsors take the position that this bill is the bill which should be passed without any changes. All we say, Mr. President, is that a strong prima facie case has been made for the proposals contained in the bill. We think the bill should be submitted to very early hearings, and if the evidence shows that changes will make it a better bill, I can assure the Senate each one of us in our individual capacities reserves the right to consider such changes.

It is in that spirit and with that feeling that I introduce the bill, urging, as I do so, that the best bill which can be reported by the committee, after full hearings, ought to be considered and passed at this session of Congress, because the great body of railroad workers should receive the justice which is due them and which was not given them in the last session of the Congress as a result of unfortunate delays. As chairman of the subcommittee let me say that we are going to do everything within our power to get the earliest possible action on a fair railroad retirement bill in this session of the Congress.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I am in full accord with the statements which have been made by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon. In 1954, when I was a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I had the opportunity to serve as chairman of the subcommittee which considered at that time amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act, and in that session of the Congress the bill was passed.

I agree with my distinguished colleague from Oregon that steps must be taken to make that act more effective.

I should like to say for myself that I, too, reserve my decision. While agreeing with the objectives of the bill which has been introduced, I hold myself open to recommend and to support such changes as will make the bill more effective and more in accord with the general objective.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky very much.

---

## CHRISTOFFER HANNEVIG—REFERENCE OF CLAIM TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which, if enacted, would confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to adjudicate the claim of one Christoffer Hannevig, of Norway, for compensation against the United States. The claim is allegedly derived from the requisition of certain properties by agencies of the United States Government during the First World War.

The United States has consistently denied the validity of the Hannevig claim, which is predicated upon his alleged interest in certain corporations affected by the requisition orders. Nevertheless, in a convention between Norway and the United States which entered into force on November 9, 1948—TIAS, 1865; 62d Statutes at Large, page 1798—it was agreed that the Hannevig claim would be referred to the Court of Claims, with possible appeal to the United States Supreme Court, in the event that the two Governments were unable to reach a settlement by diplomatic procedures. Such procedures have reached an impasse.

Article II of the convention specifically recognized that the provisions for referring the claim to the American courts "are subject to authorization by the Congress of the United States." The bill which I am now introducing would provide the requisite legislative authorization to enable the United States to comply with an international obligation which it assumed in the convention. By this bill, our Government is merely giving effect to procedures originally contemplated when the Senate gave its approval to the convention.

I should add, Mr. President, that the claim here involved seeks the recovery of a principal sum of $25 million, together with interest computed from 1917 at the rate of 6 percent. Although it believes the legal basis of the claim to be highly dubious, the Department of State is most desirous that the issue be adjudicated and disposed of by our courts, not only to remove a long-standing source of irritation between Norway and the United States, but also to give effect to an international obligation we assumed in 1948.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks a letter

dealing with this matter sent to the Vice President by the Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 64) to implement the Convention between the United States of America and Norway, which entered into force on November 9, 1948, for the disposition of the claim against the Government of the United States of America asserted by the Government of Norway on behalf of Christoffer Hannevig, introduced by Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. WILEY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The letter presented by Mr. GREEN is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
*Washington, December 26, 1956.*

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
*President of the Senate.*

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I enclose a draft of proposed legislation to implement the Convention between the United States and Norway, which entered into force on November 9, 1948, relating to the disposition of an international claim against the United States asserted by the Government of Norway on behalf of Christoffer Hannevig.

The claim is advanced on account of losses and damages alleged to have been sustained by Christoffer Hannevig as a result of acts of this Government, the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, their officers and agents, in connection with requisition orders affecting certain properties in the United States during World War I.

It was stipulated in the above-mentioned Convention (TIAS 1865; 62 Stat. 1798) that the facts and law relating to the claim be developed by pleadings and briefs to be exchanged by the respective agents of the two Governments. It was also stipulated that if the two Governments were, after such exchange, unable to agree upon a disposition of the claim through diplomatic discussions, the pleadings, and briefs so exchanged be submitted for decision by the United States Court of Claims, with possible appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. Article II of the Convention contained an understanding that the provisions for possible reference of the claim to the courts "are subject to authorization by the Congress of the United States of America."

In view of the fact that, after considering the pleadings and briefs which were exchanged, the two Governments were not able to agree upon a disposition of the claim through diplomatic discussions, it is respectfully requested that the Congress enact legislation vesting the courts with jurisdiction to decide the case, as contemplated by the Convention.

A similar communication is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

## MARIA CACCOMO—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 308) for the relief of Maria Caccomo, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.



## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST—AMENDMENTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I submit amendments, intended to be proposed by me, to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 4, line 13, strike out "Charter of the United Nations" and insert in lieu thereof "Constitution of the United States."

On page 5, line 9, after the word "used" insert "for either economic or military assistance."

## INCREASED COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] may be added as an additional cosponsor to the bill (S. 39) to increase the monthly wartime rates of compensation payable to service-connected disabled veterans, and to the bill (S. 40) to liberalize the basis for payment, and to increase the monthly rates, of death pension payable to widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II and of the Korean conflict, introduced by me, on behalf of myself and other Senators, on January 7, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. GORE:

Address delivered by Senator PASTORE at the American Chemical Society symposium, held at Johnson's Hummocks, Providence, R. I., February 8, 1957.

By Mr. BUTLER:

Statement prepared by him on Ukrainian Independence Day.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

Report No. 13 by him to the people of Wisconsin.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Article by Senator HENNINGS entitled "Washington Seminar on Government," published in the NEA Journal for February 1957.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

Editorial from the Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger of January 26, 1957, and letter written by him relating to Government aid to colleges.

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CLEMENT F. HAYNSWORTH, JR., OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE, FOURTH CIRCUIT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, March 7, 1957, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge, fourth circuit, vice Armistead M. Dobie, retired.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], chairman, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

## CENTENNIAL OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, February 23, 1957, marks the 100th anniversary of one of our country's most distinguished professional societies—the American Institute of Architects.

As the national organization representing the American architect, the American Institute of Architects is making a vital contribution to the material and cultural welfare of our people. Its first century of service is filled with great achievements in solving the complex problems of planning human environment.

One of these important achievements is the continuing effort of the AIA to maintain and raise the professional standards and the strict code of ethics which govern the practice of the architectural profession and the relationship of the architect with his client. Before the AIA was founded on February 23, 1857, untrained and unqualified persons, many of them engaged in cutthroat competition among each other, frequently undertook to practice architecture with the result that our buildings were often unsafe and esthetically unworthy. Today, thanks to the idealism of the 13 young architects who founded the AIA 100 years ago, our people and their Government can confidently expect the professional and duly registered architect to provide competent and devoted service with the highest technical and esthetic standards of any nation in the world.

Early in its history, the AIA recognized that the betterment of the architectural profession required it to give guidance and support to the training of young people in the art and skills of architecture. The AIA was instrumental in the establishment of the Nation's first architectural schools at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Columbia University, and the University of Illinois. It is giving active support to the more than 100 architectural schools which have been founded since that time.

While the AIA and its 12,000 members, organized in 124 local chapters, are constantly striving for progress in the technology and art of building, the institute is also deeply devoted to preserving and cherishing the best in our architectural tradition. It has demonstrated this in its energetic efforts to restore the original concepts which Thomas Jefferson and his great contemporary, the French architect L'Enfant, held of the Nation's Capital. The AIA has set an example of maintaining our great architectural monuments by restoring Washington's charming Octagon House, once the home of President Madison, and making it its national headquarters.

Elsewhere, too, local chapters of the AIA are guiding the planning and rebuilding of our communities to safeguard the architectural heritage of the past, erase the blight and ease the congestion of the present, and accommodate the new requirements of the future.

History has recorded that the most enduring monuments of any civilization are its buildings in which its people dwell, conduct their business, entertain themselves, house their treasures, practice the arts and sciences, and worship God. All these activities are as much influenced by the buildings in which they take place, as these structures are influenced by the manner in which we live, earn our bread, pursue our search for knowledge, and worship. Thus, the architect who plans and designs our environment bears a heavy responsibility as the catalyst of our culture.

The American architect, and the American Institute of Architects as the national organization which works for his betterment and represents him, are assuming this responsibility to our people and our Nation in a manner which merits our tribute. Speaking as a citizen, I can say that we are deeply grateful for the fine work the men and women of the American Institute of Architects are doing. We extend our heartfelt congratulations to this society on the occasion of its centennial year, and wish it well in the national centennial celebration, to be held here in Washington this coming May.

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAVITS in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee in the nature of a substitute, which is the pending amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are many Members of the Senate who desire to speak on the pending resolution. I have been informed by some of those Senators that they are not ready to speak at this stage of the debate. I think the average Senator prefers to speak when the Chamber is full and after a unanimous-consent agreement has been reached, and when he is sure that most of the Senators will hear what he has to say. But, Mr. President, we are not in a position to obtain an agreement to limit discussion at this time, and I want to appeal to Senators who desire to speak on the pending resolution to prepare themselves, and to appear, and to speak.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXTENSION OF DATE FOR FILING OF COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 91, Senate Resolution 99, submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. Before the clerk reads the title for the information of the Senate, I will say that it is a resolution which merely extends the date for the filing of a committee report. It has been cleared with both myself and with the minority leader. Probably it will require no discussion or debate. However, it is necessary to extend the date for the filing of the report. I hope the Senate may act on it at this time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection. The distinguished majority leader, with his customary courtesy, has consulted me in connection with this resolution, as he always consults me on these matters. It is a resolution which should be considered and disposed of promptly.

I now turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has the floor.

## DEBATE ON THE MIDDLE EAST RESOLUTION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to say something which I believe is equally applicable to Senators on both sides of the aisle, and I have requested the secretaries to contact Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle in connection with it.

I hope very much that Senators who desire to speak on the pending joint resolution dealing with the Middle East may do so. We are now in our second day of debate of the joint resolution. I know there is a great deal to be said on it. Therefore, I hope that the speeches may be made while we have the time, rather than next week, when perhaps we may have in effect a unanimous consent agreement to limit debate. In that case a limitation on time would be in effect and there would not be as much time available for debate as there is now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I say this in no criticism of anyone. However, we are now debating the Middle East resolution, and it is my hope that every Senator will take advantage of the time now available to make his position known. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I share the views stated by the distinguished minority leader and I have expressed as forcefully as I can the sentiments just stated by him. I have asked the clerk of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the clerk of the Committee on Armed Services to notify all members of the committee who may desire to discuss the joint resolution that there is time available for such discussion, certainly today, and I believe also tomorrow.

The majority leader is prepared to vote on the joint resolution now. We have had extended hearings on it. I have very definite views in connection with the matter, and those views have already been expressed by me to the Senate. I do not wish to act in haste, and I do not wish to preclude any Senator from stating his views at such length as he may desire.

However, Mr. President, we will not dillydally on a matter of such great importance. If there are no speakers present in the Chamber and if there should be a quorum call, and no Senators desire to speak, there will be just one thing to do, and that is to call the roll and have a vote on the resolution. Therefore, I join the distinguished minority leader in expressing the hope that the staffs of the respective committees will notify Senators that time is available to make their presentations.

## NEW YORK TIMES COMMENT ON SENATOR ELLENDER'S REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the New York Times is almost universally regarded as one of our country's truly great newspapers. Its standards of fairness, accuracy, and objectivity have consistently been high—so much so that many of America's smaller newspapers have used the New York Times almost as a journalistic bible.

I was therefore extremely disappointed to find in the New York Times editorial of February 11, 1957, entitled, "Mr. ELLENDER's Report" a number of inaccuracies. I feel sure that these were unintentional, but I should like at this time to set the record straight.

First, in referring to me personally, the editorial states:

> He is especially concerned with our whole foreign-aid program. It will be remembered that he was sternly opposed to it before he left on this fact-finding tour.

Mr. President, I have never been opposed to our "whole foreign-aid program." As a matter of fact, I supported the Marshall plan for Western Europe at its inception and I voted for it for at least 3 years. I have no apologies to make for that support, or for my votes

for the program. However, after the original goals proposed to be achieved by the program had been exceeded, I felt it my duty to raise my voice in protest.

I have taken pains to emphasize on a number of occasions that I have never opposed our whole foreign-aid program in its entirety.

For example, in reporting on my 1955 inspection trip, I told the Senate on June 28, 1956, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 8, pages 11208–11219, that too much of our assistance consists of techniques, supplies, and capital projects far beyond the capabilities of peoples of underdeveloped lands to absorb. At that time, as on a number of other occasions, I concisely stated my prime criticism of our aid program—not that it exists, at all, but rather that it is loaded with waste. I stated:

> It strikes me that we could spend one-fourth of the money we are now spending in those areas and get more for it if only we undertook reasonable, realistic projects instead of the grandiose schemes hatched by the fertile minds of our eager Washington planners. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 8, p. 11213.)

I reaffirmed this observation this year, when I said:

> It strikes me that a program to be of most benefit to those people should be started at the bottom rung of the ladder. We should educate the people there in keeping with their ability to carry on. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 7, 1957, p. 1689.)

This precise statement was made with respect to our aid program in Indonesia; however, as my subsequent remarks amply demonstrated, it was applicable to all other underdeveloped lands now receiving United States aid. I said:

> Moreover, as I stated before, no projects should be promoted in that area of the world unless the host country—in this case Indonesia—is in a position to carry them financially. Unless that course is followed we will be trying to educate men and women to operate many of the projects to which I have referred for a long time. Unless the host government itself has the money to keep the operations under way, the United States will have to carry the burden for a long time, for if we failed to do so, we would probably end up making more enemies than friends. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 7, 1957, p. 1689.)

As for being opposed to our whole foreign-aid program, reference to my report on the Philippines, which I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 7, 1957, pages 1693–1694, will show that I stated, in part, referring to technical assistance programs there:

> It is heartwarming to see men and women of this generation striving to better themselves by producing better livestock, using local products so as to provide a balanced diet for their families, and learning rudimentary techniques in food preservation.
>
> These programs of self-help will certainly pay dividends—this will occur because we are attempting to assist the people of this generation. Certainly, programs of this nature are to be preferred to the outright grant-aid which, if given lavishly, will result in the loss of self-respect by the donees * * *.

Mr. President, I believe these quotations, which were available to the New York Times reporters as well as its editorial writers, amply demonstrate that I was not sternly opposed to our whole foreign-aid program before I left on my inspection trip.

Second, the editorial declares:

> Everywhere that it has been tried, he (referring to me) now states, our large-scale economic aid has been an abysmal failure.

This reference to an abysmal failure was lifted completely out of context. The full portion of my prepared remarks was released to the press in advance of my address and the portion containing the phrase "Abysmal failure" reads as follows:

> In spite of our huge expenditures in Western Europe, the United States seems compelled to maintain large information programs in these countries in order to demonstrate to the European governments that the United States is really not so bad, after all.
>
> The record demonstrates an abysmal failure of the past program of large-scale economic aid, coupled with substantial sums in military assistance, as an effective means of winning the cold war.

Read in context, it is obvious that my reference to economic aid, and so forth, as an abysmal failure as a means of winning the cold war was in reference to Western Europe.

As for other areas of the world, I have frequently criticized the use to which this form of aid has been put, such as a light-bulb plant, a window-glass factory, and a number of other similar facilities in Formosa, flour mills in Korea, and the converting of an old opium plant in Saigon into a huge, air-conditioned motion picture studio for the use of the Government of Vietnam, because I felt the type of assistance rendered was nothing less than a complete waste of taxpayers' funds. As for being failures, these facilities are obviously just that if they are regarded as contributing anything substantial to bettering the way of life of the average man on the street whose homeland we are attempting to assist. However, I have never stated that everywhere that it has been tried economic aid has been an abysmal failure, and whoever wrote the editorial could have easily ascertained that by a bare minimum of research.

Third, the editorial raises a number of rhetorical questions, one of them being: In Western Europe, was the Marshall plan an abysmal failure?

Mr. President, if viewed in the light of its objectives, the Marshall plan has been an abysmal failure, even though it has restored the Western European countries to full economic health. The purpose of the Marshall plan was, as the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations stated in 1948 "to help European nations to help themselves to recovery in such a way as to become independent of outside assistance"—Senate Report No. 935, 80th Congress, 2d session, page 1.

Although the Marshall plan is generally regarded as having ended, reference to recent statistics will demonstrate that economic aid is still flowing to countries of Western Europe at this time—that Europe still is not independent of outside assistance.

In addition, in 1950, Paul Hoffman, at that time administrator of the European Cooperation Administration, stated, with reference to the European aid program:

> The surest way I know of to reduce the danger of war so that we may reduce our Military Establishment is to carry on the recovery program to a point where a free and self-sustaining and unified Europe is able to play its full role in cooperation with the United States and other free countries in maintaining the peace and prosperity of the world.

This statement was made in 1950 by Mr. Hoffman. On that occasion he stated that if we spent, not over $30 billion, which we have spent, but only $14 billion to $17 billion, we would be able to attain the objective to which he referred.

This objective, too, has never been fulfilled, for while European industrial production today stands at 165 percent of prewar—compared with 125 percent of prewar which Mr. Hoffman had cited as the goal of the program—Europe is not helping the United States and other free countries in maintaining the peace. On the contrary, many countries in Western Europe are still standing with their hands out for more aid. I shall not discuss the part taken by France and England in the Suez Canal debacle, but we have obligated ourselves considerably to clear that mess.

There is no doubt that insofar as the economic goals of the Marshall plan are concerned, the program has been a success, for those goals were long ago achieved. However, so far as the political and related goals of the program are concerned—not the least of which was to place Western Europe in a position where she could be of aid to us, so we could taper off our foreign spending—the program has indeed been an abysmal failure, for the foreign spending still goes on and Europe is not helping us in other areas of the world to any appreciable extent. That fact, Mr. President, I have documented on this floor many times, and I shall not take up the time of the Senate to go into any more detail with reference to it.

It is this factor, and this factor primarily, about which I complain, and about which I believe the American people have a genuine right to complain, Mr. President.

Fourth, the editorial to which I have referred says this:

> It will be recalled that even before he visited Korea Mr. ELLENDER had made his unfortunate reference to "bloodsucking" for which he subsequently made a halfhearted apology. In the light of such an episode his subsequent judgments, if they can be called that, are suspect, to say the least.

I told the Senate on February 7, 1957, that I never made such a statement (which is accurate); however, I might add at this point that if the Times desires to refer to an instance of where I did make such a statement, it might refer to CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume, 102, part 8, page 11210, where I stated, referring to our so-called NATO allies:

> We still continue to be bloodsucked for more and more by our friends, who argue that we must continue to make these funds available to them, or the mutual defense program will collapse.

This statement was confined to our so-called allies in Western Europe; on the other hand, Mr. President, although I was referring to our Western allies, the term could as well apply to our own representatives who make up the budgets for the countries we are assisting.

In this connection, as I stated the other day, the budgets for Formosa and Korea—in fact, the budgets for all the countries of Asia—are not made by the government officials of those countries, but by our own representatives, good Americans, who, apparently do not consider that impact which all this spending will have on our own economy.

I never advocated, as the editorial states, that "we should quit spending ineffective money on the foes of Communists and instead 'begin dealing with the people of Russia'." I did advocate, and I shall advocate again and again and again, that the record has demonstrated that the outpouring of a solid and continuous stream of American wealth has, alone, worked no magic permanent change in the climate of the cold war. I believe, and I hope the New York Times will agree, that by capitalizing upon the increased educational level of the Russian people, by exposing them to our way of life, they can be made aware of the benefits a free life under a free government can offer. I believe that by so doing, a desire for a better life can be created among the Russian people, a desire which, if nourished carefully, can result in such pressure on the Russian leadership that it will renounce force as a weapon of foreign policy. I am anxious to let properly screened visitors from Russia see our homes, our farms, and our way of life. I think America and her freedoms have nothing to fear from a system which must hide its failure behind an Iron Curtain. I think that just as international communism seeks to capitalize upon the suppressed desires of underprivileged people for a better life, so can we capitalize upon the similar desires of the underprivileged people of Russia, with one glaring exception: Our campaign will be based upon truth, not fiction; upon demonstrable achievements, not merely vague Marxist promises. As I stated in my prepared remarks which were distributed to the press:

> In other words, instead of relying solely upon a policy of deterrence by military force, an effort should be made to create a force within Russia, arising from the Russian people, to compel a change in Russian policies. In the interim, Western strength must be maintained; however, a successful conclusion of the program which I would like to see tried, would eventually result in a peaceful settlement between the Soviet Union and the United States and a consequent reduction in armaments.

I regret that I must take the time of the Senate to make this address, Mr. President; however, in order to keep the record straight, and in the interest of accuracy, I felt it was necessary for me to do so.

## EXTENSION OF DATE FOR FILING OF COMMITTEE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] for the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 99?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 99) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That section 3 of Senate Resolution 162, agreed to February 8, 1956, to investigate matters pertaining to technical assistance and related programs, as amended by Senate Resolution 60, agreed to January 30, 1957, is further amended by striking out "February 28, 1957" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1957."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, what was the resolution which was just agreed to?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The resolution extended the filing date of a report from the Committee on Foreign Relations. Its consideration was agreed to by the distinguished minority leader and the majority leader, but before the question was put as to its consideration, the minority leader made a statement about the necessity of having Senators come to the floor to speak on the joint resolution concerning the Middle East. The majority leader concurred in that statement. Apparently the Presiding Officer, not wishing to interrupt either the minority leader or the majority leader while we were talking, did not put the question concerning the request of the majority leader that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 99.

In the meantime, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] obtained the floor, and I assume this is the first opportunity which the Presiding Officer has had to put the question.

But I assure my distinguished friend, the acting minority leader, that he is fully protected. The majority leader would never permit advantage to be taken, if advantage could be taken, which the majority leader knows it could not be, so long as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota occupied the chair of the minority leader.

The resolution merely extends the date for the filing of a report by the Committee on Foreign Relations. The request for its consideration is fully concurred in by the very able and genial minority leader, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and by the majority leader.

Mr. THYE. The explanation made by the distinguished majority leader is sufficient for the acting minority leader. But the request had been made before I assumed this position, and for that reason I desired an explanation, because I had assured the minority leader that I would make certain that no proposed legislation would be passed without his being informed of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The distinguished minority leader is fully informed, and the acting minority leader has the assurance of the Senator from Texas that no measure will ever be presented without the knowledge of the minority leader, if he does not always have his consent.

Mr. THYE. I am confident of that, but I wanted to know what was embodied in the resolution which was just agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the resolution has been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's understanding is correct.

## COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, while I have the acting minority leader, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], in such a wonderful frame of mind—it is not always that one can get the Republicans to go along with us—I have a very unusual request to make. I feel certain I can get the Senate to agree to this, and I invite the attention of the acting minority leader to my request.

I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to meet for a short while this afternoon while the Senate is in session. I am informed that the only witness who is scheduled to be heard is the minority whip, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. Unless consent shall be given, the subcommittee cannot sit without violating the rules of the Senate, and the distinguished minority whip will be deprived of the opportunity to give his testimony on proposed legislation which is now being considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. THYE. There is no objection. I may say to the distinguished majority leader that the Republicans will always endeavor to be cooperative, as we always have been in the past, and I hope will be in the future.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I expect to speak rather briefly on the joint resolution which is now before the Senate.

I have not had the opportunity to hear the testimony that members of the Foreign Affairs and Armed Services Committees, have heard, but I have read some of the hearings and followed the releases from the committee very diligently.

President Eisenhower made it emphatically clear in his original announcement and served notice that the United States regards the preservation of the "independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East not only as vital to the national interest, but also to world peace."

As I read President Eisenhower's statement, I tried to draw an analogy between our position as a nation in 1956 and the statement of policy that was issued in President Monroe's message to Congress on December 2, 1823, to the effect that the United States could not regard with indifference any further territorial expansion on the part of European powers on the American Continent.

I think it could be well said that statement on the part of President Monroe was made in regard to the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

The exact words in President Monroe's message were:

> The American continents by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers.

While this message called attention to what President Monroe considered to be the difference between the political systems of the monarchies of Europe and of America, it definitely stated that any attempt on the part of these European monarchies to extend their system to any portion of the Western Hemisphere would be regarded as dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States.

Very spirited debate preceded the approval and adoption of the Monroe Doctrine by the Congress and its acceptance by the Nation.

The question at that time, as it is now, was how far our Nation should go in assuming obligations which we believe are in the interests of peace and security on every area of the globe.

It can be accurately stated that as a Nation—because of modern methods of communication and transportation—we are closer today to all areas of the globe than we were to countries in the Western Hemisphere in 1823. Today we are closer to the Suez Canal and to Cambodia in the Far East than we were to the Isthmus of Panama and Rio de Janerio in 1823.

The Monroe Doctrine at the time of its adoption accomplished the very purpose for which it was established; namely, to warn a group of European powers, known as the Holy Alliance, not to interfere with the independence of the newly formed Spanish-American nations.

The actions taken under the Monroe Doctrine were unilateral actions. Under the joint resolution before the Congress at the present time, there is a declaration that when the President determines it is in the national interest of world peace for the United States to use its Armed Forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism, such assistance shall be available, provided that its employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations.

The Monroe Doctrine is simply an American policy, and since its adoption it has been used by practically every President of the United States. Under some Presidents, this policy has approximated a claim of a protectorate over the Latin American countries, and, therefore, was deeply resented by them. However, it has never been our policy to regard the Monroe Doctrine as having such a meaning.

Under the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, we did adopt a policy whereby all the American States were pledged to oppose aggression from outside this hemisphere, and to minimize conflict among themselves by consultation when threats of peace arose.

As I stated earlier, there seem to me to be many analogies between our position today in the affairs of the world and the position we occupied in 1823.

Our Nation has never fought a war for territorial gain; but on several occasions we have entered into war for humanitarian reasons, when we believed that to do so was in the interest of the preservation of the freedoms and liberties that our people enjoy in a democracy.

Today, we are confronted in the world with a very serious conflict of ideologies. The conflict is between democracy and totalitarianism, and between communism and capitalism. In fact, it becomes a conflict between governments which believe that a person is a chattel of the state and governments which believe that a person is a sovereign of the state.

As I understand from reading the pending joint resolution, it is a reaffirmation of the United States foreign-aid policy; and by means of the resolution we would extend assistance to other nations, in order that they may become free and strong. This position was advanced in prior acts on the part of Congress, especially in the Security Act of 1954.

By the passage of this joint resolution by the Congress of the United States, we shall demonstrate to the world the united action taken by the executive and legislative branches of our Government in recognizing that the national integrity of other free nations is directly related to our own security. We have taken this position in several previous resolutions and bilateral defense agreements.

As I read the joint resolution, I firmly believe that it seeks the following objectives:

First. To protect the territorial integrity and independence of the Middle East nations by deterring possible attacks upon them by countries controlled by international communism. It thus attempts to effect for the area a degree of stability essential to the solution of its problems by peaceful means;

Second. To bolster the Middle East nations psychologically at this critical period, in order that they may resist communism more effectively;

Third. To assist them, in this emergency and later, in opposing Communist subversion, by strengthening them economically and providing them with the means of achieving internal stability.

Fourth. To reaffirm United States policy that we do not intend to intervene in the affairs of any foreign nation or violate its sovereignty; that we will assist any such nation only by agreement and consent.

Fifth. To reaffirm our interest in the development of the Middle East nations toward freedom, independence, and self-determination as member nations of the world, by promoting their economic growth and stability and thus lessening their weakness to external economic pressures; and

Sixth. To prevent a third world war and to promote in the area the needed peace which will permit the great petroleum and other economic potentials of the area to be used for the benefit of itself and of other nations of the world.

Mr. President, I, together with every other Member of this Congress, am concerned about preserving the inherent rights of the Congress to declare war. As I read the pending resolution, I cannot find that there is in it a delegation of authority in this respect, or that it authorizes the President to declare war. I, for one, would be violently opposed to it if it did.

President Eisenhower has on several occasions expressed his view in regard to a declaration of war, and has said that he feels keenly that only the Congress has the power to declare war.

In his address of January 5, the President stated:

> If, contrary to my hope and expectation, a situation arose which called for the military application of the policy which I ask Congress to join me in proclaiming, I would of course, maintain hour-by-hour contact with the Congress if it were in session. And if the Congress were not in session, and if the situation had grave implications, I would, of course, at once call the Congress into special session.

I realize that this statement made by the President on January 5 is not included in the resolution; but so far as I am concerned, it has the same effect as if it were incorporated in the resolution.

I believe President Eisenhower's proposal, which is the basis of the resolution, is in the interest of the national security and the future peace of the United States; and I intend to support the resolution. It is my sincere hope that the joint resolution will speedily be passed by this Congress, for I think time is of the essence.

---

## IF PARTNERSHIP IS BAD FOR THE CENTRAL VALLEY OF CALIFORNIA, IT IS BAD FOR THE COLUMBIA VALLEY OF THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on February 19, the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] announced himself as firmly and unalterably opposed to administration plans for a so-called power partnership with Pacific Gas & Electric Co. at the Central Valley project.

I commend Senator KUCHEL for thus opposing the scheme of the Eisenhower administration for surrendering to a private-utility company the hydroelectric-power resources of the Trinity River. I pledge myself to support him in his efforts to protect the natural resources of his State from this kind of selfish exploitation. I endorse his statement that "the Secretary's recommendation for

private-power development at Trinity is fraught with many perils."

Mr. President, if so-called partnership with the private utilities is bad at Trinity, a comparatively small project, it is even worse in the Columbia River Basin where, through the beneficence of a generous Creator, lurks over 40 percent of all the potential waterpower in the United States. Yet in the Columbia Basin, the administration still clings to the discredited partnership program which Senator KUCHEL, a distinguished Republican, has so rightly condemned as being against the public interest and welfare. Only last week, in a discussion with me at a hearing of the Senate Public Works Committee, the Assistant Director of the Budget, Mr. Robert E. Merriam, stated publicly that the administration had not abandoned its partnership plans for the great John Day site on the mighty Columbia.

I invite Senator KUCHEL and his distinguished Republican senior colleague from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to join with us of the Pacific Northwest in resisting the so-called private-power partnership from fastening its selfish grip on the water-power wealth of the greatest of all American river basins for power generation. Both Senators KNOWLAND and KUCHEL voted in 1956 against the great Hells Canyon project on the Snake River, main tributary of the Columbia.

Now that partnership threatens the Trinity River Basin in their own State, we invite them to join us this time in pushing to passage our bill for the great Federal high dam at Hells Canyon, which is the key to integrated development of the Columbia River Valley, where the bulk of America's treasure trove of waterpower is now concentrated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the junior Senator from Oregon yield to his colleague?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to associate myself with the invitation my colleague has just extended to the two Senators from California to join with us on the Hells Canyon Dam proposal, which will preserve for the American people their full heritage in their own natural resources, and which is aimed at bringing to a halt the Eisenhower administration's giveaway of the natural resources in the Hells Canyon Dam reach of the Snake River for the privateering by private utilities.

My colleague has mentioned the issue with respect to partnership in the case of the Trinity project. I am very glad he did.

On last Friday I spoke to the Commonwealth Club of California, in San Francisco; and I made clear to that club that I would do my utmost to prevent giving away again to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. the people's rights to the profits from multiple-purpose dams, such as the Trinity Dam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have that speech printed in the RECORD following our remarks on the subject matter, if the Senator does not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in my speech before the Commonwealth Club I made it very clear, in my judgment, that the people of California are not entitled to have the taxpayers of the United States pay the check for all the nonreimbursable costs of the Trinity project and then have the private utilities pick up the profits. That is not my idea of partnership. I taught a course in partnership for some time. Of course, the elementary principle of partnership is that, unless the partners themselves contract to the contrary, they jointly share any profits of the enterprise. But that is not the Eisenhower administration concept of partnership. Its concept is that the taxpayers shall pay the cost and the big business interests that support the administration take the profits. Well, Mr. President, that is not going to be done by my vote in the Senate, and it is not going to be done by my sleeping on my parliamentary rights.

I have this much further to say on the Trinity partnership. I found while in California that there is a terrific propaganda drive on in California not only to use the partnership formula for the Trinity project, but also to emasculate the Federal reclamation law in connection with the 160-acre limitation provision. If that is going to be the program of the administration, it will have a fight on its hands.

I said yesterday, and I repeat today, we need to have an investigation of the newly announced, but still rather vague, policies of the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Seaton, not only in regard to the Trinity project but in regard to the Pleasant Valley project and other projects on which he has been sending out trial balloons.

With respect to Trinity, the statement of the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] does not surprise me much, because when he offered the Trinity bill, I engaged him in a colloquy. The junior Senator from California at that time, in answer to my questions, made it perfectly clear that the request for an authorization for Trinity was not based upon any partnership proposal. Therefore, I am very pleased to have the statement, or the public announcement, from the junior Senator from California, and I think he is entitled to great credit, particularly in view of what I know to be a terrific drive underway in California, with the assistance of the new Secretary of the Interior, who is beginning to give evidence that he is for a giveaway program as much as was his predecessor, despite the fact that the people of the Northwest on November 6 gave a very clear answer to such suggestions. I want to say to the Eisenhower administration they are going to get that same answer in 1958, and in 1960, too, if they continue to give to the private utilities the advantages of partnership under a giveaway program.

I commend the junior Senator from Oregon as Mr. Conservationist of the Senate for raising his voice again in opposition to the administration's giveaway program in the field of public power development under the guise of a partnership arrangement, in which the partners do not share equally, but in which the taxpayers pay the costs and the private utilities pick up the profits.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank my distinguished senior colleague for his very pertinent observations. I have already had the privilege of including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD one of the effective speeches which he delivered last week in the State of California. I know he and I share the hope that the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], now that he has seen the evil impact of the partnership program on his own State, will join us in the Pacific Northwest in an effort to keep partnership from being fastened for at least half a century on our resources.

EXHIBIT 1

WATER AND AMERICA'S FUTURE

(Address by Hon. WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, before Commonwealth Club, San Francisco, Calif., February 15, 1957)

I was very happy to accept the invitation of the Commonwealth Club despite the radical sound of its name. I have it on good authority that the proper pronunciation calls for accenting the last syllable.

If the eminent British consul is here, let me assure him publicly that as an American and a Democrat I come in peace—and sympathy for the problems our two democratic countries face together.

In all seriousness, the Commonwealth Club is to be congratulated for maintaining the democratic institution of an open forum for the discussion of great public issues and the presentation of differing points of view. Open forums and open minds are indispensable to a free society. A complex world requires the friction of vigorous, unfettered debate if solutions are to be found for great public problems.

So, I propose to discuss today a problem that is critical throughout America and is reaching really serious proportions in California today—water.

WATER: THE INDISPENSABLE ELEMENT

Over 2,500 years ago the Greeks believed that there were four elements—earth, air, fire, and water and that all other things were combinations of these. While their chemistry was faulty, the emphasis of the Greeks was eminently correct.

Without water human and plant life is impossible. Lack of adequate water has doomed whole areas that once flourished.

In the strife-torn Middle East, for example, there was four times the amount of land under cultivation in Roman times as there is today.

Nowhere is the dramatic role of water more evident, nor its need more crucial, than in the great valleys of California.

It is within man's power to waste water or use it to the full. The most fearful waste is that which permits the destruction of sources of water by failure to protect watersheds and the irresponsible pollution of our God-given streams.

Population growth and concentration, new industrial uses, and the proven benefits and necessity of irrigated farming have created vast new requirements for water. For example, at the Hanford Atomic Energy Commission Works, where a prodigious amount of the flow of Columbia River is diverted to provide the plant's cooling system. A soft-drink bottling plant uses thousands of gallons in very short periods. One shower bath can use up 6 to 14 gallons of hot water alone, depending on your habits.

In an average industrial community the per capita use of water runs between 100 to 200 gallons a day. A single fire hose has a minimum requirement of 250 gallons a minute.

There is little need to dwell on this point in water-conscious California. Other areas are acutely sensitive to the growing need for water. So, for example, suburban Westchester in New York now uses 77 million gallons of water a day, compared with 47 million gallons in 1943. The Great Plains drought is a national tragedy. In Texas alone 244 counties out of a total of 254 counties have been declared drought-disaster areas.

At the same time, floods are an imminent threat to cities, towns, and bottomlands throughout the Nation. New England, California, and Oregon suffered vast floods within the past 2 years. Kentucky and Tennessee are just coming out from under high water.

TVA'S SUCCESSFUL FLOOD FIGHT

TVA has once again proven its inestimable worth during the past few weeks. In this most recent flood, this great comprehensive, integrated basin system prevented flood damage, which, at a conservative official estimate, was about 65 million at Chattanooga alone. TVA already has resulted in prevention of property damage equal to more than half the amount allocated to flood control for the entire system. Last year the Columbia River dams, and particularly the great water-storage Grand Coulee Dam, helped avert great flood damage.

These recent experiences prove the wisdom of Theodore Roosevelt's and Gifford Pinchot's conservation program. They foresaw that natural-resource development requires a basin approach.

The main cause of water feast and famine is deforestation. Without adequate upland forest cover, water flow is irregular. By turns the runoff is too great or too little where great forests do not catch and hold water for gradual flow.

A balanced basin system also requires man-made storage to control water flow for flood control, manageable power output, irrigation, industrial and domestic use.

POWER: THE KEY TO WATER CONTROL

These great basin undertakings are not economically possible without power revenues. The electric power generated at multipurpose dams is vitally needed itself for farm, factory, and home. Unless its development is integrated with water storage for multiple use, all elements of development are retarded. As we progress with pollution control, it will probably be found that power has a major part to play in achieving it as well.

RECOGNITION OF PROBLEM THE FIRST STEP

It is urgent that the dimensions of our water problem be recognized for it takes years and decades to achieve the means of adequate multipurpose water development.

As population grows and technology becomes ever more complex we will find, I predict, that the adequacy of water systems will be the ultimate limitation upon our capacity to grow.

Once this factor is taken to heart, we can move forward to meet the challenge of the future.

FAIR SHARING REQUIRED

At the heart of Theodore Roosevelt's resource and reclamation philosophy was the sound and simple principle that it is the people of the Nation who own its natural resources. It followed that its development and benefits should be widely and equitably shared.

The great trust-buster also gave to this country a crystallization of the philosophy that monopoly is a prodigious threat to a free economy and free institutions.

So, when the great reclamation acts of his administration were enacted, the requirement was included that no beneficiary of a Federal reclamation project could obtain more than reasonable share of water from that project. An individual's right to own land was not infringed. But his right to obtain water from a public project, financed by public funds, was limited.

This 160-acre limitation is rooted in the history of the West. It is a requirement of elementary fairness.

Events in California in the past few weeks underscore the importance of this provision. I feel the California Supreme Court's Ivanhoe decision, which in effect sets aside the Federal reclamation law, was most unfortunate. I do not mean to comment on a matter of State concern. It is far more than that. A basic and vital Federal policy is involved. As a United States Senator I have an obligation to speak my deeply held views about this Federal policy.

The decision can result in some good. For it dramatizes a basic issue which must be resolved before adequate progress can be made in water-resource development.

Recognizing the vital role of river basin development on a comprehensive basis—for power, flood control, irrigation, navigation, and recreation—we must decide our future course.

On great interstate streams like the Columbia and Missouri it is clear that the Federal Government has a responsibility and alone can provide the unifying factor. This doesn't mean doing the whole job—but it does mean the main job of executing adequate plans and coordination. This means, as in TVA and the Columbia River System, the operating control of the key multipurpose dams in the systems. Such a plan is quite compatible with small private or local projects which do not affect the basic system.

Where a State cannot undertake a comprehensive plan for full development of a navigable stream of system within its borders, the Federal Government has a major role as well.

But, it is not fair or right to expect that the Federal Government should bear the burden of nonreimbursable costs for flood control, for example, and surrender, give away, the power facilities or the antimonopoly irrigation policy of Federal law.

The Trinity project is one example. I opposed partnership at Trinity and the project would not have been authorized in 1955 if partnership had been included. That is a simple statement of the facts.

Now California is considering the great multipurpose Feather River project as a State undertaking—but only partially so.

It is proposed that the State would finance part of the project without including the traditional and indispensable public-agency preference clause for power for the excess lands provisions for irrigation.

Yet it is seriously proposed that the Federal Government will authorize a blank check to pay for flood control with the Corps of Engineers to negotiate the amount. The blank check aspects are bad enough.

But, is it right or fair to ask that the Federal Treasury use taxpayer's money to help finance a multipurpose project and at the same time fail to include these two basic Federal policies? This is asking too much. Such over-reaching can defeat the whole proposal.

One Senator, at least, stands here who will oppose such a giveaway of funds and policy.

RESOLUTION OF POLICY DISPUTE PREREQUISITE TO PROGRESS

Before real progress can be made on comprehensive basin development for power, irrigation, flood control and the rest, there must be a resolution of the basic questions of policy on how we shall proceed. Extended controversy can only delay the undertaking of badly needed projects.

That has happened in my State and region. The voters of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana have rejected the administration's phoney partnership. Yet the administration seems determined to insist upon partnership, after even its congressional adherents have been defeated or rejected the method.

Congress will make good on some of the projects—as at John Day on the Columbia River. Yet, the close division of parties in Congress makes real progress impossible unless the dispute is settled and a real majority can pull together in one direction.

If the Republican administration will not see this fact, the voters will do it for them in 1958 and 1960—as they have done in the past two elections. I say this not in partisanship but in an appeal to Republicans who traditionally have supported the policies of Theodore Roosevelt, Hiram Johnson, Borah, McNary, and Norris—and Franklin D. Roosevelt as well—to get the administration back on the track.

It is necessary to achieve speedy relief from the uncertainty brought on by the Ivanhoe decisions. I pledge my best efforts to that end. But, I enjoin the people and officials of California to not seek the benefits of Federal policies of long standing without being prepared to abide by the rules of equity which are embedded in the traditional Federal policies.

This is a national problem which requires foresight and leadership. It also calls for firm adherence to the historical policies of multipurpose development and fair distribution of benefits under which the West has prospered in the past.

We will make progress on comprehensive development when there is adequate recognition of the public interest, and protection is given it without evasion or equivocation.

## PERIL LURKING IN RADIOACTIVE SUBSTANCES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, repeated warnings from eminent scientists about the peril lurking in radioactive substances point up the need for coordination and consolidation of work in creating processes for effective disposal of atomic waste material. It is generally acknowledged that our information in this field is now only at the frontier-outpost point.

One of the principal objectives of the bill which I introduced last week for creation of a National Radiation Health Institute was to cope with this problem—to establish a governmental agency which can pull together the threads of research in disposal of atomic waste. Many aspects of problems connected with elimination of radiation hazards are discussed in an article in the Wall Street Journal of February 19, 1957. It reveals the scope of work which must be accomplished before human existence is safeguarded against rampant atomic particles. I ask consent to include the article in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCIENTISTS SPUR HUNT FOR WAYS TO DISPOSE OF NUCLEAR WASTES—OFFICIALS STUDY SALT DOMES, OIL WELLS, CAVES, AND THE OCEAN AS BURIAL PLACES

(By John A. Grimes)

WASHINGTON.—Congress' atomic specialists are about to join administration experts in a hunt for the world's biggest, strongest ashcan.

This receptacle will have to keep millions of tons of dangerous nuclear waste out of

circulation for centuries. The hunt is prodded by keen awareness of a harsh fact: Each particle of ash produced by burning atomic fuel is an arsenal of lethal rays which, in time, could wreck the world's population if not jailed and guarded.

The waste-disposal problem, Atomic Energy Commission officials say, will become prodigious as more and more atomic furnaces come into use to generate power and do other industrial jobs. These experts term it one of the major challenges to the industry.

A MAJOR FACTOR

A special team of AEC experts cautions that the future of atomic electricity may depend on a solution. It says: "Disposal of reactor and fuel wastes will be one of the major controlling factors in determining the extent of the use of power reactors."

Representative DURHAM, the North Carolina Democrat who chairmans the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee, agrees. But he's not pessimistic: "Look at the problems we've had in the atomic-energy field and solved already." As Mr. DURHAM sees it, the job is to find a practical solution cheap enough not to burden industry when it takes over waste disposal from the Government some years hence.

Today Mr. DURHAM's committee will open public hearings on a variety of urgent nuclear topics, including atomic waste. The group also will tackle such hot issues as whether Government construction of large-scale reactors is necessary, and what Government insurance is needed to protect reactor builders and operators in case of accidents.

But Mr. DURHAM believes the important waste disposal problem got short shrift last year in election-year scrapping between the AEC and some committee members over speeding up the atomic-electricity program. He intends to take a hard close look at what the Commission is doing in the disposal field.

"UNDER THE RUG"

Though atomic ashes are being taken care of adequately now, "we're merely sweeping the real problem under the rug," admits A. E. Gorman, Chief of the Sanitary Engineering Branch of the Commission's Division of Reactor Development.

Liquid wastes resulting from chemical reprocessing of spent reactor fuel present the major disposal problem. At Commission installations in Arco, Idaho; Hanford, Wash.; Savannah River, S. C.; and Oak Ridge, Tenn., some less dangerous wastes are buried in plain holes in the ground or in concrete-lined pits; this allows the radioactivity to "decay" or to filter through the soil. Other wastes are packaged, shipped out to sea and dumped. The deadlier material for the most part is put away in underground steel tanks.

But of this last method Mr. Gorman remarks: "We're only buying time. The radioactivity of the hottest waste," he adds, "is sure to outlive the steel tanks." Joseph Lieberman, AEC sanitary engineer, warns that burial places for even less deadly wastes are limited. He notes: "This problem is most pressing in the Northeastern United States where the only disposal sites are at Oak Ridge and in the ocean."

But AEC experts are confident the disposal problem can be solved in time to head off any slowdown in arrival of economically nuclear power. Says one: "We've got some good prospects of final solution under study."

As a prime possibility for getting rid of dangerous liquid wastes, Commission officials are doing research on pumping them into abandoned oil wells, underground salt domes, or other basins 5,000 to 15,000 feet below the surface, where the materials presumably could not contaminate drinking water or other natural resources. A special committee of the National Research Council has handed the AEC a report on this proposal that "looks encouraging," one official says.

This expert adds, however, that researchers must thoroughly explore whether this lethal material might work to the surface, despite its depth. "We need to know just what will happen to this stuff when we put it underground," he says. "Heat from the concentrated waste might spawn a radioactive geyser," the official adds.

A disposal method that looks practical and economical, according to AEC experts, is to lock the most dangerous wastes in a special clay called mountmorillonite. The clay is shaped into spaghetti-like strings which soak up the hottest radioactive materials. The "spaghetti" then can be baked hard to seal in the radioactivity. The finished product can be buried in underground caves with no danger that water might unleash the radioactivity. A pilot plant using this method has been operated successfully at Brookhaven National Laboratory on New York's Long Island.

Researchers at the John Hopkins University laboratory in Baltimore are working on a somewhat similar idea: Fixing dangerous wastes in hard, synthetic crystallike minerals for burial.

A possible partial answer to the disposal puzzler may be to strip from highly radioactive waste its two most dangerous isotopes, or variations or elements, and use them as radiation sources for medicine and industry. This deadly pair is known as strontium 90 and cesium 137. Both can be used to provide radiation for X-ray photography or metals, for thickness gauges and the like. Cesium can help treat cancer and other ailments. The AEC claims the cost of this "dehorning" could be paid in part by sale of the isotopes. Without cesium and strontium, the wastes would be "a hundred times less hazardous" and possibly could be disposed of in the air, ground, and water, the AEC declares.

But the isotopes themselves, even after they lose their kick for industrial and medical uses, still must be put under guard.

Oak Ridge National Laboratory, which is working on stripping cesium and strontium from liquid wastes, also is developing a method of putting highly radioactive wastes, slurried with earthen materials, in a limed pit. The heat of radioactive decay forms the materials into masses without actually melting them—a process called sintering. But this leaves unsolved the problems of where and how to dispose of the masses and of controlling radioactive vapors leaving the sintering mass.

Already providing an ash can for token amounts of less deadly wastes, the ocean is being studied as a possible burial place for more lethal leftovers. A special committee of the National Academy of Sciences declared: "The only place on earth where disposal can be considered practical is the ocean."

There are sea-bottom hideaways, the committee says, where waste could be confined for centuries. In the deepest parts of the Black Sea, the "flushing time"—the period it takes for most of the deep water to move near the surface and be replaced by other water moving downward—is estimated at 2,500 years. The committee reckons it's "fairly certain" that substantial amounts of long-lived radioactive materials dumped in containers on the ocean bottom would stay isolated for more than 100 years and would become safely diluted.

Research work on ocean movements now is being done for the AEC by several United States institutions, including the Lamont Geological Observatory at Columbia University. As part of the International Geophysical Year starting next July 1, scientists of several other nations will cooperate to acquire data on the age and movement of the deepest waters.

The National Academy of Sciences panel says much more must be known about deep water ocean movements before the most dangerous wastes can be dumped in the ocean. Mr. Gorman notes that the really deep spots where water will stay "stagnant" longest are limited. "This stuff will be around for centuries," he declares. "It might get out of control." If the material should escape from the deep holes, experts warn, it might be absorbed by fish, and if the fish should be eaten by humans, radiation would reach the vital organs even faster than by external exposure.

"We've even had the suggestion that we fly the stuff up to Greenland and dump it in the ice," Mr. Gorman says. But he adds that the idea has many drawbacks, "including the fact that we don't own Greenland."

Another AEC spokesman takes note of a suggestion that the waste be shot into space with this dry comment: "We're looking for a solution that is both feasible and economical."

As early as 1965, according to the National Academy of Sciences' special committee, spent fuel from the growing number of power reactors will yield more than 20 pounds of radioactive waste every day.

Mr. Lieberman figures highly radioactive wastes may amount to from 0.1 gallon to 5 gallons for every gram of uranium processed—a gram is less than 4 percent of an ounce. Some reactors take tons of uranium fuel.

"When one considers the generally extreme low maximum permissible concentrations of radioactivity in air and water, it becomes apparent there is not enough dilution available in nature to enable any practical, continuing dispersal of these wastes into the environment," he declares.

The pile of dangerous wastes is bound to multiply because there'll be no subtractions from it for a long time to come. For hundreds of years both of the most dangerous isotopes, strontium 90 and cesium 137, will give off many times more radiation than humans can safely stand.

As for the potential price of disposal, present costs may offer a clue. Underground burial of less dangerous wastes costs up to $2 a cubic foot, the AEC estimates. The cost of stowing similar materials in an underwater grave is calculated as high as $10 a cubic foot. Storage of the more potent liquid leftovers in the concrete-lined tanks runs up to $2 a gallon, or about $15 a cubic foot.

Cost, AEC officials say, is one overriding consideration affecting the final answer to the disposal problem. The cost of disposal is directly related to the cost of producing atomic electricity. Even a tiny variation in that figure, the experts note, can mean the difference between competitive and noncompetitive nuclear power.

At present, waste disposal is the AEC's problem. Since 1950, Mr. Gorman estimates, the Commission has spent at least $1 million a year for the sanitary engineering end of it. Counting related studies in the processing field, the cost might run two to three times higher.

However, it's clear that the AEC is looking for industry to lend a hand in running down an answer. Mr. Gorman declares the Government will help business with disposal problems resulting from the first generation of nuclear reactors now being planned or built. But he indicates that industry will be expected to play a large part in cracking the problem thereafter.

---

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

**The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle**

East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

COMMENTS ON SENATOR KNOWLAND'S ADDRESS RELATING TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is with trepidation that I rise to make the comparatively brief speech I am about to deliver. I have waited some 9 days for a Senator with greater qualifications on this subject to make such a speech. In the absence of such an address, I have decided to present these remarks myself.

Before commencing them, I should like to say I addressed a letter to the Senator whom I am answering, so he would be apprised in advance of the speech I am about to make. I regret that important other duties undoubtedly have kept him from being present.

On February 11, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] delivered an address at Georgetown University on the subject "The United States and the United Nations." This address has been recognized as an important speech, not only because the Senator from California is the leader of the Republican minority in the Senate, as well as serving on the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, but also because he once again expressed certain criticisms and misgivings about the United Nations which are shared by a substantial number of people. These misgivings are reinforced by support from so influential a source. Moreover, the Senator from California is currently himself a delegate of the United States to the United Nations.

I do not have nearly the same length of experience as the Senator from California has, or the privilege of service on the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have been hesitant, as a relatively junior Senator, to undertake the defense of the U. N., but I know that in the days since the Senator from California made his speech, the energies of many more experienced Senators have been concentrated on the President's plans for the Middle East. However, because I know that many thoughful men and women in my own State are deeply interested in the United Nations and would be troubled by the Senator's criticisms, I have been concerned that they should not go totally undiscussed merely because our attention is presently diverted to the more immediate debate over the Middle Eastern crisis. My comments on the minority leader's speech of February 11 will not take up each of his detailed criticisms but will deal only with the key points of his attack, an attack designed to shake the faith of the American people in the value of the United Nations and to propose its destruction in its present form.

U. N. VETO ESSENTIAL FOR WORLD ORGANIZATION

The key of the Senator's attack was on the veto power of the permanent members of the Security Council, which has been used primarily by the Soviet Union to prevent United Nations decisions contrary to its own avowed self-interest. The key to his proposals is the expulsion, or the forced withdrawal, of the Soviet Union from the United Nations, so that the U. N. could be turned into an anti-Communist collective-security organization.

Mr. President, in my opinion, this superficially simple and politically attractive scheme would hold great danger to the United States and to the world. It would destroy the present valuable functions of the United Nations which even the Senator from California recognized in his speech. Yet it would not bring us the goal of a more effective collective-security organization of the remaining members of the United Nations.

First, as to the veto. The so-called veto of proposed security actions granted the biggest powers was an essential aspect of the United Nations Charter when its structure was first developed at Dumbarton Oaks and earlier—and it is today. President Roosevelt and President Truman would never have contemplated a veto-free charter, and any such proposal would rightly have been rejected by the Senate. The Senator from California would have been the first to attack it, in my opinion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. For the record, I may say I can remember, as clearly as though it were yesterday, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, the colloquy which took place on the floor of the Senate on the San Francisco charter debate when the great Arthur Vandenberg was floor leader.

As the record will show, we discussed with him the veto question. Some of us raised a serious question then as to the wisdom of giving the right of veto to members of the Security Council.

Senator Vandenberg made it very clear to us that the delegates at San Francisco were satisfied that there would not have been Russian acceptance of the charter without the veto provision being in it. Then he made it crystal clear that there never would have been any acceptance by the American delegation without the veto provision in it. I think it is well that my colleague is bringing out, in this speech today, the indisputable fact that the veto was placed in the charter at the insistence of Russia and the United States at the time, and also at the insistence of delegations from other countries, I believe, although there was some opposition at San Francisco to the veto provision.

It is easy, though hindsight, to see the mistake which was made, with respect to which some of us had a fear at the very time. That is why we raised the question on the floor of the Senate in debate.

I wish to be the first to say that, after listening to the presentation by Senator Vandenberg, I acceded to the program. We were then still, of course, living in the hope that some of the pious pronouncements by Russia at the time could be relied upon, and that the veto would be used only in extraordinary situations, instead of becoming the rule which Russia almost invariably follows. When we seek to do something in the United Nations aimed at advancing the cause of freedom around the world, she vetoes it. She has a sorry record, time and time again, of following a course of action which increases the possibility of war in the world.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I was not a Member of the Senate at the time the United Nations Charter was approved. At that time I was a Member of the House. However, I was very much interested in the subject. I listened to many of the debates, and read most of the others.

Some opposition was expressed to the provision in the charter whereby the veto power could be exercised by one nation. Personally I was very sorry the charter had been written that way. I remember very distinctly that three Members of the Senate voted against the ratification of the United Nations Charter. Quite a number of Members, particularly on the Republican side of the aisle, expressed gratification that there was the veto power, and indicated that they would not have voted for ratification had the veto power not been included.

So the statement of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is quite clear as to the attitude of many Members of the Senate at that time, particularly Republican Members.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am grateful to both the senior Senator from Oregon and the senior Senator from Tennessee, who have made available to the Senate their greater experience than mine in this field. I realize that the senior Senator from Oregon was a Member of the Senate at the time the United Nations Charter was adopted. The senior Senator from Tennessee was then a Member of the House of Representatives.

It is extremely useful, in my opinion, for them to emphasize and underscore the fact that most people in the United States, and many Members of Congress, would not have tolerated a United Nations organization without the veto. They feared—and I think rightly so—an organization in which decisions could have been made which would have involved the commitment of American soldiers or other American action without the consent of the United States Government.

I wonder if the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] would support today—if only Russia were removed—a veto-free Security Council in which the United States could be bound by majority vote, lacking our right of veto, to take collective security actions without our own consent? Would he really suggest that the veto power would be unnecessary in the U. N. if only the Soviet Union were not a member? Or is it his position that the veto power in the Security Council is all right for those nations which need not use it, but it is bad when it is used consistently in the self-interest of a government which finds itself in a minority of one? In my view, Mr. President, nothing has demonstrated the isolation of the Soviet communism in world opinion more clearly than the repeated recourse of Soviet delegates to the veto to block otherwise unanimous U. N. proposals.

The widespread preoccupation with the veto among critics of the United Nations results from a false emphasis on the supposed significance of voting in the U. N., rather than on the actions of U. N. members. When these two are confused, neither the United Nations nor the cause of American foreign policy is advanced. It is not the veto of the U. S. S. R. in the Security Council which prevents effective international action against Russia's selfish interests, but rather the facts of Russia's size and power and aggressive Soviet determination, in the face of Western disunity and the failure of joint leadership of the free world.

REPUBLICAN LEADER'S PLAN WOULD DESTROY U. N.

Thus there could be no gain and much loss in the proposal of the Republican Senate leader to cut the Gordian knot of the veto by forcing the withdrawal from the U. N. of its chief user, the Soviet Union. Were this done, it would not change geography, or the relative military power of different nations, or their underlying economic strength and weaknesses and interests. Suppose Russia and its satellites withdrew from the U. N. or were expelled. Could we therefore expect greater cohesion or support for anti-Soviet policies from the remaining members? Rather, we should expect the very opposite. Before accepting the commands of the single-mindedly anti-Russian sort of organization which the Republican leader contemplates, scores of other members might also withdraw, including some of the most populous nations of Asia and probably several European democracies. The United Nations would disintegrate. For how would the reasons which persuade these governments to refrain from anti-Soviet alliances have been changed by Soviet withdrawal from the U. N.? Russia would still exist, in the same place, as large and powerful as before. Some of the most truly democratic and liberty-loving members of the United Nations are countries near the frontiers of Russia—gallant Finland, progressive Sweden, newly freed Austria. Could they remain in a United Nations without the U. S. S. R., a United Nations which then the Senator from California hopes would take anti-Soviet action? We in the United States are many thousands of miles from the storehouses of Red army artillery and atomic missiles—yet even we know ourselves to be endangered. The friends of ours whom I have enumerated, and others, are within virtual 20–20 vision of Soviet arsenals. How can the Senator from California expect them to accept the kind of United Nations which he plans—or does he contemplate, eventually, the same kind of a go-it-alone policy for the United States which his predecessors on the Republican side of the aisle assured when they tragically wrecked President Woodrow Wilson's League a generation ago?

LEAGUE OF NATIONS WAS DESTROYED BY ABSENT POWERS

When leaders of Senator KNOWLAND'S party attacked the League of Nations and prevented American participation in it, they thought that by remaining outside the world organization, we could escape from the world and from the consequences of our own growth to world power. Now the Senator from California attacks the League's successor—although it imposes on us less obligation than the League Covenant would have—and he asks us to eject from it our potential antagonists so as to escape from the consequences of their growth to world power. He has evidently learned little from our experience with the League. For Germany was a member of the League of Nations from 1926 to 1933, and left the League when Hitler took over and started plotting his course of aggression. Soviet Russia joined the League in 1934 in an effort to gain protection against the Nazis, and was expelled in 1939. By 1939, perhaps the Western European democracies could have got the League of Nations to adopt any resolutions they liked—but the League no longer resembled the real world. In the face of the actions of three powerful nonmembers—the infamous and cynical pact between Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia, plus American isolationism—the League of Nations system of collective security collapsed in the face of aggression. The world went up in flames—and we found that we had not escaped, after all.

Mr. President, a good many of the criticisms of the United Nations voiced by the Senator from California are undoubtedly valid, if they are directed to the United Nations as an agency of collective security. He is unquestionably right when he regrets that its friends oversold this view of it to the people of the United States. The United Nations was never designed to be a worldwide collective-security organization against any of the few large states so powerful that they could effectively mount a world war against the remainder of the organization. Such a notion would actually be self-contradictory, and the veto power given such large nations merely recognized that fact. The United Nations cannot be both a world organization and an anti-Soviet alliance, any more than an anti-American alliance or anti-British alliance. When we are disappointed at failures of justice or morality in international relations—as many of us have recently been disappointed in the contrast between the course of events in the Suez dispute and in the Russian oppression of Hungary—the failures are not those of the organization, but of the world which it only too faithfully reflects.

Yet in concentrating on his disappointment with these facts, the Republican leader virtually ignores that there is another side of the coin. He gives only the briefest mention to the fact that the United Nations has provided the sole forum on earth which presumes that potential belligerents will talk to each other rather than drop atomic bombs on one another's cities. Surely this alone justifies our continued support for the United Nations—unless there are those who think it would be better to stop talking and plunge into atomic war. The Republican leader's one-sided attacks on the weaknesses of the United Nations lead one to wonder why he is so intent on weakening the faith of the people of America in the one international forum where debate may possibly forestall fighting.

SENATE, ALSO, HAS DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION

In attacking the distribution of votes and of financial burdens in the U. N., the distinguished Senator from California quoted with evident approval the criticism of the United Nations voiced by Lord Cherwell of England because "the population of the biggest is more than 1,000 times greater than that of the smallest."

Mr. President, if this is an indictment of the United Nations—as apparently the Senator from California and Lord Cherwell intend it to be—then it is virtually equally an indictment of the United States Senate.

Here in this Chamber 10 States which pay almost 73 percent of all Federal taxes are represented by a total of 20 Senators. Yet 38 States, which pay only 27 percent of Federal taxes, are represented by a total of 76 Senators. What does the Senator from California think of that discrepancy, if he supports Lord Cherwell's criticism of the United Nations because of the disproportionate size of the countries there represented?

Furthermore, the State of New York has approximately 65 times the population of the State of Nevada, yet each has the identical number of Senators in this body. Is the Senator from California thinking of indicting the Senate and its effectiveness on that basis? I hope not.

In addition, Mr. President, the United Nations has only the power to recommend, while we in this Senate have the power to enact laws which are binding upon 170 million men, women, and children. If disproportionate membership is bad for the United Nations, why does the Senator from California tolerate it—nay, actively support it—in the Senate of the United States?

Mr. President, as the common meeting ground of 80 nations, the U. N. has the instinctive confidence of hundreds of millions of people throughout the world. They look to its meetings in New York with the hope that there the whole world will at least try to seek solutions to the problems which concern them most, problems which are different for each individual nation and which do not in every instance happen to include security from Soviet aggression. The prestige of the U. N. depends upon its inclusiveness and its accessibility to opposing points of view. We can and should make the democratic viewpoint prevail in the U. N. by virtue of leadership, not by expulsion of antidemocratic members.

UNITY AND LEADERSHIP BY FREE DEMOCRACIES NEEDED IN U. N.

I repeat, votes in the United Nations do not substitute for the actions of its members in assuring international peace and security. The Republican Senate leader is quite right that too often, recently, the Eisenhower administration has yielded to the temptation of presenting the U. N. as such a substitute for an effective American policy. When this course fails, it is not the organization's

failure—it is ours and that of other member countries.

The United Nations can be an effective force for liberty and democracy in the world when the free democracies join together in offering it firm leadership in support of those values. When we fail to maintain the unity of the free democracies, when we permit the West to appear divided and at cross-purposes, we can expect no successful collective action for liberty and democracy from the United Nations.

Thus I have often spoken of the importance of further developing the Atlantic Community.

We may rightly ask the United Nations to endorse actions which we are prepared to take ourselves in support of the principles of the charter. We cannot ask it to take such action instead of us. Let us always remember that the United Nations is not a court nor a parliament. It cannot act except by the action of its members. Yet wher its chief members ask it to support their actions in the cause of international peace or security or justice, its endorsement, as the voice of the international community, can lend unparalleled prestige and righteousness to their cause. This, Mr. President, is a value for which the United Nations is well worth preserving; and that is why I believe that the Senator from California should have directed his criticism at the lack of leadership of the present administration rather than at the institution of the United Nations. For the latter he has offered no substitute besides anarchy and mutual isolation.

Mr. President, neither we nor many of the other nations of the world have yet fully learned, after only a dozen years, how to make responsible and consistent use of the institutions of the United Nations in relation to our respective national policies. The recent crises highlight these inadequacies. But I do not agree that we should write off a great international organization because of them. Long after the crises have passed I want there to remain a United Nations organization in continued existence. If the faith of Americans in the U. N. is destroyed by attacks such as those of the Republican Senate leader, then the United Nations may disappear as an effective potential instrument for world peace and for closer international cooperation in many fields.

A Senate may fail the public interest, a court may render a decision we detest, a United Nations may prove unable to solve a world crisis between powerful antagonists, but we do not propose their destruction as human institutions. A United Nations as contemplated by the Senator from California will not be a United Nations at all. He would destroy it in an effort to turn it into an armed camp, confronting another camp equally armed with the deadliest weapons in all history. I believe Americans want a United Nations in which we can talk with our possible foes—and in which we and they can present our respective cases to the world, and the world its problems to us.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend my colleague for the speech he has just made. It is very important that we start to make the record here in the Senate in reaffirming our support of the United Nations. I am very much concerned by what is happening across the country as the result of the propaganda which seems to be abroad in the land about the so-called ineffectiveness of the United Nations.

I especially point out to my colleague, in support of his speech, that one of the reasons the United Nations is not so effective as we would wish it to be is, as my colleague points out in his speech, the failure on the part of the leadership of this administration to do those things which would strengthen the United Nations by constantly going around the United Nations and constantly circumventing the United Nations.

The record of this administration has been to go around the United Nations time and time again instead of first going through it. We ought to be carrying the fight to Russia within the United Nations by one resolution after another, to show very clearly that we are willing to submit to the procedures of the United Nations for the settlement of disputes.

We ought to be urging the use of U. N. procedures to settle international disputes but, time and again, we allow Russia to succeed in her propaganda without introducing a resolution with respect to the subject. If we did so, we would show Russia up for what she is—a designing nation intent upon dividing and ruling the free nations of the world. We have only to look at the mess the administration has created in the Middle East for proof of my statement.

We are now hearing talk in America about applying sanctions against one of the weakest nations in the United Nations and the only truly free nation in the Middle East. I think the time has come to take the debate to the President on this matter, and carry it across the Nation. I understand the President will make an appeal to the people tonight in regard to the sanctions issue. I think he should be met on that issue, because where have there been any proposals before the United Nations for the exercise of sanctions against Russia, when Russia has been violating the spirit, the intent, and the letter of the United Nations Charter? We now see the only free nation in the Middle East struggling for its survival, and what does the President want to do? Apparently, to accept the deceptive language of the Secretary of State in regard to Israel.

I wish to say to the President of the United States, "Come forward, then, and give us a concrete proposal as to what you intend to do to protect the survival of Israel. What arrangement did you make with the King of Saudi Arabia? Are you ready to tell the American people, or are you going to continue to keep it in the dark?"

I think the time has come to tell the American people what, if any, deal the President made with one of the outstanding totalitarians of the world today, that absolute monarch of Saudi Arabia who has said he is willing to sacrifice the lives of millions of Arabs to wipe Israel off the map.

It is a little late to be telling Israel to follow a course of action that once again will throw her open to the danger of Arab attacks. There is no guaranty that she is to have the use of the Straits of Tiran. There is no guaranty that her ships are to be able to move in international trade. The time has come for the President not to speak in general language. I would say to the President of the United States, "Mr. President, what do you propose to do to protect the freedom of the only free nation in the Middle East?"

Here again, we ought to be going through the United Nations and be calling upon the free nations within the United Nations Organization to make it clear that we do not intend to stand by and permit the only free nation in the Middle East to run the danger of not even surviving, while the President and the Secretary of State talk about sanctions against the weak little nation we know as Israel, but which, nevertheless, is a nation which has been willing to bleed for freedom in the Middle East while the United States has followed a course of action which for months has weakened the position of Israel in that area.

When I offered an amendment and sought to get from the Secretary of State a statement as to some commitments for the preservation of Israeli rights before we adopt the Eisenhower doctrine, what was his reply? He said, "We cannot do that. We have to do it through the United Nations. This is only a resolution directed toward Russia."

But the time has come for Israel to ask the United States. "What about us? What protection have we any right to rely upon in view of the negotiations which the United States has been making with Arab countries which time and time again have issued the public threat that they intend to wipe this little nation off the map of the world?"

Mr. President, here is one Senator—let me say to the President of the United States—who does not propose to vote for sanctions against the only free nation in the Middle East. Let the President of the United States announce a concrete program which will guarantee, through the United Nations, the preservation of the freedom and the integrity of Israel. Here is one Senator who is not going to vote for any more unilateral action on the part of the President of the United States in the Middle East. It is about time the American people told the President of the United States that he, too, as well as the Secretary of State, should start action through the United Nations. No more of these deals with Arab countries. I would have my country return to that immutable principle laid down by the great Woodrow Wilson when he pointed out that permanent peace in this world has hope of being attained only if we reach international understandings by way of open covenants openly arrived at.

I want to know what covenants the President of the United States is making in the Middle East before I vote for any such blank-check authority as that which is being asked for in the Eisenhower doctrine.

At a later time, today or tomorrow or the next day, I intend to discuss at some length this doctrine; and, let me say to the leadership of my party in the Senate, the resolution they have adopted in the committee is not good enough, because it is only one step. It does not go to the essence of the problem. It does not begin to meet the constitutional question involved. It certainly does not even touch upon the great issues which are affecting peace in the Middle East, such as the Suez Canal, the Arab refugee problem, and the territorial integrity of Israel.

I am going to vote no authority to the President of the United States by way of a blank-check resolution until we come to grips with those three problems.

Before this debate is over I shall offer each one of my amendments to the resolution and ask for the approval or disapproval of the Senate. I surmise they will be disapproved, but we have days of debate which can go out to the whole country. Let the people understand what the issue is about.

Mr. President, I was in California last weekend, and I saw demonstrated in a series of meetings what I am satisfied is great grassroots concern about the President's program. I spoke in the Kern Theater in San Francisco last Friday night. I was quite surprised that 90 cents admission was charged, and the theater was packed with 2,000 people, not because I was the speaker, but because the subject which was announced was the President's doctrine in the Middle East. Those 2,000 persons were greatly concerned about the request of the President of the United States.

Some of my colleagues in the Senate think we should have a quick debate and close it speedily. I want to say that the longer this debate lasts, within rules of reason, the greater service we shall be performing for the American people, because the American people are entitled to have time to consider the facts which will be brought out in the debate.

Here is one Senator, may I say to the Democratic leadership of the Senate, who thinks the language of the resolution does not begin to even scratch the surface of the great issues which are involved. I shall no more vote for the resolution as now phrased than I shall for the original Eisenhower resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to compliment the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on the remarks he has just made. He cross-examined me at great length when I appeared before the joint meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee in support of certain amendments which I offered to the original resolution. The amendments were designed to make it clear that the grant being made by the resolution would be a grant under the Constitution of the United States. It seemed impossible for me to believe that anyone would refuse to support an amendment of that kind. Yet, it does not appear in the resolution as it has been reported. This afternoon, shortly after the Senate began its session, I offered two amendments upon which I shall attempt to speak later on.

I think they are worthy of mention at this time, because they will appear in the RECORD tomorrow morning; and I should like those who read the RECORD to know where the amendments, if they are adopted, will appear in the joint resolution, and what they will do.

If the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] will be so kind as to indulge me, I shall refer to page 4 of the resolution as reported by the two committees with the recommendation that the Senate act favorably thereon. The first sentence of section 2 reads as follows:

> The President is authorized to undertake, in the general area of the Middle East, military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance.

Is the phrase "military assistance programs" defined in the resolution? Is it defined in the report? It is not defined anywhere. Anyone who can read the English language must know that under the phrase "military assistance programs" there could be included the utilization of the Armed Forces of the United States because that would be military assistance. If the President under this language chose to expand his authority as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces without the consent of Congress, it would be difficult indeed for Congress to stop him after he had put the Armed Forces into action. This is one of the vague portions of the resolution which must be cleared up.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Does not the Senator from Wyoming believe to be sufficient the President's statement, which he has repeatedly made, that he would be in hourly communication with the Congress and would consult with the Congress in all details of action under the resolution before taking action?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator in his question is trying to relate this matter to one single individual. I am not mentioning a name. I am talking about the office of President. It is the office of President which is mentioned in the Constitution. No names are mentioned in the Constitution, nor could they be mentioned.

Mr. BUTLER. But it is always within the power of Congress to withdraw the authority granted in section 2 if it does not want it to be lodged in the hands of a particular President.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is always possible to lock the barn door after the horse has been stolen. I want to lock the barn door now, before there is any theft.

Mr. BUTLER. Would the Senator have the section provide——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will indulge me, I will tell him what I want the resolution to provide. It will take me only a minute to do so; then the Senator can interrogate me with greater knowledge.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming permit me to make one observation concerning the question asked by the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then the Senator from Oregon will have me in trouble with the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. MORSE. Very well; I will withhold my observation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me read the second sentence of section 2:

> Furthermore, the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East.

Of course, that is a pious wish. We do cherish the hope, as vital to the national interest and world peace, that the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East will be secured. But this is merly a statement of a hope.

Now comes a statement of the means by which to fulfill that hope. I read sentence 3 of section 2:

> To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism.

Now listen to the proviso:

> *Provided*, That such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations.

If the employment of the Armed Forces of the United States is to be consonant with the Charter of the United Nations, it will be consonant with a charter which provides for the establishment of the Security Council, upon which Soviet Russia sits with a powerful veto.

So section 2—and I draw this to the attention of the Senator from Maryland—as it is presented to the Senate by the committees tells Congress and tells the people that the use of the armed services of the United States may be prohibited by the Soviet Union. Who in this body is willing to give his support to such vague, indefinite language?

I wish to make the purpose clear; so, Mr. President, I have offered an amendment on which I hope the Department of State will make a report. The amendment would strike out the words "Charter of the United Nations," and would substitute in lieu thereof "Constitution of the United States."

The proviso would then read:

> *Provided*, That such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States—

The Charter of the United Nations was established by a treaty, of course—

> and with the Constitution of the United States.

How can we think for a moment of sacrificing the authority of the Constitution of the United States? We know

that throughout the Middle East there are small governments, such as those of Ethiopia, Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Pakistan, and Afghanistan, all of whom are members of the United Nations, and we propose under the resolution as it was reported from the committees, to give any one or all of them, including the Soviet Union, the opportunity to act under the Charter of the United Nations and to undo the Constitution of the United States?

I do not believe that any person who will give 10 minutes of concentrated thought to the meaning of the resolution which has been reported by the committees can fail to support the amendment I have proposed, which names the Constitution under whose provisions we sit here. If we are unwilling to name the Constitution, how did we have the courage to take the oath to support it?

If the United States is to maintain moral leadership in the world, and is to protect political liberty and economic liberty among men, we must stand by the Constitution, which is the first and only document ever written in the whole history of the world that guarantees to the people self-government. We will throw the Constitution lightly away, toss it aside, if we refuse to write into the resolution proper reference to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, does the Senator from Maryland now wish to interrogate me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to remind my distinguished colleagues, whom I thank for their cogent observations, that I have the floor, and that the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has requested the floor after I have finished with my remarks. With his indulgence, I will be willing to yield extremely briefly, if the colloquy can be terminated in a relatively short time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, since the Senator from Oregon has been kind enough to indulge me, let me then state the meaning of my second amendment. Many other amendments could be offered, but section 3 of the resolution as reported is the one which deals with economic and military assistance under the joint resolution.

Section 3 provides, in part:

> The President is hereby authorized to use during the balance of fiscal year 1957 for economic and military assistance under this joint resolution not to exceed $200 million from any appropriation now available for carrying out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, in accord with the provisions of such act.

If I am correctly advised by the members of the two committees who sat through their executive sessions, the committees have never received from the administration any explanation whatever as to what programs have been conceived for the expenditure of the $200 million. On the other hand, we are told that at high-level press conferences which have been held, those who attended the conferences were advised that $50 million of the $200 million would be used for the purpose of providing military equipment to King Saud, of Saudi Arabia.

Then there is some rather vague language in the further proviso beginning in line 25, as follows:

> *Provided further*, That obligations incurred in carrying out the purposes of the first sentence of section 2 of this joint resolution shall be paid only out of appropriations for military assistance, and obligations incurred in carrying out the purposes of the first section of this joint resolution shall be paid only out of appropriations other than those for military assistance. This authorization is in addition to other existing authorizations with respect to the use of such appropriations. None of the additional authorization contained in this section shall be used until 15 days after the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives and, when military assistance is involved, the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives have been furnished a report showing the object of the proposed use—

And so forth. I seek to amend that by inserting in the sentence—

> None of the additional authorization contained in this section shall be used—

The following words—

> for either military or economic assistance—

And then the committee amendment continues—

> until 15 days—

And so forth. I seek to have that amendment made in the committee amendment because from this proviso in section 3 it is not clear precisely what the additional authorization is intended to mean. This authorization is in addition to other existing authorizations. I seek to make clear that the appropriate committees of Congress shall be advised before any assistance, military or economic, is extended. That merely will carry out the promise that the President of the United States made in his message of January 5, and surely there can be no objection to that.

Now I am at the command of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. I thank him very much for having permitted me to explain my amendments.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield briefly to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I wish to thank the Senator. Let me say that at the time when the amendments are submitted, I shall address myself to them. In view of the existing situation, I shall wait until then.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend my colleague for the speech he has made today, because it points the way in regard to the proper relationship of the United States to the United Nations. That is most important, because the relationship of our country to the United Nations is, I think, rather fundamental to the consideration of the so-called Eisenhower doctrine.

If my colleague will permit me to do so, I should like to ask several questions of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. My first question is this: Is it not true that the President's speech in which he said he would maintain hourly contact with the Congress, is not a part of the joint resolution?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly it is not a part of the joint resolution, nor is it a part of the report on the resolution.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Wyoming aware that when, in my examination of the Secretary of State, I proposed an amendment which would require the President to come before the Congress and obtain the approval of Congress before he sent American forces into action in the Middle East, if that became necessary under the joint resolution, or, if the emergency then existing were so great that he could not wait for the 20 minutes that are required to travel from the White House to the Capitol, to report to us, or that he could not wait for the 24 hours that are sufficient in order to convene a special session of Congress, that the President be required to come before the Congress and report his reasons for following that emergency course of action, for our approval or rejection, at that point the Secretary of State said, in effect, that he wanted none of such an amendment—although only a few minutes before he had assured the committees that the President would keep in hourly contact with the Congress? Is the Senator from Wyoming aware of the position of the Secretary of State in regard to that amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was not aware of it. However, knowing the position of the State Department in regard to my amendments, I am not at all surprised that the Secretary of State had an adverse reaction to the amendments of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say, as my last observation on this matter for the time being, that my amendments to the amendments of the Senator from Wyoming—which I completely support, and for which I shall vote—were offered in the committees as a substitute which in essence included the Senator's amendments. But the committee did not want them, as the Senator from Wyoming knows.

I wish to say that the amendments we are submitting, and for which we shall vote, not only protect the power of the Congress and not only protect the principle of the precious checking power of the Constitution, but also strengthen the Office of the Presidency.

I am at a loss to understand why the Secretary of State, purportedly speaking for the President of the United States, does not embrace the amendments the Senator from Wyoming and I are offering, so as to make clear to the American people that the President is perfectly willing to submit to the Congress his request to send American forces into action on the basis of conditions then existing or on the basis of the particular situation then existing, or that he agrees that if time does not permit that, he will come before the Congress forthwith and will report his course of action, for either the approval or disapproval of the Congress. Until the present President or any other President is willing to abide

by the spirit and intent of the Constitution, under article I, section 8, I will never vote him the kind of power he is requesting in the pending joint resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I glory in the courage of the Senator from Oregon. I know he will never surrender, and that his voice will ring in this empty Chamber until it is heard throughout the length and breadth of the land.

But I say to everyone in the gallery who may be listening that we cannot possibly make the United States the moral leader of the world on behalf of freedom for all peoples if we surrender the Constitution of the United States; and the rejection of my amendments would mean only that—namely, the abdication by the Congress of its constitutional power; and that, in turn, would mean the death of democracy.

I thank the junior Senator from Oregon for yielding.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his very penetrating remarks.

Mr. President, I raised the issue of the attack on the United Nations by the minority leader because, regardless of its faults and defects, the United Nations is the only world organization we have in which potential belligerents can talk, rather than fight and drop nuclear weapons upon each other's communities.

I felt that the February 11 speech of the Senate Republican leader was one which could only undermine the faith of Americans in the United Nations. It seems to me important that some Member—regardless of his experience or lack of experience in the Senate—should answer that speech. I have attempted to do so today because it is my hope, and I believe it is the hope of millions of other Americans, that the United Nations will survive the faults of our world, and will remain the great truly worldwide international forum it is.

---

## VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MR. AND MRS. ROCK HUDSON

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, about 3 weeks ago, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] presented to the Senate a former minister from Marietta, Ohio, who later became Colonel Hess, who is the one who airlifted more than a thousand Korean children to an island, so that they might find sanctuary there when the Communist troops came in.

Those exploits have been filmed in a great motion picture called "Battle Hymn"; and the star of that film, who comes from Illinois, is in the gallery.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the rule, that I may present Rock Hudson, the star of "Battle Hymn," and Mrs. Hudson.

(Mr. and Mrs. Hudson rose and were greeted with applause.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). The Chair wishes to extend the greetings of the Senate to Mr. and Mrs. Hudson. We hope their stay in Washington will be informative and rewarding.

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I have been privileged to attend the hearings on the pending resolution, both the open hearings and the closed hearings. As a result of what I heard, I am unable to vote for the Middle East resolution for two reasons.

First, I cannot reconcile a vote for the Middle East resolution with a proper regard for the resources of American taxpayers and the lives of American boys.

Second, I cannot reconcile a vote for the Middle East resolution with a proper observance of the responsibility devolving upon the Congress under the Constitution of the United States.

Members of Congress were astounded, a few days before the present session of Congress convened, by matters released to the press—leaked deliberately, I say—to the effect that a great, new, bold doctrine for the Middle East had been evolved by John Foster Dulles, and that it would be necessary for Congress to put that doctrine into immediate effect because of the great emergency existing in the Middle East. Some of the press dispatches even went so far as to suggest that any Member of Congress who dared to exercise his own intelligence, and determine for himself whether this new doctrine was wise or foolish, would be lending aid to the Communists.

I do not know whether the releases to the press were intended to accomplish such a purpose, but they were certainly calculated to place the Members of Congress over a barrel and make them adopt the new brain child of John Foster Dulles, regardless of whether they thought it wise or foolish.

We might as well realize the facts of government along with the facts of life: While the doctrine is called the Eisenhower doctrine, it is the brain child of the present occupant of the office of the Secretary of State.

When we got into the hearings we made some discoveries that were totally inconsistent with the releases which had been given to the press. We found, for example, that the Middle East resolution announcing the new doctrine was not, in fact, directed toward the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. We found that out because the Secretary of State himself testified that there was nothing to indicate that Soviet Russia was preparing to make any armed attack upon any of the nations of the Middle East. We found that out because Admiral Radford, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified, in substance, that there was nothing to indicate that Soviet Russia was about to make any armed attack on any nation of the Middle East. We further discovered, Mr. President, from the testimony produced before the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, that there is, in fact, no basis for the assertion that there was an emergency demanding that Congress should immediately swallow the Middle East resolution, lock, stock, and barrel, without investigating it and studying it.

The resolution has two alleged objectives. One is to authorize the President of the United States to use the Armed Forces of the United States in the Middle East.

I thought, from what I read in the press, that it was necessary for us to send our Armed Forces immediately to the Middle East to garrison the Middle East. So I asked the Secretary of State if it was planned, under the resolution, to station ground forces of the United States in the Middle East, and the Secretary of State replied, in substance, that there was no plan to station ground forces of the United States in the Middle East.

He went so far as to suggest that the Navy was in the Mediterranean, and that the Navy might take care of the situation. I thereupon observed, in substance, that I could not visualize the Navy sailing around on the sands of Arabia. Then the Secretary of State said that if any emergency should arise requiring the use of ground forces of the United States in the Middle East, the troops would be brought in from some other places on the face of the earth.

It strikes me that if we are to have time to bring in American ground forces from some far distant corner of the earth in case some emergency should arise demanding their use in the Middle East, we might have time to let Congress, which is sitting here in Washington, and which will be here until July, August, or September, act on this matter in an orthodox and constitutional manner.

Then the Secretary of State said, "It is necessary that the Congress release immediately from all restrictions $200 million of President's appropriation so that it can be spent in the Middle East." I think every member of each of the two committees tried to find out from the Secretary of State how he wanted to spend that $200 million. He told them that he did not have any plans as to how it was to be spent. I do not know how other Members of the Senate may feel; as to this, I cannot forbear observing, however, that when any official or private individual comes to me and tells me that there is a great emergency which requires him to have some amount of money which he can spend in a footloose and fancy-free manner, and also tells me, at the same time, that he does not know how he is going to spend it, he fails to satisfy my intelligence that he needs the money.

So I say that the evidence before the two committees which considered this resolution wholly failed to establish that there was any reason which would justify the Congress in passing the resolution as an emergency measure as the original press report suggested it should be passed, either from a military standpoint or from a financial standpoint.

I have alluded to the fact that the testimony of the Secretary of State himself, and the testimony of Admiral Radford, establishes beyond any question that this resolution is not directed at

Soviet Russia. I think every intelligent being knows that if Soviet Russia were to make an armed invasion of the Middle East, that act would be the signal for the beginning of the third world war, without any resolution of any character being passed by the Congress.

The truth is, Mr. President, that the testimony offered in support of the resolution makes it so plain that he who runs may read and not err in so doing, that this is a resolution advocated by the Secretary of State for the purpose of making the United States a policeman for the countries of the Middle East. We have had in our foreign policy in that area appeasement. We have had in our foreign policy in that area foreign aid. This resolution would not, on the one hand, put an end to appeasement, or, on the other hand, accomplish anything worth while in the foreign aid field that is not authorized by acts of Congress which appropriated approximately $750 million for use in this area of the world during the present fiscal year.

There is no necessity for untying these funds. According to the evidence the Secretary of State already has $95 million which he can spend in a footloose and fancy-free manner in that area of the world, and he does not even know how he wants to spend the $95 million he now has.

I have said that I could not reconcile a vote for this resolution with a proper regard for the resources of American taxpayers and the lives of American boys. On this point, let me say that the Senate might as well realize what it is doing if it passes this resolution. It is appointing the present Secretary of State as its unlimited agent in the Middle East.

I have known another person who wanted somewhat similar unlimited power. In my hometown in North Carolina, there used to be two gentlemen who trafficked in mules. One of them was named Bob Goodson and the other was named Vance Powell.

Occasionally they would engage in a joint venture in the buying and selling of mules. On one occasion, Vance Powell came into my law office and said, "Six months ago I went over to Tennessee and bought some mules for the joint account of Bob Goodson and myself, and Bob Goodson has never ceased to complain about the traits of some of the mules I bought on that occasion."

He stated further, "Bob Goodson came to see me yesterday, and wanted me to go back to Tennessee and buy some more mules for him and myself. I told him I was not going to do it unless I could get a paper fixed up to protect me against him in the future. So I have come to you to draw me a paper which says these things, according to law: that Vance Powell is going to Tennessee and buy some mules for the joint account of himself and Bob Goodson; that Vance Powell is going to do as he pleases in buying those mules, and is going to exercise his own judgment in all respects; and that when he gets back to North Carolina with those mules, there is not going to be any 'hereafter' about any of them from Bob Goodson."

The Secretary of State is trying to get the Congress to pass a resolution appointing him as its unlimited agent, to do what he pleases, according to his own judgment, in the Middle East. If the Congress passes this resolution, it will have no right to have any "hereafter" about it, because it will be authorizing in advance everything which the Secretary of State does.

I have witnessed the activities of the Secretary of State in the Middle East. I have noted the fact that at the time he became Secretary of State, England, our ally, which has a peculiar interest in the Middle East so far as the Suez Canal is concerned, by reason of its mercantile activities, had 85,000 troops in the Middle East guarding the Suez Canal and keeping it open for the commerce of the world.

The Egyptians did not like that. They desired to seize the canal in violation of their agreement that the Suez Canal would remain in the custody of the Suez Canal Company until 1968. The Egyptians advised our Secretary of State that they did not like the English. To appease the Egyptians, the Secretary pressured the English into removing their troops from the Suez Canal, leaving it defenseless. A few days after the last contingent of British troops was withdrawn—exactly 13 days, as I understand—Colonel Nasser seized the Suez Canal. All of us are familiar with the subsequent events.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, does the Senator desire to yield at this point, or does he wish first to conclude his remarks?

Mr. ERVIN. I would prefer to finish my remarks; then I shall be very glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

We are all familiar with the subsequent events, and I shall not detail them. They wound up with the United States voting with Soviet Russia in the United Nations against two of our most faithful allies, England and France.

I asked the Secretary of State, during the hearings, if we had not voted with the Soviet Union against two of our allies, and he said, "No; the Soviet Union voted with us." I remarked that that was a difference without a distinction, because the fact is, regardless of whose resolution it was, the United States and Russia voted for the resolution, which was, in substance, a verbal chastisement of our principal allies.

I do not know how the other Members of the Senate may feel about this matter. However, having observed the conduct of affairs in the Middle East by the present Secretary of State, and having observed the disastrous consequences of his conduct of such affairs, I do not have sufficient confidence in the soundness of his judgment to be willing to underwrite his future action in that area of the world with the resources of American taxpayers and the lives of American boys.

I said that a vote for the resolution cannot be reconciled with a proper regard for the resources of American taxpayers. It is proposed in the resolution to initiate for the Middle East a new policy, under which the executive branch of the Government, acting through the International Cooperation Administration of the State Department, shall have the right to expend the money of the American taxpayers at its uncontrolled whim and caprice.

I have been struck during recent days by the fact that the Federal income tax is rather burdensome. My church's catechism says that the chief end of man is to glorify God and enjoy Him forever. The Federal taxing laws take issue with that statement of the catechism, because they attempt to make the payment of income taxes the chief end of man.

Persons in our lowest brackets are now paying Federal income tax at the rate of $20 out of every $100 of their income above a very limited exemption.

Yet we are asked to adopt a resolution which will commit us to the policy of extracting money from the pockets of our hard-pressed taxpayers for the benefit of nations of the Middle East whose rulers are receiving oil royalties aggregating hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

I believe that before it passes this resolution the Senate should investigate the possibility of having these oil royalties devoted to the use of the people of the countries of the Middle East.

Mr. President, there is another reason why passage of the joint resolution would not be consistent with a proper regard for the resources of American taxpayers and the lives of American boys.

There are in Europe 15 nations, having a combined total population in excess of 270 million, lying outside the Iron Curtain. These 15 nations are directly dependent upon the continued flow of oil from the Middle East for their economic welfare. The Secretary of State himself, during the course of the hearings, went so far as to describe the continued flow of Middle East oil as the economic lifeline of these nations.

Yet, notwithstanding the fact that these 15 nations of Europe are primarily dependent upon this oil for their economic salvation, the resolution puts the burden on the American taxpayers to insure the continued flow of this oil to those 15 European nations, whose combined population is largely in excess of that of the United States, without calling on them for the expenditure of a single penny to accomplish this task.

More than that, Mr. President, the joint resolution contemplates that Congress will underwrite the continued flow of this oil to these 15 nations having a combined population of more than 270 million, with the lives of all American boys of military age, without calling on the 15 nations of 270 million persons for a single one of their sons.

No one has given me a single sensible reason why the United States should be called on to pledge the resources of our taxpayers and the lives of our sons to continue the flow of oil to these 15 nations, which are not asked to do anything whatever in regard to the matter.

If Uncle Sam is unwise enough to assume the burdens which this resolution would impose upon him, it will not be long before some of the NATO countries will be tempted to say, "If Uncle Sam can carry burdens like those without our assistance, he can assume the entire responsibility of guarding us against any menace from the Soviet Union."

If we want to do something constructive in the Middle East, Mr. President, we do not have to assume the entire burden ourselves. We do not have to adopt the go-it-alone policy envisaged by this resolution. There are in that area now four nations—Turkey, Iran, Iraq, and Pakistan—which have signed the Baghdad Pact to come to each other's mutual assistance in case of an attack by Russia. These four nations seal off the Russian border from the remainder of the Middle East. Not only are these four nations signatories to the Baghdad Pact, but the United Kingdom, as well, is a party to it. The five signatories have a combined population in excess of 170 millions. Yet, instead of allying ourselves with those 170 millions to secure the Middle East against Soviet aggression, we are asked to pledge that if necessary Uncle Sam will go it alone in defending that area of the world.

I asked the Secretary of State why he did not recommend that we become a signatory to the Baghdad Pact, and he said it would involve us in Arab politics.

When he was asked how he would spend the money which he would be authorized to spend under this resolution, he said he had no plans for it, but he did suggest one expenditure he could make, and that was that he might use some of it to strengthen the security forces of the nations of the Middle East against internal uprisings.

Mr. President, I submit that if the United States is going to attempt to maintain the status quo in the countries of the Middle East insofar as their present governments are concerned, Uncle Sam will be sticking his nose into Arab politics with a vengeance.

So much for the proposition that a vote for the Middle East resolution cannot be reconciled with a proper regard for the resources of American taxpayers and the lives of American boys.

I now wish to discuss my second proposition; namely, that a vote for the resolution cannot be reconciled with a proper regard for the function of Congress under the Constitution.

We lawyers are accustomed to use the axiom "Out of the facts, the law arises." By that we mean that we cannot tell what the law is until we know what the facts are.

This is true with respect to the war powers of the President and the Congress under the Constitution. As I have pointed out, all of the evidence produced before the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate concerning Senate Joint Resolution 19 left me with the abiding conviction that this resolution is not, in fact, directed against Russia. As I have further pointed out, world war III would automatically begin if Russia were to make an unprovoked armed invasion of the Middle East regardless of whether this resolution is passed or defeated.

The evidence presented to the committees discloses beyond all doubt that this resolution is directed against the countries of the Middle East. Under it, the United States is appointing itself a policeman for the Middle East to make the countries of that area stay at peace. This is the object of the resolution and any pretense that it is directed at anything else is not supported by the evidence we had before us.

There are two kinds of warfare—defensive warfare and offensive warfare.

The only real protection the American people have on either the national or the international level is the protection afforded them by the Constitution of the United States. For this reason, I am unwilling to do anything which will, in effect, alter the Constitution of the United States without the consent of the Congress and the States—the only agencies authorized to amend it.

I do not claim to be an expert on the subject of the war powers of the President or of the Congress.

I have nevertheless given a lot of study to it. Such study has led me to the abiding conclusion that the power of the President as commander in chief of the Army and Navy under the Constitution when not acting by congressional authority is wholly defensive in nature, and that by virtue of its constitutional right to declare war, Congress and Congress alone has the power to authorize the employment of the Armed Forces of the United States in offensive warfare.

When this resolution is read in the light of the evidence presented before the committees, it clearly appears that the resolution is designed to permit the President to send the American forces into action on behalf of a Middle East country which is attacked by another Middle East country in case he decides that the latter country is controlled by international communism. This being true, the resolution is designed to permit the President to commit the Armed Forces of the United States to offensive warfare. We would delude ourselves, indeed, if we should say in such case that the United States were fighting in its own self-defense. An attack upon one Middle East country by another would not, in fact, imperil the national security of the United States.

For these reasons, I am unable to support any of the proposed amendments to the resolution declaring, in substance, that the President would have the right to engage in offensive warfare under these circumstances without authorization from Congress.

I have equal difficulty with the resolution in its original form. It undertakes to give congressional authorization to the President to engage in offensive warfare against some undesignated nation in the Middle East in case such undesignated nation attacks another Middle East country and the President finds that such undesignated nation is controlled by international communism. When the people of the United States adopted the Constitution vesting in Congress alone the power to authorize offensive warfare, they contemplated that the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives should determine, in the exercise of their own judgments, whether sufficient justification exists for committing the Armed Forces of the United States to offensive warfare before they authorize the waging of such warfare. They did not intend that the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House should abdicate their constitutional power and responsibility by delegating to the President the power to engage in offensive warfare at some subsequent time against some other nation to be selected by the President.

Mr. President, it has been suggested by some that this resolution is similar to the resolution regarding Formosa. The fact is that the distinction between this resolution and the resolution relating to Formosa is as wide, as broad, and as deep as is the gulf which yawns between Lazarus in Abraham's bosom and Dives in hell.

In the case of the Formosa Resolution, we knew who the enemy was. The enemy was Red China, which had committed aggression against us in Korea. We also knew that the armed forces of Red China were being massed on the mainland of China, and that they were firing on some of the islands, especially Matsu and Quemoy. We also knew that Red China had threatened to conquer Formosa, which was plainly within the line of our Pacific defenses. So in that case we knew who the enemy was. We knew that the enemy was preparing to make an invasion of Formosa, and we knew that Formosa was in the line of our Pacific defenses.

In this instance we do not know against whom a war is likely to be waged. We do not know whether there will be any justification for an offensive war. As a matter of fact, the Secretary of State himself testified that there is not now a single country in the Middle East which is controlled by international communism.

So Congress is asked to pass a resolution authorizing the President to commit the Armed Forces of this Nation to offensive warfare at some future time against some nation not yet identified. In other words, we are asked to delegate to the President our constitutional responsibility of determining whether there will be any justification for offensive warfare in the Middle East at some undesignated time in the future. More than this, we are asked to delegate to the President our constitutional power to determine the identity of the nation against which the offensive warfare is to be waged. We are asked to do that at a time when Congress is in session, and when, from all prospects now apparent to us, Congress will be in session for months and months to come.

Holding these views, as I do, I am not willing to abdicate my function as a Member of the Senate and to let the President not only determine the sufficiency of the justification for offensive warfare at some future time in the Middle East, but also to select the nation against which such warfare is to be waged. Consequently, I cannot vote for the resolution.

If the administration wants to make it plain that the United States will not tolerate any unprovoked armed aggression by the Soviet Union in the Middle East or elsewhere, it ought to present a forthright resolution to that effect, calling the Soviet Union by name and apprising it in unmistakable language of that purpose.

For the reasons I have stated, I do not see how a vote for the joint resolution can be reconciled with a proper regard for the resources of the American taxpayers, with a proper regard for the lives of American boys, or with a proper regard for the responsibilities devolving upon Congress under the Constitution of the United States. Therefore, I shall vote against the joint resolution.

## VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS FROM RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in the gallery this afternoon are some 90 students from various high schools in the State of Rhode Island. They are here because of their interest in international affairs. We realize that while they are young today, they will be our elder citizens and leaders of tomorrow, and we are happy, proud, and privileged to have them as our guests.

The students have come to Washington under the auspices of the World Affairs Council of Rhode Island. They could not be in Washington at a more propitious time than when the Senate is debating Senate Resolution 19, which has to do with the conditions in the Middle East.

Mr. President, I respectfully ask that these young people be allowed to rise, so that they may be greeted by the Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Will the students from Rhode Island stand, so that they may be greeted by the Members of the Senate?

(The students rose in their places in the gallery and were greeted with applause, Senators rising.)

## TRINITY RIVER—CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, yesterday I prepared some comments relative to a problem which is of primary concern to the State of California, which I have the honor, in part, to represent in the Senate. I wish to make those same comments now to the Senate.

As authorized by Congress, the Trinity River Division project in my State will be a multipurpose project, completely integrated with the Central Valley project, which itself is a public, multipurpose project approved by the people of California in the 1930's, and which was built by the Federal Government under Federal reclamation law.

The Trinity project was recommended by former Gov. Earl Warren and by Gov. Goodwin Knight as such a multipurpose development. In the Senate, in 1955, I sponsored the legislation authorizing the Trinity project, and my colleague, the minority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], cosponsored it.

In July 1955, Representative ENGLE requested the Senate to take up his House-approved bill by reason of the lateness of the session. It was similar to the Senate version, except that it provided also for a continuance of studies and a report to Congress by the Secretary of the Interior on proposals for power development through the purchase of falling water at Trinity by a non-Federal agency, as a result of proposals made by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Last week, pursuant to the study provision, the Secretary recommended a contract with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for the purchase by it of falling water and the installation of power-generating facilities at Trinity. Whether the Federal multipurpose development there and integration with the Central Valley project are now to be abandoned and the contract approved are, under the law, for Congress to determine. I shall discuss here only a few of the salient points on which he bases his recommendation.

The Commissioner of Reclamation in his report which is attached to the Secretary's recommendation states:

> The all-Federal development assumes extending to the Trinity division policies and reclamation law which provide for sale (1) of power to preference agencies, (2) at lowest rates to all customers consistent with the financial needs of the project.

This is the basis on which the Central Valley project was built and upon which the Trinity project, now under construction, was authorized by Congress, all pursuant to Federal reclamation law in effect since Theodore Roosevelt's administration.

Preference agencies are nonprofit, public agencies which are given priority in the sale of power publicly produced by the Federal reclamation projects. Among the agencies in California presently exercising their preference with the Central Valley project and buying public power are municipalities like Sacramento and Roseville, the latter an atomic energy installation, various Army, Naval, and Air Force bases, and irrigation districts in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys.

If the Secretary's recommendations were to be approved, his own Commissioner of Reclamation states that the power available to preference agencies would be curtailed; 650,000 kilowatts would be available to nonprofit agencies under Federal development, contrasted with 400,000 kilowatts under private development.

Under private development, the Commissioner finds that the preference agencies would be required to pay $86 million more for power over a 50-year period than if Central Valley power continued to be available. If the proposed San Luis reservoir in the San Joaquin Valley were constructed, almost all preference customers would be required to look elsewhere for power. The Commissioner finds that they then would be required to pay a total of $118 million more for power, of which Federal installations would pay $71 million more, and State and local preference customers would pay $47 million more. This is tantamount to emasculating the preference law so far as the Central Valley project is concerned.

Indeed, the Secretary himself recognizes this. In his letter of recommendation, he states:

> I am not unmindful of the fact that acceptance of the company's proposal would render it impossible to comply with two of the restrictions contained in the act. The first of these is the provision which requires that contracts for the sale and delivery of the additional electric energy available from the Central Valley project power system as a result of the construction of the plants authorized and their integration with that system shall be made in accordance with preferences expressed in the Federal reclamation laws. The second of these is the requirement that a first preference be given to preference customers in Trinity County, Calif.,—

And here I observe that that will be the site of the Trinity project—

> to the extent of 25 percent of the additional energy added to the Central Valley project as a result of the construction of the Trinity River Division. Since joint development of the Trinity resource would add no energy to the Central Valley project power system, except to the extent that the company provides support under its proposed amendments to the existing sales and interchange contract, it appears that there would be no power from which to satisfy either of the two restrictions mentioned. The company's proposal would provide Trinity County with powerplant values to be added to its local tax base as an offset to its first preference position under all-Federal construction.

The 1955 report of the Senate Interior Committee on the Secretary's study accompanying the Trinity authorization bill, said on the question of the preferences law:

> The proviso is in no sense to be understood as an authorization to waive, in any negotiation for the sale of falling water, any preference in the sale or transmission of power as expressed in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, in the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, or in any other law.

In reporting the Trinity bill, it was the intention of the Senate committee to preserve inviolate the preference clause sections of the reclamation laws, and to indicate that the study by the Secretary was not to be interpreted as approving any departure from the traditional policy which, as I have said, Theodore Roosevelt's administration laid down. That was precisely my intention in handling the bill in the Senate, and was, I believe, the intention of the Senate in passing it.

In my judgment, the Congress will not consider repealing the preference clause. At any rate, that clause will not be repealed with my vote. One does not need to be doctrinaire on power policies in order to recognize the right of people to determine the kind of electric service they desire for their community or their district, under preferences given to them by Federal law on Federal reclamation projects. With respect to Federal installations, long served by Central Valley project power, such as a Navy shipyard, an Atomic Energy Commission development, or Army or Air Force bases, it is illogical to urge that the Federal Government build a $225 million project only to compel its own governmental agencies to pay private-power rates for the electric energy produced by the waters stored therein. Indeed, it would be illegal under the Trinity authorizing law.

There is another fundamental consideration to which I wish to allude. The

Secretary recommends that one segment, Trinity, of a vast, integrated reclamation project, be operated, so far as power production is concerned, entirely differently from the rest of the project. Here, in being, in the Central Valley project, is a whole integrated system of dams, powerplants, reservoirs, and canals, constructed by the United States, all designed to protect people and land from floods, and to benefit both through a dependable water supply for agricultural and domestic purposes. In paying for the cost of this immense undertaking, the people of the area benefit by the sales of electric energy which the system incidentally produces.

To expand its benefits, so as to meet the growing needs of our State for the right amount of water at the right time, the Trinity project was first a dream, and then a reality. From the very beginning, the California State government has urged the Federal Government to undertake its construction and to integrate it with the Central Valley project, with a specific recommendation for Federal generation of power attendant upon the release of waters from the new dam.

The Secretary's recommendation for private power development at Trinity is fraught with many perils.

The theory of California water law is one of beneficial consumptive use. Our semi-arid State cannot afford to waste water. In a Federal reclamation project, the Bureau of Reclamation must determine what is the most efficient use of the water in the storage reservoir for both domestic and agricultural use. That is the basis on which it must discharge its responsibility of administering reclamation projects. Beneficial consumptive use of impounded waters must have complete priority over their use for the generation of electricity. Under the Secretary's proposed contract, the single responsibility of the company would be to produce hydroelectric power in a manner most efficiently to supply the needs of its own customers. In the proper functioning of the Central Valley project, I visualize a deadly serious problem if the needs of water by the Central Valley were to conflict with the needs of electricity by the customers of the company.

The basic concept of the Central Valley project would be drastically altered, if not, indeed, destroyed, by the proposed contract. Suppose, in a period of water shortage, agricultural needs compelled the project to draw off water from the reservoir at a faster rate than that required by the company for power production. Apparently to resolve the resulting problem, the contract proposal would require the United States to pay a penalty to the Company for doing the very thing which the project was designed to accomplish. The basic purpose of the Central Valley project is storing and releasing water in the interests of irrigation and reclamation. That purpose is in the public interest, and the public interest requires that that purpose be fulfilled without imposing penalties on the Government of the United States.

There is room in California for both public power and private power to meet the growing needs of our growing State. I seek to encourage both. Where, as in the Central Valley project and the Trinity River, facilities have been created through an investment of public moneys, I believe that the power produced by them should be distributed to public agencies, as has been so successfully done for many years. The Central Valley project was not constructed for profit. It was built to satisfy an urgent need among our people for reclamation assistance. Its benefits should be distributed on as wide a range as possible.

When the Trinity authorization bill was before the Senate, I had, as I have said, the responsibility of presenting it and of urging its passage. At that time, I repeated to the Senate what I earlier had said to the Senate committee:

> Personally I believe in this instance, since all other generating plants in the Central Valley project are federally operated, the Trinity plants should be also. But to permit careful study of the partnership possibility, the Engle bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to continue its studies and negotiations and report with recommendations to Congress in not less than 18 months. I approve of this provision, because it will give Congress a full opportunity to decide whether the Trinity powerplants should be federally or privately operated.

In the intervening months I have repeated that statement to the people of California many times. That is the position I have taken in the public interest. And I am supported in that belief by the similar position which two Governors of California and their administrations have taken on it.

I am supported, too, by the vote of the people themselves in approving the Central Valley project with their votes in the 1930's. I have studied the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior. I realize that each Member of Congress must make his decision as he sees the light. I have made mine. I disagree with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior. They do not serve the interests of the people of California. I cannot and will not support them.

---

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have listened to the debate in the Senate with respect to the President's proposals on the Middle East. The President of the United States desires peace. So do the people of the United States. And it is in the interest of peace that Dwight Eisenhower is making his recommendations to the Congress.

I recall sitting in the Senate a little over 2 years ago when the President made his recommendations with respect to Formosa. At that time he asked the Congress to confirm in him the authority to commit the armed might of the people and the Government of the United States to prevent Communist aggression in the Far East. A direct hazard to the security of the American people was involved. The Congress responded, and it responded overwhelmingly. Senators on the other side of the aisle, as well as those on this side, took the lead in urging approval by the Senate of the recommendations the President had made as contained in the so-called Formosa Resolution. After the adoption of that resolution, the Government of the United States stood united before all the world. I wish to submit, as my sincere and well-considered opinion, that the action of the Congress in adopting the Formosa Resolution went a long way toward deterring Communist aggression in the Far East and toward preventing war in that area.

I see the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has returned to the Chamber. In his comments earlier today he suggested that he had made a speech in California a few days ago in the presence of a number of Californians, and he used that as an instance as the basis for his asseveration that there was a grass-roots movement across the country in opposition to the President of the United States and his recommendations with regard to the Middle East. I deny that. In denying it, I desire to say that, in my judgment, the overwhelming majority of the people of California know that the President of the United States earnestly and prayerfully works for peace. In the interest of the security of the people of the United States and of a just and enduring peace in the world, he has made recommendations to the Congress which I propose to follow.

I recognize full well that Congress, as has been stated on the floor many times, is a coequal branch of the American Government. I recognize full well the responsibility of the Congress to discharge its coequal responsibility, as it is indeed doing today, as it did yesterday, and as it will continue to do until finally the great majority in the Senate will follow the great majority in the House of Representatives in taking a stand before the world to demonstrate what we believe is in the interest of American security, and in advance indicating what we intend to do. Amendments to the original text may well be adopted by the Senate. I completely approve of some. But, basically, we will approve what an American President has proposed.

To his credit, the candidate of the Democratic Party for President in the last election stood in Los Angeles yesterday and said he would support the President if he were a Member of the Senate. Earlier, the distinguished former President of the United States, Mr. Harry Truman, did likewise.

I am not a member of the Senate committees concerned with the pending legislation but I have read the earnest, forthright recommendations of many great Americans, like Gen. Alfred Gruenther, urging that this country demonstrate its unity by congressional approval of the Presidential recommendations, and it has seemed to me that it requires very little prescience to

prophesy that in the case of the pending resolution, when it comes to a vote, there will be the same bipartisan acceptance of it as took place on the floor of the Senate in my earlier days here, when the Formosa Resolution was adopted, and as a result I believe we shall advance the cause of peace, not the cause of war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate at this time very long, but I should like to make a few further remarks about the pending resolution. First, I should like to compliment the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], who spoke on the resolution just a few moments ago. The Senator from North Carolina made a fine contribution to the deliberations of the two committees sitting jointly on the resolution. I intended to ask the Senator some questions about his remarks a moment ago, but unfortunately, I was called from the floor, and the Senator from North Carolina completed his remarks before I returned.

I want the RECORD to show that in our committee deliberations, the Senator from North Carolina played a very prominent and constructive role, especially in regard to the constitutional aspects of the resolution. I think he clarified those aspects for the committee, and he deserves much of the credit for the improvement in the text of the resolution which was adopted by the committee.

There are one or two aspects of the matter on which I wish to comment at this time. First, I should like to make it clear that the overall objective of the resolution is perfectly acceptable to me. I had no objection to the objective of the President's policy as he stated it to the joint session of the Congress—that is, the policy of this country to resist expansion of communism in the Middle East by overt armed aggression. I would go further and say aggression by any other means should be resisted by this country. I objected to the form in which the proposal was submitted to the Congress. I have noticed that some newspapers and commentators ignore the questions of the form of the proposals. They pass over my objections and those of others who object to the constitutionality of this particular procedure.

I wish only to point out, as strongly as I can, that after all Government is largely a collection of procedures. The difference between the Government under which we operate, under the Constitution, and no government at all, is a group of rules which we agree to abide by. The Senate could not function at all without rules which we accept and abide by. Year after year the Senate spends a great deal of time on the interpretation and application of its rules. When responsible citizens, and especially newspapers, which are supposed to help the citizens of this country to understand great issues like this one, ignore the significance of the arguments relating to the constitutionality of this resolution, I think they are failing in one of their chief responsibilities to the people of the country.

Whether or not they agree that those of us who have criticized the procedure followed are right, is one matter; but to ignore it and to say that this is nothing but partisan wrangling, as some leading newspapers have said, is in my opinion a disservice to the people, and I think it will cause trouble in the future.

My principal objection, as I stated at great length—and I shall not repeat the arguments—is to the constitutionality of the procedure, that is, undertaking to delegate by joint resolution an authority which I think inheres in this body and should not be delegated. Also, such an attempt to delegate authority would cause confusion with regard to the emergency powers of the President as I explained on February 11 on the floor of the Senate.

The other aspect of it which I think is a bad precedent for the future of this body and of our legislative process is the authorization of large sums of money without any restrictions or regulations whatever. I agree that we have done that on a minor scale in some instances in the past, but I think the degree in which it is proposed in this instance, and the manner in which the proposal is brought in, coupled with this other provision which is questionable on constitutional grounds, would create a precedent which would be very embarrassing to us in the future. I also think it is quite unnecessary to do this, in view of the existence of large sums of money now available in this area.

I wished to say a few words to clarify my position, and I think some of the other Members who have voted against the resolution or criticized it. We have all been motivated by the same considerations. That is to say, we are not trying to weaken the President, and we are not failing to support the overall objective of the President, but we insist that this kind of policy should follow a procedure which is well established, and about which there is no question.

I, myself, moved in the committee to change this resolution from a joint resolution to a concurrent resolution, which would cure the principal constitutional objection. That motion was voted down, much to my regret.

Now we are confronted with a resolution which, while still in the form of a joint resolution, embodies a change in the language delegating specific powers in the field of the warmaking power, so that it merely expresses a policy. That policy is much more appropriate to a Senate resolution expressing our advice and consent under the Constitution, than it is to a joint resolution undertaking to legislate.

So we have a strange combination. However, I must say that certainly on constitutional grounds the joint resolution is better than it was. I regret that this kind of confusion and difficulty has arisen in connection with such an important matter.

I can only say that we have the precedent of the Vandenberg resolution on the one hand, and on the other, the precedent of the Truman doctrine. President Truman was content to rely upon his statement to the joint session for the enunciation of the policy; and at a proper time later he brought in a full-fledged authorization bill, which was comparable to our ordinary foreign aid bill, which will be before us, probably, in a few weeks.

I wished to say these few words to try to place in a little better perspective the reason why some of us have objected to this joint resolution, and still question the procedure which is being followed, because it tends to confuse the procedure which should be used in the future.

## A PROGRAM FOR HEALTH

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to an exceedingly interesting and fine article which my able colleague from Oregon wrote and which was published in the February issue of Eagle. The article is entitled "'Crash Program' for Health." The article carries the subhead: "We Spend Billions on Weapons. Why Not Finance a Full-Scale War on Cancer and Other Killing Diseases? Success Could Open Vast New Horizons for Man."

I should like to use the article written by Senator NEUBERGER as the springboard—shall I say—for calling attention to what I think is a great moral obligation of this session of Congress. I know there are those who think, when we start talking about moral obligations in connection with the responsibilities of a free government to a free people, that one somehow becomes abstract and highly theoretical and impractical.

To the contrary, when we talk about living up to our moral obligations in carrying out the responsibilities of government, we are talking, in my judgment, about the primary purpose of government. So many times I have said—and it cannot be said often enough—that the primary purpose of this Government of ours is to protect and promote the interests of our people, who make up the Government.

The people who make up our Government are not the officials of the Government. The people who make up our Government happen to be our entire citizenry.

When one talks about our moral obligations as a Government in respect to the health of the people of our country one is treading on very thin ice in some quarters. I am shocked by the extent to which powerful lobby forces have succeeded in convincing many people that the Government should follow a complete hands-off policy when it comes to the matter of the health of the American people.

There is a great job of educating to do on this subject. I hold to the premise that the American people are entitled to receive from their Government much greater protection and much greater assistance in the realm of public health than they are now receiving. I cannot remain silent in the Senate, and shall not, on this issue of the exercise of greater responsibility on the part of Government in doing what a Government should legitimately do in giving greater protection to the American people in the field of health.

It is Christian. It is moral. It clearly falls within the keystone clause of the

Constitution, to promote the general welfare of our people.

I have no intention now, any more than I had during the past 12 years, of worrying myself about political lobby forces which hold that it is to take the American people down the road to socialism to advocate legislation aimed at better protection of the health of our people.

This Congress, this year, in my judgment, should appropriate substantial increases in funds for greater research, for example, in the fields of cancer and heart disease, and all the other great diseases which plague the health of our people, and about which the medical profession knows so much, and yet, when all is said and done, so little, or perhaps too little.

I feel that there ought to be a cooperative arrangement between Government and those great men and women who work within the medical profession and allied professions, motivated as they are by great humanitarian impulses to help give greater service to the people of our country in the field of health.

Government has a role to play. I think that my colleague, in this very fine article, published in the Eagle magazine, entitled "'Crash Program' for Health," has outlined at least a segment of this problem with great clarity, and I now ask that it be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"CRASH PROGRAM" FOR HEALTH—WE SPEND BILLIONS ON WEAPONS; WHY NOT FINANCE A FULL-SCALE WAR ON CANCER AND OTHER KILLING DISEASES?—SUCCESS COULD OPEN VAST NEW HORIZONS FOR MAN

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, United States Senator from Oregon)

With one of America's most famous female radiologists at my side, I looked through the slit-like glass window which had been niched in concrete walls 30 inches thick. Beneath a great cone-shaped apparatus, a woman lay on a table. A bathrobe covered her body. The room was darkened. The tiny point of the equipment seemed to pick out her chest and throat. She was receiving radiation treatment from a "cobalt bomb" for deep-seated cancer. The mysterious roentgen rays made no sound.

Would the treatment be successful? Would it arrest the deadly march through her system of malignant cells? Would she survive?

These questions flashed across the innermost frontier of my mind. Another question lurked there, too. Would the woman on the table ever know a moment's peace or contentment again? During her entire life, be it long or short, could she ever spend a fleeting hour free of anxiety and terror? Would each twinge of pain mean that the fatal killer had returned?

The woman on the table was obviously younger than my wife or I. What if it had been one of us on that table beneath the cone—the cone from which came the unseen rays that might mean a reprieve, if only the malignancy had been detected in time? Cold drops of perspiration dotted my forehead as I harbored these thoughts.

And yet, I mused how little we actually know about the rampant behavior of cells and tissue which men call cancer. The "cobalt bomb" was not a certain cure, even though nuclear fission had made it possible. It was a hope—a faint hope, though nonetheless genuine. And as I stood outside the vault of concrete and lead where the rays from a tiny inner cylinder of plutonium were working their mission which might mean life or death, I wondered why the richest Nation on earth was not investing more of its effort, resources, and wealth toward the possible liberation of mankind from cancer. Surely few battlefronts could be more crucial.

Cancer is a threat which hangs over us all from the bassinet to the tomb; yet we spend far less attempting to solve it than we do, for example, on the fittings for one aircraft carrier of the *Forrestal* class.

As the radiologist and I peered through the narrow window at the young woman on the table, few things loomed as important as cracking the terrible riddle of cancer. All else—politics, money, personal ambition—faded into comparative insignificance.

What America needs today is a crash program of medical research. It should be a program proportionate to the $40 billion which we seem able to spend annually on weapons of war. What war, after all, can compare with that against cancer, heart disease, mental disturbances and other sinister maladies wracking mankind?

Mike Gorman, 43-year-old executive director of the National Mental Health Committee, points out that, despite its inadequate support from governmental appropriations, medical research during the past decade has added five years to the life expectancy of the average American. Translated into earning capacity alone, the people whose existence has thus been prolonged have paid seven times as much into the Treasury in personal income taxes as has been invested in the United States Public Health Service. And Gorman adds this further heartening note:

"In an age when the Communists and their satellites outnumber the forces of the free world by better than 2 to 1, medical research has bolstered our manpower resources and increased our productive strength. It has reduced immeasurably the tragic toll of human suffering."

Yet we in the Congress, as well as the public at large, still think in pygmy terms with respect to combat against disease. Unhesitatingly, we will spend billions for tanks or battleships or bombing planes. By contrast, we are stingy with mere millions when sickness is the enemy, rather than a foreign foe. And when we contemplate that the United States Government is spending $48 million on the National Cancer Institute as contrasted with $10 billion on naval vessels, we must keep in mind that it takes $1 million multiplied 1,000 separate times to mount up to just $1 billion.

Nor was even the $48 million investment achieved for the onslaught against cancer without persistent and tireless effort on the part of certain Members of Congress.

When I was a candidate for the Senate in 1954, few topics held audiences more attentive than my insistence that Federal expenditures for medical research generally—and in the field of cancer in particular—should be increased many times. I even proposed an ultimate outlay of $1 billion for cancer research alone, if necessary. This statement was repeated by me at trade unions, civic clubs, Eagle Aeries, Grange halls, before veterans' groups, and women's organizations. It drew almost universal support and interest, especially when people learned that we were then spending $63,980,000 on the Inter-American Highway and only $24,978,000 on cancer research. Was greater knowledge of mankind's grimmest killer a mere 38 percent as urgent as the Inter-American Highway through distant jungles?

As a newcomer to the Senate, I have served as a private in the ranks of an all-out attempt to bolster our attack against the disease which is nearly the equivalent of a death sentence to all afflicted by it. Leaders in this effort were members of both major political parties—LISTER HILL of Alabama, WARREN G. MAGNUSON of Washington, and WAYNE MORSE of Oregon, Democrats; and MARGARET CHASE SMITH of Maine and EDWARD J. THYE of Minnesota, Republicans. Encouragement was received from CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, a Democrat, who is chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and has served in Congress ever since his State was admitted to the Union in 1912.

This bipartisan undertaking brought about the doubling of Federal funds available for cancer research at the National Cancer Institute, from $24,978,000 to $48,432,000.

As we worked to achieve this goal, I thought of the fact that man has learned to conquer the air, the waters under the sea, to ascend Mount Everest, and even to influence the weather under certain circumstances. But cancer remains the inexorable assassin. Neither wealth nor fame nor power can stay its ravages. It killed valiant Babe Didriksen Zaharias, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, Senator Robert A. Taft, John P. Weyerhaeuser, Jr., of the vast timber corporation, and many others who still had much to contribute to American progress.

Although a crash program of medical research into the ominous roots of cancer would come too late to prolong their lives, perhaps it might help to spare the cancer victims of a later generation—in our own country and elsewhere in the world. Mercy knows no national boundaries.

MARGARET CHASE SMITH, only woman Member of the Senate, effectively emphasized the disproportionate sums which we spend on frivolities and on grappling with the most dreadful diseases plaguing the human race. Senator LISTER HILL, chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee handling health funds, insisted that top salaries in Public Health Service laboratories be increased from $15,000 to $20,000 annually. "The productivity of any research organization depends upon the quality of the staff," said Senator HILL.

Furthermore during our discussion of health appropriations on the Senate floor, Senator HILL assured me that the increased funds for cancer research were not a goal in and of themselves but simply part of an onward march which must continue.

Partly because of the great impetus for an all-out program in the realm of malignant diseases like cancer, research expenditures by the Government for the fiscal year of 1957 also have been vastly expanded in other fields. The National Institutes of Health, located in Bethesda, Md., are now in the midst of their most active 12-month period. Note this contrast in all major classes of appropriations:

| | 1956 | 1957 |
|---|---|---|
| General operating expenses | $5,929,000 | $11,922,000 |
| National Cancer Institute | 24,978,000 | 48,432,000 |
| Mental Health Institute | 18,001,000 | 35,197,000 |
| National Heart Institute | 18,898,000 | 33,396,000 |
| Dental Health Institute | 2,176,000 | 6,026,000 |
| Arthritic disease activities | 10,840,000 | 15,885,000 |
| Microbiology activities | 7,775,000 | 13,299,000 |
| Neurology and blindness disease activities | 9,861,000 | 18,650,000 |
| Total | 98,458,000 | 182,807,000 |

Thus, United States Government expenditures for medical research have been increased 85 percent in 1 year. Even teeth and gums had participated in the advance. Yet is this disbursement enough?

In Washington, D. C., our residence has been next door to that of Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, a tall 49-year-old man, who recently retired as Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. One sultry evening, seated in our patio over coffee and cake, I asked my neighbor: "Leonard, what is probably the maximum amount of money which the National Cancer Institute could spend in 1 year for research and study, if given reasonable notice in advance?"

The Surgeon General pondered for a moment. "Half a billion dollars," he answered.

"What would be the usefulness of that quantity of money?" I asked.

"You would be certain that you could carry on your program from year to year without delay or interruption," Dr. Scheele replied. "Your top doctors and scientists would know their continued employment, at fair and adequate pay, was assured. They would not be tempted to break off their work to enter lucrative private practice. In addition, you could follow every possible lead or hope, no matter how remote or elusive it might seem. You would not have to budget so carefully and pursue only the most promising discoveries. In a war, the military often overspends because it might be fatal to the country to underspend. We could do that in the area of cancer research if we had a billion dollars or even half a billion dollars at our disposal.

The sums which Dr. Scheele and I discussed may loom as fantastic. But are they? Americans spend over $15 billion a year on liquor and tobacco. They even spend $280 million for chewing gum and $116 million for shampoos. Why not twice as much for cancer research as for gum?

Whenever I urge a vast increase in Federal funds for medical research, people invariably inquire about the sums raised for this purpose by voluntary agencies. "Don't they do the job?" is the perennial question.

The voluntary agencies do a magnificent job. In 1954, for example, the American Cancer Society collected $21,670,000 in private contributions and the Damon Runyon Cancer Fund an additional $1,751,000. Organizations such as the Eagles, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AFL–CIO, and others have helped generously toward this private total of over $23 million. Yet only $7,189,000 of the private donations were allocated for research. The rest had to go—and properly so—for the treatment of pitiful and agonizing cancer cases in families lacking sufficient financial resources for their care. It is obvious, therefore, that the Government must carry on the major responsibility in cancer research, or it will not be carried on at all.

Research into all potentially fatal diseases, and particularly cancer, is one avenue for liberating mankind from a grim fear and a painful reality. Should not our Government share in such a responsibility? We would scoff if some official in our town proposed that the fire department be entirely reliant on voluntary contributions. Yet which is the most imminent menace to the average person, fire or cancer? Ask a cancer sufferer.

Although I have been a legislator at both the State and national level, I still am unable to fathom the legislative mind when it comes to this vital human problem. Such famous Senators as Taft, Vandenberg, and Wherry have been fatally stricken by cancer. Yet the Senate will move with alacrity to vote $4 billion for B–52 bombing planes, but it can cavil over barely more than 1 percent of this for cancer research. We will appropriate limitlessly to combat the foe we can visualize, whether it be the Soviets, Nazis, or imperial Japanese. But stinginess and hesitancy cloud the picture when the enemy is an insidious disease which strikes silently and invisibly, but nonetheless murderously.

As a member of Oregon's House of Representatives, my wife had to struggle for almost 4 months to persuade her colleagues to vote a trifling $80,000 for pilot courses aimed at rehabilitating retarded children. The lack of trained teachers and classes for these unfortunate youngsters brings heartache to thousands of families. It also dooms the children to lives of public dependency and helplessness. Skilled teaching can enable them to read, to play happily, to feed themselves, maybe even to work at a trade. Yet Mrs. Neuberger, herself a former teacher of physical education, found the legislature quicker to appropriate $150 million for roads and highways than a tiny fraction of this for retarded children.

One night during the 1953 legislative session, when her retarded-children bill languished in committee, she said to me desperately, "It's easier to get funds for inanimate objects than for human beings. It hardly seems possible that human beings do the voting on these appropriations."

Yet this mental block on the part of legislators may be waning. Under the leadership of an Eagle Congressman from Rhode Island, JOHN E. FOGARTY, Congress has just allocated over $2 million for programs aimed at rehabilitating retarded children. Another goal of the program is to try to discover why some children have congenital defects which render it difficult for them to lead normal lives. This sum is by far the most generous benefaction ever set aside for such a purpose. In his campaign for the children's funds, Representative FOGARTY had the active and fervent support of a fellow Rhode Island colleague, Congressman AIME J. FORAND. Mr. FORAND is likewise a faithful member of the Eagles.

Slowly but inevitably, Americans are coming to realize that every dollar invested in medical research can be amortized in longer, happier, and healthier lives.

Some of this understanding is due to the leadership of a remarkable and attractive woman named Mary Lasker. She has used the fortune inherited from her late husband to encourage study of the ailments which cripple and kill people. The Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation gives substantial awards each year for achievements in the area of psychiatric and medical research. Writers and journalists, for example, are rewarded for outstanding contributions on these topics. Mrs. Lasker also helps to support such projects as the National Mental Health Committee and the New York Memorial Hospital for Cancer and Allied Diseases.

Each of us sees illness only as an isolated occurrence. It may happen to us or to a loved one. This is tragic, but we still do not see how it affects America as a whole. How many realize that mental sickness deprived our Armed Forces of over 2,500,000 young men in the prime of life during World War II? Are we aware that more than half the hospital beds in the United States are required for mentally disturbed men and women, and that even these are not enough? On the Senate floor I pointed out that "almost 2½ times as many people died of cancer during World War II as were killed in action in all our farflung battles over the face of the world. Furthermore, in 1 year cancer killed nearly 10 times the number of Americans who were killed in action throughout 3 years of the war in Korea."

Medical research has begun to unlock some strategic doors. The Salk antipolio vaccine is a sample of what prolonged and well financed medical research can accomplish. The vaccine is not perfect, but it provides children with 70 to 90 percent protection against the crippling havoc of infantile paralysis. We take for granted today such antibiotics as penicillin, streptomycin, terramycin, and aureomycin. All are the products of medical research. They have helped to reduce the death rate from tuberculosis 73 percent, from kidney diseases 60 percent, from pneumonia 43 percent. As a result, the life expectancy of the average American increased from an age of 60 in the year 1937 to 68.8 by 1953. Phenomenal new discoveries with respect to the fat content of diets may contribute toward cutting down fatal heart disease in the decade ahead.

These developments, it seems to me, are overwhelming arguments for vast expenditures in medical research. What can be more important than human happiness and human life? These are geared directly to good health. For a country spending $40 billion a year for armaments, there is no sum too high to invest in the well-being of its citizens. I still recall what my wife Maurine said to me when she was fighting for a paltry $80,000 in the Oregon Legislature, to spend in behalf of retarded little children.

"The beasts of the field on my mother's farm will do anything for their young," she said. "Can we look the next generation of human beings in the face if we have not done everything possible for them in the vital area of sound bodies and medical care?"

---

## SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF COVENANT CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH, PROVIDENCE, R. I.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in the State of Rhode Island we are intensely proud of our religious institutions and our religious freedom. Ours is a State of historic tolerance, a sanctuary for all religions, made so by the settlers, who from the very first, agreed to be bound by their Government only in civil things.

Our charter of 1663 declares that "we hold forth a lively experiment that a most flourishing civil state may stand and be best maintained with full liberty in religious concernments."

In those early days, Cotton Mather, looking through Congregationalist eyes, remarked that Rhode Island colonists "gave one another no disturbance in the exercise of religion. Never was held such a variety of religions," he said, "on so small a spot of ground as have been in that colony."

Almost two and a half centuries after the founding of our colony there came into being the Covenant Congregational Church of Providence. This very week—on Saturday, February 23—that church will celebrate 75 years of distinguished service to its members, to their city, and to their State.

It has always been a church in the heart of Providence—in the heart of the city materially and spiritually. It grew from modest rented quarters at 70 Weybosset Street—a most busy thoroughfare—to its present attractive edifice at Franklin and Hoyle Streets, which is still close to the heartthrob of our bustling city of Providence.

As Rhode Island always had a welcome to the stranger—this church had a special welcome to the newcomer—to the immigrant from Sweden who came to strengthen our land with his skills and to maintain our land through his loyalty which is the proud record of his citizenship.

This early chapter is one of the heartwarming memories as both church and community can look back to the distinctive contributions made to the better being of our city and State by these high-minded and stouthearted additions to the American scene. This is the story of all the membership of Covenant Congregational Church, whether they came from near or afar.

But I am happy to note that singled out for special recognition are those members with 50 or more years of golden service. The program assures us that the pastors of old will be recalled—and their sacrificing wives will be remembered—while the documented past is

only a promise of their dedication to the future, toward the common well-being of our community.

No wonder, then, that all Rhode Island, without distinction of creed, rejoices at the record and extends to Pastor Paul B. Fryhling and through him to every member of the congregation, the felicitations and good wishes of all in the light of their contributions to the greater good of the thriving city of Providence in the tolerant State of Rhode Island.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to rise and say that as a Congregationalist I appreciate the tribute which the Senator from Rhode Island has just paid to the historic church which he has mentioned. I think it is characteristic of the Senator's dedicated State that in this country we are free of religious intolerance. I wish the Senator to know that I am sure Congregationalists generally will be honored by the fact that it was the Senator from Rhode Island who paid this tribute today.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from Oregon, and I wish to say that I rejoice in the sentiment he has expressed.

## WELCOME EXTENDED TO MONTANA FARMERS' UNION CARAVAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, once again Montana has sent caravans to Washington to find out how Congress works and, in general, to become more familiar with and better informed about matters affecting their interests and welfare in the Nation's Capital. This year Montana has had 3 caravans comprising approximately 75 persons in each one. These are members of the Farmers' Union, many of whom I have known for years and for whom I have great respect. They have made great contributions to the building up of our State and Nation. I think they are typical of the family-size type farmers and ranchers and I know of their great interest in farm legislation and matters affecting their economy.

It has been both pleasant and worth while for the Montana delegation, headed by our distinguished senior Senator [Mr. MURRAY], Congressmen METCALF, ANDERSON and me, to meet with this and the preceding groups. We have learned much and we are sure that the folks from Montana have benefited as well.

I should like at this time to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the third of this year's Montana caravan delegations representing the Farmers' Union is in the Chamber, and I would ask this group to stand at this time so that they may be recognized.

(The members of the caravan delegation rose, and were greeted with applause.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## THIRTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, 39 years ago, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania proclaimed her independence, an independence that was won after more than 100 years of subjugation by the Russian empire. During her brief span of independence, Lithuania's progress in all fields of endeavor—social, cultural, economic, and political—was exemplary, and she took her place among the democratic nations of the world. Unfortunately, after a brief 22 years of independence, from 1918 to 1940, Lithuania was again seized by Soviet Russia. Today there is no independence in Lithuania, no flags are displayed, no anthems are sung. Since 1940 the Lithuanian people have lived a life of uninterrupted horror. No visitors are permitted to enter the country, and no one is permitted to leave. Lithuania itself has become a Soviet concentration camp, its inhabitants the victims of a persecution devoted to the extermination of the last vestiges of Lithuanian national life.

I think it is fitting, on the anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence, that we in America once again declare our full support of the Lithuanian people in their fight for freedom.

We are confident that these determined and courageous people, having once known the overwhelming satisfaction of living under a democratically constituted government, and having once known the gratification of freedom of worship, will never give up until their country is delivered from its captivity and can once again take its rightful position among the free nations of the world. The Lithuanian people, through their determination and courage, have set a magnificent example for the Free World. They remind us that we can never rest until freedom is restored to all people now living in Communist captivity.

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to address myself briefly to Senate Joint Resolution 19, in order to state for the RECORD the reasons why, when it comes to a vote. I shall support the resolution. I do so, Mr. President, at this time because it seems fitting that other and more senior Members of the Senate should have the opportunity to hold the floor as the debate reaches its climax in the days ahead.

Mr. President, I listened with great interest when the President of the United States delivered his special and emergency message on the Middle East to the joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives. In common, I am sure, with the overwhelming majority of my colleagues in both Houses of Congress, I find myself in substantial agreement with the principle which he enunciated, to the effect that conditions in the Middle East had deteriorated drastically during the past few months and that, despite the rosy picture of conditions in that area which had been painted for the American people during the fall election campaign, the real conditions were, during the past fall, and are today, critical in nature. They are critical particularly because, to my way of thinking, Mr. President, of the ill-advised efforts of our allies, Britain, France, and Israel, to remedy conditions which to them, I am sure, seemed intolerable, by the use of force—force in violation of their obligations to the United Nations.

Mr. President, I was in accord with the action which our country took, through the President, in using the full authority of his office, within the framework of the United Nations, to obtain a withdrawal of the French and British forces, a reopening of the Suez Canal, a withdrawal of the Israeli forces from the Sinai Peninsula and, if she will respect the resolutions of the United Nations, an even further withdrawal.

It semed to me it was eminently appropriate that, as the President of the United States requested, we should make it clear in no uncertain terms that this country would not permit international communism to move into the Middle East. And so I was predisposed to favor the general policy outlined by the President.

It was therefore with some amazement that I read the original resolution—a joint resolution that would have the force of law—presented by the Secretary of State in alleged compliance with the policy laid down by the President of the United States. Mr. President, with some slight experience as an executive at a very low level in our governmental hierarchy, as mayor of one of our great cities, it has been my observation that when an executive goes to the legislature with a recommended action having such grave consequences as that implicit in the position advanced by the President of the United States in his special message, he has an obligation to the legislative body, through his duly constituted agents—of whom, of course, the principal one in this instance is the Secretary of State—to present to that legislative body not only an overall general policy, but a plan

for implementing it, and a program to carry it out, as well as at least the bare outline of the procedures which will render the policy, plan, and program effective.

Mr. President, the joint resolution submitted to this body and to the House of Representatives by the Secretary of State was none of those things. It was neither policy nor plan nor program nor procedure. The joint resolution is appropriately described in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relatons and the Committee on Armed Services as an emergency stopgap. I quote from the report:

> The resolution is an emergency stopgap. It is idle to suppose that the actions taken under the authority of this resolution will in themselves bring about peace, security, and stability in the Middle East, and the President recognized this fact in his message to Congress of January 5. But the authority granted by this resolution is essential to provide an atmosphere in which other measures can be brought to bear and to provide time for those other measures to be effective.
>
> The joint committee is concerned that other measures be taken, that they be taken promptly, and that they be adequate to the task. The joint committee expects to be consulted as these measures are developed and applied. But it is not necessary to debate and determine all of these measures in connection with the pending resolution. To do so, indeed, would involve a quite unacceptable degree of delay.

I made it my business to attend as many of the open sessions at which the Secretary of State testified as the pressure of other official business would permit. With the kind permission of the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who is now occupying the chair, I was permitted to attend one or two of the executive sessions of the joint hearings of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services.

I was distressed to observe during those hearings what seemed to me to be a lack of candor as to the purposes of the resolution on the part of the Secretary of State in testifying before those duly constituted committees, each of which has important constitutional obligations to perform in connection with the foreign relations of our country and the state of its Armed Forces. There was a lack of candor in informing those committees as to just what was behind this stopgap resolution.

There was an effort to persuade those committees—and, indeed, the press and the public at large—that this was more than a mere stopgap resolution to discourage the forces of international communism from moving into the Middle East, while a policy, a plan, and a program—which apparently are not yet in existence—could be worked out.

I congratulate the members of the two committees of the Senate which sat long and patiently hearing not only the Secretary of State, but many other witnesses, for the effective job which has been done in rewriting the joint resolution so that it can be presented to the world, not as a great doctrine, not as something of cosmic importance, but for what it is, as described in the report which the present occupant of the chair, on behalf of the two committees, submitted to this body, namely, an emergency stopgap.

Because it is an emergency stopgap, and because I believe that each of us, regardless of party, without concern for partisanship, should rally behind the President of the United States in giving unequivocal notice to the forces of international communism that we do not propose to permit them to overrun the Middle East, and that we will give military and economic assistance to the countries of the Middle East which request such assistance and which are prepared to resist the forces of international communism, I shall vote for the joint resolution.

I hope that this debate will stress to the executive department the vital importance of moving ahead to prepare and present to the Congress of the United States, to the people of the United States, to the United Nations, and to the entire free world, a carefully thought out and elaborated plan, policy, program, and procedure for giving effect to the responsibilities of our country in that area of great world crisis.

To digress for only a moment, let me say that it was with pride that I noted the announcement, made on the floor of the Senate by the majority leader, of the position of the policy committee of the party of which I have the honor to belong, in opposition to the imposition of sanctions against Israel.

So long as Russia stands before the world unchastised, and with no sanctions imposed, or even proposed or threatened, for the rape of Hungary; so long as the friendly nation of India—with whom I hope our relationship can grow closer—is permitted to defy the resolutions of the United Nations with respect to Kashmir; and so long as Egypt is permitted to ignore the international obligations with respect to the free passage of the ships of all nations through the Suez Canal, to which free passage Egypt gave her consent in 1950, I hope we shall not take the step, on behalf of the United Nations, of punishing Israel for failing promptly to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations, while other countries are permitted to go their way without the slightest attempt to call a halt by the imposition of sanctions for their defiance of that world body.

I hope the joint resolution will pass by a very large majority. It is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] will propose certain amendments to the joint resolution in the course of the next few days. I know that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has already filed an amendment to the joint resolution which he proposes to present in due course.

In stating my approval of Senate Joint Resolution 19, as amended, I would not want it to be thought that I shall not give careful consideration to supporting the amendments to which I have referred, because in my judgment they might well strengthen the joint resolution as it is presently drafted.

I am particularly disappointed that we were unable to persuade the President and the Secretary of State to be satisfied with a simple resolution expressing the sense of the Senate, as opposed to a joint resolution said to have the force of law. But I reiterate that I hope the joint resolution, when it comes to a final vote, will receive overwhelming endorsement from Members of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to compliment and commend the Senator from Pensylvania on the speech he has just made. He has enunciated a sound aspect in his understanding of our foreign policy. I know that the Eisenhower joint resolution, as originally introduced, disturbed the Senator a great deal. I am happy to note that in the resolution as reported by the present distinguished occupant of the chair, the senior Senator from Rhode Island, and chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. GREEN], one of the main worries of the Senator from Pennsylvania, namely, the question of constitutional authority, has been relieved by amending the resolution to such an extent that there is now a clear delineation between the constitutional power of the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and the power of Congress, constitutionally speaking, to declare war. Again I congratulate and commend the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

## EXTENSION OF DATE FOR FILING COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Can the Chair inform me if Senate Resolution 99, to extend the date for the filing of a report on the investigation of matters pertaining to technical assistance and related matters, was acted on by the Senate today?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution was agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS AGAINST ISRAEL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this morning, at the White House, a conference was held by the President of the United States with the bipartisan leadership. At that time I made a proposal of a possible alternative to the application of sanctions against Israel. I had not intended to make the proposed alternative public at this time. However, as sometimes happens at a meeting so large as that one, the wire services received information that such a proposal had been made; and they had some accurate information and some information which was slightly garbled, to say the least.

In view of that circumstance, Mr. President, I determined that I would make available the text of the proposed alternative, which was submitted only as a basis for consideration. It is not claimed that it is the only alternative; neither is it claimed that it is necessarily the best alternative. However, when matters of such moment are being considered, I believe it is only fair that those who have objection to a particular course of action should present what they, at least, believe to be a constructive alternative. It is only on that basis that I present the following:

The proposal for consideration was that in the United Nations General Assembly, when it meets tomorrow, the United States Government sponsor a resolution which would:

First. State that all member states have an obligation to comply with their charter obligations, to refrain from aggression and to respect the resolutions of the General Assembly.

Second. Make clear that failure by an aggressor state to comply with the resolution of the United Nations would properly subject the offending state, large or small, to the condemnation of the law-abiding nations of the world; and if persisted in 30 days after the Secretary General has reported noncompliance, it is recommended that economic, diplomatic, and moral sanctions be applied against such offending state or states by the members of the United Nations.

Third. Provide that the General Assembly declare that all Israeli troops should be withdrawn from Aqaba and the Gaza Strip, and these areas to be occupied and administered by the United Nations until, (a) a majority of the members of the General Assembly determine that international peace and order would be served by their withdrawal, or, (b) a treaty of peace is entered into between Egypt and Israel, whichever is sooner.

Fourth. Recommend the establishment of a neutral belt between Israel and the neighboring states with whom an armistice is now in force, this neutral zone to be policed by the United Nations emergency force until the armistice has been supplanted by a treaty of peace between said nations.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM— ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no Senator desires to address the Senate at this time, I am prepared to move that the Senate take a recess or adjourn until tomorrow.

For the information of all Senators, I should like to point out that on Friday, no business will be transacted which will require the taking of votes. I am hopeful that any Senator who may desire to speak will avail himself of that opportunity on tomorrow; and that if at that time no Senator desires to speak, the Presiding Officer will have the joint resolution read the third time, and then will put the question on its passage. I am hopeful that it will not be necessary to have the Senate take a recess or adjourn in the middle of the day, when there are still dozens of Senators who desire to discuss the pending question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as I did earlier in the day, I wish to concur in the viewpoint expressed by the majority leader. As I pointed out earlier, I have asked the members of our staff to contact the Senators on this side of the aisle, to point out again to them that the joint resolution on the Middle East situation is before the Senate, and to inquire whether they contemplate making any speeches on it; and also to point out that today, tomorrow, and Friday will all be available to them, and that we hope they will make every effort to make their speeches this week, so that we can move into the voting stages of the joint resolution as early next week as the Senate determines and as is convenient to the Members.

I wish to concur in the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, and to join him in a bipartisan spirit in asking that all Members take advantage of the time which now is available, before we might enter a period in which the time would be limited, in the event the Senate determined to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to that effect.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the statement the distinguished minority leader has made.

Mr. President, I desire to repeat that I am prepared to vote on the joint resolution at any time. If, on tomorrow, no Senator wishes to speak on the joint resolution, we shall proceed to act upon it.

Many Senators have told me that they expect to address themselves to this subject, some of them at length. But for 2 days, now, there have been times when it has been necessary to have quorum calls in order to summon Senators to the Chamber. Although I do not wish to appear to be lecturing my colleagues, I do desire to place them on notice, and to be sure that they have the information. For that purpose, I have made twice before today the statement which I have just repeated.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 21, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 20 (legislative day, February 18), 1957:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Murray Snyder, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Dewey Short, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army, vice Chester R. Davis, resigned.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Coral Donzel Payne, Protestant chaplain, House of God, Mooseheart, Ill., offered the following prayer:

O God, with whom no one is great, no one is low, but all are equal and near, we thank Thee that Thou dost own us, and claim us as Thy children.

Day by day, life's duties place upon us their obligations.

The hours are filled with much serving, but at this moment we own one right.

We worship Thee. We bless Thee. We thank Thee for Thy goodness and Thy grace.

Thou findest us wherever we are. Thou knowest us whatever we do.

Thou art our comfort even when we feel lost and alone.

Thou readest our hearts correctly.

Let no sufferer believe that he suffers alone.

Let no sinner think that he bears the consequences of his deeds alone.

Let no neglected one decide that he is unwanted by Thee.

In this hostile world, we thank Thee for this body of men who have dedicated their talents to the building and maintaining a strong and free nation; but in doing so,

May we ever be mindful, that it is possible to build a nation of scientific giants and spiritual morons.

Give to us wisdom and endow us with patience, that we may train the youth of our country, so that they may become morally and spiritually capable of controlling the forces we discover.

This we ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Vice President had made the following appointments:

To the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy: Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. POTTER, and Mr. MORTON.

To the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy: Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. JAVITS.

To the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy: Mr. KUCHEL.

To the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy: Mr. PUBTELL.

To the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy: Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. ALLOTT.

To the National Monument Commission: Mr. COOPER vice Mr. BENDER.

To the Board of Directors of Gallaudet College: Mr. THYE.

## TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4897) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Rollcall No. 9]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Boggs | Hébert | Rains |
| Bolton | Kelley, Pa. | Reece, Tenn. |
| Bonner | Mason | Rhodes, Pa. |
| Bowler | Meader | Saund |
| Celler | Metcalf | Scudder |
| Dies | Morrison | Shelley |
| Durham | Moulder | Thompson, La. |
| Engle | Neal | |
| Harden | Powell | |

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 409 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

## TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4897) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read the first paragraph of the bill. If there are no amendments to this paragraph, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESERVE TRAINING

For all necessary expenses for the Coast Guard Reserve, as authorized by law (14 U. S. C. 751–762; 37 U. S. C. 231–319), including direct expenses and repayment to other Coast Guard appropriations for indirect expenses, for regular personnel, or Reserve personnel while on active duty, engaged primarily in administration and operation of the Reserve program; and the maintenance, operation, and repair of aircraft, $15 million: *Provided*, That amounts equal to the obligated balances against the appropriations for "Reserve training," for the 2 preceding years shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation, and such merged appropriation shall be available as one fund, except for accounting purposes of the Coast Guard, for the payment of obligations properly incurred against such prior year appropriations and against this appropriation.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to touch briefly on two items that we have now reached in the bill, incorporated in the Treasury budget. One is the Bureau of Customs, which, like the Bureau of Internal Revenue, is a revenue-collecting agency. Last year the Bureau of Customs asked our committee to approve a request for a handful of men to examine the ever-increasing volume of packages coming into our country from abroad. They told us that if we allowed these extra funds for this handful of men, they believed they would return in revenue to the Treasury $1 million. This year the Bureau of Customs reported that they had actually returned $2 million. This year they are asking for 40 new men for that same project. Bearing in mind, if you will, that we examine only 1 out of 30 packages coming into our country from abroad, the cost for those men will be $155,000.

When asked the question, "How much revenue do you think you will bring in as a result of this expenditure of $155,000?" Commissioner Kelly responded with the figure of $2 million. So you see, it does not pay to cut this revenue-collecting agency drastically.

I have in my hand a letter from a former Member of this body, Mr. Alfred F. Beiter, who is now president of the National Customs Service Association, and because this letter is of such importance, I believe I should read it to you now:

FEBRUARY 18, 1957.

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR GORDON: I want to thank you for your understanding remarks about the Bureau of Customs in the minority report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill.

We are particularly disturbed about the deletion of the $465,000 item for 16 buildings to house customs and immigration facilities in the field. We think it disgraceful that we can afford to send millions to other countries and are unable to provide decent housing for our Federal employees. You can well understand that the amount requested in the President's budget for these buildings ($900,000 to be shared jointly by customs and immigration), divided between 16 buildings, would provide construction of only the plainest kind of structures, functional in concept and devoid of excessive embellishment and extravagant appointments.

We know you are aware of the outmoded, ramshackle buildings used to house customs and immigration stations on the borders. Some customs employees have no toilet facilities, others are housed in old sheds and find it necessary to keep a baseball bat handy in order to chase out the rats each morning.

It will be appreciated if you will make mention of this matter on the floor when the bill is discussed on Tuesday. I think the entire membership of the House should know that the committee's action will result in depriving field employees of comforts enjoyed by most other employed Americans. This action was taken despite the fact that customs last year collected gross revenue 14 percent greater than the previous year.

We are grateful for your continuing interest in the customs service.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED F. BEITER,
*National President.*

Now the other item, the importance of the Coast Guard Reserve in the military defense of our United States. I am so glad that our committee imposed what may be called a relatively minor cut in this item. The Coast Guard asked for $16 million and in this bill they are being allowed $15 million. That indicates a $1 million cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. When Admiral Richmond, Commandant of our Coast Guard, was before our committee, I said this to him:

Mr. CANFIELD. Because of the matter you have just discussed, because of the fact that daily now there is being hammered into our ears the increasing importance of our military Reserve component and their contribution to our national security, will you discuss just briefly, in accordance with that Reserve program, what the situation will be in fiscal 1958?

Admiral RICHMOND. Well, sir, I think I could summarize it this way: As you know, the Coast Guard automatically goes into the Navy in the event of war or in a national emergency. The Navy obviously has war plans, and our war plans are geared to Navy's.

The Navy has assigned us certain duties. From those duties flow our mobilization requirements. Without mentioning those mobilization requirements, there is no way that the Coast Guard can be in a position to meet those requirements without the Reserve.

All of the indications from Selective Service are that it will be at least 2 to 3 months after an emergency is created before the Coast Guard can start drawing, under wartime or emergency conditions, from Selective Service.

Now, then, if you accept that figure and consider that a minimum of 2 or 3 months is required to train a man so that he is of any value to you, it appears that 5 to 6 months would be the earliest that we could augment our forces, in the event of an all-out emergency, unless we have a trained Reserve.

Therefore we have set our requirement at that figure which, by war plans, is our mobilization requirement of M plus 6 months.

I think in the position of the Coast Guard there is another factor that definitely ought to be considered. Particularly because of port security the Coast Guard will have to get people aboard almost within 24 hours or 48 hours if we are going to discharge that function. In other words, it will do no good to guard the ports 6 months after M-day, if in

the meantime they have been open to subversion. We have almost an immediate need that requires a very strong posture on the part of the Coast Guard in building up its Reserve so that we are ready to throw people in to guard the port areas.

One of the primary functions of the Coast Guard of the United States is to search foreign vessels coming into our harbors, notably those from behind the Iron Curtain that could possibly carry unorthodox or nuclear weapons.

After our colloquy Admiral Richmond discussed off the record the awful predicament he would be in in properly protecting our ports and harbors if there were an emergency today or tomorrow. So I hope in the other body this figure we have allowed for the Coast Guard Reserve will remain uncut, this because it is so important to the security of our people.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATIONS

For expenses necessary for the operation and administration of regional and district offices and post offices, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2131); for settlement of claims, pursuant to law, current and prior fiscal years, for losses resulting from unavoidable casualty (39 U. S. C. 49), and for other activities conducted by the Post Office Department pursuant to law; $2,290,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation available to the Post Office Department for the current fiscal year may be transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to any other such appropriation or appropriations; but the appropriation "Administration and Research", shall not be increased by more than $2 million as a result of such transfers: *Provided further*, That functions financed by the appropriations available to the Post Office Department for the current fiscal year and the amounts appropriated therefor, may be transferred, in addition to the appropriation transfers otherwise authorized in this act and with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, between such appropriations to the extent necessary to improve administration and operations.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANFIELD: On page 11, line 12, strike out "$2,290,000,000" and insert "$2,319,000,000."

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary for me to take much of the time of the House to elaborate on reasons why I propose this amendment at this time. The merits and demerits of this bill were thoroughly discussed on this floor yesterday, and I pointedly directed my remarks in my main discussion of the bill to what a cut of $58 million would mean in postal services to 170 million Americans. Since the debate yesterday, Member after Member has come to me to say this: "CANFIELD, it is unfortunate that the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriations bill for 1958 is the first bill to be considered by this body. We know, as you said yesterday, that historically down through the years, this bill has not lent itself to severe or drastic cuts." I said yesterday in my remarks that this bill providing for a $58 million cut, if sustained in finality, represented the biggest postal service money cut in all the history of the Post Office Department. I was challenged, in a way, after I made that remark, and one gentleman arose to say, "Mr. CANFIELD, that is not so. For fiscal 1954, there was a cut of $74 million by this body." Now, I challenged that statement because it is not so. The truth is as follows. The Truman budget was before us as we met that year. That was the only budget we had to consider. But, the new team in charge of the Post Office Department led by Mr. Summerfield indicated there would be a drastic revision of that budget, and they sent down a new and revised budget that cut out $72 million. We, in this body, and we in our committee imposed a cut of $2½ million and not $74 million.

Members coming to me have indicated that they would support a partial restoration of funds. They say, in effect, "We want to operate on every bill, if we can, and effect some savings and some economies. We do not want to vote for a full restoration of $58 million. We will be for partial restoration." So, I am here adding $29 million to postal operations. So that all of these services, which I described yesterday, would not be crippled, as I indicated; so that there could be in the new fiscal year some few extensions of deliveries into surburbia and so that, perhaps, it would not be necessary to restrict Saturday mail deliveries in cities to first-class mail only and so that it would not be necessary to reduce mail deliveries in business sections to two-a-day and to eliminate the sale of money orders in all except country post offices and to eliminate postal savings and so forth. This amendment is for restoration of one-half the fund cut by our committee.

I want to tell you something interesting about the budgets we are now considering. We have a budget for the legislative branch of the Congress. We are talking about dollar and percentum increases. Do you know how great an increase there is in the budget for the legislative branch, the Congress of the United States, over and above what it was 2 years ago? I will tell you the percentum increase. It is 43 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CANFIELD was granted 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. CANFIELD. A 43-percent increase in the legislative budget, a larger increase than in any other budget that we will probably consider this year.

What are the mechanics for developing and considering the legislative budget? Our budget as we prepare it in the House is practically sacrosanct. By tradition and by custom down through the years the Senate never touches the housekeeping figures of the House, nor do we in the House touch the Senate figures in any way. As far as we are concerned they are sacrosanct. Also, as far as the Budget Bureau is concerned, they are sacrosanct. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget appeared before our committee not long ago and said:

All I do when I get the legislative branch is to incorporate it in the overall budget. I am not permitted to make any review of that budget.

In that budget, Mr. Chairman, are millions and millions of dollars for capital improvements, for new structures, for modernization which we, in this $58 million cut in the Post Office Department, are denying the Post Office Department. It is going to be an interesting test when we have the legislative budget before this body, to see if this economy demand is going to stand up. Just look at that budget and say to yourself, if you can, "I am being fair, as I act upon the request of the Post Office Department here today."

Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe that this House will ever pass the buck to the other body and say it is not prepared to do a real, honest-to-goodness, realistic job respecting the budget now before us. I say to you also that the 170 million postal patrons of the United States are not going to stand for this cut of $58 million.

Now, when will that cut be imposed, if it is necessary, by Mr. Summerfield and his group? I will tell you when. It will be imposed early next July, at the beginning of the new fiscal year, when you and I are going home to sojourn for a few months with our people, and look in the eyes of many who will say, "Our postal service has been cut, Mr. Congressman. It is deteriorating to a new low. Wherefor? Wherefor? Did you perchance have anything to do with the job?"

Mr. Chairman, I plead with my colleagues in the House to look at this matter realistically and, acting in good conscience, do the right thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. GARY. I wonder if we could get some agreement as to the time for debate on this amendment?

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman can tell us why we are in such a hurry to close debate on one amendment?

Mr. GARY. As I understand, there are other matters to come before the House. Certainly I have no desire whatever to restrict the membership, but I would like to have some understanding.

Mr. GROSS. I do not think this debate is going to be prolonged. Why does not the gentleman let the debate proceed?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am rising in opposition to the amendment, and I base that opposition upon the statistics and figures that we find on page 11 of the report in the item that lists the volume of mail pieces for the years 1956, 1957, and that

estimated for 1958; the special services transactions, and employment man-hour figures.

You will notice that under this bill, before it was cut, the amount of increase for employees in the Post Office Department was proposed to be 2.93 percent, or, roughly, 15,000 additional men. At the same time the figures of the increase in the amount of mail handled is less than that figure.

I want to point out that the Congress has not increased the number of services that the Post Office Department will be rendering to our people. As a matter of fact, the Post Office Department has continued to increase its productivity; that is, each man working can produce more work per hour, and that should be reflected in the need for employees. Essentially we have the situation that the increased population of the country does require some increase on the part of the Post Office Department, but the increase of population is only 1.6 percent. There should be some relationship between the number of people being served and the number of employees required to serve them. Actually, we should be cutting more out of this bill than we are, but I cannot find out where to offer an amendment to accomplish that purpose.

The Post Office Department ought to be able to perform the services it is now rendering to the people with the same number of personnel instead of an increased number. When you multiply 15,000 additional people by the average salary shown in these hearings of $5,000 per man, it makes an amount of $75 million that is being added to this budget by way of increased employment.

Those are your overall figures; and I submit that on the basis of that the argument of the gentlemen from New Jersey that the Post Office services will have to be curtailed just falls of its own weight. I can only hope that in the other body they will make a further cut in the total and try to figure out why it is that the Treasury Department, the Post Office Department, and all the other agencies provided for in this bill, cannot handle their jobs with the same number of personnel when we are not asking them to increase their services. This is especially true with productivity per employee increasing throughout the Government services and throughout the civilian economy. Just on that basis alone I think anyone here who is interested in getting this budget in line ought to be against this amendment, and that wherever we can cut we should.

One final point. You will notice that the increase in personnel for 1956 was only 1.09 percent. Then last year, and this is taken from the 1957 estimate, the increase was less than 1 percent—seven-tenths percent. Yet this year, the very year in which we should be exercising economy, it jumps from seven-tenths percent to 2.93 percent. It just does not make sense and I submit on that basis we ought to vote down the amendment. Let us hope that the other body will find out the other spots in this bill where this proposed increase in personnel can be cut back further.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am sure the gentleman from Missouri has not read the hearings wherein the Department points out that year after year—this is history—they have had to pay for an increased volume of mail. The volume of mail during the current fiscal year is more than they originally anticipated. That is why they are in here asking for a supplemental appropriation.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will look at the figures on page 11 of the report, the volume of increase in mail for 1958 estimate is less than the percentage increase in personnel. Last year, 1957 estimate, the increase was 2.8 in volume of mail, while the increase in personnel was only seven-tenths percent. One of the points I am making is that the productivity increase should take care of this additional volume if the Post Office Department is doing the job they are alleging they are doing in increasing the productivity per man-hour.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman must bear in mind that all of the funds for operations in the main have to do with salaries for carriers and clerks. The letter carriers go to every home. How is he going to increase his productivity?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am talking about your increase in personnel overall, which is 15,000 men. That is about 3 percent. There seems to be no justification for an increase in the amount of personnel over last year when no additional service is going to be performed.

Mr. CANFIELD. But there are additional services. For instance, 5,000 new carrier routes to be established, some of them in the gentleman's own district.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman was down here telling us how we were cutting out rural post offices where we saved personnel. If we are increasing the productivity and if we are going to do the job properly, we ought to be able to do it with the same amount of personnel that we have now. I wish I could find a place to offer an amendment to cut the remaining increase in personnel.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to assure the gentleman from New Jersey that I am going to support his amendment and I am going to tell the Members of the House why I shall do that.

No. 1: The people in my district want better postal service, not poorer postal service. We will not get better postal service by cutting appropriations for the Post Office Department.

No. 2: Last year I offered an amendment on the floor of the House to cut the appropriations for what is known as foreign aid. That received a token vote only on both sides of the aisle. I am serving notice on the House right now for whatever it is worth that so long as we contribute $4 or $5 billion to throw into every corner of this earth, I am not going to vote for any measure that will restrict the services that the Government renders to the people of these United States who pay the taxes.

No. 3: The President submitted this budget. He said what he thought it would take to run the Government for a 12-month period. Later, since he submitted it, he has stated it is too high. The Secretary of the Treasury has said it is too high. If they know now that it is too high, they knew when they were offering it that it was too high.

Now, if we Democrats cut it and then have complaints about the service, the Republican orators will go the length and breadth of this country saying "The President said in his budget what it would take, and the Democratic controlled Congress would not let him have the money." Now, I am not very smart, but I am too smart to walk into a trap like that.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe very definitely that the entire $58 million should be restored to this appropriation measure. Naturally, I am going to support the increase of $29 million, because then it will only require that we come in with a supplemental bill for approximately $29 million about midway through the fiscal year.

The gentlemen who argue that there is no need for increased funds in the Post Office Department seem to ignore the fact that we are building approximately 1 million new homes in this country every year; that the population of the country is increasing; that there has been a rapid movement out of the city into the suburban areas which will require some 5,000 new delivery routes at once.

We recognize also that there may have to be adjustments in postal salaries. Likewise we recognize that there may have to be adjustments in transportation costs and the like. But, let us note this fact—and I would like my good friend from Virginia to correct me if I am wrong—that actually when we get down to the realistic figures the amount of money being appropriated with this $58 million cut is less money than the Post Office Department received last year. On the advice of Mr. Stans, of the Post Office Department, I want to say this, and I want the gentleman to listen to these figures and correct me if I am wrong.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. Not until I have completed my statement.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman asked me to check the statement. The gentleman's statement is not correct.

Mr. CORBETT. Well, I have not made it yet. The gentleman must have a crystal ball before him.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman said that this bill gives them less money for next year than they have this year, and that is not correct.

Mr. CORBETT. I want the gentleman to listen to these figures and see whether they are right or wrong. The bill actually asks for $76 million more than the appropriation bill last year provided. Is that correct?

Mr. GARY. The bill provides for $207 million more than they had last year.

Mr. CORBETT. $207 million more?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. CORBETT. The figure which the Post Office Department gave me was $76 million more, and then they said that

$31 million of that was mandated cost from legislation last year. Then they said there was pending a supplemental appropriation bill for the current year of $46 million, which means that the Post Office Department actually would receive, under this bill, $2 million less than they received in the bill last year, plus the supplemental bill. Is that not correct?

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman takes into consideration and the gentleman from Virginia does not the pending $53 million request for supplemental funds.

Mr. CORBETT. That is correct.

Mr. CANFIELD. To carry the Post Office Department through the current fiscal year. Now, the gentleman is right about mandated requirements. I believe the gentleman from Virginia yesterday pointed out that the figure was not $76 million more; that it was $44 million more, having in mind those 3 mandated requirements as the result of congressional legislation.

Mr. CORBETT. Then, does not that add up to the fact that last year the appropriation, plus the pending supplemental, minus the mandated cost, would be——

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would not mind an interruption, there is no pending supplemental.

Mr. CORBETT. Why would the Department inform me that they made the request, then?

Mr. GARY. The Bureau of the Budget has never made any recommendation, and no request for supplemental funds has come to the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD) Mr. CORBETT was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] wants to be fair about this supplemental request. Of course, there is no supplemental request before our committee at this time. But he knows, as every member of the subcommittee knows, that there is pending a supplemental request before the Bureau of the Budget which expects to act on that request in March of this year. That request is for $53 million.

What is the Department doing today? It is borrowing funds from its fourth-quarter apportionment in order to normalize the postal activities in the United States. And come the fourth quarter, they are going to be sadly out of funds, and in order to carry through without the supplemental moneys they will have to have payless working days. I know my chairman is not going to challenge that statement.

Mr. CORBETT. And there is this also; if the Post Office Department owes the money, we are going to vote to pay the bills. The gentleman knows that that is so.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Can the gentleman from New Jersey say to this body how much the Bureau of the Budget is going to request of the Congress for this year in a supplemental?

Mr. CANFIELD. Of course, I cannot.

Mr. GARY. Exactly. Thus far there is no request. The matter is pending before the Bureau of the Budget. They may not allow any of it. Nobody knows what the Bureau of the Budget is going to do.

Mr. CORBETT. Of course, we do not know for certain. We cannot even predict that the Congress is going to meet tomorrow, but we may be pretty sure of it.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, we discussed this supplemental item in our hearings. But you cannot find anything about it in the report of the committee. That is entirely discarded from consideration and it cannot be. The chairman of our committee knows that we have got to supply additional funds for the fourth quarter. He does not know how much and I do not know how much, but I have some information to the effect that the Department insists that it cannot get along with less than $45 million.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made a real contribution, and I should like to make one final point or two before my time expires. One thing is sure—there is going to be a request for increased postal rates. Certainly we are not going to be able to justify any increase in rates if we are going to decrease service to the American people, because the big complaint now is that the service is not what it should be. Secondly, on the argument of economy, here is one part of the Government whose services have to expand because population is expanding and business is expanding. A cut in appropriations for this Department is not analogous to a cut in any other appropriation bill. Hence I say that in this case we are hoping to restore $29 million of the $58 million, so that if we do, we will be just about half right and we should remember also that we will be half wrong.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. In my remarks I tried to point out that the increase in the population was 1.6 percent, but the increase in the employment figures was 3 percent.

Mr. CORBETT. But the gentleman ignored the increase in volume of 3 to 4 percent which is anticipated.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, no; those figures are right in here.

Mr. CORBETT. You are for increasing productivity of the postal employees, which has been going up year after year after year after year. You expect to grind out of those individuals more work in order to justify a little further cut in the budget here.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, no.

Mr. CORBETT. I believe the gentleman knows that this work is mostly hand work. You cannot do it by mechanical means.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Not according to the hearings and what the Post Office Department has said about their mechanized equipment. And I have seen some of it in my own post office in St. Louis.

Mr. CORBETT. Undoubtedly they are doing everything along that line for which we give them sufficient money to do. But right here we are going to cut down the amount of money, some of which may be available for mechanical equipment and at the same time we are asking increased productivity of the personnel.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am only talking about the increase in your employment which is a 3-percent increase as against a population increase of only 1.6 percent.

Mr. CORBETT. But your volume of mail is going up 3 to 4 percent. However, I appreciate the gentleman's point of view.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BUDGE. It would seem from the colloquy that we have had here that shortly there is going to be a supplemental request by the Department. Why can the appropriation not be reduced at this time and if the Department is in dire straits a year from now as has been suggested here, consider a supplemental in February or March of next year?

Mr. CORBETT. Because of the rule on deficiencies which puts them into a straitjacket during the first two quarters of the year. Services would have to be cut. They have to know now what they are going to have to work with.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman's amendment prevails and I hope when this bill comes back from the Senate the entire amount will have been restored.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not claim to be an expert on fiscal matters, but since you have been talking about figures I am going to read some figures in regard to this matter, and will ask the distinguished chairman if these figures are not correct.

We all know that the Post Office Department has requested an appropriation of $3,250,000,000. The committee recommended $3,192,000,000, or a cut of $58 million.

Following is an analysis of the current postal budget, as I understand it:

The appropriation for 1957 is $2,984,340,000. The deficiency request pending, needed to complete 1957, is $53 million. This makes a total for 1957 of $3,037,340,000.

That was recommended by the Appropriations Committee for 1958 $3,192,000,000 which is an actual increase granted of $154,660,000.

However, the mandatory items in the budget necessitate the following increases in 1958:

Contribution to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, $131,482,059. Two hundred and sixty-first working day in 1958, $6,552,042. Within-grade promotions, $24,523,679. Biennial payment of surety-bond premiums, $400,000. This makes a total of $162,957,780.

On the basis of current operations and deficiency requested, the committee recommendation is for an actual cut of $8,297,780.

Mr. CANFIELD. If the gentleman will yield, those figures are correct.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I will yield in just a moment, but let me finish reading these figures. I will be brief.

For the Bureau of Operations, the Department requested $2,326,637,000. The committee reduced this by $36,637,000, to an amount of $2,290,000,000. The following is an analysis of the appropriation for operations:

Appropriation for 1957, $2,126,730,000. Pending supplemental request, $47 million. Total for 1957, if request is granted, $2,173,730,000. Recommended by the Appropriations Committee, $2,290,000,000. Increase in appropriations, $116,270,000.

Required to meet mandatory items:

Contributions to civil-service retirement, $117,420,000. Within-grade promotions, $22,250,000. Two hundred and sixty-first working day, $5,775,000. The total is $145,445,000.

The actual reduction in money available for operations is $29,175,000.

Now, are or are not those figures correct or substantially correct?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman repeat those figures?

Mr. MORRIS. May I make this one observation, and I will conclude. I understand those figures are correct.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman has used the figures set out in the report of our committee. There is nothing new about them, except he has added to them the supplemental request of $53 million which he says is pending, and which is not pending before this body at the present time. No one knows what that amount will be, or no one knows whether there will be a supplemental appropriation. It has not yet been acted upon by the Bureau of the Budget.

If the Post Office Department is so anxious to present that figure, and certainly the two branches of Government work together, they should have sent their request to the Congress in time for it to have been considered in this report. Certainly, we cannot consider on the floor of this House budget requests that have never been presented to the Congress. We do not know whether they will be presented or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to my friend the gentleman from Oklahoma, the Deputy Postmaster General was not hiding the facts of life about this supplemental appropriation. He discussed them and presented them to our committee. He indicated most assuredly that they were pending in the Bureau of the Budget, but if we do not grant that supplement in main, we are going to be in the worst postal fix that this country has ever been placed in because the department has been borrowing, as it can under the law with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, from this fourth-quarter apportionment. It does not have the funds to do a normal job in that quarter without this supplemental, in the main.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield until I make a short statement.

On February 17, the Census Bureau announced that the population of this country had reached 170 million. Estimates by economists predict that there will be 950,000 new homes in America in 1957. How are we going to serve those new homes if we cut this budget? That is the question I ask.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the Canfield amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Canfield amendment. As a matter of fact, I had prepared an amendment to reinstate the whole $58 million cut in the Post Office Department appropriation for the coming fiscal year. So mine is the position of fully backing the Eisenhower administration on the budget amount submitted as well as the request of the Post Office Department.

I feel this—that if Congress cuts deeply essential services in as vital a department as the Post Office Department, we will be laying up future trouble. The postal employees have efficiently and well performed the mail and delivery service, and they have efficiently done it over the years without strike or delay or halt. These United States postal employees have performed all through the years so regularly that we United States citizens just simply assume good service from the Post Office Department and from the postal employees. Each of you gentlemen in Congress knows how quickly you get a letter if somebody misses their postal deliveries once or twice from the Post Office Department. Even if there is simply a late delivery of mail, the public complains at once, so you know that is how closely our postal service is watched.

I have asked the Post Office Department if this cut of $58 million in the Post Office appropriation stands just where the places might be that the cuts might be made and I would like to give it to you. They say these are the places.

The Post Office Department says it will be necessary to reduce the Post Office Department employee force for the coming fiscal year by approximately 10,000 vitally necessary jobs by several methods.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Would the gentleman state who in the Post Office Department made such a ridiculous statement as that?

Mr. FULTON. Well, the special assistant to the Postmaster General and the Director of Public Relations made it yesterday to my office.

Mr. GARY. He talked to me and he did not tell me anything like that.

Mr. FULTON. You have not heard the full statement of the figure which I am about to make.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman mentioned 10,000 employees.

Mr. FULTON. Just a minute, please, that is not all that I intended to say in explanation of the figure. I was not through with my statement, may I say to my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia. Five thousand of these jobs would include new city mail carriers that it would be necessary to put on to replace the rural free deliveries in the growing suburbs during the coming year. I happen to represent quite a few suburbs myself so I know how important that is. The other important point is this. There will be 5,000 persons now employed by the postal service who will not be replaced, vacancies occur in the postal service during the coming year. If employees are dismissed or laid off or if they resign or die, they will not be replaced. So that actually on the present postal working force is a 5,000-person gradual cut down, with no forced dismissals for this purpose of meat ax economy, but it is carried out by not filling the jobs that may become vacant.

Mr. GARY. I see no reason for any single permanent regular employee of the Post Office Department losing one penny or 1 day's work because of this bill, and I do not believe anybody can explain how it will come about.

Mr. FULTON. But may I say to the gentleman that when these jobs become vacant, and these positions are absolutely necessary to adequate current post office operations, the Post Office Department must have either somebody replacing the lost employee to do the job, or cut down the necessary service. I cannot see any escape from that alternative.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. I would like to point out to the gentleman that we have provided an increase in this bill over and above the amount they had last year, in the amount of $44 million for these expanded services.

Mr. FULTON. But may I say to the gentleman that on the project for getting better mechanical equipment and laborsaving devices which will be a saving later, that in this budget the Post Office needs $10 million for that item alone, and without the extra funds

recommended, it will have to be cut. That is money that should be spent. It is penny-wise and pound-foolish to cut out such an intelligent and efficient program. Congress can save the penny now, and the taxpayers must spend dollars in the coming years, because the Post Office Department does not have adequate modern machinery and equipment.

Mr. PASSMAN. All of those agencies appeared before the committee and pointed out the many millions of dollars which were saved in improved equipment. Nevertheless, they are always asking for more and more money.

Mr. FULTON. I understand your point, but I think the Government agencies do a pretty good job, both under Republican and Democratic administrations.

Mr. PASSMAN. You mean running the Department?

Mr. FULTON. I mean running the Department. I think a lot of this cry about cutting expenditures in the Post Office is for the purpose of making a lot of political hay in certain congressional districts, at the expense of good postal service to the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. PASSMAN) Mr. FULTON was granted 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. FULTON. I run a small business myself. I conduct several small newspapers, and have personal experience with good postal service and its benefit to the civic life of the community. If any business is faced with a prospect of layoffs and cut downs and failure to replace needed employees, it certainly does not do any good in building a career service among loyal employees in that particular department or business.

That is what we in Congress are facing here in the proposed Post Office appropriation cut of $58 million for the coming fiscal year. Everybody admits it. This will have a drastic effect on the efficiency and morale of the postal employee service, and it will particularly hurt because some of us want to make the postal service become a real career service. I, for one, would favor giving the Post Office Department the money to do a good job of modernization and building an efficient career postal service instead of cutting the ground out from the efficiency and progress the Department has already made.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to my friend and colleague from Pittsburgh.

Mr. CORBETT. I would like to cooperate with the gentleman's statement and cite as authority the Postmaster General and one of his assistants who appeared before the Post Office Committee today. It was pointed out there that while it was not certain what service would be discontinued, that certainly the things the gentleman has outlined would be among the first to be considered. But they did not want to finalize their opinions until the bill had been passed finally.

Mr. FULTON. Yes.

Mr. CORBETT. I just wanted to ask one other question.

In the Post Office Department presently the number of persons leaving the service per month is down to 1.6, which is about one-half the rate for the rest of the Government agencies and about one-third the rate in private business. So the program has been working.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman.

I think we should realize that if we cut the whole proposed program for suburban extension of city delivery service we will save only $11 million in the coming year, and that is too important a service for Congress to cut blindly.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. The gentleman is a businessman. Would the gentleman tell this House how industry or business has met the challenge of suburbia?

Mr. FULTON. I have several suburban newspapers that I publish. Our papers are expanding because the suburbs themselves are expanding. The post office has the duty of giving adequate postal service to these fine new suburbs and communities where the census shows that most of our country's population growth is developing. Some of these Congressional Members who have districts in the so-called country districts are finding the suburbs are moving in to them. They will quickly find that every one of these suburbinates was born with a fountain pen in his right hand and a piece of paper in his left hand and already knows how to write to his Congressman.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. But industry makes no bones about making the patron walk to its place of business to get his goods; makes the employee ride to his place of work. There is no visible complaint in this as yet. In suburbia, the patron generally is a cash and carry person, is he not? In the city he still has delivery service, in suburbia big city stores have built branches and the average man, Mr. and Mrs. Suburban America, go to the store and get what they want and carry it home. Industry does this for economy and profits to itself and reasonable costs to the patron. This is called modernization.

In suburbia, you go down to the corner to mail your letter, and to the post office to mail your parcels, as you do in the cities. If agreeable, in suburbia, we could have delivery depots on street corners or in locations where people can pick up their mail close to home. If the cost of rendering a postal type service exceeds its income why not use a little engineering, a little distribution ingenuity to solve the problem? It is easy to raise prices and the cost of services and taxes.

Mr. FULTON. I do not believe we have come to the point where Congress should adopt the policy that everybody in the suburbs would have to go get their mail again on foot as we did in 1860. I think the present suburban delivery service is fine; and as a matter of fact, I would like to do more as our suburban areas develop. Also I would like to replace every truck in the postal delivery service that is over 6 years old. I complained about the condition of the equipment in Pittsburgh. One day down town I had the experience of having a wheel come off a mail truck and pinning me against my own car. So there is danger in using old and worn out equipment.

They say Congress can save the money by not putting in needed improvements, and by continuing with antiquated ventilating systems and heating and lighting. I would hate to have any employees of mine working under such conditions as exist in some of these old post offices.

For example, the Post Office Department has said that if they had to eliminate the postal savings service, it would result in a saving of $1 million. I am against that.

They say that to eliminate the sale of money orders would save $15 million. I am against that.

They say we could reduce business deliveries throughout the week to two a day at an approximate saving of $5 million. I oppose that program too. They say we could restrict Saturday deliveries in the city to first-class mail only and save approximately $10 million.

This should not be done either.

As you see here are necessary items of service that the Department would have to consider cutting, but every United States citizen is vitally interested in good postal service. I particularly am interested in such a good postal service as this, which keeps this great country together as one single unit called the United States of America.

I think Congress ought not to cut out these necessary postal services that have proved their worth, but that we should give incentive to increase the efficiency and productivity of the postal employees which would result in increased efficiency of the whole postal service. We should give the postal employees a real career service.

Mr. GARY. Would the gentleman support a bill making all these services self-sustaining by increasing rates so that each one of these services would pay its own way?

Mr. FULTON. I would increase postal rates overall, but I would not treat each branch of the postal service as a separate business unit, but rather look at the whole Post Office Department functions as a necessary and good public service. I do not see how I, a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, can vote to cut the postal service of this country when every country abroad that we are helping has a better postal service than we.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman wants the service but he does not want to pay for it.

Mr. FULTON. No; I would vote for a postal-rate increase, but I cannot see that each kind of postal service must individually return a so-called profit as if it were a business, instead of a public service. I represent a city and suburban district. I would like the farmers and the people who live in the mountain areas to get good postal service, too, and that is why the postal deficit is so large. I am willing to pay my share as a United States citizen and taxpayer to see that they get better service as we people in the concentrated areas want, too. Why

should we in Congress discriminate against farmers and rural free delivery routes. I certainly do not favor this.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how much time is this going to take? The Postmaster General is going to be sworn in and some of us would like to be down there to see that service and to honor the man who is bringing us such efficient service.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not advised.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the gentleman in charge of the bill advised?

Mr. CANFIELD. If the gentleman will yield, I really feel that the Postmaster General would like the gentleman from Michigan to remain right here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. I think you misunderstand how my vote is going to be cast. I think you would like me to go away.

Mr. CANFIELD. No; I think the gentleman should remain here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am making the inquiry seriously on behalf of some gentlemen who would like to go down and see the ceremony, yet the gentleman from Louisiana is asking for additional time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman object to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana for an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I reserved the right to object and have not withdrawn it yet.

Mr. GARY. As soon as the gentleman from Louisiana finishes I intend to ask for a limitation of debate.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has withdrawn his objection.

The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who spoke a moment ago with respect to postal rates failed to answer a question asked by the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee. I think I should direct his attention to the fact that in most other countries the postmaster general fixes the postal rates, so if people demand more service the postmaster general increases the rates to provide for the additional revenue. It is, therefore, a self sustaining operation.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. Very briefly.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman raised a question in reference to my comments. May I say that I look at the postal service as a governmental public service, that it should not be a business. I want to balance the budget. I would like to compliment the gentleman on his action last year together with some of the rest of us in being able to cut the foreign affairs program by almost a billion dollars and thereby saving that money. I also say to the gentleman that I want to cut the President's recommendations where they can be and should be cut, but I do not think we should cut a vital service such as that of the Post Office Department.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman referred to the excellent service given to the patrons by other countries, so I thought it only fair to remind the gentleman that the postmasters general of these other countries have the right to increase the rates so as to provide the money necessary to pay for the greater service demanded by the mail patrons. The gentleman should discuss both phases of the problem.

Mr. Chairman, I regret the need to challenge my dear friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD]. He repeated today a statement, with obvious reference to my comments of yesterday, that this is the largest cut the House has ever made in any request from the Post Office Department. Then he brings into play the words "in finality." This will not be in finality. This will be action on the part of the House and, as always, the bill will go to the other body, and what will be done with it there no man now knows.

I want to say to the gentleman that while this is the largest appropriation request ever made by the Post Office Department, it is not the largest cut in this bill ever made by the House. In 1954 this House reduced the Truman budget for this appropriation by $74,550,000. Furthermore, in 1956 the House reduced President Eisenhower's Post Office budget request by $68,117,000. We should keep in mind that we are considering an appropriation today for the Post Office Department in the amount of $3,192,000,000, which is the largest request of money ever made for postal operations. But this is not the largest cut we have ever made.

It is rather difficult for me to understand why there is so much pressure from the left side of the aisle to grant the Post Office Department exactly the amount of money requested. You and I know there has not been a money bill submitted to the Congress that could not stand a 1.7-percent reduction. This is a very small reduction.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that this is going to be a test vote. It is rather unusual, according to my friends on the left of the aisle, to see a determined effort of our colleagues on the right side who are determined to reduce the President's budget. I want to say again, as I did yesterday, that even though we make some minor cuts as we proceed with these appropriation bills, when we finally complete the fiscal year, we will doubtless have absorbed all cuts and will have increased the total amount of expenditures by from $3 billion to $4 billion. In 1956 we finished the year spending $1,400,000,000 more than the President requested in his budget. It is estimated that at the end of the fiscal year 1957 we will have spent $4,200,000,000 more than the President requested in his original budget. When we have finished this fiscal year, any cuts we have made on this or subsequent appropriation bills will no doubt be absorbed, and in all probability we will have overspent by some $4 billion the original budget request. The amount of 0.7 percent is a very small cut. I do not actually believe there is any one of you who believes deep down in his heart that we are going to substantially affect in an adverse manner the postal operations by making this very small cut in the budget request. You know and I know that these departments have a habit of asking for a full loaf. In some instances they turn back money. In the postal establishment they have transferability of funds; and in many instances in recent years this committee has given the Postmaster General, for certain functions, more money than he could actually spend, and it was transferred to postal operations or to some other function of the postal service. That is a matter of record; so let us approach the problem realistically.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. As I recall the gentleman's remarks yesterday, he very eloquently and correctly pointed out his faith and confidence in the efficiency and the economy mindedness of the Postmaster General.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

Mr. CORBETT. Now, if the Postmaster General himself said that if this cut is to stick, despite all the economies they have made over the years—and they have been plentiful—that because of the 3- to 4-percent increase in the volume of business, plus this cut of 1.7 or 0.6, that will mean that certain services must be curtailed, where is the money coming from for the purpose of extending this service? The gentleman said we only cut it 1.6 or 0.7 below the budget. My point is this: there is not merely a reduction here, but there are no funds allocated for the tremendous increase in volume.

Mr. PASSMAN. I might say to the gentleman that almost anything can be established, pro or con, with figures and statistics. I may further state that I am very found of the Postmaster General; but before I could answer your question I would have to ascertain whether or not he was issuing those statements as a businessman or as a politician.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Would the gentleman tell me what determines the type of service your letter receives before it comes to your hands through the mail slot? What determines that factor? Is it time or cost or convenience, and on whose part and in whose favor? For instance, if you live in a big housing project in New York, as I understand it, you have to go downstairs for your mail. If you live in a private home out in the suburbs, your rural free delivery carrier puts it in the box and you walk down the path to get it. If it is in an intermediate area, or in the city, you probably have the postman come to the front door and slide the letter through the slot; people who pay 3 cents or the air mail 6 cents do not get uniform treatment in this regard. There is room here for engineering considerations. I think

the cut of 1.7 is going to force it on us until cost and revenue balance better than they do, especially in suburbia, as I mentioned earlier.

To meet the impact of traffic, the New York Port Authority is putting another deck on the George Washington Bridge. It's not building another bridge. That's engineering ingenuity with an eye on cost and revenue. Another example, take Greenwich, Conn. It is not in my District, so I can talk about it. Lots of nice people out there. They pay nice taxes, locally and to Uncle Sam.

Do they complain about postal service? Do they complain about having to go down the road to the rural free delivery box to pick up their mail? I have in mind the area around Pecksland Drive. In that vicinity you note rows of rural free delivery boxes. Elsewhere, they seem double-decked.

Apartment houses and big housing projects have streamlined the rural free delivery box idea. You go downstairs for your mail; it is in a neat, compact setup. These people do not complain.

Why do we not put this type of rural free delivery box consolidation that apartment houses have, into use on street corners, next to mail boxes, all over suburbia?

Streamline the design, waterproof it, and I venture expanding suburbia will take it as gracefully as the people in Greenwich, Conn., and in apartment and housing projects do now. It is an approach, is it not, to easing the burden on the taxpayers while keeping up essential and efficient postal service.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I might say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that if the people who have the postal service curtailed briefly will exercise some patience, they will eventually get a tax reduction by having expenditures reduced. They will be the recipients of savings made here.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman has made a good point in his statement, that we are accustomed to seeing these departments ask for more money than they expect to receive. But is it not also true that this Department has been through one wringer over at the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. PASSMAN. They might have gone through a soft-rubber wringer rather than a hard-rubber wringer; and that is what we need to do, to squeeze out a little more. If this great House of Representatives were to take a secret vote on this reduction, in all probability it would be practically unanimous for approval. This cut is justified.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes. I am pleased to yield to my good friend on the subcommittee.

Mr. CORBETT. The gentleman raised the matter of maybe there is some politics in this thing. I think we ought to note this. In most of the departments of the Government they are still pretty much manned by the folks who have inherited these jobs over the years, and I think that practice has become pretty firmly established. But I want the gentleman to know that now they have some Republican leadership and they have not become used to that procedure yet.

Mr. PASSMAN. Inasmuch as the gentleman referred to personnel and furnishing cost-ascertainment figures, may I ask whether or not the gentleman voted to reduce the Truman budget request for this appropriation by $74,550,000 in 1954?

Mr. CORBETT. I do not recall, but I would doubt that I would vote to cut an essential service of the Government. Generally I have voted for most of those cuts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think we want to be fair to all Members who want to speak on this amendment. I would still like to know, may I say to my friend from Virginia, how many Members who have not yet spoken would like to speak?

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not want to shut any debate. I want to be reasonable.

Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I believe that with a budget of $71 billion staring us in the face it would be a great mistake for this House to refuse to go along with the cuts proposed by the Committee on Appropriations here today.

We have had a great bunch of bugaboos trotted out here. I do not know whether there are any that have not been trotted out. First off, they say there is a budget estimate over there in the amount of $57 million—$47 million—$43 million—and I have heard the figure $23 million. I have known of budget requests that were made as early as this in the fiscal year to evaporate entirely before they got to the House Committee on Appropriations. Maybe this one will. They are getting into the period where the cost of operation is less than it was in the last 3 months when we were in and around the Christmas period. There is that situation.

Then they talk of a great many things that would mean cutting out services, curtailing services. Mr. Chairman, let me tell you that this appropriation was thrown together by the committee with the idea that there would be funds for approximately 6,000 additional carriers, not with the idea of reducing the number of carriers and clerks, and so forth, provided in the appropriation, so that we could have more service to take care of the demands that have increased. That is shown in the report at the bottom of page 12, where it says:

> In recommending an appropriation of $2,290,000,000, the committee is providing approximately $17,825,000 more than was available in 1957.

It is absolutely necessary, if we are going to maintain the solvency of the United States that we save every dollar that can be saved.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield? I have a profound respect for the gentleman's ability in the field of finances.

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman is satisfied in his own mind that there is nothing in this bill that is going to result in firing full-time employees or in wrecking post-office services; is he not?

Mr. TABER. I am satisfied that nothing will happen that will be untoward in connection with the Post Office administration as the result of this bill. I do not believe a single person will be discharged as a result of it, and that is one of the grand bugaboos we have had trotted out here. I do not know whether there are any more they could have trotted out or not. To me, it is absolutely tragic that we have an attempt to raise this bill with that kind of bugaboo. I hope we will throw out the bugaboos, sustain the committee in the cut it has made, and say to the Appropriations Committee and to you, Mr. Chairman, that we expect the Appropriations Committee to go down the line the rest of the way.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that, as is always true when we discuss the Post Office Department, this is an area where much disagreement can occur. Basically, as I see the question, it is one of whether we are to continue providing adequate service to the American people, who demand decent service from their Post Office Department.

The pattern of every major city in this country is one of an upbuilding of suburban areas, areas which take on all the characteristics of urban communities, areas where there is growing demand for the extension of carrier service. That demand cannot be met unless we approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

We can talk about the figures all we want, but as I read the hearings, I find that Mr. Stans, the Deputy Postmaster General, stated at the time he appeared before the subcommittee that it was the intention of the Department to seek approximately $53 million in supplemental funds. If that is true, and I have every

reason to believe it is true, then that request, if granted, would make more money available for the current year's operation than is proposed in the budget presently under consideration. If it is true and that happens, as I am confident it will, it seems to me that we will look rather shortsighted if we approve, in a Nation growing as rapidly as this, and demanding the service the American people demand from this Department, a lesser figure for the 1958 fiscal year than we made available in 1957.

There is another very important facet to this postal operation. We are faced with the most rapid turnover in carrier and clerk personnel in a great many years. This arises because many persons can find better salaries on the outside than they can get in the Post Office Department. With rapid turnover, you have as a very natural consequence a lessening of efficiency. In view of that rapid turnover, I am amazed that more money was not requested.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and permission to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, Senator KNOWLAND hit the nail on the head when he said that there must be no double standard of international morality in the United Nations. It would be wrong for the United Nations to apply sanctions against Israel and not exert the same sort of pressure against others who have disregarded resolutions of the United Nations.

I believe that a way must be found to have Israel and Egypt give ground simultaneously and with fair equality until a basis is laid for peaceful coexistence. If the United Nations is to insist on commitments from Israel, it should also insist that Egypt agree to end the state of armed truce and blockade, and grant freedom of passage to Israeli shipping in the Suez Canal and Gulf of Aqaba. There must be no return to the status quo existing before the recent hostilities.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up too much of the Committee's time. I do not have a vote, but I would like to offer the comment of some of my constituents, and I would like to read the following telegram:

JACK BURNS,
*Delegate to Congress,*
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

House Appropriations Committee cut Post Office budget by $58 million. House will vote on bill Tuesday. Urge your help to restore money. Motion will be offered by Congressman CANFIELD.

DON TOYAMA,
*President, Branch 860, National Association Letter Carriers, Honolulu.*

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I am very sorry that the amendment does not call for the full restoration of the $58 million. When I talk to people in my own area and see the overcrowded conditions and lack of facilities of both rolling equipment and other facilities in the post office and hear the statement of the department that there is no money to replace these facilities and rolling equipment, I am concerned by the attitude of the Appropriations Committee. I know that we have in the Post Office Department a group of the most underpaid people in America, and yet, we demand the finest service. In view of this fact, it seems a shame to me that there should be an attempt made to bring pressure upon a service of this type. I hope that the members of the Committee on Appropriations are prepared to accept the responsibility for what will occur if these cutbacks and curtailments of facilities develop, which are listed on page 2258 of yesterday's RECORD. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of this committee if he agrees that these cutbacks will occur. There is a list of eight items here on page 2258 of yesterday's RECORD. Does the gentleman concur that in all probability those cutbacks will occur?

Mr. GARY. Absolutely not. I see no reason for cutbacks at all since we have given the Department more money than they had for this year. Why should they cut back?

Mr. SISK. But, is it not a fact that the Department made this statement, or at least it so states in the RECORD, and I find no place, where either the gentleman from Virginia or anyone else refutes that statement.

Mr. GARY. May I point out to the gentleman that departments sometimes overestimate their needs. I believe that the Post Office Department can operate efficiently under this bill.

Mr. SISK. I would hope that the gentleman might be correct, for I am just as concerned about reducing the size of the present budget as any member of this House. I shall conclude, however, Mr. Chairman, by asking the members of this body to support the proposed amendment, for nowhere on the record has the committee justified this reduction of funds requested by the Post Office Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD]. I am strongly supporting the report of our Committee on Appropriations. I have had some little experience with postal operations, and I have some knowledge of the amount of money needed for efficient service. I was with the Post Office Department for about 10 years before I became a Member of this body, and I have been chairman of your Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for 4 terms. I am convinced that if the House stands by the Committee on Appropriations on this bill, then no essential services of the Post Office Department will be impaired, and that the Department will continue to operate efficiently under this appropriation, as approved by the Committee on Appropriations. Now, I am a great friend of General Summerfield who is a fine, outstanding Postmaster General—he is making an excellent record in office. I have cooperated with him and worked with him and I have a very high personal regard for him. I have never known a more industrious, more sincere or more capable Postmaster General than he is. But, I tell you, it is my frank opinion that General Summerfield and his staff will not have to curtail any essential services under this appropriation. I am in favor of strict economy in the operations of our Government. I think it is high time that we show more concern for the taxpayers of our country. This reduction is very moderate. It is less than 2 percent. It is only 1.7 percent. This bill gives the Department $207 million more than it has for the present fiscal year. It gives them $76 million roughly more for operations and for other facilities. In every item within the Department, there is an increase given this year for administration, research, operations, transportation, and for facilities. You cannot tell me that the Postmaster General and his staff cannot operate efficiently under the budget approved by the Committee on Appropriations. It is high time that we have some regard for the taxpayers of our country. It is imperative that we start reducing the budget of the various departments and agencies and the cost of our Government. I hope this is only the forerunner and the first test that will be made to show that the House is ready to make reductions where it can be done without impairing efficiency or reducing essential services. I can assure you, in my opinion, this will not impair efficient services of the Post Office Department if we vote down the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have requested this additional time to clear up what could be a misunderstanding. Several members of the Louisiana delegation received a telegram from one of the National Postal Association officers, stating that if the $58 million should not be reinstated, the rural mail service may have to be reduced to a triweekly basis.

The total estimated cost of operating the rural service for the fiscal year 1958, recommended in the budget, is only $221,334,000. On this basis, the cost of operating the R. F. D. represents only 7 percent of the total amount in the Post Office Department request. So, in any event, there certainly should not be any significant curtailment of the service.

I point this out so that you will not misunderstand what is proposed in the

bill. This bill will not cause any postal employee to lose his job. It does not reduce employment in the Post Office Department, but actually allows for an increase. True, it does not permit as large an increase as some people in the postal service desire; but the Nation cannot afford to indulge in every such request 100 percent.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Certainly the gentleman does not intend to give the impression that a 25 percent reduction in the rural free delivery service is reasonable.

Mr. PASSMAN. I did not make any such statement. I said the total cost of operating the rural routes amounts to 7 percent of the budget request; and yet I received a telegram stating that this service would have to be reduced to a triweekly basis if this appropriation reduction should be made. I made the statement that the rural service should not be adversely affected in any significant manner at all.

Mr. FULTON. I think that is a terrible cut in the rural service.

Mr. PASSMAN. It is not a cut at all. I am pointing out the inconsistencies in the assertions made in the telegram.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is a Member of this House who has a higher regard for the Post Office and the postal employees than I. I believe that through the years I have served on this committee, I have shown my interest in the Department, and I have shown my friendship for the postal employees. The first speech that I made on the floor of the House was in favor of a salary increase for postal employees, and at that time they had not had an increase for 20 years.

Certainly I do not want to impair, much less destroy, the postal service of the United States. I can say to you very frankly that I do not believe that the cut in this bill is going to hurt the service. I am absolutely certain that it will not be necessary to dispense with the services of one single regular permanent employee of the Post Office Department, or to reduce his salary one dollar.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I shall be glad to.

Mr. FULTON. Would not failure to pass the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey have a very severe effect on any possible consideration of a pay raise during the current session of this House?

Mr. GARY. I do not think it would have anything whatever to do with a pay raise. If we increase the salaries of the postal employees, naturally we will have to increase the appropriations to take care of it. As a matter of fact, if it were to have any effect at all, I think it would help them get a pay raise. I do not believe this body is going to favor increasing postal salaries again until we cut this deficit some. I tell the postal workers in my district that if they want a salary increase they had better try to cut this deficit, because I know this House is getting very weary of the deficit that is growing from year to year.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I have been somewhat concerned about statements that have been made relating to the places where the Post Office Department will observe economies in the event they should not receive the total appropriation requested. When I hear such drastic suggestions as eliminating Saturday delivery, and inability to extend the mail service to new commmunities, I would like to point out to the House that as chairman of the subcommittee which looked into postal operations matters, I suggested to the Department some places where operating expenses be cut, and these places I believe are much more appropriate to economize than it is to cut the kind of service which has been discussed here today. On July 20, 1956, I wrote to the Postmaster General and pointed out that while we hear a great deal from those who send third-class mailings that they tie out their mailings to zones, as a matter of fact, this is done only in the cities where they are mailed. It is not done for cities that are located outside the office of mailing. For this reason many third-class mailers—advertising circulars—locate themselves in small towns, but send millions of circulars for various companies all over the country. Let us take, for example, if a company was located in South Bend, Ind., and sending mailings in South Bend, they would zone and tie out the mail to zones in that city, but all the mail they were sending to Dallas, Chicago, and New York, and other cities would not be so affected. The clerical hire for third-class mail and second-class mail in the 23 large offices, and there are 110 where zones are in effect, is given by the Post Office Department as approximately $65 million. If half of this cost is for primary sorting, you can see that in the neighborhood of $30 million could be saved merely by requiring third-class mailers and second-class mailers to tie out their mailings to cities where the zone system is in effect. This will save the primary distribution of these mailings in those cities. I am sure there are many other places where economy can be effected that will not affect the public by curtailing service, but of course if the administrators do curtail service to the public, then they will write their Congressmen and complain that the budget should not have been cut. I think you will find this will be the general practice in every attempt we make to cut the budget, that when we have these lump-sum appropriations we are not able to specifically designate the things that should be cut out, and the economies that should be effected, so the administrators take the opportunity to make Congress the target by cutting where it hurts or irritates the public, rather than practicing the obvious economies available to them. By this method, they enlarge the bureaus, making their own jobs appear bigger and more necessary, and continue bleeding the overburdened American taxpayer.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 83, noes 148.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. GARY and Mr. CANFIELD.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 124, noes 177.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TRANSPORTATION

For expenses necessary for the administration and operation of the postal transportation service, including payments for transportation of domestic and foreign mails by air, land, and water transportation facilities, including current and prior fiscal year settlements with foreign countries for handling of mail, $648 million.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to notice on page 157 of the hearings of the Treasury and Post Office Subcommittee, that in regard to rail transportation Assistant Postmaster General Siedle said, "We have about scraped the bottom of the barrel in effective savings" in rail transportation.

I believe that for too long a period of time we have seen a pattern of increasingly rapid discontinuance of Railway Post Office service. On page 184 of the hearings, in a statement made by Paul A. Nagle, president, National Postal Transport Association, the comment appears that there were on June 30, 1913, 1,589 railway post-office lines, while in February 1955 the number had been reduced to 483, with establishment of only 184 highway post-office routes. The question is asked, "Is it reasonable to feel that 184 highway post offices and 483 railway post offices could possibly provide the service previously afforded by 1,589 railway post offices?"

Mr. Chairman, I believe firmly that distribution en route should be expanded and that it should be the sense of this body that there be no further reductions in en route distribution facilities.

Remember than not more than 25 years ago there were 20,000 trains in the United States that were carrying mail. At the present time there are less than 3,000 trains carrying mail in the United States. We cannot hope to keep up good service if we are going to continue to reduce sending this mail by train, so that it can be delivered en route.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word on behalf of the 1,000-man Postal Inspection Service.

We need such a service to make impartial surveys of the efficiency of various post offices around the country.

We need these inspectors to protect our letters, to protect the sanctity of the United States mails. Think of all the looseness we read about in connection with wiretapping, and think of how few cases we ever see of people intercepting and opening other people's mail. The

Postal Inspection Service explains the difference.

We need them to investigate fraudulent letters, loss and theft.

I understand, and members of the Postal Appropriations Subcommittee can correct me if I am wrong, that in the fiscal year 1956 the Inspection Service recovered and returned to the public some $538,000. In addition, I believe it is true that the Postal Inspection Service protected the American taxpayer to the tune of some $2 million in various tort claims cases.

Take another simple and necessary activity: We all know what a rush there is at Christmas time to get extra people to work in the post offices. Last year the Inspection Service weeded out some 4,000 applicants who had felony records.

The Inspection Service conducted last year over 100,000 inspections of possible violations of the postal laws and also conducted some 50,000 audit inspections.

This work is vitally important and the savings to the taxpayers are measurable as a result, but in addition, Mr. Chairman, I think one great value of the Postal Inspection Service which is hard to measure can best be described as preventive medicine. A lot of thefts, invasion of the privacy of our mails, and inefficiency is avoided simply because people know that this Inspection Service exists, and is on the job all the time.

I hope the distinguished chairman of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee of our Appropriations Committee will give careful consideration at this time, or when the conference committee meets, to restoring some of the $300,000 which has been cut from the Inspection Service.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, for the record I desire to call to the attention of the House the enclosed letters I have received from Deputy Postmaster General Maurice Stans, responsive to telephonic inquiries regarding the possible effects of cuts in the Post Office Department's moneys for fiscal years 1957 and 1958.

THE DEPUTY POSTMASTER GENERAL,
*Washington, D. C., February 14, 1957.*

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANFIELD: You have inquired as to our current estimate of need for a supplemental appropriation for fiscal 1957, and have asked for further details in amplification of our statements appearing on page 27 of the hearings of the Subcommittee on Appropriations.

At that time we indicated that we were in need of a supplemental appropriation of $53 million for this year, of which $47 million was for operations and $6 million for facilities.

The exact amount of the supplemental appropriation which will be requested has not yet been determined, and arrangements have been made with the Bureau of the Budget that this determination will be made and the supplemental appropriation officially requested some time before the end of March.

Consideration is being given to withdrawing our request for $6 million for capital items under the category of facilities, with the thought that we may be able to reprogram our 1958 plans to include these items, provided our 1958 request is not reduced.

As for the amount of $47 million estimated as our need for operations, we are now engaged in intensive discussions and studies to determine the extent to which this request might be reduced without impairing service. We have just finished a 3-day meeting with our regional directors, and have had numerous other meetings and discussions on the subject of possible economies. It is our present belief that the amount of reduction that we can make in this $47 million request through economies that would not impair service is relatively small.

You have asked specifically what our situation would be and what action we would have to take if we received no supplemental appropriation at all for 1957. Under such conditions we think we would have no alternatives other than (1) payless paydays for our employees, or (2) substantial curtailment of service in the last quarter of the fiscal year. This is clearly evident from the fact that 97 percent of our operations appropriation is for personnel.

Our need for this money springs from three factors. The first is that mail volume now appears to be running at a rate of $21 million higher than that estimated at the start of the year; obviously, handling this mail entails additional cost. The second is that we began the year with inadequate funds to meet continually growing demands for city carrier service in spreading urban and suburban areas. The third is that something over $4 million has been added to our costs for new legislation not provided for in the budget.

The inadequacy in our funds for city-carrier service springs from the fact that the 1957 appropriation was based upon a normal increase over the 1956 appropriation for this item of cost; however, 1956 expenditures turned out to be substantially higher than the amount available, by reason of the same circumstances of growing and spreading population; and we then secured a supplemental appropriation for 1956 and also transferred savings from other accounts to finance the service needs. This left us, however, with no funds in 1957 to provide for needed carrier routes and extensions forced upon us by the conditions described.

If we are forced, in the absence of a supplemental appropriation for 1957, to curtail service, the service curtailments would have to be of such serious dimensions as a reduction in frequency of rural mail deliveries, elimination of city carrier service on Saturdays, or closing of post offices on Saturdays. Studies would have to be made as to how to accomplish material reductions, considering also the fact that the remaining period of this fiscal year would be extremely brief in which to accomplish any "economies" of major proportions.

Sincerely,

MAURICE H. STANS.

---

THE DEPUTY POSTMASTER GENERAL,
*Washington, D. C., February 14, 1597.*

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANFIELD: In response to your telephoned question as to what action the Post Office Department would have to take if there was a reduction in our appropriation requests for fiscal 1958, I would like to submit the following:

1. Administration and research:

Any reduction in this appropriation would perforce mean a comparable reduction in our all-important research program which is just now reaching maturity.

The research program is the basis for all significant economies in the future, as well as for continuing improvement in the service to the public. It is consistent with constant urging by the Subcommittee on Appropriations over many years prior to this administration.

The only way the Department can improve service is by modernization of the mail-handling facilities in the major post offices, so that mail can get in and out of post offices more rapidly. To defer this program now is false economy of the worst type, which will be reflected in increasingly poor service as mail volume continues to increase in facilities both obsolete and overcrowded.

The request for $4.9 million is, in our opinion, an absolute minimum at this stage of the program and any decrease in the appropriation would result in a serious deferment of projects which will eventually result in significant savings through mechanization—the major area left to us where important savings can still be made.

Any further reduction in management would be unrealistic in the extreme. We have already reduced our staff in the Washington headquarters by approximately 500, a cut of 28 percent. In addition to this, through regionalization of work formerly done in Washington and in post offices over the country, we have been able to reduce our management and accounting staffs in the field by 3,696 people (see p. 7 of the 1958 House hearings).

In view of the rising volume of mail we cannot reduce our management staff further without serious impairment of service.

It is our management program, with its emphasis solidly on competent and trained supervision, that has made it possible for us to handle 12 percent more mail in fiscal 1956 than we did in fiscal 1953 with no increase in manpower, except for the city carrier force, the size of which is not determined so much by volume as by the geographical development of communities. As a matter of fact, man-years of work, except for city carriers, have decreased 2.2 percent in 1956 as compared with 1953.

2. Operations:

Any reduction in our operations appropriation would have to come from city carrier service, which is the only account for which we asked an increase over our 1957 estimated expenditures. A reduction of as much as $23 million would mean that we could not add any new carrier service until after July 1, 1958. We estimate our needs in the interim at 5,000 carriers. Any cut in this appropriation exceeding that figure would force us to explore other means of reducing our service to the public.

These ways would probably include, among others, considering:

(a) Elimination of delivery of mail on Saturdays.

(b) Reduction to one delivery a day in business areas during the week.

(c) Elimination of the sale of money orders.

Any significant curtailment of service, or some combination of these or other curtailments, would be extremely unpopular with the public, which rightly expects the postal service to move forward, not backward.

Since 97 percent of the operations appropriation is for personnel, any reduction in funds and service would necessarily result in the employment of fewer letter carriers, fewer postal clerks, and fewer employees in every category.

3. Transportation:

The major part of our transportation expenditures go to the railroads and airlines for moving the mail. There is no possibility of reducing their charges and, as a matter of fact, the railroads are now asking the Interstate Commerce Commission for an increase in rates which would sizably increase our transportation expenses.

The only reduction in transportation expenditures possible is in the field of Postal Transportation Service personnel. Such a reduction, in the face of increasing volume, would inevitably result in impaired service.

4. Facilities:

The Subcommittee on Appropriations has urged the Post Office Department for many

years in prior administrations to develop and install modern equipment which would improve the service and cut unnecessary costs.

Any reduction in the facilities appropriation would seriously reduce this badly needed program. The only means of building a truly modern postal service is through the development and production of modern equipment. It is of paramount importance to the service that this program should not be hindered at this time.

As Postmaster General Summerfield said in his opening statement before the subcommittee, our 1958 presentation is a tight budget. It is an honest budget. There is no fat in it. Any cut would be into the lean, and would cause serious impairment of service and efficiency. It would also block the way to really significant savings in the future.

Sincerely,

MAURICE H. STANS.

---

THE DEPUTY POSTMASTER GENERAL,
*Washington, D. C., February 15, 1957.*

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANFIELD: You called my attention this morning on the telephone to a United Press report that the Post Office Department is suspending plans for the construction of $20 million worth of post office buildings. You asked me to inform you what effect this suspension would have on our 1957 and 1958 budgets.

The news report in question relates to the temporary suspension of our lease-purchase programs, as stated in the attached press release. There has been no suspension of our program for the regular leasing of any post office buildings on straight leases.

With respect to the year 1957, there will be no effect on our budgetary requirements because it had not been contemplated that any of these post offices would be ready for occupancy within the fiscal years.

The most optimistic expectations were that only a few of the 48 approved lease-purchase projects would have been completed for occupancy before June 30, 1958, and in the case of these only for a few months. In the meantime, other rentals on present buildings in these 48 communities would have to be continued. We estimated that the net effect of this program on our rent account in fiscal 1958 would have been considerably less than $100,000.

Because of this, the budget was compiled on a basis of absorbing this nominal increase in rents out of our normal rent expenditures.

The entire annual rent payment for all lease-purchase projects that have been approved is limited to approximately $2,118,000 a year. This amount, in part, is a replacement of existing rentals and, in any event, would not be payable until the new structures were completed and occupied.

Sincerely,

MAURICE H. STANS.

The following is a copy of a news release issued by Mr. Stans on the Appropriations Committee cut of $58 million in the 1958 Post Office budget:

Deputy Postmaster General Maurice H. Stans warned today that the cut of $58 million in the 1958 postal budget proposed today by the House Appropriations Committee would compel a drastic curtailment in postal service to the American people and reduce the Department employee force by approximately 10,000 vitally necessary jobs.

"The Post Office Department budget submitted to the Congress had already been trimmed to the workable minimum," Mr. Stans said.

"Furthermore, the Post Office Department is unlike most Government agencies in that it provides a daily service. It cannot reprogram its activities; in fact, the only way it can operate on less money is to cut the mail service to the public.

"If this drastic and ill-advised cut is allowed to stand, the Post Office Department will not be able to establish 5,000 city carrier routes needed in new and growing suburban communities within the next 12 months.

"The Department will also have to reduce materially its research and mechanization programs to speed mail through its old-fashioned and inadequate post offices and greatly reduce its modernization program of light, color, and ventilation, and related benefits to improve working conditions in obsolete facilities.

"Additionally, the Department will have to give serious consideration to curtailing mail service in one or more of the following ways on or before July 1.

"1. End Saturday mail deliveries; close post offices on Saturday.

"2. Reduce the frequency of rural free delivery service, now daily.

"3. Reduce the multiple—now three times a day downtown in most cities—delivery for business houses to twice a day.

"4. Eliminate the sale of postal money orders.

"At this time, when postal service is so vital to the national welfare," Mr. Stans concluded, "any significant curtailment of service would, in the long run, injure the people and the industry of the country.

"The American people want good postal service and are willing to pay for it. Thus I do not believe this unfortunate proposed reduction would serve the national welfare, nor be in accordance with the wishes of the people."

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 204. Amounts contributed by the Post Office Department to the civil service retirement and disability fund, in compliance with section 4 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (70 Stat. 747), from appropriations made by this title, or from appropriations hereafter made to the Post Office Department, shall be considered as costs of providing postal service for the purpose of establishing postal rates.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the language contained in section 204, just read, is legislation upon an appropriation bill, that it deals with appropriations not contained in this bill, is not a limitation and therefore in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. GROSS. No, I see no point in reserving it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I do. I want to state to the House what this provision is. Last year, when the Congress passed the Civil Service Retirement bill, a provision was included that the Civil Service——

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to insist upon the regular order. The gentleman is not addressing himself to the point of order.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman know what I am addressing myself to?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] will address himself to the point of order.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, there was written into that bill by somebody a provision that civil service retirement payments of postal employees should not be considered in figuring the postal rates which is, of course, a ridiculous provision. This provision simply attempts to change that law and to say that civil service retirement payments which are part of the compensation of the employee, a part that he receives from his service, shall be considered in determining the postal rates under the rate law.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if I may be heard further, the gentleman, it seems to me, has admitted that this seeks to repeal a law enacted last year by the Congress. I insist upon my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has examined the provision against which the point of order is raised. It appears that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The point of order is sustained.

BY WHAT STANDARDS IS THE POLITICAL ALLEGIANCE OF THE INDIVIDUAL TO BE DETERMINED?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this vote we just heard is causing some of us considerable difficulty. You remember in the last campaign more than 9 million of a majority of us said, "I like Ike." I do, too. The 4th district of Michigan gave him 70 percent of its vote. I want to go along with Ike, but I am having trouble. It does not come from over on the Republican side. There is evidence that you gentlemen on the Democratic side have been converted and now want a little economy. I can go along with you without any difficulty.

You are now advocating a policy of economy for which I have long talked and always voted. Whether your present support comes as a result of grassroots pressure or from your own study and conclusions is of little importance. The fact that you now, as a group, advocate economy, reduction of expenditures of the Republican administration, is especially pleasing.

But here on our side, when we have the leader going one way and the assistant leader going the other way, it gets me all cross-legged.

I am having trouble, too, in determining whether I am a Republican.

Is a man's right to declare himself a Republican to be judged by his acceptance and support of the party's principles as disclosed by its history, or by the fiat of someone whose conceit causes him to declare himself a judge of party loyalty?

Whether the Republican Party was born at Ripon, Wis., or under the oaks at Jackson, Mich., is today of little relative importance.

Loyalty to that party's doctrine is of utmost importance when the right to use the party's name arises.

The first national convention of the party was held in Philadelphia, in June of 1856. The platform then adopted not only favored the admission of Kansas as

a free State, the restoring of the action of the Federal Government to the principles of Washington and Jefferson, but declared:

That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence, and embodied in the Federal Constitution, are essential to the preservation of our republican institutions and that the Federal Constitution, the rights of the States, and the Union of the States, must and shall be preserved.

At the second Republican national convention held at the Wigwam in Chicago, in May of 1860, Abraham Lincoln became the nominee, and, at the next election, our first Republican President. Again, the platform declared the party's adherence to "the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Federal Constitution."

It stated:

That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to the balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depends.

From that day until acceptance of principle gave way to the desire for office, the principles of the party were adhered to by its candidates for the Presidency.

Under the two-party system, the voter had an opportunity at each presidential election to indicate whether he believed in and would support the principles enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and written in the Constitution.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt won office upon the campaign promises:

I shall approach the problem of carrying out the plain precept of our party, which is to reduce the cost of current Federal Government operations by 25 percent.

I regard reduction in Federal spending as one of the most important issues of this campaign.

It is my pledge and promise that this dangerous kind of financing shall be stopped and that rigid governmental economy shall be forced by a stern and unremitting administration policy of living within our income.

We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party when entrusted with power, and that the people are entitled to know in plain words the terms of a contract to which they are asked to subscribe.

That party platform and the campaign promises were, within 6 months, repudiated. Legislation took from the citizen an ever greater number of his dollars. Channeled into Washington, they were extravagantly and often wastefully spent where it was thought the greater number of political votes were available.

Apparently dazzled by the political success of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Republican candidates forsook the basic principles of the party. Seeking office, they promised a bigger, better spending program than that of the political opposition.

Then it was that Wendell Willkie, our 1940 candidate, frankly announced that campaign promises—and, by inference, platform promises—were but "campaign oratory."

Franklin D. Roosevelt's political success seemed to befuddle some Republican political bigwigs. They advocated—in fact, declared—what they were pleased to call a more liberal party program. In fact, it was a program which called for an ever-increasing burden upon the taxpayer, an ever-greater paternalistic attitude upon the part of the Federal Government.

Forgotten were the principles of the Constitution, the rights of the States, the freedom of the individual.

An ever greater number of dollars were extracted from the taxpayer; then, minus a substantial administrative charge, returned to him, provided he comply with drastic restrictions upon his personal freedom to conduct his own affairs in his own way.

MODERN REPUBLICANISM

A personal friend of the President and a self-announced pal, has stated that conservatives—that is, those who believe in the party platforms as adopted at the first and second Republican conventions in 1856 and 1860—should be purged from party ranks.

Ike's victory was cited as foundation for this demand. The fact that in many an election precinct the campaign money was spent for, the party workers devoted their efforts almost solely toward, Ike's election, ignored party candidates, is one reason for his overwhelming majority.

Other conservative Republicans had no choice but to vote for the Republican nominee.

The New Deal international program of the Democratic Party had not been copyrighted. Its success in harvesting votes was apparently the envy of liberal Republican politicians. They lifted much of it bodily and incorporated it in their own party pronouncements. And they caught a substantial number of voters who disliked the Democrat candidate, loved a promiser, no matter how impossible of performance the promises might be, how ruinous if kept.

Now, President Eisenhower, who is not only your President but mine, and the President of other conservatives, through Paul G. Hoffman, who has not—so far as we know—been told by the President that he spoke out of turn, told us in Collier's of October 26, 1956, "How Eisenhower saved the Republican Party." A party whose present legislative program, if read without its sponsors, might well be mistaken for a Roosevelt-Truman production.

My first participation in Republican Party activities was in 1884, when Blaine and Logan were our candidates. It was my privilege then, at the age of 9, to carry a torch and flag, ride a horse in an old-fashioned political parade. The chant was "Blaine, Blaine—James G. Blaine of Maine."

It may be that my reasons for being a Republican would not now pass the present test. They were then sufficient for me. My dad and mom were Republicans. The parade was on. Dad had a horse. I had a flag. The committee furnished the torch, and there was no reason why I should not then be a Republican.

Those reasons were apparently as sound as some of those now advanced by individuals who seek to take over the party organization, profit from the party label.

It would seem permissible for me—not in opposition to the President, but in opposition to being discriminated against and purged, refused standing in the party—in pursuit of my civil rights about which we hear so much—to take a look and to deny publicly the right of the administration's supporters to liquidate me and other conservatives. Just how long have these would-be purgers—the Stassens and the Paul Hoffmans—been Lincoln Republicans?

Now the President was Commander in Chief of the allied armies, which won World War II. As such, he had absolute power and his wishes became commands, not to be disobeyed.

But, although the President is now Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, he is also President. The humblest citizen has the right to disagree, to criticize his pronouncements as President. This fact Paul Hoffman, and perhaps his associates, disregard, perhaps because hero worship, his conceit or his arrogance, has blinded him to the nature of our Government.

Referring to the President in the October 26, 1956 Collier article, Paul Hoffman wrote:

His whole nature was such that he felt he had to win everybody over to his point of view, that once he had persuaded them they would wholeheartedly cooperate. One of his personal aides said to me early in 1953:

"The boss thinks that if he can convince one of these characters that a measure is good for the country he can win him over, but he just doesn't know some of these blankety-blanks."

A vicious, thinly veiled false charge that even though convinced that a measure was good for the country, the legislators for personal gain would oppose it.

A kindly charitable thought? Not at all, just a cowardly insinuation that legislators lack intellectual integrity.

The quoted brief statement indicates that Hoffman was thoroughly convinced that the President, and only the President, was capable of deciding whether a legislative matter was good or whether it was bad.

He reaches the conclusion that those who do not wholeheartedly agree with the President should be characterized as blankety-blanks. That this view is not shared by all loyal Eisenhower supporters is evident from another paragraph written by Hoffman, and which reads:

What Eisenhower did not grasp was the entrenched power of some of the greater figures on Capitol Hill and how deep and firm were the rusty, old-fashioned convictions in which they believed.

Some of them, to be sure, came with him from the very beginning. In the House of Representatives, JOE MARTIN and CHARLIE HALLECK, whatever their own earlier feelings, went down the line for him.

I do not know which one went down the line today.

On one occasion CHARLIE HALLECK, shaking his head, said to me, "I've had to swallow hard two or three times because the boss

believes in things I don't, but he's the boss—and I assume he's right."

I have no criticism of Charlie, but you know the gentleman from Indiana. There is no criticism at all. He votes the way he believes he ought to vote, and that is all we can ask of anyone. Of course, I have no doubt that he had trouble swallowing it. He did have trouble swallowing it, but which one Joe or Charlie, had the trouble today I do not know.

Here again Paul Hoffman, in his assumed wisdom, charges that those who do not agree with the President entertain "rusty, old-fashioned convictions." He is liberal enough to add convictions "in which they believed."

Here again we have Hoffman's odious assumption that the President cannot be mistaken on a legislative program.

Note again Hoffman's statement that that very astute politician from Indiana, CHARLIE HALLECK, who has faithfully carried Ike's orders from the White House to the Hill, had on occasion to battle his conscience in order that he might "swallow" some of the President's policies.

What I say here is no criticism of HALLECK. We all like him. We all admire his fighting spirit. But some just cannot follow, nor swallow, everything that comes from down the Avenue. The Congress is not playing a game where we have a team captain, nor fighting a war where we have a Commander in Chief whose orders are absolute. There are 435 of us, and each owes some degree of allegiance, not only to the President but to the people of his district and to the State from which he comes.

Nor did the President's spokesman in his tirade published just 11 days prior to election day confine his demand that Republicans be defeated to the Members of the House. He wrote:

In the Senate, there are too many Republican Senators claiming the label Republican who embrace none or very little of the Eisenhower program and philosophy.

This group can be divided into two splinters. One splinter contains men like Senator Joseph McCarthy, of Wisconsin, Senator William Jenner, of Indiana, Senator Herman Welker, of Idaho, Senator George Malone, of Nevada, who can be called the unappeasables. I shall not try to stigmatize the dangerous thinking and reckless conduct of these men except to say that, in my opinion, they have little place in the new Republican Party.

Here again, the President's pal, Paul Hoffman, assumes to speak with the voice of the Almighty. He attempts to castigate the voters of Wisconsin, of Indiana, of Idaho, and of Nevada—some 2,057,192 of them—for their choice of Senators.

If the President believes in a free election, in the right of the voters to exercise their franchise under the Constitution—and you will note he has sent up again, as he did in the last session, a civil-rights bill—why not a repudiation of that statement.

The mouthpiece speaking with or without authority goes even further. He not only condemns absolutely those who differ with the President on some of his policies, but he demands complete servile obedience to the President's slightest wish. He wrote:

The other splinter within the dissident third consists of what I consider the faint-hope group: Men like Senator HENRY DWORSHAK, of Idaho, Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona. This splinter has been unable to demonstrate, conclusively and permanently, that it accepts the modern America with its needs of social security, or balanced labor-management relations, or government partnership and guardianship of our complex economy. Nor, being still wedded to the old-fashioned idea of fortress America isolated in space, can it accept America's role as the chief champion of peace and decency in active international relations.

Again condemning the voters—480,207 of them—of 2 additional States.

That the administration is more interested in establishing a new party than in adherence to party principles is evident from this Collier's article. There we find this statement:

A century ago when the Republican Party was founded, half of all Americans worked for themselves in small businesses or on small farms.

Now it is quite true that the situation in America has changed vastly from what it was when the Constitution was written, when the Republican Party was founded, when its first President was elected.

Despite these changes, it is also true that from 1861 to 1933, Republican Presidents were in office three-fourths of the time. They, with the Congress, shaped a governmental policy which encouraged the development of the country's resources, built up its defenses, made it powerful both from an economic and a military standpoint, and insured to its citizens the greatest degree of liberty and freedom of action ever given to citizens anywhere.

True. Many a thing deemed impossible in Lincoln's day is commonplace today. Man has seemingly conquered distance and the air. His destructive power is said to be such that he could in an instant destroy civilization.

But his jets, his missiles are still pulled to the earth by gravity. He has no power to make life everlasting, to defeat death. He has no power to hasten the rising of the sun, nor to delay by the fraction of a second its setting.

The spirit, the courage which sustained the Christians in the arena at Rome is still with those who believe in God and nature's laws.

Now it may be, as stated in Collier's, that—

But by and large, the nature of the party in 1956 is almost totally different from what it was in 1952—either in personalities, or in the philosophy of Republican stalwarts who have come to accept Eisenhower's leadership wholeheartedly.

That is but the wishful thinking of a superficial individual who mistakes expediency for conviction.

It is also true that neither a house built upon the sand [1] nor a political party built upon the political theory that deficit spending is sound can long endure when comes adversity's test.

It may be true that occasionally an able, kindly, liberty-loving dictator may for a short time more efficiently administer the affairs of a nation than can a people's government. History demonstrates, however, that a beneficent dictator is invariably followed by a tyrant and chaos.

ALLEGIANCE TO WHICH PARTY?

We have been told that the President had some difficulty in determining, when he decided to embark upon a political career, whether he would run as a Democrat or as a Republican. It is perhaps unfortunate that he gave no evidence of having outstanding sincere convictions as to the principles of either party.

We have also been told by some of his more slavish admirers that he should be nominated by both parties, giving us thus a single candidate and expediting the end of two-party constitutional government.

We have been told:

"I can tell you one thing," the President said to several intimates in 1953 and 1954, "if I ever do run again, it'll be as an independent."

Hoffman in Collier's gives us a glimpse into the future:

Given 4 more years of Eisenhower, his labors may achieve something unique in American politics, a party that is fundamentally pressureproof; something profoundly superior to its great rival, the Democratic Party, whose irreconcilable differences leave it permanently open to the pressure of contending narrow-interest groups.

Second only to his labors for peace, the creation of this new party may go down as Eisenhower's greatest achievement.

Perhaps the magnificent popular vote given the President last November may convince him and some of his admirers and supporters that at last America has discovered the indispensable man.

Perhaps the President, being an able, kindly, courageous, determined, patriotic man, thoroughly convinced that he can best serve his country, may be the father of a new party so sound in its policy, so perfect in its operation, that critical views will not exist. But that situation is unlikely because all are not made in the same mold.

Perhaps we have reached that stage in our political history where some think one major party is sufficient.

It might be noted in passing that the President—and there is no criticism in this statement—has given our Democratic political opponents a large share in party policy. To aid him in the for-

[1] St. Matthew (7: 24–27):

"Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock:

"And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock.

"And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand:

"And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it."

eign policy field he has chosen that master statesman of the Senate, Walter F. George, and our very patriotic and capable former chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, James P. Richards. Are they now, in the opinion of our delightful party censor, Republicans in good standing?

To assist him in his arduous official duties, the President has appointed prominent Democratic party workers to policymaking positions.

To office he has appointed, among others, Joseph A. Jenkins, a protege of former Democratic House Member and Senator, Abe Murdock, to the National Labor Relation Board; Thomas J. Donegan, a reformed Democrat, to the Subversive Activities Control Board; Gordon Gray, Secretary of the Army under Truman, to be Defense Mobilization Director; Lawrence G. Derthick, Tennessee Democrat, to be United States Commissioner of Education; Dr. Leroy E. Burney, who started with a Democratic appointment and is a career Public Health Service Officer, to be United States Surgeon General; Howard W. Habermeyer, a Democratic patronage appointee, to be Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board.

Perhaps these appointments are in recognition of the support given the President by Democratic voters. Are they now Republicans supplanting individuals who have accepted Republican principles for, lo, these many years?

However, the President's advisers seem to have overlooked one fact, which is that conservatives the Nation over—millions of them—gave him substantial support at the polls. Support without which he might well have been defeated.

WHO—WHAT—IS A REPUBLICAN?

Until the coming of the present administration, there was room in both parties for the groups which believed in and entertained views which had historically become associated with the political activities of the two parties.

The Democratic and the Republican Parties being nationwide, their members had divergent interests, but each followed certain basic and fundamental views.

The national Democratic Party was never strong enough to win an election without the solid South. Roosevelt, deceived and unduly elated by the popular vote he received, overestimated his political power; thought himself to be the party. Only in Roosevelt's time was any effort made to purge from the party the people's elected representatives.

That move, we know, met disastrous failure.

Certain individuals and groups in the Eisenhower administration, overelated by the President's tremendous personal popularity, in their conceit and ignorance seem to have reached the conclusion that he is, as suggested, the indispensable man—the man on horseback; the dispenser at home and abroad of unlimited funds.

Permit another repetition. Conservatives will go along wholeheartedly and enthusiastically with the President's effort to take the Government out of competition with private business.

They will go along with a sincere and successful effort to bring not only legality and honesty, but ethical conduct in the administration of public affairs.

They will go along with many another sound effort on the part of the administration to give us national security, a stable domestic government.

But they will not humbly and without protest submit to being read out of the party by a group of Johnny-come-latelies, who have no worthwhile accomplishments to prove their right to destroy historic Republican Party policies and principles.

Neither Stassen, Paul Hoffman, nor any other politically idealistic crackpots will without protest be permitted to read out of the party those who for years have given it allegiance, been loyal to it.

True, there is no authority like that exercised by the Food and Drug Administration which can prevent the use of the Republican label by any group, but the quackery of the nostrum attempted to be put forth under that label will be its own destruction.

It may be that by this administration conservative Republicans will be kicked out of policymaking positions; that they will be denied positions of influence in the party organization. But it can hardly be expected that, expulsion from the party organization they will cravenly, quietly accept.

Conservatives are a stubborn breed. They have convictions which many of them have entertained for years—some before Paul Hoffman was born, some before the President. Many of them are diehard individuals, and it is possible that ultimately, if the so-called liberals—those who have forsaken constitutional principles, turned their backs on sound business practices, attempted to steal a party label—succeed in purging them from the party, liquidating them politically, a new party may arise, as did the Republican Party in the late 1850's.

Failing that, it is obvious to every student of history that, if the purgers succeed and continue indefinitely the policies of a Hopkins, which they seem to have adopted—to tax and tax, spend and spend, and elect and elect—this glorious Nation of ours will ultimately destroy itself.

The President's recent warning of the danger of inflation is but a repetition of a truth uttered as early as July of 1932 by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, when he said:

> Revenues must cover expenditures by one means or another. Any government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuation of that habit means the poorhouse.

In 1932 it was at least some consolation that our spending was for our own people. In recent years, billions upon billions have been wasted in a foreign-aid program for which there is now no longer even the semblance of an excuse.

The Stassens, the Paul Hoffmans, the wasters, the spenders—those who would fritter away our national independence by making us the stooge of ambitious, self-seeking foreign politicians—possess neither superior knowledge nor experience which qualify them to dictate to the sovereign people of the States the political policies they should follow, the individuals they should elect to represent them in Congress.

If a purge of Senators and Representatives becomes necessary, the people, the voters, will bring it about without the aid of egotistical, self-anointed, unqualified advisers.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4897) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. TABER moves that the bill H. R. 4897 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 149, Rept. No. 143), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

> *Resolved*, That, effective from January 4, 1957, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to matters coming within

the jurisdiction of such committee, including but not limited to the following:

(1) administration and operation of the Federal Maritime Administration and Federal Maritime Board and all laws, international arrangements, and problems relating to the American Merchant Marine;

(2) administration and operation of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and all laws and problems relating to fisheries and wildlife;

(3) administration and operation of the Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and all laws and problems relating to functions thereunder;

(4) administration and operation of the Panama Canal and all laws and problems relating thereto, together with the necessity of providing additional transiting facilities for vessels between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

For such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof as authorized by the chairman is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories and possessions, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

## COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES, H. R. 3028

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures may have until midnight tonight to file a committee report on the bill H. R. 3028.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## PROVIDING INTERIM ASSISTANCE THROUGH THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 161) providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 209, to provide interim assistance, through the Federal National Mortgage Association, in relieving the shortage of funds for home loans pending further investigation of housing credit conditions, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 209) to provide interim assistance, through the Federal National Association, in relieving the shortage of funds for home loans pending further investigation of housing credit conditions. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman of ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 209, which was reported unanimously, without amendment, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, is a stopgap measure to provide immediate assistance to the secondary market operation of the Federal National Mortgage Association, often referred to as "Fannie May."

During 1956 the shortage of private funds for FHA and GI loans became acute and it was necessary for mortgage originators to rely more and more on "Fannie May's" secondary market to buy FHA and GI loans. Thus, the unobligated resources of the association were reduced by the end of last month to $140 million.

The present capital stock subscriptions total $109 million. Under the present charter, FNMA's borrowing authority is limited to 10 times the sum of its capital and surplus. Thus, the present borrowing authority is approximately $1,100,000,000. Section 1 of the resolution provides an increase of $50 million in FNMA's capitalization which would increase the total capitalization to $159 million, and thereby increase the total borrowing authority, using the 10-to-1 ratio, to approximately $1,600,000,000.

To accomplish the increase in capitalization, the FNMA would deliver to the Secretary of the Treasury an additional $50 million of its preferred stock in exchange for an equal amount of its notes held by the Secretary of the Treasury.

At the present time the maximum amount of FNMA's secondary market operations obligations which the Secretary of the Treasury may purchase is limited to $1 billion. Section 2 of the resolution would increase the amount which the Secretary of the Treasury may purchase to $1,350,000,000.

The Banking and Currency Committee points out in its report that there is a great need for study and legislation on the serious mortgage credit problem. The Subcommittee on Housing will begin hearings early next month so the full committee may consider, in the near future, the recommendations of the subcommittee for legislation which will provide greater and more lasting assistance in this field than the legislation we will have before us today.

The committee report complies with the Ramseyer rule and I urge the adoption of House Resolution 161 so the House may proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 209.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution was reported unanimously from the committee.

I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

## REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE WRIGHT PATMAN AT THE MEETING OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE AND NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SAN FRANCISCO, FEBRUARY 15, 1957

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a speech I delivered last Friday in San Francisco. It is as follows:

### FOUR YEARS OF TIGHT CREDIT

Mr. Chairman and fellow Democrats, I am indeed honored to be out here in San Francisco and to have the privilege of addressing this meeting. It is a great pleasure to meet with so many outstanding Democratic leaders, members of the Democratic National Committee and the National Advisory Committee, leaders from the West and from all over the Nation.

Democratic workers out here in the West did a splendid job in the last election. You sent to the Congress many new Democratic Representatives and Senators, who represent the best principles and ideals that our party stands for.

I want to talk to you today about an issue that has personal meaning for every one of you, for it threatens our system of free competitive enterprise and the economic future of our Nation.

### HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE OF TIGHT MONEY ISSUE

That issue is the tight-money policy that the Eisenhower administration has been following for most of the past 4 years. The controversy over tight money is not a new one. The battle over monetary and credit policy has been waged intermittently over the years. It goes as far back as our history.

The first sharp distinctions between the economic philosophy of the Democratic Party and that of the Republican Party emerged in the great debates of the 1890's. We became identified as the party that is dedicated to advancing the interests of all the American people—not just a few. We took the position that our economy must be kept free from banker and monopoly control.

The Republican Party identified itself as the party of the people with property and large accumulations of savings. The slogan "sound money" became the Republican slogan in the 1890's and it is still their slogan today.

The money issue in the 1890's was a symbol, just as it is today. Many who did not agree completely with Bryan on the currency question nevertheless, supported Bryan. They rallied to the side of the Democratic Party, because they knew that underlying the so-called sound money issue there was the far more important issue—Should the value of the dollar be placed ahead of the welfare of the people? Should a handful of powerful banks and monopolies be allowed to decide how our economy shall grow? How our resources shall be developed and by whom? and, How

the fruits of our abundance shall be shared? Those were the real issues then. They remain the real issues today.

We Democrats have always held that the credit of the United States should not be used to enrich just a few and strengthen their power over the economic life of the Nation. Democrats have always insisted that human welfare, the value of human beings, and their economic security are far more important than the goal of the stable dollar. Democrats have held that a primary objective of credit is to help raise living standards by promoting economic growth.

Today, as we reiterate those views clearly and unmistakenly, we strengthen our identification with the great Democratic traditions of the past.

Discussion of the current tight money issue requires that I take you back briefly in history. Banker control over our economy in the 1920's, aided and abetted by a great depressionmaker, had pushed us into the depths of the worst economic disaster ever known.

To lay the basis for our economic recovery, President Roosevelt had to break the bankers' grip over our economy. He did this through the creation of the great Government lending and insuring agencies: Federal Housing Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, Farm Credit Administration, Home Owners' Loan Corporation, Export-Import Bank, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and many others. These agencies made long-term, low-interest-rate credit available for farmers, home builders and home purchasers, rural electrification and the expansion of international trade. HOLC saved the homes of millions of American families. REA brought electricity to the farm and broadened the market for electrical appliances of all sorts to the tune of over $15 billion.

New Deal credit policies not only broke the grip of the bankers over our economic life, but they helped bring about a more even distribution of income. Instead of channeling interest income into the lending institutions and the top 1 percent of the income receivers, sharp reductions in interest rates helped achieve the broad distribution of purchasing power that made possible the sustained postwar prosperity.

ORGANIZED GROUP STARTS CAMPAIGN

Naturally, the bankers did not like to give up their power and prestige. When President Roosevelt died, they organized a powerful propaganda group under the leadership of the vice president of the National City Bank of New York, a longtime employee of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and former manager of open market operations for the powerful Open Market Committee. He was chosen as the ideological spokesman for the Committee on Public Debt Policy. The committee began its operations in 1946. Their propaganda campaign was directed against support of Government bonds at par and stable low interest rates.

In 1947 and 1948, an unceasing attack was waged against the administration's policy of supporting interest rates at low levels. Insurance companies dumped their Government bonds on the open market in an attempt to force prices down and push interest rates up. Demands for unpegging the Government bond market came from all the big bankers. But President Truman held firm. The election results of November 1948 vindicated the policy of maintaining Government bonds at par and interest rates at a low level.

Following the 1948 elections, the attack subsided. The bankers awaited a more opportune time to renew the attack. That moment arrived at the end of 1950 during the dark tragic days of the war in Korea. It was then that the bankers made their bold bid for power. They pressed the Chairman of the Federal Reserve to defy the President and declare the independence of the Board, which was done March 4, 1951.

In the struggle, an accord was reached between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve. Contrary to the popular impression, this accord did not relieve the Federal Reserve of responsibility for maintaining stable conditions in the Government-bond market, nor did it give the Board a license to raise interest rates sky-high.

The fact is that the Board moved cautiously until after the November 1952 elections. After the November 1952 elections, the leader of the campaign to boost interest rates was appointed Deputy to the Secretary of the Treasury, in charge of debt-management and monetary affairs. Putting a man like that in a position where he can raise interest rates at will is certainly not in the public interest.

MAJORITY OF NEW YORK FEDERAL RESERVE BANK DIRECTORS BROUGHT TO WASHINGTON IN 1953

In addition, four other directors of the powerful New York Federal Reserve Bank, making a majority of the directors, were brought down to fill key positions in the new administration. Think of it, directors selected by the very banks that had been campaigning for higher interest rates, against farm price supports, the various Government lending and insuring programs, the welfare programs of the Government, and even the Employment Act itself, these men were given key positions in the new administration.

It was not hard to predict the financial approach that the new administration was going to take. If anyone had any doubt, the new Deputy to the Secretary of the Treasury dispelled it. He announced that the chairman of the Federal Reserve would be retained by the new administration and that henceforth the Board would be completely free and independent. It was clear that we were in for good old-fashioned republicanism. They may call it modern republicanism, but the sound dollar policy is a cold-blooded impersonal, devil-take-the-hindmost policy.

EFFECT OF SOUND DOLLAR POLICY—INTEREST RATES GO SKYWARD

What has happened under the sound dollar policy? Interest rates have gone skyward. All except the biggest corporations have felt the impact of rising rates and tight credit. Big business gets the materials and labor; small business is denied credit for materials and labor because to extend credit to small business, we are told would be inflationary. We were told that Government spending would come down because Government spending is inflationary. But the Treasury is paying close to a billion dollars a year in higher interest charges on the national debt compared to 1952. The Treasury is paying short-term interest rates today that are higher than at any time in recent history, except for the period of bank failures in 1932 and the closing days of the 1929 stock-market boom. The floating debt has been increased, not reduced; and the average maturity of the debt now is less than it was in 1952. If the debt were refinanced at current rates, it would add $2 billion a year to interest charges.

FARMERS, SMALL BUSINESS, AND HOME BUILDERS DEFLATED

Farmers and small-business men have been deflated to preserve the fiction of stable prices. In 1956, the big monopolies raised prices with such a vengeance that even the deflation of the farmer and small-business man could no longer hold the lid down. Prices broke through to new record highs.

With the election out of the way, we have been hearing depression talk from Mr. Hoover and Mr. Humphrey. It looks like they are preparing to put the workers, farmers, and small-business men through the wringer again.

The housing industry, a key industry in our economy, is being strangled by the tight-credit policy. Housing has been deliberately cut back to accommodate the big business investment boom. Interest rates on Government underwritten FHA and VA home mortgages have been boosted upwards. From a level of 1.3 million housing starts in 1955, we have been a decline last year to approximately 1.1 million dwelling units, and the paralyzing mortgage-credit crisis shows clearly that the road ahead still points steeply downhill.

SERIOUS SLUMP IN HOME BUILDING—MAINLY IN LOWER PRICED HOMES

The serious slump in home building is even more sobering when the problem is analyzed on a per capita basis. In 1950, when housing starts reached an all-time peak of 1.4 million, this meant that 9 houses were constructed for every thousand persons. Under the tight-money policy, we have been falling further and further behind in our goal to provide a decent house for every American family. In 1956, less than 7 houses were started per thousand population. This is a per capita rate of 27 percent below the 1950 rate.

Prospective homeowners and homebuilders, like all small borrowers, have been viciously hit by the tight-money policy. It is most disturbing to realize that the heaviest impact in the housing market has been in the lower-priced homes for families in the middle-income bracket. Virtually all of the substantial decline in housing construction, which has taken place in the last year, has occurred in the FHA and GI loan programs, and these are the programs which encourage construction in the lower price ranges.

ADMINISTRATION SOLUTION—HIGHER INTEREST RATES

As the situation worsened during 1956, the administration finally acted and, typically, it took the only kind of action which it seems to understand, namely, to raise interest rates further. In December, despite the obvious damaging effect which the action would have on the GI loan program, the administration raised the interest rate on FHA mortgage loans to 5 percent per annum. It is shocking when one realizes that under a Government-supported program, the home buyer is now forced to pay 5½ percent on a Government-insured loan. (The 5½-percent burden derives from the 5 percent interest and the one-half of 1 percent of FHA annual insurance premium.)

The administration's action increasing the FHA interest rate was just another cruel episode in the tight-money tragedy now being enacted. It has literally created chaos in the home-building and mortgage-finance field.

Now the administration is insisting that the Congress must raise the interest rate on GI loans, in order to bring it into parity with FHA loans. The resistance, which the administration has encountered on this proposal, should have surprised no one. Congressional opposition to a higher GI rate is not difficult to understand. Congressmen have memories and many of us recall the setting in the spring of 1953, when the administration raised the GI rate from 4 percent to 4½ percent just 4 days before the Federal Reserve began to ease credit. Actually there was no noticeable increase in GI financing until more than a year later when the 1954 recession got underway.

SCANDALOUS DISCOUNT PRACTICE

Scandalous mortgage discounts are being imposed by lenders. The Wall Street Journal (February 7, 1957) reported that "interest rates as high as 7.2 percent are charged by a savings and loan association in Los Angeles * * * second mortgage rates go through the roof. * * * A few Los Angeles lenders reportedly charge up to 25 percent, including discounts." This practice is not confined to Los Angeles. It is widespread. Our Government is encouraging lenders to

ride roughshod over State usury laws, by condoning these vicious discounts.

Our Government is being accused by our citizens of being in a racket. The Federal National Mortgage Association is aiding and abetting this racket by buying Government underwritten mortgages at far below their face value.

If "Fanny May" is going to pay only $9,350 for a $10,000 VA-guaranteed mortgage, why should a GI be required to pay back more than the $9,350 that "Fannie May" paid to the originator of the loan?

Why should those scandalous discounts help build up the assets of the Federal National Mortgage Association until the day when the private lenders get ready to take it over?

WHERE WILL IT ALL END?

Where will all this end? Obviously we cannot continue the interest-boosting process indefinitely, because sooner or later—and I am inclined to think it will be sooner—we will reach a point where consumers will just not be able to pay the interest costs on borrowed money.

At some not-too-distant point, we will find that home buyers will not be able to meet the monthly payments on the mortgage loans needed to sell new homes.

The cutback in housing has already been felt in the lumber industry out in the Pacific Northwest and we have felt it in east Texas, too.

The home-appliance industry has also felt the repercussions of fewer homes being constructed. Workers have been discharged in plants making washing machines, refrigerators, electric ranges and dryers and other household appliances, all because the bankers have decided that housing should be postponed.

SCHOOLS HELD "POSTPONABLE"

Schools have also been tagged as "postponable." States and municipalities have found it increasingly difficult to sell their issues in the tight-credit market of 1956. Over a quarter of a billion dollars of tax-exempt bond issues were postponed in the fourth quarter of 1956.

What needs could possibly have a higher social priority than homes and schools? Yet, the so-called free money market attaches a "marginal" status to schools and home construction and allocates credit to private projects of lesser urgency and much lower social priority.

This kind of irrational rationing is the result of the tight-money policy. I, for one, am not willing to passively accept such allocation decisions. I do not think that we can or should deal impersonally with such urgent needs as moderate-priced housing and schoolrooms.

TIGHT MONEY PROMOTES MONOPOLY

What are the other consequences of bank rationing of credit in a tight-credit economy? Look at what has been happening to small business and the family-size farms in the past 4 years. We have been moving in the direction of over-growing monopoly control in manufacturing, fewer and fewer units in retailing and collectivization of agriculture.

Prof. John K. Galbraith of Harvard University writes in the February 1957 issue of the Atlantic that:

"It would be hard to find a policy better designed to encourage the large and the strong at the expense of the small and weak. When banks must limit credit, they are impelled to protect their oldest, strongest, and most reliable customers. These, in general, will be the larger firms."

Commenting further on the implications of the tight-credit policy, Galbraith adds:

"While in principle everyone is in favor of the small-business man, it has long been clear that this affection is largely verbal. We grieve terribly over his fate, but not to the point of doing anything about it. And it is true that big business is here today and doubtless will get bigger. Nonetheless, we should recognize that monetary policy, as it is now being practiced, is a magnificent instrument for promoting centralization. A move at the present time to repeal the antitrust laws would, without doubt, excite considerable opposition. But it might contribute less markedly to industrial concentration than a long continuation of monetary restraints in their present form. These deny to the smaller and weaker firm the funds on which growth or even survival may depend. The large and the strong tend to get them. The consequences must be clear." (The Atlantic Monthly, February 1957, p. 40.)

Professor Galbraith is right about the monetary policies squeezing out small business and increasing industrial concentration, just as effectively as would the repeal of the antitrust laws.

FAILURES 62 PERCENT ABOVE 1952—MERGERS AT 25-YEAR PEAK

Since 1952, small business failures have mounted alarmingly. The 12,686 failures recorded in 1956 were 67 percent above the 1952 rate. Mergers are at a 25-year peak. In 1955, corporate mergers reached a quarter of a century high of 846; but in 1956, this record was exceeded by the more than 900 competitive significant mergers that took place. Tight credit was at the top of the list of the reasons given for the 1956 small-business toll.

SORRY RECORD OF SBA

Yes, we do have a Small Business Administration that is supposed to make credit available to small business when it is not available from private sources. Our House Small Business Committee's final report for 1956 analyzed the SBA's loan activity for the 3½ years that it has been in existence. We found that the SBA has done its best to discourage small-business applicants from seeking credit aid. Out of approximately half a million loan inquiries received in the 3½ years of its existence, SBA only accepted 13,000 applications and approved 1,292 direct small-business loans (about 3 per congressional district averaging 400,000 people, or 1 each year), amounting to $54 million. This amount was less than the RFC used to make available to small business in a single year's operations. That is the extent of the SBA loan program set up to serve the credit needs of 3½ million small businesses accounting for between one-third and one-half of the Nation's manufacturing.

On the basis of the SBA's performance to date, it might have better been called an act for the relief of General Motors. There must be hundreds of thousands of small-business men who have worn out their automobiles in the process of spinning their wheels while trying to get SBA credit aid. An official of the Pittsburgh Small Manufacturers Council told the Wall Street Journal, "If you can get a loan from the SBA, you can certainly get it from a bank."

PLENTY OF CREDIT FOR BIG BUSINESS

While credit for small business has dried up, Federal credit assistance to promote the foreign operations of big business has greatly increased. A good example is the Export-Import Bank. This agency, capitalized entirely by the United States Government, had its lending operations increased from $500 million to a total of $5 billion upon the recommendation of the administration in 1954. In 1 year, from November 1954 to September 1955, export credit lines in the amount of $92.8 million were granted to 12 big corporations to finance their sales abroad on easy credit terms. These 12 corporations got substantially more credit aid than all small business got from the SBA in the comparable period of time.

I am not opposed to expanding our foreign trade. But I am opposed to a policy which says it is not inflationary to give big business all the credit it wants but it is inflationary to provide small business with the credit aid it needs.

DOES TIGHT MONEY FIGHT INFLATION?

We are told that the tight-money policy is necessary to prevent inflation. We are told that we are trying to do things too fast.

What are the factors contributing to inflation? Of all the factors contributing to price increases I can think of none more potent than the scarcity of credit, which restricts production and the rise in interest rates which increases costs. Fighting inflation with tight credit and high-interest rates—particularly the type of administered price inflation that we have—is like trying to put out a fire by pouring gasoline on the flames.

I asked the Chairman of the Federal Reserve recently whether even more restrictive monetary policy could have prevented the steel companies from raising their prices, and his answer was, "No; monetary policy could not have." The truth is that these giant monopolies ignore credit policy. They cannot be touched by credit policy. They do their financing through costless capital by raising prices to the consumer—to you and me. And we do not get any equity in new plants and equipment that we pay for—it is our involuntary investment. This is contrary to the private competitive enterprise system.

In 1956, corporations invested $30 billion in plant and equipment outlays. They obtained $24.5 billion, or over 80 percent, from retained profits, depreciation, and rapid amortization allowances.

FAILURE OF TIGHT MONEY POLICY

Four years of the tight-credit policy has ended in failure. It has not prevented prices from being boosted by the giant monopolies. It has done immense harm to small-business men, to the farmer, and to the home-building industry. It has retarded essential State and local public projects, particularly school construction. It has restricted our growth. We have become so preoccupied with the danger of inflation that we have grown complacent about our rate of economic expansion, which has fallen dangerously below our rate of growth prior to 1953.

SERIOUS IMBALANCES ACCOMPANY HIGH INTEREST RATES

In our worry about inflation, we have overlooked serious imbalances in our economy, which have been accentuated by the tight-credit policy. High interest rates have been accompanied by inflated corporate profits, dividends, and interest income, while farm and small-business income has been deflated and consumer purchasing power has lagged behind the increase in investment.

From 1953 to 1956, farm income fell 12 percent; corporate profits rose 17 percent; dividends increased 29 percent; and interest income rose 27 percent. Labor income and personal income rose only 14 percent in the same period.

LESSONS OF THE TWENTIES

This trend in income distribution is familiar. A similar pattern produced the last depression. During the twenties, the rise in investors' incomes stimulated investment and pushed up stock prices. On the other hand, the lag in consumers' incomes kept consumer purchasing power behind the expansion of productive capacity. The result was a collapse of new investment.

If more had gone into consumption and less into investment and speculation, we might have avoided the 1929 crash. This was a demonstration of the fact that you cannot fatten the herd by feeding the bull.

NEED TO REVERSE TIGHT MONEY POLICY SOON

I am greatly concerned about the effect of this tight-money policy on our economy. I think it ought to be reversed and soon. There is not enough concern about the hardships of deflation, unemployment, business failures and farm foreclosures. I am more concerned about the recent rise in unemployment to nearly 3 million; about the lack of classrooms for our children; about our great housing needs; and about the growing threat of monopoly control than I am about the danger of inflation. Experience has shown that we have many weapons to effectively cope with inflation, but our ability to reverse a depression has yet to be demonstrated.

CONGRESS WILL OVERHAUL FNMA AND SBA

This Congress is going to look very closely into a number of important Federal credit programs. I have in mind, particularly, the Federal National Mortgage Association and Small Business Administration credit programs. We are going along on the interim financing of FNMA because they are in an emergency; and without the additional capital to permit FNMA to carry on its secondary market operations, the homebuilding industry might well come to a screeching halt. But beyond this interim financing, we are going to look FNMA over from top to bottom. We intended this facility to provide mortgage assistance to satisfy the housing needs of the millions of moderate-income families who need homes at prices they can afford to pay. We intended this facility to channel funds into mortgage financing in times of tight credit, so that the homebuilding industry could maintain volume production.

We did not intend this facility to help mortgage bankers drive up interest rates. Nor does this facility exist for the sole purpose of providing liquidity for mortgage bankers. We ought to try and get FNMA back on the right track when the matter of additional financing comes up later this session. If I thought that higher interest rates would provide GI's with the housing they need at the prices they can pay, I would be for a 5-percent rate. But the insurance companies have testified before the Veterans' Affairs Committee that even 5 percent would not channel sufficient money into VA-guaranteed mortgages.

Congress has been warned by the administration that unless we raise the interest rate ceiling on loans guaranteed by the VA to 5 percent, the GI program will be deader than a dodo. The Under Secretary of the Treasury has stated that if the Congress should enact legislation to use national service life insurance fund premiums to support VA-guaranteed loans, he would recommend that President Eisenhower veto such a bill.

I think the time has come for the Congress to call a halt. It is time to notify Mr. Burgess that his interest-boosting days are over. I have introduced a bill to use up to 25 percent of the national service life insurance fund to support GI mortgages at 4½ percent and to prohibit mortgage discounts. No risk is involved to the national service life insurance fund. In fact, the return to the fund would be increased 50 percent—4½ percent compared to the 3 percent it is now receiving. And the VA has acknowledged that the use of these funds would make GI mortgage financing easier for veterans to obtain. I think Congress will enact a national service life insurance support bill. We are going to hold the line on the 4½ percent GI ceiling interest rate.

In addition to providing low-cost housing credit, we have got to be prepared to undertake a really massive credit-assistance program for small business. This is literally a matter of whether small business shall survive or be decimated. The SBA loan program has been a total bust. I venture that administrative expenses of SBA and the expenses incurred by small business loan applicants have substantially exceeded SBA's credit disbursements to small business.

Our House Small Business Committee has recommended establishment of an adequately capitalized Small Business Bank, designed to realistically meet the credit needs of small- and medium-sized firms, who are capable of expanding and competing effectively with their giant rivals.

NEED FOR A FULL SCALE MONETARY STUDY

There are many other credit problems that need to be tackled, not the least of which is the problem of State and local public works project financing. The consumer credit control issue will be raised again when the Federal Reserve Board study is released soon.

These are only a few aspects of the problems we face in the field of monetary and credit policy. Everybody seems to be in agreement that the time has come for a full-scale study of the Nation's financial machinery. We are operating under laws enacted 20 to 40 years ago. In the meantime, the financial institutions of the country have undergone revolutionary changes. The structure of the money market is something we know very little about. Yet, we are relying on that market, to a great extent, to perform a key stabilizing and resource-allocating function. The question of who shall conduct this study is crucial. Determination of the Nation's monetary and credit policy is an inescapable constitutional duty of the Congress. In order to legislate wisely, Congress must be informed. And there is no substitute for firsthand inquiry and observation to be fully informed. There is a great danger, too, in making an inquiry of this sort the exclusive business of monetary experts. We will be dealing here with problems of human beings and their welfare, not with theoretical abstractions.

HIGH INTEREST RATES AND TIGHT CREDIT MUST NOT BECOME A PERMANENT HABIT

I have made this statement before and I I am going to make it again. We must guard against the danger of making high interest rates and tight credit a permanent habit in the United States. There are other and better tools for handling problems of economic stabilization and growth.

The time has come to make a policy choice. As for myself, I believe that our long-run productivity growth can give us both stable prices and full employment and, consequently, if I must choose between a policy that maximizes expansion and growth with a mild inflationary trend in the short run as against one that strengthens monopoly and undermines competition and would plunge us into recession, unemployment, bankruptcies and farm foreclosures, my choice would be unhesitatingly for the former.

I cannot understand how anybody could possibly support the alternative of recession. But I am convinced that there are men in high places, who think recession is the lesser of two evils.

In closing, I want to emphasize that the tight-money policy and banker control of the economy are opposite sides of the same coin. We have always been the party that upheld the people's right to choose their own economic path. That is the basic issue before our country today.

NEWSPAPER REPORT

I am also inserting a reporter's account of the meeting which appeared in the Daily Palo Alto Times February 16, 1957. It is as follows:

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONFERENCE—BUILDING-TRADE SPOKESMEN RAP "TIGHT" MONEY MARKET

SAN FRANCISCO.—Spokesmen for home building, labor, real estate, investments, and small business laid the Peninsula's "tight" money market before a Democratic national conference panel yesterday.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, Texas, a high-ranking congressional finance leader, was chairman of the panel.

PATMAN called for a ban on home mortgage discounts, granting of more funds to the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie May), and a full-scale congressional study of monetary policy.

"I wouldn't care if we raised the GI interest rate to 5 percent if it would get the money," PATMAN declared, "but FHA is at 5 percent and isn't getting it.

"We should tell the banks and other lending agencies we're going to fix a certain interest rate and allow no discounts and that if they don't put up the money and let the people have homes built, the Government will."

A. F. Oddstead, of Redwood City, told the Democrats:

"We in the Bay area have almost been put out of business by the present tight-money policy of the administration. In 1955 we built 46,000 houses in 9 counties. In 1956 it dropped to 30,000 and this year we prophesy less than 20,000.

"That drop of more than 50 percent will have far-reaching effects in the employment of the area," Oddstead declared.

He advocated boosting the VA interest rate to 5 percent to bring people who lend money out of hiding.

Several speakers attacked Oddstead's proposals as stopgaps and he admitted they were, but claimed they were also realistic.

Builder Joe Eichler, of Atherton, termed today's expensive-money situation the worst the country has ever experienced.

Eichler said he combed loan money sources last year and was unable to get a single dollar for mortgages. "The same thing is true of thousands of other homebuilders and small businessmen," he added.

Discounts—premiums paid by loan seekers—have risen from none in mid-1955 to 8 percent. In some cases when notes were suddenly called builders have paid 12 percent, Eichler said.

Chester R. Bartalini, of San Francisco, executive secretary of the Bay Area District Council of Carpenters, estimated that 4,000 to 4,500 carpenters are unemployed among 30,000 in the 9 counties.

"How much more will this unemployment swell when the present commitments of builders are exhausted?" he asked.

James San Jule, of Palo Alto, who spent the past month studying the California market for investors in Hawaii, predicted another tremendous housing shortage soon. He suggested complete revision of the Federal housing program.

Lamar Childers, Alameda County Trades Council spokesman, said home buyers are being saddled with high interest for many years, even if interest rates are eased later.

Buyers will be heavily penalized if they pay off loans early and chances of refinancing are a joke, Childers declared. He predicted a depression if the banking fraternity is allowed to continue to control loans.

Congressman PATMAN said, "It upset all our financial markets" when the Eisenhower administration let Government bonds dip below par. He termed talk of inflation a GOP "bogyman."

Morris Abou, of Oakland, Permabuild Homes president, laid the blame squarely on Fannie Mae. The agency caused the whole

discount situation, set the present 5-to-1 income-to-payments ratio when 3½ to 1 would do, and won't loan on a house costing more than $15,000 though rising costs make it difficult to build for less, Abou said.

Joe Bolker, San Fernando Valley subdivider, urged use of $2 billion in national service life insurance funds for Government home loans. Reducing minimum property requirements set by Federal agencies would cut the costs of homes, he added.

Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, Los Angeles, called for a small-business tax structure revision. He charged the GOP with "a doublecross for the sake of getting some votes," because Congress repudiated the tax cut recommended by the President's Small Business Committee last summer.

San Jose appliance dealer John McEnery charged that present 8½ percent discounts on appliance loans are "in open violation of California usury law and nothing has been done about it by the attorney general's office."

True interest on such loans is 15½ percent—over the 12 percent limit—and "the public is being robbed," McEnery said.

OUTRAGEOUS DISCOUNTS

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith interesting information about mortgage discounts:

IS GOVERNMENT IN RACKET?

Mr. PATMAN. Our great Government is being accused of being in a racket. Good citizens of our country in letters to me often make this statement or a similar one in connection with the high interest and big discounts that are being required of them in order to sell a home or to buy a home.

One letter from a supplier of home building materials stated:

"* * * I think it is a shame what is happening and the way it is being manipulated by the big finance companies demanding outrageous discounts on these type loans. We closed a VA loan the other day and it cost the veteran and ourselves on a $10,900 loan around $750."

BLOOD MONEY

"It is being said that there is tight money, etc., but I call it blood money, if you will give the big discounts there is plenty of money available for the paper. I feel like the lumbermen are all being used to steal from the veteran and give it to the finance companies. I noticed what you had to say the other day in the paper about straightening this deal out, and I think it is a good approach to it. We do not object to there being a 5 percent interest charge, but we certainly do object to being made to make the veteran sign a note for par value and then FNMA, itself, buy that piece of paper if they get a big discount—anywhere from 4 percent to 7 percent. It makes a lot of us feel like our Government, itself, is in a racket, and we think that this matter should have something done about it immediately."

PRETTY DOGGONE SORE

Another letter from Houston, Tex., follows:

"* * * I am pretty doggone sore. You see, early last November I had an opportunity to buy a house here in Houston that I liked, at a price I liked, under a FHA 4½-percent loan.

"I accepted the deal. So did the owner. And I duly applied for the 4½ percent FHA loan through the mortgage company that had got the commitment from the FHA and was willing to make the loan, provided I could qualify.

"All this was before the interest rate was raised to 5 percent.

"While my application was in the mill, the FHA told the mortgage company it could sock me for even more interest than it had asked for in the first place.

"KNIFE ME FOR A POUND OF FLESH

"I hope I'm making this kinda clear: Seller, buyer, mortgage company, agent, even FHA, had all agreed on 4½ percent, and application was made before the rate was changed on December 4. Yet when my loan was finally approved, somebody had arbitrarily authorized the moneylenders to knife me for an extra pound of flesh—ex post facto.

"At least that's what the mortgage company says my Government has done to me. And they're probably right; aren't they?

"I think the whole thing could be straightened out in 48 hours, if you make money available to FNMA at par value for VA and FHA then let private capital handle it if they desire; and I am sure in just a short time private capital will buy at par.

"I wish to let you know that we lumbermen appreciate the effort you are putting forth to get the matter straightened out, but it does need something done about it immediately as we are practically frozen at this time."

I have a letter from one of my own constituents at Texarkana, Tex., in which she states:

"I am writing regarding the GI home loan which you said you were going to bring up in Congress.

"We have sold our home and the buyer has been trying to get a GI loan. That is, we have everything completed, but the investor that is buying the papers wants us to discount our papers 8 percent and we think that is outrageous.

"Could you please advise us concerning this bill? When are you going to bring up this bill and do you think it will pass? Also, how long do you think it will be before it will be in effect?

"Mr. PATMAN, we would appreciate it very much if you could let us know about this matter as soon as possible. Thank you."

---

HOUSTON, TEX., SITUATION

SHARPSTOWN,
*Houston, Tex., January 29, 1957.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PATMAN: I am taking the liberty of sending you the attached article clipped from the editorial page of the Houston Chronicle, which, as you know, is one of the largest and most influential newspapers in the country.

In my opinion this article sums up the plight of the home builder better than anything I have seen in print.

If you have a few minutes to spare after looking this over, I will very much appreciate having your thoughts on this problem which is so vital to the national economy.

Very truly yours,

FRANK W. SHARP.

---

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle of January 24, 1957]

HOME BUILDING INDUSTRY AT CRISIS IN FACE OF 24-PERCENT DECLINE

The home-building industry, under normal conditions, employs about 16,500 people in metropolitan Houston, supporting between 65,000 and 70,000, or 1 person in every 14.

As far as jobs are concerned, it is bigger than the oil industry's direct employment of 13,000, or the chemical industry's 10,000.

Indirectly, of course, the home-building industry helps to support many thousands more.

This great industry faces a crisis today in an economy which, in other respects, is booming. It is a crisis which will grow steadily worse unless quick action is forthcoming.

Construction of low and moderately priced houses has fallen off to an alarming extent—to the lowest point since 1948.

NATION GOES UP

Richard G. Hughes, past president of the National Association of Home Builders at the convention of the Texas Association of Home Builders in Houston in December, pointed out that since January 1955, home building declined 24.4 percent in the face of a continued strong demand for new houses.

During the same period the national gross product increased 8.2 percent; plant and equipment, 43 percent; personal income, 10.4 percent, to the highest level in history.

Home builders attribute this situation to the fiscal policies of the Government which have resulted in drying up the usual sources of mortgage-loan money and high-discount rate on such loans imposed by those lenders who are still willing to invest in home mortgages.

Rising interest rates have caused the usual lending agencies to channel their funds into other types of investment which yield a higher return than home mortgages.

This has resulted in an artificially created depression in the home-building field.

RUINOUS DISCOUNTS

Home builders say discounts imposed by some lenders on home-mortgage loans at the present time range from 6 to 8 percent and sometimes as high as 10 percent. This means that a $10,000 mortgage is discounted from $600 to $1,000—enough, in many instances, to wipe out the builder's profit entirely.

Many home builders have already been forced out of business. Many others have shut down their activities to await developments.

If a virtually complete shutdown of all but luxury home building during the next 6 months to a year is to be avoided, prompt and decisive action is needed.

The builders say that if Congress would appropriate sufficient funds to enable the Federal National Mortgage Association to buy home mortgages at or near par value, the ruinous discount system would be eliminated and the bottleneck choking off home building would be broken.

Probably the best argument for such a program is that it need not cost the taxpayers a single dollar.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, under the leadership of Houston's late Jesse H. Jones, channeled billions into the economy during the depression in a similar operation and was instrumental in saving thousands of businesses, large and small. The RFC made a profit.

As a matter of fact, operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association also have been profitable.

On the other hand, failure of the Government to take prompt and decisive action can lead to economic disaster.

OTHERS AFFECTED

The home builder is by no means the only victim of the present situation. Economists agree that the home-building dollar has the widest spread, that it helps to support more people than money spent in any other way.

If the home-building slump continues, widespread unemployment will result, not only in home building but in other lines. The economy will feel the effects all the way from the forests of east Texas, where trees are felled, to the home-appliance industry, furniture stores, advertising media, hardware stores, railroads, trucklines, insurance, banking—all of which share, in one way or another, in the benefits from building and selling new homes.

---

TWENTY PERCENT DISCOUNT

COLLINGDALE MILLWORK CO.,
*Collingdale, Pa., January 28, 1957.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: May I suggest the following as a fit subject for examination by the House Banking Committee?

When the Federal Reserve Board and the home loan banks take steps which result in limiting the supply of money and credit, why are they not required to place controls on the fees which their members may charge for lending this money to the public? Certainly if we had a severe shortage of any other article such as rubber, sugar, or lumber, the Government would immediately impose price controls to protect the public from gouging, yet there is evidently no limit to the charges banks can impose upon those in need of mortgage money even though the Government itself is responsible for that item being in short supply.

It is not uncommon for those wishing to obtain mortgage money in this area to have to pay a 6 to 10 percent fee, and last week I heard of a case where for a VA mortgage in a changing section of Philadelphia, the borrower had to pay 20 percent.

To my mind this is nothing but a legalized black market, and unless something is done about it, building and real-estate activity will soon dry up completely.

Very truly yours,

HOWARD J. KIRKPATRICK, *Partner.*

P. S.—I am also vice president and treasurer of Collingdale Federal Savings & Loan Association.

---

NEWMAN'S OF CUERO, INC.,
*Cuero, Tex., January 26, 1957.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
*Congress of the United States,*
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am in receipt of your letter of the 17 in reply to my letter, and it is certainly encouraging to know that you are on the job up there and trying to get something done about this racket of discounts. Since writing you the other day we have just closed a VA loan, and I am here attaching a photostatic copy of the closing costs. There are quite a few items that are legitimate charges and a fair cost for services rendered, but there are two items that I am particularly calling your attention to—No. 1 under loan expenses No. 3 origination fee. There is no reason for any such fee for we, ourselves, as a lumber dealer originated this loan, did all the necessary paperwork—application and credit report. No. 2 under the loan expenses item No. 4, the commitment fee of $780; or making a total between ourselves and the veterans of $1,187.50 cost to close this deal which I think is an outrageous situation.

The Lumbermen's Investment Corporation of Texas acts as a broker between the dealer and FNMA and out of the work that they do they make 1 percent and FNMA gets the $780. I thought I would send you this copy, as you will notice this was closed on January 24, 1957, just a few days ago. I thought this would be of some assistance as these are actual facts on paper.

Yours very truly,

J. T. NEWMAN, *President.*

P. S.—Something needs to be done about this program immediately as the lumbermen all over the United States are becoming very unhappy.

---

LUMBERMEN'S INVESTMENT CORPORATION OF TEXAS

CLOSING STATEMENT

VA—No. LH 67437

Loan No.: V–746. Amount of loan: $10,400.

Name: Donal E. Strain. Property address: Bohman Street, Cuero, Tex.

Date of note: January 23, 1957. Maturity: February 1, 1982.

Purchase price: $10,625.

Payments beginning: March 1, 1957.

| | |
|---|---|
| Monthly principal and interest | $57.82 |
| Monthly tax deposit | 10.00 |
| Monthly insurance deposit | 3.75 |
| Monthly FHA MIP deposit | ------ |
| Total | 71.57 |

| | Buyer | Seller |
|---|---|---|
| Loan expenses: | | |
| 1. Recording fee | $12.00 | ------- |
| 2. Title policy fee: Owner's $88.75; mortgagee's $15.00 | 15.00 | $88.75 |
| 3. Origination fee | 104.00 | ------- |
| 4. Commitment fee | ------- | 780.00 |
| 5. Survey | 25.00 | ------- |
| 6. Appraisal fee | 25.00 | ------- |
| 7. Inspection fee | ------- | ------- |
| 8. Credit report | 3.25 | ------- |
| 9. Certified copies of restrictions | ------- | 2.00 |
| 10. Hazard insurance | 45.40 | ------- |
| 11. Federal stamps | ------- | 12.10 |
| Attorney's fee | ------- | 75.00 |
| 12. Total loan expenses | 229.65 | 957.85 |
| Prepaid items and deposits into escrow account and interest: | | |
| 13. First year's FHA mortgage insurance premium | ------- | ------- |
| 14. First year's hazard insurance premium | 45.40 | ------- |
| 15. FHA MIP ---- months at $---- per month | ------- | ------- |
| 16. Hazard insurance 4 months at $3.75 per month | 15.00 | ------- |
| 17. Taxes 4 months at $10.00 per month | 40.00 | ------- |
| 18. Interest from Jan. 24, 1957 to Feb. 1, 1957 | 11.70 | ------- |
| 19. Total prepaid items and deposits | 112.70 | ------- |
| 20. Cash downpayment | 225.00 | ------- |

The undersigned hereby authorize Lumbermen's Investment Corporation of Texas or its closing agent to make the expenditures and disbursements listed above and hereby approve the same for payment. The undersigned also hereby acknowledge the receipt of $10,400 and hereby certify that the signatures of the undersigned on the mortgage documents furnished as security for repayment of said sum are genuine, and that the cost of the property, plus any improvements specified in the undersigned's loan application totaled $10,625. We the undersigned do certify that we will occupy this property as our home.

Dated January 24, 1957.

DONAL E. STRAIN,
*Borrower.*

DOTTIE STRAIN,
*Borrower.*

I hereby certify that the above loan has been closed in accordance with this statement, and that all moneys have been disbursed as described herein.

BERT KIRK.

---

## PROVIDING INTERIM ASSISTANCE THROUGH THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 209, to provide interim assistance, through the Federal National Mortgage Association, in relieving the shortage of funds for home loans pending further investigation of housing credit conditions.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 209, with Mr. JONES of Missouri in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] for 1 hour.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, this is an interim, stopgap resolution to take care of the present need of the Federal National Mortgage Association. As you know, the Federal National Mortgage Association is a secondary market for FHA-insured and GI-insured loans. It is now almost out of funds, and in order to keep its functions operating, it is necessary that immediate authority be given it to increase its available funds.

This resolution does that; it provides that it may issue and sell $50 million of its capital stock to the Treasury, upon which it may borrow $500 million.

The whole question of housing and home finance will be gone into by the Committee on Banking and Currency in a few weeks, and all the amendments that might be considered now will be considered then. I am hopeful this resolution will be passed without amendment. It is essential to those who want to buy homes, for unless there is a secondary market for mortgages, established by the Government, it would be difficult for them to obtain sufficient funds to carry on the program of home building in this country which is so essential not only for the peace and happiness of our people but for our national stability and our national economy.

These sound like large sums, but I know of nothing more secure than the investments which the Federal National Mortgage Association makes. Its business is devoted entirely to the purchasing of FHA-insured loans and GI-insured loans. I think the character and soundness of this institution can be well illustrated by comparison with the Home Owners Loan Corporation. You will remember that at the very depth of the depression in 1933, when the banks were crashing throughout the country like houses of cards, where failures were prevalent everywhere, where the homeowner was being dispossessed of his property, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was established. It made $3½ billion in loans to financial institutions and individuals who were in trouble, who were about to be dispossessed of their homes. That Corporation was liquidated not long ago. It made 1,018,000 loans. It saved the property and homes of at least 4½ million people and when liquidated it cost the Government nothing. It put $14 million into the Treasury of the United States.

Now, there is almost the same necessity now as then for the Government to go into this field and see that the people get sufficient accommodations to establish themselves in homes. That is the only issue here. I hope there will be no amendments offered to the bill because this is an emergency, temporary measure.

In a few weeks all of these things will be considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is essential that this bill be passed now, that the money go immediately into the Federal National Mortgage Association, which will be used to stabilize the home money market.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Kentucky, has correctly stated the facts pertaining to the pending bill. I may say that at the time this bill was introduced I offered an identical resolution. I may say further that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency and I, as the ranking minority member, agreed on a release pertaining to the bill. In that release the facts as pointed out by the gentleman from Kentucky were reported.

It should be noted that, according to my information, the home building industry in its broad aspects is so large that it may well be rated as the second largest industry in our country. It is very important to the home builders, to all those who are employed in the home building industry and especially to the people who are in need of housing that proper attention be paid to the emergency financial needs of this great industry—and that this be done without delay.

That is the reason, as the gentleman from Kentucky has stated, why we are bringing in this emergency bill and hope for quick action. A more comprehensive bill will be considered later in the current session.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. I understand that the Senate subcommittee today voted out an identical bill except that they provide $50 million for special assistance in accordance with section 213.

Mr. TALLE. I thank the gentleman for his information.

Mr. Chairman, what I was about to say was that in the legislation of 1954 pertaining to the home building industry in connection with FNMA, we sought to put into effect a method by which FNMA would ultimately become a private investors' organization. Some progress has been made in that direction, and it is hoped that in future years private investors will be the actual owners of this mortgage association.

That, I believe, Mr. Chairman, is all that I should take time to say at the moment.

I now yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN].

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 209. This resolution, as introduced by our chairman, Congressman BRENT SPENCE, of Kentucky, is identical with House Joint Resolution 210, as introduced by Congressman HENRY O. TALLE, of Iowa.

In brief, this resolution will increase the borrowing authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association for secondary market operations in FHA and VA mortgages by $500 million. Of this amount, $350 million may be borrowed from the Treasury.

The Federal National Mortgage Association under its present corporate charter carries on three separate activities.

First. The secondary market operations.

Second. The special assistance functions.

Third. The management and liquidating functions.

It is important to recall that each of these three activities is independent—each has its own assets, liabilities, and borrowing authority. Upon each—under the terms of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act—is imposed separate accountability with respect to each activity.

The resolution under discussion today relates only to the secondary market operations—in particular to the problem of financing these mixed-ownership operations in FHA and VA mortgages.

This legislation would carry out only in part the recommendations made by the President on this subject in his budget message for 1958. At best it is only a stopgap measure. Actior at this time is urgently needed because the Federal National Mortgage Association is rapidly reaching the limits of its existing authorization for the purchase of mortgages under its secondary market operations.

Our committee has been advised that during the past 6 months Federal National Mortgage Association's rate of purchases and commitments has risen so rapidly that its unobligated resources were reduced to approximately $240 million at the end of 1956, and that by the end of January 1957 had been further reduced to approximately $140 million. If the present rate of purchase activity continues it seems likely that the purchase program will be forced to come to an abrupt halt early in March unless immediate relief is provided. The need for prompt action on this measure is obvious.

I do not believe that this resolution, in itself, will provide any lasting solution to the problem of a shortage of mortgage capital. Presently awaiting committee action is the complete administration proposal for Federal National Mortgage Association, as well as many other proposals for alleviating the shortage of mortgage credit.

The importance of this problem is such that extensive hearings on the many proposals would be necessary, and any congressional action would thereby be delayed. This stopgap measure will provide time both for further study by the committee of the entire mortgage credit situation and also will assure that Federal National Mortgage Association can continue its secondary market operations at least until the end of the fiscal year without interruption.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 209.

The purpose of this resolution is to provide immediate assistance on an interim basis to the secondary market operation of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

In the drastic tight money shortage which is now plaguing the home-building industry, FNMA stands as a haven of last resort, particularly in areas hardest hit by the mortgage credit shortage. Since FNMA stands ready to buy FHA and GI loans at close to market prices, lenders are encouraged to make the liberal terms of Government-assisted mortgage financing available for moderately priced homes.

Unfortunately, FNMA's resources are just about exhausted. As private sources for FHA and GI loans progressively dried up during the past year, offerings of mortgages to FNMA accelerated sharply. In the past 4 months offerings have ranged from $150 to $200 million a month. This sharp jump in the rate of delivery of FHA and GI mortgages to FNMA has put an increasing strain upon the market facilities, and at the present moment FNMA's purchases and commitments have climbed close to the maximum $1.1 billion borrowing authority under existing law.

Under the present charter FNMA's maximum borrowing authority is limited to 10 times the sum of its capital and surplus. Capital stock subscriptions to date total approximately $110 million. Of this amount, some $17 million consists of common stock subscriptions by private mortgage sellers, and the balance of approximately $93 million consists of preferred stock which was issued to the Secretary of the Treasury in late 1954 at the time operations began under the new charter.

To give immediate relief section 1 of House Joint Resolution 209 would provide an increase of $50 million in FNMA's capitalization, making a total capitalization of approximately $160 million. To accomplish this increase FNMA would deliver to the Secretary of the Treasury an additional $50 million of its preferred stock in exchange for an equal amount of its notes held by the Secretary of the Treasury. The total borrowing authority under the 10 to 1 ratio would thereby be increased to an amount approximately $1.6 billion, from the present approximately $1.1 billion. In other words FNMA's mortgage purchase authority will be increased by $500 million.

Section 2 would increase the maximum amount of FNMA's secondary market operations obligations which the Secretary of the Treasury can acquire. At the present, the maximum amount that the Secretary of the Treasury may purchase is limited to $1 billion. House Joint Resolution 209 would raise this maximum to $1.35 billion.

This type of authorization supplies a Treasury "backstop" which assures a ready source of funds should a situation arise when private investors might be unable or unwilling to purchase FNMA's notes. It also furnishes additional assurance to private investors that FNMA has a source of liquid funds with which to pay off maturing notes in any unforeseen circumstances in which neither liquidation of the portfolio nor refinancing might be feasible.

Mr. Chairman, apparently there has been some misunderstanding among builders and others in connection with

House Joint Resolution 209. The argument has been made that the additional $500 million in mortgage purchase authority provided by the resolution is pitifully inadequate in the face of the state of near crisis in the mortgage market.

Mr. Chairman, we on the Banking and Currency Committee are in agreement with that position. We wish to emphasize that the resolution is solely a stopgap measure. We realize that it in no way provides a lasting solution to the serious shortage of mortgage capital which is threatening to cripple the home-building industry, so vital to the housing needs of our people and to the prosperity of our overall economy.

We are well aware that the resolution would provide relief for a shorter time period than would the proposal sponsored by the administration. The administration has proposed increasing FNMA's capitalization by $100 million, thereby increasing FNMA's borrowing authority by an additional billion dollars. It should be emphasized that the administration recommends $100 million increase as a long-term solution, not as an interim measure. I am far from convinced that an increase of $100 million is sufficient for the long run.

Also the administration's proposal would increase the backstop authority of the Treasury to hold FNMA obligations by an additional $700 million in contrast to the $350 million increase proposed in the resolution. However, under the administration proposal only one-half of the Treasury backstop authority, namely $350 million, would be available during this fiscal year, with the remainder to be available after June 30, 1957. Because of this spacing out of the Treasury backstop authority, I would like to point out that the assistance to be provided by the resolution would not be appreciably different from the administration proposal during the current fiscal year.

I would like to emphasize as strongly as possible that I am in complete agreement with the argument that a short-term addition to FNMA's borrowing authority, such as House Joint Resolution 209 provides, is by no means a complete answer. In reporting the resolution, the Banking and Currency Committee stressed the need for more effective mortgage credit legislation and specifically instructed the Subcommittee on Housing to give the highest priority to this problem. In this connection our colleague, Congressman RAINS, of Alabama, chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, along with the members of the subcommittee, has great experience in this field and I am confident the subcommittee can help us report a mortgage credit bill which will provide the lasting and substantial support needed to maintain a sound and healthy residential construction industry.

Mr. Chairman, House Joint Resolution 209 was reported unanimously by the Banking and Currency Committee and I urge its adoption by the House without delay.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of this resolution. However, I believe that the situation we find ourselves in nationwide insofar as the home-building industry is concerned is a very difficult one. And, the Banking and Currency Committee recognized that in most everything they have said in their report, especially on page 4 of the report, where they say that another factor which complicates the problem greatly is the question as to the ultimate action to be taken by the Congress concerning the maximum 4½ percent rate of interest on VA-guaranteed loans. Of course, that question is in the hands of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and not the Committee on Banking and Currency. In other words, when this report was written, that matter was under consideration by that committee.

Since this report has been written and this bill reported to the House, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has acted negatively on increasing the rate of interest from 4½ percent to 5. That makes the whole problem more difficult because your home builders who are caught with a 4½ percent GI loan and a demand for additional housing cannot dispose of the mortgages they have now without a very high discount rate. As a matter of fact, the FHA loans that are held by home builders are also being discounted at high rates and the half-billion dollars that we will provide in this resolution will only take care of the situation between now and the first of July, will be absorbed undoubtedly very quickly, with an additional discount on the par value of those loans.

I think the Congress has a very distinct responsibility to provide sufficient funds to meet the home building demands of the Nation; because I do not know of anything that has helped make home life more secure, reduce the possibility of delinquency, and solidify the American way of living than providing a home for the average American citizen on terms that he can afford and long enough loans so that he can see his way out of that loan.

I recognize that this is only stopgap legislation. I wish the amount were more than is provided in the resolution.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, I should like to say that the chairman [Mr. RAINS] has called the committee into session for hearings beginning the 4th of March. We intend to be in session until about the 13th of March and hear from the principal individuals in the United States who are involved in the financing and building of homes in order to provide the Congress with a complete crossection of opinion and views of the serious housing problem we are facing.

I am confident that there is no opposition to this resolution but I believe that this is the opportune time to give considerable thought to the seriousness of this problem as it affects the whole country. And to be provincial for a moment, it is seriously affecting the State of California and southern California in particular. We have thousands upon thousands of people coming there all the time looking for homes to buy and places to live, and the home builders are caught in the vortex of this economy that we are facing today and are unable to finance the building of additional homes.

I certainly urge the passage of the resolution, but I further urge that every Member of Congress give serious consideration to the situation in which we find ourselves and try to find a solution to it when the legislation comes before them to extend the authority of FNMA, which I hope will come soon.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

BAD PRACTICES ENCOURAGED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill is necessary although it is a weak approach. I am not sure that we are doing the right thing by passing it. I am willing to go along and vote for it on the theory that it will do some good; but at the same time it puts us in the position of recognizing and encouraging practices that many people brand as not only outrageous, but actually as rackets that are going on throughout the length and breadth of our country today.

I read here one letter that I received. This is from a constituent. It says in part:

> Our great Government is being accused of being in a racket.

The good citizens of our country in letters to me have been making this statement or similar ones in connection with the high interest and big discounts that are being required to buy a home or sell a home.

One letter from a supplier of home-building materials said this:

> I think it is a shame what is happening in the way it is being manipulated by the big finance companies demanding outrageous discounts on these type loans. We closed a VA loan the other day at a cost to the veteran and ourselves on a $10,900 loan of $750.

He refers to it as blood money.

Another letter says:

> I am pretty doggone sore. Last November I had the opportunity to buy a house here in Houston that I liked under a 4.5-percent FHA loan through a mortgage company. I had got the commitment provided I could qualify. All this was done before the interest rate was raised to 5 percent. While my application was in the mail the FHA told the mortgage company it could sock me for even more interest than was called for in the first place.

Of course, that caused the trouble.

Another letter stated:

> We have sold our home and the buyer has been trying to get a GI loan. That is, we have everything completed but the determination of the interest rate. They wanted 8 percent, and we think that is outrageous.

I have had letters like one from a couple who moved from Kansas to Nebraska. They had to on account of the employment situation of the head of the house. After they had established residence in Nebraska they wanted to sell their home in Kansas City. They had a $2,000 equity in that $10,000 home and an FHA loan. The person who was selling it wanted $1,500 to make the sale.

That is one case. There are discounts as high as 15 percent all over this Nation. It is a disgrace. There are discounts in the Los Angeles area aggregating 25 percent on second mortgage loans, right here in the United States of America.

LAW OUTLAWING DISCOUNTS REPEALED

Congress did something about this a few years ago. We stopped these discounts. Before 1954 it was unlawful and they were not permitted.

A bill came up here during the 83d Congress in 1954 that would have repealed that provision making these discounts unlawful. I offered an amendment here on the floor of the House on April 2, 1954, to strike out that amendment, so that it would always be unlawful to charge these discounts. My amendment was adopted by a vote, as shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 4, page 4449, of 141 ayes to 68 noes. This House went on record as being against these discounts that are against conscience.

The bill went to the other body. The other body put the amendment back in, and in the conference the conferees were told it was not necessary, that we had plenty of power to regulate discounts and the conferees wrote this language into their report. It said:

The Senate amendment added to the House bill a provision repealing section 504 of the Housing Act of 1950, which directed the Federal Housing Commissioners and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to limit and control the fees and charges imposed by lenders upon builders and purchasers in connection with mortgages on home loans. A similar provision in the House bill was eliminated when title II of the reported bill (relating primarily to mortgage interest rates and terms) was stricken out on the floor of the House.

Further quoting the conference committee report:

Section 504 of the Housing Act of 1950 is no longer needed, since adequate authority for the control of these fees and charges is otherwise available.

That is what we were led to believe, and the House accepted it and we repealed that provision which outlawed these outrageous discounts. All right. Then the Housing and Home Finance Agency put out another statement. Listen to their interpretation of the law. I am reading from it. The Housing and Home Finance Agency said:

Section 504 of the housing act of 1950, which directed the Federal Housing Commission and the Veterans' Administrator to limit and control the fees and charges imposed by lenders upon builders and purchasers in connection with mortgages on home loans is repealed. This provision is no longer needed and adequate authority for the control of these fees and charges is otherwise available.

That is the statement which the Agency gave out. They have not controlled it. When it was repealed, the sky was the limit on outrageous discounts. How can we sit here as representatives of the people, seeing this racket going on every day right in broad daylight, holding up veterans and builders and holding up other people just because that provision was inadvertently repealed. We ought to put it back in the law. But I am not attempting to amend this bill because this is just something that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] says we need now for the emergency and that the committee is going to bring in another bill later which will be an overall bill which will have enough money to really get the job done. When that is done, then we want to restore that provision making these discounts unlawful. There is no reason why Government paper that is guaranteed by the United States should be sold at a discount. Worse still, bought up by our own Government. Our own Government is buying up this paper and charging the veterans the full amount. Remember, this is going on right here in the United States of America with our knowledge. Worse yet this will be with our consent when we pass this bill. We are encouraging it. That is what makes it so difficult to vote for this bill. The Government of the United States is buying up mortgages right now. Fannie May, the Federal National Mortgage Association, owned by the United States with Government money is buying a mortgage that a veteran has given, let us say for $10,000. The veteran has signed his name to pay $10,000 and our Government is buying that mortgage right now for $9,350. Who will pay that other $650? The veteran will pay it. The veteran will pay every dime of it. Now is that right? Do you want your Government to treat the veteran that way? That is just exactly what we are doing. That is what we are doing in this bill—we are encouraging that. Of course, this is a stopgap bill. This is not the time or the place to deal with major issues like that. But I tell you we cannot feel good about it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman just gave an example of approximately a $700 discount on a $10,000 loan. I think those were your figures—a $10,000 mortgage being bought for $9,300? The veteran signs a contract to pay $10,000. The man who sells that mortgage is the man who loses the $700 and not the veteran. The veteran is not obligated to pay any more money. I do not think it is quite fair to say that the veteran loses that money. I do not disagree with the gentleman on the question of high discounts that he is arguing about, but I do disagree with him when he argues that no discounts should be allowed because then you would have no bargaining point there, and you would actually be creating a socialistic money market.

Mr. PATMAN. That could be an excuse and not a reason. You know, after all, whenever they have to discount these mortgages, they know in advance. That fact is taken into consideration in the construction of the house. After all, the veteran's mortgage is sold for $9,350. That fact is known all along the line.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is a loss to the builder.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, you say it is a loss to the builder. In some cases, the builder might lose. But, they anticipate these things. That is taken into consideration in the construction of the house. They have that knowledge. In most cases both the builder and the veteran lose. The point is that here is our Government buying up paper that a veteran is obligated to pay $10,000 for $9,350 and charging the veteran $10,000 thus making him pay an extra $650 on that house.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. For a question; yes.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I merely wanted to say that the $700 discount could be observed by the VA inspector in the building of the house.

Mr. PATMAN. But it is a discount, regardless. The major part is that we are permitting the equivalent to Government bonds that are paying 4½ and 5 percent to sell below par—down to 93½; the same Government buying up their own paper. Does that look good? Of course, it does not. You cannot justify it. There is no excuse for it. It ought to be changed. This bill is not the place to do it, probably, but it has got to be changed at this session of the Congress. FNMA can do a great job, but we have to put it back on the track, and not permit them to buy these mortgages at less than par. The only way you can make that possible is to give them plenty of money to support these mortgages at par. We have got to do it.

DEPRESSION IN THREE IMPORTANT AREAS

The home-building industry is in a depression—in a bad depression. Home building is off 50 percent in a number of areas. Small business is in a depression. Big business can get all the money they want. That is going on right now, and we know it. Agriculture is in a depression. There are three important segments of our economy in depression today. We ought to start by helping the home-building industry get back on its feet, by fixing this FNMA so that they can support these Government securities—mortgages guaranteed by the Government. The law is a good one, but we have to give them plenty of money.

We have in trust funds in this Nation today about $40 billion. We have in the national service life insurance fund $5½ billion. That is veterans' money. It has been proposed that we use a part of that money. For what? To buy common stocks? No. To buy speculative securities? No. To buy the best security on earth, a mortgage guaranteed by the United States Government, 4½-percent mortgage loans. To use at least 25 percent for that purpose. That will help stabilize the GI mortgage market. The national service life insurance fund now is only getting 3 percent. This proposal would be 50 percent more. It helps veterans, who carry that insurance, that much more. There is no reason why we should not do it. We have plenty of funds. But under this high-interest policy, the people in control do not want to do it. They are willing to make it tighter and tighter; interest rates higher and higher. It is fundamentally wrong. This thing is in confusion. We have to

do something about it. The Congress should give it first consideration, and I do not think we should take too long about it.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency has a wonderful opportunity, but they have certainly missed the boat on these discounts on mortgages on homes.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. PRESTON. I have heard a great deal about the selectivity that FNMA was exercising in purchasing paper. Is FNMA required to accept any mortgage which is developed under FHA commitment?

Mr. PATMAN. No.

Mr. PRESTON. Is it true that they are becoming so selective?

Mr. PATMAN. They are becoming selective. This may not help much more. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has expired.

Does the gentleman from Iowa care to yield time?

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time at the moment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time to make clear that although there is before you a unanimous report of the committee, not all of the Members approve of what is being done under existing law.

We take no position against this bill because it has been presented to you as an emergency stopgap measure. Whether or not FNMA is doing the job it should, will be developed very shortly at the hearings which will commence early in March under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Housing. When that committee completes its hearings on the subject we should know what must be done to deal adequately with the entire subject.

Let me make clear one thing that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] referred to, about this business of discounts. It is quite true that on the record the builder or the mortgagor borrowing the money may be charged the discount. There are two discounts involved in these transactions. One is charged when a mortgagee, a lender, take a mortgage of $10,000 and sells it to FNMA for $9,400, or whatever the discount may be. But do not think for one moment that the moneylenders of this country are losing that $600 difference on each $10,000 mortgage; they are getting that somewhere, and the only way they can get it is for either the builder or the purchaser of the property to make up the amount of the discount. They are not going to get it back at 5½-percent interest a year; no, it comes from the home buyer, the veteran, or the nonveteran, the purchaser. When they sit around a table at the closing, the builder, the banker, or the lending institution, and the purchaser, veteran or nonveteran, the purchaser does not get his deed unless he has the cash money to make up the difference. If he does not have the cash, there is no closing. It is the buyer, the veteran or nonveteran, in most instances who has to pay that discount.

FNMA is not a party to the transaction at that point. FNMA deals with the lending institution only. It buys the mortgages, thus supplying the lender with new funds for new mortgages.

There is one other point I would like to make in reference to this. The request sent up here by the administration for this bill was not for what they are getting in this bill but for twice as much.

They asked for a billion dollars in additional lending power for FNMA; and the Secretary of the Treasury and the Budget Bureau approved it, indicating that that $1 billion of lending power is not inflationary but would only help sustain the mortgage market. All that money in the first instance comes from the United States Treasury, some of which is replaced by the proceeds of the sale of FNMA bonds when sold to private investors.

A good many Members have joined me in introducing bills calling for the use of $1 billion of United States life insurance reserve funds for direct loans to veterans. Let me point out that there are $7 billion in that fund today.

But immediately the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget tells your committees that that $1 billion will be inflationary. When you take a billion dollars and use it for the sole benefit of the mortgage lenders of the country that is not inflationary; they are merely going to take that money and lend it over again as fast as they can put it into more mortgages; but if you are going to make $1 billion in loans available to the veterans with which to buy houses, which are one-time loans, these great financiers tell you that that is inflationary, and that you must not do it.

You can approve this bill as you probably will today, but take note that next week when the Veterans Affairs Committee brings to you a bill dealing with veterans' mortgages you are going to have an opportunity to vote on aid to the veterans in spite of its alleged inflationary effect. We will then ask you to make money available to them at a fair rate of interest, at 4½ percent per annum and with no discounts.

When the Government guarantees mortgages they are as good as its bonds; that guaranty makes them just as good as Government bonds, and there is no reason why any mortgage, VA or FHA, when guaranteed by the Federal Government, should bear any greater interest than your Government bonds, plus the cost of servicing and insurance.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. KILBURN. Did I understand the gentleman a moment ago to say that when a veteran goes into a bank and gives them the $10,000 mortgage he does not get $10,000?

Mr. MULTER. I must say to you, sir, that a mortgage that is being placed at a discount, whether it be 1 point or 11 points, unless somebody produces that difference equal to the discount, there is no closing and no mortgage money is disbursed. That somebody who produces the difference equal to the discount usually is the buyer. The builder may arrange the mortgage discount, but the buyer of the house does not get the deed until the builder gets the difference between the discount and the face value of the mortgage. That is paid by the purchaser of the house. Either the builder is not going to build a house to specifications and cheat and get his difference by cheating or as more frequently happens he builds to specifications and makes the buyer pay the discount in cash.

Mr. KILBURN. What he gets is $10,000 from the bank. Then he goes to the builder and makes a deal with him to build a house.

Mr. MULTER. That is just not so. No bank will lend any mortgage money to a home buyer until the house is complete and has passed inspection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. KILBURN. What he does is this: He gets $10,000 from the bank, then he makes his deal with the builder to build his house; then the bank, if it wants to get its money back before 20 or 30 years, goes to FNMA, the only way they can get it; and they lose the $600. The veteran is not gypped at all.

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman from New York is wrong. FNMA buys only existing mortgages on completed and approved homes. This is what happens in advance of that. The builder, when he starts his building project, goes to a bank and gets a commitment. The commitment from the bank or lending institution is to the effect: We will lend you X dollars per house built to these specifications, to bear interest of 4½ percent for a VA loan or 5½ percent for an FHA loan, less a discount of whatever the market calls for. In some places it is 4 points, in some places it is 11 points. It varies from place to place throughout the country. That is the deal made with the builder by the lending institution. The home buyer is not yet on the scene. The builder gets no mortgage money until the house is completed and he brings to the bank a purchaser. The purchaser signs the mortgage, and the money is paid over less the discount.

Mr. KILBURN. Does the gentleman mean there is collaboration between the bank and the builder to split $600 under the table?

Mr. MULTER. I mean to say that the bank advances whatever the face amount of the mortgage may be, less the discount.

Mr KILBURN. No; not less the discount.

Mr. MULTER. Less the discount. If there is a 6-point discount on $10,000, the mortgagor gets only $9,400. The purchaser produces the difference, except in those rare cases where the builder absorbs part or all of the discount.

Mr. KILBURN. That is simply not true. The borrower gets $10,000 if it is $10,000 mortgage. That is all there is to it. What the gentleman is confused about, I am sure, is that a great many

banks will not lend $10,000 on a home appraised at $10,000. They want the veteran to put some of his own money in.

Mr. MULTER. I am not talking about the down payment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, the problem of tight money is one which has been of great concern to every Member of this body. Perhaps nowhere has the shortage of credit had such adverse effects as in the housing field. It looks as if, in the face of a need for at least 1½ million new homes this year, less than 1 million will be built, due almost entirely to the lack of credit. What makes matters worse, this decline in new housing starts is occurring at a time when there is a continued backlog of need for new homes, and a substantial amount of unused capacity in the housing industry.

House Joint Resolution 209, by increasing the borrowing authority of FNMA by $500 million, raising its present authority from $1.1 billion to $1.6 billion, furnishes at least a stopgap interim remedy to offset some of the difficulties faced by the home buyer today. Fortunately, the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, under the expert leadership of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] will begin hearings within a few days designed to review the entire field of mortgage credit. I am confident that the Housing Subcommittee will in its deliberations take into account not only an increase in FNMA's borrowing power adequate to the needs of the economy, but to closely related matters.

First, a long look needs to be taken at FNMA's present policy of purchasing residential mortgages not at par but at substantial discounts and with substantial loading charges. The net result of this practice is that the prospective homeowner must pay a premium of up to 10 percent on his financing—enough to keep him out of the market entirely in many cases. In this connection, the testimony of Mr. David L. Krooth of the National Housing Conference before the Subcommittee on Housing of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on February 6, 1957, is illuminating:

> Since the time that FNMA has become a mixed-ownership corporation, instead of a Government-owned institution, it has been operating like a private business in its secondary operations. It does not provide any substantial support to the market, but it purchases mortgages at what it regards as their current market price. FNMA reduces its prices from time to time, if necessary, to follow the market on down. In short, FNMA's program makes limited amounts of money available—at a price. These current prices, involving large discounts, have been one of the factors which have increased housing costs, as it must be assumed that builders pass on to the consumer the additional costs of financing, just as they do with increases in cost of bricks, lumber, or other constituents of a house.
>
> Illustrative of current prices on mortgages guaranteed by the Veterans Administration and bearing 4½ percent interest are: 95 percent of par for mortgages on properties in New York and the Northeast; 94½ percent on properties in the South and Midwest; and 94 percent on properties in the West. Besides these discounts, there are fees and other costs which may be summarized as follows, on a typical sale of a GI loan to FNMA:

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| Discount, that is, pay 94½ cents on the $1 | 5½ |
| Marketing fee of | ½ of 1 |
| Investment in FNMA stock | 2 |
| Total payments to FNMA | 8 |

> In addition, there are the following additional costs of financing incurred by the builder:

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| Services of mortgage | 1½ |
| Construction financing | 1 |
| Total payments for financing | 10½ |

> While it is true that 2 percent represents the purchase of FNMA stock, this stock is currently selling at 50 cents on the dollar, so that half of the price represents an additional cost of financing. In this typical case the total costs involved in getting financing amount to 9½ percent, or over $1,200 on a $13,000 mortgage. This is a tremendous price to pay for financing.

A real task confronts the Rains subcommittee in devising methods to insure that FNMA's secondary market operations are so conducted as to provide credit in adequate amounts and at reasonable prices.

The second major field urgently requiring inquiry is the so-called special assistance functions of FNMA. Under the law, FNMA is empowered to operate solely with Government money in such specialized fields of housing as housing for urban renewal purposes, for minority groups, and for cooperatives. Under these special assistance functions, no private money is invested and no private stock is sold. Rather, FNMA operates solely with Government money. As the testimony of Mr. Bert Seidman, economist, research department, AFL–CIO, before the Senate Housing Subcommittee on February 6, 1957, makes clear, FNMA has so far utilized no special assistance funds to finance housing available to minority families. As for cooperative housing, the entire authorization has been exhausted.

House Joint Resolution 209, as an interim measure, provides a breathing space so that the constructive proposals which I know will issue from the Rains subcommittee can come before the Congress.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH].

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the statement just made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] concerning the discount being arranged for at the time the loan is granted, I have here the hearings of the committee and an insertion in the hearings by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], a member of the committee, in which an example is shown of where a loan was advanced for $10,400 to 2 individuals who wanted to build a house. They signed for $10,400. There was no discount arranged for, no lessening of the sum. The money was agreed on, and the borrowers accepted the money.

Now, we know that these discounts are being made and asked for by business institutions. The RECORD ought to show, I think, that the discount is a loss sustained by the builder and not by the veteran, but where the veteran suffers is that because of the large discount which the builder must pay he cannot afford to sell many of these mortgages and, thereby, cannot refinance himself for additional housing, because the builder will not continue to take these high discounts, knowing that on the next house he builds he will have to discount the mortgage. He just quits building, and the veterans do not get houses.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I am in support of this legislation to increase the power of the Federal National Mortgage Association to buy Government guaranteed mortgages such as GI and FHA mortgages. This would provide some relief in the current tight money situation.

I would also like to urge that the Federal National Mortgage Association take advantage of the power that it now has under the law to give the debtors or the mortgagors an incentive for accelerating the payment of their debts. Are we giving proper consideration to the development of debt reduction incentives? Thousands of GI loans contracted in the years immediately after World War II would be paid up today if it were good business for the debtor. But why should a GI mortgagor pay up a 4-percent mortgage loan when he can invest his money conservatively at 5 and 6 percent?

The Federal National Mortgage Association has accumulated in its portfolios $2½ billion in FHA and GI mortgages which are now old mortgages and which it should endeavor to liquidate. If the Federal National Mortgage Association can discount mortgages at a 6-percent rate at the time of purchase—why should it not provide a debtors discount for accelerated repayment of mortgage debt. A 5-percent discount to GI and FHA borrowers for accelerated repayment of mortgage debt would raise $50 million of increased capital for the Federal National Mortgage Association within 60 days.

Persons who now owe 4-percent money could pay up their loans and provide the Federal National Mortgage Association with added funds which could be put out at the currently prevailing rate of interest. In other words, funds raised by providing a 5-percent discount for accelerated payment of debt could immediately be used for 5- or 5½-percent mortgages and the discount paid the mortgagor could be recouped within 2 or 3 years on a new long-term loan at higher interest.

The Federal National Mortgage Association has power to provide mortgagor discounts now. They testified so in committee. It seems to me that the Association should be made to exercise every reasonable effort to clean out its port-

folio and give the borrowers an opportunity to pay up their debts at a discount.

If we provide adequate incentives for debt reduction, much of the current shortages of mortgage money would be made up by debt repayment. Four-percent mortgages would be paid up and the money could be reloaned at current rates of interest to help fill money needs in the currently expanding economy.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] such time as he may desire.

MORE FUNDS NEEDED FOR FNMA

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, in this period of tight money so generally affecting all segments of industry and private enterprise, it is clear that one of the most serious curtailments has been brought about in the production of housing for the average American family. I am pleased to support the House Banking Committee in approval of House Joint Resolution 209, which will provide authorization for the Federal National Mortgage Association to obtain more funds from the private money market in order to provide support for FHA and VA insured home loans.

I hasten to add that I agree fully with the committee that the amount in the resolution is wholly inadequate and should be regarded solely as a stopgap measure until the committee is able to hold hearings and decide upon a larger amount that will be adequate to provide the necessary secondary mortgage market assistance so badly needed at this time for FHA–VA loans. It seems to me that the critical period in the use of FNMA as a real aid to the mortgage market is now upon us. For some time the agency has steadily increased its selectivity and restrictions in its operations because of dwindling funds. It has both increased the cost of doing business on the part of sellers to FNMA and it has, at the same time, cut its prices for GI loans, or, to put it another way, increased its discounts.

One of the most startling aspects of FNMA operation is that although it is a Government agency purchasing only federally insured or guaranteed home mortgages, it can and does charge substantial discounts for these mortgages and, in effect, establishes official discount levels in many areas of the country for these loans. For example, in Arkansas, under the current FNMA purchase prices, FNMA charges a discount of 2 percent on an FHA loan with a 5-percent interest rate and a downpayment of less than 10 percent. In addition, of course, it charges another 2 percent required stock investment fee plus a marketing fee of another 1 percent. Its total effective price, therefore, insofar as builders and lenders selling mortgages are concerned is at 95 percent. Naturally, private investment sources have little reason to pay more than this figure for mortgages, with a result that the entire mortgage market in Arkansas is established by the official FNMA prices with a 5-percent discount on the new FHA 5-percent loans.

At an interest rate of 4½ percent, the official FNMA prices are even more astonishing. For an FHA or VA-guaranteed mortgage at 4½ percent with a downpayment of less than 10 percent, the total FNMA discount and fees involved is 9 percent or a net effective price in Arkansas to lenders and builders of 91 percent. For the benefit of other members, I am including in this statement a table under which the effective FNMA prices for all States can easily be figured. In using the table, you must first count the 2-percent stock investment which all sellers must make on using FNMA and then add the required marketing fee, which varies from one-half to 1 percent, but on lower-priced housing is more usually 1 percent, today. To this 3 percent you must then add the discount set forth in FNMA base purchase prices and to the base purchase prices add the number of points listed in the table appropriate for the State involved.

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION, BASE PURCHASE PRICES FOR SECONDARY MARKET OPERATIONS (EFFECTIVE JANUARY 30, 1957)

Required stock investment, 2 percent.
Required marketing fee, ½ to 1 percent.
FNMA purchase prices, see table below.

| Type of mortgage | Interest rate | 90 percent or less | Over 90 percent but not over 100 percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *Percent* | | |
| FHA sec. 203 (b), 203 (i), 222 and 213 individual mortgages | 5 | 99½ | 99 |
| FHA sec. 203 (b), 203 (i), 222, and 213 individual mortgages | 5½ | 95½ | 95 |
| VA sec. 501 mortgages | 4½ | 95½ | 95 |

| State: | *Deduct points* |
|---|---|
| Alabama | 1 |
| Arizona | 1½ |
| Arkansas | 1 |
| California | 1½ |
| Colorado | 1 |
| Connecticut | 0 |
| Delaware | ½ |
| District of Columbia | ½ |
| Florida | 1 |
| Georgia | 1 |
| Idaho | 1½ |
| Illinois | 1 |
| Indiana | 1 |
| Iowa | 1 |
| Kansas | 1½ |
| Kentucky | 1 |
| Louisiana | 1½ |
| Maine | 0 |
| Maryland | ½ |
| Massachusetts | 0 |
| Michigan | 1½ |
| Minnesota | 1 |
| Mississippi | 1 |
| Missouri | 1 |
| Montana | 1½ |
| Nebraska | 1 |
| Nevada | 1½ |
| New Hampshire | 0 |
| New Jersey | ½ |
| New Mexico | 1½ |
| New York | 0 |
| North Carolina | 1 |
| North Dakota | 1 |
| Ohio | 1 |
| Oklahoma | 1 |
| Oregon | 1 |
| Pennsylvania | ½ |
| Rhode Island | 0 |
| South Carolina | 1 |
| South Dakota | 1 |
| Tennessee | 1 |
| Texas | 1 |
| Utah | 1½ |
| Vermont | 0 |
| Virginia | 1 |
| Washington | 1 |
| West Virginia | 1½ |
| Wisconsin | 1 |
| Wyoming | 1½ |
| Puerto Rico | 1 |
| Hawaii | 1½ |
| Virgin Islands | 1½ |

NOTE.—If remaining term of an FHA section 213 individual mortgage exceeds 30 years, the price shown shall be reduced by ½ percent for each 5-year period (or part thereof) that such remaining term exceeds 30 years. Information regarding the purchase price of FHA section 207 and FHA section 213 project mortgages (management type) may be obtained from the appropriate FNMA office.

The postwar production of homes for our young families has demonstrated to the world the tremendous ingenuity and productive capacity of American private enterprise. Certainly it is my earnest hope that we are not now endangering the existence of the home building industry through current tight money policies placed in effect by the Administration. I am distressed, however, to learn that applications to the FHA in December reached their lowest monthly volume in 10 years, which of course forecasts a sharp reduction in residential construction during the coming Spring and Summer. In addition, I am advised that appraisal requests for new homes under the VA program were down in January one-third from a year ago and 60 percent below 1955. It seems clear to me that unless the Congress takes really effective action to bolster both FHA and VA financing, we are due for a real recession in residential construction. Needless to say, this will have far-reaching consequences in many directions through related industries and businesses.

It seems to me that we should pay close attention to the recommendations of the home building industry itself which is certainly the group most directly affected by this situation and perhaps in the best position to know what is needed as a remedy. I am impressed by their request for substantially more funds for FNMA than are contained in House Joint Resolution 209. I most sincerely hope that the House Banking Committee will give every consideration to the recommendation of the National Association of Home Builders that the Treasury-preferred stock in FNMA be increased by an additional $250 million and that substantial immediate assistance be given to the mortgage market through the emergency FNMA special assistance funds. This should be to the extent of $2 billion if necessary in order to assure a continued production of low-cost homes in many areas of the country where today, even under the FNMA secondary market program, the discounts being charged are too steep to permit the construction of housing for our low to middle-income families. These are matters upon which I have been given the most valuable advice from the people in my district, and I should like at this point to insert a letter from one of the most respected and ablest men in the

building and real estate field in Arkansas:

GUARANTY LOAN & REAL ESTATE CO.,
*West Memphis, Ark., February 16, 1957.*
The Honorable E. C. GATHINGS,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is a well known fact that throughout the industry the target of the builder is a 10 percent net profit. Considering the risk involved and the work and planning which goes into a project, this is indeed a modest profit.

Ninety percent of our sales are made to veterans and these loans now carry 4½ percent interest. The only market in this area and others is Federal National Mortgage Association. FNMA discount on this loan today, including the 2 percent stock purchase and a 1 percent purchase and marketing fee, amounts to a total of 9 percent. Add to this other financing costs and you can readily see that builders cannot continue. As a matter of fact, in this area, only the strong builders remain, with all of the smaller under-financed, but nevertheless capable builders having been eliminated.

There is a very simple solution to this problem which could be put into effect by Congress in one day's time. All that is necessary is to raise the VA interest rate to 5 percent, and replenish the coffers of FNMA. There may be a better long-range solution, but for immediate help, this is the simplest way. FNMA pays about 4½ points more for a 5 percent loan than for a 4½ percent loan.

Another solution to the problem would be to lower the downpayments on FHA loans to 2 percent, the same as VA loans, and at the same time replenish FNMA.

It is obvious that those life insurance companies, savings banks, etc. which have been supplying VA and FHA money are no longer interested in this type of investment. As a matter of fact, one of the larger insurance companies told me just this week that instead of purchasing new VA and FHA loans, they were trying to unload the ones they already had in their portfolio, as so many more attractive and more profitable investments now exist for them.

It is nothing new for FNMA to become the only market for VA and FHA loans. For many years, FNMA was our only outlet. FNMA is a sound proposition. It has made money for the Treasury, and stands ready to sell to any investor who should become interested in VA and FHA loans their entire portfolio at market prices.

Sincerely yours,

JACK W. RICH,
*President.*

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That (a) section 303 (d) of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In addition to the preferred stock provided for in the first sentence of this subsection, the Association is authorized and directed to issue and deliver to the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to accept preferred stock of the Association having an aggregate par value equal to $50 million."

(b) Section 303 (e) of such act is amended (1) by striking out "pursuant to subsection (d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "pursuant to the first sentence of subsection (d)", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The preferred stock of the Association delivered to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the second sentence of subsection (d) of this section shall be in exchange for a note or notes of the Association, aggregating $50 million in principal amount (and upon which the accrued interest shall have been paid through the date of delivery), held by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the authority contained in section 304 (c)."

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of interest in this proposed legislation. I think it is timely and very essential legislation, but I think there should be some legislative history made during this debate that would tend to encourage FNMA to be more liberal in its purchasing policy. What they have been doing since this hard-money policy was established in this country is buying on such a selective basis and buying only the blue-ribbon type of paper, that many builders are not able to get their paper sold to FNMA. Consequently, they went to other markets to sell their paper, and when they went to some of the insurance companies or trust companies, that was the point at which they found that they had to pay exorbitant discount rates. Yes, those rates are 10 percent and higher in some instances. I know of a mortgage closed just very recently that sold in the State of Georgia at a discount of 10 percent.

The gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH] was eminently correct when he said that the person who loses that money is the builder. He builds a $10,000 house and hopes to make a $1,000 profit. When he cannot sell his mortgage anywhere else, he resorts to a discount and winds up discounting for maybe $750 to $800 and makes a $200 profit on his venture.

So I think we should emphasize during this debate that the Federal National Mortgage Association should do the very thing it was created to do; that is, to buy these mortgages brought about through commitments issued by another Federal agency, the Federal Housing Administration. What in effect it is doing is saying, "We do not like this paper," although this mortgage was created and developed on an FHA commitment basis and had its final inspection and the property was approved and met FHA specifications. And yet in many cases, when the paper is carried to FNMA, they will not buy it. They want only blue-ribbon paper. So they are defeating the purpose for which they were created. They are not carrying out congressional intent or the policy of the Congress. I hope when we give them this additional authority and, later on in this session, when we shall likely give them further authority to bring this total purchasing power up to $1 billion, that they will liberalize their policy and help us solve this hard-money problem.

We have not said anything here today about the byproduct of this hard money policy and this business of not being able to build houses. I know of one community that had three lumber mills. All three of those mills have closed down because of this hard money policy, the inability of the contractors and builders to sell their mortgages. The result has been that the lumber market has become so critical, so sick, that the only 3 lumber mills in that one town have completely closed down and people are out of work. One of them is liquidating.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of California. Will the gentleman pursue that further and tell us what the effect has been upon the employment market, the people who filter the money in down at the lower level, the effect it has had on purchases by owners and builders?

Mr. PRESTON. Yes, indeed, it reaches down and goes into the building materials trade, it goes into the appliance business, it reaches every segment of our economy. A man desires to create a home and equip it, furnish it with the things that we are making in America, but he is denied that right, and when that happens that is bound to have an effect on the entire economy of the country. Of course, it will create unemployment. And that is one of the signs that they have been talking about around here, leading to a depression. The amazing thing to me is that we are doing so little about it.

If we are going to give FNMA this money, I certainly hope that they will live up to their responsibilities and buy this paper that was created by the Federal Housing Administration. It is another arm of the Federal Government and it should respect that paper. I think the officials of the Federal Housing Administration are competent. I think the experiences they have had in the building field have made them qualified to adequately and properly inspect and to create a good, sound mortgage. The Federal National Mortgage Association should buy every one of them that FHA has put its stamp of approval on, and not just buy the fine paper they want and turn the rest of it over to the wolves, who are gobbling it up at tremendous discounts.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman knows, too, that they discriminate against certain sections of the country. They will pay 93.5 for paper from one section, 95 from another section, and 96.5 from another one. They do not have a uniform rate.

Mr. PRESTON. They use the system of whatever the going rate is in that particular community. The gentleman is absolutely correct. That should not be. They should have a uniform policy throughout the Nation. I hope others share my opinion as to what the policy of the Federal National Mortgage Association should be.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 304 (c) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out all of the second sentence after "or (2)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "such purchase would increase the aggregate principal amount of his then outstanding holdings of such obligations under this sub-

section to an amount greater than $1,350,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JONES of Missouri, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 209) to provide interim assistance, through the Federal National Mortgage Association, in relieving the shortage of funds for home loans pending further investigation of housing credit conditions, pursuant to House Resolution 161, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, since the end of World War II the private home-building industry has produced more than 10 million new single-family homes in the United States. Even after adjusting for changes in the purchasing power of the dollar, it is significant to note that this total includes approximately 4 million new homes priced at $10,000 or less.

House Joint Resolution 209, which will increase the total borrowing authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association by $500 million, is not intended as a permanent solution to the problem of financing new-home construction. It will, however, help prevent the whole home-construction program from grinding to a near halt because of a collapse of the market for home loans.

The administration's tight-money policy has had a very serious effect upon low-cost privately produced housing. The FHA and VA home-financing programs have accounted for the great bulk of the low-cost housing built in the past decade. Since, roughly, 7 out of every 10 houses built for less than $15,000 are being produced under FHA or VA programs, the importance of maintaining FNMA secondary mortgage operations can hardly be overemphasized.

While the distinguished members of the Banking and Currency Committee consider what legislation may be necessary to help maintain a long-range high level of new-home construction, this resolution will help meet the immediate need for action to sustain current FHA and VA programs. These programs have proven of great value to all parts of our country. They have been of particular importance to those rapidly growing areas of the South and West where the demand for credit has been very heavy, but which have developed too recently to have accumulated the large pools of private capital such as exist in New York and New England.

I am grateful for this opportunity to express my support for this resolution.

## GHANA, MARCH 6, 1957

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most far-reaching events of our time is taking place on March 6 at midnight—not here in the Western Hemisphere, but across the Atlantic in tropic Africa, where the great stream of evolution is moving with a new impetus. At that moment the British colony we have known as the Gold Coast will become the free land of Ghana, a new member of the commonwealth of nations.

It is a deep honor to have been asked by the President to be a member of the official party accompanying the Vice President and Mrs. Nixon to the celebration. I shall go out to this history-making occasion as your representative, carrying our profound good wishes and congratulations to the Prime Minister and the people of Ghana.

The Gold Coast is the first of the African colonies to receive autonomy. All eyes are turned toward Accra. What takes place there and throughout the pulsing hinterland to the north will have a far more widespread influence upon the future than can be readily comprehended at this moment. Emotion rides high among the people who are taking this great step into responsibility. Why should it not?

It is so very long since the great cultures of ancient Africa were swept into oblivion. Who is there that can tell of their magnificence, or sing of their glory? But the flow of the great tides of evolution is turning. Africa begins a new march into greater and greater influence, greater and greater responsibility.

Short as my 1955 visit to the Gold Coast was, it gave me a vivid sense of the surging urge to be a free nation that has become of first importance to all who dwell there. My heart has gone out to them, and I pray the Infinite Father of all mankind to send His blessings upon them, giving them a clearer vision of the responsibilities that they are assuming, granting them wisdom and understanding to carry forward with justice and mercy the difficult tasks that lie ahead.

No people understand this passionate longing for freedom more truly than we who are Americans. Certainly no government and no people stand more ready than we to serve the new state in whatever fashion will be most useful.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the bill, H. R. 4897.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the special order I have for today and that at the conclusion of the legislative business on tomorrow and the disposition of other matters on the Speaker's desk I may address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

## HOUSING ALLOWANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES, COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, AND PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 156) providing for the consideration of H. R. 1056, a bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents, to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1056) to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents, to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 156 makes in order the consideration of H. R.

1056, a bill to permit members of the uniformed services, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service, with dependants, to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis with-with loss of basic allowance for quarters.

The resolution provides for an open rule, 1 hour of general debate, and waiving of points of order.

A bill similar to H. R. 1056 passed the House in the 84th Congress and was passed amended by the Senate. No conference was held and the legislation died.

The basic purposes of H. R. 1056 are first, to eliminate the present necessity of military personnel surrendering their housing allowance while being required, due to the family housing shortage, to occupy substandard quarters, and second, to provide an impetus for the improvement or disposal of substandard housing. Rental for substandard units should be, in the opinion of the committee, established on the basis of rentals for similar units in the area.

The Armed Forces Committee has reported the legislation favorably with two major amendments: one would reduce from 4 to 2 years the period in which to improve or eliminate inadequate quarters. The other amendment strikes out language which would repeal the act of July 2, 1945. The committee felt repeal of this act should be delayed until the housing situation of the uniformed services has become more fully developed.

The annual cost to the Government is estimated at approximately $15 million, a figure which will be reduced as present housing programs make available adequate public quarters and eliminate substandard quarters.

I urge the adoption of House Resolution 156 so that the House may proceed to the consideration of this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman explain why the rule provides for waiving points of order?

Mr. BOLLING. My understanding is that in a sense there is a technical violation of the Ramseyer rule, in that the report fails to comply with the Ramseyer rule. There is nothing beyond that.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important at this time to state that the Committee on Armed Services desires to offer an amendment at the proper time, and for the benefit of the House I want to state that an amendment will be offered creating a new section 6, which will read as follows:

SEC. 6. This act shall have no application to any housing financed with mortgages insured under the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act as in effect prior to the enactment of the housing amendments of 1955.

In other words, we are trying to say that this bill will not be used to declare any Wherry houses substandard. I want the House to know that Wherry houses, as acquired, will not be considered as substandard houses. At the proper time that amendment will be offered.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to this bill. It is for a limited period of time. It is to meet a specific need. It is not fair to require members of the Armed Forces to lose their basic allowance because of occupancy in these substandard houses. It is important that this housing be destroyed at the earliest possible time. The bill provides that. Of course the intent is that adequate housing later will be furnished.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1056) to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents, to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1056, with Mr. PRESTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] introduced this measure, which I feel is a sound measure. Actually the bill is made necessary because of a ruling by the Comptroller General. It is a bill which we should pass in fairness to all members of our Armed Forces throughout the country.

There is quite a large number of our military people involved, some 36,000 of them.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] is extremely well informed on the subject, Mr. Chairman, and will explain the bill in detail to the House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the Armed Services Committee has unanimously approved H. R. 1056, which authorized the occupancy of substandard public quarters without loss of housing allowance.

Service personnel are provided, where available, two types of Government housing: First, public quarters, which is housing for which the serviceman relinquishes his allowance for quarters; second, rental housing, which the serviceman occupies on a rental basis while at the same time he is entitled to receive his quarters allowance.

A gross inequity exists. We find today a man and his family living in a converted barracks which, were it not for the extreme military family housing shortage, should not be lived in at all. He surrenders his whole housing allowance for these quarters. Across the street or next door to him is a man living in fine public quarters which were constructed with appropriated funds—or, in the very near future, under the Capehart program—and he is paying exactly the same rent. We even find two men and their families living across the street from each other, both in quonset huts. One of the quonset huts was originally constructed as a warehouse and later converted to family quarters. This man pays the fair market rental—perhaps $25 to $40. On the other side of the street, the man and his family are in an identical quonset hut which was erected as a barracks with housing funds and later converted to family housing. This man surrenders his whole housing allowance which normally is $96.90. This, it is submitted, is not just. Solely because of the difference in statutory foundations for public quarters and rental housing a member occupying substandard quarters surrenders his rental allowance the same as a member who occupies very fine Government housing.

Failure to find a solution expensively reduces reenlistments. This inequity is very destructive to morale. The serviceman who surrenders the same amount for substandard housing as his neighbor surrenders for very fine housing is frustrated by the inability of his branch of the armed services and the Government to find a solution to this gross inequity. It is a major and expensive deterrent to reenlistment. The impact on the families is severe and it will continue to be so until Government housing is recognized for what it really is: either public quarters or temporary, low-cost rental housing.

H. R. 1056 will solve this problem by, first, authorizing the service Secretaries to determine which housing is up to standard and which is substandard; second, authorizing occupancy of substandard housing on a rental basis regardless of the statutory origin of that housing; and, third, requiring that all the substandard housing be up to standard or disposed of promptly.

You will recall that a similar bill passed the House last year. The liberality of the Senate version was at variance with the House version and no conference was held. The bill, therefore, failed of enactment. It is anticipated that the Department of Defense will support the House version in the Senate and that the probabilities are good this year that the law can be enacted.

The Armed Services Committee has held two full hearings on this measure and strongly recommends its favorable consideration. Our committee amended the original bill in substantial respects.

These amendments are designed to shorten the time that the departments will have to improve or get rid of their substandard housing which includes quonset huts, converted barracks, and other such barely livable quarters. We cut the 4 year period to 2 years.

The committee also amended the bill so as to remove very broad discretionary authorities which the bill gave to the Secretaries of the various departments. As the bill was introduced, the Secretaries could make broad exceptions to the requirement that the housing be improved or be disposed of. The committee felt that leaving this discretionary authority in the Secretaries might well tend to perpetuate a situation which should be removed as soon as possible.

I hope I have made it clear that this whole unjust situation is based on an artificial distinction between various types of housing occupied by our military. The bill will do two major things; first, it will remove an inequity and second, it will aid in the improvement or demolition of these poor quarters. There are approximately 36,000 family units which would be affected by this bill, and this means 36,000 individual morale problems which actually do not need to exist.

We are by this legislation providing a sound solution to a serious morale problem and removing inequities in the field of public quarters. I hope that this needed legislation may be promptly passed in this session.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman at this point discuss the committee amendment which was recently referred to by me on behalf of the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I will be very happy to do so.

After reporting out this bill, the committee, upon further thought, decided that it would be wise to indicate clearly in this measure that it did not and should not apply to the so-called Wherry housing.

For the most part, Wherry housing is not substandard housing, even though it is somewhat smaller than the other housing which is available to the military.

Also, I feel that the owners of Wherry housing projects throughout the country could suffer if the bill were used to declare any of this housing inadequate or substandard. It is my hope that just as many of the Wherry units as is possible can be acquired—and acquired as quickly as it can be done. If this type housing is declared by a military Secretary to be substandard, then the argument could be used by those opposed to the acquisition of Wherry housing that we should not acquire them because they are substandard.

Now we cannot have a situation like this. Every unit of Wherry housing that can be acquired should be acquired—and I do not want anything to stand in the way of their being acquired. They are expensive—they are costing the United States money every day—and it is the better part of a poor bargain to acquire them and start saving money.

I feel, therefore, that we can help the situation greatly by placing this amendment in the bill.

Mr. VINSON. This amendment the committee desires to submit makes it crystal clear that it does not apply to Wherry housing?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. That is correct. It has no application whatsoever to Wherry housing.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very meritorious bill, one that corrects an inequity that has been found to exist in the establishments of the Defense Department throughout the country and, as I understand it, one that has existed for some time. It happens to be one of those injustices or inequities that arise as a result of change of condition over a period of years and the real need for correction is not brought to the attention of anyone at the proper time.

I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Florida, a member of our committee [Mr. BENNETT] for the work he has done in presenting this to the subcommittee headed by our eminent chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

It strikes me that this will correct a situation that hits at career men in the service, such as noncommissioned officers of the Army and Air Force and the petty officers in the Navy who are living with their families on a base or an establishment of the Defense Department. They are the type of men who because of their patriotism and their loyalty to the service will live in inadequate quarters without complaining. They take it as the saying is "on the chin" and go ahead because their whole training is such that they do not complain. They are the backbone of the service. It is unfair to force them and their families to continue to live in substandard housing when we know about it. We now know about it. This bill, with the much-needed amendment which will be later offered, will correct this situation.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. I think it should be made crystal clear that the need for this is brought about by a ruling of the Comptroller General. We authorized in the committee $96.90 in housing allowance for the first three grades. Now they surrender this whole amount because of an artificial situation in the law. The Comptroller General said that they must do this. So, therefore, the three upper enlisted grades cause the great part of our moral problem.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. And they are the grades that most need it?

Mr. DURHAM. Yes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. They are the backbone of the service?

Mr. DURHAM. They are the backbone of the service; yes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, let me describe one or two of the houses we are talking about.

At Guantanamo Bay, the big naval base in Cuba, one of the stalwarts of our Navy, a chief petty officer, with 28 years' service, is living in a house which has 600 square feet. A good-sized living room in a modern home is, by itself, 400 square feet.

This man had two children. Both of them were in a bedroom which measured 7½ feet by 5½ feet. The man and his wife occupied another bedroom of the same size. The interior walls of these bedrooms did not even extend to the ceiling. There was about a foot and a half space between the ceiling and the top of the wall.

The kitchen—I could best describe as an afterthought since there was simply a small three-burner stove set in a corner of the living room.

With the dignity that is so often found in the devoted enlisted man, he showed us his house. It was as neat as a pin, clean, and attractively decorated by the petty officer's wife. But it had 600 square feet in the whole house.

That man is paying $96.90 for this house. It has a fair rental of perhaps $25 or $30 at most.

It keeps his family together, and with him, and that is why he is living in it.

What kind of treatment is this to a man with 28 years' service in our military and a man who represents the very backbone of the United States Navy?

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LANKFORD].

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, the sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] has explained it very, very adequately. I cannot believe that any Member would raise any serious objection to this legislation.

I would like to draw the particular attention of the House to the amendments which the Armed Services Committee made to the bill.

As the bill was introduced, the Secretary of a military department could, in effect, perpetuate these inadequate houses by excepting them from the requirement that they be improved or destroyed within a reasonable time—the military wanted 4 years, but we gave them 2.

The Secretaries also could except houses in areas where there was deemed to be a housing shortage. The committee felt that this could well apply to any military installation and so long as Congress permits these houses to continue in existence, they will be occupied, and occupied to the detriment of our military people.

No one can live under circumstances such as I have seen and many of you have seen and be, at the same time, the kind of military individual we expect in our Armed Forces. Dignity is not a natural result of slum living. We might find a very close connection between inadequate homes and inadequate military people.

So, I urge on all Members of the House to give this bill their full support—36,000 military families will give you their immediate thanks and the whole Military Establishment will be made aware again of the great interest which their Congress has in their welfare.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr Chairman, I take this time just to keep the RECORD straight. May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee if this bill would result in the spending of about $40,251,000? Is that correct?

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And it is estimated that approximately $25 million would be returned over a period of time to the Government from rentals of this property, is that correct?

Mr. DURHAM. Correct.

Mr. GROSS. Leaving a projected unbudgeted expense of $15 million, is that correct?

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent of the House I am pleased to have reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a telegram I sent today to the Honorable John Foster Dulles, United States Secretary of State, relating to the controversy between Israel and Egypt and the proposed imposition of sanctions on Israel by the United Nations. Certainly the United States of America should never compromise principle for expediency even though the expediency might involve oil riches beyond the comprehension of man.

Later I am going to ask unanimous consent to have reproduced in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the excellent poem entitled "Faith and Freedom," by Rose S. Goldman, wife of the former distinguished president of B'nai B'rith.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, to me the most important part of this resolution is the fact that within a reasonable time, a period of 2 years, we hope to completely eliminate substandard housing for our military forces. The subcommittee which handled this legislation and the full committee which gave it unanimous approval was insistent that our Military Establishment, within a period of 2 years, do a very thorough job in the program of eliminating this substandard housing.

WHY 1945 ACT NOT REPEALED

We did not repeal the act of July 2, 1945, for a very good reason—it does not have anything to do with this bill whatsoever.

That law permits our military people to occupy on a rental basis certain houses which are under the control of the military.

Many of these houses are quite acceptable—many of them are farm houses, for example, acquired along with property needed to expand a military installation.

But the most important thing is that the people living in these houses—which are not public quarters—do so on a wholly voluntary basis. That law, I think, should be repealed, but until we have sufficient housing to take care of our people, and I hope that will be in about 2 years, we should leave this law on the books.

I want to draw your attention to page 3 of the committee report and let me quote from that:

As the family-housing programs of the services progress, it will most probably be desirable to repeal the act of July 2, 1945. Upon repeal of the act, these quarters which are now rented will become public quarters and personnel occupying them will receive no quarters allowance. The committee considers the renting of housing under the July 2, 1945, act as a matter which should be reexamined when the housing situation of the uniformed services has had sufficient time for reasonably full development. It is expected that this development will have been achieved at approximately the date of termination of authority under this bill; that is, July 1, 1959.

That is the time to repeal the 1945 act.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents may occupy on a rental basis, without loss of basic allowance for quarters, inadequate quarters under the jurisdiction of any of the uniformed services, notwithstanding that such quarters may have been constructed or converted for assignment as public quarters.

SEC. 2. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force for the respective military departments, the Secretary of the Treasury for the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is operating as a service in the Treasury Department, the Secretary of Commerce for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the Public Health Service (hereafter referred to as the "Secretaries"), are each authorized, subject to standards established pursuant to section 5 hereof, to designate as rental housing such housing as he may determine to be inadequate as public quarters.

SEC. 3. The Secretaries are each further authorized, subject to standards established pursuant to section 5 hereof, to lease inadequate housing to personnel of any of the mentioned services for occupancy by them and their dependents. The housing facilities leased, as herein provided, shall not be required to have been constructed with funds derived from appropriations specifically made for the purpose of the construction of rental housing for personnel of the services mentioned.

SEC. 4. (a) All housing units determined pursuant to section 2 of this act to be inadequate shall, within 4 years of such determination, either be altered or improved so as to qualify as public quarters, or be demolished or otherwise disposed of: *Provided*, That there may be excepted from the requirements of this section such housing as the respective Secretary shall determine, subject to the standards established pursuant to section 5 hereof, to be urgently needed because there is a shortage of housing located within a reasonable proximity and available at suitable rentals, but such exceptions shall be reviewed and redetermined at least annually.

(b) For such time as the Secretary concerned shall determine, there may be excepted from the requirements of subsection (a) of this section, housing which is inadequate for reasons of size alone under such criteria as the said Secretary shall prescribe pursuant to standards authorized by section 5 of this act.

SEC. 5. The provision of this act shall be administered under regulations approved by the President.

SEC. 6. The Act of July 2, 1945 (ch. 227, 59 Stat. 316), is hereby repealed effective as of 1 year following the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. DURHAM (during the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "and their" and insert in lieu thereof "with."

Page 2, line 23, strike out all of section 4 and insert:

"SEC. 4. All housing units determined pursuant to section 2 of this act to be inadequate shall, prior to July 1, 1959, either be altered or improved so as to qualify as public quarters, or be demolished or otherwise disposed of."

Page 3, line 22, strike out all of section 6.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. BENNETT of Florida: Page 3, following line 19, add a new section 5, as follows:

"SEC. 5. This act shall have no application to any housing financed with mortgages insured under the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act as in effect prior to the enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1955."

Page 3, line 20, strike out the words "SEC. 5." and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 6."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask a question of the committee and that is if they will ask the Department of the Army to allow enough money in order that posts such as Fort Devens may have basements in their houses. At the present time many of the houses are built without basements. In some of the southern houses on the posts they have basements. I understand, at least I was told, the reason they have basements in the houses in the South is because the cost of building them is less. I wish more money could be spent on the houses at Fort Devens and other such posts in the North so that those houses could all have basements.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. VINSON. I will say that it will be a pleasure to communicate the views of the distinguished lady from Massachusetts to the Department, on this matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the distinguished chairman for

that and for many, many things he has done.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRESTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1056) to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents, to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters, pursuant to House Resolution 156, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended to read: "A bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, with dependents, to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SUBSTANDARD HOUSING BILL

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 1056 will permit our military—in very large part, our enlisted personnel—to occupy inadequate and substandard public quarters on a rental basis. It will probably come as a surprise to many of you that a sergeant today is paying $96.90 to live in half of a quonset hut. But this, unhappily, is the situation.

A law on the subject is highly artificial but nonetheless, has the effect of forcing our military people to surrender their whole housing allowance, whatever it may be, in order to live in a drafty, hardly habitable, converted barracks so that he can keep his family with him.

There are 36,000 of these families which today are living in housing such as I have described and who must be doing it on the basis of great devotion to the military services. Certainly their willingness to live this way cannot be because they think their housing is what they should have.

I have seen these quarters and most of the Members now on the floor have seen them and wondered—as I have wondered—why don't we provide decent housing and get rid of these shacks. We are providing decent housing and the program is well under way. This bill will do two things toward improving the whole housing situation. First, it will remove injustice and inequity until the time when we will have sufficient proper housing for our military people and second, it will sound the death knell on the squalid living—and I mean squalid—which too many of our soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen must suffer today.

This legislation is long overdue and the justice and fairness of what it will do commends the bill to all who are interested in the well-being of our enlisted people.

## CRUDE OIL POLITICS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the progress of the congressional investigation on oil prices in the Middle East, as well as the tactics of domestic oil companies in raising their crude-oil prices, has produced such a confused picture that I believe the attached editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of Wednesday, February 20, 1957, will be of value to my colleagues and other interested persons.

There begins to emerge a clearer and clearer impression that a thorough-going review of the public interest in petroleum products is necessary in order to protect a public which is almost as dependent upon petroleum products as it is on transportation or any other publicly regulated commodities.

CRUDE OIL POLITICS

The congressional investigations of the muddle over the oil "crisis" have opened a tantalizing crack of light into a darkened room. It is good news, of course, that Europe is apparently receiving most of its oil needs while Near East supplies are temporarily blocked. But this positive achievement is clouded by a still-mysterious crude-oil price increase, a painful display of Government confusion over whether or not a real crisis existed, and a suggestion of ugly tactics among warring oilmen.

It now seems clear that much of the oil-lift controversy can best be read in terms of a continuing struggle between domestic and international oil companies. The domestics have long agitated for a reduction of oil imports, which now total about 1.5 million barrels a day. Oil from Venezuela and the Near East costs far less to produce than American oil and its sale represents a major source of profit to a handful of giant oil companies.

Defense Mobilizer Arthur Flemming has testified that on the eve of the Suez crisis he was ready to certify to the President that oil imports had reached a level endangering national security. Then came the closure of the Suez Canal. Hearings on oil imports were canceled. The emergency oil lift, run by the big international firms, was put into effect.

It had been thought that the emergency would require diversion to Europe of oil normally imported to this country. But it develops that there has been no appreciable slackening of imports to east coast refineries. This result was achieved, apparently, by juggling tanker routes so that a surprising 40 percent of Europe's overseas oil has been shipped from the Persian Gulf around Africa—twice the distance from Europe to the Gulf of Mexico. In other words, the import pattern apparently has been maintained throughout the emergency. Officials now say that it will be difficult to alter the market pattern once the emergency is over.

In the midst of the emergency, news of a "critical" crude oil shortage emanated from London and was subsequently echoed by the American Government on January 27. At best, this news was an honest blunder and at worst a deliberate hoax. One immediate effect was to discredit domestic producers. This newspaper, along with others, chided Texas regulatory officials for unreasonably restraining production in face of a "crisis." Whatever the cause of the error, the resulting uproar could not have displeased the international companies who are locked in battle with domestic producers.

It is not our intention to endorse the protectionist position of the domestic oilmen or to exonerate their behavior. Many domestic companies, it is clear, hoped that the Suez crisis would provide a strategic opening for a long-sought crude oil price increase. When Humble Oil (a subsidiary of Standard Oil of New Jersey) initiated a 12 percent increase, the whoops for joy could be heard all over Texas. The internationalists, too, profit from the increase; Standard of New Jersey, it appears, had estimated beforehand that an increase would raise yearly net profits by at least $100 million. Yet considering the unhappy plight of this country's European allies, the timing of the increase could not have been more unfortunate.

Finally, the ambiguous role of the Government must be assessed. It may well be that administration officials were honestly persuaded that the effects of the closing of the Suez Canal required that the oil-lift program be turned over to the internationals and that key antitrust restraints be dropped. It may also be that the Government was either confused or humbugged by bogus figures showing a "crisis," and that it therefore concluded that neutrality on the price question was necessary. But the results have been far from happy. If little else, the oil fiasco dramatizes the danger of handing over the steering wheel to members of an enormously powerful industry which seemingly can control neither its internal feuds nor its appetite.

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AUDITORIUM COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 128, 84th Congress, as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission on the part of the House: Mr. Harris, of Arkansas; Mr. Morrison, of Louisiana; Mr. Thompson, of New Jersey; Mr. Kearns, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Broyhill, of Virginia; Mr. Barnee Breeskin, of Washington, D. C.; and Mr. Robert Dowling, of New York, N. Y.

## NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 523, 78th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the National Memorial Stadium Commission the following members on the part

of the House: Mr. TEAGUE, of Texas; Mr. LANKFORD, of Maryland; Mr. KEARNS, of Pennsylvania.

## HUNGARIAN REFUGEE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, during the past weeks of this 85th Congress there has been considerable discussion on the pros and cons of the Hungarian refugee program. I think it is very important that we pause and examine the effectiveness of this program and its impact upon American life.

Up to the present time, 26,604 Hungarian refugees have entered the United States. This number includes approximately 6,300 who received permanent immigration visas and the balance of approximately 20,000 who entered this Nation as "parolees." Of this number, over 24,000 have been processed through Camp Kilmer and have been adequately sponsored and absorbed by our growing American economy. For the greater part, this wave of Hungarian immigration has given every indication of becoming a very useful and integrated part of our American life. These refugees have found homes, jobs, and for the greater part, a very happy life in America. Of the total number of Hungarian refugees who were processed at Camp Kilmer only 2,490 remain. Most of these were recent entries under the program. The astounding fact in the record is that less than 10 percent of the total program remain to be adjusted in American life, and this entire project nears completion within a period of approximately 90 days.

No undertaking of our Government can boast of a greater degree of success. During the hour of critical need the American people have renewed their place in the esteem of the peoples of the world for their generosity and hospitality to the oppressed. At the same time America proved itself a good neighbor to help Austria in an hour of critical need when refugees were overflowing the capacities of that little nation.

In this way America has done more than millions upon millions of foreign aid could do, and at the same time America is the gainer rather than the loser for its hospitality. The first wave of immigration in recent years was to provide a haven for the hordes who were oppressed under the dictatorship of Adolf Hitler; the second wave of immigration occurred to provide a haven for those who were oppressed by the dictatorship of Josef Stalin. This third wave was to provide a haven for the oppressed of present day Russian communism. This third wave of immigrants will prove to be just as stable, just as devoted to the American concepts of democracy and liberty as those who came in the first two waves.

The processing of Hungarian refugees at Camp Kilmer began with considerable turmoil and confusion. Twenty-two voluntary agencies endeavored to participate in the work. It is to the credit of Leo C. Beebe, Vice Chairman of the Program and Director of Activities at Camp Kilmer, that this operation developed a professional technique. It is to the credit of Army Gen. Sidney Whooten that the housekeeping operation of Camp Kilmer was exemplary and beyond reproach, and the Nation owes a debt of eternal gratitude to Mr. Tracy Voorhees, Chairman of the Hungarian Refugee Program, whose devotion to duty and whose patience with people and organizations is without peer.

## A SALUTE TO THE FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this means of saluting the Future Farmers of America.

No national student organization deserves higher praise than the Future Farmers of America. Since its inception in 1928, this organization has become an integral part of the program of vocational education in agriculture in the public schools throughout our Nation, and the very foundation upon which it is built insures good citizenship and patriotism to the members thereof. The outcome of the growth of the "Future Farmer" idea resulted in the granting of a Federal Charter to the Future Farmers of America organization through passage of Public Law 740 on August 30, 1950, during the 81st Congress of the United States.

As stated in the FFA creed, I believe in the future of farming, with a faith born not of words but of deeds—achievements won by the present and past generations of farmers; in the promise of better days through better ways, even as the better things we now enjoy have come up to us from the struggles of former years.

And not only do I believe in the future of farming, but I am convinced that a decline in agriculture will threaten the lasting prosperity of all our people. Unless the American farmer and agriculture generally receive an equitable share of the national income it is impossible to have a sound prosperity. It is an indisputable fact that one-third of our entire population is dependent upon the American farmer. Yet today agriculture is undergoing a cost price squeeze while other segments of our population are prospering. Thus as the Future Farmers of America confirm their faith in the future of farming it must be not with words but with deeds.

Each year this Nation must have new farmers to replace those who die, retire, or otherwise leave the farms. They must be men of experience and training in order to be sure of attaining success, and such success is most easily attained by those who have begun farming at an early age. The Future Farmers of America and Vocational Agriculture constitute, I believe, the most effective program for training boys to become established in the farming occupations of their choice. By reason of such training they will be enabled to go forward with purposes firmer and more clear.

Any worthwhile endeavor should not only be pleasant, but challenging. Certainly those of you who take up farming as a vocation will find pleasure in your achievements, and I am sure that any obstacles you encounter will only prove a challenge toward the furtherance of your goals. I am definitely pleased at the progress made by the Future Farmers of America, not only throughout the United States, but particularly in the Second Congressional District of Kentucky. Ours is primarily an agricultural district, and your contributions for the advancement of agriculture cannot be overestimated. I have faith that through your efforts a democratic balance will be maintained in this country, thereby safeguarding the interest, rights, and opportunities of all citizens.

While saluting the Future Farmers of today, I also commend you, and join in paying tribute to all the members of your fine organization.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. NEAL (at the request of Mr. HARRIS) for 3 days, on account of official committee business.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. HARRIS), for 3 days, on account of official committee business.

Mr. FRIEDEL (at the request of Mr. FALLON), on account of illness.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. TELLER, for 30 minutes, on Thursday, February 21.

Mr. VANIK, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. BENTLEY, for 1 hour, on March 15 or, if the House is not in session on that day, on the first legislative day thereafter.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. RIVERS, his appraisal of the best-seller book, The FBI Story, by Don Whitehead.

Mr. PELLY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BERRY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POFF.

Mr. SAYLOR (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS, to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include a letter and table.

Mr. LONG.

Mr. CARNAHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KNUTSON.

Mr. HOLLAND and to include a resolution.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANFIELD to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD prior to the vote on the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill and to include a letter recently received by him from the Deputy Postmaster General.

Mr. SANTANGELO to include his own remarks together with the remarks of Mr. FINO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALBERT (at the request of Mr. BOLLING) and to include a speech.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include a telegram from her to the Secretary of State protesting against sanctions against the little State of Israel.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 21, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

513. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report stating that an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Juniper division, Wapinitia project, Oregon, has been completed as a part of the investigations required in the formulation of a definite plan for project development, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

514. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the exchange stabilization fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, approved January 30, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

515. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 97); to the Committee on Government Operations.

516. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 16, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on Licking River at and in the vicinity of Covington and Newport, Ky., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 24, 1953; to the Committee on Public Works.

517. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 28, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Holden Beach and Lockwoods Folly Inlet, N. C., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

518. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 15, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on Manhasset Bay, N. Y., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted March 25, 1938, and December 30, 1938; to the Committee on Public Works.

519. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 16, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a letter report on Big Sur River (Sur River) and tributaries, Monterey County, Calif., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

520. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 16, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on the Arkansas River, Hutchinson, Kans., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted January 21, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 149. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 143). Referred to House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 3028. A bill to provide for the relief of certain female members of the Air Force, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. R. 5097. A bill to amend section 334 (e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to increased allotments for durum wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 5098. A bill to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians for certain ceded lands embraced within and otherwise required in connection with the Huntley reclamation project, Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5099. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit amounts paid for the institutional care of a disabled person to be deducted as medical expense; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H. R. 5100. A bill to provide additional office space in home districts of Congressmen, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. AVERY:

H. R. 5101. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the manufacturers excise tax certain automobiles furnished without charge to schools for use in driver-training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 5102. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 5103. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 5104. A bill to preserve Gloria Dei (Old Swedes') Church National Historic Site by authorizing the acquisition of abutting properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 5105. A bill to provide for modification of the outlet works of Shadehill Dam, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5106. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 5107, A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act to enable producers of Irish potatoes and other nonbasic agricultural commodities to participate in the acreage reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 5108. A bill to authorize the National Potato Grade Labeling Act, which provides quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 5109. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 5110. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 5111. A bill to designate the portion of the United States Highway No. 41 between Kentland, Ind., and Nashville, Tenn., a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5112. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit the discrimination in employment against individuals on account of their age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 5113. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to permit junior colleges to participate therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 5114. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the opening of the Brooklyn Bridge; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 5115. A bill to authorize funds for the improvement by the Secretary of Commerce of the Pentagon road network and that portion of the Henry G. Shirley Memorial Highway in Arlington County, Va., and to provide for the transfer of such highways to the Commonwealth of Virginia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. R. 5116. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to provide that an employee who has received compensation for disability for an aggregate period of 20 years shall thereafter be paid compensation for disability for the remainder of his life; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 5117. A bill to amend section 5051 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to aid small business and discourage continued concentration in the brewing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 5118. A bill to raise the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5119. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of employers who are engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce, to eliminate certain exemptions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5120. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5121. A bill to reduce the maximum workweek under the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 5122. A bill to admit free of duty a beta-ray spectrometer to be imported for use at Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 5123. A bill to revise the definition of contract carrier by motor vehicle as set forth in section 203 (a) (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5124. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of power or train brakes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5125. A bill to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H. R. 5126. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 5127. A bill to authorize the sale for feeding purposes of limited quantities of wheat of less desirable milling quality; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 5128. A bill to further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 5129. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide increased payments, eliminate certain inequities and restrictions, and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5130. A bill to provide for the return to the athletic and recreation fund of Fort MacArthur, Calif., of certain proceeds of the show, Hey Rookie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KITCHIN:

H. R. 5131. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act to increase its benefits in the case of tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 5132. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 5133. A bill to authorize the National Potato Grade Labeling Act, which provides quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 5134. A bill to assist States in construction, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of buildings of State or Territorial soldiers' homes by providing grants to subsidize in part the capital outlay cost; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 5135. A bill to amend sections 1231, 272 and 631 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to iron ore royalties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 5136. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to provide mail delivery service to rural patrons by the most efficient and economical means possible, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 5137. A bill to authorize the National Potato Grade Labeling Act, which provides quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 5138. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 5139. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 5140. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOORE:

H. R. 5141. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 5142. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to provide for approval of State plans for aid to the blind without regard to the existence in any State of other programs of assistance to blind persons financed entirely by the State, and to provide for approval of any State plan for aid to the blind even though such plan makes provision for payment of a fixed monthly money payment to eligible blind persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIMTZ:

H. R. 5143. A bill to increase the equipment maintenance allowance payable to rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 5144. A bill to limit the acquisition and use by civilian agencies of the Federal Government of equipment for reproducing documents, drawings, papers, and so forth, on sensitized materials; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 5145. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5146. A bill to amend section 9 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act to liberalize the annuity computation formula for employees in the lower average salary groups; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5147. A bill to increase the annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 5148. A bill to repeal the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954, to require certain distribution and approval of new public building projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 5149. A bill to provide that whenever public lands have been heretofore granted to a State for the purpose of erecting certain public buildings at the capital of such State, such purpose shall be deemed to include construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, and other permanent improvements of such public buildings; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. R. 5150. A bill to establish recognition and observance by Post Office Department of all State holidays; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 5151. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for the inclusion of certain periods of service which were not covered by a Federal appointment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 5152. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 5153. A bill relating to the computation of annual income for the purpose of payment of pension for non-service-connected disability or death in certain cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 5154. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 5155. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5156. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POFF:

H. J. Res. 245. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering the Congress to authorize the President to approve and disapprove separate items or provisions in appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Con. Res. 120. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to a satisfactory accounting of 450 American prisoners of war who were not accounted for by the Communists; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. Con. Res. 121. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. Con. Res. 122. Concurrent resolution relative to inviting Spain to become a member of NATO; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. Res. 172. Resolution to amend the rules of the House to limit appropriations for fiscal year 1958; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 173. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the continued illegal imprisonment of 10 Americans by the Chinese Communists; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY: House Concurrent Resolution No. 1, adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, 35th session, memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a joint congressional committee to investigate the cost of living and marketing margins as it pertains to agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FORAND: Memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress to reduce the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 5157. A bill for the relief of Eliseva Kaufman (Saltz); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5158. A bill for the relief of Stefano Salvo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 5159. A bill for the relief of Janis Vitins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 5160. A bill for the relief of Margarete Herzog; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H. R. 5161. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Madeleine A. Work; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 5162. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shang-Ying Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 5163. A bill for the relief of Forest H. Byroade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 5164. A bill for the relief of Alicia Ruiz de Avalos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 5165. A bill for the relief of Boleslaw Zagata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 5166. A bill for the relief of Michael George Petrakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 5167. A bill for the relief of Hua-Tung Lee (Gordon Lee) and his wife, Chi-Wan Mow Lee (Jane Lee); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5168. A bill for the relief of William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, and Mrs. Gladys Everingham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 5169. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Farley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5170. A bill for the relief of the estate of Edward J. Vaerten; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5171. A bill for the relief of Ida Horenstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5172. A bill for the relief of Edith Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENNON:

H. R. 5173. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frieda Clausen Crews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 5174. A bill for the relief of Daniel Wilging; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 5175. A bill for the relief of Maria Talloura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5176. A bill for the relief of Lorenza Castro-Carmona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 5177. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Azniv Y. Hasserdjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 4178. A bill for the relief of Herbert Maza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5179. A bill for the relief of Anna L. Braman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 5180. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur J. Herbst; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 5181. A bill for the relief of Cherine Khalil Matta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROUTY:

H. R. 5182. A bill for the relief of Yvonne Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 5183. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the Padbloc Co., Inc., and Harry G. Lankford, of Wichita, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5184. A bill for the relief of Ralph Miranda and his wife, Maria Miranda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 5185. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe and Teresa Belluardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 5186. A bill for the relief of Dorothy E. Green and Thelma L. Alley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5187. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Antonietta Giorgio and her children, Antonio Giorgio and Menotti Giorgio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5188. A bill for the relief of Lieselotte Elisabeth Parsick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 174. Resolution providing for sending the bill H. R. 2648 and accompanying papers to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

92. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by the department executive committee of the Department of Wisconsin, the American Legion, on January 26, 1957, vigorously protesting the enactment of any part of H. R. 64 which would affect the pensions or other benefits of veterans residing at the Grand Army Home at King, Wis., or in any other State soldiers' home; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

93. By Mr. TAYLOR: Petition of the Beekmantown, N. Y., Woman's Christian Temperance Union, urging Congress to get alcoholic-beverage advertising off the air and out of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

94. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the executive director, Hawaiian Government Employees' Association, Honolulu, T. H., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to increasing the pay of legislators of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, February 20, 1957*

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, January 22 was the anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a short statement commemorating this important day in honor of a brave and gallant people.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

In recent months the world has witnessed in Hungary the outward manifestations of man's undying will to be free. In the klieg lights of world attention we have been shocked by the savage wrath of the Soviet dictators as they have, with ruthless abandon, sought to extinguish flames of freedom in this peace-loving nation.

Yet, the tragic occurrences in Hungary are not an isolated instance of Communist terror. Many a patriot has died gallantly without any knowledge of his sacrifice reaching the free world. Furthermore, countless millions of people behind the Iron Curtain are continuously confronted by conditions so inhuman and depraved as to test their very will to survive.

That the gallant people of the Ukraine have met this test through a generation of Communist tyranny, slavery, individual and mass cruelty and slaughter shall always be one of the noblest chapters in man's struggle for freedom and liberty under God.

How many men, women, and even children of the Ukraine have gone to their death in defense of their ideals during the past 30 years; and how many more lives need be sacrificed before even the atheistic dictators of the Soviet finally understand those simple principles of faith which give mere man the infinite strength to survive oppression? We do not know, but we do know that the people of the Ukraine will continue to resist and will continue to offer their very lives as a sacrifice for attainment of their ideals.

The people of the free world must rededicate themselves to the struggle against Soviet tyranny which seeks to enslave the entire world. The people of the Ukraine and the other enslaved nations of Europe do not struggle and die for principles which they alone hold dear, but for those inalienable rights which free men everywhere cherish.

We who now enjoy freedom and independence must overcome any human failings incident to the present enjoyment of these rights. The people of the Ukraine and the millions of others now enslaved under the Communist yoke must be sustained by our will to resist the spread of communism. The fight must and will continue. Beyond any doubt, and irrespective of what evil forces the Soviet dictators might bring to bear against them, the people of the Ukraine will carry on the fight until we achieve our common objective—peace and freedom for all peoples of the world.

---

## Atoms for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, February 20, 1957*

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] at the American Chemical Society Symposium, held at Johnson's Hummocks, Providence, R. I., February 8, 1957.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY UNITED STATES SENATOR JOHN O. PASTORE AT AMERICAN CHEMICAL SOCIETY SYMPOSIUM, JOHNSON'S HUMMOCKS, PROVIDENCE, FEBRUARY 8, 1957

Ladies and gentlemen, I deeply appreciate your invitation to share in this occasion. Allow me to compliment you that you find time out of your busy days and individual responsibilities to come together for the exchange of ideas—and for that comradeship that brings a better understanding of common problems.

I am grateful that you permit me to add a thought or two, which I hope will be in keeping with the mood of your meeting of this afternoon.

Out of my experience in the Senate—particularly with such activities as atomic energy, the Geneva Conference, the United Nations, and the meetings that led to the establishment of the international agency for the peaceful uses of atomic energy—I must pay at least a moment of tribute to the men of business and the men of science who have done so much to create and to strengthen this thermonuclear age.

The word "thermonuclear" is awe inspiring to the man in the street. Perhaps he reads in his newspaper a definition—"Thermonuclear reaction is similar to what goes on in the interior of the sun—liberating enormous amounts of controlled energy in the form of light and heat—without which life could not be maintained on this planet we call our world."

Even a man who hasn't been doing any thinking at all will pause and reflect on this. If it wasn't for the light and heat of the sun, man just wouldn't have any existence at all.

Man's fear of the forces of nature is older than civilization—but man gradually learned to live with them and by them because he learned to make use of them.

Now—as one writer puts it—we are more afraid of what man will do with nature than what nature will do with man.

Man first learned to use fire—and made civilization workable.

Man learned to convert heat into mechanical work—and created the industrial age.

Now—man knows how to convert nuclear energy into heat and he isn't quite sure he knows what to do with his new-found power.

Again I pay my respects to the scientists of many lands, whose eager research attacked the secret of the atom in the belief that its usable energy would be the greatest gift that could be made to mankind. And I pay special honors to the scientists in our own land—our own and our adopted sons—for they, too, had intended their atomic researches for peaceful purposes.

But when they sensed the sinister plans of other nations, they alerted this country to its dangers.

Then, with singular dedication and devotion, they preserved the secret of their researches—and their success was known only on the devastating day of Hiroshima.

Because it broke upon the world with such a terrifying impact—bringing to an end the greatest war in which men had ever been engaged—it is natural that the world thought of atomic energy as a weapon.

Perhaps, as a weapon, it was natural that the Government should hold a monopoly. The elements of spending, speed, secrecy, and security would warrant that.

In the present state of world affairs, it is probably necessary that we, for the security of the free world, maintain a position of strength in nuclear weapons.

But, of at least equal importance, has been our national quest for peace, our national dedication to atoms for peace, and our invitation to industry to come and share in the calculated risks and the rewards of this atomic age.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 was such an invitation to private participation. There were new freedoms under the law to promote atomic-power development, but these freedoms were unfamiliar to businessmen accustomed to the secrecy and security regulations of wartime.

They did not know how to go about doing business, for instance, with foreign markets for their reactors.

I saw much of this change in the Geneva Conference of August 1955. I saw the surge of a new spirit in atomic development, for here were scientists from every corner of the earth exploring what to do to make the atom a servant of man for a brighter and better future.

The Russians were there with evidence of their atomic-power reactor which they said had been in operation for more than a year. The British were there, too, and their showing was centered around atomic power. Already their station, Calder Hall, is operating with an output of 55,000 kilowatts.

True, the situation of England might be called more desperate, for Britain has no oil to speak of.

Its coal is in thin seams and far below the surface.

Its oil imports are limited and costly. The recent Suez crisis and the administration's new program for the Middle East graphically accentuate and illustrate this hunger for conventional fuels. And so the British feel and say that the discovery of nuclear energy and its application to power on a large scale has come like the answer to a prayer. By 1975 they hope to be saving—through nuclear power—the equivalent of 40 million tons of coal a year, representing largely the high-cost coal they import from the United States. Here again it is hard for many of us to understand that Great Britain is now importing coal. Therefore, we cannot be too surprised about the British being anxious and enthusiastic in every way possible to promote their atomic power production. Their need for this source of energy on a domestic level is much greater than our own because of the God-given abundance that we enjoy in natural resources. But even in spite of this abundance, there are men today who worry about our sources of energy in the not too distant future, just as the scientists 20 years ago were worrying about our diminishing coal and oil supplies when they were caught up in the excitement of exploring the atom.

There are men today who tell us that our fluid fuels will run out in the period of 1970–80. These are men who say that atomic energy is here to stay because it will be not only our primary source of energy, but we will be absolutely dependent upon it as our population increases, and haven't we been promised a population of 200 million before long?

Perhaps it is in this mood that there develops a school of thought that feels all this must be shouldered by private enterprise. They say, "Let this be the sole risk of free enterprise for profit and let us rid the Government of all responsibility for 'atoms for peace'." And then there is a school that says, "Let the Government do the whole thing alone."

In my judgment, both schools are wrong and yet both are partly right.

The path to progress and peace is one of partnership.

For atomic energy is not merely a domestic problem. We have assumed—or the logic of events has brought upon us—the world leadership of the nations of the world that would be free.

Leadership brings risk and responsibility.

In the world of today the wealth of a nation is measured by its consumption of energy.

Power is as essential to the health of a nation as food or water. We must provide the researches and the resources of power for ourselves and for those nations we would have as our friends.

It would be indeed wonderful if private industry could rise to the needs and accomplish this alone, but this would be asking too much. First of all, nuclear investment is tremendous. Nuclear power is not competitive with conventional power costs as we know them today. And what is most important at this point—we are living in a world where research in this particular field has become a keen competitive business, where other nations, such as Great Britain and Russia, will find this source of power competitive with conventional fuels much sooner than we only because through our abundance of resources our competitive costs for domestic production is much lower than in other lands.

Only this past week, in discussing this matter with the three wise men who have come here representing Euratom, I was told by Prof. Francesco Giordani at a breakfast that was held in their honor at the Capitol that whereas our national average cost per kilo-

watt-hour is 4 mills, their countries would be more than satisfied and consider it a great achievement if they could produce electric power at a cost of 14 mills per kilowatt-hour. I cite this to point up the need for greater effort in our development of atomic power, realizing that in other parts of the world there is greater interest and greater need for this development because of the high cost of electric power production. And never let us forget that necessity has always been the mother of invention.

True enough, there are problems of health in areas about reactors that have not yet been solved.

True enough, there are problems of insurance that are insoluble just now because insurance companies have no experience tables to guide them. It was for this reason that our Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy recommended in the last Congress a program for Government indemnity in order to remove this roadblock.

We also presented another bill authorizing the Atomic Energy Commission to build full-scale power reactors up to a total cost of $400 million. These bills did not pass both branches of the Congress. It is my fervent hope that they will do so this year, and soon.

Private industry, on its own, is in no financial position to assume this tremendous burden.

Furthermore, when the President of the United States delivered his inspiring speech in December of 1953 before the General Assembly of the United Nations urging the establishment of an international agency for atomic energy, the development of atomic energy for electric power essentially became part of our foreign policy. And, as long as it remains so, it behooves the Government to work with private industry in the development of this source of power so that we can win the hearts and the minds of the people all over the globe who yearn for freedom.

We cannot drift into thinking that private power has deliberately been dragging its feet.

In 1955 the Commission invited private companies to construct nuclear plants with some aid from the Government. A number of proposals have been made and accepted. Our own Yankee project in New England is a notable example and—as emphatically as I can say it—we must do much more of this. For if these reactors are built on sites already being utilized by existing public utility companies, the men who will have the responsibility of dealing with this art in the years to come will grow with its development—will learn all that has to be learned through the evolution of time, and, as we perfect a reactor, we will also be perfecting its assimilation with the generation of steam and the distribution of other electric current in our traditional fashion of free enterprise.

Furthermore, we must remember that the actual work on reactor development has been carried out entirely by industries and universities, with the Government providing the laboratories and the money, though private companies, by 1957, had already begun to put substantial amounts of their own money into research and planning. That—to my mind—is partnership, and in this fast developing art, we should have much more of it.

I must, however, admit that we have not been moving fast enough to prove our own know-how in a world that we have led to believe can look to us for help and for hope. We should be able to sell, ship, and set up abroad, working nuclear powerplants for friendly countries that need them. I have already mentioned to you the "three wise men" of Euratom. Here we find an opportunity of working with six integrated European countries for the development of this art in a spirit of partnership, where we can help them and they can help us in the development of power through the use of atomic energy.

Furthermore, even the less favored areas can have small-scale plants which would be of immense value to them and indeed a basis of friendship and comradeship with us.

Here is the opportunity to raise the standard of living in many countries, to remove pestilence and disease and indeed remove the causes of war.

Let us summarize our situation. Nuclear energy can be the salvation of free nations and the solution of the hunger and hopelessness of distressed peoples everywhere.

We lead in research and resources and we have accepted world leadership in the peaceful development of the atom, but results are not reaching up to our responsibilities. Time and cost are of the essence. Costs are beyond the reasonable risk of private enterprise in the domestic field and surely beyond private reach where we compete for the uncommitted nations against Soviet influence.

Government must close the gap, but it must do it in cooperation with and not in competition with private industry.

We need the manpower and we need the mind power that free enterprise can supply to supplement our Government needs. We no more seek to dominate domestic industry than we seek to colonize sovereign peoples—however helpless, however humble. This is not a case of public power versus private power. It is a partnership in patriotic power.

For atoms for peace can be made to be something more than a phrase as we make our wealth, knowledge, and uranium available to the people of the free world. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 provides the machinery for all these steps. We have already negotiated more than 40 bilateral treaties for the exchange of materials and intelligence. The entire world is just hungry to enter into the promised land where the atom will provide not only power, but relief from poverty and disease—the timeless miseries that have afflicted mankind through the centuries.

It will be unnecessary for me to recall the golden promises of atomic research in the fields of chemistry, of agriculture, of food preservation, and of medicine. Yet there is a temptation to dwell on this new world of health and happiness, security and peace, and opportunity that science under God holds forth to man for the asking—and for the deserving.

I say "under God," for science reveals no law, no result, no circumstance, that did not already exist. God, for reasons of His own, seems to withhold these blessing until man has need for them.

This discovery seems to have come in a time of the world's deepest despair—with man utterly helpless against the furies and hates of man for man. Suddenly man has within his own power the determination whether this civilization shall be destroyed or survive, whether it shall disappear, or whether it shall carry man on to greater achievements of material happiness.

I said, some moments ago, that we are more afraid of what man will do with nature than of what nature will do with man. But I think we need not be afraid. I am sure that nations will not choose suicide. I am sure that God will not permit mere man to destroy this work of centuries, into which has gone the labor of love of saints and heroes. I say that with all the sincerity at my command.

So let us be about the Master's business. Let us all be partners in a job that needs doing, doing well and doing promptly.

Let us pressure business, if that is our responsibility.

Let us pressure Government, if that is our duty.

Let us make atoms for peace a going business and a coming blessing.

We have promised it to the world. Let's keep our promise.

## Hon. Joseph R. McCarthy Reports to the People of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, February 20, 1957*

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my report No. 13 to the people of Wisconsin.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF WISCONSIN—REPORT NO. 13

INTRODUCING A NEW MEMBER OF THE FAMILY

Before getting down to the serious business of the Senate and the Nation, I want to introduce the new member of our family, Tierney Elizabeth. With her limited vocabulary, she has conveyed the hope that she will see many of you in Wisconsin after this session of the Senate.

NEW OUTLET FOR DAIRY SURPLUS

Some time ago I mentioned a new cheese process, developed by a Wisconsin firm. This process, which has been under experimentation for a considerable period of time, is designed to open a market for cheese in those areas of the world where the people, because of lack of dairy herds, etc., have not developed a taste for cheese. Some time ago the Pakistan Government ordered a test lot of this new process which was processed to remove the natural taste of cheese and substitute a curry flavor, which is popular in that area of the world. It was tested as a mix with rice in the soup kitchens. The report we now have received is that it proved very popular. The Pakistan Government has ordered an additional five tons of this processed cheese for further tests. Those interested in the project tell us that if the matter of paying for the cheese can be worked out, Pakistan alone can use in excess of 50 million pounds of cheese per year. This, of course, will go a long way toward solving the dairy surplus problem. The cost to the Government, incidentally, of storing cheese runs in the neighborhood of 10 cents per pound per year. On the other hand, the cost of processing this new cheese product, plus the packing and shipping, is estimated to be slightly less than 5 cents a pound. I have been working closely with both the Pakistan Government and the United States agencies involved, with the hope that this new development in cheese processing will help to solve the surplus problem.

FARMER-TO-CONSUMER PRICE GAP SHOULD BE NARROWED

I recently requested the Senate Agriculture Committee to investigate the reasons for the sizable gap between the price paid the dairy farmer for milk and the price being paid by the consumer. This request was not made because I felt that dairy companies were making too large a profit. I have, however, been increasingly disturbed by the fact that our Wisconsin dairy farmers are receiving approximately 7 cents per quart for milk, while the consumer is paying upward of 22 cents per quart. It seems logical that there should be some way of narrowing this gap. Today I received a letter from the chairman of the Agriculture Committee to the effect that they would go into this matter in the near future.

ATOMS-FOR-PEACE TREATY

I am sure you have all heard of the highly touted "atoms for peace" program, and you have probably been wondering what exactly is involved behind the glowing generalities.

First of all, what is this "atoms for peace" treaty supposed to accomplish? The idea, roughly, is to provide a means by which nations that have the technical know-how and material necessary to produce atomic energy can give their know-how and atomic materials to nations that do not have them. For this purpose an international agency is to be set up which will act as a kind of international broker to receive the atomic information and material from the "haves" and distribute it to the "have nots." This idea of sharing the wealth might seem rather appealing on the surface. As we shall see, however, offering to share our atomic wealth is in a class with the police and sheriffs departments offering to share all of their weapons and ammunition with hoodlum elements.

ATOMIC GIVEAWAY PROGRAM

The United States is, of course, a "have" nation with regard to atomic materials, and we have already acted accordingly. The President has already promised to give 5,000 kilograms of uranium 235 to this international agency for distribution to other countries, effective the day the agency comes into being. What is more, we have promised to give an additional 15,000 kilograms during the next 3 years, provided a similar amount is given during that period by all of the other nations of the world combined. Twenty thousand kilograms is sufficient to produce 2,200 atomic bombs, enough to wipe every major American city off the face of the globe.

The cost of 20,000 kilograms of this atomic material is estimated at $500 million. The delivery of it is provided for in the treaty as follows:

"Article IX, section D: On request of the agency a member shall, from the materials which it has made available, without delay deliver to another member or group of members such quantities of such materials as the agency may specify."

Therefore, if we approve this treaty, we could be required to load the atomic material on our planes or ships and take it to any Communist country the agency names. Any member of the United Nations organization is authorized to take part in this program. Also, any other nation, such as Red China, which might not be a member, could take part if a majority of the nations already belonging so provided by a majority vote. Incidentally, the total number of nations that have signed up to date is, roughly, 75. This includes practically every Communist and Iron Curtain country. The first nation to ratify the treaty was Russia. However, Russia has not offered any atomic material to the agency such as we have. Up to now she has merely gotten in line to receive.

It should be noted that we will have only 1 vote out of 75 or 80. The day-to-day decisions will be made by a Board of Governors composed of 1 member from each of 23 nations.

UNITED STATES HAS NO PROTECTION

The nations that receive this atomic material are not, of course, supposed to use it for war purposes. But no responsible scientist and no responsible proponent of the treaty will deny that this material can easily be converted into atomic bombs.

Those who favor this treaty claim that we are safeguarded because it provides that the agency may inspect to find out how this material is being used. The inspectors, of course, will again be selected by a group of nations in which we will be badly-outnumbered by the Communist bloc. Likewise, if the inspectors find that a country, say Russia, is using the material to make atomic bombs, there is nothing we can do by way of recapturing the material unless, of course, we decided to go to war and retake it. We could, of course, withdraw from this international agency, but the treaty makes no provision in such case that we would be able to reclaim from the agency materials already donated but not committed to any nation.

Incidentally, the United States has already entered into 37 individual bilateral agreements with various friendly countries concerning research and the construction of atomic power reactors, under conditions that provide some measure of self-protection to the United States. Therefore, why can't the "atoms for peace" program be pursued under these bilateral agreements? Why do we need this treaty? Why do we have to join an international monstrosity that deprives us of our protection and that includes our enemies along with our friends as recipients of American give-away?

The $500 million figure only refers to the cost of the atomic material. In addition to donating the $500 million worth of atomic bomb material, under the treaty, we would pay for the cost of the operation of the agency at the same ratio we pay for the United Nations. Last year, incidentally, our contribution to the United Nations was approximately $70 million. I, of course, shall oppose this treaty.

## The Controversy Between Egypt and Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 20, 1957*

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House I am pleased to have reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a telegram I sent today to the Honorable John Foster Dulles, United States Secretary of State, relating to the controversy between Israel and Egypt and the proposed imposition of sanctions on Israel by the United Nations. Certainly the United States of America should never compromise principle for expediency even though the expediency might involve oil riches beyond the comprehension of man.

The telegram follows:

FEBRUARY 20, 1957.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
*Secretary of State,*
*Department of State,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

The leadership and the respect of the United States among the free nations as well as with the people all over the world will be seriously damaged if for any reason the United States should compromise principle for expediency. Israel is not an aggressor nation in this current crisis. Israel has been forced to fight to protect its land and its people ever since it was established as a sovereign State. Israel is not making a demand to keep Egyptian territory won by the sword. Israel has not refused to comply with a request of the United Nations to withdraw its military forces from Egyptian territory. Israel has refused to withdraw its military forces from Egyptian territory unless Israel receives a guaranty of protection by the United Nations from the constant acts of aggression of Egypt. As a sovereign free nation, the Government of Israel has a duty to protect its land and its people. In this crisis, Israel is doing exactly that which any responsible sovereign nation would do under similar circumstances. Israel's position in this crisis is completely right.

In view of this fact I shall oppose with all my strength and power the imposition of sanctions or any similar vehicle of force upon the Government of Israel either by the United States of America or by the United Nations.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
*Member of Congress.*

## Needed New Legislation for Family Farm Parity Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 20, 1957*

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I shall introduce tomorrow a bill to substitute parity income as a concept for agriculture to replace the present parity price system. The bill is designed to substitute the price ratios, section 301 (a) (2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

It is necessary that people of the country who do not live on farms should understand the severity of the current farm depression. If they were told by the Government reports each month that farm income is only 44.4 percent of parity income which these reports now show as 82 percent price parity, there should be greater sympathy and understanding among city consumers. That is the purpose of this bill. It is essentially the plank I fought for—and we won—in the platform committee of the Democratic National Convention of 1956. It is the plank Secretary Benson disliked so heartily.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert figures into the RECORD that show the difference between these two approaches:

A. To calculate parity farm family net income for 1957:

1. Start with: Nonfarm population per person income, 1956, $2,009.

2. Divide into: Farm population per person income, 1956, $893.

3. Gives: Net farm family income parity ratio, 0.444.

4. Divided into: National realized farm operators net income, 1956, $11,900,000,000.

5. Gives: Parity farm family net income for 1957, $26,800,000,000.

B. To calculate parity farm gross income for 1957:

6. Start with: Farm production expenses, 1956, $21,900,000,000.

7. Multiplied by: January 1957 index of prices of production items, wages, taxes, and interest (1956=100), 103.

8. Equals adjusted production expenses, 1957, $22,600,000,000.

9. Plus parity farm family net income, 1957, $26,800,000,000.

10. Equals: Parity farm gross income, 1957, $49,400,000,000.

C. To calculate income parity adjustment facts for 1957:

11. Parity farm gross income, 1957, $49,400,000,000.

12. Divided by: Average realized farm gross income, 1947–56, $34,100,000,000.

13. Equals: Farm income parity adjustment factor, 145 percent.

D. To calculate the farm parity income equivalent price of wheat:

14. Average price received by farmers, for wheat, 1947–56, $2.06.

15. Multiplied by: Parity income adjustment factor, 145.

16. Gives: Farm parity income equivalent price, $2.99.

*Income parity equivalent prices calculated by proposed new income parity formula compared with parity prices calculated by price parity formulas in existing law, January 1957*

| Commodity | Parity equivalent prices calculated by— | | Average prices received by farmers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Proposed income parity formula [1] | Price parity formulas in existing law | 1947–56 | Jan. 15, 1957 |
| Beef cattle, hundredweight | $29.15 | $22.10 | $20.10 | $14.90 |
| Beef calves, do | 32.05 | 24.40 | 22.10 | 16.60 |
| Lambs, do | 32.34 | 24.60 | 22.30 | 18.00 |
| All chickens, pounds | .377 | .282 | .256 | .171 |
| Eggs, dozen | .621 | .473 | .428 | .353 |
| Turkeys, live, pounds | .484 | .368 | .334 | .276 |
| Hogs, hundredweight | 28.42 | 21.60 | 19.60 | 17.30 |
| Corn, bushels | 2.18 | 1.80 | 1.50 | 1.23 |
| Wheat, do | 2.99 | 2.49 | 2.06 | 2.09 |
| Barley, do | 1.75 | 1.34 | 1.21 | 1.05 |
| Oats, do | 1.14 | .864 | .783 | .752 |
| Grain, sorghum, hundredweight | 3.35 | 2.62 | 2.31 | 2.13 |
| Rye, bushels | 2.10 | 1.65 | 1.45 | 1.22 |
| Soybeans, do | 3.92 | 2.98 | 2.70 | 2.31 |
| Flaxseed, do | 5.87 | 4.50 | 4.05 | 3.04 |
| Cottonseed, tons | 93.53 | 71.00 | 64.50 | 60.40 |
| Butterfat, pounds | .961 | .730 | .663 | .574 |
| All milk, wholesale, hundredweight | 6.28 | 4.76 | 4.33 | 4.16 |
| Manufacturing milk, do | 5.16 | 3.91 | 3.56 | 3.39 |
| Cotton, pounds | .480 | .366 | .336 | .302 |
| Tobacco (types 11 to 14), do | .732 | .558 | .505 | .527 |
| Rice, hundredweight | 7.42 | 5.69 | 5.12 | 4.57 |
| Beans, dry edible, do | 12.11 | 9.29 | 8.42 | 6.88 |
| Peanuts, pounds | .158 | .135 | .109 | .111 |
| Potatoes, hundredweight | 3.18 | 2.42 | 2.19 | .156 |
| Wool, pounds | .850 | .645 | .586 | .620 |
| Hay, baled, tons | 32.34 | NA | 22.30 | 20.90 |
| Sweetpotatoes, hundredweight | 6.82 | 5.17 | 4.70 | 4.67 |

[1] Average prices received by farmers for commodity during immediately preceding 10 calendar years or marketing seasons multiplied by 1951 parity income adjustment factor of 145.

## Morris Weisberger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 20, 1957*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, another of my constituents has reached a high post from which he can continue to serve the public interest.

The vacancy caused by the untimely death of Harry Lundeberg, leader of the Sailors Union of the Pacific, has now been filled by the election to that important position of Morris Weisberger.

It was typical of Mr. Weisberger's anti-Communist activities to immediately announce, upon his assuming this important post, that there will be no change in the union's policies from those followed by his predecessor, indicating in no uncertain terms that the union will continue to support the American way of life and oppose all leftwing activities.

Mr. Weisberger came up from the ranks, having been a deepwater sailor on all types of ships.

He is a good, solid American with hard common sense, who can be relied upon to do the right thing for the members of his union without being unfair to employers, and always giving due regard to the public interest.

His many friends wish him well.

## Single-Item Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 20, 1957*

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today which I believe will, if enacted, make a real contribution toward the control of nonessential expenditures by the Federal Government. My bill calls for a constitutional amendment which would authorize the Congress to empower the President to veto individual items in appropriation bills without vetoing the entire bill.

Presently, the Constitution makes no distinction between appropriation bills and organic legislation and requires the President either to sign or veto every measure in its entirety, even though he may approve certain parts and disapprove others. It is extremely difficult for a President to veto an appropriation bill in its entirety. Money for essential expenditures required by law must be appropriated before the new fiscal year begins. After a veto, often there is no time for Congress to reconsider the measure. Although the President may strongly object to some nonessential or exorbitant item in the appropriation bill, he cannot, by vetoing the entire bill, jeopardize the availability of the essential funds. Recognizing the President's dilemma, Congress often pads appropriation bills with funds for pork-barrel projects. Congress also frequently attaches what is called a rider, which may amend some old organic law or enact some new organic law having nothing whatever to do with appropriations. For example, in the 84th Congress, the House attached to the defense appropriation bill a rider depriving the Defense Department of the right to dispose of business-type projects in competition with private enterprise. Although President Eisenhower strenuously objected to that rider, he had no power to veto it separately but was compelled, in order to provide funds for military defense, to sign the entire bill.

In the past, there have been several attempts to provide the President with the single-item veto power by writing that power directly into the body of the Constitution. These attempts have failed because of the fear that the President might abuse this power, and if the power should be written directly into the body of the Constitution, the abuse could be corrected only by another constitutional amendment revoking the power, a process ordinarily requiring about 7 years.

My bill meets this objection. Instead of writing the single-item veto power directly into the body of the Constitution, my bill would amend the Constitution to authorize the Congress to pass a statute granting the President this power. Under this process, if the President should abuse this power, then the power could be speedily revoked by the Congress itself simply by the passage of an act repealing the statute.

While there has recently been much pious talk in Congress about cutting the budget—a project which I most heartily endorse—my fear is that this Congress may instead try to increase the spending budget, or at least, individual items in the budget. If the President could veto these items without vetoing the whole bill, he would be better equipped to hold the line on Government spending and thereby control the menace of inflation. I earnestly trust that this bill will receive early and favorable consideration.

## Washington Seminar on Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, February 20, 1957*

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by our distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], which appeared

in the NEA Journal for February of this year. The Senator from Missouri discusses in his article the new program of the National Education Association for establishing a Washington seminar on government, for elementary and secondary school teachers, in order to increase the understanding of government in the classrooms of the Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I CONGRATULATE THE NEA ON ITS WASHINGTON SEMINAR ON GOVERNMENT

(By THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.)

It is a pleasure to take this means of congratulating the NEA, and especially its travel division and its department of social studies, for establishing a Washington seminar on government, planned especially for elementary- and secondary-school teachers.

I understand that this seminar, given during a 5-week period in the summer, includes briefings by a number of prominent Government officials, extensive visits on Capitol Hill, and meetings with a number of well-known personalities.

Certainly today the teacher has no greater responsibility than that of understanding the operations of our Government and of being able to portray them accurately and with human interest. To me, the importance of a teacher's concern for government cannot be overestimated. Our citizens and future voters must be quickened in their awareness of the operations of our Government.

It is axiomatic that a well-informed electorate is essential in directing those in authority toward the wisest and most just course. When there is a lack of interest and understanding on the part of those charged with molding the future of our country, our democratic system is not functioning effectively. The influence, then, of better-informed teachers is without doubt a major factor.

Such a firsthand experience is bound to result in greater understanding of the forces that operate in our democracy. Attending various sessions of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches gives a vivid and concrete reality to the faults as well as the virtues of our Federal Government. It is extremely important that all of us understand the weaknesses in our system, for understanding is essential to correction.

When teachers see the personalities, agencies, and all the other various forces that interact on each other, they will certainly come away with a more accurate picture of the complex Government machinery.

For instance, a great many people do not understand the function of the various congressional committees, and most people do not realize what a quantity of important work is done in committee sessions. In these meetings, Congressmen hear witnesses and draft legislation. It is only after careful research and exchange of ideas that legislation reaches the floor for consideration.

Teachers will be allowed a thorough look into these laboratories of Congress, because the seminar has recognized the importance of allowing ample time to attend meetings on Capitol Hill. I understand that there will be opportunity to visit various Government agencies and to learn of the services they perform.

For example, briefing sessions will familiarize teachers with such little-known congressional activities as performing services for constituents. Their requests vary widely and require such different activities as the following: Gathering and sending information about better agricultural methods, assisting people in their applications for social-security benefits, helping them to meet the proper Government authorities in making international trade arrangements.

I know that by personally witnessing the dynamics of our Government, those attending the seminar will be able to get the feel of Washington—a place that is uniquely itself, and yet, at once a major instigator and reflector of much that is happening in the world today.

I urge as many teachers as possible to make an effort to attend the 1957 Washington seminar. (For further information about the seminar, to be held June 24–July 26, write to NEA Travel Division.)

---

## Statement of Hon. Elmer J. Holland in Support of Senate Joint Resolution 38

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 20, 1957*

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this most worth while and badly needed legislation.

While I am heartily in favor of additional authorization of funds for the Federal National Mortgage Association, I should like to interject a word of caution as to the manner in which these additional funds are spent.

There is no question in anyone's mind that there is drastic need for more housing construction to meet the requirements of our ever increasing population. The sad fact of the matter is, however, that in 1956 there were 200,000 fewer homes built than in 1955. The present year promises further decline due to the so-called tight money market.

To my way of thinking, it was a great mistake in 1954 to make Fanny Mae a mixed ownership corporation instead of a Government owned institution. The net, and I might add unfortunate, result is that it now operates like a private business—at least in its secondary operations.

I think the FNMA's current pricing practices involving large discounts, has been a predominant factor in increasing housing costs. This is true because builders are inclined to slap the consumer with additional financing costs, just as is done with increases in cost of actual materials used in homebuilding.

Taking the case of a typical sale of a $13,000 GI loan to FNMA, we find the total cost amounting to 9½ percent or more than $1,200 for the mortgage. This is a disgraceful price for an exserviceman to be forced to pay for financing his home.

The FNMA since 1954 has insisted it must operate at a profit so it can pay dividends on the stock which is privately held, as well as the stock held by the Government. The present program of large financing charges is a product in part of private stock investment policies of the company.

There is also a great need for additional FNMA authorization of special assistance funds for providing housing where it is most desperately needed.

Under previous legislation, mortgages relating to the following groups or areas have been designated as eligible for purchase by FNMA under its special-assistance program: military; territories; renewal and relocation; disaster and elderly persons.

On special-assistance programs, no private money is invested and no private stock sold since FNMA operates with Government money as do other Government agencies. Mortgage financing should be made available on reasonable terms for these needy segments of the population.

Middle class families are also in trouble. Costs of land, lot development, and construction are all going up—along with costs of financing.

There is a serious housing need among the families of moderate incomes who are below the level which can be reached by private housing construction with present financing. These families are above the income level served by subsidized public housing. In short, they are caught in the middle with their housing needs neglected.

A sound national housing policy requires a program that will meet the needs of these families of moderate income. Their needs can be met without Federal subsidies, under a program which would be privately owned and privately constructed.

To bring the cost of housing within their reach, it is necessary that loans be made available at lower interest rates and longer-term amortization.

To assure that the benefits of such financing are reflected entirely in lower monthly costs, this type of loan could be made available only to cooperatives and nonprofit corporations.

I believe a nonprofit mortgage corporation should be established to finance cooperative housing developments. Labor unions and other institutions interested in cooperative and nonprofit housing would be prepared to invest large sums in such a venture.

A cooperative nonprofit mortgage corporation may be the answer to the entire problem. Such a program would make it possible to meet the housing needs of families of moderate income for whom housing cannot now be built under existing legislation.

---

## Congress Should Limit Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 20, 1957*

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, what a welcome and heartwarming valentine could have been offered to each and every American citizen last Tuesday, February 14, 1957, if the House had acted in accordance with section 138 of the House Rules Manual of the 84th Congress which I understand became effective under the Legislative Reorganization Act.

This rule requires a Joint Committee of the House and Senate to prepare and submit by February 15 of each year a legislative budget for the purpose of limiting expenditures. This procedure should be followed because it is the constitutional obligation of the Congress, not the President of the United States, to control the appropriation of the taxpayers' money, and if we had followed the rule we could have already acted to reduce the budget and curb inflation. Certainly such a course of action is what the American people desire.

Since no legislative budget was prepared or submitted the various spending bills will come to us piecemeal without, in my opinion, sufficient overall regard to a desirable ceiling. Yesterday our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. RAY] introduced House Resolution 170, which would have set the budget at a limit of $65 billion, and provided that any Treasury revenue in excess of this amount in fiscal 1958 be used one-half to reduce the national debt and one-half toward a tax cut.

I have not had an opportunity yet to study all implications and details of House Resolution 170, but in principle I subscribe to such a program of cutting drastically the budget. In other words, like any tailor we should cut our suit to fit our cloth. That is proper management procedure; that is good business practice. It is if we propose to hold the line and check inflation as well as lighten the heavy burden of taxation which the taxpayers of this Nation have shouldered for so many years.

The Federal Government has certain fixed charges. We have certain obligations fixed by law that must be paid. These cannot be reduced. Also we have necessary adjustments in the salaries and annuities of Federal workers and retired people which must be made. If we do not keep Government rates of pay somewhere in line with private business and the cost of living it will increase turnover and result in false economy. I think, too, that normal services of the Government must go on.

On the other hand there are many flexible appropriations, including defense and foreign aid. These must conform to the pattern of fiscal responsibility. Otherwise we will defeat our purpose and spend ourselves into bankruptcy or unchecked inflation. Some such limit as $65 billion should be set, and in this regard I hope the Rules Committee will speedily grant public hearings on House Resolution 170. Its author, the gentleman from New York, is entitled to support and commendation for his action in submitting this resolution. I do not say that $65 billion is the right amount, but I do believe that an overall limit should be set, and regret that a joint committee was never appointed from the House Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee of the Senate to prepare and submit by February 15 a budget in accordance with the recommendations of the legislative branch of the Government, which as I said is the one that is responsible for controlling Federal expenditures.

## The Refugee Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 20, 1957*

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, all Americans, I believe, are possessed of generosity and a sympathetic feeling toward the misfortunes of their fellow man. We are anxious to help those who need help. Charity is a wonderful thing, but I submit that to carry charity to the extent of destroying our own economic foundation is really defeating the entire purpose of doing good.

It is with growing alarm that I have followed the Hungarian refugee situation. At its inception the refugee program was not a large undertaking and the number of refugees was a realistic figure. But that number has increased by leaps and bounds and the original program to open our doors to a few unfortunates has broadened to the point where we are almost engulfed by a tide of immigrants who, in my opinion, could scarcely qualify as bona fide refugees. I often wonder just what constitutes a "refugee." Is it someone who is discontented with the way of life in his homeland and seeks greener pastures elsewhere? Is it someone who for economic or social reasons wishes to make a new start? Is it someone who has become ambitious to travel to a modern day utopia, which is exactly what America means to many peoples of this world? I rather think that the term "refugee" probably encompasses all of these categories of humanity.

I find it hard to generate much enthusiasm over the Hungarian refugees who have deserted their homeland in time of crisis and who under the guise of Freedom Fighters have migrated in wholesale lots to the promised land—America.

And now comes a special message from our President who is asking that our Nation's welcome mat be thrown down to the countless hordes who are oppressed by communism. The very first question that comes to my mind is, Where are our native-born citizens going to eventually wind up if we keep bringing large portions of the rest of the world into this land of ours which is bounded on the east by the Atlantic Ocean and on the west by the Pacific Ocean and on the north by Canada and the south by the Gulf of Mexico and Mexico? Sooner or later we will burst at the seams. It does not make sense to crowd and crowd and overcrowd because such continued importations will surely lead to our downfall.

The McCarran-Walter Act has certainly proven entirely adequate to our immigration program and the attendant problems. There is no reason to depart from a program which is adequate and designed to take care of normal immigration problems without flooding our population with those from other lands. In my opinion there is no justification or merit to the President's request for virtually an open-door policy favoring worldwide immigration into the United States.

I might add that we must not overlook that part of the world which we know as the Far East when we consider refugees from communism. I am sure there are untold millions in the Far East who could qualify on that basis just as there are millions in the Middle East and in European countries.

## The FBI Story—A Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 20, 1957*

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, back in 1950, there appeared a book by one Max Lowenthal entitled "The Federal Bureau of Investigation." To the casual observer, it was a pretentious-looking volume—some 500 pages, apparently well documented and seemingly representing a thorough study of that great agency of our National Government. The author took great pains to assert that this book was a complete and accurate picture of the FBI.

This book, in fact, was not a serious study of the FBI at all. It was a compilation of distortions, innuendoes, and falsehoods the like of which have seldom been concocted by the mind of man. I took the floor of this House on November 30, 1950, to warn against the pernicious, un-American and disgustingly foul stench which oozed from its pages. Mr. Lowenthal tried every device known to evil minds—from Machiavelli to Joseph Stalin—to tear down the great accomplishments of J. Edgar Hoover and his men. Year after year these valiant men had worked, day and night, to protect our Nation from the enemies of crime and communism, only to see this stealthy, malicious-minded character, with the stiletto of hypocrisy in his hand, attempt to assassinate its reputation. I was not alone in warning against the unfairness and inaccuracy of this pseudo-study by Mr. Lowenthal. Many of my colleagues in Congress sounded similar warnings. Newspaper editors, civic leaders, law enforcement officials, and men and women of all ranks of life joined to defend Mr. Hoover.

For this reason all good Americans who have faith in truth and justice are overjoyed to learn that now, for the first time, our citizens have an accurate, fair, and complete account of the FBI—an account which shows up Mr. Lowenthal's book as the warped product of a poison-pen mind. I refer to Don Whitehead's best seller, The FBI Story: A Report to the People, only recently published by Random House. Where Lowenthal's book was prejudiced and biased, Mr. Whitehead's is fair and accurate; where Lowenthal's was twisted and distorted,

using half-truths and quotations out of context to prove preconceived ideas, Whitehead, with the finesse of a trained historian, allows the facts to speak for themselves. The response to this book has been truly amazing. It has shot up to the top of best-seller lists, bookstores report that demand exceeds supply, and commentators and reviewers everywhere have given it a well-deserved pat on the back. The FBI Story is, indeed, a fine contribution of modern-day journalism to helping the American people know firsthand just how this vital agency of the Government works.

The quality of this book is stamped by the integrity and ability of its author. Don Whitehead, I am proud to say, is a good southern boy. He was born in Virginia and grew up in Kentucky. He attended the university of that distinguished State, later becoming affiliated with a Harlan, Ky., newspaper. From then his rise was rapid until in World War II he became renowned as one of the Nation's top war correspondents, later to be awarded two Pulitzer prizes. Mr. Whitehead worked for the Associated Press and his assignments sound like the rollcall of American troops in action. He was a frontline correspondent, and, in fact, was involved in five amphibious assault landings, including D-day on Normandy Beach. In 1950, with the outbreak of the Korean war, Whitehead, again as an Associated Press correspondent, was with our troops at the Inchon landing, the capture of Seoul, the campaign in North Korea. For his excellent stories, often pounded out amid the most trying conditions, Mr. Whitehead was awarded his first Pulitzer prize. In 1952 Whitehead was one of three reporters selected to accompany General Eisenhower, then President-elect, on his famous mission to Korea. For his coverage of this historic visit he received his second Pulitzer prize. At present he is chief of the Washington Bureau of the New York Herald Tribune.

This professional ability of Mr. Whitehead comes forth in his book. He had access, within the limits of security, to the records of the FBI. He was free to examine them at will, to ask questions and to draw his own conclusions. Frequently he had the opportunity to review information never previously known outside the FBI itself. He was able, working day after day, to trace the rise of the FBI, from its earliest beginnings in 1908, for almost half a century. He saw clearly the problems faced by this organization, the personalities involved, the steps taken to carry out its responsibilities, and finally, the record it has made. After carefully examining these documents and records, he wrote—page after page, chronicling, fact by fact—the story as he saw it. This book represents the facts, gleaned at first hand, by an able American journalist, free to write as he pleased.

The very title of the book, The FBI Story: A Report to the People, is indicative of Whitehead's approach—so unlike Mr. Lowenthal's. Whitehead, carefully analyzing the facts, wanted to give the American people—in the same spirit he had served them for years as a newspaper reporter—the facts. This book represents his report about the FBI to the people.

And what he found gives pride to all true Americans. After seeing the FBI in operation—in World War I, against the gangsters of the 1930's, in the fight against World War II espionage and subversion, in the battle against communism—Whitehead came to the basic conclusion that it "represents the people's effort to achieve government by law." He was satisfied that it was an agency protecting justice, freedom, and the rights of the individual. He found that it was as interested in securing the facts to exonerate the innocent as to convict the guilty. He saw the FBI as an agency worthy of the highest traditions of this great Nation. It is doing its job well. The American people have nothing to fear from it.

All of us in this Nation can take great pride in the achievements of the FBI. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, its Director, is a great servant of the American people. He has devoted his entire life to public service, emphasizing the highest ideals of integrity, incorruptibility, and loyalty. America needs more men like J. Edgar Hoover. We can give thanks to Mr. Whitehead for giving us the true story of the FBI and laying to rest, once and for all, the distortions of Mr. Lowenthal.

## Government Aid to Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, February 20, 1957*

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger on January 26, 1957, and a copy of my letter to the editor of the Newark Star-Ledger which was published in that newspaper on February 8, 1957.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Newark Star-Ledger of January 26, 1957]

SENDING HIM TO COLLEGE

New Jersey's Senator CASE has made the observation that youth is being priced out of the college market. He cites the increased cost of operating colleges which, reflected in higher tuition rates, is actually denying higher education to a large number of promising students.

The Senator suggests Federal aid to States to help expand and construct 2-year colleges as a means of extending educational opportunities to those unable to afford 4 years in college.

CASE's proposal has considerable merit, but unfortunately it could become immersed in a serious educational question that has been argued for a long time. This debate involves the role of the 2-year colleges and their ability to fully prepare students for highly technical careers.

On the one side it is pointed out that 2-year colleges serve a highly useful purpose in training young people for stenographic, nursing, art and some types of medical careers. On the other side, it is argued that they cannot train engineers, scientists, teachers, doctors and other technical people for whom there is such a great need.

Thus, until the debate is finally decided and the roles of the two types of colleges are established to the satisfaction of both, it would seem better to use any available Federal grants for the production of skills most needed at the present time. That would not only be of enormous value to the Nation but at the same time would fulfill the now unattainable dreams of many deserving, youngsters.

This aid could take the form of State or Federal scholarships to talented though needy students who currently lose out on a college education because of the limited number of private endowments. The bulk of the private scholarships now go to class valedictorians. But what of the student with straight 90's who wound up 3d, 4th or 5th in his class? Scholarships available to this group are usually insufficient to help him clear the 4-year hurdle. Result: A wasted resource.

If the Federal Government is to embark on an extensive college aid program, this seems to be the field which would produce the greatest harvest.

---

[From the Newark Star-Ledger of February 8, 1957]

CASE ASKS COMMUNITY COLLEGES

I have read with great interest the editorial which appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger of January 26, 1957, on my suggestion for expanding facilities for college education.

While I recognize that many youngsters do need financial help in obtaining a college education, it seems to me the major problem is one of providing colleges for them to attend. The vast growth in our population and in the percentage of youngsters desirous of otbaining a college education has meant that many qualified young men and women are finding there is no room for them.

It is clear we do need additional college capacity throughout the country. As you know, the New Jersey State Board of Education has warned that by 1963 one out of every three young people in New Jersey wanting to go to college will find no place unless we move to create facilities.

It seems to me that actually there is a need for both kinds of college training—the 2-year type, which would help develop the semiprofessional and technical workers who have become so essential in our society, as well as the 4-year colleges and professional schools which produce the engineers, scientists, teachers, and doctors.

Of course, many of the students who complete the work in the 2-year colleges continue in higher education. The American Association of Junior Colleges estimates this number at 65 percent.

Many of these will emerge as the engineers, scientists, teachers, and doctors we need. On the other hand, if they have no place to go for the first 2 years, we may lose their talents entirely for these fields.

The goals of the community colleges are to meet these two particular needs at the lowest cost per student:

(1) to provide 2 years of college education in preparation for the final 2 years at a 4-year college;

(2) to provide a terminal program of 2 years of post-high-school general education with opportunities for vocational training for the subprofessions and occupations of a technical nature.

It might be useful to describe the kind of vocational training offered in some of the 2-year junior or community colleges. In general, the colleges offer advanced training in all the occupations taught in the high schools. They have the staff and equipment

to instruct in air conditioning, refrigeration, airplane construction, air transportation, housing construction, radio and television, and the manufacture of synthetic products. In a State like New Jersey, with its highly diversified industry, such training should be particularly helpful.

In addition, community colleges provide training for senior professional workers beyond the range of high-school education—for architectural and mechanical draftsmen, dieticians, technicians in medical and industrial laboratories, bookkeepers, automotive and electrical technicians, dental hygienists, nurses' aides, assistants in doctors' and dentists' offices.

The President's Commission on Higher Education in its 1947 report estimated that in many fields of work there are 5 jobs requiring 2 years of college preparatory for every one that requires 4 years.

Your suggestion about a scholarship program is indeed an interesting one. I recognize the need for attracting our brightest minds into the college classrooms, and I think that a general expansion of capacity will have this effect. A scholarship program by itself, it seems to me, would help the brilliant youngster enter college, but unless total capacity is expanded, he cannot help but displace a less talented youth.

Comments such as yours will be helpful in bringing this need to the attention of the country and I am hopeful that out of this will come a real drive to do something about it.

CLIFFORD P. CASE,
*United States Senator.*

---

## Federal Tax Policy and the Economic Challenges of 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 20, 1957*

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, Democrat of Arkansas, chairman of the Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation, Committee on Ways and Means, and chairman of the Tax Policy Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, before the Tax Executives Institute, Inc., Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., Monday, February 18, 1957:

FEDERAL TAX POLICY AND THE ECONOMIC CHALLENGES OF 1957

Just about a month ago, President Eisenhower presented to the Congress the largest budget ever submitted when Armed Forces of the United States were not actively engaged somewhere in the world. Everyone here, I am sure, is aware of the stormy reception accorded that budget. Extensive discussions in various public forums all over the country have explored virtually every facet of the budget. I will, therefore, spare you my own comments on the budget details. I would like, however, to develop with you the broad context in which this budget and its implications for tax policy should be appraised.

As you know, the Joint Economic Committee, on which I am happy to serve, recently completed its hearings on the January 1957 economic report of the President. During those hearings we had the benefit of extended discussions with the President's Council of Economic Advisers, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, other governmental officials and outside experts. Our purpose was to develop the economic outlook for 1957 and the major issues of economic policy facing the Nation in seeking to attain the objectives of the Employment Act of 1946.

The testimony of these witnesses suggests that 1957 will be a year of further economic growth. In fact the budget for the fiscal year 1958 is predicated on a $14.8 billion increase in personal income in calendar 1957, over the $325.2 billion for 1956 as a whole, and about a $1 billion increase in corporate profits. This growth in personal income and corporate profits, in turn, suggests an increase in the total level of economic activity of between 3 and 3½ percent over 1956. If we realize this growth, we will attain a gross national product of about $435 billion in 1957, measured in prices about equal to those prevailing at the beginning of this year.

There are, unfortunately, some important reservations about this pleasant prospect. Certainly one major reservation is the continuing threat of inflation.

A year ago it was noted that the country was enjoying a record prosperity and that further real economic expansion would necessarily be limited by increases in our productive resources and the efficiency of their use. It was recognized that in such a situation, there is likely to be strong upward pressures on prices as producers and consumers intensified their bidding for limited supplies of goods and services. If costs and prices were not to go up throughout the economy, therefore, it was necessary to restrain the expansion of total spending to a rate consistent with the rate of increase in our productive capacity.

As you all know, the Federal Government maintained monetary and fiscal restraints throughout the year. Tax reductions which were scheduled to go into effect automatically on April 1, 1956, were deferred for another year. The Federal Reserve System, carefully watching a wide range of economic indicators, limited increases in the credit resources of commercial banks. Despite these restraints, costs and prices did rise in 1956. In fact, over half of the increase in gross national product during the year was accounted for by price increases, rather than real increases in output.

A considerable amount of evidence was accumulated last year suggesting that these restraints, particularly general credit controls, impose more severe burdens on some groups in the economy than on others. State and local governments, facing rapidly rising interest costs on their debt issues, were forced to cut back their plans for public works, particularly school construction. The housing industry appears to have been hit particularly hard by limitations on the expansion of the credit supply. And small businesses, apparently, have reason to feel that the tight money situation imposed a particularly severe curb on their ability to grow and develop.

As 1956 came to a close, therefore, the major question in economic policy was: Can we, at a time of high employment, rely on fiscal and monetary policy to curb inflationary pressures without at the same time unduly burdening major sectors of the economy and raising serious obstacles to the maintenance of economic growth? In other words, can we have a stable price level and maximum growth in employment and production when our resources are fully employed?

The President has repeatedly raised this question since the beginning of 1957. He has concluded, apparently, that we cannot rely exclusively on the Federal Government's monetary and fiscal policies if both of these objectives are to be simultaneously achieved. Rather he has urged leaders of labor and business to assume part of this responsibility by basing their wage agreements and price policies on considerations of maintaining a stable dollar.

Many serious questions are raised by this recommendation of the President, but permit me to suggest only one. Since the President's statement on this issue, I have been deluged by inquiries—and I am sure many of my colleagues have had the same experience—from business and labor leaders as to how they are to know whether their policies and actions are consistent with maintaining a stable price level. What kind of standards are they to use in providing the cooperation the President requests? What kind of machinery does the President have in mind for aiding responsible business and labor leaders in their efforts to comply with this mandate? One suggestion in reply to these questions is that the President might appoint an Economic Stabilizer with whom labor and management representatives might consult to determine whether proposed wage agreements and price changes are consistent with overall price-level stability.

I do not, frankly, believe that the President's recommendation is a satisfactory solution to the dilemma posed by the apparent conflict between the objectives of maintaining a stable dollar and of promoting maximum growth in employment and output. I have reached this conclusion after carefully questioning and listening to the expert witnesses, both inside and outside of Government, who testified during the Joint Economic Committee's hearings.

It seems to me, instead, that we must continue to rely on public policies and actions to provide the setting in which the free expression of private incentives basic to the successful operation of our enterprise system will result in a rate of growth consistent, both in the short and long run, with stability in the price level. And it is because of this conviction that I have taken you on this excursion before coming back to the Federal budget for fiscal 1958 and its implications for Federal fiscal policy.

Comparing the President's budget for the fiscal year 1958 with that of the 2 preceding fiscal years suggest a pattern which I want to sketch for you briefly. The estimated increase in net budget receipts in fiscal 1957 over fiscal 1956 is $2.5 billion. The estimated increase in budget expenditures in the same period is just about the same—$2.4 billion. The estimated increase in receipts in fiscal 1958 over estimated receipts in 1957 is $3 billion. The estimated increase in expenditures is just about the same—$2.9 billion. These comparisons strongly suggest to me, as they have to many others, a pattern in which the increase in revenues of the Federal Government, resulting from growth in the economy, are just about exactly matched by increases in expenditures.

When Mr. Brundage, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, appeared before the Joint Economic Committee in its hearings on the President's Economic Report, I sought to determine from him whether there is any substantial basis for believing this pattern will be changed in the future. Specifically, I asked him: "Do you see any prospects in the succeeding fiscal year [that is 1959] that our budget estimates of expenditures and actual expenditures will be less than the $71.8 billion which is projected in this budget?" Mr. Brundage replied: "I doubt it. I am going to try. We are already starting on our 1959 projections and I would hope that we would be able to hold to the present levels, but I doubt if we could cut it very much."

I will not predict that we will fail to arrest this growth in Federal expenditures in the near future. But if we approach this question realistically and observe the recent trends in the budget, I think we must have some serious reservations as to whether this

pattern of matching revenue increases with spending increases will soon be changed.

There are, I believe, three factors principally responsible for this pattern. The first is the increase in our expenditures for national security, which accounts, incidentally, for about $2.4 billion of the $2.9 billion increase in total spending shown in the 1958 budget. Perhaps this amount could be reduced by increases in efficiency, in real terms, but so long as the world remains in its present troubled state of affairs few, if any, of us will question the need for continuing and possibly increasing efforts in this category of governmental functions.

The second factor underlying increasing Government spending, I think, was expressed elegantly and concisely by the President in his press conference on January 24. Let me quote his words: "And I will say this: As long as the American people demand and, in my opinion, deserve the kind of services that this budget provides we have got to spend this kind of money."

The President is, of course, right. Our representative Federal Government is quickly responsive to the wishes of the people of our country, and there is no aspect of our life which the Nation more dearly prizes than this responsiveness. It is evident that the people have increased their demands on the Federal Government in the last few years. Can we predict that these demands, which result in large part from a rapid increase in population, particularly in urban communities, will soon slacken?

The third factor underlying the pattern of rising Government spending is inflation. The prices of virtually all the goods and services which the Government buys have gone up. For example, total net purchases of goods and services by the Federal Government in calendar 1956 were $300 million more than in calendar 1955, measured in the prices prevailing in each of those years. They were actually $1.3 billion less in 1956 than in 1955, however, when measured in the fixed prices of 1956. Continuing inflation, therefore, will result in increases in Federal budget expenditures, even if the volume of goods and services provided, in real terms, remains constant.

There are, I believe, serious and important implications for fiscal policy, and, more specifically, for tax policy in this budget pattern.

First, while we agree with the President that the growing demands of the American people for public services will in time be met, we may nevertheless inquire as to which level of Government can best satisfy these wants. Most of us, I think, recognize that at certain times the Federal Government may have to assume a greater proportion of the overall responsibility for public services than it has customarily in the past. But, looking ahead, we have to seek ways in which State and local governments may overcome their present financial limitations in order to avoid an ever-increasing recourse to Federal aid.

Responsibility for increasing the financial capacity of State and local governments to provide increasing services must rest primarily with them. But some redistribution of tax sources among the Federal Government, the States, and the localities may also be required. When the Federal Government is ready to face up to this problem squarely a primary consideration should be to prevent such shifts from adversely affecting the fairness of the combined Federal, State, and local tax structure or its responsiveness to changing economic circumstances.

Second, we must reexamine prospects for general tax reduction. The modest budget surpluses estimated for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958 impose at least a slight curb on current, widespread inflationary pressures. These surpluses are based, of course, on continuation of present tax rates. Tax reduction, so long as these pressures persist, would contribute to general economic instability. They would aggravate the already heavy burden on general credit controls for restraining the rise in the general price level. By adding to inflationary pressures, tax reductions would also contribute to further increases in Government spending.

Experience has shown us, of course, that we must always be prepared for quite rapid changes in the economic outlook. If during the coming months it becomes apparent that inflationary forces have subsided and that a stimulus to total demand is needed to maintain full use of our growing productive capacity, we should be ready to supplement easing of general credit restraints with a balanced program of tax reduction. Under such conditions, tax reduction will increase the opportunities of the private sectors of the economy to expand their spending programs and provide impetus for further real growth without general price increases.

Third, and I believe most important, we can no longer afford to defer serious, large-scale efforts for constructive revision of our Federal tax system. If we could count on being able to make substantial, general tax reductions in the near future, which all of us would welcome, there would be much less urgency for tax reform now. Many inequities and imbalances in the distribution of tax burdens would almost automatically be alleviated by sizable, widespread tax reductions. But so long as both budgetary and economic considerations make the prospects for such reductions relatively remote, we must now get on with the work of tax reform. If the Federal tax system is to be required to continue carrying fiscal burdens of the magnitude of the past several years, we must be sure that it is the fairest and the best system we can devise.

There is, I venture to say, not a single economic activity which is not affected or conditioned by our Federal tax laws. Evidence of the enormous impact of the Federal tax system is constantly brought to the attention of the Congress and the administration by demands from taxpayer groups for tax revisions, and these demands are constantly increasing in scope and complexity. The professional journals of lawyers, accountants, and economists are replete with instances of the way in which taxes affect decision making at the personal and business level, and with arguments for and against various approaches to tax reduction on the basis of their alleged importance to the Nation's economic development. In short, without losing sight of the basic purpose of Federal taxation—raising revenues to defray the expenses of Government—there is an ever-widening awareness of the significance of the Federal tax structure in shaping the complexion of our economic growth.

This awareness led to the broad program of tax changes which culminated in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. There was in 1953 a general realization that our changing economy required review of existing tax law to determine how well it conformed with the Nation's long-range economic requirements and with our standards of justice and fairness. No one, I am sure, will quarrel with these broad objectives.

In terms of the resources committed to the job, the code of 1954 was a monumental undertaking. In many respects, it was a successful venture which resulted in a vast number of significant improvements in our tax structure. Nevertheless, it is evident that in many other important respects, the code failed to meet the demands for simplification, greater equity, and closer conformity with the economic facts of life.

Throughout the income tax sections of the code, for example, efforts were made to afford tax relief in the hardship cases which had been brought to the attention of the Congress and the Treasury. Today we find numerous instances in which these provisions have failed of this objective or have resulted in demands for equivalent relief from similarly situated taxpayers who, because of superficial differences, do not qualify for the benefits in the present law.

In the revision of the income tax, efforts were also made to eliminate tax obstacles to customary and respectable practices in the management of business and personal affairs. Today we find that having done so, we have also opened up new, unsuspected avenues of tax avoidance. The 1954 code sought to provide greater precision in the law in order to minimize taxpayer uncertainties and therefore ease compliance and administrative burdens. Today we find new uncertainties have replaced old ones and that the application of the new provisions imposes burdens of confusion and complexity which are an even match for those in the old code. Finally, the new code was intended to remove tax barriers to business growth and to encourage certain activities which, presumably, were peculiarly important to economic development. Today we find a highly unbalanced growth in which new and small businesses are lagging behind their big, established rivals. We are also hard put to justify discrimination in tax treatment among creative activities which are apparently equally valued by the economy as a whole.

Actual experience to date in those areas of the code where major efforts for technical and substantive revision were made have shown them deficient in terms of administrability, compliance, and fairness. Additional evidence is found in the difficulty which the Treasury Department, despite its wholly commendable efforts, has found in issuing regulations pursuant to these new statutory provisions. It has had to resort, as perhaps never before, to interpretation of statutes which were intended to eliminate the need for administrative discretion and ruling. In many instances, it has had to gloss over provisions, the precise application of which has so far defied the capacity of our vocabulary. And in many other instances, it has been necessary, apparently, to rely on judicial and administrative rules and interpretations under the 1939 code to satisfy the daily demands of administration.

Apart from the errors of commission, the 1954 code reflects numerous errors of omission. Many provisions of the 1939 code pertaining to some of the most pressing problem areas were carried over virtually unchanged into the new law, at least insofar as the basic substance of these provisions is concerned. An outstanding example is afforded by subchapters O and P, dealing with capital gains and losses. Since the inception of the income tax, the tax lawmaker has been plagued with problems of definition in this area. We have seen capital gains treatment extensively proliferated to the point where it now applies to a significant number of transactions in which nothing recognizable as a capital asset or as a sale or exchange is involved. The code of 1954 made no contribution toward resolution of these difficulties, but rather added to them.

On balance, I have had to conclude that much of the work of structural improvement in our tax system remains to be done.

As a result of our experience in the preparation of the code of 1954, many members of the Ways and Means Committee became more than ever aware of the tremendous burdens imposed on them in discharging their responsibility. The present chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, my friend JERE COOPER, was, I believe, particularly impressed by the strain which the requirements of responsible legislation imposed on the committee as it was then functioning. By the middle of last summer, he was, I believe, convinced of the need for more extensive use than ever before of subcommittees which

would permit closer concentration on the principal problems lying within the committee's jurisdiction. Because of his long experience in the field of Federal taxation, he appreciated more than the rest of us the benefits which the whole committee would obtain as a result of the specialization in inquiry which use of subcommittees would make possible. His decision to set up three such subcommittees—the Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the Subcommittee on Excise Taxes, and the Subcommittee on Customs, Tariffs, and Reciprocal Trade Agreements—will, I am confident, prove to be a milestone in our Nation's fiscal history and a monument to Chairman Cooper's vision and insight into the highly complex field of Federal taxation.

Let me describe briefly the work of the Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation, which it is my great privilege to serve as chairman.

The broad purpose of the subcommittee is a close, objective review of the major provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. I say "objective" advisedly. The spirit of the subcommittee is one of searching, constructive appraisal and criticism, as devoid as possible of partisan bias. We seek to build upon the present to attain the best possible tax law and to establish a precedent in the revision of the Nation's tax system based on a nonpartisan approach.

The subcommittee's work, as now organized, has two major aspects: One involves an investigation of the substantive policy and technical adequacy of our tax statutes, and the other is concerned with the administration and enforcement of our tax laws. In connection with the first aspect, our initial approach has been a review of a number—certainly not all—of technical and clerical errors, ambiguities, and instances in which unintended benefits or hardships have been experienced by taxpayers. As you know, considerable progress has been made in this phase of our work, which has served not only to clarify issues in many cases, but to establish a strong foundation for cooperation among the subcommittee and the staffs serving it, and the Treasury Department and Internal Revenue Service. It has also served, I am confident, to establish the nonpartisan character of the subcommittee's work. It is only on this basis that real progress can be made in providing long-range forward-looking improvements in our tax laws.

A second phase of the subcommittee's endeavors is now under way. Advisory groups have been established to investigate the substantive policy and technical problems in subchapters C, J, and K, and a fourth advisory group has reported on some of the problems confronting the Internal Revenue Service in administration and enforcement of the provisions of the 1954 code. We have been fortunate in securing for these groups the services of many outstanding tax lawyers and accountants, assisted by the able staffs of the Way and Means Committee, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the Treasury Department, and the Internal Revenue Service.

Without in any way minimizing the importance of the work so far done and now under way, I must point out that it represents only a beginning in the task of revising our tax system in the light of basic standards of fairness, simplicity, and economic adequacy. The requirements of all of these standards point to the same objective—a tax system characterized by simplicity, relative ease of compliance and administration, absence of discrimination, neutrality in impact among alternative uses of productive resources, a high degree of responsiveness to changes in economic conditions, and finally, lack of bias against new and small businesses. Enumeration of these standards and characteristics highlights the magnitude of the job still to be undertaken.

There are major substantive areas with which our work so far has been concerned only peripherally. One of these, as I've indicated, is the whole broad question of capital gains. Another is the tax treatment of income derived from the extractive industries. A third concerns the large and varied issues in tax exemption.

I think we must move rapidly to resolve the problems in these and other important tax areas. A major limitation on our ability to do so is lack of widespread public awareness and interest. Until we have an adequate public response upon which to predicate major substantive reform, we will necessarily have to proceed slowly.

I would like to point out to you, however, that failure to meet these issues head on and to resolve them is very costly, indeed. If the inferences I have drawn about future budget prospects are correct—namely, that increases in revenues will be matched by increases in spending—about the only major source of tax-rate reduction would be substantive revisions of our tax laws. If, through such revision, by eliminating the myriad provisions which provide exceptional treatment for selected groups of taxpayers and in the process woefully complicate the law and make its administration extremely difficult, if through such revision we can substantially broaden the tax base, we can begin to make real progress in providing an individual income tax-rate structure which might begin at 10 or 15 percent and top off at, say, 65 or 70 percent, perhaps even lower. I am sure you will all agree that this is an objective well worth our major efforts.

---

## A Tribute to Lt. Gen. Joseph M. Swing, Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 20, 1957*

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on February 9, 1957, in New York City at the Grand Street Boys' Club House, a testimonial dinner in honor of Lt. Gen. Joseph M. Swing, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, was tendered as a mark of recognition of General Swing's humane administration of the immigration and nationality laws. The following is the committee that was privileged to take part in paying tribute to this dedicated public servant: Honorary chairman, Jonah Goldstein; chairmen, Alfred E. Santangelo, Member of Congress, and Paul Fino, Member of Congress; committee, Thomas A. Aurelio, John Cannella, Louis Capozzoli, Vincent Damiani, Ralph DiOrio, Edward Ennis, Salvatore Farenga, Vincent Impellitteri, Vincent Lupiano, Joseph Marine, Joseph P. Marro, Antonio Mendez, John J. Merli, Dr. Charles Muzzicato, Dominick Paduano, Joseph Periconi, Frank Rossetti, and Robert V. Santangelo.

The tribute accorded General Swing at this dinner reads as follows:

A TRIBUTE

Lt. Gen. Joseph M. Swing, a native of New Jersey, served with distinction in both wars, rising to the rank of lieutenant general of the United States Army. He was appointed Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization by President Eisenhower on May 24, 1954.

General Swing's administration of the immigration and nationality laws is marked with the humane and fair understanding of the problems encountered in the relationship between our Government and human beings who seek to adopt America as their land and those who come in conflict therewith. The following are some of his noteworthy achievements:

1. Consideration given to the human factors such as family ties, dependents, and long periods of residence in the United States to the end that family units remain intact;

2. Abolition of the warrant of arrest as a means of instituting deportation proceedings and thereby removing the stigma attached to arrest and detention.

3. Abolition of indiscriminate detention of aliens at Ellis Island and similar installations upon entry into the United States and pending termination of deportation proceedings;

4. Elimination of the use of confidential information in deportation proceedings, except in those cases where the Commissioner personally determines that it is in the interest of national security and safety to do so;

5. Adoption of procedures to expedite admission of immigrants by preexamination abroad and thereby eliminate hardships and delays.

This testimonial to General Swing is in recognition of his unsparing devotion and dedication to the humane administration of those laws under which fall the immigrant who seeks haven, refuge, or home in these great United States.

I wish to include at this point the various speeches made on that occasion by me, by Congressman FINO, and by General Swing, together with a telegram from President Dwight D. Eisenhower, and a telegram from Mr. Ogden Reid:

REMARKS MADE BY CONGRESSMAN ALFRED E. SANTANGELO AT DINNER TENDERED IN HONOR OF GEN. JOSEPH M. SWING, COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION

Reverend fathers, Judge Goldstein, Commissioner Swing, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, we meet to pay tribute to a man of Mars with a heart of Venus. We do not gather here to pay tribute to his distinguished military career which has spanned a period of two World Wars and has earned for him the gratitude of American citizens and the confidence of our Commander in Chief, Dwight Eisenhower. However, tonight we, as civilians, gather here to praise him for his humanity in the administration of our immigration and nationality laws. Perhaps posterity will remember not his military contributions but his civilian accomplishments.

On our statute books, Congress has placed an immigration law which is conceived in bigotry, iniquitous in content, and alien to fundamental democratic principles. It perpetuates a national-origins quota system and relegates naturalized citizens to second-class citizenship.

Despite our pronouncements in our Declaration of Independence and in the United Nations Charter that we believe that all men are created equal, that we believe in the equality of mankind, our immigration laws proclaim to the peoples of southern Europe and Asia that they are not equal, that they are not desirable. It sets up an obstacle in democracy's struggle against communism to capture men's minds and to gain their support.

It is not my purpose to castigate or criticize those who are responsible for this measure, but we are faced with the fact that our

immigration law is extremely harsh and needs revision. A Presidential commission and even our President of the United States have so declared.

Because of his military background, because of his understanding of human nature, because of his devotion to American principles, our guest of honor was selected as Commissioner of Immigration to administer this law. It is difficult to think of any appointed official in this world today in whose character and abilities the peoples of all nations have so intense and legitimate an interest. In no other nation of the world in all world's history, except perhaps in Imperial Rome, has such a post been so important. Just as Roman citizenship was once a promise of peace and security in a savage world, so today is American citizenship.

Our Commissioner of Immigration is a man who has a humane understanding of the problems encountered by the aliens who seek to adopt America as their homeland and who desire to remain here. He possesses a typically American largeness of heart and mind. We Americans who have foreign relatives and friends seeking to come to this country are happy that a man such as he fills this vital post.

I am a new Congressman. In the few short weeks I have served in the Federal Government, one fact has become crystal clear. No administrator or public official can survive without courage and a thick skin. Such qualities are necessary to withstand the verbal bombs and hand grenades.

Our guest of honor has those qualities and he is withstanding such blasts because he believes that what he is doing is morally right and is in the best American tradition.

You ladies and gentlemen have before you a program containing some of the achievements of this man. To repeat them would be to gild the lily or perfume the rose. However, I wish to point out that when General Swing closed down the detention quarters for aliens, he tore asunder the shackles which chained our Lady of Liberty; when General Swing abolished the warrant of arrest as a means of instituting deportation proceedings, he erased a stigma which should not attach to any civil proceeding; when General Swing eliminated the use of confidential information except in cases involving the internal security, he struck down a monstrous instrument of despotic government. For these deeds, I salute him.

As a young man I lived on Staten Island and from my hilltop home I saw daily the Statue of Liberty standing in the New York City Harbor—so majestic and yet so friendly. As I watched the liners steaming through the narrows, passing up the Hudson past Bedloes Island, I frequently recalled the stirring and moving words of that great poetess, Emma Lazarus, which, if trite today, still live in our hearts:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed, to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Despite the harshness of our immigration laws, General Swing by the manner of his humane administration paraphrases that theme today and says to the peoples of Europe:

"O Hungarians, O Poles, and those fleeing to be free
If a quota stops you, I will make you a parolee."

It is my honor to present to you the man who has once again opened the golden door to let democracy in—General Joseph M. Swing.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN PAUL FINO, CO-CHAIRMAN OF TESTIMONIAL DINNER IN HONOR OF GEN. JOSEPH M. SWING

Mr. Chairman, General Swing, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am sure that General Swing and every clear-thinking American will agree that the McCarran-Walter immigration law must be rewritten.

Time and experience have taught us that this law is one of the most discriminatory pieces of legislation ever enacted in the Halls of Congress. It was founded on a philosophy of fear and suspicion of all immigrants, more particularly a certain group of nationals.

This law is so restrictive in its application and so insulting to our immigrant friends that it has had the effect of excluding instead of welcoming those kinds of people whose ancestors helped build and develop America.

The recent tragedies in Hungary and in the Middle East have dramatized the urgent need for not only revision but liberalization of this statute. Political and economic conditions in the world point up to the need for more flexibility in our law, not only as applied to immigrants, but to those in the emergency status of refugees.

The unfairness and injustice of this law must be corrected by the Congress. The President has repeatedly urged that we rewrite the unfair provisions of the law.

We must eliminate all of the harsh and discriminatory features of the present law so that we can have an equitable and flexible law that will extend kind and humane treatment to immigrants of all kinds.

I am certain that a vast majority of the American people agree with the sentiments expressed by President Eisenhower when he said in his message to Congress that "the practical application of this law has demonstrated certain provisions which operate inequitably and others which are outmoded in the world of today."

I know that General Swing will present the President's request for immigration-law changes forcefully. We cannot any longer ignore this pressing problem. The welfare of America and the prayerful hopes of the unhappy and oppressed are at stake. For our own well-being and for the sake of our leadership in the world we must banish bigotry. A liberal revision of the McCarran-Walter Act would be a step in the right direction.

---

REMARKS OF GENERAL JOSEPH M. SWING, GRAND STREET BOYS' CLUB HOUSE, NEW YORK CITY, OCCASION OF PRESENTATION OF SCROLL IN RECOGNITION OF HIS HUMANE ADMINISTRATION OF THE IMMIGRATION LAWS, FEBRUARY 9, 1957

Basking in the glow of such praise is a pleasant feeling—one that is unusual, if not unique, in my experience as Immigration Commissioner.

I want to make a few comments on the general topic of immigration—possibly another statement that proves how fortunate for me that most of our immigration law is administered by Justice Department and not by the State Department. Diplomacy is not my strongest characteristic.

The plain blunt facts are these. We can get along quite nicely, with most of the present immigration law. The proposals which the President has submitted to the Congress do not change to any major degree any provisions of that law on citizenship. No suggestions are made to substantially alter any of the numerous grounds on which an individual may be kept out of this country or on which the undesirable may be expelled after he gains entry. All our citizens of good will recognize the need for reasonable safeguards, reasonably applied.

When a 2-year-old child is arrested for deportation; when a respected citizen of a friendly neighboring country is detained at the gateway to your city for 24 hours after suffering the harrowing experience of the *Andrea Doria-Stockholm* disaster; when a soldier husband has to wait a year to get papers to bring his bride to this country; when hard-earned equities are completely ignored; when a deaf ear is turned to appealing compassionate circumstances, then don't blame the horrible McCarran-Walter Act, blame the knuckle-headed administrator that allowed such action. I am no lawyer, but over the years I have had occasion frequently to hear the expression nol-prossed used among the legal fraternity members. Some common sense is used in enforcement and even though some of my legal eagles do their darnedest to prove the contrary I am not convinced that common sense and good law are incompatible terms. With that approach we have tried to administer the law. I think we have had a fair measure of success. I accept credit only for encouragement to, and support of, loyal and able career officers who now realize they can use their judgment in administering the law.

Let's look at the other side of the coin. When the United States desired to give a speedy, helping hand to both the fleeing Freedom Fighters of Hungary and their overwhelmed host in neighboring (and neighborly) Austria, there was a provision of the McCarran-Walter Act which we had tailormade to our needs—the parole provisions of that act. I want to emphasize that this provision was not an accidental, belated discovery of what some have attempted to characterize as a loophole. It is the same provision which I acknowledged to its author, Congressman WALTER, 2 years ago, was my authority and basis for closing down Ellis Island Detention Station which stood for so many years at the sea entrance to your city in mocking contradiction to the welcoming Statue of Liberty less than a mile away.

Many of the changes we have suggested be made in the law are designed primarily to streamline its administration and others are to meet changing circumstances since 1952 which the coauthor of the act has recognized in his own recently proposed House bill.

The nub of the President's proposal is twofold, to increase the number of persons who can come into this country each year, a recognition of our increased power of absorption in the last 30 years; and to change the manner of selection of those who do come. This latter provision is one that economists, sociologists, anthropologists and a host of others can discuss at length. My only contribution to the discussion is some personal observations and experience of my own. A few years ago I had the task of training some young men and later leading them in battle against an enemy of the United States. During the training I had no occasion to inquire into their ancestry; during the battle the enemy did not distinguish between northern Europeans and southern Europeans and nothing in the casualty lists or the honor lists of the 11th Airborne Division reflects that the American freedom fighter was any more or less effective because he traced his origin to forebears born along the shores of the Mediterranean or the North Sea or the Baltic. With this I leave you.

---

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, D. C., February 9, 1957.*

Hon. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO,
*Member of Congress,*
*Grand Street Boys Club,*
*New York City:*

Following is message relayed from the President to the White House Office for transmittal:

"Please give my greetings to the friends of Gen. Joseph M. Swing gathered in tribute to

his splendid work as Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

"Our Nation, established by pioneers of every race and creed, still finds a source of strength in the continuing immigration of new citizens from abroad. In helping these people to become a strong and productive part of the American community, General Swing has earned the appreciation of us all.

"Best wishes and a personal commendation to your guest of honor.

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

---

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 9, 1957.*

ALFRED E. SANTANGELO,
*New York:*

Terribly sorry, but a trip outside of the United States precludes my being present at the dinner in honor of General Swing. His leadership of the 11th Airborne Division materially helped win the war. His service as Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization is doing much to help win the peace. It is not often that the United States has a man with the ability and dedication of General Swing. I wish I could be present tonight to salute him in person. Please give General Swing my very best regards.

OGDEN REID.

---

## The Middle East and Future Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 20, 1957*

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take great pride in submitting a speech delivered by my colleague from Maine, the Honorable FRANK M. COFFIN. This was given on February 7, 1957 before the Augusta-Hallowell Chamber of Commerce in Augusta, Maine. It summarizes some of his basic, and I consider refreshing, thinking in the field of foreign affairs. The views of this freshman member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee are most welcome and contain much merit for consideration.

THE MIDDLE EAST AND FUTURE FOREIGN POLICY

As I look back over this first month of the 85th Congress, the deepest impression I can report to you is that 1957 will be a watershed year in the history of our foreign policy. By this I mean that decisions are called for which will change the course of that policy. Neither the problems facing us nor the temper of the people themselves give us the luxury of making no choice at all.

If the choice is to be a sound one—militarily, diplomatically, economically, and morally—then both the Congress and the American people must engage in as intensive a project of fact-gathering, redefinition of goals, and reevalution of policies as has occurred at any time in our history. We are favored in this project by several factors: There is no immediate threat of a hot war; this is not an election year; the American people are alert to the dangers of the spread of Communist influence; and we now have an experience of a decade in foreign military and economic aid.

But there are several obstacles to the kind of policy review that the times demand. They all stem from attitudes of mind which many of us share. We are convinced of our unselfishness and generosity, and are hurt when our efforts are not appreciated, or our motives misconstrued. We have spent $60 billion in 10 years and we yearn for an end to this drain on our resources, particularly when we see that some of this money has been wasted or spent to no apparent effect. We cannot understand why nations should hesitate a moment in choosing between Soviet communism and true democracy. We cannot understand why nations want to be spared the necessity of choosing either form of government. We are inclined to distrust any government that does not promote our kind of capitalism. And, being a Nation traditionally good at horse trading, we do not think it ever good business or sense to give aid of any kind without some guaranty in return by way of pacts, bases, or other commitments.

These attitudes are obstacles, not because they are wrong or unjustified, but because they are preconceptions. In solving any problem, preconceptions must be pushed aside, to let in the facts. Not until scientists acknowledged that there was something smaller than the atom was it possible to make progress in nuclear physics.

If we can put aside these preconceptions, let us look at these three areas of facts, goals, and politics.

The facts of international life in this year of decision, 1957, are these:

1. The United States is the most powerful nation in the world in its natural resources, its skilled research and technical personnel, its armed forces, and in the power of its traditions.

2. All resources except the last—its ideals and traditions—are limited and capable of being surpassed by another nation or group of nations.

3. The Soviet Union is fast developing its basic industries, its educational system, its military forces and weapons. Although still behind us in quality and quantity in most of its development, at its present rate Russia will substantially close all gaps within another generation, barring any internal Soviet collapse.

4. The Communist bloc of nations already claims one-half of the world's population.

5. The key to needed raw materials, base supports, staging areas, land and water lines of communication and transportation—and therefore the key to economic and military survival—for the free nations of the world lies in the underdeveloped, recently colonial, and fiercely nationalistic nations of Africa, the Middle East, South and Southeast Asia. Even within the General Assembly of the United Nations, these nations are becoming the key to the passage of resolutions.

6. The forces seething within these nations, as Justice Douglas recently said, are a rebellion against feudalism, a burning desire for independence, a striving for equality, and a distrust of the only kind of capitalism they know—colonial capitalism. To this last we must add the ever-present fact of extreme and ever increasing poverty.

7. The Russians in their post-Stalin pose, play these five themes with increasing skill. They do not preach the merits of communism as a philosophy. They join the lists against feudalism by fighting for land reform. They pose as champions of independence. They have taken great pains to treat Asians on the same level as Caucasians. They have associated themselves with the new socialist leaders in Asia. And in so doing they bid well to win the uncommitted nations.

Beyond these techniques Russia seeks credit for warring against poverty. She displays her schools, factories, new cities, farm equipment, makes loans, and sends technicians to the impressed Asian—and often without strings attached.

Here are some of the things Russia points to: Grain elevators, hydroelectric plants, and irrigation systems in Afghanistan; a steel mill in India; a technological institute in Burma; a nuclear physics laboratory in Egypt; fertilizer mills in Yugoslavia. This, to put it mildly, is rugged competition. These accomplishments may not match ours, but that is not the point. The point is that these achievements are far ahead of anything these people have known.

These I believe to be the facts essential to a review of our foreign policy. They need to be documented; they need to be presented to the people. The understanding of these facts by the people is the first step in any major rethinking of policy.

It is also vital to restate the goals of American foreign policy, whatever may be the particular plans and policies to achieve them. I doubt that many would disagree with these objectives:

1. To keep the economy of the United States healthy. This means not only checking the force of inflation, but maintaining a reasonable rate of increase in the national product and avoiding excessive taxation. This in turn implies keeping our international obligations within our means.

2. To maintain an adequate Defense Establishment.

3. To help maintain the stability and strength of our traditional allies and neighbors.

4. To strengthen our relationships with the nations with whom we have agreements or cooperative arrangements. This means all the nations of NATO, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organizations, and the Baghdad Pact.

5. To bring about a freedom-orientation on the part of uncommitted nations of Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia.

6. To strengthen the United Nations as an increasingly effective force for peace with freedom.

To state our goals and to realize them are two quite different matters. Even to agree upon our methods will challenge our energy, our tolerance for harsh facts and new ideas, our imagination, and our determination.

Before discussing our choice of methods it is all important to place the Middle East resolution in proper perspective. It does not spare us the duty of making this reevaluation of policy we have been talking about.

I supported the resolution in the House because I was convinced there was no alternative which would not be more dangerous to us. Although there were only 61 dissenting votes, it is fair to say that no one who spoke for the resolution did so with enthusiasm or with the feeling that this solved our problems.

The resolution is merely a recognition—perhaps a belated one—that the Middle East is just as important to our security and the peace of the world as Canada, Mexico, or the Panama Canal. But it is no more than a warning signal to Russia and an attempt to give short range military and economic aid to those nations of the Middle East who are disposed to accept it.

In the broadest sense it is not policy. It is a device which will give us a little time to make policy. It is not policy because it gives us no specific positive objectives to govern our use of armed forces, our supplying of military or economic assistance. It says only that we are against international communism and are for national independence. These are not enough if we are to be effective, if peace is to be established, and if the affection and loyalty of the free nations of the world are to be secured.

In what direction does the answer lie? Without posing as an expert, claiming to be original, or attempting to give specific answers at this time, let me suggest some standards that should guide our thinking during the coming year.

1. We should recognize that year-to-year foreign aid planning is an invitation to inefficiency and waste. The administration seldom has a definite idea of what it will do with funds appropriated; the Congress becomes increasingly resentful of granting

blank checks; the administrators don't know how far to go in their planning; the recipient countries never know what they can count on; and our people are merely conscious of an endless drain.

We should thoroughly explore setting up a program for a substantial period of time so that programing and administration proceed on an orderly basis.

2. There should be standards governing expenditures. These standards should recognize that countries differ in their ability to use funds productively—because of their stage of development, the adequacy of trained personnel, and the extent to which prior programing has been done. We should learn from our prior experience in Iran, for example, where, although our prime objective of keeping Iran out of the Communist orbit has so far been achieved, the program was accompanied by tremendous looseness in administration.

3. Techniques of administering aid funds should be developed and vigorously applied. These techniques should begin with the description of the need presented to Congress, should continue with sound accounting systems, and include detailed reports of progress made.

4. Adequate trained personnel to administer such programs should be available before any program is launched.

5. Programs should be set up with the objective of terminating dependence on the United States as soon as possible. In the early stages of development, this means, paradoxically, not making the mistake of giving too little or erecting unrealistic standards for repayment. In the middle stages it may mean loans to be repaid on a flexible basis, depending on the rate of economic progress. Throughout it means insisting that local governments do all that they reasonably can with their own resources and it means using loans rather than grants whenever practicable.

6. It may prove after intensive study that our own best interest is served by not making aid dependent upon military or diplomatic strings. As we have seen in the matter of bases, such strings are easily broken. And the effort to attach them may well undo the effect we are striving for. It may well be, therefore, that our emphasis should be on sound economic development looking to a sound business basis for transactions, with less emphasis on illusory diplomatic undertakings.

7. In any economic planning, we in New England see the wisdom of taking into account the effect on our own industries of the creatures we may help create. Every effort should be made to see to it that the economy brought into being is useful to the local country without turning into a Frankenstein monster which then turns on us.

8. In any such new approach to foreign aid, we in the United States have every reason to hope that there will develop within the framework of the United Nations an agency for administering the standards we set up. We do not want to be in the position of unilaterally turning down a country's application, for no matter how sound an economic reason. Neither do we want our motives to be construed as colonial or imperial by those all too eager to do so.

Underlying these suggestions is the conviction that the effectiveness of any economic-aid program lies not in the amount of dollars but in the way such a program is administered. In many instances we have undoubtedly spent too much, too soon, for too little results.

As Dr. Judd of our Foreign Affairs Committee stated to me, there are three questions to ask in determining a program of economic aid:

1. What does the Nation need?
2. What can it use effectively?
3. What can it receive with self-respect?

Too often we have asked only the first question. We must realize that we cannot hope to radically alter standards of living overnight. All we can hope to do is to make it possible for the peoples participating in any aid program to make visible, steady progress. The sense and stability of progress are the practicable objectives of any realistic program.

Much, therefore, can be done to profit by our past experience, to eliminate waste, to strengthen our effectiveness, and to work toward the time when such programs will not be necessary. The task is arduous. But the only alternatives are a series of actions improvised to meet crises after they have occurred, or a fortress America with waters of hostility lapping our very shores. The stakes are survival in a free world.

---

## The Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 20, 1957*

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the hearings by the Coal Research Committee participating members have obtained highly illuminating reports on the coal industry and on the communities and people who are a part of that industry. I am confident that the subcommittee will soon be in a position to make recommendations regarding what must be done to assure the maintenance of a vigorous coal industry. As the industry moves forward, so too will there be a welcome resurgence in those communities where coal is the substance of economic life.

My reference to the subject today is not to be construed in any manner as an attempt to make a progress report on the subcommittee's work. Our chairman, the highly capable and most conscientious gentleman from Oklahoma, will decide when it is time for the Congress as a whole to be apprised of our findings. I wish only to discuss coal communities and the opportunities which may be available to them in the years ahead. My remarks are prompted by a report on natural resources made several months ago and presented in the Iowa Business Digest. I do not know whether this report reached very many of our coal communities; I do know that any resident willing to accept this analysis would no doubt be frantically looking for greener pastures if in fact he has not already taken leave of the old hometown.

I shall not include the Iowa report in the RECORD because I do not believe that its contents would justify printing expenses. I think that it can be summarized with a comment that it reflects only the most pessimistic view of the coal industry; for this reason I feel duty-bound to analyze some of the more hopeful signs that are beginning to appear over coal-producing regions. As Representative of a district which depends to a large extent upon the success of the coal industry, I want the rest of the country to realize that we are doing everything possible to develop a more substantial and dynamic economy in our coal areas.

Increased demands upon coal as America's principal source of energy in the years ahead are a certainty. The difficulty in keeping on the course of progress and expansion is attributable to Government policies standing in the way. I am confident that the coal industry would by now be producing from 10 to 20 percent more coal if it were not for the iniquitous and inequitable Federal policies that have persisted entirely too long. Foreign residual oil should not be permitted to be shipped into this country in excessive amounts to the detriment of the coal industry. The Federal Power Commission should be instructed to take conservation into consideration when it rules on applications for new natural gas pipelines; so authorized, the Commission would be in a position to prevent such wasteful practices as dumping of natural gas into industrial plants at the expense of the coal industry. I am also convinced that the coal industry should be granted a higher depletion allowance rate. These and other considerations are matters which should be adjusted by Congress as quickly as possible. Meanwhile coal and allied industries, with the support of the citizenry of mining areas, are doing everything possible to raise themselves from the economic straits.

I recently placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Pittsburgh Press describing the accomplishments of townsfolk in Indiana, Pa., a community which over the years had relied to a great extent upon the success of the coal industry. When coal output went down, unemployment went up throughout the area. Indiana, through courage and faith and daring, was able to obtain new industries that have absorbed considerable of the surplus labor and today is looking to the future with hope and optimism.

The anthracite fields of Pennsylvania have been perhaps hardest hit of all industrial areas in recent years. In the 10-year period that has elapsed since the conclusion of World War II, anthracite production has been halved. Residents of producing districts have of course been greatly discouraged, yet they have been so resourceful as to bring a variety of new industries into their communities. There is still a long way to go in the anthracite field, and I hope that the program to be recommended by the Coal Research Subcommittee will aid in combating the economic strife in that region. Meanwhile the businessmen, local government officials, and labor responsible for progress that has thus far been made are to be congratulated for their ingenuity and determination.

The Iowa Business Digest report was correct in pointing out that there has been a decided drop in coal employment over the past 30 years or so. The United Mine Workers of America recognized, as did coal operators, that mechanization of mining equipment and methods would produce capability of mining more coal with fewer men. The union nevertheless refused to stand in the way of progress. Mechanization has reduced coal's labor force by at least one-third, but at

the same time it has made it possible for the industry to share with the working force more and more of the income from the sale of the product. To provide work for those men displaced by automation, management and labor have cooperated admirably in the campaign for new industry.

One of the most encouraging developments in the past year or so is the establishment of aluminum reduction plants in bituminous regions along the Ohio River, a phase of which was recognized in the Iowa report. One of the plants, when completed, will employ 4,000 workers; the other will employ 1,200. An executive of the Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., whose producing facilities are being constructed at Ravenswood, W. Va., last month made this statement in connection with the project:

> There is a special significance in Kaiser's Aluminum Ravenswood's works. It will be the first operation in the United States aluminum industry based on the fact that coal is the most economical source of energy for the production of aluminum when located close to major markets and a direct transportation route for raw material.
>
> Recognition of this fact led Kaiser to the Ohio River Valley site at Ravenswood—where low-cost coal-based power is readily available, where 70 percent of the Nation's aluminum consumption is within a 500-mile radius, and where the company is able to move materials from mine to fabricating plant in a direct line over a short all-water route.

According to a recent issue of Newsweek magazine, the advent of the aluminum industry in Ravenswood has reversed a 50-year decline, added 350 new homes, three restaurants, and a 56-unit apartment development. Farther down the river, at Evansville, Ind., the Aluminum Company of America is constructing another big smelter which will use coal-generated power. Irving White Wilson, president of Alcoa, which incidentally employs many individuals from my Congressional District said recently:

> As far as we can see, which is 1960, we see aluminum's growth continuing without any major let-up.

With so bright a future for the aluminum industry, coal stands to achieve almost proportional advances. I recall this excerpt from the President's Material Policy Commission Report published in June 1952:

> Such electroprocess industry as aluminum have the opportunity, by turning to coal and lignite, to break loose from their long dependence on closeness to cheap hydroelectric power sources for low cost energy.

Other industries are also beginning to recognize the advantages of locating plants near the most inexpensive sources of power and heat. Expansion of capacity in electric generating stations, steel mills, cement plants, and other traditional coal uses bids further to bringing advantages to coal communities.

For these reasons it is in error for anyone to write off coal communities as thriving centers of American economic and cultural life. The residents of these towns have demonstrated their resourcefulness and self-sufficiency. Despite the unfair burdens inflicted upon them through unwise policies of the Government, they have withstood attendant hardship and are now planning to participate in the industrial surge that is taking place nationally. To lighten the load for this hard pull, Congress should enact immediately the legislation necessary for clearing the road to coal's progress.

In conclusion, I want to thank my colleagues who participated in the hearings of the Coal Research Committee at Ebensburg, Pa., on February 13. I assure you that your presence was in itself an inspiration to our people, for it indicated the concern of Congress in our problems and gave interested parties an opportunity to appear personally before a congressional committee.

---

## Lithuanian Independence Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 20, 1957*

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, February 16, 1957, the Worcester, Mass., Lithuanian organizations commemorated Lithuanian Independence Day with appropriate programs held at several meeting places throughout the city.

As part of the exercises, it was my privilege to speak to the assemblages over radio station WNEB, in association with a local prominent Lithuanian-American attorney, Anthony J. Miller, Esq. I have been requested to include the addresses delivered by Mr. Miller and myself on this occasion, and they follow:

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY ADDRESS DELIVERED BY UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE HAROLD D. DONOHUE, OF MASSACHUSETTS

More as a friend and neighbor of my fellow American-Lithuanians, than as your United States Representative in the Congress, I consider it a particular privilege to take part in this program commemorating the 39th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania's independence.

This annual ceremony is dear to the hearts of all Lithuanians and their American friends, because it is held to recollect the date of February 16, 1918, which marked the end of well over a century of suffering under a hostile, foreign rule. Back on that joyful day, Lithuania stood forth as an independent democratic republic. There was cause for the celebration then, and the future was faced with confidence. Your homeland people were happy and prosperous in their own sovereignty.

Unfortunately, in this year of 1957, our observance here must be shaded with sorrow. The bright star of Lithuania's freedom has been clouded over by the violent storms of tyranny. We gaze with sadness upon the continuing tragedy of sacrific to ruthless imperialism that has enveloped Lithuania; she has ceased to be an independent nation.

The brutal tyranny now being forced upon Lithuania, and the other small nations, is a continuing challenge to the moral conscience of this Nation and the United Nations to reestablish the great, basic principles of freedom and liberty for all peoples. In simple justice, our Government must perseveringly insist that the Lithuanian people be permitted their inalienable right to govern their internal existence as they themselves see fit.

Until Lithuania, and the other enslaved nations are free, we cannot truthfully say that the Christian objective of liberty for which two great world wars, and indeed the Korean war, were fought, has been accomplished. The major world powers, including the United States, remain acquiescent parties to the disgraceful betrayal of the smaller nations while they continue to allow peaceful, freedom-loving peoples to be cruelly dominated by the Soviet rule of imperialistic terrorism—which defies every decent concept of self-determination and democracy.

On this occasion dedicated to the memory and future objective of Lithuanian independence, I again say that the United States and the United Nations must increasingly call upon Russia to give up her occupation and control over Lithuania and the other Baltic nations.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly violated the political pledges made at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Unless restitution is made, the United States should not be held bound by such unratified agreements. We must continue to use our moral leadership in the United Nations to demand that the suppressed rights of Lithuania and other subjugated nations to govern themselves be restored.

Although we mourn over her present plight, there is no cause for despair. Repeatedly, through her history, Lithuania has proved that her people can eventually overcome the temporary triumphs of oppressors. The Christian faith, which in 1399, defeated the Tartar invasion and saved all Europe from barbarism, is still with her today. It gives her the spiritual vigor to outlive any dictatorship. From my own knowledge and experience with my fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent, I know that deep in the heart of every Lithuanian is that passion for liberty and freedom which never dies. There is no power that can forever enslave a people who are determined to be free.

As the keynote of this ceremony, may I suggest that we rededicate ourselves in the determination to perseveringly reveal and present to the Christian world the facts and the truth about the persecution of Lithuania, so that the United Nations and the United States will be inspired to accept the full moral and humanitarian responsibility of restoring Lithuanian independence.

In this rededication, I am sure you will have the complete support of all Christian, freedom-loving people throughout the world. I am confident you can rely upon them to join in your efforts and prayers that your homeland may once again be free. May God grant that such a joyous day will soon be realized.

---

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY ADDRESS BY ANTHONY J. MILLER, ESQ.

As an American citizen of Lithuanian descent, I am very proud to participate in this ceremony marking the origin of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania 39 years ago.

Our courageous homeland, of a little more than 21,000 square miles in area and a population of 3 million before the Second World War, has a history of oppression dating back to the 13th century when Gediminas successfully consolidated the Lithuanian state.

However, invasions from unfriendly neighbors continued and internal discord plagued the country until the period when Vytautas the Great became the ruler of Lithuania. The country, under his government, grew and expanded in Western culture and Christianity.

It was during the 16th century that Lithuania began to feel the force of Russia for the first time, and, during the 18th century, history shows the decline of the country

through devastating wars in which she lost much of her territory. The following 120 years were spent under Russian domination during which time 5 revolutions were attempted unsuccessfully. During the First World War, Lithuania was finally able to overthrow the binding ties of first, Germany, and finally, Russia late in 1919. After hundreds of years of perseverance, Lithuania was free.

As soon as independence was achieved the Lithuanians lived a happy and prosperous life. They made continuing progress and added many contributions to the culture of Western Europe. Lithuania became a respected member of the League of Nations in 1921.

However, after 2 decades of a happy experience under a freely elected government of their choice, they were again engulfed by the tyrants of Soviet Russia. They were incorporated into the Soviet Union against their will, without even the opportunity to express themselves in the matter.

The Soviet Union applied the typical Communist methods in an effort to enslave and destroy the will of the sturdy people of Lithuania and has sought to force them to give allegiance to Moscow. Despite the loss of their liberties and the brutal treatment they have endured, the Lithuanians refuse to recognize Communist Russia as their overlord. They continue to offer resistance to the Soviet Union. Their determination not to yield to the aggressor exemplifies the strong character of these extraordinary people.

The Lithuanians have, since 1940, offered active resistance to Soviet rule of their homeland. Well aware of the consequences of acting against the Soviet rule, they continue in their drive for freedom.

Despite a 16-year program of Russification, we read press reports in 1957 which indicate that the spirit of our heroic people has not broken. They stand ready, fortified by their belief in Christian ideals, to shed their blood to achieve independence and break away from the Communist yoke. They have faith and hope and they will not despair before they see the dawn of victory.

The history of Lithuania has been mixed with both glory and tragedy. In their early history, the Lithuanians were called upon to defend Europe when the Tartars came from the East and threatened Western civilization. They suffered persecutions beyond human endurance during their 120-year subjugation under Russia and they are undergoing terrible persecutions and privations today.

Nevertheless, the desire of our gallant people to obtain their liberties and freedom is so strong that they will never succumb to atheistic slavery of communism.

As we commemorate this 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence and hold out our hands of friendship and hope to the heroic Lithuanian people in the homeland, we all express the fervent hope and prayer that Lithuania will soon again be free and independent.

Let us then pledge ourselves tonight to persevere in our efforts to promote the liberation of Lithuania, and may God speed that happy day.

## Get the Government Out of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 20, 1957*

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, generally when people think of getting the Government out of competition with private industry, they think of the large plants operated by the Government during the war years and since the war. We have heard a great deal of bragging both from the Congress and the executive branch on how many businesses and how many enterprises out of which we have taken the Government.

There is no one, however, who brags about the fact that a serious effort has been made to get the Government out of competition with one of the most important of all industries, the printing industry. Everyone complains because the Post Office Department shows a tremendous deficit and yet one of the things that contributes so much to that deficit is the Post Office Department selling printed envelopes and carrying on a printing business in competition with the printing industries of America at a price that is far below the actual cost of operating that business.

As in previous years, I am today introducing a bill to remove the Post Office Department from competition with private industry with respect to the printing of names and addresses and advertising on envelopes sold by the Postal Department. It will prohibit the furnishing or sale by the Department to the public of envelopes having any printing thereon other than the simple words "return to" and the three blank lines, which can be kept in stock in each post office and sold for the convenience of those desiring to purchase such envelopes, as well as serving a purpose to the Postal Department in reminding the sender to place a return address on such envelope.

There probably was a time in the early history of this country when communities were new, when services had not caught up with the western movement and when printing facilities were not what they are today, when it may have been necessary for the Post Office Department to go into the job-printing business. That time has long since passed, that time ceased to exist with the invention of modern job-printing equipment, and with the installations of modern printing equipment in almost every job-printing shop across the land. Today the Federal Government is maintaining this outmoded monstrosity at a terrific subsidy to those who are using the service and in unfair competition to the job-printing shops across the Nation who are attempting to pay their taxes, maintain a business, and, in short, build a nation based upon individual initiative and private industry.

Under the guise of public service, the Postal Department accepts and fills orders for stamped or plain envelopes with the names and addresses of individuals, businessmen, or firms printed thereon. The actual printing is done by a single contractor. Although competitive bids are invited in the letting of this contract, the last time there was a competitive bid was in 1928 when the present contractor, the International Envelope Co., received its present contract.

This printing contract which eliminates all competitors could be overlooked, were this the only abuse in this program. More serious, however, is the fact that the Department for years has been furnishing and selling the printed envelopes at a considerable loss. In one recent year when the Department handled 538,000 orders for sale of 1 billion envelopes, 26 clerks at an aggregate salary of $101,000 were required just to process the orders. This does not take into account the fact that every postmaster in every small post office across the land is required to take time out from his postal duties to take orders, complete the forms, mail them into the Regional Office, and then when the shipment of printed envelopes finally arrives back in his office, he is required to notify the firm receiving the envelopes, take time that should be used in processing the mails to make delivery, make reports, collect and transmit the funds, and what not. It is not only a waste of valuable time, it is a waste of valuable effort, and another yard in the redtape of the Postal Department.

#### YARDSTICK

Another serious result of Government competition in printing is the fact that at present rates, the Government is printing 500 envelopes and charging $1 for such printing. The standard price for printing those envelopes in a commercial shop would be about $4 or $5, depending upon the locality in which the shop is located. There is no private shop that can pay overhead, taxes, and employment charges and compete with $1 printing. The result is that the Postal Department is thus establishing a yardstick on the price of printed envelopes, a yardstick that cannot be met by private enterprise. Discontinuance of this program is the only remedy which will permit the small job-printing businessman to come in and compete fairly for his business.

Obviously the Post Office Department with its tremendous volume of business, its thousands of outlets and vast assets can command far lower prices in obtaining printed material than any small printer could offer. Because of this, the Department will always be in a position to have envelopes printed and sell them to the public at prices which the small printer cannot meet.

Through this program the Government has established a price yardstick, a yardstick by which prices of private industry to consumers are measured and compared with the prices of Government to the consumer. The public feels that because the Government can do the job so much more cheaply, that the local printer is gouging the consumer, since his prices are so much higher than Government prices.

#### FREE PRINTING

The plant of the International Envelope Co. is located at Toledo, Ohio. Here the printing is done on envelopes at the rate of $1 per 500. Printed envelopes are delivered to a customer in Los Angeles or Spokane, Wash., at exactly the same price they are delivered to a customer in Toledo. A customer living in South Dakota ordering blank No. 8 envelopes from a paper house in Toledo would pay the Postal Department 82 cents parcel post charges in delivering those blank envelopes. If the same customer orders the envelopes printed by

the Postal Department they are shipped to him free from Toledo, Ohio, which means that the customer is actually paying 18 cents for the printing.

A customer in Los Angeles would pay $1 parcel post charges to have 500 blank envelopes shipped to him from Toledo, whereas if they are printed by the Postal Department they are shipped to him free. The Postal Department has either lost a dollar or has had the printing done free, since the additional charge for such printing was $1.

SUMMARY

This is what Government does when it competes with private industry. You probably ask why has this monstrosity been permitted all of these years? The answer is that the Post Office Department's customers are businessmen scattered throughout the United States who like the present system, not because it is in anywise a good business venture, not because it is fair in any respect to private industry, not because it reduces Government or Government expenditures, but simply because it is convenient and cheaper for them.

Here—at a time when the Government is boasting of getting out of business, here at a time when the Postal Department is operating at a tremendous deficit, here at a time when there is an outcry for increased postal rates to reduce postal deficits, here, then, is the time and place to cut out a useless function costing the taxpayer millions of dollars a year, causing the Postal Department millions of yards of additional redtape; here is the place to use the ax.

# SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1957

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hearest prayer, the utmost soul of us cries out for the living God. Teach us how costly are the fruits of prayer that keep open the channels between Thy life and ours. We confess that so often we have asked for that which we already have—neglected and unappropriated. Often we have beseeched Thee to give us that which we must win for ourselves, perhaps with sweat and tears. Give us to see that the first step in the stairway that slopes through doubt and darkness up to Thee is the hushing of the clamor which so often drowns out the music of Thy peace. Grant us to know that not in the rush and roar of things, but in quietness and confidence, shall we be strengthened for the work committed to our hands in this day of destiny when we believe that in Thy providence our America has come to the kingdom for such a time as this. We ask it in the name of that Holy One who is the Way and the Truth and the Life. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 20, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Represenatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1056. An act to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, with dependents, to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters;

H. R. 4897. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution to provide interim assistance, through the Federal National Mortgage Association, in relieving the shortage of funds for home loans pending further investigation of housing credit conditions.

The message informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. LANKFORD, of Maryland, and Mr. KEARNS, of Pennsylvania, as members, on the part of the House, of the National Memorial Stadium Commission.

The message also informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. Harris, of Arkansas, Mr. Morrison, of Louisiana, Mr. Thompson, of New Jersey, Mr. Kearns, of Pennsylvania, Mr. Broyhill, of Virginia, Mr. Barnee Breeskin, of Washington, D. C., and Mr. Robert Dowling, of New York City, N. Y., as members, on the part of the House, of the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission.

## HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 1056. An act to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, with dependents, to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4897. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution to provide interim assistance, through the Federal National Mortgage Association, in relieving the shortage of funds for home loans pending further investigation of housing credit conditions; placed on the calendar.

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Internal Security Subcommittee, of the Judiciary Committee, be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today. I also ask unanimous consent that the select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor-Management Field be permitted to sit in executive session during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, after consulting the leaders on both sides and obtaining their consent, I now ask unanimous consent of the Senate that the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business. I request that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## STUDY OF ATTENDANCE AND TRANSACTION OF BUSINESS IN THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I announce that I am having a review made of the attendance in the Senate and the transaction of business in this body, in the hope that we can be as efficient and as expeditious as possible. Although we have found it necessary this week to request unanimous consent that certain Senate committees be permitted to sit during the sessions of the Senate, and although we realize the necessity for doing so, and the minority leader has been very liberal, generous, and considerate of our requests in that respect, it may be that after our study is completed and after I have an opportunity to discuss it with the leadership on the other side of the aisle, we shall wish to have sessions for 3 or 4 days a week, and not give permission, except in unusual cases, for committees to meet during that period; and then to have 2 or 3 days a week in which the committees can meet all day. I do not know how the study will result, but I wish to make this announcement, for the information of the Senate.

Many visitors to the Senate find it difficult to understand why at certain times only a few Senators are to be seen on

the floor of the Senate. The visitors do not realize that the Senate has an Internal Security Subcommittee that is meeting all day, a Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor-Management Field that is meeting all day, an Appropriations Committee that is meeting all day, and perhaps a dozen other committees that are meeting at that time. So it may be that we shall wish to alter our schedule in that respect.

## THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE ON THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD the address relative to the situation in the Middle East, delivered last night by the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I come to you again to talk about the situation in the Middle East. The future of the United Nations and peace in the Middle East may be at stake.

In the 4 months since I talked to you about the crisis in that area, the United Nations has made considerable progress in resolving some of the difficult problems. We are now, however, faced with a fateful moment as the result of the failure of Israel to withdraw its forces behind the armistice lines, as contemplated by the United Nations resolutions on this subject.

I have already today met with leaders of both parties from the Senate and the House of Representatives and we have had a very useful exchange of views. It was the general feeling of that meeting that I should lay the situation before the American people.

Before talking about the specific issues involved, I want to make clear that these issues are not something remote and abstract, but involve matters vitally touching upon the future of each one of us.

The Middle East is a land bridge between the Eurasian and African Continents. Millions of tons of commerce are transmitted through it annually. Its own products, especially petroleum, are essential to Europe and the Western World.

The United States has no ambitions or desires in this region other than that each country there may maintain its independence and live peacefully within itself and with its neighbors and, by peaceful cooperation with others, develop its own spiritual and material resources. But that much is vital to the peace and well-being of us all. This is our concern today.

So tonight I report to you on the matters in controversy and on what I believe the position of the United States must be.

When I talked to you last October, I pointed out that the United States fully realized that military action against Egypt resulted from grave and repeated provocations. But also I said that the use of military force to solve international disputes could not be reconciled with the principles and purposes of the United Nations, to which we had all subscribed. I added that our country could not believe that resort to force and war would for long serve the permanent interests of the attacking nations, which were Britain, France, and Israel.

So I pledged that the United States would seek through the United Nations to end the conflict and to bring about a recall of the forces of invasion, and then make a renewed and earnest effort through that organization to secure justice, under international law, for all of the parties concerned.

Since that time much has been achieved and many of the dangers implicit in the situation have been avoided. The Governments of Britain and France have withdrawn their forces from Egypt. Thereby they showed respect for the opinions of mankind as expressed almost unanimously by the 80-nation members of the United Nations General Assembly.

I want to pay tribute to the wisdom of this action of our friends and allies. They made an immense contribution to world order. Also they put the other nations of the world under a heavy obligation to see to it that those two nations do not suffer by reason of their compliance with the United Nations resolutions. This has special application, I think, to their treaty rights to passage through the Suez Canal which had been made an international waterway for all by the treaty of 1888.

The Prime Minister of Israel, in answer to a personal communication, assured me early in November that Israel would willingly withdraw its forces if and when there should be created a United Nations force to move into the Suez Canal area. This force was, in fact, created and has moved into the canal area.

Subsequently, Israeli forces were withdrawn from much of the territory of Egypt which they had occupied. However, Israeli forces still remain outside the armistice lines, notably at the mouth of the Gulf of Aqaba which is about 100 miles from the nearest Israeli territory and in the Gaza Strip which, by the armistice agreement, was to be occupied by Egypt. This fact creates the present crisis.

We are approaching a fateful moment when either we must recognize that the United Nations is unable to restore peace in this area, or the United Nations must renew with increased vigor its efforts to bring about Israeli withdrawal.

Repeated, but so far unsuccessful, efforts have been made to bring about a voluntary withdrawal by Israel. These efforts have been made both by the United Nations and by the United States and other member states.

Moreover, equally serious efforts have been made to bring about conditions designed to assure that if Israel withdraws in response to the repeated requests of the United Nations, there will then be achieved a greater security and tranquillity for that nation. This means that the United Nations would assert a determination to see that in the Middle East there will be a greater degree of justice and compliance with international law than was the case prior to the events of last October-November.

A United Nations emergency force, with Egypt's consent, entered that nation's territory in order to help to maintain the cease-fire, which the United Nations called for on November 2. The Secretary General, who ably and devotedly serves the United Nations, has recommended a number of measures which might be taken by the United Nations and by its emergency force to assure for the future the avoidance by either side of belligerent acts.

The United Nations General Assembly on February 2 by an overwhelming vote adopted a resolution to the effect that, after full withdrawal of Israel from the Gulf of Aqaba and Gaza areas, the United Nations emergency force should be placed on the Egyptian-Israeli armistice lines to assure the scrupulous maintenance of the armistice agreement. Also the United Nations General Assembly called for the implementation of other measures proposed by the Secretary General. These other measures embraced the use of the United Nations Emergency Force at the mouth of the Gulf of Aqaba, so as to assure nonbelligerency in this area.

The United States was a cosponsor of this United Nations resolution. Thus the United States sought to assure that Israel would, for the future, enjoy its rights under the armistice and under the international law.

In view of the valued friendly relations which the United States has always had with the State of Israel, I wrote to Prime Minister Ben-Gurion on February 3. I recalled his statement to me on November 8 to the effect that the Israeli forces would be withdrawn under certain conditions, and I urged that, in view of the General Assembly resolutions of February 2, Israel should complete that withdrawal.

However, the Prime Minister, in his reply, took the position that Israel would not evacuate its military forces from the Gaza Strip unless Israel retained the civil administration and police. This would be in contradiction to the armistice agreement. Also, the reply said that Israel would not withdraw from the Straits of Aqaba unless freedom of passage through the straits was assured.

It was a matter of keen disappointment to us that the Government of Israel, despite the United Nations action, still felt unwilling to withdraw.

However, in a further effort to meet the views of Israel in these respects, Secretary of State Dulles, at my direction gave to the Government of Israel on February 11 a statement of United States policy. This has now been made public. It was pointed out that neither the United States nor the United Nations had authority to impose upon the parties a substantial modification of the armistice agreement which was freely signed by Israel and Egypt. Nevertheless, the statement said, the United States as a member of the United Nations would seek such disposition of the United Nations emergency force as would assure that the Gaza Strip could no longer be a source of armed infiltration and reprisals.

The Secretary of State orally informed the Israeli Ambassador that the United States would be glad to urge and support, also, some participation by the United Nations, with the approval of Egypt, in the administration of the Gaza Strip. The principal population of the Strip consists of about 200,000 Arab refugees, who exist largely as a charge upon the benevolence of the United Nations and its members.

With reference to the passage into and through the Gulf of Aqaba, we expressed the conviction that the gulf constitutes international waters and that no nation has the right to prevent free and innocent passage in the gulf. We announced that the United States was prepared to exercise this right itself and to join with others to secure general recognition of this right.

The Government of Israel has not yet accepted, as adequate insurance of its own safety after withdrawal, the far-reaching United Nations resolution of February 2 plus the important declaration of United States policy made by our Secretary of State on February 11.

But Israel seeks something more. It insists on firm guaranties as a condition to withdrawing its forces of invasion.

This raises a basic question of principle. Should a nation which attacks and occupies foreign territory in the face of United Nations disapproval be allowed to impose conditions on its withdrawal?

If we agree that armed attack can properly achieve the purposes of the assailant, then I fear we will have turned back the clock of international order. We will, in effect, have countenanced the use of force as a means of settling international differences and gaining national advantages.

I do not myself see how this could be reconciled with the Charter of the United Nations. The basic pledge of all the members of the United Nations is that they will settle their international disputes by peaceful means and will not use force against the territorial integrity of another state.

If the United Nations once admits that international disputes can be settled by using force, then we will have destroyed the very foundation of the organization, and our best hope of establishing a real world order. That would be a disaster for us all.

I would, I feel, be untrue to the standards of the high office to which you have chosen me if I were to lend the influence of the United States to the proposition that a nation which invades another should be permitted to exact conditions for withdrawal.

Of course, we and all the members of the United Nations ought to support justice and conformity with international law. The first article of the charter states the purpose of the United Nations to be "the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes." But it is to be observed that conformity with justice and international law are to be brought about "by peaceful means."

We cannot consider that the armed invasion and occupation of another country are peaceful means or proper means to achieve justice and conformity with international law.

We do, however, believe that upon the suppression of the present act of aggression and breach of the peace, there should be a greater effort by the United Nations and its members to secure justice and conformity with international law. Peace and justice are two sides of the same coin.

Perhaps the world community has been at fault in not having paid enough attention to this truth. The United States, for its part, will vigorously seek solutions of the problems of the area in accordance with justice and international law. And we shall in this great effort seek the association of other like-minded nations which realize, as we do, that peace and justice are in the long run inseparable.

But the United Nations faces immediately the problem of what to do next. If it does nothing, if it accepts the ignoring of its repeated resolutions calling for the withdrawal of invading forces, then it will have admitted failure. That failure would be a blow to the authority and influence of the United Nations in the world and to the hopes which humanity placed in the United Nations as the means of achieving peace with justice.

This failure would be harmful to the long term good of Israel. It would, in addition to its injury to the United Nations, jeopardize the prospects of the peaceful solution of the problems of the Middle East. This could bring incalculable ills to our friends and indeed to our Nation itself. It would make infinitely more difficult the realization of the goals which I laid out in my Middle East message of January 5 to the Congress seeking to strengthen the area against Communist aggression, direct or indirect.

The United Nations must not fail. I believe that—in the interests of peace—the United Nations has no choice but to exert pressure upon Israel to comply with the withdrawal resolutions. Of course, we still hope that the Government of Israel will see that its best immediate and long-term interests lie in compliance with the United Nations and in placing its trust in the resolutions of the United Nations and in the declaration of the United States with reference to the future.

I do not believe that Israel's default should be ignored because the United Nations has not been able effectively to carry out its resolutions condemning the Soviet Union for its armed suppression of the people of Hungary. Perhaps this is a case where the proverb applies that two wrongs do not make a right.

No one deplores more than I the fact that the Soviet Union ignores the resolutions of the United Nations. Also no nation is more vigorous than is the United States in seeking to exert moral pressure against the Soviet Union, which by reason of its size and power and by reason of its veto in the United Nations Security Council, is relatively impervious to other types of sanction.

The United States and other free nations are making clear by every means at their command the evil of Soviet conduct in Hungary. It would indeed be a sad day if the United States ever felt that it had to subject Israel to the same type of moral pressure as is being applied to the Soviet Union.

There can, of course, be no equating of a nation like Israel with that of the Soviet Union. The peoples of Israel, like those of the United States, are imbued with a religious faith and a sense of moral values. We are entitled to expect, and do expect, from such peoples of the free world a contribution to world order which unhappily we cannot expect from a nation controlled by atheistic despots.

It has been suggested that United Nations actions against Israel should not be pressed because Egypt has in the past violated the armistice agreement and international law. It is true that both Egypt and Israel, prior to last October, engaged in reprisals in violations of the armistice agreements and that Egypt ignored the United Nations in exercising belligerent rights in relation to Israeli shipping in the Suez Canal and in the Gulf of Aqaba. However, such violations constitute no justification for the armed invasion of Egypt by Israel which the United Nations is now seeking to undo.

Egypt, by accepting the six principles adopted by the Security Council last October in relation to the Suez Canal, bound itself to free and open transit through the canal without discrimination, and to the principle that the operation of the canal should be insulated from the politics of any country.

We should not assume that if Israel withdraws, Egypt will prevent Israeli shipping from using the Suez Canal or the Gulf of Aqaba. If, unhappily, Egypt does hereafter violate the armistice agreement or other international obligations, then this should be dealt with firmly by the society of nations.

The present moment is a grave one, but we are hopeful that reason and right will prevail. Since the events of last October and November, solid progress has been made, in conformity with the charter of the United Nations. There is the cease-fire, the forces of Britain and France have been withdrawn, the forces of Israel have been partially withdrawn, and the clearing of the canal nears completion. When Israel completes its withdrawal, it will have removed a definite block to further progress.

Once this block is removed, there will be serious and creative tasks for the United Nations to perform. There needs to be respect for the right of Israel to national existence and to internal development. Complicated provisions insuring the effective international use of the Suez Canal will need to be worked out in detail. The Arab refugee problem must be solved. As I said in my special message to Congress on January 5, it must be made certain that all the Middle East is kept free from aggression and infiltration.

Finally, all who cherish freedom, including ourselves, should help the nations of the Middle East achieve their just aspirations for improving the well-being of their peoples.

What I have spoken about tonight is only one step in a long process calling for patience and diligence, but at this moment it is the critical issue on which future progress depends.

It is an issue which can be solved if only we will apply the principles of the United Nations.

That is why, my fellow Americans, I know you want the United States to continue to use its maximum influence to sustain those principles as the world's best hope for peace.

## SPEECHES ON THE MIDDLE EAST JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to read into the RECORD a memorandum for the information of the Senate:

The Senate majority and minority leaders have asked that the members of the Foreign Relations and the Armed Services Committees be notified that Senators who wish to make remarks in connection with the pending Middle East joint resolution should endeavor to do so on Wednesday, February 20, or Thursday, February 21. At the present time there do not seem to be sufficient speakers on the subject. No unanimous-consent request for a time to vote has yet been made.

On yesterday, Mr. President, we served notice that if no speakers were available from time to time, we would, in the absence of Senators who were prepared to speak, proceed to vote.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

### AMENDMENT OF TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," with respect to warrant officers' rank on retirement, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

### REPORT OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Battle Creek, Mich., reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions by that Administration, for the quarter ended December 31, 1956; to the Committee on Armed Services.

### EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BENEFITS TO TRUST TERRITORY OF PACIFIC ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the benefits of section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

### REPORT OF UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Information, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated January 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### GRANTING OF TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS TO TERRITORY OF ALASKA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to grant to the Territory of Alaska title to certain lands beneath tidal waters, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

### TRAINING OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the training of Federal employees at public or private facilities, and

for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial No. 3

"Whereas under the shared-revenue program of the Federal Government with the States and counties, 25 percent of the fees from the national forests was, by Federal statute, to be paid to the counties through the States; and

"Whereas it was discovered that the Forest Service had withheld 20 percent of the grazing fees and that they had only paid 80 percent of the 25 percent to which the counties were entitled; and

"Whereas the 81st Congress, 2d session, passed an act authorizing payment to certain States, amounts withheld from grazing fees on public land, and authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,351,149.37 for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury to the following States the following sums:

| | |
|---|---|
| Arizona | $153,829.60 |
| California | 126,880.55 |
| Colorado | 201,641.56 |
| Idaho | 167,473.14 |
| Missouri | 1,805.16 |
| Montana | 130,273.34 |
| Nebraska | 9,473.77 |
| Nevada | 74,851.66 |
| New Mexico | 95,725.13 |
| Oregon | 77,960.80 |
| South Dakota | 14,696.39 |
| Utah | 174,997.45 |
| Washington | 19,085.83 |
| West Virginia | 362.50 |
| Wyoming | 102,092.49 |

Such sums shall be expended by such States in accordance with the terms of acts of May 28, 1908, and March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 500), passed by the House of Representatives September 18, 1950. This bill was signed by the President of the United States in December of 1950; and

"Whereas the State of Colorado is the loser of the largest amount due any State, namely $201,641.56; and

"Whereas these moneys have been withheld illegally by the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture and should be forthwith paid to the States: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the Forty-first General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein)*, That we respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to forthwith make an appropriation to the Department of Agriculture to pay the several States the amount that was illegally withheld by the Forest Service, and that this money be appropriated to the use of the several States, including Colorado; be it further

*"Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States.

"CHARLES R. CONKLIN,
*"Speaker of the house of representatives.*
"LEE MATTIES,
*"Chief clerk of the house of representatives.*
"FRANK L. HAYS,
*"President of the senate.*
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
*"Secretary of the senate."*

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact or amend legislation under the shared revenue program established by the Congress of the United States for the benefit of schools and roads to increase from 25 percent to 75 percent of the gross receipts from national forest lands in those counties where the predominant annual income comes from grazing fees instead of from timber sales

*"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the 41st General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein)*, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is memorialized to enact or amend existing legislation authorizing the payments to the States for the use of the counties' road and school funds 75 percent of the gross receipts from national forest lands in those counties where the predominant annual income comes from grazing fees instead of from timber sales; be it further

*"Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States.

"CHARLES R. CONKLIN,
*"Speaker of the house of representatives.*
"LEE MATTIES,
*"Chief clerk of the house of representatives.*
"FRANK L. HAYS,
*"President of the senate.*
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
*"Secretary of the senate."*

---

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD from the State of Montana; to Congressmen LEE METCALF and LEROY ANDERSON from Montana; to the Department of Agriculture and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States; relating to unfair publicity on agricultural commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation of the United States and referred to as 'surpluses,' requesting the Department of Agriculture and the Secretary of Agriculture to consider and evaluate agricultural commodities designated as 'surpluses,' and to segregate sufficient amounts of such commodities to be called 'reserves,' to be in quantities comparable to other commodities and to be used in the event of crop failure or national emergencies

"Whereas the public is constantly made aware of the unfairness of publicity relating to the agricultural commodities purchased and held by the Commodity Credit Corporation of the United States, which commodities are constantly referred to as 'surpluses'; and

"Whereas the costs of holding the same and the losses incurred thereby are attributed to the farmers; and

"Whereas the farmers are placed in the undesirable position of being recipients of special subsidies at the expense of other classes of the national population: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved*, That the Department of Agriculture and Secretary of Agriculture of the United States be instructed and enjoined to carefully consider and evaluate these agricultural commodities and to segregate sufficient amounts of such commodities to be considered as 'reserves' in quantities comparable to the reserves of fuels, metals, munitions and manpower presently maintained for the protection of the country in the event of crop failure or national emergency; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That these amounts shall be clearly and emphatically designated and publicized as 'reserves' rather than 'surpluses,' and that the costs of maintaining such 'reserves' be charged to national security rather than the agricultural program; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be submitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD from the State of Montana; to Congressmen LEE METCALF and LEROY ANDERSON from Montana; to the Department of Agriculture and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States.

"EUGENE H. MAHONEY,
*"Speaker of the house.*
"PAUL CANNON,
*"President of the Senate."*

---

"House Joint Memorial 11

"Joint memorial of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Montana to Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from the State of Montana; to the Honorable LEE METCALF and the Honorable LEROY ANDERSON, Representatives from the State of Montana; to the Department of Agriculture and to the Honorable Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson; asking that acreages of experimental wheat be not counted in the allotted acreage set up for each farm and that the grower of experimental wheat be not penalized for this excess acreage

"Whereas wheat production makes up a major portion of the new wealth of the Nation; and

"Whereas it is an accepted fact that more research is needed to establish the wheat farmer in a healthy economic condition; and

"Whereas the present curtailed acreage allotment discourages the use of these curtailed acres for experimental work, since every allotted acre is needed to bolster the sagging farm economy; and

"Whereas experimental wheat crops cannot be counted on to equal approved varieties in the production of revenue: Now therefore be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana (the Senate concurring)*, That we respectfully urge that Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Congress of the United States; the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from the State of Montana; the Honorable LEE METCALF and the Honorable LEROY ANDERSON, Representatives from the State of Montana; the Department of Agriculture and the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, to allow wheat producers to grow unproved varieties of experimental wheat under direction of the State extension service, and that such acreages of experimental wheat be not counted in the allotted acreage set up for each farm and that the grower of experimental wheat be not penalized for this excess acreage; be it further

*"Resolved*, That the Secretary of State for the State of Montana be, and is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this memorial to those listed in the title of this memorial.

"EUGENE H. MAHONEY,
*"Speaker of the house.*
"PAUL CANNON,
*"President of the senate."*

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Resolution of the Senate of the State of Montana, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, and the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from Montana, and the Honorable LEE METCALF and the Honorable LEROY H. ANDERSON, Representatives in Congress from Montana and to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, urging and requesting the passage of legislation now being debated in Congress relating to the seeding of durum wheat in allotted acreages

"Whereas there are no surpluses of durum wheat now existing in the State of Montana, or in the United States; and

"Whereas durum wheat in the years 1955 and 1956 constituted a substantial part of the income of the farmers of the State of Montana; and

"Whereas legislation in the Congress of the United States has been introduced and is being currently debated, affecting the acreage allotments pertaining to the seeding of durum wheat in Montana: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of the State of Montana does hereby go on record and petition the Senate of the United States of America and the House of Representatives of the United States of America to act and urge passage of the legislation introduced and affecting acreage allotments of durum wheat, to wit: For each acre of durum wheat seeded within the allotted wheat acreage, one acre of durum wheat may be seeded outside of the allotted acreage: Now, therefore, be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of the State of Montana, to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America and to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from the State of Montana, and the Honorable LEE METCALF and the Honorable LEROY H. ANDERSON, Congressmen from the State of Montana, and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States of America; and that they, the Senators and Congressmen from the State of Montana, and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States of America, be requested to use all honorable means within their powers to foster and urge the passage of said legislation.

"PAUL CANNON,
*"President of the Senate."*

---

A resolution adopted by citizens of Lithuanian descent of the city of Racine, Wis., relating to the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Hawaiian Government Employees' Association, Honolulu, T. H., favoring the enactment of legislation to increase the salaries of the members of the Hawaiian Territorial Legislature; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The petition of David H. Johnson, of Draper, Utah, praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions signed by Hans E. Johnson, of Mora, Minn.; George Soupene, of Moorland, Okla.; Mrs. E. R. Horsey, Mrs. E. Martinez, and Mrs. P. Isidoro, all of Oceanside, Calif.; Hugh C. Smith, of Granada Hills, Calif.; W. E. McCorquodale, of Orange, Tex.; S. W. Rogers, of Lakeland, Fla.; Alvin O'Pry, of Morton, Tex., and Frances S. Pack, of Neosho, Mo.; praying for an investigation of the Food and Drug Administration for its action relating to the Hoxey cancer cure; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MUNDT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 1

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a Joint Congressional Committee To Investigate the Cost of Living and Marketing Margins as it pertains to agricultural commodities

*"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein)*:

"Whereas the economic welfare of the people of South Dakota is of primary concern to the legislature; and

"Whereas the rising cost of living and the widening spread between the prices received by farmers and those paid by consumers for agricultural commodities indicate need for investigation: Now, therefore, be it.

*"Resolved by the 35th legislature*, That we hereby memorialize the United States Congress, to establish a joint Congressional Committee To Investigate the Cost of Living and Marketing Margins to insure continued abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices consistent with equitable economic returns to farm people; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency the President of the United States; to the Honorable KARL MUNDT and the Honorable FRANCIS CASE, United States Senators; to the Honorable GEORGE MCGOVERN and the Honorable E. Y. BERRY, Representatives in the United States Congress.

"NILS A. BOE,
*"Speaker.*
"W. J. MATSON,
*"Chief Clerk.*
"L. R. STOUCK,
*"Lieutenant Governor.*
"NILES P. JENSEN,
*"Secretary of Senate."*

---

## RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have just received a resolution on the Library Services Act adopted by the council of the American Library Association on January 31, 1957.

It has been a source of considerable dismay to me to learn that the President's recommendations for fiscal 1958 for this critical and important public-library service program in rural areas amounts to only $3 million. Senators interested in this matter will remember that the Library Services Act, passed by the 84th Congress, authorized an annual appropriation of $7,500,000.

Here is another example of unwarranted budget cutting which is contrary to the immediate and long-term needs of the American people. For my part, I want to protest the inadequacy of the President's budgetary request, and I earnestly hope that the appropriate committees of the Congress will not agree to undercut our rural library program in this manner.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON THE LIBRARY SERVICES ACT, ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, JANUARY 31, 1957

Whereas the Library Services Act was passed by the 84th Congress and signed by the President to aid the States in extending and developing public library service to millions of people in rural areas now without such service or with inadequate service; and

Whereas this act authorizes an annual appropriation of $7,500,000 for a 5-year period to be used for grants to the States on a matching basis; and

Whereas the President's budget for 1957–58 recommends only $3 million for these grants; and

Whereas this recommended appropriation for 1957–58 will penalize States that have developed and promoted programs in anticipation of the full amount for which they could qualify under the act because any reduction from the total amount authorized under the act, namely, $7,500,000, will necessarily reduce the amount available to each State; and

Whereas this proposed reduction will seriously endanger the accomplishment of the primary objective of the act—to stimulate the States and their political subdivisions to establish and maintain adequate library facilities in our rural areas, now unserved or inadequately served: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, The members of the American Library Association at their midwinter meeting at Chicago, Ill., on January 31, 1957, recommend to the 85th Congress, sitting in its first session, that it appropriate for 1957–58 the full amount of $7,500,000 authorized by the act in order that this amount may be available to stimulate the States to proceed with their programs of further extending public library services to rural area; and be it further

*Resolved*, Copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States; to all the Members of the Congress; to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and to the United States Commissioner of Education.

(Transmitted by David H. Clift, executive secretary.)

---

## RESOLUTIONS OF SOUTH CAROLINA ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the South Carolina Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors, at its 16th annual convention at Clemson, S. C.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH CAROLINA ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS,
*February 13, 1957.*

The Honorable STROM THURMOND,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR THURMOND: This association, at the 16th annual convention at Clemson, S. C., January 10, 1957, made the following resolutions:

"1. Whereas many counties in the State of South Carolina have experienced difficulties in securing ample 5-percent funds for servicing by the Soil Conservation Service of the ACP referrals and whereas these difficulties are straining working relationships between the soil conservation districts, the county ASC committees and the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That—

"(a) We urge the Congress of the United States to make direct appropriations to the Soil Conservation Service for the servicing ACP referrals; and

"(b) The Members of the Congress from South Carolina be advised individually of this desire on the part of the State Association of Soil Conservation Districts.

"2. Whereas most of the soil conservation districts in South Carolina come in the category of being old in comparison with other soil conservation districts in the United States since South Carolina has been completely covered by soil conservation districts since May 7, 1943;

"Whereas the workload has continued to increase due to changes in agriculture and increasing interest in sprinkler irrigation and other practices requiring more technical assistance than the amount presently available;

"Whereas the amount of technical assistance currently available is inadequate to work with old cooperators with soil conservation districts and continue to plan farms for new cooperators in keeping with their interest: Now be it

"*Resolved*, That the State Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors in assembly in their annual meeting at Clemson in January 1957, request all district supervisors in the State to call this situation to the attention of their Congressmen and Senators and urge them to increase the amount of technical assistance available to soil conservation districts in South Carolina: Be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Congressman and Senator from South Carolina.

"3. Whereas the building of big dams will destroy valuable land that will be needed for food and fiber production in the future; and

"Whereas little or no protection from floods will be gained from these structures; and

"Whereas Public Law 566 is in our opinion a practical, effective, and economical means of management of water and land in keeping with the principles of good land use: Now be it

"*Resolved*—

"(a) That this association go on record as opposing the principle of water control by big dams until the proper upstream treatment has been established, including the Hartwell Dam,

"(b) That we endorse the management of water and land under the principle of upstream watersheds as provided by Public Law 566 and its amendments, which will provide overall watershed protection and the management and use of water for agriculture, municipalities, and industry, and

"(c) Further, that a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to every department of Government and legislative departments of Government which have in their power a right to carry out the wishes as signified in these resolutions."

We hold these to be important in the conservation of soil and water resources of South Carolina and shall expect your full support.

Sincerely yours,

NEWMAN D. BUCK,
*President.*

## ASSISTANCE IN RELIEVING SHORTAGE OF FUNDS FOR HOME LOANS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report an original bill to provide interim assistance, through the Federal National Mortgage Association, in relieving the shortage of funds for home loans, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 94) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 1325) to provide interim assistance, through the Federal National Mortgage Association, in relieving the shortage of funds for home loans, and for other purposes, reported by Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

## REPORT ENTITLED "ACTION BY THE 84TH CONGRESS ON THE SECOND HOOVER COMMISSION REPORTS" (S. REPT. NO. 95)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the Senate Committee on Government Operations made by its Subcommittee on Reorganization upon the action taken by the 84th Congress on the reports of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, the Second Hoover Commission, and ask that it be printed.

This report contains four tables.

Table I lists the more than 500 bills introduced relating to the Commission's reports.

Table II shows the action taken by each House of the Congress on each of these bills.

Table III shows each specific Hoover Commission recommendation to which each bill relates.

Table IV lists the public laws enacted which implement the Commission's recommendations.

I believe Members of the Senate will find this document of considerable benefit in answering inquiries relating to the action taken by the 84th Congress on the Hoover Commission reports.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

## TEMPORARY STAFF MEMBERS AND ASSISTANTS FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 101) authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to employ certain temporary staff members and assistants, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized, from March 1, 1957, through January 31, 1958, to employ 4 additional professional staff members and 2 additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 1318. A bill to provide that certain surplus property of the United States may be donated for park or recreational purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 1319. A bill to renounce any right, title, and interest which the United States may have in certain lands in Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 1320. A bill to provide that whenever public lands have been heretofore granted to a State for the purpose of erecting certain public buildings within such State, such purpose shall be deemed to include construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishings, and other permanent improvements of such public buildings; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. GOLDWATER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1321. A bill for the relief of Junko Matsuoka Eckrich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1322. A bill for the relief of Heinrich Johann Ellebrecht; and

S. 1323. A bill for the relief of Marianne Schaeffner Tarantella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1324. A bill for the relief of Lt. Cornelius J. Gearin, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1325. A bill to provide interim assistance, through the Federal National Mortgage Association, in relieving the shortage of funds for home loans, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he reported the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1326. A bill to establish a system for the classification and compensation of scientific and professional positions in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1327. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1952, with respect to the crediting for civil service retirement purposes of certain service performed by civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. BEALL):

S. 1328. A bill to permit the use of appropriated funds in purchasing land in connection with the Antietam Battlefield site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 1329. A bill for the relief of Joyce Trueman Watson; and

S. 1330. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the

Padbloc Co., Inc., and Harry G. Lankford, of Wichita, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL (by request):

S. 1331. A bill for the relief of John P. Souvaldzis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1332. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to permit the State of Maryland to provide for the extension of the insurance system established by such title to service performed by certain policemen and firemen in such State; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1333. A bill for the relief of John W. Martz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1334. A bill for the relief of Tadeusz Gasowski; and

S. 1335. A bill for the relief of Sandra Ann Scott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself and Mr. CURTIS):

S. 1336. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Pike-Pawnee Village Cite, Webster County, Nebr., as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EASTLAND (by request):

S. 1337. A bill to amend section 331 of title 28, United States Code, to provide representation of district judges on the Judicial Conference of the United States;

S. 1338. A bill to provide for the maintenance of a roster of retired judges available for special judicial duty and for their assignment to such duty by the Chief Justice of the United States;

S. 1339. A bill to provide that chief judges of circuit and district courts shall cease to serve as such upon reaching the age of 70;

S. 1340. A bill to amend section 456 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to traveling expenses of justices and judges; and

S. 1341. A bill to amend section 372 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 1342. A bill for the relief of David Romain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## RESOLUTION

The following resolution was reported by Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 101. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to employ certain temporary staff members and assistants.

(See resolution printed in full where it appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

## DONATION OF CERTAIN SURPLUS PROPERTY FOR PARK AND RECREATIONAL PURPOSES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide that certain surplus property of the United States may be donated for park or recreational purposes.

As my Senate colleagues know, under existing law surplus property may be transferred to educational institutions without monetary consideration. The bill I am introducing today, if enacted, will expand this provision so as to include the disposal of surplus property, largely lands, for recreational purposes without financial consideration.

The enactment of such legislation would be of great assistance in the expansion of State parks and recreational areas. In addition, it would assist communities, large and small, in expanding city park facilities. Historical monuments would also come under the provisions of the bill.

There are far too many instances of the expansion of important recreation areas being hindered because of the lack of sufficient funds to acquire the desired property. This proposed legislation would bring relief in the situation insofar as Federal surplus property is concerned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1318) to provide that certain surplus property of the United States may be donated for park or recreational purposes, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

## TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS IN STATE OF MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], by request I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to renounce any right, title, and interest which the United States may have in certain lands in Montana.

In 1954 the Federal Government was the beneficiary of one-half interest in eight lots of land in the community of Harlowton, Mont., "to be used for a Federal building and first-class apartment house."

During the course of the probate of the estate of Edwin A. Patterson, the appropriate Federal agencies were contacted; and it was ruled that the devise to the Federal Government was not acceptable. Thus, the decree made by the district court distributing the estate ordered that this property be distributed in a life estate to the heirs.

Subsequently the heirs have decided to sell the property, and a problem of clearing the title to the property has arisen. The purpose of the bill I am introducing today is to make clear that the United States makes no claim to the property.

I am prepared to submit the necessary information to the appropriate committee of the Senate, and I hope the matter can be disposed of expeditiously.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1319) to renounce any right, title, and interest which the United States may have in certain lands in Montana, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## ERECTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC BUILDINGS ON PUBLIC LANDS GRANTED TO THE STATES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, when the United States began to bring the Territories of the West into the Union, certain lands in those States were dedicated to use for public buildings or public schools. However, the Supreme Court of Montana has ruled that the language employed did not include the repair or the renovation of the buildings. Montana has undertaken to have this corrected by the introduction of proposed legislation in the House of Representatives, which has passed that body, and is today on the calendar of the Senate.

Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and myself, I introduce a bill which provides that whenever public lands have heretofore been granted to a State for the purpose of erecting certain public buildings within such, such purpose shall be deemed to include construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishings, and other permanent improvements of such public buildings.

I ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1320) to provide that whenever public lands have been heretofore granted to a State for the purpose of erecting certain public buildings within such State, such purpose shall be deemed to include construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishings, and other permanent improvements of such public buildings, introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. ALLOTT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST—AMENDMENT

Mr. FLANDERS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 921) to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, so that it may there be assigned to the Subcommittee on

Constitutional Rights, for consideration in connection with the subcommittee's studies of freedom of information, which began last year and are continuing this year.

I understand the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], who is the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, has reported that the Committee on Government Operations gave its approval to the rereferral of this bill at an executive session held this morning.

The bill deals with clarification of an old housekeeping statute; we seek to make clear that regulation of routine records in Government agencies should not be construed to permit withholding of information of a nonsecurity nature from the public.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ELIZABETH LUCY LEON—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] added as an additional sponsor of the bill (S. 82) for the relief of Elizabeth Lucy Leon. Mrs. Leon is the fashion editor of the New York Herald Tribune.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXTENSION OF SPECIAL SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1103) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the special school milk program, introduced by me on February 7, 1957.

I should like to say that I am delighted to have the Senator from Wisconsin sponsor this bill with me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE REPORT OF BOARD OF ACTUARIES OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILTY FUND (S. DOC. NO. 30)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 35th annual report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, previously transmitted to the Senate, be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Speech delivered by him before the fourth national conference on international economic and social development.

## DR. HENRY NORRIS RUSSELL

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on last Monday, February 18, Dr. Henry Norris Russell died at Princeton, N. J. For many years Dr. Russell was one of the outstanding members of the Princeton faculty. He retired some years ago. He was looked upon throughout the world as one of the leading thinkers in the field of astronomy; and he added great luster to Princeton's studies in scientific research which have included important discoveries by Einstein and others in the field of atomic fission.

Mrs. Smith and I are happy to claim Dr. Russell and his family as warm personal friends and neighbors of ours in Princeton. It gives me great satisfaction to pay this tribute to him in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In the New York Herald Tribune of Tuesday, February 19, there appeared an article describing the remarkable achievements of this outstanding scientist during the course of his wonderful life. I ask unanimous consent that the article in the Tribune be printed in full in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

To Mrs. Russell and their children, Mrs. Smith and I extend our affectionate sympathies.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. HENRY N. RUSSELL DIES—DEAN OF UNITED STATES ASTRONOMERS

PRINCETON, N. J., February 18.—Dr. Henry Norris Russell, 79, one of the world's leading astronomers, died today at Princeton Hospital.

Dr. Russell, who lived at 70 Alexander Street, was a research associate at the Harvard Observatory and former director of the Princeton Observatory as well as Charles A. Young professor of astronomy emeritus.

HONORED BY FOUR NATIONS

Honored by scientific societies of four countries and given honorary degrees by universities here and abroad, Dr. Russell developed the theory of eclipsing binary stars, and discovered that the temperature, luminosity, and chemical composition of most stars were related.

In 1951, when Yale University conferred an honorary degree on him, the citation accompanying the degree called him the "dean of American astronomers, profound student of the physics of the stars and the structure of the atom, master in interpreting to us the whole domain of astronomical research, philosopher of cosmic evolution and man's place in the universe."

VIEWS ON PLANETARY LIFE

Dr. Russell's applications of the ionization theory to astronomy, interpretation of solar and stellar spectra, and atomic studies led to a complete revision of earlier ideas about the chemical makeup of the universe.

From a more popular standpoint, Dr. Russell was often quoted in news accounts of scientific meetings in regard to his long-held theory there was life on other planets. In 1924 he said there were probably millions of planets with a variety of life on them, and the following year he stated as an incontrovertible fact there was vegetable life on Mars.

PESSIMISTIC PREDICTION

For long-range worriers he added a pessimistic note in 1935, when he said the earth was slowly being depleted of its oxygen and that present forms of life would die of suffocation on or about the year 1,101,935 A. D. Four years later, he added another warning note, advising that the sun would change from a red star type to a white dwarf and grow brighter and bluer, causing the earth to become hotter at the rate of 1° Fahrenheit every 100 million years.

Alone or in collaboration with Princeton colleagues, Dr. Russell has written a number of classics in astronomy. In addition to about 15 contributions to scientific journals, he wrote such books as Determination of Stellar Parallax, published in 1911; Astronomy, 1926; The Solar System and Its Origin, 1935; and The Masses of Stars, 1940.

ARMY CONSULTANT

During World War I he was consulting and experimental engineer for the Army Signal Corps and later civilian engineer for the board of aircraft production. During World War II he was a member of the ballistics advisory committee at the Army Proving Ground at Aberdeen, Md.

He received two medals from the French Academy, the gold medal of the Royal Astronomical Society of England, and medals from the National Academy of Sciences, Astronomical Society of the Pacific, and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. In 1946 Mexico awarded him the Order of the Aztec Eagle, the highest award that country gives to foreigners.

HEADED SCIENTIFIC GROUPS

Dr. Russell formerly was president of the American Philosophical Association, American Astronomical Society and the American Association for Advancement of Science.

Surviving are his wife, Mrs. Lucy May Cole Russell; three daughters, Mrs. George H. Gardner, Miss Elizabeth Hoxie Russell, and Mrs. Frank K. Edmonson; and a son, Dr. Henry Norris Russell, Jr.

## OSCAR JACKSON COFFIN

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I rise in tribute to the memory of a great North Carolinian.

Oscar Jackson Coffin, known as O. J. to his contemporaries and as "Skipper" to his legion of students, died on October 29, 1956, a few short months after he retired from 30 years of teaching journalism at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

O. J. was as much a home-grown, Tar Heel institution as the journalism school he built, and nobody in North Carolina had a keener eye or pen than his.

Along with a veritable host of others in North Carolina, I counted him as my great and good friend. The Journalism Newsletter of his school recently published a collection of excerpts from some of the dozens of editorial tributes paid to him by his fellow newspapermen in North Carolina, and I think these editorials come close to revealing O. J. Coffin's standing among his home folks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this collection be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITORIAL TRIBUTES TO O. J. COFFIN

Goldsboro News-Argus: "Oscar Coffin was a newspaperman's newspaperman. Legends

grew about him like ivy around some ancient building."

Shelby Star: "Skipper Coffin was one of the boys in the backroom whose voice was always heard out front."

Fayetteville Observer: "He taught more than the techniques of journalism. He taught honest, aggressive and investigative thinking."

Raleigh Times: "Today there are many typewriter pounders across this State, and even across the country, who would bet their last dollar that the Skipper gave them something extra and worth while, something they would not have gotten without him."

Raleigh News and Observer: "O. J. possessed a barbed wit but there was no malice in his jibes and jabs. Above all, he admired decency in human affairs."

Durham Sun: "He found much humor in life and brought it forth; but most of all, perhaps, he readily discerned pretense and bombast. He was never quite so happy as when debunking bunk."

Daily Tar Heel: "Coffin believed simply in good writing, and his students reflected that belief. He believed in being homey, and he walked and talked and drank beer with his students because he enjoyed it."

Kinston Free Press: "His spirit was a constant challenge to all who knew and loved him. That it will roam the ramparts of good journalism so long as his students live and serve we have no doubt."

High Point Enterprise: "His first loyalty was to the working newspaperman whom he regarded in need of the kind of encouragement he liked to give."

Greenville Daily Reflector: "North Carolina's newspapers are better today because of the tireless years the Skipper devoted to training men and women in the profession."

Oxford Ledger: "With his black-marking editor's pencil, he could add a word there, change one here, and then strike out paragraphs of 'loose' writing by those who came to his classroom for training."

Greensboro Daily News: "The elements in him were so mixed that he was a great teacher and a discerning, stimulating and at times riddling commentator."

Charlotte Observer: "He would always have had a voice somewhere, however long he lived, for the Skipper was a man with something to say."

Charlotte News: "This brusque, rough-hewn monolith was truly a newspaperman's newspaperman. * * * He could render a biblical phrase with the same painstaking accuracy and flavor that he could render a back-country story."

Smithfield Herald: "Skipper Coffin loved honesty and truth and accuracy. He hated hypocrisy and pretension. These loves and these hates he conveyed to his students."

Roy Thompson in the Feedbox, Winston-Salem Journal: "In his own way—he never did anything any other way—he was a great man."

Roy Parker in Hertford County Herald, Ahoskie: "In his home and away from the classroom, his richest possession was comradeship with family, friends, and former students."

Charles Craven in Byways of the News: "When you think of Skipper, the damned adjectives just keep flying up * * * adjectives like ornery, quick-witted, ironic, warm, caustic, down-to-earth, garrulous, skilled, experienced, prominent, respected, kind, profane, beloved."

Rocky Mount Telegram: "Frankness, perhaps, stood out as the greatest personal trait of Dr. Coffin—and if you were a friend of his, you added that title of 'Doctor' at your own peril."

Sanford Herald: "The Coffin front porch was the most sociable hiring hall that ever happened into being. Most of the former students calling there had acquired, in some measure, characteristics of their host. From the time they had first sat in his class in elementary news reporting, they had taken to his way of cussing one minute and citing the Book of Job as an example of polished-down writing the next, of deflating campus stuffed shirts with a colorful phrase or two, and of applying country terms to urbane subjects and characters."

Greensboro Record: "The professor scorned textbooks. He was his own textbook. What he said came from his own experience and his sharp, humorous, caustic, fertile, observant, retentive mind."

Gastonia Gazette: "He was a good craftsman."

Burke Davis in Tar Heel Notebook: "It is only half the truth to say that North Carolina journalism will never be the same again with the death of O. J. Coffin. It was never like that before him, either. If any of us are unique, surely he was."

Bob Ruark in his syndicated column: "One of the lights of my life went out the other day when a magnificently cantankerous gentleman named Oscar Coffin died in Raleigh, N. C., possibly from boredom * * *. O. J. was a humorously irascible gentleman whose hooked nose and craggy chin gave him the appearance of a truculent turtle. He had a pair of piercing blue eyes behind frosty glasses and a laugh that could be reminiscent of the croaking of ravens. Some of this was asthma, but a lot of it arrived from the sardonic view that there was little room in his racket for ineptness. * * * If he's someplace where he can read obits, he probably has already produced a blue pencil and is busy hacking them to bits."

Harry Golden in the Carolina Israelite: "* * * he influenced and 'made' more newspapermen in North Carolina than any other man in his generation. The unusual excellence of this State's press (which some graduate student should explore for his doctorate thesis) is the monument to Mr. Coffin's memory."

---

## THE CORN PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the sun is getting a little higher in the heavens right along, and there is a little more concern about the corn program in the Middle West. Some time ago I introduced a bill which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the committee and testified. He indicated the 8th of March would be pretty nearly the deadline for action, because after that time it would be useless for a farmer to make any new arrangement. The design of the bill was to get around the corn referendum in December and go back to the corn acreage program which was established in the farm bill. Nothing has been done, and time is running out. It will be only 2 weeks until the 8th of March. Then the farmers will be back to a 37-million-acre limit. There is not going to be any incentive for compliance.

I deplore the idea of some individuals hurling criticism at the Secretary of Agriculture at every opportunity. Recently the Secretary of Agriculture made a statement to the effect that "prices received by farmers have been running about 7 percent above a year ago." The record shows he was right. I think he was right. He was charged with uttering misleading information. Obviously, he certainly cannot calculate a price at a given hour and a given day. Yet the record shows that as between last December and the prior December, prices were higher by 7 percent. If one compares the prices for January 1957 with those for January 1956, the figures show prices were higher by 5 percent. So the Secretary was substantially correct. But, Mr. President, I simply must take a moment to call attention to the fact that it is becoming almost a settled habit to reflect upon persons in the executive branch of the Government, to reflect upon their character, to reflect upon their veracity, and to charge them with giving out misleading figures. I think we could better afford to devote the time to a little less quibbling and a little more action, now that we have hundreds of thousands of farmers who are interested in action on a corn bill by both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

So I take the time today to assert my confidence in the character and in the veracity of the Secretary of Agriculture. He is one of the greatest we have ever had. I am sure that no one who knows him would ever impugn his character or reflect upon his honesty or integrity. He has been a great public servant. He has been courageous. He has stood up to take sharp criticism and caustic comment at a time when so many were quailing and not going along with what he thought was a correct program in the interest of a durable solution of the agricultural problems of the country.

So in connection with my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a release by the Department of Agriculture on the 14th of February 1957.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, February 14, 1957.—"Questions have been raised regarding the manner in which the Department of Agriculture reports farm income," Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson said today. "A number of persons have said that the Secretary should include inventory changes in the income figures he reports.

"The present Secretary and his predecessors, in public statements, have consistently reported realized net income of farm operators," continued the Secretary. "This is a figure which includes receipts from farm marketings and Government payments and the value of farm products for home use. It excludes changes which result from inventory increases or decreases. The present Secretary and those who previously have occupied this office have felt that income should be reported when crops and livestock are sold and income is actually realized, because only that kind of income is available for spending.

"In my addresses and in my statements to the Congress I have consistently reported realized net income of farm operators, even though there have been years when I could have shown farm income in a more favorable light by reporting in some other manner. For example, in 1954 I used realized net income of farm operators, a figure of $12,021,000,000, as a measurement of returns in agriculture, when I might have included inventory changes and reported $12,487,000,000 a figure $466 million higher. In 1955, I might have included inventory changes and reported a figure $340 million higher than the $11,340,000,000 realized net income of farm operators which I actually used.

"Farm income is reported in a variety of ways, so as to meet the varied needs of those who use our statistics. There is gross and net cash income, net income, with and without inventory change, with and without Government payments, net with and without off-farm income, total, per capita, adjusted and unadjusted for changes in price levels and so on.

"It is possible, by shifting from one of these measures to another from year to year, to give a biased picture of the income situation in agriculture. This I scrupulously avoid, as should others who are interested in reporting the facts.

"If inventory changes should be fully reflected in farm income, as some have suggested, one could argue that year-to-year changes in the net value of farm real estate should show up in farm income. If that were done, farm income would be shown as increasing during each of the past 2 years, an average increase of more than $3 billion a year. Of course, I would never report income in such a manner; I merely indicate this to show how varied a picture of farm income one can paint if he selects, from year to year, the basis of income reporting which is favorable to his cause."

Following is a table showing, since 1953, the net income of farm operators with and without inventory changes:

*Realized net income of farm operators in the United States, 1953 to 1956, and net income of farm operators including inventory changes*

| Year | Realized | Including inventory changes |
|---|---|---|
| | *Millions* | *Millions* |
| 1953 | $13,800 | $13,263 |
| 1954 | 12,021 | 12,487 |
| 1955 | 11,340 | 11,680 |
| 1956 (preliminary) | 11,900 | 11,700 |

## SIXTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF WENDELL WILLKIE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, recently I had the honor to participate in ceremonies held in New York City in commemoration of the 65th anniversary of the birth of Wendell Willkie. The principal address was delivered by Chief Justice of the United States Earl Warren, and the ceremonies were also participated in by the Reverend Dr. John Sutherland Bonnell, of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church of New York City, and by the Honorable Herbert Bayard Swope. Addresses and messages on this occasion were received from the President of the United States, the Governor of the State of New York, the mayor of New York, and the Construction Coordinator of the city of New York, in addition to which the Reverend Dr. Bonnell delivered a most moving address.

I believe we shall keep the memory of Wendell Willkie green and fresh always, for upon looking down the road of the coming generations, his contributions to American life and to the Republican Party become more valid and valuable as the years go on.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD the proceedings of the ceremony to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the addresses and communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE FOR WILLKIE COMMEMORATION FROM PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, D. C.*

The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS,
*United States Senator,*
*Care Freedom House,*
*Willkie Memorial Building:*

Following message relayed from the President to the White House office for transmittal:

"Please give my greetings to the members and distinguished guests of Freedom House gathered in commemoration of the 65th anniversary of the birth of Wendell Willkie. New York City, built by the toil of millions from every race and nation, is a splendid setting for the continuing work of the American who saw the vision of one world. On the wall of the public library, where the wisdom of the ages is freely offered to all, it is fitting to mount the features of that vigorous champion of liberty, Wendell Willkie. To his family, his friends and his followers, I send congratulations and best wishes.

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER"

---

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY CHIEF JUSTICE EARL WARREN AT WILLKIE COMMEMORATION

This is the birthday of our friend, the late Wendell Willkie—an American to whom all of us are indebted. We gather in a place dedicated to his memory—Freedom House which shelters so many of the causes he espoused.

But it is 12 years since he passed this way. We do not know why this is so but we do not question the reason for it. We have faith that it was for an important purpose—in keeping with the divine pattern that is being eternally woven with the broken strands of man's experiences. It must be so or he would have been here to make his presence felt in the ordeals of these world shattering years. They would have been his most productive years. He would have been at the height of his intellectual powers, enriched by his character-forming experiences and by the maturity of his vision. We can only conjecture what his role would have been, but this we know: In the struggle for world peace based upon freedom for all nations and equality for all people, he would have been heard. His voice would have been strong, his sincerity would have been felt and the force of his personality would have moved the more timid among us to action.

In the 4 brief years of his political ministry he did as much to remove the blinders from the eyes of Americans and to change the course of the party whose standard he carried as any American without governmental portfolio in our national history. When he came on the political scene we were still in the throes of an isolationism which trusted the broad oceans for our national defense and our own national wealth solely for our economic stability. There was no room in that isolationism for the interplay of world affairs or of world needs. He realized the shortsightedness of this approach and undertook to change it. It was not popular at the moment, but he made a crusade of it. The opening sentence of his One World is:

"Today * * * America is like a beleaguered city that lives within high walls through which there passes only an occasional courier to tell us what is happening outside. I have been outside those walls. And I have found that nothing outside is exactly what it seems to those within."

And a little farther on he said—"There are no distant points in the world any longer. I learned from this trip that the myriad millions of human beings of the Far East are as close to us as Los Angeles is to New York by the fastest trains. I cannot escape the conviction that in the future what concerns them must concern us, almost as much as the problems of the people of California concern the people of New York. Our thinking in the future must be worldwide."

Heresy? Yes it was heresy then; to his party and to the people of great sections of our country. But it was also prophetic. Within the past month the President of the United States who carries the same banner, standing on the steps of the Capitol of our Nation had this to say at his inauguration:

"For one truth must rule all we think and all we do. No people can live to itself alone. The unity of all who dwell in freedom is their only sure defense. The economic need of all nations—in mutual dependence—makes isolation an impossibility: not even America's prosperity could long survive if other nations did not also prosper. No nation can longer be a fortress, lone and strong and safe. And any people seeking such shelter for themselves, can only build their own prison."

This met with general approbation. America has torn down the high walls surrounding the beleaguered city of which our friend spoke 14 years ago.

Wendell Willkie did not live to witness the organization of the United Nations. But he foresaw the great need for it. When the world was engrossed with passionate warfare and blind with rage, he preached the doctrine that when we are at war, we must prepare for peace.

"I was a soldier in the last war," he said, "and after that war was over I saw our bright dreams disappear, our stirring slogans became the jests of the cynical, and all because the fighting peoples did not arrive at any common postwar purposes while they fought. It must be our resolve to see that this does not happen again.

"While they fight, the people of the world must come to a common understanding of what they fight for and what they hope for. Millions have already died in this war and many thousands more will go before it is over. Unless Britons and Canadians and Russians and Chinese and Americans and all our fighting allies, in the common cooperation of war, find the instrumentalities and the methods of cooperative effort after the war, we, the people, have failed our time and our generation."

These words were strange to most people—dubious words to many—controversial words to others. Yet last month our President had this to say at his inauguration: "We recognize and accept our own deep involvement in the destiny of men everywhere. We are accordingly pledged to honor, and to strive to fortify, the authority of the United Nations. For in that body rests the best hope of our age for the assertion of that law by which all nations may live in dignity."

He also saw the need for economic aid to distressed nations, before others spoke. "It is inescapably true," he said, "that to raise the standard of living of any man anywhere in the world is to raise the standard of living by some slight degree of every man everywhere in the world."

This was long before any of the billions of dollars for foreign economic aid were spent or even advocated. But as farseeing and as concerned as he was about our foreign relationships, his greatest love was reserved for the American people, and his greatest solicitude for the preservation of the free institutions under which we are privileged to live. He was dedicated to our system of free enterprise and he insisted that it be kept undefiled—with equal opportunity for all. "Only the productive can be strong; only the strong can be free" was his battle cry. His faith in America was a simple one and the epitome of it is in these simple statements:

"The only soil in which liberty can grow is that of a united people—we must have

faith that the welfare of one is the welfare of all—we must acknowledge that all are equal before God and before the law."

"Freedom is an indivisible word—we must be prepared to extend it to everyone, whether they are rich or poor, whether they agree with us or not, no matter what their race or the color of their skin."

And he knew that as we cannot isolate ourselves from the other peoples of the world, neither can we isolate ourselves from the past. He believed with the poet that "The best prophet of the future, is the past."

Student of history that he was, and believing that true enlightenment springs from the wisdom of the ages, he haunted for many years the bookshelves of the municipal library of the city of New York. It is both appropriate and significant that this building named for him should be literally in the shadow of that library. Nothing could have pleased him more.

And today the great city of New York in gracious recognition of his contribution to public enlightenment authorizes affixing a Willkie memorial plaque to their wonderful public library; a bronze tablet that will serve to inspire the millions who will pass this way. On it appears an inscription in his own words—

"I believe in America because in it we are free—free to choose our government, to speak our minds, to observe our different religions."

It will be our present duty to dedicate that plaque. We will do so with the fervent hope that as long as people come here in search of knowledge they will help to keep alive the generous spirit of Wendell L. Willkie, implicit in these words of his:

"We must establish beyond any doubt the equality of men. And we shall find this equality, not in the different talents which we severally possess, nor in the different incomes which we severally earn, but in the great franchise of the mind, the universal franchise which is bounded neither by color, nor by creed, nor by social status. Open the books if you wish to be free."

---

FROM ADDRESS BY SENATOR JACOB K. JAVITS AT WILLKIE COMMEMORATION

We live constantly today in the light of Wendell Willkie's great contribution to United States foreign policy. We are greatly indebted to his memory for bipartisanship in foreign policy. This doctrine, born in the 1940 campaign through the need for full support of the destroyer-for-bases programs with a beleaguered Britain and brought to fruition by Senator Vandenberg, remains responsible for the fact that isolationism has become a dead letter. United States foreign policy has been able to attain that continuity so essential to our world leadership and yet so complex under our system of coordinate powers in checks and balances between the President and the Congress due very largely to Wendell Willkie and Arthur Vandenberg. I feel it may truly be said that Wendell Willkie was the political father of that concept of international responsibility which is so fundamental to modern republicanism.

Second, Wendell Willkie awakened Americans to the oneness of the world, to the interrelation of all that occurred in it; for instance, the effect upon our foreign policy and peace leadership of the continued tolerance of discrimination and segregation in the United States or of flouting civil liberties at home.

Finally, he translated so meaningfully to millions abroad the sincerity, fairness, and spiritual content of our political institutions.

I believe we shall keep the memory of Wendell Willkie green and fresh always, for upon looking down the road of the coming generations, his contributions to American life become more valid and more valuable as the years go on.

MESSAGE FOR WILLKIE COMMEMORATION FROM GOV. AVERELL HARRIMAN

ALBANY, N. Y.

HERBERT BAYARD SWOPE,

*Care of George Field, Executive Secretary, Freedom House, Willkie Memorial Building:*

All of us, regardless of political affiliations, pay homage today to the memory and achievements of a great American, Wendell Willkie. He was a man of energy and imagination, being one of those who early realized the interdependence of a modern world and the effects of this on our foreign and domestic policy. We in New York are proud that Freedom House is putting up a memorial plaque to him in our State, where he lived so many years among us.

AVERELL HARRIMAN.

---

MESSAGE FOR WILLKIE COMMEMORATION FROM MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER

Mr. GEORGE FIELD,

*Executive Secretary, Freedom House, Willkie Memorial Building:*

Regret that city business prevents me from attending the program commemorating the 65th anniversary of the birth of Wendell Willkie, February 18. It is indeed appropriate that Freedom House should be called the Willkie Memorial Building. Wendell Willkie exemplified to millions the American ideal both as an individual and in the work he carried on during his lifetime. He contributed greatly to increasing our understanding of the Nation's problems confronting our neighbors throughout the world. This tribute to the man and to the ideals that Wendell Willkie espoused takes on new significance.

ROBERT F. WAGNER,
*Mayor.*

---

MESSAGE FROM ROBERT MOSES, READ AT THE DEDICATION OF THE WENDELL WILLKIE PLAQUE AT BRYANT PARK, NEW YORK CITY, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1957

The translation of the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount into international government had its greatest modern exponent in that uncompromising Calvinist, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie were his disciples. In spite of the storm clouds overhanging the administration of the United Nations, who shall say that they failed?

The immediate and unqualified application of the principles of the brotherhood of man to international affairs was Willkie's creed. He was a courageous leader who roused and stimulated his party when it was in the slough of despond.

A century or two from now, when the immediate concerns and acerbities of our time are forgotten, our descendants will perhaps know the true significance in world history of men like Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, and Wendell Willkie. In the meantime, let us assume that the road of international brotherhood is long and broken, and that on the journey there are honorable places both for the evangelists and for the step-by-step conservatives. The important thing is to be sure that we are headed in the same direction.

---

## THE EDUCATION OF AN AMERICAN POLITICIAN

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an outstanding address entitled "The Education of an American Politician," which was delivered at the annual convention of American Association of School Administrators and National School Board Association, at Atlantic City, N. J., February 19, 1957, by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

I would emphasize particularly those portions of this outstanding address in which the Senator from Massachusetts stresses the urgent need for idealism, courage, and integrity in American public life. Senator KENNEDY has also rightly directed attention to the growing gap between educational demands and funds available for education in our country toward solving that dilemma. He has called for an adequate and effective program of Federal education to schools.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EDUCATION OF AN AMERICAN POLITICIAN

(Remarks of Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, annual convention of American Association of School Administrators and National School Board Association, Municipal Auditorium, Atlantic City, N. J., February 19, 1957)

It is a great if somewhat awesome honor to be here this evening with what is probably the greatest collection of brainpower any politician has even addressed. More important, you are undoubtedly one of the most powerful audiences in the world—powerful not in terms of the national and international policies you control or manipulate, but powerful because in your hands the future leaders of this Nation, the most powerful nation in the world, are being shaped. Your responsibilities consequently are in many ways far greater than those of us who serve in national policymaking bodies.

My announced topic for this evening was "The Education of an American Politician." It was a title which frankly I thought might stimulate some interest—for the simple reason that most Americans, including educators, are not accustomed to thinking of us politicians as educated men. We may be experienced, or cynical, or skillful, or shrewd or even fluent—but no more education is required for this kind of success than that provided by smoke-filled rooms and backstage deals. Even those of you who are required to be elected at the polls to your post as school superintendent or school board member do not, I dare say, like to regard yourselves as politicians. You may consider yourselves public servants or leaders of your community—but never politicians.

It is disheartening to me, and I think alarming for our Republic, to realize how poorly the political profession is regarded in America. Mothers may still want their favorite sons to grow up to be President but, according to a famous Gallup poll of some years ago, they do not want them to become politicians in the process. Successful politicians, according to Walter Lippmann, are "insecure and intimidated men," who "advance politically only as they placate, appease, bribe, seduce, bamboozle, or otherwise manage to manipulate" the views and votes of the people who elect them. It was considered a great joke years ago when the humorist Artemas Ward declared: "I am not a politician, and my other habits are also good." And, in more recent times, even the President of the United States, when asked at a news conference early in his first term how he liked "the game of politics," replied with a frown that his questioner was using a derogatory phrase. Being President, he said, "is a very fascinating experience * * * but the word 'politics' * * * I have no great liking for that."

Unfortunately, this disdain for the political profession is not only shared but intensified by the educational profession. To

many educators we politicians represent nothing but censors, investigators, and perpetrators of what has been called the swinish cult of anti-intellectualism. To others, we are corrupt and selfish, manipulating votes and compromising principles for personal and partisan gain.

Educators find it difficult, I believe, to accept the differences between the laboratory and the legislature. In the former, the goal is truth, pure and simple, without regard to changing currents of public opinion; in the latter, compromises and majorities and procedural customs and rights affect the ultimate decision as to what is right or good, or more accurately, what is possible. And even when they realize the difference, many educators, academicians, and other intellectuals consider their chief function to be that of the critic—and politicians are sensitive to critics (possibly because we have so many of them). We in politics must rely on the majority, but "many intellectuals," Sidney Hook has said, "would rather 'die' than agree with the majority, even on the rare occasions when the majority is right."

This disdain for the political profession in our schools and communities did not matter quite as much in the days when active participation in the political affairs of the Nation was limited to a select few. But today, the implications of national policy necessarily make politicians of all of us. Today, every citizen, regardless of his interest in politics, holds office; every one of us is in a position of responsibility; and, in the final analysis, the kind of Government we get depends upon how we fulfill those responsibilities. We, the people, are the boss, and we will get the kind of political leadership, be it good or bad, that we demand and deserve.

Consider, for example, the changes in our Nation's role in world affairs which make it impossible to prevent the man in the street from influencing, or being influenced by, our foreign policy. In the past, public interest in and knowledge of American international commitments have reached their peak only in time of war, when extraordinary demands were made upon our manpower and material resources. Even then, war touched only indirectly the lives of many Americans. But the next world war, unlike any other, will sear the lives of every American, and bring for the first time massive death and destruction within our own borders.

Moreover, what has in the past been normal in peacetime is no more relevant to a discussion of the public's participation in politics today than it is to an analysis of current budgets or airpower requirements; for this is a peace which resembles none previously experienced. Frequent hostilities, uneasy truces, military alliances, a worldwide struggle for the minds of men and a furious armaments race characterize the war upon which we have placed the curious epithet "cold"—a struggle which will continue in our generation to maintain the same excessive wartime demands upon our lives and pocketbooks and maintain the same heightened public interest.

Thus the American politician of whom I speak today, and with whose education I am concerned, is in effect potentially each and every American citizen. His opinions, his votes, and his efforts define the limits of our policy, provide its guideposts, and authorize its implementation. In Lincoln's words, that man on the street, the average citizen, the educated voter, "makes statutes possible or impossible to execute." His attitude toward taxation and selective service, foreign aid and alliances, the United Nations, imports, immigration, even his attitude toward members of minority groups in his own country—all of these have an impact upon foreign policy far beyond his knowledge. Without his indispensable support and loyalty, no American foreign policy in times such as these can succeed.

There are, of course, dangers in this increased participation of the public in the policymaking process. Public opinion in a democracy has on many occasions, in this Nation and others, been too slow, too selfish, too shortsighted, too provincial, too rigid, or too impractical—and in those situations we stand in great need of national leaders of courage and ability, men who are willing to stand for the right against the pressures of the public, men such as those whom I have described in my book on political courage.

But in these times, in facing these issues which deeply touch the lives and fortunes of every citizen, in making these hard decisions which require overwhelming public support, we cannot—we dare not—exclude the people or ignore their opinions, whether right or wrong. Instead, in the words of Thomas Jefferson, "If we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them but to inform their discretion by education."

"To inform their discretion by education." That is your task and the task of every teacher in every city and village in America—the education of American politicians, of all, or nearly all, Americans to serve as politicians in making public policy. But what kind of education will you offer? What kind of training is necessary to prepare young Americans for a more active and enlightened role in the political affairs of their Nation? Permit me to offer a few suggestions from my vantage point in the political arena.

First, I would emphasize that we need not an overconcentration upon civic and political affairs, but the development of a broad range of talents. We do not need men like Lord John Russell, of whom Queen Victoria once said that he would be a better man if he knew a third subject—but he was interested in nothing but the Constitution of 1688 and himself. We need instead men with the education of Thomas Jefferson, described by a contemporary as "A gentleman of 32, who could calculate an eclipse, survey an estate, tie an artery, plan an edifice, try a cause, break a horse, dance a minuet, and play the violin." We need men like Daniel Webster, who could throw thunderbolts at Hayne on the Senate floor and then stroll a few steps down the corridor and dominate the Supreme Court as the foremost lawyer of his time; like John Quincy Adams, who, after being summarily dismissed from the Senate for a notable display of independence, could become Boylston professor rhetoric and oratory at Harvard and then become a great Secretary of State. (Those were the happy days when Harvard professors had no difficulty getting Senate confirmation.) We need men like Missouri's first Senator, Thomas Hart Benton, the man whose tavern brawl with Jackson in Tennessee caused him to flee the State, and yet whose education was described with these words in his obituary: "With a readiness that was often surprising, he could quote from a Roman law or a Greek philosopher, from Virgil's Georgics, the Arabian Nights, Herodotus, or Sanchez Panza, from the Sacred Carpets, the German reformers or Adam Smith; from Fenolon or Hudubras, from the financial reports of Necca or the doings of the Council of Trent, from the debates on the adoption of the Constitution or intrigues of the kitchen cabinet or from some forgotten speech of a deceased Member of Congress."

Secondly, I would emphasize that we need scholarship fitted for practical action, for something more than merely discussing political issues and deploring their solutions with learned phrases, intellectual achievements fitted for more than the delights of abstract discourse. For, as George William Curtis asked a similar body of educators a century ago, in urging their interest in the Kansas-Nebraska controversy: "Would you have counted him a friend of ancient Greece who quietly discussed the theory of patriotism on that Greek summer day through whose hopeless and immortal hours Leonidas and his 300 stood at Thermopylae for liberty? Was John Milton to conjugate Greek verbs in his library, or talk of the liberty of the ancient Shunamites, when the liberty of Englishmen was imperilled?"

It is not enough, therefore, that our schools merely be great centers of learning, without concerning themselves with the uses to which that learning is put in the years that follow graduation. Indeed, care must be taken to see that it is not left behind upon graduation. Dean Swift, you know, always said that Oxford was truly a seat of great learning; for all freshmen who entered were required to bring some learning with them in order to meet the standards of admission—but no senior, when he left the university, ever took any learning away; and thus it steadily accumulated.

Third, I would emphasize the importance, in teaching students about public affairs, of avoiding the confusion of political idealism with political fantasy or rigidity. We need idealism in our public life; we need young men and women who will stand for the right regardless of their personal ambitions or welfare. But let us not permit them to carry that idealism to the point of fantasy—to the point where any compromise or concession is regarded as immoral. For politics and legislation are not matters for inflexible principles or unattainable ideals. Politics, as John Morley has acutely observed, "is a field where action is one long second best, and where the choice constantly lies between two blunders"; and legislation, under the democratic way of life and the Federal system of government, requires compromise between the desires of each individual and group and those around them. Henry Clay, who should have known, said compromise was the cement that held the Union together:

"All legislation * * * is founded upon the principle of mutual concession. * * * Let him who elevates himself above humanity, above its weaknesses, its infirmaties, its wants, its necessities, say, if he pleases, 'I never will compromise'; but let no one who is not above the frailties of our common nature disdain compromise."

It is compromise that prevents each set of reformers—the wets and the drys, the one-worlders and the isolationists, the vivisectionists and the antivivisectionists—from crushing the group on the extreme opposite end of the political spectrum. The fanatics and extremists, and even those conscientiously devoted to hard and fast principles, are always disappointed at the failure of their Government to rush to implement all of their principles and to denounce those of their opponents. But the legislator has some responsibility to conciliate those opposing forces within his State and party and to represent them in the larger clash of interests on the national level; and he alone knows that there are few if any issues where all the truth and all the right and all the angels are on one side.

Some of my colleagues who are criticized today for lack of forthright principles, or who are looked upon with scornful eyes as compromising politicians, are simply engaged in the fine art of conciliating, balancing and interpreting the forces and factions of public opinion, an art essential to keeping our Nation united and enabling our Government to function. Their consciences may in one sense direct them from time to time to take a more rigid stand for principle, but their intellects tell them that a fair or poor bill is better than no bill at all, and that only through the give and take of compromise will any bill receive the successive

approval of the Senate, the House, the President, and the Nation.

Fourth, I would emphasize the importance, in teaching students about public affairs, of avoiding the confusion of national patriotism with national mythology. Instillation of a sense of patriotism, of national pride, of awareness of gratitude for the liberties and opportunities that are ours as Americans—these are precepts which, of course, it is hoped every student shall grasp. But at the same time let us recognize the necessity of clearing away these false axioms and myths which, however comforting to our sense of security or appealing to our sense of patriotism, impair a realistic view of our Nation's role in the world. I refer to those myths, among others, that are based upon the untouchability of national sovereignty; the existence of inherently good, bad, or backward nations; the emphasis of governmental economy over national security; or the impairment of an aggressor's power by refusing him our diplomatic recognition.

Many Americans persist in the myth that the scientific skill of the United States cannot be duplicated in any other country; that the democratic way of life, inasmuch as it is the best way, will inevitably be the victor in any struggle with an alien power; that the United States can never lose a war, or that its shores can never be attacked. Many still hold to the belief that our allies owe homage and gratitude to the United States and to all of its views at all times. There are those who believe the United States can still halt aggression by the arrival of a few American gunboats and marines. There are those who oppose assistance to or cooperation with our allies, those who reject bargaining or diplomatic pressure as a method of dealing with international disputes. Education for citizenship, for increased participation in American political life, must dispel these myths, if it is to avoid the description once furnished by Lord Bryce of a political education "sufficient to enable them to think they know something about the great problems of politics, but insufficient to show them how little they know."

Fifth and finally, I would emphasize that this kind of education requires quality as well as quantity. I realize that education cannot fulfill its responsibilities when nearly a million boys and girls are deprived by the classroom shortage of full-time schooling, when millions more are held back in unwieldy classes of 40 or more and when the Nation is short 135,000 qualified teachers. It is obvious to me that the Federal Government, which has far greater as well as more effective means for raising public revenues, has an unavoidable responsibility in 1957 to enact a bold and imaginative program of Federal assistance to the States and local school districts for the construction of public schools, leaving all control over education itself, of course, in local hands. But more and better classrooms are not enough. Even an increase in the number of teachers is not enough. Better trained, better paid teachers, using better techniques and textbooks, are necessary if we are to improve still further the education of our citizens for the responsibilities of citizenship—and that task is still largely one which is in your lap, not the Federal Government's.

Of one thing we can be sure—the graduates of our schools and of our universities will be expected to play an increasingly important role in American political affairs. The effort and expenditure by which society has made their education possible have not been undertaken merely to give them an economic advantage in the life struggle. They are expected to offer leadership and guidance for all. It was Prince Bismarck who said that one-third of the students of German universities broke down from overwork; another third broke down from dissipation; but the other third ruled Germany. (I leave it to each of you to decide which third attends conventions in Atlantic City.)

Those who are to be among the rulers of our land, in the sense that all thinking citizens must of necessity become political leaders, will not lack problems to which their education can be applied—increasing farm foreclosures, for example, in the midst of national prosperity—record small business failures at a time of record profits, pockets of chronic unemployment and sweat-shop wages amidst the wonders of automation, the care of the chronically and mentally ill, monopoly, race relations, taxation, international trade and, above all, the knotty complex problems of war and peace, of untangling the strife-ridden Middle East, of preventing man's eventual destruction of mankind. If those whom you send to solve these problems are truly educated politicians, as I have described that education this evening, if they can ride easily over broad fields of knowledge, if they can be, as Goethe put it, hammers instead of anvils, then there is no limit to the contribution they can make to the society which gave them that education.

There is considerable talk these days of the educational world's need for assistance from the political world. I am confident that assistance will be forthcoming. But I have also stressed to you tonight the assistance which the world of politics needs from the world of education; and to that end I ask your thoughtful attention to the task of uniting our two worlds still further.

"Don't teach my boy poetry," an English mother recently wrote the provost of Harrow. "Don't teach my boy poetry; he is going to stand for Parliament." Well, perhaps she was right, but if more politicians knew poetry, and more poets knew politics, I am convinced the world would be a little better place to live on this 19th of February, 1957.

## INCREASE IN PRICES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a table from the New York Times of Monday, February 18, 1957, setting forth the obligations of the United States which must be met in the 12-month period following February 8. These maturities amount to $75,584,325,783. Day by day and week by week the obligations of the United States which must be paid off are increasing in amount. It occurs to me that all Members of Congress should take warning from this picture of the national debt that it is unwise and very dangerous to allow the budget of the United States to get out of balance.

The budget which was submitted by the President has been universally called the largest peacetime budget ever submitted to the Congress of the United States. Of course, that overlooks the fact that we are not at peace. We are in a very grave situation. We are in an economic war. We are not in a fighting war. The Government is making great expenditures. Costs are increasing, however. The cost of living is increasing. The costs of all sorts of materials are increasing.

During the hearings now being held with respect to oil we have heard testimony from various sources as to what these increasing costs mean to the people of the United States. This morning two witnesses appeared before our committee. One was our colleague, the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], who testified on behalf of the householders and the industries of New England, saying that they are paying an extraordinarily great increased cost for oil products, and they do not like it.

Another witness was Mr. Hines H. Baker, president of the Humble Oil Co., who testified in defense of the action of that company recently in increasing the price of crude oil.

The significant thing to me about the testimony of Mr. Baker was that he pointed out the increasing cost of steel, pipe, machinery, and other items during the past several years. He laid particular emphasis upon the increased costs beginning with the year 1953 and continuing through 1954, 1955, and 1956, so far as the figures were available.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, appeared before the Joint Economic Committee during December last, I believe, before Congress had assembled, and spoke about the danger of inflation, as he saw it. He gave his advice about the necessity of cutting Government expenditures, but when asked to name any expenditures which could be cut he declined to do so.

The head of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Martin, also testified before our committee. Members of the committee interrogated him about the efforts the Federal Reserve Board has been making, through increasing the rate of interest upon borrowed money and, incidentally, increasing the rate of interest on money which the Government borrows. Mr. Martin explained that this was an effort to hold rising costs in restraint; but raising costs have not been held in restraint.

I am not attempting now to state any conclusion with respect to these matters. However, a very clear situation developed this morning, as between the householders all over the country who object to the increasing cost of fuel oil, and the driller, who objects to increasing costs for the materials which he needs to produce the oil. I believe that this situation poses a very interesting problem. The executive branch of government has made no suggestion whatsoever as to what should be done. The Congress will be faced with the necessity of doing something.

I ask unanimous consent that the table from the New York Times be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, to be followed by the statement made by the senior Senator from Maine to the committee; that, in turn, to be followed by a copy of the statement made by Mr. Hines H. Baker, president of the Humble Oil Co.

There being no objection, the table and statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 18, 1957]

ONE-YEAR MATURITIES ARE $75,584,325,783

Direct obligations of the United States Government in the hands of the public that will mature within 12 months amount to $75,584,325,783. They consist of Treasury bonds, certificates of indebtedness, bills, and notes as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Feb. 21: Discount bills | $1,599,827,000 |
| Feb. 28: Discount bills | 1,600,093,000 |
| Mar. 1: Series E savings bonds[1] | 2,221,561,610 |

[1] Maturing monthly within a year from this date forward.

| | |
|---|---|
| Mar. 1: Series F savings bonds [1] | $439,668,849 |
| Mar. 1: Series G savings bonds [1] | 1,576,728,600 |
| Mar. 7: Discount bills | 1,600,005,000 |
| Mar. 14: Discount bills | 1,599,968,000 |
| Mar. 15: 2⅞s Treasury notes | 590,000,000 |
| Mar. 21: Discount bills | 1,600,310,000 |
| Mar. 22: 2¾s tax anticipation certificates | 3,220,612,000 |
| Mar. 22: Tax anticipation bills | 1,005,647,000 |
| Mar. 28: Discount bills | 1,614,593,000 |
| Apr. 1: 1½s Treasury notes | 10,000,000 |
| Apr. 4: Discount bills | 1,599,988,000 |
| Apr. 11: Discount bills | 1,600,455,000 |
| Apr. 18: Discount bills | 1,600,483,000 |
| Apr. 25: Discount bills | 1,600,512,000 |
| May 2: Discount bills | 1,700,238,000 |
| May 9: Discount bills | 1,700,188,000 |
| May 15: 1⅝s Treasury notes | 4,154,930,000 |
| May 16: Discount bills | 1,700,438,000 |
| June 24: Tax anticipation bills | 3,351,464,000 |
| June 24: 3¼s tax anticipation certificates | 1,311,980,000 |
| Aug. 1: 2¾s Treasury notes | 12,056,091,000 |
| Aug. 15: 2s Treasury notes | 3,792,028,000 |
| Oct. 1: 1½s Treasury notes | 824,196,000 |
| Oct. 1: 3¼s certificates of indebtedness | 7,270,942,000 |
| 1958: | |
| Jan. 1: Series E savings bonds | 2,343,258,752 |
| Jan. 1: Series F savings bonds | 210,252,572 |
| Jan. 1: Series G savings bonds | 1,667,867,400 |
| Feb. 14: 3⅜s certificates of indebtedness | 8,420,000,000 |
| Total | 75,584,325,783 |
| Week ago | 78,812,842,783 |
| Year ago | 69,489,729,203 |

[1] Maturing monthly within a year from this date forward.

---

PRICE INCREASES BOTHER US ALL—STATEMENT OF SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH TO O'MAHONEY COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 21, 1957

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, at a meeting of February 6, 1957, the members of the New England senatorial conference instructed me to appear in behalf of that group before senatorial committees investigating the matter now before your committee. It was also anticipated that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which four New England Senators are members, would hold hearings on this matter.

Consequently, I have delayed my request for appearance before your committee until the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce organized its plans for inquiry and study of this matter. I did so in the desire of appearing before the two committees at approximately the same time. However, I was informed the other day that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had decided, in the interests of avoiding duplication of the hearings of your committee, not to hold hearings although making a serious study of the matter.

I believe that there is little that I can add to the basic information which has been given you other than some refinements with respect to the effect of the fuel oil price rise upon the New England States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.

As a region, New England probably has the coldest and longest winters of any area in the United States. Since there have been no appreciable discoveries of oil or natural gas in New England and with the conversion from coal to oil heating during recent years, New England is perhaps the heaviest and most dependent consuming area of fuel oil.

To that extent, we of New England are at the mercy of the oil producers. We do not have the luxury of refusing to buy fuel oil if we feel the price is too high. We have practically no choice but to buy—if we want to keep our homes warm and our families from freezing. That is particularly the case in my home State of Maine.

As one who believes in free enterprise, I would ordinarily be impressed with the policy of permitting the law of supply and demand applied to the adjustment of this situation. Unfortunately, that respected law is not completely applicable to this situation for the simple reason that the situation existing at least borders on, or approaches, a monopolistic condition.

For a competitive factor is almost nonexistent. The only appreciable element of competition which has acted to provide some degree of protection for New England fuel-oil consumers in the past has been foreign imports of oil. And on that score we of New England have had to wage a continuing fight against attempts of domestic producers to have restrictive quotas and other restrictions placed on foreign imports of oil. Obviously these attempts of the domestic oil producers have been to eliminate the competition of foreign oil.

Had their efforts in the past on this been successful, they would have converted New England fuel-oil consumers into practically a captive market and made them helpless captive consumers.

I have read and been told that domestic oil producers have claimed that an oil price rise was justified and necessary many, many months ago and even years prior to the recent rise in prices. Perhaps they are right. Perhaps they can fully justify the oil price rise.

For I would unhesitatingly acknowledge that there has been a general rise of prices on many commodities.

But surely that cannot justify the recent raising of oil prices on the law of supply and demand for production and storage statistics reveal oil supplies and inventories at their highest levels in history. The plain fact is that the supply is greater than the demand. And under the working of the law of supply and demand, prices should fall instead of rise when supply far exceeds demand.

What then is the explanation and the justification? Apparently it is the Suez crisis and the blocking of the Suez Canal. But if that is the attempted justification and explanation, it is not convincing for supply and production still remain ahead of demand.

Instead what appears to be an attempt to exploit the Suez crisis actually makes domestic oil producers extremely suspect. If there was a justification and need for increasing oil prices years and months ago, then why didn't the domestic oil producers raise their prices at that time?

I don't profess to know the answer. But I would observe that it is entirely possible that oil prices were not raised by domestic oil producers prior to the Suez crisis for the very obvious factor of competition from foreign imports of oil. Perhaps domestic oil producers didn't dare increase prices for their oil for fear that they would lose such markets as the New England market because imported foreign oil could be purchased at lower prices.

So that it may very well be that the Suez crisis is the real reason for the price increase since the factor of foreign oil competition appeared to be eliminated or drastically curtailed for the period of the Suez crisis. In other words, that it was the element of elimination or curtailment of foreign competition rather than a matter of supply and demand.

For the Suez crisis at least gave the hope of greater possibility of making New England more of a captive market than it had been in the past—more of a captive market than had been unsuccessfuly attempted by domestic oil producers' pressures for restrictions against foreign oil imports to New England.

This is not a pleasant picture to captive consumers bearing the brunt of a fuel-oil price increase in the middle of a very cold winter. The people of New England are reasonable and fair people. But they, in turn, want fair treatment and they protest economic exploitation of themselves.

The authoritative magazine Fuel Oil and Oil Heat estimated that on January 1, 1956, there were 1,380,133 oil burners in use in New England, of which approximately 6 percent were in small stores and the like, the balance in homes.

The average consumption of fuel oil, for New England, per household is figured by the industry as 1,600 gallons per year. This, of course, may vary with weather and obviously from home to home depending on the condition of the equipment and the design and construction of the home.

In 1956 the price of fuel oil per gallon in Portland, Maine, rose from 14.1 cents as reported in January 1956 to 15.0 cents in January 1957—a rise of almost 1 cent a gallon. But in 1 month in 1957 from January to February there was an even greater rise from 15.0 to 16.0 cents. In other words, a price rise of 1 cent in 1 month. I am told that such an increase of 1 cent occurred throughout New England.

If the 1 cent rise holds for the rest of 1957, it will mean that the relatively captive consumers of New England will have had to pay out of their pockets over $22 million dollars more for fuel oil than they did in 1956.

And it may ultimately be even more than that in view of some claims that it will be necessary to raise oil prices even more. For every cent raise on a gallon of fuel oil, the heating bill of New England fuel oil consumers will be hiked another $22 million.

Perhaps your committee may not be able to persuade domestic oil producers to roll back their prices. Obviously the captive consumers of New England have no significant buyer strike bargaining power on that.

But if the hearings of your committee serve no other purpose than to prevent a further increase in oil prices, you will have earned the deep gratitude of the people of New England in the serious plight that domestic oil producers have placed them in.

In closing, may I say that I hope and am confident that the domestic oil producers will be given every chance to explain their side of this matter. However, from my viewpoint, thus far, they have failed to make a plausible case for themselves and to remove the suspicion that New England fuel oil consumers have of their motives.

I have asked for statistical information from the Independent Oil Men's Association of New England, Inc., with respect to oil consumption and prices in New England. I submit that supplied information along with my statement to the committee for its information and use in the study of this matter.

---

STATEMENT ON PETROLEUM PRICES BY HINES H. BAKER, PRESIDENT, HUMBLE OIL & REFINING CO.

On January 3, 1957, Humble Oil & Refining Co. increased its posted prices for crude oil in Texas by an average of about 35 cents a barrel. In announcing this increase, the company made the following statement:

"The immediate cause of this price change is the sharp increase in demand for domestic crude oil, particularly in Texas, that has de-

veloped since the flow of Middle East crude oil to Europe and the east coast was drastically curtailed by recent events. Humble has been unable to secure its requirements at former prices.

"An important cause of a more basic nature is the substantial rise in unit costs since the previous general increase in crude-oil prices in June 1953. During this period of more than 3½ years crude-oil prices generally have remained constant although wages and salaries, costs of materials purchased, and the investment required for the same amount of production have all increased greatly. In view of these various circumstances, Humble has advanced prices by an amount that should help it to secure additional supplies which it has been unable to purchase to meet unusually heavy demands, and should also tend to encourage the rate of domestic exploration and development of new oil resources desirable for reasons of national security."

While the statement sets forth the basic reasons for Humble's action, further information is supplied herewith in connection with the change in prices at which Humble buys and sells crude oil in Texas. Information is also supplied with reference to gasoline price changes.

EFFECT OF THE SUEZ CRISIS ON HUMBLE'S SITUATION

In October 1956, crude-oil production in Texas was 2,924,000 barrels daily. In the Texas market, Humble purchased 366,000 barrels daily from others and had available a total supply including net production run from its leases of 568,000 barrels daily. Our refinery runs were 241,000 barrels daily, of which about 150,000 was purchased oil. In addition we had some net production sold at leases to others in Texas and other States.

Early in November the flow of crude oil from the Middle East to Europe and to the east coast of the United States was drastically reduced by the closing of the Suez Canal and the disruption of pipeline movements from Iraq to the eastern Mediterranean. On November 2, 1956, Humble was advised by affiliates of Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), its largest customers, of an additional emergency export requirement at a rate of 5 to 8 million barrels a month for November and December. This constituted an increase of more than 50 percent in the amounts customers wished to purchase from Humble. We were also advised that substantial emergency requirements might continue for an indefinite period depending upon the restoration of normal movements from the Middle East to Europe.

Humble was asked to use its best efforts to provide the maximum possible quantity for export to Europe although it does not normally supply oil for Europe. It proceeded immediately to make available all the supplies it could from its receipts and inventories and to purchase additional supplies from others. In November and December, Humble was able to supply for export to Europe 7,611,000 barrels, which was less than our customers could have taken if we had been able to make more available. It was able to do this only by extraordinary spot purchases of 3,605,000 barrels from other companies and by drawing on its inventories. The company's inventories at coastal terminals for tanker loading were virtually exhausted by the end of December, so that its ability to meet requirements in 1957 depended on the supplies that it could secure from current production and from spot purchases from other companies.

Humble made appearances before the railroad commission of Texas presenting vigorously its additional requirements for crude oil in November, December, and January. There were other purchasers, however, who apparently did not need or want additional supplies of crude oil, as indicated by their nominations. After weighing evidence on market demand and other factors, as provided for by the Texas conservation statutes, the railroad commission set allowable production in December and January at only slightly higher levels than in November. After crude oil inventories showed a substantial decline, it allowed a further increase of over 100,000 barrels daily for February. The allowable production established by the commission did not make available to us as much oil as we wanted. We say this as a fact and not as a criticism of the commission because it had many factors to consider in the performance of its legal duties.

We repeatedly sought to buy crude oil from other companies but were unable to secure oil in the quantities needed. In December, we bought outright what oil was available, including 2,282,000 barrels we were able to buy from inventories held by several companies only by agreeing to make available an equivalent amount of oil in 1957 at the same prices they charged Humble. Because of the urgent needs of our customers, we bought crude oil on this basis, thereby taking the risk of having to buy oil at higher prices in 1957 to take the place of oil exported to Europe at lower prices. By the end of the year we were no longer able to secure additional supplies from other companies at prevailing prices or even through special arrangements such as described.

As a result of the preceding circumstances, Humble's prospective receipts of crude oil at the end of 1956 were such that it could plan to supply for export only 600,000 barrels in January against a minimum export demand of 5,500,000 barrels. Humble was advised by its principal customers that unless additional supplies could be made available it would be necessary to divert tankers from the gulf coast to the Middle East. This action would reduce the ability of tankers to deliver oil to Europe and would increase costs because of the distance and cost of the trip around Africa.

Efforts to make available additional oil on the gulf coast appeared highly desirable in the situation that existed at the end of December. We concluded that the only possible method remaining by which we might secure such supplies was to raise our price for crude oil. From our knowledge of the basic economic situation in the domestic petroleum producing industry and of the implications of the crisis in the Middle East for long-term domestic petroleum requirements, we decided that a higher level of posted prices at which Humble buys and on the basis of which it sells crude oil was required both immediately and for the long run. We hoped that this action would make available some additional supplies for emergency shipments to Europe. We believed also that such a move was consistent with the desirable long-term objective of seeking to assure for Humble a greater potential source of domestic supplies for its customers in the long run, as set forth more fully in the following section.

LONG-TERM IMPLICATIONS OF THE SUEZ CRISIS

The Suez crisis emphasized the hazards involved in the use of oil from the Middle East. Beyond the immediate effects, it demonstrates dramatically that future supplies of domestic oil are even more important for the security of the United States and its allies than had been generally realized. In our judgment, the crisis meant that proved domestic reserves of petroleum should grow at least as rapidly as domestic demand in order to avoid the risk of increasing dependence on foreign oil. By this criterion, the level of prices that had prevailed in recent years was inadequate.

Although drilling has continued to increase, it is a matter of concern that in recent years proved domestic reserves of crude oil have increased at a considerably slower rate than domestic demand. In 1954 and 1955, for example, they increased by only about 1.1 billion barrels, or an average annual rate of only 1.8 percent. Domestic demand has continued to grow at an average rate in excess of 4 percent annually. Domestic productive capacity has been rising at a satisfactory rate relative to normal requirements. There has been a deterioration, however, in the basic relationship of known reserves to demand. The trend in this relationship, which is the basic measure of the adequacy of domestic exploration in terms of future requirements, is shown for the period 1941–56 in the following summary:

*Relation of proved reserves to domestic demand in the United States*

| | Jan. 1 proved reserves, millions of barrels | | | Domestic demand, millions of barrels | Ratio of proved petroleum reserves to domestic demand, total liquids |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Crude oil | Natural gas liquids | Total | | |
| 1941 | 18,300 | 2,850 | 21,150 | 1,486 | 14.2 |
| 1946 | 19,942 | 3,078 | 23,020 | 1,793 | 12.8 |
| 1951 | 25,268 | 4,268 | 29,536 | 2,574 | 11.5 |
| 1956 | 30,012 | 5,438 | 35,450 | 3,228 | 11.0 |

Source: American Petroleum Institute (reserves) and Bureau of Mines (demand).

The tabulation shows that proved domestic petroleum reserves are now less adequate in relation to domestic demand than at the beginning or end of World War II. In 1956, proved domestic petroleum reserves were only 11 times the annual rate of domestic demand. This ratio of reserves to demand is considerably lower than in the past and less than is desirable. This declining ratio reflects the lack of incentives for domestic exploration and development of new resources.

BROADER CONSIDERATIONS AFFECTING CRUDE OIL PRICES

With this background of recent developments, let us look at the broader considerations affecting crude oil prices. Two important facts stand out: (1) petroleum prices have not kept pace with the increase in costs, and (2) the rate of earnings on domestic petroleum operations has been declining and is relatively lower than it should be as compared with other industries considering the risks involved.

Since 1947, there have been only two general increases in crude oil prices. Crude oil prices in the United States averaged $2.60 in 1948. They declined slightly in 1949–50, and did not increase generally until 1953. An advance of about 25 cents in 1953 raised the average price to about $2.77 a barrel. This advance was much less than the change that had occurred in costs in the preceding 5 years, as I stated in testifying before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in June 1953. The second general advance followed the increase Humble made in January 1957 and appears to have raised average industry prices to about $3.07 per barrel compared with $2.60 at the end of 1947, an increase of 18 percent.

The wholesale price index for petroleum and products as of January 29, 1957, following the recent price increase, was 29 percent higher than in the base period 1947–49 according to the latest information released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. By comparison, the principal cost items in petroleum producing operations have shown increases of 40 to 60 percent. Wage rates in petroleum production have increased by 52 percent from an average hourly rate of $1.64 in 1947–49 to $2.49 at the end of 1956. The wholesale price indexes at the end of 1956 showed increases of 63 percent for iron and steel, 52

percent for metal and metal products, and 43 percent in machinery and motive products as shown by the following tabulation. The prices of these commodities are major elements of cost in petroleum operations.

*Wholesale commodity price indexes, 1947–49 equals 100, for petroleum and other major groups*

| | Year 1948 | Year 1953 | December 1956 | Estimate, January 1957 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Petroleum and products | 111.7 | 112.7 | 120.9 | 129.3 |
| Major groups particularly affecting petroleum costs: | | | | |
| Iron and steel | 104.3 | 131.3 | 163.3 | (1) |
| Metal and metal products | 103.9 | 126.9 | 152.4 | (1) |
| Machinery and motive products | 100.9 | 123.0 | 143.5 | (1) |

[1] Not available.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The changes in two of our principal cost items, wages and steel, can be illustrated by the experience since the general crude oil price increase in June 1953. Wage rates in petroleum operations increased 4 percent in 1953, 4 percent in 1955, and 6 percent in 1956, making a cumulative increase of more than 14 percent. The price of J–55 steel casing for new wells increased 4.5 percent in June 1953, 3.1 percent in July 1954, 7 percent in July 1955, 7.7 percent in July 1956, and 3.3 percent a few days ago, making a cumulative increase of about 28 percent since May 1953. The price of this casing is now $198.25 a ton compared with $154.65 at the end of May 1953. While these numerous wage and price increases were taking place, crude oil prices generally remained the same during the 3½-year period prior to the recent advance.

In addition to the effect of the large increases in costs of materials and labor, the petroleum industry has had to contend with other factors adding greatly to its costs. The increasing depth of new wells, the increasing proportion of dry holes, and the rising volume of work in expensive areas, such as offshore drilling, all contribute to rising unit costs. Constant improvement in technology and investment in more efficient equipment have been offsetting factors that have helped to make the advance in wholesale prices of petroleum and products relatively smaller than that of many other commodities.

The preceding factors have operated to increased industry costs on the order of 10 to 15 cents a barrel annually. This would indicate an increase in costs of 35 to 50 cents a barrel since the last general advance in crude oil prices in June 1953. This consideration was a major factor in our decision as to the amount of the price increase we made in January 1957.

The fact that costs for petroleum have risen more than prices has meant decreasing profit margins and a lower rate of return on investments in domestic petroleum operations.

Despite the popular impression of greatly increased profits in the petroleum industry, our studies indicate that the rate of return on investments in domestic petroleum operations has been declining during the past 10 years. Exhibit 1 shows the net income and net assets of eight important domestic oil companies that are relatively large producers without substantial income from foreign operations. It shows that the total investment by the eight domestic companies listed had approximately doubled between 1948 and the end of 1956, whereas their net income was only 40 percent higher in 1956 than the average in 1947–49. Consequently, the rate of return on investment had declined to a level that falls below the average for manufacturing corporations generally, although the rate of return should be higher because of the greater risks in oil producing operations.

Exhibit 2 shows the return on net assets of leading corporations by major industrial groups. It indicates a return of 14.2 percent on petroleum producing and refining, including the high return on large foreign investments, compared with 15 percent for corporations engaged in manufacturing generally. It should also be noted that the rate of return in 1955 in a number of industries, such as chemicals, cement, iron and steel, automobiles, and aircraft, was higher than in petroleum operations. The return for the petroleum industry in 1954 and 1955 was at its lowest postwar level, but the 1955 rate of return in manufacturing generally and in several major industries was at the highest level in 5 years.

*Rate of return on net assets of leading corporations by major industries, 1951–55*

| | Percent return | | | | | Change 1951–55 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1951 | 1952 | 1953 | 1954 | 1955 | |
| Petroleum production and refining | 16.6 | 14.5 | 14.7 | 13.8 | 14.2 | −2.4 |
| All manufacturing | 14.4 | 12.3 | 12.7 | 12.3 | 15.0 | +0.6 |
| Iron and steel | 12.3 | 8.8 | 11.6 | 9.4 | 15.2 | +2.9 |
| Chemical products | 16.3 | 13.5 | 13.2 | 14.4 | 17.7 | +1.4 |
| Autos and trucks | 17.6 | 18.7 | 19.4 | 18.0 | 29.1 | +11.5 |

Source: First National City Bank of New York Monthly Letter.

Humble's experience illustrates the decreasing rate of return on domestic petroleum investments. Its net income in 1956 of $179 million was only 9 percent more than in 1953 and actually less than the income 8 years before in 1948. By comparison, the company's investment has increased approximately 25 percent since the end of 1953 and 87 percent since the end of 1948. Humble's rate of return in 1956 was less than 15 percent on its average net investment, and much less than that on recent investments.

It is well to note that average returns on total petroleum investments substantially overstate the rate of return being realized on current investments because of the much higher level of costs now being incurred than was the case for reserves acquired in earlier years. We cannot expect money to be reinvested in exploration and development in order even to replace current production, much less to expand reserves, unless the return on current investments appears sufficiently attractive to compensate for the risks taken.

In view of our immediate needs for more crude oil, of the cost and profit conditions in the industry, and of the length of time required to realize results from expanded exploration and development, we concluded at the end of 1956 that a higher level of prices paid by Humble to those from whom it purchases oil was not only immediately appropriate but also in the right direction for the long run.

CRUDE OIL PRICE CHANGES IN 1957

On January 3, 1957, we raised prices on the crude oils we handled by amounts varying generally from 25 cents to 45 cents a barrel, depending on relative values, and averaging about 35 cents on our total volume. The amount of the increase was a matter of judgment. The general increase we made seemed to us the minimum warranted by the circumstances.

The level of general market prices is, of course, determined by evaluation of buyers and sellers as to current and prospective conditions of both supply and demand. A certain amount of trial and error is involved in the determination of a new level of market prices following the initiation of price changes. At times in the past when others initiated price increases that in our judgment were not warranted by the economic circumstances then prevailing, we have resisted making any changes. In 1947, our judgment to resist an upward movement in prices proved wrong and we had to meet a higher level in order to secure necessary supplies for our customers. In 1948, we resisted another price increase and in this case our judgment proved right as borne out by the fact that the companies initiating the changes finally had to drop back to the general market level. If our judgment on crude oil prices in January 1957 had been in error, other companies would not have changed their prices and Humble would have taken action to move back toward the established market level.

Humble posted price increases varying among grades of crude oil in accordance with its interpretation of their relative values. Other companies made changes which were smaller in some cases and larger in others than those posted by Humble. In west Texas, for example, Humble increased its price by 25 cents a barrel, but a number of companies raised prices by 35 cents a barrel and one raised 30 cents. Subsequently over a period of time, these purchasers dropped back to a 25-cent increase. For the Anahuac and Sweden grades, we posted an increase of 45 cents but others raised comparable crudes only 35 or 40 cents. Humble found that market conditions established a lower price than it had posted; and it adjusted its prices for these grades downward by 5 cents a barrel on February 1, 1957.

Adjustments of the type described are part of the process of finding the general market level. By the end of January, it appeared that the general market level for crude oil prices had increased about 25 cents a barrel in west Texas and the midcontinent areas, about 35 cents in east Texas, and about 40 cents along the gulf coast, with an average increase of about 30 cents in Texas and 25 cents in the midcontinent producing area.

RECENT GASOLINE PRICE CHANGES

As a direct marketer of gasoline in Texas and New Mexico, Humble had to decide what part of the increase in cost of crude oil it should seek to recover from gasoline. We had to consider the situation of our refinery and also the increase in prices paid to several inland refineries for gasoline bought from them to supply part of our market.

We estimated that the average price of the crude oil used at our refinery increased about 35 cents a barrel. The output of products from a barrel of crude oil is about 40 gallons after allowing for refinery use and losses. In order for the company to realize in its refining operations the higher price of the crude oil used, whether from its own production or from purchases, it was necessary to realize nearly 1 cent a gallon more on all refined products. Therefore, we decided to raise prices at which we sell gasoline to service stations by 1 cent a gallon. The inland refineries from which we buy gasoline to supply more than 30 percent of our gasoline market raised their prices to us by an average of 1 cent a gallon, with a range from 0.875 to 1.25 cents. The amount of our increase was therefore the minimum amount that would cover the higher prices for crude oil used to make gasoline at our refinery and for gasoline purchased from other refineries.

Humble's tankwagon price for regular gasoline was increased generally in Texas from about 15.5 cents a gallon to 16.5 cents, excluding taxes. This increase was 6.5 percent. With a normal dealer margin of 5.5 cents a gallon, the delivered price of Humble's regular gasoline to customers, excluding 8 cents

in Texas and Federal gasoline taxes, is about 22 cents a gallon. In terms of performance, the quality of Humble's regular gasoline now is about equal to that of premium gasoline 3 years ago, although its price is 1 cent less than premium gasoline was in 1954.

The American Petroleum Institute reports that the average retail price of gasoline, excluding taxes, in 50 cities was 21.61 cents a gallon in 1956. If this price were to advance generally by 1 cent a gallon to 22.61 cents, it would still be only 1.33 cents, or 6 percent, above the average price in 1953. Even with such an increase, gasoline continues to be a better buy than in the past. The average hourly earnings in all manufacturing were reported to be $2.05 at the end of 1956, compared with $1.77 in June 1953, an increase of over 15 percent. With the pay from an hour's work, the average employee in manufacturing can buy 9 gallons of gasoline, excluding taxes, compared with 8.3 gallons in 1953. Even taking into account taxes, which have increased from an average of 7.4 cents a gallon in 1953 to 8.9 cents a gallon currently, the pay for an hour's work in manufacturing will still buy 6.6 gallons of gasoline now compared with 6.2 in 1953. In fact, the pay for an hour's work buys more gasoline than in any prior year, as shown by exhibit 3. Furthermore, the quality of gasoline today is far superior to that in earlier years.

The question has been raised why gasoline prices should increase at all in view of a current level of inventories considerably higher than a year ago. The level of inventories is only one factor affecting prices. Costs and the current relation of demand and new production, taking into account seasonal factors, are far more important influences on price than inventories.

The seasonal nature of the demand for gasoline and heating oil means that gasoline stocks normally increase substantially in winter and decrease in summer, while heating-oil stocks decrease in winter and increase in summer. Industry operations geared to this fact, including the accumulation of seasonal inventories, allow the industry to meet consumer requirements at the lowest possible cost. Furthermore, as demand increases it is necessary to carry larger total inventories to fill additional lines and tanks in order to avoid any risk of shortages. Surveys by the National Petroleum Council at the request of the Government have shown that about 36.5 percent of inventories of gasoline and other clean products are required as pipeline fill and in tank bottoms. A substantial part of the available inventory is required for normal operations, with the result that only a relatively small part of the total inventory is available for market.

The figures on inventories of gasoline in relation to demand will provide a perspective on the situation in recent years.

*Relation of United States gasoline demand and inventories*

| | 1941 | 1946 | 1951 | 1954 | 1955 | 1956 | 1957 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Inventories, Jan. 1, million barrels | 84.4 | 97.7 | 116.8 | 157.9 | 155.4 | 165.4 | [1] 185.8 |
| Rate of demand for year, thousand barrels daily | 1,903 | 2,139 | 3,102 | 3,466 | 3,750 | 3,873 | [2] 4,060 |
| Days' supply related to demand during year | 44.4 | 45.7 | 37.7 | 45.6 | 41.4 | 42.7 | 45.8 |

[1] Preliminary. Inventories as of Dec. 28, 1956.
[2] Forecast.

Source: Bureau of Mines (demand and inventories) and American Petroleum Institute.

The tabulation shows that in terms of days' supply gasoline inventories are quite close to what they have been in many previous years, such as 1941, 1946, and 1954. Only in a short-term perspective of selected recent years do gasoline inventories appear high in terms of demand, and that may be the result of seeking to meet the rapidly increasing demand for distillate which is concentrated largely in the winter months.

Gasoline inventories at the beginning of 1957 were about 20 million barrels, or 12 percent higher than a year ago. In our judgment they were higher than necessary for this time of year, but probably by not more than 3 to 5 days' supply in terms of the average rate of consumption estimated by the Bureau of Mines for 1957. In this light, the level of gasoline inventories at the beginning of 1957 was not such a burden on the market as to preclude the prospect of reflecting the higher price of raw materials in the price of gasoline. Furthermore, the seasonal addition to gasoline inventories in January was smaller than in any of the 4 preceding years. In other words, the current relation of demand to supply was stronger than normal at this time of year. Consequently, gasoline inventories of 196,400,000 on February 1 were only 13,700,000 barrels higher than a year ago, a considerable improvement from a month earlier. With recent adjustments being announced in refinery runs and yields in an effort to supply more oil for Europe, there should be a decline in the level of inventories relative to demand.

CONCLUSION

The preceding information can be summarized by the statement that prices of crude oil, gasoline, and petroleum products generally are relatively low. They are low considering the increases in costs of labor and materials used by the petroleum industry. They are low in terms of the earnings and purchasing power of consumers. They are low in that the rate of return on domestic petroleum investments has been declining and is now less than in manufacturing industries generally. Finally, and most important, they are low in that they have not encouraged enough exploration to maintain the ratio of proved reserves to domestic demand.

In the light of these facts, we concluded early in January that an increase in prices was long delayed and that as a buyer and seller of crude oil and gasoline we should seek to adjust our prices upward. On the basis of our knowledge of conditions in the domestic petroleum industry, we believed that this action was a step in the right direction, both in an immediate effort to supply the present extraordinary demand and for the long run, and that it would prove to be in the national interest. We are still of this same view.

EXHIBIT 1

*Net income and net assets [1] of 8 important oil companies with relatively large production and without substantial income from foreign operations*

| | 1947 | 1948 | 1949 | 1950 | 1951 | 1952 | 1953 | 1954 | 1955 | Estimate, 1956 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Net income: | *Millions* | *Millions* | *Millions* | *Millions* | *Millions* | *Millions* | *Millions* | *Millions* | *Millions* | *Millions* |
| Humble | $124.1 | $186.1 | $120.5 | $129.4 | $169.5 | $145.3 | $164.3 | $146.3 | $175.0 | $178.9 |
| Standard (Indiana) | 94.9 | 140.1 | 102.7 | 123.6 | 148.7 | 120.0 | 124.8 | 117.2 | 157.1 | 167.8 |
| Phillips | 40.9 | 72.6 | 44.5 | 51.6 | 73.7 | 75.3 | 76.8 | 76.2 | 95.2 | 95.2 |
| Continental | 31.4 | 54.2 | 36.1 | 42.4 | 41.3 | 38.1 | 40.9 | 41.7 | 46.4 | 51.8 |
| Ohio | 29.2 | 49.3 | 33.7 | 37.3 | 41.7 | 39.4 | 43.5 | 38.2 | 41.3 | 41.2 |
| Skelly | 21.1 | 39.8 | 26.2 | 28.5 | 31.1 | 28.0 | 31.3 | 29.5 | 32.2 | 33.0 |
| Shell | 61.4 | 113.8 | 80.4 | 94.2 | 97.0 | 90.9 | 115.4 | 121.1 | 125.5 | 135.8 |
| Amerada | 14.9 | 22.6 | 14.4 | 15.4 | 16.3 | 15.9 | 18.4 | 19.8 | 25.4 | 28.7 |
| Total | 417.9 | 678.5 | 458.5 | 522.4 | 619.3 | 552.9 | 615.4 | 590.0 | 698.1 | 732.4 |
| Net assets [1] (end of period): | | | | | | | | | | |
| Humble | 559.4 | 673.5 | 722.1 | 779.6 | 865.2 | 928.5 | 1,008.6 | 1,072.9 | 1,163.9 | 1,257.5 |
| Standard (Indiana) | 924.9 | 1,018.7 | 1,083.3 | 1,165.7 | 1,271.6 | 1,356.8 | 1,436.9 | 1,574.2 | 1,701.1 | 1,822.6 |
| Phillips | 332.7 | 388.1 | 416.0 | 448.5 | 568.6 | 613.5 | 653.7 | 693.2 | 901.1 | 941.4 |
| Continental | 168.6 | 210.0 | 266.8 | 246.7 | 263.7 | 277.9 | 293.5 | 310.1 | 329.2 | 351.2 |
| Ohio | 139.6 | 173.8 | 192.4 | 212.0 | 234.0 | 253.7 | 275.9 | 294.4 | 315.3 | 335.5 |
| Skelly | 92.6 | 127.8 | 147.8 | 169.9 | 192.5 | 211.4 | 233.4 | 253.1 | 275.0 | 297.7 |
| Shell | 306.9 | 377.9 | 413.9 | 489.4 | 546.0 | 596.5 | 671.3 | 740.9 | 814.9 | 890.1 |
| Amerada | 42.6 | 55.8 | 62.3 | 68.2 | 75.1 | 81.5 | 90.5 | 100.8 | 115.1 | 131.2 |
| 8 companies | 2,567.3 | 3,025.6 | 3,264.6 | 3,580.0 | 4,016.7 | 4,319.8 | 4,664.8 | 5,039.6 | 5,615.6 | 6,027.2 |
| Rate of return on average net assets: [1] | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* |
| 8 companies | 17.39 | 24.26 | 14.58 | 15.26 | 16.30 | 13.26 | 13.70 | 12.16 | 13.10 | 12.60 |

[1] Shareholders' investment.

Source: Annual reports and preliminary statements for 1956.

EXHIBIT 2

*Percent return on net assets of leading corporations in selected industrial groups*

| Industrial group | Number of companies | 1947 | 1948 | 1949 | 1950 | 1951 | 1952 | 1953 | 1954 | 1955 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tires, rubber products | 26 | 16.0 | 13.4 | 8.7 | 15.9 | 16.4 | 13.4 | 14.0 | 11.9 | 15.1 |
| Lumber | 27 | 33.1 | 23.1 | 10.7 | 17.0 | 16.0 | 11.4 | 10.3 | 9.7 | 14.2 |
| Paper and allied products | 76 | 23.7 | 19.6 | 12.8 | 17.1 | 16.1 | 12.0 | 12.2 | 12.4 | 13.8 |
| Chemical products | 61 | 17.2 | 16.9 | 17.1 | 21.4 | 16.3 | 13.5 | 13.2 | 14.4 | 17.7 |
| Drugs and medicines | 24 | 20.7 | 21.3 | 16.2 | 21.9 | 19.9 | 14.6 | 13.8 | 14.8 | 18.3 |
| Petroleum production and refining | 92 | 19.9 | 27.9 | 15.7 | 15.2 | 16.6 | 14.5 | 14.7 | 13.8 | 14.2 |
| Cement | 32 | 11.5 | 17.0 | 18.8 | 17.8 | 14.5 | 14.3 | 15.0 | 18.6 | 20.3 |
| Iron and steel | 56 | 11.3 | 13.9 | 11.6 | 15.3 | 12.3 | 8.8 | 11.6 | 9.4 | 15.2 |
| Agricultural implements | 11 | 11.0 | 13.6 | 15.8 | 15.7 | 11.9 | 10.9 | 8.1 | 6.9 | 8.8 |
| Building, heating, plumbing equipment | 75 | 19.6 | 20.1 | 12.6 | 17.8 | 13.8 | 10.9 | 10.2 | 9.8 | 11.5 |
| Electrical equipment, radio and TV | 87 | 19.9 | 20.3 | 17.3 | 22.5 | 16.0 | 14.8 | 14.9 | 13.9 | 12.8 |
| Machinery | 157 | 17.0 | 18.6 | 12.4 | 14.2 | 14.9 | 14.1 | 12.9 | 11.7 | 11.0 |
| Office equipment | 29 | | 24.3 | 18.4 | 19.3 | 16.9 | 14.3 | 13.2 | 14.7 | 16.9 |
| Nonferrous metals | 41 | 14.8 | 15.3 | 8.0 | 14.5 | 13.5 | 11.5 | 11.0 | 10.8 | 16.7 |
| Instruments, photo goods | 49 | | | | | | | 13.5 | 16.9 | 17.7 |
| Autos and trucks | 15 | 20.7 | 25.4 | 30.2 | 32.5 | 17.6 | 18.7 | 19.4 | 18.0 | 20.1 |
| Aircraft and parts | 41 | −6.0 | 2.9 | 8.2 | 14.3 | 9.1 | 17.9 | 20.1 | 27.1 | 24.7 |
| Total manufacturing | 1,765 | 17.1 | 18.2 | 13.9 | 17.1 | 14.4 | 12.3 | 12.7 | 12.3 | 15.0 |
| Coal mining | 21 | 11.4 | 16.1 | 7.2 | 8.7 | 9.0 | 6.6 | 3.5 | 1.7 | 5.6 |
| Metal mining | 36 | 13.0 | 11.4 | 7.2 | 14.7 | 14.3 | 10.4 | 8.8 | 10.0 | 13.7 |
| Other mining, quarrying | 11 | 24.3 | 24.9 | 29.4 | 29.8 | 25.8 | 24.2 | 24.4 | 26.8 | 26.2 |
| Total mining, quarrying | 68 | 16.0 | 20.5 | 12.0 | 13.2 | 13.0 | 10.1 | 7.9 | 8.2 | 11.9 |

Source: First National City Bank of New York Monthly Letter

EXHIBIT 3

*Gasoline prices related to hourly earnings, United States*

| | Average retail price of regular gasoline at 50 cities (per gallon) | | Hourly earnings in manufacturing | Gallons of gasoline purchased with an hour's pay in manufacturing | | | Average retail price of regular gasoline at 50 cities (per gallon) | | Hourly earnings in manufacturing | Gallons of gasoline purchased with an hour's pay in manufacturing | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Excluding tax | Including tax | | Excluding tax | Including tax | | Excluding tax | Including tax | | Excluding tax | Including tax |
| 1919 | $0.2541 | $0.2547 | $0.477 | 1.88 | 1.87 | 1938 | .1407 | .1951 | .627 | 4.46 | 3.21 |
| 1920 | .2974 | .2983 | .555 | 1.87 | 1.86 | 1939 | .1331 | .1875 | .633 | 4.76 | 3.34 |
| 1921 | .2611 | .2631 | .515 | 1.97 | 1.96 | 1940 | .1275 | .1841 | .661 | 5.18 | 3.59 |
| 1922 | .2482 | .2520 | .487 | 1.96 | 1.93 | 1941 | .1330 | .1923 | .729 | 5.48 | 3.79 |
| 1923 | .2106 | .2197 | .522 | 2.48 | 2.38 | 1942 | .1446 | .2043 | .853 | 5.90 | 4.18 |
| 1924 | .1946 | .2094 | .547 | 2.81 | 2.61 | 1943 | .1456 | .2053 | .961 | 6.60 | 4.68 |
| 1925 | .2009 | .2220 | .547 | 2.72 | 2.46 | 1944 | .1462 | .2059 | 1.019 | 6.97 | 4.95 |
| 1926 | .2097 | .2338 | .548 | 2.61 | 2.34 | 1945 | .1448 | .2050 | 1.023 | 7.06 | 4.99 |
| 1927 | .1828 | .2100 | .550 | 3.01 | 2.61 | 1946 | .1469 | .2077 | 1.086 | 7.39 | 5.23 |
| 1928 | .1790 | .2094 | .562 | 3.14 | 2.68 | 1947 | .1693 | .2311 | 1.237 | 7.31 | 5.35 |
| 1929 | .1792 | .2142 | .566 | 3.16 | 2.64 | 1948 | .1954 | .2588 | 1.350 | 6.91 | 5.22 |
| 1930 | .1616 | .1995 | .552 | 3.42 | 2.77 | 1949 | .2027 | .2679 | 1.401 | 6.91 | 5.23 |
| 1931 | .1298 | .1698 | .515 | 3.97 | 3.03 | 1950 | .2008 | .2676 | 1.465 | 7.30 | 5.47 |
| 1932 | .1330 | .1793 | .446 | 3.35 | 2.49 | 1951 | .2031 | .2715 | 1.594 | 7.85 | 5.87 |
| 1933 | .1241 | .1782 | .442 | 3.56 | 2.48 | 1952 | .2024 | .2756 | 1.673 | 8.27 | 6.07 |
| 1934 | .1364 | .1885 | .532 | 3.90 | 2.82 | 1953 | .2128 | .2869 | 1.765 | 8.29 | 6.15 |
| 1935 | .1355 | .1884 | .550 | 4.06 | 2.92 | 1954 | .2156 | .2904 | 1.81 | 8.40 | 6.23 |
| 1936 | .1410 | .1945 | .556 | 3.94 | 2.86 | 1955 | .2142 | .2907 | 1.81 | 8.45 | 6.23 |
| 1937 | .1459 | .1999 | .624 | 4.28 | 3.12 | 1956 (estimate) | .2161 | .2989 | 1.98 | 9.16 | 6.62 |

Source: American Petroleum Institute (gasoline prices) and Bureau of Labor Statistics (hourly earnings).

## NEGOTIATIONS IN THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the gravity of the situation in the Middle East was forcefully emphasized by the President in his address to the Nation last night. This is the time to continue, not to stop, negotiating in the Mid-East crisis. The President himself has said:

> When I talked to you last October, I pointed out that the United States fully realized that military action against Egypt resulted from grave and repeated provocations.

Yet, not by a single act or deed has Egypt given any assurances to the United States, to the United Nations or to anybody else that these grave and repeated provocations will not be renewed. Our country undertakes important moral responsibility, too, in our suggestions for a solution; do we ourselves not need some declaration on Egypt's position?

Israel's forces have evacuated the whole land mass of the Sinai Peninsula, into which its military forces penetrated on the stated ground of self-defense, and its forces are now only in the narrow littoral of Sharem-el-Sheikh. Other than that they are in the Gaza Strip, which is administered under an armistice and is not Egyptian territory.

What is their purpose? Are they holding Sharem-el-Sheikh under any color of permanency or desire to acquire territory? Of course not. They are there, according to Israel's Prime Minister, awaiting guaranties that the grave and repeated provocations will not again be repeated. In short, Israel is seeking to attain peace, which is the United Nations' mission, and not to hang on to territory not its own. Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, in his reply to President Eisenhower's letter of November 8 urging withdrawal, said:

> In view of the United Nations resolutions regarding the withdrawal of foreign troops from Egypt and the creation of an international force, we will, upon conclusion of satisfactory arrangements with the United Nations in connection with this international force entering the Suez Canal area, willingly withdraw our forces.

The real problem is, however, that the United Nations has accepted Egypt's authority to bring about the removal of the United Nations emergency force whenever it wants to and, therefore, to end its mission. On this basis, and in the absence of any assurance by Egypt as to its future conduct in the Gulf of Aqaba or elsewhere, have we any right to demand of Israel full performance of the U. N. resolutions while we fail to make a simultaneous demand upon Egypt for compliance with U. N. resolutions?

In fact, the problem is one of self-preservation and national safety and survival for Israel, and of this the tone of the President's address shows he has a deep understanding. The President has just stated:

> The United States as a member of the United Nations would seek such disposition of the United Nations emergency force as would assure that the Gaza Strip would no longer be a source of armed infiltration and reprisals.

But can this be done so long as this force is subject to being ousted on Egypt's demand, according to the U. N. interpretation of its authority, and while

Egypt has not renounced belligerency against Israel or, indeed, taken any other position along the lines of the President's address. The President also said that "Egypt has in the past violated the armistice agreement and international law" and also "that Egypt ignored the United Nations in exercising belligerent rights in relation to Israeli shipping in the Suez Canal and in the Gulf of Aqaba."

Under these circumstances, we face a moral as well as a political determination, and there should be no such thing as sanctions or an end to negotiations, but rather a continued effort to find a solution. It is highly doubtful that sanctions would be voted in the United Nations at this time with the United States opposing them, as it should under these circumstances. The moral position seems to me to require demands on both Egypt and Israel, and not on Israel only. In a court of law, Israel would have the right to counterclaim and have all rights determined in one decree.

The New York Times said, in a leading editorial on February 11, what is even more true today:

> The friendship of the Arab States, if that is what we are working for, is not worth while if it has to be brought by subterfuges and injustices.

## FEDERAL FOREST EXPERIMENTAL STATION IN SOUTHWESTERN WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues a meritorious project for conservation of our natural resources in a three-State area.

The project would establish a much-needed Federal forest experimental station in southwestern Wisconsin, to remedy a serious condition of soil erosion, flood damage, and forest depletion in an area of over 7 million acres, including portions of Wisconsin, Iowa, and Minnesota.

Especially, I would urge my colleagues on the Senate Appropriations Committee to give this project sympathetic consideration when the forest appropriations come before that committee.

I should like to emphasize that, in this case, the State has not waited for Federal sponsorship, but has gone ahead with work on the local level. However, because the project is of a major nature, and includes an interstate area, I believe that Federal participation is not only warranted, but a real necessity.

Today, I received a fine statement from Mr. L. P. Voigt, director of the Conservation Department of Wisconsin, which stresses the very urgent need of this forest station.

I send to the desk the text of this statement, along with comments by myself, and request unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. L. P. VOIGHT, DIRECTOR OF CONSERVATION FOR THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

I welcome this opportunity to present for your consideration a request to provide for the establishment of a forest watershed research program in southern Wisconsin the next fiscal year.

Southern Wisconsin once supported fine hardwood forests which helped open up and develop the area. Although this area is now primarily devoted to agriculture, there are many timber and water values which should be developed to enrich the local and State economy.

The importance of the proper watershed management of our forest land is well established. The mismanagement of our land is so disastrous to our economy that we can no longer tolerate it. Floods, erosion, and insufficient supplies of good-quality water usually results. Local agencies are spending large sums of money in activities relating to the water resource; yet there is little on-the-ground research to guide the expenditure of funds and to develop sound techniques and practices for protecting the water resource.

The same is true of timber values. There are about 7 million acres of forest land in the area. The value of the forest crop is estimated at about $43 million. Although the woodlands are producing only a fraction of their potential, they are maintaining about 400 sawmills and other wood-using industries in a 20-county area of southwestern Wisconsin and Minnesota. With the expanding use of hardwood pulp, this area can contribute even more to the local economy if techniques for growing and harvesting the forest crop economically are developed.

FOREST AND WATERSHED CONDITIONS ARE DETERIORATED

In few places in the United States has the forest resource been so heavily depleted as in southern Wisconsin and adjoining counties in Iowa and Minnesota. The impact of this depletion in accelerated erosion, low-timber yield, and poor composition of woodlands is obvious. This area was untouched by the glacial action which affected the rest of the Lake States. The slopes are steep, the soil is erosive, and the problems of land management are greatly different from those elsewhere in the region. The 20 percent of the land area covered by forest includes the steeper slopes and other areas unsuited to cultivation or intensive pasturage.

Many of the woodlots are so badly understocked that they have less than half the timber volume that they could carry. One-third of the volume is in small trees—less than 9 inches in diameter. Generally, the woodlots have received little or no care. They have been deteriorated by continuous pasturing, overcutting, and burning.

Such conditions have resulted in spectacular sheet and gully erosion with its attendant floods followed by periods of low water flows. In the forest the effect has been equally damaging. Many potentially productive timber stands have been reduced to scattered overmature cull trees with a grass sod below that prevents reproduction of the stands. Low-quality species are taking over. The solution of these timber and water problems concerns everyone in the area. These deteriorated woodlands are producing only a fraction of their potential for industrial or farm use. It is doubtful that they can sustain the local wood-using industries. They are not effectively helping to regulate streamflow. The rivers are too unstable to furnish a reliable source of water for manufacturing plants, for recreation, or for generation of hydroelectric power.

Thus, the forest is only half performing its two major roles—(1) in watershed protection, and (2) as a source of income. Timber and watershed management is no longer only a matter of esthetics. It's good dollars-and-cents business.

RESEARCH NEEDS

To rebuild the forest land to greater productivity and to improve the capacity of the land to protect soil and water values will require a careful research program. The present research effort is not adequate to meet the needs of the area. The University of Wisconsin is carrying out a limited program of forest research. The State conservation department is contributing to this effort at a cost of over $100,000 annually. However, studies in watershed management and forest management—two of the major lines of research needed—are lacking. The multiplicity of problems cannot be solved by the present local effort alone. The Federal Government's responsibility is to at least match the local effort and bring our knowledge of forest and watershed management up to the level of other fields in agriculture.

To carry out the type of research program needed will require the establishment of an experimental forest where methods of cutting can be developed which will produce a forest crop and at the same time protect soil and water values.

Studies on how to insure reproduction in oak stands and on how to establish forest cover on open hillsides that have not revegetated naturally are urgently needed. Standard forest planting methods are not fully effective on these different sites. Yet, the soil-bank legislation passed by Congress indicates the tremendous interest in tree planting as a means of diverting acres from surplus crop production.

The study areas will also serve as a demonstration to timberland owners and farmers on the steps needed to rehabilitate and manage the existing depleted stands. The proposed watershed-research program will serve as a field center where timber owners can bring their special forest problems concerning the effects of grazing and timber cutting on water yield and soil erosion, the effects of different management systems on quality and quantity of streamflow, and the development of logging road systems that are adapted to the hilly topography and erodible soils. The water, timber, soil, recreation, and wildlife resources are all dependent parts of an integrated research program.

For these reasons I request that $100,000 be appropriated specifically to the United States Forest Service to establish a forest watershed-research program in southern Wisconsin. The staff for such a research program would work in close cooperation with the State Agricultural Experiment Station, industry, and other groups interested in the forestry problems. This would permit coordination and integration of research programs and make efficient use of research funds. Findings from this region will have wide application in the north-central region.

Local agencies have long recognized the need for a research program. They have not sat idly by and waited for the Federal Government to do the job—but have made a start. It is the declared policy of the Wisconsin Conservation Commission to cooperate with the United States Forest Service in every way possible in this effort. Should the Congress see fit to provide the funds requested, the commission will provide lands on which to conduct these investigations. This is the sort of States-Federal cooperation that deserves wholehearted support.

---

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I am happy to urge favorable consideration by my colleagues of the establishment of a Federal forest research station in southwestern Wisconsin. Not a single-State project, this would carry forward a badly needed program in a three-State area of Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

HISTORY OF CRITICAL SITUATION

Historically, the area was untouched and consequently unlevelled by the continental glacier. As a result, the steep slopes and gorges allow runoffs which cause serious erosion, flooding, and general depletion of the land and timber. For example, the streams flowing through the area erode about 40,000 to 42,000 tons of silt annually, or about 12½ tons per day per square mile. The effect on the forests has been equally damaging, with a loss of timber for local farms and wood-using industries—hence, a loss of a source of income. Moreover, under present circumstances, the flow of water in the streams is too unstable to be utilized for either recreation or for generating electricity for manufacturing plants.

The establishment of a Government research station in southwestern Wisconsin would provide the research necessary for a program to revitalize the area and make use of its valuable resources—now rapidly deteriorating.

Under present law, the Department of Agriculture is authorized to carry out such a proposed project. The Department has indicated that this particular project is sound and needed to cope with the problem of conserving our natural resources.

## USE OF PUBLIC LANDS IN NORTH DAKOTA, SOUTH DAKOTA, AND WASHINGTON

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 92, H. R. 348.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 348) to amend sec. 12 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676) relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, by providing for the use of public lands granted to the States therein for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishings, equipment, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have submitted an amendment to the bill. However, when I submitted it I did not realize the emergency situation that lay behind the bill. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be changed to the form of a bill and referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in support of the pending bill I wish to present a statement, which I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY

When the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington were admitted into the Union, the Federal Government retained title to most of the lands within those States, thus greatly limiting the sources of revenue available to those States for the financing of State governments. In recognition of this fact, the enabling act of 1869 provided for various land grants to aid those States in financing their schools, asylums, and penal institutions, public buildings at the State capitals, and other purposes.

One of these land grants set aside 50 sections of land in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, the income from which was to be used for the erection of buildings at the State capitals for legislative, executive, and judicial purposes. Over the years, the State of Montana has authorized bond issues, the principal and interest of which were payable from the income of the State capital buildings land grant. A bond issue was authorized in 1955 to reconstruct and renovate the State capitol building and to install voting machines in the legislative chambers; the issue was payable from the income of the State capital buildings land grant.

By its decision in the case of *Bryant* v. *The Board of Examiners of the State of Montana*, the Supreme Court of Montana held that funds from the capital buildings land grant could be used for no other purposes than "* * * to erect a building * * *." This decision operates to preclude the proposed bond issue referred to and to block urgently needed reconstruction and repair of the Montana State capitol building, a portion of which has been condemned and vacated.

I contend that by providing land grants in the enabling act for the erection of buildings at the State capital, it was the intent of Congress that such lands be used to aid the several States in bringing such facilities into useful being and in continuing such buildings in useful being. It naturally follows that expenditures for building sites, construction, equipment, and furnishings, repairs, and renovation, and interest on money borrowed for these purposes are necessary to provide for such accomplishments.

The House of Representatives and the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs believe that to restrict the use of the income from the capital buildings land grants for erecting buildings only, as the word is used in its narrowest sense, is wasteful and uneconomic, falls short of the objectives sought, and precludes the most effective and efficient use of such income.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 348) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nominations of Ellis Verne Widney, and John David Vanderveer, for promotion in the Regular Air Force, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Joseph A. Jenkins, of Texas, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board;

Jerome D. Fenton, of Connecticut, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board; and

Dr. Michael Ellis De Bakey, of Texas, and sundry other persons, to be members of the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mansfield D. Sprague, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of E. Perkins McGuire, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert Dechert, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Department of defense.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## BOARD OF PAROLE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Eva Kelly Bowring, of Nebraska, to be a member.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United States attorneys.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of United States attorneys be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

## UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Antonio C. Basa, to be United States marshal for the District of Guam.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Vice Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., to be Chief of Naval Personnel and Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Marvin Edward Kennebeck for temporary appointment as major general in the United States Air Force.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mrs. Oswald B. Lord to be representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John M. Allison to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Indonesia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Arthur Larson to be Director of the United States Information Agency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Laird Bell to be a member.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES LYING ON THE VICE PRESIDENT'S DESK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations lying on the Vice President's desk be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the sundry nominations in the armed services are considered and confirmed en bloc. That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

CONFIRMATION OF CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. KENNEDY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement which I have prepared in support of Mr. Herter's nomination be placed in the RECORD at the point where discussion concerning his nomination took place.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I take this opportunity to say a word on behalf of an outstanding son of Massachusetts, Chris Herter. Although former Governor Herter and I have not always agreed politically and otherwise, and though I have no doubt that we may well differ from time to time on his decisions in the post to which he is now being named, I thought it important to let my colleagues in the Senate, on the Democratic side of the aisle, know of the high esteem all of us in Massachusetts have for him.

Mr. Herter is regarded by all citizens of our State, I believe, as a man of the highest character, integrity, and ability. It was my privilege to serve with him in the House of Representatives; and to work with him from the Senate while he served two terms as Governor; and I am looking forward to working with him further in his new post.

I did not, of course, consult with him about my statement today, and trust that the endorsement of a good Democrat does not embarrass him. But I want to assure my fellow Democrats, and any others who may have questions about this nomination, that the President has selected an outstanding Republican and an outstanding citizen for this high post, one whose word is always good and whose decisions, we can be sure, are always motivated by the highest interests.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF DOROTHY McCULLOUGH LEE TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Mr. NEUBERGER subsequently said: Mr. President, the Senate today confirmed the nomination of Dorothy McCullough Lee, of Portland, Oreg., to be Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board. I wish the RECORD to show that I urged the Judiciary Committee to report favorably upon Mrs. Lee's nomination by the President, and I am pleased that the Senate has ratified her appointment.

Dorothy McCullough Lee was an outstanding State legislator in Oregon and one of the best mayors Portland ever has had. She stood firm against racketeering and corruption.

As Portland's chief executive, Mrs. Lee showed great tolerance for minority views and for the civil liberties of those charged with alleged subversion and similar offenses. I have every hope and faith that she will serve her country with distinction as Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board. She is a woman who has made many notable attainments in the public life of America.

Women now comprise more than 50 percent of our national population. It is heartening to see them recognized at high levels in government.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has the Senate concluded its morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed; and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate Joint Resolution 19.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before proceeding to the remarks I intend to make on the pending resolution, I should like to comment briefly on the events of yesterday involving our policy on the Middle East.

In the morning Members of both parties conferred with the President at the White House. It was a serious conference on matters which affect the vital interests of all the people of the United States. There was a free and frank exchange of ideas. It was an example of the kind of responsible cooperation which places the Nation's welfare above party welfare. The meeting was conspicuously free of the practices which surrounded the handling of the pending resolution by the executive branch some weeks ago.

Last night we had evidence of the value of this type of responsible cooperation under the leadership of the President. In his address to the Nation, Mr. Eisenhower made clear for the first time

the scope and the gravity of the situation in the Middle East. It is not necessary to agree fully with all the reasoning of the President in order to see in his address the beginnings at least of the emergence of an intelligible policy directed at the real issues in the Middle East.

The clarity of the events of yesterday are in such sharp contrast to the obscurity of the pending resolution that it seems to me all the more essential that the Senate act to bring this resolution into harmony with the spirit of the President's address last night.

Mr. President, in line with the above remarks I should like to read into the RECORD a statement I made last night at the conclusion of the address of the President of the United States.

The President seems to have made his extremely difficult decision and we will do our best to uphold him. I believe, however, that if sanction is the ultimate answer against Israel that the doctrine of equality will have become a mockery. It is to be hoped that if the General Assembly vote sanctions, the Security Council will reconsider such action in the hope that a settlement will have been reached through a simultaneous complete withdrawal of Israel from Gaza and the Gulf of Aqaba areas and an immediate replacement at once by United Nations forces. These forces should stay in these areas until an agreement is reached between Israel and the Arab States. Nothing will be gained by going back to the status quo ante bellum, and negotiations should and must be continued without letup at the present time to the end that a truce guaranteed by a United Nations police force can be achieved and maintained. In my opinion, I believe the President of the United States was not only talking to the people of this Nation, but to the Government of Israel as well. He was doing so, again in my opinion, with the hope that a settlement will be reached in the meantime and the issue to be before the United Nations on Friday avoided.

That, Mr. President, is the end of my comment on the President's speech of last night.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to study in detail the entire statement which the Senator has made before expressing a final comment on it because I believe that it contains certain aspects with which I do not concur, but I wish to commend him highly for his remarks concerning the meeting at the White House yesterday, where real bipartisanship was evidenced. I think the Senator will agree to that statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To me it was a striking example of how two parties and an administration of one party can work together and, in the words of the leader of the Democratic Party in the Senate [Mr. JOHNSON], work on a responsible and a cooperative basis. I hope that many more meetings of the kind held yesterday morning will be held in the future. I think the country will be the gainer in the results that ensue.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator's statement, and I congratulate him on his previous remarks.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I also wish to commend the Senator from Montana for his statement, again reserving a possible difference of opinion concerning a few of the premises on which he based some of his remarks.

But I should like to ask the Senator a question. Does he differ from what the President said last night in his statement with reference to the withdrawal of the troops of Israel, and placing at the Straits of Tiran and in the Gaza strip United Nations troops? I was not quite sure from listening to the Senator whether he differed with the President in any way on that point.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, with whom I disagree very seldom, that I think the Secretary of State, in his efforts on behalf of the President to assure passage through the Gulf of Aqaba, was offering to go just about as far as this Nation should go.

I recall to the Senator, however, the fact that, under a United Nations resolution dated February 2, a proposal was made—I am not at all sure as to whether it was agreed to—to the effect that United Nations troops would occupy the Gaza Strip and the area along the Gulf of Aqaba after Israel withdrew its troops from those areas.

The Senator will recall that some of us have felt that the word "after" should have been deleted and the term "at the same time" substituted, so that there would be no doubt of any intervening force coming in. There would be no doubt that if Israel withdrew from those areas, the United Nations police force would take over and remain there until the matter was settled.

I may say further that I not only believe that should be done but I believe this Government should take the lead now in trying to make permanent the United Nations police force, which is in being at the present time, so that there may be a "fire fighting" outfit on hand at all times, and we can get away from the idea of unilateral action on the part of our own country.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator for his exposition. It was my understanding of the President's statement last night, which perhaps elaborated on some of the things he said at our conference with him yesterday morning, that the United States would do everything it could, in good faith, as a friend of Israel, to try to solve these problems as soon as the Israel troops withdrew and the United Nations troops came in.

The Senator agrees with that, does he not?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I certainly agree with the Senator's statement.

It is my hope, and I know it is the hope of all the Members of this body and of this administration, that something can be arrived at before this matter is brought before the United Nations tomorrow, so that the issue can be avoided and that further steps can be taken to solve the difficulties inherent in that situation at the present time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator for his elaboration of the one question which arose in my mind.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield further?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, there just appeared on the ticker the following statement:

JERUSALEM.—Eban was told to leave tonight or early tomorrow, informants said. Ben-Gurion is reported to be sending a personal cable to President Eisenhower outlining Israel's hopes for further negotiations. The reports said the cable will stress that these negotiations should aim at withdrawal of Israeli troops from the Gaza strip and Aqaba areas while safeguarding Israeli security and freedom of shipping.

The Prime Minister met with his Cabinet for 3 hours this afternoon. A second Cabinet meeting is scheduled for later in the day.

This news is of interest to me, and I am sure that it is to everyone else.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The news is encouraging. Let us hope that some agreement can be reached in time, to the end that we shall not be forced to make a decision which may well make a mockery of the doctrine of equality.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator in that statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, President Eisenhower's original proposal on the Middle East, in my opinion, had two basic weakness. In the first place, the proposal distorted the constitutional principle of separation of powers. In the second place, the manner in which it was presented was such as to suggest a bold new policy, a new doctrine for dealing with the grave problems of the Middle East. In fact, the approach is not new, and the most critical problems of the Middle East are touched hardly at all by the resolution.

The actions of the members of the combined Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations and the initiative of the able and distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] have helped to correct the first weakness in the President's proposal, namely, the constitutional weakness.

The amended resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 19, the version which has come from the committees, is similar to the President's in one respect. It states at least as clearly that this country regards as vital to our national interests and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. It states at least as clearly the determination of the United States to use whatever legitimate means may be necessary to prevent armed aggression from destroying the independence and integrity of those nations.

Yet there is a difference. It is a difference in words, but it is an enormous difference. It does not affect the principal purpose of the resolution which is to forestall Communist aggression in the Middle East. On the contrary, it strengthens that purpose. It does affect, however, and it affects most profoundly, the constitutional processes by which this purpose shall be pursued.

Under the original version, Congress was asked to authorize the President to use Armed Forces in the Middle East.

"Authorize" was the key word. The committee version strikes that dangerous constitutional concept from the resolution. By so doing, it places responsibility for the use of Armed Forces, short of a declaration of war, more definitely where it belongs under the Constitution—on the President alone.

Is this a mere quibbling over words, Mr. President? I do not believe it is. I do not believe the Senate will so regard it. We shall not so regard it if we stop to consider that in almost 170 years of constitutional practice, the Formosa Resolution and this resolution are, so far as I am aware—and I have done some research on this matter—the only cases in which a President has asked Congress in this fashion for authority to employ the Armed Forces prior to a declaration of war. Yet the Armed Forces have been used to protect American interests abroad many times throughout our history without a declaration of war.

Mr. President, if in almost 170 years of constitutional practice there are only two cases of this kind, both under the same President and both in the last few years, then it ought to be clear that this change which the committees have made involves far more than a mere quibbling over words. What is involved is perhaps more fundamental than the action we may or may not take in the Middle East crisis. It is a matter which goes to the heart of our system of government.

I realize, Mr. President, that in trying to remove the constitutional weakness in the resolution, the committees were dealing with a very difficult question. It may not be possible ever to draw with words that precise point at which the President's responsibilities as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces divides from the congressional authority to declare war. It is a distinction that lies in a twilight zone of constitutional power between the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

The committees' effort, however, has the merit of reversing the possibly dangerous precedent set by the Formosa Resolution several years ago, a precedent which would have been reinforced by the acceptance of the President's version of the pending resolution. Carried to a logical extreme, an accumulation of precedents in which Congress authorizes the President "to use the Armed Forces," could have only two possible outcomes.

I speak now not of what would be likely today or tomorrow or next year but of the decades which lie ahead. It is the responsibility of each Senator individually and of the Senate as a whole to measure actions taken by this body not only against the needs of the hour but for the long future when others will have to live with the consequences of our acts.

Carried to a logical conclusion, precedents of authorizing the President to use the Armed Forces could lead on the one hand to this result: They could eventually convert a fundamental power of the Presidency—the power to command the Armed Forces—into a congressional function.

If the President comes to us now for permission to order the Armed Forces to fire if necessary in the Middle East, how long will it be before other Presidents will feel impelled to come to Congress for permission to move the Armed Forces to the firing line? Where would this trend leave the country in a nuclear age when instant decisions by the President may be necessary?

Reduced to their logical extreme, these precedents, authorizing the President to use the Armed Forces, could bring about slowly, almost imperceptibly, fundamental changes in our system of government. We could be moving it on the one hand in the direction of a parliamentary form of government, with the President reduced either to a figurehead or to a mere agent of Congress.

As the able majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], has said in discussing the word "authorize" in the original resolution, it would "create a precedence for a weaker Presidency." The resolution as amended strengthens, reaffirms, and reasserts the constitutional authority of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States.

The new wording reasserts that Presidential power, moreover, at the same time that it shuts off still another avenue of distortion of our constitutional system which was possible under the original resolution. In authorizing, Congress would accept responsibility for the actions which will be taken pursuant to the authorization. It would assume responsibility for actions which have not yet taken place and whose nature we cannot anticipate. It would endorse, in effect, whatever employment the President sees fit to make of the Armed Forces. Under a system of separate powers, however, Congress does not control that employment. Congress would approve in advance whatever uses are made of the authorization, whether they are wise uses or foolish uses, whether they are cautious uses or reckless uses. Congress, in short, would impair its right of independent criticism and correction. That course invites the irresponsible use of executive power by sharing responsibility in matters over which Congress has no control and little specific knowledge. At the end of that road lies executive tyranny.

It may be contended, I suppose, that the original language of the resolution could not have worked both ways, that it could not have provided precedence both for a parliamentary system of government and arbitrary executive power. Mr. President, that is precisely what I believe to be the case. In its original phraseology, the resolution was a significant step away from the system of checks and balances. That much is certain, even though the direction of the step might not be clearly visible except in retrospect.

I do not suggest that if we had accepted the "initial" version, we would reach under the Presidency of Mr. Eisenhower the extreme of executive tyranny any more than we would find ourselves suddenly functioning under a parliamentary system of government. I do say, however, that both possibilities were implicit in the language of the original resolution.

I know that the Senate shares my conviction that the form of government under which we live is worth preserving beyond the lifetime of the President or any of us in the Senate. That is why I believe the committees of the Senate were not quibbling when they altered the language in the pending resolution. They were performing a distinguished service to the Nation.

The President came to Congress for authority to use the Armed Forces prior to a declaration of war. By this change, the committees have reminded the President that only the Constitution can give him that authority.

The President came to Congress with a request that it assume responsibility for actions which may involve the use of Armed Forces short of a declaration of war. The committees have reminded the President that under the Constitution only that he can assume that responsibility.

At the outset of my remarks, I noted that the original version of the resolution had not one, but two weaknesses. Amendment by the committee has corrected the constitutional weakness. As for the second, the hearings and the report of the committees reveal its presence but I believe it remains uncorrected in the present version. It was for that reason that I voted against reporting this measure. I wished to reserve unimpaired my right to bring to the attention of the entire Senate what I believe to be this second basic weakness.

Mr. President, only two major provisions are involved in the pending resolution, as the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] so ably pointed out in his analysis the other day. The first emphasizes our determination, in the defense of vital national interests, to act to prevent Communist aggression in the Middle East. The second gives the executive branch greater flexibility in dispensing $200 million in public funds already appropriated for military and other assistance to the nations of that region. In connection with the latter provision, the executive branch originally sought total flexibility; but again the work of the two committees has served to retain at least some restraints. The distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON], the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] were instrumental in securing in committee adoption of amendments to that effect.

If I may reiterate, then, the joint resolution, as reported, has only two principal elements: First, it emphasizes the national determination to take whatever measures may be necessary to defend our vital interests against Communist aggression in the Middle East. Second, it gives the executive branch greater flexibility in spending $200 million already appropriated. That is all the resolution does in law.

Is that all it does in fact? Is that the impression the resolution has created at home and abroad? Was that the actual intent of the resolution?

If the President believed it was essential merely to emphasize what is already known—namely, our determination to oppose Communist aggression—then a

resolution confined to that purpose would have sufficed. The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] repeatedly noted that point during committee consideration of the measure.

However, the executive branch was adamant in its insistence that the expression of opposition to Communist aggression must not be separated from the aid provisions of the resolution. But as I have already noted, these provisions involve merely the granting of greater flexibility to the President in the use of $200 million in funds already appropriated. In itself, Mr. President, that is not an inordinate demand. If that was all that was desired, a simple request from Mr. Eisenhower, I believe, would have brought prompt changes in existing legislation.

That was not the way, however, in which the matter was handled by the executive branch. On the contrary, the manner of presentation gave the proposed resolution a tremendous and worldwide significance. I recall, as do other Members, I am sure, the personal appearance of the President at a joint meeting of both Houses of Congress. I recall the sense of urgency and crisis which was injected into the proceedings.

We found ourselves dealing with more than a simple reiteration of opposition to Communist aggression. We found ourselves dealing with more than minor changes in appropriations legislation. We were confronted with what was promptly labeled in this country and throughout the world as a new policy for the Middle East—or, even more, a new doctrine. A change to a new policy, Mr. President, is always a matter of great importance to the people of the United States. A new doctrine is of even greater moment. It implies a course of action with which we shall have to live for decades to come.

That is the impression which this resolution created, both at home and abroad. If the executive branch did not deliberately create the impression, that branch certainly did nothing to allay it. The committee's hearings and report have attempted to correct it, but I am afraid that the distortion is now too widespread. Even here in the Senate, during the present debate, we have heard repeated reference to the "Eisenhower doctrine."

Mr. President, I do not know whether a new doctrine is required for the Middle East. I do know that we need, and need urgently, a new policy. The manner in which this resolution has been handled by the executive branch has created the illusion of one, but in my opinion it does not even begin to provide the basis for one.

What it does do is to restate in more emphatic tones, as the result of the committees' amendment, our determination, in our national interests, to oppose Communist aggression in the Middle East. I would have thought that repeated statements by former President Truman and President Eisenhower and the Secretary of State had made clear that opposition. Nevertheless, if the President wishes a reaffirmation in which Congress joins, I can seen no objection to the resolution as now phrased. But neither can I see a new policy.

The resolution also promises to continue military and economic aid to the Middle East in the same pattern into which it has fallen of late. If anything, with the removal of legislative restraints at the request of the President, the pattern may now become more aimless and more questionable.

What the resolution does not promise, but what it ought to promise, is action directed at the basic causes of the present tensions in the Middle East. It ignores the Suez difficulties. It ignores the Arab-Israeli dispute. It touches hardly at all on the real economic instability in the region. It ignores Soviet and other arms traffic in the Middle East which has intensified all the problems in that area.

Mr. President, if the Senate is going to join with the President in a national statement of policy, then I believe that statement ought to be more worthy of the United States than is this resolution. I believe the statement ought to illuminate our long-range purposes in the Middle East. It ought to express our deep concern over threats of aggression in that region, from whatever direction they may stem. It ought to make clear our opposition to the indiscriminate pouring of arms into that region from Soviet and other sources. It ought to emphasize our support of the efforts of the United Nations emergency forces which have performed a major service to mankind in preventing, to date, a renewal of the bloodbath between Israel and Egypt. It ought to make clear that this country is not going to subsidize endlessly with aid-funds the prejudices and oppressions which for years have kept the Middle East on the brink of turmoil. It ought to make clear that if we are going to ask the citizens of the United States to appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars for activities in the Middle East, then the expenditure of those funds by the executive branch must be linked, as was the Marshall plan in Europe, to constructive programs of specific nature, amount, and duration.

Mr. President, the work on the constitutional question by the Senate's committees has already made this resolution a far better measure than it was when it reached us. I hope the Senate, before it completes action, will act to bring about additional improvement. I hope we shall set forth the guidelines of a policy in the Middle East, a constructive policy which the people of the United States can accept in good conscience, a policy which will evoke the support of decent people in the Middle East and elsewhere in the world.

In the committee, I submitted three amendments to the resolution. These amendments were defeated, as the Members know, by virtually a straight party vote. I regret that division. There was nothing partisan in the intent of the proffered amendments, and I cannot believe that the Senators on the other side of the aisle are united in opposition to their purposes. For, what are those purposes, Mr. President?

One amendment was designed to encourage the President to seek international control over the flow of armaments into the Middle East from Soviet and other sources. As the Secretary of State made perfectly clear in his testimony before the committees, this traffic is a major source of tension. It was this traffic which set the groundwork for the recent conflict in the Suez region. Unless it is controlled in the interests of peace, it may well set off another explosion, perhaps this time with the involvement of American forces. I cannot believe the Senators on the other side of the aisle are united in their determination to prevent the inclusion in a national statement of policy on the Middle East, a clear expression of our desire to control the dangerous flow of arms into that area.

The second amendment which I proposed, Mr. President, reaffirms our moral and material support of the United Nations emergency force which is maintaining the truce in the delicate situation surrounding Suez. The acceptance of this amendment will emphasize that this country stands with the United Nations whenever that organization is really contributing to the preservation of peace. The United States, the entire world, owes a debt of gratitude to the smaller nations whose armed forces make up the United Nations emergency force in the Middle East. Without that force, it is not impossible that the great powers, including ourselves, might now be locked in combat in that area. In these circumstances, I cannot believe that the Senators on the other side of the aisle are united in opposing an expression of support for the United Nations forces in the Middle East in a statement of the policy of this Government.

The third amendment, Mr. President, represents an attempt to clarify a matter which I know has troubled members of both parties. It is the uncertainty as to where our aid policies respecting the Middle East are headed. It is the fear that in granting flexibility in the use of $200 million for several months we shall be setting the stage for programs which will run on for years and into many times that amount, without bringing any closer the elusive goal of peace in the Middle East.

This amendment, if it is adopted, Mr. President, will not foreclose assistance to the Middle East. It will emphasize, however, that before we go much further in this respect, the Senate expects to know how much is involved, what kind of aid is involved, and how long it will be involved. Most of all, it will make clear that the Senate expects aid to be related to a specific program that facilitates a settlement of the Suez dispute and the Arab-Israeli conflict, and otherwise promotes lasting stability in the Middle East. That kind of aid program, Mr. President, and only that kind, promises to serve our long-range interests in the Middle East. I cannot believe, Mr. President, that the Senators on the other side of the aisle are united in their opposition to this effort to make clear that aid programs, if they are to be a part of our policy at all, must hold rational promise of dealing with the real problems of peace and stability in the Middle East.

I believe, Mr. President, that the adoption of the amendments which I have been discussing, when added to the excellent changes already made in committee, will make this resolution something which it is now widely presumed throughout the Nation and the world to be. It will make this resolution a better guide to the kind of action in the Middle East which holds hope of coping with the key difficulties confronting us in that area. It will make this resolution a better instrumentality for serving the interests of all the people of the United States and for the preservation of world peace.

Mr. President, I should like at this time to submit three amendments, ask that they be printed and lie on the table, and express the hope that the State Department will consider the amendments and come up with some reasons as to why they should or should not be adopted. I am certain they will give them serious consideration.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. FLANDERS obtained the floor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, with the understanding that he will not lose the floor?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield with that understanding.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, last evening the President of the United States stated his position respecting the refusal of Israel to withdraw its troops in conformity with the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations. It was a forthright statement and, I think, consistent with the position that the administration has followed since hostilities began in the Mideast, and it is consistent with the enunciated principle of the United States that disputes must not be settled by force.

I do not think there is any Member of this body who does not have sympathy with the problems that Israel faces. Egypt and the Arab States have refused to recognize the fact that Israel is a state. In violation of international law and, I believe, of the spirit of the Egyptian-Israeli Armistice Agreement of 1949, Egypt has refused to permit the passage of Israeli traffic through the Suez Canal and in the Gulf of Aqaba. While it is admitted that both Egypt and Israel have broken the terms of the armistice by raids on the territory mentioned, it is true that Israel has been under great provocation because of the efforts of Egypt to deny its survival as an independent and sovereign nation.

The solutions to these questions, which would assure Israel's security and the opportunity of development, are not at this moment before the United Nations. These questions are certainly connected with the consideration of the issues before the United Nations, but they are not presently before the United Nations.

Nevertheless, I think it is clear that by every diplomatic means, the President is attempting to make progress toward the realization of these aims. Our willingness to establish the character of the Gulf of Aqaba as an international waterway by the passage of our own ships, and the sponsorship of the resolution of November 2 in the General Assembly recommending an extension of the use of the UNEF between Egypt and Israel, are proof of the positive efforts of the United States to assure the security and international rights of Israel.

No one can yet say that these aims will be immediately or wholly successful. It can be said that the Government of the United States has made it clear in the United Nations, to the conflicting parties and to the world community, that they are our aims and that the President and the Secretary of State will work to achieve them by every peaceful means.

I pause at this point to pay tribute, although it is hardly necessary, to the devoted efforts of our Ambassador to the United Nations, a former Member of this body, Henry Cabot Lodge, to achieve a resolution of those issues. I think he has worked diligently and has been a faithful servant, not only of our country, but also of all democratic countries who join us in desiring world peace.

Unfortunately, the President is dealing with a situation in the General Assembly of the United Nations about which it may be required to make an immediate decision. It may be required to decide whether it will support sterner recommendations or actions to secure the withdrawal of the Israeli force. All of us hope that stronger methods, including sanctions, will not be necessary and that the issues of the free use of the Gulf of Aqaba and the interposition of the UNEF between Israel and the Gaza Strip may be worked out by negotiations in the U. N. or with the help of free countries like the United States.

It is clear that the United States holds the greatest influence toward the settlement of these questions. Certainly, Russia does not want them to be settled, and, unhappily, Great Britain and France have lost their ability, for the time, to have influence in the area. The world looks to our country. In this crisis I believe the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and Ambassador Lodge should have the greatest flexibility in any negotiations. That is one of the reasons that led me to make a short statement on Tuesday, at the time the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] placed in the RECORD a copy of his letter to the Secretary of State announcing the opposition of the leadership of the Democratic Party in the Senate to the use of economic sanctions against Israel.

I did not question the sentiment and the sympathy which were the basis of his letter. I did say that I thought it was unwise for the Congress or the majority or minority, speaking as a party, to take such a position at this time. I believe that it would serve to make both Israel and Egypt more adamant in their positions and thus make it more difficult for the President to secure some basis for agreement and avoid use of sanctions.

All of us hope with the President that the impasse caused by the refusal of Israel to withdraw its troops may be resolved and that sanctions or any drastic steps by the General Assembly may not be required.

It was very encouraging to hear the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] state on the floor a while ago that news had been received that the Cabinet of Israel was continuing its negotiations.

Nevertheless, if the issue arises I support the President in his views because I think he is right both in principle and in the practical aspects of the problem. At the beginning of hostilities in Egypt when Great Britain, France, and Israel had chosen to use military force the United States took a very clear position. It was that our country is opposed to the use of force as a means of settling disputes and by whatever country force may be used. I believe that the United States must maintain its position. If Israel in this instance fails to comply with the resolutions, there is the possibility that fighting may break out again; and the very problems which Israel and the democratic countries of the world want settled will be made infinitely more difficult, and their solution postponed. Further, after the great efforts that have been made to stop the war and to prevent its extension into other countries, and perhaps to a worldwide war, I do not believe that one country, even a friendly country such as Israel, should risk these consequences.

I believe strongly that the position of the United States in opposition to the settlement of disputes by force must be maintained. We embarked upon a clear course of principle at the beginning of the invasion, and we applied it to Great Britain and France. It would be wholly inconsistent if we should now weaken or change that principle.

This means logically that, however desirable Israel's aspirations may be, and despite our sympathy with those aspirations, we cannot agree that they shall be attained by force. The consistent position that the Government of the United States has taken has made it clear to other countries and people throughout the world that it does support international law and international order, and this has raised the moral stature of our country. It has enlarged the capability of the United States to influence the settlement of the problems in the Mideast which caused the unfortunate military action with which the world continues to deal.

It is my own view that the action of the United States, based upon principle, in opposing the invasion by Great Britain, France, and Israel, or the use of force, from whatever quarter it might come, did more to raise the position of the United States in the eyes of the people of the world, and to secure the confidence of the great mass of the people of the world, particularly the people of the newly independent countries, than all the information services, all the speeches, and many of the actions our country has taken to prove that it stands against the use of force, and that it stands for independence and sovereignty among the newly independent countries of the world.

Whatever may be the result of negotiations in the United Nations or outside

the United Nations to avert the imposition of sanctions, if the negotiations fail, we must adhere to the principle that force shall not be used, and we must continue in our efforts and belief that solutions can be found by peaceful means. It is this principle which underlies the objectives of the Mideast doctrine which the President has enunciated, and which the Senate is now debating, without the prior condition of peace, or a consistent absence of hostilities in this section, the success of the objectives of the Mideast doctrine would be very doubtful.

It has been argued that the United States should not support sanctions if they become necessary because sanctions have not been imposed against Russia, Egypt, and other countries who may have used force. Last night the President said we were dealing with this issue, and that if in the future certain countries—notably Egypt—should fail to follow the recommendations of the United Nations, the United States would maintain its position that such countries should be required to obey those resolutions.

The principle of equality which the great Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has mentioned is a sound one, but I do not think it can be used to avoid the issue at hand. I support the President when he says that that principle cannot be strengthened by saying that we will not act in the case at hand. We are now—the General Assembly of the United Nations and thus the United States—seized with the question of whether sanctions should be imposed against the use of force if a solution cannot be reached. I hope it will not be necessary, but in principle, and in reality, the United States must act with the issue at hand.

I hope, together with every other Member of Congress, and the people of our country, that we shall not be forced to make such a decision, but we cannot avoid consideration of the issue. That is the reason the President spoke last night.

Our position in the world is one of influence. To maintain such influence, and retain the ability to settle these questions, the United States must maintain a position of principle; namely, that it will not support the use of force to obtain the settlement of disputes.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, in the days since the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, acting jointly, reported the Middle East resolution, I have been increasingly concerned with the action which we took in eliminating from that resolution any authorization for the President to act in this matter. In consequence, I have found it necessary to prepare an amendment reinstating the grant of authority by the Congress, instead of sliding over that grant in the vague words of the amended resolution. This amendment I shall send to the desk at the conclusion of these very brief remarks, and ask that it lie on the table, to be called up later.

Whatever our confidence in the President of the moment—and it is great—the Senate cannot give up its constitutional duty to give consent to the waging of war. I conceive that this is not a narrow duty to be exercised only as the President appears before us and asks for a declaration of war. We have had the experience of getting into a full-fledged war without a declaration.

The occasion was, of course, our beginning of what seemed a simple police action in Korea, and which afterward developed into years of bloody stalemate in which for the first time in our history our Armed Forces were directed to fight but were refused the privilege and crown of victory.

The right of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States to act in an emergency is undoubted. Should, for instance, our country be bombed without previous notice by a foreign power, our own Air Force would at once go into action, not merely in defense, but also in reprisal. It would not be necessary to ask for a declaration of war to bring that about. The action must be instant.

In a sense, the Korean situation was an emergency, but not an emergency of minutes or even of days. The bringing of our forces to bear on the North Korean attack required a few weeks of preparation which the President would have been justified in ordering without congressional assent.

As I remember the temper of those days, that support of military action would have been quickly given and with practical unanimity. The President could have had and should have had the authority of Congress for the action which he had to take. That authority was not asked for nor granted. The responsibility of Congress was not involved, and this body not only was permitted to duck the responsibility, but the President was thereby handicapped by criticism which might otherwise have been avoided.

A second somewhat similar occasion was the threatened invasion of Formosa by the Red Chinese forces. On that occasion we authorized the President, using that actual word, "to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack." There was more to the resolution, but these are the pertinent clauses.

This was not a declaration of war, but it was an authorization to proceed in actions which might well be a prelude to war. In giving its authority to these limited operations, the Senate accepted its responsibility in a way which unfortunately it was not asked to do in the Korean situation. The precedent established was a wise one. That precedent we have now thrown overboard.

When, in committee, we refused the President's request for a limited authorization we were asked to take an action similar to that which we did take in the Formosan case. The request for authorization we have denied. We have replaced it by the vaguest kind of language which seems to deny our responsibility, but leaves us free to criticize. We say "that the United States is prepared to use armed force."

Mr. President, it seems to me that this body is in the process of diluting its responsibilities. None of us can say at this moment whether the military and political crisis in the Middle East is as serious as has been represented to us. Yet we can view this crisis in the responsibilities of the Senate as being very real, and as presenting an instant problem which we should face with courage and responsibility.

We have confidence in President Eisenhower. That should not lead us to relax our muscles and let our hands hang idly when a future President, following precedents we are establishing today, involves us intentionally in a war about the wisdom of which the Congress may not be convinced but which by such precedent as we are establishing today it is powerless to prevent.

Mr. President, I now send to the desk an amendment which reads as follows:

On page 4, line 8, strike out "the United States is prepared" and insert in lieu thereof "he is authorized."

I ask unanimous consent that this amendment lie on the desk until it is called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TURNING POINT OF THE COLD WAR

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in his address last night, President Eisenhower said:

The basic pledge of all the members of the United Nations is that they will settle their international disputes by peaceful means and will not use force against the territorial integrity of another state.

If the United Nations once admits that international disputes can be settled by using force, then we will have destroyed the very foundation of the organization, and our best hope of establishing a real world order.

In these two sentences, the President summed up the basic issue that is at stake in the Israeli question today. Personally, I think the President is right. If the nations who profess adherence to law and morality in making international agreements abandon their commitments and resort to force, the world returns to the law of the jungle.

There is that phase of the matter, and I recognize it, but I wish primarily to mention another aspect of the situation. This other phase is the effect of the whole situation on the so-called cold war—the struggle for the minds and feelings of men in the great area that comprises the 400 million people of Moslem religious faith.

If those state leaders who deny the existence of God can say to the Moslem world "Look at your nations that talk of morality; they take what they want by force"—the cause of freedom loses its greatest weapon, the example of respect for law and pledged word.

It does not answer this point to say that the masters of the Kremlin themselves do not respect their own commitments. It merely puts everyone on the low plane that anything is all right if you get by with it.

On the other hand, if Israel will now join France and England and observe its agreement to withdraw its troops from the Gaza Strip and the entry to the port of Aqaba, as she had agreed to do, then the Communist propagandists will lose their argument.

Indeed, Mr. President, it might well be that this could be the turning point in the whole cold war. If the nations that believe in the fatherhood of God, meaning the Christian, the Jewish, and the Moslem faiths—if these unite on a basic matter of principle, then the Red tide of conquest by atheistic politicians will not engulf the Moslem world.

Mr. President, everyone has seen the maps which have shown the gradual sweep of Communist influence over the countries that border the Russian Soviet. Today, that Red tide is lapping against the countries that lie in the Middle East, the nations that make up the Moslem world which runs like a belt at the center of the globe from Morocco to Pakistan.

If, as the result of the wise intuition and profound conviction of President Eisenhower, the realization comes that God-respecting nations keep their word, a mighty spirit could sweep from Casablanca to Cairo and through the Middle East and into Pakistan with ripples carrying into India and possibly China.

If that happens, atheistic communism will be dealt a blow from which it can never recover. Against the backdrop of the bloody, dripping fist of force beating down the heroic men and women and children of Hungary will be drawn the picture of people who worship God saying in actual practice that they do not covet their neighbors' lands and will not take them by force.

Against the example of a resort to lawlessness, there will be etched a reliance upon the machinery which the nations of the world created to deal with just such questions of boundary adjustment and sea control as now threaten the peace of the world.

Mr. President, the courageous, conscientious position taken by the President of the United States in this grave hour may well be the turning point in the cold war.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

## PROPOSED TAX RELIEF FOR SMALL-BUSINESS CORPORATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BARRETT, BIBLE, BLAKLEY, CAPEHART, CARROLL, CASE of South Dakota, CHAVEZ, CHURCH, CLARK, DOUGLAS, ERVIN, GOLDWATER, GREEN, HENNINGS, HILL, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, JOHNSTON, KENNEDY, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, MONRONEY, MORSE, NEUBERGER, O'MAHONEY, PASTORE, POTTER, SCHOEPPEL, SMATHERS, SMITH of New Jersey, SMITH of Maine, SPARKMAN, SYMINGTON, THURMOND, and WILEY, I submit an amendment which I propose to offer to H. R. 4090, the bill which would extend the present Federal tax rates on corporate income. This amendment is the same as my bill (S. 150), which I introduced on January 7, 1957—the first day upon which the introduction of bills was in order in this session of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be printed and lie on the desk until February 27 for the purpose of allowing other Senators who may wish to do so to become cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, my amendment would do two things. First, it would reduce the Federal tax burden on all corporations which have less than $225,000 in taxable income. Second, it would increase total Federal revenue in an estimated amount of approximately $20 million. These effects would be achieved as follows: the normal tax rate on all taxable corporate income would be lowered from 30 percent to 22 percent, and the surtax rate on taxable income in excess of $25,000 would be raised from 22 percent to 31 percent. This adjustment imposes the lower tax rate upon the lower amounts of income and imposes the higher tax rate upon the higher amounts of income.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table showing the effects of my proposal.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Effects of a normal tax rate of 22 percent and a surtax rate of 31 percent*

| Income subject to normal tax and surtax | Present tax liability (normal rate 30 percent, surtax rate 22 percent) | Proposed tax liability (normal rate 22 percent, surtax rate 31 percent) | Change | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Amount | Percent |
| $5,000 | $1,500 | $1,100 | −$400 | −26.7 |
| $10,000 | 3,000 | 2,200 | −800 | −26.7 |
| $15,000 | 4,500 | 3,300 | −1,200 | −26.7 |
| $20,000 | 6,000 | 4,400 | −1,600 | −26.7 |
| $25,000 | 7,500 | 5,500 | −2,000 | −26.7 |
| $50,000 | 20,500 | 18,750 | −1,750 | −8.5 |
| $100,000 | 46,500 | 45,250 | −1,250 | −2.7 |
| $225,000 | 111,500 | 111,500 | (1) | (1) |
| $500,000 | 254,500 | 257,250 | +2,750 | +1.1 |
| $1,000,000 | 514,500 | 522,250 | +7,750 | +1.5 |
| $10,000,000 | 5,194,500 | 5,292,250 | +97,750 | +1.9 |
| $100,000,000 | 51,994,500 | 52,992,250 | +997,750 | +1.9 |

[1] No change.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am greatly encouraged that 35 Members of the Senate have joined me in offering this amendment. These Senators are from all parts of the Nation and from both sides of the aisle. Because of this bipartisan support, I will not include in this statement what may be my own personal views regarding the program of the President in the field of corporate taxation. Instead, I will limit my remarks to the basic evidence which should compel the passage of this, or a similar, proposal without delay.

Mr. President, a healthy community of small businesses is essential to national growth, national prosperity, and political health. We must prevent the development of an economic no-man's land in the business world. This means that some form of encouragement must be devised for the modest-sized enterprise to enable it to grow and to remain strong. The Senate must be reminded again that a healthy community of small businesses can be maintained only to the extent that reasonable quantities of capital are available for normal growth and normal fluctuations in earned income. Capital is needed to replace wornout machinery and other equipment, to convert to new production techniques, to redesign or otherwise improve the product of the business, to weather periods of low income caused by necessary changes in product or in techniques of production, to launch new products and services, and to compete with the superior resources of giant corporations.

Businesses have three principal sources for funds with which to maintain and expand production: First, new capital investment; second, borrowing; and, third, business earnings. Small business has difficulty in obtaining equity capital because it does not have the large financial resources which will guarantee stockholders against severe loss on their investment. A small-business man who needs equity capital usually is told that the expense of raising up to $300,000 in the securities market averages almost 20 percent and may reach 25 or 30 percent. He must face the uncomfortable fact that it will cost him many times as much to tap the capital markets as it costs the larger corporations.

Because of the difficulty in obtaining equity financing, the small-business man usually must borrow money for a short term from a bank or other lender to realize his capital needs. Long-term borrowings in the securities markets are subject to the same difficulties as equity financing. Interest rates are commonly established at 6 percent or even higher for the small-business man. The large corporation may either float a debt issue of securities or borrow money at lower interest rates for long terms. What may be even more significant is that, under present conditions in the money markets, funds are not available to small businesses on any terms.

But even the supply of short-term high-interest loans is insufficient. The Federal Government has for many years recognized this problem, and the Congress has provided lending programs under the RFC, the Small Defense Plants Administration, and the Small Business Administration. In fact, one of the first actions of the 85th Congress increased by $80 million the business-loan fund of the Small Business Administration. And this was stopgap legislation, intended to last the agency only through July 1957. This assistance has been but a token solution to the problem, and I, for one, do not look to Government loans as the long-term answer.

This leaves for consideration the third source of capital—business earnings. If the flotation of securities is largely fruitless, if long-term loans at low interest rates are not available, the small business must depend upon earnings for its capital requirements. Hence, unless its profits are greater, or its tax burden is less, the small company finds itself in a

position of relative weakness compared with larger companies. It is a demonstrated fact that earnings as a percentage of sales or as a percentage of assets are much smaller for small firms than they are for larger firms.

Therefore, the only hope for improving the competitive position of small businesses is through tax adjustments. If some tax relief is not given to small businesses soon, we may find our economy even more tightly controlled by giant corporations than it is today. Mr. T. M. Evans, president of the H. K. Porter Co., of Pittsburgh, as reported by the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, recently made the following observation:

> I think that if our economic system is to continue we must have smaller businesses developing; otherwise competition will be eliminated in the next 5 to 10 years, and we will end up with 1, or possibly 2, large companies in each of the major fields * * *. Smaller businesses * * * are * * * gradually being forced out of business by the giant corporations and by some of the unfair advantages which those corporations have under our present economy.

Mr. President, I believe that many of the advantages mentioned by Mr. Evans exist in our Federal tax laws, and there are many others in this country who believe that the corporate-tax structure favors the growth of large businesses as against small businesses. For instance, Mr. Dexter M. Keezer, vice president and director of the economic department of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., has made the following statement:

> I think we have at the present time a high and satisfactory level of business investment * * *. But simply in terms of maintaining an adequate level of investment, I would not say that the present is an occasion to reduce the corporate tax rate. Except, may I give this qualification? Maintaining this rate means that you are going to have larger and larger corporate units at the expense of smaller units. This seems to be a matter of great social, political, and economic significance. Over a period with which we are concerned, the smaller corporations, as you well know, have not had the same rate of growth and capital acquisition.

Now, Mr. President, I want to point out some specific and significant advantages which large corporations have under our present Federal tax laws. One example of existing big-business bias in our corporate tax laws involves the accelerated depreciation of new machinery, while similar treatment is not available for used machinery. It is well known that small businesses are the principal purchasers of used machinery. Thus, the very significant benefit of the accelerated depreciation tax provisions are not available to many smaller corporations. Some people advocate including secondhand machinery under the accelerated depreciation provisions, but I think that this action alone would merely accentuate the problem. For example, under present law a large corporation can, in a relatively short time, depreciate new machinery to a figure below its market value. The large corporation can then sell this machinery for more than its depreciated value and treat the income as a capital gain. If secondhand machinery had the benefit of accelerated depreciation, small businesses would be more eager to buy secondhand equipment. Then the giant corporations would realize even greater profits from the sales and greater capital-gain windfalls.

The way to treat small businesses fairly would be to permit accelerated depreciation of both old and new machinery, and to tax income derived from the sale of depreciated machinery at the regular rates for corporate income. But until such changes are made, this is one more factor contributing to the financial dilemma of small businesses.

I have noticed recently in the press that many corporations, in their statements, now separate their income from regular operations and their income from capital gains growing out of, particularly, the sale of assets. I have observed that this is especially true in the case of air-transport companies, because they are able to realize a substantial capital gain on the resale of used airplanes. But that is merely an illustration. I have noticed that many statements will show so much income made from regular operations and so much income from capital gains.

Another advantage for large corporations is their ability to attract and hold highly skilled management and technical personnel by deferred compensation plans. These plans reduce the impact of individual income-tax rates and give a higher real income to such employees. For instances, a special bonus is given large corporations by those provisions of the tax laws which deal with stock options. All salaried employees must pay taxes upon their incomes at the regular income-tax rates. The fortunate recipient of a stock option, however, pays no tax, in most instances, when he receives the option; pays no tax when he exercises the option; and pays only a capital-gains tax upon any profit he makes when he sells the stock.

To qualify for this preferred treatment, the corporation must be able to value its stock by some acceptable reference to market value at the time when the option is granted. The small corporation, which is closely held, has great difficulty in meeting this requirement. As a result, it is the large publicly held corporations which benefit. Almost half the corporations listed on the New York Stock Exchange have such plans. The revenue loss to the Government cannot be estimated, but it is very substantial.

By this and similar devices, big business is able to attract and to hold the most able technical and executive talent. A small corporation must pay much higher salaries, if its employees who do not have stock options, are to be able to keep, after taxes, as much as the employees of the large corporation which does have a stock option plan in force. Naturally, in a competitive labor market, the most valuable employees will tend to enter the employ of the corporations paying them the highest net salaries, after taxes.

Even the owner of the small corporation may believe that he himself can find refuge against business risk, attain relative security, and provide a fund for his retirement by giving up his small business and going to work for a large corporation. The tax laws foster this trend by such provisions as restricted stock options.

Still another advantage of the large corporations is their ability to adjust to tax rates with little effect upon their rates of earnings after taxes. This is possible because large corporations can, to a considerable extent, shift a large portion of their taxes to consumers, in the form of higher prices. This is especially the case in industries which are dominated by one or a few corporate giants, and where competition does not operate to hold prices down. An official of the General Motors Corp., when discussing his company's pricing and production policies with the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, in 1955, said that "we have come pretty close to earning what we expected over the years."

Small corporations can rarely set prices to absorb taxes. There are too many of them, and generally no single one is in a position to exert substantial control over prices in its industry.

Actually, the small corporation gets hit from both sides under the present corporate tax structure. Its raw materials tend to be produced by giant concerns which can pass on a large share of their taxes to it. Thus, corporate taxes, for the small corporation, will generally result in higher costs. At the same time, it does not have the economic power to set prices to absorb its own taxes.

Finally, some very wise provisions in the tax law, designed to encourage research and experimental programs by industry, operate to the primary benefit of big business. These provisions offer favorable tax treatment of expenditures made for research. While these provisions have considerable merit, I think we should frankly admit that the benefits inure almost exclusively to big businesses.

Furthermore, the defense needs of the Nation require direct Federal expenditures for research for weapons and other items of military necessity. The size of these Federal expenditures amounts to over a billion dollars every year, and the contracts go primarily to our huge industrial corporations. It would seem that the law has compounded the advantage of big business in the field of research.

Mr. President, I cite these other features of Federal tax laws to illustrate that rates alone do not measure the relative burden of corporate taxation. The rate adjustment which I propose may partially offset the big business bias existing in the tax structure as a whole.

To emphasize the urgency of this tax problem, I call the Senate's attention to two significant indicators of the dilemma of small businesses. First, there is the appalling number of business failures. For the 5 years beginning in 1952, the number of failures reported by Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., is as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1952 | 7,611 |
| 1953 | 8,862 |
| 1954 | 11,086 |
| 1955 | 10,969 |
| 1956 | 12,686 |

The 1956 figure is the highest since 1940. Furthermore, failures reached 320

in the week ending January 31, 1957, a figure reported to be the highest for any postwar week, and exceeding the prewar figure of 318 for the comparable week in 1939.

Second, there is the matter of growth in the business population. One indicator of trends in the business world is the relationship between the gross national product and the number of operating business firms. A noticeable deterioration in this relationship has occurred in the last 4 years. During the 13-year period from 1940 through 1952, the gross national product, expressed in constant dollars, rose in a ratio of 3 to 1 over growth in business population. During the 4 years from 1953 through 1956, however, this ratio has increased to 4 to 1. The meaning of this change is crystal clear: the fruits of our expanding economy are flowing in ever increasing amounts into the hands of fewer and fewer business units.

Mr. President, I am fearful that our tax laws may be leading us down the road to a corporate state. The present corporate rate structure seems to have contributed to the decline in the relative importance of small business in recent years. To the extent that our tax laws foster larger and larger business units, our political democracy is weakened. I am sure that we all recognize the relationship between the survival of many thriving business units and the survival of our political democracy. This tax adjustment is one way to help relieve the pressure. The headlong rush toward economic concentration must be slowed before it can be stopped. I believe that this tax change is an essential first step in the right direction.

Mr. President, I have asked and obtained unanimous consent that this amendment may be permitted to remain on the desk until February 27, 1957, so that other Senators may join me in sponsoring the amendment if they desire to do so. I had thought that the list of sponsors would be complete at this time. However, only this morning I received word of 3 or 4 additional sponsors, and I believe it is quite evident that there may be other Senators who will wish to be associated in sponsoring the amendment.

Mr. President, I should like to say a further word: Of course I have already introduced the substance of this amendment as Senate bill 150, and it has been referred to the Finance Committee. I wish to state that I shall ask the chairman of the Finance Committee to hold hearings on the measure at the earliest possible moment. It is my hope that we may be able to attach the amendment to H. R. 4090 when it comes to the Senate from the House of Representatives.

---

## STUDIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an address entitled "Current Developments in Federal Regulation of the Securities Markets," delivered by J. Sinclair Armstrong, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, before the New York Society of Security Analysts yesterday, February 20, 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the Securities and Exchange Commission is the independent regulatory agency established by the Congress to enforce the fair disclosure, antimanipulation, and antifraud provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the other Federal securities laws, including the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, which were enacted by the Congress for the purpose of protecting the investing public.

I have been deeply interested in the work of the Securities and Exchange Commission in protecting the public interest. The Commission is under the surveillance of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and particularly under that Committee's Subcommittee on Securities, of which I was chairman during the 83d Congress, and on which I served during the 84th Congress, and am presently serving. I have been extremely interested in the proper, vigorous, and effective enforcement of the Federal securities laws, particularly during the recent years of great economic activity in this country, during which the need for the successful functioning of the capital markets has been very great. The work of the Securities and Exchange Commission in enforcing the fair disclosure, antimanipulation, and antifraud provisions of the acts is vitally important in assuring the basic integrity of the securities markets, so that the confidence of the investing public may justiably be maintained.

Chairman Armstrong's address yesterday, as well as the 22d Annual Report of the Securities and Exchange Commission which was submitted to the Congress on January 3, 1957, describes many of the pressing enforcement problems of the Commission. The Commission has been tremendously active and vigorous in mounting its enforcement program over the past several years. Abuses which have developed recently in the securities markets are being actively and vigorously dealt with by the Commission. I commend a reading of this discussion to all who are interested in the continued progress and success of the Commission's enforcement program.

I understand that the Commission is coming forward with a number of suggested amendments of the securities laws which are intended to strengthen its hand in dealing with many current enforcement problems. This proposed legislation follows legislation, unanimously approved by the Congress in 1954, which eliminated certain unnecessary restrictions and clarified a number of problems which had developed over the 20 years of the Commission's history—Public Law 577, 83d Congress. The particularly vital contribution made by the 1954 legislation was in providing for much broader dissemination of information about new issues of securities being offered to the public than had ever been possible before. This was accomplished by expanding the Commission's rulemaking powers so as to provide for more informative advertisements with respect to new issues, broader dissemination to the public of preliminary prospectuses, and the use of summary prospectuses which are shorter and less complex than the full statutory prospectus, but nevertheless provide investors with vital information before they make up their minds whether to purchase the new securities being offered. The implementation of this statutory amendment by the Commission, by rules recently adopted, has been one of the major steps forward in the history of the administration of the Securities Act to provide for better dissemination of information to the public.

Also, in the address delivered by the Chairman of the Commission is a discussion of recent studies made by the Commission in regard to the desirability of extending the financial reporting, proxy soliciting, and insider-trading provisions of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to approximately 1,200 industrial companies and 170 insurance companies in which there is broad investor interest, but which are not presently subject to these requirements because their securities are not listed and traded on national securities exchanges. Reference is made to the report of the Securities and Exchange Commission, committee print, May 25, 1956, and supplementary report, committee print, February 11, 1957, on S. 2054, 84th Congress, to the Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate. The aggregate assets of the industrials are about $34 billion and of the insurance companies about $24 billion.

It is to be noted that, in the recommendations of the Securities and Exchange Commission in regard to the insurance companies covered by the studies, the Commission has limited itself to a consideration of the congressional purposes expressed in the Federal securities laws, and the Commission does not express views as to any other areas of Federal or State regulation of the insurance industry. The recommendations of the Commission, in recognition of the policy expressed in the McCarran Act (59 Stat. 33, 15 U. S. C., secs. 1011–1015), do not suggest any Federal regulation of the business of insurance companies. They flow only from the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, one of the purposes of which is to assure appropriate financial reports, and disclosures in connection with proxy soliciting, to public security holders.

I do not mean, by calling these studies and recommendations to the attention of the Senate, to take a personal position on them as yet, but I do believe that the Commission is to be commended for making the first full, complete factual study of the financial reporting and proxy soliciting practices of companies having large assets and large numbers of public security holders, and I commend these studies to the consideration of the Senate.

The importance of the broker-dealer inspections, the fraud investigations, the market surveillance work, and the public information program of the Securities and Exchange Commission cannot

be overestimated at the present time. In passing, I should like to observe that the proper staffing of the Commission, which has been discussed in the 22d annual report and recommended in the present President's budget for the fiscal year 1958, is of vital importance to assure that the vigorous enforcement program the Commission has been carrying on in recent years shall continue with full force.

EXHIBIT A

CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS IN FEDERAL REGULATION OF THE SECURITIES MARKETS

(Address by J. Sinclair Armstrong, Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D. C., before the New York Society of Security Analysts, New York, N. Y., February 20, 1957)

It is a great pleasure for me to have an opportunity to address the New York Society of Security Analysts. The members of this society represent probably the largest aggregate buying power, so far as investment is concerned, of any nongovernmental group in the world.

You are the customers of the Nation's capital markets. You are advisers to, and fiduciaries for, millions of individuals, whose savings are placed at the disposal of industry on your advice or by your decisions. You, more than any other organization in the capital markets, are disposed toward the well-being of investors. Without the confidence of investors, which means without the confidence of security analysts, our capital markets could not possibly succeed in their function of channeling the savings of the American people into industry to meet the enormous capital requirements of our free enterprise system.

The Securities and Exchange Commission is also interested in investors. Our business, assigned to us by the Congress, is investor protection. We are concerned with fair disclosures to security holders and prospective security holders of basic business and financial facts on which informed investment decisions can be made. We are concerned with the integrity of the securities markets—that they be free and kept free of abuses, such as manipulation of securities prices, misrepresentation in the purchase and sale of securities and fraud. The successful performance of our tasks is vitally important to you.

I am particularly pleased to be here at this time, February 1957, because there are a number of matters of vital importance to the securities markets which are beginning to come to a head. Some of these are within the existing regulatory authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission to deal with. I am referring to a number of abuses in the securities markets which have arisen in the past several years and with which we have been vigorously coping. Others involve matters which are not within the present statutory powers of the Securities and Exchange Commission, but are pending for legislative decisions by the Congress as to whether they should be. Legislation, some to be introduced at our request and some introduced as a result of the hearings of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on the stock market in the spring of 1955, will have to be acted upon by the Congress or passed over at the present session.

In addition to these major subjects, I will also touch briefly on several problems which the Commission has been considering under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 which should be of particular interest to you as investors. I am referring here to our study of capital ratios and to our present policy in regard to optional redemption provisions for preferred stocks and bonds issued by companies under our Holding Company Act jurisdiction.

As a matter of orientation, first let me state briefly the objectives of the Congress expressed in the statutes administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission. The Federal securities laws, enacted in the years 1933 through 1940, were intended to provide to public investors in new issues of corporate securities offered and sold in interstate commerce and in issues listed and traded on national securities exchanges certain basic business and financial information about the corporations issuing them; to provide regulation of the exchange markets so as to assure free, fair, open, and orderly markets; to provide a limited regulation of the over-the-counter markets; to provide corporate simplification and physical integration and continued regulation of the financial structures of public utility holding company systems; to provide regulation of investment companies to assure adherence to standards protective of public investors, and to provide against manipulation, "pools," rigging of prices, insider advantages, and misrepresentation and fraud in the purchase and sale of securities. These are the statutory objectives.

Capital formation is tremendously important to the economy of our country. There is nothing in the Federal securities laws designed to impede the raising of capital. These laws if well administered should help, not hurt, the capital formation process.

Capital is formed only by the voluntary cooperation of the public, and the work of the Commission is one of the factors giving the public confidence in the integrity of the capital markets. You cannot have capital formation without willing investors.

In approaching problems, naturally differences of opinion occur between the Commission and the securities industry, and between different segments of the industry, as to administrative methods and procedures or business practices and conduct. But we all share one common interest, the investor. If the Commission or the securities industry fails to serve the investor, or serves him badly, the Nation is the loser.

At no time in the Commission's experience have activities and prices in the securities markets reached such highs. The upsurge has taken place in a relatively short period of time. For example, the dollar amount of securities registered under the Securities Act of 1933 increased by 75 percent from $7.5 billion in the comparatively recent fiscal year 1953 to $13.1 billion in fiscal 1956. During the 1930's the average dollar amount of securities registered was about $2.5 billion, and in some years was below $1 billion. In the postwar years from 1945 to 1950 it was $4.5 billion a year on the average.

Of the $400 billion gross national product annual rate figure, over $60 billion is applied for capital purposes of industry, that is to say, to provide plant facilities, tools and working capital needed by American industry. Much of the $60 billion amount is supplied from internal sources, such as depreciation accruals and retained earnings. The capital formation process supplies the balance estimated at $7 to $8 billion annually through investments in the capital markets by the American people.

The aggregate market value of all stock on all stock exchanges, which never exceeded $100 billion before 1946, except briefly in 1929, increased from $111 billion at December 31, 1950, to over $250 billion at June 30, 1956. The Dow-Jones industrial average of stock prices on the New York Stock Exchange reached an alltime high of 521.05 on April 6, 1956, and yesterday's close of 466.84 is considerable when you remember that during the years 1933 to 1949 it never exceeded 220. The value of the gross national product broke through the $400 billion annual rate figure in 1956 as compared with $340 billion in 1952.

The dollar value of securities which changed hands on the New York Stock Exchange rose to $32 billion in fiscal 1956, more than double the comparable figures of fiscal 1953, and like increases were registered on the regional exchanges and are believed to have also occurred in the over-the-counter market.

The work of the Commission in sustaining the investors' confidence in the integrity of the capital markets must take into account conditions which if permitted to exist can only result, ultimately, in the destruction of investor confidence and the thwarting of the congressional objectives set forth in the Federal securities laws. Our free enterprise system will be damaged if these conditions grow and are not stamped out. A few of these problems with which the Commission has been faced and our efforts to cope with them are deserving of your consideration.

First, the activity in the capital markets has attracted many new brokers and dealers to the securities business, some of whom are inexperienced and unfamiliar with the obligations owed to their customers, some of whom have been drawn into the business in the hope of a quick profit rather than the establishment of a sound business reputation built painstakingly upon just and equitable principles of trade, and some of whom are downright dishonest. A number of new brokers and dealers have lacked adequate financial resources or speculated unwisely, thus getting into financial difficulties which threaten the safety of customers' funds or securities entrusted to them.

In order to meet this problem, the Commission has expanded its broker-dealer inspection program. We are making more frequent broker-dealer inspections and investigations of irregularities by brokers discovered in inspections or as a result of complaints received from the public, and we are presently instituting more disciplinary proceedings for broker-dealer revocation and injunctive actions in the Federal courts and are referring more cases in which violations have been willful to the Department of Justice for criminal prosecution than at any time in the Commission's history.

Second, as an outgrowth of the dishonest broker-dealer problem, there has been a resurgence of the old-fashioned "boilerroom." Investment analysts might ask why it is appropriate for a member of a Federal law-enforcement agency to "lecture" to them about "boilerrooms." Obviously, a skilled financial analyst should have sufficient commonsense and prudence to avoid the purchase of speculative securities on the basis of a long-distance telephone call from a broker whom the analyst has never met, and this is undoubtedly true, except occasionally. The fact of the matter is that not only has the general investing public been gullible and foolish when the high-pressure salesman calls up on the long-distance telephone purporting to represent a reputable house on Wall Street or from Canada and holds out promises of speculative profit, but we have had occasional instances in which men of skill and experience in finance have become the unwitting victim of these boilerroom high-pressure selling techniques.

An investment counselor of a western city recently called up my office and expressed great criticism of the Commission that a particular stock, in which he had purchased $65,000 worth, had by action of the Commission been temporarily suspended from trading on the American Stock Exchange pursuant to section 19 (a) (4) of the Securities Exchange Act. When we asked him how he happened to buy it, he stated that a man he had never heard of or met before called him up from a brokerage firm in New York City, of which he had never heard and in whose offices he had never been, and gave him a wonderful story about what a fine investment it was. Of the $65,000 of stock he pur-

chased, he placed $40,000 worth in teachers' pension funds. The next day he arrived in my office in Washington and apoligized for his criticism, because he realized that the action taken by the Commission in the case had one, and only one, objective, namely the best possible protection pending the development of the facts as to the company's actual financial condition in proceedings under section 19 (a) (2) of the act that could be afforded present and prospective investors in the particular stock. This was an unusual case, and I cite it only to highlight the danger to unsophisticated investors of these high-pressure selling techniques used by boiler-rooms in New York City and in Canada. I am happy to say that as a result of the Commission's stepped up enforcement program of the past several years, some of these firms have been enjoined.

Another problem which has been acute is the sale of securities without registration under the Securities Act of 1933 based upon claimed exemptions which, in fact, are not available. The number of securities which have been sold in violation of the registration, prospectus, and antifraud provisions of the act, pursuant to such claimed but not available exemptions, is substantial, but the exact amount cannot be determined because there is no requirement in the law or our rules that the Commission be notified of transactions made in reliance on exemptions. But we find, months after they have taken place, large offerings, which purported to be nonpublic and hence exempt, in which promptly or shortly after the initial distribution of the securities, usually to an inside group, large public distribution to hundreds of investors has been made.

We find similar conditions with respect to the intrastate exemption. We believe it is time that issuers, underwriters, brokers and dealers, and lawyers interested in the financial markets reexamine the policy of the Congress expressed in the registration and prospectus requirements of the Securities Act. The Securities Act provides for registration of new issues of securities and the delivery of prospectuses so that the prospective investor may receive adequate information on which to base an informed investment judgment whether or not to buy the securities being offered. These are the well-known disclosure provisions. The Congress, giving the public the protection of the disclosure and antifraud provisions, then, very wisely in my opinion, provided against any action of the Commission which would involve passing on the merits of the securities and left to investors responsibility for their own investment judgments.

The registration provision is broad, but the Congress provided certain exemptions. The nonpublic offering exemption was made available by the Congress because it seemed that an offering to a small group of people would be likely to be made under circumstances in which all of the offerees would already have available or be able to obtain the basic financial data and hence would not need the protection of the registration requirements. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives, in a report in 1954, referred to the nonpublic exemption as an avenue for "the making of an offering to a limited number of persons who presumably may be expected to possess some familiarity with the business involved" and stated: "There is no limit to the amount which thus may be offered, provided it is not publicly but privately offered, which the Commisison by rule of thumb construes as being to no more than some 25 offerees."[1] But we have recently seen some offerings which were unregistered in reliance on the nonpublic offering exemption. If these securities had been registered and the information which would have been required in the registration statement made available to the offerees a successful offering of them could never have been made because of the financial condition of the issuer. In other words, the private offering has been used as a means of concealment of the basic business facts which Congress specified in the Securities Act should be given to the prospective investor.

The intrastate exemption provided by the act was intended by the Congress to make possible an offering of securities to persons residing within a single State. The Congress left to the States their traditional blue-sky regulation. But we have seen many securities which purport to be made to residents of a single State—for example, some of the western uranium issues—which appear in the channels of trade here on Wall Street within weeks after their original distribution.

We are also deeply concerned by cases of evasion of the registration requirements in reliance upon the Commission's so-called no-sale rule. This is a technical interpretive rule, which has been in effect during the history of the Commission, under which certain types of corporate mergers, consolidations, reclassifications of securities, and acquisitions of assets have been deemed not to constitute a sale of securities for purposes of the registration provisions of the Securities Act. Under this rule, many merger transactions, ostensibly exempted, have in fact been consummated in order to free up large blocks of stock of the surviving corporation for distribution to the public without registration. Again, because these transactions have occurred without notification to the Commission, we are not able to estimate their dollar amount, but on the basis of figures compiled in known cases of this kind by our New York regional office, we estimate amounts approaching $100 million of securities sold to the public in which great losses to the investing public have later occurred. These are situations in which, had adequate disclosure been made of the financial facts pertaining to the issuer, a fair-minded financial analyst would have been hard put to it to justify the purchase of the securities. We have proposed changes of our no-sale rule, and are presently considering including a statutory amendment to deal with the problem for inclusion in our forthcoming recommendations for legislation.

Our program at the Commission to cope with these problems has again been in the strengthening of our enforcement activity. We are conducting more intensive investigations and more disciplinary proceedings within the Commission and legal proceedings in the Federal courts than at any time in the Commission's history. We are limited, of course, by the number of hours in the day and the number and strength of the members of our professional staff. We have a total staff of 800 persons, nationwide, in the present fiscal year, and in the President's budget is included a request for an appropriation for 950 persons in fiscal 1958. We must depend, too, upon the public to use good judgment and good sense, and, if they have been victimized, to report the facts to the Commission.

Also, we proposed to the Congress in the last session, and will again soon propose to the new Congress, amendments of the basic statutes designed to strengthen the jurisdictional provisions, correct certain inadequacies, facilitate criminal prosecutions, and generally strengthen the Commission's enforcement capabilities. These proposals, if enacted, would prohibit embezzlement of money or securities of, or entrusted to the care of, a registered broker-dealer; extend criminal liability to false statements in documents filed with the Commission in connection with small exempted securities offerings; enact the antifraud provisions of the Commission's rules under the Securities Exchange Act in statutory form as an aid to criminal prosecutions; make it clear that a showing of past violations is a sufficient basis for injunctive relief; make it clear that a registration statement under the Securities Act may be withdrawn only with the consent of the Commission; clarify and strengthen the statutory provisions relating to financial responsibility of brokers and dealers; and authorize the Commission, by rule, to regulate the borrowing, holding, or lending of customers' securities by a broker or dealer. Many other minor amendments were also proposed and some additional amendments will be proposed.

In order to facilitate the work of the congressional committees, with their approval the Commission will hold conferences on these proposals with various industry groups and members of the public on February 25 and 26, after which the proposals will be promptly submitted to the Congress.

We believe that our enforcement program, including the legislative recommendations which we have made and will make, is of vital importance to the successful performance of the economic function of the capital markets of the country.

We are appreciative of, and believe eminently sound, the request contained in the President's Economic Report to the Congress, January 23, 1957, that the Congress "give favorable consideration to proposals that will be made for strengthening the Securities and Exchange Commission's authority to prevent certain remaining types of abuses in the distribution and sale of securities."

Now let me turn to proposed legislation which was not originally sponsored by the Commission but the broad principles of which we have endorsed on the basis of studies made in the past year and a half. This legislation, it seems to us, should be of particular interest to financial analysts.

In May 1955, at the conclusion of the stock-market study of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman of the committee, introduced a bill to extend the reporting, proxy and insider-trading provisions of the Securities Exchange Act to additional corporations not presently subject to the act. In the final report of the committee, a majority had expressed the view that as a general policy, it is in the public interest that companies whose stocks are traded over the counter be required to comply with the same statutory provisions and the same rules and regulations as companies whose stocks are listed in national securities exchanges. A minority of the committee recommended further study of the over-the-counter markets, with the objective of developing specific legislation if needed.[2]

In August 1955, the Subcommittee on Securities reported a revised committee print adopting some changes suggested by the Commission and certain other changes, including a provision exempting securities of regulated insurance companies from the coverage of the bill. As revised, the bill would apply to corporations having 750 or more stockholders, or debt securities of $1 million or more outstanding in the hands of the public, and $2 million of assets.

During the following winter and spring, the Commission made a complete factual study of the financial reporting and proxy soliciting practices of the corporations which would be subject to the bill which number about 1,200 and have estimated assets of more than $35 billion. Review of proxy soliciting materials of these corporations showed that in very few instances were stockholders furnished with information comparable to that required by the Commission's proxy rules. Examination of the

[1] P. 19, House of Representatives, 83d Cong., 2d sess., Rept. No. 1542 to accompany S. 2846, a bill to amend certain portions of the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and the Investment Company Act of 1940.

[2] S. Rept. 376, 84th Cong.

financial statements contained in the stockholders' reports indicated that approximately 21 percent were deficient by Commission reporting standards. These findings were made available to the Committee in May 1956, together with our endorsement of the enactment of the financial reporting, proxy and insider reporting provisions of the bill, but our recommendation of deferral of action on the provision for recovery of profits from short-swing trading by insiders until a further study of this could be made.

The committee did not take final action on the bill in the 84th Congress, but Senator FULBRIGHT requested the Commission to extend the study we had made so as to obtain information about the financial reporting and proxy practices of insurance companies which we had not previously done because of the exemption for such companies contained in the subcommittee's August 1955, print of the bill. We have recently completed that study, estimating that 169 insurance companies with assets of approximately $24 billion would be subject to the bill if the exemption for insurance companies were deleted. We found that both the proxy soliciting material and the financial reports to stockholders of these companies to be significantly deficient by Commission proxy and accounting regulation standards and, accordingly, expressed the opinion to the committee that it would be consistent with the provisions of the Federal securities laws and of the Fulbright bill that the exemption for insurance companies be deleted and the bill passed, subject to certain other technical suggestions for amendment.

In expressing this view, we limited ourselves to a consideration of the congressional purposes expressed in the Federal securities laws and refrained from expressing views as to any other areas of Federal or State regulation of the insurance industry.

I am happy to observe that Senator FULBRIGHT has again introduced the bill (S. 1168, 85th Cong., 1st sess.) omitting the insurance company exemption, and I sincerely hope that the 85th Congress will give it favorable consideration.

Finally, let me turn for a few minutes to our jurisdiction under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935. Our Division of Corporate Regulation is currently making a study of capitalization ratios of companies subject to the act. So much attention has been directed toward those sections of the Holding Company Act which caused the simplification and integration of the huge holding company systems of the early 1930's that the act's other provisions often tend to be overlooked. In fact, the act permits the survival of holding company systems which meet certain standards and provides for continuing regulation of such companies by the Securities and Exchange Commission as to corporate and financial maters. In particular, a registered holding company or a subsidiary of such a company cannot issue securities without Commission approval.

As an indication of the magnitude of this regulatory activity, during fiscal 1956 the Commission approved the issue and sale by registered holding companies and their subsidiaries to the public and institutional investors of $565 million of securities, all to raise new capital, or 22 percent of all the external financing of all electric and gas utility companies during that period. The aggregate assets, less valuation reserves, at December 21, 1955, of the 23 registered holding-company systems was $10.4 billion.

The Commission's responsibility in this field is great and it naturally gives us a strong interest in the financial stability of registered companies. The ordinary occasion for our expressing such interest arises when we are asked to approve a financing, and the specific provisions lie in sections 1 (b), 6 (b), and 7 (d) of the act.

That the achievement and preservation of sound capitalization ratios are essential to the financial health of the public-utility industry has been recognized not only by the Commission and some other regulatory bodies, but also by informed writers on the subject. Most of these authorities are generally agreed on the necessity for an adequate "cushion" of common-stock equity to withstand the shock of a severe decline in earnings, and for not too excessive an amount of debt, notwithstanding the apparent cheapness of bond money versus common-stock money and the deductibility for tax purposes of interest expense.

The improvement in the financial health of the utility industry since 1935 is little short of remarkable. The utility industry today is in a strong economic and financial position, and we are anxious that it stay that way. At the end of 1955, on the basis of the aggregate of the balance sheets of all class A and class B privately owned electric utility companies in the United States, the composite capital structure was as follows: long-term debt 50.7 percent; preferred stock 12.3 percent; and common stock and surplus 37.0 percent.

In the Eastern Utilities Associates case (Holding Company Act, release No. 11625, p. 55, December 18, 1952), the Commission prescribed, in connection with its approval of collateral trust bonds, that the system's funded debt ratio should not exceed 60 percent and that the common stock equity ratio should not be less than 30 percent. Since the remaining component of capital in a system with this maximum debt and minimum common stock equity would ordinarily be preferred stock, this prescription is sometimes characterized as expressing a 60–10–30 policy. Although the Commission has not attempted to prescribe optimum or ideal capitalization ratios, nor assumed that the 60–10–30 policy of the Eastern Utilities Associates case sets a fixed or permanent standard to be applied to all systems, these ratios have been generally regarded as embodying the present working policy of the Commission.

On September 5, 1956, the Commission announced that its Division of Corporate Regulation was undertaking a study for the purpose of determining the advisability of recommending that the Commission issue for comment by interested persons a proposed statement of policy relative to appropriate capitalization ratios in connection with security issues by registered holding companies and their subsidiary operating companies subject to the Holding Company Act. Any state of policy issued on this subject would have as its purpose the apprising of issuers subject to the act and investors and consumers of the standards respecting capitalization ratios which the Commission would generally apply in determining whether to impose terms and conditions or make adverse findings.

In order to obtain the benefit of the views of as large a number of interested and informed persons as possible, the Division of Corporate Regulation sent a letter questionnaire directly to over a thousand Federal and State regulatory agencies, utility companies, insurance companies, investment companies, banks, underwriters, textbook writers, educators in finance, security, analysts, and other interested persons. In addition, the Commission made general distribution of the letter questionnaire to 1,000 other persons on the Commission's mailing lists. The response has been gratifying. To date, 220 letters comprising approximately 700 pages have been received. The views and comments contained in these letters are quite varied in their scope and detail and are being very carefully studied by our staff.

Essentially what the study seeks to determine are the maximum debt and minimum common stock equity ratios which the Commission should permit under the standards of the Holding Company Act; what the optimum or ideal capitalization ratios, if there be such things, should be; and whether or not the Commission should promulgate a statement of policy on the subject of capitalization ratios.

In this connection, I wish to thank your society for taking the trouble to establish a temporary utility committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Cecil E. Trefthen, to study our letter questionnaire. As you know, the position taken by your society is, in summary, that the setting up of specific capitalization ratio standards can lead to harmful inflexibility and that the question as to appropriate ratios should be considered on a case-by-case basis which takes account of the many variations existing among the various utility companies as well as the economic climate at any given time when securities are issued.

We at the Commission hope that the views and comments which we have received will be examined and studied not only by the Commission and its staff, but by many others, including your society, and that they will prove of benefit to other regulatory agencies, to utility company managements, and to security analysts.

I would also like to say a few words about call prices on public utility preferred stocks and bonds and the problems we face in dealing with this question under the Holding Company Act. The rates charged by electric and gas utility companies for the services which they render to consumers are closely regulated by the States in which they operate. The rates charged for services across State lines are also regulated by the Federal Power Commission. The interest paid by a public utility company on its bonds and the dividends which it pays on its preferred and common stocks are generally regarded by most rate regulatory authorities as an important element in the rate-making formula. We do not regulate rates under the Holding Company Act. This statute is designed to supplement and strengthen State regulation and not to duplicate it. However, we are concerned with the costs of capital to the public utilities under our jurisdiction by the mandate of the Congress.

As you probably know, the policy guidelines laid down by the Congress, which we and the courts are required to follow in interpreting the act, require that we concern ourselves with the prices at which bonds, debentures or preferred stock may be redeemed for refunding purposes.

During the periods of wide variations in interest and preferred dividend rates which we have witnessed since the Treasury-Federal Reserve accord of March 1951, the problem has assumed added significance. The Commission's standards in respect of the call prices on bonds and preferred stocks issued by holding companies registered under the act and by their public utility subsidiaries have evolved on a case-by-case basis through the years. Our policy became pretty well settled that the price at which bonds or debentures could be redeemed by the issuer for refunding and general purposes should not exceed the sum of the initial public offering price plus the coupon rate. In the case of preferred stock the policy was the same, i. e., the initial redemption price could not exceed the sum of the public offering price plus the dividend rate per share.

However, the Commission has recognized that strict adherence to rigid formulas might prove to be an unreasonable burden upon the issuers under certain circumstances. In February 1956, the Commission adopted statements of policy in which it attempted to codify its standards concerning protective provisions for the bonds and preferred stocks of public utility companies subject to the act. In these statements the Commission prescribed a broader standard for call prices than the formula I have just described, i. e., that the first mortgage bonds and preferred

stocks of public utility companies subject to the act be redeemable "• • • • at any time upon reasonable notice and with reasonable redemption premiums, if any." In no case presented for decision since these statements of policy were adopted has the Commission had occasion to determine that the formula of the public offering price plus the coupon or annual dividend rate is unreasonable. However, the Commission intends to consider each case as it comes before it for approval, in the light of all the pertinent circumstances of the case at the time and under the market conditions when it must be passed upon.

Because of the great importance of this question of redemption prices for refunding purposes in periods of high interest rates like the present, we were glad to learn that the Life Insurance Association is sponsoring a comprehensive study of redemption provisions and their effect on the offering prices of securities by the Wharton School of Business Administration of the University of Pennsylvania. A member of our staff has been invited to serve as a member of the committee which has been formed to direct this study. The report of this committee should provide a most valuable addition to our present limited store of knowledge on the subject.

The success of our free enterprise system depends on the proper functioning of the capital markets. The statutory objectives expressed in the Federal securities laws which we administer and our operating policies and programs, some of which I have just described, are vitally important to the proper functioning of the markets. The work of the Securities and Exchange Commission should help to justify and maintain public investor confidence in the integrity of the securities markets, and thus contribute to the success of our free enterprise system and the welfare of all our people.

## THE DEFENSE BUDGET

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, knowing the interest the Senate has in the proposed defense budget, I bring up a curious exercise in arithmetic that Secretary of the Air Force Quarles used in a speech last Friday.

A number of the Members of the Senate and House were present at the time of this address. Some were bewildered, as was I, because they felt that in effect Mr. Quarles was implying that the fiscal year 1958 budget was $2.5 billion more than the fiscal year 1957 budget. Therefore I looked into the details, and here is the story.

Mr. Quarles spoke of a "substantial increase" in the Air Force budget request for the fiscal year 1958. He referred to this increase as "roughly $2.5 billion." Actually the increase was $66 million.

The Air Force budget for the fiscal year 1957 was $17.7 billion. The current 1958 budget request is also $17.7 billion. The $66 million, an increase of three-tenths of 1 percent, is so small it does not even show up when the figures are rounded out.

Apparently this is the way Mr. Quarles arrived at this misleading $2.5 billion increase.

The initial request of the President for the 1957 budget was $16.5 billion. Then, under congressional pressure, the President asked for a $376.6 million supplemental for B–52 production.

Later, after listening to Defense Department testimony, the Congress added another $900 million.

As a result, $17.7 billion was the figure available to the Air Force last July 1 for the fiscal year 1957.

This year the fiscal 1958 Air Force budget request is almost exactly the same as last year's budget, namely, $17.7 billion.

First Mr. Quarles implies that last year's original budget of $16½ billion was the budget; and then, because this year's budget is some $1.276 billion more than last year's original budget as requested in January 1956, he usese that theoretical figure a second time in order to come up with a $2.5 billion increase, that turns out actually to be only $66 million.

There are other details which arouse interest and will be dwelt on later. For example, the Defense Department is, and has been giving the "qualitative superiority" of our defenses as the excuse for our now having passed over to the Russians such a large quantitative lead in production of modern jet combat planes. Therefore, I was surprised to note the heavy reduction in research and development funds—a reduction that took place in all three services. In the Air Force it was 6½ percent.

This research and development fund reduction is in direct conflict with all testimony presented by everybody who appeared under oath in the subcommittee airpower hearings of last spring and summer.

Later I intend to ask how, based on the now known tremendous progress of the Soviets in airpower, and our apparent planned reliance on such new weapons systems as missiles, this reduction can be justified.

Again, however, the important point today is that despite any implications that there is a $2½ billion improvement in the fiscal year 1958 Air Force budget over fiscal year 1957, the fact is that the budget requested for 1958 is only three-tenths of 1 percent larger than that requested for 1957.

This is verified by the President's budget message to the Congress last month. In that message he said the new obligational authority for the Air Force was $17.7 billion in 1957—and would be $17.7 billion in 1958.

The President is right, and his aides should do their best to clarify the facts, rather than confuse them.

## NET FARM INCOME STATISTICS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I wish to apologize to the Senate for making a misstatement the other day. At that time I said the President's Economic Report stated that net farm income, after sound accounting practice inventory adjustment, was the same in 1956 as in 1955; and therefore the Secretary of Agriculture was wrong when he said, "realized net farm income in 1956 was 5 percent above 1955."

That was the best information then available.

Now, however, I find from the February issue of Economic Indicators, as prepared by the President's Council of Economic Advisers from the Department of Agriculture data, that farm income for 1956, both before and after adjustment for inventory, is lower than previously reported.

The revised figures show that farm net income, properly adjusted for inventory changes, was $11.7 billion in 1955, and dropped to $11.6 billion in 1956.

In spite of the additional punishment caused the farmer by inflation since 1942, these new figures released by the President show that net farm income in 1956 contained the lowest number of dollars the farmer has received in the past 14 years.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am sorry to have told the Senate that net farm income in 1956 equaled that of 1955—and I trust Mr. Benson is even sorrier to have told the public, in repeated speeches he has made during recent weeks, in effort to justify his programs, that 1956 net farm income was greater than in 1955.

The facts are that it was lower.

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. (CHURCH in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 19.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## THE HUNGARIAN REFUGEE PROBLEM

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon two young gentlemen from the Society of Friends called upon me at my office, where we discussed for over an hour the Hungarian refugee situation as it now exists. One of these gentlemen was Edward H. Meyerding, chief of the Quaker refugee mission in Austria. The other was Mr. Ed Snyder with whom I had previously discussed Friends programs affecting Indians.

Having spent time discussing the refugee situation with Mr. Meyerding, I was particularly interested in the article which appeared in this morning's Washington Post under the byline of Warren Unna.

Since Mr. Meyerding has returned within the past 2 weeks from Austria, and since Mr. Unna's article relates quite factually the basic matters which Mr. Meyerding discussed with me yesterday, I shall ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post article be printed in

the RECORD for the information of the entire membership of both Houses and for the information of the general public as well.

This man's personal experiences over a 2-year period in Austria in connection with this program and the events that led up to the Hungarian revolt point up the necessity for prompt consideration by Congress of the legislation now pending before the Immigration Subcommittees of both Houses on this very subject.

It is my hope that those of my colleagues who share with me a real concern for finding a speedy solution to this and other immigration problems, will read Mr. Meyerding's experiences and join me in the effort to obtain enactment of the President's program on immigration.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFUGEES LOADS SEEN ON AUSTRIA

(By Warren Unna)

The chief of the Quaker refugee mission in Austria was in Washington yesterday warning that resettling Hungarians is still very much of a problem particularly for the Austrians.

"At least 70,000 Hungarians are still in Austria and the Hungarian food crisis may well bring another 100,000 or 200,000 by spring or early summer. It is a tremendous expense with the main burden still on the Austrian Government. And there are signs of rapid deterioration of morale among the refugees, particularly those in the camps," Edward H. Meyerding declared.

Meyerding, 37, former director of the American Civil Liberties Union chapter in Chicago, has just returned from 2 years of supervising the clothing and feeding of Iron Curtain refugees seeking asylum in Austria.

He declared the United States effort for the Hungarians not only has not been enough so far, it also suffers from great confusion.

This country first agreed to take in 5,000 Hungarian refugees, then 21,300. More recently, the administration decided to continue taking in refugees under temporary parole certificates. As of Monday a total of 26,593 Hungarians have now come to this country, 6,356 of them under permanent immigration visas.

Said Meyerding: "In Vienna the officials are given quotas from time to time but they are never sure what the quotas are or if they are going to continue tomorrow. There have been reports that a quota of 5,000 a month would be admissible into the United States but the officials have never really been informed of that.

"There are more than enough refugees amongst those who have relatives in the United States to fill the quotas. And those who don't have relatives are out of luck," he added.

PICKING AND CHOOSING

Meyerding noted that many countries, but particularly the United States, have been picking and choosing the refugees. He said Austria is likely to be saddled with what is left: "the aged, the sick, and the undesirable."

Refugee workers in Austria were "very optimistic that Congress would do something quickly" several months ago, the Quaker leader reported, "but now they all seem to be extremely pessimistic."

Meyerding minimized charges by Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER (Democrat, Pennsylvania) of the House Immigration Subcommittee that the first 6,356 refugees to arrive here, all with permanent resident visas, were the hard-core Communists who were first to flee Hungary.

Meyerding said some Communist officials did flee—but mainly to the East and closer to Russia. He added that Austria's "Inner Ministerium" (Ministry of the Interior), which long ago began investigating refugees as a basic national security problem, has effectively been weeding out what hard-core Communists there are among the refugees.

"THEY KNOW THE RUSSIANS"

As for the bulk of refugees, Meyerding declared: "Nobody has to give them any lessons about the evils of communism and the glories of being free. These people will be good anti-Communist agents. They know the Russians. They have lived with them. They can teach us more than we can teach them."

Meyerding also noted that there was a definite relation between the large numbers of students and highly trained technicians among the refugees and the fact that the Government, out of necessity had granted both groups access to western literature.

The Quaker leader also confirmed reports of anti-Semitism among the refugees themselves. He said part of this was caused by the fact that some of the ruthless Hungarian Communist leaders were Jewish.

He said anti-Semitism also had arisen in envy over the special dietary treatment and other services Jewish refugee officials had been able to render their own people.

## PROPOSED CIVIL-RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on Monday, February 4, 1957, I announced on the floor of the Senate—as shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1445—that Senate public hearings on proposed civil-rights legislation would be conducted by the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, of which I am chairman, commencing at 10 a. m. on February 14, 1957. We have continued to hold such hearings since that date.

At an executive session of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, meeting Monday morning, February 18, 1957, it was decided to terminate these hearings on Tuesday, March 5, 1957, and to meet every day in the meantime to be sure that witnesses representing the various points of view would have ample opportunity to be heard, especially those opposing enactment of civil-rights legislation. Time is available—an abundance of time is available—for such witnesses, but they have not come forward and expressed preference dates for their appearances during this period.

Mr. President, I am mentioning this situation for the RECORD to put everyone on notice once more that time is available on nearly every day next week—Monday, February 25, through Saturday, March 2, 1957—to hear witnesses opposed to civil-rights measures. I do not know what more I can say for the RECORD to show the adequacy of time for the subcommittee to receive the different views on this important legislation. There appears to be no necessity for any more hearings, but I intend to abide by the subcommittee decision not to terminate hearings until Tuesday, March 5, 1957.

## ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON EXTENSION OF COVERAGE OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I wish to announce that beginning at 10 a. m., next Monday, February 25, the subcommittee will hold hearings on proposals to extend coverage of minimum-wage protection under the Fair Labor Standards Act. The Honorable James Mitchell, Secretary of Labor, will be the first witness at these hearings, which will be held in the Old Supreme Court Chamber, room P-63 in the Capitol. The purpose of the hearings is to complete testimony on this subject taken by the subcommittee during the 84th Congress.

Because exhaustive hearings on this matter were held in the first session of the 84th Congress, and supplementary hearings were held in the second session of the 84th Congress, the Subcommittee on Labor has agreed to confine public hearings this year to not more than 10 sessions, extending over several weeks with approximately 3 sessions each week and to restrict testimony solely to the question of coverage under the act.

Since the views of most parties interested in this proposed legislation have already been presented to the subcommittee and published in four volumes of testimony received during the 84th Congress, it is hoped that witnesses in the current series of hearings will furnish the committee brief statements supplementing with new information the material they have previously submitted and will limit their oral presentations to not more than 15 minutes. The subcommittee, of course, will be happy to receive statements from all interested persons and organizations for the record and will give the same careful consideration to facts and views expressed in writing as it gives to testimony presented orally.

## VISIT TO THE SENATE BY A GROUP OF STATE FINALISTS IN VOICE OF DEMOCRACY ESSAY CONTEST

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, there is at this time in the gallery a group of young people from each of the 48 States, and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. They are the finalists in the Voice of Democracy Essay Contest. I ask them to stand so that the Senators may see them.

(The visitors rose in their places in the gallery, and were greeted with applause.)

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the welcome so graciously given to the young ladies and gentlemen in the gallery representing the 48 States, Territories, and island possessions of the United States, and the District of Columbia.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think it would be appropriate for me to say that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is on the

committee with me studying the subject of subversive activities and matters of that kind, and these young people are writing essays which I think will do a great deal of good throughout the United States.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator for his observation and for the opportunity of seeing these fine young people today.

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, yesterday, along with about 20 other Members of the Congress, I was invited to attend a meeting at the White House to discuss the Middle East crisis. I must confess that a great part of the time I am somewhat obtuse as to the more refined and difficult aspects of our foreign policy, but when I left, at almost the hour of noon, I, in common with several of my colleagues with whom I talked, had no clear idea of what course of action the President of the United States proposed to follow.

I wish to say, in full justice to the President, the Secretary of State, and others who were present, that every opportunity was afforded for all present to make such observations and ask such questions as they desired. But, after listening to the President's television speech last night, I again confess—admitting once more some lack of comprehension, perhaps—that I still have no clear idea of just what the President of the United States means or intends to do.

However, I did gather from the President's speech last night that he would support some sort of sanctions against Israel if the United Nations voted in favor thereof. No mention was made whether we would work for or against a vote to impose sanctions. I think it would be improper for me to state what our distinguished Ambassador to the United Nations, former Senator Lodge, had to say in the Cabinet room, but I believe I have a basis for saying that I, at least, came away with no clear idea as to whether we were going to work for or against sanctions against Israel, or whether we were going to abstain from voting.

An administration spokesman has said that the United Nations will probably vote for sanctions, whether or not the United States opposes them. This seems to me, Mr. President, very hard to believe, unless the United States influence and prestige have sunk even lower indeed than some of us have believed. After all, sanctions would require a two-thirds vote in the General Assembly of the United Nations. If the United States and its friends cannot muster one-third of the members against sanctions, we have reached an alltime new low.

In justification of sanctions, Mr. Eisenhower used the proverb, "Two wrongs do not make a right."

In essence, it seems to me, the President admitted that it is wrong for the United Nations not to invoke sanctions against Russia for defying the United Nations by not removing its troops from Hungary. If the President is going to base policy upon proverbs, I wonder—and I say with with all respect—if the President has forgotten or overlooked the Biblical injunction to have one law for both the strong and the weak, one justice for the large and the small alike.

If it is correct to call Israel's demands for firm guaranties before withdrawal a defiance of the United Nations, it is necessary to recall that the other party to this very dispute—Egypt—has defied the United Nations for 5 long years by not opening the Suez Canal to the ships of all nations. No one, least of all our President, has given serious thought, apparently, to applying sanctions against Egypt for its defiance.

I agreed thoroughly with the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] when he said yesterday that it would be immoral and insupportable to apply sanctions against Israel alone.

Last night the President spoke of moral pressures and of moral sanctions. For a moment, as I listened, I could not help thinking of a former President of the United States, Mr. Herbert Hoover. You will recall, Mr. President, that Mr. Hoover was President when we applied what we were pleased to call moral sanctions—whatever they may be—against Imperial Japan in the early 1930's, in an utterly vain and fruitless attempt to dissuade Imperial Japan, which was then bent upon conquest, from its brutal and ruthless invasion of the Chinese mainland and from setting up a puppet government in Manchukuo.

I think firm guaranties should be given to Israel on the following points: First, that the Gaza Strip will not be used again as a base for guerrilla raids. Second, that the Gulf of Aqaba will be opened to Israeli shipping as required by international law. Third, that ships bound to and from the ports of Israel will be permitted to use the Suez Canal. If such guaranties are made and then Israel refuses to withdraw its troops, then, and only then, I believe the time will have come for us to consider sanctions of any kind against Israel alone.

I might say, parenthetically, that Canada has been urging very practical measures to solve this crisis. I shall not go into them at this time, but I think we might be very well advised to give serious consideration to these measures which our neighbor to the north has undertaken to put into effect.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## NATIONAL FOOD RESERVES

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, it is a great pleasure for me to congratulate my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who sits on the other side of the aisle, for his statesmanship as a member of the United States delegation to the 11th session of the United Nations General Assembly.

For many years one of my chief concerns has been how to solve the problem of reducing the price-depressing effects of our huge agricultural surpluses without at the same time accepting unsound economic panaceas. I cannot support any measures which may give relief to any group, if their enactment may destroy our free economy. On many occasions I have opposed international commodity agreements which would tend to destroy free markets.

Secretary Dulles has skillfuly executed a complete reversal of the position we originally took in the United Nations, based on the concepts of chapter VI of the Havana Charter, which some believed provided a useful device to stabilize the prices and the volume of commodity production on a worldwide basis.

Because of my basic opposition to intergovernmental commodity agreements, I was obviously disturbed when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last May considered Senate Resolutions 85 and 86, 84th Congress, which would have directed the President of the United States to explore with other nations the establishment of an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve under the auspices of the United Nations. The substance of Senate Resolution 86 was actually incorporated in the foreign-aid bill as it passed the Senate last year. It was removed in conference.

After the conference report was filed, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota sponsored Senate Resolution 316, 84th Congress, which was similar to Senate Resolution 86. On July 23, I addressed the Senate, and voiced my strong opposition to the consideration of that resolution. I said that if we adopted it, we would completely discredit the United States representative to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, Dr. John C. Baker, the president of Ohio University. Only a few days before he advised the United Nations Economic and Social Council that our Government could not support an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve.

Mr. President, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Dr. Baker's statement in which he commented favorably on a recent study of this problem which had been made by the World Food and Agriculture Organization, in accordance with a resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly at its ninth session, in 1954.

Let me read an excerpt from Dr. Baker's statement:

Among the proposals which have been closely examined during the last 10 years,

either in the United Nations or the FAO, have been the plan for a World Food Board to hold and manage stocks of food and other commodities; a plan for an international commodity clearing house to facilitate the international movement of food and other agricultural products through various currency arrangements; and suggestions regarding various types of nationally or internationally held reserves to meet emergency famines and other similar contingencies.

While differing in scope and in their specific objectives, and in details of financing and management, all of these schemes have certain elements in common. All of them involve, to some degree, the international management of food and other commodity stocks. All of them contemplate, in some measure, the substitution of international administrative controls for national programs and for the normal functioning of market forces. None of them was designed to attack the basic causes of hunger and malnutrition—poverty and general lack of economic development.

The FAO report relates how, over the past few years, governments acting in various international bodies have considered, analyzed and found impracticable, certainly for the time being, further international action of this kind. There is nothing in the report to indicate that any different conclusions with regard to such proposals would now be warranted. On the contrary, the study brings out the great difficulties involved in attempting to pursue the objectives suggested in General Assembly Resolution 827 through the establishment of an international food reserve or buffer stocks.

Mr. President, my principal objection to the concept of a world food reserve is based on the fact that all the proposals which had been before the United Nations Economic and Social Council contemplated a single reserve which would combine the functions of stabilizing prices, improving nutrition, relieving famine, and aiding in the development of underdeveloped countries, while assisting our own farmers. All of these aims cannot be combined into a single international fund without complete regimentation of the world economy. Of course, I am as anxious as any other Senator to assist in achieving all the worthy objectives sought by the supporters of these proposals.

The report of the Food and Agriculture Organization to which Dr. Baker referred said:

It is natural somehow to think of an international pool of foodstuffs serving several different functions at the same time. When it comes to thinking of an international pool of money, or credit, the differences in initial financing, modes of operation, terms of repayment, replenishment, and control required for different purposes are much more widely understood. It is generally accepted, for instance, that the financial resources and modes of operation of the International Monetary Fund (which mainly servea the function of lessening temporary disequilibria) could not automatically be combined with the use of the same funds for the different financial requirements and criteria of loan issues for long-term development purposes by the International Bank. It would be even more difficult to combine the operations of the International Monetary Fund with those of a special development fund such as SUNFED which would have to specialize on much less self-liquidating long-term loan operations than the International Bank. And the idea of a world food reserve serving simultaneously the functions of fighting chronic malnutrition (or development), international price stabilization, and emergency relief, might be compared, in this rough example, with that of an agency combining the functions of the World Bank or SUNFED, of the International Monetary Fund, and of the administration of the International Red Cross as well. Such a combination of functions, whilst it might not be outside the realm of administrative possibilities, would certainly not be an easy thing to achieve and in any case would require separate types of financial provisions and modes of operation for each of the three main functions (though, as will be shown later, the intermittent relief of emergency shortages might on certain conditions be established as a subsidiary function of a world food capital fund).

Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota, as a United States delegate to the 11th session of the United Nations General Assembly, has presented a solution to meet this problem, a solution which was supported by the State Department and our entire delegation to the United Nations.

He urged the establishment of national food reserves in those countries which are going through the process of rapid economic development. Our own surpluses will be used to stock these national food reserves. The counterpart funds generated by selling our surpluses for local currency will be used to assist in the economic development of these countries. In a sense our surpluses will be used as a capital development fund. The presence of these reserves will prevent excessive price increases arising either as a result of failure in local food supplies or from the increased demand due to economic development programs.

The dedication of our surplus agricultural products to the establishment of national reserves is a further advantage in that the sale of these products will not affect world markets adversely. This is of importance not only to American agricultural producers, but to the producers in other countries who have been fearful that the liquidation of American surplus foods would deprive them of their normal markets.

This proposal does not establish new international machinery which would regiment our free enterprise economic system or attempt to stabilize prices on an international basis.

Our colleague, in his capacity as a United States delegate, referred to the statements made last summer in the Economic and Social Council by Dr. Baker, which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 23. This is what the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota said:

The United States delegate in the Council made it plain, however, that the discussions had resulted in useful agreements among delegations on several important questions.

We certainly agree that a world food reserve could not at one and the same time help to relieve emergencies when and where they arise, and systematically counteract excessive price fluctuations.

We also agree that rapid and balanced economic development would cure many of the ills for which we now seem to seek special treatment; and we further agree that food surpluses can be used partially to finance economic development programs.

My colleague in the Council also emphasized, and I wish to reemphasize it here before this Assembly, that we have the fullest sympathy with the laudable objectives that the Assembly's initiative in this matter contemplates.

Mr. President, the statement by our distinguished colleague repudiates more or less radical schemes of international regimentation. He said:

FAO's report has shown conclusively that, in any advance planning of international relief action, "the main problem is not one of having to ensure the physical availability of stocks by advance storage." Establishment of a physical central reserve involves practical problems that remain unresolved.

True, there is also another concept, that of an international financial relief fund—a pool of money or credit for the purchase of relief supplies anywhere in case of emergency (perhaps including pledges for contributions in kind), which the FAO studies found a more workable concept.

But there is no indication that governments and parliaments in general (including my own) would at this time be prepared to act and to pledge contributions to such a fund.

As FAO said of the earlier proposals, because of insufficient support (by governments). * * * no action was taken. This is where the matter still rests.

It is our honest view that the indicated techniques of approaching the problem at issue are not feasible at this time; the fact that our doubts are shared by other governments reinforces this belief.

Similarly, on the question of price stabilization, my Government is wary of more or less radical schemes of international regimentation, though fully aware of the dilemma presented by the need for flexibility to assure adjustments to long-run economic trends, and the need for sufficient stability to avoid unnecessary short-term economic changes—both in the interest of economic growth. My delegation had occasion to refer to the problem of commodity price fluctuations in a statement presented a few days ago with reference to economic development in underdeveloped countries; I shall, therefore, not fully restate my Government's position at this time.

These statements completely support my position.

The junior Senator from Minnesota, in his address to the General Assembly, referred to a statement made by another member of our delegation, dealing with economic development, which also referred to the question of stabilizing the prices of international commodities. The statement in question was made by the Honorable Paul G. Hoffman.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the portion of Mr. Hoffman's statement dealing with the question of stabilizing commodity prices.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In recent statements, both to the Economic and Social Council and to the General Assembly, the Secretary General has emphasized the problem of reducing fluctuations in commodity markets on which many of the underdeveloped countries are so heavily dependent. The problem of excessive price instability in primary commodity markets is one with which all governments must be greatly concerned. As to the desirability of reducing this instability, there can be no disagreement. The problem is how can this be accomplished without endangering other desirable economic objectives. In this connection, we agree with the view of the Secretary General that no new

international machinery is needed for this purpose.

Devices designed to reduce price fluctuations must be judged in the light of their effect on healthy economic growth. They may retard rather than promote such growth, if they interfere with long-term price trends and introduce rigidities and restraints which make difficult the economic adjustments which are so fundamental to economic progress. In this connection, it is well to recall the warning sounded some 3 years ago by the United Nations experts in their report on Comomdity Trade and Economic Development when they cautioned against excessive concern with international measures and emphasized the need for the pursuit by national governments of policies which would contribute to stability in this field.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to be able to completely endorse this position taken by Hon. Paul G. Hoffman.

The United States resolution proposing support for National Food Reserves was accepted in the Committee of the United Nations General Assembly without any opposition. Bipartisanship has motivated our delegation to the United Nations.

Since I was forced to oppose Senate Resolution 316, which my colleague sponsored in the last Congress, my approval of his statement which provided a solution to this difficult problem shows that all of us can work together to meet our Nation's problems in a bipartisan spirit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the statement made in Committee II of the United Nations General Assembly by our colleague the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] on January 11, 1957, to be followed by the text of the United States resolution urging the establishment of National Food Reserves.

There being no objection, the statement and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN COMMITTEE II, ON THE QUESTION OF A WORLD FOOD RESERVE

Mr. Chairman, we are convinced that our first task here in the United Nations is to be realistic.

If we aim at the possible, we will advance further than if we get stuck half way toward the best of all worlds. It is not enough to want to do a good thing; it is equally important to do it well so that the highmindedness that we cherish does not fall into disrepute with consequent damage to the very purpose that we wish to advance.

It is in that spirit I want to discuss the item on our agenda, and offer what we think is a practical and constructive suggestion. Before doing so, I would like to review the present situation and our attitude toward it.

Resolution 621, passed by ECOSOC at its 22d session last July called upon the Secretary General to report on the general subject of food reserves in order that the Council may once more consider this subject, and thereafter transmit its recommendations to the General Assembly at its 12th session. This resolution of the Council was in the nature of an interim response to Resolution 827 (IX) in which the Assembly had asked that FAO be invited to make a comprehensive report on past and present explorations of the feasibility of a world food reserve to contribute to relief emergencies and, at the same time, to counteract excessive price fluctuations. The Assembly desired that this study furnish the factual basis for the Council itself to report on the subject, with its conclusions, to the Assembly.

I termed Council Resolution 621 an interim response to this request by the Assembly because, essentially, it calls for a further report, and reserves the Council's own recommendations for transmittal to the General Assembly at its session 10 months from now.

The United States abstained from the vote on this resolution of the Council last July because, in our judgment, the subject of a world food reserve had already been adequately studied several times, both by FAO and by independent experts.

FAO's comprehensive report to the Secretary General, of November 26, 1955, made it quite obvious that further study could not at this time shed any additional or different light on the issue.

The United States delegate in the Council made it plain, however, that the discussions had resulted in useful agreements among delegations on several important questions.

We certainly agree that a world food reserve could not at one and the same time help to relieve emergencies when and where they arise, and systematically counteract excessive price fluctuations.

We also agree that rapid and balanced economic development would cure many of the ills for which we now seem to seek special treatment; and we further agree that food surpluses can be used partially to finance economic development programs.

My colleague in the Council also emphasized, and I wish to reemphasize it here before this Assembly, that we have the fullest sympathy with the laudable objectives that the Assembly's initiative in this matter contemplates.

In abstaining from voting in the Council, despite so much agreement, our conviction that the matter had been sufficiently studied was supported by the belief that the time had come for some basic decisions.

It was our belief that the time has come for governments to decide whether all that seems possible, in the present state of our development of international cooperation is already being done to relieve acute distress due to shortages of food. Is it being done in such a way as to speed progress toward economic and cultural growth, and to steady that progress? Could more be done? And, if so, how it could be best done? Which are the most practical means to an end that we all desire?

These, Mr. Chairman, are the questions that we must sooner or later answer. And this is the type of answer that Assembly Resolution 827 (IX) contemplates.

There are many programs and authorizations now in existence that empower the United Nations and the FAO to assure effective international cooperation and action in the case of emergencies. The many programs under which the United States has extended and still extends aid and assistance to other peoples are too well known to mention here in detail.

As those of other countries, the Government and people of the United States throughout their history have given proof of a genuine desire to help other peoples in distress or misfortune.

I feel somewhat embarrassed in saying this, because I know that most countries have generously acknowledged this fact.

I nevertheless mention it because it shows that our negative attitude toward establishment of world food reserves has been concerned with means, rather than end.

FAO's report has shown conclusively that, in any advance planning of international relief action, "the main problem is not one of having to insure the physical availability of stocks by advance storage." Establishment of a physical central reserve involves practical problems that remain unresolved.

True, there is also another concept, that of an international financial relief fund—a pool of money or credit for the purchase of relief supplies anywhere in case of emergency (perhaps including pledges for contributions in kind), which the FAO studies found a more workable concept.

But there is no indication that governments and parliaments in general (including my own) would at this time be prepared to act and to pledge contributions to such a fund.

As FAO said of the earlier proposals, because of insufficient support (by governments) * * * no action was taken. This is where the matter still rests.

It is our honest view that the indicated techniques of approaching the problem at issue are not feasible at this time; the fact that our doubts are shared by other governments reinforces his belief.

Similarly, on the question of price stabilization, my Government is wary of more or less radical schemes of international regimentation, though fully aware of the dilemma presented by the need for flexibility to assure adjustments to long-run economic trends, and the need for sufficient stability to avoid unnecessary short-term economic changes—both in the interest of economic growth. My delegation had occasion to refer to the problem of commodity price fluctuations in a statement presented a few days ago with reference to economic development in underdeveloped countries; I shall, therefore, not fully restate by Government's position at this time.

As I said before, resolution 621 of the Economic and Social Council, passed at its 22d session last July, now stands as an interim response to the Assembly request. We must therefore await the final judgment and evaluation by the Council at its 24th session.

However, in order to draw attention to approaches that might add realism to the further studies and evaluations now in progress, I would like to suggest a specific topic to be included in the Secretary General's report to the Council as requested in resolution 621. This suggestion, Mr. Chairman, is being submitted by my delegation to this committee in the form of a draft resolution.

Feeling as we do about these matters of practical approach to a purpose on which there is no disagreement, it is only natural that we would want to explore a number of avenues that might, in our view, contribute to a speedier and more adequate attainment of our common objectives.

The establishment and maintenance of more adequate national food reserves, especially in crop-cycle and famine areas, would go a long way toward accomplishing most, if not all, of the purposes that some of us had hoped a world food reserve or a world food capital fund could meet. The construction of storage facilities and the accumulation of reserve stocks in crop-cycle or famine areas would seem to be an essential step toward general economic development. Surplus foods from abroad not only could in part finance the cost of the construction of strategically situated storage space but could also make an important direct contribution to providing the stocks that should be held as an emergency reserve. Moreover, if storage space were available, the local governments task of dealing with domestic surpluses in years of good crops would be vastly facilitated, and years of abundance would become the blessing they should be, instead of the embarrassment they now are sometimes even in countries normally plagued by shortages.

Somehow it would seem only logical if some of the world's surplus holdings were used to bolster stocks in areas where the failure of a crop means famine and where people live on the brink of disaster from one

harvest to the next. What an impediment this condition is to progressive change in production methods has been vividly described by students of the problem. Farmers in these areas are not after the highest, but after the safest returns, and they fear that any change in their production methods may bring hunger and distress. The elimination of this fear through the provision of reserve stocks and the creation of facilities for storing them would also have significance for economic development.

FAO's report eloquently describes the desirability of adequate national reserves in countries living near the margin of subsistence. Such reserves could be brought into action at an early stage of an emergency, before panic and hoarding aggravate the plight. They would also afford some elbow room for projects of economic development; they could be drawn upon to help finance such projects—mitigating inflationary pressures of increased consumer demand resulting from intensified economic development. Unfortunately, the need for such reserves is greatest in the countries least able to afford diversion of output from current consumption to the building of stocks.

It is in the light of considerations such as these that my Government has authorized me to say that, in accordance with our traditions, the United States stands ready to make grants of agricultural commodities to countries facing famine or other emergencies. Furthermore, the United States is prepared to make available to needy countries, under existing legislation and subject to further congressional authorization, surplus agricultural commodities for the establishment of reserve stocks to meet extraordinary needs due to crop failures or other emergencies, or to mitigate excessive price effects of increased demand due to economic development programs. Assistance of this kind is predicated on the development by the countries concerned of reasonable and realistic programs, and of safeguards that insure the observance of the FAO principle of avoiding harmful interferences with the normal patterns of production and international trade. United States assistance in the above sense would be fashioned after previous arrangements entered into with several individual countries under which large parts of the local currencies received in payment for agricultural commodities supplied for building up national reserves were made available for financing economic development.

The United States Government is prepared to consult with governments of both importing and exporting countries through FAO's consultative subcommittee on surplus disposal and its working party on national reserves with a view to facilitating realization of programs of this kind. The United States will cooperate with other countries in the further development of programs for the establishment of national food reserves.

Mr. Chairman, it is in order to stimulate a more rapid exploration of such possibilities for national action, with international assistance, for purposes covered by Council Resolution 621 that we are submitting the draft resolution that is now being circulated. We should be happy if it would contribute to uncover additional realistic possibilities for action that serves the worthy purpose of improving the lot of the common man.

---

ESTABLISHMENT OF A WORLD FOOD RESERVE—REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA REVISED DRAFT RESOLUTION—INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL FOOD RESERVES

The General Assembly, having in mind the desirability of achieving the objectives set forth in Resolution 827 (IX), considering that one of these objectives is the possible use of food reserves for meeting unforeseeable food shortages, considering further that many countries may need to establish or increase national reserves for this purpose, and recognizing that many countries which are in the early stages of economic development are faced with special difficulties in establishing adequate reserves, such as the fact that levels of consumption in the less developed countries are generally relatively low, noting that Resolution 621 (XXII) of the Economic and Social Council requests the Secretary General in consultation with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations to report to the 24th session of the Council inter alia on the feasibility, and, if feasible, the manner of using food reserves for meeting unforeseeable food shortages, noting further that the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations is engaged at the present time in a special study of the question of establishment of national reserves against emergencies—

1. Requests the Secretary General in preparing his report pursuant to Resolution 621 (XXII) of the Economic and Social Council to include, on the basis of his consultations with the FAO, an analysis of the possibilities and desirability of promoting, by way of consultations between importing and exporting member countries, the use of surplus foodstuffs in building up national reserves to be used in accordance with internationally agreed principles:

(a) to meet emergency situations; (b) to prevent excessive price increases arising as a result of a failure in local food supplies; (c) to prevent excessive price increases resulting from increased demand due to economic development programs, thus facilitating the economic development of less developed countries;

2. Further requests the Secretary General, in his analysis of the possibilities and desirability of the use of surplus foodstuffs for this purpose, to examine whether such use of surplus foodstuffs may lead to displacement of markets for those commodities and what effects it may have on the economic and financial position of those countries which depend primarily on the export of similar commodities.

3. Requests the Economic and Social Council to consider the possibility of postponing until its 25th session its examination of the report of the Secretary General in order to be in a position to take fully into account the discussions and the expert technical studies being undertaken in the FAO concerning the establishment of national food reserves.

4. Invites both importing and exporting member countries to continue to consult through the appropriate bodies established by the FAO with a view to facilitating the establishment of national food reserves, with due regard for the FAO principles of surplus disposal, particularly the need to avoid harmful interference with normal patterns of production and international trade and to ensure that the use of surplus reserves will result in genuine additional consumption as defined in the FAO principles.

---

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 348) to amend section 12 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676) relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, by providing for the use of public lands granted to the States therein for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishings, equipment, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said States, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

---

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amedment in the nature of a substitute for Senate joint resolution 19.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

## THE POLL TAX

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe it is well known to the Members of the Senate that I have long been interested in the poll-tax question. As far back as 1937, as a member of the Florida State Senate, I participated in the successful fight to remove the poll tax as a requirement for voting in Florida. The constitution of Florida permits the legislature, in its discretion, to impose a poll tax of not exceeding $1 a year and to prescribe it as a prerequisite for voting.

The action which we took in 1937 has, in my considered opinion, been highly beneficial to the State of Florida and to the cause of clean politics in that State. It is a matter of record that largely increased percentages of citizens have participated in our elections since that time. It is also a matter of common knowledge that abuses which had crept in under the poll-tax system, such as the situation in certain counties where there was considerable control of local elections through the payment of poll taxes for some citizens by others—largely officeholders—have ceased to exist, so that more wholesome conditions in general prevail in Florida politics.

I should like to see the general abolition of the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting accomplished as speedily as possible in the five remaining States in which the poll-tax requirement still exists, but I would much prefer to have that result accomplished by action taken by the States themselves. However, I sincerely believe that some of the five remaining States, all of which have constitutional provisions requiring the payment of a poll tax before voting, would welcome the opportunity to remove the poll-tax requirement in presidential and congressional elections by ratifying such

an amendment to the Federal Constitution as has been proposed this year by Senate Joint Resolution 33, which is now pending in the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. President, I am inclined to be somewhat amused when I hear my good friends, particularly my good ultra-liberal friends of whom I am happy to claim some in the Senate, speak with great fervor, and even with high fever sometimes, about their desire to protect people in their right to vote and to make sure that our citizens can vote. I hear them sometimes proclaiming even privately—and, of course, they do so publicly—that it would be a wonderful thing if we could enact some legislation whereby the right of all citizens to participate in our elections would be guaranteed throughout the country as it is now in all but five States.

The reason why I am amused by those frequent discussions which I hear is that for 9 years I have had pending a proposed constitutional amendment which I am going to read into the record in a moment and which I have strenuously sought to have approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee and submitted, by a vote of the Senate and the House in appropriate number as required by the Constitution, to the States for adoption. I have been very sure that if the Judiciary Committee would ever permit this particular amendment to come to the floor we would not only get a vote on it speedily, without fear of long-winded and almost perpetual speaking, which sometimes has shut off other efforts in this and other directions, but I think we would have a vote that would be almost unanimous for the submission of such an amendment to the States. Furthermore, in my opinion, there would very speedily be a ratification of the amendment by more than the 36 States required to ratify it under the provisions of the Constitution.

I have been so sure of that, Mr. President, that every time I have appeared before the judiciary subcommittee—and that is as far as I have been able to get as yet with the presentation of this matter—I have made it clear that I would be willing to accept any reasonable time limitation for ratification by the States from 2 years up, because I am confident that the action of the States would be promptly taken and would result in a speedy adoption of the amendment.

Mr. President, in order that the record may be fully clear for those who are interested in this subject, of whom I believe there are many throughout the Nation and many in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, I wish to take note of the fact that in the 81st Congress, in 1949, I submitted this proposed joint resolution with 9 cosponsors, all of whom were southern Senators and all of whose names I would be very happy to read into the record, except that I do not wish to make this presentation unduly long this afternoon.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER. I think the distinguished Senator from Florida was incorrect when he referred to the 81st Congress and the year 1949. I came to the Senate in 1951, and I think the resolution was submitted in the 82d Congress.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, our first joint resolution on this subject was introduced on January 13, 1949. The time seems a great deal longer. But when I get through reciting the long trail which I have taken up to this time in the very sincere effort to have the proposed amendment reported to the Senate and have it passed upon as its merits may appeal to the Members of the Senate, I think the Senator from Maryland will understand why it may seem longer to me.

Mr. BUTLER. I may say to the Senator from Florida, who I think is a great statesman and one of the most able Members of this body, that in the 81st Congress I was a member of the committee before which this amendment would have come, but I do not remember it being before the committee at that time. I do not know whether it came to the subcommittee. I would have aided the Senator in his efforts. I am no longer a member of that subcommittee.

There may be one possible explanation of why no action was taken at that time. In that session the Senator from Florida will recall that we had the Bricker amendment before us, which consumed a great deal of time of the subcommittee. As a matter of fact, we sat for weeks taking testimony. Perhaps that is the reason why the Senator's amendment did not come before the committee. But I shall be glad to give the Senator support and comfort at any time he comes before the Judiciary Committee with this proposal.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate those friendly words from my distinguished friend from Maryland. I wish to say that on May 11, 1954, I appeared before the subcommittee of which the distinguished Senator was a member, though he was detained, undoubtedly by necessary business, elsewhere. However, the subcommittee thereafter reported the measure favorably to the full committee, but the full committee failed to take action. Of course, it certainly never occurred to me that any constitutional lawyer so able as is the distinguished Senator from Maryland and whose views are so well known with reference to his willingness and, in fact, desire, that all citizens shall participate in voting, could have done any other thing than was done by the subcommittee, namely, favor the reporting of the measure favorably to the full committee. As to why the full committee did not act, I hope some distinguished Senator will rise in his place in the near future and explain to us, because for years the Senator from Florida, with many other Senators—18 Senators, in all, who have been cosponsors of this measure throughout the years—has been hoping avidly that sometime we would be able to have the sympathetic cooperation of a majority of the Judiciary Committee.

So, Mr. President, I suggest to my distinguished friend from Maryland that I hope he will use his good offices and his able persuasion upon other members of the committee so that this measure may be reported to the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER. I can assure the Senator from Florida that I shall do that.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend.

I may say that since I have been advised that the present subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, which is holding such noted and, I may say, even notorious, hearings on so-called civil-rights measures, cannot hear the case again on this particular amendment, because it is a constitutional amendment, I shall propose, if, as, and when the measure now pending before the so-called Civil Rights Subcommittee shall come to the floor of the Senate—and I personally hope it will not come to the floor of the Senate—as a substitute for whatever measure shall come to the floor, my amendment which has been pending some 9 years, which I think deserves some consideration on the floor of the Senate. I think other Senators who, like the distinguished Senator from Maryland, would like to submit such a constitutional amendment and have the States pass upon it, are entitled to have a chance to discuss it on the floor and have it brought to a vote, so that all our citizens may have a right to vote for President, Vice President, and for Senators and Representatives to represent them in Congress.

Mr. President, to continue my relation, I have mentioned the fact that in the 81st Congress, by Senate Joint Resolution 34, 10 of us southern Senators, as cosponsors, offered substantially the same amendment. There has been a very minor change made in the amendment since that time, which I shall mention later. The change was necessitated incidentally, by our discovery of the fact that the constitutions of several States, including mostly States outside the South, have provisions banning the participation of paupers in elections. So we had to make clear in the proposed amendment that we were not disturbing the provisions of the constitutions of States which had that particular provision. With that exception, the amendment has remained the same amendment as it was first offered in the 81st Congress, in 1949, by 10 southern Senators.

In the 82d Congress, 12 southern Senators joined as cosponsors in the introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 12.

In each instance, I may say, I was happy and proud to have the honor of being joined by groups of southern Senators who felt as I did, that it was time, since this question had been decided in all States but five, that the matter be made a question of national policy, or, at least, that it be submitted to the States, so that it could be made a part of our fundamental law—our Federal Constitution—if three-fourths of the States thought that was the wise course.

In the 83d Congress, 10 southern Senators, including myself, joined in introducing the same measure. It was then known as Senate Joint Resolution 25.

In the 84th Congress, 10 southern Senators, including myself, joined in introducing the same measure, which at that time was known as Senate Joint Resolution 29.

In this Congress, the 85th Congress, five southern Senators, including myself, joined as cosponsors in offering the same measure, which is now known as Senate Joint Resolution 33. That resolution is pending at this time.

There are further comments I wish to make about this amendment and its introduction. It is not a matter of chance, but a matter of deliberation, that in each of the five Congresses in which this measure has been offered, it has been offered in the first month of the first session—that is, in January of the first year of each Congress.

There are some Senators—and I shall not name them at this time—who are unkind enough to shout to high heaven about legislation in this field, and who are noted for showing their interest in it in the last few weeks before the adjournment of the second session of a Congress. Without protesting against the motives of any other Senator, I wish to say that there is some showing, at least, and some ground for feeling, if one will check the calendar of the hearings of some proposed civil-rights legislation, that it has been proposed too late, nearly always, to receive any adequate attention.

That is not the case with respect to this particular amendment. It has been offered in January, in the first session of each of five Congresses. It has been offered by southern Senators, who have stated—and their statements will be found to appear repeatedly in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—that this is a sincere and a serious effort which we are making, and that we are proposing to see it through; that we propose to vote for it on the floor of the Senate; and that we propose to do our very level best to make certain that the legislatures of our respective States shall act favorably upon the amendment when it is submitted to them for ratification. I do not see how we can do more than that.

Having in mind the fact that so many States of the South have gone much further than this by completely eliminating the poll tax as a requirement for voting in all elections, I feel reasonably certain that we shall find many Southern States completely ready to go along with States elsewhere in the Nation in the ratification of this amendment, if it be submitted to the States.

I call attention to the fact that no one need feel that he cannot find the argument upon this amendment, because at three separate hearings before subcommittees of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary I have testified at length in behalf of the amendment.

On March 18, 1949, I testified before the subcommittee which was then headed by our late friend, Senator Bert H. Miller, of Idaho. I received from him a very kindly reception. Incidentally, he told me that the subcommittee would recommend the measure favorably to the full committee. I have not been able to find as yet that that course was followed. But we know that Senator Miller passed away shortly after that date, and it is barely possible that he died without actually having made that recommendation to the full committee.

On May 11, 1954, I appeared before a subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. That was in the 83d Congress. Other members of the subcommittee also were present. They gave me a very courteous hearing. I made, I thought, a reasonably full presentation of the facts and the law in connection with the proposed amendment. At any rate, Mr. President, I am happy to say that that particular subcommittee reported the measure favorably to the full committee, but no action was taken by the full Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

On May 6, 1956, which would have been in the last Congress—the 84th Congress—I had the honor to appear before a subcommittee whose chairman was the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] who again accorded me the opportunity to make a full presentation of the facts and the law behind this particular amendment, and to support the wisdom of this particular approach to the poll-tax problem.

Various other Senators were present during that hearing. I remember in particular that the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] was there and commented to the effect that he had heard the matter once before and was still of the opinion he had held previously, namely, that the measure was meritorious, that this was the only legal way to deal with the question, and that he would certainly join in reporting the measure favorably to the full committee. That course was followed, because the records of the Committee on the Judiciary, as I am told, show that that committee received a favorable report from the subcommittee, although no action was taken by the full committee.

I feel I should mention the fact that two witnesses appeared in opposition to the amendment at that particular hearing. One of them was a representative of the NAACP; the other was our good friend the former junior Senator from South Carolina, Mr. Wofford, who served in the Senate a few months last year. They were strange bedfellows, but that is the way we find things when we approach a serious question in a moderate way. We are likely to find that we are getting shot at from both directions, and that was the case that day. I have always heard it said that a middle-of-the-road position is a very hard one to maintain, because one is likely to be hit by traffic moving in both directions. I think I have never seen a better illustration of that fact than what happened at that hearing, when, as I have said, a representative for the NAACP appeared and stated why that organization did not want such an amendment submitted, and our good friend, former Senator Wofford, then a Senator from South Carolina, likewise appeared, but for greatly differing reasons, to state his opposition to the submission of the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida enlighten us as to the reasons advanced for the opposition by the general counsel of the NAACP?

Mr. HOLLAND. In general, I think it would be fair to state that the NAACP has always taken the position that a mere statute could solve this question. If that were the fact and if the Congress would enact such a statute, of course its passage could be accomplished more quickly than could both the submission of a constitutional amendment and its ratification by three-fourths of the States.

Of course, as my distinguished friend will fully realize, the provisions of section 2 of article I of the Constitution and all the other facts in connection with this matter, insofar as Federal law is concerned make it inescapable, I think, to any lawyer that the constitutional-amendment process is the only one by which this matter can properly be approached.

Mr. BUTLER. I could hardly agree more with any statement than with that statement by the Senator from Florida, because section 2 of article I expressly states—

> And the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Certainly that is a matter of local concern, and it seems to me that the only way we could get at it would be through a constitutional amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I fully agree with my distinguished friend, the Senator from Maryland; and I have noted that Senators who are good lawyers and who very greatly decry the poll-tax requirement and who come from other sections of the Nation—such, for instance, as the late Senator Borah, of Idaho, and our distinguished friend, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and many, many other distinguished Senators who are lawyers and who hail from parts of the country other than the South—nevertheless being ready to face the real questions involved in any case, have stated repeatedly that the constitutional amendment method is the only proper one through which this subject may be approached.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield further to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Since the Senator from Florida has mentioned the reasons advanced by the counsel for the NAACP, let me state that I recall that only 2 or 3 years ago, when we were discussing the advisability of giving the veteran the right to vote, this same question arose. At that time, it was contended on the floor of the Senate that a constitutional amendment was not necessary. I well remember that at that time the Senator from Florida disagreed with that contention, as did I.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend.

Mr. President, there was a time when the poll tax question was a very large one, and affected a great many States.

The provisions were drastic, either as to the amount of the annual tax required, or as to the number of years during which it must have been paid prior to the date of an election, or as to its coverage of all or supposedly all of the people of a State who were asking to vote in the elections in the State. But, Mr. President, through the years the question has become increasingly small; and I wish us to realize that now we are dealing, not with the whole Southland, but with only five States which themselves have in every instance greatly modified and mollified the requirements of their poll taxes, by their legislative action, which they can do. Many Southern States have entirely eliminated the poll tax as a requirement for voting, not only in presidential, vice presidential, senatorial, and elections to the House of Representatives, as this amendment would propose, but as to all their elections, from the top to the bottom, those States being, in the order of their action, the following: North Carolina, Louisiana, Florida—and I have already mentioned my own participation in that matter as a State senator in 1937—Georgia, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

I believe Tennessee is the latest of the States to take that action, by the adoption of a constitutional amendment, a process which is very, very difficult to fulfill. I shall not digress long enough to go into the difficulties of really accomplishing a constitutional amendment under the constitution of Tennessee; but they are very real and very great, and they require procedure that is sustained through several years. However, that State went through that procedure painfully in order to accomplish this particular liberalization of the voting laws of the State. That was done just a few years ago.

Mr. President, in addition, the other five States which still have some poll-tax requirement by constitutional provision, have, as I have already indicated, moderated the application of their constitutional provisions or of their earlier statutes. That has been done in various ways—such, for instance, as exempting all women from the requirement of the payment of the poll tax, as has been the case in certain States; or, as in other States, the exemption of all veterans from the payment of the poll tax; or, as in other States, the exemption of persons of mature age—persons beyond the age of 65; or in some State, I believe, the age limitation has been set lower—and by other measures which have been held to be appropriate for adoption by the State legislature, and which do not require the burdensome and longtime course of submitting amendments to their State constitutions.

So the question has become of not very great coverage insofar as area is concerned, and it has become of even smaller coverage insofar as the numbers of people who are affected disadvantageously may be concerned.

Mr. President, poll-tax provisions still exist in 5 States, and still apply to some of the citizens of each of those 5 States. Although there may be good reasons for so applying it in such matters, for instance, as the voting of bond issues or the fixing of tax millage or such questions as referendum and recall and various questions—and certainly I would want to be the last to wish to disturb the wise action of a State upon questions of that kind—it seems to me that upon such matters as the election of a President and a Vice President or Senators or Members of the House of Representatives, no longer is there any justification for allowing any difference in this particular field between the electors of one State of the Nation and the electors of other States.

It is for that reason, and because I have always felt that the poll-tax requirement is of questionable wisdom—and in my State we found it to be wise to repeal it entirely as a requirement for voting—and because I wish to see my section of the country take an affirmative position, and not always be in the attitude of defending against something, that for years I have both solely upon the equities of this amendment and also upon its wisdom from the standpoint of my State and my region, assiduously labored to get the amendment upon the floor of the Senate, where it can be voted either up or down. I think the amendment would be overwhelmingly supported by the Members of the Senate if they were ever permitted to vote upon it.

Mr. President, much more could be said about the general aspects of the question. However, since I am giving only a brief résumé of the subject today, at this time I should like to read into the record the text of the present joint resolution, which is the fifth of its kind. Others have grown gray, but this one is now before the 85th Congress. It is Senate Joint Resolution 33, which was introduced by me, for myself and my colleague [Mr. SMATHERS], and the 2 Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. LONG], and the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

In the event the proposed articles were submitted and were ratified, the following text would go into the Constitution:

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for electors for President or Vice President or for Senator or for Representative in Congress shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax or to meet any property qualification.

Section 2. Nothing in this article shall be construed to invalidate any provision of law denying the right to vote to paupers or persons supported at public expense or by charitable institutions.

Section 3. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Mr. President, I have already mentioned briefly—and at this point I merely wish to accentuate the point—that section 2 of the proposed amendment was inserted in, let us say, the second or third of the long sequence of resolutions, at the request or upon the advise of able lawyers in the Library of Congress and on the staff of the Judiciary Committee and on the staff of the Senate legislative counsel. That was done because they found, upon research, that there were in the laws of several States—most of them outside the South—provisions which denied the right to vote to paupers or persons supported at public expense or by charitable institutions; and for that reason that provision was added.

Mr. President, this amendment, of course, goes a good deal further.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Is there another section in the Senator's resolution in connection with the time within which it must be ratified?

Mr. HOLLAND. No. I purposely have refrained from adding a time limit, because in each appearance before each subcommittee and each time I have had the chance to discuss this matter, I have said I was so sure that affirmative action would be taken speedily that I was perfectly willing to put in a time limitation which was the least any reasonable committee, or the Senate as a whole, might think would be sufficient to allow the submission of this question to the States.

My own belief has been that the interval should be a 2-year period. I believe it took less than 1 year for ratification of the 17th amendment, which was just as controversial as this proposal used to be. It is not controversial at this time. It took just over a year to ratify the women's suffrage amendment. I am perfectly willing to agree to any time limitation which will give the States a chance to pass upon the amendment.

The Senator will recall that some of the States have provided in their constitutions a time limit beyond which their legislatures cannot act upon proposed constitutional amendments. For instance, in my own State any legislature which votes upon a constitutional amendment has to be elected after the submission of the proposed amendment to the States for consideration. There are similar provisions in other State constitutions, provisions not identical with that of Florida, but which also impose a time limitation. Therefore, the time of submission would have something to do with the subject.

Some of the provisions for limitation, as I recall them, are to the effect that action may be taken only at regular sessions of the State legislatures. So the time of submission of the proposed amendment would itself give us part of the answer as to what would be a reasonable time to impose as a limitation beyond which the States, to the total number of 36 States, could not go in indicating their ratification.

I am sure the amendment would be adopted in the shortest reasonable time, and I am so sure of it that I am ready to have the time computed at the very time we are making the submission, and have it written in the amendment.

I am not unmindful, as brought out by the Senator from Maryland, that such a time limitation would be appropriate and that, unless it were included, there might be some who would not want to see any action taken in this field and who would say we were proposing to delay a decision indefinitely. That is the furthest thought from my mind. I say

again I am willing to have provided the shortest possible time within which the amendment may be ratified by the several States.

Senators present know that the amendment goes further than to ban the imposition of a poll tax as a requirement for voting for presidential electors or for Members of the Senate or the House of Representatives in a general election. In order that the full coverage of the amendment may be clear, I desire to place in the RECORD five comments showing the great scope of the proposed amendment.

First, it is applicable both to primaries and other elections in which Federal officials are nominated or elected, namely, presidential electors, Senators, and Representatives in Congress. That means primary or special elections, as well as general elections.

Second, the proposed amendment prohibits the imposition of a poll tax as a prerequisite for such voting for Federal officials only, not relating to voting for State or local officials, or on State or local issues.

I emphasize this point because cosponsors of the resolution strongly feel that election of State and local officials and the making of decisions on strictly local matters such as bond issues, tax millage, school questions, referendums, recall procedures, and the like are properly and more effectively handled on a State and local level, and we would strenuously oppose any effort to control such elections by Federal law. In other words, I believe the people of a sovereign State have the clear right to impose conditions to participation in special elections of the sort I have mentioned if in their wisdom they think it wise and proper to do so.

Third, I note that the remedial effects of the amendment would apply not only to the State laws of all the States, but also—and I especially call this to the attention of Senators—to future enactments of the Congress itself. In other words, we do not assume that the present sentiment so dominant in the Congress of the United States will continue to prevail, but prefer to endeavor to protect permanently the right of citizens to vote for Federal officials notwithstanding any possible later change in attitude by the Congress of the United States.

Fourth, the proposed amendment would prohibit any other tax that is different from the so-called poll tax from being prescribed as a prerequisite for voting.

When the time comes for a full discussion of the matter I shall show that throughout the years there have been requirements in the constitutions of the several States, both inside the South and outside the South, as to the payment of amounts of taxes wholly disproportionate to the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting.

It may be interesting to observe that one of the finest States in the Union, the State of Pennsylvania, was the last State to have such a requirement in its State constitution as late as 1933, as I recall. No one could charge that there was bad faith or any desire to impose unusual or heavy restriction upon the people of the Keystone State. That was simply the expression of the wisdom and sound judgment of their people at that particular time, having in mind State problems which may have long since been forgotten. At any rate, in their wisdom, they repealed the requirement in 1933.

The effect of the proposed amendment would be to preclude any State from imposing, by way of subterfuge or because of its own sound desire, a requirement for the payment of some other tax as a prerequisite for voting.

Fifth, the proposed amendment would prevent either the United States or any State from setting up any property qualification as a prerequisite for voting in the election of any Federal officers, with the exception of qualifications relating to those citizens who, by State law, are denied the right to vote because they are paupers or persons supported at public expense or by charitable institutions.

I have already mentioned the fact that that particular provision was inserted because a considerable number of States—and at the time of the full argument I shall be prepared to read into the record the names of those States—have, either in their constitutions or in their long-established law, provisions banning paupers or persons supported at public expense or by charitable institutions from participating in Federal elections.

Mr. President, the full presentation of this matter would require a long time. I have a speech prepared which I could very easily impose upon the few generous Members of the Senate who honor me by remaining in the Chamber while I discuss this subject, which is, of course, of vital interest to them and to everyone else, and which, I hope, will become of more active interest.

I think this is the proper way to go about getting rid of something objectionable which has been offensive to the conscience of a large part of the people of the United States, to get rid of it permanently, and in such a way that there will not be litigation or successful attack, or any other method of long refusing to comply with a provision of this kind.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER. Did I correctly understand the Senator to make the point that if the desired objective is not accomplished by constitutional amendment, but by an act of the Congress, a different minded Congress in the future might reverse it, and there would be no stability in the change?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct in the point he makes. I did not make that particular point. I was referring to litigation rather than later legislation; but the Senator's point is well made. Even if statutory handling of the subject were effective—which in my opinion it would not be—it would still be subject to the very real objection just made by the distinguished Senator, that a succeeding legislature, or even a different judgment later in the same Congress, could, of course, modify or repeal the enactment by statute in this field.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. As a citizen of the State of Tennessee I supported an amendment to the State constitution to eliminate the poll tax, or the per head tax, as a qualification for voting. As a Member of the House of Representatives I supported in the United States Congress legislation to remove, so far as legislation could do so, the poll tax as a qualification for voting for candidates for Federal office. Therefore I find myself in full sympathy with the constitutional amendment proposed by the able senior Senator from Florida, to remove from our Nation a legal requirement of a poll tax as a qualification for voting.

Being in full sympathy with the amendment, I am constrained to inquire of the Senator why, in his opinion, it has not won committee approval, and what are the chances of winning committee approval and bringing this question to the floor of the Senate for action, and submitting the amendment to the States for their action? Or am I too inquisitive?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is certainly not too inquisitive. Before the Senator entered the Chamber I had said that, as we expected, in offering a moderate, throughly legal approach to this question, we have been assailed both from the right and left. There have been a few critics from those States where poll tax requirements still prevail, who still think that, although this measure does not apply to their State and local elections, they should nevertheless oppose it.

From the left we have heard from many eager friends who think that the mere passage of a statute would wind up the question. They do not want to see the time lapse which would be involved in the submission of a constitutional amendment.

As I warned those same people back in 1949 and 1950, and in every other year from that time until now, they were simply postponing the only legal way to deal with this question, and the only practical way ever to have this provision adopted, because there is certainly no real likelihood of the enactment of a statute on the subject. Not only that, but there are not many good lawyers—in fact, I know of no good lawyers—who believe that a statute covering this subject matter would stand. I hasten to say that I do not know all the good lawyers, but the good lawyers I know, without a single exception—I have mentioned two, and there are many more in the Senate from other sections of the country—agree that this subject cannot be legally handled by the passage of a mere statute.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. However that question may be resolved—and I submit it may be a serious question—I see no reason why those who are willing to support a statutory enactment aimed at the removal of this impediment to the free franchise should not be willing to support a constitutional amendment which

would unquestionably remove the impediment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Like the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, I see no real justification for such a position, but I am simply reporting to him that that position has been taken by a good many of my ultra-liberal friends, and that they prefer to attempt again a course which has always been a futile course heretofore, and which I predict would again be a futile course, namely, that of enacting a statute.

Mr. President, it is more than an academic question as to whether a statute or a constitutional amendment would suffice. Of course, the question is a real one, because many lawyers—I think most lawyers—do not believe a statute would stand. They do not believe we would be doing anything but making an empty gesture if we were to enact a statute. Those who have studied the question know perfectly well that if we enact a statute on this subject, and it is limited to the payment of the poll tax alone, it will invite efforts by the Federal Government to coerce States through other similar statutes—for example, in connection with such matters as the time of residence required before a voter may register, the time of residence required in a second county before a change in registration from one county to another can be made; and the age of the voter. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee knows that such a proposal has been put behind us by the Congress several times, even though suggested by a very distinguished President of the United States. It has been left to the States. My understanding is that although several States have considered the question, only two States have thus far reduced the age limit for voting.

There are such questions as the control of the absentee voting process, control of the methods of voting, the setting up of precincts, and the appointment of officials, among other things, which have to do with the exercise of the sound judgment of the State in which the election is being held. However, the situation has been left undisturbed, as a matter of State and local jurisdiction, constantly since the foundation of our Nation.

We think that to bow to the passage of a statute which we believe to be hopelessly unconstitutional, affecting only a single subject matter, would be to invite a general assault upon the plenary control by the States of their own election machinery and the practices and requirements which have been drafted heretofore, always in the history of our Nation, depending upon the decisions of the people themselves in the State affected, as to what was wise, and as to what best fitted into their particular life as the people of a sovereign State.

We do not wish to establish any precedent, even if it could be upheld by the courts—which we think it could not be—for a general, all-out assault upon the control by the States of the many important matters which have to do with the right to vote, and with the exercise of the right to vote by the people of the States.

Mr. President, I appreciate the interest which the distinguished Senators have given to the matters I have sought to present. I shall be prepared at a later time to go into this matter in some detail. However, before I take my seat, I think I should state in the RECORD, very briefly, the various constitutional provisions which are at issue here.

The first is section 2 of article I of the Constitution, which was one of the most debated provisions in the Constitutional Convention. I would be happy to go into the debates in that Convention, but time does not permit, nor does the occasion require that I do that at this time.

Section 2, article I, reads as follows:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Mr. President, that seems to me to be very clear language. I have not found anyone to differ on that point, except a few persons who think that we are not talking about qualifications when we talk about the payment of poll taxes, but, instead, are talking about something else. I shall dwell on that mater in a moment. Certain it is that the framers of the Constitution regarded the payment of poll taxes as a qualification, as we may clearly show, and as I will briefly demonstrate in a moment.

The second provision upon this point is the 17th amendment to the Constitution, having to do with the election of United States Senators.

It is interesting, in passing, to note that the only wording that appears in two different places in the Constitution is the wording relative to the qualifications of the electors.

It was placed in section 2, article I, by the Framing Fathers in 1787.

In 1912, when the 17th amendment relating to the election of Senators, and changing the method of the election of Senators from election by the legislatures to election by the people was submitted, the same provision of article I, which appeared in the original Constitution, and which I have already quoted, was written into the amendment to proscribe the qualifications of electors who might vote for Senators. I read only the first paragraph of the 17th amendment, as follows:

> The Senate of the United States shall be composed of 2 Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have 1 vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

In other words, the experience of our people had determined that the judgment of the Founding Fathers in 1787 in inserting certain words for the qualifications of voters to elect Members of the House of Representatives was so sound that they reached back to the same words and restated them in the 17th amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. President, without laboring the question, I merely wish to state—and this will come out much more fully in subsequent arguments—that there is not a shadow of reason behind the claim that the word "qualifications" used in both places in the Constitution had no reference to the poll-tax requirement.

To the contrary, the State of New Hampshire, in its early constitution, which existed at the time of the framing of the Federal Constitution, had a poll tax requirement, described in the very descriptive words "poll tax" and "qualifications." That poll tax requirement was referred to as a qualification for voters by the use of the word "qualifications."

Similarly, the constitutions of 8 of the 13 Original States, contained other tax-paying requirements—most of them much broader than the poll tax, such as property-owning requirements—and sometimes both poll tax and property owning requirement—and they appeared in conjunction with the use of the word "qualifications" or "qualified" or similar words, depending upon the context.

Therefore, Mr. President, there cannot be the shadow of pretense of soundness behind the claim that the Founding Fathers did not regard the poll tax requirement as a qualification. It had been called a qualification by some of the very men who framed the New Hampshire constitution, and they called the imposition of other tax-paying requirements—property taxes, business taxes, or various other classes of taxes—qualifications.

Mr. President, I hope the word "qualifications" will be shown within quotation marks, because the word "qualification" or "qualifications" or "qualified" appears repeatedly in the various State constitutions.

Coming down to the time of the submission of the 17th amendment—and again I will not take the time to go into great detail on this point—it is a fact that many of the States at that time, States which by the votes of their Senators or Representatives had helped in the submission of the 17th amendment for ratification, had in their very constitutions the poll-tax requirement, and that requirement was referred to as "qualifications" over and over again in those State constitutions.

Therefore the able Members of the Senate and the House who in 1912 submitted the 17th amendment knew perfectly well that they were on sound ground in using the same words. They knew they were being protected by the provisions of their State constitutions, which contained poll-tax requirements, and they knew that those requirements have been referred to time after time in those same constitutions as qualifications for voting.

Mr. President, it is interesting to note—and this matter involves questions of morals and ethics and fair play—that the 17th amendment would never have been submitted for ratification except by the votes of several southern Senators from States whose constitutions required the payment of poll taxes, along with the word "qualifications," as being descriptive of the poll-tax requirements.

Some of the Southern Senators fought very hard for the submission of the 17th amendment, and voted for it. In the debate itself it was made quite clear that the full protection of the definition of

electors by the several States would be carried into the election of Senators in the event the 17th amendment was adopted.

I remember that Representative Hobson from Alabama took that position. I remember that various Senators from various Southern States took that position. All of that is a matter of record, and will come out in debate on the subject at a later time.

Mr. President, I do not believe it is necessary to dwell longer upon the present proposal. I understand from the majority leader that another Senator wishes the privilege of the floor. Certainly I do not wish to indulge in any long or continued discussion of this matter.

I merely wish to reiterate, if I may—and I am glad to see on the floor of the Senate my distinguished friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]—what I have said to him in colloquy on more than one occasion. What is proposed, marks not only the only legal way to approach this problem, but marks, also, a perfectly sincere effort on the part of a group of Southern Senators who are willing not only to support it in committee and on the floor, but are also willing to go before their State legislatures at the proper time to do their best to obtain speedy ratification of such an amendment. It is the only way in which to get rid of a troublesome and long-continuing problem which, if eliminated, would cease to be a thorn in the side of so many good people in this country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

## PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW—ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to announce that when the Senate convenes tomorrow there will be a morning hour, and then the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] will read Washington's Farewell Address. Then Senators who care to speak may do so, and when all Senators who desire to speak have completed their remarks, the Senate will go over until next Monday at noon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## THIRTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF PROCLAMATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF THE REPUBLIC OF ESTONIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Sunday, February 24, 1957, will mark the 39th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Republic of Estonia.

As one of the first nations to be subjugated by the Soviet Union after the Hitler-Stalin Pact, Estonia was directly incorporated into the Soviet Union. After being occupied by the Nazis during World War II, Estonia was again returned to Soviet rule. Untold hardships and suffering have been inflicted upon this small nation. Collectivization and heartless mass deportations were used to break all outward resistance.

Yet in spite of this Communist enslavement, there remains in the hearts of Estonians and people of Estonian descent throughout the world an enduring hope for the restoration of freedom.

We in the United States have the deepest sympathy toward the plight of Estonia, and along with Estonians look forward hopefully to the liberation of this valiant nation. Therefore, Mr. President, I am certain that all freedom-loving Americans join me in noting this day, February 24, 1957, as the 39th anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Republic of Estonia.

By doing so, we will encourage the Estonian people in their hope for a complete restoration of freedom; heartily applaud their moral resistance to Communist tyranny, and pay tribute to this long-suffering patriotism.

Mr. President, I turn now to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

## HANDICAPS TO THE GROWTH OF INDEPENDENT SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, among the many handicaps to the growth of independent small business in this country, a new one has recently begun to develop full flower. The Government itself, through the Department of Defense and its programs for research, is managing to stifle small business by channeling funds year after year to big business. The situation is serious, and as far as this Senator is concerned, small-business men of our Nation have a right to complain.

This whole problem was discussed in an article by Sylvia F. Porter in the New York Post for Tuesday, February 12, 1957.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article entitled "Kiss of Death" be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### KISS OF DEATH

(By Sylvia F. Porter)

The Government itself well may be giving the kiss of death to independent small business in our land—through the Defense Department's program of channeling huge amounts of funds for research and development year after year almost exclusively to big business.

The importance of this cannot be overestimated.

In our age of technological revolution, research has become crucial. In more and more industries, what a corporation gets out of research decides whether it thrives or dies.

Yet, despite the Government's oft-repeated concern about the trend toward concentration of industrial power, its own policies are contributing to this trend. And no one who has the facts can deny it.

The House Small Business Committee of the 84th Congress has just released its final report on its investigations in 1955 and 1956. I have studied every page of the chilling 191-page document which leads its chairman, WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, to predict that if the trends of the past 5 years continue "within 18 years, all manufacturing business and most of the distribution and service business of the Nation will be controlled by corporations having more than $100 million of assets."

But this colorful comment of the controversial PATMAN is not what impressed me. Rather what hit me was a chapter tucked far back in the report entitled "Government Subsidies for Research and Industrial Advancement," for it tells the following tale * * *.

The Government currently pays for almost two-thirds of all research and development in our country.

The Defense Department is by far the biggest spender of the funds and it alone passes out about $1.5 billion of research money annually to private companies, "100,000 times as great as the Small Business Administration's whole lending program, designed to assist small business expansion."

Now where doe the money go?

A full 95 percent of it goes to companies employing more than 500 workers. This certainly fits the definition of big-business firms.

In the past 3 years, research contracts totaling $4.7 billion have been awarded. Of this, $4.6 billion, or 98.1 percent has gone to the 500 largest contractors.

What are some of the implications of this?

The companies doing the research turn up not only inventions for defense but also products for civilian uses.

To quote the Attorney General himself, "processed foods, electronic devices, and penicillin, to list only a few present-day commercial products, were all originally developed under research and development programs for defense purposes."

The companies have the privilege, under our national patent policy, to patent and control an invention, if they want to. In the past 5 years alone, the companies have claimed rights to at least 6,788 inventions.

Again, this leads the Attorney General to make the extraordinary admission, "what indications are available warn that the Government expenditures may not run counter to the industry trend toward concentration but in some degree may even enforce it."

So what, then, should be done? At a minimum, the report suggests:

The administration should eliminate the statistical vacuum that exists on who's getting what for research so a sound program can be worked out that will better protect our competitive system.

It certainly should greatly simplify the contract bidding process so smaller companies won't be under so brutal a disadvantage.

It should make sure that the officers in charge of awarding contracts don't discriminate against small business because of their cautious tendency to deal only with firms which have an established reputation.

It surely should begin at once a reexamination of our whole patent policy to see what amendments are in order.

The Government pays lip service daily to the health of small business. Its research program is shiveringly close to the kiss of death.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should also like to call the Senate's attention to a recent report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System which substantiates the fact that the administration's tight money policies have proved to be a bonanza to the banking fraternity. This report reveals that Federal Reserve member banks realized a net profit after taxes in 1956 of $1,026 million, an increase of $41 million over 1955. The reason for these enormous profits is the ever-rising inter-

est rates which the American people are being forced to pay.

The charge is being made by some of our industrial and financial leaders that the rise in the cost of living is due to the excessive wages of our working people. I thought it might be interesting to compare wages with the profits of the bankers for the period covering the last year of the Truman administration and the first 4 years of the Eisenhower administration to find out just what has been happening. Here is what I discovered: Average weekly earnings of production workers in manufacturing industries rose from $67.97 in 1952 to $80.19 in 1956—an increase of 18 percent. Net profits after taxes of banks were $829 million in 1952 and $1,026 million in 1956—a gain of 24 percent. This means that bank profits rose 33 percent more than did wages from 1952 to 1956.

I also learned that average weekly wages in the 4-year period 1953 through 1956 were $75.07 which is 10 percent higher than the 1952 weekly average wage. Bank profits for the 4-year period 1953 through 1956 averaged $993 million a year which is 20 percent more than bank profits were in 1952. In other words, Mr. President, bank profits have increased under the Eisenhower administration twice as much as have wages, taking the year 1952 as a means of comparison.

In view of these facts I think it would be well for our Republican friends to examine the effect that soaring interest rates are having on the increasing cost of living, before they make the charge that wages are too high and causing inflation.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that a chart I have had prepared which shows earnings of workers and bank profits for the years 1952 through 1956 be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*A comparison of gross average weekly earnings of production workers in manufacturing industries with the net profits after taxes of Federal Reserve member banks*

| Year | Weekly earnings | Net profits after taxes of member banks | Number of member banks |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | *Millions* | |
| 1952 | $67.97 | $829 | 6,798 |
| 1953 | 71.69 | 865 | 6,743 |
| 1954 | 71.86 | 1,096 | 6,660 |
| 1955 | 76.52 | 985 | 6,543 |
| 1956 | 80.19 | 1,026 | 6,462 |

Source: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Finally, Mr. President, the January issue of Economic Trends and Outlook published by the AFL-CIO economic policy committee contained a most interesting article titled "A New Look at Monetary Policy."

This article contends that the tight-money policy has had an injurious effect upon small businesses, farmers, prospective home owners and purchasers of consumer goods. It points out that the administration's credit policies have caused postponement of needed public improvements such as schools and hospitals while at the same time increasing profits of lending institutions. In conclusion the article calls for a close examination of our fiscal and credit policies with a view in mind of ending the inequities of the present monetary controls.

Because of the timeliness of this article, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW LOOK AT MONETARY POLICY

Current monetary policy needs to be reexamined. The causes and effects of a tight money market are different when seen through the eyes of someone other than a specialist in monetary policy. While some economists give credit to the monetary policy of the administration and the Federal Reserve Board for the relative mildness of price increases in the past few years, others believe the relationship between the two has been relatively minor.

Instead, it seems that the Federal Reserve Board, while "tilting at the windmill" of inflation, has been hampering the healthy expansion of our economy. The Board's attempt to curb inflation in the consumer and industrial markets has literally produced inflation in the money markets. The latter creates far more serious problems for our economy than the price inflation of the last few years.

In the past year and a half, money market inflation has followed the seesaw pattern of increased rates for Treasury bills followed by increased discount rates. Since mid-1954, Treasury bill rates have increased by 2¼ to 2½ points. Since a fair rule of thumb is that the discount rates should generally be higher than the Treasury bill rates, this pressure among others, has pushed up the discount rates. Over the past year and a half, when Treasury bill rates were higher than discount rates, the Federal Reserve Banks have increased their discount rates. Now, once more, the Treasury bill rate is hovering around 3 percent. While this may not lead to further discount rate increases, past experience would make this result probable.

As Treasury bill rates and discount rates mount, other rates also rise. In the past two years, short-term rates for loans have also gone up from 1¾ to 3½ percent, or exactly doubled. In many instances, they have risen above the long-term rate, presaging an upturn in the latter.

This seesaw pattern causes uncertainty in the money market. Loans of various kinds become very difficult to obtain—not necessarily because funds are short, but because banks and lending institutions assume that by holding off a little longer, they can charge and secure higher interest rates. Thus, the attempt to avoid price inflation produced inflation in the money markets.

To support the general contention that price inflation in the money market has caused some fundamental disturbances in the economy, five points may be cited. Each shows the effect of the rise in interest rates. Each illustrates how good monetary intentions for helping economy have produced serious problems elsewhere.

1. Business and agricultural borrowing has not been curbed; nor has the rate of investment for new plant and equipment slowed.

2. Discrimination between types of borrowers has developed.

3. Needed public buildings and activities have been postponed.

4. Profits of banking institutions have been increased.

5. The Treasury has been forced to reverse its policy of converting debt to long-term bonds.

INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL, AND AGRICULTURAL LOANS

One of the main purposes of increased discount rates has been to "spread out the boom" and slow down expenditures for new plant and equipment. However, these expenditures have continued to rise from quarter to quarter, and the total volume of commercial, industrial, and agricultural loans has continued to reach new highs almost monthly.

Starting in early 1955, the rate of new plant and equipment expenditures has risen roughly $2 billion a quarter, until the anticipated rate for the fourth quarter of 1956 of $38 billion will be $12½ billion above the $25½ billion rate of the first quarter of 1955. Discount rates have been periodically increased.

During this same period, commercial, industrial, and agricultural loans of banks in leading cities have also risen almost continually. From January 1955 to September 1956, these loans grew from $22¼ billion to an all-time high of $29½ billion. Month by month, the level of loans has risen except for slight declines in early 1955 and 1956.

Over these months, the discount rate has gone up 6 times. From a level of 1½ percent at the beginning of 1955, it moved up one-fourth of a point in April, August, September, and November of 1955, and in April and August of 1956.

It is argued that these loans and expenditures for new plant and equipment would have been even greater had the rise in the discount rate and the concomitant increases in short- and long-term loan rates not taken place. But the hard facts remain clear: Despite the efforts of the Federal Reserve Board to stop or partially control their increase by upping the discount rate, these loans have continually mounted. The September 1956 Federal Reserve Bulletin, reviewing interest rates during economic expansion, states: "During 1956, business demands in both capital and credit markets have risen substantially further. * * *" The Board might have added to this statement of fact, "This has occurred in spite of a very tight money policy."

DISCRIMINATION IN TYPES OF BORROWERS

The tight-money policy has produced restrictions on certain types of loans, but has not particularly interfered with others. Big business establishments and large corporations usually see no reason to let a rise of 1 percent or more hamper their planned rate of plant and equipment expenditures or their demand for various types of loans. If necessary, they can afford to pay higher interest rates out of their earnings and reserves. The constant rise in new plant and equipment expenditures, as well as commercial and industrial loans, is testimony to the negligible effect of high interest rates on curbing or retarding this type of expansion.

As a Wall Street Journal story on September 4, 1956 stated, "Some smaller concerns are cutting expansion plans. Some medium sized ones are delaying plans for financing them. Corporate giants generally are unaffected."

In most cases, small-business men cannot afford to pay higher interest rates. They are forced, therefore, to postpone plans for growth and expansion or even for enlarging inventory to maintain stability in their business.

In addition, an examination of the housing market shows an obvious decline in housing starts for new residential establishments and a rise in interest rates on mortgage money. The mortgage money is available, but the average American who wants to buy a new house hesitates because of rising interest rates.

The farmer, too, finds it more difficult to get money at rates he can afford, even though

he needs some types of loans just to carry him over periods of the planting season.

A series of interviews, conducted with bankers around the country by U. S. News & World Report reported in the September 14, 1956, issue, illustrates the discrepancies between opportunities of different types of borrowers:

"Bankers across the Nation agree that it is harder for both builders and home buyers to line up mortgage credit, point out that their average rate of interest on mortgage loans is up sharly from last year's rate." As for farmers' desires to finance their operations, U. S. News continues, "You are likely to find that your banker is much more critical of your plans." The rule of thumb seems to be "The more urgent your need for a loan, the more difficult and costly that loan will be to arrange."

Certainly the small-business man, the new businessman, the farmer, the prospective home buyer, and the purchaser of consumer durable goods finds it more difficult to buy what they want. If tight money accomplishes anything at all, therefore, it makes it harder for these groups to get money.

STATE AND MUNICIPAL EXPENDITURES CURTAILED

Higher interest rates increase the cost of borrowing for State and municipal governments. Normally, there is a differential between the rates that State and municipal governments pay on their bonds and the rate paid for long-term bonds of business establishments because interest on the former is tax exempt. However, as long-term bond rates rise, State and municipal governments must raise their rates in order to compete for money in the open market. As a result, costs of needed public improvements are greater for the States and local communities and, in turn, for the taxpayers.

Almost daily one can find a newspaper report that a State or municipal government has postponed the issuance of a school bond, bonds for improvement of public buildings, or bonds for highway construction, because of the costs of floating them. For example, the October 20 issue of Business Week reported: "The tax-exempt bond market has been hit even harder by tight money than the corporate sector. From Rhode Island to Florida, municipalities have been turning down bids on new issues. On scattered occasions, new municipal offerings didn't even draw a bid. Many of the municipalities that have pulled issues out of the markets have found—like most of their corporate counterparts—that conditions actually became worse later."

This effect of tight money delays necessary improvements and hampers the development of needed public facilities in States and local communities.

BANKING PROFITS

Tight money has led to higher profits for lending institutions in its September 14 issue, U. S. News & World Report's article, "Where Tight Money Helps" asks "Who gets all the additional dollars now being paid by individuals, corporations, and governments on their borrowing?" The answer is simple and straightforward: "* * * in large measure * * * the country's banks, insurance companies, and other institutions that do the bulk of the lending."

Profit statements of various banks illustrate the truth of this statement. On October 2, the New York Journal of Commerce headlined a story, "Banks Report Robust Gains in Earnings."

A paragraph in the same story points out the effect of tight money on bank earnings: "Contributing most spectacularly to gross income was interest on loans, affected both by sharply higher money rates and by generally increased volume of credit in use."

Following this is a rundown on the profits of five New York metropolitan banks. For the first 9 months of 1956, profits increased as follows: Manufacturers' Trust Co. and New York Trust Co., 10 percent; Irving Trust, 22 percent; and Bank of New York and Marine Midland Trust, 25 percent.

A current composite series on bank earnings is unavailable. The most recent Federal Reserve Board series in the May 1956 Bulletin reviewed earnings for 1955. However, since the New York banks cited are not atypical, these indications from the first 9 months of this year make it certain that bank earnings for 1956 will show a rising trend.

BULK OF UNITED STATES DEBT STILL IN SHORT TERM

In early 1953, the United States Treasury announced, as an ultimate objective, transferring United States debt from banking institutions to long-term investments as much as possible.

Short-term bonds were to be reduced and converted to bonds of long-term denomination wherever possible.

The Treasury would try to make the change to long-term bonds, but that it would have in increase interest rates at the same time. The May 1953 issue of 30-year bonds of 3¼ percent was the first step. Disastrous effects of this first issue are well known. Suffice it to say, that while the issuance of these 30-year bonds was successful, the market soon fell apart. Subsequent developments led to the reduction of interest rates. The slight recession of 1953–54 followed. After that, the Federal Reserve Board began once again to fight phantom inflation and increased the discount rate periodically. The Treasury thus gave up its policy of converting the debt to long-term bonds. Subsequent moves resulting in rising interest rates, however, have not enabled the Treasury to follow through on its policy.

Most economists would generally agree that sound debt policy would support moving the Federal debt into long-term issues and out of the bank structure. However, it appears clear that high interest rate policies of the administration and the Federal Reserve bank, have not helped the Treasury to accomplish this objective.

Tight money does not really affect the source of the economic growth and expansion which some people consider inflationary.

On the other hand, we know that tight money policy has injured small businesses, farmers, prospective homeowners and purchasers of consumer goods. Tight money policy has caused potponement of needed public activities. Tight money policy has built the profits of banking and lending institutions—to say nothing of its forcing the Treasury to reverse its debt management policy and its encouraging corporations to seek "costless capital." For these reasons, a new look at monetary policy seems to be in order.

## THE LEASE-PURCHASE PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I note that recently the administration said it would abandon the lease-purchase program which was adopted by Congress some years ago providing for the construction of public buildings. There are some $900 million worth of buildings programed, none of which has been constructed, but all of which have had headlines, many of them very convenient headlines, prior to the last election. The administration says that the reason it is abandoning the program is because it wants to stop inflation. I might suggest that the main reason why the program is being abandoned is because it did not work. As I have said, there were more than $900 million worth of public buildings authorized for construction under the terms of the program, none of which have been constructed. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] is in charge of the subcommittee which has been investigating this subject, and I am sure his report will be most illuminating.

I am always intrigued by the manner in which the public relations officials in the administration present everything to their own advantage. I stand in wonder and amazement at the unique capacities of the publicists and propagandists of the administration to make great achievements out of colossal failures.

Mr. President, I wish now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

## SUGGESTED SOLUTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL PROBLEMS OF CYPRUS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during my service as a delegate to the 11th United Nations General Assembly, I received a communication from the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions relating to self-government for Cyprus. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD.

I call to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate the practical proposal which has been made by the ICFTU directed toward a solution of the constitutional problems of Cyprus.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE ON CYPRUS ADDRESSED TO THE GOVERNMENTAL DELEGATIONS TO THE 11TH SESSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

We welcome the decision of the 11th United Nations General Assembly to place the question of Cyprus on its agenda and we wish to inform the delegates to the General Assembly of the views of the free trade unions on this problem.

The ICFTU has always advocated the right of peoples to govern themselves and to decide their own fate in freedom. We have in this spirit aimed at a rapid development of non-self-governing territories toward self-government and self-determination. In the case of Cyprus specifically, the Fourth World Congress of the ICFTU (Vienna, May 20 to 28, 1955) urged prompt action in favor of the implementation of self-determination.

After having carefully weighed the ethnical and international implications of self-government in Cyprus, our executive board, at its meeting in December 1955, adopted a constructive program which we have the honor to submit to the United Nations General Assembly for its consideration. This program contains the following proposals:

1. The people of Cyprus should immediately be granted self-government on a democratic basis.

2. The metropolitan government should forthwith accept the principle of self-determination.

3. The metropolitan government should declare its readiness to negotiate with the government, formed through the lawful procedures of a representative body, about a reasonable period, at the end of which the people of Cyprus should have the right to determine freely the future status of their country.

4. The legitimate political, economic, social, and cultural interests of the ethnic minority should be properly safeguarded, both

during the period of self-government and thereafter.

5. Any settlement should take into consideration the need for friendly relations among the democratic nations and the interests of these nations, as well as the necessity for the democratic world to be able at all times to depend on the island of Cyprus for defense.

We deeply regret that negotiations which were in process for a while between the metropolitan government and the representatives of the people of Cyprus, broke down; that the recognized leader of the Greek-speaking Cypriots was deported; that negotiations have not been resumed; that acts of violence and severe countermeasures have not yet ended; and that in the trade union field the general secretary of the Cyprus Workers Confederation, as well as other free trade unionists, have been detained for many months and that the activities of the free trade unions of Cyprus have been gravely impeded by this and other restrictive measures.

The new proposals for a constitutional reform which have been prepared by the British Government do not seem to be based on the principles of full self-government and self-determination, and there has not yet been a readiness to resume direct negotiations with the representatives of the people of Cyprus.

We therefore appeal to the governmental delegations to the 11th United Nations General Assembly to pronounce themselves in favor of a solution of the constitutional problems of Cyprus along the lines proposed by the free trade unions, and to urge the immediate resumption of direct negotiations between the metropolitan government and the representatives of the people of Cyprus.

---

## SUNFED—SPECIAL UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier I mentioned the address which I delivered 2 or 3 days ago relating to the foreign economic aid program. I have wanted for some time to comment on President Eisenhower's second inaugural address and on what he had to say relating to our foreign policy, particularly as it refers to foreign aid and foreign economic policy.

Mr. President, when I listened to President Eisenhower's second inaugural address I had hoped that the magnificent ideals to which he committed this country would augur well for some changed policies when it came to the level of implementation. Unfortunately we had to witness recently the discouraging spectacle at the United Nations of Mr. Paul Hoffman, one of our American delegates, rising, in defiance of what I am sure were his own convictions, to make what is becoming our annual rebuff to SUNFED.

The following day the New York Times carried an editorial entitled "The Trouble With SUNFED," which reviewed our embarrassing position.

This unfortunate spectacle seems to show again that the President's generous and forward-looking instincts, as expressed in the high abstractions of state papers, are not being translated into practical and useful policies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TROUBLE WITH SUNFED

Nearly 4 years ago President Eisenhower gave his support to the idea of a United Nations fund for assistance to underdeveloped countries. It was contemplated then, and has been contemplated since, that this fund, which might call for a capital investment of at least $250 million, would be used for basic and ordinarily nonprofit projects. These might include hospitals, schools, housing, and roads.

The idea was picked up by several U. N. agencies. Out of it came a report prepared in 1955 by a group of experts headed by Raymond Scheyven. The resulting proposal was baptized as SUNFED, which is short for the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development. The prospects looked reasonably good when several great powers, Britain and the United States among them, began to back away. On our own part, we made the peculiar stipulation that we could not enter into the SUNFED operation until some progress had been made toward general disarmament. This argument did not seem relevant when first made, and does not seem relevant now. A nation spending close to $40 billion on defense need not worry about somewhere between $75 million and $125 million spent to build schools and hospitals abroad.

Paul G. Hoffman had the possibly painful task of assuring a U. N. committee on Wednesday that we are still opposed. Mr. Hoffman quoted the President's remark in his inauguration speech that "we recognize and accept our own deep involvement in the destiny of men everywhere." But he argued that because "of an absence of genuine international confidence the future is filled with uncertainties" and that we were therefore "not prepared to assume a long-term commitment to make resources available to a new global-development fund."

He did not really explain why this was so. It is supposed that Washington is not satisfied with the form SUNFED is taking. If this is the case, why not bring out a better plan? We are not poor in money or in generosity. Why should we be so poor in faith, courage, and compassion that we must wait for general disarmament before we join with our U. N. neighbors to do some helpful things that politics and other reasons keep us from doing unilaterally?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me explain what I mean by calling attention briefly to the similarity of thought between the President's inaugural statement of January 21, 1957, and certain passages from the Report and Recommendations on Foreign Economic Aid made by the Mansfield subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee last year after a 2-year study of the subject.

The Mansfield subcommittee pointed out in 1956 that prosperity, like peace, is in the long run indivisible, and stated that the committee had—

grave doubts as to how long economic growth can be sustained in the United States if the rest of the world continues to fall further and further behind. In connection with the advancement of our own prosperity the prosperity of others is an important factor.

President Eisenhower said on January 21, 1957:

For one truth must rule all we think and all that we do. No people can live to itself alone. The unity of all who dwell in freedom is their only sure defense. The economic need of all nations, in mutual dependence, makes isolation an impossibility; not even America's prosperity could long survive if other nations did not prosper. No nation can longer be a fortress, lone and strong and safe. And any people seeking such shelter for themselves can now build only their own prison.

The Mansfield subcommittee report, which, by the way, was unanimous, being signed by Senators GREEN, FULBRIGHT, KENNEDY, HICKENLOOPER, AIKEN, CAPEHART, and GOLDWATER, quoted a statement made by the present senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], then the United States Ambassador to India, as follows:

The problem is not simply to counter the Russians. We were there first. We should develop our own program and stick with it and give assurance of some continuity.

In 1956 the Mansfield subcommittee said:

The broader national interests of the United States require a growth in the area of human freedom. It is perhaps significant that not since 1812 has the United States found it necessary to fight a war with a country which has standards of freedom comparable to our own. Steps which countries receiving technical assistance take to promote such a growth, either politically or economically, are in the mutual interest of the United States and of other countries concerned. This seems to the subcommittee the most valuable mutual assistance which can reasonably be expected from most underdeveloped countries; namely, a devotion to their own independence and a determination to work out their own problems. If we expect them to refuse to prostitute themselves to the Soviet Union, we must also expect them to refuse to prostitute themselves to the United States. And we are false to our own traditions if we ask them to do otherwise. A strong, free, and independent Asia is more important to the United States than a collection of weak dependents in the same area.

President Eisenhower, on January 21, 1957, further said:

In this confidence we speak plainly to all peoples.

We cherish our freedom with all nations that are or would be free. We respect no less their independence. And when, in time of want or peril, they ask our help, they may honorably receive it; for we no more seek to buy their sovereignty than we would sell our own. Sovereignty is never bartered among free men.

President Eisenhower went on to say:

We must use our skills and knowledge and, at times, our substance, to help others rise from misery, however far from the scene of suffering may be our shores. For wherever in the world a people knows desperate want, there must appear at least the spark of hope, the hope of progress—or there will surely rise at last the flames of conflict.

We recognize and accept our own deep involvement in the destiny of men everywhere. We are accordingly pledged to honor, and to strive to fortify, the authority of the United Nations. For in that body rests the best hope of our age for the assertion of that law by which all nations may live in dignity.

Now it just appears, Mr. President, that we had a real opportunity to change our policies, and to get in line with the requirements of the moment, last week at the United Nations when SUNFED came up again for discussion. My colleagues will know that SUNFED, the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development, is an undertaking which has been urged for the last 4 years, at least, by the majority of the members of the United Nations. This is a proposal,

carefully worked out and worked over, for helping the underdeveloped nations of the world to begin at the beginning with the sound underpinnings of modern agriculture, modern industry, modern harbors, transportation, public works, schools, and health facilities that are primary assurances for healthy and sound economic, social, and political developments under conditions that will improve standards of living and give the peoples the greatest possible stake in their governments, the welfare of their countries, their independence, and the security of the individual that comes with the growth of the democracy.

Last year, during the debate on the Mutual Security Act, I discussed SUNFED at some length on the Senate floor—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 8, pages 11377–11382.

I will not repeat the basic arguments here except to say this: For too many years the "have" nations, led by the United States and Britain, have vetoed the implementation of SUNFED on a plea of poverty that, believe me, rings mockingly in the ears of the representatives of nations whose gross national product and whose average per capita incomes are tragically small, dangerously small, fractions of our own.

President Eisenhower spoke the other day of the price of freedom. Part of that price, and no price is too high to pay for freedom, would have been the launching and the implementation of SUNFED, or an instrumentality along the lines of SUNFED, particularly when it was again before the United Nations Assembly. Instead, it again encountered the opposition of our own State Department.

I speak now not as a member of the United States Delegation to the United Nations, but as a Member of the United States Senate and as an American citizen, relying on information obtained not as a U. N. Delegate but as a Senator and a citizen, when I state that the State Department reneged on rather broad implications and commitments made some months ago when this matter was before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. At that time the State Department said that it would, at this session of the United Nations Assembly, support SUNFED. I believe I am reliably informed that this change of attitude comes not from within the State Department, but has been imposed upon it—by guess whom—by the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, who is no relation genealogically, intellectually, or temperamentally to the present speaker.

The Secretary of the Treasury seems to be taking an increasingly large interest in our foreign policy and how to cut it back.

Again the reason given was poverty, when we explained at the U. N. last Wednesday that we could not afford the obligations which we would undertake in support of SUNFED.

Mr. President, how pennywise and pound foolish can we get? The international obligations for the launching of SUNFED would be in the neighborhood of $250 million. Our share would be in the neighborhood of $80 million.

In terms of international political realities, we are in the position of being outvoted by a two-thirds majority within the United Nations if the question comes to a showdown. Not only are the African-Asian group and the Latin American group earnestly and insistently advocating implementation of SUNFED, but now, because we and some other "have" nations have stalled year after year, while the Soviet Union and its satellites have opposed and denounced SUNFED as a sinister tool of capitalist imperialism, we find that, under its zigzag policy, the Soviet Union and its satellites are reversing themselves to join in support of this proposal. I suppose some will cite this as a reason for opposing SUNFED. To that I would cite a statement from the Mansfield subcommittee report of 1956:

> The American national interest has too often been viewed as the reciprocal of the Communist interest, and from this it has been reasoned that anything which was anti-Communist was ipso facto pro-American. The subcommittee prefers to proceed from the converse of this assumption; namely, that anything that is pro-American is ipso facto anti-Communist. If the United States carries out programs which will positively advance the American national interest, without regard to their anti-Communist content, the anti-Communist results, although secondary, are likely to be even stronger than if the programs were specifically anti-Communist in the first place.

Mr. President, we are now in grave danger of appearing to veto the soundest and most economical method for assisting sovereign and proud peoples bent on independence and a higher standard of living in their efforts to develop their agriculture, their industry, their trade, their standards of living, and the values of individual citizens within their borders.

Let us talk in terms of money and economy, Secretary Humphrey's favorite terminology, if you will, Mr. President, SUNFED is more economical, will cost United States taxpayers less, and will be more fruitful in promoting United States interest, as so clearly redefined by President Eisenhower in his inaugural address. That will be the case if we join in supporting with words and money the launching of SUNFED.

Mr. President, here, again, I use the phrase SUNFED because it indicates to my mind not a precise formula, but an attitude or at least a philosophy of economic assistance through the United Nations. There will be those who will say that SUNFED, as originally designed, was not what might be called administratively feasible and practical. In reply to such a comment, I suggest that what we are discussing is United Nations or multilateral economic assistance through pooling arrangements, so that no one country will have to bear the major or the entire burden.

Instead of asking the United States to meet the whole costs of exterior aid in economic developments around the world, other well-off nations and not-so-well-off nations can and will help. They would share in supplying money, in supplying manpower, in supplying know-how, in supplying the understanding and sympathy which, Mr. President, are intangibles that are decisive in this whole enterprise.

In fact, Mr. President, again and again I have suggested, both publicly and privately, that a good place to start the use of an international economic special fund would be in the Middle East, and I have proposed a Middle East economic development authority. I made that proposal in the course of a speech which I delivered while I was a delegate to the United Nations. The speech was addressed to the Overseas Press Club. A Middle East economic development authority would enlist the capital of other countries, not only the capital of the United States. It would call upon the countries which have great resources of oil or other strategic commodities to make their contributions to the economic development of the entire region. In that connection, I hope our Government will soon end its sterility of imagination, and will move on to something constructive.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am familiar with the Senator's speech regarding his proposal for a Middle East development program, and I wish to commend him for it. In my judgment, it is the kind of program the Secretary of State should have been urging months and months and months before the situation in the Middle East developed into such a crisis.

Let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that if statesmanship of that kind had been shown months ago by the State Department, I believe we would then have come to grips with the real causes of trouble in the Middle East.

As the Senator from Minnesota well knows, and as he pointed out in his speech, we face the problem of seeking to bring some economic development to the peoples of the Middle East, if we are to avert the causes of the crises which from time to time develop there. The Senator from Minnesota has made a very worthwhile contribution by his proposal. I only regret that it is another example of constructive proposals which are made to the State Department, but on which that Department does not take action in meeting problems of the type of those which exist in the Middle East.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, some of the wealthier nations have long advocated SUNFED. They are, notably, the Netherlands and Belgium, both once great colonial powers, who now are learning the great lesson of history, namely, that it is better to walk out than to be pushed or carried out of colonial imperialism into the second half of the 20th century.

Mr. President, I close this appeal for action now on the further development of a bipartisan foreign policy by citing a description, written with restrained eloquence and profound and certain knowledge and feeling by a conservative banker, a citizen of Belgium, a country whose name was once a synonym for colonial misrule. This banker's credentials as a hard-headed practical man of

affairs are as good as the credentials of our own Secretary of the Treasury. I shall read this gentleman's comments regarding the advantages of international aid over aid given unilaterally. His words, Mr. President, are worth study and thought by each Member of the Congress. I believe they contain road directions which we must follow if in paying the price of freedom we are going to obtain that freedom and a further flowering of democdacy and freedom both within our country and throughout the world. These are the words of Mr. Raymond Scheyven, in his report prepared in pursuance of General Assembly Resolution 724B (viii); General Assembly, Official Records; ninth session (1954), Supplement No. 19 (9/2728, pp. 15–16):

While external aid is necessary, it can never play more than a supporting role. The introduction of capital goods and the presence of technicians are indeed essential, but are not sufficient in themselves to bring about progress. Economic development is not imported "prefabricated" from abroad, but is achieved on the spot by dint of a courageous and intelligent policy.

In many underdeveloped countries the way to progress must be opened by abandoning ancient prejudices and archaic customs, adapting social and legal institutions, suppressing barriers of caste or race and doing away with political and social privileges which serve the interests of a minority at the expense of the general welfare. Economic progress is possible only if those in authority desire it and accept its political and social consequences.

As part of the necessary financial aid must take the form of grants, the industrialized countries must have recourse to taxation. Before this source of finance can be tapped, the taxpayers must be convinced of the value of the sacrifices asked of them. Their efforts must not be compromised by bad political management, and the tax they pay must not be a substitute for the taxes that an enormously wealthy ruling class, indifferent to the poverty of its fellow citizens, might be unwilling to pay.

It is therefore necessary to introduce structural reforms, while maintaining full respect for the sovereignty of the underdeveloped countries. It might be easier to carry out such structural reforms through an international organization, which is in a better position to spare national susceptibilities. The intervention of any one country in reforms of this nature would be a very difficult matter, as is illustrated by the reactions which have been aroused whenever lending countries have sought to make their investments conditional upon stipulations which the borrowing countries regarded as infringements of their sovereignty.

When, Mr. President, is the Government of the United States going to accept the responsibility of the practical implementation of its own abstract commitments? When are we going to bring our position on Sunfed and a score of other matters in line with the President's inaugural address?

Mr. President, I turn now to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

---

## THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE ON FEBRUARY 20

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I know that other Senators wish to discuss various matters here tonight. However, since tomorrow will be a holiday, and since our session on tomorrow probably will be limited in time, I should like to make one other comment, if my colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], will permit me to do so.

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My comment relates to the address made last evening by the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I listened to that address. In fact, it was my privilege to speak last night in Kansas City, at a public forum. I insisted that the President's address be carried to the meeting. The audience listened with respectful attention. Like every other American, Mr. President, my heart went out to the President. His burdens are great. But I felt—as I said then, and as I state now—that the decisions being made internationally and the decisions being made in our own country are of such great significance that politeness must give way to candor and frankness. I suppose one can always be polite while he is being candid and frank, and I shall attempt to do so.

The President did not indicate to the American people that much of the reason why we are in the trouble we now face is that we have tried to be all things to all people. This is not to say that it is easy to have a consistent, cogent, or definitive foreign policy in the Middle East or in any other part of the world. However, the fact that it is not easy does not in any way diminish the necessity for the formulation of such a policy and for carrying it out.

The President implied that certain guaranties had already been given to the State of Israel. Mr. President, I would have this record show that no firm guaranties were made by our Government or any other government to the State of Israel.

However, I would also note that in the early days of November, this Government proceeded to cooperate with other governments, took the initiative to have the French and British withdraw from their operations in the Suez area of Egypt, and introduced two resolutions in the United Nations. Neither of those resolutions has yet been acted upon, and neither of them has yet been actively pushed. One of the resolutions relates to the Suez Canal, and is on the subject of arriving at an international agreement pertaining to the operation of that canal. The other resolution relates to positive steps to promote peace between Israel and her neighbors. Nothing has been done about either resolution.

Mr. President, it is not exactly correct that we regard the interests of Israel, France, and Britain in the Middle East as being synonymous or equal. The British and the French do not live there; their boundaries are not affected. Of course, the French have some interests there because of their interests in Algeria, but the latter interests are secondary to the direct interests of the Republic of France. Surely, Great Britain has no immediate territorial interest in the Middle East. To ask those two countries to withdraw was, indeed, a solemn decision on our part, one in which I concurred then and in which I concur now. Those great nations did withdraw, in conformity with the requests set forth in the resolutions of the United Nations. However, the State of Israel finds itself in an entirely different situation. It has been the victim of interminable raids across its frontiers, its borders.

Mr. President, one can argue as to who started these raids, whether it was Egypt or Israel. The fact is that the raids have taken place, and that the people on the border of the State of Israel have lived in constant tension and fear. I suppose it would be fair to say that those on the Egyptian border have likewise lived in a state of fear and tension.

For our Government to talk about the restoration of conditions, the status quo ante, is to ignore the facts of life. There are no conditions identical to those which prevailed prior to the attack. Prior to the attack on Egypt, France and Britain were powers in the Middle East, perhaps not great powers, but they had influence. Today they have none, and we cannot restore their influence. Prior to the attack in the Middle East, United States relations were different from what they are today. So to talk about the restoration of conditions as they existed prior to the attack is to talk of a fool's paradise, and to be lacking in responsible statesmanship.

The Israelis live under the gun, and they are tired of it. What is more, they are saying only what was said a little over 3 months ago, when, in the first week of November, our Government said we could not return to the status quo ante, the conditions prior to the attack. Then our Government said there must be a settlement; there must be guaranties. But I remind my colleagues in the United States Senate that those resolutions of the first week of November have never been acted upon or effectively promoted by our Government. I gather that is one of the reasons why the Israeli Government wants to know what we mean when we say "guaranties." Is it merely another resolution? Is it merely another declaration? Or is it something that is truly meaningful? We gave guaranties to the people of Formosa. Formosa was not going to be content with simply pious declaration. It wanted guaranties; not just declaration or a resolution, but guaranties.

Some may have thought that there was a guaranty in the tripartite agreement of 1950, but apparently there was not, because acts of aggression took place in spite of that tripartite agreement, and nothing was done. The Israelis had their rights interfered with in 1951, and then our Government, under a different administration, did nothing. In other words, Israel is a country which has witnessed larger nation states and the United Nations not adequately protecting its frontiers, boundaries, or borders, and not effectively even enforcing the rule of law.

So what the Israelis are saying today is this: "It is time we came to grips with these hard, knotty problems. It is time for the major powers, if they want peace, to help settle the boundary problems, the Arab refugee problems, the

economic problems." In the long run, what the representatives of Israel are doing may be of service to the cause of peace, because they are no longer going to let us avoid making decisions; they are no longer going to let us look at the world through rose-tinted glasses and say that all is well, and, when it is not well, simply ignore it.

We have had a propensity of late to avoid, ignore, or shunt aside anything that did not make us feel happy. The administration has been addicted to political tranquilizers, "happy" pills. Everything is wonderful. And all at once everything is not wonderful. It is like what happens when one quits taking pills—it no longer seems wonderful. Sometimes one can take pills so long that they are no longer effective. I am afraid the "happy" pills, the tranquilizers, have lost their contenting effect on the one hand and their effect of jubilation on the other; that the pink glasses have given way to smoked glasses. We have one of the most difficult periods in our national history upon us.

President Eisenhower said last night there were two resolutions adopted on February 2 which gave certain guaranties to the State of Israel. I respectfully dissent from that observation. One resolution related to the immediate and forthwith withdrawal of Israeli troops. The second resolution related to so-called "protections" Israel would receive through the expressions or statements of the Secretary General.

Mr. President, I happened to be at the United Nations on the day those resolutions were being discussed. I happen to know the Canadian representative at the United Nations wanted one resolution—withdrawals and guarantees in one; specific guarantees; United Nations patrols in the waters of the Straits of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba; and United Nations Emergency Force patrols along the borders between Egypt and Israel, particularly in the Gaza Strip. Those are the sore spots.

I know our Government did not go along with the Canadian proposal. I know our Government did what it thought was the best it could do, because it wanted to get a two-thirds majority and desired to win, even if it won nothing but approval. Our Government went along with the two resolutions, one following the other immediately, so the timing of the presentation made it appear as if they were almost one.

The second resolution is the resolution that is supposed to contain the guarantees. It so happens that the Egyptian interpretation of that resolution is opposite to the Israeli interpretation. It so happens that the Indian interpretation of the resolution is not like the United States interpretation. It so happens that the Canadian interpretation of Resolution No. 2 is not like the Iraqi interpretation of the resolution. It so happens that the resolution was broad enough, cloudy enough, and ambiguous enough so that anybody could interpret the resolution as he wanted to.

Mr. President, the State of Israel said, "That is not sufficiently specific for a nation-state to rely upon." That is what the trouble is.

The second resolution did not amount to anything except a two-thirds majority in the General Assembly for a resolution which, if everyone would interpret it as the United States sees it, would mean that Israel would have commitments and guaranties. But the trouble is that each nation is its own judge of the meaning of the resolution. Therefore our Secretary of State felt compelled later to make some additional declarations to the State of Israel, additional pledges if not actual guaranties.

One of those pledges was what is called "innocent passage" for ships in the Gulf of Aqaba. When our Secretary was asked what was meant by "innocent passage" his answer was not clear and concise. His answer was, in substance, that that would depend upon how each nation interpreted it. When he was asked whether "innocent passage" meant Israeli ships in the waters of the Straits of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba, and whether or not Egypt would so acknowledge, he said he could not say that definitely.

The words "innocent passage" are subject to broad interpretation. All I am saying is that the State of Israel, in being what some people consider to be intransigent and obstinate in this instance, may very well be forcing this issue to the point where the great powers and the other nations will come to recognize that they can no longer avoid responsible decison making in the Middle East.

If as a result of this unhappy experience we come to grips with the real problems in that area, it will have been well worth the suffering and the travail. The real problem in the Middle East is what we have been discussing continually. The real problem in the Middle East is not a threat of Soviet military attack. That is not to say that such an attack could not take place. It is always a possibility. We are better prepared to meet that kind of possibility than almost any other. The real difficulty, according to every witness who has appeared before our committee, and every person we have ever heard speak about the area, is the conflict of interests, passions, and emotions between Arab States and Arab States, between Arab States and Israel, and particularly between Egypt and Israel. Until we come to grips with the problem, there will be no peace in the Middle East.

I am of the opinion that inasmuch as Israel is the only democracy in the area, she is entitled to genuine consideration and friendship on the part of the Government of the United States. I am convinced that there is in the hearts and minds of the American people a determination not to see unfairly punished or placed in an untenable position, or left alone and desolate, a country which has symbolized, by its every institution, fulfillment of the promises of democracy. I think it is about time to say to our Asian and African friends and others that justice does not always mean a majority. Justice is not always the sum total of power. Justice has an abstract moral quality to it.

A two-thirds vote in the Assembly of the United Nations may impose sanctions, but it does not necessarily mean that it imposes justice. This country is dedicated to justice more than it is dedicated to a two-thirds vote.

I hope our country will speak up in the United Nations. I cannot believe that sanctions will be imposed, unless we acquiesce. There need not be sanctions in the United Nations if the United States, with its friends and associates, takes an affirmative position to the contrary. Make no mistake about it. The French knew that if the United States sided with France on the question of Algeria, the Algerian issue would not come before the General Assembly. When his foreign minister said to Premier Mollet, "I wonder what the United Nations will do about Algeria," Premier Mollet replied, "I wonder what the United States will do about Algeria." He was right. The issue is not so much what the United Nations is going to do about Israel and Egypt, but what the United States will do.

I conclude these remarks by saying that it is not right to make the American people believe that the United Nations is, by itself, an instrumentality of foreign policy. It is not. The United Nations is a conduit, a mechanism, a vehicle through which nation states conduct foreign policy.

The United Nations is not an exclusive instrument of foreign policy, either. It is but one part, or one of the many mechanisms through which we conduct foreign policy.

When I hear the President of the United States or anyone else say that we are going to rely upon the United Nations, I know that the purpose is to avoid decision-making and leadership responsibility. The United Nations is what the nation states make of it. The United Nations will be pretty much what we in the United States offer in terms of leadership. This does not mean that others will automatically move into line in support of our position; but when this Nation makes up its mind what its real objectives are in the Middle East—which I do not think we have done—and then speaks clearly and unequivocally setting forth our position relating to the fulfillment of those objectives, and when we begin to exercise leadership, we shall not be caught in a situation in which we shall be wondering what the tomorrows will offer.

If there ever was a time when we have had brought home the importance of leading rather than being engulfed; the importance of direction rather than being buffeted around by the forces at work, it is now, in the Middle East.

I think the American people have a right to know exactly where we stand. I heard the President say that we cannot expect the United Nations to stand if its resolutions are defied. I think that is true.

But I also wish to make it clear that we cannot expect the United Nations to survive if its resolutions are so ambiguous, so meaningless, and so subject to a great variety of possible interpretations that no one can understand what they mean.

I do not think that every problem should be placed before the United Nations. I believe that would be a disservice to the institution. In my opinion, the

United Nations should handle problems which it is uniquely capable of handling. I think there is a time when we must separate certain parts of our foreign policy from the United Nations activities or United Nations responsibilities. As some of my colleagues have said on other occasions, we need more than merely the United Nations for foreign policy. We need to have some areas of our foreign policy which are over and beyond, and away from United Nations facilities and United Nations resolutions, just as we must work through the United Nations on many other things. I shall elaborate on this matter more in a few days.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that the present tragic situation will be resolved without further embarrassment to our own country or to our friends abroad. However, I warn my fellow Americans that it is not necessarily a good practice to throw over old friends in the hope of gaining new ones. We have already had to chastise our friends in England and in France. Now we are going to be called upon, apparently, to chastise our friends in Israel.

Israel asks what? It asks for the right to live. It is a nation that we helped bring into the world. We acted as midwife at its birth. It is a nation we sponsored, in terms of recognition. It is a nation that means much to millions of our fellow Americans. We are being asked now to apply what are called equal standards of justice, but which are not equal at all.

We have a right not only to ask Israel what she will do, but we have the same right to ask Egypt what she intends to do. We have a right to ask Egypt when she will renounce her acts of belligerency and her belligerent status. Why does our Government not insist on that?

Why do we raise our political shillelagh only against Israel? Why do we not also raise it against Egypt, and ask Egypt for a complete renunciation of acts of belligerency and her status as a belligerent?

Once that is done, we will begin to get some guaranties.

There is much talk about justice. Mr. President, justice requires that all aspects of the situation be dealt with and considered and measured.

I may add that this country has fought wars for freedom of the seas. The Gulf of Aqaba is international waters. I say it is a lawyer's mind which contends that we have no particular responsibility to make certain that ships of other countries shall be permitted free access to ports on international waters, and that freedom of the seas means only that our ships may have such access. Freedom of the seas refers to all ships.

Oh, I know a good corporation lawyer can split international legal hairs and show that freedom of the seas applies only to the particular country that can enforce the principle of freedom of the seas.

Mr. President, a part of the trouble in this situation started when the British and the United States refused to become concerned about the discriminatory action of Egypt with respect to Israeli shipping in the Suez Canal.

When the Egyptian Government got by with telling the Israelis that their ships could not pass through the Suez Canal, it was only another step on another day when they could tell another country that their ships could not pass through the Suez Canal. It got to the point, Mr. President, where the Egyptian Government intercepted American warships in the Suez Canal, demanding to know the cargo and the complement of men on those ships. That was in violation of every treaty. Thank goodness the captain on one of those ships had enough good old American spunk to tell the Egyptians to go and to stay put.

Our Government did not raise any great protest about it.

All this reminds me of what Hitler used to do. So long as Hitler only nibbled at other nations, it did not seem to be too serious so far as the more powerful nations were concerned.

Egypt first discriminated against Israeli shipping. Then Egypt demanded the removal of British soldiers from the Suez Canal. Then Egypt nationalized the Suez Canal. We did not seem to get too much concerned about it as a Government. I imagine we were concerned; but as I have said so many times, if the oil of the Middle East was so vital for Europe in January 1957, it was also vital in the summer of 1956. It was very vital.

So we now see what Israel is saying. It is saying:

> We had your general assurances. We had the tripartite agreement of the three heads of state to protect the boundaries of all the states in the Middle East. That did not work. We had Security Council resolutions relating to the violation of the U. N. Charter by Egypt in its discrimination against Israeli shipping. We have had repeated attacks upon our territory by commandos across the Egyptian-Israeli border. The raiders from across the border have sacked our villages and have killed our people.

The Israelis attacked in force. The Israelis say, "We cannot afford to spend 40 percent of our budget on military defense and build an economy. We want peace. If we cannot have an honorable peace, then we will die in glory." That is what they are saying. They are saying, "Life is too short and too dear to be constantly compromising and to be constantly nibbled at and whittled at, and to be finally consumed because of expediency and compromise." The Israelis, therefore, are demanding that the United States of America, which has made great decisions in the past, make a great decision now.

I gather, however, that there are influences in the government which say, "Do not irritate the Arab nations because there is oil in the Arabian lands."

Oil is not so important as dignity and honor. I am not at all sure how much influence oil plays in the formulation of our foreign policy. I know it is important to Western European national security. However, there are Western nations such as Denmark who have stood up and said they would not vote for sanctions. Mr. President, the Danes did not try to cover both sides of the street, so to speak. The Danes have made their decision quite clear. The Danes are principled people.

I hope our Government will not apply any more sanctions to Israel than it has already applied. The Government of the United States has already imposed severe economic sanctions on Israel, to which I referred a week ago on the floor of the Senate. She is imposing on Israel sanctions of a kind she is not imposing on any other country, except Red China. No other country is subjected to the same kind of economic sanctions as those to which Israel is subjected, except Red China. How much more are we to indulge in sanctions against her, in terms of punishment? Even if we impose sanctions, we will still not settle the problem.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it possible for an American to get a passport for use in traveling to Russia?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is.

Mr. MORSE. Is it possible to get a passport to Israel?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is not.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that Israel relies heavily upon economic income from the tourist trade in order to meet her economic problems?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed, it is.

Mr. MORSE. That is one of the sanctions the Senator is referring to; is it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I should also like to point out that the Israelis have had to accept within their borders thousands of refugees who have been kicked out of Egypt by the Egyptian Government. They need food. Everyone knows that we were negotiating for the sale of surplus agricultural commodities to Israel. Those negotiations have been cut off. The food has been held back. I shall have more to say on this point at a later date.

I merely wish to say now that I do not agree with the position the President took last evening. I do not agree that the United States is without an alternative. The alternative for the United States is to lead in the United Nations and to make it clear to Egypt and to other nations that no longer will we respect their claims of belligerency and that we will ask Egypt to renounce her claims of belligerent rights, and act as a freedom-living and peace-living nation.

I also ask, Mr. President, that the United States reassert its old traditional American standard of freedom of the seas. The doctrine of freedom of the seas has stood very well for 175 years. This is no time to let it be subjected to any misinterpretation. This relates directly to the Gulf of Aqaba.

As the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] stated the other day, the United Nations Emergency Force is in being. We are prepared as a Nation to make our contribution to it. Other countries have made contributions to it, and, since the Gaza Strip has been a source of trouble and travail, I suggest that it be occupied by a United Nations Emergency Force. I suggest that we call upon Egypt to renounce her so-called rights of belligerency and act as a peace-loving nation and respect the tri-partite agreement of 1950. I then

suggest that we ask Israel to withdraw simultaneously with the movement of United Nations troops into the Gaza strip, and I suggest that as Americans we insist upon the freedom of access to all international areas without discrimination against any nation whatsoever.

If we do not do that, Mr. President, we are going to be in great difficulty in years to come. Remember that every move we make now can prejudice our rights in days to come.

So, Mr. President, I hope that we shall not be running for cover under the blanket of the United Nations resolutions which are subject to more interpretations than are the stars in the Milky Way. I refer particularly to Resolution No. 2 of February 2, 1957, which was alluded to last night by the President as the one which gives guarantees. It does not. I am sorry the President was misinformed on that subject.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had not intended to make any comments regarding the Middle East crisis, until I heard the brilliant speech of the Senator from Minnesota. I wish to associate myself with his speech. He has stimulated me to make a few brief comments on the Middle East before I speak on the subject to which I intended to devote most of my time.

I agree with the observations of the Senator from Minnesota and I wish to make a few additional comments about the President's speech of last night. I do not quarrel so much with what the President told the American people as I do with his failure to tell the whole story that I think he should have told them. As a result, it is my opinion that he left the American people with a most inadequate account of what the factual situation is in the Middle East and what our record has been with regard to the crisis in that area.

I might agree, Mr. President, that the President of the United States is obviously right when he says that two wrongs do not make a right. But adding up all the mistakes and wrongs of which the United States has been guilty in the Middle East for many months past does not make a right American policy in the Middle East, either.

In my judgment, the President cannot escape a full share of the responsibility for the crisis in the Middle East because he himself has failed to exercise the leadership that I think this country and the world had a right to expect of him for some time past.

The President spoke last night about the importance of conformity to the resolutions of the United Nations and to truces which have been negotiated by the United Nations.

ISRAEL'S PROVOCATIONS IGNORED

Any one of us who believes in government by law on a domestic plane must agree that we cannot have government by law on an international plane unless there is compliance with the law. But we cannot dismiss the factual situation in the Middle East merely by resort to the maxim that two wrongs do not make a right, because we are not, in my judgment, confronted with a situation in which a country that has participated in an aggressive course of action is demanding certain conditions or guaranties before she desists from that course of action. It does not tell the whole story. I think the President tried to oversimplify the problem in his speech and attempted to leave the American people with the impression that that is the basic principle involved.

I have said many times in the Senate and elsewhere that we cannot condone Israel's violation of the United Nations resolutions and the United Nations negotiated truce; certainly I do not condone it; but I think it is important that we understand the provocations which have produced some of the violations. It is important, also, that we understand the pattern of violations which has come to characterize the situation in the Middle East. For a long time past the Arab countries have had very strong totalitarian fingers on the economic throat of Israel, and they have been choking Israel to death. The very economic survival of Israel depends on whether we can bring to an end the type of economic wrong which the Arab states have been committing against Israel, such as the boycott, the Suez Canal discrimination, and denial of the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli ships.

So, Mr. President, that leads me to comment on an observation which the President made last night in his speech in which he told only a part of the story. I respectfully say he left a false impression with many of his hearers, and once his audience gets all the facts about this particular point, we will find them saying, Oh, I did not understand that.

The President in his speech commented upon the Gulf of Aqaba being international waters and made it clear that the United States is taking the position that we will protect our interests in the gulf. But what about the interests of Israel? Is the President of the United States, as asked by the Senator from Minnesota, ready to take the position that the doctrine of freedom of the seas applies to other free nations as well as to the United States? Are we ready to take the position outside the United Nations that we will protect our shipping in the Gulf of Aqaba and will also protect that of Israel if Egypt proceeds to move against Israeli shipping going through the gulf?

The Straits of Tiran are of vital importance to the economic lifeline of Israel. What assurance do we have from the President's speech or under any resolution thus far adopted by the United Nations that Israel has any reason to believe that her shipping through those straits is going to be protected?

NO INDICATION OF ANY ARAB COMMITMENTS

The Senator from Minnesota had something to say about oil. I suspect that there will be no oil guaranties to Europe and, therefore, indirectly, to the United States, on the part of the Arab countries any more than there will be guaranties to Israel protecting her territorial integrity.

I think that now is the time to find out, Mr. President, whether this is true. That is why I have taken the position with reference to the Eisenhower resolution known as the Eisenhower doctrine in the Middle East, that commitments ought to be obtained now before the fact, before the resolution is adopted. Commitments ought to be made a part of the resolution that will bear upon the causes of the threats to peace in the Middle East on the part of the Arab countries as well as Israel.

That is why I said yesterday that I hoped when the President talked to the American people he would inform them of what understandings or commitments he entered into with the King of Saudi Arabia, because American foreign policy does not belong to the President of the United States; it belongs to the American people. They should know now, before public opinion finally crystalizes on this resolution, what commitments, if any, the President of the United States made to the King of Saudi Arabia, and what commitments, if any, were made in return.

What assurances, if any, did he get from the King of Saudi Arabia that the King has changed his mind about his threat to sacrifice 10 million Arabs, if necessary, to wipe Israel off the face of the globe? What commitments, if any, will the President ask from Nasser, of Egypt, in regard to Nasser's future conduct, not only in connection with the Straits of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba, but also in regard to border raids in the Gaza Strip?

ARAB STATES CONTINUE TO MENACE ISRAEL

Oh, I know it is easy for us, thousands of miles away, to say to the only beachhead of freedom in the whole Middle East—to which, as the Senator from Minnesota said, we helped give birth—"You must pull back now and place your reliance upon the United Nations in this matter."

I agree with the President that Israel and the Arab countries will have to recognize the importance of abiding by a system of government by law. But we simply have to face the reality of the situation, as the Senator from Minnesota said, because the State of Israel really has been fighting for its very survival against the discriminatory tax sanctions imposed upon it by the Arab States for a long time past. So Israel is disturbed about some of the wrongs which the United States has committed against her in the Middle East.

I can speak of this from the record, because I was one of the first on the floor of the Senate, months and months ago, to protest the shipment of any military equipment to the Arab States by the United States. I did not buy then, and I do not buy now, the alibi of the Secretary of State that it was done in order to keep down internal disorder, or the threat of internal disorder, and to be available in case of a Russian aggression.

Let us consider the standpoint of Israel when, at the same time shipments of arms to Israel were denied, Israel saw certain Arab States increase their military strength with American help. Israel could not quite understand that double standard. She cannot understand it now. Many of her people cannot understand the unilateral action on

the part of this administration in proposing the Eisenhower doctrine outside the United Nations.

EISENHOWER DOCTRINE BYPASSES UNITED NATIONS

The portion of the President's speech last night which was a plea to protect the United Nations and to keep the United Nations strong was very interesting. I respectfully ask the President again, as I have in many speeches, Why are we not developing a United Nations doctrine in the Middle East, instead of an Eisenhower doctrine? Why, if the President thinks it is so important to keep the United Nations strong, does he weaken the United Nations? That, in my opinion, is exactly what the Eisenhower doctrine does, by developing a United States course of action in the Middle East in respect to those issues we want to select for unilateral action.

I think one of the wrongs, added to the others which the President cannot add up to get a right policy for the United States in the Middle East, is the wrong of the United States in proposing unilateral action, when what we ought to have been doing for many months past was to have used the great prestige of the President of the United States in the United Nations to try to get the free nations of the United Nations to join together in assuring the Arab countries and assuring Israel that if there should be a Russian attack upon them, the free nations would stand together in their defense. That could be done under the United Nations through General Assembly procedures by the free member nations binding themselves together in such a concerted course of action. That is how the United Nations might really be strengthened.

But what do we hear from the Secretary of State about that kind of proposal? The Arab leaders would not like it. The Arab leaders apparently prefer the unilateral action on the part of the United States as being more in their interest.

I believe it a great mistake to let the totalitarian Arab leaders dictate any phase of American foreign policy. I do not become so excited as some other persons about the dire consequences of losing, for the time being, access to Arab oil. Let the Arab leaders swim in their own oil. I think there is about as much danger of the Arab leaders turning their oil reserve over to Russia as there is that I will leave this Chamber, go to the other end of the city and lift the Washington Monument onto my back, and dump it into the Potomac River. The Arab leaders know what will happen to them if they permit Russia to come into their area and take their oil. I am still waiting for the first administration witness who is willing to testify that there is any reason to believe that Russia would attempt to take the oil by military aggression.

Mr. President, we are being subjected to hysteria; and, in my judgment, the President's speech last night did not lessen the hysteria, but increased it. I think there ought to have been discussion, such as the Senator from Minnesota engaged in this afternoon, about the sanctions already imposed, and I believe unjustifiably imposed. The President in his speech ought to have made it clear to the Arab countries and to Israel that the United States has no intention of standing by within the United Nations and not insisting upon United Nations action if aggression continues in the Middle East between the Arab countries and Israel.

One of the false assumptions of the President's speech is that the wrongdoer is Israel alone, when the fact is—and it is an ugly fact—that Israel has been joined in the wrongdoing, in relation to the United Nations, by other Middle East countries—by Egypt, in particular, and by Jordan.

The Senator from Minnesota is quite correct when he speaks about what the resolutions passed by the United Nations really mean. I think his analysis of the resolutions is correct. They do not have the effect which the President in his speech last night indicated they had.

Furthermore, we cannot escape the fact that for some time Egypt and Jordan have been in violation of the United Nations resolutions and mandates, as have Russia and also India. Those ugly facts cannot be dismissed simply by a statement in the form of a generality or a maxim that two wrongs do not make a right.

In my judgment, what is needed now, in the few hours which remain before the imposition of sanctions, is that this adminstration exercise a leadership in the United Nations which it has not exercised for a long time, by making clear that we insist that Israel withdraw her troops, but also that the free nations join with us in the United Nations in support of a resolution which will serve clear notice upon Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and all the other Arab countries, that if they continue an aggressive course of action in carrying out their oft-repeated threats to wipe Israel off the face of the map, they will find themselves opposed by the free nations of the world—oil or no oil.

CONCERN FOR OIL IS DETERMINING ADMINISTRATION POLICY

I make this further comment about oil, Mr. President: We need to conserve it; we do not have any to waste. But, in the interest of peace, until a settling-down process over this crisis can occur, I believe it would be better for us to give assurance to our friends in Europe that we shall help provide for such time as may be necessary an adequate supply of oil to them, in the absence of Arab oil, until we can work out this problem with the Arabs. Mr. President, I wonder what the King of Saudi Arabia and what the other Arab countries which have a reserve of $98,400,000,000 worth of oil will do if the oil royalties are suspended for a time.

I regret that I have to say that I believe oil is of great importance in determining United States foreign policy in the Middle East. I think that is unfortunate, because there are involved in the Middle East great ideals and great principles which are more important and more valuable, in terms of history, than Arab oil. I, for one, am perfectly willing to take the position that we will help the Arab countries and we will work out with them an economic program and a program of military protection; but there will have to be commitments before the fact by the Arab countries before we pass any joint resolution pledging American boys to die in the Middle East in defense of Arab oil, and to do so alone, without corresponding commitments from the European countries which will be the direct beneficiaries of the oil.

I think these ideals and principles could well have been commented on by the President last night, in place of a speech which left with many of his hearers the impression that Israel, and Israel alone, stands out today as the wicked country in the Middle East.

As the Senator from Minnesota has said in connection with his statement of intentions regarding future speeches, so let me say that I, too, shall discuss this matter at greater length in a series of speeches next week, as I take up one issue after another in connection with the Middle East crisis, in making my record against what I believe to be the most dangerous foreign policy which ever has been proposed by any administration during my 12 years of service in the Senate of the United States.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

---

## OPPOSITION BY THE UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE TO FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at this time I wish to make a few brief comments on a press statement which disturbs me very much. The press statement which emanated yesterday from the United States Chamber of Commerce carries a report of testimony by the United States Chamber of Commerce to the House Education Subcommittee in which the chamber of commerce contended that America has a surplus, rather than a shortage, of schools. I submit that this is perhaps the most fictitious objection to Federal financial aid for schools yet raised by its diehard opponents.

Of course, Mr. President, it is not surprising that such an objection should come from a spokesman for the United States Chamber of Commerce, because if I were to phrase a motto for that organization, based upon its record, as I have observed it, in the field of social-welfare legislation and economic legislation designed to promote the welfare of the American people, the motto for the United States Chamber of Commerce, based upon its record, would be "Profits for big business, at the expense of human welfare." Mr. President, the opposition of the United States Chamber of Commerce to a program of Federal aid to education, as its opposition was set forth in the testimony given by the spokesman of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the chairman of its committee on education, Mr. Thomas A. Ballantine, of Louisville, Ky., proves my point.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article entitled "Schoolroom Crisis Denied," which was published yesterday in the Washington Star. The article begins with the following statement:

The United States Chamber of Commerce said today there is no critical national shortage of classrooms. It regards Federal aid for school construction unwise and unnecessary. It produced figures to indicate an actual surplus of 14,000 classrooms.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of February 20, 1957]

SCHOOLROOM CRISIS DENIED

The United States Chamber of Commerce said today there is no critical national shortage of classrooms. It regards Federal aid for school construction "unwise and unnecessary." It produced figures to indicate an actual surplus of 14,000 classrooms.

The chamber's position was presented to a House Education subcommittee by Thomas A Ballantine, of Louisville, Ky., chairman of the Chamber of Commerce Committee on Education.

He said in prepared testimony:

"It is the consensus of business in this country that the States and their communities are responsible for, and able to finance the development of the school systems required by their citizens."

Mr. Ballentine added that Federal help "would lead inevitably to the transformation of public education from a State and local function to one increasingly directed by the Federal Government."

He added that "no critical national shortage in classrooms has been or can be demonstrated to exist."

The House committee has before it an administration bill which would provide for $1.3 billion in Federal aid for school construction over the next 4 years. Other proposals also are under committee consideration.

Mr. Ballantine said a report by the United States Office of Education states 63,000 new classrooms were built in the year ending last fall. About 49,000 of these would have taken care of the report's estimated enrollment increase of 1 million and its estimated figure of 14,000 for abandoned classrooms, he said.

That, he added, leaves a surplus of 14,000 classrooms for "pupils in excess of enrollment capacity."

Mr. Ballantine said these classrooms would be expected to reduce the excess pupil figure, but contended the report shows an increase in the number of excess pupils.

He said Oveta Culp Hobby, former Secretary of Education, indicated in 1953 a deficit of 312,000 classrooms, and said "this deficit was increasing." But, he added, in 1955 Mrs. Hobby said the deficit was declining and the classroom need by 1959–60 would drop to 176,000 classrooms.

The current report from the Office of Education, Mr. Ballantine continued, indicates the deficit has declined "faster than predicted by Mrs. Hobby" and that as of last fall, the deficit was 159,000 classrooms.

"Thus," he said, "in 3 years it appears from the new figures that the States and their communities have accomplished considerably more than was predicted to happen in 6 years, according to the testimony 2 years ago."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, according to that report, the chamber of commerce finds that of the 63,000 classrooms built last year, 49,000 will accommodate the enrollment increase of 1 million and also will make up for the 14,000 rooms which were abandoned. Mr. President, if we wish to find a good, classic example of the old saying that statistics do not lie, but liars sometimes use statistics, that statement by the United States Chamber of Commerce affords such an example, because, Mr. President, I ask you to note the fallacy in the statistical base that witness used. I repeat it:

The chamber of commerce finds, according to the report, that of the 63,000 classrooms built last year, 49,000 will accommodate the enrollment increase of 1 million and also will make up for the 14,000 rooms which were abandoned. Therefore, the chamber spokesman finds a surplus of 14,000 classrooms built last year, and contends that the shortage is being caught up so rapidly as to make Federal aid unnecessary.

If the chamber found that the construction program of last year kept pace with the needs which arose last year alone, its spokesman conveniently ignored the backlog of construction which remains. As late as last month, when the President himself sent us a special message on school needs, he stated:

Today there are enrolled in our public schools about 2¼ million children in excess of the normal capacity of the buildings in use.

Parenthetically, Mr. President, let me say that this is the overcrowding extant after the chamber of commerce has done its figuring.

The chamber takes so much comfort from last year's record that it finds no need for help from the Federal Government. Its statement to the subcommittee concludes that the classroom shortage is being caught up with much faster than was estimated in 1953, when the Office of Education found the country needed 312,000 classrooms.

I would point out to the chamber that its statistics are based on the assumption that once every school-age child is somehow crammed or jammed into a schoolroom, the fight is over. They ignore the 840,000 children attending school only part time, due to inadequate facilities or the shortage of teachers. They ignore the 22 percent of all elementary-school children in urban districts who attend full time, but in classrooms averaging 35 or more pupils. If limited to 30 pupils, which are as many as can properly be handled, these elementary schools alone would need 30,500 more rooms. They ignore the impact of the wartime population increase on the high schools, which is only now being felt, and which has not yet been met.

I suggest that the United States Chamber of Commerce is once again displaying its knowledge of prices and its ignorance of values.

Some weeks ago, Mr. President, the executive secretary of the Oregon Education Association, Mr. Cecil Posey, addressed himself to the national chamber of commerce, taking issue with the survey on which the chamber's opposition to Federal aid was based, and concluding that—

It would seem that the United States Chamber is almost frantically and emotionally upset in this particular area.

I agree with Mr. Posey, and I ask that his letter be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
*Portland, Oreg., January 10, 1957.*

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,
*United States Chamber of Commerce,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIRS: The interest of the United States Chamber of Commerce in the public-school system of this Nation is much appreciated by those of us who are working to improve the public-school program in this Nation.

However, I am of the belief that such materials as presented in the December 1956 issue of News and Cues is not only detrimental to the public schools in this country but to the United States Chamber of Commerce. Such statements as that in the second paragraph on page 1—"Far from convinced that a general 'Federal aid to school construction' program is needed for all communities and all States"—is something constructed by the person who edits the News and Cues.

I am quite well acquainted with all the materials relating to the Federal aid for school-construction program and I have never heard anyone advocate that Federal aid is needed in all communities and in all States. If the United States Chamber wishes to oppose the school program, it should be very careful in statements to present the program as advocated by the proponents of Federal aid to school construction.

Likewise, I seriously question the survey of school needs being undertaken by the chamber. In the State of Oregon our greatest needs are arising in suburban areas where there are no local chambers or business groups of any kind. These are largely bedroom areas. I am rather surprised that the United States Chamber would question the program in the various 48 State departments of public instruction.

There is much more to be said, but suffice it to say that perhaps no group is more interested in Federal subsidies than the various chambers of commerce in the various States. It would seem that the United States Chamber is almost fanatically and emotionally upset in this particular area.

Sincerely yours,
C. W. POSEY, *Executive Secretary.*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the administration's proposal and the other school-aid bills pending in both Houses of Congress are intended to catch up with the classroom shortage within 5 or 6 years, and then terminate. I strongly favor prompt passage of such emergency measures; but of course I regard that objective alone as totally inadequate, as the permanent, general aid bill sponsored by myself and the Senator from Pennsylvania testifies.

I regret that the United States Chamber of Commerce continues to take such a reactionary position on this matter of educating our children, and I hope the Congress will soon override this fallacious objection by passing a school-construction bill at an early date.

Mr. President, I am proud to stand today on the floor of the Senate and once again raise my voice in defense of the educational needs of America's boys and girls, because I regard them and their education as being of vital importance to the future security of our Nation.

I wish to say that every businessman who belongs to the United States Cham-

ber of Commerce should recognize before it is too late that we cannot afford to fall behind Russia in the development of brainpower. We cannot keep up with Russia in manpower; but our whole system of economic and political freedom is dependent, I believe, upon our keeping ahead of Russia in the development of our brainpower. Therefore, Mr. President, I completely repudiate the testimony given on yesterday by the United States Chamber of Commerce, and I label it antisocial.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment until tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, February 22, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 21, 1957:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Edward Foss Wilson, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, vice James B. Mintener, resigned.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress, and title 10, United States Code, section 3292:

*To be captain*

Chilcoat, William J., JAGC, O533421.
Horton, Warren H., JAGC, O1117881.
Richardson, James W., Jr., JAGC, O2271278.
Sandison, Richard L., MSC, O1848912.

*To be first lieutenant*

Goddard, Ross M., Jr., JAGC, O2275446.
Greene, Hazel L., Jr., MSC, O2050490.
Huntsman, Howard A., Jr., MSC, O995793.
Lakes, Cecil T., JAGC, O2203778.
McNab, James F., MSC, O1314936.
Murphy, Eugene J., JAGC, O2266939.
Newman, Stanley, MSC, O2274009.
Smith, Roy R., MSC, O1941537.
Staples, Jack E., MSC, O2205819.
Trushel, David H., JAGC, O2277873.

*To be second lieutenants*

Capitolo, Phillip G., MSC, O4019462.
Dacus, Lester H., MSC, O4071445.
Evans, Billy W., MSC, O2272537.
Glenn, Dwight W., MSC, O4004858.
Hubert, Alexander A., MSC, O2271540.
Piper, Donald R., MSC, O4002504.
Russell, James L., Jr., MSC, O2270349.
Stiles, Peter W., MSC, O4006300.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress.

*To be first lieutenants*

Ackerman, David G., O2265041.
Burnett, Otis E., O994761.
Burt, Donald L., O990133.
Butler, Elbert L., Jr., O1876460.
Conway, Donald J., O1885757.
Easton, Byron S., O2030432.
Elliott, Robert H., Jr., O2205676.
Elmore, Donald J., O1931800.
Fox, John G., O1926490.
Gardner, Morris L., O1914696.
Georger, John F., O1340362.
Gerard, Robert J., O1925174.
Gittleman, Warren E., O2033020.
Hembree, Jack E., O1929091.
Husa, Richard F., O1935134.
Hyde, Richard G., O1930880.
Irvin, Matthew W., O1917990.
Johnson, Robert R., O2211367.
Keller, George A., O2206215.
Kotite, Richard S., O1338355.
Lancaster, William A., O1885155.
Logan, Donald G., O4009088.
MacMillan, William D., IV, O1341021.
May, Edwin M., Jr., O1925946.
McIntyre, Lawrence A., O1874708.
Meyer, Frederick F., Jr., O1883990.
Michel, Werner E., O1329861.
Miller, David C., O1884010.
Moffett, Norman A., O4018679.
Myers, Lawrence S., O2104321.
Olson, Arthur G., O1881035.
Palmer, George E., O1881689.
Pedersen, Alfred L., O1926314.
Phillips, Shepperd H., O2004109.
Pritchett, Robert G., O1339310.
Puckhaber, Herman F., Jr., O1915506.
Reade, John C., Jr., O4005347.
Rolya, William I., O1913301.
Routon, Lewis A., O1877271.
Schultz, Reed S., O1936073.
Shelby, Roy E., O1885773.
Sleeper, Julian R., O1919999.
Smith, William D., O2266060.
Specker, Robert W., O1872364.
Stevenson, William J., O1936725.
Stidham, James A., O970475.
Strawn, William M., Jr., O2021145.
Suess, Philip M., Jr., O1885898.
Tourtillott, Raymond J., O1885799.
Vidrick, Robert L., O4001758.
Wagers, Robert W., O2102796.
Wallace, Robert G., O2265108.
Whelan, William E., O1933684.
Wight, Jermy B., O995359.
Willey, Oliver A., Jr., O1922603.
Williams, Roy L., Jr., O1894209.

*To be second lieutenants*

Abruzzese, John P., O4064770.
Adams, Donald S., O4075629.
Adams, George B., O4070125.
Aicken, Larry B., O4070126.
Allman, John W., Jr., O4060418.
Amerson, Hinton S., O4076143.
Amos, Julian E., O4075774.
Anderson, Douglas F., O4076265.
Anderson, Duane F., O4065812.
Anderson, George W., O4061598.
Anderson, Valjean C., O4058239.
Applewhite, Ray, O988526.
Baldwin, Robert C., O4047218.
Balint, Barry T. J., O4047383.
Barnes, Frederick, O4064280.
Barnes, Theodore F., O4066020.
Barnette, Bobby L.
Barry, John W., O4083179.
Beaube, George P., O4023721.
Bird, Max R., O4061653.
Birdsong, Edward M., Jr., O4069632.
Blaker, William J., O4077255.
Bockman, Leonard I., O4023860.
Boll, Albert F., O4068917.
Bonner, Benjamin J., III, O4061498.
Booth, John P., III, O4077052.
Brill, James H., O4066030.
Brister, Delano R., O4071637.
Broder, Nathan S., O4066105.
Brookhart, Edgar W., O4065265.
Brown, Charles H., O4083440.
Brown, Fred D., O4063257.
Brown, Robert M., O4066240.
Brown, Roy A., O4071915.
Brylla, Charles W., O4061493.
Campbell, Donald A., O4068841.
Campbell, Joseph R., O4070150.
Cann, Donald C., O4066596.
Carson, Lawrence E.
Cei, Peter G., Jr., O4071520.
Chesley, Arthur P., O4083319.
Cleary, Arthur C., O4003248.
Codd, Nicholas J., Jr., O4065726.
Coffee, Edwin F., Jr., O4070432.
Coffman, Richard L., O4061814.
Correll, Ralph T., O4060549.
Cover, John P., O4070053.
Cox, Randall S., O4061731.
Craig, Joe H., O4063164.
Croft, John A., O4068541.
Crowe, James L., O4083508.
Curran, Jan D., O4066400.
Davis, Warren L., O4068883.
Delandro, Donald J., O4071287.
Del Vecchio, John, Jr., O4066604.
Ditman, William D., O4069641.
DiValentino, Leo E., O4068638.
Dougherty, Maurice F., O4066114.
Dowling, Donald J., O4076595.
Dreeben, Lionel, O4070248.
Druit, Clifford A., O4071628.
Dunn, James E., O4083458.
Dvorak, Philip J., O4017546.
Eastwood, Clifford A., Jr., O4071850.
Einsein, Aleksander, O4031215.
Engram, Edwin J., O4023793.
Esplin, Willard B., O4013878.
Feeney, Richard L., 4067817.
Fennell, George R., Jr., O4083341.
Finley, Jerry D., O4061715.
Fiorentino, William J., O4064806.
Foard, John B., III, O4065684.
Ford, Wilbur E., Jr.
Frisbie, James G., O4063175.
Garrett, James W., O4077092.
Garside, Robert E., O4065298.
Gately, Michael P., O4064813.
Gayler, Earl D., O4075643.
Giles, George E., O4049663.
Gilmore, Joseph R.
Givhan, Walter H., O4083473.
Glover, Richard R., O4059936.
Goetz, George W., O4065823.
Gonzalez, Alvaro R., O4066048.
Green, David E., O4011928.
Greenwalt, James P., O4030908.
Greer, Richard B., O4013302.
Gross, Woolf P., O4064923.
Gullen, John P., O4066122.
Hallinan, James M., Jr., O4068648.
Harbuck, Edwin C., O4049660.
Harbuck, Eugene L., O4075647.
Hardegree, Bobby L., O4075648.
Harig, John A., Jr., O4047660.
Harris, Bruce R., O4075255.
Harwig, Donald H., O4061421.
Hatch, Vernon L., O4071546.
Heckman, Richard T., O4047283.
Hemminger, Girard L., O4071699.
Hickerson, Arville L.
Higgins, Alan R., O4017289.
High, Charles S., W2206308.
Hilgeman, Charles E., Jr., O4068323.
Hilton, Jimmie L., O4061648.
Hinkleman, Robert S., O4047228.
Hinspeter, William L., O4069849.
Hodges, Charles E., O4075334.
Hodkinson, Peter, III, O4075650.
Hoffman, William J., O4009886.
Hollister, Myron P., O4076896.
Holt, Richard L., O4061585.
Houlis, Harry S., O4065882.
Houston, Joseph B., Jr., O4061896.
Hunt, Byron W., O4077203.
Irwin, James T., O4068386.
Israel, Glenn A., O4061668.
James, William N., O4071632.
Johanknecht, George P., O4076928.
Johnson, Gerald K., O4063166.
Jones, Glenn W., O4009366.
Kane, Eugene R., O4064827.
Kennedy, Irvin D., O4060465.
King, James A., Jr., O4064424.
King, Thomas H., O4076931.
Kinney, Philip R., O999600.
Kirkmire, Nicholas J., O4076482.
Kite, John C., O4069432.
Knapper, Aubrey L., O4070551.
Kramer, Bryce R.
Krome, Alan, O4070499.
Lackey, Lyman A., Jr., O4063418.
Ladd, John P., O4060472.
Lake, Howard K., Jr.
Landry, Bernard A., O4065556.
Larimer, Charles L.
Laughbon, Richard W., O4077116.

Leath, Lewis T., O4063167.
Leckinger, Paul A., O4060451.
Lehner, William J., Jr., O4065957.
Lingaitis, Francis V., O4066358.
Lizardo, Alex R., O4010417.
Lockwood, Willard E., O4076021.
Logan, Rodney W., O4052597.
Losik, Robert C., O4060246.
Lyons, Calvin G., O4069581.
Maass, Charles G., O4083489.
Madigan, John J., III, O4001030.
Maguire, James E., O4065750.
Marguccio, Robert G., O4065686.
Marx, Thomas J., O4066419.
Massey, Oran A., O4061647.
McAden, Henry J., Jr., O4068906.
McClain, Robert C., O4068470.
McClain, Terrence W., O4075424.
McCreery, John L., O4061511.
McCullough, James A., O4060230.
McDonald, Robert E., Jr., O4075293.
McDowell, Robert C., O4069655.
McKinney, Collin J., Jr., O4060147.
McKinney, Horatio W., O4060528.
McLaughlin, James J., O4064607.
McLaughlin, Thomas J., O4006461.
McLeod, David S., O4083442.
Mendenhall, Robert L., O2206144.
Merrick, Philip B., O4006743.
Meyer, Allan E., O4071771.
Miller, Spencer R.
Milliron, Joseph F., O4066067.
Morey, William S.
Mulvanity, Donald C., O2028393.
Murphy, Clifton M., O4047335.
Murray, Jackson S., O4065896.
Nobriga, Gordon H., O4077065.
O'Rourke, Lewis C.
Osa, Nelson, O4065228.
Owen, Thomas D., Jr., O4063240.
Owens, Ronald E., O4069584.
Paas, Alfred O., O4061868.
Padgett, David H., Jr., O4075596.
Palermo, Frank J., Jr., O4009718.
Parham, Byron A. P., O4049531.
Parker, Richard G., O4066266.
Perry, James R., O4066794.
Pertain, George H., Jr., O4076150.
Peterson, Walter R., Jr., O4075672.
Pharr, Joe B., O4063242.
Pierce, Isaiah B., Jr., O4068937.
Pinkston, William R., Jr., O4076100.
Powers, Max L., O4061531.
Price, Roger J., O4059909.
Quinlan, Richard J., O4076705.
Ragains, Robert L., O4015962.
Raines, Fred B.
Randolph, William M., O4052617.
Reedy, Henry J.
Reeves, George E., O4061599.
Reichel, James E., O4061646.
Reicker, Frederick A., O4077187.
Robinson, Thonius, Jr., O4071881.
Roddy, Robert E., O4077130.
Rodenmayer, John P., O4076938.
Rogers, Roland B., O4009580.
Rupp, James E., O4051364.
Sanches, Manuel L., O4061845.
Sandstrum, Allan W., O4050615.
Schessler, Donald R.
Schober, Frank J., Jr., O4076712.
Schofield, David G., O4075447.
Schuler, James D., O4061108.
Selch, Glenn C., O4061082.
Sherron, Gene T., O4013188.
Shilko, Edwin M., O4010601.
Shuman, John N., O4043385.
Siegel, Lewis A., O4066801.
Sinagra, Robert L., O4066142.
Smith, John A., O4000757.
Snyder, Harold B., Jr., O4070284.
Solley, Charles W., O4083293.
Spinelli, Michael A., O4059373.
Spry, Alfred E., O4006472.
Squires, Myron E., O4075911.
Stevenson, Thomas A., O1880783.
Stewart, William R., O4066085.
Stone, Frank R., Jr., O4071938.
Stotser, George R., O4075336.
Stringer, Paul G., O4060454.
Stuart, James R., O4076502.
Swift, John B., O4070219.
Tengler, John A., O4049157.
Thomas, Harry L., O4071474.
Tieken, Richard V., O4075790.
Townsend, Merton L., O4061110.
Tunmire, Dana, O4023736.
Ulrich, Charles F., O4003899.
Vaughn, William V., Jr., O4063161.
Ventzek, Robert E., O4047448.
Vetterling, John M., O4071731.
Wahl, Don D., O4061249.
Wakefield, Donald Y., O4049196.
Walker, Peter H., O4051351.
Ward, Jerry E., O4071919.
Watke, Frederic W., O4060279.
Watts, Ronald L., O4061532.
Welch, Larry L., O4071621.
Wetherington, Bernard J., O4083171.
Whitt, Lawrence H., O4071261.
Wiersema, Kenneth E., O4077123.
Williams, Lawrence A., O4006378.
Wilson, Parks W., Jr., O1940088.
Wiser, Bobbie M., O4061645.
Wojtal, Robert J., O4060752.
Woods, Robert D., O4071899.
Young, Charles D., O4063163.
Zickel, Raymond E., O4047341.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. William M. Callaghan, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 21, 1957:

UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York, to be representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John M. Allison, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Indonesia.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mansfield D. Sprague, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

E. Perkins McGuire, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Robert Dechert, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Vice Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Personnel and Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel in the Department of the Navy for a term of 1 year in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 5141, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of vice admiral while so serving.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Arthur Larson, of Pennsylvania, to be Director of the United States Information Agency.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

Laird Bell, of Illinois, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for the term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1960, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Dorothy McCullough Lee, of Oregon, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the term expiring August 9, 1961.

Thomas James Donegan, of New York, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for remainder of term expiring April 9, 1957.

BOARD OF PAROLE

Eva Kelly Bowring, of Nebraska, to be a Member of the Board of Parole for a term expiring September 30, 1958.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Leon H. A. Pierson, of Maryland, to be United States attorney for the district of Maryland for a term of 4 years.

Chester A. Weidenburner, of New Jersey, to be United States attorney for the district of New Jersey for a term of 4 years.

Albert M. Morgan, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the northern district of West Virginia for a term of 4 years.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Antonio C. Baza, of Guam, to be United States marshal for the district of Guam for a term of 4 years.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as lieutenant general:

Maj. Gen. Donald Prentice Booth, O16395, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962;

*To be lieutenant generals*

Lt. Gen. Walter Leo Weible, O11308, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army).

Lt. Gen. William Kelly Harrison, Jr., O5279, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Ralph Julian Canine, O7154, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army).

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Brig. Gen. Marvin Edward Kennebeck, 18819A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), United States Air Force, for temporary appointment as major general in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10, of the United States Code.

The nominations of Peter John Huggard, Jr., and 3,411 other officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 8298, 8299, and 8304, title 10, United States Code, which were received by the Senate on January 14, 1957, were confirmed today, with the exception of the nomination of Ellis Verne Widney, 13137A, and the nomination of John David Vanderveer, nominated to be majors, which were this day withdrawn by the President, and

The nominations of Maj. Gen. Dean Coldwell Strother and 377 other officers for appointment in the United States Air Force, and/or the Regular Air Force, which were today confirmed, were received by the Senate on January 14, 1957.

These nominations, which total 3,790, appear in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 14, 1957, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Peter John Huggard, Jr., which appears in the second column, page 527, and ending with the name of Edward F. Williams III, which is the last nomination in the second group mentioned, and which is shown in the second column on page 542 of the RECORD.

IN THE NAVY AND THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of 9,534 officers for appointment in the Navy, and 2,016 nominations for appointment in the Marine Corps, a total of 11,550 nominations in both services, were confirmed today, and appear in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 14, 1957, under caption "Nominations,"

beginning with the nomination of Vice Adm. Robert Goldthwaite, United States Navy, which appears in the second column of page 542 of the RECORD, and ending with the name of Robert C. Sebilian, which is the last nomination in the Marine Corps, and which is shown on page 568.

### WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate February 21, 1957:

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

Ellis Verne Widney, 13137A, and John David Vanderveer, 15027A, to be majors in the Regular Air Force.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. David H. Cole, First Universalist Church, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Spirit of God, at this moment of great tension in the world, we seek Thy wisdom and perspective as we face the task of legislating order out of the chaos of our world existence. May we be aware of how much of the divisiveness of our times is our creation; let us, therefore, have a sense of humility before the stupidities of the past.

Too often, O God, we have taken it for granted that we are on Thy side in building Thy kingdom on earth. Make us painfully aware that the creation of a heaven of peace or a hell of conflagration is in our hands. Let us be so sensitive to the appalling alternatives that this body will display a kind of wisdom seldom in evidence in any hall of government.

Inspire us to rise above concerns that are provincial and narrow; challenge us to see the good that we can do for all mankind, fire us with such an enthusiasm for brotherhood that we seek to serve the needs of all peoples rather than simply nations; lead us in the direction that will make in our time the conditions that will enable the human race to live as one humanity, dwelling in peace and freedom.

We pray in the name of the God of love and in the confidence that the spirit of love alone is sufficient to rule our lives and our Nation and our world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 348. An act to amend section 12 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676), relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, by providing for the use of public lands granted to the States therein for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishings, equipment, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said States.

### APPROPRIATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES, 1958

Mr. MAGNUSON (on behalf of Mr. KIRWAN) from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 5189) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 145), which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JENSEN reserved all points of order on the bill.

### ISRAELI-EGYPTIAN CRISIS

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, what I know about foreign affairs could be recorded in less than the 1 minute which has been yielded me. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, one need not be an expert in this field to know that the world is troubled with the Israeli-Egyptian crisis. Because of it the chance of maintaining peace is fleeting by the hour.

It concerns me, Mr. Speaker, that up until now I have not heard nor have I read of any within the Congress recognized as expert in the field of foreign affairs who has given support to the President in his effort to bring peace in the Israeli-Egyptian dispute.

His speech of last night was wonderful. His appeal for withdrawal of Israeli forces from Egyptian soil was based on sound logic. It was reasonable and temperate. It was—or at least should have been—reassuring to both Israel and Egypt.

I trust and urge that the leadership of Israel as well as that of Egypt will heed his appeal and that it will have the support of freedom-loving peoples of the entire world, particularly of the United States.

While I have on many occasions differed with the views of our President, on this point he has my support for whatever it is worth. I hope he will have the support, the undivided support, of this Congress—particularly those who are recognized as expert in the field of foreign affairs—in his effort to effect an immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces from Egyptian soil. Until that is done the peace of the world is endangered and for every passing day the dangers are multiplied.

### H. R. 4901, ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS FOR CORN

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 4901.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN. Reserving the right to object, is there opposition to this bill?

Mr. POAGE. Yes; there is a great deal of opposition.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the gentleman incorporate in his request that the minority may have the privilege of filing minority views?

Mr. POAGE. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I include that in my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

### CORN AND FEED GRAINS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the Committee on Agriculture favorably reported a bill to encourage the placing of land now devoted to the production of corn and of other feed grains in the soil bank. The vote in the committee was close, and, in general, those who represent the largest corn-producing districts voted against the bill. This seems to be a remarkable situation in view of the fact that the bill gives to corn the very treatment which these Representatives have asked. But it goes further and gives the same consideration to other farmers who have been growing feed grains, even those outside of the commercial corn area.

What do the corn people want, and how does this bill meet their demands?

First. They want a larger allotment. This bill gives them an arbitrary increase of approximately 6,000,000 acres over the allotment of 37,300,000 acres set for 1957 by the Department of Agriculture. No crop ever had such a handsome gift of acreage allotment. In fact, the bill sets the 1957 corn allotment at exactly the same level as existed last year—with which allotment close to 45 percent of all commercial corn farmers complied without any special inducement.

Second. They want to be able to place a substantial amount of acreage in the soil bank above their allotment.

This bill allows corn farmers to place 7,800,000 acres above their allotment in the soil bank. This means that corn farmers can cut their acreage from a farm base of 51,000,000 acres in 1957—just as they did in 1956—and be paid for it.

Third. Corn farmers want to be paid at corn prices whether they place corn or other feed grains in the soil bank.

This bill provides that if a corn farmer reduces any kind of feed grain, including soy beans or flaxseed, he will be paid at the corn rate. If every possible acre authorized by this bill were placed in the soil bank, corn farmers in the commercial corn area could earn over $300 million more than they can if the bill is not

passed Last year corn farmers actually collected $179 million for these practices.

Fourth. Corn farmers want to know that supports on compliance corn will not drop below 75 percent. It is clear that many farmers voted as they did in the referendum solely because they feared that Secretary Benson would reduce supports.

This bill continues the present 75 to 90 percent supports now in the law. There is no way under this bill whereby the Secretary of Agriculture can drop supports below the present minimum.

Fifth. Corn farmers want to be sure that corn remains a "basic commodity." This bill retains corn as one of the 6 basics and strengthens its position as such by according the same treatment in respect to the soil bank to all 6 basics.

This bill does for commercial corn all that its special pleaders have asked and more. It assures the corn producer who did not comply with acreage allotments last year that he can become eligible for both soil-bank and price-support payments under this program simply by reducing his corn acreage to the level of last year's allotment. The corn grower who did comply last year—45 percent of all commercial growers—will be eligible for the soil-bank payments at the corn rate by reducing his other feed grains, and will, of course, remain eligible for price supports.

These are all firm and clear-cut advantages which the farmers of the commercial corn area will receive from the passage of the committee bill. They include all the advantages which the Department's bill, or the original Andresen bill, offered to the commercial corn grower.

Why, then, should any representative of commercial corn oppose this bill? Frankly, I do not know. The only reason ever given during the long weeks of hearings and debate has been: "The corn people are faced by an emergency, and we should pass a bill which relates to commercial corn and to commercial corn alone." Of course, the commercial corn people face an emergency. They are going to have to plant within 2 or 3 months. They naturally want to know what the program will be. Likewise, the cotton people, the noncommercial corn people, the tobacco people, and other farmers all face an emergency. They must all—or at least 90 percent must—plant before the commercial corn farmers. In fact, cotton is being planted right now in south Texas. These farmers all want to know what the program will be just as commercial corn farmers want to know. The majority of the committee have tried to give all farmers an answer and to give it now. Does any commercial corn grower object to this?

It has repeatedly been pointed out that the problem of surplus corn was actually a problem of surplus feed—a bushel of corn raised in Texas, even though it is called noncommercial, increases the surplus just as does a bushel of commercial corn raised in Iowa. A hundred pounds of grain sorghum raised in Kansas or oats raised in Tennessee adds to our feed-grain supply and displaces higher priced commercial corn. Six hundred million bushels of corn were grown outside of the commercial area last year. Close to 100 million acres of farmland went into the production of feed grains other than corn. The departmental bill and most of the bills introduced by the representatives of the commercial corn area ignored this vast production of competitive feeds, although both Secretary Benson and Assistant Secretary McLain stated before the committee that we must control the whole field of feed grains if we were to hope to deal effectively with the surplus of commercial corn.

The committee bill attempts to offer some incentive plan to the farmer who does not live in the commercial corn area to put land now devoted to feed grains or noncommercial corn into the soil bank on a basis roughly comparable to that offered to the farmer who lives in the commercial corn area. Surely, no one who is seriously concerned with the existing surplus of corn could for a moment oppose this.

Why then do the representatives of commercial corn farmers resist so vigorously every effort to pass the committee bill. It is not because the bill fails to do for commercial corn what they say should be done. It does all they ask. Their own statements belie the thought that they might feel that a general effort to reduce the overall production of surplus feed grains would be injurious to commercial corn.

Could it be that their opposition is merely the result of their disinclination to extend to others the same kind of treatment they ask for themselves. It is true that this committee bill will allow cotton farmers and wheat farmers who have reduced their plantings of these or other basic crops by as much as 15 percent without any compensation, to put another 18 percent of their allotted acres in the soil bank, provided they thereby reduce their feed-grain acreage, but it allows corn farmers to do exactly the same thing except that the commercial corn farmer will have to take only about a 12-percent cut from history without pay. To believe that this is the real basis of opposition, one must assume that the commercial corn farmers and their spokesmen are adopting the attitude of the old man who prayed, "Lord, bless me and my wife, my son John and his wife, us four and no more." I refuse to attribute such an attitude to any group of American farmers.

Neither am I going to assume that this is just a case of refusing to support a good bill just because it has the wrong political brand on it. Especially do I feel that this cannot be the answer when I recall that the majority of the committee offered to let the bill come out with committee amendments broadening its scope but under the name of its Corn Belt author. This offer was rejected, and in an effort to avoid any implication that any member supported any subject matter which he did not support the chairman of the committee introduced a new bill, which is the one reported.

Finally, it seems unreasonable indeed to assume that Members could fail to understand the effect of a bill which was so fully discussed in the committee, but, since many Members were not present and did not hear the discussion, I have concluded that this is the most charitable interpretation of the present attitude.

I can understand the attitude of those who say there is no corn problem. I think they are mistaken, but, believing as they do, I can understand their opposition to any bill. I can even understand the opposition of those who feel that there is a problem, but who contend that the solution of the problem is too expensive. I do not share that view, but I know there are those who feel that way. But, Mr. Speaker, what I cannot understand is the attitude of those who say they recognize an emergency, who say that we need to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to reduce the production of corn in the commercial-corn area, and who turn right around and say that nobody's emergency should be considered except that of the commercial-corn producer, and that nothing should be done to reduce the ever-increasing production of surplus feed supplies, including the actual production of corn itself, outside a few favored States. If we are going to spend a quarter of a billion dollars fixing up the commercial-corn side of the water tank, does good business not require that we spend another hundred million plugging the leaks on the noncommercial side

For years I have heard the demands of the corn people that the farmers of the South and West should not be allowed to grow feed grain on diverted acres. In the past the southern farmer, like the western farmer, has been forced to grow feed grains on his diverted acres in order to live with his reduced allotments of cotton, wheat, and other basic crops. Now we have a soil bank. Last year it was, for practical purposes, applicable only to corn. Corn in the commercial area got 70 cents out of every dollar spent. Corn people now say that if they are to reduce their acres they must be allowed to place their diverted acres in the soil bank. This bill allows that, but it also allows cotton and wheat men to do the same, to the extent they reduce their feed grains. For the first time, we seem to have a really practicable method of enabling cotton and wheat farmers—and professional feed-grain farmers—to reduce their competition to corn; and, of all people, we find the commercial-corn growers—or their representatives—opposing the very things they have so long claimed they needed.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a confusing world.

## COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight Thursday to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## THE LEESBURG, FLA., CENTENNIAL

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Leesburg, which you were kind enough to visit last fall, will be celebrating its 100th anniversary from February 24 to March 2.

I am going to be there for this event, and I wish that all of you could go along with me to enjoy our wonderful weather and hospitality.

This is a significant occasion, and the citizens will make an all out effort to recall Leesburg's century of life and at the same time tell the world of its tourist, industrial and farming possibilities.

For weeks, the barbers around Leesburg have had lean pickings as its outstanding citizens have tried to grow beards as decorations for Centennial Week. I tried myself, Mr. Speaker, but had to give it up when I went on television in Orlando recently.

Incidentally, later this year, on October 5 to be exact, another city in my district, Orlando, will be 100 years old. And I hope there will be a big celebration, for it has a proud and glorious history.

But back to Leesburg. Here the citizens will recall past events and modes of living of 100 years ago. For days, they have been hunting for costumes and antiques to help them relive the period. There will be a big parade, a huge pageant and a whole week of activities.

Mr. Speaker, I would not miss this occasion for anything.

Leesburg, as you know, is known as "The Big Bass Capital of America." It is located in Lake County which has the distinction of having 1,400 named lakes, in addition to hundreds of privately owned small lakes. No other county in the United States can boast of such fine fishing conditions.

Leesburg itself is on the shores of two of Florida's largest lakes—Lake Griffin and Lake Harris.

As a Leesburg Chamber of Commerce pamphlet proudly points out, the Bass Capital of America is situated at the crossroads of central Florida on U. S. Highways 27 and 441. It is in the geographic center of the State and is headquarters for leisurely planned trips to the majority of the nationally known scenic attractions Florida has made possible.

There is a wide variety of accommodations available in the Leesburg area for the vacation minded including more than 25 fishing camps and resorts, motor courts, hotels and trailer courts, restaurants, and cafes.

There is no closed season on fishing or size limit since nature has provided the best of spawning conditions making it unnecessary to protect the fish during their breeding periods.

No matter where a fisherman may make his headquarters in the Leesburg area, a lake is readily accessible providing all types of fish and countless miles of lily pads.

Any resident 65 years of age or over is exempt from buying a fishing license, as is anyone under 16.

The lakes and canals around Leesburg also provide unlimited possibilities for the boating enthusiast. There are sponsored water trips, from day long jaunts up the picturesque Oklawaha River and terminating at beautiful Silver Springs, a must on anybody's vacation, to longer cruises.

The smooth waters of the lakes provide ideal conditions for sailing.

Due to the clean, dust-free and pollen-free atmosphere around Leesburg, hay fever sufferers are a rarity. Leesburg's year-round average temperature of 74 makes it an ideal place for those suffering with arthritis, rheumatism, heart condition and other diseases of an overtaxed system.

Leesburg has a large, modern, heated, and air-conditioned community building. Nearby are other recreational facilities such as a swimming pool complete with all the equipment necessary to insure the absolute enjoyment of young and old alike. Tennis, shuffleboard, horseshoes, and other sports are to be enjoyed. For the golfer, there is a modern 18-hole course open to visitors and members alike.

The founding of Leesburg stems from the arrival of Arthur Lee of Alabama in 1849 in nearby Sumter County. He had a large family of boys and girls. As life in the frontier country became safer from the Indians, the family spread.

In 1857, Evander Lee brought his 5 sons and 3 daughters to the promising area near the 2 large lakes of Griffin and Harris. Others of the family followed him, and thus began Leesburg.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Members of Congress will get opportunity one day to visit Leesburg and my Fifth Congressional District to see what we have to offer in the way of good living.

## TEST FLYING OVER POPULATED AREAS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to make an important statement which I know the Members of this House will be interested in having. It is in connection with the tragic air accident over the Los Angeles section a few days ago.

On February 6, the Director of the Bureau of Safety of the Civil Aeronautics Board appeared before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to testify concerning the unfortunate collision in the vicinity of Los Angeles, Calif., on January 31, 1957. The Committee was advised that the Board on the previous day had adopted an amendment to part 60 of the Civil Air Regulations which, effective February 20, 1957, prohibited test flying over highly populated areas or in areas of high traffic density. This rule also charged the Administrator with the responsibility for approving or designating flight test areas within which test flying of aircraft was to be confined.

Because of the great conflict in airspace requirements of aircraft operators, the task of delineating flight test areas in the vicinity of Los Angeles has proved to be especially complex and controversial. We are faced today with the fact that so much of the airspace in the vicinity of Los Angeles is already restricted for special military use or lies within areas of high traffic density or lies over densely populated areas. The Civil Aeronautics Board and the Administrator have concluded that additional time will be required to complete necessary coordination with aircraft manufacturers and the military services in order to delineate the flight test areas required for production flight testing. In the absence of specifically delineated test flight areas, all production test flights, military and civil, came to a halt yesterday in the Los Angeles area.

Mr. Durfee, Chairman of the Board, advised me today that part 60 has been further amended to extend the date by which approval or designation of flight test areas must be completed until April 15, 1957. In the interim, flight tests will continue to be prohibited over populated areas or in airspace of high traffic density.

Because of the complexity and the importance of this problem, the sincere and effective collaboration on the part of all interests, civil and military, is urgently required.

## THE NEAR EASTERN SITUATION

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I too, am gravely concerned with peace in the world today and particularly as it concerns the Middle East; but I was astounded last night to hear enunciated a policy which, so far as I know, represents a departure from anything that has ever occurred in the history of the United States, and it sounded dangerously close to a request for a double standard for nations.

I, for one, am most vigorously opposed to the invoking of any type of sanction against Israel until she is firmly guaranteed and assured the use of the Suez Canal, the Gulf of Aqaba, and protection against bandit raids across her borders. Certainly, it would be my hope that we in this country would not be placed in a position of bringing to bear unfair restrictions or sanctions upon a nation merely because of the size of that nation and yet turn our back because other nations are so big and so powerful that we cannot make those sanctions stick.

Further, I realize the importance of unity and our need to present a united front to the world in the Middle East as we should in all our foreign relations, but certainly, I shall not be bound to follow now or in the future a leadership which appears to be weak and vacillating and which I feel is ignoring the basic concepts which have guided the policies of this Nation from its very inception.

Going back to the very beginning, our Nation was founded upon moral principles which granted equal rights, equal standards, and equal privileges to all people and to all nations irrespective of their size. For that reason, I have risen today to make my own position clear and to vigorously oppose any change on the part of this Nation in that prime moral concept.

I, for one, feel very uncomfortable in the company of a band of international gangsters on whose side our policymakers appear determined to place the United States. I do not want to stand shoulder to shoulder with an outfit which has violated and is continuing to violate every principle of international justice and every treaty, and whose chosen partner in a series of such outrages against decency is Communist Russia. I do not want to give aid and comfort to bandits, nor to assist them in legalizing thievery.

During our history we have gone to war. We believed it was necessary to protect our national existence. The United Nations went to war in Korea. I detest war, but every teaching of history shows that men, and nations of men, will fight to survive. Israel believed its life as a nation threatened and it struck out to survive. Can we now expect it to abandon the very minimum protections it sought to gain by its fight for survival? Would we ourselves accept such a course were we in that nation's precarious position?

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that it is my firm conviction that the American people will never support a policy of bringing sanctions to bear upon the nation of Israel and at the same time ignoring pressures or sanctions against larger nations merely because of their power and position in the world which would tend to make those sanctions ineffective.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, following the remarks of my friend from California, we take up the newspapers this morning to find, in the case of Kashmir, that the United Nations has acted on a resolution to send the Secretary General over to have talks, and that the Soviet Union exercised its veto power. Some of us are doing a lot of thinking about the inability of the United Nations to operate with justice, or, rather, to have the world divided into areas into one of which the United Nations cannot go and the other in which they can go.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Would the gentleman favor the repeal of the veto power without which the Armed Forces of the United States might be committed by the United Nations without any regard to the authority of the Congress of the United States?

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, the gentleman is going entirely outside the field of the observation I have made. I simply said in relation to the remarks made by the gentleman from California, that we read in the papers this morning where the Soviet Union exercises its veto power in the Security Council. The question of whether or not there should be a veto I have not raised, but they have exercised it in connection with the Secretary General going over there to have talks in connection with the Kashmir situation relative to having a plebiscite there which the General Assembly of the United Nations has voted. The direct answer to the gentleman's question is "No."

## THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the words of our distinguished majority leader and to say that I feel there is a very great need for further discussion and clarification of the entire situation in the Middle East and of our American policy in that area and in particular with reference to Israel. Certainly the story has not been fully told and it was not fully told last night. It seems to me that it went forward on a premise which it will be very difficult to sustain by world opinion if the people are given the opportunity to know the story. In effect, we have said that we will wink our eye while Russia builds up a force in the Sinai Peninsula, an aggressive force, about which the United Nations took no steps whatever. Yet we would then deny the right in self-defense of Israel or any nation to make sure that such an aggressive force did not actually enter into combat. Therefore, I have just received permission that on Tuesday next there will be one hour granted to me, at which time I will try to go fully into this situation. May I ask all those who are interested in this discussion to be present at that time.

## EXCAVATING MATERIAL NEAR NEW HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we do a lot of futile things in the House. We talk about situations that arise in other countries. The responsibilitiy for the excavating which is being done over on the west and a little south of the New House Office Building is not within my knowledge, but this I do know from personal experience within the last hour. It is one of the dirtiest deals I have ever seen since I came to Washington. The folks that are drawing that dirt out bring it out by trucks which travel up Independence Avenue. Those big trucks are so filled that as they are driven along the Avenue the dirt falls off from both sides and the end. We have over there a layer of dirt and dust, a part of which goes up into the air every time a car goes along. It dirties your clothing, clogs the air you breathe. There is neither reason nor excuse for it.

Just why is that permitted to continue? I do not know whether the Speaker has any authority over it or whether that is under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol. There ought to be an end to it. There is no sense to it and I do not see why it is permitted.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may ask if there is any other way of doing it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly there is. They can take it down the next street on which there is far less traffic. They can lessen the size of the load so it does not fall off in the street before it reaches its destination.

They can wet the top of the load so it does not blow off.

They can just use a little commonsense, show a little—just a little—consideration for others who use the crossing, the sidewalks, or the street.

## THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend yesterday morning at the White House the meeting called by the President for a bipartisan discussion with congressional leaders. I have sat in a lot of those meetings. I have sat in such meetings when our President was of the Democratic Party. I want to say that I thought the meeting yesterday was well conducted. Everybody was permitted to make his contribution. It was give and take, and I think one of the finest experiences of my public life.

I commend the President for his statement last night. I think it was masterful. I think he has laid the cards on the table. People know better now just what our position is.

But that is not the reason I rise here particularly. It happens that I come from the Middle West, out in the Corn Belt. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has said that they have introduced a bill that goes away beyond anything that had been asked. Now, actually, there is a crisis with respect to the corn farmer and need for urgent action. I have stood up in the well, coming from the Middle West, where we raise no rice or cotton or peanuts or tobacco, and have helped enact emergency legislation for those commodities, and I say what the majority of the committee is seeking to do here to the corn farmer is to give him a lemon, not some help; to propose not only what he wants to do but

to load the bill to where it will never become law.

I want to raise my voice here and now so that the corn farmers out my way will understand what is being attempted. The bill is loaded so that it would cost probably a billion dollars more than necessary. What the committee should do is not to complicate this corn situation by involving all sorts of other problems of agriculture, but give the matter further study. They ought to do for us in the Middle West what we helped them do for themselves, and that is to give us emergency legislation to meet the problem of the corn farmer and let these other things go for another time.

## THE PRESIDENT'S BROADCAST

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the President has stated the official position of the administration in his television broadcast of last night. I have learned now that there may be expected at 1: 30 p. m. today, perhaps, a statement from the chief of state of the Israeli Government, and I rise here to express the very earnest and sincere hope that that statement will offer such assurances and such opportunities for peaceful settlement as to render unnecessary a resort to sanctions or to economic force. I still believe that we should have one law for the strong and the same law for the weak. I do not believe that we should proceed against a small state and neglect to proceed against a big one. I have not changed my position. If the United Nations is to be regarded as a strong instrumentality for the welding of peace in the world, it must, above all else, be consistent and fair in its dealing with one nation and another.

## FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I do not come into the well of the House as an expert on foreign policy. I want to say, however, for the record, that I firmly support the President in his statement last night. It was a forthright statement. It required considerable courage to make it. On legal and moral grounds alone he stated the American position, and I feel sure he has the support of a great majority of our people.

Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness I would like to say this about the present situation in the Middle East—we ought not to be looking for results as of this day or tomorrow. We are engaged in a long-range problem. I do not believe that we can afford to offend 200 million Arabs who live in the broad area from the Atlantic eastward to Pakistan. The action of Nasser should not be construed as a reflection of the entire Arab world.

And secondly, the free world must have access to the oil resources in that area. It was in 1945 when James Forrestal, then Secretary of the Navy, said that unless we have the resources of the oil of the Middle East, the United States cannot win the next war. At that time he cautioned against disturbing the status quo there. He was aware of a very great danger, which is now present. The real need at this time is to resolve the differences between Israel and the Arabs. Only then will peace come to this troubled area. Wild and irrational statements serve no good purpose and certainly not the cause of world peace.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

## PROGRAM FOR THE CORN FARMER

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my friend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has just taken the Committee on Agriculture to task for a bill that we reported out with reference to corn and other feed grains. I would like the record to be kept straight and to inform my friend, if he already does not know it, that the same sort of program that the Department of Agriculture recommended for the Committee on Agriculture to report, which we did not, was offered to the corn farmers last December for a referendum, which is the usual procedure with all farm programs, and the corn farmers of America refused by vote to accept that program.

Historically, in the House of Representatives, we do not pass a new program for a commodity which the farmers of that commodity refused in a referendum to accept. If the program was not good enough for the corn farmers to accept in a referendum, I believe that this House would be making a mistake if we did not report out a bill which we thought would do the job that the corn farmer did not think would be done when they voted against the program offered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

## DUST IN MISSOURI

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I was a little amused when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] was complaining about the dust here, just a few minutes ago. If the small amount of dust that falls off the trucks endangers the health of the gentleman from Michigan, I would advise him never to come to Missouri. Down in Missouri we are 60 inches short on moisture in the last 5 years, and still our good Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, says that we have not had a drought in that State. All the trucks in Washington could not make enough dust to compete with what we have out there in a State that is not afflicted with drought at all.

I just took this time to warn the gentleman from Michigan to stay away from Missouri if dust bothers him.

## CORN PRODUCTION

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana made some timely remarks a moment ago about the farm bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture. I am sure that any Member of this House, particularly those of us in the corn area who examines this bill, will recognize its complete inadequacy in dealing with the corn farmers' problem.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] a moment ago made the statement that the farmers got what they voted for last fall in the referendum. He overlooks the fact that the referendum required a two-thirds vote, and that a substantial majority—approximately 61 percent—of the farmers voted for increased acreage for corn. As we approach consideration of a farm bill, I should like for you to reflect on the fact that a minority is denying a majority the program desired. Corrective legislation is promptly needed, but the bill from the Committee on Agriculture is by no means the answer.

Please bear in mind, particularly you who represent city districts, that corn is the greatest single factor that has a bearing on the economy of the United States today. Do remember that indisputable fact as to the basic importance of corn in our economy when you consider the farm bill which will come up next week. I repeat, corn is the greatest factor in our economy in these United States of America; steel and anything else to the contrary notwithstanding.

## COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight Friday night to file certain rules and reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, 1957, one of the oldest and most important professional societies in our country—the American Institute of Architects—marks its 100th anniversary.

The American Institute of Architects is dedicated not only to the betterment of the profession of architecture—in itself a worthy goal—but, through constant improvement of our shelter and environment, to the betterment of our lives.

As a former bricklayer, I believe I understand and appreciate the service the architect renders not only to his client but to the community as a whole. Webster defines the architect as a "person skilled in the art of building. One who makes it his occupation to form plans and designs of, and to draw specifications for, buildings, and to superintend their execution." This means more than a glance at the words might signify. His is the task of advancing our entire civilization by planning and designing the proper setting for constructive work, thought, and worship. I have taken issue, upon occasion, with several members of the profession with whose conception of specific needs relating to public projects I disagreed. However, disagreements are not unknown among friends.

The architect's responsibility in our complex society is stated eloquently in a prospectus the American Institute of Architects has issued on the theme it has chosen for its centennial celebration. This theme is A New Century Beckons. The prospectus states in part:

> Today, the architect must consider, simultaneously, man's physical environment in relation to his new social aspirations and spiritual needs; to a host of new contrivances which afford him new comfort and leisure time; to new problems of traffic flow, land use, and urban congestion; even to the problem of shielding him, not from the elements alone, but from the hazards of a world whose skill at making weapons has outstripped his ability to live without them.

The American architect today, due largely to the efforts of his professional organization, the American Institute of Architects, is fully conscious of these responsibilities and challenges, and is meeting them in a manner which deserves our appreciation and gratitude.

We need the architect—his professional competence and his efforts—to give us and our communities the most fitting, most enduring, and most economical buildings the creative genius of our people is able to erect. I have been deeply disturbed by the efforts of certain commercial groups to bypass the architect with the claim that he can be replaced by mass production. The "package dealer" who offers our school and church committees and boards "cheaper" prefabricated buildings is offering a fantasy. Buildings, like lives, are individuals, and have individual requirements. I don't wish to be misunderstood. Modern mass-production techniques in many areas have helped make our country strong and prosperous. But prefabricated "package buildings" do not properly fit the land sites, soil conditions, climates, and requirements of individual communities any more than a single stock prescription for eyeglasses would fit a nation of nearsighted citizens.

Our school boards, our church committees, our municipalities, and our builders and homeowners need the architect and his skills. For no one who undertakes to build, builds for himself alone. Our Nation needs better schools, better churches, and better buildings for business and living. We need the architect's skill as urgently as we need the skill of doctors and lawyers. Any attempt by promoters of package buildings to bypass the architect will, in the long run, be just as disastrous as replacing the family doctor with the quack.

Modern man is confronted with an enormous task. As the prospectus of the AIA centennial program puts it:

> Our vast new knowledge of the nature of matter must be matched by an equivalent understanding of the nature of man. The architect can and must contribute to a closure of this gap in knowledge.

Proof that our architects are sincere in seeking this knowledge is the manner in which they have chosen to celebrate their 100th anniversary this year. They do not pause, even on this festive occasion, to dwell on past achievements. Their efforts are directed to the future. The theme the AIA has chosen for its centennial program to be held in Washington May 13–17 is A New Century Beckons. Many of the Nation's leaders in the arts, sciences, education, business, labor, and government will speak to the architects on the forces which will shape the environment of the future. For it is the future environment, as well as the present, for which the architect must build. I confidently expect this centennial program of the American Institute of Architects to make a vital contribution to the cultural and material growth of our Nation.

---

## OIL PRICES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has been seriously disturbed by the very large and sudden increase in oil prices which we now are experiencing. Both the Senate and the House are making inquiries. Both producers and consumers are being heard. Because my State of Florida is one of the most adversely affected I am strongly interested in what is taking place. On yesterday, Mr. M. J. Rathborne, president of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, one of the largest and most powerful corporations in the world, testified for the producers. In attempting to justify the increase in oil prices, he used as a base the year 1948 to compare oil prices with the cost of labor, of steel and other products. The year 1948 does not give a true comparison and this I shall prove. People in Florida and throughout the United States will remember what happened in 1947 and 1948 in oil prices and oil shortages. So high did fuel oil prices soar that the mayors and city commissioners from cities all over Florida came to Washington in a body and petitioned the President of the United States, the United States Senate, and the United States House of Representatives for a redress of grievances against the then existing high prices of fuel oil. My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman WOLVERTON, was then chairman of a committee investigating oil prices. The people of Florida are very grateful for the invitation which the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman WOLVERTON, extended to the Florida delegation to appear before his committee. I am sure that the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman WOLVERTON, and other members of the committee will well recall that the conditions in 1948 were very similar to conditions today. The earnings of the oil companies were high; prices of residual fuel had skyrocketed 150 percent for the preceeding 2 years and basic crude oil had been increased six times during the years 1946–47 and had gone up from $1.17 in March of 1946 to $2.57 in November of 1947, an increase of 120 percent. Then like now the petroleum industry had made themselves a crisis. They had underestimated by a considerable margin the demand for oil in this country and elsewhere and had permitted the tankers to be put into the mothball fleet. When the shortage of heating oils became acute in the winter of 1947–48 all the available tankers were pulled out of the mothballs as quickly as possible and put into service. But this was not in time to save the American public against the terrific increases in all oil products. Those increases resulted from a crisis due primarily to the bad guesses of a few people who controlled the great oil industry, which together with natural gas provides two-thirds of the fuel for the work done in the United States including water power, windpower, manpower, and animal power.

I did not understand then as I cannot understand today how a shortage in tankers can increase the prices of crude at the wells.

The increase since Suez will cost the Nation $2 billion a year and cost the people of Florida an estimated $64 million a year, at an equivalent of about $50 per family. My State uses more petroleum products per capita than any other State, and I am deeply concerned about these increases. We expected crude to go down after the crisis of 1948. However, through the methods used in this country for the control of supply and demand, crude did not go down, but actually went up another 25 cents per barrel in June 1953, which, incidentally, was 6 months after the Republicans gained control of the administration. And now these oil companies, which are among the most prosperous businesses in the country, which have been favored more than any other industry by tax laws and by legislation permitting control of supply to meet the demand, have the gall to put into effect another increase and make the remarkable statement that we have had only one increase since 1947. They ask the public to ignore the six increases put into effect in 1946 and 1947 amounting to 120 percent. No other

commodity in that period increased even half that amount. Labor and most other commodities, as I recall it, were going up 5 or 10 percent a year but not 60 percent a year, as did oil. The price of crude today is two and one-half times the price of crude at the end of the war. Industrial fuel oil, which my State is so dependent upon, is selling at 3 times the 1945 price at the refineries on the gulf coast. What major commodity is selling at 2½ or 3 times the 1945 price? The public can well understand why representatives of the oil industry wish to start with 1948 for base pricing. Probably no other business in the country except the unregulated and monopolistic oil industry could get by with such increases. The users of gasoline and fuel oil have paid for the billions of expenditures in exploration and plant expansions in the prices paid for the product. The petroleum industry has operated on a pay-as-you-go basis, while other American industries must sell securities for plant expansions. Less than 5 percent of the many billions of dollars put into the exploration and expansion of the oil industry since 1946 have been financed from borrowings or the sale of securities.

The minutes of his board of directors of December 13, 1956, put into the House RECORD yesterday by Mr. Rathborne show two very startling facts. One was the statement that the expansion program would be such in 1957 that for the first time in 10 years cash generated within the business would be insufficient to finance this program. The second is the discussion of the effect of an increase in base crude oil which, according to the minutes, showed that Standard's net would increase $100 million, or 12½ percent, above the earnings for 1956 of $800 million. After reading these minutes one may understand how it was that Humble Oil, a subsidiary of Standard Oil Co., increased the price of crude on January 3 not 25 cents per barrel but 35 cents per barrel. Mr. Rathborne made a very fine case for his company when he showed the increased cost of drilling since 1948, the increased cost of ships and other items, compared with the increase in oil since 1948, but Mr. Rathborne's case in the eyes of the public must fall flat when you consider total increases in oil and increases in other costs since 1945. Oil must be paid for in this country out of the products produced, out of the wages earned by the people in this country. It may surprise some of my colleagues when I inform them that it takes 80 percent more wheat or cotton and twice as much meat to purchase a barrel of crude oil today than it did in 1945. It takes twice as much cotton or wheat or 2.3 as much beef to purchase a barrel of industrial fuel oil at the gulf coast refineries than it did in 1945.

While everyone realizes that wages in the manufacturing industry have gone up considerably since 1945, the manufacturing wage earner today must use 1.3 times as much of his wages to buy a barrel of crude as it took in 1945. It takes 1½ times as many hours of work for the wage earner to buy a barrel of heavy fuel oil than it did in 1945.

The filling-station operators of America are caught in the squeeze. They, too, are blamed for the increases in gasoline. They should not be blamed because they must pass the increase at the refinery on to the customer if they are to stay in business. The filling-station operator has not had the breaks that the major oil companies have had. The wholesale price of gasoline at the refinery has doubled since 1945, but the cost at the filling station has gone up only 50 percent. The wholesale price of gasoline for the year 1945, as shown in the United States Department of Commerce survey of current business, averaged 5.9 cents at the refinery. Today it is averaging over 12½ cents. The retail price of gasoline for 50 cities that are currently surveyed was 14½ cents in 1945 and today it is approximately 21½ cents. The filling-station operator has costs which go up the same as costs go up for the major oil companies. Yet his margin of profit is not figured on a percentage basis but apparently is maintained at the same number of cents per gallon.

One would think that with all the money the oil companies claim to be spending for research and that with larger refineries and more efficient methods, with more gasoline being produced from a barrel of crude that the price of these products would reflect some of the improved methods. Is it any wonder that the public is distrustful of the propaganda which is being spread throughout the country by one of the best organized groups of any American industry?

I am not optimistic that the House will pass any remedial legislation this session, but I serve notice on the petroleum industry now that they are riding for a fall in the same way the large public-utility-holding companies were riding high in the heyday of the 1920's. They could well take a lesson from what happened to these large holding companies.

In conclusion I would like to read into the record some very illuminating figures.

DAILY PRICES OF OKLAHOMA-KANSAS CRUDE OIL (36–36.9 GRAVITY)

In March of 1946 the price was $1.17. The following have been the increases since that date:

April 1, 1946, 10 cents to $1.27.
July 25, 1946, 25 cents to $1.52.
November 15, 1946, 10 cents to $1.62.
March 10, 1947, 25 cents to $1.87.
October 15, 1947, 20 cents to $2.07.
November 28, 1947, 50 cents to $2.57.
July 19, 1953, 25 cents to $2.82.
January 3, 1957, 25 cents and 35 cents to $3.07 and $3.17.

An increase from $1.17 to $3.07 is $1.90 per barrel. Now, gentlemen, this is a total increase since 1945 of 162 percent. I would like to read you the increase in other costs since 1945. They are as follows:

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| Beef | 29 |
| Wheat | 46 |
| Cotton | 48 |
| Retail prices | 51 |
| Wholesale prices | 70 |
| Aluminum | 81 |
| Average hourly earnings manufacturing | 100 |
| Composite price finished steel | 130 |
| Gulf-coast industrial fuel oil | 199 |

By comparison, since 1945 the average unit cost of residential electricity for 1956 was 24 percent below 1945.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman for the very excellent presentation he has made. I wonder if the gentleman agrees with me that while it is a fine thing for the Attorney General's Office to say, "If we can find any violation of the antitrust laws in the petroleum industry, we will prosecute," I wonder if the gentleman will not agree with me that any agency of the Government so empowered ought to have moved into this situation to save the consuming public millions of dollars now. Prosecution on antitrust charges, if warranted, would be helpful for the future, but will do no good as far as this bilking of the public that is going on now, today. The need is for immediate action, and it is a strange situation that with the hundreds of millions of dollars expended annually on various agencies and departments in the executive branch of Government it is left to Congress, 9 times out of 10, to initiate investigations in behalf of the public welfare. The executive branch of Government ought to have moved on these petroleum price increases and demanded to know the justification for them last December. That failure reflects no credit on those so empowered.

Mr. SIKES. I agree fully with my colleague, as I so often do in his views here on the floor.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. I would like to tell the gentleman briefly that I share his concern. Up in the Pacific Northwest the retail price of light fuel oil has gone up in the last 15 months from $3.20 a barrel to $4.24 a barrel, although the general deficiency during the same period on the west coast has declined; and I want to assure the gentleman of my support in his efforts to bring to light some of the facts back of these many price rises. I am very glad he is raising the issue.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I regret that I missed the major part of the gentleman's presentation. Did the gentleman discuss the oil lift proposal?

Mr. SIKES. I did not.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman. I was going to comment on that angle, if the gentleman had.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate our senior colleague from Florida on his fine factual presentation. I would like to point out that the State of Florida is one of the few States, if not the only State, that does not have natural gas. We are entirely dependent upon the oil industry in many of the things we do.

It seems to me that although the present picture does not look like legislation in this field, as far as I am concerned I would be glad to support legislation to do something about this from a legislative standpoint right now. I realize that there are administrative procedures that would be more rapid than legislation, but as far as I am concerned I think this abuse has shown the need for legislative or administrative action, or any other legal thing to put an end to the existing inequities.

Mr. SIKES. I know how my colleague feels and I appreciate his contribution.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. I wonder if the gentleman would tell me if he thinks it is possible to regulate the petroleum industry similar to the way the natural-gas industry is regulated?

Mr. SIKES. I see no reason why it could not be subjected to the same kind of regulation.

Mr. PELLY. The way prices are going indicates that the industry itself is inviting regulation, does it not?

Mr. SIKES. There is no question about it.

Mr. PELLY. I wanted also to comment that in the Pacific Northwest we have just obtained natural gas. I do not hold out any hope to you in Florida that when you get it, it will relieve the pressure, because since we have gotten it our prices on petroleum products have not declined.

## FARM INCOME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] for the valuable remarks and the incisive analysis he has just made relative to the growing irresponsibility of the oil industry and the disastrous consequences this will have on American consumers.

I wish now to address my remarks to an equally urgent problem, the problem of American agriculture today.

Mr. Speaker, last week the Secretary of Agriculture charged that the plight of the American farmer can be laid at the door of the American worker. He said, in effect, that increased wages paid to the working man are responsible for most of the drop in farm income since 1947.

This is a complete misconception of the problem. The American farmer, like the merchant, has no better friend than the adequately paid worker. Any move to weaken the buying power of the working families of this country will directly undercut the position of both farmers and businessmen.

For several years, certain administration spokesmen have tried to sow the false impression that farm prices are too high and are responsible for the mounting grocery bills of the city consumer, and, conversely, that the wages of working men account for the growing costs confronting farm families.

This attempt to drive divisive wedges between the farmer, the worker, and the businessman is one of the most unwholesome aspects of our contemporary political scene. It represents an irresponsible effort to cover up administration farm policy failure.

A careful examination of the facts will show that most of the farmer's difficulties stem from the fact that while industrial profits and prices have skyrocketed, farm prices have been falling steadily, due to the price-support cutting policies of the past several years.

When Mr. Benson asserts that four-fifths of the farmer's net income decline since 1947 has resulted from higher production costs, he is guilty of either gross error or deliberate deception.

A correct analysis of gross farm income and production expenses in 1955, as compared to 1947, will show that falling gross farm income has accounted for 73 percent and increased production expenses for only 27 percent of the total drop in net farm income since 1947.

Farm costs have risen, true; but to blame this cost spiral entirely on wage increases overlooks the fact that corporation profits have soared to record peaks. Workers have asked for wage increases only after industrial profits have reached the point where such wage improvement was not only justified but imperative in the interest of a stable economy.

We live in an economy governed by managed industrial prices. Industrialists have manipulated prices steadily upward in recent years without regard to the classical law of supply and demand, seemingly guided only by an appetite for larger and larger profits.

I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD two adjacent news stories from the January 10, 1957, issue of the New York Times. The heading on the first article reads "United States Oil Output Sets a New High; Gasoline Inventories Increase." The companion news article is headed with the words "Gasoline Prices Will Rise Today."

This is only one indication of the control over prices which is exercised by corporations without reference to supply-and-demand factors.

Furthermore, the sharp increases to farmers in the price of tractors, fuel, clothing, groceries, and other household items does not reflect rising wage costs so much as it does drastic increases in the profits shown by the large industrial corporations of this country. For example, when the major steel companies announced a $7.50 per ton increase in steel in the spring of 1955 following a wage increase, every effort was made to imply that this price increase was needed to cover the wage raise given at that time. Actually, the wage increase cost the steel companies approximately half of the $7.50 that they added to steel prices.

United States Seel was making a profit of $29.65 per ton prior to the wage increase of 1955. After paying that wage increase—which cost the corporation $3.80 a ton—and raising steel prices $7.50 a ton, United States Steel was earning $33.35 per ton. The same pattern has been characteristic of other wage-price increases.

The other side of the picture was well illustrated in a speech on April 23, 1956, by the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, when he said: "In 1946 farmers got $3 a bushed for wheat. You paid 14 cents for a loaf of bread. Today the farmer gets only $2 a bushel, but you pay not 14 cents but 18 cents for a loaf of bread. The price of wheat has dropped one-third, but the price of bread has gone up one-third. If the shirt you are wearing cost you $4, the farmer got only 25 cents for the cotton that went into that shirt. The middleman takes more of your dollar; the farmer gets less."

Those who want to really understand the problem of the American farmers should give heed to the fact that while farm income has fallen by 25 percent during the past 5 years, corporate profits have increased by some 35 percent.

I would like to say at this point, that if the Secretary of Agriculture is truly interested in discovering the factors responsible for the sharp cost of living increases in recent years, he should lend his support to a resolution which I introduced on the opening day of this Congress, calling for a thorough congressional investigation of those factors responsible for the cost of living spiral. My resolution, House Joint Resolution 64, calls for a careful analysis of the unjust spread which exists between the prices received by farmers for their commodities and the prices that the consumer pays for those commodities in the market place.

Mr. Speaker, the effort of the Secretary of Agriculture to convince the farmer that he is in trouble because of the improved living standards of the American worker is a hollow effort, indeed. When a man is stuck in a quagmire, as the American farmer is today, he does not get out by pulling his friends in with him. Our enlightened farm families know that their best hope of salvation lies in working with their partners—business and labor—to achieve through public cooperation a finer life for all. Any move which has as its purpose the arranging of farmer against worker and worker against farmer can only aggravate the problems of each, and in the end bring disastrous consequences to us all.

What is needed now is a firm price-support structure that will enable farmers to meet the higher cost of living that comes with a constantly rising American standard of living. I have introduced a comprehensive agricultural measure (H. R. 3987) which provides several devices that can be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to prevent farm prices from falling below the 90 percent of parity level. To secure farm prices at the 90 percent of parity level is not unreasonable. As a matter of fact, it is a ratio which guarantees that farm prices will not sink more than 10 percent below a fair price, in relation to the cost of what the farmer buys from the rest of us.

It has been my observation for some time that the Secretary of Agriculture has a rare ability to misstate the economic condition of American farmers.

For reasons which I shall not attempt to answer here, he has developed a habit of ignoring basic factual material documented by agencies within his own department, reflecting a serious recession in agriculture.

Expounding the discredited theory of flexible price supports, Mr. Benson seems to live in an Alice in Wonderland world all his own, where lower farm prices mean higher farm income, mounting farm surpluses are interpreted as evidence of the administration's surplus-removal program, skyrocketing departmental costs are the answer to the so-called economy gestures of the Secretary, and where the exodus of men from the land is interpreted as the march of progress.

American agriculture today is grievously ill. In South Dakota, we are now losing more than 1,000 farm families a year. Nationally, 100,000 farmers are going out of business each year, as the cost-price squeeze on farmers mounts. Farmers have not only been led to the brink of depression, but they have been forcibly pushed over.

Yet, the Secretary of Agriculture, has told an audience in Spokane, Wash., last week that this administration is building a prosperous, expanding, and free agriculture. It would seem that Mr. Benson is a rather versatile speaker who is able to quickly adjust his remarks from audience to audience.

To the people in Spokane, he said the first step toward building a healthy farm economy is to get Government out of agriculture.

The next evening in South Dakota, Mr. Benson gave a much different speech. That is understandable. The Secretary's price-flexing policies are very unpopular in South Dakota, where farm income is down 12 percent in 1956 from 1955, and there the Secretary humbly admitted farmers are not sharing in the national prosperity, and that Government has a moral obligation in aiding agriculture to shift from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

Mr. Benson has a long record of making contradictory statements. But Mr. Benson does the farmers of America a great disservice when he misleads millions of urban dwellers, who cannot be expected to understand the complexities of agriculture and who depend upon him for accurate interpretation.

I should like to examine the Department of Agriculture's own statistics for the next few moments, in light of Mr. Benson's statements. I think we shall learn from them that increasing prosperity in rural America is only a figment of the Secretary's imagination.

I should like to refer now to the Agriculture Information Bulletin No. 158, dated June 1956. It is published by the USDA's Agricultural Research Service and is a study of farm costs and returns, applying to commercial family-operated farms in the Corn Belt.

I should like to quote two figures to you. One is the return to family operators in terms of purchasing power, based on 1937 to 1941 dollars. The other is the hourly return to family-farm operators measured in terms of current dollars. I should like to compare the years 1947–49 with 1955.

Let us look first at hog-beef fattening farms. In the 1947–49 period these family operators received an average of $4,299 in terms of purchasing power and an hourly return of $2.28.

But in 1955 the average annual return in terms of purchasing power was only $379. And the hourly return was 24 cents.

In the 1947–49 period, cash grain, farm operators received an average of $3,068 in terms of farm purchasing power and an hourly return of $2.08. But in 1955 the cash-grain operators received an average of $983 in purchasing power income and a return of 74 cents an hour for their work.

The next table we should like to examine is the tabulation on wheat-small grain-livestock farms. I am picking those operations that apply to my area, of course.

Back in the 1947–49 period these farmers received an annual return of $2,464 in terms of purchasing power and an hourly rate of $2.07. But in 1955 the annual income received in terms of purchasing power declined to $1,647, with an hourly rate of $1.36 an hour.

Wheat-corn-livestock farm operators took a terriffic shellacking incomewise, as well. In the 1947–49 period, their return was $2,294 in purchasing power and their hourly wage rate was $1.40. But in 1955 the average annual return to these operators was only $42 and they worked for the ridiculously low rate of 3 cents an hour.

Looking at the table on wheat-roughage-livestock farms, we find that farm operators in this category received $2,070 in purchasing power and an hourly wage rate of $1.49 back in the 1947–49 period. But in 1955 the annual average was $940 with an hourly wage rate of 63 cents, in return for their labor and investment.

The last tabulation that I call to your attention concerns sheep-ranch operators. The USDA bulletin shows that their income in terms of purchasing power was $1,772 in the 1947–49 period and the average hourly return 79 cents. But in 1955, these operators had slipped to an annual return of a minus $112, and their hourly return was a minus 6 cents an hour. In other words, they are operating completely in the red.

I ask in all seriousness, does that sound like this administration is bringing prosperity and expanding opportunity and freedom for agriculture? Does that show farmers are doing better than they have for a long time?

Mr. Benson's philosophy differs a good deal from my own, I know, when it comes to farm policy. And I shall not criticize him for that. But I believe that we have the right to expect an accurate account of the agricultural situation from the man who is in charge of this department. I do not believe it is too much to expect truth from him or any other Government official.

I cannot help but think back to one of the first speeches Mr. Benson gave, when he took over as Secretary of Agriculture 4 years ago. It was made in his home State of Utah, at Salt Lake City.

He was commenting on his job as Secretary of Agriculture and said: "Surely you believe the job at hand is spiritual. We must rekindle the faith of the American people in their Government." My only comment on this praiseworthy sentiment is that one does not build faith on false promises or false premises. Yet the Secretary of Agriculture has not only tried to sell the farmers on the demerits of a phony economic theory, but has told them it is good for them and then asked the consuming public to help him put the farmer in an economic straitjacket.

No one likes to admit failure, of course. And this basic psychological fact may have some bearing on the Secretary's reluctance to point to some of the material included in the President's economic report of January 1957.

This report shows that corporation profits before taxes in 1956 were 47 percent higher than in the 1947–49 period and that corporation profits after taxes were up 19 percent.

Income from dividends the report shows is up 69 percent in the same period of time, income from interest up 93 percent, rental income is up 35 percent, income of business and professional proprietors is up 40 percent, weekly earnings of manufacturing workers is up 51 percent.

The income per person of nonfarm people, as a matter of fact, is up 36 percent across the board, from 1947–49 to 1956. I note in checking Government statistics that per person income of farm people from strictly farming operations, has gone from $641 in 1947, to $702 in 1952, $606 in 1955, and down to $599 in 1956. Thse latter figures are all the more devastating, when you consider that the number of farm families in that time has shrunk by nearly 1 million. Even with that, the per capita income of farm people from farming alone has declined.

And if you should move up the ladder, you will find that since 1952, per capita income per farm person, from all sources has fallen a total of $60—from $953 to $893 annually—in 4 years. And this, too, is figuring it on many, many millions fewer farmers.

But while farmers have been put through the economic wringer, and the price-protection programs they built up through 20 years are emasculated in the name of economy, has the administration reduced Government expenditures or Government crop surpluses?

The answer in both cases is a resounding "No." It has only succeeded in driving millions of farmers from the land and reducing farm purchasing power by millions of dollars. And this, in turn, has deeply affected main street business.

Between the years of 1952–55, again quoting Department of Agriculture figures, prices on agricultural products were severely curtailed, but as any dirt farmer

could have predicted, production rose as farmers tried to offset price drops with greater production. The following figures demonstrate what happened between 1952 and 1955:

[Percent]

| | Price down— | Production up— |
|---|---|---|
| Rye | 17 | 75 |
| Oats | 22 | 30 |
| Sorghum grains | 25 | 173 |
| Soybeans | 23 | 30 |
| Milk | 17 | 9 |
| Barley | 23 | 71 |
| Flaxseed | 23 | 42 |

The total inventory of the Commodity Credit Corporation, according to the CCC's latest report, including that amount pledged for loans was $8.2 billion as of December 31, 1956, compared to a total of $3.5 billion on June 30, 1953.

And as stated in a press report of February 11, 1957 losses for supporting farm crops under this administration have been nearly three times higher than the costs in the entire previous 20-year period.

After looking at the record of the Department of Agriculture under Mr. Benson's guidance one can safely say that never before has so much been spent with so little benefit to the people of America.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952 the total budget expenditures for the United States Department of Agriculture, were $1.6 billion. And in the year 1952, net farm income, including changes for inventory was $15.1 billion.

Total budget expenditures for the United States Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956 were $7.4 billion and net farm income in 1956 the Department reports was $11.7 billion adjusted for inventory.

Gross budget expenditures projected for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957 are $8.9 billion. The Department of Agriculture has forecast a 5 percent increase in net farm income for 1957. But Secretary Benson it would seem has already taken action to make certain there will be no such increase, through lowering the price support levels on eight commodities.

The soil-bank program cannot offset this loss. It only pays farmers for crops not produced, hence it is only replacement income for land taken out of production.

Farm people comprise the single largest group in our entire economy. They are 13 percent of the country's population. Yet in 1956 they received only 6 percent of the income.

Farm people have increased their efficiency, yet, instead of gaining increased benefits they have been penalized. Since 1952 their efficiency is up 14 percent, while their income is down 25 percent.

I believe we have long since passed the time when we should face the truth on the economic condition of farmers and move with imagination to meet that critical problem.

I believe we must consider the farm family from the standpoint of solid economic measures and true human and spiritual values instead of in a cold materialistic concept that is akin to Russian collectivism.

Farmers do not ask for any special favors. They only seek the same right their city cousins long ago attained through legislation—a decent return on their land and their labor.

[From the New York Times of January 10, 1957]

UNITED STATES OIL OUTPUT SETS A NEW HIGH; GASOLINE INVENTORIES INCREASE

The United States last week produced more oil than ever before. An increase of 24,350 barrels a day in the Nation's crude oil production was reported yesterday by the American Petroleum Institute. Production averaged 7,416,700 barrels a day, compared with 7,392,350 the week before and 7,026,450 a year earlier.

Imports of crude oil and products came to 1,515,100 barrels a day, making the average 1,360,400 a day for the 4 weeks ended on January 4. In the 4 weeks ended on January 6, 1956, imports averaged 1,485,000 barrels a day.

Gasoline stocks last week increased 1,012,000 barrels. At the weekend, they amounted to 186,808,000 barrels, compared with 185,796,000 a week earlier and 169,012,000 a year ago.

Light fuel oil supplies were down 1,867,000 barrels to 132,942,000. They were 107,269,000 a year ago. Heavy fuel oil stocks gained 82,000 barrels to 42,731,000. A year ago, they amounted to 39,719,000 barrels.

Crude oil runs to stills averaged 8,290,000 barrels a day, including 888,000 a day of foreign origin.

The daily average gross production of crude oil and condensate last week in the United States, by districts, the change from the preceding week and the output in the week ended on January 6, 1956, follow:

| | Actual daily average production | Change from previous week | Week ended Dec. 30, 1955 |
|---|---|---|---|
| New York-Pennsylvania | 30,100 | +1,100 | 29,200 |
| Florida | 1,250 | +50 | 1,400 |
| West Virginia | 4,850 | +100 | 6,150 |
| Virginia | 100 | | 100 |
| Ohio, southeast | 2,850 | | 3,400 |
| Ohio, other | 8,100 | +750 | 9,650 |
| Indiana | 33,100 | −150 | 31,400 |
| Illinois | 237,250 | −750 | 237,300 |
| Kentucky | 48,300 | −350 | 44,600 |
| Michigan | 27,100 | | 29,800 |
| Nebraska | 37,850 | −1,250 | 28,200 |
| Kansas | 339,100 | −4,000 | 332,400 |
| Oklahoma | 631,600 | +15,200 | 617,300 |
| North Dakota | 36,450 | −150 | 42,650 |
| South Dakota | 100 | | 50 |
| Texas | 3,070,000 | +12,000 | 2,938,200 |
| Louisiana | 975,400 | +3,400 | 786,900 |
| Arkansas | 77,700 | | 74,200 |
| Mississippi | 114,000 | −300 | 111,350 |
| Alabama | 11,450 | −50 | 4,300 |
| New Mexico, southeast | 244,400 | +2,900 | 227,900 |
| New Mexico, other | 1,900 | | 1,600 |
| Wyoming | 207,750 | −3,200 | 283,000 |
| Montana | 71,600 | +1,450 | 47,000 |
| Colorado | 157,200 | −2,700 | 153,200 |
| Utah | 9,000 | | 5,600 |
| Nevada | 100 | | 300 |
| California | 948,100 | +400 | 979,300 |
| United States | 7,416,700 | +24,350 | 7,026,450 |

GASOLINE PRICES WILL RISE TODAY—LEADING COMPANIES ALSO PLAN TO LIFT OTHER OIL PRODUCTS EAST OF THE ROCKIES

Prices of gasoline and most other oil products will be advanced 1 cent a gallon today by leading marketers in nearly all the United States east of the Rocky Mountains.

The Esso Standard Oil Co., domestic marketing and refining affiliate of the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), will increase prices of gasoline, kerosene, home-heating oil, and other distillates except Bunker C and No. 6 fuel oils by 1 cent a gallon for all methods of delivery. The increases will apply to 18 States on the east coast and in the South, and the District of Columbia.

The Standard Oil Co. (Indiana) will make a similar advance in all oil products throughout the 15 Midwestern States in which it markets. Indiana Standard said the price rise stemmed from the recent advance in crude oil prices that resulted from the crisis in the Middle East.

The Continental Oil Co., which recently advanced gasoline prices by 1 cent a gallon in Texas and New Mexico, announced a 1-cent increase in oil products in Montana, effective today.

COST RISE IS CITED

J. W. Liddell, vice president and general manager of Continental in the Rocky Mountain area, said the price rises were "a natural economic result of advances in everything we buy, including recent increases in crude-oil prices."

Previously, the Sunray Mid-Continent Oil Co., of Tulsa, Okla., had advanced the prices of all oil products by 1 cent a gallon at the refinery level. The company said the increase was "economically vital to refiners who have had to meet the crude oil price increases averaging 35 cents a barrel" in Texas, Oklahoma, and other Southwestern States.

With Esso Standard and Standard of Indiana the leading marketers in their respective territories, the price rise in oil products is expected to be met by other marketers in their areas and extended to all sections east of the Rocky Mountains.

Some difficulty may be experienced in making the rise in product prices stick. Stocks of gasoline and home-heating oils are sharply above the levels of a year ago. Gasoline stocks have been increasing at a rapid rate and now amount to 186,800,000 barrels, an increase of 17,800,000 over the 169 million of a year ago. Heating-oil supplies are 27,650,000 barrels more than the 107,269,000 of a year ago.

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, may I commend and congratulate the gentleman from South Dakota for speaking on this very vital subject at this time. We are happy to welcome you, Congressman McGOVERN, as a champion of the farmer, not only from your State but joining our forces in working out a good farm program. I also wish to commend the people of South Dakota for their wonderful intelligence and good sense in sending to us such a champion as you.

I would like to add a few words, and ask permission to revise and extend my remarks, about a few new ideas to help this particular program along. I do not feel that we can do any piecemeal legislation on any farm program at this point. It has to be an overall farm program, and I think this feed-grain bill we have before us is the one that is going to go a long way in that respect.

SUMMARY AND THEME

Our national economic policies and programs are caught in the vise of the great complacency. For 3 years at least, we have been coasting along on the economic reforms and social gains built into the structure during the 2 decades after the great depression. Thus far, the momentum has been sufficient to avoid depressions, and to maintain a high and somewhat advancing level of general prosperity.

But this great Nation cannot coast forever. New motive power is needed. During the most recent years, the momentum of our economic growth has seriously slackened, and some new national policies have contributed to the slowdown. In consequence, total production and employment have been far too low for full prosperity. And while the whole economy has moved forward too slowly, millions have been forced tragically backward by the inequities in the general prosperity, and by national policies which have aggravated this decline. Our traditional concepts of economic and social justice have faded into the background.

We are presented with glowing production statistics which include the pleasure palaces and swimming pools being built at luxurious resorts, but do not include the needed schools and hospitals which are not being built. We have become content with living for today, while neglecting to develop our natural and human resources for the future. We perilously slash national security outlays, on the false premise that we cannot afford the vital.

Most serious of all, we are preening ourselves with false pride because we are in some respects higher than last year or years ago. We are setting low goals, based on the dead statistics of the past, instead of high goals for the ever-increasing abundance and security which our technology and skills promise if only we show the creative intelligence to move forward.

It is easy to talk about a better future for all. But in what direction are we actually moving—and at what pace?

The great gaps in our prosperity are these:

First. Total economic growth has been too slow to maintain full production and full employment: During the 4-year period 1953–56, the average annual rate of growth in total production has been 38 percent lower than during the 7-year period 1947–53. This slowdown has cost all of the American people about $57 billion in lost production, and is costing them more than $17 billion in 1956 alone. Due also to this slowdown, excess unemployment—above the irreducible minimum level—has average 28 percent higher during the more recent period than during the earlier period, and in 1956 alone is running about 43 percent higher.

Second. The inadequate prosperity has also been very uneven: During the 1953–56 period as a whole, personal interest income has been advancing about 65 percent faster than wages, and dividend income has been advancing about 75 percent faster than wages. Farm personal income from all sources has been declining almost 3½ percent per year. With corporate profits advancing almost 29 percent faster than the personal income of the people as a whole, and with investment growing more than twice as fast as consumption, the threat is accumulating that our productive capacity will far outrun our ability to consume.

Third. The uneven prosperity has especially hurt farmers, small-business men, and low-income families: Looking at the most recent 4-year period as a whole, the average income of all American families is running about $900 lower than it would have been under conditions of full prosperity. Even worse, vulnerable groups are being especially hard hit. Per capita farm income has been declining 2.8 percent a year during these 4 years, contrasted with almost no decline during 1947–53. Small business failures are running about 55 percent higher in 1956 than in 1952. The progress of low-income families from poverty to an American standard of living has been virtually halted. In 1955, almost 22 million multiple-person and single-person families had incomes below $4,000; more than 8 mililon were below $2,000; and about 3 million were below $1,000.

Fourth. Our great priorities of national security and domestic needs are being grossly neglected: Comparing 1956 with 1953, Federal conventional budget outlays for national security have been slashed about 18 percent, contrary to all informed judgments of need. As a percent of our total national production—our ability to sustain these outlays—they have been slashed from about 13.5 percent to about 10 percent, or a slash of more than 25 percent in the portion of total production devoted to national security. Our other great national priorities of need involve the one-quarter or more of all American families who live in urban and rural slums; the underdeveloped resources, particularly water and power, lagging far behind population shifts and industrial growth requirements; the millions of children and underpaid teachers crowded into insufficient schools, plus those excluded by these shortages from educational opportunity; the serious shortages and maldistribution of medical facilities and care, which translate into a heavy toll of unnecessary illness and premature death; the shortages of technical education and training which stand in glaring contrast to the Soviet advance; the pitiful levels of old-age insurance and public assistance, which on the average provide those whom they serve with only half of the bare requirements for an adequate American standard of living, and leave millions out altogether; the dwindling level of international economic and technical assistance, when measured against the American people's common interest in free humanity. Comparing the fiscal years 1954–57 with the fiscal years 1947–53, annual average per capita Federal conventional budget outlays for these great national priorities of need other than national security have been cut from $57.22 to $33.05—measured in uniform 1955 dollars—or by more than 42 percent. Measured against the size of our total national production—our ability to serve these needs—they have been cut from 2.56 percent to 1.39 percent, or a drop of almost 46 percent in the portion of our total economic strength devoted to these essential purposes. This is doubly indefensible, in view of sharply declining national security outlays. Attention to these basic needs would also have helped to prevent the $57 billion shortfall in total production, and thus provided additional resources to meet these needs.

Fifth. Our retarded and unbalanced economic growth seriously affects our worldwide economic struggle with the Soviets: Taking into account the Soviets' recent performance and stated objectives, it is estimated that within a generation or so their production may have caught up with ours, with a far higher proportion of their total output devoted to the sinews of warfare or international economic competition. This is because our greatest nonsecret weapon—our productive power—is being dulled.

Sixth. The gaps in our prosperity are being aggravated by trying to balance the Federal budget at the expense of the Nation's security, economic progress, and human well-being: During the period 1953–56 as a whole, Federal outlays for goods and services have been about $11 billion lower than the amounts needed to help maintain full prosperity for all. Because these public outlays also stimulate private investment and consumer spending, the shortfall in Federal outlays has accounted for more than half of the $57 billion shortfall in total national production. Further, what has been bad for the American people has also been bad for the Federal budget. During the 7 calendar years 1947–53 as a whole, our shortfall in total national production averaged only $4.2 billion a year, and during the fiscal years 1947–53 as a whole the conventional budget averaged a deficit of only $0.8 billion a year and the more important cash budget averaged a surplus of $2.4 billion. But during the 4 calendar years 1953–56 as a whole, the total production shortfall is estimated to be averaging $14.3 billion a year, and for the fiscal years 1954–57 as a whole the conventional budget is estimated to be averaging a deficit of $0.9 billion a year and the cash budget a surplus of only about 1.3 billion a year. To be sure, in the most recent year a budgetary surplus has been achieved, but only at the cost of mounting deficits in production and employment, neglect of domestic needs, and risks to national security.

Seventh. The hurtful effects of the Government's hard-money policy and upside-down fight against inflation: Comparing 1956 with 1952, the hard-money policy has increased the effective interest burden on the public debt as a whole by 9 percent, on 3- to 5-year Federal obligations by 34 percent, and on State and local borrowing by 23 percent. This makes it harder to finance our great national priorities of need. By also pushing up private interest rates, it has imposed a toll of several billion dollars a year on the people, to subsidize a few who do not need it. While the hard-money policy has increased the incomes of those already doing exceedingly well, including many financial and industrial groups, it has further depressed the incomes of those already doing too poorly, including farmers and small-business men. It has done little to curb the investment boom in plant and equipment, already too high relative to consumption; but it has increased the interest burden on homeowners and veterans very seriously, and forced home building to undesirably low levels. Thus, as an anti-inflationary measure, the hard-money policy has

poured fuel on the flame and water on the embers. The big inflationary problem is the plight of millions of families with low incomes, or on fixed incomes, who have lagged behind the long-term economic advance. The Government is falling far short of its responsibilities to meet this problem.

GOALS AND PROGRAMS TO CLOSE THE GAPS IN OUR PROSPERITY

A national prosperity budget for 1957–1960 is proposed in the current study to help unfasten the vise of the great complacency by a portrayal of our full economic needs and capabilities, which should be translated into actual full prosperity for all. Every specific goal in this national prosperity budget, and every proposed policy and program, is fitted into a total picture, and thus tested for consistency and resource practicality. The Federal budget is also fitted into this picture. The main goals, with policies and programs to attain them, are these:

First. Civilian employment should rise from an estimated 64 million for 1956 as a whole to about 66 million in 1957, and to almost 68½ million by 1960. Unemployment should be reduced from an estimated 2.7 million in 1956 as a whole to about 1.7 million in 1957, and about 1.8 million in 1960.

Second. Total national production, measured in uniform 1955 dollars, should rise from an estimated $405 billion in 1956 to more than $436 billion in 1957, to about $492 billion for 1960 as a whole, and to $500 billion by the final quarter of that year. This is based on rising employment, a 3.7 percent average annual growth in productivity, and an 0.8 percent average annual reduction in working hours.

Third. Averages family incomes, including both multiple-person families and single-person families, should rise above the 1955 level by about 10 percent by 1957, and about 20 percent by 1960. The number of multiple-person families with incomes below $4,000 should be more than cut in half by 1960; the number below $2,000 reduced by more than three-fourths; and the number below $1,000 cut by about four-fifths. Roughly corresponding improvements should occur in the case of single-person families. In a full prosperity economy, these gains would leave ample room for progress by higher income families.

Fourth. Per capita farm income should rise from $881 in 1955 to about $1,450 by 1960. Even then, the farm population would enjoy only about 70 percent of parity of income and living standards with the population as a whole, contrasted with about 49 percent in 1955 and still lower in 1956. This requires drastic reconstruction of the entire national farm program starting now.

Fifth. Toward meeting the great priorities of our national needs, the national prosperity budget proposes the following programs: (a) programs to encourage about 9½ million new homes during the 1957–60 period, with about 2 million devoted to rehousing middle-income families with the assistance of very low-cost loans, about 1.2 million devoted to low-rent or low-cost subsidized housing to replace urban slums, and about 0.8 million devoted to new farm housing of all types. The balance of more than 5 million would be conventionally financed private housing. A large amount of rehabilitation is also included; (b) a program to construct about 600,000 new classrooms in elementary and secondary public schools between now and 1960; to raise average teachers' pay from about $4,100 now to about $1,000 higher by 1960; and to achieve comparable expansion in higher education, with particular stress upon scientific and technical training; (c) a health program which, by doubling by 1960 the current level of Federal contributions for hospitals, research, training of medical and other health personnel, and other health services, would bring these services into closer balance with our needs and establish a practical foundation for the adoption of national health insurance shortly thereafter. It is also proposed that the recently enacted disability insurance legislation be expanded in coverage by 1960, and applied to both permanent and temporary disability regardless of age; (d) a program designed approximately to double by 1960 the deplorably low monthly average levels of public assistance payments to the aged—now $54.07—and the benefits to the aged under the old-age and survivors insurance program—now $62.42. It is also proposed that, by 1960, Federal contributions be doubled for other welfare services, such as the care of dependent children and the blind, child welfare and the school-lunch program, vocational rehabilitation, and institutional care. And it is proposed that, by 1960, the entirely inadequate unemployment insurance benefits averaging only $27.02 a week under State laws be nearly doubled; (e) a program designed approximately to double by 1960 Federal outlays for natural-resource development; (f) a program to raise international nonmilitary assistance from the current level of about $1.8 billion a year to about $3.3 billion by 1960; (g) an allowance for national security outlays about one-half billion dollars higher in calendar year 1957, and another one-half billion higher in 1960, than the level in fiscal 1956.

Sixth. Minimum wage coverage should be extended, with the minimum protection level raised to $1.25 an hour in 1957, and to at least $1.50 an hour by 1960. This is needed not only to catch up with the long-term advance in living costs to date, but more importantly to help bring low-income families upward toward at least tolerable living standards in an expanding economy.

Seventh. Tax revision is desirable as a matter of simple justice to low-income families. It is proposed that the exemption level per dependent under the personal income tax laws be raised immediately by $100. This is also needed to help achieve a full prosperity level of total consumption. By closing some glaring tax loopholes, this change would be compatible with a balanced budget in a growing economy.

Eighth. Aids to small business should include modification of the "hard money" policy, and graduations in the corporate income tax to remove competitive disadvantage. Credit availability should be amplified at lower costs, Government contracts should be awarded more equitably, and the administration and enforcement of the anti-monopoly laws should become more vigilant. More important, small business would be helped by full economic expansion, which alone provides room for all.

Ninth. Balanced growth in private investment and business incomes will be promoted, if consumer and public outlays are fully responsive to our needs and capabilities, if small business is encouraged, and if the proposed housing program is carried forward. Total private business investment, including net foreign investment, should be about $6 billion dollars higher in 1957, and about $17 billion higher by 1960, than in 1956. Corporate profits—after inventory valuation adjustment—should rise about $2 billion in 1957, and about $6 billion by 1960. Unincorporated business and professional income and rental income should rise about $2 billion in 1957, and about $6 billion by 1960.

Tenth. Improving the Employment Act of 1946. Those administering this act should be required to comply with its requirement that needed levels of employment, production, and purchasing power be set forth in concrete terms. The failure to disclose our needs and capabilities tightens the vise of complacency in which we are now caught.

ECONOMIC PRACTICALITY OF THE ENTIRE PROGRAM

These proposed programs are not "pie in the sky." The national prosperity budget shows that these programs are entirely consistent with and necessary to the achievement of the general goals for full employment, production, and purchasing power without inflation. The effect of the proposed Federal contributions to help serve our great national priorities of need—aside from national security—would be to lift Federal conventional budget expenditures for these purposes from an annual average of $33.05 per capita during the fiscal years 1954–57 as a whole to $85.07 per capita by 1960—measured in uniform 1955 dollars. Such expenditures would come to only 3.07 percent of full national production in 1960, compared with the excessively low 1.39 percent during the fiscal years 1954–57 as a whole. With respect to national security outlays, the national prosperity budget allows for a higher absolute level both in 1957 and in 1960 than in 1956. But relative to the size of an expanding total national production, these national security outlays would decline from 10.85 percent during fiscal 1954–57 to only 8.43 percent in 1960. Thus, Federal budgetary outlays for national security and the other enumerated great priorities of need combined would be only 11.5 percent of total national production in 1960, contrasted with 12.24 percent during 1954–57. And Federal budgetary outlays for all purposes, including the general costs of government and all other Federal and Federally assisted programs, would come by 1960 to only 16 percent of full national production in that year, contrasted with about 17.5 percent of actual production during the calendar years 1953–56.

Hence, the proposed programs are well within our economic resources.

TOWARD A BALANCED FEDERAL BUDGET WITHIN THE NATIONAL PROSPERITY BUDGET

If full prosperity were restored for the calendar year 1957 as a whole, the conventional Federal Budget, despite the proposed expenditure and tax-revision programs, would show a deficit of only about $1.4 billion for the calendar year; and the far more important cash budget would be at least in balance. The foregoing of immediate "surpluses" would be a small and wise price to pay for removing the 1956 production deficit of more than $17 billion, and starting to close the other gaps in our prosperity and in our national security. By 1960, with an expanded full prosperity, the conventional budget would be at least in balance, and the cash surplus would be at least $2 billion. Also, as has been indicated, Federal conventional budget outlays for all purposes, which have averaged about 17½ percent of total national production during the 4 calendar years 1953–56, would be reduced to about 16 percent by 1960 under conditions of full prosperity. The proposed expenditure and tax programs would approximately stabilize the national debt, but this debt would decline from about 67 percent of our total national product in 1956 to about 56 percent by 1960.

All members of the national committee of the Conference on Economic Progress do not necessarily subscribe to all of the analysis or all of the recommendations, but all join in bringing this study to the attention of the public. The staff work on this study, directed by Leon H. Keyserling, has been done by Mary Dublin Keyserling, Robert A. Levine, and Philip M. Ritz. The conference has benefited by comments from a number of economists and others, especially John A. Baker, Rev. Shirley Greene, Gordon Roth, Stanley Ruttenberg, Boris Shishkin, Elmer E. Walker, and Nat Weinberg.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman on the remarks that he has made. It is my belief that the statements he has made are true and that they pertain to my State of Kansas as well as other portions of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity of having my remarks included in this great body concerning immediate legislation for drought assistance. I speak in behalf of my constitutents and also as a farmer myself from the heart of the drought area—the Fifth District of Kansas.

The cultivated land in this drought area and especially in my District contains much of the finest soil in the world. Experts agree that it has all the minerals in abundance that plant life requires. It produces some of the highest quality wheat in the Nation. During World War I, World War II, and again in the Korean war days much of what is now the drought area was literally the bread basket of the world. It is a vital part of our national economy. Although it is the victim of wet-dry weather cycles, we will not solve the problem by seriously entertaining consideration of restoring any but the most marginal portions of this land to grass. Rather, we must look to an emergency program that is designed to keep the farmers and ranchers on this great mass of productive land so they will be there ready to produce when the drought is broken.

The drought has been especially disastrous to small farmers. Much has been said about small inefficient farmers being forced off their farms, but many farmers have had to give up their land not because they were inefficient or because their unit was too small to be efficient. They have been squeezed off the farm because they did not have the backlog of cash and credit when the drought began rather than because of their methods of operation.

The financial stress in this area is not a result of the farmers' own making, but a result of a catastrophe of nature at a time when farm costs have risen in the face of sliding-scale farm prices. And so important is this region to our Nation's economy and defense that this prolonged drought has brought on a condition that is clearly a national emergency. To alleviate the condition that exists, and in order to avert a worsening of the situation, the following relief measures appear to me to be imperative:

First. Soil conservation payments for practices used to stop wind erosion: By mid-March hundreds of thousands of acres of cultivated land with adequate cover could suffer unparalleled damage from wind erosion. Much of it is blowing—and has blown—very badly already, and it will be unusually vulnerable to the customary strong spring winds of the Great Plains. Some farmers destitute of funds will be unable to fight the winds through proper practices, thus causing untold loss to our greatest natural resource. I suggest that payments of at least 75 cents per acre for chiseling and $1 per acre for listing be made available immediateley to farmers in the drought area, and that such payments be made retoactive to October 1, 1956. I ask that this be made retroactive for two reasons: First, because wind erosion practices since October 1, 1956, have already removed some land from the highly vulnerable category making it unnecessary for some of these farmers to participate in a future program. Second, it is within reason to reward those who have followed good conservation practices when such practices are needed, and who have not waited back for an announcement of government assistance.

Second. The assistance for feed and hay should be continued and proteins should be included along with hay and the surplus feed grains such as corn and grain sorghums. Throughout the whole area, ranchers have drastically reduced their herds. By means of pasture rotation some operators still have pastures—although poor ones—on which they are grazing limited numbers of livestock. To avail themselves of Government aid for hay in many areas, the hay must be shipped for hundreds of miles and the freight factor destroys any hope they might have had for cheaper feed.

Third. Deferred-grazing program: A deferred-grazing program should be included as a part of the emergency relief for the drought area. Much of the pasture land that appears almost ruined, can, I believe, be restored by nature within 1 to 3 years if it can be allowed to rest, the time depending on its present condition and the future rainfall.

Fourth. Federal aid to farm credit: I favor a program for making additional Federal funds immediately available to farmers for credit purposes. Many of the farm operators already have heavy mortgages against land and equipment and are no longer able to secure bank credit. These people are able to continue on in their farm operations only through use of retail credit. And this source has drastically tightened. Federal financial assistance is needed badly and loans must be of a long-term nature. In this respect, too, I would urge that the qualifications for FHA loans in the drought area be liberalized to include more farmers.

Fifth. More SBA drought loans needed: I believe a new approach to the eligibility factor involved in Small Business Administration drought loans is badly needed. While the SBA is authorized to make 3 percent, 10-year loans to small businesses showing a loss which can be attributed to drought conditions, very few such loans have been made. It has been next to impossible to prove that a business has lost money because of drought conditions as other factors are often involved as well.

Sixth. You can believe everything you have read about the devastation that drought has brought to this country and the hardship it has worked on the people. But you find, when traveling through the parched and dusty land, that, on farm after farm, determination to stick it out is the prevailing sentiment. A few farm families, it is true, have pulled out to seek a better living in the prosperous cities. But those who remain on the land represent a hard core of seasoned farmers whose faith in the high plains is unshakable. As the drought worsens, more and more people in other sections of the country are asking whether the Government should try to sustain a farm economy in this semi-arid region with its recurring droughts. The heavy cost to the taxpayer is being cited.

Seventh. "We ought to spend enough money to seed the whole thing back to grass and then keep it there," say some easterners. The idea of putting the Plains back to grass is termed "totally unrealistic" by Ervin L. Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. He is in charge of the Great Plains program approved by Congress in 1956. An objective of the Great Plains program is to put several million acres back into grass, but Mr. Peterson says that "most of the land now in cultivation is suitable for continuous cultivation provided it is handled right." Mr. Peterson holds that the Nation's total farm production would be cut back too far and the economy of the Great Plains would suffer if the region were returned to grass. But I

would like to make this deduction: In normal times, a quarter section—160 acres—in grass will carry about 15 beef cows. If you get 15 calves from those cows and sell them for $80 a head, you gross $1,200. Put that quarter in wheat, let it lie fallow every other year, and it will yield 4,000 bushels. At $2 a bushel, that's a gross return of $8,000 over the 2-year period. Then, too, the wheat will furnish pasture for livestock during the fall and winter months.

Everywhere the plea is for more credit. "We've gone as far as the examiners will let us on many of our farm loans," says H. H. Stephenson, of the First State Bank in Paint Rock, Tex. He estimates that about 50 percent of the ranchers in his area have had to turn to the Government for emergency 1-year loans. Says I. R. Romer, himself a rancher and businessman at Holly, Colo.:

What the Government should do is set up some long-range credit. The taxpayers will get their money back. I was on the farm board that made Government loans to farmers here in the 1930's, and the records will show that durn near every penny was paid back—with interest.

Records of the Department of Agriculture in Washington show that. The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, set up in 1933 with capital of $200 million, made loans totaling $1.2 billion over its lifetime. When closed out, it paid off the $200 million capital, paid all expenses and returned $137 million to the Treasury as a dividend.

Eighth. The following shows what the lowering of parity prices for oats, barley, rye, and grain sorghums stands to cost the State of Kansas. This is based on a 10-year average production of these feed grains from 1945 to 1955 and reflects the dollar loss resulting from lowering these grains from 76 percent of parity to 70 percent of parity:

| Feed grain | Average 10-year production, bushels | 1956 price (per bushel) at 76 per cent parity | 1957 price (per bushel) at 70 per cent parity | Drop in cents per bushel | Drop in dollar value in Kansas |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Oats | 24,623,000 | $0.65 | $0.60 | 5 | $1,231,150 |
| Barley | 5,769,000 | 1.02 | .94 | 8 | 461,520 |
| Rye | 520,000 | 1.27 | 1.15 | 12 | 62,400 |
| Grain sorghum | 30,323,000 | 1.10 | 1.02 | 8 | 2,425,840 |
| Total loss to Kansas in feed grains | | | | | 4,180,910 |

The following shows what the lowering of parity from 75 percent to 70 percent stands to cost the Kansas soybean producers: The average—10-year—production of soybeans in Kansas is 3,859,000 bushels. The support price in 1956 was $2.15; for the 1957 crop it is set at $2.06 per bushel—a drop of 9 cents per bushel which may cost the Kansas producers as much as $231,540. Adding this loss in 1957—crop oilseeds to that of the 4 feed grains mades a total of $4,412,450 in lost income to Kansas farmers on 1957 crops which will surely result from Secretary Benson's announced parity prices of these 5 items only.

I wish also to speak about the wind erosion and the drought relief that has been offered by the President of the United States since he made the tour of the West. For listing and chiseling in wind erosion areas, which includes the western half of my State, which grows principally wheat, a payment of 75 cents an acre for chiseling and a dollar an acre for listing up this soil to protect it from wind erosion is the payment that is ordinarily made.

Beginning last October, when these people signed up on the 5th day of October, the final date for the soil bank, when some of the land at that time was blown because of the drought and the lack of moisture, they were led to believe if they would go out and apply this good farming practice of chiseling and listing, if there were any funds made available certainly they would be allowed that amount for doing this work. Some of them could not afford it.

They did not have any money left because many of our operators are young GI's. They got started late in life, and some of them have not accumulated enough resources to carry them over in this kind of times. I would say that 85 to 90 percent of that land has been worked.

Now we come along with an appropriation bill that seems to say, "Let us go back and pick up the payments for good farm practice use, for something that the State committee has encouraged and said that if any funds were made available our people would get them. However, the bill is still in the making here and we hope that many of the States and many of our colleagues here will see fit to inaugurate that portion of the bill so that these people that voluntarily have done a good farming practice and have been led to believe that they would get this money and are entitled to have it will have it.

I do not say we are asking for a handout. This thing is brought onto us by an act of God, just like a flood in some other area. Actually, in my county, Morton County, Kans., we have had five and a half inches of rainfall in the last 18 months. Certainly something is going to have to happen and happen quick if we are to continue to exist out there.

Farm credit, FHA—it seems to me like an extension of time or refinancing is the only thing that is going to save many of them from foreclosure, and we have some foreclosure at the present time.

I spent 30 years in this particular area that is hardest hit now and I know that during the so-called dustbowl years that when people foreclosed on loans, everybody lost. The farmer lost and the loaning company lost. I also know that the ones that rode through, that refinanced and carried these people on indefinitely until times got better, were in the position where nobody lost any money.

Let me remind my colleagues that all through the forties this area of the United States was like the garden spot of the world. We were called on in this last world war as well as the First World War to help produce food to feed the entire Nation and the free world. We think it is an important country in the defense of this America of ours. We are not wanting to leave the country. When they say it shall all be planted back to grass, we are reluctant to leave it, because in reality it is an important area of the United States and it is the breadbasket of the world.

I am happy to join with my colleague in his remarks. Since I live on a ranch that is in the middle of the drought area, I feel that I do know something about this situation. I compliment the gentleman on his remarks.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. May I exercise the privilege of complimenting the gentleman upon the fine statement he is making to the House. He is making a real contribution. The gentleman shows that he has a comprehension of the problems of the farmers and the problems of the farm belt in general of this country. I commend the gentleman upon his good judgment.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his kind comments. I also thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for her very kind and helpful comments, which I especially appreciate because of the courageous battle she has waged for America's farm families. I appreciate also the remarks of my friend the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. I want to thank the gentleman from South Dakota and I want to compliment him on his fine presentation this afternoon. I know he is going to represent well the people of his district. I agree heartily with everything he has said, and I join also in commending the gentlewoman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Kansas for their fine remarks.

I remember as a boy reading that the doctors of 300 or 400 years ago treated their patients by bloodletting. Whether it was diphtheria or smallpox or the plague, their cure was always the same—just bleed the patients. Nowadays, we find it difficult to conceive what manner of doctor could ever have followed such a fruitless practice. What manner of man, you ask, ever followed such a program? Well, we have such a man right here in Washington. In fact, the President has in his cabinet a Secretary of Agriculture who seems to be quite similar to that medicine man of long ago. For centuries the old doctors had one philosophy—bleed the patient. Likewise today, the Secretary of Agriculture has only one philosophy to treat the ills of agriculture and that is to bleed the farmers. The olden doctors had two well-known methods of bleeding their patients—one of them was to cut a blood vessel and let the blood run, and the

other was to apply a leech or bloodsucker over a vein or artery and let it suck the blood out. Mr. Benson has even more ways of draining the economic blood from the farmer. Our distinguished colleagues from South Dakota, Minnesota, and Kansas have listed many ways in which this medicine man is bleeding the farmers white. His favorite prescription is to cut the price. One version of bleeding the patient—that same prescription again—can be called flexible price supports, which is another way to bleed the patient. Cut the acres, force cross compliance, and modernize parity are all further ways to bleed the patient. And yet, no matter how anemic any part of our farm economy is, the Secretary has never suggested a blood transfusion except for the sheep and sugar-beet growers who abound in his own State of Utah.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. As long as that kind of a tirade is going on, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order temporarily in order that some unanimous-consent requests may be made.

## H. R. 348

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House today, the Speaker be authorized to sign the enrolled bill H. R. 348.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY IN NEAR EAST

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I view the policy of the administration in the Near East as being neither intelligent, realistic, nor one which serves America's best interests.

Mr. Eisenhower took the air yesterday to discuss the possibility of pressures against Israel. There is no definition for this word but sanctions.

The President's statement shed light on his position, but not on the real situation in this most troubled area. The light shed on the position of the President reveals glaring inconsistencies and the double standard, which, to date, the administration has denied. The real fact is that the President said:

> I do not believe that Israel's default should be ignored because the United Nations has not been able to carry out its resolutions condemning the Soviet Union for its armed suppression of the people of Hungary.

The President then placed this statement on the supposedly valid pedestal that two wrongs do not make a right. That statement is a perfectly proper and correct ethical maxim, but it is inapplicable here. The reason is both simple and obvious. No sanctions against Russia have been considered by Mr. Eisenhower or anybody else.

What is the standard which the President applies to Russia? In the President's own words, Russia is subjected to moral pressure. Can anyone imagine a less moral nation, or a country less subject to moral pressure?

But what has been the treatment of Israel, to which the President is solicitous in his remarks? To date, Israel has witnessed a shutting off of all technical assistance and other aid from the United States. That, I might add, is a tremendously important item to a small struggling nation.

So the double standard is made clear. The President stands for sanctions for Israel and moral pressure for the Soviet. What a pretense of virtue and piety here in the White House and in the State Department.

The reason for Mr. Eisenhower's pique is set forth in his statement:

> But Israel seeks something more. It insists on firm guaranties as a condition of withdrawing its forces of invasion.
>
> This raises a basic question of principle. Should a nation which attacks and occupies foreign territory in the face of United Nations disapproval be allowed to impose conditions for its withdrawal.

Mr. Eisenhower says further that if we countenance Israel's position that we countenance the "use of force as a means of settling international differences and gaining national advantages.

To make the contradiction complete, Mr. Eisenhower says that the "United States fully realized that military action against Egypt resulted from grave and repeated provocations." In plain everyday English, "You are darn right it did." This soulful theme is repeated at least twice in the speech.

The truth is stated by the President in those words, but it fails to strike home to him. Between July 1949 and October 1955 the Mixed Armistice Commission dealt with 2,231 cases of armed attacks by Arabs against Israel, 5,467 cases of theft, 237 armed robberies, and 272 cases of sabotage. Israel has struck back and been condemned by the Armistice Commission 24 times during that period. Each time that the Armistice Commission condemned Israel, it noted that the Israeli's conduct was a result of extreme provocation. Or put more succinctly, what Israel did was done in self-defense. This program of vigorous self-defense was no different in Israel's recent military action against Egypt—a topic which I will develop more fully later.

Now, let us look at the recent history. Since the truce has been restored, Israel has agreed to comply with the U. N. resolutions as soon as proper safeguards for her national security are restored. What Israel has been offered has been a return to the status quo, both by the United States and by the U. N.

The United States and the U. N. both upheld the moral right of Israel to be free of the Egyptian blockade, to free access to the Suez Canal and to the Gulf of Aqaba. Israel's right to be secure from Egyptian fedeyeen raids and open military action was also recognized. But none of these wonderful recognitions by the United States and the U. N. did a bit of good in the past nor will help in the future, especially if Mr. Nasser's recent expressions on the subject are to be believed. Indeed, the post-military-action expressions of Mr. Nasser have taken much more vigorous form than the mere newspaper articles quoted in this country. There have been no fewer than 15 instances of Egyptian attack through the U. N. force charged with keeping of the peace. That force is so strong that on one occasion it had to be protected from the Egyptians by the British and French troops in the Suez Canal Zone.

The approach of Mr. Eisenhower appears to be a return to the status quo, and then United States support of Israel in the same lukewarm precrisis manner. Surely that is no way to keep the peace.

I intend to redevelop my ideas on the proper manner of restoring peace to the area in a special order which my good friend, the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California, has arranged for next Tuesday, and I hope as many of my colleagues as possible will participate in that debate.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] may extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is this the gentleman speaking?

Mr. McGOVERN. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I object, unless there is some understanding about what is going into the RECORD. My only reason for making a point of no quorum at this time—and I realize it is somewhat unusual—was that the gentleman to whom the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] yielded was making what some of us consider a personal attack upon the Secretary of Agriculture. He was comparing the Secretary of Agriculture to a bloodsucker. On reflection, he will probably strike out the "bloodsucker" references.

But if that kind of talk is in order, it is all right with me; but I want a quorum present to hear it.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter, and the same request for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL], and the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object. I made the point of no quorum. I also objected to the extension of remarks if that is what is going to be included.

The SPEAKER. That is all right if the gentleman is going to object to everybody extending his remarks.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not care how far you extend it; my objection will be made when thought necessary. You can have it unanimous if you want to; I am not making the requests, I am objecting to the extensions and continuation of the speech which the gentleman from Montana [Mr. ANDERSON] was making, not to what the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], who has the floor, was saying, but the gentleman to whom he yielded.

The SPEAKER. This question has not been put to any occupant of the chair before, to my recollection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I can take it if the rest of us can, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan insist on his point of order?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold it a moment?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, certainly.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from South Dakota desire to revise and extend his remarks?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to that if he is going to include in the extension a continuation of the remarks that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. ANDERSON] to whom he yielded was making.

I realize that what the Speaker has just been saying is all too true; and that it may not appear in tomorrow's RECORD, and I realize that perhaps I have been one of the greatest offenders in criticizing members of previous administrations. I have a clear recollection of one occasion when I was criticizing a President. The Chair ruled I was out of order—not because I was misstating the facts but because the rules were being violated.

Ordinarily I would go along, and I surely appreciate the Speaker's advice. I realize how onerous it may be upon me personally, but when the gentleman compares a Cabinet officer to a bloodsucker it is too much. If that kind of thing is to go along, all right, but I want a majority present to hear it. I will venture the prediction that after he gets his charge to the press he will strike much of the "bloodsucker" from it.

I will take the consequences of my action; I can take it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BAILEY. Has the gentleman from Montana secured unanimous consent that he be permitted to revise and extend his remarks?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not want to be critical, Mr. Speaker. I realize the importance of this kind of action, but it does seem that if we are going to have anything fair and orderly at all I cannot go along with that bloodsucker business unless a quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has already said that; maybe he is not going to say it any more.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the point if some of the other Members on this side who may want to reply are given an opportunity to express our opinion of what he is saying.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize anyone to proceed as long as they want to this afternoon.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. ANDERSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. I thank the gentleman from South Dakota for yielding to me. I see that there are a substantially larger number of Members here than there were when I initially made some remarks. Perhaps I should point out just the essence of what I had said up to this point. I said that I remember reading as a boy, that three or four hundred years ago the standard way of treating patients for every disease was to let their blood. I made the comparison that our present Secretary of Agriculture is utilizing a comparative method. I might suggest that he is a reincarnation of one of these oldtime medicine men because he has only one solution for any farm problem and that is to let the farmers' economic blood by one method or another, his most frequent method being by driving down the prices of all agricultural products.

Secretary Benson visited briefly in Montana last week, on the birthday of Abraham Lincoln—Honest Abe—and it was a particularly inappropriate day for the Secretary to make his oft-repeated but questionable claim that farm income is 5 percent higher than in 1955. This statistical claim just is not true and has been challenged by some of our Nation's top leaders alert to the grave economic dangers posed by Mr. Benson's one-track approach to this problem.

Statistics, properly interpreted by the one man who is supposed to uphold and maintain America's great agricultural economy, are being used by him instead to drive a great economic knife through the very body and soul of our millions of farm and ranch people. That same economic knife, so wildly and cruelly swung at agriculture, is going to slash and harm other segments of American economic life.

In my own great State of Montana, where agriculture, and primarily grain, is the No. 1 industry, our farmers and ranchers have just been handed a loss of millions of dollars this year on four grains which have had price supports lowered.

Now they face still another smash in their economic breadbasket through changes in the wheat standards scheduled June 1.

In the 4 years of Secretary Benson's low prices, our farmers in America have produced the biggest crops on record in an effort to get enough gross income to pay their bills. It is only logical to believe that the new lower price supports will inevitably result in heavier production, more surpluses, and a further worsening of the farm situation.

The Secretary of Agriculture at Billings, Mont., February 12, said that farm income is 5 percent higher than in 1955, yet 5 days previously his own Federal-State reporting service indicated Montana farmers and ranchers are in the poorest financial position they have been in since the pre-Korean war years of 1947–48. Prices received, according to the February 7 Montana report, were 19 percent below the 1947–49 base period, while prices paid by Montana farm families were 20 percent above this same period. That, gentlemen, is a huge gap.

Speaking for the wheat farmers of my district, I am protesting to Secretary Benson that his proposed changes in United States wheat grades and standards next June 1 is just another step to downgrade wheat to the farm, and hence it can result only in lower prices to wheat producers and lower income generally. I am for clean wheat but I feel that this problem is a function of the Food and Drug Administration as in the past.

Secretary Benson's defense is that they will get more high quality wheat on the market. But changing grade will not create more high-quality wheat, it will just juggle farm income still lower, bleeding the farmer in one more way.

Now, in conclusion, I know many of you may remember Robin Hood. That jolly and gallant man of Sherwood Forest who submitted himself to the ministrations of a bogus bloodletter. Robin Hood's good, red blood pulsed forth under this ministration until life itself was drained from his body.

Likewise, the farmers of America have received the same treatment. In his more than 4 years as Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson has bled millions of farmers. Now, more than a half million of them are gone—economically bled white, sick and discouraged, driven from their farms.

It is time for us to seek a skilled, modern physician for our agricultural illness.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] may be permitted to extend his remarks following those of Mr. MCGOVERN.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. I would like to ask the gentleman from Montana, if I may, a question. Now, I think a tirade against the Secretary of Agriculture is perfectly proper if you feel that way in your heart, but let me remind the gentleman from Montana that we think we are working under the finest, absolutely the very best sugar act which has ever been passed by the Congress. I wonder if the gentleman from Montana knows that he has sugar

beets in his State? That is a very fine attitude to take toward what I consider one of the finest bills we have ever had on sugar and it was passed by the 84th Congress.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. I do, indeed. I am thoroughly familiar with the sugar-beet program and the sheep program. I am a rancher. I raise some beets under the sugar-beet program and I raise sheep under the wool program.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman is not against the wool program, I hope.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. I am not. I indicated that in these two cases the Secretary has condescended to give the agricultural economy a transfusion, but in these two instances only.

Mr. HILL. The Secretary of Agriculture proposed the wool program. The Congress passed it. Let me ask the gentleman another question. What is the support price on wheat? You tell me the support price on wheat this very day. Just be fair with the Secretary of Agriculture. He needs no protection from me.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. In Montana?

Mr. HILL. Anywhere. I am talking about the support price on wheat. I have wheat in my area, too, and I expected to support the durum wheat bill that the gentleman proposes and the Secretary is against. But, when you make such an unfair attack as you are making today, you do not need to expect any help from me. Now, what is the support price on wheat? The gentleman does not answer, and he does not know the answer to that question. What is the support price on wheat?

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, do I have the floor? If I do I'll answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. HILL. No; the gentleman from South Dakota has the floor. I did not say I had the floor. The gentleman from South Dakota was kind enough to yield to me just to correct a misstatement. The Secretary of Agriculture has been kind to the gentleman's wheat people and he has been kind to the gentleman's wool people. Now, what are you bellyaching about is what I want to know.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. The wheat price in my county in Montana is $1.81 a bushel.

Mr. HILL. I did not ask the gentleman that.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. The support price?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. I answered the question. The support price at our rail point is $1.81 a bushel.

Mr. HILL. I would like to ask another question directed to the gentleman from South Dakota. Does the gentleman think that $1.81 is fair or anywhere near fair for the price of wheat?

Mr. McGOVERN. I will answer that question without any hesitation. It is not a fair price.

Mr. HILL. What would be fair?

Mr. McGOVERN. The wheat farmers cannot operate under that kind of a support price.

Mr. HILL. How about $2 a bushel, if I tell you the facts.

Mr. McGOVERN. $2?

Mr. HILL. That is what it is.

Mr. McGOVERN. The actual facts are that in 1947 the farmers were receiving $3 a bushel for wheat, and we gradually permitted this program to be cut to the point where they cannot operate under the present price-support level. The gentleman from Montana has stated that the support price is not $2 as alleged by the gentleman from Colorado, but $1.81.

Mr. HILL. Is the gentleman aware of who passed the wheat legislation? I think I was a Member when most of that was passed.

Mr. McGOVERN. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Does the gentleman not know that the Democrats had charge of this House at that time?

Mr. McGOVERN. I know that the Democrats in the 84th Congress voted overwhelmingly to restore price supports to the 90 percent price-support level on all basic farm commodities. That action on the part of the Congress was vetoed by the administration.

Mr. HILL. But the gentleman knows that the Secretary of Agriculture supported the price of wool at the price that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. ANDERSON] complained about.

Mr. McGOVERN. I think what the gentleman from Montana is trying to say is that we want the same kind of consideration for other commodities that has been given to wool.

Mr. HILL. How in the world can the gentleman expect to get it, when he makes such an unkind attack on the Secretary as he has made.

Mr. McGOVERN. I might say that there seems to be an ample number of friends of the Secretary of Agriculture here to answer any unfounded criticism of his program.

Mr. HILL. I hope he does have friends. But it is the programs that we are interested in and not his friends; the program for wool and the program for sugar beets.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman would make it clear in the RECORD that the program for wool which the gentleman from Colorado commends, is the identical program that the then Democratic Secretary of Agriculture, Charlie Brannan, proposed years ago? And would the gentleman also point out that the sugar program which Secretary Benson and the gentleman from Colorado both endorse was worked out and established by a Democratic Department of Agriculture and a Democratic Congress? Now would the gentleman go further and point out that the present Secretary of Agriculture has applied to wool and sugar and no other commodities the principles of direct production payments and that he has refused to even consider the application of this principle to the other commodities in the other States of the Union?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is commendable on the part of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], to rise and defend the Secretary of Agriculture because he has been sadly wanting defenders in the Midwestern part of the United States since the middle of last summer. So I commend the gentleman from Colorado.

I think we ought to make it clear, however, that at least as I have understood the arguments here, no one has been attacking the Secretary for his support of the wool program or the sugar program. But what we have been asking for is a little bit in the way of consistency on the part of the Secretary.

It may be that he operates under a different set of standards from those imposed upon ordinary men. The Secretary of Agriculture did tell the people in Utah some time ago that he had received a witness from the Almighty that he was acting as he should in being Secretary of Agriculture. I do not suppose the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] can claim that. I do not know about the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL]. I cannot establish any claim that I have that kind of witness. I have to proceed here according to whatever understanding I have and what knowledge I can get and, I hope, with a measure of good will. But the Secretary of Agriculture, we should keep in mind, claims that he has received a witness from the Almighty. If the gentleman from Colorado can sustain that, it would be helpful to the debate, I think. But if he cannot, I think he ought to permit us to go ahead and criticize this man Benson, as we have criticized Secretaries of Agriculture in the past and as, I hope, we shall continue to criticize them in the future.

The Secretary of Agriculture does not stop with claims to his own personal approval. I heard him at the grain exchange dinner in Minneapolis last fall, talking about the President and say that this man—the President—could reach out and put his hand on the unseen power and use it when he needed it.

Again I hesitate to criticize the President or his appointments, because I cannot claim that I have this kind of power and I cannot dispute with these men who claim that they have it. I would request the gentleman from Colorado to allow these Members on the Democratic side, or any other, to go ahead and make reasonable criticisms.

The original program of the Secretary was presented to us as one having four prongs. I do not know whether I should call them prongs. Maybe that would be objected to by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOFFMAN). In any event, the Secretary said he was going to accomplish four things by his program, as I remember. He was going to raise farm income. He was going to lower the prices to the consumers. He was going to reduce the cost of the farm program to the taxpayers, and he was going to reduce surpluses.

Well, what did he accomplish? The cost to the consumer has gone up. Farm

income has gone down. The surpluses held by the Government have increased about four times, and so has the cost of the program, by about three times. In my opinion, despite any association with prophecy and special inspiration or approval, we ought to proceed to judge Mr. Benson and the President, who appointed him, on the basis of their works. It has been the custom throughout history to judge prophets by their works. If we look at the works of the Secretary of Agriculture on the four points on which he based his program, we find he has failed on every one of those four points. Until he can do something better we must question his inspiration or any prophetic powers or special powers or approval he may claim.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. May I ask this question of the gentleman from Minnesota. What has a man's religion, the closest thing to his family and his home, got to do in any stretch of anyone's imagination with what we are talking about here? I resent, absolutely, mentioning anyone's religion, whatever it might be, or however little the gentleman would have in his own right to criticize any man for saying he had had inspiration or had had a feeling that certain things should happen.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not criticize him for his religion. I just want proof, if we have to act on the basis of this kind of proof.

Mr. HILL. It is hard to prove some of the inspiration that men have gotten in the past, and from that inspiration they have upset the world. I think it farfetched for the gentleman or any one on this floor to question a man's sincerity in his religion, and that is exactly what the gentleman has done.

Mr. McCARTHY. Oh, no.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman questions the man's sincerity. I do not question any man's sincerity in his religion.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have not questioned his sincerity.

Mr. HILL. I would like to discuss that with the gentleman, if the gentleman from South Dakota would be good enough to yield for that purpose. We could mention illustration after illustration in the past history of this country where a man who had an inspiration was considered a fool. I could mention a lady, if the gentleman would like to know something, who was considered a fool and an upstart, an 18-year-old girl, but today she has been canonized by the very people who put her to death. What kind of a man do you think you are to have a right to criticize someone because he happens to believe a little of the unknown which the gentleman professes to know nothing about?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not criticizing him for that.

Mr. HILL. What was the gentleman doing? Why did he bring religion into this debate?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not question his sincerity.

Mr. HILL. I am glad the gentleman made that statement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will proceed in order. The gentleman from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the gentleman will look at the text, and I will leave it as I put it in the RECORD, he will note that I am not questioning the religion or sincerity of the Secretary of Agriculture or of anyone else. All I say is, I question their performance, and I say that they should not use as an excuse their own claims to inspiration or to special witness, or to set these up as reasons why we should not criticize their program. That is all that has been involved here on my part. It has been criticism of performance not of sincerity. Perhaps they are so sincere they cannot see their own faults or the failings of their own program. That is not the issue here. It is performance I am concerned about. That has been the concern of the gentleman from South Dakota and the gentleman from Montana.

If we want to discuss the issue of religion in politics we should get time. I should be glad to talk about it further. In the meantime, I assure him that Joan of Arc was not canonized for advocating flexible price supports.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a final question?

Mr. McGOVERN. Just one more question because I would like to proceed.

Mr. HILL. I will take the gentleman on any time he gets the time of the House. I will get time and give him all the time he needs about questioning a man's religion on the floor of this House anytime, anywhere and on any occasion.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. It should not be necessary to repeat what I just said to the gentleman from Colorado, but there has been no intention on my part to question the religion or the sincerity of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman from South Dakota yield to me, please?

Mr. McCARTHY. And there has not been any question of that. All I am doing is questioning his program.

Mr. HILL. How did religion get into this? Who got religion into it? Who brought it up?

Mr. McCARTHY. The gentleman from Colorado did, as I recall.

Mr. HILL. I never mentioned it. I am only trying to answer you.

Mr. McCARTHY. Well, if you did not bring it up, you have been concentrating on it since it was brought up.

Mr. HILL. You said the Secretary of Agriculture had received inspiration from heaven.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not say he had. I said that he said he had a witness from the Almighty.

Mr. HILL. Who am I to deny that he did have?

Mr. McCARTHY. I just asked you a question. I would like to have some outside testimony in support of that. If it is true, I do not want to criticize the Secretary's program, but I want to have some proof. That is the point.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. DENTON. I notice a statement has been made that someone ought to say something in behalf of the Secretary of Agriculture. I do not know what I can say in his favor, but I cannot let this opportunity go by without thanking him for the assistance he gave me in my last campaign. He and his son and wife came to the district I represent and campaigned throughout the length and breadth of the district for one or two days. I only won by 696 votes, and I am sure that if I had not had the help of the Secretary of Agriculture in campaigning for my opponent, I could not have won. I want to thank him for the help he gave me.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I just want to say that while I have not taken part in this discussion that if, and when, the gentlemen do get time at some later date to discuss this agricultural program from the religious angle, I would like to represent the Methodists in that discussion.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. I want to commend the gentleman from South Dakota for taking this time to discuss the very important farm issue. I also want to commend my friend from Montana and my friend from Kansas for joining in this discussion. I think it highly significant that the gentleman from South Dakota, the gentleman from Montana, the gentleman from Kansas, and I are all new Members of the Congress and that we all come from very important agricultural districts in this country. I think this is of particular significance. I would like at this time to add my thanks to the Secretary of Agriculture for helping me in this past election as I know he has helped the rest of the new Members from other Congressional Districts in the West.

Agriculture is of prime importance to the district in Oregon that I represent. It is a large district and one in which a great variety of agricultural products are raised. Wheat is an important crop in the north. In the east, we produce large quantities of excellent onions and other row crops. The Second District contributes significantly to Oregon's position as a major potato-producing State. Thus, we have a greatly diversified agricultural picture. Yet, while we have diversification of product, we are, nonetheless, unified in one important respect—we have all been hit and hit hard by the program or perhaps more properly I should say the lack of any farm program on the part of the administration during the last 4 years.

The Members of the House, I know, are well acquainted with the statistics which provide irrefutable evidence of the failure of the Benson approach to agriculture. Farmers net income has continued to drop steadily since 1952. At the same time, the prices which farmers

have had to pay for necessary items have continued to rise. It is an impossible situation and one which can only mean the total disappearance of our family-size farms. Yet, I can see no evidence or indication that the administration intends to change its present position.

Secretary Benson recently announced that the position of the American farmer had significantly improved since last year. According to Mr. Benson, the realized net farm income in 1956 was 5 percent above that of 1955. Unfortunately, Mr. Benson forgot that this 5-percent increase disappears once a necessary adjustment for the change in farm inventories is made. Net income thus remains practically the same, and, of course, when the rise in the price paid by the farmer for things he buys is taken into consideration, it is equally apparent that real farm income is lower than it was in 1955. Despite this fact, the Secretary of Agriculture further reduces parity support prices on crops.

I submit that such a move can only lead to even greater economic loss to the American farmer.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in this maiden effort on the floor of the House, I had no intention of setting off the kind of explosion that has taken place here today. I am a little bit surprised at the extreme sensitivity of some of the Members on the other side of the aisle over what I think is legitimate criticism of the present administration's agricultural program. Considering the implications of treason that were aimed at former Democratic Presidents by Members of the opposition in recent years, I am at a loss to understand their extreme sensitivity to criticism of the policies of a department official. As a matter of fact, criticism of the Secretary of Agriculture has come from both sides of the aisle. I well remember a remark made by the senior Senator from my State some time ago in which he said the Secretary of Agriculture was doing such a poor job that he ought to resign. It has also been pointed out by numerous Members on both sides of the aisle that irrespective of the Secretary's sincerity, he simply does not understand the problems of modern agriculture which face our farmers today.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] has made an outstanding statement. Already he has shown a broad knowledge of the farm problem and a deep sympathy for our family farmers.

In the course of this debate, several phases of our farm program have been discussed fully. I have one addition. As our colleague from Montana [Mr. ANDERSON] has pointed out, the Secretary of Agriculture has been claiming that farm income in 1956 was higher than in 1955.

This is not the case according to statistics provided by the Department of Agriculture and published in the February 1957 Economic Indicators. Page 7 of the current issue is devoted to farm income. At the top of the page are these words:

> Gross farm income (seasonally adjusted annual rate) rose at the close of 1956 for the fifth successive quarter. Despite an increase in farm production expenses, net farm income was up $500 million in the fourth quarter of 1956.

As you read the columns of statistics on that page, you will note, however, that there was such an increase in net income only if you exclude net change in inventories. If you include net change in inventories, the statistics show that net farm income in 1956 was $11.6 billion, down $100 million from 1955.

Inventories are the livestock, the grain, and the other farm commodities which the farmer has on hand. They are like the goods on the storekeeper's shelves. A storekeeper who juggles his books to show that he is making a profit only by ignoring a decrease in his inventory, will not be in business long.

The net change in inventories cannot be ignored in figuring net farm income either. It means that our farmers had to sell off their livestock and their stored grain at prices which were below previous levels in order to get enough money to pay their bills.

By this statistical method, our farmers have 1 year of Benson prosperity left. They can sell their farms to pay their bills next year and still show a profit.

This claim that farm income actually rose last year is phony.

## BROTHERHOOD WEEK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] on the subject of Brotherhood Week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, brotherhood is an ideal we must never lose sight of, especially since the more stress and strain it is subjected to, the more important it becomes.

With this thought in mind, it has been pointed out that probably no week set aside for special observance is more significant than that of February 17–24, 1957. As all of us know, this period has been designated "Brotherhood Week," an annual observance sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews. The national conference, the many local leaders who are carrying out special activities in connection with this week, and the leaders of all faiths who have spread the word of brotherhood from their pulpits are all to be commended for their efforts to promote the unity so essential to the preservation of our way of life.

Whatever our race, religion, or creed, this week serves to remind us that we are first and foremost Americans. It serves to remind us that we are members of the free brotherhood of Americans.

Brotherhood is the tradition of our forefathers. It is written into our Declaration of Independence and into our Constitution. Intolerance in any unreasonable form is an abrogation of our duties as Americans and is sabotage to the ideals of our Founding Fathers.

Mr. Speaker, we have won our preeminent place in the eyes of the world by making the spirit of brotherhood a living, working thing. Our booming industries, our thriving communities, our manifold activities which bring individuals together in cooperation and comradeship regardless of color, faith, or national origin—all these things are significant testimonial to the dynamic practice of brotherhood in America.

But like all great things of the spirit, brotherhood is a continuing responsibility. It cannot be achieved by a people resting on their laurels. Rather, we shall have to go on striving, day after day, year after year, to live up to our own high principles. That is the task Brotherhood Week reminds us of, and sets for us.

Let us, then, salute Brotherhood Week, and resolve that its spirit of unity will be kept alive in our hearts and reflected in our actions through all the years to come.

## NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR FREE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TELLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill (H. R. 5190) aimed at combating the shocking increase in the concentration of economic power evidenced by the continued growth of huge business organizations and the steady destruction of small and medium-sized business organizations in our country.

My bill adopts a materially different approach to the problem of excessive bigness in business. Whereas the traditional approach has been to attack bigness where it constitutes a monopoly, my bill proposes to limit and reduce the size of giant business organizations which dominate and unduly restrict free and effective competition. My bill is designed not only to prevent further mergers and consolidations which result in forming unduly big business organizations, but also to reduce the size of existing corporate giants whose activities threaten the survival of small and medium-sized business.

For these purposes, my bill creates a National Commission for Free Economic Development, an administrative agency composed of five members in the executive branch of the Government. Contemplated business mergers or consolidations would require the Commission's prior approval. The Commission would also have the responsibility of initiating proceedings to reduce the size of unduly large business organizations. My bill is cast in the mold of an administrative law; it sets forth standards to which the Commission is required to conform, and it contains provisions for adequate hearings and review in the courts.

The Commission's jurisdiction would extend to any business having a combined capital, surplus, and undivided

profits of $10 million or more, or controlling more than 10 percent of an industry. Government studies have shown that corporations having $10 million or more of assets owned 70.8 percent of all the assets in 1951, and by 1956 such corporations owned 78.9 percent of all the assets. Such businesses would not necessarily be reduced in size by the Commission under my bill. Refusal to approve mergers of such a business, or directing its reorganization so as to reduce its size, would take place only where the Commission finds, under a series of prescribed tests specified in the bill, that the business in question is larger than required by economic efficiency or technology necessity, or is so large that it unduly restricts free and effective competition.

Political liberty is placed in jeopardy where economic power, instead of being diffused freely and effectively among the people, is concentrated in persons who control excessively large business organizations. The national economic and political interest requires the existence of a strong and independent middle class.

It is no accident that the middle class—that is, the owners of small and medium-sized industries—was eliminated in foreign countries upon the advent of totalitarian Fascist regimes. Here are the facts:

In Italy Mussolini's government encouraged industrial amalgamation. To this end, taxation on industrial mergers was abolished. Smaller concerns were absorbed in a few powerful corporations which controlled buying, manufacturing, and distribution.

In Germany all industry was cartelized as a result of the compulsory cartel law of 1933. About two dozen giant industrial trusts remained, half a dozen super banks, and the same number of insurance companies.

In Japan, as in Germany, compulsory cartels controlled the activities of almost every Japanese industry. A large part of the middle class was liquidated, devoured by the big business clan. One of the tasks of the Allied occupation of Japan was to break up the huge family trusts and restore the middle class to at least a measure of existence.

Our democratic system of representative government is based upon free private economic opportunity, on the one hand avoiding the Communist policy of government ownership and control, on the other hand refusing the Fascist invitation to merge all business for serving dominant economic interests. The alarming increase in the number of giant industrial empires in this country threatens our free institutions and facilitates tendencies to fascism or communism. My bill calls for aid and support by all those who despise these alternatives.

Excessively large business organizations, by their overwhelming bigness, tend to deter unduly or to exclude persons from free access to business opportunities, foster price discrimination against medium and small business organizations which imperil their existence, endanger the national defense by placing its existence in the hands of and dependent upon a few persons, facilitate the growth of patent pools which dominate vital areas of technology, and encourage anticompetitive practices such as price control, allocation and control of markets and limitations upon methods of production. In the last 2 years the Government placed $15 billion in defense business with a few favored corporate giants, and dispensed $1.5 billion a year in subsidies for development of new production techniques. Not only were these huge subsidies funneled to a few giant corporations, but they were allowed to control the patents which these subsidies produced.

The assumption that huge business is the most efficient business is not borne out by the studies made in regard to the subject. The National Industrial Conference Board, the Federal Trade Commission, the 20th Century Fund, and leading economists have made statistical analyses of the efficiency of business in relation to size. They appear to agree that companies of medium size are relatively more profitable or more efficient than very large businesses. Two main reasons seem to account for this. Undue bigness makes for unwieldy, overcomplex organization in which it is difficult to get things done. And where bigness is enhanced, competition is lessened, whereas competition is an important source of prompting to efficiency.

Alfred P. Sloan, while president of General Motors, put the matter in the following words:

> In practically all our activities we seem to suffer from the inertia resulting from our great size. It seems to be hard for us to get action when it comes to a matter of putting our ideas across. There are so many people involved and it requires such a tremendous effort to put something new into effect that a new idea is likely to be considered insignificant in comparison with the effort it takes to put it across. I can't help but feel that General Motors has missed a lot by reason of inertia. You have no idea how many things come up for consideration in the technical committee and elsewhere that are discussed and agreed upon as to principle well in advance, but too frequently we fail to put the ideas into effect until competition forces us to do so.

Dr. Clair Wilcox, in his encyclopedic study, Competition and Monopoly in American Industry, concludes that "a business may be too small to realize the economies that are implicit in modern technology; it may be too large to be administered with competence. Between these extremes there may be a size of optimum efficiency. But this size will differ from industry to industry." When to these considerations are added the sociological necessities for the diffusion of business enterprise, it is gratifying to know that competition has at least as much to do with business efficiency as bigness in business.

Our antitrust laws have proven ineffective to halt the growth of the excessively large business organization because they are traditionally addressed primarily to the prevention of monopoly and trade-restricting conspiracies, whereas our competitive economy is as unduly hindered by excessively large business organizations which are not necessarily monopolistic or conspiracies in restraint of trade within the meaning which the courts have given to the antitrust laws. Our present antitrust policy does nothing to assist the development of a strong, secure middle class. On the contrary, it encourages the growth of big business, for it condemns contracts and combinations between independent businessmen which restrain trade. Big business is the evasive answer to this policy. It restricts competition without combination. As stated by the Supreme Court in 1927 in the International Harvester Co. case, "the law, however, does not make the mere size of a corporation, however impressive, or the existence of unexerted power on its part, an offense, when unaccompanied by unlawful conduct in the exercise of its power."

Our antitrust laws are based on the assumption that if trade restraints and suppressive practices are boldly attacked, the economic system will by its own laws provide a broad base for wide participation in business ownership and operation. Little consideration is given to the fact that existing antitrust policy, by fostering the growth of bigness in business, is self-destructive of its ultimate objective. It is often said that Marx made a fundamental error in failing to foresee that capitalism would build a complex society of many interests, not simply a social order composed almost solely of dispossessed workers, and these interests would revolve around a middle class of businessmen, executives, managers, and professional persons. Yet nothing is done to insure the continued realization of this desirable society.

The ineffectiveness of our antitrust laws is abundantly brought out by their failure to halt the growth of giant business organizations and the mergers and consolidations which have brought these industrial giants into existence.

Between 1919 and 1954 over 13,000 manufacturing and mining corporations, large enough to be reported in the financial manuals, disappeared as competing entities as a result of mergers and consolidations.

The Celler-Kefauver Anti-Merger Act of 1950 plugged several loopholes in the Clayton law amendments to antitrust laws, but failed to halt the growth of big business enterprise; the merger wave of 1951–1954 eliminated more than 2,100 business concerns in the manufacturing, mining, trade, and service industries. At the end of 1954, corporate mergers were proceeding at a rate triple that in 1949. In 1955, 846 mergers were consummated.

The recently introduced Celler bill—H. R. 2143—if enacted into law will perhaps slow down these competition-destroying mergers and consolidations, since under the Celler bill advance notification to the Federal Trade Commission is required of proposed corporate mergers.

But the Celler bill does not go far enough, since it does not reach the existing corporate giants which threaten the very existence of a free and effective competitive economy in our country.

These corporate giants have extended their influence and activities to widespread areas of our economy. Three companies, for example, control 100 percent of the Nation's aluminum output;

three companies manufacture 95 percent of our linoleum; three companies control almost all of cigarette manufacture; three companies manufacture 95 percent of our Nation's tin cans and tinware. The net profit of General Motors last year, after taxes, $1,189,000,000, was greater than the combined profits, after taxes, of 82 percent of the corporate returns.

The lion's share of bank and insurance company assets, and now the investment funds, are being channeled off to the giant industrial corporations. Bigness, in other words, begets bigness; little is left for financing small and medium-sized business organizations.

Moreover, the merger movement has taken a strong hold in the banking field. Two hundred and fifty bank mergers occurred in 1955 alone—a 24-year record. We had 30,000 commercial banks in this country in 1921. Now, despite the enormous increase in our population since 1921, we have less than 15,000 commercial banks, and only 100 of these now have about one-half of the bank deposits.

There is little evidence to support the oft-heard contention that automation requires bigness in business. This may be true in some circumstances, but as a generality it does not necessarily stand up. New automation plants will tend to be smaller productive units. This means there will be more plants, not so dependent as now on large reservoirs of labor supply, hence more greatly dispersed. This is a result which may be in the national interest, since dispersion of plants in aerial and atomic warfare is desirable for national defense.

I fully realize that a measure of bigness is often necessary, depending upon the product to be manufactured or the service rendered. Neither automobiles nor steel, for example, can be produced by small business enterprise. The matter would have to depend on the characteristics of the given industry. Capitalization would be a factor. So would the number of employees, or the percentage of the given company's sales in relation to the sales of the entire industry. The permissible extent of integration would also vary from industry to industry. Given the policy, however, and the factors of continued attention and administrative expertship, complications might possibly be surmounted more easily than might be supposed by those who believe against all evidence that things will work out all right if they are left alone.

In determining the permissible size of a business, weighty consideration must, of course, be given to the fact that small businesses hope to become large and are inspired to greater efficiency partly for this reason. Society benefits from this impulse to growth. It ought not be sacrificed lightly. But when size becomes so monstrous that all effort by other businessmen to grow is discouraged, it is not entirely baseless to contend that the time has come for the Government to step in to reinstate the fluidity of enterprise.

Substantial experience in reorganizing giant corporate organizations, so as to reduce their size, has been gained under the Public Utility Holding Company Act. A measure of experience, though smaller, also exists in the consent decrees made by courts under the Sherman antitrust law. My bill would extend this experience by providing for a systematic attack upon undue bigness in business under a declared and generally applicable policy.

I do not claim perfection for the bill which I am introducing today, or that it is a final answer. Rather, I introduce it partly as a basis for further and more intensive study, as a chassis upon which we may build a rational solution of the menace to political and economic freedom which the giant corporations have posed.

Increasing the opportunity to start a business is no less a social responsibility in a system of free enterprise than enhancing the chance to find employment. Yet, much of our intellectual climate in relation to the repugnant effects of the corporate giants seems inert, perched on the edge of an abyss, and nervously loquacious. All persons interested in the survival of our democracy should assist in building a strong society of many entrepreneur interests, revolving around a free and independent middle class.

---

## COMMENT ON THE CRITICISM OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE BENSON AND HIS RELIGIOUS BELIEFS IN CONNECTION WITH THE PRESENT FARM SITUATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the first thing I wish to set right is an error made by gentlemen on the other side when they charged that by making a point of no quorum I was objecting to the criticism of the Secretary of Agriculture by the gentleman who compared the Secretary to a bloodsucker. It may have sounded that way. Perhaps that is a legitimate understanding of what I said, I think not. That was not my purpose at all. I made the point of order that a quorum was not present so that there might be an opportunity for at least a majority of the House to hear what the gentleman who came with us in January had to say. Had a quorum been called, the result would have been that every Member of the House who wanted to do so would have had an opportunity to listen to what the gentlemen had to say. Often, very often indeed, older Members, who have been here for some time, are not as closely in touch with the feeling back home as are those who have recently spent more time there. New ideas, new interpretations of official acts should be and usually are welcome indeed. They are always interesting.

I have been as frank and bitter in criticism of members of this and previous administrations as anyone who has served here in the last 20 years. I have tried to stay within the rules. Never have I criticized any Member for any vote, for any expression of opinion which he may have made and I do not intend to do so; nor have I intentionally ever criticized the motive, the sincerity, or the patriotism of any member of any administration.

But when a Member, and one who has served less than 2 months in this House, takes the floor, apparently acting in concert with other Members on the Democratic side, and repeatedly gets into the RECORD a statement that the Secretary of Agriculture is following the old bloodletting practice of the medical profession in years gone by, back in Washington's time, and before, and uses the word "bloodsucker"—I do not refer to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], but to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. ANDERSON]. I think he was the one. Someone from the great wild and woolly West somewhere. I am not critical of where they come from. That is nothing—repeatedly compares Secretary Benson to a bloodsucker—well, I want the Democrat—yes, and the Republican—Members of the House to listen to the charge.

When the gentleman said that the Secretary of Agriculture is following a course that was usual for the old medical profession, and that the Secretary was putting a bloodsucker on every vein of the farmer and the farmers' activities—that is the inference carried by his remarks, though discretion may cause another version to appear in tomorrow's RECORD—I just insist a majority of the Members of the House hear it, especially when the charge comes from individuals who came here in January. They may get wisdom. They may get discretion and understanding. They may get a charitable feeling toward some of the officials in the Department.

I hold no brief for the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson. He needs none. His actions, ever since he came here, have been proof of his sincerity, of his overall knowledge of agriculture—not only of the growing crops, but of the dairying and other industries upon which the farmers' welfare depends. Well does he serve the Nation as a whole.

I do not know him. I never saw him before he was appointed. He was kind enough on one occasion to adopt a practice which has not to my knowledge been current among any previous administration officials. He called and wanted to know if he could see me. I said sure. I said, "All you have to do is to let me know when you have some leisure time, and I will come down. There is no use wasting your time coming up here." But apparently, being someone other than a professional politician, just an ordinary, decent Christian man, he said, "No. I want to come up to your office." To this day I do not know what he wanted to come up there for. Except as he sought to establish a custom of meeting all Members of the House, and no doubt of the Senate, face to face and in a friendly way, knowing that personal contact always brought better understanding. But I do know that I felt honored to have the Secretary of Agriculture call and desire to come to my office to see me, and not have some underling tell me I could come down and perhaps get an appointment for 5 minutes to see him sometime in the uncertain future. I had no problem to

discuss with him nor so far as I learned did he with me. It was just a "Hello. How are you?" That indicates to me that the man has a heart, a conscience, a deep and sincere desire to serve the people, and not intentionally will he ever adopt a policy designed to injure anyone or any group. The charge so often, so repeatedly made, and one wholly without foundation, that he is attempting to destroy the farmer, will never, when I am present, go unchallenged.

In this world of ours there is too little kindly feeling in our day-to-day conversations and actions. I have lived several years beyond the allotted span. I practiced law for a long, long time by trying jury cases where the issues were bitterly contested, where the conduct of attorneys and sometimes of witnesses required judicial restraint. Out of it all has come to me the belief and the full, firm conviction that an overwhelming majority of people are honest and decent. They do not designedly, as the Secretary of Agriculture was accused of doing, set out to injure or bring misfortune to an individual or any group of individuals. These complaints that have today come from folks on the other side of the aisle are far afield. Ever since it has been my privilege to serve here, the folks from the South, especially the farmers from Texas, have been knocking at the door for more and more Federal funds to assist them in their daily activities. Though Texas, for many good and sound reasons, is a rapidly growing and prosperous State—cotton, tobacco, peanuts—well, the amount of money, the number of dollars, that have been paid out on those crops to benefit those growing them is more than astonishing. The West and the Midwest received some of the money that was paid for the production or nonproduction of wheat and corn, of course, but the overwhelming volume of Federal funds paid out through subsidies has gone to folks from the South and at the cost of the consumers of the rest of the country. The absurdity of the situation struck me the other day, when the Texas and Oklahoma folks succeeded in getting through a bill to reimburse them for unsound farm practices which they had followed. Under this agricultural program on wheat, Michigan, situated as it is with Lake Superior on the north, cannot raise a great deal of wheat in the Upper Peninsula; in the Lower Peninsula with Huron on the east and Lake Michigan on the west and the straits on the north, we have too much moisture in the air and ground to grow wheat, and will have wheat below the established standard of moisture. What happened when we asked for a little special consideration? Soft wheat—that has too much moisture in it to compare with wheat raised in the Northwest—and it is true—so they said, "Nothing doing. No exception for you."

The southern gentlemen—and no one is criticizing their practice of looking after their own—they are isolationists when it comes to what they are doing down there, they do not want any interstate business. Soft wheat, they said, was out. And so are the Michigan wheat-growers. But there was special consideration for crops of different kinds, for different varieties of peanuts, for different qualities of tobacco. They have all had their hand out, and time and again the outstretched hands and, yes, the pocketbooks of the constituents of the gentlemen from the South have been filled.

And in my own State not only does the Agriculture Committee not do anything special on wheat but they have never given us anything on vegetables or fruit although those represent a large part of the income our farmers have had to depend upon. And they have successfully paddled their own canoes because they were so often made to grin and bear it and finally through hard work and frugality they have made a success where others would have failed.

Years ago when we wanted to grow sugar beets in Michigan and the restrictions were on—what did the New Deal Department do? They said, "You folks get out of the sugar beet business." Why? Because Colorado can grow beets with a higher sugar content than can Michigan. So we took a penalty. We took a penalty because somebody down in the Department had a theory and wanted to apply it the country over.

That New Deal Democratic Agriculture Department insisted it knew better what was good for the country as a whole than did the individual who desired to follow his own inclination. It is just possible that the Department in theory was right, but it sure destroyed the independence which our forefathers won in the battles of the Revolution. The policy was applied socialism.

We want to get a little help on grapes; they gave New York and Ohio a benefit payment of $10 a ton over what Michigan grapes got. I asked them why they did that. They said that the practice had an historical background. That is what they told us—no reason except that was the way it had been done before.

And then again when we wanted a little assistance on raspberries they put restrictions on us which did not apply to growers in other areas. And when we got to the Department what did they say? They said the Northwest should grow the black raspberries although we had been furnishing two-thirds of the crop for the entire country. They wanted to put us out of the raspberry market because someone had a theory that raspberries could more profitably be grown in the Great Northwest. See how it works when the visionaries have their way? See how it works when the boys from the South and the Southwest who control the Agriculture Committee have their way, as they have for the last 20 years? Their way may undoubtedly help their constituents at the cost of the rest of us, but why Republican members of that committee should adopt policies which discriminate against the farmers of the Midwest I just cannot understand.

But what I was complaining about today is that a majority of the House was not having the opportunity of hearing the gentleman's very instructive, very eloquent talk belittling the Secretary, questioning the integrity, the sincerity and the motives of Secretary Benson. Frankly, I thought all Members ought to hear just how far a Member of the Democrat side would go in attributing wrong motives to the Secretary, and this notwithstanding the statement of the gentleman's insisting that he was not doing that. I did not know what was in his mind, I do not now know what is in his mind; I could not possibly know. I only know what the inference was from the words which he used. That is all I know about it. Then we went along and the gentleman who had the floor yielded to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]. I did not get all of what he said but I did get the thought that he was complaining because the Secretary of Agriculture had claimed some time during the campaign previous to the last election that he, the Secretary—if I do not have it correct I hope somebody will correct me—had an inspiration, from on high which aided the Secretary in coming to a decision or conclusion. Does the gentleman deny that prayer does not sometimes inspire one to a righteous decision?

Oh, I have heard of gentlemen, big, strong healthy individuals who feel their strength and independence as long as the sun shines and the sky is cloudless. When the thunder rolls and the lightning flashes they get down on their knees and ask the Lord's help or crawl under the bed. Then there are others who get inspiration from and are better because of prayer. We had a governor once who used to pray often, sometimes publicly. He said on one occasion that he did not accept the nomination for—I have forgotten whether it was lieutenant governor or governor, for he was both—until he had gone down in his bedroom on his knees and sought the advice of the Lord. Then he said the advice came to him to accept the nomination. He did and was elected. I have no way of knowing whether the Lord advised him. I never saw the Lord. But I have heard and read about Him. I have never had reason to deny his existence, or His concern for our welfare. I remember what was said about the sparrow.

I prefer the statement of Longfellow, who told us:

> Life is real. Life is earnest.
> And the grave is not its goal;
> Dust thou art, to dust returnest,
> Was not spoken of the soul.

I will tell you one thing. I do not personally intend to take any chance of burning in hell by acceptance of a doctrine which in substance is that when I am buried that is the end of it. No, no. I still have a little faith in what mother used to teach me and that was that there is a hereafter. I prefer to believe that, even though nobody comes down through the ceiling and tells me or shows me the Lord. I am going to believe in the hereafter in religion, a Supreme Being and His overall care of us. I am going to believe in the efficacy of prayer. I intend to believe that from it man draws inspiration. I will not accept the doctrine that the earth covers all that was my mother and my father. I will go along with Longfellow.

I cannot and I will not ridicule or question the religious faith of anyone or any people nor doubt the source of his inspiration.

When a gentleman by inference questions the sincerity of the Secretary's statement that he received an inspiration, he is entitled to that opinion, but the rest of us do not need to agree with him and I for one just cannot. I am going to believe that the Secretary of Agriculture is an honest, patriotic citizen, willing to serve his country to the best of his ability and that that is his only desire.

There are politicians, they say—I have never met any of them—who have other ideas about public service. In my judgment, the most of us, the overwhelming majority of the Members of this House, is in favor of giving to any man when he expresses a religious view the thought he is sincere, that he is trying to do a decent job.

I will only repeat what I started out to say. When any Member on either side insists on comparing any present member of the Cabinet to a "bloodsucker," I will if I am on the floor insist that a majority of the House be present to hear just what he says.

Notwithstanding what may appear in tomorrow's RECORD, what the gentleman to whom the gentleman who had the floor had yielded was saying, when I made the point of no quorum, was in substance and to the effect that Secretary of Agriculture Benson had applied and was applying a "bloodsucker" to either every vein or every artery of the farmer, with the effect to destroy the farmer.

In my humble judgment, such a statement has no substance to justify it, and it was only fair that Members of the House on both sides of the aisle should themselves, here and then have opportunity to challenge the value of such a statement.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BOYLE, for 1 hour, on Tuesday next.

Mr. PORTER, for 1 hour, on February 28 on the subject of the disappearance of Lester Murphy in the Dominican Republic on December 3, 1956.

Mr. ROOSEVELT, for 1 hour, on Tuesday next.

Mrs. KNUTSON, for 30 minutes, on next Wednesday.

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. BOYLE), for 20 minutes, on Wednesday next.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted to me to address the House for 25 minutes today be vacated, and that I may have permission to address the House on Monday next for 30 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. VANIK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ARENDS and to include an editorial.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DIXON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCDONOUGH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. BOYLE).

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. BOYLE) in two instances and include extraneous matter.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 22, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

521. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the 24th report on property acquisitions for the quarter ending December 31, 1956, pursuant to subsection 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

522. A letter from the General Counsel, United States Information Agency, transmitting the 7th Semiannual Report covering the period from July 1 to December 31, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 402, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

523. A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to amend Public Law 31, 84th Congress, 1st session, to increase the authorization for appropriation to the Atomic Energy Commission for the construction of a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

524. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of Atomic Energy Commission contract No. AT(30-3)-222 with Yankee Atomic Electric Co.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

525. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to grant to the Territory of Alaska title to certain lands beneath tidal waters, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

526. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled 'Coast Guard,' with respect to warrant officers' rank on retirement, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

527. A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the training of Federal employees at public or private facilities, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

528. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend the benefits of section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 5189. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 103. A bill to authorize the National Inventors Council to make awards for inventive contributions relating to the national defense; with amendment (Rept. No. 148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 4815. A bill to provide permanent authority for the Postmaster General to establish postal stations at camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces, and at defense or other strategic installations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary: H. R. 277. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" to provide for a statute of limitations with respect to civil actions; without amendment (Rept. No. 150). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4901. A bill to establish a minimum acreage allotment for corn, to provide acreage reserve programs for diverted acres and for feed grains, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 133. Joint resolution for the relief of certain spouses and minor children of citizens of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 89. Concurrent resolution approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H. R. 5189. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 5190. A bill to limit and reduce the size of business organizations which are

larger than required by economic efficiency or technological necessity, or are so large as to be unduly restrictive of free and effective competitive activity, to create the National Commission for Free Economic Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. R. 5191. A bill to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 5192. A bill to allow members of Reserve components of the Armed Forces to serve brief periods of active duty for training while enrolled in certain courses under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, as amended, without such period of time being charged as absences in computing their educational and training allowances; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE of Illinois:

H. R. 5193. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the Knights of Columbus; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5194. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount of the personal exemption to which a taxpayer is entitled with respect to a spouse or dependent who is a student and whose educational expenses are paid by such taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER (by request):

H. R. 5195. A bill to amend sections 1 (29a), 64a (5), 67b, and 67c of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. R. 5196. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that interest on series H United States savings bonds shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 5197. A bill to readjust postal classification on certain educational and cultural materials; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 5198. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 5199. A bill providing a preliminary examination and survey of Hammonds Cove, entrance to Locust Point Harbor, Long Island Sound, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5200. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 5201. A bill to further the economic and efficient operation of the business of the Post Office Department by the expansion of the existing research and development program of such Department and the establishment of a postal service automatic equipment program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 5202. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 5203. A bill to provide increases in monthly rates of compensation for service-connected disability payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration and to liberalize the requirements for awarding additional disability compensation to veterans who have dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5204. A bill to provide for family farm parity income for a fair standard of living among farmers of our Nation, by amendment of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 5205. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H. R. 5206. A bill to authorize and direct the Postmaster General to estimate for each fiscal year certain expenses incurred by, and losses in revenues to, the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NIMTZ:

H. R. 5207. A bill to provide that the next cruiser commissioned in the United States Navy shall be named the *South Bend*; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 5208. A bill to amend paragraph 1541 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide that the rate of duty in effect with respect to harpsichords and clavichords shall be the same as the rate in effect with respect to pianos; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5209. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt nonprofit educational institutions from certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5210. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that no urban renewal project shall be finally approved thereunder until the people of the community concerned have been given an opportunity in a referendum to reject it; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 5211. A bill to amend section (8) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 5212. A bill to provide for the computation of annual income for the purpose of payment of pension for non-service-connected disability or death in certain cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 5213. A bill to amend section (8) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. J. Res. 246. Joint resolution requesting the President to submit to the Congress specific recommendations for cuts in the proposed budget; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. Res. 175. Resolution to amend the rules of the House to limit expenditures for fiscal year 1958; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY: Senate concurrent resolution No. 2, adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, 35th session, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide equitable financial treatment to State governments with respect to aid provided under social-security programs to Indians living in this State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOULDER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri to the officers and men of the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact or amend legislation for the benefit of schools and roads, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make an appropriation and, if necessary, deduct the amount from the appropriation to the Department of Agriculture to pay the several States the amount that was illegally withheld by the Forest Service, and that this money be appropriated to the use of the several States, including Colorado; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to asking that acreages of experimental wheat be not counted in the allotted acreage set up for each farm and that the grower of experimental wheat be not penalized for this excess acreage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting passage of legislation to allow the construction of a sign to indicate a point of interest in the Helena National Forest near Frontier Town which is located in Lewis and Clark County, Mont., adjacent to United States Highway No. 10, north; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the Secretary of Agriculture to consider and evaluate agricultural commodities designated as "surpluses"; and to segregate sufficient amounts of such commodities to be called "reserves," to be in quantities comparable to other commodities and to be used in the event of crop failure or national emergencies; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 5214. A bill for the relief of Dr. Si Chiu Lou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 5215. A bill for the relief of Hyiin Golding; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H. R. 5216. A bill for the relief of Maria Theodora Hagn Zoppi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 5217. A bill for the relief of Silvio Rafael Cebellos y Pardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 5218. A bill for the relief of Arthur Sew Sang, Kee Yin Sew Wong, Sew Ing Lin, Sew Ing Quay, and Sew Ing You; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 5219. A bill to provide tax relief to the Heavy and General Laborers' Local Unions 472 and 172 of New Jersey pension fund and the contributors thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5220. A bill for the relief of the estate of Higa Kensai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 5221. A bill for the relief of Jacqueline Henrietta Labrosse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5222. A bill for the relief of Gladys Arbutus Joel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 5223. A bill for the relief of Demetra Vouvoulis (also known as Dimitra Voumvouli); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 5224. A bill for the relief of O. J. Glenn & Son, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 5225. A bill for the relief of Yuet Ngon (Wong) Chin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 5226. A bill for the relief of Cho Kaji; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5227. A bill for the relief of Chan Lem Yp and Mrs. Chan Yu Shee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 5228. A bill for the relief of the estate of Sinclair G. Stanley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5229. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Angelita L. Baclagan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5230. A bill for the relief of Yoshio Hanakoa, also known as Jimmy Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 5231. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wawara Dibert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 247. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Thomas Masaryk: Founder of the Czechoslovak Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 21, 1957*

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, America has always been considered a bulwark for democracy. For this reason many oppressed people have found refuge in our great country. Here they have found hope; here they have had the opportunity to better themselves economically and socially; here they have obtained liberty allowing them to speak and worship without the fear of intimidation and oppression.

Thomas Masaryk the great Czechoslovak patriot was among those who fled from subjugation and sought shelter in our free country. It was during his stay here that Masaryk saw embodied many of the ideals of democracy which he hoped one day could be enjoyed by the Czechoslovak people. It was here that he visualized a free and independent Czechoslovakia patterned after the American system of government.

The formation of this new republic, however, was not to be an easy task. Nevertheless, much of the inspiration for the emergence of this new nation came from Thomas Masaryk. Before World War I, Masaryk had already gained international distinction for his courageous stand against oppression. As a member of the Austrian Parliament he resisted the encroachments of Germany in Austria. Consequently, with the outbreak of war he was forced to flee to Italy, Switzerland and later London. Finally, he found refuge in America—the "mother of exiles." Here he accomplished much of the work for Czechoslovak independence.

In our country, he was free to place the case of the Czechoslovak people before the eyes of the world. Here he met and gained the respect and admiration of President Wilson for his constant struggle. Here he convinced the Allies of the righteousness of the Czechoslovak cause. Here the Czechoslovak Republic was finally formalized. On August 23, 1918, the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate declared the liberation of the Czechoslovak people as one of the conditions of peace. Later on November 18, when the Austro-Hungarian monarchy collapsed, the Republic was established and Masaryk was elected as the first President. Under his leadership Czechoslovakia became one of the foremost democracies in Europe.

Today, on the 107th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Masaryk, the Republic which he struggled so valiantly to establish is no longer free. The Kremlin has enslaved the people. However, the spirit of Masaryk lives on in Czechoslovakia. The people remember his teachings; they remember the benefits derived from a free society. These glorious memories serve as an inspiration to the people of this subjugated country.

This feeling was perhaps best expressed by President Benes at Masaryk's funeral in 1937 when he said:

> Though he passes on Masaryk is still with us * * * President-liberator, we will remain faithful to the heritage which you have laid in our hands.

## The Late Honorable C. Wayland Brooks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 21, 1957*

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I want the RECORD to show that I was privileged to be a close personal friend of the late Senator C. Wayland Brooks, known to all his many friends as "Curly." He was such an outstanding man, who meant so much to me personally and did so much for me as a friend, that I am constrained to make certain somehow, perhaps in this way, that now and for all time the people will know not only my personal feelings but also some measure of the contribution he made to Illinois and to the country as a whole.

Whatever one's political faith, whatever one's views on a particular legislative issue, all agree that no man served in the United States Senate who has shown more courage of his convictions than "Curly" Brooks and few men had the ability with which he was endowed to express so persuasively what he believed.

As great as he was as an attorney, as great as he was a Senator from Illinois, as great and as many his accomplishments in the practice of law and the making of law, for me his real greatness was his love of his fellowman, his understanding of other people's problems, his constant efforts to help them in arriving at solutions, and his complete humility regardless of the many honors he attained.

I shall miss "Curly" Brooks. I shall miss his wise counsel and advice. I shall miss him as a man for whom I had great affection as a friend.

## Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 21, 1957*

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the week of February 17 to February 24 is being observed throughout America as Brotherhood Week. It is sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews and is designed to spread the spirit of brotherhood throughout the land.

Throughout America, under the sponsorship of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, every community is conducting an event set aside to stimulate our national struggle against intolerance. Intolerance is the greatest enemy of our democratic institutions and has no place in our American democracy. The National Conference of Christians and Jews renders a tremendous service in organizing the fight against intolerance and clearing the way for a stronger and more sturdy union of the American people.

Every year the National Conference of Christians and Jews designates recipients of the national human relations award granted by the conference to some individual distinguished for his devotion to brotherhood.

On Sunday, February 24, Mr. A. M. Luntz, president of the Luntz Iron & Steel Co., of Cleveland and Canton, Ohio, will be awarded the national

human relations award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews at a civic dinner which will be attended by over 1,000 persons at the Hotel Carter in Cleveland. The award, the highest honor of the conference, is being made for Mr. Luntz' lifetime of devotion to the cause of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God and his assistance to all peoples regardless of religion, race or nationality.

The dinner will also mark the close of the 1957 Brotherhood Week under the national chairmanship of another Clevelander, Louis B. Seltzer, editor of the Cleveland Press. It is the first time in the history of the National Conference that both the national award winner and the National Brotherhood Week chairman come from the same city. Cleveland also has the distinction of being the only city in the United States to have three citizens who have received the National Human Relations Award. In addition tc Mr. Luntz, John A. Greene, president of the Ohio Bell Telephone Co., won the citation in 1956 and Mr. Seltzer in 1951.

Addressing the Luntz dinner will be national personages from every walk of life including Senator John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, Senator Frank J. Lausche of Ohio, Henry A. Roemer, board chairman of Sharon Steel, Gov. C. William O'Neill of Ohio, Mayor Anthony J. Celebrezze of Cleveland, Mayor Carl Wise of Canton, Ohio, Dr. Everett R. Clinchy, National Conference president, Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver of The Temple, Cleveland; Rt. Rev. Nelson M. Burroughs, bishop of the Ohio Episcopal District; Msgr. Albert J. Murphy, pastor St. Ignatius Church, Charles F. McCahill, senior vice president, Forest City Publishing.

We in the Cleveland community are proud of Mr. Luntz and the honor which will be bestowed upon him for his devotion to the cause of brotherhood. We are also proud of the tremendous service which has been rendered by Mr. Louis B. Seltzer, editor of the Cleveland Press, as national chairman of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

## Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 21, 1957*

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as you know, Brotherhood Week will be observed this year from February 18 to February 22. Numerous speeches will be delivered and many editorials written extolling brotherhood.

Two thousand miles from this Capitol there is an organization which is not merely giving lip service to the subject of brotherhood. It is practicing brotherhood. I would like to tell you a little about this fine old institution, the National Jewish Hospital at Denver.

Back in the eighties and nineties there was a steady procession of victims of tuberculosis from the slums of the East to the clear, healthful heights of Denver. In those days climate was an important factor in the treatment of this scourge. Many tuberculosis sufferers journeyed to the West by covered wagon. However, when they reached their destination in Denver, large numbers literally died in the streets. There were no hospitals, sanatoria, or other facilities to care for them.

In this situation the Jewish community of Denver founded the National Jewish Hospital. The first building was completed in 1892 but because of a depression the trustees were unable to open it. The building remained unused until 1899 when B'nai B'rith, the Jewish service organization, provided funds for operating expenses.

The first patient was a Catholic girl from Chicago. From that day, the hospital has never considered religion, race, or national origin in its admission of patients.

Here is a living example of brotherhood. In its patient population National Jewish Hospital at Denver has Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. It has white Anglo-Saxons from New England, Negroes from Texas, Spanish-Americans from Arizona, and Indians from South Dakota. Although Israel and her neighbors are at sword's point, Jewish nationals from Israel and Moslem patients from Indonesia receive their medication, side by side, at the famous medical center. For the tubercle bacillus which causes the dreaded tuberculosis can afflict anyone regardless of color, nationality, religious persuasion, or economic status. This organism is completely without prejudice, even as is National Jewish Hospital.

I should tell you that despite a widespread misconception and despite great progress that has been made in the last decade, tuberculosis remains a formidable health problem. Approximately 15,000 of our fellow Americans died of this disease last year and nearly 100,000 new cases were reported to public health authorities. For every reported case there were an estimated two unreported cases.

You will agree that much remains to be done in this area by the research scientists and doctors at National Jewish Hospital at Denver. Meanwhile, however, the personnel of this great, nonsectarian institution is deeply involved in other medical programs. The hospital treats all diseases of the chest. Recently it expanded its programs of treating heart defects which can be corrected by surgery. This cardiac program, like all others at the hospital, is completely without charge to the patient.

National Jewish Hospital at Denver is supported almost entirely by voluntary contributions from the public. Warmhearted citizens who practice what they preach about brotherhood make possible its lifesaving work. The hospital slogan is and always has been, "None may enter who can pay; none can pay who enter." For 58 years National Jewish Hospital has given its patients some four million days of care for which these patients paid not one cent.

It is appropriate to review the policies and activities of National Jewish Hospital at Denver on the occasion of Brotherhood Week. Here is a monument to brotherhood which all of us might well study and try to emulate.

## Repeal of Federal Cabaret Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 21, 1957*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to repeal the Federal cabaret tax.

Before attempting to discuss the effects of this legislation, I shall, first of all, give a few brief facts about this tax.

At the present time the Federal Government imposes a tax of 20 percent on amounts charged for "admission, refreshment, service—including checkroom service—or merchandise at any roof garden, cabaret, or other similar place furnishing a public performance for profit by or for any patron or guest who is entitled to be present during any portion of such performance."

Before the outbreak of World War II the rate of this tax was as low as 3 percent with an exemption granted to charges under $2.50. During this war, when Federal revenue requirements were sharply increased, this rate was increased to as high as 30 percent in 1944. The following year it was reduced to 20 percent, which is the current rate prevailing today. Some reductions in existing amusement taxes were effected by the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954; but the Federal cabaret tax has remained unchanged since the war.

Revenues from the Federal cabaret tax reached their highest peak in 1946. Since that time they have steadily declined until today this tax brings in only about half of what it produced in 1946. The total amount collected each year in my own State of Michigan and in the United States as a whole since 1946 is as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

| Fiscal year— | Federal cabaret tax receipts | |
|---|---|---|
| | United States | Michigan |
| 1946 | 72,077 | 8,312 |
| 1947 | 63,350 | 2,968 |
| 1948 | 58,527 | 2,765 |
| 1949 | 48,857 | 2,673 |
| 1950 | 41,453 | 2,266 |
| 1951 | 42,646 | 2,423 |
| 1952 | 45,489 | 2,138 |
| 1953 | 46,691 | 2,276 |
| 1954 | 38,312 | 1,832 |
| 1955 | 30,271 | 1,617 |
| 1956 | 42,255 | 1,486 |

I strongly recommend the repeal of the Federal cabaret tax for the following reasons:

First, repeal of this tax will stimulate business and employment in the entertainment field. Because of this high tax,

there has been a marked reduction in patronage which has caused numerous places of entertainment in hotels, restaurants, et cetera, to close. The American Hotel Association has reported that because of this tax the number of entertainment rooms declined from 700 in 1946 to 250 in 1950. The closing of these places of entertainment has brought about the unemployment of thousands of entertainers, waiters and waitresses, cooks, kitchen help, and other personnel.

The abolition of this tax would tend to stimulate the patronage of these cabarets since many individuals would then be able to afford this type of entertainment. This would bring about the reopening of many additional entertainment rooms providing employment for musicians, waiters, cooks, and others. The National License Beverage Association estimated in 1954 that repeal of this tax would encourage 2½ times as many establishments to use live entertainment. It has also been estimated that such repeal would cause payrolls for music and entertainment to double in volume. Repeal of this tax would stimulate business and increase employment not only in cabarets, but also in other lines of enterprise, since consumers would have to pay less for entertainment and would have more money available for other purposes.

Secondly, it is not believed that there would be any net loss in Federal revenues if this tax were repealed.

The increased employment of musicians, entertainers, and other personnel would provide additional income tax revenue to the Federal Government. This would offset the loss in cabaret tax receipts which would result from the abolition of this tax. As may be seen in the figures on collections presented above, since 1946 this tax has produced diminishing revenue.

Total collections have declined $30 million from an alltime high of $72 million in 1946 to $42 million in 1956. Similarly, collections in Michigan have been cut in half, having decreased from $3.3 million to $1.7 million in this same period.

Thirdly, continuation of the Federal cabaret tax is no longer justifiable in peacetime. Only in time of such national emergency as war when the Government must tap every possible source of income, and where the curtailment of an activity may even be desirable for manpower or austerity reasons is such tax defensible. More than 11 years have elapsed since the close of World War II, and we find this tax still on the statute books. There is no present justification for this tax.

Fourthly, repeal of this tax would create a more favorable economic climate for the training and development of musicians and other entertainers who have a real contribution to make to American culture. This tax has worked a real hardship on these individuals in the past. Continuation of it will tend to discourage gifted individuals from embarking on such an uncertain career. In time, the entertainment world would suffer a shortage of real talent.

Finally, the repeal of the cabaret tax will encourage the opening of more desirable places of entertainment for our young people.

With the closing of so many entertainment rooms in hotels, young people, seeking a place to dine and dance, have been compelled to patronize less desirable taverns and night clubs for their amusement. Repeal of this tax will enable many hotels to open rooms which will offer more wholesome surroundings for our Nation's youth.

Repeal of this tax is now long overdue. I, therefore, strongly urge immediate adoption of my bill which will bring this about.

---

## The Problems of Disarmament—a Speech by Hon. Kenneth Keating at Bangkok, Thailand, at Meeting of Inter-Parliamentary Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 21, 1957*

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the thoughtful, important address delivered by Congressman KENNETH B. KEATING of New York at the November meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union in Bangkok, Thailand. I do this with considerable enthusiasm because I am reliably informed that both speeches given in Thailand for the distinguished delegates to the Inter-Parliamentary Union by our friend, the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING, were judged to have been among the most meaningful presented for the consideration of the world gathering of statesmen. The principles and the facts emphasized by Representative KEATING may be looked upon as an affirmative hopeful program for eventual disarmament with security, justice, and peace for all the peoples of the earth. The address follows:

SPEECH OF REPRESENTATIVE KENNETH B. KEATING ON THE PROBLEMS OF DISARMAMENT

Mr. President and fellow delegates, the Committee on Reduction of Armaments is to be congratulated for the splendid report which so well summarizes the history of disarmament efforts ever since the first known treaty on this subject in 1817 limiting the naval forces maintained between the United States and Canada on the Great Lakes. Men have been thinking of disarmament for at least the century and one-half since that treaty. The committee's report is most illuminating as to the efforts of our governments in the four decades since the end of World War I and the creation of the League of Nations.

Surely no one can read this chronicle, of committees, commissions, and debates and drafts resolutions, without admitting that the efforts of our governments have been tremendous. And yet the chronicle is one of failure upon dismal failure. All efforts have produced precisely nothing. Our committee rightly concludes that there is a lack of trust and confidence among the negotiators—and that this lack is fatal to any real possibilities of agreement. Our committee implies, I fear, that the situation is hopeless.

To this I say we cannot abandon hope. We must carry on our efforts, and double them and double them again. I do not know the way. I fear that none of us in this great assembly will be able to point the way with clearness and certainty. But in my heart, there is good will. In my heart there is determination, to go on struggling with this Gordian knot until some one of us, or all of us together, find a way to lay it open.

In the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union this year and in the previous years I have seen and felt the same good will, the same high determination, all around me among our fellow delegates. I think we are brought closer, as spokesmen in this great assemblage from so many nations, by the very strains and stresses that threaten so blackly to pull our world apart. It is my personal hope—even a quiet prayer—that we shall meet again next year, and in succeeding years, with more harmony, more freedom of action, and ever more of the very mutual trust and confidence which are so rightly emphasized in this report.

Now I wish to offer briefly for these debates some observations about the problems of disarmament which seem most important and most troubling to me. Some of our negotiators, particularly in recent years, have become more and more like hagglers in the market place who do not really want to buy or sell. The good price, the fair bargain, and the sincere offer are scorned and cheapened just as lustily as the outrageous proposition. If the buyer nods agreement to a price, the seller shifts what he is offering and changes his terms. Yet, this is the most crucial series of negotiations being conducted in the whole range of human activities on the face of the earth today and the need for bargains that will stick—to make disarmament work—is plainly more urgent than it has ever been in all times past since we began recording the history of mankind.

For the simple, inescapable truth is that disarmament has become the practical equivalent of peace. The weapons we command today are so frightfully destructive that men cannot live at peace with them. The fireball itself has assumed the proportions of a mortal enemy, an evil genie who may be no respecter of the master who uncorks him.

My country has the bomb. My country has pressed forward with the awesome testing needed to keep pace with developments in the laboratories of our scientists. But let no one believe for an instant that we would not give it up and have done with the whole undertaking. Thoughtful leaders among my countrymen have long since realized that this is a burden and a responsibility from which no one can profit. We recognize it as a great liability, and we shall go on straining to find some way in which it can be safely put aside forever.

I would be less than candid if I did not note that my country's persistent efforts have not been matched in other quarters. Immediately after the war, when the United States alone held the secret of nuclear fission, we urged a plan for international control of all fissionable material, with controls to prevent the production of weapons and inspection to enforce the controls. This plan encountered the stone wall of Soviet opposition and drew a Soviet veto when it was proposed to the United Nations Security Council. Ban the bomb first, the Russians said, and then we will talk about controls.

From that day to this, the Communist leaders have flatly refused to countenance any limitations based on mutual rights of inspection. It is painfully obvious that with the development of fission and fusion weapons of total destruction, the advantage of surprise, enjoyed by treacherous aggressors, has also become total. Therefore, the need for direct assurances about the war preparations of one's potential enemies has also increased to a near-absolute degree.

In the last decade the production of these atomic weapons has gone forward to a point where it would no longer be practical to limit production alone. There are too many stockpiles, capable of being hidden away until they are needed. So any inspection system upon which confidence can be based must also include regular observation of what the experts call "delivery systems." We must watch each other's guided missiles sites, and the activities of bombers and submarines and fighter squadrons, to have full protection against the dangers of a sudden knockout blow.

Our efforts to share the secrets of the atom for peaceful uses, launched in 1953 in President Eisenhower's ringing speech to the United Nations General Assembly, were obstructed from the outset by Russian opposition to any kind of open-handed disclosure. The President's open-sky proposal at the Geneva meetings in July of last year were met with the same Communist insistence on exchanged promises without exchanged inspectors and observers. At present my country is strenuously urging an interchange of teams of observers for limited inspection missions; as well as experimental inspections in small strips of territory dedicated for the purpose by each nation. We have also offered to exchange advance notice of every movement involving our Armed Forces abroad, in international territory or on foreign soil. But the opposition still says: "Ban the bomb; take our word that we will do the same; and then we will talk about controls."

In our efforts to achieve reductions of conventional armaments, we have encountered the same frustrating techniques: our Soviet rivals are willing to talk only of cuts in manpower, not of reductions in the number or potency of their weapons; and they keep urging fractional cuts in their standing forces while at the same time absolutely refusing to tell us the number against which the fractions are to be applied.

I have strayed a little into this explanation of the frustrating deadlock that grips my own country. But I think the problem merits emphasis. In my opinion, until we throw down the walls and expose ourselves to free observation by our neighbors, there can be little of the mutual trust and confidence on which the report we are considering grounds so much. Full, open, free, and honest inspection is needed to separate the empty claims of propagandists from those offers and protestations which may constitute real steps toward peace.

Now I shall turn to one of the more general points I wish to make—namely, that many nations may soon have these frightful weapons. Some years ago, the United States, and with those nations who share our heritage of freedom, held the bomb in an uneasy monopoly. This was short-lived. Now, there is not a nation in the world community, once possessed of the secrets which cannot be guarded very long, which would find itself unable to produce this weapon. Ultimately, and perhaps not too far in the future, many many national leaders will share the awesome responsibility of having total destruction at their command. What will happen to mutual trust and confidence then? What will happen to the traditional processes of diplomacy? And what will then be the plight of the troubled citizen watching the sky in constant anxiety lest this new lightning shall destroy his world? If we do not force a resolution of the stalemate now, we may find our problems multiplied to infinite and hopeless lengths.

Next, I would like to observe that in my opinion our basic premise with respect to armaments becomes each year less valid. Most nations have believed that an adequate level of armaments meant security. We made ourselves strong so we could resist attack and protect our vital interests in the community of nations. I submit that this no longer works as it did for our predecessors. The security which any nation can fashion for itself by excelling in modern armaments may prove illusory, because such excellence now means vastly disproportionate insecurity for everybody else. With the conventional arms of half a century ago, to be powerful and well prepared for war meant only to assert a moderate threat against those with whom you might compete. If they were powerful and well prepared too, they threatened moderately in return. In a test of arms, there would be injury inflicted, losses and probably some devastation, and a separation between the victors and the vanquished.

I question whether this is true for us today. He who threatens, threatens absolutely. There may be no victors and no vanquished, but only victims and insufferable devastation. So I think we should recognize that the menace of armaments, and the resulting insecurity of those who are threatened, has greatly weakened the usefulness of the concepts of security by strength and alliances which are traditional in our thinking about international relations.

Another point which should be emphasized is the inefficiency of modern armaments to solve any of the real problems that beset us today. At peace, the burden of modern armaments is crushing to everyone who carries it. The costs have mounted and mounted, until far more than half the total costs of all of our governmental and social services are drained off for weapons and the specialists of modern warfare. This means food for the hungry, medical care for the sick, education for our children and more of the good things of life for everyone, diverted and drained off for the uneconomic and nonproductive functions of increasing our military potential.

And could the super bombers or the guided missiles ever solve the problem that really concern us? Of course, they could not. There are fundamental ideological differences between the totalitarian and democratic forms. They cannot be resolved by guns. There is a competition between the Soviets and the Western world in the economic sphere. Both they and we are dedicated to different methods of the production and distribution of the things men want and need. We feel that our system is the best that men have ever devised. We have produced abundance, and we have faith that we can go on upholding a better, richer way of life than that achieved by the Communists. But could that competition be resolved by warfare? Would anyone gain if their system were forced upon our country, or ours on them, at bayonet point? Of course not.

But would the world gain if we could achieve a lusty honest competition of economy with economy? Would we threaten each other if we undertook to prove that the good things of life flow more freely in our economy than in theirs? If we could ever turn to it, and get into that kind of competition, we would enter it with great confidence but all the world would win no matter who achieved the laurel wreath. So the positive aspects of disarmament are as important as the negative. If we can put the burden aside, there is no limit to the wonders of the golden age we might achieve.

Lastly, there is another point which we might as well face squarely, that time is running against us. The cruel reality is that we have achieved disarmament twice in this century, by the catastrophic expedient of dissipating our armaments in global warfare. We have reduced the tensions and diminished our strength by knocking ourselves prostrate in the aftermath of each of these Armageddons. And it is in these aftermaths that the possibilities of disarmament look best.

In 1919, President Wilson caught the imagination of the world with his leadership in the League of Nations. In 1945, the beginnings of the United Nations at San Francisco were auspicious and the world was full of hope. Must we wait for such an opportunity again? Or will it be possible to change the course and interrupt the cycle? Let us bend every effort here and now, this day and tomorrow and in the immediate future, to expose the truths about this problem of disarmament, then to face them realistically and find a way to do something about them.

## Felix Ullrich, Jr., of Newark—An Outstanding Young Scientist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 21, 1957*

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, next week in Washington, we will have the 40 most promising young scientists in the United States. They have been selected in the 16th annual talent search from high schools all over the Nation to come here to participate in the 5-day Science Talent Institute. I am proud to say that Felix Thomas Ullrich, Jr., a young man from my district in Newark from Barringer High School—the same high school that I attended—is included in this outstanding group. Felix intends to become a physicist or an electrical engineer.

These young people will compete for the Westinghouse scholarship in the finals of the science talent search directed by science clubs of America which are administered by Science Service. The winners have passed difficult aptitude test, submitted scholarship records and recommendations, and written a report entitled "My Science Project." One of these outstanding young men and women will win a $2,800 scholarship and the runner-up will receive a $2,000 scholarship. In all, scholarships totaling $11,000 will be awarded to this group.

The story of Felix Ullrich, Jr., must give heart to all Americans. At 17 years of age he has already distinguished himself in the field of his choice. He is an outstanding example of a young man seeking knowledge to prepare himself for an important future in a science-minded age. On his own, he has studied theoretical physics and mathematics during his vacations. For a science project, he has designed and built a small radio frequency heating unit which he used to heat material in a vacuum. His accomplishments have led him to be elected to the National Honor Society. He is also a member of the Science Clubs of America and a mathematics club. He hopes to attend the University of California at Berkeley. The fact that Felix is a member of the Ground Observer Corps shows that he is a good citizen as well as a good scientist.

Felix Ullrich, Jr., is an example of the fine young men and women included in the Scientific Talent Institute here this week. I am sure that we are all well aware of the crucial need for scientists.

The role that these young people will play in the future of our Nation is an ever growing one. The young scientists in this group are stepping forward to help their country in an era of great scientific competition. The Soviet Union is known to be placing great emphasis on scientific advancement and the nations behind the Iron Curtain are making large strides in this field. We are dependent on the young scientists of America to provide for our national survival by their contributions to a competitive and very important field. I wish to commend these young scientists on their accomplishments.

---

## America's Economic Responsibilities in the World's Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, February 21, 1957*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a speech which I delivered in Washington on February 12, 1957, before the Fourth National Conference on International Economic and Social Development, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY BEFORE THE FOURTH NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 12, 1957

Ladies and gentlemen, my good friends of the Fourth National Conference on International Economic and Social Development, you have asked me to say a few words at your opening luncheon on the topic "America's Economic Responsibilities in the World's Crisis." There could be no more timely topic.

Rethinking our foreign economic aid, a process which is going on these days all over Washington, is merely part of a needed broader reexamination of American foreign policy. This reexamination has been prompted by a series of changes in the world situation. If you will permit me at this point in your day's program, I would like to sketch some of these world changes, as I see them.

Since 1951 nearly all our foreign aid, totaling about $25 billion in 6 years, has gone to arm and maintain a circle of allies around the Communist bloc. No matter what else the Republicans or anyone else may call it, this is our policy of containment. We have sought to establish a ring of pacts, of military bases, a ring of standing armies, a ring of political and economic strong points, a ring of information, pamphleteering and propaganda for freedom. Consequently, about 60 percent of our foreign aid went for military hardware, another 25 to 30 percent for budgetary and financial support of governments which were maintaining armies otherwise beyond their means, and approximately 10 percent for technical and developmental assistance.

It is fair to say, I believe, that we have never really had a definite policy for speeding up the economic growth and development of friendly non-Communist countries. Whatever we have done along this line was basically only incidental to our military containment policy. Hence, the appropriateness of the term defense support for much of our development aid.

Last summer some Members of Congress, I among them, thought it was time to reexamine the basic premises of our foreign aid program, which had remained unchanged since the start of the Korean war. It was time we took a look at the changes in the world which might require alteration of our aid programs. In 1956 this call for a reexamination led to the creation of the Fairless Committee by the White House, and to separate investigations by the House Foreign Affairs and Senate Foreign Relations Committees.

Frankly, I think it is important that we all understand the world change that many in Congress had in mind. Many of these changes have no connection with economic development. Yet the changes in policy which they suggest may very well affect economic development. Here are some of them that bothered many of us last year when the reexamination began:

First, the Russians had achieved an extraordinary break-through in developing a long-range Air Force and the intermediate missile, which brought into question the usefulness of many of our overseas bases. While this was happening, Congress chopped $900 million off the foreign military budget and added the same amount to our domestic Air Force.

Second, the American development of tactical atomic weapons raised very serious questions about the development and size of the NATO ground forces in Europe.

Third, the Russian propaganda for coexistence had seriously weakened the bonds among our North Atlantic allies.

Fourth, the rapid growth of the Russian economy had permitted the Communist bloc for the first time to offer a steel mill to India, to pave the streets of Kabul, to build a technological institute in Rangoon, and even to dicker tentatively with Egypt about the Aswan Dam. This raised the question whether we should try to outbid the Russians. In fact, it was a panic of outbidding that produced the original offer to finance the Egyptian dam, just as it was our subsequent reversal, very clumsily done, which immediately precipitated the Suez crisis.

Fifth, the growing unrest in the satellites brought into doubt our East-West trade rules, which treated these puppet governments exactly the same way we treat the Russians.

Sixth, Soviet participation in the United Nations technical-assistance program caused some Members of Congress to oppose our participation, or at least they wished to scale down our contribution. That was a factor in the amendment to limit American participation to one-third of the funds.

Seventh, and finally, there was a wave of nationalist fervor among African and Asian nations which challenged and exposed some of our political attitudes toward colonialism and neutralism, and raised serious questions about the adequacy and purpose of our economic programs.

This is not an exhaustive list of the world changes that affected our aid programs, but it will serve as a sufficient backdrop for the points I wish to make.

Different Members of Congress have reacted very differently to these seven changes. For me, they pose one overriding question: Is "gunboat diplomacy" an adequate policy for the leader of the free world.

Even if we bring up to date that Coolidge-era phrase about gunboats, and call this "H-bomb diplomacy," or "military pact diplomacy," or "massive retaliation diplomacy," my question remains: Is this an adequate policy for the United States?

I do not question the need for adequate defense; I support it. For some time, however, I have publicly doubted whether the United States has begun to develop the kind of affirmative and constructive policies, which show what we are for, as well as what we are against—policies which can draw together the forces of freedom everywhere, policies which can ultimately establish a secure world climate for the freedoms we cherish here at home. Our foreign policy needs a new emphasis. It needs the emphasis of economic growth, and progress, along with national independence for free people and nations. Military containment must give way to economic and social development.

This dynamic policy can be compounded of many elements. The policy includes a vigorous support of the United Nations and its agencies, in deed as well as in word. It includes a rethinking and reemphasis of our educational exchange programs, of our information programs, of our diplomatic representation, to make them adequate to the new world situation. We need to back up openly the new plans of the Western European union, Euratom, and the common market. We must support the embryonic North African Federation, the regional stirrings in Africa south of the Sahara. We need to speak out in responsible Jeffersonian language on the subject of colonialism and national independence, and Wilsonian idealism on self-determination. The rest of the world honors two Americans above all others in the 20th century: Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt. It is high time that the United States Information Service and the Voice of America mentioned them once in a while.

Our disarmament efforts must be more than posturing and slogans; they must be serious, practicable, and believable. We need a much broader program for stimulating private trade, private investment, public loans; and we need to take a new look at a public investment program.

All of these things the Eisenhower administration endorses in its forward-looking speeches. And some actions have been taken. But for the most part, these ideas remain generalized slogans.

This brings me back to the subject of this conference. A vigorous approach to world economic growth has been advanced as one of the important tools in a dynamic American offensive for freedom. I agree. This is one of the keys to a practical and effective foreign policy.

I don't mean the kind of half-hearted effort we have undertaken in the past, hidden under a label of military containment. I mean the kind of bold, affirmative proposal which could capture the imagination of the entire world. Such a plan has been supported by some of you on humanitarian grounds. It has been defended by economists on economic grounds. There is good justification for each position. But I suspect the approach to world economic development that has the greatest chance for political action in the United States is the one which stresses positive American leadership in the free world.

So, if I may sum up what I have thus far said in a roundabout way: World economic development is but part of a much broader discussion about the adequacy of American foreign policy, and an economic-aid program offers one of the most important ways to demonstrate a positive leadership.

My second point is closely related to my first: There will be no significant departure in our economic development programs in 1957 unless President Eisenhower gives us both a proposal bearing his name, and more than his customarily mild, detached leadership.

I have heard some optimistic opinions about the magic effect of a Vandenberg-type resolution in the Senate, or a Stimson-Paterson type committee to stir up public support

for a new policy, or something like the Harriman and Krug committees of 1948 to gather the facts for a new program. As you know, these steps played a significant part in the launching of the Marshall plan. But sober political thinking must make us realize that without General Marshall's speech at Harvard, without President Truman's prompt and vigorous support, without the meeting of European representatives to draw up a European Recovery Program, there would have been no Marshall plan. Then, as now, the leadership of the top officials of the executive branch was the critical element.

Yet, frankly, I find no evidence today that President Eisenhower is preparing a recommendation for a bold departure in foreign economic policy. The Fairless Committee, according to all present reports, is prepared to recommend a reduction in foreign aid. The House Foreign Affairs Committee is already studying a report by its recently retired chairman, Mr. Richards, which proposes a reduction in foreign aid. I will not presume to speak for the other members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, since we are scheduled to submit recommendations on the same subject within a month or two.

I am convinced that the United States will sooner or later be driven to a more far-reaching foreign economic policy, if not by the logic of groups like yours, then by successful Russian economic penetration of the free world, or by a series of political disasters in Asia and Africa, which can only be ameliorated by bold economic action.

Let me say a word about the so-called Eisenhower doctrine in this connection. All of us know that in the Middle East there are real and present dangers of regional war, subversion, and poverty. Nothing in the Eisenhower doctrine atempts to meet these real dangers except for the request for discretionary reallocation of some economic aid already appropriated. We do not even know where that economic aid is to go, to what governments, and for what purposes. In fact, I may say that I am gravely worried that the economic-aid aspect of the Eisenhower doctrine may do the cause of economic assistance generally grave harm.

I am a champion of economic assistance for underdeveloped nations when there is a realistic probability that this assistance will be used for economically and socially progressive results. In places like India, Burma, Pakistan, and Turkey—nations where hopeful, democratically oriented, welfare-conscience governments are in power—the case for economic assistance is a strong and persuasive one. The state which most conspicuously offers that kind of opportunity in the Middle East, Israel, presumably will not benefit from the economic assistance aspects of the Eisenhower doctrine. Indeed it appears that the nations of the Middle East most likely to receive new financial benefits from the United States are those nations ruled by the most feudal and reactionary regimes.

By deliberately asking a Congress, already increasingly skeptical of economic-assistance programs, for authority apaprently to bribe feudal Middle Eastern potentates under the guise of an economic-assistance program, President Eisenhower may well have done a disservice to the cause of economic assistance generally.

I have never been known as a pessimist. I hope I am wrong about what I have just said, as well as about the chances for a new program this year. But I believe your discussions at this conference will be more realistic if they are based on the hard, discouraging outlook that there is not likely to be a substantial change in American foreign policy leadership this year. I think this is deplorable, but I believe it is the fact of the matter.

This leads me to my third point. I also believe that forward-looking groups such as yours can perform a service in advancing ideas and establishing a favorable climate for a new American economic leadership. I suggest this can be done best by identifying those key issues, those leading questions, on which a shift in American policy must be based. I have not studied this subject at length, as some of you have, and I am sure this list of issues can be improved by your discussions. In a very abbreviated form, here are my suggestions on those key questions, and my personal answers to them.

Question No. 1: Have underdeveloped countries, especially those in Asia and Africa, acquired a new importance to the United States and the free world that requires us to work out policies of accommodation to their legitimate needs, just as we have long worked out accommodations with Western Europe?

My answer is an unqualified yes. No one privileged to serve on our American delegation to the United Nations, as I have been at the current session, can fail to grasp that these new and developing nations of Asia and Africa, now numbering 27, control over a third of the votes in the General Assembly. By the end of the year, two more may be added, that is, Ghana, formerly the Gold Coast, and Malaya. Almost all future additions to the family of free nations will lie in Asia and Africa. The outcome of the great struggle between freedom and communism will unquestionably be decided by the turn of events in these countries.

Question No. 2: Is economic development the most important relationship which the United States can employ to build a position of trust and respect among developing nations?

Unquestionably it is. All the more reason, therefore, why the new economic approach must be accompanied by more sensitive attitudes toward neutralist foreign policies and toward the remnants of colonialism.

Question No. 3: Is it a fact that the developing countries need, and can wisely use, a substantially larger flow of outside capital?

I have talked to no reputable economist who does not confirm this fact. One of the ablest authorities on the subject, Professor Rostow of MIT, has been advising our Senate committee, and is appearing on your program. When you think back on the large amounts of capital which the United States found it necessary to import from Europe in launching its own development process, it is not surprising that these newly developing countries likewise look to older economies for their initial capital.

Question No. 4: Can private investment provide a sufficient capital flow for these purposes or must we look also to public investment?

The United States has not done nearly enough to encourage its citizens to invest abroad. More private investment is certainly possible. But I never heard of a private investor prepared to finance hospitals, malaria control, a teacher training school, a county agent operation, or a community development project. We know that these steps are often necessary before private investment can go into an area. The conclusion seems inescapable that public investment must supply a substantial portion of the capital, at least in the early years.

Question No. 5: Have we fully explored the use of our abundance of food and fiber as an integral part of a general economic assistance program?

Recognizing the political difficulties confronting a large-scale economic assistance program, it is all the more important that we explore the possibilities of increasing our activities by means of programs such as the Agricultural Trade and Development Act of 1954. Congress originally spelled out the use of foreign currencies accruing from the food and fiber sales under Public Law 480 as follows: (1) to expand international trade; (2) to encourage economic development; (3) to purchase strategic materials; (4) to pay United States obligations; and (5) to foster in other ways the foreign policy of the United States.

Merely to list these objectives answers the question of whether we have used this law to its fullest extent. The answer is clearly no. Both in my role as a delegate to the United Nations General Assembly, and as a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I have recently proposed increasing this type of program, including the actual extension of Public Law 480 for a 2-year period with an authorization for $3 billion.

Already we have gained practical experience under this program in India, Turkey, Spain, and certain South American countries. Further development of national food and fiber reserves, coordinated with the program of the Food and Agricultural Organization, operating under the auspices of the United Nations, remains to be explored. We have merely scratched the surface of the real possibilities in this field.

Question No. 6. Should we look to national governments like the United States, or international bodies like the United Nations, to adminsiter such a program?

I fail to understand why this question is so often posed as an either-or proposition. We need both. But I do think the greatest gap in our present economic development machinery is an international fund which can finance sound projects in underdeveloped countries. That is why I have always supported the Special United Nations for Economic Development (SUNFED), though I recognize that the present proposals for the capitalization of SUNFED are wholly inadequate. We need a good deal more thinking on what the relationship of such a fund should be to the International Bank and the International Finance Corporation, for unless that question is worked out satisfactorily, there will be little inclination of the donor countries to entrust funds to an international body. Nor should we neglect the possibility of regional economic development authorities, especially in the Middle East.

Question No. 7: How long will this proposed development program continue?

The only honest answer is that it will continue throughout our lifetime, and probably throughout the lives of our children. Our initial commitment should not be for less than 4 or 5 years. If we think this is a quickie job for political expediency, we would do better to keep the money in our pockets and forget the proposal.

Question No. 8: What would this proposal cost?

There have been many estimates. Last year the Committee for Economic Development suggested from $500 million to $1.5 billion in new capital each year, over and above the present flow. The most detailed estimate I have seen was that advanced by the MIT study project, which came up with a total cost of $2.5 billion a year, of which some part would be borne by other industrialized countries, part could be financed with American farm surpluses, and the balance of about $1.5 billion a year would be provided by American public funds. This represents a little less than we are now spending on so-called economic aid, though, of course, under the MIT proposal this amount would go entirely for economic development, rather than military support.

Question No. 9: Can we afford it?

In 1956 the United States spent 1.1 percent of its gross national product on foreign aid. Nine years ago, during the first year of the Marshall plan, we spent 1.7 percent of our gross national product, a proportion half again higher. Can you blame the United Nations members for hanging their heads in embarrassment when our Government told the Economic Committee 2 weeks ago that we cannot support SUNFED because we cannot afford it? Actually two U. N. members—

Canada and France—are making larger contributions to international development, in relation to their present economies, than is the United States. Western Europe and Canada combined are making larger net investments in foreign countries than is the United States.

The question has never been whether we can afford it, but whether our national interest will assign a sufficiently high priority to this foreign policy leadership to justify the use of our resources. It is one of the purposes of this conference, I trust, to help establish that priority.

In closing, let me quote the speech of President Eisenhower, delivered 3 weeks ago at his second inauguration. It was one of his great utterances. He said:

"We must use our skills and knowledge and at times our substance to help others rise from misery, however far the scene of suffering may be from our shores. For wherever in the world a people knows desperate want, there must appear at least the spark of hope, the hope of progress—or there will surely rise at last the flames of conflict." The President concluded: "We are called to meet the price of this peace."

I should like to conclude with the hope that he will help us meet it, with the active leadership the situation so urgently requires. If such leadership is forthcoming, I need not tell the President that you and I and all others devoted to the cause of a more enlightened foreign policy will support his efforts wholeheartedly.

## Meatpackers Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 21, 1957*

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, in President Eisenhower's economic report transmitted to Congress January 23, 1957, he emphasized the importance of a competitive economy in producing the abundance we have enjoyed in America.

The report states:

The preservation and strengthening of competition must, therefore, be a leading objective of public policy. * * * Vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws is basic to the obtainment of this objective, for threats of encroachment on competition are always present and assume constantly changing forms.

Most of us in Congress are in agreement with this objective. However, there is an important area of our economy which for decades has escaped antitrust scrutiny or enforcement. This is the meatpacking industry.

In the years prior to 1921 the Federal Trade Commission was vigorously investigating monopolistic practices among the packers. The Justice Department brought antitrust suits against the Big Five packers, and to escape prosecution they signed a consent decree in 1920 by which their activities were restricted.

In 1921 the Packers and Stockyards Act transferred monopoly and fair-trade control from the Federal Trade Commission to the Department of Agriculture. However, Congress has never given the Department of Agriculture an appropriation for an enforcement staff. Thus, meatpacking is the only industry in America which escapes Government supervision of unfair trade practices by which giant companies can force small competitors out of business or artificially lower prices for produce sold to them.

Today, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee and its antitrust subcommittee, and I are introducing identical bills to amend the antitrust laws so as to vest in the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction to prevent monopolistic practices in the meatpacking industry. Senators ARTHUR V. WATKINS and JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY are introducing the same bill in the Senate.

Strict antitrust enforcement is urgently needed, because the packing industry is heavily concentrated. This puts the consumers, the small independent meatpackers and the cattlemen in a vulnerable position. Ten national packers slaughter 50 percent of the cattle, 60 percent of the calves, 70 percent of the hogs, and 77 percent of the sheep under Federal inspection.

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson is to be commended for his recent announcement that the Department is making a survey of activities and problems concerning unfair trade practices. Secretary Benson has also indicated he expects to ask for funds to build an enforcement staff if that function remains in his Department.

However, more economic and effective antitrust enforcement against the packers over the long run would result from transferring enforcement to the Federal Trade Commission for the following reasons:

First, the FTC could do the job with little or no expansion of staff, with consequent economy to the taxpayers. It has been estimated that for the Department of Agriculture to adequately assume this enforcement would require an additional staff of as high as 60 people.

Second, scrutiny of unfair buying or selling practices would likely be accomplished with considerably greater efficiency by an agency with decades of experience in antitrust enforcement than by a newly established organization.

Third, over the long run the Department might be restrained from pushing antitrust enforcement, because the success of some Department activities, such as marketing news services and Federal meat grading, requires cooperation of the meat packers.

During the summer and fall of both 1955 and 1956 I spent considerable time visiting with stockmen from most of the 25 counties in my congressional district in Utah. These men are almost universally requesting vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws against the meat packers. In addition a growing list of powerful regional and national organizations is taking a strong stand in favor of the bill, which I am introducing to transfer authority from the Department of Agriculture to the Federal Trade Commission. These include the National Milk Producers Federation, the Western States Meat Packers Association, the National Wool Growers Association and the United States Wholesale Grocers Association.

Passage of this bill should mean added protection to livestock producers, meat consumers, and independent packers.

# SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1957

Rev. Donald O. Hornung, pastor, Grace Methodist Church, Millsboro, Del., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, as on this day we recall once again the story of our Nation's birth and our first President, George Washington, we would be mindful of our great heritage of freedom. We would be mindful before Thee and grateful that in every generation many have alined themselves for a better community. We rejoice in our country and thank Thee for all who have labored for cleaner and better government.

Grant strength and good understanding to these Senators and make them willing followers of Thy commandments and servants of the people's need. May they know in whom to trust and make their decisions in accordance with Thy holy will.

We pray for the United Nations that it may seek to enfold the earth with arms of loving concern and to create everywhere a steadfast, enlightened brotherhood that will be victorious over fear, suspicion, and hostility.

We pray in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 21, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

## NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph A. Jenkins, of Texas, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 5 years from August 27, 1956.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jerome D. Fenton, of Connecticut, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations to the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine under the Public Health Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, these nominations are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, after the morning hour, I intend to suggest the absence of a quorum before the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] reads Washington's Farewell Address.

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until Monday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## CALL OF THE CALENDAR TO BE DISPENSED WITH ON MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday the call of the calendar, under the rule, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Memorial 3

"A memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from the State of Montana; the Honorable LEE METCALF and the Honorable LEROY ANDERSON, Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana; and to the Federal Communications Commission, Washintgon, D. C.; urging that the Congress of the United States enact legislation that will lead to the authorization of very high frequency television translators and asking for an investigation of the now existing translators before any further action is taken against these translators by the Federal Communications Commission.

"Whereas television is being more and more considered a necessity to a high standard of living; and

"Whereas there are large areas of the State of Montana where due to the economy of these areas and the sparse population, television stations are not economical; and

"Whereas hundreds of thousands of dollars have been expended by the inhabitants of these areas purchasing television receiving equipment thereby adding greatly to the present economic picture; and

"Whereas even with the finest of receiving equipment most of this area has extremely poor television reception, if any at all; and

"Whereas the cost of the present ultra-high-frequency translators which have been authorized is prohibitive and the technical skill required for their operation is not available in rural areas; and

"Whereas groups have seen fit, as a last resort, to establish unauthorized very high frequency television translator stations, which are in operation throughout the State of Montana with splendid results; and

"Whereas there is not a single instance in Montana where these very high frequency television translators have interfered with any type of electronic communication equipment: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana,* That the Congress of the United States be urged to enact legislation that will lead to the authorization of these translators in certain areas and under certain conditions; and be it further

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana,* That before any further action is taken by the Federal Communications Commission against these unauthorized translators that an investigation be conducted by the Members of the Congress of the United States, the Federal Communications Commission and officers of the Montana Television Improvement Association; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be submitted by the secretary of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from the State of Montana; to the Honorable LEE METCALF and the Honorable LEROY ANDERSON, Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana; and to the Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.

"EUGENE H. MAHONEY,
*"Speaker of the House."*

By Mr. BARRETT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 2, 34th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming

"A joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to recognition by all Federal agencies of the rights and laws of the State of Wyoming

"Whereas the recognition by the Federal agencies of the rights and laws of the State relating to the control, development, appropriation and use of waters within the State's boundaries was one of the fundamental concepts of Wyoming law and of the reclamation law as stated in section 8 of Reclamation Act of 1902; and

"Whereas in recent years certain Federal agencies have either forgotten about this provision or have chosen to ignore it: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the 34th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such Legislature concurring),* That the Congress of the United States of America, be and it is hereby memorialized to promptly, diligently and fairly consider the sentiment of the people of the State of Wyoming requesting restatement and enforcement of the principle of recognizing the rights and laws of the State relating to the use and control of their waters; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the Secretary of the Interior, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, United States Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and Representative in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON.

"EARL T. BOWER,
*"President of the Senate.*
"WILLIAM F. SWANSON,
*"Speaker of the House.*

"Approved February 2, 1957.

"MILWARD L. SIMPSON, *Governor."*

## CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have in my hand Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, passed by the South Dakota Legislature, on the subject of welfare payments for American colleges. I present it for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD. It is very short.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 2

Whereas the proportion of needy Indians receiving public assistance from the categorical aid programs administered by the State Department of Public Welfare is much higher than that for the population as a whole; and

Whereas under special legislation (section 639, title 25 of the U. S. Code), the Federal Government provides 80 percent of the State and local government share of public assistance to New Mexico and Arizona, thus recognizing the need for equalizing disproportionate burdens placed upon the State and local governments by reason of the location of Indian reservations and concentrations of

Indian populations therein: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives) concurring therein*, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully memorialized to provide equitable financial treatment to State governments with respect to aid provided under social-security programs to Indians living in this State; and that copies of this resolution shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, the members of the congressional delegation of South Dakota, and the President of the United States.

L. R. HOUCK,
*Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.*
NIELS D. JENSEN,
*Secretary of the Senate.*
NILS A. BOE,
*Speaker of House of Representatives.*
WALTER J. MATSON,
*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*

## INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have just received a resolution adopted by the Duluth AFL–CIO central body urging support of the bill (S. 27) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department. I was delighted to have cosponsored this measure and am earnestly hopeful for early committee action.

I ask unanimous consent that the Duluth resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DULUTH, MINN., *February 8, 1957.*

RESOLUTION TO MEMORIALIZE THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION PROVIDING FOR SALARY ADJUSTMENT FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES, PRESENTED BY EMIL A. DREHER ON BEHALF OF THE POSTAL EMPLOYEES OF DULUTH

Whereas employees of the United States postal service have greater workloads and responsibilities than ever before; and

Whereas the work of the Postal Department is being performed in an efficient manner and is deserving of increased compensation: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Duluth AFL–CIO central body endorses a salary schedule for postal employees commensurate with that in private industry and which will give adequate recognition of the increased productivity of postal employees, and to that end urges the Congress of the United States to vote for and support H. R. 2474 and S. 27; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, Congressman, and to Senators HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and EDWARD J. THYE, of the State of Minnesota.

EMIL A. DREHER,
*Delegate, Local 142, Post Office Clerks.*

## RESOLUTION OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, AFL–CIO

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the AFL–CIO executive council at its recent meeting gave considerable thought and attention to the broad economic problems facing our Nation. That organization is understandably concerned over the rapid rise in wholesale and consumer prices that has taken place in the past year and over the harsh and unjust effects of the administration's tight money policies.

The thinking and recommendations of the AFL–CIO executive council on these topics is clearly spelled out in two resolutions titled "Statement on Prices" and "Monetary Policy" which deserve widespread attention. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., FEBRUARY 1, 1957

STATEMENT ON PRICES

The rising price level of the past year—and the accompanying attacks on union wage policies—make it essential for the AFL–CIO to consider the present price situation.

We are so convinced of the validity of our view that these price pressures are overwhelmingly unrelated to wage increases that we intend to bring organized labor's views on prices and profits vigorously before the public.

Because we firmly believe that excessive price increases in certain basic commodities have been unwarranted and because such price increases have produced excessive profit margins in such key industries as auto and steel, we urge that the Congress, through its Joint Economic Committee, conduct an investigation of the price-profit-investment-wage policies of the dominant price-leading corporations in basic industries.

The cost of living, as measured by the Consumer Price Index, rose 2.8 percent in the 11 months between January and November 1956, compared with an increase of 1.4 percent in the 4 years from January 1952 to December 1955.

Prices of basic goods have been rising sharply for a year or more. These price boosts are passed on—and sometimes pyramided—from basic producers to fabricator, wholesaler, retailer, and finally the consumer. Between June 1955 and the end of last year, wholesale iron and steel prices have risen 20 percent. Automobile prices have been boosted to the point where the low-priced car is merely a memory of the past.

Prices of various items have been raised during the past year, despite the fact that profits in the price-raising industries have been frequently high and that often there has been an excess supply of the commodities.

The American public should be made aware of the fact that price rises for many basic goods have far outstripped wage costs. The price-profit policies of many major corporations in basic industries should be brought into the focus of public attention.

The decline of food prices between 1952 and 1955 tended to offset slowly rising prices of other commodities—helping to produce the relative stability of the price level during those years. Food prices have been rising, however, since the beginning of 1956. Price rises for manufactured goods, housing, and medical care—coupled with slowly rising food prices—have meant increases in the overall cost of living.

For several years prior to 1956, price increases for basic manufactured goods, such as steel, were largely absorbed by many fabricators, wholesalers, and retailers, through improved efficiency and reduced unit profit margins. Faced with rising prices of their basic goods, and increasing interest rates on borrowed funds, many fabricators and other business enterprises have been raising the prices of their products. In the past year, much of the increases in the prices of steel and other basic goods has been passed through the price pipeline on their way to the consumer.

Manufacturers operating in industries where demand is high have taken advantage of that fact to raise prices, even though their profits were already excessive. In other industries, corporations in a position to raise prices arbitrarily, without regard to the law of supply and demand, have sought to fatten profit margins by raising prices in the face of shrinking markets and rising inventories.

Farm equipment prices, for example, have risen 8 percent since mid-1955, despite large inventories, soft markets, production cutbacks, and layoffs of employees in farm-equipment plants.

On the same day that President Eisenhower delivered his state of the Union message, advising workers and unions to moderate their wage demands lest they supposedly create inflationary pressures, the newspapers simultaneously reported gasoline price increases and sharply rising inventories of gasoline and fuel oils.

While various factors in the different industries have contributed to the rising level of prices, the major cause has been the attempt by price-leading corporations in key basic industries to obtain large profit margins and a substantial flow of cash.

Furthermore, the rise in output per man-hour of work and in output per unit of capital—along with increasing profit margins and substantial rates of return on investment—make possible both continuing improvements in wages, hours, and fringe benefits and a relatively stable price level.

Trade unions insist on the right of workers to share in the benefits of rising productivity and in the profitability of the industries in which they work. When the economy's rising productivity is not shared widely, as in the 1920's, the lack of balance helps to produce recessions and depressions, as in the 1930's. Stronger unions in the post-World War II period have been obtaining for workers a more adequate share of the benefits of improving productive efficiency than the unions of the 1920's were able to accomplish. But the wages and salaries of America's working people have not been taking the lion's share of the fruits of continuing improvements in productivity.

If the savings that flow from rising productivity were shared adequately among workers and consumers, as well as with business, the cost of living in peacetime could remain relatively stable from one year to the next. Increasing productivity in the national economy makes it possible for most firms in most industries to grant substantial wage and fringe benefit improvements, without price rises. Some companies and industries, in which manhour output is rising most rapidly, can afford to grant such improvements and to reduce their prices. A few companies and industries, in which productive efficiency is not improving, may have to raise prices somewhat.

The overall price level, therefore, can and should remain relatively stable, under peacetime conditions.

In 1955, for example, when the last UAW contracts were negotiated with the automobile manufacturers, the comparatively small cost of wage increases and other economic benefits, amounting to an average of 21 cents per hour, may be set against General Motor's profits of $2.93 for every man-hour worked in its plants and Ford's profits of

$3.06 for every man-hour. The only wage increases received by the workers in these firms in 1956, apart from cost-of-living adjustments which followed auto price increases, was the annual improvement factor which by admission of the auto employers themselves, does not provide any justification for a price increase.

In the steel industry, the 1956 economic package of about 20 cents per hour won by the United Steelworkers, was granted against the background of substantial 1955 profits. According to the Securities and Exchange Commission, the return on investment in the primary iron and steel industries in 1955 was 27.1 percent before taxes and 13.5 percent after taxes. Obviously the wage increase could have been absorbed by the companies without any price increase at all. However, the wage increase, assuming no absorption out of increased productivity, translates into additional labor costs to United States Steel of $82 million for its steel-making employees. The corporation's price rise of $8.50 per ton increased its income from the steel-making operation by approximately $230 million. Increased revenue from price rises exceeded labor costs by an almost 3-to-1 ratio. This is evidently not enough for the industry because they are now agitating for further price increases. What is true in the automobile and steel industries is substantially true of other industries such as chemical, paper, aluminum, meat, and food processing.

In the American economy a relatively stable price level can be maintained only if increasing business profits are derived from a rising volume of sales and low unit profit margins, rather than from excessively large profit margins and high prices.

The facts concerning wages and prices should be brought to the attention of the public and of the Government by the AFL–CIO and its affiliated organizations and by a congressional investigation of the price, profit, investment, wage policies of the major price-leading corporations in basic industries.

MONETARY POLICY

America cannot afford to sacrifice the needs of its citizens in the fight against inflation. The current "tight money" policy has not only failed in its purpose but has also delayed the achievement of necessary social goals. School construction has been postponed; roads and other vital public improvements have been delayed. The pinch of hard money has also hurt many other sectors of the economy—the distressed area, the home buyer, the farmer, and the small-business man have felt the discriminatory effects of the present high interest rates.

At the same time the objectives of "tight money" have not been attained. Business expansion and expenditures for new plant and equipment have not been curbed significantly. The economy's rate of growth and the boom have not been slowed. The Federal Reserve Board's six increases in the rediscount rate in the past 2 years have not even caused a ripple, much less retarded the rate of business spending for new plant and equipment. Instead, wealthy corporations have found they could afford to pay the higher interest charges, or use their own resources, or charge higher prices, and thus use costless capital to expand.

Nor has inflation been halted. Wholesale prices have risen continuously. Consumer prices have followed their pattern, though more moderately.

While efforts to treat the inflationary aspects of the economy have proved relatively useless, real harm has resulted from the higher interest rates. Important types of borrowers have suffered. Home buyers have had to face higher interest rates and fewer homes have been built. Farmers have found it more difficult to borrow enough to tide them over the planting and harvesting seasons. Small business has seen 1956 produce the highest rate of business failures since 1941. Local, city, and State governments have been forced to cut back or delay necessary improvements in schools, sewage, water, roads, and other public works. Distressed areas have found it exceedingly difficult to secure the loans necessary to help them improve their economic situation.

America cannot afford to sacrifice these social objectives in the pursuit of an unsuccessful hard-money policy. We cannot continue to jeopardize the welfare of many of our citizens because we are afraid of growth. We must choose to permit necessary borrowing at low-interests costs for the goals our citizens need.

Since the present tight-money policy, designed to fight inflation has failed in its objectives, and since its major achievement has been delay of worthwhile social programs, we recommend that the administration stop tilting with the windmills of inflation and—

1. Pursue policies designed to accomplish a steady, balanced rate of growth in the economy;

2. Relax the present tight-money policy; and

3. Take specific steps to alleviate the hardships caused by hard money. To achieve these ends, the Government should provide for Federal aid to education, an expanded public-housing program and a program for middle-income housing, and the creation of a special Government corporation to lend money at low interests rates for specific necessary social programs.

We must not undersell the American economy. Worthwhile social objectives are possible without inflationary consequences. The fearful should also be reminded that tight money policies have failed to halt rising prices.

Keeping the economy in check temporarily may require other steps in the future. Meanwhile, baseless fears should not force us to fail to meet the needs of the American people.

---

## REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE SENATE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—RESOLUTION (S. REPT. NO. 96)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, I am submitting herewith a summary and review of Senate floor sessions and committee meetings during the 84th Congress which I ask to have printed.

The report includes an analysis of legislative actions taken by the Senate and details concerning the work of all committees of the Senate. Tabulations are made of legislative actions, special studies and reports, and other functions performed by the committees in accordance with the rules of the Senate and the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Incorporated are details regarding the work of the legislative committees, the Committees on Appropriations and Rules and Administration, and the joint, special, and select committees. The report also contains a table showing, by committees, a total of 94 regular and 35 special and temporary subcommittees which functioned during the 84th Congress.

The committee believes that the report will be of interest not only to Members of the Senate, but also to their constituents who are interested in learning more about the detailed operations of the Senate. The objective of the report is to set forth the importance of committee work in the legislative process and the time devoted by the Senators to this important phase of Senate activities. The report should provide information to visitors to the Senate galleries as to why more Senators are not in attendance in the Chamber during sessions of the Senate and to newspapers which have expressed certain views in regard to the seeming lack of interest in a subject under discussion in the Chamber. The report clearly shows that more than 90 percent of the work performed by Senators in the legislative process is done in committee; and I believe the report will enable the public to appreciate fully the fact that, although a Senator may not be present on the floor during general debates and other proceedings of the Senate, he is constantly performing functions essential to the legislative process.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit, with the report, and to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a press release which I issued today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed; and, without objection, the press release will be printed in the RECORD.

The press release submitted by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

PRESS RELEASE FOR SENATOR McCLELLAN ON SENATE ACTIVITIES REPORT

Members of the United States Senate attended approximately 4,000 committee meetings during the 84th Congress in the consideration of legislative business, Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN announced today following an exhaustive analysis of the workload of the United States Senate.

Senator McCLELLAN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, which conducted the survey, stated that because of conflicts between sessions of the Senate, regular committee meetings and other official duties, such as attendance at boards, commissions and special meetings, appropriate action should be considered to permit better adjustment of schedules to enable Members of the Senate to discharge the heavy responsibilities they bear.

A total of 7,290 legislative proposals were considered by Members of the Senate in committee meetings during the 84th Congress. Of these, hearings were held upon 6,631; 3,053 were reported by the committees in executive sessions; 1,028 became public laws; and 893 private laws, illustrating the heavy workload carried by Senators in committees—apart from action within the Senate itself.

"Although it is not possible to determine accurately the amount of time Senators must devote to essential legislative duties and to other public service related to the functions of the office, the report submitted herewith makes it clearly evident that, under present Senate procedures, Members of the Senate do not have sufficient time available for committee deliberations and actions," Senator McCLELLAN stated.

"Since the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 has now been in operation for 10 years, the effective date beginning with the 80th Congress which convened January 1947, the Committee on Government Operations is submitting this report with the objective of calling the present situation to the attention of Members of the Senate. The committee feels that an analysis of the facts presented will point up the problems now confronting the committees of the Senate, in many respects similar to conditions which existed prior to the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act."

"The committee feels that, in view of the fact that 90 percent of the work of the Senate is done in committees, appropriate action should be considered in order to develop a better balance of time between sessions of the Senate and committee meetings so as to speed up, improve, and bring about better coordination of the legislative process."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, pursuant to the findings and the information the report contains, I submit a resolution and ask that it remain on the desk, subject to being called up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received, and lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

The resolution (S. Res. 102), submitted by Mr. McCLELLAN, was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the leadership of the Senate experiment with schedules for meetings of the Senate so as to determine whether the business of the Senate will be more efficiently transacted by providing for alternate days for Chamber sessions and committee meetings, or by providing for 3 full days for committee meetings and 3 full days for sessions in the Chamber, or by providing some other schedule.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1343. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 1344. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer 20 acres of land in Roosevelt County, Mont., to School District No. 9, Roosevelt County; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 1345. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make available corn from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks to certain corn producers who require such corn for livestock feed and who agree to replace such corn with corn from subsequent crops; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. CURTIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 1346. A bill for the relief of Jane Bailey (nee Jane Dzun Ma); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1347. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Earl Leiby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1348. A bill for the relief of Walter Wettschreck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1349. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the allowance of deductions for certain contributions made to Community Chests; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution providing for a study of the possibility and desirability of establishing a United States Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

## RESOLUTION

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted the following resolution, which was ordered to lie on the table:

S. Res. 102. Resolution relative to fixing separate days for Senate sessions and committee meetings.

(See resolution printed in full, which appears under the heading "Report of a Committee.")

## AVAILABILITY OF CORN TO CERTAIN CORN PRODUCERS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make available corn from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks to certain corn producers who require such corn for livestock feed and who agree to replace such corn from subsequent crops. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement, prepared by me, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1345) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make available corn from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks to certain corn producers who require such corn for livestock feed and who agree to replace such corn with corn from subsequent crops, introduced by Mr. CURTIS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That as used in this act—

(1) The term "eligible corn producer" means the operator of a farm on which, because of natural causes, the yield for the crop of corn planted during the marketing year preceding the marketing year during which application is filed under this act is less than 50 percent of the normal yield for such farm;

(2) The term "normal yield" means normal yield as defined in section 301 (b) (13) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

(3) The term "normal production" means the normal yield multiplied by the acreage allotment for the farm, except that in the case of a farm outside the commercial corn-producing area such term means the normal yield multiplied by the average acreage planted to corn on the farm during the 5 marketing years preceding the marketing year in which application is filed under this act.

(4) The term "acreage allotment" includes a base acreage for any year in which base acreages are in effect in lieu of acreage allotments.

(5) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed, upon application filed by an eligible corn producer, to make available to such producer from corn owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation an amount of corn not to exceed one-third of the normal production of the farm operated by such producer.

(b) Corn shall be made available to an eligible corn producer under subsection (a) only upon the filing by such producer of an application in such form as may be prescribed by the Secretary stating that the corn applied for is intended to be used by the applicant to feed livestock and poultry, and the execution by the applicant of an agreement to either (1) deliver to the Commodity Credit Corporation from the crop planted within the marketing year within which such application is filed an amount of corn equal to the amount made available under subsection (a), or (2) to pay to the Commodity Credit Corporation an amount equal to the value of the corn made available under subsection (a) based upon the support price paid to cooperators within the commercial corn-producing area as of the date on which it was so made available.

(c) The delivery or payment referred to in subsection (b) shall be made at such time, not later than 4 months after the end of the marketing year in which the application was filed, as may be prescribed in the agreement, except that in any case in which because of natural causes the yield for the crop from which delivery is to be made to the Commodity Credit Corporation is less than 50 percent of the normal yield for the farm the Secretary is authorized to grant such extension of the time for such delivery or payment as he may deem necessary to avoid hardship.

SEC. 3. All expenses incurred in the removal of corn from storage facilities or in the delivery or replacing of such corn under this act shall be borne by the applicant, and no services shall be performed by the Commodity Credit Corporation except upon agreement by the applicant to reimburse the Corporation for the cost of any such services.

SEC. 4. In the event of the failure of any person to whom corn is made available under this act to carry out the terms of an agreement entered into under section 2 (b), the Commodity Credit Corporation may bring suit in the United States district court for the district in which such person resides or is engaged in business to recover the value of such corn, with interest at 6 percent per annum from the date of default. For such purpose the value of the corn shall be based upon the support price paid to cooperators within the commercial corn-producing area as of the date on which the corn was made available.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. CURTIS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CURTIS

I am today, February 22, introducing a bill which would make it possible for corn producers who have had a crop failure to borrow corn from the Commodity Credit Corporation and repay in corn from the next year's crop.

We have a strange situation in the country. In many of our communities there is stored a large quantity of government-owned corn. This corn is getting older every day and the storage is expensive. In these same communities there are drought-stricken farmers who need corn for their poultry, their hogs and cattle and other livestock. These same farmers are unable to buy the Government corn at the high price the Government must, under the law, charge. My bill would permit them to borrow corn from the Government and repay it in kind.

This would be of material help to thousands of drought-stricken farmers. Such a loan of corn would enable them to carry on with their poultry, their hogs and their milk cows, and in some instances it might be the means of their continuing in farming. The borrower would have to enter into a contract to return to the Government, without expense to the Government, the same amount of corn that he borrowed.

This proposal would be advantageous to the Government and to the taxpayers. The Commodity Credit Corporation, when the corn loan was repaid, would have new corn

for old. It would have saved on the storage expense during the period of the loan. The Government would not lose because were the price of corn to decline, such a decline would affect the Commodity Credit Corporation's originally owned corn as well as that which the farmer returns in payment of his loan.

This proposal should be enacted now to help great sections of the drought area. Much of the drought relief legislation that has been passed has been geared primarily to a cattle raising economy. This proposal would, without expense to the Government, bring practical relief to corn and hog farmers, to dairy farmers and to poultry raisers. My bill would limit such corn loans to farm operators whose corn crop in the preceding year was less than 50 percent of the normal yield. It would permit such a corn producer to borrow an amount of corn not to exceed one-third of his normal corn production. The corn loan would not be available to anyone other than a corn producer. Thus, this proposal would not be taken advantage of by speculators and others who are not victims of the drought or similar disaster. The bill would, of course, permit the farmer to repay in dollars based on the support price of the corn when he received it, if he chose that method.

I wish to state that this proposal is not original with me. It was first advocated by the late Senator Hugh Butler of Nebraska. It has widespread approval among farmers. It would give a practical application of the term "ever normal granary," and it would provide needed drought relief without cost or loss to the taxpayers.

## AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO DEDUCTIONS FOR CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS TO COMMUNITY CHESTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the allowance of deductions for certain contributions made to community chests. Let me explain briefly the purpose and intent of the bill.

H. R. 8300, 1954—the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—expanded the tax benefits arising from gifts to churches and recognized educational organizations and hospitals by allowing an additional 10 percent deduction on adjusted gross income. Since 1954, additional tax benefits have been granted to individuals for gifts to medical research organizations.

An inequitable discrimination results from the failure of the 1954 code to extend commensurately additional tax benefits to gifts made to and through community trusts when the donors of such gifts nominate churches, schools, and hospitals as beneficiaries and when such gifts are in fact paid to such beneficiaries by such community trusts.

The Internal Revenue Service in its proposed regulations interprets the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to mean that a contribution made to a community trust, community chest, or other organization referred to in section 170 (c), which in turn makes the contribution available to church, school, or hospital, will not qualify under the 10-percent limitation.

Thus, under the 1954 code, a donation through a community trust does not qualify for the additional 10-percent allowance even though, first, specific churches, schools or hospitals are nominated by the donor as recipient; and, second, payment to such designated recipients is effected by the community trust within the year of the gift. This interpretation imposes a hardship on individuals who select their local community trust as a vehicle for distributing their charitable contributions. I know from correspondence reaching my own office that this is a hardship which has been felt in my own State of Minnesota. I am confident, through discussions with my colleagues, that this is a common problem everywhere.

Mr. President, this situation could be rectified by clarifying section 170 (b) (1) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The bill I introduce today, if enacted, would eliminate the current discrimination against gifts made and paid through community chests, trusts, or funds to nominated and qualifying churches, hospitals, and educational institutions.

Similar, although not identical, legislation is currently pending before the House Ways and Means Committee, where I am hopeful of early action. I am earnestly hopeful, Mr. President, that action to remove these inequities may be completed by both Houses during the current session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1349) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the allowance of deductions for certain contributions made to community chests, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## PROPOSED UNITED STATES FOREIGN SERVICE ACADEMY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution providing for a study of the possibility and desirability of establishing a United States Foreign Service Academy. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 65) providing for a study of the possibility and desirability of establishing a United States Foreign Service Academy, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the United States maintains military and naval academies to provide trained officers for our Armed Forces; and

Whereas our position of world leadership requires an increasing number of men and women skilled in the field of diplomacy; and

Whereas the purposes of Public Law 402, 80th Congress, can be best promoted by well-trained and qualified specialists in the various phases of the program; and

Whereas many young people interested in a career in the diplomatic service are prevented from study in this field because of their inability to finance their education: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on the Academy of Foreign Service (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life;

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 10 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

(e) The Commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(f) Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 2. (a) Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) The members from private life shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall make a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of determining the possibility and desirability of establishing an Academy of Foreign Service, for the training of young men and women in the field of diplomacy and international relations.

(b) In making such study the Commission shall consider all possible factors bearing upon the desirability of establishing an academy of the type contemplated by this joint resolution, and the prospects for its accept-

ance and successful operation. The Commission shall recommend a possible site for such Academy, and in the selection of such site the Commission shall give consideration to geographical accessibility, climate, and the availability of existing facilities.

SEC. 5. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable.

(b) The Commission may secure directly from any executive department or agency of the Federal Government information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall submit interim reports at such time or times as it deems necessary and shall submit to the Congress on or before January 1, 1960, its final report of the results of its investigation and study, together with its recommendations. On the sixtieth day after the date of submission of such final report, the Commission shall cease to exist.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the purpose of the joint resolution is to establish a 12-member commission to prepare recommendations for the establishment of an academy of foreign service, for the selection of a site for the academy, and the construction of the necessary buildings.

Since I have been in Congress, from time to time several Members of the House or the Senate have introduced bills designed to establish a sort of West Point or Annapolis for training of personnel in the field of foreign affairs or foreign diplomacy. None of those bills has ever been enacted.

It occurs to me that by the establishment of such a commission as the one proposed, however, we could bring into focus the best minds, selected as the members of the commission, to determine the actual need for a foreign service academy at this juncture in American history.

The commission would be empowered to recommend the establishment of the academy, to recommend a site for the location of the academy, and the methods by which students for the academy would be chosen, which I imagine would be comparable to the method in which students are selected for attendance at the Naval Academy, the Military Academy, and the new Air Academy in Colorado.

It seems quite obvious, in view of the large amounts of money we are spending today in the field of diplomacy and in the field of so-called mutual defense, with the hot war having the temperature it constantly engenders, that it would be good economy and good judgment on our part to prepare and educate a trained corps of foreign service officers by sending them through the type of institution I envisage before they go abroad to represent us in the trickery world in which we live. Obviously, if our diplomats make serious errors, it could result in a terrible war, the cost for 1 hour of which would more than pay for the cost of such an academy.

I commend the joint resolution to Senators, with the hope that in this session of Congress we can bring about the establishment of a commission looking toward the creation of a West Point, as it were, in the field of foreign policy.

We can no longer afford the luxury of using personnel in our overseas peacetime services who lack the best training in diplomatic endeavors of which our country is capable of providing. This training should be made available to capable young Americans recruited from each of our 48 States on the basis of personal ability and potentiality of service quite regardless of their ability to finance a college education emphasizing the problems of foreign service and dedicated to the development of Foreign Service officers fully trained and equipped with the best tools of the trade.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address delivered by him before the Washington section of the Society of American Foresters.

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM JOSEPH BRENNAN, JR., OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 26, 1957, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of William Joseph Brennan, Jr., of New Jersey, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent.

## BEAUTY AND THE BILLBOARD

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an excellent and forceful editorial from the New York Times of February 17, 1957, entitled "Beauty and the Billboard."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEAUTY AND THE BILLBOARD

The outdoor-advertising lobby is showing its usual effrontery in a current campaign against proposed Federal control of billboards along the new 41,000-mile Federal highway system. Latest example is its claim that such restriction would constitute an invasion of States' rights.

What nonsense this is. The Federal Government is paying 90 percent of the cost of this great transcontinental road network; it sets the standards for the roads; and the roads themselves and the motorists who travel on them create the values from which the billboard owners would profit. Yet even a mild attempt to prevent America's magnificent countryside from being blotted out behind a scabrous wall of advertising signs is denounced as infringement on States rights and a misuse of Federal funds.

The fact is that Senator NEUBERGER's bill, introduced last month, merely directs the Secretary of Commerce to establish standards to protect scenic beauty along the highways by controlling signs within 500 feet of the right-of-way, and to enforce those standards on Federal property. When it comes to property under State jurisdiction, the standards would be merely advisory, though if a State wanted to abide by them it would receive Federal help in the preclusive purchase of advertising rights along the highway. What could be more reasonable, even to the most sincere States righter?

Naturally there is no objection, except possibly from a safety point of view, to outdoor advertising in many industrial, commercial or other build-up areas. But there is a deep public interest in preventing the great through routes that are only now beginning to be constructed across the country from becoming long ribbons of billboards and hotdog stands.

## THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, ever since the Secretary of Defense announced his order imposing 6 months' reserve program on the National Guard, I have received literally hundreds of complaints from persons in Alabama who are interested in the welfare and the future of the National Guard.

For my own part, I have always supported the National Guard, because I believe it has proved to be an effective and worthwhile reserve force.

Typical of the communications which I have received is a letter from the members of the 160th Tactical Reconnaissance Squadron, Alabama Air National Guard. Senators will find this letter to express very clearly why a 3 months' training program, as recommended by the National Guard, is preferable to that proposed by the Department of Defense. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD, together with the names of the signers, immediately after my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter, together with the signatures, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

160TH TACTICAL RECONNAISSANCE SQUADRON, PHOTO-JET, ALABAMA AIR NATIONAL GUARD, DANNELLY AIR NATIONAL GUARD BASE,
*Montgomery, Ala., February 5, 1957.*

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: We are quite concerned over the present status of the National Guard, particularly the attitude of the Defense Department relative to the guard-training program.

We recognize and appreciate the support which you have given the National Guard in the past and we respectfully urge your continued support of what we believe to be the finest training program in any branch of the Reserve Forces today.

As you know, the Defense Department order imposing the 6 months' Reserve program on the National Guard as of April 1, 1957, is still in effect and it is our understanding that hearings on this matter are in progress

before the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives.

We believe that the 6 months training program is completely unnecessary and is but another step toward federalization of the National Guard. While this proposed program is not as yet applicable to the Air National Guard, we wish to point out that during the summers of 1955 and 1956, the units at this base sent approximately 75 airmen to the Air Force Basic Training School for 12 weeks of intensive training. These men received this training without interrupting their education and are men well qualified in basic service procedures and customs. Many of our Army units require new enlistees to undergo this same type training and their program is working very satisfactorily.

In addition to the basic training course, both Army and Air units continuallly encourage guardsmen to take advantage of the technical courses offered by both branches of the service. During the calendar year 1956, the units at this base sent approximately 112 airmen to technical service schools. These men, who were in addition to those sent to basic training school, returned to their units as qualified technicians.

The 3 months' training program advocated by the National Guard will provide adequate training for all new enlistees without prior service and can be done without interfering with the enlistees' education.

We feel that the National Guard is better prepared, better equipped, and the best trained Reserve organization in the program today, and we earnestly request your support of the 3 months training program in lieu of the Defense Department's 6 months program.

Sincerely yours,

Edward D. Gilmen, Jr.; Howard T. Edwards; Clifford E. Singley; Willie E. Whitman, Jr.; Henry Fillingim, Jr.; John P. Cranford; Daniel P. Thompson; Thomas N. McElrath; Norman H. Rahn, Jr.; Thomas E. Beauchamp; Thomas E. Rist; Horace Dasinger; Robert J. Wall; James P. Mills; Albert D. McQueen; Robert H. Chestnutt; William T. Turner; Ernest G. Dismukes; Bert U. McCord; Herbert E. Bullard; William M. Wood; John W. Owens; Joe M. Ross; Franklin E. Durbin; James I. Milton; Wilbur F. Aaron; James A. Lyon, Jr.; Fred W. Bozeman; Hilton C. Hall; Curtis Y. Chestnutt; Grady C. Edwards; Charles L. Williams; Glen W. Morrison; James F. Wilkinson; Bobby G. Thornell; Billy F. Self; Allen M. Smith; Paul D. Sumner; John R. Whetstone; Willie J. Booth; Rufus H. Maddox; Joseph L. Cothran; William R. Peel; Irving Kirkland; Thomas J. Brantley; Starke C. Trotter; Charles B. Stewart, Jr.; Roy H. Boddie; William B. Thompson; Jack C. Fisher; James A. Powell; James H. Hall; James E. Parrish; William C. Hornady, Jr.; Billy C. Adams; Andy L. White; Robert E. Harrison, Jr.; James C. Walden; Billy W. Kennedy; Charles H. Spraggins; Hubert R. Tucker, Jr.; David H. Hill; Herman P. Day; James D. Marsh; Patrick W. Davis, Jr.; William C. Colquett; Willard E. Haines; Rendell F. Clark, Sr.; Reese Hollon; Roy L. Baker; William C. Till; Jack M. Matthews; James C. Bass; Peyton A. Thomas; Roy E. Langley; William D. Traylor; William D. Pesey; Ernest W. Brantley, Jr.; Willie G. Welch; Ernest L. Keeffe; Donald D. McIntyre; Benjamin H. Hogg; Joseph P. Lefevers; James E. Hardwick; Martha R. Casey; Joan W. Mason; John A. Hain; Margaret E. Robinson; Lonnie J. Slauson, Jr.; Joseph L. Majors; Schuyler C. Eubank; Cecil G. Brendle, Sr.; Emile M. Bowick.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

## READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that under a designation previously made the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] will read Washington's Farewell Address.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the standing order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the Farewell Address of George Washington will now be read by the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who has been heretofore designated to perform that duty.

Mr. GOLDWATER advanced to the desk and read the Farewell Address, as follows:

*To the people of the United States:*

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommend-

ing it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyments of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its

principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state it is requisite, not only, that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion

as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under

that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
*17th September, 1796.*

---

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me congratulate the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] for the eloquence with which he has read to us today the Farewell Address of the Father of our Country. Certainly there never was a time in the history of our country—not during the course of my brief life, at any rate—when the admonitions of George Washington were more needed. In the past it has been customary for us to listen respectfully to the reading of Washington's Farewell Address as though it were a mere historical document with no immediate or present application.

### WE MUST HEED WASHINGTON'S WARNINGS NOW

Today I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that Washington's Farewell Address is of immediate importance, and that it should be considered in connection with the joint resolution which has been reported by the Armed Services and the Foreign Relations Committees, because this joint resolution, if carefully read, and not accepted upon the mere title of the report which accompanies it, will, I am sure, convince any Member of the Senate that the warnings of George Washington should now be heard.

Mr. President, I desire to call to the attention of the Senate, with specific reference to what we are now being asked to do, certain paragraphs of Washington's Farewell Address, which the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] has so eloquently read.

### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 19 DISREGARDS CONSTITUTIONAL DIVISION OF POWERS

On page 16 of the address, a copy of which is on the desk of each Senator, I find, toward the bottom of the page, the following:

> This Government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government. But the Constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 19, now the unfinished business of the Senate, utterly disregards the division of powers among the branches of the Government established by the Constitution of the United States. The resolution calls upon the Senate, which, under the Constitution, is a partner in the framing of foreign policy, to delegate to the President—not to the gentleman who is now the President, but in an impersonal sense to the President, whoever he may be—the right to exercise discretionary power with respect to the armed services of the United States and the funds of the Treasury of the United States.

### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 19 ILLUSTRATES DANGER WASHINGTON WARNED OF

Referring now to page 24, I wish to read this sentence from the Farewell Address of the first President of the United States:

> If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil, any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

I have no doubt that President Eisenhower was moved by moral principles and patriotic purposes when he delivered his message before both Houses on the 5th of January; but I submit to the Members of this body that, if they read that address and then read the resolution we are asked to pass, they will find in the resolution a perfect illustration of the danger which we face if, in the imaginary good that may result from vesting the President with discretionary powers, we delegate to him the right to determine the necessity under which the armed services may be used in a vast area of the world which, from the earliest dawn of written history down to this moment, has been the seat of war and international conflict over mere material ambitions, and not over the principles of freedom of the people and the principles of free government.

HE WARNED OF ENTANGLING ALLIANCES

But this is not all. I do not intend, of course, to reread the entire Farewell Address, but I invite Senators to turn to page 33. This is the part of the Farewell Address in which George Washington warned his country against entangling alliances.

He had just described the position this Nation occupied, sheltered, of course, by two oceans—a condition which no longer exists.

> Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?
>
> It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world.

In creating the United Nations we felt confident that we were not making a separate alliance with any particular country of the world, but an alliance with all the nations of the world that believed in the fundamental principles of free and popular government. The evidence which has been produced before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the evidence which has been adduced by the subpenas which we have issued, make it clear that giant oil companies, created by States which have no jurisdiction whatever over international commerce and no jurisdiction whatever over foreign policy, have created the situation in which we now find ourselves.

STATE-CREATED CORPORATIONS SUPERSEDE STATES IN POWERS

The States are themselves forbidden by the Constitution to exercise any control over interstate or foreign commerce. The States are themselves prohibited by the Constitution from entering into any agreements among themselves or with foreign nations without the consent of Congress. When States desired to enter into a compact among themselves in order to develop a particular river or to develop any other authority that seemed to be necessary, as, for example, the authority which administers the port of New York, the consent of Congress has been given to such a compact.

How many of us stop to think even for a moment that the States, which have no power over interstate commerce, over foreign commerce, or over foreign affairs, have created corporations which have engaged in exactly the same activities in which the States are forbidden to engage?

THEY ENTER INTO AGREEMENTS WITH FOREIGN NATIONS

Mr. President, do you not know that the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, created by the State of New Jersey, has entered into agreements with foreign nations? Do you not know that the Arabian-American Oil Co., owned by four American companies, has entered into a compact with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia? Do you not know that up and down the Middle East these giant corporations, which are so great that independent enterprise in the United States cannot compete with them, are themselves entering into the agreements which lie at the very base of the crisis with which we are now confronted?

OIL COMPANIES HAVE HAND IN FORMING OUR FOREIGN POLICY

I wish to read to the Senate certain documents which we have obtained by subpena, in the study we are making of the oil operations of our Government. Bear in mind, Mr. President, that I do not challenge the purpose of the Government in transferring oil to our allies in Europe. The stoppage of the Suez Canal and the nationalization of the canal required that action, and it was a proper thing for our Government to do. But our Government should have acted as George Washington advised in his Farewell Address, in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. I assert, upon the basis of these documents, that the gigantic oil companies, exercising the power of political and economic states in the Middle East, have had a hand in framing our foreign policy.

COMPANY DOCUMENTS SHOW THIS INFLUENCE

I have before me a document taken from the files of the Socony-Vacuum Co. Remember, the Socony-Vacuum Co. is one of the owners of Aramco. So is Standard Oil of New Jersey. So are two other American companies. There was a combination of four American companies, under the title of Arabian-American Co.

This memorandum, signed by A. C. Ingraham, of the Socony-Vacuum Co., is entitled "Memorandum for A. C.'s Personal File—Re Notes on Foreign Petroleum Supply Committee Meeting, Washington, D. C., August 13, 1956, 11 a. m."

I invite attention to the fact that it refers to the Foreign Petroleum Supply Committee. That committee, only 3 days before, had been succeeded by the Middle East Emergency Committee, consisting of practically the same corporations.

I read further from the memorandum:

> Present: Messrs. Dulles, Hoover, Jr. Murphy, Flemming, Wormser, Judge Hansen, Stewart, Gately, Lott, Fowler, and representatives of oil company members.

I was interested to see in this document whether the names of the oil companies were mentioned. They were not. But they are mentioned in another document which we obtained. This document was labeled "Confidential: Minutes of Meeting No. 2 of the Foreign Petroleum Supply Committee, August 13, 1956."

It is accompanied by a letter signed by Mr. Frederick S. Lott, Director of the Voluntary Agreement. The letter is dated September 10, 1956. It is on the letterhead of the United States Department of the Interior, Office of Oil and Gas, Washington 25, D. C. The letter reads as follows:

> UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS,
> *Washington, D. C., September 10, 1956.*
>
> MR. R. O. RHOADES,
> *Gulf Oil Corp.,*
> *Pittsburgh, Pa.*
>
> DEAR MR. RHOADES: I am enclosing two copies of the unapproved draft of the minutes of meeting No. 2 of the Foreign Petroleum Supply Committee, held on August 13, 1956, under the Voluntary Agreement Relating to Foreign Petroleum Supply, as amended May 8, 1956.
>
> I would appreciate receiving your comments or corrections on these minutes as promptly as possible.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> FREDERICK S. LOTT,
> *Director of the Voluntary Agreement.*

Attached, under date of August 10, is a memorandum reading as follows:

> AUGUST 10, 1956.
>
> AGENDA—FOREIGN PETROLEUM SUPPLY COMMITTEE, AUGUST 13, 1956, 11 A. M., ROOM 5100, DEPARTMENT OF STATE
>
> 1. Briefing by the Secretary of State on the current Middle East situation.
>
> 2. Consideration of such other matters as the Chairman may bring before the meeting.
>
> FREDERICK S. LOTT,
> *Director of the Voluntary Agreement.*

Here now are the minutes:

> [Draft—not approved]
>
> MINUTES OF MEETING NO. 2 OF THE FOREIGN PETROLEUM SUPPLY COMMITTEE, AUGUST 13, 1956
>
> The meeting was held pursuant to the telegraphic call of Mr. Hugh A. Stewart, Chairman of the Foreign Petroleum Supply Committee. The chairman's telegram, dated August 9, 1956, is as follows:
>
> "Special closed meeting Foreign Petroleum Supply Committee will be held 11 a. m., eastern daylight time, Monday, August 13, 1956, room 5100, New State Department Building, 21st and Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. Agenda formulated by director will be presented at opening of meeting. This meeting limited to members only and to a single person from each member company who must be the representative or the alternate. This meeting not open to observers, no publicity authorized. Please notify this office by return telegram or telephone person attending.
>
> "H. A. STEWART,
> *"Chairman, Foreign Petroleum Supply Committee."*
>
> The Chairman called the meeting to order at 11:05 a. m., and distributed the agenda, copy of which is attached to these minutes, among those present. A rollcall by Mr. Charles E. Gately disclosed that a quorum was present.
>
> The following members and their representatives were present:
>
> MEMBER AND REPRESENTATIVE
>
> Arabian American Oil Co., J. T. Duce.
> Caltex Oil Products Co., W. F. Bramstedt.
> Creole Petroleum Corp., N. J. Cambell, Jr.
> Getty Oil Co., Charles F. Krug.
> Gulf Oil Corp., C. W. Hurley, Jr.
> Sinclair Oil Corp., Orville E. Judd.
> Socony Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., Arthur C. Ingraham.
> Standard Oil Company of California, G. T. Ballou.
> Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), S. P. Coleman.
> Standard-Vacuum Oil Co., John A. McQuilkin.
> The Texas Co., H. T. Dodd.
> Venezuelan Petroleum Co., B. E. Hinton, Jr.
>
> The following representatives of the United States Government were present:
>
> OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION
>
> Arthur S. Flemming, Director.
>
> DEPARTMENT OF STATE
>
> John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State.
> Herbert Hoover, Jr., Under Secretary of State.
> Herman Phleger, Counsel.
> Edwin Moline.
>
> DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
>
> Col. C. Rogers, United States Army, Supply and Logistics.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Victor R. Hanson, Assistant Attorney General.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Felix E. Wormser, Assistant Secretary.

Hugh A. Stewart, Chairman, Foreign Petroleum Supply Committee.

Frederick S. Lott, Director, Voluntary Agreement.

Carroll D. Fentress, Assistant Director, Office of Oil and Gas.

Ralph Fowler, Office of Oil and Gas.

Charles E. Gately, Office of Oil and Gas.

The Chairman stated that this was more or less a special meeting, restricted to one representative of a member and a limited number of representatives of interested Government agencies, which was called for the purpose of giving the committee an opportunity to hear from Secretary Dulles on the critical situation in the Middle East. He then introduced the Honorable Arthur S. Flemming and asked him to say a few words.

Director Flemming spoke briefly to the effect that he thought the members might gain some benefit by hearing from the Secretary of State who was about to depart for London to attend the conference of the nations affected by the seizure of the Suez Canal by President Nasser of Egypt. He then asked Secretary Dulles to address the meeting.

The Secretary spoke for about 15 minutes on matters involved in the current Middle East crises. At the conclusion of his remarks he volunteered to answer questions. For about 10 minutes he responded to questions asked by some of the members. Counsel for the State Department also made a few remarks on certain legal aspects of the situation.

Secretary Dulles and his counsel left the meeting at about 11:35 a. m.

The Chairman then proceeded to the second item on the agenda, other matters to come before the meeting.

Director Flemming again addressed the meeting and expressed his appreciation for the cooperation of the members and representatives of Government, particularly the Department of the Interior and Department of Justice, which resulted in the exceptionally rapid development of the Plan of Action and formation of the Middle East Emergency Committee to handle petroleum shortages which might arise should stoppage or interruption of the Suez Canal or the pipelines to the Mediterranean or both occur. He assured the Committee that he and his office would do everything within its power to obtain the proper framework or authority for and to remove any obstacle in the way of the efficient and proper operation of the Plan and the Committee. Judge Hanson, in charge of the Anti-Trust Division, Department of Justice, also assured the members of his Department's cooperation. Mr. Coleman—

It is interesting to note that Mr. Coleman is vice president of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey and Chairman of the Middle East Emergency Committee—

Mr. Coleman expressed the thanks of the members and assured Dr. Flemming of their determination to do everything they could to prepare for and handle any dislocations in petroleum supplies which might occur. Dr. Flemming and Judge Hanson left the meeting about 11:40 a. m.

At the request of the Chairman, the remainder of the meeting was spent in discussing the subcommittees which should be appointed under the Plan of Action and the personnel of those committees. The members were urged by the Chairman to send to him, as soon as possible, the names of the people who would be available to serve on each of the subcommittees.

The meeting adjourned, on motion duly made, seconded and carried, at about 11:50 a. m.

The document is signed by Charles E. Gately, representative of the Administrator.

STATE DEPARTMENT REVEALS POLICY TO OIL COMPANIES, NOT CONGRESS

It is true that about the same time the Secretary of State, before his departure for London, had a conference with some Members of Congress. Congress was not in session, and no effort was made to bring Congress back into session and to lay before it the importance of the matters which were discussed with these leaders of the petroleum industry.

COMPANIES SET FOR PROFIT

The Senate may be interested in the documents which we have secured from the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey showing the point of view from which that company, at least, acted. First, I shall read a document dated December 12, 1956. It bears the stamp: "Return to treasurer's department files."

The names attached to it are Emilo G. Collado and T. H. Tonnessen. The title of the memorandum is "Possible changes in Humble's financial outlook."

Humble, of course, is the Humble Oil Co. which raised the prices of crude and which is a subsidiary of Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, which owns about 80 percent of Humble Oil Co.

Let me read the document:

Comptroller's has worked out the effect of various assumptions on Humble's financial outlook in 1957, as follows:

1. An increase of 25 cents per barrel in the price of crude related to Humble's pre-Suez output of 380,000 barrels per day would raise Humble's net after taxes by $17.5 million.

2. The effect on Humble's volume of the Suez situation has been calculated at 48,000 barrels per day. This produces an increase in Humble's net income after taxes of $26 million. If this is also subject to the price increase of 25 cents per barrel of crude, there will be a further increase of $2.5 million.

3. The combined effect of a price increase and an increase in output resulting from Suez would be to raise Humble's net income by $46 million. If, in addition, product prices are raised to reflect the crude price increase, Humble's net would rise by $50 million.

Our present figures show Humble's drawdown from Jersey at $18 million in 1957. The price increase alone, without any change in volume, would eliminate this drawdown. If increases in volume and in the price of crude are both assumed, Humble might be in a position to deposit with Jersey a sum on the order of $28 million. Please note that these sums make no provision for an increase in dividend.

The meaning of that document is perfectly plain. In the oil lift to Europe, Standard Oil of New Jersey saw an opportunity, not for service to mankind but an opportunity for profit.

The document shows that the Humble Oil Co. would receive in 1957 a drawdown from Standard of New Jersey of $18 million. That is the amount which it was estimated the Humble Oil Co. would draw down as an advance. Please observe the sentence:

The price increase alone, without any change in volume, would eliminate this drawdown.

So the call upon the treasury of Standard Oil of New Jersey would not have to be made if prices were increased.

I handed this document to the president of the Humble Oil Co. when he was on the stand before our committee yesterday afternoon. I read it to him first. Then I handed it to him. He had no doubt about the authenticity of the document. However, he said he had never seen it before. He did acknowledge that Humble takes its orders from Standard of New Jersey.

That is not all.

Again, Mr. President, from the files of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey I have an extract from the executive committee memorandum of December 13, 1956, from which I now read:

Present: EH, MJR, JEC, LWE, EES, MWB, SPC,[1] HHH, PTL, HWP, ATP, DAS, WRS, LDW.

Messrs. J. C. Anderson, W. J. Edmonds, R. N. Lyon, E. G. Collado, J. E. Lindroth, O. K. Taylor, and J. O. Larson joined the meeting.

The following were among the comments made during the review of the revised financial forecast and of the financial needs of several of the affiliated companies:

1. A special study indicates that if the various assumptions hold it is believed that the Middle East crisis will have almost no effect on the overall consolidated earnings outlook for 1956, 1957, and 1958, since the resulting reduction in the earnings forecast for some affiliates will be offset by increases in the earnings predicted for others.

GIANT CORPORATIONS CAN ABSORB LOSSES

I digress, Mr. President, because I want to invite the attention of Senators who are now present, and of those who may read the RECORD, and particularly members of the independent petroleum industry in the United States, the independent producers in Texas, in California, in the public-land States, the Rocky Mountain region, in Pennsylvania, and wherever they operate, to the fact that in this memorandum the officials of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey point out how the losses incurred by one affiliate can be offset by the profits of another. The independent producer has no affiliates whose profits it can use to offset its losses. When rising prices in the inflationary spiral which has been going on consistently since 1953 have made it more difficult than ever for the independent producer in the United States to make ends meet, the independent producer is not in a position to offset his losses by the profits from the production and refining of oil in the Middle East or the refining of oil in Great Britain or in France.

Some of our American oil companies have about one-third of all the refineries in England and one-fourth of all the refineries in France, and so the crude oil which they ship abroad to their own refineries there affords an opportunity for new profits to offset losses.

THE PUBLIC PAYS THE COST

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] reminds me to speak of the tankers.

[1] Part time.

Some of the giant oil corporations have their subsidiary tanker companies, and tanker rates have been skyrocketing since the oil lift to Europe began.

I return to the memorandum:

The major assumptions on which this conclusion is based are that the Suez Canal will be open for normal two-way traffic by April 1; that the IPC pipeline system will be operating at 40 percent of capacity by April 1 and at full capacity by the end of 1957; that the European and north African affiliates will fully recover all added costs, including higher freights, through local price increases; that their sales volume for the year 1957 will average only four-fifths of 1 percent higher than 1956, which compares with the previously estimated gain of 12.5 percent; that the recent price increases of about 20 cents per barrel for fuel oil in the Western Hemisphere—

Not the Eastern Hemisphere, but the Western Hemisphere. That refers to the increased cost per barrel for fuel oil, for which the private utilities of Florida are begging the Senate and the House to afford some relief because of the increase which makes them, in turn, increase the cost of electric power to their operators. It is the same increase of cost in the Western Hemisphere concerning which the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] appeared yesterday before the committee and told how the householders of the State of Maine are being taxed to enable the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey to carry on its part in the Middle East Emergency Committee.

I return to the document, Mr. President:

And of 23 cents per barrel for crude f. o. b. the eastern Mediterranean will hold; and that no further change occurs in the price of crude at all major supply sources.

2. It is estimated that at the present volume of business, the consolidated net earnings would rise at an annual rate of $100 million if an increase of 25 cents per barrel occurred in the price of crude, assuming that product prices also rose accordingly.

WHY SHOULD THESE COMPANIES MANAGE OUR WHOLE OIL BUSINESS?

These operations are in the stratosphere, above the heads of the ordinary inhabitants of the United States. But in the document from the company files we see what they mean. Do my auditors wonder that I have said there is a conflict of interest between the major oil companies who constitute the MEEC and the purposes of the Government of the United States? This gives them an opportunity to make huge profits, on a magnificent scale, profits greater than the total income of most of the States of the Union. Because they have that source of profit, why should they be permitted to manage the oil business, when it is clear from their own statements that they have predicted the profits they can make out of it?

Let me continue reading:

3. Based on the estimates of future expenditures submitted by the affiliates, and assuming continuance of the company's present dividend policy and of crude prices at their current levels, the forecast shows that for the first time in many years the consolidated group is faced with the prospect of being unable to generate, internally, sufficient cash to cover replacements, modernization and expansion to the degree desired—and no change in this situation is indicated throughout the period covered by the forecast. In this connection, however, it was pointed out that, in part, the high capital expenditure rate reflects deliberate efforts to use, to a greater degree than in recent years, the ownership route rather than the leasing route to cover tanker and service-station requirements.

THEY EVALUATE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS ON BASIS OF OIL PROFITS

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the entire document be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STANDARD OIL CO. (NEW JERSEY)—EXTRACTS FROM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMORANDUMS, DECEMBER 13, 1956.

Present: EH, MJR, JEC, LWE, EES, MWB, SPC,[1] HHH, PTL, HWP, ATP, DAS, WRS, LDW.

Messrs. J. C. Anderson, W. J. Edmonds, R. N. Lyon, E. G. Collado, J. E. Lindroth, O. K. Taylor, and J. O. Larson joined the meeting.

The following were among the comments made during the review of the revised financial forecast and of the financial needs of several of the affiliated companies:

1. A special study indicates that if the various assumptions hold, it is believed that the Middle East crisis will have almost no effect on the overall consolidated earnings outlook for 1956, 1957, and 1958, since the resulting reduction in the earnings forecast for some affiliates will be offset by increases in the earnings predicted for others. The major assumptions on which this conclusion is based are: That the Suez Canal will be open for normal two-way traffic by April 1; that the I. P. C. pipeline system will be operating at 40 percent of capacity by April 1 and at full capacity by the end of 1957; that the European and North African affiliates will fully recover all added costs, including higher freights, through local price increases; that their sales volume for the year 1957 will average only four-fifths percent higher than 1956, which compares with the previously estimated gain of 12.5 percent; that the recent price increases of about 20 cents per barrel for fuel oil in the Western Hemisphere and of 23 cents per barrel for crude f. o. b. the eastern Mediterranean will hold; and that no further change occurs in the price of crude at all major supply sources.

2. It is estimated that at the present volume of business, the consolidated net earnings would rise at an annual rate of $100 million if an increase of 25 cents per barrel occurred in the price of crude, assuming that product prices also rose accordingly.

3. Based on the estimates of future expenditures submitted by the affiliates, and assuming continuance of the company's present dividend policy and of crude prices at their current levels, the forecast shows that for the first time in many years the consolidated group is faced with the prospect of being unable to generate, internally, sufficient cash to cover replacements, modernization, and expansion to the degree desired—and no change in this situation is indicated throughout the period covered by the forecast. In this connection, however, it was pointed out that, in part, the high capital expenditure rate reflects deliberate efforts to use, to a greater degree than in recent years, the ownership route rather than the "leasing" route to cover tanker and service-station requirements.

4. With respect to the local borrowings contemplated by many of the European affiliates, Mr. Collado advised that it seems unlikely that the Middle East crisis, if resolved reasonably soon, will make it very much more difficult or costly to raise money in Europe than it was earlier in the year. He also pointed out that in the event there is a prolonged period without a settlement, money might, in fact, become easier in Europe if the local governments sought to cushion the impact on their economies through the medium of relaxation of credit restrictions.

5. None of the outside borrowing programs of the affiliated companies is based on seeking to obtain a Jersey guaranty of repayment and no change in this policy is presently contemplated.

[1] Part time.

WE ARE DISREGARDING WASHINGTON'S WARNING

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I cannot conclude this review of some of the evidence we have received, without calling to mind the warning of the first President of the United States to his successors and to the citizens of the United States that the greatest care must be observed to follow the Constitution of the United States and not to allow corners to be cut.

THE COMPANIES DO NOT REALIZE SIGNIFICANCE OF THEIR ACTIONS

We have here, I say, clearly a situation which is in violation of the warning of the Father of his Country. When I say that, I do not mean to deprecate at all the attitude, the patriotism, the ability of the managers of the major companies. I do not believe they are deliberately doing this. I believe they are patriotic and that they want to do the right thing. But they have been so accustomed to operating for profit, and for profit alone, regardless of the competition of other companies, regardless of the welfare of their competitors, regardless of the welfare of the independent petroleum operators, and regardless of the welfare of the consumers of their products, that they simply have not realized that this action is being taken in the middle of one of the greatest crises this Nation has ever faced.

Yesterday at our hearing we had before us Mr. Foley, the president of the Texas Co. We read to him telegrams which his company had frankly and freely, in response to the subpena, afforded to us. These were telegrams describing the pattern by which the Texas Co. meets competition.

How would an ordinary businessman meet competition? It would be by providing better service or lower prices, would it not, or by making a better commodity and charging less for it?

But the files of the Texas Co. were filled with telegrams showing that they ordered an increase of price in their products whenever any other big company increased its price. Asked why the Texas Co. did so, Mr. Foley said, "To meet competition."

When Atlantic Refining Co. or Continental Oil Co., operating in various parts of the country—Continental in the Rocky Mountain area—increased the price of gasoline 1 cent, Texas Co. the next day upped its price 1 cent. That, they said, was to meet competition. Of course, it was not to meet competition. It was to participate in the increasing profit the other giant oil companies were making.

COMMUNISTS EXPECT US TO DESTROY OUR OWN SYSTEM

Again, I say, I do not question the patriotism of these gentlemen, but I do not believe they realize what they are doing. This Nation is engaged in a cold war with Soviet Russia. That means an economic war. The Communists are confident that the capitalistic system does not have the leadership to overcome greed in its search for profits, even for the support which is designed to defend the free world. So the Communists sit back in the Kremlin, confident that they will watch the capitalistic leaders destroy our system by extortionate profits.

I have expressed the hope to some of the witnesses that perhaps they would see the error of their ways and would help the committee to devise a system which could be laid before the executive branch of the Government and before Congress, a system which would do away with the exploitation of the business, the industry, and the householders of America, in order to enable the oil companies to make a profit.

DULLES REVEALS PLANS TO OIL COMPANIES

I did not read all the document from the Socony Vacuum files—Mr. A. C. Ingraham's memorandum of the meeting of August 13, 1956. He was talking about the discussion by Secretary Dulles. Let me read these paragraphs:

> Secretary Dulles then addressed the meeting and indicated the seriousness of the situation. He was quite concerned over the fact that there was no plan of action available to handle alternative means of meeting supply and distribution problems in the event we lose the canal or pipeline facilities. He also indicated concern over possible loss of production in the Arab countries, although the main problem is the transportation through the Suez Canal and pipelines. He then stated that he recognizes the oil companies were very much interested in the nationalization issue and wanted to put forth his views and what line he expected to take at the London Conference. He indicated that the United States would not acquiesce in the rights of nationalization that would affect any other facilities in our own economic interests.
>
> He commented that international law recognizes the right to nationalize if adequate compensation is paid, but he admits that actually adequate compensation is never really paid and nationalization, in effect, thereby becomes confiscation.

I ask a question now, Mr. President. King Saud was here only a few days ago. He entered this country with his attendants, who carried bags of watches to be distributed to those who did him service. The tips in watches which he gave to members of the Government so violated the sense of decency of Secretary Dulles that I give the Secretary credit for issuing an order which required all persons who received such watches to return them. But imagine the comprehension of free government on the part of such a potentate who comes to the Government of the United States and deals with the employees of the United States in that manner.

FIFTY MILLION DOLLARS SAID EARMARKED FOR SAUDI ARABIA

Yet we are told by those who had the privilege of attending high level conferences in the State Department, background conferences not for publication, that of the $200 million which Senate Joint Resolution 19 proposes to give to the President for his discretionary expenditure, $50 million will be given to King Saud for his expenditure for armed assistance.

How blind can we become in the search for profit? How blind can we become to the warnings of the first President of the United States?

I continue to read from Mr. Ingraham's memorandum:

> The line he expected to take—

That is, Secretary Dulles—

> on the problem at the London Conference, and which was written up in his communique, was to the effect that the United States felt it was O. K. to nationalize only if assets were not impressed with international interest. What he meant by international interest was where a foreign government had made promises of fixed duration in the form of concessions or contracts, upon which other nations would rely on fixing their courses of action and their own economies on the basis that these certain promises would be fulfilled.

IS PURPOSE OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY TO PROTECT OIL INTERESTS?

Mr. President, does that mean anything in the world except that Secretary Dulles had a conference with the representatives of the major oil companies and said to them, "Our major policy in the Middle East will be to protect your concessions"?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield, so that the Chair may lay before the Senate the unfinished business, the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLAKLEY in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate Joint Resolution 19. The joint resolution will be read by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to read further from the memorandum I have been discussing, if I may do so at this time. It reads as follows:

> Therefore, he indicated, nationalization of this kind of an asset impressed with international interest goes far beyond composition of shareholders alone, and should call for international intervention.

Mr. President, are we going to have international intervention for the protection of the oil resources of the Middle East, which are under the control, first, of British Government-controlled companies, French Government-controlled companies, Dutch Government-controlled companies, American companies affiliated with the government-controlled companies, and American companies affiliated with one another, through affiliates and associates?

INDEPENDENT COMPANIES CANNOT COMPETE WITH THE GIANTS

On yesterday the President of the Texas Co. told us that his company has approximately 90 subsidiary and affiliated corporations. How can the little man compete with such organizations? I say they are corporations created by the States to operate in the field of foreign commerce and foreign affairs, the jurisdiction of which does not belong to any State, but belongs only to the United States; and under the United States Constitution, under the commerce clause, that jurisdiction lodges exclusively in the Congress of the United States.

THIS POLICY THREATENS US WITH WORLD WAR III

That is why I was moved today, after hearing again the reading of Washington's Farewell Address, to call the attention of the Senate and the public to this underlying conflict between private interests and the public interest which is dragging us into the danger of a third world war.

I read further from the memorandum:

> He—

Meaning again the Secretary of State—

> assured us that the United States would be careful at the forthcoming conference not to encourage nationalization, which marks a slight change in following the concept backed by international law, but consideration must be given to bring about some inter-reliance between nations.

THOROUGH SCRUTINY OF THIS POLICY SHOULD PRECEDE ACTION ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 19

Mr. President, I do not intend to spend the entire day reading these documents. The record of the committee hearings is full of them, and they will be disclosed in due time to all Members of the Senate. But I have no hesitation in saying that the hidden hand of the major oil companies upon the foreign policy of this Government has not yet been disclosed; and no action should be taken upon Senate Joint Resolution 19 until the Senate has fully scrutinized every step down the road of subjecting the principles of the Father of his Country to the desire of the major oil companies for profits.

ACTIVITIES OF THE INTERNATIONAL OIL COMPANIES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] for bringing to light some of the matters which have been developed in the hearings jointly conducted by the Anti-Trust and Monopoly Legislation Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee and a subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The subject matter of the operation of the oil lift and of the exemption from the application of the antitrust laws of the voluntary agreement which is being carried out by 15 major oil companies, most of which are the great international companies, constitutes a very technical matter which it is difficult to understand. It involves various kinds of motives, but it is of great importance. It is of tremendous importance both as to the effect it has had and the effect it will have

upon the foreign policy of the United States—with particular reference to our foreign policy in respect to the Middle East—and it is also important because of the effect it has upon United States consumers, with regard to the amounts of money they have to pay for gasoline, fuel oil, and other oil products.

Mr. President, many of us have been searching for motives and reasons for the sudden change, which came about during November and December of last year, in the attitude of the administration, and in its viewpoint toward the Middle East problem. It will be recalled that at the time of the election, and even immediately thereafter, the American people were given assurance that we were not going to become involved; that the situation was very much better; and that there was good news for the American people. But then, apparently without any overt act we know anything about, or without any worsening of any particular situation in the Middle East, we found that there was a sudden shift in position; and now we are confronted with the most dangerous situation which the United States has faced in the past 10 years.

In the committee hearings we have been told that a large part of the difficulty and the emergency in the Middle East is in connection with getting oil to Western Europe, and that it is necessary that Western Europe have oil in order to keep the countries of that area on the side of the free world. Of course, Mr. President, all of us agree that it is necessary for the countries of Western Europe to have oil, in order to keep homes warm and machines and factories in operation. But, Mr. President, I do not think the American people want to have their foreign policy based, at least not to any substantial extent, upon the judgment of the large international oil companies.

I have an idea—and my conviction in this respect is becoming stronger as we proceed with the hearings—that it is becoming quite apparent to a larger and larger extent that the policy of this administration, in dealing with the Middle East problem, has a relationship to the wants and desires of the large international oil companies which are operating in the Middle East, which today own 57 percent or have 57 percent of the oil production of the Middle East. In the past few years that percentage has been increased from 40 to 47 percent to 57 percent.

Of course, Mr. President, I want the rightful interest of these companies protected. I think they are entitled to be treated properly. I want them to operate in a legal way. I do not like the fact that some of them seem to be becoming so large that they can push around the little fellow, and can treat the consumers without very much regard, and can make things hard for the independents. I regret exceedingly the fact that it is becoming increasingly clear that the influence and position and propaganda of these large international oil companies are having a considerable bearing upon the foreign policy of our Nation, as that policy relates to the Middle East.

I agree with the Senator from Wyoming that this whole matter ought to be fully explored, as expeditiously as possible, before a final vote is taken on the so-called Middle East Resolution.

Mr. President, I now wish to refer to another matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

## PRICE INCREASES FOR UNION GAS & OIL CO.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, last October 2, Union Gas & Oil Company of Louisiana filed a proposed rate increase with Federal Power Commission which provided for a 108-percent increase in the prices charged by the company.

The date proposed for the increase was January 1. Under the Natural Gas Act, the Federal Power Commission has authority to suspend the effective date of any increase for a period of 5 months, during which time an investigation can be made and affected areas heard from. FPC therefore could have suspended this increase until May 1.

However, the Federal Power Commission did not do that, although it had notice from affected areas that they planned to protest. The Commission permitted the increase to go into effect on February 15.

Union Gas & Oil delivers natural gas to Texas Gas Transmission Co., which in turn serves large portions of west Tennessee and other areas. The increase will cost the ratepayers of the city of Memphis alone $1,600,000 annually.

Of course, there will be a hearing—someday—and if the full increase is not allowed the consumers will get a rebate. But meanwhile they have to pay.

When this situation was brought to my attention, I said that it was high-handed action by a Federal bureau, presumably constituted to protect the public interest. I said that it was hard for me to conceive of any set of circumstances which would cause any company to be justified in suddenly increasing its prices 108 percent.

Mr. President, I have read in the Memphis Press-Scimitar an article by Mr. Milton Britten, Washington correspondent for that paper, quoting FPC Chairman Kuykendall in justification of his action. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### FPC HEAD DEFENDS DECISIONS GRANTING GAS RATE HIKES

(By Milton Britten)

WASHINGTON.—The Chairman of the Federal Power Commission today defended recent FPC decisions affecting Tennessee Natural Gas consumers.

The FPC decision permitting a 108 percent price increase to Union Oil & Gas Company of Louisiana to take effect last Friday was labeled high-handed and shocking by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Senator ALBERT GORE, Representative CLIFF DAVIS, of Memphis, and other Tennesseeans here.

Union had asked that it be allowed, effective January 1, to charge Texas Gas Transmission Co. $5,858,000 more a year for gas. Texas Gas supplies Memphis, Crockett County Public Utility District, Dyersburg, Gibson County, PUB, Halls, Martin, South Bolton, Tennessee Gas Co., Tipton County Utilities Co. and West Tennessee Gas Co.

Although the FPC could have suspended the request 5 months, until May 1, it suspended it only 45 days, ending yesterday. This meant that Union put the $5,858,000 bite on Texas Gas, which in turn has passed the increase around among its own customers, charging Memphis alone an extra $1,600,000 more a year.

Fact that FPC denied a motion by Memphis and a number of other Texas Gas customers to suspend for the full 5 months, and did so without a public hearing, caused KEFAUVER to charge that for all practical purposes there are no FPC regulations.

#### FULL DELAY PERIOD

Meanwhile last week, in another ruling affecting 18 other Tennessee communities and utilities districts, the FPC did delay for the full 5-month period the request of Tennessee Gas Transmission Co. to Houston, for a 12.7 percent, $24,077,000 wholesale natural gas-rate increase. And a request by 3 TGT customers who wanted to pass on to their own customers increases totaling $867,200.

Why did the FPC suspend Union's request for only 45 days, and Tennessee Gas' request for the full 5 months?

Here's what FPC Chairman Jerome K. Kuykendall had to say about the background of the cases and the reason for FPC's decisions:

"The rate increase Union Oil & Gas Co. filed for was provisioned for in its contract with Texas Gas Transmission Co. and was to become effective January 1.

"This was not a fixed rate, but was to be determined on the basis of the average of the three highest prices paid in the producing area. It turned out, according to Union's figures, to be a pretty big jump."

#### THE BEST JOB

"Union did the best job any producer has ever done in justifying in its request the increase it asked for and the Commission was pretty well satisfied that some increase was justified. It is just a question of how much.

"Among the important points they brought out in their report were these:

"Under terms of the contract between Texas Gas and Union, Texas Gas was to get all future reserves Union discovered. Between 1951 and 1956 Union spent roughly $69 million exploring, developing, and digging a lot of wells. During that time they declared only $8 million in dividends.

"In other words, Union spent more than eight times more for exploration than it declared in dividends. And this development work was predicated on expectation of the increase provided for in its contract with Texas Gas.

"For when the contract was signed and Union started its development program, Union, like other producing companies, was not under FPC regulation. Producers did not come under FPC regulation until 1954, result of a Supreme Court ruling.

"Actually by suspending Union's increase for 45 days we've taken about $675,000 away from them, and that's too bad. (Kuykendall explained this is what it would add up to if the full 108 percent increase were granted, although how much equity will be granted remains to be decided."

#### WOULD BE EQUITABLE

"So we thought it would be equitable to split up the suspension time. By making the suspension for 45 days during the peak heating season during the coldest weather, the customer would be spared some of the financial burden. And by not making it for the full 5 months the loss to Union would be reduced."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, this is the most remarkable statement I have ever heard from the chairman of a regulatory body. In my opinion, Commissioner Kuykendall disqualified himself, by this statement, from sitting in judgment on the case. Obviously, he has already prejudged it.

It will be noted that Mr. Kuykendall says:

Union did the best job any producer has ever done in justifying in its request the increase it asked for and the Commission was pretty well satisfied that some increase was justified. It is just a question of how much.

This is a highly prejudicial statement. How does Commissioner Kuykendall know that this is the best job ever done of justifying the increase? How does he know that any increase at all is justified?

How can he know any of these things before the case has even been heard? The city of Memphis and other consumers in west Tennessee have employed counsel to present their objections to the increase in a judicial hearing before the Commission—a hearing over which Mr. Kuykendall is scheduled to preside as Chairman. Yet he has already decided, by a statement made before the hearing even convenes, and before the company's filing has been tested by evidence and cross-examination, that it is the "best presentation any company has ever made."

This is like a judge, sitting in trial of a man who pleads innocent, announcing at the outset of the trial, on the basis of the charge and before any evidence is heard, that the only question remaining to determine is whether the offense was murder or manslaughter.

Almost as prejudicial is his statement that the increase is provided for in the contract. The Commission cannot lean on a private contract provision to excuse letting go into effect rates which may be unjust or unreasonable, without according consumers the maximum protection under the law, including the full 5-month suspension and hearings.

And speaking of the full time of suspension, it is indeed an interesting theory on which Mr. Kuykendall bases his decision to split the suspension time. He says:

We thought it would be equitable to split up the suspension time. By making the suspension for 45 days during the peak heating season during the coldest weather, the customer would be spared some of the financial burden. And by not making it for the full 5 months the loss to Union would be reduced.

That, of course, is simply not the theory under which the law, passed by Congress, provided for the suspension period. The theory was that it would give the Commission time to hear the case on its merits. The 5-month limit was written into the law to prevent the Commission from being dilatory and thereby injuring the company. Now Mr. Kuykendall has decided that something less is better, so he adopts this new theory.

Mr. President, many, many times a proposed increase looks entirely different after analysis and testimony and evidence and searching cross-examination. For instance, the figures Mr. Kuykendall uses, explaining the company's exploration costs and dividends, will look different when balanced against the allowances to the company from the 27½ percent depletion allowance, the profit figures of the company, and an analysis of when these explorations were made and how much of them is for oil and how much for gas.

In view of the Chairman's attitude, however, the opponents of this increase and their counsel have very little assurance that they are not playing with a stacked deck of cards.

I think the thing for Mr. Kuykendall to do is to remove himself from the case.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

## VISIT TO THE SENATE BY STUDENTS OF UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL, BATON ROUGE, LA.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate had as guests in the gallery 24 students from University High School, Baton Rouge, La., who have been on an educational tour of Washington. They have visited many of the points of interest in Washington and have attained a better appreciation of the workings of our Government.

Having attended University High School myself, I regret that I was unavoidably detained yesterday, and was therefore unable to extend our greetings to these fine young men and women when they visited the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the names of these young men and women together with the names of their chaperones. There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chaperones: Mrs. W. W. Holmes, Jr., Mrs. Bert Burgoyne; Mrs. Hal Phillips; Mrs. James Godfrey.

Students: Jena Cox, Jo Ann Vicaro, Molly McVea, Judy Coats, Joy Clack, Judy Perrine, Mona Edgerton, Joan Hatcher, Pat Godfrey, Betty Knight, Vickie Taylor, Jenny Martin, Carol Lea Cason, Bobby Phillips, Jimmie Batte, Teke Holmes, Jim Ware, Bob Barnard, Steve Bushnell, Bill Burgoyne, Nils Herlitz, Bill Morris, Jack Meyers, John McMahon.

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, yesterday I made a statement in support of President Eisenhower's position in his address on the previous evening on the Middle East crisis. I was, unfortunately, unable to make the statement on the floor of the Senate, as I had intended to do. I now read the statement:

President Eisenhower was right in the position he took last night in his speech on the Mid-Eastern crisis. I am certain that the people of Israel and its friends in the United States and elsewhere will come to recognize how great a service the President has done for Israel as well as for the cause of peace in the Mid-East and in the world. It would be a tragedy if Israel should place herself in a position in which even her good friends are powerless to help her.

Before explaining the basis for the conviction I have stated let me make my own position in regard to Israel clear.

The existence of Israel and her integrity as a nation is a matter of the highest concern to America. We should redouble our efforts to achieve a peaceful solution of the problems in the Middle East. The cooperation of Israel is essential. If, with Israel's cooperation, our efforts fail and Israel's survival should be at stake, I shall support with every resource I possess the total support of Israel by our Nation. I think my record entitles me to have that statement believed.

Against that background I repeat again my support of the President's position.

The President's statement has made it possible for the Government of Israel to do what, if the statement had not been made, no Government of Israel could have done and survived, namely, to withdraw its forces behind the armistice lines as requested by the United Nations resolution. So long as there was a possibility that by further delaying complete withdrawal the Israeli Government might be able to gain assurances in addition to those which have already been given, the Ben-Gurion government could not have consented to immediate withdrawal.

In my judgment our Government is right in its belief that the giving of further assurances by the United States at this juncture would seriously reduce the chances for a peaceful resolution of the present crisis. Certainly it would impair, if not destroy, the great contribution which we alone of all the Western nations are still able to make to a solution. Even the assurances which have been given—and I fully support them—may well have made a peaceful solution more difficult.

Israel's prompt withdrawal behind the armistice lines will make it possible to continue to work for a peaceful solution in this area with a reasonable chance of success. If Israel does not withdraw, the chances of a peaceful solution will be greatly diminished.

It is my hope, it is my earnest prayer that the Israeli Government will promptly act to comply with the resolution for the withdrawal of its forces. When this is done we shall be able to, and we must, press unceasingly for effective measures to eliminate hostility on the Israeli-Arab borders and to keep open the Gulf of Aqaba. Equally we must devote every available resource—at whatever cost—to bring about a settlement of the underlying problems in the whole Middle East area. For upon such action the peace of the world, our own security, and the survival of Israel depends. And here too I pledge my unflagging efforts to see that our Government and our people fully meet the responsibilities which are and will be ours.

Since I made that statement yesterday, I regret to say Premier Ben-Gurion has refused President Eisenhower's pleas. Yet I was glad indeed of the fact that he has offered to negotiate further and, indeed, has sent Ambassador Eban on his way back to this country for further discussions. This is a hopeful sign, for it may well indicate that the Israeli Government does understand and may come to accept, in time, the basic fact underlying the President's statement and his position, namely, that the United States alone, of all the Western nations, is in position to make a unique contribution to a settlement of the problems in this area, and that it would be a tragedy if any step were taken which would re-

duce our ability to make such a contribution.

I was happy to learn, too, only a few moments ago, that President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles have said that the door is certainly not closed to further negotiations. Of course the door is not closed to further negotiations, nor will it ever be closed by our Government. Our only interest is the establishment of peace in this area of the world, and in all the world. It is my fervent hope that, as a result of these discussions, without a sacrifice of our unique position, which is invaluable to Israel as well as to the rest of the world, a position which we alone possess, there will be no lessening of our ability to help bring about a peaceful solution in this area. I am hopeful that ways can be found by which the Israeli Government may find itself able to comply with the United Nations resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I could not help but be keenly interested in the comments of the Senator from New Jersey. I listened to his reference to our so-called unique position, relating to the very difficult and complex issues in the Middle East, and in particular to the State of Israel and its present position in the United Nations.

I would only add that our position is indeed unique. It is so unique that no one can quite understand it. I am afraid that the Arab States do not understand our position. I am afraid that the Israelis do not understand our position; and it appears that the American people do not understand it. The least a great nation can do is to have a position, and to have a precise, or at least a coherent, foreign policy.

I made my comments yesterday relating to the message of President Eisenhower. I said then, and I repeat now, that his position is indeed a very difficult one. His burdens are heavy. But I add that, as the chief spokesman for our Nation in foreign affairs, it is important that the words which he speaks be meaningful, and that they be so well and clearly spoken that friend and foe alike can understand their full implications.

I repeat today what I said yesterday, that it is not as though we were without alternatives relating to our Government's position in the controversy between Israel and her neighbors. There are three possible alternatives for the United States.

The first is to permit other nations in the United Nations to determine the policy we shall follow, by acquiescing in their resolutions.

The second is to abstain from voting on any resolution, or to abstain from consultation on any resolution.

The third is to have a resolution of our own, and a policy which we clearly announce and effectively promote.

On the issue of sanctions, we can have sanctions imposed by resolution of the United Nations—a resolution inspired and written by others, in which we acquiesce. Or we can abstain from voting on the issue of sanctions; or we can move, as we have done on other occasions, that there be none, and make crystal clear our opposition to both political and economic sanctions.

One should not merely criticize. However, inasmuch as this subject has become a matter of public controversy, or at least discussion, I should say that there are other alternatives, as follows:

First, I suggest that our Government proceed forthwith to seek from Egypt a renunciation of her so-called belligerency rights. This is central. This is primary. This is fundamental to any kind of settlement in the East. We have not done this to date, despite the fact that since 1951 the Egyptian Government has insisted that it is at war with Israel. Is it not peculiar that we seem to be chastising only one of the participants in the war? I would have it noted that Israel does not feel that she is at war with Egypt, but Egypt insists that she has a right of belligerency, and that it was under that right that she utilized certain sections of an international treaty relating to the Suez Canal to discriminate against Israeli shipping. It is under her so-called status of belligerency that she blockades the port of Elath and the Gulf of Aqaba. Therefore, I suggest that our President ask our Ambassador to the United Nations to proceed forthwith to insist that Egypt renounce her warlike activities and her status of belligerency. That will be the beginning of successful negotiations.

Second, I suggest that we get together with our Canadian friends, who seem to have an unusual insight in these matters. Our Canadian friends have been free and independent of domination by any nation. We should pursue the objective which the representative of Canada has announced, namely, a strengthening of the United Nations forces in the Gaza Strip, along the Israeli-Egyptian border, and in the land areas of Sharm el-Sheikh, at the entrance of the Gulf of Aqaba. This would prevent Egypt from blockading that point of access into the gulf.

Third, I suggest that we also demand, at the same time, immediate and complete withdrawal of Israeli forces once the other two objectives have been attained; but the withdrawal should be after the accomplishment of the first two objectives, namely, Egyptian renunciation of belligerency rights, and the strengthening of United Nations emergency forces to protect the areas, prevent raids, and maintain tranquillity.

Finally, I suggest that our Government institute a resolution in the United Nations calling for the establishment of a United Nations Good Offices Commission, with specific directive, by resolution of the General Assembly, that the Good Offices Commission shall pursue relentlessly negotiations between the antagonists, namely, the Arab States and Israel, with the end objective of obtaining peace treaties to settle these disputes.

Preliminary steps surely should include the adjustment of boundaries. Another preliminary step should be the resettlement of Arab and Jewish refugees.

A third preliminary step would be to work out long-term settlements relating to the waters which surround both the Egyptian and the Israeli ports. I refer in particular to the use of the Suez Canal and access to the port of Elath on the Gulf of Aqaba.

The United Nations Good Offices Commission should be staffed by the most brilliant and able men on the international scene. I do not mean merely Americans. I mean men of the character of Paul-Henri Spaak, of Belgium, Chester Bowles, of the United States, Lord Ismay, of Great Britain, and others of equal and distinguished character and renown.

Others have said to me, "If you are going to be critical of your Government's policy, you should at least offer some hopeful and constructive suggestions." I offer the suggestions which I have made.

I conclude by repeating what I said in the beginning, that our position is unique. It is unique in that the greatest nation on the earth finds itself wandering, without direction and without a considered and firm policy. It is about time for us to get out of this indefensible position.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. As the Senator knows, I have a great deal of respect for his ability and for his experience and for his deep desire to make a contribution in this very difficult area, as in all other areas. However, I have no intention of withdrawing in the slightest from the position I have taken, namely, that I believe the United States occupies a unique position in all the Western World so far as our ability is concerned to bring about a peaceful settlement in this most difficult area.

I believe that many of the suggestions the Senator has made embody worthy objectives, and some of them quite feasible ones. I do not desire in any way to get into a controversy with him on this question. I believe that no American should want to differ from another American on this subject, and I certainly do not wish to differ with a Senator for whom I have such high regard.

I suggest, however, that the matter of working out these specific problems is one which must necessarily be left to the people in charge of the operation of our Government, particularly those in the executive department and with those in our delegation to the United Nations. I recognize the unique position of the Senator from Minnesota in that regard, because he has represented our country in the United Nations.

Nevertheless, I suggest that probably no man is more capable and more knowledgeable about the way to bring about a satisfactory result than the Secretary General of the United Nations, and that our policy—and I believe the Senator from Minnesota will agree with me in this regard—should be one of supporting to the full the Secretary General of the United Nations in his efforts to bring about a solution of the problem and in his use of the specifics that are suggested.

I had not intended to delay the Senator so long, because I know he has other

matters he wishes to discuss, and I do not desire to become involved in a partisan controversy on such a subject. However, I could not refrain from reiterating the opinion which I had stated, that we must preserve the unique position we have. We can do all and accomplish every objective the Senator has suggested, with which I agree fully, but at the same time we must not lose the very unique position we enjoy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank my very good friend from New Jersey. I appreciate his very serious and deep concern with this problem. His contributions are always constructive.

I would only add that, in the consideration of this problem, I hope my friend from New Jersey will realize that we Americans, with all the respect and confidence we have in the United Nations, and with all the respect and confidence we have for the Secretary General of the United Nations—and I hope all of us have it—should not rely upon the Secretary General of the United Nations for the conduct of our foreign policy. Neither should we rely upon him for the development of our foreign policy.

The Secretary General of the United Nations is the agent of the United Nations. We are one of the principal members of the United Nations. My concern is that we should establish the policies of the United Nations, or, at least, working together with other nations, should establish such policies of the United Nations which the Secretary General can follow. We certainly should not rely upon his ingenuity and his understanding and his interpretation of ambiguous resolutions for the conduct of our foreign policy.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I wish to agree with the Senator that we must have our own foreign policy, and that we cannot turn its conduct over to other nations, even the United Nations or the servant of the United Nations.

## ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, February 25, 1957 at 12 o'clock meridian.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 22, 1957:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Joseph A. Jenkins, of Texas, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 5 years from August 27, 1956.

Jerome D. Fenton, of Connecticut, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 4 years.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for the terms indicated:

FOR TERMS OF 4 YEARS

Dr. Michael Ellis De Bakey, of Texas.
Dr. Thomas Francis, Jr., of Michigan.
Dr. Ernest Henry Volwiler, of Illinois.

FOR TERMS OF 3 YEARS

Dr. Basil G. Bibby, of New York.
Dr. Jean A. Curran, of Massachusetts.
Dr. Champ Lyons, of Alabama.

FOR TERMS OF 2 YEARS

Miss Mary Louise Marshall, of Louisiana.
Dr. Isidor Schwaner Ravdin, of Pennsylvania.

FOR TERMS OF 1 YEAR

Dr. Worth Bagley Daniels, of the District of Columbia.
Dr. Benjamin Spector, of Massachusetts.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee for this day in the calendar of our national life, commemorating the birth of George Washington, whom we reverently and affectionately call the Father of his Country.

We rejoice that he sensed the sanctity of his high vocation when, as commander in chief of the Continental Army, he bravely championed the cause of the distressed colonists in their struggle against the forces of tyranny and despotism.

Grant that our hearts may expand with feelings of pride and patriotism as we call to mind his indomitable faith in divine providence, his fortitude in times of hardship, and his fidelity to the principle of human rights.

May the memory of his valorous and heroic spirit, which was undisturbed by difficulties and unafraid of dangers, inspire all our citizens in the glorious adventure of bringing peace and freedom to a troubled world.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 11, 1957, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] to read George Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. BROOMFIELD read the Farewell Address, as follows:

*To the people of the United States:*

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the oppor-

tunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyments of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how

unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state it is requisite, not only, that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and

morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty

is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
*17th September, 1796.*

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, without its being considered a precedent, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD and to include therein extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday for the next 2 weeks be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members I should like to announce the legislative program for next week.

Monday is District Day, but I am informed by the Committee on the District of Columbia that they have no legislation to bring up at that time.

On Tuesday the bill H. R. 5189, the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1958, will be taken up. Following the completion of its consideration, on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday the following bills are programed for consideration:

House Resolution 149, relating to investigations by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 2460, in connection with the Armed Forces, the Nurses, and Medical Specialist Career Incentive Act.

H. R. 4285, concerning the sale of Navy degaussing equipment to merchant ships.

H. R. 2797, relating to the Armed Forces, covering stevedoring and terminal services furnished to commercial steamship companies.

Any further program for next week will be announced later.

For the information of the Members, may I also announce that His Excellency Guy Mollet, the Prime Minister of France, will visit the House of Representatives on Wednesday next, on or about 3 p. m. This will not be a joint meeting of the Congress.

## ENROLLMENT OF H. R. 348

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that

that committee had on February 21, 1958, examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 348. An act to amend section 12 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676), relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, by providing for the use of public lands granted to the States therein for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishings, equipment, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said States.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Thursday, February 21, 1957, he did on that day sign the following enrolled bill of the House:

H. R. 348. An act to amend section 12 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676), relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, by providing for the use of public lands granted to the States therein for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishings, equipment, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said States.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 25, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

529. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Information, transmitting the 12th Report of the United States Advisory Commission on Information, dated January 1957, pursuant to Public Law 402, 80th Congress (H. Doc. No. 98); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

530. A letter from the assistant to the president, the American Academy of Arts and Letters, transmitting the report of the American Academy of Arts and Letters for the year 1956; to the Committee on House Administration.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 176. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2460, a bill to improve the career opportunities of nurses and medical specialists of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 152). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 177. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2797, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of a military department to furnish stevedoring and terminal services and facilities to commercial steamship companies, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 153). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 178. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4285, a bill to authorize the sale of degaussing equipment by the Department of the Navy to the owners or operators of privately owned merchant ships of United States registry; without amendment (Rept. No. 154). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 676. A bill to authorize the city of Rock Hill, S. C., to acquire certain tribal lands on the Catawba Indian Reservation, S. C.; with amendment (Rept. No. 155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3477. A bill relating to moneys received from mineral lands in Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Second report of the Committee on Government Operations pertaining to availability of information from Federal departments and agencies; without amendment (Rept. No. 157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 5232. A bill to provide for an experimental research program in cloud modification; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 5233. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make the tax on tobacco applicable only to manufactured tobacco and to reduce the tax on manufactured tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. R. 5234. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for retirement of certain officers and employees involuntarily separated from positions in the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5235. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5236. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to prohibit trading in onion futures in commodity exchanges; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 5237. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish supplies and services to foreign vessels and aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 5238. A bill for the establishment of a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to study the outdoor recreation resources of the public lands and other land and water areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 5239. A bill to authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 5240. A bill to extend the time within which the State of Louisiana may make initial payment on the purchase of certain property from the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 5241. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act to enable producers of Irish potatoes and other nonbasic agricultural commodities to participate in the acreage-reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 5242. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit amounts paid for the institutional care of a disabled person to be deducted as medical expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 5243. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 5244. A bill amending the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to permit deduction for a self-help meat-promotion program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 5245. A bill prohibiting lithographing, engraving, or printing on envelopes sold or furnished by the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 5246. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the district of Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 5247. A bill to provide a scholarship loan program to afford an opportunity to Americans to attain an education level to which they aspire; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5248. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits thereunder, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable to men at age 60 and to women at age 55; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5249. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Older Persons within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5250. A bill to establish in the Department of Commerce a Consumers' Advisory Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5251. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5252. A bill to provide for loans to enable needy and scholastically qualified students to continue post-high-school education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 5253. A bill to reduce the percentage depletion for oil and gas wells; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 5254. A bill to provide for the payment of uniform allowances to certain persons originally appointed, temporarily or permanently, as commissioned or warrant officers in a Regular component of an Armed Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 5255. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. J. Res. 248. Joint resolution establishing a joint committee to investigate the cost of living and the widening spread between retail prices and prices paid to farmers; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana: Memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of Montana relative to agricultural surpluses; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of Montana relative to experimental wheat acreage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Senate of Montana relative to durum wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY: House Concurrent Resolution No. 2, adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, 35th session, memorializing the Interior and Public Works Committees of the United States Senate to investigate the administration of certain sections of Public Law 534 and requesting the South Dakota congressional delegation to the Congress to assist in these investigations; to the Committee on Public Works.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that will lead to the authorization of very high frequency television translators in certain areas, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. R. 5256. A bill for the relief of Matilda Hajos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 5257. A bill for the relief of Paul F. V. Trojel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 5258. A bill to permit St. Francis Catholic Church and parish house, Bakersfield, Calif., to apply for a disaster loan under the Small Business Act of 1953; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 5259. A bill for the relief of Robert F. Danneker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5260. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Nasseff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 5261. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the heirs of Gen. John C. Fremont, the city of San Francisco, and all other persons against the United States arising out of the seizure of certain real property by the United States Government in 1863; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

95. By Mr. BROWNSON: Petition of J. L. Rockener, member of the State organization of We, the People and seven other members from the Indianapolis area, urging the defeat of Federal aid to schools legislation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

96. Also, petition of William G. Weiss, member of the State organization of We, the People and nine other members from the Indianapolis area, urging the defeat of Federal aid to schools legislation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

97. Also, petition of Mrs. Marguerite Dice, vice chairman of the State organization of We, the People and 10 other members from the Indianapolis area, urging the defeat of Federal aid to schools legislation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

98. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by members of the Racine, Wis., Milk Producers Cooperative Association urging repeal of the 3 percent Federal tax on hauling farm commodities which is a direct cost placed on producers of these commodities, including dairy products, and which in effect is a reduction in the price received for farm commodities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

99. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Robert Fitch, president, Public Affairs Luncheon Club, Dallas, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposing any commitments for a permanent police force in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

100. Also, petition of the corresponding secretary, Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., New Hyde Park, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsing and commending the objectives of the Hoover Commission and urging the administration and Congress to work together, on a bipartisan basis, toward prompt and full consideration of the recommendations, etc.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

101. Also, petition of the city clerk, Niagara Falls, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to favoring the construction of a headrace for the new Niagara power redevelopment by the use of tunnels and requesting that all Federal legislation include a specific provision that tunnels be required in the construction of said headrace as recommended by the United States Army Engineers from the intake to the powerplant; to the Committee on Public Works.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Looking Ahead on Forest Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Friday, February 22, 1957*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on February 13, 1957, I delivered a speech before the Washington section of the Society for American Foresters. My remarks were entitled "Looking Ahead on Forest Policy."

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOOKING AHEAD ON FOREST POLICY

(Address by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, before Washington section of Society of American Foresters, February 13, 1957)

It is a pleasure to have this opportunity to appear before your Washington section of the professional Society of American Foresters, founded here just over 50 years ago by Gifford Pinchot. His ideals still inspire and guide us today.

Our forest programs which assure us of our present-day timber supplies, are in large measure due to the dedication of Pinchot and his fellow foresters to the philosophy that government has an active responsibility for the custodianship of our God-given resources.

All of us concerned with conservation need to keep that philosophy to the forefront, and make sure our Government does not neglect its responsibilities.

Fortunately, ever since Pinchot's time foresters have continued to give strong leadership to the conservation movement. They have earned a distinguished place among the American professional groups.

Foresters have stood four-square in the public interest against those pressures from seekers of privilege who would corrupt governmental processes for personal gain. Never in the history of the Forest Service, which employs large numbers of you and which is responsible for custodianship of billions of dollars of national assets, has the breath of scandal touched a professional forester. In the widely publicized Al Serena case which involved national-forest timber, not a single forester was involved. It was, in fact, a deal put over in spite of your opposition.

I sincerely hope the American people realize and appreciate your unselfish devotion to an ideal. And I hope that this great tradition among professional foresters in their devotion to the public interest will continue unchanged, despite mounting pressures from those seekers of special rights in the property belonging to all citizens.

I was particularly happy to hear, tonight, that your society is sponsoring a discussion next month of both the pros and cons on the wilderness bill which I have sponsored. That is as it should be.

Foresters as a profession must look farther ahead than most groups in American life, because of the time involved in growing trees. Perhaps that is one of the reasons you are a group of men with real vision and idealism. Too often today there is a tendency to fall into the rut of conformity and to consider differences of opinion as unpleasant—or to allow personalities to blind us to the issues.

Discussion, debate, and dissension are the very stuff of which American democratic life is made. I have often referred to them as the "Three D's of Democracy." Never be afraid to dissent from popular ideas. History reveals that the unpopular dissenter of today is often the prophet of tomorrow.

But do not make the mistake of thinking you will keep free from political turmoil, or that it is professionally undignified or unethical to stand up and be counted at a time when courage and decision are called for. Preservation of a weak neutrality, at a time when the public interest is threatened, is equivalent to lining up on the wrong side. Pinchot could not do it in the Bollinger case,

and it can not be done today. And these are times in the conservation movement when the men are separated from the boys.

In recent years, some have come to think that the battles over control over our natural resources have no application today. Perhaps we have lulled ourselves into a sense of false security because we have made great achievements in the widespread application of soil conservation, reforestation, and wildlife management measures. These technical applications are vital to sound conservation. Nearly everyone today agrees that proper soil, water, and forest conservation techniques should be applied extensively.

But that is only a part of the conservation battle.

Pinchot observed 50 years ago that control over natural resources gives control over the economic and political life of the Nation.

Make no mistake, gentlemen, the conservation battles of the last 4 years have been over the control of our national forests, waterpower sites, and oil-underlain wildlife refuges, rather than over the technical applications and practices to the resources.

This is a never-ending struggle.

It should certainly surprise no one that this struggle becomes reflected in American political life, for political action is a means of achieving our aspirations and objectives in a democracy.

The fact that conservationists want the cooperation and support of elected officials or administrative officers of both political parties in our country should certainly never become a bar to recognizing and approving what a political candidate stands for or does that is right, nor to recognizing and repudiating just as firmly whatever a political candidate or administration stands for that is not right.

For example, whatever our political affiliation, I think that we would not be honest if we did not recognize that the New Deal gave new impetus to the conservation movement that had lain dormant since Teddy Roosevelt's day.

And whatever our political affiliation, I think that all of us interested in the conservation movement had a right to be shocked by some of the excesses and deterioration of resource programs during the past 4 years.

Believe me, I am not just being partisan when I express my own conviction that the great tradition of your profession was quite properly advanced into the last political campaign when leading foresters, soil conservationists, wildlife management specialists, and others in the conservation movement, concerned about what was happening under the existing administration, left their nonpartisanship behind and organized a political committee in behalf of the Democratic presidential candidate.

These men could have stayed home and avoided some of the diatribes which I understand were leveled at them. Instead, they answered a high call to public duty. One of the functions of an American political campaign is to air issues of public discussion—and this committee of conservationists did their job with dignity and responsibility.

Not one of their nine charges of misdirected resource policy was ever met, or denied by the Republican administration. They made their charges stick. And make no mistake—the effect of this committee's charges were not lost on the administration, which is now giving signs of attempting to amend some of its past follies. You may have noticed in the papers that certain proponents of a partnership program were soundly defeated last November 6 at the polls.

We need more, not less, emphasis on these vital resources issues in our political campaigns—and we need conservation leaders with courage enough to speak out boldly when they see the public's interest being ignored.

And, gentlemen, as one spokesman for the Democratic party, I want to assure you that if we ever get into a situation involving mismanagement of our public resource programs, I hope you will give us the same treatment. We will have it coming. But rest assured I shall do my best to prevent that kind of a situation from ever developing.

Now, let me make it clear that I am not professing to come before you as a forestry or resource expert. You are the experts. I am just a conservation-minded public official having to rely, to a great degree, on you experts and technicians for advice and guidance. However, I do have a responsibility of helping establish resource policies which I do not treat lightly.

As a United States Senator from the great State of Minnesota which has 20 million acres of forest land, including 2 of our oldest national forests—the Superior and the Chippewa—I have made it my business to learn something about forestry, wildlife, water, and soil conservation.

We in Minnesota have in some degree most of the forest problems found fairly generally over the United States. We have large paper and other wood cellulose converting plants and many sawmills supplied by thousands of small farmer-loggers who depend upon pulpwood and other forest products for part of their winter income.

Our forest-fire control and reforestation programs are making real headway in restoring commercial forests to the barren cutover lands left after the first wave of logging. Our State- and county-owned and managed forests of the North are steadily supplying industry with needed raw material, while at the same time assuring an independent livelihood to many of our people. Thus, we in Minnesota face not only Federal, State, and county forest management problems but those of private owners—small and large—which are in most respects similar over the country.

Forest policy is a broad field to try and cover in a limited time, so primarily tonight I am going to outline what I feel should be some of the important objectives in forestry which we in our generation should reach—and to suggest some of the policies which I feel will work in the direction of assuring adequate timber supplies, watershed protection, wildlife, and other recreational benefits from our forest land resources.

We are the posterity which Pinchot, Teddy Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt, and other foresighted leaders prepared for when they set aside the National Forests, extended fire protection programs, put unemployed boys to work planting trees and improving timber stands.

Now, upon our shoulders, rests the task of providing for the posterity of the year 2000. And, gentlemen, we have no vast forests of virgin timber to bequeath our grandchildren. We must grow timber—lots more of it than we are today—if they are to continue to enjoy the fruits of our high American standard of living. And a timber cropping economy takes some real effort, as you foresters are only too well aware.

According to figures which I have seen from the Forest Service's Timber Resource Review, we are going to need a lot more timber to supply our rapidly expanding population—almost half again as much as we now have when the year 2000 arrives.

Either we begin to grow this timber today, or our children will have to pay absurdly high prices for what little there is left by then.

I realize that the style lately has been a scoff at Pinchot's prediction of a timber famine.

But if we look at timber production figures, which have stayed nearly constant for 50 years while prices have risen much faster than for other commodities, I think we will find Pinchot closer to being right than his critics.

Of course, the decision on how much timber we will need is one for the foresters and economists to make. But it is up to those of us in political life to translate those goals into policies and programs which you men can carry out.

Our political economy is so complex today that in this field, as in most others, we need to have the advice of technical people in making our decisions. I hope that foresters will not shun this duty under some sort of mistaken assumption that it is improper to advise your Congressmen and Senators, or to take a position in favor of what you believe to be sound forest policy.

In making our plans for the next 50 years in forestry we have to develop one set for use on the greater areas of public forests occupying one-fourth of our forest land, and another set for the large area of private forest land. The first calls for direct action by public agencies, while the second, for cooperative working relationships with private owners—large and small.

We in the Congress, and in the State legislatures, too, must continue to assure that sufficient funds become available for management of public lands, including tree planting, protection from insects and diseases, and stand improvement measures. We must make sure that the Federal Government's share of the cooperative programs with the States for fire protection, nurseries, and extension work are properly met—and on a scale which will expand tree growth to meet our future needs.

But the job does not stop with Federal appropriations, and the Government is not in the business of dictating to private owners what they should do.

The proper role of Government toward private forest lands seems to me, in our democratic political economy, to be one of providing a favorable economic and social climate for individual owners to do those things on their forests which are in the public interest.

Both the public forests and the larger industrial tracts are apparently being fairly well managed, and such management will improve as your professional techniques improve. But I am told that lack of a solution of the small-owner forestry problem is one which is giving foresters much concern. And well it should, for such lands make up the majority of our commercial forest area.

Apparently more experimental research along the lines of cooperative action is needed to achieve a solution. I should like to offer my help for sound proposals which include research efforts on this difficult problem, at any time it is possible to do so.

The plain facts are, gentlemen, that none of us have clear-cut answers to the small-owner problem. The Congress is willing to do all it can to help, but the ideas must come from the forestry profession. One thing seems clear: If we are to have a strong and vital forest economy, greater research effort must be given to the problems of the small owner and independent logging operator. For example, forest-products marketing data were almost absent from the USDA 1954 Yearbook on Marketing. I might be so bold as to suggest that one reason you are so far along in the solution of your public and industrial forestry problem is because you foresters have done an excellent job in those fields. But, conversely, your lack of success with extending to small ownership is because you are devoting comparatively little research to this problem.

Because it does embrace several millions of small owners and thousands of independent farmer-loggers, our forest economy is a vital part of rural America.

It represents one of the remaining parts of our economy which has not been swallowed

up by huge combinations of corporate enterprise. I hope it will never be.

Our forest industries, even the large ones, are highly decentralized and provide markets for the products of the self-employed logger. Our public forests and those under the ownerships will continue, I hope, to assure that this great group of independent woodsmen will have free access to raw material which will not have to be cleared through a Washington bureau office or a New York corporation office. If that ever happens, I think America will have lost more of her free and independent spirit than I care to contemplate.

That is one reason I introduced my price-reporting measure last year in Congress. I know of instances in Minnesota where farmers have worked hard all winter to produce pulpwood at a certain price quoted by a dealer or buyer, only to find in the spring, when the farmer was ready to ship, that the buyer could not pay his figure—saying that the price had dropped. How is the farmer-logger to know whether or not he is just being taken?

A price and market program for forest products would have kept such a producer regularly informed of price changes and the demand. He would know whether it paid him to cut his timber or just let it grow. I am sure, gentlemen, that forestry will have to pay its way or you will not have much forestry. If a man does not know what price his timber will bring, he will never get very interested in growing it.

We have heard a lot of talk about free enterprise over the years. It has become a catchall slogan which means many things to many men, but is seldom defined. Let's think for a minute what free enterprise in forestry means. To most people it means freedom to buy and sell at the market place without crippling interference by Government or by monopoly. It means further that buyer and seller have equal access to market and price information.

So it sems to me that independent forest owners and timbermen have a right to such information as well as farmers, stockbrokers, packinghouses and papermills. Yet this simple information is being denied them.

If we are to have a free-forest economy, price data should be available to buyers and sellers alike, and I cannot understand why some of those who give lipservice to free enterprise go to such efforts to deny this rightful information to a large group of people.

These same groups have opposed adequate forest-fire appropriations, the farm forestry cooperative program, tree planting in the soil-bank law, and now price reporting—everything that would help the small owner and operator.

All through our debates in the Senate, and later in conference with the House, heavy pressure was put upon us bemoaning the tremendous burden which would be placed upon the small operator.

I think you know what groups were behind the great flurry of telegrams which reached conferring Congressmen—and whether or not their real concern was to help the small operator. The groups which went to such lengths to block price reporting by distorting its intent and purpose may have a representative or two here tonight. I hope that they will use better judgment in the future and argue this issue on its merits, rather than try and mislead Members of Congress. You will recall that some oil and gas interests which used inspired telegrams to Congress ended up thoroughly discredited.

But I will tell you what the real worry of these groups was and is. They are afraid that objective price data in the hands of small timbermen will stiffen their bargaining hand in future transactions.

Too often one large buyer can take advantage of many small sellers under conditions where the buyer has all the information. If that is free enterprise, then the definition has been badly abused.

Other things that we need to shore up the small-forest economy are better access to credit and research in marketing to find out more about how timber products are bought and sold. All of these measures and programs have been available to agriculture for years, and there is no longer any reason for withholding them from forestry owners embarking on a timber-farming program. I would hope to see more foresters speak up for these very necessary programs.

So far, I have discussed primarily some of my views on objectives for public policy in relation to private forests. Let's now consider our public forests.

Generally, our Federal forestry picture looks better now than it did 2 years ago. In my opinion, the 84th Congress deserves the credit for this. The record seems crystal clear that during the last 4 years the executive branch has not requested the funds needed for the expanded role our national forests and other Federal forests are now required to fill. The record also shows the Congress increased the funds.

There are still some weak spots in our Federal programs, and these should be corrected.

First, foresters need to convince the top-level people that certain minimum expenditures are necessary. Future generations are entitled to receive our Federal forests with the benefits of conservation management plainly evident on every hillside. This is the duty of our generation.

Further, these forests can be profitable to us today—providing industry with the sinews of trade, recreationists with enjoyment, and our people with pure water from unsilted streams.

We also need to reduce the duplication and waste of productive effort that exists because our Federal forestry functions are not consolidated. I am glad that last year the Congress endorsed again the principle of consolidation along the lines of the Hoover Commission report. I think that the President should send up a consolidation plan—and if he fails to, the Congress should act.

Let me say quite frankly, however, that I feel it would be far better for the President to use the authority he has under the Reorganization Act so that he has a full opportunity to iron out all the wrinkles himself.

In the operation of our public forests there is a growing need for greater sensitivity to the needs of small business. Our Federal forests came out of the custodial era not so much because they grew in stature, but because private timber has been diminished. During the custodial period, many small-business men cooperated with the Federal agencies. They brought public timber in small sales and helped the forester rid the land of diseased and dying trees. Even if this had not often been the case, our policy must preserve the ability of small business to grow and foster in a competitive economy.

Our forest policy now should be directed toward obtaining the full sustained yield cut from the forest. In doing this we must get more timber access roads, adequate, properly compensated personnel, and develop the highest efficiency in administration.

New demands are being felt already, and as more and more mills turn toward our public forests, these problems will be aggravated.

Overcutting and allocation of timber will be urged, and acres set aside for special uses will be marked for elimination. I think that these three factors form the hub upon which our Federal forests policy will spin for the next several years.

Let me discuss these points briefly. First let me say that I believe these problems will occur mainly in the Far West, where the forest industry is vigorous and often geared to use four times the timber that grows in a year. In addition, it is out there where Federal timber is such a big factor that it will be a target.

As local communities near Federal timber find that adjacent communities which have run out of private timber are coming over to bid upon the Federal timber near them, the demand to allocate timber or restrict bidding will probably rise.

In other communities, with productive capacity beyond the ability of private and public timber combined, as the private timber is cut out, some may seek allocation or they may seek to overcut the Federal timber.

It is going to take strong administration and well-informed public opinion to insure that conservation principles and our faith with future generations are not breached.

I am not down here tonight to deal in platitudes but to talk about policy, and policy must be fashioned in the face of the realities that exist. You cannot put up a tree farm sign then make a speech about more timber and presto there it is. So I say to you that the foresters administering public land are going to be subjected to pressures to overcut that their predecessors never fully envisioned or experienced, as private timber disappears into the mills and the green gold of the national forests stands as the sole salvation for many of the 3,000 hungry sawmills of the West.

And thus in any consideration of Federal policy we come down to a discussion of why did we create our national forests, and what uses do we envision will be made of them. As foresters, I am sure you will agree these forests shall not be sawed down as rapidly as possible. When the forests were created, the Congress, with some wisdom, set forth their purposes: To improve and protect the forest and waters and to furnish a continuous supply of timber.

In the process of operating the forests certain sound use patterns have been developed. Foresters have coined the phrase "multiple use" to describe it. In operation, multiple use has never meant that on every acre of the forest we will obtain timber, water, forage, and recreation. Many areas provide only one or two resources. Water is produced from every acre, yet very often immediately after logging there is a temporary change in the quality and yield. As the forest is replaced the water picture continues to change. Before the forest is cut it may contain many ideal undeveloped recreational areas. After logging picnic areas are changed, vistas altered, game populations may climb, and fishing of some types decrease. Grazing may result in some soil compaction which adversely affects water or logging may change grazing capacity. In some areas, sheep, cattle, and hogs, if admitted to the forest, may do damage to young trees. While in other places this may not be true. Therefore, "multiple use" is not applied to every acre, but to a large forest area.

Foresters have set aside special areas where they have recognized one use as superior to other possible uses.

Western communities and 600 hydroelectric plants depend upon the national forest for water. There are 21 million acres irrigated by water from the national forests. These users must be protected, and lumbering, grazing, and recreational use must be compatible with water production.

On the Mount Hood National Forest a huge watershed is set aside and recreation is even excluded, although perhaps it need not be. The Forest Service here is conducting a cooperative experiment with the city of Portland to determine how this watershed can be logged without damaging soil and streamflow and even increasing water supplies.

In addition to numerous campgrounds in our national forests, there are some 79 areas embracing 14 million acres set aside for specialized types of recreation. These 14 million acres, less than 8 percent of the national

forests, are the network of primitive, roadless, wilderness and wild areas where to varying degrees recreation is the primary use. When the areas were originally created, the national forests were operated mainly on a custodial basis, and there was no problem of conflicting use. Today this is not true.

Senator MORSE was telling me not too long ago that in the 1940's a company acquired a large timber tract in the Willamette National Forest near his home that had gone begging on the market for some time. Today, they have yielded to demands made to reduce the nearby Three Sisters Wilderness area by 50,000 acres to make more timber available locally. I have not heard of a case that more dramatically illustrates the change that has taken place.

This brings me to the avenue of approach to getting more timber that, in my judgment, will be widely tried.

For example, Rayonier, Inc., has been sponsoring ads in national magazines as a part of its private campaign to get more timber. They recommend a reduction of the size of the Olympic National Park.

Those of us in the Congress who are vitally interested in multiple use and conservation are worried, and I think with good cause. We see the pressure that is coming, and as elected representatives it is our clear duty to do something before the horse is out of the barn. There seems to be a crisis every day in the world in which we live, and the only way we are going to change this is by looking ahead and taking timely action.

That is what my wilderness bill proposes that we do. Instead of waiting until the crisis has engulfed us, I proposed that we make secure the preservation of those areas that do now, in fact, constitute our national wilderness system—the areas that are now, in fact, being handled as wilderness, even though they serve other and consistent purposes also. Doing that now means providing security for what we already have. This will perpetuate the multiple purpose programs we now have on these areas, but it will make sure that multiple purpose on these lands always includes wilderness preservation.

Let's look at the bill. The preamble describes the impending problem, declares a policy, and defines wilderness type areas. The bill then lists all of the present areas.

I would like to say here—and note this well—the national forest areas have all been set aside by the Secretary of Agriculture on what he deemed sufficient authority in the broad language of statutes that do not mention wilderness as such.

What one Secretary thinks he can do another may think he cannot do.

Secretary Chapman thought, at the very lease, he did not have to issue the Al Sarena mining patents until the claimants complied with the administration practices procedures. Assistant Secretary Davis brushed this contention aside and issued the patents without a word to even the Secretary of Agriculture.

Similarly, a future Secretary of Agriculture could brush aside the position adopted by the several secretaries that preceded him. If you doubt me, listen to what Assistant Secretary Peterson recently said to the Association of State Foresters when he spoke of conservation. I quote:

"To me there is one thing it doesn't mean—preservation. Resource conservation means resource use. It does not mean locking up—no use. Our great natural heritage has no meaning and significance except as it is used to provide the materials and services which as a people we must have to enlarge and enrich our living. In a very real sense our very lives depend on our basic natural resources. Resources unused are sterile—of little value."

I quote no more. I hope Secretary Peterson recognizes that, as far as our areas of wilderness are concerned, preservation is use—the very best use that we can possibly make of these particular areas of outdoor America. If he does not so recognize, I say to you that his statement is a clear warning that we may be closer than we think to the danger of having our entire system of national-forest wilderness areas thrown out the window to satisfy our desires for material things.

You know, I read this in the same issue of American Forests with a letter to the editor from Professor Chapman in which he wrote that the persons associated with the wilderness bill, and I quote:

"Had no confidence whatever in the integrity, wisdom, or public spirit of trained forestry executives."

I say to you that this is not true. I have the highest confidence in our foresters. This would indeed be shaken if Assistant Secretary Peterson's words were the words of the Chief of the Forest Service. But they are not. This is the word of a political leader in the administration, and the Chief of the Forest Service is responsible for carrying out the policies that he directs be carried out.

The fact is the wilderness bill has been prepared in accordance with the wilderness policies, programs, and practices of the Forest Service, and in admiration for them. The bill is designed to strengthen the Forest Service's hands in carrying out these policies and programs.

The national forest areas that will be included in the wilderness system are those that have been designated by the Forest Service as wilderness, wild, primitive, or roadless. And the bill provides that these areas shall be administered under regulations that would be drawn up in the Forest Service.

The wilderness bill, I emphasize, will not interfere with, but will perpetuate, the present multiple-purpose administration of these national forest areas. Its central concept is that our present areas of wilderness can be preserved within the existing land-management pattern if this preservation purpose is made a matter of fundamental policy.

Rather than upsetting the multiple-purpose program of the Forest Service, the effect of this legislation will be to prevent the upset in this program that will result if the wilderness areas are not protected from the uses that would destroy them as wilderness.

Now what are the bogeymen in this bill?

The bill authorizes all the existing wilderness and wild areas and provides for the addition before January 1, 1966, of the primitive areas, but only after the Forest Service has determined what their boundaries are to be.

Section 2—(a) and (f)—states that the Secretary of Agriculture can make additions, modifications, or eliminations—and I repeat additions, modifications, or eliminations—to the system, and that these will take effect within 120 days unless either House of Congress passes a resolution opposing the proposed action.

In a nutshell, this bill then does these things. It sets forth a policy that will protect the wilderness system, and it provides a sound procedure for making changes. It gives the technicians full authority to recommend whatever action they feel is warranted, and it prevents abuse by the executive heads.

It gives the people a chance to secure a real referendum through the action of their elected representatives, and protects them from the whims of a political appointee who does not have to face the voters.

It maintains the wilderness areas as integral parts of the national forests, serving their important multiple purposes just as they now do.

Finally, as regards the wilderness bill, I wish to make clear that it is in no sense in conflict with, or in competition with forestry for forest products. On the contrary it actually is dependent on foresters for its success. If ever the American people come to the borders of our wilderness areas with a need for timber that cannot be met elsewhere, then, gentlemen, I say to you our wilderness areas are doomed. It is to the foresters of America and their effective programs for sustained yield cutting, on our production forests, that we shall have to look eventually for success in wilderness preservation. We recognize this, and we face our present program in a spirit of cooperation and with a feeling of dependence on the intelligent foresters of America for support.

I think that all true conservationists should consider the bill in this light. In my judgment it will provide a means for making orderly changes in our wilderness system so that these areas will truly fulfill our needs and not one bit more. It will give us a chance to provide a really sound wilderness system by truly democratic processes.

In summing up my discussion, I want to emphasize my conviction that the policies and objectives which I have advocated are consistent with the ideals set forth by Gifford Pinchot—and are necessary, in fact, if we are to live up to the goals he set for us.

Let me just give you a brief quotation from Pinchot's autobiography, Breaking New Ground, which I accept as my guide for resource policy:

Conservation policy, Pinchot said, has three great purposes:

"First, wisely to use, protect, preserve, and renew the natural resources of the earth.

"Second, to control the use of the natural resources and their products in the common interest, and to secure their distribution to the people at fair and reasonable charges for goods and service.

"And, third, to see to it that the rights of the people to govern themselves shall not be controlled by the great monopolies through their power over natural resources."

That is the end of his quote. His advice is as urgently needed today as it was 50 years ago. We would do well to heed it better than we have. I urge each of you, tonight, to reread the warning contained in the last chapter of Pinchot's autobiography—and apply it to conditions we face today.

Conservation is where it is today because so many people have made genuine contributions to this unselfish course. Over the years we in the Congress have helped fight the battle for conservation along with the technicians who have made solid advances in the field.

Teamwork is a part of everything we do, and it takes dedicated people in the field backed up by conscientious and farsighted people in the top offices of the executive branch, the Congress and our courts, too, to forge ahead on the road to a better future for America.

I would like to close on this note, and to assure you that forest policy will receive increasingly more considerate attention by the Congress. We are proud of you foresters in public and private employ who are so dedicated to our Nation's priceless heritage. We will back you up with the needed improvements in forest policy.

---

## Arabian American Oil Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, February 22, 1957*

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I called the attention of the House of Representatives to the reports which have come to my attention that the Arabian American Oil Co., commonly known as Aramco, has been treating its oil-royalty payments to King Saud as a tax

rather than as a royalty. If payments to King Saud or the Saudi Arabian Government by the Arabian American Oil Co. are treated as a tax rather than as a royalty, the Arabian American Oil Co. can deduct the payments made to King Saud from income taxes due the United States and thereby take its profits on Saudi Arabian oil almost tax free.

The American people have made tremendous commitments of manpower and dollars to provide King Saud with economic aid and with weapons which have the principal effect of protecting the oil-production contracts of the Arabian American Oil Co. with King Saud. In the light of these developments and the tremendous commitments by our Government, the structure of the Arabian American Oil Co. and its treatment of tax obligations to the United States Government are no longer a matter of private business which can be properly concealed from the American people.

The American people have a right to know, and it seems to me that it is the duty of the Arabian-American Oil Co. to make a public disclosure of its contract with King Saud and its tax contribution to the American Government which has pledged so much to protect and preserve the integrity of Aramco's oil contract with King Saud.

Following is a letter which I have yesterday addressed to Mr. R. L. Keyes, president of the Arabian American Oil Co.:

FEBRUARY 22, 1957.

Mr. R. L. KEYES,
*President, Arabian-American Oil Co.,*
*New York, N. Y.*

DEAR MR. KEYES: Yesterday, on the floor of the House of Representatives, I made a statement alleging that for the purposes of United States income taxes your corporation treats oil royalty payments to the Saudi Arabian Government as tax paid to a foreign government and therefore deductible from income taxes due to the Government of the United States.

In view of the tremendous commitments of economic and military aid made by our Government to the Saudi Arabian Government, which promise dollars and soldiers to protect Saudi Arabia and the government of King Saud, it is extremely important for the American people to know what part of this tremendous investment in the Middle East flows back to the United States Treasury in the form of taxes. They are footing a tremendous bill and underwriting an obligation which may entail the lives of American citizens.

The American people, through their elected representatives, are expressing their good faith in pledging economic and military aid to stabilize the conditions in the Middle East. It seems morally incumbent upon your corporation, which is the principal beneficiary of this situation, to make clear the intricacies of your organization and your compliance with the spirit as well as the letter of the Internal Revenue laws of the United States.

Your cooperation in this matter is very much needed to clear up the record.

Sincerely yours.

## Spiraling Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON**
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, February 22, 1957*

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, while farmers and ranchers of our Nation face subnormal income and mounting costs, so, too, do the people of America's cities face a critical situation as concerns the spiraling cost of living.

Somewhere, there is something critically wrong. While production prices on food and fiber of our farms and ranches spiral downward under the relentless policies of the Secretary of Agriculture, the end results in the markets of our land spiral in the other direction, always upward. Meanwhile, giant corporations set alltime profit records.

On the front pages of today's newspapers I read where the cost of living rose to a new record high for January. It was the fifth consecutive month it has set a record. Simultaneously, it was announced 1.4 millions of workers would get automatic cost-of-living pay boosts, averaging about a penny per hour. Those few pennies, however, I do not believe will materially bridge the gap in mounting costs of living.

Obviously, there is a need for Congress to determine the facts, and take action in this mounting crisis. That is why today, on the occasion of this newest cost-of-living price advance, I am introducing a measure which calls for a broad investigation of the rising costs of living and the widening spread between prices received by farmers and those paid consumers for agricultural commodities. This measure asks the establishment of a joint congressional committee to carry out the investigation, and asks also that Congress provide $250,000 annually for this purpose. The committee could make recommendations on the basis of its findings to reduce the farm-to-consumer price spread so as to increase prices to the farmers and lower them to consumers.

# SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1957

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, let our prayers be set before Thee as incense and the lifting up of our hands as the morning sacrifice. Send us forth to the waiting tasks and responsibilities of another week determined to be loyal to the royal in ourselves—our weakness undergirded by Thy might.

In these crucial days whose decisions means so much to the present and future of all mankind, save Thy servants who here minister for the people in public affairs from self-pity, self-indulgence, and self-deceit. May their thinking be keen and clear, their speech frank and open, their actions courageous and decisive. Grant, O Father, that we may go to this week's business with an ever-present remembrance of the great tradition wherein we stand and the great cloud of witnesses by which we are at all times surrounded, whether this Chamber is empty or full. In all and above all, give us an unwavering faith which uses challenge and danger as the materials for courage and victory. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 22, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow, Tuesday, February 26, 1957.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

### CONFERENCE OF SENATE LEADERS WITH THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on yesterday, together with some of my colleagues, I attended a conference at the home of the distinguished Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles. At the conclusion of the conference, on behalf of all my colleagues, I issued the following statement, which I read now, and should like to have made a part of the RECORD:

We had a frank exchange of views and a thorough consideration of all amendments introduced to the resolution now pending in the Senate. The group appreciated the Secretary's frankness and courtesy, and assured him that his views will be given every consideration.

The meeting was productive and fruitful. It was a carrying on of the spirit of responsible cooperation between the executive branch and the Congress. It is to be hoped that this type of cooperation and consultation will be continued in the future.

The question of sanctions was discussed. The administration seems to be exploring every possible means to bring about a settlement of this matter. To that end, Secretary Dulles is meeting with Israeli Ambassador Eban this afternoon.

Mr. President, without discussing specifics which are not within my proper province as a guest at the meeting, I cannot go any further. I can only say that the net effect of the meeting was

the administration's emphasis on the importance to our foreign policy of having the joint resolution now before the Senate passed in its present form as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I am not speaking of the joint resolution which was sent to the Congress. I am not speaking of the joint resolution as it may be amended by various amendments which have been proposed. I am speaking of the joint resolution which now is pending, as reported by the overwhelming vote of two of the great committees of this body.

Mr. President, I turn now to another matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

---

## THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S LETTER OF FEBRUARY 22

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to refer briefly to an incident which took place on Friday, and which was the subject of some newspaper comment over the weekend.

On that day, Washington's Birthday, Assistant Secretary of State Robert C. Hill, with whom I enjoy a very pleasant relationship, and a man in whom I have complete confidence, called my State—Texas—office in the Senate Office Building two or three times during the afternoon, when I was on the floor of the Senate, listening to the address being made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. Mr. Hill wanted to come to the Capitol to discuss with me a hastily suggested meeting with the Secretary of State. He stated he also would deliver the answer of the Secretary of State to my letter to him of February 11.

Mr. President, I left the floor of the Senate and went to my office on the gallery floor of the Capitol Building. Then my telephone began to ring. Newspapermen called me to discuss a letter I was about to receive, before Mr. Hill had even reached the Capitol.

When Secretary Hill arrived, I told him that I would talk to him about the meeting the next morning. I was not ready to discuss the meeting, and designate the Members of the Senate from the majority side who should attend the meeting, until I found out what the meeting was about and what spheres it would cover. I had not had an opportunity to talk with my colleagues so I could speak intelligently and safely about the decisions which would be involved.

I arranged an appointment during the late part of that afternoon with the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and with members of the Foreign Relations Committee.

So far as I can recall, in my discussion with Mr. Hill I did not mention the letter, nor did Mr. Hill. It was a dignified contact between the two offices, which involved only the issue of whether we could talk fruitfully at that time or on the next day. However, Mr. President, I would be less than frank if I did not go on record today, as I have several times in the past few days, as stating that I strongly disapprove and deeply resent government by "leak." I am not unaware of what happened in the case of the Yalta papers. I am not unaware of what happened when the leadership was hurriedly summoned to Washington to discuss the Mid-East situation, only to find that selected newspapers had already received more information than the leaders were given.

It is my belief that communications of the type of the one which I received from the Secretary of State, directed to the majority leader of the Senate, either should be available to all the press at the same time or should be confidential correspondence.

Mr. President, I do not attempt to place upon any one individual the blame for this incident. I do not blame newspapermen for being enterprising, and I am well aware of the difficulties involved in watching every action in a department of the size of the State Department. I have been assured by both the Secretary of State and the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Hill, that the notification to certain members of the press was totally without their knowledge and without their approval, and that they disapprove as strongly as I do.

As to the letter itself, there was nothing in it that could not be made public property. When the letter reached me, I opened it in the presence of the newspapermen, so that all who wished to see, touch, feel, or smell it could do so. This neither added to nor detracted from the situation, and with the full consent of the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Hill, I read the letter to the newspapermen.

However, I have made my views on this subject known—I trust clearly—to the President and to the Secretary of State, and in the conversations, somewhat lengthy, I have had with the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Hill.

I certainly hope we can devise a consistent method of operation in such matters that will treat all members of the press fairly and equitably, and will certainly give the same consideration to the Secretary of State and to the majority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no comment to make on the latter part of the majority leader's statement, because I know nothing about the occurrence he discussed, but the summation of what transpired in the conference with the Secretary of State is a very fair statement, and was fully agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am sure my friend would object to a newspaper tip of a letter given to any Member of the Senate before the Senator received it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand the privileges of decency. I sent the Secretary of State a letter on February 11, and that letter came into the hands of the press on February 20, but not as a result of any release by me. I could have read the letter on the floor of the Senate when I sent it and notified the world that it stated the viewpoint of the majority leader of the Senate, but I thought that would have been unfair to the Secretary of State, and that he was entitled to receive and consider my viewpoint in private before public release.

The Secretary of State is a very harassed man. The burdens of his office are many. I know what a problem I have in executing my own responsibilities. So I did not feel I could keep faith with the Secretary by even talking about the letter on the 12th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th, 18th, or 19th of February, but the letter became public property, through channels other than my own efforts. I was shocked that communications have deteriorated to such a state that the highest Cabinet officer of the land cannot write the majority leader of the Senate without the majority leader having to answer inquiries from newspapermen on the telephone about a letter he has not received. I think the Secretary of State was shocked. I think the Assistant Secretary was embarrassed. Mr. Hill is a good man. He is a kindly man. He is a fair man. I know nothing about his background; I know nothing about his party allegiance; but I know that in his contacts with me he has conducted himself with dignity. It was with some reluctance that I had to say to him firmly, "Sir, I will discuss this with you tomorrow, first after I have had a chance to deliberate over the problem involved in the meeting. I also want the Department to know my utter disapproval of government by leak."

Mr. President, I made a brief statement this morning following a discussion I had with the Secretary of State. I desire to read it into the RECORD, very briefly. It refers to the very critical situation in the Middle East. I read from my statement:

> I believe that the situation today appears to be somewhat more hopeful than it was last week.

I emphasize that I speak on my responsibility as the senior Senator from Texas, and only for myself.

I resume reading from my statement:

> So long as the parties to the Middle Eastern dispute keep talking, there is a possibility of a settlement.
>
> The important thing is to find a path to settlement which does not involve direct coercion. Once things are put on a "put up or shut up" basis, a dispute will be created that could be with us for many years to come.
>
> There are some signs that at least some of the parties to the dispute realize that fact. I hope that this realization spreads.

Mr. President, I turn to another subject.

In the whole course of the Middle Eastern discussion, one important factor seems to have escaped public notice. It is that several forms of pressure are already being applied in that area on a one-sided basis against the United Nations. I am referring to some of the steps that have been taken by Egypt.

This situation was covered very well this morning in an editorial by the New York Times. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD, because it directly pertains to my comments this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NASSER'S SANCTIONS

While everybody else has been talking about sanctions to make the Israelis go away from the Gulf of Aqaba and the Gaza Strip, President Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt has been quietly applying sanctions of his own.

The difference is that, whereas the sanctions discussed in Washington and at the United Nations have been aimed at Israel, Nasser's sanctions are aimed at practically everybody except the Israelis. Nasser's sanctions are the same sanctions he has been illegally applying for 8 years past to keep Israeli ships and cargoes from going up to Elath or passing through the canal.

Nasser's sanctions consist in keeping the canal plugged, in spite of the efforts of the U. N. salvage crews, operating with his explicit consent, to open it up. Nasser's sanctions are directed against those who profit by the normal operation of the canal. They include almost all customary users of Arabian oil. They are particularly damaging to Western Europe; to France and Britain, who obeyed the General Assembly's request to remove their forces from Egypt; to other oil-burning European countries, who never even sent troops to Egypt.

Lt. Gen. Raymond A. Wheeler got his U. N. salvage fleet into operation on January 1, after Nasser had already caused as much delay as possible. General Wheeler believed he could have a 25-foot channel open, capable of carrying 10,000-ton tankers, by the end of March. The most formidable obstacle appeared to be a concrete-laden ship called the *Akka*. On February 15 two German salvage boats toted the *Akka* into the Great Bitter Lake and came hungrily back for more.

A vessel called the *Edgar Bonnet* then came into the limelight. General Wheeler has been trying since January 14 to get permission to take this craft out of the way. The Egyptians have replied that it was loaded with explosives which, for some peculiar reason, only their own divers could remove. Their own divers couldn't remove them, either. At least they have been vainly trying for more than a month. The *Edgar Bonnet* remains on the bottom, 4 miles south of Ismailia, about midway down the canal. General Wheeler thinks he could get her out in 3 weeks and open the waterway to heavy shipping by May 1.

If President Nasser desired to convince the world of his good faith he could tell General Wheeler to go ahead. If he doesn't do this he is fatuous indeed to expect the United States or any other self-respecting nation to play his game by the use of pressure against Israel. Let us trust that this thought will arise at the United Nations as the debate on Israel reopens.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not wish to rush Senators, or attempt to drive them or try to usurp any of their prerogatives. It is my privilege to take great pride in attempting to protect the rights of each individual Senator, if Senators need such protection. Most of them protect themselves, but last week we did not have speakers available. In the troops-to-Europe question we spent 50 days in committee. In the consideration of the Middle East resolution we spent 36 days in committee. We are proud that a resolution so all-enveloping, with such major constructive changes as the pending resolution had to undergo, could be reported in that time. On the troops-to-Europe question, under the direction of my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we took 20 days for debate on the floor of the Senate. We are now going into our second week of debate on the pending joint resolution, and I am hoping we can vote on the resolution this week, with every Senator being given an opportunity to offer any amendment he cares to offer, and with every Senator being afforded time in which to say everything he desires on the subject.

Later in the day, or tomorrow, I shall consult with my distinguished friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the acting minority leader, and propose to him, and through him to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, a proposed unanimous consent agreement. I should like to have the advice of every Senator in that connection. Each Senator on the majority side has been consulted to ascertain how much time he may require. There are indications that 1 or 2 Senators are not "firmed up" as yet. It is not definite, but probably we shall need some 15 or 16 hours of debate on this side of the aisle. I understand that some several hours will be needed on the other side of the aisle, but not nearly so much as will be needed on this side of the aisle.

I should like to suggest that we put into effect a unanimous-consent agreement, probably on Thursday of this week, giving each Senator an opportunity to speak on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday—we shall ask the Senate to sit late, until 6 or 7 o'clock, if that is the pleasure of the Senate—and then consent to limit debate on amendments to, say, 1 hour, and perhaps 6 or 8 hours on the resolution itself.

I am not now proposing such an agreement. I am giving the Senate the benefit of my thinking, after talking with some of my colleagues. I submit this suggestion for the consideration of Senators, and ask for their suggestions, for their understanding, and for any help they may be able to give.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I assure the Senator from Texas that I appreciate his faith in his colleagues' ability to handle any subject which comes before this body.

It is my considered opinion that there is not a Senator who does not know how he is going to vote. Speeches are all right; but I would rather have 1 vote than 10 speeches, any day in the week. Why is it that we must wait and beg the indulgence of some Senator who wishes to make a speech and get his name in the RECORD? Why can we not vote? I am ready to vote now. I am not stating how I intend to vote, but I am ready to vote, and I do not see why other Senators are not ready to vote.

We have been listening to the debates for a number of days. Sometimes as few as four Senators, in addition to the Presiding Officer, were present to listen to speeches, which indicates to me, at least, that Senators are ready to vote, and have made up their minds. I cannot think of a single Senator who would not be ready to vote right now.

I hope my friend from Texas will not be too indulgent. He has been patient and tolerant. I want every Senator to have an opportunity to express his views; but I do not see what is left to be said.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico, as always, speaks directly to the point, frankly and forthrightly.

I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that it is not a question of my being indulgent, when one Senator can object to any proposed unanimous-consent agreement. In a body of 96 Members, it is not difficult to find one Senator who would object.

Let me make this additional statement: Later I shall draft a proposed unanimous-consent agreement. It will not be proposed to the Senate until I have the approval of my friends on the other side of the aisle. That is the way we do business, whether the Republicans have 49 or we have 49. It has been determined that that is the way the Senate must operate for a while. Now I should like to mention another matter.

It is not necessary to have a quorum present to listen to the majority leader. However, it has been the practice of the leadership, in an attempt to promote efficiency and economy, to permit committees to meet in the afternoon during the sessions of the Senate. That has not been conducive to a full attendance of Senators in the Senate Chamber. Our guests in the galleries do not understand that Senators may be working in the basement in a committee hearing when one of their colleagues is addressing himself to empty chairs in the Senate Chamber.

Therefore, I intend to suggest the absence of a quorum when I shall have concluded, and when my friends have asked me any questions they desire to ask.

I shall insist that a quorum of the Senate be obtained. Furthermore, I shall insist that the attachés of the Senate not record Senators who are not present. Senators may be on notice that unless a quorum call is a routine matter to allow time to obtain a speaker, from now on, when there is a quorum call in the Senate, it will not be rescinded, and when Senators hear the bells, they should come to the Senate Chamber if they desire to be recorded.

I realize that that will involve inconvenience to some Senators. However, I think there are more advantages than disadvantages to the arrangement. We shall try that policy for a few days. We shall be extremely reluctant to give consent for Senate committees to meet in the afternoon, under the conditions under which we are now operating, when we have before us an important measure suggested by the President.

I know that Senators on both sides of the aisle have caused witnesses to be subpenaed and brought to Washington, and that considerable inconvenience will be caused. I shall try to adjust myself to particular cases. There will be certain exceptions.

I have mentioned this subject to the minority leader. He and I generally instinctively look at procedural questions pretty much alike. I think we are capable of rising to the occasion. I believe we have reached the point where we should proceed to vote as early as is consistent with the rights of Senators, who must render judgment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I concur in the conviction expressed by the majority leader with respect to the hope that still exists in the Middle East picture. I have been subject to the same urgings and importunities as every other Member of the Senate. I believe that the situation is very delicate and fluid. I came away from the meeting yesterday with a greater degree of hope.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I remember when the Senator came to the Congress. I sat in the gallery and heard him make his maiden speech. I thought then that there were few men I had ever heard who spoke so persuasively.

The Senator is a man of great experience. He has attended many conferences. He occupies a responsible position. I think he would join me in saying that through all the critical years through which we have both lived, we have never attended two meetings that were more constructive, more productive, and more helpful than the two we attended during the past week. Free men met and exchanged free viewpoints, without regard to personalities, and without being petty. I hope the Senator agrees with that statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I agree wholeheartedly with that statement.

With respect to the possibility of a unanimous-consent agreement, I have talked with some Senators on this side of the aisle. There are some who wish to be heard. I have urged one or two to prepare their speeches and deliver them as early as possible in the week. I share the hope of the Senator from Texas that we can reach a unanimous-consent agreement, because there is urgency about this resolution, which has been pending for a long time, since the President's special message to Congress.

I think there will be the fullest cooperation on this side in any endeavor to reach a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to my majority leader that I have nothing but the highest commendation for the leadership he has afforded in the consideration of the measure pending before the Senate. I fully appreciate the fact that, in carrying out his responsibilities as majority leader, as he sees those responsibilities, he seeks an early vote on the joint resolution.

However, I would not be fair to my leader if I did not tell him that I will not give such consent. I will not give such consent until I am satisfied that there has been full debate on this subject. I do not agree that there is any urgency about it whatsoever. I think the record made before our committee shows that there is no urgency about it. I do not think there should be a vote on the joint resolution until the subject has been fully debated and we really develop a foreign policy with respect to the Middle East, which I respectfully say this administration does not have, unless it is a foreign policy of protecting oil; and I am not interested in that kind of foreign policy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate the frankness and candor of the Senator from Oregon. He knows only one language, and that is the language of candor.

I appeal to him, in view of the opinions he entertains, to help us debate the subject. My problem last week was to find a Senator to preside, and one who was prepared to discuss the joint resolution at the same time. If the Senator will help us discuss it this week, I assure him that my admiration and respect for him is so real, and my desire to cooperate is so great that I will endeavor to keep the Senate in session until later than usual in order to hear the viewpoint of the Senator from Oregon.

I recall that one of the greatest speeches I have ever heard in the Senate was made late one evening when the Senator from Oregon rose to address himself to a proposition and said that the Senate could not proceed to vote because he would interpret that as a kind of mob rule, and he was going to see to it that all parties, representing all views, had had a full opportunity to be heard.

Mr. MORSE. I have not changed my mind.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand.

Mr. MORSE. I may say that the RECORD will speak for itself in showing that I have consumed more hours in the present debate than any other Senator, and I am waiting for the opposition point of view to provide some answers before I proceed to rebuttal and surrebuttal and rebuttal of the surrebuttal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is very difficult for me to control either the opponents or the proponents. However, if the Senator desires to address himself further to the subject, I hope he will be ready to do so this week.

I serve notice on all Senators that, instead of leaving here at 5 o'clock, we will stay in session until at least 6 or 7 o'clock this evening. If the Senate will support me, I plan to do that for the rest of the week.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I rise to support the majority leader and to commend him for his action. His statement this morning on the urgency of Senate action on the joint resolution is very timely indeed. It was unfortunate that more Senators did not remain on the floor to debate the issue last week, so that the American public could have had a proper understanding of the opinions of Members of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him at this point, I will say that I do not want the RECORD to show that we did not have full and adequate discussion last week until 5 o'clock in the afternoon of every day. However, we usually had a quorum call first. On the other hand, we did not have any surplus of speakers, and that is unusual for the Senate.

Mr. THYE. It is true that there was no surplus of Senators who could have interrogated the speakers. That is the situation as I witnessed it last week. For that reason, in all sincerity, I commend the majority leader for giving us notice that he intends to pursue this question this week, even to the extent of having an evening session. It is very urgent that we tell the world what we in the Senate have in mind and what he hope for as we proceed with the debate of the joint resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator. I want the RECORD to show that I have not said that we will conclude debate on the question this week. I have said that it is my intention to proceed with the debate and to bring it to a conclusion at the earliest possible date, consistent with the rights of individual Senators.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I make a comment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Wyoming desire me to yield to him on this question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to say to the Senator from Texas that every day of last week I came to the floor of the Senate at the beginning of each session and asked for permission to have the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs meet during the sessions of the Senate, because of the investigation we were making of the oil problem.

I desire to tell the Senator from Texas now that it is my purpose not to ask for permission this week for those subcommittees to sit. Our committee will not be responsible for holding any Members of the Senate from this important debate.

I shall take the time, when the opportunity affords itself, to ask some questions, which I believe have not been answered, either in the report or by the Senators who have debated the issue.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. This is not the time to pass judgment on the merits of individual amendments. The Senator from Wyoming is always courteous and helpful. He never proposed a request last week, to my knowledge, without first clearing it with the majority leader and the minority leader and having his request meet with their approval. However, the majority leader can make mistakes. Perhaps one of those mistakes would be to permit committees to meet if it can possibly be avoided.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] has great problems, because we rely on him to do a great deal of the work of the Senate. I know what those problems are. Therefore, I may have to make an exception in certain instances.

The Appropriations Committee also has great problems which must be considered.

However, it is important for every Senator to realize that the Senate itself is on trial. Our guests and the press do not understand why, during our discussion of a question which is so important as that involved in the pending resolution, only one or two or three Senators at times appear on the floor.

If we are about to legislate foreign policy that is not in the public interest there ought to be some Senators in the Chamber to say so and to debate the question, and there ought to be some Senators ready to answer and to defend.

If we are to delay a resolution which is intended to meet an emergency and ought to be rushed to the White House, there ought to be Senators here to say so.

Last week I was here all week, and there were few times when I was not in the Chamber. I represent a large State and I have important committee assignments, and I have other problems, too. I tell the Senate in all frankness that, although we always had speakers, last week sometimes we had to notify them. Some of them might have been a little pressed for time on other matters and we had to notify them by having a quorum call, as they would not leave their office until we had had a quorum call. By the time some Senators reached the Senate Chamber 2 or 3 of the Senators who had been listening to the speaker, had left. As I have indicated, we had speakers every day last week until after 5 o'clock. That is the normal procedure during the consideration of resolutions of this kind. It is necessary to work up to later sessions, as we will find, as we go along. However, I serve notice now on all Senators that I think we ought to keep the sessions of committees to a minimum and that the Senate should sit a little longer and a fuller attendance, would be desirable. When we have quorum calls Senators can answer to their names and be recorded, or otherwise they will be shown as being absent.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator. I just came into the Chamber, and I did not know what subject was being discussed, until the Senator from Texas referred to committees getting permission to meet while the Senate is in session.

It is not the personal wish or pleasure of the Senator from Arkansas that any of his committees meet at any time when the Senate is in session. However, it is rather difficult to schedule 2 weeks of public hearings for a committee so as to meet the changing situation in the Senate. For example, I have brought 20 witnesses here from the west coast to testify in an important public hearing tomorrow. In order that the committee may be briefed and may hear one witness in executive session this afternoon, I have scheduled, subject to approval by the Senate, a meeting this afternoon for 3:30 o'clock in executive session. It is the committee which has been established to investigate labor and management relations. I hope that I may obtain permission of the Senate to have the committee meet in executive session this afternoon.

I may say, Mr. President, that I expect to hold some 4 or 5 days of public hearings this week. It will take some 4 or 5 days to dispose of the matters which are scheduled. If we do not hold afternoon sessions, it simply means that it will take substantially all of next week to conclude the hearings. The work in this field is far more extensive than I had anticipated. I had some reason to expect it would be extensive. But if this job is to be done, if the committee is to serve the Senate and the Congress properly in making this inquiry as it should be made, thoroughly, expeditiously, judiciously, and economically, we shall have to ask the indulgence of the Senate to allow the committee to sit when the Senate is in session.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I will address myself to the Senator's statement later. I now wish to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, last week the majority leader very graciously inquired whether I wished to speak on the pending resolution, and I sent back word that he had so neatly expressed my views that I did not care to take the time of the Senate; that I would vote with him whenever he could bring the question to a vote.

I also agree with him that the Senate is, in a sense, on trial, but we should not be tried by a jury which believes the only work the Senate does is when Senators are on the floor of the Senate.

I wish to thank my friend from Texas for his commendation of the committee for getting our bill to the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator set an alltime record, and I was very proud of the able manner in which he handled his duties in that respect.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I just wanted to remind the majority leader of the fact that not since 1863 have our banking laws been codified. I undertook that task last summer. I came to the Capitol last November and conducted hearings, when I much preferred to go hunting. We have been working on that problem ever since. But the work of other committees is beginning to crowd on me, and it is a monumental task. When the bill reaches the floor, it will be thicker than all the hearings put together on the resolution which we are now discussing. Instead of there being one controversial issue, there will probably be a dozen controversial issues.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say to the Senator from Virginia that he evidently did not hear my earlier statement. It is the custom of the Senate always to give the Appropriations Committee carte blanche authority to sit during the entire session of the Senate. Each Congress does that. We realize the necessity of doing so. The distinguished President pro tempore, who is now in the chair, presides over the meetings of the Appropriations Committee, and he realizes that it is always the custom for the Appropriations Committee and all its subcommittees to have authority to sit during the sessions of the Senate.

I will say to my friend from Arkansas that I am not unaware of his problem. It is not necessary for the Senator from Arkansas to get permission for his select committee to sit. The rule applies only to standing committees. I am aware of the very special problem he has, and I referred to it in my original statement. I hope my friends will also realize the problems we have as a body, and I know they will be helpful.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I merely wanted to call attention to the fact that, though I did not hear the opening statement about the Appropriations Committee, neither did the distinguished majority leader hear the request I wanted to make. We could not get to the $72 billion budget until the Banking and Currency Committee finished its hearings.

We hope we can finish them, and then proceed with the consideration of appropriations measures, when we shall not have to ask permission for the committee to sit during the sessions of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be glad to talk to the Senator about that matter a little later.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand the minority members of the committee fully concur in the Senator's request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to read at this time paragraph (c) of section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946:

> No standing committee of the Senate or the House, except the Committee on Rules of the House, shall sit, without special leave, while the Senate or the House, as the case may be, is in session.

The Senator's committee is not a standing committee; it is a select committee.

So far as the Appropriations Committee is concerned, only one request to allow it to sit is made for the entire session. Is not that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to a report which I filed last Friday with reference to the study which the committee has made regarding the workload of the United States Senate, the operation of its committees, and the problem we have which has just been discussed, of trying to be on the floor at all times when the Senate is in session.

I commend the report to the Senate. I hope that thousands of copies will be printed, so that our constituents may have a better understanding of the workload of this body and also of the problems of Government with which we are concerned.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I say good naturedly that I hope the majority leader will not schedule his work in accordance with the clock which is behind him, which is in need of repair work by a jeweler.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Oregon for calling our attention to that fact.

Mr. President, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum. I yielded only to the Senator from Arkansas because his is a special case and he has a special place in my heart.

However, Mr. President, I have one more announcement. Several Senators have brought to my attention the fact that frequently editorials and other material which are not pertinent to Sena-

tors' comments are being inserted in the body of the RECORD. They have suggested to me that it would be much better not only for the Senator involved but for anyone who may desire to read the RECORD to limit insertions in the body of the RECORD to material which is pertinent to a Senator's remarks. I realize that when a Senator speaks on the pending resolution he may wish to insert an editorial, as I did this morning, from the New York Times. But general insertions which do not pertain to the comments of Senators, many Senators think, should more appropriately be published in the Appendix of the RECORD. I shall not exercise my right to object to their being inserted in the body of the RECORD, but I am sending a letter to each Senator on the subject, and if Senators approve, I should like to have them say so.

PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Subsequently, during the delivery of Mr. O'MAHONEY's speech,

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas said: Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me with the understanding that my remarks will appear at another part of the RECORD, and that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] will be fully protected in his opportunity to answer the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield. The charm of the Senator from Texas is overwhelming.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Earlier in the day, when the Senate met, I suggested that later in the week I would propose a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. During the absence of the majority leader, when there was a little discussion before the Chamber became so vacant, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] desired to suggest the absence of a quorum. Not wanting to disturb the labors of absent Senators, I declined to yield for a quorum call.

I wish to have the RECORD show, and to have the Senator know, that I stated at that time that I would not give my consent to any request for a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate on this subject until certain questions were answered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas is not proposing any unanimous-consent agreement. He is suggesting that a unanimous-consent agreement be printed in the RECORD, so that when it is proposed each Member of the Senate may know its provisions. I can understand the concern of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] about Members not being on the floor. I regret he is not present now.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wore him out. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority leader has many responsibilities, the most difficult of which frequently is to get Senators to listen to each other. However, the majority leader did have enough time today to eat his lunch and to consult with Senate aids. We have prepared a unanimous-consent agreement, which I propose to present to the Senate at a later date, but not today, I will say for the benefit of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Texas is referring to an outline of a unanimous-consent agreement; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is a unanimous-consent agreement that is to be proposed at a later date. Earlier in the day I promised I would read into the RECORD such a proposal, so that all Senators could have ample time to deliberate on it and to consider it. The unanimous-consent agreement reads as follows:

*Ordered,* That, effective on Thursday, February 28, 1957, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 60 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader; *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said joint resolution shall be received.

*Ordered further,* That if and when the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, whether or not amended, is agreed to, the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services jointly shall be deemed to be discharged from the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 117, the companion House measure; that said joint resolution shall be deemed to be amended by striking out all after the resolving clause and in lieu thereof inserting the text of Senate Joint Resolution 19 as amended; and that the amendment to the said House joint resolution shall be deemed to have been engrossed and the joint resolution shall then be read the third time.

*Ordered further,* That on the question of the final passage of the said joint resolution debate shall be limited to 8 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the joint resolution, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the colloquy and the suggested unanimous-consent request appear in the RECORD immediately following my remarks on this subject earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to say, if the Senator from Wyoming will indulge me further—and I appreciate his courtesy and patience—that I have not had an opportunity to consult the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. He is away from the city. I have asked that the unanimous-consent agreement be printed in the RECORD, although I realize that it is very likely that we will have to amend it in considerable detail.

We may have to change Thursday to Friday, perhaps Friday to Saturday, or even Saturday to Monday; and it may be necessary to change the 8 hours to 6 hours, so far as debate on the joint resolution itself is concerned; or it may be necessary to amend the time limitation on amendments. However, it is necessary, first of all, to make a start. This is a start. This is a suggestion. I invite the attention of all Members of the Senate to the suggestion, and I invite the cooperation of all Senators who may be interested in finally coming to a vote on the pending joint resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from Texas concede the possibility that the month may have to be changed to March or April?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Oh, yes; I concede that possibility, because anything is possible in the Senate. I have seen measures that I thought would take about an hour to dispose of take as much as a day. I know there are certain subjects on which a great many Members of the Senate desire to be thoroughly educated before coming to a vote.

I again thank the Senator from Wyoming for his usual courtesy.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Ervin | McClellan |
| Allott | Frear | Morse |
| Anderson | Goldwater | Morton |
| Barrett | Green | Mundt |
| Beall | Hayden | Murray |
| Bennett | Hennings | Neuberger |
| Bible | Hickenlooper | O'Mahoney |
| Blakley | Hill | Payne |
| Bricker | Holland | Potter |
| Bush | Hruska | Purtell |
| Butler | Humphrey | Revercomb |
| Byrd | Ives | Robertson |
| Capehart | Javits | Russell |
| Carlson | Jenner | Saltonstall |
| Carroll | Johnson, Tex. | Schoeppel |
| Case, N. J. | Johnston, S. C. | Scott |
| Case, S. Dak. | Kefauver | Smathers |
| Chavez | Kennedy | Smith, Maine |
| Church | Kerr | Stennis |
| Clark | Kuchel | Symington |
| Cooper | Lausche | Talmadge |
| Cotton | Long | Thurmond |
| Curtis | Magnuson | Thye |
| Dirksen | Malone | Watkins |
| Douglas | Mansfield | Wiley |
| Dworshak | Martin, Iowa | Williams |
| Eastland | Martin, Pa. | Young |
| Ellender | McCarthy | |

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] because of a death in his family.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on public business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is absent because of illness.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from

New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent on official business as a delegate to the United Nations.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

## QUORUM CALLS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I observe that the Chair did not announce the number of Senators answering the quorum call. I shall not ask that that be done on this occasion. However, I should like all Senators to know that hereafter I shall urge that the Presiding Officer announce the number of Senators who are present on quorum calls so that Senators who enter the Chamber 30 seconds late or 30 minutes late will know that they cannot have their names recorded on the roll. We intend to have quorum calls and to obtain real quorums and have the number of Senators who answer to their names announced. Therefore, all committees—particularly the Appropriations Committee—should be on notice; and we shall attempt to work out an arrangement whereby we can effect communications between the Appropriations Committee and the staff. But all Senators should be on notice that hereafter we shall have the Chair announce the number of Senators who answer to their names on a quorum call.

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour, for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business; and in that connection I ask unanimous consent that statements be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF VOLUNTARY HOME MORTGAGE CREDIT PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the National Committee of the Voluntary Home Mortgage Credit Program on the future of the program, adopted January 25, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

INCREASED APPROPRIATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF OFFICE BUILDING FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Public Law 31, 84th Congress, 1st session, to increase the authorization for appropriation to the Atomic Energy Commission for the construction of a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 4

"Joint memorial of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower; the Congress of the United States; Senator James E. Murray, of Montana; Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana; Congressman Lee Metcalf, of Montana; Congressman LeRoy Anderson, of Montana; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives; the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate; the Committee on Public Works of the United States House of Representatives; the Secretary of the Interior, Frederick B. Seaton; the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Wilbur A. Dexheimer; the Secretary of the Army, Wilber M. Brucker; the Director of the Budget, Percival F. Brundage; the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate; and the Committee on Appropriations of the United States House of Representatives requesting the introduction and enactment into law of the necessary and proper legislation to authorize construction by the Federal Government of the Yellowtail Dam on the Big Horn River in the State of Montana and to authorize that sufficient appropriations be provided for the detailed planning and construction of the Yellowtail Dam

"Whereas Yellowtail Dam site is located on the Big Horn River in Big Horn County in southeastern Montana, and the Yellowtail Dam will be constructed across the Big Horn River about three-fourths of a mile above the mouth of the Big Horn Canyon about 35 miles southwest of Hardin, Mont., and 44 miles southeast of Billings, Mont.; and

"Whereas Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir were authorized for construction by the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of section 9 (a) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887) for power production, irrigation, flood control, and other conservation purposes; and

"Whereas under appropriations by the Congress, the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, has expended more than $2,500,000 for investigations and preparation of preliminary plans and designs for Yellowtail Dam as a part of the Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project; and

"Whereas three Secretaries of the Interior have found Yellowtail Dam feasible from an economic, financial, and engineering standpoint, and recommended the appropriation of funds to initiate its construction; and

"Whereas the Congress, on the recommendation of its Appropriations Committees in the Public Works Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1956, included an allocation of $4 million to initiate construction and rehabilitation funds for the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; and

"Whereas the President of the United States on July 15, 1955, signed into law the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1956, including funds for initiation of Yellowtail Dam construction, and the Bureau of the Budget subsequently approved recommendations of the Department of the Interior for the apportionment of funds under the reclamation program for fiscal year 1956 to initiate said construction; and

"Whereas the President recommended in the fiscal year 1957 budget an additional $10,850,000 to continue construction of Yellowtail Dam, thus giving additional sanction to the previous action of the Congress in this respect; and

"Whereas the 84th Congress, 2d session, adopted Senate Joint Resolution 135 providing for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming, to which reference is hereby made; and

"Whereas on June 7, 1956, the President returned said resolution, 'without my approval'; and

"Whereas resolutions designed to meet the President's objection have been introduced in the 85th Congress, 1st session, on a bipartisan basis; and

"Whereas the Yellowtail powerplant, as projected, will have an installed capacity of 200,000 kilowatts with an estimated annual firm energy capacity averaging 584 million kilowatt-hours. In addition to this firm energy, the Yellowtail powerplant is expected to have an average annual nonfirm output of 163,920,000 kilowatt-hours, bringing the average total estimated production to approximately 748 million kilowatt-hours; and

"Whereas such power is urgently needed to supply existing and rapidly expanding power needs in southeastern Montana and northeastern Wyoming for irrigation pumping, rural electric cooperatives and other public bodies, and for commercial and industrial uses as well as for defense industry; and

"Whereas irrigation is one of the additional contributions Yellowtail Dam will make to the economy of the area, and that of the Nation as a whole. Approximately 45,000 acres of irrigable land will be placed under the ditch by waters made available by Yellowtail Dam. In addition, there are a number of desirable pumping units along the Big Horn, Tongue, Powder, and Yellowstone Rivers that will be made feasible by low-cost power derived from Yellowtail Dam, which will serve to irrigate some 180,000 additional acres, or an approximate total of 225,000 acres of fertile land will be brought into production of food essential to our Nation's oncoming needs; and

"Whereas Yellowtail Dam, in addition to providing hydroelectric power and irrigation, will also bring a vast contribution to flood control, silt and soil control, conservation of fish and wildlife, recreational development, and other related and beneficial uses: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved, by the 35th Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana of 1957, now in session (the senate and house of representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged and requested to approve the pending resolution before that body which provides for a fair and just settlement to the Crow Indians, so that construction of the sorely needed Yellowtail Dam project may begin at once; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be submitted by the secretary of the State of Montana to each of the individuals and to the chairmen of each of the committees named in the title of this memorial, and also to the presiding officers of both Houses

of the Congress of the United States, RICHARD M. NIXON and SAM E. RAYBURN.

"EUGENE H. MALONEY,
*"Speaker of the House.*

"PAUL CANNON,
*"President of the Senate."*

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Memorial 4

"Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from Montana; and to the Honorable LEROY ANDERSON and the Honorable LEE METCALF, Representatives in Congress from Montana, requesting passage of legislation to allow the construction of a sign to indicate a point of interest in the Helena National Forest near Frontier Town which is located in Lewis and Clark County, Mont., adjacent to United States Highway 10 north

"Whereas Frontier Town depicts the old West and portrays the historic past, and many travelers miss this place of interest due to a regulation of the United States Forest Service forbidding the erection of signs in their national forests; and

"Whereas Frontier Town is a resort of great interest to the people of the United States and would attract additional tourists if the regulation of the United States Forest Service were set aside for this particular sign; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Montana are anxious that all travelers driving on United States Highway 10 north should know the whereabouts of this site depicting the old West: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana,* That we do hereby petition the Congress of the United States of America for the passage of legislation to allow this sign to be built; be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the chief clerk of the house of representatives, to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from Montana, and the Honorable LEE METCALF and LEROY ANDERSON, Representatives in Congress from Montana.

"EUGENE H. MAHONEY,
*"Speaker of the House."*

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress for an expanded program of public housing for elderly citizens

*"Resolved,* That the 85th Congress of the United States in session assembled be requested to take note of the sentiment expressed by the members of the General Court of Massachusetts in the problem of housing for all classes of our citizens, and to expand generously their thinking when writing legislation that will substantially relieve the housing problem of all our citizens, as more clearly detailed in the facts contained in these resolutions, namely, that we are still far short of the national goal of a decent home for every family in America; that among low-income families where the need is greatest, housing for the elderly presents the most pressing problem; that advancing years bring special housing needs along with lowered incomes; that private enterprise does not find it profitable to build where only a very low rental fee is possible; that the physical and financial limitations of substantial numbers of the elderly make it impossible for them to meet their needs without assistance; that in certain States, Massachusetts among them, which have initiated housing programs for the elderly with State and local aid, the results have been too limited, both in volume and in ability to reach the lowest income groups and that these programs have created too great a drain on local resources; that the action of the 84th Congress in providing housing for the elderly as part of the minimal low-rent housing program was but a token recognition of the outstanding need and far from an adequate solution of the problem; that the future of the elderly is one of the most important issues now before American society; that only by the dynamic leadership of the Federal Government in cooperation with local public and private agencies will a satisfactory solution be assured; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth, to the President of the United States, the United States Housing Authority, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Senate, adopted, February 7, 1957.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
*"Clerk.*

"House of representatives, adopted, in concurrence, February 13, 1957.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
*"Clerk.*

"A true copy.
"Attest:

"EDWARD J. CRONIN,
*"Secretary of the Commonwealth."*

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to the enactment of legislation making marital desertion and abandonment of minor children an offense under the provisions of the Federal Code

"Whereas it is highly desirable that all possible measures be taken to strengthen family life by keeping the family together at all cost; and

"Whereas it is common knowledge that many persons have neglected their legal and moral duties to their families by deserting their families and fleeing across State lines; and

"Whereas the various States, counties, cities, and towns lack the facilities of the Federal Government in locating and returning such persons; and

"Whereas substantial public funds are unnecessarily expended for aid to dependent children and onerous financial burdens placed upon the States, counties, cities, and towns because of their inability to secure the return of persons who desert their families and flee across State lines: Therefore be it

*"Resolved,* That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested by the General Court of Massachusetts to enact legislation making marital desertion and abandonment of minor children a penal offense under the provisions of the Federal Code; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress of the United States and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, adopted, February 7, 1957.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
*"Clerk.*

"Senate, adopted in concurrence, February 12, 1957.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
*"Clerk.*

"A true copy.
"Attest:

"EDWARD J. CRONIN,
*"Secretary of the Commonwealth."*

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

*"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior; the Congress of the United States; and the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress From Alaska:*

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 23d session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas the economy of Alaska is in great need of the establishment of industrial developments that would furnish stable year-round payrolls and utilize the natural resources of Alaska; and

"Whereas, mining and pulp timber developments proposed for the Juneau and Douglas area of Alaska indicate the need for the immediate development of additional sources of electrical energy at a cost sufficiently low to encourage the establishment of such industries; and

"Whereas the increase in local populations resulting from such industrial development will create demands upon the cities of Juneau and Douglas to encourage the production of additional electric power to meet increased domestic demand; and

"Whereas preliminary studies conducted by the Bureau of Reclamation indicate that Dorothy, Crater, and Long Lakes in the vicinity of Juneau and Douglas could be economically developed by the United States to provide such power; and that the cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining such power projects would be returned to the United States by sales of such power to industrial and domestic users;

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully prays that the Bureau of Reclamation immediately conduct field and other studies necessary to complete feasibility reports on the Dorothy, Crater, and Long Lake power projects; and, that the Congress of the United States enact suitable legislation to authorize and carry forward the construction of the said projects, together with the appurtenant power production and transmission facilities, as a Federal project.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate February 12, 1957.

"VICTOR C. RIVERS,
*"President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
*"Secretary of the Senate.*

"Passed by the house February 15, 1957.

"RICHARD J. GREUEL,
*"Speaker of the House.*

"Attest:

"DOLORES D. GOAD,
*"Chief Clerk of the House.*

"I hereby certify that the above and foregoing constitutes a full, true, and correct copy of the Senate Joint Memorial 2 as passed by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska.

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
*"Secretary of the Senate.*

"I certify that the above is a full, true, and correct copy of Senate Joint Memorial 2.

"WAINO E. HENDRICKSON,
*"Secretary of Alaska."*

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

*"To the Honorable Fred Seaton, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable James Murray, Chairman of Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the United States Senate; the Honorable Clair Engle, Chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Waino Hendrickson, acting governor of Alaska; the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska; the Honorable Edward Woozley, Director of the Bureau of Land Management; and to the United States Congress:*

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 23d session assembled, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas several years ago the land office of the United States Bureau of Land Management was closed and removed from Nome and the second judicial division of the Territory of Alaska; and

"Whereas as a result of said removal residents of the second division must travel to Fairbanks or Anchorage to conduct Land Office business; and

"Whereas mineral and oil exploration in recent years have spread toward and into the second division, creating intense interest and possibilities of new basic industry in the near future; and,

"Whereas the demand for homesites in the second division, as everywhere in Alaska, is increasing; and townsite transactions and timber permits continue to need processing; and

"Whereas a land office in Nome would facilitate necessary land transactions in connection with the increased activity, and would benefit the residents of the second division:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges that the United States Department of the Interior reopen a Land Office in Nome, Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate February 14, 1957.

"VICTOR C. RIVERS,
*"President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
*"Secretary of the Senate.*

"Passed the house February 16, 1957.

"RICHARD J. GREUEL,
*"Speaker of the House.*

"Attest:

"DOLORES D. GOAD,
*"Chief Clerk of the House.*

"I hereby certify that the above and foregoing constitutes a full, true and correct copy of Senate Joint Memorial 3 as passed by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska.

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
*"Secretary of the Senate.*

"I certify that the above is a full, true and correct copy of Senate Joint Memorial 3.

"WAINO E. HENDRICKSON,
*"Secretary of Alaska."*

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

*"To the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the Interstate Commerce Committee of the United States Senate, the Governor of Alaska, and the Delegate to Congress From Alaska:*

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in its 23d session assembled, respectfully represents that—

"Whereas the timber in the national forests in Alaska is chiefly valuable for, and especially adapted to the manufacture of pulp, paper, and pulp products, and lumber; and

"Whereas the law creating the national forests in Alaska, and amendments thereto, prohibit the export of logs and timber from the national forests in the Territory, except where in the judgment of the Secretary of of Agriculture, the supply of timber for local use will not be endangered thereby; and

"Whereas the prohibition against export, contained in the law, has been recognized and faithfully enforced for more than two generations in order to protect the business of local sawmills and to encourage and promote the establishment of pulp and paper mills and plywood plants in Alaska, with the great economic advantages in the matter of increase of population, employment of labor, and contribution to the Territory's revenue; and

"Whereas one large pulp mill has been built at Ketchikan within the past 3 years requiring an investment of more than $60 million, and is now in full operation, and another of equal size will be established at Sitka with construction to be commenced this year; with others to follow if timber from the national forests is kept available under the present law and the regulations of the Department; and

"Whereas a change in the law and regulations so as to permit export of logs would be little short of disastrous to the economy of Alaska: Now, therefore,

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges that there be no change made by Congress in the law prohibiting the export of logs from the national forests in Alaska, and no relaxation in any permissible regulations of the Department of Agriculture, under the law, and that the policy of the law and past regulations be followed in the future to the end that the natural timber grown in Alaska be manufactured within the Territory so that the Territory may derive the full benefit therefrom.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate, February 18, 1957.

"VICTOR C. RIVERS,
*"President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
*"Secretary of the Senate.*

"Passed by the house, February 19, 1957.

"RICHARD J. GREUEL,
*"Speaker of the House.*

"Attest:

"DOLORES D. GOAD,
*"Chief Clerk of the House.*

"I hereby certify that the above and foregoing constitutes a full, true, and correct copy of Senate Joint Memorial 4 as passed by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska.

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
*"Secretary of the Senate.*

"Approved by the acting Governor, February 21, 1957.

"WAINO E. HENDRICKSON,
*"Acting Governor.*

"I certify that the above is a true, full, and correct copy of Senate Joint Memorial 4.

"WAINO E. HENDRICKSON,
*"Secretary of Alaska."*

A resolution adopted by the Independent Union of Petroleum Workers, of Bakersfield, Calif., relating to the fulfillment of the Government's pledge concerning the present oil crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by Americans of Lithuanian Descent, of Portland, Oreg., relating to independence for Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Delaware Bureau of Jewish Women's Organizations, of Wilmington, Del., relating to the treatment of Jewish people by the Government of Egypt; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Long Island (N. Y.) Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., in New York City, favoring the adoption of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

Two resolutions of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"H. 1017

"Resolution urging the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Tariff Commission to enact and maintain tariffs rates on textiles, including lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports

"Whereas textile, jewelry, and rubber goods manufacturing are three of Rhode Island's major industries employing over 54 percent of Rhode Island's manufacturing workers; and

"Whereas manufacturing is the foundation of the Rhode Island economy whereby over one-half of the entire State's population is directly or indirectly dependent upon such industries; and

"Whereas in all of these industries labor and labor costs are vital factors representing about 60 percent of the value of the manufactured product; and

"Whereas such products can be and are manufactured today in many parts of the world, often with the aid of the latest types of American equipment; and

"Wheras the consequent threat of price competition from low-wage countries abroad is very real; and

"Whereas the American lace manufacturing industry, 54 of whose 60 plants are located in Rhode Island, has suffered and still suffers increasingly serious difficulties as a result of tariff reductions effectuated under the trade agreement with France which became effective June 15, 1956; and

"Whereas reductions in tariffs since that date have driven the manufacture of veilings in America completely out and badly handicapped the manufacture of bobbinet and all other products of lace machines; and

"Whereas recent studies by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate the large wage differentials which place American manufacturers at a decided competitive disadvantage; and

"Whereas the Rhode Island textile industry including lace goods, represent about 30 percent of all manufacturing employment and a total investment of $300 million; and

"Whereas the jewelry industry employs about 19 percent of Rhode Island manufacturing workers; and

"Whereas the manufacture of rubber products represents a substantial portion of industry in this State; and

"Whereas this tremendous percentage of Rhode Island industrial workers would be forced into the ranks of the unemployed upon the closing of the mills and factories of this State: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved*, That the President of the United States insist on increasing and maintaining proper tariffs on the imports of textiles, including lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the Secretary of State of the United States enter into no agreements and make no concessions to any foreign nation which would affect adversely the manufacture and sale of textiles, including lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States and more particularly the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives take every legislative precaution in enacting proper legislation to ensure the creation and maintenance of proper tariff rates on textiles, including lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Tariff Commission of the United States, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, and to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, earnestly requesting that each use his best efforts to bring about the enactment and maintenance of proper tariff rates on textiles, including, lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports, to the end that the manufacture and sale of such goods in the United States are not jeopardized."

---

"Resolution memorializing Congress with respect to amendment to the Federal Social Security Act so that full benefits may be granted to women who have reached the age of 62 years instead of waiting until they reach the age of 65 years

"*Resolved*, That the Members of the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully requested to make such amendment to the Federal Social Security Act so that full benefits may be granted to women who have reached the age of 62 years instead of waiting as the law now requires until they reach the age of 65 years; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State be and he is hereby requested to transmit to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution in the hope that each will use every endeavor to have favorable action taken by Congress upon this special matter."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to assist the States in meeting the schoolhousing needs of children

"Whereas the education of the youth of Rhode Island is vital to the welfare of the State and Nation; and

"Whereas as has been noted by a distinguished Rhode Island educator:

"The day has gone by when any community can afford to be content with any arrangement short of the best in every matter touching the prosperity and efficiency of its public schools. There are moral influences as well as intellectual and material, emanating from a pupil's surroundings, and acting upon himself. If any place ought to be made wholesome, bright, cheerful, and inspiring to children, it is surely the schoolroom; and

"Whereas the neglect of schoolhousing during World War II and the increase of the birth rate have combined to leave this Nation with an unprecedented need for new school plants and for replacement and modernization of old plants that are potentially useful; and

"Whereas like other States of the Nation, Rhode Island is faced also with major rehousing and marked increases in school population which cause disproportinate debt burden or neglect of children; and

"Whereas this excessive debt burden is jeopardizing the educational programs of the schools of the Nation; and

"Whereas the communities of the State of Rhode Island are making a diligent effort to house adequately their school children; and

"Whereas the citizens of Rhode Island view with alarm the fact that, despite heavy capital expenditures, many of our children continue to be housed in obsolete facilities or are unable to attend school for a full day: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this general assembly respectfully request the Congress of the United States to place top priority upon passing legislation to assist all of the States of the Union with this most serious problem of providing adequate schoolhousing for our children, the most valuable asset of this great Nation; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States and to the Presiding Officers in both branches of said Congress."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.)

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolution memorializing the United States Senate for the establishment of a Veterans' Affairs Committee in the United States Senate

Whereas the department of Rhode Island, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, as a part of its 1957 legislative program, is seeking the establishment of a Veterans' Affairs Committee in the United States Senate: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations does now respectfully request that the United States Senate shall give attention to this particular subject and that the two Senators from Rhode Island in Congress shall give active aid and support to the passage of a resolution providing for the establishment of a Veterans' Affairs Committee in the United States Senate; and be it further

*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senators from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States.

---

## RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF STATE OF MONTANA

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, House Memorial No. 3, adopted by the House of Representatives of the 35th Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana.

House Memorial No. 3 urges the Congress to enact legislation which will lead to the authorization of very high frequency television translators. The memorial also asks for an investigation of the now existing translators before any further action is taken against these translators by the Federal Communications Commission.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on February 22, 1957, p. 2462, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

---

## FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—RESOLUTION OF ALBEMARLE (VA.) SCHOOL BOARD

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Albemarle School Board of Albemarle County, Va., in opposition to Federal aid to schools.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas under the 10th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, it is the function and the responsibility of the States to provide schools, to regulate them, and to have complete jurisdiction over them; and

Whereas we have hanging over us the financial nightmare of nearly $300 billion Federal debt with no evidence of any intention on the part of the Federal Government of making any attempt to provide for paying this debt; and

Whereas the recent fantastic proposed Federal budget is the largest peacetime budget in our history, which if adopted will cost every man, woman, and child an average of more than $400, and which will cost the people of Virginia more than $1,100,000,000; and

Whereas it is not denied that there are many problems connected with financing schools, it is believed that most of these problems are either caused by or aggravated by actions of the Federal Government and will not be solved by Federal aid; and

Whereas we believe that the greatest contribution which the Federal Government could make to schools would be to reduce the amount of Federal taxes to a reasonable figure and to stop forthwith yielding to pressure groups who demand more and more Federal waste; and further

Whereas we believe that Federal aid is not necessary either for current operating expenses for public schools or for capital expenditures and that local communities and States are able to supply both in accordance with the will of their residents: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we, the Albermarle County School Board, are completely and unalterably opposed to any Federal aid for schools; and further be it

*Resolved*, That we ask our representatives in the Senate and in the House of Representatives to do everything in their power to prevent the passage of any legislation providing for Federal aid for schools.

---

## RESOLUTION OF HAYS (KANS.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate a resolution adopted by the Hays Chamber of Commerce, in regard to the need for assisting small industries in securing subcontracts out in the agricultural area.

The mechanization of agriculture makes it imperative that some provision be made to furnish part-time work for many of our farmers and other citizens in these areas. This is not only an immediate problem, it is a long-range problem and one that should have the attention of the agencies of our Government

that write contracts for large sums of money in the defense industry.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the area comprising the Central Kansas Industrial Development Association is in the drought-stricken area of Kansas; and

Whereas this drought condition is of such serious nature that regardless of favorable weather conditions, it will affect the economical condition of this area for not less than 2 years in the future; and

Whereas the oil industry which we have enjoyed for the past many years is rapidly depleting; and

Whereas many small machine shops which have been tied in with the oil and agriculture are finding it impossible to stay in business and that such industries are manned with the very best of mechanical help: Now therefore

We, the members of the Hays Chamber of Commerce in regular assembled meeting of this 7th day of February 1957, do hereby petition our Government to consider a means of assisting such small industries as well as additional industries, in financing, leasing, and otherwise securing the necessary machine tools to participate in the many subcontracts which the national defense program is creating. Such a program would furnish them with the necessary help and information needed to participate in these lettings.

This is one positive way of balancing the economy of this area which is and has been depending entirely on oil and agriculture, and will create part-time employment for many small farmers, who otherwise will have to move off the farm.

A copy of this resolution should be mailed to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

W. E. KEATING,
*President, Hays Chamber of Commerce.*
DALE L. DUNN,
*Manager, Hays Chamber of Commerce.*

## RESOLUTIONS OF SMITH COUNTY (KANS.) FARMERS UNION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have received from the officers and members of the Smith County Farmers Union resolutions regarding the proposed changes in wheat grades and full parity price for farm products.

The Department of Agriculture is presently considering the proposed changes in wheat grades and at a meeting last Thursday in the Senate caucus room, the Department gave Senators from the wheat-producing States a thorough explanation of its proposals.

I expressed my concern about two or three of the proposed changes, including moisture content, dockage, and blending.

We have the assurance of the Department that every phase of this proposed grading plan will be given thorough consideration before it is announced for approval.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the sliding scale of farm price supports has failed; and

Whereas the free market for farm commodities offers no hope; and

Whereas farmers cannot bargain for prices like other groups; and

Whereas farmers should be as important as other groups: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Smith County Farmers Union, in session this 11th day of February, request the Congress to enact legislation which will reflect to farmers full parity prices; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be mailed to Senators ANDREW SCHOEPPEL, FRANK CARLSON, and ALLEN ELLENDER, to Congressmen WINT SMITH and HAROLD COOLEY, and the press.

ROBERT E. KAUP,
*President.*
WAYNE SCHOENI,
*Secretary.*

---

Whereas the proposed changes in wheat grades would reduce producers' income; and

Whereas the change in the percentage on dockage would disadvantage producers greatly; and

Whereas the sanitation requirements set up by pure food and drug administration have no place in grading standards; and be it

*Resolved*, That the Smith County Farmers Union in session this 11th day of February 1957 oppose the proposed changes in wheat grading standards; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be mailed to the United States Department of Agriculture, Senators ANDREW SCHOEPPEL, FRANK CARLSON, and ALLEN ELLENDER; Congressmen WINT SMITH and HAROLD COOLEY.

ROBERT E. KAUP,
*President.*
WAYNE A. SCHOENI,
*Secretary.*

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. 323. A bill to amend section 334 (e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to increased allotments for durum wheat (Rept. No. 97).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 124. A bill for the relief of Josephine Suydam (Rept. No. 103);

S. 363. A bill for the relief of Nelson Shu-Yung Chuang (Rept. No. 104);

S. 515. A bill for the relief of Nathaniel Wong (Rept. No. 105);

S. 644. A bill for the relief of Anthony Agustino Scrivanich (Rept. No. 106);

S. 657. A bill for the relief of David Y. Ong (Rept. No. 107);

S. 754. A bill for the relief of John (Ioannis) Legatos (Rept. No. 108);

S. 799. A bill for the relief of Eldur Eha (Rept. No. 109);

S. 800. A bill for the relief of Maria Naldo (Rept. No. 110); and

S. 895. A bill for the relief of Josefa Kusiak (Rept. No. 111).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 687. A bill for the relief of Stylianos Lecomples (Rept. No. 112).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution favoring appropriate observance of National Hospital Week (Rept. No. 102).

## SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the case of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 101) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation pursuant to the provisions of section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat 214; 8 U. S. C. 1254 (c)):

A-1618471, Avis, Solomon.
A-5972321, Barbalat, Robert Samuel.
A-4530872, Caplan, Jacob.
A-8291885, Dreeka, Farres.
A-5982370, Givot, Simon.
A-5341909, Gutierrez-Cantu, Matilde.
A-2069878, Jurado-Portillo, Alberto.
A-4689730, Korkaris, Spiridon Ioanou.
A-10065801, Kratka, Abraham.
A-3843882, Lentzner, Rudolf.
A-3560108, Lopez-Varela, Angel.
A-3791973, Mandisky, Ceslaw.
E-072770, Olson, Gustav Olov.
A-1285420, Radman, Annie Elizabeth.
A-1917568, Slobodian, Moses.
A-4587587, Burck, Jacob.
A-1407721, Romano, Antonio.
A-4963187, Zaytoun, Eunice Zatone Eunice.
A-4811296, Dagostaro, Sebastiano.
A-5055225, Fishman, Nathan.
A-2144176, Flores-Duran, Jesus.
A-8619031, Goldbogen, Joseph.
E-131756, Hermans, Charles Ferdinand.
A-5006378, Jez, Franciszek.
A-2109682, Lopez, Secundo.
A-3549317, Murphy, George Patrick.
A-5905086, Rintrona, Paul
A-4306639, Scuteri, Antonino.
A-3787439, Soeldner, William.
A-4167441, Swain-Rios, Raul.
A-1266712, Pozniak, Joseph George.
A-4237764, Rios-Beltran, Francisco.
A-3903054, Bernhardt, Joseph.
A-4390213, Bernhardt, Julia.
A-2854445, Chatlos, Peter Joseph Paul.
A-2663770, Drozda, Steve.
A-2663834, Gallo, Ettore.
A-8891753, Ginsberg, Samuel.
A-8729317, Ierna, Louis.
A-5398485, Kleingeld, Jan Antonie.
A-1667195, Kvederis, George.
A-1805400, Pacuka, William.
A-1953485, Rizzo, Emanuel.
A-3334493, Rozko, Gleb.
A-5920350, Tilinski, Blaise.
A-1832692, Haszaji, Janos.
A-4648788, Spiet, Casimer Joseph.
A-6036505, Wojcik, Andrzej.
A-3549327, Acks, Benjamin.
A-3540280, Camarillo-Hernandez, Melescio.
A-5957928, Conforti, John.
A-5283587, Herman, Carl.
A-4699846, Herman, Helen.
A-2331514, Geier, Michael.
A-4451943, Glocher, Louis.
A-3023919, Gomex-Romero, Macario.
A-3927637, Gordon, Sidney Dimitro.
A-2305717, Goris, Modeste.
A-4578869, Kelsik, Karl Charles.
A-3113854, Lichtstrahl, Nathan.
A-3284190, Nagy, Ferencz Fre.
A-10392951, Semrau, Otto.
A-3326451, Stefanich, Robert John.
A-4951722, Baker, Cyril Joseph.
A-1125010, Delgadillo-Bautista, Jose Audon.
A-2884715, Farhat, Assad.
A-5023157, Henry, Nellie.
A-5357355, Maggio, Anthony.

A-8728319, Mai, Felix.
A-1776754, Meldahl, Ludvik Theodore.
A-5282674, Oaxaca-Licon, Miguel.
A-2654872, Palacios, Manuel Antonio.
A-1009799, Pina, Edwin James.
A-5875661, Sowinski, Andrew Michael.
A-1355134, Strand, Emil.
A-10145314, Thomson, George Washington.
A-4827436, Corona, Vidal.
A-4578246, Corona, Maria Mercedes Murillo De.
A-3955408, Fillion, Pierre Joseph.
A-5003117, Steigerwald, Joseph.
A-3960477, Yettra, Max Henry.
A-4538625, Zinkiewicz, Theodore Stanley.
A-7387847, Aboglie, Andrew.
A-10238757, Falsbein, Lillie.
A-3559457, Farino, Pasquale.
A-8846019, Januskiewicz, Stella.
A-3872504, Navarro, Antonio.
A-3343832, Rollack, Walter.
A-5556763, Rose, George.
A-5164395, Stagliano, Alexander.
A-3917088, Vitale, Marie Rose Dolores.
A-5608431, Wagman, Anna.
A-5953152, Zuniga-Ayala, Gil.
A-5522981, Angelo, Joseph.
A-1136722, Battista, Domonick.
A-3115920, Cutrona, Paolo.
A-2433364, De Witt, Hendrick Mathilde.
A-2313159, Garza-Martinez, Anastacio.
A-5642228, Ivnitsky, Morris.
A-5055209, Johnson, Eric Gustav Christian.
A-8330014, Jurina, Stephen Martin.
A-5267881, Kaczmarek, Anthony Frank.
A-5578905, Karasiewicz, Bronislaw Daniel.
A-5526604, Karow, Harry.
A-4920268, Murphy, Frances Lavine.
A-3940909, Ferrone, Gasper.
A-4229759, Quong, Mong Lai.
A-4818926, Rivnyak, Michael.
A-5383872, Rosenzweig, Joseph.
A-4935411, Rye, Agil.
A-2837467, Teleshefsky, Harry.
A-4325513, Tkachuk, Peter.
A-1755685, Zajatz, Ivan.
A-8959188, Fajardo, Marcos.
A-4371961, Gum, Tang.
A-5621394, Geoniotes, Demetros Georgi.
A-3455978, Kucharik, John Paul.
A-4753662, Lubrano, Daniel.
A-4613965, Sanchez, Gil Ramirez.
A-4428360, Schwartz, Nathan.
A-3823508, Schwartz, Rebecca.
A-5907730, Abosketes, Nick.
A-3556323, Ciechomski, John.
A-2316600, Evtushik, Ulian.
A-5264444, Kahan, Isidore.
A-3149068, La Hood, John Joseph.
A-10165019, Leonard, Joseph Frank.
A-4647042, Maskovic, John Peter.
A-2917332, Mitchell, George Paul Vucenovich.
A-1258853, Strauber, Erwin.
A-3193490, Tresca, Benny.
A-3356111, Trost, Molly.

## WITHDRAWAL OF SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ASHUN YUNG—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution withdrawing suspension of deportation of Ashun Yung, and I submit a report (No. 100) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress in accordance with section 246 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U. S. C. A. 1256 (a)), withdraws the suspension of deportation in the case of Ashun Yung (A-4196469) which was previously granted by the Attorney General and approved by the Congress.

## CITATION OF PAULINE FEUER FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original resolution citing Pauline Feuer for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 98) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 103) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the President of the Senate certify, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana, the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Pauline Feuer before the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, to answer questions pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, to the end that the said Pauline Feuer may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

## CITATION OF LUDWIG RAJCHMANN (OR RAJCHMAN) FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original resolution citing Ludwig Rajchmann (or Rajchman) for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 99) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 104) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the President of the Senate certify, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the failure and refusal of Ludwig Rajchmann (or Rajchman), to respond to a subpena ad testificandum issued by the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, appear before it as a witness and to answer questions pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, to the end that the said Ludwig Rajchmann (or Rajchman) may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

## REPORT ENTITLED "IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 115)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 172, 84th Congress, 2d session, as extended by Senate Resolution 84, 85th Congress, I submit a report entitled "Immigration and Naturalization," and request that it be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Mississippi.

## REPORT ENTITLED "IMPROVEMENTS IN THE FEDERAL CRIMINAL CODE"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 114)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 166, 84th Congress, as extended by Senate Resolution 84, 85th Congress, I submit a report entitled "Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code." I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Wyoming.

## PROGRESS REPORT ON REORGANIZATION OF THE PASSPORT OFFICE, DEPARTMENT OF STATE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 113)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit, on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, a report on the progress made and the resulting improvements in the operations of the Passport Office of the Department of State.

This report is a summary of actions taken to improve the services rendered to the public by the Passport Office as a result of a reorganization program initiated by the committee during the 84th Congress, at my request. It sets forth the accomplishments made toward modernization of that Office by a team of Federal experts assigned to a reorganization team for that purpose, and the results attained, which have now enabled the Passport Office to expedite the issuance of passports within 3 days after receipt of an application, an accomplishment never before attained in its history at this period of the year. The report also points up certain areas which still remain to be perfected through further organization processes, most of which are now being implemented, in order to insure that its operations will be maintained at a high standard of performance.

The report contains extracts from reports of the General Accounting Office and the General Services Administration on this subject, both of which agencies were active participants in the reorganization program.

A special report prepared by a task force of the Travel Advisory Committee of the Department of Commerce, composed of representatives of the principal travel agencies of the country, is included in the report of the committee. It provides an excellent résumé of the history of passport operations and accomplishments under the reorganization program, and also contains certain recommendations regarding the possible adjustment of passport fees. In accordance with these recommendations, the

chairman of the Committee on Government Operations has requested the Comptroller General of the United States to continue a study of passport fees initiated by the General Accounting Office in order to make a closer determination relative to all the costs involved in connection with the issuance of passports, and other Federal services related thereto. The following is a list of the members of the Travel Advisory Committee and their affiliations:

Travel Advisory Committee, United States Department of Commerce, industry executives present at meeting at Washington, D. C., January 24, 1957:

Jess B. Bennett, assistant to the president, Braniff International Airways.

James L. Bossemeyer, executive vice president, National Association of Travel Organizations.

John F. Brennan, vice president, United States Lines.

Eric Friedheim, editor and publisher, the Travel Agent.

Raymond H. Hering, American Society of Travel Agents.

L. C. Jaynes, president, National Trailways Bus System.

A. J. Keenan, general passenger traffic manager, Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc.

Willis G. Lipscomb, vice president, traffic and sales, Pan American World Airways System.

Godfrey Macdonald, vice president, Grace Line.

Donald Montgomery, associate manager, Washington office, American Hotel Association.

Bruce W. Macnamee, executive assistant, American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc.

William H. McConnell, vice president in charge of passenger traffic, American Export Lines.

G. E. Owen, general manager of touring services, General Drafting Co.

E. B. Padrick, chairman, Trans-Continental Passenger Association.

Ted Patrick, editor, Holiday Magazine.

William D. Patterson, associate publisher, the Saturday Review.

Norman J. Philion, director, travel facilitation, Air Transport Association of America.

Royal W. Ryan, executive vice president, New York Convention and Visitors Bureau, Inc.

Russell E. Singer, executive vice president, American Automobile Association.

T. A. Taylor, vice president, Trans World Airlines, Inc.

Somerset R. Waters, Child & Waters, Inc.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the chairman of the committee to the Comptroller General, and his reply, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 5, 1957.

Hon. JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
*Comptroller General of the United States, General Accounting Office, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: Further reference is made to that section of your annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, which relates to the reorganization and modernization of the Passport Office of the Department of State.

On June 19, 1956, following the filing of the report of this committee on the reorganization of the Passport Office (S. Rept. 1604, 84th Cong.), the Travel Advisory Committee of the Department of Commerce, comprising representatives of the principal travel agents of the United States, appointed a special task force to consider all problems involved, as outlined in the committee's report.

On January 17, 1957, the task force of the Travel Advisory Committee submitted a draft of a committee report. At a meeting held in the Department of Commerce under the direction of the Assistant Secretary for International Affairs, this report was approved unanimously, and the Travel Advisory Committee adopted the recommendations as contained in the attached copy.

You will note that on page 12 of this report, the committee recommended that the General Accounting Office be requested to continue its cost accounting study to make a closer determination relative to the cost of issuance of passports, with a view to effecting appropriate changes in the present fees. You will further note that considerable basic information is contained in this report relating to the cost involved in connection with consideration of applications, the issuance of passports, and other services rendered to citizens who hold passports.

This committee is presently considering the submission of an additional report on the progress of reorganization of the Passport Office and will state therein that you will be requested to initiate such a study as recommended by the Travel Advisory Committee, and to submit a report to this committee for consideration.

In conformity therewith, the committee wishes to officially request that such a study be initiated at the earliest date possible, and that the results thereof be submitted to the committee.

Thanking you for your cooperation in this matter, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
*Chairman.*

---

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
*Washington, February 7, 1957.*

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
*Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter dated February 5, 1957, and enclosures, relative to the reorganization and modernization of the Passport Office of the Department of State.

This matter will be given immediate attention and we will be pleased to furnish you a report.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
*Comptroller General of the United States.*

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Committee on Government Operations, which gave consideration to legislation in the 84th Congress dealing with an increase in passport fees; the establishment of a revolving fund in order to provide more flexibility of operations for the Office, in the form of adequate funds, equipment, and personnel to meet the peak seasonal demands for passports; and to elevate the Office to a United States Passport Service, has deferred any further recommendations for legislative action pending completion of the study which has now been undertaken by the Comptroller General.

The committee report is most encouraging, and indicates that the Passport Office is current in its operations in spite of continually increasing applications for passports. There are several problems remaining, however, for which permanent solutions are yet to be achieved. For instance, there is a question as to whether passport fees should be adjusted, either upward or downward. Or perhaps the solution lies in the development of formulas which would tend to permit the Government to assess appropriate fees for such services, as revenue, under certain circumstances, while removing inequities or hardships which may exist in special types of cases through lower fees. A solution to this problem will not be attempted until the report requested by the committee has been submitted to it by the Comptroller General.

There are also indications that there is a need for more latitude for the Director of the Passport Office to reclassify efficient employees to merited higher grades, and to remove or transfer certain employees who have not shown sufficient aptitude to conform to the requirements of the modernized operations of the Passport Office. These latter employees could doubtless be transferred to positions within the Department of State, or other agencies of the Government, where they could be more readily absorbed into other Federal programs or operations, thus permitting the Director to effect deserved promotions for other employees who have adjusted themselves to the modernized operation and are able to better perform the services required.

The General Services Administration recommends further improvements in paperwork management by eliminating the present practice of combining old passport files which have been retired to the records centers with files on new applications in the current records, and through the reduction and simplification of the master index which I am informed now requires the insertion of much unnecessary information and entries which serve no useful purpose.

In its report on improved paperwork procedures, which was released recently, the General Service Administration estimates that net savings of $386,000 have resulted from improved paperwork procedures in the Passport Office, of which $332,000 will be recurring savings.

The following summary of results from the improved paperwork procedures adopted by the Passport Office was included in the GSA report:

*Summary of results from improved paperwork procedures*

ONETIME SAVINGS

| | |
|---|---|
| Replacement value of 1,700 file cabinets released for reuse | $85,000 |
| Less cost of new shelving, boxes, and other equipment required | 35,942 |
| Total | 49,058 |
| Elimination of backlogs through increased production: | |
| Filing 1 million papers (10 man-years) | 32,000 |
| Correspondence 5,000 letters (0.6 man-year) | 2,500 |
| File searching 60,000 pieces (0.5 man-year) | 1,630 |
| Adjudicating and processing 60,000 applications (6 man-years) | 24,000 |
| | 60,130 |
| Less cost of installing filing equipment | 14,985 |
| Total | 45,145 |
| Total onetime savings | 94,203 |

*Summary of results from improved paperwork procedures*—Continued

RECURRING SAVINGS

| | |
|---|---|
| Release of 6,000 square feet of space by use of shelving instead of file cabinets | $26,162 |
| Release of space and equipment by regular transfer of old files to Federal Records Center | 31,918 |
| Decreased cost of printing 600,000 smaller passport books | 48,000 |
| Combination of application forms and use of less expensive supplies | 10,250 |
| Improved rate of production in issuing 546,470 passports during 1956 (22 man-years) | 88,000 |
| Additional improvement in rate of production in issuing 625,000 passports (estimated) during 1957 (32 man-years) | 128,000 |
| Total recurring savings | 332,330 |
| Total savings | 426,533 |
| Cost of GSA survey team (4.5 man-years) | 40,040 |
| Net savings to Government | 386,493 |

It is estimated by the GSA that, if the further recommended improvements in paperwork procedures are adopted, including those I have cited, annual savings of in excess of $700,000 will result when the predicted workload of the Passport Office reaches its future potential.

In the eighth annual progress report of the joint program to improve accounting in the Government, just released jointly by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Comptroller General of the United States, it was stated that improved communications services through the use of teletype with field services of the Passport Office has resulted in annual savings of $8,500, and the improved mailing system adopted by the Office under the reorganization program has resulted in annual savings of $150,000.

These savings, and those reported by the General Services Administration to which I have referred, bring the estimated annual savings effected since the reorganization program has become effective to more than a half million dollars annually, with a possible annual saving of twice that figure by 1960. As gratifying as such savings are to the committee, the major accomplishment is the fact that, at least as of this date, the Passport Office is current in its operations, and is now prepared to cope with the expected demands for passports during the impending peak travel period without the creation of the tremendous backlogs which have resulted during the past 4 or 5 years. The Committee on Government Operations will continue its interest in and surveillance of the operations of the Passport Office in order to assure the American traveling public of prompt and efficient service. The objective will be to insure that the Office not only retains its present current operating status, but may be properly geared to accelerate its services to meet the increasing demands of the atomic age of travel which the travel experts have predicted will develop within the next few years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

## EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Randolph H. Weber, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Missouri, vice Rubey M. Hulen.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1350. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gottfried Krodel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1351. A bill to provide that certain amounts paid to the Post Office Department by other Government agencies as postal revenue with respect to matter placed in the mails by such agencies shall be considered as receipts of the post offices where such matter is mailed; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 1352. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Fairview Cemetery Association, Inc., Wahpeton, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1353. A bill for the relief of Ayako Yoshida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1354. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1955, to extend the time during which annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims subject to that act may be made; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 1355. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. REVERCOMB when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 1356. A bill to amend the antitrust laws by vesting in the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction to prevent monopolistic acts or practices and other unlawful restraints in commerce by certain persons engaged in commerce in meat and meat products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1357. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the Nevada Silver Centenary and the 100th anniversary of the discovery of the Comstock Lode at Virginia City, Nev.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1358. A bill for the relief of Johanna Mayne; and

S. 1359. A bill for the relief of Franz Hehn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1360. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Geraldine Elaine Sim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1361. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Department of Highways of the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Pigeon River"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. 1362. A bill to provide for a minimum acreage allotment for corn and increased incentive for production adjustment; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1363. A bill for the relief of Vassilios Kostikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 1364. A bill for the relief of William Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1365. A bill for the relief of Milenko Krnjajich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1366. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska," as amended;

S. 1367. A bill to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities;

S. 1368. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and

S. 1369. A bill to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U. S. C. 315); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the first three above-mentioned bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution to authorize the sale of a certain number of merchant-type vessels to the Government of India or to citizens of India for use in the coastwise trade of such country; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

## CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions were reported, and placed on the calendar:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the case of certain aliens; and

S. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution withdrawing suspension of deportation of Ashun Yung.

(See the above concurrent resolutions printed in full which appear under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

## RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were reported and placed on the calendar:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 103. Resolution citing Pauline Feuer for contempt of the Senate; and

S. Res. 104. Resolution citing Ludwig Rajchmann (or Rajchman) for contempt of the Senate.

(See the above resolutions printed in full which appear under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

## INCREASED PENSIONS TO CERTAIN ANNUITANTS

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes.

In introducing this bill I desire to call attention to the fact that those who are having the most difficult time today in gaining the necessaries of life, and in paying their way of livelihood, are persons with small fixed incomes, and particularly older people who are confronted with the costs of living without capacity to add to their incomes.

The bill would give to all annuitants under civil service a reasonable increase, and in particular it would take care of those who were not covered in the increase of 1948.

I therefore introduce the bill, and ask that it be appropriately referred, and I hope that at an early date the Congress will enact it into law. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1355) to increase annuities payable to certain annuitaints from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. REVERCOMB, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## AMENDMENT OF ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the antitrust laws. The measure is the result of many complaints which have been made to the antitrust and monopoly subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the operations of packers and others. It is the outgrowth of preliminary hearings last year and as a result of many complaints from cattle growers, small meat packers, and other groups in the meat industry, the members of the subcommittee have arrived at the conclusion that certain basic changes are necessary in the administration of the antitrust laws as applied to the meat packing industry.

The Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, among other things, gave the Secretary of Agriculture jurisdiction over certain monopolistic practices defined as unfair in this very important industry. This exemption carved out of the antitrust statutes has over the years created a vacuum against which the regulatory power of the Federal Trade Commission over unfair acts and practices could not be brought to bear.

The packing industry stands between the movement of livestock from the farm to the consumer. The importance of the major packers is not, however, limited to meat and meat products. They are also involved in, and produce or distribute, such diverse items as plant foods, soybean and cottonseed oils, eggs, poultry, cheese, margarine, soap, detergents, adhesives, glycerine, curled hair, leather, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, sporting goods, and other basically unrelated items.

By reason of the court interpretation placed on section 406 (b) of the Packers and Stockyards Act, the FTC has been excluded from jurisdiction over the so-called unrelated items, as well as unfair trade practices in the packing industry as such. For example, title I of the Packers and Stockyards Act defines a meatpacker in such a way that it has been possible over the years for a nonpacker, such as the Carnation Milk Co., to acquire a small packing operation and thus remove from FTC enforcement many of the facets of its original business. This has been accomplished even after the Federal Trade Commission has started proceedings against such a company.

With these problems in mind, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and I have prepared a bill which would restore to the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction over unfair trade practices in the meatpacking and related industries. It would seem to me that the only way the basic and important antitrust problems can be solved in this field is to place the jurisdiction over such matters squarely in antitrust enforcement agencies. The entire history of enforcement of such matters within the Department of Agriculture has shown a complete lack of interest insofar as these antitrust concepts are concerned. Hence, the bill which we introduce separates the antitrust problems from the supervisory problems insofar as agricultural markets are concerned, leaving the latter within the Department of Agriculture and subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and placing the former in the Federal Trade Commission, where they sensibly belong.

Testimony given before the subcommittee, and facts gathered in staff investigations, have clearly shown that antitrust complaints placed before the Secretary of Agriculture in this wide field of our economy have been pigeonholed year after year. No serious efforts have ever been made within the Department of Agriculture to deal with such problems. The failure of the Department of Agriculture to enforce the Packers and Stockyards Act against meat packers illustrates the danger of entrusting prosecutive functions to an agency whose other duties require close cooperation with the industry. Since the Department is dependent upon information supplied by the industry, and must maintain close liaison with the industry in the performance of its other responsibilities, there is little prospect of real enforcement of the unfair trade practices provisions of the act. Such dependence upon the industry nullifies the effectiveness of the prosecutive function.

In defense of the Department of Agriculture I might say that it is not an antitrust enforcement agency and although it has done a very commendable job in enforcing those sections of the Packers and Stockyards Act resulting in protection to the growers through the marketing channels and, particularly through the stockyards. This bill would not change this jurisdiction, but I again wish to stress that it only returns antitrust jurisdiction over unfair trade practices to the Federal Trade Commission from which it was taken in 1921. I have been given to understand that this change was made by mistake. If the Department of Agriculture had vigorously enforced the Packers and Stockyards Act as written in 1921, it would not be necessary at the last moment to introduce this bill today.

On February 27, 1920, a consent decree was entered against the major packing companies—Swift & Co., Armour & Co., Morris & Co., Wilson & Co., Inc., the Cudahy Packing Co., and others, which among other things, limited the fields of activities in which these concerns could engage. Under this decree the large companies involved were excluded from engaging in the distribution—both at the wholesale and retail level—of many grocery items.

Three of these companies included in the decree are currently petitioning the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to modify the decree in such a manner as to permit these large concerns to again engage in the distribution and sale of grocery items. Such a change in the consent decree could, of course, place these large packers in direct competition with food chains and stores, big and small. Should the court grant this modification, it would seem the height of folly, certainly insofar as the enforcement of the antitrust laws is concerned, to continue to limit the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission over such a segment of the grocery industry and place the Department of Agriculture in the impossible position of responsibility for unfair acts and practices in an enforcement field where it has no experience and little interest.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1356) to amend the antitrust laws by vesting in the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction to prevent monopolistic acts or practices and other unlawful restraints in commerce by certain persons engaged in commerce in meat and meat products, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. WATKINS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES IN COMMEMORATION OF NEVADA SILVER CENTENARY

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the coinage of silver 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the Nevada Silver Centenary in 1959 and the 100th anniversary of the discovery of the Comstock lode at Virginia City, Nev.

The bill would authorize the issuance of not less than 500,000 silver 5-cent pieces for general circulation.

Today Virginia City, sometimes called America's liveliest ghost town, is making plans to become the hub of a statewide celebration in 1959 commemorating this opening chapter in Nevada's statehood. My State wants the entire country to join in this tribute to those hardy workmen who took nearly $1 billion worth of gold and silver from beneath Virginia City.

The story of Virginia City and the Comstock lode is one of the exclamatory chapters in the American record. For 30 years following the discovery of almost illimitable deposits of precious metals in northern Nevada in 1859, Virginia City was a dateline in the news of the world of importance comparable to Boston, London, or Paris. It was the scene of a concerted gold rush which for intensity and drama dwarfed even the rush to California's mother lode a decade earlier. Recoveries made from its vast deposits of gold and silver in the early years of the lode helped finance the Union cause in the Civil War, and prompted President Lincoln's urgent advocacy of the admission of Nevada Territory to the Union of States. Its steady production of tangible wealth in the closing decades of the 19th century reared San Francisco as one of the glittering metropolises of the world and aided greatly in its rebuilding after the earthquake and fire of 1906.

The names that peopled Virginia City in its golden years are the names of American legend. Here were founded the early fortunes of Senator George Hearst, whose son, with Comstock wealth, was to build the greatest of all newspaper empires. From the deep mines of the Comstock came the money with which John Mackay was to erect a worldwide communications system of cables and telegraphs. Adolph Sutro, most beloved of San Francisco mayors, made his stake in Virginia City; so did Marcus Daly, later to be celebrated as the most powerful of the copper kings of Montana. Virginia City's contributions to the statecraft of the Nation included such silver Senators as William M. Stewart, "father of mining law," John Percival Jones, Key Pittman, and Pat McCarran. It was as a member of the editorial staff of the Territorial Enterprise that Samuel Langhorne Clemens first signed a story with the name destined for immortality—Mark Twain. The Territorial Enterprise is still published to this day as Nevada's first newspaper, and will celebrate its own centenary next year.

In the annals of the old American West the name of Virginia City will live forever with those of Tombstone, Deadwood, Hangtown, Dodge City, and Abilene, as outposts of the western frontier. Its contribution to the national wealth has been in the hundreds of millions in precious metals; its contribution to the national folklore and the record of achievement is illimitable.

The State of Nevada hopes that Americans everywhere will join in honoring this 100th anniversary of the Comstock lode, a chapter in the annuals of America that will never fade from memory.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1357) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the Nevada silver centenary and the 100th anniversary of the discovery of the Comstock Lode at Virginia City, Nev., introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

---

## CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE ACROSS PIGEON RIVER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would authorize the Department of Highways of the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Pigeon River, in a joint undertaking with Canada. Authority for the construction of this bridge was previously granted by Congress in 1945, as Public Law 66, 79th Congress. This authority, however, expired in 1947, when efforts to effect an agreement between the State of Minnesota and the Province of Ontario officials failed.

With the passage of the Federal Highway Act of 1953, and renewed negotiations between Minnesota and Ontario authorities, the prospects for an early joint agreement to relocate trunk Highway 61 and to construct an international bridge below the High Falls of the Pigeon River are now excellent.

Mr President, providing authority for the new bridge will make possible the relocation of trunk Highway No. 61 to provide a more scenic route to Canada along the last 16 miles of the famous North Shore of Minnesota. This stretch will provide one of the most spectacular scenic drives of the North American continent, and will be a great tourist attraction.

With new assurances from the Canadian authorities, and the assistance being provided by the new Highway Act, there is every reason now to move forward vigorously and swiftly to make possible this fine new international bridge and highway.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1361) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Department of Highways of the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Pigeon River," introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the act approved May 29, 1945, authorizing the Department of Highways of the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Pigeon River so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation below High Falls on said Pigeon River, is hereby revived and reenacted. This Act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to is commenced within four years and completed within six years from the date of enactment of this Act.

---

## MINIMUM ACREAGE ALLOTMENT FOR CORN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 3 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide a minimum national acreage allotment on corn and to provide greater incentive to participation in necessary production adjustments through the soil bank.

Mr. President, it is obvious to everyone in the Corn Belt that we face an extremely serious situation unless some more realistic program is provided for our corn producers this year. My colleagues from corn States on both sides of the aisle will agree to that necessity. The Department of Agriculture recognizes it.

Several alternative proposals are now before us. My measure contains some modifications of the administration program which I believe will make it more workable. We are not far apart. The intent of all of us, I am sure, is the same. The task now is to get action.

I have purposefully delayed rushing legislative language until every possibility of getting together could be explored. What I am now offering, while not all that might be desirable, is, in my humble opinion, the minimum incentive we must offer to get the participation we need.

Any program is a costly failure if it does not get the farmer participation necessary to achieve our objectives. It is not economy for the administration to hold down support loan levels or soil bank payments if by so doing we discourage farmers from participating and fail to get the production adjustment the soil bank is seeking.

For that reason, while accepting the same acreage allotment minimum the Department agrees is justified, my measure asks for a price support loan level of not less than $1.50 a bushel; provided, however, that producers must put 15 percent of their allotment in the soil bank to qualify for the support loans.

The only way we are going to get corn production trimmed down is to make it more attractive for farmers to participate than for them to stay out of the program. My measure does that. The grower who cooperates will be able to get a better total return from his farm than the grower who refuses to cooperate and overplants his corn.

The old argument that higher support levels are inconsistent with getting farmers to curtail production through the soil bank is irrelevant in this case because the farmer must participate in the soil bank to get his support loan on what he does produce.

My proposal also limits support loans to 16,000 bushels from any one producer—high enough to include almost all bona fide farmers, yet enough of a limit to ban huge loans to a few mass producers.

Only one other provision is included in my bill. It calls for establishing the allowable carryover of corn for purposes of computing normal supply, used in price-support and acreage-allotment calculations, at the same percentage level as now used for cotton.

In the case of cotton, we recognize 30 percent of annual domestic consumption and estimated exports as an allowable carryover. In the case of corn, we allow only 15 percent. That has been the cause of much of our trouble, forcing allotments down to unreasonable levels.

The 30 percent allowable carryover I propose would only be enough corn to meet our needs for some 3½ months, and in view of what we have seen drought can do I think it is not only reasonable but prudent to make sure our reserves do not fall below that level.

My measure proposes the change in calculations for future years, not 1957.

However, if this provision had been in the law for this year, our acreage allotments would have been 47,800,000 acres and our price-support level $1.52 a bushel. At those levels we would have avoided the problem we now face.

My hope is that we can obtain enough corn compliance this year to permit normal workings of the formula next year without working hardship on our farmers.

The Department of Agriculture's grain branch has recognized that the larger allotment and higher support level would mean less, rather than more, production of corn.

Mr. President, I submitted my proposal to the Department of Agriculture, and asked it to compute for me the effects of the 30-percent carryover. In its computations, it estimated production for 1957, under existing provisions, at 3,200 million bushels, and under my liberalized formula at only 3,050 million bushels.

In a footnote, the Department explained the lower figure was "based on estimated higher participation, with resultant reduction in harvested acres."

That is the goal we are seeking. If the Department agrees we would move closer to that goal, that is the direction in which we should be moving.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the tables provided for me by the Department of Agriculture showing the computation of supply percentage and indicated price-support level on the basis of normal supply under current and my proposed legislation, which would provide for a 30 percent allowance for carryover.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Corn: Computation of supply percentage and indicated price support level basis normal supply under current and proposed legislation which would provide for a 30 percent allowance for carryover*

| | Actual | Proposed |
|---|---|---|
| NORMAL SUPPLY | | |
| 1. Domestic consumption (1956–57) | 3,044 | 3,044 |
| 2. Estimated exports (1957–58) | 110 | 110 |
| 3. Total (item 1 plus item 2) | 3,154 | 3,154 |
| 4. Allowance for carryover | [1] 473 | [2] 946 |
| 5. Indicated normal supply (item 3 plus item 4) | 3,627 | 4,100 |
| SUPPLY PERCENTAGE | | |
| 6. Indicated carryover (Oct. 1, 1957) | 1,415 | 1,415 |
| 7. Estimated production (1957) | 3,200 | [3] 3,050 |
| 8. Imports | 1 | 1 |
| 9. Total supply | 4,616 | 4,466 |
| 10. Supply percentage | 127.3 | 108.9 |
| PRICE SUPPORT RATE | | |
| 11. Parity (Sept. 15, 1956) | 1.77 | 1.77 |
| 12. Price support level (percent) | 77 | 86 |
| 13. Price support rate | $1.36 | $1.52 |

[1] 15 percent of item 3.
[2] 30 percent of item 3.
[3] Based on estimated higher participation with resultant reduction in harvested acres.

*Corn: Computation of 1957 corn allotment*

[In millions of bushels]

| | Actual | Proposed |
|---|---|---|
| I. NORMAL SUPPLY | | |
| 1. Domestic Consumption 1956–57 | 3,044 | 3,044 |
| 2. Exports, 1957–58 | 110 | 110 |
| 3. Total (1 plus 2) | 3,154 | 3,154 |
| 4. Allowance for carryover | [1] 473 | [2] 946 |
| 5. Normal supply (item 3 plus 4) | 3,627 | 4,100 |
| II. 1957 ALLOTMENT | | |
| 6. Indicated carryover (Oct. 1, 1957) | 1,415 | 1,415 |
| 7. Total production needed (item 5 to 6) | 2,212 | 2,685 |
| 8. Estimated production outside commercial area and imports | 534 | 534 |
| 9. Production needed in commercial area (item 7 to 8) | 1,678 | 2,151 |
| 10. Adjusted average yield in commercial area (bushels per acre) | 45.0 | 45.0 |
| 11. Indicated allotment for 1957 (item 9 divided by item 10) (acres) | 37,288,889 | 47,800,000 |

[1] Present law provides for 15 percent carryover allowance.
[2] Proposal is for a 30 percent carryover allowance.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, ample evidence exists from the corn producing country of the Midwest that far more farmers would cooperate if we increased allotments and raised support levels.

A significant survey was recently completed by The Farmer, a farm journal published in St. Paul and serving some 265,000 farm families in the upper Midwest. Its findings were published in the February 2 issue under the heading, "What the Corn Farmer Plans To Do."

The editors of the magazine conclude that "as the program now stands, very few appear willing to go along with the soil bank cutback on corn."

Mr. President, because this article is based on actual interviews with farmers, and shows their attitude toward corn legislation, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Farmer of February 2, 1957]

WHAT THE CORN FARMER PLANS TO DO

Scratching your head about what to do with corn allotment acres? You're not alone.

If the soil bank program stays the same as at present, few farmers will have trouble making up their minds. They won't comply. But many feel the program may be changed in coming weeks. If that happens, they aren't so sure.

Many feel present allotments are too small. The cutback from base acres—about 42 percent—has been too severe. Unless allotments are revised upward, or compliance payments increased, or both, few will put corn acres into the soil bank acreage reserve. Few will even stay within corn allotments.

Some county ASC officials are guessing no more than 5 percent of their farmers will stay within allotments, let alone put corn land into the soil bank. (Corn land put into the acreage reserve portion of the soil bank must be subtracted from allotted acres, thus reducing the amount of corn which can be planted accordingly. No harvestable crop can be removed from acres diverted to the acreage reserve.)

SIGN OF ENTIRE FARMS

In other counties, usually those with less productive, lower priced land, quite a few may comply. Landlords, particularly older ones, are considering putting all land into the soil bank—under both the acreage and the conservation reserve—where there is no problem of hardship to a tenant. Some young landowners in both the corn and wheat areas are signing up their entire farms and seeking employment off the farm.

Statewide, however, apparently no more than 10 percent or possibly 15 percent of Minnesota's corn farmers will comply, as the program now stands—and that may be an optimistic estimate. In South Dakota, possibly 10 percent will put some corn land into the soil bank. Twenty-five percent may stay within allotted acres, compared to 50 percent last year.

"Our allotments are too small" was the most common complaint from farmers queried about the program. "Corn is the only crop I can make any money at," and "this land is too valuable to let it lie idle," were other complaints.

A cross section survey by the Farmer throughout the main corn areas of Minnesota and South Dakota produced these comments.

"Only two farms in the county so far may go into the soil bank with all land; both are absentee owners and both are poorer farms."—Sibley County, Minn., ASC official.

"Unless the soil bank base is reestablished upward, or allotments increased, we will lose a lot of participants."—Blue Earth County, Minn., ASC committeeman.

"This is the first year I have been in doubt about staying within my corn allotment. Up until now I have always complied, but this cut in acres has been too severe."—Blue Earth County, Minn., farmer.

"Unless farmers get greater incentive, a lot more corn will be piling up, just as it has the past few years."—Jackson County, Minn., ASC official.

"Last year 30 percent of our farmers stayed within corn allotments. Yet 49 percent of all cropland in the county was in corn. Those 30 percent of farmers made the corn price for the rest. This year, if we don't get a change from the present program, there won't be 5 percent in the allotment program, let alone acreage reserve."—Nobles County, Minn., ASC official.

"I purchased a 230-acre farm for $10,000 5 years ago. I can now get a return of $2,630 per year through the acreage and conservation reserve programs. I plan to put that entire farm into the soil bank."—Clark County, S. Dak., landowner.

"We don't look for much interest in the program, not at a 42 percent cut in the historical corn base. When I ask farmers if they plan to comply, they answer 'corn is the only thing I can make any money at,'"—Minnehaha County, S. Dak., ASC official.

"Twenty-five to thirty younger farmers are planning to put all their land into the soil bank, go north and work in the taconite mines. More than that number of older farmers will likely put all their land in and retire. Even so, compliance this year will be less than in years past. We had more cropland in corn last year than normally. Farmers either comply, or they shoot the works and go way over."—Fillmore County, Minn., ASC official.

"I'll put my farm in. It had been under cash rental, but my renter already has another farm and I can make a little more through the soil bank. That will help me establish a better social security base for retirement next year. Also, my land has been farmed pretty hard. It needs a buildup of humus through a grass-legume cover crop."—Fillmore County, Minn., farm owner.

"Not many will comply, as the program now stands. Those who stayed in the past few years made the market for those who didn't. Those who stayed out raised a lot of corn and now have a good historical base."—Steele County, Minn., ASC official.

"If I stay in I'll pour fertilizer on all the corn I plant—something I have never done before—to try and raise more corn on 18 acres than I did on 30 acres before."—Steele County, Minn., farmer.

SOME WILL COMPLY

Not all farmers feel that way. A few can be found, by searching, who will go along with the program as it now stands.

One such is the 320-acre Joyce farm in Sibley County, Minn., owned by Anne and Mary Joyce and normally worked with hired help. The Joyce sisters have 114 acres of cropland, of which 32.7 acres is the 1957 corn allotment. Those 32.7 acres will all be put into the acreage reserve. (Normal corn compliance maximums are 20 acres or 30 percent of the allotment, whichever is larger. However, those who wish to put all allotted acres into the acreage reserve may so indicate when they sign up. After March 8, the final sign-up date, those who want to exceed the maximum will be allowed to do so if funds are available. Most officials have little doubt that ample funds will still be available. If funds are short in 1 county, or even 1 State, additional funds can be shifted to it by Federal officials from areas with excess funds.

Why are the Joyce sisters complying with the acreage reserve?

"It will help cut down surpluses. If corn is not trimmed back now, so much may pile up that we'll have no support prices some day," answers Mary Joyce.

Also, they hire all work done which increases their production costs. "The Government payment is a sure return, and a fairly good sized one, compared to what we normally net after subtracting production costs, crop insurance payments, and similar expenses," they point out.

Their acreage reserve payment, which hasn't yet been figured, will probably be between $45 and $50 per acre. Payments this year are figured according to an average county payment which has already been determined by Federal ASC officials. Individual payments are calculated by county committeemen from farm productivity comparisons of individual farms to that county average. Chippewa, County, Minn., for example, has a county average payment of $37 per acre. An individual farm payment might be 105 percent of that $37 county average, or 95 percent of it, based on the farm's comparative productivity to all farms in the county.

The smallest county average, for Minnesota, is $32 per acre for corn land. The largest, for Carver County, is $53.

Another farmer planning to comply is O. L. Norgaarden, Fillmore County, Minn., landowner. Off the farm for the past 12 years, he had been renting out his 120-acre farm for cash. This year his renter has found another place and his entire 103 acres of cropland will go into the soil bank—23.8 acres of corn ground into the acreage reserve at whatever county average payment is determined, the rest into the conservation reserve at $12 per acre, per year, rental.

TERMS OF "BANK" RENTAL

Land put into the conservation reserve will be seeded down to a grass-legume and left for 5 years. In addition to the $12 per acre payment he will receive 80 percent (between $9 and $10 per acre) of the cost of establishing the cover crop. That payment will be made only once, the first year. Land put in the acreage reserve will be put in 1 year at a time. That program, at present, extends only through 1959. (Payments for acreage reserve land are refigured each year and those who wish to reassign their allotment acres to the acreage reserve in 1958 and 1959 will have no priority, as the program stands at present, over farmers who do not comply this year but may decide next year. That situation will probably be rectified to give the man who wants to stay with the acreage reserve preferential treatment in 1958 and 1959.)

Mr. Norgaarden plans to seed down his corn allotment acres to a cover crop this year with the intention of reassigning them to the acreage reserve in 1958 and again in 1959. If he does that he will get a small bonus in 1958 (equal to an extra 10 percent of the normal 1958 payment, whatever that payment may be). He will not get Government help in the cost of establishing a cover crop on land diverted to the acreage reserve, but he may receive an ACP payment for a conservation practice applied to that land, if the practice is first approved by his local ASC committee.

At the end of 1959 he has the choice of switching land, formerly in the acreage reserve to the conservation reserve, or of taking a hay crop from that land. (Remember, acreage reserve, as it now stands, runs out 2 years sooner than Mr. Norgaarden's 5-year conservation reserve signup.) In either case, there will be a sharp reduction in income from that land, if no changes are made.

"The way I have it figured, I can make a little more money from the soil bank than I could by cash renting," says Mr. Norgaarden. "That helps establish a higher social-security base, gives me guaranteed income, and my land gets a rest."

Some other older farmers are looking at the program about that same way. Quite a few landlords are insisting on compliance with the allotment program and some on soil-bank compliance, says Sam Peterson, head of the program in Minnesota State ASC office. Some young landowners, renting their farms to neighbors in past years, will rent them to Uncle Sam this year and continue to work off the farm.

Many, many others, though, won't go into the program regardless of how it may be changed.

In Nobles County, Minn., for example, of 4,200 farmers eligible to vote on the corn referendum last December 11, only 953—less than 1 out of 4—did vote. Three of four farmers, apparently, had no intention of complying with a corn program, regardless of what it might be. "The way it looks to us right now, if the present program goes through we may have as high as 60 percent of all the cropland in the county in corn next year," Nobles County officials estimate. That is an unprecedented acreage planted to one crop.

"I haven't been in the program in past years, and I sure can't go in now," says young Wilbert Pilseels, Sibley County. "I plant about 30 acres of corn a year, feed part of it, and sell the rest on the open market. Last year I got $1.42 per bushel for some of my corn; in 1955 I got $1.10. This year, if I stayed within my allotments, I'd have only 17.5 acres. If I put 5 or 6 acres of that in the silo there wouldn't be enough left to do anything with."

Charles Cramer, a Blue Earth County farmer, feels about the same way. "Up until this year I stayed in the program, sealed my corn, bought unsupported corn to feed, and was money ahead. But I'm on the fence now. I normally plant about 50 acres of corn. This year my allotment is 38.7 acres. With this $300 per acre land, it's pretty hard to leave much of it idle."

Melvin Hatlestad, Minnehaha County, S. Dak., who has also always complied in the past, feels the same. "I've got a normal corn base history of 100 acres. This year my allotment is only 57.6 acres. I'm not sure yet what to do."

"However," continues Mr. Hatlestad, who is also Minnehaha County ASC office manager, "farmers feel a change is coming. In my own case, if I could put, say, 60 acres into corn and an additional 18 into the acreage reserve (approximately his allotment, had the December 11 referendum been approved), I'd be tempted to go along. I might even put another 10 acres into the conservation reserve."

Quite a few farmers, hoping for a change in the program, would like to see allowances made for adding acreage reserve acres above present allotments. Anton A. Resler, chairman of the Steele County, Minn., ASC committee, for example, points out that "I'd be willing to put the balance between my allotted acres and my soil bank base acreage (historic base from which this year's 42 percent cut was made) into the acreage reserve. Then I'd go along with the soil-bank program. But as the program stands, I won't comply."

State officials, too, would like to see revisions in the program. "There is obvious need for controls," points out a Minnesota official. "We hope for enough modifications in the program to get at least some compliance."

Will the changes—if there are to be changes—come in time for farmers to firm up plans before corn planting? That, too, is one you can scratch your head about.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, time is running out. We were late in getting the administration's recommendations. It was early this month before the Secretary finished his opening presentation to our Senate Committee on Agriculture. We are hopeful that the House will act on similar legislation this week. But we in the Senate must proceed ourselves.

My colleague on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural

Production, Marketing and Stabilization of Prices, of which I am a member, has very thoughtfully invited me to conduct corn hearings in view of the heavy economic interest of my State in corn.

It was my hope to open such hearings tomorrow, but witnesses needed from the Department of Agriculture will be tied up before other House committees. Other hearings conflicted each day this week. For that reason we are now scheduling the corn hearings for next Monday.

Because it appears unlikely, however, that we can get both Houses of Congress to concur on corn legislation before the March 8 deadline now established for all signups in the soil bank, I intend to ask the subcommittee to recommend to the Department of Agriculture a 1-month emergency postponement of the deadline for the corn signup. I believe it is justified, in view of the fact that the Department has allowed us in Congress only about a month after the Secretary completed his presentation to hold hearings, work out suitable legislation, and get it enacted in the Senate and House.

I am hopeful that we can forget partisanship, and work together to protect the economy of the Midwest. Toward that end, I am inviting all Senators on our Senate Agriculture Committee from corn-producing States, whether members of our subcommittee or not, to sit in on the pending hearings.

My sincere hope is that we can obtain the cooperation of our colleagues primarily interested in other commodities in expediting action to avert a severe economic blow to the Midwest, which in the end would harm all agriculture.

I caution some of my colleagues from the Southwest that unless a realistic program is worked out for corn, attracting more acreage into the soil bank, more and more corn producers will be shifting into grain sorghum to make a livelihood, and thereby complicate the problems already confronting sorghum producers. Some trend is already evident in that direction. The same magazine I previously referred to, The Farmer, has a cover page article in its February 2 issue entitled "Sorghum for Those Corn Acres."

It will not do us much good just to shift from corn to another feed grain when our total feed supply is excessive. What we need to do is to pull more acres out of production entirely. Yet farmers must make a living one way or another, and will expand plantings rather than retract them unless we provide adequate means for them to exist on less acres.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the article about sorghum to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SORGHUM FOR THOSE CORN ACRES

(By James E. Sharon)

Grain sorghum, an old crop with a new personality, appears likely to become a major crop in the Corn Belt this year. All the way from South Dakota and Nebraska, across Iowa and southern Minnesota, into Illinois, farmers are figuring it in with their 1957 crop plans.

An unusual combination of circumstances brought it about. From 1 to 3 straight years of dry weather gave improved standard varieties a chance to show ability to yield as much as 100 bushels per acre alongside fields of corn that shriveled. Continued average cutbacks on corn and wheat have caused farmers to look for another crop to fit the rotation. Now, limited quantities of grain sorghum hybrids with up to 30 percent yield potential are available for the first time, for use in adapted areas.

At South Dakota State College, the head of the agronomy department, Dr. W. W. Worzella, sees no reason why grain sorghum acreage shouldn't increase considerably in the State and elsewhere this year. C. J. Franzke, plant breeder, who for more than 20 years has been developing better sorghum varieties, puts it even stronger: "South Dakota's grain sorghum acreage climbed 60 percent in 1956, from the 200,000 acres in 1955. I look for a 100 percent increase in acreage for 1957."

There are good reasons for this. Said a Union County, S. Dak., farmer: "I've been beaten out of a corn crop for 2 years running, by dry weather. The little bit of grain sorghum I raised went better than 30 bushels to the acre. I'll be planting a lot more sorghum this year." This is in the heart of South Dakota's corn area.

Southwestern Minnesota farmers have seen good sorghum crops grown across two State lines, in both Iowa and South Dakota. As far east as Redwood Falls, there will be more fields of it this year. Francis Jeckell, grain farmer and president of the Redwood County (Minn.) Crop Improvement Association, looks for a steady increase in acreage there this year, mainly for feed purposes.

"I'm a grain farmer, and as soon as there is a market for sorghums here, you can bet I'll try it. Its advance could be very much like soybeans have seen over these past 20 years," he says.

University of Minnesota agronomists are not encouraging grain sorghums for the State, however. R. G. Robinson, in reporting several years of testing standard varieties that ended in 1955, says both Norghum and Reliance crowd the growing season.

One problem pointed out by the agronomist is that Minnesota farmers will find maturity varies considerably. The upper kernels ripen early; the lower kernels in the head ripen later. Tiller heads ripen still later, so that cool weather and early frost can reduce yields by preventing developing of the late kernels. At best, he says, the standard grain sorghums are adapted to southern Minnesota only.

Maturity is a major factor, too, in North Dakota. Except for the dry areas in the western part of the State, sorghum varieties are mainly the forage types, piper sudan, one of these, has taken an important place in the pasture program.

But grain sorghum is finding a new place on farms over a much wider area than ever before. Sorghum as a grain crop may take the place of oats, barley, wheat and flax in wider areas across South Dakota. Poor oats and barley crops in 14 Southwest and South Central counties last year has resulted in short seed supplies there.

Although compliance with South Dakota's 1957 corn acreage allotment program is expected to be casual unless there are some late changes from the mid-January figures (a cutback of 370,817 acres from 1956 figure of 2,319,492), farmers in the extreme eastern part of the State have said they will boost their sorghum acreage.

Five years of variety trials with Reliance and Norghum show them to yield an average of 62.9 bushels and 64.7, respectively, in this area. Even at minimum price of 2 cents a pound, that is a gross return of $70 per acre, and some prices have been nearer 5 cents per pound. Good seed often goes at 9 or 10 cents a pound, on standard varieties. Either way, this puts grain sorghum over most of the main crops, except corn.

Part of sorghum's popularity is due to the more dependable varieties now available. The magic of hybrids also has touched grain sorghum and by raising yields to the level of corn, is puting it in new perspective.

HAVE GOOD VARIETIES

Plant breeders recall the stampede toward sorghums back in the drought years of the 1930's. There were some disappointments then, but now they have good varieties to offer, and don't expect the disappointments to be repeated. Reliance and Norghum, the two major ones now available in large quantities, have most of the desired qualities of early maturity, uniformity of height, and strength of stalk.

Hybrids are on the market this year for the first time, and more will be available in 1958. All of these have been developed from a male sterile plant of Sudan grass, a cousin of sorghums. The plant was observed by J. S. Stephens and J. R. Quimby at the experiment station near Chillicothe, Tex. By a breeding technique these men developed, the male sterile characteristic was transferred to good grain sorghum.

Regional Sorghum 501, a hybrid produced in Nebraska from Norghum and male sterile Combine Kafir-60, has just been put on the recommended list for South Dakota. Seed for 1957 planting is limited, with only enough to plant from 8,000 to 10,000 acres. Nebraska has little interest in this variety, however, since it has several more hybrids even better adapted to conditions there. Much of it, then, can come into South Dakota.

But considering that only 5 to 8 pounds of seed is enough to plant an acre, and an acre of the crop could vary in yield from 30 to 80 bushels of 56-pound grain, buildup of seeds supplies can be more rapid than with corn. As with hybrid corn, farmers planting hybrid sorghum will lose the vigor and productivity of hybrids if they save the seed they produce for planting the second year. They may, of course, use their own seed of standard open-pollinated varieties.

RS 501 was grown under the name of Nebraska No. 5 in many South Dakota counties last year and outyielded Norghum and Reliance by a substantial margin in the better-yielding locations. It is only 3 or 4 days later in maturity than Reliance, is slightly taller growing than Reliance, and combines satisfactorily. The heads are open, medium large, and the grain threshes clean.

The open head, which allows sunshine and air to penetrate, makes for rapid drying at harvesttime. Reliance is still rated better for standability under drought conditions and after a killing frost, according to Ralph Cline, extension agronomist at South Dakota State College.

MORE NEW HYBRIDS

More hybrids with even better qualities are on the way: South Dakota expects to have several in about 2 years, and at least two seed companies expect to have hybrids for Minnesota next year. In tests just outside the Twin Cities this year, one new hybrid yielded 110 bushels per acre, of mature 56-pound grain, at 13 percent moisture. Sorghum yielded 71 bushels per acre, alongside the hybrid. Another large seed firm has at least two of its own hybrids on the market in South Dakota and surrounding areas.

Widespread interest in grain sorghums led Iowa researchers to test 16 hybrids and 7 standard varieties last year, plus work in 1954 and 1955. Yields of from 30 to 114 bushels have encouraged greater emphasis on the crop. Robert Kalton, Iowa State College crop research specialist, predicts that hybrid sorghums will almost completely replace standard varieties there within the next 2 or 3 years.

He sees a good future for Iowa farmers in growing the hybrids for seed and commercial crop production. Hybrids outyielded standard varieties by from 7 to 29 percent in Iowa in 1956. Observations so far indicate the southern, southwestern, and western parts of the State are areas where grain sorghum has the most promise.

Hybrid seed produced in Nebraska, Kansas, and Texas in 1956 may be enough to plant a fourth or more of the Nation's grain sorghum acreage this year, Dr. Kalton said.

MAKE TESTS IN ILLINOIS

Even Illinois is testing these sorghums, and field tests with 37 hybrid and standard varieties show that 20 to 30 percent higher yields can be expected from the hybrids. Their average yield for all sorghum varieties tested was 102 bushels per acre, with the hybrids averaging 110 bushels. The standards averaged 92. Corn planted the same late date yielded 96 bushels.

Agronomist Carl Hittle, of the University of Illinois, sees corn as still the best crop where moisture and growing season are most favorable. But he says sorghum does have a place where moisture is short, or when a short-season crop is wanted.

This wide interest, outside the former bounds of sorghum growing, means there will be farmers trying it for the first time, and wondering how to handle the crop.

One of the best things about grain sorghum is that it does not call for a new line of machinery to grow it. Farmers with corn growing equipment will need to have plates with holes small enough to hold 3 to 5 kernels each. Some will need to order special plates from the planter manufacturer. The seed is drilled or hill-dropped in normal 36- to 42-inch rows, at from 3 to 8 pounds per acre. Seed should be planted at the lighter rate at depths of from 1½ to 2 inches on light soils, and at 1-inch depths at the heavier rate on heavy soils.

It is important that seed be treated, since germination is more of a problem than with corn. Smut and root rot are the main dangers, but chemicals like Arasam and Orthocide are effective in overcoming them. Rates are about 2 ounces per bushel.

Sorghum also is more sensitive to weed competition than corn. But since it isn't seeded until the ground warms up—from mid-May until the first week of June—there is time to make the thorough weed kill necessary before planting. Grain sorghum goes through about a 10-day dormant stage shortly after emerging, and at this stage weeds can take over. Conventional tillage tools are used in cultivation.

Agronomists agree that fertilizer rates should be about the same as for corn, according to area recommendation. Sorghum seems to take no more out of the soil than corn.

Harvest is usually in late September, although it begins by late August in drier areas. Some growers cut the crop with a swather, dropping 2 to 4 rows on adjoining stubble rows for faster drying. Then they follow up with a combine with a pickup attachment. Others combine the crop direct, after waiting for the grain and most of the stalks to mature. This would be after frost. It is usually necessary to reduce the combine cylinder speed by about one-half to avoid cracking the seed. It may be necessary to remove some concave teeth. The same riddles and sieves used for barley will handle sorghum.

STORE AT 12 TO 13 PERCENT MOISTURE

Moisture is an important factor in proper storage of the grain. Getting it down to the necessary 12 to 13 percent isn't hard for central South Dakota growers, but it may be a problem for growers in areas of higher rainfall.

Dr. Worzella believes most farmers in eastern South Dakota and southwestern Minnesota are likely to be successful in harvesting the standard varieties like Norghum and Reliance, and the new RS 501 hybrid, without using artificial drying equipment before storage. There will be years, however, when drying will be the only way to handle it.

Harvesting is easy. Sorghum comes from the combine clean.

The improved standard and hybrid varieties actually are better suited for combining than the older ones. More uniformity in height of heads has been achieved. Stalks are shorter now, allowing more plant nutrients to be used in production of grain. It also means less stalk residue to handle in the combine.

Grain sorghum has many uses already and the list appears to be growing. As a feed, it has about the same value as corn. Feeding tests at South Dakota State College show it equals corn for fattening lambs and wintering beef cattle. It has about 92 percent the value of corn for fattening beef cattle and hogs. Protein content is even higher than corn. L. B. Embry, animal husbandman, reports grinding sorghum seems to make it more digestible.

Even though this crop yields far less tonnage per acre than forage varieties, Dr. Embry has had queries from cattle feeders who are considering putting grain varieties in the silo. This would make silage with a high proportion of grain, for a fattening ration. It might also be a solution for a farmer heading into a wet fall, where there was danger that the crop wouldn't mature.

Production of seed is interesting growers. In South Dakota, production of certified seed of the standard varieties like Norghum and Reliance is a good business. Horace Wagner, a Lyman County grower, grows upwards of 100 acres of certified Reliance every year, and his seed supply is gone within a few months after harvest.

Hybrid seed production is another matter, however. The male sterile Combine Kafir-60 used in RS 501, has a maturity of about 10 to 14 days later than the other parent, Norghum. For this reason, it is adpated only to the extreme southern fringe of South Dakota, on fertile, sandy loam soils. Unusually hot, dry weather can upset the performance of the male sterile parent, making it fertile.

Dr. Kalton, the Iowa agronomist, believes hybrid sorghum seed can be produced in Iowa with little trouble. In fact, he says, conditions are more favorable for it there than in the drier plains areas where it is a major crop.

Sealing the grain sorghum under Government price supports is still another way the crop may fit into the farming program. Central South Dakota farmers have been doing this for 8 or 10 years, according to Olaf Jacobson, Agricultural Stablization and Conservation (ASC) official at Huron. Thirty States, including North and South Dakota, Minnesota, and Iowa, are eligible under the program. The Commodity Credit Corporation price support bulletins list the 1956 support rates at $1.86 per hundredweight in South Dakota and Minnesota, $1.81 in North Dakota, and $1.91 in Iowa. Some interest in grain sorghums has been expressed by feed manufacturers, who are looking at it from the angle of buying their total digestible nutrients at a lower price than in corn. There are more possibilities in starch manufacturing, as well as the alcohol distilling industry.

Already, farmers in southeastern Iowa are reported to be growing several thousand acres of grain sorghum on sandy, droughty, soil, specifically for a distillery in their area. Off-the-farm uses, coupled with the continuing push for still earlier-maturing hybrids, seem to be the main checks in the expansion of this crop onto even larger acreages.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1362) to provide for a minimum acreage allotment for corn and increased incentive for production adjustment, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 328 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision hereof, the acreage allotment for corn for any calendar year beginning with 1957 shall not be less than fifty-one million acres."

SEC. 2. Section 101 (d) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(8) The level of price support for corn to cooperators within the commercial corn-producing area for the 1957 crop shall be not less than $1.50 per bushel for not to exceed sixteen thousand bushels produced by any one producer."

SEC. 3. Section 408 (b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following: "For the purpose of price support in the commercial corn-producing area for the 1957 crop and any subsequent crop of corn for which an acreage reserve program is in effect, a 'cooperator' shall be a producer (1) on whose farm the acreage planted to corn does not exceed 85 per centum of the farm acreage allotment for corn; and (2) who devotes an acreage of cropland (tilled in normal rotation), at the option of the producer, to either the acreage reserve program for corn or the conservation reserve program equal to 15 per centum of such producer's farm acreage allotment for corn."

SEC. 4. (a) The second sentence of section 301 (b) (10) (A) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (relating to allowance for carry-over for the purpose of computing normal supply), is amended by striking out the words "15 per centum in the case of corn" and substituting therefor the words "30 per centum in the case of corn."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be effective with respect to the marketing year beginning October 1, 1957, and subsequent marketing years.

## CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC AIRPORTS IN ALASKA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Department of Commerce, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska," as amended. The bill is accompanied by a letter of transmittal from the Secretary of Commerce, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1366) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the

Territory of Alaska," as amended, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1366 is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
*Washington, February 12, 1957.*

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
*President of the Senate,*
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is requested that you introduce in the Senate at your earliest convenience the attached draft bill "to amend the act entitled 'An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska,' as amended."

This bill would amend section 5 of the act under which the Department of Commerce operates the Anchorage and Fairbanks Alaska Airports (act of May 28, 1948; 62 Stat. 277). Section 5 of that act empowers the Secretary of Commerce to lease real property on the airports for periods not in excess of 20 years for the erection of structures necessary or incident to the operation of the airports. This 20-year maximum term was considered to be adequate for this purpose because, prior to the liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, it was possible for national banks to make loans for construction of commercial facilities on land held under lease for 20 years.

Under present law, however, national banks are prohibited from lending money secured by mortgages on leaseholds having less than 50 years to run from the date the loan is made or acquired by the national bank (12 U. S. C., sec. 371). Since national banks furnish the principal source of financing for the type construction which should now be undertaken at these airports by private industry, the 20-year maximum-term limitation acts to prevent the necessary development of these airports.

This problem was recognized by Congress in 1955, when, for similar reasons, it enacted Public Law 232 of the 84th Congress, and authorized an increase from 20 to 55 years in the maximum terms of leases given by the Alaska Railroad, for industrial development of Government-owned land along its rights-of-way. The reasoning set forth in the reports of the Senate and House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees (S. Rept. 706; H. Rept. 202; 84th Cong., 1st session) is equally applicable to the Alaskan airports.

The attached draft bill would extend similar authority to this Department to make 55-year leases of land on the Alaska airports. Under these leases, private industry could undertake construction of facilities now needed at these airports to serve the public. We, therefore, recommend this bill to the Congress for early enactment.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this legislation to Congress.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
*Secretary of Commerce.*

## PROHIBITION OF GAMBLING INFORMATION AND GAMBLING DEVICES IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of Department of Justice, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills prohibiting gambling information and gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce. Accompanying the bills are two letters of transmittal from the Attorney General, which I ask unanimous consent may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

S. 1367. A bill to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1367 is as follows:)

FEBRUARY 14, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: There is attached for your consideration and appropriate action a legislative proposal "to prohibit the transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities."

The twofold purpose of this legislation is (1) to assist the States, Territories, and possessions of the United States and the District of Columbia in the enforcement of their laws pertaining to gambling, bookmaking, and like offenses, and (2) to aid in the suppression of organized gambling activities by prohibiting the use of or the leasing, furnishing or maintaining of communication facilities which are or will be used in the transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce.

By its limited definition of "gambling information" the measure is restricted in its application to information relating to horse and dog racing. Specifically, it is aimed at one aspect of the bookmaking racket—the wire service, without which that racket cannot exist on a national scale. It is recognized, of course, that gambling exists with respect to sporting events other than horse and dog racing, but it is believed that the limited application of the statute will effectively deal with the wire service problem, and that a broader statute is not necessary.

The measure creates no criminal sanctions. Rather, it provides that whenever "any common carrier, subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission, is notified in writing by a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, acting within its jurisdiction, that any facility furnished by it is being used or will be used for the purpose of transmitting or receiving gambling information in interstate or foreign commerce, it shall discontinue within a reasonable time, or refuse, the leasing, furnishing, or maintaining of such facility * * *." Thus it will accomplish its purpose by establishing a procedure to prevent persons from using communication facilities for transmitting prohibited gambling information beyond State lines.

This legislative proposal would constitute a sensible exercise of congressional power under the commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States (art. I, sec. 8). It will assist the States and local governments in the dispatch of their law-enforcement responsibilities insofar as organized gambling and bookmaking are concerned, yet violations of local gambling laws will continue within the sole province of local law-enforcement officials. Incidentally, it should be noted that the measure contains adequate safeguards to protect the operations of legitimate news-gathering and news-disseminating services.

Accordingly, I urge the early introduction and enactment of this legislative proposal.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Sincerely,

HERBERT BROWNELL,
*Attorney General.*

S. 1368. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1368 is as follows:)

FEBRUARY 6, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Experience acquired by the Department of Justice in the administration and enforcement of the act of January 2, 1951, commonly known as the Slot Machine Act, coupled with the decision of the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Five Gambling Devices* (346 U. S. 441 (1953)), indicates a need for some major revisions of the act both in form and in substance. Accordingly, the attached draft legislation is submitted for your consideration.

Section 3 of the Slot Machine Act now requires every manufacturer of and dealer in gambling devices to register with the Attorney General upon entering such business and to reregister annually thereafter. It also requires such persons to file monthly reports with the Attorney General, indicating in such reports an inventory and record of all sales and deliveries of gambling devices. The section further requires that the component parts of gambling devices shall be separately marked and numbered if sold or shipped in unassembled form.

In providing for the registration and filing of required information, the section directs that information be supplied as to business places "in such district." and sales and deliveries "in the district." The quoted language was inadvertently retained in the legislation after the Congress had decided to substitute the Attorney General for the then Collector of Internal Revenue as the official with whom the required information was to be filed. However, two of the Justices of the Supreme Court, in the case above cited, found the section void and unenforceable because of the vagueness and the uncertainty of the quoted language. The bill would eliminate this language.

In the same case, 3 of the 5 Justices constituting the majority of the Court held that the registration and report provisions of the act, insofar as they undertook to regulate purely intrastate transactions which do not directly affect interstate commerce, went beyond the commerce power of Congress. As proposed to be amended, the language: "* * * every person manufacturing, repairing or reconditioning any gambling device who buys or receives such device knowing that it has been transported in interstate or foreign commerce, or who sells, ships, or delivers in interstate or foreign commerce, or sells, ships, or delivers knowing it will be introduced into interstate or foreign commerce, or who sells, ships, or delivers in interstate or foreign commerce, any gambling device, and every other person who buys or receives any gambling device knowing that it has been transported in interstate or foreign commerce, or who sells, ships, or delivers in interstate or foreign commerce, or sells, ships, or delivers knowing it will be introduced into interstate or foreign commerce, any gambling device, shall register * * *" will clarify the matter by making quite clear who must register, and will effectuate the view expressed in the case that only those whose activities directly affect interstate commerce should be required to do so.

Another major change which the bill will accomplish will be to eliminate the present filing requirements. Rather, persons subject to the registration provision of the act will

be required to maintain inventories of essential information. These inventories will reflect not only sales and transfers in intrastate commerce, or in interstate or foreign commerce, but also the acquisition, possession, ownership, or custody of gambling devices. The registrants will also be required to maintain records of the numbers placed on their devices in accordance with the amended section 3. This bill also takes a more realistic view of the difficulties involved in the numbering process than does existing law and does not require small component parts to be separately numbered.

Two other major changes include (1) provision for the inspection of the required records by personnel of the FBI and (2) an immunity provision applicable to those who maintain records in compliance with the act. With respect to the FBI inspection the bill will authorize Federal district courts to compel the production of requested records. Finally, the bill continues and clarifies the provision of the present law which declares it unlawful to sell, deliver, or ship any unmarked or unnumbered gambling device or to manufacture, recondition, repair, sell, deliver or ship any gambling device without complying with the registration requirements. It differs from and enlarges the present prohibitions in that it would make it unlawful for a person to possess any gambling devices if, being required to do so, such person has failed to register or to maintain the required records. This will permit enforcement personnel to pursue forfeiture processes without waiting for a sale or delivery in an appropriate case.

The Department of Justice is of the view that this legislation will materially strengthen and clarify the Slot Machine Act and will be of genuine help in the enforcement and the administration of that law. Its prompt introduction and enactment are urged.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Sincerely,

———— ————,
*Attorney General.*

## SALE OF CERTAIN MERCHANT VESSELS TO GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which, if enacted, would authorize the Maritime Administration to sell to India 12 of our laid-up Liberty vessels, or an equivalent tonnage in smaller vessels.

Many Americans are not fully aware of the great efforts that are being made by the people of India to develop their inland transportation in order that the total economy of their country be improved. There is a tremendous shortage of means whereby materials can be moved within India. We have, through our ICA program, already assisted India by furnishing millions for the procurement of railroad equipment. However, even this assistance falls short of India's requirements.

Mr. President, an important and vital part of transportation in India is found in their coastwise shipping. The Indians have been endeavoring to build vessels for this purpose, but with present conditions in the ship-building industry, it has been impossible to secure deliveries to meet immediate and pressing problems.

Unlike most nations of the world, India was not in a position to participate in the provisions of the Ship Sales Act when that authority was in existence. That authority coincided with the development of India as a separate nation, and they simply were not in a position to proceed with a ship-procurement program. As they reached that position, the authority of the Ship Sales Act had expired and in the absence of specific legislation of this type there is no way they can buy any of our surplus vessels.

It is my understanding that this matter has been studied by our Department of State for some time, and that they feel that with the limitations of the type contained within this proposed legislation its purposes are in accordance with our overall objectives where India is concerned.

It should be clearly understood that these vessels would be restricted to the coastwise trade of India, and could not compete in any way with our own merchant marine. In fact, their acquisition by the Indians should help some of the congested port conditions in the larger ports which are serviced by our merchant marine.

The joint resolution also provides that the price for these vessels would be their reasonable fair market value considering their present age and condition, and the restrictions that are placed on their field of operation. However, the limitation on the price would be that established by the Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, for such vessels.

The joint resolution provides in every way that the interest of our Government be protected, and, Mr. President, I believe that it would be a material step forward in our assistance program to the Indian Government with no cost to the American taxpayer. This is one type of foreign aid which would be paid for by the recipient country.

It is my understanding that when my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] was Ambassador to India, he was familiar with this particular problem and the endeavors of the Indian Government to secure such assistance from our country. I invite his attention to this proposed legislation, and would be happy for any comments or suggestions he might care to offer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 66) to authorize the sale of a certain number of merchant-type vessels to the Government of India or to citizens of India for use in the coastwise trade of such country, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST—AMENDMENTS

Mr. RUSSELL (for himself, Mr. BYRD, and Mr. STENNIS), submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate Joint Resolution 19, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate Joint Resolution 19, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

## AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 20, 1957,

The names of Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HILL, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. HUMPHREY were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1313) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. BEALL) on February 20, 1957.

## PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO APPROPRIATIONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] may be added as an additional cosponsor of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 58) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to appropriations, introduced by me on February 14, 1957.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

Address on ideals of the Order of Elks, delivered by the Honorable RUSSELL V. MACK, a Representative from the State of Washington, on February 21, 1957, at Washington, D. C.

By Mr. IVES:

Address on labor racketeering, delivered by Hon. James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor, before the Catholic Institute of the Press, at New York City, on February 14, 1957.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Article entitled "Joe Holt's Budget Comment" published in the February 13, 1957, edition of the Valley Times, of San Fernando Valley, Calif.

## NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON BILLS RELATING TO DEPRESSED AREAS, AREA DEVELOPMENT AND AREA ASSISTANCE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that public hearings will be held on the bills S. 104, to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; S. 964, to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; and any other legislation in this field which may be then pending before the subcommittee, beginning on Wednesday, March 6, 1957.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at these hearings are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 303, Senate Office Building, telephone NAtional 8-3120, extension 865, as soon as possible and in any event before Monday, March 11, 1957.

## NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today the following nominations:

Amory Houghton, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to France.

David K. E. Bruce, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany.

William J. Sebald, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

Notice is given that these nominations will be eligible for consideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

## UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE STATE OF OREGON AND LABOR DEPARTMENT CLASSIFICATIONS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have received from the office of Governor Robert D. Holmes, of Oregon, a telegram informing me that the percentage of unemployed persons on continued claims in Oregon during the week ending February 15, under coverage by the Unemployment Compensation Commission, stood at 11.2 percent. I am told that this is presently the highest unemployment rate in the Nation.

I am calling this fact to the attention of the Senate because for several weeks I have been endeavoring to interest the Department of Labor in classifying Portland and other sections of Oregon as aeas of substantial labor surplus, so that business and labor in this distressed unemployment zone can benefit from the provisions of Federal law which allow special consideration in connection with bidding on Government contract work.

I have been informed by the Bureau of Employment Security that the present classification of Portland as a group C area of moderate unemployment was based on a survey made at the end of 1956. There are many indications that employment conditions have deteriorated since that time. The Bureau also informed me that, under its classification criteria, areas are classified as group D areas of substantial labor surplus only when high unemployment is not attributable to seasonal or temporary factors.

In my opinion, this criteria fails to recognize the realities of Oregon's economic structure. Lumbering is our State's No. 1 manufacturing industry. It is seasonal by nature because of the effects of weather on logging in forest areas and on building activity. This winter it has been retarded by the hard-money program of the administration. Unemployment hits the individual with equal force, whether it is due to the vagaries of climate or to economic maladjustment. Seasonally unemployed workers will find little comfort in a policy which, in effect, tells them not to be upset by their lack of income—that prosperity is just around the corner of the monthly calendar.

I have asked the Bureau of Employment Security to restudy and reanalyze its classification of the Portland area in the light of current conditions of unemployment. The urgent nature of the economic difficulties which now confront a considerable portion of the State which I help to represent in the Senate demands immediate action. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD with my remarks a letter addressed by me to the Director of the Bureau of Employment Security, appealing for immediate reclassification of Portland's status as a local labor market of urgent surplus. The letter is dated February 21, 1957.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 21, 1957.

Mr. ROBERT C. GOODWIN,
*Director, Bureau of Employment Security, United States Department of Labor, Washington 25, D. C.*

DEAR MR. GOODWIN: I have your letter of February 19 which denies Portland classification as an area of critical labor surplus because, as you state, "a survey showed that unemployment in the area at the end of 1956 was somewhat below the minimum level of 6 percent required before an area can be classified in the group D substantial labor surplus category."

I must respectfully disagree with your decision. In my opinion, your decision is unfair to a State which was beset this winter by what I am told is the highest unemployment rate in the Nation.

I have just received a telegram from Mr. Thomas G. Wright, assistant to Governor Holmes, of Oregon, informing me that the percentage of unemployed people on continued claims this past week in Oregon, under coverage by the Unemployment Compensation Commission, stands at 11.2 percent.

Despite our desperate appeals to you for immediate reclassification of Portland's status as a local labor market of urgent surplus, your Bureau has taken no action. This may have deprived our area of several reconversion maritime projects for the Navy which would have provided a substantial number of skilled men with jobs.

Once again I am appealing to you to rely upon the latest and most available figures in order to justify a new classification for Portland, and for other areas in the State of Oregon, which will entitle us to special consideration in the undertaking and allocation of Government contracts in similar work.

I am writing this letter to you because of the urgent nature of the economic difficulties that now confront a considerable portion of the State which I help to represent in the Senate.

With good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
*United States Senator.*

## APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS BY THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, some 2 weeks ago the junior Senator from Missouri stated on the floor of the Senate that he agreed fully with the following statement of the distinguished minority leader:

If we are to have sanctions at the United Nations, they should apply to all nations which defy the resolutions and the mandates of that organization. Otherwise the moral foundation of the United Nation is destroyed and a doctrine of "might makes right" condoned.

Mr. President, I did not agree with any unilateral applications of sanctions then, and I do not now; and I am very glad that during recent days many persons have been won over to that view.

At that time I stated:

Are we now adopting as a national program a policy of being strong against the weak and weak against the strong?

Mr. President, it would now appear that this fear, expressed some time ago, may become a reality.

I, for one, believe that as a result of the many assurances given Israel by this administration, it would be better for that nation and the other nations of the free world if Israel's leaders agreed to withdraw from Egypt, and relied on the sincerity of the more recent assurances they have been given by the Government of the United States. I also believe that simultaneously, the United Nations forces should move into the Gaza Strip and along the Gulf of Aqaba.

Mr. President, I am not a Member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; but there is more to this than just diplomacy; and for some time I have been informed with respect to the military plans and programs incident to the best interests of the United States.

Based on that knowledge, obtained over the past 10 years, I believe that any unilateral application of sanctions against Israel in this air-atomic age will reduce the security of the United States.

There should be a doctrine of equality; and if sanctions are to be applied against one state, they should also be applied against belligerent Egypt; against India, for its unfair and unjustified attack against Kashmir; and against the Soviet Communists, for their stark

brutality in their suppression of Hungary's bid for freedom.

Any other action would justify the apprehension I expressed some weeks ago, namely, that this Government was now planning to carry out a policy of being strong against the weak and weak against the strong.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to my friend the Senator from Missouri that I desire to associate myself with the remarks he has just made. I do not think he could summarize better than he has by his phrase of "being strong against the weak and weak against the strong," the administration's Middle East policy.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

## THIRTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF PROCLAMATION OF ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, Sunday, February 24, marked the 39th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the Estonian Republic. One of the first nations to be subjugated by the Soviets and occupied by the Nazis during World War II, Estonia today writhes under the heel of Communist oppression.

In taking note of this anniversary, Mr. President, we in America and all of us in the free world pay tribute to the brave people of Estonia, who live only for the day when freedom will rightfully be restored to their nation.

The sons and daughters of Estonian heritage have made many outstanding contributions to our own progress and freedom here in the United States. We join with them, today, in the prayerful hope that the land of their ancestors will soon be rid of the Communist yoke.

The people of Estonia have been fighting for the right of independence since the middle of the 13th century. Their love of liberty remains undiminished today, despite the efforts of the Soviet Union to destroy Estonia as a national entity.

Estonia has felt the full force of Soviet brutality. But the mass deportations of population, the transfer of large groups to remote regions of the Soviet Union as forced labor, and the individual persecutions, have all failed to subdue the flame of liberty in the Estonian heart.

Mr. President, in taking note of this anniversary, we must publicly restate our unswerving friendship for the people of Estonia, while we publicly condemn the action of the Soviet leaders in enslaving, torturing, and persecuting the people of this great land.

This is an anniversary which we observe without celebration. It is one, however, which we observe with determination to continue our efforts until Estonia and the other countries enslaved by the Soviets will once again take their places among the family of free nations.

## THE PINCH BECOMES A STRANGLE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my attention having been brought to a speech delivered by Gen. James Doolittle, who called upon the United States to redouble its efforts to maintain its technical lead over the Soviets, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial entitled "The Pinch Becomes a Strangle," published in the Air Force magazine of February 1957.

We are not only witnessing the perpetuation of a military machine based on traditional concepts of war, alien to modern and atomic age requirements, but we are being asked to support a 1958 budget which can only lead to the decimation of our airpower, starved because of the lack of funds, coordinated into impotency, and throttled or ignored by ultraconservative philosophies.

We are now being told that the 137 wing Air Force can be reduced to 128 wings by June 1958. We are now being told that the Strategic Air Command can lose its strategic fighter wings because the B–36 is being replaced by the B–52. We are told the Tactical Air Command can lose many of its tactical and fighter wings because of increased Army missile capabilities in close support, and we are finally told that the Air Defense Command can lose two interceptor fighter wings based on the reasoning that because of modern equipment fewer aircraft are required.

Now, Mr. President, these are the facts. The B–36 is here to stay with us for several years. Therefore the requirement for strategic fighter aircraft to support the B–36's is a valid one for some time to come. As a matter of fact, these Strategic Air Command fighters have an H-bomb capability of their own and should be considered as more than just support aircraft to the B–36. The elimination of tactical support aircraft at this time can only be valid if the Army missile capability is an actual one and not merely on paper. And, finally, if our aircraft have become so modern that we can reduce the Air Defense Command by two intercepter wings, then why not reduce the strength of Air Defense Command still further? It appears, however, that logic should tell us that the fighter force of the Air Defense Command must reflect and is a function of improved and proven Soviet delivery systems.

In lending support to the Air Force budget for the current fiscal year of 1957, both Secretary Quarles and General Twining clearly stated that the present budget was adequate only if a considerable increase and new obligating authority was provided in the fiscal year 1958 budget.

The facts are, however, Mr. President, that in the new budget the Air Force does not fare so well. Instead of the considerable increase that both Secretary Quarles and General Twining said would be needed, the Air Force is about $50 million above the current budget. The Air Force budget for the next fiscal year has no increases in funds to take care of the increasing numbers of airbases and installations, minor increase in military personnel moneys despite the contemplated increase in Air Force personnel strength, and finally, despite rapid technological changes and inflated development costs, a research and development funding which is less than previous year programs.

I now request that the editorial to which I have alluded, entitled "The Pinch Becomes a Strangle," appearing in the Air Force magazine of March 1957, be printed in the RECORD, and I commend it to the attention of all Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PINCH BECOMES A STRANGLE

Last month we predicted that the budget figures for fiscal year 1958 would reveal that we are building toward an Air Force of approximately 110 wings by the year 1960. Since then, the President has delivered his annual budget message to Congress, the budget itself has been made public, and Assistant Secretary of Defense Wilfred J. McNeil, the Pentagon's money man, has explained the military portion of it to the Washington press corps. Careful examination of these sources discloses no reason to renege on our prediction. As a matter of fact, the situation is even worse than we had feared.

First of all, let's look at the money to be made available. In his press briefing, Mr. McNeil broke down the budget into what he called "its three dimensions." These are not the familiar three dimensions of war—land, sea, and air—but a new fiscal approach—"new obligational authority," "direct obligations," and "expenditures."

New obligational authority we were familiar with. This is the traditional measure of a budget. It is the new money which Congress is asked to make available. In fiscal year 1958 it adds up to $38.5 billion. Of this, the Air Force gets $17.746 billion, the Navy $10.92 billion, and the Army $8.92 billion. The balance is accounted for in miscellaneous accounts.

Using the yardstick of new obligations, the Air Force did not fare so well. Instead of the considerable increase that both Secretary Quarles and General Twining said would be needed in fiscal year 1958, the Air Force is about $50 million above fiscal year 1957's $17.68 billion. In contrast, the Army went up more than a billion, the Navy went up about half a billion.

Expenditures, the amount actually to be paid out of the Treasury during a given fiscal year, were another of Mr. McNeil's three dimensions. They will total, during fiscal year 1958, about $38 billion—$17.6 billion for the Air Force, $10.4 for the Navy, $9.2 billion for the Army.

But, said Mr. McNeil, these figures are relatively unimportant. He called his third dimension—direct obligations—the true measure of a budget. This is the amount that will be contracted to spend during the fiscal year. Coincidentally, perhaps, this column adds up to $40.5 billion—$18.8 for the Air Force, $11.15 for the Navy, $9.7 for the Army.

Thus, by using Mr. McNeil's "third dimension," the budget appears to be some $2 billion more than the amount of new obligational authority. As one veteran newsman grumbled, "It's a new kind of shell game—three shells and no pea."

So, Mr. McNeil to the contrary, we're still going to keep an eye on that new obligational authority.

Over the months while the fiscal year 1958 budget was being prepared, we examined the Air Force problem carefully and attempted to establish a rough sort of yardstick against which to measure the budget when it should be announced. Without taking Mr. McNeil's rubber ruler into consideration, here's how the funding stacks up.

We said that, if the amount allocated to it in fiscal year 1958 fell below $22 billion, the Air Force would inevitably dwindle in strength and effectiveness. This year's

amount falls more than $4 billion below that figure.

Let's take the matter of wings. Mr. McNeil's budget table, "Summary of Military Forces," calls for a planned force of 128 wings by June 30, 1958. This subtracts down to an official loss of 9 wings in strength and 12 months in time from the previous goal of 137 wings by June 30, 1957. (Continue to bear in mind the compound adjective "combat-ready," which should be affixed to the wing structure at all times.)

This is a sizable loss. But a patient examination of the bookkeeping reveals that it is only part of the story. For once again the budget-makers have changed the ground rules in the middle of the game. What we are really getting is a 123-wing force. Let's add them up.

The Strategic Air Command will lose six strategic fighter wings.

The Tactical Air Command will lose a tactical bomb wing and five fighter wings—a total of six wings.

The Air Defense Command will lose two interceptor wings.

The total reduction is 14 wings. Fourteen from 137 leaves 123. How, then, does Mr. McNeil get the figure back up to 128? Why, by adding in four assault transport wings and a tactical guided missile wing (Matadors), which had been in the 137-wing program all along but which had never been counted as combat wings in the 137-wing goal. As Al Smith once said in another context, "No matter how thin you slice it, it's still baloney."

All of this is just more of the Washington numbers racket. The simple truth is that the Air Force no longer has a force goal. There is nowhere near enough money to maintain 128—or 123—wings on a modern, combat-ready basis, and one more budget like this one will push the Air Force down toward our predicted 110 wings even faster than we had feared.

Some of these reductions make a little sense. Some do not. One purpose of the SAC fighter wings was to escort the B–36. They would also assist the penetration problem, by helping to saturate the Red defenses and, as a matter of fact, could have had an H-bomb capability of their own. Like many another element of the budget, dropping these wings now represents an out-and-out gamble.

Presumably, the bomber wing cut from TAC consists of B–45's. This airplane is getting old, and B–57's and B–66's could probably be counted on to make up the difference. The fighter cut in TAC can only be explained by an increased Army missile capability in close support. It is hoped that this capability is actual, not merely on paper.

The cuts in Air Defense Command are much more difficult to understand. One reason put forth is that we are getting more modern fighters and, therefore, need fewer of them. This logic leads to a point where a fighter gets so modern that we may need only one or two of them. Actually, the need to modernize our fighter force springs from the improving Soviet delivery systems. As Soviet bombers fly higher, faster, and in greater numbers, it would seem we would need more and better fighters to cope with the threat. A second reason given for cutting air defense fighters is the increase in Army Nike sites. Here, too, the rules are being changed in the middle of the game. The Nike is admittedly a point defense weapon. The air defense fighter force has an area defense responsibility. It is a little murky as to how an improved capability in the Army's point defense capability makes it easier for the Air Force to discharge its area defense responsibility. It's a little like cutting your police deparement because your fire department is getting so good.

Another part of our budget yardstick said that the Air Force could be kept modern only if money for new aircraft was upped at least $2 billion over that provided in the current fiscal year. Yet the increase is piddling—$4.78 billion as compared with $4.6 billion in fiscal year 1957. Last year the procurement plan called for about 1,900 aircraft. This year's figure is down to 1,515.

The main reason given for the cutback in new aircraft is that we are moving rapidly toward new weapons, particularly missiles. As a result, you might expect that missile money would be increased. Our own estimate was that at least $1 billion additional would be needed in fiscal year 1958. The shocking fact is that there is less money for missile production in the fiscal year 1958 budget than in 1957—$1.8 billion as against $1.95 billion, to be exact.

This paradox Mr. McNeil explained by saying that large sums were included in the fiscal year 1957 budget to get the ballistic missiles program under way. The clear implication was that the program would somehow cost less as it went along, that the big sums were involved only in the beginning. Yet, not until we begin procuring ballistic missiles in quantity will we even begin to find out what big money is.

We previously estimated that funds for operations and maintenance would have to go up considerably in fiscal year 1958. Jets require more fuel, and their support demands a more complex, and therefore more costly, logistic structure. The number of bases and installations, particularly air control and warning sites, is increasing. Yet there is no comparable increase in funds to meet these costs. In fiscal year 1957 operations and maintenance money totaled $1.95 billion. In the new budget, it is only $1.8 billion.

The base construction program will drop farther and farther behind schedule under this new budget. Last year General Twining told Congress that the Air Force needed and could effectively use, another quarter of a billion dollars for construction. He didn't get it then. He won't get it in fiscal year 1958, either. The sum remains the same for both years—$1.2 billion. This means another slowdown in the DEW Line and the SAGE program, and it renders SAC's retaliatory force increasingly vulnerable to enemy attack.

Air Force money for military personnel is up only slightly. The sum for fiscal year 1958 is put at $3.84 billion as against $3.69 billion in fiscal year 1957. At the same time, the Cordiner Committee has been studying the question of pay and allowances and undoubtedly will recommend a pay raise. If the recommended raise should be significant (and it will do little good if it is not), there is no money in the budget to meet it. Mr. McNeil indicated that a supplemental request to meet a pay raise would be made most reluctantly, and it is likely that such a raise would have to come out of some other part of the already too tight budget.

As has been the case over the years, research and development money represents the gloomiest picture of all. It still hovers at $661 million, a point at which it has stuck for years. In a period of rapid technological change and inflated costs, holding research and development funds at a given level is not maintaining a plateau—it is building a toboggan slide. In this connection it is interesting to note a recent statement by Dr. Clifford Furnas, recently resigned Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development. Dr. Furnas pointed out that, during the period from 1949 to 1957, research and development costs have suffered inflation of an estimated 43 percent. The research and development dollar buys 57 percent of what it bought in 1949. In addition, according to Dr. Furnas, technology has brought heavy pressure on research spending. He cited as an example the fact that developing the B–29 involved 2,700,000 engineering manhours; the B–47, 3,500,000; the B–52, 4 million, while estimates of engineering manhours needed for a successor to the B–52 run as high as 9 million.

Mr. McNeil made a case for the low research and development figure by saying that much research and development money comes from other funds, such as procurement, for prototypes, testing, evaluation, and the like. This is true. But it has always been true and does not change the fact that each year in which research and development funds remain static is a step down the hill to qualitative defeat.

An intriguing sidelight on the fiscal year 1958 budget is the mystery of the $900 million appropriated by Congress last year in excess of the administration's request. This sum originated in the Senate, which wanted it ticketed specifically for B–52's, for interceptors, and for research and development. In conference with the House, the language was diluted to allow the money to be spent, in effect, on any weapon systems that showed promise.

Part of the $900 million has not yet been obligated, and is now being used to pare the Air Force figures for the fiscal year 1958 budget by about a quarter of a million dollars. The portion of the $900 million which has been obligated went largely into the ballistic missile program, according to Mr. McNeil, and is presumably being used to help justify the decrease in new missile money. It would seem that the clear intent of the Congress at the time it voted the money is being flouted, or at the very least, compromised.

Above all, the new budget puts in sharp focus the inadequacies of our present military organization. When, out of a total budget of $38.5 billion, the Nation does not get either the quantity or the quality it needs of the weapons of decision, then something is radically wrong with the system. In the years ahead, the technological requirements for national security will tend to pyramid, rather than shrink. And so the need to spend our money on the right things will become more and more pressing. We fail to see how this can be accomplished short of true unification of the services. Until that day, our defenses will always stand short.

We understand that both Mr. Wilson and Mr. Quarles fought against the budget cuts. We salute them for their fight. Within the imposed fiscal ceilings and within the current Department of Defense organization, the new budget probably represents the best that could be done. But while Washington fiddles, Moscow burns—with ambition. The Air Force mission grows more difficult of accomplishment with each passing day, even as the means with which to accomplish it dwindles in proportion.

There is a point at which austerity becomes starvation, and a pinch becomes a strangle. We submit that this point is being reached and fast.

---

## ADDITIONAL LEADING BUSINESSMEN PRAISE BILL FOR HOOVER-STYLE FEDERAL TAX COMMISSION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am glad to report that I have received additional large numbers of strong endorsements of my bill, S. 769, which was introduced with 14 cosponsors, for the purpose of establishing a Federal Tax Commission along the lines of previous Hoover Commission studies.

In the February 18 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there will be found, beginning on page 2115, numerous excerpts from replies to an inquiry which I had made of some of the foremost businessmen of America.

I had asked them for their frank reactions to my proposal, and I am delighted to say that, almost to a man, they warmly endorsed it.

I send to the desk the text of additional replies from numerous other prominent businessmen.

The replies are presented as they are received, except for minor deletions for purposes of brevity. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL FOODS CORP.,
*White Plains, N. Y., February 21, 1957.*

Hon. ALEXANDER C. WILEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you for your letter of January 31 inviting me to comment on your S. 769 for the establishment at a Commission on Federal Taxation similar to the valuable commissions which have carried President Hoover's name * * *.

I believe your bill is one of the most constructive that has been introduced in the Senate in a long time. I hope it will be acted upon favorably, and in expressing that hope I am speaking not only for myself as an individual but as the president of General Foods. Both are deeply interested in your proposal for a top-level study of our entire Federal tax structure.

With best regards, I am

Sincerely,

C. G. MORTIMER,
*President.*

---

STANDARD OIL COMPANY OF NEW JERSEY,
*New York, N. Y., February 21, 1957.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
*United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: * * * I am writing to advise you that I am heartily in favor of a broad objective study of our Federal tax system looking toward its fundamental revision, and I should think a Hoover-styled Federal commission, such as you suggest, would be a good way to proceed.

There can be no doubt of the urgent need for tax reform. The present tax system has many harmful long-run effects upon our private-enterprise economy and is, in many areas, inequitable and discriminating. Basic reform is therefore long overdue.

I should add that, as long as expenditures remain at the present high level, I am not in favor of reducing the Federal tax revenue and thereby lowering the budget surplus forecast for the next fiscal year. It seems to me highly desirable at this time to reduce Federal expenditures and work vigorously toward a larger budget surplus and when that position is achieved, reduce Federal taxation.

* * * * *

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE HOLMAN,
*Chairman of the Board.*

---

UNITED FRUIT CO.,
*Boston, Mass., February 19, 1957.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you for your letter dated February 12 and the reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 22, 1957, reporting your proposal for a Commission on Federal Taxation.

First, let me say that I favor your proposal and particularly the type of Commission which you envision.

Second, I believe that Congress has too long avoided its responsibility in not recognizing, or ignoring, the deterioration of the respect for our tax laws by the taxpayers. The so-called little fellow no longer believes, as so many lawmakers would like to think, that the burden is being carried by those with top-bracket incomes. That this feeling is growing is evidenced by the astounding numbers of taxpayers who are joining hundreds of newly formed associations, leagues, and groups of many names for the purpose of seeking simplification of the tax forms and taking other action designed to obtain relief.

To my desk, in increasing numbers, come such pamphlets as the one attached.

It is my considered opinion that the taxpaying public honestly believes that our income-tax structure is archaic and that tax rates are confiscatory. We of this generation have witnessed the assessment of emergency taxation with complete patriotic acceptance, only to find that long after the emergencies have been dissipated these special taxes remain. The temper of the taxpaying public has become very short, and so is the time remaining in which something should be done about it.

My best wishes to you for success in your effort to bring some light to bear on this most unhappy state of affairs.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH H. REDMOND,
*President.*

---

RAYBESTOS-MANHATTAN, INC.,
*Passaic, N. J., February 15, 1957.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. WILEY: Thank you for your communication of February 12 and I and my associates are particularly pleased that you are proposing a Hoover-style Federal Tax Commission to study our complicated tax structure which is destroying incentive in this country and causing undue waste and extravagances.

Our present tax laws have many inconsistencies. The tax structure has grown haphazardly and corporate rates should not be in excess of 35 percent and certainly individual income-tax rates should be reduced materially.

Wherever I go these days there is tremendous criticism of the present budget. It can and should be reduced promptly. We do not want to go through another period of tax and tax, and spend and spend.

I sincerely wish you success in your worthwhile endeavor to improve the Federal taxation system.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN F. D. ROHRBACH,
*President.*

---

MCCRORY STORES CORP.,
*New York, N. Y., February 20, 1957.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
*Senator from Wisconsin, United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: * * * I am certainly in favor of that kind of approach to the very complex tax situation which confronts all of us both as individuals and as corporations.

Whether or not the succeeding Congresses would see fit to enact all recommendations of such a commission is doubtful, but certainly some useful recommendations would very likely be enacted into law. It is too much to hope that the overworked House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committee will have the time to conduct an overall study of our present tax structure, which like Topsy has "just growed" over the years. So more power to you and your associates who are interested in this proposed commission on the whole tax structure of the Federal Government.

Since you opened up the subject of taxation in your letter to me, I would like to say that I feel that every effort should be made by the Congress to reduce this year's budget by the elimination of its less necessary parts, one of which to my mind, is the great increase in the amount allotted to Federal aid to education, which most certainly should be left to the individual States.

With every good wish for success in these endeavors, I am,

Yours sincerely,

F. W. PAUL.

---

R. A. HUMMEL,
*New York, N. Y., February 20, 1957.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: With reference to your letter of February 12, and in response to your request for my personal reactions to your proposal, I must say first of all that it is very heartening to note your interest in tax reduction and in finding a solution to the confiscatory and inflationary tax structure under which we are endeavoring to survive.

There is, as you know, a nationwide protest over the taxation situation and its inflationary effect. It would seem to me that the immediate action of the Congress should be addressed to the reduction of the budget submitted by the President.

If the recommendations of the Hoover Commission which have not been passed were immediately implemented, the public reaction would undoubtedly be highly favorable. Additionally, foreign aid should be eliminated entirely and all educational problems should be referred back to the States without intervention of the Federal Government. These steps would reduce the budget by many billions of dollars and permit a reasonable reduction in taxation in the present session and a surplus to be applied to the reduction of debt.

The foregoing suggestions do not in any sense preclude the organization of a "Hoover style Federal tax commission," which might well devote its primary attention to the destructive effects of the progressive income tax and its complete elimination from our tax structure.

Sincerely yours,

R. A. HUMMEL.

---

CONSOLIDATED FOODS CORP.,
*Chicago, Ill., February 20, 1957.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
*United States Senator,*
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: * * * It does seem to me that our Federal taxing system is in need of comprehensive study and overhaul. I agree in your statement "taxes are too high" and it would seem to me that the first order of business should be reduction in Government spending and its cost of operation.

Our tax structure must necessarily provide the required revenue to support the Government's various responsibilities. What is deemed necessary or desirable is debatable. I must disagree with the administration and both parties in what is sometimes termed "necessary."

The President while suggesting that taxpayers could be helpful in halting inflation by reducing their expenditures at the same time recommends the adoption of the largest peacetime budget ever * * * one that could only be balanced by the highest tax bill ever to be paid. All of this doesn't seem to square up and particularly when the large Federal bureaucracy continues to expand and increase the requests for additional moneys. Certainly this does not seem to be the time for new Government spending programs.

It is evident to me by the adoption of justifiable and realistic economies (which

are always essential in business and industry) that our Federal Government by retrenchment in expenditures (through proper curtailment in payrolls, subsidies, loans, and grants) could materially reduce the budget, keep it in balance, and, at the same time, substantially reduce existing Federal tax rates on the incomes of individuals and business firms.

As you have said the proposed Commission is not a cure-all. I feel the Hoover Commission's recommendations have not been followed by Congress to the extent possible and desirable. Despite the character of this Commission, the entrenched bureaucracy has apparently successfully stalled in carrying out many of the sound recommendations of that group.

Perhaps it might be well if we were to appoint a Commission to determine why recommendations made by the good Commissions in the past haven't been followed. But, be that as it may, I am generally in accord with your suggestion that a Hoover-style Federal Tax Commission be set up to study and investigate the present tax policy and tax structure of the Federal Government.

I have taken the liberty of sending copies of this letter to our Senators from Illinois.

Very truly yours,

S. M. KENNEDY,
*President.*

---

ILLINOIS CENTRAL RAILROAD,
*Chicago, Ill., February 19, 1957.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
*United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Your letter of February 12, 1957, concerning Senate Resolution 769, together with an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 22, 1957, touches upon a subject very close to the hearts of us railroadmen. Just as everyone else, we feel that taxes are too high. However, we have an even greater concern in the present unequal and unfair spread of the burdens of taxation. Most of the problems pointed out by you can be exemplified by the disproportionate share of taxation sustained by the country's railroads. The temporary and so-called wartime taxes bear heavily upon the railroads' lifeblood—their traffic.

The long-established pattern of Federal, State, and local taxation of railroads for the support of all levels of government is tremendous in comparison with nominal taxes paid by railroad competitors, over-the-road trucks, airlines, and barge lines. The question of direct and indirect subsidy to rail competitors and the substantially free use of public facilities for profit by those competing with railroads are as much a part of our national tax picture as the income tax. While many Federal and State facilities must be maintained for the national defense, this necessity should not be used to render ineffective the national transportation policy that each form of transportation should be allowed to pass the results of its inherent advantages along to the public.

We sincerely hope that your splendid efforts in this field, as well as those of your associates, will not be in vain.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH H. WRIGHT,
*Vice President and General Counsel.*

---

MONON RAILROAD,
*Chicago, Ill., February 15, 1957.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
*Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: * * * You are to be congratulated on this drive, for taxation is one of the big problems of the railroad industry.

One of the most aggravating tax problems faced by the railroads is the fact that the 10-percent tax on passenger fares and 3-percent tax on freight charges are still in effect. As you know, these taxes were imposed to discourage the use of rail facilities by private parties and industries traveling on nonessential business during World War II. I honestly believe that there would be no loss in tax revenue from the railroads (and there would probably be an increase in taxes paid by the railroads resulting from increased business volume).

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

WARREN W. BROWN,
*President.*

---

THE UDYLITE CORP.,
*Detroit, Mich, February 18, 1957.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

HONORABLE SIR: * * * A high level procedure approach to this very important subject, such as you describe, is timely indeed. It comes at a time when the businessmen of our great Nation need encouragement for confidence in the future of our country's economy. We have had many years of high-level taxes and inequities in the tax law itself, the result of which now points up the necessity for some relief.

Business must be given an opportunity to return a better rating of earned profits to itself, if we are to remain strong. A modification of our tax laws now would provide incentive for investment of equity capital and would promote purchasing power.

In many financial statements of business firms that come under my observation, I notice that in the majority of cases, the largest and most pressing obligation is the tax reserve setup in the liability column.

It is my firm belief that if Government will give early tax relief to business, and to us as individuals, our economy will go forward on a more safe and sure program for the future years.

Your proposed program has my wholehearted support.

Yours very truly,

THE UDYLITE CORP.,
L. K. LINDAHL,
*Chairman of the Board.*

---

HILTON HOTELS CORP.,
*Beverly Hills, Calif., February 16, 1957.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: * * * I know former President Hoover quite well and he told me not long ago that $10 billion could be saved. What a wonderful thing if this could happen as it seems to me that the business of the United States Government is like any other business. When business is good you pay your debts and give your stockholders an extra dividend.

Business is certainly good with the United States Government. They should be paying some of their debts and be paying some dividends to the people, who are the stockholders, in the form of reduction in taxes.

I have read your statement referred to as "the spider's web of taxes" and it certainly tells the story.

Good luck to you with the bill.

Sincerely yours,

CONRAD N. HILTON,
*President.*

---

UNITED STATES PIPE & FOUNDRY CO.,
*Birmingham, Ala., February 19, 1957.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: * * * Your comments regarding the need of such commission demonstrate a keen insight into a grave problem. Your statesmanlike approach should be encouraging to all Americans.

It is noted that you recognize that "literally hundreds of groups are now confronted with tax hardships." There is only one way to reduce the number of hardships; that way is to reduce taxes. Reallocation of the tax load has already been overworked—in the wrong direction. Progressive rates on individuals are confiscatory, and now some political opportunists are advocating more progression in income tax rates on corporations according to size. It seems foolish to consider loading on a comparatively few large corporations when small business cannot exist without the production of so-called big business. You cannot make steel or trucks at a cost the public can afford in a small business.

I recommend for your consideration, first reduce Federal expenditures to cover the necessary functions of government, then spread the revised tax load over a broad base.

With every wish for your success, I am

Sincerely yours,

C. S. LAWSON,
*President.*

---

THE HINDE & DAUCH PAPER CO.,
*Sandusky, Ohio, February 18, 1957.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: I have examined your proposal of a Hoover-style Federal Tax Commission and it, or something like it, might be a very good idea for the long run.

The more I have considered this proposal, however, the more I have come to the opinion that a direct limitation upon the Federal Government in the right to levy taxes is probably the only practical answer, on the same theory that a household or anyone else fits its spending to the available cloth. For this reason, I would very much like to see the constitutional limitation on taxes proposed and adopted.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES E. FROHMAN,
*President.*

---

NEWARK, N. J., *February 18, 1957.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: I appreciate your letter of February 12, 1957, concerning a Hoover-type commission proposed in your Senate bill 769, and agree with you that the Federal tax system is badly in need of reform.

Since, as you point out, there is little likelihood of any substantial tax reduction before the beginning of the fiscal year starting in 1959, such a commission could well begin now a comprehensive study to that end. All segments of our population, I think, hope for a more equitable distribution of the tax burden as well as a reduction in Federal expenditures, and I heartily endorse your efforts.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. HUGHES.

---

THE CHARLES E. HIRES CO.,
*Philadelphia, Pa., February 21, 1957.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: * * * I feel that such a type commission to look into Federal taxation principles and policies is long overdue. The current system is not conducive for industry for further expansion and investments of more risk capital. I agree wholeheartedly that something must be done to alleviate the very high corporate tax structure so that more moneys can be made

available for the expansion of industry, thereby providing more jobs for more people, and furthering the advance of our way of life.

Very truly yours,

P. W. HIRES,
*President.*

---

CALUMET & HECLA, INC.,
*Chicago, Ill., February 21, 1957.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: * * * I am heartily in accord, and I wish you complete success in achieving enactment of this legislation.

Very truly yours,

ENDICOTT R. LOVELL,
*President.*

---

## GREATER EFFICIENCY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I continue to receive Wisconsin references to my latest recommendations to bring about greater efficiency in Government.

Through my Weekly Newsletter, I have called attention to specific ways of streamlining Government operations and cutting down unnecessary expenditures.

For example, action on major Hoover Commission bills is urgent now to take the edge off the heavy load on our taxpayers. Taking Government out of unessential business in competition with private enterprise, reforming budgetary practices, doing something about the some 774 million acres of land over which Uncle Sam reigns—these are but a few chances to reduce Federal costs.

These measures, complemented by my own proposed Hoover-type Commission to study the ins and outs of our hazy tax structure, would go a long way to prove to the American people that we are not sitting here in Washington content to let big Government get out of hand.

I present an editorial expanding on this problem, from the Sheboygan Press of February 20, 1957. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREATER EFFICIENCY IN GOVERNMENT

Senator WILEY of Wisconsin devoted a large part of a recent newsletter to the efforts under way to bring greater efficiency in Government.

He reported that the second Hoover Commission for governmental streamlining made some 479 proposals. Of these, about 59 have been put into effect. The administration and Congress have, in addition, "accepted" 313 proposals as suitable for carrying out. The Senate Government Operations Committee has under consideration the remaining "hard core" Hoover proposals. Senator WILEY said that these represent the major sources of controversy and include a proposed tough policy in Federal lending agencies.

They also include proposals to reform Government budgetary practice, to get the Government out of additional business, and to attract and hold skilled administrators in Government service. Senator WILEY said that some of the greatest savings thus far have come through steps to secure greater economy in the procurement of goods by the Armed Forces, but that still more must be done to make certain that the $37 billion or so spent annually by the services are carefully managed.

In regard to Government in business, Senator WILEY pointed out that one of the results of a Hoover Commission proposal was the sale of Government barge lines. These lines have been operating for years at a deficit. Now that they are being operated by private businesses they are showing a profit. Furthermore, they are paying taxes on the profit. The Government benefits in two ways—a deficit is erased and the Government gains an additional source of revenue.

A study of the Hoover report shows that the Federal Government is engaged in businesses valued at more than $105 billion. Sale of these businesses would help reduce the Government debt and also save 2 or 3 billion dollars in interest. It has been estimated that these businesses would pay at least $6 billion in taxes to the United States Treasury, besides taxes to local and State governments.

Another possibility of large savings is found in federally owned land. The General Services Administration recently completed an inventory which showed that the Federal Government owns 774.6 million acres of land throughout the world. Of this amount, 52.9 percent is in the United States and 47 percent in Alaska. The total cost of acquisition of all the Government's lands and installations, some of which were acquired as early as 1789, was $40.3 billion. The Defense Department is the largest holder of real property in the United States, with $21.5 billion invested. The Interior Department is second with $3.6 billion and the Atomic Energy Commission is third with $3 billion.

Federal Government holdings in Wisconsin total 1,781,859 acres, or 5.1 percent of the total acreage in the State. This figure is small compared to that of some other States. The Government owns 87 percent of the land in Nevada, 70 percent in Utah, and 65 percent in Idaho.

It is recognized that much of the land would not attract private buyers. But we do not believe it needs all of the 774.6 million acres on which no taxes are paid.

We agree with Senator WILEY that these are areas in which a substantial start could be made to reducing Government costs.

Another proposal by Senator WILEY, cosponsored by a dozen other Senators, also deserves full attention. It calls for the creation of a Federal commission to study the entire Federal tax structure and make recommendations. The proposed study would be along the lines of the work done by the Hoover Commission. While finding ways to reduce costs it is also important to find ways to remove inequities in the present tax structure.

---

## THIRTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF PROCLAMATION OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on February 16 all America joined its sons of Lithuanian descent and freedom-loving people throughout the world in commemorating the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. This brave little country which in 1918, after 120 years of Russian occupation, finally threw off the tyrannical yoke, demonstrated her capacity to prosper as a free and independent nation for a score of years. Once again the Iron Curtain of tyranny has fallen and Lithuania suffers under oppression. It is, I believe, entirely fitting that we recognize the indomitable spirit of those who keep alive the spark of liberty and continue the struggle for Lithuanian independence by commemorating this 39th anniversary of the proclamation of Lithuanian independence.

I think it is important that we in the United States, to the maximum extent possible, should keep alive in our minds, and in the minds of the people of Eastern Europe, particularly Lithuanians, who do not recognize the status quo and regard Lithuania as a free-country-to-be, that our foreign policy is directed to the end not only of maintaining the security of the United States, but also, whenever possible, the independence of Lithuania.

---

## CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Dirksen | McClellan |
| Allott | Douglas | Morse |
| Anderson | Ervin | Morton |
| Barrett | Frear | Mundt |
| Beall | Goldwater | Murray |
| Bennett | Green | Neuberger |
| Bible | Hickenlooper | O'Mahoney |
| Blakley | Hill | Payne |
| Bush | Holland | Revercomb |
| Butler | Humphrey | Russell |
| Byrd | Ives | Saltonstall |
| Capehart | Javits | Schoeppel |
| Carlson | Jenner | Smith, Maine |
| Carroll | Johnson, Tex. | Stennis |
| Case, N. J. | Johnston, S. C. | Talmadge |
| Case, S. Dak. | Kennedy | Thurmond |
| Chavez | Kerr | Thye |
| Clark | Kuchel | Watkins |
| Cooper | Mansfield | Wiley |
| Cotton | Martin, Iowa | Young |
| Curtis | Martin, Pa. | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Sixty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

---

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which is open to amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] desires to be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia may proceed.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, with all due respect for the wisdom and discernment of my honored and distinguished colleagues who are supporting this resolution, I cannot in good conscience cast my vote for this proposition in its present form.

The measure before this body involves considerations far more fundamental to our national welfare and international posture than merely being for or against the spread of communism into the Middle East. Were that not so, I am confident that the Congress would have adopted this resolution unanimously on the same day it was proposed by the President.

At the outset, I wish to make it abundantly clear—in order that there may be no misunderstanding—that I have always been a consistent, outspoken, and uncompromising opponent of communism in all its forms and wherever found.

I have not changed and I will not change.

Whatever personal sacrifices may now or later be required to protect my country, my people, and my loved ones from communism's godless tyranny, I am cheerfully prepared to make.

I would be pleased, Mr. President, to join with the other Members of the Senate in declaring in the strongest possible terms the determination of this Nation to protect itself and its interests with every means at its disposal from Communist aggression or subversion wherever it may occur.

But I cannot, and will not, lend my assent—and I do not believe the people of my beloved State of Georgia would wish me to do so—to a proposal which would have such appalling consequences.

Let Senators reflect with me, and determine in their own conscience, whether these are the things they wish to accomplish through this resolution—the things they believe the American people desire to be done in the name of combating international communism.

Here is what the resolution would do:

It would abdicate the power of Congress to declare war.

It would surrender the authority of Congress to direct the manner in which public funds shall be spent.

It would lavish American tax dollars, without stipulation as to manner of use, on despotic potentates who have utter contempt for human rights and freedom.

It would underwrite grandiose projects for the economic development of the Middle East while we are unable to afford similar undertakings at home.

It would leave unsolved the two basic causes of Middle Eastern turmoil—the Israeli-Arab conflict and the Suez Canal controversy.

It would place American Armed Forces at the disposal of the United Nations without the necessity of congressional approval.

I, for one—inexperienced as I am in the intricacies of foreign policy—cannot bring myself to believe that the common good of the American people can be served in this manner.

This resolution amounts to an undated declaration of war—a blank check to be signed by Congress and handed to the Chief Executive to fill in the date and place as he sees fit.

Assuming that it may at some future time become necessary to employ American forces in the Middle East, what urgency impels action so far in advance that the occasion cannot even be foreseen?

After all, will not Congress be in session and available to take immediate action for at least 6 months more of this year?

And, should an emergency requiring the use of armed strength arise after adjournment, is it not possible for Congress to be reconvened in extraordinary session within 24 hours?

While I would be the last to say that I do not trust the judgment and discretion of the President of the United States, I would like to declare that I trust more the collective judgment and discretion of the 96 Members of the Senate and that of the 435 Members of the House of Representatives.

Our Founding Fathers placed in the hands of the Members of Congress the authority to declare and make war and in those hands that power never has been abused or misused.

I, for one, Mr. President, would prefer to see it remain in those hands.

The Constitution also charges Congress with the responsibility for levying taxes and appropriating the revenue therefrom to provide for the common defense and the general welfare. It does not provide for the delegation of that authority to the executive branch of the Federal Government.

Under the terms of this resolution the President of the United States would be given absolute and complete authority to disburse foreign aid funds, within an established maximum, exactly as he might see fit. Neither he nor the beneficiaries of his gifts would be required to account for them.

From the precedent established by such an authorization, the next logical step would be for the Chief Executive to ask Congress to make all appropriations on a lump-sum basis and to let him and the Budget Bureau decide who gets how much for what and when.

I, for one, Mr. President, do not believe it is the wish of the American people that absolute budgetary authority be placed in the hands of any one man, regardless of who he might be or what position he might hold.

Inasmuch as the governments for which gifts would be intended are principally autocracies—most of which, by our standards, have nothing approaching organized revenue systems or national treasuries—these funds in many instances probably would be spent by local rulers largely as they would their very own. They conceivably could go to pay for palace improvements or the purchase of new wives for the royal harem.

In that regard, I am reminded of the cartoon in the February 18, 1957, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald, in which the harem dealer was pictured telling a prospective customer:

> They're sold on our new easy payment plan, Excellency. Nothing down and nothing to pay until you receive foreign-aid money.

If this gesture of ours appears in such a light to an American cartoonist, I ask then, how must it appear to the cynical Arab potentate who lolls in the luxurious splendor of his palaces while his downtrodden subjects starve in wretched poverty on the streets outside?

And is it not ironic that we—with our staggering national debt and almost unbearable tax burden—are offering our paltry millions to Middle Eastern nations which yearly receive oil royalties totaling more than $1 billion and which have oil reserves conservatively estimated to have a royalty value of some $100 billion?

Parenthetically, I should like to observe here that these royalty figures represent net income for the Middle Eastern countries and their rulers. And, of course, the rulers are not subject to confiscatory income tax laws such as the one we have in this country which would take up to 91 cents of every dollar of such earnings.

I, for one, Mr. President, do not deem it unreasonable to expect that nations with such secure collateral should use it in obtaining loans to finance needed economic improvements.

Yet, in the pending resolution, we are asked to exempt these nations from those provisions of the Mutual Security Act requiring 80 percent of such assistance to be in the form of loans. In addition, we are asked further to exempt them from the requirements of mutual defense guaranties on the ground that, as the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services phrased it on page 10 of their report No. 70, "they are offensive to some nations of Asia and Africa where it is felt they impinge unduly upon national sovereignty."

To emphasize the fabulous potential wealth of these Middle Eastern nations which we propose to bolster economically, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this time exhibits A, B, and C. Exhibit A is a table showing potential oil revenues of the Middle East as found on page 262 of the testimony taken at hearings on this resolution by the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees. Exhibit B is a table detailing Middle Eastern oil output and estimated revenues for 1955 as compiled by the Library of Congress. Exhibit C is a column written by Robert S. Allen on this subject as it appeared in the January 23, 1957, issue of the Anderson (S. C.) Daily Mail.

There being no objection, the exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

EXHIBIT A

*Potential oil revenues, oil-producing states of the Near East*

| | Production (in millions of metric tons) | | Reserves, 1955 (in thousand millions of metric tons) | Revenues (royalties) (in millions of dollars) | | Potential revenues, assuming 1955 rate of production and 1955 scale of royalties (in billions of dollars) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1955 | 1954 | | 1955 | 1954 | |
| Kuwait | 54.8 | --- | 5.41 | 280.0 | --- | 27.6 |
| Saudi Arabia | 47.1 | --- | 5.0 | 280.0 | --- | 29.7 |
| Iraq | 33.2 | --- | 2.7 | 223.4 | --- | 18.2 |
| Qatar | 5.4 | --- | .2 | 36.8 | --- | 1.4 |
| Bahrein | 1.5 | --- | .03 | 8.5 | --- | .170 |
| Iran | 16.0 | --- | 3.65 | 86.8 | --- | 19.8 |
| Total | 158.0 | --- | 16.99 | 915.5 | --- | 98.4 |

NOTE.—The revenues from oil received by the oil-producing states of the Near East totaled $915.5 million during 1955. Based on estimated reserves in 1955 and assuming no change in the price of oil and no change in the royalties per unit of oil produced, the potential revenues to all oil-producing countries of the Near East would total $98.4 billion.

Source: 1955 reserves, production, and royalties from London Financial Times Oil Survey, June 25, 1956, and London Financial Times, Aug. 17, 1956.

EXHIBIT B

*Middle East oil output and estimated revenues, 1955*

| State | Population | Producing company | Output by region (millions of metric tons) | Royalties or payments (estimated, millions of dollars) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kuwait | 200,000 | Kuwait Oil Co. | 54.8 | 280.0 |
| Saudi Arabia | 4,500,000 | Arabian American Oil Co. (Aramco) | 47.5 | 280.0 |
| Iraq | 5,000,000 | Iraq Petroleum Co. | 33.7 | 223.4 |
| Iran | 18,000,000 | Khanaqin Oil Co. | 16.2 | 84.0 |
| Qatar | 25,000 | Qatar Petroleum Co. | 5.5 | 36.7 |
| Bahrain | 110,000 | Bahrain Petroleum Co. | 1.5 | 8.5 |
| Total 6 States | --- | --- | --- | 912.6 |
| Kuwait/Saudi Arabia Neutral Zone | --- | American Independent Oil Co. jointly with Pacific Western Oil Corp. | 1.4 | --- |
| Egypt | 19,000,000 | Anglo Egyptian Oilfields Mobil Oil, Egypt. | 1.8 | --- |
| Total Middle East | --- | --- | 162.5 | --- |
| British and Dutch | --- | --- | 48.7 | --- |
| United States | --- | --- | 86.8 | --- |
| Iran | --- | --- | 16.2 | --- |
| Other | --- | --- | 10.8 | --- |

Source: Time for stock-taking. The Banker (London), November 1956: 681. (From table in accompaniment entitled "Middle East Oil, the Countries, the Companies, the Interests." That table has greater detail than the above.)

EXHIBIT C

[From the Anderson (S. C.) Daily Mail of January 23, 1957]

UNITED STATES OIL COMPANIES PAY OVER BILLION IN MID-EAST ROYALTIES

(By Robert S. Allen)

WASHINGTON.—Six Middle East countries received more than $1 billion in oil royalties in 1956.

Approximately one-half of these huge payments came from United States oil companies.

These are highlights of a detailed report that has been put in the hands of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which is considering the new Middle East policy. A major feature of this plan is $200 in economic aid for this region.

The committee obtained the report from Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, chairman of both the House Judiciary Committee and its Monopoly Investigating Subcommittee. All the data in this study came from Government agencies and business sources and was rechecked by other authorities.

Foreign Affairs Committee men are using the backstage report to challenge the contention that additional large-scale economic aid is needed in the Middle East.

They argue the study shows the region is not in dire economic straits.

These critics are citing particularly the fact that Saudi Arabia averaged $24,000,000 a month in oil royalties last year.

All of these payments were from Arabian-American Oil Co., which operates in that country. Aramco is owned by Standard of New Jersey, Standard of California, the Texas Co., and Socony Mobil. King Saud is about to arrive in the United States for an official visit.

Biggest oil royalties went to Kuwait—an average of $25,000,000 a month.

According to Celler's report these payments topped those of Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and Iran. The Kuwait Oil Co. is jointly owned by American and British interests. Kuwait is a tiny sheikdom of 5,800 square miles and 205,000 population on the northern end of the Persian Gulf.

It has been graphically described as "an ocean of oil covered by a desert."

Following is a leading chart in the Celler report:

| | 1956 average monthly petroleum revenues | American average per month interest | Amount, payments |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | *Percent* | |
| Saudi Arabia | $24,000,000 | 100 | $24,000,000 |
| Kuwait | 25,000,000 | 50 | 12,500,000 |
| Iraq | 18,000,000 | 23.75 | 4,265,000 |
| Iran | 13,000,000 | 40 | 5,200,000 |
| Qatar | 3,000,000 | 23.75 | 712,500 |
| Bahrein | 800,000 | 100 | 800,000 |
| Total | 83,800,000 | --- | 47,477,500 |
| For 12 months | 1,005,600,000 | --- | 569,730,000 |

The Bahrein Islands are off the Arabian coast in the Persian Gulf. They have an area of 250 square miles, population of 120,000; and are ruled by a Sheik under British protection. Qatar is part of the Trucial Sheikdoms, also a British protectorate on the Persian Gulf. Estimated population of Qatar is 95,000.

Where it's going: A new member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee has uncovered what a large part of the proposed $200 million in new economic aid for the Middle East is to be spent for.

It is going directly into the budgets of the Arab countries.

That is what Representative DANTE FASCELL, Democrat, of Florida, "freshman" member of the committee, ascertained from Secretary Dulles in a dramatic "cross-examination."

For a week the State Department head had adroitly sidestepped questioning on this point in both the House committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Repeatedly Dulles avoided stating the specific purpose of the large economic funds being sought.

He indicated expenditures would be determined on the basis of further planning and consideration.

But FASCELL maneuvered Dulles into giving the information he had deftly avoided before. The young Florida war veteran, who is on his second term in Congress, got his revealing answers as follows:

"Am I correct in assuming," FASCELL asked Dulles, "that in seeking to eliminate the restrictions in the Mutual Security Act on the disposition of present funds your purpose is to supplement the revenue that is now being lost by Middle East countries?"

"Well, perhaps not to supplement the revenue," replied Dulles warily, "let us say to counteract the economic consequences resulting from the loss of revenue."

FASCELL shook his head.

"Mr. Secretary," he said sternly, "isn't it a fact that what we are really talking about in this proposal is no economic aid of the project type, but rather direct financial assistance to the treasuries of these Middle East countries? Isn't that what this economic aid is really for?"

"It might be that in part," admitted Dulles. "Of course, to some extent you can kill two birds with one stone, so to speak. Sometimes budgetary aid, which is used for certain specific purposes, contributes to the financial stability of a country. There very well may be a necessity for doing more in the way of budgetary aid and less in the way of long-term projects."

"Then we are talking principally about budgetary aid," declared FASCELL. "Isn't that so?"

"Well, I would say largely so; yes," agreed Dulles.

"Thank you, Mr. Secretary," concluded FASCELL. "That is exactly what we wanted to know. Now it's on the record."

At the conclusion of the meeting, FASCELL was warmly lauded by committee colleagues for his effective grilling of Dulles.

Mr. TALMADGE. To take Saudi Arabia as an example, Mr. President, you will note from exhibits A and B that during 1955 that nation received from the Arabian-American Oil Co. a total of $280 million in royalties. It was disbursed by the Saudi Arabian Monetary Agency and Finance Minister appointed by and responsible solely to King Ibn Saud.

Of that income, $36 million was spent on defense, $24 million to buy the loyalty of savage Arabian tribesmen—apparently a sort of intramural "foreign aid" program patterned after the American example—and $10.7 million for health

education and social services. While the percentage of illiteracy in Arabia is 99.5 percent, King Saud and his handpicked governing officials have seen fit to establish only two high schools and 10 elementary schools.

The remainder of this fabulous Arabian income went into the royal bank account and to pay for the upkeep of King Saud's personal establishment of 10,000 wives, concubines, slaves, royal retainers, and bodyguards, and his personal fleet of 250 air-conditioned Cadillacs, some of which are gold plated.

The King's approximately 4½ million subjects—the exact number being unknown since no formal census of them ever has been taken—eked out a minimum existence on a per capita income of $42 for the same 12-month period.

With a little simple arithmetic, it can be shown from these statistics that with a single grant King Saud could have doubled the per capita income of his people, paid for the defense, tribal loyalty, and health, education, and welfare budgetary items, and still have had $20 million for his personal pleasure.

In the little Kingdom of Kuwait, which has a population of some 200,000, oil royalties totaling $280 million were paid directly to the ruling family in 1955. Distributed evenly among the populace, each resident of that tiny principality could have had an annual income of $1,400 and, by their standards, lived a life of considerable luxury.

In the country of Yemen—presently engaged in provocations which could, under the terms of this resolution, involve us in a Middle Eastern conflict—the ruler is absolute holder of the national purse strings. U. S. News & World Report in its issue of February 15, 1957, described the situation there in these words:

> The national treasury of Yemen belongs to the Imam as a sort of privy purse out of which he pays the nation's expenses. The job of finance is kept by the Imam himself, and he publishes no budget figures.

Of course, none of these Middle Eastern potentates have ever shared their wealth with their subjects and have no intentions of mending their ways. Using past behavior as a yardstick to future actions, there is little likelihood that any economic aid which the United States might provide for this area would be used to benefit the masses.

And there is nothing in this resolution to provide for assurances that the greed of oriental royalty shall not extend its sway over American foreign-aid dollars once channeled into their domains.

To further stress the point I wish to make in this regard, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a column by Drew Pearson, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald during the recent visit to this country by King Ibn Saud, and the conclusion of an editorial carried by the New York Daily News on January 22, 1957. These are designated as exhibits D and E.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article and excerpt from the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT D

ARABIAN POVERTY POSES A PROBLEM

(By Drew Pearson)

King Saud of Saudi Arabia is a 6-foot 6-inch Arab, 55 years old, wearing a light yellow coat, brown suede shoes, a goatee, and eyeglasses, having 40 sons and a royal household with wives, concubines, slaves, royal retainers, and guards of reportedly around 10,000 people.

He is bringing one of his youngest sons, 5-year-old Prince Manshur, to the United States to see whether American doctors can help his crippled hand. He is bringing no wives. Remarked a courtier: "There are beautiful women in the United States."

There are only 200 miles of paved road in Saudi Arabia, but the country has 250 Cadillacs. The King owns quite a few of these elite cars and once gave as a tip to the servants in Iran who took care of him on a visit there, 2 Cadillacs, 1 Chevrolet, and $80,000.

The King's annual income from the Arabian-American Oil Co. is estimated at around $300 million. However, he has budget problems.

Of this huge income, the King spends $36 million on defense, though his country is surrounded by friendly Arab neighbors. He also spends $24 million on what is called internal security, which chiefly goes for payments to Arabian tribesmen to maintain their loyalty. Another million goes for what is called "general development," which reportedly is the improvement of palaces.

Only $10.7 million goes to health, education, and social services.

ARABIAN POVERTY

This gets to the heart of the most difficult problem facing the United States and President Eisenhower in the talks with King Saud. For, while the King and the President are both anxious to combat communism in Saudi Arabia, the biggest breeder of communism is the poverty of the Arabian people, which today are heavily tubercular, about 40 percent syphilitic, and 70 percent suffering from trachoma.

To combat this, the King has established only 10 primary schools in his entire nation of nearly 7 million people, and only 2 high schools.

It's reported that the King wants to secure some American cash because his royalties have dwindled as a result of the Suez stoppage. How far Mr. Eisenhower and the State Department will go in suggesting that part of the money be spent on the Arabian masses will be important to observe.

So far, however, both the Eisenhower administration and the Arabian-American Oil Co. have shied away from giving too many hints to King Saud about how he should spend either his oil royalties or American aid. In fact, the Eisenhower administration took the unusual stand of declining to sign a United Nations treaty to outlaw slavery reportedly as a result of the sensitivity of King Saud.

ARAB SLAVE TRADE

Arab slave traders for years have done a lucrative business carrying slaves from as far away as French Equatorial Africa to Saudi Arabia. In some cases, Negroes have been traded for guns. In other cases, Moslem Negroes have been promised a free trip to Mecca, thereby insuring that they will have a place in paradise. They have climbed happily aboard the slave-traders' trucks, journeyed to Arabia, and once there, have been arrested for illegal entry, and sold on the slave market.

Female Negroes under 15 sell for anywhere between $400 to $1,100, males for $400 to $500. U. N. reports tell of older slaves set free, because they are a burden on their owners, and allowed to starve in the streets of Saudi Arabian cities. On the other hand, King Ibn Saud, father of the king who is now visiting the United States, is credited with an edict requiring slaveowners to protect and support their slaves in their declining years.

The question of slavery was debated extensively at Geneva by the United Nations last August and September, and a convention finally adopted abolishing it. The United States, however, took an amazing position. It refused to sign.

Walter Kotschnig, representative of the United States, explained that while the United States abhorred slavery, his Government doubted "the efficacy of any new convention."

"Many of the provisions of the proposed new convention," said Kotschnig, "deal with subjects generally conceded to be in the area of domestic jurisdiction.

"Better results might be achieved through public debate which would bring the weight of world opinion on shortcomings," he said. He also suggested educational measures and possibly economic or other assistance.

"On behalf of my Government I wish this conference every success," he said. But he abstained from voting for the treaty outlawing an institution over which the United States had fought a long and bloody war.

EXHIBIT E

[From the New York Daily News of January 22, 1957]

HANG ONTO YOUR WALLETS, FOLKS—IF YOU CAN

Meanwhile, an interesting split has shown up in the Middle East where the President wants to scatter $400 million for aid, while brandishing congressional standby authority to fight there against Communist aggression.

Three Mid-East nations—Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Syria—have agreed that they don't like this Eisenhower proposal. Also, they have promised to give Jordan $36 million a year, to replace that little kingdom's old British subsidy.

THE BOYS ARE RICH

The four Mid-East Bagdad Pact nations—Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, Turkey—proclaim that they like the Eisenhower proposal.

So we face the interesting possibility of some day having to fight not only Soviet Russia in the Mid-East but several Mid-East nations as well.

Speaking of aid, we're reminded of some figures a tough-minded friend of ours passed along to us the other day. It seems Iraq collected $201.6 million in oil revenues in 1955, Saudi Arabia $280 million, Kuwait ditto, Iran $98 million, Qatar $50 million, and Bahrein $8.5 million.

If assorted sheiks, sultans, shahs, and kings over there would share their loot with their subjects, there would be little or no need for outside aid. And if they won't, why should the United States taxpayer take this duty of Eastern potentates onto his sagging shoulders?

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I, for one, Mr. President, do not consider the majority of the nations of the Middle East to have demonstrated sufficient fiscal responsibility to indicate that they could utilize American economic aid for the benefit of their people. Not even the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress—which we know to be perhaps the most thorough and exhaustive research agency in the world—could find enough available data on budgetary administration in the Middle East to draw any positive conclusions as to the ability of these countries to undertake vast programs of economic improvement.

As documentation of this statement, I request unanimous consent to have

printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, to be designated exhibit F, the report of the Legislative Reference Service covering the fiscal administration and revenue and debt status of the nations of the Middle East.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT F

FISCAL ASPECTS OF THE MIDDLE EAST COUNTRIES

I. FISCAL ADMINISTRATION

Many of the Middle East countries have annual budgets and apparently have organized revenue systems and fiscal administrative machinery necessary to collect and disburse the revenues. These countries are: Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Syria, and Turkey. In some of the other countries, however, there appears to be no organized fiscal system, but heavy reliance on the administration of finances by the ruler and his family. These countries are: Kuwait, Qatar, Yemen, and also to a large extent Saudi Arabia. The latter country, however, submitted a budget for fiscal 1955, and in 1952 had a monetary agency appointed to assume certain fiscal responsibilities in the country.

Even though many of the countries submit annual budgets it is difficult to appraise their finances because of the complexity and multiplicity of their budgets. The following extract from a United Nations study describes generally the budgetary systems of these countries and also indicates the problems faced in studying these systems: [1]

"In no country of the region are all public revenues and expenditures incorporated in a single budget. Municipalities and, in some countries, provinces have budgets of their own, and even the receipts and expenditures of the central government are not covered in a single budget, except in Israel, where for some years the government has presented an integrated budget.[2] In some countries, a number of public entities and enterprises have autonomous or annexed budgets, and extrabudgetary receipts and expenditures play an important role. Thus, in Turkey, the budget of most government enterprises is not subject to parliamentary approval; their expenditures are covered by their own receipts and also, to a considerable extent, by credits obtained from the central bank. Similarly in Syria, a substantial part of development and defense expenditure was met in recent years by extraordinary advances from the available reserve fund. Some development expenditures were also financed in part by government-guaranteed credits extended by the issue department of the Bank of Syria and Lebanon to the agencies involved.

"Increasing use has been made of separate development budgets. There have been such budgets in Iran, Iraq, and Israel for a number of years, and in Egypt since 1953. In 1954, in addition to its development budget for production—the National Production Council's budget—Egypt introduced a second development budget for 'public services,' to be used especially to finance investments in the field of health, education, social welfare, and town planning.

"Revenues allocated to development budgets vary from country to country. In Iran and Iraq, they consist of a certain percentage of the oil receipts (70 percent in Iraq and 60 to 80 percent in Iran), the remainder being absorbed into the general budget. In Israel, principal revenues for the development budget are United States grants, German reparations and bond flotations. Egypt has made substantial allocations to the National Production Council, but the sources of its revenues have not been clearly specified. During 1953–56 they consisted chiefly of some extraordinary receipts and of the proceeds of development loans; it is apparently intended that further development expenditure will be covered to a great extent by borrowing. The development budgets of the Public Services Council for 1954–55 and 1955–56, on the other hand, derived their revenues largely from confiscated property of the former royal family and partly from transfers of funds from the general budget.

"As in the case of Egypt and Israel, development authorities in Iran and Iraq also have the right to borrow in certain circumstances, though they receive a large current income in the form of oil revenues. In Lebanon, Turkey, and, until 1955, in Syria, on the other hand, there have been no separate development budgets. Turkey, however, classified expenditures in the general budget and the annexed budgets into current expenses and investments, and since 1954 Lebanon divided expenditures in the general budget into current, defense, and investment accounts.

"Though some countries make extensive use of annexed and similar budgets, and have substantial extra-budgetary revenues and outlays, information concerning them is often lacking. In these circumstances, it is not possible to get an exact picture of developments in public finance, especially since available data on general budgets for 1954 and 1955 usually represent budget estimates rather than actual receipts and expenditures."

In the following Middle East countries there is a Minister of Finance: Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, and Turkey. The Minister of Finance of Iran is appointed by the Prime Minister and approved by the Majlis. The Majlis, or National Consultative Assembly, and the Senate constitute the legislative power). In Iraq, the minister is appointed by the King. In Lebanon, the Minister of Finance and Information is appointed by the President of the Republic. In Sudan and Syria the Minister of Finance is appointed respectively by the Governor-General and the Prime Minister.[3]

In some of these countries the Minister of Finance has a secondary role in the realm of finances. In Saudi Arabia, for example, although there is a finance minister, a Saudi Arabian Monetary Agency was appointed in 1952 and is responsible for the currency, government revenue and expenditure and for the financial and commercial policy of the country.

In some of the other countries the ruler acts as the minister of finance. In Kuwait—which is the largest oil-producing country in this area and which derives over 90 percent of its revenue from oil payments—the oil payments are paid to the ruling family, since there is no treasury system in the country. The Shaikh acts as his own minister of finance but personally allocates his income as between government departments. And, in describing the finances of Yemen a recent article said: "The national treasury of Yemen belongs to the Imam as a sort of privy purse out of which he pays the nation's expenses. The job of finance minister is kept by the Imam himself, and he publishes no budget figures." [4]

*Estimated budget receipts (in thousands of dollars)*

| | |
|---|---|
| **Egypt (fiscal year 1956):** | |
| Income taxes | 56,004 |
| Inheritance and real estate taxes | 63,586 |
| Customs and other indirect taxes | 329,361 |
| Other receipts [1] | 156,984 |
| Total | 605,935 |
| **Iran (fiscal year 1955):** | |
| Direct taxes on income and wealth | 12,640 |
| Customs and other indirect taxes | 81,546 |
| Oil revenues | 33,013 |
| Other receipts | 17,440 |
| Total | 144,640 |
| **Iraq (fiscal year 1956):** | |
| Direct taxes on income and wealth | 7,443 |
| Taxes on land and produce | 9,716 |
| Customs and other indirect taxes | 72,380 |
| Oil revenues | 63,952 |
| Other receipts [1] | 19,208 |
| Total | 172,704 |
| **Israel (fiscal year 1956):** | |
| Direct taxes on income and wealth | 75,273 |
| Property taxes | 1,944 |
| Customs and other indirect taxes | 95,111 |
| Capital and other receipts [1] | 23,278 |
| Total | 195,611 |
| **Lebanon (fiscal year 1956):** | |
| Direct taxes and duties | 11,612 |
| Indirect taxes and duties | 26,769 |
| Other receipts | 6,388 |
| Total | 44,769 |
| **Syria (fiscal year 1956):** | |
| Direct taxes and duties | 12,953 |
| Indirect taxes and duties | 38,423 |
| Registration fees | 8,169 |
| Other receipts [1 2] | 28,653 |
| Total | 88,203 |
| **Turkey (fiscal year 1956):** | |
| Income taxes | 269,643 |
| Taxes on transactions | 182,143 |
| Customs, indirect taxes and other receipts | 611,107 |
| Total | 1,062,893 |

[1] Excludes transfers from the reserve fund and includes net results of public undertakings.

[2] Excludes exceptional receipts from Department of Issue.

Source: United Nations, Economic Developments in the Middle East, N. Y., United Nations, 1956, pp. 99–100. (Data given in this source were in national currency units. They were converted to United States dollars. Free rates were used in the conversion where available.)

[1] United Nations. Economic Development in the Middle East. New York, United Nations, 1956, pp. 95–98.

[2] "Even in Israel, however, central government transactions do not reflect outlays directly financed by such national institutions as the Jewish National Fund, Keren Hayesod and the Jewish Agency. Furthermore, there was a supplementary budget in 1954–55 which showed revenues and expenditures of £I41.3 million, receipts of which were from ordinary revenue, receipts from counterpart funds, loans and others (Government Yearbook, 1955).

"For the fiscal year 1955–56, the Knesset (Parliament) has approved a supplementary defense budget totaling £I50 million, part of which is to be financed by funds raised by the "arms for defense fund" (Israel Office of Information, Israel Digest, vol. VII, No. 7 (New York, February 17, 1956)).

[3] Information in this paragraph is taken from: Europa Publications Limited. The Middle East 1955. London, Europa Publications Limited, 1955.

[4] Few Americans Get Into Yemen, but Here's a Firsthand Report. U. S. News & World Report, Feb. 15, 1957, p. 43.

II. DATA ON REVENUES AND DEBT

Certain data on the revenues of the Middle East countries are presented in the table. However, it must be emphasized that there are many problems attendant upon any international comparison of revenues. It might be said that it is even more so with the Middle East countries. The principal problem in any international comparison rests in the difficulty of converting national currencies into United States dollars to show the true comparison in terms of real purchasing power in those foreign countries. To mitigate this problem somewhat, free rates of exchange were used where available. Other problems are the nonuniformity of budgetary methods used among these countries and the use of a number of budgets in addition to the regular budget. Furthermore, the data here are budget estimates rather than actual revenues.

The following convenient table has been presented by the United Nations on the estimated total revenue and direct petroleum revenues for certain leading oil-producing countries. (These data were given in dollar amounts and required no conversion.)

*Share of direct petroleum revenue in total Government revenues, major oil producing countries*

| Country | Fiscal year | Total Government revenue | Direct petroleum revenue | Petroleum revenue as percentage of total Government revenue |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | *Millions* | *Millions* | |
| Iran [1] | 1955–56 | $255.8 | $98.0 | 38.3 |
| Iraq [2] | 1955–56 | 318.6 | 169.2 | 53.1 |
| Kuwait | 1955–56 | 194.7 | 188.9 | 97.0 |
| Saudi Arabia | [3] 1954–55 | 361.8 | 258.1 | 71.3 |

[1] Total Government revenue includes ordinary Government revenue plus direct oil income allocated to the National Iranian Oil Co. and the Seven-Year Plan Organization. It does not cover other revenues of the autonomous agencies of the Government, United States grants and loans from Bank Melli.

[2] Total Government revenue includes revenue in the ordinary budget and related budgets, as well as income of the Development Board and the municipalities.

[3] Includes period Aug. 30, 1954, to Aug. 19, 1955.

Source: United Nations. Economic Developments in the Middle East. New York, United Nations, 1956, p. 151.

The following table gives the national debt of the Middle East countries, for which data are available. The debt stated here includes domestic and also foreign debt.

*National debt (foreign and domestic)*

| Country | Debt | |
|---|---|---|
| | As of— | Millions of dollars |
| Egypt | June 30, 1956 | $772 |
| Iraq | Sept. 30, 1955 | 47 |
| Israel | Mar. 31, 1956 | 750 |
| Jordan | Mar. 31, 1956 | 16.2 |
| Saudi Arabia | Jan. 1, 1955 | (1) |
| Turkey | Feb. 28, 1956 | 761 |

[1] Estimated at over $50 million.

Source: Information for all countries was obtained from International Cooperation Administration, except the data for Saudi Arabia which was obtained from Moody's Municipals and Governments.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, additionally to illustrate the financial irresponsibility of Middle Eastern potentates, I further request unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, designated as "Exhibit G," an article from the Washington Post and Times Herald entitled, "King Saud Tips With Wristwatches and Other Not-So-Trinkety Trinkets."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT G

KING SAUD TIPS WITH WRISTWATCHES AND OTHER NOT-SO-TRINKETY TRINKETS

If you've been tipping your favorite waitresses with cheap little alarm clocks, be advised that King Saud has been beating your time all over town.

He leaves gold wristwatches and cash tips on a scale that figures out roughly to 66 percent of the tab.

Most spectacular demonstration of the royal visitor's largesse occurred at Normandy Farm, a Potomac (Md.) restaurant to which Saud repaired for lunch Monday afternoon.

His bill for the rather elaborate menu indulged by his party of 50 ran to something like $750. By way of expressing his satisfaction with the meal they helped arrange for him, Saud presented his chief waitress, Irene Watts, and Manager Lucien Bedourat with wristwatches. Then he left about $500 in cash to be prorated among the establishment's fifty-odd employees.

Four more of his watches, it was reported, went to Walter Reed Hospital medical personnel involved in the treatment of his son, 3½-year-old Prince Mashhur ibn Saud, a partial paralytic.

A spokesman for the Army Medical Center confirmed that "certain gifts were left here and their disposition is now under consideration." That last was in subtle reference to Army regulations that forbid the acceptance of such gifts by an individual.

The King is reportedly armed with 15 trunkloads of not-so-trinkety trinkets, earmarked for casual distribution during his stay in this country.

Gifts so far reported include replicas of his royal robes for members of President Eisenhower's Cabinet—and here and there another gold watch.

His visit Friday to the Islamic Center, 2551 Massachusetts Avenue NW., occasioned a gift that did not come with him in a trunk.

"Build an iron fence around the center," he instructed officials of the center, in effect, "and send the bill to me."

His contributions to the million-dollar center already amount to some $200,000, a spokesman said.

On the other hand, the ailing baby Prince may be able to refill those 15 trunks with tokens of esteem he has been gathering from children all over the country.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I have read very carefully the transcript of the hearings on this resolution held by the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees; and nowhere in that testimony was I able to find any indication that these groups were successful in learning from the administration how it proposes to spend the additional millions of dollars it wants carte blanche to hand out in the Middle East.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks I shall be very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

However, Mr. President, through one of those so-called leaks of which our State and Defense Departments appear to have more than their share, an enterprising reporter for the Wall Street Journal, John R. Gibson, learned just what President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles have in mind. He printed it in a comprehensive story on January 14 and I have been careful to note that his facts have not been denied either directly or by implication.

Here is what Mr. Gibson reported the Eisenhower administration plans to do with $600 million in American tax dollars in the Middle East between now and 1959:

Develop the Tigris-Euphrates River Valley—apparently with the exalted goal of restoring the grandeur of Babylon and the luxuriance of the Garden of Eden.

Build a system of highways and railroads connecting the cities of the Middle East—but with no mention as to how they would get across the armistice and battlelines, to say nothing of the closed borders, which crisscross the region.

Establish TVA's on both the Nile and Jordan Rivers—including the building of the Aswan Dam on the Nile.

Widen and deepen the Suez Canal—with the understanding, of course, that we pay for getting it unblocked and reopened, first.

Inaugurate a program of low-interest loans to Middle Eastern farmers—apparently to help them increase their production of cotton, tobacco, and wheat, to compete with the surpluses we already have in our warehouses here at home.

And such other miscellaneous projects as the building of the farm-to-market roads to get these new products to market, the construction of factories to provide jobs for the unemployed, and the erection of 1 million new homes in Egypt to house the refugees from the Arab-Israeli wars.

The total cost of these undertakings would, of course, run to many times more than the initial $600 million. The widening of the Suez Canal and the building of the Aswan Dam alone would cost more than $2 billion.

The only conclusion one can draw, therefore, is that the idea is to get the projects under way to the point where to discontinue them would result in more crises necessitating more urgent pleas for Congress to vote more blank check appropriations, thereby perpetuating the program.

I, for one, Mr. President, am opposed to such profligate spending on economic developments abroad—however worthy or needed they may be—when we either are unwilling or unable to do the same things for our own people here at home.

I am opposed to restoring the Garden of Eden when we cannot even restore the drought-stricken lands of our own Western States.

I am opposed to building superhighways in foreign lands when we are slaughtering Americans by the thousands on our own woefully inadequate road systems.

I am opposed to putting dams on rivers overseas so long as our own rivers cause misery and devastation through floods here at home.

I am opposed to aiding farmers in other countries when those here in America are in the grips of an agricultural depression which threatens their very existence.

I am opposed to building houses for Arab refugees in Egypt when veterans in this country cannot obtain loans to build homes for their families without paying exorbitant interest rates.

I am opposed to subsidizing any manner of economic projects abroad so long as our own old people, veterans, disabled citizens, dependent children and those unable to take care of themselves are not adequately provided for.

I am opposed to economic aid of the type contemplated by the administration when it is done at the expense of the overburdened American taxpayer, who today is shouldering the greatest tax load of any citizen in history.

And I submit to you, Mr. President, that the citizens of this great Nation of ours—not the ones who answer the rigged polls, but, rather, the ones who make up the grassroots of America, and pay the taxes which pay my salary and the salaries of my colleagues—feel the same way.

Things have passed the point of the sublime, and have traveled far into the realm of the ridiculous when we read in our newspapers, as we did in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 11, a proposal that foreign aid-type programs be undertaken to bolster the economy of depressed areas in this country. That was exactly the recommendation made to the Federal Government by the National Planning Association, in outlining a program for the relief of local unemployment.

Such evidence of misplaced values suggests to me the urgent need of a reappraisal of where we, as a nation, are headed; and what we intend to do, when and if we get there.

I ask unanimous consent that this news item be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks to be designated as exhibit H.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT H

AID PLAN FOR DEPRESSED UNITED STATES AREAS IS SUGGESTED BY PRIVATE STUDY GROUP

The National Planning Association urged yesterday that the Federal Government extend to depressed areas in this country the same sort of technical aid it gives to some foreign nations.

A special committee of the private study group suggested this is one facet of a vigorous Federal program which it said is needed to relieve chronic local unemployment.

The 20-member group of industrialists and economists said such a program should be carried out in coporation with local and private agencies.

Other Federal aids suggested included new plant financing through direct loans or Government guaranties of private loans, and special types of tax exemptions to stimulate business expansion.

The committee based its report on a study by William H. Miernyk, director of business and economic research, Northeastern University, Boston.

The group suggested that a program of technical assistance to explore and encourage new business possibilities is the first kind of assistance to be given to communities facing problems of chronic unemployment.

"Work of this kind has been liberally and successfully financed by the Federal Government in its overseas economic-aid programs," it said. "The methods developed there can be appropriately applied to our own country."

Miernyk made case studies of redevelopment activities in affected areas in New England, Pennsylvania, and other areas to illustrade a variety of approaches to the depressed community problem.

"Remedial measures," Miernyk asserted, "should be carefully timed and put into operation during the upswing of cyclical fluctuations in employment."

He said both the extremes of labor shortage and chronic unemployment might be avoided if the entire relief program could be broadly conceived and coordinated through an agency which viewed the problem as a whole. State, local, and area development organizations would play an important role in the combined efforts.

Miernyk said the main causes of chronic local unemployment are technological change, migration of industry, shifts in demand such as from coal to oil, protracted seasonal unemployment, tariffs, and depletion of natural resources.

On the basis of his findings, the NPA committee suggested:

Technical assistance.

The possibility of Federal financing for new plants either through primary loans, supplementary loans, or the guaranty of loans made by private agencies. Alfred C. Neal, a member of the committee and former Boston Federal Reserve Bank official, dissented in part from this. He said there should be no need for primary financing by the Federal Government.

Special tax relief to serve as a powerful inducement to a company to expand and thus increase employment.

Work relief for those who cannot find jobs elsewhere or who refuse to abandon their homes to seek them. This could be given either on public works or through Government procurement contracts to local firms.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the same article by Mr. Gibson to which I referred quotes persons high in the Department of State. The statements attributed to them, if true, constitute a serious indictment of the sincerity of the motives of those who brought this resolution to Congress under the guise of an emergency measure.

One identified as "a high Dulles assistant" was quoted as saying:

The military force part of the resolution would be an umbrella over aid.

Another called one of Uncle Sam's knowledgeable Mideast officials, was said to have stated:

In order to get the resolution through Congress you have to play down the aid as a solution to basic Middle East problems. Congress is a hornets' nest on that subject.

Mr. President, is it not possible that we find ourselves debating a contrived solution to an imaginary emergency?

Is it not possible this entire issue has been raised for the sole purpose of extracting from Congress the authority which it previously has refused to grant; that is, power for the executive branch to initiate unrestricted foreign-aid programs without the consent of Congress?

Is it not possible that we are allowing ourselves to be deluded by a gnat of a military crisis into swallowing a camel of an interminable economic program?

I, for one, Mr. President, heartily resent any implication that the respect and dignity of this great body should be used as an umbrella over anybody's boondoggle.

The facts and statements of this article merit the careful and thoughtful reading of each Member of this Senate, and it is with that thought in mind that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD in my remarks as exhibit I.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT I

[From the Wall Street Journal of January 14, 1957]

UNITED STATES PLANNERS MULL COSTLY PROJECTS TO PROP SHAKY ECONOMIES—IRRIGATION IN IRAQ; HOMES FOR ARABS; LOANS AND ROADS; ASWAN DAM'S BACK AGAIN—THE COST: $600 MILLION PLUS

(By John R. Gibson)

WASHINGTON.—The Eisenhower administration already is busy figuring how to spend the Middle East aid cash it hopes to get from Congress. Officials aim to pour the money into giant projects to build up dramatically the economies of lands from Egypt to Israel to Iraq.

The likely magnitude and duration of these projects make it all but certain that in the end the Middle East aid program will cost much more than the $600 million now mentioned and that it will linger on far longer than the 2 or 3 years that officials now talk about.

SPREADING IT AROUND

Though the exact projects that will get the cash haven't been decided, such schemes as these rank high in the consideration:

Development of Iraq's ancient Tigris-Euphrates Valley with irrigation and other projects.

An improved system of highways and railroads connecting Middle Eastern nations.

A long-standing scheme for developing the Jordan River Valley, which involves squabbling between Syria, Jordan, and Israel.

A sort of TVA for the entire Nile River Valley. This power and irrigation project would harness the 4,000-mile river all the way up to its sources in central Africa and Ethiopia, as well as along its length in Egypt and the Sudan.

A scheme for low-interest loans to farmers in the region, with the aim of boosting farm production and income.

Widening and deepening of the Suez Canal to increase its capacity and accommodate many of the supertankers now being built.

A batch of land-reclamation projects, mostly in the form of irrigation projects, which would provide new homes in Egypt and elsewhere for many of the 1 million Arab refugees who fled Israel after the Arab-Israeli war of 1948.

WHO WILL PAY?

"Altogether we've got perhaps two dozen rather detailed projects we could use," says an official of Uncle Sam's aid-dispensing International Cooperation Administration. Taken together, they would cost far more than the cash the administration has or is even asking for Middle Eastern use, but the United Nations, the World Bank, and the recipient countries are expected to shoulder part of the load.

The Chief Executive wants Congress, right now, to let him spend with no strings attached $200 million of aid money already appropriated for this fiscal year, ending June 30. Then, he has served notice, he will ask Congress to give him similar $200 million allotments for the Middle East in both the

1958 and 1959 fiscal years—a total of $600 millions for free-handed spending in all.

As foreign-aid administrators explain it, the $200 million to be spent the rest of this year would be on top of roughly $30 million worth of technical cooperation already slated. That consists of United States help for schools, health projects, and the like.

Although the lines aren't clear, the $200 million would probably include any large-scale development projects already planned for the Near East. Congress gave the administration $250 million for such projects in the Near East, Africa, and Asia this year, with original planning calling for up to $60 million of this to go into the Near East. The Suez Canal seizure put a halt to any such spending in the region, and it has never been made clear what big projects originally were planned.

BARS ON SPENDING

Eisenhower men are asking Congress to let them spend $200 million in the Middle East pretty much as they want. That means removing two principal restrictions. The planners want to be free from a congressional restriction that requires 80 percent of Middle East aid for building big projects within a single country to be loans instead of grants. The other chief restriction bars Government spenders from laying out more than 20 percent of their aid appropriations in May and June of each fiscal year; this is designed to keep aid men from a last-minute rush of spending for fear of losing already appropriated funds.

In selling the aid portion of the Eisenhower Middle East resolution to Congress, the President and Secretary of State Dulles have publicly emphasized the cash is aimed at thwarting Communist infiltration. But that task is more a matter of legislative strategy than a full disclosure of intentions.

The policymakers who helped draw up the aid ideas and the men who will administer them have much broader ideas. They see the aid cash as an important weapon in solving basic Middle East troubles—Arab-Israeli bad blood and the anticolonial hatred of Arab countries, principally Egypt, for western nations.

UMBRELLA OVER AID

"The military force part of the resolution would be an umbrella over the aid," explains a high Dulles assistant. "That's what NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) was originally planned to do in Europe—remove the Russian threat so economies could be repaired."

More explanation comes from one of Uncle Sam's knowledgeable Mideast officials. Says he:

"In order to get the resolution through Congress, you have to play down the aid as a solution to basic Middle East problems. Congress is a hornets' nest on that subject."

He adds: "It would look like we were trying to undercut the United Nations if we came out and said we wanted the aid money to patch up basic troubles out there. We're backing (U. N. Secretary-General) Hammarskjold in his efforts."

Indeed, the administration is currently in the process of trying to stave off a determined move in both the House and Senate to sever the President's Middle East aid requests from the authority he wants for use, if necessary, of armed force in the region.

Secretary of State Dulles has vigorously criticized a Democratic proposal for a congressional resolution that would omit the aid part of the scheme. "It (the Democratic proposal) does not touch at all upon the economic phase of the problem which is of extreme importance and urgency," the Secretary declared .

"Without the aid, you would be closing only half the stable door," is the way an administration official puts it more directly.

What administration officials say they want is a free hand to promise economic aid to a country or group of countries quickly any time the diplomatic situation suddenly turns favorable.

TOOLING WITH CASH

Specifically, the diplomats see increased freedom in using the cash as a tool to help settle Arab-Israeli feuding. Right now, say Middle East experts, the Arabs won't talk about a joint economic project because they're angry at Israel and because some Arab countries are angry at others. They say poor economic conditions within the troubled countries underlie most of the discontent.

"It's a vicious circle that the aid freedom might give us a chance to break," contends a Dulles aid.

An ICA insider talks of three broad purposes of the spending projects the administration plans.

The first aim is to ease tensions fast. Chiefly, this means getting refugees from the Arab-Israeli war of 1948 out of United Nations camps in Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria and into productive work of their own. Old Middle East hands at the State Department narrow the reason for much of the discontent in Arab countries to ugly animosities against Israel stirred up in the Arab refugee camps. The United States and the U. N. currently have plans in the works for irrigating and reclaiming large sections of arable land on Egypt's Sinai Peninsula and in Jordan as homes for many of the refugees.

EXCITABLE PEOPLE, EASE OFF

The second, longer term purpose is to help large economic groups, such as farmers, in Mideast nations in an attempt to keep tensions down. "These are excitable people," a United States theorist says of the Middle Easterners. "But if they see you're trying to give them something, they ease off."

This situation calls, in the eyes of United States planners, for more irrigation and land reclamation. It also calls for farm-to-market roads in a region where highways, as well as other forms of transportation, are scarce. And the United States planners foresee a possible scheme for lending individual countries large amounts of cash which would be reloaned at low interest to farmers for agricultural work.

The third aim is still broader and longer range: To lift per capita incomes and living standards of whole countries in the poverty-plagued Middle East through projects of nationwide impact. These might include multipurpose river valley developments, railroad construction, and big industrial enterprises.

Administration officials won't give a complete rundown on the schemes they have in mind chiefly because they don't want to be besieged with cries for help from the countries involved. As Secretary Dulles explains it, disclosure of what projects the United States intends to underwrite makes the countries involved think they have a vested interest in the project.

But it's clear the foreign aiders have a batch of big specific projects lined up for potential use.

ASWAN'S BACK AGAIN

For instance, there's Egypt's $1.3-billion Aswan Dam, a proposal which intermittently dies and comes back to life. Officials who call it "dead as a doornail" one day admit the next that there's still a chance the United States may help pay for it. The dam's fate depends, apparently, on how friendly Egypt becomes with the free world.

They now call much brighter, however, the prospects for a United States hand in a development project for practically the entire Nile River. Whereas the Aswan Dam would have blocked the Nile in its comparatively lower reaches, the big development scheme would go into the Nile's headwaters for irrigation and power projects. These would benefit not only Egypt, but also the newly independent Sudan, Ethiopia, and British-controlled Central Africa, where one branch of the Nile starts in Lake Victoria.

Uncle Sam's strategists also eye the Tigris-Euphrates River Valley system in Iraq. The home of ancient Babylon and the cradle of modern civilization, the valley had a rich, highly advanced culture thousands of years ago. Developers would like to help the valley toward new preeminence, principally with more irrigation.

Most likely of all the schemes to win United States funds is the beleaguered Suez Canal, assuming Egyptian President Nasser agrees to play ball with the West. The State Department and the World Bank, of which the United States is the biggest member, are studying cash outlays to Egypt for widening and deepening the 105-mile desert waterway. Experts estimate the cost at up to $1 billion.

RESOLVED: PRESERVE SUEZ

Many international strategists consider a loan for this work as potentially desirable because of the strategic location of the canal on the heavy oil-shipping route connecting the Middle East and Western Europe. They seem resolved to keep Suez the main artery for this oil flow.

Neither Egypt nor any other country will get its aid just for the asking. Administration officials make clear privately, although they don't say it openly, that they want various assurances that the cash will prove effective before they dole it out.

For the Suez development, as an example, Uncle Sam wants Egypt, Britain, and France to agree first to a settlement of their Suez differences. Our diplomats expect to offer cash for expansion of the canal as a come-on, if necessary, to a final settlement by the three countries directly involved.

That's the way they expect to use many of their other aid schemes, too. They'll make clear to disputing Middle Eastern nations that we're ready to help raise their living standards and boost national income, if the countries will just work together on the projects. This squabbling which the United States wants to end not only embroils Arab countries with Israel, but, as well, Arab countries with each other. Our diplomats note, for instance, that Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Syria are constantly trying to pull oil-rich Iraq away from her friendship with Britain. And both Iraq and the Egyptian bloc are contesting for weak little Jordan's allegiance.

Not all Uncle Sam's Middle East aid dollars will go for economic schemes, of course. Some will go for military aid that President Eisenhower wants to promise the countries. The President wants to give Middle Eastern countries arms and other military help, so they can beef up their own forces against Communist threats. Leaders of Iraq already have indicated they've been promised added United States arms aid.

But our planners say military help would take only a minor part of the $200 million that Mr. Eisenhower wants freedom to spend this year and the $400 million he wants in future years, let alone money to be spent still later.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, while it is futile to labor the mistakes of the past, wise and prudent men do seek to profit by them. And it is in that light that I should like to call to the Senate's attention the experiences which we, as a nation, have had in a similar instance.

It will be recalled that in 1951 the Iranian oil crisis was precipitated by then Prime Minister Mossadegh in much the same manner as was the current Suez crisis. We were warned then, as now, of the dire consequences of failure to provide economic assistance. As a

result we undertook an emergency program of economic aid to Iran.

The International Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations has just this year completed its report on those operations. Its findings are a sad indictment of the Iranian economic program in particular and a sobering warning of what could happen on a larger scale under the program proposed by the resolution presently under deliberation.

This subcommittee found the Iranian program was administered in a loose, slipshod, and unbusinesslike manner and was based on the "assumption that as long as United States aid funds were spent promptly it was not a matter of great consequence as to what they were spent for." It characterized the $100 million program as "neither technical assistance nor economic development but an ad hoc method of keeping the Iranian economy afloat during the years of the oil dispute."

The report cited the cases of a series of industrial projects under which $10 million was spent to build a cotton mill, two cement plants, a municipal power station, a sugar refinery, and a slaughterhouse.

The equipment for the power station is rusting on the docks 2 years after delivery. And to date none of the industrial projects has been made operative. In fact, all have degenerated to the point where the International Cooperation Administration has had to hire a firm of industrial engineers to tell it how to rehabilitate the plants it built to rehabilitate the Iranian economy in the first place.

For the benefit of those who feel economic aid serves to stimulate initiative for self-improvement on the part of the aided nations, I quote this portion of the House subcommittee's report:

> Whatever Iranian efforts may have been made to solve their own difficulties through appropriate reforms in Government spending and tax collection, their successes in this regard do not appear to have been noteworthy during the period when United States aid was financing Iranian budget deficits.

The conclusions made by this group should be weighed carefully by the Members of this body before voting to undertake a similar program on a larger scale. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that these findings, as taken from pages 3 to 5 of House Report No. 10, be herewith incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks and designated as "Exhibit J."

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT J

CONCLUSIONS

1. United States aid and technical-assistance programs in Iran which, between 1951 and 1956, totaled a quarter billion dollars, were administered in a loose, slipshod, and unbusinesslike manner.

2. The so-called expanded technical-assistance program which began in January 1952 and resulted in United States obligations of over $100 million in a 5-year period, was neither technical assistance nor economic development, but an ad hoc method of keeping the Iranian economy afloat during the years of the oil dispute.

3. The expenditure of technical-assistance funds during these years was undertaken without regard to such basic requirements of prudent management as adequate controls and procedures, with the inevitable consequences that it is now impossible—with any accuracy—to tell what became of these funds. The resulting opportunities for waste and loss of funds were considerable, but the extent to which loss and waste actually occurred cannot be determined since management practices and control procedures were so poor that records of the operation, especially in the early years, are not reliable.

4. Amounts requested for United States aid to Iran seem to have been picked out of the air. There is no evidence that they were based on advance study of what the Iranian economy needed, the amount it could absorb, or programs which could be intelligently administered by the United States personnel available at the time to expend the funds.

5. The conduct of the United States operations mission's affairs appears to have been based on the assumption that as long as United States aid funds were spent promptly it was not a matter of great consequence as to what they were spent for. Members of the mission who openly objected to the uncontrolled nature of the operation were either disciplined or labeled as incompetent. To those familiar with the involved and time-consuming processes for financing public works in the United States, in whole or in part with Federal funds, the cavalier, free-wheeling casual fashion in which huge sums of United States funds were committed in Iran must necessarily be shocking.

6. The participation of Iran in sharing the expense of the program appears to have been little more than nominal, and it is clear that, from the Iranian standpoint, the program's virtue was that it supplied a source of foreign exchange. It was not United States know-how but United States dollars which was Iran's chief gain.

7. Under the expanded operations begun in 1952, about $10 million in direct aid was furnished for a series of industrial, or capital improvement projects. Under statutory criteria the eligibility of the projects is questionable. United States officials sought to justify these expenditures on the grounds that the various plants involved were not only badly needed for the economy of the country but would supply excellent demonstrations of the feasibility of such undertakings. However, the more important of these enterprises still are not fully operating after 4 years, due to poor planning and faulty engineering. Thus their value in terms of economic development has been almost nil, and as demonstrations they appear chiefly to be monuments to a fumbling aid program.

8. A major effort on the part of the United States mission in 1953 to promote the construction of a multi-million-dollar dam on the Karadj River has resulted in virtually nothing but the relocation, at a cost to the United States Government of nearly $3 million, of a road around the proposed site; while not only has there been no construction started on the dam, the Iranian Government has not even concluded a firm contract for its financing.

9. Among the programs undertaken was one of supplying nearly $5 million over a 4-year period to support Iranian students who were completing their college training abroad. Involved in the program was a $2 million subsidy, through a special exchange rate for dollars, to the well-to-do sponsors and parents of these students. The nature and scope of the program were not revealed to the Congress and the Comptroller General has ruled that the expenditure of technical-assistance funds for this purpose was unauthorized.

10. On top of annual grants of about $20 million for technical assistance, the United States began, in 1953, to supply supposedly temporary budgetary assistance to the Iranian Government at a rate of $5 million a month. In spite of the alleged temporary nature of this increased aid, the United States has continued to make budget aid grants and loans at about this same rate for 3 years.

11. United States control over what Iran did with this budget aid was practically nonexistent and the subcommittee notes that Iranian budget deficts increased rather than decreased during this period.

12. United States aid, alleged to be granted on the basis of austerity levels of Iranian Government expenditures, was utilized to pay for many extraordinary items, like the payroll of the National Iranian Oil Co. The fact that these items had not previously been considered appropriate charges against the Government budget casts doubt upon the propriety of treating them as budget items to be supported with United States aid dollars.

13. Whatever Iranian efforts may have been made to solve their own difficulties through appropriate reforms in Government spending and tax collection, their successes in this regard do not appear to have been noteworthy during the period when United States aid was financing Iranian budget deficits.

14. Iran's oil revenues are, and have been for some time, adequate to finance both the Government's operating budget and their ambitious development plan. Thus, their chronic budget deficits appear to be an outgrowth of financial management methods rather than lack of resources.

15. A factor in continued United States aid appears to be an aversion on the part of Iran to receive help in the form of United States loans, even though such loans are feasible and Iran is in a good position to repay them.

16. Each year's allotment to Iran has been justified as a temporary measure for a given set of reasons which have changed each year while the level of aid has remained about the same throughout. Presentations to the authorizing and appropriating committees of the Congress have been vague and misleading. This may be due, in part, to the paucity of factual information available to those testifying before the committees of Congress. It may also be due to awareness that a clearer picture would have led Congress to reduce the program by eliminating items of expenditure which could not be reasonably justified.

17. Program presentations to the Congress have consistently failed to point out that Iran was and is an essentially solvent country.

18. The use of the so-called illustrative method of presenting budget requests to the Congress is a major factor in the almost complete loss of control by the Congress over spending in this type of program. Under this system the Congress is given a description of a hypothetical program which might be carried out if requested funds are furnished. However, when funds are granted by the Congress, there is no commitment by the executive branch to expend them for any of the activities used as hypothetical illustrations.

19. Congressional control over expenditures in this type of program is further defeated by the fact that information supplied Congress on how funds granted on the illustrative basis were actually spent consistently omits the elementary facts needed for an intelligent postaudit.

Mr. TALMADGE. Under the terms of this resolution, the United States would be committed to go to war on the side of any Middle Eastern nation attacked by any country controlled by international communism. For lack of any clarifying definition, one can but assume

this would include any country in the Middle East which might be supplied by a Communist nation with the weapons and technical know-how for waging war.

Such would be the case in the event Syria, which already is a bristling fortress of Soviet planes and arms, should attack Lebanon or Iraq. It probably already is the case in the border warfare between the Russian-armed kingdom of Yemen and the British protectorate of Aden.

Again drawing on the experience of the past, it can be seen how, through the operation of the terms of this resolution, the United States could be committed to fight a dozen small, Korean-type wars without once having the opportunity to fire a shot at, or inflict any degree of injury upon, the real enemy.

I, for one, Mr. President, am unalterably opposed to any plan whereby American troops would be committed to fight and die in diplomatic wars with Russian satellites.

I am equally opposed to the commitment of American soldiers to United Nations control under any circumstances without prior consent of Congress in each instance. This resolution specifies that its provisions for the employment of Armed Forces "shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations."

One can but conclude that, from the date of the adoption of this authorization, the United Nations would have claim upon the services of United States Armed Forces to fight in or police the Middle East without the necessity of any additional authorization from or consultation with the Congress.

With all of its provisos and costs, however, this resolution fails to provide, or even offer, solutions to the two basic problems of the Middle East—the troubles which brought on the present situation; namely, the unending Israeli-Arab conflict and the controversy over the ownership of and access to the Suez Canal.

Until those problems are settled there will be no peace in the Middle East. And those problems cannot be reconciled until Israel is guaranteed her territorial integrity and all nations are assured full and equal use of the Suez Canal and all other mideastern waterways.

Any proposal which fails to take into consideration—or, like the one we are today considering, deliberately ignores—those two basic conflicts can do little more than scour around the edges of the problem. It can never hope to clean up the mess.

Our present situation was very aptly summarized by Columnist Henry Hazlett in the January 28 issue of Newsweek magazine when he wrote:

> Mr. Eisenhower declares boldy that we will now do in the face of every disadvantage what we did not have the foresight to do when we enjoyed every advantage.

I, for one, Mr. President, am convinced that our failure as a nation to support Britain, France, and Israel in their attempt to restore order to the Middle East last year will be recognized by historians as a costly diplomatic mistake and a military blunder of catastrophic proportions.

It is hardly likely that the United States can salvage the situation with this declaration to serve notice to the Russians of how firm we will be next time.

The one inescapable conclusion from the matter before this body is that the United States has no definitive foreign policy.

The committees which considered this resolution admitted that with the statement:

> It should be clearly understood that this proposed resolution taken by itself does not provide a definitive United States foreign policy for the Middle East, nor is it so intended. All it provides is time in which to devise such a policy.

I ask, Mr. President, whether this resolution is calculated by its sponsors to achieve that end.

I seriously doubt that its adoption will mark the beginning of a new and definitive American foreign policy for the Middle East.

I fear it will be only the signal for a continuation of this administration's discredited brand of diplomacy which substitutes words for wisdom and dollars for deeds—which measures its successes in terms of money given away and the number of miles traveled by the Secretary of State.

The only way we can be absolutely sure that the definitive foreign policy we so desperately need is devised is to make it necessary by rejecting this resolution.

I, for one, Mr. President, shall so vote.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Before I ask my first question, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Georgia for the exceptionally able speech he has made on the joint resolution, and for his keen analysis of its flagrant shortcomings.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I think the argument of the Senator from Georgia is one of the most able that has been made against the joint resolution to date on the floor of the Senate.

In the course of the Senator's remarks, he pointed out that he had read the transcript of the record of the hearings, and had failed to find any evidence in the transcript that the administration had advised us as to how it intended to spend the money, for the expenditure of which it is asking a grant of blank-check authority to the President. Does the Senator from Georgia agree with me that when we are dealing with a situation so critical as the one in the Middle East, so far as the internal difficulties of the Middle East are concerned, we, as Members of the Senate, have a right to know from this administration what projects it proposes to spend the money on?

Mr. TALMADGE. Not only do I think we have a right to know, but I believe it is our duty, as representatives of the taxpayers of our States, to know before we appropriate the money.

Mr. MORSE. My next question is this: The Senator is no doubt aware, from reading the transcript, that the witnesses for the administration advised us that the Richards Commission was to be sent to the Middle East forthwith to make a study of the situation in that area, and on their return would recommend to the administration projects on which the money should be spent. Therefore, apparently, no expenditures will be made until that Commission reports.

Mr. TALMADGE. I read that in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that that fact alone has some bearing upon the issue as to whether there is any great need for urgent action on the joint resolution prior to the report of the Richards Commission?

Mr. TALMADGE. I certainly believe that if the urgency were great, those who are to spend the funds would already be making visits to try to ascertain how to spend them.

Mr. MORSE. In view of the fact that administration witnesses have testified that they will await the findings of the Richards Commission, does the Senator from Georgia agree with me, that at least the appropriate committees of Congress ought to be advised, in executive session, what the Richards Commission recommends before we take final action on any such blanket authority as the pending joint resolution proposes to give to the administration?

Mr. TALMADGE. I think that not only the committees of Congress ought to be advised what the money is to be spent for, but both branches of the Congress itself should be so advised.

Mr. MORSE. My last question is this: In view of the very keen analysis the Senate has made of the unfortunate Iran fiasco—and I consider it such, so far as the expenditure of American taxpayer's money is concerned—does he agree with me that the American people themselves ought to have an opportunity to review the administration's proposals in regard to the expenditure of taxpayers' money on various projects on which the Senator implied the money might be spent, before Congress votes to give any President, Republican or Democrat, any such sweeping powers as the resolution grants?

Mr. TALMADGE. I fully share the views of the Senator from Oregon in that respect.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from Georgia has stated that he has read the transcript of the testimony given before the committees which considered the joint resolution. I ask the Senator from Georgia if those hearings do not disclose that there are 15 European nations, having a total population in excess of 270 million who are primarily dependent upon the continued flow of Mideast oil?

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. I will ask the Senator if he found in the hearings any sensible reason given by any witnesses why Congress should be asked to pledge the re-

sources of American taxpayers or the lives of American boys to secure the continued flow of Mideast oil to those 15 nations of 270 million people, without calling upon those nations to contribute at lease one cent of their money or one of their sons to aid in that task:

Mr. TALMADGE. I share fully the views of the Senator from North Carolina in that regard. I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, first of all I should like to associate myself with the comments of my colleagues who have already commended the Senator from Georgia upon his presentation. The Senator's address surely exhibits a great deal of hard work and careful study of the hearings, not only in the Senate but also of the record which was made in the House of Representatives when its committee held hearings.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator said in his speech:

> I for one, Mr. President, do not deem it unreasonable to expect that nations with such secure collateral should use it in obtaining loans to finance needed economic improvements.

Is the Senator referring to the possibility that some of the countries of the Middle East, in light of their oil resource revenues, would be eligible for loans from the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund?

Mr. TALMADGE. I certainly feel that their tremendous resources would be ample security with which to borrow money.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Georgia has studied the record very carefully. Does he recall that representatives of the State Department testified to the effect that in not one of the years in which funds have been made available for the Middle East countries have we been able either to spend or to obligate all of those funds?

Mr. TALMADGE. I recall that testimony.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe that for 5 years funds were made available for use in the Near East and that in none of the 5 years was the Government of the United States, through its appropriate agencies, able to contract for or to obligate the use of funds which Congress had authorized and appropriated. Is that the Senator's recollection?

Mr. TALMADGE. That is my recollection of the testimony.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator from Georgia aware of the fact, from his review of the testimony, that when it came to military assistance—that is, the military hardware, the military funds—in not one of those years to which reference was made in the testimony were all the funds for military assistance obligated or expended?

Mr. TALMADGE. That is my recollection.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yet we are told that between the first day of May 1957, and the 30th day of June 1957, a period of slightly more than 60 days, the sum of $200 million of the total appropriated funds is to be spent? Is that the understanding of the Senator, as he reads the resolution?

Mr. TALMADGE. It is to be spent for a purpose about which no one seems to know anything.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did the Senator from Georgia find anything in the printed hearings or in the public record which indicates that anyone in the Government knows the purposes for which the $200 million is to be spent between May 1 and June 30 of this year?

Mr. TALMADGE. The only information I have on that subject is the so-called leak in the Wall Street Journal, to which I referred in my speech.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator agree that, even if the leak were to be interpreted as policy, it would still be almost impossible to be able to obligate intelligently and prudently $200 million between May 1 and June 30?

Mr. TALMADGE. It would be impossible to plan the expenditure, let alone spend that much money.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator also referred to the basic problems in the Middle East. I read his words——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator speak louder, so that those of us who sit in the locality where I am may hear what he has to say?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Georgia also referred in his address to the basic problems in the Middle East. I read a paragraph from his prepared speech:

> With all of its provisos and costs, however, this resolution fails to provide, or even offer, solutions to the two basic problems of the Middle East—the troubles which brought on the present situation; namely, the unending Israeli-Arab conflict and the controversy over the ownership of and access to the Suez Canal.

Then the Senator goes on to point out that until those problems are solved there will be no peace in the Middle East.

I ask the Senator from Georgia this question: In line of his obviously keen and intelligent interest in the foreign policy of our country, particularly as it relates to the Middle East, is the Senator aware of any constructive solution that has been offered to date, either unilaterally by our Government or in cooperation with other governments, to arrive at a solution of those basic problems?

Mr. TALMADGE. If a solution has been offered, I have not heard of it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator knows, I assume, that the Dominion of Canada, our sister free nation to the north, has exhibited a keen interest and a great sensitivity and, I think, great intelligence, with respect to the problems in the Middle East.

Mr. TALMADGE. I know they have considered some solutions, but I have not studied them in detail.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator recall whether the Government of the United States has associated itself with our greatest friend, the government of the Dominion of Canada, in trying to seek a common ground for the solution of those problems?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am not aware of it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator believe that our Government might well try to obtain from the Egyptian Government a renunciation of its so-called rights of belligerency, as a beginning of a solution to those problems?

Mr. TALMADGE. Any solution of the Middle East problems, in my opinion, must address itself directly to Israel and Egypt in solving their differences.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is true, is it not, that one of those States claims it is still a belligerent and at war?

Mr. TALMADGE. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would it not seem understandable, therefore, and desirable, that that situation first be tackled?

Mr. TALMADGE. That is a problem which must be solved before any solution can be had of the Middle East problems.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have one final question. Does the Senator view the pending resolution as a means of making the American people feel that by its passage we will, first, arrive at a foreign policy for the Middle East and, second, at a solution?

Mr. TALMADGE. I hope the American people will not construe any such policy as that proposed to be a solution or a policy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I enjoyed very much listening to his address, which is his initial presentation in the Senate. It is surely worthy of thoughtful consideration by every Member of the Senate.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. First, let me congratulate the distinguished Senator from Georgia for his very able presentation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we cannot hear the Senator. We are interested in what he has to say. Will he speak louder?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I shall try to oblige the distinguished majority leader.

All of us should thank the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia for his most able and thought-provoking address on the floor this afternoon.

A sentence reads:

> I am opposed to restoring the Garden of Eden when we cannot even restore the drought-stricken lands of our own Western States.

Is it not true that in the past 4 years, based on figures from the Department of Agriculture itself, whereas the per capita nonfarm income of the United States has increased from $1,833 to $2,009, per capita farm income has decreased from $702 per capita to $605?

Mr. TALMADGE. I think the Senator's figures are correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does not the able Senator believe that as we continue to pour heavy amounts of money into foreign countries in order to help their economies we should also give some consideration to the importance of at least restoring to our own farmers that income they had 4 years ago?

Mr. TALMADGE. I certainly share the Senator's view.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I ask the distinguished Senator if he remembers when there was criticism of Mr. Henry Wallace for wanting to give a quart of milk to each hottentot? Would my friend from Georgia not agree that it would be better to give 1 quart of milk to a hungry person than to give hundreds of millions of dollars to rulers in lands of the Middle East which are already rich?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am sure Secretary Wallace was ahead of his time in his views.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does not the Senator remember the criticisms made of Mr. Harry Hopkins for wanting to put $300 million worth of food into the mouths of poor people in this country during the terrible depression of the early thirties? Does he not agree that it would be at least as important to help some of the farmers who are now losing their cattle and their land, despite Mr. Benson's hugging the grain he has stored right by them as it is to put millions of dollars into certain foreign countries that may not be our allies in case of trouble?

Mr. TALMADGE. I certainly agree with the distinguished Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. My final question: Of course some economic and military aid is important to our security, but does the Senator believe that the United States can purchase its security with dollars any more than the British could purchase theirs when they attempted to do so against the Nazis in mid-30's?

Mr. TALMADGE. I learned immediately after I got out of law school that if a man wants to lose his friends and his money, let him endorse another man's paper. [Laughter.]

Mr. SYMINGTON. Permit me to make one comment on that reply of the able Senator. The words he just uttered were almost the exact words the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire and I heard when he asked the same question of representatives of our Government in Europe who had the courage to give us the facts some 3 years ago.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Senator from Missouri; and I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia. He was straightforward; he gave the Senate the benefit of his views, and he backed up his views by exact figures. I was interested to note that the Senator said, in effect, that the resolution as it is now drawn does not, in fact, constitute a policy for the United States in the Middle East.

Mr. TALMADGE. That was my statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator agree with me in saying that so far as this particular resolution is concerned, it really was not needed, because the President had authority under section 1 of the Constitution, and he and the Secretary of State have said on occasions that they did not need any new money appropriated, that they already had sufficient, as was brought out earlier, so that they could find, if necessary, the $200 million to spend in the next 60 or 90 days?

Mr. TALMADGE. It is my opinion that the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of our country, can so dispose our forces in such a way as best to protect the security of our Nation.

With reference to the economic part of the question, I am informed that there is now in the pipeline some $7 billion, unexpended, and readily available for use.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is $750 million, so far as this particular matter is concerned; is that correct?

Mr. TALMADGE. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What the administration is asking under this resolution is a little more in the way of flexibility and a deletion of the application date of April 30. Does not the Senator think that if the President had made a request to have the date of April 30 changed, the Appropriations Committee would have been very happy to accede to such a request on the part of the President of the United States?

Mr. TALMADGE. It certainly would have given the Appropriations Committee an opportunity to determine how the money was going to be spent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Exactly. Again I wish to congratulate and compliment the Senator from Georgia for his address this afternoon.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will permit me to say so, I have listened to many speeches by newly sworn-in Members of this body since I became a Member of the Senate myself in 1934. I wish to say to the Senator that I have never heard a speech more forcefully, more lucidly, and more persuasively delivered than the speech which he has delivered today. I think he has performed a great public service. I hope that every citizen of the United States, and certainly every Member of Congress who has been lulled by slogans into the belief that this is a peace program which is before us, will learn from reading the speech of the Senator from Georgia that it is not a peace-making resolution, but is a war-making resolution.

For myself, personally, I thank the Senator very, very deeply for what he has said today.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield the floor?

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, we are all aware of the importance of widespread agreement in Congress on any matter involving foreign nations. For that reason I should have wished, if possible, to vote in favor of President Eisenhower's recommendations on foreign policy.

Instead, I find that many Members of the House voted for the resolution reluctantly, with grave doubts, with misgivings.

Some of our colleagues in the other body expressed the hope that the Senate would amend the resolution, which they were not able to amend under their rule.

I regret that after studying a thousand pages of hearings and reports, I am obliged to say that this resolution will certainly be harmful, perhaps very harmful, to the security of our country.

In accordance with my oath as Senator, to uphold the Constitution, I cannot justify my voting to give the President the arbitrary powers over the spending of our national resources or the employment of our Armed Forces, which are granted in the Middle East resolution, in both the House and Senate versions.

The witnesses from the executive branch argued that there is a power vacuum in the area, because England and France are no longer welcome there, and the Middle Eastern nations will seek help from the Soviet Union unless we step in.

They argued that the Middle East is a link between NATO and the Baghdad Pact nations, and therefore must not be lost by us to Russia. They said that the blockage of the Suez Canal had led to losses of revenue and economic upheaval in the area.

The arguments submitted seem to me to be far removed from the political, economic, and strategic realities in that are of the world.

The resolution does not help to solve the most immediate problems in that troubled zone—the blockage of the Suez Canal and the Syrian pipelines; the longstanding conflict between Israel and the Arab nations; and the dangers from Communist subversion rather than overt military attack.

We are asked to vote a blank check for economic aid of something like $200 million a year.

But the Middle East nations have vast wealth from their oil-supplies. The present rulers use much of this money as their private income. Are we to pay for the economic development of their countries, while they waste their wealth as the spirit moves them? Nations with valuable oil wells have collateral for loans. Are we to pay their expenses, when they can borrow the money against wealth in the ground?

We are not told what would be done with the money of our people. Would it be spent for current budget deficits? If so, we would really be subsidizing the rulers of the foreign countries in their luxurious tastes. Is it to be used for capital investment, for welfare, or what?

A subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations has just made an intensive study of our foreign aid to Iran, another oil-rich Middle Eastern country. There is almost no folly which our Government agents did not commit in their eagerness to give away our wealth to the country which had just cut off its own income from its oil wells. What reason we have for hoping that a bigger plan for aid for all the Middle East will be any better than our work in Iran?

The military side of the picture is equally confusing. The President already has power to use American troops in an emergency. He has that power. There is no evidence of a new situation which would justify the need for a special resolution.

When the resolution was first proposed there was almost recklessness in the administration's statements about the need for hurry; that Congress should rush it through because the situation was an emergency. That was several weeks ago.

If Congress grants blank-check power to the President for the use of American Armed Forces, it will have voted away its constitutional power to declare war.

Congress will be in session for another 6 months, perhaps longer. But the odd thing is that the administration says the President does not have time to consult with Congress in an emergency. Yet he promises to consult with the United Nations.

There is much talk of halting communism, but nothing precise. Do we have reason to believe the Soviet leaders, or their satellites, intend overt military attack? No evidence has been given us. If the danger is from subversion, how will American troops help? In the debate it is said that we are to help these nations build their own armed forces to put down internal subversion. Does that mean we are to guarantee the status quo in every nation in the Middle East? Are we to range ourselves permanently on the side of governments which sanction slavery? Are we to help to suppress any rebellion within their dominions? There is a rebellion in Indonesia at this very moment. Sukarno has indicated his warm support of Soviet ideas. We gave him the red carpet treatment a little over a year ago. His people are rebelling to preserve their religion, to establish a limited Federal Government, in place of a centralized authoritarian one, and to keep a part of their earnings at home, instead of having most of their money absorbed by the government. Is Congress voting a blank check which could mean our helping to protect the Sukarno government against "subversion" by patriots fighting for liberty and for their religion?

Are we going to help Egypt and Syria, which are friendly to Moscow, and which have Communist advisers and technicians in their countries today? There, the Communist "volunteers" are assisting the governments in power, and any resistance by the people would be resistance against communism. Are we to commit ourselves to helping governments already Communist, against their own people?

Frankly I cannot find that we are confronted with any new Communist threat.

We know the Communists have had every intention of getting control of the Middle East for years. Why have we done so little up to now?

What is new about the present proposal? If we approve the use of American troops, that will help only in the unlikely instance that the Soviet Union engages in open war. But then we would face the strategic question: Should we defend the Middle East by another local, Korean-type war, or should we strike for the heart of the enemy's military power, as we failed to do with Red China? Is Congress voting to give the President the right to start a new world war, perhaps in the wrong place?

We hear much of the Soviet Union lending money to these nations, if we do not. At the moment the Soviet Union has its hands full. It has had to put so much money back into Poland and Hungary, to prevent disorder, that the Soviet 5-year plan was reduced in scope. Red China wants money, and is probably not backward about asking for it. The Communists are apparently trying to build up their trade with the non-Communist world.

I think there is now a Polish delegation in this country which is seeking money and trade. They will need goods for trading. Are they going to cut down even lower the living standards of their people, when rebellion is as near as it was in Hungary?

The Communists moved into the Middle East, with arms for Egypt, during the very days when the western heads of state were meeting at Geneva, to establish peace in our time. This calculated insult to an American President told us 3 years ago all we needed to know.

The Soviet Union is not trying to penetrate the Middle East. She is in. She is today a power which must be reckoned with in that quarter of the world.

It is no credit to us that Soviet designs to become fully established in the Middle East were not carried out in full. Soviet plans were upset by the Hungarian patriots, who rose up, without arms, against the might of Soviet tanks, and proved for long and bloody weeks that the armed might of communism can be stopped. The Soviet satellite armies collapsed. Their own Russian troops went over to the rebels. It was not until the Kremlin brought in Mongolian soldiers that it could put out the fires of patriotic rebellion.

There is nothing new in Soviet designs on the Middle East. There is no new Communist danger there. If there were, there is no hope that we will do anything in the Middle East to shame the Communist power, as the children of Hungary, the workers of Hungary, the writers of Hungary, shamed and weakened it.

The Communists understand well the old nursery rhyme:

> Sticks and stones may break my bones, but names will never hurt me.

Mr. President, you cannot find in all the pages of these congressional hearings any evidence whatever of any new Communist threat in the Middle East. Mr. President, you will find in the loose, vague, rubbery words with which the plan was advocated, convincing evidence that the proposal is designed to give the executive agencies something else, something far removed from the Arab States, from the Communists in Syria, and from the power vacuum supposedly left by the withdrawal of England and France.

It took me a long time to see through the layers of words, to find what this proposal meant.

The first clue I came upon was the mysterious vagueness about the geographical limits of the Middle East. How many Senators have looked into that?

At first, Mr. Dulles said he would state the limits of the area only in executive session. How far have we gone on the road to executive absolutism, when a Government official tells Congress he will not define even a geographic area, except behind a curtain of secrecy, which means that the representatives of most of our States are barred from learning the answer?

Mr. Dulles later relented, and told the Senate committees that he accepted "in general" the area defined in a State Department official's recent speech. In other words, the Secretary of State would not define it publicly; but finally he said, in effect, "I will accept in general one of my employees' definitions. Let me read it to you." Here it is, Mr. President:

> There is no officially or generally recognized definition of the term "Middle East." * * * I think it is safe to say that when the American Government thinks in terms of the Middle East, it is thinking about the area lying between, and including, Libya on the west, and Pakistan on the east, and Turkey on the north, and the Arabian Peninsula to the south.

That is the end of the quotation from one of Mr. Dulles' subordinates.

The Senate committee's report refers to the same general area, but the resolution refers only to "the general area of the Middle East." That is what we are asked to vote on. There are no legal limits here. When Congress legislates, it takes full responsibility for any reasonable interpretation of the words it uses. It cannot limit the meaning of the words in a law to what someone thought we thought. We are giving the President authority to involve us in any area which has ever been classified as the Middle East by any responsible governmental or scholarly agency. So far, I have found that the term "Middle East" has been used by responsible persons to include, and has been accepted as including, all of North Africa as far west as Morocco, together with Egypt, the Sudan, Uganda, Ethiopia, and Tanganyika, to the south; and Turkey and Iran, on the north. On the east, it may include Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, and Indonesia.

The population of Indonesia is 80 million. Egypt, Iran, and Ethiopia together have 60 million more. If we exclude India, the population of the receiving nations exceeds our own. But we have no basis for excluding India. It is as logically included as is Egypt or Saudi Arabia. We are, like Atlas, carrying most of the world on our backs. How many people should a nation with a population of 170 million support?

Congress has been given only the vaguest and most shadowy justifications for voting to spend the earnings of the American people. To accept loose and shadowy explanation in place of precise language for Government spending is a violation of the separation of powers. The Constitution gives to Congress the duty of guarding the earnings of our people against the never-ending demands of Government agencies.

Vague authorizations are unlimited authorizations.

Such a practice in the best of times is a violation of our constitutional responsibility. But today the American people are approaching the 25th year of emergency spending of their hard-earned money. The value of our dollar has been cut in half. Our gold has been taken from our people, and has been made the property of the Government. A dangerously high fraction of this gold is owed to foreign nations—partly as a result of our foreign spending; and that debt is callable on demand. We have a public debt of nearly $280 billion, plus contingent liabilities of billions of dollars for all sorts of programs. Our people have a heavy burden of private debt. Family incomes are under almost unendurable strain. A break or a slow decline in employment would put us in a position where foreign obligations could crush us entirely.

What is the delusion which makes our Government officials believe they can go on spending our substance forever? Our forefathers well understood the delusion. That is why they believed Government officials should never be allowed to decide how much money they needed. That is why the Constitution put upon the representatives of the people in Congress the duty to watch spending, and to keep it down to what should properly be taken from our families and given to the Government.

Unless Congress defines precisely the area involved, it will by its vote give the executive branch permission to operate in all of that area, at least; and it will assume the responsibility for defending all of that area with American fighting men. I do not mean that if this resolution passes, American forces will be stationed in Afghanistan or Indonesia tomorrow; but I do say that under the maximum interpretation of such unprecise words, Congress will have given its permission for, and will be responsible for, any such use of American fighting men, anywhere.

Congress will be taking the men stationed in those areas from under the protection of the American Constitution. It will make them subject, if they are charged with a crime, to the law of the land they are guarding. We have had enough trouble under the Status of Forces treaties with Americans accused of crimes in France and England. Have the men who urged this resolution looked carefully into the dangers that might face our young men sent by vote of Congress to Iran or Afghanistan or Ethiopia?

So I began asking myself what the State Department was really asking for, in such a vast area, and why it insisted that important congressional restrictions, like not spending large sums in a rush at the end of the fiscal year, must be lifted. What was the real aim?

Suddenly the answer was as clear as day. This plan could only be our old familiar friend the Wallace-Truman-Bowles plan for dividing up American wealth by industrial development of backward areas. Everything was there, in fancy new dress. I ask the Congress to consider this. The administration is asking, under a new name, for the permission it sought last year to make commitments for American spending for years ahead, on long-term capital projects all over the world. It was turned down last year, but it is back this year in a brand new dress.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I prefer to complete my remarks. Then I shall yield.

Senators will remember that point 4 has two guises. It is a modest plan for sending Americans, proficient in know-how, to help undeveloped nations make two blades of grass grow where one grew before. But that is only the edge of the crowbar. The other aspect of point 4, and its real purpose, is the plan by which the United States will supply the capital for global projects to bring heavy industry, and the most advanced New Deal social-welfare schemes, to all the face of the earth.

The supporters of this plan have stated frankly their expectation of getting the capital for their global investment by reducing our defense expenditures and converting most of the savings to a give-away program for industrial pyramids all over Africa and Asia, built by Socialist or national Communist governments, installed by our planners, and supported by our taxes.

Senators have read in the columns of our intellectual guiding lights that a group within the administration believes we should abandon our ties with the West and throw in our lot with Asia and Africa—not, of course, with hard fighting anti-Communists like free China, Korea, and Vietnam, but with the philosophical neutralists who cannot turn their backs on the Soviet Union.

Behind the American spoksemen for this doctrine of winning over the uncommitted nations by a vast outlay of our people's earnings are the sinister figures of Tito, Nehru—we just gave him the red-carpet treatment—and Sukarno, the "friends" of America who are to take the place of Chiang, and Syngman Rhee, and Diem.

This dream plan has been with us for a long time. It has been endorsed by many patriotic Americans, who did not suspect that its kindly sentiments covered a subtle and daring Soviet plan for destruction of our military advantage.

The Soviet aim is to divide the wealth of the United States among all the people of the earth. The Marxian doctrine, which requires the cutting down of all incomes within a nation to the national average, has been carried a step further by Stalin, to require the leveling of the income of the "have" nations to that of the "have not" nations. The high income of 170 million Americans is ultimately to be divided among the 2 billion human beings of the globe.

Behind Stalin's welfare idea of "equal shares" is, of course, the military strategy of taking from the United States the surplus capital which supports our development of the world's best military equipment. Hindenburg said World War I was won by American industrial superiority. Stalin understood the industrial prowess of America in World War II. The Communists have no intention of going to combat with the United States until they have stripped from us our protective armor of guns, planes, tanks—the most fantastic wealth of protective and fighting equipment any fighting forces ever possessed. They know they can strip us of this protective armor by cutting economic holes through which our industrial capital will leak away, and our fighting forces will no longer have advantage of our industrial genius.

What will a nation of 170 million people do then against the 800 million people of the Communist orbit?

Let me repeat, the outer guise of point 4, the know-how program, is American. The hidden aim of this plan for "backward areas" is not American, though it is promoted by men whose loyalty to America is above reproach.

Mr. Truman said, in one of his last statements as President:

> With patience and courage we shall someday move on into a new era—a wonderful golden age—an era when we can use the peaceful tools that science has forged for us to do away with poverty and human misery everywhere. Think what can be done, once our capital, our skills, our science—most of our atomic energy—can be released from the tasks of defense and turned wholly to peaceful purposes all around the world. There is no end to what can be done.
>
> I can't help but dream out loud a little here. The Tigris and the Euphrates Valley—
>
> They are in here [laughter]—
>
> can be made to bloom as it did in the times of Babylon and Nineveh. Israel can be made the country of milk and honey as it was in the times of Joshua. There is a plateau in Ethiopia some six to eight thousand feet high, that has 65,000 square miles of land just exactly like the Corn Belt of northern Illinois. Enough food can be raised there to feed a hundred million people. These things can be done and they are self-liquidating projects. If we can get peace and safety in the world under the United Nations, the developments will come so fast we will not recognize the world in which we now live.

There is not much new about the Middle East doctrine, is there?

Here is the Walter Mitty dream plan for an easy, effortless world, in which money works magic, and all problems will be solved by pressing the push-button marked "peace." But we in Congress are the heirs of Jefferson and Franklin, John Quincy Adams, and John Hay.

We cannot endorse a foreign policy of tranquilizing pills, under whose influence the American people are put to sleep while their power and vigor seep away.

We are coming closer to the real Middle East doctrine, translated from its soft fluffy words to cold, hard realities.

I ask Senators if they think Congress can sign a blank check to let American Armed Forces be used anywhere in the world, in defense of such vague objectives? Can we, who have taken an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States, vote away our powers and duties for such ends?

Congress must, I believe, go thoroughly into the question of its constitutional relation to our Armed Forces. We have been sidestepping that issue since 1945. Do we have the moral right to sidestep it a moment longer?

• Let me review some recent history. We are told events move so fast these days

that the President does not have time to consult Congress. So we must give him a blank check in advance.

I cannot understand this argument. How many Members of Congress come to Washington by stagecoach? How many Members of this body get their news from Europe by sailing ship?

Has Congress not heard about telephone and radio and television? Can Senator KNOWLAND not reach Washington from California as quickly as the jet fliers who have cut flying time from the coast to 4 or 5 hours?

What do the State Department experts really mean? Japan did not formally declare war on us in 1941, it is true, but word of the attack on Pearl Harbor reached Members of Congress within minutes on that fatal Sunday morning. The executive branch did, it is true, have warning in advance of the attack. They could have told the Members of Congress, but they did not even tell the naval commander in Hawaii. The men on the *Arizona* never knew.

The President, in his original Middle East proposal, said that any employment of American forces in that area would "have to be consonant with any action or recommendation of the United Nations. They would also, if armed attack occurs, be subject to the overriding authority of the United Nations Security Council, in accordance with the charter."

This I cannot understand. The President of the United States says he must have blank-check authority to employ our Armed Forces, because there is not time enough to consult Congress, but he promises continuously to consult the Security Council of the United Nations. Is it easier to assemble the Security Council from Moscow and the Philippines, than to assemble Members of Congress from Florida and California?

The President uses the ominous words "the overriding authority of the United Nations Security Council." What does that mean? Does he mean that the United Nations Security Council has overriding authority over American fighting forces?

A great many people who write me believe that this provision of the Middle East proposal is designed to place the military forces of the United States under the United Nations, as they were placed in the Korean war, and to make our fighting forces over, given time enough, into parts of a United Nations military force.

I personally believe that is true. I see overwhelming evidence that such has been the intention of our foreign-policy planners since the idea of the United Nations was born. Mr. Dulles included an all-powerful international police in the original proposals for a postwar international organization—he is still calling the shots downtown—which he recommended to the American people, in December 1940, almost 17 years ago, through the commission on a just and durable peace of the Federal Council of Churches. Mr. Dulles' commission recommended a world government of delegated powers, strong immediate limitations on national sovereignty and international control of all armies and navies.

I am not dreaming. This is the report of Mr. Dulles' commission.

I ask Members of Congress to stop now and decide what stand we are going to take for the rest of our lives on the question of our sovereign right to direct American Armed Forces in the manner prescribed in the Constitution.

We are coming to the heart of the matter. The question before Congress is this: Shall American fighting men be used by the Executive power to support its global plans, or shall they be sent into the fighting only for defense of the Nation, and only with the consent of Congress?

I ask Senators first to review with me the debates in the Senate in the summer of 1944, when our postwar policies were being established. The State Department wanted the Senate Committee of Eight, which had been studying proposals for the United Nations, to give an endorsement in advance.

Senator Vandenberg wrote to Mr. Hull, on May 29, 1944:

> With great respect, I do not think you have any right to expect this Senate committee either to endorse your plans in advance, or to agree that your league shall bind us, regardless of whether the peace (settlement) satisfies the American conscience or not.

As he wrote in his diary:

> This is no time for Senators (particularly Republican Senators) to "sign up" in the dark.

President Roosevelt wanted Congress to authorize in advance American participation in international military sanctions, without specific approval in each case.

Vandenberg wrote to Hull, on August 29, 1944:

> I believe our Constitution clearly lodges the exclusive power to declare war in Congress. Frankly, I do not believe the American people will ever agree to lodge this power anywhere else.

In September he wrote Walter Lippmann:

> Why hand the President a blank check which in turn invites the American opponents of all international collaboration to prejudice this total adventure by shouting on the Middle Western hustings "Are you willing to let the President take you into world war No. III without regard to the Constitution, and without any consultation of your Congress?"

After the conclusion of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference Vandenberg wrote to a constituent, on September 30, 1944:

> I am opposed to what is generally understood by the term "international peace force." So I believe, are the President, Secretary Hull, and most realistic students of this problem. To be adequate, an international police force would have to be larger than the regular army and navy of any other power on earth. I think it is fantastic to believe that the people would long consent to the maintenance of any such enormous concentration of power in the postwar peace, and I also think that the temptation to reach for its ultimate control could become the greatest possible threat to peace in years to come.

I do not think we will find a better statement of the issue than that.

Vandenberg said again:

> I am one of those who do not believe that our greatest hope for peace lies in trying to put peace in a steel straitjacket.

He suggested, in August 1944, a thorough study of the question where under the Constitution the power of the Commander in Chief to use our military force without consulting Congress ends—as in the sending of marines to Haiti, Nicaragua, and so forth—and where the exclusive power of Congress to declare war begins.

The story of the real agreements at Teheran began to leak out in articles in the Saturday Evening Post. That is like the situation today, for the Middle East doctrine leaked out through newspapers. There has been no change; there is nothing new today. Vandenberg said, "The Atlantic Charter is already out the window."

Governor Dewey pointed out how the great powers had at Teheran set up an organization which permanently established their coercive power over the world. Secretary Hull denied it, and invited Governor Dewey to send a representative to confer with him. Thus John Foster Dulles began, on August 23, 1944, his participation in making State Department policy which has continued virtually unbroken ever since.

Dewey said there was involved only one major issue in foreign policy, and that was American participation in the use of armed force by the proposed United Nations Organization. Dewey clearly recognized the tremendous implications of this problem in relation to the future welfare of the United States and the peace of the world, but in spite of the deep concern in the Senate over this constitutional issue, in spite of Vandenberg's efforts to find a genuine solution, Secretary Hull and Mr. Dulles reached an agreement on August 25 that the subject would not be debated in the campaign. Do Senators recall that? I am sure the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] does. That meant that an issue touching the very lives of the people of this country could not be publicly discussed for their enlightenment. The shadows that hide our foreign policy have never been lifted since.

Now I ask the Senate to recall the opening of the Korean war, when the President ordered our men to take part in stopping the Communist onslaught.

I agree that there was an emergency, though it is not true that we had received no warnings of the ominous Communist buildup in North Korea. Senator Taft protested that Congress was in session, and the President could easily have asked for a constitutionally correct declaration of war. Senator Taft decided not to press the point, in the midst of the bitter struggle by our men to keep a foothold in Korea. Senators will remember that the news at that time was black indeed.

I submit, Mr. President, that the decision to authorize use of the Armed Forces against the Communists in Korea without authority from Congress was not the only important constitutional issue.

The President of the United States was quickly named as "military representative" of the United Nations, and our

troops and those of the other nations engaged were labeled "United Nations Forces." To any one who says, "But this was not war. It was only a police action," I answer, "What difference did that make in the casualty lists?"

If our forces are put into a United Nations military force, perhaps there will never be another war. It will have a new name. It will be called a police action, or something else. Perhaps there will be only police actions from now on. However, that is only another trick with words.

Our men will be killed, in the same way. The difference is that America will have no fighting men to guard her freedom.

I pass over the patent folly of pretending our men in Korea represented the moral force of the United Nations, when the enemy was a member of the "Big Three" who helped form the United Nations, had a permanent seat on the Security Council, and an absolute veto over the condemnation of its lawlessness. Insofar as the war in Korea was a UN action, it was civil war. In fact it was begun as an American war to stop the onslaught of Communist armies. It is proper that we should have provided the men and the leadership. The errors grew out of out putting our President, our fighting men, and our policies under the pretended direction of the United Nations.

Again and again I have raised the question: What are the constitutional implications of this transfer of American military power to the United Nations? I have received no answer—not even an echo of my question.

Article I, section 9 of the Constitution, provides:

> No person holding any office of profit or trust under (the United States) shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office, or title, of any kind whatever, from any king, prince, or foreign state.

As I read that section, no President of the United States, or anyone holding an office of trust, could legally accept designation as any kind of agent or representative for the United Nations or any international political entity whatsoever.

This section was put into the Constitution of the United States for a reason. The members of the Constitutional Convention did not wish our governing officials to have even the slightest temptation to hold divided or clouded loyalties. Their oath was to uphold the Constitution of the United States. They could not give their whole minds to that task if they owed any loyalty, gratitude, obedience, or anything else to any other government or governmental agency of any sort whatever.

I believe, that our President, all unwittingly, violated the Constitution, when he accepted any designation whatever to represent or act for the United Nations, or to command any forces called United Nations forces.

Please be assured I have no wish to criticize our Presidents personally, or to blame anyone for an unchallenged action of 7 years ago. I do wish, however, to make sure this act is not left standing as a precedent for the future, to help put a future Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States into any international military establishment.

We have another constitutional issue in the Korean war.

By what constitutional authority did the United States Government designate American fighting men as part of the United Nations command?

What changes took place in the constitutional rights of our fighting men?

What changes took place in the powers of the American President?

Let me explore these questions a little further.

The preamble of the Constitution refers to it as "This Constitution for the United States of America."

Article I of the Constitution establishes a Congress of the United States. Article II establishes a President of the United States.

Section 8 of article I provides:

> The Congress—

That is, the Congress of the United States—

> shall have power to raise and support armies, * * * to provide and maintain a navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

I can find nothing in these words, which permits the agencies, legislative or executive, established by the Constitution for the United States of America, to raise armed forces which shall serve any other political entity.

I do not see in the Office of the President, as described in the Constitution, any loose and general powers to decide to serve some other political entity than the United States of America. I certainly do not find any authority for the Chief Executive of this constitutional Republic to transfer the Armed Forces of the Republic to some other political body.

So zealous is the Constitution of the right of the American people to direct their Armed Forces that one Congress cannot even bind a succeeding Congress by making an appropriation for their use for a longer term than 2 years.

I believe the Constitution is equally zealous of the rights of the men who shall be called on to risk their lives for the protection of the Republic. Where in the Constitution is there any authority for either Congress or the President to raise armies to protect the security of the country which they love, and then transfer these men, under oath to obey their American leaders, to service of some other political entity?

There is one more shadowy area in the picture. If a President of the United States can add to his powers and duties the powers and duties of a quite different office, under a quite different set of laws, what has happened to the constitutional limits on the actions of this hybrid Chief Executive?

The favorite phrase is that our officials wear two hats when they take office in international agencies.

Can the President of the United States under this precedent act within the strict limits of the Constitution when he wears one hat, and then quickly takes off his American hat, puts on an international hat, and operates without any of the restrictions prescribed by the Constitution?

What is to prevent him, if he wishes, from going to any extreme?

Can the President of the United States accept an oath of obedience from Americans serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, and then, by changing hats, insist that that oath obliges them to obey any orders he gives outside the limits of the Constitution?

Can the President of the United States, by changing his hat, get the power to give orders to what are virtually his own private armies to serve anywhere for any purpose he may designate?

Could he, as a U. N. representative, order these men to put down rebellion in the United States, even though the rebellion might have the purpose of returning to the Constitution?

Now let us agree at once that no President has so far had any such intentions, and could not have been induced to try any such acts.

Let us agree that our brief experiment in collectivized armies caused no untoward incident—except, of course, the catastrophic limitations on the fighting at the Yalu, and the twisting of the peace settlement. But Congress is responsible for the laws. It dare not leave dangerous loopholes in the law and hope no ambitious man will find them.

What disturbs me is that it is standard technique for the political elite in our midst to introduce their changes in bits and pieces, to try them out briefly and then withdraw them, before the public is aware of the danger.

It is no help to us that transferring our fighting men to a UN command in 1950 caused no untoward incidents. The finesse of the operation only increases my belief that Korea was a dress rehearsal for making over American military power to an international state. Congress cannot escape the fact that that action left us with two acts which are precedents of the greatest, most frightful danger.

This Middle East resolution contains no safeguards whatever against the chance that some later President might put American forces, serving in the Middle East, without the protections of the Constitution, into a Middle East military establishment or a United Nations military establishment, and Congress would be morally involved and legally helpless.

Perhaps Senators will say that we are already involved in joint military operations with other nations under a supernational command, by virtue of our approval of the United Nations Charter.

To that I reply that if the United Nations Charter commits us to transferring our military forces to a command other than the sovereign Government of the United States, this constitutes an amendment of the Constitution, by means not sanctioned by the Constitution. Therefore, it is completely null and void. Neither the legislative body created by the Constitution, nor the executive body created by the Constitution, were given power to destroy the Constitution. They cannot abrogate the

separation of powers, and they cannot deprive the Republic, founded by the Constitution, of its means to defend itself.

Anything in the United Nations Charter which apparently authorizes the executive branch to alter in any way the complete responsibility on our Government for using American Armed Forces to protect the United States, is null and void.

Any attempt by any official in the executive branch to carry out such a doctrine, and to amalgamate the American Army, Navy or Air Force with the military forces of other areas in a supernational agency, is a matter for impeachment.

I have only touched the surface of this question, but I say again, for nearly 15 years now there has been a growing body of evidence that a determined group of men is at work amalgamating our military power with that of other once sovereign nations, and depriving it of the right and duty of protecting the United States to the uttermost.

I say the Middle East proposal is vague, indefinite, confused, and I say Congress is the only power in the United States which can protect the right and power of our Nation to defend itself.

For myself, I am willing to devote the rest of my life to demolishing any and every attempt to destroy American sovereignty by transferring American fighting forces to any political or military command other than that of the sovereign United States. I shall not keep silent in the face of proposals which may—by any chance—leave our country without its own military strength.

I believe every Member of this body is as deeply determined as am I to preserve our Nation's security. I say to them the danger is real. It is here. Do not, I beg of my colleagues, sign a blank check, which might leave the United States helpless, its fighting strength weakened by legal and political finesse, until its subordination to the rulers of the new world state becomes complete and irreversible.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. First, let me congratulate the Senator from Indiana upon what I believe to be a magnificent and courageous statement. While I do not necessarily subscribe to everything the Senator has said, I agree with his conclusions.

Mr. JENNER. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. During the 8 years I have had the honor to serve in the Senate, I have never seen a more ridiculous or downrightly foolish legislative proposal than this one concerning the Middle East.

As one who has served on the Committee on Foreign Relations, I was distressed to find that we were asked to surrender our power and responsibility. We were sitting in Congress as elected public officials, without knowing what in the world this whole matter was about. I was distressed when a former Member of the Senate, the present Secretary of State, testified before the committees without giving us the slightest concept of what the proposal is about. He was unable to cite a single example of anything which the Government has in mind doing if Congress passes the resolution.

Under the resolution we are asked to surrender to the President our responsibility to declare war, even the power to declare war on countries or governments which do not exist at the present time.

Mr. JENNER. They are not even defined.

Mr. LONG. We do not even know what countries they might be, and we cannot conceive what they might be.

My understanding of the President's responsibilities is that he is charged with the duty of saving and defending the Nation. As our Chief Executive, he is also the Commander in Chief of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

I certainly hope it will be made clear to any Communist, here or elsewhere, that should any enemy attack this Nation, or should the President know that a great power had an attack on its way, the President would not wait for Congress to act before he took action to fight back and save this country.

Mr. JENNER. The President has that power now.

Mr. LONG. He has that power. I would be one who would fight to uphold it. I would support him in his exercise of that responsibility, even without his consulting Congress, should it be necessary to fight in defense of this Nation.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. We expect the President to take action immediately to save the country. He acts in great peril if he makes such a decision, because he then must come before Congress and report what he has done. His actions are subject to review by Congress, which can determine whether he has exercised his power wisely.

This is a duty which the President of the United States should be willing to perform if he wants to run for that office. We in Congress should be willing to accept the responsibility of passing upon his conduct, even to the point of impeaching him, should he exercise judgment unwisely or without the proper sincerity and courage which we would expect of our Chief Executive.

But when we ourselves walk into the legislative boobytrap of granting the right to the President to declare war, not even knowing against what nation we are going to war, and then to let the President take the wealth of America and distribute it across the face of the globe, not knowing for what projects or purposes the money will be used, projects which could not be justified by any standard of justification in the United States, we are doing something which is very foolish.

Let us consider the Aswan Dam. After trying for some time to convince Congress of the worthiness of the proposal, the administration decided to give it up. But the administration could construct the Aswan Dam under the pending proposal.

Under the resolution, Congress would not authorize any proposals; it would not even know what they were or what their purpose was. So the resolution can provide a method for getting through projects unwise and foolhardy in nature. If Congress passes a resolution surrendering all our responsibilities, it will enable the administration to construct whatever projects it desires to build, even though they may be wasteful and unsound.

I wish to assure the Senator that while I shall vote against the resolution, there will not be anything partisan about my vote, just as there will not be anything partisan about the vote of the Senator from Indiana.

Some time ago the foreign-aid program began to be so ridiculous, even when a Democratic President was in the White House, that I found it necessary to join the bipartisan opposition.

Mr. JENNER. And to become nonpartisan.

Mr. LONG. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to submit this proposal to the people of my State and run for office against anyone who is willing to debate the question. I submit that such an opponent, when he begins to debate, will not find many persons who favor the foreign-aid program when they have heard both sides.

I am probably the first Senator in 50 years to have been elected without opposition in Louisiana. I appreciate very much the confidence expressed by the people of my State, who have elected me on the basis of my record. I know this much: When it comes to giving away our money and getting nothing whatsoever in return, the American people do not agree with such a plan.

I must confess, however, that some headway is being made in that direction. Let us consider, for example, the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Christian Herter to be Under Secretary of State. A speech was placed in the RECORD last year by a distinguished Representative from Massachusetts, in which Mr. Herter expressed a new approach to foreign policy. One novel idea which he had, which I must say had some support in the executive branch, was that in giving away our money, particularly in connection with economic needs, we should not expect any nation to do anything for us in return. We should simply give our money to the neutral nations, even those which are leaning toward the Russians.

Mr. Herter said that we were bound to come out ahead. Then he said that we ought to coordinate our giving with that of the Russians. We should get together with the Russians in giving away our money; otherwise the neutral nations might be unwilling to accept our money. He said that perhaps they might be willing to take the money if we put no strings on the giving.

Well, Mr. President, some support for that point of view can be found in the Bible. The parable of the casting of bread upon the waters is a good example. Then, too, we read how the Master suggested to the rich man that he sell all his worldly belongings and give the proceeds to the poor. If anyone wishes to do that, I urge him to do so. But not with my money.

I do not believe the people of my State particularly like the idea of giving the money of this country away, unless they are certain they will get something in return for it.

It is said that it is blessed to give. I am certain that it is; and for those who want to give, that is fine. But to give our money to the Russians or neutrals leaning toward Russia is something I do not believe the American taxpayers will approve. I do not believe they are quite ready to divest themselves of their wealth and to have Congress appropriate money for distant projects we have never heard of, and have not discussed. They would not vote for such a plan.

I hope the American people will some day be given an opportunity to vote on the issue, after they have actually heard it discussed in a campaign.

Mr. John Foster Dulles is a great advocate of the political extermination, from both parties, of anyone who dares to speak against this proposal. I recall that the Senator from Indiana some time ago made a very able address discussing Mr. Dulles' speech along that line.

As one of the great architects of the bipartisan foreign aid program, Mr. Dulles said, in effect, that he would favor quarantining any public official who dared discuss this issue before the people. I must say I do not quite agree with that point of view. I think it would be a very good idea to let the people hear it discussed, and then let them decide whether they want their Congress to surrender all its power.

One other thought occurs to me on which I think the Senator might wish to comment. If Congress passes one or two more resolutions like this, it seems to me we ought to pass a resolution to forego our salaries. What are the people paying us for?

Mr. JENNER. Perhaps they ought to abolish Congress.

Mr. LONG. By this resolution, we shall surrender our power to declare war, surrender the power of the purse strings, surrender the power of appropriations, surrender our right to know what the administration proposes to do.

If we pass one or two more resolutions like this, it seems to me that we should retire on our pensions and be done with it. That is how much sense the resolution makes to me.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to state to the able Senator from Indiana what disturbs me about this matter. I have not yet decided how I shall vote on the joint resolution. I have been on the floor during almost the entire debate, trying to inform myself. Today, I heard the able speech of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and then the able speech which has just now been delivered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]; and I have listened to the questions which have been asked by colleagues on my side of the aisle. There has been a great deal of discussion—some of it humorous, much of it biting—about foreign aid. However, this is what disturbs me: Foreign aid was supported by Secretary Marshall and President Truman, whom I regard as two very great men. Foreign aid is being proposed today by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles. They are men with whom I do not agree on many political issues; but I think they are very distinguished men, and I regard President Eisenhower as a great man, even though I repeat that I do not agree with him on many political matters. It disturbs me to feel that, in the Senate of the United States, there is a large group of Members who are so disdainful or even contemptuous of a program which is fundamental to American policy, a program which has been advocated by two eminent Presidents of the United States and by their Secretaries of State. Some of the men in the executive arm of Government to whom I refer have served their country with great distinction in the military arm of the country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Indiana will permit me to do so, I should like to complete my remarks.

Mr. JENNER. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course. I was only asking that the Senator from Indiana yield, so that I might ask a question of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. First, I should like to complete my statement; and then I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Indiana, because I think what I have in mind goes to the heart of the entire matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well.

Mr. NEUBERGER. General Eisenhower and General Marshall were famous generals of the United States Army. I cannot believe that either they or Mr. Truman or Mr. Dulles, who were eminent political figures in the life of this country, would deliberately advocate anything which in their considered opinion would not be in the best interests of our country and its foreign policy.

I remember that last year, when we discussed foreign aid, Senator George of Georgia stood right where the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is standing now; and I recall Senator George then said that our aid to the NATO countries helped maintain in being approximately 80 divisions and 200 air squadrons—I am speaking from memory now—and I think Senator George said that if our aid had not done that, American boys might have had to man all those units.

What has disturbed me about the debate today is this: Are a considerable number of Senators about to take a step in renunciation not only of the Middle East resolution but also of the entire foreign-aid program supported by the last two Presidents of the United States and their Secretaries of State?

As I have said, I have not yet decided how I shall vote on the pending joint resolution; but I am asking that question of the Senator from Indiana because it seems to me to be fundamental to the entire issue.

Mr. JENNER. It is fundamental, so far as that is concerned. There is no question about the description the Senator from Oregon has given of these men; certainly they are patriotic, competent, good Americans. But, Mr. President, as I tried to explain in the course of my remarks, which lasted approximately one hour and a half, something is going on, and it is rather hard to conceive that such a thing would occur in our country. We have a Constitution, but a constant effort is being made to chip and chip and chip away at the Constitution and to weaken it and to destroy it.

So far as foreign aid is concerned, in my opinion the program is a deliberate one, and I think it goes back of the men the Senator from Oregon has named as being active in public life; it goes back to the idea that in order for the people of the rest of the world to have more, the people of the United States must have less. It also goes back to the idea of helping the rest of the world, and to the idea of helping develop the backward areas of the world. Today we are worried about the income of our farmers, and the Government has employed many experts to teach our farmers how to grow more food. The result will be the production of more food in the United States. But at the same time we have other experts, scattered all over the world, to teach the competitors of our farmers how to grow more food, and to teach the peoples of other countries how to make 2 blades grow where only 1 blade grew before. During the last year we have succeeded in tripling the world production of cotton. Such foreign aid certainly has not brought us any peace. Certainly it will bankrupt us if it continues; and at least the people of my State are tired of it now.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to make a comment in response to my friend, the Senator from Oregon, because I note that he said that he has not yet made up his mind as to how he will vote on the pending joint resolution.

I wish to say to him that I was in favor of foreign aid and I had no hesitation in favoring foreign aid when it was proposed by General Marshall, then the Secretary of State; and I know the record of that foreign aid in Britain and in France and elsewhere in Europe. It has made those nations more productive than they were before the destruction incident to World War II. However, that is not the issue. Neither is the issue the NATO treaty. Senator George did stand here and plead with us to support the NATO program. But in that case there was a treaty among the NATO countries; and when we wrote that treaty we wrote into it the direct obligation that any act of ours, taken under it, would be taken according to the procedures of the Constitution of the United States.

In the present case we do not see such a provision. There is no treaty with Egypt; there is no treaty with Syria;

there is no treaty with Lebanon; there is no treaty with Pakistan. Instead, we are asked to act with respect to a great, unbounded area, merely designated as the Middle East area.

Mr. JENNER. And not defined.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is true; and who comprise it, no one knows.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Syria is in it, and we are told that Syria is a Communist-dominated country. Yet, Mr. President, under this very joint resolution we purport to give the President of the United States authority to aid a Soviet-dominated country. We cannot do a thing like that.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield briefly to me, in order that I may make one or two observations?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be delighted to have the Senator from Illinois make some observations to his colleagues. I wish that more Democratic colleagues were here, to listen to them, too. I hope the Senator from Illinois will not take a great deal of time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall not take very long.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As the Senator from Illinois knows, I intend to take a long time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. But I do not expect to take too long.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, in order that we may have a quorum call?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would prefer not to have a quorum call.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, earlier today the majority leader admonished the Members of this body concerning inadequate attendance. I note that at this time there is present in the Senate Chamber, on the other side of the aisle, only one Member of the Foreign Relations Committee. Certainly more Members should be present to answer questions or to listen to the comments and observations made by any Senator who engages in the debate. Therefore, is it not entirely in order to ask for a quorum call?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am a very modest and humble person, and I am quite content to address my remarks to such Members as grace the floor at this time, this afternoon. So I trust that my friend, the Senator from Idaho, will not insist on having a quorum call at this time, because my friend, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], has so graciously yielded to me.

Mr. President, I wish to address a few observations to the subject of the so-called blank check.

I distinctly remember that, as a Member of the House of Representatives, when the lend-lease proposal came up in 1941, I made a speech on it—after a fashion. It was not nearly so eloquent or so scholarly a speech as the one my distinguished friend, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] has just made; but I think the speech I made then followed very much the same line of thought. However, all that I may have said and all the observations of a similar nature which were made by other Members of Congress were washed out when the bombs fell on Pearl Harbor on the 7th of December 1941. When the blood-letting begins, Mr. President, then all the arguments and all the abstractions and all the legalisms and all the speculations go by the board. So I draw on the past when I think about that situation; and in thinking about a blank check, certain things have occurred to me.

Mr. President, there was an occasion when we wanted to stop a war—the greatest, bloodiest war in the history of mankind. So we appropriated money by means of language so abstruse and so skillfully concealed that Members of the House and the Senate could scarcely find its meaning. I recall it well, because I was on the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives; and I recall that in 1942, in the appropriation for the engineering service of our Army, this language was included: "Research and development of improved methods of such operations, storehouses, structures," and so forth, "$874,000,000."

What was it for? Mr. President, it was for the Manhattan project, for the atomic bomb. Did the Members of Congress know about it?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I prefer to continue for the moment, and to yield later, because my time is limited.

I repeat, Mr. President, did the Members of Congress know about that? Most of the Members of the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee scarcely knew anything about it.

Was that a blank check or was it not?

In the Appropriations Act for 1944 there was this language:

> To enable the Secretary of War without reference to sections 3709 and 1136 of the revised statutes to expedite production "and for any other purposes which in the discretion of the Secretary of War are desirable in expediting production for military purposes," $657,011,000.

That was more than three times the $200 million carried in this authorization resolution. Who knew that it was there? It was placed in the discretion of the Secretary of War. Who knew for what he was going to spend it? All we knew was that he was going to stop a war; and when war is here, then all the speeches die on the afternoon breeze. Nothing else counts.

In a single year we appropriated $146 billion when we were in war. Korea—a little police action—cost us $19 billion. That is 95 times as much as the request which is presently before the Congress.

When we got into World War II, it cost us $350 billion—1,750 times as much as the request which is now before us—and we are not speaking of the holy, young blood that reddened the hills and valleys of nearly every country on the face of the earth.

We talk about blank checks. There they are.

But I invite you, Mr. President, to consider something else. Last fall we had the mutual security bill before the Senate. Take a look at section 501. What does it say? It says, in effect, that "Whenever the President determines it is necessary for the purposes of this act, not to exceed 10 percent of the funds made available pursuant to any provision of this act may be transferred to and consolidated with the funds made available pursuant to the provisions of this act."

We gave him a blank 10-percent transfer power. Did we ask him why? Is it in the bill? Is it in the appropriation act? No, it will not be found there. We gave the President the power to transfer the fund. We went further than that. It was nothing specific; it was a blank check.

Suppose we look at title V of the act we approved last year—and I am reading from section 401:

> Of the funds made available under this act, not to exceed $150 million, in addition to the funds authorized to be appropriated under subsection (b) hereof, may be used in any fiscal year without regard to the requirements of this act or any other act for which funds are authorized by this act in furtherance of the purposes of such acts.

One hundred and fifty million dollars. Is it specific? Indeed, it is not. The Senate approved it.

In subsection (b) of the same section, the act reads:

> There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the fiscal year 1956, $100 million and for the fiscal year 1957 not to exceed $100 million for use in accordance with subsection (a) of this section.

Mr. President, I could cite line and page, if I had the time, of a number of blank checks which have been approved by both branches of the Congress and engrossed in the law.

Now, of course, there is a request for $200 million. It is not specific, and therefore, it is said, it is a radical innovation.

May I say that after spending $19 billion in Korea for a police action, we are spending $800 million every year to rehabilitate that country. That is four times the amount provided in the resolution.

The President's purpose, the purpose of the Secretary of State, is to do the necessary things, not only in the interest of security, but in the interest of the preservation of peace, for when the blood starts running, then arguments on the Senate floor will sound empty and vapid indeed.

So I commit myself to the request of the President. I have confidence in his integrity. I have confidence in his soul-searching effort to preserve the peace of the world, so that young bodies may not again be broken on the brutal altar of war.

I am grateful to my friend from Wyoming for yielding to me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is always a great pleasure to yield to the Senator from Illinois, and to listen to the mellifluous flow of his oratorical endeavors.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I hope my statements are persuasive.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was on the Appropriations Committee when the blank check was voted for the development of

atomic energy. It was in the middle of the war. I was one of the members of the Appropriations Committee, who knew precisely what the object of the expenditure was, it had all been explained.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Pardon me. I have not finished.

I do not want to indulge in any argument, because I think this is much more serious than, "You did it. I did it. You did it. Well, you are just as bad as we are." That is not the sort of argument to be made on the question before the Senate.

I had my eyes opened last year when the mutual security bill was before the Senate. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], who is the respected and applauded chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, at that time, as chairman of that committee, sought in vain to get an explanation from representatives of the State Department with respect to the purposes of the expenditure. So, Mr. President, I offered an amendment, a very simple amendment. All it provided was that the employees of the State Department, or the ICA, or to whomever the expenditure of these funds for security should be delegated, should be under an obligation to make a full and frank report when interrogated by members of the authorized committees of the Senate.

Mr. President, do you know what the Secretary of State did? He sent an adverse report and made the same plea then: "Oh, this must be completely secret. It would be an invasion of foreign policy powers of the President of the United States if Members of Congress should be authorized to ask a single, anonymous servant of the State Department, operating in the Far East and the Middle East, or wherever he may be operating, how he spent the money and to whom the money was paid."

Are we so naive as not to understand that in other governments, as well as in our own, there are men who are not up to the standard of ethics which I think is the general standard here in the United States? Officials of this Government, in this administration and in previous administrations—I make no partisan claim about it—were compelled to resign because of a conflict of interests.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have listened to speech after speech in the course of the debate on this resolution. It was made to appear that this was a radical departure from things that have been done in the past.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is not my argument.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When the first $5 million of emergency funds were made available for the Manhattan project, that project was not any more than a cryptic mathematical symbol on a blackboard. I think my friend will bear out that statement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But the bombs were dropped.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming stated that he knew what was embodied in the request for an appropriation at the time the atomic bomb was in the development stages in the minds of the advanced technicians.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When the appropriation was made, I knew what the money was to be used for.

Mr. THYE. Not many Members of Congress had such knowledge.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. I was not a Member of Congress at the time, but I have heard it repeatedly stated that Congress appropriated more than $2 billion upon the request of the administration of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. THYE. That appropriation was more of a blank check than anything embodied in this resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not making the "blank check" argument. I am merely pointing out that I was here at the beginning of the Roosevelt administration in 1933, when the Congress unanimously voted a blank check to President Roosevelt for the purpose of restoring economic conditions in the United States. I remember when the President sought to reduce the budget. When he said we had gone far enough, Senator Vandenberg, of Michigan, standing almost in the very spot where the Senator from Minnesota is now standing, said, "We must appropriate more, because the country is going into an economic tailspin."

I am not raising that argument. It would be beneath the dignity of the Senate, it seems to me, to base the argument on this great issue upon anything except the elements of this resolution which go so far that in my opinion they threaten the very existence of our Government unless we are told what it is proposed to do.

I wish today to ask some questions. I am like the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] who said a few moments ago that he was very much disturbed over this question. He would like to vote for the resolution. I would like to vote for it. I would like to support the President of the United States. I would like to support the Secretary of State. But there are inconsistencies in the report and in the resolution, as well as in the President's speech, which we must reconcile.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Will the Senator enlighten me, as one Member of the Senate, as to what the inconsistencies are, and what reservations the Senator has in mind, in order that tomorrow and the next day we may endeavor to obtain the answers, if they are not available on the floor at the present time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I dictated a statement Saturday morning. I did not finish it, but I had copies of it sent to the Chamber. They were to have been laid upon the desk of every Member of the Senate. I will see that copies are distributed to Senators who would like to have them.

If the Senator will indulge me, I should like to read some of these questions, and state the reasons for propounding them.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, before the Senator does that, will he yield to me briefly?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would have to confirm what the Senator from Wyoming has said, to the effect that certain members of the Appropriations Committee, at least in the House of Representatives, knew the purpose of the money provided in the appropriation for the Corps of Engineers with relation to the Manhattan District, "Manhattan District" being the code name for the atomic energy development. General Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, and General Leslie Groves, of the Corps of Engineers, in charge of the Manhattan District project, appeared before the committee. General Marshall also appeared before the committee to support them. There were at least some members of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives who knew the purpose of the appropriation. I was then a member of the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee dealing with appropriations for the War Department. That was in 1944 and 1945. I distinctly remember the presentation made at the time. Our subcommittee visited Oak Ridge long before the project became generally known.

However, having confirmed what the Senator from Wyoming says as to the request for a great deal of freedom in connection with the expenditure of certain appropriations, I must say that I do not quite get the connection between that situation and the question which is raised with relation to the pending joint resolution. I should like to have the Senator discuss that subject. In the present instance, $200 million was made available under the Appropriation Act last year. I happen to be one of those who voted for each reduction amendment offered in connection with the Foreign Aid Appropriation bill last year. Representatives of the administration say, "We already have the $200 million. We have full authority to spend it. We can spend it for the purpose for which it was appropriated last year. However, we find that there are some better purposes to which we can apply the money, and that it can be spent to better advantage than under the original authorization."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is not arguing against me. I have made no argument against the expenditure of the $200 million. I am only saying that merely because there were blank checks in the past there is no obligation upon Congress to continue to appropriate in the form of blank checks, particularly when we know that the national debt now is greater than it ever has been in what we call times of peace.

The Senator from South Dakota was a distinguished and competent Member of the House Appropriations Committee when the chairman of that committee.

Representative CANNON, of Missouri, after the shooting stopped in World War II, came upon the floor and introduced legislation repealing billions of dollars of taxation which had been provided for by legislation previously enacted. Not only did we grant blank checks, but when the occasion for blank checks in wartime had passed, we repealed appropriations of billions of dollars.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There was a rescission bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think it was a very proper bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was merely trying to point out that an argument by a Senator to the effect that blank checks were granted by Congress in the past is no argument for another blank check.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But we seek to establish the authority to use for better purposes money already appropriated.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand that. I would have no objection if I had any assurance that those who spend the money would tell the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Minnesota how it was to be spent.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, the Senator has taken note of the language of the amended joint resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There is a provision that none of the additional authorization shall be used until 15 days after the appropriate committees of the Congress have been furnished a report showing the object of the proposed use.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to see that provision in the joint resolution; indeed, I appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, in joint session, and argued for the insertion of an amendment of that character.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Probably that argument had something to do with the decision of the committees sitting jointly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wonder whether the Senator from Wyoming would be willing to yield for just a moment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think the Senator from Wyoming is right. Because we gave a blank check heretofore is no reason or precedent for giving another blank check.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Particularly when the budget this year calls for $100 million more, so far as the national debt payments are concerned, than last year.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Wyoming is correct. He and the Senator from South Dakota are members of committees which are doing a fine job for the Senate and for the people. I happen to be a member of the committee which provides the money. I assure the Senator from Wyoming—and I know he will agree with me—that so far as I am concerned I want to be convinced that the money we are now authorizing under the joint resolution will be spent in the interest of the American taxpayers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right. I should like to quote what the President of the United States said in substantiation of the action he asks us to take. I should like to quote the words of the President. These are the words of the President of the United States when he spoke at a joint session of the Senate and the House on the 5th day of January. I read from House Document No. 46, entitled "Middle East Situation." It contains the address of the President of the United States delivered before a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives relative to the Middle East situation. I read from page 6 of that document.

Of course the joint resolution must be construed, in part at least, in the light of the statement made by the President when he asked for it.

I see on the floor the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who is still politely listening to my remarks.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. THYE. Nothing could be more important than that question at this particular time, because I believe we should try to get a substantial vote in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 19. The resolution must be passed, and it should not be delayed any longer, because in my opinion the Middle East situation could be greatly improved if the Senate would express its approval of Senate Joint Resolution 19 by a strong vote.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to read what the President of the United States said:

> The legislation now requested should not include the authorization or appropriation of funds because I believe that, under the conditions I suggest, presently appropriated funds will be adequate for the balance of the present fiscal year ending June 30. I shall, however, seek in subsequent legislation the authorization of $200 million to be available during each of the fiscal years 1958 and 1959 for discretionary use in the area, in addition to the other mutual-security programs for the area hereafter provided for by the Congress.

That is what the President of the United States said. That is but the beginning.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, like the Senator from Wyoming, I have the greatest respect for the office of the President of the United States. However, I take my responsibilities very seriously. When it comes to giving discretionary power to the executive department, I do not know that I agree entirely with what is proposed. Only last Friday a Senator on the Republican side of the aisle read the Farewell Address of Gen. George Washington. I refer to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] whose State adjoins mine. That was last Friday. We listened to the Farewell Address of General Washington. He also was a general.

General Marshall did his share, and he contributed to history and to the welfare of the American people in time of war, as did General Washington. Now we are talking about aid to Europe.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall not yield again, with all due respect to my colleagues, until I have read some of these questions.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, does the Senator intend to propound every one of these vital questions at this time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the Senator yield, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum? The Senator from Wyoming must recognize that with the exception of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who is a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, no members of those two committees are present on the floor. Certainly the Senator from Wyoming wants to get the maximum result, and I am sure he desires to accomplish something. Therefore, in order to get answers to his questions, some other members of those committees should be on the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I appreciate very much the offer of the Senator, but in justice to my colleagues, and for the benefit of the guests in the galleries, I should say that the Members of the Senate are literally flooded with work of various kinds. In addition to committee work, there is the mail from their constituents from all over the United States, and then there are visits by officials of the Government, and conferences with various departments of the Government.

As the Senator from Idaho well knows, so much of the time of our colleagues is claimed by these activities that it is very difficult for all of them to be on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield. First, I should like to say that the time is coming when they will come to the floor, or these seats, which are now voluntarily vacant, will be permanently vacant.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Idaho well knows what the Senator from Wyoming says is true. The Senator from Idaho happens to be a member of 12 committees and subcommittees, and he is almost constantly required to attend meetings of those committees, both in the forenoon and in the afternoon.

I understand that the majority leader was very emphatic in saying earlier this afternoon that he wanted all Members to be on the floor, so that they could participate in the debate and consideration of the joint resolution. In carrying out that suggestion, it seems to me that we ought to have a quorum call, so that other Senators may have an opportunity to be on the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is very gracious, but I prefer not to have a quorum call. I say that for this reason. I shall propound these questions, and I beg the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the members of the Committee on Armed Services, after they have read the questions in the RECORD tomorrow, to come to the floor and answer them. I assure them that if they are anxious to get a final vote on the joint resolution there will be no unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate, so far as I am concerned, until these questions are answered.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does not the Senator believe that the majority leader

would like to have the members of those two committees present now in order to answer the questions, and not have the answers wait until tomorrow?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think he is anxious to have his debate finished. But let me conclude, Mr. President. The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] desires to speak this afternoon, and I know he has a most important engagement in New York. I will say to the Senator from New York, if I may, that when the hour comes when he wishes to speak, I shall yield the floor to him, because I do not want to delay him in meeting his important engagement in New York.

The report of the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees—Senate Report No. 70, 85th Congress, 1st session—recommending that Senate Joint Resolution 19 be passed in a modified form prepared by the committee, is entitled "To Promote Peace and Stability in the Middle East." An examination of the report seems to demonstrate that this title is no more than an advertising slogan designed to make the reader believe that the written words of the resolution constitute a peaceful program, whereas they are in fact only a vague and indefinite threat to allow the Armed Forces of the United States to be sent into conflict on the authority of the President alone, without specific reference to the Constitution of the United States.

The Armed Forces, according to the resolution itself, may be sent only at the request of the Nation seeking assistance. Here we have a definite and complete declaration, for the first time in the history of the United States, that our Armed Forces can be sent into combat to resist aggression, though the aggression is not defined, at the request of a foreign nation, and not at the request of the Congress.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is accepted more as a matter of shortening the title. The junior Senator from South Dakota repeatedly pointed out that the body of the resolution itself should make it clear that the security must be the security of the United States, and that the establishment of security in the Middle East must be a means of maintaining the security of the United States. At one time the original resolution was amended, with a clause in the second section which required that the determination by the President should be a determination which would be essentially important to the security of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall come to that in a moment.

We are dealing with what has been called the Eisenhower doctrine, but nowhere in the report do we have a definition of the Eisenhower doctrine and nowhere in the resolution do we find clear and conclusive words of explanation.

On the contrary, the report itself, in the concluding paragraph, page 11, contains language which definitely states that this proposed resolution taken by itself does not provide a definitive United States policy for the Middle East, nor is it so intended. All it provides is time in which to devise such a policy.

Observe the language, Mr. President. What do the members of the committees propose that we take, if not the resolution itself? What statements; what evidence; what commitments? What is to be added to the resolution? Resolutions are effective only as the language in which they are drafted is effective. Every lawyer in America knows that all the lawsuits and all the courts of the country depend wholly upon the interpretation of the written language and the legislative history, which, in this case, includes the speech of the President of the United States, and the report.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think it should be pointed out that at some time during the consideration of the resolution we use the phrase "when he determines that such use is important to the security of the United States." We inserted that language in the original language of section 2.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But it was deleted. Why?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No. When the substitute amendment was offered originally by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is giving me history only. Satisfactory answers can be drawn only from the report or from the resolution. The Senator from South Dakota will agree, will he not, that I have correctly read the statement in paragraph 11, the third paragraph of the conclusion of the committee?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; but I wish to refer to the language of the resolution itself as answering the question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me read the language of the resolution itself. I read from section 2:

> The President is authorized to undertake, in the general area of the Middle East—

The general area; no boundaries are specified—

> military assistance programs with any nations or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance.

No definition of military assistance is given. What does "military assistance" mean? Does it mean money? Does it mean guns? Does it mean military equipment?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My personal answer would be that it refers to guns and equipment and things of that sort.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The next sentence is the one which the Senator from South Dakota has in mind.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is the sentence which took the place of the clause which I have previously mentioned:

> Furthermore, the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East.

Then the next sentence goes to the suggestion that troops might be employed.

> To this end——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is only anticipating my reading.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But, since we are reciting history, there was a specific purpose for that language.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me read the language:

> To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof—

What does that mean? It means that everything hereafter stated depends upon the discretion of the President. If he does not determine the necessity, nothing in this resolution applies.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is nothing in the sentence of which that language is a part.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Let me finish the sentence:

> To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism.

I point out to my colleagues that this language specifically declares that the United States is prepared to use its Armed Forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance. So we are there placing the movement of the Armed Forces of the United States into the general area of the Middle East at the beck and call of some foreign nation, not knowing what nation may call, and not knowing whether, in fact, it will be a Communist nation or an international Communist nation. The language merely reads:

> Against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism.

Is Tito controlled by international communism? Tito is not in the Middle East.

But what about Syria? Syria, we are told, is infiltrated with Communists. Syria is in the Middle East. Suppose that in Syria there should be citizens like the freedom fighters in Hungary, who sought to overthrow the government. Is not this language broad enough to cover such a situation? The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] so interpreted it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Responding to the question which the Senator has asked, or to the situation he has posed, I presume that perhaps it is provided that the President shall determine the necessity of the use of our Armed Forces as vital to the national interest and world peace.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Who will have command of our Armed Forces when they go into Syria, or go into Egypt, or go into Israel? Who will have the command? The President, the Commander in Chief, will not be there, of course.

The nation which is independent will have its own military authorities. Will it be willing? Is there anything in the resolution to make it clear that the Armed Forces of the United States would be under American commanders?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There was no suggestion in the committees of anything to the contrary, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, I am certain there was not. All I am arguing is that we have before us a resolution which is so full of loopholes that a herd of cattle could be driven through it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In line 9, I think the word "such" should be placed ahead of the word "nation."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from South Dakota gives me aid and comfort. I appreciate it. He proposes that on the fourth page of the resolution there should be an amendment—at least, he thinks there should be an amendment—to insert one word. Before I have finished, I hope I shall have convinced him and his colleagues that many other words should be included.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I myself think that the failure to have included the word "such" in the resolution at that point was an oversight, and I so stated to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] following the report of the action by the committee. I am inclined to think that the word "such" will be accepted, so as to make the meaning perfectly clear.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest that the Senator from South Dakota now give notice to that effect.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The amendment would limit the nations which could request assistance.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator from South Dakota please offer his amendment? It will then be printed and will lie on the desk, for discussion tomorrow.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and other Senators. I had thought that possibly all that would be necessary would be to let the amendment be offered verbally; but I shall be glad to offer it now, if the Senator will yield to me for that purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Dakota for that purpose, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask that there may be printed, for the reference of the Senate, the amendment which I propose to offer on page 4, line 9, as follows:

After the word "any" and after the word "of", insert the word "such."

The clause would then read:

Assist any such nation or group of such nations requesting assistance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota will be received and printed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is a little progress.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is very welcome, indeed.

It will be remembered that I have read the paragraph from the section of the report on page 11 which reads:

It should be clearly understood that this proposed resolution taken by itself does not provide a definitive United States policy for the Middle East, nor is it so intended.

I want some member of the committees to tell us whether that statement in the report correctly states the attitude of the committees.

Then the committee continues:

All it provides is time in which to devise such a policy.

If the committees in their report to the Senate tell us that this is a resolution designed only to provide time in which to devise a Middle East policy, how can the nations of the world know what our policy is or what our purpose is?

It has been notable that ever since the resolution has been reported, there has been an absence of real debate. We are, however, making a little progress today. The proponents and critics of the resolution speak to an empty Chamber. They make their speeches and then retire. We have not been afforded the sort of careful, analytical discussion of the words of the resolution which the people of America and the people of the world ought to have. I trust that the time will come when the advocates of speedy action on a resolution which, in the words of the report, does not propose a definitive United States policy for the Middle East, will be willing to stand upon the floor and answer some of the questions which I intend here to propound.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I recognize that one who is a junior member of the Committee on Armed Services is not exactly best qualified to give the answers to the questions which the Senator has raised.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from South Dakota is a very able Senator and is well qualified to answer any questions.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; the Senator from South Dakota can give only his personal interpretation, based upon the discussions he heard in the committees and the testimony there offered.

My own answer to the question which the Senator has raised—and I think it is a very basic question—as to what the resolution is intended to do is to create a restraint upon aggression. The reason why the resolution will serve a useful purpose——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has not read the last sentence of the conclusion. I beg the Senator to read the report of the committees. This is the next sentence. It is in the last paragraph in the report:

It is on this basis—

Bear in mind that "this basis" is the basis that the proposal does not embody a definitive program for the Middle East; that it is intended only to gain time. Then the report goes on to tell us——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. How does it gain time? By serving notice——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Pardon me. If the Senator will give me time to make my statement, I will permit him to respond. The last sentence of the report reads:

It is on this basis that the joint committee urges the Senate to approve the resolution promptly and the administration to press forward with well-considered plans to take advantage of the time gained by the resolution.

If the State Department does not have well-considered plans now, why is the resolution before the Senate?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the Senator will permit me to express an opinion, as one member of the two committees, the purpose is to place a restraint upon armed aggression at the instigation of Communist-controlled nations, and the hope and expectation is that if that restraint shall be imposed by saying, "If you move, we are prepared to move," time will be provided in which a definitive policy may be worked out.

It was also stated in the committees that the precise details of what might be done would be stated more clearly when former Representative Richards was authorized to undertake his mission, following the passage of the resolution, and could return with the precise features of the plan for the expenditure of the funds and their use to correct the conditions or to improve the conditions which might lead to trouble.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator say that we are asked to delegate to the very able former Representative Richards of South Carolina the power to go to the Middle East and do what we ought to do?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not say that, but I do say this——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Well, is not that what it amounts to?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No, I cannot quite agree with the Senator from Wyoming. The joint resolution as presented and as amended suggests that 15 days before any use is made of these funds, the Congress should have a precise report as to what the funds are to be used for, with a statement that a precise allocation of the funds for a particular purpose or to a particular country will await the report of the special ambassador, or former Representative Richards, when he could go, clothed, so to speak, with the background of the position of restraint which it is hoped the joint resolution will produce.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I regret very much to be obliged to say that the statement of the Senator from South Dakota and his interpretation of the language are notice to the Soviet Union that the committees' report is correct when it says we do not have a plan and that well-considered plans have not been drawn up.

Mr. President, I would have finished long ago if it had not been for the interruptions. I welcome them; I like to have my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle interrogate me. I wish more of them were present—and also more Democratic Members, too, let me say. I shall not state for the RECORD how empty are the empty seats before which I speak.

I am doing my best to get the Senate of the United States to study the language upon which it is going to vote. The proposed action cannot be taken on faith, Mr. President; note the presence of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], whose patience is so enduring. He sits in committee when I take up time, and he sits upon the floor of the Senate while I am now speaking. His intelligence and good humor overwhelm me all the time. We cooperate in a great many ways.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was particularly interested in one observation a Senator made this afternoon, namely, that the seats now temporarily empty might later be permanently vacated. But when I looked at the other side of the aisle, I saw there were many more empty seats there than on this side of the aisle.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course the trend is our way; the Senator from Illinois got the returns from the Northwest; did he not? [Laughter.]

Mr. President, if this resolution is actually not intended to provide a Middle East policy, why all the pressure to get it passed? Do President Eisenhower and Secetary Dulles tell us that they have no policy, but are only trying to devise one?

The last paragraph of the report on page 11, after having confessed that the resolution does not embody a policy, concludes the recommendation for speedy action in these words:

> It is on this basis that the joint committee urges the Senate to approve the resolution promptly and the administration to press forward with well-considered plans to take advantage of the time gained by the resolution.

Is this not an open confession that the administration has no Middle East policy, and is only playing for time?

On the admission of the committee report, the resolution is not a well-considered plan. What advocate of early passage will now rise on the floor and give the country and the world some hint of the plan that is not yet born?

Mr. President, why should the Senate vote for a joint resolution that confessedly is not a well-considered plan? Are we not wasting our time when we deal with such proposed legislation?

Confessing in conclusion that there is no policy, the committee report nevertheless, on page 9, in its discussion of the use of armed forces under section 2, takes the completely contrary view, declaring—and again this quotation comes from the committee report, on page 9, in the last paragraph of section 7, which is entitled "Use of the Armed Forces":

> On balance—

Mr. President, those words intrigue me. They show that there are pros and cons; that there is weight in one part of the scales, and weight in the other part of the scales; and those words show that "on balance"—indicating the existence of pros and cons—the two committees say the following:

> On balance, the joint committee is of the opinion that the clear statement of policy in section 2 of the resolution as reported is preferable to a blanket authorization to the President to use the Armed Forces in this area. By declaring the policy of the United States, the resolution is actually stronger, in some respects, than a simple authorization to the President.

Where, oh where, in the committee report or in the joint resolution is there any declaration of policy?

Here within the compass of six lines the committees twice assert that there is a clear statement of policy in section 2, only to have the assertion repudiated in the conclusion. This is confusion confounded beyond explanation.

In the face of these conflicting statements of the report, will some member of the committees who advocates the passage of this joint resolution, tell us whether we have a policy or whether we do not? If we do have a policy, will some Senator please point out the language of the resolution in which it is embodied; and if we do not have a policy, I ask where and how does this resolution give us time to formulate a policy.

The same contradiction to be found in the report is also found in the resolution itself and particularly in section 2, the section which the committee report, on page 9, calls a clear statement of policy.

Section 2 of the resolution plainly limits the President and the State Department only to those actions which the Soviet Union will not veto in the Security Council, if it is the intention of the administration to operate—as the closing proviso states—in consonance with the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. President, I admit that I am confused about that. The meaning is not clear. The reason it is not clear is that the President in his address to the Congress had something to say about this matter. I read now from page 5 of Senate Document 46, the President's message, in which he explains what the action he proposes to take would do and what the features are. He said:

> It would, in the third place, authorize such assistance and cooperation to include the employment of the Armed Forces of the United States to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of such nations, requesting such aid, against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism.
>
> These measures would have to be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States, including the Charter of the United Nations and with any action or recommendations of the United Nations. They would also, if armed attack occurs, be subject to the overriding authority of the United Nations Security Council in accordance with the charter.

What was the overriding authority of the Security Council of the United Nations, to which the President was referring? I do not know, unless it is the veto. Is it proposed that, since in the President's mind the Security Council of the United Nations has an overriding authority, the sending of armed forces—as provided for in the joint resolution—shall actually be subject to the Charter of the United Nations? I do not believe it, but it could be so interpreted. Certainly I want some official language, either in the joint resolution or in the debate—and I would prefer to have it in the joint resolution—to show that it is not intended to submit the policy, if we have one, to the veto of the Security Council of the United Nations.

If we are to form a policy, if the dignity of the Congress is to be called upon by the President to justify a policy, then certainly let it be an American policy, not subject to the overriding policy of the Security Council with its veto.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. With respect to the need for some action, one of the things which seemed to me to be impressive was the repeated answer by Secretary Dulles to interrogations along that line, which pointed to the existence of an arms race between some of the nations in the Middle East, growing out of their fears which were elaborated upon by Ambassador Byroade, who at one time was in charge of the Middle Eastern desk at the State Department and subsequently was Ambassador to Egypt. In the testimony of both Mr. Byroade and Secretary Dulles there were repeated references to statements with respect to the bringing in of arms by some of the nations in that area. It was felt that of itself constituted a restless situation, a competitive situation, which, if unchecked, would lead to conflict which might start as a small flame, but grow into a worldwide conflagration. It was felt that the passage of the resolution, the declaration of policy, would be a steadying influence, a statement, in effect, to those countries in the Middle East: "Do not get excited. Do not worry about the situation. If overt armed aggression should come under Communist inspiration, the United States is prepared to use its Armed Forces to quell it."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How could anybody be intimidated by such a statement when we leave a door open for retreat?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. By that assurance it was hoped to encourage nations to refrain from seeking further importations of arms from the several sources described as the places from which they were getting them, and to give us time to work out a program which would settle some of the economic problems and some of the boundary problems.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator think Soviet Russia is going to give us any time?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If Soviet Russia——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did the Senator say yet?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No. The Senator from South Dakota was about to say that the nations in that area would be convinced that if the Soviet should play the passions of the nations of the Middle East one against the other, and should supply arms, and that should lead to a conflict inspired by the Soviet,

the United States would enter into the situation; and it was felt that Soviet Russia might be restrained from so doing.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator if that is the purpose, and that may be a justifiable purpose, then it should be stated in a resolution anybody can understand. My complaint is not against what the Senator says ought to be done. I have worked with the Senator from South Dakota for many years, both in this body and when he was a Member of the House. We have never found any difficulty in accommodating our views to legislation, because we have talked to one another as reasonable men; but I submit this resolution is very poorly drafted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. When the Senator complains about the draftsmanship of the resolution and its lack of clarity on this point, is he referring to the original resolution or to the amended resolution?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I am referring to the resolution as it is now before the Senate. I point out that section 2 is almost beyond understanding. It needs clarification. We owe it to those whose lives will be imperiled if our Armed Forces ever go to that area to see that the resolution is clarified.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May the junior Senator from South Dakota say that he voted for continuing the basic language of the resolution as introduced, but with an important change. The important change which the junior Senator from South Dakota advocated and offered was due in part to the points which the Senator from Wyoming presented to the committee. If adopted at that time, the language would have read:

> Furthermore, when he determines that such use is important to the security of the United States, the President of the United States is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any such nation or group of nations requesting such aid—

And so forth. In other words, the Senator from Wyoming got across to the Senator from South Dakota the importance of basing any action for the employment of our Armed Forces upon the security of the United States rather than upon the security of the Middle Eastern nations as such.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from South Dakota not see that the basic criticism of this language as it was presented, and as the Senator has now restated it, lies in the fact that it constitutes an authorization to the President to take action in the future, the nature of which we do not know?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from South Dakota could hardly admit we would not know the nature of it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How can we? No nation has asked assistance as yet.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I could not accept that statement, either. I might say some of the testimony before the committee indicated that some of the nations in the area would like this assurance.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Indicated in what manner? If we are going to send our Armed Forces into battle, should we not give to the members of those Armed Forces a definite and explicit statement of the reasons why they are going and under whose individual personal command they will serve.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If they went by direction of the President of the United States, they would go under United States command.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How does the Senator know? How do I know?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The President is the one——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How does the Senator know a nation would permit it?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Which nation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The nation that invited us to assist it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Armed Forces would not go unless the President determined it was necessary, so he would be the one who would make the decision.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say the Congress ought to make that decision.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator will recognize that there was a great deal of debate by Senators in the committee whom I would class as constitutional lawyers. I am neither a lawyer nor a constitutional lawyer.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has a very good mind.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I did not pretend to enter into the argument as to the constitutional right, but some of the ablest members of both committees contended that the President had the authority to do all this resolution would propose he might do, even if such a resolution were not adopted, except for the lifting of limitations on the $200 million.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The constitutional argument is frequently a barren sort of argument for the mass of the people. I want an argument which will be understood in the livingroom of every family in America whose sons may be in the draft.

Here we have a resolution, the object of which may be good. I should like to vote for it, if it could be written so that the boys in the armed services could understand it. As it is written, there is no limitation. It merely provides that if the President deems it necessary, the armed services may be sent to the aid of any nation asking it. It does not even say how the request shall be made. It does not say by whom it shall be made. It does not say that there shall be a treaty guaranteeing that the American forces will be under their own commanders.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. They would not go unless they were directed by the Commander in Chief of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But the Commander in Chief may be down in Augusta on a golf course when they are fighting.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Even so, he would have the responsibility for any directive he might issue, wherever he might be. No matter where the President of the United States is, he still is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no doubt about that; but when the boys were fighting in Korea, President Truman was not there.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; but I think the Senator from Wyoming recognizes the fact that when we are dealing with a large group of men, there are many things to be taken into consideration. There were 30 men in the meeting of the two committees. There were men in that group who felt that President Truman had the right, the authority, and the power to direct the troops of the United States to take part in the Korean engagement, even though Congress was not consulted and did not adopt a resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly; and I heard Republican Senators on this floor say so when it was done.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Here is one Republican who did not agree, and emphatically so stated on the 27th of June 1950.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Utah took that position then. I think he ought to take that position now. If he had been in the Chamber long enough, he would have heard some of the questions I have been asking. Let me say to the Senator from Utah, for whose capacity, ability, and patriotism I have the highest respect, as he well knows, that my only argument is that the Senate report recommending this resolution is self-contradictory.

Mr. WATKINS. I think it is extremely weak.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. WATKINS. I think it is a watered down version of what the President asked for. I think he asked for the correct procedure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The report is self-contradictory, and the resolution reported by the two committees would not carry out the intent which is stated. As I said to the Senator from South Dakota a moment ago, the resolution is full of loopholes through which one could drive a herd of cattle.

Mr. WATKINS. It was not that way in the beginning, but I think it is now.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thought it was, and that is why I testified before the two committees and urged certain amendments. I pleaded before the committees that at least they should put into this document the statement that the use of United States troops shall be in consonance with the Constitution of the United States, as well as in consonance with treaties and with the Charter of the United Nations. The committees left in the resolution the provision with respect to treaties and the provision with respect to the Charter of the United Nations, but they threw the Constitution out the window.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

I am doing my best to get the Senate of the United States to study the language upon which it is going to vote. The proposed action cannot be taken on faith, Mr. President; note the presence of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], whose patience is so enduring. He sits in committee when I take up time, and he sits upon the floor of the Senate while I am now speaking. His intelligence and good humor overwhelm me all the time. We cooperate in a great many ways.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was particularly interested in one observation a Senator made this afternoon, namely, that the seats now temporarily empty might later be permanently vacated. But when I looked at the other side of the aisle, I saw there were many more empty seats there than on this side of the aisle.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course the trend is our way; the Senator from Illinois got the returns from the Northwest; did he not? [Laughter.]

Mr. President, if this resolution is actually not intended to provide a Middle East policy, why all the pressure to get it passed? Do President Eisenhower and Secetary Dulles tell us that they have no policy, but are only trying to devise one?

The last paragraph of the report on page 11, after having confessed that the resolution does not embody a policy, concludes the recommendation for speedy action in these words:

> It is on this basis that the joint committee urges the Senate to approve the resolution promptly and the administration to press forward with well-considered plans to take advantage of the time gained by the resolution.

Is this not an open confession that the administration has no Middle East policy, and is only playing for time?

On the admission of the committee report, the resolution is not a well-considered plan. What advocate of early passage will now rise on the floor and give the country and the world some hint of the plan that is not yet born?

Mr. President, why should the Senate vote for a joint resolution that confessedly is not a well-considered plan? Are we not wasting our time when we deal with such proposed legislation?

Confessing in conclusion that there is no policy, the committee report nevertheless, on page 9, in its discussion of the use of armed forces under section 2, takes the completely contrary view, declaring—and again this quotation comes from the committee report, on page 9, in the last paragraph of section 7, which is entitled "Use of the Armed Forces":

> On balance—

Mr. President, those words intrigue me. They show that there are pros and cons; that there is weight in one part of the scales, and weight in the other part of the scales; and those words show that "on balance"—indicating the existence of pros and cons—the two committees say the following:

> On balance, the joint committee is of the opinion that the clear statement of policy in section 2 of the resolution as reported is preferable to a blanket authorization to the President to use the Armed Forces in this area. By declaring the policy of the United States, the resolution is actually stronger, in some respects, than a simple authorization to the President.

Where, oh where, in the committee report or in the joint resolution is there any declaration of policy?

Here within the compass of six lines the committees twice assert that there is a clear statement of policy in section 2, only to have the assertion repudiated in the conclusion. This is confusion confounded beyond explanation.

In the face of these conflicting statements of the report, will some member of the committees who advocates the passage of this joint resolution, tell us whether we have a policy or whether we do not? If we do have a policy, will some Senator please point out the language of the resolution in which it is embodied; and if we do not have a policy, I ask where and how does this resolution give us time to formulate a policy.

The same contradiction to be found in the report is also found in the resolution itself and particularly in section 2, the section which the committee report, on page 9, calls a clear statement of policy.

Section 2 of the resolution plainly limits the President and the State Department only to those actions which the Soviet Union will not veto in the Security Council, if it is the intention of the administration to operate—as the closing proviso states—in consonance with the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. President, I admit that I am confused about that. The meaning is not clear. The reason it is not clear is that the President in his address to the Congress had something to say about this matter. I read now from page 5 of Senate Document 46, the President's message, in which he explains what the action he proposes to take would do and what the features are. He said:

> It would, in the third place, authorize such assistance and cooperation to include the employment of the Armed Forces of the United States to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of such nations, requesting such aid, against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism.
>
> These measures would have to be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States, including the Charter of the United Nations and with any action or recommendations of the United Nations. They would also, if armed attack occurs, be subject to the overriding authority of the United Nations Security Council in accordance with the charter.

What was the overriding authority of the Security Council of the United Nations, to which the President was referring? I do not know, unless it is the veto. Is it proposed that, since in the President's mind the Security Council of the United Nations has an overriding authority, the sending of armed forces—as provided for in the joint resolution—shall actually be subject to the Charter of the United Nations? I do not believe it, but it could be so interpreted. Certainly I want some official language, either in the joint resolution or in the debate—and I would prefer to have it in the joint resolution—to show that it is not intended to submit the policy, if we have one, to the veto of the Security Council of the United Nations.

If we are to form a policy, if the dignity of the Congress is to be called upon by the President to justify a policy, then certainly let it be an American policy, not subject to the overriding policy of the Security Council with its veto.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. With respect to the need for some action, one of the things which seemed to me to be impressive was the repeated answer by Secretary Dulles to interrogations along that line, which pointed to the existence of an arms race between some of the nations in the Middle East, growing out of their fears which were elaborated upon by Ambassador Byroade, who at one time was in charge of the Middle Eastern desk at the State Department and subsequently was Ambassador to Egypt. In the testimony of both Mr. Byroade and Secretary Dulles there were repeated references to statements with respect to the bringing in of arms by some of the nations in that area. It was felt that of itself constituted a restless situation, a competitive situation, which, if unchecked, would lead to conflict which might start as a small flame, but grow into a worldwide conflagration. It was felt that the passage of the resolution, the declaration of policy, would be a steadying influence, a statement, in effect, to those countries in the Middle East: "Do not get excited. Do not worry about the situation. If overt armed aggression should come under Communist inspiration, the United States is prepared to use its Armed Forces to quell it."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How could anybody be intimidated by such a statement when we leave a door open for retreat?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. By that assurance it was hoped to encourage nations to refrain from seeking further importations of arms from the several sources described as the places from which they were getting them, and to give us time to work out a program which would settle some of the economic problems and some of the boundary problems.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator think Soviet Russia is going to give us any time?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If Soviet Russia——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did the Senator say yet?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No. The Senator from South Dakota was about to say that the nations in that area would be convinced that if the Soviet should play the passions of the nations of the Middle East one against the other, and should supply arms, and that should lead to a conflict inspired by the Soviet,

the United States would enter into the situation; and it was felt that Soviet Russia might be restrained from so doing.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator if that is the purpose, and that may be a justifiable purpose, then it should be stated in a resolution anybody can understand. My complaint is not against what the Senator says ought to be done. I have worked with the Senator from South Dakota for many years, both in this body and when he was a Member of the House. We have never found any difficulty in accommodating our views to legislation, because we have talked to one another as reasonable men; but I submit this resolution is very poorly drafted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. When the Senator complains about the draftsmanship of the resolution and its lack of clarity on this point, is he referring to the original resolution or to the amended resolution?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I am referring to the resolution as it is now before the Senate. I point out that section 2 is almost beyond understanding. It needs clarification. We owe it to those whose lives will be imperiled if our Armed Forces ever go to that area to see that the resolution is clarified.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May the junior Senator from South Dakota say that he voted for continuing the basic language of the resolution as introduced, but with an important change. The important change which the junior Senator from South Dakota advocated and offered was due in part to the points which the Senator from Wyoming presented to the committee. If adopted at that time, the language would have read:

> Furthermore, when he determines that such use is important to the security of the United States, the President of the United States is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any such nation or group of nations requesting such aid—

And so forth. In other words, the Senator from Wyoming got across to the Senator from South Dakota the importance of basing any action for the employment of our Armed Forces upon the security of the United States rather than upon the security of the Middle Eastern nations as such.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from South Dakota not see that the basic criticism of this language as it was presented, and as the Senator has now restated it, lies in the fact that it constitutes an authorization to the President to take action in the future, the nature of which we do not know?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from South Dakota could hardly admit we would not know the nature of it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How can we? No nation has asked assistance as yet.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I could not accept that statement, either. I might say some of the testimony before the committee indicated that some of the nations in the area would like this assurance.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Indicated in what manner? If we are going to send our Armed Forces into battle, should we not give to the members of those Armed Forces a definite and explicit statement of the reasons why they are going and under whose individual personal command they will serve.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If they went by direction of the President of the United States, they would go under United States command.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How does the Senator know? How do I know?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The President is the one——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How does the Senator know a nation would permit it?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Which nation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The nation that invited us to assist it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Armed Forces would not go unless the President determined it was necessary, so he would be the one who would make the decision.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say the Congress ought to make that decision.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator will recognize that there was a great deal of debate by Senators in the committee whom I would class as constitutional lawyers. I am neither a lawyer nor a constitutional lawyer.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has a very good mind.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I did not pretend to enter into the argument as to the constitutional right, but some of the ablest members of both committees contended that the President had the authority to do all this resolution would propose he might do, even if such a resolution were not adopted, except for the lifting of limitations on the $200 million.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The constitutional argument is frequently a barren sort of argument for the mass of the people. I want an argument which will be understood in the livingroom of every family in America whose sons may be in the draft.

Here we have a resolution, the object of which may be good. I should like to vote for it, if it could be written so that the boys in the armed services could understand it. As it is written, there is no limitation. It merely provides that if the President deems it necessary, the armed services may be sent to the aid of any nation asking it. It does not even say how the request shall be made. It does not say by whom it shall be made. It does not say that there shall be a treaty guaranteeing that the American forces will be under their own commanders.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. They would not go unless they were directed by the Commander in Chief of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But the Commander in Chief may be down in Augusta on a golf course when they are fighting.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Even so, he would have the responsibility for any directive he might issue, wherever he might be. No matter where the President of the United States is, he still is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no doubt about that; but when the boys were fighting in Korea, President Truman was not there.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; but I think the Senator from Wyoming recognizes the fact that when we are dealing with a large group of men, there are many things to be taken into consideration. There were 30 men in the meeting of the two committees. There were men in that group who felt that President Truman had the right, the authority, and the power to direct the troops of the United States to take part in the Korean engagement, even though Congress was not consulted and did not adopt a resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly; and I heard Republican Senators on this floor say so when it was done.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Here is one Republican who did not agree, and emphatically so stated on the 27th of June 1950.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Utah took that position then. I think he ought to take that position now. If he had been in the Chamber long enough, he would have heard some of the questions I have been asking. Let me say to the Senator from Utah, for whose capacity, ability, and patriotism I have the highest respect, as he well knows, that my only argument is that the Senate report recommending this resolution is self-contradictory.

Mr. WATKINS. I think it is extremely weak.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. WATKINS. I think it is a watered down version of what the President asked for. I think he asked for the correct procedure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The report is self-contradictory, and the resolution reported by the two committees would not carry out the intent which is stated. As I said to the Senator from South Dakota a moment ago, the resolution is full of loopholes through which one could drive a herd of cattle.

Mr. WATKINS. It was not that way in the beginning, but I think it is now.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thought it was, and that is why I testified before the two committees and urged certain amendments. I pleaded before the committees that at least they should put into this document the statement that the use of United States troops shall be in consonance with the Constitution of the United States, as well as in consonance with treaties and with the Charter of the United Nations. The committees left in the resolution the provision with respect to treaties and the provision with respect to the Charter of the United Nations, but they threw the Constitution out the window.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator, because I hope the Senator will carry this argument back to his colleagues.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the group of 30 men who were working on this problem, there were those who, on the one hand, had the same feeling the Senator from Utah has expressed, namely, that President Truman did not have the authority. There were others who felt that he did have the authority. I think the final result was probably not an attempt to settle the constitutional question, because it was realized that, after all, the committees could not settle the constitutional question.

With respect to the point the Senator has raised with reference to the United Nations Security Council, it must be remembered that the United Nations Security Council cannot act unless the United States concurs. The United States has a veto in the Security Council. Any action by the United Nations Security Council in the Middle East would require concurrence of the United States. I think the point in the President's message in that connection was that we might take action to defend against aggression, but that it could be replaced by United Nations action, if the Security Council, with the United States concurring, decided to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is that what the President meant when he referred to the overriding authority of the Security Council?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is not overriding in the sense that it could be taken without the consent of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator ask the President what he meant? We must do it, or we are not explaining it to the Senate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under the United Nations Charter, in the provisions relating to the Security Council, the Security Council has no overriding authority over the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is paying no attention to the words of the President, who asks for this authority. What does he say?

These measures—

What is he talking about? The measures he is asking for—

would have to be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States, including the Charter of the United Nations and with any action or recommendations of the United Nations.

He continues:

They would also, if armed attack occurs, be subject to the overriding authority of the United Nations Security Council in accordance with the Charter.

Will someone come forward with a definitive statement representing the will of the committees which made the report, and tell us what was meant?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Perhaps the Senator from Wyoming would prefer the language of the original resolution. The language reported by the committees is in the nature of an amendment. If the Senator from Wyoming would like to go back to the original language of the joint resolution, that can be done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am asking the Senator from South Dakota to tell me what one of the committees, of which he is a member, believes the President meant when he told the committee and told the Congress that the measures would be subject to the overriding authority of the United Nations.

Perhaps the intention is not to operate under the United Nations but to go it alone, for who will explain the words of the President in his message of January 5, 1957, House Document No. 46, page 4:

The United Nations can always be helpful, but it cannot be a wholly dependable protector of freedom when the ambitions of the Soviet Union are involved. Under all the circumstances I have laid before you, a greater responsibility now devolves upon the United States.

Question: Which controls, the words of the resolution or the words of the President? And who will tell us what the resolution means and what the President meant?

WHAT IS MAIN PURPOSE OF THE RESOLUTION?

The first paragraph of the report bears the title "Main Purpose of the Resolution," and begins with this sentence:

The main purpose of the joint resolution is to put the Soviet Union on notice that Communist aggression in the Middle East would be a serious threat to the vital interests of the United States.

If this is indeed the main purpose of the resolution, why is it necessary to say more?

The measure we are asked to approve goes much further. The first sentence of section 2, page 4, reads:

The President is authorized to undertake, in the general area of the Middle East, military-assistance programs with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance.

Does not this sentence purport to authorize the President to send armed forces as a part of a military-assistance program to any nation or group of nations in the Middle East desiring such assistance? If it does not, then there ought to be a definition of military assistance, either in the report or in the joint resolution. There is no such definition.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, may I make a suggestion to the Senator?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe the definition of military assistance would be that which is found in the basic mutual assistance legislation of the past and under the appropriations which have been made for it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That would be quite adequate, but it ought to be set out in that way, because unless it is set out, no one knows.

The sentence following the one above quoted from the first paragraph of the report attempting to define the main purpose of the resolution contains these explanatory words:

To this end, the resolution declares the readiness of the United States to use armed force to defend the area against overt armed aggression by any country controlled by international communism. It further enables the President to waive certain existing restrictions on the use of mutual security appropriations to the extent of $200 million for military and economic assistance to Middle East nations.

Are we to understand that this is only a declaration of readiness to use the Armed Forces of the United States?

If, in fact, it is only a declaration of readiness, why does the resolution in Section 2 make the use of the Armed Forces of this country dependent upon the discretion of the President when, as a matter of fact, the discretion of the President is controlled by the concluding paragraph of the resolution, already quoted above, making the discretion of the President of the United States subject to the Charter of the United Nations.

The report, in its explanation of the limiting proviso added at the end of Section 2, on page 7, referring to the readiness of the United States to use armed forces for the defense of any nation requesting such assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism, tells us "It is provided that any such use must be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the U. N. Charter."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield in order that I may make an observation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the use of the word "prepared" is in the mental sense.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If that is it, that is what the report should have said. The Senator is very helpful, but the language is not definitive. The Senator himself said a moment ago that he is only one member of the committees. He assured those who were here when he interrupted me a little while ago that he was not prepared to speak for the committees.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And that goes for what I have just said. I did not write the language of the substitute amendment. I voted against it as the language was originally drawn in the substitute. I did not write the report—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator would have written a very much better report.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator knows from his own experience that reports are usually prepared by technicians and members of the staff.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator want the record to show that very few members of the committees read this report? I am sure, from my reading of it, that they did not.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am saying that I did not write the report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has answered every criticism I have made. Now let the other members of the committees speak for themselves.

Is it not clear from this language that there is no reference to the Constitution of the United States in this proviso simply because the advocates of the resolution are avoiding the constitutional

issue of the right of Congress to declare war?

If it is the policy of the administration to try to promote peace and stability in the Middle East by seeming to offer military assistance, how can this resolution be anything less than an empty threat as long as we refuse to make any reference whatever to the only instrument that gives this Government the authority to act as an independent nation, namely the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. President, I desire to make only one more comment——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There was a point which the able Senator raised earlier in his discussion to which I wish to refer simply for the purpose of getting something in the RECORD with reference to it, and that was as to whether the President's reference to possible future authorizations of $200 million, or whatever the sum may be, for military assistance or for the economic program might be covered by the adoption of the resolution. The distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] was concerned about that possibility in the language of the original resolution. Largely as a result of his observations and his interrogations on the point, the amended resolution carries this sentence, and I think the RECORD should show it. Section 3 as proposed in the amendment contains this language:

> Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall be construed as itself authorizing the appropriation of additional funds for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the first section or of the first sentence of section 2 of this joint resolution.

I invite attention to the fact that the provisions of the first section of the resolution relate to economic assistance, and the first sentence of section 2 of the joint resolution relates to military assistance. Consequently, the language of the amended resolution clearly provides protection against the resolution being taken as an authorization for the appropriation of additional funds for either economic assistance or military assistance. That authorization could be established only by the passage of subsequent authorizing legislation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

I do not intend to ask any more questions this evening, Mr. President, but I invite the attention of the Senator from South Dakota to page 5 of the resolution as reported. Beginning in line 6 of the resolution we find this sentence:

> This authorization is in addition to other existing authorizations with respect to the use of such appropriations.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That refers to the $200 million.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And only that?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And only that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator believes there was no other authorization intended?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think that is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator believes that the phrase "other existing authorizations" has reference only to authorizations under the Mutual Security Act or under any other law with relation to mutual security?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think it goes back to the first sentence. That authorization is carried in the first sentence—

> The President is hereby authorized to use during the balance of fiscal year 1957 for economic and military assistance under this joint resolution not to exceed $200 million—

And so forth.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And that is all?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I should like to invite attention to the first paragraph of the resolution. I do this having in mind the fact that the United Nations General Assembly was to have met this morning to consider the resolutions of the conference which Ambassador Eban of Israel and Secretary John Foster Dulles had last night and early today.

I was told by the State Department that Mr. Eban had left Washington shortly before the Senate began its session at noon and that he was expected to arrive in New York for the meeting of the General Assembly at 11:30. Just a moment ago I asked one of my aides to consult the news ticker outside to see what, if anything, had happened in the United Nations. Nothing has happened. The debate has been postponed until 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. So I was not illuminated by anything that has happened in the General Assembly.

But this is the way section 1 reads:

> That the President be, and hereby is, authorized to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East desiring such assistance in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence.

Israel is a free nation in the Middle East. It has demonstrated, I think, pretty clearly that it is dedicated to the maintenance of national independence. It is the only really democratic nation in the Middle East. It has been the victim of continuous harassment by Egypt for years.

We have heard a great many complaints about the Gaza Strip and the Arabs there. The fact is that the Arabs in that general area were determined that the State of Israel should not be established, and they warned the Arabian inhabitants of the State of Israel to leave because, they said, "The Arabian forces are going to attack, and we do not want Arabs to be slaughtered by the guns of their brothers."

So the refugees who live in the Gaza Strip, and those who went to Jordan and elsewhere, fled at the request of the members of their own race, and not because they were driven out by the Israeli. They were there because they anticipated that before long the Arabian forces would drive the Israeli out of that nation at sword point. The Arabs tried, but they were completely defeated by the Israeli, who acted in the defense of the area which was assigned to them after the Turkish Empire was conquered in World War I.

The land which constitutes the Nation of Israel was not within the boundaries of any independent Arabian state when the State of Israel was established. When the Arabians were driven out, they were driven out by their own people, not by the Jews. Ever since that time, the Egyptians and other Arabs have been doing their best to destroy the independent, popular government of Israel.

The President has told us that this Government is committed to human freedom; and the resolution provides:

> That the President be and hereby is authorized to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East desiring such assistance in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence.

How does it come about, Mr. President, that we are talking about applying sanctions to the only free nation in the Middle East, with the exception, perhaps, of Lebanon, which is on the eastern shore of the Mediterranean Sea? We know that Egypt is supported by Communist arms. We know that of the oil pipelines which go through Syria, at least one has been sabotaged in that country.

How can we think we are defending human freedom when we are asked to pass a resolution so vague and so uncertain as Senate Joint Resolution 19? How can anyone believe that this is a resolution which would frighten any inhabitant of the Kremlin? We shall have to have a policy before we can frighten the Kremlin.

We have got to have a policy; not merely time in which to make one up, as the conclusion of the report of the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services tells the Senate. I think it is about time, Mr. President, that we should get busy and make a policy, and not try to submit the Members of the Senate to pressure to pass a resolution in such vague and indeterminate language as is contained in the resolution before us.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in view of the many times during the debate on the pending resolution that the question of the constitutional powers of the President has been discussed, and in view of the place which that subject has had in some of the discussion this afternoon, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a letter written by James Hart, professor of political science at the University of Virginia, to the editor of the New York Times, and published in the New York Times of today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator to say that the letter pertains to comments which the Senator has made?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The letter deals with the constitutional arguments about the powers of the President

and makes a suggestion of a possible clause relating to them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from South Dakota has answered my question. I have no objection.

Mr. WATKINS. I am delighted, Mr. President, that the Senator from South Dakota has seen fit to have the letter printed in the RECORD. It is a very interesting commentary on the discussions with respect to the war-making power of the President under the Constitution.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO BACK PRESIDENT'S ACTS—REMOVING ALL LEGAL DOUBT OF HIS COMMAND POWER SUGGESTED

(The writer of the following letter is the author of The American Presidency in Action: 1789. He is professor of Political science at the University of Virginia.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

If after prompt, unequivocal and overwhelming authorization of the use by the President of the Armed Forces to repel overt Communist aggression in the Middle East the Democrats on the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees take poor Secretary Dulles to task for his Middle East blundering, they may render a public service.

When, however, they blunt the warning to the Soviet Union which the President's request for that authorization envisages, as they patently are doing by the poor timing of their criticism, by their delay, and by their quibbling over the wording of the proposed resolution, their conduct must regrettably be pronounced nothing short of irresponsible.

Apparently the administration inaugurated the proposal by trial balloons rather than by consultation with leading Members of the Senate. That was unwise. But surely even Members of that exclusive club are not justified in putting amour propre above the national interest.

ARGUMENTS EVALUATED

The constitutional arguments which are used to justify refusal to endorse the crucial word "authorize" are summed up in the bombastic dilemma that if Congress has the power it may not delegate it to the President, while if the President has the power it will weaken him constitutionally and politically for Congress to share his responsibility. This dilemma is a superficially plausible rationalization of a position rather than a necessary legal conclusion.

May Congress delegate its power to declare war to the President? On January 26, 1799, Alexander Hamilton, who was a fairly good constitutional lawyer, wrote to Harrison Gray Otis: "I should be glad to see, before the close of the session, a law empowering the President, at his discretion, in case a negotiation between the United States and France should not be on foot by the first of August next, or being on foot should terminate without an adjustment of differences, to declare that a state of war exists between the two countries, and thereupon to employ the land and naval forces of the United States in such manner as shall appear to him most effectual for annoying the enemy, and for preventing and frustrating hostile designs of France, either directly or indirectly through any of her allies."

In his opinion for an almost unanimous Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.*, decided in 1936, Justice Sutherland said: "Practically every volume of the United States Statutes contains one or more acts or joint resolutions of Congress authorizing action by the President in respect of subjects affecting foreign relations which either leave the exercise of the power to his unrestricted judgment or provide a standard far more general than that which has always been considered requisite with regard to domestic affairs."

Does the President as Commander in Chief have the unlimited power to employ abroad the Armed Forces of the United States so as deliberately to bring us into an armed struggle with a great power if only he does not call it a war?

TRUMAN ACTION

The conclusion that he does is logically inconsistent with the possession by Congress of the expressly delegated power to declare war, if that power is to be given substantive meaning and is not to be nullified by a semantic quibble. It has been fashionable to ignore the fact that the power to declare war logically sets some limits to the command power ever since President Truman went to the aid of South Korea without asking Congress.

That he was authorized to do so is highly doubtful. The actions of Congress in backing up his intervention may be taken either as tacit ratification or, less plausibly, as tacit admission that he had had the power.

That the President may have to act upon dubious legal grounds in a grave emergency and depend upon later action of Congress for legal validation is clear. Yet the present is an instance in which anticipatory delegation is to be preferred to retroactive ratification because of its deterrent effect.

Anticipatory authorization might weaken the Presidency if the President had the undoubted power to act without it. In this case the claim that it would do so ignores the fact that the line between the President's command power and the power of Congress to declare war is one of uncertainty. That uncertainty makes it highly important that Russia and all the world should know that Congress has acted to remove it with respect to the President's authority to meet Soviet aggression in the Middle East with instantaneous use of the Armed Forces.

If the Senators desire to do so they can readily find language which will have the dual effect of removing all legal doubts and of saving the constitutional claims of Congress and of the President in the premises. They could use the word "authorize" and put in parentheses after it some such words as ("so far as such authorization may be constitutionally necessary for that purpose").

This would put the President in a legal position to act at once without having to go to Congress first, at the same time that it avoided taking any position on the delicate question how far his action would depend upon his own authority and how far the congressional authorization.

As a Democrat I am proud of the statesmanlike support of the President by ex-President Truman and by the House of Representatives. As a Democrat I am equally shocked by the partisanship of eminent Democratic Senators and the encouragement to such partisanship given by Dean Acheson.

JAMES HART.

CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA., *February 17, 1957.*

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## AMENDMENT OF ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in a free enterprise economy, the most effective regulator of economic activity is competition. Operating through the market forces of supply and demand, competition is the best and most effective device for allocating resources to the production and subsequent sale of the goods or products for which demand is greatest. Also, competition in the market for consumer preference is the best guarantee for improving product quality and maintaining prices which are fair to both producer and consumer.

As the economy has become more and more complex, so has the nature of competition. In some industries a relatively small number of firms have come to dominate economic activity. In some cases, this has been due to superior management and business skill. In other cases, it appears to have been the result of competitive practices which are not commensurate with the public interest. Price manipulation and unfair trade practices have been used to eliminate competition and to render neutral the forces of supply and demand.

The public has come to expect and demand that Government reinstate, where possible, and maintain by law as much competition as the public interest necessitates in the areas of the economy in which it works badly or where little of it exists. This public concern is reflected in the platforms of both political parties. It is a matter of bipartisanship.

For example, the 1956 Republican platform declares:

> The Republican Party has as a primary concern the continued advancement of the well-being of the individual. This can be attained only in an economy that, as today, is sound, free, and creative, ever building new wealth and new jobs for all the people.
>
> We believe in good business for all business—small, medium, and large. We believe that competition in a free economy opens unrivaled opportunity and brings the greatest good to the greatest number.

The Republicans also at that time pledged themselves to "a continuously vigorous enforcement of antitrust laws"—page 7.

On the other hand, members of the Democratic Party at their 1956 convention pledged themselves to maintaining "competitive conditions in American industry," and likewise "to the strict and impartial enforcement" of the laws "designed to prevent monopolies and other concentrations" of economic power—page 18.

Thus, both of our major political parties are committed to the objective of maintaining a free and expanding economy by fostering the growth of competition. For this reason, among others, I am happy to join with my good friend and esteemed colleague from across the aisle, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], in sponsoring the bill to prevent monopolistic acts or practices, and other unlawful restraints in interstate commerce by persons engaged in processing and distributing meat and meat products. This bill does by—

First. Amending the Federal Trade Commission Act so as to return to the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction over the meat packing and distributing industry.

Second. Amending the Packers and Stockyards Act so as to eliminate the authority the United States Department

of Agriculture has to exercise regulations over packers, but which it has not exercised for over 30 years.

Similar proposed legislation, I understand, will be introduced in the House of Representatives by my fellow Utahan, Representative H. ALDOUS DIXON, and possibly other Members, as well. Except for certain perfecting amendments, the bill Senator O'MAHONEY and I are sponsoring is identical to S. 4177, which I introduced in the 85th Congress.

Before discussing in detail my reasons for co-sponsoring the bill, I wish to make a few general observations about it. Although it repeals the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture over packers, as authorized in title II of the Packers and Stockyards Act, it leaves undisturbed the jurisdiction of the United States Department of Agriculture over the operation of stockyards, which is contained in title III of that act, as well as his special jurisdiction over dealers and handlers of live poultry, which is provided for in title V.

I also want to make it plain that no packer, large or small, or other business firm engaged in slaughtering or processing meat products has anything to fear from the return of this authority to the Federal Trade Commission, provided their business behavior and trade practices conform to the norms outlined in the antitrust laws, which are designed to maintain and foster competition.

Likewise, my action should not be construed as an attack upon big business. Bigness per se is not to be condemned. In fact, many of the comforts of everyday living which we all enjoy are made possible by economies of production which only large-sized firms can achieve. Only when big business uses its superior bargaining power and economic resources in a manner not consistent with the public interest—in this case, to eliminate competition by unfair means—is it to be condemned.

By the same token, in cosponsoring this bill, I do not intend to cast reflection upon any particular firm now doing business in the slaughtering or meat-processing industry. Rather, I have been prompted to join Senator O'MAHONEY in sponsoring this proposed legislation for two major reasons:

First, in light of the poor economic position in which most livestock producers find themselves, I believe it is imperative that proper scrutiny be maintained over the trade practices of firms slaughtering livestock and processing and distributing meat products, so as to permit the existence of as many marketing alternatives for producers as the nature of the industry will permit. Fair competitive bidding should give producers higher prices than otherwise would be the case. And such competition can exist only where producers have marketing alternatives.

Second, I believe it is in the public interest that Federal Trade Commission control be extended over packers which enter into other sideline business—businesses which now escape such control because of Department of Agriculture inaction, but whose competitors are subject to FTC control. The same need for public control applies to food firms, especially food chains, which now can acquire packing plants, or a substantial interest in one, and thus escape FTC supervision over their entire operations.

I shall discuss these two reasons in some detail at this point:

Mr. President, some 4 to 6 or 7 million farmers, ranchers, and stockmen produce meat animals for market. With respect to cattle, the bulk of such animals are marketed during a period of a few weeks each fall. Most producers, especially those in the great western range States, must market their animals at that time, regardless of the prices offered, because they either do not raise enough feed to carry the stock until prices are more to their liking, or they cannot afford to buy feed for that purpose. A great number—essentially the small operators—must sell at that time in order to meet pressing financial obligations. As we know, most ranchers operate on a basis of "borrow it in the spring, and pay it back in the fall." Still others must sell during the fall marketing season in order to meet the costs of daily living.

In recent years, these forced fall marketings have been even heavier than normal, because of the effects of drought and the cost-price squeeze. High livestock numbers, caused by excessive feed-grain production on lands diverted from wheat and cotton production under the price support and acreage allotment and marketing quota programs, also have contributed to heavier marketings and low prices. Such circumstances have served virtually to eliminate any bargaining power which producers might have had under more normal conditions.

On the buyers' side of the market, however, we find, by way of contrast, that less than 500 federally inspected plants—which for the most part are not individually owned firms, I may add—and less than 1,000 nonfederally inspected plants are engaged in slaughtering and meat processing. It also should be noted that 10 national concerns which own the bulk of these plants, slaughter approximately 50 percent of the cattle, 60 percent of the calves, 70 percent of the hogs, and 77 percent of the sheep coming under Federal inspection.

In an industry where the buyers are few in number and the sellers are great in number, it is evident that the buyers are in a position to set the prices they will pay, and the sellers have only the option of taking it or leaving it. Where all the dictating as to price is done by the buyers, it behooves us to maintain as many market outlets as possible for livestock producers, who obviously, at best, have a very poor bargaining position. Also, in an industry where the buyers' side of the market is dominated by a few national-operative concerns, this is not an easy task.

In such a situation, which now prevails, it is in the public interest—which is commensurate with that of the livestock producer, the consumer, and the independent packer—to insure that unfair trade practices do not lead to greater concentration by elimination of competition. In this connection, I point to the 1956 platform of the Republican Party, which pledged "the continuation and improvement of our drive to aid small business." "Small business," the platform added, "can look forward to a continuously vigorous enforcement of antitrust laws."

Enactment of this bill will clearly facilitate such enforcement, which now is lacking, so far as prevention of unfair trade practices is concerned, in the meat packing and processing industry.

I am well aware of the fact that the bill is backed by, among others, an association representing in the main small independent packers who slaughter about 70 percent of the livestock in 9 Western States, including my own State of Utah. These independent packers are concerned about the entry of the national packers—especially the Big Ten, which account for 77 percent of the meat animals slaughtered in the United States—into the markets of these 9 States.

I am equally aware of the fact that another association which represents, by and large, the interests of these national packers is actively and openly opposed to this bill and has used its influence to keep such proposed legislation from being introduced.

For these reasons, I wish to make it very plain that the provisions of the bill will be enforced by the Federal Trade Commission just as vigorously against an independent packer engaged in unfair trade practices as they will against a national packer. On the other hand, I want to reiterate that no packer, large or small, has anything to fear if the bill becomes law, unless it is engaged in unfair trade practices.

Taking the meatpacking industry as a whole, my concern is that no packer or distributor, big or small, independent or national, take unfair advantage of the already weak bargaining position of the livestock producer. The marketing arrangement which economists call monopsony is characterized by few buyers and many sellers. This situation is descriptive of the meat packer-producer relationship. Under monopsony, if all the buyers within trucking or shipping distance are owned by the same parent company, or if they are owned by but one or two such companies, the seller, as a result of a common policy, in the first instance, and price leadership, in the second instance, is not likely to get for his animals a fair price, which is the result of competitive bidding. Thus, generally speaking, the producer might just as well sell to the closest plant and take what he can get.

Where such a situation exists, or where there is only one packing plant or other buyer, it certainly would be in the best interests of livestock producers to insure the prevention of unfair trade practices which could prevent the entry of competitors, or would serve to eliminate or control existing competitors. The Department of Agriculture is not supplying such regulation, supervision, or enforcement today, nor has it for over 30 years. How could it, when such responsibility is literally buried in the Trade Practices Section of the Packers and Stockyards Branch of the Livestock Division of the

Agricultural Marketing Service? Yes; I mean literally buried and forgotten, since this section, which is expected to control unfair trade practices by economic giants, is staffed here in Washington by two marketing specialists and a stenographer. Yes, I said two marketing specialists and a woman stenographer. Although, in addition, the Packers and Stockyards Branch has 20 field offices, most of their employees are engaged in activities relating to the regulation of stockyards only.

This is not to be deemed criticism of the personnel of the Trade-Practice Section, but it is meant to be criticism of the almost complete lack of action in the past, under several national administrations, to comply with the congressional mandate given the Department of Agriculture to prevent unfair trade practices in the meat-packing industry. The simple facts are that the Department of Agriculture has no enforcement staff for administration of the fair-trade practices provisions of the act relating to packers. It cannot even investigate complaints, let alone take effective action. The Packers and Stockyards Branch does not even require packers to report losses on their meat operations; yet such information oftentimes is essention to the detection of unfair trade practices. Under such circumstances, a concern could absorb substantial losses in a particular area in order to eliminate competitors, and could make up the difference in other areas, or in sideline enterprises which it might operate.

In a given situation where there were several packers, including independent firms, a livestock producer might not receive much higher prices than would be the case if only one were to bid for his animals. But this much is certain: the prices he could expect to receive would not be any lower than those he otherwise would receive if he were limited to a single buyer; and if there is really competitive bidding, there is a good chance that such prices would be higher.

Opponents of the bill have voiced opposition on the ground that there is no monopoly in meat packing. This is a truism. Another is that "there is no use to lock the barn door after the horse is stolen. No; the problem is not one of correcting monopoly; rather, the problem is one of preventing unfair trade practices which will serve to eliminate competition and thus create, or tend to create, monopoly control. Should the latter happen, it is equally certain that livestock producers will receive lower prices than would be the case if competition existed.

Mr. President, transfer of control over packers from the Federal Trade Commission in 1921 to the United States Department of Agriculture, and subsequent nonenforcement since then by that Department, have given rise to another situation, which in my judgment warrants return of this authority to the Federal Trade Commission.

Many packers own and operate other types of business enterprises besides packing plants. Yet these businesses now are not subject to Federal Trade Commission control over unfair trade practices, because the parent concern is a packer, although non-packer-owned competitors are subject to such Federal Trade Commission control. This gives an unfair advantage to packer-owned, non-meat-processing businesses. An example of this situation is provided in a case identified as Docket No. 6409. This is a case in which the Federal Trade Commission brought an action against a large national packer for alleged false advertising in connection with the sale of oleomargarine. The action had to be terminated on March 30, 1956, because the company involved was a packer, exempt from Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction by reason of the Packers and Stockyards Act.

This practice by packers has, in turn, led food chains and other nonpacker firms to buy a small interest in a packing plant or similar processing facility. Such action enables them to qualify as a packer and to escape Federal Trade Commission enforcement of unfair trade practices carried on by their related enterprises; and through the United States Department of Agriculture's nonenforcement of the Packers and Stockyards Act, the trade practices carried on by their newly acquired packing plants also escape supervision. Such a situation is well illustrated by the United Corporation, and others, against FTC, case—110 Federal, second, 473. In this instance, action was brought against the corporation which then was engaged in the sale and distribution of canned meat products. After the Federal Trade Commission had filed its petition, the defendant corporation acquired an interest in several packing companies. It then filed a motion for dismissal of the Federal Trade Commission complaint, on the ground that it was a packer, and thus was not subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission. In granting the defendant's petition, the court said:

> The Commission, while virtually conceding that petitioner at the time of the entry of its order came within the definition of a packer as contained in the Packers and Stockyards Act, contends that it had jurisdiction because petitioner had not acquired that status at the time of the filing of the petition before it. The facts as to this are that the petition was filed March 31, 1937. Petitioner acquired 20 percent of the stock of Montel, Inc., April 12, 1937, and 20 percent of the stock of Emmart Food Products Co., May 1, 1937. The order was not entered until August 2, 1939. As early as 1936, petitioner had entered into a contract entitling it to a one-fifth interest in the business of Montel, which was then operating as a partnership.
>
> When petitioner here, by acquiring stock in Montel, Inc., and Emmart Food Products Co., became a packer within the meaning of the Packers and Stockyards Act and subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Trade Commission had no further power of regulation over it; and the fact that the Commission may have been considering regulation under a complaint theretofore filed is immaterial.
>
> For the reasons stated, the order of the Federal Trade Commission will be set aside for lack of jurisdiction over the business of petitioner.

Without doubt, such action by food firms has stimulated the action taken by national packers to seek relief from a 36-year-old consent decree they signed in 1920, which prevents them from handling some 140 other food and nonfood products. Such relief is essential, they say, if, under the circumstances, they are to compete on favorable terms with food chains which have and are acquiring packing plants.

The history of the consent decree and its effect upon Federal control of unfair trade practices in the meat-packing industry is indeed interesting. In the years prior to 1921, and before passage of the Packers and Stockyards Act, the Federal Trade Commission's investigation of packers resulted in the filing of antitrust suits by the Justice Department against some five national packers. Apparently, rather than to face prosecution, these packers signed a consent decree which since then has prevented them from—

First, dealing in 140 food and nonfood products, chiefly vegetables, fruit, fish, and groceries.

Second, using their distribution facilities for the handling of any of these 140 products.

Third, owning and operating retail meat markets.

Fourth, dealing in fresh milk or cream.

In 1921, when the Congress was considering passage of proposed legislation to regulate stockyards, the national packers, which had signed the consent decree, were able to convince Congress that prevention of unfair trade practices in that industry should be transferred from the Federal Trade Commission to the Department of Agriculture. Materials now being circulated in opposition to the bill which Senator O'MAHONEY and I have introduced, list four reasons why a transfer was desirable then, and why such authority now should remain with the United States Department of Agriculture. The reasons given are—

1. Meat packing, being at the time the country's largest single industry, was of sufficient importance to warrant establishment of a separate, specialized agency.

2. The Federal Trade Commission was an investigative rather than an administrative body, and hence did not have the power or the specialized knowledge necessary to do an effective job of administration.

3. Inevitably, there would be overlapping of jurisdiction between the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Trade Commission, and much confusion thereby created.

4. The Department of Agriculture had in existence the necessary bureaus and personnel to undertake administration of the act. Moreover, existing personnel were well equipped to undertake supervision of the complicated relationships characteristic of the livestock and meat industry.

Regardless of the merits these arguments may have had in 1921, it is evident from what I have already said that 36 years of ineffective administration or nonenforcement render them completely valueless today. Experience clearly indicates that the Congress made a mistake when it transferred authority to regulate trade practice of packers from a specialized agency handling antitrust matters to the United States Department of Agriculture, which did not then, and does not now, have a separate regulatory agency. Indeed, regulatory activities of the United States Department of Agricul-

ture are scattered piecemeal throughout its various agencies.

Mr. President, a short review of United States Department of Agriculture experience in the administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act will make this conclusion even more obvious. Originally, the United States Department of Agriculture did establish a separate agency to administer the act. In 1924, however, this agency was abolished; and responsibility for administration was placed in the Bureau of Animal Industry—a research agency—until the reorganization of the Department in the fall of 1953.

As a result of the 1953 reorganization, enforcement of the provisions relating to unfair-trade practices today is lodged in the Trade Practices Section of the Packers and Stockyards Branch of the Livestock Division of the Agricultural Marketing Service. This Section, I repeat, is staffed at the Washington level with just 3 people—2 agricultural marketing specialists and a stenographer; and in the field, by a handful of people. The odds against their being able to regulate the activities of economic giants the size of many of these national packers and food chains are many times greater than the odds David faced in his battle with Goliath. What more effective way is there to escape proper public regulation than to transfer such control from an effective and specialized agency, such as the Federal Trade Commission, to another agency and department, and insure its burial in a three-employee section? A handful of people, in effect, are charged with regulating the third largest industry in the country.

Under such circumstances, it should be very plain that if the national packers obtain relief from the consent decree, and if the Federal Trade Commission is not given back its original authority to prevent unfair-trade practices in this industry, the result could have dire consequences for the public welfare. Small businesses in the meatpacking and wholesale and retail grocery industries can and may well fail in droves. Livestock producers, as well as producers of other food products, could expect to see their already weak bargaining positions further destroyed. The consumer, too, would face the prospect of growing monopoly control over the higher prices he might be forced to pay.

Mr. President, testimony received last June 21 by the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Monopoly and Antitrust reveals a record of ineffective administration and nonenforcement of the provisions relating to packers contained in the Packers and Stockyards Act. One witness reported going to the Chief of the Packers and Stockyards Branch in 1953 for the purpose of filing a complaint against a national packer. The head of that Branch asked him not to file the complaint, so that he personally could contact the alleged violator and obtain his promise of future compliance, since he had neither the staff nor the funds with which even to investigate the complaint, if it were formally filed. The same witness indicated that his organization had given up going to this Branch because it never took action on any complaint it had filed.

In spite of these facts, the association which opposes the transfer of packer control to the Federal Trade Commission states in printed matter being circulated against this bill that "the same factors which influenced the decision in 1921 should have an important bearing on the issue today." One of these factors, as I have pointed out—which the same group in 1921 said warranted transfer of the controls to the United States Department of Agriculture—was that the Federal Trade Commission "did not have the power or the specialized knowledge necessary to do an effective job of administration." This factor now seems to dictate return of that authority to the Federal Trade Commission.

The desire of the national packers to give such control to the United States Department of Agriculture in 1921, and their desire now to keep it there, seems predicated upon the common knowledge that the Federal Trade Commission is an effective and efficiently operated agency. Too effective Federal Trade Commission administration, so far as they were concerned, lead to the consent decree, which lead to the transfer to the United States Department of Agriculture, and now seems to be the basis of their opposition to return that authority to the Federal Trade Commission. It is now amply clear, quite to the contrary of such assertions, that the United States Department of Agriculture personnel at the time of the transfer in 1921 were not "well equipped to undertake supervision of the complicated relationships characteristic of the livestock and meat industry." Nor are they well equipped for that role today.

On the other hand, it is certain that if the Congress is ever going to be able to get effective administration of the laws it passes, it must recognize the need to group similar functions together for administrative purposes. Sound principles of organization dictate the reasonableness of this position. We have only ourselves to blame when we establish an independent agency, such as the Federal Trade Commission, to carry out a specific function such as the prevention of unfair-trade practices, and then proceed to dismember that agency by transferring its functions to other agencies and departments not equipped or staffed to do the job.

I have heard the argument that packers are a vital part of agriculture, and that, as such, the United States Department of Agriculture should be responsible for preventing unfair-trade practices in that industry. If this be so—although all logic is against it—then, by parity of reasoning, all other processors of agricultural products are also vital parts of agriculture, and such authority over them also should be exercised by the United States Department of Agriculture. It likewise is difficult for me to understand why such an argument also did not apply when the United States Department of Agriculture recommended that the Farm Credit Administration be transferred out of the Department and established as an independent agency. Certainly credit is just as vital to agriculture as meat packing.

I hope the Department of Agriculture will take a favorable position on this bill, since its passage clearly is in the best interests of the clientele it was established to help—namely, farmers, ranchers, and stockmen.

But there is another basic reason why the authority to prevent unfair trade practices in the packing industry should be returned to the Federal Trade Commission, where Congress originally placed it. Because of 36 years of nonenforcement, title II of the Packers and Stockyards Act has never been litigated. The courts, therefore, have never been called upon to interpret the broad language which it contains. So from a practical standpoint, and in light of the seriousness of the situation, it might be several years before title II is litigated, so that effective action can be taken against alleged violators of the unfair-trade practices provisions of that title.

In the meantime, if the national food chains and other food firms continue to acquire packing plants and thus escape Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction entirely, and if the national packers concerned get out from under the consent decree, this situation would result—

First, a few large or giant firms would be able to set the prices received not only by the producers of livestock products, but also by the producers of a great many other farm products, and the prices paid by the consumer, at the other end.

Second, the same few giant concerns would be able to eliminate thousands of small businesses in all kinds of activities handling food products.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my statement an article from the New York Times of December 15, 1956, entitled "Two Packers Ask Change in Decree," and also articles under date of February 4 and February 11, 1957, in the Supermarket News, a Fairchild publication, the industry's weekly newspaper, dealing with the question of the food agency, the packing plant operations, the Federal Trade Commission, and the enforcement of the law generally.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of December 15, 1956]

TWO PACKERS ASK CHANGE IN DECREE—SWIFT, ARMOUR JOIN MOVE TO LIFT CONSENT LAW ON LIMITATION OF SALES

Two more large meat packers have asked for relief from a 36-year-old consent decree that prevents them from handling 140 other food and nonfood products.

The packers are Swift & Co. and Armour & Co., which yesterday filed a request for easement of the decree in a United States District Court in Washington, D. C. They said changes in the meat-packing industry had deprived them of any competitive advantage they might once have had.

The decree should be modified, they said, to enable them to compete more effectively against new marketing techniques, such as chainstores, supermarkets, and canned meats and frozen-food concerns.

A somewhat similar request was filed earlier this month by the Cudahy Packing

Co., Wilson & Co., the other big meat packer named in the consent decree made in 1920, has not said whether it would seek a modification of the decree. The decree was signed by the four companies to settle an antitrust suit filed by the Government.

ITEMS ARE LISTED

Specifically, the companies seek relief from four restrictions in the 1920 decree that prevent them from:

Dealing in 140 food and nonfood products, chiefly vegetables, fruit, fish, and groceries.

Using their distribution facilities, such as wholesale branches and trucks, for the handling of any of those 140 products.

Owning and operating retail meat markets.

Dealing in fresh milk or cream.

The packers seek no change in provisions of the decree that prohibit the four packers from owning public stockyard companies, stockyard terminal railroads, or market newspapers, and that restrict their cold-storage operations.

In Chicago, yesterday, F. W. Specht, president of Armour & Co., estimated that net income for the company's 1956 fiscal year, ended November 3, would be about $14 million, or $3.44 a common share. This compares with $10,107,614, or $2.49 a share, for the fiscal year ended October 29, 1955.

Mr. Specht said that the annual report for the latest fiscal year would be issued early in January.

On Wednesday, Porter M. Jarvis, president of Swift & Co., informed stockholders that earnings of the company for the fiscal year ended last October 27 dropped 38.8 percent from the previous year and were the lowest since 1951. Sales, however, gained 1 percent.

Net earnings for the latest fiscal year amounted to $14,012,210, equal to $2.36 a capital share, compared with $22,893,155, or $3.67 a share in 1955. Sales totaled $2,429,302,316, compared with $2,404,123,642.

---

[From the Supermarket News of February 4, 1957]

CHAINS WITH MEATPACKING PLANTS SEEN FTC EXEMPT

(By Art Garel and Marvin Caplan)

WASHINGTON, February 3.—A food chain—or perhaps any food firm—that operates a meatpacking plant may at present be exempt from Federal Trade Commission prosecution for deceptive practices and antitrust law violations. This opinion was expressed at the weekend by officials of FTC and the Agriculture Department to Supermarket News.

These officials also agreed that if meatpackers are permitted to enter into the retail or wholesale grocery business, these operations definitely would be outside of FTC jurisdiction.

Furthermore, an FTC official said, a food firm cited by FTC for violation of antitrust laws might be able to have that case dismissed merely by buying substantial interest in a meatpacking plant.

These Government officials' views came as a full-scale battle appeared to be shaping up on Capitol Hill to bring the meatpacking industry back under FTC jurisdiction after a lapse of 36 years and to close what some food industry people feel is a loophole in the antitrust laws.

The Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 specifically removes the meatpacking industry from FTC's jurisdiction. The Government officials believe the definition of a meatpacker is so broad that any food firm may be able to claim meatpacker exemption with a 20 percent or more interest in a packing plant.

At present, it is believed, only five food chains have packing plants.

These include Safeway stores, American stores, National Tea Co., Alpha Beta Food Markets, Inc., and Colonial Stores, Inc. (whose Albers Supermarkets division recently acquired a plant in Sandusky, Ohio). However, according to a USDA official, a supermarket chain would not necessarily have to operate a meatpacking plant—that is, a slaughtering operation—to have a meat operation.

If Safeway, for example, did not have its Idaho plant, its meat processing and preparation here in Washington would be sufficient to be considered a meatpacking operation under the law, the official said.

The law is so broad in its definition of a meat packer that officials of both agencies are agreed there is a wide "no man's land" where only the courts would be able to decide whether a firm is a meatpacker or not.

Both officials are agreed, for example, that firms primarily not in the food field—such as General Motors—would be considered subject to FTC enforcement since meatpacking is patently not a part of the firm's regular operations.

Both are agreed that meatpackers who enter into other types of food industry operations would definitely be outside of FTC jurisdiction.

Food chains who buy meatpacking plants are in the "in-between" group and an FTC official said the possibility of their being considered meatpackers "troubles me."

The question of FTC's power over a supermarket firm has not been raised in the past. A USDA official said he feels that the supermarket industry will be the first of the "no man's land" group on which the courts will have to decide.

FTC, however, has at least two demonstrations of its inability to proceed against a meatpacker's related food business and against a food firm which acquires a meatpacking plant.

Just last year, the Commission dismissed a complaint against Armour & Co., in which it had accused the company of advertising its Cloverbloom "99" margarine in terms that suggested it was a dairy product.

After carefully studying the matter, a Commission examiner and then the Commission itself concluded Armour was a packer and FTC could not proceed against the firm. It closed the case.

A more dramatic example occurred in 1940. The Commission charged United Corp., Richmond, Va., had misrepresented the origin of its canned goods, meats, deviled hams, and corned beef. FTC issued a cease-and-desist order.

The fourth circuit court of appeals set the order aside after learning that some time before the issuance of the cease-and-desist order (but after the issuance of the complaint), the firm bought a 20-percent interest in a meatpacking operation.

Even if FTC lost jurisdiction over a food chain or other food firm, the Justice Department would not be foreclosed from antitrust action.

USDA would have the responsibility of taking action against deceptive practices and unfair trade activity.

Although Justice can act under the Robinson-Patman Act, in the past it has been reluctant to do so. As one FTC official explains it, Justice feels there is a conflict and overlap between the Robinson-Patman Act and the Sherman Act and sticks with the Sherman Act.

Some food industry people believe USDA enforcement of the antitrust and antideceptive sections of the Packers and Stockyards Act has been woefully weak.

The Western Meat Packers Association, for example, recently claimed, "enforcement by the Secretary of Agriculture is lacking because the department has no appropriation from Congress, has no enforcement staff for this work, and has not exhibited for approximately 30 years any real desire to exercise its authority in the packing industry."

Administration of the act, it is pointed out, is contained in a commodity division which also has the functions of market news service and Federal meat grading—both of which depend upon packer cooperation for their success.

The association also claimed that USDA enforcement would be more costly because the agency would have to set up a completely new enforcement staff, compared with FTC, where perhaps only a few employees would be needed for an addition to its normal enforcement workload.

Last year, at the end of the session, Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, and ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Republican, of Utah, introduced bills to return enforcement authority over the meat industry to FTC.

Within the next few days, they indicated, they will introduce a new joint bill, incorporating changes suggested by FTC.

Last year, for example, Senator O'MAHONEY's bill would have transferred the authority in the Packers and Stockyards Act to FTC. This year's bill would take away USDA's authority under the act, and permit FTC to have jurisdiction under the laws it presently administers.

FTC officials pointed out that the Packers and Stockyards Act does not have the benefit of many court interpretations of the FTC administered laws where many cases have been prosecuted.

Organizations favoring the bill are gathering their forces for an all-out push, expecting to meet some heavy opposition from the big packers, the American Meat Institute, and some farm organizations.

Independent packers presently have support from the National Milk Producers Federation, woolgrowers, United States wholesale grocers, and some farm organizations.

---

[From the Supermarket News of February 11, 1957]

FOOD FAIR MAY ASK FTC TO DROP CHARGES

(By Marvin Caplan and Art Garel)

WASHINGTON, February 10.—Food Fair Stores, Philadelphia, may ask the Federal Trade Commission to drop all charges against the firm because the supermarket chain has interests in packinghouses, it was learned at the weekend.

This possibility is still in the speculative stage. An attorney for Food Fair said it is being discussed because of questions raised in an article in Supermarket News.

In this article (SN, 2/4, p. 1) it was reported that FTC and Agriculture Department officials feel there is a possibility any food firm might be completely exempt from FTC jurisdiction because of the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act.

The act transfers jurisdiction over the meatpacking industry from FTC to USDA. A definition of a packer is so broad, according to officials of both agencies, that any food firm owning 20 percent interest or more in a packing plant may be considered under USDA rather than FTC jurisdiction.

The Food Fair attorney said the chain "owns a couple of packing plants."

Meanwhile, Supermarket News learned that legislation to give the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction over meatpackers will be introduced in the Senate this week.

Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, and ARTHUR WATKINS, Republican, of Utah, will introduce bills to accomplish this by amending the Packers and Stockyard Act and removing packers from Agriculture Department jurisdiction.

These Senators introduced such legislation last year, but it could not be determined at press time whether they will sponsor identical bills or again put in separate versions. Senator O'MAHONEY is scheduled to resume a meat-price investigation by the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust and

Monopoly after that group completes oil-price hearings.

The complaint against Food Fair, issued in November 1955, charges the firm induced special promotional allowances for anniversary sales that it knew, or should have known, were not being made available to its competitors on proportionally equal terms.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, has the Senator from Utah concluded his statement?

Mr. WATKINS. I have concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 26, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 25, 1957:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

David K. E. Bruce, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany.

Amory Houghton, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to France.

William J. Sebald, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service Office of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

John Alanson Perkins, of Delaware, to be Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, vice Herold C. Hunt, resigned.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

John J. Sirica, of the District of Columbia, to be United States district judge for the District of Columbia, vice Henry A. Schweinhaut, retired.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the United States Air Force under the provisions of the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954 and chapter 35, title 10, of the United States Code:

*To be major generals*

Brig. Gen. Theron Baldwin Herndon, AO238180, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. John Philip Henebry, AO406548, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Robert James Smith, AO003591, Air Force Reserve.

*To be brigadier generals*

Col. Jess Larson, AO190462, Air Force Reserve.

Col. John Beverly Montgomery, AO304671, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Daniel DeBrier, AO348020, Air Force Reserve.

Col. James Maitland Stewart, AO433210, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Kenneth Stiles, AO000928, Air Force Reserve.

Col. John Oliver Bradshaw, AO326377, Air Force Reserve.

Col. John Richardson Alison, AO328165, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Ramsay Douglas Potts, Jr., AO431039, Air Force Reserve.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Alan M. Sokobin, Temple Beth El, Laurelton, Long Island, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, through the ages Thy servants have turned unto Thee for moral guidance in times of stress and indecision. As we contemplate our world, O our Father, with its clamor and its conflicts, we seek inspiration from Thee that we might do the good and the right.

Teach us, O God, to keep ever before our eyes Thy standards of justice and morality. While we speak for all that is good, may we never fail ourselves and our fellows by acting basely.

Remind us that while we hear our own words the peoples of the world watch our actions. Aid us, that while we act we should constantly have before us one standard of goodness.

May this House, in its deliberations, never sacrifice human rights to political expediency. May this House so act in justice and righteousness that it may be known as a house of God. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 22, 1957, was read and approved.

## ARE CONGRESSMEN AS DUMB AS THEY LOOK?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the February 21st issue of the Rollcall our very delightful colleague the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] concludes a story which tells about the way Congressmen are "stuffed" or dined and wined at social functions that come along in the early part of the session. Then at the end he asks, "Are Congressmen as dumb as they look?" I cannot answer that, because some of us look just as we are. Then some of us have a deceptive appearance, so I have been told. But his query calls to mind the days when we used to feed fatten-for-the market ducks, geese, and chickens; geese especially. We had a standard about as high as my shoulder and up near the top there was a container full of food and from it a tube came down with a pedal at floor level. To operate, you took the goose, you got one hand on the crop, the right hand here and the left hand holding the bill open, and you stuck that tube down the goose's neck and pushed the pedal and the crop was full. So far the goose had no control over its looks. Even though full of food. But there is this difference between the goose, I always thought, and a Member of Congress. We do not have to submit to being stuffed as were the geese, but Mr. BURDICK should not ask others to judge our appearance of dumbness. Not all overstuff ourselves, and certainly the hosts do not force-feed us.

## PROTECTION OF EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR; COMMERCE; HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE; AND GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill recommended by the administration to make it a Federal offense to kill, assault, resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with certain officers and employees of the Departments of Labor, Commerce, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and of the General Services Administration, as well as Federal probation officers. The only employees covered would be those concerned with investigatory or enforcement functions.

Under the present laws, such protection applies only to Federal judges, United States attorneys, officers and employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and a few other Federal workers.

Experience has shown that the knowledge that Federal laws and Federal enforcement agents apply to attacks on certain Federal employees goes a long way toward deterring such actions. Even though the crimes are crimes under State laws, the deterring power of Federal protection is immeasurable.

We owe this protection to all Government employees who face the probability of assault or intimidation in carrying out their duties.

The bill I have introduced would close a loophole in the present laws by providing the shield of Federal laws for employees in these departments who face danger constantly.

Certainly those who risk life and limb for the good of the Nation deserve all the protection we can afford them. There should be no controversy about this measure, and I trust it will be given early and favorable consideration by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in order that my colleagues may better understand the need and reasons for this legislation, I include at this point excerpts from statements of the various agencies concerned.

STATEMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

When the performance of official duties in carrying out the provisions of Federal laws subjects an employee of the Government to the dangers of assaults or homicidal acts by others, there is sound reason for extending to these employees the protection of laws punishing such assaults or homicides as Federal offenses. Such protection has been extended to many such Federal employees by section 1114 and, by reference, section 111 of the Criminal Code of the United States. Section 1114 relates to homicides against particular classes of law enforcement and investigative personnel of the United States.

Section 111 makes it a Federal crime to assault, resist, impede, oppose, intimidate, or interfere with any person designated in section 1114 while he is engaged in the performance of his duties. Among others to whom these safeguards have been extended are Federal judges; certain personnel of the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Federal Indian field service; and some employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture.

The purpose of the proposed bill is to provide these same protections for officers or employees of the Department of Labor while in the performance of investigative or enforcement duties under provisions relating to labor in any law of the United States. Wage-hour investigators conducting investigations under the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act and field representatives of the Bureau of Employment Security who conduct investigations as to compliance by employers with the terms of the agreement between this country and Mexico relating to the employment of Mexican farm labor would be the departmental personnel primarily affected if the bill were enacted.

The bill would amend section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to include the Department's personnel performing investigative and law-enforcement duties. They would thereby receive the protection afforded by section 111 as well.

While assault against the person is a crime in all States, experience has demonstrated that this is not a sufficient deterrent to prevent interference with Federal employees performing investigative and enforcement duties. Reports from this Department's investigators clearly indicate that knowledge brought home to those contemplating interference that violation of a Federal criminal statute may be involved can operate effectively to cool off a heated temper. The numerous instances in which this Department's investigative and enforcement personnel have been assaulted or threatened with assault while performing their duties plainly shows the need for providing them with the same protections available to persons engaged in similar activities under other laws of the United States.

---

STATEMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The proposed bill would extend protection of the Federal law of crimes and criminal procedure to officers and employees of the Department of Commerce and the General Services Administration, whose duty it is to guard property under their respective administration and control. Employees of the Department of Commerce protect property consisting of warehouses, terminals, shipyards, and reserve fleet sites (water areas and shore properties). Property protected by the General Services Administration consists of public building and storage areas situated throughout the United States.

The draft bill would amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, by adding to the officers and employees of the Federal departments enumerated therein, officers, employees, guards, and special policemen, whose duty it is to protect property of the United States administered and controlled by the Secretary of Commerce and the General Services Administration, from loss, damage or injury, by theft, fire, burglary, negligence or other causes.

It is essential that the persons guarding such properties be protected from violence and from interference in the performance of their duties by providing for the punishment of those guilty of such acts, according to law. While section 1114, sought to be amended, deals only with murder, section 111 of the same title provides for the punishment of persons who forcibly assault, resist, oppose, impede, intimidate or interfere with any person designated in section 1114. The amendment proposed in the draft bill would therefore protect the employees of the Maritime Administration and the General Services Administration by providing punishment not only for killing them but also for the said acts enumerated in section 111.

With respect to property administered and controlled by the Secretary of Commerce, on January 19, 1953, the Administrator of General Services Administration delegated authority to the Secretary of Commerce to appoint uniformed guards as special policemen with the powers conferred in the act of June 1, 1948, 62 Stat. 281, for duty in connection with the protection of Maritime Administration properties not protected by guards of the Public Building Service, General Services Administration. The Secretary of Commerce was also authorized to redelegate this authority to such officials of the Maritime Administration as he and the Maritime Administrator may deem necessary.

Accordingly, on May 15, 1953, Order No. 170 was issued by the Maritime Administrator, pursuant to the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, authorizing the designation of persons to protect Maritime Administration properties not protected by guards of the Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration.

Section 1114 (and its predecessor, sec. 253) has been amended from time to time to extend protection to Government officers and employees who come in contact with criminal characters or persons likely to commit crimes by making it a Federal offense to assault or otherwise injure them, or to interfere with them in the performance of their duties. Such criminal characters are often found in the vicinity of docks, warehouses, terminals, and storage areas on the lookout for an opportunity to steal or damage property therein contained.

---

STATEMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Increasingly during recent years employees of this Department engaged in the enforcement of the food and drug laws have, during the performance of their regular duties, been exposed to the risk of assaults and other injuries. On numerous occasions their routine work has placed them in personal jeopardy. Many perishable foods such as crab meat, eggs, and fresh vegetables are shipped by truck and move at night so as to reach the markets the following morning. To collect official samples and make analyses before the foods are sold, our employees must stop trucks at night on the highway. Sometimes the truck drivers are uncooperative and, on occasion, belligerent to the point of assaulting the employee attempting to make the inspection.

The danger of personal harm, however, is particularly acute in the investigation of deliberately concealed violations of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. For example, one employee who was investigating a barbiturate racket was assaulted with a blackjack and suffered a fractured skull while another was held at gunpoint for several hours.

The Food and Drug Administration recently completed investigation of the sale of amphetamine drugs to truck drivers. Such drugs are used to keep awake and combat fatigue and often result in irreparable harm to users and cause accidents. During the investigation food and drug inspectors operated for weeks undercover as truck drivers in circumstances which subjected them to great danger of physical injury or death. Duties of this kind are increasingly being required of our food and drug inspectors.

Similarly, our employees engaged in investigatory, inspection, or other activities in connection with the enforcement of our public health laws and regulations, such as the interstate and foreign quarantine laws designed to prevent the spread of communicable diseases into this country from abroad or from one State to another, frequently have to deal with uncooperative persons attempting to evade the laws or regulations or otherwise interfere with their enforcement. In such cases also, there is danger of personal harm.

In view of these facts we believe that the protection now afforded by sections 111 and 1114 of title 18, United States Code, to numerous Federal officers and employees should be extended to officers and employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare engaged in these enforcement activities.

---

STATEMENT OF ELMORE WHITEHURST, ACTING DIRECTOR, ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

The Judicial Conference of the United States has recommended that legislation be enacted to add probation officers to the list of certain officers and employees of the United States protected by section 1114 of title 18, United States Code (Jud. Cf. Rept., September 1952 sess., p. 23).

Section 1114 and by reference section 111 cover in addition to judges of the United States, officers or employees of the United States penal and correctional institutions. Probation officers of the United States district courts are subject in the performance of their duties to similar hazards, and therefore in the opinion of the Judicial Conference of the United States are entitled to the protection of the provisions.

The Federal probation officers are appointed by the United States district courts which they serve (18 U. S. C. 3654). They have two general classes of duties, one the supervision of offenders on probation or parole and, two, the making of pre-sentence investigations of offenders convicted by the courts for the purpose of furnishing information to the judges which will be helpful to them in determining the sentences. On June 30, 1956, the number of persons under supervision by the probation officers, who then numbered 388, was 31,376, of whom 23,618 were probationers, 5,133 were civil parolees, 1,532 were persons on conditional release, and 1,093 were military parolees being supervised for the Army and the Air Force. In the fiscal year 1956, 30,511 investigations were made by the probation officers, of which 22,365 were pre-sentence investigations, 7,099 were civil pre-parole investigations, and 1,047 were military pre-parole investigations.

The duties of supervision and investigation of offenders which devolve upon probation officers undoubtedly subject them to personal hazards above those of ordinary Government officers and employees. In their investigations they regularly call at the homes and upon the associates of persons guilty of Federal crimes in order to obtain information about them. Although this inquiry is designed only to assist the judges to deal intelligently with the offenders in the matter of sentence, and often works for their benefit by indicating possibilities of rehabilitation on probation which might not otherwise be known, it may nevertheless appear to be hostile. The probation officers are often thought of by the offenders and their relatives and friends as police officers. Also if the facts shown by the pre-sentence reports indicate to the judges that probation cannot prudently be granted and the offenders are sentenced to prison, they may blame the probation officers for the outcome. This tends to make the offenders hostile when they come out. If the probationers or parolees do not conduct themselves properly and commit serious violations of their probation or parole, it is necessary for the probation officers to report the violations to the court or the Board of Parole as the case

may be. In fact, under section 3653 of title 18 of the United States Code it may be their duty to arrest the offender.

These hazards which are inherent in the work of probation officers are very real. While actual menace does not occur to any individual probation officer often, there are recurring examples of it in experience and there is always the potential danger.

For the reasons stated it is believed that the Federal probation officers are entitled to the protection given by section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code to other Federal officers exposed to murder by the nature of their work. Also it should be possible to prosecute in the Federal courts under section 111 of title 18 attempts to interfere by violence or threats of violence with the performance by the probation officers of their duties, as the proposed amendment of section 1114 would permit.

## HATS OFF TO BEDFORD, IND.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if you feed a boy ripe apples he will not want the green ones—and the folks of my hometown of Bedford, Ind., well know the truth of that homely old maxim. This week they are formally opening a magnificent Boys' Club costing some $150,000 and entirely financed out of their own pockets.

They have shunned all thought of Federal aid or any other outside assistance, thus living up to another Hoosier principle of independence. They have proved to their own youngsters their willingness to sacrifice for them and their future. Finally, they have gained a great measure of self-satisfaction, proving the truth of another old maxim—"when you cut your own wood, it warms you twice."

In planning and building this project, my fellow Bedfordites encountered many unexpected obstacles. It is to the credit of their civic leaders that enthusiasm was rekindled every time it ebbed low. These leaders included Rollie A. Tindal, Stewart Riley, Ralph Holmes, Raymond Snapp, Robert Baugh, Charles Stuckey, Jim Guthrie, Gene Kenworthy, Edward Sohn, Ray Armstrong, Kent Bass, Joe Becherer, South Bellush, Bill Brunstad, Reid Coble, Chester Davis, Hugh Dyer, Charles Emery, Russell Grove, Charles Hartman, Frank Hatfield, Mrs. Robert Hurd, Bob Ingalls, H. H. Sakel, Bob Short, Dan Templeton, Frank Tincher, Arch Voris, J. B. Wohlfield, and scores of others, including many church and women's groups.

The following editorial, appearing recently in the Bedford Times-Mail, indicates the problems my constituents met as they struggled for achievement of their Boys' Club project:

NEW BOYS CLUB—GREATEST COMMUNITY ACHIEVEMENT

Bedford's beautiful new Boys Club, now virtually completed except for a few minor finishing touches, stands as the community's greatest achievement in the field of public participation for a worthwhile cause.

Never before in the history of the city have the people, the business firms, the industries, the professional men—everybody—been called upon to give in the amount that they gave for the Boys Club. Here is a building worth $150,000. It is a source of tremendous pride—something which Bedfordites for many years to come will be able to show off to visitors to our city.

A few Boys Club leaders have dreamed for years about a new Boys Club. About a year before the drive for funds got under way, one prominent member of the board of directors of the club said simply that it couldn't be done. "You can't raise that kind of money in Bedford and especially right now," he said.

At that particular time, the board was talking about a much smaller building and a modest public subscription of $25,000 or $30,000.

In the first place, the original grant of the Thornton property on Lincoln avenue to the Boys Club provided that if and when the Boys Club ever vacated the building, the property would revert to the heirs of E. B. Thornton. Location of a site figured in the same problem. The logical location was the spot on the northwest corner of Thornton Park where an old fish pond lay in ruins.

That corner of the park was not used and, on the contrary, was a detriment to the city parks department.

The heirs of E. B. Thornton were contacted. They graciously approved the sale of the old Boys Club building and application of the funds on the new building. They also gave their approval to use of a spot in Thornton Park for the new club.

The city council, after considerable discussion and consideration, also approved use of the park for the club.

The legal obstacles were out of the way, but there were many headaches and pitfalls ahead. No one suspected, for instance, that excavating equipment would run into a large storm sewer which had to be relocated. No one foresaw that a wall would collapse from the weight of the earth on it. These two items alone ran into a few thousand dollars.

Original figures on the cost of the building kept growing. Even though the contractor, Cunningham Construction Co., was very generous, the extras kept popping up. The building fund went down and down and it appeared for a while that the club was in for serious troubles.

Faith and persistence, plus a sympathetic public, kept the program moving. The response to the windup of the building fund drive was heart warming. The people of Bedford came through with flying colors and the new Boys Club—all paid for—is a reality.

It is seldom that there is a public project such as the Boys Club that is so much a community project as was this one. Although there were three $5,000 contributions and several others ranging from $1,000 to $4,500, there were no extra large contributions such as have been received in similar projects at Columbus. The bulk of the money came from the people generally. There were countless $5 and $10 donations. There were lots of gifts for $25, $50, and $100.

Never before had local men's and women's organizations poured forth their funds in the scale that they did for this effort. And no small amount of the money came from the Boys Club mothers who collected and sold rummage.

The new Boys Club means a great deal to the city. As a source of pride, it is also one more important asset which may be pointed out to prospective industries. Here is a comparatively small city which has the finest and second largest Boys Club in the State of Indiana. There probably is no finer boys club in this size city in the Nation.

In an editorial at the beginning of our drive to raise funds for the Boys Club, this column pointed out that this was a great challenge to the people of Bedford. Here would be demonstrated the kind of people of which the community is made.

Now we know. We know for a fact what we have always believed—that the people of Bedford generally are a grand lot, worth their salt and their place in the community.

Every person who gave to the new Boys Club will no doubt enjoy lasting pride that they helped make this project a success.

## BIG HORN RIVER DAM

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of pride in my home State that today I present the views of the Montana Legislature concerning a project which can mean a tremendous economic boost to a large segment of the area. It is a memorial urging the acquisition of a dam site from the Crow Indian Tribe, which will make possible the construction of a dam across the Big Horn River for irrigation, flood control, and generation of electrical energy. The memorial supports my House Joint Resolution No. 2 in asking $5 million to pay for this site, which in the resolution of the legislature is described as providing a fair and just settlement to the Crow Indians.

## RUSSIA'S ECONOMIC AND MILITARY STRENGTH

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD an article appearing in the January 19, 1957, issue of the Magazine of Wall Street by Charles Benedict, entitled "As I See It—The Seriousness of Russia's Economic Deficiencies," along with some remarks of my own which I excerpted from a speech I recently made on this general subject.

For some time I have been concerned about the assumption that seems to prevail in this country that Russia is a strong economic and military threat to the United States and to the non-Communist world. That Soviet Russia is an ideological threat, I have believed for some time. I have also felt that much more than has been done should be done to meet this threat. The Comintern and its successor, the Cominform and the present successor of this head of international communism, whatever may be its undisclosed name, is all too real. Yet it is this reality which is denied by many people in this country and the economic and military assumption which is believed.

The Joint Economic Committee has made some studies about the economic condition of Soviet Russia. I made some personal studies on one aspect of the Soviet economy. I chose a specific economic item because I felt it was necessary to concentrate in order to obtain

knowledge beyond generalities. I chose transportation for the following reasons: No strong economy can exist without good transportation. No modern war can be waged any length of time without a strong economy and indeed without good transportation. Transportation developments are almost impossible to hide from intelligence.

What do the studies of Russia's transportation system reveal? A strong and modern railroad system and rolling stock? A highly developed highway system? With trucks? An internal waterway system and shipping? A highly developed air transport system with airports, facilities, and transport planes? Pipelines for transporting petroleum? A coastline transportation system with coastal shipping and port facilities?

The answer to these questions is available to anyone who wants to do a little studying and a little questioning of people who have visited Russia and used any of the transportation facilities available. The answer is that Russia's transportation system is inadequate to an extreme degree. This answer should revise the thinking of even the strongest believer in overestimating rather than underestimating the strength of an enemy. The article of Charles Benedict comes to the conclusion that a great hoax has been perpetrated by Russia, another Potemkin display.

If this thesis is at all correct, the United States has been playing up Russia's game of bluff. Russia's game of bluffing whom? Not the United States, but the countries on its perimeters and the countries of the non-Communist world. The bluff serves two purposes: One, the obvious one, the creation of fear, of potential military strength and aggression; two, the less obvious one, but by far, in my judgment, the most dangerous, the creation of the impression that if Russia is this strong militarily and economically, then maybe the system of communism is not so bad after all. Maybe it is a pretty good system.

Right now the Asiatic and African world is watching two countries, Red China and India, to see which is able to industrialize and modernize the best. Red China is following the Communist pattern. India, though hardly following the private enterprise system—which is really the best—is following a system which is not communistic. If China wins, then the Communists will have won a tremendous victory. By the nature of things, China cannot win because communism is contrary to human nature. But there is a good part of the world watching to see. They are watching because they half believe that Russia has already accomplished these results under communism. They half believe it, not because Russia has said it, because they disbelieve Russian propaganda as we do, but because the United States has said it, not only in words but in action. Our newspapers and periodicals are full of Russia's alleged prowess. Our military budgets translate these words into deeds.

A good bit of this Russian buildup comes from our own military establishment's proganda machine which uses this theme to bolster its requests for appropriations. The biggest lobby by far in Washington, D. C., is the Military Establishment and it utilizes almost all techniques known to any lobby group to promote its interests. The Military Establishment is dedicated and loyal to our country, in fact it is this very dedication which seems to make it blind to what is the welfare of our country. It goes back to a simple attitude of mind—no supply sergeant was ever busted for having too much supplies, but many a supply sergeant has been busted for not having enough of each particular thing thought to be needed at a specific time. The Military Establishment is led by dedicated leaders who remember the twenties and early thirties when it was so starved that it could not carry out its basic function to defend our society against external forces. They are determined to see that this does not happen again. But, in doing this and pursuing their course, and using the tactics they have used and are still using, they are hurting the ability of our country to meet the problems that face us in the world today. They are playing up Russia's game of bluff.

A few months ago we had a rash of news stories and statements from people who should know better about Russia's amazing and tremendous advancement in educational training. In tracing back to find out where this all came from it became quite apparent that a study by Nicholas DeWitt, Russian Research Center, Harvard University, published a book entitled "Soviet Professional Manpower, Its Education, Training and Supply"—1955—was the source for almost all of it. However, if anyone really read the book, which was a very fine scholarly work, he would not have become greatly alarmed. He would have seen what was quite obvious, that Russia was very far behind the Western World in scientific, as well as all other forms of education, and that the Russian leaders had decided to put on a forced draft to catch up, but that in putting on the forced draft they were committing some rather basic mistakes in education. Furthermore, that they were somewhat dependent upon outdated Western Civilization material for much of their teachings. But basically what should have been seen is the very thing some people saw, if Soviet Russia was freeing up its educational system it was sowing the seeds for destruction of communism. Education, search for the truth, and communism do not go along together. And, indeed, is that not what is happening? Russia did put on this forced draft in its endeavor to catch up educationally and throughout Russia there is the rumbling of revolt.

But, in the meantime, by our playing up the Russian move in education, partly I suppose to force our own educational system to get a move on, we played right into the Russian game of bluff. Our people in education were so desirous, just like our Military Establishment, to channel funds into our educational programs that they used any argument near at hand to promote this end. The Russian threat was readily available and so, without examining the situation as people in education are supposed to be trained to do, they went out and played up Russia's game.

I picked up a piece of information in Denmark last December when I was there discussing trade and economic problems. I was asking what the Baltic countries were doing in reference to gasoline and oil supplies with the closing of the Suez Canal. In the course of the conversation, it was mentioned that Finland had made a deal with Russia to get some Russian oil. I asked how the oil was being delivered and was interested to hear the reply. It was being shipped by boat from the Black Sea through the Dardanelles, through the Mediterranean, through the North Sea, thence to the Baltic Sea, and so to Finland. Yes, indeed, Russia has an imposing transportation system.

However, I conclude with one sobering remark. A flash fire, such as a sudden atomic attack, can cause vast damage even though the fire burns itself out in the space of a few minutes. We do need to take precautions against this kind of a development, but this is hardly the kind of development we are spending much of our wealth and efforts on. In fact, by confusing ourselves, we are not maintaining the concentration necessary to face this real military danger.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the article, to which I referred, by Mr. Benedict, as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

AS I SEE IT—THE SERIOUSNESS OF RUSSIA'S ECONOMIC DEFICIENCIES

(By Charles Benedict)

Paradoxically, while our entire attention has been concentrated on attempts to checkmate Russian strength in the Middle East, very little consideration has been given to her disastrous economic weakness. Yet this is a basic factor of first importance in mapping our plans for dealing with Russia today.

For a long time, the Kremlin has been able to conceal her fundamental economic weakness by withholding and manipulating figures—misrepresenting facts—and by artfully screening visitors admitted to her country—and by prohibiting direct access to her people, and to the sources of information that would have given us the answer to her position.

All the so-called leaked information was devious and confusing. She blinded the world to the true facts, hiding behind the facade of bristling guns, atomic arms and the loud blasts of her propaganda machine. By resorting to contradictory and unscrupulous techniques—with no holds barred—even the greatest statesmen in the world found the Kremlin's maneuvers confusing and unpredictable. Said Winston Churchill, "I cannot forecast to you the action of Russia. It is a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma."

Only in the past year has the realization finally come that the Soviet Union seeks to win her goals by propaganda and subversion alone. We have learned her economy is too weak to stand a war with the United States—and their claim that their industrial growth was catching up with that of the United States was merely a pipe dream conjured up by their propaganda machine.

For 40 years the Russians worked to conceal their economic failure through their brilliant propaganda and subversive tech-

niques—developed into an art during 80 years of battle with the Czarist secret police. The truth is that at least since the twenties the Utopia they pictured was merely a slogan these tough-minded revolutionaries cruelly and ruthlessly used to win converts and dedicated adherents among the people in every land—the idealists and the socially minded intellectuals. By this means they betrayed millions of human beings.

THE INTERNATIONALE IN REVERSE

Held down and enslaved by the secret police these many long years, the people of the Soviet Union and in the satellite countries—disillusioned and embittered—have been "waiting for the day." The first sign of revolt came in East Germany, and was swiftly put down. Then followed the bread riots in Posnan, which gradually spread to all of Poland and to Hungary, which felt the full brunt of Russia's mailed fist. But not before it exposed to the world the true picture of the Kremlin's gross economic mismanagement.

In fact, the failure of bureaucratic control of the economic and social life of the people has proven to be a colossal failure, not only in Russia, but everywhere. One has only to compare the progress of West Germany under free enterprise with the dire poverty of East Germany under Soviet domination. That, together with the low standard of living in Russia and the satellites, supplies a full and grim picture.

THE COLOSSAL HOAX

From the very beginning the Soviet Government was not equipped to meet the demands of conducting the affairs of Russia following the revolution. It lacked the economic and financial brains required to rebuild the country soundly. The new masters of Russia were revolutionary saboteurs pure and simple, and three generations have been sacrificed to their incompetence and bungling in managing the Russian economy.

As I wrote in the September 26, 1936, issue of the Magazine of Wall Street after a visit to Russia—"these revolutionary propagandists, without experience in economic and financial planning, or the conduct of government—instead of putting this nation of craftsmen to work, foolishly tried to swiftly industrialize them. This, although the workers had no understanding of mechanization". Yet, if they had permitted the people to work out their own salvation, they might have succeeded because the Russians are a talented, flexible, and hard-working people.

Traveling into the country, en route to collective farms, I found the roadsides littered with rusty industrial machinery, some of which had been sent by the United States only 6 months before. From 1917 to 1936—for 19 whole years—the Communist Government had failed in supplying their people with enough food and clothing, and no new housing had been built—so that families lived in a single room and frequently doubled up. And these sad people were being exploited, in their dull lives—in the factories—and on the collective farms. In one year, 1935, 5 million kulaks had been starved to death because they failed to satisfy the greedy Communist Moloch.

Conditions in Russia were terrible, and the Government, faced with disaster due to their all-around failure, and with their substance wasted, found themselves confronted with an almost unsurmountable task of repairing the damage—living in the present—and planning for the future. And when the Communist masters found it hard to whip up the enthusiasm of a hopeless people, they resorted to forced labor. Thus, slave labor became an implement of their economy.

This was definitely established during World War II, when the Germans captured Russia's secret economic plan for 1941—a plan that was given to the United States. It shows clearly that the use of slave labor is, or at least was, an integral part of the Soviet economy. A designated share of production in a number of economic sectors was specially assigned to the Government agencies in charge of slave-labor camps.

Yet, possessed of labor for free and raw materials they confiscated, or secured below cost from their satellites, the ineptitude of the top-level engineers of the Russian economy was so colossal that they were unable to fashion the economic weapon that they had planned to use against the Western democracies. No greater demonstration of their utter incompetence to cope with the situation can be shown.

And now, owing to the revolt, destruction, and sabotage of recent months, Russia is bound to experience a serious setback that will make it impossible to fulfill her production target for 1956–57. And the general unrest that is spreading through Eastern Europe and Russia proper is sure to bring further unbalance and multiply the fears already existing in the top-level hierarchy, which is bound to stymie their efforts.

Already she has been unable to meet the financial demands of her satellites and has been obliged to sell her gold, which in 1956 amounted to 1 million ounces. The quantity was considerably less than 4 million ounces sold in 1953, but the bulk of the recent sale was dumped on the Western gold market following the uprisings in Poland and Hungary. This has given rise to the belief in informed quarters that these sales had become necessary as a result of the latest East European developments, and seems entirely plausible, since up to last October all the Communist satellite countries were part of the ruble-area system, which meant that any foreign exchange earned by satellite countries from their exports to the free world had to be made available to Moscow against ruble credits at an exchange rate determined by the Kremlin. In that way the system was similar to that of sterling bloc, in which Britain acts as the central banker, administering the foreign currencies of the entire area, with this difference: The sterling bloc is a voluntary arrangement between sovereign nations, all of which have a voice in the administration of the central foreign-exchange reserve.

This, of course, is not the case with the ruble area system. Furthermore, the exchange rate of sterling reflects the true value of this currency, vis-a-vis the dollar, the mark, the franc, and so forth. The ruble, however, is highly overvalued, so that the satellite countries are being shortchanged whenever they turn their foreign currency in for the ruble at Moscow's official rate of exchange.

According to reports, the satellites are demanding this system be abolished and Russia may well be forced to see it their way. This would deprive her of much of her regular foreign exchange income and may well be the reason she is currently buying large quantities of sterling on the Western World markets.

Russia's much-heralded aid for underdeveloped countries of the world has been seriously checked by events in Eastern Europe. Instead of milking these countries, as she has done for nearly a decade, she will have to put forth every effort to help them overcome their terrific economic setbacks, or lose control of them. It has been obvious for a long time that the satellite nations have been stymied by Russian exploitation, for the Molotov plan for East European cooperation forced each country to subordinate its economy to the needs of Moscow.

This, in the main, is the reason for the economic slump in Eastern Europe during the time when Western Europe was making great gains.

Viewed in the light of Russia's inability to supply the economic- and financial-aid requirements to support her political efforts in this area, her threats and bombast have a hollow sound. The shrill voices of Pravda and Tass reflect the high tension of the Russian leaders caught in a trap of their own making. The British-French-Israeli adventure has definitely shown up their undercover manipulations in Egypt and Syria. And now we have the opportunity to destroy their influence and domination, and secure Western Europe. If we act firmly in this time of her weaknesses, Russia never will gain control of the oil.

A revolt in Czechoslovakia would immobilize her source of arms supply—and that country is ripe for revolt. This would be a great blow to the Kremlin. The Soviet has been experiencing a dearth of skilled manpower and, for the past 2 years, has been scouring the world, making all sorts of promises to induce Soviet citizens to return.

This is our opportunity to stop Russia. Disintegration of the Soviet system has set in. Let's help it along.

Let us also call the bluff of Mideast potentates who have been trying to play off Russian power against ours. If we will, then there awaits us a victory that will serve the cause of the entire free world.

## BARBARA PERRY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Barbara Perry is an estimable young woman who resides in the ward in the city of Chicago where I have made my residence for several decades. She is an ardent admirer of President Eisenhower and during the recent campaign she worked day and night with the Youth for Eisenhower group.

Now she has come to Washington in an attempt to see the President and to ask him point blank if he does not trust the youth of America to the same extent that she in the Youth for Eisenhower movement trusted him.

I hope that the President's time will permit of giving an appointment to this young woman in order that they may discuss freely together the matter that is puzzling her. It seems to me that this is one time when the President, tremendously busy as he is, could well edge into his busy schedule the time to talk things over with a little lady who is making a one-girl fight against the entire State Department. I would not make the suggestion if Miss Perry were a Democrat or had supported Governor Stevenson. In that case my motives might be questioned by some. As it is, I am seeking only to help out.

It is an interesting story. Miss Perry had listened to an address by President Eisenhower in which he said in substance that the best way to promote understanding and peace was for the peoples of our country to meet and to get better acquainted with the peoples of other countries and vice versa. Worshiping President Eisenhower as she does she diligently sought ways and

means of implementing his counsel. She learned that soon there was to convene a convention or a festival of youth in the Russian capital. She talked the matter over with others, most of whom with her had been active in the Youth for Eisenhower group. They started to organize a party of 30 or 40 or possibly 50, representing the youth of America, to attend this youth festival in Moscow. They even planned to invite the convention of youth to hold its next gathering in the United States, preferably in Chicago.

But when Miss Perry wrote Secretary of State Dulles she got the cold shoulder. She was advised not to attend this convention or festival in Moscow because it was part of the Soviet propaganda program. She also wrote to Vice President NIXON, thinking that as she had campaigned and worked for him and the program of the Republican Party she certainly would not be suspect. Neither the Vice President nor the Secretary of State replied directly to her but she did get replies from staff members discouraging the trip to Moscow.

Miss Barbara is not satisfied. She has come to Washington to get for American youth, and especially that part of American youth that worked and prayed for President Eisenhower in the recent campaign, the answer to this question:

If American youth trusted President Eisenhower to mix with King Saud of Saudi Arabia, and was not afraid that the President would become tainted by association and be won over to the other side, why cannot President Eisenhower trust American youth to mingle with Russian youth and try to sell them an American bill of goods in the same way he tried with King Saud?

I do hope the President, and if not the President, certainly the Secretary of State, will have the time to let Miss Barbara Perry personally present the case of American youth.

## SUPERVISION OF INDIAN RESERVATIONS

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times yesterday carried an excellent editorial warning of the dangers, not alone to the Indians but to the Nation as a whole, of hasty termination of the Federal Government's role in the supervision of Indian reservations. As the author of two bills designed to forestall the economic and social chaos that will result from carrying out the Klamath terminal law—Public Law 587, 83d Congress—I am particularly impressed with this editorial.

### BEAM IN OUR EYE

The sense of bitter indignation with which Americans naturally react to unfair treatment of helpless minorities anywhere in the world is a characteristic of which we need never be ashamed. But as we rightly denounce the injustice that exists abroad it might do us good occasionally to look homeward and thus find a beam in our own eye: our treatment of the American Indian.

The position of a significant part of the American Indian population has become truly precarious. This is particularly so in the Great Plains and in the Northwest, where the key to the situation lies in the rapid sale by individual Indians of their allotted land. According to the Association on American Indian Affairs, which acts as a watchdog in protection of Indian rights, some 1,600,000 acres of Indian land have passed out of Indian control in the last 4 years. It is too much to expect that when a pot of gold is held dangling before him in exchange for his few acres an impoverished Indian would refuse to make the sale.

But here is where the United States Government, through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, could and should come in. In order to stabilize tribal economy and, in effect, save the Indians from falling victim to an almost irresistible temptation of immediate gain at the price of future ruin, the Government could discourage such land dispersion and even provide help and credit to tribes wishing to buy up their ancestral land from individual sellers.

Much has been heard about rapid termination of Federal responsibility for the Indians, and Congress even passed a resolution encouraging it. As it turns out, that resolution was unwise and it ought to be repealed. The Federal Government cannot escape its deep moral responsibility for America's 450,000 Indians. The Association on American Indian Affairs is behind a point 4 program for American Indians, which seems to us an approach infinitely preferable to that which has characterized both administration and Congress during recent years. There is no sense in trying to pretend that most Indians are ready for immediate integration into the white man's life. They aren't, and they need and deserve the kind of help and protection that only the Federal Government can give them.

## MAXIMUM WORKWEEK IN INTERSTATE INDUSTRY

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, because of the great interest that has been aroused by the introduction of H. R. 4695, a bill to shorten the maximum workweek in interstate industry, I include at this point in the RECORD a statement issued by Senator MCNAMARA and myself urging speedy consideration of this bill:

We have joined in introducing legislation to reduce the maximum workweek in interstate industry from 40 hours to 35 hours because we believe that it is of the utmost importance for Congress to give early consideration to problems growing out of the increasing mechanization of industry on the one hand and the rapid growth of population on the other.

When Congress first passed the wage-and-hour law in 1938, it adopted a 44-hour workweek as a standard workweek in American industry. Under the law, the workweek was reduced to 42 hours in 1939 and to 40 hours in 1940. The maximum workweek under the Fair Labor Standards Act has remained at that level ever since.

At various times, Congress has undertaken to review the minimum wage level prescribed in the wage and hour law, and it is currently engaged in the important task of studying the possible extension of the law to as many as possible of the millions of wage earners who have thus far been denied its protection. As the level of our economy has risen, however, and the productivity of industry has increased, according to Federal Reserve statistics, from 1947 to 1956, by almost 50 percent, little attention has been paid to the maximum hours standard provided for in the Fair Labor Standards Act. It is high time that such a study was undertaken by the Congress.

It is significant that there has already been remarkable progress in reducing the standard workweek in a number of important industries, particularly the ladies' garment industry and the printing industry. In many of the major urban areas, substantial percentages of employees, both plant and office, are on workweek schedules of fewer than 40 hours.

Under the bill we have introduced, the maximum workweek under the Fair Labor Standards Act would be reduced from its present level of 40 hours per week to 37½ hours per week after 2 years and 35 hours per week after 4 years. The bills clearly specify that employees would have to be compensated for hours in excess of the specified maximum workweek at time and one-half their regular rate of pay, as presently specified by the act.

We hold no particular brief for these specific provisions. The important task is that the Congress undertake to study now the problems involved in adjusting the maximum workweek to present rates of productivity in industry, so that the Fair Labor Standards Act will continue to be the protector of job opportunities which it was designed to be when it was passed in 1938.

It is our hope that the committees of Congress to which these bills have been referred will proceed as promptly as possible to such a study. In our capacity as members of these committees, we plan to do everything possible to see that it is done.

TABLE 1.—*Workers [1] on workweek schedules of fewer than 40 hours [2] 1955–56*

| Labor market area | Date of survey | Percent on workweek schedules of fewer than 40 hours | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | All plant and office workers [1] | Office workers | Plant workers |
| Atlanta | Apr. 1956 | 9 | 31 | 3 |
| Chicago | Apr. 1956 | 13 | 36 | 6 |
| Dallas | Oct. 1955 | 6 | 12 | 4 |
| Denver | Dec. 1955 | 6 | 14 | 3 |
| Detroit | Oct. 1955 | 5 | 16 | 3 |
| Los Angeles-Long Beach | Mar. 1956 | 6 | 15 | 3 |
| Memphis | Feb. 1956 | 3 | 12 | 1 |
| Milwaukee | Nov. 1955 | 8 | 17 | 6 |
| Minneapolis-St. Paul | Dec. 1955 | 12 | 29 | |
| Newark-Jersey City | Dec. 1955 | 22 | 65 | 10 |
| New Orleans | Nov. 1955 | 6 | 23 | 3 |
| New York | Apr. 1956 | 46 | 87 | 19 |
| Philadelphia | Nov. 1955 | 19 | 61 | 8 |
| Portland | Apr. 1956 | 6 | 15 | 4 |
| Providence | Mar. 1956 | 8 | 39 | 3 |
| San Francisco-Oakland | Jan. 1956 | 21 | 37 | 13 |
| St. Louis | Feb. 1956 | 9 | 18 | 7 |
| All 17 areas | | 17 | 46 | 7 |

[1] Nonsupervisory workers (excluding executive, technical, professional employees not in the office or plant force) in all major industry groups except construction, mining, railroads, and Government institutions. Minimum-size establishment surveyed was 1 with 51 employees in smaller cities, 101 employees in larger cities.

[2] Work schedules studied were normal work schedules. The percentages are not affected by workers on a part-time schedule or on a schedule temporarily reduced to less than 40 hours for work-sharing purposes.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, U. S. Department of Labor.

TABLE 2.—*Workweek schedules for municipal administrative and clerical employees, 1956*

[Percent of cities]

| Scheduled hours per week | All cities (over 10,000 population) | Major cities (population over 100,000) | Medium size cities (population 25,000 to 100,000) | Small cities (population 10,000 to 25,000) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Under 40 hours | 32 | 33 | 39 | 28 |
| Over 37½ but under 40 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 9 |
| 37½ | 8 | 8 | 9 | 8 |
| Over 35 but under 37½ | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| 35 | 10 | 9 | 14 | 7 |
| Under 35 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| 40 hours | 43 | 61 | 43 | 39 |
| More than 40 hours | 24 | 6 | 18 | 33 |
| (Total number of cities) | (1,062) | (109) | (421) | (532) |

Source: International City Managers Association, The Municipal Year Book, 1956.

## THE FAILURE OF MONETARY POLICY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the cost of living rose to a record high again last month. It was the fifth consecutive month the cost of living set a record. According to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics we may expect living costs to show another increase from January to February. The cost-of-living index stood at 114.2 percent of the average 1947–49 price level some 21 months ago when the second phase of the tight-money campaign began. Now after six rediscount rate increases and a serious restriction of the credit supply the cost-of-living index stands at 118.2. In citing these facts about the rising cost of living my purpose is twofold. First, I want to reiterate what I said last August after the Federal Reserve had raised the rediscount rate for the sixth time:

Federal Reserve authorities are trying to put out a fire by pouring gasoline on it. Action has again been taken pushing interest costs upward. One wonders how long it will take the "hard money" enthusiasts to recognize that their remedy is not a curative but an irritant.

In this connection I should like to quote from an article in the Washington Evening Star, February 23, 1957, by the Star's real estate editor, Robert J. Lewis, entitled "Rent Boosts Cited as 'Tight' Money Slows Building," the article points out that:

A decline in homebuilding in the Washington area, and in the United States as a whole, has led some landlords to raise rents recently.

Mr. Lewis continues, stating that:

If homebuilding continues to lag and employment remains high it won't be long until another shortage of apartments will begin to affect the rental market generally.

Here is unpleasant confirmation of the fears voiced by those of us who have opposed the policy of general credit restriction and boosting interest rates. The price of shelter, a basic cost-of-living item, is being pushed upward by the pressure of higher financing charges and curtailed housing supply. Virtually all of the decline in new construction that has taken place has occurred in the FHA and GI-loan programs, and these are the programs that encourage construction of housing in the lower price ranges.

My second purpose in citing the facts about rising living costs is to focus attention upon the need to have a comprehensive study of monetary policy. Why general monetary policy has failed in its aim of stabilizing living costs, leaving in its wake only a higher level of interest rates and financing costs and gross inequities is a subject that deserves the investigation and study of this Congress.

I now insert in the RECORD a statement issued by me last August 27, 1956, regarding further increases in the rediscount rate, and in the article by Robert J. Lewis from the Washington Evening Star of February 23, 1957:

STATEMENT BY WRIGHT PATMAN REGARDING FURTHER INCREASES IN THE REDISCOUNT RATE

For the sixth time in 16 months the Federal Reserve authorities are trying to put out a fire by pouring gasoline on it. Action has again been taken pushing interest costs upward. One wonders how long it will take for the hard-money enthusiasts to recognize that their remedy is not proving to be a curative but an irritant instead.

The cost-of-living index has steadily risen during the period from 114.2 to 116.2 in the last month for which it has been reported. No housewife and no one who does any purchasing at all can help but be aware of the fact that price increases have been gathering momentum in recent weeks. It is safe to say that those who watch their budgets closely over the months ahead will feel the increasing pinch of higher food costs, higher housing costs, and higher costs of everything they buy.

Meanwhile the Federal Reserve System continues to encourage an increase in one of the basic costs entering into the price of all manufacturing, transportation, retail operations, and one which even tends to push up taxes by raising the interest rates which cities, counties, and school districts must pay.

Meanwhile, bank loans and the business expenditures on new plant and equipment have been skyrocketing in spite of the futile attempts to slow them down by raising interest rates. The device of higher interest rates has all too obviously lost its dubious virtues as a stabilization device if it indeed ever had any. When corporations have such a ready source for financing as they do have in so-called retained earnings and do not even have to go to the money market to finance new capacity, the claims for hard money certainly need to be reexamined. The fact is that there are increasing evidences that under modern conditions the Federal Reserve System and the banking system may have lost some control over the supply and cost of credit. Whether that trend has already gone too far, why the heralded use of monetary devices has failed in its aim, leaving only higher interest rates and higher costs, are subjects well worth investigation and study.

AUGUST 27, 1956.

[From the Washington Star of February 23, 1957]

RENT BOOSTS CITED AS "TIGHT" MONEY SLOWS BUILDING

(By Robert J. Lewis)

A decline in home building in the Washington area, and in the United States as a whole, has led some landlords to raise rents recently in the belief that current demand will not lead to vacancies in desirable apartments.

Maybe these landlords have misjudged the situation. But if home building continues to lag and employment remains high, it won't be long until another shortage of apartments will begin to affect the rental market generally.

That is one of the reasons why Congress should be so much concerned with the fate of the home-building business. It is also a reason why an upturn in home sales for the immediate future is probably in the cards. So long as the scarce supply of 4½ percent GI money lasts, interest-rate bargains are still available. If costs continue to increase, advantages to buyers are implicit in the present situation.

LIMITED NUMBER SEEN

An interest-rate bargain is, of course, one good thing. If it is coupled with a selling price for the house that is in proper relation to value, that is another good thing. Both together could very well spell the kind of bargain that might not be available for too much longer in the immediate future.

The thing about interest rates is that they not only affect the monthly payments for a house and the ultimate cost of the house but they also determine your eligibility to buy, based on your monthly income.

Every time the Government's policy of pushing up interest rates succeeds, it means that fewer people are eligible to buy homes. Fewer people can pay for homes because they cost more.

This narrows down the builders' market. The builders, as an industry, don't like to have their market shrink away. But there's nothing much they can do to protect themselves if the Government's monetary policy is aimed against them.

The Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve System are using monetary-control techniques that have been likened to a blunderbuss. Monetary officials don't particularly want to hurt builders or buyers. It's merely that the methods they are using to push interest rates higher hit the little-business man and the builder with greater adverse effect than they hit other elements of the business world better able to fend for themselves in the money markets.

EFFECT NOT UNIFORM

As of the present, "tight" money has affected some builders to a greater extent than others. Some builders are in a somewhat more fortunate position than others in that they succeeded in obtaining commitments from mortgage lenders at a 4½ percent rate for GI loans. Without exception, they've had to pay for such loans. They did this as a means of keeping down-payments and monthly payments low to the ultimate purchaser.

So a current question people are asking themselves runs something like this:

If I can buy a house with a 30-year mortgage, a 4½ percent interest rate, a low down payment and a relatively low monthly payment, should I do so now? Or should I wait to see what happens?

A partial answer could go like this:

If you are convinced the house is a good buy, pricewise, and it has a 4½ percent, 30-year mortgage that you can handle with your present income, you will be able to buy it now. If the interest rate goes up later you may not be able to buy because a higher rate may make you ineligible, as well as make the house more expensive.

Another factor that you may want to consider is the trend of prices. If you believe costs of production will continue upward, and your opinion is borne out, you will, naturally, benefit if you can take advantage of present costs of production.

A THIRD FACTOR

A third factor to consider, certainly, is your present situation. If you are a tenant, how will any trend in rents affect you, and to what extent?

If you figure you are living in an apartment for which a landlord could charge more rent and get it without achieving a high (and unprofitable) vacancy rate at the same time, would you be satisfied to pay more rent? Or would you wish to move to a cheaper apartment? Would there be a purely economic advantage to you if you bought a house under these circumstances, not to speak of other satisfactions or advantages in owning your own home?

These are questions that, fortunately, everyone must answer for himself. The better informed you are the greater the likelihood that you will make the right decision. And you might as well know that no one has the complete answer, so you are on your own with everybody else. At the same time, you must consider:

1. The trend of interest rates has been upward. The FHA rate of 5½ percent (including FHA premium) is a full 1 percent above the present GI 4½ percent rate. Right now a campaign to push the GI rate still higher is being conducted by the banking industry and by the Eisenhower administration. Congress is still in a "show-me" mood and apparently isn't going to be in a hurry to authorize a GI rate increase. But the fact remains that the GI rate is not competitive with the FHA and conventional rates. Under these circumstances, builders undoubtedly would find it more difficult to obtain money for future GI mortgage loans.

COST TREND CITED

2. The trend of costs has been upward. The Eisenhower administration so far has not succeeded in stopping the climb.

3. The alternative to FHA and GI loans is the conventional loan. Disadvantageous aspects of this type of loan to some home buyers are: 1. A sharply higher down payment requirement. 2. An interest rate equal to or higher than the FHA rate and, in virtually all cases, higher than the present GI rate.

Under these circumstances as they cover the current status of production costs and of the availability of mortgage funds, there appear to be advantages for many persons in seeking to reach a decision now on whether or not to buy a home.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. LAIRD for 30 minutes on Wednesday, February 27.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri, for 15 minutes, on today.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

## BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 21, 1957, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 348. A bill to amend section 12 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676), relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, by providing for the use of public lands granted to the States therein for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishings, equipment, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said States.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 26, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

531. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, the National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting the report of the National Institute of Arts and Letters for the year 1956; to the Committee on House Administration.

532. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 16, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a letter report on Two-Mile Creek (south of Bandon), Oreg., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

533. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 16, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on Mona Lake (Lake Harbor) Channel, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted March 16, 1937, and authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Public Works.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 5262. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Department of Highways of the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Pigeon River"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 5263. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the benefits payable thereunder shall be exempt from all taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 5264. A bill to transfer ownership to Allegany County, Md., of a bridge loaned to such county by the Bureau of Public Roads; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 5265. A bill to incorporate the American War Dads and its Auxiliary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5266. A bill to clarify the jurisdiction of the Tax Court in abnormality relief cases arising under the World War II Excess Profits Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 5267. A bill to include certain officers and employees of the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the General Services Administration, and Federal probation officers within the provisions of sections 111 and 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to assaults and homicides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 5268. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 5269. A bill to authorize the construction of local flood-protection work on the Mississippi River at South St. Paul, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PILCHER (by request):

H. R. 5270. A bill to amend part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to provide a basis for awarding compensation to members of the National Guard for disability incurred in line of duty; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 5271. A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5272. A bill to grant a pension of $100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I who are over 62 years of age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5273. A bill to require that pay increases for Federal employees whose basic compensation is fixed by a wage board shall take effect within a certain period of time; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 5274. A bill to authorize the National Potato Grade Labeling Act, which provides quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 5275. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life

after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 5276. A bill to extend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to certain employees of the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 5277. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 5278. A bill to amend the public-assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide increased payments, eliminate certain inequities and restrictions, and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H. R. 5279. A bill to prohibit the donation of surplus agricultural commodities to persons who are on strike; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 5280. A bill for the purpose of regulating the speed of motor vehicles licensed to operate on public highways; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5281. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the validity of a lien for taxes as against a mechanic's lien; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5282. A bill to amend the antitrust laws by vesting in the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction to prevent monopolistic acts or practices and other unlawful restraints in commerce by certain persons engaged in commerce in meat and meat products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 5283. A bill to amend the antitrust laws by vesting in the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction to prevent monopolistic acts or practices and other unlawful restraints in commerce by certain persons engaged in commerce in meat and meat products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana: Memorial of the Senate of Montana. Memorial No. 2 relative to wheat acreages and Federal farm program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of Montana. Memorial No. 4 relative to constructing sign in Helena National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Senate and House of Montana. Joint memorial No. 7 relative to stockpiling of domestic tungsten; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Senate and House of Montana. Joint memorial No. 4 relative to purchase of Yellowtail Dam site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to secure removal of all military facilities and activities from Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport-Wold-Chamberlain Field, located in Hennepin County, Minn.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Army to reconsider a recently announced policy requiring 6 months of active-duty training of members of the National Guard, to the end that more realistic and workable requirements, agreeable to the State, be prescribed; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to an expanded program of public housing for elderly citizens; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the enactment of legislation making marital desertion and abandonment of minor children an offense under the provisions of the Federal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging and requesting the passage of legislation now being debated in Congress relating to the seeding of durum wheat in allotted acreages; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to assist the States in meeting the schoolhousing needs of children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging that there be no change made by Congress in the law prohibiting the export of logs from the national forests in Alaska, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to praying that the Bureau of Reclamation immediately conduct field and other studies necessary to complete feasibility reports on the Dorothy, Crater and Long Lake power projects, etc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging that the United States Department of the Interior reopen a land office in Nome, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 5284. A bill for the relief of Martino Palmeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. R. 5285. A bill for the relief of Gregory J. Kessenich, et al.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 5286. A bill for the relief of Christiaan Holman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5287. A bill for the relief of Yi-Fu Tuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5288. A bill for the relief of Orville G. Everett and Mrs. Agnes H. Everett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 5289. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eugenie Roges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5290. A bill for the relief of Eusebia Gardoqui Arando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5291. A bill for the relief of Julian Amesti-Guerricagoitia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5292. A bill for the relief of Antonio Zallo-Ercoreca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 5293. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrudis De Peralta Nartatez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COAD:

H. R. 5294. A bill for the relief of Laurino Saleem Debakey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 5295. A bill for the relief of Cherine Khalil Matta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 5296. A bill for the relief of Chong You How, Eng Lai Fong, and Chong Yim Keung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 5297. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Fairview Cemetery Association, Inc., Wahpeton, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5298. A bill for the relief of Walter Abish; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H. R. 5299. A bill for the relief of Maria Vlahos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 5300. A bill for the relief of Fanny Lee Lou Tak Yung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

102. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of the New Glarus, Wis., Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, urging the Congress of the United States to set aside the first Sunday in February each year, as Chaplains' Day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

103. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Evansville Central Lions Club, Evansville, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsing and commending the objectives in the report of the second Hoover Commission and urging the administration and the Congress to work together, on a bipartisan basis, toward prompt and full consideration of the recommendations, etc.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## How Reducing the Corporate Income Tax Will Help Unincorporated Businesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

**HON. WRIGHT PATMAN**
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 25, 1957*

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, many small-business people whose businesses are unincorporated are asking how they will be helped by our proposals for reducing the corporate income tax on small corporations.

I introduced in the last Congress, and again in this Congress, a bill which would substantially reduce the corporate income tax on small corporations. This bill—H. R. 7—would also reduce the tax on medium size and even moderately large corporations; it would, however, make slight increases in the tax rates on the very large, the giant, and the supergiant corporations. The increased rates which these latter corporations would pay are proposed for compelling reasons.

First, the bill is not intended to bring about any reduction in the total revenue which the Government would receive from the corporate income tax. On the contrary, the bill would simply substitute for the present uneven progression of rates, a uniform progression which is calculated to yield the same revenue.

There is, however, a second purpose to be served by a uniform system of progressive rates on corporate incomes. The purpose is to bring about a more even and equitable distribution of the actual burden of the corporate income tax and thus correct a condition of the present tax structure which is bringing about a rapid concentration of business into the hands of a few corporate giants.

PRESENT TAX RATES DISCRIMINATE AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS

As we know, the corporate income tax falls on many small corporations in exactly the same way that the individual income tax falls on an individual's income. That is to say, the corporation is left, after paying the tax, with just that much less income to spend than it would have had if there had been no corporate income tax. These are the smaller corporations. They do business under sufficiently strong competitive conditions that they cannot arbitrarily decide what their incomes are going to be. In short, they do not have a market control which enables them to shift the tax.

On the other hand, many of the bigger corporations do in reality shift the corporate income tax. This is readily admitted by many of the executives of these very corporations. These corporations do not necessarily have a monopoly in the legal sense of the term, but they do have sufficient control over the market that they can rearrange their price and production policies to accommodate the tax. They thus continue to take whatever amount of profits, after taxes, they consider to be most desirable from the viewpoint of their long run self-interest.

For example, corporations in the public-utility fields do not actually pay a corporate income tax for the simple reason that when this tax is imposed, or increased, it is the custom of the State utility commissions to allow these corporations to raise their rates sufficiently to absorb the tax. For similar reasons the giant corporations in the unregulated fields of business do not pay the tax, because they are not required to seek the permission of any regulatory body before raising their prices.

An across-the-board corporate income tax is therefore far from even and undiscriminating in its effects on corporations of different sizes. At one extreme, there are corporations that actually bear the burden, or substantially all of the burden, of the tax. In this case the tax actually reduces—and it reduces substantially—the amount of earnings which the corporation has left to pay dividends and to invest in business expansion. At the other extreme, there are corporations that can and do shift substantially all of the tax, and these are in practical effect left untaxed. And in between these two extremes there are corporations which can and do shift the tax only in varying degrees and these are in practical effect taxed in varying degrees.

At present the effective tax rate on corporate incomes—that is, the normal and surtax combined—progresses in a very curious fashion. It is, first, a flat rate on corporate incomes ranging between nothing and $25,000; then the rate progresses steeply on corporate incomes up to about $400,000; and after that the rate is flat again, so that a corporation having a net taxable income of several billions of dollars pays the same rate as a corporation having a net income of about one-half million dollars.

BIG CORPORATIONS SHOULD START PAYING TAXES

The result of a system of progressive rates then would be this: No matter in what general segment of the size scale an industry may occupy, the smaller competitors in that industry would pay a lesser rate than the bigger corporations, and the rates would vary in proportion to the relative size of the competitors. This would tend to prevent the bigger competitors from shifting the tax, or at least limit the extent to which the tax could be shifted. The result will be therefore that many of the giant corporations would, for the first time, actually bear the burden, or a large part of the burden, of the taxes which they have been paying, or going through the motion of paying.

HELPING UNINCORPORATED BUSINESSES

As a result of having introduced a tax bill of the kind I have just described, I have received over the past year, and am still receiving, quite a few letters about this matter. As I indicated, many of these letters are from small-business people whose businesses are not incorporated and who ask this question: "How will reducing the corporate income tax help small partnerships and proprietorships?" On January 9 I received a letter from a small-business man who put the question in a rather typical way. I offer for insertion in the RECORD a portion of this man's letter to me, together with that portion of my reply to him which deals with taxes, in the hope that this correspondence will help clarify the matter for others who may have the same question. This will show how, under section 1361 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, small unincorporated businesses might take advantage of any reductions that are made in the corporate income taxes.

The letter to me reads, in part, as follows:

> I, as a small retailer, have watched with considerable interest the reports of congressional aid to small businesses.
>
> To date all references to such aid seem to mention tax relief for small corporations, although the bulk of small businesses are unincorporated by more than 10 to 1. The small unincorporated businesses need aid immediately, in matters such as tax relief, pension plans, reserves for operating capital, allowable deductions, etc., questions in which the corporations have a decided advantage over the unincorporated businesses. For example, maximum taxes in corporations is 52 percent—individual taxes, unlimited. Corporations may hold certain amounts of profits for operation or expansion of business, whereas the individual cannot.

My reply to this small-business man has been, in part, as follows:

> I fully agree with you that unincorporated firms need tax relief. In fact, I believe more so than the small corporations. The corporate form of organization provides some shelter from the high and steeply progressive rates on individual incomes. This usually means that small corporations, if they are profitable, can save some money for business expansion. Executive salaries are of course deducted as any other business cost before the tax is computed.
>
> I have been pushing for tax relief on small corporations however, for the reasons, first, because the same relief will be, or can be, made available to unincorporated businesses; and second, this seems to be the only feasible way of equalizing the presently unequal tax as between big firms and small firms.
>
> NONINCORPORATED FIRMS MAY BE TAXED AS A CORPORATION
>
> Most small-business people don't seem to know about it, but section 1361 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 gives to unincorporated firms the option of being taxed as a corporation. This means, as I have said, that if we can get the tax rates on small corporations down, unincorporated firms can utilize the advantages which would result. I should add that very few unincorporated firms have actually availed themselves of section 1361.
>
> One of the reasons appears to be that while the Collector of Internal Revenue is supposed to issue regulations covering this section, I believe, as yet, he has not done so. The Small Business Committee, of which I am chairman, has recently recommended that this matter be reviewed for the purpose of removing any undue obstacles to small businesses' use of the section.

In addition, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 23, which would help both incorporated and unincorporated firms that want to acquire or improve business property. This would allow the firm to charge off an investment, up to $50,000, as a business cost within the year in which the expenditure is made. Or it would allow the firm to amortize the expenditure over any number of years it might choose.

## St. Lawrence Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 25, 1957*

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from the Ninth Congressional District, and as a member of the Committee on Public Works which considered the St. Lawrence Seaway project, I was happy to vote for the bill in committee and, of course, to support the legislation when it reached the floor of the House.

For a number of years, there was much information about the importance of this seaway program. Many who did not understand the true worth of the seaway program for improved shipping and for the development of the abundance of electric power in our part of the country, thought that this development would seriously affect and bring injury to our economy. When I studied the whole matter, I came to the very definite conclusion that it would be helpful, and certainly not hurtful, to all sections of the United States. I have long believed that any improvement in the economy and welfare of one section of this great Nation would affect the general welfare of all sections of the country.

Over a long period of time, we have recognized the value of the Tennessee Valley Authority in harnessing the waters of the Tennessee River for the production of electricity, in the control of floodwaters, and in bringing about improved recreational advantages. I call special attention to an editorial which appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal, one of the great newspapers of the Nation, which relates the importance of the St. Lawrence Seaway to the very philosophy which has made TVA so important—not only to the economy and welfare of the area which it serves, but to the Nation. It must be recognized that TVA operates within a certain geographical area.

This Authority is repaying to the Federal Treasury the amounts of money advanced to it for its construction program. Ultimately, all of the capital expenditures are reverted to the gain of the country as a whole. In other words, within 40 years its earnings, above the expenses of operation, will be returned to the Federal Government and those benefits will be shared by all of the people of the country. A great many people do not realize that all of this will be accomplished by the consumers of electricity in this limited geographical area who, by paying their power bills, will in time hand to the rest of the country a very valuable, paying business which will provide revenues to the country to be used for purposes far beyond the area served by the Authority.

The editorial follows:

ST. LAWRENCE LESSON

It seems to us there is a possibility of the St. Lawrence Seaway becoming a beneficial influence in congressional consideration of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

There has been a tendency of anti-TVA spokesmen at a distance to scoff at the idea of multipurpose dams. To them TVA was designed for the power business, with some byproducts. They totally reject the idea that flood control has the loudest voice in saying how high the water stands in TVA reservoirs.

But the multipurpose dam is about to be demonstrated in upper New York State, within view of millions of New Englanders.

Beyond a doubt the main reason for the St. Lawrence Seaway is to let bigger ships into Great Lakes ports. It will allow ships of 25-foot draft to sail into Detroit, Milwaukee, Chicago, and other cities. More than 14 feet of draft means a ship must stay outside now.

But the dams that deepen the water for the new locks are multipurpose dams which will also produce electricity in huge amounts. A single dam near Massena, N. Y., will produce 12.6 billion kilowatt-hours a year. That is more than the 11.6 billion kilowatt-hours produced by all 26 TVA dams during the most recent year.

The St. Lawrence will be producing really big power because of multipurpose design. Assuming that this idea is accepted when seen in action, the people will be more inclined to accept TVA.

But they are unlikely to really know the TVA situation for it is most unlikely that, after they have put the new power to work in homes, factories, and barns, Government plants will be set up to require all the new electricity.

## The Wave of Mergers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 25, 1957*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given by me before the Economic Club of Southwestern Michigan, at the Whitcomb Hotel, St. Joseph, Mich., February 21, 1957:

THE WAVE OF MERGERS

This evening I should like to discuss with the distinguished members of the Economic Club of Southwestern Michigan a matter of deep national concern—the wave of industrial and bank mergers that is reorienting our system of free, competitive enterprise.

My plan is to examine into the nature and extent of the present merger movement; the purpose of the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act; its enforcement by the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission; and finally, the necessity for additional legislation.

DIMENSION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MERGER MOVEMENT

At the outset it is clear that in recent years the rising tide of mergers both in the industrial and banking fields has played a key role in hastening the reduction of competition and concentrating economic power in the hands of industry superstructures.

Let me cite a few figures to indicate the extent of this trend. Considering only the industrial segment of the economy, in the 6 years from 1951 through 1956 there took place 4,686 mergers.[1] Of this amount, 2,267 were corporate mergers and acquisitions in manufacturing and mining.[2] Beyond that, in 1956, the number of mergers in manufacturing and mining set a 26-year record and proceeded at a rate four times that of 1949. As the New York Times concluded, "The wave of mergers is now more like a floodtide so wide and pervasive has it become."

This corporate merger trend has taken many different forms. For one thing, through so-called conglomerate mergers, huge corporations, not content to dominate one industry, are penetrating many other industries where the product or service offered is wholly unrelated to their original field. Justification frequently offered is that such activity is necessary to provide greater diversification or round out a product line. Whatever the merits of this argument, in many instances when this kind of consolidation occurs, the sheer economic power and vast financial resources of the giant entering a new industry threatens the continued existence of smaller competitors.

The pattern of diversification is indeed a grotesque one. A leading hard coal producer

[1] Data recently supplied the House Antitrust Subcommittee by the Federal Trade Commission show the following number of industrial mergers for each year since 1951:

| Year: | Annual total |
|---|---|
| 1951 | 703 |
| 1952 | 822 |
| 1953 | 793 |
| 1954 | 617 |
| 1955 | 846 |
| 1956 | 905 |

[2] The Federal Trade Commission reports the following number of mergers in manufacturing and mining for each year since 1919:

| Year: | Annual total |
|---|---|
| 1919 | 438 |
| 1920 | 760 |
| 1921 | 487 |
| 1922 | 309 |
| 1923 | 311 |
| 1924 | 368 |
| 1925 | 554 |
| 1926 | 856 |
| 1927 | 870 |
| 1928 | 1,058 |
| 1929 | 1,245 |
| 1930 | 799 |
| 1931 | 464 |
| 1932 | 203 |
| 1933 | 120 |
| 1934 | 101 |
| 1935 | 130 |
| 1936 | 126 |
| 1937 | 124 |
| 1938 | 110 |
| 1939 | 87 |
| 1940 | 140 |
| 1941 | 111 |
| 1942 | 118 |
| 1943 | 213 |
| 1944 | 324 |
| 1945 | 333 |
| 1946 | 419 |
| 1947 | 404 |
| 1948 | 223 |
| 1949 | 123 |
| 1950 | 219 |
| 1951 | 235 |
| 1952 | 288 |
| 1953 | 295 |
| 1954 | 387 |
| 1955 | 525 |
| 1956 | 537 |

announces purchase of an underwear company. A textile company enters the electronics business. A bus and engine manufacturer takes over food wholesalers and retail food chains. Little wonder that the Wall Street Journal commented that "the type of merger activity now going on strikes an old fogy with a sense of complete bewilderment. Rail equipment builders enter the road machinery and electronics field. A coal mining organization acquires oil, shipping construction machinery, and machine tool firms. A construction contractor acquires a steel mill and a paint maker."

Not only do many such mergers have serious anticompetitive implications, there are other considerations too. Frequently when a company is taken over by another, the plant of the acquired concern is closed down, people are thrown out of work and the economic stability of the entire community is threatened. The textile industry is a case in point. Because of widespread merger activity by large textile companies, many mills have been shut down, causing severe unemployment and community distress. Indeed, in many instances, the closed mills formed the economic heart of the community upon which local jobs, stores, professions, services, and churches depended for income.

I recognize, of course, that not all mergers have had these unfortunate consequences. Many—and those in the automobile industry are typical—have helped competition by strengthening the market position of the combined companies and their ability to compete more vigorously. Also on the positive side of the ledger, some corporations have averted bankruptcy in this way. And some firms have assured themselves of adequate supplies in periods when materials are scarce and of guaranteed market outlets in periods of recession.

On the other hand, many corporate acquisitions have not had such a fortunate competitive result. Certain giant corporations with a voracious appetite, which is sometimes stimulated by tax considerations and personal factors of prestige, have taken over growing, efficient, profitable and vigorously competitive businesses.

In dealing with this problem there are, I think, a few obvious fundamentals which are sometimes lost sight of, if not ignored entirely. The basic objective of the antitrust laws is the preservation of a free competitive enterprise system in which economic activity is controlled so far as possible by the market and not by men. Those who enacted our antitrust laws believed that the market should control business decisions, not business men the market. They strove to safeguard and preserve genuinely workable, effective competition, the kind where prices, output, wages and other rewards depend not on the decisions of a few but result from the day-to-day actions of rival business firms, independently motivated. This decentralized brand of decision-making, Congress believed, would ensure a maximum not only of individual opportunity, but of political liberty.

The inescapable fact is that these basic objectives have been frustrated in considerable part by mergers which have resulted in giant aggregations that have obtained economic power to control price and supply and to dominate many industries. Indeed, the long-term rise in industrial concentration in this country is due in considerable measure to what my economist friends refer to as external expansion of business, which is another name for mergers. Thus, the power of the industrial leaders in steel, copper, cans, dairy products, to name but a few, is primarily attributable to this reaching out and buying up other concerns, not to natural growth. Without overlooking the part tax considerations have played in pushing forward the merger movement I think it significant that many major companies in this country have acquired nearly all their assets by merger.

Beyond this, many mergers have a competitive effect that mushrooms out. The impact reaches small firms which may have to compete with a consolidated corporation; it reaches customers of the acquired enterprise who have found their former source of supply cut off; it reaches former suppliers of either of the combining corporations who find that their products or services are no longer needed; and, it reaches firms who have lost an important outlet for their products as a result of the acquiring corporation's decision to have its products sold exclusively to the marketing organization of the acquired corporation.

Up to this point I have referred to the rash of mergers that has beset the industrial sector of the economy. Let me hasten to add that the financial world is likewise experiencing a multitude of bank mergers that has concentrated the Nation's banking business into fewer and larger banks. In the period from 1950 through 1956, for example, some 1,017 of the country's commercial banks have disappeared by way of mergers or consolidations in a rapidly accelerating trend that represents a major development in banking.[2]

The banking system of this country traditionally has relied for its vitality on vigorous competition by a multitude of independent banks, locally organized, locally financed, and locally managed. Unlike other countries, such as Great Britain and France, where a few institutions control nearly all of the banking facilities, the American system is based on unit banking—that is, strong, growing community banks which provide a wide range of financial services to the people in that area. Contrary to these fundamental principles, the spate of bank mergers is contributing to unprecedented concentration in our present-day banking system. There is hardly room for complacency when the 100 largest banks in the Nation now control over 46 percent of all the commercial banks in the country and more than 48 percent of the Nation's commercial bank deposits; when in each of a majority of the leading financial centers of this Nation, a handful of banks control a predominant share of all the commercial bank assets of the area. In my own city of New York, for example, the financial center of the Nation, the 4 largest banks control over 60 percent of all commercial bank assets while the 2 largest alone control over 42 percent of these assets.

Let me say emphatically that this trend presents a serious danger to the independent banking system; permitted to continue unchecked, it could have the most dangerous consequences for the entire competitive economy which depends for its lifeblood upon banking credit.

[2] The following table supplied the House Antitrust Subcommittee by the Federal Reserve Board shows the annual number of bank consolidations and absorptions for each year from 1921:

| Year: | Annual total |
|---|---|
| 1921 | 305 |
| 1922 | 394 |
| 1923 | 392 |
| 1924 | 373 |
| 1925 | 363 |
| 1926 | 462 |
| 1927 | 567 |
| 1928 | 534 |
| 1929 | 636 |
| 1930 | 769 |
| 1931 | 798 |
| 1932 | 433 |
| 1933 | 322 |
| 1934 | 231 |
| 1935 | 160 |
| 1936 | 176 |
| 1937 | 186 |
| 1938 | 100 |
| 1939 | 119 |
| 1940 | 96 |
| 1941 | 59 |
| 1942 | 89 |
| 1943 | 86 |
| 1944 | 72 |
| 1945 | 79 |
| 1946 | 93 |
| 1947 | 84 |
| 1948 | 75 |
| 1949 | 77 |
| 1950 | 91 |
| 1951 | 82 |
| 1952 | 100 |
| 1953 | 116 |
| 1954 | 207 |
| 1955 | 232 |
| 1956 | 189 |

### THE CELLER-KEFAUVER ACT AND ITS ENFORCEMENT

Against the background of a wave of mergers in the industrial field, the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act was placed on the statute books in 1950. Its principal purpose—to limit future increases in the level of economic concentration resulting from corporate acquisitions and to block resulting monopolistic tendencies in their incipiency.

This act closed a widely exploited loophole in the Clayton Antitrust Act of 1914, which existed because section 7 of that act applied only to corporate mergers accomplished by stock purchases. Companies could circumvent the law by the simple device of buying up a plant or other assets of a second concern, thus leaving the enforcement agencies virtually powerless to proceed. The new law, among other things, plugged this convenient gap by amending section 7 to forbid corporate mergers no matter if accomplished by purchase of assets of purchase of stock if the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to monopoly in any section of the country.

I would add that this new law does not prohibit all mergers; nor does it prohibit mergers between competitors where the effect on competition is not substantial. Imbedded in the legislative history is the principle that consolidations which enable smaller concerns in an industry to compete more effectively are in the public interest.

The act made another significant change. It enlarged the coverage of old section 7 to apply to all types of corporate mergers and acquisitions—horizontal, vertical, and conglomerate—which have the specified effects on competition.[4] As the House report observed, this change was intended "to permit intervention * * * when the effect of an acquisition may be a significant reduction in the vigor of competition, even though this effect may not be so far-reaching as to amount to a combination in restraint of trade, create a monopoly, or constitute an attempt to monopolize. Such an effect may arise in various ways, such as elimination in whole or in material part of the competitive activity of an enterprise which has been a substantial factor in competition, increase in the relative size of the enterprise making the acquisition to such a point that its advantage over its competitors threatens to be decisive, undue reduction in the number of competing enterprises, or establishment of relationships between buyers and sellers which deprive their rivals of a fair opportunity to compete."

[4] Horizontal acquisitions are those in which the firms involved are engaged in roughly similar lines of endeavor; vertical acquisitions are those in which the purchase represents a movement either backward from, or forward toward, the ultimate consumer; conglomerate acquisitions are those in which there is no discernible relationship in the nature of business between the acquiring and acquired firms.

But passage of legislation such as this can be largely nugatory unless accompanied by vigilant, hard-hitting enforcement. For that reason most pertinent is the antimerger enforcement record of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission—agencies which have concurrent responsibility for administering the provisions of the Celler-Kefauver Act. To assess this record, our House Antitrust Subcommittee made extensive investigation and conducted lengthy hearings in 1955. Another purpose was to ascertain the dimensions of, and generating forces behind, the merger movement; and to obtain recommendations as to the need for additional legislation.

On the basis of this investigation, the committee found, in its report issued December 1955, that the merger enforcement record of the two agencies was far from reassuring. It pointed out that in the 5 years since the Celler-Kefauver Act was adopted, but 11 complaints were filed, 5 by the Department of Justice, and 6 by the Federal Trade Commission. It also found that no case had even reached the point of final decision either in the courts or in the Commission.

Viewed against the backdrop of over 3,000 corporate mergers, this paucity of proceedings led the majority of the Antitrust Subcommittee to conclude that the "Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission * * * made but a token gesture at enforcement"; that "both * * * agencies * * * failed to execute the provisions of law promptly, vigorously, or effectively."

The committee added that "merger enforcement activity has been seriously hampered by lack of sufficient funds which has prevented the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission from assigning more than a corporal's guard of attorneys and economists to merger work." In the committee's opinion the "merger movement is too widespread and too pervasive for anything less than a full-scale, concentrated enforcement effort to produce adequate results and adequate results can be accomplished only if necessary funds are made available."

In view of these considerations, the committee recommended that "Congress make a substantial increase in its appropriations to the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission, with the increase earmarked specifically for merger work."

I am happy to report that the efforts of our Antitrust Subcommittee have borne some fruit. The Congress has followed its recommendation and appropriated an additional $1 million to the Federal Trade Commission for the fiscal year 1957 with the increase specifically allocated by the Congress to merger enforcement work. Result is that about one-fourth of the money and manpower of the Commission is now designated for such work.

What is more, the Commission has stepped up sharply enforcement of the Celler-Kefauver Act. Since December 1955 when our committee issued its report on corporate and bank mergers, the Commission has started proceedings in 11 cases, which is almost double the number of cases filed by the Commission in the 5 years from December 1950 to December 1955. Moreover, since December 1955 the Antitrust Division has brought 6 new merger cases, which exceed the number brought in the preceding 5 years. Equally important, the Antitrust Division intends that merger surveillance occupy a major place in its enforcement program this year.

The new emphasis given corporate mergers is a most salutary development and one deserving of commendation.

In one respect, though, both the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice have fallen down by failing to proceed against so-called conglomerate mergers. Despite the fact that the Celler-Kefauver Act applies with equal force to such transactions and that such mergers encompass over half of the present mergers and acquisitions, each agency seems to assume that enforcement action is not possible. In fact, their attitude in this area seems to be one of futility.

I do not minimize the difficulty in demonstrating competitive effects of a given conglomerate merger. But the problem is not an insuperable one. Other agencies of the Federal Government have successfully coped with far more vexing questions. It is imperative that the Commission and the Department of Justice overcome their attitude of passive acceptance of conglomerate mergers, develop appropriate standards of enforcement, and proceed vigorously in this vital area of corporate activity.

THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL LEGISLATION

In addition to these considerations, investigation by our Antitrust Subcommittee has pointed to the need for additional remedial legislation dealing with the mounting tide of corporate and bank mergers. It has pointed to the need for a measure such as the premerger notification bill, H. R. 2143, which I introduced on January 7, 1957. That bill combines substantially the provisions of two bills I introduced during the last Congress which passed the House of Representatives unanimously and were pending in the Senate when Congress adjourned.

The first purpose of my bill, H. R. 2143, is to prevent bank mergers achieved by acquisition of assets where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly in any section of the country. Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Celler-Kefauver Act, now covers bank mergers achieved by stock acquisitions but fails to include bank mergers accomplished by means of asset acquisitions. This bill will close the gap in existing law and will provide the Federal Reserve Board and the Attorney General with the same authority to move against asset acquisitions by banks as against stock acquisitions.

The second objective of my bill is to require parties to a proposed merger to notify the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission or other appropriate board 60 days in advance of the transaction. Under the bill, parties to a proposed merger where the combined capital structure would exceed $10 million cannot consummate the transaction until 60 days after notice is given to enforcement officials. With the notice merging corporations would be required to furnish to the Government specifically enumerated information to enable the Attorney General or the appropriate agency to assess the merger's probable impact on competition. Willful failure to submit the notification or to furnish the required information would be subject to a penalty of from $5,000 to $50,000.

The bill sets forth 10 categories of corporate transactions which are exempt from the notification and waiting provisions of the bill. In addition, the bill requires the Federal Trade Commission or other appropriate Government agency, upon approval of the Attorney General, to establish procedures for waiving all or part of the notification of waiting requirements in categories of cases where notification and a waiting period is deemed unnecessary to effectuate enforcement of the antimerger law.

Under the bill, failure by the Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission to bring suit within the 60-day waiting period does not constitute approval of the transaction or prejudice the Government's right to institute proceedings at a later date to challenge the legality of the merger. Nor does the bill require in any way advance agency approval of mergers.

The third purpose of the bill is to provide the Federal Trade Commission with authority to seek a court order to prevent consummation of a merger pending the issuance of a complaint and the completion of the Commission's administrative proceedings. This amendment would give the Federal Trade Commission, which has concurrent jurisdiction with the Attorney General to enforce the merger provisions of the Clayton Act, authority similar to that now possessed by the Attorney General to seek a preliminary court injunction restraining consummation of a merger while adjudication of its legality is pending.

There follows some of the reasons why such legislation is imperative.

At present the staff of the antitrust enforcement agencies must rely upon newspapers, financial periodicals, trade journals, and other publications for information regarding proposed mergers which the companies themselves could readily supply. These procedures are unsatisfactory, especially since many significant mergers are not publicized in advance of consummation.

The enforcement agencies also are confronted with the problem of collecting elementary information about the companies involved in a proposed merger in order to determine the merger's impact upon competition and whether a full investigation should be made. While such information is ordinarily requested from the companies, at present they have no legal obligation to furnish the information requested, or to make it available expeditiously.

Not only will premerger notification ease this enforcement burden, it will afford the enforcement officials a reasonable period of time in which to study the competitive implications of a merger before deciding whether to seek a preliminary injunction restraining its consummation pending a determination of legality.

Furthermore, lack of a provision giving the Federal Trade Commission authority to seek a preliminary court injunction to prevent merger consummation has created a most serious loophole in the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act. Under present law, companies can obtain the benefits of a completed merger even though its legality has been challenged by the Federal Trade Commission and notwithstanding the fact that pending final disposition of the complaint, the merger may have caused the very damage to the competitive structure of the industry which the Celler-Kefauver Act was intended to safeguard. Then, too, in many mergers the acquired competitor is completely swallowed up and disappears as an identifiable entity, making it practically impossible hereafter to restore completely the preexisting competitive situation.

In this context, while premerger notification is a necessary preliminary step, it is just as important to provide the corollary power to seek an injunction preventing the commingling of the assets, management, and productive facilities to a point where they cannot be effectively unscrambled.

Despite the clear purpose of this measure, some business organizations have not only misstated its objective, but have incorrectly fostered the notion that it requires advance agency approval of corporate mergers. For instance, as Judge Hansen, head of the Antitrust Division pointed out recently:

"A survey of business opinion regarding premerger notification legislation, conducted by the Diversification Institute, Inc., came across my desk. That survey asked 500 industrial corporations, among other things: 'Do you favor legislation similar to H. R. 9424[5] described in the accompanying insert?' It, however, is dangerously misleading. For that description apparently assumed that H. R. 9424 provided, not for premerger notification, but rather for premerger approval. Thus the accompanying description averred 'approval [I repeat, "approval"]

[5] H. R. 9424 is a bill I introduced last year which is essentially similar to my present bill, H. R. 2143.

of the proposed merger would not exempt the parties from subsequent antitrust attack. Nor [and I still quote from the description] would disapproval deprive them of any defense available to them in such proceedings, in the event they went ahead with the transaction notwithstanding the disapproval.' Small wonder, then, that many questioned objected that the proposed legislation 'would give Government agencies powers that belong to the courts.' "

It is my considered judgment that should the business community be informed fairly and adequately of the details of this legislation, it would have no objection to its passage particularly since evenhanded enforcement requires notification. With that requirement incorporated in the statute, the company that tries to obey the law and seek advance clearance from the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission will no longer stand by and watch its competitor, who chooses to remain silent, consummate a merger and thereafter rely on the natural indisposition of the enforcement agency to bring suit to unscramble the commingled assets at some later date.

It must also be observed that enactment of such legislation would benefit the business community itself, since disruption of business plans is lessened by agency action before merger consummation. Some companies, in fact, argue that if the Federal enforcement agencies are to proceed at all, they should sue before consummation.

Certainly there is much that an organization such as yours can do in stimulating public discussion so that the import and objectives of legislation such as this can be fully understood.

## Results of Questionnaire—First Congressional District, Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 25, 1957*

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting the results of a January questionnaire which was sent to about 10,000 people in the First Congressional District of Wisconsin. I believe the results will be interesting to Members of the House:

RESULTS OF THE JANUARY 1957 QUESTIONNAIRE FROM CONGRESSMAN LAWRENCE H. SMITH, FIRST DISTRICT, WISCONSIN, FEBRUARY 18, 1957

1. Do you approve the exchange of atomic secrets with other countries? Yes, 262; no, 1,731.

2. Do you favor the development and use of atomic energy by private enterprise? Yes, 1,662; no, 233.

3. Do you approve the use of military force by the United States as proposed by President Eisenhower? Yes, 866; no, 940.

4. Do you approve large sums of money for use in developing Middle East countries? Yes, 198; no, 1,764.

5. Do you think the Middle East problem is one for the United Nations only? Yes, 1,085; no, 874.

6. Do you think the United States should proceed in its own way to establish peace in that area? Yes, 648; no, 1,254.

7. Do you think the Federal Government should continue its support programs of agricultural products? Yes, 803; no, 1,072.

8. Do you favor immediate balancing of the Federal budget? Yes, 1,620; no, 354.

9. Do you favor reduction of taxes before balancing the budget? Yes, 587; no, 1,397.

10. Should Federal spending be reduced? Yes, 1,975; no, 61.

11. Do you approve direct Federal grants to States to help build schools? Yes, 667; no, 1,336.

12. Do you approve an increase in the minimum wage? Yes, 467; no, 1,441.

13. Should labor union welfare funds be regulated by law? Yes, 1,848; no, 159.

14. Would you approve legislation providing for 4-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives? Yes, 1,535; no, 456.

15. Do you favor an increase in postal rates to meet postal deficits? Yes, 1,321; no, 663.

16. Do you believe there should be some relief from payment of Federal taxes? Yes, 1,700; no, 217.

17. Do you approve an amendment to our immigration laws to admit more people to this country? Yes, 291; no, 1,656.

18. Should American taxpayers support underprivileged nations? Yes, 301; no, 1,579.

19. Should Russia be expelled from the United Nations? Yes, 429; no, 574.

20. Should we break off diplomatic and other relations with Russia? Yes, 1,280; no, 668.

More than 2,000 replies have been received at this time. This is approximately 20 percent return.

## Ideals of the Order of Elks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, February 25, 1957*

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which the Honorable RUSSELL V. MACK, Representative from the State of Washington, delivered Thursday, February 21, 1957, at a banquet of Washington Lodge No. 15, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, in celebration of its 75th anniversary.

Washington Lodge, since its organization in February 1882, has grown from a membership of 41 to a present-day membership of 2,213, and is still going ahead rapidly and vigorously.

Representative MACK is a leading Elk in the State of Washington, where he served as exalted ruler of his lodge, as district deputy, and as president of his State's Elks association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IDEALS OF THE ORDER OF ELKS

(Address by Hon. RUSSELL V. MACK)

Exalted ruler, Brother Ambrose Durkin, Past Grand Exalted Ruler Barrett, my brothers and friends, we are met tonight in one of the most joyous and gala occasions in all the history of Washington Lodge No. 15 of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, the celebration of its 75th anniversary—its Diamond Jubilee.

My brothers, I was honored when you invited me to be your speaker at this birthday banquet. I am grateful to you for that honor. I only hope that my remarks tonight pay adequate tribute to you Elks of today and those who preceded you in the great work of building this lodge. You have built better than you know.

Washington Lodge, truly, is the little acorn that grew into a mighty oak. When in 1882, your lodge was born it had a charter membership of only 41. Today, its membership is more than 2,200.

Once when I was a young man, a merchant sold me a new suit. He grabbed a handful of the loose cloth at the back of the coat as was the custom of salesmen of those times and then said, "It fits you like the paper on the wall." I went out to a football game in my new suit. It was raining. In those days there were no covered bleachers. Soon, I was soaking wet. My coat sleeves climbed up toward my elbow and the pants' legs climbed upward toward my knees. I returned to town in my shrunken suit. The merchant saw me approaching in my shrunken suit and perhaps, suspecting I would seek a rebate cried out, "My goodness how you have grown."

I cannot refrain, tonight, from saying to you Washington Elks, "My goodness how you have grown."

But, extraordinary as has been the growth of Washington Elks Lodge that of the Order of Elks has been even more remarkable. When Washington Lodge came into being 75 years ago, the Order of Elks was 14 years old. It consisted at that time of only 15 lodges and the total membership of all 15 was less than 1,800.

Today, the Elks have not 15 but 1,799 lodges and its membership in 75 years has increased from 1,800 to more than 1,200,000. The entire possessions of all 15 lodges 75 years ago were valued at "about $5,000." Today, the Elks own property appraised at almost a quarter of a billion dollars. Each year the order spends more than $7 million on charitable and patriotic work.

No enterprise grows without there being a cause. There are reasons why the Elks have grown so great and been so successful.

The first of these is the Elks ritual. The order was fortunate in that for the first 15 years of its existence most members were men of the stage—actors, producers, and playrights. These pioneers produced a ritual rich in dramatic appeal, with lines as beautiful and swift flowing as those of Shakespeare. Take for example, "the eleven o'clock toast" which has been in the Elks ritual for more than 80 years.

Think of its dramatic appeal. A great room is filled with a multitude. There is the babble of voice, the blare of music and the confusion incident to great merrymaking. Then, suddenly a chime, at the hour of eleven, strikes. It tolls out 11 strokes. The hubbub subsides and ere the peal of the 11th stroke has died away utter quiet prevails.

Then, out of the stillness comes the exalted ruler's voice saying "My brothers you have just heard the tolling of 11 strokes. This is to remind you that with Elks the hour of 11 has a tender significance. Wherever an Elk may roam, whatever his lot in life may be when this hour falls on the dial of nights, the great heart of Elkdom swells and throbs. It is the golden hour of recollection, the mystic roll call of those who will come no more."

And, at those words there comes to each Elk's mind, as there always does to mine, memories of the faces and personalities of brothers whom we once knew, loved and have lost for awhile. What finer tribute to our departed brothers than each evening keeping alive in our minds memories of them.

And then, the exalted ruler resumes, "An Elk is never forgotten, never forsaken. Morning and noon may pass him by but ere the shadows of midnight shall fall the chimes of memory will be pealing forth the friendly message"—and then in unison, we all say—"To our absent brothers."

Could anything be more beautiful? Could Shakespeare or William Cullen Bryant have written anything better? I think not.

Whether it be the "eleven o'clock toast," the opening or closing lodge services or the funeral ritual, all Elks' services are beautiful and like a good play or enchanting opera one never tires of hearing them reenacted and reenacted by competent officers. The ritual properly rendered has much to do with keeping alive the interest men have in the Order of Elks.

But there is more to the Order of Elks than a ritual. The principles for which we stand and by which we, as Elks, live make Elkdom really worth while. Those principles are best expressed by the three emblems at the Elks' altar.

Mankind, since the dawn of civilization, has employed emblems and symbols to express his deepest sentiments and highest ideals. Primitive man employed the sun, the moon, the crescent, and the stars, as his symbols of his belief in the immortality of the soul.

Moderns employ the cross as an emblem of their faith in Christ and their belief in a life beyond the grave. White is with all men a symbol of purity, and to all nations the dove, the emblem of peace.

A crude and commonplace piece of wood of no intrinsic worth, when fashioned into a two-headed hammer, called a gavel, in the hands of an exalted ruler of an Elks lodge or the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the Vice President of the United States as they preside over Congress becomes the emblem of constituted authority. Because we as Americans are obedient to the constitutional authority the gavel symbolizes, a democracy of the people, by the people, and for the people has worked and endured in the United States for almost 2 centuries.

At the altar before which every Elk assumes the obligations of this order, there are the three emblems of Elkdom—the flag of our country, the book of law and the antlers of friendship. To the cynic our antlers are only bone; to the atheist our Bible is but paper and to the Communist our flag is only a rag. But to you and to me and to every true Elk our order's three emblems are the symbols of the three greatest loves in every Elk's heart—the antlers for love of friend and family, the Bible for faith in God and the flag for devotion to that common mother of us all—our country.

The antlers are the emblem of an Elk's two most valued possessions, friends and family, without which life would be empty. Wealth, it is said, has wings and not infrequently vanishes more rapidly than it was accumulated. Power and place, laboriously built up by years of planning and effort, often are washed away in the returns of a single election. Only family and friends remain constant and stick with us through thick and thin, to rejoice with us in our seasons of success and to console and comfort us in hours of misfortune and sorrow. Only our friends and family write our faults in the sands and our virtues on the tablets of their love and memory. The antlers are the emblem of that intangible something that binds Elks together with hoops of steel in a great American fraternity dedicated to the betterment and happiness of mankind.

I, sometimes, have observed that some men go through life as collectors of stamps, of coins, of antiques, or even of donkeys and elephants, but the wisest and happiest collector is the collector of friendships. Friendships such as one can make in the Brotherhood of Elks can, and often do, endure a lifetime. The emblem of the antlers teaches us as Elks that the easiest and most effective way to collect friends is simply by being a good friend to others.

The second emblem on an Elks' altar is the Bible, the Good Book on whose teachings is founded justice. It is the symbol of the the man each of us aspires to be—of the man our mothers fondly believe we are. Since each of us is a human and not a god, none ever attain the perfection the Bible teaches but in the trying each becomes a better man, a better husband, a better father, and a better citizen.

The great British statesman Gladstone once said, "The American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." The Bible, in a very real sense, is the symbol of that Constitution for it was the teaching of this book that gave the Founding Fathers the inspiration for many of the principles incorporated in that matchless document. Among these are that the weak should be protected against the strong, that right should ever be the master of might, that justice and mercy should rule mankind and that peace is better than war. When we as Elks place the Bible on our altar we each renew our pledge to defend the Constitution against all enemies, at home or abroad, who would undermine or destroy it.

The third emblem at our Elks' altar is the flag of our country. It is the symbol of all the past glorious achievements of our Nation, of the reality of the present well-being and happiness of its 170 million people and an expression of all our combined bright hopes for the future of the Republic.

To an Elk the flag is not woven of strands of silk. To him, it is woven of the threads of the lives of the millions who so lived, so labored, and so died that they left to all Americans a heritage of liberty and of freedom and the opportunity for its fullest enjoyment. Our flag is woven of the threads of the lives of those living or dead who in peace or in war have contributed to the greatness, strength, and glory of the Nation.

In the flag are the threads of the lives of those dauntless spirits, Columbus and others, who in frail, storm-tossed ships braved the dangers of a transatlantic voyage in order to establish in a new world a new country dedicated to liberty and freedom. Also, in that flag the threads of the lives of those rugged men who, with one hand on the musket and the other upon a plow, battled with the savages in the vast wilderness of Virginia and New England to lay the foundations of our first States.

We see in the red of the flag the threads of the lives of those who have fought, bled, and died on farflung battlefields that the principles laid down for us by the Founding Fathers might endure and all mankind might enjoy the blessings of a government of law.

As our flag fans the breeze we, in imagination, hear it whisper such immortal electrifying phrases as "Give me liberty or give me death," "Don't give up the ship," "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country," "We have just begun to fight," and "Damn the torpedoes; full steam ahead."

But to an Elk the flag is the emblem of peacetime achievements as well as heroic deeds in war.

We behold in it the threads of the lives of the long generations of farmers who have cleared the land, cultivated the soil, and raised the stock animals that have provided the food and fiber that have made us the best fed and best clothed people in all the history of the human race.

We see in it the threads of the lives of the woodsman and lumber workers whose labors have made Americans the best housed people of all time.

We see in it the threads of the lives of those in mines, furnace rooms, and factories and in transportation and communication who have made our Nation strong and secure in war and prosperous and happy in peace.

In our flag are the threads of the lives of the preachers, teachers, writers, actors, and others who have stimulated our minds and enriched our souls and thereby made each succeeding generation more competent of self-government than the last.

When we as Elks and Americans proudly salute the flag, that salute is not an empty, meaningless gesture to a silken banner. It is a salute to all those Americans, living and dead, who by their labors and sacrifices made the reality of our present security and happiness possible.

May we always, as we salute the flag at our altar, think of all these with a prayer of gratitude in our hearts.

The Bible, the flag, and the antlers, these three are our emblems. They symbolize the great ideals of Elkdom—for God, for country, and for friends and family. As long as we Elks are true to those ideals our order will never falter in growth or success and will go forward to greater and better anniversaries.

This is the 75th birthday of Washington Lodge No. 15 of the Elks and the 89th anniversary of the great Order of Elks. In 11 years, we will be celebrating the 100th anniversary of the order. I have a suggestion to make for that celebration.

Washington is the most beautiful city in the world. It is the heart and shrine of the entire Nation. More visitors come here to see its monuments and historic buildings than to any city.

This great American Order of Elks, now with 1¼ million members and still growing, should have in Washington, ready for dedication by the order's 100th birthday, the finest Elks temple in all our land—one that every Elk and every American citizen will want to see. It should be a temple monumental enough to be a fitting tribute to the present and future greatness of the order.

Washington lodge, alone, of course, cannot finance the construction of such a building. All Elks of the Nation should, and I believe, gladly will join in helping to build such an Elks shrine for the National Capital.

Washington lodge, of course, assisted by the lodges of Maryland and Virginia, should provide the leadership and a larger share of the funds for its construction than other lodges because it would be the home of Washington Elks as well as a monumental temple to all Elkdom.

I hope this is a dream that can be realized. What a grand 100th anniversary of Elkdom it would be if that day could be marked with the dedication by this greatest of American fraternal orders of a monumental national Elks temple here in the world's most beautiful Capital City.

---

## Labor Racketeering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, February 25, 1957*

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the recent address by the Honorable James P. Mitchell before the Catholic Institute of the Press, in New York City, on February 14, 1957, concerning the important subject of labor racketeering. I commend this excellent address by Secretary Mitchell to the Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR RACKETEERING

(An address by James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor, before the Catholic Institute of the Press, New York, N. Y., February 14, 1957)

It is a genuine pleasure for me to have this opportunity to speak to distinguished

Catholic members of our Nation's news media, and to present my views on a subject which I am sure is of great concern to you as it is to me—the menace and fact of labor racketeering in the United States. As newsmen you look upon labor racketeering as a topic of great current interest. As Catholics, inheritors of the doctrine of social justice as propounded by the great Popes Leo XIII and Pius XI, you look upon it as the social evil it is. You have here, then, both a story and a cause.

Incidentally, I do not think that this is an era in which men of faith and ability should, like Gideon's men, hide their light under a basket. In spiritual darkness of a secular culture, it is incumbent upon men like yourselves to show an affirming flame. In an age searching for faith in the racks of magazines and pocketbooks, an age when popular taste is too often untempered by the moral view of man's nature and place in time, the relief of man's spiritual ills will not be found in silence and acceptance. Because you have ability and position, you are capable of asserting truth. Because you have faith, you are required to assert truth. The truth of the proper nature of society is but a part of the larger truth of the nature of man, who comes before society.

For these reasons, the Catholic members of the press have been ardent crusaders for social justice and social charity, the two ideals that Pope Pius XI identified as the rightful directing principles of all economic life.

The Catholic press in particular has a unique advantage in judging the evil of labor movement abuses. For that movement is deeply indebted to the social teachings of the church. The proper goals of a good labor movement and a good newspaper are similar in many respects. Both are instruments of social advancement—one by deed, the other by word. Both defend the individual against unlawful exploitation. Both recognize and condemn immoral abuse of power, and immoral use of wealth. An enlightened newspaper shares the same concept of a just and charitable society which animates the labor movement.

Because newsmen of good will share in the spirit that motivates American labor, the evil of abuses in labor means more to them than a good story. Especially to Catholic members of the press, who have been so close to social progress since the encyclicals of the Popes pointed the way, racketeering represents a genuine and dangerous threat to the future of American labor.

The great Pope Leo XIII said, "Nothing is more useful than to look upon the world as it really is." So let's look at the world of American labor as it really is.

Throughout its history, it has been a social movement with a cause. The cause has been, and continues to be, based on an ethical view of society like that of Leo. Just distribution of wealth, ownership of private property, recognition of the dignity of workers and their right to representation, all of these things are in the spirit—many in the letter—of the principles first laid down for workers' associations by Leo XIII in his magnificent social document, On the Condition of Workers, issued in 1891.

The pontiff declared that "workers' associations should be so constituted and so governed as to furnish the most suitable and most convenient means to attain the object proposed, which consists in this, that the individual members of the association secure, as far as is possible, an increase in the goods of body, of soul, and of property."

American organized labor has certainly been a great force for good in our land. It has improved immeasurably the welfare of American workers. It has been an important and effective social force. It has made many, many concrete advances in the fight to end discrimination in employment. It has insisted on equality of opportunity, and it has helped lift many outstanding members of minority groups over the high walls of prejudice that confronted them.

Finally, American labor has made an immense contribution to the emergence of the American worker as a man of property. In a country where civilian employment averaged 65 million persons in 1956, 52 million American families and unattached individuals received an average personal income of $5,000 per family or person.

Seventy-three percent, or 37 million, American families owned automobiles.

Sixty percent—29 million—of all America's houses are owned by the families living in them. We have 38 million television sets, 45 million refrigerators, 31 million vacuum cleaners; 81 percent of all wired homes are equipped with television, 96 percent with refrigerators, 66 percent with vacuum cleaners, and 86 percent with electric washing machines.

This material wealth is presented here to give you an idea of the extent to which the wage earner has become a man of property.

In the particulars enumerated by Pope Leo XIII, then, the labor movement in the United States has been an effective instrument for the advance of social justice.

The second point to be considered in looking at the world as it really is, is to realize that any movement with an ethical base is bound to be the object of men with varying ethical ideas. Some of these men have been genuinely interested in human progress, if mistake on the best ways to achieve it. Such were the early Socialists with their materialistic and mechanistic view of society.

Others have been men of a different ethic—that of the jungle. They have been drawn to the labor movement for these reasons: First, the ethical nature of the movement provides an excellent and sturdy blind behind which to hide their own desires for personal gain. By acting constantly in behalf of the workers, so they say, while actually lining their own pockets, they have avoided the detection of public opinion to some extent. Secondly, the democratic structure of the labor movement with its many divisions and subdivisions provides cover and opportunity for a man of ill will. Thirdly, the wealth that has accumulated in some union treasuries is considerable and presents a great temptation to unscrupulous men.

I would like to examine these dangers—which are both philosophic and material—in greater detail.

When socialism was an experimental philosophy, a few decades ago, it seemed to some a logical answer to the imbalance in industrial society. The world was divided into the few owners and the vast majority of nonowning workers. As Pope Leo described it in 1891, "a very few rich and exceedingly rich men have laid a yoke almost of slavery on the unnumbered masses of nonowning workers."

Samuel Gompers, that great statesman of labor, was interested enough in the theory to examine it closely for a number of years. Then he spoke for the entire labor movement when he said to the Socialists, "I am entirely at variance with your philosophy. Economically you are unsound, socially you are wrong, and industrially you are an impossibility."

Gompers and men like him put the labor movement squarely on the road to free enterprise, to private ownership, to just distribution, to the creation of standards in keeping, not with the needs of an economy but the needs of individual human dignity.

It is also interesting to note that among the very first to identify the menace of communism were the Catholic Church and the American labor movement. Pope Pius XI, disturbed by the spread of communistic doctrines, wrote in 1931: "We cannot without deep sorrow contemplate the heedlessness of those who apparently make light of the impending danger. * * *" That danger presented itself to the labor movement in short order. Working with secrecy and stealth, apostles of the communistic doctrine wormed their way into places in the movement. Some attained fairly responsible positions. A few reached policy levels.

If the cancer had been allowed to grow, it would sooner or later have infested the entire body, bringing discredit and reprisal from other segments of society and negating the brilliant work of leaders of the past. The labor movement, however, had too rich a tradition of moral strength and political wisdom to allow this to happen. Labor accepted the responsibility for cleaning its own house, and it proceeded to do so effectively. Unions that had become tainted were expelled. Phony leaders were cast out.

Today the labor movement is faced with a different kind of threat.

Labor racketeering begins when a labor leader ignores the advice of Pope Leo XIII: "Have nothing to do with men of evil principles" who, he said, excite foolish hopes that usually end in useless regrets. It is promulgated when an employer ignores the similar advice from the great Pope: "Do not use men as things in the pursuit of gain." For both these persons, Leo has a final word: "To gather one's profit out of the need of another is condemned by all laws, human and divine."

There are two types of labor hoodlums—the corrupted apostle of labor's cause and the committed criminal who, after a life of crime, attaches himself to the labor movement. The second invariably depends upon the first to gain access to the movement. Thus, the labor leader who tolerates the existence of racketeering elements in his union is himself suspect. If his crime is ignorance, it is correctable. If it is willful and results in material gain to himself, he is subject not only to expulsion by the labor movement itself, but also to trial and punishment by the civil authority.

This much is obvious—the hoodlums in labor are parasites upon an otherwise healthy body. The labor leader and union members that tolerate them, and the employer to whom financial gain and a soft union are more important than honesty and integrity, both feed the parasite and give it strength. It is well to realize that a weak man might be tempted beyond his powers to resist. It is also important to realize that a genuine gangster cannot get into the door of any labor movement unless a dishonest labor leader opens that door and a dishonest employer keeps it open.

It was, as a matter of fact, the work of the real gangster that precipitated public outrage: Larceny, murder, extortion, theft—the marks of a criminal. The creation of entire criminal segments, the threat of gang war hovered over the labor movement like a black cloud. The jackals had come to fill their bellies, but the lesser criminal, the corrupted leader who wanted only financial reward and the blind employer who wanted the same, pointed the way.

Labor racketeering will not be stamped out until the labor leaders who are criminals and hoodlums are cast out; until the labor leaders who have tolerated their existence are castigated; until the employer who sees in a racket a chance for his own gain is made to suffer the consequences; and until all union members themselves repudiate unprincipled leadership and assure themselves of the kind of leader whom they can trust and who will bring dignity to their association and themselves.

How can this be done?

In the first place by the labor movement which is accepting and discharging its responsibility in this area. I have the greatest faith, gentlemen, that labor will once again accept the challenge and clean its own house.

Today's true labor leaders have preserved and act upon the ethical principles of their predecessors. George Meany is such a man.

The great leaders of today realize that the lice that inhabit and infect a few labor unions do more than merely injure those unions. They deprive the labor movement of its very meaning. They make it a mockery. They destroy public confidence. They mitigate the progress of the past. Like the sharks they are, they devour their own substance. Leaders like George Meany know that what is at stake here is not merely the future of a few unions but the future of the entire movement.

Their response to this challenge, as evidenced in both the statement of policy and the ethical code released from Miami Beach last month, has been magnificent.

The statement calls attention to the fact that the trade-union movement is a moral one and has a responsibility not only to itself but to society in general to remain free of corruption. This wise and statesmanlike view has always been labor's greatest strength. The statement reads in part:

"No institution or agency, whether labor or business, public or private, enjoys special immunity from the equal application of the laws, from appropriate investigation by duly constituted legislative committees and from scrutiny of its operations by the members of the press or the general public."

While recognizing the right of any citizen to invoke his constitutional prerogative and plead the fifth amendment, the statement warns any labor official that if by so doing he is attempting to hide corruption, then he faces expulsion.

The tide is starting to run against labor criminals. The AFL–CIO code of ethical practices forbids labor leaders from maintaining compromising personal ties with an employer—a warning to the soft leader who opens the doors to the criminals. As to labor leaders who are criminals themselves, the code is a weapon for cutting them out of the movement.

As for the Government's part, it will enforce the applicable laws vigorously and fairly.

I would call your attention to the fact, also, that the President requested and the Department of Labor prepared legislation to protect the beneficiaries of employee welfare and pension plans by requiring registration and full disclosure of the financial operations of the plans. A bill was introduced in the Congress but no legislation was finally enacted. I look for passage of appropriate legislation this year.

Government cannot do the job as effectively as labor itself. However, Government has the responsibility to help the labor movement help itself by strengthening the hand of honest labor leaders. The present congressional investigations are healthy for the reasons pointed out in the AFL–CIO Miami statement.

As I testified before the Labor Racketeering Committee last month, however, I think that such an investigation will be healthy only if it takes into account the fact that its energies are directed against the hoodlum who has appeared in the labor movement contrary to the desires of most union leaders. This is not a case of general disease but of localized infection.

The AFL–CIO's Miami statement reflects the determination of the labor movement to intensify its drive on racketeers in its ranks. Its assurance of cooperation with congressional committees augurs well for the future.

Finally, to the force being exerted by the leadership of organized labor, by Government and by public opinion, must be added the efforts of union members themselves. They must accept the responsibility which is theirs in our democracy. They must vigorously support the course charted in Miami by seeing to it that unscrupulous leaders are uprooted from their unions and cast out. The power is theirs and in the last analysis they must use it.

If I were a labor racketeer; if I were a weak labor leader who tolerates the rackets; if I were a weak employer who finds immorality profitable, I would not sleep with any comfort these days. Society's scrap heap is littered with the dishonored remains of such men. Their turn in the evolution of American labor toward ever richer promise has come. You might say, even, that these crooks have done labor a favor. For principles are made strong in the testing. Faith is made firm by conflict. Devotion to the ethical way as proclaimed by the great Popes Leo XIII and Pius XI is made firm in the struggle against those who would turn society and its elements away from the truth and the right.

Thank you.

## Representative Holt's Budget Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, February 25, 1957*

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, Benjamin Franklin said:

If you would be wealthy, think of saving as well as of getting.

Representative JOE HOLT, of California, made a comment the other day to the effect that both Senators and Representatives should look in their own backyards to see if they could not find a means of saving a little money in connection with the outlandish budget which has been presented. In view of the timeliness of his remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article on that subject which appeared in the Valley Times of San Fernando Valley, Calif., on February 13, 1957.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION: JOE HOLT'S BUDGET COMMENT

"If you would be wealthy, think of saving as well as of getting."—Benjamin Franklin.

In simple down-to-earth language, Congressman JOE HOLT has gone to the heart of the problem in the matter of the controversial budget which has been submitted—with some misgivings—by President Eisenhower to the Congress.

Writing in his newsletter, Reports From Congress, of January 28, the valley Congressman said:

"The budget is high, but I am glad the President has welcomed the cutting down of his budget by Congress. I agree with him and will be very happy in voting against many of the recommended projects.

"The blame for this high budget cannot be placed entirely at the doorstep of the White House. Every Congressman has a pet project. I am equally guilty, because we have $2 million in the budget for our Los Angeles flood-control project in the West Valley. All are for reducing the budget by eliminating projects in somebody else's congressional district.

"I do, however, believe there are places where appropriations can be reduced and eliminated and I shall vote accordingly. I shall work very hard for a tax cut for the American people. The only one we have had in recent years has been under this administration, but I believe that even with the world situation requiring top military strength, there can be a tax reduction again.

"It is the best way to stop spending—take the source of revenue away."

Mr. HOLT has put his finger on the hole in our economic and budgetary dyke with the key words, "The blame for this high budget cannot be placed entirely at the doorstep of the White House. Every Congressman has a pet project."

This is literally true. And because every Congressman has his pet project, he has to play ball with the majority of his fellow legislators—and their own pet projects—if he expects to have any chance of getting his own section of the gravy train passed for his constituents at home. And if he doesn't? Well, maybe he won't get reelected the next time around.

Now, Congressmen are just as practical as the next businessman. Most of them see it something like this. If they can bring home the bacon to their homefolks—they can likely keep their jobs. If they don't—they may be job-hunting but soon. So what would you do yourself in such a case? Wouldn't you be willing to help your fellow legislators on their legitimate problems, which incidentally required cash to be appropriated from the taxpayers, providing they were also willing to help you with your legitimate problems in return? The answer is obvious. It's teamplay that wins.

The trouble with this approach is that it somehow resembles Santa Claus. That latter whiskered old gentleman usually turns out to be Joe Doakes, himself. And Joe Doakes knows that too many legitimate requests can break the bank. Much as he may wish to honor everyone—good guy that he is—he is at last forced to the realization that what is needed in the end is self-denial of sorts for himself and his family. But where to start? And with whom? Where does self-denial and discipline commence?

## On Federal School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 25, 1957*

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, editorial notice was taken by the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal on a suggestion recently made by our esteemed colleague, OTTO PASSMAN, from the State of Louisiana.

It occurred to me that both his idea and the editorial are provocative of serious thought. The editorial follows:

ON FEDERAL SCHOOL AID

As Congress moves toward consideration of Federal taxes for building new schools there is at least one member with a better idea.

He is OTTO E. PASSMAN, a Democrat from Monroe, La. Mr. PASSMAN recently proposed lowering of Federal taxes as the best way to help finance new schools. With the Federal pressure removed, State and local taxes could be adjusted to do what needs doing.

"When you go to the Federal Government for funds, before the money can be supplied the Government must collect the taxes in the States, bring the money to Washington, and then reallocate it to the States. And in

this process the tax dollar collected shrinks by some 30 percent before it is returned to its original source," he says in asserting a truth now receiving more recognition.

It is a truth that includes the shrinkage of money collected by State taxes before it is returned to the communities where county, city, and school taxes could accomplish the same purposes better.

There is a consideration of even higher importance than efficiency in handling tax money. As Representative PASSMAN says it:

"Federal aid to education would give the Central Government in Washington control over the public schools of the Nation * * * Local self-government and local responsibility and independence would be bound, sooner or later, to disappear."

## The Overton Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 25, 1957*

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly urged, during the time which I have been privileged to represent the Fourth District of Louisiana, action on our part to promote and support the construction of the Overton Waterway in central and northwest Louisiana. I have stated and have demonstrated numerous times that water navigation is of utmost importance to the continued growth and development of the Red River Valley. This project is vital and drastically needed in this Southwest area.

There are those in Louisiana who are evidently against progress in any form. Those forces which are urging the use of the Red River for navigation purposes are actually fighting to destroy the possibility of navigation in the Red River Valley. Red River, because of the nature of its shifting banks, which constantly crumble and slough off into the river, is unstable. Stabilization of its banks and navigation of the Red River are, therefore, impossible without a vast expenditure of money. The cost of such a project of bank stabilization and the other measures necessary for navigation completely rule out the use of Red River.

I want to point out specifically that the river route is 75 miles longer than the Overton Waterway project and this fact alone will increase the costs tremendously, and would increase navigation costs up and down the river, in the event efforts are made in the future to use the river channel instead of the proposed canal. The proposed Overton Canal would be only 205 miles in length, as opposed to more than 280 miles for the Red River route, and the swift current of Red River resulting in constantly changing channels and unstable banks, requiring at least 12 locks and dams, as against only 9 needed for the Overton Waterway, definitely rule out the river itself as usable for navigation.

It it were determined to use the Red River channel for navigation, the costs would run from $200 million to $300 million, whereas the Federal costs for the Overton Waterway would be less than $100 million.

In 1945 the Army engineers studied this entire matter and came up with the report that the channel of Red River is not susceptible to modern navigation. They recommended the use of a series of bayous like Bayou Pierre, Cane River and Old River as a feasible, slack water route for water travel from the lower part of Red River to Shreveport, La.

Those forces urging a study of the use of the channel of Red River for navigation purposes, disregard the findings of the Army engineers made in 1945, which have not been seriously disputed, and are out to destroy efforts to obtain navigation in the Red River Valley. Without navigation we cannot hope to have major new industrial development at Alexandria, Natchitoches, and Shreveport.

## Small Business Selling to Big Business—Is There a Future in It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 25, 1957*

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Committee receives hundreds—I believe thousands—of letters from small-business people who have some specific and acute problem with which they need help.

The committee also receives, however, many thoughtful letters from small-business people who are not asking for help, but are advancing constructive ideas to help others. Such a letter came to me on January 29 from a small-business man in Pennsylvania. I believe that the Members will find two points of interest in this letter. First, the writer advances an idea for forming local committees of small-business people within the local civic clubs, such as the Kiwanis Club. Second, all of the advertising and all of the special studies which we receive from the big corporations about how much they purchase or subcontract from small firms conveys to us a much rosier picture about big business purchasing from small business than the small-business man encounters when he calls on the big corporate purchasing agent with catalogue and order book in hand.

I would like to insert the letter at this point and then make a few concluding remarks:

PURCHASING AGENTS VERSUS ADVERTISING DEPARTMENTS

JANUARY 28, 1957.

I am watching with interest your committee's spendid work in exploring the complex problem of small business and realize that you have a tremendous task in working out how the small-business man may continue to survive in the ever-increasing economic bigness.

We are small—with about 15 people on our payroll. We have our problems and are doing all we can in order to continue in business. It requires hard, persistent work to maintain our position in the business world.

Our main competition is in the big firms in our field. However, in some ways, the very bigness of our competition works to our advantage. Like all small business we can offer a personalized service. In fact in some of our advertising we are starting to use the slogan "Small Business Gives You Personal Service."

In fact, this type of slogan, actually followed up, can be of value to small business.

However, the one fact that I have been confronted with in my job of selling has been that of the lack of interest on the part of purchasing departments to give the small manufacturer consideration. The top officers of a large corporation will advertise, talk about, and publish the fact we do this for small business. You go to these firms that are receiving from the Government money for the products that they can best produce, and when you talk about your product and service you notice a notable lack of interest because you are small.

I feel that your committee, among many things, can do a job bringing to Government, management and the public that small business is the basic foundation of our economy and that big business is the result of small business growing greater with the passage of time. So that encouragement to small business is good business.

I feel very keenly about small business and only this week we are organizing a small-business committee in the Kiwanis Club of my hometown. We feel, that service clubs, being made up of small-business men in the main, have a common exchange of ideas that could result in worthwhile ideas that come from the grassroots.

A small-business man is a "breed unto himself," for instance, as owner of this company of mine I must be financier, traffic manager, purchasing agent, production manager, sales-manager, new product developer—yes, even janitor.

I must work with my hands and head. I must spend many, many hours reading and thinking of my business. My mind is framed with a dollar mark because my time must be spent in thinking of money from every angle.

However, I feel that small business will continue. We still have rugged people that don't want to be part of a big machine but want to get out and do something on their own—work for themselves—not beholden to anyone or corporation. They will do this despite the complex obstacles thrown in their way by current conditions.

* * * * *

Trusting that you'll find this of interest and will show that we in the small-business world are rooting for you and your efforts on our behalf, we are.

Sincerely yours.

BIG COMPANY BACK SCRATCHING

The writer of this letter points out that in contrast to all of big business' advertising about its fondness for purchasing supplies and parts from small firms, the big corporations are in reality usually not interested in the small firm's product. He hopes that some means can be found for appealing to the big corporations to be more generous in this respect. I hope that this can be done, and I believe that to a certain degree such an appeal can succeed.

There are terrific barriers, however, which the small-business man frequently does not appreciate. The fact is that a very large portion of the total volume of business transacted in the country today is buying and selling between one giant corporation and another. Frequently there is reciprocal buying between a pair of giant corporations. Take

for example the auto tire or the auto battery or other auto accessories which we might buy in the local filling station. Behind those products we find buying and selling arrangements like this: A major oil company, or a pair of major oil companies, sell the raw stock for making synthetic rubber to one of the big rubber companies. Then the oil company buys auto tires—as well as batteries and other auto accessories—from its rubber company-customer, for distribution through its retail gasoline stations. In other words, this is a packaged deal. The small-business man who makes things the rubber company makes, is wasting his time to try to sell to the oil company. And so, too, the small-business man who sells things the oil company sells is wasting his time trying to sell the rubber company.

Our business system today is riddled with arrangements of this kind, but usually these arrangements are somewhat more complex, and their outlines are not so visible to the eye of the small-business man. There are complex financial ties where one big bank or one big insurance company, is the financier of both the buyer and seller corporation ;and there are other more elaborate reciprocal buying-selling arrangements which parallel the elaborate patterns of interlocking boards of directors among the giant corporations. As arrangements of this kind spread and increase in the community, interest between and among the giant corporations becomes more closely knit and there is less and less opportunity for the small-business man. The quality of the service he offers and the price at which he can offer a product will have nothing to do with his breaking into a market like this.

SMALL BUSINESS PEOPLE SHOULD DEVELOP THEIR OWN IDEAS

As for the idea of establishing "small-business committees" within the local civic clubs, it seems to me this is both wholesome and constructive. Small-business people are extremely busy people. As this small-business man points out, in his own firm he must be "financier, traffic manager, purchasing agent, production manager, sales manager, new product developer," and "even janitor." Being busy, the small-business man does not have sufficient time to keep informed on the general economic and legislative issues which affect his well-being. Consequently, small-business committees such as have been suggested should provide an opportunity for small-business people to exchange information and discuss their problems. This kind of exchange of information and frank discussion will not find a hospitable home in some of the national business organizations such as the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce. Such get-togethers among small-business men would, then, serve a very real need for giving expression to ideas coming up from the "grass roots." In the organizations I have just mentioned, the ideas, the propaganda and the "party line" all seem to flow down from the top.

I have heard many small-business people say that the giant corporations use these organizations to propagandize the small-business man against his own interests.

I believe that the democratic processes provide our best assurance of progress, as well as our best safeguards against economic totalitarianism. Small-business people must learn to make the best uses of these processes.

## Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 25, 1957*

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the observance of Estonian Independence Day today, because Estonian Independence Day fell on Sunday, February 24, is an act of devotion to the permanence of political morality and of dedication to the future of a free Estonia, restored to her rightful sovereignty among the family of nations.

Let us keep in mind that Estonia was a free nation for 2,000 years before the first aggressive neighbor temporarily subjugated her. "Temporarily," I say, for it cannot be Estonia's destiny to remain subjugated. History proves this. Despite the tyranny of Czarist Russia for over 200 years, on February 24, 1918, Estonia declared herself "an independent, democratic republic." As many another newly born State, as our own infant United States, she was immediately compelled to fight to prove her determination to remain free. Not until German occupation forces were expelled, and a new Russian invasion repelled, was Estonia truly established, a democracy based upon a constitution which, like ours, guarantees representative government, civil rights, and civil liberties.

It is ironic to recall that the Soviet Government recognized Estonia's independence in a peace treaty signed in 1920. This was the same Soviet Government which, 19 years later, in secret negotiations with Nazi Germany, started steamrolling over Estonia by placing her, with other Baltic States, under Russia's "sphere of influence." This dangerout phrase was too soon to become a notorious synonym for overrunning a smaller country which the circumstances of war had left in helpless isolation. It became a formula for injustice by force, for enslavement by starvation.

In Estonia the repulsive pattern was set. Under the pretext of wartime necessity, at the beginning of World War II, the Soviet Government saturated the country with military establishments. A puppet government followed, never, of course, acknowledged by the United States. A second German occupation, from 1941 to 1944, repressed Estonia's desperate attempt to reestablish her independent government, but the hardships endured during this period were only the beginning. More followed the return of Soviet might in 1944.

The story has not been told in full. Estimates have been made that about 150,000 Estonians have been deported to the Soviet Union, most of them to slave-labor camps. Thousands were murdered. Other thousands simply disappeared.

So the picture looks dark, indeed, today. Estonia is a land voiceless and isolated, a Soviet military bastion, a people stripped of liberty and of economic opportunity. Nevertheless, there must be hope. This celebration of the 39th anniversary of her independence is not a vain gesture. It is our acknowledgment that we feel deeply that the Estonian people will be free again as they have been free in the past, that Estonia's spirit is alive and surging, and that in Estonia, as in every country where independence has been enshrined as the greatest treasure, there can be no other ending. It is our acknowledgment that we feel deeply that the Estonian people will be free again as they have been free in the past, that Estonia's spirit is alive and surging, and that in Estonia, as in every country where independence has been enshrined as the greatest treasure, there can be no other ending.

## Corporate Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 25, 1957*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given by me before the Management Club of the Whirlpool-Seeger Corp., in St. Joseph, Mich., February 22, 1957:

CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY

I welcome this opportunity to discuss with you some of the problems that today confront the management of our leading corporations. These problems involve social and political responsibilities, both domestic and international. They flow from the extensive economic powers now possessed by the managers of the corporations that form the foundation for our modern American society and its current prosperity.

As managers of the Whirlpool-Seeger Corp., your operations clearly involve these responsibilities. Since the merger in September 1955 of the Whirlpool Corp. and the Seeger Refrigeration Co., your organization has risen to rank 127th among all the industrial corporations of the United States. Your importance to the country is indicated by the cold statistics of the economists. With assets of $146,217,000, in 1955 you had net profits of $14,130,000 on sales that amounted to $280,363,000.

Already Whirlpool-Seeger produces by far the greatest volume of laundry appliances of anyone in the field. As your engineering and research department accomplish their projected advances in automation, there is no doubt that your organization will challenge the leaders in every segment of the home appliance industry.

The magnitude of your activities is impressive. Whirlpool-Seeger directly provides jobs for 16,000 people in 7 communities in the States of Minnesota, Ohio, Michigan, and

Indiana, and in its regional sales offices across the Nation. In addition, your organization provides the basis for the substantial operations and investment of 81 independent distributors and their employees throughout the United States.

In light of these considerations as managers of this business, I am sure you realize your responsibility not to your stockholders alone, but responsibility, as well, as trustees for the entire community affected by its activities.

Since World War II there has been extensive debate over the dangers posed to the American system of free enterprise by the industrial phenomenon commonly designated "the increasing concentration of economic power." This condition has aroused my personal interest because of my conviction that the principles of private enterprise embodied in our antitrust legislation in the main have released the essential energies underlying our industrial and technological development. The principles of private enterprise have kept us free.

As a consequence, as chairman of the House Judiciary Committee's Antitrust Subcommittee, I have conducted a number of inquiries to ascertain the degree of concentration in American business and its relationship to our political and social institutions. I think it would be well to summarize some of the outstanding observations that have been made about the corporate structure and the nature of competition that typify our present economy.

The extent of economic concentration of power may be very briefly stated. Prof. M. A. Adelman, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in his 1951 study indicated that 135 corporations own 45 percent of the industrial assets of the United States. This is nearly one-fourth of the manufacturing volume of the entire world.

Although there is dispute about the rate of increase in concentration, everyone agrees that the top corporations control a growing percentage of American business life. This is indicated by the fact that at the end of 1952, corporations with more than $100 million in assets had 52 percent of all assets of manufacturing corporations. By the middle of 1955, 57 percent of these assets were held by corporations of this size.

The extent of industrial concentration is perhaps most graphically expressed by the following: At the present time 3 companies make more than 90 percent of all our silk; 3 companies make over 95 percent of our tin cans and tinware; 3 companies make 90 percent of our linoleum. Three corporate organizations dominate the production of cigarettes, aluminum, whisky, and automobiles.

My good friend Adolf A. Berle, professor at Columbia University, in his book The 20th Century Capitalist Revolution (published in 1954), directed attention to the outstanding characteristic of the modern American corporate economy. He stated, "A pattern has emerged, that we may christen the concentrate," a pattern that covers roughly 70 percent of all American business. It is the situation where a few large corporations dominate the trade in their industry.

Professor Berle described this characteristic to our Antitrust Subcommittee as follows: "In industry you find a standard pattern of not less than 2, nor more than 5, large corporations which have 50 percent or more of the volume of that industry between them." The remainder is divided among small firms that must necessarily live under conditions established by the "big two," the "big three," or the "big five." This pattern, Mr. Berle said, "* * * is typical of more than half of American industry, and the most important half."

Moreover, the economic power of the large companies in the concentrate is not fully revealed by a study limited to consideration of the assets they actually own. The ability of the large corporation to direct economic activity and to make decisions transcends the area of the plants and facilities it owns.

In the automobile industry, for example, the power of the big three manufacturers extends to their franchise dealers, who themselves have investments greater than $5 billion and employ more than 600,000 people. Although nominally "independent," their policies, operations, and for all practical purposes their prices, are determined by their supplying manufacturer. The same extension of the concentrate's power to peripheral relationships exists in other industries that distribute through dealers, as, for instance gasoline retailing and farm implement distribution.

It is immediately apparent that one result of corporate growth during the last 60 years, is that American private free enterprise no longer resembles the classic system where numerous sellers competed on equal terms in a free market composed of equally numerous buyers. The picture presented by our economic system now is one where the American community depends upon the operations of a relatively few very large corporations. It is a picture that shows the basic industries that support our business life have become concentrated in the hands of an extremely small number of powerful units.

Significant changes in the nature of competition have accompanied the development of the concentrate structure of American industry. First, competition no longer takes the form of vigorous price rivalry. It has been superseded by acceptance of a situation in which pricing is no longer the primary factor.

In industries where the "concentrate" prevails, there appears to be a "follow the leader" policy in pricing. Each member of the industry, both the large and small concerns, individually elects to follow the policy of not changing prices until the "leader" changes his prices. Price movements of the leader are followed almost automatically.

This condition is difficult to correct under the antitrust laws. If the Government can establish the existence of an actual agreement or tacit agreement among the companies in the industry to adhere to or to follow the prices of the market leader, then the companies can be charged with a conspiracy or combination to restrain trade. In most instances, however, evidence is not to be found of an actual agreement and the courts have been reluctant to infer the existence of conspiracy in the absence of some direct evidence of an agreement.

This is one of the problems of concentration that has plagued antitrust enforcement officials since the war. In all probability the absence of price competition often results from recognition of the mutual hazards of a price war among the members rather than from an "agreement" to adhere to the pricing system that exists.

A result of the development of the "concentrate" has been to reduce competition to a struggle for power, to balance supply against demand rather than to secure additional customers by price competition. This type of competition requires industry to create elaborate planning organizations that can predict the future market conditions, needed to permit a planned production that can be disposed of at anticipated prices. And I stress the word "anticipated."

In many industries the drive for stability in supply has resulted in direct Government participation in basic production decisions. In the oil industry, for example, supply is limited by State regulatory bodies on the basis of demand estimates prepared in the Federal Bureau of Mines from information obtained from importing and purchasing oil companies. In the sugar industry, the same result is accomplished by the Secretary of Agriculture limiting sugar imports to his estimate of the future market. Planning for stability in supply by means of Government instrumentalities now is accomplished in vast areas of the American economy. To name but a few of these areas, in addition to oil and sugar, there are: banks and banking, railroads and trucks, electric light and power, radio and television, shipping, meat products, aviation transport, and aircraft production.

Professor Berle noted this phenomenon of planned supply with the following comment:

"In greater or less degree, the practice of national industrial planning is now familiar throughout great areas of the 20th century capitalist system. Participation in it is frequently a function, and in any case an occupational hazard, of the management of large corporations."

Planning any substantial part of the economy has significant implications. In the first place, planning does not reduce power, it increases it. More important, in the hands of the people who do the planning rests the future course of our economy. It is they, as far as is humanly possible, who will determine the level of prosperity, the nature of social organization, and the artistic and moral values that society shall reward.

Concurrently with the increase in concentration there has been a removal of many of the outside checks upon the routine business decisions made by corporate officers. No longer does management have to submit its past record and its projected operations to the judgment of the market place in order to secure needed capital. Major corporations in most instances now do not seek capital. They form it themselves.

According to a 1953 study made by the economists of the National City Bank, an aggregate of $150 billions was spent by all businesses in the United States for capital expenditures to enlarge corporate plant and equipment in the period 1946–53. Sixty-four percent came from internal sources, i. e., retained earnings and reserves set aside for depreciation, depletion, and amortization.

The remaining 36 percent was divided among the following groups: 18 percent was raised by current borrowing chiefly, bank credit; 12 percent was raised by issue of bonds and notes, half of which was privately placed rather than disposed of through the capital market and, only 6 percent of the total $150 billion was raised by issue of stock.

The private investor, who determined the use to be made of capital, gave capitalism its name. His function in large measure has vanished as the determinative force in corporate decisions. Direction formerly supplied by the sum of the investor's decisions in the capital markets have been replaced by corporate boards of directors. These, in practice have tended to become small self-perpetuating oligarchies. The only substantial control that limits and guides their economic and social action is their philosophy and their assessment of future public reaction. Perhaps, that is why the public relations divisions loom so large today in the corporation setup.

In broad outline, the features we have been discussing are the outstanding characteristics of our present American economy. It is clear that the powers now possessed by the "concentrate" corporations impose impressive responsibilities to the public.

Participation in industrial planning, by necessity nationwide and frequently international in scope, involve decisions much broader in range than the specialized functions of running their businesses. Their obligations involve assurances that conditions will prevail for employment of vast numbers of people. The goods and services they decide to provide, the manner in which they are marketed, the employment conditions they create, and the plants they build, all exert widespread influences on the framework of community life. Their decisions

with regard to expenditures in pure research, and their support to educational institutions lead and shape the content of the future. In apportioning capital expenditures, they direct the continued growth of one section of the country as against another. Decisions to move plant and equipment may make ghost towns of the communities from which they withdraw.

Decisions of their personnel offices in security matters determine the ability of the individual worker to earn his livelihood. Unwisely applied they may deprive him unjustly of his rightful place in the community.

In their international operations, large corporations have developed relationships to the other countries that rise to the stature of treaties between governments. In its operations, the international corporation directly affects the amount of foreign exchange brought into or taken away from the foreign country, and in small countries this materially affects the position of its own currency. Expansion of its activities in a small country may affect materially the level of employment and the level of wages. The taxes it pays frequently are a major item in the country's revenue.

In a word, the corporation cannot disassociate its activities from the policies of the countries in which it trades. Moreover, decisions in foreign operations of necessity must be accommodated to the overriding policies of the United States Government in that area.

The concentration of economic power into a relatively few corporations brings continual pressure for increased Government action in the industry. When corporate management has failed to act responsibly in its relationships to the community, eventually an aroused public opinion forces the Government to step in.

A notable example of this Government-business relationship is found in the legislation enacted by Congress last year to readjust the bargaining position of franchise automobile dealers to their automobile manufacturers. This legislation was a direct result of the concentration of economic power in the automobile manufacturing industry and the widespread abuse by manufacturers of their superior position with respect to their dealers.

Implicit in this legislation is the conclusion that in the automobile industry concentration of economic power had resulted in conditions where traditional concepts of contract law no longer were adequate. The bill also was a recognition that the antitrust laws were not adequate to cope with concentration in this instance.

The "auto dealers day in court bill," in essense, affords a dealer an opportunity to secure a judicial determination, irrespective of the terms of his contract, as to whether the manufacturer failed to act in good faith in performing the provisions of his franchise or in canceling, terminating, or not renewing his franchise. In addition to the provisions of any contract, in its definition of "good faith," the bill imposed a duty on each party to act in a fair and equitable manner toward each other, so as to guarantee freedom from coercion, intimidation, or threats of coercion or intimidation.

This type of legislation constitutes a new departure in adjusting corporate powers. It necessarily is an experiment and may not apply to other corporate areas. Its significance is the demonstration that an aroused public will require the Government to step in and adjust situations where corporate powers are not exercised in a responsible manner.

Possibly, the greatest danger that accompanies the concentration of corporate power in the United States is to our political institutions. If the power is used unwisely and fails to keep the public substantially satisfied, it unavoidably will lead to some form of State socialism with excessive Governmental control over the lives of individuals. Such extensive Government supervision and regulation is not in the heritage of the American people, and I am convinced is not the desire of the American people.

In this connection, it is significant that, because of the difficulties surrounding attempts to correct abuses by means of antitrust laws, some advocates advance alternative proposals for dealing with the problem of concentration. These alternative methods invariably call for an increase in the Federal Government's supervision and regulation over economic behavior.

Prof. Louis B. Schwartz, professor of law, University of Pennsylvania, for example, recommended to the Antitrust Subcommittee the creation of a "free enterprise commission" to take over the anti-monopoly functions of the Federal Trade Commission. Such a commission would have the power by regulation to define and prohibit anti-competitive practices and to prohibit integration and merger unless specifically approved. The commission would also have the power to compel reorganization of large enterprises in order to reestablish competition, as well as other broad regulatory powers over the economy.

Other witnesses before the Antitrust Subcommittee have recommended enactment of legislation comparable to the Public Utilities Holding Company Act. Legislation of this type would empower agencies of the Government to compel, in appropriate instances, the dissolution of the giants in the economy and the creation of smaller economic units.

Whether concentration has progressed to the degree that requires such far-reaching proposals is at this time highly debatable. I would much prefer that the solution to the problem of concentration be reached within the basic framework of our existing antitrust legislation. I am reluctant to have imposed additional Government supervisory over the economy unless the growth of large scale firms and the misuse of their powers preclude any other solution for adequate protection to the public. Unless corporate management, however, discharges its responsibilities so that the public continues to be substantially satisfied, there is real danger that existing corporate concentration could result in a far greater degree of Government control over business than it has today.

The petroleum industry illustrates many of the characteristics of the modern economy that we have been discussing. It also provides numerous examples of abuse by corporate leaders of their responsibilities to the public.

Structurally, the industry is composed of 20 fully integrated large concerns under the general hegemony of 5 companies that operate both domestically and internationally. The big five in the oil industry, Standard Oil Company (New Jersey), Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., Gulf Oil Corp., the Texas Co., and Standard Oil Company of California, in terms of assets rank No. 1, 6, 8, 9, and 11, respectively, among American industrial organizations.

The Government has granted many benefits to the petroleum industry. I have already discussed the Government's activities in stabilizing supply with the industry's estimate of the future demand for their products. In addition, the industry receives unique favors under the income-tax laws of the United States. These special tax benefits, granted to encourage explorations and development amount to a virtual Government subsidy to the industry. I refer to the 27½ percent depletion allowance in the production of oil and its corollary, the privilege of writing off completely all drilling and development costs.

These benefits amount to a double deduction with respect to the same capital investment and, in addition, the depletion allowance goes on indefinitely. It does not end when 100 percent is reached as in the case of depreciation.

In companies that are engaged only in the production of oil, these benefits are substantial. The January 1946 issue of Fortune magazine described Amerada Petroleum Co.'s tax benefits as follows:

"Amerada's tax situation is a businessman's dream. The corporation quite literally does not have to pay any Federal income tax if it does not want to. This is due to the highly reasonable provisions of the internal-revenue law designed for producers of crude oil. Amerada pays so little in Federal income taxes that it does not even segregate the tax item in its annual reports. In wartime, though Amerada's profits soared, it made no provision for excess-profits taxes, and from 1943 to 1944 its normal Federal income tax actually declined. In 1944, on a gross of $26 million, a gross profit of $17 million and a net after all charges of $5 million, Amerada's allowance for its Federal income tax was only $200,000."

Even among the integrated companies the depletion allowance and the drilling write-off are significant in their operations. Humble Oil & Refining Co., a company owned by Standard Oil Company of New Jersey is integrated to a certain extent, and it distributes about one-sixth of the products of Texas. Its own operations make it a big crude-oil producer. According to the record before the antitrust subcommittee, in 1952, Humble Oil & Refining Co. made net income after taxes and expenses of $145,292,144, and paid Federal income taxes of $30,500,000. In that year it took a depletion allowance of $88,488,000. For tax purposes it wrote off another $63,044,110, in intangible drilling costs.

In addition to production controls and tax benefits, the Government virtually permits the petroleum industry in times of emergency to conduct its own affairs. This is accomplished by the industry staffing the Government agencies responsible for its performance. The Government agency then works through a myriad of committees composed of oil company officials. These committees provide most of the coordination and undertake the joint activities desired by the Government.

At the height of World War II in 1943, the Petroleum Administration for War in the Department of the Interior was staffed in its important positions by oil company executives serving on a without-compensation basis. The Petroleum Administration for War discharged its responsibilities through 155 industry committees with 1,635 members, of whom 1,136 were officials and employees of the major oil companies.

The same type of committee activity was invoked during the Korean emergency; it was used to resolve the crisis in the industry that occurred when Iran nationalized the concession of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co.; and it is currently being used as a device to resolve the crisis posed by Egyptian seizure of the Suez Canal. It is significant in all these joint activities the industry asks for, and obtains, immunity from the antitrust laws.

Despite these special favors granted to the petroleum industry, the record of the industry discloses notable abuses of corporate power. A series of actions that started with corruption of Government officials in the famed Teapot Dome scandal and extend to the industry's 1955 effort to influence enactment of natural gas legislation had made "oil" synonymous with corporate irresponsibility in both political and public opinion.

During World War II, the relationship of our leading oil firm, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) with the I. G. Farben cartel stimulated severe criticism of the industry. Hearings conducted in the Senate disclosed that

this company's relationship with I. G. Farben over a 13-year period had stifled synthetic rubber production in America and had put control over that vital defense product in the hands of the German Government. In addition, Thurman Arnold, then Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, testified that as late as February and March 1941, Jersey Standard had sold gasoline and enabled Axis airlines operating out of South America to defeat the British blockade. Indignation over these disclosures caused the then Senator Harry S Truman to remark "I think this approaches treason." [1]

An aroused public after these hearings required Jersey Standard to relieve the principal officer involved from his duties in the company.

Another example of oil industry officials' failure to act responsibly is found in the remarks of Mr. P. C. Spencer, president of the Sinclair Oil Corp., at a meeting of the National Petroleum Council on September 29, 1953. On that occasion Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, had requested the Secretary of Interior, Douglas McKay, to explore with the oil industry construction of standby pipeline facilities that would be required in the event of an emergency. In his request, Mr. Flemming noted "* * * it is apparent that timely provisions of this additional capacity could not be achieved, if construction were to be deferred until after the emergency arose." [2]

Mr. Flemming's request was presented to the National Petroleum Council, whereupon Mr. Spencer opposed the construction of standby pipeline facilities. He stated:

"Surpluses not properly handled or controlled are an anathema, because they have a way of destroying price structures, they have a way of breaking down progress, and they can destroy an industry. It certainly would be a tragedy, gentlemen, to attempt to protect our national security by building up standby facilities which in the end make the industry so feeble it could not do the job in any event.

"I am talking particularly here about standby pipeline facilities. It applies with equal force to standby tanker facilities, standby refining facilities, standby storage, and, if you please, standby production. It applies all through the line." [3]

As to his solution for the maintenance of a proper mobilization base, Mr. Spencer said:

"I am a rank amateur as a strategist in war or logistics, but it seems to me, perhaps somebody told me, that the greatest cushion in the world for petroleum reserves is in the elasticity of and the flexibility of civilian demand. Take it away from them, if we are going to have a war. * * * We have tried to make war too comfortable and too convenient for civilians. * * * War should be tough. We should cut back the civilian demand. I think that is the greatest reserve cushion we have." [4]

It is submitted that these statements hardly reflect the requisite degree of corporate responsibility for the problems of the American public.

Currently, the Senate is again investigating the petroleum industry in connection with the actions the industry has taken to resolve the crisis presented by closure of the Suez Canal. In this instance, it appears that the oil industry has again acted with a view toward corporate profits rather than the welfare of the American public. At a time when stocks of gasoline were at alltime highs, the industry used the Suez crisis as an excuse to impose additional price increases. As of February 8, 1957, the industry had nearly 200 million barrels of gasoline in stocks. This was an increase of nearly 4 million barrels over the preceding week and 12 million barrels over the stocks in storage a year ago. It now develops that the crisis presented by the Suez shutdown was not as extensive as originally feared. In fact, there is a widespread belief that the public relations campaign surrounding the seriousness of the crisis were based in large part upon recommendations made by the major oil companies in order to justify an increase in crude petroleum prices.

In conclusion, I think you will all agree that the problems presented by the existing concentration in American industry are most intricate.

Let no one doubt that benefits from our existing corporate structure are substantial. I believe it is fair to say that the United States as a community has profited mightily in the development of our current corporate economic structure. The system of large scale distribution and mass production made possible by these large institutions can fairly claim the credit for changing the face of our country for the better. As a result, poverty, in the sense it is understood elsewhere in the world, in America has been reduced to minimal proportions.

The most dramatic social revolution in history has occurred through natural growth and without the bitter divisions that have darkened the political life of other nations. It gave the lie to Karl Marx.

All to the good, but the good must not be diminished. Unless the powers that have been concentrated in corporate management are exercised prudently and with vision, it is apparent that this concentration will force the Government to take action and direct the complex itself, and freedom will be the price we pay.

I am convinced that it is essential to maintain in full vigor enforcement of the antitrust laws to cope with these problems even though in some respects results have not been satisfactory. Change must be made slowly. The problem presented by existing concentrates are of such gravity that precipitous action by the Government on any particular phase would be unwise. Tinkering with the economic process without full comprehension of the results likely to ensue, could create more problems than are solved.

We must hope the determination of the type of economic life of and the nature of political institutions which are to be enjoyed by the American people in the future, rests in the hands of those who understand freedom best.

[1] Hearings, Current Antitrust Problems, vol. 2, House Antitrust Subcommittee, 84th Cong., 1st sess., p. 755.

[2] Hearings, WOC's and Advisory Groups, pt. 4, House Antitrust Subcommittee, 84th Cong., 2d sess., p. 2636.

[3] Ibid., p. 2640.

[4] Ibid., p. 2640.

# SENATE

## TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1957

Rev. R. L. Clem, rector of St. John's Military School, Salina, Kans., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, Thou who hast so richly blessed this Nation, we thank Thee for the heritage that is ours. Grant that Thy people everywhere may have the grace to understand what is Thy will, and the strength and determination to fulfill Thy purpose for us. Lift us, we beseech Thee, above all selfishness. Keep our hearts in confident trust. Make us reverent in the use of our freedom, and deepen within us our faith and righteousness.

We invoke Thy blessing upon this body here assembled, that they may rise to high levels of devotion and service to the benefit of all people and to Thy honor and glory. This we pray in Christ's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 25, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Olin Hatfield Chilson, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of the Interior, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Gore | Morton |
| Allott | Green | Mundt |
| Anderson | Hayden | Murray |
| Barrett | Hennings | Neely |
| Beall | Hickenlooper | Neuberger |
| Bennett | Hill | O'Mahoney |
| Bible | Holland | Pastore |
| Blakley | Hruska | Payne |
| Bricker | Humphrey | Potter |
| Bush | Ives | Purtell |
| Butler | Jackson | Revercomb |
| Byrd | Javits | Robertson |
| Capehart | Jenner | Russell |
| Carlson | Johnson, Tex. | Saltonstall |
| Carroll | Johnston, S. C. | Schoeppel |
| Case, N. J. | Kefauver | Scott |
| Case, S. Dak. | Kennedy | Smathers |
| Chavez | Kerr | Smith, Maine |
| Church | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Clark | Kuchel | Sparkman |
| Cooper | Lausche | Stennis |
| Cotton | Long | Symington |
| Dirksen | Magnuson | Talmadge |
| Douglas | Malone | Thurmond |
| Dworshak | Mansfield | Thye |
| Eastland | Martin, Iowa | Watkins |
| Ellender | McCarthy | Wiley |
| Ervin | McClellan | Williams |
| Flanders | McNamara | Young |
| Frear | Monroney | |
| Goldwater | Morse | |

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent on official business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO LIMIT DEBATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have asked for a quorum call in order that all Senators might be on notice with respect to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement which I suggested yesterday, and which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 2495.

I ask that the clerk read the agreement, and I now propose it, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] and myself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

*Ordered*, That, effective on Thursday, February 28, 1957, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 60 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said joint resolution shall be received.

*Ordered further*, That if and when the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, whether or not amended, is agreed to, the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services jointly shall be deemed to be discharged from the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 117, the companion House measure; that said joint resolution shall be deemed to be amended by striking out all after the resolving clause and in lieu thereof inserting the text of Senate Joint Resolution 19 as amended; and that the amendment to the said House joint resolution shall be deemed to have been engrossed and the joint resolution shall then be read the third time.

*Ordered further*, That on the question of the final passage of the said joint resolution debate shall be limited to 8 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the joint resolution, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are three things which I should like to point out for the information of the Senate.

First, if this agreement should be entered into, it would not become effective until Thursday.

Second, 1 hour is provided for each amendment, 30 minutes to a side.

Third, a total of 8 hours is provided on the joint resolution. Any of that time can be yielded on amendments if Senators so desire.

I hope every Member of the Senate will give this proposal serious consideration. I am not claiming it is perfect. It is open to adjustments if Senators feel that it is necessary to increase the time or reduce the time. I hope we may be able to remain in session a little later, work a little longer, and conduct our business a little more efficiently, so that perhaps we may reach a vote this week.

If we do not get a unanimous consent agreement, and if we are unable to reach a vote through the normal processes, it may be necessary to have a Saturday session. I do not like to ask Senators to attend a session of the Senate on Saturday, when they have so much work in their offices and so many other duties to attend to; but this is an important matter. It has been before the Senate for a substantial length of time. Senators have been accorded great opportunity to express themselves.

The Senate will remain in session as late as Senators may desire this evening, tomorrow evening, and the remainder of the week.

I appeal to my colleagues seriously to consider the suggestions which the leaders have made. If they feel that they cannot go along with us at this time, I hope they will make some constructive alternative suggestions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I have listened very carefully to the debate during the past week. It seems to me that the debate has been very spirited. Many Senators are beginning to come out from behind the brush.

I was very much interested in listening to the speech yesterday by the able junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE].

I believe that further debate is necessary. I myself have awaited my turn. As I recall, I told the majority leader that I would like to speak on Thursday. It is not important when. However, I think it is unwise to limit debate at this time, when it seems to me we are just beginning to get some of the answers. I object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas is always eager to accommodate his friend from Nevada. I wonder whether he would be willing to withhold his objection for the time being so that perhaps we may reach some modifications in the proposed unanimous-consent agreement which would suit his convenience and in that way permit us to obtain an agreement; or does the Senator feel that we should not enter into any agreement at this time?

Mr. MALONE. I think it is a very laudable ambition of the distinguished majority leader, who has always shown himself cooperative with all Members of the Senate, on both sides of the aisle on every subject; however, at this time I would have to object.

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of the usual routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may I have the question stated?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield, Mr. President, and I ask unanimous consent that the time I yield to the Senator from Oregon not be charged to my 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assume the Senator from Oregon wishes to speak on the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MORSE. I will accommodate myself to even less than 3 minutes. However, I believe, in view of the fact that the majority leader, on behalf of himself and the minority leader, has raised a procedural matter in connection with the unanimous-consent agreement, it may be well that I speak on that subject now. I may say that other Senators also hold the point of view expressed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

I think it might be well to get it out of our system at this time, and therefore, I should like to make some observations on the procedural point raised by the majority leader, if I may be permitted to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no desire to foreclose any discussion of the subject. I have some statements I should like to make under the 3-minute rule. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that I may yield to the SENATOR for not to exceed 3 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I will not take 3 minutes.

I am glad the Senator from Nevada objected, because I would have been one of the other Senators who would have objected if he had not done so. The Senator from Nevada and I are not alone in taking this position. There are a considerable number of us who feel that debate on this subject should not be limited. However, I wish to address myself to the whole matter of unanimous-consent agreements to limit debate in the Senate.

I have been making a study of the subject. I wish to say most respectfully that I believe we are moving too far away from the regular order of business in the Senate. I believe we have gone too

far already, as a matter of general practice, in not transacting business in the Senate without unanimous-consent agreements limiting debate and fixing time for voting. I believe it is a very bad procedural practice, and it ought to be brought to an end, not only with respect to the pending joint resolution, but with respect to all other items of business; and I intend to do that in this session of Congress. That should be the procedure followed, except when it is absolutely necessary to limit debate.

I believe that the place for Senators to be is in the Senate Chamber listening to debate. Each one of us knows what happens when we accept a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate and to vote at a fixed time. Senators go about their business, instead of attending to the business on the floor of the Senate. I do not think that is in keeping with the functions of this body. The whole practice of transacting business, by and large, primarily by way of unanimous-consent agreements is bad practice, and I am not going to support it in this session of Congress. I am particularly not going to support it with respect to the pending joint resolution. I think much debate still needs to be had on it. All one need do is to watch one's mail to find out what is happening to American public opinion as more and more people comprehend what is involved in this very dangerous resolution proposed by the Eisenhower administration, so far as the Middle East foreign policy is concerned.

I happen to believe that no resolution on the Middle East policy ought to be adopted until some of the pending disputes in the Middle East, which threaten peace in the Middle East, are resolved.

Furthermore, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] pointed out yesterday, we ought to know what the economic program of this administration is with respect to specific projects that are going to be supported by the money for which the President is asking. We should have full debate on the whole question.

The regular rules of the Senate take care of the situation. If no Senator is prepared to discuss the pending question, or wants to discuss it, the discussion is stopped, and the Senate votes. What is wrong with that?

So far as the majority leader's suggestion is concerned that we sit longer hours, I can only say that in this delightful brotherhood we enjoy each other's company. I do not mind spending evenings with my colleagues, and I assume that is the fraternal spirit that moves my colleagues. Therefore I have no objection to spending evenings and even Saturdays in the Senate. That suggestion does not disturb me.

What disturbs me, Mr. President, is that we are creating a pattern by which the business of the Senate is coming to be transacted almost entirely or certainly in many instances by unanimous-consent agreements limiting debate. I do not believe that is in keeping with the true parliamentary functions of the Senate. Therefore, as a matter of policy, Mr. President, I am against it; and in this session of the Senate I will not give unanimous consent to limit the debate, except on very rare occasions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I believe my colleagues are on notice that it is impossible to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement at this stage of the game, and perhaps even later, so far as the pending resolution is concerned.

I should like to point out to all my colleagues, however, that when debate ceases, the joint resolution will be open to amendment; the Chair will put the question, and, unless Senators are here to express themselves, as they were not here last week, a vote may be taken on this very important measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is now in order.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ENTITLED "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT ACTION REPORT"

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of that Department entitled "Research and Development Procurement Action Report," covering the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTION OF ALASKA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior transmitting an original copy of the proposed Constitution of Alaska (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to restrict its application in certain overseas areas, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Two resolutions of the Senate of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Finance:

"The Social Security Act has been extended so as to provide benefits for totally disabled persons who are over the age of 50 years.

"The law as written is difficult to interpret and administer and the few persons who come within its general scope are unsuccessful in obtaining benefits.

"The humanitarianism of the law cannot be questioned and if practicable and possible, should be clarified and made less stringent so that worthy totally disabled persons over 50 years of age can obtain benefits it affords: Therefore be it

*"Resolved*, That the Senate of Pennsylvania memorialize Congress to clarify the existing provisions and further, to relax the strict requirements of the Federal social security law that relates to eligibility for benefits for totally disabled persons over the age of 50 years; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

"I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution introduced by Senators W. J. Lane, James S. Berger, and John H. Dent and adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania the 12th day of February, 1957.

"A. H. LETZLER,
*"Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania."*

---

"The impending cessation of operations of the Vesta Coal Mine, a subsidiary of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., in the borough of California, in Washington County, Pa., will rapidly increase unemployment in surrounding communities located in Washington, Greene, and Fayette Counties.

"Unemployment and consequent hardship in these three counties is of vital concern to the people of this entire Commonwealth. The economic dislocation of any large area within this Commonwealth has its repercussions throughout the entire State, and affects the economic well-being of the entire State as well as arousing the humanitarian instincts and sympathetic concern for fellow Pennsylvanians in their hour of need and duress. Economic need and want vitally effects not only adults, but many helpless children who will feel the want of proper food, clothing, housing, and medical facilities, and should the economic dislocation continue for a long period of time, the want of proper educational facilities through lack of teachers and buildings.

"Government should be concerned with helping areas with serious economic difficulties through aiding business and any type of productive economic enterprise to locate in the suffering areas.

"Washington, Greene, and Fayette Counties have a large, skillful, and willing labor force which has proven its desire in the past to produce the essential products of our modern economy. The tax structures in these three counties are favorable to business, and many industrial sites are available to manufacturing enterprises and other business activities which care to locate in communities where the public and its leadership will lend the utmost cooperation in establishing an atmosphere favorable to the establishment and growth of business: Therefore be it

*"Resolved*, That the Senate of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to make a thorough study of the possibility of locating Government subsidized industries in Washington, Greene, and Fayette Counties, and to take into consideration the huge labor pools available, as well as the large number of available industrial sites and favorable tax structures existing in these three counties; and be it further

*"Resolved* That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

"I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution introduced by Senators W. J. Lane, Thomas J. Kalman, Rowland B. Mahany, Frank Kopriver, Jr., Joseph M. Barr, and John H. Dent, and adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania the 18th day of February 1957.

"A. H. LETZLER,
*"Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania."*

A letter in the nature of a petition from the junior class of the Morganza, La., High School, relating to portions of Washington's Farewell Address; ordered to lie on the table.

## RESOLUTION OF TEXAS STATE SENATE

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Texas and majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Texas.

This resolution urges the President of the United States to take immediate steps to limit the importation of foreign oil to the 1954 percentage of the domestic market, as recommended by the President's own advisory committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 126

Whereas the President of the United States has called upon oil producers and proration boards to consider where our long-term interests are with reference to current oil production, thereby implying some failure on the part of such producers or State regulatory boards to consider the public interest in their actions; and

Whereas the Railroad Commission of Texas is required by the laws of this State to promote sound conservation practices and prevent waste of irreplaceable natural resources; and

Whereas the inability of Texas to produce and transport more oil without waste has resulted from the continued and constantly increasing excessive importing of foreign oil into this country; and

Whereas the oil lift to Europe can succeed if members of the Middle East Emergency Committee, made up of international companies given Federal antitrust immunity, were required to (1) divert their excessive imports to Europe, (2) reduce refinery runs to free crude oil for export, or (3) change their refinery yields to produce needed fuel oils; and

Whereas the National Congress has authorized the President and the executive department by the Trade Agreements Act of 1955 to limit foreign oil to its 1954 percentage of the domestic market; and

Whereas the executive department has failed to take any positive action to secure such limitation, allowing such imports to rise from 16.6 percent in 1954 to over 20 percent at the present time, thus curtailing the ability of Texas producers to produce and market, finance new discoveries, or transport new domestic supplies of oil from the interior to the seaboard; and

Whereas over 1 million barrels per day of potential Texas production cannot be transported to the gulf coast due to lack of transportation resulting from excessive importing, not only limiting the amount of oil available for Europe but endangering the future national security: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas,* That the President of the United States be urged to take immediate steps to limit imports of foreign oil to their 1954 percentage of the domestic market as authorized by the Congress and required for the security of the United States; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and to each Member of Congress from Texas.

BEN RAMSEY,
*President of the Senate.*

I hereby certify that the above resolution was adopted by the senate on February 13, 1957.

CHARLES SCHNABEL,
*Secretary of the Senate.*

## INCREASE IN OIL PRICES—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present a resolution from the Shevlin Copley Farmers Union Local, of Bagley, Minn., opposing recent increases in oil prices.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 20, 1957.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Whereas there is an investigation being conducted in regard to the raise in the price of gas and fuel oil to consumers in the United States; and

Whereas we can see no reason for a raise in price just because oil is being exported in huge quantities, and as we farmers are taking less and less for what we have to market; and

Whereas the big oil companies apparently influence to a great extent the doings of the Congress of the United States: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That we, the members of the Shevlin Copley Farmers Union Local No. 341, go on record as opposed to the recent raise in price and any further raise under present conditions in the price of gasoline and fuel oil or like commodities.

MRS. OSCAR KVANDE, *Secretary.*

## BROADER COVERAGE OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION—PETITION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have just received a letter from Local 337 of the United Garment Workers of America, of New Ulm, Minn., embodying a petition concerning broader coverage of unemployment compensation.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED GARMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA,
LOCAL NO. 337,
*New Ulm, Minn., February 18, 1957.*

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
*State Capitol Building,*
*St. Paul, Minn.*

DEAR SENATOR: We, of Local 337, Garment Workers of America, are for increased benefits in unemployment compensation. We believe there should be broadened coverage. We favor the elimination of unfair disqualifications.

Gratefully yours,

LEONA AUSTAD,
*Recording Secretary.*

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

C. Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State, vice Herbert V. Prochnow;

G. Frederick Reinhardt, of California, to be Counselor of the Department of State, vice Douglas MacArthur 2d; and

Walter K. Schwinn, of Connecticut, and sundry other persons, for appointment and promotion in the Foreign Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Hyde Gillette, of Illinois; to be an Assistant Postmaster General, vice Albert J. Robertson;

John M. McKibbin, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Postmaster General, vice Norman R. Abrams; and

Sixty-two postmasters.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1370. A bill for the relief of Wanda Wawrzyczek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 1371. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Vinci; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1372. A bill to waive any claims of the United States for the repayment of loans made by the Department of State to Harry H. Thomas and Jeanne A. Thomas; and

S. 1373. A bill for the relief of Noel Kaiser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1374. A bill for the relief of Marie Frittmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL (by request):

S. 1375. A bill for the relief of Sheldon J. Coffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1376. A bill for the relief of Chong You How (also known as Edward Charles Yee), his wife, Eng Lai Fong, and his child, Chong Yim Keung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. MORTON):

S. 1377. A bill to remove inequities created by, and to avoid discrimination resulting from, administrative practices and enforcement of the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 1378. A bill to provide for modification of the existing project for Chefuncte River and Bogue Falia, La.; and

S. 1379. A bill to modify and extend the project for Lake Pontchartrain, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1380. A bill to authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes;

S. 1381. A bill to amend section 402 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide more definite standards for determining who is entitled to exemption from part IV of that act as an association of shippers or a shippers' agent;

S. 1382. A bill to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended;

S. 1383. A bill to amend section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to require freight forwarders to obtain certificates of public convenience and necessity;

S. 1384. A bill to revise the definition of contract carrier by motor vehicle as set forth in section 203 (a) (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes;

S. 1385. A bill to amend section 11 of the Clayton Antitrust Act to extend the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission thereunder to contract carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; and

S. 1386. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of

power or train brakes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1387. A bill for the relief of Rebecca Jean Lundy (Helen Choy); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1388. A bill to allow credit or refund of gift tax erroneously paid by reason of treating nontaxable divisions of community property as gifts; and

S. 1389. A bill relating to the income-tax basis, in the hands of a surviving spouse, of certain property previously held as community property; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1390. A bill for the relief of Roberto Mario Bettinzoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 1391. A bill to repeal the act of February 18, 1896, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1392. A bill to provide for increasing the storage capacity of the Bumping Lake Reservoir, Yakima River Basin, Wash.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. IVES, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1393. A bill to authorize the National Potato Grade Labeling Act, which provides quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mrs. SMITH of Maine when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 1394. A bill to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System established by the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 814), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1395. A bill to amend section 9 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, relating to computation of annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 1396. A bill to amend section 6 of the act approved July 10, 1890 (26 Stat. 222), relating to the admission into the Union of the State of Wyoming by providing for the use of public lands granted to said State for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishing, equipment, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 1397. A bill for the relief of Angeline Mastro Mone (Angelina Mastroianni); and

S. 1398. A bill for the relief of Anna M. Spinelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 1399. A bill for the relief of Allart Dirk Haverkamp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1400. A bill authorizing the construction of local flood-protection works on the Mississippi River at St. Paul and South St. Paul, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

## PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT STUDY ENTITLED "THE RIGHT TO BUY AND ITS DENIAL TO SMALL BUSINESS"

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 105), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That there be printed as a Senate document a study on "The Right To Buy and Its Denial to Small Business," prepared for the Senate Select Committee on Small Business by Dr. Vernon E. Mund; and that 4,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the committee.

## PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "TAX GUIDE FOR SMALL BUSINESS"

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 106), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That there be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate 6,000 additional copies of the Committee Print entitled "Tax Guide for Small Business" prepared during the 84th Congress, 2d session.

## CIVIL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF SECURITY PROVISIONS OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting this proposed legislation, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1380) to authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
*Washington, D. C., February 18, 1957.*

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
*President of the Senate,*
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is requested that the enclosed draft of a bill be introduced in the Senate at your convenience. The purpose of the proposal is: "To authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes."

Following the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, legislation was enacted authorizing the Secretary of Commerce, upon the direction of the President, to exercise control of the flight of aircraft over certain areas for national security purposes. (64 Stat. 825; title XII, Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; 49 U. S. C. 701–705.) Thereafter, an Executive order was issued by the President (Ex. Ord. No. 10197, December 21, 1950), directing the Secretary to put the program into effect. At present the only sanctions which may be applied for violations of the security regulations which have been issued by the Secretary under that authority are either (1) suspension or revocation of the pilot's certificate in cases where the pilot is personally chargeable with the violation or against the air carrier's operating certificate where the air carrier is chargeable with the violation, or (2) in the case of willful offenses, criminal penalties. In most cases, neither of these sanctions is appropriate.

To a pilot holding an airline transport pilot or commercial rating, suspension or revocation means loss of earnings and, to the air-transport industries, loss of essential man-hours of skilled services. Suspension of the operating certificates of an air carrier means loss of essential transportation service to the Nation. These results are both inappropriate to the times and too severe for the usual offense.

Criminal penalties are even more drastic and thus even less appropriate in most of the cases presented. In any event, criminal intent is usually lacking in these cases, which generally involve some unauthorized entry into an air defense identification zone through oversight or neglect.

The civil penalty which is the normal sanction applied for minor violations of other safety provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 would provide a moderate and expeditious remedy more appropriate to these technical violations. An amendment to the law is necessary to authorize the imposition of that sanction in such cases. The attached bill would provide that authority; it would amend section 901 (a) of the act so as to include within those infractions for which a civil penalty may be imposed any violation of a rule, regulation, or order issued under title XII of the act.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the transmission of this letter and proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER WILLIAMS,
*Acting Secretary of Commerce.*

## PROPOSED AMENDMENTS OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Interstate Commerce Commission I introduce, for appropriate reference, three bills to amend the Interstate Commerce Act. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, requesting this proposed legislation, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request) were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

S. 1381. A bill to amend section 402 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide more definite standards for determining who is entitled to exemption from part IV of that act as an association of shippers or a shippers' agent;

S. 1382. A bill to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; and

S. 1383. A bill to amend section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to

require freight forwarders to obtain certificates of public convenience and necessity.

The letter accompanying the above bills is as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
*Washington, D. C., February 1, 1957.*

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
*Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MAGNUSON: I am submitting herewith for your consideration 20 copies each of draft bills to amend sections 402 (c), 409, and 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, respectively, together with statements of justification therefor. The draft bills would give effect to legislative recommendations Nos. 17, 18, and 19 appearing on pages 169, 170, and 171 of the Commission's 70th annual report to Congress, as follows:

"17. We recommend that section 402 (c) be amended to make the exemption of shippers' associations and shippers' agents applicable only where the operation is that of a bona fide association or agent as defined in that section.

"18. We recommend that section 409 be amended so as to (1) place the burden of proof on the parties to contracts between freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle subject to part II of the act for the transportation of freight when such contracts are called into question, (2) prohibit such contracts at compensation lower than the motor carrier's tariff rates in all cases where the line-haul transportation is for a total distance of 450 miles or more, and (3) provide penalties for the offer, grant, giving, solicitation, acceptance, or receipt of any rebate, concession, or discrimination resulting from the transportation of property at compensation less than that specified in such contract.

"19. We recommend that section 410 be amended so as to require the obtaining of a certificate of public convenience and necessity as a prerequisite to engaging in service as a freight forwarder."

We would appreciate your assistance in introducing these bills and scheduling early hearings thereon.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

OWEN CLARKE,
*Chairman.*

---

JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDATION 17

The attached draft bill is designed to provide statutory standards by which the Interstate Commerce Commission may determine who is entitled to exemption, as a shippers' association or a shippers' agent, from the application of part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act.

When part IV was added to the act there were few shipper associations claiming exemption under the provisions of section 402 (c) thereof. Since then, however, especially following the court's decision in *United States* v. *Pacific Wholesalers Assn.* (338 U. S. 689), the number of groups and individuals purporting to do business within the purview of the exemption has greatly increased.

At present there are almost as many shippers' associations and shippers' agents engaged in consolidating and distributing freight as there are authorized freight forwarders. Many of these associations have large memberships, and their activities are nationwide and involve the movement of general commodities in substantial quantities. The regulated freight forwarders which compete with the shipper associations have, in several instances, reduced or attempted to reduce their rates to meet such competition.

Complaints are received regularly respecting the operations of self-styled shippers' associations. A number of such associations have been investigated by the Commission's staff, and, in general, there is little distinction between the service received by a shipper from such an association and that provided by a regulated freight forwarder. In some instances former principals in forwarder businesses have been found to be prominently identified with newly established shippers' associations.

While probably a number of such individuals and groups are bona fide associations and agents, the exemption in section 402 (c) has become a loophole through which enterprising promoters are engaging essentially in a freight forwarder business under the guise of a shippers' association and are thereby evading regulation to the detriment of forwarders subject to the act.

The Commission is unable to cope with this situation effectively in the absence of statutory standards for determining who is entitled to exemption under section 402 (c). Studies made by the Commission's staff have indicated that the operations of certain self-styled shippers' associations are open to question with respect to certain features. The draft bill would provide that these features, among others, shall be considered by the Commission in determining whether a particular operation is to be exempt, or subjected to regulation. More specifically, it would amend section 402 (c) by adding thereto a new paragraph which would authorize the Commission to make the exemption of shippers' associations and shippers' agents inapplicable if it finds that their activities are not being conducted solely for the purposes, and within the limitations, specified in the provision permitting the exemption, or that such action is necessary to carry out the purposes of part IV and the provisions of the national transportation policy.

---

JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDATION 18

Under the provisions of section 409 (b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, contracts for the transportation of freight between freight forwarders subject to part IV of the act and common carriers by motor vehicle subject to part II thereof must be filed with the Commission, and the Commission has the power, after hearing, upon complaint or upon its own initiative, to prescribe the terms, conditions, and compensation of such contracts if it finds that such terms, conditions, or compensation are inconsistent with the provisions and standards set forth in paragraph (a) of section 409.

Thousands of such contracts are filed with the Commission. However, the Commission's attempts to subject certain of these contracts to formal investigation have disclosed several major defects in the law, the most important of which is the failure to place the burden of proof on the makers of such contracts when called into question.

The attached draft of bill would correct what the Commission considers this most important defect by adding a new paragraph "(c)" to section 409 providing that at any hearing involving an investigation into the terms, conditions, and compensation of any such contract the burden of proof shall be upon the parties thereto to show that such terms, conditions, and compensation are not inconsistent with the provisions and standards set forth in section 409 (a). Similar provisions respecting burden of proof may be found in sections 15 (7), 216 (g), 218 (c), 307 (g), 307 (i), and 406 (e) of the act relating to investigation and suspension of ordinary commercial rates, charges, etc.

The proposed bill would also amend paragraph (b) of section 409 by adding at the end thereof provisions which would strengthen and spell out more clearly the prescription powers of the Commission and provide it with authority to prescribe the minimum compensation which may be charged under such contracts. This amendment would allow the parties to change the amount of compensation to be paid so long as such amount does not go below the minimum prescribed, without petitioning the Commission for modification of its order as would be necessary if the precise amount of compensation were prescribed.

In addition, section 409 (a) would be amended by the proposed bill so as to prohibit such contracts at a compensation which is lower than the motor carrier's tariff rate in all cases where the line-haul transportation is for a total distance of 450 highway-miles or more. Under the present provisions of the statute, such prohibition applies to "line-haul transportation between concentration points and breakbulk points in truckload lots where such line-haul transportation is for 450 highway-miles or more." This amendment is proposed because (1) it is considered uneconomical for freight forwarders to utilize motor carriers to assemble and distribute forwarder traffic for distances of 450 miles or more from the forwarder's assembly and distribution stations, (2) it would prevent the circumvention of such prohibition (through the use of contract rates which are not subject to any specified minimum weights) by eliminating the term "truckload lots" and making the prohibition applicable to all cases where such line-haul distance is 450 miles or more, and (3) it would eliminate the necessity for the Commission to determine what is meant by "truckload lots" as used in the statute, a term considered almost impossible to define with exactness sufficient to stand up in court in a criminal proceeding.

New paragraphs "(d)" and "(e)" would also be added to section 409 by the proposed bill to insure better observance of the terms, conditions, and compensation of such contracts, and to provide penalties for any rebate, concession, or discrimination resulting from the transportation of property at compensation less than that specified therein. Without such provisions, freight forwarders and motor carriers could possibly violate their contracts with impunity, since there appears to be some question as to whether or not the enforcement provisions of parts II and IV of the act are applicable to this situation.

---

JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDATION 19

The attached draft bill would amend section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act to require future applicants for freight forwarder authority to obtain a certificate of public convenience and necessity instead of a permit as a prerequisite to engaging in freight forwarding service.

At the time part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act was enacted, Congress was of the view that freight forwarder operating rights should be granted with greater liberality than the operating rights of common carriers. Accordingly, the law governing the issuance of forwarder rights was patterned after the provisions of part II of the act governing the issuance of permits to contract carriers by motor vehicle instead of those governing the issuance of certificates to common carriers. And, in order to encourage persons to enter the freight-forwarding field, section 410 (d), which has no counterpart in part II of the act, was included. Under this provision the Interstate Commerce Commission is prohibited from denying authority to engage in proposed forwarder service solely on the ground that the existing forwarder service is adequate. This provision is discussed at length in *Lifschultz Fast Freight Extension—West and Midwest* (265 I. C. C. 431).

There exist, at present, almost 100 authorized freight forwarders. Of these, five are authorized to serve virtually all points in the United States. Six others are authorized to serve all points in the United States from specified origin points, and 12 of the remaining have rights to serve all points in

more than 30 States. Others have broad authorities which generally follow existing traffic-flow patterns in the United States. A large number of freight forwarders are, therefore, now competing with each other and other carriers for the available traffic.

The ease with which permits may be obtained under the present provisions of section 410 (d) could very well result in an overcrowding of the freight forwarding field, with general impairment of forwarder service and harm to the general public. Moreover, since freight forwarders were classified as common carriers by the act of December 20, 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.), it seems appropriate that applicants for forwarder rights should be required to make a showing similar to that of other persons seeking common carrier rights.

The draft bill would, therefore, revise section 410 to require an applicant to show that the proposed service is or will be required by the present or future public convenience and necessity and would eliminate the present provisions of section 410 (d). The rights of the present holders of permits would be protected by the provision for automatic conversion of permits to certificates.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Interstate Commerce Commission, I introduce, for appropriate reference, three other bills to amend the Interstate Commerce Act. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, requesting this proposed legislation, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request) were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

S. 1384. A bill to revise the definition of contract carrier by motor vehicle as set forth in section 203 (a) (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1385. A bill to amend section 11 of the Clayton Antitrust Act to extend the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission thereunder to contract carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; and

S. 1386. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of power or train brakes.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
*Washington, February 8, 1957.*

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
*Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MAGNUSON: I am submitting herewith for your consideration 20 copies each of draft bills, together with statements of justification therefor, designed to give effect to Legislative Recommendations Nos. 6, 20, and 24, appearing on pages 162, 171, and 174, respectively, of the Commission's 70th annual report to Congress as follows:

"6 (a) We recommend (1) that the definition of contract carrier by motor vehicle as set forth in section 203 (a) (15) be amended so as to state clearly the nature of the services which may be performed by such carriers and to provide that such services may be performed under continuing contracts for only one person or a limited number of persons, and (2), if so amended, that section 212 be amended by adding a new paragraph (c) authorizing the Commission to revoke the permit of such a carrier and to issue in lieu thereof a certificate of public convenience and necessity if it finds, after a hearing, that the operations of the permit holder are not those of a contract carrier under the revised definition, are those of a common carrier, and are otherwise lawful.

"(b) We also recommend that section 209 (b) be amended so as (1) to empower the Commission to limit the person or persons and the number or class of persons for which a contract carrier by motor vehicle may lawfully perform transportation services without additional authority and (2) to provide that additional permits may be issued only upon a showing that existing common carriers are unwilling or unable to provide the type of service for which a need has been shown.

"20. We recommend that section 11 of the Clayton Antitrust Act (15 U. S. C., sec. 21) be amended so as to provide that the Commission's jurisdiction thereunder shall include contract carriers as well as common carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act.

"24. We recommend that the Safety Appliance Acts (45 U. S. C., secs. 1–16) be amended so as to give the Commission authority to prescribe rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of power or train brakes."

Your assistance in having these bills introduced would be very much appreciated.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

OWEN CLARKE, *Chairman.*

---

JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDATION 6

The attached draft bill would revise the definition of contract carrier by motor vehicle as set forth in section 203 (a) (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act and provide a "grandfather" clause authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to issue a certificate in lieu of a permit without requiring proof of public convenience and necessity if it finds that the operations of existing permit holders do not conform to the revised definition and are those of a common carrier. The proposed measure would also amend section 209 (b) of the act so as to grant the Commission authority to limit the number of contracts under which a motor contract carrier may perform transportation services without additional authority, and would further provide that additional permits may be issued only upon a showing that existing common carriers are unwilling or unable to render the required type of service.

One of the most difficult problems with which the Commission has been faced in recent years in connection with the regulation of motor carriers is the question of determining the line of demarcation to be drawn between contract carriers and common carriers. Under the present definition of contract carrier by motor vehicle in section 203 (a) (15) of the act and the proviso in section 209 (b), which specifically prohibits the Commission from restricting such carriers from substituting or adding contracts within the scope of their permits, some contract carriers have been able to effect so many contracts that they are actually performing what is tantamount to a common carrier service. The resulting diversion of traffic from the common carriers could, if continued, seriously impair their ability to render adequate service to the general public, particularly to the smaller shippers who depend almost entirely upon public transportation facilities.

The underlying purpose of the Motor Carrier Act, 1935, is to promote and protect adequate and efficient common-carrier service by motor vehicle in the public interest, and the regulation of contract carriers was designed with that end in view. The purpose of the amendments proposed in the draft bill is to enable the Commission more effectively to administer the act so as to achieve the principal purpose thereof.

A contract carrier is one who has permission to engage in the transportation business on the public highways, but without the obligation to serve all persons alike. They enjoy a decided advantage in the competitive struggle for certain types of traffic. Common carriers are required to serve the general public, at their published tariff rates, without unlawful discrimination. Contract carriers, on the other hand, may pick and choose the shippers they may wish to serve and may discriminate in their charges which are required to meet a standard of only minimum reasonableness. Their costs, moreover, are substantially reduced if they have no terminals to maintain and are able to refuse to transport other than full loads, or only when return loads are available.

The position of the contract carrier in the overall transportation picture is justifiable only from the advantages which it can offer in the way of personal and specialized service for one or a limited number of shippers. It seems clear, therefore, that unless a contract carrier renders a particular shipper or a limited number of shippers a type of service different from that which existing common carriers are able or willing to provide, it should not be permitted to encroach upon the operations of the common carriers and skim off the cream of the traffic upon which the common carriers depend to support their overall service to the public.

In its administration of the act, the Commission has generally required, in granting contract carrier authority, a showing of a need for individual and specialized service, or at least dedication of equipment and facilities, under continuing bilateral contracts. The Commission has also described in permits "the business of the contract carrier and the scope thereof" in the terms of territory, commodities, and occasionally the type of equipment to be utilized. In some instances it has specified the class of shippers to be served. This is most desirable in certain cases when specifying, with particularity, the type of service for which the grant of authority was intended. Experience has indicated, however, that the Commission is in need of broader discretionary powers to enable it to specify in the permit the type and nature of the service to be performed with such particularity as to confine future service thereunder to that for which a need was shown at the time the permit was granted.

Under existing law, even though the initial grant of authority may have been based on a showing of a need for individual specialized service, there is no assurance, once a permit has been granted, against a contract carrier actively competing with and supplanting common carriers by subsequently adding a large number of contracts with other shippers. In this connection, the Supreme Court recently stated in *U. S.* v. *Contract Steel Carriers* (350 U. S. 409), decided March 2, 1956, that a contract carrier is free to aggressively search for new business within the limits of its license. This decision has also cast considerable doubt on the correctness of the Commission's interpretation of the act as to specialization. Freedom to solicit customers without restriction as to specialized service will tend to obliterate the distinction between common and contract carriers which Congress intended.

The amendments proposed in the draft bill would enable the Commission to give greater effect to this congressional purpose by amending the definition of contract carrier by motor vehicle to state clearly that the transportation services furnished by such carriers are to be of a special and individual nature for one or a limited number of per-

sons and which are not provided by common carriers; by specifically providing in section 209 (b) that the Commission, in granting contract carrier authority, may include terms, conditions, and limitations respecting the person or persons or the number or class thereof for which a contract carrier may perform transportation services as may be necessary to assure that the business conducted by the permit holder is that of a contract carrier and within the scope of its permit; and by removing from the proviso in section 209 (b) the prohibition against the Commission limiting the number of effective contracts which a contract carrier may have under its permit. The proposed further amendment to section 209 (b) which would permit the issuance of contract carrier operating authorities only upon a showing that existing common carriers are unwilling or unable to furnish the required type of service would serve to provide a further measure of control over unlimited expansion of contracts for nonspecialized service.

The recommended amendment to section 212 is in the nature of a "grandfather" clause authorizing the Commission to issue a certificate in lieu of a permit without proof of convenience and necessity where it finds the operations of existing permit holders do not conform to the revised definition, are those of a common carrier, and are otherwise lawful.

The proposed new subsection (c) to section 203, prohibiting the performance of for-hire motor carrier transportation in interstate or foreign commerce without a certificate or permit from the Commission, is necessary because under the proposed revision of the motor contract carrier definition certain types of operations formerly included in the definition would be excluded therefrom, not all of which would come within the definition of effective contracts which a contract carrier may have under its permit. The proposed further amendment to section 209 (b) which would permit the issuance of contract carrier operating authorities only upon a showing that existing common carriers are unwilling or unable to furnish the required type of service would serve to provide a further measure of control over unlimited expansion of contracts for nonspecialized service.

The recommended amendment to section 212 is in the nature of a grandfather clause authorizing the Commission to issue a certificate in lieu of a permit without proof of convenience and necessity where it finds the operations of existing permit holders do not conform to the revised definition, are those of a common carrier, and are otherwise lawful.

The proposed new subsection (c) to section 203, prohibiting the performance of for-hire motor carrier transportation in interstate or foreign commerce without a certificate or permit from the Commission, is necessary because under the proposed revision of the motor contract carrier definition certain types of operations formerly included in the definition would be excluded therefrom, not all of which would come within the definition of common carrier by motor vehicle as set forth in section 203 (a) (14) of the act. In the absence of such a provision, anyone engaging in motor transportation for compensation, either with or without a permit, which is not that of a common carrier because not held out to the general public, or for other reasons, and which is not within the amended and restricted definition of a contract carrier would not be subject to regulation by the Commission as either a common or a contract carrier. Presumably such person would also be able to engage in such operations without being subject to any regulation whatever, not even to the safety and hours of service regulations which are applicable to private carriers. Without this proposed provision the proposed amendments would not accomplish the intended result.

It should be noted in this connection that if the second proviso in section 206 (a) (1) of the act is repealed, as recommended by the Commission in its 70th Annual Report (Legislative Recommendation No. 9), the reference thereto in proposed new section 203 (c) in the attached draft bill should be stricken.

---

JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDATION 20

The attached draft bill is designed to make the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission under section 11 of the Clayton Antitrust Act applicable to contract as well as to common carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act.

At the time the Clayton Act was passed, the Commission had jurisdiction under the Interstate Commerce Act only over certain common carriers, principally common carriers by railroad. Since that time it has been given jurisdiction over various other common carriers, and also over contract carriers by motor vehicle and by water. The Commission's jurisdiction under section 11 of the Clayton Act, however, still applies only to common carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act. It appears, therefore, under the present provisions of section 11, that jurisdiction over the acquisition by one corporation of stock in another corporation, where the effect would be to substantially lessen competition, would be in the Federal Trade Commission where contract carriers are involved, while at the same time the Interstate Commerce Commission would have jurisdiction under section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act over the establishment of common control of two or more contract carriers.

Under section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act, the standards prescribed and used in determining whether or not a proposed transaction, within the scope thereof, should be approved by the Commission are different from those used by the Department of Justice and other agencies in determining whether or not any violations of the Clayton Act or other antitrust laws have been committed. This is necessarily so because a regulated industry is involved, which regulation in itself protects the public interest.

Inasmuch as the Interstate Commerce Commission has jurisdiction over various activities and practices of contract carriers, and the issuance and transfer of permits authorizing the operation thereof, it seems logical and appropriate that the Commission should also administer the Clayton Act with respect to contract carriers as well as common carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act. This would make for greater uniformity in the application of the Clayton Act to the transportation industry and would also serve to avoid the possibility of conflicting requirements being imposed upon such carriers by the different agencies.

---

JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDATION 24

The attached draft bill would give the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to establish rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of power or train brakes.

Under section 3 of the act of March 2, 1903 (45 U. S. C., sec. 10), the Commission is charged with the responsibility of enforcing the power or train brake provisions of the Safety Appliance Acts (45 U. S. C., secs. 1–16). It does not, however, have the authority to prescribe rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of such equipment. (Promulgation and Enforcement of Rules, Standards, and Instructions for Installation, Inspection, Maintenance and Repair of Power Brakes, ——— I. C. C. ———, Docket No. 31938, decided January 3, 1957.)

Section 1 of the act of March 2, 1893 (45 U. S. C., sec. 1) provides, in part, that it shall be unlawful to run any train that does not have a sufficient number of cars equipped with power or train brakes so that the engineer of the locomotive drawing the train can control its speed without requiring brakemen to use the common hand brake for that purpose, and section 2 of the act of March 2, 1903 (45 U. S. C., sec. 9) provides that any train which is operated with power or train brakes shall have such brakes on 50 percent of such cars used and operated by the engineer and all power brake cars associated together with such 50 percent shall have their brakes so used and operated. The Commission's order of June 6, 1910, increased this percentage to 85. Subsequent orders of the Commission requiring, with certain exceptions, the installation of power brakes on all cars has had the effect of increasing this percentage to 100 percent.

Since almost all cars are now equipped with power or train brakes, all such cars associated together must have their brakes used and operated. Inoperative train brakes associated together with operative brakes are in violation of the law. To assure compliance with the law, some method must be adopted to determine if each such brake is operative. The only way in which this determination can be made is by actual visual inspection of each brake after the cars are assembled in the train.

Because of the nature of the power or train brakes, rigid maintenance standards must be maintained in order to assure operative brakes. The design of these brakes is such that their efficiency is dependent upon correctness of adjustment. A train brake may be operative, but in such poor adjustment that its braking effect is practically nonexistent.

In order to insure that power or train brakes are kept in proper adjustment and properly maintained, and to insure efficient operative brakes, the Commission in 1925 cooperated with the mechanical division of the Association of American Railroads in the formulation of a code of rules for maintaining and testing air brakes. This code, which has been revised from time to time, represents minimum requirements for inspection, maintenance, and repair of train brakes. It was last revised in 1953. The Association of American Railroads, however, has no authority to require adoption of the code by the carriers or to enforce compliance with its rules; nor is there any provision in the law requiring compliance with these rules. Each railroad is free to adopt, amend, or disregard the rules in whole or in part. Some railroads have adopted standards equal to or more exacting than the code, while others have chosen to adopt rules which do not meet the minimum requirements. Even among those railroads that have adopted the association's code, there is widespread noncompliance of the rules, particularly with respect to train brake inspections.

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, the Commission's inspectors made train-brake inspections on 2,484 trains, consisting of 117,399 cars, before departing from terminals. A total of 8,007 cars were found to have inoperative or inefficient airbrakes. Of this number, 3,221 were detached from the train and the airbrakes subsequently repaired, 4,634 had their airbrakes repaired while still in the train, and 152 with inoperative airbrakes were allowed by the carriers to depart in the trains. These trains had been prepared for departure by the carrier's employees, yet when afterward tested by the Commission's inspectors it was necessary to set out or repair the brakes on an average of 3.16 cars per train, and 6.7 cars per hundred were found with defective train brakes. Airbrake tests were also made on 1,588 trains,

consisting of 96,962 cars upon arrival at terminals. Brakes were found to be operative on 94,879 cars in these trains, or on 79.9 percent thereof. Of these operative, however, 8,867, or 9.14 cars out of every 100 inspected, had train brakes with impaired efficiency due to excessive piston travel.

During the same fiscal year the Commission's inspectors observed many instances where the minimum requirements of the association's code had not been met. These matters were brought to the attention of the railroad managements involved, but with little or no improvement.

The records of the Commission indicate a progressive deterioration of train brake inspection and maintenance practices. It is therefore apparent that the carriers are either unable to enforce their own rules or are deliberately ignoring minimum requirements for safety.

In the past the railroads have generally cooperated with Government inspectors in the administration of the Safety Appliance Acts. Recently, however, several instances of lack of such cooperation have been reported. Our inspectors have been deliberately prevented from making train-brake inspections at certain terminals. This has been done by not providing the inspectors the opportunity to make their inspections, or by permitting the trains to depart before their examinations of the train brakes have been completed, notwithstanding that delays resulting from such inspections are trifling.

The industry's self-imposed rules have not produced the desired results. The Commission believes that the problem can be met by giving it statutory authority to prescribe and enforce adequate power and train brake rules. It is therefore urged that the Safety Appliance Acts be amended as proposed in the draft bill in order to provide the degree of safety contemplated therein for employees and the traveling public.

## PROPOSED NATIONAL POTATO GRADE LABELING ACT

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and Senators AIKEN, ALLOTT, BARRETT, BRIDGES, BUSH, CHAVEZ, DWORSHAK, IVES, JAVITS, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, MORSE, NEUBERGER, and YOUNG, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of, Irish potatoes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk through Friday next, to permit any Senator who desires to cosponsor it to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Maine.

The bill (S. 1393) to authorize the National Potato Grade Labeling Act, which provides quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of Irish potatoes, introduced by Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## DISCONTINUANCE OF POSTAL SAVINGS SYSTEM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System.

The Postal Savings System was established by an act of Congress on June 25, 1910, and has rendered a useful service. I think, however, that on the basis of a decline in deposits and the number of depositors, it has become increasingly uneconomic in its operation. This is because fixed overhead remains relatively stable, and offices with few depositors must maintain records, file reports, and account for balances and for certificates, and so forth.

It is interesting to note that the amount on deposit as of June 30, 1956, dropped to $1,765 million from $3,393 million on June 30, 1947, or a decrease of about 50 percent. The decline for the past 3 years has been well in excess of $200 million a year.

The number of depositors has dropped from a peak of 4,196,517, as of June 30, 1947, to 2,482,026 depositors, as of June 30, 1956. For the past 3 fiscal years, respectively, the number of accounts closed out have been 228,000, 223,000, and 229,000.

The convenience of the public no longer seems to be served as it was at the time of the creation of the Postal Savings System in 1910. At that time there was no protection of depositor savings in the case of the failure of a bank.

The Postal Savings System provided a convenient means whereby savings could be deposited at earned interest with complete assurance of repayment by the Government. Since then, however, this assurance to the public is now provided through the availability of United States savings bonds, which earn interest, and through the guaranty by agencies of the Government of bank and of savings and loan deposits.

At the time of enactment of the Postal Savings Act, in 1910, the convenience of small-town patrons was undoubtedly taken into consideration. This is not so important today, when less than 2 percent of the aggregate deposits and of all depositors are served by third-class and fourth-class post offices. In fact, the fourth-class post-office depositors account for only one-fiftieth of 1 percent of all depositors. Ninety percent of the depositors are in first-class offices, and 8½ percent are in second-class offices. Thus, deposits are concentrated in post offices in communities which have commercial banks. For the very few which do not, the growth of automobile transportation since 1910 and the increased popularity of banking by mail have provided ready alternatives.

The Comptroller General of the United States in his reports to Congress on the survey and audit of the Postal Savings System has consistently concluded that the purpose and justification of the system are no longer applicable, and has consistently recommended that the Congress give consideration to the further need for the System.

The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government recommended, in May 1955, that a plan for orderly discontinuance of the Postal Savings System be inaugurated. In prior Congresses, bills calling for the abrupt termination of the Postal Savings System have been introduced.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas whether he has looked into the matter of the small depositors in the banks of the Nation during the past 3 or 4 years.

Mr. CARLSON. Let me say to the distinguished chairman of my committee that I have not done so, but I have followed with interest the record of postal savings.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to have printed in the RECORD a statement showing what the personal savings have been. I shall furnish the statement in the near future. I may say the records show that personal savings have dropped while the Nation as a whole has been prospering, which is an indication that the small people are not prospering at this time.

Mr. CARLSON. I think it would be very helpful to have that information printed in the RECORD.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have been associated with my colleague, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], as one of the sponsors of the bill. I was its original sponsor in 1952, as a result of a statement made at that time by the Comptroller of the Currency—namely, that, in his opinion, the usefulness of the Postal Savings System had ended. That was 5 years ago.

If the deposits continue to drop, the burden on the Department will continue to increase. Furthermore, because the interest rates being paid by the banks and savings and loan associations are so much higher than the rates paid by the Postal Savings System, I also hope that the transfer can be made with a minimum of inconvenience.

I think this service has been very valuable, but I feel that it has outlived its usefulness. I hope that when the time comes, the Senate will pass the bill which the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] has introduced today, on behalf of himself and myself.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think I should make clear that in the statement I made a moment ago, I was not opposing the bill as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Certainly we shall hold hearings on the bill. In making my statement, I was only pointing out that the deposits by the small depositors of the Nation have been decreasing.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the statement the Senator from South Carolina has made. We are confident that he, as chairman of the committee, will have ample hearings held on the bill; otherwise we would not have introduced it.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanation of it, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1394) to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System established by the act of June 25,

1910 (36 Stat. 814), as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. BENNETT), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That (a) the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this act is hereby established as the closing date for the Postal Savings System created by the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 814), as amended, and thereafter no deposits shall be accepted in any existing postal savings account nor shall any new postal savings accounts be opened.

(b) Commencing with the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this act, interest on all postal savings deposits shall cease to accrue on the interest anniversary date of each outstanding deposit certificate.

SEC. 2. After June 30, 1958, the total amount of the unpaid deposits, including the accrued interest due thereon as shown by the books of the Board of Trustees of the Postal Savings System shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall deposit the sum so transferred under the authority of this section in the trust fund receipt account in the Treasury as "unclaimed moneys of individuals whose whereabouts are unknown (postal savings)." Expenditures are authorized to be made from this account as provided by section 17 (a) of the act of June 26, 1934 (48 Stat. 1230; 31 U. S. C. 725p).

SEC. 3. In order to facilitate the settlement of the account of a depositor who cannot be located or who is deceased, the amount to the credit of such depositor, including such interest as may be due thereon, shall be paid in the following order of precedence, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person of amounts so paid:

First, to the spouse of such depositor;

Second, if there be no surviving spouse, to the child or children of such depositor, and descendants of deceased children, by representation;

Third, if none of the above, to the parents of such depositor, or survivor of them; and

Fourth, if there be none of the above, to the duly appointed legal representative of such depositor, or if there be none, to the person or persons determined by the Board of Trustees of the Postal Savings System to be entitled thereto under the laws of the State in which the deposit was made.

SEC. 4. Where any payment of a postal savings account, including such interest as may be due thereon, is to be made to a minor, except in the case of an account maintained by a minor in his own name in accordance with section 4 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 815) or to a person mentally incompetent or under other legal disability adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction, such payment may be made to the person who is constituted guardian or other fiduciary by the law of the State of residence of such claimant or is otherwise legally vested with the care of the claimant or his estate. Where no guardian or other fiduciary of the person under legal disability has been appointed under the laws of the State of residence of the claimant, the Board of Trustees of the Postal Savings System shall determine the person who is otherwise legally vested with the care of the claimant or his estate. Payments made under this section shall be a bar to recovery by any other person of amounts so made.

SEC. 5. To facilitate the liquidation of the Postal Savings System, the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem or purchase the public debt obligations of the United States, held for the account of the Postal Savings System, at their par value whenever it will not be advantageous to sell such public debt obligations on the regular market.

SEC. 6. Until June 30, 1958, the Postmaster General shall continue to cover into the postal revenues the excess of interest and profit occurring from the deposit or investment of postal savings funds after the payment of interest due depositors in the Postal Savings System.

SEC. 7. The Board of Trustees of the Postal Savings System, commencing with the 30th day after the enactment of this act, shall not be required to maintain the 5-percent reserve of postal savings funds required to be maintained by the provisions of section 9 of the act of 1910 as contained in section 2 of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 159), as amended.

SEC. 8. Effective June 30, 1958, all powers, functions, and duties vested in the Board of Trustees and in the Postmaster General by the act of June 25, 1910, as amended, shall be and are hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of completing the liquidation of the Postal Savings System.

SEC. 9. The Board of Trustees is hereby authorized and directed to prescribe such rules and regulations and make such delegation of authority as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The explanation presented by Mr. CARLSON is as follows:

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON POSTAL SAVINGS BILL

EXPLANATION

Section 1 of the bill establishes the 30th day after enactment as the date upon which the Board of Trustees will close the Postal Savings System. After that date, no deposits in existing accounts will be accepted and no new accounts will be opened. Interest will cease to run on all outstanding certificates on their anniversary date falling between 30 days after enactment and June 30, 1958.

Section 2 of the bill provides for the transfer of the records and unpaid deposits, including the accrued interest as shown by the books of the Board of Trustees to the Secretary of the Treasury. He will deposit the sums in the trust fund known as Unclaimed Moneys of Individuals Whose Whereabouts Are Unknown (Postal Savings).

Section 3 sets up a descent and distribution table for the payment of accounts to the representatives of deceased depositors. In the absence of this, we would be required to observe the laws of each State with respect to the descent and distribution, administration of estates, and similar provisions of State law. It would hamper us tremendously in the orderly closing out of the accounts of the postal savings if we have to apply the various laws of the States.

Section 4 is a special provision with respect to the payment of postal savings accounts to minors.

Section 5 of the bill provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem or purchase public debt obligations of the United States which are held for the account of the Postal Savings System at their par value whenever it is not advantageous to sell them on the regular market. I am sure you will appreciate that a serious situation could occur if we were forced to sell our securities purchased with depositors' moneys at less than par.

Section 6 provides that any interest accruing on bank accounts and from securities over and above that necessary to pay the interest due to depositors will be covered into the postal revenues during the liquidation year.

Section 7 authorizes the immediate use of the 5-percent cash reserve now maintained in the Department of the Treasury. This will, of course, make ready cash available for liquidation purposes.

Section 8 merely provides for a shifting of all powers and duties of the Board of Trustees to the Secretary of the Treasury for the completion of liquidation.

Section 9 authorizes the Board of Trustees to issue rules and regulations and to make delegations of authority to accomplish the objectives of the law.

---

## CONSTRUCTION OF FLOOD PROTECTION WORKS ON MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT ST. PAUL AND SOUTH ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the construction of local flood-protection works on the Mississippi River at St. Paul and South St. Paul, Minn. I wish to make a brief statement relating to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1400) authorizing the construction of local flood-protection works on the Mississippi River at St. Paul and South St. Paul, Minn., introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during 1951 and 1952 two savage floods—the latest in a long series of lesser floods—devastated large areas of the cities of St. Paul and South St. Paul, situated at approximately the confluence of the Mississippi and Minnesota Rivers at a point where the Mississippi River becomes for the first time a formidable stream.

One would not expect that a flood so far upstream could cause such severe damage as the Mississippi River did in St. Paul and South St. Paul in 1951 and 1952, and which it has with considerable frequency caused throughout the more than 100 years of St. Paul's existence.

Yet it is a fact that the damage to private property and the cost of restoration efforts in the west side of St. Paul following the 1952 flood was estimated at $3,160,000. This, I point out, is substantially the same as the estimated Federal cost for the St. Paul section of a proposed project to provide flood-protection works for the west side of St. Paul and for the city of South St. Paul.

A study and report by the district and division engineers covering a proposed flood-control project at St. Paul and South St. Paul was approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors on January 28, 1957. This approved report will, within a few days, be sent to State and local authorities and to other Federal agencies for review, which can be expected to take place within 3 weeks.

Estimated Federal costs of the twin project are $3,137,700 for St. Paul, and $2,567,700 for South St. Paul.

I wish to emphasize that not only has it been thoroughly demonstrated that a flood in the west side of St. Paul can cause, and has caused, more than $3 million in damages in a few short days, but that a flood in the industrial section of South St. Paul—a few miles downstream—strikes the site of the second largest livestock market in the Nation. Thus, not only is there extensive damage and suffering to the immediate inhabitants of South St. Paul, but it also causes

the serious disruption of an industry which serves a hinterland comprising 14 States and 3 provinces of Canada.

For these reasons I feel it necessary to bring this urgent flood-control project before the Congress at the earliest practicable moment, in the hope that it will be possible to include authorization for the project during the present session of Congress.

## TAX RELIEF FOR SMALL BUSINESS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on January 7, 1957, for myself and Senators IVES, BEALL, CAPEHART, BRICKER, and BUSH, I introduced the bill (S. 245) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in order to provide tax relief in small corporations and more equitable tax treatment for persons engaged in small businesses. This bill would, if enacted, implement the small-business tax recommendations of the President's Cabinet Committee Report on Small Business issued last August.

My good friend, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], who shares our interest in small-business tax problems, has indicated his desire to cosponsor this bill. I am happy, indeed, to ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] be added to the list of cosponsors of Senate bill 245.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## INCREASED PENSIONS TO CERTAIN ANNUITANTS

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, on yesterday I introduced a bill to increase the compensation of certain annuitants. The bill has been designated as S. 1355, and has been referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. In my remarks on yesterday, I requested, at the conclusion of my statement, unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD. However, although my remarks were printed in the RECORD, the text of the bill was not printed in the RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that in today's RECORD there be printed both my remarks on the bill and the text of the bill itself.

There being no objection, the statement and bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes.

In introducing this bill I desire to call attention to the fact that those who are having the most difficult time today in gaining the necessaries of life, and in paying their way of livelihood, are persons with small fixed incomes, and particularly older people who are confronted with the costs of living without capacity to add to their incomes.

The bill would give to all annuitants under civil service a reasonable increase, and in particular it would take care of those who were not covered in the increase of 1948.

I therefore introduce the bill, and ask that it be appropriately referred, and I hope that at an early date the Congress will enact it into law. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1355) to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. REVERCOMB, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Senate bill 1355, introduced by Mr. REVERCOMB is as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That (a) the annuity of each individual who, on October 1, 1956, was receiving or entitled to receive an annuity from the civil-service retirement and disability fund shall, in addition to any increase in such annuity heretofore provided by law, be further increased, effective on the effective date of this act, in accordance with the following schedule:

| If annuity commenced on or after— | Portion of annuity not in excess of $1,500 shall be increased by— | Portion of annuity in excess of $1,500 shall be increased by— |
|---|---|---|
| October 1, 1955, and prior to October 1, 1956. | 25 per centum. | 10 per centum. |
| October 1, 1954, and prior to October 1, 1955. | 26 per centum. | 10 per centum. |
| October 1, 1953, and prior to October 1, 1954. | 27 per centum. | 10 per centum. |
| October 1, 1952, and prior to October 1, 1953. | 28 per centum. | 10 per centum. |
| October 1, 1951, and prior to October 1, 1952. | 29 per centum. | 10 per centum. |
| August 20, 1920, and prior to October 1, 1951. | 30 per centum. | 10 per centum. |

(b) No increase provided by subsection (a) shall exceed $756 per annum for any individual or be computed on any part of the annuity purchased by voluntary contributions. Except as provided in subsections (c) and (d), the increases provided by this section when added to the annuities of retired employees shall not operate to increase the annuities of their survivors.

(c) The annuity of a widow, widower, or designated survivor annuitant of an individual referred to in subsection (a), which (i) is payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, (ii) is based on the service of such individual, and (iii) commences after October 1, 1956, shall be increased, effective on the beginning date of such annuity or on the effective date of this act, whichever is later, by such amount if any as may be necessary to provide such widow, widower, or designated survivor annuitant with an annuity equal to one-half of the annuity which such individual was receiving at the date of his death excluding any part thereof purchased by voluntary contributions, but such increased annuity in the case of a widow or widower of an individual who retired prior to April 1, 1948, shall not exceed $756.

(d) The annuity of each surviving child of an individual referred to in subsection (a), which (i) is payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, (ii) is based on the service of such individual, and (iii) commences after October 1, 1956, shall be increased, effective on the beginning date of such annuity or on the effective date of this act, whichever is later, by such amount if any as may be necessary to provide each such child with an annuity which—

(A) in any case in which such individual is survived by a widow, shall be equal to one-fourth of the annuity which such individual was receiving at the date of his death (excluding any part thereof purchased by voluntary contributions), except that no such increased annuity shall exceed the lesser of $1,200 divided by the number of such children or $600; or

(B) in any case in which such individual is not survived by a widow, shall be equal to one-half of the annuity which such individual was receiving at the date of his death (excluding any part thereof purchased by voluntary contributions), except that no such increased annuity shall exceed the lesser of $1,500 divided by the number of such children or $720.

SEC. 2. The limitation contained in the last sentence of section 8 (d) (1) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, as enacted by the act of August 11, 1955 (69 Stat. 692; Public Law 369, 84th Cong.), is repealed effective as of August 11, 1955, but no increase in annuity shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this section for any period prior to the effective date of this act. In computing, for the purposes of subsections (c) and (d) of section 1, the amount of annuity which an individual who died after September 30, 1956, and prior to the effective date of this act was receiving at the date of his death there shall be included any amount which he would have received had this section been enacted prior to such death.

SEC. 3. The widow of an employee where such employee had completed 20 or more years of Federal service and was subject to the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Canal Zone Retirement Act, or the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act at the time of his death, before April 1, 1948, while in the service of the United States or retired from such service, on or before such date, if such widow had been legally married to such employee or retiree for a period of at least 10 years prior to his death and was not entitled to any annuity based upon the service of such employee or retiree under any other provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act and has not remarried, shall be entitled to receive an annuity equal to one-half of the annuity to which such employee or retiree would have been entitled to receive under the annuity computation formula in effect at the time of his death or received (excluding any part thereof purchased by voluntary contributions), but not to exceed $756 per annum. Any annuity granted to a survivor under this section shall commence on the first day of the month following the month in which application therefor has been duly filed with the Civil Service Commission, and shall cease upon the death, or remarriage, of the annuitant.

SEC. 4. The monthly installment of any annuity increased or provided by this act shall be fixed at the nearest dollar.

SEC. 5. The annuities and increases in annuities provided by this act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund; but such annuities and increases in annuities shall terminate on the 30th day of June of any calendar year, after the calendar year 1959, in which an appropriation shall not have been made by the Congress prior to July 31 of such year to compensate such fund for the cost, as determined by the United States Civil Service Commission, of such annuities and increases in annuities during the fiscal year ending on June 30 of the following calendar year. After such termination the preceding sections of this act shall not be in effect and annuities and increases in annuities within the purview of this act shall be determined and paid in the same manner as immediately prior to the effective date of this act and as though this act had not been enacted.

SEC. 6. This act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of this act.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Address entitled "United States Foreign Policy Today and Tomorrow," delivered by him at Georgetown University on February 25, 1957.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

Statement prepared by him discussing Federal aid for school construction.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

Remarks made by him before Bernalillo County Democratic Convention, Albuquerque, N. Mex., on February 18, 1957.

## NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE BILL 11, TO AMEND SECTION 2 (B) OF THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled to commence on Tuesday, March 12, 1957, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 11, a bill to amend section 2 (b) of the Robinson-Patman Act so as to provide that the good-faith defense is not a substantive defense when the discriminatory price practices are of such magnitude as to tend to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and myself as chairman.

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON H. R. 2528, TO AUTHORIZE THE SALE OF THE GOVERNMENT-OWNED ALCOHOL BUTADIENE FACILITY AT LOUISVILLE, KY., KNOWN AS PLANCOR 1207

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that a public hearing will be held on the bill H. R. 2528, to authorize the sale of the Government-owned alcohol butadiene facility at Louisville, Ky., known as Plancor 1207, on Thursday, March 7, 1957, at 10 a. m., in room 301, Senate Office Building.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at this hearing are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 303, Senate Office Building, telephone National 8-3120, extension 865, as soon as possible.

## STATEMENT BY SENATOR KNOWLAND, A UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, CONCERNING COMPLAINT BY SOVIET RUSSIA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of a statement I made yesterday in the United Nations Special Political Committee in my capacity as United States Representative on the Special Committee, and speaking in behalf of the Government of the United States in answer to a complaint by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics relative to the Government of the United States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAM S. KNOWLAND, UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE ON THE SOVIET ITEM ENTITLED "COMPLAINT BY THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS OF INTERVENTION BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN THE DOMESTIC AFFAIRS OF ALBANIA, BULGARIA, CZECHOSLOVAKIA, HUNGARY, POLAND, RUMANIA, AND THE U. S. S. R., AND ITS SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITY AGAINST THOSE STATES"

Mr. Chairman, the torrent of abuse against my country which the Soviet Union has launched in recent months is nothing new. It is a disagreeable old story brought up to date.

We Americans naturally dislike hearing our country attacked from any quarter. But we know that what the Soviet representative says, like many accusations he has made here in the past, will be recognized as false by this General Assembly and by the whole free world.

Most of these charges by the Soviet Union are familiar in the United Nations. The Soviet representative himself has noted that fact. As he said, his country put forward many of them in the General Assembly in 1951. And they were rejected by the Assembly—he forgot to mention this—on January 10, 1952, by a vote of 42 to 5. The wide variety of other false and sensational accusations which his delegation has brought against my country here nearly every year for 10 years past has likewise been rejected, and by overwhelming majorities. In this process the very term "Soviet item" has become a synonym to United Nations delegations for a propaganda offensive against the United States.

By reviving these charges, the Soviet Union is merely trying to divert world attention from its own year-in and year-out program of using foreign Communist parties to subvert and undermine the government of free countries all over the world. Also, no doubt, the Soviet Union would like to obscure the truth revealed in recent discussions by the Assembly of the situation in Hungary, and for that purpose produces its own myth of United States intervention in Eastern Europe. Once again we call upon the Soviet Union to permit free access to Eastern Europe, and thus to the facts.

It is well to remember that a story does not become true merely by being detailed. Often here in the General Assembly the Soviet delegation has produced reams of material to support charges they thought it expedient to make, but always the charges have been discredited and rejected.

We regret that the Assembly's time must be taken up by these well-known charges, particularly now when new grave international problems need to be discussed, but the United States appreciates this opportunity to clarify matters once again. When we are falsely accused we cannot remain silent.

Naturally, we would like to see improved and different conditions in Eastern Europe. We shall never cease to hope that the now captive peoples will be permitted to enjoy those fundamental rights and freedoms recognized in the United Nations Charter. If we can say or do something here that can help to reassure our Soviet colleagues that our motives and policies in no way menace Soviet security, and indeed, that they reflect an objective on which all must agree—to preserve and maintain international peace—this discussion will have served a useful purpose.

II. UNITED STATES AIMS TOWARD EASTERN EUROPE

Mr. Chairman, it is necessary at the outset to put the record straight about United States policy. As the Soviet Government knows, the chief spokesmen of United States foreign policy are the President of the United States and the Secretary of State. They are the sources to whom I shall refer in this discussion.

In Moscow's picture of United States policies regarding Eastern Europe there are two chief distortions. One of these is the idea that the United States wants to impose its political and economic ideas on Eastern Europe. That is untrue. In a speech at Dallas, Tex., on October 27, 1956, Secretary Dulles said:

"The captive peoples should never have reason to doubt that they have in us a sincere and dedicated friend who shares their aspirations. They must know that they can draw upon our abundance to tide themselves over the period of economic adjustment which is inevitable as they rededicate their productive efforts to the service of their own people, rather than that of exploiting masters. Nor do we condition economic ties between us upon the adoption by these countries of any particular form of society."

The second Moscow distortion, even graver in its import, is that we want to turn the Eastern European countries into military allies or even military bases from which to attack the Soviet Union. In the same address at Dallas Secretary Dulles said:

"And let me make this clear, beyond a possibility of doubt! The United States has no ulterior purpose in desiring the independence of the satellite countries. Our unadulterated wish is that these people, from whom so much of our national life derives, should have sovereignty restored to them, and that they should have governments of their own free choosing. We do not look upon these nations as potential military allies. We see them as friends and as part of a new and friendly and no longer divided Europe."

Further on this point, President Eisenhower in his television report to the Nation last October 31 said:

"We have also—with respect to the Soviet Union—soughtly clearly to remove any false fears that we would look upon new governments in these Eastern European countries as potential military allies. We have no such ulterior purpose. We see these peoples as friends, and we wish simply that they be friends who are free."

Again on December 18 in his press conferance in Washington, Secretary Dulles reemphasized that we have no wish to turn these countries into our allies. He continued:

"The United States is very openminded to any suggestions that might be made as to the status—whether neutralization or otherwise—of satellite countries which would take away any fear, I would hope, by the Soviet Union that it would be physically or militarily endangered if it facilitated this evolution to independence."

Mr. Chairman, once again the Soviet Union seems determined to misrepresent the United

States as a power bent on conquest by producing its familiar file of press clippings which prove nothing. But if the Soviet leaders honestly seek to know that the true purposes of the United States are toward Eastern Europe and the entire world, I suggest they study without prejudgment the statements I have just quoted. I suggest also that they study with equal seriousness the inaugural address of President Eisenhower a month ago, in which he said:

"We honor the aspirations of those nations which, now captive, long for freedom. We seek neither their military alinement nor any artificial integration with our society. And they can know the warmth of the welcome that awaits them when, as must be, they join again the ranks of freedom.

"We honor no less in this divided world than in a less tormented time, the people of Russia. We do not dread—rather do we welcome—their progress in education and industry. We wish them success in their demands for more intellectual freedom, greater security before their own laws, fuller enjoyment of the rewards of their own toil. And as such things may come to pass, the more certain will be the coming of that day when our peoples may freely meet in friendship."

### III. TRUE SOURCES OF TENSION IN EASTERN EUROPE

Mr. Chairman, what I have said makes it clear enough that there is nothing in United States policy in which the Soviet Union can find cause for alarm. Obviously we must look elsewhere to find the true causes of tension and unrest in Eastern Europe. Recent tragic events in Hungary illustrate conclusively the root of the problem—the complete and total suppression of every expression of independence which the Soviets, in their psychopathic concern for security, regard as a threat to their control of the area.

How did this state of affairs come to pass in Eastern Europe? It came about as a result of the aggressive policies and repressive actions of the Soviet Union for nearly two decades.

The Soviet Union has denied the legitimate aspirations of the peoples of Eastern Europe for national independence.

The Soviet Union has denied to these peoples basic human freedoms recognized in the Charter of the United Nations.

The Soviet Union has imposed puppet governments on the states of Eastern Europe and has used its armed forces to keep those governments in power.

The Soviet Union has plundered the economies of these countries for the benefit of the Soviet state.

The Soviet Union converted the three Baltic Republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into Soviet Provinces in violation of their solemn treaties of friendship and nonaggression.

The Soviet Union has built up large satellite armies staffed by Soviet officers.

The Soviet Union has cut off the captive peoples from contact with the free world by monopolizing all channels of communications.

The Soviet Union has filled the newspapers and schoolbooks of Eastern Europe with "Hate America" slogans.

The Soviet Union has persecuted the churches and intimidated and harassed those who worship God.

The Soviet Union has erected physical barriers against escape, including barbed wire, mine fields, and lookout towers.

The peoples of this area unceasingly seek ways and means of piercing this Iron Curtain which separates them from contact with the rest of the world. Clearly it is the Soviet Union which has intervened directly in the internal affairs of the countries of Eastern Europe.

These, Mr. Chairman, are some of the major sources of tension in Eastern Europe. All of them arise from the actions and policies of the Soviet Union itself. Were it to change these actions and policies, the Soviet Union would find its own security enhanced and the cause of international peace would be immeasurably advanced.

### IV. THE TRUTH ABOUT HUNGARY

Mr. Chairman, no event of our times has more clearly illustrated the nature of these tensions than the uprising of the Hungarian people against their Soviet masters.

There is no need to recite here the history of Hungary, which is still fresh in the minds of all of us. The Special United Nations Committee on the Problem of Hungary has made an excellent beginning on its assignment in the report which it issued on February 21, which I commend to the attention of the members of this committee. It is enough for me to mention such highlights of the Hungarian story as have a bearing on the absurd Soviet charge that the United States instigated these tragic events.

I quote from a letter presented on February 4 to the Secretary General from Mr. Peter Mod, who signed himself permanent representative of Hungary to the United Nations. This letter was circulated as Document A/3521, February 5, and here is what it says about the calling in of Soviet forces to crush a patriotic outburst of Hungarian national feeling:

"The Hungarian Government exercised its sovereign rights and called for the assistance of Soviet troops stationed in Hungary under the Warsaw Defense Pact so as to avoid further bloodshed and disorder and to defend the democratic order and the peoples' power."

Mr. Chairman, I have three comments on this story.

First, if the Hungarian Government had to call for troops, it is strange that it did not call for the Hungarian Army, a sizable military force. It is clear throughout the years of Soviet rule over Hungary, the regime was unable to arm Hungarians to handle an anti-Soviet fight in Budapest.

Second, the allegation that Soviet troops intervened to avoid further bloodshed cannot be passed over without comment. In fact, the massive intervention by Soviet tanks to avoid further bloodshed brought death to an estimated 25,000 on the Hungarian side, as well as several thousand Russians.

Third, it is all very well for Mr. Mod on February 5 to tell us about the calling in of Soviet troops, but there is an earlier message to the United Nations which will not soon be forgotten here, and which I wish to quote at this point. It was a cablegram addressed on November 1 to the Secretary General, and signed by Imre Nagy, President of the Council of Ministers of the Hungarian People's Republic, designated Minister for Foreign Affairs. This telegram stated as follows:

"Reliable reports have reached the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic that further Soviet units are entering into Hungary. The President of the Council of Ministers in his capacity of Minister for Foreign Affairs summoned M. Andropov, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Soviet Union to Hungary, and expressed his strongest protest against the entry of further Soviet troops into Hungary. He demanded the instant and immediate withdrawal of these Soviet forces. He informed the Soviet Ambassador that the Hungarian Government immediately repudiates the Warsaw Treaty and at the same time declares Hungary's neutrality, turns to the United Nations and requests the help of the four great powers in defending the country's neutrality. The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic made the declaration of neutrality on November 1, 1956. Therefore, I request Your Excellency promptly to put on the agenda of the forthcoming General Assembly of the United Nations the question of Hungary's neutrality and the defense of this neutrality by the four great powers."

I come again to the Soviet charge that this resolution was instigated by the United States. Mr. Mod's letter appears to be the only attempt at a systematic summary of these specific charges that we have seen to date. Under the heading of "Facts That Have Come to Light," it names 5 Hungarians as spies and counterrevolutionaries, and it alleges that 1 of these had sent 20 others into Hungary—it quotes 2 broadcasts by Radio Free Europe advising the Freedom Fighters not to trust Imre Nagy—and it says that a 2-way radio and various small arms of German, Belgian, and American manufacture, were captured in one of the Freedom Fighters' strongholds.

Examine that letter as you will, Mr. Chairman, those are the only concrete details it contains to support the Soviet charge that the United States instigated the Hungarian revolution. We are being asked to believe that a foreign plot, resting on the work of some 2 dozen emigre agents, caused the population of Budapest to rise en masse, and that the resulting insurrection had to be crushed at the cost of 25,000 Hungarian lives. Clearly, we must look for the real origin of the events not outside Hungary, but inside—in years of brutal misrule by the servants of Moscow.

It is not necessary to go to so-called "capitalist" sources to find support for this statement. Here is part of an editorial from the Budapest newspaper, Szabad Nep, dated October 29, 1956:

"The latest issue of Pravda carries a dispatch from its own correspondent about the events in Hungary entitled 'Collapse of the Antipopular Adventure in Hungary.' This is an error. What happened in Budapest was neither antipopular nor an adventure. What is more, it did not collapse. For 5 days this city, torn by fate, shed blood and suffered. But through hundreds of deaths, the ideals of true patriotism and democracy were burning in the fires.

"The slogans of Socialist democracy were the loudest to be heard and not those of the reaction and counterrevolution. The revolutionary people of Buda and Pest want a people's freedom without tyranny, terror, and fear. They want more bread and national independence. Is this then an antipopular adventure?

"What collapsed could indeed be called antipopular. It was the reign of the Rakosi-Géro clique.

"The Pravda article further states that manifestations of the people of Pest and the revolt were instigated by the subversive work of the British and American imperialists. We can safely say that all 1.5 million inhabitants of Budapest are deeply hurt and insulted by this assertion. In body or in spirit, a large portion of the population of Budapest was present at the demonstrations on Tuesday, October 23. They sympathized or agreed with the basic patriotic and democratic aims of the great popular uprising.

"The bloody, tragic, but at the same time ennobling fight, lasting 5 days, was not instigated by some sort of subversive work. It was caused, alas, by our own faults and crimes. The greatest of our faults and crimes was our failure to protect the sacred flame which our ancestors had bequeathed to us—our national independence."

And not only Budapest, Mr. Chairman, but Moscow, also began to admit the same truth, however reluctantly. On October 30 the Soviet Government issued a remarkable statement.

"The Soviet Government and all the Soviet people deeply regret that the development of events in Hungary has led to bloodshed. On the request of the Hungarian People's Government the Soviet Government con-

sented to the entry into Budapest of Soviet Army units to assist the Hungarian People's Army and the Hungarian authorities to establish order in the town. Believing that the further presence of Soviet Army units in Hungary can serve as a cause for even greater deterioration of the situation, the Soviet Government has given instructions to its military command to withdraw the Soviet Army units from Budapest as soon as this is recognized as necessary by the Hungarian Government."

Mr. Chairman, despite all the elliptical phrases in that Soviet Government statement, two things are noteworthy:

1. Not one word in the whole statement—which is much longer than the part just quoted—alleges outside instigation, by the United States or any other country. That line began to be played vigorously only after the Soviet Union had proceeded, through an act of classic perfidy, to crush the revolution and disperse the Nagy government.

2. On October 30, Moscow admitted in effect that its army was fighting against a genuine patriotic outburst. That is the only possible meaning of its admission that the further presence of Soviet Army units in Hungary can serve as a cause for even greater deterioration of the situation. The Soviet leaders can never unsay that admission.

October 30 was the high tide of Soviet candor. On November 2, after the Nagy government repudiated the Warsaw Pact, and declared neutrality for Hungary, hundreds of Soviet tanks descended on Budapest. Then Moscow began to tell a different story—that the United States had planned the mass uprising of the Hungarian people.

Mr. Chairman, to most of us here this Soviet argument is a mockery of the facts. We wonder how any man can present it with a straight face. We must remember, however, that the Soviet measure of truth consists solely of whatever advances the interests of the party and the regime.

V. CONCLUSION

There is much that we could propose in the way of Assembly action on this subject, and we would willingly make proposals if we thought that new and constructive resolutions at this time were likely to be a beneficent influence on Soviet policy. However, there is little reason to hope that that would be the case.

The General Assembly has adopted many resolutions pertinent to the problems raised here, most recently with regard to Hungary. The Soviet Union has always failed to observe them. The United States feels that this is not the time for the General Assembly to add new resolutions to what has already been so well expressed. As in so many cases, the need is for Soviet compliance.

Yet we do not despair. We look for the time when the Soviet Government will see fit to restore to the peoples of Eastern Europe their national freedom; to open up their borders to the fresh air of genuinely free interchange with all nations; and to concentrate on promoting the genuine safety and welfare and creative power of their own remarkable people. No event within the power of governments could be of greater benefit to world peace. Someday the Soviet Government must recognize that freedom in Eastern Europe is not incompatible with Soviet security.

If progress is to be made along this road, Mr. Chairman, it is the Soviet Union which must help itself. Today its leaders remain committed to a grim totalitarian philosophy of conflict which leads to suppression of human liberty, to battling all ideas differing from their own.

Mr. Chairman, I close with this word of hope. Long after the Soviet slanders we have heard today are forgotten, this General Assembly will be remembered for the devoted efforts made here in favor of a just peace. The settlements for which we strive are based on the idea that disagreements between nations, no matter how stubborn, can be solved without war. The United States believes that the political warfare which Soviet Communist feels obligated to wage against the free world need not be an exception to that rule. It is of human origin, it is limited, and it will end. May the Soviet Union understand this fact, so that, with its prompt and indispensable help, we can begin to end the conflict peacefully, and in the justice and friendship for which humanity longs.

---

## NOMINATION OF DAVID K. E. BRUCE TO BE AMBASSADOR TO WESTERN GERMANY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, one of the more unusual manifestations of partisanship has appeared in this morning's newspapers. It was carried in a story by the very careful and very responsible Associated Press correspondent, Jack Bell.

The story describes protests carried all the way to the White House by some of our colleagues against the nomination of David K. E. Bruce to be Ambassador to West Germany. The protests have an overtone that deserves careful consideration.

The protests do not claim that Mr. Bruce is unqualified by temperament, training, or inclination to fill this responsible post. They do not claim that he has taken any actions that would hamper his service to the United States.

Those who are doing the protesting base their anger on one point and one point only—that Mr. Bruce has allegedly contributed $1,000 to 1956 Democratic campaign funds.

Mr. President, since when has this Nation operated on the theory that only Republicans can deal with diplomacy? Since when is the sole criterion of a man's ability to serve the use to which he puts his campaign checkbook?

The President of the United States has selected Mr. Bruce without regard to his partisan affiliations. Presumably, the President feels that his qualifications outweigh this factor.

A decision of that kind is one that most Americans would applaud. I do not believe that they would agree with the influential Republican Senator, who asked not to be quoted by name, but who said, according to Jack Bell:

> Senate Republicans were angry at the appointment of a Democratic contributor to one of the choice posts as ambassador often given as a reward to those who have given financial support to the party in power.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Not at this time. I shall be glad to yield when I have concluded my statement.

Mr. President, I do not pose as an expert in the methods by which our Ambassadors are selected. But I think it is an outrage to assume that an ambassadorial post is nothing but a reward for faithful partisan service.

I would take that stand regardless of which party made the appointment.

Our Ambassador to Germany is a key figure in our foreign policy. The American people have only one question about the man who will fill the job—is he capable of representing the United States with ability and with loyalty in a post that is crucial to our future?

I do not recall that Mr. Bruce has ever been overly partisan. He has his convictions—but he has not denied others the right to their convictions.

His nomination will go to a committee which can determine his qualifications. There will be ample time for all the testimony that is needed as to his experience, his faithfulness and his capacity.

Once we have all the facts, we can make our decision. But it will be a sad day for the Senate if it is a political decision rather than a decision as to what course best serves our country.

I ask unanimous consent that Jack Bell's article be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as pertinent to my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRUCE CHOICE AS ENVOY IRKS GOP LEADERS—SENATORS REPORTED IN UPROAR OVER NAMING OF DEMOCRAT

(By Jack Bell)

President Eisenhower's appointment of a $1,000 contributor to 1956 Democratic campaign funds as Ambassador to West Germany threw Senate Republicans into an uproar last night.

Overruling protests carried to the White House by some Republican leaders, Mr. Eisenhower sent to the Senate the nomination of David K. E. Bruce, 59, an Under Secretary of State and an Ambassador to France in the Truman administration.

Bruce, who replaces James B. Conant, was among three diplomatic assignments announced yesterday. The others were Amory Houghton, chairman of the board of the Corning (N. Y.) Glass Works, to replace C. Douglas Dillon as Ambassador to France, and William J. Sebald, a State Department career officer, who fills the vacancy caused by the death of Ambassador to Australia, Douglas Moffat.

Bruce was listed by a Senate elections subcommittee as having contributed $1,000 to Democratic organizations in a report covering the period from January 1 to November 30, 1956.

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, said his colleagues were incensed at the appointment of another Democratic campaign contributor to an important diplomatic post.

"That eliminates any ardor we Senate Republicans might otherwise have to defend the administration from the attacks the Democrats are making on it," he declared.

"They ask us to defend Secretary John Foster Dulles and the President when they are criticized by the Democrats," AIKEN said. "But every time there is an important job to be filled—they give it to a Democrat."

AIKEN, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said it was too early to say whether there would be any organized effort to block confirmation of Bruce's appointment.

Bruce is the son of the late Senator William C. Bruce, a Maryland Democrat, and formerly he was married to a daughter of the late Andrew Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury in three Republican administrations.

There was no immediate Senate reaction to Mr. Eisenhower's appointment of Houghton. Corning Glass has been involved in 1 criminal and 5 civil antitrust actions brought by the Government since 1939.

James C. Hagerty, White House press secretary, was asked whether the President was aware of the antitrust cases against Corning and whether the White House had

any comment on why Houghton resigned from the War Production Board in 1942.

"I have no comment," Hagerty said, "although before an Ambassador is appointed he has a complete check made on him."

PROTESTS OVERRULED

An influential Republican Senator, who asked not to be quoted by name, said Senate Republicans were angry at the appointment of a Democratic contributor to one of the choice posts as Ambassador often given as a reward to those who have given financial support to the party in power.

This Senator said protests had been made more than 2 weeks ago to Meade Alcorn, Republican national chairman against the appointment. He described Alcorn as disturbed by the prospective appointment. Alcorn was reported on his way to Washington from his home in Hartford, Conn., and could not be reached.

The Republican Senator said direct protests against the appointment had been made to Sherman Adams, Mr. Eisenhower's chief assistant. But he said Adams had overruled these objections.

Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Republican, of Maryland, said he was disappointed at the President's action in nominating Bruce but would not oppose confirmation.

"I don't think it's a good practice to appoint Democrats to these jobs when there are plenty of Republicans capable of filling them," BUTLER said.

[Senator FRANCIS CASE (Republican, of South Dakota) said that the "mere fact that he (Bruce) happened to be a Democrat wouldn't disqualify him in my opinion."

["I think the Foreign Relations Committee would want to inquire into the cause of his (Bruce's) espousal of the Stevenson candidacy in relation to the Eisenhower foreign policy and the position of West Germany in the European picture," CASE said.]

Over the last 16 years, Houghton has had several Government jobs. He served as Assistant Deputy Director of the Materials Division, Office of Production Management, in 1941–42, and later in 1942 he was Deputy Chief of the War Production Board's Bureau of Industry Branches. In 1943–44 he was chief mission officer for the Lend-Lease Administration.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER. It is very unlike the very able and distinguished majority leader to regard all objections to this appointment as being in the same category. If he will read the article carefully he will find that I made no objection to the qualifications of Mr. Bruce; as a matter of fact, I said I thought he was qualified. Likewise I made no mention of political contributions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have not charged the distinguished Senator from Maryland with anything.

Mr. BUTLER. But I happen to be one of the Senators mentioned in the article, and I have a right to say on the floor that I made no objection to this nomination. I stated publicly that I had no objection. I could not complain of Mr. Bruce's qualifications. I did not wish to play politics with his nomination. I said and now repeat that there are plenty of qualified Republicans from whom to choose an ambassador and that we do not have to go outside our party to find one. There is nothing evil in Mr. Bruce's appointment, but I say it is better practice at this juncture to choose a Republican.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to associate myself with the distinguished majority leader, and to state that on the basis of personal knowledge, in my opinion David Bruce is one of the best qualified men this country can produce for any post in the diplomatic service, regardless of party.

I recall full well that under Democratic administrations Republican Ambassadors have been appointed. I recall a former colleague of ours, Warren Austin, who was appointed as the first Ambassador to the United Nations. He was a Republican in good standing.

I recall our late colleague Dwight Griswold, a Senator from Nebraska, who was appointed head of the Economic Mission to Greece with the rank of Ambassador.

I recall John McCloy, who was a Republican, and who was appointed High Commissioner to Germany. A High Commissioner is the same as an Ambassador. All of these men were of exceptional ability and all of them served our country well.

I think the President of the United States and Mr. Dulles are to be commended for showing the good judgment they have displayed in selecting a man with the qualifications and the capabilities of David Bruce. He is an honor, an asset to this country, a man of real value, and we need him now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the statement which my friend from Montana has made.

I have made no charges against my friend from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. I merely said that I hoped that we had not come to the point where we operate on the theory that only Republicans will be called to work in the foreign policy field.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, when I read the newspaper this morning, I was very unhappy to see David Bruce's appointment headed for political controversy.

I was personally unhappy, because I have known Mr. Bruce for, I think, about 30 years, and I have watched his record and his interest in our national affairs, which I think have been admirable at all times. I believe he has become one of the most effective men we have seen in the State Department in a good many years.

I should like at this point to make a further statement. I had not realized that the majority leader was going to raise this issue——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that the majority leader did not raise the issue. The issue was raised by the article written by Mr. Bell.

Mr. BUSH. I understand that. I had hoped that the matter would not boil up, so to speak, as it appears to have done.

Mr. Bruce has had considerable experience in the Western European area. As early as 1926 he served as a Foreign Service vice consul in Rome. He returned to Great Britain as chief representative of the American Red Cross in 1940, and from that date until 1954 he was continuously associated with the activities in Western Europe except for a brief period when he served as Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

In 1953, in keeping with the principle of bipartisanship in foreign affairs, Mr. Bruce was appointed United States observer to the Interim Committee of the European Defense Community and special American representative to European High Authority for Coal and Steel. Both of these positions carried a considerable amount of responsibility, were extremely important to United States foreign affairs, and required the utmost in diplomacy. Mr. Bruce served in this capacity at the request of the President. Quoted below is an excerpt from a White House press release of February 18, 1953:

In view of the importance which the United States attaches to the progress being made in Europe toward developing a unified six-nation community, the President has asked Mr. David K. E. Bruce, former Under Secretary of State, to serve as United States observer to the Interim Committee of the European Defense Community and special American representative to the European High Authority for Coal and Steel.

The position of Ambassador to Germany is today one of our most sensitive positions, and requires a man of unique background and the qualifications which Mr. Bruce possesses. And again, in keeping with the principle of bipartisanship, Mr. Bruce was considered the best qualified man for the position.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which will give background information on Mr. David K. Bruce.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON DAVID BRUCE

1921: Admitted to the Maryland bar.
1921–25: Practiced in Baltimore.
1926–28: Vice consul, United States Foreign Service, Rome.
1928–40: Engaged privately in business and farming.
1940: Chief representative in Great Britain for the American Red Cross.
1941–45: With OSS (1943–45, Director of European theater OSS).
1947–48: Assistant Secretary of Commerce.
1948–49: Chief of ECA mission to France.
1949–52: United States Ambassador to France.
1952–53: Under Secretary of State.
1953: Appointed special United States observer at Interim Committee of the European Defense Community.
1953–54: Special American representative to European High Authority for Coal and Steel.

MISCELLANEOUS

1924–26: Member of the Maryland House of Delegates.
1939–42: Member of the Virginia House of Delegates.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, Mr. Bruce is a Democrat. He was a member of the Maryland House of Delegates for 2 years, 1924 to 1926. He was also a member of the Virginia House of Delegates from 1939 to 1942.

In 1953, as a member of the Randall Commission, I was in Paris, and we held hearings there. We heard American Ambassadors assigned to different countries of Europe testify. I believe the members of our commission agreed that Mr. Bruce's testimony was the clearest, the best, and the most effective given to our commission by anyone representing the United States.

So I hope, Mr. President, that this nomination will be considered on its merits. We know that during the Truman administration numerous Republicans were appointed to high office.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement of examples of prominent Republicans who served during the administrations of President Franklin D. Roosevelt and President Harry S. Truman.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following are examples of prominent Republicans who served during the administrations of Roosevelt and Truman:

Secretary of Navy Knox.

Secretary of War Stimson.

John Foster Dulles, who served as adviser to Secretary Acheson on the Japanese treaty.

Warren Austin, first United States Ambassador to the United Nations.

Robert Lovett, Under Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense.

John J. McCloy, United States High Commissioner to Germany.

Paul Nitze, head of the policy planning staff, Department of State.

Dwight Griswold, chief of United States aid mission to Greece.

Milton Eisenhower, representative of the United States to 3d session of UNESCO.

Paul G. Hoffman, Administrator for Economic Cooperation.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, recalled from retirement at Columbia University to serve as commander in chief, NATO.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I shall supply additional names later.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to thank the majority leader for the courtesy he has shown me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I deeply appreciate the statement which the Senator from Connecticut has made.

I shall be glad to yield to all Senators to express themselves on the subject.

I have not known Mr. Bruce as long as has the Senator from Connecticut. I do not know Mr. Bruce as either a Democrat or a Republican, but I believe him to be a patriotic American.

I believe also that the Committee on Foreign Relations will hold hearings and take testimony to determine whether Mr. Bruce is qualified for the post to which he has been appointed. I shall await the action of the committee and the recommendations it may make to the Senate.

The only point which the Senator from Texas desired to make was that he hoped we have not reached the point in the Senate where it is felt that only Republicans are qualified to hold diplomatic positions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I thank the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Texas, for bringing forth from our colleagues these testimonials in behalf of Mr. David Bruce. They are testimonials which are surely merited.

I also wish to thank the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] for his very able and accurate statement relating to Mr. Bruce.

Then I should like to add, in connection with the list which the Senator from Texas has mentioned, that only recently the Committee on Foreign Relations reported favorably the nomination of Mr. Zellerbach to be Ambassador to Italy. Mr. Zellerbach formerly was Chief of the ECA mission in the Truman administration. He served then with the rank of Ambassador, and now he has been named by this administration to be Ambassador to Italy.

A former Ambassador to the United Kingdom, a position which is the chief, choice, top ambassadorial post, was Mr. Gifford, a Republican, who served in the Truman administration. The Ambassadorship to Great Britain is one of the most important ambassadorial posts, if not the most important, in the gift of this Nation.

Mr. Eric Johnston, a Republican, served the Truman administration ably, loyally, and patriotically. He was selected because of his competence rather than because of his political persuasion.

It appears to me that although undoubtedly there are many Republicans who are capable of filling ambassadorial posts, the criteria should be the skill, the ability, and the knowledge of those who are called upon to fill the the posts; their politics should be a secondary consideration.

In Mr. Bruce, the administration has selected a man who was Under Secretary of State, and is keenly aware of the problems which face this country and the world. He served in France during the time when the relationships between France and Germany were of a most critical and crucial nature. His assignment now to one of the most important diplomatic posts is certainly in line with his previous experience. I, for one, not knowing Mr. Bruce personally, except in a casual way, but knowing him chiefly because of his splendid service record, feel that the President is to be commended for making this appointment.

I urge the President to reach deep into the talent of this Nation for further such assignments. It is a national shame that great talents, skill, and ability, which are so sorely needed at this terrible hour in our Nation's history, are being lost to the Government while they cruise around the world, so to speak, on a private basis. The Government needs the best assistance it can get.

There are men of the stature of the former Senator from Connecticut, Mr. Benton, and Mr. Chester Bowles, and also, to mention him again, John McCloy, who are needed for the service of this Government, rather than in private industry or in the writing of articles. They are desperately needed to bring our Nation peace and security, and to give us better faith and better image in the world in which we live.

I hope the President will make more such appointments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the comments of my friend from Minnesota. I thoroughly subscribe to the sentiments which he has expressed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I rise to make a brief comment on the colloquy concerning the nomination of Mr. David Bruce to be Ambassador to West Germany. I think it has been generally realized, both during this administration and in the previous one, that it was important in the field of our foreign policy to have bipartisan representation and support. It is perfectly obvious to every observer, both within the Senate and without, that with the parties so closely divided as they are, and with the Democratic Party holding the control of both this body and the body on the other side of the Capitol, if our Government is to function as the Government of the United States, and not as two warring coequal branches of the Government, it is necessary that there be cooperation.

I have commended Senators on the other side of the aisle on various occasions throughout the first 4 years of this administration for having supported administration proposals on a basis which placed the country above any narrow partisanship. I think it is entirely proper that from time to time Members of the other party be selected, just as it has been pointed out that during the 20 years of Democratic administrations many Republicans were appointed to office.

I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle will not become overanxious, because I think by the time we Republicans have been in power for 20 years, our list will equal in size their list. But that does not necessarily have to be done in the first 5 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I want the record to show that I do not share the Senator's optimism. [Laughter.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it is entirely proper, as the President of the United States and the Secretary of State have felt it is, to have the nomination of Mr. Bruce submitted to the Senate. Based on the information I have concerning the caliber, character, and background of Mr. Bruce, I should imagine, without trying to prejudge what the Committee on Foreign Relations will do, that the nomination will probably be reported favorably to the Senate by a substantial majority; and after due discussion, the nomination probably will be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am grateful for the comments which the distinguished minority leader has made. The contribution which he has made to the discussion is the type of statement which I would expect to come from BILL KNOWLAND.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his statement. The junior Senator from Arizona merely wishes to make the observation that he does not desire to enter the colloquy about the merits or demerits of Democrats for appointment to foreign posts or for other political assignments.

The distinguished majority leader read a list of Republicans who had served under the Democrats, and while the junior Senator from Arizona is perfectly willing to accept almost all of those names unequivocally, and a few of them with some reservations, I suggest that, in my book, Paul Hoffman does not fulfill the requirements of being a Republican.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Arizona and Mr. Hoffman can debate that matter between themselves. I never become involved in such discussions.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I simply wanted to remind the Senator from Texas that Collier's is no longer in business.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I was not aware of the Bruce controversy until this morning. Frankly, I was deeply shocked to hear of the story that was reported in the newspapers.

I have known Mr. David Bruce for a considerable time. I was very closely associated with him in his operations abroad during the days when this Nation was trying to develop the Marshall plan and similar operations in Europe.

I feel that his appointment constitutes one of the finest appointments this administration has made. He is a man eminently well qualified and trained for the post. He has been living with the western European situation practically since the close of World War II. It never occurred to me to question whether he was a Democrat or a Republican. I agree with the distinguished majority leader completely on that score.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I never have entertained any doubt about my able and scholarly friend from New Jersey associating himself with the theory that Ambassadors should come from only one party. The senior Senator from New Jersey is not that partisan.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, We are having a very important discussion. I am in favor of more appointments from the Republican Party, but certainly in the field of diplomacy or foreign relations, we must try to pick the best Americans available.

I know from personal experience that David Bruce is one of the outstanding and one of the best-informed Americans of today; and from my experience on the Foreign Relations Committee, I have felt that he is one of the most intelligent Americans we have had serving us abroad, where he has reported accurately and faithfully the existing conditions.

I wish to state that I do not believe politics should enter into our consideration of nominations to ambassadorships.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my delightful friend, the Senator from California, if he wishes to take part in this discussion.

Mr. KUCHEL. I do; and I thank the Senator from Texas for yielding to me.

I wish to state that I very much regret that the article to which reference has been made, written by a distinguished newspaperman, has caused my friend, the majority leader, some concern and, beyond that, has provoked the long colloquy which has occurred here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to point out to my friend that not only has it caused the majority leader some concern, but it has caused others some concern. When we reach the point where protests are made to the White House because an ambassadorial appointee may have supported one party or contributed to one party, we come to a sad day in America.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to attempt to allay a little of the apprehension which apparently the newspaper article has caused.

Mr. President, I do not doubt that in the past 25 years, political considerations have—perhaps unfortunately, perhaps not—sometimes motivated national administrations in making appointments to specific positions. But in the present instance I am glad to say that, like the Senator from Texas, I want the person nominated to serve our Nation as Ambassador to West Germany to be judged on his merits, and on his merits alone.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I welcome the Senator from California to the fold; I am always delighted to be associated with him, and I am glad that he feels that the standard of merit should control in the making of appointments.

Mr. KUCHEL. However, with all due respect, I suggest to my friend, the Senator from Texas, the relevancy of the Good Book:

> Judge not, that ye be not judged.
> For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.
> And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?

I suggest that the Republican Party and the Democratic Party equally have within them great men of the Nation, and equally have within them men who are motivated by politics and by political considerations and by nothing else.

Good appointments and bad appointments have been, and will be, made by any and every administration. Neither holding public office, nor party labels, are any guaranty of ability.

In this instance a Republican administration has seen fit to designate one who apparently is an able American citizen, registered in the Democratic Party, to participate in the nonpartisan foreign policy of the Government of the United States. The Senate will now await the recommendations of the Foreign Relations Committee. Then we here will make our judgment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement the Senator from California has made. Evidently he did not hear my statement when I said that I would take the stand that I have taken today in the Senate regardless of which party made the appointment.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am sure my friend would do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, referring to the colloquy regarding the nomination of Mr. Bruce to be Ambassador of the United States to West Germany, may I say that I think the apprehension of the distinguished majority leader may be exaggerated. However, I do not wish to address myself to that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield at this point?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I deplore the fact that the Senator from Kentucky feels that I exaggerated any apprehension. I merely quoted from an article quoting certain Republican Senators. I said—as I have stated many times in the past, when Democratic administrations have named Republicans to ambassadorial posts—that I did not think partisan affiliations should be the sole qualification for appointment to diplomatic posts.

Mr. COOPER. I understood perfectly the statement made by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would not want my friend, the Senator from Kentucky, to think that I exaggerated anything.

Mr. COOPER. I only say that I think the Senator has exaggerated the political significance of the newspaper report.

However, I wish to address myself to the appointment itself.

Because of the positions Mr. Bruce has held, and with distinction—as our Ambassador to France, and in other positions connected with NATO and ECA—I am sure that his background of experience will be very valuable in the position of Ambassador to West Germany, for which he has been nominated.

The relationships of France and Germany are important, as they have always been. Mr. Bruce understands these relationships and he has played an important part in the development of our relationship with our European allies. I am happy the President has nominated him. I have no doubt, and I am sure the distinguished majority leader has no doubt at all, that his nomination will be confirmed by the Senate. While consideration of the appointment by the Foreign Relations Committee is required, I have no doubt of the confirmation of Mr. Bruce's nomination, nor of the great abilities he will bring to the post.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I express the hope that my good friend from Kentucky will carefully read the statement of the majority leader, which will appear in the RECORD tomorrow morning, and then draw his own conclusions.

Mr. MONRONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished majority leader for raising the question whether political membership in one party should deny to a proven able diplomat the right to serve his country. Certainly if the State Department thought Mr. Bruce could properly fill the toughest diplomatic position today, that of being Ambassador to West Germany,

and selected him for that purpose, he was selected not because of his membership in a particular political party, but despite his membership in it. He was selected because throughout the years, when he was tested by the State Department in various diplomatic posts, where decisions had to be made, Mr. Bruce met the tests.

In meeting the challenge which appeared in the form of complaints to the White House, I feel the distinguished majority leader has raised a most important point, and one which should prevent future attacks on individuals and attempts to blackball their appointments simply because they are not members of the party of the President who happens to be in power.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to identify myself with Senators who spoke earlier expressing confidence in David Bruce as our prospective Ambassador to the Republic of West Germany.

I have known Mr. Bruce for a long time, and have great confidence in him. I may observe that it is the essence of bipartisanship when the best from both parties are picked for important appointments.

Perhaps the majority leader looks for too much when he expects every member of both parties to be convinced that bipartisanship is best. We can hardly expect that in our country. We have seen today some of the differences which exist. The expression of views on both sides has been helpful. It has shown what I think is true; namely, that the great majority of opinion supports bipartisanship, including appointments to high office.

## SCHEDULED ADDRESSES BY THE PREMIER OF FRANCE AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF WEST GERMANY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have an announcement to make concerning the program for the Senate. As previously announced, the Premier of France, Guy Mollet, will address the Senate tomorrow at 3:30 p. m.

I had earlier advised the Senate that a joint meeting of the House and Senate had been arranged for March 7 to hear an address to be delivered by the President of the Republic of West Germany, Adolph Huess. Unfortunately, President Huess is ill, and has postponed his visit to the United States. I am sure that at a later date similar arrangements will be made, and the Senate will be advised.

## INCREASE OF THE INTEREST RATE ON GI MORTGAGES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was with great satisfaction that I noted that the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs firmly rejected, last week, the administration's proposal to raise the interest rate on GI home mortgages from 4½ percent to 5 percent, and, instead, proposed to the House a bill similar to my own bill, S. 88, which would provide substantial funds derived from the national service life insurance revolving fund to purchase GI mortgages at par.

It is typical of this administration to take the sterile line that the only way out of the current home mortgage problem is to raise the interest rate.

Mr. President, this administration seems to have only two answers to the great economic problems of this Nation. One is to lower price supports on agricultural commodities wherever possible, and the other is to raise the interest rates wherever possible. The result is that the farmer is desperately trying to keep his farm together, the construction worker and the whole construction industry are slipping frantically into a truly desperate situation, and veteran home buyers are unable to find financing; and, on the other hand, the great financial houses of the country are enjoying unprecedented profits.

A recent issue of the St. Paul Pioneer Press carried an article, written by Mr. Relman Morin of the Associated Press, entitled "Tight Money: High Loan Rates Drag on Housing." I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD this article from the February 20, 1957, issue of the St. Paul Pioneer Press.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIGHT MONEY: HIGH LOAN RATES DRAG ON HOUSING

(By Relman Morin)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Tight money is not a mysterious condition confined solely to banks, bond houses, or Wall Street. It touches the blueprints of the home you may be planning or the house you want to buy. In this third article of a series on the Nation's economy Relman Morin, AP staff writer, shows how it has affected the home building industry and the people in industries affected by building.)

Most Americans want to own their own home today, and most of them do. Of all the astonishing changes of the last 25 years, this is one of the most spectacular. Today nearly 60 percent of America's 43 million families live in their own homes. Before World War II the figure was nearer 40 percent, and there were fewer families.

Well, wedding bells ring for 1½ million couples a year now, and young people don't wait, as their parents had to wait, to accumulate so much cash for the down payment on a house.

Babies arrive—over 4 million a year at the latest count—and they tend to set people thinking of a home with a backyard.

Government help on financing spurred these urges.

Thus the home-building industry has become a gigantic segment of the Nation's economy. Every year since 1948 it has erected a million or more dwelling units. Into them went mountains of wood, glass, metal, bricks, concrete, plaster, and plastics—quickly followed by other mountains of furniture, rugs, household appliances, textiles.

Estimates say 1 out of every 15 wage earners (not counting those on farms) owes his livelihood today to home building.

So this is big business, involving millions of people. And right now it is a wide-screen headache for many of them.

A builder here is angry, a would-be buyer there frustrated. Congress is examining problems of both. The Federal managers of money have come under hot fire.

LOAN PROBLEMS

Home building dropped off in 1956. It went down from the 1,300,000 units of 1955 to 1,100,000. Some estimates, but by no means all, are that it will drop again this year.

Looking at 1956, analysis saw a sharp reduction in total GI home-loan applications to the Veterans' Administration. Did that mean fewer ex-GI's are trying to buy homes?

"No," said the builders. "It's money." They pointed out that GI applications are not accepted by the VA until lenders have agreed to put up the money for the proposed purchase.

Tight money has brought a rise in interest rates on loans. The VA rate is 4½ percent. It is 5 percent for the Federal Housing Administration. Investigators found they could do better elsewhere than on these mortgages.

Allied with the drop in GI applications was another aspect.

Requests from builders to the VA to appraise the value of homes to be made available for GI loans also fell off sharply.

That could mean more builders plan to concentrate on putting up higher priced dwellings. Along with interest rates, the cost of land, labor, and materials have risen.

But George Sullivan Goodyear, president of the National Association of Home Builders (NAHB)—himself a builder—said tight money was the chief item in the headache.

"The cost of money has gone up more than any other single item in the cost of a house," he said. "It has forced us to price ourselves out of the market."

Late last year, the NAHB questioned 800 contractors across the country on the situation and the outlook for this year. Some findings—

1. Most thought money would remain tight and many expect it to get tighter.

2. Median prices on homes were expected to rise from $14,700 last year to $15,200 this year.

3. A majority reported that they, personally, expect to do as well or better in 1957 as last year. But nearly 70 percent predicted a nationwide drop in home building.

"Uncertainty * * * is the dominant note," said the NAHB, summarizing the outlook for 1957.

To see the picture at a closer range, take an individual case.

Samuel Block is a contractor in Detroit suburbs. He has been building 7 years. No specialist, he put up different types of homes, ranging from $7,000 to $30,000 in price.

"I've got 12 VA-type homes standing empty," he said. "Every time I sell one, I lose close to $500. I would have been better off just to hold the land."

## EARLY DAYS IN MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, steamboat travel on the rivers in Montana is rather remote, and a point of history; but in Montana there is one lady who has a vivid memory of days when steamboat travel on the Missouri River was an accepted mode of transportation. Mrs. Jessie Robertson, when 11 years old, came up the Missouri River by steamboat with her mother. She has lived in the Great Falls-Sun River area for 81 years.

Mrs. Robertson is very alert at 92, and can relate many interesting incidents in the transformation of Montana Territory into the great Treasure State.

A feature story in the February 12, 1957, issue of the Great Falls Tribune contains a number of Mrs. Robertson's recollections of her earlier years in Montana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Great Falls Woman, 92, Recalls Early Days at Sun River," be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHE CAME UP THE MISSOURI RIVER BY STEAMBOAT—GREAT FALLS WOMAN, 92, RECALLS EARLY DAYS AT SUN RIVER

(By Tribune staff writer)

Montana residents in this year of 1957 who can remember steamboat days on the Missouri River are, in the nature of things, extremely few. One Great Falls resident who has such memories is Mrs. Jessie Robertson, who lives at the Elmore Apartments, each winter, and in an historic brick house at Sun River town each summer.

She is Mrs. Jessie Robertson, who at the age of 11 came up the Missouri River by steamboat with her mother, and who has lived in the Great Falls-Sun River area for 81 years.

It was in June 1876—the month of the Battle of the Little Big Horn—that Jessie and her mother, Mrs. John Vorus, boarded the steamboat *General Meade* at Sioux City, Iowa, for the trip to Fort Benton. Jessie's father, a Civil War veteran, was hospitalized at the Soldiers' Home in Milwaukee because of disabilities resulting from war service. Mrs. Vorus and daughter were en route to Montana Territory to make their home with Mrs. Vorus' father, James Strong, who had a ranch near Sun River town.

The Strong ranch was a mile and a quarter from the town, near the James Adams place. On arrival at Fort Benton, Mrs. Vorus and Jessie boarded a stagecoach for the final leg of their journey.

Today, Mrs. Robertson's memory, sight, and hearing are excellent. She observed her 92d birthday January 19.

What does she recall of the trip up the Missouri?

"I recall that among our fellow passengers was a brother of Nick Kessler, Helena pioneer, and his three daughters," Mrs. Robertson said. "The girls' mother had died, and their father was taking them to Helena to make their home. The Kessler girls' names were Louisa, Mary and Emma."

At one point on the river where the steamboat halted to take on wood, Indians came aboard.

"They wanted to buy the second Kessler girl and me," Mrs. Robertson said. "They offered 20 ponies for her and 10 ponies for me. I don't think they were joking, either."

Every time the boat stopped to take on wood, Jessie and the Kessler girls would go ashore to play. At one point, some of the men took rope and put up a swing to amuse the young passengers during the stopover.

The up-river trip from Sioux City to Fort Benton took 4 weeks.

Jessie Vorus attended the old Sun River School, later going to Helena to study at a Catholic convent. At the age of 18, she married B. A. Robertson, who worked at the George Steell store in Sun River. Robertson died at Havre in 1933.

Mrs. Robertson now maintains the former Steell home as a summer residence. Steell, long a leading citizen of Sun River, later became agent for the Blackfeet Indians and still later was a pioneer resident of the Flathead North Fork area, at Polebridge.

She recalls the days when troops were stationed at Fort Shaw.

"I remember riding horseback from Sun River to Fort Shaw with a girl friend, and seeing the soldiers at target practice. We rode side-saddle, of course; it was considered quite improper for girls and young women to ride in any other fashion in those days.

"What did we do for recreation besides riding? Well there was a dance almost every Friday night in the hall above the Sun River store. Usually we danced all night and would go to the hotel for breakfast. I remember that when Negro troops were stationed at Fort Shaw, an excellent orchestra from the post, conducted by a tall Negro named Whittaker, supplied the music."

Mrs. Robertson also recalls the lynching of a Negro soldier at Sun River, following a shooting affray there. This was only a short time before the Army post was deactivated and the troops removed forever.

"Sun River residents were apprehensive after this lynching," Mrs. Robertson recalls. "They were afraid of a reprisal by the soldiers, but nothing of the kind occurred.

"Negro soldiers at Fort Shaw were not allowed to have their wives and families on the post, and some of them maintained their families in Sun River. Normally, relations between the townspeople and the soldiers were friendly."

Did the soldiers from Fort Shaw visit Sun River much during their leisure hours? Not much, Mrs. Robertson said. The Negro troops appeared to frequent the neighboring town more than the white troops which had preceded them, possibly because of the ban on Negro families at Fort Shaw.

Mrs. Robertson knew Will Hanks, editor of the Sun River Sun, very well. Hanks subsequently moved his printshop to Great Falls and established the Great Falls Tribune.

Other pioneers of the valley she recalls were Robert Vaughn, for whom the town of Vaughn was named; the Dunn brothers, Matt and Tom; John Largent, Robert S. Ford, father of Lee M. Ford, chairman of the board of the Great Falls National Bank, who still lives in the paternal home near Sun River; John Healy, and, of course, James Adams, who was her uncle.

Mrs. Robertson's mother died at the age of 102, at Billings, and is buried at Sun River, as are her grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. James Strong.

The Robertsons had 5 children—2 sons and 3 daughters. Only the daughters survive. They are Mrs. Norma Ketchum, Ephrata, Wash.; Ruth Robertson, Puyallup, Wash., and Mrs. Dorothy Davies, Missoula.

Mrs. Robertson has 10 grandchildren, and 9 great-grandchildren. Mrs. Fred Traber, 1512½ First Avenue South, is a granddaughter.

---

## THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I read in yesterday morning's issue of the New York Times a most interesting list of the public obligations of the United States which must be paid in the next 12 months. The brief article to which I refer is headed "One-Year Maturities Are $75,770,817,783."

It reads:

Direct obligations of the United States Government in the hands of the public that will mature within 12 months amount to $75,770,817,783. They consist of Treasury bonds, certificates of indebtedness, bills, and notes as follows:

I shall not read the entire list, but I point out that this list, as published yesterday, shows obligations almost $200 million greater than the list published a week ago; that it is more than $6 billion greater than the maturities which were coming up a year ago.

I have been making it a practice, Mr. President, to call the attention of the Senate and of those who read the RECORD to the enormous debt of the United States. These figures in the article published in the New York Times, which occupy less than 4 inches of space, tell us that the obligations which we must pay during the next 12 months are greater than was the entire national debt before we entered World War II. The debt has been steadily increasing, and, more important than that, the interest upon the national debt has been increasing during the last 4 years.

Beginning with 1953, it has been the policy of the Treasury Department to raise the interest on the national debt. The budget which the President sent to Congress last January for the fiscal year 1958 calls for $100 million more to pay the interest upon the national debt than during the previous fiscal year. The interest upon the national debt has been steadily increasing, until now it amounts to about $7,500,000,000. The $7,500,000,000 which we now will have to pay to the holders of the obligations of the Treasury is more than the cost for the operation of Congress, for the operation of the courts, and for the operation of all the other normal activities of government.

Only back in 1939 and 1940, before we became involved in World War II, the total appropriations made by the Congress of the United States for all purposes was scarcely more than $10½ billion. It is important to bear this in mind when we are considering resolutions such as that which will presently be before the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the clipping to which I have referred may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the clipping was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE-YEAR MATURITIES ARE $75,770,817,783

Direct obligations of the United States Government in the hands of the public that will mature within 12 months amount to $75,770,817,783. They consist of Treasury bonds, certificates of indebtedness, bills, and notes as follows:

| Date | Bonds, etc. | Amount |
|---|---|---|
| Feb. 25 | Discount bills | $1,600,093,000 |
| Mar. 1 | Series E savings bonds [1] | 2,221,561,610 |
| 1 | Series F savings bonds [1] | 439,668,849 |
| 1 | Series G savings bonds [1] | 1,576,728,600 |
| 7 | Discount bills | 1,600,005,000 |
| 14 | do | 1,599,968,000 |
| 15 | 2⅞-percent Treasury notes | 575,000,000 |
| 21 | Discount bills | 1,600,310,000 |
| 22 | 2¾-percent tax anticipation certificates | 3,220,612,000 |
| 22 | Tax anticipation bills | 1,005,647,000 |
| 28 | Discount bills | 1,614,593,000 |
| Apr. 1 | 1½-percent Treasury notes | 9,000,000 |
| 4 | Discount bills | 1,599,988,000 |
| 11 | do | 1,600,455,000 |
| 18 | do | 1,600,493,000 |
| 25 | do | 1,600,512,000 |
| May 2 | do | 1,700,238,000 |
| 9 | do | 1,700,188,000 |
| 15 | 1¾-percent Treasury notes | 4,154,930,000 |
| 16 | Discount bills | 1,700,438,000 |
| 23 | do | 1,800,319,000 |
| June 24 | Tax anticipation bills | 3,351,464,000 |
| 24 | 3¼-percent tax anticipation certificates | 1,311,980,000 |
| Aug 1 | 2¾-percent Treasury notes | 12,056,091,000 |
| 15 | 2 percent Treasury notes | 3,792,028,000 |
| Oct. 1 | 1½-percent Treasury notes | 824,196,000 |
| 1 | 3¼-percent certificates of indebtedness | 7,270,942,000 |
| *1958* | | |
| Jan. 1 | Series E savings bonds | 2,343,258,752 |
| 1 | Series F savings bonds | 210,252,572 |
| 1 | Series G savings bonds | 1,667,867,400 |
| Feb. 14 | 3½-percent certificates of indebtedness | 8,422,000,000 |
| | Total | 75,770,817,783 |
| | Week ago | 75,884,325,783 |
| | Year ago | 69,490,985,203 |

[1] Maturing monthly within a year from this date forward.

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLAKLEY in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Barrett | Holland | Neuberger |
| Bible | Humphrey | O'Mahoney |
| Blakeley | Javits | Saltonstall |
| Carroll | Johnson, Tex. | Stennis |
| Ervin | Long | Thurmond |
| Gore | Mansfield | Watkins |
| Hayden | McClellan | |
| Hennings | Morse | |

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Oregon whether he wishes the quorum call continued? I am addressing the junior Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No debate is in order at this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. I object. If we are going to have the practice of holding Members to a quorum call, it cannot be had only for the convenience of the leadership of the Senate, but will have to be had——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No debate is in order. Objection is heard. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERR, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THYE, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YOUNG answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

---

## DISQUALIFICATIONS OF JOHN FOSTER DULLES TO BE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to address a few remarks to the question of the qualifications of the Secretary of State to perform the duties of his very important position in this hour of great crisis in American foreign policy. I base my remarks on an interesting article entitled "John Foster Dulles: A Very Complicated Man," written by Joseph C. Harsch, and published in Harper's magazine. The article reads, in part, as follows:

John Foster Dulles' father was a Presbyterian clergyman, daily and earnestly concerned with righteousness and duty. Both his maternal grandfather, John W. Foster, and his uncle, Robert Lansing, were men who achieved prominence, wealth, and an identical title: Secretary of State of the United States.

Matching the achievements of his grandfather and uncle, without breaking faith with his father, is not a task which our present Secretary of State consciously assigned to himself in his boyhood. Yet this difficult ambition is woven unmistakably in his career—and it has helped make him the most intriguing and the most controversial figure in the Eisenhower administration.

Dwight D. Eisenhower has called Mr. Dulles the greatest Secretary of State he knows anything about. RICHARD NIXON once said, "Isn't it wonderful to have a Secretary of State who stands up to the Russians?" But to Randolph Churchill is attributed the remark that he "smells of nonconformism," and the Democratic view is typified by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON'S contention that Mr. Dulles is "the original misguided missile, traveling fast, making lots of noise, and never hitting the target."

Mr. Harsch goes on to say:

Assessments of Mr. Dulles seem usually to fall into one or the other of these extremes.

The article is a very interesting one. It continues by analyzing the complex nature of this man. I wish to make it a part of my remarks about the Secretary; therefore I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN FOSTER DULLES: A VERY COMPLICATED MAN

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

John Foster Dulles' father was a Presbyterian clergyman, daily and earnestly concerned with righteousness and duty. Both his maternal grandfather, John W. Foster, and his uncle, Robert Lansing, were men who achieved prominence, wealth, and an identical title: Secretary of State of the United States.

Matching the achievements of his grandfather and uncle, without breaking faith with his father, is not a task which our present Secretary of State consciously assigned to himself in his boyhood. Yet this difficult ambition is woven unmistakably into his career—and it has helped make him the most intriguing and the most controversial figure in the Eisenhower administration.

Dwight D. Eisenhower has called Mr. Dulles the greatest Secretary of State he knows anything about. RICHARD NIXON once said, "Isn't it wonderful to have a Secretary of State who stands up to the Russians?" But to Randolph Churchill is attributed the remark that he "smells of nonconformism," and the Democratic view is typified by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON'S contention that Mr. Dulles is "the original misguided missile, traveling fast, making lots of noise, and never hitting the target."

Assessments of Mr. Dulles seem usually to fall into one or the other of these extremes. One of the many curious things about him is the fact that he tends to arouse either approval bordering on veneration, or disapproval ranging close to moral contempt. Those who have worked closely with him in business and in government seldom view him dispassionately. This is surprising, when it is noted that in his personal relations Mr. Dulles is gregarious, sociable, a genial dinner-table companion, lucid in exposition, reasonable and openminded in discussion.

British diplomats—who were prepared to dislike him after their relatively successful relations with Dean Acheson—will tell you privately (never publicly, for that would do too much violence to a British folklore presumption of original Dulles sin) that he is very good in private negotiations, and much better than Acheson, you know, on the colonial question.

Mr. Dulles himself has probably contributed more than anyone to the confusion and controversy which surrounds his career. Because of him, "liberation," "unleashing," "massive retaliation," "agonizing reappraisal," and "brink of war" have become clichés in the current vernacular of Washington. They are often used with a connotation of an empty pose.

He is more vulnerable to criticism from his own publicly spoken record than from any other source, because in his official life he is given to overstatements, oversimplification, and less than total candor—flaws which are usually absent from his private conversations.

A substantial explanation of the dualism between his public and private behavior is that he progressed from being a small-town preacher's son to his present eminence by way of the legal profession. For years his daily task was to make the best case he could for his client. He is reputed to have been the most highly paid corporation lawyer in the history of New York City. A lawyer is not expected to believe the partisan side of the case which he presents for his client. He does not carry it into his personal beliefs or private conversations. Nor is consistency expected. He may take the opposite side of the same argument on behalf of his next client. Such professional habits are not easily shaken off.

COURTROOM DIPLOMACY

Mr. Dulles earned his position in the legal profession against odds. He got his job with the law firm of Sullivan & Cromwell at $50 per month on the insistence of Grandfather Foster and against the better judgment of the senior partners. The partners consented to give him a chance, but they took negligible interest in a boy from the back country who had slight connections with the big families or big corporations—and who, besides, had taken his law at George Washington University, not at Yale or Harvard. The fact that he had graduated with the highest marks ever granted at George Washington was no compensation in their eyes for his other shortcomings.

The quality which broke through the resistance of Sullivan and Cromwell and made him, ultimately, the senior partner was his

ability to make a case for a client. He did it so successfully that not until he reached the age of 61 did he experience what could be called a check to his career. Then, in 1949, he ran for the Senate, and was beaten by Herbert Lehman.

The technique of making a case for a client has persisted into his conduct of American diplomacy, and not surprisingly it has involved him in instances of embarrassing inconsistency. When he was in Pakistan last March, for example, he argued to members of the SEATO alliance that it pays to be an ally of the United States—citing facts and figures to prove that allies get better treatment at the United States Treasury than nonallies. Seven days later he was in nonallied Indonesia saying, "there is no connection whatsoever" between our financial aid and membership in a military-security pact with the United States. He cited as evidence the fact that India and Ceylon receive such aid although they are not allied with the United States.

In between he stopped over in New Delhi and tried to persuade Prime Minister Nehru that he had not been unfriendly to India when he had previously referred to Goa, that much debated Portuguese enclave on the Indian coast, as a province of Portugal.

Another striking example of making a case was provided by Mr. Dulles on February 24, 1956. The new Soviet diplomacy had for months been running rings around Western diplomacy. Soviet arms had gone to Egypt, Soviet trade delegations were roving as far afield as Latin America, Pakistan had agreed to send a trade mission to Moscow, and the administration had entangled itself in the on-again, off-again fiasco of tank shipments to Saudi Arabia. Yet Mr. Dulles asserted: "At this moment in Moscow they are having to revise their whole program. They have failed."

This was followed by one of the rare explosions of Senate, and public, criticism of Mr. Dulles (there had been an earlier explosion over his "massive retaliation" phrase). It evoked an explanation at the State Department that Mr. Dulles' doctrine of Soviet failure was based on a comparison of the Soviet position in 1948 with the Soviet position in 1956. Now the West was undoubtedly better off in 1956 than it had been in 1948—but what critics had been talking about was the appearance of a Western decline from 1953 to 1956. Mr. Dulles had built his case for Soviet failure on a convenient selection of dates which gave him the advantages of the Marshall plan, formation of the NATO alliance, successful resistance to aggression in Korea, and the refurbishing of Western military power—all pre-1952 Truman-Acheson achievements, which Mr. Dulles had tended to minimize in the 1952 election year. He may have felt, however, that his client had changed, after the Democrats regained control of Congress in 1954.

Certain inconsistencies between remarks made by Mr. Dulles during the 1952 campaign and in a 1949 Senate speech were raised at the Senate hearing on his confirmation in January of 1953. Mr. Dulles explained that "under our constitutional system we have a general election every 4 years * * * one side presents his case, and the other side presents the other case, as two lawyers do when they go into court. At that stage the two parties are not judges and they are not judicial. In my opinion they should not be * * * but when that time is past, then I believe we should try to work together on a bipartisan basis."

When Life magazine came on the streets in early January of 1956 with an article based on recorded conversations with Mr. Dulles which pictured him as almost the sole bulwark of the peace, Democrats concluded that Mr. Dulles' quadrennial release from judiciousness had come around. Even Vice President NIXON commented dryly that "the rest of us can take care of the campaigning."

Another characteristic of many distinguished lawyers is the lack of an administrative flair. (This is, perhaps, natural, since they ordinarily work alone or with a handful of close associates, and thus have little chance to learn the techniques of managing a large organization.) In Mr. Dulles this trait seems to be pronounced.

Sullivan & Cromwell partners recall that when Dulles was senior partner he exhibited more than usual aversion to administrative work. The senior partner normally oversees this part of the firm's operations—as the present senior partner, Arthur Dean, does. During the Dulles term, however, one of the other partners took over this work by mutual and tacit consent.

Shortly before taking office as Secretary of State Mr. Dulles expressed a wish that he might have an "ivory tower" office off in some obscure corner of the White House where he could just think about foreign policy, and not have any formal connection with the vast, complex, hierarchical structure of the Department of State. He did not get his wish, but his subordinates have sometimes suspected that in his own subconscious mind he did. It is frequently said that he carries the foreign policies of the United States around in his coat pocket. He seldom delegates policy responsibility and it is noteworthy that—as in the case of the Saudi Arabian arms shipments—no one was quite sure what the policy was until he came back from his Duck Island vacation retreat.

The once-powerful secondary officials of the Department have tended to become merely executors of his policy (when they are informed of what it is) and the rank of Ambassador has steadily declined in importance during the Dulles incumbency. When there is any important negotiating to be done Mr. Dulles usually goes himself, leaving his Ambassadors no function higher than that of reporters. Even this residual function has been of declining relevance, since Mr. Dulles has his own views of each situation clearly in mind. Ambassadorial reports bear upon Dulles' thinking, but seldom influence it; and, it is said, they never cause a reversal of a strong Dulles view. Ambassadors have been called home for consultation without being consulted by Mr. Dulles.

During the Acheson period, policy was generated out of the impact upon each other of many and diverse minds in the Department. Mr. Acheson set up and used an institution called the policy planning staff. He frequently overrode its conclusions, but he did not assume that his thinking alone could generate foreign policy. Today the policy planning staff has fallen into disuse: Department policy begins and ends in Mr. Dulles' own mind. Dulles' policy is influenced heavily by the Senate. It is sometimes reversed by the President. It is adjusted within the limits of tolerance of public opinion. But the machinery of the State Department plays the least of the roles in the process.

The fact that Mr. Dulles is one of the most traveled Secretaries of State in history is a direct result of his unfamiliarity with the use of an administrative apparatus. To him, his staff of experts, his farflung Foreign Service, appear to be not an instrument, but a baffling encumbrance from which he disengages himself insofar as he is able.

James F. Byrnes—another lawyer—exhibited a similar inclination, although to a lesser degree. When he was negotiating with the Soviets in Moscow in 1945, one of his aids (now an Ambassador) suggested that the delegation ought to send a report of its work back to the State Department. "Why?" Mr. Byrnes inquired in genuine bewilderment. "What would be the point of that? I'm here."

Mr. Dulles also is capable of assuming that wherever he happens to be at the moment, there, too, is the Department of State. In his case, however, it comes closer to being true.

A related quality is his facility for disentangling himself from embarrassments. In 1947 he had nominated Alger Hiss, with the highest recommendations, for the post of director of the Carnegie Endowment. When the pumpkin papers were unearthed in August 1948 he and Dean Acheson were both vulnerable to criticism, because of their past associations with Hiss; Mr. Dulles was, if anything, more so because he had provided Hiss with refuge at the Carnegie Endowment after Hiss had been maneuvered out of the State Department under Mr. Byrnes.

### A MATTER OF THEOLOGY

At once Mr. Dulles relieved Hiss of all active duties at the Carnegie Endowment. He appeared as a prosecution witness at both of the Hiss trials. He contradicted Hiss testimony on five specific points during the final stage of the second trial. By the day of the verdict, January 21, 1949, he was ready to say:

"The conviction of Alger Hiss is a human tragedy. It is tragic that so great promise should have come to so inglorious an end. But the greater tragedy is that seemingly our national ideals no longer inspire the loyal devotion needed for their defense." (Some 25,000 American boys were shortly to challenge Mr. Dulles' lugubrious generalization by giving their lives on the battlefields of Korea.)

Precisely 4 days later Dean Acheson—citing as his text the 25th chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, verses 34 through 46, the theological basis on which the ministers of the Christian church follow even a convicted murderer to the scaffold—said:

"I should like to make clear to you that whatever the outcome of any appeal which Mr. Hiss or his lawyers may make in this case, I do not intend to turn my back on Alger Hiss."

Some philosophic observers of the two men see in this disparity of reaction to the same incident an outbreak of the ancient conflict between Presbyterian and Episcopalian: the one prudently turning his back, the other defiantly wearing past mistakes. If there is self-righteousness in either position, or both, it is a matter for a panel of theologians to determine.

The triple reconciliation of righteousness, duty, and success is not always an easy one. Theologians would also be intrigued by the way Mr. Dulles resolved it when he had to deal with the controversial personnel cases which he inherited from his predecessor. The McCarthy group in Congress had declared total war against a number of Foreign Service career officers, in particular, John Carter Vincent and John Paton Davies.

Mr. Dulles dutifully went through the long records and found—as Mr. Acheson had—that there was no basis for dismissal on the ground of doubtful loyalty. But he divested himself prudently of Mr. Vincent on the ground that his China reporting had been a failure, and of Mr. Davies for disregard of proper forbearance and caution in making known his dissents outside privileged boundaries. His personal feelings about the Davies case may or may not be suggested by the fact that on the day after he had announced his decision he telephoned Mr. Davies and authorized him to use his (the Dulles) name as a reference if it would be helpful in obtaining another job. His final session with Mr. Vincent ended on the Dulles observation (apparently conclusive to Mr. Dulles) that Mr. Vincent's critics in the Senate talked louder than his supporters.

The rationale of Dulles' defenders in these matters is that when a man is trying to do something as important as preserving the peace of the world he cannot afford to carry excess baggage, any more than can a man

trying to climb Mount Everest. Mr. Dulles found ways and means of shedding the liabilities which had plagued Mr. Acheson unless, as in the case of Charles E. Bohlen, the defenders could muster stronger support than the critics. Dwight D. Eisenhower and Senator Robert Taft both spoke up for Mr. Bohlen. Dulles' detractors on the other hand use such words as "hypocrisy" and "moral cowardice" in speaking of these cases.

It is not clear whether the free run which Senator McCARTHY enjoyed around the State Department in the early Dulles days represented Dulles' prudence or orders from the White House. It has been noted that when Harold Stassen did talk back to Senator McCARTHY in those same days he was repudiated by the White House.

Dulles' adaptability to changed circumstances was tested, and confirmed, by his relations with his son Avery. Mr. Dulles himself has been loyal to his father's Presbyterianism in personal faith, in constant references in his public life to moral and spiritual values, and in considerable prominence as a layman in the work of the National Council of the Churches of Christ, an organization of Protestant churches. When Avery Dulles entered the Roman Catholic Church to study for the Jesuit priesthood, Mr. Dulles broke off relations with his son. Relations were established before photographers when Dulles became a candidate for Senator.

There are plenty of other examples of Mr. Dulles' adaptability. When he visited South Korea just before the outbreak of war he promised the South Koreans that they would "not stand alone" in the event of attack. Back in Washington, he confided to reporters that he was vastly relieved when President Truman ordered United States troops into the Korean battle, for otherwise his promise of support to the South Koreans would have remained unfulfilled. From the outbreak of the war until the 1952 campaign he defended the Truman decision to enter the war. He then became critical of that decision during the campaign; but returned to its defense after the 1954 mid-term elections put a Democratic majority back in control of the Senate.

He contributed comfort and usable quotations to the Bricker amendment cause during the 1952 campaign, but turned against the amendment when it came toward a vote in 1953.

WHAT HE SAYS AND DOES

The qualities which make Mr. Dulles controversial show up in his control of foreign policy. One usually knew with Acheson what his policy was trying to achieve. With Mr. Dulles one is not quite sure whether the American attitude toward Communist China, for example, is to be measured by the fact that he refused to shake hands with his Chinese opposite number, Chou En-lai, when they were in the same room in Geneva in 1954, or by the fact that since July of 1955 a United States Ambassador and a Communist Chinese Ambassador have been accredited to each other in Geneva.

Dulles' admirers cite his famous brink-of-war doctrine as evidence of his mastery of the technique of foreign relations. They take seriously his version of events, which is that he has deliberately taken the United States to the brink and thus saved the peace by his boldness.

His own version of how he got the Chinese Communists to agree to the truce in Korea is that when in India, on his first of many trips around the world, he told Prime Minister Nehru that if there were no truce the United States would open up the war and carry it across the Manchurian frontier. In the Dulles version of history Mr. Nehru presumably relayed this stern warning to Peking, after which the truce was concluded. But Mr. Nehru has since been reported as saying that if Mr. Dulles ever told him any such thing on that trip he, Mr. Nehru, didn't take it seriously enough even to remember it, let alone relay it to Peking.

The greatest single controversy over Dulles' conduct of foreign policy is whether Mr. Dulles has shaped events, or adjusted himself to them. Facts permit one to say only that at the end of Mr. Dulles' third year in office his policy was almost diametrically opposed to what he said it was going to be when he started out. His opening declaration was to take United States policy off the alleged dead center of Acheson's containment, inject boldness into it, and by boldness liberate the captured peoples of the Soviet realm and roll back the Iron Curtain.

Perhaps the most characteristically Dullesian operation was the one involving the famous Formosa Resolution. Congress was asked for what amounted to a blank check, authorizing the President to do almost anything to save Formosa. The country braced itself for war with China, and the world shuddered. But when the 7th Fleet steamed westward under cover of the resolution it did not fire its broadsides against the Communists on the China coast, but merely evacuated the Chinese Nationalists from the Tachen Islands, then turned quickly away. The affair left people wondering whether the resolution was intended to protect the Chinese Nationalists in the Far East or to cover the Dulles flank on Capitol Hill. And was the 7th Fleet spared from attack by Chinese Communist planes because of the much publicized resolution, or because urgent unpublicized advices sent from the State Department to Peking by way of London, Moscow, and New Delhi had explained that the fleet maneuver was solely intended for the evacuation of the islands?

In pre- and early-Secretarial days Mr. Dulles spoke often and critically of the Acheson containment policy. The implication always was that he intended to go over from passive containment to an active rollback of the Soviet frontiers of power. But the fascinating fact is that as the months elapsed and the Communist frontiers rolled over half of Indochina, Dulles' pronouncements on foreign policy more and more frequently included passages which sounded much like the theories of George F. Kennan, author of the containment doctrine.

The essence of Kennan doctrine was stated in the following passages from Mr. Kennan's Stafford Little Lectures of March 1954:

"I can conceive that Soviet power will some day recede from its present exposed positions, just as it has already receded in Finland and Yugoslavia and northern Iran. But I can conceive of this happening only precisely in the event that the vital prestige of Soviet power is not too drastically and abruptly engaged in the process, in the event that change is permitted to come gradually and inconspicuously as the result of compulsions resident within the structure of Soviet power itself, not created externally in the form of threats or ultimata or patent intrigues from the outside."

In 1952 during the election campaign and long thereafter, Mr. Dulles advocated policies toward the Soviet Union which bore some of the external earmarks of threats, ultimata, and patent intrigue although he would not himself of course put such labels upon them. Instant and massive retaliation sounded rather like a threat. The warning to the Chinese Communists extended through Mr. Nehru partook of the quality of an ultimatum. And the liberation policy sounded rather like a patent intrigue, for Mr. Dulles never made it clear how he intended to bring about this desirable end; he just kept hinting at various ways and means of giving the Soviets homework and difficulties in their own backyard. He seemed to imply an intensified psychological warfare and propaganda offensive abetted by undercover CIA work. He never spelled it out in detail beyond the creation in the free world of political task forces to develop a freedom program for each of the captive nations.

There does seem to have been a stepup in CIA undercover operations against the Communist bloc in the early days of Dulles' regime. The Committee for Free Europe was also for a time stimulated to greater activities. But by 1954 Washington had begun to demobilize the Chinese Nationalist division which had tried to operate in northern Burma against the Chinese Communist southern flank, and had begun to dismantle the CIA operation on Formosa known as Western Enterprises, Inc. Mr. Dulles had formally assured the United Nations, as early as September 15, 1953, that "our creed does not call for exporting revolution and inciting others to violence." Long after this the Committee for Free Europe continued to float its "freedom balloons" across the Iron Curtain, but everyone knew that the forward strategy of the early Eisenhower days had been laid aside. The Free Europe people, whose hopes had been focused on liberation by revolution, wondered plaintively just what was their continuing function.

So much attention was paid to the massive retaliation phrase in the famous speech of January 12, 1954, that few at the time noticed the balancing Kennanesque passage: "If we can deter such aggression as would mean general war, and that is our confident resolve, then we can let time and fundamentals work for us."

On March 17, 1954, in an expansion of this thesis, he was sure that "there is going on, even within the Soviet empire, a silent test of strength between the powerful rulers and the multitudes of human beings * * * their aspirations in the aggregate make up a mighty force." This was further documentation for the thesis that "time and fundamentals will work for us, if only we will let them."

On the day Mr. Kennan had his final farewell session with Mr. Dulles he spent a long evening of soul-searching with an old friend. At the end of the conversation, Mr. Kennan remarked that he supposed that Mr. Dulles could not after all pursue a Kennan policy as long as he, Kennan, remained in the State Department. Mr. Dulles continued to use bold words along with his Kennanesque passages, but certainly by February 8, 1955, the men of the Kremlin had taken the real measure of the bold words. On that date Vyacheslav Molotov said to the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union: "* * * the Republicans won the presidential elections not because they proclaimed a more aggressive foreign policy, but, on the contrary, by virtue of the fact that they actually appeared to be for a certain time the political party which was furthering not the continuation of aggression in Korea but the ending of the war and the reestablishment of peace in that country."

Paul Nitze, Mr. Acheson's last chairman of the Policy Planning Staff, studied the Dulles record and published an article in Foreign Affairs (January 1954) analyzing the difference between declaratory policy and operation policy. The Dulles declaratory policy has been all that the most ardent warhawks on Capitol Hill could desire, but his operating policies began with a private explanation after Chiang Kai-shek had been "unleashed" that real United States policy in the Far East was one of disengagement from the mainland of Asia.

The United States has not yet disengaged entirely from the coast of Asia, but its armed power, its psychological warfare, and its propaganda have steadily receded from the frontiers of the power struggle. Under Mr. Dulles the actions, though not the voice, of the United States have beat less and less vigorously on the vital prestige of Soviet power and have given increasing opportunity for the compulsions resident within the structure of Soviet power to operate.

Whether Mr. Dulles ever consciously practiced Kennan policy, while declaring a contrary policy, is a secret Mr. Dulles has never disclosed. But it is obvious that there has been a gradual flow of Dulles policy around the clock from denunciation of Kennan doctrine toward the actual practice of Kennan policy.

INSIDE HIS OFFICE

Did Mr. Dulles play it this way from the start, or simply adjust himself to events as they changed? The answer is obscured by many things, including Mr. Dulles' own methods of operation as a Secretary of State. An Assistant Secretary of State who attended his daily staff conference for many months is sure that if he entered the Dulles office at any other than the scheduled time, Mr. Dulles would not be able to recall his name.

In Mr. Acheson's day the upper levels of the State Department seethed with new ideas. Under Mr. Dulles, policy originates with Dulles texts. The fitness of one Ambassador for promotion was questioned on the ground that he had exhibited ignorance of a particular Dulles speech.

Two theories are equally permissible about Dulles' conduct of our foreign policy. One is that with a truly Machiavellian skill he has kept the Senate war-wing happy by his public pronouncements, while quietly paving the way for a settlement with the Communist world by his actual operations. The other theory is that the domestic Soviet aftermath of Stalin's death—coupled with a vast American urge for peace which seized upon Dwight Eisenhower as its instrument—have together produced a more relaxed world with which Mr. Dulles has, if sometimes tardily, come to terms.

One theory among those who have worked with him is that Mr. Dulles is more preoccupied with the record of John Foster Dulles on the pages of history than with history itself. He seems to be singularly unaware of other people around him, and their possible corollary contributions to events. The "brink of war" article in Life attributes the peace exclusively to Dulles' technique—leaving one to wonder what Dag Hammarskjold, Nehru, Anthony Eden, Winston Churchill, Dwight Eisenhower, and several others were doing with their time.

At a ceremonial occasion convoked for the presentation of an award in international jurisprudence to Dr. Manley O. Hudson, Mr. Dulles made a long speech on international jurisprudence. He made no mention whatever of Dr. Hudson. One person present remarked that it seemed to him "an extraordinary example of gracelessness in an intelligent man." The thoughts of more than one member of the audience went back to Mr. Dulles' opening letter to the employees of the State Department when he took over command with the announced expectation of receiving their "personal loyalty."

Mr. Dulles is unquestionably intelligent. He is beyond doubt a highly skilled negotiator. He is a brilliant pleader of a case. There is no record of any client ever having been dissatisfied with the Dulles handling of his legal affairs. He is a candid and articulate expounder of a complex problem in foreign affairs. His knowledge of such problems and his ability to grasp their ramifications is probably unequaled by any other foreign minister of these times.

But, curiously enough, there seems to be a lurking lack of self-confidence, or perhaps nonfulfillment, somewhere in his makeup—as though in his own mind grandfather John Foster still loomed unmatched over him. Mr. Dulles has made a far larger splash on the pages of history than the grandfather whom others have long since forgotten; but perhaps the grandson is still subconsciously a member of the clergyman's branch of the family, made uncomfortable by grandfather's condescension toward his poor and more obscure relatives.

In the process either of making the peace, or of adjusting his record to the peacemaking work of others (take your choice), Mr. Dulles has chalked up one incontrovertible score over his predecessor. There have been grumblings on Capitol Hill from time to time, but never any real revolt against Mr. Dulles. The Senate voted its nonconfidence in Dean Acheson just before Mr. Acheson went to Brussels to negotiate the NATO alliance (which the Senate then ratified). No such public humiliation has ever been visited upon Mr. Dulles.

It can certainly be said of Mr. Dulles that he has successfully shielded himself and President Eisenhower's foreign policies from attack in the Senate. Whether he has actually generated American foreign policy is a further question which cannot be answered surely from the existing public record. Mr. Acheson and Mr. Kennan did generate policy. Mr. Dulles has steered old policies through a number of storms, and often steered wisely and well. At least, he kept the policies afloat.

Technically, Mr. Dulles has initiated only two new policies since he took office. One was the treaty of alliance with Chiang Kai-shek. The other was the "northern tier" policy in the Middle East which the British converted into the Baghdad Pact. It is not necessarily a mark against him that neither of these policies has produced spectacularly successful results, nor that there are only two. It may be that he best served the needs of the times by steering old policies along old courses. Congress has unquestionably been more comfortable during Dulles' steering than it was during Acheson's generating—although it did vote, and heavily, in favor of every Acheson policy presented to it (albeit attacking Mr. Acheson personally). Mr. Dulles has yet to test his ability to carry a major new policy of his own through Congress.

But the conduct of foreign policy does not consist exclusively of negotiating formal treaties, implementing formal statements of policy, and generating concepts like the Marshall plan and the NATO alliance. Policy can also be the absence of action. It may even involve the absence of action under the cover of much verbal sound and fury. Mr. Dulles inherited from Mr. Acheson a public opinion which demanded bold statements of defiance against the Communist world, but which also yearned for an end to the Korean war, and release from the fear of a greater atomic war.

THE TWO-WAY CHARGE

The Secretary has marvelously served these conflicting desires. He has appeared to be the crusading knight bearing the cross of righteousness on his shield, his sword upraised against the foe and his voice calling for the charge. But if your glance descends from this stirring picture, you notice that the charger he bestrides is ambling placidly in the opposite direction.

The spring crisis in Arab-Israeli affairs shows the characteristic earmark of a Dulles operation. At suitable intervals Mr. Dulles loudly called upon the Soviets to prove their good intentions by deeds, not words. But when Soviet arms flowed into Egypt Mr. Dulles inconspicuously noted that Moscow had a legal right to do what it did. Britain, in anguish over the apparent threat to its Middle East oil supplies, reversed its ancient pro-Arab inclination, sided with Israel, and tried to involve the United States under the 1952 Tripartite Declaration. Mr. Dulles deftly sidestepped this London move by invoking the United Nations, thus leaving the door open for Soviet participation in a settlement.

There was no formalized declaration or implementation of policy in this operation. There were no documents. There was a risk that the Soviets would seek dangerous advantage from the leaning of Mr. Dulles away from London. But it was not the kind of risk Mr. Dulles takes in the picture of his behavior beloved alike by his adulators and his detractors. History is likely to record that Mr. Dulles has taken more and bolder risks on the brink of appeasement than on the brink of war.

It is perhaps premature to suggest that whereas the times of Stalin called for a Secretary of State who literally did stand up to Russians, the times of Khrushchev call for one who will make peace with them behind a smokescreen of threatening words. We know that the men of Moscow were shaken out of some of their illusions by the resistance of the West in Korea. We do not know yet whether they understand and will respond to Mr. Dulles' extraordinary way of riding foreign policy backwards. And it is much too early to decide whether the Dulles way of riding is intentional or accidental.

In the meantime, in spite of all criticism, Mr. Dulles continues to ride American foreign policy as though it belonged to him by inherited right.

He took office with the following statement to his assembled employees in the courtyard of the State Department:

"I don't suppose that there is any family in the United States which has for so long been identified with the Foreign Service and the State Department as my family. I go back a long way—I'd have to stop and think of the date—when a great-great uncle of mine, Mr. Welsh, was one of our early Ministers to the Court of St. James. In those days, you know, they were Ministers, not Ambassadors.

"My grandfather, John W. Foster, was for a long time in the diplomatic service and then ended up as Secretary of State under President Harrison. His son-in-law, my uncle, Robert Lansing, was Secretary of State under Woodrow Wilson.

"Coming down to my own generation, my brother, Allen W. Dulles, was for many years in the Foreign Service of the United States. My sister, Eleanor Lansing Dulles, is today in the State Department and has been for several years. I, myself, have had at least sporadic association with the Department of State and with the Foreign Service throughout most of my life. So you can see, from the standpoint of background and tradition, it is to me an exciting and thrilling thing to be with you here today, as Secretary of State."

To Mr. Dulles the State Department has become a family fief. He inherited it by feudal right, he and his family, of which he is the senior living member.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have not changed my opinion, as previously expressed on the floor of the Senate, about the Secretary of State, namely, that I think his usefulness in his position has long since passed. It is only necessary to look at the sorry mess in the Middle East to have all the proof one needs.

The Senate has before it for consideration a resolution which I do not think anyone can deny was principally authored by the Secretary of State. As I brought out in my colloquy yesterday with the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the committees listened to the Secretary of State over a period of days. Questions which ought to have been answered by him specifically were answered with lengthy, evasive language. It was too bad we did not have Mr. Dulles in a courtroom, where he could have been tied down to answering directly, under the rules of

examination which prevail in courtrooms.

Mr. President, I cannot possibly vote for a resolution which is so strongly recommended by the Secretary of State until he supplies the Senate with a bill of particulars, which we are entitled to receive from him, as to exactly what he, as Secretary of State, proposes to do under the resolution if the broad blanket power is voted as provided in the resolution.

I recognize the seriousness of the comments which I make when I express publicly my lack of confidence in the Secretary of State. But I shall not vote for a resolution which gives this blanket authority to the administration with John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State. I want to know what deals he has in mind under the Middle East program. I am not going to accept him on faith. I think the taxpayers of the country are entitled to know specifically what John Foster Dulles will recommend to the administration if the blanket authority contained in the resolution is voted to the administration.

As I said earlier this morning, I think there are increasing thousands of people in the United States who, day by day, as the debate proceeds in the Senate, are beginning to ask themselves some very interesting and penetrating questions. Senators need only to read their mail each morning to know how true that statement is. The people of the Nation are entitled to know what the administration intends to do under the resolution, because the foreign policy of the country belongs to the people and not to the President of the United States and the Secretary of State.

Mr. President, I have made these brief comments this morning, based upon the article published in Harper's magazine, because I think the article itself raises very serious questions as to the competency of the Secretary of State to continue to perform the duties of that office.

Mr. President, I now desire to address myself to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

## RUSSIAN POWER PRODUCTION IS INCREASING

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to discuss an excellent article entitled "Russia Increasing Power Production," written by Marquis Childs, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of today.

A group of us in the Senate have for a long time sought to point out the very great danger to the security of our country which is being created by this administration through its power program. After all, it is the sources of energy available to private enterprise in the United States which give us the assurance of whether our productive power will increase in relation to Russia's, or whether we shall find ourselves secondary to Russia in a very few years. As Marquis Childs points out:

Public power development was a conspicuous feature of the New and Fair Deals. It figured, too, in the election campaign last fall in many Western States, including those in which the Democrats scored unexpected gains.

When Douglas McKay came in as Secretary of the Interior, this concept was quickly vetoed and a study recommending it was put on the prescribed list. But from areas where power shortages are acute there is evidence of dissatisfaction with this veto.

The Portland Oregonion, a Republican paper—

And, I may add parenthetically, one of the most active anti-Morse newspapers in the recent campaign—

expressing editorially the hope of a change in power policy, noted that the Interior Department under McKay "had even sold its transmission line through central Oregon to Klamath County to California-Oregon Power Co."

"This prevented," the editorial noted, "effective interconnection between the Federal Bonneville system and the Federal Central Valley system of California. Had this connection been completed, the Northwest probably could be utilizing power from California on an exchange basis this winter rather than cutting off a third of its aluminum production."

The President of the United States is saying much these days—and rightly so, in my opinion—about the dangers to the security of our country; but I direct his attention to what I believe to be the fact, namely, that his own power policy, with the give-away partnership program which the President is underwriting, also endangers the security of our country in the years not too far ahead, because that policy deals with the matter of developing the maximum energy potentials of this Nation.

The President of the United States, I charge, is following a policy in the power field which will not develop the maximum energy potential of the great river basins because he has been drawn in by unsound advisers, in my judgment, and is following the bad advice of those advisers in regard to his partnership scheme, which will turn over great power resources to the private utilities, not for the maximum power development, but for underdevelopment.

That is why I think it is so important that the Senate give consideration to the excellent article written by Mr. Marquis Childs and published his morning. Mr. Childs has hit the nail on the head, in my judgment, in regard to the issue of the development of a power program in Russia as compared with the underdevelopment program in the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### RUSSIA INCREASING POWER PRODUCTION

(By Marquis Childs)

The startling statement that the United States has already lost the lead in science to Soviet Russia, made with the authority of Edward Teller, who developed the hydrogen bomb, should shake the complacency which assumes that high prosperity and shiny new automobiles are evidence of superiority.

What Teller confirmed was what many scientists and educators have long suspected. The extraordinary push of Soviet technical and scientific education has achieved in a relatively short time the leadership that this country has held for many years.

But it is not alone in science that America's preeminent position is threatened. In many fields the rate of growth in the Soviet Union exceeds that of the United States. One of these is the development of electric power production.

Recent estimates made by power specialists show that in the period 1951–55 Russia's installed hydroelectric power capacity increased at the rate of 80 percent, while the rate of growth in this country was 29 percent.

These are rough estimates, especially in view of the uncertain nature of Soviet statistics. But they give a general idea of the order of difference in the growth of this element vital to the development of industry, technology, and science.

Soviet power production today is only a fraction of that in the United States, which has 42 percent of all the installed capacity in the world, according to a study made by the International Cooperation Administration.

But if the rate of growth continues to be 2 or 3 times that of the United States, then we may wake up one day to discover the same thing has happened in power production as has occurred in science. In power produced from coal and natural gas, the rate of growth for the Soviet in the same period was 63 percent against 30 percent for this country.

Among those concerned over this threat are advocates of public power production who believe the policy of the present administration is preventing the construction of large-scale projects that only Government can build.

Public power development was a conspicuous feature of the New and Fair Deals. It figured, too, in the election campaign last fall in many Western States, including those in which the Democrats scored unexpected gains.

When Douglas McKay came in as Secretary of Interior, this concept was quickly vetoed and a study recommending it was put on the prescribed list. But from areas where power shortages are acute there is evidence of dissatisfaction with this veto.

The Portland Oregonian, a Republican paper, expressing editorially the hope of a change in power policy, noted that the Interior Department under McKay "had even sold its transmission line through central Oregon to Klamath County to California-Oregon Power Co."

"This prevented," the editorial noted, "effective interconnection between the Federal Bonneville system and the Federal Central Valley system of California. Had this connection been completed, the Northwest probably could be utilizing power from California on an exchange basis this winter rather than cutting off a third of its aluminum production."

A vast intercontinental grid is the core of Soviet power development. This was described by Shelton Fisher, publisher of Power, a McGraw-Hill business publication, after a visit to the Soviet Union last fall.

In a 3-hour interview, Georgi Malenkov, Minister of Power, explained how the grid would link up the great hydroelectric resources in Siberia with the central power area around Mocsow, including eight nuclear powerplants to be in operation by 1960. Fisher made an extensive tour of Soviet power facilities.

The Bratsk Dam under construction in Siberia will be 3 miles across and 425 feet high. Yearly production at Bratsk is expected to total 20 billion kilowatt-hours. Total hydro production consumed in Russia in 1955 was 28 billion which gives some idea of the scale of development now going forward, Bratsk will be producing power by 1960.

## DISPLAY OF THE AMERICAN FLAG OVER SCHOOLHOUSES

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the schools of the United States are the fountainhead of civic responsibility. In the classrooms of poor communities—often overcrowded, filled with worn desks, smelling of chalk—and in the bright glass-walled school buildings of wealthier areas, young people from every walk of life are learning and practicing the great principles upon which our concept of government rests.

Sixty-three years ago, the first United States flag to be raised over a school building was raised in the small town of Gaylord, in my own State of Michigan. Today that patriotic idea has become a great American tradition, sanctioned by law. Every school in the land flies the red, white, and blue symbol which throughout the world is synonymous with freedom and equality.

I offer for inclusion in the RECORD an excerpt from the Otsego County, Mich., school directory, which recounts this story from its beginnings in Gaylord, Mich., to its present status in our national patriotic lore.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST WORK FOR FREEDOM TO MAKE FREEDOM WORK FOR US

"PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands; one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Sixty-three years ago the first United States flag to be raised over a school building, was raised in the small town of Gaylord, Mich., in Otsego County, and over a small, insignificant school.

There was opposition to this from Civil War veterans.

The school fought for a referendum and won out. The issue was carried to the State legislature and it was made a State law that the United States flag be flown over school buildings. Eventually every State in the Union made it mandatory to display the United States flag over the buildings or grounds of every school.

This move to make display of the flag mandatory was initiated by Gaylord High School 63 years ago. Its principal was Frank H. Farnham, who now lives in Pensacola, Fla.

Gaylord can be very proud of its contribution to the patriotic history of our country.

## INVESTIGATION OF INCREASING NEWSPRINT COSTS

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, zooming newsprint costs have become the center of an investigation by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

At the time when I proposed the investigation, I pointed out on the Senate floor that these rising costs work a hardship on publishers, and therefore curtail the functioning of the free press of America. The small-business man finds himself squeezed in a vise which becomes tighter and tighter as his advertising costs rise along with newsprint costs. And beyond that, the average American is in the unpleasant position of paying almost twice as much for his daily newspaper as he did a few years ago.

On February 4, Mr. President, in my weekly report to the people of Michigan, I pointed out some of the underlying facts in this situation, and laid the blame on the doorstep of an international newspaper cartel which experts seem to think is manipulating prices for its own benefit. A distinguished Michigan newspaper, the Dearborn Independent, reprinted the newsletter in the form of an editorial. This is most gratifying, for it carries the assurance that efforts to identify the offenders are meeting with approval at home. Furthermore, it serves the laudable purpose of bringing the newsprint situation to the attention of a wider audience.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Dearborn Independent of February 8, 1957, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Here you are, son," the man smiled as he tossed a nickel on the stand and picked up his daily paper.

"Sorry, mister," the boy replied, "it's 7 cents."

The man's smile faded. And with good reason, for the cost of newspapers everywhere is rising. It is happening in the big cities and spreading to the smaller communities. And as this occurs, it raises a very important question: Are you, the newspaper reader, trapped in the meshes of a cartel? Is the small-business man who must advertise to live—is the newspaper publisher himself—trapped in the same web?

The price of newsprint, which represents one-fourth of the cost of publishing a paper, has skyrocketed in the past few decades. Now comes a new increase of $4 per ton, bringing newsprint costs to an all-time peak.

Advertisers once paid nominal rates for advertising. But now, rates have climbed steadily to a point where small-business men find it difficult to advertise at all.

The publisher suffers, too. Back in 1946, newsprint cost $67 per ton. Last year, it was $130 per ton. Such increases are forcing many newspapers out of business, causing some advertisers to stop advertising, and making John Q. Citizen pay more for his paper.

Naturally, the cost of manufacturing those bulky rolls of paper has gone up during the passing years. But production costs are way out of line compared to selling prices. For example, in 1946, it cost the mill $44 to produce one ton of newsprint. Now, it costs $76. Freight charges have risen only $9 per ton in the last 10 years. In other words, manufacturing costs rose $41 per ton. But the selling price rose $63 per ton. All told, since 1933, the price of newsprint has zoomed by 325 percent.

That brings up the subject of profits. The St. Lawrence Corp. showed a 58.7 percent increase in profits for 1955 over 1954. Other companies had profits ranging from 20 percent to 45 percent for 1955 over 1954. When the new $4-per-ton increase becomes effective on March 1, chances are that profits will soar again. American publishers will be paying $23 million more than they did last year for the very same product. And in the end, the individual newspaper reader picks up the tab.

Incidentally, these price boosts always follow the same pattern. One newsprint manufacturer announces an increase and immediately the other producers follow suit with an identical price hike.

Is this a cartel fixing prices and restricting trade? It certainly looks that way and I've called for a Senate investigation. Probes of this kind have occurred before in the newsprint industry in 1917, 1927, 1939, 1947 and 1951. Last week, on the Senate floor, I traced the long history of indictments in the background of this latest price hike. It may take international cooperation to get at the bottom of this—for 75 to 80 percent of our newsprint comes from Canada—but we intend to see that the offenders are identified and prosecuted.

CHARLES E. POTTER,
*United States Senator.*

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I favor the Mideast Resolution, and support the policy of the President as submitted to the Congress. I believe that the resolution is all-important if the problems of the Mideast are to be solved, and that it marks a beginning in the firm recognition by the United States that leadership on Mid-East policy is not alone necessary within the United Nations, but also is necessary outside the United Nations, in order to deal with the major problems of this area, so critical to international peace.

Yesterday I listened to much of the debate upon this question, and I heard the protestations of the opponents of the pending joint resolution, partially based upon the number of things which we have to do in our own country in the development of our own resources. When I was in the other body, I think I voted for and advocated actively as many measures for the development of the natural resources of our country as did most other Members, perhaps as much as any other Member; but it struck me that the protests made against the pending joint resolution were directed to the state of the world, rather than to the state of our own country.

What we in the United States should understand is that we are dealing with abysmally low standards of living in the Mideast, generally lower than anything we can imagine, let alone so much worse than obtain in our own country as to be hardly comparable. Without in any way wishing to consider ourselves to be do-gooders—though I do not see why that would be considered invidious—it is a fact that the Soviet Union is competing with us, especially for the support of the people of the underdeveloped areas. We should know that if the largely uncommitted 1,200,000,000 people of the underdeveloped areas fall under the domination of the Soviet Union instead of being free, then our days could well be numbered. The Soviet mounts, in this competition, force plus fanaticism while we juxtapose productive power plus faith in human worth and dignity.

Unless we evidence in world affairs, the strength we possess, then we shall have yielded the field to the other side, with results which could be fatal.

One further point which has come into the discussion is the urgency of the

Mideast Resolution. It is my deep conviction that the resolution is urgent. Very properly and necessarily, time has been taken in a discussion of the resolution, but there is no reason for extending the time beyond that required to permit adequate debate and consideration. I am convinced the resolution is not only sound, but urgently needed, and for the reasons which I shall now submit.

Tension in the Mideast has been brought to the boiling point right now, not alone by the conditions, inherent in it, of medieval standards of living, health, sanitation, and social organization, not alone by hostility to European administering powers by the indigenous peoples, explosive as are these forces, but also by the fact that both of these explosive forces were manipulated by the Soviet Union for the purpose of creating the greatest amount of discord, confusion, hatred, and incitement to war in the area right now. The fact that the Soviet Union became a "big brother" to Egypt and Syria made out of intense nationalism a burning crisis and a dire threat to international peace.

The fever-heat period of the Mideast crisis began on September 27, 1955, when Egypt announced the conclusion of an agreement with Czechoslovakia to exchange Egyptian cotton for Czech arms. It was followed on October 10 by Soviet announcement that it was ready to give the Arab countries any help they needed "to carry out economic development projects." The years from 1953 to the end of 1955 had marked a concentrated effort by the Soviet Union to break into the Mideast. Finally, when the agitation of the Arab countries against the Baghdad Pact was at its height, and when Britain had withdrawn its forces from the Suez base, pursuant to agreement with Egypt—which we had a great deal to do with bringing about—and was preoccupied with its trouble in Cyprus, the Soviet bloc struck, in the diplomatic sense, by the arms deal with Egypt. The culmination of this phase of intensive Soviet effort at infiltration and disruption was realized on July 26, 1956, when Egypt assumed full control of Suez Canal operations and seized the assets of the Suez Canal Co. It is the crisis set in motion by the Suez seizure by Eypt which we have since been in the process of liquidating.

In short, the present grave threat in the Mideast is not alone the result of action of the Middle East countries, but a result of the Soviet Union's activities which have aggravated the problems in the Mideast countries. Therefore any measure by the United States setting forth to meet the dangerous Soviet policies in the Middle East, is urgent in character for the United States.

Under these circumstances it is important to note the size and consequence of the military aspects of the Mideast Resolution which is before the Senate. It has been the pattern of operation of the Communist bloc, particularly in underdeveloped areas, to induce internal subversion by external aggression and coercion, either direct or indirect. This was certainly the pattern in Indochina. It was tried and failed against Burma, and it was the pattern in Korea. Going back in history it was the pattern used on Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Bulgaria. Hence, the military phases of this resolution, by serving notice upon the Communist bloc that aggression or coercion by armed forces will produce an immediate reaction from us, would be insulating the area against the most direct threat of hostility which exists in it. With the states in the Mideast knowing that the Communist bloc cannot intervene by force directly or indirectly, or through "volunteers," without involving United States counterforce, we restore our capability of dealing with the situation in the Mideast on the basis of the states and problems indigenous to the region.

This does not mean that the Soviets will not try to have their hand in every situation, but so long as they cannot use force without meeting similar force from us, we deprive them of the great advantage which they have in international affairs in tense areas; the advantage of being able to order secretly the use of force or to disguise its use through "volunteers" or by some other means which are not available to a free nation like our own. The adoption of this resolution, therefore, becomes a condition precedent to doing anything really effective with respect to the problems in the area, notably the Arab-Israel conflict.

The real point about this resolution is the advance notice which it serves on the Soviet bloc. I repeat that statement. The real point of the resolution is the advance notice which it serves on the Soviet bloc. Surely, many Members have said, and we all understand, that Congress can declare war; but who wants that? This resolution is a new technique in the effort to prevent war. That is what we must understand about it. This technique began with the Formosa Resolution.

In the Formosa Resolution we served notice that, at the invitation of our friends, we would react to force by the use of force. In this particular case we serve notice that, if invited, we will exert force against force. This is a different type, but it is the same answer. It is a new technique in American policy. It is not a declaration of war; nor are we waiting for a situation to arise when it would be the prerogative of Congress to declare war. It is advance notice that we will combat force with force. In that respect I think it is a new technique in meeting Communist techniques which present us with a new situation, and one which the Senate should adopt.

One other point is essential. The masses of people in the Mideast outside of Israel live under such depressed economic conditions now, and so low is the standard of literacy, that psychological influences, especially as expressed through its popular leaders, like Colonel Nasser, have a disproportionate effect compared with the situation in our own generally literate society. One of the basic aspects of this psychology is the desire on the part of both the leadership and the masses to be with the winner. By decisively ruling out the possibility of Soviet intervention with force in the Mideast and exercising, upon the highest level, authority which indicates our determination not to be on the losing side in this area, we speak in language which is unmistakable and understandable to the masses as well as to their leaders and realize an important gain, already.

It has been said that the resolution settles nothing, and that the major conflict in the Mideast area, the Arab-Israel struggle, remains unaffected by it. The essential purpose of the Mideast Resolution is well-stated on page 5 of the committee report:

> But the authority granted by this resolution is essential to provide an atmosphere in which other measures can be brought to bear, and to provide time for those other measures to be effective.

To effectively implement this resolution and to take advantage of the time opportunity which it gives to us, it will be essential for our Government to develop an effective policy to settle the Arab-Israel conflict. It is already apparent that this conflict cannot be dealt with solely within the United Nations, as the United Nations does not have adequate powers or forces for the purpose.

I should like to take a few minutes to address myself to what must be an effort to resolve that conflict.

Extremely desirable as it is to bring about recognition by the Arab States that Israel exists, and peace negotiations with Israel, and vital as this is not only to the peace but to the development of the whole area, I deeply feel—and I have been there recently—it does not seem attainable under present circumstances. What we need to do, therefore, is to assure Israel of its essential rights as a state, while at one and the same time we adopt policies which will be most conducive to stability of the area and offer the best chance for ultimate peace.

The first priority in this would appear to me to require accounting of Egypt's responsibility to the free world; for too long Colonel Nasser and his predecessor, General Naguib, have been allowed to evade such responsibility. This responsibility includes guaranties for international transit, including the ships of Great Britain, France, and Israel, through the Suez Canal in compliance with the six principles adopted by the United Nations Security Council on October 1956—principles in which Egypt concurred—assurance of transit of international shipping, including the ships of Israel, for peaceful commerce through all international waterways in which Egypt has any part, including both the Gulf of Aqaba and the Suez Canal. It also requires cessation of violations of the armistice agreement with Israel, negotiated in 1949 under United Nations auspices. Further, it requires the cessation of governmental organization of guerrilla raids, largely from Egypt, upon the territory of Israel.

It requires also—and in this, too, the free world has a vital interest—the cessation of Egypt's agitation throughout north and central Africa; indeed, through all the Moslem countries against the free world, with Egypt acting, in effect, as a tool of the Communists.

Finally, it requires Egypt to quit blocking the resettlement of the Palestine-Arab refugees. There are grounds for optimism—and to me this is perhaps the most significant of recent developments—that our Government is now beginning to recognize the need for calling Egypt to task as to its international responsibilities, and is preparing to do it. No less than clearance of the Suez Canal and an end to Egypt-Israel hostilities wait on it.

The "fedayeen" or guerrilla raids, openly backed and organized by Egypt in the Gaza Strip and in the Sinai Desert, represent a clear violation of the armistice agreement with Israel, negotiated in 1949 under U. N. auspices. With the armistice agreement violated a vacuum is created which calls for administration of the Gaza Strip by the United Nations in the absence of some new agreement between Israel and Egypt. Also, I believe our Government should spell out such raids as being contrary to the guaranties of the three-power declaration of May 1950, entered into by the United States, the United Kingdom, and France, which guaranteed the armistice borders between Israel and the Arab States.

I point out that there is adequate precedent for calling upon the United Nations to administer the Gaza Strip, and perhaps, as a first step, sending a United Nations commission there to ascertain exactly what will be the situation when Israel's forces withdraw and the United Nations emergency force steps in.

A similar situation existed in the case of Libya. Under the Italian peace treaty of 1947, Italy renounced all claim to her former colony, Libya. Its fate, according to that peace treaty, was to be determined within one year, that is, by 1948, by the United States, Britain, France, and Russia. When those four failed to agree upon a solution, as they did, the United States took the problem before the United Nations in 1949, and that organization handled it completely from then on, and, indeed, brought about the independence of Libya.

I respectfully submit that that is almost an exact precedent for a situation in which an armistice agreement, negotiated under United Nations auspices, has broken down, leaving a vacuum, which should now be filled by United Nations administration. The first step is the appointment of a United Nations Commission to ascertain just what the United Nations ought to do, and how it ought to handle the problem.

I spoke of action outside the United Nations. It seems to me that we have many areas for action which could be very helpful. For example, we should offer to join, at the request of the U. N., in a naval patrol to secure freedom of international shipping through the Gulf of Aqaba. That is the Canadian proposal, put forward by Lester Pearson, Canada's delegate to the United Nations. Also, we should offer to aid the U. N. in establishing its civil administration in the Gaza Strip. It may require money. It may require some logistical support, in the way of shipping. All these things we have made available in the past to facilitate United Nations action; and it certainly is desirable that a similar course be followed in this instance.

Finally, upon withdrawal of Israel's forces, we should support the entry into the Sharem-el-Sheikh area bordering the Gulf of Aqaba and into the Gaza Strip of the United Nations Emergency Force, to remain there until the U. N. mission, the maintenance of peace, is accomplished, and the forces of Israel should accordingly withdraw.

Everyone agrees that the United Nations Emergency Force ought to step in when the Israeli forces move out; and there is a pretty grave question as to whether they should remain there until their mission is accomplished—namely, pacification of the area—or whether they are subject to being ousted whenever Egypt says they should go.

It seems to me that we ought to support the idea of the United Nations force remaining until such time as its mission is accomplished. If the United Nations is to deal with international brigandage and violations of international agreements, it will have to do so on someone's territory. Every piece of the world, for practical purposes, is owned by someone. So we had better make the determination now, that when the United Nations acts under the charter with the necessary authority it is acting in behalf of the people of the world. Therefore, to that extent, in the maintenance of international peace there must be some understanding of rights on the part of particular people in a particular country being recognized within the context of the right of the world to maintain peace. Such actions require United Nations resolutions.

Here I come to a very critical phase of the situation. Only yesterday we were told by the press that the Ambassador of Israel had conferred with the Secretary General of the United Nations presumably about U. N. resolutions dealing with Aqaba and Gaza. I suppose the question will be asked, "Suppose the resolution does not pass. What then?" Then the situation will be stalemated, while negotiations continue under the impasse. Such a stalemate is certainly to be preferred over the imposition of sanctions on Israel, sanctions which, it seems to me pretty clearly, now are unpopular in the United States, and, indeed, in the United Nations, as tending to make the United Nations an instrument of one-sided action. Indeed, Mr. President, it seems to me that sufficient progress has been made by now so that perhaps our Secretary of State could say that negotiations have proceeded to the point where sanctions are no longer being considered and thereby clear the air even further.

Mr. President, we must get over the idea that the United Nations can do everything, or that we must always be lined up with a two-thirds majority there, right or wrong. We need not help make the two-thirds majority and should in fact oppose it if we feel action is wrong. Where the United Nations is frustrated by the veto or has not the powers or means to act it is necessary for us to act outside the United Nations, at least in part, as the Mideast Resolution itself shows. On occasion no action by the United Nations is better than action which is wrong or damaging to the United Nations and to the prospects for peace. Members of the United Nations are bound only according to their Charter obligations and by lawful United Nation actions, not by United Nations inaction or inability to act.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a document entitled "United States Foreign Policy and the United Nations." It is a draft study prepared at my request, and shows three alternative situations.

It shows cases in which we have acted outside the United Nations, cases involving international affairs in which we have acted partially within the United Nations and partially outside the United Nations, and cases where we have acted completely within the United Nations. This study shows that at this stage in the development of our international policies, all three alternatives are essential to the maintenance and the pursuit of our policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, another one of the very grave problems which we face in the Middle East area is the resettlement of the Palestine-Arab refugees. More than 900,000 are on the rolls of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency, financed to the extent of 90 percent of the necessary budget by the United States and Great Britain. Of the total number, it is estimated that only about two-thirds, or 600,000, are truly Palestine-Arab refugees in the sense that their original homes were in the area which is now Israel.

I had the privilege of seeing one of the large refugee camps outside Gaza only 2 months ago. About one-third of the refugees are located in the Gaza Strip, and the remainder are primarily in Jordan.

Subject to U. N. administration, it should be possible to induce Palestine-Arab refugees in the Gaza Strip to seek resettlement, for the major barrier toward such resettlement has been the intransigeance of the Arab host governments and their propaganda directed toward the refugees, urging them not to be resettled.

Indeed, Mr. President, some of the nations in the Middle East themselves have enormous capacity from the standpoint of resettlement. For example, Iraq, in the Tigris and Euphrates Valleys, has a tremendous potential in that respect.

Once the way is cleared for the United Nations in the Gaza Strip, it could undertake to break the logjam by seeking resettlement projects through agreements with nations having the capacity to absorb immigrants. That is the same plan which worked satisfactorily in resettling the displaced persons in Europe beginning in 1948. The U. N. resolution passed Friday last already contemplates such independent U. N. activity to resettle the Palestine-Arab refugees. In that way, at long last, it would be possible to resettle

the unhappy and unfortunate Arab-Palestine refugees.

Also the U. N. could then open negotiations with Israel for compensation to these Palestine-Arab refugees for property left in Israel, and for some repatriation within Israel for those of them who sincerely wish it, with due and careful consideration to the requirements of Israel's security and the reuniting of families. I might say in this connection that the Government of Israel has already shown its receptivity to that kind of negotiation.

There is also involved in the compensation question consideration for the losses sustained by those of Jewish faith who emigrated to Israel following their expulsion by Arab States, including Egypt, Iran, and Yemen, and the persecution they endured, including the appropriation of their property there without any compensation.

An essential element of our Mideast policy is what we are to do about economic and technical assistance programs for the whole Middle East, and how we can best bring to bear our resources in a peaceful way as an element of our policy of seeking area stability and peace.

I have noted three major arguments which have been made against the adoption of the joint resolution. The first is that a number of the countries of the Middle East have very large resources which they obtain from their oil revenues, and therefore they ought to take care of their own economic and technical assistance programs.

The second is that there is no specific plan contained in the joint resolution for the spending of the $200 million, or exactly how we are going to spend the money.

The third argument is that perhaps the aid will not be accepted by many of the Arab countries of the Middle East, and therefore will be of no use.

I should like to deal with each of these arguments. I may say, incidentally, that I am not new to this subject, as I served as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives for 8 years during the formative years of both the Marshall plan and the mutual-security program. I have had considerable experience with these questions, which have been debated before with respect to this and other areas of the world.

First, as to whether the nations of the Middle East will accept the aid that is offered to them. I think that question refers to the fundamental principle involved and to the fundamental question of American policy in the Middle East. I believe that policy ought to be to keep the door open to all nations for participation in economic and technical assistance efforts, and that we should not deny any aid to any other State because other nations refuse to accept it or resist terms for their participation.

This, of course, applies to Israel. As we know, there have been refusals in the Mideast to accept our aid by nations who stated that because they refused aid, it automatically meant a veto on giving aid to any other nation in the Middle East, and therefore Israel should not receive aid either.

The aid which we give should be designed, as is true in the Middle East Resolution, on a regional basis, and we should contemplate constantly maximum joint action among the nations affected. The United States cannot always contemplate the fact that this area will remain unsettled and divided. On the contrary, we must look forward and beyond the present difficulties to our ultimate objective.

The aid which we give should be directed toward the maximum joint action among the nations affected. Such joint action is entirely practicable in the fields of irrigation and flood control, highways, regional development banks, power systems, education, public health, communications, immigration, and customs control. Aid should be programed in each country with a view toward integrating individual country plans into a regional plan for the rest of the area at such time as additional Arab States may join. In this process, too, there should be employed the multilateral technical assistance activities of the United Nations whenever advisable.

In that respect I might say that we have an automatic regulator with respect to how much multilateral technical assistance there should be through the U. N., because we are the main support of that activity, and it depends on our appropriations as to how large or how small it shall be.

Our appropriations amount to about $17 million, in round figures, and we spend about 8 to 9 times that amount on our own technical assistance programs; so there is no great danger that the United Nations technical assistance program will run away with the ball. We must have faith enough to believe that men with full stomachs will choose the freedom road. If we are to believe that men, given a free choice, will choose the Communist road, then we are in a bad way, indeed. Therefore, Mr. President, much as I appreciate, together with my colleagues, the pleasure of seeing the tag "Made in the U. S. A.," on everything we do in the form of foreign aid, I do not believe it is not nearly so vital as doing the job in terms of getting results in the form of peace and stability and free choice on the part of people.

Examples of this cooperative approach, or keeping the door open to it, which is what I feel is the only thing we can do and what we should and must do with our economic and technical assistance, are found in the Nile River Dam project which too many people have forgotten as being a cooperative project with the Sudan and not solely a project of Egypt itself. It seems to me that at every stage we must keep all the pipelines, the ends of the road, the ends of the project, the planning for the project, always open. Though at the moment it may be necessary to have a program apply to one country in order to do the maximum job possible in that country, it must always be with the idea, in a decade or two, of extending what is done in one area to the rest of the region. For this, Mr. President, is a region. It has got to be treated as a region. That is true of Israel as well as of every Arab State. I think some Arab leaders are giving their people the most misguided and misleading information that has ever been given to them in preaching the end of Israel.

The impact upon the chronically depressed Arab countries of modern, productive, and fruitful Israel, with a vital and functioning representative government controlled by the people under free institutions like our own must not be underestimated. Ultimately, Israel's achievements in the utilization of natural resources, in agricultural and in urban development, education, health, communications, and science will prove to be a model for the Arab world and the decisive factor in the modernization of the Near East and the defeat of the Communist threat to it. Therefore, Mr. President, Israel represents a pilot plant of what we are trying to do in terms of economic development in the entire area.

Mr. President, I now wish to take up another of the objections, and that is the objection that an Arab country with oil resources, like Saudi Arabia, should do its own developing. It is true that some Arab nations have large revenues from oil, and it is also true that often only small amounts of those revenues are spent for education and reconstruction purposes. These are the facts of life; and if we could afford to wait decades until such time as the situation were changed and improved by the internal determination of the people themselves, that would be a very fine idea. But we cannot wait, because we are not alone in the world. We have a big, tough, mean, and often angry, duplicitious, and constantly cunning competitor who challenges us at every step, who is delighted to let people of the Mideast area remain benighted because some governments will not look after their own. The Soviets are trying to accomplish the communization of the world. Therefore, we cannot wait. We must ourselves encourage projects in Saudi Arabia and in other countries by being willing to put up some seed money. We are trying to arouse a demand on the part of the people in those countries and bring about, sooner or later, the development of those countries which is so essential to—whose security? To our security. We are the most productive of the free nations. We are looking after our own security which is decisively linked with the security of the whole free world.

The reason why there are no specific projects today, the reason we are talking about $200 million instead of $2 billion—which is what it would take to complete some of these development jobs in those areas of the world—is so we can go forth with money and put it to the best use, because it can be used for the purpose of encouraging others to spend their money and arousing a public appetite for achievement not only by us, but by them in their own country.

Mr. President, that is the fundamental basis which underlies the question. I am rather interested that on the part of some of the strongest opponents of this particular phase of the resolution there is not some recognition of the fact that

we have to proceed—within the constitutional limits of our society—and not tell the other side everything we are going to do in the greatest detail.

I was deeply interested in the fact that my very distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for whom I have great admiration and respect, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday an article by George Sokolsky of which he approved. He said it looked to him like a fine exposition of an important idea. The article begins with the following statement:

> Soviet Russia has only one advantage over the United States and it is a tremendous one. The Russians can formulate a program of action based on a design for achievement and can put behind it all the resources of government. This the United States has not been able to do since John Hay was Secretary of State.

In other words, Mr. President, we have to find some way within our constitutional framework to give ourselves some of the advantages of not telegraphing every punch we are going to throw. The only way we can do it sometimes is by limiting what the Executive can spend, as we are doing here, to $200 million, and giving the Executive the opportunity to spend it in the way in which it will do the most good.

A tremendous opportunity exists in this Mideast area in the utilization of private United States business, trade associations, professional, missionary, veterans and civic organizations, as well as institutions of learning, for the interchange of ideas and for the extension of their activities on an international basis, through the Middle East. This can result in the interchange of ideas and experience and the development of codes of good practice and conduct. Beginnings have already been made in the activities of certain professional engineering societies in some Middle East countries and in the activities of the International Bar Association, but the surface has hardly been scratched. In our aid programs, and bearing in mind the low living standards which we are seeking to raise, and the medieval society which we are seeking to affect, our aid should be on the simple level, touching the daily lives of the people, increasing their individual productivity, and relieving them of immediate hardships. This is the case to begin with.

My wife and I visited India only 2 months ago and saw with the deepest interest the so-called village-development program there, which is on a village level in the most elementary terms of a sheet-iron stovepipe to take out of a home the odor which is caused by cooking on a small, open fire. Little things like that are coming directly home to the people in the villages and are helping to transform the lives of the people right at their own fireside.

We should be wary of additional capital in the hands of leaders in some countries not yet concerned with social justice in the use of national resources, both public and private, as additional capital employed in this way in major projects may only widen the gulf between the very rich and the very poor, since there is no middle class, by and large, in the great majority of the Mideast countries.

So, in developing our projects, I suggest, as word of caution and advice, that an effort should be made to develop projects which are the closest and most dear to the individual family and the individual village.

Finally, in dealing with the Middle East, we need to have clearly defined our understanding of the governmental situation in extending aid and operating under the resolution. Turkey, Iran, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, and Egypt have basic governmental organizations and specialized functional agencies needed to correlate with our programs for economic and social development. Egypt, however, although it is equipped with such a basic governmental organization, now finds its Government in the hands of Colonel Nasser and his group, who exploit, as they have quite clearly shown, anything done with them for the purposes of their own power, and xenophobia at the very least, and on occasion as Communist tools, as well, as we have already seen from experience.

We are, in the Middle East, in an area of great conflict with regard to self-determination by peoples in various stages of nationhood. This aspect has some fundamental principles which need to be laid down, and which require our attention.

For one, the responsibility in the United Nations to maintain international peace must be considered as paramount. I expressed my views on that point a little while ago, in reference to the right of the United Nations to endeavor to maintain peace although it may affect the individual territory of any particular members.

Thus in the situation between Egypt and Israel, where the fomenting by Egypt of fedayeen raids was a direct cause of the outbreak of hostilities on October 29, 1956, the obligation existed on the part of the United Nations once it stepped into the situation to supress this brigandage. Obviously, an event of this kind can only take place on the territory of someone. Accepting, therefore, a self-imposed condition that the United Nations Emergency Force could only remain in Egypt with Egypt's permission, was accepting a control of the United Nations efforts for the maintenance of international peace which threatened constantly to completely defeat it, and weakened and debilitated it at every stage.

Second, the right of self-determination which we honor so rightly must nevertheless exist within the context of other rights pertaining to other peoples. It does not stand alone. Also, it carries responsibilities implicit in the concept of nationhood, and these require a people who would attain nationhood to insure political, social, and economic viability in a modern world and to guarantee freedom from subjugation of its people to communism or any other hostile ism, as well as the ability to maintain free institutions among them.

These are inalienable rights, which must be dealt with in the context also of the other inalienable rights of mankind. These are the rights of peace and freedom, which all mankind must enjoy.

Our concept of our foreign policy leadership and responsibility is certainly maturing, and the pending resolution marks the further development and maturity of it. In the Formosa resolution, which preceded it, we responded to an urgent call from a close friend and valued ally whose security was imminently threatened. In the Mideast resolution we see chaotic and incendiary situation imminently dangerous to international peace, and we offer our resources and our leadership for the solution of the problem at one and the same time that we serve notice that we will not tolerate the subjugation of a region by force and coercion or infiltration, so far as the Communist bloc is concerned. Our devotion to the United Nations and our operations within the United Nations context, subject to our charter obligations, complete the developing concept of United States foreign policy leadership. The emphasis now needs to be upon the affirmative in resolving practical questions like Aqaba and Gaza, like those which we now face in endeavoring to resolve the Egypt-Israel difficulty; and in mounting our own offensive against communism essentially by the exercise of our productive power and technical genius, and the expression of our moral ideology and belief in human dignity and freedom. The Middle East resolution opens this road to us in the critical and strategic Middle East region.

Mr. President, I think the Middle East resolution represents a step along the road to responsibility and maturity of leadership on the part of the United States. What is made of it will depend not only upon the President of the United States and his Cabinet officers; it will depend also upon the Members of the Senate, and upon our taking advantage of the opportunities which the resolution affords us to have some influence constructively upon the foreign policy of our country. The same is true of our great sister body, having equal powers, at the other end of the Capitol.

In short, Mr. President, the United States is growing up and is establishing and accepting a responsibility which is compatible with our power in the world. This is a good thing. It requires somewhat more flexibility and somewhat less restraint from the exact and precise rules and regulations in which we have heretofore allowed ourselves to indulge.

But, Mr. President, this responsibility is demanded of us, not by any ideas we have as to how great or how wise we are, but by the intense, the grim, the mortal competition which we face from the Soviet Union.

In all the arguments and discussions, let us not forget that there is only one end and aim of the Soviet Union, namely, the subjugation and the destruction of every value we hold dear. No matter how many smiles there are to disguise it, that is the fundamental proposition. Hence, the competition with the Soviet Union is real and final. So we must act in a spirit of awareness if we are to be effective, if we are to serve. That is the mission for which I deeply believe the Lord put us on earth.

EXHIBIT 1

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY AND THE UNITED NATIONS

This paper examines the use which the United States has made of the United Nations in attaining the objectives of its foreign policy. The United Nations is in essence a permanent conference of the nation states who are its members. As such its powers are basically those of an international conference, that is, action by the U. N. can only be accomplished by the power of the states that compose it. In some instances the United States has made no use of the instrumentality of the U. N., but has exerted its power and influence entirely through alternative channels of diplomacy. In other instances we have used the U. N. in conjunction with these other channels. Finally, there have been a few problems where the United States has found that the exclusive use of the U. N. offered the best possibility of successfully attaining our policy goals.

At tab A is a discussion of those cases in which no use has been made of the United Nations. In general these are cases involving regional security in Europe or southeast Asia. The U. N. is by nature not designed to deal with problems of regional security. Both NATO and SEATO are primarily meant to deter or meet Soviet aggression thus making it impossible for them to come within an organization like the U. N. which includes the potential enemy. The wars in China and Indochina were also dealt with exclusively outside the U. N. as they were matters of domestic jurisdiction and there seemed no desire on the part of even China and France to involve the U. N. in the situations.

Instances when the United States has utilized the services of the U. N. in addition to other means are discussed at Tab B. These include such cases as the fate of Trieste, Indonesia, the Berlin blockade, the Greek border incidents, the presence of Soviet troops in Iran, and the attack on the Republic of Korea. In some of these cases the United States utilized the U. N. in a merely perfunctory way while in others the bulk of United States energies were exerted under the sanction of U. N. resolutions and recommendations. Sometimes the role of the U. N. was to make known to the world the reality and extent of Soviet-bloc guilt for the threat to the peace. In others, the U. N. provided a means of settling a difficult problem within the free world in a way that prevented an extension of Soviet power into the area. In the case of Korea, the U. N. was used to establish objectively the fact of Communist aggression, to give international sanction to the military response of the United States and increase the number of nations supporting our fighting forces in a material fashion.

There have been a very few problems in world politics since the end of World War II that the United States has sought to resolve almost exclusively through the use of the United Nations. Those that seem to fall into this category are discussed at Tab C. They include the independence of Libya and Palestine, and the problems concerned with the control or reduction of armaments. Each of these situations has been so different it is impossible to generalize upon them in this introduction, except to say that at the time the United States Government of the day apparently felt that American interests could be more thoroughly realized by use of the U. N. than by any other possible diplomatic means.

The results of this study indicate clearly that the United States has made substantial use of the United Nations as an instrument through which to realize its foreign policy goals. However, it has never felt itself restricted to using only the U. N. When United States interests could not be served by use of this general international organization it was not used at all. In each situation it has been necessary to decide if the nature of the U. N., its current membership, the nature of the problem, and so forth, were such that it would be worthwhile to exert our influence through the U. N. in attempting to resolve the question. When the circumstances that made the U. N. highly useful in handling a particular problem at one stage of its development have significantly changed, then it would clearly not be logical for the United States to continue to seek the solution of that particular problem exclusively through the U. N.

A. MAJOR UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY PROBLEMS DEALT WITH LARGELY OUTSIDE THE UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations has not been found significant in assisting the United States in the attainment of its policy goals with reference to developing adequate economic and military security in Europe and Asia or in dealing with the war in Indochina or the Communist takeover of power in China.

After the great damage wrought by World War II, extensive economic assistance was necessary if Western Europe was to again become economically viable. The United Nations did not possess the funds necessary to do this. But almost from the beginning of the United States aid programs to Europe there was the second aspect of building the military defenses of the countries against possible Soviet aggression. When tension between Russia and the United States increased, economic aid to Europe became important in preventing Communist subversion and political victory at the polls. The North Atlantic Treaty and the program of military aid to Europe were of the utmost importance to the United States. They had nothing to do with the United Nations, despite the fact that NATO was justified under the terms of article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

It would not have been possible to accomplish through the U. N. the goals of rebuilding Europe economically and militarily to meet the threats of Communist subversion and overt aggression by the Soviet Union. The U. N. lacked the massive economic resources that were required. But more importantly, the U. N. contained the potential enemy, the Soviet Union. She would hardly have facilitated the development of West European internal strength against Communist subversion. It was hardly possible to make the U. N. a defensive military alliance of some members against an attack by other members of the same alliance. Also, an effective alliance required closer cooperation and integration of planning and armed forces than would be possible through a loose, general, almost worldwide organization like the U. N. Thus, the United Nations was irrelevant here by virtue of its very nature, its lack of resources, and inappropriateness of the members that composed it.

For much the same reasons the U. N. has been of no significance in developing military security in southeast Asia. The development of military security in that area is considered an extremely divisive program by many of the nations in the area. Thus it would not even have been possible to obtain a Security Council or General Assembly recommendation in favor of the formation of something like the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. Many of the states in that part of the world seek to avoid alining themselves with either the United States or the Soviet Union for a variety of reasons. Again, of course, at least one of the potential enemies, Russia, was included in the United Nations and the representatives of the other, Communist China, were knocking at the door seeking to have their representative seated. Russia has called both NATO and SEATO threats to world peace and signs of United States imperialism around the world. SEATO, which is, of course, much looser and less fully developed than NATO, is also supplemented by many unilateral United States commitments of military and other forms of aid to the member states.

The control of the Nationalist Government of China over the Chinese mainland was gradually whittled away until it now exercises sovereignty only on the island of Taiwan (Formosa). This matter was not considered by the United Nations. To the extent that the United States was able to fortify the Nationalist Government in its fight against the Communists the United States chose to do so by direct military aid and other forms of assistance. The United Nations is not designed to deal with internal problems such as a civil war. The change of government in China has come before the U. N. primarily in the form of a contest between the two governments for China's seat in the United Nations. The United States and some other members have sought to prevent the organization from accepting the credentials of the representatives of the Communist government.

The United Nations played no role in the long war which France waged against the independence movement in Indochina. This was a problem for United States foreign policy because of our desire to prevent the spread of Communist control in the world and our reluctance to oppose independence movements. France bore the problem alone except for extensive United States military and economic aid directly to France which she was able to divert to support her forces fighting in Indochina. Again, this was treated as an internal question which logically could not come before the United Nations.

B. MAJOR UNITED STATES FOREIGN-POLICY PROBLEMS DEALT WITH BOTH THROUGH THE U. N. AND OTHER DIPLOMATIC MEANS

There have been a number of instances since 1945 when the United States has felt its foreign-policy objectives could best be realized by using a combination of several resources of diplomacy, including the United Nations. In some cases the U. N. was the major channel utilized and only supplemented in part by other means. In others, the U. N. was used less significantly. The following are included here: The Trieste problem, Indonesian independence, the Berlin blockade, the Greek border incidents, the presence of Soviet troops in Iran, and the invasion of the Republic of Korea.

The free territory of Trieste was created by the Italian Peace Treaty of 1947. It was to be under the special protection of the United Nations Security Council, which was also supposed to name a governor for the territory. Great power differences prevented the Council from even naming a governor for this tense area claimed by Italy and Yugoslavia. This would have helped settle the problem and perhaps hurt Yugoslavia's chances to gain additional sections of Trieste. Early in 1948, prior to the Italian elections and the defection of Yugoslavia from the Soviet bloc, the United States, Britain, and France declared all the territory should be returned to Italy and the peace treaty so amended. The U. N. ceased to play any role in the issue. After Yugoslavia's defection from the Soviet bloc the problem became essentially one within the free world which the United States therefore sought to settle on its merits and in a manner that would be least upsetting to good Italo-Yugoslavian relations. The United States then urged direct negotiations between the two contestants and finally an agreement was reached in 1954. Thus, the role of the U. N. in the Trieste case was perfunctory. At first the United States sought to use it to keep more of Trieste from falling under Soviet (Yugoslav) control and later worked for direct negotiations to settle the issue when it was clear the U. N. would

not be useful in achieving a worthwhile settlement.

In the Indonesian situation the United Nations served magnificently as a means of resolving a difficult problem within the free world that was a problem for the United States because of the great power role it played. The essential job of the U. N. here was to provide an acceptable third party to usher the Republic of Indonesia (1949) into inevitable independence without increasing Soviet influence there as the Dutch power was withdrawn. In this situation the U. N. was useful in its own right as a mediator and a means of providing some pressure on the Netherlands to agree to Indonesian independence. The United States faced something of a dilemma because the Netherlands was our ally in the Marshall Plan and at the same time the United States wanted to win the approval of the Asian nations. The United States sought the independence of Indonesia outside the U. N. as well as inside the organization. One of the decisive factors in final Dutch agreement was the withdrawal of United States Marshall plan aid that was slated to be used in Indonesia. Without United States pressure on the Netherlands it is dubious whether the U. N. would have been successful. Without the U. N., it would have been much more difficult to pacify the situation and hammer out a workable agreement at the same time preventing the active intervention of the Soviet Union.

The Berlin blockade, however, is another instance in which the role of the U. N. was only formal and did not contribute to the substantive solution of the problem. When in 1948 the U. S. S. R. refused to permit trucks and trains to pass through her part of Germany in order to reach Berlin, the United States responded with the airlift that kept the city of Berlin supplied with the basic necessities. The Soviet Union vetoed a Security Council resolution that the blockade should be lifted coincident with a settlement of a related currency problem in Berlin. Later the United States delegate, Mr. Philip Jessup, and the Soviet delegate, Mr. Jacob Malik, met in the corridors of the U. N. and more or less agreed on a settlement that had been hinted at earlier in the Soviet press. Thus, the U. N. helped focus world attention on the issue, provided the physical setting for an agreement and the daily availability of the diplomats concerned. But the U. N. did not in any way settle the problem itself. The U. S. S. R. had created a situation by which it hoped to force the United States and the other Western Powers to withdraw from Berlin. The only alternative seemed to be for the West to accept the consequences of starting a general European war to preserve their stake in Germany. The Berlin airlift provided a solution that evaded either alternative and made it necessary for the Soviet Union either to back down or itself start the big war to force back Western power in Germany. Russia ended the blockade. Thus, the U. N. played a significant, if small role.

In the case of the Greek border incidents (1946–48) the United States sought to prevent the conquest of the Greek Government by Communist guerrilla forces supported by Yugoslavia, Albania, and Bulgaria. The major factors in accomplishing this goal were the Truman doctrine of United States aid to Greece, the stationing of the United States Sixth Fleet in close proximity to Greece, the defection of Yugoslavia from the Soviet bloc, and the role played by the United Nations. Undoubtedly, a Communist takeover could have been prevented without the participation of the U. N., but the international organization served the purposes of providing internationally acceptable objective accounts of aggression from Yugoslavia and to a lesser extent from Albania and Bulgaria.

It also provided a greater measure of international support for the United States aid program to defend the Greek Government. The U. N. provided this added support because the membership of the international organization at that time was such that a clear majority could be obtained to adopt a position against the military expansion of Soviet influence in Europe.

One of the earliest cases to come before the U. N. Security Council was the complaint of Iran that Russia was interfering in her internal affairs by refusing to withdraw troops stationed there during the war. The United States, Britain, and Russia had agreed at the Teheran Conference that all troops would be withdrawn from Iran within 6 months after the end of the war. The Western Powers were vitally interested in securing the drawback of Soviet troops to preclude an increase of Soviet influence and control in the Middle East. The United States took a strong public stand in favor of the Iranian position in its complaint to the U. N. It is also reliably reported that the United States expressed itself very strongly to the U. S. S. R. in private. The Soviet troops were quickly removed from Iran. In this case the U. N. served the purpose of notifying the world of Soviet attempts to extend its position in the Middle East. This focusing of attention had some effect, but most observers agree that the vigorous response by the United States both inside and outside the U. N. was the key factor in forcing Soviet withdrawal. The Soviets did not want to have a showdown with the United States so soon after the end of World War II.

The invasion of the Republic of Korea is the final and perhaps most important instance to be noted in which the United States pursued the goals of its foreign policy concurrently within and outside the United Nations. Here was the first example of an attempt to extend Chinese-Russian domination by overt armed aggression. It was thus a direct challenge to the United States foreign policy of containing communism. Unless the United States acted decisively here, it would be apparent to the rest of the Asian nations that they could not depend on the United States for real security in case of armed attack. It was also a direct challenge to the authority of the United Nations which had had special responsibilities since 1947 for the establishment of a democratic government in Korea.

The United States supplied large contingents of Armed Forces and material to repel the attack by the North Korean Communist Government. This was the essential basis for the degree of victory that was achieved in Korea under the U. N. But beyond this, it was vital to the United States that it be made clear this was not another instance of western imperialism in Asia. It was particularly important to have the support of other Asian governments. The United Nations provided these other requirements. The U. N. observation team was able to establish the objective fact of North Korean aggression on South Korea. The wide support in the U. N. for sending aid to the Republic of Korea gave a firm international if not disinterested character to the United States military assistance. This made it clear the United States action was merely to aid a nation that had been attacked and that it was not western imperialism. Thus, in this case, the U. N. was a vital channel through which the United States attained its foreign policy goal. But, of course, it was primarily the power of the United States and not the nonexistent power of the U. N. itself that halted the aggression.

C. INSTANCES IN WHICH THE UNITED STATES HAS USED THE U. N. ALMOST EXCLUSIVELY AS THE MEANS OF CARRYING OUT ITS FOREIGN POLICY

There are, of course, no instances where the U. N. by its own power effectuated the pacification of an international threat to the peace. The only power possessed by the U. N. is that of its member states who may or may not choose to exert it through the U. N. or in support of the resolutions and recommendations of that organization. Thus, it would be well nigh impossible to find a case in which the goals of United States foreign policy were achieved merely by giving the problem to the United Nations and then sitting back. But there are at least three significant cases where the United States used the U. N. almost exclusively as the agency through which American influence and power was exerted. These are: independence for Libya and Israel, and the discussion of disarmament and the control of arms.

Under the Italian Peace Treaty of 1947 Italy renounced all claim to her former colony, Libya. Its fate was to be determined within 1 year by the United States, Britain, France, and Russia. When the four failed to agree on a solution, the United States took the problem before the U. N. in 1949 and that organization handled it completely from then on. The General Assembly decided Libya should become an independent state by January 1, 1952. A U. N. commission advised by a council of 10 which included the United States, but not Russia, made the necessary preparations. As a result the Soviet Union was unable to gain an entering wedge in that country, the United States airbase at Tripoli was preserved, and Libya remained firmly in the Western camp. The effect of the United States relying completely on the instrumentality of the U. N., after the initial four-power negotiations had broken down, was to achieve the United States goal of preventing a Soviet advance here. The U. N. was the perfect instrument for this because it could make Libya an independent nation and thus keep it within the free world. Without using the U. N. here it is not unlikely Libya would have become another instance of divided great power administration, for Russia might have insisted on taking part in the absence of a settlement.

The Palestine situation is one that the United States has up to now handled almost exclusively through the U. N., though the real decision in Palestine was rendered by the effectiveness of the Jewish fighting groups that carved out the State of Israel. There were two problems involved for United States foreign policy here. The first was how to settle this thorny dispute among members of the non-Communist world in a way that would be least damaging to our general position vis-a-vis the Middle Eastern countries, while at the same time seeking to realize popular desire that the oppressed Jewish people of Europe might have a homeland in Palestine. The second was that of resolving the situation in a way that prevented the intrusion of Soviet power into Palestine in the process of this withdrawal of the former British power in the mandated territory.

The United Nations apparently seemed to be a logical means to use in attacking the Palestine problem both because it was the legal successor to the League of Nations mandate and because the Arab-Jewish warfare was clearly a threat to the peace. The Palestine problem, in addition, presented the United States with a peculiar dilemma. The fact was that it was clearly impossible to devise any boundary solution for Palestine that would have satisfied both the Arab States that resented the very presence of any Jewish state and the Jewish Zionists who demanded the entire area of the Palestine mandate. Thus any boundary solution that the United States favored would alienate at least one group, if not both, to say nothing of having serious domestic political repercussions in the United States itself. Placing the problem before the U. N. would remove from the United States the onus of whatever solution was finally achieved. The

United States was pledged to support the U. N. and thus, beneath this banner, could lend its weight to the implementation of any U. N. decision that seemed fair and workable.

Another advantage to dealing with the problem through the U. N. was that whichever way the issue was decided between the two contestants, it would not involve any advance for Soviet influence in the Middle East. Thus the United States could support a decision on the merits of the case, or on whatever seemed a practical result of the combat of the two armed forces. Secondly, the Soviet Union was in favor of letting the U. N. deal with the issue, probably for the reason that it would guarantee the departure of British power from one important Middle Eastern country. The United States and its supporters in the U. N. were able to prevent the U. S. S. R. from using the device of the U. N. to increase its influence in Palestine.

One must distinguish, of course, between the Palestine situation and the present crisis in the Middle East. It was possible to utilize the services of the U. N. and this country did in the Palestine situation because, in the absence of great power conflict, membership of the organization in those years was willing to have the U. N. mediate the conflict and seek to give permanence to the solution that seemed most practical. Today, membership of the U. N. has changed significantly by the increase of a large number of states that have assumed a neutralist position in world politics. The Middle East, in addition, has become much more a center of great power conflict. It would therefore seem reasonable to suppose that the United States could not pursue a solution to the Arab-Israeli situation entirely through the U. N. with the same confidence today as it had in the earlier situation. The neutralist inclined states seem unwilling to vote against an Arab member state. Two Arab states that are dedicated to the extermination of Israel are also currently receiving extensive Soviet bloc military aid. Today, the solution of the Arab-Israeli dispute is very much bound up in the attempt of Soviet Russia to replace British and French influence in the Middle East and the consequent United States attempt to prevent this as well as defend the democratic State of Israel and maintain essential good relations with the neighboring Arab States.

The United States recognized the independent State of Israel immediately after it was proclaimed in 1948 and since then has supplied extensive public and private aid. Many commentators conclude that United States aid has been a basic factor in the continued economic well-being of Israel.

The United States has also pursued the solution to the problem of disarmament and the control and reduction of both conventional and atomic weapons almost exclusively through the U. N. This has also been the case with the Soviet Union. In this situation, the U. N. has offered the opportunity for each of the superpowers to demonstrate to the world its readiness to make agreements leading to these laudable goals and at the same time demonstrate that it is the obstructionist tactics of the other that prevent any positive accomplishments in that direction.

This is not to suggest that the United States has been insincere in its desire to lessen the dangers of atomic warfare or to halt the development of arms races. It is merely to indicate that in the presence of continuing worldwide tension between the Soviet bloc and the free world it has not been possible to make agreements that would seriously curtail their military strength. In these circumstances the U. N. provides both the arena where any possible agreements can be negotiated and the best facility for indicating to the world that the United States continues to seek a just and workable agreement.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. I wish to place myself on record as highly commending the excellent address which has been delivered by our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from New York. He has set forth in very constructive form the aims, the ideals, and the objectives which the resolution seeks to accomplish. It is unfortunate that some Senators who have had questions about the exact meaning of the resolution and about the objectives of the administration and of Congress in trying to enact the resolution, were not present on the floor so that they might hear the very constructive address by the Senator from New York.

I thank the Senator from New York personally for what he has said.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Maine.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I desire to commend the junior Senator from New York for a most excellent address. The Senator and I served together some 10 years ago in the other body of Congress. He was advocating then the same principles he has espoused today, and he was speaking as forcefully on those occasions as he has today. I am in complete agreement with his statement that what the United States needs is a dynamic, positive foreign policy to accomplish the objectives so ably outlined by the junior Senator from New York. It is unfortunate that more Senators were not on the floor this afternoon to hear his outstanding speech.

Although no reservation could come from anything which the junior Senator from New York said in his speech, it is true that some Senators may have reservations, either unconsciously or subconsciously, stemming from the fact that we have watched the development of a strong foreign policy over the last 10 years become more ineffective in recent months. We were present when a strong policy was formulated. We have seen it made effective. We have spent billions of dollars to implement such a policy. We know that it has cost much money. But there is a growing feeling that we no longer have a dynamic, positive foreign policy. The growing tendency is to form, for the most part, military alliances, and not to achieve the splendid objectives which the junior Senator from New York has so ably outlined in his speech. That is the concern of some Senators on this side of the aisle—at least, it is of concern to me.

I am not so much concerned with the amount which is covered in the resolution. The resolution asks for a large amount of money. That disturbs some Senators on this side of the aisle; it does not disturb me one iota. But I should like to know the purpose for which the money is to be used. It is the purpose for which the money will be spent which is hidden. I do not mean that we desire to telegraph our punches; but is there a positive, intelligent foreign policy which will give some purpose and direction to the solution of the problems of the Middle East?

I do not ask the Senator from New York to answer this question. I intend to study his speech carefully tomorrow, as I hope other Senators will. But if we could achieve the aims and objectives which were outlined in his speech, there would be no question, in my mind, that that would meet the overwhelming approval of the American people. I think that is what they want to have done. But there is a hidden doubt and deep concern that there has not been nor will not be that sort of foreign policy if present practices are continued. I repeat, the junior Senator from New York has made a most excellent address, one which has been sorely needed in this debate. I am very happy to pay tribute to the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I agree with the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Colorado, who have just commended the junior Senator from New York. I think he has laid the cards on the table very clearly.

One underlying purpose of the resolution which is sought by the President is very clear, namely, to put a brake against the onslaught of the Communists from the north by any means whatsoever. Why? In the first place, 70 percent of the known supply of oil in the world is in the Middle East.

If the Communists were to take over, it is agreed—as demonstrated by recent events—that there would be a throttlehold upon our allies in Europe, and the effect upon us should be apparent to anyone who is willing to observe and who does not wear blinders.

Second, I think it is very clear that, according to the military men, if the Middle East area were taken over by the Communists, it would provide a gateway for them to Africa. Let us be frank and admit that on our own continent we have less than one-third of the materials necessary for our own defense. If the Kremlin obtained the gateway to Africa and then obtained Africa and obtained Europe, I think anyone who wishes to see can understand what the effect upon our country would be.

So I wish to thank the Senator from New York for his very thought-provoking and very logical speech, which I believe should be read by all who seek the truth.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I am very grateful to my colleagues, the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] for their kind words.

I desire to conclude with a brief word to my friend, the Senator from Colorado, with whom I enjoy serving and for whom I have great admiration. I think we should examine ourselves, too. If we feel that the foreign policy of our country does not have the inventive genius that it should have, I think some of that can be supplied by those of us who serve here. On the other hand, at times when

the foreign policy has perhaps too much inventive genius, it should be restrained. Let me give an example: It will be recalled that the United Nations essentially began from a resolution adopted in the Congress. The resultant study and development brought the United Nations into being; we proceeded on that basis, instead of proceeding on the theory that, in view of the end of the League of Nations, there was no longer a chance for an international organization.

The Senator from Colorado may recall that in respect to the Marshall plan, particularly the sections which dealt with the encouragement of private enterprise and the sections which dealt with the shipment of relief parcels—I am sure there were others, but those are the ones which occur to me at the moment—those sections were written into the bill by action of one or the other of the legislative bodies.

It will also be recalled that the so-called Kersten amendment—which was looked at askance for a time, and which purported to give the President sums of money, without strings attached, to be used for the purpose of encouraging escapees from behind the Iron Curtain—turned out to be very useful in providing a fund to be drawn on when needed for specific purposes in that connection. I think I could present quite a list of that sort. For instance, the NATO idea had its fundamental origin in the great interest in the Congress occasioned by the great pressure on Europe, both militarily and economically.

Certainly I shall never hesitate—regardless of whether the administration in power represents my party—to present ideas which seem to me to be good. Certainly all the Members of this body are very anxious to back useful, effective, and constructive ideas and proposals. Certainly all the brains capable of dealing soundly with foreign policy are not concentrated in the State Department; that is not the tradition of our country.

So I hope very much that not only from the Congress, but also from all of the great talent existing elsewhere in our country—in the universities, in the associations, in the unions, in the business organizations, and in the foundations—constructive proposals will come. I hope all our people will feel free to develop their ideas for positive dynamic action on foreign policy, and that they will be aided constructively by those of us who serve in the Congress, and who have a national, and, indeed, an international platform. As one Member of this very august body, I hope very much that I shall have the privilege of doing so, and I am sure that my colleagues will do the same.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I have no desire to encumber the very excellent speech made by the Senator from New York by making some observations about the concern which I tried to express a short time ago.

There is no question in my mind that any administration—including the present one—deserves bipartisan support in many instances. On that point, I agree very much with the Senator from New York, based upon our years of service in the other body. We served during the consideration of the Marshall plan and the Berlin airlift and Korean aid. As those programs proceeded step by step, we knew that the way to stem the tide of international communism was to go forward with a strong, dynamic foreign policy.

In this body, the junior Senator from New York and I are new Members. As I listened to the debate a moment ago, it seemed to me that the Senator from New York, in the course of his speech, referred to the year 1953 and to 1955, referring to events which occurred in the Middle East. I think our foreign policy in regard to that area has not been intelligent; I think it has not been constructive; I think it does not solve the basic problems which have been so ably presented to us today by the junior Senator from New York.

I agree completely with him that there are in this body and in the other body Members who are able to formulate or to participate in the formulation of the sound plans.

For example, the other day I submitted an amendment to the Foreign Relations Committee. I did so with all due humility as a new Member. The amendment was not based upon my idea; it was based upon an idea conceived by one of the great Americans to serve in this body. I refer to the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg. The idea was his, as set forth in a speech he made on the floor of the Senate in 1948. He conceived the idea of having a watchdog committee established; the words watchdog committee were his own. He wanted to have such a committee protect the taxpayers of the Nation, inasmuch as we were then about to embark upon a great program of spending billions of dollars to aid Europe.

Without trying to recall the voting record of the distinguished junior Senator from New York, let me say that I believe that in those days sometimes he stood almost alone as a Republican Member in the House of Representatives. He was most progressive and most constructive. On many occasions he stood alone in the House of Representatives voting in favor of such measures.

Senator Vandenberg gave many reasons why a watchdog committee should be established. The amendment I submitted to the committee was based upon that idea. I do not know whether I shall submit the amendment to the Senate, because there are other pertinent resolutions which have been passed by the Senate setting forth the watchdog concept.

But, as I said in my statement, which appears in the RECORD, it is significant that there was, and in this body there is, an intelligent constitutional argument as to whether or not there is an improper request for a delegation to the executive branch of the war-making power of Congress. I stated there was a twilight zone of opinion as to whether there was or was not such a request, but the important point is that we ought to bridge the gap in an effort to truly create a bi-partisan foreign policy. I gave the names of the members of the committee, and, for the RECORD, I refer to page 908 of the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services. Recently, for the first time in years they have been called into conference at the White House. As the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] said, it was the first time he had ever been called into such a conference, at least since 1954, although he is the second ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The President, after he had called the conference, had a perfect right to speak to the people, as he did, over television.

I cannot agree with the handling of the sanctions situation with regard to Israel. By virtue of the fortitude and courage which has been shown by Israel in saying, "Give us further guaranties," there has been a decided change. I do not know what happened this afternoon at the United Nations, as I have not read a report of it. At any rate there has been a forcing, there has been clearer thinking, there has been a more constructive thinking by all of us concerning the Arab-Israeli problem and the resolution under consideration. Obviously the question arises if we cannot solve the sanctions issue should we commit ourselves to spend hundreds of millions of dollars in support of a policy that is foredoomed to failure?

I say to the junior Senator from New York that $200 million will not be the end of it, for next year there will be another $200 million, and the year after that another $200 million. I do not believe, under those circumstances, that my constituents would particularly favor that.

If we spent $1 billion in the Middle East on a good, constructive program, such as the junior Senator from New York has outlined in the Senate this afternoon, which would bring peace, stability, and the friendship of the people of the Middle East area, I say it would be well worth the price, rather than to muddle in and out of a situation which may throw us into an atomic war and world war III.

I again commend the junior Senator from New York for a very excellent statement, but despite the excellent speech I have heard I wanted to express the reservation which I had in mind, not as to the aims and objectives, but as to whether he has the insight—and I refer to the Secretary of State—and whether he has the vision, to carry out this program which is vitally necessary, in my own opinion, for the strength and security of our own Nation, and the peace of the world.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe the Senator from Colorado has uttered words which will find an echo in the hearts of many people in our country. In reply I merely wish to say that in order to resolve the debate and come to a vote, which the Senate will do before very long, it is necessary, as we sometimes do in law cases, to assume the Senator is right, but nevertheless support the effort, which is a beginning and is opening the door available to us. I urge that we pass through it and, having passed through it, give to the effort not only the

initiative of those in the present administration, but our own initiative. But as to the desirability of passing through the door, which is the point of my address to the Senate today, I have no doubt.

Mr. CARROLL. Does the Senator express the hope that the most inevitable thing in life has changed and there is hope for a more constructive effort to bring about the end which we all desire?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have been following closely the debate on the Middle East resolution so that I might inform myself as fully as possible concerning this vital issue before we shall have to vote on it.

However, I confess to being disturbed over the turn that the debate has been taking. We are hearing from both sides of the aisle what amounts to some indiscriminate and often reckless attacks upon the fundamental concepts of an internationalist foreign policy. These attacks have been directed not so much against the Middle East resolution as such, but actually against the United Nations, against all overseas financial expenditures, against our NATO alliance with the democracies of the Atlantic community, and against the entire conception of an American foreign policy founded on constructive relationships with other nations.

Already the leader of the Republican Party—the President's party—in the Senate has delivered a major attack at a college forum on the organization and composition of the United Nations. From both sides of the aisle, we have recently heard the idea of international cooperation denounced, ridiculed, and held up to disdainful contempt. My mail is beginning to reflect the impact of this kind of debate upon public opinion. People without information and extremists are sending in many letters which can only be described as inflammatory or hysterical and highly isolationist in tone.

Perhaps as a result of this trend in our mail, speeches on the Senate floor now tell us that the voters are overwhelmingly opposed to all sorts of international commitments—and that woe betide the public figure who dares to defy such sentiment.

### SENATORS MUST EXERCISE RESPONSIBILITY AND COURAGE

To begin with, Mr. President, I doubt if the United States Senate is supposed to be some vast Univac machine which faithfully reflects each batch of letters and telegrams. We are supposed to be responsive to our mail, but not dominated by it. Furthermore, I know of no governmental activity easier or more tempting to level demagoguery against than the whole principle of overseas programs. We are hearing now that farmers will be prosperous, for example, if only we can choke off foreign aid. Well, this administration is appropriating much more money than ever for so-called farm programs, and still the family-sized farm does not enjoy prosperity. How do our overseas expenditures figure in that? Indeed, I always have thought that an aggressive program of international trade and commerce might be the one way to dispose of some of our agricultural surplus production.

Mr. President, I have not made up my mind definitely on the Middle East resolution. I believe the purpose of the present debate is to clarify the questions at stake. I still eagerly await this clarification. It is urgently needed. But, to date, much of the debate has seemed to me more calculated to weaken our national faith in an enlightened, 20th century foreign policy than to analyze and discuss the Middle East issues.

Since the preset debate began, I have listened to Senators attacking foreign aid, hip and thigh. They have lambasted it—horse, foot, and dragoon. They have found in it no good and much evil. Yet our postwar programs of international commitments and cooperation were initiated by a Democratic President, Harry S. Truman, and by Gen. George C. Marshall; and the successors to these programs are now carried on by Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. Many other eminent leaders of both parties, or of no party, in the executive branch and in the Congress, have devoted their best efforts to these policies. Is it possible that this great Nation has been so unfortunate as to have only knaves or fools at the helm of its Ship of State for the past decade? I refuse to believe such an implication, yet that would be the inevitable logic of some of the speeches we have been hearing recently.

This is a time, Mr. President, for responsibility and not for reckless destruction of the whole basis of our postwar international policies.

Yet, unless the trend and tone of the debate change, it is my fear that the most significant result of these past few weeks will not be passage or defeat of a resolution involving certain relatively superficial phases of the Middle East problem, but the wreckage of any chances for responsible statesmanship in the realm of foreign policy for years to come.

### ADMINISTRATION MUST BE CANDID WITH THE PUBLIC

If this fearful result were to emerge from the present debate, much of the blame must rest on the administration itself for the manner in which it has presented the substance of the resolution we are debating. Not only have the President and the Secretary of State failed to enlighten the public on the exact nature and dimensions of the problem with which the proposed resolution is to deal, in preparation for an intelligent discussion of that problem and our proposed policies toward it—no, Mr. President; there is every evidence that the administration has equally failed in the preparation of the supposed program itself, so that neither the public nor the Congress can form any real understanding of what is proposed, and why. Is it any wonder if the only impressions created—rightly or wrongly—are that, first, we are to risk American lives in defense of Arab selfish interests and desert sands, and, second, that we are to spend vast amounts of American funds on unspecified projects in those areas?

Mr. President, such undertakings as our mutual security programs, technical assistance and reciprocal trade require a great deal of understanding on the part of the American people. For the sake of future gains in world peace, security, freedom and prosperity, such programs call for apparent self-sacrifice and altruism now, in an era when more than half the residents of the world are hungry and there is loose on the planet a destructive force which could totally wipe out the human race. Does anyone think the Senate debate of recent days has uniformly been calculated to produce that understanding, idealism and altruism?

Mr. President, if there is a scintilla of truth to some of the speeches delivered on the Senate floor during recent days, then this great democracy has suffered the misfortunate to be governed during the past 10 years by some of the most misguided and ill-advised men on earth. Such instrumentalities as mutual security, the United Nations, international cooperation and reciprocal trade programs did not, like Topsy, "just growed." They were brought into existence, on our part, by American Presidents and American Secretaries of State. If these institutions are as foolish and wretched as some Senators claim they are, what can be said for the sort of men—Democrats and Republicans alike—whom the American people have been entrusting with foreign policy? Either Senators are speaking too passionately and too dogmatically, or else America has been in sorry hands, indeed. If certain Senate speeches are accurate in fact, I fear for the future of the United States.

### PRESIDENTS ARE NOT ALWAYS WRONG AND SENATORS RIGHT

Of course, it is always possible that the men in the White House may sometimes have been right, and some Senators wrong. I will not venture that as an outright statement of fact, but I will merely vouchsafe such a possibility. It could be the case, however.

Mr. President, I am not yet ready to judge the issue in the present instance. I have been disturbed by the obvious incompleteness, both of the diagnosis given us by the administration of the asserted danger facing the free world in the Middle East, and of its prescription for it. I have been disturbed by the inconsistency of the President's simultaneous readiness to support sanctions against Israel, the most democratic and Western-oriented nation in the Middle East, while we are told that this central Middle Eastern crisis in Arab-Israel relations has no place in, or even bearing upon, the danger with which we are supposed to concern ourselves in the pending resolution. However, Mr. President, when the time comes to vote on the resolution, I shall do so on the merits of its purposes as I see them, in the light of the overall internationalist policies America has followed in the postwar years. I do not believe that the present debate

should serve as an occasion for destructive broadside attacks on the whole underlying conception of these internationalist policies, which do not need to stand or fall on the weakness of the Eisenhower administration's present proposals for the Middle East. After this one issue has been disposed of, we still must have left a bipartisan and effective foreign policy which will function to stem Communist aggression and bolster free government throughout the world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very pleased that I could be in the Senate Chamber at the time the Senator from Oregon made his remarks, because I gather that what the Senator is concerned about is the possibility that in the discussion of this resolution we may actually set loose forces, or at least generate attitudes, which could be injurious to the whole structure of international cooperation. Is that the Senator's view?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is my view, and that is the fear I attempted to express in the comparatively brief remarks to which the Senator from Minnesota refers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure the Senator would agree with me that we on this side of the aisle—and I trust also those on the other side—would not want to indulge in the kind of reckless invective and petulant argument which was so characteristic of the Republican leadership during the Truman administration.

I say that with a note of sadness, and yet of truth. I can recall the bitterness of the debates in this Chamber, and the unrelenting attacks not only upon the wisdom of the policies of Mr. Acheson, former Secretary of State, but actually upon his ability, his loyalty, and his character.

It is fair to say that Mr. Truman did not have the protective cloak around him that the present occupant of the White House has been privileged to enjoy. Yet under the Truman administration some of the greatest instruments of American foreign policy were consummated.

Therefore I hope that we on this side, while some may have good reason to be doubtful as to the wisdom of the resolution before us, will remember that in discussing it we should confine our remarks to the resolution and its strength and weaknesses, and not run wild over the entire area of American foreign policy, which has been meticulously and carefully built.

I ask that my colleague from Oregon note with me again—as he did in his remarks—that this resolution had an unfortunate beginning. The majority leader said he was a little tired of "government by leak." I am sure we all know to what he referred. There has been a tendency to give the "razzle-dazzle" public-relations treatment to matters of high policy; yes, of fundamental, basic policy relating to the very security of this country.

It is true that many Members of this body and of the other House were very much upset over the fact that a resolution which apparently bears upon the security of our Republic was first advanced in the press rather than in the nature of a formal document presented to the Senate or to the House of Representatives.

Also, many Members of the Senate were disappointed by the lack of candor which was exhibited by some of the administration witnesses in the presentation of support for the resolution. The argument over economic aid is characteristic of what I have referred to.

The junior Senator from Minnesota has supported economic aid in every vote in the Senate. I have supported it at times to the disappointment of my friends and colleagues. I believe in an effective foreign economic policy. I am trying to help build one. But I say that the lack of documentation for foreign economic aid in the pending resolution as presented by the administration really jeopardizes constructive, effective foreign-aid programs and policies. It is to this subject that the Senator from Minnesota and other Senators have referred on other occasions.

I do not intend to vote to kill foreign aid, but I do not want the debate on this resolution to result in discrediting effective foreign aid. Therefore, I think it is pertinent, and very important, to note that the Senator from Texas, the majority leader, was able to have written into the resolution as reported by the committees an amendment reading as follows:

> None of the additional authorization contained in this section shall be used until 15 days after the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives and, when military assistance is involved, the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives have been furnished a report showing the object of the proposed use, the country for the benefit of which such use is intended, and the particular appropriation or appropriations for carrying out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, from which the funds are proposed to be derived:

The purpose of that amendment is to see to it that Members of Congress are at least informed as to the purposes for which that money would be expended; in other words, that money would not be expended for projects, programs, and uses, which would adversely reflect upon an economic assistance program.

I mention these facts, because the resolution as reported from the committee contains three basic amendments which I believe greatly improve the resolution.

The first amendment Mr. President, places the responsibility for the use of our Armed Forces on the President, as Commander in Chief under the Constitution. The amendment provides:

> To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism.

That is a fundamental amendment, and it complies with the traditions and precedents of our constitutional history.

The second amendment was offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. It provides that the $200 million authorized shall no longer have placed on it the limitations imposed in the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and that that $200 million is authorized to be used until the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1957. That is a far cry from what the administration presented.

The administration presented a resolution in which the authorization ran on ad infinitim, to the point of eternity. This is a direct limitation, and requires that Congress shall review the entire matter of economic assistance on a fiscal-year basis.

I point these matters out because, as the Senator from Oregon has indicated, there is doubt in my mind as to how one should vote on the resolution. However, I do not want my criticism of the economic assistance aspects of the resolution to be interpreted as my being opposed to a constructive economic policy. In fact, I cry out today for the administration to formulate and to present to us a foreign economic policy. It has none.

The administration has many ad hoc and part-time policies. It would be well for every Member of the Senate to read the Millikan-Rostow report from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology on the subject of America's foreign economic policy. It contains some very important reading. Members of the Senate should determine once and for all what kind of foreign-aid program we should have. Instead of a policy based on 3 months, 6 months, or 2 months, or on any other hit-and-miss basis, it should be a policy designed to meet long-term objectives.

Ninety percent of all our foreign economic aid has been for military support. That is hardly an economic policy. That is a military policy.

The Senator from Oregon has been very generous in yielding time to me. I will conclude by saying that his reference to the United Nations is entirely appropriate. I know there are some people who are condemning what is going on in the United Nations today, and our activities in the United Nations, in order to discredit the United Nations. The Senator from Minnesota feels that if the administration will effectively utilize the facilities of the United Nations and give direction, leadership, and guidance, the United Nations will be able to be an effective instrument in certain areas.

The United Nations is only 11 years old. It is not fully developed. We ought not to ask, as the saying goes, a boy to do a man's job. The United Nations ought not to be given impossible problems to solve. It ought to be given problems that are possible of solutions. Therefore I am not going to join in the hue and cry of condemning the U. N. What should be done is to constructively criticize our failure to give leadership in the United Nations.

A classic example of that is to be found in the existing situation relating to the Israel-Egyptian situation, where we are constantly saying that we are going to wait and see what other people

do, and that we are going to wait and see what the African-Asian bloc does.

That is not leadership. That is even poor following.

As I have suggested before, we might at least consider what our friends to the north, in Canada, are doing. Canada has had the courage to stand up against Britain when the British went into Egypt. We might cooperate with a nation that has demonstrated sensitivity to the problems of the modern world. The Dominion of Canada has shown great courage. By working with the Dominion of Canada, at least on hemispheric policy, we might be able to contribute to leadership and direction.

However, I sense that when some people want to cover up for the failures or the errors of judgment or the inadequacies of our own foreign policy, they usually say that the United Nations is at fault.

Let the record be clear that no sanctions could be imposed on anyone in the United Nations if we did not want them imposed. That is the first point.

The second point is that there can be effective economic and political leadership in the United Nations if the United States will lead.

I hope that while Mr. Mollet, the French Prime Minister, is in the United States, we can reestablish the spirit of friendship and cooperation which has symbolized our foreign policy for many years.

I conclude by saying that I am delighted the Prime Minister of France is visiting our President and our country. I hope those meetings will produce again that great spirit of fraternity which has characterized the relationships between the United States and the Republic of France. France is a great country. It has a great people. It has great history. It is doing great things. French political leadership, despite all the criticism that has been leveled against it, has given the world the Coal and Steel Community, the proposals for the European Defense Community, and, more recently, the Common Trade Area Community. The French are struggling to strengthen the areas of freedom. I hope that we will be able to reestablish our friendly relationships with the French and the British, with mutual respect for our differences, but with a great faith in those things that unite us.

I again thank the Senator from Oregon for his fine statement and for his generosity in yielding to me.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his very effective response to my remarks.

I wish to say this to the Senator from Minnesota. I do not have his long experience in the Senate or the benefit of his very able service on the Committee on Foreign Relations. However, I believe he does share with me the knowledge of how difficult it is in the Senate, under present circumstances, to try to be a responsible member of the Democratic Party.

I remember that last year, when the Eisenhower administration was urging that Congress allow the administration to continue aid to the Tito government in Yugoslavia, so far as my own State is concerned—and I can only speak for the State of Oregon—it was a highly unpopular proposal in Oregon.

The Republican floor leader in the Senate and, I believe, also the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, joined in submitting an amendment on the floor to strike out aid to Tito in the bill which provided foreign aid for various countries throughout the world.

The Republicans had their cake and ate it, too. If I am not mistaken, we liberal Democrats, who have been at times berated all over the place for allegedly being leftists, had to stand on the floor of the Senate and save the Eisenhower administration's program with respect to assistance to Yugoslavia.

After the Congress adjourned I went home to my State. I spoke all over the State at various meetings, not only at nonpartisan meetings, but at other meetings, where I campaigned for the reelection—happily successfully—of my distinguished senior colleague in the Senate.

On many occasions people came up to me—almost always they were members of President Eisenhower's political party—and told me how disappointed they were that I had voted to continue aid to that blackguard and rascal, Tito. When I told them that this was the specific request made by the President and the Secretary of State, many of them refused to believe it. I asked friends of mine to check at county courthouses on the political affiliation of these people, because in my State people register to vote by political parties, and almost invariably all the people who were thus so critical of me were members of President Eisenhower's party. They refused to believe that President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles would suggest so unpatriotic and un-American a policy as continuing aid to Tito. The only way I could convince these people that the "terrible" Democrats had voted for a policy favored by Secretary Dulles and President Eisenhower was to send them copies of the letter from Mr. Dulles, in which he stated this policy was adopted with the full concurrence of the President. The administration has had its cake and has eaten it, too. The administration has looked to us on this side of the aisle to vote for their program, to save it from being wrecked by the Republican leaders, and then we get berated by Republicans when we go home.

I have been a Member of the Senate for only a very short time, but I remember that virtually the same thing happened with respect to reciprocal trade.

I think, on 5 or 6 rollcalls, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and I voted with the administration for a 3-year extension of the reciprocal trade program. But when I went home I was criticized by Republicans because I allegedly voted to wreck the tunafish industry or the cherry industry. When I told them it was an administration program, they said, "Ike would not propose a program that you Democrats would vote for." They did not believe that the 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act or the allowance of aid to Tito are part of the Eisenhower program, because they think that only Democrats would do anything like that, and that "old Ike" would not do such a thing.

We have been depended upon to defend the Republican foreign policy from attack by their own Republican leaders in the Senate, but when we go home, we get criticized by the Republicans in our own States.

Mr. President, I wish to add one thing which I think is quite significant.

Almost at the very time the President of the United States went on the air to appeal for United Nations action in the Middle East crisis—action which many of us hope will not come to pass in the terms which the President favors—almost at the very time the President did that, the Republican minority leader had made a major foreign-policy speech criticizing the very composition, the very organization, of the United Nations.

One of the things that amuses me is that some Republicans will quote with approval a criticism of the United Nations on the basis that, in the United Nations, there are certain countries which have a thousand times the population of other countries.

I do not know whether they realize it, but that could also be a criticism of the United States Senate, where certain States have 65 or 70 times the population of other States. But I think it highlights the whole Alice-in-Wonderland atmosphere of this situation, that almost while the administration is offering all these platitudes about the United Nations, the administration's chief Senate spokesman is making a policy speech criticizing the entire fundamental basis of the structure of the United Nations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to revert to something said a moment ago about Democratic support meeting with criticism in the Senator's home State. As a matter of fact, did not the Senator also encounter the situation that during the campaign it was thrown up to him constantly that the Republicans gave the President better support for his foreign policy than did the Democrats, and that many times that argument would be made by the very leaders to whom the Senator has made reference?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Constantly. One other amusing thing happened in my State. There was a Republican Member of the House of Representatives who was extremely isolationist in his voting. He was an opponent of foreign aid. He was defeated in 1956 for reelection, but he has now been appointed to a foreign-aid position under this administration with reference to a program which he voted against steadily during his career.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There have been analogous situations both in connection with foreign aid and with other programs of the Federal Government. For instance, one of the criticisms which I think is a sound one is that in a great many of the agencies which have been set up as independent agencies for the purpose of regulating certain segments of our industry, persons have been appointed from the very ranks that were supposed to be regulated. As a matter

of fact, predominantly the employees have come from those ranks.

Mr. NEUBERGER. We often have to take political risks to support the administration's foreign policy. I am not objecting to that. If we run for this particular office we should expect to hazard political risks.

I asked the capable girl in my office who handles the mail to give me a statement concerning it, and she told me that my mail ran 5 to 1 against the administration's reciprocal trade program, for which I voted. I am speaking of my mail from the State of Oregon. I do not think I received one letter favoring aid to Tito. We are supposed to vote according to our conscience and our own best judgment, but it is at least interesting that we have to undergo political jeopardy for defending the administration's program.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think we should give a great deal of consideration to foreign policy. I understand the Senator believes in resolving doubts in favor of the President on any foreign policy question, but at the same time having an obligation to criticize constructively such foreign policy as the President may promulgate. Is that correct?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Definitely. If it meant staying in the United States Senate for the rest of my natural life, I would never indulge in the type of criticism such as that which was leveled against President Truman by certain Republicans during the Korean war.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the distinguished Senator agree with me that under our form of government as it has developed through the years the President of the United States has not only the power but the responsibility to promulgate and to executed foreign policy?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Definitely. Most assuredly the Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If that be true, does it not follow logically that it is our duty to scrutinize carefully the portion of foreign policy in which we alone have a part in carrying into effect, such as confirming nominations, ratifying treaties, appropriation of funds, and all the things which are necessary to carry foreign policy into effect, and to engage in constructive criticism whenever we believe the proposals are justly subject to such criticism?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Of course, the distinguished Senator from Alabama is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I commend the Senator from Oregon for the very fine presentation he has made. I regret that I was not on the floor to hear all of it, but I have enjoyed greatly the part I have heard.

I particularly wish to commend the Senator from Oregon for the sterling defense he has made of the United Nations. I agree with the statement made by our friend, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], with reference to the United Nations.

It was my pleasure and privilege to have served as a delegate to the United Nations in 1950. I count it as a real distinction. I have been a strong believer in the United Nations, recognizing all the time its imperfections and its weaknesses, but believing that as we recognize its imperfections, our obligation becomes even greater to work harder to make the United Nations the kind of effective organization which we dream it may someday be.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his defense of the United Nations, because the United Nations is the only international organization which exists in the entire world in which we can vote rather than plunge into dreadful atomic war.

If I may address a personal comment to the Senator from Alabama, Mrs. Neuberger and I have said many times, when we have watched Senator SPARKMAN in the Senate, that he has confirmed our belief we voted for the right candidate for Vice President of the United States in 1952.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, Mr. President, I should like to second the observation by the Senator from Oregon relating to the Senator from Alabama. Indeed, that was a vote for the right man and for the right cause.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Would that it had prevailed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say, Mr. President, that these words of comfort are indeed welcome, even though they come——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Belatedly?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; from a minority representation. However, let me say to both the distinguished Senators that I speak in truth and yet facetiously about the minority in which we found ourselves in 1952.

However, there is one thing with reference to that election of which I have always been proud. I have never, at any time, felt downhearted as a result of the outcome of that election. I felt proud of the fact that 27 million Americans voted their belief in the principles for which the Democratic Party stood.

While I am thinking of that, I may add that I was in Kansas City last night, and a newspaperman asked me this amazing question: "What about the Democratic Party? Do you think it will come back?"

I believe they were the words he used.

I said "Before I answer that question, I should say that I do not accept the implication of your question. The Democratic Party has not been away. As a matter of fact, it seems to me you should be asking that question about the Republican Party, because in 1956 the Democrats among the American people expressed their confidence in the Democratic Party by electing a Democratic Senate, a Democratic House, and a majority of the governors. They elected also a Democratic majority in many of the State legislatures throughout the country. I am certain the same thing would be found to be true if you inquired about the election of officials to positions in county courthouses and to other political positions."

I said to him, "I say the Democratic Party won a tremendous victory in 1956. We made a clean sweep except for one man."

He then asked me, "Do you think that in 1960 you will get that office?"

I said, "Yes; I believe we will make a clean sweep in 1960."

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Democratic Party is the healthiest corpse anybody in this country ever saw.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am certain the Senator wants the RECORD to be complete and accurate. Lest anyone misunderstand what the Senator from Oregon has said when he spoke of aid to Tito, the resolution or the proposal on which we voted in the Senate was not merely for aid to Tito, but it was a vote for confidence in the integrity and judgment of the President of the United States.

That resolution, if the Senator will recall, provided that we would give Marshal Tito aid, but that we were willing to vote that if the President determined it was in the vital interest of the United States and the national security of this country, he could, if in his judgment all those factors prevailed, extend aid to Tito. That is what we voted for.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the President made a public pronouncement to that effect.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

The Senator from Oregon has commented about the rather isolationist former Representative from his State who has recently been given a choice administration job in the foreign aid field, although he voted against foreign aid.

I have almost come to the conclusion, I regretfully say, that the way for one to get a job in an agency which he has opposed is, first, to lose the election, and then to secure an appointment to the agency which he sought to kill before he lost the election.

I remember when Mr. Cole was appointed head of the housing administration. He had voted against public housing when he was a Member of Congress, but afterward he was put in charge of it. I said then that that was like putting a fox in charge of a chicken coop. I still think that that was perhaps the most accurate description I could give.

The Senator from Alabama knows that the present Director of the International Cooperation Administration—the ICA—Mr. Hollister, had a record of opposition to the ICA and the policies and programs under the jurisdiction of that agency.

It seems to me that this is a part of what must be called the schizophrenia of the Republican Party. Is it any wonder that the President wants to modernize his party? Is it any wonder that he is asking for some kind of rehabilitation of his party?

We witnessed that in the Senate today when one of our distinguished colleagues rose and said that Paul Hoffman was not the kind of Republican his party could use; that they would wash their hands of him.

Mr. President, if Mr. Hoffman is not wanted in the Republican Party—I have only one invitation; I can only speak for myself as a Democrat—I think he would be a wonderful addition to any organization, and we would be glad to welcome him into the Democratic Party, if he would join with us in our programs.

The other observation I wish to make is this: The Senator from Oregon has pointed out how difficult it is for Democratic Senators to maintain a sense of responsibility. I have said that we Democrats must never be irresponsible, but that we ought to be irrepressible. Let us not be irresponsible; let us be irrepressible in what we believe and in the advocacy of what we believe. It has been mighty difficulty not to let our emotions get the best of us, particularly when in 1952 the leaders of the Republican Party, then campaigning, said they were going to unleash Chiang Kai-shek. Poor old Chiang. Not only is he still on a leash; he has a halter on him so firmly that he can hardly wiggle.

But we were going to unleash Chiang Kai-shek. But then he lost some islands in the north, and he has been tied closer to home than any young boy who has violated the household rules and has been sent behind the closet door.

Then Senators may recall that there was to be a liberation. That idea took hold among certain groups in this country. Our friends of Polish extraction and of Lithuanian extraction—great Americans—felt that somehow or other the Democratic policy was one of containment, not one of liberation.

The Republicans said, "We are going to liberate."

All at once someone decided he wanted to get liberated. What happened?

The Secretary of State said, "No; you are not supposed to get liberated the way you are trying to liberate yourselves. You are not supposed to fight for it or accept our help."

What I am trying to point out is that it is extremely difficult not to try to take advantage of what are such glaring weaknesses and conditions that they are obvious even to the blind. To exploit these issues for political purposes would in a sense do an injustice to sound, constructive, and creditable foreign policy. For instance, does the Senator from Oregon recall the emphasis on "agonizing reappraisal" and "new look"?

The plain truth is that I am afraid some of the propagandists in the Republican ranks decided that the way to get a foreign policy was to "jazz it up" public-relations-wise. The truth is that that kind of policy became foreign to our friends and foreign to our constituents, and no one could quite understand it. Much of our trouble can be attributed to that situation. At the proper time we shall discuss it in more detail.

I am sure the Senator from Oregon has asked us to discuss the pending joint resolution with conviction and with conscience, and that is the way the debate will be maintained.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Minnesota places that interpretation upon my remarks, because it was my intent and purpose to encourage responsibility in foreign policy.

Before yielding the floor, I wish to say to the Senator from Minnesota that I am extremely pleased that earlier in the debate he spoke about the responsibility of our own Democratic leadership in the Senate. Both he and I realize that occasionally some of our liberal friends have been critical of the Democratic majority leader of the Senate. I am relatively new to the Senate, as compared to the service here of the Senator from Minnesota. But I wish to say that I, for one, glory in the fact and rejoice in the fact that the Democratic Members of this body have so responsible a leader as the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. There have been many occasions, as is evident to anyone who is familiar with American politics, when the Democratic leader could have used demagoguery or opportunism—if we wish to use those descriptive terms—to stand against such administration proposals as foreign aid, the continued program of giving a certain measure of assistance to Tito, the reciprocal trade program, and other features of the administration's foreign policy, many of which were inherited from previous administrations, and rightly so. I am very proud that the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has not used those political openings, but that, instead, he has placed what he considers to be the welfare of his country above certain ephemeral political opportunities for his party. I have felt great pride and faith in that fact. It seems to me that when we read the history of these times, we shall find that the occasions when statesmanship has been demonstrated in our country have been those when the welfare of our country has been placed ahead of temporary political advantage. Every one of us familiar with the state of public opinion in the Nation realizes that there is a great deal of political hay to be made out of blind, reckless denunciation of foreign aid or of certain international policies or of reciprocal-trade agreements, particularly in areas where certain industries or certain persons legitimately feel that their businesses or jobs may have been hurt by reciprocal trade.

I feel that the Democratic majority leader of the Senate has certainly demonstrated a high order of statesmanship when he has not taken narrow or partisan advantage of his political opportunities on occasions when he has felt the national welfare demanded that we support the administration, no matter how unpopular its policies might be. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] about the characteristic statesmanship of our majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], in those instances and circumstances.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very happy that the Senator from Oregon has made those comments. They bring to my mind the fact that a political party does not have to be unanimous in order to have unity. Certainly there is a great deal of difference between unanimity and unity, as we have stated many times on this floor. Unity leaves room for differences based on respect for the points of view of others and their background and their outlook and their experience. Unanimity means enforced discipline which would leave no room for differences of opinion.

Let me say that I have not always voted as the majority leader has requested or as he himself has voted. But I believe it fair to say that we have had leadership which has been considerate and temperate and experienced, and at all times has put the welfare of the country above all else. The majority leader has an excellent record in the field of international relations, in particular. This has been to the benefit of the administration.

As the Senator from Oregon knows, our majority leader once said to us that he did not view the role of the opposition as one of simply opposing. Instead, he has used the role of the opposition as being that of opposing when we believe that the majority or the administration is wrong, and of supporting it when we believe it is right. That does not eliminate constructive debate—either on the pending joint resolution or any other subject.

In the case of the pending measure, there is considerable argument, because there are doubts and uncertainties about it. When the vote on the pending joint resolution is taken, we must vote either for it or against it; we cannot vote "maybe." I have often said to my constituents that when we come to decide about one of the primary issues, I often wish there were a column "down the middle." Often there is talk about going down the middle of the road; and such a course is supposed to be a safe one. However, when we vote on a bill or other measure, we must either vote for it or vote against it; we must either vote "yea" or "nay"; there is no "maybe" column, which might help one be popular with many persons.

The purpose of the debate is to give us an opportunity to express any doubts or misgivings we may have, as well as to give us an opportunity to express our convictions. Finally, when the debate has concluded, we resolve the issue by voting. That is what will happen in the case of the pending joint resolution.

That is what the majority leader stated in his opening remarks, after the joint resolution was called up. He proposed that there be thorough debate, that there be responsible debate. He urged that the debate not be limited, that there be no attempt to cut off any reasonable degree of participation in the debate or of examination of the details of the pending measure. But he pointed out that ultimately we must vote on the joint resolution. I believe that the people of the country should know that that is what we wish to do, and that there is a determination here not to stall, not to play politics with the joint resolution, but to examine it and evaluate it, and then decide about it, and to express our decision by means of our vote.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his very cogent and effective remarks.

Mr. President, if no other Senator desires me to yield to him, I now relinquish the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina obtained the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me, to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LONG. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Gore | Morton |
| Allott | Green | Mundt |
| Anderson | Hayden | Murray |
| Barrett | Hennings | Neely |
| Beall | Hickenlooper | Neuberger |
| Bennett | Hill | O'Mahoney |
| Bible | Holland | Pastore |
| Blakley | Hruska | Payne |
| Bricker | Humphrey | Potter |
| Bush | Ives | Purtell |
| Butler | Jackson | Revercomb |
| Byrd | Javits | Robertson |
| Capehart | Jenner | Russell |
| Carlson | Johnson, Tex. | Saltonstall |
| Carroll | Johnston, S. C. | Schoeppel |
| Case, N. J. | Kefauver | Scott |
| Case, S. Dak. | Kennedy | Smathers |
| Chavez | Kerr | Smith, Maine |
| Church | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Clark | Kuchel | Sparkman |
| Cooper | Lausche | Stennis |
| Cotton | Long | Symington |
| Dirksen | Magnuson | Talmadge |
| Douglas | Malone | Thurmond |
| Dworshak | Mansfield | Thye |
| Eastland | Martin, Iowa | Watkins |
| Ellender | McCarthy | Wiley |
| Ervin | McClellan | Williams |
| Flanders | McNamara | Young |
| Frear | Monroney | |
| Goldwater | Morse | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). A quorum is present.

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I believe that each Senator present knows that what I shall have to say here today is not said because I am a Democrat. What I shall say will be the same as what I said when the Democrats were in office. I take the same position in matters of this kind, whether it be under a Democratic or a Republican administration.

Mr. President, I am bitterly opposed to the so-called Eisenhower doctrine. I am opposed to it in its watered-down version. It has not, in my judgment, been watered down enough. It should be watered down to the point that unless we are prepared to stop aggression everywhere, aggression by the large nations as well as by the small nations, we should not attempt to stop it anywhere. Unless all the nations, who are members of the United Nations, contribute their pro rata share of manpower and resources, then I contend we should refrain from carrying the sole responsibility. Though the United States is the leader of the free world, ours should not be the sole responsibility of policing the entire world. We simply do not possess sufficient manpower, nor do we possess the material resources to stop aggression everywhere.

We have stopped England and France. We have not stopped Israel. To adopt an inconsistent, immoral position of forcing our friends to stop aggression against their rights, and then of assuming the responsibility of preventing aggression ourselves, and on the other hand of winking at aggression by Russia against Hungary and other satellite countries and of preventing aggression by India or by China, is wrong. Our actions in this regard are neither justified nor are they moral.

Our foreign policy under the President is disastrous. It is fraught with danger to the lives of our American boys and with danger from the standpoint of the waste of our material resources. Our foreign policy under the President and Secretary Dulles is bankrupt in its principles and purposes.

Let me prove the charges.

The President proposes to do now, at a late date and under circumstances and grave handicaps—which, by the way, he himself has created—what the President prevented others from doing when quick and certain success would have attended our efforts.

The resolution which the President wishes us to pass proposes to do now just the opposite of what he earlier prevented others from doing with their own manpower and at their own expense. This happened when the Suez crisis first arose and was at its height.

The President said in substance last year when the crisis in the Middle East was at its peak that he "could not conceive of the use of military force as a good solution." At what point did he get this conception?

What he must have meant was that the use of military force by England, France, and Israel was not a good solution. But, in essence, he now says give me 200 million extra dollars and the right—in advance of a declaration of war by the Congress—to use American forces wherever I please. The President helped to create a vacuum in the Middle East by causing the forces of England, France, and Israel to withdraw from that area. The President's resolution would fill that vacuum with our own men and material strength. What other deduction can a fair and objective mind reach?

Mr. President, how long, oh, how long, will the American people permit themselves to be the stooges of the divergent forces which are at work today?

If it was wrong for England and France to prevent the confiscation or nationalization of the Suez Canal Co. with their own men and own resources, what right have we to subject our American boys and girls and our American resources to about the same purpose and in the same undertaking? The President wants Congress to give him a blank check and an absolute grant of power and, at the same time, subject the use and deployment of such power and money according to the mandates and edicts of the United Nations. Such action gives Russia a veto over what we may wish to do. The Congress must give up its veto power and hand it over to Russia in the Security Council.

The President wants us to bypass our constitutional requirements on the one hand, but, on the other hand, he wants us to subordinate our actions to the mandates of the United Nations. In what a predicament such a lack of regard for our constitutional form of government can involve us. Shall we again give in to Russia's veto on the pretense that we need to do so to halt Russian infiltration?

The Constitution of the United States is more sacred to me than the charter or a thousand charters of the United Nations. A charter which permits force against the weak and restrains force against the strong is not much of a charter to me. A rule which does not work both ways is a poor rule to me.

A few dates and a few events will prove the truth of the charges I make. Let us look at the facts. They are not in dispute. Let us look at the events as they have occurred. The timetable of them is clear. The recorded events are not now subject to argument. The obvious deductions from them may spell just as disastrous an adventure as we experienced in Korea.

Here is the recent history of world events in their date order. In late July—July 26, 1956—Nasser announced that he was nationalizing the Suez Canal Co. Nationalization without prompt, adequate, and just compensation is confiscation. Such has been our national policy from the beginning of our history as a Nation.

Who dares to deny this? Did the President complain that Egypt had broken her treaty obligations when Egypt nationalized this private corporation, the Suez Canal Co.? Did the President complain about Egypt's immoral act of violating her duty to mankind? Did the President address himself to the question of Egypt's compliance with international law? Not at all. His efforts were directed principally to restrain England and France from protecting the rights of their citizens and their Governments as the stockholders in the Suez Canal Co. He wishes to punish Israel now because she is unwilling to be strangled to death.

We should bear in mind also that when that event was taking place, there was a treaty in existence between Egypt and England under which England had the right to go in there to protect the Suez Canal.

High level diplomatic talks began on August 1, 1956. Mr. Murphy, Assistant

Secretary of State, was first dispatched to London. Then Mr. Dulles suddenly flew back from South America and migrated after him within a few days. Throughout the month of August 1956 we talked, and talked, and proposed further discussions. Other nations were called into conference. Not one word came from the White House in condemnation of the international banditry being practiced by Nasser on the stockholders of the Suez Canal Co.

The negotiations which started in August failed in September of 1956. Every proposal for a solution of the crisis created by Nasser's piracy failed.

Russia seized the turn of events in her favor. Through her western doors, she used her might to repress the uprisings in Budapest. Hungary became a bloody battleground for the further practice of Russian tyranny.

On October the 25th, a few days before the election, the President said it was not necessary to call a special meeting of the United Nations to consider the unrest in the Middle East or, for that matter, for any other action. The President satisfied himself and the situation by saying:

> The United States deplores the intervention of the Soviet military forces.

The puppet government of Hungary has defied the United Nations. That government will not even let the Secretary General of the United Nations pay it a visit. The Secretary General cannot observe what is going on in Hungary much less stop it. The President has yet to denounce the international thievery of Nasser. But look. When Israel sent her forces into the Sinai Peninsula of Egypt and was within 20 miles of the Suez Canal, and England and France, on October 30, 1956, sent Egypt an ultimatum, the President dispatched to England and France a "vigorous and emphatic protest."

In desperation, on October 31, 1956, England and France started troop movements into Egypt.

The President then took to the airwaves and in a broadcast on October 31 finally declared:

> We took our first measure in this action yesterday. We went to the United Nations with a request that the forces of Israel return to their own line and that hostilities in the area be brought to a close—there, with no veto operating, the opinion of the world can be brought to bear.

Why had not the President brought the opinion of the world to bear on Nasser in his confiscations in July? Why had not the President done more than "deplore" the Russian action in Hungary and in Russia's earlier depredations in the satellite countries? What about bringing world opinion to bear on Russia? What rule of law is there that is worth a continental that does not apply equally to the strong as it should to the weak?

I hold no brief for England. I hold no brief for France. I hold no brief for Israel. I owe my loyalty and my responsibility to the boys and girls of America, to their mothers and to their fathers. I owe an obligation to the economic welfare of all the people of the United States. Why should we play a game of international chess with the blood of our boys and girls? Why should we waste our economic well-being and permit Russia to hold the check rein of a veto over our actions?

Mr. President, it never occurred to the President to protest Egypt's unlawful actions in her seizure of the canal company. Deploring Russia's use of force in Hungary is quite a different thing from wanting to use our boys and girls and our own money to do what we had theretofore prevented France, England, and Israel from doing on their own account. These dates and these events compound a situation that requires more explanation than we have yet been given. The Secretary of State is facile of speech, easy with the gift of explanation, but the reason for our doing what we are now asked to do is a poor excuse for having prevented our true and tried allies from assuming the job on their own responsibility.

Talk not to me about our actions conforming to the mandates of the United Nations. Our actions in Korea conformed to the mandates of the United Nations. By conforming we suffered in excess of 150,000 casualties. That is the kind of conformity that I, as one American, want no more of. How soon are we to forget that we furnished more than 90 percent of the manpower and more than 85 percent of the materials in that fiasco? In Korea, we lost the only war in history in which we were ever engaged. We lost it when we could have won it. We lost it under the charm and direction of the United Nations. We will lose another war, a more costly war, unless every member of the United Nations pays its proportionate share of the cost of every such police action, not only in manpower, but in material resources. Must we be the banker for the world both in manpower and material wealth?

Shall we continue to be the blood bank for the world?

I ask again, When will the American people awaken to the disaster that awaits us when we attempt to crush the weak and merely scold the wrongdoings of the strong? Such actions do not help the morals of the world one iota. They only further weaken and hurt us. Weaken, I mean, our own United States.

Moral leadership is fine. I admire moral leadership. I adore moral leadership. But I detest intellectual dishonesty. I detest immorality that permits the strong to run rampant in committing violations which result in the weak knuckling under to the forces of the strong. I say in substance with the leader of the Republican side in this Chamber, that such a course of conduct by us is immoral, unjustified, and unwarranted. I say in substance with the leader on our side of the aisle, that it is wrong to pressure only one side of a two-sided dispute. No amount of juggling of words, twisted phrases, doubletalk, schoolteacher approach, or radio adaptation of "Father knows best" from the President or his wandering boy, Secretary Dulles, can convince me that it is moral for Russia to crush Hungary, but that it is improper for England and France to protect their property interests in the Suez Canal Co. This immorality of action is compounded a thousand times and made infinitely worse from every point of view I hold when it is proposed that we, in America, shall now do what we prevented others from doing on their own account and in their own interests.

In November we voted with Russia and Egypt for a cease-fire. We voted against England, France, and Israel.

In the early days of November, just before the election, the British and French invaded Egypt. The Russians had already sent their armored tanks into Hungary. At about the same time, Bulganin proposed that Russia and the United States intervene in Egypt to halt invasion there. A White House spokesman said:

> Neither the Soviet nor any other military forces should now enter the Middle East except under a United Nations mandate.

Nothing was said then to the effect that the United States should use its own forces under a United Nations mandate to oppose Russian forces from infiltrating the Middle East. The threat then was greater than it is today. While the threat of the use of force in Egypt and Hungary was at its peak, the President flew, on November 10, to Gettysburg to tramp over his place and look after his livestock.

The oil shortage in Western Europe was being felt to the great detriment of all our allies in NATO. Rationing in Europe was being enforced. People were suffering from the slow-down in industry. Others were suffering from insufficient heating oil. The clarion call for the protection of law and order and the preservation of peace was sounded by the then Prime Minister of England. Here are Mr. Eden's words:

> Surely it was never the intention that, if the United Nations could not act, its members should not be allowed to take action to protect the interests of peace itself—if we renounce the use of force when law cannot command order, then we are in fact undermining the rule of law. We are leaving the world open to the lawbreakers.

It was not until December 12 that the General Assembly condemned Russia's cruel actions in Hungary. All the while, the Secretary General of the United Nations was forbidden even to enter Hungary; much less did the use of force to repel force there receive any consideration. If it was wrong for England to invade Egypt to prevent the theft of her property, was it right for Russia to continue to steal the freedom of millions of suffering Hungarians?

Such a contradiction of positions is so immoral and so hopelessly insolvent as to bankrupt any national policy which pursues it.

On January 5, 1957, 2 days after the Congress was convened, on Saturday, if you please, before any of our committees had been organized, the stage was set for the great drama. The President came before us with all the trimmings, fanfare, and scenery of an announcement of world-shaking proportions. Someone around the President leaked the news to the press before he spoke to us. This

was to condition us as to what was coming: That communism was threatening to invade the Middle East; that the Reds were again on the march; that Syria was being weakened by Communist inroads. That the Middle East countries were being subverted; that infiltration was raging; that freedom again was being imperiled. All these things were a part of the buildup. The President politely reversed, on January 5, 1957, the position he took in the fall, during the crisis in the Middle East, for he then said:

The use of force is inconceivable.

On January 5, 1957, the President requested an extra $200 million over and above the other hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars we have appropriated to prevent Russian aggression by infiltration. He asked us to waive our constitutional duty. He did not propose that England, France, and Israel return to Egypt, so as to help prevent the destruction of their national interests and their properties in those countries and in Egypt.

We have only one excuse to enter the Middle East with our own boys and girls and spend our own national wealth there. That excuse is wrapped up in the question: Is it in our own national interest to do so? If it is, then is it in our own national interest to prevent our allies from doing likewise or from helping us now?

Our entering now is inconsistent with our preventing the entrance of our traditional allies. This situation, however confused and confusing, cannot be dressed up in other terms, no matter what words are employed or how they may be distorted in their meaning. On what terms does the President now wish to have this extraordinary power? This is the most extraordinary situation I have ever known. He wants the Congress to abdicate its constitutional function to declare war, and yet to make that abdication subject to the changing, uncertain, unreliable, undependable, and vacillating moods, opinions, mandates, or edicts of the conglomeration of nations constituting the United Nations. Such a proposition to me is as preposterous as it is unwise. I shall have none of it. Not a bit of it is worth a single drop of blood of any humble American boy or girl who has been the pride and joy of a helpless American mother or a devoted American father. None of such blood in such a cause will stain my vote on the President's resolution. I am for America's interests first. I shall vote for American interests first. Shall we spend our money, squander our resources, and spill our blood, as the President on January 5, 1957, said: "Consonant with the actions and recommendations of the United Nations"?

Perish the thought. Perish the plan. Perish the resolution that will permit another American life to be lost under the wishy-washy, inconsistent policies of the phrasemakers who deceive, beguile, and mislead the American people.

This policy under the resolution relieves the President from "consulting" the Congress, but requires him to conform his actions "consonant" with the "actions and recommendations" of the United Nations. Before any American boy is sent off to fight Communist aggression in the Middle East or elsewhere, I want the American Bill of Rights to go with him. I want him to have the opportunity to win his fight. I want him to come home after his victory. I do not want these rights to be subject to Russia's veto in the United Nations. Every excuse to sidestep the Constitution and the will of the Congress is the best reason I know why we as American representatives should withhold our consent. A blank check of money and authority is the demand of every one wishing dictatorial powers. Hitler got one. Tojo was clothed with that kind of authority. Mussolini possessed such advance power. I shall withhold my vote to entrust such power to any man.

We would be led to believe by many members of the press that this advance grant of power, this go-ahead signal of authority, is necessary to ward off the subtle growth communistic subversion. This to me is so much tommyrot. The evidence before the Internal Security Subcommittee, of which I am a member, does not justify such a conclusion. The truth of the matter is, and I add to it Chairman WALTER'S statement as further proof, that we have opened the very doors of our country to thousands of Communists by our do-good policy toward the Hungarians. Many Communists have recently entered our country as refugees. Let me ask the simple question, What would have happened to the United States in 1776 if the patriots of the American colonies had fled to Canada or Mexico? There would have been no America as we know it today. We do not overcome communism by running from it. Neither do the Hungarians. I grieve for suffering humanity wherever it suffers. I mourn the loss of freedom wherever it is being lost. But when we run from communism, we strengthen it. Yet when we stand by, persevere, fight, and suffer, we can overcome it.

The myth of the communistic infiltration in the Middle East as the reason for the President's resolution disappeared as a mist before the rising sun when King Saud in one of his latest press releases said he did not feel that the Middle East was in danger of subversion from communism. The Arab World looks to Mecca. Russia would not dare to break the ties of the Arabs or to prevent their facing Mecca. The leaders in other Arabian countries seconded the note of King Saud, namely, that the Arabian countries had no fear of the growth of communism among them. Thus, in one fell swoop, falls the scarecrow of communism. The window dressing afforded by this reason—growth of communism—has to be pulled aside. In my judgment—and there is much evidence before the Internal Security Subcommittee and much evidence before the House Un-American Activities Subcommittee to sustain this judgment—we have received, through the refugees admitted to this country from Hungary, more Communist agents than today are operating from Russia in all the Middle Eastern countries. I fear that that is so. If the President must consult the United Nations before he acts in the Middle East, that is the best reason in the whole wide world why he should consult the Congress. Why is it that he can wait to consult the United Nations, but that he cannot wait until the Congress is consulted and until it acts? I should like to have someone answer that question. Do the Members of Congress not represent the American people? When, oh when, will America come first? Why should we neglect our own people? Why should we continue to look after, suffer, bleed, and die for others? All the while, we continue to neglect our own. When will our national leaders begin pulling for America first? When will we cease sending billions of dollars to other countries, when there is so much need for a few hundred thousand dollars here at home? Consider the present situation of the farmers of our country, some of whom are in dire need of a small loan, in order to make a crop this year. But it is said that America cannot afford to make such small loans—not gifts—to farmers in the United States.

We drive away and antagonize our friends with whom we were allied in two world conflicts. We pull them away when they are seeking to protect their national interests. I refer to England and France. We assert that the use of force is inconceivable. Before the echo of his words has died away, the President says on a Saturday, in true sportsmanship style, that it is necessary to clothe him in advance with power to use force whenever he feels it is necessary, wherever he feels it is necessary, and against whomever he feels it is necessary. Such a policy lacks responsibility. Such a policy lacks statesmanship. Such a policy is dangerous. The truth of the entire matter is that he wants to place the Congress "behind the eight ball."

Such policy, on the other hand, is the very essence of irresponsibility. Representative government is being destroyed, democracy is being destroyed, and freedom itself seeps down the drain, when we give any man, whoever he may be, the power of life or death over American lives and property, as is now proposed by President Eisenhower to be given—even to him.

When Congress yields its powers to the President, without limitation or restriction, what is left of the Constitution? When the Constitution is gone, what is left except the concentration of power in the President? As Woodrow Wilson once said "Such concentration precedes the death of human freedom."

The sun does not shine today on any man in America to whom such power should be given. The sun has never shone on any President of the United States to whom I would entrust any such power.

In connection with the pending joint resolution, there is more at stake in human freedom, in human liberty, and in free government everywhere than meets the ordinary eye. Bit by bit, our Constitution has been interpreted in such a way

that human freedom and the way of life in America, as we and our forebears have known it and loved it, are gradually being whittled away. Now the right of Congress under the Constitution to "declare war" is to be transferred to the President. The lights of the past, the wisdom of the years, the experience of our forebears, their sufferings and the sacrifices of our ancestors, must now be laid aside, forgotten, forsaken, and neglected. We shall rue the day when we grant such a power. Let us return now to responsible, representative democracy. Let us not abdicate our constitutional functions and pass even a watered-down version of the joint resolution demanded by the President. Watered-down poison is no less poisonous. Poison thus becomes slackened in its death-dealing effect, but gradually and in the end it is fatal—fatal, in this case, to the best form of government ever devised in all recorded history by the toil, sacrifice, and brain of man. I say the very foundation of free government can be destroyed unless we are willing now to return to our ancient moorings and our enduring landmarks.

The net effect of what the President said in his latest broadcast on the Middle Eastern situation is that the weak, God-fearing nations must suffer because they are vulnerable, while a strong, atheistic country, such as Russia, must be sidestepped because she is strong. What an even-handed way to administer justice. To me, that is a novel concept of morality and international justice. Can such a policy be reconciled with any law of God or man that gives hope of enduring the test of time? The President, by his latest announcement, shows that expediency, not justice, prompts his actions and motivates his joint resolution. My duty in the matter is clear. My purpose will not be diverted. I will not forsake justice. I will not pursue the easy path of expediency. I will vote my conviction that no more American blood shall be shed in a fruitless, purposeless enterprise. I will not vote to give up the constitutional right of the Congress, when necessary, to declare war.

## APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce for him the following appointments:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] to be a member of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, to fill the vacancy caused by the retirement from the Senate of the Honorable Walter F. George.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to be a member of the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, vice the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], resigned.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] to be a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, to fill the vacancy caused by the retirement from the Senate of Hon. Herbert H. Lehman.

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Gore | Morton |
| Allott | Green | Mundt |
| Anderson | Hayden | Murray |
| Barrett | Hennings | Neely |
| Beall | Hickenlooper | Neuberger |
| Bennett | Hill | O'Mahoney |
| Bible | Holland | Pastore |
| Blakley | Hruska | Payne |
| Bricker | Humphrey | Potter |
| Bush | Ives | Purtell |
| Butler | Jackson | Revercomb |
| Byrd | Javits | Robertson |
| Capehart | Jenner | Russell |
| Carlson | Johnson, Tex. | Saltonstall |
| Carroll | Johnston, S. C. | Schoeppel |
| Case, N. J. | Kefauver | Scott |
| Case, S. Dak. | Kennedy | Smathers |
| Chavez | Kerr | Smith, Maine |
| Church | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Clark | Kuchel | Sparkman |
| Cooper | Lausche | Stennis |
| Cotton | Long | Symington |
| Dirksen | Magnuson | Talmadge |
| Douglas | Malone | Thurmond |
| Dworshak | Mansfield | Thye |
| Eastland | Martin, Iowa | Watkins |
| Ellender | McCarthy | Wiley |
| Ervin | McClellan | Williams |
| Flanders | McNamara | Young |
| Frear | Monroney | |
| Goldwater | Morse | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, what is the pending question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which is open to amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and myself, I send forward an amendment to the committee's substitute which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee's amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

That the United States regard as vital to the national interests and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use Armed Forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism: *Provided*, That such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations.

SEC. 2. This joint resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the nations in the general area of the Middle East are reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise except that it may be terminated earlier by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to promote peace and stability in the Middle East."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was not able to be on the floor earlier today, and I did not know whether the leadership had announced any definite time at which the Senate would adjourn this afternoon. I observe that it is now quarter to 6 o'clock. I intend to address myself to this amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute, not at any great length, but I should prefer not to do so this afternoon. I should prefer to proceed tomorrow after the conclusion of the morning business. If the leadership wishes to stay here longer this afternoon I have no alternative but to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. RUSSELL. In the absence of any other procedure that might be taken at this time, Mr. President, I do suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Gore | Morton |
| Allott | Green | Mundt |
| Anderson | Hayden | Murray |
| Barrett | Hennings | Neely |
| Beall | Hickenlooper | Neuberger |
| Bennett | Hill | O'Mahoney |
| Bible | Holland | Pastore |
| Blakley | Hruska | Payne |
| Bricker | Humphrey | Potter |
| Bush | Ives | Purtell |
| Butler | Jackson | Revercomb |
| Byrd | Javits | Robertson |
| Capehart | Jenner | Russell |
| Carlson | Johnson, Tex. | Saltonstall |
| Carroll | Johnston, S. C. | Schoeppel |
| Case, N. J. | Kefauver | Scott |
| Case, S. Dak. | Kennedy | Smathers |
| Chavez | Kerr | Smith, Maine |
| Church | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Clark | Kuchel | Sparkman |
| Cooper | Lausche | Stennis |
| Cotton | Long | Symington |
| Dirksen | Magnuson | Talmadge |
| Douglas | Malone | Thurmond |
| Dworshak | Mansfield | Thye |
| Eastland | Martin, Iowa | Watkins |
| Ellender | McCarthy | Wiley |
| Ervin | McClellan | Williams |
| Flanders | McNamara | Young |
| Frear | Monroney | |
| Goldwater | Morse | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are confronted with a very rare and unusual situation in the Senate: We have Senators who do not desire to speak and do not desire to vote. Most of the time there are plenty of Senators who wish to address the Senate.

We have had a quorum call in the hope that we could get Senators to come to the floor and express themselves on the pending joint resolution.

Mr. President, if no Senator cares to speak this evening, I am prepared to

move that, pursuant to the order previously entered, the Senate stand in adjournment until tomorrow.

Mr. President, I so move.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 27, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 26, 1957:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Olin Hatfield Chilson, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of the Interior, vice Clarence A. Davis, resigned.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for this new day. May we rejoice and be glad in it.

We gratefully acknowledge that always and everywhere Thou art ministering unto our many needs, sustaining and supporting us in our weakness and restraining and guiding us in our strength.

Hear us in our prayers of intercession for all who are the victims of difficult and tragic circumstances.

Help us to cultivate a nobler skill in the art of brotherly living, and may our minds and hearts sense the high value and eternal worth of all human souls.

Grant that we may hasten the coming of that glorious day of prediction when every need shall be supplied.

In Christ's name we bring our petition. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## BUILDING ON SAND

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, throughout the long period of negotiations, conferences, statements, speeches, announcements and proposed deals for achieving peace in the Middle East, many of us have been impressed by the hopelessness of building something durable on sand.

Much of our Government's approach and many of the proposals put forward by Secretary Dulles have apparently been based entirely on an assumption of good faith and an assumption of cooperation from Egypt's Nasser.

Isn't that attempting to build on sand? Hasn't the Egyptian dictator shown that any arrangement he enters into is only at best a temporary policy which he will repudiate at will?

As a very new Member of Congress, I certainly do not presume to tell the President how to run his job. I do not pretend to be a great expert in foreign policy. I am seeking to learn the duties of being a Member of Congress and I am trying hard to become familiar with the operation of our Government generally. I admit I have much to learn.

Nevertheless, I should think by now it would be obvious to anyone in our Government, and particularly anyone assigned to responsible duties in connection with foreign policy, that before attempting to settle this far-reaching crisis in the Middle East on the basis of what we hope Nasser might be willing to do, that we make sure we know his real intentions.

Much of the difficulty in getting Israel out of the areas the U. N. says Israel should evacuate is based on the plain fact that Nasser has agreed to and then repudiated a series of understandings which turned out to be insincere, or at least turned out to be misunderstandings. As long as we let policy be set that way, any peace will be built on Egyptian sand.

## THE UNITED NATIONS AND EGYPT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the American conscience is uneasy, as it views our Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde foreign policy.

No word of criticism for Egypt which still stands in contempt of a U. N. resolution, but righteous indignation and threats of sanctions against Israel under similar circumstances.

How to reconcile these opposites?

It just cannot be done without treating both alike.

Is the leadership we contribute to the United Nations to be based on military assistance and economic aid, accompanied by secret diplomacy that is as variable as the wind?

This does not satisfy Americans.

Diplomats must never forget that the conduct of foreign policy cannot be alienated from public opinion here in the United States.

Our people are known for their sense of fair play.

They do not believe in the doctrine of expediency, whereby a small nation is pressed to the limit, while a larger nation, guilty of brutal aggression, goes unpunished.

The United Nations can never command the confidence and support of mankind, unless it establishes a consistent policy. And for that, in the present state of the world, it must depend upon just leadership on the part of the United States.

There must be no sanctions against Israel unless similar sanctions are invoked against Egypt, Communist Russia, and India.

Obviously all this cannot be done on the basis of votes and vetoes.

But there is another imperative at work, namely, justice.

What is the rule for them must be the rule for Israel, until such time as there is equal justice for all.

Therefore, Americans oppose sanctions against Israel.

We realize that Israel must withdraw from Egypt, but, in return, must have genuine guaranties that Egypt will not interfere with the passage of Israeli shipping through the Suez Canal and through the Gulf of Aqaba.

Whatever formula is negotiated to achieve these ends, as a preliminary to settlement of the tensions in this area, will be acceptable to the American people provided that no sanctions are brought to bear against Israel.

Otherwise, our Government will ignore the majority opinion of its own people, leading to a loss of confidence in its conduct of foreign policy.

There must be no sanctions against Israel.

## MARY ANN BARTHOLOMAY—SHE COOKED THE BEST CHERRY PIE IN AMERICA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored to announce that America's best cherry pie baker is in Washington today. She is Mary Ann Bartholomay, of Henrietta, N. Y., a resident of my Congressional district.

After capturing State and regional awards, Mary Ann just the other day was chosen the winner of the National Cherry Pie Baking Contest in Chicago. She won out over representatives of every other State, Canada, Alaska, and Hawaii. It is a high honor, and from all reports, a well-deserved one.

Mary Ann is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Karl Bartholomay. She is 17 and a senior at Rush-Henrietta High School, where she is preparing to become a home economics major in college. Besides her cooking proclivities, she has been extremely active in 4–H work, with the Youth Fellowship and the junior board of the Henrietta Civic Center.

She is in Washington today, accompanied by Miss Jane L. Merry, 4–H Club agent for Monroe County, to present one of her famous pies to a representative of President Eisenhower. I am sure the President will be most appreciative of this tasty gift.

Mr. Speaker, Mary Ann Bartholomay proves a point I have long contended—that the best cooks in America come from the 38th Congressional District of New York. I am therefore not surprised that this award has come to a resident of that area, but I do want to extend my heartiest congratulations to this queen of cherry pies. I wish her many more years of happiness and success in cooking and in life.

I am also proud to announce that western New York's far-famed cherry indus-

try received recognition recently when H. B. (Pete) Pearson, president of the Alton Canning Co., was elected president of the National Cherry Institute. Mr. Pearson is from Sodus, N. Y., which is, I believe the largest cherry growing township in Wayne County of my district, which is the largest cherry county in New York State. His elevation to this office comes as fitting recognition for his outstanding contributions to the cherry industry.

## ECONOMY IN THE NATIONAL BUDGET

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that there is a great deal of agitation in the country over the matter of the national budget. We know that the Honorable George Humphrey, the Secretary of the Treasury, has been suggesting legislation that will tend to reduce the budget, and the President himself has been making efforts in that direction.

However, in practically every section of the country the agitation for a reduction of the national budget is keeping up.

Mindful of this situation, I consulted with some of the Republican Members from Ohio, and I called a meeting of the Ohio Republican delegation. We met yesterday, February 25, and, after thorough consideration, we adopted resolutions with reference to this important matter. These resolutions, I think, will reflect the sentiment of the Ohio citizens quite generally.

I think this is the first time any sizable group of the House of Representatives has spoken its views on this important matter. The resolution which was adopted carries the signatures of all the Ohio Republican Members and is as follows:

The Ohio Republican delegation in the United States House of Representatives, after careful study and evaluation, has unanimously agreed that a substantial reduction of the $72-billion budget will be in the best interests of the people of the United States.

It was further agreed that every proposed reduction in the budget, which does not curtail essential services or endanger the security of our country, will be supported.

The action of the Ohio Republican delegation is the first of its kind with respect to the present budget and is in accord with the admonition of President Eisenhower and Ohio's own Secretary of the Treasury, George M. Humphrey, that Congress exercise its independent control over Government spending.

Signers are (by districts):

1. GORDON H. SCHERER.
2. WILLIAM E. HESS.
3. PAUL F. SCHENCK.
4. WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH.
5. CLIFF CLEVENGER.
7. CLARENCE J. BROWN.
8. JACKSON E. BETTS.
10. THOMAS A. JENKINS.
11. DAVID DENNISON.
12. JOHN M. VORYS.
13. A. D. BAUMHART, Jr.
14. WILLIAM H. AYRES.
15. JOHN E. HENDERSON.
16. FRANK T. BOW.
17. J. HARRY MCGREGOR.
22. FRANCES P. BOLTON.
23. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL.

## PUERTO RICO

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1917, there was enacted into law a bill of far-reaching and paramount importance to the people of Puerto Rico, which bill extended to the people of Puerto Rico United States citizenship. The 40th anniversary of the enactment of that very important and far-reaching bill will be celebrated on Saturday next. As the House will not be in session on Saturday, of course, adequate observations and exercises in the House cannot take place on that day. However, it is fitting and proper that this important event should not pass this year without significant notice.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, ask unanimous consent that the Commissioner of Puerto Rico, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN, be permitted to address the House on Monday next for one-half hour and that during such period, if he desires to do so, he may yield to other Members for the purpose of appropriate celebration of this very important event.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5189) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5189, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, we have with us again today the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior, H. R. 5189. The budget request submitted this year for 1958 was in the amount of $515,189,700. The appropriation for 1957 was $458,135,000. The committee recommends $454,395,700 for 1958, $3,739,300 below the bill last year and $60,794,000 below the budget request.

I have always made the statement when I have spoken on this bill that, if I had my way, the bill would be for $1 billion or $2 billion. I meant it then and I mean it now, because the people of this Nation have robbed and looted this great country down through the centuries since the white man first put foot in it. And we are paying the penalty today.

We have lost our oil in eastern Pennsylvania. We have lost our soil from erosion, and so forth. Let us stop and think for a moment of the many millions of acres of land in Alaska, only 1 percent of which has been surveyed. We do not even know what we have in Alaska.

Like everyone else I believe today—and I mean today—we need economy. I think back on two points in my own life, the first in 1907 when this great country had men in Europe recruiting people to come over here to work. They were recruiting them by the thousands. I remember one July morning in 1907 when I went to work. I want to point out how little they knew about a depression. I was working for the United States Steel Corp. At 7 o'clock in the morning, they sent the men out to work. At 11 o'clock they got a telegram from New York telling them to pay the men off and discharge them. I was one of the very few who were kept at work at United States Steel and I remember that they paid me in scrip. Here was the largest corporation in America, and they did not have enough money to pay an employee in money. That was 1907.

I remember 1929, with the same company, when the general superintendent advised the yardmasters that they should give good service, that there were orders on the books for 5 years. The next day came the crash.

In order to economize, your committee has made every effort to reduce this bill. We have reduced it 12 percent. At the same time I think we have brought in a good bill. We have not made large cuts in such things as land management, soil conservation, water resources, forestry, minerals research, and so forth. That is where the wealth of the country comes from. The $454 million in this bill represents only $17 million more than the receipts we are taking in. Had we heeded the warning of the scientists of America in the last century, and developed our resources and protected them, instead of wasting them through the years, we would be much better off today.

The committee has disallowed the $40 million requested for the nondefense subsidy for tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum. Take the item of tungsten. The man who owns the second-largest mine in the country comes from the State of Pennsylvania.

His name is Philip McKenna. He is Mr. Tungsten himself. He has five refining plants in this country and is the second-largest producer of tungsten. The mine happens to be in the State of Nevada.

This man came into my office and said if he had to take it to the United States Supreme Court he was going to stop the Congress from appropriating this subsidy. They are tired of accepting money from the United States Government. He said the Government has an 18-year supply of tungsten today. They should be selling enough each year to take it down to a 5-year stockpile. So we have an 18-year stockpile of tungsten.

I want to read a letter that he addressed to Senator MARTIN:

The House Committee on Appropriations refused to appropriate any more money to buy tungsten when the Government stockpile is now at least 18 years' supply at present rate of consumption for all uses in the United States of America. But I was horrified to learn that, despite Senator DWORSHAK'S vigorous protest, the Senate Committee on Appropriations approved $30 million for that purpose. Seventy million will be required. I enclose a graph showing the situation. It has been a boondoggle since 1940. It has cost taxpayers about $300 million.

Worse than that, it has taken out of use $300 million of our raw material which would otherwise be available for refining and fabrication into cost-saving tools and machines, for use in industry, which raise our standard of living in time of peace and our industrial potential in time of war. Suppose 96 percent of the leather was in the hands of the Government while many people went without shoes? Many people go without efficient tungsten carbide tools and appliances by which we may compete with the world because the Government has obtained and sterilized so large a proportion of the tungsten.

Monday I believe there will be a debate in the Senate on the subject of the appropriation to continue buying tungsten by appropriating $30 million for that purpose when the Government already has 18 years' supply. They should sell it, 5 percent every year, until it is down to 5 years' supply.

It harms our industries in Pennsylvania that we cannot use tungsten more generally so that our efficiency is good and able to compete. It harms the coal mining industry, the people in many States, to appropriate any more money for buying tungsten not needed for national defense and which would otherwise be used for improving our conditions in competitive private industry.

As you know, I have been in this business since I was a child; my father started the first good tungsten mine in 1900 in Colorado and we in Pennsylvania made the tool steel from it.

I speak as a tungsten miner, because I got the Nevada Scheelite Corp. started 6 years ago as a wholly owned subsidiary of our Pennsylvania company; but nevertheless I do not want to be subsidized despite the fact that it has been profitable, moneywise, to mine tungsten that went into the stockpile. I speak as an expert, qualified by 50 years of experience and more years of my father's experience in the mining, refining, and fabricating of tungsten. My company makes 25 percent of all the tungsten carbide alloy used in the United States of America. I speak as a taxpayer, both in Pennsylvania, and as a Federal taxpayer.

I realize that you may not know how silly it would be to appropriate any more money to buy tungsten when we have 18 years' supply. If you believe in my honesty and integrity, as well as my wisdom in this matter, you will voice your opposition to wasting any more money of the taxpayers in that boondoggle.

I could write 100 pages about it. But I should not impose upon your time to that extent.

I am responsible for 1,600 folks that work in our business. I am responsible for 14,000 concerns all over the United States of America that depend upon our products. I am acquainted with many military and atomic secrets of which I cannot write you. To the best of my knowledge and belief nothing but harm will come from appropriation of further funds to carry on an unnecessary activity of the Federal Government in taking more of our tungsten into an unnecessary stockpile.

Naturally you will realize all this without my having written you. But I want you to know that I depend upon you as our Senator to oppose further waste. Please oppose that by voting against further money for buying tungsten.

That is just one of the letters. The other tells the same story. A third one came along. Yet we received a budget estimate to appropriate another $40 million in this bill. I am not blaming those down at the Department. The authorization came before the House last year under a suspension of the rules. There were no hearings printed on it. It went through the House without debate and then passed the Senate. That is the history of it. The Department did not make much of an effort to defend it, and again I say, I am not blaming them. They know it is not needed, but the Congress insisted on authorizing this tungsten stockpiling.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. If I understood my friend correctly, he stated that there is at present a stockpile sufficient to last 18 years.

This morning we were advised by one of the members of the administration, whom my friend quotes in his report, that there are less than 6 years' supply in the stockpile for any objective for which the stockpile has been proposed. How does the gentleman reconcile those two statements—one from Dr. Flemming himself, and the other from the chairman of this committee?

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Kenna states that 1 pound of tungsten today is equal to what 60 pounds was up until 1940 when he made a certain invention. He said we are working under the old rule, and do not know that this invention is in effect.

Mr. ASPINALL. But this statement was made by the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; but the man that was the head of ODM when this bill was passed last year said there was no defense justification for the subsidy program.

Mr. ASPINALL. I have no quarrel with the statement made by my friend, because he quotes Dr. Flemming correctly in that respect. The one question I have is how there could be such a variance as to the amount in the stockpile. This act was not passed in order to increase the stockpile quantity.

Mr. KIRWAN. Let me just finish this letter:

Our company mines, refines, and fabricates tungsten carbide. We are one of the nine companies which received 87 percent of the payments through our Nevada Scheelite Co. in Nevada.

He is one of the biggest mine owners in Nevada, and he does not want it.

But I see no continued prosperity in Government buying. On the contrary, they should sell the surplus until they get down to 5 years' supply, which is plenty for any war emergency.

Mr. ASPINALL. There is no contradiction in that respect, but I wish to know how there could be this wide variance from the man who is supposed to have made both statements.

Mr. KIRWAN. The man in charge now has been there only about 2 weeks, but I am referring to "Mr. Tungsten" himself in the actual producing of it. If he does not know, who does know?

Mr. ASPINALL. On page 4 of the report there is this statement:

The committee is advised that some of these large producers are selling the production of their domestic mines to the Government at the subsidy program price of $55 a unit and purchasing foreign tungsten for use in their own industry at the United States market price of $35.

The gentleman from Colorado has gone through the hearings completely and he finds no statement by any witness that would substantiate that statement made in the report.

Mr. KIRWAN. The President of the Tungsten Institute in the hearings before the Senate last year when the question was asked, "Do you use any of your own tungsten?" said, "Not a single pound." He admitted that it is all sold to the Government, and that the big processors buy their product from foreign countries. That is the president of the Tungsten Institute who said that.

Mr. ASPINALL. Does the gentleman have any evidence of one group or any company that has engaged in this practice since this act went into effect?

Mr. KIRWAN. If the president said that they were not even buying 1 pound of their own production, who else could be better qualified to make the statement than the president of the Tungsten Institute.

Mr. ASPINALL. But it is not in the hearings.

Mr. KIRWAN. It is in the Senate hearings on the authorizing bill.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. BUDGE. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the other body and in the hearings shows one such company, the Union Carbide Co. That was mentioned on the floor in the debate in the other body last year.

Mr. ASPINALL. Would my friend yield that I may ask a question of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE]?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; then I must continue for I do not have much time at my disposal.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is the gentleman speaking of Union Carbide as such or Union Carbide Nuclear?

Mr. BUDGE. I do not recall which corporation, but I think the gentleman will recall that the Kennametals Co. which the distinguished chairman of our committee has been quoting has been taking exactly the same position. That is the information we have received in the committee.

Mr. KIRWAN. We have allowed $1,308,000 for tree planting under Clarke-McNary, an increase of $308,000 over 1957. We have disallowed the $4 million for the new tree planting program under section 401 of the Agricultural Act of 1956. Under the soil bank program the Forest Service in 1957 and 1958 is receiving an allotment of $16,550,000 for tree planting—$10 million this year, plus the $6.5 million in 1958.

Now, I want to say a word about this tree planting program and yet I do not want to be taken as being humorous. Under the soil bank program alone they expect to plant 5 billion trees; that is what they are working on, 5 billion trees. We had a tree-planting program once before and we are embarking upon another one now as we widen existing highways and put in additional ones. But it seems to me if we are going to plant up to 5 billion trees a year we ought to begin training guides, for you will have to have a guide to take you through the forest of trees in order to find the local Safeway or other chain stores.

Under section 401, the new program is set up to be a matching program with the States, but we do not know yet whether the States will accept or how far they will go. So until we can determine that we have cut the $4 million out.

Last year a question was asked on the floor of the House by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. He is an alert and a good Congressman. He asked the sponsor of the bill reorganizing the Fish and Wildlife Service how many employees it would take and received the answer that it would not take over six. Yet this year this department comes in and requests an increase of over $900,000 for administrative overhead, an increase of over 100 percent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a slight correction?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The response was that it would take 10 or 12 additional employees, yet this year I understand they requested $900,000 from your committee for this reorganization, which was supposed to provide for greater efficiency and economy.

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And if the gentleman will yield another moment I want to commend you, Mr. KIRWAN, and your committee most heartily for refusing the huge increase that was sought, and telling these people to come back with detailed information in support of their request for $900,000 or any part of it.

Mr. KIRWAN. And I thank the gentleman. He will remember that I said he was alert and a good Congressman, and I mean that sincerely.

I wish to again emphasize that we have cut this bill by 12 percent, and I am asking the Members present today to support the committee. If there is any motion made on the floor to restore this item for the purchase of tungsten, turn it down because we have got enough tungsten in the Government stockpile to last for 18 years. What do you think John Taxpayer is going to say and do when he learns that we are paying out a subsidy of $20 a unit to put tungsten in a pile when we have so much there already?

We have heard about the millions it takes to build airplanes and they have tried to justify the cost on the ground that in the next war the nation that strikes first will win it, that after the first blow the war will be over. If the next war is going to come to an end that fast why should we buy more tungsten when we already have an 18-years' supply? Do not overlook that.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. WESTLAND. I certainly subscribe to the thoughts of the chairman of the committee in supporting his committee's action in cutting these budgets. I appreciate what the committee has done in this regard in this program. I see one item however for a very small amount, $25,000 for the functioning of the National Monuments Commission, which item was omitted, and I am real disappointed that it was not allowed. Congress has authorized this Commission to draw up plans and specifications for a structure symbolizing the ideals of democracy and freedom. The President has appointed a member of this Commission, the Vice President and the Speaker of the House have likewise appointed members to this Commission. This Commission held its first meeting in January of 1956 in pursuance of that authorization, yet so far as I know they have never been provided with any funds to carry out what the Congress authorized them to do. I am not going to make any appeal to reinstate such a small item as this, but I wish merely to say that I am disappointed that the committee saw fit to leave these funds out of the bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. We left that out, as the gentleman from Washington states, but the committee thought the request should be denied. We may be wrong in our judgment. This would be a wonderful monument, but there is this Capitol, there is Washington Monument, and the Lincoln Monument. This new monument would cost millions, yet they are hollering about balancing the budget. It is not just the item of $25,000. I have never seen a group of architects or engineers in my life, especially when it comes to spending the Government's money, that are not for building the finest monument in the world.

Mr. WESTLAND. I agree with the gentleman. However, it is my understanding the actual cost of construction of this monument would be through public donations and it would not be a charge against the Federal Government.

Mr. KIRWAN. I would like to see just one building in Washington put up the way the gentleman is talking about. They talk about many of them that will be put up through public donations but it always costs the Government money. I happened to be on the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee when the Pentagon Building was planned. At that time General Somervell said it would not cost more than $24 million. It finally cost $88 million.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Colorado who is now speaking are members of this Commission to which the gentleman from Washington has just referred. The question I wish to ask the distinguished gentleman from Ohio is this: Would the gentleman approve an appropriation in the approximate amount of $25,000 provided there was a showing of the expenses that have been incurred by this Commission when there is a report filed by the Commission in accordance with the authorization passed by the Congress. When that report comes before the Congress as a report it can either be approved or disapproved by the Congress. There could be a further provision in such piece of legislation that there are to be no more funds for which the Federal Government will have assumed liability——

Mr. KIRWAN. They have already spent the money?

Mr. ASPINALL. If the money had been money spent by members of the Commission, acting in accordance with the provisions of the authorizing legislation?

Mr. KIRWAN. We have a code on that. They are not allowed to spend money in advance unless it is appropriated.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will the gentleman tell us what is to protect any civilian serving on these commissions, which are authorized by the Congress and by the Executive, in connection with expenses which they incur doing the work they are authorized to do and that they are in fact commanded to do?

Mr. KIRWAN. The answer is, Do not incur any expenses until an appropriation takes place. That is very simple. The code is there. It is prescribed in the Antideficiency Act. We have turned this item down twice before.

Mr. ASPINALL. Then it is the position of the gentleman that any money that may have been spent by members of the Commission in the performance of their duties should not have been spent until the gentleman's committee has appropriated the funds?

Mr. KIRWAN. Let me explain it this way. A Commission was authorized to plan the new civic auditorium. We appropriated no money but they went ahead and spent some. We turned down their request and told them if they came in here in the right way, that we would reconsider. They stopped work and came in with an appropriate request which we granted.

The public has awakened to the fact that a $72 billion budget has been requested for 1958. And, there are many things needed in this country today, so that I think we could get along without another monument. I again repeat, we already have the Jefferson monument,

the Lincoln monument, and the Capitol dome, and we can do without another one until we see better days.

Mr. ASPINALL. Then let me suggest that some of us should be more careful in accepting assignments from the House of Representatives and the other body understanding at the time of our acceptance that we are following the legislative mandate of Congress and the Executive, and later finding that our work has been for naught.

Mr. KIRWAN. It has not been for naught. You did not get the appropriation, and you have no right to go on doing any work without it. The gentleman would not go out and work for some private concern if they did not have the money.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. While you are discussing the monuments and other governmental buildings here, has the money been appropriated up to this time for the taking over of three or four Blackstones, the Congressional Hotel, and others?

Mr. KIRWAN. I could not tell you.

Mr. WIER. Where is the money coming from? I have never seen any authorization for it.

Mr. KIRWAN. I could not tell you.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks, I want to say that I am in perfect agreement with our chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], regarding the tungsten issue. I am sure that I can speak for every member of the committee when I say that the committee was unanimous in the action we took regarding that item. Certainly, as the chairman said, if we had approved this appropriation request for tungsten and somebody in the Congress or out of the Congress learned the facts about the matter, they would have laughed our committee off the floor today, for by no stretch of the imagination can anyone who knows the facts approve such a request.

With respect to this bill, the budget request was for $515,189,700. The committee reduced that amount by $60,794,000. Now, in this bill you will find that there is $3,739,300 less for 1958 than was allowed for fiscal 1957. We reduced the budget request by 12 percent, and we reduced where we felt reductions were in order.

There are some things in this bill that are very important; many things, as a matter of fact. There are 24 bureaus and agencies all dealing with matters of great concern to the American people. There are 70 appropriation items in this bill, and again they are broken down into many smaller items.

It is a far-reaching and important bill for America. We have under the departments of Government dealing with the public domain in this bill 771 million acres of land, on the mainland and in Alaska—771 million acres of land of the public domain, land that is owned by the Federal Government, by the people of America.

We have many problems to cope with that pertain to these public lands. For instance, the Bureau of Land Management has approximately 180 million acres under its jurisdiction. Ten years ago we were appropriating the large sum of one-half cent an acre, or almost one-half cent an acre, for soil and moisture conservation on those 180 million acres of the public domain. The committee has gradually brought that expenditure up to 2¼ cents per acre. And yet we have people who think that we are spending too much money for soil and moisture conservation on the public domain. We spent such a small amount in the past that wind erosion and water erosion have taken their toll no end on these public lands. We should be spending much more on water and soil conservation. But with a budget of over $71 billion, the committee felt that it was necessary not to increase but to reduce wherever we could.

I am sure that the American people, generally speaking, who know the problems that we have in this committee as they pertain to all our natural resources, would like to spend much more than we are spending today for the preservation, the conservation of our natural resources, our mother earth, our resources under the ground, and our timberlands. The timberlands are under the Forest Service that now comes under the jurisdiction of this committee.

But because of the fact that we are spending so much money for other things, many of which I am sure should not take priority over the conservation of our natural resources, we feel it is necessary to hold down expenditures for this very important Department of the Interior and the Forest Service, to the point that we have done so.

For instance, the request of the Bureau of the Budget was for something like 2,000 more employees than they have at the present time.

The committee went through each one of those requests with a fine-tooth comb. We reduced that request by 1,300 employees, yet there are more employees in this bill for the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service than there were in the fiscal 1957 bill.

I just heard a little colloquy on the floor of this House where one Member said that there was an authorization for $25,000 to be spent for a Monument Commission. We have heard that story so long. We have heard fine, able conscientious Members of Congress stand on this floor when an authorization bill was before this body and say, "This is just an authorization bill, this is not an appropriation bill. The Appropriations Committee will yet have an opportunity to operate on this bill. Maybe they will not give anything."

However, the facts are, as history records and as the records show, that 99 times out of 100 the Congress appropriates the money to support an authorization bill. Many times that authorization bill should never have been brought to the floor of the House.

There is the Fish and Wildlife Service. Last year it asked for an authorization to establish a separate department for commercial fisheries, and the Congress authorized it. Then they bring in a request in this budget for in the neighborhood of $900,000 to support that new department of the Fish and Wildlife Service. The committee has allowed what it felt necessary to start an organization, but we did not allow enough to go absolutely head over heels into the expenditure of funds to establish a complete organization of regional offices, district offices, and a great body of people here in Washington, D. C., to administer that department. That is the one the chairman just spoke of a minute ago and about which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] talked.

In conclusion, may I say a word about a member of this committee who has done yeoman service in the field of mines and mining. That Member is the Honorable Dr. FENTON, of Pennsylvania, who grew up with the mines, so to speak, and who has had the responsibility on this committee to see to it that mines were properly taken care of and that the laws were lived up to.

I venture this statement, that no man in America has done more for the mining industry and for the safety of mining than our fine and able colleague, Dr. FENTON, of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] I am sure will tell you that the committee puts complete trust in Dr. FENTON'S judgment as far as mines and mining are concerned, and to a very great degree on other matters pertaining to this committee.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. I only wish that our fiscal condition in America today was such that we could justly spend more, but such is not the case. This committee has done as good a job as we possibly know how, under present conditions, and I hope the House will approve this bill unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to compliment our subcommittee chairman, Mr. KIRWAN, for the fine, impartial manner in which he handled our subcommittee hearings and his presentation today.

It has been a pleasure to work with him as well as with the other members on this subcommittee—regardless of political affiliation.

The experience of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the ranking minority member of this subcommittee and its former chairman, together with that of our chairman, Mr. KIRWAN, is invaluable to the rest of us.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] is also a long-time member of the committee, and his advice and guidance is always appreciated.

Mr. SIEMINSKI, of New Jersey; Mr. MAGNUSON, of Washington; and Mr. BUDGE, of Idaho, are the younger men who make up the committee. Their contributions in the final analysis of the Interior Department's request for funds are appreciated.

Our staff assistant, Eugene Wilhelm, was especially wonderful to the subcom-

mittee members and has been, as usual, the real workhorse for this subcommittee.

I must also pay my respects to our former staff assistant, Mr. Carson Culp, who has taken over the job of staff assistant to another subcommittee, and who assisted Mr. Wilhelm in the handling of this bill. We are indeed grateful to these two fine men for their assistance.

Now, since the previous speakers have covered pretty thoroughly the highlights of the bill, I will not attempt to discuss all the bureaus in the Interior Department.

As a matter of fact, in summarizing the bill, you will note that the Bureau of the Budget recommended an appropriation of $515,189,700 for fiscal 1958.

The committee allowed $454,395,700, or a reduction of $60,794,000—a 12-percent reduction.

The major portion of that reduction is in the refusal of the committee to go along with the mineral acquisition program for tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum, in accordance with Public Law 733.

The purchase of tungsten, particularly, was discussed during the supplemental appropriation for 1957 a few days ago, when your committee and the House refused to allow a supplemental of $30 million.

An explanation of this item and the reasons for the committee's refusing to sanction further purchases of tungsten are set forth fully on pages 3, 4, and 5 of our report.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The Bureau of the Budget recommended an appropriation of $38,775,000 for 1958 fiscal year. The committee approved $36 million for this bureau, which is all inclusive for—

(a) Topographic surveys and mappings.

(b) Geologic and mineral resource surveys and mapping.

(c) Water resources investigations.

(d) Soil and moisture conservation.

(e) Conservation of lands and minerals.

(f) General administration and special purpose buildings.

The work of this bureau is very important, and while there is a cut of $2,775,000 from the budget estimate, it does represent an increase of $4,398,000 over the 1957 fiscal year, the current appropriation.

This bureau, like most of the others, is finding it difficult to recruit engineering personnel to take care of their expanding programs. As is indicated in the report, there were 511 vacancies for those positions as of December 31, 1956. In other words, with half of fiscal 1957 gone they were only able to fill 117 out of 628 vacancies.

However, in the face of all these handicaps, this bureau is being called upon to step up its mapping of all sorts from all the Federal Departments and the States.

As usual, the Geological Survey has done a fine job and it has the continued confidence of this committee.

BUREAU OF MINES

The budget estimate for the Bureau of Mines for fiscal year 1958 is $26,633,000, which is $4,435,950 more than the current fiscal year.

This increase is distributed in 4 principal categories—namely, $3,712,250 in conservation and development of mineral resources; $595,700 for health and safety; $23,000 for construction; and $105,000 for general administrative expenses.

Broken down by obligations the budget estimate for fiscal 1958 is (a) conservation and development of mineral resources, $19,575,000; (b) health and safety, $5,900,000; (c) construction $23,000; (d) general administrative expenses, $1,135,000.

Our subcommittee granted the entire request except a reduction of $875,000 for conservation and development of mineral resources.

This reduction of $875,000 includes $210,000 for standby expenses of the plant at Rifle, Colo.; disallowance of 110 new positions, and so forth.

Since the Rifle project is on the Navy oil-shale reserves, the committee is of the opinion that this item should be taken care of in the Navy appropriation, even though the Bureau of Mines does the work.

Because there is considerable difficulty in recruiting engineers and technical men in most of the governmental departments and bureaus, it was felt that the increase asked for by the Bureau of Mines was excessive. The committee therefore disallowed 110 new positions of the requested increase.

The increase asked for in conservation and development of resources was, of course, justified in view of the very fine increase in the research program. It is believed that this modest cut should not interfere with its progress.

HEALTH AND SAFETY

Historically, one of the basic missions of the Bureau of Mines is the promotion of health and safety in the mineral industries.

This function of the Bureau of Mines is carried on through programs of safety education, accident-prevention training, development of safer mining methods, proving the safety of equipment and explosives for use in coal mines, and the mandatory inspection of coal mines under the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act.

Since the enactment of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act there has been quite a diminution of fatal and nonfatal accidents.

On January 16, 1957, when the Bureau of Mines was before our committee, it was testified by the new Director, Mr. Ankeny that "We are about to approach a 26-month period without a major disaster, and if we make it in the next 2 or 3 days that will be the record, the longest period in history that the industry has ever operated without a major disaster."

Underground mining is, as you all know, the most hazardous of the mineral industry. It must be carried on under adverse natural conditions, and the hazards range from falling of overhead roof rock, explosive or harmful gases and dusts, restricted working space and illumination, proximity to electric power, dangers of impounded waters, unsafe explosives, and mechanical equipment.

In view of the great hazards and in spite of the exhaustive work that the Bureau of Mines has done to prevent accidents, both fatal and nonfatal, we experienced early this month, February 4 I believe, a major disaster in a coal mine in Virginia and West Virginia, just a few days after the statement of the Director of the Bureau of Mines, Mr. Ankeny, before our committee, that we were about to enter a 26-month period without a major disaster.

In looking over the statistics for the past 20 years you will see that the vast number of fatal accidents ranged from over 1,400 in 1937 to 785 in 1951. You will also note that since 1951 fatal accidents have decreased to 444 last year.

The incidence of fatalities has remained fairly constant since 1953 when there were 461.

It will also be seen that "falls of roof" cause between 50 and 65 percent of the fatal accidents in both the anthracite and bituminous mines.

While we all realize that as long as we have mining we will also have fatal and nonfatal accidents, yet I am of the opinion that a further large reduction can be secured with a stepping up of preventive measures and research.

Cooperation between all concerned—operators, workers, State and Federal Governments—can effect a minimal amount of deaths and maimed people in the United States.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The National Park Service people are to be congratulated on the fine work that they have been doing so far this year.

More progress has been made than at any time in the past and mission 66 will accomplish a much desired improvement in our park services.

Some 57 million people are expected to visit the parks in 1957 and 60 million in the 1958 fiscal year.

With virtually all the land acquired for the Independence National Historical Park in Philadelphia and demolition progressing, it is hoped that the project will be completed at as early a date as possible.

FOREST SERVICE

Since this Agriculture facility has been placed under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department Subcommittee for Appropriations it has provoked a great deal of interest to our subcommittee.

It calls for the largest amount in appropriations in this bill.

The budget estimate for the Forest Service was $126,186,000. The committee allowed $118,456,000, an increase of $16,945,250 over the 1957 allowance of $101,510,750 and a decrease of $7,730,000 from the budget estimate. So that out of this large budget estimate there was a cut of $7,730,000 which was from 2 sources—$3,730,000 from forest land management and $4 million for tree planting which is a cooperative with the various States.

The reasons for the cuts are fully explained in the committee report.

I appreciate the vast amount of work that comes under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service.

The expanded program that they have presented for 1958 is indeed one that will require a great deal of time and energy to fulfill.

They envisage almost as many visitors to the national forests as the national parks which in itself proves the interest in the forests of the average person.

The keeping abreast of a sustained timber yield while cutting billions of board feet each year is indicative of good management. It is to be hoped that reforestation keeps ahead of the allowable cutting.

I have been greatly interested in prevention and proper management of fires in our coal mines. It seems to me that with the terrible and extensive fires taking place in our forests—national and private—that research is very necessary and indeed urgent.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to compliment the gentleman and the committee of which he is a member for the deletion of the sum for the pilot plant at Rifle, Colo., because of the jurisdictional question involved. I think under the circumstances the committee acted wisely.

Mr. FENTON. I thank the gentleman. Since the Rifle project is on the Navy oil-shale reserve, the committee was of the opinion that this item should be taken care of in the Navy appropriation bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the generosity of my friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and regret again to find myself in serious disagreement, not only with him but also with my friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The committee has refused to include in this appropriation bill the money for tungsten and other minerals that likewise were excluded from the urgent deficiency bill earlier this session. The committee in both instances has quoted testimony of the Office of Defense Mobilization in support of and as a basis for refusing this money.

I want to call the attention of the committee today to the fact that Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, appeared before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs this morning and testified in support of this program authorized by Public Law 733. In particular, I called his attention this morning to the language appearing on page 5 of the committee report, as follows:

> Proponents of this nondefense subsidy claim that continuing support of these mining industries is necessary to assure a supply in time of emergency.

I asked Dr. Flemming if, as a proponent of this mining program, he subscribed to that statement. He said he did not, and that he had made it perfectly plain he did not support the continuance of this program as an emergency defense program, but as an interim program, to sustain this vital part of the American economy until the Secretary of the Interior comes up with a promised long-range mining program.

To quote his statement precisely, here is what he said:

> It is recognized that our total mobilization program must rest, if it is to succeed, on the foundation of a strong and sound economy.
>
> It is clear that if the industries with which we are dealing this morning are shut down, one segment of our economy will be weakened.
>
> Surely no one can argue that closed down mines filled with water, with miners out of work, can do anything but weaken a segment of our economy.
>
> We felt last year and still feel that it would be unwise for the Congress to permit this to happen in view of the fact that the administration intends to recommend and the Congress to consider, long-term policies that are designed to create a more favorable economic climate for these industries than now exists.
>
> As I indicated last year, we regard this as purely interim stop-gap legislation.
>
> Nevertheless, we feel that it is important for Congress to go through with the policy set forth in Public Law 733 until the long-term policy is developed and enacted into law.

That is the testimony of Dr. Flemming, who is quoted as the basis and authority for the action of the appropriations subcommittee, given this morning, February 26, 1957, before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. I wonder if the gentleman would comment on this statement by the American Mining Congress in its declaration of policy adopted at Los Angeles, Calif., on October 1–4, 1956.

Mr. ENGLE. I know what the statement is and I will comment on it right now if the gentleman wants me to do so.

Mr. BUDGE. It is one short paragraph:

> The use of direct subsidies will lead to eventual Government control of industry. The nature of mining requires that the industry make long-range plans, and revocable or stop-gap measures by the Government contribute little to the real problem.

This is a stopgap measure. Will the gentleman comment on that statement?

Mr. ENGLE. That is entirely correct. The idealistic position of the mining industry is it would prefer not to have a subsidy program. That is precisely the point I want to get to and I am glad the gentleman brought it up. They would prefer an adequate tariff.

The plain facts are that if we do not give the mining industry in this country some help, the entire mining industry is going to close up. That is the problem faced by the administration and that is why they recommended Public Law 733. That is why the Congress last time appropriated $21 million as stopgap money. It is just as plain as that. My friend from Iowa says that if the public knew about this they would have a fit. I should like to address my remarks to the gentleman from Iowa.

I looked at the President's budget. I found that the farming industry of this Nation is being subsidized to the tune of $5 billion which represents about half of the actual profits of the farming people of America. And yet we are told here that $90 million in total to keep this vital mining industry alive on an interim basis until the administration comes up with a long-range program is somehow morally wrong. I just cannot see it. It takes 5 years to put a mine in production. When this mining industry closes down, we are going to lose it. And, let me say to my friends who are interested in other types of mining, lead, zinc, copper, manganese, and other types not specifically included in this particular public law, if this same program to aid and assist the mining industry is not brought into existence, we will simply not have a mining industry in this country. That is what is involved here today. And, to hear the argument that it is somehow morally wrong to subsidize such a vital industry flies in the face of what our country is doing in many other instances.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further? It was, of course, through my courtesy that the gentleman obtained his time.

Mr. ENGLE. I am very deeply indebted to him and thank him so much for it.

Mr. BUDGE. All of us are very sympathetic toward the domestic mining industry.

Mr. ENGLE. They need something besides sympathy.

Mr. BUDGE. The distinguished gentleman from California is the chairman of the committee which acted upon the authorizing legislation.

Mr. ENGLE. I was the author of the bill.

Mr. BUDGE. I think that the gentleman should, in all fairness to the House, admit that this program touches only a very small segment of the mining industry. Now, the facts of the matter are that of the almost $15 milion which was spent last fall on this program, 86 percent went to 11 producers; 92 percent went to 18 producers. Now, that is a very small percentage just in this particular segment of the mining industry compared to the overall mining picture.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith a summary of revised list of tungsten producers participating in Public Law 733 program:

| | |
|---|---|
| Wah Chang: | |
| California | $552,622 |
| Nevada | 819,620 |
| Colorado | 819,620 |
| Subtotal | 2,191,862 |
| Union Carbide (Nevada) | 44,902 |
| Union Carbide and Nuclear: | |
| California | 1,105,884 |
| Nevada | 546,755 |
| Subtotal | 1,652,639 |
| Minerals Engineering: | |
| Montana | 1,273,580 |
| Montana | 447,474 |
| Subtotal | 1,721,054 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Getchell (Nevada) | $1,390,150 |
| Nevada-Massachusetts (Nevada) | 1,390,848 |
| Tungsten Mining | 1,374,945 |
| Bradley Mining (Idaho) | 897,328 |
| Nevada-Scheelite | 722,616 |
| Climax Molybdenum Co. | 931,738 |
| Subtotal, above (9 producers) | 12,318,082 |
| New Idria, California | 280,742 |
| Surcease Mining, California | 227,941 |
| Subtotal (11 producers) | 12,826,765 |
| Gabbs Exploration (Nevada) | 186,807 |
| Minerva Scheelite (Nevada) | 118,247 |
| Hillside Mining & Milling (Arizona) | 118,346 |
| Browstone Mining Co. (California) | 110,111 |
| Browstone Mining Co. (California) | 3,223 |
| Palmer & Decker | 142,921 |
| Cold Spring Tungsten (Colorado) | 100,800 |
| Valley View Mine | 105,824 |
| Subtotal, above | 13,713,044 |
| All other | 1,140,051 |
| Total | 14,853,095 |

Nine largest producers received $12,318,082 or 83 percent of total.

Eleven largest producers received $12,826,765 or 86 percent of total.

Mr. ENGLE. Will the gentleman let me answer that now?

Mr. BUDGE. But they do not fit these facts.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman was very generous and kind to give me the time, and I hope he will let me answer. When we had this program going over a year ago, we had over 750 tungsten producers in this particular program. By reason of this stopgap business, starting and stopping, we practically wiped all of the little fellows down to about 209. The committee report limits it somewhat. The report shows, eliminating duplications, it is down to 177. Well, the fact is that the little fellow cannot stand the gaff. These are not big outfits, in the way we think of bigness in this country; Union Carbide, U. S. Vanadium are the only two that really represent any size. And, as anyone knows who knows anything about mining, it takes a little time and money to get going underground and to get these operations under way. That is why it is so important that they be kept going at this time.

I would like to complete one thought before I yield further. I would like to call the committee's attention to what has happened here. We had policies made by the Congress of the United States and enacted into law, Public Law 733, which said that we intended to continue this mining program for a period of 30 months. And, the industry got its feet under it again, having been pretty well closed down, and started to get ready to operate. Then along came the Committee on Appropriations, and the Congress appropriated last August $21 million, so the miners went to work, reopened their mines, did the necessary exploration work, got up their crews and started out, and when the appropriation bill came up on the Senate floor last year, the Senate committee said that the $21 million was inadequate and that a supplemental request should be filed. So, they started out to produce with this legislative record behind them.

Now, I ask anyone here: Do you think it is fair, after the Congress has stated a policy clearly and explicitly, signed by the President into law, and the Congress has initiated that program to total $90 million, with an initial appropriation of $21 million, to then cut them off at the pockets and tell them that it is just too bad that they went out and opened their mines, committed themselves to the construction of mills, hired employees and did exploration work that cost hundreds of thousands of dollars?

I venture to ask my friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] what he thinks would happen if the Appropriations Committee abruptly cut off the $5 billion in the current budget to make subsidy payments of one kind and another to American agriculture—or even to cut a substantial part of the budget request? The howls would go to high heaven. The farmers would contend, with justice, that they had predicated their farming operations in reliance on the announced program not only adopted by Congress but previously appropriated for. I am sure the Appropriations Committee would be quickly informed that it had to keep faith with the farmers. This is exactly the situation in which these miners find themselves, although not as large an industry or as influential a voice politically as that of the farmers.

Mr. Chairman, I assert that this procedure is not only against the interests of this country, but it is unfair to these mining people who have been imposed upon in this fashion.

My friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has referred to a communication which he received from one Philip McKenna. He has called Mr. McKenna "Mr. Tungsten." Mr. McKenna is no more "Mr. Tungsten" than I am. He is a tungsten fabricator and uses about 7 percent of the total tungsten consumed in the country. Furthermore, he is not a tungsten producer. Mr. McKenna opened the Nevada-Scheelite tungsten mine in Nevada when tungsten was $73 a unit, but he closed it up about 5 months ago. He buys tungsten on the open market to make a tungsten alloy called tungsten carbide, which sells for $15 a pound and has a tariff protection of $2.15 a pound. Is it any wonder that Mr. McKenna is advocating that the tungsten stockpile be dumped on the market so that he can buy his raw material very cheap and continue to sell his tungsten carbide at a high price protected by the tariff? Mr. McKenna does not speak for the tungsten miners of this country. He is not a producer of tungsten but is a tungsten fabricator and holds the same position with reference to the tungsten producers as the jewelry fabricators hold with reference to gold, or the clothing industry with reference to the wool producers. Mr. McKenna, like all of these others, wants to get his raw material at the lowest possible price in order to make the highest possible profit. I am sorry that my friend, the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, has been misled by this correspondence in this fashion because Mr. McKenna no more represents the tungsten miner than the wolf represents the sheep.

In conclusion, I would like to point out again, as I did when the urgent deficiency bill was before this House, that Public Law 733, continuing on an interim nondefense basis the production of tungsten and these other minerals, had the support of all the executive agencies that studied the situation—Interior Department, the Bureau of the Budget, the Office of Defense Mobilization, and, finally, that of the President himself who signed the bill. Additionally, this legislation was passed last July without opposition through both this House and the Senate and the initial appropriation of $21 million was approved by both the Appropriations Committees and by the House and the Senate. It is mystifying to us to find the opposition with which we are now faced. One further quotation from Dr. Flemming, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, in his testimony this morning before the Senate Interior Committee, will serve to show how emphatic he is in his belief that this money should be restored and this mining program should go forward:

> It seems to me that the Government could be put in a ridiculous situation. Forget the defense angle for a moment and let us assume that the Congress approves a long-term nondefense policy which is designed to improve the economic climate and make it possible for these industries to be an integral part of our economy; if they are already shut down the long-term policy does not become very meaningful at that particular point.
>
> From the defense point of view, there is always a possibility of a shift in requirements and if we have a going concern we can adjust to that shift in requirements. That is why I have personally felt that this just made good sense on the part of Government and a contrary policy would not be a commonsense policy to follow under the circumstances.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], the chairman of the committee, and my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], and other members of the committee for the generous treatment accorded Alaska in this bill.

I should like to ask the chairman a question or two, if I may, in reference to it. Is it not true that the committee allowed Alaska all of the budget request except a comparatively small item for painting the governor's mansion at Juneau?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; the committee, I think, treated Alaska very well and, as the gentleman stated, approved everything requested by the budget.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I might say that I was especially pleased that the Bureau of the Budget's request of $5 million for Alaska public works was granted. That program has had permanent beneficial effects and I am glad, too, the committee noted in the report that half of that money is to be repaid by the people of Alaska.

I should like to say in connection with the section of the report dealing with the Alaska Railroad Revolving Fund that it is stated that a gas line may be built from Gubik in the Arctic which may diminish the receipts of the Alaska Railroad. In the first place, I would say that that gas line, when and if built, will be constructed by private capital and it is our hope and belief, if that is done, that cheap fuel will create an industrial establishment there that will, in fact, aid the railroad.

I should like to ask the chairman, if I may, about the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife. The report says that the Bureau of the Budget had requested 25 percent of the Pribilof Islands seal receipts be used for commercial fisheries and it was the committee's decision that that should be divided between that bureau and the one having to do with sports fisheries and wildlife. I should like to ask the chairman why that was done.

Mr. KIRWAN. That was done to protect the wildlife, because, with the Armed Forces there now, the wildlife there is going the same route that the buffalo went years ago in this country. That is why we gave 12½ percent to the commercial fisheries and 12½ percent to wildlife.

Mr. BARTLETT. Personally, I applaud the committee's action because there are fewer game wardens in Alaska now than in some of the smaller States of the Union and if the game resources are to be protected, we are going to have to put more money in it.

Mr. KIRWAN. Alaska is about one-sixth of the size of the United States and they have fewer game wardens there than they have in Rhode Island.

Mr. BARTLETT. And the responsibility is entirely that of the Federal Government?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I think Congress should look closely at the history of our tungsten and strategic metals purchase program before approving this bill which, unless the Senate takes a different view, will close out much of our domestic tungsten-mining industry.

The domestic tungsten industry came into being to meet a critical shortage in this vital metal at the start of the Korean war. Prior to that time, we had no domestic production to speak of.

With the outbreak of the Korean war, we found many of our sources cut off. South Korea, itself a major source of tungsten, was in turmoil. American soldiers were stationed around Korean tungsten mines to protect the output of tungsten.

The Nation also searched the world for this vital metal, and watched the price double, then triple as foreign sources boosted prices to all the market would bear. We had to have the metal, so we paid the price.

In the process, however, we learned how important it is to have domestic sources of raw material needed for defense. As a result, this Nation offered to buy domestic ore for $63 per ton. Under this stimulus, a new industry came into being, an industry that now affects the welfare of some 60,000 people. As a result of the investment in domestic mines, tungsten no longer is in short supply. Foreign sources, many of them subsidized by our tax dollars, have cut prices. The Government purchase price for domestic tungsten has dropped to $55 per ton. All this is a direct result of the investment, initiative and know-how of our domestic tungsten miners and refiners.

Now, the House Appropriations Committee is asking us to abandon our domestic tungsten industry. The squeeze no longer is on. We are at what is called peace. The price of foreign-produced tungsten is only $35 per ton, instead of $90 which was the price the Government was forced to pay when we had no domestic tungsten industry. So, just as we are about to become independent of foreign sources, we decide to close down our domestic mines, abandon expensive mining investments and tell our American producers to go into some other business.

Can we be so gullible as to believe that we can again depend upon foreign sources if the going gets rough? Will they continue to sell at $35 per ton when we need the metal and must have it at any price?

I think not. If we were to approach this solution from the standpoint of the Nation's best interest, we would protect our domestic mines and keep them operating by putting an adequate tariff on tungsten. If there is overproduction of this vital metal, let it be mines in French Morocco that make the adjustment.

It seems foolish and shortsighted to cut domestic production and return to the situation as it was at the outbreak of the Korean war. The administration was being pound-wise, not penny-foolish, when it asked for a temporary extension of our tungsten purchase program until a long-range mineral policy can be formulated. The House Appropriations Committee, in not following the President's advice, not only threatens to wreck an important domestic industry but leaves us once again to the mercy of foreign producers.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I have the highest regard for my good friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and I regret exceedingly that I find myself in disagreement with him and the other members of the committee concerning their actions relating to the defense minerals purchase program. As I explained to the House a few days ago when the emergency supplemental appropriations bill was being considered, we in southern Illinois produce approximately 50 percent of all domestic fluorspar and the failure to allow funds with which to continue this program will be disastrous to the entire fluorspar mining industry. Our operators have spent a considerable amount of money preparing their mines for operation under the assumption that the Government would continue its program as indicated by the passage of Public Law 733.

There are many reasons why this program cannot afford to be stopped. I will not take the time of the House to enumerate the many reasons, but instead refer anyone who is interested to my remarks appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 1542 under date of February 5. Surely the Congress is not going to break faith with those producers who have done much and will continue to do all they can to insure that this country has an adequate supply of defense minerals. My friend the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] has given a very forthright and clear statement concerning the true facts surrounding this controversy. As he has told you, Dr. Arthur Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, testified in the Senate committee this morning that this program is needed. I believe he is in a position to know.

I urge my colleagues to give this matter very serious thought as it means not only providing this country with an adequate supply of defense minerals, but in my district alone in southern Illinois where we have 30,000 able-bodied men and women unemployed, it will mean a further loss of 500 jobs if these funds are not restored and the program continued. This, we cannot afford.

There is one question to which my constituents are demanding an answer: They want to know why very few people raise their voice when millions are sent to foreign countries but find strong opposition such as this to a program that not only will help preserve an adequate defense, but help thousands of needy miners in this country. Would you deny your child a loaf of bread and give it to a stranger down the street? That, too often, seems to be the case with a lot of our domestic programs.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING].

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, it is practically impossible to say what I want to say in the short time available to me, but I have to go on record as opposing the action of the Committee on Appropriations. Once again, I want to state that we of the West who are most concerned with this action of the committee were denied the right to come before the committee to testify, as was the case 2 weeks ago, when the urgency deficiency bill came up. Again when I called the Committee on Appropriations, the clerk who answered the telephone told me he could give out no information though he knew I was a Congressman. On such a vitally important subject, I think that the particular segment of our economy should have been given a chance to come before the committee to tell the need of this appropriation. I still cannot believe that the House committee would so com-

pletely reverse itself with regard to the tungsten program after it had become law last year. Their action has shattered the faith of the public toward Congress. Assurances were given to producers by public law, who in turn laid out operational programs and expended funds for development and operation and found themselves suddenly cut off. The tungsten industry was turned on and off like a water spigot. Does not the committee understand that, if this segment of our economy is ended and a national crisis arises, these mines will be filled with water and it will be impossible to produce tungsten except by opening new mines, which takes 4 to 5 years for each mine? Producers and the miners who work for them are being taxed like everyone else for foreign aid, which moneys help produce the foreign tungsten, but their support at home is cut off. How can they pay taxes if their work is shut down?

The deficiency bill came up here 2 weeks ago and most of us spoke at length in behalf of the minerals program. We stated our reasons at that time for believing that for the purposes of national defense and for other reasons tungsten is one of the most important minerals. Now this tungsten program is a national defense issue. This very morning Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, former Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, stated upon my questioning that he knew of the research now going on in various defense laboratories which shows that by putting 15 percent more tungsten into the alloy that goes into a jet motor that such alloy can withstand a temperature of 2,000° F.; there is even a possibility of raising this figure to 3,000°. There is no other metal that can withstand this degree of temperature.

I asked Dr. Flemming this morning about Public Law 733 and he replied:

We feel that Public Law 733 is sound public policy at this time. Congress should go through with this until a long-term policy is developed.

I asked him if he could answer this question, without revealing any classified information:

When we know we are using more tungsten all the time, could a world crisis come about whereby the bulk of our present tungsten could be swallowed up quickly for national defense?

Mr. Flemming replied:

We are better off if the industry is a going concern rather than shut down * * * that is why we came to the Congress and said that we felt that in order to keep these mines as going concerns until a long-term policy was approved that it would make good sense for the Congress to adopt this interim stopgap policy which would insure the continuation of these industries until a long-term policy was approved. Between now and the time the long-term policy is enacted by Congress (these world conditions) may be translated into actual requirements and that may change the national defense picture. If it does, we can adjust to it. The industry is there and we can acquire it, if it is necessary to do so, but if these mines are shut down and flooded with water, etc., if we decide that we have to acquire additional supplies, we would spend far more money than is involved in this issue at the present time.

Mr. BARING. I wish to quote here from the Senate hearing this morning: "If Public Law 733 is carried out, then you can quickly change and get your requirements?"

Dr. FLEMMING. This is right.

Mr. BARING. But the danger is that the mines will be closed and flooded and possibly at lot of miners—like in my own State, some 3,000 miners are affected—would clear out of the regions and the mines would go to pot.

Dr. FLEMMING. It seems to me that the Government could be put in a ridiculous situation. Forget the defense angle for a moment and let us assume that the Congress approves a long-term nondefense policy which is designed to improve the economic climate and make it possible for these industries to be an integral part of our economy; if they are already shut down the long-term policy does not become very meaningful at that particular point.

From the defense point of view, there is always a possibility of a shift in requirements and if we have a going concern we can adjust to that shift in requirements. That is why I have personally felt that this just made good sense on the part of Government and a contrary policy would not be a commonsense policy to follow under the circumstances.

I would, for the benefit of the House, like to point out that Mr. McKenna, of whose letter the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN, has made such an issue, is not a producer but a fabricator and is thus more interested in getting cheap tungsten from foreign countries. I would also like to point out the fact to the House of Representatives that the other body has reinstated the money, $30 million, into the urgency deficiency bill and this action was passed by a 64 to 17 vote showing that two-thirds of the Senate is certainly behind this program.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The amount appropriated for the Geological Survey shall be available for purchase of not to exceed 125 passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service for protection of confidential files; contracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it is administratively determined that such procedures are in the public interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gaging stations; and payment of compensation and expenses of persons on the rolls of the Geological Survey appointed, as authorized by law, to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts, including not to exceed $10,000 for the person appointed by the President to participate as the representative of the United States in the administration of the compact consented to by the act of May 31, 1949 (63 Stat. 145): *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President is authorized to appoint a retired officer as such representative, without prejudice to his status as a retired Army officer, and he shall receive such compensation and expenses in addition to his retired pay.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am disturbed by a statement I find on page 244 of the hearings in connection with the construction of a new building for the Geological Survey. We find this statement made by a Mr. Nolan:

The agreement with the Budget Bureau, the Office of Defense Mobilization, and the General Services Administration was that it would be located within 10 to 15 miles of Washington.

Going on, he said:

We learned indirectly that the Senate committee was reluctant to authorize the project because of the concern that was expressed by District of Columbia people over the effect of the proposed moves of so many agencies and so many people from downtown Washington.

Then he goes on to say:

This is almost a complete reversal, and you remember the proposals that have been made over the past 4 or 5 years that we should move as far away from Washington as possible.

My question is this: Who is running this business of locating buildings in or near the District of Columbia? Is it the Washington Board of Trade? Who are these "people" to whom Mr. Nolan refers? I wonder if some member of the Committee on Appropriations could tell me. This building is probably justified, but I would like to know who is establishing location policy.

Mr. KIRWAN. I think there are probably a half a dozen agencies, and one has to get permission from the other. There is the Planning Commission, and two or three other commissions that all dovetail into each other. One has to get permission from the other before they can do anything. But these are all the results of acts of Congress.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but it is——

Mr. KIRWAN. But I am telling you what we have to do. They tell them it should be moved out in the country somewhere. They want to try to get a building in the city, and every time they try it there is objection to it. But the committee itself feels the building should be in the city of Washington.

Mr. GROSS. We have traffic problems in the city of Washington and Congress is continually called upon to build bridges over the Potomac River or tunnels under it. Eventually Congress may be called upon to operate ferry lines over the Potomac in order to move traffic. Why not locate this and other new buildings out to where there is parking space, out where the people who are employed by the Geological Survey can live close to their work.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say in response to the gentleman's question, the Geological Survey Agency is now located in 19 different places throughout the District of Columbia and a couple of them outside of the District. Now, as the chairman has said, there is always a hassle when the question arises, "Where do you want this building? Do you want it within the District of Columbia or should we move it outside the District?" I might say that the committee has not taken a position on that as yet, but in

the final analysis I can assure the gentleman that before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior Department makes an appropriation to construct this building we will know where the building is going to be built and we will know pretty well the circumstances which surround the problems of traffic, and so on. Some will say "We want that building built outside the District," and perhaps half the people who work for the agency live on the other side of the city. You do not always save money just because you build the building outside the city. There are many people that live in apartment houses within the District who work for the Geological Survey. May I say that because of my high regard for the top officers of the Geological Survey that I would be willing to leave the location to their best judgment.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, and I prefaced my remarks by saying that I believed a building for the Geological Survey was in order. But certain unidentified people downtown seem to be dictating where the building should go and I would like to know who they are and whether their reasons are purely mercenary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS was granted 1 additional minute.)

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. LANKFORD. I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Iowa in bringing up this point. I would like to join with him in the statement that I think some of the Government buildings should be moved outside the District of Columbia to alleviate the traffic problems here. In my own district there are a thousand acres of Government land which are lying there idle, and yet every day these agencies buy additional land. We hear they do not want to have an airport at Burke, so they will go down to Belmont Bay and pay $8 million there to save $2 million, while we in Maryland have a perfectly good airport, Friendship International, that is just as close as Belmont Bay already in being and thousands of acres of land available.

Mr. GROSS. And if the gentleman will recall it was only a short time ago we were told we ought to adopt a policy of dispersion of buildings in future construction for reasons of national defense. Yet they continue to locate them in the District, in the heart of the target area.

Mr. LANKFORD. The gentleman is absolutely right.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF MINES

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation, exploration, development, production, and utilization of mineral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its Territories and possessions; and developing synthetics and substitutes; $18,700,000.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect for the members of the Committee on Appropriations, and certainly I think we are all concerned in the attempt to reduce the size of the budget and reduce expenditures. I do, however, want to take this opportunity to express on behalf of the people I represent what they feel to be a breach of faith on the part of the Congress of the United States in not carrying on the domestic minerals purchase program. A great many of the people concerned in the production of these minerals proceeded with exploration and development and spent thousands and thousands of dollars because of the passage of Public Law 733. Today they feel very definitely they are being let down and that there has been a lack of faith on the part of the Congress of the United States.

Certainly, as I said, I have the greatest respect for the committee, and particularly for my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, with whom I have discussed this matter personally. It does not remove from the minds of the people, particularly in the western areas who have expended thousands of dollars, the feeling that they are being abused on the basis of what this Congress did in enacting the law, to develop these mines. They felt they were doing something for the welfare of this country, something that would strengthen the defense of this country. Certainly I cannot let this opportunity pass without calling the attention of my colleagues in the House to what I firmly believe to be unfair treatment of a great segment of our people in the West. Certainly it is my hope that before this session ends, somewhere down the line we will be able to restore the money for this program in order to keep the faith which these people have in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. BARING. I would like to point out at this stage that the other body has reinstated the funds that we denied in the deficiency bill.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman, and I certainly hope that in the other body action will be taken to continue the program.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and for the departmental administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including expenses of the offices of the Governors of Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, as authorized by law (48 U. S. C., secs. 61, 531, 1422, 1431a (c)); salaries of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Government Secretary, and the members of their immediate staffs as authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 1591); compensation and mileage of members of the legislatures in Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands as authorized by law (48 U. S. C., secs. 87, 599, 1421d (e), 1431a (c), and 1572e); compensation and expenses of the judiciary in American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 1431a (e)); grants to American Samoa, in addition to current local revenues, for support of governmental functions; and personal services, household equipment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation of the houses of the Governors of Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and American Samoa; $1,965,000: *Provided*, That the Territorial and local governments herein provided for are authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That appropriations available for the administration of Territories may be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance, and operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary to be necessary.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and take this time to propound a question to the chairman of the committee. Is it the committee's position that in the allowance of $25,000 to take care of the audit proposed by the Governor of Guam, it would obviate the necessity of the local government duplicating the same responsibility?

Mr. KIRWAN. The Governor of Guam testified before the committee and said he needed an auditor to make an independent audit. I think that is so.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is this in place of an audit that the legislature might itself authorize or would it be in addition to that?

Mr. KIRWAN. It would be in addition to that. He wants to get his own information as to the standing of the place over there, coming in as a new governor.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the act of August 13, 1946 (25 U. S. C. 70), creating an Indian Claims Commission, $177,700, of which not to exceed $3,600 shall be available for expenses of travel.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time not to offer any change in the language of this legislation but to express the appreciation which I am sure is in the hearts of many Indian people in this country for the action taken by the committee with regard to funds for the work of the Indian Claims Commission. The work of that Commission has been lagging. It is a problem of which the House Interior Committee is well aware and which we are pleased to see cognizance has been taken of by the Appropriations Committee in providing additional funds.

I hope the Appropriations Committee will follow the very desirable action with regard to this appropriation by insisting that the Department of Justice when it seeks its appropriation will also secure sufficient funds to do the job that it needs to do to bring these cases to issue. Much of the lag that is present in the work of the Indian Claims Commission is due directly to the failure of the Department of Justice to file its pleadings in these cases and to bring these cases to trial.

I think this subcommittee has taken the very necessary first step toward getting this problem behind us, a very necessary problem to be resolved before we can actually have a full resolution of our Indian problems.

If the Committee on Appropriations will just follow up by seeing that the Justice Department also obtains the

money and uses that money to get these cases tried, then I think the Congress will have taken a very, very long step toward a complete solution of the Indian problem. I want to thank the committee for the work done in this regard.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it should be stated in regard to the Indian Service that in this bill you will see the committee has appropriated the budget request for additional schoolrooms and teachers for Indian children. Appropriation is made in this bill for additional educational facilities for 5,090 Indian children, which means that after this money has been expended in fiscal 1958 school facilities will be provided for every Indian child of school age. Just 4 years ago there were over 15,000 Indian children of school age that were not in school because there were no school facilities or the necessary teachers. Mr. Emmons, Director of the Indian Service, took hold of that situation, and with comparatively little money as against what former directors of the Indian Service said it would take, has done this great job of getting all the Indian children in school and also in establishing schools that will teach children many different kinds of vocations, which will finally bring about the desired situation where Indians will be self-supporting much sooner than has been expected and the Indians will be in a position to be emancipated, so to speak. I am sure I express the sentiments of every member of the committee when I say that we are very happy to compliment Mr. Emmons for the great job he has done in getting the Indian children in school and providing for vocational training which will fit these Indians, not only the children but the adults, to make their own living in this great blessed land of theirs and ours.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to join the gentleman in expressing appreciation to Commissioner Glenn Emmons for his leadership in this educational field. I think the program which he in large measure is responsible for, for an expanded educational program, not only for Indian children but for adults as well, is a real milepost in the history of Indian legislation and of Indian programs, and I think the gentleman from Iowa, who has been one of the leaders in the fight for vocational educational programs for our Indian children, is deserving of the appreciation of not only the Indian people but of his colleagues in the House.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman. May I say that every member of this committee has been very active and greatly interested in the Indian problem, and I have nothing but the highest praise for every member of the committee for a job well done, and we thank every Member of this House who has supported the committee so loyally over the past many years.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOX. I should like to ask the gentleman relative to the educational facilities for Indians, if that is "without exception" through the entire Nation?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. KNOX. Now I come back to a date when the Congress deeded over property which was owned by the Federal Government to the State of Michigan and in doing so the State of Michigan became responsible for the education and institutional care of all Indians in the State of Michigan. Now, the gentleman said this is "without exception," and I am wondering whether it is without exception or whether Michigan is still going to have to continue to care for all of the Indian children in the State of Michigan whether on the reservation or otherwise.

Mr. JENSEN. I do not know how the legislation reads which the State of Michigan passed, but if the State of Michigan passed legislation which provided that it would take over the responsibility of the Indians in your State in toto, then, of course, that holds as a State law. We are happy that your State took such action, and I am sure the gentleman must be proud of his State for taking such action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5189) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 168, Rept. No. 169), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Education and Labor, effective from January 3, 1957, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI, clause 6, of the Rules of the House of Representatives. For such purpose such committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued only over the signature of the chairman of the committee or a member of the committee designated by him; they may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

The committee may report to the House of Representatives from time to time during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

With the following committee amendments:

That the Committee on Education and Labor, effective from January 4, 1957, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of all matters—

(1) Relating to employee health, welfare, and pension plans;

(2) Relating to the question of Federal aid to school construction; and

(3) Relating to education and labor generally.

For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House has recessed or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued only over the signature of the chairman of the committee or a member of the committee designated by him; they may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

The committee may report to the House of Representatives from time to time during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Amend the title so as to read: "Resolution to authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters coming within its jurisdiction."

---

## ARMY NATIONAL GUARD AND ARMY RESERVE 6-MONTHS' TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to announce to the membership that the Subcommittee on Armed Services which was considering the dispute of the Army and National Guard has reached a solution of the problem which is satisfactory to all parties. We had a vote this morning in the subcommittee and approved a "memorandum of understanding" which has been worked out with the Army and the Army National Guard Association.

Under the terms of this memorandum of understanding enlistees between the ages of 17 and 18½ will be given 6 months' active field training in the National Guard after the 1st of January 1958. Prior to that time they can enlist in a program of 11 weeks' training, but that program will cease to exist January 1, 1958.

When the 6-months' program goes into effect, the Army agrees to certain programs to assure the strength of the National Guard so we may know that at no time will the strength of the National Guard fall below the level set by the United States Congress which at the present time is 400,000.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a short statement which I made before the subcommittee this morning together with a copy of this memorandum of understanding entered into between the Army and the National Guard so that it will be available to all the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

Members of the subcommittee, I have called the subcommittee together so that I could submit a memorandum of understanding concerning the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve 6-months training program.

Everyone knows the problems we have had in this regard. The Department of the Army issued a directive on January 19 which requires all National Guard recruits to perform 6 months of active-duty training after April 1, 1957. The Guard opposed the provisions of this directive. The subcommittee held 2 full weeks of hearings on this problem. The subcommittee then authorized the chairman to proceed to negotiate this matter with the Army and the National Guard, in order to see if some area of agreement could not be reached.

I have discussed this problem with virtually every member of the subcommittee and many members of the full committee. I contacted representatives of the Army and of the National Guard Association and discussed the matter at length with both groups.

As a result I can now announce to the subcommittee that a full agreement has been reached with the National Guard Association and the Army.

Practically all of our members agree that 6 months of active duty training should be required of new recruits in the National Guard. The big problem has been to decide when this program should go into effect and how we could assure the Guard that the overall strength of the National Guard would not be materially decreased after the new program was put into effect.

The members of the subcommittee will find before them a memorandum of understanding. I will have the agreement read in a moment, but I can tell you that this memorandum of understanding settles the two questions which have plagued us for the past 3 weeks. It provides that the 11 weeks' training program advocated by the Guard will go into effect in conjunction with the 6 months training, but the 11 weeks' training program will be discontinued on January 1, 1958. Furthermore, all persons enlisting in the 11 weeks' program must have completed their training by that date. After January 1, 1958, all new recruits in the Guard under 26 years of age will be required to perform 6 months of active duty training.

The agreement assures the Guard that its strength will not decrease below approximately 400,000, or such strength as may be set by appropriations of Congress. There are several ways that this can be accomplished and these are included in the agreement.

In all such matters where there is an honest difference of opinion there must be give and take on the part of all parties, if an agreement is to be reached. Both the Army and the National Guard, in my judgment, have been extremely fair in their approach to this problem and are entitled to high credit for their actions and good faith in attempting to work out an agreement.

If this report is adopted by the subcommittee it should bring to a close an old controversy which has existed between the Regular Army and the National Guard. As a matter of fact, if this memorandum of understanding is agreed to by the subcommittee it can well be considered a basis upon which a new era of good will and understanding between the National Guard and the United States Army will begin, and in the future may be considered as a cornerstone of support for the strongest and most active establishment the Army has been able to maintain in this country in peacetime.

---

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING THE ARMY NATIONAL GUARD AND ARMY RESERVE'S 6 MONTHS' TRAINING PROGRAM

1. Until January 1, 1958, persons between the ages of 17 and 18½ may enlist in the National Guard for 11 weeks of active duty training and the remainder of the unexpended portion of the obligation is to be spent in the National Guard (Ready Reserve), where active participation will be required, provided, persons entering the 11 weeks' training program must have enlisted in such program on a date sufficiently prior to January 1, 1958, to insure completion of 11 weeks of training by January 1, 1958.

2. Persons within the age group 17 to 18½ who voluntarily perform 6 consecutive months' active-duty training will only be required to serve 3 years in addition to the 6 months' active duty for training in the National Guard (Ready Reserve) where active participation will be required. At the end of that period they may be transferred to the Standby Reserve for the remaining 4½ years of their total 8-year obligation. It is understood, however, that these young men may remain in the National Guard, if acceptable, and if they volunteer to do so.

3. Beginning January 1, 1958, all persons enlisting in the National Guard between the ages of 17 and 18½ will be required to perform 6 months of active duty for training, and the 11 weeks' active-duty training course will be discontinued. The Ready and Standby Reserve obligations will be the same as set forth in the foregoing paragraph, 6 months' active duty for training, 3 years Ready Reserve and 4½ years Standby Reserve.

4. Persons between the ages 18½ through 25 enlisting in the National Guard will be required to perform 6 months of active duty training to be followed by 5½ years' service in the National Guard (Ready Reserve) where active participation will be required.

5. Persons in a deferred status, age 26 and over, who possess qualifications in a technical or scarce MOS, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, and members of the Alaska Scouts will not be required to undergo active duty for training upon enlistment in the National Guard, but may volunteer to do so.

6. It is agreed that the size of the Army National Guard shall be maintained at an authorized strength of approximately 400,000 for the remainder of fiscal year 1957 and fiscal year 1958, and thereafter at such greater or lesser strength as may be determined in annual appropriations of the Congress, and it is agreed to use every means to maintain the Guard at approximately the determined figure. The Army agrees to provide sufficient spaces in the 6 months' training program to allow the National Guard to reach this figure, taking into consideration the input into the Guard from other programs.

7. Persons enlisting while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of high school instruction may have their active duty for training deferred for a period of not more than 1 year in order not to interrupt their high school course of instruction; provided, that persons enlisting for 11 weeks of active duty for training may be deferred from entrance on such active duty for training until their graduation; provided, they will complete their active duty for training prior to January 1, 1958.

8. It is agreed that everything possible will be done to maintain the Army National Guard at its appropriated strength, supra, including the following actions:

(a) Recruitment of persons between 17 and 18½ years of age for either 11 weeks' or 6 months' active duty for training as set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2, supra.

(b) Recruitment of persons age 18 through 25 for the 6 months of active duty for training as set forth in paragraph 4, supra.

(c) Recruitment of persons age 26 through 35 as set forth in paragraph 5, supra.

(d) Nonassignment of prior service personnel to the United States Army Reserve for a period of 60 days subsequent to their release from active duty during which time the Army National Guard shall have exclusive opportunity for recruitment of such personnel.

(e) Recruitment for the Army National Guard will be accomplished by the Regular Army Recruiting Service on the same basis as recruitment for the active establishment and the Army Reserve.

(f) As a last resort, the prerelease of personnel on active duty.

---

## INTERNATIONAL PANCAKE DAY RACE AT LIBERAL, KANS.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, in old England it was customary for the housewives to drop whatever they were doing and hurry to the church at the tolling of the bell to be "shriven" of their sins. In 1445 a wife in Olney, England, started baking her pancakes rather late. They were not quite finished when the church bell rang, but she hurried off to the "shriving" carrying her griddle and pan-

cakes with her. Thus an annual sporting event was born.

In Liberal we heard of this 500-year-old event of pancake racing over a 415-yard course from the town pump to the church, and in 1950 the challenge was accepted by Rev. R. C. Collins, vicar of Olney. In the running of the First International Pancake Day Race over identical courses, times of the winners in both Liberal and Olney were compared by transatlantic telephone.

Mrs. Breeding and I cordially invite the Members of the 85th Congress to attend this world famous celebration in Liberal, Kans., on March 5, 1957.

LIBERAL, KANS.—One of the strangest events in the realm of athletics will take place in Liberal March 5 when housewives will run 415 yards through the main streets at 11:55 a. m. flipping pancakes in skillets in a traditional race with the housewives of Olney, England. In the eighth annual such race, Olney housewives will be trying to even the score. Liberal leads, 4 to 3.

It all started more than 500 years ago in England when on Shrove Tuesday, the day before lent, housewives used up accumulated cooking fats before fasting by baking pancakes. Legend has it that one day a housewife baking pancakes lost track of time until suddenly she heard the church bell ring, calling everyone to the shriving service in the church. In her haste she ran to the church, clad in her apron and with her skillet in hand, and this was the first pancake racer.

Other women of Olney in following years, not to be outdone by their neighbors, got into the act. The one who beat the others to the church was kissed by the Verger, and the kiss came to be called the "kiss of peace" and is still the traditional prize for the winner of the pancake race here and in England.

Liberal got into the competition in 1950 after a picture of the Olney racers appeared in a magazine. Liberal jaycees decided that their housewives might be just as fast on their feet as the English women. They dispatched a letter to the Vicar of Olney, who ramrods the race over there, challenging the English to an international race. Vicar Collins quickly accepted and the race was on.

Each year since then on Shrove Tuesday thousands of cheering spectators crowd the streets in each town to watch the apron-clad housewives flit and flip their way merrily down the village streets in this sporting gesture of international good will.

In spite of any temporary diplomatic differences between the United States and England, the race has always been carried out in a spirit of friendly competition and has remained a strong and permanent link of international friendship between the people of the two countries.

In Liberal the race course is over brick and asphalt streets. In Olney the setting is cobblestone streets, thatched-roofed cottages, and the old bull-inn. Both races, according to age-old tradition, end at a church, where the kiss of peace is administered—in England by the church verger and in Kansas by the British Consul. The accompanying whirr of television cameras and the general hubbub of a major celebration are background additions to the traditional kiss, brought on by intense new coverage of the event.

The Kansans are one up on the British now after Mrs. Nina Jordan, 25-year-old gas company employee, ran the cold and slippery 415 yards in 1:14.6 last year to beat the Olney time of 1:15.2. Winning times are compared by transatlantic telephone call.

In the eighth annual race coming up, Mrs. Jordan is expected to defend her title. The traveling trophy, a griddle engraved with past winners' names, now hangs in the Liberal Chamber of Commerce office for all the townsfolk to see. Approximately a dozen housewives are in training now to prevent the loss of the trophy.

Various methods of training are used, usually under husband's advice, most of the would-be contestants practice running in the later afternoons or evenings. And it is nothing to see a woman running round and round the block where she lives flipping her pancake in a skillet, cheered on by the members of her family.

One more serious contestant in recent years would eat nothing for breakfast but a cereal guaranteed to give you the utmost in pep and energy, and would eat no fats for months before the race. Others give up chocolates and cigarettes or go for long daily walks to build up their wind.

The police were alerted one evening when rural residents saw a man in an automobile apparently trying to run down a woman on the road. As it turned out, she was practicing for the pancake race, in the lights of the car while her husband times her efforts.

Athletic attire is prohibited in the race. Regular housewifely garb of housedresses, paron, headscarf, and oxfords or regular street shoes are required.

The best time ever turned in for the race was 1:05.1 by Mrs. Binnie Dick in 1955. She won the race here three consecutive years, and was international champion twice. After three local victories, a contestant is disqualified.

With a tradition of 500 years of racing behind them, Olney housewives jumped off to a quick lead, winning in 1950 and 1951. Liberal women soon caught on and won in 1952. Olney avenged their loss in 1953, but Liberal girls found the winning combination and swept the 1954, 1955, and 1956 races for a record string of consecutive victories.

Winning times are:

| Year | Liberal, Kans. | Olney, England |
|---|---|---|
| 1950 | 1:18 | 1:10.4 |
| 1951 | 1:14.5 | 1:12.1 |
| 1952 | 1:08 | 1:10.8 |
| 1953 | 1:09 | 1:07.2 |
| 1954 | 1:07.7 | 1:12.2 |
| 1955 | 1:05.1 | 1:18.5 |
| 1956 | 1:14.6 | 1:15.2 |

Interest will run high in the March 5 event in both places. Olney will be trying hard to even up the score. Liberal will be trying to chalk up the comfortable margin another win would bring. The whole town is pitching in with feverish excitement making ready for the day-long celebration which accompanies the event. Festivities here include a parade, beauty and amateur contests, dances, and parties honoring the visiting celebrities who crowd into the small town of 10,000 for the unique spectacle. Liberal, not normally well known for its athletics, will shine if pancake racing is ever added to the Olympic.

---

PANCAKE DAY SCHEDULE, LIBERAL, KANS.

TUESDAY, MARCH 5, 1957, PANCAKE DAY

6:45 a. m.: All Civic Club pancake breakfast.

9:30 a. m.: Pancake Day parade.

11:15 a. m.: Kids' Pancake Day race.

11:55 a. m.: International Pancake Day race.

12:15 p. m.: Telephone call to Olney, England.

1 p. m.: Kiddies free matinee—plaza.

1:30 p. m.: Five-State beauty contest.

4:30 p. m.: Fifth annual all-American Pancake Day race.

7 p. m.: Finals of amateur contest, coronation of international, and all-American race winners.

## NEAR EASTERN POLICY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring before the House the important issues arising out of the President's speech to the country last Wednesday, because it is my firm conviction that these issues need a thorough airing. I hope that at the conclusion of my remarks, as many Members as possible will join in the debate. I propose to yield the floor to any Member for comments after my remarks are completed.

There is something very wrong in the picture of the United States supporting sanctions against a small democracy like Israel. It violates the traditional American sense of fair play. I was amazed that the President of the United States in his speech chose to call Israel an aggressor, as if there had not been justified provocation because of numerous belligerent acts by Egypt. The Arab-Israeli conflict did not begin on October 29. There is a long history of Arab guerrilla warfare and aggression prior to that date, culminating in the self-defense action of Israel. During the Arab invasion at the establishment of the State of Israel in 1947, Israel suffered over 10,000 casualties. Continued aggression by Egypt and other Arab States after the signing of the armistice agreements, for example, took the lives of 100 Israelis and left 132 others wounded in 1951 alone. In fact, from the signing of the armistice agreements to the end of 1955, Israel has suffered 1,293 casualties at the hands of the Nasser-inspired guerrilla armies operating to a large extent from bases in the Gaza Strip. I may add that the Gaza Strip is not Egyptian territory and its Arab inhabitants are not recognized as Egyptian citizens, nor has Egypt ever done anything for these 200,000 refugees. Let it be established once and for all that the action of Israel was wholly an act of legitimate self-defense.

I was equally amazed by a recent statement of one of my colleagues here on the floor of the House that our paramount interest demands that we do not dare to antagonize the Arab nations for fear that this would jeopardize our oil interests. I hope that we will never come to the point when we have to sell our friends down the river for a mess of oil or sacrifice our historic moral principles for the sake of expediency, and when I speak of these moral principles, I want them to be applied in accord with a single standard in all situations.

The double standard of morals at the United Nations is revolting to most Americans. We cannot accept without protest one rule for the strong nations and another for the weak. We cannot ignore the fact that Soviet Russia has defied 11 resolutions dealing with the Hungarian situation. India objects to the United Nations resolution dealing with the Kashmir problem, and I have yet to hear in the United Nations a demand for punitive measures against either of these nations, or against Egypt, which has openly and repeatedly defied the United Nations Security Council

resolution of 1951, calling for a halt to her practice of blockading the Suez against Israeli shipping.

There is a lamentable tendency to gloss over the fact that Israel's insistence upon firm guaranties for the security of its citizens and the freedom of its shipping is the result of belligerent acts by Egypt. The raids of the Egyptian fedayeen and the blockades imposed by Egypt against Israel shipping through Suez and through the Gulf of Aqaba were acts of war openly proclaimed as such by Egypt when she attempted to justify the violation of the armistice agreements to which she had affixed her signature in 1949.

In this perspective, it becomes unthinkable and immoral to speak of imposing sanctions against Israel. If Israel withdrew her troops from the shores of the Straits of Tiren and from the Gaza Strip without adequate guaranties, Egyptian raids would begin once more and the blockade of Aqaba would be restored. It would be far more fitting if the United Nations first obtained from Colonel Nasser a renunciation of his self-proclaimed state of belligerency against Israel, and until Egypt is prepared to enter some satisfactory arrangement, the United Nations should station its emergency force at Aqaba and in the Gaza Strip, so that peace can be maintained along her borders with Israel.

It is manifestly unfair for the United States to continue the economic squeeze which it is presently imposing on Israel, and I strongly deplore our failure to resume our aid program to Israel. I wonder how many of my colleagues are aware that the 1956 program of surplus foods for Israel amounting to about forty to fifty million dollars is in a state suspension. In addition, the $25 million grant-in-aid to Israel voted by the Congress under the foreign-aid program has not gone forward, and the technical-assistance program to Israel, which has brought our top experts to help in developing Israel's agriculture, industry, transportation, health and education, public administration, and mass communications facilities, has been interrupted by the recall of most of these experts. Israel thus is faced with a major economic problem at a time when it is admitting over 80,000 homeless refugees. Given this increased flow of refugees, many of them victims of communism in Hungary and Poland, as well as the persecuted Jews from Egypt and north Africa, the withdrawal of American aid constitutes severe hardship. In addition, the arbitrary denial of passports to American citizens who wish to travel to Israel, particularly now that the holy season of Passover is approaching, constitutes a particularly unfriendly act on the part of this administration toward the only democratic country in the Middle East. I call upon the President to restore this urgently needed aid and to treat Israel once again as she is entitled to be treated as a valuable ally in our battle against Communist aggression.

President Eisenhower told the Nation that the United Nations ought to support peace in the Middle East. He has thrown the full responsibility for keeping the peace in the Middle East to the United Nations. Here is where the trouble lies. Without lessening our support of the U. N., we must recognize the existing hard fact.

There is a voting bloc in the United Nations which has developed within the year which could spell death for the little nation of Israel in the years ahead. We should consider it.

Because of the Soviet veto in the Security Council, the real power of the United Nations has shifted to the General Assembly, where all the nations may vote. But in the assembly, a resolution can be adopted only by a two-thirds vote.

This gives the Afro-Asian-Soviet group of 36 nations the power to defeat any resolution of which it disapproves.

This applies today to the Israel debate because it means that while sanctions against Israel could be adopted, no General Assembly resolution could be passed against Egypt if she resumed the blockade against Israel shipping and the raids against Israel settlements. It means that the United Nations can no longer strike a just balance on the Arab-Israel issue.

It behooves us, therefore, to evolve our own foreign policy in the area, a policy that is firmly based upon our own interests, that is willing to take risks in pursuance of our objectives, not a set of platitudes. Such a policy would have as its paramount aim, the welfare of the United States and its allies in the free world, and would prove ourselves to be a nation interested in true justice, not just in temporary gain because of oil considerations or other special interests.

There has been much talk of a "void" in the Middle East, with respect to responsible leadership. If we are truly interested in filling that void, in the interests of permanent peace, even now it is not too late to do some or all of the following:

First. Secure from Egypt a valid and legal binding agreement to give to the United Nations the responsibility of maintaining free passage through the Straits of Tiran for all nonbelligerent shipping of all nations. Failing this, to reach agreement with appropriate nations mutually binding themselves to guarantee this freedom of passage.

Second. Failing a voluntary agreement by Egypt that United Nations forces should be permanently established in control of military and civilian functions in the Gaza Strip, we should lead a fight for a declaration by the Assembly of the United Nations that because of the violations of previous armistice agreements, it has become the responsibility of the United Nations to assume such powers.

Third. To secure from the United Nations Assembly a statement that any further assaults upon Israel territory or citizens from the Sinai Desert will justify the closing of the border and the manning of the border by United States security forces.

Fourth. A statement that the United States will consider a failure by Egypt to help organize and adhere to the internationally controlled Suez Canal administration will be considered by the United States as an indication of bad faith, and result in immediate steps by the United States in establishing other means of transportation to the Mediterranean, including passage through Israel from the Gulf of Aqaba.

Fifth. An all-out effort in the United Nations to secure and to set up enforcement machinery for an embargo of all military arms shipments to any country of the Middle East until permanent peaceful conditions and treaties have been reached between Israel and the Arab States.

Only such an approach would justify the terms we are demanding of Israel. Admittedly, it is not an easy one, but it can contribute immeasurably to the pacification and progress of the Near East, and would not injure our Western ideas of liberty and freedom. It certainly is far less dangerous than the present ill-fated policy of toying with sanctions of doubtful morality and high-explosive potential. Mr. Speaker, it is high time that the United States, under the leadership of its President, rise to the great challenge of our time. The privilege of leading the world forces of freedom will, I pray, be met by a program bold enough, far sighted enough, and humane enough to insure the coming of lasting peace with justice.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to commend the gentleman from California upon these forthright statements and say that I agree with him.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman very much indeed.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO] may extend his remarks immediately following those of the distinguished gentleman from California; and, on my own behalf, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may also be extended at this point in the RECORD and to include two documents which I am about to refer to, together with tabulations and exhibits connected thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the gentleman from California has seen fit to take this time. I know the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] will follow him shortly with another special order on the same subject. I wish to commend them and all of the other Members of the House who participate in these special orders for giving their time and attention to this very important matter.

May I direct the attention of the House to certain facts to supplement or corroborate what is being said. Corroboration of the distinguished gentleman's statements is unnecessary. Nevertheless some people may say, you made some statements, you made some charges. Is there any evidence to back them up?

Mr. Speaker, there is ample evidence to substantiate every statement of fact

that has been made on the subject by the distinguished gentleman from California. One document I hold in my hand is entitled "Nasser's Pattern of Aggression." Its contents will be included in my remarks in accordance with leave already granted to me. This contains the translations into English of various documents. The Arabic appears here, too, but in accordance with the rules of the House the Arabic will not appear in the RECORD. The translations into English will. These are photostats of original documents captured from the Egyptian Army, taken from prisoners captured by the Israel Army.

They contain, among other things, original orders issued to these men, not only issued to the officers and members of the Egyptian armed forces but to the guerrillas, to the fedayeens, the trained guerrillas, who are actually part and parcel of the Egyptian Army. We find set forth here their orders to go into Israel and commit all kinds of murder and ravage, robbery and destruction. You have the details here, the dates of the orders, the precise directions to these people. Throughout these documents you will find repeated the statement that Egypt and Egyptians cannot rest and will not rest until every Israeli has been annihilated.

I have in my hand another document which in accordance with leave granted to me will also be spread on the RECORD as part of my remarks. It deals with another important phase of this matter, though actually independent of the war or belligerency between Egypt and Israel or between the Arabs and Israel. It is entitled "The Black Record. Nasser's Persecution of Egyptian Jewry."

Here you have documented Nasser's persecution of Jews of all nationalities, not only British Jews, French Jews, Jews who came there from all parts of Europe, but the native born Egyptians, men, women, and children who trace their ancestry back to Jews who were born in Egypt, long before Nasser's ancestors. These people have been deprived of their Egyptian nationality solely because they are Jews. The British Jews, the French Jews, other European Jews who had sought refuge in Egypt during the Hitler days, are all deprived of their rights. Many of them had been naturalized as Egyptian citizens.

By one fell swoop of the hand, Mr. Nasser, after, I repeat, after the fighting ceased, after the United Nations said, this fighting between Israel and Egypt, and between Britain and France and Egypt, must stop, and after they had stopped the fighting, Nasser issued these decrees depriving these people of all of their rights and drove them all out of Egypt. Many of them were given orders to leave on an hour's notice. As these people, with written orders of expulsion, arrived at the point of departure, they were searched, the orders were taken from them, and they were required to sign a document indicating that they were leaving Egypt voluntarily, and abandoning all of their property and money to the Egyptian Government. They were permitted to leave with a few Egyptian pounds, in most instances as little as 10 pounds. That is all they were able to take out.

What is even worse than that, one hostage was taken from each family; one person out of every family was seized by the Egyptian authorities without warrant or process, thrown into jail without indictment or trial, and held as a hostage so that the rest of the families as they got beyond the borders of Egypt would not tell of the terrorism that was being practiced upon them under this dictator Nasser.

All of these things, all of these black record documents, long since have been placed on the desks of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles, and all that has happened has been a dreadful—a deafening silence. There were any number of requests made to the President and to the Secretary to do something in the United Nations about this horrible situation. Once in December a United States delegate to the United Nations rose on the floor of the general assembly and referred to this and said it would be best that we do not talk any more about it and asked all those delegates who listed their names to speak on the subject not to speak any further on the subject, lest the talk worsen the situation.

Shades of Hitler.

I think it is high time that the President directed his delegation to the United Nations to stand up and protest against these inhumane and bestial acts and that something should be done about it. If we meant what we said when we became a party to the convention on human rights of the United Nations, it is high time something was done about this.

Again I commend the gentlemen who are participating in these special orders and I join them in urging that there can be no peace without justice in that part of the world or anywhere else.

I am sure that if the program that the gentleman from California has so succinctly set forth is implemented, we can have peace in that part of the world—peace with honor—peace with dignity—peace with justice.

The two items I referred to during my remarks are as follows:

NASSER'S PATTERN OF AGGRESSION—CAPTURED DOCUMENTS REVEAL ARMY AND FEDAYEEN ROLES IN EGYPTIAN PLOT AGAINST PEACE

On October 29, 1956, the Army of Israel crossed into the Sinai Desert in order to wipe out the bases from which fedayeen terrorist gangs were sent by the Egyptian high command into Israel, and break up the concentration of military forces, which had been built up during the previous year for an attack upon Israel.

In the course of the rapid Israel advance the Egyptian forces were broken up, over 5,000 prisoners were taken and heavy booty was captured. The remnants of the defeated Egyptian Army fled in disorder to the west bank of the Suez Canal. So rapidly did they abandon their positions that the Egyptian headquarters units failed to destroy their archives, which fell into the hands of the advancing Israel forces.

The documents seized in these archives, some of which are reproduced below, bear significant testimony to the preparations made by the Egyptian military junta for war against Israel. They reveal that the oft-stated Egyptian plan of invading Israel and annihilating her was not mere bluff. They show clearly that the concentration of Egyptian forces in the north of the Sinai Desert was of a definitely offensive character, designed for an all-out war against Israel.

Thus, a directive of the command of the 3d Infantry Division of the Egyptian Army states that: "Every commander must prepare himself and his soldiers for the important battle with Israel in which we are fully immersed, with the aim of realizing our lofty tradition, i. e., to overpower and destroy Israel in the shortest possible time, and with the greatest brutality and bestiality in battle."

The documents reveal that the troops stationed in the Sinai Desert in an offensive posture against Israel included the 3d and 8th Infantry Divisions, the 1st Armored Brigade and three infantry battalions, with strong armor, air cover, airships, and vast supplies built up during the past year. Troops were being trained for the impending invasion.

Other documents throw a revealing light on the fedayeen squads recruited by the Egyptian High Command from criminal elements in the Gaza area for the purpose of murder, robbery, and sabotage in Israel.

Finally, there are the drawings found in a school where the children were asked to exercise their imagination on how best to kill Israelis; and the Arabic edition of Hitler's Mein Kampf, standard reading for Egyptian officers, from which they are taught to draw their inspiration for the war of extermination against Israel.

THE EGYPTIAN ARMY

Nasser: "The war between us and Zionism has not yet ended, and perhaps has not yet even begun. For us, this war of tomorrow or of the near future means the ending of a disgrace, the realization of a hope and the regaining of rights." (From Nasser's introduction to the book, This Is Zionism, Cairo, 1955.)

Gen. Abdul Akim Amer (Egyptian minister of war and commander in chief of the Egyptian Army): "Our army stands at the frontier ready to teach the Zionists a lesson they will never forget, when the time is ripe." (Broadcast by Government-controlled Cairo Radio, January 22, 1956.)

Anwar Al-Sadat (Egyptian minister of state): "Wait and see, Ben-Gurion. Soon will be proven to you the strength and willpower of the Arabs. Egypt and the Arab nations will teach you a lesson and quieten you forever. Egypt will grind you to the dust." (Reported in "Al Goumhouriya," official government newspaper, April 8, 1956.)

The official directives of army commanders prove the avowedly aggressive character of the Egyptian forces in the Sinai Desert and the Gaza Strip. As stated by Maj. Gen. Ahmed Salam, commander of the 3d Infantry Division, in the document here reproduced and translated, the aim of the Egyptian army in the Sinai Desert and in the Gaza Strip was the destruction of Israel:

*Subject: Directive No. 2 of commander, 3d Infantry Division*

Third Infantry Division (Operations)
Registration No. 558/2/56/2/5/E.
Date: February 15, 1956.
From C. O. Egyptian District, Palestine.
To C. O. Reinforced 5th Infantry Brigade.

The following is the essence of the directives of the commander of the 3d Division to commanders and officers on the days and dates detailed below:

El Arish, day, February 1, 1956.
Rafah, day, February 3, 1956.
Khan Yunis, day, February 4, 1956.
Gaza, day, February 4, 1956.

Please see to the execution of these directives by all officers and insure that these directives shall not be put down in writing for classification lower than battalion or parallel classification in other units.

1. Introduction: Every commander must prepare himself and his soldiers for the important battle with Israel in which we are fully immersed, with the aim of realizing our lofty tradition, i. e. to overpower and destroy Israel in the shortest possible time and with the greatest brutality and bestiality in battle.

2. Training:

(a) Training is the basic factor in the attainment of our goal. Without it, it is impossible to achieve victory.

(b) Our faith in battle must be in all ranks, a faith in aggressiveness and speed.

(c) The following factors must be a part of the training:

(1) Perseverance and strong will to fight brutally.

(2) Training in leading men and their commanding officers gaining their confidence and affection. Any breach of discipline by soldiers against their officers must be prevented.

(3) Earnestness and realism in all our actions.

3. The commanders:

(a) The term "commander" is not limited to an officer but applies to anyone of any rank who has to give commands.

(b) Our policy must be built up on the preparation of commanders for the next 10 years. Aid to prepare commanders and their units:

(1) High discipline.

(2) Knowledge, and the increase of knowledge.

(3) Absolute obedience and loyalty to commander.

(4) Tact, initiative and care of equipment.

(5) Good example in leading men; treating men in order to gain their confidence and affection.

(c) Personality of commander:

(1) The commander should control his men more by personal example than by punishment.

(2) He must accept every decision of his superior officer without hesitation.

(3) When the commander imposes his personality on his unit, hesitations about entering battle are dispelled, regardless of reasons such as lack of time or equipment. His personality is thus decisive in determining the victorious outcome of the battle.

(d) Hence the annual report of officers in general and commanders in particular must include:

(1) The level of ability of the commander.

(2) His ability to lead his men.

(3) His ability to take care of his equipment.

(e) The mistakes made by the commander when he takes fateful decisions, or when he executes an order given to him are not to be condemned, because they teach a lesson that must be put to use. Mistakes emanating from carelessness, however, including those from unfitting behavior, should be treated with all severity.

(f) Clarity in giving orders, the exposure of errors, the expression of opinions and criticism, are the right and duty of every commander. Forthrightness must be a constructive, and not a destructive factor. It must not be an instrument of degradation. Implied by this is also appreciation of diligence and fitting and constructive guidance of the one who errs.

(g) Commanders of all ranks must understand that their place is not in offices but rather with their soldiers, either training, directing or educating them, studying their social problems and participating with them in sport and entertainment.

4. Arms and equipment: Commanders of all ranks must make certain that—

(a) Every weapon shall be fit for action and efficient use by periodic tests with live ammunition.

(b) That vehicles are fit for service. Drivers must be instructed in their proper maintenance. They must be given instructions against over-speeding.

5. Fortifications: Trenches should be examined to insure that they are as deep as a man's requirements. Arms must be examined of course in the light of ability to use them from this position, and with the view of testing the soldiers' expertness in aiming and fire.

6. Inspection: It is expected that a number of commanders of units of the Central District will conduct a tour of inspection in the area of the unit. We must therefore be worthy of appreciation and be able to explain the situation, whether by means of maps or on the ground, each according to his level. Likewise, it is possible that a number of officers and other ranks of the unit will conduct tours of inspection of the battle order of the units of the Central District, within a period of 7 hours, beginning and ending in Abu Ageilah.

7. Hit and run policy: Hit and run policy is transformed into aggressive policy as follows—

(a) Fifth Brigade—in constant preparedness.

(b) Third Brigade should arrive by April 1, 1956, for company assault training within the framework of the battalion.

(c) Eighty-sixth Brigade must arrive April 1, 1956, for company assault training, regardless of present shortage of manpower and equipment.

(d) The National Guard must complete the training of its volunteers in invasion tactics, without regard to training received preceding their entry into camp. The training of every course must end within 7 weeks from arrival at the camp.

8. Our aim is always "the destruction of Israel." Remember, and act for its attainment.

LIWA (major general) AHMED SALEM,
*Staff Officer.*

OFFENSIVE POSITION

Even administrative units were being trained for the impending attack on Israel, as borne out by the following Training Instructions of the 3d Division. The basic purpose was transition to an offensive position.

*3d Infantry Division, training instructions for the administrative units for the year 1956–57*

Purpose

1. Training the men of the administrative units of the division during the period between June 1, 1956, and March 31, 1957, and bringing them to the highest possible level.

Responsibility

2. Every commander is responsible for the training of his units down to the lowest rank as well as for their attaining a high level of training in a friendly atmosphere and through cooperation with the remaining units of the division. All this is in addition to the operational task that has been set for him.

General Framework for Training

3. The basic purpose of training this year is the transition from a defensive to an offensive position. The administrative units must work together with the other units and must prepare their men for these operations.

4. All of them must concentrate on training the units in night operations and in maneuverability.

5. All the administrative units must undertake to prepare the soldier so as to make him fit for battle. The soldier should also be prepared for the professional task that has been assigned to him.

(The last part of the document deals with the technical details concerning the organization of the training.)

The document is signed by Bikbashi (Lt. Col.) Mahmoud Anis Ismail, 3d Infantry Division.

EGYPTIAN RESPONSIBILITY FOR BORDER INCIDENTS

The following is a facsimile of an operational order issued by the eastern command of the Egyptian Army to the 2d and 3d Infantry Divisions on September 29, 1955. Egyptian responsibility for border incidents is demonstrated by this passage in the document (pars. 1 and 2):

"Our forces should harass the enemy and divert its attention by attacks on the settlements. These attacks should be based on the following principles: a number of settlements will be chosen as targets; the 2d Division will attack the settlements along the Eilat-Beersheba road; and the 3d Division will attack those near the Gaza-Rafa front."

The order then goes on to describe the size of the forces scheduled for these attacks, fixes the length and time of the operations (3 to 4 hours during the night), and asks for detailed plans to be submitted by October 15, 1955.

AGAINST DEMARCATION OF ARMISTICE LINES

The Egyptian command also opposed the recommendation made by the United Nations Secretary General and the United Nations Chief of Staff to mark the armistice lines clearly in order to avoid border incidents. The document reproduced below is an order issued by the commander of the third Egyptian division stating that "the marking of the frontier lines including the area of El Auja and Khamsa is to be prevented by all means, including the use of force if necessary."

ARMORED COLUMNS PREPARING IN SINAI DESERT FOR ASSAULT UPON ISRAEL

Reproduced below is a circular issued by the commander of the first armored division. This document compares the strength of the Egyptian and Israeli armored forces and ends with the following passage:

"In conclusion I shall not ask you gentlemen to decide whether Egypt or Israel is stronger; I shall leave it to the Israelis to find out for themselves the danger that is now threatening them from our armored forces, lurking in the Sinai desert to spring the trap on them."

(Signed) YUZBASHI,
*Commander, First Armored Division.*

NAZI GERMANY IS THE MODEL

From training pamphlet No. 42, April 1955, issued by the training and education branch of the Egyptian Army:

"Germany convinced herself that the Jews are traitors and could not be trusted, and so she expelled them from her land, * * * but outside of Palestine they could not find any refuge.

"In the years 1935–36, the Arabs stood up with arms against the Jews in order to drive them back into their countries of origin and clear them out of Palestine. The Palestine war united the Arabs in their aim to expel the Jews from the Holy Land and to return the refugees who were driven out by Israel. The Arab countries continue to proclaim their hatred of the Jews and are preparing to drive them out of the Holy Land.

"Thus history repeats itself. The Arabs refuse to leave even a single Jew in Palestine so that the country will be all Arab. Today it is we who are in the first line, preparing ourselves for the battle which will end in the annihilation of Israel."

THE FEDAYEEN

Nasser: "I was no stranger to the fedayeen. I knew them in Faluja during the war in Palestine. When I decided to raise a unit of fedayeen I was reminded of the Faluja days and I knew at once that the sons of that land who have faith in their rights to it would be worthy to bear the name of fedayeen." (In a statement made to a correspondent of the Cairo daily Al Akhbar, and broadcast by Cairo Radio on May 29, 1956.)

Hassan el Bakouri (Egyptian Minister of Religious Properties): "There is no reason why the faithful fedayeen, hating their enemies, should not penetrate into Israel and transform the lives of its citizens into a hell. Yes, brother and sister Arabs. The fedayeen will be victorious because their motives are holy and their aims are the highest. They will be victorious because they are more diligent in death than Israel is in life." (Voice of the Arabs radio, April 11, 1956.)

Government-controlled Radio Cairo: "Egypt has decided to dispatch her heroes, the disciples of Pharaoh and the sons of Islam, and they will cleanse the land of Palestine. Therefore, ready yourselves; shed tears, cry out and weep, O Israel, because the day of your liquidation is near. This we have decided and this is our belief. * * * There will be no peace on the border because we demand vengeance and vengeance is Israel's death." (August 31, 1955.)

The documents captured in the Sinai campaign clearly prove the objectives of the fedayeen murder gangs, organized by Nasser to take vengeance on Israel through a hit-and-run campaign of murder of civilians and sabotage of vital installations.

Infiltration and marauding had been going on ever since the 1949 armistice agreement, though on a smaller scale. In 1955, Nasser organized and trained the fedayeen as a paramilitary force, equipped and directed by the Egyptian Army.

Their function was to enter deep into Israel territory, ambush road traffic, kill men, women, and children, blow up wells and water installations, mine roads, collect military data, and at night demolish houses in which settlers and their families were peacefully asleep.

Israel's narrow size and long frontiers surrounded on three sides by Arab States made it an ideal target for these hit-and-run tactics. The country has virtually no hinterland. At its widest point, it is not more than 68 miles across. At its narrowest point, there are only 10 miles from the Mediterranean to Israel's eastern frontier. Few villages and towns are far from the border.

The accelerated fedayeen attacks followed Nasser's arms deal with the Soviet bloc. By November 1956 Israel, as a result of Egyptian action, had experienced 1,834 cases of armed robbery and theft, 1,339 cases of armed clashes with Egyptian armed forces, 439 cases of incursions from Egyptian-controlled territory, 172 cases of sabotage perpetrated by Egyptian military units and fedayeen in Israel. Over 450 Israel citizens were killed and over 1,000 wounded by fedayeen terrorists and other Arab attackers.

CHARACTER OF THE FEDAYEEN

The fedayeen were recruited for the most part from the destitute Arab population in the Gaza Strip which had been captured by the Egyptian Army when it invaded Palestine in 1948.

After recruitment, the fedayeen were first trained in Egypt and then employed on a monthly basis or paid for each mission. A large proportion of them were murderers and criminals released from prison on condition that they join the fedayeen units. Following is a document on this subject found by Israel troops in Gaza. The translation of the first paragraph reads as follows:

JULY 10, 1955.

To: Head of Operations Division.
From: Headquarters, Military Forces in Sinai—Intelligence.
Subject: The Palestine National Guard.
Reference: Your letter of November 6, 1955.

1. These volunteers were recruited for service in the national guard, and not in the regular forces, by the Chief of Intelligence in Palestine, and most of them have a criminal past and they have but one desire: to wreak vengeance on Israel and to steal there. The action of the volunteers was taken in accordance with the proposal of the above-mentioned chief of intelligence to the commanding general of the armed forces, who approved it on condition that the volunteers constitute a part of the Egyptian National Guard. The approval was given during a visit of the commanding general at the front.

The document is signed by:

Lt. Col. AHMAD SALEM,
*Staff Officer, Commander of the Military Forces in Sinai.*

EGYPTIAN ARMY INTERVENES ON BEHALF OF FEDAYEEN ON TRIAL FOR MURDER

How the Egyptians recruited murderers and other criminals for the fedayeen is further substantiated in a copy of an official letter sent to the administrative governor of Gaza by Egypt's chief of intelligence, commander of the fedayeen, in a successful intervention in behalf of Yunes Mubarak Hassan el-Abid, on trial for murder in Gaza.

The letter dated September 17, 1955, and signed by Maj. Mustafa Muhammad Hafez, said:

"The above-mentioned represents our office and is one of our most trusted men. He can always be depended upon to perform important and dangerous missions. During the period in which he worked for our office, he was a paragon of manhood and highest courage, always showing his love and readiness for sacrifice for Egypt and the Egyptian armed forces.

He has already proved this in the past by performing good deeds, especially quite recently.

The above mentioned has volunteered to work with the Palestinian national guard and has performed numerous infiltrations into Israel together with his comrades. He acted in causing explosions and sabotage and killings to avenge the incursion of the Jews into our position in Hamam on August 22, 1955.

These operations had important consequences for they instilled fear and anxiety into the Israel nation. They also raised the morale of Gaza residents and refugees, as well as members of the armed forces at that moment. These acts have raised high the name of Egypt among nations, and especially among the Arab peoples.

The lion's share of these wonderful acts belongs to the above-mentioned. He and the men of his squads have done good deeds, which it is worth while to mention and to praise. And there they are:

On August 29, 1955, they performed the following acts of revenge:

1. Killed three people working in an orange grove in Beit Hanan, 12901495.

2. Killed a mechanic in the power stations near al-Kubeiba.

3. Exploded a charge under the 70-meter main mast of the broadcasting station. Four subsidiary masts depend on this main mast in the Kubeiba area, 12721448.

4. Attacked the Jaliya settlement near al-Kubeiba, killing a man and wounding four others. Destroyed a building and damaged the store, or the dining room of the settlement.

5. Laid an ambush on the main road at al-Mughar. They saw a convoy of 22 various vehicles coming from the north. They opened submachinegun fire on a pickup which was last in the convoy. The vehicle had to stop and return fire, then continued its way to overtake the convoy. It is to be presumed that there were casualties among the occupants of the vehicle. The men of the ambush succeeded in escaping eastward and laid another ambush in the area of el-Jabaliya, between the village of Ajjur 14281219 and the village of Tel e-Safi.

On August 30, 1955, they performed the following operations:

1. Attacked a civilian pickup on its way from Tel e-San to the Ajjur settlement and killed its three occupants, destroying the vehicle.

2. Attacked the settlement of Sumeil, destroying its guardhouse by throwing a hand grenade on it. Later they infiltrated into the settlement and blew up a house and all its inhabitants and later fled.

3. Lay in ambush along the road which links the village of al-Jasir to Falujja and attacked a pickup vehicle belonging to the Israel army and carrying soldiers. The vehicle was damaged and it is presumed that there were casualties among the passengers.

4. Ambushed three vehicles carrying soldiers on the Falujja-Abu Jaber road. It is presumed that there were casualties among the Jewish soldiers.

5. During their stay in this area they saw a convoy of 86 vehicles moving from north to south, and informed us accordingly.

Attached are several cuttings from the Egyptian press describing the acts of valor of the fedayeen.

As the above-mentioned is one of the accused in major crimes case No. 26/55, and taking into account his wonderful acts, we would ask you to have mercy on him and weigh his past full of acts of sacrifice. A way should be found to help him and not endanger his life. It may be mentioned as well that there will be an opportunity to use him in the future if he knows that the authorities took notice of his courageous actions in the past.

CAPTURED FEDAYEEN DESCRIBES TERROR GOAL

The character of the terrorism practiced is corroborated in the testimony of fedayeen captured in Israel.

Thus Abdullah Hassan Abu Sardani told the Jaffa military court, April 1956:

"I heard that the fedayeen receives a wage of 9 Egyptian pounds per mission, so I decided to enlist at the office of Major Hafiz. After training for 15 days at Mahal in the Gaza strip, I was sent to a camp in Egypt near the Pyramids. There, Egyptian officers taught us how to use British rifles, the Bren and Browning machineguns, the Karl Gustav automatic, and hand grenades. After that, I returned to a fedayeen base in the Gaza Strip, Major Hafiz sent two groups of us into Israel. One was instructed to reach Jaffa; the second, consisting of 10 men, was to attack the area Wadi Rubin, Yavne, Kubeiba, Gedera, Rishon-le-Zion. At the border, Major Hafiz shook hands with everyone and said: 'Good luck. You know your jobs—shoot up vehicles and kill everyone in sight.' We answered: 'Right, sir, that's what we are paid for.' We carried 400 bullets each and hand grenades. We were taken to the border by jeep and crossed the lines near the orchards at Beit Hanun."

EGYPTIAN EMBASSY IN JORDAN IS FEDAYEEN BASE

Having done their nefarious work in Israel, the fedayeen crossed over into Jordanian territory and handed over their arms and supplies to the Egyptian Embassy in Amman. These documents reveal the connivance between Egyptian and Jordanian authorities in the conduct of terrorist activities against Israel:

"Directorate of Military Intelligence, Intelligence Office—Palestine, No. 3597/24/1, Gaza 15.8 1956.

"Subject: Supplies and arms that the Palestinian fedayeen have transferred to the Egyptian Embassy in Amman.

"EXECUTIVE OFFICER: This is to notify you that the Palestinian fedayeen that arrived in Jordan and have accomplished acts of revenge in Israel during the period April 8–15, 1956, have returned their arms and supplies to the Egyptian Embassy in Amman. In Gaza a committee has been organized to register these supplies and arms. The lists have been passed to the Eastern Command.

"Enclosed find copy of said lists for your knowledge and use.

"SAGH (Major),
*"Assistant Director, Field Military Intelligence, Mohammed Fathi Mahmoud,*
"(For Bikbashi (Lieutenant Colonel)).

"For your information—copy to commander of the liberation army.

"List of arms transferred to the Egyptian Embassy in Jordan in the period April 8–15, 1956, giving registration numbers of all weapons. Total: 59 units Karl-Gustav submachineguns (with the registration numbers of the weapons) 295 Karl-Gustav magazines and 1 rifle."

U. N. CHIEF OF STAFF SAYS SPONSORS OF FEDAYEEN ARE AGGRESSORS

On March 17, 1955, Gen. E. L. M. Burns, then chief of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, reported to the Security Council: "Infiltration from Egyptian controlled territory has not been the only cause of present tension, but has undoubtedly been one of the main causes."

On April 8, 1956, General Burns, in a letter to Israel's Foreign Minister, declared, inter alia: "I am dispatching to the Foreign Minister of Egypt a protest against the action of the fedayeen, assuming it to have been authorized or tolerated by the Egyptian authorities, and requesting the immediate withdrawal of any persons under Egyptian control from the territory of Israel.

"I consider that if Egypt has ordered these fedayeen raids she has put herself in the position of an aggressor."

FEDAYEEN ARE PRAISED FOR THEIR ATTACKS

For efficiency in acts of murder and sabotage, the fedayeen were awarded certificates of merit:

*"General Command of the Armed Forces, Gaza Area Command, Aref Post.*

"Certificate of Merit

"No. Rank: A volunteer sergeant.

"Name: Al Sayed Hasan Dahasmah.

"Unit: K. 313.

"I, Captain Tala'at Suleyman Jalabi, Commander of the Aref post, hereby declare that the above mentioned has fulfilled his holy mission on the land of Palestine on May 28, 1956, in a perfect way. He acted on the Israeli soil with exemplary courage, valor and bravery, and maintained excellent discipline, the highest morale and a noble behavior. He is a man who understands and appreciates discipline and reveres it.

"Thereby the present certificate is delivered to him.

"(Signed) CAPT. TALA'AT SULEYMAN,
*Commander, Aref Post."*

*"General command of the armed forces, Gaza Strip command, Araf post*

"Certificate of Merit

"Name: Mohammed Al Sid Al-Hashash.

"Rank: Volunteer sergeant.

"Unit: National Guard.

"I, Uzabashi (Captain) Talaat Suleyman Jalabi, commander of the Araf post, give witness herewith that the above has fulfilled his holy duties in Palestine during the period 6 June 1956 to 6 September 1956 and fulfilled his tasks inside the area of Israel in the best way possible. He has served as a sublime example of bravery, heroism and willingness to sacrifice himself. In addition he set an example of the highest discipline and high morale and is able to assume responsibility to the full.

"This certificate is issued for the above reasons.

"Uzbashi (captain),
"Commander Araf Post.

"Certificate issued on 6.9.56."

SOME TYPICAL FEDAYEEN ACTIVITIES

These are some typical terrorist activities carried out by the fedayeen in Israel:

On March 24, 1955, Patish (a village in the Negev) was attacked while a wedding celebration was going on. One of the bridesmaids was killed, and 20 other guests were wounded.

On October 27, 1955, there were seven attacks by fedayeen in Israel territory adjacent to the Gaza Strip. A farmer was killed, several others wounded in highway ambushes; two wells were blown up.

Two days later 4 workers were ambushed and killed; 2 soldiers were shot to death and 5 others wounded when their vehicles struck a mine near the settlement of Beeri.

In Gela village a well was blown up, at Nahla grenades were thrown into a farmer's house and a woman was severely injured. There were further ambushes and attacks on the following days, the entire toll being ten dead and many wounded.

Three weeks later fedayeen ambushed a bus traveling from Safad to Haifa, attacking it with machinegun fire and hand grenades, killing and wounding twelve of the passengers.

Between April 7 and 11, 1956, the wave of fedayeen murder and destruction reached its peak. During those five days there was a total of 64 attacks, in which 14 people were killed and 43 wounded. Among them six children and their teacher, who were murdered at the agricultural school of Shafrir while attending evening services.

In the summer of 1956, following the nationalization of the Suez Canal by the Egyptian Government, and the subsequent international conferences and discussions, there was a comparative lull in the activities of the fedayeen. However, as soon as Security Council discussions on the Suez Canal issue had come to an end, Egypt again felt free to turn against Israel and orders were given for a resumption of the fedayeen raids into Israeli territory:

In 1 week, 24 Israeli citizens were killed and wounded by the terrorist squads.

On October 14, 1956, the fedayeen organized a raid on Sde Boker, the Negev home of the Prime Minister of Israel, deep inside Israeli territory.

Commenting upon this raid, Cairo Radio, on October 16, 1956, broadcast the text of an official communique issued by fedayeen headquarters in Gaza: "The fedayeen headquarters in Gaza has issued a communique stating that a group of fedayeen succeeded on October 13 to cross the southern border of Palestine in order to discover the concentration points and the factories which the Zionists have started to transfer to the coastal region so as to get them out of the fire range of Egyptian guns which threaten to destroy them. The communique of fedayeen headquarters in Gaza states also that all the fedayeen returned safely to their bases, except two who are believed to have been killed in an encounter which took place between them and the guards of Prime Minister Ben-Gurion's home in Sde Boker. Further, it is believed that two other fedayeen have been wounded and taken to a hospital in Rehovoth. The fifth of the fedayeen has not yet returned from his mission in occupied Palestine."

On October 15, 1956, an ambulance was ambushed north of Safiah.

On October 20, 2 army vehicles were blown up by mines placed on the Ketziot road, and 3 soldiers were killed and 27 wounded.

FEDAYEEN REORGANIZED AFTER SINAI CAMPAIGN

After the Sinai campaign Nasser reorganized his fedayeen operations so that on December 2, 1956, the Government-controlled Cairo Radio could announce, "a heavy campaign inside Israel in the coming winter."

And on December 24, 1956, Cairo Radio stated that "if Israel prevented the use of Gaza bases there are many other places which could be used for that purpose." "The Government of Egypt is organizing fedayeen and instilling them with readiness to fight." Other Arab governments, the broadcast said, "are training fedayeen and instructing them in warfare which is neither forbidden nor shameful."

During the month of December 1956, over 30 raids were organized inside Israel from bases in Jordan and Lebanon.

TEACHING HATRED

Nasser: "I am not fighting solely against Israel but also against world Zionism and Jewish capital. My task is to deliver the Arab world from destruction through Zionist intrigue which has its roots in the United States and which receives aid from Britain and France. * * * The hatred of the Arabs against the Zionists is very strong, and there is no sense in talking about peace with Israel. There is not even the smallest place for negotiations between the Arabs and Israel." (Interview with New York Post correspondent, October 14, 1955.)

Radio Cairo: "Peace between us and the Jews is impossible. As far as we are concerned, it is a matter of life and death, not a dispute over frontiers or interests. Nor is it a difference over viewpoints which require mediation for settlement. The Middle East cannot hold both of us. It is either we or them. * * * There is no other solution. * * * Steel and bullets will realize our objectives." (In a broadcast on January 12, 1956.)

The campaign of hate against Israel does not stop short of the schools. It is part of classroom instruction in Egypt. Reproduced below are drawings submitted by high-school students, in El Arish, chief town of the Sinai Desert, in an examination under the general heading of "Ambushing Israelis."

MEIN KAMPF

An Arabic translation of Hitler's Mein Kampf was part of the standard issue to Egyptian officers. This is the cover and frontispiece of copies found on Egyptian prisoners-of-war.

---

THE BLACK RECORD—NASSER'S PERSECUTION OF EGYPTIAN JEWRY

INTRODUCTION

On October 29, 1956, units of the Israeli Army entered the Sinai Peninsula. On November 1, within 72 hours of this thrust, the Egyptian Government promulgated a series of detailed, highly complex decrees which, among other things, established a state of siege, imposed a thorough-going censorship, facilitated the denationalization of certain Egyptian citizens, and provided a juridical basis for the subsequent sequestration and confiscation of property of various private persons.

On the very next day, November 2, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a resolution calling for a cease-fire and the withdrawal of Israeli, British and French forces from Egypt. On the following day, the United Nations adopted a resolution calling for the creation of a U. N. emergency force to enforce the truce. On November 4, the Egyptian Government published further military decrees implementing its earlier regulations for the seizure of private property. On November 6, the United Nations cease-fire was accepted by the belligerent parties and arrangements were made for supervision of the cease-fire by an international U. N. police force.

It was expected that the repressive measures enacted during the hostilities would be withdrawn or annulled after the cease-fire. But this expectation proved futile. Beginning with reports received from Cairo on November 15, and almost daily thereafter, it became evident that Egypt was bent on exploiting the brief hostilities to despoil and ultimately destroy its Jewish community. Indeed, after the termination of hostilities, the persecutions of Egyptian Jewry, far from diminishing, took on such intensity that their ultimate import could not be mistaken. The initial reports from Cairo came to the world's notice in confused and fragmentary form. This was due to the special care taken by the Nasser regime to obscure the truth and veil its arbitrary actions in secrecy. Patterned on Nazi techniques, the Egyptian campaign against the Jews has been con-

ducted with ruthless efficiency and disregard of the minimal moral standards that civilized nations embrace.

There are, however, important differences between Hitler's and Nasser's approach. The latter has learned to avoid the errors committed by Hitler. Where Hitler's anti-Semitism was blatantly avowed, Nasser's anti-Semitism is concealed. Where Hitler openly attacked Jews as Jews, Nasser has resorted to the disingenuous pretense that his animus is limited to "Zionists." In short, the Egyptian Government has learned from Hitler's example that it cannot afford to ignore world opinion and that it is more expedient to conduct its anti-Jewish campaign in a manner that would avoid international notoriety. In the words of Dean James A. Pike of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York, "Nasser is much more clever than the Nazis."

The precautions of secrecy taken by the Nasser regime and its deliberate obfuscations made it difficult in the initial stages of the anti-Jewish campaign to piece together an exact picture of what was taking place in Egypt. The early reports could only hint at the systematic and well-organized plan, long in preparation, that had been put into practice to pauperize, denationalize and expel the Jewish community. Since then, thousands of Egyptian Jews have arrived in Europe and Israel and have corroborated by their own experiences the harrowing reports of journalists, travelers, and diplomats about the desperate plight of the Jewish community of Egypt. Official Egyptian documents also have come to light which testify to the drastic measures adopted by Egypt to destroy the Jewish community.

The physical survival of one of the oldest and most peaceful religious communities of the world is at stake. Its rescue depends upon firm intervention with the Nasser regime by our own country as well as by the other free nations.

### I. EGYPTIAN XENOPHOBIA

#### *The semantic ruse*

Spokesmen for the Egyptian Government have repeatedly denied that it is engaged in a campaign of anti-Jewish repression; they contend that whatever action has been taken against Jews has been directed solely against "Zionist agents." But the fact is that the Zionist movement has had little influence among Egyptian Jews. This is not surprising if only because Egypt's 50,000 Jews, a tiny minority in Egypt's total population of 22,000,000, would not have been so foolhardy, even if they so desired, to espouse pro-Zionist or pro-Israel attitudes since 1948, let alone engage in any acts even remotely inimical to the security of the Egyptian Government.

But as Fred Sparks, a Scripps-Howard correspondent, has observed, the Egyptian authorities emphasize the anti-Zionist rather than the anti-Jewish aspects of their discrimination strictly for public relations purposes:

"At this time there is 'no anti-Jewish terror' in the manner of a Hitler-style pogrom. The pressure—subtle and unofficial—is a 'shadowy persecution.' * * * The Government has condemned anti-Jewish threats and violence; such publicity cannot serve Colonel Nasser in his battle for world opinion." (New York World Telegram, December 27, 1956.)

But in 1947, Egyptian leaders were less discreet. Dr. Mohammed Hussein Heykal Pasha, then chief of the Egyptian delegation to the United Nations, publicly warned that:

"The lives of 1,000,000 Jews in Moslem countries would be jeopardized by partition * * * if Arab blood is shed in Palestine, Jewish blood will necessarily be shed elsewhere in the world despite all the sincere efforts of the Government concerned to prevent such reprisals." (New York Times, November 25, 1947.)

These threats are now realities. Despite avowals by Egypt's officials that there is hostility only to Zionists and not to other Jews, open anti-Semitic comments have appeared in the Egyptian press and have been made by Colonel Nasser himself. On August 14, 1955, he publicly stated:

"I am not fighting solely against world Zionism and Jewish capital." (Al Ahram, Cairo, August 15, 1955.)

Following the same line, the Cairo newspaper, El Tahrir, on November 27, 1956—that is, after the wartime censorship had already been instituted and no newspaper article could appear without the sanction of the Egyptian Ministry of the Interior—published an article describing the history, traditions, and religious practices of the Jews, in terms as odious as any that can be found in the Nazi and Fascist publications of the 1930's and 1940's.

If there was any lingering doubt that the semantic maneuver of adopting the term "Zionist" for "Jew" was designed solely to divert world opinion from the essential character of Egypt's anti-Jewish campaign, it is finally dispelled by the scope of that campaign. The number of Jews affected by the acts of internment, expulsion, and sequestration is so large as to preclude any belief that the target of Egypt's wrath is solely the "Zionists" who allegedly menace Egypt's security.

#### *The doctrine of "Egyptianization"*

In the earlier phases of the Egyptian anti-Jewish outbreaks, there was a tendency to believe that they represented merely a temporary and passing expression of ultra-nationalist fervor intensified by Israel's entry into Sinai. But the scope of the continuing anti-Jewish campaign, and the speed with which it has reached into every corner of Egyptian Jewish life, indicate that it is the culmination of a carefully prepared and planned design for the dispersion and destruction of the Jewish community.

One of the proudly proclaimed doctrines of the Nasser revolution is that of "Egyptianization." This professedly is intended only to encourage domestic ownership of domestic industry, but actually it is a euphemism for a program that includes the expropriation of private property, the exclusion from economic life, and the expulsion from Egypt not only of so-called "enemy aliens" and "foreigners" but also of non-Moslem native Egyptians, no matter how long they and their families have resided within the land. It should be borne in mind that a large majority of the 50,000 Jews living in Egypt were born there and derive from families who have lived there for generations, but that less than 20 percent have been permitted to obtain Egyptian citizenship. About 15,000 were deemed stateless and the rest were technically the nationals of foreign countries, principally Great Britain, France, Italy and Greece, even though most of them had never been outside of Egypt's borders.

The Egyptian authorities, by restrictive interpretation of the Nationality Act of September 13, 1950, as well as earlier statutes, for years have in effect barred all Jews from citizenship in the interest of preserving national homogeneity. Since 1936, an occasional Jew has been permitted naturalization, but throughout this period such cases were exceptional. It is ironic that many technically stateless Jews, as well as those nominally nationals of other countries, belong to families whose residence in Egypt antedates that of some members of the military junta now in control of the government.

Nevertheless, these are the persons now being made the principal victims of Egyptianization. The way this program operates to exclude them from virtually all segments of Egyptian economic life is demonstrated by the effect of a decree announced in Cairo on January 15, 1957. To quote the New York Times of January 16:

"Nasser has decreed the 'Egyptianization' of all British and French banks and insurance companies in Egypt. * * * All other foreign banks and insurance companies were given 5 years before they too would be 'Egyptianized'. * * * Private shareholders will continue to retain their stocks in companies, but all shareholders must have been born in Egypt and must be Egyptian citizens. Directors must be nativeborn citizens also. * * * Another decree to become effective tomorrow makes it imperative that all agents representing foreign manufacturers in Egypt must be native-born Egyptian citizens. However, the Government can in certain cases extend permission to foreigners to continue as agents of those companies for five years more."

Since a large proportion of the Jewish community has been barred from Egyptian citizenship, this decree disqualifies practically all Jews from participating in any Egyptian financial corporation. The "Egyptianization" program under Nasser is reminiscent of the Nazi slogan "Germany for the Germans" and the Nazi technique for pauperizing the Jews and forcing them out of the country.

That the destruction of the Jewish community is a deliberate and long-planned policy of the Nasser administration is made evident by the dispatch with which it promulgated its new nationality laws and the regulations governing the sequestration of private property. These decrees are intricate and comprehensive. They are obviously the product of considerable study and preparation. They could not have been conceived, written and printed in the three or four days that intervened between the opening of military hostilities between Israel and Egypt and their publication in official journals. The very perfection of the techniques now employed by the Egyptian government clearly indicates that these acts reflect not an improvised response in a moment of crisis but a thorough and well-wrought plan for the spoliation and destruction of the ancient Jewish community of Egypt.

In carrying out this design the Nasser government has resorted to four principal measures: (1) seizure of hostages; (2) denationalization of Jews; (3) internments and expulsions; and (4) sequestration of property.

### II. TECHNIQUES OF DESTRUCTION

#### *The seizure of hostages*

The most reprehensible of all the acts of persecution ordered by Nasser—the seizure of hostages—is motivated by two considerations: to terrorize the Jewish community and to intimidate Jews expelled from the country from speaking the truth about what is taking place in Egypt. In seizing hostages, it has reverted to a method of suppression that all civilized states have abjured. In seeking to ensure the silence of the Jews who have departed from Egypt, the Nasser regime has emulated typical totalitarian practices.

An Associated Press dispatch from Port Said on November 26, 1956, reported that "Jews began leaving Port Said today, leaving behind hostages seized from each family by the Egyptians the night before the British and French landings." The seizure of hostages was confirmed the next day by Mr. Harry Coe, the British consul in Port Said. Mr. Coe declared that he had received reports that of the 300 Jewish residents of Port Said one member of each family was taken away by the Egyptian police and none has been heard from since. He added that the secret police reportedly seized a number of Jewish leaders in raids in other Egyptian

cities. (New York World Telegram, November 29, 1956.)

This practice of seizing hostages extended beyond the immediate emergency of the British and French landings. On December 15, the Washington Star reported:

"The last shipload of Jews fled Port Said yesterday, leaving behind two frightened families. These two refused to depart until their men are released from hostage.

"They say it's no use going anywhere without their men," explained Rabbi Marcel Kalifa, Jewish chaplain for the French forces who supervised yesterday's departure. "They feel life isn't worth while with just half their families and they would just as well suffer here as somewhere else."

He added: "Please, no names, they're in trouble enough already."

"Jewish families had been visited by Egyptian secret police in the early morning hours just before British and French troops landed here last month and one member of each family was taken hostage. There has been no word of them since, Jews here say. Rabbi Kalifa said his check of families here showed 92 had been taken from Port Said's total Jewish population of 300 in that raid."

On December 12, a New York Post correspondent reported that he had personally talked to a dozen persons whose friends and relations had disappeared, and that in a synagogue he visited "every Jew I talked to had a close friend or relative who had just 'disappeared.'"

*The denationalization process*

A product of the combined thinking of Egypt's Jewish department and the authors of the Egyptianization program was Law No. 329, issued on November 20, 1956 by President Nasser. This law, in effect, denationalized all Zionists and laid the groundwork for branding as undesirable all stateless Jews in Egypt because of their alleged failure to integrate themselves into Egyptian life and because of their presumably unstable loyalty to the state. The text of the law was published in Egypt's Journal du Commerce et de la Marine and reproduced in the Egyptian newspaper, Le Progrés Egyptien.

The most drastic feature of this law is contained in Article 1, which stipulates that "neither Zionists, nor those against whom a judgment has been handed down for crimes of disloyalty to the country or for treason" are to be considered Egyptian nationals, and that "no request for the delivery of a certificate of Egyptian nationality will be accepted from persons known as Zionists." The law provides that the citizenship of all Jews who acquired Egyptian nationality after January 1, 1900, is to be reexamined for possible denationalization proceedings and only those who can persuade the minister of interior that they are not lacking in loyalty and that they are not Zionists are secure against cancellation of nationality.

It has already been noted that the Egyptian authorities tend to use the terms Zionist and Jew interchangeably. When this is taken into account, along with what is known of the avowed anti-Jewish views of Zakariah Mohieddine, who functions in Egypt as chief censor as well as minister of the interior, it is evident that the Jews who apply to him for preserving their nationality will receive scant sympathy. Whatever their personal beliefs and sympathies, Egyptian Jewish nationals who acquired citizenship after 1900 have only the remotest chance of maintaining their nationality.

The chief effect of the new nationality law will be to augment the ranks of stateless Egyptian Jews, and this is an ominous time in Egypt to be rendered stateless. The promulgation of this law heralds the summary deportation of 15,000 stateless Jews.

One of the more cynical aspects of Egypt's anti-Jewis campaign is its use of legal forms to disguise its lawless behavior. The Egyptian Government has effected the mass eviction of Jews on the pretext of their anomalous legal status. It has expelled or forced the departure of thousands of persons whose sole fault is that they could not persuade the Egyptian Government that Jewish affiliation should be no bar to citizenship. The average stateless Jew in Egypt is neither a recent arrival nor a person indifferent to citizenship. Typically, he belongs to a family that has resided in the country for generations and has made energetic efforts to acquire nationality. In other modern States he would be considered eminently qualified for the responsibilities and opportunities of citizenship. In selecting stateless Jews as the chief victims of xenophobic nationalism, the Egyptian Government was careful to single out the most vulnerable group in the country. The stateless persons can make no claim to the protection of any government and there exists no official agency empowered to intervene in their behalf.

The mass expulsion of the Jewish community began with the sudden and shocking notification to thousands of stateless persons that they were to be expelled, in most cases within a matter of 7 to 10 days. The alternative to evacuation was internment. There was no publication of an edict, or decree, or general order of expulsion. In most cases, police descended on the stateless Jews and ordered them to leave or face imprisonment. In a few cases, however, Egyptian police did isue to individuals written orders of expulsion in the expectation that these documents would be extracted from them at the time of departure. A few of these orders, however, were brought out of Egypt.

After originally concentrating its fire mainly on stateless Jews, the Egyptian Government began to widen its target. It does not trouble now to make nice distinctions as to nationality. There are reports that on November 23, 1956, instructions were issued by Sheikh El Bakouri, the Egyptian Minister of Religious Affairs, and read on that day by order of the government in every mosque in every town and village in Egypt. El Bakouri announced that from that day on all Jews in Egypt were to be regarded and treated as enemies of the country. He urged the people of Egypt to refrain from contact, whether comercial or social, with Egyptian Jews, and assured them that the remaining Jews would soon be compelled to depart. He stated that the government was proceeding expeditiously to rid Egypt of the Jews; and on that ground alone asked Egyptians to refrain from private retaliations against them.

*Mass arrests*

Under cover of legalistic pretexts for persecution, the life of the Egyptian Jewish community has already been converted into a nightmare of oppression. Emergency Law No. 533 of 1954 authorized the Military Governor of Egypt to "order the arrest and apprehension of suspects and those who prejudice public order and security." The provisions of this law furnished the legal basis for the arrest and detention of thousands of persons, including many already under order of deportation but who were unable to obtain foreign passage. It is estimated that at least 1,000 persons were imprisoned under wretched physical conditions in the Prison des Barrages in Cairo, and in special detention centers in Cairo, Alexandria, Assouan, and Heliopolis. Those jailed included practically every leader in Egyptian Jewish communal life. Almost every member of the Jewish Community Councils of both Cairo and Alexandria was arrested and imprisoned in the earliest stages of the terror. A few have since been released.

In seeking to screen its ruthless conduct from the world the Egyptian Government has not been entirely successful. It is impossible, despite the most carefully contrived schemes, to conceal official crimes of such scope. In the first weeks of December a number of Egyptian Jewish escapees gave affidavits to the American Jewish Congress, attesting to the measures employed by the Egyptian Government to oppress its Jewish population and to harass them into voluntary flight. These persons are unwilling to disclose their names for publication but they are ready to appear before any official agency of the United States or the United Nations to describe the conditions they have personally witnessed in Egypt. The reason for their insistence on anonymity is understandable and, of itself, a significant commentary on Egypt's reign of terror.

There are uniform themes running through all the statements that have been received. The mass arrests of Egyptian Jews are accompanied by no legal warrant and there is no provision for arraignment or indictment. There is no discernible pattern or rationale in the sequence of arrests or in the manner in which individuals are singled out for imprisonment. No one is appraised of the identity of others arrested or of the grounds for arrest. Part of the nightmarish atmosphere derives from the mixture of informality and ruthlessness with which the arrests are carried out. The police appear suddenly at the residence of the person to be arrested, almost always late at night or in the early morning, obviously to avoid public attention. Occasionally the arresting officers are in civilian dress. There is no explanation for the arrest and very little conversation of any kind. Persons arrested are quietly ordered to pack a small case of personal articles and are then taken to the nearest police station. From that point they are assigned to detention centers. During the arrests there is no violence. The police have been careful to permit no show of brutality on the streets. But this restraint is dropped at the door of the detention centers.

As noted earlier, stateless Jews at first comprised the overwhelming majority of those arrested. But since then Jews of all nationalities have been interned. Possession of a passport of another country, even one at peace with Egypt, offers no protection to Egyptian Jews. At best, a foreign passport serves only to expedite final departure. The American Jewish Congress has in its files an affidavit from an American Jew interned in Egypt recently even though he had been traveling on a United States passport. This person, a native of Cairo, had entered the United States as a quota immigrant but had returned to Egypt to attend to personal business affairs. He was released from prison only after he had guaranteed he would leave Egypt.

While it is impossible to determine the exact number of arrests, it is certain that they have been carried out steadily since Israel's entry into Sinai. A dispatch appearing in the New York Times as early as November 24 reported that:

"Two days after the Israeli attack of October 29, the Egyptian police rounded up between 25 and 30 Jews and took them to Cairo. In effect, they are hostages there. 'What can I do? What can I do?' an elderly widow sobbed. Her older daughter, age 30, was among those taken to Cairo."

On the same day the Times correspondent in Cairo, Osgood Caruthers, noted that although "the Egyptians have made it a matter of basic doctrine that their strongest opposition was aimed at Zionism and at Israel, and not against the Jewish people," nevertheless the arrest orders "according to authoritative estimates affect thousands of Jews in Cairo who are of foreign nationality, many of them British and French subjects, or who are in the status of stateless persons. It was not known how many others might be affected throughout the rest of the country." He went on to observe:

"As it is, Britons, Frenchmen, and Jews of foreign nationality, or in the stateless

category, were being given individual orders as to when they were to pack up and leave the country. They were permitted to take with them 20 Egyptian pounds ($56) for each adult and 10 Egyptian pounds for each minor."

On November 27, a New York Herald Tribune correspondent reported from Port Said:

"Some 150 Jews, many of them old residents of this city, fled Egypt today on board a French hospital ship.

"Taking along not much more than they could carry, they sailed for Marseilles with 37 other evacuees from this occupied area. The group, which included 30 children, departed rather than face an uncertain fate when Anglo-French forces leave and the Egyptian Government takes over again.

"Before the trouble began, the community totaled an estimated 300 families. * * * The number of Jews still here is believed to be less than 50.

"Most of the group were stateless, but a few carried Egyptian passports. They sailed with refugee permits that will allow them to stay in France for 3 months before deciding on a new domicile."

An International News Service correspondent reported that a Jewish escapee in Paris had told him:

" 'The policeman who arrested me was a fairly high official,' he told me: 'We've got a list of 6,000 Jews we're going to imprison or expel. And that's only a first list of 6,000. Soon there'll be no more Jews in Egypt. You'll all have to go.' The refugees arrived in Europe begging correspondents not to use their names for fear of reprisals against relatives" (New York Journal-American, December 21, 1956).

Conditions in the improvised detention centers into which internees have been herded are appalling. The New York Post of January 8, 1957, gave this account:

"Jewish refugees arriving from Egypt disclosed today they were led handcuffed through the streets of Cairo and Alexandria and were stoned and spat upon by Arab mobs while their guards laughed and taunted: 'Now you are going to die.'

"The men among the *Misr's* passengers had all been held at the Sebil School in Cairo, which the Egyptians had converted into an internment camp. The women were interned first at the Betesh School in Heliopolis, a suburb of Cairo, and later transferred to the Citadel prison. One of the women was interned with a 2-day-old baby.

"For the first 3 days of internment the men at Sebil were kept completely without food by the camp commandant, Major Hadidi, a blue-uniformed official of the national police.

"The stocky, muscular major seems to have conformed to the classic pattern of prisoner of war and concentration camp commandants. He was violently anti-Semitic, often proclaiming that Egypt had no place for Jews—although Colonel Nasser himself has said many times that Egpyt welcomes "loyal Jews," a statement at which these refugees laugh with some ironic bitterness.

"For the first 3 days at Sebil, Major Hadidi locked 18 to 20 men in small rooms in which camp beds were packed so closely the occupants had to crawl over them to reach the door when they were finally allowed out. For the first 3 days they were kept without food.

"In all there were more than 500 men interned at Sebil. They were allowed to go to the toilet only twice a day and then only during 1 hour in morning and 1 hour in evening.

"After several weeks of internment the Egyptian government allowed a representative of the International Red Cross to visit the camp. The internees told him their serious grievances. On learning of their report Hadidi was so incensed that he locked all the men in their rooms for 3 days and gave them no food whatsoever. This meant that for two 3-day periods in the 60 days they were held, the 500 went without any sustenance at all.

"And the food, when it was given, was comparable only to prisoner of warfare in the latter days of wartime Germany. Although orders were given for the men to be allowed 2 hours of daily exercise in the open, they were never allowed out of the buildings. On arrival their watches and all personal jewelry were taken by Hadidi's guards—and never returned.

"The women internees were equally bitter. The women were first taken to the school in Heliopolis, where their food was below subsistence level and sanitation facilities limited. They also were stripped of all jewelry and trinkets."

An International News Service dispatch in the New York Journal-American of January 7 reported:

"One man told of being taken to Cairo's Abassia Prison, where he was strung up by his wrists and beaten for 3 days. He said the torture was administered by Egypt's secret police in an effort to make him tell where his fortune was hidden.

"He added that another prisoner subjected to the same brutality went mad.

"One woman refugee, whose husband still is in prison, related: 'The terror began soon after the war began. Superintendents of all buildings began reporting the names of all Jews and other foreigners to police. Then came the police raids and orders confining us to our apartments. When the police would come after midnight, we knew it was bad. They would point at some member of our family and say, "Come along. You're wanted." Then they would take the member to the police station and imprison him without court procedure.'

"She said the prisoners would be jailed along with criminals."

The arrival of the refugee ship *Misr* in Naples on January 7, 1957, afforded Western correspondents the first opportunity of interviewing a substantial group of Egyptian Jews free of Egyptian surveillance. The New York Times correspondent who reported their arrival was able to persuade some of the escapees to disclose their names:

"Aboard the *Misr* were Dr. Jacob Coen and Dr. Raymond Bayer, both formerly on the staff of the Jewish Hospital in Cairo. They had been held in the Jewish school in Cairo with hundreds of other men. The women and their families had been sent to a camp at Heliopolis.

"The physicians said there were 15 camp inmates to a room in the Cairo school. After reveille at 6 a. m., armed guards marched the inmates, 3 by 3, to a washroom. Then there were checks by policemen at 10 a. m. and 2, 4, and 10 p. m.

"Rabbi Shalom Morg said that most of his fellow passengers were destitute.

"Elie Matalon, 22 years old, former employee of a photographic agency in Cairo, said he had been deprived of Egyptian citizenship and interned after he had applied for a passport to go to Paris.

"Victor Benattar, a stateless chemist, who had been working for a foreign pharmaceutical concern in Cairo, charged that Egyptian police had beaten him till he signed a declaration that he was leaving the country for good.

"Ibrahim Vetaya, born in Egypt to Turkish parents, said he had been expelled with his wife and children after local authorities had seized his textile concern and £E800,000 in his bank account. [This would be equal to $2,240,000.] None of the refugees had been allowed to take more than £E5 (about $14) out of Egypt. They had many bundles but few suitcases.

"Most of the exiles asked that their names be withheld because they feared reprisals against relatives and friends.

"Of the 967 who arrived, 394 were women and 104 were children." (Times, January 7.)

There are widespread reports that upon learning of the arrest and imprisonment of Jewish leaders, the chief rabbi of Egypt, Haim Nahoum Effendi, acted to obtain their release. His appeal was summarily rejected, and he was instructed by government officials not to meddle in "political" affairs. Rabbi Nahoum, who has held office since 1922, had been repeatedly decorated by Egyptian governments for his public services. When his attempted intervention was so brusquely rebuffed, Rabbi Nahoum—old, sick, and almost blind—sent his resignation to President Nasser. Immediately thereafter two members of the security police came to his home and took him to the Ministry of the Interior where he was ordered to rescind his resignation; this he refused to do. One of his subordinates, however, was prevailed upon to issue an unauthorized "denial" of Rabbi Nahoum's resignation to an Associated Press correspondent. This "denial" is not given much credence among the Egyptian Jews who were his congregants and were familiar with the duress to which he was subjected. The New York Post reported on January 8:

"No one believes the Egyptian version of the recent broadcast by Egypt's Chief Rabbi Nahoum. They all claim Egyptian strong-arm men visited this aging, blind martyr and said: 'You must say you are a loyal Egyptian; otherwise you are a Zionist. Zionists are our mortal enemies and if you are a Zionist all Jews here will be named Zionists and imprisoned.' "

In the face of incontrovertible evidence of the mass arrests and abuse of Egyptian Jews, Egyptian officials have blandly denied all. However, like Egyptian Foreign Minister Mahmoud Fawzi, they have been compelled to admit that "a few Jews" were taken into custody "because they were dangerous to the security of the state." (New York Times, November 29, 1956.) Fawzi's "few Jews" became in the admissions of Lt. Col. Zakariah Mohieddine, Minister of the Interior, "288 Jews" who were being detained "for reasons of security." (Times, December 4, 1956.) In addition, Colonel Mohieddine, while denying blanket seizure of Jewish property, admitted that "the assets of rich Jews" had been placed under government control "to be sure that they do not try to smuggle their money out of the country." (New York Post, December 4, 1956.) Col. Abdel Kader Hatem, director of the Egyptian Information Office, stated that of the non-Egyptian Jews in Egypt "only 280 had been asked to leave for 'security reasons,' and 26 of these were now out of the country." (New York Journal-American, December 21, 1956.) But, at another point, Colonel Hatem had the effrontery to claim that "Egypt has not deported one single Jew." (New York Post, December 26, 1956.) How much faith can be reposed in official Egyptian denials of anti-Jewish measures can be gaged by the fact that Premier Habib Bourgouiba, a Moslem himself and one who is certainly sympathetic to Arab aspirations, has found it necessary to protest to Egypt about the discrimination against Jews of Tunisian nationality. He reminded Egypt that his government had never "made any difference between Tunisians on the basis of their religion." (New York Times, December 26, 1956.)

*Deportations*

The most informed estimates indicate that between November 22, 1956, and January 23, 1957, 8,435 refugee Jews—almost one-fifth of the entire Jewish community—succeeded in making their way to various foreign ports. (A schedule of arrivals of refugee Jews from Egypt apears in the appendix.) Thousands more are anxiously seeking passage to avoid

imprisonment, and the shortage of transportation facilities has made the competition for space intense. William Richardson, in a report from Cairo published in the New York Post of December 13, 1956, contrasts the plight of the Nazi and Egyptian expellees in this regard:

"Thousands of British, French, and Jewish nationals * * * have even less chance than the Hitlerian refugees in the 1930's of salvaging anything from their property. In those days it was possible to arrange for some transfer of property. Some British and French nationals were able to help in a few cases and there were many routes out of Germany. From the day sequestration and expulsion began here there has been only one route—via a daily Scandinavian Airlines plane. Other airlines are only now beginning services from Cairo airport."

In another dispatch published January 8, Mr. Richardson reports that those fortunate enough to get passage are permitted to take with them only one suitcase of clothing and 20 Egyptian pounds ($56). They are forced to sign formal declarations promising never to return. They are required to sign away all ownership to property in Egypt and renounce all financial claim they might have. In return for the privilege of exit, they are forced to declare that all assets they leave behind are to be "given" to the Egyptian Government. There were a number of refugees who refused to leave Egypt but who were coerced into departure. Mr. Richardson continues:

"More than half the refugees to whom I talked said they had not asked permission to leave Egypt, as Nasser's government claims they did.

"On the contrary, many refused at first to sign a prepared typewritten statement saying they wished to leave. But they were forced at gunpoint to sign. At least a dozen were beaten when they refused to sign; one man so severely he was hospitalized for 10 days."

*Sequestration and confiscation*

Most Jews left behind in Egypt and who are not in jail find themselves without means of support. Bank accounts have been frozen, private and commercial property sequestered, industrial and commercial firms requisitioned and Jewish employees dismissed. A once economically independent community has been reduced to poverty and want and faces a desperate future. Department stores, banks, and textile firms known throughout Egypt and the Middle East have been sequestered or confiscated. Official lists of sequestrations contain the names of hundreds of business enterprises, including such well-known and long-established firms as the Cicurel, Chemla, Hanau, and Chalons department stores; the banking houses of Zilka and Mosseri; the Pinto Cotton firm, and many others. Conservative estimates indicate the assets sequestered or frozen amount to at least $400 million.

The principal legal device for the sequestration of Jewish property is contained in Egyptian Military Proclamation No. 4, published in the Journal Officiel No. 88 bis A of November 1, 1956. This proclamation, titled the "Administration of the Property of Persons Interned or Put Under Surveillance and Other Persons and Institutions," should be distinguished from proclamation No. 5, promulgated on the same day, which provides for the seizure and administration of assets in Egypt belonging to British, French, or Australian subjects. The very publication of proclamation No. 4 indicates that all other sequestration proclamations have some purpose apart from freezing the funds of enemy aliens.

Proclamation No. 4 is specifically addressed to the control of assets belonging to persons placed under surveillance who are not enemy nationals. It clearly contemplates the wholesale expropriation of property of stateless Jews, Egyptian Jews, and foreign Jews whose investments and assets otherwise would have escaped sequestration.

In order to concentrate large commercial holdings exclusively in the hands of Egyptian Moslems, the provisions of article 2 of proclamation No. 4 have been widely invoked. This article authorizes the designee of the state, appointed to administer a sequestered property "to agree to a settlement or to waive the total or any part of debts owing the business * * * and with the authorization of the Minister of Finance and Economy to proceed to sell the goods and to wind up any industrial or commercial enterprise or, in particular, to bring about the dissolution of the company or to acquiesce in such a dissolution."

The administrator is thus endowed with full control over the assets of the sequestered business. Debts may be forgiven at his whim, businesses may be sold and important interests may be transferred. This proclamation, moreover, goes far beyond the mere sequestration of property. It prohibits all direct or indirect transactions with any person or establishment whose property has been sequestered and bars the execution of any contract or agreement concluded by or for the benefit of such a person or establishment before the military decree was published. Finally, it has the effect of barring any person whose property has been sequestered from initiating any action in any court of Egypt or from continuing any such action already begun. Thus any firm owned or controlled by Jews is exposed to complete economic destruction. Jewish property and businesses may be seized at the whim of the administrator and transactions entered into may be retroactively nullified by the issuance of a sequestration order against which no defense is possible and from which no right of appeal exists.

The effect of giving a political functionary such absolute command over the assets of a business is to increase the opportunity for profitable side-deals and private frauds of his own. Under the law no one could question the decision of an administrator who depletes the assets of a Jewish firm in his custody through a series of disadvantageous deals with enterprises owned by Moslems. There is in addition a public purpose. The Egyptian Minister of the Interior has publicly invited Moslems to bid on shares of stock in firms sequestered from their Jewish owners. The Nasser government is thus able to advance its Egyptianization program. Under the guise of legality, it has taken properties belonging to Jews who spent their lives in developing them and placed them in the hands of Egyptian Moslems.

Proclamation No. 4 provided only the general legal authority for sequestration; within a week after its publication, implementing regulations were isued. Decree No. 170, published on November 8, 1956, listed 440 persons whose properties were to be sequestered and who were made liable to arrest and expulsion. Decree No. 171, published on November 11, mentions 25 additional persons, including the president of the Jewish community in Cairo. Decrees Nos. 174 to 196, published in the period from November 11 to 13, 1956, name 13 of the principal mercantile or commercial enterprises owned by Jews to be sequestered.

It is no accident that of the hundreds of persons who have been specifically included in decrees issued pursuant to proclamation No. 4 almost all were Jews who were either Egyptian nationals, stateless persons or nationals of countries other than Britain or France. Without the extraordinary authority of proclamation No. 4, their property could not have been touched under any regulation providing for the blocking or sequestration of the assets of enemy aliens.

In addition to the seizure of businesses under regular sequestration orders, all Jewish businesses that could be construed as having the remotest connection with defense have been expropriated under a regulation permitting the requisition by the army of all firms engaged in producing military items.

These decrees have been drastically enforced. In some cases Jewish firms simply were closed and their doors sealed. In others, a representative of the Ministry of Interior, accompanied by security officers, appeared at the firm's main offices and informed the owners that the ministry had designated an administrator of the business and that all control was to be vested in his hands. Nominally, profits accruing from these operations are to be credited to the real owner and placed in his accounts, but these accounts are frozen and from present indications Egypt has no intention of returning the funds to their legal owners. Although a few Jewish-owned enterprises have been returned, notably the Cairo department store owned by the Cicurel family, the vast bulk of Jewish property is still in government hands.

The Jewish community has also been stripped of communal property. Hospitals constructed and maintained by the community have been taken over by the Egyptian army while hospitals of other religious communities have not been touched. Jewish patients were evacuated from their hospital beds. With the requisition of the Jewish hospitals, Jewish surgeons have no access to hospital facilities. Moreover, the Medical Association of Egypt has directed the Egyptian populace to refrain from consulting Jewish physicians or surgeons for any cause.

Jews in other professions have suffered the same fate as the doctors. Jewish lawyers, nationals of Egypt, have been disbarred. Jewish engineers have been denied the right to practice. Since the Jewish laboring class was dependent for its employment upon the maintenance of Jewish enterprise, the forcible closing of Jewish business and the prohibition of Jewish professional life has resulted in the virtual exclusion from employment of the whole Egyptian Jewish community.

At the present time, with only a few exceptions, Jewish businesses are not permitted to operate in Egypt under their legal owners. Jewish employees have been dismissed from all sequestered firms including foreign corporations not owned by Jews. One informant of the American Jewish Congress related that of 40 Jews employed in the office of the Shell Oil Co. in Cairo only 4 were permitted to return to their desks on the day following the appointment of a government administrator under proclamation No. 4.

No property is too small for sequestration and government functionaries have not hesitated to exploit the situation for private gain. Reporting the experiences of persons he had interviewed, Barrett McGurn wrote from Naples on January 7 in the New York Herald Tribune:

"One said that he had lost a $55,000 printing plant. Another, born 58 years ago in Alexandria, but never an Egyptian citizen, said that he had lost a $25,000 farm property.

"Many said that army officers and police were taking apartments which fleeing Jews were leaving. Egyptians are offering to buy the property of fleeing Jews but sometimes at merely 1 percent of value, it was reported. One boy said that his father had been offered $125 in payment for the family's $15,000 house.

"Most aboard were members of the lower middle class, many of them small shopkeepers, but some, according to their fellows, left as much as '$125,000 to $600,000 in apartment houses, land, and large commercial firms.' "

In its determination to squeeze every bit of profit from its expellees, the Government

has even stripped them of modest private possessions. Persons searched at Egyptian airports have had to surrender even such items of personal jewelry as wristwatches, tiepins, and brooches. This relentless pressure has succeeded in forcing the Jewish community to try to sell its property for trifling sums:

"Those ordered to leave—or who, under pressure, decide to go—can take out 100 pounds (or $280). Business and property and valuables like jewels, furniture, fur coats, are padlocked by a public custodian for future disposition.

"Naturally, deportees don't expect to hear again from the custodian. They make every effort at salvage. I was approached on a Cairo Street and offered a vast amount of currency and jewelry for my word that I would have a bank pay the deportee a trifling amount of dollars in Paris. I rejected the deal, but there is profitable traffic with these unfortunates; many participating are in government service.

"When police have the power to deal with enemy aliens they are seldom gentle, often corrupt." (World Telegram, December 28, 1956.)

American newspapers continue to report that the Egyptian Government is hamstrung for cash. (The New York Times, January 2, 1957.) A. J. Liebling in the New Yorker of January 12, 1957, noted that the economists in Egypt believe that the sequestration of British and French enterprises has yielded few tangible assets to the Egyptian Government and that for the most part these have been offset by the counterblockage of Egyptian funds in Great Britain and France. Most of the French and British firms were principally service organizations, he wrote, and all the Egyptians got with most of these properties was a heap of office furniture and their own money back.

These profitless seizures of British and French assets may account in part for the avidity and haste with which Jewish property has been despoiled. Egyptian Jews can take no countermeasures and Egypt, by looting its own nationals and stateless persons, places itself beyond the reach of international action. Whatever they wrench from the Jewish community, they take in absolute immunity. In the words of an Egyptian Jew, identified by the Associated Press as a former Egyptian industrialist who escaped to Naples:

"We are probably Egypt's most profitable export of the year. We are taking out of the country, all of us together, a few thousand pounds. We are leaving in Egypt tens and tens and tens of thousands of pounds in cash, jewelry, profitable businesses, and industries." (New York Post, January 7, 1957.)

### III. NASSERISM AND HITLERISM

The parallels between Hitler's campaign against the Jews of Germany and Nasser's attack upon the Jews of Egypt are too close to be coincidental. The anti-Jewish techniques developed in Germany are now being applied in Egypt with increasing rigor. Nasser's "Egyptianization" and Hitler's "Aryanization" programs have the same xenophobic intent and both concentrate on the Jews as their primary target.

It has already been noted that on November 20, 1956, Nasser in effect opened the door for denationalization of Egyptian Jews. Similarly, on July 26, 1933, the German Minister of Interior handed down a decree providing for the denationalization of a large percentage of German Jewish citizens. Jewish lawyers in Egypt have been disbarred, and Jewish physicians, dentists, pharmacists, architects, and other professionals have been dropped from the rolls of their professional societies and have been prevented in other ways from practicing. This duplicates a German statute of July 25, 1938, which declared that "Jews are not to be licensed as physicians" and a subsequent decree declaring that "Jews are excluded from the practice of law."

Perhaps the closest parallels between the two regimes is to be found in the programs of economic expropriation. In November 1938, Hermann Goering decreed that "Jews * * * are excluded from the operation of individual retail businesses, exporting firms, and sales agencies" and, further, that from that date on "no Jew can manage a firm. * * *" These edicts have been paralleled by a number of Egyptian ones.

By 1938 some 120,000 German Jews were driven to migrate to other countries. Just as the Egyptian escapees are permitted to take with them a maximum of 20 Egyptian pounds (a 100 pounds according to some reports), so Jewish emigrants from Germany were divested of their possessions and permitted to carry out a maximum of 10 German marks. On all capital transferred abroad the German treasury levied a flight tax of 25 percent and allowed the remaining 75 percent to be transferred in blocked marks whose value was only one-sixth of the free mark. Nasser has gone even further: he has compelled Egyptian Jews to flee abroad in an even more destitute condition than their German predecessors.

Nasser's aim, like Hitler's aim, is first the pauperization and then the expulsion of the Jewish community. In both countries, Jewish enterprises and properties were seized to bolster an economy weakened by ruinous military expenditures. Goering, in a memorandum in 1938, cryptically noted: "Very critical situation of the Reich Exchequer. Relief through the billion [marks] imposed on Jewry, and through profits accruing to the Reich in the Aryanization of Jewish enterprises." Nasser's grandiose aims have also entailed financial outlays beyond the capacity of Egypt's economy and the expropriation of Jewish properties is a patent source of relief.

It is significant that the notorious Johann von Leers, formerly a top official of the Nazi Propaganda Ministry, occupies an important place in the Ministry of National Guidance. With such men as von Leers occupying influential posts in Nasser's government, it is not surprising that Egyptian officers and men in Sinai were found to have carried copies of an Arabic translation of Hitler's Mein Kampf in their knapsacks, and that an important Damascus newspaper, Al Manar, should have been moved to write:

"One should not forget that, in contrast to Europe, Hitler occupied an honored place in the Arab world. His name awakened in Arab hearts feelings of love and enthusiasm. The Arab world should be congratulated on producing in its midst this Hitler who has shaken the world from end to end. * * * [Journalists] are mistaken if they think that by calling Nasser Hitler they are hurting us. On the contrary, his name makes us proud. Long live Hitler, the Nazi who struck at the heart of our enemies. Long live the Hitler of the Arab world." (Quoted in the Paris Le Monde, August 17, 1956.)

### IV. THE ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The preamble of the Charter of the United Nations recites that—

"We, the peoples of the United Nations, determined * * * to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal right of men and women * * * do hereby establish an international organization to be known as the United Nations."

The very first article of the charter repeats this high resolve, declaring that among the stated purposes of the United Nations are "promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion. * * *" Finally, the member states of the U. N. pledge themselves by articles 55 and 56 of the charter to take joint and separate actions in cooperation with the U. N. to achieve universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

These declarations and pledges are gradually being made effective. Since its first meeting the U. N. has attempted to translate the majestic generalities of the charter into precise undertakings and ultimately to establish an international code of human rights having the effect of law. On December 10, 1948, the General Assembly without a single dissenting vote (Soviet Russia, Saudi Arabia, and six other countries abstaining) adopted the universal declaration of human rights. Among the provisions of this declaration, intended as a "common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations," are two that are directly relevant to this study.

Article 9 of the declaration provides: "No one shall be subject to arbitrary arrest, detention, or exile."

Article 15 provides: "Everyone has the right to nationality. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality."

It is clear from the legislative history of these two provisions that the term "arbitrary" means more than "illegal" but rather any act "taken at the will and pleasure of some person who could not be called upon to show just cause for it."

The members of the United Nations have likewise been concerned with the protection of civilians during the time of war or armed conflict. At Geneva, in 1949, four conventions were signed and later ratified by most of the members of the United Nations, including Egypt and the United States. The Fourth Geneva Convention attempts to protect "the whole of the populations of the countries in conflict, without any adverse distinction based, in particular, on race, nationality, religion, or political opinion * * *" (art. 13). Article 27 of the convention in defining the rights of "protected persons" declares that they "are entitled, in all circumstances, to respect for their persons, their honor, their family rights, their religious convictions and practices, and their manners and customs." While internment is specifically allowed, it may be ordered "only if the security of the detaining power makes it absolutely necessary" (art. 42). Article 33 forbids punishment for an offense which a protected person has not "personally committed" and likewise forbids "reprisals against protected persons and their property."

While Jews in Egypt of Egyptian nationality are not protected by the Fourth Geneva Convention, Jews of British or French nationality and stateless Jews are (arts. 4 and 13).

The acts of reprisal taken against Egyptian Jewry not possessing Egyptian nationality—confiscation of property, internment, denationalization, and deportation—are all in violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention.

The United Nations has, however, failed to take any public action with respect to Egyptian Jewry. It did not request the Secretary General to investigate the grave reports that had caused so much concern. It set up no committee of inquiry. The General Assembly addressed no inquiries to Egypt. A desultory discussion was held in December 1956 and then the matter died. At no time was a resolution on Egyptian Jewry presented to the Assembly.

In other similar cases the U. N. had not been silent. Despite the opposition of the Soviet bloc, the United Nations has adopted no less than 10 different resolutions relating to the oppression of the gallant Hungarian revolutionaries. These resolutions asked for

food and medicine for the Hungarian refugees, called for an end to deportations, requested permission for U. N. observers to examine the situation in Hungary, and designated a committee to hear the testimony of Hungarian refugees.

The contrast is almost unbelievable. The nations whose hearts were justly open for Hungarian refugees could not find the time even to talk about the persecution of Egyptian Jewry.

V. THE ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES

The United States has expressed its concern to the Government of Egypt over the pressures exerted on British and French nationals and on the Jewish community in Egypt. On December 21, 1956, Ambassador James J. Wadsworth, the Alternate United States Representative at the United Nations, stated to the plenary session of the General Assembly:

"The United States has received information concerning the treatment of certain nationals and stateless persons in Egypt which occasions concern. It has not yet been possible to evaluate this information fully. Nor has it been possible to obtain a clarification of some aspects of the situation which are still obscure.

"The information which is presently available to my Government indicates that an indeterminate number of persons, including British and French nationals and persons of Jewish origin, in Egypt have been subjected to pressure and intimidation, and in some cases have been ordered deported. While we recognize the right of any government to take measures which are necessary in the interests of its security, the United States must express its concern at any unwarranted pressures exerted against minorities.

"The United States Ambassador in Cairo has been requested to bring to the attention of the Government of Egypt the concern of the American people over these reports.

"The United States hopes that everything possible will be done to insure that measures will not be employed which will discriminate unjustly against human beings merely on racial or religious grounds or on the basis of foreign nationality."

Mr. Wadsworth's statement was significant since it made clear that, whatever confusion existed at the time about the exact state of affairs in Egypt, there was at least sufficient evidence to warrant the United States Ambassador's intervention in Cairo. It raised the reasonable expectation that the United States Government would pursue an investigation that would substantiate or refute the charges. With the resources at their command, with the abundant data available for its study, appropriate United States agencies, it was felt, would readily ascertain the truth and assume leadership in the United Nations in the effort to cause the Egyptian Government to desist in its campaign of violence and violations of basic human freedoms.

Unfortunately, Mr. Wadsworth undermined the effect of his expression of our Government's concern by following immediately with this statement:

"I make bold to conclude with a plea. I suggest that the matter we are now discussing is not one which is likely to benefit from prolonged discussion here; certainly it will not benefit from any intemperate discussion. That is why, without in any way wishing to cut off speakers whose names have been inscribed on the list of speakers and who will follow me to the rostrum, I would suggest to them, as well as to other representatives who may desire to speak on this subject, that the most useful thing we could do would be to bring this phase of the discussion to an early end."

Since Mr. Wadsworth's declaration at the U. N. General Assembly, the United States has not appeared to advance either in determining the facts or in rallying world opinion to the necessity of opposing firmly and immediately Egypt's contravention of fundamental human rights and liberties. In early January, in response to an appeal by the American Jewish Congress and other organizations for vigorous action to save those who are being persecuted in Egypt, the State Department, in a form letter, stated that it was still trying to obtain an accurate picture of the situation in Egypt in the light of the many conflicting assurances now being made and that the problem is being kept under active surveillance.

These sentiments, which in ordinary circumstances might have provided some comfort, can hardly allay anxiety at a time when the Egyptian Government is moving with rapidity and thoroughness to destroy the lives and liberties of the Jewish community. What is perhaps the most disappointing aspect of the State Department's response is its assertion that it is still not in full possession of the facts. The reports of Egyptian excesses have appeared in the press of virtually every non-Arabic country. In addition, there are at least 8,000 expellees from Egypt (as of January 23) who can testify from their own experience to the cruel treatment of the Jewish community of Egypt.

The conscience of the American people has been outraged by Egypt's persecution of an innocent and powerless minority and by its flagrant assault on those principles of freedom and human dignity all free nations cherish. Civic groups, church bodies, and labor and professional associations have urged the United States to take more effective diplomatic action than it has thus far.

Thus on December 16, 1956, 34 leading Christian clergymen in the United States addressed a moving appeal to President Eisenhower to seek action by the United Nations to end the persecution of Jews in Egypt. These clergymen included many of our most respected religious spokesmen, a good number of whom have been actively concerned for years in Middle Eastern problems, including the problem of providing for and resettling the Arab refugees. Their appeal stated in part:

"While we are gratified that the United States Government is expressing its deep concern to the Government of Egypt, we feel impelled to express to you our deep concern over the campaign of violence entered upon by the Government of Egypt against citizens, stateless persons, and nationals of other lands.

"In the present Egyptian program directed against the human rights, security, freedom, and economic welfare of Egyptian Jews and Jews in Egypt, a pattern has emerged that is clearly imitative of the Hitler pattern and of the present Communist pattern in Hungary. * * *

"In canceling citizenship, in ordering deportation of citizens, or stateless persons and nationals of other lands, in taking away property, in confiscating bank accounts, in the establishment of concentration camps, and in holding men and women as hostages, we find an awful and terrible imitation and refinement of the Hitler program and practices which ultimately plunged the world into war. * * *

"The United States, indeed the world, paid an appalling price to rid humanity of these evils when finally it was forced to go to war against Hitlerism. Since then, mankind has been on guard against a renewed outbreak of this malady in many lands, even in our own Nation. It is our persuasion that unless the United States opposes firmly and immediately the reappearance of racism in Egypt, in whatever guise, this pernicious evil will endanger the spiritual foundation of morality and freedom in all the world." (New York Times, December 17.)

The deep attachment of the United States to the concept of religious freedom has induced our Government in the past to intercede in instances of religious persecution and even where such intercessions entailed direct criticism of the internal legislation of other states. In 1840, in the first representation relating to Jews made by the United States to any foreign state, Secretary of State John Forsyth, at the direction of President Van Buren, instructed the American Consul at Alexandria, Egypt, to intervene in behalf of Damascus Jews who had been falsely accused of murder.

Since that time the diplomatic record is studded with instances of altruistic intervention by American officials on behalf of persecuted Jewish populations abroad. The United States, for example, protested on behalf of the Jews in Morocco in 1863, to Persia in 1897, to Russia in 1903, to Syria and Palestine in 1915, to Italy in 1938, and to Argentina in 1943. In the Nazi era, the United States Government utilized available diplomatic channels to protest the atrocities of Hitler's regime.

In 1878 Secretary of State William Evarts interceded in Morocco, despite an awareness that his action might be construed as improper. In accord with America's finest ideal of compassion for the victims of suffering and oppression, he wrote the American Consul in Morocco: "Still, there might be cases in which humanity would dictate a disregard of technicalities, if your influence would shield Hebrews from oppression." It is in this traditional spirit of humanity and understanding that we ought to approach the agony the Jewish community is undergoing in Egypt today.

VI. CONCLUSION

Once again, a Jewish community has been doomed to destruction by a brutal dictatorship.

For many weeks Jewish leaders had been assured by their governments and by the spokesmen of international organizations that the Egyptian dictatorship had undertaken only a limited action against a handful of Jews as a precautionary measure justified by emergency war conditions. These statements were made and widely disseminated on the basis of replies to inquiries addressed to the Egyptian Government and its leading members. Today it is all too clear that behind this propaganda of calculated deception the Egyptian Government was engaged in the task of uprooting the Jewish community and making its further existence impossible.

A substantial number of Jews whose families had resided in Egypt for generations were denationalized; many Jews of all nationalities were served with orders of expulsion; thousands were subjected to intimidation and pressure with the object of compelling them to apply for permission to depart. In order to insure that this deliberate creation of a new refugee problem should not evoke protests from international public opinion, those who had expulsion orders were deprived of them before departure and they, as well as all who left, were compelled to sign statements certifying that they were going voluntarily. The victims of this lawless and vicious process were deprived of their possessions and were allowed to take with them only trivial sums and personal effects needed on the journey. Hundreds of those who have reached lands of refuge have testified that they were taken from prison or concentration camps, often in shackles, to the ships, and subjected to indignities on the way.

Over 8,000 of such refugees, out of a total Jewish population of approximately 50,000, have now reached lands of freedom. This steady stream threatens to become a flood unless in the meantime international au-

thorities exert themselves in an effort to halt it.

An element of major importance in the scheme of persecution elaborated by the Egyptian authorities has been the sequestration of Jewish properties. Orders were promulgated authorizing the appropriate military authority to sequester the property not only of enemy aliens but of any other persons whom this authority at its unfettered discretion might designate. As a result, hundreds of properties and enterprises, belonging in whole or in part to Jews, and among them some of the most important in the country, have been taken over by the government. No distinction has been made on grounds of nationality. Among the victims are Egyptian citizens, stateless persons, foreigners of various nationalities other than and in addition to British and French nationals. Every Jewish enterprise of any significance has, in fact, been sequestered under those orders.

Closely associated with this process of sequestration has been the deliberate impoverishment of the great mass of Egyptian Jewry by depriving it of the means of livelihood. Jews have been dismissed or suspended without compensation from posts in all public enterprises and services. The same fate has overtaken Jewish employees in the sequestered enterprises and businesses. Non-Jewish employers have been forced, often against their will, to dismiss Jewish employees. Jewish professionals have through various devices been deprived of the right to practice. The result has been that a once prosperous community has been reduced in a few weeks to the status of paupers.

Jewish communities everywhere have been profoundly shaken by the apparent helplessness of the U. N. in the presence of this great human tragedy. Not a single authoritative voice has been raised on behalf of the Egyptian Jews by the international community in public protest. There have been sincere efforts made privately by international diplomacy and democratic governments to urge counsels of moderation on the Egyptian regime, but they have apparently failed.

The Egyptian Government has worked out its anti-Jewish designs with the aid of notorious Nazis and with the aid of techniques elaborated by the Hitler regime. It has pursued these designs in flagrant contravention of international agreements which it has helped to draft and which it has ratified. Adapting the Nazi methods to the Egyptian scene, the Nasser regime has enacted special legislation to give the color of legalism to its inhumanities; it has taken hostages from Jewish families in order to silence the victims who have escaped.

The process of spoliation and persecution was undertaken not during the conflict with Israel but after the U. N. intervened to save the Nasser regime from destruction. The cease-fire became effective on November 6 but the sequestration order is dated November 8. The new nationality law, which stripped many Jews of Egyptian nationality on the flimsiest pretexts, dates from November 20.

The implications of Egypt's campaign to end the existence of the Jewish community should be seriously pondered by the free peoples of the world. It should be recalled that the Nazi regime struck out first at the Jews and then proceeded against other groups. Similarly, the assault by the Nasser regime on the Jews, its most defenseless minority, inaugurates a process which can extend to every group which bars the way to the grandiose Pan-Arabic design under Egyptian leadership, articulated in Nasser's book The Philosophy of the Revolution.

For the leaders of the free world to ignore these portents, is to do so at the peril of world peace. In these circumstances, apart from the dictates of humanity and compassion, apart from preserving the cherished ideals of freedom and liberty, it is a matter of enlightened self-interest for the international community and all democratic governments to intervene energetically to halt the destruction of the Egyptian Jewish community.

This solemn obligation is one which the United States Government should in particular assume. The United States Government was a bulwark of support for the Nasser regime in the recent crisis. It has become a beacon of hope for all groups throughout the world who chafe under tyranny and oppression. Its prestige would be tarnished by failure to act in a situation which so palpably calls for the United States Government's immediate action.

There are three courses which the United States Government can pursue and which all men who abhor violence, cruelty and oppression will enthusiastically endorse.

First, the President of the United States should remind the Government of Egypt directly of its obligation as a member of the United Nations and of the civilized community to abandon its present course of inhuman oppression of its Jewish population, to cease and desist from its acts of arrest, economic strangulation, persecution and deportation.

Second, the United States delegation to the United Nations should take the lead in the General Assembly in calling for action consistent with the Charter of the United Nations and with the several international compacts to which Egypt is a signatory that expressly guarantee respect for fundamental human rights.

Third, the Government of the United States should extend this country's tradition of sanctuary and haven to the Egyptian refugees. It should use the existing authority exercised by the Attorney General under the immigration laws on behalf of Hungarian refugees in a similar fashion on behalf of those Jews and stateless persons in Egypt who have been deported or compelled to leave.

## APPENDIX

*Arrivals of refugee Jews from Egypt, Nov. 22, 1956–Jan. 23, 1957, ports, dates of disembarkation and number of refugees*

| Name of vessel | Piraeus | Number | Naples | Number | Marseilles | Number |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Askania* | | | Nov. 22, 1956 | 4 | | |
| *Achilaus* | | | Nov. 30, 1956 | 250 | | |
| *Marseillaise* | | | | | Nov. 30, 1956 | 250 |
| *Al Sudan* | | | Dec. 4, 1956 | 21 | | |
| *Esperia* | | | Dec. 5, 1956 | 80 | | |
| *Korinthia* | | | Dec. 7, 1956 | 145 | Dec. 9, 1956 | 60 |
| *Sultan* | | | Dec. 8, 1956 | 18 | | |
| *Enostica* | | | Dec. 12, 1956 | 80 | | |
| *Achilaus* | | | Dec. 14, 1956 | 350 | | |
| *Aolia* | | | do | 240 | Dec. 16, 1956 | 180 |
| *Misr* | | | do | 103 | | |
| *Jugoslavia* | | | | | Dec. 18, 1956 | 140 |
| *Esperia* | | | Dec. 18, 1956 | 50 | | |
| *Nefrettiti* | | | Dec. 19, 1956 | 40 | | |
| *Achilaus* | | | Dec. 21, 1956 | 150 | Dec. 23, 1956 | 230 |
| *Lydia* | | | | | Dec. 22, 1956 | 150 |
| *Al Sudan* | | | Dec. 21, 1956 | 380 | | |
| *Argentina* | | | Dec. 22, 1956 | 20 | | |
| *Pasteur* | | | | | Dec. 25, 1956 | 100 |
| *Korinthia* | | | Dec. 27, 1956 | 73 | | |
| By 8 different vessels till Dec. 27, 1956 | | 250 | | | | |
| *Jugoslavia* | | | Dec. 29, 1956 | 20 | Dec. 31, 1956 | 200 |
| *Achilaus* | Dec. 31, 1956 | 20 | Jan. 1, 1957 | 45 | Jan. 2, 1957 | 385 |
| *Esperia* | | | do | 130 | | |
| *Nefrettiti* | | | do | 45 | | |
| *Aolia* | Dec. 31, 1956 | 20 | Jan. 2, 1957 | 20 | Jan. 4, 1957 | 250 |
| *Misr* | | | Jan. 6, 1957 | 967 | | |
| *Jugoslavia* | | | | | Jan. 7, 1957 | 200 |
| *Carinthia* | Jan. 18, 1957 | 72 | Jan. 19, 1957 | 30 | Jan. 21, 1957 | 189 |
| *Jugoslavia* | | | | | Jan. 20, 1957 | 130 |
| *Aolia* | | | | | Jan. 21, 1957 | 100 |
| *Misr* | Jan. 23, 1957 | 857 | | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | |
| Greece | | | | 1,219 | | |
| Italy | | | | 3,261 | | |
| France | | | | 2,555 | | |
| Total | | | | 7,035 | | |
| Estimated arrivals during same period by plane in Italy, Switzerland, France, and Great Britain | | | | 1,400 | | |
| Total | | | | 8,435 | | |

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to President Eisenhower's speech on Wednesday night last, one overriding thought stayed with me—how brave, how courageous was United States policy vis-a-vis Israel. Here we are, a nation of 170 million people, the most powerful, the richest in the world, bringing all our weight to bear upon a little state of a million and a half people, the weakest and most isolated of all democracies, a state not even as large as Massachusetts, let us say.

Here we were, bringing all our pressure to bear and literally begging that the rest of the world join us in this tremendous display of strength against a tiny segment of the world which, for 8 years, has struggled against Arab hostility and acts of aggression. Israel asked as a condition precedent to her withdrawal from the Gaza Strip and Sharm-el-Sheik that she be permitted, along with all the other nations of the world, free and innocent passage through international waterways. She asks that she be guaranteed protection against the organized Egyptian fedayeen raids which took daily toll of lives and property. The Arab world attacked Israel when she declared her statehood, and since that time, Israel has lived through many heartbreak hazards. Her ships were barred from the Suez Canal. A sustained economic boycott drained her economy. Daily raids took her young and despoiled her produce.

These were facts well known to our President—or should have been—and to the rest of the world; yet not one single move was made nor one step taken to help Israel to maintain her national existence. True, the United Nations Security Council passed a resolution in 1951 calling on Egypt to stop the blocking of Israeli ships in the Suez Canal. The United States itself had voted for that resolution. Egypt ignored it for 6 years. There was no talk of sanctions against Egypt. Indeed, the President himself, only a few weeks ago, stated that he did not even know there was such a resolution. How brave and how resolute we are now.

There was another thought that occurred to me during the President's speech. In all kinds of international crises, he has called for patience. For years now the United States has been negotiating with Communist China for prisoner release. We have been holding fruitless conversation after conversation with the Soviet Union. Only with little Israel was the President's patience rapidly evaporated. Even while the talks were going on between the United States and Israel, between Israel and United Nations officials, the President took to the air in righteous indignation against the smallest of nations, inviting the world to join with the United States in bringing sanctions to bear upon the one vital spark of democracy in the Middle East. Was this not the very quintessence of patience?

Certainly no sanctions were voted against the Soviet Union for its Hungarian invasion, or against India for its annexation of Kashmir. The President did not take to the air to urge the imposition of sanctions against these aggressive acts. One needs to be careful of stepping on the toes of a big boy. One need not be quite so careful about the toes of a little boy.

Israel has not said she will not withdraw. She has not made a mockery of United Nations resolutions as has the Soviet Union and, in the latest instance, India. She asks only firm guaranties that those conditions which provoked the attack will be removed. If the United Nations resolutions are to have any meaning at all, any substance, then it is mandatory that it recognize the history which led to the present crisis.

Let us consider for a moment that Israel withdraws unconditionally and Egypt continues her raids, continues her blocking of the Straits of Aqaba and the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping. What then? Is it, therefore, not more sensible to recognize now that these conditions have existed and, in the face of Arab hostility, will exist in the future, and take preventive action now instead of inviting another disaster all over again?

We cannot advocate other procedures dependent upon Egypt's consent, as we seem to have been doing. We know, or should know, that this consent of Egypt will not be forthcoming. It took Israel's march into Egypt for the world to wake up to the punishment Israel had taken these many years from a hostile Arab world. Had policy been firm before this, the attack would never have been necessary. We have not shown our faith heretofore. Is it any wonder, then, that our faith is questioned by Israel? The moral indignation of the President against Israel hardly becomes us.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from California on his very penetrating and thoughtful analysis of the terribly dangerous situation in the Middle East, and to commend him, too, for the constructive solutions that he has offered.

If law and justice are to mean anything, there cannot be a double standard under which small nations are penalized while larger and more powerful nations maintain their defiance with impunity. Russia has ignored United Nations resolutions on Hungary, India has refused to abide by them in Kashmir, and Egypt remains stubbornly defiant on the issue of Israeli shipping through the Suez Canal. Yet the United Nations has been either unwilling or powerless to impose any penalties against these nations.

To apply sanctions now against Israel alone would be a mockery of the basic principle of the United Nations that all nations are equal before it, and would represent little more than using the U. N. as an instrument of coercion by those who are in fact far more eager to render Israel helpless than to uphold valid principles of universal justice.

I would like to ask the gentleman from California this question. This House has recently received from the administration a request for very prompt action on a resolution sent up by the administration asking congressional backing for certain action that the administration feels it might be obliged to take in the Middle East on some future date. Specifically, House Joint Resolution 117 asked for our concurrence in the administration's being prepared to resist open armed Communist aggression in the Middle East. This House did act with great promptness, and has given the administration the assurance it sought, even though the area that was the subject of that resolution was an area traditionally within the confines of the Executive. This House acted with such promptness because the administration had said on an important, indeed a vital matter, of our foreign policy it wanted national solidarity. Here we have a situation discussed by the gentleman from California where the administration is apparently proposing the use of sanctions against Israel without at the same time insisting on a settlement of some of the other elements such as the Egyptian raids and the closing of the Gulf of Aqaba, which brought about the Israeli action in the first place. My question is this: Does not the gentleman think that a parity of reasoning would require the administration to come up here and sample the sense of Congress on what it proposes to do in this vital Middle Eastern problem, right here and now, in view of the fact that the administration has seen fit to come up and get congressional assent to much vaguer and more general action which it may in the future contemplate in the Middle East?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would say in answer to the question of my distinguished friend from Wisconsin that while it would follow logically that what he has suggested should be done, I think in view of the absence of a bipartisan foreign policy, the bipartisan opposition which has already been demonstrated to the proposal that consideration be given to sanctions, has made it very clear to the Secretary of State and to the administration that they just would not get that approval from Congress; so I am afraid that we will not get the opportunity actually to express our opinion much, of course, as I would like to see it done.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, with others of my colleagues who have spoken, I wish to commend the gentleman from California, Mr. ROOSEVELT, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. BOYLE, for their action in getting unanimous consent for 2 full hours of debate on the situation in the Middle East, especially as it revolves around the State of

Israel. I have listened with rapt attention and an applauding heart to the address of the distinguished gentleman from California, Mr. ROOSEVELT. It was an address scholarly in its reasoning and eloquently moving in its presentment. I find myself in entire agreement with the gentleman's conclusions.

I think at this point it would be helpful to the men and women of the country who are not here but will be reading in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an account of what we now are doing to explain the nature of the present proceeding. There is no bill or resolution now before us. There is nothing upon which we shall be called upon to vote. The gentleman from California and the gentleman from Illinois had obtained unanimous consent each to address the House for 1 hour at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day. They invited other members of the House to share with them the 2 hours that they had been granted. Members are on the floor at this time so to participate.

What is the reason for what we are doing? The President not long ago spoke to the American people on the subject of sanctions against Israel. We in the Congress today are speaking for the constituents in our respective districts and our words will go out to the country and to the world and be part of the permanent record of these times in the volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In a broad sense we in this Chamber today, are speaking in a court of American public opinion.

The cause of Israel is very close to the hearts of the American people. The security of the State of Israel is entwined with the security of our own country. In that troubled area of the world the Middle East Israel stands for everything for which we have stood in the long role of our history. International morality, no less than fidelity to our own traditions, command that, as Alderman Leon Despres expressed it in a letter to me, we should not quail before the strong in order to flail the weak. In every American mind the thought of the United States joining in a move to impose unilateral sanctions on the little State of Israel, our friend, is repulsive. Always have we in our national existence followed the moral law. That is the source of our strength, and unless we continue rigidly to follow the moral law in all our relations with other nations and other peoples we will not meet the large responsibility of world leadership that has been given us by providence.

The State of Israel has a right to live and a right to its opportunity to make its contribution to the job of all nations, the job of making this a better world for all mankind.

It is unfortunate that at the present time the Arab world does not understand that from the State of Israel, its growth and its prosperity, will come to the peoples of the Arab nations only an abundance of blessings. The State of Israel and the people of Israel are bringing into that troubled area an outpost of the industrial order that is responsible for the scintillating success of what once was called the American experiment. Our cities grew great and rich as industrial centers, and from them came the buying power that made possible the rich development of the agricultural regions. So will it be in the Middle East. The State of Israel will establish in that area a great industrial center and from this center will come the buying power to bring the agricultural development of the Arab States to a plane far above that of which they ever had dreamed. The fact is, and it should be as plain as the hand before one's face, that the State of Israel and the Arab States are partners in a great undertaking, a glorious adventure that can only end in making a region now troubled and peopled largely by the children of poverty again a Garden of Eden. All that is needed now is understanding. It is our mission to aid in the reaching of that understanding.

But we cannot lead the hearts and the minds of people unless we are strong and courageous in avoiding expediency and in insisting upon the application in every situation of the moral law to which we give our faith.

When we were a young Nation, and it would have been expedient for us to buy for our sailors a temporary freedom from harassment the inspired words were born: "Millions for defense; not 1 cent for tribute."

They inspired the Americans of that period and they have inspired every generation of Americans that has followed. The course of our history very well might have been different if in that early stage we had sold the moral law at the price of expediency.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if our present approach does not amount to an enthronement of expediency rather than an uncompromising insistence upon the application of the moral law even in areas and with peoples temporarily lacking understanding that it is all for their ultimate good albeit at the moment unpopular.

I wonder, too, if we are not departing from the very spirit of that good old American slogan, "Millions for defense and not 1 cent for tribute." It can be said in all truth that what we are offering the Arab States is tribute. If it is money we give them for the development of their own economies so that all the peoples of those countries can be elevated, that is all for the good. Wherever we strike at poverty and need, we strike at the causes of war. Wherever we remove poverty and elevate the standard of living among people we are advancing not only the interest of those people but the interest of our own people. That I think too is self-evident. He who casts bread upon the waters will have it returned to him many fold.

But when we give money to one nation and that nation insists upon kicking around another and a smaller nation, and nevertheless we go on handing it money, that is tribute. That is violative of the moral law. It mocks at every American tradition. Pursuing such a course we can only end without the respect either of the nations that do not like us or of the nations that for expediency profess friendship.

When Secretary of State Dulles was before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, then having under consideration House Joint Resolution 117, I asked whether there was danger that to obtain the cooperation of the Arab States in the proposed program, concessions would be made to those States injurious to the State of Israel. You will find the reply that Secretary Dulles gave to my question on page 145 of the printed hearings of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on House Joint Resolution 117. I quote the Secretary's exact words:

> I can assure you, sir, that we shall not in any application of this policy or any of our discussions with the Arab countries do anything whatsoever that would detract from the statements so often made by this administration and others and by the Congress that the preservation of the State of Israel is a vital part of the United States foreign policy.

Coming from the Secretary of State, a gentleman for many years of high standing in public life and for a time a Member of the United States Senate, I accepted those words in all good faith. I gave the Secretary full credit for a direct answer, without any mincing of words he gave his pledge that this administration would do nothing to endanger the preservation of the State of Israel. Yet today, only a few weeks after he gave that pledge to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, he is reported to be favorable to imposing unilateral sanctions on the State of Israel on the demand of the Arab States that openly declare that the State of Israel shall not be allowed to exist. I hope and I pray that the attitude of the Secretary of State has not been correctly reported.

This country wants in every legitimate way to help the peoples of the Arab States. We wish the rulers of the Arab States all to be our friends, and we wish to work with them in the attainment of goals of mutual interest. But we cannot buy their friendship at the price of betraying a friend. Even if we did we could not expect to gain their respect or their trust since always they would have in mind that if to curry favor we abandoned one friend the time might come when to curry favor in another quarter we would abandon them.

When we were young we were not afraid to tackle Great Britain when she insisted on her self-proclaimed right to seize American sailors from vessels on the high sea and subject them to British law. How, then, can we criticize the government and the people of Israel for being as redblooded under exactly similar circumstances as were we in our national youth? The oceans of world commerce belong to the ships of all nations. That is moral law and that is international law. We do violence to the reputation of our own country as a world leader if we retreat 1 inch from an insistence upon the universal recognition of that moral and that international law.

The reputation of nations, as well as of men, is built on character. The man who is not loyal to the members of his own family cannot be trusted to be loyal to the community composed of his own and other families. So is it with nations, which are made up of many families woven into one organized society for a common purpose of advancement.

What would be thought of us by the peoples of the rest of the world, all as human as are we and measuring themselves and others by the same scale of human valuations, if we abandoned Israel, our friend, to the designs of her enemies? What would be the low esteem in which an individual family would be held in the community of which it was a part if it betrayed another family in the same community in the hope of currying favor with another and remote community?

He who is not steadfast in loyalty to his own cannot be trusted to remain loyal to anyone. As it is with individuals so is it with nations.

In our foreign policy we have retreated too far from principle in the excuse of expediency. In the matter of passports, in the matter of respecting the bigotry of other nations instead of adhering to our own religious tolerance in the stationing of our own armed personnel in other lands, we have sold the American heritage for a mess of pottage.

To regain the respect of others we must recapture our own self-respect. Respectfully and earnestly, I suggest that we as a Nation begin by proclaiming to all the world that the foreign policy of the United States is built upon the moral law and the qualities of virtue, the greatest of which is loyalty. We cannot abandon Israel to her enemies without abandoning our own self-respect. We cannot continue to permit in any land that calls itself our friend a differentiation among American citizens according to the faith in which they approach an understanding of the divinity. We cannot longer permit any land that calls itself our friend to say that some of the American family can come and some of the family, but of a minority religion, cannot come. We must stand before the world as a united family, and the nation that will not accept one part of the family on the same measure of character as others of the same family cannot expect to treat with us as a friend until it mends its ways.

For peace and understanding, for the advancement of friendship among nations and peoples, we will give freely of ourselves and of our means. But never must we abandon principle or by accepting the dictum of another nation's bigotry to drive wedges into the unity of American toleration and brotherhood.

Should we invoke sanctions against Israel at this point we would confess either to absolute ignorance of the events which have led to the present Arab-Israeli crisis, or to an abdication of principles for which the United States has stood.

Let us look at the record.

May 14, 1948 the State of Israel was born. Immediately Egypt began economic war upon her with seizure of ships of any nation carrying goods to or from Israel. Egypt searched the ships of Norway, Holland, Italy and the United States and confiscated their cargoes, including not only items on a contraband list but also frozen meats and other foods, even motorcycles.

July 11, 1951, Israel presented her case before the Security Council of the United Nations. The Security Council held that Egyptian restrictions represented unjustified interference with the rights of nations to navigate the seas and to trade freely with one another. The resolution of the Security Council concluded by calling upon Egypt "to terminate the restrictions on the passage of international commercial shipping and goods through the Suez Canal wherever bound.

In February 1954 a New Zealand resolution noted with grave concern Egypt's lack of compliance with the 1951 Security Council resolution and called upon her to honor that resolution in accordance with her obligations under the Charter of the U. N. Eight of 11 Council members supported the New Zealand resolution, but it failed of adoption because of the veto of the U. S. S. R.

Egypt continued her practice of search, seizure, and confiscation in violation of international law and the resolution of the United Nations.

In an attempt to maintain economic life Israel turned to the Gulf of Aqaba, which has the status of an international waterway and therefore should be open to the commerce of all nations.

The Egyptian Government fortified two islands at the mouth of the gulf. In January 1950 the American Embassy at Cairo sent a note of inquiry to the Egyptian Government. The reply was:

> This passage (through the Straits of Tiran) will remain free as in the past in conformity with international practice and with the recognized principle of international law.

However, as it affected Israel, promise was one thing, practice another.

Using fortified islands to prey upon international commerce constitutes piracy. When the pirates of North Africa demanded tribute as the price of free access to international waters our answer was: "Millions for defense, not 1 cent for tribute." Have we so far retreated from our moral plane when we were young as a nation that we will vote sanctions against a now young nation which is struggling to maintain freedom of navigation of international waters even as did we against the Barbary pirates and later against England in the War of 1812? Mr. Speaker, the answer of the American people as reflected in my correspondence and that of my colleagues in the Congress is a thunderous "No."

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the virtues of democracy is that the right of free criticism can frequently bring about modifications and improvements in the direction of public policy.

I believe that constructive criticism by Members of the House and Senate is having that effect on American policy in the Middle East, and I am glad to note that the administration is making strenuous efforts to reach a reasonable settlement in the difficult Middle East situation. Such a settlement will bring an end to the suggestion of a United Nations resolution imposing sanctions against Israel. It is to be hoped that present negotiations will be successful and that the United States will, in any event, oppose sanctions against Israel.

When reference is made to the provision of the United Nations Charter outlawing force as a means of securing national objectives, it should not be overlooked that force was used to bar Israeli shipping from the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba. In seeking a settlement, a fair and impartial attitude must be maintained, and the nations which have resorted to force should be asked to give ground simultaneously and with fair equality. This must be the objective, rather than to expect Israel to withdraw first, and then trust to the United Nations to secure justice, a trust which is not justified by past experience.

Secretary Dulles was frank in admitting this at his news conference on February 19 when he said:

> Whereas * * * the decision of the Security Council of 1951, that Israeli ships are entitled to go through the canal, was allowed to be disregarded at that time, I think that for the future there will be a greater effort to secure, through the concerted influence of the nations of the world, a compliance with such decisions embodying principles of right and justice. * * *
>
> I think we are going through what may prove to be a very significant stage in the development of an international order. And if the world can get through this present stage by liquidating the armed attack, and then following that with a more vigilant effort by the United Nations and its members to preserve and secure the satisfaction of other rights under international law, I think we will have made one of the greatest forward steps in history in the development of an international order.

It is on the question of the order in which these events should take place that the greatest difficulty has arisen. I again submit views which I stated to the House on February 20:

> I believe that a way must be found to have Israel and Egypt give ground simultaneously and with fair equality until a basis is laid for peaceful coexistence. If the United Nations is to insist on commitments from Israel, it should also insist that Egypt agree to end the stated of armed truce and blockade, and grant freedom of passage to Israeli shipping in the Suez Canal and Gulf of Aqaba. There must be no return to the status quo existing before the recent hostilities.

As the situation develops from day to day and from hour to hour, it becomes clear that our Government is working in that direction. It is only fair to recognize the practical difficulties. Mr. Walter Lippmann has pointed to the paralyzing effects of voting blocs in the United Nations. The result is that while a resolution critical of one side to the dispute might find easy passage, one critical of the other side might face defeat.

It is to be hoped that future emphasis will be not on criticism, not on recrimination for past actions, but on a settlement that will reach the fundamental issues, and will lead to the strengthening of the rule of law among nations.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from California for his able and fair presentation of the facts in the matter of the current dispute in the Middle East. I can only add that it adds honor to the proud name which the gentleman bears that as in the past he too is fighting that justice may prevail not only here but throughout the world.

I would like to ask the gentleman, in his opinion would it not seem that this would be an appropriate time, if the President's prestige is at a new alltime peak as I read in Time magazine and other periodicals, with the Afro-Asian bloc that he use that prestige of his office to get the Arab nations to sit down and merely admit the fact that Israel is a state; that it is a state that was established by the United Nations and that it is here to stay and that it is to the interest of the Arab nations, as well as to the peace of the world, that they recognize this fact so that they can work together and bring peace and prosperity to the Middle East.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. I think it would be well to point out that the recent visit from the King of Saudi Arabia would have been an excellent chance to have begun that work, when we had a few cards on our side of the fence. I hope that we shall have that kind of leadership in the future.

Mr. MACDONALD. I again wish to compliment the gentleman; and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of talk recently about the tiny country of Israel being an aggressor, of her being unreasonable in failing to heed the U. N. demands to evacuate her troops from the positions she presently occupys on what has been considered Egyptian territory in the Gaza Strip and Sharm el Sheikh.

Certainly it is true that technically speaking Israel has been guilty of aggressive action against Egypt. And though all parties still deny it, if she did not work in concert with England and France, the fortuitous timing of the attack was the greatest coincidence of our time.

However as that might be, I feel that the United States Government would be in grevious error to embark on a course of action which would put pressure on Israel to abandon her recent gains, without guaranties from Egypt that there would be no further "fedayeen" raids and that the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba would cease. I feel strongly that this Congress would be compounding the error if we did not protest any such contemplated action. To understand Israel's unique position in October of 1956, is to forgive her so-called acts of aggression, which in the opinion of many, and in my own opinion, was not so much an act of aggression as an act of aggressive self-defense.

Eight years after its war of independence the State of Israel still faces a security problem of unusual complexity. The area of the country is only 8,100 square miles. Owing to the peculiar shape of its territory there are more than 400 miles of frontier. Three-quarters of the population of Israel lives in the coastal plain, running from north of Haifa to south of Tel Aviv, with a slender branch heading to Jerusalem. This densely settled area has an average width of no more than 12 miles between the Mediterranean and the Jordanian border. From the Israel Parliament buildings in Jerusalem, the armed sentries of the Jordanian Arab Legion can be seen a few hundred yards away. The headquarters of the Israel General Staff are within clear view from the hills which mark the Jordan frontier. The country's main roads and railways are exposed to swift and easy attack. Scarcely anywhere in Israel can a man live, or work, beyond the very easy range of enemy fire. Indeed, except in the Negev, no settlement is at a distance of more than 20 miles from an Arab frontier.

Obviously then, the term "frontier security" has little meaning in the context of Israel's geography. The entire country is a frontier, and the whole rhythm of national life is affected by any hostile activity from the territory of neighboring states. On the other hand, the Arab States, especially Egypt, are in no such position. Border tensions affect only a narrow fringe of their territories, beyond which stretch deep hinterlands entirely remote from the hazards and strains of frontier life. An American citizen who can cross our vast continent without seeing a hostile face, requires a highly unusual measure of imagination to understand the degree of vulnerability which geography imposes upon the people of Israel.

The effects of geographical vulnerability are aggravated by fierce antagonism, directed against Israel across her embattled frontiers. There is no other state in the world whose very right to existence is so persistently challenged by all its contiguous neighbors. This is not the classic pattern of international conflict, in which neighboring peoples recognize each other's statehood but are divided by specific disputes which they have failed to reconcile. The struggle between the Arab States and Israel has been constant yet has passed through four phases: First, before 1948, there was a determination by the Arab States to prevent the establishment of an independent Israel; second, in 1948, there was an unsuccessful attempt to destroy Israel's independence at its birth by armed assault; third, in the period 1948–54, there has been an attitude of inveterate revenge based on nonrecognition and the undying hope of Israel's extinction; fourth, Egypt, as leader of the Arab world, has embarked on a special arms-seeking policy in which it invited arms from Communist sources. The elementary duty of members of the United Nations to recognize each other's right to sovereignty and integrity has never been found in the relations of the Arab world with Israel.

In order to really understand Israel's need for guaranties against further aggression, it is necessary to take into consideration the expressed intentions of the leaders of Israel's foes against the Israelis. The secretary general of the Arab League said:

> This war (in 1948) against Israel will be a war of extermination and a momentous massacre which will be spoken of like the Mongolian massacre.

Indeed, these are not just warlike words as is shown by the fact that the Arab attack, especially in its first guerrilla stage, did not lack instances of disregard of the rules of war, for not one single Jew survives in any part of Palestine that came to be occupied by the invading Arab armies. The Jewish quarter in the old city of Jerusalem, with its ancient synagogues and monuments, was completely destroyed; even the Jewish cemetery of the Mount of Olives was desecrated and laid waste.

The then President of Egypt, Naguib, said on April 18, 1953:

> The existence of Israel is a cancer in the body of the Arab Nation.

Following this unthinking train of thought, the man who succeeded Naguib, the former colonel and current President, Nasser, said on May 8, 1954:

> Israel is an artificial State which must disappear.

Another Arab leader, Mohammed Salah-ad-Din said recently:

> The Arabs will not be satisfied with the implementation of United Nations resolutions. We shall only have complete satisfaction when Israel is finally blotted out from the map of the Middle East. The Arabs will find no rest until this cancer has been removed from their heart.

In another sphere—an economic sphere—hostility has long been shown the State of Israel by the Arab world. From the very inception of the State of Israel, an economic boycott has been enforced against it by the Arab States, the most significant aspect of which was the closing of the Suez Canal to all Israel shipping, and the interference with the passage of ships of other nations carrying cargoes to Israel. This action of the Egyptian Government was a violation of the Constantinople Convention of 1888 under which the power contiguous to the Suez Canal is bound to keep the canal—in the words of this convention:

> Always * * * free and open in time of war as in times of peace, to every vessel of commerce or war without distinction of flag.

A widely ramified boycott machinery was set up with headquarters in Cairo to prevent trade between the Arab States and Israel—indeed, between Israel and other countries. International firms trading with Israel were blacklisted, airlines and shipping companies are denied servicing in Arab airports and harbors if they insist on maintaining contact with Israel. A conspicuous example of this policy was the campaign of intimidation conducted by the Arab States against the German Federal Republic which had signed a reparations agreement with Israel. Danger to international air traffic has been caused by the

refusal of Arab airports to provide flight information to aircraft proceeding to or from Israel. The boycott of the Arab States against Israel extends even to the denial of information on the movement of infectious disease or locusts.

Is it, therefore, unreasonable that Israel, in her isolation—the only democratic country in the world so isolated—should seek guaranties against further aggression?

The situation in the Middle East has deteriorated where it now constitutes one of our weakest security links. Our lack of firmness, our obvious indecisiveness for a long period of time has now brought us to a position where we now face Soviet penetration of the Middle East.

Now we have a new method of obtaining peace in the Middle East. It has been suggested that we apply pressures, within the framework of the United Nations to force Israel to withdraw troops from the Gaza Strip and the Gulf of Aqaba. These are the same troops who have provided her with her only form of protection against the fedayeen raids of her neighbors in carrying out the spirit of the Arab world which resisted the notion that Israel is a sovereign state.

Who are the people who are pressing for sanctions against the independent State of Israel? It would seem clear that the most vociferous cries raised against Israel are being emitted by those who have ignored the will of the United Nations when it suited their own interests to do so.

Were sanctions applied against India when it used naked force in Kashmir? Were sanctions instituted against Russia when her heavy tanks slaughtered thousands upon thousands of liberty-loving Hungarians in the most sordid mass homicide in recent history? The answer is of course so obvious that one can only believe that the answer lies in the words of Cartoonist Herblock: "The way of a little transgressor is hard."

There have been no reasons advanced as to why Israel should give up what she's won without any guaranties that Egypt will not inevitably attack in the future. However, there are abundant reasons for her to believe that a mere U. N. condemnation will not deter the Arab world from carrying out its avowed intention to destroy Israel.

In 1951 the Security Council of the United Nations found that Egyptian interference with the passage of goods destined for Israel through the Suez Canal was inconsistent with the purpose of the armistice agreement between Israel and the Arab States and called on Egypt to terminate all such restrictions.

As a matter of fact the U. N. Security Council passed a resolution calling on Egypt to stop the practice of blocking Israeli ships in the Suez Canal. The Egyptian Government has successfully defied this resolution for 6 years even though the United States voted for and strongly backed this reasonable resolution. No so-called pressures or sanctions were imposed on Egypt at that time. Could it be that we have developed two views of international justice—one to be applied to strong nations and one to be applied to weak nations?

Certainly we all hope that the Government of the United States has not reached the point of view that might makes right. In urging President Eisenhower and our State Department to reconsider its newspaper-announced views, I can only point to the President's own words, spoken at the time of the invasion of Egypt in November, and ask him to carry them through. He then said: "We cannot subscribe to one law for the weak and another for the strong."

For again, in President Eisenhower's own words, it is my very strong opinion that if we do, "there will be no peace" in the Middle East.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to commend the gentleman from California for taking up this very important matter at this time. As the gentleman knows, I have always opposed sanctions against Israel. I am very glad the gentleman is talking in opposition to sanctions against the little State of Israel. Might does not make right, and in this case Israel is right.

On previous occasions, both on the floor of the House and in various communications, I have expressed my total and unqualified opposition to the employment of sanctions against Israel. I am still strongly opposed to any such measures being adopted by the United States. I am opposed to the employment of sanctions for the following reasons.

First, I do not accept the premises upon which arguments in favor of the employment of sanctions are based. One of these arguments, and the most important one, is that Israel is guilty of aggression in her recent military action against Egypt. Not for one moment do I believe that such an argument can be legally or morally justified and substantiated.

The second reason why I am opposed to sanctions against Israel is that sanctions constitutes a method of force which, generally speaking, should be instituted by the so-called injured nation. There is a question in this case just which nation is the injured one. The us of force in the settlement of international disputes by the sovereign nations is contrary to the long-established policy of the Government of the United States and certainly the use of force, regardless of the way in which it is used, is not the kind of an atmosphere or the type of foundation upon which permanent peace can be constructed.

The third reason why I am unalterably opposed to the use of sanctions is that the employment of sanctions never has been and never will be of any importance or effect when used against a large, powerful country. For example, any attempt, either by the United Nations or the United States, separately, or as a part of the United Nations, to employ sanctions against Russia for its invasion of Hungary would not only be totally ineffective but would be ludicrous and a complete failure. Against a small, weak nation, however, namely Israel, the employment of sanctions by the United States in conjunction with the United Nations would be effective, causing the result of great suffering on the part of the people of Israel.

I do not believe permanent peace can come to the Middle East, or a solution to the existing problems in the Middle East can be achieved by any rule of force which might be effective against a small nation and ineffective against a large nation. From the viewpoint of respect for the Government of the United States throughout the world and from the viewpoint of our desire for international peace of a permanent nature, sanctions, if employed, would result in serious damage to both our respect and our permanent peace. You cannot have one rule which applies to the strong nations and another rule which applies to the weak nations.

In this crisis it appears to me some faulty thinking has been taking place without a fundamental and exacting analysis of all of the factors involved. Israel has been branded an aggressor. Now this word "aggressor" is another one of these legal terms many persons associated with international diplomacy and affairs toss around rather recklessly. In some cases it has a certain meaning. In other cases it has a different meaning. In still other situations, other interpretations are given within its concept. In this controversy between Israel and Egypt there has not been any thorough application of thought so far as this term "aggression" is concerned. Just because a nation happens to strike the first blow in a military action does not make a nation an aggressor. A sovereign nation has the duty to protect and defend its life. The government of a sovereign nation has the duty to take whatever steps are necessary to protect its nation from being destroyed.

If it is the stated intention of a nation to destroy its neighbor, and certainly that was the assertion and intention of Egypt against Israel, and if the nation determined to destroy the other one takes positive steps to do so, then certainly the nation that is threatened has the right to act in its own self-defense. In the present crisis, Israel was the threatened nation and Israel had a duty to take whatever steps were necessary to defend itself against the prevailing threat.

There has been considerable loose talk on the part of statesmen, both in and out of the United Nations, regarding the question of international morality in this current crisis. So-called statesmen have concluded that it is an act of national immorality to fire the first shot. Such a conclusion is against commonsense, patriotism, the right to defend oneself, and the right to prevent being destroyed. The issue involved is not whether or not firing the first shot constitutes a moral or an immoral act. The issue involved is whether or not a sovereign nation has the duty and the right to protect itself from destruction.

In this current crisis between Israel and Egypt, certainly Israel had every right to take the action which it did take. If any nation on the face of this earth,

or any group of nations, threatened the United States of America with destruction, I hope the United States would not wait for the fatal blow to be made. I hope my country would move and move quickly to prevent that fatal blow from ever being struck. In this way my country not only would save itself but it would save injury and destruction to millions of American people. In the same way and in the same concept, the little nation of Israel was faced with the job of preventing that fatal blow from being struck by the military forces of Nasser's Egypt. In view of this fact, Israel is not an aggressor and it is wrong for the United States of America to even consider such a premise.

For the purpose of protecting its sovereignty, in fact, for the purpose of its survival, Israel has asked the United Nations as well as the United States for certain guaranties that the aggressive atrocities and the violations of its sovereignty on the part of Egypt be prevented in the future. The guaranties Israel has requested are not unreasonable. They are, in fact, worthy of honor. Just because Israel is a small, comparatively defenseless nation is no reason why it should be subjected to wrongs by any other nation. The guaranties Israel has requested should be given. Any reasonable solution of the problem of guaranties certainly will be considered by the State of Israel. Only one important matter has to be made certain. It is this. Any guaranties that are given to Israel must be dependable, they must be enforced.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thoroughly agree with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. I would like to point out too that when these topics were discussed there was no publicity. We have a serious role insofar as the United Nations is concerned, and we should exercise it to secure the peace.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. Like so many of your colleagues here on the floor of the House I too wish to commend the gentleman from California for bringing this to the attention of the House today. I wish also to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE].

This debate is long overdue. Since I had an opportunity of making a statement here on the floor in reference to the same subject matter earlier today I do not desire to encroach upon the gentleman's valuable time now except to say that the gentleman is to be complimented and congratulated for his very sincere, thoughtful, and worthwhile statement here this afternoon, and I too wish to join with the other Members of Congress in vigorous opposition to the imposition of any sanctions against Israel. This is a subject matter that should be of vital interest to every citizen of the whole United States at this crucial time.

I congratulate the learned gentleman on his excellent statement and his timely action in bringing this matter to the attention not only of the people of our country but also of all nations of the world.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am very grateful to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague on a very fine exposition of a very difficult subject. I think what he has done today is not only a credit to himself but to his State and to the Congress. I would like also to join my colleague in his statements. I think he and I feel exactly alike on this subject.

I find, Mr. Speaker, that the American people pride themselves on a traditional sense of fair play. What we are witnessing is not only typical but I might say even commendable to the American people. Today we are witnessing this sense of fair play being flouted by Mr. Nasser and the Arabs, and I am afraid disregarded by our own Secretary of State. The subject of the administration's Near East foreign policy I discussed in my remarks in the RECORD on last Thursday. I was very critical of the President and of the statement which he made on this subject. I said at that time that I would join with my colleagues today in discussing what I thought might be an intelligent approach to this overall problem, and I think it has been set forth very well by my good friend and colleague—the gentleman from California.

I would like to join my colleague in saying that the United States should and must seize the initiative in the United Nations. The United States has been projected by history into a place of leadership in the world, and up until very recently used that position not merely for the good of the United States but also for the good of the people of the world and for world peace. Lately we have reached the point where we see that prestige and leadership endangered by an Arab dictatorship under Nasser pressing this matter of sanctions and trying to set forth what will be American foreign policy. Imagine that. The principal aggressor in the area determines what will be the policy of the U. N. and of the world. At this very hour the question of sanctions against Israel is being discussed, if you will, by the very people who are responsible for the trouble in that area. These sanctions will be applied not by the Arabs, because they have continuously applied sanctions and kept up a state of war by blockade and border warfare against Israel since the 1948 armistice. This has all been in direct defiance of the terms of the armistice and the will of the United Nations.

I think the will of the people of these United States should be recognized. Their will is that no sanctions be applied to the small and weak like Israel while the big aggressors like Russia and India stand with bloody hands arguing such sanctions.

The real solution to the trouble in the Mid-East can only come by approaching this problem realizing that there are a multitude of conflicts to be considered. The first is that international aspects of right and justice demand that there be free access to the Suez and to the Gulf of Aqaba by all the nations of the world. This Mr. Nasser has flouted, is flouting, and will continue to do so until stopped. Even now he is stalling the clearing of the Suez Canal.

We can approach the problems of the area together, including the internationalization of the Gaza Strip, which is a long trouble area. We can offer a new guaranty to all the nations of that area that their borders will be protected by an adequate United Nations police force so that no one needs to fear strife and border raids. Incidentally, there have been 15 or 20 border raids into Israel during the last 2 weeks, while Nasser has been talking about Israeli aggression. We can use the $200 million aid in the Middle East resolution on which we voted recently not to make richer the already wealthy Arab dictators, but to really solve the basic economic problems of the area. Some of this money can be used to help develop the Jordan River Valley and the Nile River Valley for the benefit of all the states in the area. It can help resettle refugees. Now is not the time to develop Mr. Nasser's Nile, when he is again buying Communist arms, as he is doing for the third, fourth, or fifth time in recent history.

I submit that this is the intelligent program. This will serve not only the interests of the United States, but, very frankly, the interests of the world. It will do something to solve the problems of that area, not to continue them unabated as they have been by merely destroying the status quo, as apparently it is the intention of the administration.

I would like to commend the gentleman and my other friends on the floor who have thrown some light on a subject which is very important and very near and dear to the hearts of all of us.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman from California.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is a very wholesome thing that certain Members, and particularly the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], have arranged an opportunity for a discussion by representatives of the people of the United States in what might be called a national forum on the Israeli-Arab problem, and in particular, of course, the proposed sanctions against Israel. If partisan viewpoints influence the objectivity of our discussion, it could be unfortunate. Certainly we recognize that President Eisenhower is following his conscience. As for me I have never changed my position, namely that I have actively urged our representative in the United Nations, Mr. Lodge, to do everything in his power to see that Israel is given full guaranties as far as withdrawing from the Strait of Aqaba and likewise, of course, the Gaza Strip. United Nations troops should immediately be stationed at Sharm-el-Sheik to

keep the Gulf of Aqaba open to Israel before any evacuation of Israeli forces.

I have constantly pointed out the inconsistency of invoking sanctions against one small nation when the United Nations failed to act in similar cases. Unfortunately I am at this moment supposed to be at a committee meeting and therefore it is impossible for me to elaborate in any detail. But I do think the Arab-Israeli problem is closer to the hearts of the American people at the present time than any other problem. I believe that the majority of the Members of this House sense this. In particular I believe that the American people are against active sanctions, and favor a sort of compromise operation whereby Israel is given full protection as she withdraws.

At this very moment further talks between Abba Eban, the Ambassador of Israel, and Mr. Dulles are probably in progress. I hope what is said here will help and not hurt an agreement. Let us hope a satisfactory arrangement is concluded.

Let me repeat there is a great danger, it seems to me, in injecting partisan politics into this issue. I felt so gratified that our former colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. Richards, was selected by the President as a sort of roving ambassador to help work out the Middle East problem. The United States under the leadership of our President I am sure when history is written will always be proud that it stood up for a policy of peaceful settlements of all national disputes. Now I feel that our second step is to continue our proper course and to insist that a just peace be consummated. We cannot compromise on that. We are morally bound to uphold the integrity of Israel, and the Arabs have been unwilling to sit down and discuss peace. Once peace is achieved the entire area can start trading and developing its resources and thus build a higher standard of living for its people. Meanwhile in struggling with this problem let us never overlook that Israel is much like America was when our Founding Fathers were debating the problems of that day. Solutions for the establishment of a just peace in the same way is what Israel is seeking today.

I thank the gentleman for yielding briefly to me so I could rather inadequately express my views, which nevertheless are heartfelt.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman for his very able contribution.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Certainly I, too, wish to commend him for taking this time today and for entering into what I believe to be one of the most important discussions we in this country can indulge in at the present time. I am concerned about peace in the Middle East also. I think all of us, as Members of Congress, and I think all of the people in America, are concerned with resolving the difficulties with which we are faced. It is my firm conviction that the people of this country are much concerned about any attempt to use pressure or to bring sanctions against the nation of Israel. Certainly, Israel in that area of the world represents in a large measure, I believe, the position that we held some 150 years ago in this area of the world.

I would like at this moment, because I think it is important, to discuss this matter of sanctions. As I understand, at this very moment, the resolution proposed by the Arabian countries is before the United Nations for discussion as to whether or not sanctions will be voted against Israel. I would like to ask my colleague from California just what in his opinion he feels would be the impression upon the many small countries in the world of friendship toward the United States if we go along and vote with the bloc for sanctions against Israel. I think that it is important for many reasons, because certainly if we become a party to bringing pressure to bear upon Israel, pressure that could bring Israel to her knees and actually destroy her as a nation, what, in the gentleman's opinion, would be the effect on our standing with many of the other nations of the world? Would the gentleman comment on that, because I know he has given a great deal of study to this subject. I think that he has had an opportunity to visit some of these areas. I certainly am not an expert on foreign affairs, although I will say right here that as I look around and see some of the things that are occurring I wonder if we have any experts on foreign affairs. I would like to have the gentleman's comment on what he feels might happen so far as our friendship with other countries in the world is concerned if we did join in sanctions.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will say to the gentleman that I think we would be helping in setting a very dangerous precedent. As you know, it would establish once and for all, I think, that we were willing to impose sanctions where we felt that they could not be resisted because of the weakness of the individual nation against whom the sanctions were to be placed. And, it would give encouragement, in my humble opinion, to more aggressive action by the Soviet bloc and it would encourage our Communist opponents to make certain that wherever they wanted they could exercise pressure, and they would feel they had moral justification, which we would in some way have provided to them for the kind of action which we had under consideration. And, I think in the long run, it would mean that the small nations which are growing up in Asia and starting now to grow up in Africa would have a sense of insecurity unless they could join a powerful bloc and that their only hope would be in the protection of a power, one side or the other of an argument, and they would tend to lose not only their respect for us, because they could not help but feel we had sacrificed friendship for expediency, but it would tend to divide the world into two great power blocs, which is exactly what we have been trying to get away from through the work of the United Nations.

Mr. SISK. I want to say that I agree completely with the gentleman. He, as I understand his statement, agrees with me that by taking that action we are going along and, in fact, sanctioning a double standard for nations; is that correct?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. SISK. And in the sanctioning of a double standard for nations, then actually is it not a fact that the many small countries of the world who are attempting to get along and to maintain their independence and to copy American democracy would receive a very grave blow from the standpoint of their morale if they felt that we, after all, as the leader of the free world, turned our back upon the great precept that we have used down through the years of our history? These are some of the things that I think are so important. And although I have the kindest feeling for our Ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, for our Secretary of State, and for the President, and appreciation of the task they have in the determination of these very grave problems, because they are faced with tremendous burdens, yet I would hope that they might be able to see their way clear to pursue a course which would not place us in that position.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I want simply to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] and say that I think what he has made clear is that we should not be a part of building a greater system of satellite nations. We should be standing behind a system of free, independent nations.

Mr. SISK. Exactly.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to my friend from Illinois, Mr. YATES.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] for the very excellent statement that he has made, and for the very comprehensive analysis that he has given to the House on the extremely complicated situation in the Middle East.

I voted against the President's Mid-East resolution when it was before the House a few weeks ago, not without some trepidation, because one does not easily vote against our President when he asks for approval of a certain policy he intends to espouse in the field of foreign affairs. It is his primary responsibility to formulate our relationships throughout the world and ordinarily, in the absence of the most cogent reasons, one does not reject his recommendations.

Nevertheless, because I had so many qualms about the direction which American foreign policy has taken in recent years, because of the profound lack of information furnished the Congress by Mr. Dulles, because of the total failure of the doctrine to attempt to come to grips with any of the vital problems which are fomenting strife in the Middle East, because of many reasons, I decided to vote against the resolution. Subsequent events in the Middle East, and the debate on the resolution in the other body, have sustained my conviction that my vote was the correct one.

This morning's newspaper showed a picture of King Saud seated with other members of the Arab bloc. The caption under the picture said that King Saud was explaining the so-called Eisenhower doctrine to other members of the Arab bloc. If this be true, King Saud is in a much more fortunate position than Members of Congress because none of them have been told how the Eisenhower doctrine is supposed to operate. Perhaps the $100 million which has been promised to King Saud, according to the report which appeared in the papers last week, had something to do with his approval of the doctrine. It seems to me, however, that the speech made by the junior Senator from Montana in the other body last week expressed the impression which most Members of Congress have of the doctrine, namely, that it is an empty declaration devoid of policy.

The President's Middle East resolution was brought to the Congress in an atmosphere in which a sense of urgency was sought to be imparted. It had to be passed quickly and unanimously—as unanimously as possible, if it was to have the desired effect, which was to show to the world that the President and Congress were united behind the Eisenhower doctrine. The President wanted Congress to stand with him. He showed a respect for the opinions and action of Congress in urging its Members to enact, as promptly as possible, the resolution embodying his Mid-East doctrine.

Is it not exceedingly strange therefore, that we now find the profound reluctance on the part of the President to accept congressional opinion in opposition to the imposition of sanctions upon Israel? The majority and minority leaders of both Houses of Congress have made known to the President their opposition to such sanctions. Two of the Members of Congress who are now a part of our delegation to the United Nations have publicly declared that they will resign from the delegation if sanctions are voted by the United States against Israel. Opposition to such sanctions has been expressed by many Members of both Houses. There are only a few, fewer, I would say, than voted in opposition to the Eisenhower resolution, who would vote to sustain the President's viewpoint in demanding sanctions against Israel. And yet the President insists on pursuing his course stubbornly. And so I ask the gentleman from California, would he not believe that the President, in the same spirit which induced him to request congressional approval for his Mid-East resolution, would accept the congressional viewpoint in opposition to placing sanctions upon Israel?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would agree with the gentleman. Of course, I recognize that in matters of foreign policy it is the responsibility of the executive branch and the President and the Secretary of State in particular to lead and to formulate and to carry into action our foreign policy; but it would seem to me only logical that if he feels that he needs to be advised on certain parts of his foreign policy it would be only proper to come and make sure that he has our agreement on the rest of the foreign policy. That very argument is one of the reasons I am delighted that so many from both sides of the aisle have taken the opportunity to inform the Executive of our feeling today, and I hope that others will in the future, in order that he can be sure that he does not have agreement with regard to the present seeming policy toward the Middle East.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman. I want again to express my approval of the statements he has made and to join with him in the hope that the executive branch will not see fit to impose sanctions on the one bastion of democracy in the Middle East.

Much has been said about the double standard and the incongruous position in which the President's insistence upon sanctions against Israel would place our country; namely, that of having one standard for powerful nations such as Communist Russia, and another for tiny, weak nations such as Israel. Apparently, the President is willing to apply the same double standard in his relations with Congress. On one hand he asks congressional approval of his statement of policy for the Middle East. On the other hand, he is unwilling to accept congressional disapproval of his standard toward placing sanctions against Israel. Such a piecemeal approach to the highly complex Middle East situation rather than promulgating a total constructive program, must inevitably result in failure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLLAND). The gentleman from California has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend the gentleman upon his statement. I think the American people are opposed to double standards of international morality. In my opinion the people of this country do not want to see the United Nations impose sanctions upon Israel. In my judgment, if the United States voted for sanctions in the United Nations, it would seriously divide our people on an issue on which they should be united.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], in his criticism of our Government's position in pressing upon the United Nations the exercise of sanctions against the Israeli nation. The ostensible purpose of these sanctions is to compel Israel to relinquish the Gaza Strip and the Straits of Tiran without any assurance that it will be able to engage in free and unrestrained commerce through the Gulf of Aqaba.

The imposition of sanctions presupposes that Israeli occupation constitutes an act of aggression against Egypt and also presupposes that the prohibition by Egypt of Israeli use of the Suez and the Gulf of Aqaba does not. The restraint upon Israeli commerce in the use of international waterways is as much an act of aggression as actual invasion. For practical purposes the Egyptian disregard of the rights of a sister nation to engage in free and unrestrained international commerce is as harmful to the nation of Israel as the use of gunfire.

The Israeli Government has made clear that its holding of these disputed areas is only for the preservation of its rights to peaceful commerce. It has been made abundantly clear that the occupation is not designed for permanent acquisition or for self-aggrandizement. The willingness of the Israelis to evacuate for United Nations occupation is a clear and positive refutation of its own claim to territorial occupation.

In a sense the Israeli Government has indicated its willingness to interplead or leave to the determination of the United Nations the occupation of the disputed areas until the steps toward permanent settlement can be established. The Egyptian-Israeli controversy cannot be settled in any other way.

To compel one of the disputants to the controversy to relinquish its tactical advantage without review and careful analysis of the causes of the dispute results in arbitrary action. To this point in the Middle East conflict the Egyptian Government has given every assurance that it will not change its position or attitude toward its nationalization of the Suez or to its power to determine who shall have the right to use the Suez for commercial purposes. Nor has it conceded the right of the Israelis to use the Gulf of Aqaba and its seaports thereon in an unrestrained manner.

In the face of a prohibition on the use of the Suez and the prospect of armed resistance to its use of the Gulf of Aqaba, the tiny nation of Israel, with all its great enterprise and promise, is assured of a dismal future indeed. Without freedom to develop its own enterprise through the use of international commerce, the Israeli nation faces the prospect of early atrophy.

The struggle of the Israeli nation to take its place among the nations of the world has been rewarded with phenomenal success. As a matter of fact, the success and the development of this nation has posed a most serious threat to the retarded development of adjoining nations. In this area, competition has been wholesome and to the good. It is indeed regrettable that national envy has forced Egypt to deny to Israel the right to continue its very fruitful development.

It is indeed deplorable that American diplomatic policy has forced the United Nations to this position in its anxiety to court favor with a recalcitrant Egypt—a

nation which has made clear in no uncertain terms its intentions to continue in a course of conduct which precipitated a dangerous international conflict. The imposition of sanctions by the United Nations upon Egypt is not a course toward peace. On the contrary, it is a course toward war. It is an offering to an ambitious dictator whose position and continuance in office depends on the forcefulness of his demands upon free world governments. His appetite for concessions for himself and sanctions against his enemies is insatiable.

The Secretary of State seems to have an uncanny ability of separating this Nation from its friends in this shrinking world.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would not want the occasion to pass without taking this opportunity of congratulating the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] for the very fine and forthright statement he has made on this very serious prooblem. I will not delay the deliberations other than to make some brief comments.

First, I would like to say to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] that I am sure the majority of Americans join with him in expressing the sentiment that the United States is taking the wrong attitude when we talk about imposing sanctions against Israel. The clouds over Israel are dark and heavy. I believe conditions will be worse instead of better if sanctions are imposed on that country. So I say to the gentleman that I hope his forthright advice made in this House today is heeded, and I hope that those people who are guiding the affairs of the United States in the United Nations will give some serious thought to the proposals made today. I reiterate that I predict that conditions will become much worse instead of better if sanctions are imposed.

I want to congratulate the gentleman. He has made a wonderful statement today, as he always does when he takes the floor. I thank him for his statement and agree with everything he has had to say on this very important subject. I am sorry that more Members were not present to hear his enlightening and eloquent statement.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] has expired.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in the past week the Israeli-Egyptian conflict has reached a new stage of crisis. The United Nations called for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the Gaza Strip and Sharm el Sheikh, the strategically important area along the Gulf of Aqaba. This Israel refused to do until it had ironclad guaranties that both areas would not be used by Egypt to stage future attacks. Pending in the United Nations General Assembly is a resolution calling for sanctions against Israel.

At first our Government had not entirely clarified its position on the issue of sanctions. It apparently took the position that some pressure ought to be exerted by the United Nations upon Israel. On February 26, however, the press reported that the Government was prepared to submit a resolution to the General Assembly which would call for the United Nations control of the Gaza and Aqaba areas but would omit any mention of sanctions.

In many respects the initial position taken by our Government was somewhat precipitate. No doubt it had reasons for this action; but the issue at stake goes far beyond the question of Israeli-American relations: It vitally concerns our relations with the entire Middle East.

In this complex of international politics our guide should be to seek justice and accomplish the objectives of our policy interests. The question is, Can justice and our enlightened self-interest be achieved by imposing sanctions on Israel? I think not. I welcome, therefore, the change of mood in our Government on this question. More than any other nation, Israel depends upon the United States for its economic sustenance. Were we to cut off all economic ties with Israel, that small democratic nation would be perceptibly weakened and clearly placed in an indefensible position. Certainly a course of action which would bring about such results would not be just. Nor would our best interests be served. Egypt is not without guilt in this present crisis. Indeed, it was the uncompromising hatred that Egypt so often voiced for Israel and the continued Egyptian threats to eradicate Israel from the face of the globe that was the root cause of the crisis. And while America would not wish to reward Israel for her action, certainly it would not want to whet the Arab appetite for conquest by a move which would inevitably invite an attack on an economically weakened Israel.

The solution to this highly complex problem is difficult. The world has had this seemingly insoluble problem for over a decade, and the prospects are still not bright for reaching a reasonable agreement. However, sanctions against Israel are not the answer. A just solution would seem to require concrete guaranties to Israel that once withdrawal from the disputed areas was effected, Egypt would not use them to stage attacks on Israeli territory and shipping.

In addition, every effort should be made to persuade Egypt to permit the final clearing of the Suez Canal and to accept a form of control of the canal that would be consistent with both Egyptian national interests and the interests of the other nations of the world which look upon the canal as a vital waterway. Once success has been achieved in these matters all energies should then be directed toward building a broader Arab-Israeli understanding.

America has entered the Middle Eastern political arena in full force. Let our force, both physical and moral, continue to be applied to serve the ends of justice, as well as our own enlightened national interest, constructively at all times. Sanctions, gentlemen, are neither constructive nor do they serve our interests.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, let me congratulate the Representative from California for the eloquence and clarity with which he has spoken this afternoon. He has presented forcefully the facts in this complex situation and he has made constructive and feasible recommendations. I fully concur with his position on this crucial issue.

I expressed to the House on February 11 my strong opposition to both political and economic sanctions against Israel. Sanctions cannot be justified on any grounds. The problem is one of self-preservation and survival for Israel, and we have no right to place demands on her alone. A constituent aptly expressed it in the following: "A beagle with a stuffed nose cannot flush quail."

Yesterday the prayer in the House was offered by Rabbi Alan M. Sokobin, Temple Beth El, Laurelton, Long Island, who is the son of my esteemed friend, Mr. Max Sokobin. I was impressed with Rabbi Sokobin's words:

> May this House, in its deliberations, never sacrifice human rights to political expediency.

May principles, not expediency, guide our Government and the U. N. in this difficult hour and may the double standard of morality be repudiated. It is my earnest prayer that our Government will exert leadership in reaching a just settlement that will rightfully preserve the freedom and integrity of Israel.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND], who is now in the chair as Speaker pro tempore, be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I feel highly honored that Speaker RAYBURN asked me to preside during the debate on Israel today. The presentation of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], and the presentation of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE], were very instructive. I feel sure that many of my colleagues who entered into the debate were instrumental in bringing into the open the true story of what may go down into history as Israel's betrayal.

Not many years ago, a man by the name of Hitler was made a power in the world by appeasement. I am sure that all of you remember Neville Chamberlain, the man with the umbrella, and his appeasement policy. Mr. Chamberlain granted Hitler many concessions despite the fact that many voices were raised here in America pointing out the appeasement of Hitler could only result in war. There were others who claimed that concessions made by Chamberlain meant there would be no war in our lifetime. I personally feel that this one act of Neville Chamberlain's was the primary cause of World War II with the resulting death and suffering to many millions of people.

Today we are being challenged by another dictator, Nasser of Egypt, who is fast becoming a hero in the eyes of the

Arab world because he is getting concession after concession with the apparent backing of our State Department.

Have we in America forgotten that at one time our country was also a small nation attempting to establish a true democracy just like Israel is trying to do today? Here is an outpost in the most troubled part of the world where a little nation has established a government of freedom and whose progress in the short time of its existence might be called miraculous.

Here is a country which has brought modern know-how to a backward area and which has practically cultivated the desert sands and made them give the necessities of life. Here is a country in which hospitals have been built to administer to the Arabs—where they have been cured of disease which would have taken many Arab lives. Here is a nation where millions of Americans of both Jewish and Christian faiths have donated money to build an outpost of real civilization.

I could go on and on enumerating the contributions Israel has made to that part of the world. She has demonstrated that free people can build a nation of freedom and of progress. It could be that dictators of backward countries are afraid their subjects will somehow discover what it means to have the freedom which Israel offers.

I believe this debate has brought very clearly to the American people the sad realization that the policy of our State Department is not the policy of a friend or a brother. Neither is it that of a kindred spirit, but more on the order of a brutal bully, willing to sacrifice this small nation to gain the good will of Dictator Nasser.

I realize that oil plays an important part in some of the decisions which have been made, but I hope we are not going to revert to a policy that considers money or profits before the welfare of free people. Surely the United States is not going to tell other small nations of the world they are too little or too unimportant to consider. How are we going to appeal to oppressed people if we appease the oppressors? Has the principle of big business so permeated the thinking of this administration that they only want to play with the strong at the expense of the weak?

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that this is not the case. I hope that the President of the United States who is morally responsible for our foreign policy will not become known as the Neville Chamberlain of his day by appeasing Dictator Nasser at the expense of our friend, little Israel. The people of Israel have suffered much at the hands of the Arabs. Hundreds have been killed while tilling the soil. Rifles must be kept handy at all times.

Israel today is engaged in the same sort of struggle waged by the Founding Fathers of America in their fight for survival against the Indians. The fate of Israel and its right to exist among the free nations of the world lies largely in the hands of the President of the United States. I hope he shall rise to the occasion.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the core of this problem for our country lies not in the Middle East but here in the United States. We can make a real contribution only if we face the problem here—and this is a responsibility and a challenge which the administration and Congress must face up to.

Just a little over a year ago—on February 7, 1956—many of us who are here today participated in a lengthy debate on this same matter. I recall saying on that occasion that "we must face the fact that the realities of the situation in the Near East are not what they were a year ago. Soviet influence is now firmly established in Egypt and in other areas of the Middle East." Many Members of this body joined in pointing out not only the clear-cut danger of Soviet influence in this area but also the dangers surrounding the rising tensions between Israel and the Arab States.

In the 12 months which have elapsed since that time, Mr. Speaker, the administration has faced up to only one of these critically dangerous problems. There is no question but that the recently announced Eisenhower doctrine recognizes the disastrous consequences which will follow the further establishment of Soviet influence in the Middle East. Tragically late though it may be, I believe that this doctrine will offer some hope of halting the covert Soviet aggression which has as its aim the paralysis of the economies of our best allies.

But surely we are all aware that the Eisenhower doctrine offers no United States leadership for the solution of the hostility between Israel and the neighboring Arab States. Our efforts appear to be directed to perpetuating the shadowy policy of "impartial friendship" which long since has lost us the respect of Arabs and Israelis alike.

Actually, of course, there is nothing impartial about our policy in the Middle East. We are all too ready to relegate the fate of Israel to the United Nations, and at the same time to use every means possible to pressure this isolated outpost of democracy into the totally indefensible position in which it has found itself for nearly 5 years.

We are quick to brand Israel's military action into the Sinai Peninsula as aggression, but we steadfastly refuse to consider the Egyptian acts which inspired this move as anything akin to aggression.

President Eisenhower is very impressive when he states that under no circumstances can Israel, as an aggressor, lay down conditions for her withdrawal from the Gaza Strip and the Gulf of Aqaba, but the fact of the matter is that for months prior to this pronouncement, the United States has done everything possible to negotiate with Israel the conditions of her withdrawal.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, we recognize the indefensibility of requiring Israel to resume the position of extreme vulnerability which could only result from returning to the status quo of last year and the years leading up to last year. Surely we must recognize, if we are to be honest, that the United Nations has failed to provide Israel with that minimum degree of security which the integrity of any democratic nation demands.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I concur with the sentiments expressed by my colleagues and that I exhort this administration to devote its great potential leadership, both within the United States and outside, to the immediate problem of protecting the basic rights and guaranteeing the security of Israel and the other Middle Eastern nations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLLAND). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] for 60 minutes, under a special order heretofore entered.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] for his fine presentation. I want to adopt by reference and incorporate in my speech those observations he has made.

For some 3 hours I have noted that the great chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], has been sitting in the Chamber. I know there are few greater liberals in the world than that great chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. I know that he has many and varied demands on his time. Out of deference to his tight schedule I am very happy, if Mr. DAWSON desires at this time, to yield such time to him as he may need to talk about this highly critical subject.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] for his courtesy. I am not prepared at this time to carry on. I came to listen to my colleagues [Mr. ROOSEVELT and Mr. BOYLE] and others who spoke on this subject matter. I am in agreement with all that I have heard.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, from what you have already heard on the floor today and what you have read in the newspapers and seen over the television and heard over the radio for some months, it is not hard for you to grant that the situation in the Middle East poses one of the most challenging problems that has come across the international scene in generations.

Today the fate of Israel, yes, probably the fate of the United Nations, the fate maybe even of democratic processes in the world scheme, are at stake; and since the attention of the world has been so riveted on this problem maybe we ought to go back in retrospect just a little bit to better understand some of the physical facts that gave rise to this situation.

The giant oil companies with their billions of dollars at stake have indulged in a program of advertising, public relations, and brainwashing to the extent that it is almost a proved and established premise in this occult syllogism that Israel is an unjust aggressor in this whole picture and should be dealt with

summarily. Having accepted that premise, of course, you never go into or approach the more necessary question of "unclean hands"; you never resolve the question of self-defense. Through the centuries of civilization the history of every nation has recorded the fact that self-defense was one of the most noble and one of the most moral occupations and assignments of free people. If you will recall the current history, the short history of Israel, you find through 9 long years she has been challenged repeatedly for her very existence, and the challenge has been no isolated or ill-thought-out boast; no, it has been repeated and reiterated so often that you can scarcely blame any nation for taking upon itself the titanic effort of defending itself against the aggression of her avowed and mortal enemy. That probably is the fact that provoked Abba Eban, Israel's Ambassador to the United States, and head of the delegation to the United Nations, to observe and point out to the United Nations General Assembly on November 1, 1956, the historical background. I quote his statement:

> Stretching back far behind the events of this week lies the unique and somber story of a small people subjected throughout all the years of its national existence to a furious, implacable, comprehensive campaign of hatred and siege for which there is no parallel or precedent in the modern history of nations. Not for one single moment throughout the entire period of its modern national existence has Israel enjoyed that minimal physical security which the United Nations Charter confers on all member states and which all other member states have been able to command.

Israel is a beleaguered state. Its 8,000 square miles of territory—about the size of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts—are wedged between the Mediterranean Sea and hostile Arab nations. From the time of the United Nations General Assembly's resolution calling for the partition of Palestine—November 29, 1947—Arab guerilla bands and then armies from the adjacent Arab States carried on full-scale war against the Zionists, determined to destroy the new state. For nearly a year the new Republic of Israel fought for its very existence against overwhelming odds, fought and put to rout the Arab armies with the exception of Jordan's Arab Legion in the Jerusalem area. Under auspices of the United Nations, armistices were concluded between Israel and the neighboring Arab States. The first of these was signed on February 24, 1949, almost exactly 8 years ago, between Israel and Egypt. Subsequent arrangements were made between Israel and Syria, Lebanon and Jordan.

These armistice agreements were to be the first step toward the conclusion of genuine peace treaties between Israel and the Arab States. In reality, they only exchanged one form of warfare for another: full-scale military action for border raids, guerrilla attacks, economic boycotts and blockades, all of these underscored by the unremitting hostility of the Arab States toward Israel and their often-repeated avowal to exterminate the Jewish nation. The President of Syria has referred to Israel as a "cancer" which must be eradicated. Other Arab leaders have spoken of "one Arab nation," vowing to mobilize all Arab strength to destroy Israel.

Such has been the situation for nearly 9 years. The continuing violation of Israel's borders by Arab raiders from Syria, Jordan and Egypt has meant constant vigilance to meet the assaults that have taken such a heavy toll of Israeli life and property. It has meant the diversion of a large measure of Israel's very limited resources to maintain the military strength with which to defend her frontiers. It has meant that new towns and settlements in a land where no point is more than 25 miles from a hostile border must serve as frontier fortresses—must be built in such a way as to provide the most advantageous defense positions rather than to provide for the best utilization of land and other natural resources.

But the constant pillaging and harassment of Israel's frontiers has been only one aspect of the concerted Arab effort to destroy Israel. Since 1948 the Arab States have maintained a consistent economic boycott of Israel. Cut off from natural sources of vital materials and from natural markets for her industrial products, Israel has been compelled to subsist with enormous foreign trade deficits. In 1955, for example, Israel's imports were valued at $326 million and exports at only $86 million.

In 1948 the Government of Egypt inaugurated a program of visit, search, and seizure of vessels known to be or suspected of being involved in the transportation of goods to or from Israel. Both ships and cargoes were confiscated in some instances and punitive measures taken against the shipping of various countries desiring to enter into normal commercial relations with Israel. The flags of at least 15 nations, possessing unconditional right of free navigation of the Suez Canal, have been abused by unjustifiable interception—and that by a state which professes to abide by the Suez Canal Convention of 1888. The basis of that Convention is the assurance that "The Suez Maritime Canal shall always be free and open, in time of war as in time of peace, to every vessel of commerce or of war, without distinction of flag." Ships attempting passage through the canal, with Israeli goods among their cargoes, nevertheless have been confiscated and sold, sailors have been imprisoned, and penalties have been imposed on shipping lines known to have touched at Israel's Mediterranean ports. All of this represents an effort to destroy by economic warfare a small nation that could not be crushed by Arab military force.

These restrictions on peaceful international commercial shipping have been applied since 1950 to the Gulf of Aqaba—the approach to the Negev and the new Israeli port of Elath at the head of the gulf—from the Red Sea. On the tip of the Sinai Peninsula and on two tiny, previously uninhabited islands—Tiran and Sinafar—straddling the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba, Egyptian fortifications—with the collusion of Saudi Arabia—were placed with guns trained across the narrow straits to prevent any ships—of whatever flag—from reaching the Israeli port of Elath. Although the Egyptian authorities assured the United States that the gun emplacements were not intended to restrict shipping in the gulf, only a handful of ships succeeded in loading or discharging cargoes at the Israeli port prior to November 1956.

These repeated, flagrant violations of international rights of free commerce and navigation for all nations were protested by Israel before the United Nations Security Council. On September 1, 1951 the Security Council called upon Egypt "to terminate the restriction on passage of international commercial shipping and goods through the Suez Canal wherever bound, and to cease all interference with such shipping beyond that essential to the safety of shipping in the canal itself and to the observance of the international conventions in force."

That resolution has been completely disregarded by Egypt. Before the Security Council, Egypt insisted that the armistice agreement signed with Israel did not put an end to a state of war with Israel and would not prevent Egypt from exercising "certain rights of war."

The same attitude of belligerency was repeated in 1954 when Israel again protested to the Security Council that Egypt's continued restrictions on shipping were violations of the armistice agreement and of the Security Council's own resolution. In this instance the resolution calling upon Egypt to permit Israel-bound ships to pass through the Suez Canal and referring the issue of shipping in the Gulf of Aqaba to the Israeli-Egyptian armistice commission was vetoed by the Soviet Union. Thus, in the more than 5 years since the original United Nations resolution was adopted calling for an end to Egypt's interference with free navigation, neither the United Nations nor the major powers, singly or in concert, have found means of securing Egypt's compliance with that resolution. Israel, the target of Egypt's intransigence, has been compelled to distort its trade paterns and expend vast sums needed for other purposes on rerouting its shipping.

This is well illustrated by the situation with respect to oil, as well. Lacking other adequate sources of fuel and power, and believing that its hope of achieving economic viability lies in the development of small industries, Israel is dependent to a considerable extent on petroleum products. Its own oil production, while promising, supplies only a small fraction of the country's needs. Situated geographically near to the vast oil fields of Iraq, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, and possessing a large, modern refinery at Haifa, Israel would have easy access, under normal conditions, to ample supplies of oil. Yet the oil produced so abundantly from the Middle East fields has been denied to Israel. Not only did Iraq cut the pipeline originally supplying the Haifa refinery from the Mosul area, but neither Saudi Arabia, Kuwait or Bahrein will permit oil concessionaires to divert any production to Israel. Egypt, of course, prohibits the transport of Iranian oil through the Suez Canal to Israel; Lebanon and Syria take pains to prevent any oil reaching their Mediter-

ranean ports by pipeline from being shipped to Israel. The latter thus has had no option but to import oil at great expense from the Venezuelan fields—a distance of some 5,000 miles.

Israel's struggle for survival against such overwhelming economic odds has been complicated by moral necessities which have added to the burdens of the new state even as they have enhanced its stature as a symbol of democracy in an area dark with despotism and absolutism.

Those who founded this little republic did so with a strong sense of dedication to a cause—that of providing a haven for displaced and persecuted Jews—not only those who survived Nazi pogroms in Central Europe, but also those whose lives and liberties were endangered in other sectors of the world. The first Israeli Knesset—parliament—in January 1949 promulgated a Law of Return. This was a pledge that Israel would remain a refuge and home for all Jews who might be under pressure to emigrate from any corner of the earth. This was a formal expression of the prime meaning of Israel: to be a haven where persecuted Jews from every land can live in dignity and freedom.

The implementing of this ideal in a small land with few natural resources has created a series of extremely difficult problems. Internal situations in many countries often has borne heavily on Jewish elements whcre these have been distinguishable from the bulk of the population. In some instances, entire segments of the population were dislodged, finding only in Israel a place of refuge. Thus, at the close of World War II nearly all the Jews of Bulgaria emigrated. The same was true of the greater part of the Jewish community in Yugoslavia and tens of thousands in Czechoslovakia and Poland. Others came from all over the Moslem world from Morocco to Kurdistan—Jews whose forebears had been established in those countries for a thousand years. The Jewish communities of Iraq—125,000—and Yemen—46,000—departed for Israel almost en masse.

This influx threatened to swamp the new state. While adding to the nation's manpower in the army and in the factories, many of the immigrants were destitute, many of them were aged and infirm. In the first 4 years 700,000 immigrants more than doubled the original Jewish population in Israel of 650,000. There are few precedents in history for a population movement of this magnitude. Even though the flight from Palestine of large numbers of Arabs had created some space for Jewish refugees, the immigrant flood created almost insuperable emergencies. In the critical shortage of adequate housing, the newcomers lived in caves, in overcrowded slums and in immigrant tent camps—adding not only to the economic burdens of the young nation, but to its health and educational problems as well. The continuing problems posed by this merging of diverse groups, even of a common religious faith, have affected every aspect of private life and public planning in Israel. They have called for many kinds of sacrifice on the part of the whole population. But they have been met with fortitude, with courage, with the determination that Israel shall fulfill its destiny as a haven for the oppressed and maintain its rightful, historic place in the community of nations.

This resolution has not faltered even as the forces opposed to Israel's peaceful purpose have been gathering strength and extending their influence. We are all familiar with the course the dictatorship of Egypt has followed in recent years—stirring up hostile emotions in the whole of the Arab world, accepting Soviet bloc armaments which could be intended for one purpose, and one purpose only, defying the United Nations, refusing to consider any peace settlement with Israel.

In a speech on the floor of this House February 8, 1956, I joined in urging that formal treaties be negotiated within the framework of the United Nations guaranteeing the present borders of Israel and that Israel be permitted to buy the $50 million of arms requested from the United States—a request that has been denied repeatedly. In pointing out the dangerously explosive situation in the Middle East and the prospect of imminent hostilities against Israel I cited four factors as contributing to this tension:

First. Progressively increasing Arab hostility.

Second. Unconditional Soviet support of the Arab position and Soviet penetration of the Middle East, threatening Israel's national existence and its democratic principles of life.

Third. A massive infusion of deathly armaments into Arab countries from both the Communist bloc and the West.

Fourth. The lack of a security alliance with any other nation, causing Israel to feel she stands alone in her peril.

The ensuing course of events only confirmed the correctness of these statements. The pattern of Arab attacks on Israel increased in scope and intensity. Colonel Nasser, the dictator of Egypt, publicly declared his decision to organize a corps of fedayeen—commandos—to fight in Israel under Egyptian direction. Egypt, Syria, and Saudi Arabia solidified their plans for a joint military establishment. The flow of arms from Communist sources continued, leading to the Egyptian boast that "We, and not Israel, shall fix the place and time for the battle."

This, then, is the background to the events of October and November 1956. In the firm belief that a state is entitled to the inherent right of self-defense, the Government of Israel took action to eliminate the source of the constant threat to the lives and property of its citizens and, indeed, to its independent existence. On October 29 Israeli forces advanced into the Sinai Peninsula to eliminate the bases from which fedayeen units had conducted systematic attacks on Israel. On November 2 Israeli forces occupied Gaza and most of the Sinai Peninsula. Within a period of a few days this move had accomplished its aim. It had also uncovered evidence that extensive accumulations of Egyptian arms and supplies had been made with a view to a major invasion of Israel. With the destruction of frontier fortified posts and the seizure of Egyptian arms depots, Israeli forces evacuated the peninsula, in keeping with the resolutions of the United Nations, with two exceptions. On the Mediterranean front, Israeli forces remained in control of the Gaza Strip, traditionally a part of Palestine, but occupied by Egypt since 1948 and used as a base for forays against Israel, and Israel also retained a hold on the Sharm el Sheikh sector at the mouth of the Gulf of Aqaba, commanding the Strait of Tiran, as insurance that shipping would not again be denied access to the Israeli port of Elath. Israel expressed a willingness to evacuate these positions upon guaranties, first, that Egyptian forces would not be permitted to reoccupy the Gaza Strip so as to resume attacks on Israel; and, second, that an acceptable guaranty be given that Egypt would not again close the Gulf of Aqaba to shipping in Israel's interest. Lacking these assurances, the Israeli Government felt obliged, in the interest of national security, to refuse to accede to the directions of the United Nations or appeals from the United States Government.

The attitude of our own Government in this matter is significant. Very laudably it has been deeply concerned with preserving the peace. Acting in accordance with this view, it had resolutely opposed the military action of Great Britain and France in Egypt, while conceding that the provocation, in Egypt's violation of the Suez Canal Co.'s charter, was very great. Having been, to a large extent, instrumental in securing the withdrawal of British and French forces from Egypt in accordance with United Nations directives, this Government considered the complete withdrawal of Israel from the positions it had occupied to be essential to any attempt to arrive at a solution of Arab-Israel problems. This attitude was reinforced by the measure of approval gained for the United States in the Arab countries and elsewhere in Asia and Africa in consequence of the firm position taken with reference to the action in Egypt by its two principal allies.

The refusal of Israel to withdraw in the absence of guaranties from the two strategic positions on which its future welfare—even survival—to such a large extent depended thus posed a dilemma for the United States. On February 20 President Eisenhower stated that—

> We are now * * * faced with a fateful moment as the result of the failure of Israel to withdraw its forces behind the armistice lines, as contemplated by the United Nations resolutions. * * * It insists on firm guaranties as a condition to withdrawing its forces of invasion. This raises a basic question of principle. Should a nation which attacks and occupies foreign territory in the face of United Nations disapproval be allowed to impose conditions on its withdrawal?

His conclusion was that Israel's failure to act in accordance with U. N. direction would do injury to the United Nations, and jeopardize the prospects of peaceful solution of the problems of the Middle East. In short, while admitting that Egypt has in the past violated the armistice agreement and international law, the President implied that Israel should be compelled, by the imposition of sanctions, to withdraw from its remaining

footholds and trust to the United Nations for the security of its vital interests.

How can we justify such a position? How, for example, can we support a vote of sanctions on Israel—sanction which might well accomplish in a few short months the ruin that the Arab States have been unable to achieve in 9 years—when no penalties are imposed on Egypt for its flagrant and far-reaching transgressions? Not only was no action ever directed at Egypt because of noncompliance with United Nations directives regarding the free use of the Suez Canal, but at this very moment Egypt is refusing to permit final clearing of the canal under U. N. auspices and at U. N. expense, thus depriving the world of the use of that waterway in direct violation of the 1888 convention. Yet no steps are being taken or apparently are being contemplated to end that intolerable situation. Leaving out of consideration for the moment the absence of any move to put weight back of the United Nations resolution of November 4, 1956, calling on the Soviet Union to withdraw its forces from Hungary or that of January 24, 1957, charging India with transgressing previous U. N. directives in taking over Kashmir, it is clear that the application of sanctions against Israel alone would amount to a grave injustice.

This view, I may say, is not uniquely my own. It is borne out in authoritative comment from every part of the country. Conceding the technical act of aggression in Israel's armed entry into the Sinai Peninsula, how can that nation be singled out for condign punishment when its very survival as a nation may well depend on the answer to its demand that it be given assurances that its withdrawal from the outposts now held will not result in renewed jeopardy in time to come? How can the policy of advocating that Israel withdraw from its remaining positions and trust to the United Nations for the security of its vital interests alter the factors which have contributed so much, and are contributing so much, to the situation in the Middle East—the increasing Arab hostility, Soviet support of the Arab position and Soviet penetration of the Middle East, the armaments still arriving in Arab States from the Soviet bloc, and Israel's vulnerable position, without alliances, without guaranties, in a hostile world?

I submit that, if the United States proposes to play a major part in the Middle East area, as in other parts of the world, its voice will be heard and its influence will be felt only as its actions are consistent, its policy based on justice and objectivity. Prejudicial action naturally will be applauded by the beneficiary or beneficiaries of the moment, but only an abiding concern for the relative justice of conflicting claims, which means consistency in foreign policy, and the courage to adhere to such policy in the face of short-term influences and interests will make for a lasting peace. You are not going to win the battle of today or the battle of tomorrow or the battle of the future just with sanctions; no, because you are going, by that very oppression to lay the seeds for bigger and more profound hates. We are not going to win the negative way. What we need is not sanctions. We need settlement. And the first and best way to solve the problem is to look at the matter factually and fairly and try to do complete justice between all of the parties. It is not for a nation or a group of nations having any semblance of respectability or any notion of ethics or morality to pick on the little alleged offenders and leave where it finds them those who are too big or powerful to handle.

It is my hope that this problem will be settled fairly and completely. I am convinced the Gulf of Aqaba problem can be solved by, (1) an Assembly resolution upholding and reiterating what is already in the record—the guarantee of freedom of navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba as well as the Suez Canal; and (2) a firm guarantee that the United Nations Emergency Force be stationed in the area, not as mere "tenants at sufferance" who are there at the convenience, whim, wish, or will of some sheikh or Arab ruler, but with every necessary armament and piece of equipment to completely enforce the armistice. We might as well look at the problem honestly and forthrightly now. If we are ever going to establish the framework for a lasting peace the United Nations force cannot exist there merely at the will of the present dictator of Egypt or of any dictator anywhere.

The problem of the Gaza Strip poses still another real question and in trying to solve it, you have to see the total problem. The question revolves around two alternatives: whether Egypt or the United Nations will take over that territory. If the United Nations does not take over the Gaza Strip, you are not going to have any peace. So whether or not the United Nations has the exclusive or the primary control of the Gaza Strip is not too important, but the United Nations must have at least primary, if not the exclusive jurisdiction and the wherewithal to maintain the peace and order of that area, because every nation in the world and every person in the world has a stake in the problem that is fomenting and festering in the Middle East.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has just touched upon a very important point that should be brought out in connection with this very critical matter. The Gaza Strip, by the original U. N. resolution of 1947 was ceded to what was to become, but never did become a new Arab State. This Gaza Strip was not given to the State of Israel. It was not given to Egypt. It never belonged to Egypt. But when the Arabs attacked Israel in that war of aggression of 1948, Egypt by force of arms captured the Gaza Strip. When the armistice was entered into between Egypt and Israel and the other Arab States in 1949, the Gaza Strip was not given to Egypt, nor was it given to Israel. That agreement, the armistice agreement of 1949, stated that temporary—and I stress the word "temporary"—jurisdiction over the Gaza Strip should be vested by the United Nations in Egypt until there was a determination of the whole problem and peace treaties were entered into. So when the gentleman points out that what is to be done now is for the United Nations to go in and take back jurisdiction of the Gaza Strip, it is doing exactly what it should do and what it should have done a long time ago. Neither Israel nor Egypt as of now should exercise jurisdiction there. The important thing is to make sure that it is not used as a base for military operations, which will further disturb the peace of the area.

Mr. BOYLE. I thank the gentleman for his very timely observations, as they amplify and supplement my remarks at this point.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In supplementing the fine remarks by the gentleman from New York, it is also not true that if technically the lawyers should rule that Egypt still has technical control under the armistice agreement and that, therefore, the United Nations cannot exercise that control—of course, I do not agree with that, but suppose that that should be the point upon which the technical entrance of the United Nations forces into the Gaza Strip was being held up—would it not then become the duty of the United States to lead inside the United Nations an all-out effort to get from Egypt a resolution that they would give to the United Nations this right until permanent arrangements should be made?

Mr. BOYLE. I think so. I think any time you are able to define and limit areas of dispute between the actual participants you are doing a real service toward compromise and settlement.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Therefore, is it not a fact that it is not of great value for us to be simply harping on what Israel ought to do; we should also begin harping on what Egypt ought to do, if it is Egypt that is blocking the way to this final solution?

Mr. BOYLE. I agree with the gentlemon totally, and I want to reiterate the proposition to reasonable people all over the world. The world owes it to itself to see if it can remove itself from the debate on sanctions and talk more and more in terms of settlement.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. In furtherance of what the gentleman from California has stated and in supplement of the very able remarks of the gentleman from Illinois, does the gentleman not believe that if Israel were to withdraw its troops from Gaza and from the Straits of Aqaba in accordance with the direction of the United Nations and especially as a result of the insistence of the United States, actually this might result in Egypt's thinking and the other nations of the Middle East thinking that the actions of Egypt which provoked the response by Israel were actually justified, that we were condoning what Egypt had done in provoking the Israeli Government in seeking to do away with the

fedayeen raids and seeking to do away with the raids upon her shipping in entering the Gulf of Aqaba?

Mr. BOYLE. I think that is very true. Again, of course, I think the biggest thing in this whole field today is a positive approach. If we can start today and compose our differences here, we might eliminate the necessity to litigate and relitigate all of those problems that are no longer current. In that case, we would be doing a service not only to Israel, and to Egypt, and that particular area of the world, but we would be assisting the United Nations in her role as the greatest forum ever devised for resolving the collective controversies of civilization.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is exactly right in that. I should like to recall to the gentleman a fact which I am sure he already knows, and that was the statement by Foreign Minister Moishe Sharett approximately a year ago in pointing out that the Middle East did not consist only of Israel or the Arab nations, it consisted of both of them, of all the nations of the Middle East, and that all of them had to live together and had to find some way of resolving the difficulties that existed.

The difficulties that have existed have been fomented and have been emphasized primarily by the recalcitrants of the Arab nations in refusing to sit down at a conference table and find some modus operandi of getting along with Israel.

Mr. BOYLE. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield.

Mr. VANIK. Will the gentleman not agree that a parallel to the current situation in the occupation of the Gaza Strip was the situation in Korea, where the United Nations came in and remained in authority until a truce was called? Why not have the same sort of situation prevail in this area: the only pattern we have in our national experience in the Korean situation. Would it not be in keeping with that same pattern to have United Nations come in in this situation and exercise dominion until all of the issues of the conflict have been resolved?

Mr. BOYLE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that our distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] on this same subject. And I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so may extend their remarks on the subject covered in the special orders of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE], at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I hope the remarks I have made on the floor today and those of my colleagues have in a small measure pointed up some of the facts that have to be resolved in handling this very difficult problem. I hope that in bringing this to the attention of the Members of the House we have not left the area more clouded than it already is, because I know all of my colleagues and myself have been motivated by the highest of feelings of patriotism, Americanism, and brotherhood.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois upon the able delineation of the problems and the possible solution of the difficulties in the Middle East.

Mr. BOYLE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from California for arranging this very important and timely discussion on the floor of the House regarding the very critical and tense Middle East situation. With great relief I noted in this morning's papers that some break in the crisis seems nearer today than was thought possible a few days ago. At least the parties to the dispute are continuing peaceful discussion and negotiation. This, in itself, is a hopeful sign that some solution can be worked out that is both fair and just to all parties involved.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, I was chagrined when the President went before the American people and, to all intents and purposes, called for sanctions against Israel for that nation's refusal to withdraw its forces from Egyptian territory at the mouth of the Gulf of Aqaba and in the Gaza Strip. The President's statement acted as a signal to the Afro-Asian-Arab bloc to move ahead with its resolution demanding sanctions against Israel. This six-nation resolution is now pending before the United Nations General Assembly.

It seems that we have come a long way since the "peace and prosperity" days of the last campaign. Now we are being told that the crisis is so serious that the President needs authority to use American troops in the Middle East and hundreds of millions of dollars must be spent for military and technical aid to the nations of the Middle East. What is more, we are now told that the very future of the United Nations is linked with the Middle East crisis. The key to the President's address last week is found in the statement:

> If the United Nations once admits that international disputes can be settled by using force, then we will have destroyed the very foundation of the organization. The United Nations must not fail.

I agree with the President that the United Nations must not fail. It is still our best hope for world peace through the peaceful solution of differences between nations. However, I fail to see why the fate of the U. N. is at stake now when it was not during the time the Soviet Union mowed down 25,000 Hungarian patriots, or while India defies the U. N. with respect to Kashmir and while Egypt itself ignores her international obligations with respect to the free passage of ships through the Suez Canal. Not the slightest attempt to apply sanctions against these nations for their defiance of the U. N. has been made, but when a small democracy in the Middle East fails promptly to comply with U. N. demands we suddenly become very self-righteous, high principled, and concerned for the future of the United Nations. This administration turns its moral force on and off like a hot water faucet. And it becomes especially moralistic when certain American oil interests are involved.

It seems almost inconceivable to me, Mr. Speaker, that we as a Nation should take a position against a young, thriving democracy in its struggle to stay alive as a nation against almost insurmountable odds. We have traditionally helped the little guy; been on the side of the underdog. We have always helped and nurtured nations whose people share our beliefs in liberty, freedom, human rights, and the dignity of man. Such a nation is Israel.

I have traveled through this country, and I wish all of you sitting here today could have seen and shared with me the experience of watching a young and vital people create out of desert sand a productive and democratic way of life. And always under danger of enemy attack and reprisal raids. The years of torture these people have undergone gives them an incentive to work toward those same goals that caused our own forefathers to revolt against colonial tyranny or escape from bondage into freedom. There they are, surrounded by enemies, looking to us for encouragement. And what do we do? In as sanctimonious a pronouncement that has ever been made in the name of American foreign policy, we turn our backs on a people's fight for survival and excuse our action on the ground that the future of the United Nations is at stake.

Mr. Speaker, is it the United Nations this administration cares about, or is it rather that their real concern is steeped in Middle East oil? In the past 4 years we have bypassed the U. N. at every turn, going back to it only after our own inept policies have so embroiled us in untenable positions throughout the world that our only choice is to throw the entire mess into the lap of the U. N. Then, if something goes wrong, we have someone else to blame. This has been the history of American foreign policy since 1953—a slipshod policy—dodging, drifting, vacillating—which has resulted in consistent loss of prestige, friends, power, and the ability to bring about peace in the world.

Now, trapped by our own errors of judgment and policy, we allow the Arab bloc to back us to the wall in the U. N. and demand sanctions against Israel. Sanctions against Israel are as much the result of our own bungling as they are the result of Israeli's refusal to withdraw their troops from Gaza and Aqaba without U. N. guaranties which they seek. It is for this reason that I cannot, in good conscience, agree with the President that the U. N. should apply sanctions

against Israel. That tiny nation should not be made to suffer because of our mistakes and our selfish interests in Middle East oil. If this administration is so concerned with principles, then let it not forget certain principles upon which this Nation's greatness is built: fair play, justice, equal treatment to all, big and small alike.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ALLEN of California for the period from February 28 to March 19, 1957, inclusive, on account of official business.

Mr. MAILLIARD from February 28 to March 19, on account of official business.

Mr. JACKSON for 30 days for active duty in the United States Marine Corps Reserve and study mission for Committee on Foreign Affairs in the Near and Middle East.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BAILEY, for 30 minutes, on Monday next.

Mr. HILL, of Colorado (at the request of Mr. HENDERSON), for 90 minutes on March 4.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. REUSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAILLIARD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUDGE, his remarks made in Committee of the Whole and to include a summary of a revised list of tungsten producers participating under Public Law 733 program, prepared by the staff of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ENGLE (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL), his remarks in Committee of the Whole on H. R. 5189 and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HAGEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. METCALF and to include extraneous matter.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 27, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

534. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a copy of the Air Force's semiannual report entitled "Research and Development Procurement Action Report," for the period July 1 to December 31, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

535. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An Act Relating to Children Born Out of Wedlock,' approved January 11, 1951"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

536. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to restrict its application in certain overseas areas, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

537. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the proposed Alaska constitution. The original of this proposed constitution was transmitted to the President by the Governor of Alaska, pursuant to section 15 of chapter 46 of the Session Laws of Alaska, 1955; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 168. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 169). Referred to the House Calendar.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 174. Resolution providing for sending the bill H. R. 2648 and accompanying papers to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1501. A bill for the relief of Beulah I. Reich with amendment (Rept. No. 159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAMER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1537. A bill for the relief of Jacob Baronian; without amendment (Rept. No. 160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAMER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1562. A bill for the relief of Maj. John P. Ruppert; with amendment (Rept. No. 161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2950. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Emery A. Cook; without amendment (Rept. No. 162) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3322. A bill for the relief of James L. Bostwick; with amendment (Rept. No. 163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1359. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theodore (Nicole Xantho) Rousseau; without amendment (Rept. No. 164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1400. A bill for the relief of Mitsuko A. Hachita; without amendment (Rept. No. 165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1757. A bill for the relief of Nicola Marcello; without amendment (Rept. No. 166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2256. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Lucie Leon (also known as Lucie Noel); with amendment (Rept. No. 167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HILLINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 247. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 5301. A bill to provide a right-of-way to the city of Alamogordo, a municipal corporation of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 5302. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 5303. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained the age of 50 in order to become entitled to disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 5304. A bill to provide Federal assistance to States to augment their efforts to prevent surface damage resulting from mine cave-ins; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5305. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 5306. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Relations Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 5307. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 5308. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a domestic parity plan for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. R. 5309. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, rehabilitate, operate, and maintain the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas, Mercedes Division; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LENNON:

H. R. 5310. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act to provide that one-half of any cut in acreage allotments shall be placed in the acreage reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 5311. A bill to provide that State agricultural experiment stations shall devote a portion of the appropriations made to them by the Federal Government to carry out researches with respect to the various aspects of organic farming; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 5312. A bill to authorize the construction of certain works for flood control

and other purposes on the Sacramento River in California; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 5313. A bill to modify the upper Mississippi River Basin flood-control plan to authorize the construction of a local protection project at New Athens, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 5314. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to make grants to certain educational institutions for the construction of military and naval science buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 5315. A bill to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act to provide a new housing program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 5316. A bill designating the 27th day of October in each year as Navy Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 5317. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to reduce from 65 to 62 the age at which a single person can qualify for admission to a low-rent housing project and the age at which a family can qualify for admission to a project designed specifically for elderly families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 5318. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for certain amounts paid by a teacher for his further education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5319. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 5320. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. R. 5321. A bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 5322. A bill to extend certain veterans' benefits to or on behalf of dependent husbands and widowers of female veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5323. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the central west coast area of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 5324. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 5325. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 5326. A bill to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that amounts paid for the medical and dental care of children who have not attained the age of six shall be deductible without regard to the limitations contained in such section; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5327. A bill to postpone the effective date of the amendments made to the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by Public Law 985, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 5328. A bill to amend the Medals of Honor Act to authorize awards for acts of heroism involving any motor vehicle subject to the motor carrier safety regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5329. A bill to amend section 11 of the Clayton Antitrust Act to extend the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission thereunder to contract carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5330. A bill to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5331. A bill to amend section 212 (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H. R. 5332. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 5333. A bill to amend section 2011 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and section 813 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H. R. 5334. A bill to improve and extend, through reciprocal legislation, the enforcement of duties of support in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 5335. A bill authorizing a monetary contribution for the flood-control accomplishments of the multiple purpose Oroville Dam proposed to be constructed on the Feather River by the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NEAL:

H. R. 5336. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 5337. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of employers who are engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce, to eliminate certain exemptions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 5338. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H. R. 5339. A bill to authorize the National Potato Grade Labeling Act, which provides quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. J. Res. 249. Joint resolution to provide for the preparation of a history of momentous scenes in the Congress since the Revolutionary War; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Scientific Research; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. Con. Res. 123. Concurrent resolution creating a joint committee of the Congress to attend the ceremonies to be held at Plymouth, Mass., on May 25, 1957, in connection with the landing of the *Mayflower II*; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana: Memorial of the House of Representatives of Montana relative to construction and use of VHF television translators; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FORAND: Memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress to enact legislation to assist the States in meeting the school housing needs of children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress with respect to amending the Federal Social Security Act so that full benefits may be granted to women who have reached the age of 62 years instead of waiting until they reach the age of 65 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress to enact and maintain tariff rates on textiles (including lace), jewelry, and rubber goods imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States for an expanded program of public housing for elderly persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolutions of the General Court, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to the enactment of legislation making marital desertion and abandonment of minor children an offense under the provisions of the Federal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN: Resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress for an expanded program of public housing for elderly citizens; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to the enactment of legislation making marital desertion and abandonment of minor children an offense under the provisions of the Federal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Texas, memorializing the President to take immediate steps to limit imports of foreign oil to the 1954 percentage of the domestic market as authorized by Congress and required for the security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take corrective measures to equalize imports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging approval of pending legislation which provides for a fair and just settlement to the Crow Indians, so that construction of the sorely needed Yellowtail Dam project may begin at once; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to clarify the existing provisions and further to relax the strict requirements of the Federal social security law that relates to eligibility for benefits for totally disabled persons over the age of 50 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 5340. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Catania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H. R. 5341. A bill for the relief of John J. Farrelly; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 5342. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Skidmore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 5343. A bill for the relief of Elena Ramirez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5344. A bill for the relief of Sun Hsi Zen Yung (also known as Yung Sun Hsi Zen); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 5345. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Haruno Miyasaka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5346. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lum Shee Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5347. A bill for the relief of La Patria Tobacco Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5348. A bill for the relief of Pedro Africa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENNISON:

H. R. 5349. A bill for the relief of Lorna Isabel Azevedo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 5350. A bill for the relief of Haralambos Athanasios Deligiannis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 5351. A bill for the relief of Harlee M. Hansley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 5352. A bill for the relief of Vito Pupo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL (by request):

H. R. 5353. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clarabelle Greene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 5354. A bill for the relief of Stanley Lawrence Ahern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H. R. 5355. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of the United Foundation Corp. of Union, N. J.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENNON:

H. R. 5356. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Sidawi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H. R. 5357. A bill for the relief of Geronimo Navarrete-Rivera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTOSH:

H. R. 5358. A bill for the relief of Hideko Nagabuchi Lafontaine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5359. A bill for the relief of Edith Elisabeth Wagner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5360. A bill for the relief of Chan Kim Tun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 5361. A bill for the relief of Marie Haladjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 5362. A bill for the relief of Hannelore Zinsel-Steeger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED:

H. R. 5363. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarete U. Kayner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 5364. A bill for the relief of Joseph R. Flanders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5365. A bill for the relief of Robert P. Peterman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 5366. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the heirs of Gen. John C. Fremont, the city of San Francisco, and all other persons against the United States arising out of the seizure of certain real property by the United States Government in 1863; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 5367. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Estrada-Salinas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5368. A bill for the relief of Jose Ascencion Orozco Ortega; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5369. A bill for the relief of Aureliano Velazco-Loera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5370. A bill for the relief of Jose Becerril Tores; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5371. A bill for the relief of Wong Chin Yuck Shee (Mrs. Chun Yuck Shee); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5372. A bill for the relief of Gisaburo Nishikawa and his wife Aya Nishikawa (nee Honda); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 5373. A bill for the relief of Simeon Augustus David Linton George Geogahan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5374. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Georges Zacharias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 5375. A bill for the relief of Salvador Arce Davidson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution for the relief of certain creditors of the Norwood Pulp & Machinery Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

104. Mr. CANFIELD presented a petition of the Fratellanza Serinese, Inc. organization of Passaic County, N. J., adopted on February 3, 1957 at Paterson, N. J., endorsing the recommendations of President Eisenhower to revise the quota system as set forth in the present Immigration Act which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Federal Aid for School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, February 26, 1957*

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared relating to Federal aid for school construction be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET US BUILD SCHOOLS

Even though the United States Chamber of Commerce was founded in 1912, I have always suspected a stubbornness on the part of that organization to acknowledge the presence of the 20th century.

Today we have further proof of the chamber's antediluvian outlook on life.

We are informed by the chamber, according to an article in the Washington Star of February 20, that the organization is opposed to Federal aid for school construction.

This is not very shocking.

It is consistent with the chamber's apparent desire for a return to the good old days—which means government for the benefit of the robber barons and others out to gouge the public.

Efforts by the Federal Government to be genuinely helpful to all the people are summarily rejected.

But while denouncing Federal aid, the chamber also took another long step along its dusty trail back to the dark ages when it proclaimed there was actually a surplus of classrooms today.

According to this same article, the chamber puts this surplus at 14,000 classrooms.

This outrageous statement is directly contrary to the opinion of the President of the United States, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the National Education Association, a large part of Congress and the authorities of most of our States—not to mention the children stacked like cordwood in our present schools.

However, the chamber has never been known to be swayed by the facts.

I will not attempt to explain the mathematical whimsy by which the chamber of commerce arrives at this 14,000 figure. Nor do I intend to enter into a numbers game.

I don't know exactly how many classrooms we are short. But even the most conservative estimate of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare puts the current shortage at 159,000 rooms.

The shortage exists—the shortage is critical.

No distortions by the chamber of commerce can hide this basic need of our country.

Again I urge the Senate to move promptly to consider the school construction measures that have been introduced.

## Replies to Questionnaire Sent to Citizens of the Fourth District of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 26, 1957*

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the Fourth District of California have again shown a commendable interest in their Government by respond-

ing in large numbers to my most recent questionnaire. One out of every sixth voter was asked to participate and, as of this date, over 20 percent have answered.

I am greatly encouraged by the substantive thought given to some of the most important current issues. The following tabulation may be of interest to my colleagues:

| | Yes | No | No opinion |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* |
| 1. Do you favor the tight money policy of the Federal Reserve Board currently used to check inflation, recognizing that this policy tends to restrict the availability of mortgage money? | 72 | 24 | 4 |
| 2. Is it your belief that Congress should grant a high priority to the school-construction bill designed to meet emergency needs for more classrooms? | 75 | 22 | 3 |
| 3. Does the administration's civil rights package, including a commission to investigate asserted violations of civil rights, creation of a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, enforcement of voting rights, and preventive relief through civil courts, meet with your approval? | 55 | 33 | 12 |
| 4. The Post Office Department wishes to offset its deficit by increasing postal rates. Do you approve of a boost in 1st-class charges to accomplish this? | 59 | 39 | 2 |
| 5. Do you support the President's proposal that permanent residence be granted Hungarian refugees recently arrived here? | 49 | 46 | 5 |
| 6. Would you favor special tax relief for small-business firms? | 72 | 24 | 4 |
| 7. If the Federal budget is again balanced this year, would you favor some reduction in the national debt before taxes are lowered? | 65 | 33 | 2 |
| 8. Would you support President Eisenhower's request for more authority to admit refugees from Communist countries? | 35 | 60 | 5 |
| 9. Do you favor legislation that would provide statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska? | 79 | 17 | 4 |
| 10. Do you favor stronger antitrust laws, including closer Government scrutiny of merger proposals of large companies? | 73 | 22 | 5 |

## Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 26, 1957*

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on civil-rights legislation as delivered to the Subcommittee on Civil Rights of the House Committee on the Judiciary:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY, FIFTH DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 25, 1957

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee on Civil Rights, let me first express my thanks for the courtesy you have shown in arranging for me to appear before you today, and also to compliment you on the thoroughgoing manner in which you are proceeding in your study of the vital problem of assuring that none of our fellow citizens are denied the civil rights guaranteed them by the Constitution. Certainly when legislation is reported by this subcommittee no one can rightfully say that any aspect of the problem has been ignored, nor that full weight has not been given to all shades of opinion, pro and con. Because of my own lifelong efforts in support of equal opportunity for all races and creeds I have followed closely the progress of these hearings and those in previous Congresses. It is a tremendously good feeling to know that at last we seem to be nearing the goal of congressional action to chart such a course.

For my own part I have long believed that the United States, at a peak never reached by any nation in the history of the world, faces but two really crucial problems, and they are interrelated. The one is the relentless fight against world communism; the other the elimination of second-class citizenship as applied to any segment of our people by force of law or custom. As long as such discrimination exists in this land, based on group antagonisms rather than an evaluation of the individual as he stands on his own two feet, so long shall we be morally disunited and subject to the divisive threat of subversive forces.

We do not have to prove the existence of the problem. What we do have to prove is that we are looking for an honest solution. Left to themselves the States and local communities have failed, and we might as well admit it. And I speak not only of the South but of countless communities in the North as well—Detroit, where a critical problem is right now receiving the attention of the press; Chicago, New York, the Southwest, where Americans of Mexican ancestry are subject to the same type of treatment as Negroes in the South; and even my own area, the west coast, to some degree.

The executive branch of the Federal Government has also failed to use either the legal means now given it under discretionary authority, or the moral force of the Presidency to act against the evil. Where the administrative will is weak or subject to political opportunism, it is the inherent duty of the Congress to provide through laws which say "shall" and not "nay" the force which will implement the constitutional guaranties with which we are now concerned. The Constitution which guarantees to the States certain rights, does not guarantee them the right to do wrong. It does, however, contain in its preamble a guaranty of an overriding purpose to establish justice and to promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to all citizens, white, black, brown, yellow, or red, and it is that purpose we must now implement.

The legislation now before this subcommittee will let us take a long stride in the right direction. Your distinguished chairman and the equally distinguished ranking Republican member have both contributed much to clarifying the issues involved. By the legislation they have drafted they have charted a practical course for us to follow in beginning to right the wrongs under which generations of our fellow citizens have suffered. I personally believe that the Celler bill, H. R. 2145, because of the more explicit guide lines it lays down, should serve as the basis upon which the subcommittee acts.

The establishment of a Commission on Civil Rights to serve as an authoritative body for studying the legal and moral issues, and for formulating executive policy and recommendations is an absolute essential in bringing the executive branch of the Government to a proper exercise of its functions. As a counterpart in the Congress, the provision for a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights in the Celler bill is also necessary lest we tend to delegate too much of our responsibility to the executive authorities. A third requirement in setting up the legislative and administrative framework needed for active operations in the civil-rights field is provided for in the establishment of a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice. Such a new division will lay the proper stress on these functions of our law-enforcement agencies, functions which have been sadly neglected heretofore. Fourth, the Federal courts must be granted clear and undeniable jurisdiction over civil-rights violations if the framework we set up is to be complete.

However, it must be remembered that these provisions of the bills now before the subcommittee provide only a framework. If the legislative structure is to be complete, we must gird that framework with a definite body of principles and definitions upon which to act. The protection of the right to political participation and of other civil rights provided in the Celler bill, and the criminal penalties authorized for violations of these rights, are, it seems to me, an absolute minimum for our present purposes. Certainly there are other forms of discrimination widely practiced, such as that in the field of employment, to which attention must be given. But we must in deference to the great difference of views in so many of these problems, and because of the practical impossibility of immediate agreement on all phases, be content with a beginning aimed at the more basic discriminations.

I certainly agree with those who contend that mere passage of a law, however comprehensive, will not automatically solve the complex problems of racial discrimination, nor bring a new era of good feeling overnight. The deep-seated social attitudes and customs with which we are dealing are not that easily uprooted. We must be wary of any tendency to feel that once the job is begun it will finish itself. Automation has not yet reached that stage of development. The unhappy experience with the 18th amendment should be an example to us in this regard. Therefore, I feel quite strongly that we must be tolerant of intolerance to a degree at least in the initial stages of this vast undertaking. We must look to other measures than the law for a real and final solution of the unhappy problem.

In the last analysis, education must provide the answer. By that I mean not only providing book learning for those to whom it is now denied, but education in the deeper sense. We must educate ourselves to a full understanding and acceptance of the Golden Rule as it applies to our human relations with our fellow man. We must not attempt to force acceptance of a principle where we ourselves are not willing to practice it. We must, in short, use "deliberate speed" in moving toward our goal of true brotherhood, but we must begin to move toward that goal. I believe that our education has now reached the stage where a fruitful beginning is in order through the legislative processes. For that reason, I urge the subcommittee to bring out a bill which will let us take the first step.

## Aldo Leopold Memorial Award Medal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 26, 1957*

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on March 5, during the annual banquet of the 22d North American Wildlife Conference here in Washington, a very high honor was bestowed on a man known to many of us in Congress as a sincere and dedicated conservationist.

Those of us who know C. R. "Pink" Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute, recognize and respect his dedication to the public-spirited cause of improved natural resources management.

Before the more than 900 natural resources administrators, technicians, sportsmen, and Members of Congress attending the banquet, Gutermuth was given the Aldo Leopold Memorial Award Medal in recognition of distinguished service to wildlife conservation.

The Leopold medal and scroll, which is given by the Wildlife Society, a continentwide society of professional fish and game technicians, commemorates the late Aldo Leopold, considered by many the father of wildlife management in North America. Conferral of this coveted medal shows the great esteem and appreciation that conservationists hold for a fellow worker who has done an outstanding and monumental job in furthering the objectives of their profession.

The first Leopold Memorial Award Medal was conferred in 1951 upon Carl D. Shoemaker, former conservation director for the National Wildlife Federation. Subsequent natural resources workers who have been honored are: Dr. Olaus J. Murie, 1952; Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, 1953; Harold Titus, 1954; Hoyes Lloyd, 1955; Dr. Clarence Cottam, 1956.

## Thomas G. Masaryk: Champion of Human Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 26, 1957*

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a little over 100 years ago, on March 7, 1850, there was born in Moravia a man who today is revered as one of the great champions of human freedom: Thomas G. Masaryk.

Americans are particularly responsive to the greatness of Masaryk because of his own close personal association with our country, his marriage to an American, and his friendship with Woodrow Wilson. We know, too, how much he drew his inspiration from our American ideals and institutions.

But the spirit of liberty and justice knows no natural boundaries. Masaryk today has become a world figure and we Americans in turn are in his debt for the contribution he made to freedom's cause.

I think we can repay that debt in some small measure by giving new life to our determination that Czechoslovakia shall once again be free. We know that in that land—as in other lands behind the Iron Curtain—the dedication to true democracy remains undimmed by the oppressor's iron fist. We cannot today merely mouth sterile slogans, nor must we be terrified by the Soviet Union's campaign of violence. A positive program aimed at a peaceful settlement is urgently needed.

In this endeavor, Americans of all national origins will join with heartfelt thanks that the greatness of Thomas Masaryk lives on to give us confidence that out of darkness shall come a rebirth of the freedom for which he gave his life.

## Middle East Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, February 26, 1957*

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD remarks which I delivered before the Bernalillo County Democratic convention at Albuquerque, N. Mex., on February 18, 1957.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIDDLE EAST PROPOSALS

(Remarks of Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON before the Bernalillo County Democratic convention, Albuquerque, N. Mex., February 18, 1957)

This week the Senate of the United States will start its debate on the Eisenhower Mid-East Resolution. Next week it expects to vote. Possibly we should ask how the Democratic Senators on the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees have been acting in your behalf.

As you know, the combined committees reported out the Eisenhower Mid-East Resolution by a vote of 20 to 8, with Senators JOHNSON of Texas and LANGER absent. There were a number of attempts made to improve the resolution and to take into consideration the basic difficulties in the areas, such as the Arab-Israeli dispute, the Suez Canal question, the Soviet Union arms traffic, and the like; but no success was achieved, as a solid Republican bloc voted down all but the Humphrey amendment which, in effect, reaffirmed the President's constitutional authority as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and under it the power to act instantly in case our security was in danger.

It is my belief that if some of the amendments had been accepted, there would have been fewer votes against the proposal. It is my further belief that if this bill is not amended on the Senate floor in such a manner as to recognize the basic difficulties, there will be a sizable minority—possibly numbering about 25—against it.

This resolution as it was presented might have been regarded as unnecessary because the President had the constitutional right to exercise the military power and had the funds in this year's Mutual Security Act to carry out what, if any, economic ideas he may have had. However, this resolution means that we act on a unilateral basis; it means in the words of Senator RUSSELL, that despite weeks of effort to find out what the administration proposed to do in the matter of economic assistance, the Senate members of the two committees were given nothing they could hang on to, and in effect were "buying a pig in a poke."

Personally, I do not believe that the administration has a program for the Middle East. I think the resolution is a prelude to a policy, but not a policy in itself, and I am fearful that we may become committed in an area where we will find ourselves at a great disadvantage. Some Democrats felt that the military and economic sections should be separated, others felt that more consideration should be given to the basic difficulties inherent in the area, and others felt that a grave constitutional question was involved which was both against the interest of the Congress by, in effect, giving the President some of the constitutional authority belonging to the Congress, and against the interest of the President by putting a limitation on his own constitutional powers. There is absolutely no similarity between the President's proposal on the one hand and the Greek-Turkish doctrine and the Formosa resolution on the other. No country has requested us to come into the Middle East. The situation is extremely precarious because of the instability of all the Arab States except Iraq, and unless something definite is embodied in the final draft of the resolution, its chances for ultimate success are, in my opinion, not too good.

While we all recognize that the President has a primary and great responsibility in the field of foreign affairs, it is well to keep in mind that every Senator individually, and the Senate collectively, likewise has a great stake in the field of foreign policy. If we are going into an adventure in this area of the world, I think we are entitled to know much more in the way of facts than we know at the present time. In that respect our knowledge of what we intend to do, on the basis of testimony before the committees, is practically nothing.

But the Democratic Senators on those two committees have measured up to the standards of a party of responsibility. They studied with care the proposals of the President and his Secretary of State. Senator MANSFIELD, of Montana, early delivered on the Senate floor a memorable address which was universally praised in the press as outstanding in its fairness and in its appeal for true bipartisan conduct of our foreign affairs. Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, followed up his statement of January 24 with a strong Senate speech on February 11, just 1 week ago. I want to quote some sentences from it to show why reasonable and internationally minded Democratic Senators have trouble signing on the dotted line, whatever the President asks.

"In form and substance, the resolution as prepared by the administration wants something from this Chamber, the mere asking of which would have led to a national outcry under any other administration back to Washington's. It asks for a blank grant of power over our funds and Armed Forces to be used in a blank way, for a blank length of time, under blank conditions, with respect to blank nations, in a blank area. We are asked to sign this blank check in perpetuity or at the pleasure of the President, any President.

"Who will fill in," asks Senator FULBRIGHT, "all these blanks?"

"The resolution says that the President, whoever he may be at the time, shall do it. And that's not all it says. It says that in filling in the blanks, the President need not consult, much less be accountable to any other constitutional organ of Government. He shall be the counsel—judge—jury of the national interest.

"His judgment about world realities shall be the sole warrant for his deeds in committing our forces to battle and our funds to who knows what purpose.

"His office shall be the only archive holding the record of his transactions, except as he reports the results once a year to the Congress.

"And, finally, he shall decide autonomously when his autonomous powers shall expire."

Now I say to you that in situations like this one we need representatives in the Congress—and this convention is held to select

the delegates who will pick the proper one in the State Democratic convention—who will not be afraid to take time to consider the implications of every Presidential proposal and then vote upon each as they believe the welfare of the Nation demands.

It has been 10 years since I sat in the Cabinet Room of the White House and discussed with a group of the Nation's leaders headed by President Truman, the need for aid to Greece and Turkey if these lands were not to surrender to the pressures of communism. A great Republican statesman sat just at my right, the late Arthur Vandenberg of Michigan. The situation in Congress was comparable to the present—only reversed. The Congress then as now was controlled by the opposite political party to the President. I have not forgotten that the Republican Senators of 1947 exercised their full right to proceed with caution on the statesmanlike proposals of President Harry S. Truman for the aid of Greece and Turkey. I will neither be surprised nor shocked if Democratic Senators 10 years later examine with equal care the much more drastic proposals of President Eisenhower to stabilize conditions in that same area.

Every mile of the road is marked with signs reading, "Proceed With Caution." What the administration asked us to do was not to pass a simple Senate resolution expressing our composite view, nor a concurrent resolution in which the House of Representatives added its voice, but a joint resolution which when signed by the President has the force of law, and thus becomes a blanket transfer to the Executive of the constitutional right vested in the Congress to declare war.

I am ready and willing to vote for a resolution which clearly states and pledges the support of the Senate to the President as he seeks to oppose the spread of Communist influence in the Middle East. With the amendment proposed by Senator HUMPHREY, a Democrat, of Minnesota, and adopted by the two Senate committees engaged in the Middle East hearings, I believe the resolution comes closer to that objective and I shall probably vote for it. But the span of hearings and debate upon it has persuaded me, if I needed any proof or persuasion, that the position of Representative in Congress is one of tremendous importance to the people of New Mexico, and that the Democratic Party should do its utmost to select a strong candidate and win the April election in an impressive manner.

---

## Today's Republicanism Is in Essence the Republicanism of Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

**HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT**
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 26, 1957*

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the Lincoln Day period it was my privilege to address a series of Lincoln Day dinners throughout the State of Pennsylvania, sponsored by the various Republican county committees. The final address in the series was delivered at the annual Lincoln-Washington dinner held at Greensburg, Pa., February 22, 1957, under the auspices of the Westmoreland County Republican Committee. The address follows:

It is a distinct honor to join you on this occasion as you pay deserving tribute to the immortal Abraham Lincoln.

It is a happy coincidence that this Lincoln Day Dinner is being held on the birthday of the first President—the Father of our Country—George Washington.

For years there have been friendly debates over the question as to who was the greatest American—Washington or Lincoln. While the issue is still a topic of discussion, nevertheless, the names of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln will always be enshrined in the hearts of the American people.

This year, the Republican Party through these Lincoln Day Dinners observes the 148th anniversary of the birth of the 16th President of the United States—the martyred Lincoln.

Abraham Lincoln was a self-made man. A pioneer farm boy, he had barely a full year of formal schooling. He was truly a man of the people who worked as a hired man on a farm, on a flatboat crew, as a rail splitter and a store clerk. Then he was a storekeeper, a village postmaster, a surveyor and a soldier.

He owed his outstanding quality of humanity and his deep insight into the hearts and minds of the people to this training in the school of real life. Continuing his self-education, he studied law and entered politics. He became a fabulous figure as a successful trial lawyer in Illinois. He served in the State legislature and for a term in Congress.

When the Republican Party was founded, Lincoln became one of its early leaders. He gained nationwide attention in a series of debates with Senator Douglas. From this point he moved forward as a gifted son of the United States. His feet were planted on the path of destiny to the Presidency—and his martyrdom.

Lincoln and the Republican Party led the Nation during the greatest crises any free government ever endured. Together they saved the Union and won equality for all men.

Today Republicanism is in essence the Republicanism of Abraham Lincoln. It is an up-to-date application of his enduring principles. It is a projection of Lincoln's principles into the age of atomic energy, electronics and guided missiles. Truly, it is 20th century application of a faith which was firmly founded in the age of steam and muskets.

It is a faith based on Lincoln's timeless statement that:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all or cannot so well do for themselves in their separate and individual capacities.

"In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves government ought not to interfere."

This is basic Republicanism. This is—and always has been—the philosophy of the Republican Party.

President Eisenhower referred to Lincoln's philosophy last April 3, when speaking on The Function of Government he said:

"There we try to stick to the old Lincolnian dictum that it is the function of Government to do for people those things—(they) could not do for themselves and to stay out of things in places where the people can do things for themselves.

"We would hope, therefore, to have wisdom in Government to help distinguish the line beyond which Government should not go and yet be courageous in doing those things that it should do."

This is today's Republicanism as defined in the words of President Eisenhower—a Republicanism forged out of time and tested by the strains and stresses of this atomic age.

The Eisenhower administration has followed this Lincoln philosophy in its actions and its programs. It has taken to heart Lincoln's words: "To us it appears * * * the best sort of principle * * * the principle of allowing the people to do as they please with their own business."

The Eisenhower administration has restored the confidence of America in the free-enterprise system. It has chopped away at the systems of controls inherited from previous administrations. It has created a climate in which free enterprise can function at its best to bring us prosperity and full employment.

In the field of social legislation the Eisenhower administration has broadened and increased railroad and civil-service retirement benefits. New programs have been put into effect to help our farmers. New loan funds have been made available to help complete rural electrification, to improve rural telephone service, to aid small businesses. Funds have been made available to continue guaranties on GI mortgages.

A slum-clearance program is going full blast to make our large cities better places in which to live.

The Hungarian refugee program is under way on an expanded basis.

The Eisenhower program for modern highways was enacted—a program of today's Republicanism to meet today's travel needs.

A modern school construction program remains a prime goal of the Republican Party—the party of peace, progress, and prosperity.

This forward-looking program of Modern Republicanism is in keeping with Lincoln's administration which encouraged the building of railroads to link East with West.

It also provided funds from Federal land sales for State agricultural and mechanical colleges—a program constantly trying to determine and solve the needs of all our people.

While doing all of these things, financial stability has been achieved. We are operating under a balanced budget—the first in almost a decade. Much effort has been made to put the Hoover Commission recommendations into effect and to add to the efficiency and economical operation of our Government.

As under Lincoln, the Republican Party is once again standing firm for the principle of equal rights for all men. Under the Republicans, today great strides are being taken in the fight against discrimination and injustice. The Republican policy of firmness and strength has gotten us out of one war and kept us out of others. We have made no secret diplomatic deals even with our allies. We stand for the right even when our friends do wrong. We worked to stop war in Egypt and are working to keep the peace.

Another quality inherited from Lincoln is a deep and ingrained respect for our constitutional republican form of government. As Lincoln said in his first inaugural address:

"A majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinion and sentiments is the only true sovereign of a free people."

President Eisenhower, in his speech at San Francisco accepting renomination, said that the Republican Party "is the party of long-range principle not short-term expediency." He went on to say that "Our Founding Fathers showed us how the Federal Government could exercise its responsibility for leadership while stopping short of the kind of interference that deadens local vigor, variety, initiative, and imagination."

This respect for the rules and limits of our Constitution is typical of the Republican Party. The Republican Party of today has retained from Lincoln's time a great quality—that of moderation. As Lincoln said, "Now let us harmonize, my friends, and appeal to the moderation and patriotism of the people."

Harmony and moderation are the keynote of the present Republican administration.

Never have the people of the United States been so at peace with themselves—so prosperous, so satisfied. This Eisenhower administration—yes; this Republican administration—has been one of good will to all. The

pettiness, personal animosities, and appeals to class hatred of previous administrations have no part in this one.

What a contrast exists, ladies and gentlemen, when you compare what took place during the 20 years under the New Deal and the Fair Deal. They sought to substitute a Government-planned and controlled economy for the free, competitive, private economy which made this Nation the greatest wealth-producing nation in the world.

Remember how the New Deal tried to regiment all American industry into codes in a Government-dominated NRA? Remember how New Dealers set up Government corporations in competition with our own citizens and pressed for Government monopolies over electric power? Remember how they tried to spread Government-controlled TVA's to other parts of the country in disregard of State lines and interests?

By piling bureau upon bureau and by extending the long arm of the Federal Government into every activity in the land, the New Dealers sought to make the farmer, factory manager, worker, and other large segments of our population subservient to Federal decrees and dependent upon Federal handouts.

Remember how the Fair Dealers kept production, wage, price, and rent controls long after the war was over? Remember how they tried to seize the steel industry, how they tried to draft railroad workers into the Army in order to force them back to work, and how they continuously raised taxes on all our people until the Government's tax bill demanded a quarter of the Nation's income?

Frankly, during the 20 years of Democratic rule the New Dealers and Fair Dealers had the Nation on a toboggan slide down the road to socialism.

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, down the road to socialism. And even though they were repudiated at the polls in 1952, and again by an increasing majority in 1956, yet this same group of New Dealers and Fair Dealers are today not only fighting to take over the Democratic Party, lock, stock, and barrel, but they are playing the role of a wrecking crew in their efforts to create disunity within the ranks of the Republican Party.

Regardless of what the Eisenhower administration proposes, whether it be a program for national defense or foreign or domestic policy, spokesmen for the New Deal-Fair Deal forces never miss an opportunity to launch vicious, personal, and partisan attacks on the Eisenhower administration in general, and in particular on President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, and Secretary of State Dulles.

These self-styled "liberals" who are experts in the field of political sniping charge the Eisenhower administration with failure of foreign policy, especially in the Middle East; yet former Democratic President Harry S Truman on last January 1 said:

"If I were now a Member of the Senate, I would support the request of the President for congressional authority to use the Armed Forces of the United States against any Communist or Communist-dominated aggressor in the Middle East.

"And I would quickly approve granting him the funds he seeks to extend economic aid to help the Middle East nations maintain their independence."

In the field of national defense this New Deal-Fair Deal wrecking crew charges that the Eisenhower administration has weakened our national defenses, yet the military brains of the Nation have assured the American people time and time again that the United States has the greatest concentration of military force in its peacetime history.

Let me read a recent statement of Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat of Georgia and chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, of which I am a member. Chairman VINSON said on February 1, 1957:

"The armed services have built not only strong defenses but have the ability to bring devastation on any nation that starts a war.

"The Military Establishment," he said, "was built for the defense of freedom and for the purpose of preserving peace, but it is capable of waging war, if necessary."

Echoing the attack they made in last fall's campaign in regard to the rise in the cost of living the New Deal-Fair Deal wrecking crew conveniently forgets that since President Eisenhower took office in 1953 inflation has been halted, the increase in the cost of living has been held to 3.6 percent, the dollar stabilized—and above all, we have full employment as well as increases in wages and purchasing power.

Then too, we are at peace with the world, with the American people accepting the 3.6 percent increase in the cost of living in preference to the wholesale slaughter of American youth on the battlefields of the world.

The New Deal-Fair Deal wrecking crew forgets that under Democratic President Harry S Truman the cost of living from April 1945 to December 1952 rose 50 percent and that during his last term in the White House the cost of living increased 11 percent.

This same group claims that the Democratic Party is alone the friend of the common man. This myth is exploded when you study the tax record of the Democratic Party which shows that when they took over the Government of the United States in 1933 a married man with 2 children paid $68 in Federal income tax if he had an income of $5,000—but in 1952, when the Democratic rule ended, he was paying $461, or nearly 7 times as much. Since 1952, the Republican Party has granted two tax reductions which returned to the pockets of the wage earner and his family $2 out of every $3 granted in tax relief.

So, ladies and gentlemen, you can use your own judgment as to which political party is really the friend of the so-called common man.

The vicious personal and partisan attacks that led to twisting and distorting facts proved futile in last fall's campaign when the Democrats could not find a real issue they could use against the team of Eisenhower and NIXON despite the fact that during the Democratic-controlled 84th Congress they launched 218 congressional investigations and inquiries at a cost of nearly $9¼ million.

The present Democratic-controlled 85th Congress is at it again and to date has appropriated nearly $3 million for all sorts of investigations on every phase of Government as administered by President Eisenhower and his Republican administration. These investigations are designed to develop issues to be used against the Republican Party in the 1958 congressional campaigns.

In mentioning 1958, let me emphasize its importance because it has a twofold significance to every resident of Pennsylvania. First, we have to rid our State capital of the Leader administration by electing a Republican Governor and giving him a supporting Republican State legislature. Secondly, we have to elect a Republican United States Senator and Republican Members of the House of Representatives to support President Eisenhower.

If our efforts are successful in 1958, our success will mean the end to divided government in Harrisburg where we have a Democratic Governor and a Republican legislature—and in Washington where we have a Republican President and a Democratic Congress.

Experience over the years has proved that a divided Government does not function in the best interests of the American people.

Having mentioned 1958 as a crucial election year, let me make a few timely observations. To begin with, we are going to be faced with a militant Democratic Party headed by Governor Leader and gloating over its victory last fall in electing a Democratic Congress including Democratic Senator from Pennsylvania despite President Eisenhower's impressive victory.

Do you know that a study of the 1956 election results reveals that Republican congressional candidates last November ran over 7 million votes behind the 35½ million ballots cast for President Eisenhower?

In plain words, ladies and gentlemen, over 7 million voters who favored President Eisenhower did not even bother to vote for Republican congressional candidates.

This fact is alarming mainly because in 1958 we will not have President Eisenhower on the ticket. In other words, we Republicans will have to row the political boat alone. This situation hurls a challenge at the Republican Party. Mark you, to meet this challenge face-to-face we must rededicate ourselves to Republican principles and especially the Eisenhower brand of Modern Republicanism. In so doing, let us resolve to spend more time and effort at the precinct level in the education of voters on the objectives and accomplishments of the Republican Party.

Let us elect to public office Republicans in whom the voters have absolute confidence and respect. In short, let us become political missionaries by preaching the gospel of true Republicanism, thus building a more vigorous and dynamic Republican Party.

Ladies and gentlemen, we can take pardonable pride in the fact that the Republican Party—the party of Abraham Lincoln—is the party of the future. It is growing in strength because it is attracting to its ranks thinking men and women of all political faiths.

In its early days a large percentage of the founders of the Republican Party from all walks of life were former Democrats who felt that their old party was not true to its original ideals and who, therefore, turned to the Republican Party as the true party of the people. In recent years, as more and more Americans felt that the party of their choice was not living up to its principles, the Republican vote for President rose from less than 17 million in 1936 to more than 35½ million in 1956.

Many of these Americans are going the full distance and becoming active in the ranks of the Republican Party which more nearly meets their ideals. The Republican Party welcomes all Americans to its ranks to participate in the building of a better future—a future in the true tradition of Abraham Lincoln.

The up-to-date application of Lincoln principles under sound Republican leadership has brought peace, prosperity, and progress to America. The United States is the strongest hope of a troubled world. Because of this the points of agreement between Americans are growing stronger every day under the principles of Republicanism. Differences are settled by ballots, not by bullets. Never before in the history of the world have so many of the good things of life been shared in such abundance by so many Americans. America's progress is of a material and spiritual nature and is reflected by new homes—new factories—new autos—a greater interest in religion—and a stronger determination for peace.

Therefore, on this occasion, as we commemorate the 148th anniversary of the birth of the immortal Abraham Lincoln, let us face the future with renewed confidence because of the realization that, as Republicans, we have gone far toward living up to Lincoln's words:

"With malice toward none—with charity for all—with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in * * * to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and all nations."

## A National Grammar Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

**HON. HARLAN HAGEN**
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 26, 1957*

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation which would establish a National Grammar Commission to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate which shall have the usual prerogative of a national commission and a specific purpose to be carried out. In this instance, the purpose is that of research into the rules of spelling and grammar deemed to be desirable for use of the English language in the United States. The product of such research would be the establishment of an official dictionary of reformed spelling and grammar. Once established, this dictionary would serve as the directive for the reproduction of material by the United States Government and its officials and employees with the hope that usages established would become common in our society generally.

This legislation was introduced by me at the request of Mr. Homer Wood, of Porterville, Calif. Mr. Wood is presently the publisher of a daily newspaper in that city. In addition to his newspaper experience, he has in his background a qualification to practice law and experience in the administration of courts. For some time he has been concerned with the problems created by the inadequacies of our grammar and spelling. He is convinced that the establishment of a more scientific system of spelling and grammar would result in a saving of tens of millions of dollars and would ease considerably the burden of our educators with a correlative improvement in the language usage habits of our citizens. The proposal has received wide publicity already.

I am convinced that there is much merit in it. Neither Mr. Wood nor myself visualize that such a commission would establish a complete new method of spelling, phonetic or otherwise, or the abandonment of a substantial portion of our rules of grammar. The commission would make its attack on the most obvious inadequacies of our language usage. In other words, the proposals of the first grammar commission would be moderate. Experience would demonstrate to what extent more radical changes in our language usage would be desirable, but the initial effort would be modest according to my conception. The proposal contained in my bill is not original because efforts have been made in the past in various quarters to rationalize language usage which I will give you briefly from the history of such efforts and from the justifications announced in the past.

In 1550, the poet Ronsard said:

> Thou shouldst not put any letters in words if thou dost not pronounce them.

Since that time, scholars and learned men of every generation have attempted to simplify the spelling of the language. English, which in most respects is considered a relatively simple language to master, has the most difficult spelling of all. Down through the years, there have been attempts to simplify other languages such as Dutch, French, Norwegian, and Spanish.

Why is such a reform desirable? Reform, when it means improvement, is always desirable. Spelling reform would tend to give the language greater uniformity in pronunciation. It would save time, space, labor, and money. The question of economy is more far-reaching than we might suppose. It occurs day after day and year after year in many countless ways. Think of the hours that a child wastes in school learning to read—hours that could be saved by easier reading. Think of the hours wasted in learning to spell words in which letters and the pronunciation are entirely different. The battle with spelling does not end there. It is a continuous process through life—keeping up and perfecting the knowledge of spelling. It means countless hours wasted at the dictionary consulting the spelling of a word. Then, too, he spends much time in the needless task of writing silent letters. The cost of printing the silent letters runs into the millions of dollars for each generation. Yet, many people defend silent letters by pleading their advantage in the study of etymology. That etymologies would be obscured by the use of simplified spelling is not true. The fact is that etymologies would be clarified—few would be obscured and none would be lost. Finally, the present system of spelling is a hindrance in modern education. It is difficult for a child to learn and difficult for the teacher to teach. A simplified system would save many teaching hours. It would have greater rewards for the child and hence would be of greater interest to him. All of these arguments have been set forth many times. Because they are true, they cannot be repeated too often.

Other languages have adopted reforms in spelling. Because of the differences of writing and printing methods used in the various parts of Germany a conference of delegates was held at Dresden in October 1872. Dr. Falk, the Prussian Minister of Education, proposed that Professor von Raumer should prepare a report on the need for reform. The reforms were prepared, sent to the various governments and then submitted to a ministerial commission composed of Von Raumer and 11 other scholars. The commission met in January 1876 and, with certain modifications, approved the reforms. The reformed spelling was then required to be taught in all schools.

In Denmark, in the 1800's the reform movement resulted in an official decree confirming certain regulations. This decree, however, was not made obligatory.

Spain has been designated as one of the languages with the simplest forms of spelling. In 1741 the Spanish Academy laid down the principles for the spelling of Spanish.

> Pronunciation must have for its sole and universal rule, that by it alone there can always be known with what letter the sound should be written. (La pronunciación se debe tener por regla única y universal siempre que por ella sola se puede conocer con que letra se ha de escribir la voz.)

More recently, the French Government has requested a report on spelling and other grammar reforms for their native language. In 1950 the Conseil Supérieur de l'Education Nationale requested that such a report be made, and the findings of the Commission de Réforme were made public in 1952. The commission was headed by M. A. Beslais, director of primary education for all France. The report includes the recommendation that what Beslais calls "parasite consonants"—that is, silent letters—be thrown out altogether. In addition, the report recommends that certain letters be dropped and others substituted in the alphabet. M. Beslais says that there is no reason for children in this modern day and age to spell words the same way that their grandparents spelled them. Children of today have too much to learn. The report quotes the decree of the Conseil Supérieur de l'Education Nationale of 1901, which said that tolerance should be shown to any student who used poor spelling on his exams provided that the student showed intelligence. M. Beslais further stated that the reforms should be started with the children entering in the first grade and not with adults. In conformance with the decree of 1901, tolerance would be shown for student use of simplified spelling in the higher grades. The report states:

> In 10 years, reformed spelling will have an existence parallel to the orthography of today and in a generation it will have practically eliminated it.

In addition to the spelling reform, the report also deals with the reform of some rules of grammar which might have an even greater effect than the proposed spelling changes. But before these reforms go into effect, they must be approved by the Conseil Supérieur de l'Education Nationale.

There have been several reform movements for the English language, both in spelling and other forms of grammar. In the late 1800's, 130 British school boards petitioned the education department for a Royal Commission to study the matter. The British Social Science Association, the Philological Society of England, the American Philological Association, and the Spelling Reform Association asked for reforms. In 1877, the State Teachers' Association of New York appointed a committee to ask the State legislature to create a commission to study reform spelling. In 1878, a petition in favor of reform spelling was presented to the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Many prominent men have advocated spelling reform in the English language. Among these are Theodore Roosevelt, George Bernard Shaw, and Colonel Robert McCormick.

In 1906, Theodore Roosevelt had the following to say about the proposed spelling reform:

> Most of the criticism of the proposed step is evidently made in entire ignorance of what the step is, no less than in entire ignorance of the very moderate and commonsense views as to the purposes to be achieved,

which views are so excellently set forth in the circulars to which I have referred. There is not the slightest intention to do anything revolutionary or initiate any far-reaching policy.

They represent nothing in the world but a very slight extension of the unconscious movement which has made agricultural implement makers and farmers write "plow" instead of "plough"; which has made most Americans write "honor" without the somewhat absurd, superfluous "u"; and which is even now making people write "program" without the "me."

It is not an attack on the language of Shakespeare and Milton, because it is in some instances a going back to the forms they used, and in others merely the extension of changes which, as regards other words, have taken place since their time.

It is not an attempt to do anything far-reaching or sudden or violent, or indeed anything very great at all. It is merely an attempt to cast what slight weight can properly be cast on the side of the popular forces which are endeavoring to make our spelling a little less foolish and fantastic.

George Bernard Shaw was a lifelong advocate of simplified spelling, punctuation, orthography, and phonetics. He advocated the use of spaced letters instead of italics. Shaw wrote many articles on the subject, some of which are as follows: A Plea for Speech Nationalization, the Morning Leader, August 22, 1901; The Dying Tongue of Great Elizabeth, the Saturday Review, February 11, 1905; and Orthography of the Bomb, the Times, December 27, 1945.

Col. Robert McCormick used many of the simplified spelling rules in his newspaper, the Chicago Tribune, all during the time that he controlled the newspaper. He was a firm believer in the benefits derived from simplified spelling.

One other report in connection with grammar reform that should be cited is the Joint Committee on Grammatical Nomenclature. This committee was appointed by the National Education Association, the Modern Language Association of America, and the American Philological Association. Its report was first published in 1913 and reprinted in 1929. In the report, it states the following concerning its purpose:

> The adoption of a system of identical nomenclature for identical phenomena in all the languages of our family which the student may take up, with its natural accompaniment of differing nomenclature at the points where the phenomena differ, would have the effect of making these differences stand out more sharply in his mind.
>
> * * * And it is believed, therefore, not only that the acceptance of the system recommended will at once lead to a state of things much more satisfactory than the present one, but also that the greater part of the system will successfully stand the test of future thought; while the general use of it will at the same time direct attention more sharply upon points at which its results may at some future day be bettered.

If we look at the grammar books of today, we find that the nomenclature used differs from textbook to textbook. It is true that there is a greater degree of conformity than in the past, but a uniform system still has never been adopted.

Much has been written on the subject of reform in the past. Reform is still being advocated by the scholars of today. Yet nothing has been done about making official recommendations for reform. A National Grammar Commission, authorized by the Government, would have that power. It would make our grammar as much a part of this modern age in which we live as has modern industry.

---

## United States Foreign Policy Today and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, February 26, 1957*

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on February 11 the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] inaugurated the first of a series of lectures at Georgetown University. The lectures are a part of the Father Edmund A. Walsh lecture series. On that occasion the distinguished minority leader made a speech, which I believe to be entitled not only to the consideration of this body, but also to the consideration of the House of Representatives and the country as a whole. As usual, he was constructive and fair-minded, and he laid before the American people a proposition for their consideration.

Mr. President, on last evening I had the opportunity and the honor of following the distinguished senior Senator from California, at which time I spoke on the subject "United States Foreign Policy Today and Tomorrow." I ask unanimous consent that the speech I made last evening at Georgetown University be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY TODAY AND TOMORROW

(Address by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, Montana, Father Edmund A. Walsh lecture series, Georgetown University, February 25, 1957)

More than 35 years ago the late Father Edmund A. Walsh saw the fulfillment of a dream for which he had labored with steadfastness of purpose and great energy. It was the foundation at Georgetown University of the school of Foreign Service which now, fittingly, bears his name.

The circumstances of its birth are familiar to you all. A terrible war had ended. Father Walsh recognized the demands which coming events would make upon the intellectual resources of the Nation. He properly estimated the importance of having an informed citizenry and a trained and dedicated personnel to discharge the responsibilities of this country in the cause of world peace.

Yet Father Walsh could not have anticipated the extent to which the life of our people was to be dominated by the subject of foreign policy, or the scope of its development. The world is quite a different place today from what it appeared 35 years ago. When I was a student, our problems, our interests were predominantly local or national. We were concerned almost exclusively with domestic matters. The United States was an immense country, so immense that even what happened on the west coast touched the east but lightly. Our relations with foreign governments were for the very few who were qualified to understand the meaning of incidents around the globe.

Today one has only to look at the curriculum of the average university to appreciate the extent of our preoccupation with foreign affairs. Main Street knows, and insists on knowing, why Washington proceeds in one way or another; for Main Street is directly affected by decisions on countless matters to which, a few decades ago, it paid little or no attention. Areas of the world which were merely places in a book are common topics of conversation, because they are vital to our national interest.

Foreign policy has become the business of everyone. And it is just about the biggest business of our Government right now. National defense, commerce, and agriculture are all involved in the determination of our policy toward other nations. Tangible proof of this regularly comes across my desk.

A few days ago I received a routine distribution of Department of State press releases. One of these dealt with an agreement for the sale of United States surplus agricultural commodities to Korea under Public Law 480. The purpose of this agreement was to assist in stabilizing the Korean grain market and the entire Korean price structure. Defense equipment will be procured by the Korean currency generated in the transaction.

Another press release informed me that the United States and Mexico had reached agreement on the use of standard band radio broadcasting channels. Another set forth the latest facts concerning the failure by the Chinese Communists to release imprisoned Americans, as they had undertaken to do. Still another contained word that the Italian Government had notified the United States of its intention to limit the export of velveteens to this country during 1957 to 1.37 million square yards.

Now, this was only one day's announcements. But observe the broad range of subjects involving issues of foreign policy, which bear directly on activities of our people within the United States. Decisions of our Government in the field of foreign relations reach down into every corner and crossroad of the country, affecting the farmer, the blouse manufacturer, the dairy producer, the watchmaker, the wheat rancher, the radio broadcaster. This trend will grow, as the world is more closely knit together, as technology advances and as the major problems of each nation are identified with the problems of every other nation. In the past 10 years we have concluded almost 2,000 agreements with other governments on matters of mutual concern.

If the United States is to be equipped adequately to meet these problems, our reservoir of human talent will have to be enlarged. There will be more and more demands for trained personnel in overseas posts. At the present time there are approximately 100,000 Americans working abroad. If current trends continue, it is not unlikely that in another 25 years that figure will reach 200,000.

Yet before the Second World War the average college graduate gave hardly a thought to utilizing his special training in foreign countries. The opportunities inviting him abroad today are so many and so attractive, even apart from the career Foreign Service, that they should not be overlooked in the planning of a graduate's future. As the intercourse of nations widen, the burden of universities to feed this reservoir will grow heavier. We are already feeling the pinch, in a shortage of those skills we should like to make available to other governments—particularly engineering—under the point 4 program.

The development of a competent corps of overseas personnel, and particularly of the

career service, is a most vital matter for the future of this Nation.

No policy, no matter how brilliantly conceived, can be effective unless it is executed with skill. Even more important the actual policy which is adopted will, in large measure, be determined by the resourcefulness, ability, and quality of the men and women who represent the United States Government in the field. This is what is meant when it is sometimes said that foreign policy is made by the cables to the Department of State. To a considerable degree this is true. Yet, as impelling and compulsive as those cables may be, it is what the Secretary of State does with them which, in final analysis will measure the success or failure of a policy. The freedom of action they permit may often be very restricted. Yet within those narrow limits, a decision must be made, and made correctly. Peace and war may hinge upon it. Certainly the recent events of the Middle East have evidence how true this is.

To an outsider, to one not in a position to appraise all the facts, the policy indicated in a particular situation may seem to offer no difficulty. The question may appear clearcut, black and white, an open and shut case.

But things are not always what they seem—not even in foreign relations. We cannot always do what we might like to do. Let me cite just one example: During the last session Congress received mounting protests from eastern cotton blouse and shirt manufacturers against ruinous competition from Japanese exporters. The Japanese were able to market their finished product here for about one-fourth of what identical cotton goods could be sold in this country. Some American plants had already closed down in consequence. And so, pressures grew for an increase in tariff rates against the Japanese blouses. A simple and obvious solution—or so it seemed.

But when the Committee on Foreign Relations held hearings on a bill introduced for that purpose, we found it was not so simple or obvious. Japan was manufacturing shirts from cotton imported from the United States. In fact, Japan has been the largest single export market for American cottongrowers. To deny the Japanese the American market would have inflicted serious injury upon American agriculture. A particular segment of industry would have been protected at the expense of a much larger branch of our agriculture. The Carolina shirtmakers—and I might add, a great many newspapers—could see only a local consequence, not the overriding national interest on which the policy decision had to be based. Their remedy might well have been worse than the disease. Happily, Japan by a self-imposed quota on exports to this country has partially relieved the tension.

I have oversimplified this illustration for convenience. But there was a more subtle point involved. We were not only dealing with a tariff and trade problem. Indirectly, had the bill passed we would have been tinkering with the national security. It is, of course, to our interest that Japan should find an adequate outlet for her exports, if it is to maintain a viable economy. Unless Japan can do business with the West and the so-called neutralist powers, it may be forced to draw closer to the Communist trade orbit. Such may well prove to be the ultimate outcome, in any event; and I do not wish to imply that American business should be sacrificed to the trade requirements of another Government. I merely mention this as one of the many veiled elements in what, on the surface, appeared to be a relatively uncomplicated problem.

I do not believe that ever before in our history, at least in peacetime, have we been so preoccupied with the security of the United States, as we have been during the past 10 years. The quest for national security preempts almost every other issue in the life of our country; directly or indirectly it cuts across both domestic and foreign policies. It dominates the budget; it is a brake upon atomic progress for peaceful purposes; it is the principal cause for the growth in the national debt, the drop in the value of our dollar, and the burden of taxation which you and I must carry. And, most regrettably, there is little on the visible horizon to encourage the hope that the search for security will not continue to be the principal concern of American foreign policy for the next decade. The general elements in that policy are, as you well know, support for the United Nations, the system of regional defense pacts capped by NATO and the Rio Treaty, and our foreign-aid program. All these have the same predominant purpose—security.

We are all aware that the broad lines of our foreign policy have been conditioned for the past 10 years by the designs of the Soviet Government. And as long as that Government seeks control over the rest of the world, it will not be possible for the people of the United States to cultivate with the people of Russia those bonds of human friendships which could enrich their existence and ours. Years in advance of most of his contemporaries, Father Walsh, who visited Russia not long after the revolution, sounded a warning to this country of the peril which the Soviet Union offered.

We have seen a reflection of that peril in Hungary. That tragic episode has caused a worldwide reappraisal of a principal source of Soviet power. It is recognized to a larger degree than ever before throughout the world that this source is naked force. It is clearer now that in the satellite countries, at least, Soviet control is maintained largely by force of arms or threat of force. Given any kind of a chance, the oppressed peoples of central Europe will light the flame of freedom again and again.

The emergence of Russia as the most powerful nation in Europe and Asia has compelled a course of action upon the United States and a preoccupation with the problems of other nations which would have been unthinkable a few decades ago. And yet it is not, in my view, necessarily the most significant long-range political development of recent years insofar as our policy is concerned. Nor is the emergence of China as an industrial society, nor indeed the effect of atomic energy on world relations.

I think one of the most shattering events in our time so far as United States foreign policy is concerned, has been the impact of developments affecting the United Kingdom. For it was Britain during the 19th and early 20th century that played the role of world policeman; and it is no mere accident that this period coincided with what now seems like the golden age of international law and order. By and large, an agreement between nations then was meant to be kept. It was not a treacherous artifice employed to bring down a government's guard, an instrument of hostility bound with a red ribbon. The sanctity it received was undoubtedly due to the fact that the nations of Europe respected their heritage of Christian morality in a manner foreign to the Soviet tradition. Indeed, the Soviets have taken advantage of this very heritage.

Because the relative decline of British power has occurred in our lifetime, its ultimate effects may appear more obscure than they very likely will to a historian 50 years hence. To this country, however, it has already meant a vast increase in worldwide responsibilities. You have only to glance at a map of the world to see some of its immediate consequences. One of these consequences we can see right now, in the Middle East.

Before I go any further into that matter, let me make one thing clear. During the last 15 years, the executive branch under both Republicans and Democrats has frequently invoked the so-called principle of bipartisanship to obtain congressional backing for the conduct of foreign relations. I do not view bipartisanship—or, more accurately, nonpartisanship—other than as cooperation with the President on policy proposals which merit cooperation. It does not, and it cannot, signify blind acceptance of any policy merely because the Executive tells us it is a good policy and that it is needed. Nor does it signify announcing a policy first, then informing congressional leaders afterward. This administration, as administrations before it, can make unwise decisions. And Members of Congress have a duty to the American people to criticize constructively, and oppose any policy which does not seem to them to serve the national interest.

I would like to emphasize the word "constructively." For the purpose of criticism of our foreign policy must be to make it a better policy if the national interests are to be served.

Yesterday morning we had an example of responsibility when Secretary Dulles met—for 2 hours—with the congressional leadership to discuss amendments to the Mid-East Resolution and the question of sanctions. The meeting was both fruitful and worth while. Mr. Dulles is to be commended for the frankness and understanding he displayed.

Last week we had another example of the effectiveness of genuine bipartisanship or what I prefer to call responsible cooperation between the President and Congress. You will recall that President Eisenhower conferred with members of both parties at the White House on the crisis in the Middle East. I attended this serious, nonpolitical conference on matters which affect the vital interests of all the people of the United States. There was a free and frank exchange of ideas. Members of Congress came away with a better understanding of the situation which confronts us in the Middle East. On his part, the President obtained the views of members of both parties. This meeting last week, and the Dulles meeting on yesterday, may well mark a new start in the field of responsible cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

On the night of the meeting last week, the President, in response to a suggestion by the distinguished Senator RUSSELL of Georgia, addressed the entire Nation. In his speech, Mr. Eisenhower made clear for the first time the scope and gravity of the situation in the Middle East. I do not agree with all of the propositions which he advanced. It is not necessary to agree with all of them, however, in order to recognize in his address the beginnings of a more intelligible policy directed at the problems of the Middle East. Because he had spoken with Members of Congress, the President was in a far better position to talk not only to the people of the United States but to the people of the Middle East and the world as well. That was because, in calling the conference which preceded his speech, the President was availing himself of a cross-section of both party and regional leadership.

May I say at this point that there is, I believe, a somewhat mistaken concept that the Democratic Party is run by only one section of the country, by the South alone, or more specifically by Texas alone. That is a tribute to the distinguished services to the party and the responsible cooperation of LYNDON JOHNSON, the majority leader in the Senate, and Mr. SAM RAYBURN, the Speaker in the House. Those gentlemen, I am sure, would be the first to point out that there can be no effective leadership of a great national party without participation of all sections of the country. And all sections of the country are in fact represented in the

leadership of the Democratic Party in Congress. That leadership in the Senate, in addition to LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, is composed of CARL HAYDEN of Arizona, our distinguished President pro tempore, the Secretary of the Democratic Conference, the very able TOM HENNINGS of Missouri, and myself as party whip. In the House of Representatives, the party is guided not only by Mr. RAYBURN but by the outstanding majority leader, JOHN MCCORMACK of Massachusetts, and CARL ALBERT, the very capable whip from Oklahoma.

Is there any merit at all in nonpartisan support of foreign policy? In the proper sense, I think there is. The most obvious advantage, of course, is that it presents to the outside world a united front on vital issues, to obtain the maximum effect where desired.

With the kind of problems we now face, however, it has become increasingly evident that unity on a national, nonpartisan basis is not enough. The point has been reached where something akin to an international nonpartisanship must be developed. By this I mean that more effective relationship must be achieved between ourselves and friendly democracies, so that we may avoid a repetition of the appalling sequence we have witnessed in the Suez area. There are more rewarding pastimes than to continue our incredible unpopularity contest with the Soviets in France and England.

Policies of the Western democracies during the past few years and particularly with respect to the Middle East question have given the appearance of a kind of diplomatic Tower of Babel. It is time for all to try to act with something approaching a singleness of purpose, even if we cannot speak with one tongue, if we are to avoid further disaster. In this respect, the Communist orbit has one important advantage. It knows where it is going. That has repeatedly been made clear to us, just as Hitler's purposes were made clear in Mein Kampf. In contrast, the United States and its Western allies have had little common perception of where we are going, and still less of an agreed idea on how to get there. If we had, some of the recent defeats might have been avoided. What is even worse, too many of us do not seem to be aware that we have suffered these defeats at all. It is in this, I believe, that the real danger lies.

If we compare the relative position of the United States—and the West—with the Soviet Union, we will have to concede that the Western position has deteriorated. Anyone who doubts this need only review on the map the gains made by the Soviets, at the expense of the West. The most recent of these, after two centuries of effort, was in the Middle East. The Communists are in there with both feet, without the use of military force, and despite the so-called northern tier defense system. If reports concerning the Syrian arms buildup are correct, the Kremlin may well have succeeded in turning the flank of the Baghdad nations without firing a shot. This paramount factor is going to influence and direct our policy action in that area for the foreseeable future.

What is most tragic about this crisis is that it did not descend upon us suddenly. There was every reason to anticipate it; and there was a great deal we might have done to prevent it. It had been germinating for several years, ever since the Israeli-Egyptian armistice agreement of 1949.

For the United States, it is a sorry illustration of the failure of a policy—or rather a lack of policy—since our aberrations in this area hardly qualify as a policy. There has been temporizing. Politics, domestic and international, have been played. We have done everything, so it seems to me, except face up to the problem and take the minimal steps necessary to keep peace in the Middle East.

It is all very well to say, as has been said by the administration, that we seek our answer to the difficult problems of the Middle East through the United Nations. And it is all very well to find, as a distinguished, able and outstanding Republican Senator, a man of great integrity, did find in discussions before this group, that the United Nations has fundamental weaknesses. I think we can agree—I know that I do—with both the administration and Senator KNOWLAND. The administration, as it says, has certainly placed a large part of our trust in the United Nations to solve the Middle East dilemma. And the United Nations, in dealing with this and other problems, as Senator KNOWLAND says, has displayed basic inadequacies.

Both the administration and Senator KNOWLAND, in my opinion, are correct but where does that leave us? If we are going to find the answer to this question, I believe we have to start by accepting the premise of the President and the very able and hard-working Secretary of State that peace, stability, and the preservation of the independence of the nations of the Middle East is in our vital national interests. We ought then ask ourselves whether we were correct in entrusting such a large measure of the defense of our vital interests in the Middle East to the United Nations which as Senator KNOWLAND correctly says, has basic structural weaknesses?

Where, then, do we go from there? It seems to me that we must either reassume part of the defense of those interests ourselves or seek to correct some of the basic structural weaknesses in the United Nations. I regret to say that I have seen no evidence of an eagerness on the part of the executive branch of the Government to do one or the other.

On the contrary, that branch seems willing to content itself on the one hand with sending to Congress an urgent resolution which on its own admission is directed at no immediate danger or difficulty in the Middle East. On the other hand, it continues to rely solely on the United Nations in dealing with the immediate and difficult problems of that area.

That seems to me to be a formula for inertia, for drift, dodge, and delay and ultimately for disaster. It is a policy which would make the United Nations the scapegoat for our irresponsibility. A scapegoat may relieve the executive branch of a sense of frustration in this situation, but it will hardly serve the interest of the United States. Either the Middle East is or is not vital to these interests. If it is, as the President says it is, then we had better defend those interests through the United Nations or otherwise.

The tendency to impose tasks on the United Nations beyond its capacities, then to bemoan the inadequacies of that organization but to take no initiative in their correction can ultimately bring us to only one end. This tendency, if persisted in, will eventually destroy even the limited capacity which the United Nations now possesses for constructive action. Before we are much further along this road, I think we had better stop for a moment to consider the consequences. I think we had better decide whether it is in the interests of the United States—our long-range interests—to continue in that direction.

My own view is that it is a highly dangerous direction. It is not, as some may think, the road of return to a secure national isolation. Scientific developments of the past two decades have closed off all roads back in that direction. Rather, it is the road to isolated internationalism; it is the road to the disastrous delusion of omnipotent national power.

The position I have assumed with regard to the President's proposal on the Middle East is related very directly to this matter. I have been critical of this proposal. While I accepted the premise on which it is based, namely, that developments in the Middle East involve the vital interests of the United States, I do not accept fully the manner in which the President has proposed to protect them.

It has seemed to me that two basic steps are essential if these interests are to be protected. First, we must be prepared to reassume that portion of the responsibility which we have shifted to the United Nations which is beyond its present capacity; and, I may add parenthetically, that within our Government we must apportion the reassumed responsibility as between the executive branch and Congress more strictly in accord with the Constitution so as to avoid a misuse of power. Second, we must be prepared to enlarge the capacity of the United Nations to discharge responsibilities in the Middle East and elsewhere if the enlargement can be brought about. To that end I have proposed an amendment to the President's resolution which would make clear our support of the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East as a force for peace in that area. I have also proposed an amendment which would make clear our initiative in seeking international control of the present unrestricted arms traffic in the Middle East, one of the principal causes of the tension in that region.

The Western Nations face a serious predicament in the Middle East and we are not entirely without responsibility for it. Today Suez is in hostile hands—that is, hands hostile to the West. French strength is dispersed in Algeria, bogged down in a revolt. The British are gone from the canal area—with our encouragement—without retaining adequate guaranties for freedom of maritime transit. The supply of Europe's vital fuel is thus delivered over to the caprice of one Middle Eastern nation, which has yet to display a sense of its international responsibility. With the current drain on world shipping resulting from this situation, where would we be if another Korea broke out somewhere in the world? Is there not something incongruous in a policy which produces this kind of a result, a policy which alienates our friends and invites the Soviets to give aid to the Arab nations?

No American can take satisfaction over this unhappy record. Recriminations over how we got to the present point would be futile. On the other hand, an examination of the steps which, under Democratic and Republican administrations, led to the disaster, could contribute to the formulation of future policy. What is essential is that we should recognize what has happened for what it really is—a serious setback for the West. And we must begin without delay to repair the damage.

With respect to the Arab World, further penetration by the Soviet Union is not only possible but inevitable unless we bring our energies to a solution of the issues which have plagued the Middle East since 1948; unless we base our actions upon principle and not upon expediency; and unless we can persuade all the nations in the Middle East that we have no desire to replace Britain and France in the vacuum we helped to create.

It must, instead, be made clear to them, by every means at our command, that our objective is the preservation of their independence—and not necessarily only their independence of Russian communism. That is the menace today. Tomorrow the menace may arise elsewhere.

With respect to Western Europe, it is imperative to restore the former confidence which has been shattered and to rebuild the foundations of mutual understanding. This applies to all relations with our allies, including their problems with dependent territories. It is well and good to support

bona fide nationalist movements and the natural desire of peoples to be independent. Let us take care, however, to avoid paths which conflict with our vital interests.

Of the many lines of action we might follow there is one that should be pursued immediately. I believe we should do what we can to enable Europe to reassert its former influence in the councils of the world. We can do this by encouraging the nations of Europe to draw together in closer association, as is the case in the coal-steel community. Separately, each of these nations has lost much of its former authority in international affairs. Drawn together in a common enterprise, the collectivity of Europe can once again exert the power which is commensurate with its magnificent heritage and the great capacities of its inhabitants.

We should also give very serious thought to encouraging a pooling of the economic and technological resources of Western Europe and the development of close ties ourselves with that pool. It is almost ludicrous that the Western nations should be withholding their markets and technical processes from each other, while bidding against themselves for the Kremlin's trade.

Such is exactly what the Communists want. Europe's leaders may be coming to see this. They are, at the moment, concluding negotiations to establish a common market through the elimination of trade barriers and the creation of Euratom. I consider these important first steps which the United States should support; but they are only the first steps to that cooperation which must exist among the nations of Europe and with the United States. We can only achieve it, if we proceed with an urgency of purpose, recognizing that, in truth, we are met upon a major battleground.

---

# SENATE

## WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1957

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, Thou art the reality behind all shadows, the shining presence at the altar of our heart's devotion. Closing the doors of a noisy world, so full of terror and alarms, we pause at this shrine of quietness and peace to acknowledge Thy sovereignty. Thou hast made us for Thy holy purposes. May the mire and misery of our moral failures prove but steppingstones to our better selves. Purge our minds of the prejudices which separate us from others. Cleanse our hearts of the uncleanness which blinds our eyes. Make us builders of the road of world concord, which shall make the rough places smooth and the deep ruts level, and of bridges of understanding which shall at last span the chasms which separate Thy warring children, and over which the glad and eager feet of brothers shall pass to and fro in a world of peace. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 26, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5189) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5189) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TOMORROW AT 11 A. M.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until tomorrow, at 11 o'clock a. m.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### VISIT TO THE SENATE BY GIRLS DRILL TEAM FROM HOUSTON, TEX.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before I came to Washington, to join the Federal service, I taught school in Houston, Tex. This morning I have had the very unusual privilege of welcoming to Washington a large group of high-class students from one of the best high schools in the largest city in Texas. It is not the high school in which I taught; nevertheless, it is one of the outstanding educational institutions of the Southwest. These students—63 charming, intelligent, and very pretty girls, members of the girls drill team of Reagan High School—are today in the gallery, with their sponsors. It is with pleasure and gratification that I present to the Senate this fine group of young Texan and American womanhood. I should like to ask that they stand, and that the Senate welcome them.

(The group of students rose in their places in the gallery, and were greeted with applause.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article giving the history of this fine organization and the names of those in attendance today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The article and the names appear in the RECORD.)

### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AREA ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1957

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents in the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

### PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 520

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend title I of the United States Social Security Act to authorize the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to approve a State plan which provides, in determining need, an exemption of $50 per month earned income in the old-age assistance category as is now provided in title 10 of such Social Security Act granting this exemption, in determining need, to recipients of the aid to the blind category

Whereas the aged and indigent citizens of the State of Oklahoma and the United States blazed the way in the frontiers of America for the development of the United States of America, the benefits of which the present generation are now reaping; and

Whereas the courage and fortitude of these people laid the foundation upon which the State of Oklahoma and the United States have developed; and

Whereas they did throughout their period of struggle and did throughout their lifetime, insofar as they were able, support and maintain the government of the State of Oklahoma and the United States for the benefit of the present generation; and

Whereas the increase in the cost of living has far exceeded the increase in grants and aid that the aged and indigent people are receiving and, as a result of such increase in the cost of living, the living standards of our aged in the State of Oklahoma and the United States are such that our aged citizens must live in a manner incompatible with decency and health; and

Whereas an amendment such as is suggested herein would create a desire in recipients of old-age assistance to earn whatever amount they are capable of earning and, in so doing, raise the standard of living in such category together with all dependents for whom they are legally responsible; and

Whereas it is the consensus of the members of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, now duly convened in the 26th session of the Oklahoma Legislature, that the Congress of the United States should so amend such Social Security Act to permit the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to approve a State assistance plan which will provide an exemption, in determining need, the sum of $50 per month earned income, as set forth above: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 26th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma* (the Senate concurring therein), that the Congress of the United States be memorialized to amend title I of the United States Social Security Act which would permit the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to exempt $50 per month earned income in determining need in the old-age assistance category; be it further

*Resolved*, That the people of the State of Oklahoma, through their representatives in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the 26th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, hereby pledge the State to enact or amend any State laws necessary to comply with such Federal amendment; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the Chief Clerk of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress.

Adopted by the house of representatives the 6th day of February 1957.

B. E. HARKEY,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

Adopted by the senate the 18th day of February 1957.

COWBOY PINK WILLIAMS,
*President of the Senate.*

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment:

S. 913. A bill to provide permanent authority for the Postmaster General to establish postal stations at camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces, and at defense or other strategic installations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116).

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 101. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to employ certain temporary staff members and assistants (Rept. No. 117);

S. Res. 105. Resolution authorizing the printing of a study entitled "The Right To Buy—and Its Denial to Small Business";

S. Res. 106. Resolution to print additional copies of a committee print entitled "Tax Guide for Small Business";

H. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Arthur H. Compton as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution;

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 additional copies of House Report Numbered 2966, 84th Congress;

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on the national highway program for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives; and

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on excise taxes held by the Committee on Ways and Means during the 84th Congress, 2d session.

## REPORT ENTITLED "NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 118)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report entitled "National Penitentiaries," pursuant to Senate Resolution 169, 84th Congress, 2d session, as extended by Senate Resolution 84, 85th Congress, which was ordered to be printed.

## AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I report an original bill to amend sections 801, 802, and 1102 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and I submit a report (No. 119) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 1423) to amend sections 801, 802, and 1102 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, reported by Mr. SMATHERS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 1401. A bill for the relief of Georges Kocens; and

S. 1402. A bill for the relief of Gualberto Rocchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1403. A bill for the relief of Michael James Bolger; and

S. 1404. A bill for the relief of Yaeko Kawata Stevens (Masako Sasaki); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 1405. A bill for the relief of Hsu Jen-Yuan, also known as Joseph Jen-Yuan Hsu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1406. A bill to allow individuals to deduct for Federal income-tax purposes not to exceed $50 of political contributions made each year to candidates for elective Federal offices; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1407. A bill to incorporate the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1408. A bill to provide allowances for transportation of house trailers to civilian employees of the United States who are transferred from one official station to another; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 1409. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to provide mail delivery service to rural patrons by the most efficient and economical means possible, and for other purposes;

S. 1410. A bill to provide that appointments to the position of Deputy Maritime Administrator shall be made by the Secretary of Commerce under civil service laws, and for other purposes;

S. 1411. A bill to amend the Act of August 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security; and

S. 1412. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of the Performance Rating Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. LONG):

S. 1413. A bill to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Port Allen-Indian Village Canal in West Baton Rouge Parish, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1414. A bill for the relief of Wolfgang Jochim Herman Schmiedchen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 1415. A bill to authorize the Vancouver Lake Project on the Columbia River in the vicinity of Vancouver, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MCNAMARA (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. POTTER, Mr. WILEY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JENNER, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. THYE):

S. 1416. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin Compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR):

S. 1417. A bill relating to the affairs of the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 1418. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to handling of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. STENNIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 1419. A bill to amend section 85 of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to the District Court for the District of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 1420. A bill to amend veterans regulation No. 1 (a) to provide that tuberculosis developed by veterans within 4 years after date of separation from active service shall be presumed to have been incurred in or aggravated by active service; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1421. A bill for the relief of Ansis Luiz Darzins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. POTTER, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 1422. A bill to establish corporate income tax rates of 22 percent normal tax and 30 percent surtax; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1423. A bill to amend sections 801, 802, and 1102, of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he reported the above bill, which appear under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

## TAX INCENTIVE FOR PUBLIC ELECTION CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to allow individuals to deduct for Federal income tax purposes not to exceed $50 of political contributions made each year to candidates for elective Federal offices. This bill is similar to the one I introduced in the 84th Congress.

The principle of this bill has received wide endorsement. It has been incorporated in many versions of omnibus bills to amend the Corrupt Practices Act.

The reasoning of the bill is simple, and, I believe, irrefutable. It is this: We need to broaden the base of American election contributions. We need to have millions of average grass roots Americans feel an increasing share in the outcome of Presidential, Senatorial, and House of Representatives races.

No candidate should become overdependent on any one group in the population, any one interest, any particular handful of individuals.

Modern campaigning is expensive, especially for television programs and time.

If millions of Americans can be encouraged to chip in $5, $10, or $25, just as they contribute to voluntary charities and welfare groups, in a tax deductible fashion, I believe we will be going a long way toward achieving an even finer and more effective type of representation in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1406) to allow individuals to deduct for Federal income tax purposes not to exceed $50 of political contributions made each year to candidates for elective Federal offices, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by renumbering section 217 as 218, and by inserting after section 216 the following new section:

"SEC. 217. Contributions to candidates for elective Federal office.

"(a) Allowance of deduction: In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction any political contribution (as defined in subsection (c)) payment of which is made within the taxable year. A political contribution shall be allowable as a deduction only if verified under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(b) Limitation: The deduction under subsection (a) shall not exceed $50 for any taxable year.

"(c) Definition of political contribution: For purposes of this section, the term 'political contribution' means a contribution or gift to—

"(1) an individual whose name is presented for election as President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, an elector for President or Vice President of the United States, a Member of the Senate, or a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate to the House of Representatives) in a general or special election, in a primary election, or in a convention of a political party, for use by such individual to further his candidacy for any such office; or

"(2) a committee acting in behalf of one or more individuals described in paragraph (1), for use by such committee to further the candidacy of such individual or individuals."

(b) The table of sections to part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out

"Sec. 217. Cross references."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"Sec. 217. Contributions to candidates for elective Federal office.

"Sec. 218. Cross references."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this act shall apply only to taxable years ending on or after the date of the enactment of this act, but only with respect to contributions or gifts made on or after such date.

## INCORPORATION OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on January 25 of this year, I introduced, for myself and my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], a bill to grant a Federal charter of incorporation to the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America. That bill is Senate bill 848.

The organization of World War I veterans has asked my colleague and me to reintroduce our bill so that it will list correctly the incorporators of the organization. The average age of World War I veterans is 62½ years, and, unfortunately, many of those veterans of the First World War who were listed in my original bill as incorporators have died. I have made certain other changes in the earlier bill, after consultation with the staff of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a new bill as a substitute for the first bill, S. 848, to grant a Federal charter of incorporation to the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks of January 25, when I first introduced our bill, may be printed in the RECORD following this statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the remarks of the Senator of January 25 will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1407) to incorporate the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The remarks referred to are as follows:

REMARKS OF JANUARY 25

Mr. President, of the patriotic Americans who served our Nation in the First World War 39 years ago, 3,025,000 were living on November 30, 1956. Their average age was 62½ years. Since the time of their service, nearly four decades ago, much history has been made and other great wars have been fought. In the memory of many Americans alive today the great world war means that which we fought between 1941 and 1945, and another generation of Americans is growing up whose war-veteran husbands and brothers are those who fought for freedom and security in Korea.

Twenty-four years separate the service of the veterans of World War I from the beginning of the Second World War. Yet, many Members of the Senate, who themselves served in the first great war of our century, will understand that, to the veterans of that war, it is a memory to be held and shared in common with their contemporaries.

For that reason, many of them have decided to form among themselves the special organization known as the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America. Already this organization has over 70,000 members in all 48 States and the Territories. It has 782 barracks posts organized in 45 States.

This organization now seeks a Federal charter of incorporation to help it to bring the memory and the interests of this generation of American veterans to the attention of the American people. Federal charters have in the past been granted to such other veterans organizations as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the AMVETS, the American Legion, and the Marine Corps League. No reason is apparent to me why an organization of veterans of World War I should not be entitled to equal rights and recognition from the Congress. Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for early consideration.

The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I introduced a similar bill in the 84th Congress, to grant a Federal charter to the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, and I trust that the Congress this year will be able to act promptly and favorably on our proposal.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague, and to commend him for again introducing this very much deserved veterans bill.

It is another example, Mr. President, of the need for a standing committee in the Senate on veterans legislation, and calls to mind the fact that I have pending before the Senate a bill which would establish a standing Veterans Affairs Committee. This is another veterans bill which ought to go to a veterans committee for immediate consideration.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank my colleague.

## AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938, RELATING TO HANDLING OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], I introduce,

for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to handling of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the RECORD, and lie on the table until Friday next, in order that other Senators who so desire may add their names as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Mississippi.

The bill (S. 1418) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to handling of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1418

A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to handling of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That (a) subsection (f) of section 3 is amended by inserting a comma in lieu of the period at the end thereof and adding the following:

"(f) 'Agriculture' includes farming in all its branches and among other things includes the cultivation and tillage of the soil, dairying, the production, cultivation, growing, and harvesting of any agricultural or horticultural commodities (including commodities defined as agricultural commodities in section 15 (g) of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended), the raising of livestock, bees, fur-bearing animals, or poultry, and any practices (including any forestry or lumbering operations), performed by a farmer or on a farm as an incident to or in conjunction with such farming operations, including preparation for market, delivery to storage or to market or to carriers for transportation to market, handling, packing, storing, cleaning, dressing, eviscerating, extracting, grading, ginning, compressing, pasteurizing, curing, fermenting, drying, canning, cooling, or freezing of any agricultural or horticultural commodity, including livestock, poultry, bees, and fur-bearing animals, or the making of cheese, butter, dairy or similar products, whether or not such practices are ordinarily performed by farmers or on farms."

(b) Section 3 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (p), as follows:

"(p) 'The area of production' of any agricultural or horticultural commodity, including livestock and poultry, includes all of each county in which such commodity is produced in commercial quantities, except that it shall not include the corporate limits of a city or municipality having a population in excess of 250,000 as reported in the 1950 census."

(c) Section 7 (c) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"(c) For the purpose of this subsection (c) the term 'first processing' shall include all operations prior to, including, and through the completion of such first processing, whether performed at the same or different times, or in one or more places or by one or more employers."

(d) Subsection (a) of section 13 is amended by striking out paragraph (10) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new paragraph (10):

"(10) The employees of an employer who is engaged within the area of production in the preparation for market or handling of any agricultural or horticultural commodity, including livestock and poultry, and including but not limited to the handling, packing, storing, cleaning, dressing, eviscerating, extracting, grading, ginning, compressing, pasteurizing, curing, drying, fermenting, canning, cooling, or freezing any such commodity, or the making of cheese, butter, dairy, or similar products; or."

## APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 420) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

## RECOGNITION OF ORGANIZATIONS OF POSTAL AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from the State of Washington [Mr. JACKSON] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 386) to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees, introduced by me, for myself and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], on January 9, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXTENSION OF EXISTING CORPORATE NORMAL-TAX RATE AND CERTAIN EXCISE-TAX RATES—WITHDRAWALS OF COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be stricken from the list of sponsors appearing on the amendment, submitted on February 21, 1957, by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to the bill (H. R. 4090) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I make the same request, that my name be stricken also, primarily because there has been some misunderstanding with respect to some of the features contained in the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I also make the same request, that my name be stricken from the list of cosponsors of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that my name be deleted from the list of cosponsors of the amendment, which I understand is at the desk at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Statement by him concerning the girls drill team of Reagan High School, Houston, Tex.

## NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF A NOMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today the nomination of Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, of New Hampshire, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, to fill an existing vacancy.

Notice is given that the nomination will be eligible for consideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

## ADDRESS BY SENATOR GOLDWATER BEFORE PENNSYLVANIA MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, last night in the city of Philadelphia, the birthplace of American freedom, the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association assembled for its annual dinner. It was the largest and most representative gathering of that historic organization. The speaker was our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. He thrilled his great audience with a calm challenge to meet the dangers confronting us and our way of life.

This eloquent and able address should be read by every American, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. BARRY GOLDWATER, OF ARIZONA, BEFORE PENNSYLVANIA MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 26, 1957

When my good friend and colleague, one of the most distinguished gentlemen I have ever known, Senator ED MARTIN, asked me to appear this evening before this gathering of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association, I was honored and, at the same time, highly pleased.

It is always a privilege for a man in public life to be invited to address a group such as this. It is, likewise, always a pleasure for me to be able to meet with my fellow businessmen to discuss our problems as I see them, not only as a Senator, but as a businessman.

It is difficult tonight to know just which hat to wear—that of the Senator or that of an American businessman. So, if you don't mind, I think I will attempt a little bit of magic and try to wear both at the same time as I outline for you the problems as I see them today, and then go a step further and suggest to you what might be done about them.

As we gather here tonight, I believe there are two clear and distinct threats afield, threats that must be recognized by all of us, threats that must be met. The first of these threats, naturally, is that of war. It is one that has been with us since the end of World War II, and I suggest to you tonight that it will be with us for many, many years in the future—probably longer than any of us in this room will live to see. Living as we do in a world that is dominated by two diametrically opposite philosophies of government, we must recognize that until those vast differences are brought to a oneness, the threat of war will be with us.

Today we are threatened, as are all of the freedom-loving peoples of the world, by a dialectic materialism of communism. On the other hand, believing as we do in the spiritual values of life and, believing as we do that our freedom comes from God, we are faced with the task of convincing the Communist-dominated peoples of the world that our concept of freedom is the only one that will stand the test of time and produce the dignity of man that God intended to be.

Whether or not we can resolve these differences by peaceful means is beyond my power to say tonight. I can only do as you do: pray each day that the settlement of these differences will not have to come on the battlefields, on the sea, and in the air, because such would result in a holocaust that would not only destroy one or the other of these concepts or philosophies of government, but would also create an entirely different concept than we now have, regardless of whether we won or lost.

I can say to you tonight that the threat of retaliation is the one big stick that we carry that has kept the menace of communism from our door. I am convinced, as I believe all thinking Americans are convinced, that as long as we retain the strong position in the air that we hold today, with our Strategic Air Command, that Russia will not yield to the temptation to attack us or to attack our allies in the Western World. That is a threat that is obvious. It is a threat that you and I can see and know of each day. It is a threat that your Government is doing something about and I believe that we are daily growing stronger in the areas in which we must be strong to prevent Russia from ever attacking us. That threat, then, is a threat which is receiving the attention of the people and of your Government. It is a threat about which something is being done.

There is a second threat abroad tonight, however, and that one can be classified broadly as an attack on our freedoms.

I remember reading in the Federalist papers an article by Hamilton warning the people of a man who would speak of freedom. Hamilton was right in issuing that warning at that time, because then freedom was on the minds of everyone and to speak of it could almost be interpreted as being demagogic.

You will remember when our Constitution was written that we didn't have spelled out the specific rights and freedoms of the American people. And it wasn't until the Constitution was completed that the wise men who framed it in this great State of Pennsylvania decided that to protect the inherent rights of people they had best spell some of them out. This they did in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, which are the Bill of Rights.

They recognized that man has inherent rights, rights that he received as a free child of God; and that these rights are inalienable; that they could not be taken from the people. They listed the freedom of speech, the freedom of assembly, the freedom of worship. They put down in those first 10 amendments just about everything that is fundamental to our free way of life, and then to make sure that all rights would be recognized as inherent and inalienable, they added the ninth amendment, which said, in effect, that all rights not specifically mentioned would be considered as inherent and be the inalienable property of the people.

How wise those men were who wrote those first 10 amendments, because they could foresee the day in this country when there would be question put on the rights of the people, when certain things that you and I consider as inherent rights would be questioned by others.

For instance, no one in those days supposed that a man's right to work would ever be questioned. The right to work is fundamental to the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, for without being able to work a man cannot enjoy those or any other rights that come from our source of liberty and strength.

Today, however, that right to work is being questioned. We have compulsory unionism in the laws of our land and in only 16 States of this Nation has legislation been enacted to say that a man cannot be denied employment by virtue of belonging to or not belonging to a labor organization.

Now we go on to the 10th amendment which says, in effect, that all of the rights not given to the Congress remain with the States. But look at what is happening today.

Tonight I want to talk in four general fields of the threat that I feel exists to our freedoms. The first one that I wish to touch on is the tendency, and it is a growing one in this country, to look to Washington for the solution of all of our problems. Mind you, the Constitution didn't give to the Federal Government all of the powers that it now assumes. The Supreme Court, by its interpretations, has granted powers to the Congress and the executive that I feel were never intended under the Constitution. Yet, these rights, the rights of the States, have been tampered with and today the American people seem to be succumbing to the idea that Washington can to everything for them.

We used to be able to build our schools by taxing our people locally, but, today, the clamor is for Federal aid to education. Now, Federal aid to education might be all right if we could develop some blank check method of just saying to the State or school district: "Here is X amount of dollars. You build your building. We will not tell you how to build it, nor will we tell you how to run it." But remember this, gentlemen: the Federal Government gives nothing to the people that it does not first take from them, and it gives nothing unless it controls.

The people of this country must awaken to the fact that it was the intention of our Founding Fathers, as expressed in the Constitution, for local problems to be solved locally. Unless this trend to Washington is stopped and a reverse track taken, we can expect to endure further encroachment on our freedom.

Back in the 1930's, 75 percent of our tax dollars remained at home and 25 percent came to Washington. Today, that distribution is exactly reversed. As the New Deal crow of the 1930's suddenly discovered the inherent and hidden power in the income-tax amendment, they began to broaden their concepts of what the Federal Government should do under the welfare clause of the Constitution, and under the statement of interest and welfare in the preamble, and, also, under the newly enlarged powers given by the liberal decisions surrounding the commerce clause of the Constitution.

They started to spend and spend and spend until, today, our debt is greater than the combined debts of all the other nations in the world. Our debt is a $1,675 first mortgage on every newborn child in this country. Remember, gentlemen, that some Senators laughed at the idea that the income tax would ever go over 10 percent when that amendment was passed in 1913. Today, as you will realize, the average of the income tax is fast approaching 30 percent; and, I might remind you, no nation in history has ever successfully lived through taxation that exceeded 25 percent for any length of time.

As a result of this unchecked urge to spend, we have found ourselves failing to recognize and follow the economic laws. Chiefly, the law of supply and demand has been totally ignored as this Nation has spent itself further and further into debt. As the people of the country look more and more to Washington for assistance, Washington takes on more and more regulations that control the business life of this country.

Now, you might believe that this is the first time in history that a government has tried this, but let me remind you that practically every nation that has fallen has fallen because at some point in its history the governing bodies have ignored the basic laws of economics.

Go back to the days of Egypt when the Pharaohs attempted to control wheat. Go back to the days of Babylon. Study the fall of the Roman Empire, and you will find one of the greatest examples of how a government, in attempting to regulate agriculture, pretty much as we are attempting to do it today, started a dependency on the Federal state that ultimately caused a decline in morals which resulted in only one thing: the fall of that great empire.

Today, there is a crying need for leadership to return to saneness in the conduct of our economic affairs. This call is loud and it should be heard by every businessman, because poised against us in this international struggle for peace and freedom is a power that has openly declared she will destroy us without ever firing a shot—by destroying our economy. A few more years of adherence to the "crackpot" ideas that the Government can control the business cycles of this country, to the ideas that the Federal Government can reach and maintain a level of so-called full employment and full products, a total blindness to the fact that prices establish themselves as do wages through the law of supply and demand—and the forecast of Engles, Marx, Lenin, and Stalin might well come to pass.

This constant tempering with the economic laws of our system has resulted in one period of serious inflation within the last 10 years and now places before us the threat of another.

Let me, at this point, praise the President of the United States for having pleaded in his message to Congress for restraint by both the leaders of organized labor and management in their desires to increase wages and hence, prices.

I sincerely hope that this challenge is heeded. I mention it here in this great State of Pennsylvania because here we find one of the greatest concentrations of industry in the entire country, and here is where the correction can start.

I have mentioned before the ignoring of the economic laws that govern our economy and I would like to call to your attention the fact that there has been great evidence that big management and big labor have, in effect, been getting in bed together in the matter of wage and price increases. If that has happened and, as I say, there is evidence to confirm it, then industry and labor themselves can be charged with tampering with the laws of supply and demand.

Now, certainly, a union has every right—in fact, it is charged with the responsibility—to see that its members receive proper pay and proper hours; but it should do that only when it feels that the production of the individual worker or the collective worker has reached a point which warrants such an increase. For management to assume that it can easily pass on wage increases to the public is an act of tampering with the laws of economics that is every bit as serious as when the Government itself does so.

So, gentlemen, you have a grave responsibility in this period, and I hope and pray that both sides will exercise judgment in it.

I would like to go a step further, though, in commenting on the President's message and say that I feel Government has a responsibility in this area of restraint. Certainly, if the administration is going to insist on increased coverage under the minimum-wage law, then prices will go up in areas where prices can least afford to go up, namely, the rural areas of this country where one is apt to find minimum wages below the standards set by the Federal Government.

I will proceed further, too, in commenting upon the Government's responsibilities in the control of inflation, and say that I feel that this year's budget, as recently submitted, is incredibly high and that it should have been reduced before it ever reached Congress. Without having had that action, however, it should certainly receive the sharp knife treatment from Members of the legislative body.

The mistaken idea that we can continue to spend in the fields of deficit and, by doing this promote prosperity, is to me one of the most ridiculous hypotheses ever embarked on by man in attempting to operate an economy and to operate a government in relationship to it. As deficits decrease, the purchasing value of the dollar decreases and I imagine if we wanted to be selfish in this and say, "Well, let's let our children and our grandchildren worry about the mess—we'll live on the same high plane we are now in, in spite of what it does to the economy," we would certainly be progressing along the right road at about the proper speed.

This philosophy of phony spending will work as long as there remains any value to the dollar. But, what happens when the dollar becomes valueless? Who are the people who suffer most through this ridiculous approach to controlling the economy? They are the very people with whom the pseudo-liberals loudly concern themselves—the retired person, the aged, the workingman, the person on a fixed income, the veteran, and the disabled. As the dollar is depreciated through the activities of these egghead economists, those are the people who suffer.

I sincerely hope that the Congress is effective in establishing sizable reductions in the Federal budget so that we can continue the practice that President Eisenhower so notably started—namely, living within our means.

Because of this constant looking to Washington, and the consequent failure to recognize and follow economic laws, which has produced one inflation and the threat of another, we find these pseudo-liberals and egghead economists trying to fix the blame somewhere. And where do you think they put it? They are placing it on free enterprise. They are saying, gentlemen, that you and I, operating our businesses in the free way that was intended under our Constitution, are contributing to the economic downfall of this country. That is what they are saying, and you and I are not answering them as we should.

We are not telling the American people the various facets of the free-enterprise system and what it has done for them and what it is doing now for our country. We don't tell them, for instance, that all productivity is based on 3 factors—1, natural resources; 2, human energy to develop these natural resources; and 3, with the aid of tools, tools that are purchased by the money of free enterprise, money that is the reward for initiative, money that comes from profits.

Now, you will ask at this point: "Well, what does the Senator suggest that we do?" And to start off in answer to that, let me quote something that Bishop Fulton Sheen said recently: "Liberty is no heirloom, it requires the daily bread of self-denial, the salt of law, and above all, the backbone of acknowledging responsibility for our deeds."

In fact, Benjamin Franklin said something pretty close to that in Philadelphia on leaving the Constitution Hall. A lady asked him what the people had been given by their deliberations. He said, "Madam, we have given you a Republic—if you can keep it."

I think the American business fraternity must awaken to the fact that the forces to destroy them are strong and that they are operating within the framework of both our economic and governmental structures, and that the forces on the outside, you and I, must be equally strong.

We must be strong in the presentation of the American business story to the American people. We must be strong in our adherence to the truth, for, gentlemen, at no other time in our history has truth been such a basic objective as it is today. Among the people there is bewilderment caused by the threats of a growing Federal bureaucracy and by those in authority who evidently think against it but do not speak in that direction.

People in public life, such as I, have a definite responsibility, too. We must be truthful to our constituency. We must outline carefully to them, from our platforms during campaigns, what we think about these matters I have been discussing with you, and then, if elected, we must go to Washington or go to Harrisburg, and act in the manner that is consistent with our pledges and our beliefs.

There is no place in our governmental setup, no call in our Constitution, for a rubberstamp Congress or a rubberstamp legislature. In fact, the entire opposite is true in this country. Here we are a group of 168 million people, the majority of whom intend to live by the words of Thomas Jefferson, believing that we are the free children of God. Here we are more or less individualists. Here we are free to think and speak as we care, as our consciences direct us.

Under this concept, a man should go to his legislative body and act as he told his people he would act and never be dissuaded by the glamor of public office or the expediencies of political horsetrading.

Indeed, gentlemen, a firm adherence to principle as a sacred responsibility is the indelible prerequisite for maintaining the system that makes it possible for us to choose between the good and evil side in this struggle for ideological dominance.

Take away a man's or a nation's principles, in public or in private life, and you take away the full worth of any man or any nation.

## THE SCHOOLROOM SHORTAGE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the New York Times of yesterday, February 26, there appeared an editorial entitled "Is Your Child Surplus?" The editorial is a timely reminder of the critical situation we face with regard to the shortage of schoolrooms for the children throughout the country. As the editorial states:

In the past 5 years the number of pupils in the Nation's public schools has increased by 5.5 million, and in the next 5 years it will jump by another 6 million. This extraordinary rise in school population, combined with a completely inadequate rate of school building, means that this year—right now—7 or 8 percent of the total number of enrolled school children in this country may be considered surplus in the sense that there are not facilities properly to take care of them.

The editorial continues to outline the immediate crisis. In light of the importance of the subject and the fact that we are about to consider proposed school-construction legislation, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS YOUR CHILD SURPLUS?

In the past 5 years the number of pupils in the Nation's public schools has increased by 5.5 million and in the next 5 years it will jump by another 6 million. This extraordinary rise in school population, combined with a completely inadequate rate of school building, means that this year—right now—7 or 8 percent of the total number of enrolled schoolchildren in this country may be considered surplus in the sense that there are not facilities properly to take care of them.

The latest report of the United States Office of Education estimates the classroom shortage at 159,000, and the number of excess students at about 2.3 out of a total of 31.5 million. This excess is taken care of, so to speak, by various expedients, such as half-day or two-shift sessions, makeshift accommodations, or, most simply, by excessive overcrowding. While satisfactory physical conditions certainly cannot guarantee a good education, the absence of such facilities is pretty certain to prevent a child in the America of today from getting a good education.

As President Eisenhower said in his message on school building earlier this year, "solutions to all of the other problems in education will be empty achievements indeed if good teaching is not available"; and everyone knows that, by and large, teachers are disgracefully underpaid and the teaching profession has yet to achieve the status in public esteem and support that is its due. Yet of all the many problems facing education in the public elementary and secondary schools today, perhaps the most critical, and certainly the one where the Federal Government can be of most immediate and effective help, is the classroom shortage.

Considering the disproportion between the enormous rise in national income during the last two decades and the relatively small rise in expenditures on the public schools, the country has to become as accustomed to thinking big in terms of schools and education generally as it already is doing in terms of highways and national defense. Surely there is no defense more important to a democracy than an educated and enlightened citizenry. We would like to see Congress produce action on a school bill as early in this session as possible.

## HEART RESEARCH

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Heart Research Pays," which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 26, 1957, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

This editorial points out the striking progress made in reducing the death toll caused by heart disease through in-

creased expenditures for research activities in this field.

Mr. President, during my service in the Senate I have continually advocated greater appropriations for research into the causes and cures of diseases which cripple or kill thousands of Americans each year. I have proposed a crash program of medical research aimed at the destruction of cancer, heart disease, and other potentially fatal maladies wracking mankind. I believe that the facts contained in this editorial fully confirm the justification of my position and present an overwhelming argument for vastly increased expenditures in medical research. For a country spending $40 billion annually for armament, no sum is too high to invest in the well-being of its citizens and the reduction of human suffering.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEART RESEARCH PAYS

Last year a big frontal attack, costing around $15 million, was made on this Nation's No. 1 killer, heart disease. The amount allocated for heart research through public and private sources was more than six times that spent in 1949. Naturally Americans ask: Has it paid off?

Dividends from these 8 years of research, as recently reviewed in this newspaper by Nate Haseltine, are remarkable. Half a dozen major developments in heart surgery have saved the lives and increased the capacity for living of countless children, young people, and adults. Medical advances have made possible prevention of recurrent sieges of rheumatic fever, the second most common cause of death by disease in the 20–24 age group, and the leading cause of death, except for accidents, among school-age children. Through new drugs, high blood pressure can now be better controlled; blood clotting in persons who have had heart attacks prevented; and the heart's workload in those having coronary disease relieved.

The three organizations that sponsored this research—the American Heart Association, the National Heart Institute, and the Medical Life Insurance Research Fund—are furnishing eloquent proof that money wisely expended can purchase longer and fuller lives for many persons who otherwise would fall victim to heart disease.

## POWER FOR THE NORTHWEST

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, comments have been made on this floor in recent weeks on the alleged failure of the Eisenhower administration's partnership program of water resource development. In fact, it has even been suggested that we are losing to Russia the race for power development.

In view of these continuing comments, I think it pertinent to give a somewhat different appraisal, as reported in the Wall Street Journal and commented upon editorially by the Washington Star.

A staff article in the Wall Street Journal of February 20 stated very positively that while politicians are shouting for Federal construction of hydro-power dams on the rivers of the Northwest, the private companies and local public agencies of that area are now engaged in a vast construction program that will add 4.6 million kilowatts to the Northwest's power system. This vast partnership-type building program, the Journal's article points out, adds up to roughly the same generating capacity that the Federal Government has constructed in that area over the years.

In order that my colleagues and the public may have access to this other side of the Northwest power story, I hereby request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the Wall Street Journal article of February 20 and the Star editorial of February 26.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 26, 1957]

POWER IN THE NORTHWEST

The Wall Street Journal, in a report from the Pacific Northwest, has cited some impressive figures that tend to pull the rug out from under Senator MORSE and other politicos who have been clamoring for a vast Federal dam-building program in that part of the country. The figures leave little room for doubt that the clamor, which has included all sorts of dire predictions about an imminent and critical power shortage, has had a considerable amount of hot air in it.

Actually, according to these figures, private companies and local governmental agencies in the Pacific Northwest have been doing a tremendous dam-building job of their own. In fact, as the Journal reports, they now have approximately 4.6 million kilowatts of hydroelectric power under construction, just completed or definitely licensed for development, and they are seriously considering projects designed to produce an additional 4 million kilowatts. In the words of one utility official, this postwar program has been the largest of its kind ever undertaken "at any one time in any single area in the history of America." By way of contrast, all the Federal dams built in the same region in the past 25 years amount to no more than 4.6 million kilowatts.

Indeed, after looking over the Northwest's private and local public utility accomplishments of recent years, the head of the Federal Bonneville Power Administration—which a year ago warned of a near future "serious shortage" in electrical output in the region—now asserts that the danger of a "crisis" has been deferred until at least 1964 or 1965. All of which makes one wonder about the accuracy of the information that has led Mr. MORSE and like-minded legislators to predict a sort of calamity unless our National Government steps into the picture and goes on a dam-building spree.

---

[From the Wall Street Journal of February 20, 1957]

POWER PARADOX: WHILE POLITICIANS SHOUT FOR UNITED STATES AID, NORTHWEST BUILDS ITS OWN DAMS—PRIVATE COMPANIES AND LOCAL AGENCIES FINANCE A VAST 4.6 MILLION KILOWATT PROGRAM—CLAMOR IN CLACKAMAS CANYON

(By Ray J. Schrick)

IN THE CLACKAMAS CANYON, OREG.—While Northwest politicians are shouting in Washington for a vast resurgence of Federal dam building, local initiative already has under way a hydropower program as big as anything the region has ever known.

Stand here at the edge of the Clackamas River and you'll hear the roar of huge shovels and trucks, punctuated by dynamite blasts, as a 40-foot layer of earth and stone is moved from the river bottom to reach bedrock. Next month concrete will begin pouring to create a picturesque arc which will stretch nearly one-sixth of a mile across the canyon.

Within a 5-mile stretch of the Clackamas, workmen are drilling a 23-foot-diameter tunnel through a mountain, and adding a generator to an existing powerhouse. When this North Fork-Faraday project is completed 19 months from now, it will have cost Portland General Electric Co. $20 million and will boost this region's electrical production capacity by 78,000 kilowatts.

LITTLE JOB

This North Fork Dam will rise as high as an 18-story building, yet husky construction boss Hugh Parker emphasizes that it's a "little job," compared to others afoot.

Private companies, together with cities and the local governmental agencies known as PUD's or public utility districts, today boast approximately 4.6 million kilowatts of hydroelectric power under construction, just completed, or definitely licensed by the Federal Power Commission for construction. In comparison, all the Federal dams built in the area in the past quarter of a century—from Grand Coulee and Bonneville, started in 1930's, to McNary, whose last generator has just gone on the line—will add up to no more than a like 4.6 million kilowatts.

"It's the largest hydroelectric program at any one time in any single area in the history of America," proudly observes Kinsey Robinson, president of Washington Water Power Co., of Spokane, Wash. He estimates close to $1 billion in financing is involved.

Each solid black dot on the map below represents one of these firm homegrown projects. But this is only a beginning. Local utilities, private and public, already are giving serious consideration to another group of projects which would produce an additional 4 million kilowatts; preliminary FPC permits have been granted for most of them. Each of these shows up on the map as a white dot.

This peppering of the power map almost precisely reverses the picture of the past decade and a half. Between 1940 and 1956, Uncle Sam was doing more than double the hydro construction of local utilities. Today, the firm local projects are more than double the 2 million kilowatts of Federal construction under way.

Breaking the dam jam is, of course, of utmost importance to the expanding economy of the Northwest. The Bonneville Power Administration, which sells Federal power and keeps tabs on the whole electrical situation, was warning as recently as a year ago that a serious shortage was shaping up for the early 1960's. Today it concedes that any crisis has already been rolled back until at least 1964–65. "Public agencies and private utilities have accepted the challenge," declares Dr. William A. Pearl, Bonneville Administrator.

Yet the solid accomplishments are outshouted by the politicians and remain almost unnoticed even here in the Nation's greatest waterpower land.

PARTNERSHIP PLAN

"There is unanimous agreement that the Pacific Northwest faces a power shortage within a few years," loudly proclaims Oregon's Democratic Senator WAYNE MORSE. He contends that in the last congressional elections, which went heavily against the Republicans in the Northwest, "the people of the region have rejected decisively the phony partnership program." Under the partnership idea, the Eisenhower administration granted a role to local interests as well as the Federal Government in power development.

As Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay was the leading administration exponent of partnership; since he resigned and was trounced in an effort to unseat Mr. MORSE from the Senate last November, a bit less has been heard of it, though one such scheme has been proposed for northern California.

For instance, Fred Seaton, now Secretary of the Interior, has asked the FPC to delay a private license for Pleasant Valley Dam

on the Snake River—a project approved by his predecessor. The administration is understood to be ready to back all-Federal development of this stretch of the river. This despite the fact that Pacific Northwest Power Co., jointly owned by four private utilities—Washington Water Power Co., Montana Power Co., Pacific Power & Light Co., and Portland General Electric—is willing to spend $234 million there to produce 1,183,000 kilowatts from the proposed Pleasant Valley-Mountain Sheep Dams.

Federal power advocates are demanding United States construction of the John Day Dam, to rise on the largest remaining water power site on the Columbia River. A year ago, President Eisenhower recommended in his budget that this be a partnership deal, with local electric utilities advancing $273 million of the $310 million cost for a 1,105,000-kilowatt project to be built and owned by the Government. That proposal was killed and today Democratic leaders criticize Ike for not putting it in his 1957 budget message as a full Federal project. Charges Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, the other Oregon Senator: "The President drives another coffin nail into Oregon's economic future."

So fond of Federal kilowatts are some political leaders that they aim to ruin a private project along the Idaho-Oregon border upon which $15 million has already been spent, in over a year of construction. In the deep Hells Canyon of the Snake River, over 800 "construction stiffs" are compacting clay and performing other work on the first of three Idaho Power Co. dams, which are scheduled to produce 900,000 kilowatts at $133 million cost. But in Washington, 26 Democrats led by Senator MORSE have reintroduced a bill to authorize a Federal dam that would flood out this private project. At the same time, the Federal dam proponents, through the National Hells Canyon Association, have gone to the United States Supreme Court to contest the FPC license to Idaho Power.

Private power executives in the Northwest grumble that the administration has not done enough to expound the achievements of local utilities. "If it had sold partnership like Ezra Taft Benson has sold agricultural policy, our power accomplishments would be better accepted," says one.

PRIVATE PROJECT

In the current firm program, the private electric companies have 14 projects to supply 2.1 million kilowatts; the local governmental agencies such as the PUD's have assumed primary responsibility for 8 projects to yield 2.5 million kilowatts, and the Federal Government has 9 projects to produce 2.0 million kilowatts.

Of the projects not definite but under serious consideration, private companies are looking into dam construction to turn out 2.3 million kilowatts; local public agencies are investigating projects which would produce 1.7 million kilowatts, and the Federal Government might back ventures yielding 2.7 million kilowatts.

Such statistics seem cold, perhaps, but their impact on taxpayers throughout the Nation can be warm enough. Federal dam building calls for enormous outlays from the United States Treasury—about $1.7 billion to date plus nearly another $1 billion in Northwest dams already under construction. A great deal of this money, of course, is scheduled for ultimate repayment from power sales.

In contrast, locally backed power ventures take no money from the Treasury; in the case of those built by private companies they actually produce heavy revenue from Federal income taxes.

Seven private companies alone will spend $225 million for construction in 1957, up approximately $55 percent from $145 million a year ago.

BEAMS TO BEDROCK

Under the ancient bed of the Lewis River in southwestern Washington, a man operating a power steam hammer drives long steel beams 80 feet into the earth to bedrock. He's helping make a watertight curtain at Pacific Power & Light Co.'s $46 million, 204,000-kilowatt Swift Dam. He and about 300 other men are beginning a 510-foot-high earth and rock dam. It will be so large that its materials, piled on a single city block, would tower nearly 2 miles into the air. Next year power generating will begin.

Besides this big dam, Pacific is adding a 45,000-kilowatt $5 million generator at its existing Merwin Dam on the Lewis River and investigating 3 more Washington and Oregon projects totaling 351,000 kilowatts whose price tag would run $80 million to $100 million.

"Our industrial powerload alone has grown 58 percent in the past 5 years," points out a Pacific Power spokesman.

In central Oregon, Portland General Electric's $25 million Pelton Dam will harness the Deschutes River, to the chagrin of local fishermen. Through the dam's three 16-foot penstocks, water next year will begin spinning generators of 120,000 kilowatts capacity. Looking into the future, PGE also hopes to build the still bigger $55 million, 225,000-kilowatt round Butte Dam upstream for which the Federal Power Commission has O. K.'d a preliminary permit.

California-Oregon Power Co. in southern Oregon has cleared the way for immediate as well as long-range projects on the Klamath River by obtaining a new 50-year contract from the Bureau of Reclamation, permitting the company to use Upper Klamath Lake as a storage reservoir to supply water and regulate stream flow for its proposed power dams downstream.

"Between now and next March, construction crews will tunnel a 16-foot river-size channel through a mountain to our Big Bend dam site," says A. S. Cummins, COPCO president. The 80,000-kilowatt, $15 million Big Bend Dam due for completion next year, is only the first of possibly five ultimate COPCO projects on the Klamath with an estimated 320,000 kilowatts combined capacity. "The stretch of river will furnish our power needs for years to come. We're in about as fine shape as we could be," adds Mr. Cummins.

In the Hells Canyon area, Idaho Power began construction in 1955 on the $63 million, 360,000-kilowatt Brownlee Dam on the Snake River, its completion is set for next year. Today, 13 miles downstream, Morrison-Knudsen Co., Inc., construction crews also are making roads ready so giant machinery can start building the companion 190,000-kilowatt Oxbow Dam. Tom Roach, president of Idaho Power, reported recently:

"In the next 2 years, construction will add more new power than our entire system developed in 40 years."

In Montana, two private companies push ahead power projects. Washington Water Power Co.'s $85 million, 400,000-kilowatt Noxon Rapids Dam on the Clark Fork River represents the largest dam being built by any single Northwest power company. Construction crews numbering about 800 workmen pour concrete even through the winter in order to hit the 1959 starting date for the first generator.

Montana Power Co. even reached across the Continental Divide, beyond the area shown on the map, to the Missouri River last August in breaking ground on the $10 million, 60,000-kilowatt Cochrane Dam. Completion is scheduled next December.

PUGET SOUND PUSH

In the far northwest corner of the country, Puget Sound Power & Light Co. has a $40 million, 178,000-kilowatt construction push under way around Puget Sound. Finishing touches are being put to a 20,000-kilowatt addition to start in April at the present Snoqualmie Falls generating station.

Major public power growth includes Seattle city light's new 90,000 kilowatt generator at Ross Dam; city of Tacoma's 460,000 kilowatts at the proposed Mayfield and Mossyrock Dams (stymied in court proceedings, this is now before the Washington State Legislature); Grant County PUD's 1,200,000 kilowatts at Priest Rapids and Wanapum Dams; Chelan PUD's 711,550 kilowatts at Rocky Reach Dam and Cowlitz County PUD's 63,000 kilowatt Swift No. 2 Dam.

The United States Corps of Engineers works on McNary, Chief Joseph, the Dalles, all on the mainstream of the Columbia; Ice Harbor on the Snake, Hills Creek, and Cougar on western Oregon streams. The Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation builds Roza Dam on the Yakima River, Palisades in Idaho and Greensprings in southern Oregon.

Local public and private utilities are teaming up to lick some of the biggest jobs.

The largest local partnership dam under construction on the Columbia is Rocky Reach Dam, upstream from Wenatchee, Wash. Chelan PUD is building the 711,000 kilowatt project. However, Puget Sound Power & Light Co. guarantees a market for the power with a reservation of up to half the total output for Chelan PUD.

---

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there is no further routine or morning business, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] as a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am very anxious——

Mr. LONG. Vote!

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as I was saying, I am very anxious that each Member of the Senate be protected in his right fully to express his views on this subject—including the Senator who has just said "vote," but who I am sure is not ready to vote. [Laughter.]

For that reason, Mr. President, after consultation with many Members of the Senate, including members of the committee which reported the joint resolution, and who have the responsibility of guiding it either to passage or to defeat—whichever result may prevail—and after discussing the matter in some detail with the minority leader, I shall ask the Senate to sit later than usual today—until, I hope, 6 p. m. or later—and also to convene earlier than usual tomorrow. I have already obtained unanimous consent for the Senate to convene tomorrow at 11 a. m. If the Senate will follow my recommendations in the matter—I

shall ask the Senate to hold a session on Saturday.

Now, each Senator who is anxious to discuss the pending resolution will have ample opportunity to do so. I hope I do not seem too pedagogical, but I wish to caution the Members of the Senate against haste, and appeal to them to be patient and understanding of their colleagues, because I have never seen any good results flow from attempting to pressure Members of the Senate. It is not in that spirit that I shall ask for a Saturday session. It is not in that spirit that I ask for the Senate to sit later than usual. It is not in that spirit that I ask the Senate to convene at 11 o'clock a. m.

No one has a right to complain to our colleagues about delays in the progress of the Middle East Resolution, when it took the Senate 70 days to pass the troops-to-Europe resolution; but we in the Senate do have a right to expect Senators who claim for themselves the right to speak on the pending resolution to come forward and speak if opportunity is afforded to them, and the Senator from Texas is going to attempt to provide them with the opportunity.

Some of the Senators who desire to speak will be Democrats, some will be Republicans. I pray no one will try to make the result a Republican victory and a Democratic defeat, or vice versa. We all recognize our responsibilities.

On yesterday two popular Members of the Senate refused to give the majority leader the consent he had requested. I understood their viewpoint. I did not quarrel with them about their objection, but I had my responsibilities, and I discharged them, and I hope to continue to discharge them in a manner that will reflect credit on this great body in which I am privileged to serve.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I understand the Senator is anxious that the pending joint resolution be brought to a vote. I should like to suggest that perhaps meeting until 6 o'clock in the evening is not long enough. Many Senators think it is important to make speeches when more than only a few Senators are present. Senators know that after they have done their office work and have met with their constituents, it is possible to have an actual quorum present, rather than merely a quorum to answer the rollcall. Perhaps the Senator might find it desirable to keep the Senate in session to as late as 9 or 10 o'clock in the evening during the next 2 or 3 days, so we can dispose of the resolution.

So far as the junior Senator from Louisiana is concerned, he has no particular desire to delay a vote on the resolution. However, if it goes over until next week, he will not find it personally convenient to vote on Monday or Tuesday.

It seems to me those who desire to speak should proceed with their remarks. There is no particular reason why they cannot make their speeches. The resolution has been before the Senate for some time. It has been discussed in the newspapers for about 60 days. So far as I am concerned, I am ready to vote on the resolution, or the pending amendment, right now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have always found the junior Senator from Louisiana extremely helpful. I deeply appreciate his constructive suggestions. If I did not have such a vivid memory of past results of attempts to hold night sessions in March, I might be tempted to follow the Senator's suggestion. When the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] attempted to hold the Senate in session late in the evening, the Senator from Texas made a motion to recess, and the motion prevailed.

I am not so sure I would do it again. I now understand some of the responsibilities my friend was carrying which I did not fully understand when I made that motion. So I shall be reluctant to ask the Senate to remain in session late in the evening at this stage of the debate. But I shall continue to appeal to Senators who desire to speak to come to the floor and do so.

Last night at 6 o'clock we obtained a quorum, and there were no Senators who desired to speak. If that situation prevails many times, I think the Senate will very properly be criticized. I appeal to my colleagues to be available, and to follow the discussions as closely as possible. I hope those who do not care to have the unanimous-consent request agreed to will debate the joint resolution.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Goldwater | Morse |
| Allott | Gore | Morton |
| Anderson | Green | Mundt |
| Barrett | Hayden | Murray |
| Beall | Hennings | Neuberger |
| Bennett | Hickenlooper | O'Mahoney |
| Bible | Hill | Pastore |
| Blakley | Holland | Payne |
| Bricker | Hruska | Potter |
| Bush | Humphrey | Purtell |
| Butler | Ives | Revercomb |
| Byrd | Jackson | Robertson |
| Capehart | Javits | Russell |
| Carlson | Jenner | Saltonstall |
| Carroll | Johnson, Tex. | Schoeppel |
| Case, N. J. | Johnston, S. C. | Scott |
| Case, S. Dak. | Kefauver | Smathers |
| Chavez | Kennedy | Smith, Maine |
| Church | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Clark | Kuchel | Sparkman |
| Cooper | Lausche | Stennis |
| Cotton | Long | Symington |
| Curtis | Magnuson | Talmadge |
| Dirksen | Malone | Thurmond |
| Douglas | Mansfield | Thye |
| Dworshak | Martin, Iowa | Watkins |
| Eastland | Martin, Pa. | Wiley |
| Ellender | McCarthy | Williams |
| Ervin | McClellan | Young |
| Flanders | McNamara | |
| Frear | Monroney | |

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is absent because of illness.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORTON in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], as a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement setting forth my general attitude with respect to any amendments which may be offered to Senate Joint Resolution 19.

As my colleagues know, during consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 19 by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, sitting in joint session, a number of amendments were voted upon. Several of these amendments were adopted and a number of others were rejected. I anticipate that some of the amendments which were defeated in committee may be reoffered on the floor of the Senate. Indeed, some of the amendments offered on the floor may be amendments which I myself supported in the committee.

As the chairman of the joint committee, however, I want it clearly understood that I expect to support the version of Senate Joint Resolution 19 now before the Senate.

It seems to me that the version now reported represents a compromise position which deserves the support of as large a group of Senators as possible. When I made my opening statement in support of this resolution, I said:

> This new language is stronger than that in the original resolution.

It is my intention, therefore, to support the joint resolution as reported, with two possible reservations:

In the first place, if amendments are offered on the floor, the substance of which was not considered by the joint committee, I reserve my right either to support or to oppose them depending on their merits.

In the second place, if amendments are offered which are generally acceptable to Members of the Senate, I shall not oppose them.

Mr. BUSH obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am serving temporarily in the post of the Majority Leader. Is it my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut is about to address himself to the pending business?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I rise in support of the pending resolution, because it is a step which must be taken before the United States can continue, with renewed and intensified vigor, her leadership in efforts to bring stability and lasting peace in the Middle East.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. BUSH. I yield for a question.

Mr. WILEY. Did I understand the Senator to refer to the pending business? As I understand, the pending business is the Russell amendment. Is the Senator speaking to that amendment?

Mr. BUSH. I referred to the pending resolution, Senate Resolution 19, as reported by the committees.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator for the reminder.

The central purposes of the resolution are twofold:

First. To serve notice upon the rulers of the Soviet Union that the United States is prepared to fight, if necessary, to prevent Communist aggression from taking control of that vital area of the world.

Second. To give the President greater flexibility in the use of $200 million in funds, which the Congress has already appropriated, for military or economic assistance to Middle East nations.

There is danger that these purposes may be obscured by the dense fog of extravagant and ill-founded statements by some Senators opposed to the resolution.

It has been contended, for example, that the resolution means that the Congress is abdicating its power to declare war, that we are giving the President a blank check to spend public funds, and that we are giving the United Nations control of American Armed Forces.

Some have grounded their opposition, in large part, on their dislike of all so-called foreign aid, forgetting that our national security, the safety of our own shores, and our own people from attack is heavily involved with the freedom and independence of other nations.

I have listened attentively while other Senators who are lawyers have discussed constitutional questions, and have congratulated each other on the wisdom of their remarks. I must respectfully disagree with those who find in the resolution any abdication by the Congress of its power to declare war. I am not a lawyer, but laymen can read, and this is what the resolution says:

> The United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use Armed Forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism.

I find in that language a clear and distinct warning to the men in the Kremlin to keep hands off in the Middle East, but I find nothing which in any way involves a sacrifice by the Congress of its constitutional power to declare war.

Those who have expressed vague and nebulous fears that the Congress in some undetermined way is abdicating this power forget that we have expressly retained the right to terminate the authority granted by the resolution at any time we see fit.

And I suggest that they have forgotten that the record of Dwight D. Eisenhower's administration has demonstrated that no President in the history of the United States has had a deeper respect for the constitutional doctrine of the separation of powers. With that on the record, there is no justification for doubting the solemn pledge made by President Eisenhower in his message to Congress on the Middle East, from which I quote:

> If, contrary to my hope and expectation, a situation arose which called for military application of the policy which I ask the Congress to join me in proclaiming, I would of course maintain hour-by-hour contact with the Congress, if it were in session. And if the Congress were not in session, and if the situation had grave implications, I would, of course, at once call the Congress into special session.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I would be glad to yield, but I should prefer to finish my remarks first. Does the Senator have a brief question? I should prefer not to enter into any colloquy until later.

Mr. WATKINS. Then I shall be glad to ask the Senator a question later.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. President, equally without substance is the contention that the Congress is surrendering the power of the purse.

I can find nothing in the resolution which justifies the charge that we are giving the President a blank check which he can spend at will and without answering to the Congress.

The check we are giving the President is far from blank. Not only is it limited in amount and in time, but the conditions under which it can be spent are carefully set forth.

The President must determine that an expenditure under this authorization is important to the security of the United States. He must separate expenditures for military assistance from those for economic assistance, and he must, before making any expenditure at all, report what he plans to do to at least four committees of the Congress, and, under some circumstances, to six.

I believe it would be dangerously unwise to attempt to spell out in this resolution, or for the President to announce publicly now, what will be done under the authority of this part of the proposal.

We are dealing with a rapidly changing situation in the Middle East, and there is need for flexibility in our ability to meet new circumstances as they arise. Moreover, it is to our advantage to keep the Communists guessing about our exact actions in these assistance programs.

Mr. President, when Yogi Berra gets behind the plate to give the signals in the world series—I see present the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] who, I believe, is a baseball expert—Berra hides his hand so that no one but the pitcher can see the signals. He does not want others to know what is coming. So it is very important that we keep the Russians guessing as to what may be our plan, and for that reason I believe it would be very unwise for the President to disclose what he intends to do with the very definitely limited amount of money for which he has asked.

The argument that the resolution places American Armed Forces under the control of the United Nations is without foundation. Those who advance it have neglected to read the resolution with sufficient care.

Under the resolution, as under the Constitution of the United States, the President alone has the power to order the use of our Armed Forces when he determines that such action is necessary in the national interest.

It has been contended that the Soviet Union would have veto power in the United Nations Security Council over the employment of Armed Forces of the United States under the circumstances contemplated by the resolution. That is not the case. Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations makes vetoproof the actions taken by a nation or group of nations in defense against armed aggression.

To support this statement I cite the hearings, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, article 51 of the United Nations Charter, and the discussion by Senator HICKENLOOPER and Secretary Dulles which appears on pages 69 and 70 of the hearings.

There being no objection, the article and the discussion referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLE 51 OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

> Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense, if an armed attack occurs against a member of the organization, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present charter to take at any time such action as it may deem necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

---

SECURITY COUNCIL—VETO POWER

> Chairman GREEN. Mr. HICKENLOOPER, do you have any questions?
>
> Senator HICKENLOOPER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
>
> Mr. Secretary, I think you have covered a vast area of questions which have arisen in the minds of most of us in this questioning thus far, but I would like to ask your discussion on that portion of section 2 of the proposed resolution which refers to action "consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations and actions and recommendations of the United Nations; and, as specified in article 51 of the United Nations Charter, measures pursuant thereto shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security."
>
> Does that give an opportunity in the Security Council for Russia or any other member of the Security Council to veto, to prohibit, or to stop any action which the United States might feel called upon to take under the other terms of this resolution?
>
> Secretary DULLES. No, sir; it does not, because it comes the other way around: That under the charter, and under article 51, action can be taken and can be continued unless and until there is action in the Security Council which is effective to restore peace and security.
>
> Now, the Soviet Union in the Security Council has no veto power whatsoever upon our taking action under article 51. We do not have to go there to get its consent, and

the authority of the Security Council under article 51 is merely that measures—it says measures taken by the members—now, that is in the past tense, measures have been taken "shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security."

In other words, it would take affirmative action by the Security Council, and that affirmative action could not be taken without the concurrence of the United States.

INHERENT RIGHT OF INDIVIDUAL OR COLLECTIVE SELF-DEFENSE

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I think a great many people feel that such action as may be taken unilaterally by a country in case of aggression against that country's territorial boundaries itself is quite different from aggression against some foreign state far removed from the actual territorial boundaries of the nation taking such action.

In other words, it is perfectly understandable if some nation attacks the United States or any other nation, that the nation attacked can take through an emergency, such immediate action as is necessary to attempt to repel the attack.

Under this resolution, we are considering the matter of an attack on, and a request by, a foreign nation far removed from the boundaries of the United States. I merely wanted you to clarify what would or would not be the rights of the Security Council under these very different circumstances.

Secretary DULLES. It was to meet that point of view, Senator, that article 51 was drawn to recognize what is referred to as the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense.

Now, I had some part in the drawing of that article at San Francisco, and it was drawn as it was drawn to meet the very point which you are making, namely, is there going to be a situation here where a nation can attack countries, weak countries, perhaps, one by one, and nobody can go to their aid unless the Security Council agrees?

And we all knew at that time that the Soviet Union might very well veto that. So what was recognized as an inherent right is not just the right of the nation which is directly attacked to react, but that that can be done on a collective basis. And it is, indeed, pursuant to that article that we have made the arrangements that we have in respect to the Republic of China, with respect to the Republic of Korea, the Philippines, North Atlantic Treaty, and the like.

It all assumes, and correctly assumes, that if there is an attack, there can be a collective defense, and that the Security Council has no power to prevent that.

We do not have to wait until the Security Council has acted. We felt, otherwise, that this charter might create a kind of deathtrap for some countries, if they got into a situation where they could be attacked and they could not get helped except with the approval of the Security Council.

And I am sure you will find that the historical record on that point is very clear, was made clear in the hearings which were held before this committee in 1945 when the charter was being considered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, there are some who oppose the resolution because it will involve expenditures of funds which, they contend, should be spent on programs within the United States.

No one wishes more than I that world circumstances were such that we could afford to cut down on so-called foreign aid and devote the savings to needed and desirable domestic undertakings and to the relief of the taxpayers of the United States.

But I believe that we must keep in clear focus the purpose of the mutual security program. As the name implies, our national security is involved in that program.

Americans are a great and generous-hearted people. We are distressed by poverty and suffering in any part of the world. Even if the danger created by international communism were removed, we would want to help relieve such conditions, as we did by voluntary contributions in many years gone by and as we still do through the work of many religious and charitable organizations.

However, the justification for the spending of public funds for mutual security lies in the hard fact that we are defending our national interest by helping to keep other nations from falling under Communist control.

Mutual security is not a one-way street. We obtain such benefits as overseas bases, the presence of armed forces of other nations besides our own as a shield against armed attack, and the denial of control of important resources to our potential enemies.

The mutual-security program has helped to check the advance of international communism. It has helped our Defense Establishment to maintain the capacity for retaliation which has deterred the Soviet Union from attacking the free world and thus precipitating the outbreak of world war III.

One should not contend that the program has been free of mistakes. There can be endless argument about matters of detail. In certain countries, as in Iran, "crash" programs were undertaken which, with the benefit of hindsight, now are the subject of criticism.

The present administration, and also Congress, are constantly reviewing the program to make certain that funds are spent as wisely as possible. There is need to maintain a constant guard against waste and extravagance.

But, on balance, I believe the money spent for mutual security has provided benefits to the United States which outweigh the costs. To keep matters in their proper perspective, we must weigh the cost of mutual security against the staggering costs which would be involved if we were to be plunged into a nuclear world war III.

Should such a tragedy ever be inflicted upon mankind, it would impose upon the people of the United States costs in money, as well as in lives and human suffering, beside which our mutual security expenditures would fade into insignficance.

If mutual security can help prevent that tragedy, it will have been well worth the expense.

The pending resolution also has been criticized in the Senate because it does not offer an all-embracing solution to the underlying causes of unrest in the Middle East, namely, the bitter hostility between the Arab States and Israel, and the controversy over the Suez Canal.

The short answer is that it is not intended to do so, nor do I believe that any resolution which the wisdom of Congress can draft will provide such a solution.

What the resolution will do is to lift from the Middle East nations the fear that they will be left undefended against Communist armed aggression, and to assure them of our willingness to provide reasonable assistance in the creation of internal conditions which will lessen the danger of Communist subversion.

The removal of that fear and the giving of that assurance will contribute to the stability of the Middle East. We will gain time in which the United States can work, through the United Nations if possible, and by other means if necessary, for a just settlement of problems created by the Israeli-Arab conflict and by Egypt's seizure of the canal.

In recent days we have been hearing from the Senators who are opposed to the resolution. I think it is time that we consider the views of some of those who support the resolution and the reasons why they support it.

This is essentially a question involving military judgment.

The resolution was recommended by the President of the United States. It has the support of General Gruenther, who until recently was the supreme commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in which position he succeeded President Eisenhower; of Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States; of every other military leader who testified before the joint committee; and of our Ambassadors to Mideast nations, career men who know what they are talking about, who have lived in the area, and who comprehend the issue because they have been living with it at close range.

What is the danger in the Middle East?

This is how President Eisenhower appraises it:

> In the situation now existing, the greatest risk, as is often the case, is that ambitious despots may miscalculate. If power-hungry Communists should either falsely or correctly estimate that the Middle East is inadequately defended, they might be tempted to use open measures of armed attack. If so, that would start a chain of circumstances which would almost surely involve the United States in military action. I am convinced that the best insurance against this dangerous contingency is to make clear now our readiness to cooperate fully and freely with our friends of the Middle East in ways consonant with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Mr. President, I suggest that that statement comes from a man whose record speaks for itself, a man who has devoted his lifetime to the services of the Nation, most of it as a military commander; and that that view is supported by the other military leaders of the Nation.

Is there a threat to the security of the United States?

Admiral Radford was asked by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], at page 408 of the hearings, if Communist control of the Middle East would endanger the life of the United States.

This was the reply of the Nation's top military commander:

> I cannot think of anything more dangerous, because I am sure that in these circumstances Western Europe, the alliances

in Western Europe, NATO, would be seriously crippled. I think there would be a good chance of the Communists taking over Western Europe in time through sheer economic strangulation. In other words, if the Communists controlled the oil of the Middle East, they could in effect control the economy of Europe.

Admiral Radford pointed out that the Communists also would gain access to Africa, a continent with many essential resources, including uranium; and if that happened, he concluded:

* * * the chances are they can gradually communize all of Africa.

Now if they should get all of Africa and all of Western Europe then we are in a very bad situation.

Some Senators have questioned the necessity of this resolution and whether a real danger to the United States exists. Among them are some whose judgment in other fields I greatly respect. But I respectfully suggest that in matters affecting the national security their qualifications for forming a judgment on which it is safe to act are perhaps not so reliable as those of the men who bear the heavy responsibility of defending the United States.

When the President of the United States and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff advise us that in the Middle East there exists great danger which involves a threat to the very life of this Nation, and that the enactment of this resolution will lessen that danger, certainly our patriotic duty is to act on the basis of their recommendations. Dare we ignore their recommendations, Mr. President?

For my own part, I believe that the enactment of the joint resolution will reduce the danger in the Middle East. History has demonstrated that when the United States speaks in clear and unmistakable terms in defense of her vital interests and in defense of freedom, the cause of peace is advanced.

Such was the result when President Monroe warned the colonial powers of another day of our vital interest in the preservation of freedom in the Western Hemisphere. Such has been the result of many actions which have been taken since World War II, by Democratic and Republican administrations alike, to check the advance of Soviet colonialism.

Mr. President, events have demonstrated that the danger of war increases when the Communists miscalculate our intentions, as in the case of Korea, and recedes when they know that we are prepared to fight, if need be, in defense of our national interest and in defense of freedom—as in the case of Formosa.

Mr. President, during the course of this debate I have been saddened by an apparent breakdown in the spirit of nonpartisanship which should govern the conduct of our foreign affairs. This has been evidenced by the savage and intemperate attacks which have been made upon the Secretary of State, and by what have appeared to be tactics of delay.

But it is not too late to close ranks. I hope the resolution will be put to a vote in the very near future, and I hope it will be passed by a very large majority.

When this debate is concluded, there must remain no room for doubt that the United States is undivided in its determination to combat Communist aggression in an area of the world which is vital to our national existence.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield for a question?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator first, as a forerunner of my question, that I am not among those who are opposing the joint resolution. I expect to support it. When the President has gone as far out as he has in a matter of vital foreign policy, I believe we should support him on such basis as we think necessary in order to show that we are behind him.

I may also say that I believe the record of the Congress for the past several years will show a rather favorable degree of support of the President by the senior Senator from Florida. Therefore, the question I shall ask will be based upon what I believe to be the soundest interest, namely, that of supporting the President by voting for the passage of the joint resolution.

I may say to the Senator from Connecticut that my own mail has shown a vastly greater opposition to the portions of the joint resolution which deal with setting up a new or at least a changed kind of foreign aid in the Middle East region, particularly since the hearings show that there is not yet any intimation as to what the specific nature of such aid might be. I may also say that it seems to me that there would be much more popular approval of the joint resolution if it were limited to the expression of what we regard as our vital interest and our willingness to support the President in his declaration as to our vital interest and concern in the Middle East area, and our willingness to support those in that area who may be assailed by Communist-controlled nations.

My question is this: Does the distinguished Senator from Connecticut not feel that in this issue it is of importance to have the joint resolution so presented in its final form and so passed as to carry with it the largest and fullest possible measure of popular support, so that not only the Senate, not only the entire Congress, but the people of the whole country by and large will be strongly in support of the joint resolution?

Mr. BUSH. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that, of course, it would be highly desirable to have the very largest possible majority of the Senate vote in favor of the joint resolution; I quite agree with the Senator in that respect.

However, I would not want what I have said so far to be regarded as indicating that I agree with the Senator from Florida that in order to attain that end, the so-called economic-aid provisions of the joint resolution should be eliminated. I would not go that far. In other words, I believe those provisions are in the pending measure for an important purpose, and that they constitute an important part of the joint resolution. I have discussed in some detail the limitations upon those provisions. Such aid will be temporary, and the giving of the aid will not increase the appropriations Congress has made. Therefore, I should dislike very much to see those provisions eliminated.

Mr. HOLLAND. I see that the Senator from Connecticut in his answer has confined himself to stating that he would like to have the joint resolution passed by means of the largest possible vote in the Senate. However, my question was predicated upon a much stronger and much wider basis than that; namely, Does the Senator from Connecticut not think it is highly desirable that the joint resolution pass not only with the largest obtainable vote in the Senate, but also in a form in which it can receive the fullest possible approval and heartfelt support by the great majority of the people of the country?

Mr. BUSH. I think the more people who approve of it, the better; I certainly agree as to that. I am not so sure that I agree with the possible implication of the Senator's question; namely, that by eliminating the economic-aid provisions, we would necessarily increase the support the joint resolution might receive in public opinion.

If the economic-aid provisions of the joint resolution were to be eliminated, the result might be to attract some persons to its support, but the result also might be to alienate the support of a good many persons who might think that such elimination would weaken the joint resolution very substantially.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, I appreciate the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. However, it seems to me that the elimination of the economic-aid provisions would not weaken the joint resolution, but, to the contrary, would greatly strengthen it.

I wish to suggest to the Senator from Connecticut that, in my opinion, if unfavorable or emergency developments were to occur in that area, the amount of money to be voted by the Congress would greatly exceed the proposed $200 million and would greatly exceed the amount of any other "appropriation now available for carrying out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended."

In short, I believe that the economic-aid provisions of the joint resolution weaken its objective; and I believe that, after all, we are so much concerned with the situation in that area that we are willing to have more than $200 million which was appropriated some years ago for another purpose diverted to that use, for I know perfectly well that if an emergency were to develop there, the amount of money we would be willing to devote to such use would far exceed that amount.

So I state strongly that I feel the elimination of the economic-aid provisions of the joint resolution would be very useful to it and would make it receive much stronger support from the general public.

Mr. BUSH. In regard to the point the Senator from Florida has been making, I should like to state that although support of the joint resolution by the general public is desirable, and although

I should like to see such support as widespread as possible, nevertheless the purpose of the joint resolution is not to win the affections of the American people. Instead, its purpose is to win friends and to influence people in the Middle East, for the benefit of the United States. That is the important point, and that is why I believe the economic-aid provisions of the joint resolution should be retained.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I fully agree that it is important that the confidence of the people of the Middle East be gained by means of the enactment of the joint resolution. However, I think it is infinitely more important that when the joint resolution reaches the President, it shall be in such form and will be understood by the people of the Nation in such a way that a great outpouring of public confidence from the vast majority of the people will immediately occur, in support of the joint resolution in its final form. I believe that to be of vastly greater importance than any impression which might be made upon the people of the Middle East, if I may respectfully say so.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I appreciate the candor of the Senator from Florida. But I say, respectfully, that I believe the people of the United States are overwhelmingly in favor of the joint resolution as reported by the two committees; and I believe that if the provisions of the joint resolution to which the Senator from Florida has referred were to be eliminated from it, the joint resolution would not then receive anywhere near the amount of support from the people of the country that it now receives.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will yield once more——

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to say that my mail not only shows very strong opposition to the aid provisions, but shows considerable resentment on the point discussed by the distinguished Senator a while ago, and that is that we are not advised as to how this $200 million will be spent. The distinguished Senator has referred—and I appreciate it—to the fact that I was a very humble baseball player, and he has said he understands the practice to be that the catcher makes the signals in such a way that they will be seen by the pitcher and not by the general public, and certainly not by the opposing team, with which I agree.

It occurs to me, however, that in this instance, if I follow the distinguished Senator, he pictures the President as the catcher and he pictures the Congress as the pitcher. It seems to me, since we have not had any signals indicating how much money will be spent, we would be sort of pitching out of turn if we contributed $200 million, in addition to the very large sums which the President has available under the various mutual-security acts, to be spent at his discretion, in any way he wants to. If we should provide an additional $200 million with the statement in the RECORD that, not only the other nations of the world, but we ourselves are not to know how it is to be spent, it seems to me the distinguished Senator is not willing to follow his figure of speech through, but, instead, is suggesting that the pitcher—Congress—should throw before having received the signals.

Does the Senator have any comment to make on that statement?

Mr. BUSH. Yes, I do; I have some comments to make on these rather lengthy comments on my simile, and about the Senator's having made some assumptions of what I had in mind in putting people in certain places on the ball team. Actually, I did not go so far as the Senator from Florida did. I simply used the illustration that in any contest where we are playing "for keeps," we do not let the opposition know what we are doing and we do not "flag" the pitcher.

With respect to what the Senator has said about the mail, I am unwilling to back up what he has said about the mail——

Mr. HOLLAND. May I comment at that point?

Mr. BUSH. Let me complete my statement about the mail, and then I shall yield further to the Senator, if he desires me to.

I have not been a Member of the Senate so long as has the Senator from Florida, but my observation about my mail has been that we generally hear from objectors, but we do not usually hear from those who approve. There may be just as many citizens who agree with a Senator on an issue, but they do not write to tell him so. If they are against it, they are very apt to write and express their opposition. Therefore, it does not surprise me that much of the mail is from objectors, and, with all respect, it does not impress me too much, that the Senator has received indications of opposition from those who do not like the foreign-aid provision; but I am sure he will find, if his State is anything like mine, that there are many people—and maybe a large majority—who have no objection to that section and that policy.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say to the distinguished Senator I am impressed not only by the numbers of such objections and objectors, but by the character of the objections and objectors, because they come not from the group of professional objectors to whom the Senator has adverted, but they come from longtime, indeed, lifetime, friends of mine, persons who rarely express any opinion on a public matter, unless invited to do so. They express a grave concern that we may not only be surrendering our constitutional right in this matter, but may be lending ourselves to the setting up of a new, ambitious, and very generous foreign-aid program beyond anything we have set up until now.

Mr. BUSH. Will the Senator let me ask him a question at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. BUSH. Let me say I certainly do not presume to be a judge of what his mail means to him. I hope the Senator understands that.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that, and I understand also that each Senator must be the judge of the character of the objectors as well as the soundness of the objections. I have been unable to state effective answers to people who say, "Here the President has hundreds of millions of dollars already subject to his expenditure in his sole discretion."

Mr. BUSH. I wish to suggest to the Senator an answer he may give to his constituents, which he may have already done. I call attention to the fact that the authorization expires July 1——

Mr. HOLLAND. That is one of the objections.

Mr. BUSH. Any additional appropriation for the same purpose would have to be made right here on the floor of the United States Senate, and I am sure the Senator from Florida would have something to say about that. I believe he is a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida knows perfectly well the limitation which is in the resolution. The fact is that this measure will, in effect, be stating: "We hope the $200 million will be expended between now and the last of June this year in this relatively small area of the world which we have already very generously provided for in earlier bills, and will be expended in addition to the discretionary funds already given to the President in very large amounts"—thus becoming, as many good citizens in my State fear, the predicate for a very large, very generous, and very extravagant additional aid program, beyond anything we have provided up to this time.

The Senator from Florida is a member of the Appropriations Committee, and he does pass upon foreign-aid matters, and, unlike some of his friends, he has been supporting foreign aid all the way through, as the votes will show; but the Senator from Florida would like to know what he is supporting when he supports it, and he has insisted on that heretofore.

Mr. BUSH. I yield to no one in my respect for the senior Senator from Florida. He has been one of the finest Senators I have ever seen in my life.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my friend.

Mr. BUSH. I have sought his advice and counsel many times and have always respected his opinions, but in this particular case I suggest that he should have some faith in the President of the United States, because what we are dealing with, as stated in my earlier remarks, is really in the field of military judgment. The question with respect to this moderate amount of economic aid, $200 million, which may be transferred from existing accounts already approved by the Senator's committee and by this Congress, is whether the President should not have the discretion of using that money, for a rather limited period of time, rather than have it go where we thought a year go it ought to go, but where, we are convinced, it may not be so useful as it would be if it were used by the President in his discretion.

The Senate and the Congress are not losing any rights. Nobody is losing any rights. We are simply giving the President some discretion, and I think we may assume, from his whole record in his public life as a servant of the people, that he will faithfully discharge his responsibility.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, if that argument were sound, we would be held to

have been greatly in error in not making all the mutual security appropriations which we have made—and we have made a great many of them, and I have joined in making them—in the form of blank checks, since we have so much confidence in a distinguished public servant who serves as President that we can deliver to him the conscience of the Congress. I am sure the Senator from Connecticut does not mean to go that far.

However, to go back to the figure of speech which the distinguished Senator used, a very generous one relating to the baseball game and to the fact that the Senator from Florida had been a pitcher in the old days, the Senator from Florida would say, in closing, he thinks his distinguished friend is asking us to proceed to deliver the ball to the catcher before the catcher has given the signal, and the Senator from Florida does not wish to be left in that position.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. BUSH. Let me say to the Senator from Florida that I was thinking not of the pitcher, but of the rival coaches on the third base line, from whom the signal should be concealed, as well as from the batter. But I appreciate the Senator's courtesy, and the courteous manner in which he has discussed his views on the subject.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Connecticut is always kindly and courteous, and I appreciate the opportunity to interrogate him.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. First I wish to congratulate the senior Senator from Connecticut for his very clear statement in support of the resolution, and also for his discussion of the arguments which have been made against it. Let me ask the Senator this question: If in the Senator's judgment conditions prevail which affect the vital security of the Nation, and which make necessary the passage of this resolution, does not the Senator believe that the resolution should give the President the fullest capabilities to deal with the situation, not only to meet aggression if it should occur, but also to prevent aggression?

Mr. BUSH. I certainly agree with the Senator from Kentucky. That is exactly what it should do, and that, I believe, is the purpose of the resolution. The President should have authority to prevent the possibility of aggression. If the resolution is any good, that is exactly what it is supposed to do.

Mr. COOPER. Turning to the provision with respect to economic aid, I ask the Senator this question: If the provisions relating to economic aid were to be stricken, in the opinion of the Senator would not the result be to constrict the resolution to such an extent that it would give the President only the capability of dealing with a situation after aggression had occurred, and, then, leave to his discretion the question of the use of military forces?

Mr. BUSH. I certainly agree with that statement. Such a restriction would deprive the President of a part of the power or authority which the resolution was originally designed to arm him with. It would weaken his position in dealing with the question of aggression.

Mr. COOPER. As I stated a moment ago, if the situation is such that it calls for such a resolution as this, does not the Senator believe that the President should have the capability, through economic measures as well as other measures, to avoid the possibility of ever being called upon to send troops into this area?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator is absolutely correct. Let me add that that observation comes from one who can speak with authority, from a background in the diplomatic service of the United States. I believe the Senator has comprehended the situation correctly, and I agree with him.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to address myself to some of the misunderstandings which have developed over the use of economic aid. I may say that when the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] spoke of the mail he receives questioning economic aid, he spoke factually. I receive the same kind of mail. I think it arises from some misunderstandings about the economic-aid fund which should be cleared up.

I ask the Senator first a very simple question: Does not this resolution contemplate the use of funds which have heretofore been appropriated by the Congress?

Mr. BUSH. It definitely does.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not a fact that the $200 million which the President asks to use has already been appropriated by the Congress for this area of the world?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator is absolutely correct, as was brought out in the hearings repeatedly by witnesses supporting the resolution.

Mr. COOPER. I have listened with interest to the so-called blank-check arguments. There is an impression in some quarters that this resolution would call for a precedent in the use of discretionary funds. I ask the Senator if it is not a fact that the Congress has already recognized the use of discretionary funds, and if last year there was not allocated to the President, for his discretionary use, a fund of $100 million?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator is correct with respect to his general observation. He is correct as to the amount. I certainly agree with him that there is nothing new in this proposal with respect to the use of discretionary funds by a President of the United States. Presidents before this one have frequently had appropriations made for that purpose.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not true, with respect to the use of discretionary funds heretofore allocated to the President, that he was not required to tell the Congress in advance what he intended to do with such funds?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator is absolutely correct. A fund would not be discretionary if the President had to tell in advance exactly what he proposed to do with it.

Mr. COOPER. With respect to the mutual aid program, I think the impression has been created that the President goes to the Bureau of the Budget, through the Executive Department, and specifies to the Congress the exact projects and the exact amounts and countries for which mutual-aid funds are to be expended. Is it not a fact that, even in those cases, the President lays before Congress only a general statement as to the amounts to be appropriated to various countries, and the general lines of use in those countries?

Mr. BUSH. I believe the Senator is correct. Of course, the appropriations for mutual aid are more specific than this particular $200 million item. But the Senator is quite correct, that the appropriation bill usually carries some discretion for the administration of such funds. That is almost necessary.

Mr. COOPER. Would not the argument that the President should specify the uses and the amounts impose upon him a greater restriction and limitation than even now exists with respect to the mutual-security funds?

Mr. BUSH. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. I return to my first statement. I should like to have the Senator express himself upon the question as to whether or not, if we believe such a resolution is necessary, the President should have the capabilities, the implements, and the instruments to avoid the use of troops, rather than a resolution which would state what the sense of the Senate would be if the awful facts of aggression and war should ever occur?

Mr. BUSH. I will say to the Senator that I listened to witness after witness, each one a witness of real competence. The list of witnesses included Ambassadors in the field, Admiral Radford, General Gruenther, and others, all men of experience and great responsibility in the field of foreign affairs and military affairs. They expressed their view as to the absolute necessity of this resolution. I must say that I was very much impressed, indeed. As of today, I believe that the resolution is very much more important than it was when it was first introduced.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I, too, would like to compliment my colleague from Connecticut for a very able contribution in calling our attention especially to the views of the distinguished public servants responsible for our security.

Is it not a fact that, over and above the question of immediate popularity and support—although I firmly believe that the resolution has popular support, at least in my State—there lies the paramount responsibility of the President and of every Senator to support a policy which promises success?

Mr. BUSH. I certainly agree with that statement. I commend the Senator for bringing out that point. After all, this is not an election campaign. We are not trying to win the votes of the American people. We are trying to win a cold war.

We are trying to help settle the situation in the Middle East, and we are trying to prevent war in the Middle East. Under those circumstances, we must be bold, and we must be willing to take an

affirmative and a strong position. I certainly agree with the Senator from New York in what he has said.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I should like to extend the baseball analogy a step further by asking him this question: Are we not asking the whole infield to play in close? Is that not a legitimate simile? In other words, the President is asking the Senate and the House to give him this expression of confidence.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I was formerly a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, and I served in that capacity for about 8 years. Therefore, I have some boldness in speaking on this subject, even though I am a junior Senator. Many times in similar situations during my service in the House, I, along with my colleagues, found that if the United States wanted to do a good job, it was necessary to get foreign nations to accept aid upon the terms we were willing to make or offer. Is that not the real reason for giving the President authority to use $200 million free from any restrictions contained in the Mutual Security Act? That act, as we know, contains certain restrictions and limitations on the use of money authorized by the act.

Many of the recipient countries may wish to accept money under those restrictions, but cannot very well do so because of an internal situation or because of adverse public opinion in some of them.

Therefore, if we give the money to the President to be used free of restrictions, the President can put it to use where heretofore it has not been accepted. Some persons may think that is a silly way to get people to take money they were not willing to accept before. However, we must remember that this is a tough war, and it may be necessary to use just that kind of procedure. Is that not the real and effectual and substantive reason why the economic aid part of the program is equally as strong and equally as important as the military part; and does not that fact also help answer the feeling of many millions of people in the world that we should not fight the war against communism only with military means, but that we should use our economic strength as well?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from New York has stated that point very well indeed and he has brought out some very important facts in that connection. I commend him for it, and I agree with all he has said.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I, too, wish to commend the Senator from Connecticut for a very fine statement. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] mentioned the receipt of mail on this question. I, too, have received a great deal of mail from my constituents. Judging by that mail, it would seem that many people believe that we are about to vote $200 million in additional funds for foreign aid. If I read the report of the committee correctly, these are not new funds, but funds which have already been appropriated. In other words, the only thing we are being asked to do is to make an allocation to the President of funds presently available. Is that correct?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. CARLSON. I believe that is one message we have not gotten across clearly to the country. Many people in Kansas, for example, feel that we are about to vote $200 million of additional funds, and many of them also believe that we have already voted enough aid on previous occasions; and in that regard I might agree with them. However, if the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point a short quotation from page 5 of the committee report, as follows:

> It gives the President greater flexibility in the use of up to $200 million of existing mutual security appropriations for either military or economic assistance in the area.

I wish to say again that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has rendered a real service to the country in emphasizing the fact that this is not new money but money which has already been appropriated.

Mr. BUSH. I appreciate the Senator's adding emphasis to that point. I am somewhat distressed to hear that the impression exists in the Senator's State that this is additional money. The Secretary of State, when he testified before the committees, emphasized over and over again that this was not new money. Therefore I am delighted to have the Senator place in the RECORD the quotation from the report, which makes it very clear that no new money is involved.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. If I remember correctly, the money is not money which was appropriated to any other nation or to any other area, but is money which was allocated to the same area but had a limit placed on it as to its use, in that it had to be used before April or May, as I remember. Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. BUSH. It is money which was to be used within the same general area.

Mr. WATKINS. But it had to be used by a certain date, which I believe is May 1. In other words, it had to be allocated or programed before that date. The pending resolution would change that and give the President the authority to use the money up to the end of the present fiscal year.

Mr. BUSH. That is correct. The Senator asked earlier if I would yield to him. I do not know whether he still has a question in mind. If not, I shall yield the floor.

Mr. WATKINS. Has the Senator finished his statement?

Mr. BUSH. I have finished my comments.

Mr. WATKINS. What I wanted to ask the Senator was his view with respect to the constitutional power of Congress to authorize the action the President originally had asked for.

Mr. BUSH. I do not wish to repeat myself, and I did deal with that specifically in my comments earlier. I see no constitutional question involved in this issue. I believe that those who have tried to make a constitutional issue of it are mistaken.

We are not yielding any constitutional authority to the President. As I said in my remarks, he is not asking for anything unconstitutional. He is asking us to join him in stating this policy so that the policy will be the policy of our Nation, and as such will be made clear to the whole world. No one is yielding any power to anyone else.

It is asserted by many that, under the Constitution, the President does not have to ask Congress to pass this joint resolution; that he has the authority to do what is sought by the resolution.

However, the fact that he has made the request is an indication to me that he is a constitutional President and is thoroughly aware that Congress has the authority to declare war, but he considers this to be a matter of great importance and that it is possible that a war may result. Therefore he feels that it is desirable for the body which has the authority to declare war to join with him in expressing the policy of the United States respecting the Middle East situation.

Mr. WATKINS. Then it is not the Senator's position, as I understand, that the President of the United States has full power to do all that he requested in the draft of the resolution which was sent to Congress?

Mr. BUSH. In my opinion, it is immaterial whether he has the authority or not. The point is that it is advantageous to the whole situation that Congress join with him in stating the policy of the United States, as outlined in the joint resolution.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator did not make that clear while I was listening to his speech, and I had to leave before he had finished. I must take issue with his position. If we are going to give the President the power to use the Armed Forces of the country, then he does have to get such authority, or he does not have it under the Constitution as now written.

Mr. BUSH. What I am trying to say is that the purpose of the joint resolution is to make it clear that we in Congress join with the President in stating that the United States will resist aggression by the Communists in the Middle East if it is asked to do so.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. It seems to me that Congress should join the President in making that statement and that a great deal of effectiveness is added to such a statement, because Congress is the body which has the right to declare war. That does not interfere with the President's ability to use the Armed Forces of the United States. That has been brought out repeatedly. He may do so if the national security requires him to take such action.

Mr. WATKINS. Even to wage war without authorization from Congress?

Mr. BUSH. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. WATKINS. Even to wage war without authorization from Congress?

Mr. BUSH. No; he cannot wage war.

Mr. WATKINS. What else can he do with the Armed Forces?

Mr. BUSH. He can use them until Congress gets ready to decide whether we wish to wage war. In the Korean incident the President used armed forces without authority for such use by Congress. That subject was a matter of serious discussion, but a great body of public opinion was in support of the President in his use of the armed forces and felt he was wise in using them in the interest of the United States, because, it was felt, the interests of the United States were involved.

Mr. WATKINS. I must take issue with the Senator on that point.

Mr. BUSH. I did not say that I approved of it. I said there was a great body of approval.

Mr. WATKINS. There was a great number of people who thought so, but most of them backed up afterward, and called it Mr. Truman's war.

Mr. BUSH. I am not fighting the Korean war. What we are trying to do is to prevent fighting world war III.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Is it not correct to say that the joint resolution will have a great psychological effect?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. THYE. First of all, it will have a great psychological effect. Secondly, all the countries in the Middle East do not have a full knowledge of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THYE. What is embodied in the joint resolution assures those people. Many of those countries are small and at present cannot defend themselves against Soviet invasion.

In the resolution the United States tells the countries in that area of the world that we will assist them to resist infiltration by communism. That of itself will have a great psychological effect upon the Middle East and in encouraging countries there to stand with the West, perhaps more so than anything else that could be done. Therefore the resolution is not only very much needed to make clear to those countries what we propose to do, but, also, to put the Soviet Union on notice that it cannot invade that area without bringing upon it the opposition of the United States.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for that very clear statement, and it is absolutely the way in which I see the situation.

Mr. THYE. Is it not, then, advisable to give the discretion and the authorization involved in the resolution in order that in the event the administration at some moment should like to be able to assist in some manner, it would have the means with which to do it? Unless it is able to do it there might be a time when an opportunity would be lost tc firm up our position in the Middle East.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Minnesota is absolutely correct. I wish to say, again, with respect to what the Senator said in the earlier part of his question, that the fact that Congress joins with the President by passing this resolution is of tremendous psychological importance.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not insist upon a quorum call.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do, Mr. President.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the majority leader wishes a quorum call, I have no objection; but I certainly do not request it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Goldwater | Morse |
| Allott | Gore | Morton |
| Anderson | Green | Mundt |
| Barrett | Hayden | Murray |
| Beall | Hennings | Neuberger |
| Bennett | Hickenlooper | O'Mahoney |
| Bible | Hill | Pastore |
| Blakley | Holland | Payne |
| Bricker | Hruska | Potter |
| Bush | Humphrey | Purtell |
| Butler | Ives | Revercomb |
| Byrd | Jackson | Robertson |
| Capehart | Javits | Russell |
| Carlson | Jenner | Saltonstall |
| Carroll | Johnson, Tex. | Schoeppel |
| Case, N. J. | Johnston, S. C. | Scott |
| Case, S. Dak. | Kefauver | Smathers |
| Chavez | Kennedy | Smith, Maine |
| Church | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Clark | Kuchel | Sparkman |
| Cooper | Lausche | Stennis |
| Cotton | Long | Symington |
| Curtis | Magnuson | Talmadge |
| Dirksen | Malone | Thurmond |
| Douglas | Mansfield | Thye |
| Dworshak | Martin, Iowa | Watkins |
| Eastland | Martin, Pa. | Wiley |
| Ellender | McCarthy | Williams |
| Ervin | McClellan | Young |
| Flanders | McNamara | |
| Frear | Monroney | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, at the outset of my remarks I wish to state that I am keenly aware of the fact that under our system of government the Chief Executive of the United States—the President—has the initial responsibility in the field of international relations. This country has but one voice which can speak in the first instance on matters that deal with the comity and exchange of views among nations.

The President has the great power which is his by virtue of the fact that he is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States. Whether for better or for worse, he may exercise that power at times in such a way as either to curtail or impinge upon the power of Congress, specifically spelled out in the Constitution, to declare war. His power can be exercised in such a way as to create a state of war which would make any formal declaration of war a mere formality.

Insofar as I possibly can, I support the President of the United States in the exercise of the powers of his office in international relations. I am not one of those who distrust the President of the United States. I have a great deal of confidence in the integrity, patriotism, ability, and dedication of President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I rise in this instance to support an amendment in the nature of a substitute which has been offered by myself and on behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and which, in my judgment, clarifies the issue which is pending in the Senate. Our amendment supports the President to the greatest extent that Congress possibly can do so in the exercise of his power in being the initial voice of the Nation in speaking to other states of the world.

The pending resolution is really composed of three parts. The first part deals with what is called a military-assistance program. That program has ofttimes been confused with the support which Congress has been asked to give the President in putting the Communist world on notice that any overt military aggression against nations in the Middle East which desired our help would be met with force. As a matter of fact, it has nothing whatever to do with that. The first part of section 2, as well as all of section 3, has to do with a military-aid program which comprises military hardware, so to speak—guns, tanks, ships, airplanes, and ammunition.

Section 3 deals with an economic-aid program to improve the living standards of the Middle East.

The substitute, which I shall read for the information of the Senate, deals with the matter which might be considered to be of an emergent nature. It incorporates the language which was finally approved by the committees, and which, I understand, was later endorsed by the administration. It reads as follows:

> That the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism: *Provided*, That such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations.
>
> SEC. 2. This joint resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the nations in the general area of the Middle East are reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise except that it may be terminated earlier by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.

In my opinion, Mr. President, the substitute—being brief, succinct, and clear, and not encumbered with a great many controversial and related subjects—represents the wisest course for the Congress of the United States to pursue at this juncture. The substitute puts the Soviet Union and its satellites on notice that armed force used against a peaceful nation in this area which requests our aid will be met with armed force.

If there be any emergency, the substitute is sufficient to meet it.

SUBSTITUTE PERMITS CONGRESS TO DISCHARGE ITS FUNCTIONS

Furthermore, Mr. President, the substitute will give the Congress of the United States sufficient time to deal according to our usual procedures with the other parts of the joint resolution which are of vast importance. The substitute will give us time to consider the steps the administration proposes to take in the expenditure of public funds. I submit that is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Congress. Unless irreparable harm will be done to our Nation by taking such time, we have a right to request that it be afforded. We have a right to request that we be fully informed before the adoption of a procedure affecting this area which could well result in an arms race and a nice weighing of the military aid we give to this country or to that country, and which could provoke a war or could lead to world war III.

The substitute will give the Congress of the United States information which will enable it to determine the proper scope of an economic program in this area.

OBJECTS AND AREAS OF EXPENDITURE NOT DEFINED

In the hearings which we held week after week, by means of question after question we sought to obtain information as to how these funds would be expended if we departed from the ordinary procedures of the Congress and surrendered the power of the purse, in the case of these funds. However, we were not told specifically how a single dollar would be expended. The Secretary of State stated in the broadest possible terms that the money could be expended for anything from the ordinary operations of a government, including paying the civil employees or paying the armed forces of a country, or, indeed, repairing its public buildings or palaces, all the way to the construction of vast projects of water development and great communications systems of highways and roads.

NO SHOWING OF NECESSITY FOR EMERGENCY AID

Mr. President, I submit that neither in the records which are now before us here nor in any of the classified material was there presented to the committee a single factual statement which asserted the existence of an emergency which makes it necessary for us to plunge into the dark on this new economic program. Not a single word of that sort was presented to the two committees. On the contrary, we were told that $750 million was available for expenditure in the Middle East, for purposes of military assistance, for military hardware, and for an economic program. We were told that almost $100 million is left in the President's emergency fund, which he can spend almost as he sees fit, anywhere, and for nearly any purpose he desires. However, for some reason, Mr. President, now we are told that we must give the President the power to spend—for undetermined purposes, on a program of undetermined length, and of which we have no knowledge as to its general extent or to the number of years it may last—between now and July 1, the sum of $200 million.

I submit there is no emergency. Time and again I asked the Secretary of State to tell us just what was impinging upon the wishes of the administration regarding the expenditure of this fund. He said that after May 1, a certain part of it then could not be obligated. He stated there was a definite percentage of the funds that must be used in the form of loans, rather than grants.

The Congress of the United States is not going anywhere in the next 60 days. We have already been wrestling with this joint resolution for 60 days, trying to get information about the secret program of which the representatives of the administration say they know nothing they can tell the Congress or about which they can take us into their confidence. Yet we are told that 60 days prior to the date when the restrictions will apply, we must remove them.

SPECIFIC PROGRAMS SHOULD BE SUBMITTED

I submit that proper comity between the executive branch of the Government and the legislative branch requires that in the 4 months the administration has, it send its missions to the Middle East, and at least outline to us the program, and at least say to us, "Gentlemen, this is what we have in mind"—as the administration has done in the case of all the other phases of the mutual security program. But instead of that, the administration continues to insist that 2 months in advance of the application of the restrictions about which it complains—although it not only has wasted the 2 months which now are behind us, but still has 2 months to come before the restrictions complained of will apply—we should agree to take a jump into the dark, and embrace this program, without having any idea of what the result will be if we follow that course of action.

In the past in dealing with all foreign-aid programs, the Congress has had very little control over the expenditures. In the last analysis, the only power the Congress can assert, the only power which makes the Congress a coordinate branch of the Government, is the power of the purse. The whole foreign-aid program has now amounted to approximately $60 billion, and the control of Congress over it has been most tenuous.

O Mr. President, the Congress examines down to the last dollar and the last cent the appropriations proposed for the people of this country, and the Appropriations Committees must have complete information regarding all such expenditures proposed to be made. On the other hand, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, the Congress has been most generous in voting vast foreign-aid appropriations without having, in respect to such expenditures, the comprehensive data which we insist upon having in respect to appropriations for domestic expenditures.

Mr. President, I submit that whatever may have been done in the past does not justify our embarking upon any course such as the one now proposed, by means of which we would vote a blank check—and it would be a blank check, I care not who disputes that assertion—60 days in advance of the time when the restrictions complained of will take effect.

DEFEND PREROGATIVES OF CONGRESS

I am perfectly willing—and the substitute so provides—to support the President in the exercise of the powers which are justly his as the Chief Executive of the United States. But I shall stand on this floor and shall jealously seek to protect what I regard as being a proper prerogative of the legislative branch of the Government; namely, to have some information as to exactly what is proposed to be done by means of this program. Let the proposed delegation—the Richards mission—be sent abroad, even at this late date, and then return and give the Congress some idea of the magnitude of the program which the administration proposes to saddle upon the American taxpayers—a program which may last for the next 20 or 25 years. After such information is obtained, then let us pass judgment upon the proposed program.

NOT LACK OF CONFIDENCE IN PRESIDENT

The only single thing upon which all those who testified before the committee agreed was that if we embark upon an economic program in this area, it will run for a long period of time, and will cost a great many American tax dollars. For my part, before I vote to commit myself to such a program, I desire to have some information about it. I submit that it is no answer at all to say, "You must trust the President of the United States." If that is the proper answer, then the country made a mistake in ever creating a government under the system we now enjoy; instead, there should have been only a President and a Congress which, when requested by the President, would vote him the total budget he desired, without asking a single question about it. Such a government would have been authoritarian in form. We condemned such a government when it existed under Hitler and under Stalin. We condemn it in Russia today and in any other state where there is no opportunity for the representatives of the people to pass judgment upon the expenditures proposed to be made. But we are told now that if we do not abandon the system under which we have operated and which we have found pretty desirable over a period of 170 years, it will be a sign of our lack of confidence in the President of the United States. When that is the only argument that can be advanced in support of the program, it is not worthy of the name of argument. It falls flat on its face when confronted with the facts of our Government and the system we enjoy.

Long before we risk an arms race in the Middle East area of the world, before we make a downpayment on a program as to which its proponents will tell us from year to year, "You have started it; you have got to carry it on," let them utilize the 60 days available and submit a program at least in sketchy form, and I assure them I will give it every consideration. If it deserves merit, I shall support it; but I refuse to give up my congressional responsibility and buy a pig in a poke without knowing its size or

weight. I shall not consent to buying a pig in a poke. As a matter of fact, we do not even know if there is a pig in the poke.

RECIPIENTS GET DETAILS BEFORE CONGRESS

Mr. President, if the press of this country is to be believed, our friend the King of Saudi Arabia left here after a visit with some pretty good ideas about what he was to get from the program. I have before me an article from the New York Herald Tribune, a newspaper which seems on occasion to have a pretty good pipeline into things going on in this country, particularly in the State Department. On the day when King Saud departed these shores that newspaper carried a headline reading "President, Saud Reveal Aid-Agreement Details; King To 'Buy' Part of $200-Million Arms Supply; Renounce Force."

I shall not read the whole article. It is written by Miss Marguerite Higgins, who is a very capable reporter. I read one line:

> According to Arabian sources, the total arms and economic deal, including troop training, exchange of missions, etc., amounts to between $150 million and $200 million.

King Saud left this country knowing what he was to get. But the whole Congress of the United States cannot find out about one dollar of it. I submit that if we shall tolerate a situation of that kind we will have completely abandoned our responsibilities as legislators representing great States, and we will deserve the very lowest position to which we may finally be assigned by the people of the United States. It will be our fault and no one else's.

As I said, Mr. President, I want King Saud's friendship for our country. I think he is a very valuable friend to have. I have no patience with those who sought to show their scorn for King Saud, particularly since he was in the United States as an invited guest. In my section of the country, if we do not like somebody, we do not kick him when he is in our house, particularly if he was invited to come in by a brother.

SAUDI ARABIA SHOULD BE ON LOAN BASIS

I do not share the conviction that he should have been shown the scorn evinced by some persons, but I do share the conviction that if there is any country on earth which should be dealt with on a loan basis, it is Saudi Arabia. The greatest natural resources on earth lie beneath its sands. There are billions upon billions of barrels of petroleum lying there. That wealth is an asset which I know can be used as security for borrowing money from the International Bank, and I doubt not that the Chase National Bank would lend money with such collateral, if we want to get into the field of private banking rather than Government banking.

I, for one, am not willing to withdraw the loan requirements. If Saudi Arabia is to receive money, as stated in the Herald Tribune, I prefer to help Saudi Arabia with a loan rather than a grant. I think the loan aspect of the program should be emphasized, particularly in the area of the Middle East, where there is so much natural wealth. I will not vote to remove the loan provision of the existing law, which is a wise provision, without being told more than I was told when I sat in the meetings of the joint committee day after day, and week after week, and questioned witness after witness.

The Ambassador for Saudi Arabia was very frank with us. I asked him if he would recommend for Saudi Arabia, in an aid program, either military or economic, a grant from the United States, and he said, "Yes," he would. I think he said, "My King sees this program going on all over the world, and he cannot understand why he cannot share in it with some grants."

OVEREMPHASIS ON GRANTS IN OUR FOREIGN POLICY

I think it is time we considered the need features of the program in making expenditures, and not have dollars as our sole instrument of foreign policy. The dollar is the only voice, the only instrument, we have in our foreign policy. If any trouble breaks out anywhere we say, "Appoint a mission, get a black bag, go to Congress, and get $200 million. Send it to the trouble spots and quiet the people there." We have given away many billions of dollars belonging to the American taxpayers under that kind of policy. I think the loan features should be emphasized.

As a Member of Congress who thinks he is reasonably responsible, I rather resent being treated like a child and told I cannot find out anything about the program, when an Arabian king can go back to his country knowing exactly what he is to get from it. I do not think that such a situation reflects congressional insistence upon our responsibilities in this field.

Mr. President, I am not one who has always opposed an aid program for nations across the seas. I voted in times past for a certain measure of assistance. I recognized the importance of an aid program in the days immediately following the war, when it was necessary to undertake to repair some of the damage of war. I went along with it for a while on that basis, although I thought the Democratic administration was moving a little too fast and spending a little too much each year. It seemed to me the aid should have been strung out a little slower and spread a little thinner, because even under the Marshall aid program there was a great deal of waste. I could see justification for such a program at that time. It had a definite objective. It had a definite time limitation. There was a ceiling on the overall amount involved. But we were not able to retire from this activity when the time limitation had been reached, when the money had been expended, when we had reached the objective we set out to achieve in the beginning. We were not able to lay the burden down.

Bear in mind, Senators, when you come to vote that the $200 million will be merely a down payment or "earnest money" on a program that could run into billions of dollars over the years, and bear in mind the fact that we shall be confronted, as we have been in the past, with the statement, "You have started it; now you have to carry it on. If you don't, these people will be more irate when you pull out than they would have been if you had not come in at all."

We know that has been the fact in countries where millions of dollars which had been extracted from the American taxpayers were expended. So I undertook to some extent to examine the program in all its aspects, military and economic. I went overseas and undertook to study the situation on the ground. I undertook to get information in this country about it. I shall not tire the Senate by going into details. I will say, however, that 3 or 4 years ago I came to the conclusion that if the Congress did not start tapering off and reducing the foreign-aid program, if we did not resist the efforts to increase it, as this administration is asking us to increase it in the budget this year, if we did not assert ourselves in connection with this program, we would create a condition which would change our form of government and bring us to economic disaster.

I realize that it is an easy, simple way to cure the troubles of the world to rush out with American money and undertake to placate people. I realize that we have had this program for so long in many countries that today the recipients of tax money from this country feel that they have a vested interest in the United States Treasury—indeed, in the income of the individual American taxpayer.

MUST DIMINISH FOREIGN SPENDING FOR DOMESTIC FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

I realize that we have reached the stage where we have depended on the program for so long that to start reducing it presents hazards. That is the reason we are asked to increase it. No other answer has been presented. But even if it does involve hazards, we must start tapering off the foreign-aid program if we ever hope to have a program of fiscal responsibility at home.

I have read a great many of the reports which have been submitted by various institutions which have surveyed the foreign-aid program. I have read reports from the Brookings Institution, and from a number of other institutions. They argue that the $4,500,000,000, or whatever the administration is requesting this year, is only 6 percent of the total spending, and therefore it cannot add much to the inflation; it is not much of an inflationary force.

I think it is generally agreed that the Federal budget, swollen as it is, and increasing from year to year, is the greatest single inflationary force in the country today.

I assert, without any fear that the statement can be refuted in any way, that we cannot bring down Federal spending for domestic purposes, we cannot level off Federal spending for domestic purposes, so long as we increase our foreign-aid program. A theoretician may figure it out on a mathematical basis, but when we get down to the political realities here in the legislative trenches, where men must make a record on which to run for reelection, we cannot prevent an increase in domestic spending so long as we increase the foreign aid program.

There is not a Senator who has not received hundreds of communications saying, "Grandma needs a $10 increase in her old age assistance, and I want you to vote for it. Do you not think she is as much entitled to it as all these foreign countries for which you are voting billions of dollars?"

What is the average Member of Congress to do when he goes home? Is he going to permit himself to be sliced to pieces by an adversary on the stump who says that the Member voted to increase the funds for foreign countries, but voted against the old folks at home; that he voted against the veterans; that he voted to give it away overseas, but he voted against every program to help the American people? We cannot possibly reduce the domestic budget so long as we increase foreign aid spending.

The administration talked about a $60 billion budget when it came into power. I know they talked in good faith. Where is it today? It is $72 billion today. If we increase our foreign spending, it will be $78 billion next year.

All the increase will not be earmarked for foreign spending, but 90 percent of it will be due to foreign spending. It is asking too much of a Member of Congress to reduce domestic spending without a corresponding reduction in the foreign-aid program.

I picked this postal card off the top of my mail, because it is so illustrative of what I am trying to say:

DEAR MR. RUSSELL: The plight of disabled veterans is desperate. Our totally inadequate compensation, coupled with the terrific cost of existing, is squeezing us to death. Many of us are forced to live in cellars and attics. This is outrageously unfair when billions are being squandered on foreign nations. I urge you very strongly to please use your influence to gain favorable action on H. R. 51, as presented by Mr. TEAGUE.

I am sure that other Members have received mail along the same line, human nature being what it is. The Brookings Institution, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and other agencies can talk about the foreign-aid program not being any real factor in the budget but we who live and work in the political atmosphere know that that is simply not so. A man who is working for the Brookings Institution or the Massachusetts Institute of Technology can make the statement that the foreign-aid program spending is not much of an inflationary force, and hold his job. But there are not many Members of Congress who are strong enough in their bailiwicks to vote for increased foreign-aid spending and then vote against all the domestic programs.

There is another aspect to this subject. We have not yet gotten around to all the countries in the world with this program. How are we going to stop it? How are we going to keep from adding new countries, so long as we are increasing aid to the older ones on the list? Some of the best friends we have, some of the most valuable nations to us, are those south of us in this hemisphere. They are becoming pretty restive about this question. Anyone who doubts that statement should visit those countries and talk with the people. They cannot understand why they have not been able to hold a pot under the cascading stream of American tax dollars which we are pouring out, as do countries in Europe and the Middle East.

I say that unless the Congress of the United States has the courage to live up to its responsibilities and start reducing this program, not only can we not reduce domestic spending, but we cannot stop the foreign-aid program until we have an aid program in every country in the world outside the Iron Curtain. And I am not so sure that a great deal of the program will not be in countries behind the Iron Curtain—the entire program being financed at the expense of the American taxpayer.

It may be too late. Sometimes I fear it is too late. I have voted against this program for the past 4 years. I did not do so because I was opposed to any foreign-aid program. I am willing to support a reasonable program if we are in the process of reducing it. I wish to place emphasis on the point 4 program. I believe that, in the last analysis, the only way we can help people in other countries is to help them to help themselves. If we merely give them money to spend, they will not help themselves. I shall not take the time of the Senate to cite chapter and verse with respect to the dozen countries where that is the case. I am willing to carry on a point 4 program to help them help themselves.

This program has almost become entrenched in our system. We have an entrenched bureaucracy. When we talk about cutting down in Washington, we know what trouble we have. We have an entrenched bureaucracy here which is pretty stable. It has been operating for a long time. It is of vast size. Every man working for the Federal Government believes in his job. He particularly believes in the importance of the work he is doing. That spirit is not confined to the foreign-aid program. It runs through the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Defense, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and every other Federal agency. The fact is that there is an entrenched bureaucracy in our Government, and it is certainly very hard to cut it down. It is hard to cut down the appropriations for that bureaucracy. That is one thing we are confronted with.

### UNITED STATES DIPLOMATS PLEADERS FOR OTHER COUNTRIES

Another thing, Mr. President, which has caused me great anguish and which I cannot understand is the attitude of many of our representatives in foreign countries who believe themselves to be the champions of those countries in getting American tax money. I have talked to our Ambassadors in foreign countries and have heard them almost cry about not getting enough money for those countries. One of them said to me, "I did not get enough money. I got only $280 million. Look at this other country, with only half the population of my country, and it got $310 million." As he put it, "My country is being discriminated against."

That attitude is pretty well illustrated by our Ambassador to Saudi Arabia who, during the course of the hearings, referred to "my King," when he said, "My King feels like this. He feels that he ought to have some of this money that you are spending so generously all over the world."

I deplore that kind of attitude. That is another difficulty with this program. It is almost a rat race between ambassadors in trying to get the most money for the country to which we have sent them as our representatives.

That is another field in which Congress had better assert itself, before it is too late. Perhaps it is too late already. God forbid that it is already too late. We had better start cutting down on the program, instead of expanding it and writing blank checks for things we know not of.

It has even come to the point where many of our citizens are convinced that the foreign-aid program is necessary to our economy.

### CANNOT SPEND YOURSELF RICH

Along the same line, a very eminent newspaper recently wrote in an editorial that if we were to cut off our foreign aid program it would bring about a great calamity, and would be a great shock to our economy. It would dry up jobs, because the program had given jobs to so many people in processing the natural resources of the United States.

I am willing to agree that if we sawed it off at one time, it would hurt certain industries and certain areas. However, I cannot accept the conclusion reached by many eminent newspapers and many eminent economists that it contributes to the total economic strength of our country to continue to increase foreign-aid programs and to continue giving our resources away.

If that be true, we had better start the same thing at home. I do not see how we can bring more prosperity by giving our resources away or how we can build a permanent economy upon that kind of base. If that be true, then we have certainly been taught a great deal of economic foolishness in our youth. I do not believe that we can build this Nation's economy permanently and strongly by giving away our tax money and our resources. If that were true, a person would be able to spend himself rich, or to drink himself sober. I do not believe that over a long time it is possible to build a strong economy at home on any such program as that.

Mr. President, I do not wish to tire the Senate, even though I feel very deeply on this subject, and I could address myself to it at great length. I submit, however, that any emergency that has been shown to exist—although I must confess that during the long course of hearings I was rather pleasantly disappointed by the size and by the imminence of the emergency—can be met by a declaration that the armed might of this country will be used in case of overt Communist aggression against the people of the Middle East who request our aid. There is no emergency in a program in connection with which no Member of Congress can find out how it is going to operate, or the size of it.

We have a right to inquire into how the money will be expended. We have 2 months during which we can formulate a program which will enable Congress to assume, rather than to abandon, its responsibility to the American people in handling this subject. After all, Congress does have a great responsibility. It has a greater responsibility than the executive branch of the Government in the expenditure of taxpayer's money. We have a peculiar responsibility in that field.

If we will assert our responsibility, we will be able to obtain some information about what is planned. We can then go home and tell our people how long the program will last and also tell them something about the size and shape and nature of it. We can even defend it.

However, I remind Senators that it will be very difficult to defend anything that happens under this unlimited grant of power to spend $200 million between now and June 30. Many Senators will not only be defending such action but will be trying to explain why they did not know how this particular sum was to be expended.

I do not intend by anything I have said to suggest that I lack confidence in the President. I have great confidence in the President. However, I have even more confidence in our system of government as framed by the Founding Fathers. I have the greatest confidence in the division of powers in our Government and in the checks and balances that were established as between one branch of the Government and another branch. It is not a matter of who occupies the Presidency, whether it is Truman or Eisenhower or John Doe or Bill Roe. I would never grant any such power as this to commit me and to commit Congress to a program about which we know nothing whatever.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. First of all, I commend the Senator as strongly as I can on the position which he has taken relative to the unwisdom of attaching to the joint resolution a provision for aid and giving access to $200 million of the people's money to be committed or expended between now and the end of June.

It seems to me that the sound principles involved in the resolution—and I believe there are some sound principles contained in it—are cheapened by the addition to it of the provision for aid.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if he is familiar with a phrase which we use in Florida, and I believe also in Georgia and in many other places, called "chumming up," when we are talking about fishing in salt water. By chumming up we mean throwing out a great amount of bait so that the unwary fish will come up close to the surface, where we can get them in our net or hook them. Is the Senator familiar with that expression?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have heard that expression used on the few occasions when I have sought the denizens of the deep off the Florida coast. I might say that I did so very unsuccessfully.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am distressed to hear that the Senator did not meet with the degree of success which his ability and inclination would entitle him to. Does it not seem to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that we cheapen the expression of a resolution, designed to state that it is our belief and our conviction that the vital interests of our Nation are bound up with what happens in the Middle East, by adding to it the willingness to spend within a few weeks' time hundreds of millions of dollars in addition to the large sums already available, so that the beneficiary nations may know that there is bait being thrown out? Does that not seem to the Senator very much like the chumming-up process which we use in salt-water fishing off the coast of his State and mine?

Mr. RUSSELL. I heartily agree with the Senator's statement.

Mr. HOLLAND. One more question, if the Senator will yield further. Does not the Senator think we are making a great mistake if we jump to the conclusion that the same process—and frequently an efficacious one—which is used to attract nonintelligent fish close enough so that we may encompass them with a net or catch them with a hook may lead to binding friendships with other nations composed of people who are as intelligent as we are, and toward whom we are planning to employ the "chumming-up" process?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have said that the way the program is presented is almost insulting to the proposed recipients.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator, and I commend him for his amendment which I hope will prevail. I am going to vote for the resolution, because I think we should express our vital interest and our willingness to come to the aid of those who may be assailed by Communist foes in that immediate region which does affect us so vitally. But I think we would be cheapening our resolution, placing a question upon our own motive, and doing anything but complimenting those whom we hope to attract to us, by including in the same resolution this proposal to turn loose $200 million to be committed in the next few weeks.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I do not want to discuss the economic questions involved, but at the bottom of page 1 of the Senator's amendment I note a proviso—

*Provided*, That such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations.

I am one who feels that this country is honor bound to comply with its treaties. I have often thought we should give them more adequate consideration than we give them at the time they are ratified. But I have two questions I wish to propound to the Senator which no doubt he and his committee have considered.

First, what are the treaty obligations which might affect the meaning apparent on the face of this amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. Treaty obligations?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know of no treaties we have in that immediate area that would affect it. As a matter of fact, I rather insisted to the Department of State that the matter should be approached on a treaty basis, either through some arrangement such as we have in NATO, SEATO, or some of the other arrangements, or else on a State-by-State basis; I suggested that we should deal with them through treaties where the responsibilities and obligations of both parties would be clearly defined, rather than to have this kind of unilateral action. But the State Department insisted that they did not want to have any treaties; they wanted a free hand in dealing with the situation.

Mr. BRICKER. One other question: Does the Senator consider the Charter of the United Nations any more than a treaty obligation?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not. I may say, speaking as one individual, that I was not particularly enamored of the language, but I took in its entirety the language which was approved by the committee. For that reason I incorporated it in the amendment, rather than to have a controversy about taking from or adding to what the two committees had done in dealing with this particular phase of the program.

Mr. BRICKER. In my opinion, there is danger of an implication that the Charter of the United Nations imposes greater obligations than does an ordinary treaty. What would the Senator think of amending his resolution by using the words "consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Constitution of the United States"?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have seen the time when I would have said it was completely redundant to mention the Constitution of the United States in this connection, but some of the trends of the times cause me to be a little bit intrigued with the idea.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator that I am 1 of 3 authors of this amendment, and we adopted it on the basis of the action of the 2 committees. For my part, I think the United Nations Charter is another treaty, a very important treaty. I might say, that it is one of the most important that this country has ever ratified.

Mr. BRICKER. I agree with the Senator on that point.

Mr. RUSSELL. But I would not feel at liberty to agree to change the language.

Mr. BRICKER. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Georgia, as it is of the Senator from Ohio, that that is a redundant phrase?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it is. In my opinion, it was included as a matter of support of the administration's efforts to utilize the United Nations for some very important purpose in this area.

Mr. BRICKER. I agree that it ought not to be necessary to emphasize the fact that we will carry out our obligations,

but I think it is almost necessary to refer to it now and then for emphasis.

Mr. RUSSELL. I heartily agree. I should like very much to support a general act requiring any person, before assuming any office under the United States Government, particularly in the judiciary, to sign an affidavit that he has read the Constitution of the United States from the preamble to the last amendment.

Mr. BRICKER. I would support that suggestion.

The great difficulty in the interpretation of the Constitution is that so many questions get to the point where they are considered as political questions, and there is no official body to which an American citizen can go for recourse to determine whether the political bodies in this country are acting within the terms of the Constitution.

Mr. RUSSELL. I heartily share that opinion.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I had not quite completed my statement. I have only one other thought I wish to express before I conclude my main statement.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for one question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The amendment offered by the able Senator is before us, and I note that the language used is taken verbatim from section 2 of the committee's draft of the resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But it does not take in all of section 2. There is omitted from the Senator's substitute this language:

> The President is authorized to undertake, in the general area of the Middle East, military assistance programs with any nations or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance,

The inquiry which I now address to the Senator is this: Why was that language omitted?

Mr. RUSSELL. Because that is military financial aid, and I was endeavoring to omit financial aid. Military aid refers to arms, machineguns, and so forth. I think that is a program we should look at with some care, and we have responsibility in that field which goes beyond the mere dollars and cents involved in the war equipment which might be furnished. I think Congress should have advice on this program. We are dealing with the most inflammatory area in the world when we deal with the Middle East. We have got to use representatives. The President of the United States is not going there personally. It has been said that former Representative Richards will be sent there. I have known him for 20 years and have served with him in the Congress, but I am not willing to give to any member of the executive branch, no matter how long he has served in the Congress, any power that denies me the right to know something about the scope of the program. The language refers to the impedimenta of war that could be furnished.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then the Senator does not confine his exclusion from the committee's resolution to economic aid only; does he?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator excludes military aid also; does he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. I seek to exclude dollar items from the resolution, because $750 million is available now for these purposes; and the President has $95 million available under another authority which he can spend for almost anything he sees fit. The administration has 2 months in which to act, before any of the restrictions will take effect. Why cannot the State Department and the Defense Department—yes, and even the President of the United States—formulate a program, as has been done in the case of other mutual security programs, and say, "We want to give $150 million worth of military aid to Saudi Arabia"—if the article which was published in the New York Herald Tribune is correct? They could say, "We want to give $50 million worth of military aid to Iran or Iraq, where we have an active program."

Why cannot the administration come before Congress, tell us about its plans, and let us pass our judgment whether we are likely to be setting off an arms race in the Middle East which might start a small war that would lead to world war III? We are dealing with a deadly thing when it comes to dishing out arms in that area at the present time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is it the Senator's view that the President should be authorized to use the Armed Forces of the United States in the event he deems it necessary to protect some country in the Middle East from aggression by a Communist country, but that he should be prevented, by the exclusion language, from sending arms and armaments? Is it not preferable to send armaments rather than to send armed forces?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, that is true, if it comes down to a question of that kind. But there is a considerable difference, as the Senator, I am certain, will see upon reflection. Every witness who came before the committees, without exception, testified that he did not believe there was any danger of the Soviet Union undertaking an overt armed attack on any nation in the Middle East area. The Secretary of State said so; every ambassador said so; the Defense Department representative said so. Every one of them said there was no danger of overt Soviet aggression. They all testified that this is an area where there is very deep feeling among the people, where wars are not only maintained in guerrilla fashion, but are being waged openly today.

I think the Congress of the United States ought to know—at least, I as one Member of Congress want to know—something about the extent to which we will ship arms, vessels of war, tanks, and airplanes into that area, because I want to see to it, in meeting my responsibility, that they will go to the right country. Otherwise, the situation will eventuate in a program which will be certain to provoke war among some of the countries in that area.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield on that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate the Senator's sincerity in the argument he makes, because I have sat beside him for the last 6 or 8 years in the Committee on Armed Services, and his arguments are always consistent with the position he takes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the Senator's saying that I am consistent; but I have never been frightened about being inconsistent. I have changed my mind in a number of instances in the years I have been in the Senate, and this happens to be one of them.

I think we have achieved all the good we could accomplish by increasing the foreign aid program, and that it is now time to taper off that program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think the Senator's position is perfectly consistent. I hope my own position will be as consistent in asking the questions I shall address to him.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am certain it will be.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. One of the things which disturbs me most about the position which the Senator now takes is that he would send our military forces, if any country should request them, to paraphrase the language of the resolution, and if the President should deem it necessary, to prevent aggression by international communism. That is the sense of the resolution.

If we are not going to arm the right countries, wherever the aggression may occur, we may not be able to repel the aggression. Under the terms of the Mutual Security Act, with the funds which the Senator says are available—and presumably there is a very substantial amount available for military assistance—if in order to prevent armed aggression we are going to send our forces into a country where military supplies are not available, that country will not have the means to help itself.

In the Formosa Resolution, in which the language is very similar to what the Senator now proposes in his amendment, we include the statement that we were leaving it to the President to send our forces to Formosa, if it became necessary, but we had already previously armed and trained the Nationalist Chinese of Formosa.

In this instance, if the Senator's amendment shall be agreed to, no opportunity will be provided to send arms to the area where aggression might occur, to the countries which may need it the most in order to help themselves, and where American boys might be sent. That is what disturbs me as much as anything else about the proposal the Senator now makes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I must confess my complete shock that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts could find

no larger gremlin than that which he has presented to the Senate in his statement.

In the first place, I am surprised that the Senator from Massachusetts should express a fear that the President of the United States would send American boys into a deathtrap to be unnecessarily sacrificed. I have more faith in President Eisenhower than that. I do not think he will send American boys into the area of the Middle East, if they should be called on to go there, unless they will have a good chance when they go. I think President Eisenhower would see to it that they had such a chance. I am surprised that the Senator from Massachusetts has such grave doubts about what the President of the United States would do in dealing with a situation of that kind.

I am more astounded at the other gremlin the Senator brought forth. Nobody knows better than the Senator from Massachusetts exactly what the arms program is in this area. He knows exactly what it is. He knows that there is a comprehensive arms program for Iraq and for Iran, and a limited arms program for Saudi Arabia.

If the administration wants to use $200 million under the arms program, they almost will be limited to either Egypt or Israel. I submit this is not the time for the United States of America to be arming either Egypt or Israel. We are trying to bring about peace in that region now.

Who is wise enough to say that we will be able to balance such a program exactly even, so that the Israelis will have so much and the Egyptians will have so much? Or is it proposed to give all the arms to one country and let it destroy the other?

I think the elimination of arms assistance will tend to confine the program to what has already been provided, and will do more to help the United Nations create a peaceful atmosphere in the Middle East than will any other single step we might take.

The Senator knows that the proposal submitted would not stop the program. He knows that of the $750 million, most of it is for arms. It is to go to the countries with which we have agreements that they will train their people in the use of the arms.

If the program is to be expanded so as to include other countries, I think Congress ought to know something about it. We are giving to Iraq all that country says it can use; we are giving to Iran all they say they can use. We are giving vast quantities to Turkey, but not so much as they say they can handle. However, if it is now proposed to start a program of giving arms to Egypt and Israel on the theory that we will be protecting American boys, I do not "buy" it. I think we would be starting a war in which we would eventually be involved.

I believe this is a good time for Congress not to be starting an arms program for Egypt or Israel. They do not get arms under existing programs. I am trying to confine the resolution to existing programs.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree that the President will not send American boys into an area where they will be killed. But he wants to make the resolution as effective as possible so as to provide for greater security and more peaceful conditions than now exist. If we destroy the opportunity to provide military assistance——

Mr. RUSSELL. We are not destroying it; we are merely preventing the Government from enlarging it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The President is given greater discretion in the use of the funds in May and June of this year, beyond the plans which he may now have, or which may now be in existence, in order to make the resolution as effective as possible, and to provide a greater opportunity for security in the Middle East area which is so hot and dangerous.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the President of the United States wishes to start an arms-aid program for Egypt or for Israel, I think he should tell the Congress about it. In saying that, I am not speaking disrespectfully of Dwight D. Eisenhower; I mean that any person who occupies the office of the President of the United States should tell the Congress about such a proposed program. He should not embark upon it covertly or clandestinely or surreptitiously, by saying to Congress, "Give me power to provide aid for this area."

We have already appropriated $750 million for aid for the countries in this area that are said to be playing ball with us. A part of this amount may be used to obtain military equipment and to train their armed forces. If such a program is desired for Israel or for Egypt, let the President tell us about it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, let me say that I am very much disturbed by what I heard the distinguished Senator from Georgia say, knowing that he is the respected and esteemed chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. I wish to make the record clear. I respect the judgment of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and I ask this question with deep feeling: Am I to understand that the Senator from Georgia is of the opinion that if the additional authority which has been requested is granted, so as to enable the President to make rather free use of the funds, the additional arms assistance will go primarily to Egypt and to Israel?

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say that it would. I said they are the only ones that could need this authority, as I see it, because we have a spelled-out program for Iraq; and we have a program for Iran; and we have a program, which has been adopted, apparently, for Saudi Arabia—a program with which I do not quarrel, although I think the Congress is entitled to know what it is.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What program is that?

Mr. RUSSELL. The one for arms aid to Saudi Arabia.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the committee we did not hear about that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I addressed myself to that subject; I said that according to the New York Herald Tribune——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, I see.

Mr. RUSSELL. According to the New York Herald Tribune, the Arab team went home with a promise of aid that we know nothing about.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is that information available for the RECORD?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no other means of knowing about it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, that information appears in the New York Herald Tribune, one of the country's great newspapers.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to make it clear that I did not say that Israel or Egypt would receive such aid; but I said that if the authority requested of us is granted, it will have the effect of giving the administration authority to give arms aid to Egypt and Israel without regard to the requirements of the Mutual Security Act—something the administration does not have authority to do under existing law.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And the Senator from Georgia said that such a program has already been set up for other countries; did he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; we have set up such programs for Iraq and Iran, in the same area. It may be that the administration will wish to establish an arms program for Jordan. Whether such a program would be proper, I do not know. But as a Member of the Senate, I believe that before I vote to have the United States "pick up the British tab" in Jordan, I am entitled to know the facts about the matter. It seems to me that as a Member of the Senate, representing a sovereign State of the Union, I am entitled to have that information.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield further to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand the Senator from Georgia has said that such countries as Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Iran, Turkey, and Pakistan are the recipients of American aid under arms programs which are working; and I further understood the Senator from Georgia to say that if the authority now requested is granted, such arms aid could be given to the two protagonists at the present time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say that would be done; I said that under this program it could be done.

We went into some detail about the programs for Iraq and Iran and Turkey; and we discussed the possibility of stopping Communist aggression in that area, through the use of indigenous forces. The Senator from Minnesota will recall that we received testimony at some length on that subject.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. RUSSELL. A considerable sum of money—I estimate it as perhaps $300 million or $400 million of the $750 million—was provided for arms aid for that area. The 80-percent loan provision applies only to the economic aid; it does not apply to the arms-aid program. I think it should apply to the arms program in this area, but it does not.

In short, Mr. President, I do not know why it is necessary to seek this new assistance. I say that one of the things which could happen, if such authority were granted, would be to supply arms to Egypt or to Israel.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would not the Senator from Georgia agree with me that, if that is one of the possibilities, the Congress should at least have some assurance that we are not going to contribute to furthering the arms race in that particular area?

Mr. RUSSELL. I expressed the fear that that would ensue. Everyone talks about the President; but there is not one Member of the Senate who does not know in his heart that the President is not going down into the minute details of the proposed program. Instead, they will be handled by others. If a mistake is to be made, let the Congress take its responsibility. If we find it is a mistake, we can stop it. If we find that it is not a mistake, we can share our responsibility for the proposed action.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from Georgia will recall that following the reporting of the joint resolution, I called his attention to the fact that I thought there had been an intention to include the word "such" ahead of the word "nation" and also ahead of the word "nations", so as to make it perfectly clear that our Armed Forces could be used to assist any such nation or group of such nations. That language would make it clear that the reference was to those nations in the Middle East.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thought the Senator from South Dakota had had that point straightened out. However, as I now read the language, I find that the change has not been made.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I did discuss it with the Senator from Montana.

Mr. RUSSELL. For my part, I am willing to take the responsibility—and I am confident it will be agreeable to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]—of adding the word "such" at those two places in the substitute.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the Senator from Georgia will agree to include the word "such" at those two points, it seems to me we shall be taking a consistent position.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can modify the substitute accordingly; and I do so now, Mr. President.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then is it understood that the word "such" will be inserted, in line 6, on page 1, ahead of the word "nation" and also ahead of the word "nations"?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I repeat, Mr. President, that I am making this change before the substitute is voted upon.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

### MORE CREDIT FOR RUSSIAN SALES THAN FOR UNITED STATES GRANTS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have only one other observation to make, and it will be a brief one. The allegedly urgent program for this area has been dangled before us as bait, in an effort to persuade us to take precipitate action. However, it so happens that we have not yet been able to obtain any information about any program for this area under which Russia has given away a thing, and we have very little information about any such program anywhere else in the world. The United States has allotted $3,700,000,000 for this area, for the purpose of making friends and influencing people. Most of that money has been provided as grants—as money to be given away.

Thereafter, the Russians went to that area and made a few sales, and got the money on the barrelhead or got a mortgage on the cotton for the next 3 years, and got 100 cents on the dollar for a lot of old equipment. Through the exercise of some kind of mysterious power in diplomacy, the Russians can cause more trouble in that area by selling $200 million or $300 million worth of stuff than we can patch up by giving away $3,700,000,000. I do not think we need be afraid that the Russians are giving away a great deal in this area. It seemed that the United States was almost ready to build the Aswan Dam, on the theory that if the United States did not build it, the Russians would build it. But then, when one day it was announced that the United States would not contribute to the building of the Aswan Dam, within 24 hours the Soviet Union announced, "We have never seriously considered building the Aswan Dam."

In short, Mr. President, the Russian policy in this area is not supported by grants. Instead, it is supported by sales, by getting money on the barrelhead. I asked questions about that matter of nearly every witness who appeared before the committee. I believe it was found that the Russians did give Mr. Nehru an airplane, something like one of our DC-3's; and it was found that the Russians had paved a square in the capital of Afghanistan.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was not a gift from the Russians; it was in the form of a loan. The Afghanistan Government signed on the dotted line for $12 million for that project.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thought there was some trick about it, when that testimony was given; it did not sound like a Russian operation—to give Afghanistan $12 million. So it was not a gift; instead, they borrowed the money, and the Russians expect to collect. However, I believe the Russians did give them three ambulances for a hospital.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know about that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is so.

Mr. ELLENDER. But as regards anything of consequence, the Afghanistan Government has paid for it.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct, and that is true everywhere else in the world, insofar as dealings with the Russians are concerned. So what is causing all the trouble is a matter of sales by the Russians. The Russians are not rushing in and saying, "Let us get King Saud to come here, so that we can see whether we can convince him and the other rulers in the Middle East to accept our money."

At the hearings I was amazed to find that the fact that we had persuaded King Saud to attempt to prevail upon the rulers of the other countries in that area to accept American dollars was hailed as a great diplomatic triumph on our part.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. With respect to his very able presentation, it will be hard for me to vote against anything the President says he needs to combat world communism. In the budget which he recently presented to Congress, however, the President has now actually cut the Air Force by 14 wings, and has cut out hundreds of planes; and his administration defends passing over to the Communists quantitative superiority on the ground the United States is superior qualitatively. Now, in view of the fact that in the field of research and development, the budget appropriations for each of the three services, does not the Senator agree that if the President would refrain from reducing such military requisites it would have considerably greater effect than this $200 million to countries of the Middle East, especially as we do not know what country or countries will be the recipients?

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the magnificent work my friend from Missouri has done in the field of national defense. I support him and agree with his conclusion. In my opinion, while I want to see the free people everywhere feel they have some security, one wing of the United States Strategic Air Command under the American flag, ready to fly with the nuclear bomb, would do more to deter a general war than would any amount of millions we may spend on arms assistance in the Middle East area, although I am not opposed to reasonable arms assistance there.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree with the able and experienced chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have talked longer than I had intended to. I want to say again that in my opinion the time has come when we must consider some new formula in American foreign policy other than pouring out American dollars in any places where problems may arise. If by so doing some hazards would be created, we must accept the hazards.

With respect to the pending resolution, it is my opinion that the wisest course Congress can pursue is to support the President's hand when he tells the Russians that aggression in the Middle East would be met by armed forces. Then we can get more information on the other phases in the 2 months that lie ahead, before the restrictions of which the administration complains will be applied.

The executive branch of the Government, in following orderly processes, must recognize the legislative branch of the Government as a coordinate branch

of the Government, and furnish it a detailed program so that Congress will know how the money of the money of the American taxpayers is to be spent. Up until the past few years, if someone in this body had made such a request as that now being made, he would have been led up the aisle and it would have been said that he had lost his mind. Nobody would have thought of spending the American taxpayers' dollars without telling Congress how the last penny would be spent. Now we do not have even a general outline of how the money is to be used.

More than that, in my opinion it is of vital importance to the people of the United States that we put the world on notice that we propose to scan carefully in the future all aspects of the foreign-aid program. I hope by so doing Congress will indicate a determination to reduce the programs, restore some stability to the American economy, and hold out some hope to the American taxpayer that somewhere along the line he may get a reduction in taxes. That, Mr. President, is the American way of dealing with this problem, the way that our institutions of Government demand that we approach the problem.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Let me congratulate the Senator on what I believe to be a magnificent statement. I agree with the Senator completely.

Let me see if I have in mind the figures mentioned by the Senator. During the next 60 days the President has at his disposal, without any strings of any kind, a certain amount. Would the Senator mind repeating how much that amount it?

Mr. RUSSELL. A total of $750 million, but a part of that is subject to an 80 percent loan limitation. He has, in addition, $95 million in his emergency fund, which he is free to spend in nearly any way he sees fit.

Mr. LONG. So he has $95 million which he can spend in the next 60 days without any limitation whatever. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. He can spend that until the first of July. There is no time limitation on that. The time limitation is on the $750 million, and it does not run completely on that.

Mr. LONG. So the President has $95 million which he can spend without any limitation whatsoever. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Up to the first of July.

Mr. LONG. In addition to that, he has available $750 million, as to the spending of which he has a great degree of flexibility, and which we thought was supposed to be under some sort of carefully considered program.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG. If I understand the situation correctly, we had hearings in which we tried for more than a month to find out what the program was about, and never succeeded in getting an answer to the question as to a single project anybody had in mind. The answer, for the record, was that the executive witnesses could not tell us of a single project on which they proposed to spend a single dollar.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG. The President has $95 million sitting there, with no limitation whatever, and $750 million, with great flexibility available. Until the administration officials can show us some sort of examples of what they have in mind, the Senator's position, which I believe to be a correct position, is that there is simply no basis on which we can go ahead and vote another $200 million, to be spent without any limitation or any strings whatever, until we know what they propose to do.

Mr. RUSSELL. My point is that the Congress of the United States has the responsibility of levying taxes, raising revenue, and making appropriations. The Constitution provides that Congress shall make appropriations, and Congress is entitled to know how the money raised by taxation is to be expended.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we have a distinguished visitor who is in the Vice President's office. I prevously announced he would address the Senate at 3:30 p. m. I should like first to take up some routine business, and then have a quorum call, before the visitor is escorted into the Chamber.

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from Louisiana desires to have the floor immediately after the address by the distinguished visitor, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Louisiana may yield to me with the understanding that he will not lose the floor by so doing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Pablo Rivera, Jr., to be postmaster at Salinas, P. R., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Richard D. Schmidtman, and sundry other persons for appointment in the United States Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). If there are no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Randolph H. Weber to be a United States district judge.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nomination of C. Douglas Dillon to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State and the nomination of G. Frederick Reinhardt to be Counselor of the Department of State.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that those nominations be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be passed over.

## POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hyde Gillette to be Assistant Postmaster General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John M. McKibbin to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, they are confirmed.

## POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the postmaster nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified immediately.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## VISIT TO THE SENATE BY PREMIER GUY MOLLET, OF FRANCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint a committee to escort the distinguished Premier of France to the Chamber at the appropriate time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair appoints the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] to escort the Premier of France into the Chamber.

Thereupon (at 3 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m. the Premier of France, escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President, entered the Chamber and was greeted with prolonged applause.

The Prime Minister took the place assigned to him immediately in front of the Vice President.

Accompanying the Premier was Mr. Louis Joxe, Ambassador, Secretary General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of France, who was escorted to the place assigned to him on the floor of the Senate.

Members of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the French Republic were escorted to the seats assigned to them in the diplomatic gallery.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Members of the Senate and guests of the Senate, this year marks the 200th anniversary of the birth of Lafayette, the founder of American-French friendship. The United States, from the beginning of its existence as a free nation, and France have been allies. France was our first ally, and it has remained through the years as one of the best and greatest friends of the United States in the world.

It is, therefore, a very great privilege and honor for me to present to the Members of the Senate today the Premier and President of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of France, Mr. Guy Mollet.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Thereupon the Premier of France delivered the following address:

Mr. President, honorable Members of the Senate, it is for me a great honor to have this opportunity to bring today to the distinguished Senators of the United States of America the message of friendship which my country, France, has asked me to deliver to you. You must surely feel that, to me, the delivery of this message is much more than the fulfillment of an official duty. Past and present events would preclude any such thought. The common heritage we share gives to any Franco-American reunion a special quality of friendship.

This does not mean that misunderstandings have never arisen between us. It is the privilege of free nations to express different viewpoints without, in so doing, jeopardizing their friendship. Frankness is indeed the basis for mutual confidence and I am glad to say, in this respect, that we have had, with President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles, the most gratifying conversations.

The Atlantic Alliance, of which our two countries are charter members, remains for France the basis of her foreign policy. Arising from a common need for defense, this alliance is nevertheless more than just a military organization. We have many common interests and share the same ideals. Therefore, the duties stemming from our alliance should apply beyond the mere geographic limits of our organization.

On the other hand, we should be highly concerned with the constant strengthening of the cohesion and vitality of our Atlantic Community. European unification offers us today one of the means for achieving this aim. To this end, outstanding progress has been made during these past months. Europe is now engaged in an irreversible process which not only will, in the end, mean the abolition of economic barriers, but will also provide the African peoples with the benefits of a common European economic assistance. Last week, the heads of six European governments met in order to set up the final terms of this project. They also have agreed on the creation of EURATOM which will give Europe, freed at last of economic obstacles, the resources in atomic power which are indispensable to the completion of these bold plans. Europe will thus have the means which will enable her industry to expand at a pace similar to yours. Her economic development will bring about a better standard of living to the European as well as to the African peoples freely associated to her. This is not a hazy dream. I am firmly convinced that EURAFRICA will be the reality of tomorrow.

Europe is emerging with a new face. Reconciliation between France and Germany has cleared the way toward a united Europe. France and her European partners have been able to overcome every obstacle because they were firmly convinced that European unity is a necessity.

But this unity is also in the interest of this country. A more prosperous Europe will contribute, in turn, to the prosperity of the rest of the free world. A more powerful Europe will also mean to the United States a more powerful ally. Thus, our action will benefit the whole Western community. The United States, which has so strongly supported the moves toward European unity, has evidently nothing to fear from this European emancipation. The relationship between the United States of America and the new United Europe will turn into an association which, since it is based on mutual interest and—on our side—on a more solid foundation, will contribute more than ever to the safeguard of peace.

Undoubtedly, the tasks before us will demand our continued efforts for years to come. But the young people of France have enough faith and ardor to see these vast projects through. France is conscious of her responsibilities. She knows that her ideals are shared by her oldest and most powerful ally: The United States of America.

For almost 200 years, we have accomplished great deeds together. Our friendship has survived the vicissitudes of history. I feel sure that it is our common destiny to advance hand in hand on the road which leads humanity toward peace and progress.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Mr. Premier, we wish to express our appreciation to you for your very eloquent statement.

I know that all the Members of the Senate would appreciate the opportunity of meeting you personally; therefore, with your indulgence, the recess will continue while introductions take place in the well of the Senate.

(Premier Mollet was thereupon escorted to the well of the Senate, where he was greeted by the Members of the Senate, after which he and his party retired from the Chamber.)

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

At 3 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m. the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CLARK in the chair).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is entitled to the floor.

## NATIONAL PRESS CLUB ADDRESS BY HON. GUY MOLLET, PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE REPUBLIC OF FRANCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Louisiana yield to me, so that I may make a brief statement and submit a request?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it was less than 4 months ago that I had one of the most interesting and stimulating conferences of my career. It was with Premier Mollet, in his office in France. For that reason, it was a great pleasure and privilege for me today to participate in the enthusiastic welcome given him by the Senate.

The United States has always felt very close to the French people. France came

to our help in one of our hours of severe trial. Our 2 countries have been allied in 2 great wars of worldwide magnitude.

Premier Mollet will find in this country sympathy and a warm welcome, which are extended to him both personally and in behalf of the country he represents so ably.

Mr. President, today Premier Mollet delivered a very able address to the National Press Club. I understand that his address was enthusiastically received. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, and I thank the able Senator from Louisiana very much for his consistently courteous treatment of the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY MR. GUY MOLLET, PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS, AT THE LUNCHEON OF THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, FEBRUARY 27, 1957

Eighteen months ago, you welcomed me in this very same room as the President of the European Council and as the leader of a great party. Today, as head of the French Government, I will have no difficulty in using the same language as I did then.

Today also, though it is not as easy for a Prime Minister as for an ordinary citizen to speak freely, I would like to talk to you frankly and with an open heart as I have just done with the President of the United States. I have outlined to him what we are doing in France at this moment and what are our worries and our preoccupations which, in many cases, are also his worries and his preoccupations.

At length the President has questioned me about Europe for which his interest is unfailing. I was happy to be able to let him know of the importance and of the speed of our latest achievements.

Eight days ago, for the first time in the history of Europe, six European Prime Ministers met in Paris at the invitation of France. Together we have settled the last difficulties concerning the Euratom Treaty and that of the common European market. We took also a capital decision: to associate Europe with the territories of Black Africa which today are linked with Belgium and France.

Euratom means pooling together the atomic destinies of our six countries. The European common market means doing away with the customs barriers, harmonizing the social legislation and coordinating the economic policies of the six countries so as to constitute a vast market of 165 million consumers where, as in the United States, goods, products, and persons will move about freely. In associating the overseas territories of our countries with this market, the road is open to the union of Europe and Africa, to what we are beginning to call Eurafrica.

My two essential objectives have always been Franco-German reconciliation and the European Union. By building Europe upon a firm Franco-German entente, we shape in prosperity and in peace the destiny of generations to come.

In the atomic age, to speak of rivalry between France and Germany is meaningless. The Saar problem had been poisoning our relations for decades. I found in Chancellor Adenauer a keen sense of the superior interest of our two countries and of Europe, which made possible a just settlement while giving a new impulse to European unification.

Through unity alone can our countries of continental Europe find again a true independence; alone a united Europe can also guarantee that the Atlantic Alliance will be lasting and strong. The relations between Europe and the United States will then be able to develop on a basis of true equality. Nothing can be lasting in the world that is not based upon equality and free cooperation.

Between the United States and Europe we must establish a real partnership, that is to say an entente which will not be a one-way street but will provide for a mutually advantageous two-way traffic. I have emphasized this point to President Eisenhower who has also assured me that such an association on a basis of equality was the aim of his policy.

The recent visit of the three wise men of Euratom has demonstrated what, in the vital field of the atom, the association of Europe and the United States will be. You have expressed your readiness to provide enriched uranium to Europe, which is in need of it for launching a vast program of nuclear energy. This program, we shall be the only ones to carry it out on such a wide scale. It will lead to considerable technical progress, and we shall extend its benefits to you. To the aid which you have so generously granted to our countries will succeed a mutual aid between the two continents for more prosperity and happiness.

The union of European peoples will also provide, beyond the Iron Curtain, a reason for hope and encouragement to all these men whose will for freedom has not been bent by years of slavery.

The European community, as soon as it was established, decided to play the card of Africa. Africa is the first domain where a common European policy will be applied: Our objective is to mobilize the industrial power of the whole of Europe to provide the social progress and technical equipment needed by Africa.

At the same time, France is proceeding with revolutionary changes in her overseas territories. She is giving to their peoples the right to look after their own affairs in accordance with democratic principles and within the framework of a freely accepted union. Next March 31, elections will give to the populations of the whole of French Black Africa the opportunity to choose, in complete freedom and equality, their representatives to the territorial assemblies which, in turn, will designate the Ministers who will be entrusted with the task of administrating those territories. In studying the situation now obtaining in the autonomous Republic of Togoland, the United Nations have recognized the value of these new institutions.

In any case, France refuses to preserve her overseas territories as a private hunting ground. Without relaxing her own effort for their development, she now throws open to them the doors of Europe, which is their best chance. To a narrow nationalism and to communism, which so often act together as if they were accomplices, we offer the only remedy, the formation between Europe and Africa of a vast community of free peoples, helping one another for their mutual benefit and for their common prosperity.

The President spoke to me of the Atlantic Alliance. We recorded the fact that it remains one of the foundations of the policy of our two countries. It may even appear more important to us today than when it was established 7 years ago. Alone it can guarantee freedom in the future as it has already saved it in the past. Any breach in this alliance would at once be exploited by our enemies.

The Atlantic organization is political as well as military, perhaps even more so. I have come here to help make our political solidarity as strong as our military alliance. It is beyond thinking that, as Allies, united against a common peril in Europe, we could be divided in the face of this same peril, however more insidious, in Asia and in Africa. Our solidarity can and must assert itself in every domain and in every part of the world. Our conversations have helped us realize this is a necessity.

With frankness I outlined to President Eisenhower my preoccupations about the defense of Europe. Thanks to his action when he was the head of SHAPE and to that of his successors, a strong Atlantic force has been set up: To balance the enormous mass of the Soviet divisions on the European peninsula, the United States, Canada and Great Britain have accepted to station part of their forces on the continent.

The presence of GI's on our soil imposes upon you, our American friends, a sacrifice for which France is deeply thankful. It has for us an exceptional importance. As head of the French Government, I can repeat all that I have said to you on this score in 1955.

If in 1914 or in 1939 there had been thousands of American soldiers on the European continent, never William the Second nor Hitler would have started a war. They would have known that, from the very first, the mighty United States would have been against them. Today, because of the physical presence of your GI's and of British and Canadian soldiers, the Soviet Union cannot have the slightest doubt as to the consequences of an aggression. The presence of your soldiers is in a way the political deterrent within the Atlantic Pact.

From my point of view, the Atlantic Pact requires more than ever a perfect entente between the allied nations insofar as both strategy and tactics are concerned. It requires that decisions be taken in common as soon as it comes to questions of effectives and of armaments. Technical progress may create new problems in these fields but they must be solved in complete solidarity.

From the President I have received formal assurances about the United States policy in this respect. I have received them with joy. As long as the Soviet Union knows that the reply to an attack in Europe will be a general war and the massive intervention of the United States forces side by side with the united European peoples, that is to say total destruction for the Soviet Union and for the Communist ideology, there will not be a third world war.

I would like so say now a few words about a purely French problem but one that has such a special importance for us that I want to inform you about it, personally. I mean Algeria. I have warmly thanked the President for the efficient and trusting support given us during the United Nations debate. Thanks to this support, an intervention in domestic affairs, contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and which would have delayed the realization of peace, was avoided.

You have helped us in New York, but now you are waiting for us to act. You are afraid we might be backward colonialists. Let us speak frankly. To us, the liberation of man, that is to say the personal liberation of each individual, is more important than a pseudo national sovereignty, which too often results in political or social regression, and which would mean, in the case of Algeria, the oppression or even the eviction of 1,200,000 Algerians of European origin by a mass of 8 million Moslems.

The Algerians of European extraction settled in that country in 1830, at a time when there were only 24 States in the United States. These people have their families in Algeria. They have buried their dead there. Algeria is their country. Our task is therefore to establish a coexistence and a collaboration between the European community and the Moslem one, so that neither can dominate the other. This is not easy. It is much simpler indeed to use violence and to fan

the fires of fanaticism and xenophobia. But since when has democracy been an easy solution?

We propose a cease-fire without any preliminary political condition. In order to determine the general terms of this cease-fire, the Government is ready to enter into official and direct contacts with those who are fighting.

The fighting will stop so that every one may vote according to the dictates of his conscience. In the 3 months which will follow the cease-fire, free elections to a single assembly will be organized. We will invite the representatives of the democratic nations to come to Algeria to observe the perfectly honest and aboveboard manner in which these elections will be conducted. Free elections are the very foundation of democracy.

It is with these elected representatives of Algeria, no matter what their political views may be, that we will discuss the future organization of Algeria. This organization will result from an understanding between all the interested parties, that is to say the peoples of Algeria and of the whole of France.

Such are the measures we are ready to apply at this time. I believe you will agree that we cannot do this alone. Our adversaries now have the floor. We offer them a cease-fire: Are they willing to give up violence? We propose that free elections be held, in the presence of observers from free nations, and that immediate talks be entered into with the elected representatives of the Algerian people: Why have they turned their backs on such proposals up to now? France will not be discouraged. She will multiply her initiatives in order to convince all the citizens of Algeria that all she seeks is peace and justice.

Of course, the President and I have broached the subject of the Middle East. Without concealing our disagreements of the past months, we have recorded that our respective positions have always been clear-cut so that our mutual confidence has remained unchanged. We have one common purpose, which is the restoration of a lasting peace in the Middle East, a peace based on justice and international law.

The worst possible formula would be to return purely and simply to the situation as it existed prior to the so-called Israelian aggression. This would even constitute a crime against peace. All of us have had the weakness, for 8 years, to allow disturbances to develop and to accept an undeclared war, as the United Nations' resolutions were repeatedly flaunted. Our peoples would not allow us to repeat the same tragic error.

We must strike at the very factors of this state of tension, at all the factors. A piecemeal or temporary solution in the Middle East will always be a bad solution. Some of the factors of the present situation are geographic, others are purely political.

The first of these geographic factors concerns the frontier of Israel and in fact the very existence of the State of Israel. Let us not forget that Israel, encircled as it is by ill-intentioned neighbors and subjected to repeated aggressions chiefly instigated by Egypt, was forced to report to its elementary right of self-defense. I refuse to brand this State as an aggressor.

Israel was born under the auspices of the United Nations. It is entitled to have the question of its frontiers definitely settled and its territorial integrity guaranteed. At the same time this problem is settled, the problem of the Arab refugees as in Gaza, until yesterday a base for attacks against Israel, must also be settled.

The second of these factors is the Gulf of Aqaba. Bordered by four States, the Gulf of Aqaba is an international waterway. To guarantee free passage through the Tiran Strait and thus to prevent the choking of Israel, is nothing but implementing international law.

The third factor is the Suez Canal. The deliberate sabotage of the canal by Egypt without any military justification, as well as the blackmail of the past 2 months with respect to the clearing up of a channel, are proof that we can place little trust in the signature of the Egyptian Government.

The Suez Canal, an international waterway, as the Gulf of Aqaba, must be kept free, in accordance with the resolution of the Security Council, from political interference on the part of any country and, first of all, on the part of Egypt.

The economic life of Europe and of many countries of Southeast Asia cannot possibly depend on the good will of an Egyptian dictator.

The elimination of these three factors of tension may be obtained through the customary international procedures. Some have already been started. We must not relax our efforts before a general settlement has been reached.

The problems which I have called political are even more serious. Among them, I shall rate first the Pan-Arab activities of Egypt and Soviet infiltration in the Middle East.

A year ago, when the French Government was denouncing the Pan-Arab ambitions of Colonel Nasser, the response it met with was at times rather skeptical. A definite scheme had, however, been outlined in The Philosophy of the Revolution. In this book Nasser has proclaimed his will to unify the Arab world from the Atlantic Ocean to the Persian Gulf around a "hero"—himself—and to use toward this aim against the West the instrument of blackmail which the geographic position of his country has put in his hands—the Suez Canal and the oil of the Middle East. Subsequent events have proved that these were not empty threats.

Denouncing Pan-Arabism does not mean attacking the Arab world, and even less so the Moslem community. Isn't France, in any case, a Moslem power? Pan-Arabism is not the expression of the feelings of a people. As Pan-Germanism and Pan-Slavism which other dictators have made famous, it is a myth, in the name of which the independence of peoples is being threatened.

It would be the worst possible mistake to answer this Arab propaganda spreading from Cairo and Damascus with concessions or counterpropaganda. The free nations must make a stand; they must show to the rest of the world that provocations never pay and that one cannot compromise when the respect of international obligations is at stake. Such a task will require time, much firmness, and a large dose of confidence.

Yet such effort is all the more necessary, as pan-Arabism is the best tool of Communist infiltration. Following Lenin's advice, the leaders of Soviet Russia bring aid to all movements of extreme nationalism. Cairo and Damascus, fountainsprings of pan-Arabism, are also the strongest bridgeheads of the Soviet Union.

The French Government has acknowledged the extreme importance of President Eisenhower's message on the Middle East. The United States has acted with leadership. It has served well the cause of peace, and we know that Soviet Russia is not indifferent to warnings such as the one she has just received.

I do not want to abuse your patience in dealing in greater details with these problems, however much they deserve a more thorough analysis. Their settlement requires that the free world engages into a joint and long-range policy. This I indicated to the President of the United States.

Allow me to tell you, in conclusion, of the highly comforting impression I had in talking with your great President. Yesterday a brief ceremony at the Lafayette Monument served as a reminder of how deeply rooted is the friendship between our two countries. I sincerely hope that my visit here, the talks I have had with your leaders, and my contacts with you, interpreters of American opinion, will contribute to strengthen further these ties of friendship as well as our mutual understanding. I could not wish for a better result from my visit.

---

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wished to address myself to the pending amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. My address will relate to the resolution as a whole, and will cover the amendment to it in some respects.

Mr. President, the so-called Eisenhower Middle East doctrine, even in its watered-down form, is unnecessary, super-superfluous, even impolitic, doubtless unwise, and wholly unjustified. It does not represent a new policy or a new approach; it is a restatement of an existing policy. It does not pretend to strike at the source of the troubles which have plagued and which continue to harass the Middle East. It offers the free world, the people of this country, the people of the area involved, or any peoples, anywhere, nothing constructive. On the contrary, it will be harmful. It is nothing more than this administration once again going through meaningless motions of doing something about a critical situation that has been festering for quite a while. This situation did not develop over night. It has been smoldering for quite a few years. It is strange that all was well, on the surface, at least, during the recent election.

As reported to the Senate, the resolution, among other things has three main objectives:

First, it would permit the United States to enter into military alliances with those countries of the Middle East which may desire such alliances. The President has this authority under existing law. In his testimony before the House, Secretary Dulles stated:

> There are two things as I interpret this resolution. Section 2 has two parts. One is to undertake military assistance programs. This can be done under agreements just as we are doing today with 20 or 30 countries.

Second, the resolution would authorize the President to spend $200 million in the general area of the Middle East immediately, using money already appropriated under the Mutual Security Act for the 1957 fiscal year.

This too, Mr. President, can be done without the approval of the resolution. I am conscious of the fact that many take issue with my statement. Secretary

Dulles, ICA Director Hollister, and others contended during the joint hearings that while there were enough unobligated balances of 1957 and prior fiscal year funds on hand to finance the $200 million program, the resolution is necessary because of restrictions imposed by Congress on the spending of these funds.

I quote now from page 357 of volume 1 of the Senate hearings:

Senator MANSFIELD. Is it fair to say that although there is some possibility of having to disregard sections 105, 141, 142, 201, and 303 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, the greatest need for section 3 of the resolution in your opinion is the need to be able to disregard section 105 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act of 1957.

Mr. HOLLISTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. President, section 105 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act of 1957 reads as follows:

Except for the appropriation entitled "Special Presidential Fund" not more than 20 percent of any appropriation item made available by this act shall be obligated and/or reserved during the last 2 months of the fiscal year.

Let us see what effect this section would have with respect to money already on hand and appropriated for foreign aid under the Mutual Security Act.

With respect to the President's Special Fund, it has no applicability.

With respect to military assistance it means that no more than 20 percent of the approximate amount of $2 billion appropriated for that purpose can be obligated during the months of May and June. Twenty percent of 2 billion is 4 hundred million.

With respect to the $167.5 million appropriated for economic aid to the Near East and Africa, 20 percent or $33.5 million could be obligated during the last 2 months of fiscal 1957 without violating section 105.

I propose to show, Mr. President, that the full $200 million requested by this resolution can be spent from existing appropriations under existing law without the necessity for this resolution.

Reference to page 360 of the hearings discloses that the maximum amount of money which could be made available from the President's Special Fund is $95 million. In addition, $33.5 million could be used from the economic aid appropriation item for the Near East and Africa, as I have just indicated. This gives us, then, over $128.5 million in economic aid available under present law without any need for this resolution. In addition, reference to page 127 of the hearings shows that as of October 31, 1956, more than $2 billion in military aid funds was neither obligated nor reserved. All except $300 million of this amount has been programed. But Mr. President, this entire sum of $300 million could be used by the President for aid to the Middle East without violating section 105, since, as I pointed out previously, as much as $400 million could be spent without violating section 105.

Thus, Mr. President, from these 3 sources alone, more than $400 million could be used tomorrow, if the administration desired, for aid to the Middle East without Congress taking any action whatsoever.

The Secretary of State and the President declare they need more "flexibility" in the program. Mr. President, this administration seems wedded to the theory of flexibility. The administrators of the foreign aid program have been practicing flexibility for many years. As I pointed out a few weeks ago, no complete allocations have been made of the 1957 appropriations, although only four more months remain in this fiscal year. That simply means that the money can be flexed from one country to another.

But still the administration keeps demanding more leeway—more flexibility.

Why, may I ask?

Mr. President, there are at least two reasons, in the area of military aid alone. First, Secretary Dulles testified that some of the Middle Eastern countries would not agree to use the military equipment we might give them as a contribution to the defense of the "free world." Mr. Dulles stated:

The "free world" has connotations in that part of the world which principally seem to, in their mind, refer to Britain and France.

Second, Secretary Dulles said some of the Middle Eastern countries would not permit "continuous observations and review by United States representatives of the program of assistance, as required by section 10 of the Mutual Security Act."

For my own part, Mr. President, I do not think our country can afford to give arms to the countries of the Middle East without knowing what they will do with those arms. Without supervision, observation, and review, how would we prevent the use of American equipment by both sides should the fighting between Israel and the Arab world be renewed?

As for objections on the part of some Mid-Eastern nations to the words "free world," I think any attempt to erase that term would be absolutely futile. Certainly the President of the United States himself has indicated on any number of occasions that the entire purpose of this so-called doctrine is to preserve and maintain freedom in the world.

The administration has made much of the point, too, that 80 percent of the funds authorized under the Mutual Security Act must be made available on a loan basis. For my own part, I cannot see what objection there could possibly be to making any economic aid to countries of this area on a loan basis. Surely countries like Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Lebanon, and other nations of this area are good loan risks; and even if they were not grade A credit risks, certainly loans would be preferable to grants if for no other reason than to permit these countries to retain their own self-respect.

The hearings show that Iran's proved oil reserves are 30 billion barrels. Proved reserves of other countries in this area are: Iraq, 22 billion barrels; Israel, 50 million barrels; and Saudi Arabia, 40 billion barrels. The Dead Sea has billions of dollars' worth of minerals in its waters. If these countries, with such vast resources, are not good credit risks, then I have never seen one. As for such countries as Syria, Lebanon and Egypt, which are described as "oil transit countries" figures show that their combined incomes from oil revenues alone were over $32 million. They, too, are capable of taking aid funds on a loan basis. As a matter of fact, I do know of my own personal knowledge that Syria never took aid from us, although our big-hearted administrators tried to persuade her to do so; but she is anxious to negotiate loans on a reasonable interest-rate basis.

Even if this were not so, Mr. President, the 80 percent limitation should not hamper the program, since, as noted in the House report, the 80 percent limitation of section 201 of the Mutual Security Act can be waived by the President, House Report on House Joint Resolution 117, pages 11 and 12.

Mr. President, the third objective of this resolution would permit the use of United States troops in case of an overt act of aggression by a country determined by the President to be under the domination of international communism. Since the President has assured Congress that he would notify us, or, if Congress were not in session, that he would call a special session, before using American troops under the authority he now seeks, it seems to me that this feature of the resolution is likewise unnecessary.

But, Mr. President, the administration says it needs this blanket authority to use our sons in combat in the Middle East at the choice of the President in order to serve notice on the Soviet Union that the United States will fight if the Middle East is attacked.

This contention is untenable, for Admiral Radford himself said, in response to a question by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], that an overt attack by the Soviet Union would, even without this resolution—and I quote him—"bring on a general war, it wouldn't be fought as a local war," page 440 of hearings.

Mr. President, the Soviet Union well knows that we would not stand idly by if she attempted to take over the Middle East. What has become of the hydrogen bomb "deterrent" that has saved Europe from attack, according to many of our experts? Would the same deterrent not apply to the Middle East? No, Mr. President, the mere wielding of a big stick will not act as a deterrent. We must take a new look at our foreign policy, particularly in our dealings with Russia. We must taper off our foreign spending, lest we lose our way of life and ready our country for foreign isms.

It was admitted, Mr. President, by all administration witnesses that this resolution would not empower the United States to take any action to halt the infiltration of Middle East governments by Communist agents.

There is only one thing the resolution would do. It would permit the President to use American troops to defend a Middle East country from attack by another Middle East country, if the President determines that the attacking country is dominated by international communism. Would that be a wise move? Could the President make his

determination overnight? With so many trigger-minded people in that area, with so much hatred existing between the Arabs and the Jews, I fear, Mr. President, that we would be in a war sooner than we expect.

No, Mr. President, I fear that the enactment of this joint resolution would not act as a deterrent to war, but would invite conflict.

Mr. President, boiled down to its essentials, I repeat, the joint resolution is unnecessary because it would not accomplish a single thing that could not be done by following normal constitutional procedures—by having the administration utilize the abundant authority it already has.

It is obvious, Mr. President, that this entire resolution is predicated upon the theory that since all fury has broken loose, something has to be done. This resolution, I repeat, would not really do anything, but it would at least look like the administration is doing something.

This administration, Mr. President, is doing something—just exactly what it always does when the crazy-quilt patchwork that it pompously calls a foreign policy begins to fall apart at the seems. This resolution is nothing more than the administration's standard operating procedure all dressed up in fancy clothes; this resolution is another approach to the brink of war, another application of Dr. Dulles' famous nostrum, good old dollar balm.

This so-called remedy to the problems of the Middle East will not solve a single, solitary question at issue—it will not, and cannot, because it does not attempt to get at the source of the trouble. If this administration was caught off guard by recent events in the Middle East, it was the administration's own fault. Following my inspection of United States missions abroad in 1954, I warned the Congress and I warned the President that—and I quote from my report:

> This summary would be incomplete without a reference to the explosive situation which obtains with respect to Israeli-Arab relations in the Near East, and the threat it poses to the maintenance of peace and freedom, as well as United States alliances in that vitally important area. We should immediately press for solution of the problem posed by the smoldering conflict between Jews and the Arabs. It should be realized that both parties blame the United States for their present difficulties; it must be understood that both factions have imposing arguments to advance in favor of their respective causes. I shall not offer specific recommendations concerning a settlement of this issue, but I would be derelict in my responsibility as a United States Senator if I did not warn the committee that unless the sources or friction between the Arab world and the infant State of Israel are promptly recognized, and an active effort made to resolve them, world war III may find its origin at this crossroads of Asia. The sad plight of Arab refugees is indescribable. It is not possible to settle the problems in that area of the world through financial assistance made available by us to both sides.

Mr. President, I repeat that that is a quotation from the report I made in 1954, 3 years ago; and it was sent to the Secretary of State and, in fact, to the armed services and other departments affected.

In my report of 1954 I also stated that the Arab-Israeli problem could not be solved by trying to appease both sides with dollars and hoping that a solution would come automatically. I repeated the same conclusion in my 1956 report.

The danger signals have been there for a long time, Mr. President. They were ignored by the White House and the State Department. Why were they ignored?

The answer is simple. They were ignored because the administration and its followers, before and during the recent presidential campaign, were issuing statements by the bushel that 3 years of dollar diplomacy, 3 years of brinks and dollar balm, had brought peace to the world.

Now, Mr. President, the crazy-quilt patchwork has torn asunder, and the administration is doing two things. It is trying to make the people think it is accomplishing something constructive and it is asking Congress to endorse this latest approach to the brink so that if war comes, the administration will not have to take all the blame.

For my own part, I refuse to participate in any act which is unnecessary; I would be derelict in my duty as a Senator, to the duty I owe my country under the oath I took, to participate in an action which I believe would serve to make the Congress of the United States a scapegoat for a general war.

Instead, Mr. President, I urge the Senate and the administration to look squarely at the facts and to get at the root of the problem which plagues the Middle East.

Mr. President, we shall never have peace in the Middle East until the conflict between Israel and the Arab world is resolved. Any attempt to appease both sides with dollars and arms—as this resolution would empower the President to do—is doomed to failure.

This past fall, I spent considerable time in the Middle East. I spoke with leaders of the Governments of Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria. Based on these conversations, it is my view that the problems in the area are threefold.

First, the Arab world fears that the State of Israel will be forced to expand its territorial holdings on an everincreasing scale due to continuing immigration of Jews from other areas of the world.

Second, Arab populations forced to flee Israel in 1948 are concentrated in temporary camps, and are forced to live under conditions which, from my own knowledge, are indescribable. Besides the sorry economic plight of these refugees, there is also a psychological factor involved, since they can look out from their concentration camps and see their lands being farmed by Israeli workers.

Third, there is a shortage of arable land in the Middle East. This is a direct result of a pressing water shortage due to a lack of proper utilization of the waters available.

Unless and until these problems are solved, Mr. President, there can be no peace in the Middle East. If the United States is desirous of obtaining a peaceful settlement of the smoldering Arab-Israel conflict, the way to do it is to strike at and eliminate the cause of the conflict; there can be no solution by the free-wheeling application of dollars, arms, and military force. Russia relishes conflict in this area and many of our planners are giving Russian leaders much propaganda material to fight us with, as I pointed out in a speech made by me recently in the Senate.

It is my recommendation that an effort be made to solve these problems in the following manner:

First, Israel must be made to understand that if it is to continue to exist as a separate, independent nation, it must remain within fixed boundaries, boundaries which might be guaranteed by the United Nations or even the United States; it is my feeling that the Arab world would probably accept a State of Israel based upon the 1947 General Assembly resolution if it were assured that these boundaries were to be fixed and made permanent.

Second, the Arab refugees should be repatriated or, with respect to those not desiring repatriation, should be adequately compensated by Israel for the lands taken from them.

Third, the Arab States and Israel should cooperate in developing the water resources of the Middle East to the end that more lands can be brought into production to provide a decent standard of living for the peoples of the area. This development could be undertaken in a number of ways—through the United Nations, with loans from the United States, or by the creation of a Middle Eastern Development Authority financed by the International Bank in cooperation with other sources.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize, with all the breath I have in me, that our country cannot afford to begin haphazardly pouring money and arms into the Middle East in the pious hope that American dollars and American-made arms, coupled with the constant threat of carte blanche American military action, will bring stability to this area. Such action will bring nothing except a heightened prospect of all-out war, plus an ever-increasing danger to our already overburdened economy—an economy already brought to the brink of collapse by past years of reckless foreign spending.

There are no specific programs as to how the money proposed to be made available under the resolution would be spent; it is not even definitely known what proportion of the $200 million suggested to be used this year would go to economic aid, or what proportion would go to military aid, although it is generally assumed to be about half and half. As Secretary Dulles stated:

> We are not yet in a position to say just what the new needs are. These will be ascertained by a mission to be headed by former Congressman Richards.

This, Mr. President, is a blank-check resolution. It would commit the United States of America to an unknown volume of expenditures in an area where already over $3 billion in appropriations have been provided, since 1948.

For my own part, Mr. President, I am not disposed to appropriate vast sums of

money for unknown and unexplained purposes. I am sick and tired of taking the State Department and our foreign-aid planners on faith alone. I, along, I am sure, with the other taxpayers of this country, have had my fill of financing endless foreign-aid projects which, in the light of present-day developments, have accomplished only scant permanent good.

I am opposed to the appropriation of one thin dime more for the Middle East or any other area of the world unless the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and our foreign-aid planners are able to present to Congress specific items for which these funds are to be spent, with full and complete justifications of the necessity for the expenditures proposed.

Mr. President, this Middle East resolution, insofar as its economic-aid features are concerned, boils down to nothing more than the beginning of a new Marshall plan, a Marshall plan for the Middle East, a Marshall plan with no specific objectives, no cutoff date, no limitation on expenditures, no set goals, and no firm purposes for its initiation. Let us also bear in mind that these sums are to be made in addition to existing expenditures now being made in that area.

We have had too much experience with grandiose schemes, presented to the Congress and to the people as absolutely necessary for the solution of world crises, but which turn out to be only a continuing and apparently endless drain upon our economy. I need not remind the Senate that when the Marshall plan for Western Europe was undertaken, it was done with two major objectives in mind. The first of these was to restore European productivity and economic health to a point where Europe would become financially independent of outside assistance. The second objective was predicated upon the theory that upon the achievement of this financial independence, Europe would be in a position to be of assistance to the United States in defending the free world.

To date, however, Europe is still looking to the United States for aid. Europe is still apparently not willing to help our country carry the burdens of free-world defense.

At the time the Marshall plan was undertaken in 1948, the Committee on Foreign Relations pointed out—

> The wartime movement of peoples to certain areas in Western Europe and a 10-percent increase of population have all contributed to the economic breakdown in Europe.

It also pointed out that internal-trade barriers and economic nationalism were hampering European recovery.

Since February 26, 1948, the date the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations made its initial report on the Marshall plan, all of our economic objectives in Europe have been surpassed. It was only in the last few months that Europe has been willing to sit down and seriously discuss the possibility of removing trade barriers and creating a common market, a market which would permit European productive capacities to be fully utilized.

Europe has been restored to economic health, but she still has her hands out, she still wants American aid, she still depends upon the United States to supply much of the troops and at least a third of the money to finance our allies in carrying out their obligations to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I ask this administration the following question: Is this Middle Eastern plan, this new Marshall plan, going to be a repetition of our experience in Western Europe? Does it mean that for an interminable time the American economy is to be subjected to another heavy financial drain?

I fear that it is, Mr. President. My fear is not groundless, for, at least with respect to Western Europe, there were goals in mind, although they were exceeded beyond the expectations of the most optimistic. Here, there are no goals. There is apparently nothing but an abiding feeling on the part of the administration that something has to be done, be it good, bad, or indifferent.

Mr. President, I have no apologies to make for voting for the Western European Marshall plan. I voted for it in good faith. I voted for it in the belief that by rehabilitating the war-torn countries of Western Europe, the United States could look forward to a time when Western Europe would help us share the burdens of free world defense. However, 9 years have passed since the Marshall plan was begun and this assistance is not yet forthcoming.

I do not propose to make the same mistake twice; I do not propose to vote our planners another blank check for economic aid. For my own part, I will not vote for one penny, unless it can be shown not only that the money is needed, but that it will be spent wisely and in accordance with specific plans designed to achieve specific objectives.

Of course, the proponents of this resolution have unlimbered their propaganda machines, and spread across the daily press their theory that this resolution is nothing new. An attempt has been made to equate it with the so-called Formosa Resolution.

The two cannot be equated, Mr. President, and it is ridiculous to try to do so.

In Formosa, we were dealing with only two countries—Red China and Free China. In the Middle East, we are dealing with an unknown number. As a matter of fact, the Secretary of State has found it impossible to define the area which would be embraced by this resolution.

With respect to Formosa, we had at least reasonable assurance that the country we were attempting to assist would not provoke an attack. We can have no such assurance in the Middle East, Mr. President, because of the number of nations involved and because of the discontent and the hatred existing among some of the peoples of the area. We cannot possibly prevent Israel from attacking Arab States or Arab States from attacking Israel. If such an attack should occur, and I repeat that we could not prevent it, American troops would doubtless be committed to military action as a foregone conclusion. On the other hand, Mr. President, Formosa, insofar as our defenses in that area are concerned, is to all intents and purposes a part of the United States. It is a part of our defense system in the Pacific.

This resolution cannot be equated with the so-called Truman doctrine for Greece and Turkey. There, no American troops were proposed to be used. There, specific objectives were in mind. There, only two countries—two known countries—were involved, instead of an unknown number covering an undefined area.

Much has been made of the fact that unless the Suez Canal is placed in operation, our European allies—and I use the term "allies" in the generous sense of the word—will be endangered. I remind the Senate, Mr. President, that some of our European allies brought this situation upon themselves. I certainly do not agree with the action of Egypt in seizing the Suez Canal—particularly since Colonel Nasser had only to wait until 1968 for the canal to become Egypt's anyway. But, let us remember that in seizing this facility, the government of Egypt did no greater moral wrong than the government of Great Britain, for example, when it nationalized its railways, its coal mines, and other privately owned properties in the United Kingdom. Or France, for that matter, when she seized privately owned property. The Suez Canal was private property, a private stock company, just as were the British railroads and coal mines.

Of course, some of the proponents of this resolution say, "Would not we have done the same thing—would not we have employed our armed forces if the Panama Canal had been seized?"

The Panama Canal and the Suez Canal cannot be compared. Mr. President, the Suez Canal was built with private capital—it was and must be regarded as a private stock company. It must be remembered that the stock company built the canal, and it was only after the canal was a going concern that the government of the United Kingdom purchased shares in the canal company. France was an original stockholder, but its stock was held as an investment—not as an exercise of sovereignty over the canal or the canal company. The Panama Canal was built with American funds. It is the property of our Government, not of any group of stockholders.

The Suez Canal traverses territory of a sovereign nation. The Panama Canal is on property over which the United States has control in perpetuity. Over this property the United States exercises practical sovereignty—all rights, power, and authority it would possess if it were sovereign owner. For all practical intents and purposes the Canal Zone is our property, and we have soldiers stationed there to defend it if need be. On the other hand, Mr. President, I believe that the Suez Canal issue would have been settled ere now if no force had been used. Those who suffered most from the seizure were the Arabs, themselves—those who control vast oil resources. They would have forced Nasser to recant, in my opinion, if France, Britain, and Israel had not resorted to force.

To my way of thinking, Mr. President, there is absolutely no difference in principle between the attack of Israel, England, and France upon Egypt after the seizure of the Suez Canal, and the bloody assault by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics upon Hungary following last fall's revolution there. As I indicated earlier, while Britain may have felt her security was endangered by seizure of the canal, it certainly had no right to use armed force against the Government of Egypt—any more than the Government of Russia had the right to use armed force against the people of Hungary. The same is true of France, and as for Israel, to my way of thinking, Israel seized upon what it regarded as a favorable opportunity to acquire the Gaza Strip, the Sinai Peninsula, and greater access to the Gulf of Aqaba.

Just as it was unconscionable for Soviet Russia to attack Hungary in the wake of the revolt there, so was it unconscionable for Israel, France, and England to attack Egypt.

Mr. President, in all sincerity I say to the Jews of the world, "If you desire to cooperate fully in the establishment and maintenance of world peace, you must forego for all time the idea of creating a Jewish state in the Middle East of such size as to care for and sustain all Jewish immigrants who might desire to live there. You must do this because to do otherwise would mean that Israel would be forced—due to population pressures alone—to continue expanding its territory, to continue its encroachments upon the lands of its neighbors, to continue to give cause for unrest, dissatisfaction, and the display of military might in the Middle East by nations of that area."

As I indicated earlier, Mr. President, I would certainly support the existence of the State of Israel if it were confined within fixed boundaries. I feel that this would be just. I cannot support, however, a State of Israel of such size as to support 3 to 4 million persons, for to do so would mean that the territory of Israel would have to be greatly expanded—expanded at the expense of Israel's Arab neighbors.

If there are more homeless Jews desiring to build a new life in the Middle East than can be given homes in an Israeli State of limited size, it is my suggestion that they attempt to integrate themselves into neighboring Arab countries—to work with the people of these countries in building a better life for all concerned, or else migrate to other parts of the world. It is my understanding that the Jews and the Arabs at one time lived together for generations without much conflict.

I recall at this time a speech made by my good friend Congressman OMAR BURLESON before the American Council for Judaism, Inc., in Chicago on April 28 of last year.

At that time he said:

> There are 900,000 Arab refugees who have become the innocent victims of the creation of the State of Israel. Both sides (referring to both Israel and the Arab world) must be induced to make concessions which will help settle this problem. * * *
>
> Let us remember that just concessions at this time can avoid disaster. The alternative is that either the Israelis attack and conquer the Arabs or the Arabs attack and conquer them. In neither case is it likely that Israel can win. Should they initially conquer the Arabs, the task confronting 1,700,000 people, of keeping under subjugation 40 million Arabs, will prove an impossible one. Moslems of the surrounding countries will inevitably become involved. The floodgates to communism will be opened by the Arabs as they struggle to free themselves from any temporary rule under the Israelis.

Mr. President, this is the choice the Congress, indeed our country, faces. Either we can continue to attempt to appease both sides in the Middle East—which is the course this resolution would follow—or we can exert our leadership to achieve a fair and just solution of the basic problems which create the conditions of turmoil in the Middle East.

To my way of thinking, Mr. President, there is no choice when the alternatives are viewed realistically, for our country cannot afford morally, financially, or militarily to choose appeasement over realism.

As submitted to the Senate by the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, even in its present watered-down state, this resolution is an invitation to world war III—an invitation which is absolutely unnecessary.

Mr. President, the reasons which I have outlined thus far compel me to cast my vote against the resolution. I urge other Senators to do likewise. I realize full well that in making this speech, I shall probably be subjected to abuse and ridicule by some pressure groups in our country. However, I think it is time for all of us to realize that the grave situation which prevails in the Middle East—a situation which cries out for solution, not appeasement—is such that it is time for us to put our own country, our own way of life—indeed, the continued peace of the entire world—above partisan or other comparatively minor considerations. I fear that in recent years too many of our people regard themselves as Hungarians, Czechs, Poles, Jews, and many other nationalities, first, and Americans, second. The times are much too perilous for any segment or national group to press for its own advantage when to do so would endanger the peace of the world, the continued well-being and perhaps existence of our own way of life.

I do not believe I need to remind the Senate that, until the British, French, and Israeli armies committed their acts of aggression in the Middle East, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was suffering severe psychological defeats—its true purpose and character had been laid bare before the entire world.

History has demonstrated that every great movement must have its martyrs to perpetuate it and give it strength. Christianity, for example, received its martyrs on a cross outside Jerusalem and in the arenas of Rome.

Today, freedom has its martyrs in Hungary. Until acts of aggression in the Middle East replaced the Hungarian revolt and the subsequent Russian aggression in the minds of world opinion, Soviet Russia was suffering severe setbacks in its attempt to picture itself as a benevolent, freedom-loving, anti-colonial government—an attempt which must succeed if Russia is to achieve her goal of world domination by subversion. Now, at this time, the adoption of this resolution would give the Soviet propaganda machine sufficient propaganda for years to come—propaganda which would be used to good advantage to convince the peoples in the newly independent nations of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East that the United States of America had embarked upon the same kind of colonialism which the history of British and French rule has taught these people to abhor.

This, of course, is manifestly untrue. Nevertheless, it would follow as an inevitable result from the passage of the resolution.

Senators should ask themselves these questions:

What good would this resolution in its present form accomplish?

The answer, as I have demonstrated, is, "None."

Would any evil flow from its adoption?

The answer to that is "Yes," for it would provide the Soviet propaganda machine with the ammunition which it urgently needs—a propaganda blanket under which it can bury the martyrdom of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters.

I say, Mr. President, that since the resolution would accomplish no good, since it would result in no solution of the basic problem plaguing the Middle East, and since it would most certainly result in imperiling the position of the United States in the eyes of the uncommitted nations of the world, it should be defeated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there are indications in the morning newspapers that the United States is at last beginning to move into the vacuum of positive leadership which the Middle Eastern situation has required for weeks and which has not been forthcoming from our Government hitherto. We do not yet know whether the initial reports regarding the new United States resolution at the United Nations are true. We do not yet know whether the reports about the specific content of the new United States proposal will be proved accurate.

Mr. President, I pause to note that my information relating to this subject comes from newspaper columns, not from any official statement or information issued by the State Department.

Nor, Mr. President, can we be entirely sure what factors have been chiefly responsible for these belated but welcome indications of a new and more constructive United States position. Perhaps the State Department has at last become sensitive to the historic requirements of the situation. Perhaps the Department has wearied of its own previous inactivity in developing a positive policy. Perhaps even the warnings and suggestions from those of us who have submitted proposals on this issue for many months have at last had some effect. Perhaps with so much advice being offered by our allies, by distinguished laymen in this country, by Members of Congress—yes, even Members of the Senate—and

by the press, the State Department has decided to listen, evaluate, and move.

Whatever the reasons, Mr. President, I am sure that all exponents of a more realistic and effective Middle Eastern policy were encouraged by the reports in this morning's newspapers. I again say that I hope these reports are accurate, and I trust that the position of our Government as indicated in the columns of the press this morning will prove to be the official position.

Let me say that I am particularly encouraged because the press reports of a new turn in the American policy seem to go part way at least in the direction which I have urged for many weeks.

I refer particularly to my floor statement on the Middle East which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 11, 1957, on pages 1870–1891, to my further statement which appeared in the RECORD for February 22, 1957, on pages 2479–2480, and to my remarks on the floor yesterday, February 26, 1957, which appeared in the RECORD on pages 2604–2605.

As a summary of some of the constructive proposals which I have urged for several weeks, I ask unanimous consent that a press release which I issued on February 18, 1957, be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HUMPHREY OFFERS SIX-POINT MID-EAST PROGRAM

"Senate debate on the Eisenhower doctrine has served the valuable function of exposing the real problems in the Middle East," Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, said in a meeting at Los Angeles last night. The Minnesota legislator, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, offered his own six-point program for peace with justice in the Middle East, proposals which he urged be given prompt, belated attention.

Listed by the Senator as constructive steps which our Government ought to consider were the following:

"1. We should strengthen the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East as an instrument of interposition between Israel and Egypt at such strategic assignments as the Gaza Strip, the Straits of Tiran, and outposts along the Sinai frontier. We should initiate proposals in the United Nations to place the United Nations police force on a continuing basis for permanent availability for service elsewhere as the United Nations may direct.

"2. We should initiate proposals to end the arms race in the Middle East by an effective embargo against shipments from any outside source other than under United Nations auspices. To this end, we should seek the establishment by the United Nations General Assembly of a Special Commission on Arms Traffic, which Commission would be charged with responsibility for proposing early recommendations on regulating all flow of non-United Nations materiel into that region.

"3. We should consider proposing a pilot project, open-skies aerial and ground-inspection system over the Egyptian-Israeli-Jordanian-Syrian-Saudi Arabian border areas. Since many of these governments supported the 1955 United Nations resolution giving priority to these proposals on a wider scale, the same governments might be asked to assist in the reduction of tensions in their own areas, as well as help promote the usefulness of this concept for disarmament negotiations generally, by agreeing now to such a pilot mutual-inspection system to be conducted by themselves or by outside parties as agreed upon.

"4. We should recognize the critical importance of reestablishing the principle of free navigation on international waterways, specifically including unfettered access to the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba for the shipping of all nations. To this end we should go beyond Secretary Dulles' bargaining proposal on Aqaba, to take leadership in the United Nations to implement and reinforce existing resolutions on this matter. Our Government should also give serious attention to the possibility of placing all international waterways under special international control. Ownership of waterways could remain with the national governments involved, while maximum rates and minimum standards of operation could be fixed by an independent international body perhaps modeled on our own Interstate Commerce Commission.

"5. We should propose the establishment of a United Nations Good Offices Commission, whose purpose would be to reduce tensions in the Middle East by promoting direct negotiations between the current antagonists and mediating among them if direct negotiations prove to be impossible. The Commission should be specifically charged with unremitting exploration of the possibility of negotiations on the central problems of determination of boundaries, resettlement of Arab refugees from Israel and of Jewish refugees from Egypt and Syria, and the conclusion of treaties of peace.

"6. We should help break the stalemates of inertia and blockade by promoting dynamic projects to help raise living standards, strengthen economies, and encourage orderly social progress in the Middle East. We should affirm our interest and support for long-term regional economic development programs sufficiently broad to encompass multi-national river development projects for the Jordan, Nile, and Tigris-Euphrates River Valley systems. Toward this end, we should take the initiative in the United Nations in proposing a Middle East Development Authority, as an administering agency for the mutual pooling of capital and technical aid in the region, the Board of Directors of which would contain representatives of all Middle Eastern States, as well as of all other States furnishing capital aid and technical assistance.

"I consider these proposals to be sound, practicable, and indicative of the positive approach which the United States must soon adopt. It will take courage and daring to adopt such an approach in the Middle East.

"Without these qualities, however, we will continue to muddle, moralize, and probably miss the opportunity to be of constructive use in the Middle East. With these qualities, we can at least hope that our courage will be rewarded."

Mr. HUMPHREY. I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the text of a telegram which I sent last Monday, February 25, to an emergency meeting of national Jewish organizations in New York.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 25, 1957.

Plight of American foreign policy never more fully disclosed than in bankruptcy of our Middle East position. Flattery for feudal Arab potentates and sanctions for Israel constitute affront to future of democracy in Middle East. Imposition of sanctions would not only be travesty of justice but would be negative divisive action threatening usefulness of United Nations itself. American policy should cease being preoccupied with recrimination and start being directed toward constructive achievement. Suggest immediate four-point approach.

1. Press Egypt for declaration of nonbelligerency, wiping out legal basis for continued discrimination against Israeli shipping.

2. Strengthen United Nations forces for internationalization of Gaza Strip and for stationing at appropriate points along Israeli-Egyptian border to Gulf of Aqaba.

3. Seek withdrawal of Israeli forces after first two objectives achieved.

4. Establish United Nations Good Offices Commission specifically charged with promoting negotiations between antagonists in Middle East on basic issues involved, including boundary questions, resettlement of refugees, and regional river valley development programs. Only by reversing current State Department policy can Israel's present desperation be relieved and the cause of democracy served.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In each of these statements, Mr. President, I have stressed the importance of several specific constructive steps, including:

First, pressing Egypt for a declaration of nonbelligerency to wipe out any legal basis for continued discrimination against Israeli shipping.

Second, strengthening the United Nations emergency force for the occupation and U. N. administration of the Gaza Strip and for stationing at appropriate points along the Israeli-Egyptian border to the Gulf of Aqaba.

Third, following agreement on these first two points, seeking withdrawal of Israeli forces from present occupied territories.

Fourth, establishing a United Nations Good Offices Commission charged with promoting negotiations between the Middle East antagonists on all of the basic issues involved.

Mr. President, we know that these basic issues include boundary questions, resettlement of refugees, arms traffic control, free navigation on international waterways for all nations, river valley development programs, and the promotion of other dynamic projects to help raise living standards, strengthen economies, and encourage orderly social progress in the Middle East. In the floor statements and in the public statements which I have made during the past 2 months, I have offered specific proposals on all of these matters including the development of a Middle East Development Authority, the establishment of a pilot open-skies and ground inspection system in the Middle East, and further consideration of special multinational control for international waterways.

Mr. President, I would not want to say that I see indications from the State Department that the American position is moving ahead on all these fronts. Apparently, however, with the additional prod and inducement of constructive proposals from Canada, the American position may begin to take on a more constructive hue.

Last Friday on the Senate floor I said:

I suggest that we get together with our Canadian friends, who seem to have an unusual insight in these matters. Our Canadian friends have been free and independent of domination by any nation. We

should pursue the objective which the representative of Canada has announced, namely, a strengthening of the United Nations forces in the Gaza Strip, along the Israeli-Egyptian border, and in the land areas of Sharm-el-Sheikh, at the entrance of the Gulf of Aqaba. This would prevent Egypt from blockading that point of access into the gulf.

Yesterday I again reminded the Senate of the relevance of the Canadian position by saying:

As I have suggested before, we might at least consider what our friends to the north in Canada, are doing. Canada has had the courage to stand up against Britain when the British went into Egypt. We might well cooperate with a nation that has demonstrated sensitivity to the problems of the modern world.

Yesterday at the United Nations, Mr. Lester Pearson, the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, exercised what the Washington Post this morning calls his "enviable flair for going to the heart of international issues." I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD, excerpts appearing in this morning's New York Times from the remarks made yesterday by Mr. Pearson in the General Assembly.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 27, 1957]

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS IN U. N. ON ISRAEL

LESTER B. PEARSON, CANADA

We realize that the issues before us will never be truly solved if we are content to let our minds become submerged in tales of past tragedies. These, it is true, have given just cause for grief and bitterness on both sides, but we can scarcely hope for success if we allow ourselves to be persuaded that the record of violence in the past justices a policy of continuing violence today.

As I see it, the problem is basically one of fear, which breeds distrust and animosity and conflict. There has been fear on the one side of the extermination of neighbors, whose hostility to the creation and continued existence of the State of Israel has been strong and unremitting.

The fear from which the people of Israel suffer, the fear which explains the violence of reprisals which they have taken against their neighbors, will be on the way to elimination when the Arab States are willing to recognize Israel as a sovereign state, and its right to national existence within accepted boundaries and under conditions of life tolerable to its people.

On the other side, however, there is also fear which has led to extreme views, to extreme policies and to violence. There is a fear that Israel will yield to expansionist ambitions, which is the counterpart of Israel's own fear of Arab intentions. This has bred in the Arab world animosity and violence toward Israel. When that fear is dissipated we may count on moderation in the attitude of Israel's neighbors toward that state.

*Danger to Israel seen*

The problem immediately before us is the one of securing a fair and agreed basis for the withdrawal of Israel from those places which she still occupies beyond the armistice demarcation line; a basis which can be used to increase security and create conditions conductive to peace. If we do not secure such a basis, we may fail completely to bring about this withdrawal—with consequences which will be tragic for us all, and perhaps especially for Israel.

It is not a question of rewarding or punishing; of laying down conditions or refusing conditions; it is a question of associating the withdrawal of Israel with arrangements which should remove the necessity, or at least minimize the possibility, of facing this same problem a year or 2 years from now.

We think there is still a way of bringing about withdrawal by spelling out the detailed arrangements which would follow, and which would strengthen security and prepare the way for pacification. In its resolution of February 2, the Assembly indicated in general terms the necessity for such arrangements. We should now, before considering other measures, follow up that indication with something more concrete and specific.

We think that both parties should be willing to accept recommendations to this end which are satisfactory to the majority of the members of the Assembly. If Israel refused to withdraw its forces immediately on the adoption of such recommendations, she would be taking on a very heavy responsibility indeed, would forfeit our support, and invite other measures by the Assembly.

*Arrangements proposed*

In our view, the arrangements which we should now agree on to follow withdrawal and which would insure that such withdrawal would help to bring about conditions which promise greater security and stability might include the following:

First, there should be a formal pledge by the Governments of Israel and Egypt to observe scrupulously the provisions of the 1949 armistice agreement. But when we talk about scrupulous observance of the armistice agreement, we should mean, not some of its provisions, but all of them.

Second, the Secretary General and the commander of UNEF (United Nations Emergency Force) should make arrangements with the governments concerned for the deployment of UNEF on the armistice demarcation line. This deployment, which should be made effective with the minimum of interference with civilian life or activity, would be for the sole purpose of putting the force in a position:

(A) To assume certain duties of the Truce Supervision Organization in the areas in which it has been operating under the armistice agreement between the two States;

(B) To assist in the prevention of incursions, raids, and retaliatory attacks across the armistice line;

(C) Generally to maintain peaceful conditions along both sides of the line.

Third, Gulf of Aqaba and Strait of Tiran. It should be agreed and affirmed that there should be no interference with innocent passage through or any assertion of belligerent rights in the Strait of Tiran or the Gulf of Aqaba.

Israeli troops, on their withdrawal from the Sharm-el-Sheikh area, should, as the Secretary General puts it in his report of January 24, "be followed by UNEF in the same way as in other parts of Sinai," in order to assist in maintaining quiet in the area.

Fourth, Gaza Strip. This is perhaps the most complicated and difficult of the arrangements to be decided, as it has political, social, economic, and humanitarian aspects. We are dealing here with 300,000 people, not merely with territory.

*Israeli control opposed*

Surely there would be little logic to an arrangement whereby Israel would assume responsibility for the administration of a territory not belonging to it, and where it remained in opposition to a decision of the Assembly and against the wishes of the Arab inhabitants, for most of whom, as refugees, Israel in these new circumstances might also have to accept responsibility.

Nor could the United Nations take on any new role for security in the Gaza Strip if Israel insisted on remaining there in spite of the armistice agreement and of repeated United Nations Assembly decisions that she should withdraw.

First in priority and essential to all other steps, Israel should withdraw from the Gaza Strip. This action would be in accordance with previous decisions of the Assembly, and implicit in a return to the scrupulous observance of the armistice agreement.

At the same time, the Assembly should now provide for effective United Nations action to insure that the area would not be used as a base for raids and incursions against Israel after its withdrawal.

Provision must be made for a peaceful transition from the administration of Israel to something no less strong and effective and at the same time more generally acceptable. Such a transition can be effected only by negotiation, and such negotiation, which must be both speedy and thorough, can only be conducted by direct agents of the United Nations.

To coordinate and make effective arrangements, the Secretary General might decide to appoint a United Nations commissioner for Gaza.

After the replacement had been completed, this United Nations Commissioner should remain in Gaza, where he would have chief responsibility for all United Nations activities there. In discharging these responsibilities he would work through UNEF rather than UNTSO, United Nations Truce Supervision Commission Organization—though this would be without prejudice of course, to the role of UNTSO in the three other armistice agreements.

In view of the status of the Gaza Strip, however, as an area not belonging to the sovereign territory of any neighboring state, any arrangement for the administration of the territory such as that outlined above must be considered as an interim measure pending final agreement as to the proper disposition of the territory. That final agreement is the responsibility of the United Nations and it should be met and discharged after these interim arrangements have been completed.

Such a program is admittedly a compromise, but it is meant to be a constructive compromise which may lead to further steps that will make for lasting peace.

MR. HAMMARSKJOLD'S NOTE

*I. Gulf of Aqaba and Strait of Tiran*

A. The representative of Israel, starting that his government's primary concern in this area was in measures designed to reduce the risk of reoccurrence of acts of belligerency after the withdrawal of Israel, raised the following three questions:

1. Following the withdrawal of Israel's forces, would the function of UNEF be as described in the Secretary General's memorandum of January 5 in response to Ambassador Eban's questions, namely, the prevention of possible acts of belligerency?

2. In connection with the duration of UNEF's deployment in the Sharm-el-Sheikh area, would the Secretary General give notice to the General Assembly of the United Nations before UNEF would be withdrawn from the area, with or without Egyptian insistence, or before the Secretary General would agree to its withdrawal?

3. The question of adding a naval unit to UNEF for purposes of instituting a United Nations naval patrol in the Gulf of Aqaba and Strait of Tiran to insure free and innocent passage.

B. The responses of the Secretary General to these questions are summarized as follows:

1. With regard to the function of UNEF in the prevention of belligerency, the answer is affirmative, subject to the qualification that UNEF is never to be used in such a way as to force a solution of any controversial political or legal problem.

2. On the question of notification to the General Assembly, the Secretary General wanted to state his view at a later meeting. An indicated procedure would be for the Secretary General to inform the Advisory Committee on United Nations emergency force, which would determine whether the matter should be brought to the attention of the Assembly.

3. The question of the naval unit, in that it implies a function which would go beyond the prevention of belligerent acts as envisaged in the basic General Assembly resolutions, would be beyond the competence of the Secretary General on the basis of those resolutions.

*II. Gaza*

A. The representative of Israel defined the policy of his Government with regard to Gaza, as follows:

1. The policy of Israel is overridingly one of opposition to Egyptian civilian administration or military control in Gaza; Israel cannot compromise on the direct or indirect return of Egypt to Gaza.

2. Egypt has violated continuously the armistice agreement and is in a state of belligerency against Israel which is incompatible with the armistice agreement. That agreement, therefore, cannot be invoked to bring Egypt back to Gaza.

3. The question was raised whether a de facto United Nations administration in Gaza, as outlined in the recent statement of the Secretary General, would exclude Egypt's return to the area.

4. It was suggested that after the withdrawal of Israel's armed forces, the General Assembly should send a fact-finding commission to Gaza to investigate the situation and to make recommendations to the General Assembly for the achievement of its objectives.

B. The Secretary General responded as follows:

1. Egypt is given the right to control the Gaza Strip by the armistice agreement. This being binding on the secretariat, the Secretary General's concentration has been on arrangements to secure peace and quiet in the area—always on the assumption of the Egyptian legal position.

2. Question 3 is dealt with in a special memorandum annexed hereto.

3. In the light of Israel's stand on Gaza it may be seriously doubted that the question of Aqaba can be solved separatedly, as intended by Israel's approach.

*III. Deployment of UNEF*

A. With regard to the question of stationing of UNEF on both sides of the armistice line and in the El Auja area, the representative of Israel stated that he has not considered this question as related to the problems of Gaza and Aqaba, which in his view were the urgent problems becauses it was from there that the withdrawal of forces was envisaged.

In the discussion between the permanent representative of Israel, Ambassador Eban, and the Secretary General, Ambassador Eban asked the Secretary General whether his statement in the General Assembly Friday, February 22, meant that after the takeover, United Nations would have "exclusive administration" of the Gaza area. The question was motivated by the fact that the government of Israel could not accept the return of Egyptian civilian or military administration, directly or indirectly, to the area. Withdrawal from the area was discussed by the Israeli Government on the assumption that no such return would take place.

The Secretary General in reply pointed out that his statement obviously was made within the framework of the legal situation established by international agreement. He could neither detract from, nor annul any rights existing under the armistice agreement. His statement indicated practical arrangements, envisaged within the framework of Egyptian control of the territory as established by the agreement, and could, therefore, not be understood as limiting Egyptian rights within the area under the terms of the agreement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the lead editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post entitled "Governing Gaza."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Washington Post of February 27, 1957]

GOVERNING GAZA

With his enviable flair for going to the heart of international issues, Canadian Foreign Minister Lester B. Pearson has spelled out a potential solution to the Gaza problem. He apparently has prodded the United States into further action. In his speech yesterday in the United Nations General Assembly, Mr. Pearson reiterated the compelling need for Israel to withdraw her troops and civil administration from this legal no-man's-land as a first step. Israeli retention of the Gaza Strip in violation of the 1949 armistice, he noted, would merely increase the likelihood of new belligerent acts by Egypt. He added the altogether salient point that an effort to move back the frontier a few miles by occupation of this alien territory would not really increase Israeli security, since the staging area for fedayeen raids could merely be moved back.

But Mr. Pearson also would heed Israeli concerns. In addition to deployment of the U. N. Emergency Force along the armistice line as already authorized, he proposed that the U. N. assume administrative responsibility in Gaza as a transitional arrangement pending a settlement. Legally Gaza is not part of either Egypt or Israel. The U. N. already has an important responsibility in the area in the care of more than 200,000 refugees, and the U. N. thus is very much involved in any interim administrative system. The appointment of a U. N. High Commissioner to be responsible for U. N. military and civil functions as a sort of intermediary between Egypt and Israel would be altogether logical.

None of this ought to constitute an excuse for delaying Israeli withdrawal, beginning with removal of troops. But a simultaneous resolution to set some such plan in motion would do a great deal to amplify the protection of the legitimate interests of both sides that only the U. N. can provide.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to note at this point that the editorial calls for United Nations supervision and administration of the Gaza Strip, which is the proposal I made earlier in New York while a delegate to the United Nations, and which I made on three successive occasions in the Senate of the United States.

If, Mr. President, as the lead article in the New York Times suggests, this country is now prepared to support the main outlines of Mr. Pearson's proposal, I think we have cause for rejoicing. These proposals are identical to those which I and others in the Senate have advocated in the Senate for some time: that the United Nations emergency force should be deployed on the Egypt-Israeli armistice line, that there should be no interference with navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba, that there should be a renunciation of the rights of belligerency by Egypt, and that the United Nations administration of the Gaza Strip be effectuated at once. I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article by Mr. Hamilton be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am hopeful, Mr. President, that these points will not be greatly diluted in the American resolution. I am also hopeful that the American resolution will not include further points, so recriminatory as far as Israel is concerned, that the constructive features just mentioned will be undermined.

I have often said, Mr. President, that I am prepared to support the President and Secretary of State when I believe they are right, and I shall oppose them just as sincerely when I believe they are wrong. Lately I have had much to criticize in the formulation and conduct of our policy in the Middle East. Today, on the basis of the information in the morning papers—subject to the abrupt reversals and disillusionments which have often occurred in the past—I am prepared to congratulate the administration on breaking the logjam of inaction and inertia on moving ahead to what may be a hopeful basis for leadership and effective compromise.

Mr. President, I should add that since I have prepared this statement it has been indicated to me that all may not be well. I hope that is not the case, and I suggest that the administration try to pursue a line of action in this matter which is similar to that being pursued by the representatives of Canada in the United Nations, and that we present an expression or a demonstration of solidarity and unity with the representatives of our neighbor to the north.

Mr. President, the distinguished English professor, Geoffrey Barraclough has just written an article for the Nation magazine which has an immediate bearing on our discussion of the Eisenhower doctrine. The article is entitled "Doctrine for Mid-East Disaster," and appeared in the Nation magazine for February 9, 1957. In stressing the things that need to be stressed and placing the others in proper perspective, this article serves as well as any I have seen in the whole debate on the Middle East. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Nation of February 9, 1957]

DOCTRINE FOR MID-EAST DISASTER

(By Geoffrey Barraclough)

LONDON.—As the dust of battle clears and we start adding up the debits and credits of the Suez war, some queer and disturbing perspectives open out. Suez, we are now beginning to see, was a defeat for the United States, as well as for England and France—not, of course, a defeat in terms of military power, but a defeat in the battle of ideas which goes so much deeper and in the end is decisive. And since it is going to be of fundamental importance to know whether this paradoxical defeat is final and irretrievable, it is high time to look back and analyze what has happened.

The decisive month was December 1956. No one whose business it is to follow the prevailing atmosphere of world opinion can doubt that the last 6 weeks have witnessed a startling change in tone and temper, from moderate optimism to pessimism and disillusionment. And there can be no doubt either that this change of atmosphere has reflected, step by step, the shifts and expedients of American policy. Outside of Paris and London where the old guard (Labor as much as Conservative) bleated in pained unison for a return to the good old days, the prevalent mood at the beginning of December was expectation. The bombs at Suez, people thought, had destroyed a system as well as a few thousand creatures made in God's image: at least there could be no return to the rigid stratification in which 10 years of cold war had embedded mankind's fossilized hopes. By exposing the ugly skeletons in the Western cupboard, England and France had forced the United States to reformulate the whole basis of American policy.

For a time American attitudes fostered this belief. When Governor Herter was nominated as Under Secretary of State, the world believed, with the Washington Post, that "obeisance to the extreme conservatives" was ending and "a new and bolder leadership emerging." When Mr. Nehru visited Washington the world heaved a sigh of relief; was not this the clearest sign of a new alignment? Around the middle of the month numerous reports spoke of "far-ranging debates" within the Eisenhower administration over the whole field of American policy. The United States was ready for an arms cut with controls; it was ready to explore Russian suggestions for a neutralization of central Europe; the objectives of the foreign-aid program were being rethought with less emphasis on anti-Russian maneuvering and new awareness of the disadvantages of strings. Washington, it seemed, was at last awakening to the reality that the world contained other forces besides the two colossuses locked immovably in a deathly clinch.

What happened to destroy so suddenly this illusion of ferment and unfreezing in American policy? Was it simply the return of Mr. Dulles? In any case, no sooner had Mr. Nehru left the United States than the Eisenhower plan was announced. The theory of the power vacuum on which it was based was directly contradictory to Mr. Nehru's expressed views; and the whole uncomitted world of Asia and Africa saw in the plan a rebuff to India. In England it was welcomed by those whose desire was to involve the United States, no matter how, in the belief that, once involved, it would be forced to pick a few badly charred Anglo-French chestnuts out of the Suez fire. Elsewhere the most charitable adjective used was "ham-handed"; and a French Middle East expert expressed the view that, if Washington had not thought of the Eisenhower doctrine, Russia would have had to invent it. In the Middle East only those States already tarred with the British brush reacted favorably. The odds were that the rest, confronted abruptly by an unwelcome choice, would inevitably gravitate toward the Russian axis.

The worldwide disillusionment that followed the enunciation of the Eisenhower plan was due, however, not merely to its tactical shortcomings in the sense that it was likely to produce results the very opposite of those intended. It was due, above all else, to the revelation that American policy was, after all, still blind to the realities of the post-Suez world. When Mr. NIXON proclaimed that the outcome would be finally determined by what happens to the millions of people now neutral who are trying to decide whether they will aline themselves with the Communist nations or with the free nations, the mental paralysis of Washington was obvious. For everyone knew that the basic preoccupation of the millions concerned was not with which side they would aline themselves, but how to avoid alinement with either. Since this is the distinctive feature of the international situation in 1957, failure not merely to see it, but still more to make it a plank in American policy, is the reason why Suez was a defeat for America, as well as for England and France. The United States may not have lost the war, but it is losing the peace because it has not learned the lessons the war taught.

What made the situation worse was that, in Europe, the Hungarian tragedy produced the same negative reactions. To many observers Russia's intervention in Hungary was an act of perplexity and desperation, unwillingly undertaken to bolster a crumbling system. In the State Department, on the contrary, it seems to have been evaluated as a sign that the Russian attitude was hardening, and consequently that it was no time to negotiate a mutual withdrawal of forces as a first stage toward relaxation of tension. The reassertion by force of the Russian position in Hungary was linked with exaggerated reports of Russian penetration in Syria to create a picture of renewed Communist pressure as the dominant factor to which American policy must be adjusted. The result, in Mr. Nehru's words, has been a return to "the concept of the cold war in its most intense form," a reversal of the trends of the last 2 years. If pursued further, this line is calculated to make Soviet policy more inflexible in all aspects of its relations with the Western World.

It would be an error to exaggerate the defects in United States policy which the past month has revealed. If we cast our minds back only 4 years to the start of President Eisenhower's first term, when the theme was "massive retaliation," "rolling back communism" and "unleashing Chiang Kai-shek," the change of ground is unmistakable. Furthermore, though it would seem that in the debates between progressives and conservatives in the Eisenhower administration, the former suffered a severe defeat in mid-December, it is equally certain that they are fighting back and that the possibility of directing United States policy onto more imaginative lines is not dead. The more serious question about this struggle within the administration, over which (according to well-informed sources) the Government is deeply split, is whether the issues at stake are rightly defined in terms of the world situation of 1957. If a more imaginative and liberal policy means simply greater sympathy for England and France and their NATO allies, and conservatism is closely alined with isolationism—and those are the terms in which the issues are usually defined in Europe—then the deadlock will be final and defeat assured. For those are issues of the past, not of the present, and the imaginative rethinking required is of another caliber. It is not too late to undertake it, but it is not too soon.

If American policy is to recover the ground lost since last December, there are three fundamental requirements to be fulfilled. The first is that Washington must realize that the peoples of Asia and Africa are much more interested in nationalism and in the betterment of their own position (and that not simply in terms of economic improvement) than in the ideological struggle between communism and Western democracy. At present the United States is speaking a language which the Afro-Asians do not understand. Secondly, there will be no progress without a more realistic appreciation of the Russian position; and here again American official thought is befogged by thick layers of ideological presupposition. Russian interest in the Middle East, for example, is a fact which no one will minimize; but the State Department seems to forget the equally important fact that the Middle East lies, as Mr. Nehru has emphasized, at Russia's doorstep. Consequently it would be as logical to expect the Kremlin to be disinterested in what goes on in Iran or Egypt as it would be to expect the White House to wash its hands of Mexico or Panama. To treat every Russian move in this area with suspicion as part of a deep-laid plot for imperialist expansion not only implies misjudgment of plain geopolitical facts, but also creates an atmosphere of conflict which renders it impossible to test out Russian initiatives in other spheres (e. g., disarmament) at their face value. In any case, the people of the Middle East will not thank the United States if it acts as though their territory were merely a cordon sanitaire.

Finally, America is committed, since Suez, to the United Nations, and this commitment, which it voluntarily undertook and which was not forced upon it, cannot for the future be left out of account in the formulation of American policy. America is no longer free to use U. N. when it suits its purposes and to disregard it otherwise. More specifically, it can no longer oppose the Afro-Asian peoples, whose balance of power in the United Nations Assembly is now a fact, without disrupting American U. N. policy. And yet this is what the Eisenhower doctrine, despite the reservations which hedge it about, envisages in the last analysis. No one, it is true, can stop the State Department if it persists in this path; but where will United States policy be then? What will be left save naked power in a world of power politics? Britain has been taught, by its defeat, that it cannot "go it alone." America has to learn that, by an act of its own free choice and volition at the time of the Suez crisis, it cannot "go it alone" either. It has to learn that alleged American interests (which, incidentally, are not always self-evident to America's advantage) no longer afford a sound basis of policy, and that America's role in world affairs demands a larger view. Above all, it has to learn to accept loyally the views of the majority, to which it has committed itself, even when they do not tally—as in the case of the Eisenhower doctrine they do not tally—with those of the administration. It has to learn that the world includes 1,000 million Asians and Africans, with minds of their own, who will be governed neither by 168 million Americans nor 220 million Russians, nor accept their ideas from either. A policy adapted to these realities can still achieve results.

---

[From the New York Times of February 27, 1957]

EXHIBIT 1

UNITED STATES DRAFTING PLAN ON U. N. GAZA RULE AND AQABA RIGHTS—PROPOSED RESOLUTION WOULD PLACE TIME LIMIT UPON WITHDRAWAL OF ISRAELIS—PUNITIVE ACTION HINTED—PEARSON PRESENTS PROGRAM CALLING ON RIVAL PARTIES TO AVOID HOSTILE MOVES

(By Thomas J. Hamilton)

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y., February 26.—The United States is drafting a resolution calling for temporary United Nations administration of the Gaza Strip and freedom of navigation of the Gulf of Aqaba.

United States sources revealed tonight that the resolution, which may be ready for submission to the General Assembly tomorrow, would follow the main outlines of the speech today by Lester B. Pearson, Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs.

However, it is intended to be a middle-way resolution, halfway between an Asian-Arab proposal for economic sanctions against Israel and Mr. Pearson's four-point plan.

The United States, therefore, intends to include two additional provisions:

1. Israel must give an undertaking within a certain time limit that she will withdraw completely from both the Gaza Strip and the Gulf of Aqaba area. It was understood that the suggested deadline would be from 3 to 5 days after adoption of the resolution.

2. Israel would be threatened with further action if she did not meet this deadline. The United States delegation declined to reveal how this would read except that it would not mention economic sanctions. Other sources said the delegation was planning to have the resolution provide that "additional measures" would be taken if Israel did not agree to comply within the time limit.

POINTS MADE BY PEARSON

Mr. Pearson made the following additional suggestions:

Israel and Egypt should undertake to observe scrupulously all the provisions of the 1949 Palestine armistice. This, among other things, prohibits any form of aggressive action or hostile acts, without prejudging political or territorial claims.

The United Nations Emergency Force should be deployed on the Egypt-Israel armistice line—in other words, in both Israeli and Egyptian territory. The force would take over certain duties of the United Nations Palestine Truce Supervision Organization in preventing raids across the line.

There should be no interference with navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba, for any assertion of the rights of a belligerent in the gulf or in the Strait of Tiran, where Egypt had imposed a blockade of the Israeli port of Elath. The United Nations Force should be stationed in the area "to assist in maintaining quiet."

A United Nations Commissioner, to be appointed by Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, would administer the Gaza Strip pending a final settlement of its status by the United Nations. Egyptian armed forces would not return to the Strip.

UNITED STATES HOPES FOR COSPONSORS

The United States hopes that some or all of the members of the Secretary General's advisory committee on the Middle East will join in presenting the resolution. India, Brazil, Colombia, Norway, and Indonesia were cosponsors of the ambiguous United States resolution on an Israeli withdrawal that was adopted by the Assembly February 2.

The other members of the Advisory Committee are Canada, Ceylon, and Pakistan. Pakistan already is one of the cosponsors of the Asian-Arab economic sanctions resolution, and there is doubt as to whether she would now shift to a milder proposal.

Canada already has prepared a draft of a resolution that would embody the program suggested today by Mr. Pearson. The United States and Canadian delegations were expected to confer during the night on the possibility that Canada would abandon her own draft and cosponsor the United States resolution.

So far as could be learned, India is the only country that has received a copy of the present draft of the United States resolution. A spokesman declined to say whether India would join in introducing it.

Secretary of State Dulles informed Abba Eban, Israeli Ambassador to the United States, of the main lines of the proposed resolution during a new meeting in Washington. However, it was understood that Mr. Eban was discussing an arrangement for an Israeli withdrawal that would not require an additional Assembly resolution.

The United States was understood to want a postponement of the Middle Eastern debate in the Assembly, which is scheduled to resume tomorrow morning, if the resolution is not ready for submission by that time.

The United States hopes that inclusion of a time limit for an Israeli withdrawal, together with the threat of further action in the event of noncompliance, will induce the Arab States to abstain on, instead of pressing, the sanctions resolution. Since the proposal cannot be adopted without United States support, it has little chance of adoption at this stage.

SOVIET FAVORS SANCTIONS

Arkady A. Sobolev, Soviet representative, told the Assembly during the day that while he would have preferred that the Security Council take the responsibility, he would vote for the sanctions resolution.

The delegates of Jordan, Syria, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia urged the Assembly to adopt the sanctions resolution and Canada's program was immediately denounced by the Syrian and Iraqi representatives.

Dr. Farid Zeinnedine of Syria ridiculed Mr. Pearson's statement that the four-point program was a "compromise" and said it was "only the Zionist proposals in substance." He declared that Canada—the author of the United Nations force—was trying to use the force for purposes for which it was not intended.

Dr. Zeinnedine added that Canada was "trying to help continue Israeli aggression by continuing its consequences." He said it was time to take action now "inside the United Nations, or outside the United Nations" if necessary.

Dr. Fadil Al-Jamali of Iraq was even more bitter. He declared the Canadian program would mean victory for Israel. He said Mr. Pearson had never been to the Middle East and never had had a serious discussion with Middle Eastern statesmen.

JERUSALEM ISSUE RAISED

He charged also that Mr. Pearson saw the issue in a one-sided way, that of Zionists' propaganda, "which is natural since they abound here and in Canada." He added that Mr. Pearson had applied a double standard and asked why the Canadian delegate had spoken of internationalizing the Gaza Strip and not of establishing the same status for Jerusalem.

The Egyptian delegation refrained from formal comment. However, its first reaction was that it would oppose the impending United States resolution and hoped to rally enough Asian-African and Soviet votes to block the necessary two-thirds majority. Nevertheless, Henry Cabot Lodge of the United States is expected to continue his efforts to induce Dr. Mahmoud Fawzi, Egyptian Foreign Minister, to acquiesce.

The Asian-African bloc has 27 members. But some of them, notably Japan, the Philippines, Thailand, and other countries that have mutual defense agreements with the United States, are expected to vote with the United States, or at least abstain.

The Soviet bloc has nine members, but Hungary still is boycotting the Assembly. Yugoslavia usually votes with the Soviet bloc, and is expected to do so on this issue. Since South Africa also has walked out, 78 countries are now attending the Assembly session.

SOBOLEV ASSAILS PRESIDENT

In his speech during the day Mr. Sobolev renewed his attack on the Eisenhower doctrine for the Middle East, which he said was "heated by oil." He accused Mr. Pearson of having attempted to induce the Assembly to ignore the fact that the principal thing now was to make Israel withdraw.

Mr. Sobolev did not elaborate on his statement that he would have preferred action by the Security Council, instead of by the Assembly. However, this derived from the longstanding Soviet contention that only the Council has the right to impose sanctions of any kind. This was one of the bases for the Soviet contention that the Assembly resolution of 1951, which recommended a strategic embargo against Communist China and North Korea, was illegal.

Although it was known last week that the United States was working on another resolution, the decision to go ahead with it apparently was taken after Mr. Dulles' latest talk with Mr. Eban. Just before lunch a spokesman said the United States was not planning a resolution.

Mr. Eban's decision to break off his talks with Mr. Hammarskjold and go to Washington resulted from a complete deadlock in his two discussions with the Secretary General yesterday. Last night Mr. Eban said he would call on Mr. Hammarskjold this morning, but instead he decided to see Mr. Dulles.

ISRAELI SCORES HAMMARSKJOLD

An Israeli spokesman charged that Mr. Hammarskjold's report on the two discussions yesterday, which he submitted to the Assembly during the afternoon, was sheer legalism. The report showed that while Mr. Eban had said flatly that Israel would not agree either to Egyptian civilian administration or to military control of the Gaza Strip, the Secretary General held that Egypt had been given control by the armistice agreement.

Although Mr. Hammarskjold reported Friday that Israel would agree to the functioning of the United Nations Emergency Force in the Gaza Strip, he told Mr. Eban yesterday that this could not be understood as limiting Egyptian rights under the armistice agreement.

---

## THE NEVADA REPUBLICAN STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE REAFFIRMS THREE BASIC PRINCIPLES OF CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT: SOUND MONEY, PROTECTION OF AMERICAN JOBS AND INVESTMENTS, AND STATES RIGHTS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on December 15, 1956, the Republican State Central Committee met in Fallon, Nev., and passed the following resolution reaffirming the three basic principles of government embodied in the Constitution of the United States:

The Republican Party of the State of Nevada strongly advocates the return to constitutional government by adopting the following principles which have been the basic tenets of the Republican Party since its inception more than 100 years ago.

We believe the Republican Party must advocate a free market for gold, with removal of all restrictions upon its purchase, sale, and ownership, and a return to the traditional hard-money standard using gold and silver certificates redeemable in the respective metals.

We believe the Republican Party must urge the Congress of the United States to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce through the adjustment of duties, imports, and excises, through its agent, the Tariff Commission, and allow the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act, which transferred such responsibility to the President, to expire in 1958.

We believe the Republican Party should urge Congress to respect the rights of the individual States in all those matters which have been historically matters of State concern.

FIRST STATE TO TAKE A STAND IN 24 LONG YEARS

Mr. President, my State of Nevada is the first sovereign State of the 48 to reaffirm the principles of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln in 24 long years.

Since 1933, inflation has been encouraged, so that Congress can appropriate any amount of money for any purpose at any time, including billions of dollars to

European and Asiatic countries, and can have the money printed without regard to its ultimate value.

Under free trade and the policy of sending billions of dollars to Europe and Asia, more than $30 billion of American capital has gone abroad to operate plants with cheap labor and to ship the products to the United States to compete with our own labor and investments.

IT IS INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM AT ITS WORST

It is time that we again reverted to sound principles of government that we won through the Revolutionary War and preserved for nearly a century and a half.

Mr. President, the years 1933 and 1934 were eventful years for this Nation.

In 1933 we followed England off the hard-money standard.

In 1933 this Nation recognized Communist Russia without any safeguards whatever.

In 1934 Congress passed the 1934 Trade Agreements Act (so-called reciprocal trade) transferring to the President the constitutional responsibility of Congress as provided in article I, section 8, to regulate our foreign trade and national economy. That act included full authority for the President to transfer that responsibility to Geneva, Switzerland, under the auspices of any organization that he might spearhead.

That act, as extended, will expire in June 1958.

In the meantime the State Department is pounding at the door with the Office of Trade Cooperation, which is before us now; and if approved by Congress, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act may no longer be needed.

The constitutional responsibility of Congress to regulate money has long since passed into the hands of the Executive.

As a matter of fact Congress has little left of its duties fixed by the Constitution, except to approve appointments and to fix the continually higher tax rate, which is almost beyond human endurance now for the small-business man and individual taxpayer.

CONSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. President, 1957 could go down in history as a rival to the years 1933 and 1934 in the transfer of the constitutional responsibility of Congress to the Executive if all the legislation now before Congress should be enacted.

PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNMENT DO NOT CHANGE

The principles of government do not change. The methods of making such principles effective may vary with the times.

The principles upon which this country was founded and upon which the highest living standard in the world was developed were:

First, sound money—gold and silver certificates redeemable in the respective metals.

Second, protection of the workingmen's jobs and the investors' money, with a duty to make up the difference in the effective wages and the cost of doing business here and in the chief competitive country on each product.

Third, States rights. The 10th amendment to the Constitution provides that all the power not delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution, and not prohibited by it to the States, is reserved to the States and to the people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Republicans Set the Stage," published in the Nevada State Journal of December 18, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICANS SET THE STAGE

Taking almost a directly opposite stand to the rubberstamp attitude which dominated the party in the recent campaign, the Republican State central committee, meeting in Fallon on Saturday, adopted a resolution advocating States rights, a return to the free market for gold and hard-money standards, and the resuming by Congress of the regulation of the tariff and foreign commerce.

Long will it be remembered in the political annals of Nevada that the Republican State central committee and the candidates for the Senate and the House repeated time and time again that whatever President Eisenhower wanted they would favor.

No one ever before in Nevada's history ever agreed to surrender congressional rights to the executive branch of the Government in advance of an election. It did not happen in the Roosevelt era when the pressure from the White House was terrific.

The rubberstamp attitude gained very little support for the Republican contenders and left the party leaders out on a limb.

Senator GEORGE MALONE, who has never been a rubberstamp, told Republican leaders and candidates during the campaign that they were on the wrong track, but MALONE was relegated to the sidelines in the campaign and did not seem to care very much.

He dominated the meeting at Fallon on Saturday. It was called at his request, and the Republican Party, represented by its executive committee, went on record favoring the Malone policies. The resolutions adopted by the Republicans could have been adopted by the Nevada Democrats not many years ago, with a few changes.

Senator MALONE set the stage at the Fallon meeting for his 1958 reelection campaign, and it behooves the Nevada Democrats to take a good look at what the Republican leaders did to help him.

The statement of policy set forth in the resolutions will appeal to most Nevada people, Democrats and Republicans, and if the Republicans go into the 1958 campaign on that basis and in the meantime straighten out some of their internal troubles the Democrats had better come up with something substantial for campaign material. The Republican rubberstamp policy was tossed into the discard at the Fallon meeting.

THE NEVADA NEWSPAPERS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Nevada newspapers, both Republican and Democratic, had much to say of the stand taken by the Republican Party at Fallon on December of 1956.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Nevada Republicans Favor Return to Party Precepts," published in the Reno Evening Gazette of December 17, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEVADA REPUBLICANS FAVOR RETURN TO PARTY PRECEPTS

Republicans of Nevada were on record today as favoring a return to constitutional government following a meeting of the State GOP executive committee in Fallon Saturday.

Acting after a talk by Senator GEORGE W. MALONE the committee came out for sound money, protection of the workingman's job and investor's money, and for States rights.

FORGOTTEN POLICY

It was recalled that such a policy was worked out in the State convention in Winnemucca last spring but that in the heat of the general election campaign last fall most of it was forgotten.

Only by returning to the basic tenets of the GOP since its inception 100 years ago can the party hope to present a program which will appeal to the American people, and such a program must be strongly advocated in the interval between now and the next presidential election year, Senator MALONE told the committee members.

The committee reaffirmed the sound money policy including a free market for gold and the redemption of the gold and silver certificates with gold and silver coins.

Also reaffirmed was the century-old policy of the Republican Party of protecting workingmen's jobs and investors' money through a tariff (article I, section 8 of the Constitution) which adjusts the duty to be paid by foreign nations to make up the difference of the wage standard of living and the general cost of doing business here and in the chief competing nations on each product.

FOR STATE RIGHTS

Further reaffirmed was the policy of State rights according to the Constitution which says specifically that all rights not transferred to the Federal Government by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States and to the people.

State Chairman Emery Graunke announced that he had been named liaison man for tickets to the presidential inauguration ceremonies in Washington, D. C., with 4 days of activity to center around Inauguration Day, Monday, January 21. Any Nevadan who wants tickets should contact him in Gardnerville, Graunke said.

Graunke announced that Lt. Gov. Rex Bell has been named liaison man with the GOP national committee for parade entries and said that it is hoped that the Clark County sheriff's posse can be sent to represent Nevada in the inaugural parade.

DENY ENDORSEMENT

The committee in effect denied endorsement of a plan presented by Bruce Shelly of Sparks to found an official Republican newspaper in Nevada. Shelly asked that the executives agree to endorse the proposed newspaper but the committee took no action. Several members expressed the belief that the committee could not hope to control the policies of the paper but at the same time would be forced to accept responsibility, financial and otherwise, for the paper. Shelly, administrative assistant to Representative Clifton Young, and who will become publisher of the Sparks Tribune January 1, indicated he may still go ahead with his plan to found the Republican paper.

Chairman Graunke said that the central committee will hold its next meeting sometime in February and that Republican members of the Nevada State Legislature will be invited to attend the session.

Attending Saturday's meeting in Fallon in addition to Senator MALONE and Graunke were Mrs. Kenneth Johnson of Carson, GOP national committeewoman; Mrs. Eve Penrose of Wabuska, vice chairman; Mrs. Mary Eisele of Reno, State chairman of Citizens for Eisenhower-Nixon; Ralph Casazza of Reno, State chairman of Nevada Young Republicans; the following county chairmen: John Suverkrup, Douglas; Mel Lundberg, Elko; Mrs. Ruth Duffy, Esmeralda; Leslie

Stewart, Humboldt; Leroy Cassady, Austin; O. E. Schrader, Lincoln; Dr. Wellington Jenkins, Lyon; John Sinkey, Mineral; Mark Bradshaw, Nye; William Dial, Ormsby; D. E. Winchell, Pershing; James Slattery, Storey; Leslie M. Fry, Washoe, and Ralph W. Crosser, White Pine; the following vice chairmen: Russell Turner and Helen Thornton, Churchill; Leland W. Whipple, Clark; Mrs. Lolamary Dressler, Douglas; Mrs. Edith Green, Elko; Vera Williams, Humboldt; Mrs. R. W. Lemaire, Lander; Mrs. Jean Orr, Lincoln; Mrs. Elaine Sarnowski, Mineral; Mrs. Mabel Cannon, Nye; Ruth Collins, Ormsby; Mrs. Ronald D. Starr, Pershing; Mrs. Helen Page, Storey; Mrs. Helen Atkinson, Washoe; and Mrs. Marjorie H. Smith, White Pine.

The resolution adopted reads as follows:

"The Republican Party of the State of Nevada strongly advocates the return to constitutional government by adopting the following principles which have been the basic tenents of the Republican Party since its inception more than 100 years ago:

"We believe the Republican Party must advocate a free market for gold, with removal of all restrictions upon its purchase, sale, and ownership, and a return to the traditional hard-money standard using gold and silver certificates redeemable in the respective metals.

"We believe the Republican Party must urge the Congress of the United States to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce through the adjustment of duties, imports, and excises, through its agent, the Tariff Commission, and allow the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act, which transferred such responsibility to the President, to expire in 1958.

"We believe the Republican Party should urge Congress to respect the rights of the individual States in all those matters which have been historically matters of State concern."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "MALONE Calls for Return to Basic GOP Principles," published in the Ely (Nev.) Daily Times of January 2, 1957.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MALONE CALLS FOR RETURN TO BASIC GOP PRINCIPLES

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE is drafting legislation to carry out policies unanimously adopted by the Nevada State Republican executive committee at its December meeting in Fallon.

The legislation, which MALONE will introduce at the opening of the 85th Congress, would reaffirm basic Republican Party principles from which, the Senator said, the country has been diverted for the past 24 years.

The Nevada Republican executive committee called for Congress to resume its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade in the interest of the national economy and American workers and investors (art. I, sec. 8, pars. 1 and 3); restore sound money (par. 5), and reassert the individual rights of States not delegated to the Federal Government (art. X, amendments to the Constitution).

SENATOR PERSISTENT

MALONE has been an ardent champion of all three principles throughout his 10 years of service in the United States Senate. Prior to the Fallon meeting he urged adoption of the historic party tenets by the committee and vigorously supported the committee resolution during the session.

Two bills and one resolution are being drafted by the Senator to fulfill the Nevada party mandate.

One bill, similar to S. 2926 introduced by the Senator in the 84th Congress, would return the power to adjust duties, imposts and excises on imports of foreign goods to Congress through its agency the Tariff Commission, and thus safeguard American workingmen and investors from disastrous competition of cheap European and Asiatic labor.

At present, the Senator points out, our foreign trade and the national economy are being regulated in Geneva under the 35-nation so-called General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in which the United States has one vote. This trade organization (GATT) has never been submitted to Congress.

FREE GOLD MARKET

MALONE's second bill would reinstate a free market in gold, remove restrictions upon its purchase, sale, and ownership imposed in 1933, and revert to redemption of gold and silver certificates in the respective metals as had been the Nation's traditional policy until repudiated by Executive decree.

Nevada's senior Senator said the third principle enunciated by the executive committee—a State's right—will be incorporated in a formal resolution and will closely follow the language of the Constitution and the committee which urged that "Congress respect the rights of the individual States in all those matters which have been historically matters of State concern."

"All three principles are based on the Constitution," MALONE said. "The Constitution is our only protection from the encroachment of foreign ideologies and interference, which are jeopardizing our economy and security.

"The legislation which I intend to introduce would return us to constitutional government, the greatest form of government ever conceived by man. I am proud that our State of Nevada is to spearhead the reestablishment of these principles."

STATES RIGHTS

MALONE said that the doctrine of States rights was incorporated in the Republican platform of 1860, on which Abraham Lincoln ran and was elected, in these words:

"The maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depends."

TARIFFS NEEDED

The same platform, MALONE pointed out, called for tariff adjustments "to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country," and for economic policies that would "secure to the workingmen liberal wages, to agriculture remunerative prices, to mechanics and manufacturers an adequate reward for their skill, labor, and enterprise, and to the Nation commercial prosperity and independence."

"What we have witnessed for the past 24 years," MALONE asserted, is a continuous assault on these three principles with the primary object of boosting the economy of foreign nations at the expense of our own workingmen and investors. It is time that Americans revert to the basic tenets that made America the greatest Nation in the world, and the Congress resume the responsibilities imposed on it by the United States Constitution."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Battle by MALONE," published in the Ely (Nev.) Daily Times of January 2, 1957.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATTLE BY MALONE

Senator MALONE has certain ideas for the benefit of Nevada—and of the country as a whole in the long run. He has talked these ideas for 10 years, some of them even longer, before he was a Senator. As far as we can find out, nobody in Nevada has put up a very strong case against them, but most of us have shrugged our shoulders and said they might be good for Nevada but are contrary to Federal policy; therefore, we can't do anything about them.

So we have smiled good-naturedly at the Senator and let him go on talking, while his message goes in one ear and out the other. This has not been good. If our senior Senator's ideas are contrary to our ideas, then we should talk them over with him and see that his ideas are changed. If, on the other hand, his ideas are right, then we should listen carefully enough to understand them and give him wholehearted support in putting them across.

Surely, now, the time to resolve this ridiculous situation has arrived. In December the Nevada Republican executive committee backed the Senator in reaffirming what were called the three fundamental principles on which the Republican party was based—sound money, protection of workingmen's jobs and investors' money, and States rights—and now the Senator is drafting legislation on these subjects for introduction in Congress.

The Senator is a Republican. Most Nevadans are Democrats, as is the editor of this newspaper, but this has little to do with the situation. Surely, we are Nevadans and Americans first, and if the policies advocated are good for Nevada and America, they deserve our support.

A sound money policy is urged, including a free market for gold and return to the hard money standard, with gold and silver coins and gold and silver certificates. This policy would almost certainly be good for Nevada, and we suspect it would be good for the entire country. If not, let someone come forward and tell why. Let's not just shrug our shoulders and ignore the situation.

A policy of protecting workingmen's jobs and investors' money by means of a tariff—as provided in article I, section 8, of the Constitution—is urged. It is proposed that duties be paid by foreign nations to make up the difference between wage standards and general cost of doing business here and in the chief competing countries on each product. Surely, this would be good for the mining and livestock industries of Nevada, without hurting other industries in the State, and, we suspect, without hurting the country as a whole. If this belief is wrong, for goodness' sake let someone come forward and tell why. Let's not just shrug our shoulders and say nothing can be done. The steady encroachment of centralized government in Washington on the rights of the States is opposed. Right now the Federal Government is collecting around $100 million a year in taxes in the State of Nevada, then giving a small part of this amount back to us under certain terms and conditions to which we must kowtow. The Federal Government is taking us over, for the taxes collected here by Uncle Sam are far in excess of those we collect for government within our own State. If this trend should not be reversed, for the benefit of Nevada and the Nation, let someone come forward and tell why. And if they do not come forward, let's pitch in and work to strengthen States rights before it is too late.

We know these ideas are contrary to some trends. We know there are arguments against them, and we suspect that those arguments are arguments against Nevada and against free enterprise. We know it is

being said now that tariffs must be still further relaxed, to build up other countries in the fight against communism, but we suspect that we are involved in a frenzy with little reason, and that American methods of building up other countries should be reexamined in the light of reason and logic—not entirely because they result in weakening Nevada but also because they seem to represent not a strengthening but a weakening of those other countries in the long view. Those countries must be strengthened from the ground up, not from the top, lest they collapse from topheaviness.

We haven't time or space to explore all the factors involved in one editorial. What we are calling for is serious consideration of the ideas advanced, serious discussion throughout Nevada, and then full support for the principles that are found to be good. Let's quit spinning our wheels. Down with the weak idea of rubberstamping anything the Federal administration advocates. After all, Nevada is part of the United States too.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an article entitled "MALONE Receives GOP Committee Endorsement," published in the Carson City (Nev.) Appeal of December 18, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MALONE RECEIVES GOP COMMITTEE ENDORSEMENT

RENO, December 18.—Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, reported today the executive committee of the State Republican central committee reaffirmed the GOP platform approved at Winnemucca calling for sound money, protection of the working men's jobs and investors' money, and States rights.

The executive committee's action was an obvious endorsement of MALONE, who was one of three GOP Senators sharply criticized by President Eisenhower before the November 6 general election as not being "his kind" of a Republican.

MALONE said the executive committee at a weekend Fallon meeting called for a sound money policy, including a free market for gold, and the redemption of gold and silver certificates with gold and silver coins.

The committee also endorsed the tariff program to "regulate foreign commerce through the adjustment of duties, imports, and excises through its agent, the Tariff Commission, and allow the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act, which transferred such responsibility to the President to expire in 1958."

A resolution approved by the 33 Nevada GOP leaders who attended the session said, in part:

"The Republican Party of the State of Nevada strongly advocates the return to the constitutional government by adopting the following principles which have been the basic tenets of the Republican Party since its inception, more than 100 years ago.

"We believe the Republican Party must advocate a free market for gold, with removal of all restrictions upon its purchase, sale, and ownership, and a return to the traditional hard-money standards, using gold and silver certificates redeemable in the respective metals.

"We believe the Republican Party should urge Congress to respect the rights of the individual States in all those matters which have been historically matters of State concern."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "GOP of Nevada Urges Return to Gold Standard," published in the Austin Reveille of December 22, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOP OF NEVADA URGES RETURN TO GOLD STANDARD—PROTECTION OF HOME INDUSTRIES ALSO ADVOCATED

The three fundamental principles on which the Republican Party was based—sound money, protection of workingmen's jobs and investors' money, and States rights—were reaffirmed Saturday by the Republican State executive committee, meeting in Fallon. In adopting its resolution the executive committee followed the broad lines of the platform laid down by the State convention in Winnemucca last May.

In particular, the executive committee urged a sound money policy, including a free market for gold and return to the hard money standard, with gold and silver coins and gold and silver certificates.

In general, the resolution followed the policy long advocated by Senator GEORGE W. MALONE and specifically urged by him for adoption at Saturday's meeting.

The executive committee reaffirmed the century-old policy of the Republican Party of protecting workingmen's jobs and investors' money by means of a tariff—as provided in article I, section 8 of the Constitution—adjusting the duties to be paid by foreign nations to make up the difference between wage standards and general cost of doing business here and in the chief competing countries on each product.

The committee also went on record as opposing the steady encroachment of centralized government in Washington on the rights of the States.

The resolution as adopted was as follows:

The Republican Party of the State of Nevada strongly advocates the return to constitutional government by adopting the following principles which have been the basic tenets of the Republican Party since its inception more than 100 years ago.

We believe the Republican Party must advocate a free market for gold, with removal of all restrictions on its purchase, sale, and ownership, and a return to the traditional hard money standard using gold and silver certificates redeemable in the respective metals.

We believe the Republican Party must urge the Congress of the United States to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce through the adjustment of duties, imports, and excises through its agent, the Tariff Commission, and allow the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act, which transferred such responsibility to the President, to expire in 1958.

We believe the Republican Party should urge Congress to respect the rights of the individual States in all these matters which have been historically matters of State concern.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, an article "MALONE Tells Policy Stand," published in the Battle Mountain Scout of December 20, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MALONE TELLS POLICY STAND

RENO.—Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican of Nevada, reported Monday the executive committee of the State Republican central committee reaffirmed the GOP platform approved at Winnemucca calling for sound money, protection of the workingmen's jobs, and investors' money and States rights.

The executive committee's action was an obvious endorsement of MALONE who was one of three GOP Senators sharply criticized by President Eisenhower before the November 6 general election as not being his kind of a Republican.

MALONE said the executive committee at a weekend Fallon meeting called for a sound money policy, including a free market for gold and the redemption of gold and silver certificates with gold and silver coins.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "State Republican Leaders Reaffirm Historic Stand," published in the Fallon (Nev.) Eagle of December 21, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE REPUBLICAN LEADERS REAFFIRM HISTORIC STAND

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE has announced that the Republican Party reaffirms the Winnemucca platform: sound money, protection of the workingmen's jobs and investors' money and States rights.

The party reaffirmed the sound money policy, including a free market for gold, and the redemption of the gold and silver certificates with gold and silver coins.

The State executive committee reaffirmed the century old policy of the Republican Party of protecting workingmen's jobs and investors' money through a tariff—article I, section 8 of the Constitution—which adjusts the duty to be paid by foreign nations to make up the difference of the wage standard of living and general cost of doing business here and in the chief competing countries on each product.

They further affirm the policy of States rights according to the Constitution, which says specifically that all rights not transferred to the Federal Government by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States and to the people.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Republicans Set the Stage," published in the Elko (Nev.) Daily Free Press of December 17, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICANS SET THE STAGE

Taking almost a directly opposite stand of the rubberstamp attitude which dominated the party in the recent campaign, the Republican State central committee, meeting in Fallon on Saturday, adopted a resolution advocating States rights, a return to the free market for gold and hard-money standards and the resuming by Congress of the regulation of the tariff and foreign commerce.

Long will it be remembered in the political annals of Nevada that the Republican State central committee and the candidates for the Senate and the House repeated time and time again that whatever President Eisenhower wanted they would favor.

No one ever before in Nevada's history ever agreed to surrender congressional rights to the executive branch of the Government in advance of an election. It did not happen in the Roosevelt era when the pressure from the White House was terrific.

The rubberstamp attitude gained very little support for the Republican contenders and left the party leaders out on a limb.

Senator GEORGE MALONE, who has never been a rubberstamp, told Republican leaders and candidates during the campaign that

they were on the wrong track but MALONE was relegated to the sidelines in the campaign and did not seem to care very much.

He dominated the meeting at Fallon on Saturday. It was called at his request and the Republican Party, represented by its executive committee, went on record favoring the Malone policies. The resolutions adopted by the Republicans could have been adopted by Nevada Democrats not many years ago with a few changes.

Senator MALONE set the stage at the Fallon meeting for his 1958 reelection campaign and it behooves the Nevada Democrats to take a good look at what the Republican leaders did to help him.

The statement of policy set forth in the resolutions will appeal to most Nevada people, Democrats and Republicans, and if the Republicans go into the 1958 campaign on that basis and in the meantime straighten out some of their internal troubles the Democrats had better come up with something substantial for campaign material. The Republican rubberstamp policy was tossed into the discard at the Fallon meeting.

The resolution adopted by the Republicans is important in Nevada's political arena and it is as follows:

"The Republican Party of the State of Nevada strongly advocates the return to constitutional government by adopting the following principles which have been the basic tenets of the Republican Party since its inception more than 100 years ago.

"We believe the Republican Party must advocate a free market for gold, with removal of all restrictions upon its purchase, sale, and ownership, and a return to the traditional hard-money standard using gold and silver certificates redeemable in the respective metals.

"We believe the Republican Party must urge the Congress of the United States to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce through the adjustment of duties, imports, and excises, through its agent, the Tariff Commission, and allow the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act, which transferred such responsibility to the President, to expire in 1958.

"We believe the Republican Party should urge Congress to respect the rights of the individual States in all those matters which have been historically matters of State concern."—Nevada State Journal.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "It Seems to Us," published in the Las Vegas Review-Journal of January 9, 1957.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT SEEMS TO US

GOP PURGE

Citizens of Nevada who are interested in politics should keep their eyes peeled on the Washington scene, because history is about to repeat itself. There is a desperate struggle developing in the Republican Party, much the same as came in the Democratic Party about 15 years ago and, now as then, a Nevada Senator is right in the middle.

This time it is United States Senator GEORGE MALONE, a rather outspoken critic of many of the Republican policies and the man who intends to introduce bills into the Senate to point up the GOP administration's failures. Fifteen years ago it was United States Senator Pat McCarran who battled the liberals in the Democratic Party, and found himself placed on the purge list by President F. D. Roosevelt.

The liberals of the GOP are laying plans to gain control of the party during the next 2 years and marked on their lists as must go are Senators JOHN BRICKER, of Ohio; WILLIAM JENNER, of Indiana; BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona; JOSEPH MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, and MALONE.

If a close look at the record is taken, it will be found that these men are far from being rubberstamps as the liberals demand of their cohorts. These men frequently are singled out as men who should not occupy seats in the United States Senate. However, their home States continue to vote them into office because they believe the men are doing a good job for their constituents and do not care what the Republican Party thinks about them.

It is a strange thing about the citizens of Nevada that they brook no interference in their politics by the upper echelons of either party. That has been demonstrated time and again during elections and both parties have steered away from bringing in outsiders during election campaigns to tell them how to vote.

During the McCarran purge, every effort was made to sidetrack the Senator at the polls but, when the votes were counted, McCarran was elected by larger majorities than before.

The same thing happened when Thomas Mechling ran for the United States Senate against MALONE. The people of Nevada believed that Mechling was an outlander, sent in by adverse interests, to take over the politics of the State.

The Republicans, if they don't know it now, will be convinced, the same as the Democrats were 15 years ago, that Nevada voters are a pioneer breed of citizens. They like their Senators to express themselves and steer clear from the "rubberstamp" label.

No matters what anyone thinks of United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, he cannot be tabbed with going along just for the sake of partisan politics. He is a wild maverick, who believes he represents the people of Nevada rather than the Republican Party, and doesn't care what his party thinks so long as he pleases the voters who elected him to office.

If the purgers have laid their plans on getting rid of MALONE, then they had best keep it a secret, because any attempt to influence the voters of Nevada through such action will backfire, just as it did in the case of the late Senator Pat McCarran.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "MALONE Drafts Bills To Return to Constitution," published in the Pioche (Nev.) Record of January 3, 1957.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MALONE DRAFTS BILLS TO RETURN TO CONSTITUTION—RESTORATION OF TARIFF COMMISSION, RETURN TO GOLD IS PROPOSED

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE is drafting legislation to carry out policies unanimously adopted by the Nevada State Republican Executive Committee at its December meeting in Fallon.

The legislation, which Malone will introduce at the opening of the 85th Congress, would reaffirm basic Republican Party principles from which, the Senator said, the country has been diverted for the past 24 years.

The Nevada Republican Executive Committee called for Congress to resume its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade in the interest of the national economy and American workers and investors (art. 1, sec. 8, pars 1 and 3); restore sound money (par. 5), and reassert the individual rights of States not delegated to the Federal Government (art. X, amendments to the Constitution).

MALONE has been an ardent champion of all three principles throughout his 10 years of service in the United States Senate. Prior to the Fallon meeting he urged adoption of the historic party tenets by the committee and vigorously supported the committee resolution during the session.

Two bills and one resolution are being drafted by the Senator to fulfill the Navada party mandate.

One bill, similar to S. 2926 introduced by the Senator in the 84th Congress, would return the power to adjust duties, imposts and excises on imports of foreign goods to Congress through its agency, the Tariff Commission, and thus safeguard American workingmen and investors from disastrous competition of cheap European and Asiatic labor.

At present, the Senator points out, our foreign trade and the national economy are being regulated in Geneva under the 35-nation, so-called General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in which the United States has one vote. This trade organization (GATT) has never been submitted to Congress.

MALONE's second bill would reinstate a free market in gold, remove restrictions upon its purchase, sale, and ownership imposed in 1933, and revert to redemption of gold and silver certificates in the respective metal as had been the Nation's traditional policy until repudiated by Executive decree.

Nevada's senior Senator said the third principle enunciated by the executive committee—State's rights—will be incorporated in a formal resolution and will closely follow the language of the Constitution and the committee which urged that "Congress respect the rights of the individual States in all those matters which have been historically matters of State concern."

"All three principles are based on the Constitution," MALONE said. "The Constitution is our only protection from the encroachment of foreign ideologies and interference, which are jeopardizing our economy and security.

"The legislation which I intend to introduce would return us to constitutional government, the greatest form of government ever conceived by man. I am proud that our State of Nevada is to spearhead the reestablishment of these principles."

MALONE said that the doctrine of States rights was incorporated in the Republican platform of 1860, on which Abraham Lincoln ran and was elected, in these words:

"The maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend."

The same platform, MALONE pointed out, called for tariff adjustments "to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country," and for economic policies that would "secure to the workingmen liberal wages, to agriculture remunerative prices, to mechanics and manufacturers an adequate reward for their skill, labor, and enterprise, and to the Nation commercial prosperity and independence."

"What we have witnessed for the past 24 years," MALONE asserted, "is a continuous assault on these three principles with the primary object of boosting the economy of foreign nations at the expense of our own workingmen and investors. It is time that Americans revert to the basic tenets that made America the greatest Nation in the world, and the Congress resume the responsibilities imposed on it by the United States Constitution."

TIME FOR CONGRESS TO RESUME CONSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. MALONE. It is high time that the Congress of the United States resumed its constitutional responsibility to reestablish the sound principles of government upon which this Nation was

founded—and upon which the highest standard of living on earth has been established.

REMEMBER HITLER DID NOT VIOLATE LAW OF REICHSTAG

It may be well for the Members of this body (U. S. Senate) to remember that Adolf Hitler, pronounced the greatest scoundrel of all time, never violated a law of the Reichstag. The Reichstag always gave him exactly what he demanded in power to act; and when the Reichstag had no power left Hitler suggested that they abolish themselves, and they meekly complied.

---

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I feel that this amendment to the resolution is a proper approach to the problem. I might agree that some parts of the amendment could be worded differently, but, nevertheless, it follows pretty much a suggestion I have made repeatedly to the White House, namely, that those of us who are opposed to foreign economic aid as such should be allowed to differentiate in our vote between that and other portions of measures presented to us which we feel might have sound merit.

For instance, I have suggested to the White House on numerous occasions that when appropriations for mutual security come before us, we should have an opportunity to vote separately on economic aid, on military aid, and on technical assistance. If that were the case, I would be voting for technical assistance and for military aid, but against economic assistance, as I have done ever since I have been a member of the Senate. As opportunity is not afforded to vote separately on those items, as I would wish to do if I could, I am forced to vote against Mutual Security Act appropriations each time; and I intend to do so if economic giveaways to foreign countries are included.

In my opinion, it is very appropriate that the distinguished Senator from Georgia has offered his amendment at this time, because I think we must consider the economic aspects of the resolution as they apply to our domestic economy. It is necessary that we in this body and in the other House begin to give very serious thought to the fiscal situation of the United States. I believe that if we give serious and sober thought to an amendment such as the one the Senator from Georgia has offered, we shall find prompt and enthusiastic approval of it from both sides of the aisle in the Senate, and in the House.

We are confronted with the largest peacetime budget in our history. I have heard, for too long a time, in this body and in the Halls of Government, both at the Federal and State levels, this saying: "Well, we can't afford not to do it." Some people use that expression. I have heard it used in debate on the floor of the Senate—"We can't afford not to do it."

In my judgment, the question is, "Can we afford to do it?" How long can we in Washington bask in the shade of the money tree, thinking that somewhere in its branches there actually grow dollar bills which we are going to use to finance the rest of the world in this international welfare state in which we find ourselves? We cannot support the rest of the world. We admit we cannot take care of all our own domestic problems and necessities.

As a Republican I find the domestic part of the budget running at $30.9 billion. I recall very vividly campaigning some years ago against a budget which at the time totaled around $17 billion. So I think it is about time that this body and its brother body across the Capitol began to think seriously about the situation in which this country finds itself from a fiscal standpoint. There is now the largest deficit we have ever faced. The United States owes more money than do all the other countries of the world put together. As I have said before on this floor, every baby born at this moment has a $1,675 first-mortgage tag hanging right around its little white or dark neck. Whatever color neck it has, it has a $1,675 tag. We have the largest peacetime budget we have ever had.

I realize the opponents of the amendment and the proponents of the resolution will say, "Well, we have already committed this money, so it does not hurt if we spend it as here provided." I do not consider that to be sound reasoning. I think we who sit in the Congress are charged not to look for ways to get rid of money, but how to save money. While this $200 million may be committed, it has not been spent. Is it not conceivable that we might save it in some way, so that we might say to the people of the United States, "Here is $200 million, citizens, which we are not going to let go abroad this year, which we are going to apply to the huge deficit we face, which we are going to apply so as to see to it that the budget is balanced this year and so that sooner or later—and the sooner the better—the taxes of the American people can be reduced"?

Our economic system will remain in a rather serious situation if we continue the high rate of taxation which is now imposed. We can look at our economic indicators and say with pride, if we want to ignore facts, that the disposable income last year was ahead of that of the year before. However, if we take into consideration all the committed moneys, the mortgage money, the life insurance money, the rent money, and the tax moneys which are not counted in the deductions used in arriving at the disposable income, we reach about the same level of disposable income we had 1 year ago.

What does that mean? It means that there is only one way we can give the people more money to spend, and that is through the reduction of taxes. I suggest to this body and to my colleagues in the other House that if we continue with this pie-in-the-sky idea that we can spend it whether we have it or not, taxes will not be reduced. There can be only one result, and that is a continuation of the inflationary spiral, in an even more drastic and hurtful form than it has assumed up to the present time.

We cannot spend money we do not have if we expect to lower taxes. I have spoken on this subject many times. I am convinced that in defending freedom against the spread of communism across the world, next to the Strategic Air Command in the Air Force—in fact, I will say equally as strong as that great organization—is our economy. Engels recognized it. Marx recognized it. Stalin and Lenin recognized it, when they said they would take the West without firing a shot, by destroying our economy. If our economy is weakened the ability of the people to defend themselves is likewise weakened. If our economy is destroyed, we can forget about Air Forces; we can forget about Navies; we can forget about the Marines and about the Army; yes, we can forget about allies, because when the economy of the United States cannot continue to grow under the private free enterprise system which is sparked by the earnings of men, and which is helped by lower taxes and by an intelligent approach to the deficit and to our fiscal problems generally, we stand in danger of destroying the greatest thing that stands between us and worldwide communism today.

I am glad to support the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and his colleagues.

Let me make one or two further observations as to why I am doing so. I have heard discussed on the floor something about the rights of American citizens. The question is asked, "What rights have we lost?" Let me name one right we have lost. We have lost the right to decide for ourselves how to spend about 30 percent of our income, because that is about what is going into taxes today. Thirty percent of the income of the people is regulated by the Federal Government. We have lost the right to decide for ourselves where we are going to spend it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator has referred to the fact that our national debt is greater than the combined debts of all the other countries of the world. He mentions a tax take of 30 percent. Of course, some countries have heavy

sales or transactions taxes; but is it not a fact that when we consider the total of our taxes, we are the most heavily taxed people in the world?

Mr. GOLDWATER. There is no doubt about that. A glance at any compilation of tax figures is sufficient to convince anyone of that fact. If we consider not only the income tax, but all the other taxes, the answer is "Yes."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Some countries have high income taxes, both for individuals and corporations, but they make no pretense of enforcement. Some countries have undoubtedly large concealed amounts of gold.

With respect to our efforts to reduce domestic spending, from a practical standpoint we cannot do a proper job of reducing our domestic spending unless we reduce our giveaway spending.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am not one who says that we cannot do something about our domestic spending. I do not agree that through the course of 5 years domestic spending should be almost doubled. I think it could be reduced. However, I agree with the Senator that if we stop the unconscionable giveaway of money to foreign countries, which I understand now totals more than $57 billion, certainly we can reduce the number of personnel and the extreme overhead necessary to give away that much money.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia has referred to domestic spending. When we approach a domestic project, as the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] said today, we are met with the question, "If you can give away billions to foreign countries, why can you not give some to me?"

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is the attitude which prevails in America, the junior Senator from Arizona is unhappy to say. I think it will require courage on the part of the American people to bring about a tax reduction. I think they will have to come to the Members of the Senate and House and say, "This year we do not need it. Let us not build the proposed new road or new bridge, or the new Federal building this year." It will require a little old-fashioned courage, but it can be done.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I know the Senator from Arizona is a good businessman. His family in Arizona have been fine business people for a long time. I have watched the growth of the budget. I have been particularly interested in the fact that, in order to show that we are going to balance the budget, we have based our expectations upon anticipated extremely high receipts. I ask the Senator, based upon his business judgment, whether this country, which had tax receipts of about $60 billion in the fiscal year 1955, can always budget on the basis of a continued expansion of receipts? Are there not downturns as well as upturns in the business of raising money by taxation?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I answer the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, who is a highly regarded businessman in his own right, by saying that I have never found a banker who would lend me money on the same basis as that on which the Federal Government is proposing to borrow money from the people of the country.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have had the same experience. The point that struck me was that the budget has been based upon an increase of receipts of $13 billion in a period of 3½ years. I do not believe it is wise to budget on that basis. That is why I have become very much interested in trying to find out if we can make some reduction in expenditures. I do not believe it is sound business to say that year after year the budget will move upward. I think the margin was about $1,600,000,000 a year ago. The current year's surplus will be about $1,700,000,000; and by anticipating receipts of $73 billion, we reach a theoretical surplus of $1,800,000,000 in the fiscal year 1958.

I feel that Congress would be well advised if it were to say that the budget should not go upward every year, and therefore take some precautions to see that we do not get ourselves into the red. If, by some fortuitous circumstance, we should find that we have some money left over, we should remember that our national debt has been reduced only 4 or 5 billion dollars in 4 or 5 good years. It would not hurt us if we were to reduce it by $1 billion in a single good year.

I have already said to the able Senator from Georgia that I intend to vote for his amendment, because I believe that this $200 million ought not to be committed.

I have just returned from the section of the United States from which the Senator from Arizona and I come. I find, for the first time in many trips back to that part of the country, that businessmen, working people, white collar workers, and others generally have said to me, "Be careful about the budget. We are very much worried about it." I was glad to see a conviction on the part of the people that the budget is important. They feel that the budget itself may be inflationary. It cuts into the pension rates of the people. It disturbs those who have fixed salaries, and makes the whole battle for living very difficult.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for his remarks. I wholeheartedly concur in what he has said.

Mr. President, I started this discussion by saying that if the administration would allow us to divide these foreign giveaway bills into their component parts, some of us might be able to vote for certain parts of them, if not for all of them.

With respect to the Middle East resolution, I find myself in favor of giving the President the military authority for which he asks, to use troops, to use the threat of strength, which is the only thing our opponents in this world understand.

However, Mr. President, I do not understand, and it has never been explained to me in sufficient detail, why the United States must go into one of the richest sections of the world—and I used to fly over it during World War II and I have visited it since then—and encourage the continuation of serfdom and slavery in that area saying, "We are going to allow you few people, who have all this money, to keep your money, and, in addition, we are going to pay you $200 million."

That is buying good will at the rate of about $10 a person in that section of the world. I do not believe we can buy good will. I believe it has been demonstrated that we have not been able to buy good will anywhere in the world since World War II.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator realize that the pending joint resolution does not call for the athorization of any additional money?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is the kind of argument I have been contending against. That is the kind of argument I do not like to see develop in the legislature of our country.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator realizes, of course——

Mr GOLDWATER. I realize it.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator realizes that that is the fact, that no additional money is to be authorized.

Mr GOLDWATER. I realize perfectly well that, if we wish to work it out academically, it will not cost us any more money if we pass the joint resolution. I know that the President can use that money. However, I say to the Senator from Utah that we should quit kidding ourselves. If we can save the $200 million, by not giving the President the right to spend it now or by completely striking it out——

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator realize that the President has the right to spend it now?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Certainly.

Mr. WATKINS. The President merely wants additional time in which to spend the money. As it stands now, he must spend that money, or at least allocate it, by the 1st of May of this year. The joint resolution would extend that authority of the President until the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. GOLDWATER. With all due respect to my distinguished friend from Utah, for whom I have great affection, that is one of the most fallacious arguments I have ever listened to in an effort to get money put into the budget and in order to be able to spend it.

Mr. WATKINS. The resolution does not ask that the money be put into the budget. The resolution deals with money which has already been appropriated, but the allocation of which must be made within a certain time limit. All the President is asking for is that he be given a little more leeway in that regard.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In other words, the Senator is suggesting that the President wants to make sure that he will have a little more time within which to get rid of that money.

Mr. WATKINS. The President believes he can use it more wisely in the interest of the taxpayers if he has a little leeway in connection with its use because of the changed situation in that area.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The junior Senator from Arizona is not arguing against that.

Mr. WATKINS. I thought he was.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I know that the President has authority to use the money, and that the money is available. I merely argue against the type of argument the Senator from Utah is using. The argument is, in effect, inasmuch as the President has the money, let us give him the authority to spend it faster. In other words, it is an argument which says we should give the President authority to spend money faster or slower.

Mr. WATKINS. The President already has the authority. We have already given him the money to spend, and the President already has that authority.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Why does the President ask for the money, then?

Mr. WATKINS. He is not asking for the money. The money already has been appropriated. We have tied some strings to the use of the money. We have placed some conditions on it. The President says, "You have put conditions on it, under which I must spend that money by May 1. I want to be able to spend it over a little longer period of time in the light of the situation which has recently developed in the Middle East area." That is all he is asking.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the distinguished Senator believes that that argument holds water——

Mr. WATKINS. I think it does.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If that argument holds water, I suggest that we tie the same strings to the whole program.

Mr. WATKINS. That cannot be done. In the present situation we have come to the last move, to the last loophole in the line of defense we have built. Personally, I am in a little different position from most other Senators. I thought at the very beginning of our postwar foreign policy that it was wrong in many respects, and I said so. I said so with respect to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. However, after the decision was made and after that foreign policy was adopted, I felt I must support it. It is the only foreign policy we have. We cannot retrace our steps and we cannot turn history back. We cannot honorably refuse to keep commitments lawfully entered into. We have gone beyond the point of return with our policy of alliances and mutual-security pacts.

Now that we have gone as far as we have with 46 nations in making defense pacts, we are confronted with the situation in the Mid-East. Here is a situation where we cannot make a defense pact, because the nations in that area cannot agree among themselves. Therefore, the only thing we can do is to say to Russia and the rest of the world that we will not permit anyone to come into that area and take away the liberties of people there if those people request us to help them. That is the last large area not covered by security pacts. If we do not adopt the proposal of the President, the whole security policy may fall down flat, and we may lose all we have done.

I am pleading that we give the mutual security program to parts of which I was opposed and which I thought were unwise in the beginning in 1949 but which are now our only program, a chance to succeed. I am in a different position from most Members of the Senate, because of my position against it in the beginning. However, since the position has been adopted, as a loyal American I believe it is my duty to do everything I can to help the program succeed, because it is the only one we have and it is too late to go back to the situation of 8 years ago.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor. Does he yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not deny the right of the Senator from Utah to continue in his convictions. I admire him for them. He came out very strongly against this program, but he has changed his mind.

Mr. WATKINS. No; I have not changed my mind. I said in the beginning it was not wise, but the decision was made; and as a loyal American I must support it. It is the same situation as if I were a staff officer of a commander on a battlefield. I would have had my chance to state my opinions and to give my views, as other officers would have had. However, after the battle plan had been adopted it would be my duty to support it. As a loyal American it is my duty to do that. I think we must give the program a chance to succeed. We cannot retreat completely now.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am not suggesting that we retreat.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator apparently wants to back out now.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I was one of the first to say, when John Foster Dulles made his brink-of-war statement, that that was the first time in the history of this Nation that anyone in the State Department or anyone else in our Government recognized that military force is an instrument of peace and an instrument of foreign policy. That is the first time that had been used. I recognized it on the floor. I realize that Russia will respect only strength. However, I do not believe that we must spend $200 million in order to tell them about it. I believe we have already told them about it.

Mr. WATKINS. We made the decision to spend the money a year ago.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The decision was made in 1953, if I recall. However, we do not have to go on spending money year after year after year.

Perhaps I should rejoice that we have exhausted the detecting ability of our State Department to find countries of the world to whom we can give money of the United States taxpayers.

I have nothing against the President of the United States standing up and saying to Russia, "Look here; you have gone so far; you are going no further." I agree with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in that respect. However, I do not believe it takes $56 billion or $60 billion of this country's wealth to say that to Russia.

I believe that the maintenance of a strong Air Force and a strong defense and a strong offensive posture is all we need, not the giving away of our money.

I would be much happier about the whole thing if the executive department would tell us if there is going to be a Middle East command; and, if there is to be a Middle East command, who is to be the head of it. I believe the Air Force is the logical armed service to be in command over there. I say that because I have served in that area. I do not believe that it should be the Navy or the Army. I believe it should be the Air Force. So far we have not heard anything about that.

Possibly the Senator from Utah will argue that a good general does not divulge his plans in advance. That is entirely proper. I will buy that kind of argument, because I have had some experience in the military. However, when the President comes to Congress and asks for money, as in this instance, we ought to be told something about how it is to be used.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Utah. It seems to me he is correct in his statement that this money has been appropriated and is presently available to the President.

The junior Senator from Arizona and I voted against it a year ago. Now we confront the situation that the money is available, but we are asked to make it possible for the President to use it more wisely. Under the circumstances, we certainly ought to accede to his request.

I say to the Senator from Arizona that I am in complete agreement with his statement with reference to giving foreign economic aid to countries which are in better shape than we are. However, the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] does not strike at the root of his objections.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I should like to finish my thought. It seems to me that the substitute offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia does not do anything about the $200 million which was appropriated by Congress a year ago, even though I voted against it. If the amendment were to separate economic aid from military aid, and put the economic aid on a loan basis, rather than on a grant basis, I would support the amendment wholeheartedly. However, the proposal does not do anything about the $200 million. It states that the money must be expended in the same fashion as provided in the bill a year ago.

Therefore, I do not see how we are striking at the objective which I know the junior Senator from Arizona has in mind. In that respect the amendment

of the senior Senator from Georgia is defective.

I can subscribe to practically everything the junior Senator from Arizona has stated this afternoon. However, being realistic about it, I do not understand how we can accomplish anything along the lines he is advocating. I respectfully say to him that if we are to do anything that will tie some strings to the $200 million, some of the money will have to be put on a loan basis, particularly the economic aid part of it, which, I understand, is about 50 percent of the total.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I must confess to my amazement at the statement made by my distinguished friend from Wyoming. He voted against the appropriation when he knew how it was going to be spent; but, now that he has no idea on earth how it is going to be spent, he finds it more palatable.

One of the very purposes of this proposal——

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I did not say I was in favor of removing all restrictions; I said I would prefer to do it on a loan basis rather than on a grant basis.

Mr. RUSSELL. The difficulty with that is that under the law at the present time, if this amendment is adopted, 80 percent of economic aid must be in loans. But if the Senator supports the committee proposition he is removing the requirement that it be made in the form of loans, and is making it available in the form of grants. The effect of the amendment is to remove the restrictions of the Mutual Security Act of last year, making the aid available in the form of grants.

So it has a different purpose from that which the Senator from Wyoming has asserted.

The reason why officials of the administration want to remove this $200 million from the restrictions of the Mutual Security Act, as amended, is to get into some of the countries in the Middle East. Saudi Arabia, for example, accepted a point 4 mission for a brief time and then asked our representatives to get out. They would not permit Americans to see that the money was being spent as intended.

The Mutual Security Act, which was passed last year, contains the general requirement in section 142 that no assistance shall be furnished to any nation under this title unless such nation shall have agreed to promote international understanding, good will, and world peace.

That does not seem to me to be a very onerous requirement.

I read:

SEC. 142. Agreements. (a) No assistance shall be furnished to any nation under this title unless such nation shall have agreed to—

(1) Join in promoting international understanding and good will, and maintaining world peace;

(2) Take such action as may be mutually agreed upon to eliminate causes of international tension;

(3) Fulfill the military obligations, if any, which it has assumed under multilateral or bilateral agreement or treaties to which the United States is a party;

(4) Make, consistent with its political and economic stability, the full contribution permitted by its manpower, resources, facilities, and general economic condition to the development and maintenance of its own defensive strength and the defensive strength of the free world;

(5) Take all reasonable measures which may be needed to develop its defense capacities;

(6) Take appropriate steps to insure the effective utilization of the assistance furnished under this title in furtherance of the policies and purposes of this title;

(7) Impose appropriate restrictions against transfer of title to or possession of any equipment and materials, information, or services furnished under chapter 1 of this title, without the consent of the President;

(8) Maintain the security of any article, service, or information furnished under chapter 1 of this title;

(9) Furnish equipment and materials, services, or other assistance consistent with the Charter of the United Nations, to the United States or to and among other nations to further the policies and purpose of chapter 1 of this title;

(10) Permit continuous observation and review by United States representatives of programs of assistance authorized under this title, including the utilization of any such assistance and provide the United States with full and complete information with respect to these matters, as the President may require.

There are several nations in that area which absolutely refuse to conform to that requirement. It seems to me not to be unreasonable to suggest that a donor has some right to follow his gift and see that it is used for the purpose intended. But several nations have never agreed to that. The committee amendment proposes to strike down these very reasonable stipulations. There is no question that it is proposed to embark on this program in Saudi Arabia not on a loan basis, as the present law requires, but on a grant basis, and without any agreement that representatives of the United States may go there to see how the money is expended.

There is no question in my mind that other nations in that area which heretofore have not accepted our aid, if we waive this condition, will start a program there. Certainly, Mr. President, no Member of the Senate is so naive as to think that if we embark on a 4-month basis we will be able to stop the program on July 1. Instead of stopping it, the argument will be made that under this provision of the joint resolution if it is passed in its present form, we have struck down the loan features, and have started this program in certain countries, and the peace and stability of the world will depend on increasing the appropriation next year.

I do not think there is any doubt about that being the effect. I wish I could remember the names of the 7 or 8 countries Secretary Dulles testified were not in this program under these conditions but which would be able to avail themselves of it if the committee amendment doing away with the loan program, and granting this largess wrung from the American taxpayers should be adopted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So as to keep the record straight, let me say that the fact of the matter is that every one of those countries was on the agenda before the Committee for Nonmilitary Assistance last year. Each of them receive nonmilitary assistance, but there are six countries at the present time in that area which receive no military assistance at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not understand that statement. What is the significance of it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is a classified record.

Mr. RUSSELL. If they are not included on a loan basis, why does the Senator want to change it to a grant basis?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It applies only to economic assistance.

Mr. RUSSELL. I so stated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed so, but the Senator said they would not comply and, therefore, they were not in the program. They must have complied for a number of years, because I have a record of the unexpended balances and the amount carried in the 1957 bill. I know, also, that a half a dozen countries received no military assistance.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Illinois is correct, then the Secretary of State did not know what he was talking about, because he testified before the committee and named 5 or 6 countries in that area which were not now the recipients of any benefits under the program. I cannot find it in the record in a moment, but he so testified, and there cannot be any question about that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say to my distinguished friend that the best place to check is in the Senate Appropriations Committee. I reexamined all the data no later than this afternoon. It is confidential and I cannot reveal amounts or name the countries, but the unexpended balances are there, showing that they were in the program before this year; in fact, for a number of years. They received no military assistance, and we are dealing with what I think is an urgent danger in that area.

Mr. RUSSELL. That may well be.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, with all due respect, I rose with the intention of making a short speech, because I know my distinguished friend from Illinois has some remarks to make on the subject. So I wish to sum up what I have been trying to tell the Senate.

I recognize at the outset that the $200 million is available and can be spent. We are not arguing about that. I think it is time this body took cognizance of the fact that we have given away vast sums of money; that the tight-money situation in the United States is due in large part to the scarcity of money, and that it is high time to start thinking about the domestic economy, a balanced budget, and a respectable value for the dollar, when we are talking about $2 or $2 million or $200 million, whether it is appropriated or not. We cannot afford not to do it. A bankrupt America means a bankrupt world. An American economy weakened by 1 cent means a weakened world economy and a weakened defense against communism.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, so that we may be clear about the problem before us, I wish to refer a question to my very distinguished and scholarly friend from Georgia, for whom I have high affection.

Mr. RUSSELL. I reciprocate the sentiments of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As I understand, his amendment strikes out all military aid and economic assistance, and leaves nothing more than an authorization to use troops in the Middle Eastern area.

Mr. RUSSELL. No. I insist that the amendment does not strike out anything. We cannot have it both ways. If money is already appropriated, why should we take off the restrictions? The money is already appropriated.

The amendment provides only that the money must be spent in accordance of the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended in 1956, or else the administration can come before Congress between now and July 1 and tell Congress how it wants to spend the money, and we will authorize the spending.

The amendment does not strike out or recapture any of the appropriations.

The great argument which has been made in favor of the amendment is that the money has been appropriated anyway; why should we worry how it will be spent?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want Senators to have a clear understanding of what the amendment will do. The significant language in the amendment is:

> The United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism.

That is really the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the gist of it; that is the substance of it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is the whole amendment. Section 2 deals only with its termination. The proviso deals only with requiring the action to be in conformity with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations.

So what we have before us is a proposal to authorize the President to use the troops of the United States, and nothing more, if a request is made for troops in the face of armed aggression.

Let us look at the whole picture. In November 1956, the people elected a President and Commander in Chief. Two months after election day, we heard in Congress a special message directing attention to what the President thought was the danger and the delicate situation which had developed in the Middle East. He came to Congress with his message even before he was inaugurated the second time. In fact, he was here 2 weeks before the inauguration.

In the message, if it may be skeletonized, he did three things: First, he pointed out the danger. Second, he said he would like to have the authority to use the military forces of the country under given restrictions and under certain circumstances. Third, he asked for an amount of money to be used for military and economic assistance.

When the resolution was considered by the committees, it authorized, in effect, the use of the armed forces. It announced to all the world that there was a unity of feeling between the executive and the legislative branches.

Then the joint committees inserted a provision to make $200 million available until June 30, 1957. The resolution also contained a provision for military and economic assistance. Both those terms are used in the assistance clause. The money is to be spent, of course, in conformity with the Mutual Aid Act, with some restrictions removed. In that respect, of course, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is exactly correct. He would delete all that language and leave only the provision for the naked use of the armed might of this country whenever there was a threat of international communism and a request was made for the use of the military forces of this country.

What is the argument in support of the amendment? First, that the resolution is a blank check. Is it? The resolution contains an ascertained amount. A blank check, to me, is something which is perfectly blank, has no amount in it, has no dateline on it, and contains no termination date of any kind.

The amount remains available only until June 30, 1957. It represents $200 million. That amount is expendable in the discretion of the President. The resolution is scarcely a blank check.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not true that with the adoption by the combined Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services of the so-called Johnson amendment, which I think is a constructive contribution to the proposed legislation, it is required, as to any economic assistance or military aid, that the proper committees of Congress be given 15 days' notice?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. So Congress will be advised not only of what the projects are; but under the so-called Johnson amendment, as modified, there is a provision that the executive department must state whence the funds are to come—in other words, whether they are to come from the discretionary funds which the President already has, or whether they are to be extracted from funds which have been previously allocated. So Congress will be on full notice in regard to such allocations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is exactly correct. In that respect, the resolution speaks for itself.

Second, it has been argued that no defined purpose is stated. I cite to Senators that in the Mutual Security Act $50 million was made available to develop components for military forces behind the Iron Curtain. Did we know how they were to be recruited? Certainly not. Did we know how they were to be provided with weapons? Certainly not. We took the matter on faith. The $50 million of the $150 million which was made available to the President for expenditure could have been used for that purpose.

Two billion dollars was spent on the Manhattan project. I was a member of the House Committee on Appropriations when that was happening. Believe me, there were very few Members of Congress, in either branch, who had the slightest idea what that money was to be expended for. In fact, the item could not be found because it was hidden in rather abstruse and abstract language. The first $5 million of emergency funds made available was made available about the time some algebraic examples were placed upon a blackboard. That is all anyone knew about that project.

So when we talk about definitive purposes, we are dealing with a tremendous area; and how to spell out the provisions, under these circumstances, is not so very easy.

I listened with great interest to the remarks of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE]. He spoke about restoring the Hanging Gardens of Babylon and the luxurious Garden of Eden. I have been in that area and have gone around it, through it, and over it. I have visited with its people. They are not interested in restoring the Hanging Gardens. They are not interested in the restoration of the Garden of Eden. All they would like to have is a little irrigation water in order to sustain life, because life is a pretty difficult and neurotic thing in that area.

If some of the money which is sought were to be used for the development of some of the resources which perhaps 700 or 800 years ago began to fall into a state of disuse, perhaps that would be a good use of the money.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator let me continue, please?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I only wish to say that all that the citizens of Arizona want is a little irrigation water.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Good. I am glad my friend has brought that up, because his comment brings to our attention something which has been entirely overlooked. The people of Arizona are still in their whole skins, and none of their youngsters are dying in war, and none of them have been during the last 5 years.

Recently we have heard in this Chamber a great deal about peace. The only challenge before our country is as to its security, its survival, and the maintenance of its people. The people of Arizona are like the people of Illinois. If they think it is conducive to their salvation and to the maintenance of peace, so that young blood will not be shed, they will, I am confident, be willing to make a few sacrifices in this field.

So we come to address ourselves to the basic objective in this case, which is to prevent the starting of a war. That is the point I make now.

By means of the Russell amendment, we would provide the means to kill people; we would say that it is all right to send soldiers and tanks and bazookas and rifles and other equipment of war

to these countries. By means of the Russell amendment, we would give the President the authority to provide these countries with the means to kill, if necessary. But where is the authority to use a little money to heal? It is proposed that we provide the authority to destroy lives, but where is the authority to provide money with which to mend?

The people of these countries are like all other people. Believe me, in my judgment, this area is a very dangerous one. The very size of the area indicates the inherent danger. How big is it? Has anyone asked that question?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. I have asked that question, and I cannot find the answer. Will the Senator from Illinois tell me how big the area is? I should very much like to know. I have read a thousand pages of the testimony, but I cannot find the answer to that question. Secretary Dulles said he would not define it in public. Finally he said he would accept the definition given by one of his assistants. I simply cannot find out how big the Middle East is.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me edify my friend, the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. Very well; that will be fine, Mr. President.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the first place, when we ask about the size of the Middle East, some persons will wish to include one country and others will wish to include another.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I am asked whether Pakistan should be included, I will reply that Pakistan is in Asia; so why include it in the Middle East? If I am asked whether Libya is included in the Middle East, I will reply that Libya is in Africa; so why should it be included in the Middle East? The fact of the matter is that it is impossible to find any two people who, finally, will agree exactly on the definition of the Middle East. So we have to agree on the best we can.

Mr. JENNER. What is that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us start with Lebanon, at the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea. Lebanon is in the Middle East, and next to it is Syria, and next to it is Iraq, and next to it is Iran, and next to it is Afghanistan, and next to it is Pakistan. Those countries are more or less on an east-and-west line; and that is the first line to which I point.

Then, if we drop down to the next line to the south, we find there Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Yemen.

That looks like a good description of the Middle East.

If someone else wishes to include another country as being a part of the Middle East, that is all right with me.

Mr. JENNER. How about Indonesia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, Mr. President, Indonesia is away off in Asia.

Mr. JENNER. Is Uganda in the Middle East?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; it is in the heart of Africa.

Mr. JENNER. Is Tanganyika in the Middle East?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; it is also in Africa, I say to my friend, the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, let me ask whether the Senator from Illinois has read the testimony which was given.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield to me, let me answer the question by pointing to the map which is included with the hearings.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I have seen the map; but it is not of any assistance to me.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The map shows the area of the Middle East, as defined by the Secretary of State.

Mr. JENNER. Oh, no; the Secretary of State did not define it. He did say that he would accept the definition or statement of one of his subordinates about what is included in the Middle East. But that is not legal or binding.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But he referred to the general area of the Middle East.

Mr. JENNER. The "general area of the Middle East" could include Indonesia, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Uganda, and Tanganyika; and, according to certain scholarly definitions, it could also extend all the way to Morocco. The fact of the matter is, Mr. President, that I do not think any Member of the Senate can state accurately what the Middle East includes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I just told my friend, the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. That is the definition given by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is good enough for me. [Laughter.]

Mr. JENNER. Well, Mr. President, it is not good enough for me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, now I have to enlighten my friend, the Senator from Indiana, a little more.

Mr. JENNER. I need enlightenment. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. There are 3,300,000 square miles in this area.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield, let me ask whether that is according to his definition or according to my definition or according to whose definition?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is according to my definition, and that is good enough for me.

Mr. JENNER. Very well; temporarily I shall accept the Senator's definition.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I obtained my facts from the documents. I have had a fine time going through the current atlases, to find out what the area is. It comprises 3,300,000 square miles. That area is 300,000 square miles larger than the United States of America. According to the best censuses I can obtain, there are about 93 million persons there.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. That brings up a problem which has been worrying me a great deal. Will $200 million, if put into that vast area, really result in anything material; or will it be only the beginning of a much larger program which will follow immediately after the $200 million has been released from the restrictions?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am delighted that my friend, the Senator from Maryland has asked that question; and I wish to give him the answer to it. If he will be patient, I shall now address myself to it.

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to hear the answer.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The United States spent $100 per capita, for every man, woman, and child in our country, when we got into an imbroglio in Korea.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. We spent billions of dollars in trying to keep out of that imbroglio in Korea. How about that expenditure? How about the hundreds of dollars per capita we spent in trying to stay out of that imbroglio? However, we only succeded in getting into it; and then we spent $19 billion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I only know that when we got into it, and when the bloodletting began, we spent—according to the figures of the Defense Establishment—$19 billion, in Korea. We did not seem to hesitate then about spending $125 per capita—$125 for every man, woman, and child in the United States—to fight a war.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield to me, let me say that we should keep the record straight. That was not a war, that was said to be a police action.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; to fight a police action, we spent $125 per capita, for every person in the United States. In addition, how do we calculate the blood cost, I ask.

In the present instance, what is involved for the people of the United States, based on the census clock in the Department of Commerce? We find that $1.25 per capita is involved. That is what is being requested in connection with the joint resolution—$1.25 per capita, to do a little something about staying out of war. Mr. President, I have sufficient faith in the President of the United States to believe that he will play the cards well and will do everything within his power to keep our country from becoming embroiled in carnage.

We got into the Second World War, and it cost us $350 billion, or $2,000 for every man, woman and child—oldsters and babies alike—in the United States; that was what our people paid to fight that war, and that amount does not include the cost of the casualties.

Are we now to be so niggardly as to say, "You are asking too much when you ask for $1.25 for every man, woman and child in the United States, in the hope of keeping the United States out of a war"?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield to me, let me say that takes us back to the question I asked him. Does he believe that if we authorize the spending of the

$200 million, that will be the end of the program; or will it be only the beginning? If we authorize the spending of the $200 million, will it satisfy the needs of this great area; or will it be only the beginning of another huge foreign-aid program in a new area of the world?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is a matter for the Congress to determine entirely. Congress can shut off the program, if there is doubt about it. However, in view of the urgency which has been asserted time after time, I am willing to accept the program at face value, and I am willing to vote to commit the $200 million, and to vote to remove the restrictions, in the hope that in an area larger than the United States of America we probably can build an initial resistance on the part of some of these humble people, especially those in small countries, and thereby can diminish the chances of our being sucked into another conflict.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator from Illinois not know that in this very area the Egyptian Army made no defense whatever, but threw down its arms and apparently fled in terror before the Israeli Army?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know of nothing of the kind.

Mr. BUTLER. Well, that is what I read in the newspapers, which are the only source from which we can obtain information about that situation. Apparently the Egyptian Army made no defense whatever.

Have we any assurance that the people to whom it is proposed we give this money would do any differently?

Mr. DIRKSEN. How can we tell what they will do, unless we try? It is our hope to orient these people in the direction of the free, Western World. We are dealing with people. If they have nothing to depend on for that orientation, what do we do?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me say that I have voted for every foreign-aid bill that has come before the United States Senate since I have been a Member of it. I have heard it stated repeatedly on this floor that the money we are pouring into foreign countries is doing us good and is getting us allies and is helping us in many other ways. But I have not yet seen one ally who would stand with us in a time of peril. How can we keep on, indefinitely, year after year, pouring more of our money down the foreign-aid rathole? I think the people of the United States are becoming sick and tired of having their money poured abroad. I am frank to say that I have not yet made up my mind as to how I shall vote. I may vote against the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I hope the Senator from Maryland does.

Mr. BUTLER. But the people of Maryland are becoming very sick and tired of these year-after-year expenditures abroad of huge sums of money, with apparently no results.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is on the last point, of course—that there are no results—that our distinguished friend is wrong.

Mr. BUTLER. When are results to be expected?

Mr. DIRKSEN. After the police action in Korea, we escaped a war of such dimensions that it would suck us in. We have maintained a kind of peace, elusive as it is.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator say that is due to the pouring out of money rather than the military might of America? Does the Senator have any idea that Russia would not attack America tomorrow, irrespective of the billions we are spending, if she thought she could prevail?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I must remind my friend that the basic purpose of foreign aid and the basic purpose of mutual security was to build initial resistance on the part of those countries until they could be succored from their difficulties. In that respect the program has been conducive to the peace of the world.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator not know we gave those countries the means for their initial resistance? When the materiel which we furnished them wears out, they come and ask us for new and modern materiel. They do not build their own guns or spend their own money. Are the people of America to keep on spending billions and billions of dollars on those countries?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would the Senator prefer that we spend it directly for our Defense Establishment?

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator not think our so-called allies, when we give them the initial help, should thereafter maintain their strength and help themselves, rather than spend their own money in reduction of taxes for their own people and in other ways, and then ask us to replace the materiel we originally gave them?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There are two answers. The first is that we have built their initial resistance and kept the world at a rather peaceful level. I think that is a consummate accomplishment, not only on the part of the present administration, but on the part of those who have served with us. In that respect the aid has been directly helpful.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator not know that the reason the peace of the world has been maintained is that the United States has kept itself strong, not only militarily, but financially? The minute the ability of this country to produce is destroyed, and the minute taxes are made so onerous that a man who makes his living has no incentive to continue doing so, but would rather be in Florida, we are not going to have the capacity to manufacture the guns we are shipping to other countries.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Where does a man go for military advice and where does he go to get some idea as to the effectiveness of the program, unless he goes to General Twining, Admiral Radford, and our other military leaders? They are the ones upon whom we depend for military advice, just as a person requiring surgery depends on a surgeon.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have listened to the remarks of the Senator from Illinois, and he has replied to the points raised by the Senator from Maryland with great emphasis, but I should like to go a little further in answer to the Senator from Maryland. I point out to him that United States aid resulted in putting England and France back on their economic feet to such a degree that economic aid to them is now almost completely ended, if not completely ended. England and France have been our greatest friends and our greatest bulwark in NATO. True, they have had their own troubles, and have not behaved in everything as we would like them to have done; but they have been our true allies, and our economic and military aid have made that possible.

I agree with the Senator from Maryland that our military strength is a very forceful and dominant factor in keeping the peace of the world, but it is not the only factor. There is also the factor that many, many people are turning to us as friends. We want them to keep turning to us as friends. That is what the resolution attempts to do.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. With the greatest of pleasure.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator from Massachusetts referred to the fact that our great allies, England and France, are true allies. I do not recall the total sum of money involved, but, as I recall, we gave them something like $40 billion. How did they respond when they started war in the Suez Canal? By not consulting us. Does the Senator think that is the act of a true ally? That is playing hide and seek.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Every country has to act according to its own conception of what will lead to its own security and the peace of the world.

Mr. JENNER. If the Senator gave a friend of his $40 billion, does he not think he should be consulted before that friend started a war?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me answer the Senator's question. Those countries used their own best judgment. We may not agree with it. We wish they had talked to us, but I say to the Senator from Indiana, when we boil the question down to world conditions today, England, France, Belgium, and some of the other countries in that area are the countries who are with us and are the countries we have got to consider and keep as friends. If we do not, we shall be in an isolated situation that will lead us into trouble.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator has stated that our aid to England and France has stopped.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Economic aid.

Mr. JENNER. How about military aid?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is some military aid going to France at the present time. The Senator from Illinois

probably has the exact figure. I do not want to give a wrong figure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The Chair will have to insist that the usual procedure be followed. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator from Illinois yielded to me to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an additional question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Did the testimony before the joint committee not show that, in the opinion of our military and naval experts, there was no imminent danger of aggression in the area in which the administration would spend the money?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator desire an answer from me?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. I did not attend the hearings, but I understand and have gathered that to be the fact.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me give the Senator my answer. The first part of the answer is that arms were delivered to Egypt, through Czechoslovakia and the Skoda plant. The cotton crop of Egypt was virtually mortgaged. The mortgageholder is going to collect. Make no mistake about it. I think one of the most significant things the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] said was: "They have a note, and the noteholder will want to collect." Who holds the note? Obviously the Soviet Union, either for itself or one of the satellites, and in that inherent condition is the danger.

Mr. BUTLER. If that is the danger, then why should not we adopt that policy and make loans? Then we can be the noteholder and we can collect.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Under our constitutional system, how would we follow up? There are no inhibitions in the Soviet Union. They do not have to go through a 60-day debate before they take action. They can do as the leaders in the Kremlin please.

No. 2, the Senator should take a look at the shipping through the Sea of Marmara and the Dardanelles. There are two Soviet vessels a day going through those waters. They do not have to show their cargoes. There is no examination. They make no declarations. Those cargoes are going to the eastern Mediterranean. It is a fair guess much of the cargo is going to Syria. Does that spell out a danger or does it not?

Mr. BUTLER. Why did the military leaders not come before Congress and state they could see the imminence of aggression in that area?

Mr. DIRKSEN. One does not talk about aggression unless aggression has begun.

Mr. BUTLER. The military leaders are supposed to see it coming. That is what we are paying them for. What kind of military leader is he if he does not know aggression is coming before it hits?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If we could foresee events, we would have the rest of the world at our feet.

Mr. BUTLER. They certainly would not make the statement they made if they did not see such a threat of aggression.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We see it and our responsible leaders see it in the conditions existing at the present time. That is a second answer. Where do those cargoes go? How are they to be used? Obviously for some kind of offensive purpose when the time comes.

There is a third reason why I see a danger. Here is a little country which gained its independence in 1951. I am speaking about Jordan. Actually, it is a sort of invented country. The British are going to withdraw the subsidies they had put into it. The British leader of the Jordan legion has been dismissed. Where is the cohesive force to hold it together? But suppose it collapses. Who will move in? Can the Senator tell me? I cannot tell anyone. I only know that we have to set the stage for a dangerous situation and we are 5,000 miles away. If we are not prepared to meet the situation; what then?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Has Jordan expressed a desire for American aid?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know.

Mr. BUTLER. As I understand, Jordan has refused our aid. The very country the Senator has just mentioned has refused our aid.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sorry that I cannot speak specifically here, because of the classification rule, with respect to the countries in the Middle East which have not received military aid. But there have been a good many. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] sought to point out that because they would not accept our restrictions they would not accept any military aid. I have the record. It is a classified document. But they have been receiving nonmilitary aid for some time.

I am pointing out what I think are the inherent dangers. Certainly our leaders are fully aware of them. If one goes along the eastern Mediterranean coast he will see two of the finest refineries which the ingenuity of man can devise. One can fly over a pipeline from Tripoli all the way across to Iran, because it lies on top of the soil, and it makes an easy guide for an airplane. What a prize, when we think of the metric tons of oil that go through that pipeline year after year. What do Senators think the colossus of the north is interested in, if it is not interested in resources like oil, which is the stuff of peace and also the stuff of war?

Must we be so definitive about a danger and pinpoint it? The situation is inherently fraught with danger. There is an area larger by far than the United States, with only 93 million people, with much of this natural resource undeveloped. If that is not a dangerous area, I can conceive of no area in the world which qualifies under that definition.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an additional question? If he will yield to me once more, I shall not trouble him further.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator not believe that a firm declaration by the United States Government, the executive and legislative branches acting in unison, would have just as salutary an effect on Soviet aggression as would such a declaration coupled with economic aid?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator believe that the Soviet Union would not be deterred by a firm determination on the part of this Nation to act if Russia moved aggressively, unless we were to tie into such a declaration economic aid to the countries involved?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We must have strength and power in being to beget respect.

Mr. BUTLER. We have such strength and power in being; and any program we might undertake in that area certainly could not bear fruit within the foreseeable future without such strength.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When the aggressive forces move, I am sure it will be rather tragic if we must wait until the Senate gets through discussing whether or not, under given circumstances, we should use certain forces and certain aid, both military and economic, in order to set up an initial resistance.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. What does the Senator foresee in this area—another Korean type of war?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I hope not.

Mr. JENNER. If it is another Korean type of war, had we not better take stock of who is causing the trouble? Might it not be the wrong war, at the wrong place?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it not wisdom and prudence to try to prevent a fire before the structure is consumed? Is not that what we are trying to do?

Mr. JENNER. Let us assume that war might come. Is that the place for America to fight the war?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Can we be choosers?

Mr. JENNER. Who is causing the trouble?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator was in uniform and I was in uniform——

Mr. JENNER. Who is causing the trouble?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I remind my friend that back in 1914 a student shot an archduke. Very few people in this generation even remember his name, but the legions began to roll, and before we got through we were in it. Today we live in an integrated world.

Then came a Hitler, to annex a neighboring country. A British statesman went to Munich. He returned to London, climbed out of the plane, and said, "Peace, not only in our time, but for all time." Then he placed his umbrella in the corner. It was not there long before we were in it. There were 1,100,000 American casualties. We cannot rub out that fact. So the idea is to see if there is not some way to prevent such a catastrophe.

Mr. JENNER. If the Senator foresees in the Middle East another police war of the Korean type, what will it profit us to engage in it? We engaged in one such war in Korea. We did not dare attack

the enemy. We would not even allow our soldiers to win the war. We did not dare attack beyond the Yalu River. We did not dare attack the concentration of Communist power.

What are we going to do? Shall we allow those people to call upon our wealth and our blood whenever they pull the plug and light the signal? If we are called upon to face such a situation, had we not better do it honestly? Is not the trouble communism in Russia? Why fool around the fringes?

I hope there will not be another Korean type of war, because that proved nothing. As things stand today, even the armistice agreements are being violated, and this great country has not the moral courage to call the hand of the aggressors. Does the Senator suppose we shall have moral courage in the Middle East when we did not have moral courage in Korea? Let us not have another police action at the wrong place, and at the wrong time. If we are to face this situation, let us face the colossus which is causing trouble. Why should we be entertaining illusions with respect to Communist satellites? Are we trying to make a distinction between Russian communism on the one hand and international communism on the other?

Today the Communist Polish Government is asking for $100 million. We cannot spend $100 million in Poland and another $200 million in the Middle East to fight the very thing we are helping in Poland. Let us be consistent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to yield the floor. However, before doing so, let me say to my friend from Indiana that, in the face of all the ghosts in history rising up—ghosts of young men who did not come back—I will not let the question of expenditure of a fund of $200 million at the disposal of the Commander in Chief stand in the way of preventing war, or a police action in the Middle East, if there is some danger of it.

Mr. JENNER. I do not see how this resolution has anything to do with the situation, because, first, we shall not be masters of our destiny. The doctrine has been clearly defined that we are living in such a fast-moving age that it is not possible to consult Congress on this subject, although there is time to consult the United Nations.

In the United Nations there is the veto power. If we are to limit our action to that consonant with the action of the United Nations, remember that one veto would stop all the money we might spend in the Middle East and all the action we might anticipate there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the Senator has expressed some interest in the Russell amendment, and has intimated that he might support it.

What is the Russell amendment? It is an authority to use troops. That is all that is in it. It does not provide a dollar to build a military road; not a dollar over and above what is in the mutual-aid bill, to help some of the countries set up an initial resistance. There are half a dozen countries which receive no military assistance under the mutual-aid program. When we think of this huge area with only 93 million people, lush in resources——

Mr. JENNER. That is the Senator's definition, not mine.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Are we going to take a chance for the sake of $200 million?

I must evaluate history, and consider what the cost has been to us—how many youngsters left their holy blood on some foreign battlefield. I believe that $1.25 per capita, which is represented by the $200 million, might be pretty good insurance for the continuity of the peace and security of the world.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to what has been said about the situation in the Middle East.

In 1953 I visited there as a representative of the Refugee Subcommittee and the Immigration Subcommittee of the Senate. While there I studied a part of the background of the situation we are now discussing. I have heard a great deal of discussion about the wonderful, rich nations over there. Some of them are rich. Perhaps I should say that some of the rulers over there are rich, because they control all the income from the oil resources—the average citizen gets very little of it.

However, there are other nations which are desperately poor. Their people are in poverty. I had the opportunity to visit Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, Egypt, and Israel. All of those nations are badly in need of help. They are having a desperate time to maintain even a very low standard of living.

Therefore when we talk about money going to rich nations over there—or, as one Senator put it, about restoring the hanging gardens of ancient times in that area—we are not talking about those countries which are desperately in need and which are looking for a big brother to help them.

As the result of the partition of Palestine and even prior to the proclamation of the Israeli Republic, there was strife between the Arabs and the Israelis. After the announcement of the establishment of the Republic of Israel, our country recognized Israel.

From that time on the impression has been gained—whether right or wrong, I am not debating at this time—that the United States has been the Big Brother of Israel. That is the impression that has been gained in that area among the Arab countries. Those Arab nations—Egypt and others—have taken the view that if it had not been for our help, Israel would not have succeeded. Those countries live in fear of Israel. The Israeli Army has been kept strong and active and well led, and is also fairly well supplied with weapons. In the war following the announcement of the establishment of the Israeli Republic, its army disastrously defeated those Arab nations that had started a war against Israel.

Under those circumstances those nations have been looking for a champion. Those people feel that the United States has taken up the cudgels in behalf of Israel—has been its principal supporter. As a result, we have had a desperate time of it over there. That situation was not created by this administration or by Secretary of State Dulles. It existed before 1953. Since that time those nations have been looking for a champion who would be helpful to them, or who would offset our help to Israel. They do not believe that we have been neutral. I, of course, do believe that we have desperately tried to be neutral in that situation. They say all the evidence is against us. I talked to many government officials of the Arab nations during the time I visited there, and they have told me frankly that they do not believe the United States has been neutral in that area. Frankly, they were deeply offended by what they thought was our conduct.

When Russia comes along and offers to be friendly with them and offers to give them credits and sell them weapons and help them with the construction of the big dam, as in Egypt, those countries naturally are ready to welcome such offers. That is the state of mind we are faced with over there.

Now, for the first time, when the President of the United States has said to our allies of France and Great Britain, "You did not do right in going into Egypt in violation of the United Nations Charter and its basic principles, and that situation should have been settled by negotiations instead of by force," and has said to Israel, "You are also guilty of aggression," those countries begin to realize that we are perhaps trying to be fair. It also helped when we had the courage to say to our allies that they did wrong and that they must retire from the area they had seized.

Now, when we get into that position, where those nations are beginning to have some confidence in our neutrality, in our fairness—which I believe we have been trying to exercise all along, but about which we have had a hard time convincing those nations over there—is the time to convince them that we want to continue to help them, and that there is no necessity for them to seek aid elsewhere.

That background must be considered before we can really understand what is happening over there and why it is necessary to do all the things that are sought to be done by Senate Resolution 19.

I very much regret that the committees have reported a watered-down version of what the President had requested. I intend to discuss that subject at some length before a vote is had on the joint resolution.

I made a special study of the situation, and I believe I have a record which is consistent with respect to matters of this kind. I feel that the discussion this afternoon probably has brought to light some of the objections which I do not believe are well taken when all the facts are understood.

I hope that Members of the Senate will thoroughly study this matter and the situation that was portrayed by the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, in the hearings.

I have not always agreed with Secretary Dulles, and I have not supported him on all the things he has done. But for this one time I think he did a magnificent job before the committee, under

the physical limitations he must have been under, having only recently undergone a very serious surgical operation. Under those circumstances, I believe he did a very good job indeed. I was amazed at the way he handled himself before the committee. I want that to be known because I think there has been too much said against him undeservedly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in keeping with my record of cooperation with the leadership of the Senate, irrespective of which side of the aisle I sit on, I propose tonight to speak very briefly on one phase of the Middle East issue. This speech will be followed by a series of other speeches, continuing to the end of the Senate's consideration of this subject matter, as I feel that a record should be made on each one of the issues connected with this very unfortunate resolution the administration has seen fit to submit to Congress.

I was very much interested in the remarks of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. I wish to stress that my record is a record of supporting foreign aid to those countries which can show they need aid. Some of the countries in the Middle East to which the Senator from Utah has referred—Syria, Jordan, Egypt, and Israel—are countries for which a case for foreign aid can be made out, and I shall support it.

However, I wish to repeat, Mr. President, that I am not in favor of giving 1 cent to oil-rich Arab countries which have the basis for a mortgage to support a loan to them.

I believe that distinction needs to be drawn clearly in this debate. It is very interesting to see thrown together, under the catchall phrase of "foreign aid" all the countries of the Middle East, including Iraq, Iran, and Saudi Arabia, Arab countries which the Secretary of State himself admitted, under my examination, have oil reserves worth $98,400,000,000.

Senators are welcome to go home and tell their constituents their justification for voting aid, but I have no intention of voting aid to an Arab country that has rich oil reserves which can be used as collateral for a loan until such time as the King of Saudi Arabia can once again get his pipelines connected so oil can be sent to those places that buy it, and he can collect for himself the royalties which the record shows very clearly are used primarily to the advantage of the throne of Saudi Arabia and not to the advantage of the economically downtrodden people of Saudi Arabia.

I think the time has come, Mr. President, to start drawing some clear lines of distinction and differentiation between those nations which are putting their hands into Uncle Sam's pockets and taking out grants from the taxpayers' money.

As I shall mention later on in my manuscript, the friends of foreign aid in this body and in this administration had better realize that those of us who are trying to draw those lines of distinction and differentiation are true friends of a sound foreign-aid program.

Mr. President, I wish to address my remarks tonight primarily to the subject, The Constitutional Issue Over the Power To Declare War Remains Unsolved in the Middle East Resolution.

I have sent this speech to the gallery earlier today, and feel an obligation to deliver it tonight in fairness to the press and in fairness to my colleagues, for I wish to make it a matter of reference, because it raises issues that I challenge the proponents of the resolution to answer before the debate is over. I believe the American people are entitled to the answers, because more and more of them are becoming more and more concerned about the constitutional issues involved in this resolution.

One of the reasons why I refused to give consent to any request to close the debate on the issues at this time was that they afforded a clear example of how important it was to discuss the joint resolution on the floor of the Senate for the time necessary to awaken the American people to the facts involved. As more and more American people become aware of the dangerous implications of the so-called Eisenhower doctrine, they will make clear their repudiation of it and will urge that the Senate of the United States reject the doctrine.

There is little doubt that the resolution as presented to the Congress by the President proposed an unconstitutional delegation of the power to declare war.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution expressly empowers the Congress to declare war and there is no question that this power is exclusive with the Congress. Many Members of the Senate and House challenged the constitutionality of that provision of the original resolution which purported to authorize the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States. During the debate on the resolution in the House several Members expressed their strong opposition to the resolution on this ground, among others.

Such distinguished constitutional authorities as the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] presented challenging and conclusive arguments to this attempted usurpation of the exclusive power of the Congress, in speeches already delivered in the Senate.

I was among the first to discuss the constitutional objection to the resolution. So, on January 25—more than a month ago—I said on the Senate floor:

> I turn to my fifth and last point. It is a constitutional question. The Secretary of State, under examination, admitted that the Congress cannot delegate the power to declare war. But he is a very interesting witness. After making that admission, then, typical of his testimony, he seeks to divert attention away from that admission by saying, "Wars are not declared any more, after all. A state of war is upon us, and what we do is recognize that a state of war exists."
>
> How important that is in our constitutional system, because it is at that point, Mr. President, that the Constitutional Fathers guaranteed to the American people a check upon the President of the United States. The remark might be made, "Oh, Mr. Senator, you speak hypothetically, speculatively. It must be assumed that when the situation of an attack exists, a declaration of war is going to follow." I think so, too, Mr. President. Yet it is of vital importance that the Congress exercise that check, because it is conceivable that something might happen to these democratic processes of ours in the decades ahead whereby, some time in the future, we might have a President against whom that check should be exercised. But here, Mr. President, as I said in the hearings and as I said at the time of the discussion of the Formosa Resolution—the President is asking for predated action by the Congress of the United States. He is asking for approval in advance. He is asking for a blank check, knowing that if he gets it, whatever decision he renders, Congress will consider itself estopped from imposing a check. I think that is constitutionally dangerous.
>
> I am talking here about a constitutional abstraction of vital importance to the welfare of the American people in terms of constitutional history. I am raising my voice today, as I will in the weeks ahead, forewarning the American people that these precious checks of the Constitution should not be given up for a Dwight Eisenhower or any other President of the United States at any time.

These were the views which I expressed on this floor on January 25 of this year.

This basic objection was widely discussed by editorial writers and columnists. Those of us who expressed these grave reservations emphasized that any impairment of the exclusive power of the Congress to declare war would be a sacrifice of a great constitutional protection given by our basic charter to the people of the country.

The strict limitation of the Executive in relation to the war power was very much in the minds of the drafters of the Constitution. So, for example, in No. 69 of the Federalist papers Hamilton wrote:

> Secondly, the President is to be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. In this respect his authority would be nominally the same with that of the King of Great Britain, but in substance much inferior to it. It would amount to nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces, as first general and admiral of the Confederacy; while that of the British king extends to the declaring of war and to the raising and regulating of fleets and armies, all of which, by the Constitution under consideration, would appertain to the legislature.

We ought to learn from history, Mr. President. What I have just read into the RECORD makes perfectly clear Hamilton's view, which was typical of the views held by the other constitutional fathers, who were very careful to place a check on any warmaking power of any President of the United States. Yet, in 1957, the President of the United States is willing to send to the Congress of the United States a resolution which beclouds, to say the least, this great constitutional check. It is an exceptionally dangerous precedent he is asking for. I shall never vote to give it to him, because I believe it violates the spirit and the intent of the Constitution itself. I think all one needs to do is to cite the Hamilton quotation in support of the thesis for which I am contending.

Mr. President, applying the Hamilton force and logic against the original language of the resolution in regard to the use of the Armed Forces had its effect, and the Senate committees attempted—I submit unsuccessfully—to remove the objection that some of us raised.

So, for example, the committee report states:

The joint committee gave extensive and serious consideration to the question of the use of American armed forces to repel Communist aggression in the Middle East. Various views were strongly held and vigorously expressed as to the constitutional powers of the President and of Congress in this respect and as to the proper constitutional procedure to be followed.

After exhaustive consideration of the principles and concepts, involved by a vote of 15-13, the joint committee agreed to the following language:

"Furthermore, the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism: Provided, That such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations."

This language has the virtue of remaining silent on the question of the relationship between the Congress and the President with respect to the use of the Armed Forces for the objective stated in the resolution.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT DOES NOT CURE CONSTITUTIONAL DEFECT

But, Mr. President, this is a dubious virtue indeed. Congress is considering a precedent-shattering resolution which is out of all proportion to the actual gravity of the situation. It may well be that the precedent will be of greater importance than any action which may be taken under the resolution. Is it then a virtue that the resolution, as amended, is supposedly "silent on the question of the relationship between the Congress and the President with respect to the use of the Armed Forces"? To the contrary, where the basic fabric of the Government and the integrity of the checks and balance system are at issue, nothing less than gemlike clarity will suffice.

But let us see whether the resolution as amended is actually as silent as is claimed by the majority of the committees in the report. I submit to the Senate that the new language is far from silent, although the words muffle and obscure what is to be done.

In the language I have just quoted for which a majority of the committee claims magical silence, it is expressly provided that under certain circumstances the United States is prepared to use armed forces. Does any proponent of the amended resolution have the temerity to claim that such use of the Armed Forces would be less than an act of war? That question will echo through this Chamber and across the country until it receives a forthright answer from the proponents of the resolution, an answer to the people are entitled to have. I solemnly warn the Senate tonight that such use of the Armed Forces, absent an overt attack upon the territory, property, or citizens of the United States, would be an act of war committed by the United States.

How then would this act of war come about? On this point the amended resolution is unfortunately clear. It expressly provides that the act of war would be undertaken "if the President determines the necessity thereof." Under this language Congress would yield all of its power to the President to determine the use of our Armed Forces.

The original constitutional objection to the delegation of Congress' power to declare war has not been removed one whit from the resolution. It is there and is not obscured by any magical silence on the part of the majority of the committees. It cannot be made to disappear because the majority of the joint committee claims it is no longer there. Their saying it is no longer there does not make it so. If this resolution is given the force of law by the approval of the Congress, the delegation of the war power will remain as a precedent to haunt future generations of Americans.

To those who would dispute this analysis of the language I submit that the only alternative is that the language of the resolution on the United States Armed Forces is meaningless insofar as any mention of the President is concerned. If the language relating to the President were stricken, the resolution would read:

The United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism.

Obviously this would leave the decision on the use of United States Armed Forces entirely within the power of any nation that requested armed aid against an aggressor controlled by communism.

This reductio ad absurdum demonstrates that the sole power to decide upon the use of armed forces of the United States—that is, to decide upon an act of war—is granted by the resolution to the President of the United States.

While I voted for this amendment in committee in the hope that it would be some improvement, later analysis convinces me that the substitute language helps not at all.

My distinguished colleague, Representative EDITH GREEN, of Oregon, was among those who posed some of the constitutional questions raised by the so-called Eisenhower doctrine. She voted against it after a discussion of the issues which was clear, precise, persuasive, and forceful. I know of no better distillation of the unanswerable reasons for voting against the resolution than that presented by EDITH GREEN on the floor of the House of Representatives.

THE ISSUE OF ECONOMIC AID

A few comments on the economic aid provisions of the resolution are in order at this time, although I may have more to say on the subject later in the debate.

Since World War II, the United States has demonstrated a generosity and foresight that marked a new phase in international relations. To paraphrase Lincoln, we gave of our substance to bind the world's wounds. Our economic aid program to war-ravaged European nations was both noble and wise. It was not only humanitarian, but was sound policy in the interest of resuscitating democratic nations.

We recognized on the international scene a proposition that is basic to America's own domestic philosophy, namely, that political democracy cannot long endure where economic democracy is absent. Totalitarianism, both Communist and Fascist, breeds where human beings lack adequate food and the decencies which modern industry and farming can provide.

President Truman advanced this concept with his historic point 4 proposal in the 1949 inaugural address.

We have a moral obligation to assist less fortunate peoples to achieve higher standards of living by providing technical assistance through the U. N. and bilaterial arrangements. This enables underdeveloped nations to put their energy and aspirations to work with the modern tools that are available.

I yield to not a single Member of Congress in my support of economic and technical aid programs. But I warn those who support aid and fear for its future—as I do—that we do not help the aid principle by supporting indiscriminate aid, blank-check aid, bad aid. Such programs can only discredit the aid principle.

THE RESOLUTION WILL HARM THE AID PROGRAM

Regrettably, the resolution is deficient on every count. There is no program for its use. If there is, it is being withheld from Congress and the public. The resolution asks for a blank check with the expectation, however, that it will be used to make contributions to the dictators in the Arab States with fabulous incomes from oil royalties.

Mr. President, I desire to say at this point that I am greatly concerned about the ugly fact that the principal spokesman for the administration, the Secretary of State himself, has refused, up to this hour, to give to the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and on armed services one single specific as to how he proposes to spend one single dollar of the $200 million for which the administration asks blanket authority to spend in accordance with the arbitrary discretion of the President. That is why I think it is justified that the question should be asked of the Secretary of State, as I asked it in committee, "Mr. Secretary, do you think the Arab leaders will stay bought?"

I raised the question with all the ugly implications inherent in it because I thought the American people were entitled to know how much, if any, of the $200 million was to be used, to speak very frankly, to buy the support of the Arab leaders. No matter how polite the language in which it may be phrased, no matter what one may call it, I believe it would be most unfortunate in the name of diplomacy to use $1 of American taxpayer money to be channeled into the pockets of an Arab dictator in return for some secret promises concerning which members of the Foreign Relations Committee, at least, cannot be advised.

Mr. President, it is not very pleasant to say some things, but, in my judgment, there are involved some implications of most serious import. I think the time has come to return to the great tenet and saying of Woodrow Wilson. If there is

any place in the world where it is important to the welfare of the American people that our Government be required to apply the principle of open covenants openly arrived at, it is in dealing with Arab leaders. Before I vote for one red cent to go to the Middle East, I wish to know what understanding there is—if any—between the President of the United States and the Secretary of State as to the use of these funds.

Oh Mr. President, I know that in the committee the question was asked, "Do you not have confidence in the President?" I wish to say that is a non sequitur. Whether I do or do not have confidence in the President—and I do not have much—but whether I do or do not is irrelevant to the issue before us. In this case we are dealing with a great constitutional question, on the one hand, and a great policy question as to economic aid, on the other. As a constitutional liberal, I shall not vote to give a discretionary power to the President, so that he can commit an act of war without the approval of Congress. The operative facts of the given incident should be brought before the Congress, and then it should decide whether to give its approval.

I give the President of the United States the warning of Hamilton himself. I am not going to vote to have a single dollar of economic aid go to a single Arab country until I know the purpose for which the money will be spent. In my judgment, we are about to endanger the whole economic-aid program, if we take the position that we must go along with a blanket-aid program, not knowing, as the elected representatives of a free people, what their money is to be spent for. That violates the very basic concept of the checks and balances provided in the Constitution of the United States.

As I pointed out in reference to what the Senator from Utah said, I am in favor of aid to Egypt and Jordan and Syria and Israel; I am in favor of the making of grants there. But they should be open; they should be aboveboard; we should know about them; we should be in a position to approve them. I am not in favor of the giving of aid, by way of grants, to Arab countries that can borrow by using their $93,400,000,000 of oil reserves as collateral.

Mr. President, if we do not start drawing these lines of distinction in connection with this aid program, then I fear that some of us who now for years—ever since the great point 4 program of President Truman, in 1949—have stood up against growing opposition in the Senate, and have fought for a sound point 4 aid program, are likely to find ourselves, some day, on the losing side in the Senate, as to an entire foreign-aid program. One of the reasons why I shall oppose the pending joint resolution is that it does not draw the lines of discrimination and differentiation between and among aid programs.

Speaking on that issue, Mr. President, is it aid in the tradition of the Marshall plan or the point 4 program, to help finance King Saud's Arabian Nights economy? No, Mr. President; I suggest that it is not. If the administration could come before the Congress and could outline a program of advancing the economies of these Arab countries, to advance them from the medievalism, disease, and hunger which now characterize so many of the lands covered by the joint resolution, then a convincing argument could be made in favor of the aid provisions of the pending joint resolution. But we do not have such a plan. To the contrary, we are presented by Dwight D. Eisenhower with a request for a blank check, with an amount filled in until June 30, 1957, and to be spent at his discretion.

As the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has said both in committee and on the floor of the Senate, let us make no mistake that the $200 million of this blank check is but the beginning. It will end in several billions of dollars, if we establish this precedent without the imposition of the check for which I have been pleading throughout the days of this debate.

Can we suppose that once the Arab States which will receive the aid come to depend upon it, the program will stop there? Some persons may indulge themselves in such self-delusion, but I cannot bring myself to it. On the contrary, I completely agree with the Senator from Arkansas, when he forewarned us that that will be but the beginning of much larger sums to be given by way of blank-check authority to the President. This $200 million blank check is only the first step, I predict.

Mr. President, in closing, let me say that Congress should not have been asked for such an inexact, open-end authorization. However, the request has been made, and the only reasonable answer for friends of the aid principle, as well as for other Members of the Senate, is a resounding "No," until such time as the President, through his Secretary of State, is willing to lay before the appropriate committees of the Congress a bill of particulars as to the proposals for spending the money.

I wish to see a statement of the economic benefits which it is proposed to develop from the expenditure of the money. I feel that I owe it to the people of my State to make certain that not 1 cent of the money will go into the pockets of an Arab leader, for his personal advantage. I feel that I owe it to the people of my State to make certain that any money that is voted under this joint resolution will go to the benefit of the people of the Arab countries, because—as I have been heard to say before—I recognize that most of the Arab countries are not free nations, in the sense in which I use the term "freedom," for when I speak of freedom, I speak of the dignity of the individual and of the right of the individual to personal liberty and of a constitutional system containing the precious Bill of Rights which we know as the basis and foundation of American freedom.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think the time has come when, before the fact—not after the fact, we should get from the Arab leaders specific commitments, open commitments, as to what they propose to do with any economic aid which may be granted under the provisions of this joint resolution or under any other economic-aid measure.

Mr. President, on other days, as this debate proceeds, I shall take up other issues which I believe to be of vital importance, and which must be answered by the proponents of the pending joint resolution before this debate closes.

## NOTICE OF MEETING OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, of the Committee on the Judiciary, investigating the oil industry will meet tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock in room 457, Senate Office Building.

If the Senate meets earlier tomorrow, the subcommittee hearing may run over the time for meeting. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee may meet during the morning session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A. M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). In accordance with the order previously entered, the Senate now stands adjourned until tomorrow, at 11 o'clock a. m.

Thereupon (at 7 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.), the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, February 28, 1957, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 27, 1957:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, of New Hampshire, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

W. Wilson White, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice J. Lee Rankin, elevated.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

*To be first lieutenants*

Acers, William F., O70578.
Adams, Kenneth N., O71058.
Adams, Robert L., O70579.
Aguanno, Edwin M., O70580.
Aitken, Milton L., Jr., O70581.
Alameda, Donald J., O70582.
Albro, Ames S., Jr., O70583.
Allan, William L., O70584.
Allen, Raymond F., Jr., O70585.
Allison, James K., O70586.
Almon, William J., O70587.
Altland, Robert W., O71059.
Anderson, Andrew H., O73283.
Anderson, Cecil M., O71436.
Anderson, Darrell R., O70588.
Anderson, James H., O71060.
Anderson, Jerome H., O70589.
Anderson, Richard V., O71754.
Anderson, Warren H., O70161.

Andreas, Charles R., 3d, O70590.
Anklam, Frederick M., O70591.
Ansted, Genoa W., O71311.
Anthis, Robert F., O70592.
Archer, William T., O70593.
Archibald, Robert J., Jr., O71438.
Ashby, Peter B., O71061.
Attaya, Freddie A. D., O70594.
Aubry, Robert F., O71312.
Austin, Clinton W., O71639.
Avery, Cyrus S., 2d, O70595.
Ayers, Lawrence F., Jr., O71137.
Azzolin, Robert A., O71138.
Bacon, Willis G., O70596.
Badger, Robert W., O70597.
Bahin, Louis J., Jr., O70598.
Bailey, Kenneth R., O70599.
Bailey, William R., O71064.
Baker, Frank H., O71440.
Baldwin, Jessie E., O74629.
Baldwin, William R., O70600.
Ballantyne, John L., 3d, O70601.
Bard, John C., O70602.
Barnes, Harold F., O70603.
Barnes, Wilson C., O70604.
Barnitt, George W., Jr., O71139.
Barrand, Kerwood W., O70605.
Bartlit, Fred H., Jr., O70606.
Bartos, Robert E., O71140.
Baughman, Richard C., O70608.
Baum, Richard A., O71066.
Beaumont, Charles D., O70610.
Beck, Earl K., O71067.
Bedell, Norman H., O70611.
Beil, Glenn N., O71141.
Belcher, Eugene R., O71759.
Bell, James F., O71142.
Belville, Owen E., Jr., O70612.
Bender, Rogers A., O71143.
Benfer, Richard H., O70613.
Benn, Clark H., O70614.
Bennett, George C., Jr., O70615.
Bennett, John C., O70616.
Bennett, Joseph D., O71760.
Benson, Joseph E., O71315.
Beringer, Jack M., O70618.
Bernard, Paul H., O71643.
Berney, Robert E., O71144.
Bethke, Robert L., O71762.
Beyer, Robert J., O71145.
Bickston, Walter J., O71316.
Bidwell, Bruce W., O70619.
Bierlein, Leland E., O70620.
Blaisdell, Robert J., O70621.
Blasingame, Josiah, Jr., O71646.
Blazzard, Trevelyn G., O74640.
Boaz, Charles A., O71317.
Boden, William C., O71068.
Boe, Richard I., O70622.
Bonner, Laurence B., O70623.
Booras, Danny, O71150.
Boose, Gordon D., O70624.
Bossert, Paul W., O71318.
Bowling, Frederick B., O70625.
Boyd, Bobby K., O71448.
Boyd, Sidney H., O71151.
Boyle, Richard M., O70626.
Boynton, Marshall E., O71319.
Bradbury, Donald K., O70627.
Bradel, James F., O70628.
Bradley, Gregory A., O71648.
Bradley, William C., O71069.
Brainard, Alfred P., O71153.
Bramblet, William B., O71451.
Brant, Kenneth E., O70629.
Breeding, Gene L., O70630.
Breedlove, Smedley D., O71764.
Brennand, James L., O70284.
Breslauer, Benjamin F., Jr., O70631.
Brickwell, Wilbur D., O70632.
Brizee, Harry A., O71154.
Brodt, James H., O70634.
Broumas, Andre G., O70635.
Brown, Charles S., O70636.
Brown, Dallas C., Jr., O71156.
Brown, Dwight K., O71157.
Brown, John W., O71321.
Brown, Sam A., O73437.
Brown, Thomas C., Jr., O70637.
Browne, Roger J., 2d, O70638.
Brummit, Philip A., O71070.
Bruns, Bernard W., O73296.
Buchanan, Gerald H., O71071.
Buckheit, Wilbur C., O70639.
Buckley, Fletcher J., O70640.
Bullock, Robert L., Jr., O70641.
Bunevich, Peter C., O70642.
Burbach, Frederick J. L., O73300.
Burn, Joseph P., O71072.
Burnett, John C., O71073.
Burnett, Sheldon J., O70643.
Burns, William F., O71074.
Burris, James C., O70644.
Burton, James, O71159.
Butler, Henry W., O70645.
Button, Ronald E., Jr., O70646.
Byrd, Roger D., O73226.
Calhoun, George B., O70648.
Callaway, Luke L., Jr., O70649.
Campbell, Donald R., O71323.
Campbell, George E., Jr., O71324.
Canja, Safron S., O71325.
Cantrell, Jack R., O71160.
Carlson, Charles W., O70650.
Carmichael, Horace H., O73301.
Carnahan, John W., Jr., O70651.
Carney Zach T., O71161.
Carr, Robert F., O71652.
Carroll, Charles W., O70652.
Carroll, Henry S., 3d, O70653.
Carroll, James L., O70654.
Cate, Hugh C., Jr., O71326.
Caudill, James M., Jr., O71162.
Caylor, Oscar C., O71163.
Cecil, William I., O71164.
Chacon, Jose L., O70655.
Chambers, Andrew P., O71458.
Chambers, John A., O71327.
Chancellor, George W., O70657.
Chandler, Edwin W., O71328.
Chandler, James D., O70658.
Chant, Robert J., O71165.
Chapman, James L., 3d, O70659.
Chenevert, Ronnie L., O71329.
Chesbro, John S., O70660.
Ching, Edmund K. S., O71653.
Chitwood, Thomas E., Jr., O71166.
Christensen, John E., O71461.
Christensen, Walton J., O70661.
Cicchinelli, Robert D., O70662.
Clair, Melvin W., O71167.
Clark, Robert H., O71655.
Clarke, Robert S., Jr., O70663.
Coggins, James E., O71330.
Collins, Harold E., O71464.
Colpini, Frank P., O70665.
Combs, Oliver B., Jr., O70666.
Cone, Eugene B., O71331.
Congleton, Roy E., O71656.
Cookesy, Jesse L., O71332.
Cooper, James C., 3d, O70667.
Cooper, Joe L., O71468.
Corning, Terence C., O71076.
Coron, Ira, O70668.
Cory, Billy J., O70669.
Cose, LeRoy E., O71660.
Cottle, Robert E., O70670.
Crabtree, Sidney J., O71774.
Craig, John V., O70671.
Craig, Michael F., O71471.
Creath, Marion G., Jr., O70672.
Creel, Tilford C., O71473.
Cronin, Daniel W., O71333.
Crosby, John S., O71662.
Croswhite, James L., O71334.
Crowell, Howard G., Jr., O71168.
Curtis, Jerry J., O70674.
Cutolo, Edward P., O70675.
Dahl, Eldon T., Jr., O70677.
Danford, Marvin D., O70678.
Daniel, John S., Jr., O71335.
Daniel, Robert N., O71336.
Darling, Sterling P. A., O70679.
Dart, Frederick R., O71169.
Daura, John, Jr., O70676.
Davis, Bobby J., O71476.
Davis, Henry G., O71078.
Davis, Roger K., O71337.
Davis, Vernon K., O71478.
Dean, Bobby J., O71338.
Debellius, Charles A., O70681.
Decker, Robert J., O71170.
Delamain, Frederic J., O70682.
Dennis, Jackson D., O70683.
DesChamps, Thomas F., O71079.
De Simone, Thomas E., O70680.
Dickey, Robert R., O71481.
Diller, Richard W., O70684.
Dillon, James W., O71080.
Dimick, David L., O70685.
Dockler, Gordon S., O71171.
Domenicucci, Louis, O71172.
Donnelly, Eugene M., O70686.
Douglass, Elmo T., O71482.
Dowdell, Joseph O., O71483.
Downen, Robert B., O70687.
Drake, Michael D., O70688.
Driscoll, Paul C., O70689.
Drisko, Shapleigh M., O70690.
Drugge, Henning E., O70691.
Dubovick, Richard R., O72703.
Dulin, Ralph W., O71494.
Dunkelberger, William F., O71342.
Dunn, Robert F., O71081.
Durbin, James J., O71785.
Dyer, Alexander T., Jr., O70692.
Eberhart, Loren M., O70693.
Eberle, John S., O71486.
Eckhardt, John G., O70694.
Edwards, Julian B., Jr., O70695.
Egelston, Robert B., O70696.
Eisenberg, Herman S., O71174.
Eitel, John C., O70697.
Ellis, Alvin C., O71175.
Ellis, Robert J., O70698.
Ellison, Henry L., O71176.
Elton, Robert M., O70699.
Eng, Charles, O71178.
Epling, William Y., O70700.
Erickson, Paul G., O70701.
Eudy, Jay L., O71344.
Evans, Bobby G., O71489.
Evans, Earle R., O70702.
Fair, Cecil G., Jr., O72864.
Farmer, Richard A., O70703.
Farr, Robert A., O71179.
Farrar, John H., Jr., O70704.
Farris, John T., O71180.
Feore, Patrick L., Jr., O71082.
Fernandes, Vincent R., O71491.
Fetzer, Homer D., O71345.
Ficks, Filmore L., O74003.
Fischer, Daniel J., O71083.
Fisher, Edward J., 3d, O71084.
FitzPatrick, William F., O71085.
Flaherty, Thomas D., Jr., O70705.
Flanigan, Clifford T., O70706.
Flournoy, Walter T., O71163.
Focht, Charles W., O71493.
Foley, William R., O72332.
Forman, Robert C., O70707.
Fossett, John J., O71086.
Foster, Donald G., O71920.
Fraher, James D., O71087.
Francis, John K., O71184.
Freeman, Edward V., Jr., O70708.
Fry, Dudley L., Jr., O71187.
Fuller, Bernard E., O73448.
Fuller, Leonard H., Jr., O70709.
Fulp, Charles A., O71669.
Fust, John W., Jr., O71189.
Gabbert, Howard M., 2d, O70710.
Gager, William A., Jr., O70712.
Galloway, Frederick M., O70713.
Galvin, John R., O70714.
Ganahl, Joseph, Jr., O70715.
Garcia, Santiago A., O71088.
Garneau, Paul R., O70716.
Gaston, Donald E., O70717.
Geasland, Floyd E., O71348.
Geiger, Donald T., O70719.
Gerda, Joseph J., O70720.
Gerich, Robert A., O71349.
Gerkey, George E., 3d, O71497.
Gheen, John W., Jr., O70721.
Gibson, James F., O70722.
Gilbert, Wendell H., O70723.
Gilboux, John W., O70724.
Gilbreth, Lee E., O70725.
Giles, George R., O71089.
Gillard, Robert W., O71191.
Ginn, Charles J., O71498.
Ginn, Louis H., 3d, O70726.
Goebel, James R., O71499.
Gomez, Robert M., O70727.
Goodwin, Robert E., O70728.

Gordon, James C., Jr., O71671.
Gosney, Durward D., O71192.
Goss, Ephriam M., O72716.
Gould, Jay W., 3d, O70729.
Grace, William P., 3d, O70730.
Graf, John A., Jr., O71193.
Grant, Wendell F., O70731.
Graves, James R., O71195.
Green, Charles F., O71196.
Greenberg, William M., O71503.
Greene, Henry E., Jr., O71198.
Greer, Harold R., O70732.
Greer, Jeptha V., Jr., O71199.
Gregory, Draper B., O70733.
Grider, Roy C., O71200.
Grifenhagen, Richard A., O70734.
Griffin, Richard W., O70735.
Grinder, Richard H., Jr., O70736.
Gritton, Elliott W., O70737.
Gross, Louis, O70738.
Gross, Robert H., O70739.
Grove, Glenn M., O71672.
Grubbs, Brandt F., O70740.
Gruene, Ernest K., Jr., O71351.
Grummt, Otto C., O71201.
Guettler, Gerald C., O71352.
Gunter, Arlie L., O71353.
Guy, George S., Jr., O70741.
Haas, Virl E., O70742.
Hall, David R., O71354.
Hall, Sayward N., Jr., O70743.
Halliday, Samuel L., O70744.
Halvatgis, James N., O70745.
Ham, Lewis H., Jr., O70746.
Hamel, Robert L., O71203.
Hamlett, Ellis H., O71091.
Hammel, Robert L., O71796.
Hampton, Wade, O70747.
Hannon, Clarence W., O70748.
Hanson, Charles B., O70749.
Hardy, Herbert F., Jr., O71092.
Harmon, Leonard J., 2d, O71506.
Harper, William B., O70751.
Harrington, Robert E., O71355.
Harris, David F., O70752.
Hart, Edward P., O70753.
Hart, Franklin A., O70754.
Harvey, Robert J., O70755.
Haskell, William N., O70756.
Hauck, Richard E., O71093.
Hauser, William L., O70757.
Hawkins, Lawrence R., Jr., O71357.
Haws, Elbert D., O73343.
Hays, James E., O70758.
Hayward, Arnold C., O71204.
Healy, Thomas F., Jr., O70759.
Hee, Howard Y. K., O71205.
Hendon, William A., O71358.
Henry, James R., O70760.
Herndon, George W., O71510.
Herrmann, Klaus J., O71511.
Hertzberg, Hugo H., Jr., O71359.
Hess, Donald L., O71512.
Heverly, Clifford C., O72374.
Hicks, Conrad O., O71360.
Hicks, Franklin D., O70761.
Hill, Elbert B., O71361.
Hill, Michael E., O71515.
Hilsman, William J., O70763.
Hilt, George H., O70764.
Himmel, Daniel L., O72732.
Hincke, John I., Jr., O70765.
Hines, Jere D., O71363.
Hines, Thomas G., O71516.
Hobbs, Leo P., O70766.
Hobbs, Richard W., O70767.
Hobson, Charles, O71364.
Hoffmann, Joseph H., O71680.
Hogue, Gale W., O71365.
Holland, Evan F., O71520.
Holmes, Alan K., O71366.
Holt, Xavia M., Jr., O71367.
Holtam, David N., O70768.
Honholt, Bradley J., O70769.
Honor, Edward, O71368.
Horlitz, Alfred E., O71522.
Hornsby, Jesse S., O71208.
Howden, Charles I., Jr., O71209.
Hoy, Richard P., O70770.
Hudachek, John W., O70771.
Hugo, Victor J., Jr., O70772.
Hunt, Robert L., O70773.
Hunter, Kelvin H., Jr., O71523.
Ianni, Francis A., O70774.
Ironside, Robert A., Jr., O70775.
Jacobitz, John P., Jr., O71814.
Janairo, Maximiano R., Jr., O70776.
Jauch, Raymond M., Jr., O71372.
Jenkins, Paul R., Jr., O70777.
Jenne, Dale E., O70778.
Jennings, Robert H., Jr., O71373.
Jessee, William T., O70779.
Jobert, A. Philip R., O72910.
Johnson, Dion, O70780.
Johnson, James R. L., O70781.
Johnson, Moses G. H., O71528.
Johnson, Peter W., O70782.
Johnson, Richard T., O72740.
Johnston, Johnny J., O73349.
Jones, Daryl D., O70783.
Jones, Marvin C., Jr., O70784.
Jones, Peter G., O70785.
Jones, Robert A., O71211.
Jongebloed, Nicholas H., O74740.
Jordan, Donald R., O73351.
Judd, Edward O., O70786.
Kampschror, Darrell B., O71818.
Kastner, Joseph H., O71685.
Kavanaugh, Richard D., O70788.
Keener, Robert E., O70789.
Keiser, Edwin C., O70790.
Keller, Donald F., O71374.
Kelley, Paul B., O71531.
Kennedy, Donald R., O71213.
Kersh, Fred, Jr., O70791.
Kincaid, Jack D., O70792.
King, Charles R., O71215.
Kirby, James W., O71535.
Kirby, William D., Jr., O70793.
Kirklighter, Donald R., O70794.
Kirschner, Lester S., O70795.
Klein, William E., O70796.
Kleis, C. Frederick, O71688.
Klingberg, John H., O70797.
Knight, Bobby M., O71216.
Knoff, Edward M., Jr., O70799.
Kohler, Glenn, O71096.
Kortum, Marvin R., O70800.
Kortz, Leon L., O70801.
Koskella, John A., A70802.
Koun, John N., O70803.
Kourakos, George S., O70804.
Kowalczyk, Chester A., O71690.
Kramer, John K., O71376.
Kramer, Kenneth R., O70805.
Kraujalis, Robert P., O70806.
Kriegh, James A., O70807.
Labourdette, Albert H., Jr., O71540.
Lachance, Martin P., O70809.
Lacour, George A., O70810.
La Grone, Clyde W., O70808.
Lamb, David O., O71379.
Lamb, Luke F., O71692.
Larcade, Herbert C., Jr., O71380.
Lasher, Sebastian A., O70811.
Laverty, Wayne B., O71381.
Lawrence, Billy G., O71218.
Leach, Robert A., O71546.
Lecroy, Richard J., O70812.
Lee, Ronald B., O70814.
Leiser, Maurice H., O70815.
Leisy, Henry J., O71382.
Lemanski, Ronald J., O70816.
Le Mere, John R., O70813.
Leone, Peter N., 2d, O70817.
Levensky, Emil E., O70818.
Ley, Robert E., O70819.
Lieber, Albert C., Jr., O70820.
Lindsey, Fred S., O70821.
Linger, Albert F., O71219.
Littlefield, Richard E., O70822.
Lochner, Jack A., O70823.
Lodge, Gerald A., O70824.
Logan, Jack R., O70825.
Lohman, John H., O70826.
Lokie, Andrew P., O72341.
Long, James L., O73367.
Longanacre, Louis E., O71547.
Longhofer, Melvin L., O71548.
Lopes, John F., Jr., O71220.
Lucas, Andre C., O70827.
Luce, Charles M., Jr., O70828.
Lundberg, Leonard V., Jr., O70829.
Lybert, Elmer J., O71551.
Lykens, Robert L., O70830.
Lykke, Arthur F., Jr., O70831.
Macklin, Joseph D., O70832.
Maloney, Andrew J., Jr., O70833.
Maloney, James P., O71386.
Mann, William M., Jr., O72757.
Manus, Peter C., Jr., O70834.
Marcrum, Robert H., O70835.
Marcus, John E., O70836.
Marcy, Edwin J., Jr., O72928.
Marshall, Raymond E., O71554.
Martin, David C., O73568.
Martin, Jesse H., 3d, O70837.
Martin, Walter J., O70838.
Marvin, Ernest A., Jr., O70839.
Massaro, Joseph M., O70840.
Masuck, Joseph, O70841.
Matsumoto, Glenn K., O70842.
Matthews, James E., O71834.
Matthews, Lloyd J., O70843.
Matthias, Judson S., O70844.
Matthias, Norman A., Jr., O70845.
Mattmuller, Norman A., O70846.
Mauerhan, Karl E., O71387.
Maurer, William W., O73968.
Mawhinney, Perin, O70847.
Maxson, Robert H., Jr., O71097.
Mayberry, Thomas S., O70848.
McCarthy, Arthur, O70849.
McCarthy, Walter R., Jr., O71388.
McClain, Richard A., O71223.
McCloskey, Edward W., 2d, O70850.
McClusky, James D., O71836.
McCoole, Delos A., O71224.
McCord, Thomas B., O71556.
McCusker, George E., O71225.
McDermott, Mark A., O70851.
McDowell, Billy J., O71226.
McFather, Bennie S., O72343.
McGee, Bernard A., Jr., O71557.
McGee, Carl D., Jr., O71389.
McGuire, William E., Jr., O70852.
McHaney, Robert H., O71098.
McKee, Richard W., O71704.
McKenney, Hubert F., Jr., O71390.
McKenney, William R., O70854.
McKeon, Joseph M., Jr., O71391.
McKinley, David J., O71392.
McKinney, Ralph V., Jr., O71228.
McKinnon, Wayne T., Jr., O71393.
McKnight, James R., O73375.
McMartin, Duane A., O70855.
McNair, Edward P., O70856.
McPherson, Robert M., O70857.
McQuarrie, Robert W., O71394.
Meaders, Barney R., 3d, O71560.
Meador, Marion F., O70858.
Meese, John R., O71839.
Meister, Melvin E., O71099.
Mellish, James R., O71229.
Mendoza, Joseph A., Jr., O71230.
Menetrey, Louis C., O71395.
Mentillo, Louis R., O70859.
Metcalf, James L., O71397.
Milani, John A., O71100.
Milder, Alvin S., O70860.
Miller, Charles E., Jr., O70861.
Miller, Henry T., O71398.
Miller, James M., O70862.
Miller, John T., O70863.
Miller, Paul, Jr., O70864.
Milligan, George W., O70865.
Minturn, Lindsey B., Jr., O70866.
Mischak, Robert M., O70867.
Mitchell, Don B., O71706.
Mitchell, Frederick H., O71564.
Mologne, Lewis A., O70868.
Moody, Herbert E., O71565.
Mooney, Robert, O71233.
Mooneyham, John A., O71101.
Moore, James E., Jr., O70869.
Moore, James M., O71401.
Moore, Jesse G., O70870.
Morgan, Jerry T., O71566.
Morn, Charles P., O71234.
Morris, Eddie L., O71235.
Morris, Robert J., Jr., O70871.
Morris, Robert P., O70872.
Morrow, Robert D., O71569.
Moses, Edward M., O70874.

Moulton, Richard B., O70876.
Muhlherr, Joseph J., O71236.
Muldrow, Robert, 4th, O71571.
Mullen, Gordon R., O71572.
Mullin, William E., O71102.
Munsey, Jackson L., O70877.
Murphy, Charles K., O72346.
Murphy, Philip J., O71404.
Muth, Roy W., O70878.
Nack, Thomas P., O72378.
Nagorski, Walter J., O71405.
Nelson, William D., O70880.
Neroni, Frederick J., O71579.
Neu, George T., O70881.
Newnham, Donald F., O70882.
Nidever, Richard L., O71238.
Niland, James J., Jr., O71406.
Nodland, Stanley K., O72769.
Nolan, John D., O71239.
North, Jerrold M., O70883.
Norton, Maurice R., O71103.
Nowak, Donald E., O70884.
Nunziata, Salvatore W., O71104.
Oakes, James R., O70217.
Obendorfer, James F., O70887.
O'Brien, George F., Jr., O70885.
O'Connor, Douglas J., O70886.
Odom, William E., O70888.
Okazaki, Kenneth T., O71241.
Okita, Harold K., Jr., O71242.
Old, William D., 2d, O70889.
Oleksy, William G., O71105.
Olmsted, George H., Jr., O70890.
O'Malley, John M., O73383.
Ormsby, Mark A., O70891.
Orr, Charles R., O70892.
Ovberg, William J., O70893.
Owen, Ernest J., O71407.
Owen, Johnny O., O71408.
Owings, William M., O71852.
Pace, Ray D., O70894.
Pacha, Leonard E., O71106.
Palastra, Joseph T., Jr., O70895.
Palmer, Warren T., O70896.
Palumbo, Joseph E., O70897.
Panzer, Donald F., O70898.
Pappageorge, John G., O70899.
Paprocki, Thomas H., O70900.
Parker, Don L., O71107.
Parker, Russell W., O70901.
Parkinson, William H. R., Jr., O71245.
Parry, Raphael P., Jr., O71584.
Partridge, Edward A., O70902.
Passmore, Edwin E., O70903.
Pate, Robert I., O71409.
Patnode, Clarence A., Jr., O71109.
Patterson, Mercer H., O70904.
Paul, William V., Jr., O70905.
Pawlowski, Edward J. P., O70906.
Peerenboom, Maurice A., Jr., O71585.
Peisinger, Roman J., Jr., O70907.
Pellegrino, Vincent T., O71110.
Percy, Francis J., O70908.
Perrin, George E., O70909.
Perry, John W., Jr., O71247.
Person, David E., O71712.
Petley, George S., O70910.
Peyton, Cary R., O70911.
Pierce, James R., O71587.
Pilet, Stanford C., O70912.
Piolunek, Chester J., O70913.
Plumbley, William R., O71249.
Poarch, James W., O71111.
Poor, Thomas D., O70914.
Porter, Donald C., O70915.
Porter, John G., O70916.
Poteat, John A., Jr., O70917.
Powers, Paul V., O70918.
Prescott, Howard, O70919.
Presley, James N., Jr., O71591.
Preuitt, Robert C., O70920.
Proietto, Raymond T., O73111.
Purdue, William P., O70921.
Purdy, John T., O70922.
Qualls, Orbun F., Jr., O70923.
Rackley, Jerry D., O71250.
Randall, James R., O70924.
Ransone, James F., Jr., O70925.
Rasmussen, Ronald R., O71411.
Ray, Howard, O71252.
Redmond, Robert S., O71412.
Reed, Leonard F. B., Jr., O70926.
Reed, Robert T., O70927.
Reese, Mark L., Jr., O70928.
Reid, Frederick L., Jr., O71413.
Reistrup, Paul H., O70929.
Remus, Melvyn D., O70930.
Renfro, Richard M., O70931.
Reniker, Gene B., O71254.
Resley, Robert D., O70932.
Rhea, Donald M., O70933.
Richard, Alan V., O70934.
Richards, Charles D., O70935.
Riese, Robert C., O70936.
Riley, John F., O71255.
Robertson, Jerry G., O71257.
Robinson, George R., O71258.
Robinson, Hugh G., O70937.
Robinson, Jerry L., O71831.
Roderick, Edward E., O70938.
Rogers, John C., O70939.
Rolph, Paul R., Jr., O71593.
Rorke, Donald M., O71260.
Rose, Charles E., O71415.
Rose, Myron W., O70940.
Ross, Ralph C., Jr., O70941.
Ross, Ralph R., O71416.
Ross, Vaughn C., O71261.
Roudabush, Donald R., O71417.
Rowan, George R., Jr., O71262.
Royals, William C., O70942.
Rue, Norman L., O73393.
Ruhf, Harry F., O70944.
Russell, Dean F., O71264.
Ryan, James P., O70945.
Sager, Robert A., O71266.
Sale, Robert B., Jr., O70947.
Salvador, Ronald L., O70948.
Samouce, Warren A., O70949.
Sanders, Ralph D., Jr., O73077.
Satterfield, Jewel W., O71115.
Sauer, George E., Jr., O71267.
Schemmer, Benjamin F., O70950.
Schulz, William R., 3d, O70951.
Schwarz, Henry E., O71268.
Schweiger, Frederic M., O70952.
Schweikert, Paul, Jr., O70953.
Scott, Charles G., O71269.
Scott, Charles H., O71270.
Scott, Richard L., O71596.
Scott, William T., O71271.
Scovel, James L., O70954.
Screen, Donald D., O71119.
Seay, Jefferson, 3d, O71719.
Shafer, John C., O70955.
Shalikashvili, Othar J., O73583.
Shamblee, Curtis G., O71273.
Sharp, Benjamin F., Jr., O71274.
Shaw, Donald P., O70956.
Shebat, Donald, O70957.
Shelby, Jerry L., O71419.
Shelter, John R., O70958.
Shiraishi, James T., O71275.
Short, Audrey J. W., O70959.
Short, Robert B., Jr., O70960.
Shreeve, Caleb A., Jr., O71598.
Siefferman, Floyd E., Jr., O70961.
Simmons, Eugene F., Jr., O71276.
Simmons, Ralph T., O71723.
Sirkis, Arthur K., O70962.
Sisson, Lowell E., O70963.
Skibbie, Lawrence F., O70964.
Skladal, George W., O71278.
Sleppy, Alan E., O71279.
Sloan, James H., Jr., O70965.
Sloan, Leonard W., O71121.
Slocombe, Donald K., O71871.
Slogar, James H., O70966.
Smith, Charles W., O71281.
Smith, Douglas S., O71725.
Smith, E. Vernon, Jr., O71282.
Smith, Ivan F., O71604.
Smith, Marion G., O73405.
Smith, Nelson H., O71726.
Smith, Robert J., O71122.
Snyder, James E., O71283.
Snyder, Quay C., O70967.
Sonneborn, Charles L., 3d, O71420.
Spence, Craig H., O70968.
Spruill, James P., O70969.
Spruill, Joseph L., O71285.
Stallard, James E., 3d, O71123.
Stark, Carl J., O70970.
Stark, John M., Jr., O70971.
Stark, Thomas A., O70972.
Steimle, Carl R., O70973.
Stenehjem, George N., O70974.
Stephens, James E., O71727.
Sterling, Allan C., Jr., O70975.
Stewart, John K., O71286.
Stewart, Kennon B., O70976.
Stewart, Robert R., O70977.
Stodter, Charles S., Jr., O70978.
Stommel, Raymond R., O71124.
Storck, George H., O70979.
Storrs, Charles E., Jr., O70980.
Stout, Glen W., O70981.
Stout, Herald F., Jr., O70982.
Strang, Charles W., Jr., O71729.
Stroh, William H., O70983.
Stuart, Douglas B., O70984.
Studt, Perry L., O70985.
Subotky, Gerson J., O71126.
Sugg, Richard H., O70987.
Sulik, John A., O70988.
Sullivan, Harry E. B., O70989.
Surber, James W., O70990.
Sutherland, James C., C71421.
Swaren, John W., Jr., O70991.
Sweeney, Humbert F., O70992.
Tanimoto, Robert H., O71287.
Tawes, Robert H., O70993.
Tawoda, Robert J., O71730.
Teberg, David T., O70994.
Terry, Richard T., O71288.
Thayer, James H., O71432.
Thomas, James E., O70995.
Thomas, Julius O., Jr., O70996.
Thompson, Bill T., O70997.
Thompson, Lonnie E., O72796.
Thoreson, David P., O70998.
Thorp, Lee L., O71611.
Thrash, Melvin C., O71289.
Tilley, John E., O70999.
Tinsley, Philip, Jr., O71613.
Tippett, Jesse R., Jr., O71000.
Tobey, Joel N., O73416.
Tobin, Daniel J., O71001.
Tomsen, Willis C., O71002.
Toreson, Lowell E., O71003.
Towers, Luther, O71422.
Townsley, Richard W., O71004.
Traver, Thomas G., O71616.
Travis, John R., O71127.
Traxler, Grady M., O71617.
Treadwell, Millard L., Jr., O71884.
Turner, LeRoy C., O71005.
Tuten, Jeff M., O71885.
Tyler, Richard B., O71006.
Ulmer, Norman H., Jr., O71128.
Underwood, Andrew F., O71007.
Van Camp, James P., O71736.
Van Natta, Thomas F., Jr., O71008.
Van Valkenburg, Gerald E., O71009.
Van Vranken, Robert L., O71291.
Vaught, Ralph R., O71292.
Veditz, Raymond P., O73418.
Vesser, Dale A., O71010.
Vigee, Gerald S., O71011.
Vinson, Newell E., O71012.
Vought, Donald B., O71293.
Wagner, Louis C., Jr., O71013.
Waite, Hugh G., O71295.
Walker, Prosper N., O71014.
Walker, Samuel P., 3d, O71015.
Wall, Frank B., Jr., O74881.
Wallace, John R., O73420.
Wallace, William L., O71016.
Wallenfeldt, Evert C., O71739.
Walser, Lewis A., Jr., O71017.
Walter, Francis J., Jr., O71129.
Ward, Floyd J., Jr., O71740.
Ward, Gayle G., O71425.
Ware, Fletcher K., Jr., O71018.
Warf, Elmer R., O71741.
Warren, Carl W., O71622.
Washer, Robert J., O71019.
Watkins, James E., O71297.
Watlington, Thomas M., 3d, O71020.
Weafer, William J., O71021.
Weatherby, Yale D., O71022.
Weaver, John L., O71893.
Weaver, Richard L., O71024.
Weckerling, John H., O71426.
Weeks, Frederick H., O71298.
Weeks, Robert E., O71026.

Wells, Robert W., O71027.
Welsh, William W., Jr., O71028.
Westervelt, John R., Jr., O71029.
White, Chad B., O71623.
White, Marion F., O71300.
Whiteley, Frank G., O71624.
Whiteside, George W., Jr., O71301.
Whitley, James R., O71031.
Whitmore, Wesley C., O71625.
Wilkie, James B., 3d, O71302.
Willemse, Cornelius W., 3d, O71303.
Williams, Herbert E., O71032.
Williams, James A., O71033.
Williams, Louis F., Jr., O71428.
Williams, Norman I., O71304.
Williams, Patrick M., O71305.
Willner, Larry E., O71034.
Wilmes, John J., O71427.
Winston, William K., O71036.
Wise, David M., O71629.
Wisniewski, John A., O71037.
Witek, James E., O71308.
Witteried, Peter F., O71038.
Wood, Charles D., O71039.
Woodbeck, Jay W., O71430.
Woodbury, Grayson C., Jr., O71040.
Woodruff, Albert R., O73431.
Woodyard, John H., O71041.
Wooge, LuVern J., O71042.
Wyatt, James E., O71632.
York, Don J., O71043.
Yost, Raymond F., O71131.
Young, John G., O71044.
Young, Raymond H., O71132.
Young, Thomas C., O71045.
Zahn, Andrew T., O71133.
Ziegler, Richard G., O71046.
Zoldak, Andrew B., O71636.

*To be first lieutenants, Women's Army Corps*

Dotts, Eloise M., L469.
Giffin, Joan L., L490.
Slawson, Elizabeth F., L476.
White, Jocelyn A., L491.

*To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps*

Albertson, John N., Jr., O71134.
Axtens, Frank W. B., O73462.
Blackburn, Edward W., O71147.
Buffington, James A., O71158.
Conselman, Charles B., O71466.
Elmer, John D., O71177.
Fletcher, Ronald D., O71182.
Gomez, Ludgero S. A., Jr., O71090.
Guibor, Milferd T., O73467.
Hill, Clifford L., O71206.
Miller, Vandy L., O71231.
Patterson, William J., O73534.
Singletary, Winfield S., Jr., O71601.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3304. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

*To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps*

Marquardt, Ruth L., N2715.
Sullivan, Louise E., N2690.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 27, 1957:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Hyde Gillette, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

John M. McKibbin, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service officers to the grade indicated:

*To be consuls general*

Walter K. Schwinn.
D. Chadwick Braggiotti.

*To class 2, consul, and secretary*

Vaughn R. DeLong.

*To class 3, consul, and secretary*

Frederick B. Haskell, Jr.
Lewis M. Lind.
Warren F. Looney.
William L. Uanna.

*To class 4*

Edward S. Benet — Robert L. Ware, Jr.
Jesse D. McElroy, Jr. — Vernon B. Zirkle
William B. Snidow

*To class 4, consul, and secretary*

Charles M. Gerrity — Neil N. Muhonen
Karl F. Mautner — William H. Rusch

*To class 5 and consul*

Miss Faith V. Andrus — Edward M. Peach
Fred A. Durling — Miss Elizabeth Rice
Clifford J. Glennon — Regulo Rivera
Seymour S. Goodman — Mrs. Helen E. Sheehy
Miss Teresa Offie — Fred A. Somerford
Joseph E. O'Mahony — Robert G. Sturgill
Neil L. Parks

*To class 5, consul, and secretary*

Henry Bardach.
John R. Bietz.
Albert Beryl Hudes.

*To class 6*

James H. Bahti — Wilbur W. Hitchcock
Melville E. Blake, Jr. — Ernest A. Nagy
Byron E. Byron — Russell A. Price
Charles W. Henebry — Warren E. Slater

*To class 6, consul, and secretary*

Miss Alice C. Mahoney.

*To class 6, vice consul of career, and secretary*

John J. Bentley — Archibald Lappin, Jr.
Miss Hulda Christiansen — Frederick E. Myers
Leland A. Pyle
Glen H. Fisher — Martin G. Ryerson
Miss Edna T. Flach — Miss Lois M. Unger

*To class 8, vice consul of career, and secretary*

Alfonso Arenales — Charles H. Hallock
Miss Joan E. Bennett — Miss Jo Ann Hallquist
Miss Alix S. Bouldin — William Bruce Harbin
Benjamin N. Brown, Jr. — Thomas J. Henighan
Miss Evelyn R. Hessler
Robert S. Cameron — Marvin J. Hoffenberg
Miss Pamela Cheatham — Martin Jacobs
James D. Johnston
J. Chapman Chester — Samuel C. Keiter
George E. Chewning — James E. Kerr, Jr.
William Clark, Jr. — John W. Kizler.
Peter D. Constable — George B. Lambrakis.
John E. Crump — Henry Ellis Mattox.
Curtis C. Cutter — Robert Marden Miller.
Robert B. Dollison — F. Pierce Olson.
Marvin B. Durning — John A. Perkins.
Miss Doris Ann Fetters — Kenneth W. Preston.
Robert G. Ryan.
Rudy V. Fimbres — George M. Scanlan.
Robert L. Flanegin — C. Richard Spurgin.
Miss Dagmar Frahme — Ulrich A. Straus.
Benson Lee Grayson — George H. Wall.
Miss Elinor Greer — Howard L. Worthington, Jr.
William H. Hallman

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to the grade indicated:

*To be consul*

Arthur L. Funk — Henry H. Stephen
Dwight B. Herrick — John M. Stuart
Henry C. Palm, Jr.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to the grade indicated:

*To be consul*

Miss Geraldine B. Stibbe.

*To be secretary*

Robert M. Snyder.
Vasia C. Gmirkin.
Miss Frances D. Hyland.

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Irvan W. Fleming, Ajo.
Robert L. Honea, Marana.
Jimmie L. Matheson, Sierra Vista.

CALIFORNIA

Henry Payne Thayer, Newport Beach.

CONNECTICUT

Violet A. Grape, Cobalt.
Robert M. Gates, Niantic.
Vincent S. Iovieno, North Branford.
Theodore D. Lindemark, Rockfall.

GEORGIA

Robert M. Ellis, Villa Rica.

INDIANA

Alvin J. Vaal, Ferdinand.
Madeline L. Freeman, Griffin.
Charles L. Lemonds, Otisco.
Glendel D. Marshall, Swayzee.
John D. Gaston, Urbana.

IOWA

Alexander Thomas Carlisle, Atalissa.
George A. Brooks, Bagley.
Billy M. McClanahan, Bloomfield.
John N. Malmquist, Boxholm.
Leo E. Dunbar, Brighton.
Charles Donald Finch, Bussey.
Elmer E. Brumm, Curlew.
Lawrence E. Myers, Dallas Center.
Darwin L. Hascall, Emerson.
Donald C. Ogden, Fonda.
Carl H. Kuhnle, Hiawatha.
Duane A. Yeakel, Kanawha.
Martin O. Knapp, Lohrville.
Wayne A. Stein, Newhall.
Howard W. Cruise, Olin.
Howard L. Pritchard, Pilot Mound.
Esther B. Hass, Preston.
Harvey Norman Wilberg, Ringsted.
Edward H. Brandt, Sibley.
Russell E. Mullins, Westgate.

KANSAS

Orville W. Hopkins, Augusta.
Joseph W. Rush, Longford.

KENTUCKY

Jessie R. Hodges, Alva.
Guy Samuels, Baxter.
Escar O. Coe, Burkesville.
Rufus D. Higgins, Gray.
Rees H. Dickson, Jeffersontown.
Arnel C. Taylor, Livingston.
Mattie F. Cole, Louellen.
Clarence B. Howard, Loyall.
Pauline M. Collins, Lynch.
Ralph P. Chaney, Pine Knot.
John D. Miller, Valley Station.

MAINE

Leonora H. Good, Hampden.
Augustus Sylvester, Orrs Island.
Albert Ellsworth, Oxford.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Edna R. Perry, Center Barnstead.
Ives Atherton, Hanover.
Orimer Bugbee, Newport.
Gordon A. Cheney, Newton Junction.
Helen R. Quimby, Northwood Narrows.
Lavinia Y. Ladd, West Stewartstown.

NORTH DAKOTA

Leo E. Tibbs, Minot.

RHODE ISLAND

Ralph E. Olney, Coventry.
Harold J. Pepler, Mapleville.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Leo W. Lingemann, Ethan.

VERMONT

William George Bushey, Charlotte.
John William Laramie, North Springfield.

## WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate February 27, 1957:

POSTMASTER

Pablo Rivera, Jr., to be postmaster at Salinas, in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the only source and sustainer of life, inspire and incline our minds and hearts to accept life as a great gift, a sacred trust, a divine opportunity, and a capacity for noble endeavor and service.

May we never break faith with our better self or allow our life to go to waste, but help us to appreciate its high eternal qualities and resolve to invest it with dignity and worth.

Constrain us to realize more fully that it matters not how long we live but how well and with what ideals and goals and with how much of faith and fortitude.

We humbly beseech Thee that daily we may take up life with joy and vigor, never delighting merely in its comforts and pleasures and dreading its risks and dangers and sacrifices.

Show us how we may bring all mankind into the fellowship of the larger life and deliver them from those doubts which darken their days and those fears which dwarf their faith and weaken their powers.

Hear us in the name of Christ who is the way, the truth, and the life. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MERRIMACK RIVER VALLEY FLOOD CONTROL COMPACT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to note the cooperation between Massachusetts and New Hampshire in approving the Merrimack River Valley flood-control compact.

Massachusetts had taken the initiative to legislate approval, and to compensate, in large measure, for taxes lost and economic damages by reason of reservoir construction in New Hampshire.

Under the leadership of Gov. Lane Dwinell, the New Hampshire House recently gave overwhelming approval to the compact by a 286 to 11 vote. The president of the New Hampshire State Senate, E. C. Ferguson, predicted on February 23, that the upper chamber will speed final legislative approval of the interstate compact.

The compact provides for Federal construction of a huge $34 million flood-control dam and reservoir at West Hopkinton on the Contoocook River, a major tributary of the Merrimack; and smaller dams and reservoirs near East Weare on the Piscataqua River and Loudon on the Suncook River.

Although this flood-control project will take more than 5 years to complete, we in this important industrial valley will know that our worries and losses will definitely disappear at the end of that time, if the Federal Government goes to work immediately on it as soon as the New Hampshire Legislature finalizes interstate action.

I want to compliment the Governor, the State legislature, and the people of New Hampshire for their courage and determination in expediting approval of this project.

Soon it will be up to the Federal Government to assume its responsibilities, promptly and decisively.

We, the residents of the Merrimack Valley in New Hampshire and Massachusetts, are serving notice that we expect the Federal Government to get going on this flood-control project when the New Hampshire Senate gives the green light, which is imminent.

## JOHN M. HAID, JR.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the great organizations of today for the young men of our country is the Future Farmers of America. Into this organization come lads from farm homes throughout the land who are training for useful citizenship as farmers and farm leaders. In the exchange of ideas and experiences from the various sections of the country, these young men grow to know and realize that we are bound together in the different sections of the country by a common interest.

One of the great honors which has come to our congressional district is the election of John M. Haid, Jr., of Siloam Springs, Ark., as national president of the Future Farmers of America. He has brought honor not only to his parents but to all the rest of us.

One of the great privileges that has come to me is to have had him as my guest here in Washington, along with the national vice president, Victor Cappucci, Jr., of Mehoopany, Pa.; and the national secretary, Jerry Litton, of Chillicothe, Mo. It is good to share the enthusiasm of these young folks and to be reassured of the future safety of our freedoms and institutions.

Our heartiest best wishes go with these young leaders, and to each of them we give a hand salute.

## THE SO-CALLED DEMOCRATS' CORN BILL

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, after more than a month of delaying tactics, the House Agriculture Committee last week approved by a one-vote margin the so-called Democrats' corn bill. Like opening a Pandora's box, this bill would open the soil bank to growers of all feed grains and other basic commodities and would cost the taxpayers between $600 million and $1 billion annually, in addition to present soil-bank payments.

If this legislation goes through Congress as it is now written, Mr. Speaker, I feel certain the President would have no other course than to veto it. If this happens, there will be no corn legislation this year, and I would like to make certain the responsibility is placed where it belongs—on the majority members of the House Agriculture Committee.

To avert such an eventuality, however, I would like to call on Members on both sides of the aisle to get behind the Andresen bill which is supported by practically 100 percent of the Members from the Corn Belt. The Andresen bill represents both a fair and proper approach to this problem.

## THE SO-CALLED DEMOCRATS' CORN BILL

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I protest the delaying tactics endangering enactment of an emergency corn program. This is an emergency situation. Quick action is necessary so corn growers can plan how much acreage to plant this spring.

A bill providing for emergency corn legislation for 1957 was introduced in the House January 16. Hearings on corn legislation by a Democrat-controlled committee dragged on until last week, and a highly controversial bill was finally reported. It is now the end of February and I sincerely hope that the Rules Committee will see fit to take action on the bill this week, so that corn legislation can be considered by the House next week. If immediate action is not taken, the bill will be of no benefit this season.

## THE SO-CALLED DEMOCRATS' CORN BILL

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, that old maxim, "The operation was a success, but the patient died," applies perfectly to the emergency corn legislation now before the Rules Committee. The Democrat bill approved by the House Agriculture Committee last week is no solution to the problem. It might well kill the patient.

The Corn Belt farmers are in the unfortunate position of having badly needed corn legislation saddled with amendments, terrifically added additional costs, and plain claptrap that it will not even get past the Senate, let alone reach the President's desk.

To make the operation a success and save the patient, it is vital that we get behind a bill that has a chance of not only getting through Congress, but will be signed into law by the President. That bill is the Andresen bill.

## SOVIET RUSSIA'S ECONOMIC CONDITION

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I discussed to some extent the estimations of Soviet Russia's economic condition. I simply want to call the attention of the House to two rather lengthy discussions of this same matter, one contained in the most recent issue of the U. S. News & World Report and the other in the February issue of Fortune magazine.

## CORN LEGISLATION

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, the demand for corn legislation from the Corn Belt section of the country is extremely urgent. Spring planting plans are already underway and if we are going to help the corn farmer this year, we must enact an emergency corn program within the next 2 weeks.

In this regard, I would like to call attention to the delaying tactics of the Democrat-controlled House Agriculture Committee which has had before it an emergency corn bill since January 12. The committee finally approved a corn bill last week, but first loaded it down with extraneous amendments that will result in exorbitant costs and probably result in a Presidential veto.

If the House Rules Committee brings this bill to the floor, as it is now written, I would hope that all Members would oppose it and vote to substitute the Andresen bill as the only practical means of solving this corn problem.

## CORN LEGISLATION

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] about the so-called corn bill. I would remind those gentlemen, as well as others, that the House Committee on Agriculture, acting in an orderly manner, approved a bill. It is now before the Committee on Rules, and if the four Republican members of the Committee on Rules will lend their cooperation, we can bring out a bill under an open rule and let the Members of the House determine the kind of legislation they want to pass. My two colleagues refer to a bill which they prefer, evidently, to call a Republican bill because it is supported largely by Republicans, which would not solve any problem. It would give a lot of corngrowers what they want; increased acreage and increased production, and another handout from the Federal Government as was done last fall. The bill that has now been reported by the Committee on Agriculture proposes to solve the problem, and I think if the Committee on Rules will give an open rule, the Republicans, if they want to put forth a partisan bill, will have an opportunity to present it to the House. But, if you want to get the whole problem solved, including feed, corn, and grain, I am in favor of bringing it out here and letting the House determine which bill is in the best interest of the whole economy of this country, including the farmers.

## VISIT OF PRIME MINISTER MOLLET

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as the Members are aware, we are going to be honored this afternoon at about 3 o'clock by the presence in the Chamber of one of the world's outstanding statesmen, the Prime Minister of France, His Excellency Guy Mollet. I want to announce that about 2:20 or 2:25 there will be a quorum call so that the Members will be advised and govern themselves accordingly.

## ARMED FORCES NURSES AND MEDICAL SPECIALISTS CAREER INCENTIVE ACT

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 176 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2460) to improve the career opportunities of nurses and medical specialists of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 10]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Adair | Hays, Ohio | Pillion |
| Barrett | Healey | Powell |
| Belcher | Holifield | Prouty |
| Boggs | Holt | Rabaut |
| Bowler | Jackson | Radwan |
| Bray | Johansen | Reece, Tenn. |
| Brownson | Judd | Riehlman |
| Buckley | Kearney | Roosevelt |
| Cannon | Kelly, N. Y. | Santangelo |
| Chelf | Krueger | Saund |
| Cretella | Lennon | Sieminski |
| Curtis, Mass. | Loser | Staggers |
| Dies | McGovern | Teague, Tex. |
| Gray | Magnuson | Williams, Miss. |
| Green, Pa. | Miller, N. Y. | Wilson, Ind. |
| Gregory | Morrison | Young |
| Gwinn | Moulder | |

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. COOPER]. On this rollcall 381 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

## ARMED FORCES NURSES AND MEDICAL SPECIALISTS CAREER INCENTIVE ACT

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order consideration of the bill H. R. 2460, the Armed Forces Nurses and Medical Specialists Career Incentive Act.

Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up for consideration House Resolution 176, which makes in order H. R. 2460, the Armed Forces Nurses and Medical Specialists Career Incentive Act.

The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate on the bill.

The bill as reported by the Armed Services Committee, with several amendments, would, it is believed, do much to attract professionally qualified people into the Armed Forces as well as to aid in retaining those already in these branches of the services. This would be achieved primarily by increasing the rank structure of the permanent grades which the average nurse or medical specialist could expect to attain during the course of a full military career.

For the Army it would mean increasing the rank from captain to major, the same for the Air Force; and for the Navy from lieutenant to lieutenant commander, the permanent rank one could expect to attain.

It would also, for the Army and Navy, increase the number of officers presently authorized to serve as lieutenant colonel or commander and establish the permanent grade of colonel or captain—Navy—for those in these categories—existing law already provides authority for these grades in the Air Force. It should be noted, however, that all promotions au-

thorized under this proposed legislation will be subject to the over-all limitations contained in the Officer Grade Limitation Act of 1954.

The bill also provides for retirement of nurses and medical specialists of the Army and Air Force under procedures which are applicable generally to the other regular officers of those services. The Navy retains its present retirement procedures but provides, for the first time, for mandatory retirement of officers of the Nurse Corps.

The bill contains three titles: Title I—Army, title II—Navy, and title III—Air Force. Differences in these titles are necessary because of the variances in existing law pertaining to officers of the regular components of the Army, Navy, and Air Force generally.

If enacted, the cost of the legislation for fiscal 1958 would be about $769,000, increasing each year to $1,892,000 in 1962.

The committee has complied with the Ramseyer rule and I urge the adoption of this resolution so the House may proceed to the consideration of H. R. 2460.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the rule and I know of none on this side. I am in agreement with the statement just made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY]. I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 149 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That, effective from January 4, 1957, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee, including but not limited to the following:

(1) administration and operation of the Federal Maritime Administration and Federal Maritime Board and all laws, international arrangements, and problems relating to the American Merchant Marine;

(2) administration and operation of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and all laws and problems relating to fisheries and wildlife;

(3) administration and operation of the Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and all laws and problems relating to functions thereunder;

(4) administration and operation of the Panama Canal and all laws and problems relating thereto, together with the necessity of providing additional transiting facilities for vessels between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

For such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof as authorized by the chairman is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories and possessions, whether the House has recessed or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 14, after "places", insert "within the United States, its Territories and possessions."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the passage of House Resolution 149, which will authorize the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to make studies and investigations, as well as inquiries, into matters coming within the jurisdiction of that committee.

Among the proposed studies and investigations are the following:

First. Administration and operation of the Federal Maritime Administration and Federal Maritime Board, and all laws, international arrangements, and problems relating to the American Merchant Marine.

Second. Administration and operation of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and all laws relating to fisheries and wildlife.

Third. Administration and operation of the Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and all laws relating to the functions thereunder.

Fourth. Administration and operation of the Panama Canal, and all laws and problems relating thereto, together with the necessity of providing additional transiting facilities for vessels between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain the Members are well acquainted with the all-important work that this committee does, and how it is reflected in the better operation of our merchant marine, as well as those other matters which come within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The committee had an appropriation of $85,000 in the 84th Congress, and as of December 31, 1956, they had an unexpended balance of $34,000.

I hope the House membership will adopt House Resolution 149 and that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will then go on doing the excellent work that it has done previously.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM].

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual routine authorizing resolution of one of the standing committees of the House. I have no objection to its passage and have no requests for time.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF A MILITARY DEPARTMENT TO FURNISH STEVEDORING AND TERMINAL SERVICES AND FACILITIES TO COMMERCIAL STEAMSHIP COMPANIES

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 177 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2797) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of a military department to furnish stevedoring and terminal services and facilities to commercial steamship companies, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2797, which was reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with 2 amendments, seeks to amend title 10, United States Code, so as to make more positive the existing, though doubtful, legal authority to perform the services contemplated by the bill, H. R. 2797.

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize the military departments to furnish stevedoring and terminal services to commercial steamship companies engaged in carrying cargo sponsored by the Department of Defense and to permit payments for such services to be reimbursed to the appropriation or fund initially charged. The actual stevedoring is not done by members of the armed services but by commercial stevedores under contract to the Department of Defense at military terminals and depots.

Commercial steamship companies require terminal stevedoring services to carry out their shipping contracts which call for loading and unloading of vessels. The cost of these services is included in the freight rates charged the Department of Defense. However, when such services are rendered by the stevedores under contract to the Department of Defense the commercial steamship companies must reimburse the Department of Defense for the furnishing of such services.

When using the services of the military "contracted for stevedores" the commercial steamship companies place a deposit estimated to cover such services

as reimbursement to the military. Should the deposit fail to cover the costs, due to unforeseen delays, it is now necessary to stop the stevedoring when the amount so placed has been used until the carrier can be contacted to have the original deposit supplemented based on a new estimate of costs. Should this situation arise on a Saturday, Sunday, or other holiday when the administrative offices of the steamship lines are closed considerable delay is experienced in handling the cargo on or off the vessels, due to the interpretation of the existing law by the Navy which claims that under the present law it cannot make any financial commitment beyond the original amount deposited by the commercial steamship company without further authorization from such company.

Enactment into law of this measure will not involve the expenditure of any Federal funds but will allow a continuing stevedoring operation under these situations which do occur rather frequently.

The committee report complies with the Ramseyer rule and I urge the adoption of House Resolution 177 so the House may proceed to the consideration of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM].

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection on this side.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## AUTHORIZING THE SALE OF DEGAUSSING EQUIPMENT BY THE NAVY TO PRIVATELY OWNED MERCHANT SHIPS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 178 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4285) to authorize the sale of degaussing equipment by the Department of the Navy to the owners or operators of privately owned merchant ships of United States registry. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half hour to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 178 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 4285 to authorize the Department of the Navy to sell degaussing equipment to the owners and operators of privately owned merchant ships of United States registry.

The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate.

Some components in degaussing equipment, which are the devices that protect ships against magnetic mines, are not available commercially. The Navy purchases this equipment from time to time and places it in stock. Since the bill authorizes the Navy to sell some of this equipment for use in merchant ships, of United States registry, it would mean that the equipment would be maintained in operational condition and hence a part of our merchant fleet would be properly equipped in the event of mobilization.

The Armed Services Committee amended the bill to provide that the sale of this equipment be made at current or estimated replacement cost to the Navy so no loss would be involved. A second amendment provides that the money received from sales shall be reimbursed to the appropriation or fund which was used to make the original purchase.

We were informed that the enactment of this legislation would involve no cost to the Government. I urge the adoption of this resolution so the House may proceed to the consideration of H. R. 4285.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am in complete agreement with the statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING]. I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## ARMED FORCES NURSES AND MEDICAL SPECIALISTS CAREER INCENTIVE ACT

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2460) to improve the career opportunities of nurses and medical specialists of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2460, with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill to improve career opportunities of nurses and medical specialists of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. It applies only to Regular officers in the Army and Air Force and all active officers of the Nurse and Medical Service Corps of the Navy. The bill is in three titles, separate titles relating to the Army, Navy, and Air Force. This is necessary because at the present time there are different laws affecting the three different services. One of the main purposes of this bill is to bring the three services as nearly into line and into equality as it is possible to do. At the present time there are, as I say, three different types of laws controlling the situation. We have provided here for a larger degree of uniformity.

The main purposes of the bill are as follows:

First. Increases from captain to major, or lieutenant commander in the Navy, the permanent grade to which the average nurse or medical specialist may expect to attain during a full military career.

I may say that, in essence, the first purpose I have stated is the important part of this bill.

Second. Increases the number of Regular officers authorized to serve as permanent grade lieutenant colonels and establishes the permanent grade of colonel for Army nurses and medical specialists. Hereafter, five Regular Army officers may serve as nurses in the grade of colonel. None are authorized today. In addition, 107 officers may serve in the grade of lieutenant colonel; today only 33 Regulars may serve as permanent lieutenant colonels in the Nurse Corps. A similar provision has been inserted for Air Force nurses. In addition, in the Army and Air Force, one medical specialist may serve in each corps as a permanent medical specialist colonel, and 20 may serve in each corps as permanent lieutenant colonels. Likewise, the proposed legislation authorizes four Navy nurses to serve as captains and 105 to serve as commanders; today no nurses in the Navy may aspire to the grade of captain, and only 34 may aspire to the grade of commander. The Chief of Nurses will continue to serve as a captain.

Third. Establishes a new mandatory retirement system for the Army and Air Force, with increased attrition after 25 to 28 years of service. Establishes for the Navy a new mandatory retirement system with increased attrition after 20 to 30 years of service and at certain ages.

Fourth. Broadens the integration authority in the Army and Air Force for nurses and medical specialists by authorizing initial appointment in grade of captain.

Fifth. Liberalizes the Army and Air Force method of computing retirement pay comparable to the method for other officers. Navy already has this.

Sixth. Establishes separate promotion lists for nurses and medical specialists in the Army.

Seventh. Establishes 2,500 nurses as the regular nurse strength of the Army, and 350 medical specialists as the regular officer medical specialist strength of the Army.

Eighth. Eliminates the present limitations on the number of persons who may serve in the permanent grade of major in the Nurse Corps and medical specialists of the Army and Air Force, and in the grade of lieutenant commander in the Navy Nurse Corps.

Ninth. Authorizes the promotion of all nurses and medical specialists of the Army and Air Force to the grade of

major after 14 years of service, if fully qualified.

Tenth. Allows service prior to December 31, 1947, to be counted for promotion list service in the Army and Air Force, and permits adjustments to reflect this service among Air Force nurses and specialists.

Eleventh. Changes the composition of selection boards for nurses, medical specialists and Medical Service Corps officers to permit representatives on the boards of members of their corps or specialties.

Twelfth. Removes the present limitation on the number of officers who may serve in the grade of captain in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy.

Thirteenth. Limits constructive service to 3 years for appointments of first lieutenants only, in the Army and Air Force, for nurses and medical specialists. Existing law already permits this.

Fourteenth. Involves a fiscal 1958 cost of $768,000, increasing to $1,932,000 annually in fiscal 1962.

It is the considered opinion of the Committee on Armed Services that at the present time we are not attracting to the military service young nurses on a regular, professional, career basis. This is reflected by the very few young women who are now entering in the lowest grades.

The report contains figures which I believe will be rather startling and which prove conclusively that in the regular service we do not now have the young women who are qualified as nurses entering upon a professional career in the military. I think if you would turn to page 5 of the report you would see that in the Regular Army, for instance, there are 1,293 Regular Army nurses, but only 87 are permanent-grade first lieutenants, and only 4 are permanent second lieutenants, so that nurses are not coming in at the bottom of the career pattern as they must if we are to have a professional career Nurse Corps. I believe that in the Air Force, you will find there is only one regular Air Force nurse in the grade of second lieutenant. We feel that by raising the grade to which the average nurse may attain, by increasing it one grade, to major and its equivalent in the Navy, rather than captain and equivalent, as it is now, we will establish an improved professional career which will attract more young women to the professional nursing corps. Now, I will be glad to yield for any questions.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Does the gentleman know how much the bill is expected to cost the Government?

Mr. KILDAY. As I stated a moment ago, for the first fiscal year of 1958 the cost is $768,000. That includes both the increase in active duty pay and the increase that will be reflected in retirement payments. That will increase to the extent that by the fiscal year 1962 it levels off at a recurring cost of $1,982,000.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the very distinguished and able chairman of my subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], has fully described the objectives of the proposed legislation.

I would merely like to add that we are fast approaching a time when there will be no career nurses in our Armed Forces unless we take remedial action now.

There are 940 Regular Navy nurses serving on active duty, but only 26 are serving in grades below that of lieutenant.

Of the 1,293 Regular Army nurses serving on active duty, there are 87 permanent grade first lieutenants and only 4 permanent grade second lieutenants.

There is one, I repeat, one, permanent grade second lieutenant now serving in the Air Force.

The young ladies who are graduating from our nursing schools are not entering the armed services on a career basis. They realize that under present law the maximum grade they can attain in a normal career is that of captain in the Army and the Air Force, and lieutenant in the Navy. They simply are not willing to devote long years of service to a career that gives them such a limited opportunity.

This bill removes the limitations on the number of nurses who can attain the grade of major or lieutenant commander.

We have also increased the number of permanent grade lieutenant colonels' billets in the Army and Air Force from 33 to 107. A similar provision is contained in the proposed legislation for the Navy. And for the first time, we have established, on a very restricted basis, the grade of colonel and Navy captain, for 5 nurses in each of the 3 services.

I sincerely hope that the House will overwhelmingly approve the proposed legislation.

The costs involved are negligible compared to the results expected.

The fiscal 1958 cost is less than $769,000 and even though the fiscal cost goes up to $1,982,000 by 1962, it will more than pay for itself if it can establish increased stability among our career nurses and medical specialists.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS].

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Chairman, one of the most necessary and important tasks which those of us on the Armed Services Committee have is to continually review the career opportunities in our armed services and to see that at all times the morale of our personnel is of the highest possible quality.

It will probably surprise many Members to learn that under existing law the average nurse serving in our Armed Forces can only attain the grade of captain in the Army and Air Force, and lieutenant in the Navy. Considering rank as it is today, this is small recognition for many years of faithful service.

What this bill does in effect is to increase the grade to which the average nurse can attain in a normal career in the armed services from captain to major in the Army and Air Force and from lieutenant to lieutenant commander in the Navy.

The duties performed by nurses in the armed services involve more than the care of the ill. In addition to normal nursing duties, our service nurses play a key role in instructing the medical corpsmen and hospital men in our armed services. Service nurses also handle a heavy administrative burden in connection with our service hospitals.

Much of the credit for the amazingly low mortality rate of our wounded during World War II and the Korean conflict can be attributed not only to the outstanding work of our physicians but also to the heroic work of our corpsmen and our aid men who received much of their excellent training from our armed services nurses.

Considering the liabilities that are a natural concomitant of service life, the proposed legislation is more than fully justified. Nurses must be assigned to various duties in all parts of the world without regard to personal choice. They cannot have the choice of residence, hours of duty, and other privileges which can be found in a civilian nursing career. They are required to live in quarters, many of which leave much to be desired. Their services must be available whenever and wherever they are required by the needs of national defense.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in order to attract the high type of young women needed in our armed services, legislation of this kind is absolutely essential if we are to stimulate recruitment into our armed services nursing corps.

We must also, in my opinion, provide opportunities for nursing leadership in our armed services. I am very happy to point out that this bill permits five nurses to aspire to the rank of colonel in the Army and the Air Force, and a similar number to the rank of captain in the Navy. The number is not great, but it is significant. Those nurses of outstanding ability who seek to improve themselves will have an opportunity to be promoted and recognized. The legislation also removes the limitation on the number of nurses that may hold the rank of major and lieutenant commander. Statistics prove conclusively that presently nurses graduating from nursing schools in this country are not attracted to a career in the armed services. As a result there are at present an insufficient number of young women going into the services to replace those who will retire during the next few years.

I am convinced that the enactment of the proposed legislation will do much to overcome this shortcoming, and will provide an opportunity for a nursing career in the armed services more in line with civilian advantages. It will also insure a continuance of excellent care for our hospitalized servicemen.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, no legislation which we can recommend to this House has greater importance than this which we present for your consideration today. The morale factor involved in

this long overdue legislation is inestimable.

Those covered by this proposal are dedicated to service beyond the call of duty; they work in good weather and bad—around the clock—and always in the interests of the health of the military and their dependents. No higher calling can be claimed by any group of Americans.

This legislation, as I say, is long overdue. Our committee worked long hours to bring it to you in its present form. We feel that it merits your serious consideration, because those affected now have that barrier removed from them which has prevented their getting promoted at regular intervals. Some of those covered by this legislation have held their grade in excess of 12 years and can never aspire to or become eligible to go to the grade of captain in the Navy or colonel in the Air Force or Army.

We recommend this to you most respectfully because we believe it is needed and we urge your prompt and favorable consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee that considered H. R. 2460, a bill to improve career opportunities of nurses and medical specialists of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, I wish to take this occasion to strongly endorse the action of the subcommittee and the full committee in reporting this bill to the House.

The situation among our career nurses in the armed services is critical. The simple arithmetic of the problem demonstrates without question that if we do not obtain some young nurses on a career basis we face the unpleasant realization of one day awakening to a situation that will reveal the nonexistence of career nurses in our armed services.

The salaries of nurses in our armed services compares quite favorably with the average income of a nurse in the civilian economy. But even with the favorable comparison as it exists today we are not attracting young nurses.

One of the major objections is the fact that the highest permanent grade to which the average nurse or medical specialist can obtain in a normal career is that of captain in the Army or Air Force and lieutenant in the Navy. By increasing the grade possibilities for the average nurse from captain to major or lieutenant commander, I am confident that more young nurses will now look with favor upon a career of nursing in the armed services.

In addition, we have made it possible in this proposed legislation for more nurses to aspire to the grade of lieutenant colonel and colonel and their Navy equivalent. The number is still quite restricted but it is a substantial increase over the present very severe limitations. This, too, will act as a stimulant to recruiting new nurses, for now they will realize that there are better career opportunities in the higher grades and by dint of work, perseverance, and capability, the best of them will be selected for these higher grades.

In short, we have increased the prestige and dignity of the nursing career in our armed services. We have established a better career pattern and it is to be hoped that the proposed legislation will do for nursing the same laudable job that the Career Incentive Act did for physicians and dentists in the last Congress.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,*

TITLE I—ARMY

SEC. 101. Subtitle B of title 10, United States Code is amended as follows:

(1) Section 3069 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3069. Army Nurse Corps: Chief; appointment

"The Army Nurse Corps consists of the Chief of that corps and officers in grades of second lieutenant through colonel. The Secretary of the Army shall appoint the Chief from the officers of the Regular Army in that corps whose regular grade is above major and who are recommended by the Surgeon General. The Chief serves during the pleasure of the Secretary, but not for more than 4 years. She may not be reappointed. Without vacating her regular grade, she is entitled to the temporary grade and the pay and allowances of a colonel while so serving and ranks above all other colonels in that corps."

(2) Section 3070 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3070. Army Medical Specialist Corps: organization; Chief and assistant chiefs

"(a) The Army Medical Specialist Corps consists of the Chief and assistant chiefs of that corps, other officers in grades of second lieutenant through colonel, and the following sections—

"(1) the Dietitian Section;

"(2) the Physical Therapist Section; and

"(3) the Occupational Therapist Section.

"(b) The Secretary of the Army shall appoint the Chief of the Army Medical Specialist Corps from the officers of the Regular Army in that corps whose regular grade is above captain and who are recommended by the Surgeon General. The Chief serves during the pleasure of the Secretary, but not for more than 4 years. She may not be reappointed. Without vacating her regular grade, she is entitled to the temporary grade and the pay and allowances of a colonel while so serving, and ranks above all other colonels in that corps.

"(c) The Surgeon General shall appoint three assistant chiefs of the Army Medical Specialist Corps from the officers of the Regular Army in that corps whose regular grade is above captain. Each assistant chief is the chief of a section of that corps. She serves during the pleasure of the Surgeon General, but for not more than 4 years. She may not be reappointed to the same position. Without vacating her regular grade, each assistant chief is entitled to the temporary grade and the pay and allowances of a lieutenant colonel while so serving and ranks above all other lieutenant colonels in her section."

(3) The analysis of chapter 307 is amended by striking out the following item:

"3070. Women's Medical Specialist Corps: organization; Chief and assistant chiefs."

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

"3070. Army Medical Specialist Corps: organization; Chief and assistant chiefs."

(4) Section 3206 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3206. Regular Army: commissioned officers on active list; Army Nurse Corps

"(a) The authorized strength of the Army Nurse Corps in commissioned officers on the active list of the Regular Army is 2,500.

"(b) Of the authorized strength of the Army Nurse Corps in commissioned officers on the active list of the Regular Army, not more than 5 may be in the regular grade of colonel, and not more than 107 may be in the regular grade of lieutenant colonel."

(5) Section 3207 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3207. Regular Army: commissioned officers on active list; Army Medical Specialist Corps

"(a) The authorized strength of the Army Medical Specialist Corps in commissioned officers on the active list of the Regular Army is 350.

"(b) Of the authorized strength of the Army Medical Specialist Corps in commissioned officers on the active list of the Regular Army, not more than 1 may be in the regular grade of colonel, and not more than 20 may be in the regular grade of lieutenant colonel."

(6) The analysis of chapter 331 is amended by striking out the following item:

"3207. Regular Army: commissioned officers on active list; Women's Medical Specialist Corps."

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

"3207. Regular Army: commissioned officers on active list; Army Medical Specialist Corps."

(7) Section 3288 is amended by inserting the words "section 3291 and" after the words "Except as provided in."

(8) Section 3291 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3291. Commissioned officers: Army Nurse Corps and Army Medical Specialist Corps: original appointment; additional qualifications, grade

"(a) An original appointment in the Regular Army in the Army Nurse Corps or the Army Medical Specialist Corps may be made in the grade of—

"(1) second lieutenant, from women who have performed less than 3 years of service creditable for promotion under subsection (c), who on the date of nomination have not passed their 27th birthday, and who are not qualified for appointment in the grade of first lieutenant under clause (2);

"(2) first lieutenant, from women who have performed less than 7 years of service creditable for promotion under subsection (c), and who on the date of nomination have not passed their 30th birthday; and

"(3) captain, from women who have performed at least 7 years of service creditable for promotion under subsection (c), and who on the date of nomination have not passed their 39th birthday.

The maximum ages specified in clauses (1) and (2) of this subsection are increased by the period of active commissioned service in the Armed Forces after December 7, 1941, but not by more than 5 years.

"(b) To be eligible for appointment in the Army Nurse Corps under this section, a woman must be a graduate of a hospital or university school of nursing and a registered nurse.

"(c) For the purpose of determining years of service creditable for promotion, a person appointed under subsection (a) shall be credited at the time of her appointment with all active commissioned service in the Armed Forces that she performed after becoming 21 years of age and before her appointment. However, not more than 14 years of service may be so credited. A person appointed as a commissioned officer under subsection (a) (2) who has not performed at least 3 years of active commissioned service in the Armed Forces after December 7, 1941, shall, for the same purposes, be credited with that amount of service."

(9) The analysis of chapter 335 is amended by striking out the following item:

"3291. Commissioned officers: Army Nurse Corps and Women's Medical Specialist Corps: original appointment; additional qualifications, grade."

and inserting the following in place thereof:

"3291. Commissioned officers, Army Nurse Corps and Army Medical Specialist Corps: original appointment; additional qualifications, grade."

(10) Section 3296 is amended—

(A) by striking out the words "those of the Army Nurse Corps and the Women's Medical Specialist Corps," in the first sentence of subsection (a); and

(B) by striking out the words ", except the Admy Nurse Corps and the Women's Medical Specialist Corps" in subsection (b) (3).

(11) Section 3297 (a) is amended—

(A) by striking the period at the end of the last sentence; and

(B) by adding at the end thereof the following new phrase: ", and a selection board considering promotion-list officers of the Army Nurse Corps or the Army Medical Specialist Corps may include promotion-list officers who are in the same corps as the officers being considered by that board and whose regular or temporary grades are above major."

(12) Section 3298 (b) is amended—

(A) by striking out the word "Vacancies" and inserting the word "vacancies" in place thereof; and

(B) by inserting at the beginning of that sentence the words "Except for officers of the Army Nurse Corps and the Army Medical Specialist Corps,".

(13) Section 3299 is amended—

(A) by striking out the words "subsection (f)" in subsection (a) and inserting the words "subsections (f) and (g)" in place thereof;

(B) by adding at the end of subsection (c): "No officer of the Army Nurse Corps or of the Army Medical Specialist Corps may be promoted under this subsection."; and

(C) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h) and inserting the following new subsection after subsection (f):

"(g) Promotion-list officers of the Army Nurse Corps and Army Medical Specialist Corps may be promoted to the regular grade of lieutenant colonel in accordance with section 3304 of this title."

(14) Section 3304 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3304. Commissioned officers; Army Nurse Corps and Army Medical Specialist Corps: promotion to lieutenant colonel or colonel

"(a) Having in view the number of actual and anticipated vacancies in the promotion lists of the Army Nurse Corps or the Army Medical Specialist Corps in the regular grade of lieutenant colonel and the number of officers desired in that grade on the applicable promotion list, the Secretary of the Army shall furnish to selection boards lists of all promotion-list officers in the regular grade of major who have completed at least 21 years of service with which she is entitled to be credited for promotion and all promotion-list officers in that grade whose names appear on that promotion list above the name of any officer who has completed that service, in the order in which their names appear on that promotion list. The Secretary may also furnish to the boards the names of promotion-list officers in the regular grade of major who have not completed 21 years of service creditable for promotion, in the order in which their names appear on that promotion list. He shall direct the boards to recommend for promotion to the grade of lieutenant colonel a number prescribed by him, but not in excess of the number of promotions anticipated to be made to that grade within the next 2 years. The Secretary may not furnish the name of any officer to a board unless he furnishes to it the names of all officers above that officer on that promotion list who are not on a recommended list for promotion to that regular grade. The board shall recommend the prescribed number of those officers whom it considers to be the best qualified.

"(b) Having in view the number of actual and anticipated vacancies in the applicable promotion list in the regular grade of colonel and the number of officers desired in that grade on that promotion list, the Secretary of the Army shall furnish to selection boards lists of all promotion-list officers in the regular grade of lieutenant colonel (except those officers who would not be eligible for nomination by reason of subsection (d)) in the order in which their names appear on that promotion list. He shall direct the boards to recommend for promotion to the grade of colonel a number prescribed by him but not in excess of the number of promotions anticipated to be made to that grade within the next 2 years. The list furnished may not contain the name of any officer who is on a recommended list for promotion to that regular grade. The board shall recommend the prescribed number of those officers whom it considers to be best qualified.

"(c) The names of officers recommended for promotion to the regular grade of lieutenant colonel or colonel shall be entered at the foot of, and carried on, the appropriate permanent recommended list for promotion to those grades in the same order among themselves as on the applicable promotion list. Officers shall be promoted in that order when there is a vacancy in those grades for that list. A vacancy in those grades may be filled at any time. It is not mandatory that the authorized numbers be maintained in the regular grades of lieutenant colonel or colonel on a promotion list.

"(d) An officer must compete at least one year of service in the regular grade of lieutenant colonel before being nominated for promotion to the regular grade of colonel.".

(15) The analysis of chapter 335 is amended by striking out the following item:

"3304. Commissioned officers; Army Nurse Corps and Women's Medical Specialist Corps: promotion to first lieutenant, captain, major, or lieutenant colonel."

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

"3304. Commissioned officers; Army Nurse Corps and Army Medical Specialist: promotion to lieutenant colonel or colonel."

(16) Section 3305 is amended:

(A) by amending the catchline to read as follows:

"§ 3305. Commissioned officers other than officers in Army Nurse Corps and Army Medical Specialist Corps: promotion to colonel"

(B) by inserting the following new sentence at the end of subsection (a): "No officer of the Army Nurse Corps or Army Medical Specialist Corps may be promoted under this section."

(17) The analysis of chapter 335 is amended by striking out the following item:

"3305. Commissioned officers: promotion to colonel."

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

"3305. Commissioned officers other than officers in Army Nurse Corps and Army Medical Specialist Corps: promotion to colonel."

(18) Section 3888 is amended—

(A) by striking out the word "or" appearing after the words "clause (A), (B), (C), (D)," in clause (2) of that section;

(B) by inserting the words "or (F)," after "(E)," in clause (2); and

(C) by inserting the following new clause after clause (2) (E):

"(F) For a commissioned officer appointed in the Army Nurse Corps or Army Medical Specialist Corps, the sum of—

"(i) her years of active commissioned service in the Regular Army after that appointment; and

"(ii) the service credited under section 3291 (c) of this title

(19) Section 3915 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3915. Twenty-five years: regular majors; Women's Army Corps, Army Nurse Corps and Army Medical Specialist Corps

"(a) Unless retired or separated at an earlier date, each officer of the Women's Army Corps whose regular grade is major shall be retired, except as provided by section 47a of title 5, on the 30th day after she completes 25 years of service computed under section 3927 (a) of this title.

"(b) Unless retired or separated at an earlier date, each officer of the Army Nurse Corps and the Army Medical Specialist Corps whose regular grade is major shall be retired, except as provided by section 47a of title 5, on the 30th day after she completes 25 years of service computed under section 3927 (a) of this title. However, if her name is carried on a list of officers recommended for appointment to the regular grade of lieutenant colonel, she shall be retained on the active list while her name is so carried. In addition, if the authorized strength of the corps concerned in officers on the active list is not exceeded, the Secretary of the Army may retain her on the active list until she completes 28 years of service computed under section 3927 (a) of this title, in which case she shall be retired, except as provided by section 47a of title 5, on the 30th day after she completes that service."

(20) The analysis of chapter 367 is amended by striking out the following item:

"3915. Twenty-five years: regular majors; Women's Army Corps."

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

"3915. Twenty-five years: regular majors; Women's Army Corps, Army Nurse Corps and Army Medical Specialist Corps."

(21) Section 3916 (b) (2) is amended by inserting the words "Army Nurse Corps, or Army Medical Specialist Corps," after the words "Women's Army Corps,".

(22) Section 3927 is amended—

(A) by inserting the following new clause immediately after clause (5) in subsection (a):

"(6) For a commissioner officer appointed in the Army Nurse Corps or the Army Medical Specialist Corps, the sum of—

"(A) her years of active commissioned service in the Regular Army after that appointment; and

"(B) the service credited under section 3291 (c) of this title.";

(B) by striking out the word "or" in subsection (b) (2); and

(C) by inserting the words ", or (6)" after the number "(5)" in subsection (b) (2).

(23) Section 3991 is amended:

(A) by striking out formula "A" of the table therein; and

(B) by redesignating formulas "B", "C", "D", and "E" as formulas "A", "B", "C", and "D", respectively.

SEC. 102. Where two or more officers of the Army Nurse Corps or the Army Medical Specialist Corps have the same regular grade and the same date of rank, their relative position on the applicable promotion list shall be determined as prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

SEC. 103. An officer of the Army Nurse Corps or Army Medical Specialist Corps who is promoted to a higher regular grade before January 1, 1958, may not be retired under title 10, United States Code, sections 3915 (b), 3916, 3919, or 3921 (a), before the date which is 2 years after the date she is promoted.

SEC. 104. (a) This act does not affect the appointment of an officer of the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army, or the Army Medical Specialist Corps, Regular Army, on the active list on the effective date of this act.

(b) This act does not affect the retired status or retired pay of a person retired under section 108, Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, or any other law.

(c) An officer of the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army, or the Army Medical Specialist Corps, Regular Army, on the active list on the effective date of this act does not lose any years of service creditable to her on that date for promotion, computation of basic pay, or other purposes, by the enactment of this act.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an officer of the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army, or the Army Medical Specialist Corps, Regular Army, who is on a recommended list for promotion to a higher regular grade on the effective date of this act may, if nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, be promoted to that grade.

(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an officer of the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army, or the Army Medical Specialist Corps, Regular Army, who, on the effective date of this act, has been nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate for appointment to any regular grade, may be appointed in that grade.

SEC. 105. This title may be cited as the "Army Nurse and Medical Specialist Act of 1957."

TITLE II—NAVY

SEC. 201. Subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 5444 (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The number of officers serving on active duty in the grades of captain and commander in the Nurse Corps may not exceed, respectively, 3/10 of 1 percent and 5 percent of the number of officers serving on active duty in that corps."

(2) Section 5444 (c) is amended by—

(A) adding the word "and" after the semicolon in clause (1), and striking out clauses (2) and (3) and inserting in place thereof the following clause:

"(2) the number of captains and commanders authorized under this section for the Nurse Corps.";

(B) striking out in the third sentence the words "in the grade of captain in the Medical Service Corps, or in the grade of commander or lieutenant commander in the Nurse Corps" and inserting in place thereof the words "or in the grade of captain or commander in the Nurse Corps"; and

(C) striking out in the last sentence the word "commander" and the words "lieutenant commander" and inserting in place thereof the word "captain" and the word "commander", respectively.

(3) Section 5444 (e) is amended by striking out the last sentence.

(4) Section 5449 is amended by—

(A) repealing subsection (c) and relettering subsections (d), (e), and (f) as (c), (d), and (e), respectively;

(B) amending the first sentence of present subsection (d) to read as follows: "The number of officers on the active list of the Navy in the Nurse Corps holding permanent appointments in the grades of captain and commander may not exceed, respectively, 3/10 of 1 percent and 5 percent of the number of officers on the active list of the Navy in that Corps."; and

(C) striking out in the last sentence of present subsection (e) the words "lieutenant commander" and the word "commander" and inserting in place thereof the word "commander" and the word "captain", respectively.

(5) Section 5702 is amended by—

(A) striking out in clause (2) of subsection (a) the words "each corps and each grade" and inserting in place thereof the words "each corps, other than the Medical Service Corps and the Nurse Corps, and for each grade";

(B) adding to subsection (a) the following clauses:

"(3) A board for the Medical Service Corps to recommend captains for continuation on the active list, and a board for the Nurse Corps to recommend captains and commanders for continuation on the active list, each consisting of not less than 3 or more than 6 officers of the Regular Navy in the Medical Corps serving in the grade of rear admiral.

"(4) A board for the Medical Service Corps, for each grade, to recommend commanders, lieutenant commanders, lieutenants, and lieutenants (junior grade) for promotion to the next higher grade, each consisting of not less than 6 or more than 9 officers serving in the grade of captain or above, of whom two-thirds shall be officers in the Medical Corps and one-third officers in the Medical Service Corps, except that when officers in the Medical Service Corps in dental specialties are eligible for consideration for promotion the membership of the board shall include, in lieu of one of the officers in the Medical Corps, an officer in the Dental Corps serving in the grade of captain or above.

"(5) A board for the Nurse Corps to recommend commanders for promotion to captain, consisting of not less than 6 or more than 9 officers serving in the grade of captain or above, of whom two-thirds shall be officers in the Medical Corps and one-third officers in the Nurse Corps unless there are insufficient officers of the Nurse Corps available to serve in which case the Secretary shall complete the minimum required membership by the appointment of officers in the Medical Corps serving in the grade of captain or above.

"(6) A board for the Nurse Corps, for each grade, to recommend lieutenant commanders, lieutenants, and lieutenants (junior grade) for promotion to the next higher grade, each consisting of not less than 6 or more than 9 officers of whom two-thirds shall be officers in the Medical Corps serving in the grade of captain or above and one-third officers in the Nurse Corps serving in the grade of captain or commander.";

(C) amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) Each board convened under this section to consider officers in the Medical Corps, the Supply Corps, the Chaplain Corps, the Civil Engineer Corps, or the Dental Corps shall consist of officers in the corps concerned, and each board convened under this section to consider officers of the Medical Service Corps or the Nurse Corps shall consist of officers in the corps indicated in subsection (a). Except as provided in subsections (c) and (d), each board convened under this section shall consist of officers of the Regular Navy on the active list or the retired list.";

(D) amending subsection (c) by striking out the word "When" and inserting in place thereof the words "Except as provided in subsection (a), when"; and

(E) amending the second sentence of subsection (e) to read as follows: "However, boards to recommend officers in the Nurse Corps for promotion to the grades of captain and commander need not be convened unless there is a vacancy in the grade concerned or the Secretary estimates or determines that a vacancy will occur during the next 12 months."

(6) Section 5707 (a) is amended by repealing clause (3) and renumbering clauses (4), (5), (6), and (7) as (3), (4), (5), and (6), respectively.

(7) Section 5708 is amended by—

(A) repealing clause (5) of subsection (b) and renumbering clauses (6), (7), and (8), as (5), (6), and (7), respectively; and

(B) striking out in clause (2) of subsection (c) the words "lieutenant (junior grade)" and inserting in place thereof the words "lieutenant or lieutenant (junior grade)."

(8) Section 5753 (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Officers in the Medical Corps, the Chaplain Corps, the Dental Corps, the Medical Service Corps, and the Nurse Corps, in the grades of lieutenant and lieutenant (junior grade), except officers in those corps appointed under section 5590 of this title, are eligible for consideration for promotion to the next higher grade by a selection board convened under chapter 543 of this title when they are in the promotion zone or are senior to the officers in the promotion zone in the grade in which they are serving."

(9) Section 5762 is amended by—

(A) striking out in the first sentence of subsection (a) the words "or the Dental Corps, or the grade of commander in the Medical Service Corps" and inserting in place thereof the words "Dental Corps, or the Medical Service Corps";

(B) repealing subsection (b) and relettering subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) as (b), (c), (d), and (e), respectively;

(C) striking out in present subsection (e) the words "or the Medical Service Corps" and inserting in place thereof the words "the Medical Service Corps, or the Nurse Corps";

(D) striking out in subsection (f) the words "commander or lieutenant commander" and inserting in place thereof the words "captain or commander"; and

(E) repealing subsection (g).

(10) Section 5773 is amended by amending the first sentence of subsection (c) to read as follows: "Each commander and lieutenant commander in the Nurse Corps, whose name is placed on a promotion list under subsection (a), may be promoted to the grade for which selected when a vacancy for her occurs in that grade."

(11) Section 5775 is amended by striking out in subsection (e) the words "Each officer in the Medical Service Corps who is promoted to the grade of captain and each officer in the Nurse Corps who is promoted to the grade of commander or lieutenant commander" and inserting in place thereof the words "Each officer in the Nurse Corps who is promoted to the grade of captain or commander."

(12) Section 5776 is amended by striking out in subsection (d) the words "in the grade of lieutenant commander or lieutenant."

(13) Section 5782 is amended by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

"(d) Notwithstanding subsections (b) and (c), no officer may be permanently appointed in the grade of captain or commander in the Nurse Corps unless there is a vacancy for her in the grade in that corps as determined by computations made under section 5449 of this title."

(14) The analysis of chapter 573 is amended by striking out the following items:

"6377. Regular Navy, line captains restricted in performance of duty and staff corps captains; Regular Marine Corps, colonels designated for supply duty: retirement for length of service.

"6378. Regular Navy, line captains restricted in performance of duty and staff corps captains; Regular Marine Corps, colonels designated for supply duty: continuation on active list; retirement."

and inserting in place thereof the following items:

"6377. Regular Navy, line captains restricted in performance of duty, staff corps captains, and Nurse Corps commanders; Regular Marine Corps, colonels designated for supply duty: retirement for length of service or for age.

"6378. Regular Navy, line captains restricted in performance of duty, staff corps captains, and Nurse Corps commanders; Regular Marine corps, colonels designated for supply duty: continuation on active list; retirement."

(15) Section 6377 is amended by—

(A) changing the caption to read as follows:

"Regular Navy, line captains restricted in performance of duty, staffs corps captains, and Nurse Corps commanders; Regular Marine Corps, colonels designated for supply duty: retirement for length of service or for age"

(B) striking out in subsection (b) the words "Medical Service Corps" and inserting in place thereof the words "Nurse Corps";

(C) amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

"(c) If not continued on the active list under section 6378 of this title, each officer serving in the grade of captain on the active list of the Navy in the Nurse Corps shall be retired on June 30 of the fiscal year in which she becomes 55 years of age or completes 30 years of active service as computed under section 6388 of this title, whichever is earlier.";

(D) inserting between subsection (c) and (d) the following new subsection and relettering subsection (d) as (e):

"(d) If not on a promotion list and if not continued on the active list under section 6378 of this title, each officer serving in the grade of commander on the active list of the Navy in the Nurse Corps shall be retired on June 30 of the fiscal year in which she becomes 55 years of age or completes 30 years of active service as computed under section 6388 of this title, whichever is earlier."

(E) amending present subsection (d) by striking out the words "subsections (a), (b), and (c)" and inserting in place thereof the words "subsections (a) and (b)."

(16) Section 6378 is amended by—

(A) changing the caption to read as follows:

"Regular Navy, line captains restricted in performance of duty, staff corps captains, and Nurse Corps commanders; Regular Marine Corps, colonels designated for supply duty: continuation on active list; retirement"

(B) striking out in the first sentence of subsection (a) the words "except the Medical Service Corps," and inserting in place thereof a comma and the words "each officer serving in the grade of commander on the active list of the Navy in the Nurse Corps,";

(C) striking out in the second sentence of subsection (a) the words "captain or colonel" and inserting in place thereof the words "captain, colonel, or commander"; and

(D) amending clause (7) of subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(7) The number of captains in the Medical Corps, the Dental Corps, the Medical Service Corps and the Nurse Corps, and the number of commanders in the Nurse Corps, that the Secretary of the Navy determines to be necessary to meet the needs of the service."

(17) Section 6379 is amended by—

(A) striking out in subsection (a) the words "or an officer in the Medical Service Corps"; and

(B) amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) This section does not apply to officers in the Nurse Corps."

(18) Section 6381 is amended by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) The retired pay under this section of an officer in the Nurse Corps may not be less than 50 percent of the basic pay upon which the computation of retired pay is based."

(19) Section 6382 is amended by inserting in subsection (b) after the words "lieutenant (junior grade)" a comma and the words "except an officer of the Nurse Corps,".

(20) Section 6388 is amended by striking out in subsection (d) in the first sentence the words "of the preceding sections" and the words "serving in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade)," and in the second sentence the words "of the preceding sections."

(21) Section 6395 is amended by—

(A) striking out in clause (3) of subsection (h) the words "serving in grade of lieutenant (junior grade)"; and

(B) repealing clause (4) of subsection (h) and renumbering clause (5) as clause (4).

(22) Section 6396 is amended by—

(A) amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(a) An officer on the active list of the Navy serving in the grade of lieutenant commander in the Nurse Corps shall, subject to the provisions of section 5777 of this title, be retired on June 30 of the fiscal year in which she becomes 55 years of age or completes 30 years of service computed under section 6388 of this title, whichever is earlier.";

(B) amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) An officer on the active list of the Navy serving in a grade below lieutenant commander in the Nurse Corps shall, subject to section 5777 of this title, be retired on June 30 of the fiscal year in which she becomes 50 years of age or completes 20 years of service computed under section 6388 of this title, whichever is later."

(C) repealing subsection (c) and relettering subsection (d) as (c);

(D) amending clause (2) of present subsection (d) by striking out the phrase "more than 75 percent" and inserting in place thereof the phrase "more than 75 percent or less than 50 percent."

SEC. 202. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5762 (e) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by this act, for 1 year after the effective date of this act, the number of officers in the Nurse Corps that may be recommended for promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander, which the Secretary of the Navy may furnish a selection board convened under chapter 543 of title 10, United States Code, may be a number equal to the number of lieutenants in the Nurse Corps in and senior to the promotion zone for that grade, minus the number of officers of that grade on the promotion list.

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

SEC. 301. Subtitle D of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 8206 is amended to read as follows: "The authorized strength in Air Force nurses on the active list of the Regular Air Force is as prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force within the authorized strength of the Regular Air Force in commissioned officers on the active list."

(2) Section 8207 is amended to read as follows: "The authorized strength in Air Force medical specialists on the active list of the Regular Air Force is as prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force within the authorized strength of the Regular Air Force in commissioned officers on the active list."

(3) Section 8212 is amended by striking out the figure "8304,".

(4) Section 8285 is amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "In addition, to be eligible for original appointment with a view to designation as an Air Force nurse, a person must be a graduate of a hospital or university school of nursing and a registered nurse."

(5) Section 8286 is amended—

(A) by striking out in subsection (a) the words "8291 or"; and

(B) by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(c) This section does not apply to persons appointed with a view to designation as an Air Force nurse or medical specialist."

(6) Section 8287 is amended—

(A) by striking out in subsection (a) the words "except a person" and inserting in place thereof the words "except as provided in subsection (b) of this section and except for persons";

(B) by inserting the following new subsection after subsection (a):

"(b) For the purposes set forth in subsection (a), a person originally appointed in a commissioned grade in the Regular Air Force with a view to designation as an Air Force nurse or medical specialist shall be credited, at the time of her appointment, with all active commissioned service in the Armed Forces after December 6, 1941, that she performed after becoming 21 years of age and before her appointment. However, not more than 14 years of service may be so credited. For the same purposes, a person who is originally appointed in the grade of first lieutenant under section 8288 (b) of this title and who has not performed at least 3 years of active commissioned service in the Armed Forces after December 6, 1941, shall be credited with that amount of service."

(C) by redesignating present subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) as "(c)," "(d)," "(e)," and "(f)," respectively.

(7) Section 8288 is amended—

(A) by inserting "(a)" at the beginning thereof;

(B) by inserting before the words "section 8294" the words "subsection (b) of this section and";

(C) by inserting after the words "section 8287" the designations "(a), (c), (d), or (e)"; and

(D) by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(b) Based on the service credited under section 8287 (b) of this title, the commissioned grade in which an Air Force nurse or medical specialist is originally appointed in the Regular Air Force is:

"(1) For persons with less than 3 years of service who on the date of nomination have not passed their 27th birthday and who are not qualified under clause (2)—second lieutenant.

"(2) For persons with less than 7 years of service who are qualified under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force and who on the date of nomination have not passed their 30th birthday—first lieutenant.

"(3) For persons with at least 7 years of service who on the date of nomination have not passed their 39th birthday—captain.

The maximum ages specified in clauses (1) and (2) of this subsection are increased by the period of active commissioned service which the member performed in the Armed

Forces after December 6, 1941, but not by more than 5 years."

(8) The last sentence of section 8297 (a) is amended to read as follows: "However, a selection board considering—

"(1) Under section 8300 (a) or (b) of this title female promotion list officers other than those designated under section 8067 of this title, may include female promotion list officers who are not designated under that section, who are senior in regular grade, to and who outrank, any female officer being considered by that board; and

"(2) Air Force nurses or medical specialists, may include Air Force nurses or medical specialists, as the case may be, in a temporary or regular grade above major."

(9) Section 8299 is amended—

(A) by inserting in subsection (a) after the words "subsection (f)" the words "or (g)";

(B) by inserting the following new subsection after subsection (f):

"(g) Air Force nurses and medical specialists may be promoted to the regular grade of lieutenant colonel in the manner prescribed in section 8305 of this title to fill vacancies in the number authorized for that grade by the Secretary. Whenever a selection board is considering Air Force nurses or medical specialists for promotion to the regular grade of lieutenant colonel, the Secretary shall furnish to the board the name of each Air Force nurse or medical specialist, as the case may be, in the regular grade of major who has completed at least 21 years of service with which she is entitled to be credited for promotion purposes, and the names of all of those officers in that regular grade whose names appear on the applicable promotion list above the name of any officer who has completed at least 21 years of that service. In addition, he may furnish to the board, in the order in which their names appear on the applicable promotion list, the names of any other Air Force nurses or medical specialists, as the case may be, in the regular grade of major who have not completed 21 years of that service.

(C) by redesignating present subsection (g) as "(h)."

(10) Section 8300 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d) This section does not apply to the promotion of Air Force nurses or medical specialists to the regular grade or lieutenant colonel."

(11) Section 8301 (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) This section does not apply to the promotion of Air Force nurses or medical specialists to the regular grade of lieutenant colonel."

(12) Section 8303 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(f) This section does not apply to Air Force nurses or medical specialists being considered for promotion to the regular grade of lieutenant colonel."

(13) Section 8305 is amended—

(A) by amending subsection (g) to read as follows:

"(g) Air Force nurses and medical specialists may be promoted under this section only to fill vacancies in the number authorized for that grade by the Secretary."

(B) by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(h) This section does not apply to female officers on the Air Force promotion list who are not designated under section 8067 of this title."

(14) The analysis of chapter 835 is amended by striking out the following items:

"8291. Commissioned officers; Air Force nurses and women medical specialists: original appointment; additional qualifications; grade."; and

"8304. Commissioned officers; Air Force nurses and women medical specialists: promotion to first lieutenant, captain, major, lieutenant colonel, or colonel."

(15) Section 8888 is amended—

(A) by inserting the following new clause after clause (2) (B):

"(C) For an Air Force nurse or medical specialist, the period of service credited to her under the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, or credited to her under section 8287 (b) of this title at the time of her appointment, plus her years of active commissioned service in the Regular Air Force after her appointment in the Regular Air Force."

(B) by striking out in present clause (2) (D) the words "(A) or (C)" and inserting in place thereof the words "(A), (C), or (D)";

(C) by striking out in present clause (2) (E) the words "clause (B)" and inserting in place thereof the words "clause (B) or (C)"; and

(D) by redesignating present clauses (C), (D), and (E) as "(D)", "(E)", and "(F)", respectively.

(16) The analysis of chapter 865 is amended by striking out the following items:

"8381. Age 50: Regular Air Force nurses and women medical specialists below major.

"8382. Age 55: Regular Air Force nurses and women medical specialists above captain."; and

"8887. Computation of years of service: discretionary retirement; Regular Air Force nurses and women medical specialists."

(17) Section 8915 is amended—

(A) by inserting "(a)" at the beginning thereof;

(B) by striking out the words "section 8067" and inserting in place thereof the words "section 8067 (a)–(d) or (g)–(l)"; and

(C) by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(b) The Secretary of the Air Force may defer the retirement under this section of any Air Force nurse or medical specialist in the regular grade of major until the 30th day after she completes 28 years of service computed under section 8927 (a) of this title."

(18) Section 8916 (a) is amended by striking out the words ", except an Air Force nurse or a woman medical specialist,".

(19) Section 8927 (a) is amended—

(A) by inserting the following new clause after clause (2):

"(3) For an Air Force nurse or medical specialist, the period of service credited to her under the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, or credited to her under section 8287 (b) of this title at the time of her appointment, plus her years of active commissioned service in the Regular Air Force after her appointment in the Regular Air Force."

(B) by striking out in present clause (4) the words "(1) or (3)" and inserting in place thereof the words "(1), (3), or (4)";

(C) by striking out in present clause (5) the words "clause (2)" and inserting in place thereof the words "clause (2) or (3)"; and

(D) by redesignating present clauses (3), (4), and (5) as "(4)," "(5)," and "(6)," respectively.

(20) The analysis of chapter 867 is amended—

(A) by striking out the following items:

"8912. Twenty years or more: Regular Air Force nurses and women medical specialists.";

"8915. Twenty-five years: Female majors except those designated under section 8067 of this title."; and

"8928. Computation of years of service: Voluntary retirement; Regular Air Force nurses and women medical specialists."; and

(B) by inserting the following new item:

"8915. Twenty-five years: Female majors except those designated under section 8067 (a)–(d) or (g)–(l) of this title."

(21) Section 8991 is amended—

(A) by striking out formula "A" of the table therein; and

(B) by redesignating formulas "B," "C," "D," and "E" as "A," "B," "C," and "D," respectively.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may convene boards of officers to review the records and compute the service of each Air Force nurse or medical specialist who is on the active list of the Regular Air Force on the effective date of this act, in order to adjust the service credited to each of them to reflect the service authorized to be credited under section 8287 (b) of title 10, United States Code. When that adjustment is made, the officers whose credit is so adjusted shall be given precedence for promotion purposes in accordance with their adjusted dates of rank. If, as a result of readjustment of service credit under this section, an officer becomes eligible for promotion, she shall be considered for promotion by the next selection board considering officers of her grade and category. If she is promoted on the recommendation of that board, her date of regular grade and her position on the applicable promotion list shall be adjusted to reflect her increased service.

SEC. 303. An Air Force nurse or medical specialist who is promoted to a higher regular grade after the effective date of this act and before January 1, 1958, and who would otherwise be retired under chapter 865 or 867 of title 10, United States Code, before that date which is 2 years after the date she is promoted, may not be retired under either of those chapters until that date which is 2 years after the date she is promoted.

SEC. 304. This act does not affect—

(1) the appointment of an Air Force nurse or medical specialist on the active list of the Regular Air Force on the effective date of this act; or

(2) the status or retired pay of any person retired under section 108 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, or any other provision of law.

SEC. 305. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) an Air Force nurse or medical specialist who is on a recommended list for promotion to a higher regular grade on the effective date of this act may, if nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, be promoted to that grade; and

(2) an Air Force nurse or medical specialist who, on the effective date of this act, has been nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate for promotion to a higher regular grade, may be promoted to that grade.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Sections 3881, 3882, 3887, 3912, 3928, 8291, 8298 (c), 8299 (h), 8304, 8881, 8882, 8887, 8912, and 8928 are repealed.

(2) The analysis of chapter 365 is amended by striking out the following items:

"3881. Age 50: regular commissioned officers below major; Army Nurse Corps and Women's Medical Specialist Corps.";

"3882. Age 55: regular commissioned officers above captain; Army Nurse Corps and Women's Medical Specialist Corps."; and

"3887. Computation of years of service: discretionary retirement; regular commissioned officers; Army Nurse Corps and Women's Medical Specialist Corps."

(3) The analysis of chapter 367 is amended by striking out the following items:

"3912. Twenty years or more: regular commissioned officers; Army Nurse Corps and Women's Medical Specialist Corps."; and

"3928. Computation of years of service: voluntary retirement, regular commissioned officers; Army Nurse Corps and Women's Medical Specialist Corps."

(4) The analysis of chapter 835 is amended by striking out the following items:

"8291. Commissioned officers; Air Force nurses and women medical specialists: original appointment; additional qualifications, grade."; and

"8304. Commissioned officers; Air Force nurses and women medical specialists: promotion to first lieutenant, captain, major, lieutenant colonel, or colonel."

(5) The analysis of chapter 865 is amended by striking out the following items:

"8881. Age 50: Regular Air Force nurses and women medical specialists below major.";

"8882. Age 55: Regular Air Force nurses and women medical specialists above captain."; and

"8887. Computation of years of service: discretionary retirement; Regular Air Force nurses and women medical specialists."

(6) The analysis of chapter 867 is amended by striking out the following items:

"8912. Twenty years or more: Regular Air Force nurses and women medical specialists."; and

"8928. Computation of years of service: voluntary retirement; Regular Air Force nurses and women medical specialists."

Mr. KILDAY (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be printed in the RECORD and be subject to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as there are a number of committee amendments I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

On page 5, lines 10 and 11, strike out the word "bithday" and insert in lieu thereof "birthday."

On page 8, line 24, strike out the words "she is" and substitute in lieu thereof "they are."

On page 9, line 19, strike out the words "applicable promotion list" and insert in lieu thereof the words "promotion lists of the Army Nurse Corps or the Army Medical Specialist Corps."

On page 9, line 21, strike out the words "that promotion list" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the applicable promotion list."

On page 12, line 2, place the 2 in parentheses: (2).

On page 12, strike out lines 9 and 10 and insert in lieu thereof:

"(ii) the service credited under section 101 or 105 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 41), as amended, or the service credited under section 3291 (c) of this title, as the case may be."

On page 13, line 21, strike out the word "commissioner" and insert in lieu thereof the word "commissioned."

On page 14, strike out lines 4 and 5 and insert in lieu thereof:

"(B) the service credited under section 101 or 105 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 41), as amended, or the service credited under section 3291 (c) of this title, as the case may be."

On page 14, line 22, strike out the date "January 1, 1958" and insert in lieu thereof: "the date which is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act,".

On page 27, after line 13, insert a new subsection as follows:

"(23) Section 5140 (a) is amended by striking out in the first sentence the words 'commander or lieutenant commander' and inserting the words 'lieutenant commander or above' in place thereof."

On page 27, after line 24, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 203. (a) A woman officer appointed in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy before the effective date of this act may, upon her application, made not later than January 30, 1958, be reappointed in that corps under section 5579 of title 10, United States Code, notwithstanding the limitations specified therein with regard to age or grade. The provisions of law applicable to male officers appointed under that section are applicable to a woman officer so reappointed.

"(b) A woman officer reappointed in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy under subsection (a) shall be reappointed in her permanent grade with date of rank held by her at the time of reappointment. The running mate of a woman officer so reappointed shall be an eligible male line officer of the Navy of appropriate precedence assigned by the Secretary of the Navy. Officers so reappointed who at time of reappointment had to their credit leave accrued, but not taken, shall not by reason of reappointment lost such accrued leave.

"(c) A woman officer appointed in the Medical Service Corps of the Naval Reserve before the effective date of this act is considered for all purposes to have been appointed under section 5581 of title 10, United States Code. Such an officer shall be assigned a running mate in the same manner as is provided for a male officer appointed in the Medical Service Corps of the Naval Reserve."

On page 28, strike out lines 4 through 14, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) Section 8206 is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 8206. Regular Air Force: Commissioned officers on active list; Air Force nurses

"'(a) The authorized strength in Air Force nurses on the active list of the Regular Air Force is as prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force within the authorized strength of the Regular Air Force in commissioned officers on the active list.

"'(b) Of the authorized strength of the Air Force in Air Force nurses on the active list of the Regular Air Force, not more than 5 may be in the regular grade of colonel, and not more than 107 may be the regular grade of lieutenant colonel.'

"(2) Section 8207 is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 8207. Regular Air Force: Commissioned officers on active list; medical specialists

"'(a) The authorized strength in Air Force medical specialists on the active list of the Regular Air Force is as prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force within the authorized strength of the Regular Air Force in commissioned officers on the active list.

"'(b) Of the authorized strength in medical specialists on the active list of the Regular Air Force, not more than 1 may be in the regular grade of colonel, and not more than 20 may be in the regular grade of lieutenant colonel:'"

On page 31, after line 22, add a new subsection, as follows:

"(9) Section 8298 (b) is amended by adding the following new sentence at the end thereof: 'This subsection does not apply to Air Force nurses of medical specialists.'"

On page 31, line 23, change "(9)" to read "(10)."

On page 31, after line 25, insert a new subsection, as follows:

"(B) by inserting the following new sentence at the end of subsection (c): 'This subsection does not apply to the promotion of Air Force nurses or medical specialists to the grade of captain, major, or lieutenant colonel.'"

On page 32, line 1, change "(B)" to read "(C)."

On page 32, line 22, change "(C)" to read "(D)."

On page 32, line 23, change "(10)" to read "(11)."

On page 33, line 3, change "(11)" to read "(12)."

On page 33, line 7, change "(12)" to read "(13)."

On page 33, line 12, change "(13)" to read "(14)."

On page 33, line 23, change "(14)" to read "(15)."

On page 34, line 1, change "(15)" to read "(16)."

On page 34, line 20, change "(16)" to read "(17)."

On page 35, line 1, change "(17)" to read "(18)."

On page 35, line 13, change "(18)" to read "(19)."

On page 35, line 16, change "(19)" to read "(20)."

On page 36, line 13, change "(20)" to read "(21)."

On page 36, line 16, change "(21)" to read "(22)."

On page 37, lines 19 and 20, strike out the words "after the effective date of this act and before January 1, 1958," and insert in lieu thereof "within 1 year after the effective date of this act."

On page 39, strike out sections 401 (4), 401 (5), 401 (6).

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. COOPER] having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2460) to improve the career opportunities of nurses and medical specialists of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, pursuant to House Resolution 176, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF A MILITARY DEPARTMENT TO FURNISH STEVEDORING AND TERMINAL SERVICES AND FACILITIES TO COMMERCIAL STEAMSHIP COMPANIES

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2797) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of a military department to furnish stevedoring and terminal services and facilities to commercial steamship companies, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2797, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this bill authorizes the Secretary of the military departments to furnish stevedoring and terminal services and facilities to commercial steamship companies.

From the title of this bill, it might appear that it grants some new and different authority to the military departments. I want to assure the Members of this House that this is not so. I also want to deal very briefly with why this bill is necessary.

Commercial steamship companies require certain terminal services in carrying out their shipping contracts, charters, and bills of lading. The cost of these services at their own terminals is included in the ocean transportation rates negotiated and paid by the Military Sea Transportation Service and, in turn, is ultimately charged against the applicable appropriations of the military departments available for ocean transportation. In many cases, however, the cargo is loaded onto or discharged from the commercial vessels at terminals or depots of the military departments at which the necessary services for the vessels must be provided by the military departments concerned, either directly or through their stevedoring contractors.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] introduced this measure and is well versed in its desirability. He will explain it to the Members. Therefore, I yield such time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] as he may desire.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues; in the first place I would like to stress that the only piers and the only facilities which are in any way affected by this bill of mine, H. R. 2797, are those which are already under the control of the military department; the Defense Department. The bill does not in any way, relate to commercial facilities or commercial ports. It applies exclusively to military ones.

I would like also to stress the fact that only cargo of the Department of Defense is in any way involved in this bill.

No commercial cargo is in any way involved. Today, when a merchant vessel calls at a military terminal to load or unload cargo, the Navy requires that the owner or operator of that merchant vessel make an advance deposit of the amount of money estimated to be necessary to cover the stevedoring and other terminal services which will be furnished the vessel. The reason the Navy feels that it must receive this money in advance as at present is because of its interpretation of section 3678 of the Revised Statutes. The law reads as follows:

> Except as otherwise provided by law, sums appropriated for the various branches of expenditure in the public service shall be applied solely to the objects for which they are respectively made, and for no others.

You might ask what is wrong with requiring an advance deposit. I will answer that. There actually would be nothing wrong with it if it could be estimated in advance what the actual costs would be. This for various reasons, including the hazards of weather, make that practically impossible.

For example, let us say that a ship operator deposits $1,000 for services which it is estimated would be sufficient to cover the loading of a vessel on Thursday or Friday. Owing to bad weather or some other unanticipated delays, the ship doesn't arrive at the military terminal until Saturday and will require services on Saturday and Sunday. All of these hours involve overtime premium pay because the work is being done on Saturday and Sunday. At six o'clock on Saturday night, the ship is two-thirds loaded but the $1,000 has been exhausted. The Navy feels that it must then stop loading the ship until it can get additional money from the shipowner's main office. The shipowner's office is generally not open on Saturday night or Sunday. So here we have a ship delayed in its sailing, with the owner of the ship losing money, the military department not having its cargo shipped as quickly as it should be and encountering other similar unnecessary delays and inconveniences.

I would grant most freely that there are other ways to do this. I suppose, for example, that large deposits of money could be given to each ship captain to cover contingencies like this, or that large initial deposits could be made at every military terminal throughout the United States which would be adequate to cover any possible situation. This, however, is, if I may state it in this fashion, doing it the hard way.

Under this bill, the services will be provided and the Navy will bill the owner or operator of the vessel in a normal business fashion. At the time the Navy bills the vessel, the Navy is already indebted to the shipowner for many times the amount of the money owed for the terminal services. If the situation ever arose as to whether the charges were correct or not, the Navy simply can withhold what it feels is the correct charge from the payment which it will be making for the carrying of the cargo. So there is no danger on that score.

Understand, Mr. Chairman, that this bill does not authorize any new activity on the part of a military department. It merely places on a simple fiscal, and sound administrative basis an activity which is now carried on. As a matter of fact, the Army today does what this bill would authorize. The Army has simply interpreted the law differently from the Navy. The passage of this bill will place the whole matter on a sound legal basis as well as remove the doubts and inconveniences which the Navy now encounters.

One last point which I would like to make is the fact that the military departments load and unload vessels under stevedoring contracts with civilian companies in exactly the same fashion that a private company or terminal does. This does not involve military personnel.

The amendments to the bill do not relate to any matters of substance. They represent only better drafting. For example, instead of stating "Notwithstanding the provisions of any law," the bill refers to the specific law. The other amendment which inserts the word "vessels" in place of "commercial steamship companies" is merely to make clear that the bill has application only to the vessel which receives the services and not some other vessel owned by the same company which is not carrying defense cargo. This does not involve military personnel.

In conclusion, therefore, I wish to say, only military terminals are involved; only Department of Defense cargo is involved. The bill will not cost the Federal Government one cent. It should save a tidy sum of money. The bill will not grant the military departments any new authority because the activities contemplated by the bill are now being carried on. The only reason for having this bill at all is to clear up a doubtful area in the law as interpreted by the Navy Department.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. In other words, all this bill does is to put on a more orderly basis the fiscal arrangements by which shipping companies reimburse the Federal Government for these services when they are rendered to us?

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER of California. And it in no way enlarges the scope of the operations of the United States Navy or the Military Sea Transportation Service beyond their present operations.

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct. It in no way changes the status of the contractual relationships between the military departments and the stevedoring companies or groups.

Mr. MILLER of California. So all it does is to provide a more realistic method by which the Federal Government is reimbursed for the services rendered.

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHELLEY. I think the gentleman may have answered the question I had in mind. In other words, there is nothing in this bill that would allow the military services to substitute enlisted personnel to unload or discharge cargo as against regularly employed longshoremen?

Mr. DOYLE. It would not. As the gentleman knows, these military cargoes are handled through a coordinated contract with the Military Sea Transport Service and that is not changed one iota.

Mr. SHELLEY. It would not extend any authority of the Navy or the Army Transportation Service to make available other facilities than those which are now military pier facilities?

Mr. DOYLE. It would not.

Mr. SHELLEY. The gentleman mentioned the case of a ship due to arrive on a Saturday being held up for some reason. Has the gentleman given any thought to what may develop in the event of a strike situation where commercial cargoes were being held up on account of the strike? Could this in any way be resorted to by the military to have these vessels shifted to a military facility and then have military personnel load or discharge cargo?

Mr. DOYLE. I see my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] is ready to answer that question, and I yield to him.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from California that normally, if there is a strike, they unload military cargo anyhow.

Mr. SHELLEY. I know that, but I am asking if it could be interpreted in any way to apply to other cargo?

Mr. DOYLE. Absolutely not. It applies only to military cargo.

Mr. SHELLEY. Because it is my understanding, in a strike situation, and military cargo is aboard a vessel, the strikers usually go in and handle that, but will not handle the regular commercial cargo.

Mr. DOYLE. That will be continued.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does this bill apply to foreign-flag ships as well as American-flag ships?

Mr. DOYLE. It does not.

Mr. GROSS. Only to ships operated under the American flag?

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. As I understand it, this will cost the Government not one penny?

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. And it will expedite the unloading of cargo for defense purposes. It renders simple justice to the owners of private shipping and there is no way at all whereby the Government will have to pay more money than it is now paying, because all the people with whom the Navy will deal are already indebted to the Navy?

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct; as a matter of fact, I believe in its ultimate application a good many thousand dollars a year.

Mr. GROSS. Do I correctly understand the gentleman to say that no military supplies for the United States forces are carried in foreign bottoms?

Mr. DOYLE. I did not state that.

Mr. GROSS. Then if military supplies are carried, would that not be drawn under the terms of this legislation?

Mr. DOYLE. Will my distinguished subcommittee chairman answer that?

Mr. DURHAM. There are no foreign countries, as far as I know, carrying military supplies.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I think the gentleman is familiar with the Port of Whittier in Alaska, which, as I understand, is a military port. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not they use civilian or military personnel for stevedoring services in Whittier?

Mr. DOYLE. I am sorry I do not know what the fact is there at this time. Does the gentleman from North Carolina know what the fact is as to whether or not the stevedoring at the Port of Whittier in Alaska is done by military personnel or by civilians?

Mr. DURHAM. It is done just as they do in any other port. It is all civilian.

Mr. PELLY. It is a military port. At one time there was some complaint that the armed services were used to unload the vessels.

Mr. DURHAM. No; we use the ordinary civilian forces to unload the ships.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] has given a fine, clear, and concise statement on this bill and there is little I can add to it. I would like to stress, however, that this bill provides no new or different authority to any of the military departments. On the contrary, it merely continues a practice which is now going on but puts the stevedoring and other terminal functions on a businesslike basis.

The gentleman has mentioned that the Army today does what this bill will permit the Navy and Air Force to do.

The Army, because of its interpretation of the law, feels that advance payments are not required to cover these services. The Navy, by a more limited construction of the law, feels it is at least doubtful that these services can be performed without an advance payment.

I do not know which department has the better lawyers interpreting the law but I will say this—that the Army's practice is certainly a great deal more sensible than the course which the Navy feels that it must pursue.

Advance payments give no greater protection to the military department or to the Government generally; they do not provide any additional funds for the services performed; and all in all, they merely tend to make difficult a situation which does not need to be so cumbersome.

The bill does one single thing. It permits the military departments to bill commercial ship companies after the services have been performed rather than before.

The measure is a sound one and I urge the House to give it its full support.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting the following new section after section 2632:

"SEC. 2633. Terminal services, furnish to commercial steamship companies

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of a military department, under such regulations as he may prescribe, may furnish stevedoring and terminal services and facilities at fair and reasonable rates to commercial steamship companies engaged in carrying cargo and passengers sponsored by his department. Collections received for such services and facilities shall be reimbursed to the appropriation or fund initially charged."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 157, title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting the following item:

"2633. Terminal Services, furnish to commercial steamship companies."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out " 'Notwithstanding any other provision of law" and insert " 'Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3678 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 628),"

Page 2, line 3, strike out "commercial steamship companies engaged in" and insert "vessels".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COOPER, having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2797) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of a military department to furnish stevedoring and terminal services and facilities to commercial steamship companies, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 177, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AUTHORIZING SALE OF DEGAUSSING EQUIPMENT TO MERCHANT SHIPS

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4285) to authorize the sale of degaussing equipment by the Department of the Navy to the owners or operators of privately owned merchant ships of United States registry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4285, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require

Mr. Chairman, this bill was reported from both the subcommittee and the full committee unanimously. It authorizes the sale of degaussing equipment by the Navy to privately owned merchant ships. During the war this equipment was placed on some 6,000 or more vessels. That equipment has grown old and needs maintenance. Under the present system we cannot sell replacement parts to the merchant shipowners. It is still necessary to use this degaussing equipment in some waters of the world. This bill would give the Navy authority to sell this important equipment to private individuals, owners, and operators of merchant vessels.

I invite the attention of the Members of the House to the report on this bill and particularly to that portion beginning on page 3 which reads as follows:

> Degaussing equipment consists of various electrical devices, magnetic coils, switches, and the like, which when installed on ships affords protection against magnetic mines. During World War II degaussing installations were placed on a number of merchant vessels. These installations were made as part of the merchant-vessel defense-installation program. The major special items of degaussing equipment were furnished by the Navy under appropriations designated as "Defense installation, merchant vessels, Navy," and the installation work was done under the Maritime Administration.
>
> At the end of World War II a number of private owners who acquired these vessels decided to retain the degaussing installations. on the ships and they have kept them in operating condition. This maintenance has been encouraged by the Navy inasmuch as the danger from magnetic mines planted during the war still continues to exist in certain areas. Moreover, in the event of future mobilization the maintenance of the maximum number of degaussing installations would be in the national interest.
>
> Some of the components in the degaussing installations are of special design and are not available commercially. These components are available, however, in Navy stock. Accordingly, when private shipowners are in need of these special components they apply to the nearest naval shipyard to purchase them. Under present law, however, there is no authority which permits such a sale by the Navy. Because of the lack of these special components, the private shipowner may find his installation inoperable and may have it removed. A number of requests of such purchases have been received in the past by the Department of the Navy.
>
> It is therefore considered to be in the interest of national defense that special degaussing equipment, available in sufficient quantities in Navy stock but not available commercially, be sold at Navy prices by Navy field activities to private shipowners for installation aboard their vessels.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LANKFORD] introduced this measure and understands it very well. I yield to him such time as he may desire.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 4285 is a bill that would authorize the Navy to sell to the owners of merchant ships degaussing equipment.

Degaussing equipment is comprised of rheostats, compass coils, compensating boxes, and degaussing cable. The function of this equipment is to remove the danger of contact with a magnetic mine. How does this equipment do the job? A ship is a magnet because of the presence of magnetic material—steel—in its hull, machinery, and cargo. Like any other magnet, it is surrounded by a magnetic field which is large near the ship and small at a considerable distance from it. When a ship is close to a magnetic mine or torpedo, the magnetic field of the ship actuates the firing mechanism and causes the mine or torpedo to explode.

A shipboard degaussing installation consists chiefly of degaussing coils, a power source to supply direct electric current to the coils and means to control the coil current. This installation provides a means of counteracting the ship's magnetic field and establishing a condition such that the magnetic field near the ship is neutralized.

During World War II, this equipment was put on some 6,000 merchant ships for protection against magnetic mines, torpedoes, and other similar devices. At the close of the war, many private owners retained the equipment on their ships and have attempted to keep them in operating condition. The Navy encouraged the proper maintenance of this equipment inasmuch as the danger from magnetic mines continues to exist even today in certain parts of the world.

About 500 ships now in use still have this equipment aboard. Some of it works and some of it does not. Many of the owners are anxious to keep the equipment in first-class shape but are unable to do so because they cannot buy replacement parts.

This bill will permit the Navy to sell the equipment to private shipowners. You will note that the committee has amended the bill so as to insure that when the Navy does sell a piece of this equipment, the price which it will receive will be as close as possible to that which the Navy will have to pay to replace the part sold.

It might be asked why the private shipowner does not go to a commercial source and buy this equipment. The answer is that there are no commercial sources. The Navy is the only one that procures degaussing equipment. An individual manufacturer could conceivably sell the equipment to a shipowner but it would be on a special order and the price would be most probably so high as to discourage the shipowner from repairing his equipment.

What are the economies of the situation? As I mentioned, this equipment was installed on some 6,000 ships during World War II. If we should have another situation which would require this equipment to be placed in our merchant ships again, then we would crowd our shipyards for the installations—and crowd them at a time when the shipyards would be at the absolute peak of their activity.

Furthermore, anything done in a hurry costs more. If this equipment now in place can be kept in shape, those ships which have it in operating condition can function safely and immediately.

As to cost, the individual items cost from $100 to $500. Degaussing cable, for example, cost $2.50 a foot. A rheostat costs $500.

The question might be raised as to whether this kind of equipment will be valuable in the next war in view of the new weapons likely to be encountered. The experts in the Navy said that there is no reason to believe that the threat of mine warfare has been diminished in any way and the equipment will be most important.

As to the mechanics of a sale under the bill, the shipyard will advise the operator of a vessel of the availability and cost of the part it needs; the operator will present full cash payment and accept delivery of the materials.

One might ask why this material could not be disposed of under the surplus-property laws. The answer to this is that the material is not surplus; it is being retained for issue to naval vessels and for mobilization purposes.

There is no cost whatsoever to the Navy or to the Federal Government under this bill, and the Armed Services Committee believes that it is a defense measure which may well save considerable sums and considerable time at some time in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to support this bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Is it not true that this will apply only to ships of United States registry?

Mr. LANKFORD. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. And is it not also true that in addition to being a bill that will require no expenditure on the part of the Federal Government, it undoubtedly, in event of war, can save many, many millions of dollars?

Mr. LANKFORD. Yes, sir. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. And it also expedites the facilities for defending our country.

Mr. LANKFORD. It is properly a defense measure to keep this equipment in working order so that when the time arises when we need to get cargoes overseas, at least this many ships will be ready to go on a moment's notice.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has given a fine explanation of what this bill will do, and why it is important to us from a defense standpoint.

I would like to emphasize one aspect of this bill, however. If war comes, we are going to be required to put this equipment on thousands of ships. This will cost a great deal of money, but it is highly probable that the total cost of this will be borne by the Government—the installation of this equipment being a defense measure.

If the degaussing equipment on the 500 ships which now are so equipped is maintained in good condition, it means that we will not have to install equipment on these ships. This represents a very large saving in itself.

Another aspect of the matter is this: If the degaussing equipment on these ships continues to deteriorate by reason of its not being maintained, then complete installation will have to be made on each of them in the event of an emergency or war. To completely degauss a ship costs from $15,000 to $30,000. This means that it would cost the United States at that time somewhere between 7½ million to 15 million dollars to completely equip these 500 ships.

If this bill becomes law, not only will we not have to make this large expenditure, but the shipowners themselves will pay for the component parts which will be sold from time to time to maintain the equipment in first-class condition.

One last remark: This bill will cost the Government not one single penny for, as the gentleman has pointed out, the price which the shipowner will pay is not just that which the Navy originally paid for it—perhaps several years ago—but will be the actual replacement cost to the Navy at the time the equipment is sold.

I urge favorable consideration of this bill by the House on two bases: First, it is a sound defense measure and second, it is a businesslike and economically desirable measure.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in both instances.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. I have no requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting after section 7229 a new section reading as follows:

"§ 7230. Sale of degaussing equipment.

"The Secretary of the Navy, under such regulations as he prescribes, may sell at Navy prices to owners or operators of privately owned merchant ships of United States registry, degaussing equipment available from Navy stock but not readily available commercially, in order to promote the installation, repair, and maintenance of degaussing equipment on American vessels."

(2) by inserting at the end of the section analysis of chapter 631, title 10, United States Code, a new item reading as follows:

"7230. Sale of degaussing equipment."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "Navy prices" and insert in lieu thereof "prices which represent the current or estimated replacement costs to the Navy."

Page 2, line 3, strike out the quotation marks and insert "Collections received from such sales shall be reimbursed to the current appropriation or fund concerned." Insert quotation marks following the period.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and Mr. COOPER having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. METCALF, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4285) to authorize the sale of degaussing equipment by the Department of the Navy to the owners or operators of privately owned merchant ships of United States registry, pursuant to House Resolution 178, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Minnesota [Mrs. KNUTSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 28, I am again introducing my student loan bill of last year. When I offered this bill, I wrote colleges and high schools for advice on student loans, and the overwhelming response was favorable. The bill provides that three members with backgrounds in social science and as student counselors be appointed to a board by the President. Loans will be administered by the Board with all reasonable discretion for the interests and welfare of students.

I believe the $10 billion revolving fund which I propose would be capable of continuing a stream of educated students for many years to come, and it compares favorably with the $14 billion to $15 billion spent under the GI bill.

The essence of my bill is to give every student consideration and encouragement to attend school if he wishes. This can be done without tax burdens if loans are applied with restrictions loose enough to meet personal problems. That is one reason why my bill provides for members on the Board who are sympathetic to students' problems. When a student has proven himself, he can borrow money for living costs, educational facility costs, such as lab fees, books, and so forth, and a moderate amount of spending money, all without interest, while he is in school. Three percent interest would start 1 year after graduation.

I know that time and study will be required to initiate the perfect student loan program, and therefore I have phrased the bill in general terms and will present it with the proviso that the bill and I am open to corrections, suggestions, and improvements in the program.

This, in a nutshell, is the essence of my bill. But I would at this time ask your indulgence to discuss the proposition and the theory behind my proposal.

Since the time of the introduction of this bill, last year, intense interest has been generated, and it has received enthusiastic response throughout the country. Just last week President Eric A. Walker, of Pennsylvania State University, urged student loans in a major address here in Washington. The acclaim given the idea by such people as Dr. Walker, plus the enthusiastic opinion polls throughout the country, indicated to me that this is a coming program. The State convention of the Indiana Farmers Union passed a resolution endorsing the Knutson student loan bill just last month. There are many, many examples of such endorsement.

Try as we might, we can find no greater source for individual enterprise and initiative than for an interested student to pay his own way. There is no greater equity than this approach. All Americans get free education through high school, but perhaps a person who benefits from college educational salaries should be expected to pay his own way unless he does so by a term of military service or by exceptional scholastic standards. Not only does the individual benefit, but also our Nation benefits economically and by staying technologically ahead of Russia.

There is a new principle of economics in this proposal—as revolutionary as installment buying. Twenty years ago a person was scorned in his community for buying on time payments instead of in cash. But borrowing against one's future productivity for an education is unquestionably here already, as indicated by public-opinion polls on student loans.

One comparison must necessarily be made here, parenthetically. The GI bill study program revolutionized thoughts on college education. This legislation in some sense carries the same qualities. The principal difference—the educated person repays by ability to repay, his own costs, but under these circumstances, he does not necessarily spend several years in the military service. I sincerely believe this concept works well with the tradition of education at the expense of our Government.

My bill has the advantage of having been proved a valid program by prior experience in Norway, the first country

to use this principle. Individual initiative is one of the most pronounced characteristics of the people of that country. If I may, I would like to give you a picture of the student-loan program in Norway.

The program was begun in Norway about 1946. Since that time it has been adopted in both Denmark and Sweden. A surprising feature is that the second two countries hardly knew of the loan or its features until a couple of years ago. It is so simple in its operation that one hears the word for it and almost does not give it a second thought. Norway had last year about 8½ million kroner, roughly $1,214,000, under loan with about 14,000 students subscribing for it.

The student-loan program lies under the educational department of the Government, which also includes the state church. This separate agency studies the student's background and fits the loan to its perspective future repayment of his loan as geared to the family he may acquire or the hazards and conditions of his profession. It is dealt with in a manner very sympathetic to the individual. If necessary, they extend the period of payment.

The student-loan agency pays the state 3½ percent on the loan that it uses. This is paid up through educational subsidies. When the student graduates and begins work, 9 months later he begins to pay interest on his loan at 3¾ percent interest.

The burdens of the individual are considered as to the size of his payment. If he has a personal economic burden, the loan may be put off for 6 months or even 15 months. A good example of its operation is this: an engineer must pay his loan faster than a teacher. That is because the engineer's earning power is greater. Allowances are made for a family, house and other personal payments. The loan repayment may be allowed to lapse for a period of 2 or 3 years if the individual is not able to pay. Should sickness or catastrophe enter the picture, the individual is given all due consideration. However, it is a policy of the agency to have this loan repaid as soon as possible—for the sake of the individual as well as of the soundness of the fund.

Students may borrow money through college up until the point of receiving a master's degree. After that point a student must provide his own money or receive a scholarship for future study.

The theory of this agency is that a student should also go into advanced study, but should not do so in an irresponsible manner. They often point out that you don't buy a car unless you have the means to pay for it. The agency helps in all possible ways and one of the finest is through its counseling service.

Under this program a student may begin to take a loan after he has a proven scholastic standing from something like a year's study. If one is handicapped, he may borrow for the first year also. If parents refuse him money he can borrow from this fund.

If it is known that parents have adequate resources the agency will write them directly providing the student insists he has not asked them. If he has asked them for money and they refuse, the agency will likely grant the loan. Sometimes they write an accredited financial institution to find out the family's financial background.

When a student who makes a loan dies, the state repays the loan. Of 850 million kroner let out in loans the state lost about 56 thousand kroner through deaths. The agency has the feature of being able to attach wages of an individual. It first determines if the individual has the ability to pay. If so, and a person through stubborn resistance, refuses, they will finally after all other measures are exhausted, try this avenue. If the individual is in business, the matter can be taken to court. It is extremely doubtful if such a proceeding has ever been used though perhaps it was needed in 1 or 2 cases. Authorities in this Student Loan Agency say individuals are not likely to fail to make payments on their loans because they come from an unusually select group of people with ambition, intelligence and a well-developed sense of responsibility. The state checks everyone's qualifications.

Almost all enterprise in Norway is carried on by individuals. The shipping industry is privately owned, farms are owned by individuals, retail businesses are owned by individuals. The student-loan program is a program for individual enterprise and opportunity.

Norway uses its old-age pension fund as the basis of its revolving fund for student loans. My plan provides for a separate fund because of the already heavy demands upon our social-security fund. Aside from this relatively unimportant point which can be worked over, there are certain other variants in my plan from that used in Norway, to provide for the different conditions and problems such a plan will encounter in this country, and for the differences in the two countries.

I would like to sum up with a couple of quotes from eminent individuals who know of our dire need for trained and professional people. In a speech here a day or two ago, Elisha Gray II, president of Whirlpool Seeger Corp., said "While we fill the Sunday papers with page after page of ads for engineers, and raid each other's plants to obtain them, the Soviets have been graduating nearly three times the number of engineers as are coming out of our technical schools. Soviet science technology and industrial production are progressing at a rate which exceeds that of any country including our own. Time has come when we had better start 'running scared.'"

Note also the American Legion's National Security Commission pamphlet entitled "Survival in the Air Age" in which is the quote from remarks of Gen. C. S. Levine, "Staying ahead of the Russians technically presents a very real challenge. Our rate of progress in recent years has been surpassed by the Russians. If we are going to stay ahead, we must train more technical people, and be willing to pay the cost of more effort in research and development."

Not only is this essential to security, but we do need a program of general nature that will satisfy the needs of our growing democracy. There is general acceptance of this type of legislation as indicated by the Minnesota poll taken just after my bill was introduced last year. Seventy-five percent of Minnesotans are for it. And I feel sure a national poll would indicate the same enthusiastic approval of the idea.

Educational freedom and progress are most dear to my heart. We can't take the risk of limiting education to only those who can afford it. As our Nation grows, so should our democracy grow, and our thinking along educational program lines should and must grow with it.

---

## PENSACOLA NAVAL AIR STATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, for weeks hearings have been in progress on this year's appropriation bills. Spurred by the realization that the President's budget is the largest peacetime budget in the history of the Nation, the Congress is stirred to unusual efforts in an attempt to find ways in which savings can be made. A very small beginning has been made in the first of these bills which already have been considered by the House. Much more is required if a realistic dent in public spending is to be achieved. Not only is peacetime spending at an alltime high, but peacetime taxes also are at an alltime high. Every budget item should be scrutinized carefully, but the area of greatest concern is in the $38 billion military budget. Everybody wants adequate defense. An adequate defense is an absolute must. Yet, there always is the possibility that this desire on the part of the Congress to insure adequate funds for our defense may encourage unwarranted and unessential expenditures by the military services.

We in Congress frequently have the benefit of good help from many sources which contributes to our effectiveness. My interest in an item of more than average importance has been brought into much clearer focus through the invaluable services of Mr. Frank Kennedy, an outstanding and able newspaper reporter.

I am discussing an item where I think there is an opportunity for a substantial saving—a saving of $17 million initially and very probably of at least that much additional before the completion of the project. This is the amount of money that would be required for the construction of a midshipman air training base near Annapolis to be operated in conjunction with the United States Naval Academy. It is my sincere belief that fully adequate facilities already are to be found at the great Naval Air Station in Pensacola, Fla., and at its satellite fields. Commonly referred to as the "Annapolis of the Air," Pensacola can meet the requirements for air indoctrination and training of midshipmen with very little additional expenditure. Those in our Navy who seek to make use of every available man, hour, facility and space will do well to consider this project.

Undoubtedly, it would be desirable from the standpoint of convenience to have an air training facility near Annapolis. But, there are other considerations which I think outweigh convenience at this time. Already the Navy has recognized the availability of facilities at the Pensacola Naval Air Station by its announcement that more than 900 Naval Academy midshipmen from Annapolis will participate in an air indoctrination course at Pensacola this summer. Not only am I happy over the announcement, but the residents of Pensacola, who are "Navy-minded" and who welcome any Navy activity in the area, are welcoming the news with headlines and preparations for making the midshipmen's stay a happy one as well as a productive one. In Pensacola, residents and city fathers are willing to work diligently toward having the Pensacola Naval Air Station incorporated as the official air training center for midshipmen. By contrast, there has been controversy regarding the use of the Annapolis area. Many who live there object to the establishment of an air base. No one outside of the service seems to welcome the idea.

The Pensacola Naval Air Station's facilities are adequate. This was indicated in a speech by Rear Adm. W. F. Boone on the construction of a flying field in the Annapolis area to serve as a component part of the training program at Annapolis. During his speech the admiral, then Superintendent of the Naval Academy, said that some of the citizens in the area had suggested that midshipman flight training be conducted at existing naval air stations elsewhere, or in the fleet during the summer. Later in his speech the admiral said that midshipman flight indoctrination would be incompatible with the normal operations at other stations except Pensacola. Gentlemen, I would like to emphasize that he said except Pensacola. This speech was covered by Mr. Frank Kennedy, who was attentive enough to catch this comment. Later, I would like to elaborate further on Mr. Kennedy's part in this project.

I am wondering if the Navy Department is fully aware of another important work which has been advanced as desirable for the Pensacola Naval Air Station. This activity is a valuable one which in time will almost certainly be enlarged. It is one which could play an important part in the training of the midshipmen at Annapolis. In a memo from the commanding officer of the United States Naval School of Aviation Medicine to Vice Adm. A. K. Doyle, Chief of Naval Air Training, at Pensacola, a plan for saving the naval air training program over $21 million annually has been advanced. This is projected through enlargement of the Aviation Psychology Laboratory at Pensacola which has requested a permanent building with adequate space. This department has made a study of its work and I would like to give some of the facts and figures which will demonstrate its effectiveness. At the present time, some 15 to 20 percent of the physically fit applicants are eliminated by psychological aptitude tests. Just assuming that we have 5,000 applicants, approximately 900, or 18 percent of the applicants then, are rejected annually. The most conservative followup figures show that some 60 percent of these men would fail the flight program if permitted to enter. Fortunately, most of these 540 men would attrite early in the program. Nevertheless, the cost of such attritions runs about $18,000 per man. Then, by use of common arithmetic, not training these men results in a savings of about $9,720,000 per year. It is to be recognized, of course, that 360 potential aviators are refused training. To the best evidence, though, indications are that these men, even though they may complete training, would be, as a group, less effective than the currently selected training group. It was upon the recommendation of the School of Aviation Medicine that the maximum age requirements were changed from 27 years and 6 months to 25 years. Conservative estimates indicate that lowering the age reduced attrition by 1 percent at an estimated savings of $720,000 per annum. It was also this department that first pointed up the high attrition rate of the Marine trainees. Suggestions were made regarding screening and selection which resulted in the attrition rate for Marines being cut in half at an annual saving of approximately $5 million.

Not only is money saved, but simplifications of procedures for recording and computing grades, initiated last year, have resulted in savings of an estimated 4,000 to 6,000 clerical man-hours per year.

In summary, then, it is estimated that the work of the Aviation Psychology Laboratory of the School of Aviation Medicine results annually in direct or immediately potential savings of over $21 million plus many man-hours and countless problems.

I would like to emphasize that the above information represents only the work of the Aviation Psychology Laboratory of the Pensacola Naval Aviation Psychology Laboratory and Training Command. The equally far-reaching research of other laboratories cannot be expressed in monetary values or even in terms of accidents prevented and lives saved except in most general terms. Briefly, the following are examples of other areas in which research is in progress, all of which are of critical importance to aviation; pilot aging, arteriosclerosis, and heart disease; physical fitness and physical standards; vertigo, disorientation, and associated phenomena; physiology of extreme altitude; explosive decompression; cosmic radiation, and other hazards of extreme altitudes; psychological factors in airsickness; speech communications and intelligibility; effects and protection in high intensity noise; dynamic visual acuity; acceleration; aviation safety, escape, survival, and others.

The functions of the school include formal courses for all forms of flight technicians and professional men as well as training for all student aviators, pilots, and crewmen in the psychophysiology of altitude, acceleration, night vision, ejection seat escape, and survival; plus clinical consultations in aviation medical problems.

Concerning the laboratory, Admiral Burke has said, "The need for additional space and a modern integrated building is well recognized. Funds for this project were included in the initial estimate of the fiscal year 1958 military construction program, but it became necessary to defer this project in favor of those of higher military urgency. You may rest assured that this project will be considered for inclusion in the fiscal year 1959 program."

Gentlemen, all of this information is given to you for a very specific purpose. The joint importance of air indoctrination and training of midshipmen at Pensacola, plus the use of the Aviation Psychology Laboratory and Training Command, would make it possible to eliminate in the very early stages of training those who do not meet all requirements for pilot capabilities. It seems the most logical thing imaginable to determine positively and finally whether a cadet possesses aptitude for air training before cost, time, and facilities are expended in his air training. I hesitate to put a figure on the savings that would result or the value to the service of insuring that only the best qualified cadets would receive training.

Since it has been inferred that Pensacola Naval Air Station is suitable for the air training of the midshipmen and has been shown that the need for an adequate laboratory for testing naval air personnel exists, we should avoid duplication of facilities by permanently and officially establishing Pensacola Naval Air Station as the air training center for the naval midshipmen. By combining the improved methods formulated at the center and the air facilities presently used by the Navy, we can profitably avoid the necessity of building a complete air station at another location. I am taking the liberty, with the permission of Mr. Frank Kennedy, whom I have mentioned previously, of including several editorials and news items concerning this project. These items will point out the great interest shown by residents of the Pensacola area in obtaining this project. Mr. Kennedy's keenness and awareness in desiring to save the public funds is a tribute to American newspapermen and women.

I believe the Pensacola Naval Air Station, with its great record of training, is the place to indoctrinate the midshipmen. It possesses the unmatched history, tradition and esprit de corps. Climate and weather conditions are favorable to year-round flying. I firmly believe that Annapolis and Pensacola working together would make a great team.

Transportation difficulties are of little consequence. Exploration has clearly shown that there is adequate air transportation which can be utilized for the purpose of transporting midshipmen from Annapolis to Pensacola for the training period. I am sure that any transportation difficulties that might be cited can be worked out satisfactorily if there is an earnest desire to do so.

The newspaper articles which follow will show that a trial run of one summer at Pensacola for the midshipmen is currently planned. It is my hope that a

careful analysis will show that this project should continue and be made permanent. I trust that further efforts to build an additional costly air facility will be postponed pending a fair trial. At no place would midshipmen from Annapolis receive finer air indoctrination than at the Pensacola Naval Air Station, the center of naval aviation throughout its history and at no place would those cadets receive a warmer welcome than at Pensacola.

[From the Pensacola News-Journal of January 7, 1957]

NINE HUNDRED ANNAPOLIS CADETS TO GET TRAINING HERE—FLIGHT COURSES SLATED AT NAS FOR MIDSHIPMEN—NAVY DEPARTMENT REVEALS PLAN NOW SET FOR INDOCTRINATION

More than 900 Naval Academy midshipmen from Annapolis will participate in an air indoctrination course at Pensacola Naval Air Station next summer, according to an announcement made Monday in Washington, D. C., by Representative BOB SIKES. The Congressman made the announcement after receiving official word from the Navy Department.

Word was received in Pensacola from Frank Kennedy, Pensacola News-Journal Washington correspondent. Congressman SIKES told Kennedy details have not been worked out but it is expected the midshipmen will come to Pensacola shortly after "June week," the week devoted to graduation exercises.

This is an interim program. Proposed action of providing appropriations for an airfield near Annapolis for this training program was turned down during the last session of Congress by the Senate Armed Services Committee. Last year the midshipmen trained on Virginia Capes.

MEANS MUCH HERE

Washington reports said the move will mean much to Pensacola area with more than 900 men here for the training period.

First steps toward bringing this program to Pensacola NAS were taken in March 1956, when Kennedy publicized a speech by Rear Adm. W. F. Boone, in which the admiral was justifying the opening of an airfield near Annapolis. The project was meeting considerable local opposition. In that speech Admiral Boone said it had been suggested that midshipman flight training be conducted at existing naval air stations elsewhere, or in the fleet during summer cruises. The admiral later said "midshipman flight indoctrination would be incompatible with the normal operations at other stations except Pensacola."

Kennedy publicized this speech in an article titled "Annapolis-Pensacola Integration." Kennedy and Congressman SIKES then began, after the action of the Senate Armed Services Committee against the Maryland site, to bring the program to Pensacola NAS. On July 29 Kennedy devoted his column to his subject, again on November 11 and then again on December 9.

SIKES AIDS

In the meantime Congressman SIKES was working closely with Navy officials in Pensacola and in Washington. Before real progress could be made it was necessary for the plan to be approved by Vice Adm. Austin K. Doyle, chief of Naval Air Training. "Staff officers" said on Sept. 27 they felt the Chief of Naval Air Training had approved the plan.

"This announcement today is official," Kennedy informed the News-Journal. "We expect to have more complete details in a short time."

[From the Pensacola News-Journal of January 8, 1957]

NAVY MIDSHIPMEN TO BE TRAINED HERE

Pensacola Naval Air Station will be the site this summer of an air indoctrination course for more than 900 Naval Academy midshipmen from Annapolis, according to information received by Pensacola News-Journal Monday morning from Washington, D. C.

Announcement was made by Congressman BOB SIKES after he received official word from the Navy Department. Information concerning the announcement was sent to the News-Journal by Frank Kennedy, the newspaper's Washington correspondent.

Kennedy and Congressman SIKES are credited with playing an important role in the program being brought to Pensacola NAS. Last March the Navy was discussing a possibility of having an airfield constructed near Annapolis. The project was meeting considerable local opposition.

Rear Adm. W. F. Boone was making a speech to justify the construction of the field in that area to serve as a component part of the training program at Annapolis.

During his speech the admiral said that some of the citizens in that area had suggested that midshipman flight training be conducted at existing naval air stations elsewhere, or in the fleet during the summer.

Later in his speech the admiral said "midshipman flight indoctrination would be incompatible with the normal operations at other stations except Pensacola." Kennedy, who was covering the speech, was listening attentively and caught the words "except Pensacola."

After the Senate Armed Services Committee failed to approve the airfield in the area adjacent to the Naval Academy, Congressman SIKES, using the admiral's speech as reported by Kennedy as a basis, began working to bring the program to Pensacola NAS. Kennedy wrote about the project in several of his columns published in the News-Journal while Congressman SIKES contacted Navy officials in Washington and Pensacola.

Details of the training program in Pensacola have not been announced but it is expected the 900 or more men will be brought to NAS soon after June (graduation) week.

The Pensacola program, is an interim program. The announcement concerning the program in Pensacola for this summer is official, Kennedy reported.

---

[From the Pensacola News-Journal of January 20, 1957]

PERMANENT TRAINING HERE OF MIDSHIPMEN SOUGHT

Representative BOB SIKES has some good arguments lined up against the reported move of the Navy to again seek authorization for establishment of an airfield near Annapolis for indoctrination of embryo naval officers.

Congress twice has rejected this plea for funds, of which SIKES says $17 million is only a starter. Residents of the area also have protested location of a field in their midst. This is why the midshipmen will come to Pensacola Naval Air Station this summer for their naval air indoctrination, now an important part of every naval officer's training.

SIKES, in a strategic position as a member of the Armed Services appropriations subcommittee, thinks that this indoctrination could well be tied in permanently with the history, tradition and training at Pensacola, the "Birthplace of Naval Aviation," once called the "Annapolis of the Air." He also believes that the problem of transportation of midshipmen here can easily be solved and that the Pensacola experiment should be tried for more than one summer.

The dean of Florida's delegation thinks there will be waste in duplicating expensive facilities at or near Annapolis which exist here. There are other reports according to Frank Kennedy's Treadmill column in this issue, that the pressure for the field is largely from high naval officers who want to set their planes down nearby.

Naturally, we in Pensacola welcome the coming of the midshipmen even temporarily, but would much prefer to see them come here each summer where they may learn at the fountainhead of naval aviation and at the same time enjoy our delightful summer months with their unsurpassed recreational advantages of surf and sand, boating and fishing fiesta and other historic attractions.

---

NAVY TOPS'LS SET ABACK OVER MIDDY AIR TRAINING

(By Frank Kennedy)

WASHINGTON.—Last week's announcement by Congressman SIKES that the first classmen at the Naval Academy will receive their air indoctrination courses at Pensacola next summer, has put the Navy high brass snugly behind the nautical 8-ball—it snapped their tops'ls squarely aback, old sailormen would call it—and the Congressman seems not disturbed that the admirals must fall away and try to capture the wind again.

The Navy has been plugging for a $17 million jet field within 10 or 15 miles of Annapolis, more closely to tie the indoctrination training into the Academy's curriculum, and perhaps to provide the brass with a field 20 miles from Washington where they could set down their own planes, just like the brass of the Air Force do at their own Academy. Last spring the Senate Armed Services Committee struck out an item of $4 million for land acquisition at a village called Davidsonville, 11 miles from Annapolis, but from Adm. Arleigh A. (31-Knot) Burke, on down, the Navy still is shooting for the local field and intends to come to Congress for the money this session, too. Meanwhile, the Pensacola Naval Air Station has been selected as the interim site for midshipmen's air indoctrination courses, while the Navy tries to persuade Congress all over again that the field really ought to be located near the Annapolis Academy.

Congressman SIKES, apart from his desire to upbuild Pensacola Naval Air Station, truly believes that the place to indoctrinate the midshipmen with the Navy's splendid record in the air all over the world, is at Pensacola Naval Air Station, which possesses the only history, tradition, and esprit de corps of the Navy fliers, even though this history, tradition, and esprit de corps is little more than 40 years old.

"I believe that Annapolis and Pensacola ought to be married for the best way to make the midshipman airminded," said Congressman SIKES. "I believe the difficulties of transportation can be worked out. I certainly am sure that the Navy ought to give Pensacola Naval Air Station a fair trial run of more than one summer, as now proposed, before we are called upon to duplicate at Annapolis a lot of facilities which already exist at Pensacola. The first cost, $17 million, will be only a starter, you may be sure of that."

Congressman SIKES obtained his information about the midshipmen going to Pensacola next summer from authoritative sources he knows how to find within the Pentagon. As a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee for the Armed Services, the Pentagon people accord SIKES more respect and attention than to run-of-the-mill Congressmen who don't pass upon the appropriations that the Pentagon wants. This reporter dismally has failed to get the same information from the Navy in the form of an official release, quoting somebody, and the

reason for such silence appears rather obvious.

Last spring the Senate Armed Services Committee threw out of the military construction bill a $4 million item for land acquisition at Davidsonville, for the proposed jet field, because of local opposition to a noisy jet base and because some of the committeemen, acknowledged military experts themselves, felt that the field was so much stage property for the admirals. Now the Navy is coming to Congress for the money again, and the fact that a substitute site at Pensacola, for next summer only, has been selected, assuredly will prompt the Senators who last year were hostile to a jet field near the Academy, to explore the possibilities of Pensacola as a permanent, not a temporary, substitute. The admirals now must think up a lot of reasons against Pensacola's permanency—a permanency which Congressman SIKES truly believes would provide the most appealing and superlative sort of air indoctrination for spirited young midshipmen.

---

[From the Panama City Herald of January 23, 1957]

PENSACOLA LOGICAL SITE FOR JET TRAINING FIELD

An attempt by some Navy officials to locate a jet training field for midshipmen within 10 or 15 miles of the Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md., is without obvious sound reasoning and has a mercenary tinge.

Why would the Navy want to "plunk" out an initial expenditure of $17 million when most of the facilities for air indoctrination already exists at Pensacola Naval Air Station?

That is one of the big questions Third Distric Congressman BOB SIKES has been asking high Navy officials. There have been no positive answers, so far, and it is unlikely that there will be.

The fighting Third District Congressman has won the first battle in his campaign to have the Naval Academy Air Indoctrination Center located at Pensacola, but the admirals have not given up.

Pensacola will be the training location this summer for over 900 midshipmen, but the neighboring city is only an interim site for the air training program.

The Senate Armed Services Committee last spring saw fit to throw out a $4 million military construction bill for acquisition of land near Davidsonville, Md., located near the Academy, to be used as a jet field. Residents of that community voiced opposition to the proposed noisy jet base.

Rear Adm. W. F. Boone, in making a speech to justly construction of the Maryland base, reportedly said that "Midshipman flight indoctrination would be incompatible with the normal operations at other stations except Pensacola."

Frank Kennedy, the News-Herald's alert Washington correspondent, was covering the admiral's speech and heard his admission that Pensacola is the only logical site for the jet base.

Congressman SIKES, hearing of the admiral's speech through Kennedy, went to work. The Florida solon is sincere in his belief that Pensacola is the only place to train air-minded midshipmen.

There are several good reasons why Pensacola should be selected as the location for giving midshipmen their air indoctrination.

The naval air station is steeped in 40 years of tradition and pride, in addition to having the facilities and the know-how to train midshipmen in the field of aeronautics. There is no question about it, Pensacola Naval Air Station justly earned the title "Annapolis of the Air."

Mr. John Q. Taxpayer should have something to say in the matter, regardless of the outcome, because it will be he who will pick up the bill.

Selection of Pensacola as the training site would save millions for the taxpayers of America.

Officials soon will go before Congress asking for several millions of dollars to start the jet base near Annapolis. Members of Congress should give every detail careful consideration before making a decision, because the people's money will be involved.

---

[From the Pensacola News-Journal]

MIDSHIPMEN AIR TRAINING TRANSPORTATION IS SOLVED

(By Frank Kennedy)

WASHINGTON.—Further to convince the top Navy brass that Pensacola NAS should be married to the Annapolis Academy for the fullest indoctrination of midshipmen to the Navy's espirit de corps in the air, Congressman SIKES, of Crestview, has assembled at least 2 telling suggestions to solve the transportation difficulties between the 2 institutions:

(1) The use of the Military Air Transport Service (MATS) whose headquarters are at AFB Andrews Field, hardly 20 miles from the Academy, to airlift 1,000 midshipmen to Pensacola every summer.

(2) Utilization of Baltimore's little-used modern airfield Friendship Airport and commercial air carriers, just 20 miles from Annapolis in the other direction.

The Congressman anticipates some difficulty in selling these ideas to the admirals in the Pentagon. According to some of the Pentagon people, the Navy almost would be guilty of trespass to use the facilities of the Air Force at Andrews Field, notwithstanding the famous Unification Act of 1947, which was supposed to merge the services to a substantial degree.

SIKES has had some bad luck already in trying to implement the Unification Act. Some years ago he trustfully sought to unify the Chaplain's Corps of the three armed services, believing such a merger to be fraught with no insurmountable service rivalries. He never got anywhere with the idea. It almost would seem that the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force worship separate gods, too, and that their Chiefs of Staff insist that men of the cloth tend their service flocks properly identified by their service uniforms.

The proposition to airlift the midshipmen from Baltimore to Pensacola NAS may collide with similar Pentagon objections. Congressman SIKES has been supplied by the commercial airlines with figures to show that the commercial carriers can transport troops by air more cheaply than can MATS. He has learned through his House Armed Services Appropriations Subcommittee that the Pentagon frowns upon the use of commercial carriers for troop transport because the prices quoted undercut so drastically the cost which MATS sets up in its budget for air transport of troops. The Congressman has not yet obtained an offer from the commercial airlines for an airlift of midshipmen from Baltimore to Pensacola NAS.

Meanwhile, Congressman SIKES has reiterated an earlier statement that Pensacola should be afforded a real trial run over a period of years before Congress is called upon to put up $17 million for a training field near Annapolis. The upcoming military construction bill is expected to carry such a request from the Navy, notwithstanding the turndown Congress accorded the proposal last year. By the admission of its own witnesses, the Navy must do something about air indoctrination at Annapolis—and do it soon. The Academy owns only a few obsolete flying boats incapable of replacement. If Congress still refuses to put up the money for an airfield at the Academy, the Navy must of necessity turn to Pensacola NAS—its only other facility where the midshipmen's indoctrination training can be geared to training programs already in being.

The Navy is under further compulsion, according to official statements, to step up air indoctrination of the midshipmen because of the steadily mounting voluntary resignations of first classmen (freshmen) which nearly have doubled during the past 4 years. The admirals believe that the training, such as is in store for the midshipmen at Pensacola next summer, may halt and reverse the disturbing increase in these voluntary resignations.

---

[From the Pensacola News-Journal of February 17, 1957]

SIKES TO THE ATTACK

(By Frank Kennedy)

Congressman SIKES is just about ready to go over to the attack on his proposition to nail down for Pensacola Naval Air Station the permanent air indoctrination courses for the Annapolis midshipmen.

Heretofore, the Crestview Congressman has been somewhat on the defensive—putting Pensacola's qualifications forward as a substitute for facilities which might be installed at a jet field near the Academy—a project which Congress turned down flat just a year ago. The Navy Department advised Mr. SIKES early last month that the Annapolis first classmen would receive their air indoctrination at Pensacola Naval Air Station on an interim basis, beginning next summer—supposedly until Congress could be persuaded to build a new airfield near Annapolis. Mr. SIKES now believes that he has discovered a strong affirmative argument for the permanency of the Pensacola training program, and curiously it was the Navy Department which presented him with the facts on which he has built this new argument—though it is not to be surmised that the admirals ever believed that he would put the information to such use, to wit:

The Navy has on the drafting boards plans for a $5 million medical laboratory at Pensacola Naval Air Station to house the existing psychological and aptitude test work, already established there. The Navy proudly told the Congressman some months ago that the psychological tests applied to embryo pilots at Pensacola were saving more than $18 million a year by screening out otherwise physically qualified trainees. This annual saving of $18 million was arrived at by estimating the cost of future training of fliers who ultimately would have been bumped had not their psychological deficiencies been revealed at the start by the elaborate aptitude tests to which they had been subjected.

The Congressman wants the midshipmen to be put through the same psychological mill, or as much of it as they can assimilate in conjunction with regular air indoctrination (which does not include flight training at all), and he proposes that the indoctrination and the psychological testing be applied to the midshipmen at Pensacola every summer. Mr. SIKES wants to indoctrinate the midshipmen early in their Academy courses, and so do the admirals, but he also wants to establish the aptitude of the midshipmen to serve as Navy pilots at the same time—not to wait until they graduate to find it out. Should the midshipmen take the air indoctrination work at Annapolis, those among them who select the air arm for their subsequent careers could not be put through the psychological mill at Pensacola until after their graduation. Mr. SIKES contends that by the training of midshipmen at Pensacola Naval Air Station, air indoctrination and aptitude testing, both, automatically would select the best-qualified midshipmen for the air arm 2 or 3 years earlier than would be the case

should Congress go along with the Navy's present desires and provide air indoctrination only at the base near the Annapolis Academy.

The Sikes proposals now are being whipped into shape for a speech on the House floor—his opening ranging shot at the admirals who find themselves in the uncomfortable position of plugging for an airfield near the Academy and not being able to brag about Pensacola Naval Air Station, with its superb air training program and its psychological laboratory which discovers their best pilot material long before the instructors can evaluate the trainees' skill.

## A NEW PROGRAM IS NEEDED FOR DAIRYING

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 years I have been making every effort to develop a dairy program which would be of real benefit to the dairy farmers of this Nation. This task has been made most difficult, as it has seemed almost impossible for the dairy farmers of this country to agree upon one specific program. The major farm organizations have all gone in different directions, and as a result the individual dairy farmer blames the United States Congress and the Department of Agriculture for not having come up with an answer. I believe that the dairy farmers themselves, represented through their various farm organizations, also have a responsibility to help develop a plan.

This afternoon I would like to first point out to the Members of the House why the present Government support program for dairy products and milk is not good for dairying; second, what the alternatives are; and third, the new two-price program which I believe deserves the attention of every dairy farmer and farm organization.

### DAIRY SUPPORT LAW OF 1949 DOES NOT HELP FARMER

Let us look at the 1949 dairy support law which has been in effect for these past 7 years. This program as enacted by the Congress in 1949 was designed to protect the dairy farmers' income. The experience of these past 7 years has shown that it gives the greatest protection to the dairy plant operators, assemblers, and middlemen. With the Commodity Credit Corporation standing ready to buy top-quality cheese, butter, and powder to remove surplus milk production from the market place, we find that the real incentive for most processors to sell their products in the market place has been almost destroyed. We have found our best quality manufactured dairy products being channeled into Government warehouses.

Milk is not like wheat, cotton, peanuts, corn, rice, and tobacco. These so-called basic agricultural commodities can be loaned on or purchased by the CCC in the form in which they were produced by the farmer. Milk to be purchased under a support program must be processed into a storable form. This processing is done away from the farm and for that reason the Commodity Credit Corporation, under the 1949 Agricultural Act, must support dairy products through a middleman. This 1949 purchase program has done almost as much to destroy dairy markets as the action which allowed colored substitutes to be shipped in interstate commerce.

Nutritionists agree that the consumption of milk and milk products in this, the richest country in the world, is not on a level commensurate with good health. Milk producers organizations, including the American Dairy Association, have recognized that a lot of educational work must be done in order to increase consumption of milk and its products. In this 20th century we have seen advertising sales promotion of less healthful substitutes and soft drinks outdistance us by as much as 2,000 percent. We all admit that milk and its products have not been satisfactorily sold to the American consumer.

The manufacturers of dairy products have not increased sales staffs in the proportion to the sales promotion which has been done by other sections of industry. This lack of sales promotion is the direct result of a program in which Uncle Sam stands ready to buy dairy products at a fixed price. The plant operator is in a position where he can always sell to Uncle Sam without lifting a finger as far as sales promotion is concerned.

The present price support program is made to order for the middleman, not the dairy farmer. It guarantees him a market. He knows exactly what his selling price will be. He can calculate his margins and pass what is left back to the farmer. It is much easier to be a manager of a dairy processing plant under the 1949 dairy support law. Obviously, a man would be less than human if he would want to have such an ideal arrangement kicked out. In other words, many of the dairy processors are very happy, very content, with the situation as it exists today. It is only the dairy farmer who is hurt, so we find some plant managers giving lipservice to a new program, to satisfy their member patrons, but actually, behind the closed doors, doing little or nothing to see that it is promoted. In fact, some actively work against any change.

The per capita consumption of dairy products will not be substantially increased as long as the present program is in effect.

The 1949 dairy support law also has shown that milk production cannot be effectively controlled through the use of its variable support levels.

### THREE ALTERNATIVES ARE AVAILABLE TO CONGRESS

The 85th Congress is indeed a critical session for the future of America's dairy farmer. The facts clearly show that a new dairy program is absolutely essential and vital. There are three alternatives which are open to milk producers.

First. Remove all price supports and let prices fall where they will clear the market. This would tend to squeeze out farmers with low producing cows and high costs of milk production. This course of action, if followed without sufficient advance notice, would put the entire dairy industry in complete chaos for several years and would tend to further promote restrictive local marketing regulations throughout the country.

Second. Adopt the subsidy payments plan through which farmers would receive direct payments from the Government. These payments would make up the difference between a low free market price and a given percentage of parity. This type of program would further discriminate against those areas of the country producing milk for manufactured dairy products. This alternative would call for the strictest type of milk production controls and would be disastrous to future dairy sales promotion efforts by establishing an unrealistic sales price for dairy products in the market place. This type of program would make Uncle Sam the master of every milkhouse in the United States. Dairy products are currently the best food buy in America today. Today the American consumer can buy over three times as much in dairy products for the same hour of labor as he could purchase prior to World War II. The facts are that substitute manufacturers will always be able to cut their prices. They will demand the same type of treatment from the Government in the market place; therefore always will be in an advantageous position to compete with us if price was the only consideration. Milk producers have the best product, but the present dairy price support program has destroyed the incentive for selling it.

Third. Milk producers throughout the United States have within their grasp the third alternative which is the most realistic in its approach and will provide the dairy farmer with the brightest future. I refer, of course, to a two-price dairy-stabilization program. This two-price program or domestic parity program is an amended version of the dairy program recommended by the National Milk Producers Federation last year.

The two-price dairy-stabilization program is the best insurance policy for a bright dairy future thus far proposed. It merits the closest and most thorough study of every dairy farmer and of each Member of Congress. I have asked dairy farmers throughout the United States to send me their criticisms and constructive suggestions. It is most important that we devise a new dairy program which will increase the income of every dairy-farm operator in the United States.

Conferences which began in my congressional office in Washington, resulted in exhaustive studies being made throughout the year by the National Grange, the National Milk Producers Federation; W. D. Knox, editor of Hoard's Dairyman; Stanley H. Benham, president of the New York Dairymen's League; Gordon F. Zimmerman, research director of the National Grange; Robert G. Lytle, general manager, Carolina Milk Producers Federation, North Carolina; William B. Pearson, master of the Minnesota State Grange; William H. Naudain, master of the Delaware State Grange; George F. Clement, master of the New Hampshire State Grange; Walter E. Winn, president of Pure Milk Association, Chicago; Patrick Healy, assistant executive secretary of the National

Milk Producers Federation, and E. M. Norton, executive secretary of the National Milk Producers Federation. The results of their meetings have led them to personally believe that the best hope for the dairy industry requires the establishment of a two-price system for marketing milk production.

HOW TWO-PRICE DAIRY PROGRAM OPERATES

Under this two-price system, the same type of dairy stabilization board elected by the Nation's milk producers would operate the program. Immediately prior to each marketing quarter, the dairy stabilization board would publish a market-surplus ratio. At the present time, this ratio would be approximately 96 percent market and 4 percent surplus. In other words, we would have a domestic market for about 96 percent of our national production if we continue at the current rate of production.

Let us assume for the moment that Mr. Processor operates a plant in Wisconsin and Mr. Farmer is shipping to Mr. Processor's plant. The dairy stabilization board has published the ratio for the coming quarter. At the same time the dairy stabilization board announces that all it can get for the surplus milk in disposal operations—relief-foreign trade-industrial use and livestock feed—is approximately $2 per hundred. That then will be the surplus price for the coming quarter.

At the same time, the dairy stabilization board announced that it will support the domestic market price of dairy products at 100 percent of parity. Let us for example, assume that the support of manufactured dairy products at 100 percent of parity, means that you would receive in the free market in Wisconsin about $4 a hundred, for milk. Now let us go to Mr. Farmer's farm. Let us assume that for the past 3 years he has averaged to market 30,000 pounds of milk each month. Mr. Farmer's market for the month of January 1957 will be 96 percent of the 30,000 pounds, or 28,800 pounds. Only on that much milk will he be supported at 100 percent of parity level, or in Wisconsin, $4 a hundred. Any milk he produces over 28,800 pounds will be paid for at the surplus rate of $2 a hundred.

So, if Mr. Farmer produces at the same rate as he did last year, he would have 1,200 pounds for which he would receive $2 per hundred. Naturally he would probably keep that milk on the farm and feed it to his calves or cut out some of his low-producing cows rather than produce at that rate of return.

Obviously if we were to stop here there would be an opportunity for Mr. Processor's dairy plant to make a substantial financial killing. No one would accept that proposal. When Mr. Farmer is paid $4 a hundred for 28,800 pounds, however, and only $2 a hundred for any surplus milk he produced, Mr. Processor would stand to gain $2 a hundred on the surplus milk. At the same time the dairy stabilization board would be losing about $2 a hundred in the purchase of milk and its disposal. It would mean that Mr. Processor's dairy plant then would divide his payment on the surplus milk between the dairy farmer and the dairy stabilization board. Mr. Processor's dairy would actually pay at least $4 a hundred for every drop of milk it received, but for surplus milk the dairy plant would pay $1 to the farmer and $3 to the dairy stabilization board to underwrite the disposition of surplus milk. The dairy plant could do anything it wanted with this milk because actually it paid $4 a hundred for all its milk which was the minimum market price in Wisconsin.

TWO-PRICE SYSTEM INSURED BRIGHT FUTURE

The dairy stabilization board through the United States Department of Agriculture would guarantee dairy farmers a minimum of from 80 percent to 100 percent of parity for all milk sold for domestic consumption. All surplus milk would be paid for at not to exceed the actual disposal price on foreign markets, in industry or in feeds, and so forth. Milk producers would be assigned a base quota arrived at on the basis of his average production during the preceeding 3-year period. The national quota would be determined on the basis of milk needed for domestic consumption in any given year. If this plan would have been in effect during the current marketing year, each milk producer in the United States would have received a minimum of 90 percent of parity for 96 percent of the milk he produced. On the amount of milk produced over and above his base or quota, the dairy farmer would receive a price determined by the dairy stabilization board to be the price at which it could dispose of surplus milk production.

ADVANTAGES OF TWO-PRICE PROGRAM

This two-price dairy stabilization program which would take the place of the 1949 dairy support law if approved by referendum vote to our Nation's milk producers, has several features offering great advantage to the dairy industry.

First. This proposal will be run by dairy farmers themselves through a dairy stabilization board elected by dairy farmers in nine dairy regions of the Nation.

Second. It provides a strong incentive for farmers to produce for the effective domestic market at a fair parity price.

Third. Provides a stimulant for increased sales activities.

Fourth. Rewards and places a premium on the efficiency for milk production.

Fifth. Provides an insulation against diverted acres being dumped from the basic commodities through the establishment of a base on 3-year production records of existing milk producers.

Sixth. Provides no subsidy on surplus for export or industrial use, thus is far less objectionable than the present price-support program or the so-called direct-payment program when viewed solely as to its effect on our foreign relations and foreign trade.

Seventh. This program does not condition the consumer to unrealistic low prices for dairy products which in the long run could prove disastrous.

Eighth. Provides the same financial advantage provided by the original self-help bill advocated by the National Milk Producers Federation, but places major cost on the producer of surplus milk rather than on the producers of all milk. The only cost assessed to all milk would be the handling and assembly cost which could be met by a small fixed-stabilization fee by direct Government appropriation.

Ninth. Government responsibility for import-quota controls, school-lunch, and school-milk programs and Defense Department use would be clearly and permanently established.

I realize that in the time allotted to me that I cannot cover all ramifications of this two-price dairy-stablization program. It does offer the best hope for our future and it is a proposal which requires the careful consideration of every milk producer in America.

In 1955 when the Dairy Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee conducted hearings in Minnesota and Wisconsin, 22 separate proposals were made by dairy groups. The confusion which confronted the Dairy Subcommittee cannot be continued for another 2 years. The 1949 dairy-support law under which we have operated these past 7 years is clearly not the answer.

Stocks of dairy products in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation have reached a 3-year low. These stocks can be moved and this new program can be put in operation.

If we are to maintain the family dairy farm in the areas of our Nation which have historically produced our milk, if we are truly desirous of alleviating the cost-price squeeze in which milk producers are currently caught, we must adopt this new two-price dairy-stabilization program as the best insurance policy that has been offered for a bright dairy future.

I recommend that every dairy farmer and every Member of Congress read the article in the February 25 issue of the Hoard's Dairyman entitled "New Dairy Program Would Boost Dairy Prices 43 Cents." This article summarizes the work of the committee that has studied this new dairy program for the past year. The legislation is currently being drafted and I would appreciate your directing any suggestions or criticisms to my office. This will be of great help in arriving at the final draft of this new two-price dairy or domestic parity program.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the article which appeared on February 25, 1957, in the Hoard's Dairyman magazine entitled "New Dairy Program Would Boost Dairy Prices 43 Cents."

NEW DAIRY PROGRAM WOULD BOOST DAIRY PRICES 43 CENTS

Finishing touches are now being placed on a new peacetime dairy price support program. After 6 months of intensive study, a national dairy policy committee is recommending a self-help program embodying the domestic parity principle.

If approved by Congress, and then by dairy farmers in a referendum, the new program would mean an increase of about 53 cents per hundredweight in all milk prices. This would not be net gain, however, because a 10-cent stabilization fee would be paid on every hundredweight of milk marketed. This provides a net of 43 cents per hundredweight. In addition, a lower "surplus" price would be paid on about 3 or 4 percent of production.

A dairy farmer with 30 cows and selling 300,000 pounds of milk per year should realize a net gain of about $1,080 over and above what he receives under the present price support program.

To understand how the new program would apply on your farm, it is necessary to look into some of the mechanics of the program on the national level.

First, of course, the program must be written into bill form and introduced into Congress. There it is referred to the Committee on Agriculture of the House or Senate, which can hold public hearings to determine whether there is support for it from dairy farmers and their organizations. If that support is shown and encouragement is received from the administration, the prospects are good that the program will be approved by Congress and the President.

Upon becoming law, dairy farmers across the country will vote on the program through a referendum. If approved, they then nominate, through an election, dairy farmers to make up a Dairy Stabilization Board. This board is appointed by the President of the United States from the nominees named by dairy farmers in their votes in 15 proposed dairy districts of the country.

The dairy farmers making up the board will recommend price-support levels, methods of financing the program, and how it will be administered.

Actual operation of the new program, however, rests with the Commodity Credit Corporation of the United States Department of Agriculture, as at present.

Let's assume that Congress has passed the bill and dairy farmers, in a nationwide vote, have approved its going into operation. The Dairy Stabilization Board then drafts its dairy program for the coming year and submits it to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Secretary, in the meantime, has appointed a Dairy Advisory Committee representing the public, processors, importers, and any other groups he may select. To this committee the Secretary refers the program drafted by the farmers' Dairy Stabilization Board. The Dairy Advisory Committee may recommend to the Secretary the acceptance or rejection of the board program.

If the board's program is rejected by the Secretary, he must draft an alternative program and submit both his and the board's program to a joint standing committee of Congress. This committee would be made up of members of both political parties on the Committees on Agriculture of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. This is the group which has the final say on what program it will be—the board's or the Secretary's.

Should the board's program be approved by the Secretary, however, it becomes the dairy program for the next marketing year. There is no need to refer the question to the joint standing committee of Congress.

Assume, for example, that the board's program has been approved, either by the Secretary or the joint standing committee of Congress. It is, then, the program for 1957. The following example illustrates how the program would operate:

Prior to the beginning of the marketing year (April 1) the board meets to review production, sales, surplus stocks, and prices. On the basis of the information it has and its estimates for the coming year, the board recommends the new peacetime dairy program for the next marketing year.

Here is what the board might see if it were meeting next month:

| | *Billion pounds* |
|---|---|
| 1956 milk sold from farms | 112.0 |
| Government purchases | 4.5 |
| 1956 price level of manufacturing milk (3.95 test), $3.25 per hundredweight. | |
| Per capita consumption steady. | |
| If new program adopted, price support level (90 percent of parity using 88.5 parity equivalent), $3.78. | |

*Market forecast for 1957*

| | *Billion pounds* |
|---|---|
| Milk sold from farms in 1956 | 112.0 |
| Less government purchases | 4.5 |
| Actual 1956 domestic market | 107.5 |
| Add 1957 population increase | 2.0 |
| | 109.5 |
| Deduct loss in sales from retail price increase | 2.0 |
| Expected 1957 domestic market | 107.5 |

The above data are used for illustrative purposes only because accurate 1956 figures are not available at this writing. The actual figures will not be far from the example, however.

Using the above example, we find that the 1957 domestic market, with increased prices, will be about 4.5 billion pounds below 1956 production. It means, in other words, that the domestic market in 1957 will be about 96 percent of the 1956 volume of milk marketed.

With this information, the board makes the first of two major declarations it must make prior to the beginning of the marketing year. It declares that the market-surplus ratio for the marketing period is 96:4. (More about this later.)

Next the board must set the price support level and the surplus price. Let's assume the board sets the price support level at the minimum, which is 90 percent of parity using the parity equivalent method of calculation. This means a price support level of $3.78 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk as the national average test of 3.95 percent fat. This is 53 cents above the 1956 level.

The only price decision left, then, is: What will be paid for the remaining 4 percent, or "surplus" milk?

Last year CCC could realize only 60 cents per hundredweight for its surplus. This year manufactured milk products in CCC hands will cost $3.78 plus about $1 for processing, handling, and storage costs. This means the CCC, if it realizes only 60 cents this year, would take a per hundredweight loss of $4.18.

If CCC must purchase 4.5 billion pounds and take the $4.18 loss, the total cost would be $188,100,000.

How is the loss financed?

First a stabilization fee of 10 cents per hundredweight is paid CCC on all milk marketed. This brings in $112 million leaving a deficit of $76,100,000.

This remaining deficit of $76,100,000 is financed through a levy on all "surplus" milk, which is 4 percent of last year's production.

If we divide 4.5 billion pounds of milk into the remaining deficit of $76,100,000, we find that it will take a charge of $1.69 per hundredweight on "surplus" milk to raise the funds needed.

By subtracting the $1.69 charge from the support price of $3.78, we find that the price on "surplus" milk will be $2.09 for the next marketing period. The board may set such a figure at this time. Let's assume, for purposes of illustration, that the board asks for an additional 4 cents' cushion for safety and sets the surplus price at $2.05.

In summary, then, the board has made these decisions:

1. Support prices are increased from $3.25 to $3.78 for the ensuing marketing year.

2. The market-surplus ratio will be 96:4 for at least the next quarter (3 months).

3. The price of "surplus" milk for the next quarter will be $2.05.

How do these decisions affect the dairy farmer?

We use here an example of a dairy farmer marketing 300,000 pounds of milk annually. We assume it is of national-average test (3.95). Since almost all milk for fluid purposes has its price based on the price of manufacturing milk, the gains and costs are approximately the same, no matter where you may be.

Last year: In 1956 a production of 300,000 pounds, or 3,000 hundredweight, at $3.25, brought the dairy farmer $9,750.

This year: Upon the announcements of the Dairy Stabilization Board, the first handler of a farmer's milk would total last year's production and apply the 96:4 market-surplus ratio to it. Our dairy farmer would have a "market" of 288,000 pounds, for which the full support price would be assured because of the program. Our friend can, however, produce as much as he wants. He knows that if he does so, the price will be $2.05 for that surplus milk.

Let's suppose he does not sell those two cull cows and produces again 300,000 pounds of milk in 1957. Here is his return:

| | |
|---|---|
| 2,880 hundredweight at $3.78 | $10,886.40 |
| 120 hundredweight at $2.05 | 246.00 |
| Gross return | 11,132.40 |
| Less 10 cents per hundredweight | 300.00 |
| Net in milk check | 10,832.40 |
| 1956 return | 9,750.00 |
| Gain on new program | 1,082.40 |

Obviously, many questions arise which dairy farmers will want answered. Perhaps the best way to handle them is in a question and answer manner.

Just what is the price picture today? Can price supports be lowered under the present program?

The average national price of manufacturing milk (3.95 test) is now supported at $3.25. Under the present program, price supports can be dropped to $2.96 April 1. This would be 75 percent of parity as manufacturing milk parity is now calculated. If we use the parity equivalent method of determining manufacturing milk parity, 75 percent becomes $3.15.

The proposed new program support of $3.78 is 90 percent of parity on manufacturing milk (3.95 test) using the parity equivalent method of determining parity (see Hoard's Dairyman, November 25, 1956).

How far would prices drop if we had no price support program at all?

Because of the comparatively low demand-price ratio for dairy products, estimates are that manufacturing milk testing 3.95 would drop on a national average to the $2.60 to $2.70 range. Milk testing 3.5 would bring about $2.40 per hundredweight.

Does the dealer or processor gain financially through the deduction on surplus milk?

No. He must pay to the Commodity Credit Corporation the difference between $2.05 and his going, or free-market, price on all surplus or above-market milk. Further, he pays CCC the 10 cents per hundredweight on all milk received. These are, of course, deductions from the farmer's milk check.

The dealer or handler simply acts as the accounting and paying agent. His records are subject to continuing audit by the Government to make certain that all calculations and payments are made according to the program.

Is this program a deterrent to increased, or surplus, production?

Yes. Our large drop in dairy prices in the past few years has been caused by a small surplus, averaging only about 4 percent. The problem, then, has been one of finding

means of managing that small surplus without having the entire price structure collapse. The proposed program guarantees a fair parity price for all milk sold in the domestic market but a lower price on the 4 percent which cannot find a profitable market.

Obviously, the smaller the surplus, the higher will be the surplus price. The surplus, if high, will cause a lower price on surplus. But under no circumstances will the domestic market price be affected. It is tied to 90 percent of parity.

What happens if the board makes an error, and not enough money is collected to finance the program?

In the next quarter the board can either (1) reduce the price on surplus milk, or (2) widen the market-surplus ratio to 95: 5, for example. Either action would increase the revenue for the program.

How will the markets or bases be set up at the beginning?

As indicated above, the first year's market would be 96 percent of last year's production.

Could the market be transferred?

Yes. It is currently planned to transfer a market when 2 legs of a 3-legged market stool are moved. For example, a market goes with the herd, farmer, and farm. If any two move together, the market moves, too.

How about a new producer who has no market or base?

During the first year he will receive a market of 70 percent of his current production. The second year, 80 percent; and the third year, 90 percent; and then the full market on his production just like established producers. On this basis, his income the first year will be equal to the income he would receive under the present price-support program.

Marketing 300,000 pounds of milk today, he receives $9,750. Under the new program, as a new producer he would receive $9,783. At 80 percent, the second year, he would receive $10,302.

What happens if I increase the size of my herd and, of course, the amount of milk I ship?

You still receive the full support price on your market quantity. During the current year you receive the surplus price on all above that amount. The next year, however, your market is increased by 50 percent of your previous year's surplus production. This serves to act as a deterrent to overproduction.

You are still better off than you would be under the present program. Let's take an example:

Suppose you produced 300,000 pounds in 1956 and produce 350,000 in 1957 and in 1958.

| | *Total income* | |
|---|---|---|
| | *1957* | *1958* |
| Present program | $11,375.00 | $11,375.00 |
| New program | 12,157.40 | 12,693.70 |

Even with the lower price on surplus milk, the man who enlarges his herd gains under the new program compared with the present or old program. Only the more efficient dairymen will want to enlarge their herds, however, because of the lower surplus price on overmarket quantities.

Suppose I have a market of 288,000 pounds and produce only 286,000 pounds. Will I lose part of my market the following year?

No. You are assured that your market will not be reduced.

If this is so, how can the fellows increasing their herds pick up additional market?

Through increased sales resulting from population increase and from normal turnover where farmers leave the dairy business. If this does not increase the market enough to provide for these men at the above percentages, the Dairy Stablization Board will reduce the amounts that can be added to existing markets.

How much will retail prices be increased by the increase of 53 cents per hundredweight?

About 1¼ cents per quart on bottled milk, 7 cents per pound on butter, and 5 cents per pound on cheese.

Am I guaranteed $3.78 for manufacturing milk?

No. The average national price is supported. This is for manufacturing milk testing 3.95. Some plants will pay a bit more and some less depending on volume, costs, and distance from markets.

How do I benefit when all my milk is used for fluid or bottling purposes? None goes for manufacturing.

Fluid or bottling milk (class I milk) prices are normally based on manufacturing prices. In other words, the class I price is made up of manufacturing prices plus a premium for class I. When manufacturing prices increase, class I prices advance, too.

If the surplus price is quite low, won't it tend to hold down production or at least keep it from expanding? If so, it may make some fluid markets short.

This is true. For this reason, it is proposed that any Federal order area which is able to sell 90 percent or more of its annual production in bottled milk or cream will not have the market-surplus ratio applied. They will, however, pay the 10 cents per hundredweight on all milk marketed.

Because of seasonal variations in milk flow, it was felt that 90-percent fluid utilization was, for all practical purposes, proof of a self-sufficient market. Only a very few markets in the country will qualify. Incidentally, State orders can also qualify if their audits are of comparable completeness as those under Federal orders.

Under this program, will dairy farmers be paying for school milk costs?

No. It is proposed that the Federal Government will continue to underwrite the costs of school milk, school lunch, and Armed Forces milk purchases.

If we finance our own surplus disposal, why shouldn't supports be set at 100 percent of parity for the domestic market?

Perhaps they should. Dairy leaders, however, feel that the course of good judgment indicates the 90 percent level, at least until we have had some actual operating experience under the new program. Even at the 90 percent level, the advantages are so great compared to the present program that dairy farmers should give it widespread support during these initial phases of its operation.

Why shouldn't the surplus price eventually become the world or export price?

It should. When it does, the surplus price would be higher. Those in this country who have low costs can then deliberately produce for the export market in addition to the domestic market without having the domestic market fall to world market levels.

Is this production control?

Those who oppose it will probably use such terminology. In reality, it is price support limited to the domestic market. A farmer can produce as much as he wants if he is efficient enough to do so at the surplus price.

Obviously, the lower price on surplus production will deter the inefficient dairyman from adding to the surplus. Even he, however, is better off financially if he continues to produce in the same volume as he has in the past.

This domestic parity, or two-price, plan has been called dramatic and novel. Shouldn't we be wary of such a new idea?

It is only human to be skeptical of a new idea. History is replete with examples of how long it takes to accept a new concept. Certainly this is true of domestic parity. Believe it or not, the principle of domestic parity was first advanced 35 years ago.

It was embodied in the McNary-Haugen bill in the twenties, was twice passed by Congress with widespread farmer support, but was, each time, vetoed by the President. It figured prominently in the national political conventions of 1928 and was responsible for Governor Lowden of Illinois refusing to be a candidate for President when his party would not endorse it in a platform plank.

New? Hardly. It is just coming of age and ready to work.

How soon can this new program be put in operation?

Probably not before the marketing year beginning April 1, 1958. The bill must be drafted, hearings held, and then be debated and passed by both Houses of Congress. After being signed by the President, it goes to a dairy farmer vote. If passed by a two-thirds vote, elections are held to name the nominees to the Dairy Stabilization Board.

Only then can the program begin to work for dairy farmers.

## LEASE-PURCHASE ACT OF 1954

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, apropos of hearings now under way by the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds in an attempt to justify repeal of the Lease-Purchase Act of 1954.

Repeal of the Public Buildings Contract Act of 1954 appears to me to be a folly of inconsistency. It is true that a "tight money" situation, so-called, and the peril of inflation have temporarily halted the program of lease purchase advanced by the General Services Administration.

Yet, is it wisdom now to cancel out the considerable sums already expended in plans, surveys, real-estate acquisition, and similar endeavors through repeal of what is basically a sound piece of legislation?

This act must remain. It should continue in force against the day when the inflation danger has lessened. It must be an ever-present mandate of the Congress for use at that time, which I am sure each Member of the House hopes is not too far distant, when the money market will find ready takers for these projects.

This is a public law soundly based upon the American principle that private capital can operate more cheaply and efficiently for all in certain areas.

I hope it is the sense of this House to defeat H. R. 4660.

## PUBLIC BUILDINGS LEASE-PURCHASE ACT

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in the proposal of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL]. However, I should like to state this. The delay has been inexcusable in processing public buildings under the

Lease-Purchase Act. I should like to know if the gentleman would have any objection to a direct appropriation providing for the Federal building that is included in that bill for the city of Huntington?

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the suggestion of my colleague from West Virginia. I would have no objection whatsoever to an appropriation that would take care of the building at Huntington. For the past 6 or 8 years it has been a matter of consideration entailing both costs and delays.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman agrees that it can be built for about 30 or 35 percent less under a direct appropriation than it could under the high interest rates necessary under the lease-purchase program?

Mr. NEAL. I think that is probably true. I prefer a direct appropriation if that can be had. However, inasmuch as many of these projects, 24 or 30 of them were ready to let the contract, if it is the sense of the Congress that it is not possible to make appropriations for these structures, I think it would be folly to repeal the legislation which would permit construction under the Lease-Purchase Act at some early date. Huntington has become very disillusioned by the failure of the Congress to appropriate direct funds to complete this much needed public improvement.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

## FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an address by the President of the United States delivered on February 25 on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of the Voice of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 25, the President of the United States made a radio address in observance of the 15th anniversary of the Voice of America. So that all of my colleagues may have an opportunity to read this inspiring message, I include the complete text of the President's broadcast.

TEXT OF THE BROADCAST BY THE PRESIDENT IN OBSERVANCE OF THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VOICE OF AMERICA

For 15 years now the Voice of America has been bringing to people everywhere the facts about world events, and about America's policy in relation to these events.

This, then, is a fitting occasion to review some aspects of United States foreign policy. Its guiding thought is this: We believe that we can permanently prosper and enjoy peace only as all peoples prosper and enjoy peace.

In speaking of this subject—rather than talk in abstractions—I would like to draw a picture. It is a picture, in essence, of the kind of world which we would like to see for ourselves and for our children, and which we think most people would like to see for themselves and their children.

There are two parts to the picture. The first part relates to the building up of individual countries and their peoples.

One of the vital facts of this century is that dozens of new nations have come into being. These nations, along with the older nations, are struggling—each in its own way—to improve the lot of their people—through a better standard of living, more diversified industry and more efficient farming, increasing political stability, and fresh realization of cultural and religious traditions that are sometimes thousands of years old.

The first task of this new age is to ensure that this magnificent surge toward a better life, both personal and national, goes forward in all these countries as rapidly and as safely as possible.

The United States has been working at the side of most of these nations, while they have been making great strides in education, farming methods, control of diseases, construction of hospitals and roads and schools and factories and dams and irrigation projects, and improvement of political machinery, legislation, and labor-management relations.

There is a second part to this picture. Suppose we achieved a world of healthy, free, sovereign nations. We would still have the question: how are they to settle their differences of interest among themselves? For there will always be differences of interest. And there must be some source of international order.

A principal source of order in the world, and one that can provide an overall pattern, is the United Nations.

And so, just as we support the vigorous independence of today's many separate nations, so too we support just as vigorously the practice of settling the inevitable disputes between these nations under the principles and procedures of the United Nations.

The history of the United States is that of a struggle for the right of self-determination and human dignity. Our story begins with a ringing declaration which has inspired millions of free people everywhere, that "all men * * * are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." But this same declaration also states that, along with this self-determination, we must show "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind."

In world affairs this Nation has striven to confirm and give meaning to these noble words. Through the years we have helped new countries achieve political and economic strength. And the way we dealt with the Suez crisis and its aftereffects in the U. N. was also an action demonstrating our conviction that international harmony begins with "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind."

Recently I set forth before our Congress proposals about the Middle East designed to help bring stability to that troubled area. I would like to show you how these proposals fit in with what I have just described as our purposes.

I believe that the well-being of the people of the Middle East requires the nations of that region to build up and strengthen their economies and institutions. We want to see that kind of progress. My proposals fit right in with this purpose, for they suggested two things: First, in order that this constructive work may go on within these countries, they must be free of the menace of international communism, which could smash all their hard-won accomplishments overnight. And so we give these countries the assurance that if such a danger develops, and if the United Nations machinery cannot deal with the danger, and a threatened country asks for our help, it can count on our help. So, behind the protective arm of this assurance, the real creative work of progress can go on, and, to speed this creative work, an extra measure of economic assistance for the area is included in my proposals.

We must face the fact that, while we are trying to help build a world of freedom and justice among sovereign people, the masters of international communism are working constantly to tear down this kind of world.

Communism, according to all its own leaders, must be a system of international control and conformity. Thus, at its very heart, it is the complete opposite and enemy of any kind of nationalism. Its avowed program is to destroy totally the religion, governments, institutions and traditions of the Christian world, the Buddhist world, the Islamic world, the Judaic world, and the world of every religion and culture. The Communist rulers then propose to substitute a whole new system of thought and control dictated from Communist Party headquarters. They think that a few theorists and rulers know what is best for everyone, and they are determined to drive everyone toward that kind of world.

One small country after another has been swallowed up by international communism. Their freedom is lost. Their national pride is crushed. Their religion is trampled on. Their economies are mere feeders for that of Russia. And if they attempt to assert their tradition of freedom, their people are shot down by the thousands. Witness: Hungary.

I should like to direct a special word to those people now living under the tyranny of international communism:

We want your friendship. We cherish the ties that have linked us in the past. And we wish you well in your aspirations toward freedom. For we know that, whatever the designs of power-hungry rulers may be, there dwells deep in the heart of every person this same God-given desire to realize freely his own destiny.

And to all people, everywhere—this final pledge: With you we look forward to and shall never cease to work for a world of peace, based on justice. May the God of us all keep you—and hasten that glorious day.

## DRIVER EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection?

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide Federal grants to the States to develop driver education programs in the public schools.

The need for driver training at the elementary and high-school level to help cut down on the slaughter on our highways was shown very clearly in the hearings held last fall by the Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The value of learning good driving habits cannot be overestimated. This training should start in the school. Yet we were told by the National Safety Council, only eight States now have public-school driver-education programs.

The bill I have offered, in general, follows the Smith-Hughes Act, which set up the vocational agricultural education program. That program has been very successful. Driver education, of course, would not be limited to training for a vocation, but my bill will provide a starting point to discuss the important problem of how to get these young drivers off to a good start, one that will produce good, safe drivers. Training good drivers is something which vitally concerns

the States and local communities, but the Federal Government has a very great responsibility in protecting life and property in interstate commerce. By encouraging State action, legislation along the lines proposed would go a long way in promoting safety in motor-vehicle transportation in interstate commerce. By giving the States encouragement to set up driver-training programs, we can cut down on the terrific loss of life and limb on our highways. Even a modest start will be well worth the cost involved.

The National Safety Council has recognized the importance of driver training. Objective No. 8 of the council is "to teach every elementary school child and to provide driver education for every high-school student."

The subcommittee was told by Mr. Wayne P. Hughes, director, school and college division, National Safety Council, in our hearings in Chicago that we have a potential of 1,600,000 public school students who reach driving age each year. Of those, 33 percent get classroom instruction only, and 29 percent get both classroom and road instruction. Of the 20,000 public high schools, 11 percent offer classroom work only; 39 percent offer both classroom and road instruction. Those figures are based on the 1954–55 school year.

We were told that there are two chief hurdles in establishing a driver education program. One is the cost. That is the bigger hurdle. The other is fitting the course into the curriculum of the schools. Mr. Hughes told the subcommittee that in those States which have passed permissive and enabling legislation, the driver education program is developing very well. Those States are California, Delaware, Florida, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Washington. In those States where financial support has been given by the State, the programs are developing very nicely.

We were told that the cost of these programs would run about $35 per student a year. This, however, is only an estimate. I understand that in some cities in Michigan the cost has been less than half that.

In the report of the Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety, House Report No. 2971, 84th Congress, Recommendation No. 5 is "School driver education and adult retraining programs must be expanded." The total of highway traffic accidents increases each year. We must do something to stop this annual slaughter. I have no doubt that proper driver education in the public schools will make a great contribution to safety. I am submitting my bill as a starting point for discussion of this important subject.

## A BILL TO AMEND THE CUSTOMS SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a bill to amend section 2 of the Customs Simplification Act of 1956 and to repeal section 6 of said act. I believe my colleagues should be apprised of the reasons why such legislation is necessary and advisable.

Section 6 of Public Law 927 (84th Cong., ch. 887, 2d sess., 70 Stat. 943), cited as the Customs Simplification Act, provides for the promulgation by the United States Secretary of the Treasury of a list of commodities where the customs duties are assessed in whole or in part on an ad valorem basis and where the foreign values as defined in section 402 (c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Customs Simplification Act of 1938, for such commodities imported into the United States during the fiscal year 1954 exceed by 5 percent or more the export values as defined by section 402 (d) of the Tariff Act of 1930, for the same period, for such commodities. Public Law 927 contemplates after the promulgation by the United States Secretary of the Treasury of the above-mentioned list that section 402 of the Tariff Act of 1930 shall be applied to all commodities on such list and that all commodities not on such list will be assessed ad valorem duties in whole or in part in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 927. This statute then provides that there be simultaneously two tariff laws for commodities dutiable in whole or in part on an ad valorem basis. Notwithstanding the fact that Public Law 927 was approved by the President on August 2, 1956, the above-mentioned list has not been promulgated by the United States Secretary of the Treasury.

I understand it is very doubtful that such a list will be promulgated prior to July 1, 1957.

I further understand that there will be at least 2,500 commodities on which ad valorem duties are assessable in whole or in part. Special determinations as to foreign value and export value shall be made on every one of these commodities for every country of exportation in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 927, so it is apparent that the work entailed in the preparation and promulgation of this list is enormous.

Public Law 927 provides that the commodities to be set forth on this list are those imported into the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, so that by the time this list is promulgated, at least 3 years will have expired since the fiscal year 1954. Conditions have unquestionably changed during those 3 years so as to make this list to a great extent ineffective.

Furthermore, in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 927, within 60 days after the promulgation of the preliminary list, domestic manufacturers, producers or wholesalers can present to the United States Secretary of the Treasury their beliefs that certain imported commodities should be on the list. The Secretary of the Treasury will then investigate the matter and if he agrees with this belief, these commodities will be added to the list. No opportunity is afforded by this statute to importers to have a commodity removed from the list. This is unfair treatment of international trade.

In view of the foregoing, section 2 of Public Law 927 should be amended and section 6 of that statute should be repealed.

## HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER RECEIVES AMERICAN GOOD GOVERNMENT SOCIETY AWARD

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, February 22, the 225th anniversary of the birth of the first President of these United States, the American Good Government Society made its annual awards to two outstanding American statesmen.

Prior awards were made to Senator Harry F. Byrd and Senator Robert A. Taft, in 1953; former President Herbert Hoover and Gov. Allan Shivers in 1954; Representative Howard W. Smith and Gen. Robert E. Wood in 1955; Senator Walter F. George and Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey in 1956.

This year's recipients were Representative WILLIAM M. COLMER and Senator KARL E. MUNDT. Both gentlemen have made outstanding contributions to constitutional government and to preserving the American way of life.

It is my privilege to place in the RECORD at this point the citation on the award received by our colleague, WILLIAM M. COLMER, and his notable address acknowledging this award:

WILLIAM M. COLMER

Lawyer and statesman, educator, soldier, and conservationist, has served Mississippi and the Nation for 35 years as county attorney and district attorney, and for 24 years as a Representative in the Congress of the United States.

Under his chairmanship, the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning developed comprehensive plans for conversion of the national economy from war to peace, and recommended a new and firm policy toward Russia. Champion of sound fiscal policy, his wise and courageous leadership has cut the cost of government by billions of dollars.

Representative COLMER'S understanding of the American political system—a limited dual sovereignty of State and Nation—as a heritage of English law, and his determination that it shall continue free from the fetters of European social democracy, have won for him a powerful influence among his colleagues in the Congress—an influence for the good of the people of the United States.

SPEECH OF HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER, OF MISSISSIPPI, UPON RECEIVING THE GEORGE WASHINGTON DAY DINNER AWARD OF THE AMERICAN GOOD GOVERNMENT SOCIETY, FEBRUARY 22, 1957

Mr. President, to have one's name inscribed in the archives of this unselfish, patriotic society along with those who have been similarly honored in the past is a greater tribute than I ever dreamed of or hoped to achieve. But if love of country and devotion to the high and cherished principles of him whose birth we tonight commemorate is the criterion rather than achievement, I humbly and gratefully accept your gracious and prized award.

Likewise, Mr. President, I regret that I, as a Member of the Congress for almost a quarter of a century, cannot escape my own responsibility for the assaults that have been

made against the principles of good government on which the Republic was founded. For, in no similar period have we strayed further from the sound philosophy and admonitions of Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, and men of like mind. A brief comparison of the fundamental principles of the philosophy of the Republic's founders and their handiwork, the Constitution itself, with the modern philosophy that now prevails will, I fear, confirm this sad commentary.

Washington urged that we "cherish public credit." He said, "One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible." Today that public credit has been extended to almost $276 billion. This represents an increase of some $250 billion in the past 24 years.

Again, in his farewell address, President Washington admonished: "Avoid likewise the accumulation of debt not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in times of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear."

Yet today, enjoying the greatest national income and burdened with the highest taxes in the peacetime history of the country, we hover on the precipice of deficit spending. Prudence suggests that under such conditions we should be retiring a part of our gargantuan debt and fortifying our fiscal position for the proverbial rainy day. On the contrary, we are now faced with the new executive budget approximating $72 billion. It is often argued that because two-thirds of our expenditure are either to pay for previous wars or to prepare for possible future ones, we cannot retrench; but that we must increase our defense program without limitation for fear of a sneak Pearl Harbor attack. For more than a decade this humble voice has been heard repeatedly in the halls of Congress to the effect that the masters of the Kremlin want neither war nor peace. They are following the blueprint of their idol, Lenin, himself, who wrote in the early stages of the Bolshevik Revolution that the way to conquer the United States was to make it spend itself into bankruptcy. If this be a correct analysis of the sinister Russian objective, they certainly have no more useful allies than the special interests and minority groups who year after year descend upon Washington seeking larger and larger favors from the public till.

Mr. President, I fear the Russian menace less than the danger of the collapse of the fiscal structure. I am more apprehensive of inflation than I am of Communist infiltration. For if our economic strength is destroyed, hungry people might well become easy prey to the siren song emanating from the Kremlin.

Along with the peril of unbridled spending and exorbitant taxation, I am sure that the members of this society are justly alarmed with the ever-increasing tendency toward consolidation of power in the Federal Government at the expense of the States and the freedom of our citizens.

Jefferson, who contributed so much to the cornerstone of our freedom, warned: "It is not by the consolidation or concentration of powers that good government is effected. Were not this great country already divided into States, that division must be made, that each might do for itself what concerns itself directly, and what it can do much better than distant authority."

It was to prevent this consolidation of power that the 10th amendment was adopted providing that, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." For more than a century that mandate was scrupulously honored. On the few occasions when Congress, with an excess of zeal, invaded the domain of the States, the Supreme Court firmly pulled it back. Thus, when Congress attempted by the Civil Rights Act of 1875 to exercise the police power of the States by requiring the operators of inns, theaters, and other places of public amusement to serve white and colored people alike, the Supreme Court held the measure void. It told Congress that neither the 13th nor 14th amendments conferred any authority for this interference with the conduct of private individuals.

How changed the situation today. Apparently the States no longer have any rights which the Federal Government is bound to respect. Congress, I am sorry to admit, is partially responsible for this development. It has passed laws, expressed in vague general terms, empowering Federal agencies to regulate vast areas of our economy. Immediately these agencies set up all the trappings of bureaucracy. They issue directives, regulations, and interpretations, which as time goes on, bear less and less resemblance to the act passed by Congress.

But the evil wrought by the executive and the legislative branches has been minor in comparison with the transgressions in the past two decades of the nine black-robed gentlemen of the Supreme Court. You won't find anything about preemption in the Constitution, but the Supreme Court, with ever-increasing frequency, is applying that doctrine to whittle down the jurisdiction of the State courts. Of course, in doing this the tribunal always professes to be carrying out the intent of Congress; the effect is the further centralization of power in the Federal Government. Among the most flagrant examples of this practice in recent months have been the Steve Nelson and Slochower cases. In the Nelson case, the Supreme Court held, under this doctrine of preemption, that Pennsylvania's antisedition law was void. And in the Slochower case, the Court denied the right of the city of New York to discharge a teacher who had invoked the fifth amendment in a congressional committee investigation concerning his past membership in the Communist Party. If this doctrine is permitted to go unchallenged, our State courts will become but empty shells.

Remedial legislation sponsored by a number of us under the leadership of my able colleague, Congressman SMITH of Virginia, has been languishing in committees of Congress for the past 2 years.

"There is no danger I apprehend so much," Jefferson wrote, "as the consolidation of our Government by the noiseless and, therefore, alarming instrumentality of the Supreme Court."

One can conceive of no more flagrant example of the digression from the doctrine enunciated by Washington and Jefferson than the recent school segregation decision of the Supreme Court, on the one hand, and the current drive in the Congress for the so-called civil-rights bill, on the other. In the school case the Court admittedly substituted its own political and social theories for legal precedent. The enactment of the civil-rights bill under the guise of protecting the liberties of certain minority groups would result in the further encroachment upon the liberties of all of our citizens.

We are now told that centralization is liberalism. Jefferson called it "toryism in disguise." By whatever name called, it can only end in totalitarianism.

The basic principles of human freedom are as invariable as the solar system. They are the same in the jet and nuclear age as they were in the horseback and ramrod and musket days.

To those of us who believe in the principles of Washington, Jefferson, and Hamilton enshrined in the Constitution, the present posture of affairs would indeed appear discouraging. The distress signals are all about us.

But, surely, we, the beneficiaries of the labor and sacrifice of those who founded the Republic, have the courage, the will, and the patriotism to see to it that this Republic, embodying the most perfect form of human liberty ever conceived by the minds of men, shall not perish from the earth.

## POULTRY INSPECTION—A SECOND BILL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, by request, a second bill on compulsory Federal inspection of poultry—this one identical to S. 1128 introduced in the Senate on February 7 by Senator HUMPHREY and a number of other Senators.

This bill, in almost all particulars, seeks to accomplish the same purpose as my own bill, H. R. 12, which I introduced on January 3, and which was similar to H. R. 11800, which I had introduced in the 84th Congress.

H. R. 12 would accomplish the goal of a compulsory poultry inspection system by amending the Meat Inspection Act to apply in all relevant respects to poultry. The Meat Inspection Act is 51 years old and has been eminently successful, as we all know, in protecting the health of the American people by assuring the wholesomeness of the red meats—beef, lamb, pork—moving in interstate commerce.

### DISEASED POULTRY A SERIOUS HEALTH MENACE

Poultry is at present not subject to any compulsory Federal inspection for wholesomeness. The Food and Drug Administration is authorized to seize filthy or diseased poultry shipments moving in interstate commerce, of course, but it is so understaffed for the vast amount of work it has to do in all areas of food, drug, and cosmetic control that it cannot possibly as a routine matter inspect all poultry shipments.

There is a voluntary system of Federal poultry inspection paid for by those processors which elect to come under it. As far as it goes, it does a great deal of good. It is always a good idea to buy United States inspected poultry, when the opportunity is present.

But most poultry which is eaten in this country is not inspected for wholesomeness. Consequently, an alarmingly high proportion of food poisoning cases has been traced to diseased poultry. And, I might add, several deaths have occurred among poultry processing workers in recent years following outbreaks of epidemics resulting from diseased birds.

So this is a matter of extreme urgency and importance to the American consumer, as well as to the farmer and poultry processor. Unless the consumer has confidence in the wholesomeness of the poultry sold in the stores, efforts to build poultry sales will not succeed. So this all does have an economic basis for the producer.

For the consumer it is, however, a matter of even more urgency; one could almost say it is a matter of life and death.

STILL SUPPORT H. R. 12

In introducing this second bill on the subject this year, I am not by any means withdrawing my interest or support or emphasis from H. R. 12, which I still feel is the simplest and best approach to the problem of setting up an effective inspection system.

The new bill which I am introducing today, however, provides the Committee on Agriculture the choice of two approaches. I would be satisfied to see either measure become law. The new bill establishes a separate system of poultry inspection separate from the meat inspection program, but in the same Department of Agriculture division, the Agriculture Research Service.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I submit the testimony I presented to the Committee on Agriculture last year on the predecessor bill to H. R. 12, which was then H. R. 11800, and, also, I submit an analysis of this new bill I am introducing as it was outlined to the Senate by Senator HUMPHREY.

COMPULSORY INSPECTION OF POULTRY FOR WHOLESOMENESS

(Testimony by Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of Missouri, before Poultry Subcommittee of House Committee on Agriculture on H. R. 11800, by Mrs. SULLIVAN, to require compulsory inspection for wholesomeness of poultry and poultry products, Tuesday, July 17, 1956)

Chairman POLK and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate very much this opportunity to appear as your first witness on the various bills before you to require Federal inspection of poultry and poultry products for wholesomeness. It is extremely encouraging to me that you are taking up this issue with the intention of recommending legislation in this session, and I sincerely hope we can get a good bill through. I understand the Senate Committee on Agriculture intends to meet tomorrow in executive session to consider bills on this same subject, so it is conceivable we can enact legislation before adjournment. I certainly hope so.

Let me say first that I know how busy all of the members of this subcommittee are in these closing days of the session. I am similarly pressed for time, with so much to do in such a short period yet remaining of this session, and so I have no intention of taking up unnecessary time here today. I do not think I have to tell you in great detail why we must have compulsory inspection of poultry. The members of the subcommittee are as familiar with the problem as I am. What concerns us all is finding the most practical and effective solution.

RESEARCH MATERIAL APPEARED IN JUNE 18 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

As the members of the subcommittee know, I went into great detail in the remarks I made in the House on June 18, at the time I introduced H. R. 11800, explaining why legislation was necessary, and I do not want to take time to repeat that material this afternoon. I do think it should be made part of the record of this hearing, however, and so I ask that it be included at the conclusion of my oral testimony—that is, the remarks I made in the House on June 18, along with the research material presented at that time and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If it is done in that way, it will save us much time and still provide a complete record for those interested and concerned in this important issue.

What I want to do in the time here this afternoon is to explain, then, not why we must have poultry inspection—for I believe that everyone connected with the poultry industry will now acknowledge that we must have additional consumer protections or the poultry industry will suffer from serious consumer resistance—but rather, what I want to do is to discuss the various proposals for providing an inspection program and to explain why I think my bill, H. R. 11800 is the best approach.

Let me give you briefly, the high points of H. R. 11800. To put it as concisely as possible, my bill would amend the Meat Inspection Act in every relevant provision to require that poultry and poultry products be inspected in exactly the same manner in which—for 50 years—we have been inspecing the red meats.

NO LEGAL PITFALLS IN USE OF MEAT INSPECTION ACT

It does not set up any new rules, regulations, definitions, procedures, or other legal pitfalls. By "pitfalls," I mean provisions which would set off endless litigation and thus prevent prompt and effective application of the new law.

The Meat Inspection Act is exactly 50 years old. It grew out of the same circumstances a half century ago as the demand today for poultry inspection laws—that is, the practices of unscrupulous operators who defied the public good and sent diseased and unwholesome meats into the channels of commerce.

Some of the information now available on the kind of diseased and unwholesome poultry products which have been shipped in interstate commerce is so sickening and revolting I do not want to go into it here. I think you are all familiar with this problem. I know you join me in wanting to see the public protected. As members of the Agriculture Committee, you also want to make sure that the legitimate poultry raisers and processors are protected from the poison peddlers in the trade.

I have given much thought to this problem ever since officials of the Meat Cutters Union first called my attention to the health hazards many of their members were experiencing in the poultry plants. The more I went into this problem, the more it became my conviction that poultry should be inspected in exactly the same way as the red meats. The meat inspection program has been remarkably successful—one of the most successful of all Government programs—and has been a great thing both for the consumer and the livestock and packing industries.

While it is true that meat can be spoiled in transit, or in improper handling after it leaves the packinghouse, nevertheless we know that when it left the plant—with the Government stamp on it—it was pure and wholesome and not diseased and dangerous to eat.

PURPOSE IS PRIMARILY TO PROTECT CONSUMING PUBLIC

I want to see us enact a law which will give us the same assurance on poultry.

As my bill states, its purpose is "to protect the general consuming public."

I think that is first and foremost, but there are additional factors also, and they are:

"To protect the health of persons engaged in the processing and distribution of poultry and poultry products, to prevent the spread of disease through shipments in interstate and foreign commerce of unwholesome poultry and poultry products, and to promote the wider use of poultry through assurance to the consuming public of its wholesomeness and freedom from disease, thus assisting agriculture and the food marketing industries in expanding their sales and augmenting their important contributions to our economic system."

I hope the members of this subcommittee will agree with me on the objectives I have cited, and also on their relative order—that is, that the health of the public comes first. I say that because I know that some of the other bills before you, while aimed at protecting the public, of course, nevertheless seem to stem primarily from the desire to protect the industry from unscrupulous competitors. I want to do that, too; but the first thing, as I said, is to protect the public. If we can agree on that, then I believe my bill, H. R. 11800, best suits the purpose.

It provides for compulsory inspection of all poultry and poultry products in interstate commerce, and also in intrastate commerce if it burdens or affects interstate commerce. I think the industry itself is anxious to see both covered. Now as I understand it, the intrastate inspection could be carried out under working relationships between the Federal service and State or local authorities.

ANTE MORTEM INSPECTION MADE MANDATORY

My bill makes ante mortem inspection compulsory—that is, inspection before slaughter as well as after. This is the only way, according to information which I have received, that we can assure the health and wholesomeness of the poultry involved. I know that many of the industry spokesmen oppose this on the grounds that it would make processing slower or more costly. But, believe me, if we are going to have an inspection system, let's not have half a system. All red-meat animals are inspected both before and after slaughter. Under the meat-inspection law this is discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture, but for years it has been mandatory by regulation. My bill amends the basic law to make it mandatory for the red meats and for poultry.

Otherwise, in every particular, H. R. 11800 adopts exactly the existing provisions of the meat-inspection law. For 50 years, with only occasional amendment, this law has held up remarkably well. It can apply equally well to poultry.

The Department of Agriculture has made comments on this legislation in connection with the so-called poultry industry bill which is also before you. That bill would delay enforcement of poultry inspection for 2 years, and then permit other exemptions and delays for 2 additional years. That would mean we would not have general compulsory inspection until 1960. That is too long a wait—too late. My bill would provide 6 months to bring about conformance. I do not think that is too soon.

If you will note the Department's comments on the industry bill, it has in instance after instance suggested changes to bring the bill more generally into conformance with the Meat Inspection Act. I say, rather than set up an entirely new law and procedure for poultry, let us use the perfectly good law we now have for meat inspection, and let it be extended logically to include poultry. The Department, in effect, endorses just about all the proposals in my bill, by its criticism of the industry bill. In other words, we can solve this whole problem just by adapting the meat-inspection law to include poultry.

POULTRY INDUSTRY BILLS FAIL TO MEET NEED

The poultry industry says that poultry competes with the red meats and therefore should not be placed under the Meat Inspection Branch. My bill does not require that poultry inspection be in the Meat Inspection Branch, although I certainly think that is the logical place for it, rather than in a sales promotion branch of the Department. But I do provide the Secretary with discretion on this. However, there is no discretion to provide different standards for poultry than for the red meats. They should be treated alike. After all, beef and pork compete for business, and so does lamb. The meat inspectors are not promoting one type of meat over another; they are only seeking to make sure that the meat we serve in our homes, or

which is served to us in restaurants, is wholesome and not diseased and insanitary.

My criticism of the poultry industry bill is that while it seeks to show a desire to conform to good inspection laws, it provides so many delays, so many modifications, and so many relaxations and exemptions that I am afraid it would do us little good for a long time to come. For the immediate future it would merely shift to the Federal Government the cost of the voluntary program which is presently paid by industry. We should pay for the inspection service—but we should get our money's worth—and have real and effective and full inspection—in the immediate future, rather than 4 years from now.

I urge you to study my bill from this standpoint.

---

MEMORANDUM BY SENATOR HUMPHREY COMPARING POULTRY INSPECTION BILLS BEFORE THE SENATE

Three major mandatory poultry-inspection bills have been introduced in the United States Senate. These are S. 313, S. 645, and the Humphrey bill.

S. 313 and S. 645 are inadequate, however praiseworthy their purposes. The Humphrey bill is a measure which will truly protect the poultry consumer, poultry worker, poultry-processing industry, and poultry farmers. It helps all of these four groups and is no way harmful to any of them.

It is doubtful whether S. 645 actually provides mandatory poultry inspection. Both it and S. 313 contain loopholes which would rob a poultry-inspection program of effectiveness and integrity. Any comparison of them with the inspection programs carried out under the Meat Inspection Act finds them sadly lacking. In fact, some of their sections could be used in the future as precedents to weaken the Meat Inspection Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Under S. 313 and S. 645 the inspection could be carried out by plant employees in their employers' processing establishments. Antemortem inspection, which health authorities, including the Food and Drug Administration, have testified is essential for the protection of consumers and poultry workers is not required. Prosecutions for violations of the act would be extremely difficult—if not impossible—to secure.

The Humphrey bill is on a superficial level similar to these two bills. Many sections of the three bills are the same, word for word. But the Humphrey bill plugs the loopholes in the other two bills. It provides for an effective system of mandatory poultry inspection in practice as well as in name. It is an amended form of a bill supported by the Department of Agriculture last year.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE BILLS

Here are the major differences between S. 313 and S. 645, on the one hand, and the Humphrey bill, on the other:

1. Ante mortem inspection: S. 313 and S. 645 do not require ante mortem or before slaughter inspection. The Humphrey bill does require it. The manner of ante mortem inspection is left by the Humphrey bill to the discretion of the Secretary. In other words, slaughter inspection is mandatory under the Humphrey bill, but it need not be bird-by-bird inspection; it can be an examination by flock, coop, batch, or in any way the Secretary of Agriculture will later prescribe.

Public health experts believe ante mortem inspection is essential to protect consumer interests. Respiratory diseases which are difficult to detect after slaughter may be easily identified in the live bird.

Mandatory ante mortem inspection is also a major protection for poultry workers against industrial hazards. Any diseased birds which are prevented from coming on the processing line obviously cannot infect the workers. The dread danger of psittacosis, which hit 136 persons, killing 3, in 3 epidemics during 1956 alone, could be minimized through the use of ante mortem inspection.

2. Post mortem inspection: S. 645 does not specify the type of post mortem or after-slaughter inspection. The Humphrey bill and S. 313 agree in providing for carcass-by-carcass inspection.

A post mortem inspection of the carcass of every bird is an absolute essential protection for consumers. Although the voluntary poultry-inspection program now carried on by the Department of Agriculture is lacking in many respects, it does require a post-mortem inspection which is carcass by carcass.

3. Prohibited acts: S. 313 and S. 645 prohibited acts and penalties sections would make these measures extremely difficult—if not impossible—to enforce. These sections repeatedly state that a violator must knowingly commit illegal acts before he can be punished. This means that an extreme degree of intent of violation, as well as the violation itself, must be proved.

The Humphrey bill closes this loophole, which would allow violators to either ignore or flaunt the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. The Humphrey bill still prevents any unfair or unwise indictments. Like S. 313 and S. 645 it gives the Secretary of Agriculture the discretion not to report for criminal prosecution or for institution of injunction proceedings any minor violations when the Secretary believes the public interest will be so served, and compliance may be obtained by other means.

Congress previously wrote the word knowingly in other bills pertaining to agriculture and was forced to initiate new legislation because the laws were thereby made unenforceable. The word is not contained in either the Meat Inspection Act or in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. In fact, if it is incorporated in a poultry-inspection law, it would set a very dangerous precedent for possible weakening of these two laws.

4. Inspectors: S. 313 and S. 645 identify inspectors simply as "any person authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture to inspect poultry or poultry products under the authority of this act." This seriously endangers the integrity of the program since it would permit, for example, the use of a company's employees to inspect the firm's poultry.

The Humphrey bill would avoid such dangers by stating that all inspectors must be employees of the Federal Government. Thus, the inspector would be responsible to the Secretary of Agriculture. There would be no chance for conflicts of interest.

The Humphrey bill thereby provides an extremely essential safeguard for the integrity of the inspection program. Further, it assures that if the Federal Government's seal, which is to signal clean and wholesome poultry to the consumer, is to be put on the bird, a man responsible to the Federal Government and having no conflicting interests would do it.

5. Designated areas: All three bills, S. 313, S. 645, and the Humphrey bill contain a provision that the Secretary of Agriculture may, after hearings, designate certain cities and areas of intrastate commerce which have such a large volume of poultry business as to affect interstate commerce. After designation, these cities and areas are brought under the scope of the act. This extends the protection of the poultry inspection law to many more consumers, poultry workers, poultry farmers, and poultry processors.

However, care must be taken that the jurisdiction of State and local governing bodies will be protected. Inspection programs by States and local governments for intrastate commerce within their areas should be encouraged and not wiped out. The Humphrey bill therefore provides that the governing bodies of the city or area affected must consent to the designation before the Secretary can authorize it.

6. Inspecting agency: S. 313 and S. 645 do not specify which agency in the Department of Agriculture would be responsible for the inspection work. Under such circumstances, it is most likely that the work will be performed by the Agricultural Marketing Service. Under the Humphrey bill, the Agricultural Research Service would specifically be delegated with the poultry inspection work.

The Meat Inspection Branch of the Agricultural Research Service has done an excellent job in protecting the public against undesirable meat during the past 50 years. It has done the type of work on red meat which is now sought for poultry. The Agricultural Marketing Service, although having done admirable work in promoting the sale of agricultural products, has often done an unsatisfactory job in protecting consumers with its voluntary poultry inspection program.

The Meat Inspection Branch has only one function: making certain that meats are wholesome and clean. The Agricultural Marketing Service's main task is to promote the sale of farm products—a duty which conflicts with consumer protection.

7. Shipment of uneviscerated poultry: Some of the practices used in holding dressed, but uneviscerated poultry carcasses, for later evisceration are among the most unsanitary and most objectionable practices existing in the poultry industry today. S. 313 and S. 645 would allow these practices to continue. The Humphrey bill, however, would prohibit the shipment of uneviscerated carcasses in domestic commerce.

8. Insanitary processing: In the definition of "unwholesome" S. 313 and S. 645 can be interpreted to excuse any filthy conditions during the processing through the point of evisceration. The Humphrey bill plugs this loophole or possible oversight.

9. Records of interstate shipments: S. 313 and S. 645 are indefinite concerning the length of time processors, wholesalers, retailers, and shippers must keep records. S. 313 would put the unnecessary hardship upon them of permanent retention. S. 645 says that they must maintain records for a period of 2 years, but does not state when the 2-year period begins. The Humphrey bill very specifically provides that they must maintain the record of each transaction only for 2 years after the transaction has taken place.

10. Labeling: Both S. 313 and S. 645 would allow the Secretary to grant any exemption from the labeling requirements. The Humphrey bill contains no such loophole. The public depends upon factual and informative labeling of food products. Exemptions from basic labeling requirements would confuse the housewife and would make the task of State and local regulatory officials very difficult.

11. Parts of diseased birds: S. 313 would permit, because of its definition of "unwholesome," the sale of parts of diseased birds. The horrible practice, used by some processors, of cutting off the unmarked wings and legs of tubercular birds would be allowed to continue. The Humphrey bill and S. 645 provide that poultry which is "produced in whole or in part from diseased poultry or poultry which has died otherwise than by slaughter" is unwholesome and therefore, to be condemned.

With the exception of the above points, which are vital to the effectiveness and integrity of an inspection program, the three bills contain only minor differences.

In short, the Humphrey bill contains all of the constructive provisions of S. 313 and S. 645. In addition, it closes the loopholes which would prove detrimental to all whose best interests depend upon an effective poultry-inspection program, that is, poultry consumers, poultry workers, poultry processors, and poultry farmers.

## MONETARY POLICY INVESTIGATION—PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL VERSUS CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE—BIG BANKERS ALARMED, CIRCULATING UNTRUE STATEMENTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, monetary policy and the adequacy and effectiveness of our financial institutions has come to occupy a central place in discussions of domestic problems today. On January 3, 1957, I introduced House Resolution 85 which authorizes the House Banking and Currency Committee to conduct a full and complete investigation of monetary policy and our Nation's financial system, to see what it is, how it works, and whether it can be made to function to the best advantage of all the people.

The President then requested that a commission of outside experts be selected to do the study. He emphasized the importance of a broad national inquiry into our monetary and financial structure in three major messages to the Congress—the state of the Union message, the budget message, and his economic report.

It is plain that the Executive attaches great importance to such a study. However, it appears that the Executive is apprehensive about the Congress conducting the study and is particularly concerned about the Banking and Currency Committee of the House making this study. Indeed, the ranking Republican member of the Banking and Currency Committee has testified before the House Rules Committee that notwithstanding the President's repeated urging that such a study be undertaken, he would rather not have any investigation if it was to be conducted by the House Banking and Currency Committee as provided for in House Resolution 85.

The fact is that the administration and the Republicans in Congress want a study that they can control, one that will not be likely to look too critically into the way in which monetary policy has been carried out and at our financial institutions. I understand that the Republicans and their big banker friends are so alarmed that they are circulating confused accounts of the resolution I introduced. Small bankers are told that the object of the Patman resolution is to examine their banks and subpena their records. Nothing could be further from the truth. People are also being told that the Nation's economy is so delicately balanced that any slight disturbance might produce a depression. Imagine this. People are being told that if the Patman resolution passes the confidence of bankers and investors and depositors might be upset and the psychological impact upon the economy might be devastating.

There must be some reason why so much effort is being put into blocking House Resolution 85 and attempting to talk it to death in the Rules Committee. I wonder what the reason could be?

There also have been rumors spread about that the author of the resolution is biased and has a closed mind on the questions to be studied. The author of the resolution has been portrayed as a cheap-money inflationist by Members who voted for inflation during World War II and who prematurely killed price controls in 1946. The author of the resolution will match his anti-inflation votes in this House against any one of the Members who are spreading the accusation that he is in favor of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, the opponents of this resolution piously proclaim the need for objectivity and extreme caution in approaching this question. Yet three witnesses have been invited to testify before the Rules Committee on House Resolution 85, whose position on the issues is so clearly biased that only the uninformed could fail to perceive it.

### HOUSE RESOLUTION 85 SHOULD COME BEFORE HOUSE

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will have an opportunity before very long to express itself on House Resolution 85. The opponents have produced such a confused picture that the Members may lose sight of the basic issue. Money and what to do about it has become today's major political controversy. It is by no means a new argument, as the attached articles from the Wall Street Journal of February 18, 20, and 25, 1957, make clear. I think the attached articles will be of value to the Members and other interested persons. From these articles there emerges a historical perspective of the role that the monetary issue has played in shaping America. I think these articles also show why it is necessary for the Congress to undertake this thoroughgoing review of monetary policy and our financial institutions if the public interest is to be protected.

[From the Wall Street Journal of February 18, 1957]

MANAGING MONEY—AN ANCIENT ARGUMENT SETS OFF A NEW CONTROVERSY

(By John F. Bridge)

(Money—and what, if anything, the Government should do about it—is one of today's major political questions. This is the first of several articles on the history, issues and personalities of the controversy.)

When President Eisenhower recently asked for a grand inquiry into the Nation's money system, he plunged into the No. 1 question for economic argument this year.

The immediate thing behind the proposal was "interest rates." The administration has at times opposed the increases made by the Federal Reserve Board in its interest charges on loans to member banks. The actions of the Reserve Board, which is the administrator of the Nation's money system, generally are believed to determine interest rates throughout the economy. And interest rates influence both the cost of hiring money and its supply, for purposes ranging from building a factory to running Government to financing a new home or auto.

Those current issues are important enough in themselves. But in a much wider sense the President was plunging into one of the oldest arguments in United States economic history—"the monetary question." The issue is not only economic; it is also political. And it is also philosophical. Embroiled in it down through the years of this Republic have been such famous figures as Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Nicholas Biddle, Salmon P. Chase, William Jennings Bryan, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt—and now Dwight Eisenhower.

And behind them there have always been other less well-known but important figures who have made "the monetary question" almost their lifelong cause for being—an Albert Gallatin, a Senator Thomas Hart Benton, a "Coin" Harvey—or, nowadays, Representative Wright Patman, of Texas, and William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

#### BASIC ISSUES

"The monetary question" is an amorphous one. Different aspects have been emphasized at different times in American history. But the basic issues remain:

1. Should there even be a central banking system in the United States to issue and control the currency?

2. Granted, as it usually is nowadays, that there should be such a system, who is to control it? Should the controlling force be the money power or the people? Or, in other words, is the central system to be controlled by professional bankers or by politicians? Or is it to be independent of both?

3. And underlying these perhaps mechanical questions are some highly emotional ones: Is money to be made cheaper for debtors to borrow and easier to repay, even at the cost of making its purchasing power decline? Or is it purchasing power to be maintained, even though that would be less happy for debtors, though encouraging to savers?

#### HEAVY FIRE

The Federal Reserve System—independent of both bankers and politicians—is, of course, the presently constituted answer to the first and second questions. But the third set of issues has brought it under heavy fire. And Chairman Martin is battling strongly for the independent statutes of the system.

Lined up against him are such veteran easy money men as Democratic Representative PATMAN, who sees the reserve as banker-dominated. For some months Representative PATMAN, who sees the reserve as banker vestigation of the Federal Reserve, to be conducted by the House Banking Committee.

And now President Eisenhower has also called for an investigation. He proposed it be conducted by a citizens committee to be drawn from outside Government as well as from within it. Meanwhile Representative PATMAN was quick to move that the House Banking Committee adopt this indirect Presidential endorsement of his own plans for investigation. So, many people have begun to wonder if the Federal Reserve must face an alliance between the administration and the easy money forces in Congress in its fight for its precarious independence.

One reason for the administration's interest, of course, is the increasingly wide acceptance of the theory that the way the Federal Reserve operates can make or break a boom. Chairman Martin discounts this idea, although he does believe the Reserve can help the economy move against either an inflation or a deflation.

#### PARALLEL BOOSTS

One way he tries to move against inflation is to raise the discount rate—or the rate that the Federal Reserve System charges its member banks for moneys they borrow from it. And these are the moves—six increases in 2 years—that have brought the ancient monetary question up for new scrutiny.

Recent rises in the discount rate have paralleled increased interest costs to the ultimate borrower. Mr. Patman and others say discount rate increases are the cause. Mr. Martin says the cause is huge demand for money—which the discount rate hikes merely reflects. There is general agreement that higher interest costs will deter some

borrowers and take some of the inflationary, or boom, forces down a peg or two.

Now that is where much of the trouble begins. For while almost no one admittedly is in favor of inflation, almost everyone is in favor of boom.

People in debt like boom times because they seem to mean ever-rising wages; thus the $2,000 debt on an auto bought now can perhaps be handled more easily after next year's pay hike. The businessman likes boom also, for higher wage incomes and higher prices seem to add to sales and profits; and the borrowing done for a new plant this year will perhaps be easier to handle a few years from now if those dollar sales figures just keep climbing. The salaried worker, the union member, and the stockholder like boom too, for it seems to mean more pay and higher dividends.

DISCOUNTING THE COST

Almost no one appears to count the cost of what it may take to keep the boom going. And the cost could be inflation. To be sure, there are outcries from unions about price increases and outcries from management about wage increases. But it often appears the outcries are not taken seriously even by the people making them.

Some economists, it's true, say inflation is not too bad a thing, if it is controlled—if prices and wages rise at a rather uniform and generally comfortable rate. One notable economist, Sumner Slichter, of Harvard, has even theorized as to how much of an annual rise there should be in the price level. He puts it at around 3 percent and says this would continue prosperity conditions without being serious enough to cause economic breakdown.

But to people with assets of fixed dollar value—bonds, insurance policies, savings accounts, for example—the ever-rising prices which are a mark of inflation constitute a loss in eventual purchasing power. To retired people the loss is not eventual; it is now.

Boom—or inflation or the appearance of boom—is part of the question of interest rates. And it is part of the monetary question which has played such a major role in the making of America. It is to these complicated things that the President, Mr. Patman, and their monetary investigation, whatever its makeup, must address themselves.

I desire to make the following comments concerning this article on Managing Money by Mr. Bridge.

INTEREST RATES A MAIN ISSUE

First. Mr. Bridge is right that the immediate thing behind the proposal of President Eisenhower for an inquiry into the Nation's money system was "interest rates." The administration has consistently sponsored higher and higher interest rates. In fact, when the President was taking the oath of office, January 20, 1953, the Federal Reserve System was at that very time increasing discount rates to raise interest rates. Secretary Humphrey—the only Secretary of the Treasury in the history of the Nation, who has not tried to save the Government money by lower interest rates—he, too, has been a consistent and persistent advocate of higher and higher interest.

WHO SHOULD RUN CENTRAL BANK

Second. Mr. Bridge is also correct in saying that one of the main questions today is who shall run the central banking system, the Federal Reserve, the money power, or the people. That is really one of the main issues.

President Woodrow Wilson refused to permit bankers to become members of a governing board that would enable them to fix interest rates high in their favor.

It was only in 1935—22 years after the Federal Reserve Act had been passed—in the depths of the depression when Congress was not looking that the act was amended to really, for all practical purposes, give the bankers dominating control over our money system.

CENTRAL BANK ALRIGHT

I do not object to the central banking part, which came into the act in 1935, in view of the huge national debt and other major considerations not evident in 1913.

EASY MONEY LABEL

Third. I do not object to the label, "easy money," before my name as long as it is used to represent my true feelings, which are in the public interest against bank concentration and for national expansion and progress. I do object to the phrase, "easy money," being used in connection with my name to indicate inflation as I have always opposed inflation and will continue to do everything in my power to prevent inflation or ruinous deflation.

It is noticeable that so many of our banker friends are always pointing out the danger of inflation, as I have so often done and am now doing, but they fail to ever mention how destructive a deflation or depression could be. This is important since we have plenty of ways to stop inflation, but we have no known way of quickly—or even within a reasonable time—reversing a depression. Therefore, it is very necessary that we stay away from depressions as well as inflation.

Fourth. The President's committee was asked for after I had filed my resolution, House Resolution 85, so it is a mistake for my critics to infer that my resolution was filed after the President's proposal since just the reverse is true.

Fifth. Mr. Bridge quotes Mr. Martin as saying that the higher interest rates have been caused by demands for money. It should be pointed out that Mr. Martin's policies have restricted money, which has caused more people chasing fewer dollars. A discount rate raise was intended to increase interest rates. This is admitted. No informed person can deny it. The discount rates were increased for the sole purpose of raising interest rates in the market. It was done on the theory of fighting inflation. I think it was an excuse and not a reason. There are plenty of ways to fight inflation without raising interest rates, but that is the only way that could be used that could increase the profits of the bankers, who create money on the Government's credit.

[From the Wall Street Journal of February 20, 1957]

MONEY'S STORMY HISTORY—POLITICAL CLASHES OVER IT PLAY BIG PART IN SHAPING AMERICA

(By John F. Bridge)

William "Coin" Harvey was born in 1851 in a small West Virginia village, became an attorney, an investor in Colorado property—and a student of a long-standing American problem, "the monetary question." He felt so strongly about it that before he died, he built a pyramid in the Ozark Mountains of northwest Arkansas; in it he buried stone tablets engraved with his theories, so that no holocaust could deprive posterity of his views.

In essence, Harvey wanted to make money cheaper to borrow and debts easier to repay. He would have accomplished this by free and unlimited coinage of silver, which was cheap and abundant in the West, in the ratio all schoolboys have learned, 16-1 with gold.

Coin Harvey's basic idea of cheap money was hardly revolutionary, in the sense of being new. The idea is as old in this country as the Plymouth colony. It is the root of the present wrangle over the monetary question in Washington, which involves the Republican administration, Democratic Congressmen like Representative WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas, and the Federal Reserve Board. In the view of such critics of the FRB as Mr. PATMAN, the Board has been tightening interest rates, making money costly to borrow, and thus hampering the economy.

In one of the most famous bits of oratory in United States history, William Jennings Bryan drew heavily on Coin Harvey's beliefs in preparing his famous Cross of Gold speech. The silver-tongued boy orator stood before the Democratic convention of 1896 and cried:

"You come to us and tell us that the great cities are in favor of the gold standard; we reply that the great cities rest upon our broad and fertile prairies. Burn down your cities and leave our farms and your cities will spring up again as if by magic; but destroy our farms and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in the country * * *."

ANTICITY, ANTICREDITOR

Nebraskan Bryan made no bones about it. He was pro-country and pro-debtor; he was anticity and anticreditor. And his followers were legion. He still holds a place in the hearts and minds of many older Americans that has not been supplanted by more sophisticated exponents of economic theory. He represents a viewpoint that exists today.

Since the beginning of the United States, the fantastic rate of economic growth has kept up an almost continual pressure for capital. The country has been built on borrowing. Thus it is perhaps not so startling that through United States history there runs a thread also of an effort by debtors to ease the burden of their debts by making money cheap to hire, and even more plentiful.

The man or the corporation who borrows today for 20 years hopes that his burden will become less through the years, even if it means an ever-depreciating currency. Lined up on the other side have been the people with capital to lend, who do not want to see the value of their dollars depreciate. Among them, directly or indirectly, are the small capitalists whose savings are in banks, insurance companies, and pension funds, and who want their dollars to be worth as much when they are needed as at the time they are saved.

Both sides, of course, have generally been interested in seeing that there is some convenient medium of exchange. Just what it is to be, and how it is to be controlled, is what has been moot more often than not.

In the earliest days of the Republic there was a bewildering variety of money in circulation, both paper and coins, or "hard money." For example, in 1781 the Maryland General Assembly passed an act which set forth "what foreign gold and silver coin shall be deemed current money of the State." Included were such things as doubloons, Spanish pieces of eight, Arabian chequins, French pistoles and guineas, and English crowns. Banks issued their own paper currency, usu-

ally as promises to pay in coin of one type or another, as did merchants and even private citizens, if they could get anyone to accept the paper.

On the one hand there was a continuing and ever-growing demand for paper currency, because it was handy. But on the other was the fact that it usually was worth less than the issuer claimed in printing it; the possibilities in the printing process have always been a little too much for human nature.

The Nation had a bad experience with paper currency during the Revolution, when both the States and the Continental Congress printed paper money to meet war costs, and it became almost without value. So while paper money was needed and wanted in the early days of the Republic it was not generally trusted.

HAMILTON'S SOLUTION

How this problem was solved is of major importance in United States economic history. It laid the formal basis for the monetary question which still persists—as a political and philosophical issue as much as an economic one.

Alexander Hamilton, President Washington's financial genius, solved the matter of paper money along with his solution of the related problem of the Revolutionary War debt. He got Congress to assume State war debts, hoping to bind the States' creditors more firmly to the central Government. And he got the legislators to charter a central bank to issue a paper currency which would be backed 100 percent by coin. This was the First Bank of the United States—a private concern whose main client was to be the United States Government. The Government furnished one-fifth of the capital, but the rest was put up by private shareholders.

This put paper currency on a firm foundation. But in essence Hamilton was following his belief that "power follows property and cannot be disassociated with it." He saw his bank tying "the interest and credit of rich individuals with those of the State." The Jeffersonians took deep issue with this; and the thread of distaste for central banking and "the money power" persists to this day.

When, during Madison's Presidency, the bank's charter expired it was not renewed. Issuance of currency was left to State banks, as part of the Jeffersonian theory of decentralization of power. But under local demands that money be made plentiful, the State banks began issuing it with much less than the 100 percent metallic backing of the United States Bank. Soon some of the notes were being marked down in value by the recipients by as much as 75 percent.

Notes issue by State banks, which was the rule in one form or another until the Federal Reserve System was established, produced a currency that was no better than a local banker's judgment and luck.

The mechanics of the State bank note issues were these: A borrower would go to the bank and arrange a 3-month loan of, say, $1,000 at 6 percent. The banker would hand over $1,000 of money which had been printed to his order. What was behind it? Some gold and silver in the vaults, but mostly the borrower's note. The local banker was constantly subject to heavy demand for loans; if many of these went bad at the same time, his solvency was imperiled and the currency he had issued depreciated swiftly.

PANIC'S PENDULUM

A panic which saw many bank failures tracing to this system caused the pendulum soon to swing the other way. And in 1816, 5 years after the demise of the First Bank, the Second Bank of the United States was chartered by Congress. Its note issues were again backed 100 percent through capital and the amount that could be issued were more than tripled. Five directors were appointed by the President and 20 by private stockholders, and branches were opened in most major cities.

As president, the Second Bank had the bright young Philadelphian, Nicholas Biddle. With demand for money to finance growing business advancing rapidly, he devised a system for expanding (and contracting) the currency through the branches. The Second Bank's easy but sound credit made it the dominant force in industry and agriculture, but the control of this national currency was essentially private. The bank won little popular esteem for collecting its debts in bad times as well as good.

And to President Jackson and his Cabinet, it appeared they had a monopoly on their hands.

The problem—as always—was what to substitute for the central bank. Someone had to issue the banknotes so widely needed, and the worry was that a central bank in the hands of politicians would be worse than one in the hands of private interests. But the fact remained that the bank was hated and feared by many as the tool of the "money power." When its charter came up for renewal, Jackson decided to veto it, and withdraw the Federal deposits.

Biddle decided to contract credit in retaliation. Amid the resulting economic storm he declared: "The bank has taken its final course and will not be frightened nor cajoled from its duty by any small driveling about relief." Such talk cost the bank what friends it had.

The bank was dead, and control of currency issuance again reverted to the State banks along with the Federal deposits. As Herbert Agar writes in his The Price of Union: "Paper money was printed on little or no security—or on the security of the country's faith that tomorrow must always be richer than today." There was no brake on either a credit or a currency inflation.

A money panic resulted. The upshot was that Government funds were stored in an Independent Treasury in Washington and in subtreasuries throughout the country. And the Government issued the currency.

This system lasted until the post-Civil War era, when the westward expansion and southern reconstruction brought a new passion for debt. From it grew the greenback movement. During the Civil War Lincoln had printed $450 million of bills, unbacked by gold or silver, to finance the fighting. And the Union Government had issued bonds which carried no specific promise to pay in gold. The greenbackers wanted to redeem these bonds in more greenbacks, to further depreciate the currency and help the debtors of the West and the South ease their burden.

Despite the rise of a political party devoted to little but the principle of printing greenbacks, this scheme failed of adoption. For one thing the voice of the West was now turning to free silver instead.

THE SILVER ISSUE

Free silver would have accomplished about a 10-percent depreciation of the dollar. As much silver as could be mined was to be minted; and while a silver dollar would contain but 90 cents' worth of silver, it was to be accepted as having 100 cents'. The law authorizing this passed Congress but was vetoed by President Hayes, and the silver forces had insufficient votes to override. The issue died until the depressions of the 1890's, and its revival and refinement by Coin Harvey and William Jennings Bryan.

Meanwhile, during the Civil War, Salmon P. Chase as Secretary of the Treasury had undertaken a patch-up of the Nation's banking system. The United States Government put a 10-percent tax on notes issued by State banks, in effect driving them out of existence. And at about the same time a national banking act was passed which required the banks to keep specified reserves in lawful United States money and in Government bonds.

But the panics of the 1870's and 1890's had proved this decentralized system of national banks was too weak and its credit machinery too inelastic to meet the ever-changing demands on it. In 1895 and again in 1907, it fell to one private individual, the elder J. P. Morgan, to mobilize the resources of the banks and other financial institutions against panics. Out of this situation came a National Monetary Commission to study banking reform and to make recommendations.

The result: The Federal Reserve System, a peculiarly American institution of checks and balances and regional decentralization against the money power of the East, but designed also to operate as a central bank.

The following comments, I believe, are appropriate concerning the above article by Mr. Bridge:

BORROWING BUILT COUNTRY

First. It will be noticed that Mr. Bridge said, "The country has been built on borrowing." He is correct. In our capitalistic system, which we believe is the finest and best system on earth, our money is based on debt. Without sufficient debts, we would have insufficient money. This system can only be implemented by a good banking system, and I believe we have the best. We must keep it that way. My fight is against concentration of banking and ownership of banking by a few of the big banks and big bankers. The trend is definitely in that direction. I am on the side of the small banks, the medium-sized banks, and all the other banks which are not pursuing a greedy policy. I am against the greedy, big bankers, who are trying to continue to monopolize the free use of the Government's credit and have a Nation of only a few banks with branches.

LIMITED CHARTER CHANGED

Second. Mr. Bridge outlines the troubles the Government had with the First and Second Banks of the United States. Charters of each were canceled by the Congress for good reasons. At first, the Federal Reserve had a limited charter. Doubtless, the bankers, who sought and gained control of the system, looked for a good opportunty to change this charter from a limited charter to an indefinite charter so as to prevent what happened to the First and Second Banks of the United States. At a good time, when Congress was not looking, the charter was changed without objection and probably without notice to a perpetual charter. Although the charter can be abolished by an affirmative act of Congress, they do not have to worry about an expiration date.

MONETARY COMMISSION OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Third. Mr. Bridge states that out of the panic of 1907 came the National Monetary Commission to study banking reform and to make recommendations. It should also be stated, I believe, that this was a commission composed of 9 Members of the United States Senate and 9 Members of the House of Representatives. The question at that time as to whether or not outsiders should be on the Commission was turned down. Good reasons were given for not accepting outsiders on the Commission. The main reason was that it was a power

delegated to Congress and neither the executive nor outside interests and experts should be allowed on the Commission to make such a study for Congress. This was during a Republican administration—both the executive and legislative branches.

[From the Wall Street Journal of February 25, 1957]

MONEY MACHINE—FEDERAL RESERVE DRIVES POWERFUL AND COMPLEX ENGINES

(By John F. Bridge)

Just 100 years after Alexander Hamilton's first attempt at a central banking system for the United States was ended by Jefferson and his followers, their political heir in the White House was throwing his weight behind another attempt.

But President Wilson was determined that the money power of the East should be kept from becoming dominant in the new system. William Jennings Bryan was a strong influence in the Cabinet; and the new administration had drawn much of its support in the 1912 election from the traditionally debtor South and West.

Under the previous President, Taft, a commission headed by Senator Aldrich of Rhode Island had drawn up a plan for a system with a single central bank, but this had been defeated because of the traditional fears that it would come under a money trust. Instead, the Federal Reserve System, as finally authorized by Congress in 1913, established 12 regional central banks, sovereign in their own right and superimposed on the existing banking system. Banks could become members of the system by buying stock in the regional Federal Reserve Bank. About half are members today.

Linking the 12 Federal Reserve banks is a 7-member Federal Reserve Board with supervisory powers. The members are appointed by the President; the Aldrich commission had wanted this board to be elected by the banks. The bankers thus were curbed under the system. But their talents were used. A 12-member Federal Advisory Council of bankers was provided for, to meet with the Reserve Board on request, and to be appointed by the 12 Reserve banks.

To curb the banker power at the regional bank level, a typically American system of checks and balances was evolved. The directors of these regional banks are divided equally among bankers, borrowers and the public. Three are appointed by the Reserve authorities in Washington to represent the public (and Government) interest. The other six are elected by banks holding stock in the regional Federal Reserve Bank; three are bankers and three businessmen or farmers, as representatives of borrowers. In addition, the Presidentially appointed Federal Reserve Board must approve the president and vice president of each regional bank.

A SIGNIFICANT CHANGE

This general organization remains 44 years after it was drafted, although the name of the Federal Reserve Board has been changed to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Board's control over the Reserve banks has been increased. These changes took place mainly during the depression of the 1930's. At that time another change also took place—one which altered significantly one of the main weapons used by the Federal Reserve in expanding and contracting the money supply, a change which has been condemned by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas as increasing "banker domination" of the national credit machinery.

This change was in the Federal Open Market Committee. Formerly it had been an unofficial group. But in 1935 it was recognized by statute and expanded. It now consists of the seven members of the Board of Governors, plus the president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank and four other Reserve bank presidents serving in rotation. Mr. Patman attacks the perpetual representation of the New York bank as domination by the moneyed East. The defense is that New York is the money capital, and that the New York bank president can be most closely attuned to these "open market operations."

Open-market operations of the Reserve are one of its three major tools for regulating credit. These operations of the committee consist of buying and selling Government bonds with its member banks; this decreases or increases the reserves against which the members grant loans. The other tools are directly raising or lowering the reserve requirements of members; this alters the ratio of cash reserves they must keep to loans granted. The third tool is alteration in the discount rate; this affects the price at which money can be borrowed by member banks from the Reserve banks.

Credit is of course the main "money" used nowadays—some 90 percent of the "money" in circulation consists of so-called checkbook money, as contrasted with bills and coin.

SEVERE PENALTY

Coin is issued by United States Government mints. Bills are issued both by the United States Treasury and the Federal Reserve banks. A dollar bill—or a dollar's worth of checkbook money—gets its inherent purchasing power because, if it is refused in payment, the debt is legally cancelled. (This system seems to work better than the pre-Revolutionary War system of making death the penalty for not accepting paper money.)

Behind both checkbook money and the currency is the gold in Fort Knox—though, to be sure, it is illegal for you to have any of it. The actual basis of the money supply is the Government's debt—in the form of United States Government bonds in the hands of banks and the public.

A holder of savings bonds can turn them into dollars at any bank. Holders of long term Government bonds can sell them for dollars on the open market. Supposedly if all holders wanted to sell them at once, the Federal Reserve would "support" the market as it did before 1951—buy the bonds with, in effect, "dollars" it would run from its printing presses.

This possibility doubtless would have been horrendous to such relatively mild inflationists as Coin Harvey and the Greenback party. Fortunately it is not a likely possibility. But, in fact, the Government debt is gradually being turned into money. This is the basic reason why the price level, as measured by wholesale commodity prices, is more than double pre-World War II; there is nearly three times as much money in circulation as prewar.

Responsibility for the devices for expanding and contracting credit are distributed among the various parts of the System. Reserve requirements—the most drastic instrument—are the sole responsibility of the Board of Governors in Washington. Discount rate changes—a milder tool—are a joint responsibility of the Board and the regional Reserve Bank directors. Open market operations—generally used for meeting seasonal needs for money in the System—are the responsibility of the Open Market Committee.

TUSSLE OVER TOOLS

Just how are these tools used to affect the supply of money? To be sure, there is debate on just how they should be used. Much of the current money wrangle in Washington centers on the way discount rate increases have affected the economy. Chairman William McChesney Martin, Jr., of the Board has expressed this view: "Open market operations, discount rate changes, and reserve requirements changes are the closely related parts of Federal monetary mechanism. Confusion often arises because we are apt to talk about the three parts of this mechanism as if we were offered a choice among three separate means of easing or tightening credit.

"All three must operate together—in a continuing pattern, the supply of reserves always being basic. Open market operations and reserve requirements affect that base. Discount rates do not affect the volume of that base, but only the cost of reserves. It is therefore misleading to think of the three components as if they were alternatives to be used independently of each other. They must be used together.

"The use of one component rather than another at a particular moment is explained by the fact that, by its nature, each has a different impact. Reserve requirements are the bluntest of the three, having the heaviest impact because they directly affect all member banks in varying degree and release or absorb very large sums. Changes in reserve requirements are best suited to broad basic adjustments, and the impact of such changes is often modified by subsequent Federal open market operations.

"Open market operations are best suited to day-to-day adjustments, for they can be used to release or impound small or large sums of reserves in accordance with current conditions. In this way, what have aptly been called high-powered dollars are added to or taken out of the reserves of the banking system."

PYRAMIDING DOLLARS

Assume the System wants to add to the number of these "high powered" dollars in the System by buying United States Government securities from its member banks. Since it would create the money by a bookkeeping transaction in which it simply gives the member banks an account to draw against, this puts additional reserves at their disposal.

The member banks can then make loans or investments on the increased reserves, at the present required maximum ratio of reserves to loans outstanding of 1 to 6. This pyramiding effect is what makes the dollars "high powered." If the Reserve wants to decrease the number of dollars in the System it sells Government securities to its members, taking away reserves and reversing the process.

From this "gentle" instrument's workings, it can easily be inferred what the impact can be when the most drastic weapon is used—a change in the ratio of reserves required to bank credit outstanding. Assume, for example, that the present reserve requirement of $1 of reserves for each $6 of credit outstanding should be raised to 1 to 5. There would be a contraction of one-sixth in a bank's maximum lending ability. Cutting reserve requirements similarly would increase a bank's maximum lending ability, increasing the credit flow.

The theory of the discount machinery is essentially the theory of any price mechanism: Higher prices tend to decrease demand, lower prices to increase it. If the Board and its regional banks increase the discount rate, they increase the price charged member banks for a loan of funds. This may discourage the bank from borrowing at all, and the bank in turn will discourage its customers from some loans. Or the member bank may rent the money from the Federal Reserve bank at the higher rate being asked. In turn it will charge its customers more, tending to discourage some borrowers.

All this is the complicated machinery of money. But any machine's workings depend largely on how it is operated. In charge of this machine are the Board of Governors of the Reserve, and their Chairman, Mr. Martin. Their theories and beliefs are therefore worth examining—along with the beliefs of Representative PATMAN and others who are challenging their views.

Concerning this article, I would like to make the following brief comments:

BANKS OWN NO INTEREST IN FEDERAL RESERVE

First. Mr. Bridge refers to the member banks buying stock in the regional Federal Reserve bank. The word "stock" is a misnomer. It is not stock at all. It is something in the form of an involuntary investment, equal to 3 percent of the capital and surplus of the bank upon which the bank receives a 6-percent dividend. Most of this stock was issued prior to 1941, and these dividends on stock issued before that time are tax-exempt. The banks do not own stock in a Federal Reserve bank in the sense that it is a proprietary interest of any kind or nature. Such ownership does not give the bank the power to sell the stock or hypothecate it. Neither can it be voted in the selection of officers in proportion to the value of the stock. The so-called stock serves no purpose, and the money could be paid back to the member banks right now without jeopardizing the System at all. The System is not strengthened by the purchase of this so-called stock as the money so invested in it—over $300 billion—is not used by the Federal Reserve banks for any purpose.

BANKERS DO NOT BELONG ON BOARD TO CONTROL MONEY

Second. Mr. Bridge correctly points out that the Aldrich Commission, which was the monetary commission heretofore referred to, wanted the Federal Reserve Board to be elected by the banks. This was the main fight in the successful passage of the law.

President Woodrow Wilson refused to compromise on that point. Senator Carter Glass, who had so much to do with the passing of the Federal Reserve Act, in his book on constructive finance, commencing at page 115, had the following to say about this important issue:

The President was adamant; and, if there was ever a lapse, I soon was to revive the conviction that Mr. Wilson knew more about these matters than I did. As anticipated, when the bill was introduced in Congress, bankers raised an uproar about this provision. With scarcely suppressed satisfaction, I headed a delegation of them to the White House to convince the President he was wrong. Forgan and Wade, Sol Wexler and Perrin, Howe and other members of the Currency Commission of the American Bankers Association constituted the party. The first two, peremptory and arbitrary, used to having their own way, did not mince matters. They evidently were not awed by titled consequence, for they spoke with force and even bitterness. Sol Wexler and Perrin were suave and conciliatory. The President was courteous and contained. These great bankers, arbiters for years of the country's credits, were grouped about the President's desk in the Executive Office adjoining the Cabinet room. I was outside the circle, having already voiced my own dissent from the President's attitude. President Wilson faced the group across the desk; and as these men drove home what seemed to me good reason after good reason for banker representation on the central board, I actually experienced a sense of regret that I had a part in subjecting Mr. Wilson to such an ordeal. When they had ended their arguments Mr. Wilson, turning more particularly to Forgan and Wade, said quietly: "Will one of you gentlemen tell me in what civilized country on the earth there are important government boards of control on which private interests are represented?" There was painful silence for the longest single moment I ever spent; and before it was broken Mr. Wilson further inquired: "Which of you gentlemen thinks the railroads should select members of the Interstate Commerce Commission?" There could be no convincing reply to either question, so the discussion turned to other points of the currency bill; and, notwithstanding a desperate effort was made in the Senate to give the banks minority representation on the Reserve Board, the proposition did not prevail.

PRIVATE BANKERS RUN FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

Third. Mr. Bridge's statement about a regional Federal Reserve bank is not as plain and clear as, I believe, it can be represented. The fact is, out of 9 directors, 6 of them are elected by the banks; 3 of these 6 may be bankers, and the other 3 of the 6 cannot be actively engaged in the banking business, but may own stock in banks; and the fact is that a majority of them actually do own stock in banks. The other three are selected by the Board of Governors, but they must be men of tested banking experience, which usually results in these directors disposing of their stock in banks for the purpose of becoming class C directors appointed by the Board. So, for all real and practical purposes, each Federal Reserve bank is dominated by the private banks.

CREATING MONEY

Fourth. It will be noticed that Mr. Bridge correctly states in the above article in reference to the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System: "Since it would create the money by a bookkeeping transaction in which it simply gives the member banks an account to draw against, this puts additional reserves at their disposal."

I desire to mention two points: one is an admission that the money is created by a bookkeeping transaction and the other is that additional reserves are created by the banks.

Fifth. The additional reserves created are high-powered dollars, as Mr. Bridge points out. This enables the banks to create money equal to 6 dollars for every 1 high-powered dollar it has on the same theory that the goldsmiths of old issued receipts for 10 times as much gold as they actually had on hand.

Sixth. I have not attempted to study these articles, which I expect to, as they are all so interesting and well written, for the purpose of criticizing or elaborating on what Mr. Bridge has said, but I have hastily gone over them and it should be said, too, that my criticisms in this statement are hastily and hurriedly written without taking time for careful thought.

## COMMITTEE OF ESCORT

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint as a committee to escort our distinguished visitor into the Chamber the following Members of the House: The gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. McCORMACK; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN; the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. GORDON, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CHIPERFIELD.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair will declare a recess at this time. The Chair wants the membership to know that the bells will be rung at 2:30 for a quorum call, so that Members may be here to meet our distinguished guest at 3 o'clock.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.), the House stood in recess until 2:30 o'clock p. m.

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., the House was called to order by the Speaker.

## LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS ON TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in connection with tomorrow, there is a resolution out of the Committee on Rules authorizing investigation with reference to the Committee on Education and Labor, which will be the order of business on tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I make this announcement for the benefit of the Members of the House, and then we will adjourn from tomorrow to Monday.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 11]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Adair | Green, Pa. | Morrison |
| Barden | Gregory | O'Konski |
| Barrett | Gubser | Polk |
| Blatnik | Gwinn | Powell |
| Bolton | Hagen | Rabaut |
| Bowler | Halleck | Radwan |
| Bray | Hardy | Reece, Tenn. |
| Broomfield | Hays, Ohio | Riehlman |
| Brownson | Healey | Santangelo |
| Buckley | Holifield | Saund |
| Cannon | Holt | Shuford |
| Chelf | Jackson | Sieminski |
| Christopher | Jarman | Spence |
| Cretella | Johansen | Teague, Calif. |
| Curtis, Mass. | Kearney | Walter |
| Dawson, Ill. | Kelly, N. Y. | Williams, Miss. |
| Dies | Loser | Willis |
| Diggs | McGovern | Wilson, Ind. |
| Dooley | Magnuson | Withrow |
| Feighan | Michel | Young |
| Friedel | Miller, Calif. | |
| Gray | Miller, N. Y. | |

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 359 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Our distinguished guest will arrive in the Chamber at 3 o'clock. The Chair declares a recess.

## RECESS

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess.

## VISIT TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF HIS EXCELLENCY GUY MOLLET, PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC

During the recess the following occurred:

The Doorkeeper announced His Excellency Guy Mollet, President of the Council of Ministers of the French Republic.

The Prime Minister of France, escorted by the Committee of Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. Members of the House of Representatives, it gives me great pleasure and I deem it a high honor to have the privilege of presenting to you a representative of a great, a proud, a free, and a friendly people, His Excellency Guy Mollet, President of the Council of Ministers of the French Republic. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives of the United States, I wish to thank you for the honor you have bestowed upon me and, in my person, upon my country, in asking me to speak today before this honorable assembly.

This visit to Washington, during which I have the great privilege of being the guest of the President of the United States, is being marked by great friendship. But this is an old tradition between us. Never in the course of our common history have we stood on opposite sides of the battlefield. [Applause.] On the contrary, we have fought together, and twice, for the triumph of democracy and for the freedom of the world.

The symbol of this tried and true friendship is always before us; it is young General Lafayette, whose 200th anniversary we are celebrating this year, in France as in the United States. The inspiration of this youthful and generous courage has guided and confirmed our feelings for almost two centuries.

We were allies and close allies even before your great Republic had definitely set up the legal bases of its existence. Just as we were united yesterday, we are still bound together today. [Applause.] Our Atlantic alliance, which is for France the strongest basis of her policy, demands that we defend together, should circumstances make it necessary, the world's freedoms against tyranny and intolerance. But it also requests that we study and decide together all problems pertaining to the maintenance and reinforcement of the Atlantic organization, whether it be in matters of strategy, of armaments, or of distribution of armed forces placed at the disposal of the organization.

The close friendship which links our two nations does not mean that there never existed between us misunderstandings or different viewpoints. Some have arisen in the recent past. I am glad to say that they have now been cleared up. But I also want to stress that we have always made our intentions absolutely clear. We have stated in all frankness how important were for us the issues at stake. It is also in all frankness that we have clarified, in our conversations here, our positions.

Since our common alliance was sealed on the battlefields of yesteryear, many things, and we ourselves, have changed. You have become a great, strong, and peaceful nation which has remained true to the enthusiasm and to the generosity of her Founding Fathers. France, for her part, is also deliberately open to the future. She has forgotten feuds of old standing and I am in a position to say that friendship between France and Germany today is a reality. [Applause.] A new Europe is now being born; its old barriers are falling. You are aware that, with the necessary transitions, the foundations of a common market of 165 million inhabitants are now in the process of being laid. On the other hand, EURATOM will be the foundation of the common atomic destinies of our six countries. A great economic union is about to be born which is to complement, rather than to compete with, the American market. Important progress has thus been made during the past 2 years. United Europe will mean a more powerful Europe. Between that Europe and the United States, a new relationship will be established, which will mean an active association to the mutual benefit of both the American and European peoples. It will moreover contribute to the strengthening of the Atlantic community.

This new Europe also aims at associating African territories with the making of a more prosperous economic entity. It is now our task, hand in hand with our European partners, to put our industrial resources at the disposal of Africa; thus, EURAfrica will come into existence.

Recently, France has introduced important reforms in the political and administrative structure of her overseas territories. Next month, general elections will take place, conducted in complete freedom and equality, which will give birth to new assemblies in each African territory. As a result, local executive powers will be constituted. Thus, without stopping her economic aid to Africa, France is presently transferring to the African elites ever-increasing responsibilities in the management of their own affairs.

Cooperation between Europe and Africa thus opens the road to a greater future.

In these 20th century projects a broad vision is more important than ever. I am sure the European youth is worthy of the great task ahead. They are looking forward to the future, not with skepticism and discouragement, but with resolution and confidence. France is faithful to her vocation because she has brought her contribution to these constructive achievements from which peace will emerge stronger.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.

## PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The motion was agreed to.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, Members of this House and of the Senate are becoming increasingly aware of and concerned about situations wherein the private interests of important members of the executive branch, or of members of their families may conflict with their primary obligations to the Federal Government. Some of these situations are governed by statute; in other instances, however, plain common sense tells us that it is unwise, unsound, and not morally proper for a top Federal official, or for his wife, to hold outside positions which result in the official or in members of his immediate family representing the United States on the one hand and representing private companies which deal with the United States through that official, on the other.

Recently, in reviewing material relating to the Virgin Islands Corporation, a Federal Government Corporation, I have noticed two arrangements which seem to require a careful investigation.

In the first place, it appears that a member of the Board of Directors of the Virgin Islands Corporation is also a partner in a firm which contracts directly with the corporation to perform services for it on an annual basis. Thus a member of the governing body of the Government corporation is also a member of the governing group of a firm which contracts with and receives fees from the corporation. The conflict of interest and the possibility of undue and improper influence on corporation employees in, for example, resolving disputes between the two parties is obvious.

The other situation involves the employment of the wife of the President of the Virgin Islands Corporation, by a company which had a contract with the corporation. It appears that in March 1955, the corporation negotiated a contract with the TMT Trailer Ferry, Inc., a shipping firm, to carry the Corporation's raw sugar to the United States. In July 1955, TMT hired the wife of the Corporation president to act as its agent in St. Croix, the island from which the Corporation ships sugar. A substantial part of TMT's Virgin Islands business, at the time, consisted of carrying sugar for the Corporation. In 1956 the shipping contract was renewed for another year.

Here again, I believe we have a very unsound arrangement from the Government's point of view. In case of any dispute over terms, rates, service, and so forth, the Corporation president

would be in the position of arguing with his wife's employer and, in fact, might have to deal with his wife as the representative of the other party to the dispute.

Thus, a situation was created in which both financial and personal considerations could influence, perhaps even subconsciously, the Corporation president to act or make decisions which were not in the best interests of the United States.

I think it is clear that both instances I have described are basically unhealthy. The first continues to exist; the second lasted for two shipping seasons, although I understand that the Corporation is making other shipping arrangements this year.

Perhaps the most amazing thing in both these cases is that these arrangements were not only known to, but were actually approved by top officials in the Interior Department. Apparently conflicts of interest do not just occur in the present administration; they are encouraged from the highest levels.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN for 30 minutes today, also to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COUDERT on March 4, 1957, for 1 hour for the purpose of commemorating the 168th anniversary of the institution of Congress under the Constitution of the United States, and in connection therewith, the bicentennial anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton; and that this request be the first order of business on that day after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk, and that he may be permitted, during the period of the 1 hour, to yield to other Members. He trusts that other Members will take advantage of this opportunity either to request time, or if there be insufficient time, to prepare statements for inclusion in the RECORD. All Members have been sent copies of the pocket library edition of the basic ideas of Alexander Hamilton prepared by Mr. Morris.

Mrs. SULLIVAN for 10 minutes today, and also to revise and extend her remarks.

Mr. CHUDOFF for 5 minutes today.

Mr. BAILEY, for 20 minutes, on Tuesday next.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. KELLY of New York (at the request of Mr. LANKFORD) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZELENKO (at the request of Mr. LANKFORD) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. LANKFORD) in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. BENTLEY in connection with the Estonian anniversary of independence.

Mr. YOUNGER and to include extraneous matter which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $173.25.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. HENDERSON) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCDONOUGH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLYNT and to include a statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, February 25, 1957.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 28, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

538. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to grant additional powers to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved December 20, 1944, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

539. A letter from the adjutant general, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the stated convention of the 58th National Encampment, United Spanish War Veterans, held in Louisville, Ky., September 2 to 6, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 103); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCCULLOCH: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 110. A bill to amend section 372 of title 28, United States Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3818. A bill to provide for the maintenance of a roster of retired judges available for special judicial duty and for their assignment to such duty by the Chief Justice of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3819. A bill to amend section 331 of title 28, United States Code, to provide representation of district judges on the Judiciary Conference of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOLTZMAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4191. A bill to amend section 633 of title 28, United States Code, prescribing fees of United States commissioners; without amendment (Rept. No. 173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 5376. A bill to remove certain restrictions imposed on the political activities of officers and employees of the Federal and State Governments; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5377. A bill to grant to the Territory of Alaska title to certain lands beneath tidal waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 5378. A bill to amend section 2 of Public Law 927, 84th Congress, 2d session, and to repeal section 6 of Public Law 927, 84th Congress, 2d session; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 5379. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to a Bear River compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE of Illinois:

H. R. 5380. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 5381. A bill to extend the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain positions in, and employees of, the executive branch of the Government; to the committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 5382. A bill to amend section 301 of the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act to provide for expeditious payment of the death gratuity by the military departments; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 5383. A bill to exempt certain professional sports enterprises from the antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5384. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for the preservation of competitive through routes for rail carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 5385. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5386. A bill to extend the rights, benefits, and privileges granted to World War II veterans to certain citizens of the United States who entered the armed forces of governments allied with the United States during World War II, and to their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5387. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5388. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil

rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5389. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of employers who are engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce, to eliminate certain exemptions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 5390. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for certain amounts paid by a teacher for his further education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5391. A bill to provide that the Secretary of Commerce shall furnish weather reports to certain air pollution control agencies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H. R. 5392. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of the Performance Rating Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 5393. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped; to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 5394. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its coverage, with certain exceptions, to employees of employers engaged in activities affecting interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5395. A bill to provide equitable compensation for Saturday, Sunday, holiday, and overtime duty in Government service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5396. A bill to grant a deduction, for income-tax purposes, to handicapped individuals, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income-tax purposes for a taxpayer supporting dependents who are so handicapped as to be unable to care for themselves; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5397. A bill to provide for veterans erroneously required to reimburse the United States for overpayment on the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (by request):

H. R. 5398. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 5399. A bill to provide for the control of certain advertising on federally owned or controlled lands adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and to encourage such control on other lands adjacent to such National System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H. R. 5400. A bill to require notice by certified mail of the lapse of Government life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5401. A bill to authorize the renewal of expired five-year level premium term national service life insurance where application for reinstatement is made prior to January 1, 1958; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 5402. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall make certain payments from the proceeds of sales of timber cut from land acquired by the United States within a State for flood control, navigation, and allied purposes, to the counties in which such land is situated; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 5403. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 5404. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain widows and widowers of retired employees and certain widows of employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 5405. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5406. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemption, and the exemption for dependents, from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 5407. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 5408. A bill to provide for the recognition by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of veterans of World War I of the United States of America in the presentation of claims under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 5409. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 5410. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for grants-in-aid for the eradication and control of mosquitoes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 5411. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a widow or former wife divorced who loses mother's insurance benefits by remarriage may again become entitled if her husband dies within one year of such remarriage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 5412. A bill to permit an individual who retired before September 1954 under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program to have his benefit amount recomputed, without acquiring any additional coverage, to take advantage of the "drop-out" provisions in title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIMTZ:

H. R. 5413. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Marquis de LaFayette; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 5414. A bill to prohibit banks insured under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act from engaging in the travel agency business; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 5415. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a minor child shall be deemed dependent upon an insured individual at the time required for entitlement to benefits if such individual (pursuant to court order) was then legally obligated to contribute to his support; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 5416. A bill to promote safety in transportation by motor vehicle in interstate commerce by assisting the States to establish programs for driver education; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5417. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped; to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 5418. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make a comprehensive survey and study of the ground-water resources of the Mississippi Valley embayment area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 5419. A bill to amend section 6 of the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 5420. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped; to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WESTLAND (by request):

H. R. 5421. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange lands at Olympia National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H. J. Res. 252. Joint resolution to establish a commission to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCK:

H. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution to establish a commission to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. Con. Res. 124. Concurrent resolution designating the first Sunday of February hereafter as a day for the observance and commemoration of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. Res. 179. Resolution to provide funds for the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. R. 149; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. Res. 180. Resolution requesting an investigation of fish imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend title I of the United States Social Security Act which would permit the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to exempt $50 per month earned income in determining need in the old-age assistance category; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 5422. A bill to provide for the advancement of W. O. Charles Burger, United

States Army (retired), to the grade of chief warrant officer on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 5423. A bill for the relief of R. M. Clark, an individual doing business as Lenoir City-Alcoa Bus Lines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5424. A bill for the relief of Thomas Helms and other employees of the Bureau of Public Roads; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 5425. A bill for the relief of George Leonidas Parthemos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5426. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ignacio Lahorra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 5427. A bill for the relief of Felix Mandaluniz Ibarranguelua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5428. A bill for the relief of Siu-Ching Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 5429. A bill for the relief of Eugen Hoelzli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 5430. A bill for the relief of Dragica Kukich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5431. A bill for the relief of Evangelos Demetre Kargiotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 5432. A bill for the relief of Juana Maria Geldrich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 5433. A bill for the relief of Ramona Astudillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 5434. A bill for the relief of George A. J. Froberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 5435. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Wang (Wang Kwang Hsi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 5436. A bill for the relief of Yehoshua Weitzenblum and Chaja Weitzenblum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5437. A bill for the relief of Leon Bergere; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5438. A bill for the relief of Miss Vova Rubin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 5439. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Taicia Meyers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5440. A bill for the relief of Elia Amerigo Bizzarri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEAL:

H. R. 5441. A bill for the relief of Scott Berry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 5442. A bill for the relief of Fenna Doorenbos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 5443. A bill for the relief of Olavi Kurko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5444. A bill for the relief of Maitland McKinley Joseph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5445. A bill for the relief of Melvin Grant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

105. By Mr. BARING: Resolution adopted by Basic Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, on January 24, 1957, urging the Congress of the United States to set aside the first Sunday in February each year, as Chaplains' Day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

106. Also, resolution adopted by Yerington Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, on February 7, 1957, urging the Congress of the United States to set aside the first Sunday in February each year, as Chaplains' Day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## The Girls' Drill Team of Reagan High School, Houston, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, February 27, 1957*

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement giving the history of the girls' drill team of Reagan High School, of Houston, Tex., and the names of the members of the team who are in attendance today as visitors to the Senate, where they are now seated in the gallery. Their high school is one of the best in the largest city of Texas, and is one of the outstanding educational institutions of the Southwest. It has been a great pleasure to me to present these students—63 very charming young women—to the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

The girls' drill team of Reagan High School, of Houston, Tex., is the oldest drum and bugle corps in that city. It was founded in 1926.

This is a leadership organization. The girls chosen for membership must have demonstrated a high degree of scholarship and conduct. They are carefully selected by a faculty committee which also sees to it that the same high standards are maintained after a girl is chosen for membership.

Mrs. Johnson and I had the privilege this morning of visiting with 63 members of this girls' drill team who are here for a tour of the capital city. This was a great pleasure to me, one which I shall not soon forget.

Sponsor of the girls' drill team is Mrs. Harry F. Noe, of Houston. Mrs. Noe accompanied the group to Washington, as did the following: Mr. Harry F. Noe, Mr. and Mrs. Gordon Cotton, Mrs. Gale and Miss Keller, Mr. Hank Worsham, and Mr. Lloyd Williams.

The following girls are included in the group that visited with me this morning and are in the Senate today: Judy O'Dell, Judy Walser, Barbara Long, Gladys Wallis, Mary Carol Lemons, Diane Dishroon, Delores Moore, Carolyn Kilgore, Beverly Brenner, Nancy Greer, Darlene Ming, Barbara Clark, Jeannine Davis, Camille Morrish, Judy Kelley, Jo Ann Elsik, Patricia Abernathy, Carolyn McKee, Frances Smith, Charlotte Ballard, Julia Kirkpatrick, Myrna West, Linda Patterson, Sharley Early, Vernita Cunningham, Mary Ann Evans, Virginia Huffington, Gay Chapin, Mary Carolyn Smith, Kay Menton, Bettie Scott, Sharon Andexler, Gladene Michel Barbara Duke, Julia Jeu, Barbara Vinsonhaler, Sherry Ledbetter, Barbara Wood, Hedy Hauk, Judy Gillespie, Shirley Joynson, Glenda Swanner, Connie Su Collins, Sarah Boozer, Claudette Rogers, Paulette Darcy, Carol Petty, Carole Ann Guastad, Anne Gest, Shirley Miller, Marcelyn Bond, Mary Nell Ward, Linda Huffman, Pat Moore, Ann Hillyer, Terry Schoenemann, Lerma Engberg, Sigrid Haller, Carol Kay Morrison, Julia Schwartz, Carol Sue Pitchford, Daler Santell, and Francine Gordon.

## Imports and Exports of Agricultural Commodities, 1936–37 and 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 27, 1957*

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable discussion among Ohio farmers concerning imports and exports of agricultural commodities in which figures for the year 1936–37 have been used as a base. In order to provide up-to-date information, I requested comparative tables for 1936–37 and 1955 which have been supplied by Assistant Secretary Earl Butz.

I believe these tables, together with the Department of Agriculture explanatory material on imports, may be of general interest. Under leave to extend, I include them with my remarks.

AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS OF THE UNITED STATES

The United States is the world's largest exporter and the world's second largest importer of agricultural products.

During the 1954–55 fiscal year, agricultural exports amounted to $3,143 million, or 21 percent of the total United States exports ($14,870 million).

During 1954–55, agricultural imports amounted to $3,787 million, or 36 percent of total United States imports ($10,422 million).

KINDS OF AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS

There are two general kinds of agricultural imports:

Sixty percent of the imports of agricultural products are commodities not produced by United States agriculture in commercial quantities. These products, such as cocoa, coffee, rubber, pepper, bananas, and cordage fiber, amounted to $2,271 million during the 1954–55 fiscal year.

Forty percent of the imports of agricultural products are commodities similar to those produced in the United States. These products, such as cotton, apparel wool, nuts, some fruits and vegetables and their products, tobacco, hides and skins, grains, and sugar, amounted to $1,515 million in the 1954–55 year.

CAN THE UNITED STATES ELIMINATE AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS?

Sometimes the question arises as to why the United States does not eliminate agricultural imports, thereby directing more buying power to domestically produced commodities. The answer is not a simple one but contains a number of facets. There is, of course, no legislative authority for eliminating all imports of agricultural commodities that come from foreign countries.

In the case of the first group of commodities, apparently their elimination would have no appreciable effect on the home market for United States farm products. Since the United States does not produce such products as coffee, cocoa, tea, bananas, and spices, eliminating their import would merely mean that the United States public would do without them, and some lowering of the national level of living would result.

In the case of the second group of commodities, legislation has been established for those that currently are under support programs to protect the United States from interference by excessive imports. Commodities whose import currently is controlled under such legislation are wheat, cotton, dairy products, rye, flaxseed and linseed oil, peanuts and peanut oil. In 1954–55, United States imports of this group totaled $115 million, or only 3 percent of total agricultural imports.

Other commodities in the second group are necessary to supplement domestic production. Some vegetables, for instance, are imported in greatest amount during the off-season when United States growers do not produce in sufficient volume. Some cheese specialties, kid and goat skins, and various oriental tobaccos are varieties or types not produced commercially in the United States. Elimination of such imports would limit variety and quality of consumer products, and in the case of tobacco might even lead to reduced rather than increased marketing of the similar United States agricultural products. For example:

Tobacco imports are largely oriental and cigar leaf types, brought in to use with American tobaccos to produce flavor and aroma desired by smokers.

Hide and skin imports consist largely of kid and goat skins, used mainly in the making of specialty leather goods. United States hides and skins are largely cowhide variety, which do not fill the same place in the consumer market.

Apparel wool imports supply about 55 percent of United States annual requirements. These imports during 1954–55 were valued at $149 million, representing 4 percent of all United States agricultural imports. In addition, there was another $91 million of carpet wool imported; virtually none of the latter is produced in the United States.

Sugar imports come largely from neighboring Caribbean and Latin American countries and are one of the principal agricultural imports. During 1954–55, sugar comprised 10 percent of United States agricultural imports. Quotas are set by law to limit each year's sugar imports. This brings stability to the market and benefits both foreign producers and United States producers. Money spent by the United States in buying sugar from other countries is used largely by these countries in buying agricultural and industrial products from the United States.

*United States agricultural exports and suppplementary imports for domestic use,[1] fiscal years 1936–37 and 1955–56*

[In thousands]

| Commodity | Unit | 1936–37 | | 1955–56 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Imports | Exports | Imports | Exports |
| QUANTITY OF SELECTED ITEMS | | | | | |
| Corn, including meal [2] | Bushel | 77,974 | 729 | 1,108 | 120,159 |
| Wheat, including flour [2] | do | 34,359 | 21,764 | 9,761 | 343,727 |
| Soybeans | Pound | 1,005 | 42 | 110 | 70,757 |
| Vegetable oils, expr.[3] | do | 1,516,805 | 41,604 | 472,074 | 1,274,730 |
| Lard, including compounds | do | 2,797 | 103,711 | 2 | 638,249 |
| Tallow | do | 57,662 | 1,229 | 1,493 | 1,329,687 |
| Dry milk [2] | do | 12,766 | 3,606 | 2,010 | 516,921 |
| Cheese [2] | do | 65,694 | 1,076 | 52,022 | 155,283 |
| Meat and products | do | 149,925 | 107,300 | 283,977 | 271,800 |
| VALUE | | | | | |
| Above commodities | Dollar | 222,936 | 62,061 | 266,681 | 1,538,618 |
| Other commodities | do | 643,839 | 670,413 | 1,316,228 | 1,953,990 |
| All commodities [3] | do | 866,775 | 732,474 | 1,582,909 | 3,492,608 |
| Value of all commodities in 1955–56 dollars [4] | do | 2,075,370 | 1,558,685 | 1,582,909 | 3,492,608 |

[1] Excludes imports in bond for reexport.
[2] Includes relief shipments.
[3] Imports include only commodities similar in use to those produced domestically (supplementary); excludes coffee, tea, and like commodities not produced commercially in the United States (complementary).
[4] This calculation makes comparisons between 1936–37 and 1955–56 more correct by eliminating the changes in value due to depreciation of the dollar.

*Imports (for consumption) into the United States of specified agricultural commodities during 1955*

| Commodity imported | Unit | Year ended Dec. 31, 1955 |
|---|---|---|
| Supplementary products: [1] | | |
| Corn, grain | Bushel | 1,087,929 |
| Wheat, grain: [2] | | |
| Unfit for human consumption. | do | 5,198,631 |
| Other dutiable wheat | do | 1,052,389 |
| Total | do | 6,251,020 |
| Barley malt | Pound | 70,942,835 |
| Rye, grain | Bushel | 3,377,887 |
| Tapioca | do | 130,344,411 |
| Hay (2,000 pounds) | Ton | 25,670 |
| Soybeans | Pound | 60,110 |
| Cottonseed oil | do | [3] |
| Butter | do | 741,752 |
| Cattle, dutiable: | | |
| Less than 200 pounds | Head | 3,795 |
| 200 to 700 pounds | do | 191,849 |
| 700 pounds or more each: | | |
| Cows for dairy purposes | do | 26,676 |
| Other cattle | do | 73,696 |
| Total cattle | | 296,016 |
| Hogs | Pound | 1,317,661 |
| Meats and meat products: | | |
| Pork, fresh | do | 41,745,235 |
| Hams, bacon and shoulders | do | 107,347,609 |
| Beef: | | |
| Fresh | do | 26,162,405 |
| Canned | do | 87,120,370 |
| Other meats and meat products | do | 30,156,487 |
| Total meats and products | do | 292,532,106 |
| Eggs, in the shell | Dozen | 2,255,690 |
| Eggs and egg products, frozen, dried, etc | Pound | 28,647 |
| Yolks: | | |
| Dried | | [3] |
| Frozen | | [3] |
| Egg albumen | | [3] |
| Wool and mohair, unmanufactured: [2] Dutiable types. | Pound | 181,474,762 |
| Milk, dried | do | 2,108,536 |
| Hides and skins [4] | do | 127,465,642 |
| Molasses, inedible | Gallon | 377,811,962 |

[1] Supplementary products are all those similar to agricultural commodities produced commercially in the United States and all other that are interchangeable in use to any significant extent with such United States commodities.
[2] Excludes free in bond for manufacture and export.
[3] Not separately classified.
[4] Excludes the weight of "other hides and skins," reported in pieces only.

Source: Foreign Agricultural Service. Compiled from official records, Bureau of the Census.

*Exports (domestic) from the United States of specified agricultural commodities during 1932, 1937, and 1955*

| Commodity exported | Unit | Year ended Dec. 31— | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1932 | 1937 | 1955 |
| Corn, grain | Bushel | 7,885,855 | 5,834,196 | 108,110,114 |
| Wheat, grain | do | 54,879,484 | 34,848,437 | 221,515,014 |
| Wheat flour, wholly of United States wheat | Bag | [1] 11,359,106 | 4,449,390 | 21,469,725 |
| Barley malt | Bushel | 238,876 | 197,917 | 3,914,458 |
| Rye, grain | do | 1,095,704 | 4,261,819 | 5,327,056 |
| Tapioca [2] | | | | |
| Hay (2,000 pounds) | Ton | 2,799 | 46,407 | 30,908 |
| Soybeans | Bushel | [2] | 76,240,524 | 67,289,138 |
| Cottonseed oil | Pound | 55,767,385 | 7,250,199 | [3] 572,150,353 |
| Butter | do | 1,605,150 | 799,877 | [3] 22,499,386 |
| Cattle (includes breeding cattle) | Head | 3,614 | 4,178 | 34,901 |

See footnotes at end of table.

*Exports (domestic) from the United States of specified agricultural commodities during 1932, 1937, and 1955*—Continued

| Commodity exported | Unit | Year ended Dec. 31— | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1932 | 1937 | 1955 |
| Hogs | Number | 11,078 | 234 | 4,378 |
| Meats and meat products: | | | | |
| Pork, fresh | Pound | 8,133,092 | 4,237,537 | 6,657,095 |
| Hams, bacon, and shoulders | do | 84,174,830 | 42,858,454 | 18,817,422 |
| Pork, pickled | do | 15,258,569 | 9,009,390 | 37,076,223 |
| Beef, fresh | do | 1,633,464 | 4,424,400 | 18,437,899 |
| Beef, canned | do | 1,002,328 | 2,078,556 | 5,094,375 |
| Other meats and meat products | do | 80,816,175 | 61,022,090 | 142,854,643 |
| Total meats and meat products | do | 191,013,458 | 123,709,427 | 228,937,655 |
| Eggs and egg products: | | | | |
| In the shell | Dozen | 2,319,039 | 2,376,421 | 49,725,348 |
| Egg products: | | | | |
| Dried | Pound | (1) | (1) | 557,537 |
| Otherwise preserved | do | 44,323 | 216,621 | 536,793 |
| Wool and mohair, unmanufactured | do | 179,161 | 67,917 | 6,338,405 |
| Milk, dried: | | | | |
| Nonfat dry milk solids | do | 1,672,522 | 2,115,853 | [2] 231,349,165 |
| Dried whole milk | do | 1,885,193 | 2,125,999 | 45,890,930 |
| Hides and skins, raw | Number | [3] 1,088,761 | [3] 1,109,526 | [4] 10,277,811 |
| Molasses, inedible | Gallon | [5] 640,188 | [5] 12,502,794 | 10,895,369 |

[1] Includes flour from foreign wheat.
[2] Not separately reported in official export statistics. It is included in farinaceous and other vegetable starches.
[3] These figures do not include the amounts exported under "Food for relief or charity," which are as follows: Cottonseed oil and shortening, 50,964,000 pounds; butter, 104,151,000 pounds; and powdered milk, 254,889,000 pounds.
[4] Not separately classified.
[5] Includes cattle, calf and kip. All other hides reported in pounds.
[6] Excludes the weight of "other hides and skins," which are reported in value only.
[7] Includes edible molasses.

Source: Foreign Agricultural Service. Compiled from official records, Bureau of the Census.

## Anniversary of Estonian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 27, 1957*

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1957, the 39th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Estonian Republic was celebrated throughout the free world.

Like its Baltic neighbors to the south, Latvia and Lithuania, the country of Estonia has been held in the grip of Communist tyranny ever since 1940, with the exception of a brief period during World War II when Soviet tyranny was replaced by the Nazi variety. But even this grim fact of 17 years of slavery under a totalitarian regime, even the unlawful and immoral incorporation of these three small countries into the Soviet Union, has not destroyed the hope of the Estonian people for freedom.

It is fitting and proper on this anniversary which has such great significance to the people of Estonia to remind them that the United States has never recognized or admitted the legality of their enslavement and still maintains diplomatic relations with an Estonian Government in exile. It is further fitting and proper to remind them that the United States Government has always expressed its hope and its belief in the peaceful liberation of all captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain. Surely the powerful combination of our determination and the burning desire for independence of the Estonian people themselves will one day bring freedom and self-determination to Estonia as it will to captive peoples everywhere. It is a privilege to salute the people of Estonian descent everywhere on the 39th anniversary of their independence and to assure them of my own solemn conviction that the day will soon come when their homeland will be freed from the chains of the oppressor.

## Encouraging Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 27, 1957*

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1957, I introduced H. R. 712, to provide a 30 percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees for higher education.

Nearly 40 percent of those qualified high-school graduates who do not continue their educations do so because of financial need. This bill would help these persons as well as the thousands of other families who barely have sufficient funds to educate their children.

Our country must encourage higher education, particularly in the scientific and technical fields. We are engaged in a qualitative defense race with Russia, upon which the survival of the free world depends.

Russia now has an estimated 890,000 trained scientists and engineers, while the United States has some 760,000. They are training this technical personnel at a more rapid pace than this country.

Through use of the tax credit, we would be encouraging more youngsters to continue their educations. In the long run, this would reflect in great benefits to our Nation—at home and abroad. It would also be a stimulus to the growth and development of our country's institutions of higher learning.

According to my bill, 30 percent of the total amount spent on tuition or fees for the individual at a level above the 12th grade at a recognized institution of higher learning, would be credited to the taxpayer. I believe the enactment of this measure is imperative.

## Poultry Inspection Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 27, 1957*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, 1957, I introduced H. R. 4357, a bill for the compulsory inspection of poultry. This measure is the same as H. R. 12016, which I sponsored last year.

It would provide an excellent program of poultry inspection. However, I find that a great deal of misunderstanding about this measure has developed and has aroused fear in some sections of the poultry processing industry. Some processors have thought the measure dangerous to them.

These fears have no basis. H. R. 4357 would only help the poultry processing industry, just as it would benefit consumers, poultry workers and poultry farmers. But I would like to avoid all misunderstandings and suspicions lest they harm the chances for poultry inspection legislation, which is truly effective.

I am therefore, introducing a new poultry inspection bill today. This measure clearly spells out my views on all of the points which have previously disturbed some individuals concerned with this subject.

This new bill provides mandatory ante mortem inspection, to be carried out in such a manner as the Secretary of Agriculture may determine. There need be no fear about a bird-by-bird ante mortem inspection. If the Secretary decides to fulfill the ante mortem requirement by an examination of each flock, coop or batch, that will be satisfactory.

Post mortem inspection will be on the carcass of every bird. Plant sanitation and sanitary processing rules would be established by the Secretary of Agriculture. A processor who fails to meet the sanitation standards would not have his poultry inspected. Uninspected poultry would be banned from shipment in interstate commerce.

Areas of intrastate commerce in which poultry is handled or consumed in so great a volume as to affect interstate commerce, could be designated and brought into the Federal program. But the designation could be achieved only with the consent of the governing body of the area or locality affected.

The inspection would be handled by Federal employees working under the direction of the Agricultural Research Service of the United States Department of Agriculture. One of this Service's units has handled meat inspection for over 50 years. But to ease any industry fears that poultry might be subordinated to meat inspection, let me say that I look forward to the Secretary of Agriculture establishing a poultry inspection branch in the Agricultural Research Service, independent of and equal to the meat inspection branch.

The cost of inspection would be paid by the United States Government—except in the case of overtime of inspectors.

A farmer who slaughters his own poultry or a retailer who only cuts up poultry products, would be specifically exempt from the provisions of the bill. The measure would also establish sound labeling practices.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this bill would establish an effective and practical inspection program. It would truly benefit the poultry consumer, the poultry worker, the poultry farmer, and the poultry processor.

## TWA's New President: Carter L. Burgess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 27, 1957*

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the reputation which Trans World Airlines has earned as one of the world's foremost carriers may be attributed, in large part, to the vision, enterprise, and leadership of the men who have steered TWA's course of progress. No group of people is more aware of this fact than my constituents in Kansas City, Mo., where TWA has been a symbol of our city's economic growth since 1930.

The recent election of Carter L. Burgess as president of TWA, succeeding the late Ralph S. Damon, presages another important chapter in TWA's history, and brightens the future not alone of that company, but also of the whole aviation industry to which Mr. Burgess brings his exceptional talents.

Although Mr. Burgess is just 40 years old, he is accustomed to assuming heavy responsibilities. His record as Assistant Secretary of Defense was outstanding, as was his performance in the other Government agencies where he has served.

In Carter L. Burgess, TWA has a dynamic administrator whose rare abilities and dedication to duty insure TWA's continuing success in the ever-growing field of air transportation.

With the jet-transport era fast approaching, new and increasingly complex problems confront the aviation industry. How effectively airline managements will respond to new and bigger challenges will depend upon the resourcefulness and acumen of men like Carter L. Burgess.

The future outlook for TWA is one of great promise. Kansas City shares the confidence and enthusiasm of TWA's 6,000 employees located in Kansas City, and TWA's personnel halfway around the globe in greeting their new chief executive officer.

## Federal Aid to School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 27, 1957*

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in a short time we will have before us for debate a Federal aid to school construction bill. At the present time two bills of the many which have been introduced on this subject are receiving the most consideration—H. R. 1, the Kelley bill, and H. R. 3986, the administration proposal.

In order that the representatives of each State may know what each bill offers to his State in the way of aid and cost, I have asked the Tax Foundation of New York to prepare the following table, showing the grant to each State under each bill as well as the cost to each State as their share of the tax burden imposed by the appropriation for each bill:

[In thousands]

| | Federal grant | | Share of Federal tax burden | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | H. R. 1 | H. R. 3986 | H. R. 1 | H. R. 3986 |
| Alabama | 13,453 | 11,148 | 5,841 | 3,125 |
| Arizona | 3,807 | 2,524 | 2,804 | 1,500 |
| Arkansas | 7,971 | 6,620 | 3,037 | 1,625 |
| California | 41,319 | 14,180 | 56,426 | 30,186 |
| Colorado | 5,417 | 3,009 | 5,374 | 2,875 |
| Connecticut | 7,174 | 2,011 | 11,916 | 6,375 |
| Delaware | 1,253 | 381 | 2,979 | 1,594 |
| Florida | 11,436 | 6,309 | 12,442 | 6,656 |
| Georgia | 15,356 | 11,926 | 7,944 | 4,250 |
| Idaho | 2,538 | 1,801 | 1,519 | 812 |
| Illinois | 30,371 | 11,125 | 42,407 | 22,686 |
| Indiana | 15,340 | 8,021 | 14,194 | 7,593 |
| Iowa | 9,630 | 5,813 | 7,243 | 3,875 |
| Kansas | 7,125 | 3,744 | 5,958 | 3,187 |
| Kentucky | 12,477 | 8,917 | 6,425 | 3,437 |
| Louisiana | 12,135 | 9,204 | 6,834 | 3,656 |
| Maine | 3,367 | 1,932 | 2,745 | 1,469 |
| Maryland (D. C.) | 11,712 | 5,829 | 15,654 | 8,374 |
| Massachusetts | 15,860 | 6,782 | 20,970 | 11,218 |
| Michigan | 25,588 | 12,102 | 30,666 | 16,405 |
| Minnesota | 11,550 | 7,047 | 10,047 | 5,375 |
| Mississippi | 9,760 | 7,772 | 2,862 | 1,531 |
| Missouri | 13,762 | 5,885 | 15,129 | 8,093 |
| Montana | 2,391 | 1,405 | 2,044 | 1,094 |
| Nebraska | 4,831 | 2,856 | 3,972 | 2,125 |
| Nevada | 699 | 203 | 1,168 | 625 |
| New Hampshire | 1,920 | 1,074 | 2,103 | 1,125 |
| New Jersey | 17,016 | 5,489 | 23,949 | 12,812 |
| New Mexico | 3,481 | 2,643 | 1,986 | 1,062 |
| New York | 49,192 | 15,765 | 77,864 | 41,654 |
| North Carolina | 18,270 | 14,615 | 8,411 | 4,500 |
| North Dakota | 2,586 | 2,013 | 1,460 | 781 |
| Ohio | 30,355 | 11,321 | 35,982 | 19,249 |
| Oklahoma | 8,573 | 5,998 | 5,783 | 3,094 |
| Oregon | 5,840 | 3,099 | 5,724 | 3,062 |
| Pennsylvania | 37,659 | 18,803 | 40,947 | 21,905 |
| Rhode Island | 2,668 | 886 | 3,213 | 1,719 |
| South Carolina | 10,509 | 8,727 | 3,972 | 2,125 |
| South Dakota | 2,586 | 1,881 | 1,402 | 750 |
| Tennessee | 13,762 | 10,144 | 7,243 | 3,875 |
| Texas | 32,974 | 19,842 | 25,701 | 13,749 |
| Utah | 3,253 | 2,317 | 2,103 | 1,125 |
| Vermont | 1,448 | 1,007 | 1,110 | 594 |
| Virginia | 13,811 | 9,275 | 9,755 | 5,218 |
| Washington | 8,996 | 4,298 | 9,112 | 4,875 |
| West Virginia | 8,622 | 6,699 | 4,206 | 2,250 |
| Wisconsin | 13,111 | 7,365 | 12,442 | 6,656 |
| Wyoming | 1,171 | 674 | 1,051 | 562 |

## Homebuilding Seriously Hurt by Tight Money and High Discounts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 27, 1957*

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the tight money and high discount prevalent in the present money market is having serious effects on the homebuilders throughout the Nation.

These problems are not confined to the homebuilder but are reflected in the many other industries that are related to homebuilding such as lumber, home appliances, hardware, homefurnishings, and many other items in building materials.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF HOMEBUILDING TO THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

Homebuilding is one of America's major industries, ranking second in importance perhaps only to food and food processing. The 12 million dwelling units provided since the end of World War II—an output in construction dollars alone of more than $100 billion—did much to spark and sustain the postwar economic boom. By its very nature, operating practically everywhere our people live, it affects the economic life of every community in America.

Our economic history indicates that homebuilding is a bellwether industry. What affects it, also affects eventually, practically every other sector of our economy. It is not too much to say that without a healthy homebuilding economy, geared to our people's requirements, we cannot long have a healthy overall national economy.

The value of new residential construction put in place in recent years has run close to $16 billion annually, accounting for one-fourth of new private investment. Taking into account land and other nonconstruction factors, the value of the industry's product is probably in the neighborhood of $20 billion annually.

In recent years it has provided directly approximately 2½ million jobs a year, with about half the total involved in work on the construction site. The impact of new housing is further extended by the market it provides for a multitude of products. About 3,000 different items go into every new home; thus, any change in home-construction volume is felt in thousands of factories and by thousands of suppliers all over the country, to say nothing of the thousands of builders and millions of workers employed in this industry. Residential construction uses one-third of our total lumber output, two-thirds of all brick, four-fifths of all gypsum.

Surveys indicate that the sale of a new home generates in the first year of occupancy alone about $1,500 per home in retail sales of furnishings and equipment. Homebuilding also creates additional demand for other types of construction—stores, churches, schools, utility expansions, and the like. Moreover, construction of new housing is a

prerequisite to industrial expansion in many areas. Thus, apart from any sociological importance, homebuilding is a vital dollars and cents influence now and in the future in every part of our country, geographically and economically.

INFLUENCE OF TIGHT MONEY ON HOMEBUILDING

In view of the significance of homebuilding to our economy, the disadvantage at which homebuilding finds itself in the current money market is of importance to everybody. This disadvantage arises partly from the nature of homemortgage lending; because of the relatively small dollar volume involved in any single transaction, because homebuilding is essentially a small businessman's business, it cannot compete for scarce funds on anything resembling even terms with the financing operations of major corporations.

Moreover, the nature of the mortgage instrument and the lack of satisfactory devices for mortgage financing have practically barred it from access to some of the fastest growing forms of savings such as pension and welfare funds.

It is absurd to consider our tight money policy as though it stands by itself, apart from other Government policies, particularly fiscal.

Our economy today is susceptable to management—to an extent generally unrealized—by the Government through a number of devices, primarily monetary policy—as exercised by the Federal Reserve—and fiscal tax and budget policy. While monetary policy goes off in one direction—presumably to restrain inflation—fiscal policy moves in another, furnishing large competitive advantages and incentives to industry for plant and equipment expansion through accelerated depreciation, fast tax writeoffs and a tax policy which, in effect, encourages business spending rather than saving. There has been little evidence that monetary restrictions have succeeded in restraining corporate expansion in the past year; in fact, as has been pointed out by prominent economic authorities, under current tax policy, corporate borrowing rates are actually lower than they have ever been in peacetime America.

At the end of 1956, corporate borrowings totaled $211 billion, a gain of $15 billion during the year. Between the first quarter of 1955 and the first quarter of 1957, business spending for plant and equipment soared from an annual rate of $26 billion to $38 billion, a gain of 48 percent and it is still going up.

Contrariwise, look at housing. With money tight, housing starts and builders' plans have been drastically cut. Between January 1955 and January 1957, the seasonally adjusted annual rate of private starts fell from 1,416,000 to 1,010,000—a drop of 29 percent. Housing starts began to decline in mid-1955. The decline has lasted all through the last 18 months, and 1956 volume was in total 200,000 less than the previous year.

That this result is not sheer accident is shown by a recent statement of the Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, that he considers housing "postponable." In essence, he has undertaken to rewrite not only public policy in the housing field, but to bypass a clear declaration of congressional intent on our national housing policy, as embodied by the Congress in the Housing Acts of 1949 and again in 1954.

The net of a monetary policy of restraint and a fiscal and tax policy of encouragement to business expansion has been what might be expected; powerful forces working unevenly on the economy. In this setting, it is inevitable that the homebuilding industry suffer the major impact and be singled out for "postponability." It is for this reason that the industry has developed proposals, not to give it any unfair advantage, but merely, to restore a competitive position barred to it by conflicting governmental policies.

## Remove Political Restrictions on Government Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 27, 1957*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which calls for the removal or elimination of certain restrictions imposed on the political activities of officers and employees of the Federal and State Governments under Public Law 252 of the 76th Congress. This is the law which is commonly referred to as the Hatch Act, passed by Congress in 1939.

It is my firm conviction that under this act the civil-service employees of our Federal and State Governments are relegated to a position of second-class citizens. I do not believe that this was the original intention of the sponsors of that act when it was enacted some 16 or 17 years ago. Nor do I think that the assertion of political privileges can be denied under the United States Constitution to a large segment of our population simply because they happen to be Government employees.

Political freedom and the freedom of expression should be granted on the same scale to Government employees as to all citizens of this Nation. Federal or State employment should not in itself become a means of depriving American citizens of rights guaranteed them in the Constitution. These people are entitled to express their views and opinions on political parties and candidates, regardless of their employment.

For this reason, I believe it is high time to ease such restrictions imposed on civil-service workers and that we extend to them the same privileges of participating in the political life of the country as all others enjoy. Originally, the Hatch Act was intended to curb unorthodox and pernicious political activities on the part of certain individuals or groups, who abused these privileges. It was not intended to punish all civil-service employees and to deprive them of the full benefits of citizenship. In the long run, our country will be the loser and our democratic processes will suffer if we continue to deny such rights to several million of our citizens, who are among the most loyal and most patriotic.

My bill simply seeks to remove the restriction contained in the Hatch Act which forbids any officer or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government from taking any active part in political management or political campaigns. It also seeks to remove the same restriction with respect to officials and employees of any State or local agency whose principal employment is in connection with any activity which is financed by loans or grants made by the Federal Government or its agencies.

Mr. Speaker, our country is regarded as the moral leader and moral spokesman of the free nations of the world. As such, it does not befit the United States to deny basic rights and to discriminate against many of its citizens merely because they are employed by the Federal or State Governments. Government employment should be a badge of honor, not a status of second-class citizenship.

## Status of Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 27, 1957*

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the January issue of the American Legion magazine carried an article, We Learned About Jap Prisons From the Inside, based upon my interviews with two American servicemen who had been tried and convicted in Japanese courts under the authority granted Japan by our agreement on the status of our forces. Col. Howard S. Levie of the Office of Judge Advocate General of the Army has asked me to disclose the identity of the two former servicemen so that the Army may investigate their complaints of improper treatment in the Japanese prisons.

A part of the article reveals the ineptitude of Army officers who visited the prisons from time to time and who, according to the prisoners, seemed more interested in friendly relationshps with the jailers than in improving conditions of confinement. As I talked with these boys, I thought it was shocking that the Army apparently had made no serious effort to be informed of the conditions of their imprisonment. I am certain spot checks of the prisons or interviews with American servicemen after their release would have brought out all the facts stated in my article, and more.

I am certain that serious investigations undertaken even at this late date would reveal all that the Department of the Army could learn by interviewing the subjects of my article. For this reason, and because I do not wish them to be subjected to further harassment at a time when they are having the greatest difficulty in establishing themselves, I must decline to reveal their identity.

Let me say, however, that I am personally convinced of the accuracy of their reports, and I think the article will have been well worth while if it arouses the conscience of the Defense Department with regard to the victims of the status of forces agreements.

In order to publicize my reason for protecting the identity of these former prisoners of the Japanese, I include Colonel Levie's letter to me and my reply made to the Secretary of Defense:

Hon. FRANK T. BOW.
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR BOW: I refer to your article entitled "We Learned About Jap Prisons From the Inside" which appeared in the January 1957 issue of the American Legion magazine.

The Department of the Army, as the designated executive agency of the Department of Defense for such matters, is in the process of investigating the serious charges set forth in this article concerning the Japanese prison installations in which convicted United States personnel are confined, the conditions under which such personnel are confined and the treatment which they receive while so confined. We recognize that you are as interested as the Department of the Army in a fair, impartial, and thorough investigation of any charge of mistreatment of American servicemen confined in Japanese prisons to the end that efforts may be made to correct any deficiencies that may exist.

Inasmuch as any congressional committee which might be called upon to consider the charges would require a complete report on a matter of this nature, it would be greatly appreciated if the full names of "Ed" and "Bill," as set forth in your article, could be made available to this office so that the investigation may be properly concluded.

It is noted that in a conversation with Mr. Esgain of this office on February 18, 1957, Mr. Melchior of your office confirmed the fact indicated in your article that the subject individuals are no longer subject to military jurisdiction since they are not members of the military establishment and advised that they have indicated a willingness to appear before any congressional committee concerned with the treatment of our soldiers in Japan.

The results of any investigation will, of course, be used for official purposes only.

Your interest in the welfare of these servicemen and of those who may find themselves in a similar situation is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD S. LEVIE,
*Colonel, JAGC, Chief, International Affairs Division.*

---

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C., February 25, 1957.*

Hon. WILBER M. BRUCKER,
*Secretary of the Army,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am in receipt of a letter from Col. Howard S. Levie, JAGC, dated February 20, 1957, requesting the full names of the men whose experiences were described in my article in the American Legion magazine entitled "We Learned About Jap Prisons From the Inside." I regret that I am unable to comply with his request.

These men served their sentences of imprisonment in Japan. They both received the type of discharge as provided, I believe, by regulations. Their records made adjustment to civil life rather difficult, particularly in the matter of securing employment. I do not wish to subject them to the embarrassment or harassment of further inquiry by Army investigators. It might cost them their present jobs and upset the whole new pattern of existence they have tried to build for themselves in their communities.

Frankly, I am unable to understand why the Department of the Army must know the identity of these men in order to make a complete investigation of the conditions which have existed in the various prisons in Japan. Apparently your officers have lacked either the ability or the desire to penetrate the window dressing supplied by the Japanese officials whenever an inspection was imminent. Some of the inspectors were either too anxious to maintain cordial relations with the Japanese officials or approached their duty with the feeling that the prisoners deserved what they were getting.

I have found sufficient corroboration of the stories of these former prisoners to accept their statements as true. It is to be expected that some persons will attempt to discredit them. I hope that your present investigation will be more thorough and productive than inspections have been in the past. Any effort put forth by the Defense Department to lessen the hazards of service in foreign countries is commendable. However, no panacea will cure the first wrong, which was the surrender of jurisdiction over our servicemen in the first instance.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK T. BOW,
*Member of Congress.*

---

## George Washington's Birthday

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 27, 1957*

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on Thursday, February 21, 1957, to deliver the following address at the annual George Washington's Birthday banquet at the George Mason Hotel, Alexandria, Va., sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States:

SPEECH IN OBSERVANCE OF GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY BEFORE THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, ALEXANDRIA, VA., ON FEBRUARY 21, 1957

I am greatly honored by the invitation to address you in this historic city on the eve of George Washington's Birthday.

Washington belongs to Alexandria as Alexandria belongs to him.

At every turn in your city one is reminded of George Washington:

1. As a little boy on his brother Lawrence's barge bringing Mount Vernon tobacco to the Hunting Creek warehouse;

2. On horseback riding to the village of Belle Haven;

3. As a young surveyor carrying the chain to plot the streets and lots.

George Washington danced at the balls in Alexandria, visited the young ladies, drilled the militia, launched vessels, engaged workmen, and dined in many homes.

As a citizen of Alexandria he ran for office, sat as justice, sponsored the Friendship Fire Co., a free school, the Alexandria Canal, and other civic enterprises.

He was pewholder of Christ Church, and master of the Masonic Lodge.

George Washington came to Alexandria to collect his mail, to cast his ballot, to have his silver or his carriage repaired, to sell his tobacco or his wheat, to join the citizenry in celebrating independence.

His closest friends and daily companions were Alexandrians.

The dwellings, wharves, and warehouses of the town, were as familiar to him as his Mount Vernon farm.

In Alexandria Washington took command of his first troops.

From the steps of Gadsby's tavern he received his last military review.

An Alexandria doctor closed his eyes, and Alexandrians wept as he was carried to his last resting place.

The geographical location of Alexandria, in the shadow of our capitol dome, its intimate association with the lives of prominent men and the numerous historic points of interest, constitute an ideal climate for my efforts this evening—to pay tribute to the father of our country.

The boyhood of Washington was as healthy and normal as a Virginia boyhood could be.

VERY LITTLE STUDY—A GREAT DEAL OF OPEN AIR

He had, as a matter of fact, only some 7 or 8 years of formal schooling, but it is significant to note that period included an excellent grounding in mathematics and surveying.

For 4 years, under the hard necessity of earning his livelihood, he assisted in plantation work and took field lessons in surveying.

The private character of George Washington was to a great degree molded by his surroundings and the influences to which he was exposed.

Left fatherless at the age of 10 years, he fell under the influence of his brother Lawrence, his senior by some 14 years.

Lawrence had received a finished education in Europe.

The ambitions of young George were stimulated by the well-bred, graceful, easy, and polished manners of his tall and distinguished-looking brother.

At 17 Washington entered the public service and his life as an official and citizen began.

He was the appointed surveyor of Culpeper County.

During his lifetime, excepting 7 years, he was, in some capacity or other, in the public service.

He was surveyor, militiaman on the frontier, member of the colonial assembly, member of the Continental Congress, General of the Continental Army, President of the United States, and, finally, lieutenant general of the Nation in prospect of European war.

It is the destiny of America that, in periods of crisis, we have a vast reservoir of human resources from which to draw the leadership that sees us through.

In each of the trials that have beset America's growth and development the opportunity has been there for our form of government to prove its vitality, its wisdom, its greatness.

As we, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, observe Washington's birthday it is well for us to pause and recall that the Father of our Country in his time also faced perplexing and burning problems similar to those which confront us now.

All of us can profit by emphasizing that in those early years enemies both from without and from within beset the new Republic.

Truly, history repeats itself.

In George Washington's time the powerful nations of the world then stood ready to prey on our commerce, to stifle our economic growth, and to grab our territory.

In a message to both Houses of Congress in 1789 Washington pleaded for an "effective system for the Militia of the United States."

In terms that might well fit our present situation, he said: "It is unnecessary to offer arguments in recommendation of a measure on which the honor, safety, and well-being of our country so evidently and so essentially depend."

In those days it was the militia—soldiers on foot.

Today, along with the Army, it is the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force.

This Nation finds itself in the midst of a revolution in military affairs, brought about by scientific advances in the development of nuclear weapons and means of delivering them.

As the result, the capability to destroy has reached unprecedented proportions.

This capability to destroy, in my opinion, has forced upon the free world and Communists a nuclear stalemate which in plain words means that the free world or Communists can now accept the hazards of a full-scale atomic-hydrogen war.

From the United States standpoint the striking power of the United States Armed Forces, joined with those of our allies, and enjoying worldwide deployment by air, sea, and land around the Soviet perimeter, constitutes the deterrent element that makes the risk of war unacceptable in Soviet calculations.

In addition to the striking power of our Armed Forces and allies, designed for an atomic-hydrogen war, we must at all times maintain an all-around force to handle brush fire and local emergencies.

The striking power of our Armed Forces is mainly represented by:

(a) Increased nuclear firepower.

(b) Ever-increasing mobility of our three armed services.

(c) New types of aircraft.

(d) Navy nuclear-powered task force including carriers.

(e) Smaller and more mobile groups for the Army.

(f) Development of air supply.

(g) Wide dispersal of airfields and supply bases.

In our laboratories you will find the weapon of tomorrow with the trend continuing toward the guided missile with a nuclear warhead which, in the not too distant future, will provide the major element of firepower for all of our Armed Forces.

A strong and ready reserve force, designed to take its place alongside of the Regulars in the maintenance of combat-ready force for the present, while developing one to face up to defense threats of the future.

The maintenance at all times of a strong and expanding peacetime industrial structure, readily convertible to the tasks of defense and war.

In the building of such a force, we very definitely must take into consideration the importance of maintaining our economic strength at all times.

Otherwise, as a Nation, we could lose the war without military action.

National unity, so essential today, was of equal prominence in the days of George Washington—who constantly pleaded for unity among his people.

Disturbing elements tore our land with inward strife.

State was jealous of State, faith opposed faith, and race persecuted race.

Those were really dark days in the life of the infant Nation.

A great statesman, as well as a great general, Washington realized that the young Nation could grow in strength and take its place among the other nations only if intolerance and bigotry were conquered.

He feared what was happening, therefore he admonished his countrymen.

He pointed out how small are the differences that form the basis for misunderstandings and conflict.

He emphasized that love and pride of country must rise above selfish personal interests.

Today we realize that there are those nations in the world that are jealous of America's greatness.

In addition, they are fearful of our efforts to build a God-worshipping world. A world wherein freedom and happiness shall prevail for all mankind.

Our first President, I feel sure, would have been elated at this convincing evidence of our belief in his concept of the principles upon which our country is built.

If George Washington could step out of the pages of history tonight, I am confident he would repeat what he asserted in the struggling, creative days of our Republic, as he fought to create the civil and religious liberties of the American people.

To the United Baptist Churches in Virginia and other Protestants, George Washington wrote: "Every man ought to be protected in worshipping the deity according to the dictates of his own conscience."

To the Catholics in the United States he wrote in 1789:

"I hope ever to see America among the foremost nations in examples of justice and liberality.

"And I presume that your fellow citizens will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the establishment of their Government."

To a Hebrew congregation in Rhode Island, he said:

"All, possess alike, liberty of conscience.

"The Government of the United States gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance."

Yes; we Americans do possess this precious heritage that now unites us, a legacy that transcends any political, religious, or economic difference.

Our heritage secures to us the ideals that mankind has longed and searched for since the dawn of time.

As one approaches our Nation's Capital from the South, driving through Alexandria, the George Washington Masonic Memorial, reminds us of his Masonic activity in the Masonic Lodge of this city.

But George Washington was not great because he was a Mason.

Nor was he great because he was from Virginia.

He possessed natural gifts and rare qualities of mind that enabled him to successfully meet and gain the esteem of the most distinguished diplomats of the Old World.

He was a man of magnificent presence.

He impressed all with respect and admiration, not only because of his excellent qualities, but on account of his unerring judgment, strong appreciation, and consideration of the rights of others.

He was not gifted with what we might term "eloquence," yet because of his honesty of purpose, both of heart and mind, he inspired his hearers with that confidence that carries with it conviction.

When we survey other characters in the American military and political field in the last quarter of the 18th century, we look in vain for anyone with Washington's unique combination of qualities and abilities to meet our country's need.

It is true that Washington was surpassed by others in various ways:

Patrick Henry was more eloquent.

Jefferson was a greater political theorist.

Thomas Paine a more ready writer, and some have thought General Green a more clever militarist.

But it is certain that no one had the combination of qualities which made Washington the "Father of His Country."

Someone has suggested that Washington became commander in chief of the Continental Army and first President of the United States merely through chance.

Such critics cite as examples his military experience in the French and Indian War and his financial independence obtained by a fortunate marriage.

But when in a nation-forming and world-changing crisis the one prepared leader appears, is it not more reverent to keep still about the wheel of fortune and acknowledge the working of divine providence?

The world needed America, America needed Washington, and he was prepared. God saw to that.

Washington's public service falls into four parts:

(a) The first was his work for Virginia, mainly preceding and during the French and Indian war, and it was preparatory to his greater accomplishments as our Founding Father.

(b) His second great service was as commander in chief of the Continental Army.

Here the value of his personality is most plainly manifest.

When Congress was well-nigh powerless to furnish money or supplies, when jealously, slander, and treachery were abounding and when trusted leaders proved traitors, Washington would not quit.

His persistent courage, his bravery, his poise, his unselfishness, and his deep sense of justice held together the tattered remnants of a hungry army.

A man of less character would have been disgusted, disgruntled, and discouraged.

He would have sent his resignation to Congress the first time that Gen. Charles Lee (no relation to any Virginian) misbehaved.

But not George Washington.

The Father of Our Country might have tried to make himself king.

Others have done it with less occasion.

But when his unpaid troops at the close of the war were ready to use military power on the Congress to enforce their rights, Washington persuaded them, with pleading eloquence, to preserve the civil authority and abide respectfully by the decisions of the Congress.

He assured them that he would use his influence to get just pay for them.

(c) Washington's third contribution was in connection with the Constitutional Convention, where he presided from May 25 to September 17, 1787.

He was a natural-born President.

He was by instinct and by training an administrator.

In the Virginia House of Burgesses, where Washington served for years in its colorful sessions, he had very little to say.

He shunned the free-for-all debates enjoyed by Jefferson, Madison, and Patrick Henry.

On the other hand, with Washington in the chair he was right at home.

Whether directing his servants at Mount Vernon, an army in the field, or a deadlocked constitutional convention, he had an instinct for avoiding rashness and for getting the right thing done.

And so, as chairman, he is said to have admonished the delegates as they began their task in these words:

"Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair.

"The event is in the hand of God."

And, as chairman, he signed that great document, the Constitution of the United States, which Gladstone said was "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

But signing the Constitution was one thing and its adoption by the States was another.

The sentiment in Virginia was closely divided, and without Virginia there could be no Union.

Washington, with his thorough knowledge of the Convention debates, threw his influence strongly in favor of adopting the Constitution and was without doubt responsible for the happy outcome.

This is George Washington, our Founding Father.

(d) It is little wonder Washington was chosen our first President.

This was his fourth great public service.

With no precedent to guide him he had to depend largely and often upon his deep sense of propriety as to how a President of the United States should act.

He acted like the gentleman and citizen of Alexandria that he was and set a worthy example for a long line of notable successors.

Washington was no infallible prophet.

He did not claim to be one.

He did not foresee the development of political parties in our country.

Neither did he know that within a century and a half one could travel from New York to London more quickly than he in his day could go from Alexandria to Philadelphia.

Yet even with his necessarily limited vision Washington enunciated some great principles of government when he said:

"My politics are plain and simple.

"I think every nation has a right to establish that form of government under which it conceives it may live most happy; provided it infracts no right, or is not dangerous to others; and that no governments ought to interfere with the internal concerns of another, except for the security of what is due to themselves."

The fame of George Washington stands apart from every other figure in history.

In conclusion, as we commemorate his birthday on this occasion, let us hold high the faith in America, which he bequeathed to us, and which the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States have constantly helped to preserve.

Yes; let us move forward through peace to preserve George Washington's ideals for all future generations.

---

## Statement of Representative James C. Davis of Georgia, Before a Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, February 25, 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 27, 1957*

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Representative DAVIS of Georgia before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary:

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have the opportunity to appear before you and the members of this subcommittee in opposition to this group of bills you are now considering.

There are so many valid objections to this legislation that one individual can deal with only a small percentage of them.

There are many able Members of the House and Senate who want to present arguments, both factual and legal, against these bills. I felt when the announcement was first made that hearings on this legislation would be confined to 4 days, at such an early stage of this session, that that was a grave and serious mistake.

Your subcommittee has now extended the hearings, I believe, until tomorrow, February 26. I do not believe hearings on such far-reaching and revolutionary legislation should be closed until ample opportunity has been afforded for full hearings to those desiring to be heard. I sincerely hope that you gentlemen will not close these hearings until that opportunity has been afforded.

I am opposed to this legislation, first, because it is unconstitutional; second, it is absurd and ridiculous; and third, it is unnecessary.

Advocates of this type of legislation have tried to create sectional prejudice. Some have promoted the false theory that the South, my section of the country, is prejudiced against Negroes and has denied them equal rights in education, jobs, housing, justice in the courts, and otherwise, while people of the North, East, and West, in direct contrast, eagerly extended to them the right hand of fellowship and gave them a warm welcome into schools, churches, office, factory, and neighborhood community life.

In both respects these claims are false, and that attitude is false.

Some professional liberals and professional South haters have had the brass and effrontery to assume a holier-than-thou attitude toward the South, and to deal with this question on the basis that it can be assumed without argument that the southern people hate Negroes, and make a practice of murdering them, cheating them, oppressing them, and depriving them of civil rights.

Whether this attitude stems from ignorance, political considerations, or an evil heart and mind, I do not know. I do know that such an assumption is unfounded, and first I want to give to you some facts in support of the proposition that the Negroes in the South (and the great bulk of them do live in the South) have fared better and received more consideration from white people than those who have left the South and gone to other sections of the country in search of the Promised Land.

Whatever opposition may exist in the South to integration with the Negro, has its counterpart in the North. The thinking people of all sections know this.

I want to quote a paragraph from an editorial in Collier's weekly for May 11, 1956:

"The people of the North can help most, we believe, by cleaning up their own mess—and this process might well begin with a general soul searching to discover what residues of prejudice remain there. When Harlem has been desegregated, when Negroes have been welcomed as neighbors in the present suburbs of New York and Chicago, when Chinese and Filipinos have been made to feel at home in San Francisco's Sea Cliff and Pacific Heights, there will be time enough to point a finger at the South."

That editorial writer faces the facts, and admits the truth, that there is no warmer welcome for desegregation in New York, Chicago, or San Francisco than there is in the South.

I do not, of course, have time to go into this situation in the great detail which the facts bear out, and in support of which thousands of instances could be cited from every section of this country. However, I do want to go into it to a sufficient extent to satisfy any fair-minded person that I am not dealing in isolated instances or referring to rare and unusual occurrences.

Former Senator Herbert Lehman, a supporter of integration, of New York, on June 3 last year, speaking at an Urban League meeting in New York City, said that conditions in Harlem, a large Negro and Puerto Rican community in New York City, are "a rebuke to us of the North." He further told them that "Harlem is an area of poverty, congestion, substandard housing and substandard schools." This is not the statement of a northerner talking about the South. It is not the statement of a southerner talking about the North. It is the statement of a former Governor and Senator of the State of New York talking about conditions existing in his home State and city.

The Christian Science Monitor carried in its issue of June 12, 1956, an article written by Mary Hornaday, bearing the title "Barriers Confront Negroes Seeking Housing in North." She quoted Alan S. Paton who wrote a survey of the Negro in the North for Collier's magazine, as saying "the cry of the Negro is no longer: 'Let my people go'; it is: 'Let my people in.'"

I quote the following from her article:

"FREE CHOICE DENIED

"Here in New York City, where Negroes make up about 20 percent of the Manhattan population, they are still almost completely excluded from a free choice to buy or rent homes in the open competitive market. The Protestant Council of the City of New York recently found that 22 of the city's 27 major real estate operators turned down Negro applicants for apartments, though accepting white applicants of the same economic status.

"Into New York's Harlem are crowded more than a quarter of a million Negroes from the Southern States, West Indies, and Africa. Negroes began to move into Harlem in 1901 as a result of a deflated boom in real estate. Hundred of families deserted tenements on the west side to move into apartments built by speculative real estate promoters. Today Harlem contains Sugar Hill where affluent Negroes live in dignity and comparative splendor but it also contains some of the most notorious rat-ridden slums in New York."

I take it that these statements are true. Certainly no one would undertake to accuse the Christian Science Monitor of being either pro-southern or anti-northern.

On June 12 last year, Mr. Hal Dumas, formerly executive vice president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. in New York City, said in a speech to the Atlanta Rotary Club that except for public transportation segregation is just as strong in New York City as any place in the South. He said:

"They make a great effort to condemn segregation in the South, but it (New York) is the most painfully racial and religious clique-minded town in existence."

Some writers who have devoted study and thought to these problems feel that Chicago gives New York City keen competition in the field of segregating Negroes. In the Christian Science Monitor of July 16, 1956, a news item by James K. Sparkman quoted a Negro director of the Urban League as saying that Chicago "is the most segregated city in the North," and that Negroes in Chicago "are situated in the middle of the Nation's largest racial ghetto."

He quotes the same Negro spokesman as saying that Negroes pay 30 to 50 percent more than a white man would pay for the same housing and that: "Negroes are not only denied freedom of movement, but they are ruthlessly exploited, overcharged, overcrowded, and disproportionately forced into slum living."

The article by Mr. Sparkman is quite long, but I want to quote a few paragraphs from it:

"CHICAGO NEGROES FIND OLD MANSIONS DISAPPOINTMENT

"(By James K. Sparkman)

"'Many of our people thought that mansions were palaces. They have found them monstrosities.'

"This is how Roi Ottley, noted Negro author and Chicago radio commentator, brings home the point that for Chicago Negroes, achieving size in homes has not proved an answer to their longings.

"Mr. Ottley, along with Negro newsmen, welfare, and politician leaders, is quick to say that if jobs are the incoming Negro's primary gain here, housing is his area of least progress.

"Indeed, despite the visible evidence of changing home and apartment ownership, including that of many old South Side lakeshore mansions, little has been accomplished when compared with the growing problem, they argue.

"Less than a month ago, Edwin C. Berry, new executive director of the reorganized Urban League, concluded from the weight of the league's study data that Chicago 'is the

most segregated city in the North' even though there has been progress in Negro housing.

" 'You and I,' Mr. Berry told delegates here to a redcap union convention, 'are situated in the middle of the Nation's largest racial ghetto.'

"It is, he said in describing the area lying parallel to Lake Michigan south of the Loop which takes in the site of the ill-reputed Mecca flats and a hefty fraction of Chicago's 23 square miles of densely populated slums, '8 miles long by 2½ miles wide and contains more people than the entire population of Columbus, Ohio.'

*"Restrictive device*

"By its nature, if not always by design, housing restrictions are 'a landlord's device for controlling rents,' one Negro spokesman observed here to this correspondent recently. The victimized tenant, if given poor return for his money, has little chance to flee. Said the Urban League on this subject:

" 'This residential segregation forced by Chicago custom means that Negroes are not only denied freedom of movement, but they are ruthlessly exploited, overcharged, overcrowded, and disproportionately forced into slum living.' Although no study of Negro rents in Chicago has yet been made, Mr. Berry estimates that Negroes pay 30 to 50 percent more than would a white man for similar quarters.

"Why has there been no answer to this problem—especially in an era of record home and apartment building? The causative forces are to be found deep in the nature of the steady stream of 1,000 to 2,500 Negroes which are believed settling monthly in Chicago.

"Some Negro spokesmen believe this figure should be smaller; southbound trains are daily full of Negroes, they note, who have decided they have stayed long enough in the Windy City."

Illinois, a State which produces so many knights in shining armor to point an accusing finger at the South, has been the scene of race riots with more violence and disturbance in one riot than in all of the Southern States combined. In 1951 the International News Services reported that an anti-Negro mob of 10,000 milled about an apartment building in Cicero, Ill., a west Chicago suburb.

These 10,000 Illinois people were stirred to a mob-violence pitch because a Negro war veteran undertook to move his family into an apartment building in a white neighborhood. This news item stated that Illinois National Guardsmen were lined up 4 deep holding back the crowd with guns and fixed bayonets, and that at least 6 persons were bayoneted by the guardsmen. The mob which began on Wednesday with 3,000 people, grew to 10,000 by Thursday.

The Atlanta Constitution of July 12, 1951, carried this news story of the mob violence taking place in Chicago on that occasion:

"SIX WOUNDED AS 10,000 BATTLE IN RACE RIOT

"CHICAGO, July 12.—At least 6 persons were bayoneted Thursday night while steel-helmeted troops and police fought to rout an anti-Negro mob of 10,000 milling about an apartment building in Cicero, west Chicago suburb.

"The most seriously wounded was identified as Vicent Kaduk, 20, of Cicero, who was jabbed in the left side with a bayonet.

"The others were reported to have suffered minor cuts.

"Illinois National Guardsmen were lined up four deep, holding fixed bayonets in a cordon about the building, trying to push the screaming crowd back.

"Although most of the crowd had edged back to 200 feet from the building, some of the mob kept breaking through to as close as 50 feet from the troop perimeter, tossing bricks, rocks, and firecrackers at the building.

"Several windows that had remained intact through two pillagings Wednesday night and Thursday were broken.

"Although the guardsmen were outfitted with guns, no shots were fired.

"The menacing crowd, kept a block away from the building since sundown, broke through police lines as the steel-helmeted troops arrived aboard guard trucks and chartered buses.

"Earlier, police routed 25 persons who broke through their lines by firing pistols into the air.

"The violence stemmed from efforts of a Negro war veteran and his family to move into the apartment building. They would have been the suburb's first Negro residents.

"Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson ordered 500 troops to the apartment building Thursday after vandals rampaged through the building for the second time.

"An estimated 3,000 screaming, jostling Cicero residents gathered outside the building Wednesday night when teen-agers and hoodlums raced into the dwelling, ransacked four apartments, and made a bonfire of the furniture.

"Not a single family remained in the 12-flat structure."

Chicago people have not become more tolerant since the Cicero occurrence. In 1954, 2 years later, a mob of such size as to require approximately 2,000 policemen per day staged riots at the Trumbull Park housing project in Chicago. This resulted, as in Cicero, Ill., from efforts to forcibly integrate a Negro family into a white housing project. Eighteen months after the riot started Police Commissioner Timothy O'Conner said that 313 policemen were assigned to the project daily, and that police details at the project have ranged to more than 1,800 men in a 24-hour period.

Michigan has pointed the finger at the South from time to time. In the 1952 Democratic National Convention, Michigan's Governor was brazen enough to say that delegates from the South should actually not be seated in the convention of the Democratic Party.

Yet Dearborn, Mich., is far more prosegregationist than Atlanta, Ga. Dearborn's mayor boasts in newspaper interviews that not a single Negro lives in the city limits of Dearborn.

One might judge from the breastbeating of the Michigan Governor that Detroit would be a model brotherhood city, to which Negroes might come as a place of refuge from the segregated South, and be welcomed with open arms. However, on April 5, 1956, a mob of nearly 500 people in Detroit threw rocks through the windows of the home of a 70-year-old retired private policeman who had just moved in. Although this man said he and his family were white people, the word got around among the neighbors that he was a Negro, and the same sentiment manifested itself in Detroit as in Cicero and Chicago, Ill. The news item about the Detroit incident is as follows:

"DETROIT MOB FORCES OUT FAMILY RUMORED NEGRO

"(By Bem Price)

"DETROIT, April 5.—Aged John W. Rouse bowed today to his neighbors' belief that he and his family are Negroes.

"Rouse said he had decided to sell and move after a near race riot by nearly 500 people last night on quiet, tree-lined Robson Avenue in northwest Detroit. Two windows in the modest brick home were broken by rocks before police broke up the growing demonstration.

*"Private policeman*

"Rouse, a retired private policeman, insists that he and all of his family, wife, daughter, and two grandchildren, are white. The 70-year-old former watchman sold the house to the Belmont Subdivision Association for $18,500, a $2,000 profit.

"Under the terms of the sale Rouse has 2 months in which to move. In the meantime he has free rent. When the sale was completed a 6-foot red-lettered sign appeared on the front lawn, reading, "Settled." It was taken down an hour later by the association. Police blocked both ends of the street, cutting off the steady stream of curiosity seekers who had been driving past.

"People think that (sign) means they're going to stay here," one member of the association said.

"Mrs. Rouse, also 70, cried, 'How do they know we are Negro? They haven't even seen us. We didn't even get out here until after dark Tuesday. I think there is something very wrong. I could expect something like this in a foreign country.'

*"Youngsters play*

"While Mrs. Rouse talked, her two grandchildren, a boy 7 and a girl 10, were playing with a baseball in the backyard under police protection.

" 'You know how children are,' she said. 'They don't know about things like this and I couldn't keep them in the house all day.

" 'I did not want them in the front yard where the other kids could make nasty remarks.'

*"Girls giggle*

"Off and on all day little girls in Bermuda shorts and long hose passed in front of the Rouse house giggling and occasionally yelling, 'There's a Negro in the crowd.'

"Large numbers of teen-agers gathered in knots across the street from time to time while housewives sat on porches in the warm sun gossiping about the neighborhood affair.

"Oddly, a reporter ranging the street could find no one who admitted having seen or known the Rouse family, but all insisted they knew they were Negro.

*"Racial unit*

"Sgt. Thomas Nickerson and Detective Ed Boggs, members of the special investigation bureau which deals with racial problems, tried all day to trace the source of the rumor which set off the demonstration.

" 'As near as we can determine,' said Boggs, 'it started with the movers. One of the workmen moving furniture into the house told a boy, "You ought to tell your folks there is a Negro moving in." It apparently started from there.'

"The gray-haired Mrs. Rouse said, 'I guess you know how all this started. I wish they had broken my dishes instead.'

*"Trace rumor*

"Boggs and the sergeant, in tracing the rumor, found it passed by word of mouth mostly from one agitated neighbor to another.

"The two officers said that their investigation showed that both grandchildren were registered at birth as white. Rouse said he is part Cherokee Indian and that his wife is Scotch-Irish and French-Canadian."

As I prepare this statement for this subcommittee, newspapers are carrying stories of riotous demonstrations taking place night after night in Detroit to protest a Negro moving into a white neighborhood. These demonstrations began on February 11 this year, and continued nightly, the crowds ranging up to 250, and requiring 25 policemen to prevent breaches of the peace. The demonstrators are now not only demonstrating in front of the house of the Negro, but also are demonstrating in front of the home of the white woman two blocks away who sold the house to the Negro.

The Washington Evening Star on Thursday, February 21, 1957, carried the following news item, and I quote it for the purpose of illustrating the fact that Detroit white people today are exhibiting the same antipathy to Negroes moving into white sections which

they exhibited last year in the case of the man who said he was an Indian and not a Negro:

"DETROIT CROWDS PROTEST NEGRO IN WHITE AREA

"DETROIT, February 21.—Nightly crowds demonstrating before the home of a Negro woman who moved into a white neighborhood February 1 have grown to more than 100 on Detroit's Northwest Side.

"Police said 100 to 150 were dispersed last night in the vicinity of 12356 Cherrylawn, a house recently purchased by Mrs. Ethel Watkins, a widow seamstress.

"Detroit's Commission on Community Relations said demonstrations began February 11 and have continued nightly since with most participants now also demonstrating before the home of a white woman who sold the home to Mrs. Watkins.

"The commission identified the white woman as Mrs. Eugenia Novak, who now lives two blocks away, and police said they had established an around-the-clock two-man guard there as well as at Mrs. Watkins' home.

"Police usually dispatch around 25 men to the neighborhood to disperse demonstrators and at times have barricaded Cherrylawn, turning back anyone who could not prove he lived there.

"There have been no daytime demonstrations and no peace breaches during the night gatherings, police said.

"David Gracie, field representative for the commission on community relations, said several demonstrators have been taken to the precinct police station and talked to, but none has been arrested.

"First crowds of demonstrators ranged around 200 to 250, but dwindled to 35 to 40 over the weekend, then increased last night and the night before."

Feeling between the races became so intense in Detroit in 1943 that the worst race riot in the Nation's history occurred there. I hold no brief for race riots. I have never seen a race riot. I have never been near one. I hope I never see one.

Race riots, of course, are illegal. They occur only when normal restraints are discarded, when respect for law and order is overcome by emotionalism. A race riot, or any kind of riot for that matter, is the final culmination of a feeling that anything is better than submission to the impending event.

We in the South have maintained all along that by reason of our experience with the race problem, we know better how to keep down race tensions, race riots, and ill feeling between the races, than those people in other sections who have not had the experience, and to whom the problem is a new one. We believe we are correct in this attitude and belief. I think the riots in Detroit, Cicero, Ill., the Trumbull Park housing project in the South Deering section of Chicago, the lake steamer riot in Buffalo, N. Y., the situation in Dearborn, Mich., where no Negro is permitted to live, and the evidences of race tension in many cities and areas throughout the country demonstrate the correctness of our views and position on this serious problem.

Regarding the 1943 Detroit race riot, the U. S. News & World Report of May 11, 1956, said:

"On that occasion, roving gangs of each race terrorized downtown Detroit and other parts of the city for 3 days—shooting, stabbing, beating, and looting. Before the United States Army could restore order, 25 Negroes and 9 whites were killed, 700 persons injured, and millions of dollars' worth of property damaged or destroyed."

That magazine in the same issue May 11, 1956, quoted a Detroit Negro paper as follows:

"Detroit seems to be rapidly returning to its old pattern of a few years ago, when we lived from crisis to crisis. . . . In the last 2 years there has been an unmistakable resurgence in organized resistance to Negroes based upon color prejudice. . . . No effort is made to correct tragic mistakes in attitudes which can only lead to the destruction of our whole town."

Another example of the resentment which the white people of Detroit have against Negroes moving into white sections is the occurrence in October 1955 when a Negro couple with 3 children moved into a home on Chalfonte Street. A mob of about 1,000 white people collected and threw rocks at the home. Two policemen were injured. The family sold the house and moved. This was reported in the Sunday Star on May 13, last year.

There are some things which cannot be forced upon people. Mayor Orville Hubbard of Dearborn, Mich., told a newspaper reporter in an interview in regard to Negroes moving into that city: "That can't get in here. We watch it. Every time we hear of a Negro moving in—for instance, we had one last year—we respond quicker than you do to a fire. That's generally known. It's known among the Negroes here."

He was asked if the NAACP ever called upon him, and he answered: "No we'd chase 'em to hell out of town." He also is quoted as saying: "The politicians have made the race question a football. It's hot up here, but we've taken an open stand in our community. Detroit hasn't done it; they're in a hell of a mess. We're for complete segregation, no ifs, ands or buts about it. That is my position and I tell the Negroes the same thing. I say 'We don't have equality among the whites and you don't have equality among the Negroes. Why stir up something when you are getting along all right?' "

The newspaper reporter also quoted Mayor Hubbard as saying: "The politicians are trading out their votes. Our Governor up here is way over on the thing. He's doing it for votes, right? And civilization is suffering over it."

While the mayor of Dearborn, Mich., states that he would chase the NAACP out if they called on him, they do call upon the mayor of Atlanta, the Governor of Georgia, and any other public official in our State at will. They hold regional meetings in Atlanta; in Birmingham, Ala.; New Orleans, La.; without any trouble at all. And while we know they are troublemakers, and while we know that more than 41 percent of their officers and board of directors are listed in the records of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as having connections with subversive organizations, and while we know that their program closely parallels the platform of the Communist Party, they are free to come and go as they please in our section so long as they are orderly and do not violate our laws.

We know, of course, that there is a breaking point in this problem of good race relations. We know that if attempts are made to force things beyond this breaking point by legislation, executive orders, or judicial decisions there finally will come violence. It is to avoid this tragic result that we are so vigorously protesting this legislation.

It is hypocritical for so-called liberals in other sections of the country to point an accusing finger at the South and say we are more intolerant and have more racial antagonism than other sections, in the face of such occurrences as fights between 300 white and Negro high-school students at the Kansas Municipal Stadium on April 24, last year; a fight between about 200 whites and Negroes, with thousands of spectators milling about, in Asbury Park, N. J., on July 2, last year; a fight between white and Negro sailors in Honolulu on June 9, last year, resulting in the death by stabbing of 1 white sailor; fighting between white and Negro Air Force recruits in Crocker, Mo., on June 1, last year; a racial disturbance in Muncie, Ind., on June 10, last year, resulting in the closing down of a newly integrated swimming pool in that city; Memorial Day race riots last year in Crystal Beach, Ontario, which was referred to in newspaper stories as "a nightmare of flashing knives and sobbing, frightened passengers"; a riot at Newport, R. I., among 1,500 white and Negro sailors and marines, their wives and women companions, on September 18, last year, which completely wrecked a club and sent 15 sailors to a hospital; 1,100 taxi drivers in St. Louis going on strike on August 18, last year, in protest against the hiring of Negro taxicab drivers. On July 25, last year, a Toronto judge upheld an apartment house owner in his refusal to rent to a Negro; cross burnings and court hearings in Columbus, Ohio, on November 14, last year, resulting from Negroes moving into a white section in Columbus; banishment of a Negro woman and 8 children from Cleveland, Ohio, on June 8, last year, although the woman tearfully protested she didn't want to return to Alabama.

Ohio seems to be learning something about the race problem. On August 1, last year, a Negro, one I. W. White, Jr., executive director of the council to aid migrant workers in Cleveland, wrote a letter to an Alabama schoolteacher, advising him to urge his pupils to stay in the South instead of coming North. He was reported as having said that "The exodus North of southern Negroes has hurt the battle of Negroes to obtain first-class citizenship." The Ohio Supreme Court on April 18, last year, upheld an amusement park near Cincinnati in refusing to admit a Negro.

The papers are constantly carrying news stories of similar occurrences and of racial problems in the North, East, and West. Several years ago Sgt. John Rice, an American Indian who was killed in Korea was refused burial in a privately operated Sioux City, Iowa, Memorial Park Cemetery. Burial in that cemetery is limited to Caucasians only and the body of the American Indian sergeant was finally interred at Arlington National Cemetery. Time does not permit me to give anything like a recital of all occurrences of this nature even for only 1 year. I have taken the time and trouble to give you merely a few of those which occurred in 1956.

While we are thinking about the sectional aspect of this problem, it is well to bear in mind that the first court case upholding segregated schools for white and colored children was in Massachusetts, and not in Georgia or any other Southern State. The case was that of *Sarah C. Roberts* v. *The City of Boston* decided in 1849, 108 years ago. It is reported in 59 Massachusetts 198 (Cushing 5, 1849–50). The opinion was written by Chief Justice Shaw. It was a case where the parents of Sarah C. Roberts, a Negro girl, wanted her to go to a primary school supported by the city of Boston for white children only. She had been assigned to a primary school supported by the city for colored children only. She alleged that this was discrimination on account of race and color. The court denied the petition and held that it was proper for the city of Boston to send this child to a colored school. On the question of prejudice the court had this to say:

"It is urged that this maintenance of separate schools tends to deepen and perpetuate the odious distinction of caste, founded in a deep-rooted prejudice in public opinion. This prejudice, if it exists, is not created by law, and probably cannot be changed by law."

On the question whether prejudice would not be as effectually fostered by compelling colored and white children to associate together in the same schools, the Massachusetts court said:

"At all events, it is a fair and proper question for the committee to consider and decide

upon, having in view the best interests of both classes of children placed under their superintendence, and we cannot say that their decision upon it is not founded on just grounds of reason and experience, and the results of a discriminating and honest judgment."

Although vote-hunting politicians are pandering to such groups as the radical NAACP in trying to force race mixing on protesting people, it is not succeeding. This is true in New York City as well as Atlanta, Ga. On February 7 this year, Robert C. Weaver, New York rent administrator, said that racial segregation is increasing in cities and suburbs. He said that "existing Negro ghetto in cities were getting larger, and newly lily-white subdivisions were growing beyond city lines." He also said "the majority of our dwelling units are still closed to minorities. Our failure to secure a wide distribution of ethnic groups throughout communities tends to increase segregation in all its forms."

He also said that the influx of Negroes into northern cities increased their concentration in those neighborhoods where housing was available to them, and this, in turn, resulted in some schools, parks, and other community facilities being utilized almost exclusively by Negroes while those in other neighborhoods served only white residents.

His statements are found in the following article in the February 8, 1957, issue of the Atlanta Constitution:

"NEW YORK RENT CHIEF FINDS SEGREGATION ON UPSWING IN CITIES AND SUBURBS

"NEW YORK, February 7.—Racial segregation is increasing in cities and suburbs, Robert C. Weaver, New York rent administrator, declared tonight.

"Despite scattered progress against discrimination in the sale and rental of housing, Commissioner Weaver said, existing Negro ghettos in cities were getting larger and new lily-white subdivisions were growing beyond city lines.

"'Signal gains have been made in New York State in barring discrimination in publicly assisted housing,' he said, 'but the majority of our dwelling units are still closed to minorities. Our failure to secure a wide distribution of ethnic groups throughout communities tends to increase segregation in all its forms.'

"Weaver said the influx of Negroes into Northern cities increased their concentration in those neighborhoods where housing was available to them.

"He declared this, in turn, resulted in some schools, parks, and other community facilities being utilized almost exclusively by Negroes while those in other neighborhoods served only white residents.

"Weaver and Herbert Bayard Swope were guests of honor at a fund-raising party for the national and New York State committees on discrimination in housing. Two hundred persons were present in the home of Mr. and Mrs. Ronald Tree, 123 East 79th Street.

"Weaver was chairman of the committees from their organization in 1950 through 1954. He resigned to become deputy State housing commissioner. Swope was honored for his service as chairman of the New York City commission on intergroup relations, which he held until last December 31.

"Weaver said passage at Albany of the Metcalf-Baker bill was 'imperative to extend nondiscrimination coverage to a broader segment of the housing market.'

"The bipartisan measure is now in the finance committee of the State senate and in the assembly's judiciary. It would outlaw discrimination in most of the 4 million private housing units in this State. The present Metcalf-Baker law bans discrimination in housing that receives any form of public aid.

"Algernon Black, chairman of the committee on discrimination in housing, declared passage of the Metcalf-Baker amendments would 'set an example in civil rights for the whole Nation.' He said it was the first antibias bill affecting private housing to be introduced in any State legislature."

It is a cruel fact that the hypocritical representations of some contemptible politicians seeking Negro votes have created false hopes in the minds of southern Negroes. Some Negroes have accepted these hypocritical statements at face value and are moving into such cities as New York City, Chicago, Ill.; Detroit, Mich.; Columbus and Cincinnati, Ohio, and elsewhere believing that they will be accepted into schools, churches, and all phases of community life.

When they arrive, they find the opposite is true. They are herded into squalid tenement quarters like cattle. They are overcharged. They are cheated. If they settle in a white neighborhood, the white people rush to move away as if the bubonic plague had struck the community. Although Negroes there are not segregated by law, they are segregated by reason of residence, and the only way their children can be sure of attending nonsegregated schools is for the school authorities to haul Negro children from Negro communities, past Negro schools, and enter them in white schools in white communities, and on the other hand to haul white children from white communities, past white schools, and put them in Negro schools in Negro communities. This is pointed up by an article in the Wall Street Journal of January 29, 1957, entitled "School Migration," which is as follows:

"SCHOOL MIGRATION—NEW YORK CITY REGROUPS PUPILS IN EFFORT TO ABOLISH NORTHERN FORM OF SEGREGATION

"(By Peter B. Bart)

"NEW YORK.—Every weekday morning several school buses pull up in front of Public School 93 in the Bronx and some 200 Negro children scamper off to class.

"Until last September these 7- and 8-year-old tots could walk to their own neighborhood schools. Today the city of New York takes them in buses the 20 city blocks or more to Public School 93.

"Their daily journey is part of an enforced migration of school children being launched by New York's board of education. It's a matter of racial integration. Until the Negro children were transferred to Public School 93, that school was attended almost entirely by white pupils living in the neighborhood. Now, like many of the 790 other New York public schools, it is mixed.

"Mixed is a big word in New York City these days. Without fanfare—but by no means without objections—city officials have begun a program of racial integration that involves more than a policy of nondiscrimination. As at Public School 93, many school youngsters are already being transported from one school district to another so the board of education can achieve what it feels is a proper balance.

"This is only a beginning. A master plan to speed up the integration process for New York's 925,000 public-school pupils has been drawn up by the subcommittee on zoning of the board's commission on integration. If approved, the plan will take effect next September. It proposes extensive use of city-financed buses to create racially balanced schools, and suggests that racial integration should be the sole objective of school zoning.

*"Rotating teachers*

"Also under consideration: A plan for the rotation of experienced teachers from 'good' schools to 'problem' schools so as to improve the quality of instruction in slum areas. Meantime, the board of education wants a $68 million boost—to $412 million—in its new budget; some of the additional money would be used to expand the work of the commission on integration.

"The aim of all this activity is to eliminate the school segregation that occurs in the North as an outgrowth of local housing patterns. To banish it the officials must also banish the traditional concept of the neighborhood school.

"Elsewhere in the North this campaign to abolish alleged de facto school segregation is also picking up in intensity—notably in cities like Chicago, Philadelphia, and Detroit. But the most impressive efforts are being made here in New York.

"Even here the size of the school migration can't be fully measured. One difficulty is that its operation is decentralized; school officials say they've made no attempt to add up the number of pupils transferred. Another is that the best informed officials hesitate to give a guess; they shy away from public comment because they think it is an explosive subject.

*"Crisscrossed city*

"Nevertheless, all concede that hundreds of New York students are already crisscrossing the city by bus and subway to schools far from home. In the slum-ridden Bedford-Stuyvesant area of Brooklyn, full-scale transfers of children from zone to zone have brought about integration in at least 20 schools since the opening of the school year.

"Not only are children from Negro sections like Harlem traveling to hitherto all-white schools; in some instances, white pupils are crossing regular school zones to enter all-Negro schools.

"'One junior high school in my three Brooklyn districts was almost entirely Negro last year, and it's now 50–50 in racial composition,' says Samuel M. Levenson, an assistant superintendent of schools. He adds: 'In another junior high school white students were brought in from a mile or so away to prevent it from becoming 100 percent Negro.'

"'We've got busloads of Negro children coming in from big distances,' the principal of a formerly all-white school in Manhattan relates. 'I hate to think what it's costing the city.'

"In some cases, integration is being achieved by means of minor gerrymandering of school zones without much transfer of pupils. This is particularly true of schools in so-called fringe areas where white and Negro neighborhoods converge.

*"Vigorous pursuit*

"Spearheading the integration movement in New York and other cities, is the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. At its 1956 convention in San Francisco, the NAACP resolved that 'the entire resources of this organization be dedicated to pursue with vigor the elimination of segregation in fact in the schools in northern communities. * * * We cannot wait for residential discrimination to be eradicated before something is done about the elimination of segregation in our northern public schools.'

"Backing the NAACP in a number of cities are such groups as the Urban League, Americans for Democratic Action, United Automobile Workers, plus local civil rights and religious groups.

"Not surprisingly, public officials are extremely sensitive on the issue. Consider the curious case of an obscure Brooklyn minister, Dr. Milton A. Galamison of the Siloam Presbyterian Church. Irritated by what he considered to be a delay in desegregating Brooklyn Junior High School 238, Dr. Galamison sent a personal telegram to Superintendent of Schools William Jansen, demanding the latter's resignation.

"To the minister's astonishment, Dr. Jansen personally called and 'asked for an appointment.' Later the telegram was released to the press along with a rather defensive explanation by Dr. Jansen of this position.

Thus the affair attained citywide publicity. And Dr. Galamison was elected president of the Brooklyn branch of the NAACP.

*"Moving away*

"School authorities tend to discount the protests they hear. 'We had some white parents who threatened violent action if their children were transferred to Negro schools,' confides a Brooklyn principal, 'but in the end some of them just gave up and moved away.' Agrees Rev. Dr. David M. Cory, executive secretary of the Brooklyn division, Protestant Council: 'You hear a lot of talk about violent opposition to school integration, but I have yet to find any actual manifestation of it.'

"Nonetheless, some open opposition exists. The scheme to rotate experienced teachers from good to problem schools has already drawn sharp objections from the powerful High School Teachers Association. Its president, Mrs. Concetta T. Roy, warns: 'It will only create more dissatisfied high-school teachers.'

"And Rev. W. Sterling Cary, of Brooklyn, says: 'I just don't think the schools are the answer. The real problem lies in the housing ghettoes themselves which are the cause of northern school segregation. And I think all this rezoning could be a hardship on children who may have to travel great distances to school every day.'

"'I believe we're being stampeded into a dubious program,' contends the principal of a recently integrated Brooklyn school. 'We have incontrovertible evidence of large numbers of white children withdrawing from schools when Negroes are brought in from outside. Many New York schools will be 100 percent colored within 2 years after Negro children are introduced. The hard truth is that we can't have full-scale integration until both Negroes and whites are really ready for it.'

"But such voices seem unlikely to halt the rush. As one highly placed New York school official puts it: 'Any racial issue is political dynamite in a city like this. If anyone suggests that the integration program be slowed down while we find out where we're going he's immediately branded a racist'."

Any unbiased and objective study of the race question will show that where there is any appreciable number of colored people, generally the same attitudes exist and the same feelings are held, whether it be Detroit, Chicago, New York City, or below the Mason-Dixon line. One difference which exists is that people in the South are less hypocritical, and deal with the problem more realistically than people in other sections, to whom the problem is a new one.

At present rate of migration, the people in the North, East, and West are not going to remain unacquainted with the problem much longer. It is probably a good idea that Negroes are being attracted away from the South into other sections by the pleasing stories they hear of higher wages, good living conditions, and integrated schools and dwellings.

This migration very likely will continue, unless such people as the Cleveland judge who banished the Negro woman and her eight children back to Alabama, and the Cleveland Negro who wrote to the Alabama schoolteacher to keep his pupils in the South, can convince southern Negroes that they are better off at home, and that they are not wanted in the North.

In the South, we have known for many years that if Negro children are to be educated, the cost of educating them would have to be borne by white people. I live in De Kalb County, Ga., a county whose population now is about 210,000. It was 186,000 in 1950. The city of Atlanta lies in Fulton County and De Kalb County. I want to give you some facts about our treatment of Negro children, which may be news to some of you.

In 1950, I requested the superintendent of county schools in my home county to give me figures from his records regarding the number of Negro children in our county public school system, the cost of operating those schools, and by whom that cost was paid. These facts were that we had 2,042 Negro children in the county public school system; that the county (not including the State contribution) spent $85.33 per pupil on white and colored alike which amounted to $174,243.86 the county paid toward the education of these Negro children.

His information further showed that Negro property owners in De Kalb County paid school tax upon 1,348 parcels of real estate, total valuation $357,320, net valuation after deducting the homestead exemptions $77,600. Negro property owners paid taxes upon 842 items of personal property, gross valuation $79,500, net valuation after homestead exemption $50,750. The Negro property owners thus paid school tax upon $128,350 of taxable property. Our school tax rate is $1.50 per 100. The total amount of school taxes paid by those property-owning Negroes was $1,925.35.

The county operated 4 Negro school buses to haul Negro schoolchildren to the county public schools at an annual expense of $2,000 each, or a total expense just for school buses of $8,000. So, the total school taxes paid by the Negroes of De Kalb County into the county school system was less than one-fourth the actual money spent by the county to haul their children to the schoolhouses. The $1,925.35 would have provided less than $1 per pupil for the 2,042 Negro children who attend the county public schools.

We have known all through the years that we have to carry the tax burden. We have carried it uncomplainingly, and are now carrying it uncomplainingly, because we know that if the burden of educating their own children were carried by the Negroes, they simply would not be educated. Last year, in 1956, I asked the county school superintendent to furnish me the same information which he previously furnished me for 1950. Last school year the State of Georgia paid $92.35 per pupil for operating purposes, and De Kalb County paid $51.70 per pupil, making a total of $144.05 per pupil. Of the $51.70 local payment the Negro taxpayers paid $1.93 per pupil; the white taxpayers paid $49.77 per pupil. In the past 6 years the De Kalb County Board of Education has spent $1,377,223.28 rehousing Negro children and purchasing school equipment for them. This represents $517.95 per Negro pupil in capital outlay.

The value of Negro property in my home county has grown now to $326,920, and their annual school taxes for 1956 amounted to $5,124.47, which, as I stated before, amounts to $1.93 per Negro pupil.

On Sunday, December 11, 1955, De Kalb County dedicated 13 new school buildings. Eight of those were for white children, and five of them were for Negro children. At this time all Negro children in our county are in new classrooms. All Negro schools meet full standards for accreditation; of the Negro teachers 17 percent hold master's degrees; 75 percent hold bachelor of arts or bachelor of science degrees, and only 8 percent have less than 4 years of college. No Negro teacher with less than a bachelor of science degree has been employed in the last 5 years.

Such legislation as that which you are now considering would disrupt our peaceful relations. Destruction of our segregated system of schools would carry with it destruction of the opportunities now enjoyed by qualified Negro teachers in the South. This is pointed up by a recent article written by a Negro named Davis Lee, who is publisher of the Newark (N. J.) Telegram. This article was written by Lee after visiting in Georgia and the South and seeing for himself what the conditions are. I quote several paragraphs from Editor Lee's article:

(By Davis Lee, Publisher, Newark (N. J.) Telegram)

"The efforts being made by certain paid agitators and pressure groups to have segregated schools in the South declared unconstitutional may cause southern Negroes to lose a lot more than they will gain. * * *

"Integration in the schools in the North and East is not a howling success. A Negro can attend most of the schools up here and get an education, but few of the States that educate him will hire him as a teacher. The State of Connecticut doesn't have 25 Negro teachers.

"Recently I visited Albany, the capital of New York State, and learned that the city only employed three Negro teachers. Our own city, Newark, with Negroes constituting 20 percent of the population employs 2,200 teachers, but only 70 of them are Negroes, and we don't have 1 Negro principalship.

"Nowhere in these integrated States do Negroes get anywhere near proportionate representation. Every device is employed to keep qualified Negroes from being assigned. Recently a reputable New York labor union made a report on the employment of Negro teachers in New York City and charged that a systematic scheme has been adopted to exclude Negroes as teachers.

"This is not true in the South. The State of Georgia employes 7,313 Negro teachers and paid them close to $15 million in salaries last year. North Carolina paid its Negro teachers over $22 million last year. Florida is another State that ranks at the top on teacher pay.

"If these States, that are now pouring millions of dollars annually into Negro pockets which provides our people with money that enables them to enjoy the dignity of man, to enjoy prestige and respectability, to buy homes and the necessities of life, are forced to abandon the segregated school, 75 percent of the Negro teachers in the South will lose their jobs. Not only that, but approximately 20,000 Negro principals will lose their jobs as well.

"Can the southern Negro afford to take this sort of economic licking for the privilege of sending his kids to a mixed school? I don't think so. The price is too great. Again, what will happen to race relations in the South if school integration is forced down its throat? At present 50 percent of the southern Negroes assume very little personal responsibility. Their employers do everything for them including selecting an undertaker when a death occurs.

"Certainly ruling out segregation in the schools is not going to change the habits of these Negroes, but white employers will definitely change their habits, and to the detriment of these poor people who are not responsible for the forced change. * * *

"This present movement to end segregation in the schools is merely the beginning of a well laid plan to completely end segregation in everything in the South. If this happens, the Negro will be thrown into direct competition with the white race, and our business institutions will crumble.

"No place in the world do Negroes own and control as much as do those in the South. Atlanta is without question the Negro capital of the world. It is the center of Negro culture, education, business and finance. And both Negroes and whites live, work and operate businesses without either being conscious of the other race.

"This movement to integrate the schools in the South is loaded with more racial dynamite than appears on the surface, and the Negro will be the one who is blown away.

"During the past 2 years I have spent more time in the South than I have in my

office, and I have interviewed thousands of Negroes in all walks of life and I have found very few who favor mixed schools. They want their own schools, but equal facilities. This being the situation, one questions the fairness of forcing these colored citizens to accept what they don't want. If a little group of paid agitators succeed in forcing their will upon these people, it appears to me that they should at least be given an opportunity to be heard.

"Right now the southern Negro is in a better spot educationally, politically and economically than the Negroes anyplace else in the world. Race relations are continually improving. Every day more southerners are recognizing the Negro as a man and according him the respect which he merits, but the southern Negro himself can do more about improving conditions than can courts, legislation or pressure groups."

In the 5-year period from 1951–55, a $274 million school construction program was carried out in the State of Georgia. More than half of this school construction, 54 percent of it to be exact, went into construction of Negro schoolhouses. The Negro schools are exactly the same modern, fully equipped schools as the white. In my own county Negroes have fared better than white students, because now all Negro students are in new construction while many white students are still using old schoolhouses. Here are photographs of some new schools constructed for Negro pupils.

We name the Negro schools after outstanding Negro citizens, which we believe is an inspiration to Negro children to become good citizens themselves.

We also provide for higher education of Negroes. There are Negro colleges and universities in Georgia, and the State has a scholarship assistance program under which, during the school year 1954–55, 2,290 grants were made to 1,825 Negroes studying at 67 institutions, at a cost to the State of $208,217.90 for that 1 school year. So you can see, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that the white people in my State and in my congressional district are giving the Negro children, almost wholly unaided by the Negroes themselves, unlimited educational advantages. We have done this, and we are doing this, uncomplainingly.

We encourage them to progress as much as possible. In my home district, Negroes have progressed to a remarkable extent. They own banks, radio stations, insurance companies, drugstores, grocery stores, office buildings, undertaking establishments, and commercial businesses of practically every description. In will probably shock some of you to know that there are Negro policemen serving on the Atlanta City Police Force and that a Negro member serves on the city of Atlanta School Board. There are some 25,000 registered Negro voters in the city of Atlanta. Everyone is registered who wants to register just as the white people are, and everyone votes who wants to vote just as the white people do. They do not have to vote by themselves. They stand in the same lines the white voters stand in and they use the same voting machines which the white voters use.

We insist upon segregation—yes, for the experience of generations and years has demonstrated that good will and the mutual advantage of both races is best served on a segregated basis. The Negroes know that as well as we do, and the peaceful relations which exist between us demonstrate unquestionably that our solution of the problem is the best solution.

So long as meddling busybodies will leave the whites and Negroes alone in our section, we have peaceful relations; we will live side by side on friendly terms; the Negroes will have unlimited educational opportunities, and will progress as fast as they are able to progress. They will fare better with us than they will in the North, and the sensible Negroes know it. Our segregated system keeps down the riots which you have had in Detroit, Chicago, Cicero, and other places when a Negro moves into a white neighborhood. We know the Negro must have a roof over his head, and we help him provide it in his own neighborhoods. If that neighborhood grows and expands, we help him get located in another neighborhood. He does not have to move into a section where he is not wanted, and where the white people gather by the thousands and throw rocks through the windows and inflict personal violence upon the occupants.

Both Negroes and whites when left alone will voluntarily segregate themselves as to schools, churches, dwellings, and social affairs. This is demonstrated in Baltimore where the school pattern is substantially the same as it was before the fraudulent decision of the Supreme Court on May 17, 1954. It is demonstrated by the segregated pattern which is followed in New York City where the cheap politicians and the meddlers are now trying to bolster up a sagging integrated program by hauling bus loads of Negro children from Negro neighborhoods to white schools and bus loads from white neighborhoods to Negro schools, and by putting on a program of forced integrated dancing among the pupils as they are doing there.

This tendency of the races to voluntarily segregate themselves is proven here in Washington where in spite of all the frantic efforts to force integration of the races in schools, the introduction of Negroes into a white school does not turn it into an integrated school—it turns it into a Negro school within the course of a few years, just as fast as the white people can make arrangements to uprcot themselves from the community and reestablish themselves over in Virginia or Maryland where they are not plagued with this crackpot theory of forced integration. These things are the facts of life, and it is far better to settle them peacefully than it is to push things to the breaking point where law and order break down and violent rioting with its tragic consequences takes place.

Mr. Chairman, if the American people are to remain a Nation of self-governed people, government must be kept close to the people. There can be no dispute that our Government is a Republic of sovereign States. Under our Constitution, control of local affairs is the function of the State. It also guarantees to the citizen the right of trial by jury. So long as these two constitutional provisions are respected and carried out, the American people will have self-government and protection of individual liberties and personal rights.

Local government should not be taken from the States and placed in the hands of bureaucrats in Washington. If local self-government is destroyed, and if the right to trial by jury is lost, then individual liberty and freedom will surely be lost along with those two constitutional bulwarks.

This legislation is an attempt to overturn those two constitutional provisions. The radicals who want to remake our Government and remake the world know well enough that substitution of judicial dictatorship for trial by jury is a long step toward that objective. This legislation goes hand in glove with such schemes. It is a strong threat to our form of government.

This legislation is also a threat, and a serious one, to law enforcement. The policemen and sheriffs who have the job of protecting the lives, safety, and property of law-abiding citizens have an extremely difficult task now of coping with the thieves, robbers, yokers, purse snatchers, rapists, and murderers. Even under existing laws, this radical organization, the NAACP, is continually bombarding the FBI, the Attorney General's Department, and other Federal Government agencies with false and unfounded claims that Negro criminals are being manhandled, mistreated, oppressed, and deprived of civil rights. To illustrate the absurd, ridiculous, and unreasonable extent to which these tactics are carried, I want to give you some figures from a statement of the Attorney General introduced by Chairman CELLER at a committee hearing before Subcommittee No. 2 of the Judiciary Committee on July 13, 1955. These figures appear on page 176 of that printed hearing. In the years for which total number of complaints of alleged civil rights violations were given and total number of cases tried and convictions secured, the figures given by the Attorney General were as follows: In 1940, 8,000 civil rights complaints were received; no figures given as to how many cases prosecuted, or how many convictions secured. In 1942, 8,612 complaints received; prosecutive action taken in 76 cases; no statement as to how many convictions or acquittals. In 1946, 7,229 complaints were received in civil rights and political cases. Fifteen cases were prosecuted, in which five convictions were secured. In 1947, 13,000 complaints were received; 12 cases were prosecuted, of which 4 defendants were convicted. In 1948, 14,500 complaints were received; 20 cases prosecuted; no figures given as to convictions. In that same statement the Attorney General estimated that 15,000 complaints would be received during 1949.

Certainly when a situation exists where 13,000 complaints are filed alleging violations of civil rights, of which 12 were considered worth trying, and of that 12 cases tried 4 convictions were secured, undoubtedly the world's record is broken for the filing of groundless complaints.

Yet these groundless charges, stirred up by the NAACP, 41 percent of whose officers and directors are cited in the records of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as having connection with subversive organizations, caused the harassment and hindrance, and in some cases intimidation, of policemen, sheriffs, prosecuting attorneys, and law-enforcement officers all over this country. It cost the taxpayers millions of dollars to process 13,000 groundless complaints. The Department of Justice, according to the testimony of witnesses, maintains in the Federal Bureau of Investigation 172 specialists on civil rights matters, and the Attorney General maintains in his Civil Rights Section 7 civil rights attorneys and 4 other civil rights employees.

While the Attorney General's office is spending millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money on this civil rights foolishness, he is costing the taxpayers of the country other millions of dollars which could be saved if money spent for employees in this useless Civil Rights Section were used to employ attorneys to try cases which are 5 years and more behind, in the Tax Division, and Court of Claims, cases in which interest is running against the Government, and will finally have to be paid, at the rate of $5,000 per day or nearly $2 million per year. If the Attorney General would use this money which he is wasting fooling with 13,000 groundless civil rights complaints, and hire lawyers to catch up with these untried cases in which interest is running against the Government, those millions of dollars could be saved. Testimony on this waste of taxpayers' money is found in the statement of Attorney General Brownell on page 56 of the Senate State, Justice, and Commerce Subcommittee hearings on May 10, 1956, and testimony of Mr. W. E. Burger on page 47 of the State, Justice, and Commerce Subcommittee hearings of the House on March 2, 1953.

One might well ask why the United States Department of Justice would continue year

after year to encourage and magnify thousands of groundless complaints, which their experience of 18 years since the civil rights section was set up in 1939, has demonstrated to be groundless. I think the testimony of Mr. S. A. Andretta, administrative assistant to the Attorney General, on page 149 of the State, Justice Senate subcommittee hearings for fiscal 1957, let the cat out of the bag and gives the answer. That testimony is:

"Senator JOHNSON. Mr. Andretta, I want to ask you one or two questions.

"I understand that the appropriation carries provision for several lawyers in the civil rights section; is that right? I understand it is seven.

"Mr. ANDRETTA. Yes; it is.

"Senator JOHNSON. I understand that going back to 1951 you have had the same number.

"Mr. ANDRETTA. Yes; the same staff.

"Senator JOHNSON. If you were not asking for any additional people in the civil rights section in all these years, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955, why is it that you are asking for a whole new division in an election year, 1956?

"Mr. ANDRETTA. I don't know the answer to that.

"Senator JOHNSON. Thank you very much."

Now the same question presents itself with reference to these pending bills. If the 18 years' experience with this civil rights section in the Justice Department shows that as many as 13,000 civil rights complaints will be stirred up and filed in a year, of which all but 4 were groundless, what reason is there for creating a new "civil rights division" which would be done under this legislation?

One reason, I think, is this: Although there are many good law-abiding Negroes in this country, nevertheless the bulk of the crimes of violence are committed by Negroes. The records show it, and there is no escaping the truth of it. This radical organization, the NAACP, under the guise of protecting civil rights, runs to the assistance of Negro criminals and seeks to protect them from the punishment for the crimes they commit. This has been their record.

This pending legislation, if enacted, would tie the hands of law enforcement officers throughout this country, and would place law-abiding men, women, and children at the mercy of brutal, merciless, hardened criminals.

Much of the crime of this country is committed by dope addicts. A Federal Narcotics Bureau report issued on February 15 shows that 60 percent of the drug addicts in the United States are Negroes. The news item giving this report follows:

"SIXTY PERCENT OF UNITED STATES DRUG ADDICTS ARE NEGROES

"Washington, February 15.—A Narcotics Bureau report that 60 percent of United States drug addicts are Negroes was made public Friday.

"Negroes represent about 10 percent of the total population, the report said. It was contained in testimony by Narcotics Commissioner H. J. Anslinger to a House appropriations subcommittee in closed hearing February 4.

"The Bureau's breakdown gave these other figures: White population, 87.8 percent of the total, with 29 percent of the addicts; Mexican, 1.5 percent of the population, 4 percent of the addicts; Puerto Rico, 0.2 percent of the population, 5 percent of the addicts; other races, 0.5 percent of the population, 2 percent of the addicts.

"Representative PASSMAN (Democrat, Louisiana) said in a statement the analysis was furnished at his request. He commented it shows an 'extremely one-sided' racial distribution of addiction, and he added:

"I think this is significant and should be brought into true perspective, so that the problem may be factually and objectively recognized by the public."

Here in the city of Washington, the Nation's Capital, where both white and black ought to make the best possible showing, crime records for fiscal year 1955 show that of major crimes committed, 82 percent were committed by Negroes, the figures being 1,947 committed by whites, 9,053 committed by Negroes.

The crime records of the Federal Department of Justice show that of 13 Eastern, Northern, and Western States, including Illinois, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, the rate per 100,000 of Negroes in prison on felony charges was 681 percent over whites. The same crime record of the Justice Department shows that in 10 Southern States the Negro is a better citizen than his Northern counterpart, the rate of Negroes per 100,000 in prison on felony there being only 248 percent over the whites.

Law enforcement officers in every section of this country know that this pending legislation would seriously cripple law enforcement.

On February 1 this year, Police Chief William H. Parker of Los Angeles, Calif., in a speech at Fresno to the California Peace Officers Association, pointed out the danger of this legislation. He told the association that these very bills pending before your subcommittee, being the civil rights program offered by the Eisenhower administration through Attorney General Herbert Brownell "would put the police out of business." He further said that he opposes the proposal to establish a Federal Commission to Investigate alleged civil-rights violations by local law enforcement agencies. He declared that such a group (Federal Civil Rights Commission) would play into the hands of the Communists, "who know they cannot bring about a revolution or make advances in the face of a resolute police force."

The California Peace Officers Association, after hearing Chief Parker, authorized its executive committee to petition Congress to "look at both sides and beware of legislation which might seriously cripple law enforcement."

The following news item regarding this action was carried in the Los Angeles Times for February 2:

"PARKER HITS CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION—LAW ENFORCEMENT MAY BE HAMPERED, HE TELLS OFFICERS

"FRESNO, February 1.—The California Peace Officers Association, at the urging of Police Chief William H. Parker of Los Angeles, asks Congress to be careful of any civil rights legislation which would hamper law enforcement officers.

"The group's action was taken here today. The executive committee was authorized to caution Congress to 'look at both sides and beware of legislation which might seriously cripple law enforcement.'

"San Diego Police Chief Elmer Jansen, association president, said the action will not commit the organization to oppose or support any specific legislation but will state the organization's views.

"Parker declared the civil rights program offered by the Eisenhower administration through Attorney General Herbert Brownell 'would put the police out of business.'

"He said he opposes a proposal to establish a Federal commission to investigate alleged civil rights violations by local law-enforcement agencies.

"Parker declared such a group would play into the hands of Communists 'who know they cannot bring about a revolution or make advances in the face of a resolute police force.'"

Mr. Edward Scheidt, motor vehicle commissioner of North Carolina, a former FBI agent for 22 years, has already testified before your subcommittee. He has warned that this legislation would be an open invitation to any complainant to circumvent local governmental facilities by dealing directly with Federal authorities merely by claiming that some civil right was endangered or violated. This would bring law enforcement to a complete halt, inasmuch as there is no possibility that Federal courts can take over and expeditiously handle the trial of State law violations. There are not enough of them and they do not sit long enough.

There is no necessity for this legislation in order to protect voting rights. Ample law now exists to protect any person from being deprived of his right to vote. I can cite you a case tried in Georgia in 1955 which will refute any claim to the contrary. The case was that of Charlie W. Thornton et al versus C. C. Martin et al., registrars of Randolph County, Ga. It was civil action No. 520 in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia, Columbus division. This is the congressional district so ably represented by my distinguished colleague, Congressman E. L. FORRESTER.

This suit was brought by nine Negro plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and others who alleged that their names had been illegally removed from the voters registration list in 1954. A jury verdict was taken in which the allegations of the plaintiffs were sustained, and $880 damages was awarded to the named plaintiffs. A decree was entered by the court upon the jury verdict in which the registrars were ordered to place the names of 134 Negroes back on the voters list within 10 days of the decree, and the order was complied with.

If there are any other Negroes in Georgia who claim they are illegally deprived of the right to vote, the same remedy, under the same law, is available to them in the United States District Court just as in the Randolph County case. Being brought under Federal laws, in a Federal court, the same remedy is available to citizens of any State, a fact which is well known to the Attorney General, and to his civil rights section.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is not only dangerous in that it threatens a complete breakdown of law enforcement; it is unconstitutional; it is absurd and ridiculous; and finally, it is unnecessary. I urge this subcommittee to so declare it.

---

## Fortieth Anniversary of United States Citizenship of People of Puerto Rico

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 27, 1957*

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, March 2, 1957, will mark the 40th anniversary of the United States citizenship of the great people of Puerto Rico. I rejoice with them in the celebration of this memorable day.

Love of freedom and adherence to democratic ideals have been the outstanding characteristics of these fine Americans.

The present administration of the island, under the inspiring leadership of the Honorable Luis Muñoz-Marín, is to be congratulated upon its almost unbelievable progress in all fields of social, political, and economic development.

May the years ahead see its continued growth and prosperity.

# SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1957

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our light and our life, whose judgments search all things, and whose love beareth all things: for this dedicated moment, turning from our often divisive loyalties and party watchwords, we would bow humbly in a unity of spirit, with a sense of our oneness in Thee. Forgive us for the presumption of asking that Thy kingdom come, and then by our own selfish stubbornness barring the way when it seems to come through us.

Grant to Thy servants in this body a fundamental fealty to the common good, expressing itself in divergent attitudes and convictions which are the glory of our national heritage, yet putting above all partisan advantage the weal and welfare of the Republic to which we have solemnly pledged our supreme allegiance. Send us forth this day to our waiting tasks, whose implications are so vast, saying gratefully—as Thy servants have said across all the changing centuries—"He restoreth my soul." In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

## DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
*Washington, D. C., February 28, 1957.*

*To the Senate:*

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
*President pro tempore.*

Mr. PASTORE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 27, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## REPORT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 28, 1957.*

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2460. An act to improve the career opportunities of nurses and medical specialists of the Army, Navy, and Air Force;

H. R. 2797. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of a military department to furnish stevedoring and terminal services and facilities to commercial steamship companies, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4285. An act to authorize the sale of degaussing equipment by the Department of the Navy to the owners or operators of privately owned merchant ships of United States registry.

## HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 2460. An act to improve the career opportunities of nurses and medical specialists of the Army, Navy, and Air Force;

H. R. 2797. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of a military department to furnish stevedoring and terminal services and facilities to commercial steamship companies, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4285. An act to authorize the sale of degaussing equipment by the Department of the Navy to the owners or operators of privately owned merchant ships of United States registry.

## ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW, AT 10 A. M.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce, for the information of the Senate, that one of the great newspaper reporters of our time, the congressional authority for the New York Times, Mr. William S. White, has said in his recent book, The Citadel, that the Senate is a body of accommodation. Mr. President, it is the hope of the leadership that we can establish beyond peradventure of a doubt the truth of Mr. White's statement. So we plan to have the Senate convene at an early hour and remain in session until a late hour—as late as Senators will permit the Senate to continue in session profitably. We plan to have the Senate meet on Saturday. We plan to have the sessions of the Senate next week convene at an earlier hour than usual, and remain in session later in the day than usual, until we reach a vote on the Middle East joint resolution.

Mr. President, I am convinced that there is not one Senator who desires to refuse to face up to deciding whether the Senate should pass the Middle East joint resolution. There are many Senators who desire to discuss it more fully than they have been able to do up to this time. So, Mr. President, if the Senate will accommodate me and will go along with my recommendations, we shall have the Senate convene on tomorrow at 10 a. m. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 10 a. m. tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## THE MIDDLE EAST JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am hopeful that we shall be able to obtain a vote on the so-called Russell-Byrd-Stennis amendment this week; in fact, I should like to see that vote come late today, if it were possible, and if Senators could make their speeches by that time. It may be that during the day I shall submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement to set a time for the taking of a vote on that specific amendment, in the hope that I can appeal to all my colleagues—if they will not agree to unanimous consent for voting on the whole joint resolution—to agree that we act on it one step at a time.

Mr. President, regardless of whether the joint resolution constitutes emergency legislation or not, it is important proposed legislation. So long as it is before the Senate, the Senate cannot consider other important proposed legislation which already has been reported and has been placed on the calendar.

I am very anxious that we establish a good record in the Senate this year—a record for thoroughly and adequately considering every measure coming before us. I hope we have an affirmative record, a record of achievement. I have heard it said by great authorities in the field of congressional procedures that the 84th Congress was one of the most effective Congresses and one of the Congresses of greatest achievement. I hope the 85th Congress will excel the record of the 84th Congress. We can do so only by having all 96 of us work together.

Mr. President, I turn now to another subject.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

## TEXAS NEWSPAPERS COMMENT ON PROPOSAL TO APPLY SANCTIONS AGAINST ISRAEL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have made clear my own position regarding proposals that the United Nations apply economic sanctions against Israel.

Today it appears that the sanctions threat is easing. I believe most Americans hope and pray this is the case. I deeply appreciate the contributions which my colleagues in the Congress—in both the House of Representatives and the Senate—have made to this matter; and particularly do I appreciate the very courageous and very able position taken by the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND].

I ask unanimous consent that editorials on this subject from two Texas newspapers, the Houston Chronicle and the Greenville Herald-Banner, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Chronicle of February 20, 1957]

IF SANCTIONS, THEN CONSISTENCY

It appears less likely now that the move in the United Nations to impose sanctions against Israel for her failure to withdraw troops from Egyptian territory will get anywhere. Which is well.

The Israelis are stubborn and uncooperative, it is true. They are defying a U. N. demand in maintaining troops in the Gaza Strip and the area adjoining the Gulf of Aqaba. If they would go ahead and withdraw, the action should help release Middle East tensions and perhaps contribute to ultimate solutions.

But, after all, the Egyptians used to raid Israeli territory from the Gaza Strip. And they blockaded the Gulf of Aqaba for several years, preventing Israeli shipping from entering. The U. N. ordered Egypt to end the blockade shortly after it was imposed, but Egypt never did.

Those shouting for sanctions against Israel seem to disregard these facts.

The U. N. can never prosper under a double standard of morality. The question of sanctions against Russia for the rape of Hungary scarcely was raised. Nor has there been any move to apply pressure on India, which for 8 years has prevented the holding of a plebiscite in Kashmir.

Pressure upon Israel would be all right if pressure had been used on these offenders. But pressure is not right if applied to the small but not to the big and strong.

---

[From the Greenville Herald-Banner of February 17, 1957]

SANCTIONS THREAT EASES

In effect Egypt for 8 years has been exercising a kind of unilateral sanction against Israel. It refuses to let the ships of Israel ply the Suez Canal. It fortified strategic positions at the inlet of the Gulf of Aqaba, which is Israel's link with the Red Sea and thence with the outside world, from which it interdicted with gunfire Israel's use of that waterway.

The purpose of these actions was of course to strangle the little republic to death, by choking off its commerce with the world.

The United Nations in 1948 condemned this, by the same sort of resolution by which it has asked Israel in recent weeks to get its troops out of positions by which it interdicts Egypt's blockading fort at Aqaba.

Nothing was done against Egypt 8 years ago except to administer a slap on the wrist by resolution. The blockade of the gulf and the denial of passage to Suez to Israeli shipping went right on. So far as we know there was no threat to impose sanctions on Egypt for this definance of U. N. orders. The big nations were too busy on other matters to pay attention to this seemingly minor affair.

So Egypt waxed ambitious, and Nasser came to power, and eventually seized the Suez Canal itself, 12 years or more ahead of the time the 100-year-old treaty with the international operating company was to expire.

Now, as Egypt did 8 years ago, Israel refuses to obey the U. N. resolutions. She insists withdrawal of her troops would be followed by Egypt's reoccupation of the Aqaba area and of Gaza, the land base from which Egypt has made commando raids on Israel. Unless and until guaranties she can depend on are given her against Egypt's resumption of hostilities, Israel says she won't withdraw.

The threat of sanctions against Israel, urged by the Afro-Asian Nations, is now subsiding.

Warnings from both parties in the United States Congress took the wind out of the sails of sanctions. Why sanctions against Israel for disobeying U. N. resolutions, when Russia disobeyed them in the case of Hungary, and Egypt herself had disobeyed them in the case of Aqaba and Israel's use of the canal?

Even Dag Hammarskjold, U. N. Secretary General, got round to warning against sanctions, on the ground such extreme action would merely complicate matters and make a settlement more difficult if not impossible.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend, the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to pay my tribute to both the majority leader and the minority leader, who in this case have shown the finest type of bipartisanship and statesmanship in connection with this important foreign-policy matter. I sincerely believe that when a satisfactory result is attained in connection with an agreement between our country and Israel which will end the great threat of injustice and the great threat against world peace, these two distinguished Americans will be found to have made a salient contribution in bringing about that result.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to join wholeheartedly in the expression of the sentiments which have just been voiced by the Senator from New York.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

## SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was delighted to read in the Tuesday, February 26, issue of the Wisconsin State Journal, published in the State capital, an editorial praising the statesmanship of the Senate's majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON].

The editorial, entitled "Senator JOHNSON Takes the Long View," reflects, I believe, thinking sentiment all over the Nation, in praise of the responsible leadership which has been exercised by our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Texas. His leadership is demonstrated not only in the present foreign-policy instance—as regards advancing the Eisenhower Mid-East doctrine—but also in innumerable other instances, when he has set aside partisanship in the interest of national unity and well being.

Mr. President, I now wish to address myself to another matter.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

## SOUND USE OF DEMOCRATIC AMBASSADORS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, while I am on the subject of the majority leader, I should like to state that I agree with the basic sentiment which he has also expressed, concerning the desirability of continued utilization of the talents of outstanding members of the Democratic Party in America's diplomatic service abroad.

Since I believe that partisanship must definitely stop at the water's edge, and since I believe that a United States Ambassador serving the President and 170 million people abroad is a "frontline soldier" in the never-ending fight for peace, I think it is eminently sound to draw upon the fullest abilities of our Democratic friends. That includes outstanding men like Ambassador Bruce.

I would be less than human if I did not state frankly that I hope, too, that the most earnest consideration will of course be given by the administration to outstanding representatives who happen to be of my own political party.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no authority to give the Senator from Wisconsin any assurance about this matter; but I can state that I feel that my information is such that I can give him adequate assurance that his administration is not going to overlook giving real consideration to members of the Republican Party. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. I am glad to have the benefit of that statement by the majority leader. I trust that he speaks with authority, and that we shall have a clear-cut demonstration that what he has said is 100 percent correct. But, at the same time, I very definitely feel that not only must we not close the door to able leadership in the opposite party, but in considering Embassy assignments the door must be held wide open for truly deserving and well-qualified members of the Republican Party.

I can well understand why some of my Republican associates may feel at times that their own suggestions for appointments by the administration have not been sufficiently heeded.

I state very frankly that, in my judgment, this administration has definitely not always been either as fair or as considerate as it should be toward those of its own party who have been in the forefront selflessly serving it and the Nation. I say that irrespective of any personal consideration of myself or any other specific member of the party. I am speaking for the principle of remembering one's own friends, which the administration has not always done. I am not speaking on the issue of particular personalities.

I feel that the administration can and should remember advice and suggestions of its own supporters. I feel that, simultaneously, it is both feasible and desirable that the administration give consideration to bipartisan and nonpartisan selections for Embassy posts. There is nothing inconsistent in this twofold approach, although, necessarily, the number of top jobs available is of course limited.

Now, however, with particular reference to the need for a patient solution of the Middle East problem—a noncoercive solution, if it is at all possible—I send to the desk the text of the Wisconsin State Journal editorial in reference

to the majority leader, and this, sir, is a Republican newspaper. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR JOHNSON TAKES THE LONG VIEW

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, showed his ability to rise above partisan advantage and petty criticism in his statement Monday on the Middle East situation.

JOHNSON said that the vital ingredients for a workable solution of the Israel-Egypt dispute are time and patience. So long as the two parties keep talking there is chance for a settlement, he declared, adding that when either side is faced with a "put up or shut up" ultimatum there is little further room for compromise.

The Texas Senator, majority leader in the upper House, has been against the use of sanctions against Israel from the start, as have been most of the key Congressmen in both parties. He does, however, favor getting United Nations emergency troops into the Gaza and Aqaba zones at the same time as Israeli forces are withdrawn.

And he is convinced, as apparently Secretary of State Dulles is, that there is no reason to rush into the use of coercion on either side so long as the possibility of a negotiated solution remains.

The racial, religious, and economic enmities that are at the bottom of the Middle East troubles have been a long time in the making. All signs are that they will be an equally long time in subsiding, if ever.

Meantime it is refreshing to see a legislative leader take the long and statesmanlike view instead of blaming the whole mess on one or two men in the administration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be delighted to yield if the Senator will give me a moment to contribute some observations with regard to the very generous statements which my friends from New York and Wisconsin have made concerning me.

Mr. President, first of all, I wish to say to the Senators that the distinguished minority leader and I do not always see everything alike. On occasion we differ as to words like "shall" and "may," and whether the Senate should sit until 9 o'clock without a recess.

But as I said the other day, we have a very pleasant relationship, one which I think works in the public interest. I believe that, instinctively, our approach to important questions is very much the same. That is because every effort is made on the part of both leaderships to work with understanding, and always to think of our country first.

I may say to the Senator from Wisconsin I appreciate very much the personal comments he has made. I tried to give the assurances I could and to the extent I could. I suggest to the Senator that I do not speak so much with the voice of authority, as he suggested, as with the voice of experience. Last year the Senate confirmed some 85,000 nominations, and I did not notice any gross negligence on the part of the Republican Party in looking after its faithful.

As to the statement of the Senator with respect to the Republican newspaper commending the efforts of the majority leader, I wish to say the majority leader gets so little commendation that he welcomes it from any source. There was a time in Texas, in the good old days, when I probably would not have welcomed any out-of-State Republican newspaper commendation, but because of developments in Texas in recent years, as reflected in some votes, I am happy to have my friend collect this material and put it in the RECORD, and I hope the distinguished and very learned and able editor from my home town, Mr. Buck Hood, who now sits in the gallery, will take judicial notice of the comments of the editor from Wisconsin.

I yield now to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I would not like the RECORD to fail to show that this side of the aisle shares the views of the junior Senator from New York with respect to the splendid service which the minority and majority leaders jointly rendered in exercising the constitutional powers given to this body of advising the executive arm of our Government with respect to foreign policy. I am particularly happy that the bipartisan effort has restrained the Executive from taking action with respect to sanctions against Israel, which I, for one, would have been most loath to have seen taken. I am sure I speak as many of my colleagues who have superiority in influence and seniority would speak, when I say I am proud to be a Member of the body so ably led by the majority and minority leaders.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am grateful to my delightful friend from Pennsylvania. I appreciate very much what he has said. My colleagues are always more generous with me than I deserve. I should not want anyone to think that I pretend to have exercised on behalf of myself or the minority leader, or the two of us working together, any great restraint. We merely spoke our views, as did most of the Members of this body. The results are not yet known. The Executive consulted frequently and fully with us. The Executive has kept us informed of all the negotiations. I think it is fair to say that we, like the administration, are hopeful that it will not be necessary to resort to coercion and pressure, but, rather, that we can obtain and achieve what we seek by the exercise of reason.

Most Members of this body have heard me say I am a devotee of the great prophet Isaiah, who said, "Come now, let us reason together," and that applies whether we are dealing with Egypt, Israel, Great Britain, France, or any of the other great nations of the world. I claim no credit for myself or any other Member of this body which I am not willing to accord to others for their efforts to insure peace in the world.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. PASTORE). The Chair wishes to associate himself with the complimentary remarks of the Senators from New York, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania.

## DEBATE ON THE MIDDLE EAST JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest that Senators give consideration to the possibility of agreeing to conclude debate on the pending amendment after each side has consumed 4 hours on the amendment. That would give us 8 hours' debate.

While I am not proposing that suggestion as a unanimous-consent agreement at this time, let me say that when I do propose it it will be preceded by a quorum call. I have given some thought to such a proposal, and I hope my colleagues will do likewise.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. Does the Senator intend to submit a unanimous-consent request today in connection with the pending amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am giving thought to it. I have not had an opportunity to discuss the subject with the distinguished minority leader. I do not know what sort of humor he is in this morning. [Laughter.]

My own feeling is that 4 hours on each side is enough time. I wish to talk with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the beloved Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If I can get the conflicting forces together, I may propose such an agreement. If I cannot, I may wait until tomorrow.

Mr. POTTER. If the Senator should succeed in obtaining such an agreement, would he also propound another unanimous-consent agreement further to limit debate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That will depend entirely on the individual sentiments of Senators. The Senator from Texas applies two standards to almost any proposal. First, would it result in the greatest good to the greatest number? Second, is it attainable? There are so many things the minority leader and I can achieve that we do not spend a great deal of time and effort in fighting windmills. If we think it is possible to obtain such an agreement, we shall perhaps attempt to do so. However, I will say to the Senator such a situation does not prevail at present.

Mr. POTTER. If the Senator will further yield, is it the intention of the Senator from Texas that the Senate should vote on the so-called Russell amendment today, if possible?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I doubt if a vote can be reached today. I would not wish to preclude that possibility, but it is now 11:20. I am sure Senators have engagements for the evening. They have had no advance notice of a night session. We cannot obtain such an agreement until later in the day. I should think the vote might come sometime late tomorrow.

The Senator from Texas has an engagement in Chicago on next Wednesday. That is the only such engagement I have made in several months. If I had to select a day when the Senate would be most likely to vote on the joint resolution, I suppose it would be next

Wednesday. The last time there were a number of yea-and-nay votes in the Senate I went to the Mayo Clinic. Attachés of the Senate and others thought I was safe in getting away for an examination. There were 11 rollcalls the first day I was gone. That situation may prevail on next Wednesday.

In any event, we shall do everything we can to protect each Senator's right to discuss this subject, and we shall seek a vote at as early a date as possible.

Mr. POTTER. The Senator's statement confirms the old adage that "When the cat is away the mice will play." [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I thank my friend the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and welcome him to the group of Senators who expressed themselves the other day as believing that the field of diplomacy in foreign relations is not reserved to one party alone, whether it be Democratic or Republican. I particularly welcome my friend to that fold because that is the kind of record he has made since he has been in the Senate. The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has presided with great dignity over the Foreign Relations Committee, and has great influence in this body. I know that both Democrats and Republicans, as well as Americans everywhere, will welcome his assurance that there will be no politics in connection with foreign policy.

Mr. WILEY. I hope the distinguished editor of the Wisconsin newspaper heard what the Senator from Texas said.

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, and I ask unanimous consent that any statement made in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide for a stronger national transportation industry, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA

A letter from the Boys' Clubs of America, New York, N. Y., signed by the chairman of the board, president, and national director, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization, for the year ended December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## RESOLUTIONS OF WISCONSIN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, earlier this month there met in Madison delegates and directors of the Wisconsin Electric Cooperative, speaking on behalf of the rural electric cooperative movement of my State.

This splendid group of rural leaders addressed themselves to various Federal, State, and local problems.

I have received copies of resolutions which they adopted at this, their 21st annual meeting, as conveyed to me by W. V. Thomas, general manager.

Three of the resolutions bear upon matters of Federal interest.

The first deals with the absolute importance of expanding rural telephone service throughout the Nation.

The second deals with the need for a Federal high dam at Hells Canyon. I might note in this connection that the resolution kindly commends my own efforts on behalf of this objective, efforts reflected in my vote in the 84th Congress for the Federal high dam, as well as my cosponsorship during the 85th Congress of the Morse bill for this same purpose.

And lastly, there is a resolution dealing with Niagara power.

I present the three resolutions and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 2

REA ELECTRIC AND TELEPHONE APPROPRIATIONS

Whereas the stability and progress of American agriculture requires adequate electric facilities to meet the requirements for highest standards of service on the farm; and

Whereas use of electric power on the farm is doubling every 5 years, electric cooperatives must carry on a continuous program of expanding service capacity, creating a continuing need for adequate loan funds through the Rural Electrification Administration to finance additional capitalization; and

Whereas less than half the rural people in America today have adequate telephone service available to them and there is a pressing need for a more vigorous rural-telephone program conducted through the Rural Electrification Administration; and

Whereas all loan funds provided to carry on the expansion of our rural electric and telephone facilities under the REA program are being repaid in full with interest: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we the delegates at this 21st annual meeting of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative, do urge the President and the Congress of the United States to provide REA loan funds during the next fiscal year adequate to meet all the legitimate needs of the program as requested by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association upon completion of a survey of these needs now being conducted.

RESOLUTION 3

HELLS CANYON

*Be it resolved*, That we the delegates at this 21st annual meeting of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative do strongly endorse legislation authorizing a Federal high dam at Hells Canyon; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we commend United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, for joining in cosponsorship of this legislation; and be it

*Resolved*, That we condemn the efforts of the Idaho Power Co. to seize control of the upper Snake River in order that it may construct three small dams which would result in the waste of approximately half the power potential and almost triple the cost of power: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we reaffirm our conviction that it should forever be the policy of the United States Government to promote the development of our great waterways on a multipurpose basis to protect the interests of all citizens in these great resources.

RESOLUTION 5

NIAGARA LEGISLATION

*Be it resolved*, That we the delegates at this 21st annual meeting of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative strongly endorse the Clark-Davidson bills for development of Niagara power potential providing for allocation of power under traditional Federal preference policies, which protects the interests of electric cooperatives, municipal, and other small power suppliers.

## JOINT RESOLUTION OF WASHINGTON LEGISLATURE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Legislature of the State of Washington is completing action on an important memorial to Congress, one which should be reaching us shortly.

The memorial recounts some important facts, facts that we should remember as later in this 85th Congress we consider extension of the GI bill of rights.

Introduced in the House of Representatives of the Washington Legislature by Representatives William C. Klein, of Vancouver, George G. Dowd, of Bellingham, and John D. Bigley, of Auburn, House Joint Memorial 14 deserves a place in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Joint Memorial 14

*To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:*

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the educational benefits provided by the so-called GI bill of rights have enabled millions of Americans to enjoy the advantages of college training and to render services that are often more valuable than their military service itself; and

"Whereas our national security depends upon the strength of our whole society and not merely on our military forces in being, and in a period of life and death competition in weapons development even our military strength depends directly on technical knowledge and skills; and

"Whereas the history of our great Nation has proven that governmental expenditures for education are efforts more likely than any other to result in the realization of our fundamental aim in government—'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness'; and

"Whereas the GI bill of rights has been denied to draftees and enlistees subsequent to January 31, 1955; and

"Whereas the educational opportunities of many draftees and enlistees subsequent to January 31, 1955, have been seriously or permanently interrupted because their service to their country commenced after January 31, 1955; and

"Whereas many enlistees in the Armed Forces today were induced to enlist by the promised opportunities held forth by said GI bill of rights, through providing a day and a half schooling for each day spent in uniform; and

"Whereas many of the young persons serving and soon to serve their country may be asked to assume posts of greater danger than some of those who have served in the past; and

"Whereas it would be unfair and discriminatory to deny to present and future servicemen the educational benefits conferred by the Government upon those who have served in the past; and

"Whereas a cutoff date has been established for the educational provisions of the GI bill of rights; and

"Whereas the increased earnings and economic opportunities made possible by the GI bill of rights would be a material factor in improving and assisting the economy of the Nation to finance these and future educational benefits: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved,* That your memorialists respectfully pray that the Congress of the United States take such legislative action as is necessary to extend and make uniform the educational phases of the GI bill of rights to all members of the Armed Forces presently serving as well as to those who have recently served to continue these necessary educational opportunities for all service personnel for as long as men are drafted into the Armed Forces, so that there may be some compensation and gratitude for the time taken from the normal and rightful development of their careers; and to broaden and extend the GI bill of rights to all members of the Armed Forces; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Washington."

## RESOLUTION OF CREW OF THE STEAMSHIP "LOUISIANA"

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, my office is being deluged with communications from various parts of the country, voicing alarm at current efforts from abroad and from within our country directed at impairing the very minor advantage now accorded by law to vessels of United States registry in the transportation of Government-aided or financed ocean cargoes.

The cargo preference statute—known generally as the fifty-fifty law—merely reserves to vessels of United States registry one-half of ocean cargoes given or financed by this country under aid programs, farm surplus disposal programs, and so forth. It has been the salvation of American shipping over the past decade or so, but despite the fact that only approximately 5 percent of our total foreign trade is thus denied to foreign shipping, and despite further the incontrovertible fact that operation of the American commercial fleet has been instrumental in keeping down ocean freight rates, thus saving this Government and its shippers millions of dollars, there is threatened a recurrence of efforts to deprive our ships of these cargoes, under the easily disproved contentions that it will cost us less to use foreign shipping and that we can depend on shipping of our allies for war or emergency.

Typical of the protests received is a forceful resolution expressing the views of the crew members of the steamship *Louisicna* which speaks for itself. I ask unanimous consent that the communication be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEAMSHIP "LOUISIANA",
THE TEXAS CO.,
*New York, N. Y., February 19, 1957.*

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
*The United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: At a special meeting of the crew of this ship, a resolution was adopted to be sent to you, as your record shows your sympathy and understanding toward the merchant seamen, and the upholding of his rights as any other American.

The following is an excerpt from the minutes:

"ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION BY THE CREW

"After a varied discussion, the following resolution was adopted unanimously by the crew:

" 'We, the crew members of the S. S. *Louisiana,* as active seamen, and being directly affected by any laws pertaining to the maritime industry, and therefore entitled to be considered by our law-making bodies prior to the passing of such bills into law, do hereby make the following resolution:

" 'Whereas the foreign shipowners are attempting to rob us of our hard-won gains in aid cargoes; and

" 'Whereas the American Farm Bureau attempts to assist them in their efforts is endangering our employment; and

" 'Whereas we, the people most affected by the results of legislation involving the maritime industry, are entitled to have a voice in any such legislation, do hereby

" '*Resolve,* That as seamen, voters, and most of all, Americans, we protest and condemn any form of legislation, repeal or amendments in our Congress that will take our jobs from us, to be given over to cheap labor from foreign countries.' "

We ask that you, as a United States Senator, and long-time friend of the American Merchant Marine, do all in your power to help us now, and keep American cargos in American ships, manned by American seamen.

Respectfully yours,
JOSEPH F. MCENNESS,
*Chairman.*
PETER KRUPA,
*Recording Secretary.*
EDWARD FACUNDO,
*Delegate.*

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1424. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that the duty imposed on the importation of wool shall be payable in all cases, regardless of the purpose for which the wool is to be used; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 1425. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 in order to provide that projects contracted for under such act, which furnish irrigation service, shall be subject to certain excess land requirements of the Federal Reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas):

S. 1426. A bill to amend the act of March 6, 1952 (66 Stat. 16), to extend the time during which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1427. A bill to make the Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1956 applicable to certain persons who retired under the automatic separation provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act prior to the enactment of such amendments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1428. A bill authorizing furniture and furnishing for the additional office building for the United States Senate;

S. 1429. A bill authorizing the enlargement and remodeling of Senators' suites and structural, mechanical, and other changes and improvements in the existing Senate Office Building, to provide improved accommodations for the United States Senate; and

S. 1430. A bill increasing the limit of cost fixed for construction and equipment of an additional office building for the United States Senate; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 1431. A bill for the relief of Joyce Sihlangu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. 1432. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Clay Curtis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. REVERCOMB, and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 1433. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1434. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to foreign tax credit for United Kingdom income tax paid with respect to royalties and other like amounts; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 1435. A bill for the relief of Louis Glaros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KERR, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1436. A bill to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for administration of farm programs by democratically elected farmer committeemen; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to designate the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Chicago, Ill., as the A. A. Sprague Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST—AMENDMENT

Mr. BARRETT (for himself, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

## AID FOR DEPRESSED AREAS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, earlier in the day I introduced Senate bill (S. 1433) to provide aid to depressed areas.

I now ask unanimous consent that the names of the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] be added as cosponsors of the bill.

I ask unanimous consent, further, that the bill lie on the desk until Wednesday of next week for the purpose of permitting other Senators to become cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the names of the additional cosponsors will be added, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I am glad to be associated with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania as a cosponsor of the bill about which he has spoken and which he introduced today in his own behalf and on behalf of myself and other Senators.

The bill will be known as the Administration's Area Assistance Act of 1957. Its purpose is to grant opportunities to localities within States where there are more workers than there is work, and in places where there is need of industry.

It seems to me to be very fitting at this particular time, when we are discussing the sending of money abroad and the expenditure of funds abroad to help persons in other lands, that our Government should take this step toward aiding areas within the United States which are in need of assistance and to aid them in moving forward into new industries.

I refer, of course, to those communities where there are more workers than there are jobs. There are a few such areas in my State, and there are areas in other States of the Union, where, despite the high level of prosperity the country is enjoying, a considerable surplus of workers exists. This condition in West Virginia has resulted largely from mechanization of the coal mines, which are presently employing far fewer men than they did a decade ago. This will ever be the case, regardless of the degree of prosperity in the mining industry.

Many of these men have large families; many have put their life savings into homes of their own; and these people have close community ties. They do not want to migrate to other States to seek employment, but they must either do that or remain idle. This condition has not only created a serious economic problem in the isolated areas affected, but it has also created a serious social problem. This program, Mr. President, offers a sound plan for diversifying and stabilizing local economies so vital to the well-being of our people and our country.

The Area Assistance Act is a practical, long-range program designed to help such surplus labor areas to help themselves. The primary initiative in both planning and financing their economic redevelopment rests with the community; and the aim is for lasting improvements, not just temporary relief.

I feel that the technical and financial assistance the Federal Government will be able to offer to these areas can provide the incentive for the kind of local initiative and effort at the community level that will see the establishment of new industries in West Virginia and all other States where this special problem exists.

I would emphasize that the big responsibility in this program rests with the community and State affected by a labor surplus—but the assistance the National Government will be able to offer in the way of planning and financing can be of invaluable help.

I am convinced that this is a practical program. I am convinced that it offers an opportunity for greater industrial diversification so essential to a sound economy, not only in the State of West Virginia, but in every State in the Union.

Mr. President, it is my hope the Senate will enact this program.

## AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, RELATING TO ADJUSTMENT OF CORPORATE NORMAL TAX AND SURTAX RATES—WITHDRAWAL OF COSPONSOR

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name may be withdrawn as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 150) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to adjust corporate normal tax and surtax rates, introduced by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] on January 7, 1957.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## WISCONSIN VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS COMMENT ON H. R. 64

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there is now pending before the House of Representatives Veterans' Affairs Committee H. R. 64, introduced by its distinguished chairman, Mr. TEAGUE, of Texas.

This bill "prescribes standards for withholding pension, compensation, or retirement pay during periods of hospitalization, institutional, or domiciliary care as to a veteran having no wife, child, or dependent parent."

This morning I received from Edward J. Schmidt, Adjutant-Quartermaster of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Wisconsin, a most interesting and helpful analysis of this proposed legislation. The analysis indicates losses which might be suffered by the State of Wisconsin under the proposals incorporated in this bill.

Naturally, I believe that this grassroots analysis deserves the most careful consideration, since we are, of course, most anxious that the well-being of those who have protected our Nation on the field of battle shall be advanced rather than be hindered. Similarly, a progressive State like my own and progressive State homes such as the one at King, should be rewarded, not penalized.

And that goes, in particular, for the elderly veterans of our Nation.

I send to the desk the text of the Wisconsin VFW's analysis of the adverse impact of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
DEPARTMENT OF WISCONSIN,
*February 21, 1957.*

GENTLEMEN: The following are the results of the survey made at the Grand Army Home to determine exactly what effect passage of bill H. R. 64 would have on the revenue to the State of Wisconsin, submitted by Gil Stordock, commandant of the Grand Army Home.

The month of January 1957 was used in computing individual contributions under the present rate of pension paid to veterans; and contributions were computed under the provisions of H. R. 64. A summary of the survey is attached for your information. The summary indicates, for the month of January 1957, a loss in revenue to the general fund of the State of Wisconsin, in the amount of $8,261.12. This would be an average of almost $100,000 a year, based on present membership as of January 31, 1957.

For the purpose of comparison, there is also attached a summary showing how bill H. R. 64 would affect Federal aid to the Grand Army Home for Veterans. Of course, the amount of Federal aid would increase in direct proportion to the reduced collections reported to the Veterans' Administration. In this connection, the quarter ending December 31, 1956, has been used to compute the comparison, to arrive at an accurate figure relative to Federal aid. The home is paid Federal aid at the rate of $175 per quarter on the basis of the average men present for the quarter. During the quarter ending December 31, 1956, there were 270.86 men present, and at $175 per quarter, this would amount to $47,400.50. Collections during this quarter, at the present rate of benefits to veterans, amounted to $38,675.26, one-half of which ($19,337.63) would be deducted from the above total Federal aid ($47,400.50), leaving a balance of $28,062.87 due the Grand Army Home for Federal aid for the quarter ending December 31, 1956, and which was received.

Collections for this same quarter from the proposed benefits to veterans (H. R. 64) would amount to $13,995.98, one-half of which ($6,997.99) would be deducted from the total Federal aid due the home ($47,400.50), leaving a balance of $40,402.51 due the Grand Army Home for the quarter ending December 31, 1956. This would result in a gain in Federal aid (which would be de-

posited to the building fund) in the amount of $12,339.64, although there would be a corresponding loss in total collections in the amount of $24,679.28 (normally deposited into the general fund of the State of Wisconsin.)

Therefore, it is evident that this legislation, which will reduce the pension of veterans to $30 per month, will adversely affect the Grand Army Home, as well as other State homes that have been sufficiently progressive to effect a system of collections from the incomes of members. H. R. 64 would not affect veterans who are members of this home, who have a wife, child, or dependent parent, or who are receiving compensation or retirement benefits.

It may be seen from the above that while Wisconsin would gain in the amount of Federal aid paid for the care of veterans, nevertheless there would be a net overall loss to the State of Wisconsin of approximately $50,000 (based on the Grand Army Home's present membership of January 31, 1957).

Some of the same arguments can be presented against the passage of H. R. 64 as were presented by major veteran organizations against pension economy measures of a similar nature.

It is believed that if H. R. 64 becomes law, particularly that part pertaining to a reduction of pensions paid to veterans living in State homes, in addition to the decrease in revenue to the State of Wisconsin, that it would seriously affect the various funds that are established by many other State homes—such as their burial fund, recreation fund, and similar funds. Then, too, many veterans now living in State homes would request their discharge and try to live on the outside with the result that they would, no doubt, soon become objects of charity, or be required to seek assistance from some public welfare agency.

It would appear that Wisconsin is being penalized for being sufficiently progressive to effect a system of collections from the incomes of members—a system satisfactory to the members themselves, and one that is believed to be fair and equitable for everyone.

If H. R. 64 is passed by Congress, it also appears that they are making it extremely more difficult for States to care for their veterans—thus relieving the Veterans' Administration of this responsibility—and this was not the original intent of Congress when it passed the act of August 27, 1888, because that law, and subsequent amendments, encouraged States to establish State homes for veterans.

Yours truly,

EDWARD J. SCHMIDT,
*Department Adjutant-Quartermaster.*

EXHIBIT A

| Income: | Totals |
|---|---|
| Pension | $20,518.55 |
| Compensation | 1,069.21 |
| Social Security | 3,270.30 |
| Retirement (specify) | 361.16 |
| Other (specify) | 60.25 |
| Present contribution under provisions of Sec. 45.37 (2) (h) | 14,200.67 |
| Contribution under income as proposed in H. R. 64 | 5,939.55 |
| Loss in collections for the State of Wisconsin | 8,261.12 |

EXHIBIT B

*Federal aid for quarter ending Dec. 31, 1956*

(Comparison: Federal aid payable to the Grand Army Home for Veterans, King, Wis. based on collections from members' incomes at present rate of pensions, as compared to Federal aid payable if collections were on proposed rate of pension under H. R. 64)

| Average men present for quarter ending Dec. 31, 1956 | Rate of Federal aid per quarter | Total Federal aid due Grand Army Home | Collections under provisions of sec. 45.37 (2) (h) based on present rate of pension | Collections under provisions of sec. 45.37 (2) (h) based on rate of pension payable under H. R. 64 | Federal aid due for quarter ending Dec. 31, 1956 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 270.86 | $175 | $47,400.50 | [1] $38,675.26 | | [2] $28,062.87 |
| 270.86 | 175 | 47,400.50 | | [3] $13,995.98 | [4] 40,402.51 |

[1] One-half of which is reported to Veterans' Administration or $19,337.63.
[2] At present rate of pension.
[3] One-half of which is reported to Veterans' Administration or $6,997.99.
[4] At proposed rate of pension under H. R. 64.

Summary:

| | |
|---|---|
| Federal aid due for quarter ending Dec. 31, 1956, at proposed rate of pension under H. R. 64 | $40,402.51 |
| Federal aid due for quarter ending Dec. 31, 1956, at present rate of pension | 28,062.87 |
| Gain in Federal aid for quarter | 12,339.64 |
| Total collections based on present rate of pension | 38,675.25 |
| Total collections based on rate of pension payable under H. R. 64 | 13,995.97 |
| Total loss in collections | 24,679.28 |
| Total loss in collections | 24,679.28 |
| Gain in Federal aid | 12,339.64 |
| Net loss in collections, for quarter ending Dec. 31, 1956, if H. R. 64 were in effect | 12,339.64 |

## DELAY IN MAKING EFFECTIVE THE EISENHOWER DOCTRINE WITH RESPECT TO THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "The Dawdling Senate," published in the New York Times of yesterday.

This editorial expresses extreme regret that the Senate has taken so long in acting upon this particular resolution. I should like to make it clear that in placing this editorial in the RECORD I am not doing so in any spirit of criticism of the majority leader, because I believe that individually, as a leader, he has done all he could do to expedite the debate and to arrive at a decision on the pending joint resolution.

However, I think there have been dilatory tactics which have held up consideration of the resolution, and that there are still dilatory tactics. Every day we delay coming to a vote means an injury to the effectiveness of this resolution, and an injury to the prestige of the United States.

I hope we can get behind the majority leader in his effort to expedite voting, and come to some agreement which will limit debate to reasonable proportions, so that we can obtain action as quickly as possible on the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 26, 1957]

THE DAWDLING SENATE

The American Government is now working overtime, both within and outside the United Nations, to save the Middle East by breaking the immediate Egyptian-Israeli deadlock as an essential step toward a solution of its other problems. But a handful of Democratic partisans is forcing the Senate to present to the world the spectacle of a deliberate slowdown amounting to a filibuster on a major project in the same field.

This project is the Eisenhower doctrine, designed to protect the Middle East from Communist aggression by pledging American military and economic support to nations in that area requesting such aid. In this respect the new proposal seeks to do for the Middle East what the North Atlantic alliance does for Europe, what the Truman doctrine did for Greece and Turkey, and what the Taiwan resolution is doing for peace in the Far East. All these measures found quick congressional approval by overwhelming bipartisan majorities. But on the Eisenhower doctrine, the Senate hamstrung by the veto power of individual Senators, has pursued a policy that can best be described in the words with which Senator MANSFIELD sought to castigate the administration but which could well have been reserved for the Senate—namely, a policy of "drift, dodge, and delay," to which he might have added "dawdle."

The Eisenhower doctrine was submitted to Congress on January 5. It was approved by the House of Representatives on January 30. It was approved by the Senate's Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees in somewhat modified form and against but scant opposition on February 13. Since then it has been subjected to a desultory debate in the Senate attended by only a few Senators and constantly interrupted by such weighty matters as tributes to local celebrities. The opposition group appears to be acting from a mixture of confused and conflicting motives which tend to unite the left and right wings in a new isolationism which, as Democratic Senator NEUBERGER warns, is undermining the bipartisan policy founded on internationalism and strong alliances in support of a free world.

Fortunately, nothing has happened thus far that cannot be remedied by prompt action. But every day's further delay, and any increase in the opposition caused by such a delay, is bound to impair the psychological impact of the Eisenhower doctrine and so increase the risk of a conflict which the doctrine is designed to avert.

## VISIT TO THE SENATE BY STUDENTS FROM WESTERN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, SILVER SPRING, MD.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I am very happy today to call attention to the presence in the gallery of a number of my constituents from Montgomery County, Md., consisting of a group of students from the Western Junior High School, of Silver Spring, Md. I should like to have them stand.

(The students rose in their places in the gallery and were greeted with applause.)

## MILK MARKETING DIFFICULTIES IN THE NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY MILKSHED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I make this statement on behalf of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and myself. Later in the day we shall formalize it into a written statement which we shall issue.

There has been some disorder and there has been some violence in both New York and New Jersey in connection with milk deliveries, because of dissatisfaction with the price situation, it being claimed by those who are active in this matter that costs of production are about 12 cents a quart, and that all the producers receive is 10 cents a quart. This may be of some interest to other Senators who also have milk producers in their States. Our experience in resolving the problem in New York may be of help to others in the country.

This is a very grave problem, which presses so urgently upon people that they undertake violence—which cannot be condoned in any orderly society—in order to make their feelings known.

Today I have talked with Governor Harriman, of New York, and I am able to state that the Governor is hopeful that the violence and disorder in New York State are now things of the past. That is very important so far as the people are concerned.

There is grave urgency to city consumers that there be an orderly supply of milk. There are problems of overproduction, as well as of price and other problems involved in the situation.

Obviously, in an atmosphere of disorder and destruction of property great losses occur. For example, firing a rifle bullet through one of the milk tank trucks destroys about $18,000 worth of property. They are built like thermos bottles. In such an atmosphere it is impossible to accomplish any constructive result.

Hearings are scheduled for March 5 at the Commodore Hotel, New York City, with respect to the fairness and justice of the milk-marketing order for the New York City milkshed and the area coverage which such a milk-marketing order should have. Deep as feelings may have run on this issue, we hope that those concerned will understand that the forum in which to seek justice and satisfaction of their legitimate demands, in the best interests of the people of the particular area, as well as all the people of the State of New York and the people of the State of New Jersey, is in these hearings.

My senior colleague and I will do our utmost to see that justice is done to all legitimate claims. We are not moved by the fact that violence has occurred, because it would be unfair if its use could have such an effect, but are, rather, moved by the basic principles involved. We will stay with the situation to see that justice is done.

In my discussion of the subject with Governor Harriman this morning I was assured that we would have the full cooperation of the State authorities, because the Governor feels as we do that the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture is the right forum and that every effort should be made to see that justice is done there.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I wish to commend the Senator on his statement. Inasmuch as the trouble has spread to the New Jersey producing area, we likewise are very much concerned. The way to settle these difficulties is not by resort to violence, and we hope that the hearings will induce a settlement of the troubles and that a satisfactory arrangement will be worked out.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

Address by Senator THURMOND and response by Senator MUNDT at presentation of awards for distinguished service by the American Good Government Society to Senator MUNDT and Hon. WILLIAM L. COLMER, Representative from Mississippi.

## APPROPRIATIONS AND NET CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS FOR WAR ACTIVITIES

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement of appropriations and net contract authorizations for emergency funds granted to the President of the United States from the fiscal year 1941 through the fiscal year 1946.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A

EMERGENCY FUNDS FOR THE PRESIDENT (APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS THROUGH AUG. 31, 1945)

TABLE C.—*Statement of appropriations and net contract authorizations for war activities, revised to Aug. 31, 1945*

| Act reference | Total appropriations and contract authorizations (net) | Appropriations | | | | | | | Contract authorizations | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Total | Fiscal year 1946 | Fiscal year 1945 | Fiscal year 1944 | Fiscal year 1943 | Fiscal year 1942 | Fiscal year 1941 | Total | Fiscal year 1942 | Fiscal year 1941 |
| Navy Department Appropriation Act, 1941, Public Law 588, approved June 11, 1940 | $68,000,000 | $34,000,000 | | | | | | $34,000,000 | $34,000,000 | | $34,000,000 |
| Military Appropriation Act, 1941, Public Law 611, approved June 13, 1940 | 132,000,000 | 66,000,000 | | | | | | 66,000,000 | 66,000,000 | | 66,000,000 |
| Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, Public Law 781, approved Sept. 9, 1940 | 100,000,000 | 100,000,000 | | | | | | 100,000,000 | | | |
| Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, Public Law 9, approved Mar. 1, 1941 | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | | | | | | 5,000,000 | | | |
| Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942, Public Law 28, approved Apr. 5, 1941: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Liquidation of contracts | | 100,000,000 | | | | | $100,000,000 | | −100,000,000 | | −100,000,000 |
| New funds | 125,000,000 | 100,000,000 | | | | | 100,000,000 | | 25,000,000 | $25,000,000 | |
| Additional Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, Public Law 73, approved May 24, 1941 | 15,000,000 | 15,000,000 | | | | | | 15,000,000 | | | |
| Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, Public Law 353, approved Dec. 17, 1941 | 400,000,000 | 400,000,000 | | | | | 400,000,000 | | | | |
| Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943, Public Law 630 approved June 27, 1942: Liquidation of contracts | | 25,000,000 | | | | $25,000,000 | | | −25,000,000 | −25,000,000 | |
| First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, Public Law 678, approved July 25, 1942 | 100,000,000 | 100,000,000 | | | | 100,000,000 | | | | | |
| Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, Public Law 763, approved Oct. 26, 1942 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | | | | 25,000,000 | | | | | |
| Total | 970,000,000 | 970,000,000 | | | | 150,000,000 | 600,000,000 | 220,000,000 | | | |

EXHIBIT A

EMERGENCY FUNDS FOR THE PRESIDENT (APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS THROUGH AUG. 31, 1945)

TABLE C.—*Statement of appropriations and net contract authorizations for war activities, revised to Aug. 31, 1945*—Continued

| Act reference | Total appropriations and contract authorizations (net) | Appropriations | | | | | | | Contract authorizations | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Total | Fiscal year 1946 | Fiscal year 1945 | Fiscal year 1944 | Fiscal year 1943 | Fiscal year 1942 | Fiscal year 1941 | Total | Fiscal year 1942 | Fiscal year 1941 |
| Transfers from other funds: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Public Law 609, approved June 15, 1938 | $14,688 | $14,688 | $3,257 | $11,432 | | | | | | | |
| Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, Public Law 800, approved Oct. 8, 1940 | 29,500,000 | 29,500,000 | | | | | | $29,500,000 | | | |
| Housing for National Defense, Public Law 849, approved Oct. 14, 1940 | 10,000,000 | 10,000,000 | | | | | | 10,000,000 | | | |
| Fourth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, Public Law 13, approved Mar. 17, 1941 | 125,000 | 125,000 | | | | | | 125,000 | | | |
| Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942, Public Law 28, approved Apr. 5, 1941 | 500,249 | 500,249 | | 500,249 | | | | | | | |
| Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, Public Law 353, approved Dec. 17, 1941 | 15,000,000 | 15,000,000 | | | | | $15,000,000 | | | | |
| Joint resolution, Public Law 371, approved Dec. 23, 1941 | 20,000,000 | 20,000,000 | | | | | 20,000,000 | | | | |
| First Deficiency Appropriation Act 1942, Public Law 463, approved Feb. 21, 1942 | 15,000,000 | 15,000,000 | | | | | 15,000,000 | | | | |
| Second War Powers Act, 1942, Public Law 507, approved Mar. 27, 1942 | 153,822 | 153,822 | | 103,722 | $40,000 | $10,100 | | | | | |
| Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, Public Law 528, approved Apr. 23, 1942 | 1,959,000 | 1,959,000 | | | | | 1,959,000 | | | | |
| Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943, Public Law 630, approved June 27, 1942 | 47,682 | 47,682 | | 47,682 | | | | | | | |
| First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, Public Law 678, approved July 25, 1942 | 74,000 | 74,000 | | | | 74,000 | | | | | |
| Transfers to other funds: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Public Law 609, approved June 15, 1938 | −30,471 | −30,471 | | −15,368 | | −15,103 | | | | | |
| Housing for National Defense, Public Law 849, approved Oct. 14, 1940 | −44,593,500 | −44,593,500 | | | | | −210,000 | −44,383,500 | | | |
| Emergency Ship Construction, Public Law 5, approved Feb. 6, 1941 | −36,500,000 | −36,500,000 | | | | | −36,000,000 | −500,000 | | | |
| Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942, Public Law 28, approved Apr. 5, 1941 | −4,565,000 | −4,565,000 | | | −3,065,000 | −1,500,000 | | | | | |
| Joint Resolution, Public Law 371, approved Dec. 23, 1941 | −10,000,000 | −10,000,000 | | | | | −10,000,000 | | | | |
| Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1943, Public Law 456, approved Mar. 10, 1942 | −890 | −890 | | | | −890 | | | | | |
| Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, Public Law 528, approved Apr. 28, 1942 | −1,634,000 | −1,634,000 | | | | | −1,634,000 | | | | |
| Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943, Public Law 630, approved June 27, 1942 | −219,237 | −219,237 | | | | −219,237 | | | | | |
| Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1942, Public Law 648, approved July 2, 1942 | −600,000 | −600,000 | | | | −600,000 | | | | | |
| Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944, Public Law 90, approved June 26, 1943 | −675,000 | −675,000 | | | −675,000 | | | | | | |
| Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944, Public Law 375, approved June 28, 1944 | −7,500,000 | −7,500,000 | | −7,500,000 | | | | | | | |
| First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1945, Public Law 529, approved Dec. 22, 1944 | −793,000 | −793,000 | | −793,000 | | | | | | | |
| Department of State Appropriation Act, 1946, Public Law 61, approved May 21, 1945 | −1,562,000 | −1,562,000 | −1,562,000 | | | | | | | | |
| Total funds made available | 953,701,344 | 953,701,344 | −1,558,743 | −7,645,283 | −3,700,000 | 147,748,870 | 604,115,000 | 214,741,500 | | | |

## UNNECESSARY TUNGSTEN SUBSIDY

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in yesterday's Washington Daily News there appeared an excellent editorial pointing out the unnecessary waste involved in the $30 million appropriation to purchase tungsten at $55 a ton, when plenty of the same material is available at $35 a ton.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD the editorial condemning this extravagance.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TUNGSTEN SUBSIDY

Every once in a while we get a glimmering idea of where the money goes.

Tungsten is essential to steel manufacture, hence essential to national defense. But the House Appropriations Committee has found that we have enough tungsten stockpiled to last 5 years in any emergency.

Accordingly, when the Interior Department asked $30 million to continue this year the subsidy buying of domestic tungsten, the House committee knocked it out. The Senate promptly voted it back.

Starting a second go-round, Interior then asked for another $40 million for next year, largely for domestic tungsten. This is before the House today.

Meanwhile a House-Senate conference committee is scheduled to battle it out over

the original $30 million, and some interesting revelations are coming out.

Senators backing this large and questionable expenditure insist the subsidy encourages hundreds of domestic tungsten producers, mostly in the Western States. They came up with a list of only 177 such producers.

Of these 177, the House committee promptly pointed out, only 11 have received 86 percent of the money spent in the last 6 months, or $12,800,000. Eighteen got 92 percent of the subsidy.

Worse still, according to the committee, some of these big producers are being paid by the Government $55 per unit for their tungsten while they are buying foreign tungsten for use in their own industry at the United States market price of $35.

Unless there is a great deal more to this business than meets the eye, here is a big Federal subsidy going to a small group for a project which has limited, if any, essentiality to our defense.

The House committee has done a good job putting the finger on this apparent handout. We hope the full membership will put the finishing touch to it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] as a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Bush | Church |
| Allott | Butler | Clark |
| Anderson | Byrd | Cooper |
| Barrett | Capehart | Cotton |
| Beall | Carlson | Curtis |
| Bennett | Carroll | Dirksen |
| Bible | Case, N. J. | Douglas |
| Blakley | Case, S. Dak. | Dworshak |
| Bricker | Chavez | Eastland |
| Ellender | Knowland | Purtell |
| Ervin | Kuchel | Revercomb |
| Flanders | Lausche | Robertson |
| Frear | Long | Russell |
| Goldwater | Magnuson | Saltonstall |
| Gore | Malone | Schoeppel |
| Green | Mansfield | Scott |
| Hayden | Martin, Iowa | Smathers |
| Hennings | Martin, Pa. | Smith, Maine |
| Hickenlooper | McCarthy | Smith, N. J. |
| Hill | McClellan | Sparkman |
| Holland | McNamara | Stennis |
| Hruska | Monroney | Symington |
| Humphrey | Morton | Talmadge |
| Jackson | Mundt | Thurmond |
| Javits | Murray | Thye |
| Jenner | Neuberger | Watkins |
| Johnson, Tex | O'Mahoney | Wiley |
| Johnston, S. C. | Pastore | Williams |
| Kefauver | Payne | Young |
| Kennedy | Potter | |

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is absent because of illness.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] as a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I listened with profit yesterday to the words of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I always pay attention when he speaks. After he had finished his speech I came to the conclusion that his remarks were more aptly addressed to what we might call the mutual security program which will come before the Senate later.

I then went to my office and dictated the few words which I shall be happy to read on the subject of this particular amendment.

Mr. President, I do not place any limitation upon the potentialities of the American people. I think this age is different from any other the human race has experienced. I believe we have been called unto a great destiny, and that destiny will not be served by resting on our accomplishments and by ignoring the facts on the world stage. Mention has been made of our spending, and I agree that we should, wherever possible, effectuate economy, but a penny-wise and pound-foolish course is not economy, especially when the safety of the Nation is involved. When one talks about the budget of the Nation, one must also talk about the Nation's income. We have the largest budget—$72 billion—in peacetime history. But, in a sense, this is not peacetime. We have got to remember that since World War II, the labor force of the United States has increased by more than 4 million and the population by more than 11 million. Employment is going up, and our national income now is in excess of $330 billion and our national product in excess of $400 billion.

We hear many leaders talking about cutting expenses and reducing the overhead. I am for that. During the Eisenhower administration there has been one big tax cut. The Government is operating on the right side of the ledger. While the budget has been increased by 11 percent, the national product has increased 12 percent.

Let me make myself clear. I practiced law for 30 years before I came to this august body. I always followed the advice of a professor, who said, "Before you start to apply the law or the remedy, get the facts—and get them straight, if it is possible."

I should like to see the overhead cut, if that can be done, after a close examination of the situation. Let me repeat: This is not a peacetime budget. When I speak on the resolution itself at the appropriate time, I shall have more to say on that subject.

We are engaged, as our expenditures indicate, in a war—a cold war. We are buying more expensive war machines than we ever bought before; and we are building machines for our defense such as we never built before. Let us pray to God that war will not come—and I do not think war will come.

If there is an implication that the Government has not been curtailed, let me say that there has been a substantial reduction in the number of Federal employees. On the subject of mutual aid, it is well that we get the facts in relation to it.

There is much talk that the mutual-aid program is a giveaway program. At this place, I should like to read into the RECORD what the Secretary of State has said on this subject:

Senator WILEY. The primary purpose of this resolution is to stabilize the Near East. There is ample evidence to show that the Kremlin would probably take advantage of unstable conditions, march in, and take possession of the oil. Am I right about that?

Secretary DULLES. Yes, sir.

Senator WILEY. Am I also right that if it took over the Near East, it would then have a gateway to Africa and to the raw materials there?

Secretary DULLES. Yes, sir.

Senator WILEY. If it had the oil and the raw materials, it would be a very serious threat to the free world as well as to America?

Secretary DULLES. Yes, sir.

Senator WILEY. The purpose of this resolution is to serve notice that if the Kremlin moves to take over this area vital to our security, it will have a fight on its hands?

Secretary DULLES. Yes, sir.

Senator WILEY. How do all these other matters we have been talking about fit into that picture? Take, for instance, the Israeli-Arab situation. That might precipitate, I take it, an opportunity for the Kremlin to provide volunteers or to take other action. Then we would have to decide, I take it, under the resolution, what our position would be?

Secretary DULLES. Yes.

Then I asked the Secretary some questions about the $200 million, which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] discussed yesterday.

Senator WILEY. I want to get something else clear in my own mind. Last year this Democratic Congress appropriated $750 million for this area for military and economic aid; is that right?

Secretary DULLES. That is approximately the figure; yes.

Senator WILEY. Yes. And your resolution, as presented, would give you added time or, let us say, flexibility with respect to $200 million of that $750 million?

Secretary DULLES. That is correct.

Senator WILEY. You are not asking for an additional penny of appropriations?

Secretary DULLES. That is correct.

Senator WILEY. Nor are you asking for any additional powers in relation to that $750 million?

Secretary DULLES. Only that there be somewhat greater discretion, primarily in terms of time, as to its commitment.

Now I wish to read a few more sentences in relation to the $200 million:

Senator WILEY. What does it cost us to maintain a Turkish soldier?

I asked that question in relation to a question as to the cost of maintaining an American soldier. The Secretary was not exactly definite, so he placed in the record of the hearings a letter showing the respective costs. In that letter he said:

I am informed by the Department of Defense that the average cost per year of maintaining a soldier in Turkey is $234 and in Pakistan $272. The cost of maintaining a United States soldier in those countries would average $5,463 per year. Those figures do not include weapons or training but they do include pay, allowances, medical care, clothing, etc.

If anyone wants to speak about economy, I think this is a pretty good example of what economy means. Does any one doubt that the program which has been evolved, with the Turkish soldiers standing erect and on guard, and with the Pakistans doing likewise—and I might say the evidence is that the relative difference in cost is about the same in Formosa and Korea—is not a program of economy?

Mr. President, the testimony I have been reading will be found on pages 454, 455, and 456 of the record of the hearings.

I think it is generally agreed that if we did not have allies abroad, we would have to extend our expenditures at home probably 10 times what it costs for our military contributions abroad. Yet some persons talk about a giveaway!

I shall not argue the advisibility of maintaining military contributions to Turkey, Pakistan, Formosa, and Korea. That policy has been definitely established.

So far as the Far East is concerned in this atomic age, in this shrunken world, every leader from MacArthur down to the leaders of the present day has said that our first line of defense stems from Alaska through the Kuriles, to Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand. I have not heard anyone question that conclusion.

But we are talking about—and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] yesterday was talking about—the $200 million which has already been appropriated, and which is in the jackpot of $750 million appropriated by the Congress for the Middle East in fiscal 1957.

Something else was said yesterday which was a little confusing. It related to the fact that the original resolution would abolish what the Senator from Georgia called the loaning feature. Let me state the facts as to that.

Section 201 (a) of the Mutual Security Act authorizes appropriations for assistance designed to promote economic development in Asia, the Middle East, and Africa, based upon self-help and mutual cooperation among friendly nations, so as to maintain economic and political stability in those areas. Eighty percent of this assistance must be in the form of loans.

The effect of section 3 of Senate Joint Resolution 19 would be to enable the President to waive the loan requirement in regard to a maximum of $110 million with respect to the Middle East.

Mr. President, either we are mistaken about the situation in the Middle East—either we have all been fooled by the President, two former Presidents, and by the military authorities—or else the situation there is dynamic and explosive. Of course, the testimony was that there is no evidence that the Kremlin at present is ready to commit an overt act and march into the area. Of course, the Kremlin has not directly done that elsewhere, in taking over the vast amount of territory it has acquired since the end of the war. But the record contains ample evidence that our ambassadors and our intelligence service and our President believe the situation in the Middle East to be serious.

When the committees were holding the hearings, I could not help but think of the time when our country was struggling for its freedom, and when a certain amount of money was placed in the hands of Benjamin Franklin, who then was sent to Paris. An accounting for that money was never had; but the result of that mission by Ben Franklin was that our country obtained a powerful ally, who aided greatly in helping America become free.

Mr. President, as has been so graphically described, the Near East—where nations are mentally in conflict, and where there is much oil—is full of eruptive conditions.

Last year the Congress appropriated $750 million, to be available for use by the President. Now the President has asked us to permit him to use, in such a way as to avoid a third world war, $200 million of the larger amount the Congress has already appropriated for his use. He wishes to use the $200 million in such a way as to make sure that the Kremlin does not take over these countries—not by the overt use of military force, but by the use of the tactics the Kremlin has already used in many other areas of the world, and today is attempting to use in Africa and elsewhere.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Yesterday, it was admitted that even if the joint resolution should not be passed, the President now has at his disposal the sum of $95 million which he can use for military assistance in the Middle East. Is that correct?

Mr. WILEY. I think that is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. I understand that the effect of the pending joint resolution is to add either $105 million or $200 million to the total amount which thus will be available to the President, for use for that purpose. Is that correct?

Mr. WILEY. No. The joint resolution calls for $200 million; but I was replying to the argument made by the Senator from Georgia, from whom I received the impression I stated. So I had that matter checked.

Mr. PASTORE. Therefore, I understand that the effect of the joint resolution, whether it be the original resolution of the administration or whether it be the version reported by the two committees, and recommended by them for passage—and I am not referring to the Russell substitute—would be to make available $295 million; is that correct?

Mr. WILEY. I am informed that the joint resolution would make available an additional $200 million without restrictions.

Mr. PASTORE. If the President already has at his disposal $95 million which he can use for military assistance, regardless of whether the pending joint resolution is enacted, and if we then add $200 million more, to be available for the same purposes, we shall have placed at his disposal a total of $295 million, to be available for use for military assistance. Is not that correct?

Mr. WILEY. The money has already been appropriated.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; but the ceiling will then be $295 million, for that purpose; is that correct?

Mr. WILEY. I think it is correct. However, my point is that if the joint resolution is not enacted, the President must obligate 80 percent of the money by May 1, if he is to spend it at all. The explanation for that situation is that when the Congress appropriated the $750 million in connection with an authorization to the President to use such funds for military aid, as well as for nonmilitary aid, the Congress tied to that appropriation a congressional order that the President obligate no more than 20 percent of the money in the last 2 months of the fiscal year.

Mr. PASTORE. I desire the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin to understand that I am not being critical.

Mr. WILEY. I understand.

Mr. PASTORE. I merely want to have the matter stated correctly for the record.

As I understand, the result of enactment of the joint resolution will be to give the President free use of $295 million, not $200 million.

Mr. WILEY. I must say that I shall have to check on that matter with the committee experts.

Mr. PASTORE. There has been a great deal of confusion about this matter, indeed, so much confusion that, as one listens to the debate, the situation seems, minute by minute, to grow more confusing; and sometimes it becomes very amusing.

First of all, I should like to know whether we need to make the requested authorization of the $200 million. Second, I should like to know the effect of the joint resolution on the over-all amount which will be available to the President, for use by him for purposes of military assistance in the Middle East.

I should like to have some Member of the Senate answer that question in a way that I shall be able to understand.

Mr. WILEY. Last year the Congress stated what the $750 million was for. But since that time, eruptive conditions have developed in the Middle East. It is the judgment of the President that from the $750 million, there should be released a total of $200 million, so that he would not be required to obligate so much of it by May 1.

Mr. PASTORE. But where does the President get the $95 million? Does not it come from the $750 million, too?

Mr. WILEY. No; I am informed that the $95 million is available as a result of the provisions of section 401 (b).

Mr. PASTORE. Therefore, that money is available to the President, without restriction, is it not?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; the $95 million.

Mr. PASTORE. But the $95 million which the President can use for military assistance in the Middle East comes from the $750 million which we have been discussing.

I understand that the effect of the pending joint resolution will be to make available to the President $200 million out of the $750 million. Is that correct? If that is correct, then, if we add $95 million to the $200 million, we get a total of $295 million. Is that correct, or is it incorrect?

Mr. WILEY. I am informed that the analysis the Senator from Rhode Island has made is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Very well. I have used only simple arithmetic. I wish to know the answer to my question.

Mr. WILEY. The $95 million which already has been appropriated and is now available, comes under section 401 of the act; and the $200 million is literally frozen now, since it must be used according to the plans made before the eruptive conditions developed in the Middle East.

When the Senator from Rhode Island uses the words "for military assistance," let me point out that the $750 million was not appropriated only for military assistance purposes. The $750 million, to be used for the various countries, was to cover a program outlined by the congressional committees. In that connection, the Congress appropriated the money for military and mutual assistance.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for another question?

Mr. WILEY. Of course.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Wisconsin has said that the amount is now frozen. Why is it frozen?

Mr. WILEY. It is frozen because the law provides that 80 percent of the money must be obligated by May 1.

Mr. PASTORE. Then, is it a fact that the $200 million we are discussing was originally intended to be used for this particular purpose, and is a part of the total amount of $750 million?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. Am I also to understand that the effect of the joint resolution is merely to extend the original purpose?

Mr. WILEY. Yes, and to give the President larger discretion because of the new situation.

Mr. PASTORE. That is precisely the point. What does the Senator from Wisconsin mean by using the words "larger discretion"? Does he mean that the President would be allowed to use the money for purposes not originally intended? The confusion on that point is what I should like to have clarified for the record. We are told that the President had this amount of money available, anyway.

Mr. WILEY. No; what the Senator from Rhode Island wants is what our other friends on his side of the aisle have continuously wanted. They want the President to outline what he will use the money for, under explosive conditions; they want to know for what purposes the President will use the money, and in what countries he will use it. To me, that position is ridiculous. Either the situation is dynamically evil and explosive, or the money is not needed.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that the situation is explosive, and I shall vote for the passage of the joint resolution.

However, my question is this: Is the purpose contemplated by the President in this crisis broader than the purpose the Congress had when it appropriated the $750 million?

Mr. WILEY. I think the answer is "Yes," because the $750 million was appropriated for specific purposes, so far as that could be done. But since then the conditions have changed, and countries which then were in a certain status are now in another status.

Mr. PASTORE. Therefore, is it fair for me to assume, again in hope of clarifying the record, that the $200 million which is authorized by the resolution goes beyond the original scope of the $750 million originally appropriated?

Mr. WILEY. It is discretionary.

Mr. PASTORE. To be used for a broader purpose?

Mr. WILEY. In the area.

Mr. PASTORE. In the Middle East?

Mr. WILEY. Yes. In other words, the situation may be compared with the treatment of a man who has measles, and all of a sudden the doctor finds the prescription he has prescribed for the measles is not going to take care of the situation, because the man has another disease. The country has another disease. Really, I have not made a diagnosis; I am taking the facts given to me by those who claim to know and have their fingers on the pulse of the situation, who say that the situation calls for a different remedy, and that the $200 million may be applied to the head this time instead of to the feet.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. The argument was made in the Senate yesterday that, in view of the fact that $750 million has already been provided——

Mr. WILEY. And appropriated.

Mr. PASTORE. And appropriated for the Middle East, and includes programs for Iran, Iraq, and Turkey, the only other place we could go with the $295 million would be either Eypt or Israel. Does the Senator agree with that deduction?

Mr. WILEY. No; I do not agree with it?

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator kindly tell me why he does not agree with it?

Mr. WILEY. Because the situation is so dynamic and subject to change, in spite of the good news which comes this morning from the United Nations. It is good news, thank God; it looks as if the atmosphere is clearing; it looks as if the combatant forces have been brought to see the light——

Mr. PASTORE. Thanks to the efforts of the majority and minority leaders of the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. I would give them all the credit in the world, but I would not confine it to them.

Mr. PASTORE. No.

Mr. WILEY. I would say the Secretary of State, God bless him, has been sweating blood, and others, including Mr. Lodge, have done a grand job, as have countless others in the domestic and foreign services of the United States.

Now back to the question of the Senator from Rhode Island. I cannot look around the corner of tomorrow. I am not a prophet or the son of a prophet. But I can readily see that the $200 million might be available to do a most constructive job right now, if things should settle down. However, I cannot say where the money is going to be used. The figure was used yesterday with the idea that it would be used to contribute arms, that it would be used to produce combative forces. That is not the idea at all. It is to be used for remedial purposes. I am satisfied that is the high objective of the Executive.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the junior Senator from Rhode Island to understand that the $295 million we are talking about may be used for purposes other than military assistance?

Mr. WILEY. Of course, just as the original $750 million was for purposes other than military purposes. I examined the Secretary on that point. While I cannot at the moment turn to the place in the RECORD, I shall try to find it. The Secretary analyzed the proportionate use for military and for economic purposes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Can the Senator tell me whether the discretionary use of the sum of $200 million will in any way differ from the discretionary use of the sum of $95 million?

Mr. WILEY. If I understand the use of the word discretionary, I think the sums are both available to be spent in the discretion of the Executive.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am asking the question merely for information. It is conceded that the $95 million can be expended by the President in conformity with his own discretion, where he thinks it will tend to the security of our country?

Mr. WILEY. That is correct, and the $200 million would be available for the same purpose.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the question.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to continue with the ideas I dictated yesterday.

Mr. President, for every dollar that is spent, since the cost is something like $250 for a fighting Chinaman, or a soldier in the Mideast, or a fighting Turk, or other fighting men in our first line of defense, we are saving over $5,000, according to the records. We are not spending that money recklessly.

I am not a military man, but I am acquainted with the way the world is changing.

As I have stated on the floor, when I came to Washington, Wisconsin was isolated mentally and physically. Now it is only in part, and a very small part, thank God, isolated mentally. Today we are nearer to attack than is New York City. We are 6 hours away from bombers stationed in Siberia. We know they are not coming, but why have we established the DEW line across Canada? Why do we constantly have planes in the sky? Are we all "buffaloed" with fear? No. What is happening is that we are realists.

I wish to relate a little incident to show my colleagues that when I first came to Washington, as I said, 18 years ago, my State was really safe and isolated. No one ever thought that we would practically be a neighbor to the Kremlin. Some of us were accused of being isolationists. We were not. We were noninterventionists, because we thought the policy of Washington was right. He was not an isolationist. On Februry 14, 1941, I submitted a resolution in the Senate of the United States and spoke on it, I resire to read the resolution:

*Resolved*, That on Thursday, February 20, 1941, at 2 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business with closed doors, and that the Secretary of State and his Under Secretaries be requested to attend to discuss the eastern situation and other related matters with the Senate.

I asked that we be informed as to the defenses of our country in Hawaii and the Philippines. No attention was paid to the request. I spoke on the subject.

Later—and I bring this up because the situation is much the same now—on March 4, 1941, as appears from page 1714 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day, I spoke again. I said in substance, "What is the condition of our fleet, especially its coordinating arm? Will it be like the Russian fleet in the Japanese War, when it was surprised and annihilated?"

That was on March 4, 1941. I again asked that the President of the United States take notice of the situation and give us a report as to the defenses in Hawaii and the Philippines. I made a speech on the subject. No one paid any attention to it.

A few months later the Nation was asleep. Its military arm in Hawaii was asleep. Pearl Harbor came upon us like a thief in the night.

Thank God, today our President is not asleep. The President at that time paid no attention to the warnings. A southern newspaper, commenting on the resolution, stated that if the Wiley resolution had been acted upon it would have saved tens of thousands of lives, 2 years of war, and $100 billion of wealth.

I refer to that situation only because it is a historical incident which should shore up, so to speak, the condition of America today.

What do I find in my mail? I find demands to reduce expenses. This world never was in such a serious situation. Senators need not take my word. That is the word of the man to whom this country gave a 10 million majority. The common people are aware of the situation. In arguing the question of the $200 million, let me say that in my opinion it is the most important thing we could vote for. I know what the power of money is. I have seen it. Benjamin Franklin used it. Either we are asleep or we have blind spots in relation to the world situation. When I came to Washington the world was big. Now it is small.

Mr. President, are we fiddling while Rome burns? We do not hesitate to spend half a billion dollars for an aircraft carrier. Yet when the President—your President and mine—asks that he have 60 days more in which to handle the $200 million which has already been appropriated, it seems that some Senators want a definitive explanation with respect to every dollar. They adopt the same attitude as do some men when they give their wives the money to operate the household. They want an explanation with respect to every cent.

Why are we in the Near East? Why, for 3 years have we had there the 6th Fleet? That fleet is in the Near East. Why is it there? Why has our fleet been in the Near East? Was it useless, or was it because the leaders of our Government sensed that the situation was dynamic and explosive? If we have a third world war, we shall spend half a billion dollars a day.

It has been said many times, but I must repeat, that if the Kremlin takes the Middle East oil by one means or another, it will have a clutch hold upon Europe. How much is the situation costing us now? Why are additional pipelines planned to circumvent the Suez Canal, if it should become imperative to do so? It is because until atomic energy comes into full fruition, Europe will literally starve without oil. Her industries will be paralyzed.

Have we any interest in that situation? What is the cost to us now? We hope that before long the Suez Canal will be opened. We hope that alternative routes for the transmission of oil through pipelines will be made available. We know that oil is badly needed in Europe. We know that the Kremlin has had its eyes on the Middle East area for decades.

The President tells us, through his advisers, that while at present there is no evidence of aggression, he needs the $200 million, already appropriated—to do what? To handle a situation involving many boiling pots.

We hesitate. We ask to be told how the President intends to spend the money, so that the Kremlin may know what steps we are taking. We had better be a little practical, in an age which is so full of problems and challenges.

I do not want to release any of my rights as a Senator. Neither do I wish to become so blind that I forget that the Constitution makes the President the spearhead of foreign relations. Either the Middle East is important to the security of this country or it is not. If it is, then the money which a Democratic Congress has already appropriated should be made available to the President for another 60 days. In agreeing to the President's request for authority to handle this fund for another 60 days, I am not surrendering the authority of Congress. I am exercising it. Certainly the evidence on the world stage of the Kremlin's penetration and its methods should be clear enough to all who wish to see, when the leader of the Nation says what he has said.

Has there ever been a comparable period in the history of the world? While I said that a President fell asleep before Pearl Harbor, let me add that the same President, sensing the danger, let Great Britain have 50 destroyers. We were not in war. What else did he do? He sent forces to Iceland. Why? It was to protect America. We were not at war then. I voted for vast sums. I had hoped that we could keep out of war.

I repeat, Mr. President, that the world at that time was big. It was not possible then to travel around the world in 45 hours, as it is possible to do now. The world is very small today. The world has been contracted, and a new evil force, under the leadership of the Kremlin, is taking over a great part of the world by its penetrating methods.

I repeat that our best military brains say we do not have the manpower to stand alone; that we do not have on our continent the necessary and vital strategic materials which we need to fight a war. Let us think that over. We are faced with inadequate supplies in the event of another war.

Therefore, when the Kremlin is told by the President, in substance, not to take over the Middle East, we sit around and debate and give the world the impression that we are divided, just as we were once before. I repeat, this is not the first time we have done that. We have paid for it with billions of dollars of treasure and with oceans of blood. Another war would bankrupt this Nation and change its economy. It would change its whole political economy.

I believe the President's request is a request for adequacy, and indicates alertness. If, in this period, I felt that all those who fear the menace of communism were mistaken, then I might agree that this is a time, above every other time, to follow the arguments of some of my good friends; but they are arguments which I believe are inaccurate and misleading. I think they miss the point. We cannot afford to stand around and do nothing in spite of everything.

Some persons talk about spending recklessly. On that point, Mr. President, we should realize that this program is the best insurance premium we can pay. We know that in eastern Germany the Kremlin is building rocket

sites. Russia has rockets. Why is she building them? Anyone can answer that question.

I wish to express one other thought with respect to an idea that has become so prevalent, namely, that this is a give-away program. Let me make it perfectly clear that when the mutual security program comes before the Senate for discussion, I shall proceed along the line suggested by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. We should examine it and, where necessary, cut it. However, we will have to be sure that it is necessary to do so. I am not in favor of being penny-wise and pound-foolish where the security of our Nation is involved.

We know that every dollar which is sent abroad creates a demand on our economy. We know that it creates jobs. We know that it increases our export and import business.

Mr. President, I have a memory that goes back to the period after the war ended—if it has ever ended—when the President of the United States and his economic advisers thought we were going to suffer the greatest depression the world had ever known. What line of reasoning did they follow? They followed the precedent of what had happened after the First World War, and they thought it would happen again.

Why did it not happen? Mr. President, I am not a specialist in economics, but when we extend credit to our allies to buy our farm surpluses and to buy materials with which to rebuild their cities, jobs are created in the United States. That is what happened. We helped create jobs and an economic situation which absolutely made impossible a depression or recession.

People talk about giving away $50 billion. Mr. President, we have more dollars in America today than we ever had. Why? Because every dollar that is given in credit abroad comes back home. It does not remain frozen over there. It creates, as I said before, a demand upon our economy that results in jobs, in production, and in labor. I remember that at that time someone said that that was the complete answer to the depression argument of the then President. We stopped the Kremlin short then.

So far as the $200 million is concerned, when we consider a $72 billion budget, and also remember that the $200 million has already been appropriated, that is really only a pittance. Who is that $200 million to be used by? It is to be used by a coordinate branch of the Government, the executive department. For what is it to be used? It is to be used to stave off a third world war.

Our country does not want a third world war. No; we certainly do not want a third world war.

I am satisfied that this is not a give-away program. That does not mean there have not been some mistakes made in the past.

I went through Europe after the last war, when the souls of men were seared, when men, women and children reacted like beasts, and when they were filled with fear of the results of war, and were discouraged. Since then I have returned to Europe, and I have seen the same people walking erect before their God, thanking America with a paean on their lips.

Let us remember also that the mutual assistance program is a two-way street; that we get assistance in return.

With particular reference to the $200 million, let me make it perfectly clear that I am in favor of applying the argument of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to the mutual security program when it comes before the Senate. However, I am not in favor of interfering with a coordinate branch of the Government in this situation, when I think it is imperative that we carry through the program.

I shall speak again on the main issue at a later date.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a memorandum dealing with this subject.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Section 201 (a) of the Mutual Security Act authorizes appropriations "for assistance designed to promote the economic development of free Asia, the Middle East, and Africa, based on self-help and mutual cooperation of friendly nations, and to maintain economic and political stability in these areas." The Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1957, appropriated $250 million under this authorization.

2. Section 201 (b) of the Mutual Security Act provides that 80 percent of this assistance "shall only be available on terms of repayment, except (1) when such funds are used to finance sales of surplus agricultural commodities * * *, or (2) when granted for the purpose of a regional project involving two or more beneficiary nations." Section 201 (b) further provides that not more than 25 percent of the funds "shall be used in furnishing bilateral assistance to any one nation."

3. According to the Department of State, of the $250 million appropriated under section 201, approximately $120 million is still available for use in the general area of the Middle East during the balance of the current fiscal year. Under the present law, at least $110 million of this would have to be used on a loan basis in order to comply with the 80 percent loan requirement in regard to the total $250 million.

4. The effect of section 3 of Senate Joint Resolution 19, therefore, would be to waive the loan requirement in regard to a maximum of $110 million.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin, the ranking minority member on the Committee on Foreign Relation, for his splendid analysis of the situation this morning. He has spoken of the way it affects the security of the United States, and he has put into the RECORD an exchange between himself and the Secretary of State.

I wonder whether the Senator would permit me to insert a few paragraphs from the record of the hearings, when he questioned Admiral Radford, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. WILEY. I shall be very happy to have the Senator do so.

Mr. BUSH. I read from page 407 of the printed hearings:

Senator WILEY. Admiral, not being a military man myself, and always profiting by the cross-questioning of Senator RUSSELL, I shall stay away from that field.

You are a specialist. I assume you have consulted not only with the best military brains in this country but also with the leaders of the countries in the Near East and our allies.

Is it in the interest and the security of the United States and the free world that this resolution be passed?

Admiral RADFORD. Senator, I most emphatically do feel that way.

Senator WILEY. Will you tell us why?

Admiral RADFORD. I feel from the military standpoint that we will be able to cooperate and plan with the military leaders of the friendly countries of the Middle East and help them to assure stability in their own countries. We will at the same time counter this great feeling of fear that exists in some of those countries that a Communist buildup of arms in the area cannot or will not be met.

[Deleted.]

The resolution will have a great stabilizing effect.

STOPPING SOVIET ADVANCES IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Senator WILEY. When you say it stabilizes, you mean that it would keep the Kremlin away from the oil of the Middle East and away from Africa and the vital materials there?

Admiral RADFORD. It will prevent the Communists from taking over the Middle East. It will be one of the ways that we can prevent them. The resolution will solve only part of the problem, but it will certainly help a great deal in the solution to the whole problem.

Senator WILEY. As a military man is it your conviction that if the Communists did take the Middle East, with its oil, and obtained a passageway to Africa whence we get a lot of our vital materials, that coup would result in a most serious danger to the life of this Nation?

Admiral RADFORD. I cannot think of anything more dangerous, because I am sure in those circumstances Western Europe, the alliances in Western Europe, NATO, would be seriously crippled. I think that there would be a good chance of the Communists taking over Western Europe in time through sheer economic strangulation. In other words, if the Communists controlled the oil of the Middle East, they could in effect control the economy of Europe.

Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Wisconsin permitted me to get that testimony into the RECORD, because it seems to me the questioning of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff brings out the central point, to wit, that the interests of the United States are basically at stake.

I congratulate the Senator on the able way he brought out this point.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. I think he has placed his finger on the main point. I am very happy he stressed the fact that Admiral Radford was chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I wonder if we realize what that means. We have the greatest Army in the world. We have the Air Force and the Navy, and here is a man who sits as the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of those three great branches, and tells us in plain Anglo-Saxon language what the situation is; and still we sit around and wait and wait and wait.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I was very much interested in the Senator's address, in which he pointed out the continuing danger in the Middle East. Is it not a fact that every day since hostilities began in the Middle East there has been always a possibility that a new outbreak might occur in which this Nation might become involved?

Mr. WILEY. Again speaking as a layman, I am satisfied from conferences we have had both in committee with distinguished leaders in government, and at the White House, that that is a common conclusion. I do not think it takes necessarily a brainy person to recognize why. For decades the Kremlin has had its eye on the Middle East. That is based upon facts which have been adduced from persons on the ground.

The Kremlin has its eye on the vital oil interests. Seventy percent of the known oil reserves of the world are found in the Middle East. Consequently, we are sensitive to the fact that the Kremlin has its finger in it, one way or another. Therefore, our Government, through another constitutional branch—I say constitutional branch because we are going to have more constitutional arguments before we get through with this resolution—our Government, through the Executive, has reached a conclusion, and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has raised the point that the situation is dynamic for evil consequences.

Mr. COOPER. In these discussions it seems sometimes that we forget the realities of the existing situation, namely, that there has been a continuous danger of the outbreak of hostilities, and that it has been chiefly the influence of this country that has led the way toward a solution of the problems in the Middle East.

Mr. WILEY. Together with the strong arms of our allies, such as Turkey, Pakistan, and other friends in that area, we have been able to prevent any real outburst of hostilities, except in connection with the Israeli and Egyptian conflict. We hope it will not come about.

Mr. COOPER. I think the Senator has made the strong point that, in the face of continuing danger, it would be hazardous, if not reckless, if the Senate of the United States should deprive the President of any instrument he thinks is needed to help resolve the present tense situation, and avoid an outbreak of war.

Mr. WILEY. I agree with that conclusion. I feel that there is no other course open for us. I am satisfied that that is the conclusion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. The only point on which I think he is mistaken is his argument that giving the President some latitude in connection with the expenditure of the $200 million is something extraordinary, something we must guide and control. We cannot do that. The Middle East is as big as the United States and has many conflicting interests, and we must trust a constitutional arm of government to handle our foreign policy.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin, because in the field of foreign policy he speaks with much authority. I should like to ask for the opinion of my colleague——

Mr. WILEY. Does the Senator wish an expert opinion? If so, I would refer the Senator to the able Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. CHURCH. There are many experts in this Chamber. But, having listened to the reading of the testimony before the joint committee, I should like to ask whether the $200 million in question, which has already been appropriated, would be spent in ways now authorized if the Congress of the United States failed to include in the resolution authority to the President to spend the money in a discretionary way.

Mr. WILEY. I am sure that I am not in a position to give any definitive answer. Let me see if I can make the situation clear. Here is one yard; here is another yard; and here is a third yard. The Senator and I are given funds which are apportioned among the three yards, but all at once something happens to one of those yards requiring a disposition of the funds we wanted to apply to the other two yards. The situation in the Middle East is such that if the President wants to use his discretion in connection with the expenditure of the $200 million, he should have the power to do it. The Senator knows the world is changing. Consequently, it seems to me only common sense that we recognize the changing situation, and say, "Use your judgment, and afterward come back and account for it in due season."

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Frear | Monroney |
| Allott | Goldwater | Morton |
| Anderson | Gore | Mundt |
| Barrett | Green | Murray |
| Beall | Hayden | Neuberger |
| Bennett | Hennings | O'Mahoney |
| Bible | Hickenlooper | Pastore |
| Blakley | Hill | Payne |
| Bricker | Holland | Potter |
| Bush | Hruska | Purtell |
| Butler | Humphrey | Revercomb |
| Byrd | Jackson | Robertson |
| Capehart | Javits | Russell |
| Carlson | Jenner | Saltonstall |
| Carroll | Johnson, Tex. | Schoeppel |
| Case, N. J. | Johnston, S. C. | Scott |
| Case, S. Dak. | Kefauver | Smathers |
| Chavez | Kennedy | Smith, Maine |
| Church | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Clark | Kuchel | Sparkman |
| Cooper | Lausche | Stennis |
| Cotton | Long | Symington |
| Curtis | Magnuson | Talmadge |
| Dirksen | Malone | Thurmond |
| Douglas | Mansfield | Thye |
| Dworshak | Martin, Iowa | Watkins |
| Eastland | Martin, Pa. | Wiley |
| Ellender | McCarthy | Williams |
| Ervin | McClellan | Young |
| Flanders | McNamara | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). A quorum is present.

## QUORUM CALLS AND PROCEDURE IN CONNECTION WITH THE MIDDLE EAST JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate, I should like to make a very brief announcement. I hope each Senator will read the announcement in the RECORD tomorrow morning. I shall ask the attachés of the majority and the minority to notify each Senator during the afternoon by telephone, and to notify each Senator's office of the announcement. I hope the clerk in charge of preparing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Digest will see that this announcement is recorded there, or at least that the page reference is given.

Mr. President, it is my intention to ask for quorum calls for the following purposes during the further consideration of the Middle East joint resolution:

First, to get Senators to come to the floor, to speak.

Second, to get Senators to listen to Senators who care to speak.

Third, to notify Senators to come to the floor when a unanimous-consent agreement is about to be proposed.

Fourth, to have Senators present when a vote is about to be taken.

Mr. President, there are many other purposes of quorum calls, but those are four of the purposes for which quorum calls will be held during the days ahead. I desire to announce that this procedure will be followed during the further consideration of the pending joint resolution.

I desire to notify Members of the Senate that their names will not be recorded on quorum calls unless they answer to their names before the Chair announces the presence of a quorum.

The Chair will be requested to announce the number of Senators who answer the quorum calls when he announces that a quorum is present. Senators who may be engaged in important committee meetings when a quorum is called should come to the floor. They should start to the Chamber when they hear the first bells, so that they may arrive before the call is concluded.

Beginning Friday, March 1, at 10 a. m., the procedure as stated above will continue during the further consideration of the pending joint resolution, and I appeal to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to give the best cooperation possible.

This statement will, in certain minor respects, modify the announcement on this subject which I made to the Senate on Monday, February 25, and which is to be found on page 2496 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I had scheduled subcommittee hearings on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of next week. I should like to inquire of the majority leader if it is his purpose to call the Senate into

session at 10 a. m. on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is my plan. I apologize to the Senator for inconveniencing him and inconveniencing many subcommittee chairmen and committee chairmen, but we have had the pending resolution before the Senate for consideration since early in January. It was the first matter submitted to the Senate. The Senator from Tennessee is one of the most regular of Senators in attendance, but the Senator cannot conduct hearings and be on the floor at the same time, and we must have priorities, and the priority in this instance is going to be given to the sessions of the Senate until the pending resolution is disposed of.

Mr. GORE. I may say to the distinguished majority leader that I raise no objection. I commend the majority leader in his efforts to bring the issue to a final conclusion. I inquired only in order that I might cancel hearings scheduled by the subcommittee, and thus occasion the least possible inconvenience to those who had made plans to appear. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understood the purpose of the Senator's inquiry, and the statement he has made is characteristic of him. He understands the burdens of the leadership. He frequently has to bear them for me. I appreciate the very fine example he has set, and I express the hope that every other chairman will emulate him.

## VISIT TO THE SENATE BY REPRESENTATIVES OF THE BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have the honor of asking unanimous consent that I may introduce to the Senate two young gentlemen who are in the gallery. They come from my State of New York. They are the winners of the national Boys' Clubs contest for the "Pledge To Register and Vote" appeal. That is a matter in which all of us are very much interested.

Their prize has been this trip to Washington, in order that they may watch their Government in action.

The contest commemorates the 50th anniversary of the Boys' Clubs of America, which have done such outstandingly fine work for our young people.

Therefore, Mr. President, I should like to introduce to the Senate John Drupa, 14 years of age, of the Binghamton Boys' Club; and Paul Schmidt, 15 years of age, of the Boys' Club of the Tonawandas, together with John M. Gleason, national director of the Boys' Clubs of America. [Applause.]

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement regarding the contest.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be prined in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWS FROM BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA

Boys' Clubs of America's first annual report to Congress since the national boy guidance organization was granted a congressional charter last August, will be formally presented at the Capitol to Senator CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate and Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN on Thursday, February 28, by two New York State teen-agers.

The youngsters are John Drupa, 14, of the Binghamton Boys' Club, and Paul Schmidt, 15, of the Boys' Club of the Tonawandas.

John and Paul were selected for the honor as cowinners of a special "pledge to register and vote" appeal conducted nationally during the 1956 presidential election campaign by Boys' Clubs of America in cooperation with the American Heritage Foundation and the Advertising Council. The appeal was cosponsored as a public service by A. G. Spalding & Bros., Inc.

Young members of boys' clubs in all parts of the country conducted a unique campaign to get signed pledges to register and vote from eligible citizens in their home towns. They also submitted their own suggestions for urging more voters to go to the polls on each election day.

Reward for the national winner who "harvested" the greatest number of signed pledges and who also submitted the best suggestions was a trip to Washington, D. C., to see his Government in action. However, members of the national judging committee were unable to choose between the two New York youngsters and duplicate prizes, including the Washington trip, were awarded by the Spalding Co.

John Drupa came to this country from Latvia with his mother and brother 6 years ago. His father and older brother have been prisoners in Siberia since World War II. John belongs to the Binghamton Boys' Club where he is an active member of the Boys' Club Mayor's Council and Service Guild. In urging the citizens of his adopted city to vote, John spoke from bitter experience.

"Voting is the voice of the people," he told them. "Take it away and men won't dare to speak about things such as liberty, justice, and freedom. Freedom and vote? Millions of Europeans and Asians are only dreaming of those magic words. As a future citizen of the United States, I ask you to show the true spirit of democracy. We, the citizens of tomorrow ask you, the citizens of today, to vote."

Paul, a member of the Boys' Club of the Tonawandas, is the proud possessor of a letter from Mrs. Mamie Eisenhower on his efforts in getting more than 872 pledges to vote from citizens of North Tonawanda.

She wrote:

"It is most heartwarming to hear that you are so aware of the important privilege and obligation of exercising one's right to vote, and I sincerely appreciate all your energetic endeavors. It is young people like you, with spirit and enthusiasm, who can do much more than you realize, and the President joins me in deep gratitude for your loyal efforts proving that you are a conscientious citizen of our country."

John and Paul have a busy schedule for the 3 days they will be in Washington. On Thursday, at 11 a. m., they will assist John M. Gleason, national director of Boys' Clubs of America, in the formal presentation of the report to Senator HAYDEN and Speaker RAYBURN. Congressmen WILLIAM E. MILLER and W. STERLING COLE, of New York, will also be present. In addition to the honor of presenting the report to Congress; the boys will visit the White House, attend sessions of both the Senate and the House, and make a special tour of the FBI academy.

The Boys' Clubs of America's congressional charter, the first granted to a boy organization in the past 40 years, is a recognition by the Government of the United States of the work being done nationally by this 51-year-old organization of which former President Herbert Hoover is chairman of the board. More than 400,000 boys belong to the 460 clubs affiliated with Boys' Clubs of America.

## PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and miltary cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] raised in this Chamber what I consider to be some very fundamental questions regarding one phase of the pending resolution. With all deference to those who have undertaken to answer his arguments so far, I think a fair summary of what they said is, "We must stop communism and we must back the President."

If a resolution reading, "*Resolved*, That communism should be stopped in the Middle East and elsewhere" were to be put to an oral vote, I suppose that there would be a unanimous vote in favor of it. Therefore that question is not subject to contest here. Likewise, if there were put to an oral vote the question of backing up the President, that broad principle would certainly get a unanimous vote. So I do not think that is the real issue involved in the pending amendment, and it is not the issue the Senator from Georgia raised.

In my opinion the pending resolution with reference to the Middle East should pass by a large and overwhelming vote, and that is one reason why I should like to see it stripped of all reference to economic and military aid. In my humble opinion, it is not necessary to include that provision. It beclouds the issue, and it will rob the resolution of some votes on the Senate floor at the time of final passage.

Mr. President, I supported the resolution in committee, and I shall vote for it on final passage. I hope it will be passed by an overwhelming vote. I think it is very unfortunate that there was tied to the measure, at this stage of the proceedings, the question of changing the law with reference to economic and military aid. In my humble opinion, the provision is not necessary, and will prevent the resolution receiving full support.

I wish to give, briefly, my reasons for my statement. Besides other available funds now appropriated for use in the Middle East, the Mutual Security Act of 1956 authorized the President to use $100 million entirely as he might see fit, without any strings or restrictions. With regard to suggestions about backing up the President, I remember when that provision was included in the appropriation bill there was a minority vote; if I remember correctly, that was a vote on which I came in a little late, and I either broke a tie or kept the vote from being a tie. But no one wanted to emasculate the provision as a whole. That was the sentiment of the committee then, and it is the sentiment of the committee now. No one wants to take that money away from the President.

It is undisputed that the President has, of that $100 million, $95 million of free money which he could have used during January and February, and

which he can now use, without any restriction. In addition, he had available money which totaled $750 million and which was provided for the Middle East in the bill which Congress passed. A great deal of it is still available. The President has all of that money available for use within the very limited restrictions of the present law.

So, if the Senate should adopt the Russell amendment, let us keep it clear that striking out the authorization in the pending resolution regarding economic and military aid will mean that the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1956 will nevertheless continue in operation, and that $95 million will be available for the President to use as he sees fit.

Furthermore, the Mutual Security Act for 1957, this calendar year, with appropriations thereunder, will be enacted into law within slightly more than 3 months after the pending resolution becomes law. I am fully satisfied, after hearing virtually all the proof before the two committees, that funds in addition to the $95 million are not needed and could not be used to advantage prior to June 30, 1957.

I am not an expert, but for a number of years I have been hearing the proof presented with reference to various bills. I hear a great deal of it in the Armed Services Committee, and I hear it in the Appropriations Committee. Reference was made a while ago to the testimony of a very fine military officer with respect to the funds, to the effect that we had to have such funds to stop communism. There is no debate about that. Testimony like that is offered before the committees all the time. I am a member of the Military Construction Subcommittee, and have been a member of that subcommittee for years. With all deference to the fine officers who come before the committee, not a single one of them ever suggested the saving of as much as $10 on any individual project. I have never heard any one of them point out, even under cross-examination, in connection with a $2 billion appropriation bill, where as much as $100 could be saved. The whole theme is necessity. Everything is necessary. Such testimony as that year after year convinces me that until the Congress, the legislative branch of the Government, steps in and takes charge with reference to the continuous expansion and increase of these programs, they will continue to increase and pile up debt on the people of the United States. We have a responsibility we cannot avoid.

I wish to refer briefly to one witness, and cite the book and page of the proof, as one of the things which made it clear to me that, so far as the need for the extra $200 million during the next 90 days is concerned, the need does not exist. I refer in particular to the testimony of Hon. Joseph C. Green, former Ambassador to Jordan, now retired. He expressly stated that the $200 million in question could not be properly used within the time limit. I quote from his testimony, on page 674 of the recent joint hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 19:

> As far as spending $200 million between now and June out there—

Referring to Jordan, where he had been—

> is concerned, the administration may have some specific projects that I have never heard of, but I know of no way that that could be done in that space of time except by simply handing it out.

Those are significant words, Mr. President, in view of a great deal that has happened—"except by simply handing it out."

I definitely conclude from all the proof that, so far as the money is concerned, there is no emergency. Certainly there will be no emergency between now and the time when we allow the Mutual Security Act of 1957 to take its regular course through the Legislative Chambers and run the gauntlet of the searching test of examination, reexamination, and debate.

Let us remember always that this unused reserve, the $95 million of free money, is at the beck and call of the President. There has been no program; there have been no plans; no one has been sent to give us a plan or a blueprint.

Quoting further from the testimony of former Ambassador Green:

> It is possible of course to start making plans, constructive plans, such as for irrigation works and to start buying materials and so on and spend some of that sum, but I can't possibly see how you could spend it all.

He was referring to the 90-day period that was in question. So I think it is certainly fair to say that $95 million is sufficient with which to start planning a constructive program and make some commitments, but certainly there is no emergency which requires a reevaluation of the law in connection with a foot-in-the-door proposal to launch an entirely new program, about which the Congress knows nothing.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I find the statement of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi challenging, particularly so because he is a member of the Committee on Appropriations. Does the Senator assume that, after the presentation of justifications by the administration in requesting appropriations, the Congress will respond reasonably and make such appropriations as are reasonably justified?

Mr. STENNIS. I certainly think so. That is my assumption, and I believe that is the sentiment of Congress.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. As I have stated, the Senator from Mississippi serves on the Appropriations Committee. I serve on the Public Works Committee. The distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi was formerly a member of the Senate Public Works Committee. As a result of his experience in that capacity he knows, and from my experience I know, that a considerable period of time is necessary between survey, authorization, appropriation, and construction of projects, even in our own country, though the need for such projects may be rather definitely known. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. STENNIS. I fully agree with the Senator.

Mr. GORE. Would it be reasonable to presume, then, that the decision as to the economic validity of a project, the necessary local preparation and surveys, the planning, the acquisition of rights-of-way, and such other plans and actions as are necessary preliminaries to the consummation of a project, would require a considerable time, no matter in what country the project was to be built?

Mr. STENNIS. That is very obviously true. It simply cannot be done in such a way as to bring value to the people of the other country, and a return to our country, unless there is constructive planning, which requires time—either that or, as former Ambassador Green says, it is a case of "simply handing it out." I do not think it is the purpose of anyone simply to hand it out.

Mr. GORE. I am sure the entire country would be disturbed if the Congress should vote vast sums merely for the purpose of "handing out." I presume the administration has something more constructive and material in mind.

I have not concluded my own position definitely with respect to this amendment. I should like to inquire of the Senator what evidence his committee had before it with respect to the need and the justification, specifically, for the removal of restrictions on the $200 million.

Mr. STENNIS. About the only explanation or justification I heard—and I shall develop it fully—was that we must stop communism, and we must support the President. I covered that argument in part in the early portion of my remarks.

I studied the hearings on the pending resolution. I objected to certain language; I objected to the word "authorized" and asked that it be stricken out. It has been stricken. I went into the subject with the intention and purpose of voting for the request for the $200 million. I am for the resolution. I supported it in committee, and will support it on the floor. However, when we got to this part of the proposal, we found that witness after witness failed, in response to direct questioning, to indicate any semblance of a plan. They failed to give us any kind of blueprint. When that happened during the open hearings, I thought that certainly we would be given something when we went into executive session. However, in the executive sessions, time after time witness after witness failed to give us even a vague outline of how the $200 million would be used.

However, I still clung to a hope. I said I would support that part of the program because certainly some kind of assurance would be given to the senior members of the committee. White House conferences were being held at that time, and the chairmen and the ranking members of the committees and other Senators were in conference at the White House.

I thought that someone certainly would be given some kind of blueprint or bill of particulars.

However, up to this date, so far as I know, and so far as I have been able to learn from other sources, there has not been presented any kind of plan or bill of particulars or anything of any nature which goes into the real meat of what this money is to be used for.

Thereupon, I made up my mind that I was not going to support such a provision as that, because I realized that this was one of the most serious matters ever to come before Congress. I refer to the realization that we must sooner or later step in and get a reevaluation of the entire aid program. I am one who supported that program all the way through, until last year. Last year I voted against it, more as a protest than as a matter of policy. I voted in the negative as a protest against the magnitude of the program, the extravagance of it, and the unsound basis on which we were traveling.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have been following with some interest the argument of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I should like to ask him if there is anything in the hearings or in any understanding that the $200 million which is being asked for under an unlimited authorization could be used by the President for the purposes requested in connection with the foreign aid bill of last year, namely, to make definite commitments for long-term developmental projects in various areas of the world. As we know, Congress declined to give the President such long-term authority. The money which has been appropriated in the past, with the exception of the President's discretionary fund of $95 million, can be used only on a year-to-year basis. Is there anything in the testimony to indicate that some of the $200 million which is being asked for might be used to guarantee the carry-to-completion of such projects as the Transjordan project, utilizing the use of the waters of the Jordan River by Jordan and Israel?

Mr. STENNIS. We know that it will be used for some item, but we do not know for what. So far as I am aware, there is nothing in the testimony which ties the use of this money to any particular project. I believe it has been rather embarrassing to some of the proponents of the joint resolution that we have not been told something about how the money is to be used. I know of nothing in the testimony that ties the use of the money to any program.

Mr. MONRONEY. But it would be possible that some of the $200 million could be used for long-term projects.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. I am driven to the conclusion that this is a foot in the door, perhaps, preparatory to the launching of an elaborate program under the old system. That is one reason why I have definitely concluded that we might just as well meet the issue now, especially since there is no emergency in existence at this time, and determine what the will of Congress is with respect to these programs in the future.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is there anything in the testimony to indicate that some of the $200 million might be committed for the building of the Aswan Dam in Egypt, which at one time had been assured to Mr. Nasser and then suddenly canceled by Secretary Dulles?

Mr. STENNIS. So far as I know there is nothing in the testimony to indicate there was such a committal. The record is silent in that respect.

Mr. MONRONEY. The record is silent?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct. It is when these periods of silence kept exploding, one after another, that I became convinced that we had better call a halt and have a reevaluation of the whole program.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to point out to the Senator, by way of allaying his fears, that the authority which the President seeks does not constitute a foot in the door, or even a toe in the door, because both feet have been in the door for several years already.

The $200 million have already been provided by the Congress. The proposal before the Senate is simply to permit the President to spend the money over a longer period of time. The fact is that most of it has already been promised or allocated anyway. What is left of the $200 million would be available for the purpose of bargaining or negotiating for new projects, but how much of it is available or what the projects are, I am not able to say at this time. The amount may be $30 million or $40 million. I do not know. Members of the committee asked very pointedly for some specific indications as to what the money would be used for.

We were told, in effect—at least I got the inference—that it would be used for bargaining purposes where it would do the most good. The agencies felt that to make public all the uses to which it could be put would simply give advance notice to the Communist influences, who would immediately take steps to counteract it.

Actually, I believe we are making a mountain out of a molehill with respect to the $200 million. The money has already been appropriated, but it must be allocated before May 1, as I understand; and the President would like to have 2 additional months within which to decide how to spend it.

If we can judge from past experience, it will all be allocated for something anyway. The agencies seem to think they may be able to allocate it more judicially if they have a little longer time in which to do so.

So far as having a foot in the door is concerned, it seems to me both feet have been in the door for a long time. Therefore we can hardly refer to it in that way.

I believe that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and other Senators have made out a very good case for tightening up on the whole foreign-aid program. I believe we must watch very carefully how we make appropriations which may be carried from year to year for an indefinite number of years. We will probably have to require the departments to keep their spending more nearly in step with their allocations. We should not permit them to merely allocate it, so that they can hold the money for long periods of years.

That does not apply only to the agencies dealing with the foreign economic program, the military program, or the technical-assistance programs, but applies also to other agencies of the Government.

When we let the agencies get too far ahead in their planning, and let them get too much slack in the reins, so far as Congress is concerned, it becomes very difficult to control their spending to make sure that it is being done in accordance with the intent of Congress.

I believe that on general principle the Senator from Mississippi is on very good ground, but I shall vote against his amendment, because in this instance I think it is making a mountain out of a molehill. Most of the $200 million has been spent anyway; and if it has not been spent already, it will be spent. If the agencies need another 2 months to plan the spending, and only for this year, I am perfectly willing to give them the extra time.

I do not agree with those who say that the military-assistance program will be fully effective in meeting the advance of communism. I believe that technical assistance will play a very strong part, provided it is properly used.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's fine contribution. The foot-in-the-door reference was made having in mind the launching of a new and unknown program which I felt we would be called on to finance.

I am now very glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, one thing which concerns many of us is that on which the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] placed his finger yesterday, when he pointed out that one of the reasons why some countries have not accepted our money in the past has been because of the requirement that they make available to us information as to how our money and resources are being used. It seems to me it is very unwise to waive that requirement. Some of these countries could take the arms we give them and use them to start a war with some nation which is at peace with the United States, and which has no differences to settle with us.

Furthermore, we have had experience as to what happened in some countries where we do not have inspection. I recall the handling of offshore procurement in connection with military aid in some areas of the world. A certain country was to produce tanks, and we were to pay for them. Yet, our armed services found great difficulty in reaching an agreement whereby the other nation would let us see that they made the tanks

for their own army. They said it was a violation of their sovereignty. We would like to make sure that the arms remained where they were.

Furthermore, with reference to the economic phases of the program, the Senator well knows that we have required that 80 percent of economic aid should be on a loan basis. We do not think it is wise to waive this loan requirement as to countries that are able to pay back.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's remarks. He has certainly given a vivid illustration of what has happened in the past, and he sums up one of the points I have in mind, Mr. President, namely, that we may just as well meet this issue now and formulate a stronger and firmer aid policy.

I think we can do it for less money and can make it more effective. But we are bypassing it by establishing a looser program in connection with this resolution when there is no necessity for it. Within a few weeks we shall be debating the bill which will provide new money.

Mr. LONG. It seems to me the administration is overlooking one of the important factors involved. I have discussed this matter with persons who are trying to handle the expenditure of this aid money. One country will undertake to see what kind of bargain other nations have been able to make. If nation A gets money under more favorable terms than nation B, nation B will want its money on the same terms.

I had the honor of serving on a subcommittee with the Senator from Mississippi, dealing with military base construction overseas. We found that England would give us a fairly good agreement on military bases, but then she found that France had driven a hard bargain, and so England wanted a similar agreement.

Iceland extracted a much better bargain from us.

Each Nation was checking on what the others were obtaining.

The same situation will exist if we start giving our money away in the Middle East without attaching any restrictions whatever.

Mr. STENNIS. I think the Senator from Louisiana has made a very fine contribution to the debate. I got the impression from a very brief visit to some of those countries that it will require well-laid plans, envisioned over the years and really worked out well in advance, before we can get the interest and understanding of those nations. I think it is a great mistake to jump in, in an emergency atmosphere, and spend a great deal of money or promise a great deal of money. I think it works against us. I think the reaction has been against us in many foreign nations. We are continuing to suffer what can be permanent injury unless we revalue and make a new start on this entire program. I think we may as well start now. Instead of relaxing the limitations, we should be formulating a long-range program with firmer requirements.

I shall favor a system of well-chosen projects for application of loan-grants wherein the nations receiving assistance will be required to repay a major part of the money and will have to impose a tax on their own people. This will make them partners, and will insure the approval of only those projects which are worthwhile and which fit into the local economy as well as the needs and desires of the local people.

At the same time we shall be taking part in worthwhile projects in friendly nations as well as opening the doors of opportunity for them to improve their economic position and standard of living.

Further, I shall favor loans, or certain tax advantages, to American companies that may build certain approved industrial plants in foreign countries that will help build up the economy of those countries.

We can furnish at our own expense technical aid to participating countries enabling them to construct and operate the projects into which they put their own funds for construction and operation. My on-the-ground observations have convinced me that technical aid should be on a limited scale and only where such aid is actually administered in helping the whole population of those countries to help themselves.

I favor certain technical aid in agricultural pursuits, sanitation, medical care and teaching, and related matters.

The further we go with our present program, the less we do and the more involved we become.

Mr. President, I shall not continue any longer. I do not wish to take the time of the Senate unduly, but I feel that Congress should not approve any more programs without being told in advance exactly what the program is and what is going to be done with the money. It is not unreasonable for the Congress to say, "Give us more information on this Middle East plan so that we may judge of validity." We are not experts, and we might come nearer to the composite viewpoint of the American people as to what is best and what program they are willing to support if we can get more information on the subject.

So I repeat, Mr. President, there is no emergency here. I believe that until we meet the issue squarely and firmly we shall fail in our duty and shall certainly fail to have an effective and worthwhile aid program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I wish to say that I am very happy indeed the Senator has expressed himself as frankly and as forcefully as he has. I find myself thinking along the same lines described by the Senator as representing his convictions in the matter.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. It seems to me, in the first place, that without any explanation as to how the $200 million will be used—and it must be used or committed within a few weeks time—Congress would be doing a very questionable thing by adding this item to the declaration of high principle, which is what I regard the resolution to be.

The Senator from Mississippi will recall that only last year in the hearings before the Appropriations Committee, of which he and I are members, it was very clearly shown that there were differences in thinking between some members of the committee and the Secretary of State appearing as a witness and being cross-examined by various Senators, including myself, as to what should be done and what projects should be undertaken. The Senator will recall, of course, a series of questions with reference to the Aswan Dam which has been adverted to by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and it was very clear that there were strong differences of opinion between the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the head of the Department of State.

Does it not seem to the Senator, knowing full well, as he does, the differences which existed before, differences which may well exist now and may well continue to exist in the future, that, in effect, by passing this resolution with the $200 million blank check appropriation attached to it, the Senate might well be in the position of agreeing in advance to the use of this rather large sum of money for objectives which it does not approve and objectives which it has disagreed upon with the Secretary of State heretofore?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is absolutely correct. That is the whole picture of what we are being asked to do. If we go into it, we are going into it blindfolded and we shall have no one to blame except ourselves, because we shall have spoken and told the executive branch to lay any foundation they may see fit, and we will follow it up with the money.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the Senator of the conviction that, if we took action and passed the resolution as it is now drafted, we would, in effect, be seeking to absolve ourselves from any responsibility for the use which would be made of the $200 million, notwithstanding the fact that we know that some of the uses, at least, which have been contemplated in the past by the Department of State were in contravention of the sound judgment of the great majority of the Senate Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. STENNIS. In my opinion, we would be estopped, so to speak, from doing anything about it, as I have just said. Although we could not absolve ourselves from not having gone into it, we could be excused, more or less, for what might happen thereafter.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is saying, is he not, that while we would be abdicating our responsibility, we could not absolve ourselves from responsibility, because the responsibility is ours under the law. We should accept it and insist upon having full information before we take action of this kind. Is that the Senator's position?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is entirely correct. Really, the one major

point I wished to make, and the reason why I decided to make a few remarks on this subject, was that I felt this was a legislative responsibility; that we were right on the border line; that we would have to decide what we were going to do about it, or else waive our responsibility; that we would have to determine here and now what the issue was, and not when the regular mutual security bill came before the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. I want the Senator to know that I agree with him in both of his positions; namely, that it is of great importance that the resolution be passed in such form as to indicate a declaration of policy and of purpose on the part of the legislative branch in agreeing to the policy and purpose already expressed by the executive branch, although in some modified form. I congratulate the Senator from Mississippi for his part in accomplishing the modification of the resolution in the committees. I agree completely with the Senator from Mississippi in that respect.

I agree completely also with his feeling, as I understand it, that he thinks there is no place in such a declaration of high principle for appending a little bit of money to be used to toll people into our camp, which is what this provision amounts to.

Mr. STENNIS. I agree with the Senator from Florida. I thank him very much.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator not feel that to attempt to add this kind of proposal to the resolution is, in effect, a cheapening of our declaration of high principle? We had no such expression in the Formosa resolution. We had no such expression in the Monroe Doctrine. We had no such expression in the Declaration of Independence. There has never been any such expression in any other pronouncement of a high and important principle of this Nation as the appending of a little bit of money to be handed out to the people who agreed with us.

I feel that it is a cheapening of purpose which results.

I congratulate warmly the Senator from Mississippi for the statement of his position. I am glad the Senator has made his statement, because it is so thoroughly in accord with the position which the Senator from Florida has taken and intends to take, and which he hopes the Senate will adopt.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Florida for his constructive remarks concerning the situation before the Senate. I have very little patience with the argument which is made over and over again that we must vote for this resolution in order to back up the President.

Mr. President, I commend the President for wanting Congress to pass a firm resolution concerning the Middle East situation. But with all respect to the President and his office, I think that such a request could well have been made 12 or 18 months ago.

I do not want to detract one bit from all the strength and force Congress can give to the resolution. I think it is very unfortunate that it is encumbered or weighted down with the confusing issue concerning our foreign-aid policy. I see no real emergency necessitating the aid provision. Without any definite program before us, we are asked to authorize a wasteful cash program through the relaxation of the limitations of the present law. I am not willing to approve such a program. As I have said, instead of relaxing the limitations, we should be formulating a long-range program containing firmer requirements.

This problem will last long after the tenure of the present President of the United States. Congress will be wrestling with the problem and the policy long after the term of the present administration has expired.

Mr. President, this is not a political matter. This is not a partisan matter. It is a continuing policy.

I conclude with the same thought with which I started, namely, that the resolution should be passed by an overwhelming vote as concerns the high principle of the policy question. But I hope the Senate will strike from the body of the resolution the encumbrances and the entangling and disputed matters concerning the money, especially when there is already enough money available with which to operate for the next 90 days.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have listened with great interest to the very able address made by the Senator from Mississippi. I am sorry that I was not on the floor at the time he spoke; but I listened to him from the gallery. Both by reason of what the Senator has said here and what I know he said in the deliberations of the joint committees, he holds very strong convictions on this point, and I think it is a point on which there can be an honest difference of opinion.

In the light of the issue as the Senator has presented it, I may say for the RECORD that my approach to the money feature of the resolution, the amount of $200 million, is possibly from a little different standpoint. I should like to submit my view for the Senator's comment.

The $200 million which is already available was appropriated in prior acts. It can be spent under the provisions of the existing law. There is nothing Congress can do about it unless it passes a rescission act of some sort to recapture the money.

I am one of those who have felt that we should taper off the foreign-aid appropriations, and I have so voted for several years past. I have voted for amendments to reduce the amounts. Consequently, at this stage of the proceedings, it seems to me that it is entirely consistent with that position for me to say that when the President comes before Congress, as he has now, and says, in effect, "Here is $200 million which I could spend under the existing law, but we find that there are higher purposes for which we can spend the money and get more for our dollars than if we were to spend it on the basis of the prior law," it is a measure of economy and a measure of better spending to say, "Then let the money be spent for the new purposes rather than to keep it committed for the outworn purposes."

I should be glad to have the Senator's comment on that thought.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's sentiments. I also desire, as a Member of the joint committees, and also on behalf of other Senators, to thank the Senator from South Dakota for the very fine contribution he made to the consideration of the entire resolution in the committees. I know he contributed thought to each one of these subjects. I know he contributed a very timely amendment, too.

With respect to the phrase in the resolution pertaining to the best interests of other countries, the Senator from South Dakota was successful in having adopted an amendment to the effect that these matters must be in the interest of the United States, too. That certainly is something we must not overlook.

Let me say this about the Senator's position. I know there is no new money involved. I do not think there are any restrictions on the present use of the money which would hamper the President in any way, as I see it, in view of the $95 million he has in the Special Presidential Fund.

I have no doubt in my mind that the approval of the $200 million provision of the resolution will be the foundation from which will be launched an entire and very extensive aid program for the whole Middle East, and that the Congress is passing up, here and now—unless provision for the economic and military aid is deleted—its real opportunity to have any part in formulating the policy involved.

That is why I say that, there being no emergency, and there being available money, we should say, "Here is the line where we stop," and then start again in the next bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, let me express my appreciation of the fine statement the Senator from Mississippi has made.

In my opinion his point regarding the possibility that the start now proposed will expand itself into demands for new appropriations, is certainly worthy of consideration. However, in the committee we gave it consideration; and I think the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], were among those who were responsible for voting to attach an additional sentence to the joint resolution. It appears on page 6, and adds to section 3 the following language:

> Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall be construed as itself authorizing the appropriation of additional funds for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the first section or of the first sentence of section 2 of this joint resolution.

In my opinion the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Virginia very properly sponsored that amendment in the committee.

If the Senate in its wisdom does not adopt the pending Russell amendment, but reverts to the language which was reported by the committees, it should be

noted, for the benefit of whoever may wish to study this matter in the future, that the sentence I have read just now was included for the purpose of insuring that any additional appropriations for these new purposes should be the subject of direct and specific subsequent legislation.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for making those points.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey obtained the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me, to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I find myself in an interesting position in rising to contest the position of three distinguished Senators for whom I have the highest regard, namely, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I understand and appreciate their viewpoint. They are all members of the Armed Services Committee. I, however, am a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and probably that may be a reason why my approach to this matter is somewhat at variance with theirs.

Earlier in this debate last week, I delivered an address on the floor of the Senate on the general subject of the complete resolution. That address had nothing to do with the pending amendment, and I shall not repeat what I said on that occasion. I do desire, at this time, to make a few outstanding points, and to indicate some of the aspects in which I think the amendment as presented by the Senator from Georgia overlooks the real purpose of the resolution—the Eisenhower resolution.

I

I think fundamentally that it must be realized that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is assuming that the Eisenhower resolution constitutes a new foreign-aid program. That is where we have gotten off on the wrong track in the debate. Everyone who has spoken seems to believe this is a new foreign-aid program.

Let me say, in that connection, that the Committee on Foreign Relations is making a very careful study of the whole foreign-aid program. We have experts working on it. Before the next foreign-aid program is presented to the Senate we shall have had the benefit of the most expert testimony in the United States as to how we can improve the program, how we can remedy mistakes made—which we all admit have been made—and how we can evaluate it and put the necessary safeguards around the program.

The pending resolution has absolutely nothing to do with the foreign-aid program. Let me make that statement at the start. The proposal can best be described as an emergency "partnership" between the President and Congress to keep Soviet Russia out of the Middle East while efforts are made to settle the crises in the area with the countries concerned. To use an expression which I used in my address, it is an "umbrella" to protect the area from, first, Russian or satellite military attack, or second—and note this carefully—Russian subversive infiltration.

There are two dangers, the military danger, and the danger of Russian infiltration. In the pending resolution we say to Russia, "No Communist fishing in these waters." That is what the resolution proposes, and it has nothing whatever to do with the foreign-aid program.

II

My second point is that the resolution gives the President, with the support of Congress, the power to use our Armed Forces in the area in the event of a sudden military emergency and if the countries of the area ask for our aid under those conditions.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] approves of that authority. His amendment includes that particular point. He feels that the President should have such power as the resolution gives him.

III

But, and here is the important part—and it is my third point—there are also economic-aid provisions in the resolution; not as a part of a general foreign-aid program, not as a foot in a crack of the door, and not with the purpose of opening up enormous expenditures. The economic-aid provisions are intended to give to the President power to help countries of the area resist subversive infiltration by helping them to build their own economies. It has been our policy for years, and I hope it will continue to be, to help countries, especially the underdeveloped countries, to ward off Communist subversive infiltration. If nations have an economy which is undernourished or weak, that is the time when Russia moves in.

We cannot overlook the economic part of the resolution. It is a helping hand to enable the countries affected to be free and independent, and to be able to determine their own destinies. It helps them to resist communism. Communism is the menace we are trying to ward off in the Middle East. We are trying to prevent the fishing by Communist Russia in its troubled waters.

Mr. President, there is really more danger of subversive infiltration than there is danger of immediate military attack by Russia; but, we are telling Russia, by the pending resolution, "No fishing in these waters by military aggression, and no fishing in these waters by infiltration."

What I regret about the Russell amendment is that power would be taken away from the President and he would be deprived of flexible authority in dealing with the critical situation. Of course, appropriations were provided last year, and many of them are now in effect with respect to various areas. However, restrictions upon them leave the President with little flexibility in handling any emergency, and the Russell amendment would continue this deprivation.

IV

I now proceed to my fourth point regarding this $200 million flexible fund. Frankly, I think it has been unduly exaggerated. I agree with the comment made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] a few minutes ago in the debate on the floor. It is a relatively small part of the overall funds being used in the area. About $750 million has been allocated for Middle East commitments. The Eisenhower proposal simply sets some of those funds aside in order that the President may have the dollar power to help those countries with military assistance and with emergency economic aid if they need it. I shall in a moment mention the numerous provocative factors in the area. The fund must be uncommitted and available for any emergency which may arise anywhere. It cannot and must not be pinpointed now. The Secretary of State was perfectly correct when he stated that he did not know where it might be needed.

This new emergency has arisen throughout this area since the foreign-aid funds under MSA were committed earlier this fiscal year. It is the only weapon in the resolution which gives the President power to deal with Communist subversion and infiltration. It is a fund already authorized and appropriated. All we ask for is flexibility for the President—that some of the money already authorized and appropriated for the foreign-aid program of fiscal 1957 be made available to the President because of emergency conditions.

V

I come now to my fifth point. I wish particularly to try to meet the argument of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. He drew a dire picture of what might happen if the fund were not earmarked for certain countries, and if the Congress could not pass on every cent to be spent.

Let us look at the situation in this emergency. The Arab world is definitely divided. I could go into detail on that question, but, generally speaking, we know that Iran and Iraq are with the free nations. Turkey and Pakistan are also with the free nations, and we hope they will remain there. But we cannot be certain that in these critical times occasions may not arise when they will be in need of military aid or economic aid to enable them to remain with the free nations.

We know perfectly well that Egypt and Syria are danger spots. We know perfectly well from the testimony, and from our own knowledge, that Jordan is on the brink of a precipice. Jordan may not be able to survive. The British

police force was deported, and Jordan exists today between the sea and the sky. Trouble may break out there at any time. Certainly the Arab-Israel crisis is a special danger spot, as we all know. We do not know what may happen. Funds should be made available to the President to enable him to offset possible worsening of internal stability in the Middle East nations as a result of Arab-Israel differences, for example, but not for extensive irrigation projects.

We all know that the Suez Canal is a danger spot. We know that the Arab refugee question is a hot kettle all the time, and it represents a very great danger spot.

We also know that we have an air base in Saudi Arabia, by special arrangement with that country, toward the maintenance of which we make some contribution.

I need not add that the oil situation in the entire area is a critical danger spot. After all, the fate of Western Europe may well depend upon the way the oil situation is settled.

I am citing these examples because they relate to areas where some economic aid might be helpful if trouble should arise. Without such aid the susceptibility of these nations to communism will become so much greater. At present neither the Secretary of State nor anyone else can say where trouble may arise next. That is why the Secretary of State says that this is one of the most serious crises of the past 10 years.

If we should declare that the President shall have authority only to use the Armed Forces and not to extend economic aid, he would be handicapped if an emergency should arise. There might not be time to come to Congress and say, "We must deal with this situation."

So I object to the Russell amendment because it eliminates the possibility of economic aid and ignores all the dangers to which I have referred and which weaken the area to Communist penetration. We have heard plenty of testimony with regard to those dangers, but they have not been publicized.

To repeat, there exists a critical condition in the Arab world. Iran and Iraq are parties to the Baghdad Pact, which we are supporting. They are parties to the pact with Turkey and Pakistan. They are a part of the northern tier defending the area from an onrush by Russia into the Iranian oil fields.

We do not know what may happen with respect to Egypt and Syria. We know about Jordan. We know about the Arab-Israel crisis. We know about the Suez Canal situation. We know about the Arab refugee problem, and we know about the big airbase in Saudi Arabia. So I do not believe we need to labor those questions. These are areas where the President should have discretion and power to act immediately in order to minimize the possibility of Communist penetration or the happening of something which might start a train of perilous events, situations which could not await formal action by Congress.

I object to the Russell amendment because under it any possibility of giving economic aid to those areas will be eliminated.

Referring generally to past foreign-aid legislation, we have always given the President a leeway of $100,000,000 to use wherever an emergency might arise. We have also given the President leeway for the transfer of funds. In this resolution we seek simply to give him the power to deal with the Middle East emergency. I cannot emphasize the word "emergency" too strongly.

VI

The resolution reported by the two committees after days of study and debate would give the President the minimum powers he must have to meet his responsibilities as Commander in Chief in this particular situation.

I repeat that the Russell amendment confuses the emergency with our foreign-aid policy. They are two totally different things, and this is not a foreign-aid discussion.

VII

In closing these remarks I wish to sum up a few points which I have noted in respect to what the Russell amendment would do in the existing situation if it were adopted:

First. The amendment would strike from the resolution everything in it designed to prevent Communist subversion in the area. The danger from subversion may be even greater than the danger from armed aggression.

Second. The amendment would delete three things which the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations and the President of the United States have said are very important:

(a) It would delete the reaffirmation of the willingness of the United States to assist Middle East nations to build up security forces which can put down attempts at internal subversion.

Military assistance would be eliminated by the Russell amendment. There may be differences of opinion as to whom we should help. But there must be authority to provide help in case the emergency should arise.

(b) It would omit the reaffirmation of the willingness of the United States to furnish economic and technical assistance in order to help remove the breeding grounds for Communist ideology and infiltration.

(c) It would eliminate the provision giving discretion to the President, limited to $200 million of funds already appropriated, to enable him to cope with the changed conditions in the area since the fiscal year 1957 program was approved by the Congress.

That is the thing we do not seem to understand. The amount of money approved by the Congress last year for this area has been channeled in certain grooves. Conditions have changed. We want to have flexibility to meet the altered conditions by changing the program to that extent.

The main need is to be able to obligate more than 20 percent of certain appropriations in the last 2 months of the fiscal year. This need arises because the war in the Middle East disrupted many of our aid programs there.

Third. The amendment changes the character of the resolution to a purely military proposal. This would have a deleterious effect on United States foreign policies. We are concerned not only with Communist aggression, but also with the welfare of the free peoples of the Middle East. The world knows that the President has asked Congress for an expression of our support for the efforts of these countries to develop economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence.

The Russell amendment would say, "No; the United States cares only about guns and force."

It seems to me that that is placing the wrong emphasis on this situation. I do not have in mind grants, or anything like that; but it is necessary that sufficient money be available to help the Middle East countries in these crises and to enable them to know where their real friend is if they want aid in building up their economy.

The Soviet Union has seen the effectiveness of United States economic and technical assistance, and the Soviet Union now has started some programs of its own in the Middle East. We all know that if Middle East nations accept such aid, they will endanger their independence, but the temptation for them is great. To help them resist this bait, the United States must demonstrate to the peoples of the area our desire to help them achieve their hopes for a better life.

I have tried to sum up the situation as I see it. I especially wish to emphasize the point that we are dealing with an emergency which is temporary in nature. The program can be stopped at any time by concurrent resolution of the two Houses, without reference to the President, or, the President can stop it when he believes that the situation in the Middle East area has cooled down. It is in no sense a continuing foreign-aid program. It is in no sense a foot in the door. It is not an attempt to get around, as has been suggested by some persons, an action taken by the Committee on Appropriations, nor is it an attempt to do certain things the Congress has not approved. I know that nothing like that would be done, and I am sure no one else believes it would be done, unless we were to distrust the President entirely.

I am perfectly willing to agree that we cannot give a blank check to anyone, but I believe that we must have confidence in the President. The President is seeking peace in the world above all else, and has pledged to carry his purpose through in an honorable way; that is what the resolution calls for.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator agree with me that the essence of the joint resolution as reported to the Senate, as opposed to the Russell amendment, is the presentation of a strong expression of opinion as to what the United States will do if any aggression occurs in the Middle East area? In other words, it is an effort to prevent war. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the purpose of the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator is correct. The resolution is intended to give the President the power not only to use military force but also to use such judgment and authority as might be necessary in developing the friendship of the countries of the Middle East, which are teetering, so to speak, between the free Western World and the Communist world.

It is not to buy them, but it is necessary to have the funds available in order to deal with any situation that may arise.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield further.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Russell amendment, if it is substituted, would narrow the effort we could make to accomplish our purposes in that area. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree entirely. That is my objection to the Russell amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator another question. The first paragraph on page 8 of the committee report seems to sum up the situation. I ask him if that paragraph does not in a sense express very clearly the purpose of the President's message and the purpose of the resolution as reported to the Senate by the two committees. I will read the paragraph, since it is very brief. It reads:

> The Soviet threat to the Middle East is partly military, partly economic, and partly political. The response to that threat must likewise be partly military, partly economic, and partly political. The clear announcement of the firm intention of the United States to use armed force to repel overt aggression is designed to deter and prevent such aggression. But it affords no safeguards against the threat of overt subversion. Certainly a military guaranty would be pathetically futile and misdirected if the whole area were allowed to go into a state of complete economic collapse. Futher, the political repercussions in the area might be unfortunate if the impression were given that the United States has only a military interest.

Does that paragraph not express to the Senator the purpose of the resolution which we reported from our committees as a result of the long hearings and the sessions which were had with the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, and others?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the distinguished Senator entirely. I recall that that paragraph was the result of discussions in committee which centered on stressing the integration of the three factors, military, economic, and political. Unless we combine those three points in this resolution, we do not get the full effect of what is needed in this great emergency. We are not dealing with the foreign-aid program. We are dealing with an emergency.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to join in commending the Senator from New Jersey for bringing back into focus this whole situation. I believe he has done a very effective job indeed. I wonder whether the Senator would permit me, in assisting him, so to speak, to read into the RECORD at this point a part of the colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the Secretary of State during the hearings. The part to which I refer is found at page 455 of the hearings.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be very glad to have the Senator read it. Anything that will help clarify the point will be helpful.

Mr. BUSH. This is the part I should like to read:

> Senator WILEY. I want to get something else clear in my own mind. Last year this Democratic Congress appropriated $750 million for this area for military and economic aid; is that right?
>
> Secretary DULLES. That is approximately the figure; yes.
>
> Senator WILEY. Yes. And your resolution, as presented, would give you added time or, let us say, flexibility with respect to $200 million of that $750 million?
>
> Secretary DULLES. That is correct.
>
> Senator WILEY. You are not asking for an additional penny of appropriations?
>
> Secretary DULLES. That is correct.
>
> Senator WILEY. Nor are you asking for any additional powers in relation to that $750 million?
>
> Secretary DULLES. Only that there be somewhat greater discretion, primarily in terms of time as to its commitment.
>
> Senator WILEY. Yes. In other words, for more time, thus making possible more profitable, economical, and constructive investment of the $200 million?
>
> Secretary DULLES. Yes, sir. It permits us to expend this money with regard to the new situation created during November and December of last year, and I believe that if it is expended with regard to that situation rather than on the lines that were worked out prior to those important events, it will be spent more usefully and more productively from the standpoint of the United States.

It seems to me—and I am sure the Senator from New Jersey will agree with me—that that is the nub of the whole matter.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator for his remarks which indicate that he agrees that we are dealing with an emergency resolution, and not with a foreign-aid program.

Mr. BUSH. I certainly do. I believe that if the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] should be adopted, it would have a catastrophic effect upon the whole situation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I concur fully, and I hope the Senate will defeat the pending amendment by a substantial vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to have the Senator comment briefly on the reasons why the Secretary of State and other witnesses could not be more specific in stating where the aid was to be given. That is one of the criticisms of the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As I stated, it seems to me that if we are to make the program effective and to use the $200 million most efficiently we must give the President flexibility to act where an emergency calls for action. That is why I have tried to point out those places which I believe constitute the danger spots. Perhaps there are others. I do not know where the next one will be. None of us knows whether it will be in the Suez area or in Iran or in Iraq or in Israel. The President does not know. The Secretary of State does not know. We cannot blame him and we cannot accuse him of concealing anything. He points out that an emergency exists, that a fire may break out anywhere and that some leeway must be provided so as to be able to meet situations as they may develop.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The purpose of the resolution is to give the countries in the Middle East sufficient confidence that we have a friendly interest in them as to cause them to turn their faces our way. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It will have the psychological effect of showing to the people of the area that we are saying to Communist Russia, "No fishing in these waters," and that we are prepared to help in the solution of their problems.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I overheard a discussion the other day in which one person said, "I listened to the discussion for a long time, but, heck, I would not take away the hose and the water from a fireman to put out even a potential fire." Is that not what we would be doing if we eliminated the $200 million item?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It certainly would be.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am about to suggest the absence of a quorum in the hope that we shall have in attendance most of the Senators to hear what I am sure will be a very able address by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I shall be glad if the Senator from Virginia may be recognized at this time and take the floor, with the understanding that he will yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me, without losing his right to the floor, in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the staff on the Republican side to notify each Republican Senator, and I ask the staff on the Democratic side of the aisle to notify every Democratic Senator, that we are about to hear a speech, and that we may have a unanimous-consent agreement to propose. I hope we may have the attendance of all our colleagues at the conclusion of the quorum call.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Frear | Monroney |
| Allott | Goldwater | Morton |
| Anderson | Gore | Mundt |
| Barrett | Green | Murray |
| Beall | Hayden | Neuberger |
| Bennett | Hennings | O'Mahoney |
| Bible | Hickenlooper | Pastore |
| Blakley | Hill | Payne |
| Bricker | Holland | Potter |
| Bush | Hruska | Purtell |
| Butler | Humphrey | Revercomb |
| Byrd | Jackson | Robertson |
| Capehart | Javits | Russell |
| Carlson | Jenner | Saltonstall |
| Carroll | Johnson, Tex. | Schoeppel |
| Case, N. J. | Johnston, S. C. | Scott |
| Case, S. Dak. | Kefauver | Smathers |
| Chavez | Kennedy | Smith, Maine |
| Church | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Clark | Kuchel | Sparkman |
| Cooper | Lausche | Stennis |
| Cotton | Long | Symington |
| Curtis | Magnuson | Talmadge |
| Dirksen | Malone | Thurmond |
| Douglas | Mansfield | Thye |
| Dworshak | Martin, Iowa | Watkins |
| Eastland | Martin, Pa. | Wiley |
| Ellender | McCarthy | Williams |
| Ervin | McClellan | Young |
| Flanders | McNamara | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for only a short time, but I wish to make my position very clear with respect to the pending joint resolution.

From the moment this resolution was presented to Congress, I have entertained deep-seated reservations relating to the scope of sections 1 and 3 and the first sentence of section 2.

I have joined with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] in offering the pending amendment which would eliminate the language in the resolution which is, to me, an unprecedented declaration of intent to approve future foreign-aid authorizations.

In the long hearings before the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, the members of the committees were completely unable to ascertain for what purpose the $200 million in economic aid was to be expended. We were told that such information must await the Commission that would visit the Middle East after the adoption by Congress of the resolution now pending.

I want to be frank and say that the secrecy which surrounds this $200 million transfer of funds has created in my mind very serious misgivings. Economic aid is certainly not a matter for security classification. Yet repeated questions directed to the Secretary of State and his aids failed to obtain even the most indirect intimations as to how this fund would be expended. Great stress was laid on the fact that the $200 million fund is not a new appropriation, but is merely a transfer, and does not necessarily commit us to further appropriations.

To my mind, this reasoning is completely fallacious, by the passage of the resolution, we shall be opening the door to larger appropriations for aid in the Middle East, which, in time, will amount to billions of dollars. This is the first step down the road from which we cannot turn back. No previous authorization for assistance to foreign nations within my recollection is quite so broad in its terms or is more completely devoid of restrictions and limitations.

The members of the committees were unable to discover the reason why the Mutual Security Act was not amended instead of introducing a new resolution, which establishes a different and much broader definition of economic aid than does the Mutual Security Act.

I quote from the new authorization:

> That the President be and hereby is authorized to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East desiring such assistance in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence.

It would be difficult to find words which would establish a broader conception or definition of this new economic-aid program as applicable to the Middle East.

It will be noted that the area to be assisted is described as the general area of the Middle East.

I questioned the Secretary of State at length as to what nations would be eligible for this aid under the term "the general area of the Middle East." From his reply, it can be said that this area, as described in the pending resolution, would cover from 18 to 20 nations; and, at least one-half of these nations have never before received either economic or military aid. Therefore, what this resolution does is to take under the umbrella of economic aid at least 10 nations which have not heretofore enjoyed such economic aid to any extent.

The extent and amount of such aid to which the pending resolution commits this country is unpredictable, but it is certain to be very large in amount.

It is a peculiar thing, to me, that the Secretary of State is asking for $200 million to be transferred from an existing fund, and this amount of money must be either obligated or expended prior to July 1, only 4 months away; yet at this late date he was unable to give to the two committees of Congress even the most meager information as to where the aid would be expended.

When the resolution was first presented to the two committees, the Secretary of State laid great stress on the fact that the main reason for the request for this transfer of funds was that the Mutual Security Act requires that the economic aid funds be obligated by April 30, which is correct. I then asked the Secretary whether his purpose could be served by amending the Mutual Security Act and striking out this date; but he declined to accept that suggestion.

We now have in foreign economic and military aid unexpended balances of approximately $6 billion; and I can see no reason to ask for this transfer of $200 million, except to commit this country to a new program of foreign aid which will last for many years to come and will cost many billions of dollars.

In my service of 24 years as a Member of this body, I have never known a matter of such importance regarding which information was not given to a committee of Congress on a matter which could not be regarded under the classification of security.

I do hope that the citizens of America and the Members of Congress will realize that the obligation on the part of our Government is not limited to the $200 million, but that obligation will exist until the President shall determine that the peace and security of the nations affected are reasonably assured by international conditions, or until the obligation is terminated earlier by a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of Congress.

Inasmuch as the Middle East has been in a state of war and turmoil since long before the birth of Christ, it is not reasonable to think that the conditions set forth in the resolution for the termination of this aid will occur for a very long time, if ever.

It is well for us to remember that the foreign-aid program was started under the so-called Marshall plan, and was limited by law to 4 years. During that time $15 billion was expended. At the end of the 4 years, the program was continued and enlarged; and to date we have spent on it $55 billion, much of which has been squandered and wasted.

Mr. President, all other Senators know, as do I, as a result of the visits we have made abroad, to make investigations regarding our foreign aid, about the extent to which much of the money has been squandered without obtaining any real results. For instance, $100 million was given to Denmark, to be used by her to make payments on her public debt; that is listed in the records. That is one instance, although a small one, it is true, of giving away our money, to be applied to making payments on the national debt of another country, whereas at the same time we thus increased to that extent our own national debt.

On yesterday, the able senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], in the course of his excellent speech, made a point which I desire to emphasize in the strongest language. He said that one of the greatest obstacles to reducing our domestic expenditures is the fact that we are giving away great sums of money all over the world. The people back home, he said, cannot understand why expenditures are denied to them, when day by day the newspapers report that these charity gifts are being made throughout the world, for the taxpayers of this country to pay.

In fact, Mr. President, I shall go further, and shall say that the foreign-aid action our Government takes is increasing our Government's budget; I say that because I have received letters, and I know that other Senators have also received similar letters, asking why there cannot be an increase in salaries or an increase in other domestic expenditures, if the United States of America has so much money that it is able to scatter it broadcast throughout the world, as we are doing.

It is a fact that practically all of the $55 billion we are giving away in economic aid has been added to the public debt for our children and grandchildren to pay, both as to principal and interest.

As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and as a member of the committee for 25 years, I wish to say frankly

that today we have a tax system which is so burdensome that it cannot be continued for any great length of time without real disaster. We have approached the point of destroying the incentive on the part of those engaged in business, by diminishing net profits to such an extent that the incentive to do business may be destroyed.

Our total tax take exacted by the Federal Government, the States, and the localities amounts to $100 billion a year, which is 30 percent of the total national income.

Our past experience has proven and the economists have shown that no nation can survive over a long period of years when 30 percent of the total gross income of its citizens is devoted to the payment of taxes. The Federal Government collects $72 billion in direct taxes; but that $72 billion does not include the $2 billion collected from roads, which amount is placed in a trust fund; neither does it include the social-security taxes or the taxes collected for unemployment or a number of other taxes which are collected and placed in trust funds. If we add to what the Federal Government collects, the taxes which are paid to the cities, the counties, and the States, we arrive at a total of $100 billion which is being collected in taxes from the people of the United States.

Any slight recession in business conditions would be serious. Secretary Humphrey recognized this when he denounced the budget presented by the administration, and urged that it be reduced.

I have received hundreds of letters protesting against further foreign aid; and I join the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in expressing the belief that trimming the highest peacetime budget ever presented to Congress will be made much more difficult if—even before the appropriation bills are considered—the Congress passes, and if there is enacted, a joint resolution which not only will continue the foreign aid, but actually will increase it, by including new territory.

Sooner or later we must come to grips with our fiscal situation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My question is directed to the statement the Senator from Virginia just made regarding the establishment of a new policy by means of the pending measure. Is it not a fact that under the terms of the joint resolution as reported by the committees, the $200 million, although it is money which has already been appropriated, will be relieved from every restraint included in the Mutual Security Act and the appropriation bill thereunder?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Wyoming is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not also a fact that one of the restrictions was that of those funds, not more than 80 percent could be expended, except by loan?

Mr. BYRD. Yes; that is true.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Virginia agrees as to that; does he?

Mr. BYRD. Yes; I do.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So that under the provisions of the joint resolution as reported by the two committees, the President may grant away all of the $200 million; is that true?

Mr. BYRD. Certainly that is my understanding of the joint resolution. I think the Senator from Wyoming is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not also true that in his address to Congress on January 5, the President frankly declared that it was his plan to propose additional appropriations of the same kind? Will the Senator from Virginia permit me to read, in that connection, from page 6 of House Document 46, of the 85th Congress, 1st session, which contains the address delivered by the President of the United States? If he will permit me to do so, I should like to read the following words which were uttered by the President:

> The legislation now requested should not include the authorization or appropriation of funds, because I believe that, under the conditions I suggest, presently appropriated funds will be adequate for the balance of the present fiscal year ending June 30.

Is that not a statement that the $200 million will be adequate until the 30th of June?

Mr. BYRD. I think that is a correct statement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a clear implication that something more will be needed?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me read the next sentence:

> I shall—

And this is the President of the United States speaking—

> I shall, however, seek in subsequent legislation the authorization of $200 million to be available during each of the fiscal years 1958 and 1959 for discretionary use in the area, in addition to the other mutual-security programs for the area hereafter provided for by the Congress.

So that those who vote for the $200 million authorization as reported by the committee are, in fact, creating a precedent to vote for $600 million to be used in the President's discretion, and probably on the same precedent, without any limitation of any kind.

Mr. BYRD. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I note that the Senator is stepping from this discussion to a discussion of the tax phase. Almost every week I have risen on the Senate floor and inserted in the RECORD a list of public obligations which must be paid by the Government of the United States during the ensuing 12 months. It is an amount which is growing, and with it a constantly increasing interest burden.

The President's budget asks for at least $100 million more to pay interest on the national debt than was used last year. With the interest on our bonds increasing, with the cost of money which the Government must use increasing, with the Congress compelled, through the Finance Committee of the Senate, of which the Senator from Virginia is the distinguished chairman, to raise money from the people of the United States, is it not a strange time for members of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee to recommend to us that we place from $200 million to $600 million in the hands of the President for his discretionary expenditure? Does the Senator not know, from his experience in the committees of Congress, that in the Department of State there are innumerable persons who will spend the money who never come in contact with the President at all? Is that not correct?

Mr. BYRD. I certainly think it is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not correct, therefore, that in authorizing the expenditure of the amount requested we are handing over to the unknown appointees of the President or his subordinates the right to spend money which only the Congress can constitutionally authorize? We remove the restrictions. We provide no guide but that which may be conceived in the mind of the President or the delegated employee who speaks for him. This is giving money not to the President of the United States to spend, but to Secretary John Foster Dulles and those whom he may send abroad. Does the Senator see any justification for that?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia does not see it, and he is very much opposed to it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does anybody who expects to have any tax reduction provided by this Congress believe that a tax reduction can be achieved if we throw money away as is now proposed?

Mr. BYRD. It would be very foolish to expect tax reductions when we continue such things as are covered in the pending proposal.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Has the Senator heard any explanation by Mr. Dulles or any other witness on the part of the administration with respect to plans for the expenditure?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator has just stated that no information was given. Mr. Dulles was under the most vigorous and aggressive questioning I have probably ever observed since I have been in Congress. We do not know how one red cent is going to be spent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Such information was refused, was it not?

Mr. BYRD. The Secretary said he did not have it. If he did not have such information, why is it he wanted this emergency legislation, which he thought was necessary to authorize spending the money?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I interrupted the Senator at greater length than I had intended to do.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall seek only to make a little summary, if the Senator will permit me, because I feel that what is now engrossing our attention is, by all odds, one of the most important questions that has come before the Congress of the United States since I first became a Member thereof on the 1st of January 1934.

We are dealing with the fundamental policy of divided power. If the men who drew the Constitution of the United States were right when they said that the sole legislative authority should be lodged in the Congress, and that the power of the President was to execute the law, to make appointments to his Cabinet and of ambassadors and other officers, only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—if that be true, if we believe in that division of power, if we took our oaths to support it, how under heaven's name can we now vote to abdicate it? The Congress of the United States will be abdicating the constitutional powers it has if it supports grants made to an absolute monarch, to dictators, to kings, and to others who rule the Middle East countries, and in which area there is, except for Israel, no shadow of popular government.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator.

In connection with the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming, I wish to say I have a letter in my hand which I was very astonished to read, indicating the manner in which this Government committed itself to the Aswan Dam. The letter was written to a Mr. Horne. Mr. Horne wrote to the State Department, protesting and complaining against using American money to build the Aswan Dam, which will cost from $2 billion to $3 billion. He wrote the letter to Mr. Dulles, and received a reply from the State Department. I obtained a copy of the reply. It is dated May 29, 1956, and reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
*Washington, May 29, 1956.*

DEAR MR. HORNE: I trust you will excuse the delay in replying to your letter of February 9 to Secretary Dulles and that the following information concerning United States financial assistance to the Government of Egypt for construction of the Aswan Dam will still be of interest to you.

Pursuant to conversations recently conducted in Washington with the Government of Egypt, the United States and British Governments have assured the Egyptian Government of their support in the construction of the Aswan high dam. Assistance in the form of grants from the United States and the United Kingdom was offered toward defraying foreing exchange costs of the first stages of work. This phase involves the construction of the cofferdams, foundations for the main dam, diversion tunnels, and auxiliary works which will take from 4 to 5 years to complete. Assurance was given that the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom, subject to legislative authority, are prepared to consider sympathetically in the light of the then existing circumstances, further support toward financing, the later stages to supplement World Bank financing. The foregoing proposals are presently being studied by the Government of Egypt.

The construction of the high dam, viewed from the standpoint of the Government of Egypt, is an economic necessity. Egypt is a densely populated country confined to the Nile Valley and Delta. Its population is growing at a very rapid rate and there are few resources other than land to be exploited. It is estimated that at the present rate of growth, the population, by the time this project is fully completed, will be 61 percent greater than at present. The project will provide more irrigated land, more food, and more national income; but it is not at all certain that these increases will more than keep pace with the growing demands. The high dam will control the Nile floods, assure a uniform, dependable flow of water, and provide a source of hydroelectric power for future industrialization. It will also provide a greatly improved means of inland water transportation. The construction of the high dam represents a political promise by the Government of Egypt to its people, a promise which the Government appears determined to observe. It represents a project on which the Government will almost surely move regardless of where it obtains its financial support.

Here is a paragraph which I wish Senators to consider very carefully:

Among the considerations which contributed to the United States decision to offer assistance for a part of the foreign exchange costs of the preliminary construction for the dam, I believe two are particularly noteworthy. They are the traditional American desire to respond to an urgent humanitarian need and the vital interest of the United States in seeing established in the Middle East conditions of stability with freedom and orderly progress.

I assure you that the Department of State welcomes comments from Americans concerning the problems which confronts us in carrying out our responsibilities for the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States. These indications of American opinion are brought to the attention of Secretary Dulles and receive careful consideration by other officers of the Department. Perhaps you will be interested in the enclosed publication, "Your Opinion Counts".

Sincerely yours,

JOHN P. MEAGHER,
*Chief, Public Services Division.*

That is the way this foreign aid was decided upon. That is the way the money is expended. I recognize that the Department is limited by appropriations made by Congress, but once these projects are started, once we make a contribution to them, it is difficult to stop. Some say we are morally bound to complete them. It is hard to start a project and then cut it off. Such action may result in very great repercussions.

This is an illustration of how the money is being spent throughout the world. In this case assurances were given to the Government of Egypt without the approval of Congress. This project has never come before Congress. We all know the enormous cost of it. It is estimated, as I have said, to be as much as two and a half or three billion dollars. We are to render assistance not only through the World Bank, which is practically all our bank, but through the economic-aid program as well.

I cite this letter to the Senate as coming directly from the State Department, indicating how the Department makes its plans, and how the money is spent.

I read again:

The reasons are the traditional American desire to respond to an urgent humanitarian need, and the vital interests of the United States in seeing established in the Middle East conditions of stability with freedom and orderly progress.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thought both the Senator and the Senate might be interested in a letter which I have today received from the Secretary of State, dated February 28, 1957. It reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, *February 28, 1957.*

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
*United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I understand that you have asked for assurances that the administration would not, under the authorization in the Middle East resolution as that resolution was reported out of the joint committee, enter into any commitments which would seem, morally or legally, to obligate the Congress to appropriate funds in the future. I assure you that no such commitment will be made.

I also understand that you have inquired whether any of the funds, the use of which is authorized by this resolution, would be used for the Aswan Dam. The answer is "No."

I hope this information will be helpful to you.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator. That testimony was given to the committees. However, the fact remains that here is a letter from the State Department to the effect that the Department had agreed with the Government of Egypt to aid in this project. I assume the letter is signed by a responsible official of that Department.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not think it would be a vast improvement in the resolution as reported by the committees if the minority leader of the Senate were to offer certain amendments to the resolution expressing in legal language in the resolution the restrictions which the Secretary of State wishes us to take on faith. Why can we not make them a matter of law? If the Secretary of State really wishes to bind himself, and to give assurances to the Congress that these expenditures, which are open possibilities, according to the evidence which the Senator from Virginia has submitted, why do not the proponents of the resolution offer an amendment to the resolution which would accomplish that purpose?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, is the Senator asking me a question? The Senator from Virginia has the floor.

Mr. BYRD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming I believe that in the operation of the Government of the United States we must have some confidence in the executive branch of the Government and in its chief officers. At the time President Truman was President of the United States the 80th Congress gave him very extensive power—and properly so; I supported it—in connection with the Greek-Turkish aid program. No one knew from day to day what might happen. There must be a certain amount of discretionary authority.

In the meetings of the combined Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees a certain amendment to the resolution was proposed, namely, to the effect that before any commitments were entered into, the matter must be submit-

ted to the House and Senate, through their proper committees, for a period of some 15 days. That amendment was offered by the distinguished majority leader of the Senate [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas], who is a member of the Armed Services Committee. I think it was a proper amendment and a constructive amendment. The administration, both through the President and the Secretary of State, indicated that it was an acceptable amendment.

The House wrote an amendment—and if the House had not written it into the House joint resolution, the Senate would have written it in, because I made the suggestion when the subject was before the Senate committee—to the effect that the Congress should have the power to terminate the joint resolution by concurrent resolution, which means that by a resolution passed by the two Houses of Congress, without the signature of the President, the powers under the joint resolution can be terminated. That amendment has been announced as being acceptable to the administration.

I do not believe there has been a piece of legislation in recent years dealing with important matters of foreign policy with respect to which it can be more truly said that the Congress and the administration have worked as partners, and have accepted, not reluctantly, but in a full partnership arrangement, the suggestions which have been made by the Congress of the United States.

So when a high official of the Government—I do not know that he ranks above other Cabinet members, but at least in protocol arrangements he always heads the line of Cabinet officials when they attend a joint session of Congress and other official functions—writes a letter in response to an inquiry of the minority leader of the Senate, who also has a responsibility as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and when that Cabinet official gives a categorical answer, as he has done in this case, I believe we are certainly entitled to accept his assurances, without trying to encumber the proposed legislation with a great deal of additional amendments or language.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Virginia will permit me, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from California.

Mr. BYRD. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I agree with the minority leader that we ought to have some confidence, as he carefully limits it, in the officers of the executive branch of the Government.

However, when the Secretary of State, the head of the department which handles our foreign policy, undertakes to secure $200 million which may be expended at the discretion of the Department, and some of it perhaps for the benefit of the dictator of Egypt, then I believe the time for confidence is past and the time for rigid language in the law has come.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator from California for his comment. It is, nevertheless, correct to say that the assurances in the letter refer only to the Aswan Dam. What the Senator from California says with regard to the $200 million, and the restriction of the 15 days, applies only to the $200 million, and does not apply to the $6 billion of unexpended balances, or to any balance that may remain in appropriations which may be made later for the regular military or economic aid programs.

Mr. KNOWLAND. All I can say, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, on which I am honored to serve, as well as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, is that when the matter of the Aswan Dam was discussed with the Secretary of State and others—and I am sure the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], as members of the Committee on Appropriations, were present—assurances were given to the Committee on Appropriations that funds of the mutual aid program would not be used for the construction of the Aswan Dam; and that if there was any change made in the future, or if there was any contemplated change on the part of the administration, the administration would come to the Committee on Appropriations and give us a chance to discuss the matter with them.

I believe I have stated the situation to the best of my recollection.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator has reference only to the Aswan Dam. However, there are many other projects in these countries in addition to the Aswan Dam. What protection do we have in those circumstances?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The reference I have made was to the Aswan Dam, because I understood the Senator had been discussing that particular project here today.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I wish to make it clear that I simply used it as an example of the way and the manner in which obligations are made by the State Department. They are not made by the President, apparently. They are made by the State Department. This was a letter I received which related to this particular matter. There may be hundreds of others with respect to which the same thing has been done.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia has pointed out, for many weeks many of us in both open and executive hearings have tried to find out where this money was to be used. Inasmuch as the distinguished minority leader has just stated that the money would not be used for the Aswan Dam, and inasmuch as there is apprehension among some of the Members of the Senate that it is planned to use at least some of the money to mollify the present belligerent head of the Egyptian Government, I ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia if he will ask the distinguished minority leader if he knows whether any of this $200 million is intended to be used for military or economic support of Egypt.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from California if he desires to make an answer to that question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that I do not wish to give an answer which would be merely my own answer. I do not have the facts upon which I could give an official answer to the question. So far as I personally know, there is no commitment at the present time to give any such aid. I suppose that in the course of events over the period of time the resolution is in force, if the President of the United States felt it would be in the interest of this country and in the defense of the Middle East and in the protection of the Middle Eastern area from potential Communist aggression from without to do so, he would have the authority under the resolution to make allocations to Egypt, Jordan, Iraq, Iran, or to any of the other countries in the Middle East. Certainly Egypt would not be excluded from it; nor would it necessarily be included. The money would be available for use in the entire area of the Middle East.

Mr. BYRD. I wish to say a word or two more about our fiscal situation. I know Members of the Senate will understand that I do not speak in a partisan spirit. I do not believe I have done so since I have been a Member of the Senate.

I regard the present budget of the President of the United States as one of the most dangerous budgets ever submitted to Congress in my day. It is dangerous because of its implications. It contains greatly enlarged programs for spending which, once started, cannot be stopped.

It is not only the largest peacetime budget on record, but it is the third largest budget of any kind, war or peace, in the history of the United States.

Why is it that we must spend $72 billion when we are at peace and when we have high prosperity in the country? The reason is that the budget embarks upon new methods of spending. It obligates us to future spending which will last much longer than the life of anyone present in this Chamber. It starts a school-building program which will open a Pandora's box of spending the end of which no one can foresee. It provides $400 million for only 1 year. That is merely a drop in the bucket so far as the construction of school buildings is concerned. The school program should not be undertaken except in localities where the Federal Government itself, by its installations or activities, has increased the population to such a point that the local authorities cannot finance their own school buildings.

There is also contained in the budget a health program. There are 13 separate and distinct aids to the States in the budget.

When I came to the Senate the only Federal grant to the States was for roads,

and amounted to $250 million. Now we have 53 Federal grants, with 13 to be added by this year's budget. That makes 66 Federal grants, which will cost more than $4 billion.

Therefore I say, Mr. President, that the budget as submitted represents the most unconscionable increase in expenditures that has ever made. It provides for new methods of spending, which once started, cannot be stopped.

I wish to pay my tribute to Mr. Eisenhower for his action in 1953, when he came into office, cutting the Truman budget from $78 billion to $69 billion. It is true that the Truman budget included some expenditures for the Korean war. Nevertheless, President Eisenhower cut the budget back from $78 billion to $69 billion. The next year the budget was cut down to $64 billion. Mr. Eisenhower said, "My goal is $60 billion."

Then a year ago he started to build it up again. Now he submits to Congress the biggest budget in peacetime history and one which presents many more new ways of spending money than any budget I have ever studied in the time I have been in the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. In addition to the $72 billion budget which the Senator mentioned, I am sure he remembers that the Air Force has submitted plans for 61,000 Capehart units under the military program at an estimated cost of $1,006,500,000, which, when we figure in the 4½-percent interest with a 25-year-amortization period, will equal approximately $1,647 million, which is not reflected in the $72 billion budget

Mr. BYRD. Also, the $2 billion for road construction is not reflected.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. With reference to the matter which we have been discussing, while the Senator from Virginia was speaking I received from the State Department a letter relating to this subject, and if I may read it, the Senator from Virginia may like to comment upon it.

The letter is dated February 28, 1957, and is addresed to me as chairman of the joint hearing of the Committee on Foreign Relations and Armed Services of the United States Senate. The letter reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 28, 1957.

The Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
*Chairman, Joint Hearings of Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, United States Senate.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your staff has asked the views of the executive branch on an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 19 (the Middle East resolution) intended to be proposed by Senator RUSSELL for himself, Senator BYRD, and Senator STENNIS. The effect of the proposed amendment would be to delete from the resolution the authority provided by section 1 to provide economic assistance, the authority provided by the first sentence of section 2 to provide military assistance, and the authority provided by section 3 to use for these purposes, with greater flexibility than now permissible, $200 million of the funds already appropriated under the Mutual Security Act.

This proposed amendment would strike from the resolution any reference to economic aid or to military assistance. This would in our view largely destroy the effect which the resolution is designed to have in the Middle East. As the President said in his press conference on January 23, with reference to this very subject:

"To my mind, it is vital * * *. You cannot do the things that need to be done, as I call it to wage the peace, merely with arms. You have got to have the human understanding of human wants, and you have got to make it possible for people to achieve something in satisfying these wants if we are going to wage peace successfully."

In order to make clear why we are so strongly opposed to any such amendment, it should be recalled that the resolution is proposed by the President and as reported by the Joint Committee is aimed at the twin dangers of Communist armed attack against, and Communist subversion of, the nations of the Middle East. As President Eisenhower said in his address to the Congress, the resolution is designed to deal with these dangers in three ways:

"It would, first of all, authorize the United States to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence.

"It would in the second place, authorize the Executive to undertake in the same region programs of military assistance and cooperation with any nation or group of nations which desires such aid.

"It would, in the third place, authorize such assistance and cooperation to include the employment of the Armed Forces of the United States to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of such nations, requesting such aid, against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism."

To make possible the first and second provisions, the resolution would make available certain funds already appropriated under the Mutual Security Act. As Secretary Dulles stressed repeatedly in his testimony, the resolution would not authorize the use of a single penny that has not already been appropriated. It involves no new money. It authorizes only an additional flexibility as to the way in which a part of $200 million of funds already appropriated can be spent.

In our view, any deletion of the economic and military assistance provisions of the resolution might well be interpreted in the area of the Middle East as an indication that the United States has no concern for the economic plight of the peoples of the area. In view of the very great efforts that the Soviets are now making to appear as the principal supporters of the Middle East nations, such an impression, erroneous as it might be, could have a very disastrous effect upon the efforts which the United States is making to win the confidence of these peoples.

The deletion of these provisions would also destroy the value of the resolution as a shield against destruction of the nations of the region by subversion from within. The present gravely unsettled conditions of the area present a striking opportunity to Communist influences. It is urgently necessary to help these nations take positive steps toward dealing with their economic problems and toward developing security forces essential to maintain order and to be able to counter, if necessary, the potential danger of Communist-led armed efforts at internal subversion. Rejection of the provisions for economic and military assistance would strike from the President's hands two of the three tools he has declared to the Congress he needs to help preserve this vitally strategic area for the free world.

For the reasons outlined above the Department of State urges on the Senate most strongly that the proposed amendment not be adopted.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HILL,
*Assistant Secretary*
(For the Secretary of State).

I thought it was proper at this time to read this letter.

Mr. BYRD. If my recollection is correct, the Senator voted for this amendment.

Mr. GREEN. I did.

Mr. BYRD. Furthermore, $750 million is available in the Middle East for military aid, without this authorization.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's giving me the opportunity to observe that the contents of that letter are just as new and just as cogent as is the news in a newspaper 8 weeks old. That is the same theme Mr. Dulles adopted on the first day he came before the committee. He said, "We want this money, and we want it without any restriction." That was his theme on his first appearance; that was his theme when he departed from the committee several days later. After having been asked innumerable questions as to what he proposed to do with the money, he now comes up, 8 weeks later, still refusing to tell the Congress of the United States how he proposes to spend, as the Senator from Virginia said, one red cent of this $200 million.

The letter refers to the Soviets claiming to be the friends of the nations in the Middle East area. That argument was made 8 weeks ago. We asked every ambassador in that area whether the Soviet Union was moving in with any aid program, and whether it was necessary to bid the dollar against the ruble in the way of economic aid or of military assistance, and every witness testified that the Russians had not given them a thin dime. They had made some sales and demanded their money on the barrelhead. If they did not get the money, they took a note or a mortgage, for instance, on the cotton crop of Egypt for the commodities they sold.

So they bring in again the Soviet hobgoblin.

I detest communism as much as does any other Senator on this floor. I am willing to make any sacrifice necessary to repel this ugly force which is threatening to destroy human values. But, Mr. President, I become tired of having this argument brought up as a reason why we have to spend hundreds of millions of dollars. Are we the enemies of the nations in that area? Do we not wish to be their friends? Why cannot our diplomatic corps convince these people of our good will and friendship? They are fortified with an aid program. The Soviet diplomats seem to be so skillful they can outwit our people by making a few sales for full consideration.

We have manifested our friendship by grants of dollars and by aid in the form of all kinds of foodstuffs to feed the starving people. We have dealt our aid to friend and foe alike in that troubled area. We have fed the Arab refugees and have assisted the new State of Israel.

But they persist in the argument that because the Soviet Union claims to be a friend to the Middle East the Congress should abdicate not only its responsibility but also its duty to the American people.

The executive branch of the Government does not vote taxes on the people. The taxes must be voted by Congress. As a direct corollary of the voting of taxes Congress has the responsibility to determine how those funds shall be expended.

But after 8 weeks of searching questions we now receive this letter, this startling bombshell, which does not bring out one new fact that Mr. Dulles did not state on the first day he came before the committees in open session. He used identically the same argument then. He said we must trust the President. We all trust him. But we believe first in the American form of Government with its division of powers.

It is a sad day when the magic name of a popular President is invoked to entice the Congress to abandon its responsibilities. We have had that kind of experience with Democrats and Republicans alike since the Senator from Virginia and I entered this body.

In any case, it eventuates in some wrong to the people of this country, because Congress cannot abdicate its responsibility under any kind of administration without eventually doing injury to this system of government and all that it means to the people of the country.

Having heard that letter read, I can only say: This is where I came in on the first day of the hearings, when Mr. Dulles appeared.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry I had to miss much of the address of the able Senator from Virginia, but I had to leave the Senate Chamber because I was called before the Committee on Appropriations.

One of the features which I wanted to mention, if it had not been mentioned, and about which I should like to ask the Senator, is that we have found several times in the past that the judgment of the administration, as expressed at least to the Committee on Appropriations, has differed rather widely from the judgment of the majority of the Committee on Appropriations on various important issues. Did the Senator advert to the fact that that was true with reference to the Aswan Dam, for instance?

Mr. BYRD. I did.

Mr. HOLLAND. Did the Senator state in his remarks that in that matter the Committee on Appropriations, by a sizable majority, voted to insist, and the Secretary of State acceded to the request, that nothing be done in that field without first resubmitting the proposal to the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. BYRD. I did not mention the vote, but I mentioned the Aswan Dam.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator recall that the same difference of opinion existed with reference to both the economic aid and the military aid to Yugoslavia, and that that matter came to the floor of the Senate in the course of very heated debate both last year and the year before?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not the Senator's view that by voting these funds without imposing any condition or limitation at all, except a time limitation, the Senate surrenders its convictions on such matters, whether they be right or wrong? It is not for me to say whether the Senate was right or wrong; perhaps the spokesmen for the administration were right. At any rate, does not the Senate surrender its convictions and, in effect, say, "Go ahead and do what you want to do, even though it varies from our ideas of what is wise to be done with the people's money?"

Mr. BYRD. That is correct. The Senator from Florida has made an excellent statement, and I thank him.

Mr. President, we cannot continue to borrow and borrow and tax and tax and maintain a solvent government. Already, in a brief space of 15 years, we have lost by inflation one-half of the purchasing power of the dollar. Nothing is more inflationary than huge Government spending. If we should lose in the next 15 years one-half of the present dollar, bringing our dollar down to 25 cents, as compared to 1935–39, we would face a calamity nearly as bad as war.

About as close as the committee could get to the reason for asking for this initial commitment of economic aid to the Middle East, which will last only to July 1, next, was the statement that its purpose was chiefly psychological. Let me ask: How can such language simultaneously have a psychological impact in the Middle East, yet not commit us to future economic and military assistance programs of great magnitude?

It was shown at the hearings that approximately $750 million is available for expenditure in the Middle East under programs now authorized and for which appropriations have been made. It is certain that the Congress will be asked to approve another Mutual Security authorization for fiscal 1958. At that time we unquestionably will be presented a program for the Middle East, and the determination as to whether the amounts requested should be approved or not can then be arrived at by due and orderly procedure.

Other members of the committee and I asked repeatedly as to what emergency existed to justify the extraordinary procedure of bringing in a bill which bypassed the present Mutual Security Act and established a new area and a new definition of economic aid. Although the questioning was vigorous and aggressive, the committee was not able to obtain any satisfactory answers.

I am entirely unwilling by an extraordinary enactment of this type to open up an entirely new area of spending. I repeat again, and let nobody be misled, that this resolution will ultimately involve the expenditure of billions of dollars in the Middle East without any compensating reduction proposed in existing programs for other areas.

I think, considering the present condition of our appropriation bills and the demands upon the Treasury, if it is necessary to spend this money in the Middle East—I do not know whether or not it is, because no justification was made to the committees—then we should cut off economic aid somewhere else, and not simply pile this amount on top of what we are now spending.

Almost everyone recognizes that the resolution is not directed to the basic problems of the Middle East. It is not advertised as soothing the Arab-Israeli animosities, or as making any direct contribution to a more satisfactory operation of the Suez Canal.

It has always been my desire, unless there is strong reason to the contrary, to support the administration in power in all matters of foreign policy. The insistence of the Secretary of State and the administration upon the mixing up of economic aid with a declaration of policy against Communist nations is a most unfortunate one. I would yield a great deal to give by my vote solidarity of support, but I simply cannot support the pending resolution in its present shape.

Whether the Russell amendment wins or loses, it will receive very substantial support in the Senate of the United States. There is hardly a Senator who is not willing to vote for a resolution expressing the determination of the United States of America to resist Russian aggression in the Middle East area, but many of us have the most sincere convictions that a declaration of military policy should not be used as a vehicle to induce the Congress to embark upon a long-range economic program when no explanation has been made as to why such a program is necessary.

I think it is very unfortunate that those in authority saw fit to mix up a declaration of policy against communism with a matter of economic aid in the Middle East. I should like to see the Senate give a solid vote of approval to the resolution, and it could be done if the provision for economic aid were deleted from the resolution. It should never have been in the resolution, to start with.

In the letter just read by the very distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, not a single line in the letter justifies the appropriation or expenditure for economic aid.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Virginia for the speech he has just made. My interruptions have indicated my agreement with him on several substantial points.

At this time, I wish to make particular reference to the fact that when the Senator from Virginia takes a position upon any matter which is before the Congress, he is regarded by his colleagues

as one who speaks with sincerity and as one who speaks as the result of the knowledge he has acquired during a long public life which has shed honor upon him and upon his State and upon his Nation. I have not always agreed with the Senator from Virginia, but I have known that whenever he spoke, he did so without partisan motive. I know that whenever the Senator from Virginia takes a position in regard to a matter before the Congress, he does not take it for the purpose of gaining political advantage or for the purpose of placing one faction against another.

Mr. President, I am glad to have had the honor and the privilege of being associated with the Senator from Virginia for many years, and of knowing that he measures up to the highest standards which have been established in the history of the United States for the Members of this body. I compliment him.

In doing so, I wish to refer to the fact that many newspapers which comment upon the pending joint resolution, do so without sufficient knowledge or information about the underlying facts, and some of them now are trying to represent the speeches which have been made by Members on this side as mere attempts on the part of Democratic Senators to harass and impede the administration. No less a newspaper than the Washington Star published, last night, an editorial accusing the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself personally of being strange bedfellows with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] because we have insisted upon a full debate on this matter. The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], whose excellent speech on this subject drew the largest attendance of Senators that has been had on this floor at any time during the debate on the joint resolution, was also mentioned in the editorial.

If the questions I have propounded on the floor, after careful preparation, would be answered by those who constituted the majority of the committees which reported the joint resolution to the Senate, there might be some justification for editors and newspaper writers to determine whether our effort to pass upon a very important piece of proposed legislation relating to public policy is a sincere and honest one.

Mr. President, it is of no advantage to talk about having faith in the President or faith in the Secretary of State, when we are dealing with the fundamentals of popular government.

I desire to continue my remarks at this time, instead of yielding for a quorum, which might precipitate a question of a unanimous-consent agreement. There would be no sense in making an agreement to vote, while so many Senators have absented themselves from the floor and are not yet fully advised as to the issues which are before the Senate.

Mr. President, I was glad that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] spoke of the fiscal aspects of this policy. I know that every Member of this body realizes that the fiscal aspects are almost as important as are the military aspects.

While I was interrogating the Senator from Virginia, I sent to the clerk's office to obtain a copy of this morning's New York Times, the business section of which shows the market prices of practically all the stocks and bonds in the United States and the market prices of some of those in Canada. One of the most important lists is that of the bonds of the United States Government and the bonds of governmental agencies.

Let us remember that no one can go to the Treasury of the United States and find there $200 million in cash, to be used for the purpose now proposed. Our Government is in debt; and it has to borrow the money which will be needed in order to carry out this program, if it is voted.

If the Senate votes to grant the President discretionary power to spend $200 million, and if that measure is enacted, it will be necessary to obtain the money from borrowed funds. The cost of the money the Government of the United States is borrowing, in order to be able to carry on its functions, has steadily been increasing.

Here is the record, Mr. President: I find in the New York Times of today a list of Treasury notes. I shall not read all of them; that would be tedious. But in the August 1957 issue there were $12,056,000,000 worth of Treasury notes. Twelve billion dollars is twelve thousand million. Those notes are now selling on the stock market below par—for $99.25 per $100 note. On their face they carry an interest rate of 2¾ percent; but because they are selling below par, they have a yield of 3.27 percent. More than 3 percent interest can be earned on those obligations of the Government of the United States by any big business corporation or any bank which may desire to go into the open market and buy them.

Here is another one on the list: It shows $1,445,000,000 of 3½-percent Treasury notes. Those notes are the only ones in the whole list issued by the Treasury of the United States which are selling above par, and they are selling at only three-tenths of 1 percent above par—at 100.3, on the market. All the other Government notes are selling below par. The $156 million due in October 1961, pay 1½ percent, and are selling at $91.18, for instance, and with a yield, therefore, of 3.44 percent; and the $5,102,000,000 of Government notes due in February 1959, are selling at $97.20, with a yield of 3.41 percent.

When I consider the certificates of indebtedness, I find that the same story is told with regard to them. They have almost reached par; one issue is selling at $100, and another is selling at $100.1, and another is selling at $100.2 and another is selling at $100.3.

The Federal Land Bank bonds go to the banks which have been established by Congress for the purpose of assisting agriculture. Those bonds—which bear an interest rate of 3½ percent, 2½ percent, or 2¾ percent—also are selling below par.

It is only the bonds having the highest interest rate that stand any chance of reaching par. Does this not raise a consideration in the mind of every person present as to what the effect will be on our own economy, when at the very moment we cannot borrow money except by offering bonds at a price below par?

On the list of Treasury bonds only 2 out of almost 30 different issues are selling above par. One of those two is the 2¾-percent 1963–1958 bonds, selling at 100.6, and the other is the 2¾-percent 1965–1960 bonds, selling at 100.20. But those 2 bonds are exempt from income tax. If it were not for the fact that the receipt of income from the interest paid by the Government is exempt from Federal income tax, those bonds would be selling at below par, as are all the other bonds in this category.

Even the 3¼-percent bonds, which are due in 1983–1978—they were issued in 1953, the first act of this administration—which for a time were far above par and were felt to be wonderful securities, now are listed at 99.18 asked with 99.10 bid. That is down 0.2 from the day before. All the other bonds are selling at from 90.1 to 98.18.

Bonds of the United States, constituting our debt of about $280 billion, are selling at below par. Under such circumstances how is it possible, Mr. President, that we can contemplate giving away money in the Middle East? We are not lending it but giving it away—$200 million now, $200 million in 1957, $200 million in 1958, as the President has stated in his message. Is not this something to give us concern? Apparently not. Senators say, "It is not interesting to learn of the cost the Government must pay for the money which has to be expended."

Mr. President, what I have said about bonds and notes and Federal land bank bonds is also true of Treasury bills and Federal National Mortgage Association obligations. It has been so difficult to borrow money that the Treasury has now finally come to the decision that it must increase the rate of interest upon E-bonds. E-bonds were issued early in the war, for the purpose of selling them to people of small wealth, who would give their savings, patriotically, to the winning of the war. The bonds were to be purchased at a fixed value of $50 or $100 or $500, and sold at a discount, to earn 3 percent if held for 10 years. Now the Government proposes not only to increase the rate of interest, but the Treasury also is asking the House at this moment, as the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] well knows, to give it the power to decide whether or not to increase the interest rate to 4¼ percent.

The request of the Treasury Department to transfer to it the power to determine what the interest rate on the bonds shall be is merely another instance of the continuing series of requests whereby the executive would take over the duties of the Congress. If we consent, we shall not be preserving free government; we shall be undermining it.

That is what is disturbing about this whole matter. I am not motivated by any political desire to criticize President Eisenhower or Secretary Dulles. I have not uttered a word of personal criticism against either of them. I feel as I do only because we are confronting a decision which will go far to determine whether or not the Congress of the United States shall continue to exist as the lawmaking body.

The Secretary of the Treasury wants to fix the interest rates. The State Department wants to determine how the money shall be spent. "Just give us the money, ask no questions, and we will spend it." They do not add what I add: "And then watch Government bonds fall in market price on the stock market."

How can we close our eyes to the fact that we are setting a precedent here with respect to the control of money and men in this great Republic. We are consenting to grant to the Executive authority over the use of the armed services in the Middle East and discretionary authority over the grant of money in the Middle East, where the governments are either absolute monarchies or dictatorships. Nasser is called the President of Egypt. He is, in fact, the dictator.

We have provided money to that area before. We have made other grants. We did not do so with blindfolds on. But now the pending resolution asks us to take this precedent-making step by first putting blindfolds on our eyes and voting for the humanitarian purposes which the Department of State writes on the 28th day of February, in a letter to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, just as he testified, as the able senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] said, 8 weeks ago when the hearings first began. We are asked to go behind the curtain, the curtain of silence, the curtain of ignorance, the curtain of Executive duty, in order to enable the State Department to follow its will.

Mr. President, it seems to me to be altogether impossible to comprehend how any Senator who hopes to see this country survive as a Republic is willing, in the present state of our Nation's finances, to pour money down the drain hole in the Middle East, without knowledge on the part of any Members of Congress as to how the expenditures are to be made.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of these remarks the tables from the New York Times of this morning, from which I have been reading.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Bonds*

| Treasury | 3:30 p. m. Bid | Asked | Ch'ge in bid |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2½s '58-57 Mar | 99.5 | 99.7 | −.1 |
| 2½s '59-57 Sept | 97.2 | 97.4 | −.1 |
| 2½s '59-57 Mar | 97.26 | 98.0 | −.2 |
| 2½s '58 June | 98.19 | 98.21 | −.2 |
| *2½s '63-58 June | 100.6 | 100.10 | |
| 2½s '58 Dec | 98.16 | 98.18 | −.2 |
| 2½s '62-59 June | 94.18 | 94.24 | −.8 |
| 2½s '62-59 Dec | 94.20 | 94.26 | −.8 |
| 2½s '60 Nov | 95.26 | 96.0 | −.6 |
| *2¾s '65-60 Dec | 100.20 | 100.28 | −.4 |
| 2¾s '61 Sept | 97.10 | 97.16 | −.4 |
| 2½s '61 Nov | 95.26 | 96.0 | −.6 |
| 2½s '67-62 June | 92.24 | 93.0 | −.8 |
| 2½s '63 Aug | 95.2 | 95.8 | −.6 |
| 2½s '68-63 Dec | 91.24 | 92.0 | −.8 |
| 2½s '63-64 June | 91.8 | 91.16 | −.8 |
| 2½s '69-64 Dec | 91.4 | 91.12 | −.8 |
| 2½s '70-65 Mar | 91.2 | 91.10 | −.8 |
| 2½s '71-66 Mar | 90.30 | 91.6 | −.8 |
| 2½s '72-67 June | 90.18 | 90.26 | −.6 |
| 2½s '72-67 Sept | 90.14 | 90.22 | −.8 |
| 2½s '72-67 Dec | 90.16 | 90.24 | −.8 |
| 3½s '83-78 June | 99.10 | 99.18 | −.2 |
| 3s '95 Feb | 94.8 | 94.16 | −.4 |

*Exempt from normal income tax. Figures after a period represent 32ds of a point.

*Treasury bills*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1,600 | Mar. 7 | 2.70% | 2.45% |
| 1,600 | Mar. 14 | 2.70% | 2.40% |
| 1,600 | Mar. 21 | 2.85% | 2.65% |
| 1,005 | Mar. 22 | 2.85% | 2.65% |
| 1,614 | Mar. 28 | 2.80% | 2.70% |
| 1,600 | Apr. 4 | 2.85% | 2.75% |
| 1,600 | Apr. 11 | 2.85% | 2.72% |
| 1,600 | Apr. 18 | 2.92% | 2.80% |
| 1,600 | Apr. 25 | 3.00% | 2.90% |
| 1,700 | May 2 | 3.15% | 3.06% |
| 1,700 | May 9 | 3.18% | 3.10% |
| 1,700 | May 16 | 3.20% | 3.12% |
| 1,800 | May 23 | 3.25% | 3.18% |
| 1,801 | May 31 | 3.28% | 3.25% |
| 3,351 | June 24 | 3.27% | 3.23% |

*Federal National Mortgage Association*

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 100 | May, 1957 | 3.55 | 99.30 | 100.1 | 3.17 |
| 100 | Aug., 1957 | 3.90 | 100.2 | 100.6 | 3.47 |
| 200 | Sept., 1957 | 4⅛ | 100.5 | 100.9 | 3.60 |
| 570 | Jan., 1958 | 2½ | 98.20 | 98.30 | 3.69 |

*Treasury notes*

| Outstanding millions | | Rate | Bid | Ask | Yield |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 575 | Mar., 1957 | 2⅞ | 99.31 | | |
| 9 | Apr., 1957 | 1½ | 99.28 | | |
| 4,155 | May, 1957 | 1⅝ | 99.20 | 99.22 | 3.13 |
| 12,056 | Aug., 1957 | 2¾ | 99.23 | 99.25 | 3.27 |
| 3,792 | Aug., 1957 | 2 | 99.12 | 99.14 | 3.24 |
| 824 | Oct., 1957 | 1½ | 99.0 | 99.8 | 2.80 |
| 382 | Apr., 1958 | 1½ | 98.4 | 98.12 | 3.04 |
| 4,391 | June, 1958 | 2⅞ | 99.7 | 99.9 | 3.44 |
| 121 | Oct., 1958 | 1½ | 97.6 | 97.14 | 3.17 |
| 5,102 | Feb., 1959 | 1⅞ | 97.2 | 97.4 | 3.41 |
| 118 | Apr., 1959 | 1½ | 96.6 | 96.14 | 3.28 |
| 99 | Oct., 1959 | 1½ | 95.8 | 95.16 | 3.33 |
| 198 | Apr., 1960 | 1½ | 94.12 | 94.20 | 3.35 |
| 1,445 | May, 1960 | 3½ | 100.3 | 100.5 | 1.45 |
| 277 | Oct., 1960 | 1½ | 93.18 | 93.26 | 3.36 |
| 144 | Apr., 1961 | 1½ | 92.18 | 92.26 | 3.39 |
| 156 | Oct., 1961 | 1½ | 91.18 | 91.26 | 3.44 |

*Certificates of indebtedness*

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3,220 | Mar., 1957 | 2¾ | 99.31 | 100.0 | 2.70 |
| 1,312 | June, 1957 | 3¼ | 99.31 | 100.1 | 3.12 |
| 7,271 | Oct., 1957 | 3¼ | 100.0 | 100.2 | 3.12 |
| 8,422 | Feb., 1958 | 3⅜ | 100.1 | 100.3 | 3.27 |

*Federal land bank bonds*

| Outstanding millions | | Rate | Bid | Ask | Yield |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 170.0 | May, 1957 | 3.30 | 99.29 | 100.1 | 3.10 |
| 135.0 | July, 1957 | 3⅜ | 100.2 | 100.6 | 3.25 |
| 214.9 | Oct., 1957 | 1¾ | 98.28 | 99.4 | 3.23 |
| 140.0 | Feb., 1958 | 3⅞ | 100.0 | 100.4 | 3.69 |
| 131.1 | May, 1958 | 2¾ | 98.28 | 99.6 | 3.45 |
| 184.1 | Nov., 1958 | 2¼ | 97.18 | 97.28 | 3.55 |
| 71.0 | May, 1959 | 2¼ | 96.24 | 97.2 | 3.65 |
| 124.0 | Feb., 1960 | 2¼ | 95.24 | 96.2 | 3.65 |
| 106.5 | June, 1960 | 2½ | 96.0 | 96.10 | 3.70 |
| 60.3 | May, 1971 | 3½ | 96.0 | 97.0 | 3.78 |
| 72.0 | Feb., 1972-67 | 4⅛ | 100.20 | 101.4 | 3.96 |
| 110.0 | Sept., 1972 | 3⅞ | 99.16 | 100.16 | 3.84 |

*International bank bonds*

| | Bid | Asked |
|---|---|---|
| 2¼s, Sept. 15, 1959 | 97.16 | 98.16 |
| 3s, July 15, 1972 | 91.0 | 93.0 |
| 3s, March 1, 1976 | 90.0 | 91.16 |
| 3⅛s, Oct. 1, 1981 | 90.8 | 91.8 |
| 3⅜s, May 15, 1975 | 91.0 | 93.0 |
| 3⅛s, Oct. 1, 1958 | 100.8 | 100.24 |
| 3⅛s, Jan. 1, 1969 | 97.16 | 98.16 |
| 3⅛s, Oct. 15, 1971 | 97.16 | 98.16 |
| 4½s, Jan. 1, 1977 | 104.20 | 105.4 |

The following quotation for the IB serial issues represents the highest and lowest yields for all maturities:

2s, 1957–62 ..... 4.00 3.25

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand that the pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] as a substitute for the amendment reported by the committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The substitute has been proposed, and it is pending.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Before the proposed substitute for the committee amendment was offered I submitted an amendment to the joint resolution as reported by the committees. This amendment was, on page 4, section 2, line 13, to strike out the words "Charter of the United Nations" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "Constitution of the United States."

My parliamentary inquiry is whether or not that amendment takes precedence over the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that any amendment of the original text, or of the substitute, would have precedence over either the substitute or the original resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When the Presiding Officer refers to the original resolution, he means, does he not, the resolution as introduced?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution as originally introduced.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Has not my amendment, which is offered to the committee substitute, precedence over the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, who undertakes to offer a substitute for the committee substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that that is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then I offer my amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be stated.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest that in this situation there should be a call for a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 13, after the words "with the", it is proposed to strike out "Charter of the United Nations" and insert in lieu thereof "Constitution of the United States."

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Clark | Holland |
| Allott | Cooper | Hruska |
| Anderson | Cotton | Humphrey |
| Barrett | Curtis | Jackson |
| Beall | Dirksen | Javits |
| Bennett | Douglas | Jenner |
| Bible | Dworshak | Johnson, Tex. |
| Blakley | Eastland | Johnston, S. C. |
| Bricker | Ellender | Kefauver |
| Bush | Ervin | Kennedy |
| Butler | Flanders | Knowland |
| Byrd | Frear | Kuchel |
| Capehart | Goldwater | Lausche |
| Carlson | Gore | Long |
| Carroll | Green | Magnuson |
| Case, N. J. | Hayden | Malone |
| Case, S. Dak. | Hennings | Mansfield |
| Chavez | Hickenlooper | Martin, Iowa |
| Church | Hill | Martin, Pa. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| McCarthy | Potter | Sparkman |
| McClellan | Purtell | Stennis |
| McNamara | Revercomb | Symington |
| Monroney | Robertson | Talmadge |
| Morton | Russell | Thurmond |
| Mundt | Saltonstall | Thye |
| Murray | Schoeppel | Watkins |
| Neuberger | Scott | Wiley |
| O'Mahoney | Smathers | Williams |
| Pastore | Smith, Maine | Young |
| Payne | Smith, N. J. | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have called up my amendment to the resolution as reported to the Senate by the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services.

On page 4, line 11, a proviso begins which reads as follows:

*Provided*, That such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations.

I have offered an amendment to strike out "Charter of the United Nations" and to insert in lieu thereof "Constitution of the United States."

I do this because the words "Charter of the United Nations" are surplusage. The Charter of the United Nations has been adopted by this Government as a treaty, and is therefore included in the phrase "with the treaty obligations of the United States," on lines 12 and 13.

The Constitution of the United States is not mentioned in the resolution. I know it has been customary for Senators to say that everything Congress does is presumed to be in accordance with the Constitution of the United States. But many laws which have been passed have been found, after a long delay, not to be constitutional.

Because the resolution deals with such a fundamental policy affecting the foreign and domestic standing of the United States, I felt it was desirable to offer my amendment. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] has notified me that on behalf of the committees, he will accept the amendment. The minority leader, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], also has advised me that he will accept the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am very much in favor of the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and agreed to by the minority leader and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I wish to point out, though, that in the original resolution presented by the administration, in addition to the words "That such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations," there was the following language, which was stricken by the committees: "and actions and recommendations of the United Nations; and, as specified in article 51 of the United Nations Charter, measures pursuant thereto shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security."

I say to my good friend from Wyoming that I am delighted that that language was deleted, and I am happy to be in accord with the amendment offered by him, which places in the resolution, instead of the language agreed to by the joint committees, the words "Constitution of the United States."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator being present and having made his statement, I am certain he will not object to my adverting to a private conversation which we had, something I never do without the consent of the Senator with whom I have had the conversation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Georgia knows well that I live in a goldfish bowl. I indulge in no conversations that I am not willing to make public.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure of that. I am not sure that I live in a goldfish bowl, but I try to be reasonable in all my actions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is always open in his dealings.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Wyoming discussed with me the desirability of amending the amendment in the nature of a substitute which I have proposed for myself and on behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], so as to incorporate this change in our proposal. From our conversation grew his action in offering an amendment to the original text.

I assured the Senator that I should be happy to support the amendment to the original text or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, but that I preferred that he should offer his amendment first to the committee text.

I wish to express my gratification that the chairman of the two committees, who presided over the weeks of hearings, and the distinguished majority leader have agreed to accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who is most conversant with the Constitution, raised the issue yesterday or the day before when the amendment was under discussion.

In view of what has transpired, I desire to modify my amendment in the nature of a substitute by making this change in the substitute. The language in the amendment in the nature of a substitute relating to the use of military forces to resist overt aggression would then be identically the same as it is in the committee-reported resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have discussed this matter with the Senator from Wyoming, and also with the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. I have been in consultation also with the Department of State and have talked with the Secretary of State. I am authorized to say that the amendment is acceptable to them. It certainly is acceptable to me and, as has been indicated, to the others with whom I have spoken.

I think there ought to be this much legislative history, perhaps a reiteration of what the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has stated. It seemed to me actually, from the start, that the phrase "Charter of the United Nations" was redundant, in my opinion, because the United Nations is covered, as the Senator from Ohio pointed out the other day, in the general language "consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States." I think it is important that that phrase be included in the resolution, because of the possibility of a Soviet veto in the Security Council. There is a method under article 51, I believe, whereby nations in self-defense can circumvent a veto to that extent in the common defense. I wish to say also that certainly no Senator, on either side of the aisle, would raise a question regarding the phrase "the Constitution of the United States." I myself believe that neither Congress nor the executive wants to do anything which is inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States. I do not believe it is essential that in every piece of proposed legislation which we pass we should include this language; but in view of the discussion which has taken place there certainly is no harm in including it in the joint resolution.

I understand the Senator from Wyoming desires to have a yea-and-nay vote on his amendment. I hope the amendment will be agreed to by a unanimous vote, so that there will be no question in this regard.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say, to add to the legislative history, that I urged this amendment, in a somewhat different form, perhaps, to the original resolution which was considered by the committees. That amendment was not accepted. I therefore felt compelled to offer the amendment, under the parliamentary procedure, first to the substitute amendment reported by the committees.

I am very happy, indeed, that the leadership on both sides of the aisle, and also the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, have agreed that the amendment is acceptable.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand the parliamentary situation, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], for himself and the other authors of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, have voluntarily asked that his amendment be modified in the same way.

Mr. RUSSELL. We have that right.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I understand that the Senator has that right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia for himself and other Senators has been modified accordingly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The question which is presently pending before the Senate, and the only question which is pending before the Senate, is the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, which is designated "2–20–57–A," reading as follows:

On page 4 of the committee amendment, in line 3, to strike out "Charter of the United Nations", and insert in lieu thereof "Constitution of the United States."

Is that the parliamentary situation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The Senator from California is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming on page 4, line 13, of the committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not desire to take time to speak on the pending amendment to the committee amendment. I favor it, as proposed by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

However, I should like to announce to the Senate that at the conclusion of the taking of the vote on the pending question, I intend to propose two unanimous-consent agreements. The first is that the first hour following the conclusion of morning business on Monday, March 4, be set aside for commemorative purposes for the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission. This will be done at the request of the distinguished chairman of the Commission, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. If that agreement is entered into, then we shall be able more accurately to determine the schedule of the Senate for the remainder of that day.

Second, I intend to propose a unanimous-consent agreement that the time available on the amendment of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to the committee amendment, and all amendments thereto, be limited to 3 hours to a side.

If those proposed agreements are entered into, it will be my purpose to move that the Senate adjourn at approximately 6 p. m. today; and then convene on tomorrow, under the order previously entered, at 10 a. m., and attempt to obtain a vote before the conclusion of our business tomorrow. Many Senators have made plans for Friday and Saturday. If any votes are to be taken on either of those days, all such Senators are willing to adjust their schedules to the necessities and convenience of the Senate. But I should like to have such unanimous-consent agreements entered into, if possible.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, many committees have scheduled hearings for next week. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has scheduled hearings for March 4 and March 5. It now appears that those hearings should be postponed, unless the majority leader believes we can safely continue to schedule them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; I think it would be unwise to schedule committee hearings on Monday and Tuesday of next week, because I expect that the Senate will be in session during the morning hours of those days, and I hope Senators will be present in the Chamber, so the Senate will be able to take final action on the joint resolution next week.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope the Senator from Texas understands that I am not objecting; I merely did not want needlessly to call off the committee hearings. I would not wish to have them called off unless that is judged to be necessary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the position of the Senator from New Mexico. Although I frequently make mistakes of judgment, it is my opinion that the pending joint resolution will still be before the Senate on Monday and Tuesday of next week.

I express the hope that the Senate will conclude its action on the joint resolution before Wednesday, because I must be away on Wednesday. However, experience has shown that on occasion the Senate has transacted more business when I have had to be away than it has when I have been present. For instance, the last time I was required to be away, the Senate took 11 yea-and-nay votes in 2 days. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Am I to understand that the majority leader is proposing that next week the Senate convene before noon, and that therefore the committees should set aside any plans they have made for committee meetings?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is my hope.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I must say to the majority leader that we have scheduled a hearing on the corn bill on Monday, at which time the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry hopes to obtain testimony from representatives of the Department of Agriculture, who previously have testified before the House Committee on Agriculture. We have not been able to agree upon any date except Monday for that hearing. That measure is of great economic importance to a number of producers. I hope the Senate will not convene before noon on that day. I am not worried about the total number of hours during which the Senate meets, and I want the Senate to vote on the joint resolution. But I think we shall be subject to criticism unless we are able to proceed with the hearing on the corn bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LONG. As I understand, the Senator from Texas proposes that the Senate vote on Monday, or at least on Tuesday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have not yet proposed anything. At the conclusion of the yea-and-nay vote which is about to be taken on the O'Mahoney amendment to the committee amendment I intend to propose that debate on the Russell amendment or any amendments thereto be limited to 3 hours to a side.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator from Texas see any reason why on either today or tomorrow we cannot vote on that amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think that would be highly desirable.

Mr. LONG. For my part, I think we should proceed to vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Louisiana is always cooperative. If he had been the only Member of the Senate with whom I had had to deal, it is probable that the vote would already have been taken.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, let me say that I do not expect that any Member of the Senate will vote against the O'Mahoney amendment to the committee amendment. I may be in error; but I do not think one vote will be cast against it, because it is not the kind of amendment against which any Senator would vote.

However, merely because the Senate approves of the O'Mahoney amendment to the committee amendment, I do not want it to be assumed by anyone that the sponsors of the pending joint resolution were undertaking to have enacted any proposed legislation the provisions of which were in conflict with the Constitution of the United States; nor do I believe that we should expect that in the future every piece of proposed legislation the Senate passes will have to carry the same O'Mahoney amendment, in order to make it clear that the Senate believes that the measure it is acting upon is constitutional.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on page 4, in line 13, of the committee amendment.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Curtis | Kennedy |
| Allott | Dirksen | Knowland |
| Anderson | Dworshak | Kuchel |
| Barrett | Ellender | Lausche |
| Beall | Ervin | Long |
| Bennett | Flanders | Magnuson |
| Bible | Frear | Malone |
| Blakley | Goldwater | Mansfield |
| Bricker | Green | Martin, Iowa |
| Bush | Hayden | Martin, Pa. |
| Butler | Hennings | McCarthy |
| Byrd | Hickenlooper | McClellan |
| Carlson | Hill | McNamara |
| Carroll | Holland | Monroney |
| Case, N. J. | Hruska | Morton |
| Case, S. Dak. | Humphrey | Mundt |
| Chavez | Jackson | Neuberger |
| Church | Jenner | O'Mahoney |
| Clark | Johnson, Tex. | Pastore |
| Cooper | Johnston, S. C. | Payne |
| Cotton | Kefauver | Potter |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Purtell | Smith, Maine | Thye |
| Revercomb | Smith, N. J. | Watkins |
| Robertson | Sparkman | Wiley |
| Russell | Stennis | Williams |
| Saltonstall | Symington | Young |
| Schoeppel | Talmadge | |
| Scott | Thurmond | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to the committee amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—Yeas 82, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—82

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Goldwater | Morton |
| Allott | Green | Mundt |
| Anderson | Hayden | Neuberger |
| Barrett | Hennings | O'Mahoney |
| Beall | Hickenlooper | Pastore |
| Bennett | Hill | Payne |
| Bible | Holland | Potter |
| Blakley | Hruska | Purtell |
| Bricker | Humphrey | Revercomb |
| Bush | Jackson | Robertson |
| Butler | Jenner | Russell |
| Byrd | Johnson, Tex. | Saltonstall |
| Carlson | Johnston, S. C. | Schoeppel |
| Carroll | Kefauver | Scott |
| Case, N. J. | Kennedy | Smith, Maine |
| Case, S. Dak. | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Chavez | Kuchel | Sparkman |
| Church | Lausche | Stennis |
| Clark | Long | Symington |
| Cooper | Magnuson | Talmadge |
| Cotton | Malone | Thurmond |
| Curtis | Mansfield | Thye |
| Dirksen | Martin, Iowa | Watkins |
| Dworshak | Martin, Pa. | Wiley |
| Ellender | McCarthy | Williams |
| Ervin | McClellan | Young |
| Flanders | McNamara | |
| Frear | Monroney | |

NOT VOTING—14

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bridges | Gore | Morse |
| Capehart | Ives | Murray |
| Douglas | Javits | Neely |
| Eastland | Kerr | Smathers |
| Fulbright | Langer | |

So Mr. O'MAHONEY's amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of the vote a letter from the Department of State.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
*Washington, February 28, 1957.*

The Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,*
*United States Senate.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has requested the comments of the Department of State on two amendments proposed by Senator O'MAHONEY to Senate Joint Resolution 19, as reported by the joint committees. Our comments are as follows:

1. Senator O'MAHONEY's amendment to strike "the Charter of the United Nations" from the proviso at the end of section 2 and to substitute instead the words "the Constitution of the United States."

This proposal would seem to be both unnecessary and undesirable. It is unnecessary to provide that the action of the President should be "consonant with * * * the Constitution of the United States" since presumably the legislation is intended to authorize only constitutional actions and Congress is entitled to assume that the President can be depended upon to act in accord with the Constitution which he is sworn to uphold and defend. The proposed amendment seems undesirable because it would call for the deletion of language indicating that the action of the United States under section 2 would be consonant with—that is, not inconsistent with—its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations to which the United States has adhered with the approval of the Senate. The deletion of this clause might give rise to the implication that the United States intends to ignore its obligations under the charter. Such an implication would, of course, be incorrect and it would be unfortunate to provide any basis for it.

We understand that among the arguments advanced for the proposed amendment is the fear that the language reported by the joint committees would enable the Soviet Union to veto the use by the United States of its Armed Forces in response to a request for assistance. However, we do not believe that the Soviet Union would, in fact, be in such a position. Should the use of United States forces ever be necessary under section 2 of this resolution, such use would not be in conflict with the Charter of the United Nations. Article 51 of the charter provides that nothing in the charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense against an armed attack, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Under this article a nation under armed attack could call for assistance from the Armed Forces of the United States—and the United States could provide such assistance—without waiting for Security Council action. There would, therefore, be no opportunity for a Soviet veto. Moreover, should the Soviet Union endeavor to bring about any action by the Security Council to obstruct the defense of a country subjected to armed attack, the United States would, of course, be able to prevent such action.

2. Senator O'MAHONEY's second amendment proposes to insert the words "for military or economic assistance" after the word "used" in the third sentence of section 3 (the Johnson amendment). This proposed amendment seems unnecessary because, as mentioned in the beginning of the first sentence of section 3, the entire section deals specifically with the exact matter referred to in the proposed amendment, that is, the use of funds for economic and military assistance.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HILL,
*Assistant Secretary*
(For the Secretary of State).

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am pleased to ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] may appear as a cosponsor of the amendment, in the nature of a substitute for the committee substitute, proposed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO LIMIT DEBATE ON THE RUSSELL AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we have just had a very unusual vote. I hope we will be able to preserve the kind of unanimity during the remainder of the consideration of the joint resolution that was demonstrated on the last yea-and-nay vote, which was a vote of 82 to 0. I hope that Senators will profit by what they have witnessed, namely, a yea-and-nay vote on an amendment that was not controversial, and will recognize the necessity of giving some attention to the ringing of the bells.

We delayed announcing the vote longer than ordinarily, in order to attempt to accommodate some Senators. We did accommodate some; others entered the Chamber just a little too late.

I believe that fact points up the necessity of entering into some kind of agreement about when we ought to vote, if it is possible to do so.

In the hope that it may be possible to obtain such consent, I send to the desk, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself, a proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The legislative clerk read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, as follows:

*Ordered*, that debate on the so-called Russell substitute and all amendments thereto be limited to 6 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the majority leader, respectively.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I may say that if this agreement is entered into, the Senate will recess later this evening and no votes will be taken, so far as I am aware. Of course there

will be no vote on the substitute until sometime tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I hesitate to object to anything proposed by the Senator from Texas——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have made arrangements to obtain the floor tomorrow, after the morning hour. I have some remarks, not too extended, taking, at the most, 45 minutes, on the Middle East resolution. I am afraid I shall have to object to this unanimous-consent request, because it would deny me the floor. I have been working on this matter for a number of days, and I wish to be heard. For that reason I very reluctantly object to the request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate the position of the Senator from Wisconsin. I am sorry he finds it necessary to object.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will alter his unanimous-consent request to provide that after I have had the floor, it may be presented again, I would have no objection to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I shall be glad to renew my suggestion after the Senator has concluded his address, and I shall try to adjust myself to the Senator's convenience. I appreciate the reasons he has advanced. They are reasons which appeal to every Senator.

## COMMEMORATIVE PROGRAM CONCERNING THE ALEXANDER HAMILTON BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk another unanimous-consent request submitted on behalf of myself, the distinguished minority leader, and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

*Ordered*, that on Monday, March 4, 1957, after the approval of the Journal and the transaction of morning business, 1 hour be set aside for a commemorative program concerning the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hope this agreement will be entered into. It requires only an hour of our time in order that Members of the Senate may address themselves to a very important subject. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has given a great deal of time and work to the subject. There will be similar arrangements in the House. I am hopeful that the Senate will find it possible to go along with the majority leader, the minority leader, and the distinguished chairman of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does the agreement relate to voting on the resolution or on any amendments thereto?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It has nothing whatever to do with the pending resolution. It merely provides that after the morning hour on Monday, March 4, 1 hour shall be allotted to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and he, in turn, will share that time with the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]; and I assume they will talk about Alexander Hamilton.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues, and I should like to inform the Members of the Senate of the likelihood of votes both tomorrow and on Saturday, in view of our inability to get a unanimous-consent agreement. I suggest that Senators all be at their posts.

I do not anticipate any yea-or-nay vote this evening. Senators may act accordingly.

## FACTS AND FICTION ON WEATHER MODIFICATION (CLOUD SEEDING)

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD tomorrow an address entitled "Facts and Fiction on Weather Modification—Cloud Seeding"—delivered by Capt. Howard T. Orville, Chairman of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Weather Control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## AMENDMENT OF SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT, RELATING TO FARMER COMMITTEEMEN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators SCOTT, SYMINGTON, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, KERR, MURRAY, NEUBERGER, KEFAUVER, and MORSE, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to give some legislative status to the farmer-elected committee system used in directing our farm programs at the local level, and to better protect the rights of farmers serving on such committees.

Mr. President, this bill is the result of several years of sincere effort to protect and preserve grassroots democracy at its best—the use of local committees, chosen by farmers our farm programs are intended to serve, to administer such programs for the Secretary of Agriculture.

Legislation for this purpose was first introduced by myself in January of 1955. Since that time, extensive hearings have been conducted by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which I was honored to serve as chairman. The hearings were broadened into an investigation of abuses of our committee system as now administered, with field hearings in Missouri as well as hearings in Washington.

After 2 years of study and negotiations with the Department of Agriculture, our subcommittee submitted its report on abuses and disruptions of the elected farmer committee system following adjournment of the last session. That report was published as a committee print on September 10, 1956.

It is out of the recommendations in that report that this bill was drafted, modifying my earlier bill in light of evidence developed at our hearings and views expressed by the Department of Agriculture. A majority of our subcommittee has joined me as cosponsors, along with other Senators who have followed our work with interest.

Mr. President, these committees deserve the serious thought and attention of the Congress. Elected farmer committees are responsible for administering seven major agricultural programs involving billions of dollars in Government funds and property. These programs include the $1.2 billion soil-bank program started last year.

The elected farmer committee system is a proven, established system of administration. It has a record of high accomplishment. It has handled billions of dollars with full safeguard of the public interest during the last 22 years.

The fact that a few abuses have crept into handling of the committee system is no reflection on the system itself, nor on the fine men who have served rural America as committee members. Rather, it just focuses the spotlight on the need for a legislative framework clarifying methods of operation for these committees and pinpointing better understanding of their responsibility in relation to the administrative responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Since early 1953, basic changes have been made in the elected farmer committee system by administrative decree. These have reduced authority of the farmer committees. An arbitrary pattern of operation has been imposed upon the counties by Washington. More and more, the "Washington knows best" attitude has invaded our original concept of keeping some guidance of these programs in the hands of local people.

If followed to its logical end, this pattern could administratively sterilize the elected farmer committee system, and permit the rise of a bureaucracy and patronage system reaching into every rural community of America.

Growing concern as to the fate of these committees, and over abuses of the system that have been charged and proven by sworn testimony, have led to the action we are now asking in this bill.

Most of us I am sure are familiar with the background of the farmer committee system in our respective States. The farmer committee system of administering farm programs was born in the agonizing distress of low prices, low income, dried up markets, and overburdening mortgage debt which characterized the agricultural depression of the late twenties and early thirties.

In discussions of that day, the question arose as to how a program of economic aid that would touch every farmer in the country could be administered without "hordes of bureaucrats" descending upon the land.

The idea of having committees, groups, or associations of farmers administer the early adjustment and income-lifting programs originated with M. L. Wilson, at that time head of the Department of Agricultural Economics at Montana State College. He had been one of the most active of the agricultural leaders of the day in working with Congress and others to produce measures making it possible for agriculture to live more nearly on an economic par with other groups. He has since retired from the Department of Agriculture after a long and productive career which has brought him high honor and esteem. Not the least of the monuments to his honor is the farmer-committee system.

One of the chief values of this system was that the normal political patterns of an area did not interfere with program administration. The focus was on program rather than on party. And any partisan attempts to upset this pattern incurred resentment. The temptations toward partisanship inherent in the appointive system were reduced, if not eliminated, by the elected committee system. Partisan control of farmer committees could never succeed as a goal of administration because control could be achieved only by local ballot.

This is the farmer committee system that successfully met the challenge of surplus in the early thirties, because it had the confidence of farmers and could obtain their cooperation in necessary adjustment programs.

It was the system which, because of the grassroots character of its members, became the backbone of the war mobilization committees in rural areas of the country. These committees rationed farm machinery and other scarce materials; worked with draft boards on problems relating to agriculture; handled farm drives of every description, including the collection of scrap, encouraging production of special crops needed in the war, and collection of 80 million bushels of scarce corn in the winter of 1944 to keep war industries running. This also was the system which helped to maintain high production of food during the critical postwar years—food which enabled some countries to stand off absorption by the Communist bloc until productive capacity and facilities were more fully restored.

A good many men of both parties prominent in public life came up through the farmer committee ranks. These include a Senator, several Congressmen, a Secretary of Agriculture, 4 Under Secretaries of Agriculture, a member of the Federal Reserve Board, and 2 Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture, including the incumbent Marvin McLain, of Iowa.

This was the elected farmer committee system in effect when the present officials of the Department of Agriculture took office. It was an inheritance truly American in concept, rich in tradition, great in performance, and abundant in promise—an inheritance to be prized.

Today this system faces new challenges in agriculture. Now, more than ever before, we need the grassroots cooperation of agriculture in climbing out of another economic bog. We need a committee system in which farmers have confidence, and which can get and keep the cooperation and respect of farmers.

Many of us fear we are headed in the other direction. For that reason we want to recognize the contribution of these committees to American agriculture by establishing their rights under law.

The bill I propose with my cosponsors merits the support of everyone who really believes in grassroots democracy. I can see little grounds for anyone opposing it unless he fails to believe in the concept of a local voice in these programs—unless such opponents prefer an army of bureaucrats directed by orders from on high in Washington.

The Department of Agriculture assures us repeatedly, despite mounting evidence to the contrary, that it still believes in the farmer committee concept and wants the system preserved and strengthened. If that is true I see no reason for objection to doing so by specific legislation, rather than leaving these farmers at the whim of any Secretary or Administrator through administrative edicts.

Our bill protects the Secretary by keeping primary authority in his hands, but at the same time it lets the elected committeeman know just what his responsibilities are and what his rights are.

We provide that community committeemen shall be nominated in open meeting from the floor and elected by secret ballot at such community meetings. We provide for chairmen of each community committee to gather in county nominating conventions, to nominate farmers for each position to be filled on the county committee, including alternates, with provision for write-in of additional candidates in the election to follow by secret ballot. We provide for all farmers being eligible to vote.

We provide further that chairmen of county committees elected through this proceess shall in turn select one member of the State ASC committee, to serve with 2 others to be named by the Secretary of Agriculture, 1 of which shall be named by the Secretary as chairman. At present all State committee members are appointees of the Secretary.

Because removal of an elected official by an appointed bureaucrat is a serious action that should never be lightly taken, we seek to curb the power of the State committee to remove elected county committeemen without a proper hearing being held. We limit the power of the State committee to suspension, following a majority vote and giving the accused a statement of charges and advice as to his rights and opportunities for appeal. It is only simple American justice that such procedures be established. We have ample evidence that such justice has not always been followed in summary removals in the last 2 years.

Our bill substitutes removal hearings for appeal hearings at the State office level—in other words, requiring that charges upon which a committeeman was suspended be proven before he is removed, and that he be given an opportunity to answer such charges against him.

We retain final appeal rights to the Department of Agriculture whenever such removal actions have been taken.

Perhaps it is regrettable that it appears necessary to legislate such safeguards, which appear only to be traditional American rights. Yet our hearings developed instance after instance where individual rights were not so protected, particularly in the State of Missouri.

I am convinced that this is constructive legislation in keeping with the true spirit of our democracy, and legislation that will improve the handling of our farm programs without in any way hampering the functioning of any Secretary of Agriculture.

The thousands of fine Americans who have served so loyally and well in these farmer committees deserve the recognition that enactment of this legislation in their behalf would provide.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill which I have just introduced be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1436) to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for administration of farm programs by democratically elected farmer committeemen, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the 4th to the 17th sentences, inclusive, thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "In carrying out in the continental United States the provisions of this section, the crop insurance program, acreage allotment and marketing quota programs, and such other farm programs requiring dealing on individual farms as the Secretary may deem fit, the Secretary is directed to utilize the services of local, county, and State committees selected as follows:

"(1) Local committees: The Secretary shall designate local administrative areas as units for administration of the programs described above. No such local area shall include more than the geographic area served by a common farm trading center. Farmers within such local area shall elect annually by secret ballot from among their number a local committee of three members for such area, together with first and second alternate members who shall serve in that order in the absence of committee members. Election of local committee members and alternates for any year shall be conducted by the local committee serving at the time of such election. Public notice of such election shall be given by such local committee at least 2 weeks prior to the date of such election. Candidates for election shall be selected only by nomination from the floor. The local committee shall elect from its members a chairman and a vice chairman. The local committee shall select a secretary and may utilize the county agricultural extension agent for such purpose.

"(2) County committees: The chairmen of the local committees (or vice chairmen in the absence of chairmen) shall, in a county

nominating convention, nominate annually one or more farmers within the county for each position on the county committee and for each position of alternate member on the county committee. The county committee shall consist of three members. There shall also be first and second alternate members who shall serve in that order in the absence of committee members. The nominating convention shall be called by the county committee then serving, which shall give the chairman of each local committee at least 2 weeks' notice of the date of such convention. The county committee then serving shall, immediately following such convention, give public notice of the names of the persons nominated at such convention and of the time and place fixed for the election, which shall be held not earlier than 15 days following such notice. Such election shall be by secret ballot and shall be conduced by such committee either by mail or at one or more public polling places. Each farmer in the county shall be entitled to vote at such election, and may vote for any of the nominees named by the nominating convention, or may write in and vote for any additional candidates he desires. The votes shall be counted by the county committee conducting the election. Unless such count is made in the presence of a representative of the State committee, the ballots shall be preserved for such period as the Secretary, by regulation, may prescribe. The committee conducting the election shall certify the results of the election to the State committee. The three condidates receiving the highest number of votes shall be declared committee members; the candidate receiving the next highest number of votes shall be declared first alternate; and the candidate receiving the next highest number of votes shall be declared second alternate. The county committee shall elect from its members a chairman and a vice chairman. The county committee shall select a secretary who may be the county agricultural extension agent. If such county agricultural extension agent shall not have been selected secretary of such committee, he shall be ex officio a member of the county committee. The county agricultural extension agent shall not have the power to vote. In any county in which there is only one local committee the local committee shall also be the county committee.

"(3) Provisions applicable to local and county committees: Special elections for the purpose of filling vacancies not filled by alternate members, occurring at least 60 days prior to the time for holding an annual election, in the membership of a local or county committee shall be held as expeditiously as possible, and shall be held in the same manner and subject to the same restrictions as annual elections, except that only 5 days' notice of the nominating convention shall be required. The State committee may, if it deems necessary, appoint temporary committee members to serve pending any such special election, or to fill vacancies occurring less than 60 days prior to an annual election. County and local committees authorized by this section shall be administratively responsible to the Secretary of Agriculture for the conduct of farm programs assigned to them. Any work of a county or local committee may, at the discretion of such committee, be performed by members of such committee or may be performed under the supervision of the comittee by persons employed by the committee, except that, if the State committee with the approval of the majority of the county committees in the State so prescribes, responsibility for day-to-day operations and employment and supervision of field and office personnel shall be delegated to a county office manager employed by and responsible to the county committee.

"(4) State committees: In each State there shall be a State committee for the State composed of three farmers who are legal residents of the State and who have had previous service on county or local committees established under this section. One member shall be elected by the members of the county committee at an election to be held on a date or within a period of time fixed by the Secretary which will afford full opportunity for participation therein by all county committee members: *Provided*, That such date or period of time shall fall between July 1 and December 30 each year. Such elected member shall take office on the first day of the month next after his election and shall serve for 12 months or until a successor has been elected and qualified. Such elected member shall be subject to removal by the Secretary only for cause. The other two members of such committee shall be appointed by, and serve at the pleasure of, the Secretary, one of whom shall be designated as chairman. The State director of the Agricultural Extension Service shall be ex officio a member of such State committee, and shall be in addition to the number of members of such committee hereinbefore specified.

"(5) Removal of local and county committee members: The State committee may remove a local or county committee member from office, but only by majority vote after furnishing such member with a statement of the charges against him, advising him of his rights, and giving him an opportunity for a fair hearing at which a representative of the Secretary shall be present. The State committee shall cause a transcript of the proceedings at any such hearing to be made and a copy thereof to be furnished to such member. Pending such hearing the State committee may by majority vote suspend such member, but no such suspension shall exceed 30 days unless such hearing is delayed at the request of such member. Such member may appeal from the decision of the State committee to the Deputy Administrator of the Commodity Stabilization Service, or such other officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture as the Secretary may designate. All pertinent and material evidence may be presented at such appeal.

"(6) Regulations: The Secretary shall make such regulations as are necessary relating to the selection and exercise of the functions of the respective committees, and to the administration through the committees, of such programs.

"SEC. 2. Section 503 of the Agricultural Act of 1954 is amended by inserting after the word 'country' the words 'or local.'"

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I support the bill introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. For some 20 years Congress has encouraged direct farmer participation in administration of the farm program, through democratically elected community and county farmer committees.

During the depression years of the thirties and the war years of the forties, these farmer committees proved their effectiveness as they placed national policies into action in rural America.

In recent years, however, some of us have been disturbed by what appears to be unjustified interference with the work of these duly elected committees.

As example, in many of our Midwestern States the county committee has been completely relegated to the position of an advisory group.

The steadily declining participation of farmers in governmental farm programs may be a direct result of this single action, because one of the outstanding features of the committee system, prior to this administrative change, was the direct personal contact between farmers and their elected committeemen.

In the past 4 years many Missouri farmers have written complaining about this and other changes in the administration of the Missouri agricultural stabilization and conservation program.

These complaints were called to the attention of the Department of Agriculture, by letter, by telegram, by speeches on the floor, and in complaints to committees in both Houses of Congress.

No satisfactory action was taken.

On July 29, 1955, therefore Senator HENNINGS and I asked that a Senate committee conduct an investigation of this matter.

This request was absolutely necessary, because, in my State at least, many county committeemen elected by their farmer neighbors were being removed from office often as the result of improper and unsubstantiated charges.

During a 3-year period some 55 committeemen were removed from office in Missouri—at one time 29 percent of all such removals in the entire country.

As a result of our request, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held extensive hearings and thereupon made a report on the operation and administration of the farmer committee system.

Abuses were found; the need for legislative action was apparent.

Today, Senator HUMPHREY, chairman of the subcommittee, has introduced a bill which is the outgrowth of those hearings. I am pleased to cosponsor this measure because it is an honest and able attempt to provide safeguards which will insure the continued operation of our farmer committee system—the backbone of our entire farm program.

In no sense is the bill a reprisal for past actions. It seeks only to prevent the reoccurrence of such abuses in the future.

When read together with the hearings and report of the subcommittee, it is clear that this bill points the way toward a better and more representative farm program.

Therefore, I respectfully urge its passage during this session of Congress.

---

## FAILURE OF PARTNERSHIP POWER PROGRAM TO PROVIDE FOR MULTIPURPOSE RIVER BENEFITS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the failure of the Eisenhower administration's so-called partnership power policy to implement a program of comprehensive, multiple-purpose development of Columbia River Basin water resources is well known to the majority of Pacific Northwest citizens. From comments during the past few days, it is apparent that the press in parts of the Nation, some of which reflect a Wall Street viewpoint, may not recognize the basic inadequacy of the partnership approach.

Much of this recent comment has used an article in the Wall Street Journal of February 20, 1957, as its springboard to a number of erroneous conclusions. This article implies that the volume of hydroelectric dam construction by private and public agencies in Pacific Northwest

States is meeting the water development needs of the region. Actually, the facts in the article are evidence to the contrary.

The Wall Street Journal article tells of local public and private dams being built to add some 4.6 million kilowatts of energy to the Northwest supply. But, the article fails to disclose that these partnership-type dams have not added a single acre-foot of flood-control storage, nor a single acre-foot of irrigation storage, nor opened a single foot of river channel for navigation. That is the indictment against the administration's partnership approach in the Columbia Basin—it is not a program for multiple-purpose use of water. Indeed, the partnership-type dams at Priest Rapids and at Hells Canyon have trimmed a total of 3,100,000 acre-feet from the flood-control storage potential of the Columbia Basin. These are facts to contemplate whenever houses, barns, cows, silos, and human beings are swept away in floods.

I have always taken the position that local public and private agencies should be allowed to develop power sites which do not conflict with the maximum multiple-purpose development of water resources. The present initiative of these agencies in providing additional power from dams on tributaries of the Columbia, such as the Skagit, Lewis, and Clackamas, is commendable. I have always been in favor of their activities in this field of power development. But this does not mean that the main stem of the Columbia and its vast resources for flood control, irrigation, navigation, and recreation should be sacrificed to partial development for power alone.

It is noteworthy that while non-Federal projects have been launched to add 4.6 million kilowatts to the Northwest's power storehouse, the present administration has not sought the start of a single multiple-purpose Federal dam in the entire Columbia River drainage. The administration has opposed Federal development of the million-kilowatt multiple-purpose dam at the great John Day site on the Columbia. Preconstruction planning of this authorized project, with power, flood-control, and navigation benefits, will be completed at the end of the current fiscal year. But the administration's budget does not contain one cent with which to start its construction.

Why, I ask, does the administration's policy emphasize only the highly profitable power aspects of river development, but checkmate attempts to provide equally valuable flood-control, navigation, and irrigation benefits? Is this a program responsive to the needs of a region whose most valuable natural asset is its flowing water?

I think not, Mr. President; and it is my opinion that the vast majority of Pacific Northwest citizens will agree. Thoughtful people in the region favor all possible haste to expand the power supply—but not at the expense of desecrating the Columbia's potential for other uses. The present construction program described in the Wall Street Journal is not achieving the objectives of comprehensive river development.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I must take issue with the statement that the added kilowatts are eliminating the power shortage in the Northwest. Seventeen idle industrial plants in Oregon and Washington stand as mute evidence to the contrary. Operations in these 17 electroprocess plants were drastically curtailed when the Bonneville Power Administration last month was forced to cut off the supply of interruptible power because of low flow on the Columbia. These operations are still down, idling more than 1,200 workers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article from the Oregonian of January 27, detailing the extent of industrial shutdowns resulting from the current power shortage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. NEUBERGER. Furthermore, Mr. President, it should be emphasized that the kind of kilowatts being added by the present construction program of local interest is not the kind which will give impetus to our region's industrial expansion. The Oregon Journal of December 2, 1956, quotes Dr. William A. Pearl, Bonneville Power Administrator, as saying that no additional power will be available for new electroprocess plants in the Northwest during the next 10 years.

Another article of the same date, in the Portland Oregonian, states:

The Pacific Northwest could use an additional 9 billion kilowatts of power by 1966 for electroprocess industrial development, William A. Pearl, Bonneville Power Administrator, told the Portland chapter of the Izaak Walton League at the University Club Friday.

Pearl said no additional power will be available for elecroprocess plants, such as aluminum reduction projects, during the next 10 years on the basis of present scheduled generation.

Electroprocess plants for titanium, zirconium, petrochemicals, ferroalloys and other mineral and chemical fields would be feasible if the power is available, Pearl declared.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian of December 2, 1956]

PEARL ANTICIPATES BIG POWER DEMANDS

The Pacific Northwest could use an additional 9 billion kilowatts of power by 1966 for electroprocess industrial development, William A. Pearl, Bonneville Power Administrator, told the Portland chapter of the Izaak Walton League at the University Club Friday.

Pearl said no additional power will be available for electroprocess plants, such as aluminum-reduction projects, during the next 10 years on the basis of present scheduled generation.

Electroprocess plants for titanium, zirconium, phosphorus, petroleum, petrochemicals, ferroalloys, and other mineral and chemical fields would be feasible if the power is available, Pearl declared.

The BPA Administrator noted, however, there would be no serious power deficits for other commercial, industrial, and domestic consumption until at least 1964–65. He said the sixfold increase in scheduled non-Federal and additions to Federal projects during the past year had pushed back the immediate power shortage threat.

Seven United States projects on the Columbia River will add 2,363,250 kilowatts, while 18 non-Federal plants under construction or licensed will add an installed capacity of 4,147,000 kilowatts during the next 10 years, Pearl pointed out.

Heavy power demands, however, will require close cooperation and the best efforts of utilities to meet the load demands, Pearl said.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, that forecast of a blackout of industrial growth was voiced by the Bonneville Administrator, despite the knowledge that local interests were building many new power projects.

Kilowatts from the "partnership" construction program described in the Wall Street Journal can be marketed to power electric shavers, stoves, air conditioners, vacuum cleaners, and various other appliances. But the price of these kilowatts is far too high to attract industrial users of electricity. The abundance of low-cost power which is needed to revive economic opportunity in the Pacific Northwest can be obtained only through revival of the Federal dam-building program. There will be a shortage of low-cost kilowatts in the Columbia Basin so long as the policy of the present administration is permitted to endure. I, for one, Mr. President, intend to direct my efforts toward termination of that policy at the earliest possible moment.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Oregonian of January 27, 1957]

POWER CUTBACK BY BPA SLOWS 17 BIG PLANTS

The mercury plunged toward the bottom of the thermometer throughout the Northwest Saturday, and was expected to come near the alltime low record of minus 3 degrees at Portland early Sunday.

The temperature dropped to 6 above shortly after 6 a. m. Saturday at Portland International Airport, where the area's alltime low of minus 3 was recorded February 2, 1950.

The temperature climbed back to 28 degrees in midafternoon but had dropped back to 9 at 1 a. m.

BPA CUTS OFF SOME

Among more serious effects of the prolonged cold snap were frozen water pipes, a power outage in the southeast Portland area and cutoff by Bonneville Power Administration of interruptible power to 17 plants owned by 13 Northwest firms. Largest are the three aluminum companies—Aluminum Company of America, Reynolds Metals Co. and Kaiser Aluminum Corp.

Alcoa announced closing of two potlines—1 at Vancouver and 1 at Wenatchee.

Donald H. Tilson, northwest manager for Alcoa, said about 170 men will be laid off through shutting down of its two lines at 7 a. m. Sunday. The two plants employ a total of about 2,800 men.

Reynolds Metals Co., Saturday night, was in the process of taking one potline out of production at its Troutdale plant. Half a line dropped Saturday at the firm's Longview plant and the rest of the line was being taken out of production Saturday night.

LAYOFFS TO FOLLOW

The Troutdale line represents about 25 percent of the plant's capacity and H. W. Shoemaker, plant manager, said "a proportional number" of the plant's 920 employees

would be affected. V. G. Kneeskern, manager of the Longview plant, said more than 100 men of the 515 employed would be affected there with one-third of the plant capacity down.

In Spokane, Kaiser Aluminum Corp. said it was considering closing one potline at its Mead reduction plant. About 200 men would be affected. Officials estimated that the Trentwood rolling mill there could continue for 10 more days with materials on hand.

The power cutbacks resulted from a situation in which power just wasn't available in any form. BPA originally had planned to stop all delivery of interruptible power at midnight Saturday, but had expected to replace it with provisional power from Hungry Horse Dam in Montana.

By Saturday morning, however, demands for power for such items as home heating had grown so heavy BPA cut 200,000 kilowatts from its interruptible power load, a reduction of about 45 percent.

So heavy were demands on the system that the additional power could not be brought in from Hungry Horse. Bonneville Dam also reported that ice conditions at the intakes for water used to cool its generators forced a slowup in generation, costing the BPA system 70,000 kilowatts.

Spokesmen for both Alcoa and Reynolds pointed out that they could not obtain even the more expensive steam power to replace the hydroelectric from BPA.

## UNITED NATIONS ACTION ON SOVIET UNION COMPLAINT OF INTERVENTION BY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on February 25, the Soviet Union introduced before the Special Political Committee of the United Nations a resolution labeled "Complaint by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of Intervention by the United States of America in the Domestic Affairs of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Its Subversive Activity Against Those States."

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the resolution be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPLAINT BY THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS OF INTERVENTION BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN THE DOMESTIC AFFAIRS OF ALBANIA, BULGARIA, CZECHOSLOVAKIA, HUNGARY, POLAND, ROMANIA AND THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS, AND ITS SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITY AGAINST THOSE STATES

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS: DRAFT RESOLUTION

The General Assembly,

Noting with anxiety the recent aggravation of the international situation and the deterioration of relations between states;

Noting that this situation has been caused, among other things, by the subversive activities of the United States of America and its intervention in the domestic affairs of the people's democracy;

Considering that the states members of the United Nations are bound under the charter "to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors";

Recalling that in its resolution 110 of November 3, 1947 the General Assembly condemns "all forms of propaganda, in whatsoever country conducted, which is either designed or likely to provoke or encourage any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or acts of aggression";

Taking also into consideration the fact that the General Assembly on December 17, 1954 recommended to member states the international convention on the use of broadcasting in the interests of peace of 1936 in which the contracting parties "mutually undertake to prohibit and, if necessary, to bring to an immediate stop in their respective territories any transmission which could, to the detriment of proper international understanding, instigate the inhabitants of any territory to acts contrary to the internal order or security of the territory of one of the high contracting parties";

1. Condemns the subversive activities of the United States of America against other states as contrary to the United Nations charter and incompatible with the principles on which relations between states should be based;

2. Calls upon the United States Government to cease its subversive activity and its intervention in the domestic affairs of other states on any pretext and to develop its relations with these states in accordance with the principles of the United Nations charter.

Mr. President, the resolution speaks for itself, and each Member of the Senate can examine it at his leisure. However, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the entire language of the resolution, and particularly that appearing in the next to the last paragraph, reading as follows:

1. Condemns the subversive activities of the United States of America against other States as contrary to the United Nations Charter and incompatible with the principles on which relations between States should be based;

Mr. President, I am pleased to report to the Senate that when this matter came to a vote on yesterday before the Special Political Committee, the resolution was rejected by a vote of 53 to 8. The only countries whose representatives voted in favor of the resolution were the Soviet Union and the captive nations, which were Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and Poland.

Parenthetically, Mr. President, I wish to say that representatives of the Gomulko government of Poland are now in Washington, seeking to negotiate a loan, which has been reported in the newspapers as being $100 million. I hope the Government of the United States will call to the attention of those negotiators the fact that just yesterday the representative of their government at the United Nations, before the Special Political Committee, voted to condemn the alleged subversive activities of the United States of America, as I have previously read.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I shall not support any Communist Marshall plan.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As an associate in the United States delegation to the United Nations, along with the distinguished Senator from California, let me say we were very proud of the address he made to the Special Political Committee, which address has been made a part of the RECORD. He stated the United States Government's position in response to that Soviet resolution; and he stated it clearly, concisely, and effectively. Personally, I wish to commend him for that excellent job and that splendid address.

The Senator from California is a man of deep convictions and great courage, and I know he has stated here in the Senate his thoughts respecting certain economic and political relationships with countries associated with or friendly to the Soviet Union; and in view of his important position in the Senate and in his party, I trust that he has also conveyed those views to the President and to the Secretary of State and to others in responsible executive positions in our Government. I am sure he has done so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his very kind remarks.

I wish to take this opportunity to say that the Senator from Minnesota very ably served as a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations. This year the United States happens to have had two Members of the Senate—one a Democrat and one a Republican—representing the United States at the United Nations. In alternate years the United States delegation has been composed of two Members of the House of Representatives—one a Democrat and one a Republican. I think that is an excellent procedure; it gives the Members of Congress firsthand knowledge of the workings of the United Nations and its assets and its liabilities, and an understanding, perhaps, of what may need to be done to improve the organization and to overcome some of the obstacles which presently may exist.

I wish to say that it was my privilege to watch the work done by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota on the committees to which he was assigned, and also to watch him perform certain work he was assigned to do in the plenary session. I found him both competent and diligent in carrying out those obligations, and I was very much pleased to be associated with him in representing our Government at New York at the 11th session of the General Assembly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

## FINNISH INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today, February 28, the people of Finland and those of Finnish descent throughout the world will celebrate the anniversary of Finnish independence.

We must not let this day pass without paying special tribute to those brave and courageous people. Having had close associations with people of Finnish descent in my own State of Minnesota, I know the many fine qualities and attributes of the Finnish people, and especially of those who have done so much to make our own country the great nation it is. Their great pioneering

spirit and the cultural assets they brought from their native land have greatly enriched the American scene.

The present educational and cultural exchange program between Finland and this country is indicative of the close friendship which exists between us. I, for one, favor a further extension of this program, so as to enable more young scholars to take advantage of the opportunities which both countries offer. This will enable the American people and the Finnish people to understand each other better, thus creating better relations for all concerned. From past experiences, our Nation could and would be made stronger if we could admit more Finnish immigrants by a liberalization of the present immigration laws.

Not the least of our considerations for the Finnish Republic and its people should be plans for economic assistance to help Finland in developing its natural and human resources. The ultimate development of such resources are indispensable to the future of any nation.

Mr. President, I salute the Finnish Republic and its people and all the people of Finnish descent throughout the world on their anniversary of independence.

Mr. President, I now wish to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

## PROPOSAL TO CREATE SINGLE ARMED SERVICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in mid-1956, a number of my colleagues and I, including the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the distinguished Senators from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTAL], discussed on the floor of this body an alarming proposal which was then being put forth by certain members of the Department of the Army and others for the establishment of a single Chief of Staff heading a Supreme General Staff. On July 23, 1956, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire analyzed with devastating effect this proposal to substitute for the present Joint Chiefs of Staff system a Prussian system which would threaten our vital constitutional principles of civilian control over the military.

I opposed the Prussian general staff system at that time, and I oppose it today, no matter in what guise it may be presented, and no matter which of the services may be advancing the proposal in 1957. The proposal which is now being put forth is the creation of a single uniformed service under one command—"total unification" might be the phrase to describe this proposal. But its proponents neglect to point out that this is only a back-door method of arriving at the same goal—the same old proposal for a single general staff, carrying the same threat to civilian control over the military.

The implications in the current proposal threatening constitutional government are serious enough in themselves. But there are other considerations which should also give serious pause to advocates of a single armed service and a single General Staff. Chief among these is the danger that a single point of view may grow to dominate the military services, so that our military policy might become doctrinaire, inflexible, rigid.

I fear, frankly, that those well-meaning friends of the Air Force who are advancing the idea of a single service are permitting their genuine distress over the administration's budget policies to warp their judgment. It may be that they have been driven into the position that if there is going to be a small defense budget pie to split, strategic bombing should get the whole pie.

The danger to our national security of such a position is something separate and distinct from the danger to our democratic form of government. In the February issue of the American Mercury—a periodical, by the way, with whose editorial policies I find myself in almost complete disagreement—there appears an article which summarizes the arguments, from a military point of view, against the single service and single supreme general staff concept. It is entitled "Should We Unify the Armed Services?" and was written by William V. Kennedy.

Mr. President, recognizing that there is much that can be done to eliminate duplication and waste in the procurement policies of the Armed Services, I believe that my colleagues will find some thought-provoking arguments in this article which should give pause to anyone contemplating total unification. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, the article entitled "Should We Unify the Armed Services?"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD WE UNIFY THE ARMED SERVICES?

(By William V. Kennedy)

Demands for the creation of a single "Armed Force of the United States" have cropped up once more, prompted by the public airing of some violent interservice disputes.

Former Secretary of the Air Force Thomas K. Finletter has suggested that we solve our military disputes by converting to a single military service garbed in a single uniform.

The Air Force Association, a vocal, hard-working Air Force veterans group, has adopted the Finletter proposal as one of its long-term objectives.

Judging from the origins of this latest demand for "unification," and the arguments advanced in its favor, the uniform of the new single service would bear a marked resemblance to that worn now by the United States Air Force.

This desire for a simplification of our military structure and for an end to recurring, violent disputes among the services expresses a strong public sentiment, one that goes far deeper than the position of a single partisan group.

Those who wish the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps to be continued as separate services have made a strong appeal to tradition, esprit de corps, and past glories. Powerful as those arguments may be, they must take second place to purely technical and economic considerations.

Four factors make the single-service idea seem plausible: (1) What appears to be an increasing similarity among the services in matters of procedure, equipment, discipline, and organization; (2) a widespread belief that the three services, as now constituted, represent a vast amount of duplication; (3) belief that a single service will eliminate recurring interservice disputes; and (4) a conviction on the part of the more extreme airpower partisans that the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps have ceased to play a decisive role in warfare.

The appearance of an ever-increasing similarity among the services is based on the fact that a gun is a gun whether mounted on a tank or in the turret of a cruiser, that an airplane is an airplane whether it flies from a 10,000-foot concrete runway or from the deck of an aircraft carrier.

The best test of this view would be to have the Navy gunner's mate and the Army tank gunner, the pilot of a B-52 and the pilot of a Navy attack bomber trade places.

The gun tubes and the cockpits would be nearly identical in certain essentials. But beyond that the differences would be so complex as to require a retraining period of from a month or two to a year before any of the four men could perform his new job effectively.

A far more serious difficulty would be encountered in attempting the interchange of supervisory and command personnel.

The difference between fighting in the air, on the ground and at sea are so vast as to create three separate worlds, the inhabitants of which, although citizens of the same country, barely speak the same language.

In their proposals for an Armed Force of the United States, the proponents of a single service have taken into account the fact that different elements do impose different requirements. As a solution they propose that the single service be divided into departments for land, sea, and air forces.

If the average human being was not burdened by severe limitations on his imagination, on his physical and mental energy, on his ability to comprehend and on his ability to retain and keep properly sorted vast amounts of technical data, the idea of a single military service might be a more practical one.

Unfortunately, each of us has these limitations. As a result, it is almost impossible for a man who has spent the major part of his military career in one element of warfare to command military forces in totally different elements with the same degree of efficiency he has attained in his own.

In war, that difference in efficiency can be the difference between victory and defeat.

The inability of army generals in the German high command to grasp the full meaning of war at sea and to employ seapower with the same efficiency they employed landpower has been demonstrated in Germany in two World Wars.

By the same token, the failure of Germany's air leaders to understand the realities of both sea power and land power led to disaster in the Battle of Britain.

Goering and the Luftwaffe simply could not bring themselves to comprehend that as long as the sea lanes remained open, as long as the British Fleet was able to operate in the Channel, no German soldier would set foot on England, no matter how much TNT was dumped from the sky.

The complete dominance of air and sea power in Russia by the Army has crippled the efficiency of those two elements from the days of the Czar to the present. It may yet prove to be the greatest single Soviet weakness in a world war III.

It would appear, then, that a basic similarity among the services is more apparent than real, that each service and the men within it are severely limited by background, training and experience.

Far from eliminating these natural limitations, a single armed force of the United

States would be subject to the limitations of whatever group dominated it.

The support given the single service idea by Air Force partisans and the powerful support they have mustered in Congress make it almost certain that a single service would be dominated by air officers. Historical experience has demonstrated that such dominance would straitjacket the ground and naval "departments" of the single service.

The belief that the present services represent a vast amount of duplication has a somewhat firmer base.

Here again, however, we must be careful to distinguish the real from the apparent.

The services have made considerable progress since World War II in eliminating duplication of materiel and functions.

The single manager system is one of the most notable advances in this regard. By this means, an item of equipment in use by all the services, but of special interest to one, is purchased for the entire Department of Defense by the service having primary interest.

Unfortunately, standardization of equipment is limited by the same factors that limit the ability of a single human being to fight on land, at sea, and in the air with equal efficiency.

All three services require clothing that will protect the wearer against moisture, wind and severe cold. But for the Army to adopt the Navy's foul weather gear as its battle dress, or for the Navy and the Army to adopt the Air Force's flight clothing would not only impose cruel discomfort on thousands of men but endanger the success of their combat mission.

It might make little difference to the airman if his radio headset were susceptible to failure in rain or heavy dust. To the tank crewman, it could make the difference between life and death.

The only guaranty the fighting man has that someone is thinking of and fighting for his specific needs is a separate military service built and run to fight his kind of war.

The factors considered up to this point bear so heavily on the future of the United States and on the lives of so many men that they should be sufficient reason for rejection of the single service proposal. It would not seem reasonable, therefore, to destroy a tried and proven military structure merely to eliminate recurrent public disputes.

Indeed, it is doubtful that combination of the present services into a single armed force would achieve that objective.

Conversion of the Army into a Military Departments for Deserts, Swamps, and Hayfields will not resolve the issue of whether the intercontinental ballistics missile should be handled by artillerymen or by pilots. Nor will use of a similar euphemism for the Navy settle the issue of whether the aircraft carrier is or is not a suitable base for bombers.

What is likely to occur is the stifling of all opposition to the ideas of the group dominating the new Armed Force of the United States. The settling of vital public issues by such a means does violence both to sound military procedure and to the democratic process.

We have shown that a single service will almost certainly be dominated by the most extreme air power partisans. Taking into account the long-standing opinions of this group, it is equally certain that the Army, under a single service system, would be shorn of its aviation, its antiaircraft and all but a handful of its combat formations.

The Navy would become an antisubmarine force without capital ships of any type and without its own aviation, even for antisubmarine missions. The Marine Corps, if it continued to exist in any form, would be reduced to the status of a guard detail.

The implications of atomic warfare may or may not justify such a drastic revamping of our military structure. To go so far on the basis of the evidence at hand and in the face of the known capabilities of our potential enemies would be to take a calculated risk against the odds of a roulette wheel.

If the time does come when the evidence on the side of the air power extremists is so incontrovertible as to warrant virtual destruction of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps as we now know them, then no consideration of sentiment or past glory should stay our hand.

To adopt a single armed force of the United States at the present time, however, would be to fall in with a strategem designed to put an end once and for all to formal military opposition to the all-out air power doctrine originated by Gen. Giulio Douhet and carried forward at present by Mr. Alexander P. de Seversky.

Mr. De Seversky admitted in 1954 in a speech at Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine, that "during World War II we did not possess the aircraft or the munitions to win the war by air power alone." Yet throughout that war he repeatedly urged the cutback of our land and sea forces in favor of a strategy based exclusively on long range aerial bombardment.

The chances that Mr. De Seversky, Mr. Finletter and the Air Force Association may have made a similar miscalculation as regards our present military policy are too great for the Nation to accept a single service on the strength of their advice alone or on the basis of a desire for peace and harmony in the Pentagon.

The problem of recurring interservice disputes can be solved without wrecking the entire defense of the United States in the process. A commonsense public information policy on the part of the Department of Defense that recognizes the right of the people, as the final arbiters of military policy, to know the details of military disputes would improve the situation.

Considered without relation to individuals, to a particular world situation and to emotional arguments the single service idea may have merit. But a military institution is above all a human institution. It must be considered in the light of the ambitions, the jealousies and the limitations of the human beings who design it and administer it.

The "Armed Force of the United States" is a facade for the furtherance of a military doctrine that has, by the admission of its own greatest protagonist, been found wanting in the past. To gamble the future of the United States on the assumption that the crystal ball has now cleared would take a lighthearted people indeed.

## RECESS TO 10 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate recessed, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, March 1, 1957, at 10 o'clock a. m.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Father Bernard W. Gerdon, national chaplain, the American Legion, Indianapolis, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, keep these United States in Thy holy protection. Watch over our beloved country, preserve her integrity, guard her against all enemies, that she may walk in ways of peace a happy, prosperous, divinely blessed land.

We pray Thee cultivate in the minds of all her citizens the spirit of devotion and obedience to government, of respect for law, of self-sacrificing service and love for their fellow man, and of dedication and consecration to Thee. Be with our President and all those in lawful authority over us to counsel, guide, and inspire them. Let the light of Thy divine wisdom direct the deliberations of this Congress and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government that they may tend to the preservation of peace and the promotion of national happiness and keep America a bulwark of freedom and justice—a beacon of love and hope piercing the darkness to light the way to a world at peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On February 20, 1957:

H. R. 3845. An act extending for 1 year the time in which the Boston National Historic Sites Commission shall complete its work.

On February 26, 1957:

H. R. 348. An act to amend section 12 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676), relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, by providing for the use of public lands granted to the States therein for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishings, equipment, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said States.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Presiding Officer had made the following appointments:

Mr. KERR to be a member of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, vice Mr. George, retired.

Mr. CLARK to be a member of the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, vice Mr. MCNAMARA, resigned.

Mr. NEUBERGER to be a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, vice Mr. Lehman, retired.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 57–6.

## COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## REPORT ON COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 28, 1957.*

## STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 168) to authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within its jurisdiction, and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Education and Labor, effective from January 3, 1957, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI, clause 6, of the Rules of the House of Representatives. For such purpose such committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued only over the signature of the chairman of the committee or a member of the committee designated by him; they may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

The committee may report to the House of Representatives from time to time during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike all after the resolving clause and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"That the Committee on Education and Labor, effective from January 4, 1957, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of all matters—

"(1) relating to employee health, welfare, and pension plans;

"(2) relating to the question of Federal aid to school construction; and

"(3) relating to education and labor generally.

"For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued only over the signature of the chairman of the committee or a member of the committee designated by him; they may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

"The committee may report to the House of Representatives from time to time during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is the customary resolution authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct investigations within the field of its jurisdiction. There are certain committee amendments to make it conform to the usual policy in such cases.

The resolution has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Rules and, as I say, is the usual resolution given to the committee.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to the resolution on this side.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "Resolution to authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters coming within its jurisdiction."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

## COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Saturday to file a report on the bill H. R. 4135, a bill to promote and preserve local management of savings and loan associations by protecting them against encroachment by holding companies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

## ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATION

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which, I feel, has great merit in furthering the economic development of our country. This legislation is designed to benefit communities which are not blessed with great agricultural or waterway projects that have added materially to the growth and development of those communities that do possess them.

I am offering an amendment to the Watershed and Flood Protection Act which will enable the Federal Government to participate in financing projects of recreational nature when such projects provide a major portion of income in the immediate vicinity of the project.

In my district, as I am sure is the case in other districts, there are communities whose economic conditions are directly or indirectly based on recreational activities and allied businesses. These communities should not be discriminated against for their lack of other sources of income. On the contrary, they should be given the same privilege of financial participation in the watershed program as other communities with economic factors whose development is assisted by Federal financing.

In connection with this, I would like to quote from the Presidential Advisory Committee Report on Water Resources Policy dated December 22, 1955. On page 31, the report reads:

The Committee has considered many cost-sharing proposals and has weighed carefully the elements of fairness to all concerned and precedents for sharing the cost of other programs. Further, it gave due recognition to the types of benefits accruing to individuals, groups of individuals, local and State governments, and the Nation as a whole. It was unable to discover for all cases a completely equitable yet practicable procedure for cost sharing based solely on the principle of sharing costs in proportion to benefits.

The Committee recommends, as a general policy, that all interests participate in the cost of projects in accordance with the measure of their benefits, and that the Federal Government assume the cost of that part of projects where the benefits are widely dispersed and represent substantial con-

tributions to the general economic growth of the country or region, or to the national defense.

On page 32, the policy report states:

The Committee believes that the enhancement or improvement of basic recreation facilities (provision for access, public health, safety and protection) and fish and wildlife resources of less than national significance should be treated in accordance with the general cost-sharing procedure proposed herein. Those of national significance should be financed entirely by the Federal Government. Lands to be acquired for purposes of enhancement of recreation or fish and wildlife resources should be shown separately in reports of project plans, and the acquisition of such lands should be authorized by the Congress for each individual project.

So, you see, gentlemen, the amendment that I am offering conforms with the President's recommendations.

The amendment which I offer will have important bearing and be of great benefit throughout the Nation. My interest in it was activated by a situation which has arisen in my own district. The Dead Lakes area has long been famous for fresh water sport fishing. In recent years, low water table has virtually destroyed that once great industry which provided the chief source of income for the residents of the area. An additional detriment to a constant water level has been provided by the construction of the Jim Woodruff Dam on the Apalachicola River. The level of the river has considerable influence on the level of the water in the Dead Lakes and floodwaters which are impounded above the dam are not available to help restore the needed water level in the Dead Lakes. As an illustration of this, the average gage reading prior to the construction of the dam was 5.9 feet. Since the dam was built, the gage has fallen to an average of 3.1 feet. A watershed project which would provide the Tumbler Dam for Dead Lakes would be a comparatively inexpensive item because of the narrow mouth of the lakes. Yet, this project cannot participate because the present law does not permit contributions by the Federal Government for projects based principally on recreation. Obviously, recreation in this area and in many similar areas in the Nation is just as important a source of livelihood as would be agriculture in other areas. I trust that this amendment will be approved so that recreation when it provides a major source of income for the surrounding areas, can be placed on the same basis as those activities now authorized for Federal financial participation in watershed projects.

## REHABILITATION SERVICES FOR THE PHYSICALLY AND MENTALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which will, in my opinion, greatly strengthen the rehabilitation services which are now available for physically and mentally handicapped persons. The principle is simple. Federal surplus properties will be made available for rehabilitation centers and workshops. Under my bill, which amends the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to allocate Federal surplus personal property for donation to public and other nonprofit rehabilitation facilities or workshops in the same way that he may now transfer such property to tax-supported or nonprofit medical institutions, hospitals, clinics, health centers, school systems, schools, colleges, and universities. The bill would also authorize the Secretary to sell or lease surplus real property to nonprofit rehabilitation facilities and workshops. Under the provisions of the existing act, the price must take into account any benefit which may accrue to the United States because of its proposed use.

The need for this legislation was brought to my attention by Mr. Jay J. Shuer, Toledo, Ohio, president of the Ohio Association for Retarded Children. Under the present interpretation of the Federal Surplus Property Act, very few rehabilitation facilities and workshops can receive surplus Federal property. The law as amplified by the administrative regulations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare requires that a facility must be devoted primarily to the provision of health or educational services. A majority of rehabilitation facilities have educational, health, employment, and other aspects, and are not deemed by the Department to be within either of the two categories of eligible facilities because they are not primarily devoted to educational or health purposes.

Under the provisions of the bill introduced today, rehabilitation agencies in communities throughout the land would be eligible for property which has been declared as surplus because of a change or a reduction in the operation of agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Thus, personal property such as all manner of shop equipment, power tools, and hand tools could be donated to rehabilitation centers. Fabrics, metals, and other raw materials could be given to sheltered workshops. Technical property, such as whirlpool baths and X-ray machines could be given to physical therapy units, and basic office equipment could be made available for the administrative functions of all these types of facilities. Moreover, lands and buildings could be sold or leased to such agencies. I am informed that quite a lot of surplus Federal real estate is located in places readily accessible to the people who need such services.

The value of this amendment is probably best illustrated by the beneficial effects it would have in rounding out the State-Federal vocational rehabilitation programs. This is particularly true in respect to the encouragement it will give to the growth of private nonprofit establishments such as the sheltered workshops of the Goodwill Industries, the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, the United Cerebral Palsy Association, and the Associations for Retarded Children. In my own State of Ohio, the Association for Retarded Children conducts classes in 55 of the 88 counties in the State. These classes deal with children who have been excluded from public schools. In many counties a program of vocational training has been started and sheltered workshops have been organized. Most of these workshops cannot qualify for surplus property because they are not, under present regulations, deemed to be "primarily" devoted to education.

I want to emphasize, however, that this is a national problem. The need for this legislation is suggested by a preliminary report of an extensive study now under way in Kansas City, under a local nonprofit research group, Community Studies, Inc. The objective of the study was to determine the prevalence of handicapping conditions, to ascertain what proportion of handicapped people could benefit from rehabilitation services, and to measure the costs incurred and the benefits a community derives from a comprehensive program of rehabilitation.

The preliminary results of this study are impressive documentation of the need for such legislation as I am proposing. Data collected indicated that 65 percent of the people interviewed who were classified as disabled could be aided by rehabilitation services. Of these, 6 percent were 65 years of age or more, 39 percent were under 18 years of age, and the remainder were in other age groups. About 40 percent of these people could be rehabilitated to the point of remunerative employment.

If we apply the Kansas City results to the national population, it would appear that there are approximately 2,230,000 physically handicapped capable of rehabilitation. Of this group, however, nearly half, or more than 1 million, will find employment after rehabilitation only in sheltered workshops.

The growth of the importance of sheltered workshops in the rehabilitation picture, in recent years, is one of the most important arguments for my bill. New sheltered workshops have been started or existing programs have been expanded with Federal grants-in-aid in Alabama, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Oregon, and Washington. Goodwill Industries programs have been expanded not only in my own city of Toledo, but also in Columbus, Cincinnati, and Dayton, as well as in Washington, D. C. Moreover, 12 years ago there were only a handful of organized rehabilitation centers such as the Institute for the Crippled and Disabled in New York, the Cleveland Rehabilitation Center, and the Milwaukee Curative Workshop. Today there are well over 130 such centers.

Dr. Howard A. Rusk, an eminent authority in the field of rehabilitation, commented recently on this development:

It would appear * * * that this growth needs to be greatly accelerated if more than 1 million Americans are to have the dignity

and self-satisfaction that comes only from productive activity.

My bill will provide a much-needed "shot in the arm" to the Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program. Federal, State, and private funds now used to buy such property would be released for activity in other areas. The development of further centers and workshops in many communities where such facilities are not now available would thus be accelerated.

In the past the Congress has consistently supported proposals for the expansion of rehabilitation services. The importance of further development of these services has been emphasized time and again. The unanimity of opinion on this point is refreshing. Last May, at the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, representatives of labor, industry, and Government joined in their endorsement of increased rehabilitation efforts. For example, AFL–CIO Secretary-Treasurer William F. Schnitzler said:

> Rehabilitation, retraining, and employment of the handicapped—that is not charity. Oh, certainly they are objectives close to the hearts of all humanitarians. But they are more than just humanitarian ideals. In our practical world it seems to me important to consider these matters in terms of concrete investment. And it is a good investment. It is good business."

John S. Coleman, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States stated:

> It may become a matter of national necessity—far more than a matter of national concern—to hire more handicapped workers and train more young persons for employment.

And Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Marion B. Folsom said:

> To take full advantage of the new (vocational rehabilitation) act, the Federal and State governments and many voluntary groups have joined in a cooperative effort to bring more and better services to those who are disabled. Nearly 150 nongovernmental organizations have launched projects, some to expand the range and volume of their services, others to undertake research and other developmental work, to widen the horizons for the whole field of rehabilitation.
>
> These voluntary groups include such fine organizations as the crippled children's societies, Goodwill Industries, and their nationwide system of affiliates, local units of the American Heart Association, and many others. In these projects now going forward with the support of the Federal and State rehabilitation agencies, the voluntary organizations are investing their own funds as well.

I trust that the Secretary will welcome the opportunity presented by this bill to assist the work of the voluntary groups which he so heartily endorses. I take further hope from the fact that the President's budget message for 1958 shows concern for a further expansion of the program of "financial aid and technical assistance to the States and community for rehabilitating the disabled."

What more appropriate use can be made of surplus Federal property than to use it to strengthen this important program? Prudence dictates that this avenue of assistance should not be overlooked.

I am happy to say that the National Rehabilitation Association and the Goodwill Industries of America, Inc., have already indicated that they support this legislation. I believe it will also receive the support of the Congress.

## COMPENSATION FOR OVERTIME WORK IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the Post Office Department has a curious option policy that is the cause of considerable dissatisfaction among its employees.

The question comes down to this: "Shall a mailman, for instance, who works overtime (usually during some rush period like the Christmas season) be paid in cash for such extra work, or be given time off instead?"

As far as the employees are concerned, they prefer to be paid for the overtime in order to boost their none-too-generous paychecks, rather than take compensatory time off later on.

Furthermore, the present option policy frequently results in conflicting administration or interpretation in different sections of the Nation.

This inconsistency is confusing, and disruptive of employee morale.

The Federation of Post Office Clerks has formally filed many complaints on this score with the Post Office Department, complaints received from its members.

Obviously, a change in the postal laws by Congress is the only practical solution.

To this end, I am introducing a bill to eliminate this option policy.

This will insure that postal employees who work overtime, as during a holiday rush period, will be given overtime pay, instead of subsequent time off.

From my observation of hard-working postal employees, I believe that they are entitled to the same consideration for overtime work, as that enjoyed by employees in private industry.

Time off is no substitute for overtime pay.

## EXEMPTING TEACHERS' TUITION FEES, ETC., FROM TAXATION

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is the season when the thoughts of most Americans, busily engrossed in the preparation of income-tax returns, are centered on the subject of taxation. From a schoolteacher in the district I have the honor to represent, I have received a letter that is so timely I am sure it will be of interest to my colleagues, with whom I am taking this opportunity of sharing it in the hope that it will fall upon fertile and responsive soil. The letter reads:

> DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: The status of the movement toward exempting tuition fees and teachers convention fees interests me this evening as I finish filling out form 1040.
>
> This is a long overdue deduction. Teachers are bitter over businessmen being able to entertain customers at the Stork Club and deduct the fun, while we sit in stuffy lecture halls absorbing Plato, psychology, and human dynamics, also for the purpose of increasing our income, and can't deduct the tuition. Not only is it not fair, it is an indictment of our American value system.
>
> Fortunately, my son is attending college on a scholarship, but I should be able to deduct his books and lab fees in the interest of supplying another scientist to the American welfare.
>
> I'm sure you are in favor of this amendment to our tax laws, but I'm curious to know if anyone has introduced such a bill, and what has been its fate.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> MRS. ADAH MAUER.
>
> CHICAGO, ILL.

I urge upon my colleagues that we well may give heed to this voice of a schoolteacher speaking for many in similar position. Certainly when schoolteachers to improve the standards of education give up their hours of leisure to take fresh college courses they should enjoy the same deductions as a businessman deducting the cost of a dinner as an allowable item of business expense. That is not only justice, it is commonsense.

## THE HARDWOOD-PLYWOOD INDUSTRY

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues joined with me in an interesting meeting held here in Washington recently by our constituents who manufacture American plywood. I was particularly interested in this meeting because we have three plywood mills in my district that employ a large number of our people.

There has been a tremendous industrial expansion in United States industry since 1951, but the hardwood-plywood industry showed an increase of only sixtenths of 1 percent since 1951, even though the American consumption of plywood has increased 74 percent. The reason for this tragic fact has been the importation of foreign plywood priced at less than the United States production costs. These imports have increased 1,000 percent since 1951. Japanese plywood imports are the major cause of this problem, since Japanese imports have increased over 4,000 percent since 1951. Japanese plywood workers are paid but 11½ cents an hour, thus making the labor cost of Japanese plywood come to about $4.17 per thousand square feet, compared to $30 plus for plywood produced in the United States. Naturally then Japanese plywood has taken United

States manufacturers' sales and there have been plant closings and loss of work hours due to the inevitable cutback of United States production.

In 1956 the domestic consumption was 1,500,000,000 square feet, but of this amount 690 million square feet was imported. The Japanese plywood industry has grown from 125 plants in 1935, producing 429,820,000 square feet and exporting 64,028,000 square feet, to a total number of plants in 1956 of 220, with an annual production of 2,343,488,000 square feet and exporting 700 million square feet, most of which has been exported to the United States, which in turn has caused our plywood manufacturers to have to go out of business. To pinpoint this problem again, Mr. Speaker, may I point out that in 1956 in the United States we consumed 1,500,000,000 square feet of plywood, and of this amount 690 million square feet, or 46 percent, was imported.

I realize that there are many facets to this problem. I am conscious of the fact, for example, that before World War II approximately 85 percent of Japanese trade was with what is now Communist China. The safety of our country depends upon making it possible for the great free nations of this world to trade with other free nations and the American dollar is today the most important commodity in the establishment of that trade. If the Japanese cannot sell to us and get American dollars to trade with us then they will have to look elsewhere and circumstances might force them to look to Communist China.

There is a golden mean, however, Mr. Speaker, to be followed in our relationship with Japan as far as this problem is concerned. To permit an American industry to participate less than one percent in the growth of American consumption of a product that has nearly doubled in the last 5 years compels me to say that the manufacturers of American plywood are being called upon to accept too big a burden. The cost of foreign policy should be more justly equated among the different industries in America and certainly the manufacturers of plywood should be able to enjoy a greater participation in the increased American consumption of this important commodity. Surely we cannot evade our responsibility to our own people—not only to our manufacturers, but to our laborers in the plywood industry and associated industries that are American.

Manufacturers of hardwood-plywood have tried diligently to bring about a solution by working with appropriate Federal agencies and departments. An escape clause complaint, for example, was filed and after a hearing, was denied on the ground that the 1954 business recession and not imports, were the cause of the industry's damage. It is my earnest conviction that at that time there was good and compelling evidence to point out that it was the tremendous competition that the American manufacturers of hardwood-plywood faced with imports that caused their problem and not a business recession.

Many manufacturers of American hardwood-plywood from all over the country have expressed to me the thought that a quota on plywood imports through regulation or legislation to limit plywood imports to 15 percent of the annual domestic consumption of hardwood-plywood is the best answer to their problem.

I sincerely hope that some immediate help can be given to the American plywood industry because I believe that unless help is soon forthcoming that more plants will be closed and more American laborers will be deprived of jobs.

## CORN LEGISLATION

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am personally much disturbed by the delay in bringing corn legislation up for consideration. I spent several days with the great Committee on Agriculture during its hearings and know of the time and labor that went into the development of a bill. I know how urgent is the need throughout the Midwest and the entire commercial corn area for legislation, and they need it now.

The President, the Secretary of Agriculture, farm organizations, and a great many Members of Congress have all stressed the prime importance of this legislation and the demand for prompt action by the Congress. That is why I am so concerned about the delay on the part of the Rules Committee.

We are now in the second week since a rule was requested. Several hearings have been held by the Rules Committee and yet no indication of action. They seem to have time and inclination to grant rules on inconsequential measures now coming before us, but not on a measure of tremendous importance to agriculture.

## FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IS NEEDED TO DEAL WITH POCKETS OF UNEMPLOYMENT THAT HERE AND THERE MAR THE NATION'S GENERAL INDUSTRIAL PROSPERITY

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this date with my colleagues from Pennsylvania, Representatives CARRIGG, FENTON, and SAYLOR, I introduced a bill known as the Area Assistance Act of 1957. This bill should be known as the administration bill as it reflects the views of President Eisenhower when he said, "We must deal with pockets of chronic unemployment that here and there mar the Nation's general industrial prosperity." In other words, the bill which I introduced today provides for the basic elements of the Eisenhower program to aid distressed areas.

Mr. Speaker, over a period of years, I have sponsored legislation on this subject and frankly, it was not until the 84th Congress that interest was manifested to the extent that we could get action of this type of legislation. As many will recall, last year the Senate passed the so-called Douglas bill in the closing minutes of the 84th Congress. Regardless of the determined efforts on the part of several of us, we were unable to secure consideration of the bill by the House before adjournment.

I think it is time to face the facts concerning the distressed areas of the Nation. At the present time there is pending in the Senate the area redevelopment bill, S. 2663, which is a revised version of the so-called Douglas bill of the 84th Congress. From what I am told, S. 2663 is not acceptable to the administration.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that I have introduced today known as the Area Assistance Act of 1957 has the blessings of the administration and while it may not be acceptable to everyone, I am hopeful that it can be amended and thus serve as a basis for providing aid to the distressed areas of the Nation now badly in need of relief.

The following is an analysis of my bill to assist distressed areas:

AREA ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1957

PURPOSE

"To assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance."

BASIC PRINCIPLES

1. Communities are to retain primary initiative and responsibility in planning and financing their economic redevelopment.

2. The program should aim at lasting improvement of economic conditions, not temporary relief.

3. Federal assistance is contingent upon the active financial participation in specific projects by the State or local groups identified with the troubled community.

4. A project will receive Federal aid only if it creates new job opportunities and does not merely transfer such opportunities from one area to another.

ADMINISTRATION

An Area Assistance Administrator who would be in charge of the program would be appointed by the President with advice and consent of the Senate.

To advise the Secretary of Commerce in the performance of his functions authorized by this act, there is formed an Area Assistance Advisory Board, consisting of these members: Secretary of Commerce (chairman), Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Secretary of Labor, Secretary of the Treasury, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and representatives of other interested executive branch agencies.

AREAS ASSISTED UNDER PROVISIONS OF THIS ACT

Areas certified by the Secretary of Labor as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment (that is, where the unemployment rate is currently 8 percent or more, adjusted seasonally, and has been at least 8 percent for the major portion of each of the preceding 2 years).

All other areas, with particular attention to one-industry communities, low-income

rural areas, and other economically underdeveloped areas.

TYPES OF ASSISTANCE TO AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL AND PERSISTENT UNEMPLOYMENT

Financial assistance in the form of loans for such purposes as: (a) Preparing land for industrial use; (b) constructing new factories; (c) modernizing old factories. (Total amount outstanding at any one time not to exceed $50 million.)

Grants for technical assistance, including studies evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth. (Up to $1,500,000 annually.)

TYPES OF ASSISTANCE TO LOW-INCOME RURAL AREAS AND OTHER UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS

Technical assistance and direct field consultation in establishing new industries based on local resources, in expanding existing industries, and in economic diversification.

BASIC TERMS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

1. To assure that State and local leaders join in the program, there must first be submitted by the area or community an overall program for its economic development, as well as a finding by the State that the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with that program. For the same reason, assistance is to be extended only to public or private persons approved by the State in which the project is located.

2. Assistance shall not be available for working capital, purchase of machinery or equipment, or to assist the relocation of establishments if this will cause unemployment in their original locations.

3. Borrowers must first exhaust the possibility of a loan on reasonable terms from private lenders or other Federal agencies before obtaining assistance under the act.

4. Federal assistance in the form of loans may be granted up to 35 percent of project costs. These loans may be on a second-mortgage basis if necessary to assist the area. Private, State, and local sources are to provide no less than 65 percent of project costs (of which a minimum of 15 percent is to come from State or local sources). Under such authority, a first-mortgage loan from private sources representing 50 percent of the cost appears entirely feasible.

USING EXISTING FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Activities authorized by this act are coordinated with existing Federal programs affecting local economic conditions in areas of substantial and persistent unemployment. The existing programs would be used on the problems of these areas so as to provide the maximum assistance from the minimum Federal expenditure.

1. The Secretary of Labor, in addition to certifying areas of chronic unemployment, is also authorized to carry out or assist in studies of capabilities of the labor force, development of its skills and assist in its training.

2. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may provide necessary assistance for vocational education services.

3. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator, under provisions of the Housing Acts of 1949, 1954, and 1955, as amended, may permit the following considerations:

(a) Priority will be given cities and similar bodies for financial assistance for needed public facilities and public works (such as water and sewerage systems).

(b) Financial assistance may be provided urban renewal projects for industrial or commercial redevelopment of land previously nonresidential in character.

(c) Planning assistance grants may be made to counties, cities, and other municipalities having a population of 25,000 or more according to the latest decennial census.

## DISTRESSED AREAS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that my friend from Pennsylvania and his colleagues from the same State have introduced what they refer to as a distressed-areas bill or a surplus-unemployment bill, or call it what you will. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have been beating your ears off on this problem for a number of years. This applies also to some of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle who have joined me. We have been advocating legislation having the same general purpose.

We are glad to have as many on both sides of the aisle as care to join us.

What we are concerned with is a bill which will serve the best interests of the people in these areas. I am sure such a bill will be passed with the help of Members on both sides of the aisle.

## THE BUDGET

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Congress this year faces a most unusual situation. For the first time in the history of this country, a President has submitted a budget to the Congress for money to operate the Government, and neither he nor the Secretary of the Treasury has attempted to justify the budget. My correspondence on this subject is continuing to increase, and I think certainly that if the President of the United States wants money to operate the Government on, he should submit a new budget or at least send his representative to the Congress and let us know that he is actually serious in his request for money, and let us know where it should be cut or where it should be increased before this Congress continues to labor over a problem without any justification at all from the White House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I received a letter the other day, which was a most unusual one, from a businessman up around Boston. His first sentence was, "I am a lifelong Republican, but I am opposed to you supporting President Eisenhower's budget message."

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. That is very typical of what is going on all over the country.

## THE BUDGET

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal said about the President's budget. I would remind all the Members of the House that the President cannot spend any money that has not been authorized by law or appropriated by the Congress. Since 1930 there have been but two Republican Congresses, the 80th and the 83d, both of which reduced appropriations and expenditures, both of which reduced taxes, and both of which reduced the Federal debt.

The facts are self-evident. The laws calling for bigger and bigger spending have been passed, for the most part, by Congresses with big Democrat majorities since 1930, with the two above-mentioned exceptions.

This, the 85th Congress, as the 84th, has a Democrat Speaker, a Democrat majority. Every committee has a Democrat majority and a Democrat chairman.

This Democrat majority which passed the bigger spending legislation has the power, it has the votes, to repeal these laws in whole or in part; it has the power, it has the votes, to reduce appropriations—if it has the will. They should replace criticism of a big budget with action by refusal to pass new legislation calling for still bigger expenditures—with admonition to all to curb their requests for Uncle Sam to spend more and more.

## THE CORN PROGRAM

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's corn growers are impatiently waiting for a Democrat-controlled Congress to enact corn legislation. These farmers are being delayed in planning their operations for 1957. They want action, quick action. They hope that Democrats in Congress will stop playing politics with corn growers' problems.

Late in February, the Democrats in control of the House Agriculture Committee finally allowed the committee to report out a bill containing provisions for a corn program.

But their bill contains the germs of further delay. Instead of a simple and noncontroversial corn program, which could be rushed through with little opposition, their bill also includes a controversial and expensive feed grain program, which endangers the chances for a corn program this year, or at the least, may considerably delay it.

## TIGHT MONEY SITUATION STALLS HOME BUILDING PROGRAM

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the residential home builders in the Cleveland area have called my attention to the fact that the 1957 home building program is at a serious standstill because of the current "tight money" situation. Residential construction under the GI bill is completely curtailed pending determination by Congress whether relief to the critical housing needs will come through an increase in the GI loan interest rate or through the adoption of an effective direct loan program.

Commitments in the local money market are conditioned upon discount and an increase in the GI loan interest rate. Residential home builders are reducing their 1957 building program by as much as 80 percent and withdrawing all consideration of building for GI buyers.

Perhaps this administration can procrastinate the problem by assuming that home building is a postponable part of our economy. This position is untenable in housing-short areas like Cleveland and the northern Ohio community.

I earnestly hope that the Rules Committee will very quickly send to the floor of the House of Representatives H. R. 4602 with an open rule so that it can be amended to provide for expanding the contemplated program by providing direct loan funds or an increase in the GI interest rate so that the House of Representatives may determine which program it will support.

In any event, the situation calls for prompt action so that residential building plans can be developed in time to provide some of the needed housing starts the current construction year.

---

## THE GERRY MURPHY CASE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include four editorials and a statement from the President.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, recently a young man from my hometown, Eugene, Oreg., disappeared under mysterious circumstances in the Dominican Republic. To help his distraught parents, I began a routine investigation of the case. But as I got deeper into the details surrounding the disappearance of the boy, it became apparent that we were dealing with the logical result of the present United States policy toward the Dominican Republic.

I have decided to bring the facts before Congress, for the tragic and puzzling case of Gerald Lester Murphy deeply concerns not only me as the Member from Oregon's 4th District, but every Congressman, every Senator, in fact all Americans who respect justice and love liberty. Only the courage and bravery of Gerry's parents make it possible to reveal publicly the sordid details so that we can take appropriate action.

Gerry's mother has written to me: "Lester and I are believers in the truth, no matter how it might hurt our own." What, then, is the truth of the strange disappearance of Gerry Murphy? And is it in any way the inevitable result of misguided official policies of the United States, policies this Congress can do much to change?

### SINISTER IMPLICATIONS

Perhaps you have seen Life Magazine's story in the February 25th issue. But if you merely glanced at it and dismissed it as another isolated tragedy, I would like now to point out its far-reaching and sinister implications.

Gerry Murphy was born in Minot, N. Dak., in July 1933. In Granville, N. Dak., at the age of 16, he was the first youngster in town to attain the rank of Eagle Scout, a proud testimonial to his character and perseverance. In 1949 Gerry moved with his parents and three younger sisters to Eugene, Oreg. He was widely known as a gentle, personable youngster, conscientious and honest, the son of pious parents with whom he happily lived in a loving family circle until he was 21 years old.

### LOVE OF FLYING

As he grew to manhood Gerry's consuming desire to fly was obvious in everything he did. He filled his room with airplane models and books. He worked in his spare time through high school to pay for flying lessons. At 16 he soloed. He haunted the airport to watch the planes. All through his high-school days in Eugene, he worked at Green's Flying Service, ending up his time there as flight instructor and ground-school teacher. It was at this time that a member of my staff, R. H. Schillios, who was an aerial photographer, had occasion to fly with Gerry, having contracted with Green's Flying Service for a pilot. Of Gerry he has said, "To fly is to surrender to a wonderland apart. I could sense Gerry's love of flying."

After high school Gerry hoped to get a degree in aeronautical engineering. For this purpose he attended the University of Oregon, Oregon State College, and took some night courses at the University of Washington. But his burning desire to fly drove him back to the planes, and his education was always interrupted by some promising offer to fly.

One thing stood in the way of his goal—he had poor eyesight for a pilot. He was rejected by the armed services and the airlines on account of his defective eyesight. And he was also rejected by the Army as a civilian flight instructor. This was a severe blow to the young man, but he continued to work toward fulfilling his ambition to fly. For a time he worked as a draftsman in Texas for Boeing. In November 1955 he took a job as draftsman in Miami and began flying occasional charter jobs for Tom Guthrie's air taxi service.

### GEN. ARTURO ESPAILLAT

About that time Gerry told friends and his parents that he had made a new friend, Gen. Arturo Espaillat, New York consul-general for the Dominican Republic. In early March last year, Gerry told Tom Guthrie he had been offered a charter job and was going to take it. That job seems to have been the beginning of the end for this unsophisticated boy from Eugene, Oreg.

Gerry went up to Linden, N. J., on March 5 to rent a plane for a month. He paid $800 in cash for a twin-engine Beechcraft plane, No. N–68100. At 9:44 a. m. on March 12—mark that date—Gerry took off from Newark, announcing his destination as Miami and listing no passengers. The plane landed, not in Miami, but at Amityville, Long Island. That evening an ambulance entered the airport and what Gerry presumed to be an "invalid" was hustled into the plane. Early the next morning, N–68100 came into Lantana Airport near West Palm Beach for gas. The pilot bought $95 worth of gas and paid for it with cash, thus avoiding signing a gas slip. Gerry and his passenger took off for Montecristi Airport in the Dominican Republic.

### ORDERS FROM TRUJILLO

A few days later the young American was back in Miami in buoyant spirits. He told friends he had flown a wealthy invalid from New York to Tampa. And he bought a 1956 convertible for cash, although previously he had been anything but affluent. A month later Gerry left Miami to work for the Compania Dominicana de Aviacion in the Dominican Republic. George Burrie, then general manager of the airline, refused him a captaincy because he was short on experience, but by direct orders from the dictator, Generalissimo Trujillo, Gerry was hired as a copilot.

Gerry lived well in Ciudad Trujillo, the capital of the island country that lies in the Caribbean some 4 hours flying time from Florida. He wrote home that he was getting $800 a month plus overtime. He met Sally Caire, a Pan-American stewardess, and in September they became engaged. Meanwhile, he was chalking up flying time which was very precious to him. He planned to stay 2 more years to save money for his schooling, but changed his mind when he began to receive offers to fly for United States transport lines. He then planned to marry Sally immediately. On November 17 he wrote his parents that his stay in the Dominican Republic had served its purpose and that he was coming home. Two days later Gerry resigned from the Dominican Airlines. On December 3 he put an advertisement in a Dominican paper to sell his car and furniture. That afternoon he met Sally for a period in the airport in Ciudad Trujillo where she had a brief stopover. There he told her he had an appointment in the dictator's palace at 5 p. m., and made a date to see her in Miami on December 8. The next day Gerry's small car was found

abandoned near a slaughterhouse on a cliff overlooking shark-infested waters.

MURPHY DISAPPEARS

A few days later the Department of State notified Gerry's parents of his disappearance. The following day the Dominican authorities began a search for the missing American. Mr. Murphy and Sally hurried to the Dominican Republic to do what they could to turn up a trace of Gerry. Gerry's father and fiance went to see the Dominican attorney general, but instead of getting news of the boy, they were interrogated persistently about what Gerry might have told them of his activities in the Dominican Republic. They were shadowed constantly and were frightened. On the 19th Mr. Murphy and Sally went to Gerry's apartment to pack his belongings and they noticed that his briefcase was missing. It had contained his insurance policy, bank stubs, and other personal records. Sally told a Eugene reporter last week, "It's so easy to get killed in the Dominican Republic. It can be made to look like an accident, like getting run over by a car." She said she had been forced to quit her stewardness job because Pan-American officials said it would be too dangerous for her to continue because of possible repercussions from the case.

THE CASE OF GALINDEZ

Meanwhile, in the minds of those who know and understand the methods of Trujillo, the story of Gerry's mystifying disappearance began to add up. March 12, the date Gerry had flown an alleged invalid from the United States to the Dominican Republic, is the date the noted scholar, Jesus de Galindez, vanished from the heart of New York City.

Galindez was a Basque who had sought refuge from Franco Spain in the Dominican Republic in 1939. There he worked for almost 7 years as a law instructor and legal adviser to the Department of Labor. In those years he acquired an intimate knowledge of the Trujillo regime, and he brought with him to the United States a burning desire to expose it. In 1952 he began work for a doctorate at Columbia University. Its subject was "The Era of Trujillo."

Trujillo had much to fear from the pen of this gifted scholar. Galindez was immensely respected throughout the Spanish-speaking world. His sensational revelations, endorsed as a doctoral dissertation from an American University, would take on a prestige that similar disclosures in journals or books, however accurate, would not possess. Galindez knew his subject. The noted Latin American specialist, Prof. Frank Tannenbaum, remarked recently: "Trujillo's fears were far from unfounded. In time, Galindez came to resemble nothing so much as a walking, one-man intelligence bureau. He knew more about Trujillo than anyone else in the whole wide world."

On the fatal evening of March 12, Calindez lectured on the History of Latin American Civilization at Columbia University, had a cup of coffee with several of his students, got a ride to Columbus Circle with one of them, and was last seen descending into a subway. On March 14 Galindez missed a class he was scheduled to conduct. For several days his friends tried to reach him by telephone. Finally, one notified police that the professor seemed to be missing.

ASSASSINS HIRED

Among Galindez' papers was found a note stating that if anything happened to him those responsible would be found in the Dominican Republic. On March 30 a young Cuban notified the FBI that late in February a notorious Dominican thug named Martinez—but better known as "El Cojo," the "Lame One"—told him that Trujillo had assigned him the job of hiring two assassins for $35,000 each to kill Galindez and Romulo Betancourt, former democratic president of Venezuela. A rumor, picked up and circulated by Dominican revolutionaries here in the United States, held that Galindez had been carried out to a Dominican ship in the port of New York and cremated in the ship's boiler. Over a week later when the Dominican ship returned to New York, United States authorities made a search at the invitation of the Dominican Government, but no clues were revealed.

In the meantime, the insinuations against Trujillo in the press here, and especially in Latin America, brought a counterattack from the Dominican Republic. In an effort to blacken Galindez' reputation, Dominican officials accused him of absconding with half a million dollars of Basque government-in-exile funds and of being a Communist. Basque government officials angrily denied the allegation, and those who have known Galindez personally and from his writings protested the charge of communism. Moreover, Galindez' last will and statement, uncovered among his papers, began, "I am a believing Catholic and I want to be buried according to the rites of my church."

MURPHY-GALINDEZ LINKED

Perhaps the Galindez case would have slowly gathered dust in the files of unsolved mysteries if Gerry Murphy had been less gregarious. Gerry, learning from newspaper reports of the missing Galindez, began to add 2 and 2. His fiance reports that he spoke of the possibility of his having flown the drugged Galindez out of the country on the night of March 12. We can only surmise that he spoke to others of the matter, and perhaps questioned his fellow workers. In any case, Gerry vanished as completely as had Galindez.

With pressure upon the Dominican Government to close the Gerry Murphy case before too many unsavory facts were uncovered, Dominican officials came up with an answer. A fellow pilot in the Dominican airlines, Octavio De la Maza, was picked up on December 16 for questioning after a member of the United States Embassy in Ciudad Trujillo informed the Dominican attorney general that he had heard a serious enmity existed between De la Maza and Murphy. On January 7 De la Maza is alleged to have hanged himself with a piece of mosquito netting tied around a shower pipe in his jail cell, and to have left a suicide note there in which he confesses to having killed Murphy.

SUICIDE CLAIM ABSURD

If we could accept the tale of De la Maza's suicide, Gerry Murphy's disappearance would be neatly buttoned up. But I have seen a photostat of the note. It is patently absurd. A portion is too obscene to quote verbatim into the RECORD, but so much hinges on the authenticity of the note that I feel obliged to tell you, as far as propriety will permit, the exact words De la Maza is claimed to have written to his wife. In translation, the note reads:

DEAR LOVE: I am writing to tell you that I am taking this fatal decision because something very grave happened which only you shall know.

Some nights ago an old companion of mine from the company, Murphy, invited me to have some drinks and he had 3 liters of rum in the car and we went down to the avenue and sat down beside the sea. I have heard it said that he was effeminate * * * [here I will paraphrase] * * * and he made a pass at me * * * [now back to the text] and I did not accept this and I refused for which reason he began to reproach and insult me telling me that we Dominicans were uneducated brutes and that the personnel of the Dominican Airlines were no good. You know that this American left there because he was a rumor monger and a traitor, then he offended me personally and he tried to strike me and I gave him a blow in the face and he fell into the water and I could not save him. For this reason remorse is killing me and that is why I am putting an end to my life. Pardon me. Since I denied all this to the law I have wished to make the confession to you. Goodbye.

TAVITO.

It is common knowledge that Trujillo has on call a virtuoso at forgery named Alonzo Alonzo. The Dominican Government sent to Spain for a handwriting expert to pass on the legitimacy of the note. In view of the fact that Gerry was a United States citizen and that an FBI expert could have been on the spot in a few hours, why did Trujillo send for a Spaniard?

CONTRADICTIONS NOTED

But even if De la Maza somehow was forced to write the note, its contents tax the credulity of even the most naive observer. Its stark contradictions leap out from the page. Let us examine them for a moment.

First. If there had been bad blood between De la Maza and Murphy, would the two have gone off on a joyride on Murphy's last day on the island?

Second. It seems absurd for De la Maza, after denying everything to the police, to commit suicide and leave for his wife alone a confession which the police would necessarily be the first to find.

Third. Moreover, remorse as a motive for the suicide is nothing short of ridiculous. Several years before, while military attaché in London, De la Maza shot to death a fellow Dominican. Saved from British justice by diplomatic immunity, he escaped punishment at home on the grounds of self-defense. It was never noted that he was remorseful over the murder. Even if we accept as fact that De la Maza pushed Gerry off the cliff under the circumstances set forth in the note, would a man of De la Maza's character feel remorse at having defended—if you accept his note's expla-

nation—his own honor and that of his country?

German Ornes, former editor and publisher of the Dominican newspaper, El Caribe, tells me that "suicide for remorse" is one of the favorite methods employed by Dominican police for eliminating prisoners. Cases like that are so frequent, he says, that while publisher of El Caribe, he finally ordered that they no longer be printed. The other daily, La Nacion, continued to print them.

Fourth. From what I have been able to learn of Dominican jails, prisoners on admission are stripped of all their possessions. Where would De la Maza have gotten hold of pencil and paper? Witnesses who have been inside of Dominican prisons also ridicule the idea of mosquito netting in Dominican prison cells.

Fifth. As for the allegations of homosexuality, here we come to an old trick of Generalissimo Trujillo. In another case involving the murder of an American in the Dominican Republic, the same line was followed. In 1938 the Reverend Charles Raymond Barns, minister of the Episcopal Church in the Dominican Republic, was found shot and beaten to death in his home. It was known that he had written letters to the States criticizing the bloody massacre of Haitians ordered that year by the dictator. His houseboy, a Puerto Rican named Diaz, confessed to killing the minister because the latter had made improper advances. After trial, Diaz was found guilty of justifiable homicide, and condemned to a short prison term. He was never seen again. It is presumed he died shortly after being placed in a cell, a most effective way both to halt any United States investigation and to shut up Diaz forever.

ATTEMPT TO THWART FBI

We may even guess that De la Maza was offered a deal to help get the FBI off Trujillo's scent: confess to homicide, with a guaranty that Trujillo's puppet courts would let him off with a light sentence, followed by a suitable award for his services after the case cooled off. It is also conceivable that the story of enmity between Gerry and De la Maza was planted in preparation for the farce. De la Maza's trial then would have a ring of authenticity, for after all, had not the American Embassy originally put the Dominican police on his trail? Perhaps the plan blew up because De la Maza, a long-time Trujillo henchman, remembered Diaz's fate and refused to go along with the plot.

In any case, the scurrilous allegations against Gerry Murphy's character are clearly absurd. All those who have known him throughout his life speak only well of him. The Dominicans' efforts to sully Gerry's character in this respect are vile and ludicrous. The Dominican attorney general's report gives them away. In the report, it is stated that the investigation could turn up no evidence that Gerry visited brothels or kept mistresses. The maid when questioned denied ever finding lipstick marks in the apartment. Perhaps to the base minds of Trujillo's gang, this might be good Latin evidence of Gerry's sexual aberrations. On the other hand, I see it as additional evidence that Gerry was an upright, decent boy, engaged to marry the girl he loved.

Sixth. De la Maza's movements before his arrest also cast grave doubts on the authenticity of his suicide. On December 10 he appeared at the United States Embassy, highly agitated, and applied for visas for his parents. On December 14, 3 days before his arrest, the parents left the Dominican Republic. It now seems likely that De la Maza had already been approached to play some part in the hoax, had determined to refuse, and was justifiably worried about the safety of his parents.

Seventh. In order to hang himself from the shower fixture, De la Maza had to keep his knees flexed to keep his feet from touching the floor.

TERROR WIDESPREAD

You get some idea of the terror felt by those even remotely connected with the case when I tell you that De la Maza's father-in-law, a Spanish national, desperately sought asylum in several embassies. He found asylum in the Spanish Embassy in Ciudad Trujillo. It is also of interest to note that the wife of "El Cojo," who was mentioned earlier as having knowledge of the Galindez assassination plot, was struck dead by an automobile last week in Ciudad Trujillo. Remember what Sally Caire said to the Eugene paper? While we are on the subject, and while it may be only circumstantial, I have learned that the night watchman at the Amityville Airport where Gerry picked up the invalid died shortly afterward of a heart attack. He was 57 years old and had a history of good health. Veteran metropolitan law enforcement officers inform me that even a Congressman should not consider himself immune from the long arm of Trujillo's vengeance.

I believe that the State Department and the FBI are no more convinced than I am of the veracity of the Dominican tale. I commend Mr. Richard H. Stephens, who was Chargé d'Affaires of our Embassy in the Dominican Republic at the time of De la Maza's death. On a visit to the jail cell, he tried to demonstrate that De la Maza could not have hanged himself from the shower pipe which extended only 6 inches over his head. To me, Stephens' skepticism was a normal reaction and his conduct in the cell as our representative was courageous.

Dominican officials have done everything in their power to frustrate an effective investigation. I have already mentioned the Spanish handwriting expert instead of an FBI man. Delays in submitting documents to the Department of State have been beyond all reason or excuse.

VISITED DOMINICAN AMBASSADOR

Recently I had my own experience with the type of cooperation we can expect from the Dominican Government. On February 11, I called personally on the Dominican Ambassador. His secretary was present and took shorthand notes of our conference. I asked for a transcript of her notes, and in the Ambassador's presence and without contradiction from him, she replied that she would be glad to supply it. When time passed without receiving the promised transcript, I called the Embassy and later wrote a letter. I have never received the transcript of our conversation, nor even the courtesy of a reply to my letter, but I have received, directly and indirectly, repeated assurances of fullest cooperation by the Dominican Government.

One nagging fact emerges from my experience in trying to investigate what happened to Gerry Murphy. In neither the case of the vanished Gerry nor the case of the vanished Galindez can our law enforcement officials carry the search for the culprits into a sovereign country.

The really terrifying aspect is that these are not isolated incidents. The dictator's barbarous tactics for holding and maintaining power are not confined to his domain. Trujillo's thugs have the audacity to bring his strong-arm methods right onto American soil. He operates a network of terror in this country—as well as throughout the hemisphere—with apparent impunity. Anonymous calls, threats, coercion, frameups, and murder are commonplace. Here are a few examples.

1. THE ANDRES REQUENA CASE

In 1952 Andres Requena, a journalist and writer of an exposé on the Trujillo regime, was decoyed to a New York tenement and shot dead. Prior to his murder, the FBI had been notified by a Dominican that Requena was a marked man. The informant said that Felix Bernardino, then Dominican consul-general in New York, had offered him money to find two Italians to assassinate Andres Requena and Nicolas Silfa, leader of the Dominican Revolutionary Party in New York, at $5,000 a head. In spite of this prior warning, Requena met death, and the New York police never found his murderer. Immediately after the murder, Bernardino, the Dominican consul, was transferred to Venezuela, a safe distance from the inquiry.

2. NICOLAS SILFA

Nicolas Silfa, the other Trujillo opponent marked for murder on that occasion, still lives. He is constantly harassed by threats, anonymous phone calls, and frame-up attempts. On one occasion he and his wife found a box of bandaids in their car, with some marijuana cigarettes inserted. A box under the car seat was found to contain counterfeit coins. These were turned over the New York police. Several days later, Silfa was visited by United States agents investigating a denunciation that he was counterfeiting United States money. Last December, at the height of the Murphy search, Trujillo's stooges made another attempt to silence Silfa's efforts to expose the nature of the Dominican dictatorship. This time four policemen accompanied by two photographers, but no search warrant, entered Silfa's apartment on a tip that he was practicing dentistry without a license. The man who made the illegal practice charge against Silfa stated he fell into a 3-day coma as a result of Silfa's malpractice. In sworn testimony, that gentleman was seen out dancing the night he was supposed to have been in a coma. Silfa's

witness to this interesting fact was promptly rewarded for his courage by a vicious beating in the corridor of his apartment house.

3. ARTHUR HICKS

Arthur Hicks, the journalist and author of another Trujillo expose entitled "Blood in the Streets," has another tale to tell of an experience with Trujillo's hoodlums in the United States. Shortly after the publication of his book, his brother-in-law was awakened at 3 a. m. by a loud pounding on the door. Upon opening the door, he was greeted by a dark-complexioned man who asked for Hicks, explaining that Hicks had invited him up for a drink earlier in the evening. Hicks had not lived at that address for some time, and only the passport which he had used in the Dominican Republic while gathering material for his book carried that address. We can only deduce that Hicks was very lucky to have moved some time before. This matter, as dozens of others, was reported both to the New York police and to the FBI.

Nor are Trujillo's activities confined to New York. On one occasion in 1953, three cars belonging to the dictator's opponents had their tires slashed while parked in the 4300 block of 16th Street NW., right here in the Nation's Capital.

What are we going to do about Trujillo's dogged pursuit of his opponents beyond the borders of his plantation, otherwise known as the Dominican Republic?

TRUJILLO

Who is this man who has the effrontery to send his hired thugs into New York, Washington, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Miami? And who asks us to believe the De la Maza "suicide" explanation of Gerry's disappearance? The Chicago gangster methods he employs so skillfully in the United States are only a pallid demonstration of the savagery of which he is capable. We must look to the Dominican Republic itself for the real nature of Trujillo.

The dictator came to power by revolution in 1930. Through a formidable system of secret police, spies and assassins, who intimidate, torture and assassinate even the mildest critic within the Dominican Republic, he consolidated his political power. Parties were done away with and he set up his personal organization. He controls every single organ of public information. The stories of the Murphy and Galindez disappearances have received no coverage whatsoever. Only De la Maza's "suicide" was perfunctorily announced to the public.

Signs everywhere—in shops, on trucks, over the doors of flimsy shacks—proclaim: "Trujillo Is My Protector," or "God and Trujillo Are My Faith." And woe to him who shows the slightest doubt, even by a facial expression. Trujillo even had the colossal gall to have the capital city's name changed to Ciudad Trujillo from Santo Domingo, the one bestowed upon it by none other than Christopher Columbus.

COUNTRY IN IRON GRIP

Trujillo runs the country like his personal plantation. It is indeed hard to find where Trujillo's private property begins and the public domain ends. By two laws, the law of identification and the law of vagrancy, he has set up a system of forced labor that enables him to develop his personal industries which yield him vast returns. Listen to the run-down of his sources of funds from the December 1956 Harper's magazine:

> Trujillo owns—either in his own name or in the name of selected cronies or members of his family—6 of the 15 Dominican sugar mills; the only milk pasteurizing and distributing organization in Ciudad Trujillo; a lumber cutting and drying trust; the only edible-oil factory; and the only cement and cigarette factories. He operates the only modern slaughterhouse; owns the only glass factory, the only paint factory, a hat manufacturing concern, a large liquor plant, the only battery works, the only air-conditioning equipment factory, the most powerful radio and television stations, a chemical manufacturing concern.

It goes on and on.

The dictator constantly lauds himself as an anti-Communist and a defender of private property. But when we examine the facts, it is apparent that the only private property Trujillo is defending is Trujillo's. The frequently reiterated phrase by Trujillo eulogists that he welcomes and protects foreign capital is nonsense. The American-owned electric power company has just been eased out to the tune of $13.2 million. Trujillo is paying for the company, but it amounts to nationalization. The Compania Dominicana de Telefonos, a branch of the International Automatic Electric Corp. of Chicago, has been expecting to be nationalized any day now. Similarly, Trujillo recently purchased the West Indies Sugar Co. for $35 million, grasping sugar in the country pretty well in the hands of his family.

CONTEMPT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

This centralization of the means of production of the entire country in the hands of a single family must really be gratifying to the Communists. Free, competitive private enterprise—the kind we mean when we say private enterprise—already has ceased to exist in the Dominican Republic. There is only Trujillo's industry, or whatever at the moment does not compete with him or in which he is not interested. Thus, the economy has already been prepared for a takeover by the State. In this instance, instead of the Communists, Trujillo is the State. The result in terms of freedom and bread for the average Dominican family is the same.

As for the feature of democracy we most highly prize and which is the core of our battle with communism—human rights—Trujillo has as much contempt for them as the most rabid Communist.

What about the much-vaunted material progress of the country under the self-styled "benefactor of the fatherland"? In 1956 the Dominican Republic exported goods valued at $126 million and imported $108 million worth, leaving a tidy balance for the treasury of $18 million. For more than a decade the country has enjoyed a favorable balance of trade. Reserves are strong, the Dominican currency is on a par with the dollar, and the country's credit is good.

DOMINICANS DEMORALIZED

But what of the people? How much of this apparent prosperity has trickled down to the masses of people? The ordinary family income is still miserably low. More than 50 percent of the people remain illiterate. It is true, more children attend schools and universities in the country than did so 27 years ago. But they are fed a steady diet of adulation of the dictator that rivals even Hitler's efforts to pervert the minds of youth. Most damaging of all is the fact that 27 years of the dictatorship have demoralized Dominicans. They live in cringing fear of all-powerful "big brother," who controls their livelihoods, who has the power of life and death over them, and who seems to have access to even their innermost thoughts.

Every journalist of integrity who has visited the Dominican Republic has come away keenly aware of the rottenness of the regime. Many of them have written about it in biting terms. Trujillo, of course, has vast sums of money to spend to perpetuate his regime. Those writers he cannot buy out he drowns out with a steady stream of eulogies from paid hacks. His public relations firms here in the United States spare no expense to publicize Trujillo's kind heart and his island paradise. Some of the United States firms hired by Trujillo are listed as agents of foreign governments at the Department of Justice. Undoubtedly there is plenty more Trujillo money floating around that is not registered.

For years Latin Americans have raised the question: Does the United States condone the policies of the Dominican dictator? We have taken a firm stand against Communist tyranny. Why, they ask, do we allow to pass as if unnoticed Trujillo's vilest acts of tyranny committed on our own doorstep? Why, I ask, do we sit on our hands while he extends his machinations within the very borders of the United States?

The evidence of foul play in the Gerald Lester Murphy case demands action. Even if the Department of Justice's hands are tied, because a sovereign nation is involved and involved up to its neck, surely the United States does not have to rest its case.

ACTION AGAINST COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

In the past we have taken vigorous steps to protect our citizens from Communist tyranny.

1. THE OATIS CASE

Do you remember the case of William Oatis, the Associated Press bureau chief? He was sentenced in 1951 to a 10-year prison term by the Czechs for espionage. Strong action was taken to keep Oatis from languishing in a Czech prison.

Our Government made continuous representations to the Czech Government through our Embassy in Prague for Oatis' release. The 82d Congress passed a concurrent resolution expressing profound indignation at the arrest and conviction and calling for the termination of all commercial relations with Czechoslovakia. President Truman, in a personal interview, let the Czech Ambassador know emphatically that the case was not closed from the point of view of the

American people. The United States cut off nearly all trade with Czechoslovakia, which had sold here about $20 million worth of goods yearly. We also banned travel to Czechoslovakia by Americans except on urgent official business, and barred Czech civilian planes from West German airports. Shortly after President Eisenhower took office, he wrote President Zapotocky a personal letter, and it has been disclosed that Zapotocky responded with a letter announcing the newsman's pardon.

We shall never know exactly which measure turned the trick. Perhaps the combined determination of the Government and the American people eventually had an effect.

2. THE VOGELER CASE

Similar actions were taken in the case of Vogeler, an American businessman arrested in Budapest and sentenced to 15 years for spying on Hungarian military and atomic developments. The Hungarian consulates in New York and Cleveland were promptly shut down in retaliation. Travel by American citizens to Hungary was banned.

WHAT ABOUT GERRY MURPHY?

Parallel gestures to rescue Gerry Murphy may now be futile. The accumulating evidence indicates, tragically, that it might be too late to save his life. But does that mean that the little Caesar of the Caribbean is to be permitted again and again to outrage every code of decency and trample human rights? It is fantastic that he be allowed to terrorize American citizens and our guests, while we stand by seemingly in abject helplessness.

The fact that Trujillo's agents have been able to carry out their monstrous crimes without effective blocks lends shameful credence to the charge that the United States is interested only in fighting communistic tyranny. The rigid stand we take when Communists inflict injustices is in glaring contrast to the gloved-hand approach of the Government toward the Dominican Republic. Why is this true?

FREEDOM OR TYRANNY?

The global struggle today is not only between democracy and communism. The battle is between freedom and tyranny. If the ultimate victory is to be won, tyranny, whether it be communism, fascism, or Trujilloism, must be resisted with resolution and fortitude. Whether it is Capone's Cicero, Ill., the Politburo's Moscow, or Trujillo's Ciudad Trujillo, such sources of infection must be fought with every means at our command.

I am, of course, not suggesting that we turn the clock back half a century. The idea of sending United States marines to this little country is repugnant to all Americans. We have other weapons at hand whose use, judging from press reports throughout most of Latin America, would be welcomed and cheered in our sister Republics. The people in Latin America wonder why we treat Trujillo so gently.

POSSIBLE ACTION IN THE GERRY MURPHY CASE

On February 4 I wrote to President Eisenhower calling for a full and responsible investigation. It was my suggestion at that time that our Government appoint 2 commissioners and that the Dominican Government appoint 2 more; that the 4 agree upon a fifth man who shall be chairman; that the commission have subpena powers and the full, actual cooperation of the Dominican police and other officials. However, since then so much evidence has piled up indicating willful complicity of the Dominican Government in the disappearances of Murphy and Galindez that an investigation with official Dominican participation may now be out of the question.

CONGRESSIONAL INQUIRY NEEDED

I believe the answer is a congressional inquiry to expose the nature and source of the fantastic immunity Trujillo's crimes appear to enjoy. Several newspapers have been urging action. A recent New York Post editorial states:

> Surely enough is now on the record to warrant a full-scale congressional inquiry into the machinations of this gang.

The Washington Post of February 23 editorializes:

> It is to be hoped the American Government will press relentlessly for the full details of this sordid and ugly story. * * * If an official investigation confirms Life magazine's shocking exposure, some form of diplomatic action against Trujillo surely seems in order.

Clearly, the time is long overdue to demonstrate that the United States will not tolerate Trujillo's abuses. We could take economic measures designed to hurt the dictator's pocketbook. Last year the country earned about $6 million from the tourist trade, mostly from our country. As in the Oatis and Vogeler cases, a ban could be imposed on American travel to the Caribbean land. Moreover, over half the Dominican Republic's exports are purchased by the United States. By cutting off United States trade, Trujillo might be persuaded that we mean to protect our citizens from his audacious criminality.

Then there is the matter of the sugar quota. Passage of the sugar-quota bill on April 30, 1956, was favorable to the Dominican Republic. I am informed that the Dominican quota for 1957 will permit almost double the entry of Dominican sugar over their 1955 exports. A little tinkering with the sugar quota might make Generalissimo Trujillo mend his ways, if not, at this late date, his morals.

TRUJILLO WANTS $40 MILLION

In addition, the dictator has pending an application to the Export-Import Bank for a series of credits that add up to some $40 million. The purposes of the credits sound worthy enough on paper: irrigation, communications, water system, electric power, roads. But we know that this money will be spent, not for the Dominican people, but further to enrich and entrench the Trujillo dynasty. We cannot honorably lend the support of United States taxpayers' money for such a purpose.

To be effective, the methods we use to combat the evils of the Trujillo regime must have the support of the American people. I mean all the American people. I am certain that the great majority, when they are informed—and that is one of the main purposes of this speech—will be aghast at the depravities of the Trujillo regime. But, unfortunately, there are a handful who, for a price, are willing to blink at or ignore the unsavory aspects of the dictatorship. Perhaps others have been honestly blinded to the truth by the constant blare of Trujillo's paid propagandists. Some, I am sorry to say, are fully aware of the foulness of the regime, and equally aware of United States interests in encouraging the growth of democratic institutions in the hemisphere and the world. This last group cynically lends its services to promote the dictator's interests, against the national interests of their own country, the country to which the whole world must look for moral leadership toward world peace. Only a thorough investigation into the activities of Trujillo's apologists among a small, but influential, number of United States citizens will reveal the real reasons he has enjoyed immunity and a certain respectability for so long.

DICTATOR'S AGENTS INFLUENTIAL

The list of Trujillo's registered agents include some very distinguished names. Currently on his rolls is the law firm of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., and Charles Patrick Clark, with a neat annual retainer fee of $60,000. His agents here in Washington include: Cummings, Sellers, Reeves & Conner, at $2,000 a month; Joseph Gerald Feeney, at $1,500 a month; International Services, Inc., at 1625 I Street NW., draws $12,500 every 3 months for public relations expenses and services; Brookhart, Becker & Dorsey on K Street were paid formerly about $2,500 monthly but now their contract reads, "in accordance with services rendered." In New York, Harry Klemfuss Associates spent over $30,000 during April, May, and June of last year on the dictator's behalf, and is still on the payroll.

I do not mean to imply that all or any of the above named have base motives for serving Trujillo. I only raise the question of the propriety of their serving in a capacity to lend respectability to a regime which plots and carries out murders of American citizens and guests. I know of at least one of them who will shortly terminate his connections—much to the relief, I am sure, of his many friends. Nor would it be fair to single out the above. Many influential people who are not registered as agents are serving Trujillo's purposes.

It would be interesting to learn why the New York police felt it necessary to send 4 policemen and 2 photographers to Nicolas Silfa's apartment on the suspicion of so mild a charge as practicing dentistry illegally, especially after Mr. Silfa's long and undisputed record as a target for Dominican frameups.

INFILTRATING UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

A number of other peculiar circumstances makes one wonder if there are Trujillo agents or sympathizers employed by the United States Government. Let me give an example. On

September 7, 1956, German Ornes, Dominican editor, and his American wife applied for United States visas when they found the dictator's wrath turned upon them. Mr. Ornes was called in and confronted with a membership card in his name in the Partido Socialista Popular, the Dominician Communist Party, dated 1944. Fortunately for Mr. and Mrs. Ornes, Mr. Ornes remembered that it was not until 1946 that the Partido Socialista Popular received its name.

But the couple's troubles did not end with this farcial frameup. A number of weeks passed and still no visa from the United States Embassy. The delay conveniently gave time for Trujillo to trump up a case which would be grounds for denying Mr. Ornes a visa under the McCarran-Walter Act. Mr. Ornes was charged by the Dominican Government with embezzlement from El Caribe, his own newspaper. The lapse of time after the patently false charge of communism inevitably leads one to suspect an element of collusion between some United States officials and the Dominican regime somewhere along the line.

United States private investments in the Dominican Republic currently run to about $90 million. The following companies have sizable operations: the South Puerto Rico Sugar Co.; Alcoa; Barium Steel Corp.; Pepsi-Cola; Coca-Cola; Canada Dry; Pan American Airways; Lockjoint Pipe Co.; Elmhurst, N. J., Construction Co.; Ambassador Hotels; William Pawley is doing mineral exploitation and acting as adviser to the Government on mining matters.

SOME ANSWERS NEEDED

Among the questions Congress ought to probe should be the matter of who in the Government and the private companies considers Trujillo's interests uppermost. It should investigate if someone in the Embassy or in the Justice Department worked improperly in the Ornes' visa case. It should try to find out why Trujillo's thugs molest American citizens and commit crimes on American soil with impunity. It should look into the extent of Trujillo's holdings in the United States and Puerto Rico. It should find out who is paying the expenses for the trips some Congressmen have taken to the Dominican Republic. And it should examine the implications of the visits taken by the people who have been Trujillo's all-expense-paid guests, including the visits of Secretary Dulles' daughter and son-in-law, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Hinshaw.

As the Congressman from Gerald Lester Murphy's district, I am carrying the case through you to the conscience of the American people. I have tried without success to get the cooperation of the Dominican Government through their Embassy here in Washington. I have been in constant touch with the Department of State, whose career personnel have provided sympathetic and intelligent assistance. I have written appeals to Secretary Dulles and to President Eisenhower. I have been in close touch with the press in their wonderfully resourceful and courageous investigations. I fully expect to be labeled a Communist, as have all the other opponents of Trujillo. Consul General Espaillat said last week in New York that I was using "the tragic death of one of my constituents as a steppingstone to cheap publicity." The truth is, any publicity on the Murphy and Galindez cases deeply and understandably distresses Mr. Espaillat, the man who was responsible for drawing Gerry Murphy into Trujillo's web, then after his disappearance, denied knowing him.

TRAVESTY OF JUSTICE

When a man is imprisoned in Czechoslovakia or Hungary or Red China, we let the whole world know our position and we fight for him and the basic principles of freedom and fair play. Is the death or kidnaping of Gerry Murphy less reprehensible? How can the people of Latin America, Europe, and Asia believe we really stand for democracy when we tolerate such a travesty of justice so close to home? When indeed prominent United States officials and private citizens seek to make respectable a government which is based on terror and intrigue?

Above all let us remember that if we tacitly condone the Trujillo regime by our silence and inaction, we do grievous damage to the moral basis of our Government. The dichotomy in the world today is not between the free world and communism. It is between the free world and any tyranny, communistic or otherwise. I do not underrate the threat of the international Communist conspiracy—but I suggest that our failure to call a spade a spade, a tyrant a tyrant, in the Dominican Republic hinders us in our efforts to light a torch of freedom and fair play for all the world. Other nations want to look to us to aid in the attainment of a world under God and the law.

REVISE POLICY

In conclusion, let me stress that I need this House's help to answer the two questions: What happened to my constituent, Gerry Murphy? and—Should we revise our present official policy of toleration, conciliation, and condonation of the Dominican tyranny, revise our policy so that no more American boys will disappear in the Dominican Republic under circumstances which not only suggest murder but indeed shriek of murder—not casual, unpremeditated murder, but murder by order of Trujillo, premeditated and a part of the policies of his government, policies in which terror and intimidation are foremost and all pervasive.

I say to Gerry's parents in my hometown, Eugene, Oreg.: Mr. and Mrs. Murphy, I have every confidence that this Congress will help me find out what happened to your son, and, if he is in fact dead, help me to avenge him and to revise misguided official policies which distress friends of freedom and fair play throughout Latin America and all the world.

[From the Oregon Statesman, Salem, Oreg., February 20, 1957]

DOMINICAN MYSTERY

Representative CHARLES PORTER of the Fourth District has his teeth in a mystery which he promises to shake with his characteristic bulldog tenacity. An airplane pilot, Gerald Lester Murphy, whose parents live in Eugene, died in the Dominican Republic where he was employed, under mysterious circumstances. The Republic authorities say he was killed by one De la Maza, a fellow employee who later committed suicide. In view of the ruthless Trujillo dictatorship in the Dominican Republic, doubts are raised as to the truth of these reports. Hints are heard that Murphy "knew too much" and so was disposed of.

Porter has been pressing for fuller inquiry with as great zeal as he showed in agitating Al Serena in Oregon. He has prodded the State Department, the Dominican Embassy, and all others who might help. In tackling the Dominican dictatorship, however, he takes on a tough customer; but power to him.

---

[From the Christian Science Monitor of February 18, 1957]

A BETTER EXPLANATION DUE

An American has disappeared in the Dominican Republic. The Dominican explanation is that a fellow employee of the government-owned Dominican Airlines was arrested and later committed suicide, leaving a note admitting the murder of the American, Gerald Lester Murphy. Dominican exiles, however, hint darkly that Mr. Murphy knew something about the disappearance in New York last year of Jesús de Galíndez, Spanish anti-Trujillo author and Columbia University lecturer. Other foes of the island strong man Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina, have disappeared or been slain under strange circumstances.

Other governments will not feel inclined to interfere in what Dominicans do to one another, but when the treatment or safety of nationals of other countries is involved, that is another question.

Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat, of Oregon, after attempting unsuccessfully to get detailed information from the Dominican Embassy in Washington, was sharply critical of the manner in which Dominican authorities handled the inquiry. The incident is serious enough to create an uneasy feeling. Certainly it is in the interest of the island government itself to see that all the facts are brought to light in this case.

---

[From the Washington Post of February 23, 1957]

SPOTLIGHT ON TRUJILLO

It is an unhappy commentary on the efforts of New York police and the Federal Bureau of Investigation that a picture magazine has taken the biggest step toward explaining the mysterious disappearance of Dr. Jesus de Galindez. Life Magazine presents strong evidence that Dr. Galindez, a bitter foe of the Trujillo dictatorship in the Dominican Republic, was kidnaped from New York and flown to that Caribbean country by an American pilot who also has vanished mysteriously. If nothing else, the magazine's disclosure should stir police officials out of the torpor they have previously shown toward this grim case.

Dr. de Galindez was of Basque origin and a foe of all forms of despotism, including Spanish fascism, international communism, and Trujilloism. After a brief exile in Ciudad Trujillo, he found asylum in New York, where he was known as a vigorous and honorable critic of the Dominican dictator. Last March 12, he disappeared. Among his effects was a note warning that if he should vanish, the person responsible would be found in the Dominican Republic.

Apparently, Dr. de Galindez was right. Life's investigation shows that a young American pilot, Gerald Lester Murphy, seemingly flew a bundled-up "invalid" from New

York to Trujillo's land—on the same day that Dr. de Galindez was last seen. Then Murphy, who according to Life talked "carelessly," also disappeared. The Dominican Republic explained this disappearance by producing a suicide-note "confession" written by one Octavio de la Maza, a Dominican pilot who allegedly said he killed Murphy in a fight.

It is to be hoped that the American Government will press relentlessly for the full details of this sordid and ugly story. There is unhappily little this country can do when a foreign despot lends the strong smell of an abattoir to his country's politics. But it is quite a different matter when a foreign dictator imagines that his powers of vengeance extend to American soil. If an official investigation confirms Life magazine's shocking exposure, some form of diplomatic action against Trujillo surely seems in order.

---

[From the New York Post of February 22, 1957]

TRUJILLO OVER THE U. S. A.

Newest developments in the case of Dr. Jesus Galindez dramatize the need for a sweeping congressional investigation of the operations of Trujillo agents within the United States.

Galindez, a valiant exile foe of Trujillo's despotism, mysteriously vanished from this city last March. Now, in a documented and detailed inquiry, Life magazine has produced evidence strongly suggesting that Galindez was kidnaped by Trujillo agents and that a youthful American flier may have been murdered by the Dominican dictatorship because he talked too freely about his role in the kidnaping.

An interview with the fiancee of the flier, published in the Post yesterday, gives added support to those suspicions. She declared flatly that the flier—23-year-old Gerald Murphy—told her on one of his return trips to the United States that he had been hired to fly the plane bearing the drugged body of Galindez to Trujillo's domain. Not long after that conversation Murphy disappeared; he was later reported by Dominican authorities to have been murdered in a personal argument with another pilot. But there are many mysterious contradictions in that explanation.

Dominican officials have branded all charges of involvement as fantastic. It is fantastic to believe such things could happen. But Trujillo's tyranny has committed atrocities that defy ordinary human imagination, and it has paid large sums to Americans—in journalism and politics—to suppress curiosity about its crimes.

Surely enough is now on the record to warrant a full-scale congressional inquiry into the machinations of this gang.

---

MESSAGE FROM PRESIDENT, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1957, TO HIS EXCELLENCY, GEN. HECTOR B. TRUJILLO MOLINO, PRESIDENT OF THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

The people of the United States join me in wishing prosperity and happiness for you and the people of the Dominican Republic upon this anniversary of their independence.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much interested in the statements made by the distinguished gentleman from Oregon, the Honorable CHARLES O. PORTER. It so happens that I remember reading several newspaper articles about this case for some period of time.

Mr. Speaker, you know I have traveled extensively in Central and South America during the years I have been in the House, although I have never visited the Dominican Republic. I say this, because I am deeply concerned about the relationships between our friends and neighbors to the south, and you have heard me upon occasion when the foreign-aid programs were before this House, emphasize the fact, that I deplore what seemed to me a studied neglect of the Central and South American nations, who have been our tried and true friends, and preferment being showed to nations all over the world, who by no means had exhibited friendship.

Then, as a member of the Defense Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on American Defense and hemispheric defense have been matters close to my heart. I say these things because any kind of a problem of the nature referred to by the gentleman from Oregon should not be swept under the rug and ignored by our Government. Actually, I know nothing about the facts one way or another, other than I have read in the papers and have heard here today, but I have been around here long enough to know that there are 2 sides to every question, and sometimes 3 or 4 sides. I yield to no one in my full and complete abhorrence of atheistic communism and on its teachings; and I am concerned with its skillful process of infiltration in this country and in countries in the Central and South American areas. The Dominican Republic has been honored by that great enemy of communism, Cardinal Spellman, for their outstanding fight against this menace. There was a time when the proudest boast a man could make would be to stand up in the market place of any city of any country, in the then known world, and declare, "I am a Roman citizen." I want to be able that in any market place in any nation of the world today, someone from my country could stand up and proudly say, "I am an American citizen," and feel assured that he would be entitled to all the rights and privileges and protection incident thereto.

I am sorry, indeed for the family of this young Murphy boy and I am perplexed and concerned with all the circumstances surrounding this very peculiar and very difficult case.

In keeping with what I have just said, I believe that my country should be a haven, refuge, and political asylum for people from all over the world, but by the same token, that sanctuary must not be abused by those receiving such asylum, and understandable enthusiasm for their causes must not be permitted to transgress upon the integrity of the sovereignty of this Nation.

Under all of these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I feel that there is a solemn obligation on the Department of State to take special notice of this case, and sift it to the very bottom to establish the facts and the truth.

At the same time, as you know I am a great admirer of the FBI, and for many years sat on the Appropriations Subcommittee having jurisdiction over the Department of Justice, which includes the FBI, and I am still willing to vote for their requested budget and more, in support of the great service they have done to the Nation. I would expect the FBI, independently of the Department of State, within jurisdiction of this country, to likewise examine and investigate for the purposes of determining the facts and the truth of this mysterious controversy. I am certain the above-named agencies of this Government will not be influenced by inflammatory articles and statements issued by any person or persons on this subject.

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANFUSO. The gentleman from Oregon is to be congratulated on the very fine statement he has made. He has shown the utmost sincerity, and I certainly sympathize with the interest he has taken in this case. I also know that the gentleman is interested in the promotion of Latin-American relations and relations between the United States and other countries. I also know that the district attorney of New York County conducted an investigation in the Galindez case. I also know the State Department is presently conducting an investigation.

Mr. Speaker, in this debate we are faced with the situation where the Galindez case has been fully investigated by District Attorney Frank S. Hogan, of New York County, where the alleged crime is alleged to have taken place. The State Department is still investigating the Murphy case. Surely no one can imply, at least no one who knows Frank Hogan, that he would protect any individual or entity guilty of crime. He is one of the most honored and fearless prosecutors in our county. Nor can any one state that our State Department would not protect an American citizen against any foreign power.

Now here is the situation I find myself in. The Lord knows I am opposed to a dictatorship in any form whether it be garbed in Communist, or Fascist clothes. My record proves that.

I have never had any particular love for President Trujillo—self-proclaimed benefactor of the fatherland—and here again I suppose I am being unkind because maybe his people think he is just that.

My sympathies in this case are definitely with the families of Jesus Maria de Galindez and Gerald Lester Murphy and I sincerely hope that these two men have not met with foul play.

But I cannot overlook the fact that the Dominican Republic is an ally of the United States, that she is part of our Western Hemisphere Defense, that we do business with it and maintain the most cordial relationships.

I also know, as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture that the Dominican Republic is largely dependent upon the sale of sugar to sustain its people. Yet she refused to sell that sugar

to Communist Russia and offered it to the United States at a much cheaper price.

We cannot break international relations with a country on mere suspicion or innuendo. The worse criminal under our system of jurisprudence is entitled to a fair trial. We must have proof before we take the bold action that the distinguished gentleman from Oregon suggests. With such proof I would be the first to condemn. With positive proof I would even go so far as to immediately recommend to our State Department that we break diplomatic relationship with it.

In these critical times when the United States is engaged in a death struggle again a common enemy which threatens our very existence, we cannot discard or insult an ally without positive and justifiable cause.

For all of these reasons I must restrain my emotions, which might lead me in an entirely different direction, and refrain from the condemnation which has been suggested here and at this premature moment.

My present expressed opinion for temperance at this time is motivated by a statement made not so long ago regarding the Dominican Republic by His Eminence, Cardinal Spellman, at the opening of the International Catholic Culture Congress for World Peace in the Dominican Republic. The article containing the statement of Cardinal Spellman follows:

GENERALISSIMO TRUJILLO AND CARDINAL SPELLMAN OPEN INTERNATIONAL CATHOLIC CULTURAL CONGRESS FOR WORLD PEACE IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

(By Richard Klemfuss)

Generalissimo Rafael L. Trujillo keynoted the opening on February 28 of an International Catholic Cultural Congress for World Peace held in Ciudad Trujillo in the presence of Cardinals Francis Spellman and Carlos Maria De La Torre, of Ecuador, warning that peace does not reside in "the treacherous Russian dove," and can only be found in the "whole complex estate of Christian culture." The Dominican statesman and stanch foe of communism in the Caribbean told 166 world delegates and diocesan priests gathered at the Dominican Republic World's Fair now in progress there that Pius XII "has been the greatest defender of the right of humanity to live in peace and justice" and that institutions as well as individual men must, to achieve world peace, be oriented in Christian purpose.

Francis Cardinal Spellman, of New York, cited the material progress of the Dominican Republic since its founding as "the cradle of the Americas" terming himself a "Catholic of the Americas." The cardinal said:

"Even more significant than the buildings and monuments, highways, and ports, the Dominican Republic will be remembered in history for a great act of social justice." Shortly after the outbreak of the war, representatives of 38 nations met at Evian, France, to study the refugee problem created by Hitler's campaign to eliminate the Jews from Germany. At the time the President of the Dominican Republic, Generalissimo Rafael L. Trujillo, opened the doors of this island to the first haven anywhere for the oppressed Jews of Europe, the now famous colony at Sosua on the north coast. In memory of this generous act, the Jewish colony last month erected its beautiful marble monument symbolizing Generalissimo Trujillo's open door policy and commemorating this humanitarian act.

Cardinal Spellman said:

"The Dominican Republic has been among the first in the world to recognize the need for the solidarity of the Americas. You have been among the first to recognize the threat to the Americas of world communism. Perhaps long after your physical achievements have disappeared you will be remembered for your courage and wisdom in this regard." The cardinal recalled his recent visit to Korea to spend Christmas with American troops saying, "Once again I saw how communism would enslave the peoples of the earth." He said he was "thankful to Almighty God for the strong Christian tradition of the Americas. That tradition is well symbolized," he said, "in the strength and faith of the Dominican people as expressed in your magnificent International Fair for Peace and Progress."

Delegates here for the conference until March 6 will discuss via three-language translation system and make final declarations on numerous topics including the use of nuclear energy in the service of peace, education of the citizen for national and international life, cinematography, and other topics. Each day will begin with Mass in one of the many historic churches in the city. On Sunday Archbishop Spellman said Mass in the Cathedral of Santo Domingo, oldest in the New World. The delegates will tour the World Fair, the historic Columbus related shrines and Dominican industrial sites.

Generalissimo Rafael L. Trujillo said:

"This congress is gathering at a time when the world is witnessing a general devaluation of basic conceptions of Christian morality. The noblest human rights are used nowadays to blindfold the truth and to broadcast fallacious information thus raising walls of misunderstanding between men. If it is abominable to deny Christ by defaulting any one of the commandments, it is also abominable to default liberty by abusing its conquests, corrupting people's feelings.

"Religion is consolation, duty, and hope for humanity. It is also the stimulating force for resistance and a sample of sacrifice for the people. Without God, no nation is able to face destiny and time; without religion the strongest nation will perish. Organized atheism is currently threatening the world with martial subversion by the so-called Red Army, it is imperative to activate the spiritual forces and to reinforce the imponderable defenses now offered by our religion.

"Now is the time to decide without hesitation, inspired by irrevocable faith, between the two opposing systems now struggling to dominate the world, namely the materialistic conception and the Christian conception of life and history.

"I am deeply convinced that the Christian culture can contribute to establish a sound regime of human rights, morals, justice and peace. These are the reasons for my having initiated and sponsored this International Congress. The holy father has stated again and again that the world can only build the basis of this much sought international peace on the words of Christ.

"Jesus Christ said 'he who is not with me is against me,' thus marking the way to mankind. In these times of universal turmoil, it is necessary to bring men to God, to let the voice of the church be heard by those who by not wishing to hear have dry souls and wingless spirits.

"While communism roars and threatens everywhere and the materialism continues disseminating false dogma it was my wish that this Dominican land—proud of its Catholic tradition, and firm in its battle against the anti-Christian attitudes, would raise its potent voice of Catholicism, pointing out to the roads of well-being, justice, culture and peace. I strongly believe that the immaculate white flags of Christ will triumph over evil.

"Peace can spring out with the help of a complex combination of good actions carefully elaborated by Christian culture. Child education, economic life of the family, welfare of workers, the spirit of cooperativism, respect for the authorities, orientation of both written and oral press, radio, and other mediums are most important to achieve the goals of universal understanding and fraternity. Your agenda covers many and more of these vital points, which together with your love for mankind and your strong Catholic feeling will ratify and disseminate with utmost advantage the orientations as taught by the holy father.

"Upon inaugurating this International Congress of Catholic Culture for Peace of the World, I beg that God's will be done here."

Cardinal Spellman said:

"This is an occasion I shall long remember with affection, not only because of the hospitality you have shown me but also because of the inspiration I have received by being among you. I accept your welcome not as a tribute to my own presence, but as a salute from the great Catholic people of the Dominican Republic to their friends in the United States of America. For a Catholic—a Catholic of the Americas—to set foot on the soil of this Republic is to surround oneself with the richness of your historical tradition. For one who, as I do, has his origins in New England, the birthplace of American Independence, this historical tradition is particularly precious. For, your beautiful island has been aptly called by the historians "The Cradle of the Americas." Here the Americas themselves were born. In the mind's eye one can visualize the dedicated men under the leadership of Christopher Columbus who took possession of this fair land in the name of the Catholic King and Queen of Spain, Ferdinand and Isabella, and christened it "La Espanola." One thinks of those dedicated men who built here in the village of La Isabella the first Catholic church in the Americas.

"This Republic is known to history as the land that Columbus loved and one visualizes the great navigator instructing his brother Bartolome to found a city on this soil. Today that city, now called Ciudad Trujillo, is the oldest in the Americas. Here the Catholic faith has flowered in our hemisphere and I rejoice to be here at last. I rejoice to be at the city of the first convent of the Americas, the first hospital of the Americas, and the first university of higher learning in the Americas, founded by the Dominican Fathers. In the mind's eye one can still see Friar Bartolome De Las Casas, the young lawyer of this city who later became the first priest to be ordained in the New World. It was from here that De Soto set forth to discover the Mississippi and Pizarro to make his way to Peru. It was from here that Cortes began his famous voyage to Mexico. Reflecting on these glorious traditions, the mind moves to the Dominican Republic of today, host to all the free world in this, its international fair of peace and progress. Here 30 nations salute the people of this Republic and honor them for their achievements. New and magnificent edifices have risen to stand alongside the ancient Cathedral of Santa Maria La Menor, San Nicolas De Bari, San Francisco, Santo Domingo, San Miguel and others. The people of the present generation are adding to the richness bequeathed them by their ancestors. The proof is all around us. New hospitals and clinics, new roads, new industries, greatly improved social and sanitation facilities, new housing, new ports, and new public works, a higher standard of living and education. At the same time there are rising in the Republic new churches and new convents and magnificent new schools to educate the future generation of your

citizenry. But even more significant than buildings and monuments, highways, and ports, the Dominican Republic will be remembered in history for a great act of social justice.

"Shortly before the outbreak of the war representatives of 38 nations met at Evian, France, to study the refugee problem created by Hitler's campaign to eliminate the Jews from Germany. At that time the President of the Dominican Republic, Generalissimo Trujillo, opened the doors of this island to the first haven for the oppressed Jews of Europe, the now famous colony of Sosua. In memory of this generous act, the Jewish colony last month erected its beautiful marble monument symbolizing the open door and commemorating this humanitarian act.

"My friends of the Dominican Republic, you have been among the first in the world to recognize the need for the solidarity of the Americas. You have been among the first to recognize the threat to the Americas of world communism. Perhaps long after your physical achievements have disappeared, you will be remembered for your courage and wisdom in this regard. Only last month I returned from a trip around the world. For the fifth consecutive year I spent Christmas with the American troops in Korea, still devastated by the years of war. With my own eyes I saw once again the results of Communist aggression. Once again I saw at first hand how communism would enslave the people of the earth.

"In the sad faces of the heroic men and women of South Vietnam I saw the human destruction that communism can wreak. Once again I was able to appreciate the strength of spirit which our holy Catholic faith had given to those people of heroic Vietnam as it had to the magnificent people of South Korea. And, above all, I was thankful to Almighty God for the strong Christian tradition of the Americas. That tradition is well symbolized in the strength and faith of the Dominican people as expressed in your magnificent international fair.

"Once again I recited to Almighty God, as I would like to recite to you now, a few lines which I have written in invoking a blessing upon our beloved America: Father in heaven, God of all nations, bless the Dominican Republic, bless Thou the world, bless Thy peoples with Thy truth, that they may be all truthful with Thy mercy, that they may be all merciful with Thy wisdom, that they may be all wise. Bless us, O God, with Thy spirit of peace, that we may know peace and may sow peace upon the earth for the sake of Thy glory. O God of Justice, inspire Thy family of nations with the sense of Thy fatherly providence, with the passion for brotherly unity, with the national spirit of good neighborliness. Glorify Thy fatherhood on earth by presiding over all nations as Thy sons. O Gracious God, grant, we beseech Thee, that all nations may become one in mind, united for the purpose of abiding peace, one in heart, united by universal good will; one in spirit, united by love and by law. Do Thou, O God, glorify Thyself on earth this day, for Thy spirit is health and wealth, Thy spirit is power and peace, Thy spirit is Lord of a nation's destiny. O Heavenly Father, Thou who art God, teach all nations the mystery of Thy peace and grant to Thy family of nations the blessing of enduring peace. Amen."

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. The gentleman spoke of writing a letter to the President of the United States proposing a commission of five. Did the gentleman receive an answer to his letter?

Mr. PORTER. I received an answer from one of the secretaries of the President saying that the matter was under investigation, indicating that they did not reject the idea but that they wanted the investigation to go further.

Mr. KEARNEY. There are two other questions I would like to ask. I came in after the gentleman started talking, but being a native New Yorker I am quite interested in this particular phase of this case.

As I read the stories in the magazines there was a so-called ambulance at the subway station at a very busy intersection, and at no time was there any police or spectators around there, at the time that this alleged abduction was supposed to have taken place. Is that true?

Mr. PORTER. As I understand, there were no witnesses to the actual abduction.

Mr. KEARNEY. To me it seems strange, because knowing New York City as I do, I know that this entrance to the subway is in a very very busy section of the city, and the minute an ambulance comes to that particular area there are certainly not only police officers but prowl cars and also plenty of curious spectators.

Mr. PORTER. I would remind the gentleman that there is terror in New York too, the same as there is in the Dominican Republic. I suggest that if there were witnesses they may very well have been intimidated. I can cite an instance, that of the doctor who examined the body. He said there were bruises on the body that were caused as the man thrashed around when he hanged himself; yet according to the official transcript sent by the Dominican Republic, the dead man's brother, who also examined the body, found no bruises, not a bruise.

Mr. KEARNEY. Another phase of this very peculiar case in which I am interested is the flight of this plane by Murphy, and I am wondering whether there is any information as to whether or not the Strategic Air Command had any information concerning the flight of that plane toward the Dominican Republic.

Mr. PORTER. I think that is a good question. I do not know the answer.

Mr. KEARNEY. I am especially interested remembering that we are voting millions and billions of dollars for the defense of our shorelines and our country. It would seem very peculiar and strange indeed for an individual to be able to fly the length of the eastern shoreline to the Dominican Republic without being spotted and checked on.

Mr. PORTER. He went to Florida first, I believe.

Mr. KEARNEY. Even from here to Florida or from New York to Florida. Now, as far as the name "Silfa" is concerned, is it not true he was arrested and charged with practicing dentistry without a license in the State of New York?

Mr. PORTER. Yes.

Mr. KEARNEY. I am informed by certain individuals in the State of New York that he had a rather elaborate office when he was practicing dentistry up there.

Mr. PORTER. I know the explanation is that it belonged to someone else. I know nothing of the merits of that, but I do say that 4 policemen and 2 photographers seem to be quite a few people to arrest a man for the illegal practice of dentistry.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Along the lines the gentleman has just been questioning, the plane had to be cleared from the United States. I certainly think that the Customs Service should be asked and the officials at the Miami Airport, if that is where he cleared, what kind of inspection was made, because it would certainly be an outlet for not only the thing the gentleman is trying to suggest could have happened but for any kind of other situations to occur. I wonder whether we should not have some information that could give us some basic facts rather than a lot of this magazine story business? I would like to hear from our own people who had charge of these inspections before I come to any conclusions whatever.

Mr. PORTER. I agree with the gentleman. The FBI is rather reticent to disclose this information. I am sure they are making a very fine investigation.

Mr. FULTON. I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We get a lot of these lurid stories about foreign intrigue, and so forth, but I would like to see the bases of them when they involve our services before I jump to conclusions. I would like to know what our various services have to say. For example, if it went from the New York Airport, how was the plane cleared there?

Mr. PORTER. I suggest that to the gentleman we have a prima facie case.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman has made some very startling charges. He has implicated Members of Congress, he has implicated the FBI and the State Department, he has implicated the police department of my city of New York as well as the district attorney's office of the County of New York. I have not hesitated at any time to take the State Department apart when I thought they were wrong. I have stood up on this floor many times and urged action against dictators. I do not like dictators no matter what they are, whether they are Fascists, Nazis or Communists. My record shows that. But I think before we make charges of as broad a scope as the gentleman has, we ought to have more information. The gentleman should be sure that each of the investigating authorities has made a complete investigation. In all my criticism of the executive department I have never, and I do not recall that anybody has ever, accused J. Edgar Hoover of anything but the highest of intentions in connection

with the conduct of the FBI. That agency has always done a good job. Surely they should be permitted to complete their investigation. I get many news items that come across my desk every day. I get some every day from the State Department, including one release on this same subject. The State Department said it had received a report from the Dominican Republic and was conducting further investigation. I know the district attorney of New York County, Mr. Frank Hogan, got his appointment to that office through Tom Dewey. He was elected and reelected as district attorney of New York County as a Republican and as a Democrat, a bipartisan nomination. No one can point a finger at Frank Hogan. He investigated this alleged murder and found no proof to submit to the grand jury. Now I find that the charge is not that he was murdered but that he was kidnaped, and the information was submitted to the district attorney's office. Have they completed their investigation? And, I resent, sir, the comment that there is terror in New York. There is terror all over where thugs are abroad. We do an awfully good job of ferreting out crime and prosecuting criminals and we do not care whether they come from the Dominican Republic or anywhere else.

Mr. PORTER. I would like to make two comments on your statement. I appreciate your fervor, and I want to say this:

First, the statements in my speech are facts or based on facts. If there are implications from those facts, they are not unsupported. I suggest that the gentleman examine my speech in the RECORD tomorrow, and if he finds that there are unsupported charges, he should take them up with me and I will discuss them further.

Secondly, as for the infallibility of the FBI, I do not agree with that. I have the highest respect for them and for Mr. Hoover, but only yesterday or only last week, two district judges, one Judge Wyzanski, a district judge in Connecticut, and one in the West, criticized the FBI tactics, and I think with some reason. They are not perfect; they are doing a fine job and I have great respect for them, but we have a function here, too, when a constituent is involved in something as important as this.

Mr. MULTER. The police department and the district attorney investigated this charge of kidnaping, and that brings in the FBI, too. Are both of these departments in cahoots with the State Department and the Dominican Government? Or, do we care so much for the Dominican Government that we will let all of our system of justice be destroyed? I do not think so.

Mr. PORTER. The gentleman should read my speech.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. May I say something in all courtesy? I do not think the gentleman intended to make serious charges against the law-enforcing and the law-administering agencies, did he, when he criticized the Customs Department, the FBI, and the police department for failure to enforce the laws and regulations that are required. I do not think he intended to do that.

Mr. PORTER. That is entirely true.

Mr. FULTON. But, if you look your speech over, you made some very serious charges, as the gentleman from New York brought out, in regard to terror in this country, and the lack and failure to enforce laws by United States and State officials, and I can hardly credit those statements.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PORTER. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. Of course, I realize, as does my good friend from New York and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that we do have terror in this country. We have terror in some of our cities and in some of our States. We have people who disappear, thousands of them, all over the country every year. We have, even, according to the press, terror in Oregon today. But, that is beside the point. What I want to emphasize and what the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], said, the way I interpret the gentleman's speech—and if I am wrong, I apologize—I am of the impression that the gentleman was saying that the FBI and the police in the city of New York were in cahoots with these terrorists. And, while not a native of New York City, being a native of New York State, I will stick up for that police department in New York City. They are the finest.

Mr. PORTER. I do not think I stated that, and I think if you will examine my remarks, you will find that I did not.

Mr. FULTON. I hope that the gentleman does not bring in any inference that because there have been certain relatives of certain officials do things, that then there is a tie-in with the State Department, and that because a former Member of this House, whom I respect highly, who is an attorney in the State of New York, represented this particular country, that there is any inference of wrongdoing or that they are in league or that local attorneys here who perform a legitimate function are in league. I think the gentleman's inferences go so far that I hope he does not draw too wide a brush against these American citizens or agencies of the United States and the State of New York.

Mr. PORTER. My point, which I probably did not make as clear as I should have, is simply that these prominent people by associating themselves closely and socially with Mr. Trujillo embolden him by giving him a respectability which he does not deserve.

Mr. FULTON. But that has nothing to do with a kidnaping or a murder case.

Mr. PORTER. It has everything to do with the kind of policy we have been carrying out with regard to the Dominican Republic and which I believe led to the death of my constituent.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I might say that I have been trying for a long time to get in a word here.

Mr. PORTER. I am sorry.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The gentleman said, if I understood him correctly, that a part of this conspiracy is being carried on in the city of Chicago. Would the gentleman explain his statement in that regard?

Mr. PORTER. There are any number of conspiracies. I have a tremendous file on them, but I do not want to go into that any further at this time. They do exist, and I should be glad to supply the gentleman privately with that information. But I do not intend to bring out any further specific data at this time.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I might say to the gentleman that we have a very efficient department of police in Chicago, and if the gentleman has any information as to anything that is happening in the city of Chicago that should not be happening, and that is happening at the command of a foreign government, the gentleman certainly should let the police in Chicago know.

Mr. PORTER. I am not casting any aspersions on nor am I making any indictment against the police, the FBI, or the State Department in general terms. I might say that there is a situation here which needs their fullest attention and which, so far as the State Department and the FBI go at this time, as well as the New York police, is getting very full attention. Nothing in my speech says otherwise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The time of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] has expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman may be extended by 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is another special order following that of the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes at the conclusion of that special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes following the speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

---

## THE GERRY MURPHY CASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I share the concern of the gentleman from Oregon and the parents of Gerry Murphy over the disappearance of their son and I commend the gentleman for his diligence and untiring efforts in looking after the interests of his constituents in this affair. However, I do question the wisdom of the manner in

which the gentleman is proceeding to accomplish the desired results.

The United States is associated with the Dominican Republic in the Organization of American States—otherwise known as the Pan-American Union—and the United Nations, and the two countries cooperate in plans for hemisphere defense. It is my understanding that the relations of our two countries have been pleasant and satisfactory and I am concerned that the gentleman from Oregon may seriously damage that relationship by failing to take into account the usual diplomatic procedures involved in the dealings between two friendly countries.

As the gentleman knows, the State Department and the Justice Department have been working with the Dominican Republic on the Murphy disappearance case and I do not believe there can be any question but that these departments are pursuing the matter diligently and have hardly had time to complete their investigation.

Would it not be better if the gentleman from Oregon withheld his indictment of a friendly government and its head until the departments of the United States Government which are primarily responsible for the investigation have been given full opportunity to develop all of the facts and take whatever action that may be required?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PORTER. I want to say that I did at the outset get in touch with the State Department, and I was convinced that they were using the usual diplomatic procedure and that it was not calculated to achieve the results desired.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Let me ask the gentleman, then, two questions: In his opinion, have the Department of State and the Federal Bureau of Investigation had time to complete the investigation?

Mr. PORTER. The State Department early in the game could have had a much more rigid attitude toward the facts.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman answer my question?

Mr. PORTER. As to whether or not they had time, the State Department has had time to take a firmer stand. The FBI, who knows?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman's answers are not responsive. Have they had time to complete their investigation?

Mr. PORTER. They have had time to get the essential facts to our policy-making leaders so that they can take the sort of action which I here today have recommended.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If I understand the gentleman correctly, it is his opinion the FBI has had ample time already to complete its investigation, and the fact it has not completed the investigation would indicate it is derelict in its duty?

Mr. PORTER. No; I would not say that.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is the gentleman's implication, and he could have no other implication.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Referring to the speech of the gentleman from Oregon a few minutes ago, I take it he implies now what we have been trying to do away with here in language for several years, and that is guilt by association.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Of course, and we also know as a practical proposition we cannot control how other countries govern themselves. For example, I understand there are approximately five dictatorships in South America. Maybe they do not like the way we run our own country. I think the important thing is, how well we get along together in our governmental relations.

Mr. KEARNEY. I think with reference to certain Congressmen that go to the Dominican Republic, we can also point with pride to the fact that Congressmen from the House of Representatives travel all over the world to various countries. That is their job.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. May I ask the gentleman from Oregon if he has approached the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs asking for action on this subject before he has taken the floor, and, I might say, rather surprisingly to me, associated quite a group of United States Government departments, State agencies, and the names of prominent people with something that is a general inference rather than the specific thing he started to talk about, which was a crime in the State of New York.

Will he answer the question? Has he approached the House Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. PORTER. I have not. I intend to.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I think the gentleman will also realize if his statement today and the inferences are correct that his constituent was also guilty of several law violations in this matter. For example, as I understand it, there was no flight plan filed on the alleged flight to the Dominican Republic.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, when I first read the story of Dr. Galindez in the recent issue of Life magazine of February 25, I was stirred by its serious implications.

Life magazine has long ago established a good record and reputation for reportorial integrity. This intriguing article evidently was not based on fact. It was apparently an excursion into the fictional, if not melodramatic field. Because of the reader interest such an article would offer, a story of this character embellishing foreign intrigue and sensationalism often pleases the appetites of a wider reader audience.

After my first reaction to the article it occurred to me that here is a situation with many international implications which could conceivably create seriously strained relations with a friendly Latin American country. A feeling then developed in me that the article beyond its reportorial aspects was really a challenge to the properly constituted authorities in our country to immediately initiate a thorough investigation to unearth the facts.

The remarks made by the gentleman from Oregon, undoubtedly in good faith, crystallize my feelings in this direction and the urgent need of action.

There can be no other way as I see it to demonstrate to our friends not living within the borders of our country that they can be the beneficiaries of fair and authoritative consideration at our hands.

Therefore, it is plain that it is incumbent upon us to urge one or more of our existing agencies to take appropriate steps at once to put asleep the seemingly fantastic stories which of late have been abroad, and clearly establish the facts in this case so that both justice and friendship can be served.

## THE GERRY MURPHY CASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Oregon. A splendid young man from his district disappeared or died under conditions hard to explain. The gentleman from Oregon did what I think he should have done and what I would have done if the young man had come from my district. He has come into the well of this House to present the matter as he understands it. Naturally he feels strongly in a matter that so concerns his constituents, many of them the dear friends of this fine young man, Gerry Murphy. His zeal and earnestness are understandable.

I think the gentleman, and I think not with intention, brought into his remarks the names of many people, placing all of those people under a certain implied suspicion. I know the gentleman did not intend to do that.

I think everyone in this House knows my liberal position. I objected to what I thought was unfair treatment of the witnesses before some congressional committees. Because I thought the Committee on Un-American Activities, not as presently constituted but in past years, had violated the rules that obtain in American courts of justice, I was one of very few Members of the House who voted against appropriations for that committee.

Now, we stand for a principle or we stand for nothing. It does not make any difference to what person or situation the principle applies. It is the principle itself.

There should be the same fair treatment accorded nations in the protection of their reputation as under our concept

of American justice we accord to individuals. If it be true that in the Dominican Republic, there is a government of murder and in the Dominican Republic a fine young man, like this young man from the gentleman's district, can be murdered in cold blood and murdered by the Government, certainly we should do something about it. We should give no aid to such a Government in any way, and I think we should take the same position with regard to nations that refuse to accord Jewish Americans the same treatment they accord to non-Jewish Americans. I think that should be a firm part of American policy, and if in any country American citizens are not safe or they are discriminated against either in whole or in part, we should cease doing business with that country and let the whole world know we are standing on the moral law.

But, we should not judge nations on any other plane than that on which we judge individuals. The gentleman from Oregon has rendered a moving argument that if addressed to a grand jury could be expected to result in an indictment. But, then, the one accused, even though indicted, would stand before the court, presumed to be innocent, until by the evidence he was found guilty beyond all reasonable doubt. The gentleman knows that. Any man serving on the jury would be asked by counsel, whether he would follow that cherished rule of justice, and as he looked at the defendant, he with every other juror would see not guilt but innocence until the facts proved the defendant guilty.

I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, a relatively new member, and because my interest is in this hemisphere, I am a member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. We must have hemispheric solidarity or we perish. Our entire defense is built on our solidarity in our defense strategy and solidarity in the thinking of all the people in the American Hemisphere. When in one country there is a government that has existed for many, many years, we can presume that though there may be good and there may be bad, the people of that country have not seen fit to change it. If it is a bad government, if all of these things are true, let us find out, using all the agencies and facilities of our Government to that end. Like my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who also is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, much senior to me on the committee, I think there should be a sweeping investigation, fair and impartial, but it should be conducted in the spirit of American justice with no predetermination of guilt until the facts in evidence had fixed it, and it is only fair and just, according to long established concepts and traditions of our people, that the Government of the Dominican Republic should be accorded the opportunity of participation.

It is the duty of our Government to pursue relentlessly but fairly such an investigation. Let us use all the facilities of our great Government to get at the truth. Let us have such an investigation. But, let us pursue the investigation as we would in any American court of justice, presuming the innocence of the accused until by the evidence he is found to be guilty. I think the gentleman from Oregon, and I have great respect for him, will agree with practically everything I have said. Further, I know that the gentleman in the enthusiasm of his presentment meant no reflection on many men and women who are very dear to the people who are in this Chamber. I do not think he intended so to reflect.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. PORTER. I deeply appreciate the gentleman's remarks and I do agree with what the gentleman has said, and I am glad the gentleman saw fit to say it. I was seeking in this speech to make a grand jury indictment so that there would be an investigation. I would be glad to have the Dominican Government come in and clear itself, if it can.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. That is as I understood the gentleman. He was making a moving presentment for an indictment. But, of course, the gentleman being learned in the law, as he is, wishes the Members in this Chamber to be in the same mental attitude as they would be if they were jurors in an American court of justice, withholding judgment until all the evidence is in and until the very moment to the end of the presentment of evidence, to presume the accused innocent; am I right or wrong in that?

Mr. PORTER. That is correct.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I shall be happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. FULTON. The word "aid" was mentioned in connection with the Dominican Republic. As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs I can tell the House there has been no United States aid to the Dominican Republic as such under mutual-security or foreign-aid programs. Consequently the question comes up of the reason for questioning the attorneys representing the Dominican Republic or those United States citizens associated with officials of the Dominican Republic, whether there is any possibility of the survivors of this young American citizen who died entering suit.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Oregon if his people are against the counsel representing what might be the opposite side? Does he know of anything that might indicate the possibility of a suit being entered that either he or somebody in his area whom he knows might be interested in as an attorney or otherwise.

Mr. PORTER. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield that I may answer?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PORTER. First of all let me say to the gentleman that I made no statement about foreign aid. I did mention the line of credit with the Export-Import Bank.

As for the suits, there is a lawsuit. Through me the parents have authorized an attorney friend of mine, a man from Philadelphia to engage counsel down there to pursue a lawsuit.

Mr. FULTON. Then, if through you they have selected counsel, and there is counsel representing the other side I believe you should give full faith and credit to opposing counsel; and, if I might suggest, the gentleman should have notified them in advance that he was going to attack opposing counsel so they could be here when the gentleman attempted to do it or when he attempted to call into question the motives of Members of Congress who have made trips there through invitation—and that occurred as I understand a year or so ago—I would suggest that before the gentleman attacks that particular trip or the Members who took it, attack them by indirection, he should likewise let them know he was going to do it.

Mr. PORTER. I fail to see the ethical point the gentleman is making. I spent a good many years studying ethical points.

Mr. FULTON. It is a matter of courtesy, not ethics, that if you are going to bring into question a person's name here on the floor or some action of his, you should let him know in advance. That is what you should have done in this case before drawing such a broad picture that indicts so many people, even Members of the House, Government agencies, United States agencies, and, yes, State agencies, and, yes, police officers of the city of New York.

Mr. PORTER. If the gentleman will recall what I said—and, of course, he does not have a transcript, but I will state it for him:

> I do not mean to imply that all or any of the above named have base motives for serving Trujillo. I only raise the question of the propriety of their serving in a capacity to lend respectability to a regime which plots and carries out murders of American citizens and guests.

Mr. FULTON. I think the gentleman should have given them the courtesy of advance notice.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in considering the current accusations against the Dominican Republic I am impressed with the need for caution in reaching conclusions that a friendly neighbor country has been party to an unfriendly act without an official report of such act made after an impartial investigation.

It has always been a basic proposition that our international relations are the subject of administration by the Department of State, with such advice and support by formal action of the Congress as is required for specific occasions.

In the present instance the executive branch of our Government represented by the Department of State and the Federal Bureau of Investigation are reported to be looking into the possibility of abuse of the rights of an American citizen and the possibility of other violations of our

laws. These Government agencies are duly authorized and competent to make such an inquiry. We have always stood for the proposition that any formally accused person is innocent until proven guilty, and juries are required to be sure beyond a reasonable doubt. Until such accusations are formally made and our traditionally fair hearing is held we shall withhold judgment.

Before we give credence to attacks on a friendly neighbor we must weigh the effect of our actions in our relationship to such country and our other allies of the free world. In the struggle against the Communist world and our leadership of the free world in improving the lot of democratic countries everywhere, we have had no more consistently friendly supporter than the Dominican Republic. Progress in that country reflects, in considerable part, the support given by the United States in the growth of its economy and improvement of health and living standards. The Dominican Republic stands out as one of the most stanchly anti-Communist countries in the Western Hemisphere. I suggest that this legislative forum can contribute little to an inquiry of the kind that is being conducted and untimely publicity may even impede the efforts of the executive branch. Untimely or unwarranted public attention by this body will undoubtedly give comfort to the common enemies of both countries and tend to shake the strong bonds of international political unity between the United States and our Latin-American neighbors.

## THE PROPOSED EXECUTION OF EVAGORAS PALLIKARIDES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe from the discussion here today we can see that while there is sympathetic interest in the situation and everyone wonders what has happened, that we should likewise be patient enough to let the United States Government agencies have their necessary time and come up with a proper investigation and findings. We should not be misled by either lurid stories in magazines or by a false set of sympathies to make suppositions against our own United States agencies too quickly. Likewise, in our dealings with foreign countries, while we may disagree with them, we should be very careful that we do not inflame and destroy the present relations when our respective countries are a part of our Western Hemisphere defense.

We of the Foreign Affairs Committee have that question coming up frequently. I speak when I think something is wrong, but that does not mean I have any less respect for our United States Government and make no personal charges against the officials in our Government about which I am speaking, especially when as here, no real facts are given for extreme inferences against State, city, and national agencies.

I take the floor under this special order today to complain strongly about a proposed action of a good loyal ally of ours, the Government of Great Britain. I am here to protest strongly the proposed execution of Evagoras Pallikarides, a young man on the island of Cyprus, who has been sentenced to death under so-called Cyprus governmental emergency regulations for the possession of a gun.

On my information, there is no indication that he had taken any action with the gun or that anybody was hurt by him. Likewise, I would point out that if this happens at a time when the Cyprus issue is before the United Nations for discussion, after a 76-to-0 vote by the General Assembly on February 20, 1957, to ease the extreme positions of Britain and Greece, it will simply further inflame the relations between the people of Cyprus and the great British Government.

I hope the action of our friendly British people will not soil the Crown of Great Britain with this young man's blood. He may have been misguided, but certainly did not act from criminal or base motives. Pallikarides pleaded guilty and said at that time, "My only excuse is I am a lover of freedom and ready to die for my belief that Cypriotes should be free." That causes concern to us American citizens when comparison is made of the severity of this death sentence of Pallikarides for simple possession of a weapon when we look at the current sentences that are being imposed by a Communist Hungarian Government on people who have actually engaged in revolution. There the punishment is less severe. The sentence is imprisonment from 10 to 20 years. I oppose that action just as strongly, too.

But here we have a free country, a free government such as Britain handing out death sentences to patriotic young people who think they are fighting for the liberty of their own colonial people. I think it is something less than necessary for the protection of the British Crown or the British people. As a matter of fact, I have opposed other actions of the British Government in Cyprus that seemed extreme, such as closing the primary and secondary schools.

On September 28, 1956, I sent a telegram to President Eisenhower, Ambassador Lodge, and Secretary Dulles saying as follows:

I strongly request your support of the Greek appeal to the United Nations to have a prompt open hearing before the General Assembly of the United Nations on the issue of Cyprus so that this whole important matter to our own United States security and allies may be threshed out and both sides may be heard in justice in order to achieve a peaceful solution and avoid further bloodshed and executions of young citizens of Cyprus.

That is just what we have here. Why did not Great Britain wait until action has been thrashed out under the General Assembly of the United Nations resolution before punishing young men, misguided as they are, such as this young man, aged only 19 years? When immediately he pleads guilty, then they sentence him to death promptly. That is very discouraging to the relations of the United States people with the friendly people of Britain who are trying to support freedom and the North Atlantic Alliance.

I will read further from the telegram, as follows:

I would request you use your good offices in strongly appealing to the British Government, first, to promptly release Archbishop Makarios, of Cyprus, or grant him a prompt open trial as he has been held prisoner and incommunicado without charges for so long on Seychelles Islands in the middle of the Indian Ocean, and desist from further execution until the General Assembly of the United Nations has acted. And secondly, use your good offices to appeal to the British Government to show fairness and decency in immediately opening the elementary and secondary schools in Cyprus, most of which have been closed during the period of the last year, causing a great injustice to the younger generation in depriving of education innocent victims in this dispute. Certainly repression of schools and free education is not an inspiring example for the free world at this time and the United States should promptly enter its protest. Assuring you of my continued high regard.

Congressman JAMES G. FULTON.
PITTSBURGH, PA.

Now, with that same high regard for the British Government and our friendly British allies, I ask them to postpone the execution of this young man, age 19, Pallikarides, and to hold up the judgment of the special court in Nicosia, which just acted, and give him a chance. Give the United Nations resolution time to moderate actions on both sides.

Let me tell you this: This young man sounds a good bit like our own Nathan Hale when he stood up and was executed, saying, "I am sorry that I have only one life to give for my country." I hope that there will still be people in this free world of ours to stand up for young men, misguided and perhaps hotheaded at times, but, nevertheless, moved by the sincere motive that Pallikarides was moved by when he said, "My only excuse is that I am a lover of freedom and ready to die so that my beloved Cypriotes should be free." That man, to me, is no criminal. That man is a patriot, and I believe the British Government will feel, much to its dismay, that many people throughout the world feel that this is unwarranted, unjust, and hasty action, at the same time that we in the United States are dealing with them in the General Assembly, as are all other General Assembly nations, on the very question of Cyprus. Is the quality of mercy now so strained that opportunity for our friends is closed for working out better relations between Britain and Greece on the Cyprus question? Who will first break this chain of extreme action and counteraction?

## THE NATIONAL BUDGET

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including a resolution adopted by the Ohio Republican congressional delegation yesterday. I was most happy to be a member of this group and I wholeheartedly support the recommendations that a substantial reduction of the budget is absolutely essential and in the best interests of the people of this great country. The resolution and signatures of the Ohio Representatives by district are as follows:

The Ohio Republican delegation in the United States House of Representatives, after careful study and evaluation, has unanimously agreed that a substantial reduction of the $72 billion budget will be in the best interest of the people of the United States.

It was further agreed that every proposed reduction in the budget, which does not curtail essential services or endanger the security of our country, will be supported.

The action of the Ohio Republican delegation is the first of its kind with respect to the present budget and is in accord with the admonition of President Eisenhower and Ohio's own Secretary of the Treasury, George M. Humphrey, that Congress exercise its independent control over Government spending.

The following Members signed the resolution: GORDON M. SCHERER, 1st District; WILLIAM E. HESS, 2d District; PAUL F. SCHENCK, 3d District; WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, 4th District; CLIFF CLEVENGER, 5th District; CLARENCE J. BROWN, 7th District; JACKSON E. BETTS, 8th District; THOMAS A. JENKINS, 10th District; DAVID DENNISON, 11th District; JOHN VORYS, 12th District; A. D. BAUMHART, Jr., 13th District; WILLIAM H. AYRES, 14th District; JOHN E. HENDERSON, 15th District; FRANK T. BOW, 16th District; J. HARRY MCGREGOR, 17th District; FRANCES P. BOLTON, 22d District; WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, 23d District.

## JOINT HOUSE-SENATE COMMITTEE ON SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I introduced House Joint Resoution 250, to establish a joint House-Senate Committee on Scientific Research to help meet the problem of securing adequate trained personnel in scientific and technological fields. An identical resolution is being sponsored in the Senate by Senator EDWARD J. THYE, of Minnesota.

The committee would be composed of eight Members of the House and a like number from the Senate. It would have no legislative authority but would be given wide authority to study and investigate manpower needs and requirements in the areas of science, engineering, and related fields.

There is no longer any doubt that we have been losing ground to the Soviet Union in scientific and technological advancement. Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, has warned:

In 5 years our lead in the training of scientists and engineers may be wiped out, and in 10 years we could be hopelessly outstripped. Unless immediate steps are taken to correct it, a situation, already dangerous, within less than a decade could become disastrous.

Dr. Edward Teller, chief developer of the United States hydrogen bomb, said within the past few weeks:

Ten years from now the best scientists in the world will be found in Russia. I am not saying this will happen unless we do this or that. I am simply saying it is going to happen.

In a recent speech, Communist Party Secretary Khrushchev boasted:

The capitalists always regard our people as being backward, but today we have more engineers and more supporting engineering technical personnel than any capitalist country.

Available statistics indicate that over the last 5 years the United States has turned out only 142,000 engineers compared to an estimated 216,000 in Russia. In 1955 our output was around 23,000 compared to Russia's 63,000. Over the next 5 years our projected output is 153,000, against at least 400,000 in Russia. In Russia at least 30 percent of the college students are in engineering, compared to only 8 percent in the United States.

Unless this trend is reversed, the free world's struggle against Communist aggression and subversion will be lost. With the Soviet's superiority in population, it is absolutely imperative that we maintain our leadership in the field of scientific and technological advancement.

In addition to the military considerations is the equally great danger which this shortage of scientists and engineers poses to continued expansion of our economy and further improvement in our living standards. Increased productivity per worker, largely through improved machinery and scientific discoveries, has been chiefly responsible for the tremendous gains in the standard of living of our people. During the past 15 years, productivity, in dollars of constant purchasing power, has nearly doubled. Our total population has increased only 25 percent, which has meant a tremendous rise in the economic well-being of the American people as a whole. If our living standards are to show continued improvement, productivity per hour of labor must be increased at an even faster rate. It is primarily to the scientists and engineers that we must look for help in accomplishing this objective.

The issue before us is unmistakably clear. We must find ways to overcome the acute shortage of scientists and engineers if we are to ensure our security as a free nation and at the same time continue our economic progress.

The solution lies primarily in the field of education. I do not advocate any crash program to try indiscriminately to drive high-school student into science and engineering. Such an approach might jeopardize the quality of scientific and engineering training. Any sound solution must first challenge and stimulate, and then enable a greater percentage of qualified high-school graduates to continue their education, particularly in the field of science and engineering. It has been estimated that of the most intelligent 20 percent in the group of college age in the United States, fewer than half enter college, and only a third graduate.

Another serious weakness is the fact that an estimated one-quarter of all American high schools offer no chemistry or physics. Engineering school deans report that fully half of their students enter with deficiencies in mathematics. Also contributing to the present shortage of scientists and engineers has been the inability of industry to make the most efficient use of available technical manpower. Engineers and scientists often spend much of their time doing work which properly should be shifted to technicians, clerical personnel, and even machines.

It is to help find sound answers to this very serious situation that I have introduced the resolution to establish the joint committee of the House and Senate on Scientific Research. Present committees do not have the time or the technical staffs to carry out this assignment.

The joint committee would work in cooperation with executive agencies, private industry, and our institutions of learning. The committee would help in providing realistic and up-to-date assessments of our comparative standing with the Soviet Union. It would assist in the formulation of basic policies. And the committee would compile and assimilate information which will be of invaluable assistance to the appropriate legislative committees which will act on specific bills to implement these basic policies.

A highly successful precedent for this type of committee is the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The Joint Committee on Scientific Research would in no way conflict with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, but rather would assist it in its most important work.

We cannot delay further if we are successfully to meet this challenge. Mr. Speaker, I urgently request the early consideration of my resolution.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HILL for 90 minutes on Wednesday, March 6.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky for 5 minutes today.

Mr. DURHAM (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) for 10 minutes on Monday next.

Mr. PRICE (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) for 10 minutes on Monday next.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PASSMAN.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. CELLER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

Mr. PRICE in 2 instances, in 1 to include a speech by Senator ANDERSON and in the other a speech by Mr. HOLIFIELD.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, commemorating the birthday of the State of Nebraska.

Mr. ALGER and to include a speech.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, either today, Monday, or Tuesday, and to include extraneous matter, when the material arrives.

Mr. JONAS and include a speech by Mr. CRAMER and an editorial.

Mr. MACK of Washington in two instances.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 4, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

540. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy, Air Force and Armed Services Petroleum Purchasing Agency prime contract procurement actions with small and large concerns for work in the United States during the first 6 months of fiscal year 1957, pursuant to Public Law 268, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

541. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

542. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the power generating and marketing and related activities of the Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, and the Southeastern Power Administration, Department of the Interior, in the southeastern area, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956; to the Committee on Government Operations.

543. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

544. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide for a stronger national transportation industry, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

545. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide reimbursement to the Tribal Council of the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation in accordance with the act of September 3, 1954"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

546. A letter from the chairman of the board, Boys' Clubs of America, transmitting the first annual report of the Boys' Clubs of America, pursuant to section 14 of the act of August 6, 1956, entitled "An act to incorporate the Boys' Clubs of America"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4939. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property of the United States located in Juneau, Alaska, known as the Juneau Subport of Embarkation, to the Territory of Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Joint Economic Committee. Report on the January 1957 Economic Report of the President; without amendment (Rept. No. 175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. R. 5446. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer 20 acres of land in Roosevelt County, Mont., to School District No. 9, Roosevelt County; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 5447. A bill to provide for a minimum acreage allotment for corn, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 5448. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to make rehabilitation facilities and sheltered workshops eligible for donations of surplus real and personal property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 5449. A bill to authorize the National Potato Grade Labeling Act, which provides quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 5450. A bill to authorize the enlargement of the administrative headquarters site for Isle Royale National Park, Houghton, Mich., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 5451. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the disposal of surplus property to municipalities; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 5452. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to include certain compensation increments for insurance purposes under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 5453. A bill to authorize the erection of a memorial in the Badlands National Monument in honor of Peter Norbeck, Paul E. Bellamy, Sr., and Ben Millard; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5454. A bill to amend the antitrust laws by vesting in the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction to prevent monopolistic acts or practices and other unlawful restraints in commerce by certain persons engaged in commerce in meat and meat products, and for other purposes; to the Committe on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5455. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 5456. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H. R. 5457. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing as a national monument a site on the Old Santa Fe Trail near Dodge City, Kans.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5458. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the seventh quinquennial Indian peace treaty celebration at Medicine Lodge, Kans.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 5459. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H. R. 5460. A bill to amend section 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide that surplus property which is not used in the donable property program shall be offered for sale to States and political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHER:

H. R. 5461. A bill to amend section 104 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 with respect to certain veterans to provide that statements containing certain information arising out of their military service shall be furnished them; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 5462. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Cuba Independent Rural Board of Education, Cuba, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 5463. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 5464. A bill to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5465. A bill to assist States in providing needed vocational education of less than college grade in essential occupations, including retraining made necessary by scientific and technological developments, through establishment and maintenance of area vocational school programs providing vocational training and retraining for persons residing in the State or area, including related instruction for apprentices; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5466. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit school teachers and administrators to deduct expenses of

attending classes to acquire additional training or education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5467. A bill adopting and authorizing a project for the improvement of the Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi, for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 5468. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 5469. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of his children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 5470. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to make municipalities eligible for donations of surplus real and personal property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 5471. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 5472. A bill to permit an individual to obtain coverage under title II of the Social Security Act on the basis of service which was not covered employment at the time it was performed, if service of that type has since become covered employment and such individual makes payment of the applicable social security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 5473. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Navy shall construct a highway in the State of Maine; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 5474. A bill for the relief of the Grant County School District No. 146, Warden, Wash.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 5475. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 5476. A bill to permit unmarried annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to elect survivorship annuities upon subsequent marriage; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 5477. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for certain amounts paid by a teacher for his further education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5478. A bill to amend subchapter G, part II of the Internal Revenue Code of the United States, relating to personal holding companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 5479. A bill to provide a program of Federal student loans to assist students to pursue programs of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5480. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 5481. A bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 to provide premium compensation in all cases to certain postal field service employees for holiday work; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 5482 A bill to retrocede to the State of Maryland exclusive jurisdiction held by the United State over lands within boundaries of the United States Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Charles County, Md.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 5483. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Deep Creek, St. Marys County, Md., for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5484. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5485. A bill to exempt from the tax on club dues amounts paid with respect to any nonprofit neighborhood swimming pool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 5486. A bill to authorize the Vancouver Lake project on the Columbia River in the vicinity of Vancouver, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 5487. A bill to authorize the construction of a Federal office building and courthouse at San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5488. A bill to authorize the execution of a purchase contract under the Public Buildings Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to a Federal office building and courthouse at San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 5489. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 5490. A bill to authorize foreign vessels to be employed in the coastwise transportation of lumber from Savannah, Ga., to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 5491. A bill to provide that persons who served in the Army or Navy during World War I may, if they possess certain qualifications, wear the Distinguished and Presidential Unit Emblems and Combat Infantryman's and Medical Badges; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H. R. 5492. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1044) to extend the time during which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 5493. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include California among the States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts so as to obtain social-security coverage, under State agreement, for only those State and local employees who desire such coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5494. A bill to authorize the construction of a Federal office building and courthouse at San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5495. A bill to authorize the execution of a purchase contract under the Public Buildings Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to a Federal office building and courthouse at San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 5496. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide that certain surplus real property of the United States shall be disposed of only after giving former owners thereof an opportunity to repurchase such property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 5497. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 5498. A bill to amend the act of June 29, 1938, to increase the amount of the bond or insurance for the protection of passengers required of cabs for hire in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 5499. A bill to amend the acts known as the Life Insurance Act, approved June 19, 1934, and the Fire and Casualty Act, approved October 9, 1940; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 5500. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 5501. A bill to provide that certain aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 5502. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLE:

H. J. Res. 254. Joint resolution to establish December 15 of every year as Bill of Rights Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. J. Res. 255. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection and their survivors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 256. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Con. Res. 125. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. Con. Res. 126. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the Massachusetts State House of Representatives memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the elimination of pollution in the Merrimack River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the elimination of pollution in the Merrimack River; to the Committee on Public Works.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 5503. A bill for the relief of Norma Conchita Magrecia Valmores; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 5504. A bill for the relief of Peter Penovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 5505. A bill for the relief of Mladen Wendl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 5506. A bill for the relief of Kazuo Matsunami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. R. 5507. A bill for the relief of Louise Reynolds; to the Committe on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 5508. A bill for the relief of Constantina Moushouros; to the Committe on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5509. A bill for the relief of Gertraude Ilse Narkoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 5510. A bill for the relief of John R. Baker, William J. Bradshaw, William L. Campbell, Fred W. Gruber, Charles E. Kircher, Edward I. Kwitchoff, Alexander Manfredi, Clyde H. Pettit, Joseph Petrotta, Ernest R. Rosenstrom, Charles Simonson, John F. Schneider, Sidney J. Smith, Otto Ubell, Dickson Watson, Ernest Wesley; to the Committee on the Juriciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. R. 5511. A bill for the relief of Abdul Gani; to the committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 5512. A bill for the relief of Kenichi Sugahara; to the Committe on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 5513. A bill for the relief of Enrique Corona-Lozano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5514. A bill for the relief of Octaviano Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5515. A bill for the relief of Carlos Enrique Bong-Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 5516. A bill for the relief of Elpis Eleptheria Morelell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. R. 5517. A bill for the relief of Dusan Lezaja; to the Committe on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 5518. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yvonne Jeanne Gauthier and her minor son, Patrick Jean Jacques Gauthier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 5519. A bill for the relief of Emilio E. Gomez y Arias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

107. By Mr. CRETELLA: Petition of the American Recreation Society to make available surplus property to tax-supported public recreation agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

108. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Petition of the Ninth District Dental Society, a constituent of the Dental Society of the State of New York, with respect to the Jenkins-Keogh bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Editors Favor Reducing Foreign-aid Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. RUSSELL V. MACK**
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 28, 1957*

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, throughout my 10 years in Congress I have been talking for and voting for cuts in foreign-aid spending.

As a Nation we have spent $53 billion on these foreign-aid giveaway programs. They have not produced returns commensurate with their enormous cost.

Almost everyone admits these programs have been and still are filled with waste.

I have been convinced all along that millions of American taxpayers have felt as I do about this subject—that they were against giving away so much of their wealth to foreign countries.

Recently the American Press, official magazine of the weekly newspaper editors of the Nation, took a poll of all weekly editors asking them if the United States should, first, spend more; second, spend less; or, third, spend about the same on these foreign giveaway programs as it had been spending.

A total of 794 weekly newspaper editors sent replies to that poll. Of these 63 percent, nearly two-thirds said "cut foreign-aid spending," only 6 percent said "spend more" on foreign aid than we are now spending while 26 percent favored continuing the program at the level of last year. Five percent had no opinion.

Here is the question the American press propounded to the 794 editors and here are their answers by regions and by totals.

Question: During recent years Congress has appropriated about $4 billion each year for countries in other parts of the world, to help prevent their going communistic. Do you think Congress should appropriate more, less, or the same amount for the coming year?

[In percent]

| Answer | Northeast | South | North central | West | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| More | 7 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 6 |
| Less | 52 | 66 | 64 | 64 | 63 |
| Same | 34 | 24 | 25 | 24 | 26 |
| No answer | 7 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 5 |

Mr. Speaker, no one is closer to the people in his town than the weekly newspaper editor. Usually he helps gather his own news. He visits and talks with hundreds of his townsmen each week, on the street, in their offices and homes, at their clubs, lodges, and grange meetings. He has his ear to the ground and his hand on the pulse of public sentiment. He knows by daily personal contact what the people are thinking. As a trained newspaper man he knows how to evaluate public opinion.

Sixty-three percent of the weekly newspaper editors, in response to the American Press poll, say the people want foreign aid reduced. Nearly all citizens are agreed that the present $71.8 billion budget must be drastically reduced. One place the Congress can cut the budget drastically is by reducing foreign aid spending.

## Joyce Kilmer's Son Pays Tribute to St. David

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. BARRATT O'HARA**
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 28, 1957*

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is St. David's Day, and in honor of this day I am extending my remarks to include an article written at my request by Kenton Kilmer, of the History and Government Division of the Library of Congress. Mr. Kilmer is the son of the late Joyce Kilmer, the poet who was killed in action in World War I, and in his tribute to the patron saint of Wales will be detected the touch of poetic beauty that made the poems of his celebrated father an imperishable part of American literature.

The article follows:

ST. DAVID'S DAY, MARCH 1, 1957

March 1 is a day that never passes unnoticed by any man with even a drop of Welsh blood. On this day we honor St. David, archbishop of Caerleon, and patron saint of Wales—and in honoring this great saint we join, all over the world, in loving tribute to the land of strength and beauty, of rugged coasts and craggy mountains, of deep green valleys and steep hillside pastures.

Out of the depth and strength of the heart of Wales come the poetry and song, the wisdom and stubborn courage, that are the Welsh contribution to America. Today we give thanks to Wales for these qualities, and to St. David, the patron saint of Wales, and to God, whom St. David served with Welsh determination and single-mindedness throughout his long and fruitful life.

Giraldus Cambrensis, the great Welsh historian to whom we owe much of our knowledge of early Britain, writing almost 700 years after St. David's time, splendidly sums up what the life of the saint meant to his contemporaries and to those who came after him. Giraldus calls St. David "a mirror and pattern to all, instructing both by word and example, excellent in his preaching, but still more so in his works. He was," Giraldus continues, "a doctrine to all, a guide to the religious, a life to the poor, a support to orphans, a protection to widows, a father to the fatherless, a rule to monks, and a model to teachers; becoming all to all, that so he might gain all to God."

The story of St. David, as we read it today, is cluttered with the legendary accretions of the centuries. A pedigree places the saint as 18th in lineal descent from the Virgin Mary herself. A pious tale accounts for the warmth and health-giving properties of the hot chalybeate springs at the town of Bath, in Somerset, by recounting how an angel gave the springs these properties to help the saint to rest and relax after a hard preaching tour. Whenever St. David preached, a white dove perched on his shoulder, and the ground under his feet humped itself up into a hill so that he could be the more easily seen and heard.

These are foolish stories, such as accumulate around the reputation of a great man, attracted by the dynamism of his character as dust flies to an electrically charged object. Brush them off, and even after 15 centuries the character of the historical St. David shines forth clearly—a man of force and wisdom and kindness, builder of churches, founder of monasteries and convents, organizer of the church in Wales, a man loved and admired by his contemporaries and successors. He was a fighter for the faith, and it was not entirely an error that a later age, the age of chivalry, made of him a hero of knightly romance, one of the seven champions of Christendom. In sober fact, he wore no armor and swung no sword, except that, following St. Paul's advice, he put on the whole armor of God, and took up the shield of faith, and the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God. In this warfare St. David is still our leader, and his influence, through the Welsh, is strong for good in today's America.

## Youth Wants To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 28, 1957*

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, a young constituent wrote to me recently, asking for certain information. Such requests, I realize, are routine but perhaps the phrasing of this letter may be of interest to my colleagues. Addressing his letter to the Chamber of Congress, Washington, D. C., he wrote a single sentence. "Please send me any free information on the United States as a hole that I may use in school."

## Max Abelman, Brooklyn's Ambassador of Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN A. BURNS
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 28, 1957*

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, congratulations and acknowledgments of his January birthday and his 50 years of philanthropies continue to draw attention to Max Abelman's many virtues. Mr. Abelman well merits the recognition of his many kindnesses and philanthropic accomplishments. His example is an inspiration to others, and the recognition given to him is in a sense recognition of the philanthropies of the many who do so much to further charity.

I am pleased to insert in the RECORD two letters and a newspaper article attesting to his virtues:

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of January 22, 1957]

FIFTY YEARS OF SERVICE: GOOD WILL ENVOY TO MARK 70TH BIRTHDAY

Max Abelman, "Brooklyn's Ambassador of Good Will," will celebrate his 70th birthday Saturday and round out 50 years of philanthropic service to the borough, the city, and the Nation.

Max, as countless Brooklynites know him, has coaxed more than $100 million out of borough residents in his 50 years of activity. The largest single amount he collected was $43.9 million, a sum he raised in 1 night when 44 Brooklyn banking institutions met at the Brooklyn Academy of Music in 1919 in a Liberty Bond drive.

BIG BROTHER ORGANIZER

But his services to his community extended far beyond the collection of money. He was one of the organizers of the Big Brother and Big Sister movement; he persuaded 2 artists to decorate 16 children's wards in the Brooklyn Jewish Hospital with gay murals and brought hundreds of celebrities to the hospital to autograph the murals. He worked constantly to better interfaith relations.

His motto was, and is, even in retirement, "Do something kind for somebody every day."

His kindness and his work have brought him many honors: a degree from the University of Manila, Philippines; the first honorary membership in the Alumni Society of the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn; an award from Brooklyn College; and dozens of testimonial dinners and hundreds of letters of commendation from civic and fraternal organizations, from city and State officials, and from the Navy Department.

BEGAN CAREER IN 1907

Mr. Abelman began his philanthropic career in 1907 when he joined the Brooklyn Federation of Jewish Charities. Two years later he began an association with the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn which ended, but only officially, in 1954, with his retirement as director of public relations for the institution. He also managed to squeeze a 9-year banking career and a 14-year career as executive director of the Brooklyn Federation of Jewish Charities into his life.

Mr. Abelman married Bessie Schwartz on October 6, 1907, and they had one son, Alan Nathan. Mrs. Abelman died September 1955. Mr. Abelman lives at 35 Tennis Court.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

MAX ABELMAN,
*Care Federation of Jewish Philanthropies:*

We are both very pleased to be able at this time to send you our congratulations on the attainment of your 70th birthday and at the same time to wish you many more fruitful years. You have certainly contributed nobly and unselfishly to the welfare of others and we hope that some of the good you have done for others will be returned to you in a continuing long and prosperous life.

Congressman and Mrs. GEO. S. LONG.

JANUARY 31, 1957.

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
*Brooklyn, N. Y.*

DEAR MAX: It is hard to believe what I read in the papers, that you are going to be 70 years old. You have led a wonderfully useful life. I congratulate you heartily on the birthday and wish you many, many more to come.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

## Anniversary of Hungarian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 28, 1957*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the 109th anniversary of the Hungarian declaration of independence against foreign oppression occurs on March 15. This date is traditionally observed by Hungarians everywhere as the anniversary of their national independence. This year it takes on added significance for the people of Hungary and for the freedom-loving nations all over the world because of the heroic resistance last fall by the Hungarian people against its Communist oppressor.

Today, the Hungarians are a captive nation, suffering under the subjugation and enslavement of a ruthless regime. The people in Hungary have paid a huge toll in human lives lost, in property destroyed, in nearly 200,000 of its citizens forced to flee from the Communist terror, and the complete extinction of freedom—and all because they dared to stand up and ask for their independence and the right to live their own way of life.

The revolt in Hungary last October, I regret to say, has caught the United States and the Western World by complete surprise. As a result, we were totally unprepared to cope with the situation. We were not aware of what was taking place during the early days of the revolt, and we did not know what to do when it was discovered that an uprising was in full force. We hesitated to recognize or contact the Imre Nagy government, and this lack of action made the Russians realize that they could undertake their own brutal action without fear of any outside reprisals. Because of our unpreparedness, we missed a grand opportunity to help the Hungarian people achieve their freedom.

Nevertheless, the fight for freedom and the hope for national liberalization

must not be given up. The people of Hungary are now sealed off from contact with the rest of the world. Yet we know that their indomitable desire for freedom and independence has not been extinguished, that it still lives in their hearts and minds. This annual observance is one way of keeping this desire alive.

We send our heartfelt greetings to the Hungarian Freedom Fighters on this occasion, together with our hope and prayer that their country will soon be liberated from the yoke of communism and will join the free nations of the world.

## So-Called Civil Rights Measures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 28, 1957*

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release:

"Force measures under the guise of protecting civil rights, but which in reality would create civil wrongs, constitute a monstrous threat to the liberties of all Americans, and could result in the sacrifice of old and basic individual rights and freedoms to possible political prosecution and persecution," United States Representative OTTO E. PASSMAN has warned congressional colleagues.

He said today, in a statement at Washington, that rights which have long been uppermost to all citizens "already seriously threatened by the Supreme Court's notorious school integration decision and the attendant activities of Federal courts in attempting to enforce that decision" now "stand in danger of being usurped" through precedents being set in Federal courts, and would be "even more seriously endangered" by passage of the civil-rights legislation being proposed by the administration and other proponents in Congress.

Representative PASSMAN, of Louisiana's Fifth Congressional District, charged that the "so-called civil-rights measures further threaten the individual's rights to be secure in person and property against individual arrest and seizure, the right of indictment by a grand jury, and trial by jury."

The proposed legislation includes establishment of an investigatory commission (with power of subpena), a civil-rights division (with injunctive authority) in the Justice Department, and "other interference" with individual and States rights, Congressman PASSMAN said. He asserted that the program, against which southern Congressmen are now waging vigorous opposition, would by-pass the need for a person to exhaust State judicial and administrative remedies before turning to the Federal courts.

His statement continued:

"It begins to look more and more as though the highly emotional and inflammatory question of 'segregation or integration' is methodically being used as a whipping boy to disguise an all-out attack upon constitutionally guaranteed freedoms of the American people.

"But there are areas, including the Southland, where the concept of civil liberties is still unclouded by the specter of something called 'social equality.' We can see more clearly the steps to tyranny that are being taken, cloaked in a misguided sense of compassion for racial minorities.

"We must continue to hope and strive to awaken the majority of Americans to the grave threats to liberty that are being perpetrated and attempted in the name of something called 'liberalism.'

"May the majority of Americans—and consequently the majority of the Congress—realize before it is too late that liberty and liberalism are not, and never have been, one and the same."

## Forty-fifth Anniversary of Girl Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 28, 1957*

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this week the Girl Scouts of the United States of America are celebrating their 45th anniversary. Since their founding in 1912, by Juliette Gordon Low, the Girl Scouts have developed a remarkable and respectable record. During their entire history they have held fast to their ideal to learn to cooperate and work together, to prepare basically and fundamentally for the responsibilities of life and to know and understand those qualities necessary for happiness and successful living.

On this 45th anniversary, the organization of Girls Scouts is national in scope and extends all over the United States of America. In addition, its influence has extended beyond the seas. During the last 10 years many troops of Girl Scouts have been organized in many countries of the world. It is of real significance and value to the cultural development of our community life to know the Girl Scouts of America carry on a worldwide exchange-of-persons program with Girl Scouts of other lands.

As a part of this program, Girl Scouts from many of our neighboring countries are brought to the United States to live and work with the Girl Scout organizations of America. In like manner, American Girl Scouts visit many foreign countries. This interchange is not only of great value to the individual girls involved but it is also of considerable value to our respective countries. Conducting themselves according to the ideal of the Girl Scouts everywhere, these girls contribute friendship and good will and help greatly in the international understanding that is so basic and so necessary for permanent international peace.

The Girl Scouts all over the world are increasing in membership and in troop organizations. This increase must be encouraged by the adult citizens of all communities. The Girl Scouts not only deserve the support of the adult citizens of their respective neighborhoods, but they should have the active encouragement of everyone, for theirs is an organization which not only develops a finer citizenship but it also greatly assists in international cooperation and understanding.

It is a genuine pleasure and honor for me to congratulate the Girl Scouts of America and the Girl Scouts of Lowell on this 45th anniversary. To be a member of the Girl Scouts is an accomplishment. It is something worthy of pride. It is an organization in which every girl can benefit for within its activities it is possible to learn the basic qualities for community leadership and to understand the responsibilities necessary and required for tomorrow's motherhood.

The Girl Scout movement, constantly expanding, has become indeed one of the great international organizations whose benefit to mankind is unmeasurable. The Girl Scouts have earned respect and admiration and deserve the support of everyone.

## Nebraska's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 28, 1957*

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will be Nebraska's birthday. It was on March 1, 1867, 90 years ago, that President Andrew Johnson signed the proclamation making the Territory of Nebraska one of the United States of America, the 37th in the Union. Statehood was thus achieved after the first statehood bill had been vetoed by the same President.

Just this month, we have celebrated the birth anniversaries of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. That gave us a chance to glance backward through the years to see what Nebraska looked like during the terms of office of those great Presidents.

During Washington's administration, Nebraska was but rolling prairie land, cut through by many rivers, populated mainly by the Indians. At that time, the territory belonged to Spain and the Spanish were beginning to press their claims in the upper Missouri Basin.

Long before Lincoln's day, Nebraska had become the property of the United States as a part of the Louisiana Purchase. The territory had become settled in most of the eastern part. The Oregon Trail and the Mormon Trail had crossed Nebraska and the dream of a new State was in formation.

According to the Nebraska Blue Book, the huge fossil beds and glacial deposits of Nebraska give proof that in past geologic ages, this region was the bottom of an inland sea which was later elevated above the water. At one time, a tropical climate prevailed and during a later period glaciers covered the land. Archeological explorations have uncovered considerable evidence indicating the presence of prehistoric man in the State.

It has been estimated about 40,000 Indians lived in Nebraska at the time of the earliest white settlements. Presumably they had migrated to the area several hundred years before the first explorers.

The Spanish are presumed to have been the first white men to come to Nebraska. Right now there is a minor controversy on that point where Nebraska and Kansas are both claiming to be the last point of the northward penetration of the Spanish in the summer of 1541 when the Indians dominated the area and bison roamed the prairies by the thousands.

About the year 1700 French trappers began to venture up the rivers. By 1739 they had named the Platte River and traveled nearly the entire length of the State.

Spain, France, and England had all claimed the Nebraska region at one time or another. In 1803, after establishing her rights, France sold the region to the United States.

The famed Lewis and Clarke commanded the first American expedition to reach the area in the years 1804–06. There followed then the glowing story of the courageous pioneers who carved a great State out of the prairie wilderness.

The history of Nebraska built rapidly after the first military post was established at Fort Atkinson on the present site of the village of Fort Calhoun which is a few miles north of Omaha. It had a population of over 1,000 people and was the location of the first school, library, brickyard, sawmill, grist mill, and the first extensive farming by white men within this particular territory.

Missionaries came early to minister to the needs of the Indians. By 1832 covered wagons had started the parallel ruts across the prairies that later became the Oregon Trail, which for the next 40 years was the greatest wagon road this world has ever seen. Other great trails across Nebraska included the Mormon Trail from Bellevue or Omaha west to Utah; the Denver Trail from the Missouri River to Denver, and the Nebraska City cutoff up the West Blue to the Platte and on to Denver. Thousands of wagons traveled over these trails each year until the construction of the Union Pacific made them no longer practical.

The most rugged frontier conditions reigned in Nebraska during those years but out of that prairie sod the pioneers carved homes. They started to farm and villages grew. The heat of summer, the blizzard of winter, the marauding Indians, the droughts, the grasshopper plagues, the prairie fires never for a moment daunted these courageous pioneers in their bright vision of a new land they could call home under the Government of the United States.

The Nebraska region was a part of the Territory of Indiana in 1804. The following year it was made a part of the Territory of Louisiana with its capital at St. Louis. After 1812 it became a part of the Territory of Missouri but was detached in 1821 when Missouri became a State. Nebraska then became a part of the great unorganized region commonly called the Indian Country.

Nebraska got its name from a river. The Indians called the Platte River "Nebrathka," meaning "Flat Water." The State claimed title to "Nebraska" and the river reverted to the "Platte."

The first bill to organize Nebraska Territory came in 1844. The Congress turned down the bill. Similar bills failed to pass in 1848 and 1853. The fourth effort won success and Nebraska became a Territory in 1854 during the administration of President Franklin Pierce.

The first Governor of Nebraska Territory was Francis Burt, of South Carolina. Immediately a struggle was started between Omaha and Bellevue as to which would be the capital. Omaha won. Later the capital was moved to Lincoln.

It was in 1865 that the Union Pacific started to build the railroad across the State, the rails which revolutionized transportation in the area.

Nebraska had a long, hard fight to become a State. With a sharp division of interest between free and slave territory, many delays were encountered. Many residents were opposed to the very idea of statehood.

The Congress passed an enabling act April 19, 1864, and on June 2, 1866, an election was held to climax the stirring controversy. The tabulation showed 3,938 Nebraskans in favor of statehood and 3,838 against.

The Statehood Act was vetoed by President Johnson. The veto was overridden, and on the following March 1 the State of Nebraska was created.

Succeeding years found more settlements starting in all parts of the State except the sandhills. Pioneers were beginning to move into the extreme west end of the State. New railroads were built. Waves of homesteading immigrants came.

The new homestead law proved a major boon, and people came in from the many States to the east, most to live out their lives in Nebraska.

They came in various nationalities. These individuals blended into the communities. It was a hardy lot of pioneers who grubbed a living from the soil. Disappointments were many, but these people stayed on and on, raising their families despite incredible hardships all along the frontier. Regardless of periods of drought, Nebraska's pioneer farmers faced the future unafraid.

In the western part of the State, where the rainfall is sometimes scant, farmers looked at the lazy waters of the Platte going by to waste themselves in the sea.

Men of vision organized irrigation in the North Platte Valley. Crops boomed. Irrigation spread to other parts of the State and is still spreading. It is Nebraska's guaranty of crops despite the rainfall which may or may not come. Later the same water was put to another task—production of electric power.

Industry got started in Nebraska. Many farmers expanded their agricultural pursuits to include the raising and feeding of livestock and now millions of cattle, hogs, and sheep annually go to market. Stockmen looked at the green grass which covers the sandhills and saw a new potential. Now millions of cattle graze those hills.

Nebraska boasts of having the finest steaks in the world. Every automobile license issued in Nebraska proudly proclaims it "the Beef State."

During the wars in which the United States was engaged Nebraska's young men and women served notably. Thousands of our servicemen have died for their country on the field of battle. Always we have tried to hold our flag high among those of the other great States.

Nebraska has grown up and tomorrow we will be 90 years young. In June Omaha is going to celebrate the 100th anniversary of its incorporation. Mayor John Rosenblatt and Gov. Victor Anderson have invited President Eisenhower to be the principal speaker at the jubilee. Other cities and towns across the State are celebrating other anniversaries this year.

We have in Nebraska a people of courage and ambition who seek to be good Nebraskans and good Americans.

A portrayal of the State is contained in this description of the great seal of Nebraska, adopted by the legislature in 1867:

> The eastern part of the circle to be represented by a steamboat ascending the Missouri River; the mechanic arts to be represented by a smith with hammer and anvil; in the foreground, agriculture to be represented by a settler's cabin, sheaves of wheat and stalks of growing corn; in the background a train of cars heading toward the Rocky Mountains, and on the extreme west, the Rocky Mountains to be plainly in view; around the top of this circle, to be in capital letters, the motto "Equality before the law," and the circle surrounded by the words "Great seal of the State of Nebraska."

"Equality before the law," "honesty before men," and "reverence before God," are the precepts upon which Nebraska built and is building. These are the precepts which will keep Nebraska great and enduring through the years to come.

For tomorrow's 90th anniversary, I raise my hand in salute to the great State of Nebraska.

---

## Addresses of Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico, and Hon. Chet Holifield, of California, Before AFL–CIO Conference on Atomic Radiation Hazards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 28, 1957*

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD, two addresses made yesterday by two of my distinguished colleagues on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as delivered before the AFL–CIO Conference on Atomic Radiation Hazards, held here in Washington, D. C. This has been a very important and worthwhile AFL–CIO conference, and I believe that botn of these addresses were also significant, both in their content and their thoughtfulness.

The first of these addresses was by the distinguished vice chairman of the joint committee, Senator CLINTON P. ANDER-

SON, of New Mexico. In his address, Senator ANDERSON discussed the problems in atomic-energy development, both in terms of domestic events and the international market.

The second address was by my distinguished colleague from California, Mr. HOLIFIELD, who has ably served his country both as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and also as chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Applications of the House Committee on Government Operations. In this address, Representative HOLIFIELD discussed the civil-defense problems facing our country in these perilous days of uneasy world tensions, the guided missile, and the atomic and hydrogen bombs.

I believe that both these addresses are worthy of study and reflection by every Member of Congress, as well as by the American people:

PROBLEMS IN ATOMIC ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

(Address of Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Vice Chairman, Joint Committe on Atomic Energy, before the AFL–CIO Conference on Atomic Radiation Hazards, Washington, D. C.)

The topic assigned to me this noon is: "Problems in Atomic Energy Development." If I did a full-scale job, you would have to invoke cloture on me—and let's hope your chairman's gavel would work better than Senate rule 22—because, believe me, there are plenty of problems in the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in this country. In fact, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is near the end of 2 weeks of public hearings designed to explore current problems in atomic-energy development. The committee has heard from many well-qualified witnesses, including an excellent statement by my long-time friend, Andy J. Miller, of the AFL–CIO.

I will discuss problems in atomic-energy development on several levels. Each can have little more than a lick and a promise, but the levels are: First, some special problems in the AEC reactor licensing program because that subject is closely tied up with the subject of your conference, "Atomic Radiation Hazards"; second, some technical and other problems appearing in our domestic atomic-power program; third, the development of reactors for uses other than generating electric power; fourth, the international market for reactors; fifth, a legislative program to help overcome some of these problems; and sixth, a few words about labor's stake in the atomic-energy program as an introduction to the program for tomorrow noon.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS IN THE AEC REACTOR LICENSING PROGRAM

As you know, the 1954 act was intended to open the doors to facilitate rapid development of the atom by allowing private industry, for the first time, to possess nuclear fuels and to build privately owned nuclear reactors. However, the act also required that in order to obtain these materials or to construct and operate a reactor, one must obtain a construction permit or a license from the AEC.

This system of requiring licenses before permitting possession of nuclear fuels or construction of nuclear facilities was enacted by the Congress because of two main reasons:

First, in the interest of national defense and security, the Government has retained title to the nuclear fuel, in order to facilitate accounting and control—since the nuclear material may be used for weapons as well as for peaceful purposes. We need to know who has it and where it is.

Second, because of the radioactive hazards involved, the Government, in the interests of protecting the public health and safety, must carefully consider each application to possess nuclear fuel or build a reactor, and the AEC must make the determinations required by the act concerning safety before granting the construction permit or license.

Thus under the present procedures the entire atomic-energy industry in this country must grow up under this AEC licensing system—since one needs a license or a construction permit to go ahead.

Now for a brief glance at the problems that developed under this AEC reactor licensing procedure.

As the AEC began the program, in 1955 and 1956, it followed uniformly the procedure of granting the construction permit or license without any prior notice to the public or without holding a public hearing. Thus the AEC granted construction permits for three large power reactors near New York, Chicago, and Detroit, without giving any advance information to the public as to the health and safety factors involved, or the AEC's hazard analysis of the proposed reactor.

In one case, for construction of the fast breeder power reactor near Monroe, Mich., there had been an unfavorable report by the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards which the AEC did not make public. In that case, there was no valid reason to protect the people from the truth, and so, as many of you know, after the AEC issued the construction permit, three labor unions and other parties intervened, and requested a public hearing. I stated then, and I repeat now, that the AFL–CIO unions in obtaining a public hearing on this construction permit are rendering a valuable public service.

This public hearing—the first ever held by the AEC on an application for a reactor license—is now in progress and is a very significant event. Because of the important health and safety questions involved in the development and construction of new reactor designs, it is advisable that the public obtain full information in this field and that the AEC make maximum information on proposed reactors available to the public. These purposes can perhaps best be accomplished by means of a full and open public hearing.

The method in which AEC issues its reactor licenses, and the amount of information it makes public, are important because they are two of the keys to the safe and orderly development of atomic energy in this country.

Prior to the requests for public hearing in the Monroe, Mich., reactor case, I had directed the staff of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to undertake an investigation and study of AEC reactor licensing and construction permit procedures. On August 9, 1956, I wrote the chairman of the AEC, informing him that I was directing the staff of the joint committee to study three suggestions of fields in which the joint committee might wish to take corrective action by legislation to amend the Atomic Energy Act.

First, to require public hearings on all applications for construction permits or for facility licenses.

Second, to require that the AEC make public reports on the safety of all proposed reactors before issuing a construction permit or facility license.

Third, to separate the licensing and regulatory functions of the AEC from its other functions.

Accordingly the staff of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy therefore undertook a detailed study of AEC licensing procedures and organization and also a study of the procedures and organizations of certain other Federal agencies in order to obtain comparative ideas. This staff study has now been under way for about 6 months and the report is due soon. It will be made public.

While the staff study was in process the AEC changed its procedures significantly. In late December 1956 for the first time it announced ahead of time that it was intending to issue a construction permit for a small research reactor unless a request for a hearing should be received within 15 days. At the same time it made public a fairly detailed memorandum discussing the reactor in technical terms, including an extensive section as to reactor hazard analysis, even though this was a small research reactor of proven design. In addition to these changes concerning procedures and safety reports, the AEC has also indicated that it is considering some form of internal reorganization to separate its licensing functions from other functions of the AEC.

I have looked over a preliminary draft of the staff study on the questions of required public hearings, required public reports on reactor safety, and the separation of the licensing and regulatory functions of the AEC. I intend to discuss the whole subject with my colleagues on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I hope we will have some legislative proposals in this field.

So much for the problems in the AEC reactor licensing program.

I turn now to the second major group of problems which I would like to discuss: the technical and other problems in the development of domestic atomic power reactors in this country.

TECHNICAL PROBLEMS

Now, as to the domestic situation and the technical aspects of the development of atomic power in this country, I should say right away that some progress is being made.

Out at the Argonne National Laboratory earlier this month, members of the joint committee had the pleasure of attending the official opening of the EBWR—the experimental boiling water reactor. This was a memorable occasion because the EBWR is the first real atomic powerplant in this country. Although the AEC first generated "juice" back in 1951, the new EBWR plant is the first atomic reactor designed specifically for the generation of electricity. It is the heart of a powerplant designed to produce 20,000 kilowatts of heat and 5,000 kilowatts of electricity, and represents a significant stride forward.

Next fall the 60,000 kilowatt pressurized water reactor now under construction at Shippingport, Pa., is scheduled to become critical—and this will be the first full-scale civilian power reactor in the United States.

Meanwhile the General Electric Co. has been making good progress with construction of its 5,000-kilowatt boiling-water reactor at Vallecitos, Calif., and that reactor also is scheduled to commence operation next fall.

On the bright side of the picture also should be mentioned the career of the *Nautilus* which has just gone into drydock for refueling after completing over 60,000 miles—its 20,000 leagues under the sea—on its first core without refueling.

Another bright star in our atomic progress has been the tremendous growth in the beneficial uses found for radioactive isotopes.

Originally considered a byproduct in our atomic program, radioisotopes have progressed to the point where they can now be accurately heralded as our "first peaceful dividend from United States atomic investment"—the phrase used by the AEC in the testimony submitted last week to our congressional committee.

Radioisotopes have brought huge dollar savings to industry in thickness and density gaging, industrial radiography and research, and applied industrial tracing. By

developing new techniques and new products, radioisotopes are saving our United States industrial concerns close to $400 million annually—and last Monday Dr. Libby said that in 1958 or 1959 that figure would reach $1 billion each year.

Radioisotopes have brought additional blessings, in the extension of human life and the relief of suffering, and in plant treatment. These applications in medicine and agriculture cannot be measured in dollars.

These are truly satisfying advancements, all made realities by help from man's newest—and smallest—ally: the atom. These are a few of the bright spots in the overall program to seek economic nuclear power in this country. Let us now look at the other side of the coin and scan the many problems that beset those working in this field.

Practically all of the projects now actually under construction are encountering unforeseen engineering and technical problems which are slowing schedules and raising cost estimates. Let us run through the list of just a few of the projects—public and private—which are running into tough sledding.

First, the Oak Ridge homogeneous reactor work received a setback last fall when chloride contamination was discovered in the leak-detector system. Although the defect was nonnuclear in nature, it was necessary to stop all pre-operational testing, and the startup of that reactor has been indefinitely postponed. (As an aside, it is interesting to note that many of the technical problems causing delay—in fact almost all of them—involve construction of nonnuclear components, as compared with nuclear components.)

In addition to the Oak Ridge work, experiments on homogeneous reactors were also being conducted at Los Alamos, but these encountered repeated heat exchanger leaks.

Similarly the North American Aviation Co. has run into constant delays and increased costs in the sodium reactor experiment work at Santa Suzanna, Calif.

At Argonne the EBR–2 schedule has dropped behind the original plans and expectations.

And, of course, there is the celebrated case of the second atomic submarine, the *Sea Wolf*, which developed leaks in its sodium superheater system. These leaks were potentially hazardous because the reactor utilizes liquid sodium as a coolant, and sodium reacts violently if it comes into contact with water.

In addition to the setbacks in the Government program, private and semiprivate reactor construction groups are finding unwanted technical problems which give the tasks a two-way stretch—the completion date will be later and the cost will be higher. Thus the Yankee Atomic Electric Group, the Consolidated Edison, and the Consumers Public Power Group of Nebraska, and possibly others, have run into increased costs and difficult technical problems as development and design become more concrete, even though major construction work has not yet even begun on those reactors. In some cases it appears the costs will be increased as much as 30 to 40 percent above the original estimates.

Another significant straw in the wind is the recently published result of the atomic industrial forum's poll of persons and companies active in atomic-energy development, asking them to name problems slowing progress. The No. 1 obstacle was listed as "lack of economic incentive."

Also a whole morning session of the recent American Management Association meeting on atomic energy was devoted to the problem of economic incentive. This problem also has been mentioned time and time again in the current section 202 hearings before our committee.

Just last week the joint committee received two very significant letters.

One letter described increased costs at the Shippingport project. Total estimated costs are now increased from $37,500,000 to $55 million, and still not definitely fixed, of course. As Commissioner Murray said in his testimony before our committee last week, it takes a bold man to estimate the cost of electricity from Shippingport—our first full-scale atomic power plant—in mills per kilowatt hour.

The other letter we received last week described the preliminary work being done by the Consolidated Edison Co. on its reactor to be constructed at Indian Point, N. Y. This letter concluded by saying that the estimated total cost had now been revised upward from $55 million to $70 million.

The Consolidated Edison Co. is sincerely interested in building the atomic powerplant it has undertaken. The letter indicates it intends to shoulder its increased burden, and do so cheerfully. I would praise the company and its officers. But the realities of increased costs are there. They cannot be ignored.

Let me emphasize one point: These plants are pioneers. They are the first of a handful of full-scale atomic powerplants. More will follow. In time costs will go down.

As surely as we have mass-produced automobiles, machine tools, and TV sets—and as surely as we have doubled our electrical generating capacities every 10 years in this country—someday we surely shall produce atomic-power reactors and components in volume. Of that I am sure. American industry and labor, working together, will achieve for us that goal. Someday we shall have safe, cheap, and abundant atomic power.

The only question is: When?

These are all difficult technical and economic problems. Perhaps the AEC move in proposing larger subsidies and making them retroactive under the third-round power-demonstration program is in recognition of these problems.

There are two ways to look at this. One way would be to point out that Members of Congress have worried about these problems and sought ways to accelerate the reactor program while optimistic words and sweet promises dropped from some official lips. It would be easy to say "I told you so." A wiser course might be to say that these problems were to be anticipated and to make the best of it. A little later I shall say a few words about how to make the best of it by looking toward other reactor applications, and the international market, as well as the Government-supported accelerated reactor program.

### MANPOWER PROBLEMS

Besides the difficult technical problems, certain other problems have arisen in atomic energy development. There is a shortage of scientific and technical manpower. The AEC has made commendable efforts to overcome this shortage by the use of fellowships, grants, and aids to educational institutions, and by Commission-run schools to train nuclear scientists. My colleagues on the Joint Committee, Representative MEL PRICE and Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, have recently introduced bills to provide scholarships for high-school students to enable them to pursue mathematical studies in college. This is a more long-range approach to the problem, but it should bear fruit someday in the future.

Another way of solving the manpower shortage, in my opinion, is to make better use of our existing labor force. Possibly there are jobs which have been labeled "graduate engineer" which a competent and trained nongraduate could well perform if given a chance. I urge, therefore, that the Atomic Energy Commission and companies doing work in atomic energy development, carefully consider their job-classification methods and make an effort to utilize our existing personnel to better effect.

### INDEMNITY PROBLEM

Another significant problem in atomic energy development has been the indemnity insurance problem. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy studied this problem last year, and arranged a symposium discussion group and two sets of public hearings on the many legal, technical, and policy considerations involved. I have introduced legislation again this year and it is my hope that this roadblock can be substantially removed by appropriate congressional action during this session of the Congress. But the insurance companies will still have to do their part by providing insurance at rates which will not be impossible for this struggling embryo industry. We have just received proposed rates on some reactors and hope to analyze them during the current hearings.

### INFORMATION PROBLEMS

Still another problem has been that of "secrecy and information." The recent AEC declassification announcement, if followed up by rigorous and effective AEC action, should go a long way toward solving this problem. Private industrial reactor development should receive a much-needed "shot in the arm" with the rapid declassification of all—and I mean all—of the reactor information not necessary to our national defense.

Thus, some of the problems in domestic atomic power development appear comparatively near to solution; others will be more difficult. Let us now look at areas other than domestic power development which hold promise for the future—namely, reactors for uses other than generating electricity, and the international market.

### OTHER APPLICATIONS FOR LARGE REACTORS

Certain other applications for large reactors are receiving more attention recently—and probably should receive still more attention. Thus, reactors can be utilized for making process steam and the steam can be put to work in many industrial applications. Or the heat from atomic reactors can be used for space heating, to heat large factories or office buildings. Out in Hanford, Wash., the Columbia River has been used for many years to cool the large plutonium-producing reactors there. And the Columbia River does a good job, draining millions and millions of B. t. u.'s away from these reactors each day. In one of the newer Hanford reactors this heat instead of being drained away has been utilized to heat the building. Perhaps this approach could be used in large suburban housing areas.

Reactors for making processed steam or for space heating can operate at lower pressures and temperatures and have less troublesome materials requirements than power reactors. Perhaps many of the technical breakthroughs and economic applications can first be found in those applications.

Atomic reactors will be used to drive ships. Besides the Navy program, economic merchant marine application would not seem to be far distant. Last year Congress authorized construction of the first nuclear-powered merchant ship. The AEC and the Maritime Administration are now going ahead with plans for this ship, and the type that they have chosen is a combination dry-cargo passenger vessel.

In my opinion, the type of ship which holds the most promise for future development is a nuclear-powered oil tanker. An oil tanker combines long trade routes and fast loading time with national defense requirements and a growing commercial market. Many other countries are exploring the possibilities of atomic-powered oil tankers, and I hope that we shall maintain aggressive efforts along these lines because here again the economic market may soon create valuable pur-

chase orders for American industry and our working force.

Thus, although problems develop in the domestic atomic power field, economic applications may soon be found in other fields.

INTERNATIONAL MARKET FOR ATOMIC REACTORS

Now let us take a look at the international market for atomic reactors and see whether our American industry can receive a shot in the arm by receiving orders from other countries.

We have recently had a visit here in Washington by three distinguished European industrial leaders who are called the "Three Wise Men." One is an Italian, one a Frenchman, and one a German, but they speak of themselves as Europeans and they are working together in laying plans for EURATOM, which is a six-nation European plan for the development of atomic energy. These six nations—Germany, France, Italy, Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg—have set for themselves an ambitious program. They are currently importing, at high prices, 25 percent of their fuels. The coal figure is 100 million tons per year and they are willing to increase this to 160 million tons but they hope to hold it at that figure. To do this they hope to have an installed capacity of 3 million kilowatts of atomic power by 1963, and to increase this amount by 3 million annually for each of the succeeding 4 years to produce a total installed atomic capacity of 15 million kilowatts by 1967.

These are indeed ambitious plans. In fact, they are much more ambitious than those which private industry is willing to undertake in this country. It means building 30 reactors the size of the proposed Detroit Edison reactor by 1963, and an additional 120 reactors of this size (100,000 kilowatts) by 1967. We should offer full cooperation—and I will explain what I mean by the word "cooperation" in a few minutes—to these European countries. Historically our economy and our ties of friendship have always been closely linked with the nations of Western Europe, and it is to our enlightened self-interest to help promote their prosperity.

I hope that we will be able to persuade them to build a substantial proportion of the same general types of reactors that we are building in order to pool information on technological developments. In addition, we should be willing to assist in developing types of reactors, such as natural uranium reactors, in which they may be more interested than we. These "poor men's" reactors may prove more economical in the long run. If their urgency is greater than ours, perhaps many of the breakthroughs and developments will first come in Western Europe.

By the word "cooperation" I mean "two-way street." I think that we should be liberal in making our information and our uranium available, but we are entitled to expect something in return. I believe that we should get firm commitments as to receiving complete information on technological developments which we can anticipate will be achieved by our Western European friends.

Now let us look for a moment to England where the Calder Hall plant for the generation of 45,000 kilowatts was brought into operation last October and an additional 45,000 kilowatts is coming in shortly. From the point of view of kilowatts of "juice" on the line, the British are ahead of the United States and appear also to have ambitious plans for the future.

The AEC has executed an agreement with the British to give to them all the U. S. A. information on the design and operation of the *Nautilus* and other military reactors. Will we get valuable information from the British in return? I hope so.

We are now interested in developing gas-cooled reactors—along with other types already in our program. Will the British give us full and complete information—all the details—on their Calder Hall reactors, which are gas cooled? I hope so.

I realize that during the war the British made a real contribution to our atomic program, but I am concerned with the present situation, and I hope that there will be a quid pro quo, and that we will get something back from the British. I hope that our British friends will be completely open with us in giving us information concerning technological advances made by their reactor manufacturers using the gas-cooled approach. If we are going to assist other countries in their development and defense, I think we are entitled to something in return.

Looking to other international areas, we find that Japan is sincerely interested in both research and power reactors and I hope that we will be able to develop some mutually beneficial cooperation with that country. Also several American manufacturers have already arranged for export of research reactors to South American countries and other Asian and African countries also offer valuable potential markets for American atomic equipment manufacturers.

Speaking of Japan, and of Britain, I would like to quote briefly from a report the joint committee received last week. This report was made by a Japanese task force of nuclear scientists and engineers who visited both our country and Britain, to see whether they should build United States of America or British-type reactors. The joint committee received a copy of the report by the Japanese task force, and here is part of it:

"While taking future developments in the United States, and so forth, into full consideration, it is advisable that the first step to be taken by our country should be to introduce a British-type power reactor, a large prototype of which has been completed and for which the technical and economic problems involved therein can easily be explained."

In other words, the Japanese team recommended the British approach because they were further along than we.

Also on the international front you will watch with interest the developments leading to the creation of the International Atomic Energy Agency. This should be a step along the difficult path toward a more peaceful and stabilized world.

Thus far I have dwelt mainly on the economic realities—domestic and international—in the atomic-energy field. There are also political realities. Whether we like it or not—and I do—atomic energy has become a part of our foreign policy. We are committed on "atoms for peace" and we must make it work, not only in industrially advanced countries but also in the so-called underdeveloped nations. These nations see in atomic energy a means of bridging the gap between a backward colonial economy and a modern industrial economy. Obviously the immediate introduction of atomic power in such countries will not be economic, in terms of having an economy and industry entirely ready to receive it. But politically they are more than ready. Moreover, we have the stern alternative: If we do not help, the Russians will.

Hence, we find ourselves with a domestic atomic equipment industry which is not making any money, and whose domestic prospects look more gloomy because of greater technical problems than its promoters would have had us believe. Moreover, we have only one operating pilot plant in operation, and one full-scale plant scheduled to commence operation next fall. In spite of this situation, it appears that Europe and the underdeveloped countries will require a great number of reactors.

Facing that situation, what are we to do about it? If we are to develop a healthy and profitable atomic industry, it appears obvious that we should attempt to capture a portion of this greatly expanding foreign market. This market can't be captured at the rate we are going. We just celebrated our first 5,000-kilowatt atomic plant 8 years behind the Russians. We hope to celebrate our first full-scale atomic powerplant at Shippingport next fall, 1 year behind the British.

From then until 1960 or 1961, the United States will experience a long hiatus when no additional full-scale plants will be completed and operated, whereas the British and the Russians each have over 2 million kilowatts scheduled for operation by 1959 or 1960. Since the American plants are being constructed primarily at private risk and with private money, we have no guaranty that they will not be further postponed or abandoned entirely.

In order to capture the international market, we must have operating reactors. This conclusion is supported by a recent survey of world opinion on atomic power development by the authoritative magazine, Nucleonics. The survey indicated that although a majority of people interviewed believe that the United States is ahead in technology, a majority of foreign industrialists believe that Great Britain is ahead of the United States in industrial applications of atomic power. It is these industrialists who will be setting the policies and actually buying the reactors.

Therefore, although there are problems in the international picture which require careful and intelligent handling, the international market for atomic reactors offers great promise to the American manufacturer. Moreover, if two-way cooperation is successfully worked out, this country should receive benefits from crash programs being pushed by our friends in other countries.

A LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

In order to solve the difficult, increasing engineering and technical problems affecting current reactor construction plans, and in order to get additional American reactors on the line, I believe that a legislative program along the following lines would be of great help:

1. There should be more funds authorized and appropriated for research and development, especially in the field of power reactor technology and construction.

2. There should be an accelerated power reactor program along the lines of the committee bill introduced in the Senate in the last session of Congress by Senators GORE, JACKSON, PASTORE, and me, and by Representative HOLIFIELD in the House.

3. There should be legislation providing Government indemnity to protect the growing atomic power industry and the public, together with certain procedural requirements to assure maximum safety in the AEC reactor licensing program.

LABOR'S STAKE IN THE ATOMIC ENERGY PROGRAM

Tomorrow you will hear about labor's stake in the atomic energy program, but let me have a few words of introduction to that subject.

First, labor has a legitimate interest in plant and employee safety standards, protective devices and records kept by employers and Government concerning safety of employees working in our atomic energy industry. In this connection the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has been studying for some time the problems of radiation hazards, and hopes to have hearings on this vitally important subject sometime this spring.

Second, labor also has an interest in reactor design and construction, and safety features affecting the general public.

Third, labor, working together with industry, has a stake in helping our country achieve its proper place of leadership in the expanding market for atomic power reactors throughout the world.

Fourth, and most important, labor has, as all of us as citizens, a stake in helping develop an atomic energy industry which will be expanding and prosperous and yet will not endanger the public health and safety.

Labor, industry and Government, working together, can achieve for our country continuing world leadership in the development of the peaceful uses of the atom. As our other fuel resources dwindle, we shall have this great new force, sent to us as if from providence, to keep our country, and our people, prosperous and at peace.

---

RADIATION HAZARDS AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

(Remarks by Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD of California, at the AFL–CIO conference for affiliated unions on atomic radiation hazards, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., February 27, 1957)

"Radiation hazards and the public interest" is a timely and appropriate subject for discussion by this conference of organized labor. It is timely and appropriate for at least three reasons.

1. The Nation stands on the threshold of a great, new atomic industry. Organized labor has a great stake in this enterprise. Many of its members now are engaged in atomic occupations, and many more will become so engaged in the future.

This is the dangerous environment of reactor technology, with its complicated shielding apparatus, radiation measuring devices, protective clothing, and sanitation measures. New work habits must be learned, new industrial disciplines observed.

2. This Nation and several other nations of the world are building and testing nuclear weapons. Bomb explosions of the nuclear kind spread radioactive dust far and wide and contaminate the atmosphere with this deadly material. Weapons testing, if carried on at an increased rate and by more nations, will generate persistent radiation hazards affecting the health of all the inhabitants of this earth.

3. This Nation and the free world must reckon with the danger of the all-out enemy attack. We hope and pray that nuclear warfare, with its sinister portent of destruction of civilized society, will never come to the world. The search for world peace must go on unendingly. And yet, in the final analysis, Americans must learn the basic lessons of survival in the nuclear age.

These lessons which, for want of a better term, we call civil defense, will not be wasted in peace. In learning about the dangers of radiation to human beings and about the necessary measures of control, we will know better how to preserve the health and safety of the people in advancing our atomic technology.

The public interest in protection from radiation hazards associated with peacetime development of atomic energy was recognized in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The congressional findings set forth in that act make frequent reference to the need "to protect the health and safety of the public."

The jurisdiction of the Atomic Energy Commission over the operation of atomic facilities by private industry is grounded in part on the potential danger of interstate damage from such operation. In the congressional findings, the possibility of interstate damage "places the operation of those (atomic) facilities in interstate commerce."

How effectively the Atomic Energy Commission will exercise its regulatory authority to protect the health and safety of the American people is a matter of great interest and concern to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. I say this as one who has been privileged to serve on that committee since it was established by law, more than a decade ago.

Speaking as a member of the joint committee, I was happy to see the labor-union challenge to the construction of an atomic plant at Lagoona Beach, Mich.; the Atomic Energy Commission's proposed licensing arrangement did not give sufficient assurance that the safety problems were fully resolved. This challenge will have a healthy effect in testing Atomic Energy Commission procedures under its new regulatory authority and in bringing greater public awareness of the safety requirements in atomic-reactor construction.

The semiannual report of the Atomic Energy Commission for July–December 1956 devotes considerable space to detailing the "radiation safety" activities of that agency. It says, among other things, that "the total record of radiation safety in atomic-energy operations is believed to be without parallel in industrial history."

While this statement may be accepted as true on its face, the industrial history of atomic energy in its peacetime applications is just beginning. As atomic technology comes out from under the wraps of official secrecy and special military applications, we can anticipate that atomic installations will no longer be relatively few in numbers and confined to secluded sites.

In the years ahead, atomic powerplants will be located throughout the country, in or near large population centers. Radiation safety measures must contend not only with the protection of laboratory and plant technicians and workers but with protection of the public against explosions or other accidents which could contaminate large areas with radioactivity.

The Atomic Energy Commission tells us in its report that for 9 years or more of operation, 99.4 percent of nearly 200,000 workers of the Commission's 32 principal contractors have averaged an exposure of less than one-third the amount of radiation allowed by strict safety standards. The Commission seems to be saying that it is 99.44 percent pure.

But the frequency of these accidents or injuries, however minor they may appear in relation to the members exposed, cannot be lightly dismissed. Mishaps occurred despite the fact that the Atomic Energy Commission, with no lack of funds or scientific and technical brains, presumably took every precaution within reason to protect its workers and to insure the success of its operations.

As the Government relaxes its hold on atomic energy development and transfers an increasing burden of responsibility to private enterprise, will it be able to enforce the high safety standards in industry that it boasts for Government-sponsored operations? Certainly this is a question for which the labor unions can help to find the right answers.

And not only the labor unions, but State and local agencies of Government concerned with the health, safety, and welfare of their people will be increasingly drawn into this new area of atomic enterprise. Labor standards, community zoning ordinances, workmen's compensation laws, indeed a wide range of governmental powers over the daily life and work of America will have to be adjusted to this new industrial art which contains within it always the deadly menace of radiation.

This menace is the more deadly because it defies the senses. It cannot be seen, heard, smelled, or tasted. It attacks the body cells and the reproductive organs. Its harmful effects may not show up for years nor always be precisely associated with the cause. And the bodily impact of radiation, whether from the natural environment, medical X-ray and fluoroscope treatment, or bomb bursts, is cumulative in nature.

I foresee the time, not too distant, when every man, woman, and child in America will carry a radiation "bankbook" in which is entered the measurable doses of radiation received. When the entries add up to a certain quantity, the "account" becomes overdrawn in terms of personal bodily health. Workers exposed to radiation hazards in atomic occupations already have their "bankbooks."

In the course of atomic energy operations for the past 13 years, 69 Americans have overdrawn their accounts. Two died; the others suffered greater or lesser injuries. Of these 28 were military personnel overexposed to fallout in the testing of nuclear weapons.

The injuries in weapons testing occurred at the Eniwetok proving ground in March 1954. According to the Atomic Energy Commission, unexpected weather conditions caused heavy radioactive fallout on four Pacific islands. In this same test, 23 men on a Japanese fishing boat, the *Fortunate Dragon*, were caught in the open sea by the fallout. On 3 of the island atolls, 239 Marshall Islanders were exposed.

The American military personnel, who were stationed on Rongerik Island, received 78 roentgens, the Marshall Islanders varying amounts ranging from 14 to 175 roentgens. No data are given in the Atomic Energy Commission report for the dosages received by the Japanese fishermen.

The Atomic Energy Commission, in its above-mentioned report (p. 112), comes to this optimistic conclusion: "After 2 years, residual findings were minimal for all of those exposed to this fallout accident except for four cases which showed various amounts of skin damage." This statement, like so many others of the Commission, which play down the radiation danger, conveys the impression to the lay reader that all is now well, that the victims of this fallout exposure in the Pacific proving ground are now fully recovered, except for a few cases of skin damage.

Medical science has a great deal yet to learn about radiation injury, but on one fact all seem to agree: No amount of radiation is good for the human body, and radiation effects, as I have said before, are cumulatively harmful. In that sense there is never any recovery from substantial doses of radiation.

The radioactive material which fell on the luckless inhabitants of the island atolls caused skin lesions, whole body radiation injury, and bodily intake of certain radioactive materials. I have here a study of the Marshall Islanders by a medical team of the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission. The colored pictures of skin lesions following page 32 of the study are not pretty to observe.

And while these lesions may be healed in most cases, while those who lost their hair may now have it back, we really know very little about the long-term effects of these injuries. Whether they predispose the unfortunate islanders to cancer, or cause gene mutations, cataracts, lower fertility, slower growth, or shortened life span, are possibilities upon which the medical experts can only conjecture or await future studies.

One of the significant points in the report of the medical team on the Marshall Islanders was the finding that persons who received 175 roentgens showed more serious effects than were expected in laboratory ratings. These effects indicated that people would begin to die at a dosage of about 225 roentgens, and that half of the exposed persons would die at 350 roentgens.

The dosage resulting in 50 percent fatalities heretofore has been put at 450 roentgens. The medical observers see in their data a strong argument for lowering, or at least not raising, the 450 roentgen estimate of 50 percent mortality used in current civil-defense planning.

The report on the Marshall Islanders, while it describes the fallout pattern in the proving grounds and gives considerable detail about the consequent radiation injuries to exposed persons, does not reveal any facts

about the present state of radioactivity on the islands. Persistent radiation is an important factor in civil-defense planning. I have asked Chairman Strauss of the Atomic Energy Commission to supply the data on roentgen measurements on the islands as of January 1, 1957.

The first official release of the Atomic Energy Commission on the March 1954 weapons test and resultant fallout conditions was issued in February 1955, almost a year after the event. And this release, too, was couched in language which did not begin to convey to the average reader the enormity of the threat of high-yield nuclear weapons. No mention was made of persistent radioactivity, an omission which Dr. Willard F. Libby later acknowledged before my Subcommittee on Military Operations as inadvertent. The potential genetic damage from radiation was dismissed with the casual comment that "There is a rather wide range of admissible opinion on this subject".

Radiostrontium, the bone-seeking, cancer-producing radioactive substance which can linger for years, gets brief notice in the 1955 release of the Atomic Energy Commission, but the public is almost told that the dangers are so remote as to be negligible. The public is further advised that the 1950 handbook, The Effects of Atomic Weapons, is being revised and brought up to date, but we are still awaiting its publication.

Although the Atomic Energy Commission has released a considerable body of technical data, scattered in speeches of Commissioners and in scientific journals, it has been grossly tardy and negligent in educating the American public in the harsh realities of nuclear weapon effects.

This tardiness and negligence is characteristic, too, of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, which has not even begun to discharge its responsibility in any meaningful sense for the protection of the American people against nuclear attack.

As my time is limited I will refer to two bills, introduced in this Congress, which deal with atomic problems. Both of these bills have been endorsed by the AFL–CIO, I am happy to say.

The first bill is H. R. 2154, the Gore-Holifield reactor development bill. This bill advocates Government construction, without further delay, of 3 or 4 large power reactors in safe areas (away from heavily populated centers). Its purpose is to maintain United States leadership in the international race to harness the atom.

Cheap energy is the basis for an increased standard of living. If we can offer the key to cheap energy to the have not nations of the world, we will have the advantage over Communist economic penetration. It's just as simple as that. If the Soviets beat us in this race, they will be able to penetrate the so-called neutral nations first on an economic base and then on a political base.

Our fight on this bill is against a stubborn administrative position backed by the huge, privately owned utilities and machinery manufacturers, who see in this new promise of cheap energy, only the opportunity for private profit and monopoly control of our future.

The second bill is H. R. 2125, a bill to authorize an effective civil defense in the United States. The administration has refused to face the problem of protecting our people from the horror of a possible nuclear war—a war in which deadly radiation would destroy many more millions than those destroyed by the immediate bomb hits.

The key to this effective civil defense is an underground shelter system which might cost 15 to 20 billion dollars.

I say this one-time-cost is small when compared with an annual military budget of 35 to 40 billion dollars.

If a nuclear war comes and we do not have these shelters, it is estimated that 75 to 100 million people could be destroyed. We should start now to prevent the possibility of such a catastrophe.

In closing, I ask of you continued alertness—continued support of the legislation which your organizations have endorsed.

## A Great Labor Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 28, 1957*

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, each year the leaders of the building and construction trades section—AFL–CIO—gather in our Nation's Capital for a 3-day legislative conference. These national meetings have been attended, both last year and this year, by more than 2,800 leaders in these unions.

The building and construction trades unions are among the oldest in the Nation. They have held for many scores of years the confidence and respect of both the employers of these crafts and of the general public as patriotic and constructive organizations that work constantly for the welfare of their members and the general good of the Nation.

I was honored last year and again this year by being invited by the leaders of this great labor organization to be one of the speakers at its annual meeting. I was proud and pleased to accept the invitation.

I include here the address I made to these unions on Thursday at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, D. C., a meeting which President Richard Gray, the head of this great labor organization, told me was attended by more than 2,800 labor delegates. My address follows:

A TRIBUTE TO A GREAT LABOR ORGANIZATION THAT IS HELPING BUILD A STRONGER AND HAPPIER AMERICA

(By Representative RUSSELL V. MACK, Member of Congress from the State of Washington)

President Gray and representatives of the building and construction trades section (AFL–CIO). I thank you, President Gray, for your kind and generous praise of my efforts in the Congress to secure a fair deal for labor.

I have supported your labor groups in the committees and on the floor of Congress because I was convinced that your cause was right, fair, and just. The millions of workers in your great labor building and construction trades organization were entitled to the protection of the Davis-Bacon labor provisions in the highway bill.

I will continue to work for the preservation for labor of the Davis-Bacon protection in all construction work that the Federal Government undertakes or helps to finance.

I also agree with President Eisenhower and the members of your organization that certain changes should be made in the Taft-Hartley law, and I hope these will be made at the present session of Congress. President Eisenhower is recommending to Congress, I understand, that changes in the Taft-Hartley law be made. I shall support these changes in that law which your members and President Eisenhower both recommend be adopted.

I come today to talk to you about the great new expanded highway program, the legislation for which was written by the committee of which I am a member. Helping to write this expanded highway bill was one of the most interesting and satisfying experiences I have had in my 10 years in Congress and makes a greater contribution to the welfare of the United States and its people than anything I ever have done in public life.

No group is more interested in good highway legislation than the members of your building and construction trades since they will supply nearly all of the labor required to build this great new system of public roads for which last year's highway bill provides.

The new expanded highway program authorized last year by Congress and now rapidly getting under way will be the biggest public-works project ever undertaken by mankind in all the history of the world.

Compared to this colossal roads program, the building of the Egyptian Pyramids, the Roman Appian Way, the digging of the Panama Canal, the construction of the Grand Coulee Dam, and the erection of the Empire State Building, all of which long have been considered among the construction-engineering wonders of the world, were insignificant, pygmy projects.

Under the highway bill passed by Congress last year, a $51 billion roads-building program will be carried to completion during the next 13 years. Of this money, $24½ billion will be new and additional Federal money over and above any amounts heretofore spent by the Federal Government for highways.

That you may grasp something of the magnitude of this road program, let me say to you that this $24½ billion of extra Federal funds that will go into the building of roads is sufficient to build 70 Panama Canals, or 90 Grand Coulee Dams, or 450 Empire State Buildings.

Man in all his history never has had any experiences that enables his mind to understand or grasp the colossal magnitude of this leviathan new roads-building program.

Figures supplied me by the Federal Bureau of Roads reveal that the 13-year road-building program will require such astronomical quantities of materials as 49 million tons of steel, 1,399 million barrels of cement, 128 million tons of bituminous materials, 7.1 billion board feet of lumber, 48 million tons of concrete pipe, and 1,812 million pounds of explosives.

The 13-year Federal expanded highway program enacted last year by Congress and started this year by the Federal Government is rapidly getting under way, and soon will be supplying 120,000 new and additional jobs for construction workers over and above the numbers now employed at roadbuilding. Another 80,000 additional new jobs also will be created by the highway program in road-building material operations and in factories of the building-equipment industry.

These figures, I am sure, will convince all of you that "happy days are here again" for the American construction industry and all those, who, like the members of your union, work in that industry.

The very availability of this vast spending power in the hands of the President of the United States, with these expenditures to be equitably distributed in all parts of the Nation, assures a high level of prosperity and employment for our American people for the foreseeable future.

The very existence of such a program is the best possible insurance the Nation could have against a depression or recession. If a temporary dip in employment and prosperity should occur anytime, anywhere in the 48 States during the next 13 years this program can be speeded up thereby restoring

full employment in any area where greater employment is needed.

There is another desirable feature of this expanded roads program. It will save lives. Last year, 40,300 Americans, many of them children, were killed in traffic accidents. The traffic safety experts say that present indications are that more than 50,000 will be killed in traffic accidents annually by 1965 by which time there will be many more automobiles on the highways than now. But these traffic safety experts also say that the better roads now being built will lessen the traffic death rate by at least 20 percent. In short, when this great road system, now under construction, is completed, it will save 8,000 to 10,000 American lives a year.

Believe it or not, this great $51 billion system of new roads the Nation will build during the next 13 years is not going to cost taxpayers anything. These new roads will pay for themselves out of the savings which they make possible for the automobile owner.

True, to finance this gigantic program the automobile owner is paying an additional tax of 1 cent a gallon on his gasoline and diesel fuel. Also, he is paying 3 cents a pound in additional taxes on new tires.

But the motorist will recapture the extra tax money he pays through the savings he will make, because of the better roads, on the wear and tear on his tires and his automobile, in the fewer and smaller repair bills he will be called upon to pay and also in the less chances he will run of having the heavy medical and hospital bills that result from automobile accidents. Also, the motorist, due to the increased safety of highway travel, probably will get reductions in his automobile accident insurance rates.

The new expanded highway program is the greatest public works project in man's history. You, the men of the building and construction trades unions, will play a major role in building these highways. By turning your hands to the great task of building this great best-in-the-world system of highways you will be rendering a great service to your country. You will be building for a better, a stronger, a safer, and a happier America.

---

## Humane Methods in the Slaughter of Livestock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 28, 1957*

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1957, I reintroduced a bill to require the use of humane methods in the slaughter of livestock and poultry in interstate and foreign commerce. This bill (H. R. 176) is now pending before the House Committee on Agriculture.

WHY COMPULSORY HUMANE SLAUGHTER LEGISLATION IS NEEDED

Over 30 years ago there was a strong movement throughout the civilized nations of the world for the institution of humane methods of slaughter. As a result of this movement the Netherlands, Norway, Scotland, Ireland, England, and parts of France, Germany, and Austria and other foreign nations enacted compulsory humane slaughter legislation. In the United States the meat-packing industry agreed to voluntarily institute humane methods of slaughter. In 1929 the American Meat Institute, the trade, research, and educational association of the meatpacking industry set up a special committee to develop improved methods of slaughter which would—

First. Be considered more humane than present practice.

Second. Be practical and economical in regular plant operations.

The efforts of the industry as a whole throughout the years indicate little or no real effort to solve the problems of developing improved methods of humane slaughter. Only in isolated plants has real progress or substantial results been achieved.

It appears obvious that the meatpacking industry has not chosen to proceed aggressively and conscientiously to voluntarily institute humane methods of slaughter and having had over 25 years in which to do so I believe one can assume that they never will institute such methods voluntarily.

Legislation in this area is certainly long overdue. Daily, we attempt to lead nations in matters of foreign affairs, often emphasizing and stressing the fact that we are a nation guided by humane principles. Such reasoning must appear hollow to people who long ago recognized the need for compulsory humane slaughter legislation and did something about it.

ECONOMIC FACTORS—(1) REDUCTION IN ACCIDENT RATE

Besides the humaneness of the thing, a compelling reason for modernizing slaughtering methods is the fact that accidents would be drastically reduced. The various humane methods—carbon dioxide or other gas, the captive bolt pistol and others would materially reduce the hazards present in our plants.

The latest figures of the Department of Labor show that accidents occur at almost double the rate in slaughterhouses as for all industrial activity combined. The average accident rate for all manufacturing in 1955 was 12.1 per million man-hours worked. For slaughterhouses the rate was 18.9 per million man-hours worked.

Preliminary figures from the Department for 1956 show a significant increase in the accident rate in slaughterhouses. For 1956 the accident rate jumped to 19.1 (first 9 months) per million hours while the average for manufacturing was 12.1 (first 9 months).

Here is a table setting forth these statistics for quick reference:

*Accident rates per million man-hours*

| Year | General manufacturing | Slaughterhouses (includes slaughtering and dressing only, not processing) |
|---|---|---|
| 1953 | 13.4 | 20.0 |
| 1954 | 11.9 | 19.4 |
| 1955 | 12.1 | 18.9 |
| 1956 [1] | 12.1 | 19.1 |

[1] Estimates by Department of Labor for 1st 9 months of 1956.

These safety figures should not be construed as an adverse reflection on the industry or labor unions involved. Both labor and management are credited with making a continuous strong effort to reduce accidents but it should be emphasized that present methods of slaughter are hazardous and I submit the introduction of humane methods—whereby immobile, unconscious animals are substituted for kicking, screaming animals—would materially contribute to a reduction in packinghouse accident. Lost man-hours, injury, and medical expenses are of benefit to none. Humane slaughtering methods can reduce this unnecessary economic loss.

(2) REDUCTION IN BRUISED AND DAMAGED MEAT

Apart from the compelling considerations to accord humane treatment to the animals involved, the use of humane techniques in slaughtering could have important and beneficial economic consequences for the meat packing industry.

Perhaps the most important would be the reduction in bruised and damaged meat. It is presently estimated that as much as $50 million worth of meat is rendered unsalable annually because of damage coincident with the slaughtering process. This loss could be reduced substantially if humane methods were employed. An unconscious animal is easy to work with, presents no problem in the subsequent killing process, and thus the prospect of loss in dressing is reduced to an important degree.

Secondly, it should be noted that meatpacking companies would be entitled to the generous depreciation rate of the internal revenue code in charging off the cost of new installations necessary to accomplish humane slaughtering.

Under the 1954 Revenue Act this depreciation can be accomplished at twice the rate previously allowed.

Enactment of this legislation requiring new installations would not place the packing industry in any less favorable position than other industries which are subject to legislation and regulation. All public carriers, for example, are obliged to maintain safety devices called for in law. These costs are a part of doing business.

The same circumstances would obtain for the packing industry under this proposed legislation. Furthermore the legislation gives the industry a voice in the final determination of the new methods to be used. There would be no arbitrary decision involved or enforced.

HUMANE SLAUGHTERING METHODS AND COSTS

One of the most frequently voiced objections to this legislation is the statement that advocates of humane methods do not agree on a specific technique to be used. This is certainly not a valid argument. The legislation would establish in law the fact that a humane system of slaughtering shall be practiced in those humane slaughtering plants whose products move in interstate commerce. The legislation reserves to the industry and the Secretary of Agriculture the right to determine the best humane method to be employed. Different animals present different slaughtering problems, and it is proper that the law allow flexibility to meet every need.

While it is difficult to estimate the total cost of converting the packing industry to humane methods, some useful data is available.

The captive bolt pistol and the new Remington stunning instrument cost

less than $200. The electric stunning equipment is relatively inexpensive.

But perhaps the most significant advance in humane slaughtering in this country was the perfection of an immobilizing unit for hogs which is now in operation at the Austin (Minn.) plant of the George A. Hormel Co. This method using carbon monoxide gas to render the hog unconscious before sticking, was pioneered by Hormel engineers and has been in successful operation 3 years on a commercial scale.

Mr. L. W. Murphy of the Hormel Co. service division spoke before the American Meat Institute in 1952 and pointed out that the above method has the complete approval of the Department of Agriculture and he made these other significant observations:

> We are sure the method can be applied to other packinghouse livestock.
>
> * * * the hog was presented to the sticker so that he could operate at arm's length, accurately, safely, unhurried, and with cleanliness to himself.

Mr. Murphy pointed out with emphasis that the Hormel Co. has effected substantial savings in operating costs and has brought about improved working conditions. Mr. Murphy concludes:

> They alone (these savings) more than compensate us the cost of our years of research.

Incidentally, it might be noted that this company has reaped immeasurable benefits in good will because of this forward step.

This installation is concrete proof that humane methods can be combined successfully with practical business considerations. Several other smaller packing concerns have also adopted humane methods in recent years. These installations would seem to demolish the contention that it cannot be done.

The idea of protecting our animals from unnecessary pain and suffering is certainly not new and unique. It is, indeed, interesting to note that man at one time sought and received statutory protection for his animals before the same protection was given to human beings. In 1866 the first anticruelty legislation was passed in the United States. This legislation made cruelty to animals—such as the man beating his horse on the street—punishable by fine and imprisonment. At this time there were no statutory laws to prevent cruelty to children. Parents and guardians in the United States had the legal right, under the common law, to treat their children as they saw fit. The only deterrent to vicious and cruel treatment of children was a moral obligation not to do so.

The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals was constantly besieged with cases of cruel treatment to children but the laws at the time provided no remedy for such actions. Then one day the case of Mary Ellen was brought to the attention of Henry Bergh, a leader in the anticruelty movement. This little girl was daily the victim of viciously cruel treatment by her guardians. They kept her chained to a bedpost, dressed only in a thin and dirty chemise, unchained her only to do housework, and punished her regularly with a big leather whip and with fierce prods of scissors. Mr. Bergh could stand it no longer. He went to the State legislature and got the 1866 act—an act better to prevent cruelty to animals, amended—so that in 1874 it prohibited acts of cruelty to "every living creature"—and in November of 1874 the courts declared this to include children and thereby the Mary Ellens were given statutory protection against cruel and inhumane treatment. Soon specific legislation to prevent cruelty to children was enacted, and a society to prevent cruelty to children established.

In closing let me say that progress in any field has not come easily or willingly on the part of those persons, groups, or business interests affected. But when it can be demonstrated—as indeed the weight of evidence does in humane slaughtering—that a beneficiary result will be obtained for all concerned, we cannot, in good conscience, delay this legislation any longer.

It is my earnest hope that humane slaughter legislation will be acted upon favorably during this session of Congress. I am certain that you will find an overwhelming majority of our people in agreement.

---

## Good Government Award to Senator Karl E. Mundt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, February 28, 1957*

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Last Friday night, on the anniversary of the birthday of George Washington, the American Good Government Society presented its award for distinguished service to two great Americans, my senior colleague [Mr. MUNDT] and the honorable WILLIAM L. COLMER, of Mississippi, a Member of the House of Representatives.

The presentation to the senior Senator from South Dakota, my colleague, was made by another of our distinguished colleagues, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. With the consent of the Senate, I offer for printing in the RECORD the citation given in the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina and, following that, the response by the Senator from South Dakota.

Then, to show that my distinguished colleague is not without honor in his own State, I ask leave to insert thereafter an editorial from the Rapid City Daily Journal.

There being no objection, the addresses and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR STROM THURMOND, DEMOCRAT, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, ON PRESENTING THE GEORGE WASHINGTON AWARD TO SENATOR KARL E. MUNDT ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN GOOD GOVERNMENT SOCIETY AT THE HOTEL STATLER IN WASHINGTON, FEBRUARY 22, 1957

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, any award made in the name of the first President of this great country should be made to a recipient who is of the same high character and integrity, and who has the same courageous statesmanship which set George Washington apart from others in the fight for representative government.

I congratulate the trustees of the American Good Government Society on selecting the man named on the scroll which I have the honor of presenting tonight. He measures up to the standards set in the early days of this Nation by the Father of our Country.

In every way he has demonstrated that he possesses the ability, the integrity, the penetrating interest and understanding of public affairs, and the unbounded capacity for work, which are the essentials of an outstanding representative of the people of this country.

He had been successful in several fields of endeavor before entering public life. He is a compelling speaker whose words attract the attention of citizens all over this Nation. They recognize him for the patriotic public servant that he is.

After his experience as a member of the Un-American Activities Committee in the House of Representatives, he was instrumental in the enactment of legislation in 1950 to establish the Subversive Activities Control Board. Then, as now, many people did not see the necessity for such an organization, but all of us should be grateful to this man that he had the courage and vision to sponsor this legislation.

Another achievement I want to mention is the success he has had in developing a national consciousness of the desirability for reformation of the electoral college system. Here again he has exhibited courage as well as a deep concept of how practical measures should be applied to the functioning of government so as to more truly reflect the will of the people.

Many times this man has shown his adherence to the principles of constitutional government by his advocacy of the rights of the States as delineated in the Constitution.

I am proud to call him my personal friend and I am happy to present this scroll to the senior United States Senator from South Dakota, the Honorable KARL E. MUNDT.

The inscription on the scroll reads as follows:

"KARL E. MUNDT

"Farmer, educator, statesman, master of forensic arts, has served the people of South Dakota and the Nation for 18 years in the Congress of the United States—the last 8 in the United States Senate.

"Among his notable achievements are the provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950, which established the Subversive Activites Control Board to halt Communist subversion; and the creation by Congress of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, to reemphasize Hamilton's enduring contributions to the cause of personal liberty and national independence—separation of powers and checks and balances in State and Nation, honor and integrity in Government, and immortality of the public credit.

"Senator MUNDT has raised the twin standards of political realinement in Congress and reform of the electoral college, to the end that the separate powers of the President and Congress shall rest on the same principles of representation, thus serving his creed: 'A fair chance for a free people.'"

---

GEORGE WASHINGTON DINNER AWARD, AMERICAN GOOD GOVERNMENT SOCIETY, FEBRUARY 22, 1957

(Response by Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota)

Mr. President, distinguished guests at the head table, fellow Americans. Certainly to receive a certification of this kind from an organization like this makes one at the same time feel very humble and very happy. I recall being in the audience in 1953 when the first annual Good Government Award was presented. It was presented at that time to

two good friends of yours and mine, the late Senator from Ohio, Senator Bob Taft, and Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia.

Nothing was further from my mind that night certainly than that the time would come when I would be standing here receiving an award of that type from the American Good Government Society. And for that, I certainly wish to thank you all very much indeed.

To you, Senator THURMOND, for that altogether too generous statement in connection with the presentation of this award, I am doubly grateful to have it come not only from a warm personal friend but from a great statesman in his own right from a great State in a great section of the country.

And to Senator Burke, the president of the Good Government Society, and the trustees of the society, I am certainly more than grateful for the generosity expressed in the words recorded on the scroll which I have been awarded here tonight. I am especially grateful that this scroll referred to my work in connection with the Internal Security Act of 1950 because that was a bill which most of you recall as the old Mundt-Nixon bill, which we batted around the Halls of Congress for a good long while. You remember the long, hard, bruising battle that we had to finally get it enacted into law. I think virtually every Member of the Senate and the House who is here tonight voted for that bill when the chips were down and it was necessary to decide whether we could pass it over a Presidential veto as it ultimately was done.

I think that ensuing events have demonstrated that our decision then was right when we decided that the best approach to communism in this country was not an attempt to delude ourselves into a sense of false security by a statutory outlawing of the party but instead to permit it to operate but compel it to come out of the dark and into the open and expose itself.

The years since then have pretty clearly demonstrated what so many thought correctly was the situation then, and that is that the germs of communism on American soil once they were treated to the pitiless spotlight of public opinion could not advance and grow when they had been identified so people could clearly know them for what they were. Communism can withstand almost any other attack on our homefront except complete exposure and pinpointed identification. The cowardly self-serving little men and women who still cling to communism lack either the good cause or the great courage required to promote their doctrines effectively in an open battle for the minds of men. And this act, along with others, has caused the rats among us to come out of the dark and squeal ineffectively in the open or else perish in the confines of their own dark and infested dens.

I would also like to say here that it was the American Good Government Society that first interested me in the possibilities of an Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission.

When I spoke before this annual dinner in 1954, on George Washington's Birthday—Yesterday and Today—I mentioned the fact the society has already established a committee to see that the 200th anniversary of Alexander Hamilton's birth was properly signalized. I remember praising the society for this leadership and offering whatever cooperation I could provide.

Sometimes it is wondered on Capitol Hill whether any of the many speeches that we give ever produce results or win decisions. I can testify to the fact that sometimes they do because I so convinced myself in talking about Alexander Hamilton that night that I introduced a resolution creating the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission and ended up as its chairman.

Most of you, I am sure, have seen or read something about the work of this Commission.

We have sent each Member of Congress a copy of the new book edited by Prof. Richard B. Morris of the Department of History, Columbia University, entitled "The Basic Ideas of Alexander Hamilton." Preparation of this pocket-book compilation of the writings of Hamilton has led Professor Morris to a larger compilation of Hamilton's writings designed, I believe, to become the standard one-volume Hamilton reference work.

The third new book published this year is Alexander Hamilton in the American Tradition, by Dean Louis M. Hacker of the School of General Studies of Columbia University. We are also proud of the great project under way at Columbia University to edit and publish a definitive edition of The Papers of Alexander Hamilton. Dr. John A. Krout, whom you have already heard this evening, is chairman of the editorial board of this project which is financed by private funds of $200,000 made available by Time, Inc., and the Rockefeller Foundation.

I am sure you are all also aware of the new 3-cent Alexander Hamilton commemorative stamp issued in New York City on January 11th—his 200th birthday. In addition, a British stamp was issued the same day on the Island of Nevis where Hamilton was born.

Insofar as we have been able to determine, this is the first time in history the 2 governments have honored 1 man simultaneously with a commemorative stamp. Also, we are told it is the first time a British stamp has been issued in honor of an American.

In cooperation with the Department of the Treasury, your commission has established an Alexander Hamilton exhibit in the Department of the Treasury here in Washington. Displayed there are priceless historical items and you are all invited to visit this exhibit.

A major undertaking was finalized this week when plans were completed for holding a series of contests in high schools and colleges for Alexander Hamilton commemorative scholarships and fellowships. Frederick C. Crawford, chairman of the board of Thompson Products Co., Cleveland, Ohio, has accepted chairmanship of a committee of prominent Americans who will raise $400,000 from private sources for this purpose.

However, our Commission seeks not to glorify Hamilton, the man—but rather it is our purpose to emphasize the quality and permanence of his work on the foundations of the Government of the United States under the Constitution.

As has been indicated here by earlier speakers tonight, it seems that we face in this country a crisis in good government—a sort of constitutional crisis. For more than 20 years we have witnessed, all of us, a tendency for a growth of the Central Government—in power and strength and cost far beyond that anticipated by our constitutional forefathers. Certainly it has grown far beyond what we would anticipate by a careful reading of the 10th amendment of the Constitution which I have always construed to be the headstone of our Bill of Rights.

Since 1940, at least, we have had developing in this country what, in my opinion, is something of an American phenomenon because it has been a whole series of pretty sharp disagreements between the executive branch of Government and the legislative branch of Government. Disagreements over matters of substance and importance in policy and in principle. Disagreements which in the main have not been attributable to differences of political affiliations, not simply created out of a situation such as we have now where the President is of one political party and the Congress is of another or such as we had during the 80th Congress when with reverse English we had a President of one political party and a Congress of another. Differences which, in my opinion, are deeper rooted than that. Rooted in the fact that there is developing, it seems to me, an executive position or an executive attitude vis-a-vis a congressional or a legislative attitude in Congress and it seems to me as those differences become increasingly apparent we approach a crisis in this whole business of good government.

I might say here tonight for the benefit of those who have come from Mississippi and South Dakota and from many other States across the length and breadth of this land and who are not regularly inhabitants upon the Hill, that you find here seated in this room tonight in the main Democrats and Republicans who while they have differed frequently at election time have agreed even more frequently when it comes to voting in the Halls of Congress. It has been a long source of personal perplexity to me why it is that a coalition or a working machine or a political mechanism which for 20 years has been able to go far and do much in Congress toward preserving constitutional government in America should not be able to extend its ramparts out to the voting precincts of this country so that parties can begin meaning more than they do once again in American political life, and so that like-minded people can vote together effectively for President regardless of where they live geographically or how they are registered politically.

I think it would be a wonderful thing if behind these congressional Democrats and Republicans represented here tonight in the Statler Hotel in this dining hall we could create lines of party affinity running into the courthouses and into the statehouses and into the voting places of all the States in the Union. I have a feeling that the course of events in American history would be different if we had this same kind of working arrangement among people generally that has done so much and meant so much to America as it has operated for many years in the Halls of Congress. I believe political realinement is long overdue in this country and that the time is here, now, when we should begin thinking about what our parties should clearly advocate and where we should best find ourselves to have the greatest degree of congeniality and sympathy with other people of the party.

In addition to that, another reason why this executive position and the legislative position have come to clash so frequently even among members of the same political party stems from the fact that we elect our Presidents from one voting constituency and elect our Congressmen from quite a different constituency.

This grows out of the electoral college system where by practice, use, custom, and necessity we have gradually adopted the system of bloc voting in the electoral college—the system of winner take all in a general ticket approach—so that when the voters have voted in the polls in November, the electors whose votes actually chose the President vote in blocs when they meet in December to determine the deciding votes. In December of last year, for example, in all of our State capitols, members of the electoral college met to decide who should be the President of the United States, casting votes not in accordance with the way voters back home had cast them but casting them on a basis of winner take all. The winner taking the votes of the loser as well and voting them all one way for President.

Let's take what happened in December in New York State, for an example, our biggest, our most potent and powerful State of the Union. There in December at Albany, N. Y., 45 electors met to cast their votes in the electoral college. I wonder if it wouldn't be a splendid lesson in American political life if somehow or other on the same occasion we could have taken the 45 members of the New York congressional delegation and had

their meeting at the same time in the city of Albany, N. Y. After all, with the exception of Senator IVES, all of the 45 had been elected in the same election, in the same campaign, at the same day in November as the members of the electoral college. But when they came to vote in the electoral college the 43 electoral votes given to New York State because of its 43 Congressmen and the two awarded it because of its 2 Senators, the 45 voted in toto—45 votes for the Republican candidate for President. Actually, of course, had the Senator and Representatives themselves done the voting, the men who had been elected at the same election by the people voting in their respective parties, the people from whom the electoral college delegates got the votes that enabled them to vote at all, we would have had quite a different vote because there, there were 27 Republicans and 16 Democrats elected to Congress from New York State last November.

It seems to me that points up to the fact that there is a reason why we find this growing tendency to have disagreement between the legislative branch of Government and the executive branch. Take Texas, for example; twice within 4 years the electoral college vote of Texas has gone unanimously for a Republican President and with 1 notable exception all the members of the Texas congressional delegation have been Democrats. Louisiana, in the last election, cast its electoral vote unanimously Republican and as far as I know, Louisiana has not sent a Republican Member to the Congress since the War Between the States. I point this up to indicate that if we could find a way so that the same constituencies voted for President as voted for Congress, I think it would eliminate this tendency for a growing centralized government in Washington and the tendency for there to be an executive position differing from a legislative position.

In company with STROM THURMOND, in company with FRED COUDERT of the State of New York, and others, I have introduced a simple amendment which would do exactly that. It would have the electors to our electoral college elected from precisely the same districts as the Congressmen and at the same time, and in the same manner. So that each congressional district expressing itself for a Congressman could also express itself for an elector to vote for one candidate or the other. So that, in the main, you wouldn't have the kind of situation which you have with all the electors going one way and many Members of Congress going another. It certainly would bring about a closer meeting of minds on the problems which confront the voters as they try frantically once in 4 years to write the pattern of performance they would like to have in America.

This amendment would do something in addition to that—it would do away with the most conspicuous class of second-class voters that we have in the country and that is the situation whereby a single voter in New York State when he votes puts 45 electoral votes into motion. If one voter in New York breaks the tie of the popular vote his vote thunders with the power of 45 electoral votes. An equally intelligent voter, equally wise and careful and cautious and prudent, voting in the State of Delaware if his vote breaks the tie of the popular vote in that State, his vote counts for only 3 electoral votes. So each New York voter actually has 15 times as much vote power and influence in a Presidential campaign as an equally intelligent citizen from Delaware and measured against your own State wherever you live, the disparity is not quite as great but it is also there. You too are second-class citizens.

None of us are first-class citizens in a presidential election today unless we live in New York when it comes to voting for President under our present electoral college system. And that means, of course, the pressure groups operate to secure the clusters of votes available in the congested cities of America and that 8 or 10 or 12 crowded metropolitan areas have tended to have a tremendous influence in what we write in national platforms, in whom we nominate for national President, and in how we elect the candidates for the other end of the Avenue because, necessarily, that great influence is imbedded in our electoral college system. But because it is not necessary for very many Congressmen to make appeals to clusters of votes in crowded areas, to make appeals to groups and pressure organizations, we get a different congressional viewpoint up on Capitol Hill and I think we should reconcile those points of view by constitutional amendment. To do so would go far toward correcting what I consider a most unwise tendency to have too much of our spending and to have too much of our tax authority and too many of our functions operated from Washington. My amendment would tend to put the Government back where Hamilton and Washington wanted it to be: in the hands of the people. It would tend to give the people of all States an equal voice in selecting not alone their Members of Congress but also Presidents and Vice Presidents. It would put the same constituency behind both groups of candidates and I think do more than any one thing to bring about permanent conditions which would keep budgets in balance and do more than any one thing to discontinue encroachments by the Federal Government on the domains of the separate States. It would also do more than any one thing to dignify again the individual in America and in American political life because each of us then would be as important as a voter in the State of New York.

So I suggest as we conclude tonight that as we ponder over the changes that have occurred in the 225 years since the birth of Washington and the 200 years since the birth of Hamilton, as we try to find the causes for the situations of which we disapprove, so that we may find the answers to the problems which seem so prodigious. I propose that we think a little bit about our political machinery. Much of this mechanism isn't in the Constitution; it just grew up like Topsy and necessity compels each State of ours to cast its electoral votes en bloc—en masse—and if by constitutional amendment we break them up we move back in the direction of putting government in the hands of the people. I would say in all sincerity to these fine Democrats here tonight with whom I have served so long and these fine Republicans from Capitol Hill, that after more than 100 years now of having our two political parties we're convinced I know that we want to maintain a two-party system in America. But perhaps we should reexamine what's behind the labels of the parties, perhaps a transmigration of political forces in this country would find most of us happier if we could surround ourselves with some new faces as we picked recruits from one area and lost supporters to another. We should rebuild our parties around principles and policies as clearly definable as the positions of the group of Congressmen you find here tonight quite regardless of their party preference.

I recall with Hamilton his words when he said: "We are laboring hard to establish in this country principles which are free from all foreign ingredients, so that we may be neither Greeks nor Trojans but truly Americans." We have something unique in America but something which we uniquely must continue to keep functioning and in tune with the times adjusted to influences which otherwise can use machinery which has not been kept up to date to challenge and undo the work of these great forefathers of ours.

And with Washington tonight let us conclude by saying as he did "Let us raise a high standard to which the wise and honest may repair. The event is in the hand of God." As it was then, so it is now. Thank you all very much indeed.

---

[From the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Daily Journal of February 5, 1957]

GREAT HONOR FOR SENATOR MUNDT

South Dakota's Senator KARL E. MUNDT has been selected for one of the American Good Government Society's two 1957 George Washington Day awards.

These awards are presented annually on George Washington's birthday, at a dinner in Washintgon. The honorees are chosen for outstanding contribution to good government.

Senator MUNDT will share honors this year with Representative WILLIAM M. COLMER, dean of the Mississippi congressional delegation.

Senator MUNDT was first elected as East River Congressman in 1938. He served most usefully and with distinction in the House of Representatives until 1948 when he was elected United States Senator. He was reelected to the Senate in 1954.

Among Senator MUNDT'S many accomplishments, perhaps his outstanding contribution has been his efforts to win the world battle for men's minds. He is coauthor of the Smith-Mundt bill which brings foreign students and leaders to this country where they have an opportunity to better understand the United States. The same law enables American students and leaders to travel abroad, learning the problems and getting to know the people of other nations.

Senator MUNDT also is the "father" of the Voice of America program and the United States Information Agency which tell the truth about America abroad through libraries, lecturers, and other mediums.

Senator MUNDT constantly works for the benefit of the people of his State. He has been influential in the Missouri River development program with its benefits of power, irrigation, navigation, recreation, and flood control.

He has worked hard to attract industry to South Dakota and to develop the national parks and forests, minerals and agriculture in the State.

MUNDT is coauthor of the pending Mundt-Coudert electoral college amendment which is designed to localize the power of minority groups in presidential elections.

He believes that conservative, patriotic Americans are in a big majority in this country, but that they are divided by traditional party ties. MUNDT is convinced that such a division has played into the hands of the Communists, Communist-fronters and other leftist elements in their program to divide the American people and destroy the system of private enterprise that has made ours a great Nation.

Senator MUNDT and Congressman COLMER will take places of honor by the side of Virginia's Harry Byrd and Howard Smith, Ohio's Bob Taft and George Humphrey, Texas' Allan Shivers, Herbert Hoover and Georgia's Walter George, who have received the Good Government Society's George Washington Day awards during recent years.

Mr. RUSSELL subsequently said: Mr. President, a moment ago, when the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] obtained consent to have an insertion made in the RECORD, I sought to get in one word edgewise, before he surrendered the floor. However, the controversy over the O'Mahoney amendment prevented my doing so. I understand that he inserted in the RECORD an award

which had been made to his distinguished colleague the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] for his valiant services in the cause of good government.

Mr. President, I merely wish to make this brief observation: The information that this deserved award has been made gives me hope for the quality of awards of this kind which may be made in the future. In my book, if any Member of the Senate deserves to receive a reward for constructive service to good government and for courageous service to his country, it is the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

## The Challenge of Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 28, 1957*

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address recently delivered by our colleague from Florida, the Honorable WILLIAM C. CRAMER, to the graduating class of Tampa University, and an editorial from the Tampa Morning Tribune of February 9, 1957, complimenting Mr. CRAMER on his speech:

THE CHALLENGE OF TOMORROW

(Address by Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER, of Florida, before the graduating class, Tampa University, February 7, 1957)

I am highly honored and privileged to have this opportunity to address this group of promising young Americans who are looking forward to—and I am sure will be willing to accept—the challenge of tomorrow. You are to be congratulated for having spent many tedious and trying hours in preparing yourselves for more productive future lives through higher education. You have surmounted one of the important hurdles of life and are today being justly rewarded by receiving these degrees.

The community should be proud of the ability and tenacity which each of you has displayed in order to merit your degrees. You likewise, of course, are justifiably proud of your present successes, and I share with you in that pride and wholeheartedly compliment you.

It is fortunate that you have so equipped yourselves, for you have before you as young men and women, in my opinion, the greatest challenge of the ages. Our world today, of which the United States is a fulcrum point, is developing technologically, economically and spiritually with giant strides. The longer the stride over the shorter period being made today in the fields of science, medicine, the betterment of international relations, and industry, just as examples, indicates first how well the present generation has accepted their challenge and indicates further how greater the challenge will be to you.

What are some of these challenges? In the field of science and chemistry, you, the youth of today, will probably conquer space and answer the mysteries of outer space; you will be developing new and unheard of peaceful uses for nuclear and atomic energy. You will be thus accepting the challenge bequeathed to you by many of today's leaders. President Eisenhower has spoken to the world through the United Nations urging other free nations to join with us in the common goal of harnessing this newly discovered energy which, when fully developed, undoubtedly will mean better lives for all. Your Government last year appropriated $400 million for research in this field.

The doctors having answered the challenge already in our time presented by infantile paralysis, must now accept the challenge presented by the number one killer, heart trouble, and the second killer, cancer, and through research you will be participating in this challenge and the span of life through your efforts will be increasing even in greater measure than the some 20-year increase over the last 50 years of effort.

Yes, even military strategists, who we all pray some day will be needed only to police the peaceful nations of the world, at present and for a lengthy foreseeable future must accept the challenge of keeping America prepared and in the forefront in the development of war materiel. Recent experience has shown that we must deal from a position of greatest strength in order that our ultimate goal of world peace might be gained, and that the continuing threat of Communist aggression and oppression might be successfully met. The challenge of today and tomorrow in the field of military preparedness is the greatest in our history. This is a period of transition—transition to jet aircraft, intercontinental missiles, nuclear-powered ships, higher power through more effective rockets of every description, redeployment of troops and equipment to conform to this transition. Fifty-nine percent of this year's recommended budget of $71.8 billion is being spent to meet this challenge and that of national security. Your further challenge will be to see that these fabulous sums spent today for this purpose will not have been spent in vain and that this great strength shall be used by you as future leaders in the quest for permanent world peace.

The challenge to the ministers, the priests, the rabbis, is to keep all in this rapidly changing world of today in proper perspective; to keep us ever mindful when we are tempted to be preoccupied with such fast-moving events, that we must never become so self-centered as a result of our own accomplished miracles, that we forget that all of this springs from the fountainhead of Almighty God. To teach us further that if all of this is to mean anything, if our contribution is to be worthwhile in the short span of life given us, then our ultimate effort should be directed toward the permanent and peaceful brotherhood of mankind.

To the statesmen, to those of you who will participate, and I hope that each and every one of you will in some way, in what I believe to be one of the noblest professions, that of government, these swiftly moving events offer one of the greatest of all challenges. Ultimately the goal must be an orderly, lawful society where the rights of all are respected, where the duties of the collective republican form of government are fulfilled with the least individual coercion. You, as Americans, must be ever appreciative of the fact that you in your own right do the governing in our representative form of government where you choose your own leaders. It has often correctly been stated that bad government results from good people failing to participate.

Of course, the challenge is great in every other field, but I mention last but not least, the responsibility in the future of the educator whose job it is to make certain that the young men and women of all this Nation and the world seek out the truth, foresight, perseverance and training to make them, as yourselves, the future leaders in these fields; to equip you fully to be capable of accepting this challenge. This is the greatest challenge of the ages.

More and more in my short public life, particularly as a representative in the highest legislative tribunal in the world, the United States Congress, I realize how great are our responsibilities, not only to ourselves as American citizens, but to the world. Unquestionably, our Nation is in a dominant position, more so than probably at any other time in history. We are cast in the role of world leadership. I was taught in law school that every right which we enjoy under our legal scheme of things has a correlative duty. Likewise, when applied on a broader scale, our position of world leadership vests us with tremendous responsibilities. There is no doubt in my mind but that the inspirations gained by the people of Hungary, who learned of and know the freedoms we enjoy in this country, became the torch that lit one of the national revolts against communistic tyranny. The United States, and the freedom that its people enjoy, as exemplified by the torch held on high by the Statue of Liberty and seen by all who seek to gain admission to this Nation, is the light that gives hope in the hearts of the Communist-dominated peoples of the world and other freedom loving nations seeking selfdetermination. It is the hope of those, who like ourselves, seek the security of permanent peace, it is the hope of those who suffer in poverty and ill health, those who live in antiquity and discomfort. It is our responsibility to see that this torch of hope continues to burn ever bright.

In the position of world leadership, I believe the moral fiber of our country has stiffened in recent years and that America has found new courage and strength. Our country today is accepting its challenge, not only in the field of military preparedness in order that we might perform on the stage of world politics in a position of greatest strength, but we have also gained new moral stature throughout the world. Recent pronouncements from the executive and legislative bodies clearly pronounce to the world that we intend to deal firmly with those who refuse to abide by law and rightness. Doing so, in the hope of strengthening the United Nations is the greatest hope for the accomplishment of our ultimate goal. One of the most gratifying votes I have had the privilege of casting was that of confirming President Eisenhower's position on Formosa, stating to the world, as well as to Red China, that should that nation violate the territorial integrity of Nationalist China, that our answer would be swift and certain.

In that same year, the Congress of the United States, as representative of all the American people, took a significant stand on a sound moral basis condemning colonialism throughout the world. Already this session, the President's Mideast doctrine has cleared the House and undoubtedly will pass the Senate. This doctrine acknowledges fully the responsibility of this Nation, calling initially for $200 million in economic aid to the nations in this area needing such aid, and military aid to fill the power vacuum before the Communists do so. At the same time, the President, and now the House of Representatives, has importuned the United Nations with the full power of our country behind it to settle this dispute on a fair and honorable basis. Dealing from this position, with a sound moral foundation, with adequate preparedness, and dealing firmly, the goal as announced by our President in his inaugural address, it is our prayer, can be achieved; that goal is "the building of a peace with justice in a world where moral law prevails:". Thus the leaders of today are accepting the challenge. Your challenge of tomorrow will be even greater. This effort today will be history tomorrow. Tomorrow's history rests with you. Tomorrow's history is your challenge.

Just the few matters touched upon indicating the responsibilities of your government today I hope will be convincing proof that in future years it is essential, in that

you are the leaders of the future, that you participate to the fullest extent in government, which is the medium through which history is made. Covernment work, elective, professional, or appointive, is noble work. The challenge is ever increasing as government becomes more complex and begins to accept greater responsibilities. Your government affects your everyday lives and under our system of representative government, by participating you can influence the effect that it has. What greater power over a person could an agency have than to determine whether you should be subject to service and sacrifice in time of war? What greater influence over a man's labors—over your labors, could there be than to oversee the negotiations of your working conditions with management—to deduct from your payroll taxes for the conduct of your government, social security for your future retirement? What greater control of your comforts of life than to supervise and license all public utilities and communications, to be responsible for the provision of adequate transportation facilities? These are just a few examples, but I believe just these few examples indicate the importance of your participation in the noble profession of government.

There are just a few thoughts concerning this profession and its fundamental philosophy that I would like to leave with you. I believe it essential that every American develop and cling to certain basic concepts, certain truths, that to me are self-evident in this field. Conviction with regard to these general concepts as expressed through your participation in working for those who will represent your beliefs is an essential element of our form of government. The expression of your conviction through your work is one of your greatest challenges. What are some of these convictions—these truths—that I believe to be self-evident?

The first, I believe, is that those who are governed best are those who are governed least. We must accept our responsibilities on the local level for solving the problems that are not specifically delegated to the Federal Government under our Constitution. We must reverse the trend most markedly developed in the last quarter century of looking expectantly to Washington for a solution to all of our problems. Obviously, carrying such an approach to its logical extreme will result in a concentration of power in one place, with a possible domination of one person, and eventually a socialistic state.

In connection with this, we must realize that the assumption by the Federal Government of jurisdiction over any program and the providing of Federal money to facilitate it, means at least to some degree, Federal control and if in the hands of wrong persons, could mean Federal dictation. There is, in my opinion, a very real threat being offered to these aforementioned concepts in Washington today. Perhaps the most concrete example is the proposal for Federal aid to education. We all want adequate schools but this has traditionally been accepted as a local responsibility.

I am firmly convinced that one of the major bulwarks guaranteeing future representative government is a diversity of teachings found best suited to serve not only the national but the local purpose, a finding which is presently determined in each locality. There should never be an opportunity presented for the Federal Government to control the teachings in our schools or the policies with respect to school operations. Although the President and I seem to disagree with respect to the wisdom of the school aid program, we do agree in the broader generality which he stated in his state-of-the-Union message in referring to his general concept of government: "May we know unity—without conformity." From a practical standpoint, tax money to support such a program comes from us on a local level and by the time it is returned from Washington it has been depleted by some 30 percent for administrative costs alone. This is one example of where we must accept the challenge on local responsibility. Failing to accept it undoubtedly will leave a void into which the Federal Government will asert itself and in so doing, will to some extent infringe upon our rights and privileges to control our local educational policies. I cite these concepts and the challenge offered by the effort to adhere to them in that I believe the trend towards the bigness of government in Washington and the accumulation therein of responsibility that has traditionally been State and local, has developed to alarming proportions of recent years and the necessity for reversing this trend is, in my opinion, the most imminent danger and the greatest challenge.

Though I do not intend to labor at length on these fundamental concepts, I would just like to cite 1 or 2 additional fundamental beliefs to which we must all adhere if we are to preserve the most successful form of government in the history of the world. We must at all times encourage the development of and curb encroachments on, our free enterprise competitive system, which, of course, is inimic to socialistic regimentation. Struggles concerning this are going on constantly in Washington today. Efforts are being made to get the Government out of businesses that can better be handled by private enterprise, particularly in the Defense Department. The great struggle over the question of whether the Federal Government or private enterprise should develop the great hydroelectric powerplants of the Nation continues unabated. These problems undoubtedly will be with you in the future.

The recognition of fiscal responsibility is essential in your Government as well as in private enterprise, as in the operation of your home. We should spend what we can afford to spend. We should operate on a balanced budget basis. We should accept the responsibilities of this generation to pay off our $269 billion indebtedness, that costs us $4 million daily in interest alone.

We must not solve emergency problems with permanent measures, but must recognize that such measures are temporary. They are only expedients at best, and, therefore, as soon as possible, we should relieve the American people of these emergency burdens. Some of these burdens have been relieved. Those imposed in time of war, such as price and rent controls, have been relieved. Others remain, such as excise taxes. But the real risk involved is that in the heat of a passing emergency, such as the present critical school shortage, we pass legislation of a permanent nature with which posterity will be saddled.

To sum up, and again to quote our President: "When dealing with peoples' problems, be human, be liberal. When dealing with their money, be conservative."

This is the challenge of tomorrow—this is the challenge of the ages. You will be called upon to meet this challenge. The manner in which you do this will constitute your legacy to posterity—to your children. You have, through your college education, better equipped yourselves to meet this challenge. I wish you every success and may your lives, each and every one, be happy and purposeful.

---

[From the Tampa Tribune of February 9, 1957]

STRAIGHT TALK FROM MR. CRAMER

Too many Southerners who shout about States' rights talk out of both sides of their mouths, as Gov. Marvin Griffin did in a recent message to the Georgia Legislature. In one breath he damned Federal intrusion upon State authority. In the next breath he boasted that Georgia led the Southeast in the amount of Federal aid funds obtained "in benefits for our people."

It is absurdly inconsistent to wave a States' rights banner with one hand and rattle a tin cup in Washington with the other. If the Federal Government takes over a State's financial responsibilities, it is inevitably going to take over more of that State's governmental powers.

This inconsistency of position has been particularly noticeable in the controversy over Federal aid to schools. Many Southern Congressmen apparently oppose a school building handout only if a desegregation string is specifically tied to it. Otherwise they'd vote for this new surrender of responsibility to Washington and brag to the voters back home how much Federal money they were bringing to the State.

We're happy to see that Congressman CRAMER, of the Tampa district, is not one of these.

In his talk to the University of Tampa graduating class, Mr. CRAMER pointed directly to the principle involved.

"We must accept our responsibilities on the local level for solving problems that are not specifically delegated to the Federal Government under our Constitution," he said. "We all want adequate schools but this traditionally has been accepted as a local responsibility. * * * It is time we reversed the trend of a last quarter century of looking expectantly to Washington for the solution of our problems."

And he pointed to a fundamental fact so often forgotten by voters and concealed by politicians: Federal aid is not "free" money. It comes right out of the pockets of local taxpayers—with the difference that a large part of it melts away in Federal administrative costs before it returns to the people from which it was collected.

The present special Federal aid to communities which, like Tampa, bear an abnormal school burden because of the presence of military installations can be justified. Here the Federal Government is helping meet a federally created problem.

But there certainly is no justification for the Federal Government to hand out money to meet normal public school needs which ought to be paid for from State and local taxes. Federal controls will follow this aid as surely as bills follow Christmas.

We commend to other Congressmen the stand taken by Congressman CRAMER. This is the kind of States' right talk which is good for both the South and the Nation.

---

## Federal Government Can Be Reduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 28, 1957*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the responsibility of every Member of Congress, it seems to me, is to evaluate the course of government in terms of basic principles. This is readily recognized at the beginning of a new term of Congress when, as at this time, the state of the Union message, the budget message, and the economic report outline the administration's program and the course recommended for study by the Congress. With these thoughts in mind, I was privileged to speak to a Lincoln Day dinner in Kingsport, Tenn., on February 23, 1957.

**The following remarks comprise my views concerning the Federal Government at this time:**

Mr. Chairman and fellow Republicans, it is unusual for me to be in the hills of Tennessee, but the gracious invitation of Congressman CARROLL REECE could not be refused. In fact, it's a real compliment to be wanted, and I hope you are not disappointed. My frequent feeling, as a newcomer to Washington, was that I was being carefully scrutinized and appraised. Sometimes I even felt the disappointment that I did not have two heads or some obvious abnormality to go along with being a Republican Congressman from Texas. Again, I hope you are not disappointed. However, you represent, in your Congressman, something of an outpost too, as I understand it. Possibly we have an unusual kinship between our districts. In any event I would be happy to enjoy the widespread acquaintance and friendship which your Congressman enjoys in Congress. There is much I could learn from CARROLL REECE, and, believe me, I am determined to learn. As a matter of fact, Texas has frequently benefited in the past from lessons from Tennessee. As you may know, a number of our statesmen came to Texas from Tennessee, although not all of them so revered in my family and district as is Davy Crockett. In this connection, were it not for Davy, my children would have been totally unimpressed with their father's new occupation.

Historically, men are judged after they leave us, and we see in Davy Crockett and in our revered President Abraham Lincoln a similarity of greatness which made this country what it is. Studying and remembering this remarkable man is a refreshing experience. Across the years his words are prophetic. With a background of 12 or more major defeats, including a nervous breakdown, death of a dear friend, and numerous unsuccessful political campaigns, he still said, "With God's help, I shall not fail." Of preserving our form of freedom-loving government and society as a beacon light for the entire world, Lincoln said, "We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last hope of earth * * * the fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the last generation."

This applies to each one of us, most obviously those entrusted in government, to represent his fellow men. At this point, you who are business people might ask yourself, as did I when approached, "Why be a Congressman?" Witnessing the typical businessman's participation in civic drives and other forms of community service, I might warn you that becoming a Congressman is just a further degree of that activity. So in my district it could have happened to any one of a number of businessmen.

However, worse things than this can happen, since public service is certainly a satisfying and gratifying experience. If anything, in maturing in this job I feel a greater humility as a result of serving 827,000 people of Dallas County and running head on into the great issues of the day on which I must vote "yes" or "no." The challenge is great and so is the opportunity for achievement. One other personal note, if you will permit: My reelection—and some highly placed political figures assured me I wouldn't return—has taught me something which I fervently hoped would be the case, and that is that a Congressman can vote his convictions and be reelected without regard for politics or political expediency as the end in itself, which I am afraid some public servants consider it to be. In the hustle and bustle of Washington affairs, with always more to be done than can be done, I am amazed at times how much work actually is accomplished under the peculiar strains imposed on the Congressmen. Maybe help from the Man upstairs is responsible as we try, in too short a time for deliberation, to solve the grave issues of the day in study and debate on the House floor. I don't know how smart we are, but we must try to find the right answers.

Maybe a Congressman on occasion is not as smart as the pressure groups would like him to be, yet a Congressman is always anxious to stay in touch with his constituents and to benefit from the ideas of the representatives of the various industries and businesses which he represents. We all recognize that the businessman's "pocketbook nerve" is always exposed and is very sensitive. Regardless of pressures, I endeavor to find the right answers to the troubling problems of our day. For example, since we are all quite interested in highways and transportation, let me illustrate with my experience on the Highway Subcommittee 2 years ago when I was the lone Republican in my committee and on the floor of the House to oppose the President's highway bond-financing program. It was necessary for me to debate against all the other Republican Members, including our respected Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey, who was representing the President's point of view. I maintained my position, believing in the pay-as-we-build principle, and it was with great delight that some months later Mr. Humphrey made it plain that he, too, believed in the pay-as-you-go plan for building the highways. He and the administration then supported the view that I had championed sometime before. I learned then, if I had not known it before, that the best politics is no politics; that the answer to the great issues of our day lies in the facts and in principle and not in "political expediency," or "in order to get along you have got to go along." How interested in government are you, or better still, how interested in government should you be, for yourself, your children, and generations to come.

Certain I am that some politicians, motivated simply by the desire for reelection and political expediency, underestimate the intelligence of our citizens. However, there are those who say that the people are uninformed and uninterested in government, or to quote a Congressman during the debate recently on the new Federal budget and the terrific sums of money involved there, said rather pessimistically: "People do not seem to care any more." I wonder do you care or don't you? How much money is taken from your income for Government purposes, for programs which may not represent your philosophy of government at all? How interested are you in Government programs? You see, the Government has no money that it does not take from the people, and in the taking of the money and spending it again the Government subtracts a terrific amount for overhead—and with little accountability unless you, the people, demand Government be accountable and responsible for the money that is collected and spent allegedly in your interests.

There are four basic axioms which I follow. I shall document these briefly and then go on to make what I hope will be some positive suggestions for your further consideration. By the way, if I seem to get after you a little bit as though I were taking you to task or inferring that you should take an active part in government, let me assure you that it is the shoe pinching me that causes this approach on my part. As a businessman I neglected my civic chores, I am afraid, and now I am trying to make up for it.

You know when it comes to government, people are interested, I am sure, right up to the point where they are expected to do something themselves to make a contribution of their own time and effort toward good government, and at that point they conveniently find they are too busy with other things and too often fail to take the part they should to keep our representative form of government on course.

Now, for the four positive suggestions as to what we should do in trying to keep our form of government on course, in order to preserve freedom and free enterprise and stem the tide toward the bureaucratic centralization of government at the Federal level, which ultimately, if unchecked, must deprive us of the freedom we hold so dear. These four points I intend to follow. First, let's stop increasing the size and functions of Federal Government; second, let's eliminate those functions of government in which the Government has no business being; third, let's decentralize the Government back as far as possible to the State and local level where the 10th amendment says it should be; and, fourth, let's rededicate ourselves to recognizing and keeping our faith in what comes from the Almighty, our basic rights and freedoms. Let's keep Government our servant, not our master. This fourth point is simply restating the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution in letter and spirit. Now to recapitulate, let's examine these four principles in the light of current events, in your business and in affairs of Government, all of which actually are your business.

If the state of the Union message did not cause you to sit up and take notice, surely the budget message and the economic report must have done so. I am talking about point No. 1, which was: "Let's stop increasing the size and functions of Federal Government." Government is already huge and swollen at the Washington level. Should we enlarge it? Of course not. The budget is twice the size of a Sears, Roebuck catalog, 6 pounds, 4 ounces, 9 by 11½ by 2½ inches, 1,521 pages, thousands of items, totaling $71.8 billion, $3 billion more than fiscal 1957.

[In billions]

| | 1957 | 1958 |
|---|---|---|
| Interest on public debt | $7.1 | $7.4 |
| National defense | 38.5 | 39.5 |
| Veterans' benefits | 4.9 | 5.0 |
| Foreign aid | 4.9 | 5.0 |
| Federal payroll | 9.5 | 10.2 |
| Miscellaneous subsidies, grants, etc. | 4.0 | 4.7 |
| Total | 68.9 | 71.8 |

Commendable features stress need for a sound dollar, combating inflation, balanced budget, surplus property sale, Government out of business, and natural gas bill endorsement. Self-contradictory? It's your money. Isn't this inflationary? Let's not justify any Government program by comparing it to an even more questionable one, as some do of the foreign aid.

This calls to mind the three seemingly self-contradictory axioms of this administration, axioms the President early recognized and demonstrated. These were: First, Government expenditure can be decreased and national income increased. Rather than national prosperity being based on increasing Government expenditure, the reverse can be true. The Truman budget was cut $10 billion and taxes cut $7.4 billion. Second, that taxes can be reduced and the budget balanced. Third, that economic controls can be removed and economic stability maintained. Now, remember these three axioms because they prove once and for all that it is not necessary to increase further the size of Federal Government. All right, now, let's think about the budget and economic message this year. We see the expenditures of the various Government departments are slated to go up. We see aid for new programs, like school construction; we see a new civil-rights program with a provision for unlimited new employees; we see additional public housing, public power, and other welfare measures; we see the highest peacetime budget in his-

tory. But like an iceberg, you only see part of it; you see this budget is not the whole story. It is an accounting budget and is not the cash budget. Actually the expenditures for the next fiscal year will not be $71.8 billion, as the budget shows, but rather $96 billion or more because the highway expenditures, social security, and other welfare and trust funds are not included in the budget. At the same time, income will not be $73.6 billion as it's anticipated, but actually in the neighborhood of $99 billion or more. Does this strike you as being just a little bit large? Is there any need for increasing Government further in size? Further, local and State cost of government should total $50 billion plus or minus, making a total of $150 billion for all government.

At this point I recall a conversation I had recently with Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey when we discussed at great length the current financial situation, which I well know affects you so keenly in your various business interests. The Secretary pointed out that money spent by the Federal Government is nonproductive money; that is, when money is taken from the taxpayer by the Government and spent by the Government for, let's say, defense weapons, as an obvious example, this money is not productive; whereas, if left in the pocket of the consumer, it would go to buy more goods which would mean more production, more jobs and higher standard of living.

We discussed at some length the tight money situation. Let me endeavor to pass on several of his view which strike me as good sense. First of all he put his finger, I believe, on the sore spot in the money market today and the key to the preservation of free enterprise, as opposed to bureaucratic control and inflation. He said there ought to be a flexible price for money; that interest rates must be left to change, depending on the supply and demand in the money market. This flexibility will serve as a natural governor of the cost of living and will preserve a virile economy, so that when the price of money rises it will tend to keep the demand for expansion in line with the supply of resources.

In this system, people's confidence in business is reaffirmed and the incentive to save and invest creates more and more savings; more savings means more money available for loans and for business expansion; this means more jobs and that means a higher standard of living and so on. This is the way he presented the formula to me. With the stimulus and incentive of a "natural" interest rate savings and investments are stimulated. This will make for high productivity because there will be capital available for plant expansion. Factories will expand more, machines will be put into operation because of the availability of the money. High productivity, in turn, means high wages because there can be no sensibly increased wages that are not tied to increased productivity. This is an axiom that labor and business must never forget. High wages, in turn, means the high standard of living.

On the other hand, inflation kills the entire process. Inflation can result from the arbitrary control by government of the supply of money, and by other Government controls of business economically. Government tampering as it was done prior to 1952 with the value of money, before the Federal Reserve Board was divorced from Government, resulted in watering the buying power of our dollar. The cost of living increased. There were artificially low interest rates. This, in turn, killed the incentive to save and invest. There was deficit financing, cheap money as it is known, and always inflation killing the desire to save. Today we see the earlier investments in Government bonds and life insurance have been watered because of inflation. Government dabbled in all kinds of controls—price, wage, rent, allocation of materials. Inflation naturally results when there is more money available than products to buy, people to work, and materials to use. These factors will always be out of kilter when Uncle Sam endeavors to run our intricate economy and most disastrously when without reference to the market places where supply and demand govern. Government will be in your picture; this we know. Here again it is hard to apply Lincoln's yardsticks today. President Eisenhower, dwelling on Lincoln's philosophy in 1954 said, "In all those things which deal with people, be liberal, be human. In all those things which deal with the people's money, their economy, or their form of government, be conservative." When applied to our present Federal Government, to me this becomes a succinctly stated contradiction. Everything Government does takes terrific expenditures, and this money comes from the citizens' pockets. Being liberal or conservative with one means being liberal or conservative with the other. All of which returns me to point No. 1, "We must stop increasing the size of Federal Government." Yet, the budget shows Government increasing in almost every department.

Now point No. 2: Let's eliminate government from those fields where it has no place being. As one reference, the Hoover Commission has spelled out the way this can be done and I commend it to you for such study as you can make. This may be of great interest to you. You will learn that the Defense Department is engaged in over 2,500 different business activities, many of them in direct competition with free enterprise. There are 2,000 water projects and 2,000 storage installations. Why should Uncle Sam, as TVA, manufacture fertilizer? Did you know that the last session of Congress actually passed a law that would prevent the Defense Department from getting out of business? The administration has made strides in eliminating government from many areas of business operation, but much more remains to be done, and looking at the current budget, I can suggest immediately several areas wherein the budget could be cut; where we could eliminate government and not be sacrificing any allegedly basic programs needed to preserve both our necessary services for the people and to stimulate our economy for future growth. First of all would be the elimination of the Government from business enterprises, as the Hoover Commission outlines. In this connection, the Government is the Nation's biggest electric-power producer, the biggest power consumer, the biggest banker, the biggest employer, the biggest insurance company, biggest landlord, biggest tenant, and biggest publisher. In fact, Uncle Sam owns more wheat than the wheat farmers, more grassland than the cattlemen, and more trucks than General Motors. Our national debt is $279 billion and we have a hidden debt of $250 billion, plus or minus, and a tax rate overall of 30 cents on the dollar.

We know that wherever free enterprise can do the job, the Government should not be in business. Another example, there are 104 different lending agencies in Government. We know some can be eliminated and some combined, all at a savings to the taxpayer.

Second, let's increase the sale of surplus property. Hundreds of millions of dollars in the last session of Congress were added to the Federal Treasury from the sale of such property. Much more of this can be accomplished.

Third. While there is a differing of opinions between many Congressmen, I maintain that parts of the foreign-aid program can be eliminated where we have learned we cannot buy friends and where our experience shows there is waste and overlapping.

Fourth. We can eliminate many of the existing and proposed public works projects, including many of the public power developments where private industry can accomplish the task without a burden on the taxpayer.

Fifth. We should not start any new welfare or social programs, as for example, the school construction program when private initiative at the local and State level can do the job, nor the new Niagara power development nor the Frying Pan-Arkansas River project nor any of the new projects unless they are of such a nature that only the Federal Government can do them, if they must be at all.

Beyond this, all of us recognize the danger of a blank check to our Government for military and economic assistance to all the nations of the world. As evidenced in our President's inaugural address and state of the Union message, the United States has charted a new course in world affairs, namely that of unlimited responsibility for the free nations of the world, both as to their military defense and economic security. It seems to me we are going much too far for our financial ability. So much for the second point.

The third point, let us decentralize the Government wherever possible back to the State and local level. This is a belief in States rights. For example, take the current debate on the school construction program. There is no money that does not come from the taxpayer and we get back only a fraction at the local level of what we paid to Uncle Sam. These schools can be built at the local level as they are being built—67,500 classrooms having been built in the last year. We are licking the problem without Federal aid and Federal aid means Federal control. In this, as in many other programs, let's leave it at the State level. If financial help is needed, leave 1 or 2 percent of the Federal income tax in the State. Or take the civil rights bill. It actually proposed that the State courts be bypassed and cases be taken directly to the Federal courts. Here again State facilities could be used in preference to further Federal centralization.

Point No. 4 is the most important of all in that it defines the proper role of government. Let's reaffirm our faith in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Have we really outgrown these simple truths? I do not think we have, not even in this jet and atomic age. As a matter of fact, what is the role of government? It can be most simply stated in this way—government should in practice reaffirm and reestablish the confidence of the people in themselves by bolstering and strengthening the free-enterprise system rather than undermining or weakening it through top-heavy Government intervention in our affairs, economic or otherwise. Our freedoms are so closely interrelated in this country that any loss of economic freedom ultimately means loss of all freedom.

In stressing these four basic principles or yardsticks to follow in government I recognize it is difficult at best to ever get the Government to retrench. There is a self-perpetuating, if not a built-in growth factor, in government that cannot be overlooked. There's good reason for a single citizen or group of citizens to feel somewhat helpless when faced with challenging this towering bureaucracy. But there is a way that it can be done if the people want to do it. Rest assured the Government will not retrench and economize and follow the basic axioms which I have discussed tonight, either in letter or spirit, unless the people demand it. Self-discipline is lacking in the pressure groups, in Members of Congress, and in the administration. The President recognized this in his state of the Union message, and I fear demonstrated far beyond what any of us care to see that self-discipline was lacking in the budget. In my brief time in Congress I can assure you I have frequently witnessed the lack of self-discipline in the

Chamber as we debated and voted on current issues of the day.

Our role in world affairs is difficult to interpret and challenging. Lincoln, and President Eisenhower in quoting him, said, "Liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope for the world for all time." Again, it is a matter of interpretation. Our role in history, it seems to me, is by precept and example to inspire other nations to freedom, self-determination, and economic prosperity—not for us to make each nation militarily and economically secure. This goal is too gigantic and is impractical financially. Some nations are not ready in their own level of development for our United States philosophy and social standards. It seems mighty risky to me to impose one nation's will on another, no matter how idealistic the motivation. Anyway, I'm sure the philosophy of Abe Lincoln is timeless, as are all abiding principles, and will work today as yesteryear. It's just a matter of not misinterpreting.

To correct the lack of self-discipline in domestic affairs and protect our constitutional form of government in world affairs, let me outline five constitutional amendments, which, if supported and sponsored by the people, can help to solve the grave problems facing us today, both at home and abroad.

First, the Byrd-Bridges amendment. To require annual budget balancing by limiting congressional appropriations in any fiscal year to the estimated receipts of the Government for that fiscal year, except in times of dire emergency to be determined by three-fourths vote of the Congress.

Second, the Reed-Dirksen amendment. To eliminate to a large extent the heavy progressive rate feature from our income-tax system without impairing the power of Congress to raise revenue. This amendment limits the top rate of income taxes to 25 percent, but, unlike the rigid 25-percent restriction in the amendment which has for the last 17 years been going through the State Legislatures, this amendment permits Congress to exceed the 25-percent rate by a three-fourths vote, provided that in such event the top rate of tax shall not exceed the lowest rate by more than 15 percentage points. This amendment also returns to the States, where it belongs, the right to tax inheritances and gifts.

Third, the Mundt-Coudert amendment. To reform the electoral college by choosing electors by congressional districts, and 2 at large to correspond with each State's 2 United States Senators. This amendment is designed to take away the excessive power now exercised by the larger cities in the present electoral-college system, thus removing the excessive influence of minority groups in such larger cities.

Fourth, the Reed-Walter amendment. To give to the States full power to amend the Constitution without the intervention of Congress.

Fifth, the Bricker amendment. To prevent the changing of our Constitution and our domestic law by use of the treaty power. This amendment would make our Constitution inviolate so that no executive agreements or treaties, such as the U. N. Charter or the various multilateral pacts, could abridge our Constitution and would give us a measure of safety in our foreign affairs which we do not now enjoy. This week some of us witnessed the House transferring from Congress to the President the authority to wage war and then further transferring the jurisdiction over our troops to the Security Council of the United Nations, thus completely superseding and setting aside our Constitution.

These five amendments offer a blueprint of how the people, how you, can make your voices heard so that government must trim its sails, balance the budget, reduce taxes, reduce the debt, and keep government from growing out of hand. You can and must take a part. Believers in freedom and free enterprise, you really have no choice but to do so.

Today's world events and our domestic affairs alarm me considerably. I am convinced that in national policy, just as in daily conduct, the Lord helps those who help themselves. If we, all of us, individually and collectively, pray as though it all depended on the Almighty and work as though it all depended on ourselves in matters of government, we could have the calm and comforting knowledge that "Thy will be done" would have real meaning. We will have taken our legitimate and necessary part in directing the course of our Government and our lives.

No man's effort and fight for the right is wasted. As we face our individual problems in daily life and in government, endeavoring to solve our problems and the problems of this troubled world, knowing that the solution must be found or we perish, we might remember the debt we owe those who have gone before us—men like Lincoln and our combat buddies who did not return. We might now recall President Lincoln's prophetic words—"That we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Government, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from this earth." Finally, "With God's help, we shall not fail."

Thank you.

---

## How Long Can They Stand It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 28, 1957*

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, how long can the farmers of America stand the assault of economic pressure which is being used against them? A few days ago in the House I challenged the policies of the Secretary of Agriculture, whose claim is that the farm prices were 5 percent higher than a year ago.

PRICES DOWN, COSTS UP

It was announced by the United States Department of Agriculture, as of February 28, that prices received by farmers for crops and livestock fell another 2 percent for the month ended February 15, while, meanwhile, the cost of production and living supplies purchased by farmers rose nearly 1 percent during the month.

Agriculture now is taking a large share of the brunt of this perilous course of action which day by day is getting worse. How long can these 22 million people on American farms keep going? We need a courageous course of action by the policymaking people in the administration, not the slow whittling-down plan which could lead to the serfdom of our rural people. I stress again that a change in policy direction be made, and made soon. The United States Department of Labor only 1 week ago announced living costs for the fifth consecutive month had scored another record high.

Mr. Speaker, how long can the rest of America survive this?